UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 108—PART 5

APRIL 3, 1962, TO APRIL 24, 1962
(PAGES 5745 TO 7140)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1962

J
11
.R
v.108
pt. 5

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rabbi Alex J. Goldman, of the West Oak Lane Jewish Community Center, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Baruch atta Adonoi Elohenu melech haolam shenatan mechachmato l'vasar vadam.

Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, King of the universe, who hast shared of Thine divine wisdom with mortal man.

O Thou who endowest man with wisdom and understanding, we pray for Thy guidance in the work of our hands. Gird us with strength, courage, and determination as we deliberate the destiny of our land. Strengthen the chords of our hearts, that we may with all our might strive to achieve the noble principles upon which America rests.

Pour forth Thy manifold blessings upon the President of the United States, the Vice President, all the Senators of this great House of service, and upon all others chosen to lead our Nation.

Do Thou, Heavenly Father, instruct and teach them out of Thy law, that they may continue to serve Thee, our citizens, and all mankind with distinction, glory, and honor. Inspire our people all over the land to encourage, support, and strengthen the work of their hands and their minds.

Unite us all, we pray Thee, into a brotherhood of peoples, a brotherhood true, sure, and constant.

May all the nations of the world perceive and know the meaning and blessing of peace. May they, with America at the forefront, lead the effort to bring peace and security, freedom and understanding, to all mankind.

Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who wilt lead us to the day of peace. In Thee we place our trust. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 2, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements in connection with the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. SPARKMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

JOINT MEETING TOMORROW TO HEAR ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF BRAZIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that tomorrow, at 12:30, there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses in the Hall of the House of Representatives, to hear an address by the President of the United States of Brazil. It is anticipated that the Senate in a body will leave this Chamber at approximately 12:15.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Spain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank B. Ellis, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William M. Burkhalter, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I was delighted that the President of the United States nominated William M. Burkhalter, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board. Mr. Burkhalter is a very able lawyer, a distinguished citizen, and will be a conscientious public servant. He has been very active in Tennessee State Society affairs and has an excellent background for the particular position for which he has been appointed, as to which his nomination has been confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Raymond H. Dwigans, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert M. Ball, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Social Security, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that tomorrow will be the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1278, House Joint Resolution 441. The joint resolution would commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 441) to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1277, Senate Joint Resolution 99, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], which is also a joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to section 4355 of title 10, United States Code, I hereby appoint Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, and Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, as members to the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy.

Pursuant to section 6968 of title 10, United States Code, I hereby appoint Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and Senator J. CALEB BOGGS, of Delaware as members to the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

Pursuant to section 9355 of title 10, United States Code, I hereby appoint Senator GALE W. MCGEE, of Wyoming, Senator ALAN BIBLE, of Nevada, and Senator JACK R. MILLER, of Iowa, as members to the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

Pursuant to section 194 of title 14, United States Code, I hereby appoint Senator OREN E. LONG, of Hawaii, as a member to the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

Pursuant to section 1126c of title 46, United States Code, I hereby appoint Senator BENJAMIN A. SMITH, of Massachusetts, as a member to the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1962, FOR THE JUDICIARY, AND PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1961 AND 1962, FOR THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH (S. DOC. NO. 83)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1962, in the amount of $300,000 for the judiciary, and proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years 1961 and 1962, in the amount of $17,300,000 for the executive branch, together with proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the period July 1961–January 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED ASPECTS OF THE DOMESTIC URANIUM PROCUREMENT PROGRAM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected aspects of the domestic uranium procurement program, Atomic Energy Commission, June 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

APPROVAL OF CONTRACT NEGOTIATED WITH THE QUINCY COLUMBIA BASIN IRRIGATION DISTRICT

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Districts, and to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 (57 Stat. 14), as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF A CERTAIN ALIEN

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order suspending deportation in the case of Gain Yuey Wong, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to the alien and the reason for ordering the suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 29

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, in 1956, enacted the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

"Whereas the Congress found in said act that 'In the case of recurring natural disasters, including recurring floods, insurance protection against individual and public loss is not always practically available through private or public sources'; and

"Whereas the avowed purpose of said act was to establish a program of Federal insurance and reinsurance against the risk of floods and to encourage private insurance covering such flood risks; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore failed to appropriate the funds necessary to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

"Whereas since 1956 there have been numerous disasters, storms, and floods in many of the States of this Nation; causing untold damage to public and private property; and

"Whereas in the State of New Jersey, as a result of the storm and flood of March 1962 alone, the damage to public and private property will exceed $100 million; and

"Whereas the public and private losses suffered as a result of such storms and floods have caused widespread distress and hardship adversely affecting the general welfare without regard to State boundary lines; and

"Whereas much of said distress and hardship could have been avoided, reduced, or guarded against if the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 had been properly and adequately implemented at the time of its original passage; and

"Whereas it is in the common interest of all of the States of this Nation to support the program of insurance protection provided for in the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has stated his approval of this program and willingness to implement its provisions as soon as the necessary funds are provided: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:*

"1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact the legislation necessary to fully implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956.

"2. The secretary of state shall transmit forthwith a duly attested copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senators from New Jersey and to each Member of the House of Representatives of the United States elected from New Jersey.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Sugar Act for the purpose of encouraging the American farmer to produce a favorable portion of our sugar requirements within the Continental United States

"*To the Congress of the United States of America:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas it is necessary for the economy and welfare of this country that we produce a favorable portion of our sugar requirements within the continental limits of the United States; and

"Whereas our former source of procuring large quantities of sugar is now closed, it becomes more imperative than ever that we utilize our own resources within the continental limits of the United States; and

"Whereas the production of cane and beet sugar in the State of Arizona would not only improve the economy of the State but would divert acreage now producing surplus crops to the production of sugar; and

"Whereas the State of Arizona has 1,260,000 acres of the finest farmland in the country. Furthermore, Arizona is blessed with a favorable climate with fewer weather hazards than other areas in the United States now raising sugarbeets; and

"Whereas a sugar mill in Arizona would have advantages over mills located in other States. Due to weather conditions in Arizona, the producing areas would harvest their crop at different times thereby allowing the mill a longer period for productivity: Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona prays:

"1. That the State of Arizona has amply demonstrated that it has the desire to participate in sugar production, the climate and the available acreage and the willingness to establish a sugar mill.

"2. That the Congress of the United States amend the Sugar Act by establishing substantial quotas for Arizona and other States which are capable of economically growing cane and beet sugar and who are desirous of participating in the industry.

"3. That the secretary of state transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the members of the Arizona delegation in Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL 1

"Concurrent memorial requesting the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Interior to take appropriate action to name the Glen Canyon Dam the Fred T. Colter Dam

"To the Congress of the United States of America and the Secretary of the Department of Interior:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The Honorable Fred T. Colter, a native Arizonian, distinguished himself by his civic and political activities throughout his life up until the time of his death.

"Mr. Colter was born in the village of Nutrioso, Apache County, Ariz. In addition to being an established rancher, he participated in Arizona political activities and was instrumental in developing not only the Constitution of Arizona but many of the laws which make up the Arizona Revised Statutes.

"Fred T. Colter was a member of the constitutional convention which met in Phoenix, Ariz., in 1910. Mr. Colter, along with former Governor Osborne, had the distinction of being one of the youngest members of the constitutional convention. Moreover, he served the citizens of this State as State senator and representative and also in other county offices.

"The interest of Fred T. Colter in the development of Arizona was maintained by him throughout his life. He became interested in the utilization of water from the Colorado River and pushed his program forward relentlessly for many years. For their time, his ideas relating to the use of water appeared visionary but as the years passed it was realized that he had proposed a practical program of water utilization: Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, the House of Representatives concurring, prays:

"1. That in honor of Fred T. Colter, a person of established eminence, the Glen Canyon Dam be hereafter named the Fred T. Colter Dam.

"2. That the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Interior recognize the achievements of Fred T. Colter and his importance in development of the State of Arizona, and take appropriate action which would result in changing the name of the Glen Canyon Dam to the Fred T. Colter Dam.

"3. That the secretary of state of the State of Arizona be directed to transmit a certified copy of this memorial to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of Interior, and to each member of the Arizona congressional delegation."

Resolutions adopted by the city councils of Pacific Grove, Woodland, Rolling Hills Estates, Woodlake, Morgan Hill, Mount Shasta, Alhambra, and the boards of supervisors of Lake County, Sacramento County, and Mariposa County, all of the State of California, protesting against the enactment of legislation to impose a Federal income tax on income derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the junior chamber of commerce of the Virgin Islands, favoring the principle of more self-government for the Virgin Islands in the form of an elected Governor and voting representation in Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED—RESOLUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Massachusetts House of Representatives has passed a resolution asking the U.S. Congress to enact legislation to provide medical care for the aged under the social security program.

I would like to present this resolution to the Senate today as evidence that this approach provides the only practical answer to the enormous problem now facing this Congress—that of providing adequate medical care for our senior citizens.

Many opponents of this program, which is embodied in the King-Anderson bill, feel that the Kerr-Mills bill will fill the need in this area. The record shows, however, that the Kerr-Mills bill has not done the job properly.

During the first year the bill was in operation—at a cost of $215 million—less than 1 percent of the Nation's senior citizens were helped.

Almost five out of six beneficiaries live in only three States—New York, Michigan, and my own State of Massachusetts. These three States spent 92 cents out of every dollar used through this bill.

Massachusetts offered as full a program of benefits under the Kerr-Mills Act as any other State in the Union.

In the first year of operation, however, these benefits cost over $40 million of which more than $20 million came out of the pockets of the citizens of the State. At no time during that year were more than 3 percent of the 571,600 senior citizens of the Commonwealth receiving Kerr-Mills benefits. The State was still paying medical bills for thousands of senior citizens who did not fall within the Kerr-Mills provisions.

I think this is ample proof that the Kerr-Mills program has not worked and will not work even when it is used, as it is in Massachusetts, to its broadest extent.

I ask unanimous consent to enter in the RECORD this resolution calling for a national program of medical care to the aging under social security.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS TO ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING MEDICAL CARE FOR THE ELDERLY THROUGH SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCING

Whereas a major problem facing a large number of the elderly citizens among us is how to meet the rising cost of medical care with fixed or declining income; and

Whereas the social security system has enabled large numbers of our elderly citizens to maintain a way of life which preserves their identity—and their dignity—and their independence—and their purpose; and

Whereas adding medical care would be a natural extension of the social security idea; and

Whereas the medical care proposal is deadlocked in Congress; and

Whereas the problem involved transcends party: It is hereby

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide medical care for the elderly through social security financing, and that the State secretary transmit a copy of these resolutions to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

Adopted by the house of representatives February 21, 1962.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

SHORE PROTECTION PROJECT ALONG THE ATLANTIC COASTLINE OF NEW YORK STATE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the New York State Legislature recently passed a concurrent resolution requesting the President and the Congress to implement the project to aid storm-damaged beach barriers along the Atlantic coastline of the State, by making available its share of the necessary funds for the project. Last Saturday the New York State Legislature appropriated $10 million to get started on the work. This is a significant token of the State's good faith. The readiness of the Governor to go ahead is apparent. I am hopeful the Congress here will boost the preconstruction planning funds to $250,000 so that the damage can be repaired and preventive measures be taken, before the autumn storms strike.

Mr. President, I ask that this concurrent resolution of the New York State Legislature be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 189

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to make funds available for a shore protection project between Fire Island Inlet and Montauk Point

Whereas the recent storms and high tides, which caused widespread damage to public and private property and to the barrier beaches along the Atlantic coastline of the State of New York, have dramatically emphasized and have made more critical the need for action to protect life and property from the havoc of future storms; and

Whereas the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers issued in July of 1958 a cooperative beach erosion control and interim hurricane study of that section of the Atlantic coastline of the State of New York between Fire Island Inlet and Montauk Point, which study called for a substantial shore protection project in said area; and

Whereas a combined Federal project for beach erosion control and hurricane protection of said area was authorized by the Congress of the United States in the River and Harbor Act approved on July 14, 1960, with costs to be shared by the local, State and Federal Governments; and

Whereas the Congress has not as yet appropriated funds for the initiation of said project, which is estimated to cost approximately $40,000,000, and the President's budget for the fiscal year 1963 includes only $50,000 for preconstruction planning of said project; and

Whereas the Governor of the State of New York has assured the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Chief of Engineers of the Department of the Army of the State's firm intention to make available its share of the necessary funds for said project, and of the readiness of State officials to work with the corps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the President and Congress of the United States, be and they are hereby respectfully memorialized to implement said project with all possible urgency and expedition to provide the necessary Federal appropriations for that purpose; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States, duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

By order of the assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

By order of the senate:

JOHN J. SULLIVAN,
Secretary.

KATYN FOREST MASSACRE—RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the downstate New York division of the Polish American Congress adopted a resolution on March 18, 1962, at the 22d anniversary of the Katyn Forest Massacre.

In 1940 in the Katyn Woods near Smolensk, Russia, 4,800 Polish Army officers were massacred by Soviet NKVD agents. The Polish American Congress requests that the facts of this genocide, gathered at the Special Katyn Investigating Committee and transmitted to the Secretary of State on December 22, 1952, be widely publicized so that all the world can know the truth of this shocking tragedy.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the guilt of Soviet NKVD agents in the bloodcurdling massacre of four thousand eight hundred odd Polish Army officers in the Katyn Woods near Smolensk, Soviet Russia, early in 1940, has been duly established; and

Whereas in spite of official Soviet denials, Swiss experts in forensic medicine, brought to the Katyn mass graves during the war, have established the approximate date of the crime as early Spring, 1940, long before the German invasion of the U.S.S.R.; and

Whereas a special U.S. congressional investigation committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana, after a series of hearings conducted both in the United States and in several European countries, found substantial corroborative evidence of the perpetration of the said massacre of the Polish Army officers by Soviet NKVD agents in the Katyn Woods early in the spring of 1940; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States on December 22, 1952 transmitted the findings of the Special Katyn Investigating Committee to the Secretary of State with the request that a copy of its findings together with the minutes of its hearings be transmitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations; which request remains unfulfilled; and

Whereas Nikita Khrushchev, Premier of the U.S.S.R. in his by now world-famous denunciation of Joseph Stalin's crimes during the sessions of the 22nd Congress of World Communist parties failed to mention Stalin's genocide crime perpetrated in the Katyn Woods near Smolensk in the spring of 1940: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this meeting of Americans of Polish birth or descent, assembled in the Polish Community Center (Polish National Home), 19–25, St. Marks Place in the city of New York under the auspices of the New York downstate division of the Polish American Congress, express to Dr. Dean Rusk, our present Secretary of State this resolution with the request that the 1952 recommendation of the U.S. Congress be fulfilled and the U.S. delegation be instructed to present the findings of the special congressional Katyn Investigating Committee to the General Assembly of the United Nations, and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the chairmen of the Foreign Relations Committees of both Houses of the Congress and the two U.S. Senators from New York.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted at a meeting of Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, relating to the restoration of the independence of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN RALLY ON FEBRUARY 18, 1962

We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, loyal citizens and residents of the United States, gathered on February 18 of this year of grace 1962 at Webster Hall in New York City to commemorate the 44th anniversary of the restoration of the independent Lithuanian State.

Voicing once more our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by the government of the Soviet Union of Lithuania's independence and freedom and her subjugation to Soviet colonial exploitation,

Pointing out that the global surge toward national independence poses a particular challenge to the United States and other Western countries to press for the restoration of Lithuania and to all other captive European nations of a free exercise of their right to self-determination,

Stating that the present Soviet political moves in Europe as well as in Latin America, Asia, and Africa are aimed at the consolidation of Soviet imperialist conquests and at creating conditions for further Communist expansion in Europe and elsewhere;

Considering that the Soviet Union, while hypocritically posing as champion of freedom and national independence to former colonial peoples, is stiffening its regime of oppression in Lithuania and increasing its measures of Russification of the Soviet-enslaved Baltic nations with their highly developed culture and traditions of independent life: Therefore be it

Resolved—1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States firmly to restate and vigorously to promote a permanent U.S. policy of the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania and other captive countries of central and eastern Europe, through free and unfettered elections after the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and agents, and to reaffirm the determination of the Government of this great country not to be party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subjugation of Lithuania, now held in bondage by the U.S.S.R.;

2. To request the President of the United States that, in line with the principles enumerated above and to the advantage of both the United States and captive Lithuania, the issue of the abolition of Soviet colonial rule in Lithuania and of the restoration of her rights to national independence be raised at the United Nations and at any forthcoming international conferences and negotiations;

3. To ask the President of the United States to designate the third week of July 1962, as Captive Nations Week;

4. To insist that the Free Europe Radio initiate broadcasts in Lithuanian language to Soviet-occupied Lithuania;

5. To rededicate ourselves to the just cause of Lithuania's independence and freedom and to combat Communist aggression and Soviet-Russian imperialism;

6. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of the indissolubility of our ties and of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and freedom;

7. To support our brothers and sisters in Moscow's bondage in their efforts to maintain their national identity and culture and to oppose all Soviet-Russian measures of Russification;

8. To support actively the policy of the U.S. Government aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and durable peace based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to governments of their own choosing.

STEPHEN BREDES, Jr.,
President, Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H.R. 6676. An act to designate the Kettle Creek Dam on Kettle Creek, Pa., as the Alvin R. Bush Dam (Rept. No. 1320).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 2801. A bill to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to extend for 2 years the time during which a certain definition of the term "obsolete vessel" shall be used (Rept. No. 1322); and

S. 2829. A bill to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title (Rept. No. 1323).

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 323. Resolution authorizing for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare additional copies of hearings on S. 1129, a bill to stabilize the domestic farm labor force.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1321)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 2800) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to make permanent a temporary increase in the maximum construction differential subsidy that may be paid under such act and to provide that such maximum shall not apply with respect to reconstructing or reconditioning of ships.

I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Douglas in the chair). The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. Metcalf, and Mr. Mansfield):

S. 3097. A bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give full force and effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidations and mergers until December 31, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kefauver when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Case of New Jersey, Mr. Scott, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Bush):

S. 3098. A bill to provide that, for purposes of certain studies, investigations, and demonstrations authorized with respect to mental illness under the Public Health Service Act, addiction to narcotics be considered as a mental illness; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ (by request):

S. 3099. A bill to authorize an adequate White House Police force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks by Mr. Chavez when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 3100. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Georgetown, Colo., to Frank W. Whitenack; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 3101. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the American War Mothers, Inc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 3102. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 3103. A bill to amend section 4281, title 18, of the United States Code to increase from $30 to $100, the amount of gratuity which may be furnished by the Attorney General to prisoners discharged from imprisonment or released on parole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Missouri when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3104. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that the minimum quota for any quota area shall be 250; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 3105. A bill to provide that the law limiting the transportation of merchandise in the coastwise trade to certain U.S. vessels shall not apply to such transportation between a port on the east coast of the United States and a port on the west coast of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3106. A bill to make certain federally impacted areas eligible for assistance under the public facility loan program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 179. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate May 1, 1962, as a day for observance of the courage displayed by the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto against the Nazis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

EXPRESSION OF WILLINGNESS OF THE SENATE TO COOPERATE IN A SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM

Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Dirksen, and Mr. Humphrey) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 324) expressing the willingness of the Senate to cooperate in a Senate youth program, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Kuchel, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORIZATION FOR AN ADEQUATE WHITE HOUSE POLICE FORCE

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize an adequate White House Police force, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury requesting the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3099) to authorize an adequate White House Police force, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Chavez, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter presented by Mr. Chavez is as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1962.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to authorize an adequate White House Police Force, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to: (1) Remove the existing numerical limit on the strength of the White House Police Force; (2) include in permanent law, with modifications, language that has appeared in acts making annual appropriations for the force; and (3) clarify certain language pertaining to the duties of the force.

With respect to the first purpose of the bill, the numerical limit on the White House Police Force is 170 members. This limit has now been reached and an increase in the force is necessary to assure the effective performance of its responsibilities.

The limit on the strength of the White House Police Force currently in effect was set at 170 members in 1952 (act of June 28, 1952; 66 Stat. 283). During the 10-year period since that time, there has been a general increase in all phases of White House activity causing increased demands on the force. The number of individuals visiting the White House on public tours rose to an alltime high of 1,320,000 persons during 1961, necessitating additional personnel to handle the large crowds. Special tours which were previously conducted by only one or two men now require the services of as many as five or six men. Press conferences which required five officers in the Executive Office Building now require a minimum of 11 in the new State Department building. The increase in the number of visitors having official business with the White House staff has imposed added screening functions and workmen performing repairs have required extra man-hours for escort duties. Recent Presidents have maintained other residences in addition to the Executive Mansion, making it necessary during their sojourn at these abodes to utilize White House Police as an outside perimeter of defense. In addition, a total of 20 policemen have been assigned since 1959 to protective duties in the White House areas of the Executive Office Building pursuant to authority contained in annual appropriation acts. Thus, the increased workload of the White House Police force has made the existing ceiling on its total authorized strength inadequate.

The Department believes that it would be preferable to control the size of the White House Police force through the annual budget process rather than by the inclusion of a ceiling as a part of permanent law. Budget requests for the White House Police force are initially carefully evaluated in the Department. Thereafter, they are thoroughly reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget. After submission to the Congress, the requests must be adequately justified before the appropriations committees of both Houses. Hence, the appropriation process assures that the staff of the White House Police force is held to the minimum number necessary to perform its functions and a ceiling in permanent law serves no useful purpose. Personnel ceilings in the basic statute have proved too inflexible in the past as is evidenced by the six increases that it has been necessary for the Congress to enact since the creation of the White House Police force in 1922 (act of May 14, 1930, 46 Stat. 329; act of May 28, 1935, 49 Stat. 304; act of April 22, 1940, 54 Stat. 156; act of June 9, 1947, 61 Stat. 132; act of August 15, 1950, 64 Stat. 448; act of June 28, 1952, supra).

In regard to the second purpose of the bill, the White House Police force, has, as previously stated, performed protective duties in the White House are as of the Executive Office Building since 1959 under the authority of language appearing in annual appropriation acts. The draft bill would incorporate this appropriation language as a part of permanent law with modifications considered desirable because of the following circumstances.

Under the appropriation language in question, the protective functions of the White House Police force in the Executive Office Building are limited to the White House areas of the building. Thus, only certain areas of the Executive Office Building are protected by the White House Police force with the remainder being afforded protection by guards of the General Services Administration. The performance of protective functions by two separate forces results in dual responsibility with respect to the protection of one building. Such dual responsibility is undesirable from the standpoint of efficient management.

To eliminate the foregoing situation, the draft bill would consolidate in the White House Police force the function of protecting the entire building where members of the White House staff have offices. The language of the proposed legislation has been phrased in general terms rather than naming a specific building, for example, in order to provide the necessary flexibility to meet future situations without another amendment to the statute. To illustrate, members of the White House staff now have offices in the Executive Office Building. However, funds have been appropriated for a new office building which will be ultimately occupied by the staff. Thus, general language is needed to authorize protection under present as well as future conditions.

As to the third purpose of the bill, the basic statute, after establishing the White House Police force for the protection of the Executive Mansion and Grounds, further provides that the members of the force shall have such additional duties as the Chief of the Secret Service Division may prescribe. The latter language would appear sufficiently broad to permit the use of the White House Police force anywhere for any purpose. However, the use of the White House Police outside the confines of the Executive Mansion and Grounds has, under the language in question, been generally limited in practice to the performance of duties incidental to the protection of the President and his immediate family. As previously indicated, the force has been used at press conferences held outside the White House confines and at residences other than the Executive Mansion during visits by the President and his family. It has also been utilized at other locations outside the White House Grounds proper, such as the White House garage and the White House mail room where security precautions are considered necessary to guard against possible indirect attempts to harm the President. Thus, the draft bill would substitute for the catchall phrase appearing in existing law revised language which would limit the incidental duties of the White House Police to past practice, i.e., these duties prescribed in connection with the protection of the President and his family. The draft bill would also revise the language of existing law to reflect the effect of Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 which vested in the Secretary of the Treasury all the functions previously vested in subordinate Treasury officials.

There is enclosed for your convenient reference a comparative type showing the changes in existing law that would be made by the proposed bill.

It is requested that you lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposal has been sent to the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas Dillon.

INCREASED GRATUITY FURNISHED TO CERTAIN PRISONERS DISCHARGED OR PAROLED

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4281, title 18, of the United States Code to increase from $30 to $100 the amount of gratuity which may be furnished by the Attorney General to prisoners discharged from imprisonment or released on parole.

In a letter dated March 21, 1962, the Attorney General recommended this amendment in a letter to the Vice President.

It seems to me that the present maximum allowance of $30 falls far short of the intended purpose of such payments, which is to tide the released prisoner over until such time as he receives his first pay from the job to which he is going. In most instances, this period would be a minimum of 2 to 3 weeks, which means that a released prisoner who has no other funds—and it is my understanding that this is the typical situation—faces serious economic pressures during the critical time immediately following his discharge from prison. This payment provision was enacted in 1944, and all of us are aware of the cost of living increase since then.

The Attorney General's letter calls attention to the fact that a great number of parole violations occur during the early weeks of a prisoner's release, and that a large percentage of these violations can be directly attributed to the obvious situation these men find themselves in, when they must attempt to once more take up community living, without funds enough to provide reasonable sustenance for themselves and their families.

When a man leaves prison, he must resume his life in society. I think that it is our obligation to provide him with every reasonable means to begin this new phase of his rehabilitation. The effect of this legislation would be to allow the Attorney General, within his discretion, to provide the prisoner with an amount of money which would be more realistic to meet the needs indicated by each individual case.

It is my hope that the Congress will give prompt and favorable consideration to this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Attorney General to the Vice President, above referred to, and the recommended bill, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3103) to amend section 4281, title 18, of the United States Code, to increase from $30 to $100, the amount of gratuity which may be furnished by the Attorney General to prisoners discharged from imprisonment or released on parole, introduced by Mr. Long of Missouri, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. Long of Missouri is as follows:

Office of the Attorney General,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1962.

The Vice President,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Vice President: Enclosed for your consideration and appropriate reference is a legislative proposal to amend section 4281, title 18, United States Code, by increasing the amount of gratuity from $30 to $100, which may be furnished by the Attorney General to prisoners discharged from imprisonment or released on parole.

The purpose of the gratuity is to enable a released prisoner to support himself until he is able to receive his first pay from a job and therefore should last a minimum of 2 weeks. The present $30 maximum which was established in 1944 is totally inadequate in view of today's cost of living.

In addition, since 1944 there has been a marked trend toward lower ages among persons committed for Federal offenses. Comparatively few of these persons have any financial resources or have compiled sufficient savings to see them through their most difficult period—immediately after release. The present limitation presents a serious obstacle to the rehabilitation of a released prisoner who finds himself without funds for the barest essentials. There have been numerous instances which indicate that an inordinate number of parole violations occur during the first few weeks following release and are attributable to the economic pressures faced by a person without funds who has had no time to readjust himself to community living.

It should be pointed out that it is not contemplated that all prisoners would receive the maximum gratuity. Rather, the gratuities will be granted up to the maximum as the requirements of each case dictate.

The proposed increase of the maximum allowable gratuities is the most feasible approach to this problem. The Department, therefore, urges early intrdouction and favorable consideration of this legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Kennedy,
Attorney General.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that the minimum quota for any quota area shall be raised from 100 to 250 persons per year.

At the present time there are 35 nations with quotas of less than 250, most of which have an annual quota of 100.

This is a very modest bill which will add about 5,000 quota places a year, but it is an important bill in that it is a step toward easing the discriminatory restrictions which bear down heavily on African and Asian nations.

Among the nations whose immigration quota would be more than doubled are Burma, Cyprus, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Korea, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Pakistan, South Africa, and Tunisia.

In each of these countries the backlog of applicants represents a catalog of individual and family tragedies, of people who seek here what our forebears sought and found here.

This bill will open the door for 5,000 such people each year and though this is a small number in comparison with the total immigration picture, its passage would constitute a significant achievement both for the well-being of those affected and for the reputation of our country in the nations involved. I therefore hope that the Congress will act favorably upon this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3104) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that the minimum quota for any quota area shall be 250, introduced by Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXCLUSION OF INTERCOASTAL SHIPPING FROM JONES ACT RESTRICTIONS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, for the past several years those of us who represent the Pacific Northwest have been searching for appropriate means to combat the catastrophic decline in domestic lumber production, a decline which threatens to pauperize the entire region.

Economists and lumbermen agree that a principal cause of this decline has been the competitive advantage enjoyed by Canadian lumber exporters over domestic producers. During the past decade imports of softwood lumber from Canada have increased substantially, coinciding with steadily decreasing production of U.S. softwood lumber. In 1948 Oregon and Washington produced 85 percent of the lumber shipped by water to the Atlantic coast. Today, the Canadians have taken more than 70 percent of this market.

Because of this situation in our lumber market, I was glad that I was offered an opportunity to go to Ottawa, Canada, a few weeks ago with our interparliamentary group, which gave me an opportunity to sit down and talk over the situation that exists firsthand.

Last year, when lumber producers from my State came to Washington to talk to me about the plight of the industry, I said, "Your trouble is the market. Steel, glass, and aluminum are going into buildings, instead of lumber. But the Congress of the United States knows there is a need for low-priced housing, and we will pass the housing bill, and then you will see the lumber market come to life."

My prediction was right. The lumber market jumped substantially, but Canadian lumber came in to take a substantial part of it. Our Housing Act has almost subsidized a portion of the lumber companies in British Columbia. The reason is that we are not able to compete with them in water shipment. That is one of the reasons; there are some others. But I am convinced, after long study and delving into the problem with the Department of Labor, the Forestry Service, and the State Department, that one of the things we must do is what I am proposing in the bill I am introducing.

I am convinced that the primary factor contributing to Canada's favorable competitive position is the artificial and unjustifiable restraint placed upon intercoastal shipping by section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, popularly known as the Jones Act. The Jones Act provides a domestic navigation monopoly to U.S.-flag vessels. Thus, while British Columbia cargo shippers utilize chartered vessels, including foreign tramp steamers, for shipping lumber to eastern U.S. markets, American cargo shippers are required by the Jones Act to use American bottoms for intercoastal shipments. Charter rates available to Canadian shippers are considerably less than established conference rates on American ships. Typical rates in 1961 ran from $6.50 to $11.50 per thousand board feet of lumber less than domestic rates.

Although the Canadians have the advantage of cheaper stumpage and cheaper labor, the average cost of lumber alongside a ship in British Columbia is as high as or higher than it is in the United States. Canadians must pay higher towing charges from the forests to the mills and higher logging costs arising from the rougher coast terrain. The sole true competitive advantage the Canadians enjoy is their ability to use foreign bottoms.

When I said to them, during our meeting in Ottawa, "Why don't we go into an agreement whereby we will use either American or Canadian shipping, and you will do the same," one of the members of Parliament said to me, "Do you know how many ships we have in our merchant marine?" I said, "No." He said, "One. We cannot afford this luxury."

Cabotage, the practice of reserving the coastal trades to national vessels, originated in the reign of Edward III of England—1327 to 1377. The British have wisely long since abandoned the practice. Laws excluding foreign-flag vessels from the American domestic trades were first passed in 1808 and have remained in effect to the present day. After intensive study, I have concluded that while cabotage restrictions may have performed a useful function in the 14th, and even in the 19th century, such restrictions are not justified today.

In effect, the Jones Act forces producers of goods shipped in intercoastal commerce to subsidize the domestic shipping industry. Yet, under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, domestic carriers engaged in foreign commerce are subsidized directly by the Federal Government. I have been shown no valid rationale for thus distinguishing between domestic and foreign shipping.

Furthermore, the Jones Act simply has not worked. Domestic shipping has steadily and relentlessly declined from postwar highs. Intercoastal shipping, particularly, is a ghost industry. As late as 1955, 101 ships and 4,300 men were employed in the intercoastal trade; today, barely 39 ships and 1,500 men. The prognosis is clear: In a very few years there will be no intercoastal shipping trade, Jones Act or no Jones Act.

Immediate repeal of the Jones Act restrictions on intercoastal shipping will have the following salutary effects: First, restoration to American lumber producers of their rightful share of the American lumber market; second, preservation of thousands of lumbering jobs throughtout the Pacific Northwest; third, creation of additional longshoring and ship servicing and repairing jobs in west coast ports; fourth, reduction of the balance-of-payments deficit caused by excessive purchase of Canadian lumber; and, fifth, reduction in the costs to east coast consumers of west coast lumber, and other products.

For these reasons, I am introducing a bill amending the Jones Act to exclude intercoastal shipping from all Jones Act restrictions. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lay over until April 5 for additional sponsors, and that the text of the bill and a Department of Commerce chart, showing the decline in waterborne shipments of lumber from Oregon, and Washington, through November 1961, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the bill and chart will be printed in the Record, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 3105) to provide that the law limiting the transportation of merchandise in the coastwise trade to certain U.S. vessels shall not apply to such transportation between a port on the east coast of the United States and a port on the west coast of the United States, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 883), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further,* That this section and the first section of the Act of February 17, 1898 (30 Stat. 248), shall not apply to the transportation of merchandise between a port on the east coast of the United States and a port on the west coast of the United States, including the State of Alaska."

The chart presented by Mrs. NEUBERGER is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 7.—*Waterborne shipments of lumber from Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia to the U.S. Atlantic coast, 1947–61*

[Thousand board feet]

	Total	Oregon and Washington	Percent	British Columbia	Percent
1947	478, 274	478, 274	100.00	([1])	0
1948	648, 796	552, 724	85.19	96, 072	14.81
1949	1, 324, 907	1, 021, 382	77.09	303, 525	22.91
1950	1, 785, 061	1, 054, 539	59.08	730, 522	40.92
1951	877, 242	815, 944	93.01	61, 298	6.99
1952	[2] 1, 275, 777	[2] 1, 053, 699	82.59	222, 078	17.41
1953	[2] 1, 593, 834	[2] 1, 058, 869	66.44	534, 965	33.56
1954	[2] 1, 441, 531	[2] 933, 696	64.77	507, 835	35.23
1955	[2] 1, 376, 059	[2] 1, 031, 139	74.93	344, 920	25.07
1956	[2] 1, 305, 199	[2] 1, 023, 038	78.38	282, 161	21.62
1957	[2] 1, 248, 831	[2] 973, 398	77.94	275, 433	22.06
1958	[2] 1, 526, 388	[2] 923, 961	60.53	602, 427	39.47
1959	[2] 1, 497, 054	[2] 902, 836	60.31	594, 218	39.69
1960	[2] 1, 543, 593	[2] 848, 989	55.00	694, 604	45.00
1961 (11 months)	[2] 1, 272, 612	[2] 546, 588	42.95	726, 024	57.05

[1] Trade, interrupted by World War II, not resumed until 1948.

[2] Includes California.

Source: Reports of Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau, Inc.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, May 1, 1962, marks the 19th anniversary of the uprising against the Nazis in the Warsaw ghetto. The heroic effort, doomed from the outset, remains a symbol of man's struggle for freedom. Twenty-eight thousand men, women, and children were killed in this fighting, and 10,000 were deported to later death in concentration camps and gas chambers. Temporarily nazism triumphed. But in the long run the forces of human freedom and dignity were successful. Out of the ashes of the Warsaw ghetto has come the vigorous, free, courageous State of Israel.

Today, we are faced by a different kind of totalitarianism—from the left, not from the right. Although the Soviets have not recently conducted such barbaric massacres, they are continuing in other ways the totalitarian effort to kill religious freedom and persecute those who follow the paths of righteousness.

Mr. President, on this anniversary of a heroic struggle against fascism—a struggle recorded for all posterity in some of the greatest literature of our time—let us renew our determination to continue to battle against the forces of oppression and tyranny.

Therefore, Mr. President, in conjunction with my distinguished colleague in the other body, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to mark the 1st day of May 1962, in recognition of that heroic battle for freedom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 179) authorizing and requesting the President to designate May 1, 1962, as a day for observance of the courage displayed by the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto against the Nazis, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I wish to announce the appointment of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], to serve on the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy, in the place of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], who has resigned.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MUNDT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment (in the nature of a substitute) proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) to the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment (in the nature of a substitute) proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) to Senate bill 2768, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute for Senate bill 2768. If this amendment is adopted, it will require the United States to lend an amount of money equal to the amount which the other nations of the world actually lend to the United Nations, as distinguished from the present wording of the bill, which requires us to lend an amount of money equal to what the other nations agree to lend. My amendment will limit our subscription only to the amount which the other nations actually lend, not also to the amount they agree to lend. In my opinion there is a distinct difference between matching the actual loans and matching what the other countries agree to lend, but may never lend.

I ask that the amendment be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO CREDIT FOR INVESTMENT IN CERTAIN DEPRECIABLE PROPERTY—AMENDMENT

Mr. HARTKE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 10650) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BYRON R. WHITE TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 11, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, on the nomination of Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF RESUMPTION OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF IRVING BEN COOPER TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearing will be resumed on Thursday, April 12, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Irving Ben Cooper, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of John K. Mansfield, of Connecticut, to be Inspector General, Foreign Assistance; and the following-named persons to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for the terms indicated, and until their successors have been appointed and qualified:

For a 1-year term: Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan; James R. Fleming, of Indiana; and Dr. Mabel M. Smythe, of New York.

For a 2-year term: Dr. Walter Johnson, of Illinois; Dr. Roy E. Larsen, of Connecticut; and Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, of California.

For a 3-year term: Dr. Luther H. Foster, of Alabama; Dr. John W. Gardner, of New York; and the Reverend Theodore Martin Hesburgh, of Indiana.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The **VICE PRESIDENT** announced that on today, April 3, 1962, he signed the following enrolled bills which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 1352. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Aniello;

H.R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Prischl Rogers;

H.R. 1492. An act for the relief of Ernest John Large;

H.R. 1671. An act for the relief of Edvige Cianciulli;

H.R. 2180. An act for the relief of Eugene C. Harter;

H.R. 2684. An act for the relief of Mohan Singh;

H.R. 3105. An act for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a minor;

H.R. 3376. An act for the relief of George A. McDermott;

H.R. 6082. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vartanus Uzar;

H.R. 6216. An act for the relief of Theodore T. Reilmann;

H.R. 6276. An act for the relief of Athaasia Dekazos;

H.R. 6343. An act for the relief of Mrs. Izabel A. Miguel;

H.R. 6740. An act for the relief of Teofilo Estoesta;

H.R. 7676. An act for the relief of George W. Ross, Jr.;

H.R. 8422. An act for the relief of Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll);

H.R. 8780. An act for the relief of Dr. Carl F. Romney;

H.R. 8781. An act for the relief of Walter Singlevich;

H.R. 8947. An act for the relief of Harry A. Sebert;

H.R. 9612. An act relating to the elections under section 333 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the shareholders of the G. L. Bernhardt Co., Inc., of Lenoir, N.C.; and

H.R. 10573. An act to grant the American Numismatic Association perpetual succession.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article entitled "The Rambler Lunches With Blind Vets," written by George Kennedy and published in the Rambler's Column of the Washington Evening Star of November 20, 1961.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to address a couple of questions to the distinguished majority leader. There has been discussion of the pending compromise on the U.N. bond issue bill which would substitute a provision by which this measure would be called a measure providing for loan; and for my own clarification I would like to know, first, whether under the amendment which would be referred to as a loan the President would be empowered to buy United Nations bonds.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The President would.

Mr. SCOTT. Is the majority leader able to state whether it would be the intent of the President to use the fund in the purchase of United Nations bonds, or as a loan?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, that I cannot speak for the President in this respect. I will say, however, it is my understanding that the purpose of this accommodation between the bill as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations which was not the administration bill, let me say, and the Aiken-Hickenlooper-Morton proposal, was to give a greater degree of flexibility to the President and to place the responsibility more firmly where it belongs.

There has been some question relative to the rate of interest which would be charged under a loan or bond issue. Incidentally, it is my understanding that actually a "bond," in the sense that it is used in this proposal, is fundamentally a loan. There is a technical difference in the wording.

Getting back to the question of interest, which I assume is a question the Senator from Pennsylvania had in mind——

Mr. SCOTT. I was going to ask that question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The President can determine, on the basis of the circumstances and the issues involved, what rate of interest would be charged during the 3, 4, or even 5 years, if he considered it advisable.

Mr. SCOTT. Let me ask first about the term of the loan. Is there any policy yet as to how long such loan or bond issue, whichever it may be, will run?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. But there again we get the principle of flexibility, which I think we should be willing to entrust to the President of the United States, who is charged with the constitutional responsibility of the conduct of this country's foreign policy. It would be my best estimate at this time that the loans could run anywhere from 3 to 25 years. So there is quite a leeway there—25 years may well not be the limitation thereon; it could be 2, 3, 4, or 5 years.

Mr. SCOTT. I now revert to my earlier question. Is the majority leader in a position to state whether or not it is the intent of the President to use all or any part of this fund in the purchase of U.N. bonds?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be at the President's discretion. He would have the authority and power to do so, should he think it desirable, in the best interest of our country, to do that.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator under the 3-minute rule has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for additional time.

Mr. SCOTT. The majority leader has asked for additional time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the Senator from Pennsylvania direct his question for confirmation to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. SCOTT. My time has expired. If the majority leader will ask for time, I shall be glad to do as he suggests.

Mr. AIKEN. If it will accommodate the Senator, I shall be glad to ask for time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Pennsylvania has additional time.

Mr. SCOTT. My question was an effort to determine whether or not it is the intention of the President, under the accommodating change in the U.N. bond issue matter, to purchase bonds, even though it is called a loan; that is, whether the President intends to purchase bonds or make loans.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator means U.N. bonds.

Mr. AIKEN. I have absolutely no way of knowing. Whether he purchases bonds or makes 3-year loans or 6-year loans or loans for any other period is a matter of executive responsibility, assuming the compromise proposal is approved by the Congress.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate offering an amendment appropriate to the objective of striking from the bond bill the language which authorizes the purchase of bonds on a matching basis over and above the initial subscription of $25 million, as follows: Both of the amendments now before the Senate state that our Government shall match the aggregate amount of bonds purchased or agreed to be purchased. I contemplate moving for the elimination of the words "or agreed to be purchased."

If my amendment is adopted, the President will be authorized to buy a base of $25 million in bonds, or make a loan—the bonds would be indebtedness instruments—and, over and above the $25 million, to match dollar for dollar the amount of bonds purchased by the other member nations.

SUPREME COURT RULING ON APPORTIONMENT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the respected columnist William S. White has observed with great truth that "not a thousand rotten boroughs in the legislatures can justify what is now happening" as the result of legislative decision by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Referring to last week's decision in the Tennessee reapportionment case, Mr. White concluded that it no longer can be denied that the Warren Court "is rewriting the Constitution and meddling in politics." And he had some good advice for those who are applauding that decision. He put it thusly:

> Those who are celebrating this presumed fall of rural dominance would do well to take a second thought and a second look below the surface. For something else is falling, too—the Constitution of the United States as we have known it.

The ramifications of this usurpation of legislative power also brought an expression of alarm from the distinguished columnist Walter Lippmann. He commented that it is "an appalling thing to contemplate, to have Federal judges drawn into becoming the arbiters of the political affairs of each State." It was his expressed view that "the burden of working out the strategy and the tactics of the movement for fairer and more realistic representation should be on the politicians and not the judges."

Mr. President, for two so competent and knowledgeable observers of the American scene to view this latest indulgence in judicial experimentation with alarm is just cause for all Americans to ask themselves whether what they are gaining is worth what they are having to give up for it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of these two columns be printed herewith in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 28, 1962]

APPORTIONMENT RULING ASSAILED—SUPREME COURT DECISION VIEWED AS REWRITING OF THE CONSTITUTION

(By William S. White)

Men who have long tried to hold the Supreme Court in special veneration cannot now deny that it is rewriting the Constitution and meddling in politics to suit the wishes of some—but only some—of nine unelected men.

This is the central, the true and tragic, meaning of the new divided Court decision claiming for the Federal judiciary the unexampled power to make its own determination as to whether seats in State legislatures are rationally apportioned as between urban and rural areas.

This extraordinary ruling to their enduring credit was ably and memorably opposed by the two best legal minds on the bench, Justices Felix Frankfurter and John Marshall Harlan. On its face it is a good thing. For it is undeniable that rural voters in many States have been given disproportionate voices in their legislatures by redistricting formulas which penalize city voters.

Thus, no doubt there will be dancing in the streets of the metropolitan centers—indeed, in the metropolitan centers in which this column now appears. But those who are celebrating this presumed fall of "rural dominance" would do well to take a second thought and a second look below the surface.

For something else is falling, too—the Constitution of the United States as we have known it. It is being altered not by Congress and people—the only constitutional way for its alteration—but rather by a momentary majority of a court which seems fatally determined to change the whole social and political fabric of this country—on its own writ and mandate.

It may well be that such changes should be made. But they cannot rightfully be made merely and solely by a handful of men—six men in this case—whose thirst for reform has caused them to falter in a high mission. This is the high mission of a cool, detached, impersonal justice which is the only true distinction of the loftiest court in all the world.

Losing this, the Court in the end will lose itself. And this is the greatest tragedy of all.

"Well," it will be said, "if the rural people have in fact gained undue power and the legislatures themselves won't do anything about it, why shouldn't the Supreme Court step in?"

The ultimate answer is that the Court should not "step in" simply because it has no right under the Constitution to do so, a fact which until now it has repeatedly recognized over the long course of nearly 2 centuries.

And the practical answer is that the people themselves must work out their own difficulties here, however long and hard the task, if we are to maintain the Constitution of the United States. A bleak prospect? Yes. But listen to Justice Frankfurter, a great judge who a generation ago was the very symbol of radicalism to certain excited conservatives but who has now proved himself a towering guardian of that best of all conservatism, which is constitutionalism:

"There is not under our Constitution a judicial remedy for every political mischief. In a democratic society like ours relief must come through an aroused public conscience that sears the conscience of the people's representatives."

Not a thousand rotten boroughs in the legislatures can justify what is now happening. For the Supreme Court is being made the agent of a determined political drive by urban interests to reverse the balance of political power and so make urban voter hereafter overmaster rural voter.

There is nothing evil in this drive: there is no criticism in this column of the motives or actions of those who thrust this case before the Court. The business of advocates is to advocate. But the business of the Supreme Court is to judge and decide, not what is good for country and people but what the Constitution and laws are—not what they should be.

THE TENNESSEE CASE

(By Walter Lippmann)

In his brilliant and moving dissenting opinion, Mr. Justice Frankfurter called the decision of the Supreme Court in the Tennessee apportionment case "a massive repudiation of the experience of our whole past in asserting destructively novel judicial power."

Coming from him, the most learned of the judges, and supported by Mr. Justice Harlan with his great legal wisdom, this strong language is enough to give pause not only to the layman but to the judges who will for a long time to come be working under this new finding.

Being a layman myself, I find it useful as a beginning to fix in mind the facts of the case, which was started on its way to the Supreme Court by a group of citizens of Tennessee.

The heart of the their complaint was that the constitution of Tennessee has been violated over a period of half a century, and that they are unable to obtain a remedy from the Tennessee courts, the Tennessee Legislature, or by an election under the existing apportionment.

The constitution of Tennessee says that there are to be not more than 99 members of the house of representatives and 33 members of the senate. The general assembly, which is the name of the whole legislature, is to allocate, at least every 10 years, the seats among the counties or districts "according to the number of qualified voters in each."

Although that is what the constitution says, there has been no reapportionment since 1901. In the intervening 60 years the legislature has rejected all bills to carry out the mandate of the constitution requiring a reallocation every 10 years.

In Tennessee only the general assembly can pass the legislation to carry out the law of the constitution. But the legislature, as now constituted, will not pass these laws. It nullifies the constitution, and no majority of voters in Tennessee can make it obey the constitution.

Fifty representatives elected by one-third of the voters control the lower house and if there were a reapportionment according to the Tennessee constitution, 17 out of these 50 would lose their seats.

Inside Tennessee there is no remedy and the State is in the grip of a self-perpetuating rural minority.

This situation, which exists in several other States, means that there is no legal remedy for a very serious wrong. It is a very serious wrong that in the Tennessee Senate 20 out of 33 members are elected by 37 percent of the voters, and that in the House of Representatives 63 members out of 99 are elected by 40 percent of the voters.

It is a serious wrong because such a State legislature is not and cannot be sufficiently interested to deal with the mounting problems of the growing cities.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter's comment on this crucial point is that "there is not under our Constitution a judicial remedy for every political mischief, for every undesirable exercise of legislative power. The framers carefully and with deliberate forethought refused so to enthrone the judiciary. In this situation, as in others of like nature, appeal for relief does not belong here (that is in the Supreme Court). Appeal must be to an informed, civically militant electorate.

If there is no judicial remedy for a serious wrong affecting the welfare of the urban masses, and if, as is in fact the case in Tennessee, relief cannot be had from the electorate, however informed and civically militant the majority may be, what happens then?

If all the doors are closed, how do the city people of Tennessee get relief? It is always a dangerous situation when the doors are closed against judicial or public or political relief and against peaceable change.

What has actually happened is that the six Justices, the majority of the Court, have opened a little the one door of Federal judicial relief.

They have opened it only a crack at the moment, but there is no doubt that the two dissenting Justices are fully justified in warning the country that if the door is opened wide, the courts may become dangerously involved in State politics all over the Union.

This would be an appalling thing to contemplate, to have Federal judges drawn into becoming the arbiters of the political affairs of each State.

One must conclude, I think, that this "novel judicial power" will be destructive, depending upon the wisdom and restraint with which it is exercised. That, of course, is true of all power. But in such a novel power it is especially important to be aware of it.

For the remedy is a highly dangerous drug and it will have to be administered most cautiously. That means, I think, that we must not do again what was done after the 1954 decision in the school segregation case. We must not leave the application of the new rule to haphazard local lawsuits.

There must be national leadership this time, and it should come from the President and from the Republican and Democratic leaders. The burden of working out the strategy and the tactics of the movement for fairer and more realistic representation should be on the politicians and not on the judges.

TRADE LIBERALIZATION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, "Trade liberalization has become a holy cause. Decent people are prepared to lie for it."

The words I have just quoted are taken from the second of two articles on the administration's proposed trade legislation by Mr. Oscar Gass, a Washington economist, which recently were published in the New Republic magazine.

Mr. Gass has made a penetrating analysis of the weaknesses in the administration's arguments for the proposed bill, and has made some constructive suggestions for amendments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gass' articles may be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, and I commend them to the attention of all Members of Congress who are interested in this vitally important subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I do not accuse the administration of lying, but in the constant propaganda barrage being laid down in support of the trade bill there has been misrepresentation of fact and distortion of facts.

An example of the gross abuse of statistical information is a so-called fact sheet on Connecticut and foreign trade which has been published by the Department of Commerce. Similar statistical compilations have been made for the other States, and I understand for each congressional district.

The obvious purpose is to impress upon the reader the importance of the export trade to the State or congressional district concerned.

The Connecticut fact sheet contains such statements as these:

> Exports of manufactured goods from Connecticut amounted to $385.9 million in 1960; 250 Connecticut establishments exported more than $25,000 in 1960; 213,877 Connecticut workers are employed in these establishments.

This apparently is intended to create the impression that exports are responsible for 213,877 jobs in Connecticut.

Mr. President, when Secretary of Commerce Hodges appeared before the Joint Economic Committee in February he agreed with my contention that presentation of statistics in such a fashion was definitely misleading.

Accordingly, I was shocked when I received the so-called fact sheet and found that the same technique was still being employed.

In a letter to the Secretary on March 8, I brought this to his attention, and addressed to him a series of questions to which I requested answers in the belief the true facts could be developed.

On March 30, I received a reply from the Secretary. It is an extraordinary confession of ignorance about manufacturing industry in my State.

Among the questions addressed to the Secretary were these:

> What was the total production of manufactured goods in Connecticut in 1960?
>
> What percentage of total production is represented by exports?

Here is the Secretary's reply:

> The total value of manufacturing production or shipments in a State is not published by the Census Bureau because of duplications resulting from shipments from one manufacturer to another. Figures are available on total number of manufacturing employees, total value added, etc., but not total shipments. Since we do not have the total shipments, it is not possible to give you the percent of total production represented by exports either.

What a fantastic situation it is.

The Department compiles and broadcasts figures on Connecticut's exports, but confesses it is unable to compute Connecticut's total production of manufactured goods. Surely production for domestic markets is not so unimportant that the Department should not be informed about it.

Similarly, for each individual industry listed in the Department's fact sheet, the Secretary was unable to inform me concerning its total production and what percentage of production is represented by exports.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary, including references to the so-called fact sheet, and his reply may be printed in the Record following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New Republic, Mar. 19, 1962]

THE CRUSADE FOR TRADE—THE NEW FRONTIER'S ECONOMIC WAGER

(By Oscar Gass)

Consequently I rejoice, having to construct something upon which to rejoice.—T. S. Eliot.

Many Americans are hungry in 1962 for some public cause which both engages sympathy and satisfies intellect. And they prefer to take their stand for the right and the good, in respected company and at a reasonable price. For these people, trade liberalization is the dish of the day. The menu description is attractive and the company grand. (Indeed, it would, I think, not be unfair to describe trade liberalization as the cause of the American establishment in 1962.) Yet, I fear many now so attracted by the menu and the company will, one day, rise from the table, shamefaced, still self-consciously hungry and feeling they have been deceived. The dish is being wildly overadvertised.

The gains from international exchanges are indeed great—not easily measured or even delimited. To travel from New York to Rome is not some multiple of traveling from New York to San Francisco. And we cannot, as a nation, pay our way to Rome unless we have some international earnings. Nobody has computed what it would cost to raise coffee in the United States or even to supply domestically all our needs of pulp, newsprint, and paper. Nobody can compute the gain to the efficiency of our economy and to its innovating drive from the challenge, in our markets, of foreign competitive suppliers. Without international earnings, we could give or lend to less-developed countries only American products. We could not pay for any activity abroad. And are we to forget the obligations of world citizenship? The import purchase which is comparatively indifferent to us may mean a great deal to the foreign seller.

But let us not give combat so that virtue may triumph over imaginary ogres. The issues before the American people in 1962 are not so wide as the gains from international exchange. Nobody is suggesting that international trade be eliminated or even reduced in any drastic way. The real issues are both narrower and more troublesome. First, is the economic gain to the American economy, from further lowering of our customs duties, likely to be large? This may be questioned. Second, will it be easier for the United States to maintain full employment in an economy in which international trade is more important? The contrary seems more likely. Third, would trade liberalization mean a great step forward in closer and more sympathetic working relations with the more advanced non-Communist countries? This I doubt. Fourth, will the American initiative in trade liberalization be of aid to the less-developed countries? This depends on how the initiative is worked out. Fifth, is it perhaps realistic, therefore, to regard the American program of trade liberalization not only as an initiative toward more open markets but equally as a reaction to the discriminatory closing of Western European markets against American imports? In this, there appears to be much truth. Sixth, does the trade liberalization program advanced by President Kennedy provide adequate standards and sound criteria of action? Are its proposed delegations of power to the President in accordance with the responsible conduct of American Government? These things I would question.

THE CHARACTER OF AMERICAN IMPORTS

In 1959–61, United States imports of merchandise averaged about $15 billion annually. This is barely 3 percent of gross national product. For Great Britain, the corresponding figure is about 15 percent. Yet, such is the ascendancy of British economics over the American mind, that much of what Americans write about international trade reads as if it were counsel addressed to a British Chancellor of the Exchequer. (Intellectually, the ascendancy is justified. We have not from an American hand anything comparable to "The Theory of International Economic Policy," by J. E. Meade.)

In the bad old days of the late 1920's, when U.S. tariffs were greatly higher, our imports were also more important—about 5 percent of gross national product. Many things the United States buys abroad have become relatively cheaper; synthetic substitutes have been developed for some imports; and the range of American manufacturing has broadened greatly. From a merely American point of view, and a merely economic one, the potential gain from free international trade is correspondingly less important.

American imports declined in importance while tariffs were being reduced. In 1926–30 our duties averaged 13.7 percent of all imports. But in 10 of the last 15 years, our duties have averaged 6 percent or lower. Even when duty is related to dutiable imports alone, U.S. customs duties have never averaged above 12.7 percent in any year of the last 11. This contrasts with 40 percent in 1926–30. In a world of quotas and buying discriminations, customs reductions are not an exact guide, but they do reflect a gross change.

The most striking decline, in economic weight, has been in just those articles where we charge no customs duty at all. For about 10 years now, some $6 billion of U.S. imports have been free of any duty. In this decade, the dollar total of our gross national product has increased from a range of $330 to $520 billion, but these custom-free imports have continued to hover around $6 billion a year, without any rising trend.

A further reduction in U.S. tariffs would have impact initially through the $9 billion of imports which do pay some duty. And it would affect also other items which do not come in at all because our duty is prohibitive. Consider what might result, at best, from the total elimination of duties on all our dutiable imports. Let us allow, as best we can, for those entrepreneurs who will be invigorated—and for those who will be killed. At how much lower cost might we then be able to buy these $9 billion of imports and also the other items now excluded? (Our exports are, of course, our means of paying for our imports.) Is it likely that, as a nation, we would save $5 billion a year, in any year of the 1960's, as the result of buying abroad more cheaply—and more? As costs go down, real incomes are enlarged. Yet a gain of $5 billion looks like a saving of over 50 percent derived principally from additional trading in our presently dutiable imports, now valued at $9 billion. Is such a $5 billion gain likely? If the answer is in the affirmative—if we would save $5 billion annually—our economic gain would be somewhat under 1 percent of our annual gross national product. Is a gain of the order of 1 percent what is now being advertised? Is this the bold new road to the future of the American economy?

The potential economic gain to the United States from further trade liberalization is the smaller because we already admit either duty free or with very low duties many items in which foreign production costs are greatly lower than ours. Coffee and pulp plus paper head the list—each with $1 billion of free imports. We admit $300 million or more in free imports of three other items: crude rubber, iron ore, and nonferrous materials. We also admit duty free $100 million or more of each of the following: sea fish, skins, cocoa, vegetable oils, silk, fuel oils, diamonds, ferroalloys, tin, and fertilizer materials.

Observe: These items free of duty are raw or semimanufactured articles. In finished manufactures, it is a great thing when we admit free of duty about $50 million of tractors or $25 million of typewriters. Our advertised manufacturing efficiency does not invite foreign competition.

We are prepared to buy other peoples' resources but not their labor. Even dairy produce pays 18 percent duty and vegetables 30 percent. On synthetic fibers and their manufactures—where we claim inventive leadership—our customs duties average 33 percent. On the dutiable coal-tar products of our great chemical industry, our tariffs average 31 percent. On clocks and watches, the average is 51 percent.

Canada and Venezuela supply the United States with raw materials, and they consequently each pay an average of only 3 percent duty on all their sales to us. Brazil pays only 1 percent. Great Britain and Western Germany are favored manufacturing suppliers; they each pay 12 percent duty. But Italy pays 18 percent, Japan 19 percent, Hong Kong 23 percent, and Switzerland 25 percent. Our barriers are highest against those who have nothing to sell except their skill and their work.

Under more international trading, with reciprocally lower customs duties, the occupations in which the United States is competitively strong would expand. These are usually high-wage, heavily capitalized industries. Examples are machinery, chemicals, and metals. The United States already exports annually about $7 billion of machinery, instruments, and transportation equipment; we also export $1¾ billion of chemicals and $1½ billion of metals. These are occupations in which the value of exports per worker may approximate $12,500.

On the other hand, many light industries, when less sheltered by tariffs, will give ground to foreign competition. (If some did not give ground, international trade would hardly be possible.) Usually these industries pay lower wages and are less heavily capitalized. The supplier who prevails in the market may be the previously handicapped exporter from Italy or Switzerland, Japan, or Hong Kong.

Among the competitively weak, we must include much of our agriculture. Today, we protect our meats, dairy products, vegetables, and temperate fruits by customs duties characteristically ranging from 10 percent to 20 percent. And, in world farm markets, we have a hard time against Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and Denmark. They are not technically more efficient, but their people are prepared to accept lower incomes in farming than ours. We find it necessary to give away part of our food exports and subsidize much of the rest.

The United States gets less than $3,000 per worker for the farm products we sell abroad, and we subsidize the prices of these exports an average of about 25 percent.

The world sales position of our agriculture has also been weakened recently by the formation of the European Common Market. In the Common Market, the Western Europeans are expanding their own high-cost production of most temperate farm products, through price supports. They are raising barriers against all competitive farm imports, including ours. The Government of the United States has recently failed to induce the Common Market to desist from this path; there is little reason to believe present tactics will be more successful in the future.

MORE WORK OR LESS

The purpose of international trade is to economize labor (and also other costs of production). There is no economic sense in the international exchange of merchandise unless this trading constitutes a means to buy abroad a volume of merchandise which would take relatively more labor (and more of other costs) to produce at home. It is therefore most peculiar that the reciprocal liberalization of international trading should be advocated as a method of increasing employment.

What each nation does with the labor it saves from international trading is a quite independent question. The saved labor may be employed or unemployed. In the United States we have every year far greater cumulative additions to our labor supply than we could conceivably get even once from trade liberalization. We have a basic increment of about 2 percent each year, through the growth in the size of the population over age 14, from which the labor force is drawn. And additionally about 2 or 3 percent is added to our effective labor supply annually by the increase in man-hour productivity.

We have done a poor job of employing this growing labor power. There is no reason to believe we would do much better with the relatively small net increment of unemployed hands earned from more international trading. Indeed, because of the probable concentration of the unemployment profit from more international trading in some industries and regions, we might do worse than generally. But to discuss national employment in the United States with primary concentration on international trading is to let a very small tail wag a very big dog.

Nevertheless, the employment issue seems likely to be much to the fore in the general discussion of trade liberalization—and, from both sides, largely on specious grounds. During the Eisenhower administration, it was common for official statements to say that exports were responsible for 4 million American jobs. On exuberant days, the figure was 5 million. On January 25, 1962, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics issued a report arguing that employment attributable to U.S. exports was about 3.1 million. But, on the same day, President Kennedy surpassed all previous claimants. In his formal message on trade, addressed to the Congress, the President stated: "Several hundred times as many workers owe their jobs directly or indirectly to exports as are in the small group—estimated to be less than one-half of 1 percent of all workers—who might be adversely affected by a sharp increase in imports." Was it really necessary to say several hundred times? Only 200 times one-half of 1 percent is already 100 percent. The President was saying—in effect, though loosely—that more than 100 percent of all American workers owe their jobs to exports, directly or indirectly. Here we attain a limit of fantasy where all other competitors are left breathless.

Those who drafted the President's bill on trade liberalization (H.R. 9900) obviously took much more seriously the negative impact of customs reductions and import increases. The bill devotes no less than 31 pages to "adjustment assistance" for those injured by imports. But it may perhaps be questioned whether the effectiveness of the assistance is in proportion to the length of the text.

To me, it seems the sound and valuable protection is in the one page the bill devotes to staging requirements (sec. 243) rather than in the 31 pages devoted to adjustment assistance. Under staging requirements it is provided—but perhaps with too many exceptions—that any reduction or elimination of customs duty shall not take effect more rapidly than in five equal annual installments. This provision might be strengthened. In cases of reduction of present very high (over 25 percent) duties to zero, the period for full duty elimination might be extended even to 8 or 10 years. Then the affected industry would be given all it can reasonably ask. If a customs duty needs to be lowered, in the national interest, adequate time for readjustment is the essence of what can reasonably be given the injured party.

The President's bill, on the other hand, concentrates its emphasis primarily on helping industry with adjustment assistance, through Government-provided technical assistance, loan guarantees and tax reliefs. But these measures of assistance would follow only after a Presidential finding of injury from imports, a finding which the President need not make. The President's administering agency would then have discretion to certify an adjustment proposal, a certification which the agency need not perform. The administering agency could then offer assistance—such assistance as it thought proper. Every determination of the President and his administering agency, in this long sequence, would be final and conclusive and not reviewable by any court. In the circumstances, this adjustment assistance seems unlikely to be expeditious or of substantial value. To my mind, the whole idea of adjustment assistance is a blind alley. The President's trade liberalization bill would be improved if the whole 31 pages dealing with adjustment assistance were struck out. At best, the unemployment compensation provisions contain useful suggestions for general unemployment legislation. On the issue of adjustment assistance to labor, wise words were spoken, 2 days before the President's message, by Representative Wilbur D. Mills. He said:

"Why should a worker who is out of a job due to import competition be placed in a more favorable light (if that is to be done) than any worker who is unemployed due to cancellation of defense contracts, closing of defense installations, or technological advances? Does the fact that increased trade is a matter of national policy justify singling out this area for special treatment? Why are we more concerned with causation than with the realities of people out of work?"

It testifies to the maturity of his audience that Congressman Mills said the above (together with much more in equally good sense) before a meeting of the AFL-CIO, and was warmly applauded.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS CONSTRAINT

A professor of economics who spent many years in the Federal Reserve System and in the National Government said to me sardonically, early in 1961, "That balance-of-payments constraint is certainly going like wildfire. That is the most useful constraint that has been discovered in Washington or New York for some years."

In the United States today, the gross national product can rise perhaps $30 billion without increasing our merchandise imports by more than $1 billion. In the jargon of the economists, our national propensity to import is low. Given the mentality of our business and financial community, perhaps it is best for us to keep this propensity low.

If we were now operating at reasonably full employment, our gross national product might be $60 billion higher than it was in the fourth quarter of 1961. U.S. imports of merchandise would then probably be about $2 billion higher. The income effect abroad could not, however, be expected to increase our exports by the full $2 billion. A substantial fraction would emerge as an additional balance-of-payments deficit. Our public authorities would then be pressed, in substance, to cure the balance-of-payments deficit by stopping the economic expansion. The financial community would call for higher interest rates. Voices of conventional rectitude would demand curtailment of public expenditure. The tail wagging the dog, we would be pressed to forgo $30 billion of national product to save $1 billion in balance-of-payments loss.

Such pressures are the greater because the United States has acquired the role of the world's banker, and we have international liabilities, payable on demand, far in excess of our immediate liquid international assets. These pressures would be still greater, and might arise more frequently, if we liberalized our trade and thereby raised our propensity to import. And this is a case where, in the next years, the minus—when it occurs—is likely to be more important than the plus. A net increase of $2 billion in our exports will give us only the expansionary benefit of the added demand. But a net increase of $2 billion in our imports will produce also increased pressure for a contractionist monetary and fiscal policy, which may result in a much greater loss of employment and national output.

Our balance-of-payments constraint is the tighter, and more limiting, because of problems that grow distinctively out of our failure hitherto to reach a satisfactory readjustment of economic relations with Western Europe (including Great Britain). We deceive ourselves—or are dupes—with the story that we have a favorable balance of trade with Europe. Indeed we do. In the 12 months ending September 30, 1961, we exported to Western Europe some $2.9 billion more of merchandise than we imported. But, in the same 12 months, our balance of payments with Western Europe, including both merchandise and other items, was in deficit to the extent of $2.6 billion. During the year, Western Europe took almost exactly half of its surplus out in gold, and it accumulated the other half as dollar claims on the world's banker.

On the whole, during the year, the deficit with Western Europe grew worse, though irregularly. Our exports fell from quarter to quarter. It is an open secret in Washington that, with the consolidation of the European Common Market, importing from the United States is expected to decline further. The barriers are going up against farm imports. American coal is kept out by tight quotas. And industrial tariffs are being averaged up. (For an example of averaging up, both Germany and the United Kingdom have a zero tariff on aluminum, and they together bought $86 million of U.S. aluminum exports. All the rest of Europe bought only $20 million worth from us, but by averaging up these duties of the small buyers, the Common Market reached a common external tariff of 10 percent on aluminum, which is probably prohibitive.)

Americans must reconcile themselves to the fact that Western Europeans do not lie awake nights worrying about the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. The U.S. Government gives Western Europe about $1 billion a year in military supplies. So what? The U.S. Government spends additionally over $1½ billion annually in Europe on military activities. Again, so what? No doubt, the Americans have their own reasons. We must not expect gratitude; nobody is grateful to the rich for their small kindnesses. And we cannot yet count on ready European participation in aid to the poorest countries in Asia or Africa or Latin America. Let the rich Americans pay for their fancy charities.

TRADE WITHOUT CREDIT

Under these circumstances, strengthening the international monetary reserves of the United States is of importance. The United States does not need more gold. But we do need to know that the United States will not be confronted by lawful demands for gold, from foreign governments, in excess of our ability to supply. And, even more important, the United States must not be constrained to forgo the greater economic object, full employment, for the sake of the lesser one, the conservation of gold reserves.

The consultations on strengthening international monetary reserves, which took place in 1961, were therefore of more than technical importance. The fruit of these consultations was, however, meager. There emerged a most curious international agreement (in the form of an exchange of letters, dated December 15, 1961, between the French Minister of Finance and each of the nine other participants). Ambiguous in several places, this agreement is so carelessly done that, in at least one case (par. F), the official English text—though having equal legal status—is not an accurate translation of the French. The agreement provides ostensibly for an emergency fund of $6 billion. But, though this is a fund in which the United States pledges 2 billion, a U.S. request, as an applicant, can be rejected by members who pledge $1.6 billion plus $1. Moreover, the voting itself is of little importance; every member has an absolute veto regarding his own participation. Perhaps, therefore, it would be least misleading to say that there is no fund at all but only a procedure of consultation; every member may, on his own judgment, withhold his own money.

Under liberalized trading, the U.S. needs, more than ever, a workable international reserve system. To be of value, such a system must satisfy two criteria. First, the reserve fund must be large, in relation to any reasonably foreseeable demand. Second, the resources of the reserve fund must be certainly available to a qualified applicant. The agreement reached in 1961 (and not yet ratified by the U.S. Congress) does not satisfy either of these two criteria. It has indeed been argued, by reasonable people, that this 1961 agreement is better than nothing. But thoughtful consideration needs to be given to the alternative possibility that, by creating the illusion of a firm resort where none exists, this agreement is, in fact, worse than nothing.

[From the New Republic, Mar. 26, 1962]

The Crusade for Trade—A Bold New Move Toward Europe

(By Oscar Gass)

When doubt is raised whether trade liberalization is likely to be of great economic value to the United States, as I have raised it previously, the answer comes back, almost automatically, "The President needs it for his foreign policy. Enactment of a trade liberalization bill in 1962 would be a great step toward Europe."

Toward Europe or against Europe?

The reconstruction of Western Europe after World War II was based on four politicomilitary fundamentals. First was the universal understanding that the traditional struggle for European hegemony should now be declared obsolete. (This theme was perhaps caught most suggestively by Prof. Ludwig Dehio in a series of essays published between 1950 and 1953, which are translated in his "Germany and World Politics," London, 1959.) This understanding found worthy embodiment in the personalities of Adenauer and De Gaulle, and it made possible deep-reaching Franco-German reconciliation and collaboration. Second was the rejection of communism. This was clear by 1948. Though large Communist parties retained their hold among the working classes of France and Italy, communism would not come to power in Western Europe except as the result of Russian occupation following a war. Third, the United States would resist Russian occupation of Western Europe. Therefore any Russian aggressive move against Western Europe would certainly bring on world war III. Fourth, though this became clear only in the later 1950's a world war would be one of intercontinental missiles delivering nuclear explosions. In such a war, the United States would be little, if any, more safe than Europe.

Crystallization of these politicomilitary fundamentals of the new Western Europe was greatly assisted by American economic aid. But none of these fundamentals was dependent on particular institutions of regional Western European economic cooperation. To be specific, nothing in all this was dependent—as some Americans in Washington now seem to think everything in Europe is dependent—on the Common Market. The Common Market came into business only on January 1, 1958, when these fundamentals were long established. Moreover, Great Britain, which remained out of the Common Market, gave firmer support to NATO than France, which chose to go in. Also, none of the countries who stayed out of the Common Market has as extensive trade with the Communist countries as did Germany and Italy, who were in. President de Gaulle seems to have been designed personally for the discomfiture of those who see in the Common Market a European political integration in association with the United States. The Gaullist regime continues a firm supporter of the Common Market, an unremitting enemy of all European supranational political integration, and the most uncooperative member of NATO.

The Common Market may be a good thing, for its members, as an economic matter. Insofar as its members become richer, they will also have the means to become stronger. The Common Market may even contribute to the quality of European society. But the institutions of the Common Market are in no way indispensable to the unity of Western European resistance to communism. Still less indispensable is any American partnership with the Common Market. And the day may yet come when Americans lament bitterly that the benefits of trade liberalization were not sought in Europe on the road of universalism rather than regionalism.

Beware the Greeks bearing gifts. The Common Market countries are in no hurry to accept the new American partner who, in his very first tender of agreement, asks the present members to give up much of their exclusive benefits. Indeed, there is every reason to believe that the Common Market countries would prefer that all such suggestions of breaching their protective wall be withheld, at least for a few years.

By 1966, on their present accelerated schedule, the four present members of the Common Market (France, Germany, Italy, and Benelux) will have removed all tariffs among themselves. They will have raised a common protective wall against all other countries. Within the wall, the same protective shelter will be enjoyed by American firms who have established local factories. No interest protected by the tariff wall will wish it removed. And the value of the internal benefits will increase with each further discrimination involved in the steps toward 1966. Only 40 percent of the way has been traversed up to now.

THE INTERNATIONAL RICH AND POOR

To the internal beneficiaries of the Common Market discriminations, the United States now comes and says, "You are reducing your tariffs among one another to zero. Good. Count me in. And please give the same most-favored-nation treatment to all other non-Communist countries. I may propose zero tariffs where you and I account for 80 percent of all non-Communist international trade. (Of course, you and I will not add up to 80 percent very often unless the British have joined you first.) Let us also agree to bring tariffs for tropical products down to zero. In other cases, we may reduce tariffs 50 percent. But, remember, please, I want a place also in your market for my farmers. And above all, on balance, I cannot afford to have you—Europe—continue to cost me as much money as you have in recent years. I must, in all ways taken together—trade, aid, military spending, investments, loans, etc.—receive more payments net from you, on balance, than I have recently. You can see the merits of my position. And I trust you will have remembrance of things past. Can the United States count on the welcoming mat being out?"

The United States cannot.

Where the character of the American initiative in trade liberalization is more likely to be welcome is in the poorer countries. In this respect, Mr. Kennedy has consistently spoken for a very statesmanlike position, in recent months. And, in this context, the President adhered severely to the traditional American approach of universalism in trade liberalization. On December 6, 1961, in a forceful speech before the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. Kennedy said: "I am not proposing, nor is it either necessary or desirable, that we join the Common Market * * * establish a rich man's trading community, abandon our traditional most-favored-nation policy, create an Atlantic free-trade area, or impair in any way our close economic ties with Canada, Japan and the rest of the free world. And this, of course, is a problem of the greatest concern to us all. We do not want Japan left out of this great market, or Latin America, which has depended so much on the European Market."

The same understanding note sounds repeatedly in the formal message on trade, which the President sent to the Congress on January 25, 1962, together with his bill on trade liberalization. There he says: "We must make certain that any arrangements which we make with the European Economic Community are worked out in such a fashion as to insure nondiscriminatory application to all third countries * * * the United States and Europe together have a joint responsibility to all of the less-developed countries * * * we will preserve our traditional most-favored-nation principle under which any tariff concession negotiated will be generalized to our other trading partners."

The President also requested special authority to join with the Common Market in eliminating all duties on tropical products "* * * supplied by friendly less-developed countries and not produced here in any significant quantity." In this case, however, the President's generosity is perhaps not of the highest order. The United States already has on the free list such tropical products as coffee, cocoa, and bananas, while several European countries subject these items to considerable tariffs, either for revenue or to protect former colonies. The President is here offering to give up someone else's cow.

Moreover, in the text itself of the draft bill on trade liberalization, as submitted by the President, the great principles of concern and care for the poorer countries have only a modest place (sec. 213 and sec 241). A critical case is the intent of the bill in the matter of tariff discrimination against friendly third countries. For example, in Europe there are three major trading nations now or prospectively in the Common Market—France, Great Britain and Benelux, who discriminate sharply against Japanese imports. (These discriminations contribute to Japan's selling twice as much to the United States as to all Europe.) Does the new bill mean that the President could not lawfully conclude the special agreement with the Common Market, permitted under its charter, unless the Common Market undertook to remove these discriminations? If the bill does not mean this, are President Kennedy's statements on protecting the poorer countries only Sunday sermons? Perhaps the text of the bill should be amended to determine this issue positively.

The President regrettably does not advert to the most difficult principle in trade policy with poorer, less-developed countries. This is a principle that goes beyond formal reciprocity. If the United States and Western Europe are considerate of the development problems of the poorer countries, we will indeed open to them our markets. We will buy from them on a nondiscriminatory basis, appreciating that the less-developed countries must sell us whatever their special natural resources or labor are able to supply. But the economically advanced nations will not then insist on reciprocal freedom to sell in the markets of the less-developed countries. If a poor country determines that passenger automobiles costing more than $2,000 are luxuries it cannot afford to import, the advanced countries must not press for a change of policy. The less-developed countries must also be allowed to protect their weak industries even in disregard of our judgment that these industries are often ill advised. And also respecting the import of capital goods, a less-developed country can be indulged in the use of tariffs and import licenses to which we would rightly object in a developed country.

It is for the more advanced countries to attain the understanding of the justice which consists in treating unequals as unequals.

TARIFF POLICY AND LEGISLATIVE CONTROL

Under the bill which Mr. Kennedy proposed, the President would be delegated authority for 5 years. He could "enter into trade agreements with foreign countries." He could proclaim "such continuance, reduction, or elimination of any duty or other import restriction * * * as he determines to be required or appropriate to carry out such trade agreements." In general, the President would be delegated authority to reduce any duty by up to 50 percent. In special cases, of which the most important would be a general agreement with the European Common Market, he could reduce duties to zero. When he had concluded any agreement, he would be obligated only to "transmit to the Congress a copy."

In my view, this 5-year delegation of power is unnecessary. There is no task to be done which requires present delegation of authority for so long as 5 years. In my view, further, so prolonged a delegation, where unnecessary, is not a desirable practice of government. Such delegation frees the executive branch from the need to respond to effective critical review, and it deprives the Congress of real, meaningful participation in the process of Government.

I suggest, therefore, that the trade liberalization bill would be improved greatly if its delegation of authority were made renewable after 2 years, rather than 5. A 2-year period is enough to prepare and conclude any trade negotiation, and yet it is not longer than the term of a single Congress. Properly scheduled, a 2-year period would give each Congress an opportunity to review carefully what has been done, to decide where the previous act of delegation needed to be revised, and to continue whatever experience showed to be well designed.

An additional, but more problematic, instrument of control is, I think, desirable in the case of the broad power to reduce customs duties to zero, in an agreement with the European Common Market. Such an agreement should, I suggest, lie for 60 days before both Houses of Congress, before entering into effect. And it should, in my view, become valid only if neither House took negative action during that period. A comprehensive reduction of customs duties to zero is of sufficient legislative importance to justify this deliberate and responsible mode of approval.

After this major issue of congressional participation, the structural changes needed in the President's draft bill may be narrowed down to four.

1. In regard to controlling purposes. The preamble of the bill and its statement of purposes (sec. 102) include everything except the kitchen sink. But they omit the major objective of improving the international balance of payments of the United States. This omission is perhaps less than clear sighted and candid. In 1962 and 1963, to look no further forward, American trade policy must operate within the controlling need to improve the U.S. balance of payments, not by trade policy alone but by trade policy also. The Trade Liberalization Act should set forth this balance-of-payments objective as one criterion, among others. And the law should instruct the President to report annually on how his actual trade liberalization measures were conceived to be related to this objective and on the experienced outcome.

The United States needs to keep balance-of-payments considerations from having undue constraining effect on the expansion of the domestic economy. This is the danger, discussed above, of allowing the tail to wag the dog. But we shall not succeed in avoiding constricting influences from deficits in our international balance of payments unless we deal with these deficits in our arrangements of international trade and finance.

Second, in regard to staging requirements. These are the provisions of law (sec. 243) which limit the amount of decrease in customs duty that can take place in any one year. They provide the really worthwhile element of protection from the impact of the tariff reductions that would be negotiated under a trade liberalization program. It is therefore my suggestion that these staging requirements be strengthened. The maximum reduction in import duty might be limited, in all cases, to 5 percent of the value of the article imported per year, for the first 5 years. Then in cases of really high present duties, over 25 percent ad valorem, the remainder—the amount of duty over 25 percent—would be subject to elimination in a maximum of 5 more years.

Third, in regard to adjustment assistance. This comprehends the armory of technical assistance, loans, tax reliefs and special compensations, outlined in 31 pages of the President's draft bill. I have indicated earlier why I think adjustment assistance is a huge mistake. I suggest this entire aspect of the bill be eliminated.

Fourth, in regard to most favored nation treatment. This is where the United States can take a step toward regaining its universalist position in trade policy. This is also where we can assist the poorer countries, if we are serious about doing so. I therefore suggest that consideration be given to requiring most favored nation treatment not only as a principle of action by the U.S. Government (as in the present sec. 241) but also as an engagement of the other countries with whom the United States makes agreements under the Trade Liberalization Act.

Outside the Trade Liberalization Act as such, there is the related issue of the enlargement of international monetary reserves. What is up for current consideration is the so-called $6 billion supplementary international monetary fund, which (as I have indicated in my earlier article) is really no fund at all. This issue does not come before the Congress for formal ratification. The controlling exchange of letters between the French Minister of Finance and the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury (dated Dec. 15, 1961) presumably records an Executive arrangement not requiring to be ratified formally. But the United States needs to have made ready $2 billion, for our participation. Therefore the matter must come before the Congress for appropriation or for an authorization to borrow $2 billion.

The Congress of the United States would, in my view, act most responsibly if, after careful review and inquiry, it rejected this request for a $2 billion appropriation or authorization. Such rejection should be accompanied by counsel to the Executive to attempt to negotiate a more satisfactory agreement. Then this rejection would, in the long run, serve the interests of international monetary stabilization. It would also, in the long run, improve the quality of the relations between the Congress and the Executive. And it would generally contribute to improving the quality of the conduct of the public business of the United States.

THE CRUSADE FOR TRADE

Trade liberalization has become a holy cause. Decent people are prepared to lie for it. In Washington, from Capitol Hill to Georgetown and beyond, one hears the same counsel, "That may be true. But don't say it. You will be helping the protectionists." If one cannot unqualifiedly praise, then one should be silent, so that the right and the good may prevail.

Elsewhere, gaudier fireworks are burned. On January 31, 1962, the Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs gave a speech entitled "The President's Trade Program—Key to the Grand Design." The minted phrase "and design" had then already been taken up by a Washington journalistic claque. (The Secretary of State had used it a month earlier in a speech before the American Historical Association. And the President had used it several times.) But we must still ask ourselves seriously: "Grand design? What design? Do we have here a genuine foreign policy reality, or is this only another piece of advertising lingo? I fear the latter is the case."

The text of the Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs speech is not reassuring. He calls upon God. He invokes peace and freedom. But he gives no indication of awareness of what the design of a foreign policy might consist of. Concerning trade itself, he says, "Unity will ultimately depend upon the development of a real community of interests, involving all of the varied activities and aspirations of man. Trade is the warp and woof of such a community." If trade is already both the warp and woof, what is left? (No doubt, finishing and ornamentation.) But lest we fear that we may have misunderstood the Undersecretary, he goes on, "Trade is the one most universal common denominator among the pursuits of man." Not work, not play, not love, not struggle, not search—but trade. Here we have reached the 1960's version of the wisdom of Calvin Coolidge, "The business of the United States is business." But we have 40 years of progress: the wisdom of Calvin Coolidge is now perceived to have universal application.

The problem of China? Trade. The problem of the Germanys? Trade. The problem of nuclear annihilation? Trade. No need to proceed. It is easy to see how trade liberalization is the key to the grand design of a foreign policy.

In the fullness of time, our generation too may have its understanding historian. Perhaps a Johan Huizinga, perhaps a Lucien Febvre. Why should imaginative richness and intellectual penetration be expended only on remote centuries? Even then, our historians may find this whole trade liberalization affair, as it is being played out in the United States, a puzzler. How could intelligent people in the America of the 1960's come to think of a question affecting some customs duties on merchandise as a great crusade? Our historian will, by definition, see deeper than we, but perhaps we can help him.

Ours is not a society rich in attractive public causes. We live in what is, in several fundamentals, a frustrated democracy. The great Aristotle defined a citizen as "a man who shares in the administration of justice and in the holding of office." By this exacting definition, we have few citizens. Indeed, perhaps the dominant characteristic of our public life is the political nonparticipation of the greater number of our people. But Americans are profoundly dissatisfied with this nonparticipation.

Moreover, political advocacy is now extremely timid in the United States. If there is any political impulse that holds deeper appeal for Americans it is the pull toward a more exacting reformulation of democracy. But did not the same Aristotle also say that democracy is the rule of the poor? And is it not un-American today to speak of poor and rich? Surely our polite tradition holds we are all affluent; rich and poor have been abolished. But, in our more reflective moments, we are nevertheless repelled by the emptiness of this polite tradition.

Politics is always a struggle for the exercise of the public power. But when politics passes beyond a chapter in zoology, it is a struggle for the exercise of the public power in the service of some conception of the good life. Whatever elements of the impulse to a politics beyond the limits of zoology have persisted in our American tradition were lulled to sleep in the prosperity of the better-placed or bludgeoned out of existence by the cold war. You never had it so good. And, besides, will you give aid and comfort to the totalitarian enemy. But the reduction of politics to a struggle between Gog and Magog leaves us distressed.

What joy, what release, in this moral climate, to find a cause like trade liberalization. Here the good, the wise and the rich are come together. The great banking figures (almost to a man) are joined with the prominent names in the AFL-CIO (also almost to a man). College presidents jostle corporate presidents. And the assembly achieves a mood of high solemnity. Here is no trumpery business of cotton and oil, buttons and beeswax. Here is combat for the unity of freemen and a hard blow struck against the Communist hydra. What a glorious festival. What a noble company.

Consequently we rejoice, having to construct something upon which to rejoice.

A MOTE IN THE MIND'S EYE

I would not recommend rejection of the President's initiative in trade liberalization. I would recommend enactment, after major structural modifications.

The contribution of the United States to world affairs would be diminished by rejection. People all over the world would probably understand rejection of trade liberalization to mean a movement of congressional opinion toward international economic isolation. And they would, quite reasonably, be led to speculate on whether the Congress was not also moving in the direction of diminishing its support for American political participation in world affairs. To so withdraw would be to shirk American responsibilities. To appear to withdraw would create confusion.

It is of the first order of importance that Americans should appreciate, with all possible clarity, how little can rationally be anticipated in domestic economic gain, from trade liberalization. A freer international trade is not among the more important policies of the United States in relation to its domestic economic problems.

It is equally important that Americans should realize, clearly and consequently, how small is the contribution to our general foreign policy that can be made by trade liberalization. Nothing we can do in the sphere of customs duties will make a weighty contribution even to overcoming the major differences of outlook, in their approach to world problems, between our Government and the governments of friendly non-Communist countries. Far less will anything we can do in trade liberalization have significant consequences in helping toward reconciliation or equilibrium where we are in conflict with the Communist bloc.

One of the more attractive aspects of the program of trade liberalization is the promise it holds out of assistance to the poorer peoples, through markets for them. But this promise will be realized only if the United States adheres to a firm univeralist line in our trade agreements. In the past, our Government has inconsistently indulged—indeed fostered and sponsored—regional economic exclusiveness. If we are to act better in the future, we must first straighten out our thinking.

Above all, and as a prelude to all other rational conduct in this sphere, we must deflate the swollen image of trade liberalization to its true dimensions. A mote it is to trouble the mind's eye.

EXHIBIT 2

U.S. SENATE,
March 8, 1962.

Hon. LUTHER HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY HODGES: You will recall our colloquy during recent hearings of the Joint Economic Committee in which I protested against statistics presented in such a way as to give a misleading impression of employment generated by export trade.

Your Department had issued a news release containing the statement, "approximately 6 million American workers are engaged in manufacturing plants which produce for export." You agreed that this statement could be misleading after I pointed out that it gave the definite impression that there are 6 million workers engaged in production for export, whereas, in fact, only a small percentage of the total production of these plants is for the export market.

To my regret, I have found that your Department has persisted in presenting statistics in such a fashion as to mislead, and can only conclude that this is being done deliberately in order to win support for the administration's proposed trade legislation. In view of your statement at the hearings, I believe this is being done without your knowledge and consent.

I invite your attention to a so-called "fact sheet" on "Connecticut and Foreign Trade" which was supplied recently to my office in response to a request for information concerning export trade in my State. A copy is enclosed for your ready reference.

Because I know that you agree with me that judgments concerning the trade program should be based on the whole truth, and not half-truths and misleading statistics, I request that you supply me as promptly as possible with answers to questions raised by statements in this document.

The administration's trade program is important, and its objectives of expanding trade in the free world by lowering trade barriers deserve support whether or not one agrees with the specific details of the bill the administration has presented. However, I do not believe presentation of half-truths and misleading statistics are a proper method of winning support for the program and can only obstruct efforts to judge it on its merits.

Herewith are statements in the so-called "fact sheet" which I question, and which I believe your Department should more fully explain:

1. Statement: "Exports of manufactured goods from Connecticut amount to $385.9 million in 1960."

Questions: What was the total production of manufactured goods in Connecticut in 1960?

What percentage of total production is represented by exports?

2. Statements: "250 Connecticut establishments exported more than $25,000 in 1960;

Two hundred and thirteen thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven workers are employed in these establishments (total number of manufacturing workers in Connecticut in 1958 was 380,556).

Questions: Of the 213,877 Connecticut workers employed in the 250 establishments referred to, how many were employed in producing goods for export, and how many were employed in producing goods for the domestic market?

Of the 380,556 manufacturing workers in Connecticut in 1958, how many were engaged in production for export, and how many in production for the domestic market?

3. Statement: "Connecticut ranked 14th in the Nation in the value of manufactured exports."

Question: What rank does Connecticut hold in total production of manufactured goods?

4. Statement: "Connecticut's transportation equipment industry exported $154 million in 1960."

Question: How many workers were employed in this industry, and what percentage of them were engaged in production for export?

What was the total production in 1960 of this industry, and what percentage of total production is represented by exports?

Of the $154 million in exports in 1960, what amount is accounted for under the military or economic aid programs?

5. Statement: "Connecticut's nonelectrical machinery industry (primarily metal-working machinery, special industry machinery, general industry machinery, and office machines) exported $76.8 million in 1960 and employed 43,238 Connecticut workers."

6. Statement: "Connecticut's electrical machinery industry exported $27.9 million in 1960 and employed 25,536."

7. Statement: "Connecticut's instruments and related products industry (primarily mechanical measuring devices and medical instruments and supplies) exported $23 million in 1960 and employed 23,590 Connecticut workers."

8. Statement: "Connecticut's fabricated metal industries (primarily cutlery, handtools and hardware, and fabricated metal products, n.e.c.) exported $21.3 million in 1960 and employed 23,590 Connecticut workers."

9. Statement: "Connecticut's chemicals and allied products industry exported $20.7 million in 1960 and employed 6,831 Connecticut workers."

Questions: What was the total production of each of these industries in Connecticut in 1960, and what percentage of total production is represented by exports? How many of the Connecticut workers in each of these industries were engaged in production for export?

Under the heading, "Exports by Individual Connecticut Industries," are listed the countries which are "best customers for similar U.S. products." In each industry classification, please give the amounts exported to each individual country listed by Connecticut industries, if available, and by U.S. industries.

The so-called fact sheet also includes these statements:

"Connecticut's equivalent share of the U.S. total exports of $4.9 billion of agricultural products was $11.5 million in 1960–61. Included were $7.5 million for field crops; $2.9 million for livestock and livestock products; $0.4 million for vegetables; and $0.7 million for fruits and nuts.

"About 1,900 farmworkers may be attributed to the production of farm products that were exported both in unprocessed and in processed form."

I would appreciate being informed how Connecticut's "equivalent share" was determined, and how the number of farmworkers "may be attributed to the production" of the listed products.

On their face, these statistics appear to be completely unreliable, and I am surprised that your Department would take the responsibility for disseminating them. Connecticut may export some tobacco, some poultry and other farm products, but I should think the amounts could be readily determined rather than picking figures out of the blue by the device of attributing to our State an "equivalent share" of total U.S. agricultural exports.

By copy of this letter, I am requesting the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor, the agencies apparently responsible for the statements quoted above, for an explanation. Accordingly, I ask that there be no delay on this account in your Department's response to the questions raised concerning the statements for which it is directly responsible.

In closing, I repeat my regret that your Department, I trust without your knowledge, has been distributing such questionable material, and express my hope that you will immediately put a stop to it.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PRESCOTT BUSH,
U.S. Senator.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1962.

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: I am sorry for the delay in answering your letter of March 8, 1962, concerning the Department's export origin studies. By this time, I am sure you have received the final study for Connecticut, but a copy is enclosed for reference.

I shall list the statements and questions appearing in your letter, followed by my comments. After the specified items, I will make some general comments as you did in your letter. Because of the relationships among several of your questions, there will necessarily be considerable duplication in my comments.

1. Statement: "Exports of manufactured goods from Connecticut amounted to $385.9 million in 1960."

Questions: What was the total production of manufactured goods in Connecticut in 1960?

What percentage of total production is represented by exports?

Comment: The total value of manufacturing production or shipments in a State is not published by the Census Bureau because of the duplications resulting from shipments from one manufacturer to another. Figures are available on total number of manufacturing employees, total value added, etc., but not total shipments. Since we do not have the figure on total shipments, it is not possible to give you the percent of total production represented by exports either.

2. Statements: "Two hundred and fifty Connecticut establishments exported more than $25,000 in 1960."

There are 213,877 Connecticut workers employed in these establishments (total number of manufacturing workers in Connecticut in 1958 was 380,556).

Questions: Of the 213,877 Connecticut workers employed in the 250 establishments referred to, how many were employed in producing goods for export, and how many were employed in producing goods for the domestic market?

Of the 380,556 manufacturing workers in Connecticut in 1958, how many were engaged in production for export, and how many in production for the domestic market?

Comment: Estimates are not available on the number of workers required to produce exports of manufactured goods by States. As stated in the employment section of the Connecticut report, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has estimated that employment required in exporting the more than $20 billion of merchandise in 1960 was the equivalent of 3.1 million jobs. The Secretary of Labor in his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on March 13 released the State breakdown of this total estimate which I am enclosing. These are the only statistics available for export attributable employment by States.

3. Statement: "Connecticut ranked 14th in the Nation in the value of manufactured exports."

Question: What rank does Connecticut hold in total production of manufactured goods?

Comment: Figures for total production or total shipments are not published by State because of duplications. However, Connecticut ranked 14th in number of manufacturing employees in 1958, the same position as in the rank of exporting States.

4. Statement: "Connecticut's transportation equipment industry exported $154 million in 1960."

Questions: How many workers were employed in this industry, and what percentage of total production is represented by exports?

Of the $154 million in exports in 1960, what amount is accounted for under the military or economic aid programs?

Comment: In 1958, the last year for which total figures are available, 70,612 workers were employed in this industry in Connecticut. Figures on total production or shipments of this industry are not released because of the duplications resulting from the shipments from one manufacturer to another. Consequently, percentages of the total production in this industry represented by exports is not available.

Estimates by States of exports for the military or economic aid programs are not available.

5. Statement: "Connecticut's nonelectrical machinery industry (primarily metalworking machinery, special industry machinery, general industry machinery and office machines) exported $76.8 million in 1960 and employed 43,238 Connecticut workers."

6. Statement: "Connecticut's electrical machinery industry exported $27.9 million in 1960 and employed 25,536."

7. Statement: "Connecticut's instruments and related products industry (primarily mechanical measuring devices and medical instruments and supplies) exported $23 million in 1960 and employed 23,590 Connecticut workers."

8. Statement: "Connecticut's fabricated metal industries (primarily cutlery, hand tools and hardware, and fabricated metal products, n.e.c.) exported $21.3 million in 1960 and employed 23,590 Connecticut workers."

9. Statement: "Connecticut's chemicals and allied products industry exported $20.7 million in 1960 and employed 6,831 Connecticut workers."

Questions: What was the total production of each of these industries in Connecticut in 1960, and what percentage of total production is represented by exports? How many of the Connecticut workers in each of these industries were engaged in production for export?

Comment: The value of production or shipments of each and all of these industries is not published by the Bureau of the Census because of the duplications resulting from shipments from one manufacturer to another. Consequently, it is also not possible for us to give you the percent of total production or shipments represented by exports.

Estimates are not available by State on the number of workers in each of these industries producing for export.

Immediately after your numbered questions, you referred to exports to individual countries and asked, if available, for figures on exports by Connecticut industries. Separate figures by State are not available. Separate figures by country of destination for U.S. exports are shown in the enclosed Foreign Trade Report No. F.T. 420 for 1960.

You also state that you have written to the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture regarding the figures on agriculture exports and estimated number of workers producing for export. Consequently, I will not make further comment on these statistics regarding agricultural exports supplied by the Agriculture and Labor Departments.

I must take strong exception to your statement that the statistics appearing in our fact sheet appear to be completely unreliable. The Department is aware of many gaps in our statistical data. It is for this reason that we are proud of our recent export origin survey. For the first time we have some knowledge of where exports originate in the United States. The figures certainly underscore the point that exporters are important in all parts of the country. We have hopes that as time goes on we may be able to expand and refine such statistical information. Certainly this information can be useful to business, farmers, and labor as well as to the Congress since foreign trade has become so important to our economy. In my opinion the export origin studies are an honest first step.

I regret very much that you found it necessary to question the integrity of the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture. I am confident that neither these Departments nor any other Department would release unreliable figures.

I hope that this information has satisfactorily answered your questions and will give you a better understanding of our efforts to present as clear, complete and objective a report as our statistics will permit.

I appreciate your raising these questions and I am glad you agree that the administration's trade program is important and its objectives deserve support.

With kindest good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

RETIREMENT OF JUSTICE WHITTAKER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, Mr. Justice Whittaker's retirement from the U.S. Supreme Court, first made public by President Kennedy at last Thursday's Presidential news conference, came, I am sure, as a complete surprise to all of us. Our Nation is deeply indebted to Justice Whittaker, for his long years of dedicated service.

His life and record of accomplishments have truly been in the tradition of the classic "American dream." Leaving the Kansas farm that was his birthplace in order to take a job as clerk and messenger with a Kansas City law firm, he worked days and attended night classes to complete high school and study law. Later, after his admission to the Missouri bar, he became a partner in this same law firm, engaging in private practice in Kansas City for more than 30 years.

Appointed U.S. district judge for the western district of Missouri in 1954, he began his judicial career. Within 2 years, he was chosen to fill a vacancy on the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, where he served less than a year before he was elevated to the U.S. Supreme Court on March 2, 1957; the first Missourian ever to serve as a member of this country's highest judicial tribunal.

Charles Evans Whittaker has won wide respect from both bench and bar. As a jurist, he has become known as a careful legal technician. His judicial manner has always been soft spoken and especially considerate. He has continually displayed an uncanny ability to quickly grasp the minute details of the complex matters coming before the Court.

President Kennedy has expressed the gratitude of the Nation for his devoted service. Chief Justice Warren, in addition to his testimonial to Mr. Justice Whittaker's great ability, has, I think, paid him the warmest compliment that a man can know from those with whom he works and studies, when he expressed the feelings of the members of the Court: "We lose the daily association of a devoted colleague and friend."

It is especially regrettable that the exacting responsibilities of the Court and his dedication to the discharge of those responsibilities, have brought on such complete physical exhaustion that he could not continue his rigorous duties without serious impairment of his health. I know that Missourians are of one mind in praying that the rest and relaxation his retirement permits will speed him to full recovery of his health; a prayer in which, I am sure, citizens throughout the length and breadth of this great country of ours join.

SUGAR LEGISLATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, some time within the next 90 days we shall have to consider new sugar legislation. The present Sugar Act expires June 30, and we must enact a new law before that date.

Because a small tax is involved, sugar legislation originates in the House of Representatives. The chairman of the House Committee on Finance has announced that he will begin hearings on a new sugar law on Tuesday, May 1. That will be only 60 days before the present law expires.

In the interest of saving time, Mr. President, and to avoid the last-minute, barely-under-the-wire passage of sugar legislation—which has, unfortunately, marked action on sugar since the middle of 1960—I strongly urge the leadership of the Senate Agriculture Committee to schedule sugar hearings simultaneously with the hearings in the House of Representatives.

The administration has not yet come forward with its sugar proposal, although I understand discussions have been carried on for several months at various levels in the executive branch. Early drafts made available to interested parties have been far from satisfactory and I hope the plan will be thoroughly revised before it is submitted to Congress. Until then, I shall reserve final judgment of the administration's program.

However, time is of the essence. If the administration should continue to delay and if expiration date of the present law draws uncomfortably close, I urge the consideration by the Congress of a bill embodying the principles of a proposal which has been carefully worked out by the various segments of the domestic sugar producers and refiners.

The industry proposal was developed at the behest of Members of Congress and of officials in the executive branch. The proposal was presented to various Members of Congress informally, and to responsible officials of the executive branch, last January. Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are familiar with its details, so I shall not dwell on them. It has appeared in the RECORD. However, for the convenience of all who may study the RECORD of this day, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD again, at the conclusion of my remarks, the outline of the industry proposal.

This program, as I have said, was developed by the industry at the suggestion of persons in both the legislative and executive branches of the Government. It was developed after many long months of conferences and compromises. It represents an agreement of many minds and many divergent views and interests.

It appears to me to be a sound program—sound for the consumer of sugar, sound for the domestic sugar producers, sound for the domestic sugar refiners, and above all, sound for our Nation. It appears to me to be an eminently workable program, a program that does indeed commend itself to our strong support.

I recognize that every segment of the industry would like to have a greater share of the American sugar market allocated to that segment than the agreement proposes, but all segments have yielded and modified their aspirations in the interest of achieving full agreement on a unified program for which all segments could reasonably ask support. I feel confident any refinements necessary to be made to the industry bill will be incorporated following full hearings by both the House and the Senate.

In my own State of Texas, I know, there are many farmers who would like to produce sugarbeets, enough to warrant the erection of a processing plant, but who cannot now do so under the beet-sugar quota provisions of the present law. The industry proposal provides modestly increased quotas for the continental producing areas, including the beet sugar industry—enough to open the door for a reasonable and sensible expansion of both the mainland cane and the domestic beet sugar reproducing industry.

The industry proposal would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to set aside a reasonable number of acres each year specifically for the expansion of the beet sugar industry, in addition to the authority now in the law authorizing him to allocate acreage to new growers. He would make the special allocation for expansion after holding public hearings. And I am sure that my good friends in my State of Texas have the ability and the facts to make a strong enough case at such hearings to obtain their full share of the acreage for expansion.

In Texas, also, is represented another segment of the domestic sugar industry whose views often are opposed to the views of the beet sugar industry. I refer to the cane sugar refinery which is located, appropriately enough, at Sugar Land, Tex. This refinery depends upon a steady supply of raw sugar, in order to stay in business. The availability of raw sugar for domestic cane sugar refiners has been automatically enhanced by 375,000 tons a year through the elimination of Cuban sugar from our market—because included in the former Cuban quota of more than 3 million tons was a "white" or fully refined quota of 375,000 tons. This may seem to be merely a technicality of the law, but it is of importance to the domestic cane sugar refining industry. The industry proposal would require that all foreign sugar brought to our shores be admitted as raw sugar only, and this is a provision which, along with the quota provisions, merits our support.

We do not know, of course, what proposals the administration may make. I am hopeful that the administration will send up a bill before the Easter recess, so that we may study it. I do not imply that we should accept it, sight unseen. We may find it unacceptable. In that event, or in the event that the administration continues to delay, Mr. President, I repeat that we should proceed with the industry proposal—which has strong support in both Houses of Congress—and get the job done. The alternative may be another short-term extension of the present law, which would solve no problems, and would merely continue the uncertainties which have plagued sugar consumers, producers, and refiners for nearly 2 years.

SUGAR LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

First. Term: The new law would be a 5-year act extending from January 1, 1962, through December 31, 1966.

Second. Basic quotas: New basic quotas for domestic areas would be established at a consumption estimate level of 9,700,000 tons. These would be as follows:

Beet area	2,665,000
Mainland cane area	900,000
Hawaii	1,150,000
Puerto Rico	1,200,000
Virgin Islands	15,000

Third. Growth: Growth—decrease—over—under—the 9,700,000 level of consumption requirements—consumption estimate minus unallocated amounts and deficits in allocated amounts under section 408—would be divided 67½ percent to domestic continental areas and 32½ percent to foreign areas. The 67½ percent would be shared 75 percent by the domestic beet sugar area and 25 percent by the mainland cane sugar area. If in any year, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or Virgin Islands, produces more than its basic qouta, it may in the following year, upon request, have such quota increased by the amount of such excess, provided that in no event shall such quota exceed the basic quota—plus growth—under the law before amendment, all such increases being charged to the foreign total. Hawaii's and Puerto Rico's direct-consumption limitations would be 0.342 and 1.5 percent, respectively, of the consumption requirements in lieu of the provisions relating thereto in the present act.

Fourth. New beet growers: A special reserve of up to 20,000 acres, out of the total acreage required to produce the beet quota, would be available each year for the expansion of the industry.

Fifth. Domestic deficits: All domestic deficits would go to foreign areas, with the exception that the excess of Hawaiian deficit over 350,000 tons would go to the beet area.

Sixth. Direct consumption sugar: All foreign sugar would be imported in raw form. The Philippines would be given the option of a larger raw sugar quota in place of their quotas under existing law and the treaty between the United States and the Philippines.

Seventh. Personal history: The law would assure continued use of personal history as a basis for allocating proportionate shares in those sections of the beet area in which personal history now is a basis. No change would be made in those areas in which land history is now the basis for allocating proportionate shares.

Eighth. Liquid sugar quotas: All such quotas would be eliminated except provision would be made to permit continued entry of normal quantities of Barbados-type molasses.

Ninth. Nontransferability of quotas: Foreign countries assigned quotas under the act could fill such quotas only with sugar they produce. No net importing country would be eligible for a quota.

Tenth. Sugar-containing products: The Secretary would be given authority to limit importation of sugar-containing products when such importation would be contrary to the intent of the act.

Eleventh. Foreign supplies: Price incentives would be maintained in the act to insure that foreign sugar will be available to the U.S. market in the quantities needed at the times required.

PROPOSED U.S. PURCHASE OF U.N. BONDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, S. 2768, now before the Senate, represents a committee response to the President's request for the U.S. purchase of $100 million worth of U.N. bonds, for further support of the United Nations. What it will look like, when up for fund passage, it is hard to say.

In considering this recommendation, we—Members of Congress, as well as the American people—must evaluate its cost and effect in the long perspective—not just of today, but of history—and the future of peace in the world.

As a free-world leader, dedicated to perpetuation of freedom, we, the United States, have a continuing responsibility for military defense, yes, but also for creating the machinery that will help to establish, and perpetuate, peace in the world.

Now, let us face facts. The U.N. is not a panacea, not a miracle worker, not an international instrument which can automatically devise a formula for peaceful solution of differences among nations.

Indeed, there is a growing feeling, with or without justification, that the strength and influence of the U.N. as an international peacemaker is waning.

At this time in history, however, we must evaluate the degree of our responsibility in carrying forward, or undercutting, the United Nations.

The factors that deserve consideration include, I believe:

First. What would be the significance of actions, by the United States and other nations, of further weakening the capabilities of the U.N. to engage in negotiations for peaceful solutions of problems among nations?

Second. What would be the impact on world peace of further disintegrated relations among nations, if the U.N. were allowed to wither away and die?

Third. Currently, the United States earmarks about 1½ percent of its total expenditures for national security, to the U.N. Are the results worth the expense? Would military defense require greater expenditures—now at the $52 billion level—if the United Nations were allowed to collapse?

Fourth. In the long view of history, what would be the effect of the collapse of the U.N. upon humanity's efforts to establish machinery to settle differences among nations without war, and promote peace in the world?

Despite its obvious shortcomings, the United Nations, with moderate if not always complete success, condemned aggression by the Communists; helped in peacefully resolving some, if admittedly not all, crises around the world; and opened the way to cooperative efforts among nations for peaceful progress.

One hundred years ago, we recall, Abraham Lincoln said:

> The struggle for today is not just for today, it is for the vast future also.

In the space age, this truism has special significance.

Realistically, the present-day struggle is against communism, to resoundingly defeat the efforts of this totalitarian ideology to conquer and enslave the world.

The anti-Communist nations, in my judgment, possess the military strength, economic power, political principles, ideological precepts to—if we are willing to dedicate the necessary energies and resources—defeat communism.

Fundamentally, this means:

First. Maintaining a deterrent power that would make an attack synonymous with suicide.

Second. Outprogress, as we are now doing, the Communist world economically.

Third. Exert the extra energies to crystallize and translate what the ideas and ideals of freedom really mean to—and how they can serve—humanity.

In girding ourselves for the long battle ahead, we must ask ourselves: Are we fully utilizing our human and natural resources; our military, economic ideological powers; the potentials of bilateral and multilateral international organizations, including the regional alliances, as well as the United Nations?

Recognizing that the enemy of freedom in the world in the 1960's is communism, we must however, in my judgment, look even further ahead to the world of tomorrow. Are we making enough of a contribution to the survival of freedom, if we defeat only today's enemy, without attempting to create the machinery for permanent world peace to prevent the emergence of threats to freedom for mankind, generation after generation, for the future?

Within this perspective, then, we must evaluate the proportionate significance of current proposals before the Senate.

As a taxpayer who, along with other Americans, accounts for my budget, dollar for dollar, $100 million is a lot of money.

Considered in relation to our expenditures for national security, however, totaling, as I mentioned, about $52 billion—a figure incomprehensible to most of us—the requested funds appear of lesser magnitude.

The President, as spearhead of our foreign policy, has requested the funds to support such policy. The Senate, I believe, must now act, within its best judgment, to take the necessary action to provide support for this aspect of our foreign policy.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT, RELATING TO THE SET-ASIDE PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced, at the request of a number of my constituents, a bill which would amend the Small Business Act to repeal the so-called small business set-aside in Government construction. Under the set-aside program, the Corps of Engineers is presently setting aside a number of procurements in which only small concerns, as defined by the Small Business Administration, can bid.

As many Members of this body are aware, the applicability of the set-aside program to the construction industry has been a subject of prolonged debate, particularly during the last 2 years. There is perhaps no program in which Congress has indicated a greater continuing interest than those programs relating to small business. It is because of this continuing deep concern of the Congress that I am introducing this bill, so that the Congress may have an opportunity to hear, first hand and at whatever length is required, the often divergent views which one encounters on this subject.

It has, for instance, been maintained that the small business set-aside program, as it relates to the construction industry, has actually subsidized inefficient and marginal small business contractors at the expense of solid and responsible businessmen.

The present program has been criticized as bringing new contractors into a field in which competition is already acute and where the existing firms are by no means fully occupied.

It has been said that this competitive pattern obtains in construction set-asides as opposed to other aspects of the set-aside program, that in other set-asides, competitive bidding is used to determine price, and that after the price has been arrived at in this manner, the procurement item in question is set aside in order that small businessmen may have an opportunity to meet the competition of price as well as quality. Yet it is urged that in the operation of the construction set-aside, this has not been the case; the competent and efficient contractors are not allowed to bid, with the result that the Government does not know what a fair price for these set-asides might be.

Those who defend this program urge that exempting any given industry from the set-aside provision would establish a precedent that could only lead to attempts to exempt other industries. In response it has been maintained that Congress has always treated the building construction industry separately, as in the Landrum-Griffin Act, the Taft-Hartley Act, and other statutes dealing with labor-management relations.

It has been maintained that the workings of the present construction set-aside by definition invite people into Government construction who are nonunion and not organized; that even though these small business contractors pay the prevailing wage provided by the Davis-Bacon Act, they are not required to pay the so-called fringe benefits which exist in all construction contracts. And it is pointed out, too, that the set-aside contractors make no contribution to the manpower training program in the construction industry, nor are they part of the apprenticeship agreements.

I have heard disputed the loss rate of loans by the Small Business Administration in the construction industry. It is maintained that the loss rate on these loans far exceeds the loss rate on the other SBA loans.

These are but a few of the aspects of this matter, on which I have heard many conflicting views, and I am sure other Members of this body have had similar experiences.

I am aware that the Small Business Administration has been conducting a series of hearings on this matter, which are not yet completed. I understand too that the Senate Select Committee on Small Business has held informal conferences regarding specific aspects of the problem. I, of course, welcome every attempt to clarify the sometimes contradictory aspects this entire matter presents.

Therefore, I have introduced this bill in the hope that the Senate can conduct a wide-ranging survey of the entire matter and resolve the many questions which presently characterize the entire issue. I hope that appropriate committees of the Senate will move forward with hearings on this problem, so that the Senate may be in a better position than it presently finds itself in giving congressional direction to the set-aside program.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE PROGRAM

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the eminent columnist, Mr. George E. Sokolsky, has summed up in a column what seems to me to be a very significant trend of thought in connection with the international trade program now under consideration in the Congress.

The column speaks so plainly that I believe it requires no further comment. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of the article be printed as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TARIFF

(By George E. Sokolsky)

When the United Mine Workers adopt a high tariff policy, the changes that are taking place in the thinking of the workers are notable. While businessmen and bankers and their various associations hold different opinions on this subject, depending upon how much capital and how many jobs they have exported, the workingman must protect himself from unemployment and Government-imposed impoverishment.

This is part of an editorial which recently appeared in the United Mine Workers Journal:

"The showdown battle over foreign trade policy has just begun in the 87th Congress. The immediate concern of the coal industry, the UMWA and allied industries and labor organizations is to convince the powerful House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee that American coal must be protected from the ravages of imported residual (waste) oil."

In another place the same publication says:

"If the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (H.R. 9900) is enacted by the Congress it will make the Chief Executive a virtual dictator over the economic welfare of American business and industry and the jobs of millions of American workers.

"Under the proposed legislation the Congress would give up, once and for all, its constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce. The new Foreign Trade Act would place in the hands of the President of the United States absolute control over the import-export policy of the Nation. It would permit the Chief Executive to open the floodgates to a deluge of cheap labor produced foreign goods."

This will be the principal issue in the 1962 congressional campaign and it will surprise the politicians of both political parties to discover that labor rather than management has gone high tariff. Should there be increased unemployment, the so-called labor statesmen who prefer to go along with President John F. Kennedy will have a revolt on their hands.

The real difficulty is that the United States has become so involved in treaties and agreements that it is almost hopeless to make head or tail out of it. The worst of these is GATT, which in a measure deprives the United States of its sovereignty in economic matters. When the GATT agreement comes up for renewal, it would be sound to drop it and start all over again.

The reason that the United Mine Workers are so opposed to the Kennedy tariff policies as they were opposed to the Eisenhower tariff policies is that coal mining is ceasing to be a profitable enterprise. It is this that has impoverished the State of West Virginia. The worst offender against West Virginia is residual oil, a cheap product of the oil industry, brought in mostly from such countries as Venezuela.

Here again is a difficult situation. The United States seeks to build up the economy of Latin American countries in the hopes of keeping them on our side of the fence. As long as the United States is the principal consumer's goods market in the world, nations which have commodities to sell will bargain politically for their share of this market.

If the Kennedy administration can find a formula for preventing unemployment, this problem could solve itself. But unemployment is intolerable. It is a tough nut to crack and thus far no wise man has come forth with a solution.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, further on the same subject, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks at this point an editorial which appeared in the March 15, 1962, edition of the United Mine Workers Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENSIBLE FOREIGN TRADE IDEA FROM SENATOR CAPEHART OF INDIANA

A lot of silly nonsense comes across our desk from day to day about President Kennedy's free trade proposals and how American workers are just going to have to tighten their belts and sit back and go hungry in the interest of the greater good or something.

It is therefore refreshing to run across, as we did in the March issue of the International Teamster, a most thoughtful article on the subject of foreign trade by Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican of Indiana, himself a successful businessman and employer before he started serving in the Congress. He always employed union labor.

"There is too much unemployment now," Senator CAPEHART writes. "What we need is legislation to create jobs. Will President Kennedy's program do that?" The Senator says he doesn't know the answer but that if the program will make jobs he's in favor of it. But the Congress is going to have to give a long, hard look at the program if it is going to get factual answers.

WE CAN'T AFFORD A MISTAKE

"Let's take a year, or two, or three if necessary, to be sure we don't make a mistake. We can't afford to make a mistake on this one."

The Indiana Senator emphasizes two essential points: (1) "Industry cannot compete with foreign imports produced by low-cost labor"; and (2) "the establishment of new and expansion of existing businesses is one of the great hopes for correcting the serious unemployment picture."

He notes: "Many employers feel they must delay plant expansion or the opening of new plants for fear these new plant facilities would be noncompetitive by the time they were ready to go into operation because of the trade program.

"They feel they may be forced to invest in foreign countries the money they would normally use for growth and expansion in the United States, thus substituting foreign investments for national investment in plant facilities."

Senator CAPEHART said that when President Kennedy's free trade program comes up on the Senate floor, "I am going to propose amendments that will provide an equalization of labor costs through tariffs."

Now, this makes such good sense and is so obviously a prolabor position that it probably won't have a chance of being adopted by the Congress. It would protect American jobs and the American standard of living. It would say to the foreign employer: We believe, as a matter of policy, that you should pay decent wages to your workers just as American employers do. It would remove human labor, American and foreign, from the ravages of cutthroat competition, something that should appeal to the mind of even the most fuzzy-brained, double-dome freetrader. And it would help stop the exploitation of foreign workers by their employers and the subsidizing of this exploitation by American workers, who have the choice of losing their jobs or lowering their standards of living and taking pay cuts.

Assume the labor cost of making a pair of shoes in Italy is $1 and the labor cost in America is $2. Senator CAPEHART's amendment would make it mandatory that a $1 tariff be added to the Italian-made shoes. This tariff would equalize the labor cost so the American shoe manufacturer would not be driven out of business. And it would assure the American shoeworker that his standard of living would not be reduced and probably save his job.

We'd like to know what's wrong with this.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION EXPANDS EXISTING PROGRAMS AND WORKS VIGOROUSLY TO ASSIST IN DISASTER STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Small Business Committee, I have worked closely with the Small Business Administration and I desire to speak of its accomplishments.

The SBA has been helpful in several ways to small businesses in West Virginia, and I have confidence that the agency's assistance will be continued, even accelerated. Legitimate SBA loan activity is helpful in our State's progress toward diversifying its industrial base.

Official Washington is keenly aware of the extensive increase in all SBA programs since President Kennedy came into office and since John E. Horne became the agency's able and dedicated Administrator.

While a Member of the Senate, our President was a member of the Select Committee on Small Business. I had the privilege and the responsibility of serving with him and I know of his genuine interest in the small business segment of the national economy.

Before assuming the duties of SBA Administrator, Mr. Horne was the capable administrative assistant to Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, chairman of our Small Business Committee. Thus, Mr. Horne moved into his new post with a detailed understanding of the Small Business Administration and of the intent of Congress in creating it.

I would remind you that small business, in the aggregate, is actually the country's biggest business. Of the 4,700,000 businesses in America, some 4,500,000 are classified as small businesses, existing in every community of the Nation. They furnish employment to at least 30 million people.

SBA has 60 offices located at strategic points throughout the country. We have two branch offices in West Virginia—one at Charleston and one at Clarksburg.

I would like to review briefly, some of the major programs and accomplishments of SBA in the country as a whole and in West Virginia in particular. The year 1961 was by far SBA's most productive. As I proceed, I will compare the records of various SBA programs in 1961 with those of 1960.

During 1961, SBA not only continued and expanded existing programs, but also undertook several new functions.

There are many who regard SBA as essentially a moneylending agency. While loans to small firms for various purposes constitute major agency activities, there are others also vital to the health and growth of small business.

Let us look briefly at the SBA business loan program and compare its 1961 record with that of the year before. During 1961 there were 6,836 such loans nationwide, for a total of $370 million. This compares with 4,012 loans for $195 million in 1960.

West Virginia's small business loans numbered 57 in 1961 and totaled $4,782,000. This is considerably better than the 31 loans for $1,830,000 in 1960. West Virginia has had, through 1961, a total of 213 SBA loans which aggregated $13,210,000.

Since the inception of SBA in 1953, and through December 31, 1961, the agency has approved approximately 30,000 loans for a total of nearly one-and-one-half billion dollars.

I point out that the Small Business Administration is in no wise competitive with local banks or lending institutions. In fact, SBA will not consider a loan application unless the applicant has tried and failed to get adequate financial aid from private sources.

Even then, SBA strives to have local bank participation in whatever loan it makes. The result is that more than 60 percent of all SBA loans have local bank participation.

SBA has recently developed what it calls a new simplified bank loan participation plan. This is a streamlined procedure through which local banks can supplement their lending activity to small firms seeking long-term loans.

For example, a bank desiring to be prudent and yet progressive budgets $2 million of its lending funds for term loans to deserving small businesses in the community. When this $2 million has been committed, the bank would be inclined, in order to stay within the budget, to desist in considering further loans of a term nature.

However, if the bank had initially shared these on a 25- to 75-percent basis—a bank may take a larger share and in some cases must take a larger share to the extent of existing bank debt to be refunded—with SBA furnishing the major portion of the loan, the bank could have advanced within the community a total of $8 million in term loans. Yet the bank's exposure stands at $2 million, the budget ceiling.

Through this method of collaboration with SBA, a bank can meet the needs of many customers it might otherwise be unable to serve. This helps increase the bank's business and also helps build the community.

Loan forms have been simplified and all procedures are streamlined. The emphasis is on speed, commensurate with sound lending practices. The new plan eliminates many former requirements and drastically reduces paperwork. SBA relies heavily on the bank's credit judgment.

SBA's disaster loan program has been helpful in West Virginia and throughout the country. This is a plan whereby loans are made, with little delay, to areas of the country suffering property damage through storms, hurricanes, floods, excessive rainfall or other natural disasters.

Under this program, SBA makes loans at 3 percent up to a maximum of 20 years to owners of businesses, homes and to churches and charitable institutions victimized by disaster.

Last summer and again last month several sections of West Virginia were hard hit by floods and the property damage was heavy. SBA made 100 disaster loans in the State for a total of $575,000 last year and others now are being processed. Also we all recall the devastating tides and storms along our eastern seaboard that severely damaged a large area. SBA immediately went to the rescue, opening temporary offices and sending in the necessary workers to process loan applications. That work continues and it is estimated that SBA will make several thousand loans to property owners and institutions.

We can also recall the terrific damage suffered when Hurricane Carla ripped the gulf coast area of Texas and Louisiana last September. In this instance SBA made more than 3,300 disaster loans in Texas alone for more than $14 million.

Throughout the country in 1961, SBA approved nearly 5,000 disaster loans for nearly $30 million. Nationally, there have been nearly 16,000 disaster loan approvals since SBA began operations in 1953 for a total of over $142 million.

So we can see this disaster loan program is indeed a great help and comfort to communities ravaged by the elements.

Another phase of SBA which has been helpful in West Virginia and other States and which I hope will grow in scope as time goes on, is the SBA State and local development company loan program. This provides local communities with a powerful tool in cheating new businesses or expanding or modernizing existing ones.

When SBA Administrator Horne took over the agency reins a little over a year ago, special emphasis was placed in order to create a wider awareness and a better use of development company loans.

There are several thousand local improvement or development organizations and chambers of commerce all over the country which should become acquainted with this program. SBA can lend as much as 80 percent of money needed by a community for a small business project, provided the remainder of the necessary money is raised locally.

In some cases, SBA's participation can be even more.

It is also emphasized by SBA that the initiative in the local development projects must start with the folks at home. SBA cannot step in and suggest what to do, or how to do it. It is only when the ball starts rolling that SBA can take part.

The impetus which can be given to a community's business and industrial activity by an SBA development loan can be seen in the histories of loans made in West Virginia.

In October of 1961 SBA made a direct loan of $80,000 for 20 years at 4 percent interest to the Petersburg Industrial Development Corp. for the construction and equipping of a new plant at Petersburg for the Edinburg Manufacturing Co., makers of infants and childrens garments. The new plant is expected to provide a minimum of 100 jobs—perhaps more as the plant gets into full swing.

A direct loan of $100,000—also at 4 percent interest—was made by SBA to Lincoln Industries, Inc., at Hamlin, W. Va. This was for the purchase of and construction of a building for the Dee-Mure Brassiers Co., at Hamlin. The company's customers include several major department stores.

The new Hamlin enterprise is expected to provide 100 new jobs at the outset and increase to 200 within 2 years of operation.

A deferred participation loan by SBA for $205,000, made to the Tygart Valley Development Corp., is expected to be of real help to Grafton, W. Va. This was for improvement and installation of new machinery and equipment for the Baby World Co., makers of children's toys, baby aids, and novelties. The company moved its entire operation from New York to Grafton. It expects an initial payroll of at least $400,000 annually and to provide more than 200 jobs.

The First National Bank of Grafton participated with SBA by taking 10 percent of the $250,000 loan.

A development company loan now nearing completion will see SBA taking 90 percent of a $173,000 loan for development of Webster Wood Industries, Inc., at Webster Springs. A local bank assumed 10 percent of the loan. The West Virginia Industrial Development Authority is expected to lend $25,000 with local banks adding another $25,000 to make the entire Webster project a $250,000 operation.

Management expects to employ 36 men at the outset and after a year's operation increase the employment to 100.

It was in 1958 that Congress amended the Small Business Act so as to create an Investment Division of SBA. I was an enthusiastic supporter of this legislation, which I regard as an excellent way of getting more private capital into small businesses by way of long-term loans and equity financing.

The growth of the Investment Division has been little short of amazing. When Administrator Horne took over, there were fewer than 200 small business investment companies in operation—177 I think was the number—and many Members of Congress felt that the program was lagging far behind their expectations.

Mr. Horne's Administration went to work with vim and vision. Some 6 or 8 weeks ago the 500th SBIC was licensed and there was a modest ceremony of celebration in the SBA offices. At this time, the number has increased to nearly 530, and I would not be surprised to see it hit 700 before the end of this year.

In our State we have the West Virginia First Small Business Investment Corp. at 1218 Fifth Avenue in Huntington.

I will not detail how the SBIC pattern works, but it is a great aid for small firms which are not large enough to sell stocks or get long-term loans as can be done by the great industrial concerns and businesses. As I have said, SBA itself does not actually control these SBIC's nor does it dictate as to loans which can or cannot be made. However, SBA is empowered to make loans to SBIC's to help provide them with sufficient working capital. This SBA assistance generally is in ratio to an SBIC's original capitalization.

Thus far I have spoken mostly about SBA's lending program. I will touch briefly on other activities and also discuss some of the new efforts and programs developed during 1961.

The assistance SBA gives to small firms seeking Government contracts constitutes a program equally as important as the Agency's lending activities. This has done much to keep the wheels of industry humming and to provide work and payrolls for many thousands of people throughout the country.

SBA representatives in Washington work closely with major Government contracting and purchasing departments.

Upcoming Federal contracts are carefully analyzed to see if they could be set aside for exclusive bidding by qualified small firms. Even the larger contracts which generally go to major industrial concerns, are closely scrutinized to see if they could not be broken down into subcontracts the prime contractor might offer to small firms.

This small business procurement activity is properly called the set-aside program. In 1961 there were 69 set-aside contracts awarded to small firms in West Virginia. Federal expenditures amounted to nearly $4 million. This was a significant increase over the 1960 figures of 34 contracts for $2.6 million.

Nationally, there were 46,000 contracts valued at, roundly, $1.5 billion. This compares with the 1960 total of 25,974 contracts worth $954 million.

Here again is positive proof of the manner in which SBA activities have been intensified under the Kennedy administration.

The SBA management assistance program also has been widely extended. Working in cooperation with schools, colleges, universities, and other educational bodies, the agency offers evening management courses to owners and operators of small businesses of all kinds.

These management courses, running 8 to 10 weeks, one night a week, cover many problems confronting the average businessman. A number of these courses have been held in West Virginia, attended by several hundred small business executives. Cooperating institutions include West Virginia Wesleyan, Buckhannon Institute, Charleston High School, Davis and Elkins College, Glenville College, Morris Harvey College, Potomac State College, Salem College, Shepherd College, the University of West Virginia, and the State department of education.

Throughout the country there have been more than 1,500 management courses, attended by some 41,000 businessmen and women. Some 450 schools have participated.

Another phase of SBA's management assistance is the research grant program whereby grants totaling $53,000 were made to West Virginia University and Marshall University for studies of several small business problems in the State.

The Morgantown study report has been made available to those who are interested. It is titled "Selecting a Site for the Small Manufacturing Plant." SBA has issued a summary of the report and it may be obtained, at no cost, from the SBA offices in Clarksburg or Charleston.

The other study, made by Marshall, has been completed and is under review at SBA offices in Washington. The full report and the SBA summary will be issued in the late spring. It should be of much interest to West Virginians, judging from the title, "Small Business Opportunities in a Depressed Coal-Dominated Tri-County Area in West Virginia."

A third phase of the management assistance program is the publications department through which thousands of small business problems and possibilities are analyzed. Most of these are available at no charge. SBA offices have listings of all these publications and business operators are invited to send their requests for the listings.

There are two new major SBA efforts which are being actively carried forward.

Prior to 1961, SBA's attention had been directed primarily to the problems of financing, procurement, production, and management which faced small business within the domestic market.

During 1961 SBA joined with the proper departments of the Department of Commerce to stimulate the interest of American small business in the possibilities of foreign trade.

SBA has published and is circulating some three or four management aids in the field of foreign trade. Field offices of SBA have been alerted and are participating in the effort.

I heartily agree with the SBA Administrator that there is opportunity in this area for small businesses. They need to know more about these possibilities.

The Area Redevelopment Administration of the Department of Commerce has a most potent partner in the Small Business Administration. Somewhat like SBA's development company program, ARA is placing emphasis on the economic development of areas most in need of stimulation.

ARA has been able to generate wide interest in its program in West Virginia. More than 95 percent of the counties of this State have been designated as redevelopment areas.

Overall economic programs have been approved for 25 West Virginia counties, the initial step for participation in the ARA program.

When a development proposal has been submitted to ARA, the Small Business Administration is called to process the loan applications and provide redevelopment area agencies with technical information and counsel.

Three West Virginia communities have applications for development of public facility improvements. Morgantown wants to develop an interceptor sewer. Webster County seeks an administration building to be used in the development of recreational facilities for that area. Fairmont is seeking a multipurpose dam with a filtration plant to develop tourism potentials.

One technical assistance grant of $7,000 has been made which will develop an engineering industrial site survey for Fairmont.

One ARA loan has been approved for $572,000 to the National Seating and Dimension Co. at Gilbert which will create 200 new jobs. Several industrial projects for West Virginia are now being considered by ARA.

An important phase of ARA is the training and subsistence. Three are underway now in West Virginia—at Huntington, Williamson, and in Harrison County. This program permits the training of electricians, auto mechanics, machine tool operators, typists, stenographers, nurses aids, waiters and waitresses, and many others.

SBA Administrator Horne has mentioned to me—and I thoroughly agree—that it is very important for local leaders to understand that the overall economic development plan of ARA does not necessarily mean their loan requests will be approved.

Before SBA recommends approval or disapproval of a loan application under the ARA authority it must have pertinent information to make certain that all terms are in keeping with the law. If unnecessary delay is to be avoided, a loan applicant must comply as quickly as possible SBA's requests for information.

I make this statement because I think the ARA program, as well as SBA State and local development plans, hold forth promise for rebuilding the economy of West Virginia and many other areas across the land.

SBA is indeed a most important and permanent Federal agency. It has proven its worth to the national economy and will continue to broaden its base of value to our citizens.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, has the morning hour been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, the morning hour has not been terminated. If no other Senator desires to speak under the provisions of the morning hour, the Chair declares the morning hour to be closed.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

RAILROAD MERGERS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, some 2 months ago on this floor, I expressed my deep concern over the announcement by the Pennsylvania and New York Central railroads that they would seek approval to merge their giant systems. I saw in this proposed merger the very essence of a grab for monopoly control over the railroad industry in the East. I particularly pointed out that this proposed merger was not merely a combination of the Pennsylvania and New York Central, as such, but that it obviously included other major roads controlled by, or affiliated with, these companies. I warned that this vast superconsolidation of economic power, if approved, would establish a far-reaching precedent, and that it would create a snowballing effect on other large consolidations, both within the transportation industry and elsewhere, which could result in the elimination of vital competition, the development of regional monopolies, the destruction of railroad facilities, the creation of serious unemployment, and the discrimination against many important communities and sections of the country.

Most important, I saw in these mergers another movement toward undue concentration of economic power in the hands of a few people.

Because I considered this rail merger movement, and particularly the Pennsylvania and New York Central merger, to be a national problem without sufficient solution, and without any satisfactory leadership toward seeking that solution, I called for an immediate deferral by the Interstate Commerce Commission of all decisions on pending rail merger applications, and urged the President of the United States to appoint a special commission with balanced membership—including representatives from the Justice Department and the Defense Department—to investigate and suggest a merger policy with standards and safeguards, and general directions of merger, which could be used as a foundation upon which Congress and the Interstate Commerce Commission could effectuate a national transportation merger policy.

The Pennsylvania and the New York Central have recently filed their joint application for merger with the Interstate Commerce Commission. In this application, these companies openly endorse the plan for three giant rail systems in the East. They support and approve the presently proposed Chesapeake & Ohio-Baltimore & Ohio combination, and the proposed Norfolk & Western-Nickle Plate-Wabash amalgamation. Their application lays its position squarely on the line when it states:

> There is no economic justification, presently or in the foreseeable future, for applicants to maintain separate lines which duplicate each other.

It then proceeds to describe that these lines lie in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois, seven of the most industrialized, most populated, and most productive States in our country. In addition, it states that the principal competitive lines of applicants run from New York to Chicago, Peoria and St. Louis—important gateways to the West—and from Michigan to Kentucky in a north-south direction. Despite all this vast area, and all the production, consumption, invention and just plain living that goes on in it, Mr. President, it is being urged that there is no "economic justification" for preserving competition between these carriers; "no economic justification" for retaining duplicate tracks and facilities, though these may be miles apart and servicing different communities; and no "economic justification" for keeping separate and independent these two corporate giants totaling over $5.6 billion in assets and almost $2 billion a year in revenue.

With the filing of this merger application by the Pennsylvania and the Central, the Interstate Commerce Commission now has before it the giant plan. This is, in essence, the "closing of the ring" as far as the big merger applications are concerned in the East. This is the way the big financial interests want it in order to obtain the maximum profit from their investments, regardless of all other considerations.

There are no alternatives offered, no other methods of improving efficiency and financial conditions short of such vast mergers. It has all been decided. This is to be the future pattern of American railroading. The pressure is on in the East in order to get the precedents established so that the pattern can be carried out throughout the Nation. The only alternative to approval by the Commission is rejection of all three merger proposals, and the big companies apparently believe that with the attitudes of a majority of members of the Inter-State Commerce Commission so favorable to merger, the chance of such a wholesale rejection is not very great.

The propaganda for such mergers has convinced a substantial segment of the public that big rail mergers are the only cure for what the railroads claim to be financial trouble. Business is good. There is a temporary public apathy toward big financial maneuvers and increasing financial concentration. So, the big financiers have decided that this is the time to push it all through, revamp the basic transportation structure, tear up the rails, eliminate the schedules, bypass communities, lay off the workers, divert the traffic, acquire large controls over industrial property, cut down the equipment, hold down expansion, control the rates—and keep them high, and maximize profits.

Time is running out. Some very large and very important rail merger proposals before the Interstate Commerce Commission have finished with their hearings or are nearing completion.

The Seaboard-Atlantic Coast Line merger application is awaiting momentarily the examiner's decision. Since the Southern recently received the examiner's approval for its control over the Central of Georgia, any further opposition by it to the Seaboard-Atlantic Coastline union may well blow away, especially as the Southern now seeks to acquire the Georgia & Florida. The Southern Pacific's fight with the Santa Fe over control of the Western Pacific has also been concluded. Hearings have started on the Great Northern, Northern Pacific and Burlington merger proposal. It is expected that they will be completed by June. The hearings on the Chesapeake & Ohio's petition for control of the B. & O. are over, Mr. President. The major opponent, the New York Central, withdrew from that case the day it announced its proposed merger with the Pennsylvania. The Norfolk & Western, Nickle Plate, Wabash proceedings started last December and have been moving rapidly since the New York Central withdrew its opposition, again on the day it announced the merger with the Pennsylvania. In the meantime, hearings are developing in a game of musical chairs involving the Louisville & Nashville—which is controlled by the Atlantic Coast Line—the Illinois Central, the Missouri Pacific, the Chicago & Eastern Illinois and other roads in the Midwest and in the South. Thus, time is very much of the essence. The records, such as they are, are being made and the cases are becoming closed. Action to halt this movement pending a full investigation must be taken in this session of Congress.

The national transportation policy under which the Commission presently operates, and has operated since the enactment of the Transportation Act of 1940 is too vague and too general to cope with the magnitude of the problems presented by the current movement to create giant systems and scrap railroad facilities. In fact, it is quite doubtful whether Congress in 1940, when it gave the Interstate Commerce Commission that policy, anticipated that a three-way oligopoly with the size and power of that which is presently being promoted by the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, and others in the East would ever be forced upon the Commission for decision. The danger is compounded by the extraordinary situation created by that policy, as the Interstate Commerce Commission interprets it. The Commission apparently intends to act upon each proposed merger on a case by case basis, based only upon the evidence contained in the record of each case, as such matters come to it for decision. It apparently takes the position that it cannot, and will not, conduct any general investigation as to what kind of mergers, in what areas, and under what conditions, would be acceptable in the public interest. Nor does the Commission appear to have any intention of making a general analysis of the collective impact which these proposed mergers may have on the Nation's transportation system, the national defense, and the economic growth of individual communities and the Nation as a whole.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is faced with a real problem, and I think some commissioners are beginning to realize it. The record, upon which the Commission must make judgments affecting the military defense, economic growth, and the political and economic freedom of the people of the United States is not being fully developed by these piecemeal hearings. In addition, the standards and criteria which have formed the basis for determining the public interest in the past on a single case approach may not now, in the light of these mammoth mergers, be either desirable or feasible. The record of the benefits to the private financial interests which would be obtained by the collapsing of lines and facilities, the elimination of competition and the increase of financial and operating controls, no doubt has been well made considering the millions of dollars which have been spent in developing it. But the record for the public—for the communities, the sections of the country which stand to be hurt, for labor, and for those who are to be vitally affected by the anticompetitive and monopolistic effects of these mergers—that record is woefully deficient, and does not have the appearance of being improved. In fact, it may be impossible for such a record to be made in the consideration of mergers on a one by one basis.

The Department of Justice has been referred to by the press and news commentators across the Nation as a guardian, a security, for the development of a full record with respect to the public and antitrust aspects of these rail merger cases. Yet, the Department, in its short manpower situation, has been sporadic in attendance at hearings and notably lacking in essential cross-examination or presentation of expert testimony, not only in connection with the effects of these mergers upon competition among shippers and among carriers, but with respect to the real impact upon communities, regions of the country, upon the national defense, economic growth, and other public matters. Although it has filed briefs in opposition to some merger applications, it has built up little record of its own which would give such opposition any substantial teeth. From what I have learned the Department has only a handful of men working on these public problems which extend across a number of regulated fields, and its ability to step up its participation as "public counsel" to the full extent that is demanded by the magnitude of these problems is limited. I am presently considering legislation which would augment both the personnel and the authority of the Department of Justice to insure its adequate and effective participation in regulatory proceedings where antitrust and other public matters are involved. Perhaps the substantive laws governing mergers and financial controls having effect on mergers should be reviewed.

An excellent example of what can happen to the record in a merger proceeding before the Commission is to be found in the Norfolk & Western-Nickle Plate-Wabash proceedings. Many of the Eastern roads were protesting this merger vigorously at the beginning of the hearings, and the New York Central was leading the field with the apparent intention of challenging every issue. But as each of the merger deals and the protective traffic agreements were worked out by the big financial interests, these major opponents quietly folded their tents and stole away. This undoubtedly jolted the Commission, and to bolster its collapsing record, the Commission ordered its Bureau of Inquiry into the case. That bureau then called top experts from the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics to the stand who in clear language told the Commission that the Norfolk & Western merger could not be viewed apart from the merger proposals of other railroads in the East, that substantial issues were raised as to the effects of this merger on competition and the balance of economic power, and that there was even the important question as to whether the protective agreements and arrangements worked out by the Norfolk & Western with the affected roads were adequate to protect the public and the carriers from adverse effects of the merger. This amply demonstrates the need for public intervention to make sure that all the issues are presented in these merger proceedings. These merger applications are not like ordinary law cases, where the parties maneuver in the background to settle the case out of court for their own personal interests. These are far-reaching economic and social decisions which can be made only on the basis of a full and open record with all positions explored to the fullest. Such decisions can be made wisely only after a consideration of the total problem and guidelines devolved.

Just about a week ago, the Interstate Commerce Commission issued a staff study by its Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics entitled "Railroad Consolidations and the Public Interest," which as I read it—and I hope many Senators will read it—casts serious doubts that this agency is presently equipped to make these vital merger decisions. The study indicates that there is no consistent pattern of applying the criteria of adequacy of service, economy and efficiency of service, and best use of transport facilities, and that there is no precise specification of basic components of these criteria which should be tested with respect to each of the larger mergers. It further states that with respect to "savings to the carrier," which is one of the major justifications for merger being urged by the big financial interests, "no overall procedure has yet been developed for forecasting traffic levels or levels of economic growth as a basis for estimating future carrier savings." In addition, the study asserts that at present there are no satisfactory methods of appraising the effects of competition among railroads, as well as competition between the rails and other modes of transportation, and that standards for measuring the severity of the competitive impact are not available. Finally, the study admits that the effects of mergers on the localities and regions of the country and upon the national defense have never been given separate, and apparently important, status in the determination of rail mergers, and it urges that these vital matters be given special attention because they are essential to the public interest. But again I question how this can be done on a piecemeal basis.

In the introduction to this study, on page 1, there is this startling statement which goes to the very essence of this matter:

> Proponents and opponents of individual mergers present their views adequately in most instances, but no voice speaks before the Commission for the public as a whole in rail consolidation cases. Thus the question arises as to whether the Commission receives all of the evidence it requires respecting the overall public interest as differentiated from the various private interests.

No voice speaks for the public as a whole. That is what this study by experts is telling us. No voice speaks for all of the people who stand to be affected by this grand design for the shrinking of our transportation system. The voices of private, vested interests are fully presented to the Interstate Commerce Commission, but the best interest of the people remains largely unheard.

Certainly this situation which I have presented deserves immediate consideration by the President and by Congress to halt any further decisions on these rail and airline merger cases, and to work out a strong national transportation merger policy, with specific standards, adequate tests, and most important, a full opportunity for the public interest to be heard.

Now I am not taking the position that no rail mergers are practical and in the public interest. I realize that the reasons given in support of the proposed mergers in most cases, if not all, is that economies will be increased and the claimed dire financial condition of railroads improved. Nor am I contending that we have no railroad problem. On the other hand, some of our railroads have serious problems of earnings to which attention of Congress should be directed.

There is reputable authority, however, to the effect that railroads generally are not on the brink of bankruptcy. In fact one study reveals that the percentage of total railroad mileage operating under receivership or trusteeship was 0.48 in 1959 and about 1.23 percent in 1960 as compared with 5.16 percent in 1950 and 30.63 percent in 1940. Yet in 1940 or 1950 was there any wholesale proposals of mergers to solve the problem? Furthermore, net income of the railroads in 1959 and 1960 was reduced by greatly increased deductions for depreciation and retirement. Such deduction was 626 million in 1959 as compared with the average of 462 million during 1947–53. Such deductions were 37 percent higher in 1960 than the 1947–53 annual average. These figures are from a study by Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, a well-known economist and lawyer.

An examination of the net income as a percent of invested capital as of December 31, 1960, reported in the Fortune Directory of August 1961 for the 29 largest railroads does show some lower percentages for certain of the railroad companies, but there is not shown any great pending danger of a financial collapse of railroads generally.

Some experts in the transportation field say that mergers are not the answer to the difficulties in which some railroads find themselves. With respect to the effect of mergers on economies, the study by the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics points out:

> There is a marked division of opinion among students of transportation as to whether the cost savings possible from large-scale railroad operations have already been realized or whether such savings could be further increased by consolidations.

There are too many other factors which cast doubt on the wisdom of such a large merger program for this discussion.

My statement is addressed to the point that there has been shown no national railroad emergency such as requires our rushing into this widespread merger plan without first studying and knowing their effects, both national and sectional. Railroad financial difficulties should be dealt with in that light for the sake of both the public interest and the railroads themselves.

However, there is an even larger issue extending over these transportation mergers which is very much a part of the public interest but yet does not appear to be an issue adequately met by Interstate Commerce Commission expertise. This concerns the interlocking financial and operating controls and influence which overlay the railroad industry and may be responsible for the present monopolistic directions which these merger proposals are taking. Much information has already been obtained by Congress over the years with respect to general lines of ownership and affiliation among the railroads, but the details of actual control and influence have never been fully spelled out. Such details, especially with respect to the interconnections between the carriers and financial institutions and shippers must be examined by Congress before the present rail and airline mergers are allowed to proceed.

Already there is a substantial concentration of economic power in the railroad industry. A considerable amount of this power is controlled and exercised by a few very large financial interests in a variety of ways. Huge bank mergers over recent years have brought increasing controls through stock interests owned or managed, and through combined credit relationships. Interlocks by directors, officers or agents, and interlocks through stock and security holdings, between insurance companies, investment banks, brokerage firms, investment trusts, together with the commercial banks, all in a substantial way, finger down to the transportation industry on the one side and the big shippers and other customers of the transportation industry on the other side. Certainly, superconsolidations such as those proposed by the Pennsylvania and New York Central, the Great Northern, Northern Pacific and the Burlington, and American and Eastern Airlines will only mesh together more closely the controls and influences exercised through this overlay. The extent of the control and influence which may be exerted by the big shippers over the policies of the railroad industry through these interconnections is clearly a matter for congressional investigation in the light of this proposed reorganization of our railroad plant. Likewise, the effect that these rail mergers—and mergers in the trucking field as they become more numerous—may have on the pricing policies of the big shippers, and upon their competition in general, represent anticompetitive and concentration problems with which I, and many of my colleagues both in the Senate and in the House, have been greatly concerned for a number of years.

One of the more basic positions being taken by some of the larger merger applicants, both in the rail and the airline fields, is that the big mergers can produce systems "competitively balanced" in size and power. Aside from the question of whether big systems can create efficiencies and economies in the "public interest" there indeed is the larger question as to how really separate, competitive and balanced these proposed systems could be if these mergers were allowed to be consummated.

At the very least, as we approach these many mergers which are developing and which are presenting themselves for approval, we must know in detail where the basic policy controls lie. To consider any of these mergers as merely a combination of physical properties is to make a grave error. They are also an increased concentration of financial control and influence which is moving ahead on many fronts in many large and basic industries.

What is behind these vast proposed mergers? Are they a bona fide effort to attain greater railroad economies without first trying other alternatives to attain that aim, or are they for the purpose of creating more concentrated and perfected financial control of the American rail transportation system in the hands of select financial powers? Recent news stories indicate that those financial powers have made the decision and drawn the plans. If this is true, it is of urgent importance to the country that this be known before these enormous mergers take place.

Therefore, because this matter is of such importance and because the details with respect to these financial and operating controls are so necessary to a full evaluation of the rail merger problem, I hope the Commission will have its Bureau of Transport and Statistics make an immediate study of this problem of financial control and its effect upon the vast proposed mergers. It is urged that the various committees of Congress concerned with the various aspects of these mergers make appropriate studies. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, I have requested its staff to analyze all current information in order that the subcommittee may be informed as to its responsibilities in this matter.

In closing I want again to alert my colleagues here and in the House as to the wholesale reorganization which is now being attempted in the railroad industry, and to a lesser extent in the airline industry. This rail reorganization is being presented right now before an agency which by its own published staff study has no clear-cut direction, no specific policy, and not even a sufficient record to make these far-reaching social and economic judgments. I say to my colleagues, most respectfully, this is an issue deserving your immediate concern, for if the present merger proposals are approved, they will affect every State and every community in this Nation. And when they start ripping up the tracks, laying off the workers, cutting down schedules, bypassing communities, and reducing equipment, it will be too late and the damage will be done. We, the Congress, will be without an answer to the many complaints from shippers, communities, and sections of the country which complaints will most certainly arise. The time is now for Congress to halt these merger cases and meet these public issues by thorough investigation and specific policy recommendations.

In line with this proposal and as a stopgap measure, I am sending to the desk a bill on the railroad merger problem, for appropriate reference.

This bill would amend section 7 of the Clayton Act. The effect of the amendment would be to prohibit the Interstate Commerce Commission from approving, prior to December 31, 1963, any act, proposed or consummated, in violation of the merger provisions of section 7 by a railroad corporation with total assets of more than $200 million and which was not then in involuntary bankruptcy, a trusteeship, or receivership.

Smaller railroads would not be denied approval by ICC under the law as it now exists. Railroads of more than $200 million in assets could merge if the merger could meet the test applied in section 7. A railroad which is bankrupt or in receivership or trusteeship could merge with another railroad without the delay provided in the bill.

This, in my opinion, is fair to the small railroads whose merger has no great economic significance and may well need to merge. It takes care of the railroad in dire financial trouble. At the same time, it will hold in abeyance these proposed gigantic mergers, unless they do not violate section 7, until a study of the whole merger problem can be made and its national effects determined.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 5 days so that any of my colleagues who may desire to may join with me in sponsoring it.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The bill (S. 3097) to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give full force and effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidations and mergers until December 31, 1963, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE U.N. BOND ISSUE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the current debates on the financing of the United Nations have created national interest in the functions and purposes of this world organization, and also have revealed that many citizens harbor serious misconceptions regarding this Nation's position in the world organization.

I know of no recent question or issue that has evoked such an avalanche of correspondence, telephone calls, and telegrams from the people back home. Much of this correspondence reflects the types of misconceptions which have prevented a clearheaded solution of the difficulties which face us.

I should like to address myself for 2 or 3 minutes to some of these misconceptions that have been perpetrated deliberately on the part of many organizations, in my judgment, and which have tended often to mislead well-meaning people who have not had an opportunity to learn the full story of the U.N.

One of these misconceptions is that the United Nations has taken over the foreign policymaking functions of the President of the United States and of our State Department.

In truth, the U.N. has served the diplomatic interests of the United States in many instances. Often there has been a unity of policy in the national interest of our Government and of the U.N. One of the mistakes that is made is to construe this as the U.N. making American foreign policy, when, in fact, the coincidence has enabled us to strengthen our security position through the United Nations. Two cases in point will illustrate what I seek to show.

In the Berlin crisis the Soviets apparently hoped to get us to back down. The United States, quite outside the context of the United Nations, by resorting to its alliances in Western Europe, NATO particularly, rose to beat down the Soviet pressure for a Western withdrawal from that critical spot. This may indeed, in the light of history, loom as the turning point of our current relations with the Soviet Union. In Berlin the United Nations was not a proper or effective agency for dealing with that matter.

On the other hand, in the matter of the Congo, where I visited at the time this whole matter was reaching its peak of development, we were faced with very severe and harsh alternatives. We were confronted with the alternative, in the face of the threatened Soviet encroachment, to leave the area to stew in its uncertainty, or to take unilateral action, with the consequence of being accused of being just another colonial power, with all that that connotes, or finding some lesser alternative in terms of evil consequences. The alternative that was available was to resort to the United Nations.

I must say that it has been with great pleasure and surprise that I have noted the almost miraculous strides forward the United Nations has been able to make in these most tortuous crises areas where it has been called upon to act in so many unexpected ways.

Thus we find that there is a place for the United Nations in American policy calculations, as we retain a place for other agencies and other instruments of force to protect our best interests. Our membership in the U.N. is just one instrument in our diplomatic tool chest.

A second misconception about the United Nations is that it has better served the Communists than it has this country. Rather than torture this question or to spell it out in great detail, I simply suggest that if that be true, it is curious that Mr. Khrushchev and his Communist cronies work so hard seeking to destroy the United Nations. If it truly is serving their purposes, as some groups in our own country assert, it would be to their best interest to try to perpetuate that body; yet the record is obviously replete with instances in which the Soviets have done everything, short of the actually bringing about the demise of the organization, to see to it that the United Nations does not succeed.

Then the critics of the United Nations frequently state that the world organization is an ineffective debating society that has done little, almost nothing, to solve the problems of the world. I think that here we suffer from a complex; that sometimes we forget that the problems which plague us at the moment would be with us if the U.N. had never existed. Therefore, we expect the United Nations to find solutions that we have not been able to find through other lines. We come to expect solutions and outcomes far beyond anything within reason.

I would be the first to admit that the U.N. has not solved all of the world's problems; unfortunately, there are more than enough to go around. I will also admit that there are frequent debates in that body which have produced little in the way of substantive results. However, on the other side of the ledger there are numerous positive accomplishments which attest to the worth of the U.N. and to its unique role in world diplomacy.

Without going into detail, I might cite the Suez crisis, the Korean war and, of course, the Congo, to which I have just alluded.

A final point I would suggest is that in this world debating body the neutrals of the globe have seen firsthand the conduct of intransigence, of bitterness, and of vituperation practiced by the Communist bloc countries. We must remember that the history and the memories of the neutral countries have been with the so-called colonial nations of the West. Since their memories have been negative memories of that relationship, and since they have had almost no direct experiences with the Soviet Union, it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of their confronting the U.S.S.R. at firsthand in the goldfish bowl of world opinion which is the United Nations. One cannot put a dollar value on the psychological aspect of a constructive impact of this kind of experience. Yet it is one of the most important, most telling experiences in the education of neutral nations in some of the hard facts of power politics in the world today.

I would be the first to admit that the United Nations is not a perfect experiment and cannot settle all the problems of the world; but the fact that it can settle some of them makes it an instrument available in the world to try to reduce critical areas of tensions.

This brings me to the real point of my concern over the helpful, constructive discussions which have been taking place in this Chamber during the last few days. While we have demonstrated our ability to advance our diplomatic gains through many agencies, including the United Nations, including our own unilateral decisions, including NATO, including the OAS, the U.N. is only one of the many expressions of our security.

The fact that our discussions on this question by serious students and experts in this body concerning the problems that face the U.N. have come at this particular moment seems to be exceedingly unfortunate, for while the constructive criticisms and the intensive questioning have been raised with the best of intentions by Members of the Senate, the fact is that however well intentioned, however constructive the suggestions, the danger now lies in the moves already being made by organized groups in our own country to take the suggestions as a further excuse for their own demands that the United Nations be destroyed; that we get out of it; and that we get the United Nations out of the United States.

Extremists, in our own country, and Communists outside our boundaries, have mounted a massive assault on the United Nations for the single purpose of destroying it. What we have reason to fear, then, is that the creditable and helpful suggestions for improving United Nations mechanisms are being and will continue to be seized upon by wrong people for the wrong reasons in order to intensify their attack. Therefore, I submit that it is incumbent upon those of us in the Senate and other Members of Congress as a whole to do everything in our power to make certain that our own efforts are not misused or abused. Congress should not be used as a means, however inadvertently, of throwing the baby out with the bath water.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD IMMEDIATELY CEASE PAYING OVERCHARGES IN EXPORT-IMPORT RAILROAD RATES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last year alone the people of Alaska purchased 3,919 new cars and paid excess railroad freight charges on those cars of approximately $200,000. That is, they paid $200,000 more than if they had lived in the State of Hawaii.

This is due to the fact that the railroads, through what I believe to be the unconstitutional and illegal action of the Interstate Commerce Commission in sanctioning such excess rates, charge more to ship merchandise to Seattle if it is destined for Alaska than if it is destined for Hawaii.

The export-import rates which apply to foreign and domestic areas in the Pacific however exclude Alaska. This is the longstanding discrimination that needs to be voided.

This intolerable and unjust burden upon the people of Alaska must be stopped.

It is however a burden also on the people of the United States. This extra tariff is also exacted on goods shipped by the U.S. Government for use by its agencies in Alaska. It is costing the taxpayers of America untold millions annually. This is apart from the maritime rates which constitute another chapter in discrimination against Alaska. That is another story.

In an effort to break down this artificial and costly barrier to trade with the 49th State—the discriminatory railroad rates—I have addressed letters to the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the General Services Administration requesting that they "instruct the appropriate officials of the Department of Defense—or General Services Administration—immediately to take such steps as may be necessary to desist henceforth from paying railroad rates obviously favoring ports in the State of Hawaii or any other State as opposed to ports in the State of Alaska."

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to the Secretary of Defense, which is almost identical with the one sent to the General Services Administrator, be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

April 2, 1962.

Hon. Robert S. McNamara,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I am calling your attention to a serious matter concerning excessive payments by the Department of Defense to railroads with respect to freight shipments to Seattle destined for ports in Alaska.

Before Alaska became a State, the Interstate Commerce Commission refused to disapprove higher freight rates for the Seattle portion of rail shipments destined for Alaska ports then for similar shipments destined for Hawaiian ports. Whatever may have been the justification for such approval while Alaska had territorial status (and I believe there was no justification for such action) it seems obvious that such rate differential favoring the ports of Hawaii cannot constitutionally be maintained with respect to the ports of the now State of Alaska.

The Constitution of the United States provides in section 9:

"No preference shall be given by any regulation of Commerce or Revenue to the ports of one State over those of another * * *."

It is clear, therefore, that the additional export-import rates collected by the railroads, for the Seattle portion of the transportation of freight ultimately bound for Alaska, could not have been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission after Alaska was admitted to the Union on January 3, 1959. Hence, the additional rates charged after that date were unlawful.

I am therefore requesting that you instruct the appropriate officials of the Department of Defense immediately to take such steps as may be necessary to desist henceforth from paying railroad rates obviously favoring ports in the State of Hawaii or any other State as opposed to ports in the State of Alaska.

With all best wishes, I am,
Cordially yours,
Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senator.

MEDICAL AND LEGAL TREATMENT OF NARCOTICS ADDICTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of my colleague from New York [Mr. Keating], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Bush], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to supplement the series of bills which we, along with other Senators, introduced at the last session, to provide for more effective and enlightened medical and legal treatment of narcotics addicts.

I have spoken on this subject from the beginning of my experience with it as attorney general of New York, where I found, much to my deep concern, that notwithstanding the gravity of the problem and the fact that it probably is the principal crime breeder, certainly in the New York area, it is a problem which has had very little attention in terms of research into its cure.

The bills introduced last session were based upon the now widely accepted scientific premise that narcotic addiction is a major illness as well as a crime breeder. The basic objective of the bills was to permit more flexibility in the treatment of the innocent victims of this malady without relaxing penalties in any way against those engaged in the sale or pushing of narcotics. The bills were largely stimulated by a group of law enforcement groups, including the New York District Attorney's Association, which recognized that the rigid, indiscriminate approach which characterizes our present laws does not adequately protect the community.

The package of bills included three measures.. S. 1963, the Narcotic Addict Hospital Facilities Act, would establish a new Federal-State program for the construction and operation of narcotic hospital facilities and for the provision of technical assistance to the States. Up to 75 percent of construction costs and 60 percent of operating costs could be provided. This bill was cosponsored by Senators Bush, Case of New Jersey, Hart and Kuchel. S. 1694, of which Senator Keating was the principal sponsor, would permit civil commitment of narcotics addicts to the custody of the Surgeon General of the United States, so long as the addicts were not charged with an offense involving the sale or other transfer of narcotics and so long as other provisions were met. This bill was cosponsored by Senators Bush, Case of New Jersey, Hart, Kefauver, Kuchel, and Scott. A third bill, Senate Resolution 127, called for a White House Conference on Narcotics to study all aspects of the problem, including methods of coordinating State and Federal efforts and to report findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress. The resolution was cosponsored by Senators Bush, Case of New Jersey, Kefauver, Kuchel, and Scott.

Companion bills were introduced in the House of Representatives by Representatives Anfuso, Derounian, Halpern, and Lindsay of New York.

To date, administration response to these proposals has been disappointingly slow. After many indications that the administration was interested in the proposals and sympathetic with their objectives, almost no progress has been achieved as yet in obtaining the necessary departmental reports to the committees to which the bills were referred. In a letter dated April 14, 1961, the Attorney General, referring to the White House Conference on Narcotics which had been one of the President's campaign pledges, reiterated that "the President, of course, has previously indicated his personal interest in this matter," but said that the agenda for such a conference was still in the planning stage. Almost a year later it is still in the planning stage. On August 22, 1961, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare stated that his Department "will certainly try to complete our preparation of the report before the adjournment of the present session of the Congress." At this date the reports have still not been received from his Department or any others.

Meanwhile, two States in which the problem of narcotics addiction is most acute, New York and California, have moved ahead. Last fall California enacted a pioneering program in this area, parallel to the proposals which I and my colleagues had introduced in the Senate. The California law set up rehabilitation centers in which addicts could receive treatment and to which they would be returned if periodic and surprise tests over a 5-year probation period indicated they had returned to narcotics.

Last week, I brought to the attention of the Senate the enactment in New York State of similar forward-looking legislation. The New York measure offers to addicts medical treatment instead of prison in situations where their "crime" relates to their addiction. At the same time, New York also established a new central narcotics office in the department of mental hygiene to direct expanding State programs in narcotics research, treatment, and aftercare, and created a State council on drug addiction to advise in formulation, progressive improvement, and operation of the State's narcotics programs.

This last feature, of continuing research, is highly significant and underlines the need for the measure which I am introducing today. While much is known about the need for a medical approach rather than a purely penal or punitive approach to the prevention and cure of narcotics addiction, much remains to be learned. There has been great disappointment at the high rate of recidivism among prisoners released from the two existing narcotic hospitals in Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex. Consequently there is an urgent need for continuing research into new techniques of prevention and control, particularly in the area of supportive activities in the addict's home environment.

The bill now being introduced is designed to fulfill this need by means of federally assisted State and local, public and private research activity. Unlike S. 1693 and S. 1694, which provide for a new large-scale program for treatment and civil commitment of narcotics addicts, the present bill is designed to provide a research supplement to that program under the already-existing federally aided program in the field of mental health. The bill amends section 308 of the Public Health Service Act—42 U.S.C. 242a—which provides for up to 100 percent grants to State and local agencies, laboratories, and other public or nonprofit agencies and institutions and to individuals for investigations, experiments, demonstrations, studies, and research projects. The section is presently geared to the development of improved methods of diagnosis, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of the mentally ill. While it is presently understood that narcotic addiction often is the result of mental illness, there is understandably some uncertainty as to the extent to which research projects in all aspects of narcotic addiction can participate in the existing mental health program. Under section 303 grants may be made only upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, and applicants for aid must compete for the available funds. To date the emphasis upon projects in the central areas of mental illness research has caused the related narcotics area to be relatively ignored both by the council and by those in the field who might have applied for aid.

A look at the figures will indicate both the extent of the mental health program and the very minor role which narcotics research has played in it under the present statutory wording. For fiscal 1962, the entire mental health program received appropriations in the amount of $108,876,000. Of this sum, approximately $80 million was devoted to grants for research and training under section 303. Participating in this sum were 27 grants in some way identified with the narcotics field. Grants for these 27 amounted to a total of $793,000. Most of this sum was devoted to fundamental research, which is largely laboratory study. Only 5 of the 27 projects related to prevention and treatment of narcotics addiction and these amounted to only $160,000 of the total appropriation. Thus the 27 projects having some relation to narcotic addiction accounted for less than 1 percent of the total appropriation for section 303 mental health grants; and 5 relating to prevention and treatment of narcotics diseases received only two-tenths of 1 percent of the section 303 grants.

Thus the bill now being introduced, which explicitly includes research into narcotic addiction within the section 303 program, would serve several purposes. It would constitute express congressional recognition for the first time of the relation between narcotic addiction and the general field of mental illness. It would clarify the intent of the Congress to include grants for prevention and cure of narcotic addiction within the authority given to the Public Health Service under section 303. By focusing attention on the narcotics problem, it would stimulate applications by public and private agencies which are now entering this field and it would make it possible to increase the share of funds made available by the National Advisory Mental Health Council for narcotics research. Since it would key into an already going and highly respected program, it is hoped that it will be accepted as a first step toward the broader, new program which is represented by S. 1693 and S. 1694.

The magnitude of the problem we are faced with and the type of research activity which will be aided and stimulated by the present bill should be indicated. It is estimated that there are 60,000 narcotic addicts in the United States and that over half of these are in the metropolitan New York City area. One wholly private local group in New York City which is typical of the kind of activity which may receive help from a new stepped-up program of research grants, is the Lower East Side Information Center. This facility, consisting of four rooms on the second floor in a building at 197 Henry Street on the crowded lower East Side of New York City, was organized in November 1959 in response to the demand of youth workers in the Two Bridges Neighborhood Council, a social service agency, and was initially financed by the Sea and Land Presbyterian Church. The center charges no fees but is financed wholly by contributions from church groups, foundations, one college, and individual contributors. Its total budget for 1961 was approximately $5,800. Its program is set out in detail in the following memorandum. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENT PROGRAM, 1961

The present program is outlined according to the goals which have been formulated.

1. To give information: The narcotics information center is open for 2 or 3 hours each of four afternoons and staffed by workers from Hamilton Madison House, Sea and Land Church, St. Augustine's Chapel, and volunteers. Statistics were included in the 1960 annual report. Information is given about available hospital facilities and addicts claim that they can come here to talk whereas there is no one else with whom they are free to talk.

2. Accumulation of information: Confidential files are kept on interviews with addicts as well as statistics on visits, ages, residences, addict relationships, and type of service rendered. We also try to keep contact with habitats of addicts and areas of drug pushers.

3. Community education: Two workers from the educational alliance head up the narcotics education subcommittee. Besides the available annual report on 1960 of the subcommittee, a fall workshop for agency workers and a mass meeting for laymen were held. Presently 11 programs are being held for schoolteachers in the Lower East Side school districts in which our subcommittee members furnish speakers and programs. Also a legislative subcommittee is considering State legislation and city proposals for hospitalization.

4. Education of relatives of addicts: Group education meetings are held for relatives, led in English by a volunteer Spanish psychiatric caseworker and in Spanish by a family caseworker from the Henry Street Settlement. Parents of addicts in the detoxification program also attend.

5. Bridge for adults between hospital and community: For addicts who are working or otherwise are unable to remain hospitalized for several weeks, an outpatient medical detoxification program is serviced by a volunteer physician. Volunteer nurses visit the addicts during detoxification, agency workers supervise and follow up the addicts with regular meetings, parents are enrolled in the relatives' group, and our psychiatric caseworker sees the addicts each week thereafter.

6. Volunteers: A center staff meeting is held each week for the agency workers and the volunteers not only for business but also continued education. Guest speakers, special topics, verbatim interviews and case problems are presented for review. The whole narcotics committee meets once a month for coordination, policy planning and broader action. Supervision of volunteers is shared by the director and the committee cochairman from Hamilton Madison House.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this list of activities is notable particularly as an experiment in dealing with the addict, not in isolation, but in immediate relationship with his family and community. After 2 years of operation, the center has dealt with 145 addicts, 119 of whom sought detoxification, and 72 members of their families; its detoxification program now has a waiting list of 1 week. the center is now beginning a new program of outpatient detoxification at home, under the supervision of a relative able to stay with the addict for 5 days, for addicts who are unable to use hospital facilities.

The possibilities of the kind of contact with the addict and his community which the center is designed to explore and foster are exemplified in the following summary of the contacts between a worker for the center and a group of boys who had started to use narcotics. I ask unanimous consent that the summary be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NARCOTICS ASSIGNMENT SUMMARY

In October of 1960 I was assigned to the Lower East Side Narcotics Center as part of my total assignment of fieldwork education at the educational alliance. The director of the center was concerned with a group of boys who had started using narcotics and from this concern stemmed the structure of my assignment. There was a possibility that I could make contact with these boys, establish a working relationship and form a group with them. There were two main areas of concern in relation to the assignment: (1) to help these boys in any way possible, and (2) to learn as much as possible about the cult of addiction so that we could work better with the problem in the future.

The narcotics committee was formed by the Lower East Side Neighborhoods Association in 1959 and was divided into two subcommittees. The first, the education subcommittee, has endeavored to prevent drug addiction through the media of education and has had many programs involving the community and the drug addicted person. The second committee works directly with addicts through an information center, being called the narcotics information center. Originally the center had three main goals: (1) to give information and to encourage addicts to seek hospitalization; (2) to acquire information about the problem, and (3) to use the center as a focus for the education program. Sometime after the center's formation an additional service was established. It was realized that many addicts had to wait for a long period of time before being admitted to a hospital and that many addicts were married and working which made it even more difficult for them to spend considerable time in a hospital. It was thought that a detoxification program could help those addicted persons who could not get into a hospital, or who would have to wait too long, and for those addicts who were married or worked. The detoxification program enabled the addicted to "kick the habit" at home within a week's time. Certain qualifications and limits had to be established so as to provide for better conditions for success and to limit complications that could arise. The process involved having a physician prescribe medication and to determine degree of ability of the addict to complete this program. It also involved having the addict's close friend or relative stay with him for the duration of the program and having an agency worker (a responsible professional member of the community) provide a check on the addict while going through the program, and to work with the addict on an aftercare basis after detoxification was completed. The medication that was used for the program was sleeping pills and tranquilizers that varied in dosage according to the individual addict. In addition to the detoxification program, parent meetings were established where the parents of the addicted persons could relate their difficulties and learn how to cope with the addicts and to learn about the problem in general by sharing with other parents. Any parent could join this meeting as long as their child or relative was addicted to drugs but the addicted person didn't necessarily have to be participating in the detoxification program. Meetings were established for both English and Spanish speaking groups. Psychotherapy was also offered each addict after withdrawal from drugs by a psychiatric social worker.

I have just described the center in short and will now proceed with describing my assignment. The boys that I was to work with were once members of a fighting gang, but severed relations after drugs became a predominant part of their life. I assume that the ending of this relationship was not of their own accord although when I spoke with the boys they said they didn't want to be with the gang anymore. The boys ranged in age from 19 to 22, were predominantly Puerto Rican, one boy being Italian, and were approximately eight in number. I did not know much about the problem of drug addiction and had never been in contact with an addict previous to this assignment. The first step was to learn as much as possible about the problem before trying to contact these boys. The center gave me the names of agency workers who have had contact with the boys.

I received information about all the boys who broke away from this particular fighting gang before I made contact with them. Most of my information was obtained from a recreation director of a Protestant chapel. On one of my visits the recreation director introduced me to two of the boys that were on my list. My first contact with an addict was with Jose, a Puerto Rican boy, 19. I was not sure of what to talk about with him and I asked questions pertaining to his habit and if he was working and what he planned to do in the future. Before we discussed his habit I had to let him know that I knew he was using drugs. At first he did not talk very much but when he realized that I knew he was using drugs he started to talk freely. There is the possibility that he felt I might be a new person for him to get to know that he could use in a manipulative way in future contacts. I listened and tried to see how he would try to manipulate. There is also the possibility that he wanted to talk with someone who understands what is going on and it seems that he likes to talk about himself which I found to be true of other boys. He told me he was using drugs for 2 years and is now trying to get into Lexington again to "kick the habit." He mentioned that he had a job polishing jewelry which he liked but wanted to make more money. This seems to be another trend in their behavior.

They always want jobs that are unrealistic with their ability to produce; such as jobs that do not require too much work and jobs that pay higher salaries. The longer I spoke with him the more at ease I felt. I later found out that Jose was accepted at Lexington and I therefore wouldn't be in touch with him again for some time.

My next contact was with Vinnie. There was an interesting correlation between Vinnie's reactions and Jose's. Although Vinnie was more aggressive and active, he still had the same ideas as wanting a job with a high salary, was friendly and willing to relate. Vinnie also worked for a jewelry polisher but did not mention that he wanted to get off the habit. He had tattoos on his arms that covered up the needle marks and it seemed to signify to me that he had guilt feelings about being a drug user and that he was using this superficial means to alleviate these feelings of guilt. He had later on given me his address and phone number and said I could call him but mentioned that if I call I should say I am a friend because he didn't want his mother to know about his use of drugs. He said she was the last person he wanted to hurt. This seems to follow the pattern of addict being dependent upon mother and it would seem that the mother is trying to get away from the fact that her son is using drugs. It would be difficult for her not to know what is going on, thus only influencing the further use of drugs on Vinnie's part. Vinnie had walked me to the subway that night and we talked about his use of drugs. He seemed to enjoy educating me on the lingo and it seems that he felt I would be a good target later on for manipulative reasons. On this one-to-one relationship the boys seem to be willing to relate and are not as manipulative as when they are in a group. This was the trend throughout the entire time I was with these boys. After I saw Vinnie two or three times he asked me if I could get him a job which was the way he wanted to use me.

My next contacts were with three Puerto Ricans. I met with these boys and Vinnie three times. At these group gatherings the boys were very manipulative and I was somewhat threatened. It was very difficult meeting them in a group from the one-to-one relationship. It was difficult for me to tell when they were lying or telling the truth but after being with them for awhile I began to understand and was able to differentiate. They would stick up for each other and it seems that status among these boys relates to who is the best manipulator. In the group gathering they found it difficult to share true feelings. One time I took them out for coffee which they responded to without hesitation. I thought afterwards if this was the right thing to do since I was falling into their game of letting them manipulate me and would only encourage their wanting to further manipulate. I tried not to let it go any further than this. The other ways they tried were: trying to sell me anything that would give them money (they showed me pawn tickets and it seemed whoever had the most pawn tickets had the higher status); trying to talk me into using drugs by saying that I couldn't really know how they felt unless I tried it myself; bumming cigarettes; trying to get me to get them privileges in the center as using the pool table in the afternoons; etc. They also tried to borrow money and would say that someone else lent them money and if I wanted to be their friends or talk with them that I would have to lend them money. At times they would seem very sincere but actually were leading up to something. One time when I spoke with Felix about his working with the post office and the possibility of his trying to secure a full-time job with them by taking a test which I said I would help him study for, he became threatened and did not show up the next day for us to go over the test. It seems that they are easily threatened by any situation that requires their taking on some responsibility. This would imply that in trying to treat these boys it would be important to build up a feeling of independence. To do this they would have to become completely dependent upon you and then slowly help them depend upon themselves. This cannot be done unless the parents are contacted since they reinforce the addicts dependency, usually the mother.

After I had more contacts with them, the manipulating process started to decrease and they would approach me individually for some kind of help as Vinnie did when asking for a job. I do not think they really like this pretending and way of acting when with the other boys but it seems to have become a retreat where they can support each other and share the same experiences (everyone needs someone to share their problems with). I tried to get these boys to come down to the chapel on a regular basis just to talk and I was thinking of forming a little club where we could all do something together. I do not think that this was realistic and these boys did not come down on a regular basis. I also hoped that I could meet the other boys on my list through the ones I already met, but the others never came. When I spoke to them about sports they shied away by saying it was too much like work. They wanted a place where they could listen to music and could sit when they were high. I did have the opportunity to play pool with them which I felt is a good means to get to know these boys and to talk with them.

I went down to meet them at other times but they did not show up or the times I could be at the chapel they were not there. A month passed from my last contact with them and it was then felt that this assignment was not realistic. I would feel that in order to form a group of drug users that a great deal of time would be required with an experienced worker. In fact, I do not really know if forming a group is such a good idea unless the worker had the purpose of forming them to make them dependent upon the worker so that he could help them to depend upon themselves and would try to disband the group. I would think that if this were tried again that certain factors would have to be considered: (1) for the worker to be able to devote at least 20 hours a week with these boys; (2) that the worker has a good understanding of the problem and the dynamics involved; (3) that the worker has the available means of helping these boys get jobs and a place to meet; (4) that the worker has to contact parents and work with them since progress made with the boys will only be retarded by the parents; (5) the worker has to present an "ego model" for these boys to want to follow, one that coincides with their cultural background, implying that worker has to understand the culture and community resources; (6) the worker has to be aware of not talking too much about the problem of drug addiction as this, I feel, doesn't give the boys a chance to communicate feelings about other things they would like to do and ideas about life that they may have—talking about drugs all the time only reinforces their continued use; and (7) steps should be taken to help these boys come in contact with other community resources which would help them overcome their habit and with other people which would give them a wider scope of experiences other than those experienced with their subgroup.

I myself felt inadequate many times with this assignment feeling that I was not accomplishing anything and at the same time wanting to help and work with the problem. Other factors also reinforced my retreat from following up further contact with these boys. I felt I still learned a great deal about the problem and had the opportunities to come in contact with different members of the community working with the problem therefore obtaining different viewpoints on how to cope with drug addiction and how the community can work together.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the experience of the center with groups such as these shows dramatically the pressing need for concerted effort, at the local, State, and Federal levels, to explore the means of eradicating the social and economic menace of addiction.

Public awareness of the problem on a large scale is beginning to emerge as a result of the legislative action at the State level in California and New York and the public attention now being given to the problem by responsible publications—many of them with national readership—and in a number of recent stage plays and movies.

Within the last week there has been further evidence that the Federal Government will finally respond to this increased public awareness of the problem. In his news conference last week, the President was asked about his attitude toward the narcotics hospital bills now before the Congress. The President replied:

> I would certainly support effective, sufficient number of hospital beds to provide effective treatment for addicts and if our hospitals in Kentucky and Texas—our two hospitals—are not sufficient, I will certainly support others. I know there has been a good deal of interest in the hospital in New York which is now being examined.

Mr. President, the purpose of the bill which I am introducing today, with the cosponsorship of my colleague [Mr. KEATING] and the other sponsors I have named, and let me say this has been a longstanding struggle by my colleague [Mr. KEATING] and myself—is to form a proper basis, for which both of us have been fighting in the Congress, and which I described a minute ago; and this measure is intended to be added to that package of bills.

This matter requires very urgent attention. It is estimated that there are 60,000 narcotics addicts in the United States, and it is estimated that over half of them are in the New York City area.

From my personal experience, I wish to state that the judges in the New York County courts of criminal jurisdiction, in the center of New York City, have told me time and time again that not less than one-third of those charged with felonies who are brought before their courts are the victims of narcotics addiction.

Mr. President, this problem is a most important one, and it is most critical for all of us. Hence, I think we are entitled to have thorough and prompt action taken on these measures.

In that connection, one of the measures calls for a White House Conference on Narcotics. That bill has been pending since April of last year—almost a year ago. It, too, suddenly came to life yesterday in the political context of a discussion between the mayor of New York City and the Attorney General of the United States. The mayor reported that the Attorney General was receptive to a White House Conference on Narcotics. Let us remember that the President, in his own campaign, pledged that he would call for the holding of such a conference. Yet today it is still in the planning stage. Furthermore, Mr. President, it is also in the political talk stage. However, the subject is altogether too critically important to be handled in such a way.

I emphasize that the bill calling for a White House Conference on Narcotics, which was introduced by me, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. KEATING], has been awaiting action for a year. This subject must be treated with the dignity and professional attention which it deserves. There no longer seems any reason why such a White House Conference on Narcotics should be deferred; and the people have a right to expect that it will be handled directly on the governmental level with the aid of doctors and other professionals in the field, and will not be made a pawn in political discussions. Certainly the matter should not be made a subject of political discussions.

I express the hope and the expectation that these points may be made very clear to the Attorney General and to Mayor Wagner, of New York City, for this is a very serious business. For a year we have been trying to have action taken on it, and it should be handled in a professional way, not through an offhand political conversation between the mayor of New York City and the Attorney General of the United States. Certainly we are entitled to better than that.

In any event, the long-awaited action by the Executive is, hopefully, about to come. And it is hoped that this will result in speedy action both on the bill now being introduced and on the bills already introduced. The Federal Government has long recognized that this is a problem of national interest. It is also time that the Federal Government acknowledged that it is a problem which deserves an enlightened solution on the national level.

Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. KEATING] has introduced a measure to inaugurate a very fine program along the line pledged in our bills. There is great need for a program for this purpose in the New York hospitals. By means of all this forward-looking legislation, which I may say coincides with that of California, which has been a leader in this field, we shall be able to make very effective use of such a narcotics facility.

So I hope very much that action on this matter will be taken now. I repeat that I would feel very badly, and I think the people would take very kindly to it, if this matter were treated in a political way. I hope we are not getting a foretaste of action of that sort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the New York State Legislature, memorializing the United States to establish a narcotics facility hospital, to be specifically located in the New York City area, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 117

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to provide a Federal narcotics hospital in the New York metropolitan area

Whereas the human suffering and social and economic loss caused by drug addiction are matters of grave concern to the people of this State; and

Whereas persons who become addicted to narcotic drugs are most often adolescents and young adults who are victimized before they are old enough to appreciate the tragic consequences; and

Whereas the highly infectious scourge of drug addiction continues to take its toll of human lives and the health of thousands of its helpless victims; and

Whereas essentially the entire illegal supply of narcotics in the United States is brought into New York State from foreign countries; and

Whereas Federal authorities have not been able to sustain an effective attack against the smuggling of narcotics into the country; and

Whereas the inability of Federal authorities to cope effectively with the illicit importing of narcotics has directly contributed to the increasing urgency of this most pressing medical and social problem; and

Whereas effective, coordinated State, Federal, and local programs of treatment can be developed to save hundreds and ultimately thousands of young narcotics addicts from enslavement to drugs by offering them medical and psychiatric treatment; and

Whereas the problem of drug addiction can be attacked effectively only if all levels of government, local, State, and Federal, shoulder their full measure of responsibility in research and in prevention, treatment and aftercare of drug addiction; and

Whereas the State of New York has taken a major step forward to meet its share of these responsibilities by enactment of legislation and other action offering arrested drug addicts humane medical treatment instead of imprisonment, and by strengthening its program of voluntary commitments of noncriminal addicts to State hospitals for treatment; and

Whereas it is the unanimous consensus of expert medical opinion that drug addicts share a common need for programs of planned hospitalization followed by intensive aftercare treatment; and

Whereas New York State, and particularly the city of New York, by reason of its national eminence as a seaport and the availability of illicit narcotic drugs smuggled into the United States from all over the world through the enormous port facilities of New York City, has the most serious addiction problem in the country; and

Whereas hospital and aftercare treatment facilities, to be of maximum benefit to persons in need of such assistance should be located in areas of high concentration of addiction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, (if the assembly concur) That the Congress and the President of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized to take immediate steps toward providing affirmative support to State, local, and individual initiative in obtaining a Federal narcotics hospital in the New York metropolitan area to provide for: (a) extensive research in narcotics addiction; (b) addict treatment services affording adequate inpatient care; and (c) aftercare services for released addicts; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to assert their best efforts to the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the senate

JOHN J. SULLIVAN,
Secretary.
ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted to be able to join with my distinguished colleague in offering this amendment to the Public Health Service Act. Our proposal, if adopted, would stimulate interest in research into the problems of narcotic addiction, and would make available Federal grants to State, local, and nonprofit private agencies, for demonstration projects.

This would be an important step forward. There is a great deal which we do not know about the causes and treatment of addiction. This terrible affliction, which each year enslaves thousands of Americans, many of them young men and women, deserves to have the thorough study now being given to other illnesses under the Public Health Service Act.

I want to stress, however, that this proposal is in no way a substitute for the broader legislative recommendations which my colleague [Mr. Javits] and I introduced in April 1961. Our legislation would authorize a cooperative Federal-State program for the construction of needed narcotic treatment facilities, and would establish machinery for the mandatory commitment, treatment, and aftercare supervision of the victims of narcotics addiction. Action on these measures is urgently needed, and should supplement any research programs undertaken under the Public Health Service Act.

Our resolution of more than a year ago, calling for a White House Conference on Narcotics, should also be acted upon promptly. Such a White House Conference, in our judgment should have been called before now. This subject matter is too important to be neglected or to become enmeshed in politics. The legislation passed in the State of New York received fine bipartisan support, and we have offered our proposals for Federal action in a completely nonpartisan spirit.

Governor Rockefeller, in approving new legislation recently adopted in New York, to permit more effective handling of narcotics addicts, stressed the need for a Federal narcotics treatment hospital in the New York City area. President Kennedy in his news conference last week said he favored a sufficient number of hospital beds to provide effective treatment for addicts, and said that the matter of a narcotics hospital in New York is being examined. I hope that examination will result in a favorable recommendation.

Anyone familiar with the situation in New York will agree that the construction of new facilities for the treatment of addicts is imperative. There is now a waiting period of a month between the time when an addict applies for admission to Metropolitan Hospital's narcotics ward and the time when he is admitted. This is a city-operated hospital, with some 50 beds for addicts.

The waiting list at Manhattan General, a proprietary hospital operating a 100-plus bed narcotics ward, is at least 2 weeks.

Riverside Hospital, on North Brothers Island, the Bronx, is operating at peak capacity. It handles adolescent addicts only.

The waiting list for Lexington—USPHS—is at least 2 weeks.

The State of New York's Department of Mental Hygiene operates three narcotics wards—at Pilgrim State, on Long Island; at Manhattan State, in New York City; and at Utica State Hospital. The total capacity is approximately 150 beds.

In all of New York State, including both State and city facilities, there are long-term treatment facilities for only 1 out of every 200 known addicts.

Under the recently passed legislation in New York, arrested addicts who are not pushers may be committed to hospitals for treatment in New York State. Last year, nearly 7,000 persons were arrested on narcotics charges in New York. Under the new law, they could be placed under long-term quarantine in a hospital. But if there are no hospital beds for them, they will be sent to jail, and the purpose of the New York law will be defeated.

Last week the New York State Legislature adopted a concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to provide a Federal narcotics hospital in the New York metropolitan area.

The resolution points out that New York State has taken a major step forward to meet its share of the responsibility for dealing with narcotic addiction. It emphasizes, however, that the problem can be attacked effectively only if all levels of government—local, State, and Federal—participate in a program of research, prevention, treatment, and aftercare supervision of drug addiction. It explains the reasons for the serious addiction problem in New York City, and concludes with a request to Congress and the President to take immediate steps toward establishing a Federal narcotics hospital in New York, for research, inpatient care, and aftercare services for released addicts. This resolution has my full support.

The New York Journal-American has been rendering an outstanding public service by its series of articles on narcotics addicts. I have been advised by the reporters for the Journal-American, who are responsible for this magnificent series, that that newspaper has received scores of letters and phone calls from addicts or from the kin of addicts, asking for help in gaining admission to a narcotics ward.

All these communications have echoes of the same fact: The addict cannot wait 2 weeks. When he has reached the painful decision to try to break his habit, he cannot sit quietly in some dark corner, waiting for a hospital bed to be vacated for him. If there is a delay, he is apt to change his mind. Money will suddenly become available to buy just one more "fix," or he will find the agony of withdrawal too much to endure.

Two months ago the Journal-American published an article about a young man who was waiting to get into Lexington Hospital. The application was "in the works"; he was notified of the date when he should report to the Kentucky hospital. He bought a bus ticket. Then the waiting began to wear on him. There were temptations. He gave in. He cashed his ticket.

He bought a shot of heroin. The police arrested him in the act of shooting up a Brooklyn hallway. Now he is in jail. If there had been a narcotics hospital in New York, he might be under treatment today. But the nearest facility that would admit him for long-term care was 650 miles away.

Mr. President, the Federal Government cannot ignore these conditions. President Kennedy recognized, during his campaign, that the States could not cope with this menace alone, and that Federal assistance was essential to any successful program. As has already been pointed out, in recent days President Kennedy has reiterated his interest in a White House Conference on Narcotics and in a Federal narcotics hospital. I hope he will also give his support to the proposal we are today making and to the other legislative recommendations on which action is critically needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, and appropriately referred, the concurrent resolution of the New York State Legislature, memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to provide a Federal narcotics hospital in the New York metropolitan area.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the article, from the New York Journal American, about the young man who could not be admitted to a hospital in time, and who regrettably gave in to temptation, after he might at one time have been saved.

There being no objection, the resolution and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 117

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to provide Federal narcotics hospital in the New York metropolitan area

Whereas the human suffering and social and economic loss caused by drug addiction are matters of grave concern to the people of this State; and

Whereas persons who become addicted to narcotic drugs are most often adolescents and young adults who are victimized before they are old enough to appreciate the tragic consequences; and

Whereas the highly infectious scourge of drug addiction continues to take its toll of human lives and the health of thousands of its helpless victims; and

Whereas essentially the entire illegal supply of narcotics in the United States is brought into New York State from foreign countries; and

Whereas Federal authorities have not been able to sustain an effective attack against the smuggling of narcotics into the country; and

Whereas the inability of Federal authorities to cope effectively with the illicit importing of narcotics has directly contributed to the increasing urgency of this most pressing medical and social problem; and

Whereas effective, coordinated State, Federal, and local programs of treatment can be developed to save hundreds and ultimately thousands of young narcotics addicts from enslavement to drugs by offering them medical and psychiatric treatment; and

Whereas the problem of drug addiction can be attacked effectively only if all levels of government, local, State, and Federal, shoulder their full measure of responsibility in research and in prevention, treatment and aftercare of drug addiction; and

Whereas the State of New York has taken a major step forward to meet its share of these responsibilities by enactment of legislation and other action offering arrested drug addicts humane medical treatment instead of imprisonment, and by strengthening its program of voluntary commitments of noncriminal addicts to State hospitals for treatment; and

Whereas it is the unanimous consensus of expert medical opinion that drug addicts share a common need for programs of planned hospitalization followed by intensive aftercare treatment; and

Whereas New York State, and particularly the city of New York, by reason of its national eminence as a seaport and the availability of illicit narcotic drugs smuggled into the United States from all over the world through the enormous port facilities of New York City, has the most serious addiction problem in the country; and

Whereas hospital and aftercare treatment facilities, to be of maximum benefit to persons in need of such assistance should be located in areas of high concentration of addiction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Congress and the President of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized to take immediate steps toward providing affirmative support to State, local, and individual initiative in obtaining a Federal narcotics hospital in the New York metropolitan area to provide for:

(a) extensive research in narcotics addiction;

(b) addict treatment services affording adequate inpatient care; and

(c) aftercare services for released addicts; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to assert their best efforts to the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the senate:

JOHN J. SULLIVAN,
Secretary.

[From the New York Journal-American, Jan. 26, 1962]

IS YOUR TEENAGER SAFE?—A TICKET TO HOPE—OR HORROR

(By James D. Horan, Dom Frasca, and John Mitchell)

Six hundred and fifty miles separate the Raymond Street jail in Brooklyn from the Federal Narcotics Hospital in Lexington, Ky.

Six hundred and fifty miles, one canceled train ticket, a mother's wedding ring in a pawnshop window, and—heroin.

Two weeks ago, Patrick F., 22, made a decision.

"I've decided," he told his wife, "to kick it, honey. I'm going to get myself admitted into Lexington."

The wife cried a little and said, "Thank God." Pat looked at their year-and-a-half-old baby playing on the floor.

"When I get out," he said, "everything's going to be swell."

Life had not been swell for Pat and his wife for a long time. Pat, addicted to heroin for 2 years, was often out of work on the piers. It takes a strong back to be a longshoreman and heroin saps a man's strength.

So Pat was broke. Whatever money came his way was spent on two things: milk for the baby, and heroin for his veins.

When word came back from Lexington that his application was accepted, Pat went to see an aunt. She gave him $50.

"You promise you'll buy your ticket to Lexington with that?" said the aunt, handing him the money.

"I promise," he said, and he did. At home, he displayed the one-way coach ticket proudly, and said to his wife:

"See? There's no going back now. I'm as good as committed." The prediction was premature.

Four days before Pat was due to arrive in Lexington, the craving for heroin came at him like a tropical tempest. His pockets were empty. No cash. He needed a fix.

Pat paced the floor of his small Brooklyn apartment. Within the next 24 hours, he knew, the agonies of withdrawal would rack his body—unless he got himself "fixed up."

So Pat got himself a fix, cashed in the ticket to Lexington, located his connection, opened his vein to the white "horse" of heroin.

Last Monday, Pat and three other young men were arrested by police in a hallway of a building on Brooklyn's Seventh Avenue. The charge: congregating for the purpose of using narcotics.

That's how Pat came to the Raymond Street Jail.

On Tuesday he appeared in felony court, was bound over to special sessions, where he was scheduled to plead sometime today before Judge Ludwig Glowa.

Wednesday, Pat's wife and mother visited him on Raymond Street.

"Bail's $1,000," said Pat's wife. "To get you out we've got to post a $100 bond. We need $50 more."

"Where'd you get the first $50?" Pat asked.

The two women looked at each other, avoiding the answer.

"Where did you get it?" Pat demanded.

Finally the young wife spoke.

"Your mother," she said. "She pawned her wedding ring."

Pat glanced quickly at the third finger of his mother's left hand.

"Maw," he said, "Maw, it wasn't worth it, not for me."

The women saw the strain then on Pat's face, saw the sweat on his forehead.

"Are you sick, Pat?"

"A little," he said. "I need a fix."

"You drink a lot of milk, son, milk will fix you up."

"You don't see much milk in this place, Maw," said Pat. "What I need is another ticket to Lexington."

So Pat's wife and mother went home and wondered when, if ever, Pat will see the blue grass of Kentucky.

In a telephone interview with a New York Journal-American reporter, Pat's wife said yesterday: "What will happen if the Judge sends Pat back to jail?"

And the reporter replied: "It depends. Has Pat been arrested before?"

"Yes," said the wife. "Last summer, for stealing cable. The case was dismissed."

"Then Pat could go to jail for quite a while. Three months, six. You can't predict these things. It's up to the judge."

Six hundred and fifty miles east of Lexington, Patrick F. pleads today in special sessions; guilty or not guilty? Jail or hospital? Addicted or cured?

Six hundred and fifty miles is a long way for a man without a ticket.

Is everything going to be swell, now, Pat, when you get out?

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague. This is a fight by both of us, and I hope it will be waged successfully.

I should like to make the two points which I believe we wish to leave with the Senate:

First, here is a new approach to narcotics addiction—an approach more promising than that in any other area—namely, the medical approach. It was in effect in California, and it is now in effect in New York. We believe very strongly that it needs to be implemented by such a Federal establishment.

Second, this effort is entirely a bipartisan one. I call attention to the fact that the bill introduced today demonstrates its bipartisanship; and we wish to continue to have this matter treated precisely in that way.

Finally, I point out that this is an essential extension of our research activities. My colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] has said it fits in completely with the package of bills we have offered in an effort to bring about the adoption of a medical approach. I was chairman of the Committee on Narcotics of the National Association of Attorneys General when I was attorney general, and I can assure the Senate of the worthiness of this approach, its validity, and the urgency of its adoption as a national policy, as it has been adopted as State policy in the States of California and New York.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **JAVITS**. I yield.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I associate myself completely with the comments the distinguished Senator from New York has made. I am very proud to have been cosponsor of two measures in this field which have been introduced by the able junior Senator from New York. Also, I have joined with the Senators from New York in urging a White House Conference on a national problem of transcendent importance which, I regret to say, has a high incidence of application in the large States of the American Union.

What the Senator does today is to fix attention on the problem, and the new means by which the Federal Government might attack the problem is deserving of the attention of our colleagues in the Senate and the constituents of the Senators from New York. I am happy to associate myself in a fight that is of transcendent importance to our Nation.

Mr. **JAVITS**. I thank the Senator from California.

I also wish to express my appreciation to the New York Journal American, which is carrying on a campaign in this field in New York. We have had campaigns in this field by the New York Daily News and other newspapers. They are of tremendous help in getting public support in this problem, for which there is a crying need, and which is richly deserved.

REVENUES FROM FEDERALLY OWNED LANDS

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, very often we hear about the loss in revenue by some of our States as the result of a large percentage of their land being owned by the Federal Government.

It is true the Federal Government does own substantial acreage in many of our States, and on some of this land there are valuable mineral resources upon which the Federal Government collects substantial amounts in revenue in the form of royalties and payments for leases. Substantial income results from the sale of Government-owned timber, and several million more acres of Government land are leased for grazing purposes. The Government also derives some income from its wildlife refuges located throughout this country.

While it is recognized that from these sources the Federal Government collects millions annually, what is ofttimes overlooked is that a substantial part of this same revenue is automatically paid back to the respective States under a fixed formula approved by Congress.

With the thought of determining just how the States fare under this formula I asked the Secretary of the Interior to compile a list of revenues from all sources collected by his Department on Government-owned lands and the amounts of such revenues that are allocated back to the respective States.

Thinking perhaps the report may be of interest to other Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and report printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: We regret the delay in replying to your request for information on revenues collected by the Department of the Interior and amounts paid to States from such revenues.

A reply was prepared previously but in some manner was lost.

Revenues collected by this department are the result of statutory requirements and amounts paid to States are also in accordance with law.

A brief statement of these statutory requirements is set forth below.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Payments to States from receipts under Mineral Leasing Act: Alaska is paid 90 percent and other States 37½ percent of the receipts from bonuses, royalties, and rentals resulting from development of mineral resources under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191) and from leases of potash deposits (30 U.S.C. 285) on public lands.

Payments to Oklahoma (royalties): The State of Oklahoma is paid 37½ percent of the Red River oil and gas royalties in lieu of State and local taxes on Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache tribal funds (42 Stat. 1448), to be used for construction and maintenance of public roads and support of public schools (44 Stat. 740).

Payments due counties, submarginal land programs, Farm Tenant Act: Of the revenues received from the use of submarginal lands, 25 percent is paid to the counties in which such land is situated, for school and road purposes (7 U.S.C. 1012).

Payments to States from grazing receipts, etc., public lands outside grazing districts: The States are paid 50 percent of the grazing fee receipts from public domain lands outside grazing districts (43 U.S.C. 3151, 315m).

Payments to States from grazing receipts, etc., public lands within grazing districts: The States are paid 12½ percent of grazing fee receipts from grazing district lands within their boundaries (43 U.S.C. 315b, 3151).

Payments to States from grazing receipts, etc., public lands within grazing districts, miscellaneous: The States are paid specifically determined amounts from grazing fee receipts from miscellaneous lands within grazing districts when payments are not feasible on a percentage basis (43 U.S.C. 315).

Payments to State of Alaska, income and proceeds, Alaska school lands: Alaska was paid the income derived from sal· of timber and disposition of lands or minerals on public lands reserved for school and other educational purposes (38 Stat. 1214; 53 Stat. 1243; 48 U.S.C. 353). This account will be discontinued in 1961 when the State assumes administration of the lands.

Payments to counties, Oregon and California grant lands: 50 percent of the receipts of Oregon and California land-grant funds are paid the counties in which the lands are situated, to be used as other county funds (39 Stat. 218).

Payments to Coos and Douglas Counties, Oreg., from receipts, Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands: Out of receipts from the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands in Oregon, payments in lieu of taxes are made to Coos and Douglas Counties for schools, roads, highways, bridges, and port districts (53 Stat. 753–754).

Payments to States (proceeds of sales): The States are paid 59 percent of the net proceeds from sale of public land and public land products (31 U.S.C. 711).

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Payment for tax losses on land acquired for Grand Teton National Park: Park visitor fees collected at Grand Teton National Park, Wyo., are used to compensate the State of Wyoming for tax losses on Grand Teton National Park lands (64 Stat. 851).

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

Payments to counties from receipts under Migratory Bird Conservation Act: Of the net proceeds from sales of refuge products 25 percent is paid to counties in which the refuges are located for the benefit of public schools and roads (16 U.S.C. 715s).

We are enclosing statements prepared in the form indicated in your letter for the Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

Sincerely yours,
STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amounts collected from royalties, leases, payments, and land rentals by States and amounts paid or allocated back to these States, fiscal year 1960

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

States	Amounts collected from—					Amounts paid or allocated back to States				
	Royalties	Leases	Payments	Land rental	Total	Royalties	Leases	Payments	Land rental	Total
Alabama	$2, 156		$11, 906		$14, 062	$808		$476		$1, 284
Alaska	3, 097, 711	$11, 889	314, 734		3, 424, 334	2, 787, 939	$11, 889	12, 589		2, 812, 417
Arizona	676, 157	223, 337	1, 371, 343		2, 270, 837	253, 559	41, 732	54, 854		350, 145
Arkansas	61, 878		2, 783		64, 661	23, 204		111		23, 315
California	7, 347, 587	168, 720	1, 894, 359		9, 410, 666	2, 755, 388	53, 760	75, 774		2, 884, 922
Colorado	9, 154, 639	185, 840	703, 066		10, 043, 545	3, 432, 990	26, 791	28, 122		3, 487, 903
Florida	364		54, 266		54, 630	57		2, 171		2, 228
Idaho	237, 204	292, 726	314, 854		844, 784	88, 951	33, 381	12, 594		134, 926
Kansas	322, 317	25			322, 342	120, 869	12			120, 881
Louisiana	257, 556		5, 141		262, 697	96, 664		206		96, 870
Michigan	1, 588		1, 080		2, 668	596		43		639
Minnesota			36, 246		36, 246			1, 450		1, 450
Mississippi	6, 468		4, 531		10, 999	2, 425		181		2, 606
Missouri			138		138			6		6
Montana	4, 754, 736	538, 412	189, 257		5, 482, 405	1, 761, 994	114, 484	7, 570		1, 884, 048
Nebraska	17, 695	24			17, 719	6, 636	12			6, 648
Nevada	427, 739	520, 924	786, 655		1, 735, 318	160, 402	55, 115	31, 466		246, 983
New Mexico	20, 733, 770	418, 932	215, 468		21, 368, 170	7, 774, 844	46, 445	8, 619		7, 829, 908
North Dakota	220, 316	2, 877	7, 119		230, 312	82, 618	1, 438	285		84, 341
Oklahoma	129, 978	795	10, 632		141, 405	48, 742	398	425		49, 565
Oregon	144, 708	250, 363	34, 879, 515		35, 274, 586	54, 266	33, 272	[1] 16, 373, 232		16, 460, 770
South Dakota	272, 010	20, 090	6, 454		298, 554	102, 004	10, 045	258		112, 307
Utah	7, 278, 990	353, 948	86, 515		7, 719, 453	2, 729, 621	33, 258	3, 461		2, 766, 340
Washington	1, 447	9, 034	353, 068		363, 549	500	4, 517	14, 123		19, 140
Wisconsin			7, 401		7, 401			296		296
Wyoming	33, 165, 395	472, 611	180, 241		33, 818, 247	12, 437, 023	89, 804	7, 210		12, 534, 037
Total	[2] 88, 312, 409	[3] 3, 470, 547	[4] 41, 436, 772		133, 219, 728	34, 722, 100	556, 353	16, 635, 522		51, 913, 975

---

[1] Includes $16,331,178 paid direct to Oregon counties from receipts, Oregon and California; Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands.

[2] Mineral leasing, oil and gas, coal, potash, phosphate and sodium. Principally royalties and minor amounts of rentals and bonuses.

[3] Grazing, $3,458,658, and Alaska school lands, $11,889.

[4] Sales of public land and timber, $7,608,610, and receipts from Oregon and California; Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, $33,828,162.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued

Amounts collected from royalties, leases, payments, and land rentals by States and amounts paid or allocated back to these States, fiscal year 1960—Continued

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

States	Amounts collected from—					Amounts paid or allocated back to States				
	Royalties	Leases	Payments	Land rental	Total	Royalties	Leases	Payments	Land rental	Total
Wyoming			[5] $121,178		[5] $121,178			[5] $30,064		[5] $30,064
Total										

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

States	Royalties	Leases	Payments	Land rental	Total	Royalties	Leases	Payments	Land rental	Total
Alabama			[6] $171.00		$171.00			[7] $42.75		$42.75
Alaska			40,536.12		40,536.12			18,805.46		18,805.46
Arkansas			70,204.45		70,204.45			15,440.87		15,440.87
California			7,018.85		7,018.85			1,751.68		1,751.68
Colorado			8,467.12		8,467.12			2,116.77		2,116.77
Delaware			122.20		122.20			30.55		30.55
Florida			16,730.74		16,730.74			2,770.86		2,770.86
Georgia			96,688.07		96,688.07			20,221.35		20,221.35
Idaho			9,441.10		9,441.10			2,360.27		2,360.27
Illinois			23,751.68		23,751.68			5,935.35		5,935.35
Iowa			5,432.94		5,432.94			1,327.19		1,327.19
Kansas			1,797.63		1,797.63			449.41		449.41
Kentucky			61,857.84		61,857.84			13,925.33		13,925.33
Louisiana			1,094,876.92		1,094,876.92			273,653.19		273,653.19
Maine			4,138.59		4,138.59			0		0
Maryland			998.52		998.52			247.75		247.75
Massachusetts			933.31		933.31			233.33		233.33
Michigan			19,749.79		19,749.79			4,935.24		4,935.24
Minnesota			13,310.65		13,310.65			2,179.90		2,179.90
Mississippi			39,784.01		39,784.01			8,192.11		8,192.11
Missouri			3,816.22		3,816.22			947.05		947.05
Montana			50,295.26		50,295.26			12,072.33		12,072.33
Nebraska			126,777.23		126,777.23			30,693.05		30,693.05
Nevada			17,448.34		17,448.34			4,362.09		4,362.09
New Mexico			3,270.95		3,270.95			817.74		817.74
New York			7,586.68		7,586.68			1,852.97		1,852.97
North Carolina			2,142.72		2,142.72			535.68		535.68
North Dakota			24,177.23		24,177.23			5,983.43		5,983.43
Oklahoma			61,973.99		61,973.99			13,024.29		13,024.29
Oregon			154,814.37		154,814.37			38,703.59		38,703.59
Pennsylvania			20.00		20.00			5.00		5.00
South Carolina			265.45		265.45			66.36		66.36
South Dakota			12,696.96		12,696.96			3,172.12		3,172.12
Tennessee			756.90		756.90			192.26		192.26
Texas			43,777.47		43,777.47			10,944.37		10,944.37
Utah			147.34		147.34			36.84		36.84
Vermont			1,186.78		1,186.78			296.69		296.69
Virginia			1,471.03		1,471.03			367.13		367.13
Washington			31,178.32		31,178.32			7,794.58		7,794.58
Wisconsin			11,472.25		11,472.25			2,828.62		2,828.62
Wyoming			672.50		672.50			168.13		168.13
Total			2,071,959.52		2,071,959.52			509,483.68		509,483.68

[5] Represents collection as visitor fees at Grand Teton National Park, Wyo., and payments made to the State of Wyoming in lieu of taxes on lands acquired for Grand Teton National Park, pursuant to Public Law 787, 81st Cong., approved Sept. 14, 1950 (64 Stat. 851).

[6] Amounts in this column represent receipts from wildlife refuges.

[7] Amounts in this column represent payments to counties in which the refuges are located.

RECIPIENTS OF PAYMENTS IN EXCESS OF $10,000 UNDER THE FEED GRAINS PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last August 21 I directed a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman in which I asked for a breakdown and a list of all payments in excess of $10,000 to various individuals and corporations under the feed grains program. The purpose of the letter was to learn to what extent small farmers are benefiting under the Kennedy feed grain program as enacted last year.

On the 28th of August 1961, I received a reply from the Secretary, signed by James T. Ralph, Assistant Secretary, in which he said:

> Such information is not available at this time but will be available during the fall as soon as performance has been checked for all farms.

The information did not come, and on January 15, 1962, I directed another letter to the Assistant Secretary who signed the letter of August 28, 1961, and asked him when I could expect a reply.

On February 2, 1962, I received another acknowledgment, in which it was again stated that the information would be available very soon.

I am still waiting. I most respectfully suggest to the Secretary of Agriculture that if at this time he does not know how the approximate $700 million have been spent he had better be finding out.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD copies of this correspondence.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 21, 1961.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I would appreciate it very much if you would provide the following information in connection with the Feed Grains Act. I want this information broken down by States:

1. The names, addresses, and the amounts received by each, of all individuals or corporations, who under the feed grains program will receive payments in excess of $10,000 (including cash payments and payments in kind).

2. If the information is readily available to show how much of this $10,000 accrued from payment toward reduction of acreage in corn and how much for reduction in sorghum acreage, then let the report show such breakdown; but if your statistics are not compiled separately the combined total will be acceptable.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of August 21, 1961, requesting the names, addresses, and amounts received by each, of all individuals or corporations who will receive payments in excess of $10,000 (including cash payments and payments in kind) under the 1961 feed grains program.

Such information is not available at this time but will be available during the fall as soon as performance has been checked for all farms. We will be happy to furnish this information as soon thereafter as possible.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES T. RALPH,
Assistant Secretary.

JANUARY 15, 1962.

Mr. JAMES T. RALPH,
Assistant Secretary,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RALPH: On August 21, 1961, I directed a letter to Hon. Orville Freeman requesting information in connection with the Feed Grains Act and on August 28 I received a letter from you informing me that the information desired was not available at that time but would be available during the fall as soon as performance had been checked for all farms.

As yet I have not received the above material and I would appreciate very much having this information as early as convenient.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1962.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your letter of January 15, 1962, and a further followup to our letter of August 28, 1961, regarding your request for specific information on the 1961 feed grain program.

We have made arrangements to have our field offices tabulate and submit this information. As soon as the tabulations can be compiled and reviewed for accuracy, we shall furnish the results to you.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH M. BIRKHEAD,
Assistant to the Secretary.

RELAXED AMERICANS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, recently in this Chamber I adverted to observations I had made overseas, in South America, Europe, and the Far East, as to the thousands of Americans associated with AID and other agencies, as employees and officials who were living "high on the hog" and doing very little work of importance to our country.

I stated at that time that if this multiplicity of agencies continued, the taxpayers would be paying and paying and sweating and sweating, and we could probably combine all of these alphabetical agencies into one agency and term it "I O U."

This morning I received a letter of much more than ordinary importance. It came not from one of those relaxed Americans overseas I referred to in my previous remarks, but from an important constitutent in my State of Ohio who is presently on the staff of the University of Dacca in East Pakistan; a man who, before he went overseas, had served in this country in his professional capacity as an instructor in a leading university.

He said he was pleased that a Senator from his State demonstrated the courage to criticize the lavish way that many of our official fellow Americans live overseas. I quote now from his letter. He states:

> We are wasting taxpayers' money by giving a 20-percent hardship allowance to U.S. Government employees in East Pakistan. The luxurious way that they are living in Dacca and other parts of Pakistan makes this a joke.
>
> Americans working for AID——

AID—Agency for International Development—is our foreign assistance program. Of course, I am thankful, and I think all Americans should be thankful, that in this administration we are referring to this program as foreign assistance and are not using that title which was a subterfuge—mutual security. We are calling it what it is—foreign assistance. The writer of the letter also refers to Americans working in the U.S. Information Agency and in the Department of State in East Pakistan. He says:

> They are living on a lavish scale that they could never afford to maintain back home. Their palatial homes, Government-supplied air conditioners, free transport, and commissary privileges with cutrate food and liquor.

And so forth.

He states these conditions do not jell with the idea of a "hardship post," and makes the following observation:

> If a congressional or senatorial investigation were to be made here, it would reveal the waste of thousands and thousands of dollars of taxpayers' funds on luxury living.

Then he adds:

> I am not writing in a spirit of envy, but in criticism of needless waste.

I can well believe that, from the position he occupies at the University of Dacca.

To the contrary, he says he is writing the letter in criticism of "the ostentatious way of living by our Government employees," and that this "does not go down well in a land where most people have about 20 cents a day to live on."

Mr. President, I am sure that many of my colleagues as well as thousands of Americans who have traveled abroad have come to the same conclusions as this perceiving gentleman. We should heed these criticisms and take action to put these agencies above reproach. A good start would be to reduce unnecessary personnel working abroad and living well at taxpayers' expense.

THE SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and myself, I submit, for appropriate reference a Senate resolution to authorize a nationwide, competitive high school Senate youth program. This program would be operated at no expense to the Federal Government. It would become effective only upon evidence of sufficient private support and with the sanction of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

My colleagues and I are firmly convinced that, in the words of the resolution "the continued vitality of our Republic depends, in part, on the intelligent understanding of our political processes and the functioning of our National Government by the citizens of the United States." As Senators know, Mr. President, a number of privately sponsored internship programs already exist for students in their final years of college or for those who are completing their graduate work. As a result of these worthwhile endeavors, hundreds of young men and women are brought to our Nation's Capital each year to work in congressional offices, for committees, or merely to observe and to enhance their knowledge of Congress.

Perhaps the leader among these various efforts is the congressional fellowship program sponsored by the American Political Science Association which for almost a decade has brought political scientists, journalists, and now some young teachers of law to work with Members of the House and the Senate for 9 months. Still other programs include those sponsored by Vassar-Wellesley, Yale, Colgate, North Carolina, Wisconsin, Maine, Williams, Amherst-Mount Holyoke-Smith, to name but a few. Only recently the last named sent a large number of students to the Senate. Outstanding work has been done in recent years by the National Center for Education in Politics, perhaps better known by its former name, the "Citizenship Clearing House," and its various State affiliates.

Congress, the teaching profession, and our Nation have profited by the insights which these young people have gained through their contact with the legislative process. Many of us have cooperated with several of these programs. The number is increasing.

Recently I was honored to serve with the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and Representatives JAMES C. WRIGHT, of Texas, and THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, as the congressional Members of a nine-member steering committee, including five representatives of the academic internship programs which operate primarily during the summer months. The purpose of this steering committee is to discuss the relationship of these various programs to the congressional demand for their services and to provide some degree of coordination for the many college programs now operating.

While content will remain with the individual institution, it is hoped that some overall enrichment will result from this coordination and the pooling of ideas.

But it should be stressed that the "education" process of these programs has been limited almost exclusively to students attending institutions of higher education. Our proposal is for a Senate youth program which would be composed solely of high school students.

The germ of the idea for the proposal we offer as a Senate youth program arose in an interesting manner. Some members of the William Randolph Hearst Foundation were discussing the erroneous impressions which some of our fellow citizens have about the work of a "politician" with our late colleague, Senator Andy Schoeppel. From that session, several of us in and out of the Senate began thinking how we could improve public understanding of what Senators—as one group of elected politicians—really do.

One possibility which arose was the idea of bringing into contact with Members of the Senate politically minded high school students based on a competition sponsored by private funds. Our thinking was that perhaps once a year, two high school students who have held elected student body office in their sophomore, junior, or senior years could be selected by various competitive methods and brought to Washington, D.C., for a week.

The transportation, housing and feeding, insurance, and chaperon arrangements would be supervised by a private foundation or a group of private foundations.

Private funds would also pay for a part-time director who would arrange for various lectures, meetings, and discussion groups during that week which would provide these students with a better understanding of the work and function of the U.S. Senate and its relationship with the executive branch and the House of Representatives. Perhaps the student would spend 1 day in the office of one of the Senators from his State if that Senator desired to participate in this program. The arrangements would be flexible depending on the interest and cooperation evinced by a particular Senator.

The form of the competition at the State level would depend on a cooperative arrangement with the various State superintendents of public instruction. This, again, would be arranged by the private foundation with the sanction of the Senators from that State. Such competition might be in the form of an essay or oratorical contest, or some other vehicle which would stimulate interest in American Government.

After coming to Washington, D.C., for a week, these young high school students would return to their homes. There they would share an increased understanding of the work of a legislative body in a constitutional democracy with their friends and townspeople. Through this understanding the durability of our form of government would be enhanced. Talented and alert young people would have a broader basis for good citizenship. Some might, hopefully, even be inspired to seek political office—the quality of whose occupants in the years ahead will determine to a large degree the course of our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution which I and my colleagues have offered appear in full at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 324), submitted by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Senators MANSFIELD, DIRKSEN, and HUMPHREY), was received, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the continued vitality of our Republic depends, in part, on the intelligent understanding of our political processes and the functioning of our National Government by the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas the durability of a constitutional democracy is dependent upon alert, talented, vigorous competition for political leadership; and

Whereas individual Senators have cooperated with various private and university undergraduate and graduate fellowship and internship programs relating to the work of Congress; and

Whereas in the high schools of the United States, there exists among students who have been elected to student-body offices in their sophomore, junior, or senior year a potential reservoir of young citizens who are experiencing their first responsibilities of service to a constituency and who should be encouraged to deepen their interest in and understanding of their country's political processes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby expresses its willingness to cooperate in a nationwide competitive high school Senate youth program which would give several representative high school students from each State a short indoctrination into the operation of the United States Senate and the Federal Government generally, if such a program can be satisfactorily arranged and completely supported by private funds with no expense to the Federal Government.

SEC. 2. The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration shall investigate the possibility of establishing such a program and if the committee determines such a program is possible and advisable, it shall make the necessary arrangements to establish the program.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the really thrilling things it is the pleasure of a U.S. Senator to enjoy is the opportunity to speak with the young people of America. The young people of America are eager to learn and to understand. The young people of America for the most part have hearts which are free of hate or of fear. The youth of this country today cherish the freedom of this Republic precisely as we and our forebears of the past have.

The youth of today are inquisitive and responsive to discussions by people in the public service. When a Senator has an opportunity to speak to them it is thrilling, and something which I think comes under the heading of one of the finest things a Senator is permitted to do.

This kind of program, Mr. President, if it is favorably recommended by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and if the Senate gives it its stamp of approval, would indicate to the American people that this group of men and women, temporarily representing their States in the Senate of the United States, invite high school students, appropriately chosen by each State under appropriate examinations and screening, to come to the Capital of America and to be given a unique opportunity to study the processes of government as you, Mr. President, and I know them, and thereby to become enriched as to what the word "politician" really means, in the good sense, in America.

HIGH INTEREST RATES CHOKE OFF RECOVERY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, many commentators have pointed out recently that the recovery from our last recession is not encouraging. Bernard Nossiter recently wrote, in the Washington Post and Times Herald, a good summary of some aspects of this concern.

Some components of demand and output have failed to increase at a rate comparable with rates in previous recoveries, but the real problem is the rate of interest. Bernard Nossiter does not deal specifically with the rate of interest, but it seems to me it is very clear in any kind of analysis of what he has written that this is the root of our difficulty.

Mr. Nossiter observes correctly that home building has been declining. Why? In the midst of recovery, why is this true?

Interest constitutes the biggest cost in home building and construction. It is the prevailing upward trend in our rates of interest which is choking off construction and enfeebling recovery. So long as the Nation's long-term rates of interest remain as high as they have been in the recent past we cannot expect the housing sector to be a source of strength in this or any other recovery.

This point is very obvious when we compare the behavior of housing in this recovery and its behavior during the 1958 recovery when the interest rates were much more permissive. At the bottom of both recessions the annual rate of housing starts was close to 1.1 million. Eight months after the bottom of the 1958 recession the annual rate was 1.6 million. Eight months after the 1961 recession the annual rate was less than 1.4 million. This difficulty in the rate of recovery is likely to persist into the next year. According to Federal Reserve Board survey of consumer buying intentions only 9.8 percent of all families were planning to buy houses in the next 24 months, compared to 10.3 percent in January 1961 and 12 percent in January 1960.

Mr. President, the reason why I bring up this subject, upon which I have been hammering away often in the Senate, is that the level of interest rates, is the responsibility of the U.S. Congress, according to the Constitution, a responsibility that has been largely delegated to the Federal Reserve Board. The Federal Reserve Board is in a position to lower or raise interest rates. Some of us on the Joint Economic Committee have been pleading with them to follow policies which would reduce interest rates. They could do so right now by buying long-term Federal bonds without endangering our adverse balance-of-payments position, and by doing so, they could greatly improve our economic position.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Economists Skeptical About 'Strong' Recovery; Capital, Labor Agree Kennedy View of Economy Too Rosy," by Bernard D. Nossiter, published in the Washington Post of yesterday, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMISTS SKEPTICAL ABOUT STRONG RECOVERY—CAPITAL, LABOR AGREE KENNEDY VIEW OF ECONOMY TOO ROSY

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Wall Street and organized labor, an unlikely pair of bedfellows, apparently agree on one point: President Kennedy's view of the economy is too rosy.

Outside of Government, economists are increasingly skeptical of the President's insistence that this is a strong recovery. In fact, a sampling of the major economic indicators shows that the current recovery could be labeled the weakest of the four postwar upturns.

This does not mean that a slump is on the horizon. As far ahead as economists can see with assurance—about 6 months—there is no sign of a downturn. But the pace of the advance in the last 6 months has been meager.

Wall Street reflects this in stock prices which haven't been rising; labor expresses it in more insistent demands for Federal action, partly appeased by the President's proposal on Monday for an extra $600 million in public works spending.

At the White House, Mr. Kennedy's experts single out the first 3 months of 1962 as the sore spot, acknowledge that they were disappointing but find the results mysterious.

Here, in the schematic form, is a picture of how the first year of this recovery compares with the first year of the three earlier postwar recoveries.

All four began climbing at about the same rate. But after 6 months of advance, the three earlier recoveries rose at a faster pace; the current recovery continued rising too, but at a slower rate.

This shows up by comparing four important measurements of the economy in the four recoveries. The four indexes are jobs outside of farming, incomes of persons, industrial output and business investment in new plant and equipment.

Here is the percentage that each indicator gained in the first 6 months of the four recoveries:

Recoveries

	1949–50	1954–55	1958–59	1961–62
Jobs	3.4	1.7	1.2	1.6
Incomes	7.5	3.0	3.3	4.0
Output	13.8	7.5	10.2	10.7
Plant	8.0	−4.4	−1.2	2.5

In general, the 1961–62 advance (which began last March) is about in line with its predecessors for this 6-month segment.

But now look how it stacked up in the latest 6 months (through February) for the current recovery:

Recoveries

	1949–50	1954–55	1958–60	1961–62
Jobs	5.1	2.8	3.5	0.7
Incomes	7.4	5.0	4.3	3.2
Output	12.3	6.7	11.0	1.6
Plant	21.2	15.6	8.5	[1] 4.0

[1] Current quarter is estimated.

In the second 6 months of the first three recoveries, the gain in jobs was four to seven times as great as in the current period; the gain in incomes, one-third to more than twice as large; in output, two to eight times; in investment, two to five times.

Why is this recovery lagging? Many experts point to two factors:

1. Consumers are no longer buying autos, washing machines and other durable goods with the same enthusiasm that they did in the earlier advances.

2. Homebuilding has been declining.

As a result, business is investing less.

Why are hard goods and homebuilding no longer giving the economy a big lift? There are three major schools of thought.

The White House experts argue that there is no structural flaw in the economy, that consumers and corporate treasuries are loaded with cash and both should begin spending as soon as some economic spark is put to this money fuel. The cheap steel pact now in the making, the investment tax credit now before Congress or even spring weather might be the spark.

A conservative school would contend that there is a basic flaw, a lack of profits and incentive to invest. This could be cured by cutting labor costs and reducing business and top bracket taxes.

A liberal school would agree that there is a basic flaw but finds it in maldistributed income. Too much wealth in the top half and not enough in the bottom, with the top half's demand for housing and durables relatively satiated. This could be cured by cutting bottom bracket taxes, lifting wages of the submerged sector and increased Federal spending to reemploy the jobless.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, being from the home State of the President who gave professional poll takers their darkest hour, Harry S. Truman, I am sure it will be understood if I sometimes view poll results with some skepticism.

Of one recent poll, I have not the slightest doubt. I am referring to the Gallup poll, which found that at least 8 out of every 10 Americans hold that it is very important for the United States to try to make the United Nations a success.

In talking with Missourians of all walks of life, I have found that they overwhelmingly support the United Nations. Ours is a diverse State; but there is no diversity of opinion of a big majority concerning the United Nations. Folks told me their sentiments in dialects ranging from the soft southern drawl of the bootheel cotton country of Missouri to the rather clipped accents of the cities.

But their thoughts were the same:

> We hope and pray that the United States will do everything possible to keep the United Nations effective as a world peace-keeping Organization.

Missourians are concerned with the future of this Organization, which they feel is the best hope toward reaching a lasting world peace.

And like Missourians, and other Members of the U.S. Senate, I, too, am concerned.

The United States is facing one of the key votes of our times—whether to authorize President Kennedy to buy up to $100 million worth of U.N. bonds.

I realize that there can be honest differences of opinion as to whether bonds are the best way to finance the activities of the United Nations. I also realize there are differences of opinion on how to handle the proposal.

However, I do not believe that any realistic alternative to this cooperative bond or loan effort of the nations in the U.N. has been proposed. I also do not believe technical differences on how to set up the bond or loan proposal should be allowed to threaten passage of the authorization. I do believe that it is imperative that action be taken soon on this matter, because the result of a negative response, as far as the peace and security of our world goes, could be a grim one.

Violent and grisly deaths, chaos, heartache and heartbreak for the world resulted from the bullet that killed an archduke in the Balkans.

Less than 30 years later there was an even more horrible repetition of world war when a weakened League of Nations was unable to avert this conflict.

There is a parallel in the situation which prevailed then in the League of Nations and that which could come about today, should the United Nations be weakened through a cutoff of peace-keeping funds.

For without the security operations and world sounding board of the United Nations, how could we today successfully cope with an incident such as the slaying which touched off World War I, or prevent a disintegration similar to that which wrecked the League?

And consider the stake of all nations, of all people, in preserving the peace today.

The alternative is a nuclear holocaust that would make previous wars appear as soldier games of neighborhood children.

I agree with Adlai Stevenson who recently said:

> Even if we had to give the $100 million outright, it would be worth the cost many times over. It costs money to wage war and it costs something, though far less, to avoid it.

On a per capita basis, each American spent only $1.06 on the United Nations in 1961, contrasted with about $300 on defense.

The bond issue proposal, as contained in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee bill, is, in my judgment, in accordance with good business practices.

One important reason I favor it is this: The United States will not be footing the bill alone; and, through the bond issue, the American share of the U.N.'s peace-keeping costs in the Congo and Middle East will be reduced from 47½ to 32 percent.

Since the amount needed for each year's payments of the principal and interest on the bond issue will be about $10 million, this will mean a contribution of about $3.2 million a year by the United States. In contrast, we have recently been paying at the rate of about $66 million a year for the UNEF and UNOC operations.

Spreading the financing of the special U.N. operations over a 25-year period will enable the poorer members to meet their obligations more readily.

And I think this is perhaps one of the most important factors—the plan should make Russia and other nations which have not been paying peace-keeping assessments responsible for all back payments—it could be "put up or shut up" for the Soviets, for they can either meet their obligations or come face-on with action to deny them their votes.

Another basic factor—the Communist nations are strongly opposing this bond issue—for if it fails, the U.N. may well be reduced to the Russian ideal—as nothing but a sounding board for their propaganda.

While I favor this bond proposal I intend to support the amendment submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], for himself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], because it will materially assist the United Nations in carrying out a purpose set forth in the preamble to its charter:

> To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

But, listening to the pros and cons on U.S. support of the United Nations, and the arguments over how to do it, I imagine many of us and many of our constituents may be reminded of the words of John Haynes Holmes.

He said:

> The life of humanity upon this planet may yet come to an end and a very terrible end. But I would have you notice that this end is threatened in our time not by anything that the universe may do to us, but only by what man may do to himself.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I desire to address myself very briefly to the so-called compromise that was reached on the subject of United Nations bonds. I realize that in a legislative body compromise is a very necessary tool. But I do not consider the proposal now before the Senate in the nature of a compromise. I consider it in the nature of a surrender.

I am opposed to any type of financing for the United Nations such as the one proposed, but if I were forced to vote "aye" on the question, I would much rather vote on the original proposal.

The so-called compromise proposal would provide appropriated money without fiscal limitation.

In other words, the provision is for back-door, open-door financing. That type of financing was fought hard against last year in the Congress. The proposal would turn the responsibility away from the Congress and away from the intent of the Constitution and would put it entirely in the hands of the President.

I do not desire to reflect upon my opinion of the responsibility of the President, but if the President of the United States has not the ability to balance the budget and keep our Government's fiscal house in order, I do not see how we can expect any responsibility to be shown when we are asked to provide $100 million for a loan to the United Nations.

There is absolutely no mention of interest in the proposed surrender. There is no mention of the length of time that would be required to repay the loan. The proposal is the most complete case of surrender to the executive department that I have seen in my 10 years in this body.

I believe that Senators should be very careful before they place themselves in a position of no retreat on this particular piece of proposed legislation. I intend to offer amendments not only to this proposal, but to any measure of the nature proposed, unless limitations are placed on the length of time of the loan, and unless the amount of interest to be paid is specified. The Congress of the United States should not surrender its responsibility under the Constitution for the financing of any project in which our Government is engaged.

Again I deplore the surrender by both parties in the Senate to the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in opposition to my good friend from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I will support the proposed United Nations bond issue for the reasons advanced by the President of the United States. I am happy indeed to support the compromise which was submitted by the majority and minority leaders yesterday, and which is the pending business before the Senate at this time.

In my judgment, except for semantic differences, the compromise wisely permits the President of the United States to do exactly what he has wanted to do all along, which is to buy up to $100 million of 25-year United Nations bonds carrying an interest rate of 2 percent.

I shall not detain the Senate with a detailed argument as to why I shall support the President and support, by so doing, the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations. A very able speech in support of the proposed purchase of the bonds was made on the floor of the Senate yesterday by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is handling the bill on the floor of the Senate.

I agree thoroughly with the cogent reasons advanced by the Senator from Alabama, and hope that the Senate will promptly take favorable action on this measure.

Last week, Under Secretary of State George W. Ball appeared on my weekly television show, which is broadcast by most of the television stations and many of the radio stations in my State. Our subject was the United Nations bond issue. We did our best in 15 minutes to explore the problem.

I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the program may appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. The President last September 25, in a historic address to the United Nations, which has received far too little attention, in my opinion, in the press and by our citizens, set out better than I could the reasons why support of the United Nations is of vital importance to the security and freedom of the entire world and therefore, of course, is in the best interest of the United States of America. I quote from that splendid address:

> Our problem is the life of this Organization—

Referring to the United Nations—

> It will either grow to meet the challenge of our age, or it will be gone with the wind, without influence, without force, without respect. Were we to let it die—to enfeeble its vigor, to cripple its powers—we would condemn the future.
>
> Our problem is the life of this Organization rests the only true alternative to war—and war appeals no longer as a rational alternative. Unconditional war can no longer lead to unconditional victory. It can no longer serve to settle disputes. It can no longer concern the great powers alone. For a nuclear disaster, spread by winds and waters and fear, could well engulf the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the committed and the uncommitted alike. Mankind must put an end to war—or war will put an end to mankind.

I now paraphrase what the President said further. The President called for a truce to terror. He asked us to invoke the blessings of peace. He called upon us, as we build an international capacity to keep peace, to join in dismantling the national capacity to wage war.

I quote again:

> This will require new strength and new roles for the United Nations. For disarmament alone without checks is but a shadow—and a community without law is but a shell. Already the United Nations has become both the measure and the vehicle of man's most generous impulses. Already it has provided—in the Middle East, in Asia, in Africa this year in the Congo—a means of holding violence within bounds.

I strongly support the President's statement with respect to the United Nations and our need to strengthen it. I regret that there are those in the Senate and elsewhere who do not agree with the President. That, of course, is their privilege—the right of dissent.

However, I think that we should be quite clear that those who wish to downgrade the United Nations are in fact dissenters from the policy of the President of the United States. I recognize the sincerity and the integrity of those critics, but I find myself in disagreement with them, and support President Kennedy's position.

Recently two able columnists, Arthur Krock and William S. White, have taken up the cry that we should downgrade the United Nations in U.S. foreign policy. The columns were published, of Mr. Krock, in the New York Times of March 22, and of Mr. White in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 26.

In such disagreement was I with their views that I undertook to write letters to the editors of both papers, which they were kind enough to publish. These letters state in as brief form as I could muster the reasons why I disagree that the United Nations should be downgraded as an instrument of the foreign policy of the United States.

Further, I am in complete disagreement with the efforts of some persons to downgrade the position of Adlai E. Stevenson, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. In my opinion, during the last 15 months, Mr. Stevenson has made an extraordinarily able contribution to the conduct and, indeed, to the formulation of our foreign policy and, therefore, an extraordinarily able contribution to the advancement of peace throughout the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Krock's and Mr. White's articles and my letters to the editor in reply thereto be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if there is merit in what I have said, the United

Nations should be strengthened so as to enable it to perform its peace-keeping functions. To achieve this the U.N. must be placed on a sounder fiscal basis, for such an institution is merely a shell of what it should be if it does not have adequate finances.

It must be apparent to all, as a result of wide public discussion in connection with the United Nations bond issue, that the finances of the United Nations at the moment are in some disarray. This is due to a number of causes, with which all are familiar. Perhaps the most important causes are that the U.N. quite rightly, in my opinion, has moved into troubled situations in the Middle East and the Congo and has used its best efforts to keep the peace there. Those efforts give every prospect of continuing and increasing success.

I am happy that the United Nations is doing what it has been doing to help keep the peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors. I am happy that the results of intervention in the Congo are each day appearing more worthwhile; are slowly but surely bringing a greater measure of law, order, and justice out of what was, only a short time ago, a chaotic condition.

However, such intervention costs money—money at the rate of $10 million a month for the Congo operation; $20 million a year in the Middle East. The United Nations is at present in debt as a result of such efforts. It will need more money to continue operations in those areas. Unless the proposed bond issue is approved promptly, it will indeed be a difficult matter to arrange for the necessary financing.

The second reason why the bond issue is needed is that many members of the United Nations have not paid their special assessments. Notorious among this group are the Soviet bloc nations. I think it is no secret that the Soviet bloc would be happy indeed if the United Nations were to turn into nothing more than a debating society. The Soviet bloc is quite unhappy with the strong action which the United Nations has taken to help keep the peace. The Soviet bloc is particularly unhappy in that its efforts to create chaos and bring communism into the Congo have failed, largely as a result of the activities of the United Nations.

It is difficult for me to understand the reasoning of some patriotic, honest, and earnest American citizens, who are opposed to communism as strongly as I am, but who, nonetheless, feel that the United Nations should be downgraded and should not be provided with the finances necessary to enable it to continue to thwart the aims of the Soviet bloc in Africa, the Middle East and elsewhere.

The President of the United States has recently, in a message sent to Congress, outlined the reasons why he asks us to support him in this regard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from President Kennedy's message of January 30, 1962, to Congress be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> I regard it as vital to the interests of our country and to the maintenance of peace that the capacity of the United Nations to act for peace not be inhibited by a lack of financial resources. * * *
>
> It is my judgment that [the bond purchase] plan is sound both for the United Nations and for its members. * * *
>
> I ask that the Congress act now to back the United Nations by authorizing the purchase of these bonds. Failure to act would serve the interests of the Soviet Union, which has been particularly opposed to the operation in the Congo and which voted against this plan as part of the consistent Communist effort to undermine the U.N. and undercut its new Secretary General. For without the bond issue, either the United Nations executive arm will wither or the United States will be compelled to pay a larger share of the costs of operation than is reasonable for any one member of an international organization.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at his press conference on March 22, 1962, the President of the United States returned to the subject and stated, in part, with respect to the pending proposal:

> It may be possible to suggest other plans, but * * * this is the plan the United Nations adopted, and we have committed ourselves [to it] and we hope the Congress will support this effort * * *. In my judgment, failure to go ahead is going to mean the collapse of this special effort, and then what is going to happen in the Congo and the Middle East? I think it would be a great mistake and I'm hopeful that the Senate will consider it very carefully.

The Senate is at present considering the proposal very carefully. I hope an overwhelming majority of Senators, and particularly an overwhelming majority of Senators on this side of the aisle, will support the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the principal architect, under the Constitution, of U.S. foreign policy.

I point out the adverse effects upon the prestige of the United States which would result were the pending proposed legislation to fail of passage. In a very real sense, the proposed bond issue is the child of the United States of America. It was our delegation which sponsored it in the General Assembly. It was the chairman of the U.S. delegation, Adlai E. Stevenson, who worked out the plan with U Thant, Acting Secretary General of the United Nations. It was with our support and that of our allies that the proposal passed the General Assembly by a vote of 58 to 13, with 24 abstentions. Only the 11 Soviet bloc countries and Belgium and France voted against the resolution. One can understand the action of Belgium, in view of the history of the operations in the Congo. I find it difficult, indeed, to understand the position of our noble ally, the French Republic; but, after all, it was their right to oppose the bond issue, if they saw fit, and we should not be unduly critical.

But for the U.S. Senate at this late date to repudiate the President of the United States and our delegation to the United Nations, after they have worked so hard and so well to secure the adoption of this measure which will shore up the finances of that international institution, which is so important a vehicle of our foreign policy, would, I suggest, be nothing less than tragic.

I support the President of the United States. I hope an overwhelming majority of the Senate will do likewise and that, as a result of the vote in the Senate, we will be able to show to the country and to the world that we stand foursquare for international peace and justice and for the development of that international institution which is so necessary to the security and well-being of the entire world; an institution which, in the words of the President of the United States, quoted earlier in my talk, is essential to its survival in peace and in decency.

Exhibit 1

(Following is the text of "Your Senator Reports," a public service program by U.S. Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, for broadcast on television and radio stations in Pennsylvania. Guest: George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State.)

Announcer. In today's report to the people of Pennsylvania, Senator Joseph H. Clark has as his distinguished guest Under Secretary of State George Ball. Now, to introduce our guest here is Senator Clark.

Senator Clark. My guest on today's show is the Honorable George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State. Mr. Ball, an eminent practicing lawyer in Illinois until 1961, took 4 years off during World War II in distinguished service to our Government overseas. Since President Kennedy came into office Mr. Ball has been a high official in the State Department and some months ago was named Under Secretary of State. In this capacity he is our No. 2 man in the State Department and he is acting Secretary of State whenever Dean Rusk is out of the country, which has been quite frequently lately.

George, I'd like to talk to you on this program about the United Nations bond issue. As most of you know, we tape this program in Washington on Tuesday, and you don't see it until Sunday. The U.N. bond issue will be debated in the U.S. Senate this week and by the time you see this show some things may have happened with which we may not presently foresee. I strongly support the administration's proposal to authorize purchase by our country of up to $100 million of U.N. 2 percent, 25-year bonds. This is a controversial issue, and I'd like you to understand why I feel as strongly as I do in support of the President.

George, I'd like to ask you, first, if you would tell our audience what is the financial problem confronting the U.N. which resulted in having to ask for the subscription to U.N. bonds.

Mr. Ball. Well, as you know, Senator, in the last few years the U.N. has had to undertake operations overseas in order to keep the peace by interposing itself in situations where otherwise there might be a confrontation of the great powers which could lead to a major war. As a result the U.N. has run into some severe expenses over its normal operation costs. It now owes about $114 million, I think, and its extraordinary peacekeeping expenditures are running at a rate of $120 to $140 million a year. Therefore, if we are to continue to have an effective instrument for keeping the peace in these difficult troubled areas around the world, and if the U.N. is going to serve as that instrument, it is going to have to find additional funds.

Senator Clark. Now, George, isn't most of this additional money over and above what normal assessments bring in needed to cover two critical operations: one in the Middle East and one in the Congo?

Mr. Ball. That is true. Obviously, we are going to have to continue to maintain U.N. forces in the Congo if there isn't going to be civil war there which could very well lead to the Soviet Union coming in and setting up shop in the heart of Africa. This is a matter of real concern.

Senator Clark. Now, what is the President's plan for shoring up the U.N.'s financial situation, particularly as the plan was amended when it came out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. Ball. Well, really this plan was put forward by the U.N. itself to solve its financial problems by floating a $200 million bond issue, and the President has proposed that the United States buv half of that.

Senator Clark. The bond issue has been approved already by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. Ball. It has been approved by the General Assembly. Some 26 or more nations[1] have indicated that they are going to buy bonds. I think that the total amount subscribed so far by other countries is well over $50 million, and the subscriptions are still going forward.

Senator Clark. Now actually, our delegates supported this particular proposal when it was brought up in the U.N., did they not?

Mr. Ball. Oh, certainly. This seems to us to be the best way to solve this problem without any question.

Senator Clark. So in a sense this is our own plan——

Mr. Ball. It is our own plan, yes. I did not mean to suggest that it is not, but I meant that it is something that the U.N. had acted on, which is not simply an American idea being put forward for the first time now.

Senator Clark. Now there are some safeguards, are there not, to assure that we do not pay more than our fair share?

Mr. Ball. That is right. What we are asking for here is to give the President authority to buy $100 million bonds. When those 25-year bonds are repaid the repayment will be part of the regular assessment which the countries have been willing to pay. Also under the bill as it was reported out by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, we cannot buy more than $25 million above the amount which other countries are willing to subscribe.

Senator Clark. In addition we will deduct the share of the interest and principal due us before we pay our regular assessments to the U.N.

Mr. Ball. The effect actually will be to diminish the amount that the United States will have to provide for the total running needs of the U.N.

Senator Clark. And we don't put up any money unless it's matched by other countries, because the Foreign Relations Committee proposal calls for matching above a $25 million unconditional borrowing by the United States for the purchase of bonds and already other countries have pledged over $50 million.

Mr. Ball. That's true.

Senator Clark. So, we will be matched more than dollar for dollar on our first payment.

Mr. Ball. Exactly.

Senator Clark. And if we go through with this there will be $100 million already provided, $50 million from us and $50 million from other countries, and that will leave another $100 million to be put up of which we will put up another $50 million and other countries will provide $50 million——

Mr. Ball. That's right.

Senator Clark. Now, two Republican Senators, for whom I have the highest regard, Senator **Hickenlooper** and Senator **Aiken**, have proposed an alternate plan which will probably come before the Senate for a vote in the reasonably near future. Would you comment on the Aiken-Hickenlooper proposal?

Mr. Ball. Well, this would be a plan for a 3-year loan. The difficulty with a 3-year loan is that there is no foreseeable way in which the U.N. could be able to repay this loan at the end of 3 years. At that time the U.N. would be faced with another financial crisis.

Senator Clark. So actually we'd just be postponing the problem without solving it for 3 years.

Mr. Ball. That's right. And it would create a sense of uncertainty within the U.N. which could be a real deterrent to its effective conduct.

Senator Clark. And also, George, I think it would repudiate what the U.N. has already proposed at our urging.

Mr. Ball. Well, we can't very well be in a position where the U.N. General Assembly passes a resolution; where many countries already come forward and offer contributions under this resolution, and then we say, "Well, we're sorry; we originally favored this, but now we'd like to try another scheme."

Senator Clark. It would make us look rather silly, in my judgment, in the eyes of all of our friends as well as in the eyes of our Soviet opponents who are not contributing one cent for the U.N.'s peacekeeping efforts.

Mr. Ball. That's right.

Senator Clark. Now, George, there has been a certain amount of criticism voiced about the fact that other nations aren't carrying their share of the load. We know of course, that the Soviet group, which I suspect would be only too happy to wreck the U.N., hasn't subscribed its fair share. I'm sorry that some American citizens seem to be taking that line too and wanting to cut down U.N. But there are other countries that haven't subscribed their fair share. Would you comment on that?

Mr. Ball. The way in which this proposal would work would mean that those other countries would have to come forward with their share by additional regular assessments. As you know, there's a case now before the International Court of Justice. It's expected that the decision of the International Court of Justice will provide that a country must pay its special assessments in the same way that it must pay its regular assessments. and that if it fails to do so for 2 years it will be subject to losing its vote.

Senator Clark. I think sometimes those of us down here in Washington tend to assume that everybody throughout the country knows all the technical details of these problems that we have to cope with on a day-by-day basis, and I wonder if you would mind amplifying first, the difference between a regular assessment and a special assessment, and, secondly, how the International Court of Justice gets into the act?

Mr. Ball. Well, the difference between the regular assessment and the special assessment is that the normal annual budget provisions of the U.N. constitute a regular assessment. The U.S. share of that regular assessment is, I think, running at a rate of 32 percent at the moment. The special assessments are assessments which are made to take care of emergency situations which arise. Now if the International Court of Justice decides (which it's almost certain to do) that the special assessments have to be paid in the same way that the regular assessments do, then the countries will be under a penalty if they don't meet all assessments, and they will have to forfeit their voting rights.

Senator Clark. How did the Court get into the act?

Mr. Ball. Well the Court is an international body to which many of the U.N. members have subscribed.

Senator Clark. Maybe it's something like this, let me say to our listeners. Suppose you belong to a club or a lodge and you pay annual dues to support your share of the expenses. Then maybe the roof falls in on your clubhouse and you've got to build a new roof and you just don't have the money from your regular assessments to do it. So hopefully everybody chips in under a resolution passed by the board and approved by the members of the club to meet this extraordinary expenditure. Is this about what we're faced with in the U.N.?

Mr. Ball. I think that states it very well, Senator. I think that is a very good analogy of the situation.

Senator Clark. Now, my good friend and yours, Senator **Dick Russell**, came in yesterday with another amendment proposing that instead of purchasing bonds, the United States should forgive the debt of about $38 million which the U.N. presently owes us for the advances we're made for these special operations, that thereafter the President should never again be able to commit the United States to any of the U.N.'s special operations, particularly to send armed forces in support of the U.N., without a resolution of Congress. What do you think of that as a substitute for the President's plan?

Mr. Ball. Well, the difficulty with it is, in the first place, is that it wouldn't meet the financial requirements of the U.N. Thirty-eight million dollars of forgiveness of debt is not at all the same thing as subscription to a bond issue of $100 million. But, in the second place by requiring a special resolution every time there were extraordinary expenses incurred, it would inject an element of uncertainty into the U.N. operations. The U.N. must be free to move quickly. We're trying to help the U.N. to develop some authority to move into situations where a few hours of difference may mean that a war is in the making; where protection by the U.N. could prevent the kind of confrontation which could be escalated into a great conflict.

Senator Clark. George, do you think if the Congress fails to approve the proposal for the United States to lend this money to the United Nations in pretty much the form which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has recommended that this could be construed as quite a setback in our foreign policy?

Mr. Ball. It could be, because many nations around the world and particularly the new nations regard the United Nations as the great hope for peace. They regard the United Nations as the one international body which symbolizes the things which the United States stands for. I think they would regard such an action by Congress as a kind of repudiation or loss of faith in what we ourselves believe, and I think this could have very bad consequences.

Senator Clark. Thank you very much, Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, for being on my program in support of the U.N. bond issue. I do support the President in this regard. I hope you will write in and tell me whether you think I'm right or not. Thanks a lot and goodby.

Announcer. You have been listening to a discussion between your Senator, **Joseph S. Clark**, Democrat, and Mr. George Ball, Under Secretary of State. I return you now to your station announcer.

[Exhibit 2]

[From the New York Times, Mar. 22, 1962]

PLENTY OF GROUND FOR THIS POLICY REAPPRAISAL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—Senator **Jackson**, of Washington, has now powerfully enforced the mounting concern and mystification in Congress and the public study groups over the primary influence in shaping the foreign policy of the United States that President Kennedy has increasingly granted to the United Nations. JACKSON is the second member of the Democratic Senate hierarchy to raise questions pertinent to this highly important situation for the purpose of inducing the President to reappraise or modify it.

---

[1] As of Mar. 28, 1962, 33 countries had pledged to buy U.N. bonds.

The first was Senator FULBRIGHT. He is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which is the Senate deputy in executing that body's constitutional assignment as junior partner of the Executive in the international field. Writing in the October 1961 issue of Foreign Affairs, FULBRIGHT urged the formation of "a concert of free nations" to meet the challenge of world communism; and he counseled limiting the U.N. to what JACKSON described as "tasks * * * within its capabilities." Demonstrably, these tasks do not, as JACKSON noted, include the ability or the will to "put an end to the cold war."

Mr. Kennedy's response to this judgment has been to forge even closer interrelation between U.N. and U.S. foreign policy, and to broaden the function of our U.N. delegation as (in JACKSON's term) "a second Foreign Office." The President's reliance on the U.N. for what it already had shown it neither could nor would do, reached the point where, in his address to the Assembly last September, he asserted that "in the development of this Organization rests the only alternative to war."

INFLUENTIAL DISSENTS

Not only has recent U.N. history controverted this glowing evaluation, but more and more influential dissents have been publicly registered. The Fulbright article was supported in November by John J. McCloy, one of the most experienced agents in international negotiation, who acted for the last three Presidents in this capacity. Addressing a national audience, McCloy urged the formation of a new economic and political community of the Americas and Western Europe, to supply the U.N.s lack of the potential of keeping world peace. "Many of our present problems," he said, "would then fall into place * * *" because world communism could not "seriously contemplate an attack on such a combination of strength."

Senator JACKSON's approach to a fundamental U.N. policy revision was to begin with "a top-level review conducted under the authority of the President and the Secretary of State * * * handled in a nonpartisan manner." This review, he said, would meet the acute need he sees "to take another look at our role in the United Nations, remembering that the U.N. is not a substitute for national policies wisely conceived to uphold our vital interests." The Senator presented in the form of questions the issues calling for review. But his appended comment to each of the following inquiries made it completely plain that he believes the answers are in the affirmative.

JACKSON'S QUESTIONS

"Are we taking an exaggerated view of the U.N.'s role? May not the most useful function of the U.N. lie in serving as a link between the West and the newly independent states * * * to seek out areas of agreement rather than to dramatize conflicts of interest * * * and bring every issue to a vote? In our approach to the U.N. do we make too much of the talk and too little of the deed * * * attempt to measure something called 'world opinion' by taking the temperature of the Assembly? Should our U.N. representatives play a larger role in [our] policymaking process than our representatives to NATO and to major world capitals?"

Although the President at his news conference today said he saw no conflict between his U.N. position and JACKSON's conflict is plainly exposed in a comparison between these questions, JACKSON's comments thereon and the President's record. His news conference statements today were mostly unresponsive to the Senator's criticisms, and silent on his U.N. policy reappraisal proposal. But the cogency of these criticisms by a Democratic Senator, whose committee studies have strengthened security, and who served Mr. Kennedy as party national chairman in the 1960 campaign, advance the day when the President must meet the issues they raise.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 28, 1962]

SENATOR CLARK SEES IN ORGANIZATION OUR BEST HOPE FOR PEACE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Constant readers of your distinguished and able columnist, Arthur Krock, have long noted that his support of the United Nations, never enthusiastic, has diminished still further of late.

Thus it occasions no surprise to find Mr. Krock strongly supporting the view that the U.N. should be downgraded in U.S. foreign policy as recently advocated by Senator HENRY JACKSON and stated earlier by Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and others.

But Mr. Krock's efforts to add John J. McCloy to this group are doomed to failure, as indicated by a careful reading of the speech referred to in the Krock column (March 22). Although Mr. McCloy expressed disappointment over certain recent U.N. actions to his audience on that occasion, he repeatedly spoke of the urgent need for better means of settling international disputes by arbitrament of reason and law rather than war.

John McCloy is perhaps the country's leading advocate in private life today of the need for stronger international institutions capable of maintaining peace during and after the disarmament process—which he believes must and will come in the foreseeable future.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR PLAN

As Chief White House Disarmament Adviser at the time, Mr. McCloy bore considerable responsibility for the disarmament plan calling for a stronger U.N. put forward by President Kennedy at the U.N. last fall.

Unquestionably Mr. McCloy would agree with the policy so clearly stated by the President in his magnificent September 25 address to the United Nations: This organization will either grow to meet the challenge of our age—or it will be gone with the wind, without influence, without force, without respect. Were we to let it die—to enfeeble its vigor—to cripple its powers—we would condemn the future.

"For in the development of this Organization rests the only true alternative to war—and war appeals no longer as a national alternative."

It is never a happy task to differ in public with respected friends and colleagues; from Mr. Krock as well as from the two Senators I have received many courtesies. Yet the issue is, in my judgment, vital to our national security and well-being and the case for the President needs to be stated as frequently and clearly as possible.

The fallacy of the Krock-Jackson-Fulbright position on the United Nations is twofold:

They seem to believe support of the Atlantic alliance and NATO requires a turning away from the U.N. and a curtailment of its influence. Yet there is not the slightest inconsistency in supporting with equal fervor both the U.N. and a closer Atlantic community.

They ignore the President's sound and eloquent theme: "Let us call a truce to terror. Let us invoke the blessings of peace. And as we build our international capacity to keep peace, let us join in dismantling the national capacity to wage war. This will require new strength and new roles for the United Nations."

PRESIDENT'S POLICY

There is a long, hard road to travel before the President's policy is achieved. But it would be tragic to become discouraged so early in the journey and to turn our backs on the world's best hope for peace—a strengthened, not a weakened, United Nations under whose auspices the world can move slowly, but one may hope surely, toward the ultimate goal of world peace under enforceable world law.

I was delighted with your March 23 editorial "What Good Is the U.N.?", particularly with your phrase, "here is something that can yet grow into a great power for peace."

JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senator From Pennsylvania.
WASHINGTON, *March 23, 1962.*

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Mar. 28, 1962]

U.S. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE U.N.

(By William S. White)

Demands for a reexamination of America's relationships to the United Nations are now insistently rising. And they are coming from genuine but cool-headed friends of the U.N. who cannot longer be fobbed off by its wet-eyed and excessively uncritical lovers as isolationists, or rightwingers, or other such bad types.

The hope must be that from all this will at length come a readjustment in the balance as between sweetness and light. What is needed is much less warm sweetness and far more cool light. For unless our official and public attitudes toward the U.N. can be made more rational, the U.N. itself is surely on the way out as a significant forum.

At this point it needs not happy adulation but rather the brisk attentions of practical-minded critics. Such critics have for years existed in plenty. Until now, however, they have been largely silent, for it has been difficult to lay a single critical word against the U.N. without being called a "reactionary," an antipeace fellow and an enemy of the good and the beautiful.

Now, however, constructive criticism is at last bursting through the old barrier of cliche epithets. And, to repeat the most meaningful point of all, it is coming from men with notable records as internationalists, and with suitably liberal bona fides.

It is against all this background that the recent speech of Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington should be read. His brilliant analysis of what is wrong with the U.N.—or rather what is wrong with the way we deal with the U.N. and look at the U.N.—reflects far more than the views of a single Senator, albeit a liberal internationalist one who was one of the first of President Kennedy's New Frontiersmen.

What Senator JACKSON said amounts to a distillate of the case as seen by a large and growing number of politicians, the last thing they want to do is to injure the real U.N. But the next last thing they want is to allow the U.N. to go on trying to dominate the foreign policies of its members—particularly its Western members.

These are among the things they believe:

That the U.N. was never intended to be a substitute for our own American leaders as makers and movers of American policy. Vital national interest is still that—national interest. And it must be cared for by the State Department in Washington, not in our U.N. office in New York.

That the U.N. with all its value as a forum and the persuasive influence toward peacekeeping is properly a useful international meeting ground. But it is not properly a place for dumping our national problems—or for permitting others to usurp our own powers and responsibilities.

That the men primarily in charge of U.N. affairs, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson and Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland, are unwise in their campaigns to give more and more executive responsibilities to the U.N. This kind of responsibility belongs at home.

Senator JACKSON politely disclaims any personal criticism of Mr. Stevenson. Such criticism, however, is inescapably involved in the general anxiety at U.N. empire building, for empire building is no proper part of the functions of the U.N.; nor can it repeal the right of national self-defense; nor is it, though many think otherwise, a place touched with a special holiness.

It is a highly useful, but in terms of power also a highly limited, political body with the right to explore and debate world issues and make recommendations to sovereign countries.

It is no more sacrosanct than, say, the U.S. Senate. And its momentary majorities are no more inevitably "right" than is any other momentary majority.

SENATOR CLARK COMES BACK AT A COLUMNIST

To the EDITOR OF THE INQUIRER:

William S. White's jubilant treatment in his March 26 column of Senator JACKSON's recent speech urging that the United Nations be downgraded in U.S. foreign policy comes as no surprise to his regular readers. His nostalgia for the early 19th century has long turned his mind against international solutions to international problems. Unfortionately, Mr. White compounds several of the misconceptions in the Senator's own remarks.

1. "The U.N. was never intended to be a substitute for our own American leaders as makers and movers of American policy. Vital national interests * * * must be cared for by the State Department in Washington, not in our U.N. office in New York."

Mr. White does not document his charge, nor could he, for vital national interest is cared for by the President of the United States. Every undertaking of major importance to the United States at the United Nations is decided upon in Washington. The center of decision and the source of instructions is the White House.

These instructions give considerable weight, as they ought to do, to the facts and recommendations received from the U.S. mission to the United Nations. They also leave a certain degree of responsibility and flexibility for the U.S. Ambassador.

2. "The U.N. * * * is not properly a place for dumping our national problems or for permitting others to usurp our own powers and responsibilities."

Again no chapter and verse. What national problem have we dumped on the U.N? Does Mr. White consider the Arab-Israeli dispute ours? The Congo problem?

3. "Ambassador Stevenson and Assistant Secretary of State Cleveland are unwise in their campaigns to give more and more 'executive responsibilities' to the U.N. * * * This kind of responsibility belongs at home."

Executive U.N. action is presently keeping the peace in several troubled areas. It maintains peace in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Gaza Strip. United Nations observation of the Kashmir cease-fire line helps keep that troubled country quiet. And it was the major instrument in keeping the Soviet Union out of the Congo in 1960.

To accuse Adlai Stevenson of empire building or seeking to repeal the right of national self-defense is arrant nonsense, which Mr. White should know.

The real issue raised by the current attacks on the U.N. is whether America will turn its back on President Kennedy's statement of policy made in his historic address at the U.N. last September 25: "This Organization will either grow to meet the challenge of our age or it will be gone with the wind * * * Were we to let it die * * * we would condemn the future.

"For in the development of this Organization rests the only true alternative to war—and war appeals no longer as a national alternative."

I am confident the overwhelming majority of the American people support the policy of our President and Commander in Chief.

JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senator.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY BARON KARL GUTTENBERG, A MEMBER OF THE WEST GERMAN BUNDESTAG

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is a great honor for me to announce to the Senate the presence in the Chamber of Baron Karl Guttenberg, a member of the Bundestag of West Germany. Baron Guttenberg is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of that body. He is an expert on foreign affairs and is a great friend of the United States. I am happy that he is visiting with us in the Chamber this afternoon.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. DODD. Yes, Mr. President, I am very happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority, I wish to join the Senator from Connecticut in welcoming Baron Guttenberg. He is one of the stanchest friends our country has. He is a very influential member of the German Parliament; and I am sure his visit here will help further cement the friendly relationships between his country and ours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Chair is delighted and honored to have the distinguished Member of the German Parliament visit the Senate. He is most welcome here.

THE MERIDEN JOURNAL'S CAMPAIGN AGAINST PORNOGRAPHIC PARTY RECORDS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, one of the most noxious and despicable areas of criminal activity is the sale of obscene materials. What makes this crime so distressing is that it is directed, for the most part, at teenagers and young people. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has said:

> The publication and distribution of salacious material is a peculiarly vicious evil; the destruction of moral character caused by it among young people cannot be overestimated. The circulation of periodicals containing such material plays an important part in the development of crime among the youth of our country.

As chairman of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, I am familiar with the widespread nature of this insidious business. Our studies show a frightening relationship between the increase in sex crimes and the sale and distribution of pornographic materials. The traffic in these dirty books, pictures, and records is a problem which requires the constant vigilance of our citizens and law-enforcement officers. The most effective weapon in the continuing fight against obscenity is an informed public.

The Meriden Journal, one of Connecticut's leading newspapers, recently launched a series of vigorous articles attacking the sale of pornographic party records. The peddling of these smutty records is a racket which has been growing throughout the country. It is gratifying that the combined efforts of a respected newspaper and the State police resulted in an effective crackdown on their sale.

Since this is a problem familiar to most American cities, I think the series of articles will be of interest to communities throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the series of articles published by the Meriden Journal.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICE HIT PARTY RECORDS

State and city police in synchronized raids today moved against dealers in four cities in the start of a campaign against the sale of new type party records in Connecticut.

In addition, police armed with search warrants entered the buildings of two Hartford wholesale record distributors to see if they were handling the records.

The police were acting after the Meriden Journal investigated the situation in Connecticut and turned over its information to law enforcement officials on the State and local level.

Two Meriden outlets were among those arrested in today's raid. The city stores involved were Barker's Discount Store, East Main Street and Azzolina's Music Box, 49 Colony Street.

Armed with both arrest and search warrants issued by the Seventh Circuit Court, State and local police confiscated the party records at both stores.

At Barker's, State Troopers Martin Devine and Morton Denerstine and Meriden Detective Sgt. David Doherty arrested Frank Cessario, 58, of 44 Parker Avenue North, a clerk in the record department.

Police confiscated six of the party records there.

At Azzolina's Music Box, 49 Colony Street, police arrested Mrs. Irene Azzolina, 39, of 44 Woodlawn Terrace. Sgt. Henry A. Przybylo, of the Meriden police, and Trooper John Bonolo conducted the raid and confiscated one record.

Both Cessario and Mrs. Azzolina have been charged with the "possession of obscene literature and pictures with the intent to sell" in violation of section 53–243 of the State statutes.

Each has posted a $500 bond and they will appear in circuit court on February 14.

In Hamden, police arrested Joseph Cohn, owner of the Music Box, in the Hamden Shopping Plaza, Dixwell. Twenty-two records were confiscated by the arresting officers.

Cohn has also posted a $500 bond and trial is slated for February 14. He is charged with violation of section 53–243 of the State statutes.

Elsewhere, State police arrested two distributors and a warrant is pending for a third.

Seaboard Distributors, of 313 Park Avenue, East Hartford, was arrested under the same statutory violation as the retailers.

Maj Leslie Williams, executive officer of the Connecticut State Police, reported that approximately 1,600 to 2,000 records were confiscated at Seaboard with the possibility of many more being withdrawn from the store.

Police arrested Marvin Ginsburg, of New Britain, vice president of the operation.

In Hartford, Major Williams reported that Trinity Record Distributors, of 477 Park Avenue, had also been charged. Some 552 records were confiscated and Jack Manus, of West Hartford, a store employee, was arrested.

Later, Pasquale William Ciervo, 33, of 160 Water Street, proprietor of Ciervo's TV & Music Center, 148 Center Street, was arrested for selling the records and he, too, posted $500 bond.

The Southington arrest was made by State Police Detective John Falvey and Detective Lt. Henry Nonemacher and Sgt. Frank Triano, of the Southington department.

In Wallingford, police raided Barker's Discount Store, on South Colony Street. Detective John Cei, of the Wallingford police and Trooper Paul Stensland and Policewoman Ann DeMatteo, arrested Ralph Nappi, 39, of 311 South Elm Street, Wallingford. Nappi is assistant manager of Barker's.

According to Major Williams, this is the first time any arrests of this nature have ever been made in Connecticut.

"The whole matter was brought to our attention by the Meriden Journal," Williams said, "and they conducted a considerable inquiry."

The State police official explained that the arrests were made possible as a result of joint cooperation of local and State police officers.

These arrests, according to Major Williams, should do much to stop the sale of these records in the State. He indicated that more arrests might follow.

Journal Investigation Paved Way to Arrests

(By Tom Affinito)

(Note.—On Wednesday, January 24, the Meriden Journal called in district and State law enforcement officers to listen to a new crop of so-called party records and to turn over to the officials information gathered during weeks of investigation by this newspaper. At the 2½-hour conference in the board room of the Journal were Maj. Leslie W. Williams of the State police; James Varrone, chief prosecutor of the Seventh Circuit Court; Meriden Police Chief Henry Maguder; Hamden Police Chief Robert Thatcher; Sanford H. Wendover, editor of the Journal; Donald D'Elia, city editor of the Journal, and Tom Affinito, Journal reporter who did almost all of the legwork on the investigation. After hearing the records, the law officers agreed that these new party records had crossed the line of mere robust humor and had entered the realm of obscenity. They decided to move against retail sale of the records, using information gathered by the Journal as a base for obtaining their own evidence for introduction in court. At the request of the enforcement officers the Journal withheld a story it had prepared for its editions of January 25, agreeing it might hinder attempts of the police to gather evidence for court. Below is the story the Journal withheld from publication on January 25.)

Sex, perversion, and profanity are among the subjects dealt with in a series of "comedy" party records that have flooded Connecticut in recent weeks.

The records, labeled "For adults only," are sold in open display in most instances, and they are known to be available in Meriden, Wallingford, Southington, New Haven, Hartford, and Bridgeport, among other places.

The Meriden Journal has been investigating the growth of these new party records in Connecticut and has turned over its findings to State and city police and to the office of the prosecutor of the Seventh Circuit Court.

Produced by a New York City firm, these records are on-the-spot recordings of actual nightclub performances. Throughout the records, there is constant reference to sexual intercourse, sexual organs of both male and female and to all types of perversion and unnatural sex acts.

In addition, the records are flavored with an almost constant use of profanity. And in some cases, the performers tell stories which tend to disparage certain religious beliefs.

These party records should not be confused with the comedy recordings of such established comedians as Shelly Berman, Mort Sahl, Bob Newhart, and Jose Jiminez.

Attempting to establish that the records are handled by most of the area record shops, the Journal purchased records at two outlets in Meriden, two in Wallingford, one each in Southington, New Haven, and Hartford. All but two of the purchases were made from open floor display. In only two instances, the salesman had to go under the counter to supply the disc.

In addition to personal purchases, a telephone survey of record stores indicated that these records may be purchased in Bridgeport, Newington, Manchester, Middletown, New Britain, and Waterbury.

Sales clerks report the records are moving briskly, although there has been no known advertising in public mediums. Word of mouth is carrying the news from customer to potential customer.

The Journal also learned that Connecticut dealers can get the recordings from at least one Hartford independent distributor.

The Journal had to crack barriers of suspicion, resistance, secrecy, and silence at every turn in its successful attempt to learn all it could about the records; who manufactures them, who distributes them, who sells them.

Produced with labels bearing the names of two different recording companies, the recordings, it turned out, were manufactured by the same firm. They are not listed in the New York telephone directory, and little is known about the organization, which was formed only a few months ago.

The 12-inch records are manufactured at the regular 33⅓-r.p.m. speed and are neatly packaged. The covers bear colored photographs of the performers and in addition to mentioning that the recordings are for adults, the words "Not for air play," are also inscribed.

The cover photographs are not lurid or suggestive and give no indication as of the contents except for the titles, which are suggestive and of the double entendres nature.

About five little-known night club comedians make most of the recordings.

Reports are that in New York the records of these performers have gone under the counter.

In Meriden, more record outlets don't carry the records than do.

Party Records Seized; Two Arrests Made Here

On information supplied by the Meriden Journal, State troopers and local police officers yesterday arrested eight persons in six Connecticut cities on charges of violating a State statute prohibiting the selling of obscene phonograph records.

Two of the arrests were made in Meriden yesterday morning on warrants issued by James Varrone, chief prosecutor of the Seventh Circuit Court.

At 11:15 a.m. State troopers arrested Frank Cessario, 57, of 49 Parker Avenue, at Barker's Discount Store on East Main Street. Six so-called party records were seized there.

The charge against Cessario was the same as that placed against the seven others arrested—violation of section 53-243 of the State statutes.

Cessario, a clerk in the record department at Barker's, was later released after posting bond of $500. Trial was set for February 14 in circuit court.

Shortly after noon, Meriden Sgt. Henry Przyblo and State Trooper John Bonolo arrested Mrs. Irene Azzolina, 40, of 44 Woodlawn Terrace, at Azzolina's Music Box, 49 Colony Street, also seizing one record.

She also posted bond of $500. Trial was set for February 14.

The other arrests:

Joseph Cohn, Music Box, Hamden Shopping Plaza, Dixwell Avenue, Hamden. Twenty-two records were seized.

Marvin Ginsburg, of New Britain, vice president of Seaboard Distributors and Park Distributors, of 313 Park Avenue, East Hartford. About 2,000 records were seized.

Jack Manus, of West Hartford, an employee of Trinity Record Distributors, 477 Park Avenue, Hartford. About 1,500 records were seized.

Pasquale W. Ciervo, 33, of 160 Water Street, Southington, proprietor of Ciervo's TV and Music Store, 148 Center Street, Southington, where 11 records were seized.

Ralph Nappi, 39, of 311 South Elm Street, Wallingford, assistant manager of Barker's Discount Store, South Colony Street, Wallingford. Wallingford Detective John Cei and Policewoman Ann DeMatteo and Trooper Paul Stensland also seized 125 records.

Antonio Cruz, of 98 Russ Street, Hartford, clerk at E. J. Korvette's, 915 Main Street. Police seized 134 records.

Some 35 officers, both State and local, working in two-, three-, and four-man teams staged the raids.

Maj. Leslie W. Williams, administrative officer of the State police, credited the Journal with starting the investigation which produced the arrests. Major Williams also said the arrests were the first made under section 53-243.

The Journal reported its findings to State police at a conference in the newspaper's board room on January 24.

At the request of the police, the paper withheld publication of a story on the investigation in order to give them time to collect evidence of violation of the statute.

The story of the arrests moved on the State news wire and received wide coverage in other newspapers.

Bond for each was set at $150.

Secrecy Marks Operations of Party Records

Thousands—possibly tens of thousands—of the latest variety of party records have been sold in Connecticut, yet information about their manufacturers and methods of distribution is as hard to find as a midget on a basketball team.

The records themselves list no address of the recording company, or where they are manufactured.

The names of the companies on the labels have no telephone listings.

The record firms don't go in for advertising.

Representatives of the record firms, once they are found, are evasive and refuse to tell you much.

Only through the most diligent and persistent digging was the Meriden Journal able to learn anything about who makes the records that have brought about the arrest of nine retailers and distributors in six Connecticut cities.

The arrests, made in synchronized raids by State and municipal police, came about after the Meriden Journal turned over to law enforcement agencies information gathered from a long investigation of the new party records and their sale and distribution in Connecticut.

The arrests were made under a State obscenity statute, but in no instances were the arrests made for printed literature or photos. Sale of records was the only charge involved.

The Journal first became interested when Reporter Tom Affinito, on a hunch bought a longplay record by Pearl Williams, called "A Trip Around the World Is Not a Cruise." It was bought in one of the stores raided Friday morning by police.

He played the record, then brought it to the attention of Donald D'Elia, Journal city editor.

Sanford H. Wendover, editor of the Journal was told about the record and its content. Affinito, meanwhile, had learned there were other records of the same type.

A meeting was set up for D'Elia and Wendover to hear the record for themselves. Both sides of the 12-inch, longplay record were played.

Party records are nothing new on the American scene. Everyone remembers them. A comedian in a recording studio told a lot of risque jokes that never quite got to the point, and they were generally regarded as pretty clean fun. You wouldn't play them in front of the kids, maybe, but you couldn't really call them dirty.

This was something else.

Throughout both sides of the record there were the most open, to the point descriptions of exotic situations. There were repeated reference to male and female sexual organs. The record was laced with gutter jokes about homosexuality and unnatural sex acts. Religious and nationality groups were frequently the object of ridicule.

There seemed to be no issue of freedom of speech involved here. There didn't seem to be any way the performances could be arguable as works of art.

The Journal decided to gather as much information as it could about stores selling the records, their manufacturers and Connecticut distributors. The information would be turned over to the law enforcement officials.

Company funds were made available to purchase records in as many stores in the district as needed to prove that sale of the records was widespread. Purchases would be made in Hartford and New Haven, too.

The Journal made purchases at two outlets in Meriden, two in Wallingford, one in New Haven, and one in Hartford.

All record outlets in Meriden were checked. Only two carried the records.

The reporters bought records by these performers: Pearl Williams, Belle Barth, B. S. Pully.

They were all on the labels of either Surprise Records or After Hours Records. The albums were neatly and professionally packaged, with photographs of the performers on the album covers. The photos were not suggestive.

The albums were marked "for adults only" and not for use on the air.

One of the records was a sort of anthology of a number of party record performers.

Affinito and his city editor conferred at length about how they would set about gathering information about the party records.

They noted that all of the records they had purchased were produced by either Surprise or After Hours. Because they cross-advertised on their albums, it was deduced that they were one and the same company. The New York City phone directory was checked for listings of those two firms. There was none. The long-distance operator was asked if there were numbers for either firm. No luck.

There is a national trade publication for the music and recording industry. It carries pages of ads on records and where retailers can get them. It might have an ad by Surprise or After Hours. A copy of the publication was purchased. It had no ads by Surprise or After Hours.

Perhaps a call to the publication itself might turn up some information. A staffman there gave a Manhattan address for Surprise and After Hours records. He didn't have a phone number. He said their records were not generally sold above the counter.

Meanwhile, Tom Pritchard, suburban editor of the Journal, was brought into the inquiry. He instructed Gerald MacLean, staff reporter in the Southington bureau, to survey Southington. Two Southington stores carried the records, he reported. He made a purchase at one of the stores.

Affinito and D'Elia conferred to figure out a way to get information about the firms on the record labels. The same day a call was made to the department of the state at Albany, N.Y. This department, as in Connecticut, has on file certificates of incorporation of firms in its State.

An aid there gave the directors at Surprise Records, two men and a woman. One of the men was a Broadway lawyer. The firm was incorporated only last October, according to Albany.

It was decided that a personal look at the Manhattan address might be enlightening. A reporter drove to New York on the afternoon of January 17. He found that the address was one of a midtown skyscraper office building.

He went into the lobby and looked at the wall directory. There was no listing for Surprise Records or After Hours Records. There was one listing of a record firm of an entirely different name.

Back in Meriden the next day, a check of the New York phone directory listed a number for that company. The number was called person to person for anyone in Surprise Records. A woman at the other end said there was no one there just then. She suggested calling back in about an hour.

The call was made again an hour later for anyone in Surprise Records. A woman wanted to know who was calling. The caller said he was from Connecticut. She said to hold the line. About 20 seconds later she said, "There's no one here right now."

The operator asked if there would be someone there later. The woman replied, "maybe." Then the woman at the other end wanted to know "the nature" of the caller's business. He replied that he wanted information on the possibility of purchasing a large quantity of Surprise Records and would like to know the name of a Connecticut distributor.

"Can't a record store help you?" she asked.

"No."

"Well, we can't tell you that either," she said in closing.

The Journal still didn't know any Connecticut distributors of Surprise or After Hours Records. Pritchard, the Suburban editor, learned from an industry source that Hartford was one point of distribution for Belle Barth and Pearl Williams records.

This was confirmed by calls to two distributors in Hartford. Each gave wholesale price quotations on the records. One of the distributor's Belle Barth record was on a label other than Surprise or After Hours.

A telephone survey of record stores in a half dozen other Connecticut cities, including Bridgeport, Waterbury, Middletown, and New Britain, confirmed that sale of the records in the State was widespread.

All the information was coordinated at a meeting of Wendover, D'Elia, Affinito and Carter H. White, general manager.

The Journal called in enforcement officials on the State and local level, played the records for them and turned over information the newspaper had gathered in its investigation. The law officers took it from there, sending plainclothesmen out to retail outlets to make their own purchases and gather evidence before the raids.

Teens Exposed to Party Disks

The wholesale distributors of the type of party records seized last Friday in raids by State and municipal police were willing to sell hundreds of the albums to a college student although the record covers are plainly marked "for adults only."

Also, it has been learned by the Journal, whose investigation led to last Friday's raids, that at one of the retail outlets hit by police, a teenaged boy had, in fact, been selling party records of the type seized.

Several weeks ago a college student called two wholesale distributors in Hartford district. Both of the firms were wholesalers of the records, which deal with erotic behavior, homosexuality, and unnatural sex acts.

In each case, he told the distributor's representative that he was a member of a college group which was trying to raise money.

Would the distributor quote him a price on a large quantity of Belle Barth records? In each case, the distributor's representative quoted a price and wanted to close a deal.

In neither case was the distributor interested in the caller's age, although only a decidedly small number of college students are 21 or over.

In neither case did the distributor seem to be interested in whether the records would be sold to the general public or to other college students, under 21 or otherwise.

At one of the stores raided (not in Meriden, by the way) police reported that a teenage boy had made a sale. When the store was hit by police, however, an older member of the firm came forward to take responsibility and be arrested.

The records are market "For adults only" but there is no way of being certain the records will remain in adult hands.

Police theorize that in many homes records bought by parents are played by children when mom and dad go out for the night.

They theorize, too, that many purchases are made by persons over 21.

There is concern, too, that teenagers may find a way to order the records by mail, thus the desire of law enforcement agencies to dry up flow of the records completely.

All of the retailers and wholesalers arrested last Friday were charged under the State's general obscenity statute, but in no instances were arrests connected with printed literature or photographs. Sale of the records was the only violation alleged, it should be emphasized.

Three wholesale distribution firms were hit by police last Friday. They were:

Trinity Records Distributors of East Hartford, and Seaboard Distributors and Park Distributors, both at the same address in East Hartford, where 1,700 records were seized on both sides of the building. One man was arrested as an official of both of the latter two companies.

In Pastor's Mail: Obscenity Catalog

The sale of offcolor party records is by no means limited to distribution through the retail record stores that dot the main streets of every American community.

This is big business—so big in fact, that mail-order houses have been set up for the sale of these records. A check or a money order will get you one of these recordings, regardless of age.

These companies send out thousands of catalogs advertising their wares and undoubtedly they do a voluminous business. Who gets these catalogs and how do you get on their mailing list?

Just recently, after the Journal's disclosures about party records began, a Meriden minister came forward and told a rather remarkable story.

It seems that this clergyman had occasion to purchase a book dealing with public and parochial education a number of months ago. However, once he got his book be began receiving advertising for "obscene" literature and records.

"This company actually sold a number of very legitimate books," the minister said. "However, they sold this obscene material in addition. Once they got your name for an order of any kind, they put you on their mailing list."

The irony of the situation is that this material is always mailed to the Meriden clergyman with an address bearing the title "Rev."

The brochure was turned over by the clergyman to Chief of Police Henry J. Maguder, who made its contents available to the Journal.

What sort of records are they trying to peddle? Here's an example of their November catalog.

One group of records is called, "Fax Wild Party Series." What are these disks like? Here's the way the company describes them:

"Rollicking, frolicking tales of sin and seduction to titilate funloving adults. * * * The service songs albums feature songs about the hell holes of the world, officers, carousing and jaded whores." "Miss V.D. of Guam," and "Our First ——— of ———." (Portion of title deleted by editor.)

Another series advertised "uncensored smoker stories" which are described as being so spicy that they "would blow out your TV tube."

The songs described on these albums include "The Virgin and the Parachute Jumper" and other titles too suggestive, in our opinion, to be mentioned here.

Two of the special records offered in the circular were titled "Erotica." The records are described in the following manner.

"Two of the most electrifying records ever produced, the famous Erotica No. 1 and the brand new Erotica No. 2, combine to bring you a panorama of erotic experience never before recorded. Never before have you experienced such heart-pounding delight, intimate, uninhibited, startling beyond description. Hear the actual, almost unbelievable sounds of erotic love, the soft groans and sighs and whispered words that sting and lash desire (* * * Ovid). These records pay full tribute to the beauty of man's greatest experience. The cries and moans of delight and despair, pain and pleasure, ecstacy and exultation, are a thousandfold more meaningful and more beautiful than any interpretive art."

These records are not manufactured by the same companies producing the party records involved in the police raids last Friday. Those were produced by a New York City firm while the ones described here are handled by a Culver City, Calif. outfit, among others.

In addition to their record business, the California mail-order house handles printed literature appealing to prurient interests.

One section is headed by the following description, "Full Length Novels of Love, Sin and Corruption."

One of the books is called "Cheating Wives." According to the circular, "They made a game of unfaithfulness."

Another is called the "Male Virgin." A description of the contents states the following: "The unblushing story of a blushing lad who was taught the facts of life by four passionate young ladies."

The cost of these recordings run $4.98 to $10.95. The printed literature goes from 50 cents to $10. All are sold with unconditional satisfaction guaranteed.

ADDRESS BY GEN. CURTIS LeMAY AT ASSUMPTION COLLEGE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, Gen. Curtis LeMay is one of our most distinguished soldiers. He is a man who has steeped himself in the world of military technology, and who must certainly be regarded as one of our foremost experts on the military potentialities of space.

General LeMay is also a man who speaks his mind, without being dogmatic. "Like other responsible citizens," said General LeMay, in a speech several days ago before Assumption College in Worcester, Mass., most military men try to study problems objectively and judge proposals honestly. We appreciate problems differently because of this difference in experience. And we do not always agree. So it seems to me wrong to suppose that some kind of thought control produces only one military viewpoint on our problems. There is no such thing in our country. There are many military viewpoints."

I believe General LeMay's wise words should be particularly noted by those who urge that our military experts not be permitted to speak on military problems as they see them, and that technological and strategic disputes within the Department of Defense be muted.

In the same speech, General LeMay discussed at length the military implications of space, as he views them from his experience as a military man. He points out that, while most people recoil from the idea of building military space capabilities, the Soviets have frankly recognized the military importance of space, and they are moving ahead at full speed to provide themselves with maneuverable space craft and other military space capabilities. If the Soviets achieve these capabilities before we do, says General LeMay, not only will they be in a position to deny us access to space, but they might be able to neutralize our intercontinental missiles and confront us with a choice of destruction or surrender.

Mr. President, I believe that General LeMay's speech of March 28, before Assumption College, merits the careful consideration of every Member of the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the text of General LeMay's speech of March 28 before the student body and faculty of Assumption College.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, Assumption College, Worcester, Mass., Wednesday, March 28, 1962

Monsignor Desautels, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, your invitation to speak here today was a welcome one. Monsignor Desautels deserves a great deal of credit for the job he has done with the foreign affairs program. And I consider it a privilege to be able to participate. A forum such as this presents a fine opportunity for an annual assessment of our fast-changing world.

You have asked me to discuss our national position in the world from a military point of view.

The military point of view is a figure of speech often used to describe something that really doesn't exist in our country. The views of our military men differ just as much as the views of Congressmen from different districts, or clergymen of different faiths, or scientists of different backgrounds.

Like other responsible citizens, most military men try to study problems objectively and judge proposals honestly. But we use different background experience in the solution of our problems. We appreciate problems differently because of this difference in experience. And we don't always agree. So it seems to me wrong to suppose that some kind of thought control produces only one military viewpoint on our problems. There is no such thing in our country. There are many military viewpoints.

I will speak to you tonight from my point of view as a military man. In our world that has witnessed great changes in the last few years, a military point of view must consider space as a new factor in our foreign affairs. I should therefore like to spend my allotted time in discussing this new factor that will influence greatly our country's future. And I am going to describe my ideas that seem valid from my background in aviation and my experience with military problems.

The field of knowledge that is producing our capabilities in space today has its origin in the development of aviation. And the problems of space development are much the same as problems that confronted the growth of aviation. But our world has changed swiftly since World War II and it is changing swiftly today. Now, we can no longer take long years to recognize coming problems and more long years to theorize about their solution as we did with airpower in the 1920's and 1930's. In today's world we have a hostile competitor for the solution of every problem—political, technical, and strategic. On the outcome of this competition depends our military security and our leadership of the free world.

Let me give you an example of the way we were slow to recognize coming problems.

It was right here in Worcester, Mass., at Clark University almost half a century ago that Dr. Robert Goddard proved the validity of rocket propulsion principles in a vacuum. These are the principles applied today to launch intercontinental missiles, satellites into orbit, and interplanetary probes. They will be applied to launch our lunar expedition and return it to earth. They will probably be applied to control maneuverable vehicles in space someday.

But it took a long time for us to recognize the importance of Goddard's work, even though he continued this work until 1945. In 1929 he demonstrated the first successful liquid fueled rocket flight at your neighboring town of Auburn.

Many times during these years Doctor Goddard successfully demonstrated rocket engine performance, and technical reports on his work were widely published by the Smithsonian Institution.

But it was after that, in 1936, that a representative of the Army Air Corps visited Goddard to assess officially the military value of his work. He reported that there was little military value in it, but that rockets would appear useful to drive turbines. And we did little to exploit Goddard's work until after World War II. We can't afford to make that kind of mistake today.

We were not only slow to recognize the value of Goddard's work. We were also slow to see that it was part of a growing problem.

Goddard's work was recognized in Germany and Russia as early as 1920. By 1923 a technical study of the rocket in a space environment was published in Germany. By 1929 the first of nine volumes of an encyclopedia on space travel was published in the

Soviet Union. In 1930 the German Army, after reviewing the work of Goddard and others, decided to establish a rocket program and to equip an artillery proving ground to develop military missiles. In 1934 the first Soviet liquid propellant rocket was successfully fired. In 1937 the German Army and Air Force opened the rocket research station at Penemunde on the Baltic Sea. This is where they developed the V-1 and V-2 missiles of World War II. Those missiles lacked only nuclear warheads to make them effective strategic weapons. Also in 1937, the Soviet Union established rocket test centers at Kazan, Moscow, and Leningrad. And after the war, they captured and put to work in the Soviet Union a number of German personnel and missiles from the German arsenal at Penemunde.

The strategic problem of intercontinental missiles and space operations was impending when Germany and the Soviet Union decided to pursue the development of Goddard's knowledge. We might even say that the conditions for the strategic missile problem were established when Goddard acquired his knowledge of rocket propulsion.

After all, in our society we can't keep men's minds under lock and key. Goddard's knowledge would be gained by those who wanted it. We cannot control what men will do with their knowledge. And problems arise not only from what men do with their knowledge; they also arise from what men fail to do.

I suppose World War II is one classic example of the kind of problem that can arise from what men fail to do. For a long time, we failed to stop Hitler at any point in his continual march of aggression. And finally he brought much of the world to ruin.

There were many reasons why no nation tried to stop Hitler before his march into Poland. And I don't wish to oversimplify the reasons. But one important reason was that no nation, or alliance of nations, outside of Germany had strategic capabilities in being that were clearly superior to the Germans'.

The weapons of all major powers were much alike—and the Germans' might have been a little better during the 1930's. No nation had the advantage of a breakthrough in new weapons and none held great quantities of arms, but Germany had the greatest quantity. No other nation wanted the burden of a large military establishment, but Germany developed one.

I think we could have obtained enough strategic advantage from the development of our technology to deter Hitler without large standing armies. Let me give you an example. In 1922 our National Bureau of Standards published one of the first studies of the jet propulsion engine. Standford Moss at General Electric had already developed the supercharger. This supercharger turbine technology was the essential basis for the design of a turbojet engine. Eight years later in 1930, Frank Whittle, a British Air Force officer, obtained British patents for turbojet engines. And so the stage was set for the American or British development of the jet engine. But it was the Germans who were the first to fly a jet airplane. They did it in 1939. It was several years later, during the war, that the British and we began to build jet airplanes. In the meantime, the Germans had them in operational squadrons.

We probably could have had them before Hitler. And if we had had them, Hitler would have had to reckon with their superior performance even if he did have a large air force.

Another example. After Marconi invented the radio he reported in 1922 that radar could be developed and he described how it would work. It wasn't until 13 years later that the development of radar was seriously considered in Britain. In the meantime, we had made some important observations and studies of radar in our own country. Again the stage was set. And when radar was finally developed, it was a real breakthrough that gave the British the margin they needed to win the Battle of Britain in 1940. But we could have had radar much sooner and Hitler would have had to reckon with this, too.

Of course, this kind of strategic anticipation and development would have been called an arms race. But we might have deterred Hitler at least long enough for the rest of the world to organize its opposition to him. It would have been a struggle between laboratories and learning and men's minds instead of a ruinous war. We didn't make the choice for the development of arms in the 1930's and we probably could not have done so in the political climate of those years.

The choice between what our societies will do and what they will not do is always a political choice. And the process of choosing often takes years longer than the action itself after the choice has been made.

Twenty years after the Germans had bombed London from Zeppelins and night bomber aircraft in World War I, we had only 13 B-17's. Later the B-17 was the mainstay of our bomber force in Europe in World War II.

Two years after we had 13 B-17's that flew 140 miles an hour, the Germans flew the first jet aircraft. We could have had B-17's years earlier than that and we tried to get them. But we spent those years in making a choice. Part of making the choice was listening to argument.

We heard arguments that Army bombers should not be designed to fly farther than 300 miles from our shoreline. And this argument came 17 years after the old, early Army bombers under General Mitchell had sunk the captured German battleship *Ostfriesland*, the light cruiser *Frankfort*, and the destroyer *G-102*. And later, we sank the obsolete battleships *Alabama*, *Virginia*, and *New Jersey*. But still the argument was that bombers weren't supposed to fly more than 300 miles from our shores. Those years of choice were the years when bombs were falling regularly on Chinese cities and, in Spain, on Barcelona.

Most of us think of Lindbergh's flight from New York to Paris as the event that dramatized the new era of aviation. And yet, 10 years after Lindbergh's flight, Pan American and Imperial Airways survey flights across the North Atlantic were the 11th and 12th successful nonstop transatlantic flights completed out of 85 attempts made up to that time. So we didn't develop aviation very rapidly after Lindbergh's flight.

We had to choose many times between what we would do and what we would not do in aviation. And there were all kinds of arguments about each choice. An aeronautical authority of his day said that airplanes would never fly faster than 440 miles per hour. There were other arguments that there was a maximum size and weight for airplanes and therefore a maximum range that airplanes could attain. Later there were arguments about the sound barrier—we could never fly faster than sound. And there was the argument about the heat barrier. All these arguments turned out to be wrong. But they prolonged the time it took to make our choice. But the political choice between things we would do and things we would not do was determined by much more than these technical arguments. There were economic arguments—and there were philosophical arguments.

In the 1920's-1930's when we were developing aviation we had also pursued a policy of disarmament—mainly naval disarmament. The public attitude was to support a policy of isolationism if possible and neutrality at most. The popular idea that our country should never become involved in what we called Europe's wars was a very powerful idea. And it certainly influenced the political choice between the development and deferment of new weapons.

Now we face the problem of choosing what we should do and what we should not do about the development of capabilities in space. And there is technical argument, economic argument, and philosophical argument about our political choice.

The popular ideas accepted by the public today will probably influence the political way we choose our capabilities in space. The powerful ideas of today are not the neutrality and isolationism ideas of the 1920's and 1930's. The powerful ideas of today are new and peculiar to our time.

Not too many years ago, for example, the public was accustomed to the idea that the Defense Department would provide for our external security. The job of keeping America secure was the military's, under the direction of the President, and with appropriations voted by the Congress.

Today a new phenomenon has tended to disassociate this public image of security from the Defense Department. This phenomenon fogs the vision. It outmodes classical ways to deal with security problems. And it confuses our efforts to develop a workable national military strategy.

This phenomenon is a condition in which many people question whether security will, in fact, be provided by the Armed Forces if they are called on to perform.

Historically, the Armed Forces provide security by protecting lives and property from enemy forces. If the man on the street comes to believe that this type of protection will involve the destruction of the persons being protected as well as the aggressor, then to him, obviously, the cure has become as painful as the disease.

To a person who believes this, military action no longer promises the security traditionally sought from military forces.

It makes little or no difference that this image of modern war may not be valid. If it exists at all—and very few will question that it exists—then it serves to divorce security from military forces in the public mind.

This is the subject I want to deal with at this point. I feel this is vital background not only to the solution of modern military problems in space but to many other problems as well.

An ancient Greek once wrote that the art of war is, in the last resort, the art of keeping one's freedom of action. This thought has stood up through the ages and is pertinent here.

When all is said and done, we maintain military forces to give us freedom to exercise national power. Some of our new strategic literature tells us that our present posture gives the statesman too little freedom of action, too little room to maneuver. It says that today's nuclear posture doesn't lend itself to control, that limited actions won't remain limited. And it also says that missile forces don't give enough time for decision and negotiation.

Well, I don't subscribe a hundred percent to all these ideas. I think there are many ways that you can maintain a nuclear posture and still have freedom of action. And I am certainly not suggesting that we stop building missile and manned weapon systems—they are going to be needed for some years to come. But I do recognize this:

Each dominant war system that has emerged in this century has tended to increase the danger attached to the exercise of national power and to complicate the statesman's job. Instead of making his work easier and giving him the variety of options he desires, these new weapons have closed in steadily on his maneuver room until today he senses he has none at all.

Seapower was an ideal tool for the diplomat. War and the threat of war were far removed from his shores and there was all kinds of time for decision. This offered the diplomat lots of maneuver room.

But each succeeding war system, built on an expanding technology, has cut into the statesman's art. Large land war systems, for example, resulted in wide damage, huge costs, and they couldn't always be controlled for the purpose of national power. The First World War was a good example of how such systems could expand war beyond control.

More recently, the jet bomber came on the scene to remove land and sea barriers. It offered almost unrestricted access to an enemy's forces. It reduced the time for decision. And, with its atomic payload, it increased the scope of destruction.

Finally, today, the ICBM has severely limited the statesman's maneuver room. In a word, then, security has declined and the exercise of national power has been restricted as technology has advanced.

Faced with this kind of dilemma, the statesman has tried to increase his maneuver room by other means. This search for security, excited by arguments over nuclear weapons, has taken two main directions in the last several years. One involves nuclear disarmament. The other addresses various ways to deter nuclear war. These are the powerful ideas of our time.

Most people recoil from the idea of building military space capabilities because they see this as a further cause for instability and a needless extension of a nuclear arms race that, in their view, has already gone too far.

When you lump their arguments together with those of the very logical and calm fellow who asks why try to deter nuclear war by taking the nuclear weapon into space—since we can already do an impressive job with it from here on earth—when you get the total effect of these arguments, then you have a lot of tough opposition to military space systems. You have economic, technical and philosophical opposition.

But there is one point which all of these miss.

Their entire emphasis is on the nuclear weapon. Some of them favor nuclear disarmament or nuclear arms control. Others strive for nuclear deterrence. They all look on nuclear weapons as the last and final form of weapons that man will devise—and as weapons that will always determine the outcome of wars.

They look on space operations merely as an extension of the use of nuclear weapons.

This may not be the case at all.

Our national security in the future may depend on armaments far different from any we know today. And, believe me, they won't be ultimate weapons either.

Perhaps they will be weapons that enable us to neutralize earth-based ICBM's.

Perhaps they will be weapons that strike with the speed of light. That kind of speed makes the 15,000 mile an hour ICBM a relatively slow-moving target.

If a new generation of space weapons can neutralize an aggressor's ICBM's, then the world will enter a new era in warfare, or in the prevention of warfare.

What I am saying is that space capabilities may bring about the technological disarmament of nuclear weapons.

Let me give you one brief example of what I am talking about:

Beam-directed energy weapons may be used in space. And the energy directed by these weapons could travel across space essentially with the speed of light. This would be an invaluable characteristic for the interception of ICBM warheads and their decoys.

We've looked into the phenomena associated with this kind of weapon. We have evidence from scientific papers they have published that the Soviets are also interested. And Khrushchev himself has boasted publicly about "fantastic weapons."

Suppose the Soviets were first to develop advanced weapons of this sort and to employ them aboard maneuvering spacecraft?

If they could neutralize our ICBM's with such a system, they could change the balance of decisive power in their favor.

If they could neutralize satellites and spacecraft with such a weapon, they could prevent us from developing an equal defense against their ICBM's.

And they could even prevent us from going into space for peaceful purposes.

I don't think it is an exaggeration to say that with such a capability an enemy would have the potential to dominate the world. He would have the military superiority essential to support all forms of aggressive policies to pursue his objectives.

Never before has there been so great a need to be certain of the steps we take to guarantee our security. For centuries, successful national military strategies have been based on principles of war learned in equally as many centuries of military experience. Those lessons came hard. And at great cost in lives and gold and in national power.

When Nathan Bedford Forrest said that the secret of success in battle was "to get there first with the most men," he was recognizing principles of war that have been successful for more than 2,500 years. We ignore those lessons at our peril. Modern war is far too destructive to apply those principles exactly the way General Forrest would have applied them. Today, the desired way to apply those principles is by strategic anticipation and development. For if we are not the first with the most capability, we are very likely to be too late with too little.

In the past 15 years it has been the Soviets who have been too late with too little.

The atomic bomb canceled the advantages of Soviet capabilities for mass aggression at the end of World War II when the Soviets maintained extremely large military forces and began to build modern air forces.

The development of our effective air defenses with nuclear weapons circumvented slower Soviet efforts to develop a long-range bomber striking force.

The rapid development of the B-47 jet bomber force in the Strategic Air Command frustrated Soviet intentions to control the aerospace in areas vital to our interests. It also countered their ability to employ their masses of men and aircraft in long wars of attrition. It forced them to build strong air defenses and, by diverting their resources, retarded the development of their strategic striking forces.

In the same manner, the rapid development of our missile warning systems and second generation ballistic missiles has frustrated Soviet efforts to seize a strategic advantage in this area with their ICBM's.

We have maneuvered our strategic advantage to counter the Soviets in each of these developments. But each time they have come closer to winning the contest for strategic advantage. The race for missile dominance has thus far been marked by an uncomfortably close margin and it has not been clear who enjoyed the margin. And it is a well-known fact that the Soviets now lead us in the field of booster thrust for both missile and space development.

One danger to our security will come from Soviet efforts to exploit this situation. Another and greater danger can come from our willingness to accept and perpetuate this status quo—either through fear of destabilizing this relationship, or through resigning ourselves to arguments that nothing can be done about it.

In this situation, one significant strategic requirement for both sides is to develop the capability to neutralize opposing ICBM's. But we could become preoccupied with the requirement stated this way.

We could become so preoccupied that we might overlook an equally important one—to retain forces that can control the aerospace. This includes the area from the earth's surface all the way up to and including what we now know as outer space.

Controlling the aerospace from the earth's surface on out into space is going to take modern versions of missiles and manned aircraft and it is going to take manned and unmanned spacecraft. It would do no good to leapfrog into outer space without a simultaneous ability to control the lower aerospace.

I have said many times that I believe we should never replace tested and reliable weapons with new and unproven ones until we are sure the new one can either do a better job or a necessary job that cannot be done at all by the old systems. In short, I believe in having in-being protection along with progress.

Achieving that protection in-being along with progress will require a great deal of wisdom and courage in the years immediately ahead. We will need in-being forces that can control each stratum of the aerospace. At the same time, we will have to plan for the future. The long lead times to develop modern weapon systems and the fact that those weapon systems could hand the developer a decisive advantage will demand that we handle our military resources with a balance far more delicate than ever before.

So when I call for the development of military space capabilities I am not forgetting that there is a simultaneous requirement to update our capabilities in the other strata of the aerospace.

Nevertheless, there is this fact of very long lead times between inception and a combat capability with modern weapons. This means that we have to start now on the systems of the future. I think we can start with what we know now.

Military space capabilities will eventually be the choice made by our political process. What we should do is to expedite the process by recognizing the advantages of developing military space systems as quickly as possible.

We can be reasonably sure of one thing. Whatever we do, the Soviets already have recognized the importance of these new developments and they are moving at full speed for a decisive capability in space.

If they are successful, they can deny space to us. I don't believe it is necessary to dwell any longer on the strategic consequences of such a situation.

All of us join in hoping we will make real progress toward disarmament and true peace. While we wait for distinct signs that we are in fact making progress toward disarmament, however, we must continue to make adequate preparations for freeman's defense. To prevent a fatal technological surprise in the 1970's, those preparations must include capabilities in space.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 193. An act for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd;

S. 899. An act for the relief of Lieu Shui Chen;

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito;

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska;

S. 1578. An act for the relief of Edward Yin Liang;

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza;

S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla;

S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani;

S. 2018 An act for the relief of Robert B. Kasparek, Robert M. Kearney, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.; and

S. 2101. An act for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 860. An act to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes; and

S. 1037. An act to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 857. An act to amend section 4005 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that cases appealed to the Board of Veterans Appeals shall contain a brief statement of the facts of the case appealed with a citation and application of the law, together with the recommendations of the office appealed from, and for other purposes;

H.R. 946. An act to extend to oyster planters the benefits of the provisions of the present law which provide for production disaster loans for farmers and stockmen;

H.R. 1171. An act to assure continued fish and wildlife benefits from the national fish and wildlife conservation areas by authorizing their appropriate incidental or secondary use for public recreation to the extent that such use is compatible with the primary purposes of such areas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3728. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to authorize the Administrator to asign a total rating for compensation to a veteran granted service connection for blindness of one eye who subsequent to separation from active duty incurs blindness in the remaining eye;

H.R. 4783. An act to grant constructive service to members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve for the period from July 25, 1947, to November 1, 1949;

H.R. 7336. An act to promote the production of oysters by propagation of disease-resistant strains, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8030. An act to amend the act admitting the State of Washington into the Union in order to authorize the use of funds from the disposition of certain lands for the construction of State charitable, educational, penal, or reformatory institutions;

H.R. 8050. An act to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees;

H.R. 8282. An act to amend section 3203(d) of title 38, United States Code, to provide that there shall be no reduction of pension otherwise payable during hospitalization of certain veterans with a wife or child;

H.R. 8415. An act to change the classes of persons eligible to receive payments of benefits withheld during the lifetime of deceased veterans while being furnished hospital or domiciliary care;

H.R. 8484. An act to authorize establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace and Sagamore Hill National Historic Sites, N.Y., and for other purposes;

H.R. 8567. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to create trial boards for the U.S. Park Police, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8802. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration;

H.R. 8992. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration;

H.R. 9351. An act to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone;

H.R. 9805. An act to change the name of Whitman National Monument to Whitman Mission National Historic Site;

H.R. 9822. An act to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest;

H.R. 10062. An act to extend the application of certain laws to American Samoa;

H.R. 10069. An act to amend section 216 of title 38, United States Code, relating to prosthetic research in the Veterans' Administration;

H.R. 10098. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands at Antietam National Battlefield site;

H.R. 10162. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the United States to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system;

H.R. 10613. An act to eliminate the requirements for certain detailed estimates in the annual budgets;

H.R. 10652. An act to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another;

H.R. 10669. An act to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the assignment of national service life insurance;

H.R. 10743. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10931. An act to revise and codify the general and permanent laws relating to and in force in the Canal Zone and to enact the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 489. Joint resolution to provide protection for the golden eagle; and

H.J. Res. 628. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of each year in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 857. An act to amend section 4005 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that cases appealed to the Board of Veterans Appeals shall contain a brief statement of the facts of the case appealed with a citation and application of the law, together with the recommendations of the office appealed from, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3728. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to authorize the Administrator to assign a total rating for compensation to a veteran granted service connection for blindness of one eye who subsequent to separation from active duty incurs blindness in the remaining eye;

H.R. 8282. An act to amend section 3203(d) of title 38, United States Code, to provide that there shall be no reduction of pension otherwise payable during hospitalization of certain veterans with a wife or child;

H.R. 8415. An act to change the classes of persons eligible to receive payments of benefits withheld during the lifetime of deceased veterans while being furnished hospital or domiciliary care;

H.R. 10669. An act to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the assignment of national service life insurance;

H.R. 10743. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance;

H.R. 946. An act to extend to oyster planters the benefits of the provisions of the present law which provide for production disaster loans for farmers and stockmen;

H.R. 8050. An act to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 1171. An act to assure continued fish and wildlife benefits from the national fish and wildlife conservation areas by authorizing their appropriate incidental or secondary use for public recreation to the extent that such use is compatible with the primary purposes of such areas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4783. An act to grant constructive service to members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve for the period from July 25, 1947, to November 1, 1949;

H.R. 7336. An act to promote the production of oysters by propagation of disease-resistant strains, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 489. Joint resolution to provide protection for the golden eagle; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 8030. An act to amend the act admitting the State of Washington into the Union in order to authorize the use of funds from the disposition of certain lands for the construction of State charitable, educational, penal, or reformatory institutions;

H.R. 8484. An act to authorize establishment of the Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace and Sagamore Hill National Historic Sites, N.Y., and for other purposes;

H.R. 8567. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to create trial boards for the U.S. Park Police, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9805. An act to change the name of Whitman National Monument to Whitman Mission National Historic Site;

H.R. 9822. An act to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest;

H.R. 10062. An act to extend the application of certain laws to American Samoa;

H.R. 10098. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands at Antietam National Battlefield Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 8802. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration;

H.R. 8992. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration;

H.R. 10069. An act to amend section 216 of title 38, United States Code, relating to prosthetic research in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

H.R. 9351. An act to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone;

H.R. 10931. An act to revise and codify the general and permanent laws relating to and in force in the Canal Zone and to enact the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 628. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May of each year in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

H.R. 10162. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the United States to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system; to the Committee on Foreign Relations;

H.R. 10613. An act to eliminate the requirements for certain detailed estimates in the annual budgets; and

H.R. 10652. An act to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another; to the Committee on Government Operations.

ORDER FOR REFERENCE OF H.R. 10931 WITHOUT REPRINTING

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, House bill 10931, providing for the codification of the laws of the Canal Zone, has been passed by the House of Representatives and sent to the Senate. It is voluminous, containing 954 printed pages, and the expense of printing it for the Senate would be rather large. Arrangements have been made to deliver to the Committee on the Judiciary sufficient copies for its needs.

In view of the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary without being reprinted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to know if the request has been cleared with the minority.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, I am sure it has been. The majority leader gave me the notice. I am sure it has been cleared with the minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE UNITED NATIONS, THE CONGO, AND UNITED NATIONS FINANCING

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, at the core of the United Nations financing debate lies the Congo. The costs of the United Nations operation in the Congo have contributed, in large measure, to the current United Nations deficit. Critics of the United Nations have therefore insisted that we coldly evaluate the Congo in terms of our national self-interest, before we consider further financial aid to the United Nations.

Others have written and spoken forcefully of the need for averting the financial collapse of the United Nations, regardless of the particular impact of the Congo operation upon American foreign policy.

Yet the Congo operation can well withstand inquisition.

The Congo operation has been an extraordinary achievement, a signal victory not only for humanity, but, indeed, for American self-interest, no matter how narrowly defined. The United Nations in the Congo has administered a sound defeat to ignorance and barbarism, anarchy, starvation, and the self-interest of international communism. Moreover, these ends could not have been achieved by any existing body other than the United Nations.

This conclusion is, of course, more easily stated than proved. Yet, one need only compare the Congo of July 1960 with the Congo of April 1962. Sture Linner, former officer in charge of operations in the Congo, has described the scene which met the arrival of the first United Nations forces in the Congo. The United Nations faced pure anarchy. Government had vanished; the economic structure of the country had collapsed; communication and transportation were dead. Order had fled with the terrified Europeans. And the breakdown had occurred so swiftly that the United Nations forces found patients still bound to operating tables, helpless. Then, succeeding anarchy, came the threat of starvation.

Dr. Linner describes his symptomatic first meeting with the Minister of Public Health, from whom Linner sought help in averting a smallpox epidemic in Stanleyville. The Health Minister did not know what smallpox was. He did not know where Stanleyville was. Previous to his appointment as Minister of Health, he had been scrubbing floors in a hospital. At the date of independence in the Congo, 17 Congolese had had some form of higher education.

The Congolese did not know what the United Nations was.

They did not know what the United States was, or what Communist Russia was. Virtually none of them could, nor can today, comprehend the subtleties of communism or free enterprise capitalism. They were a people tailor made for coldblooded exploitation by external powers.

Opponents of the bond issue condemn the United Nations role in the Congo; but it is unpleasant to speculate upon a U.N.-less Congo. In the unlikely event that no foreign power intervened in the Congo, the 40 million people of the Congo would soon have been devoured by tribal warfare and starvation. Tshombe is a fraud. In the only free election held in the Katanga Province, Tshombe's party polled less than 40 percent of the vote. Propped up by Belgian capital and mercenaries, Tshombe remained incapable of dealing with the looting, burning, and killing which raged more rampant in Katanga than in any other section of the Congo. Tshombe has never made any pretense of controlling northern Katanga. Popularly billed as a champion of Western democracy, Tshombe has thought nothing of firing mortars into a defenseless refugee camp where a few of his political opponents had fled.

Overt military moves by Belgium or any other Western power to bring order to the Congo would have met the armed response of Communist Russia.

No power could have gained from this confrontation. The Congo would certainly have lost.

What has the United Nations contributed to this bleak picture? The United Nations force moved swiftly and brilliantly. With the strenuous support of the U.S. Air Force, 300,000 people in south Kasai alone were saved from starvation. In rapid sequence, railroads, harbors, telephone and telegraph communications, and hospitals were revived. Following the restoration of basic governmental control of services, United Nations experts in governmental operations began the laborious process of training the half-educated Congolese to rule themselves. Slowly, the Congolese acquired expertise; policies and procedures were established; and the extensive training programs began to bear fruit. Today, 2,300 Congolese are being educated in the Congo and abroad to function as leaders of a modern society. Dr. Linner reports that his good friend, the Minister of Health, has, in 2 years, become an able and effective administrator.

Through the most delicate and sensitive guidance the Parliament was gathered, and an effective central government was created. Prime Minister Adoula, perhaps the only man to combine the training, wisdom, and character to lead his country, was elected Prime Minister. Gizenga, widely heralded as the effective head of the Communist conspiracy, has been neutralized, ousted from the Government, and is presently held in protective custody. Tshombe and the Belgians have grudgingly accepted the necessity for coming to terms with the Central Government.

Purely as an investment of American foreign policy, the Congo operation has been well worth $200 million. As a unique experiment in man's humanity to man, the Congo operation has been priceless.

Mr. President, it was my extreme pleasure and good fortune to be with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] when we visited Mr. Sture Linner. It was only a short 2 weeks after the death of his countryman and beloved friend, Dag Hammarskjold. Mr. Linner was despondent; he was somewhat discouraged about the state of affairs in the Congo; and he wanted to leave. But he was persuaded by members of our Embassy, by our Foreign Service people, and by others in the United Nations that the very greatest memorial he could build to Dag Hammarskjold was by remaining there and seeing to it that harmony was restored in the Congo. And he did so.

He is now back in New York, where he is serving on the staff of the United Nations.

In retrospect, as he looks back upon those days, he told me recently, when he was here, he loved the people of the Congo. He has great faith in their future, and he is looking forward to continued peace and organization of government in that troubled land.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I wonder if the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is contemplating a lengthy speech, which I judge to be so by the size of his manuscript. I wonder if he will yield to me so that I may submit an amendment to the U.N. bond issue bill.

Mr. CHURCH. How long will the Senator take?

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly not more than 5 minutes; perhaps less than that.

Mr. CHURCH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I asked for this opportunity because the new substitute U.N. bond bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is now before us, and I would not be faithful to my understanding of the responsibilities of the U.S. Senate if I were to permit it to lie on the desk and not say, as one Senator, that I repudiate it syllable by syllable and word for word as anything that could remotely be considered as a compromise, because it in fact entirely eliminates the U.S. Senate from fulfilling its responsibilities, obligations, functions, and authority as I understand the functions of the Senate to be.

To read the first sentence, which is the overwhelming, overpowering theme of this capitulation which is misnamed a compromise, it says:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, without fiscal year limitation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $100 million for a loan to the United Nations.

This is in substance all it says concerning the terms by which it proposes to commit the United States to this vast expenditure of funds.

It does not say whether the loan is to be paid in 1 year, 10 years, 25 years, or 25 centuries. It is an open-ended loan with no stipulation for repayment, and it has no stipulation even for an interest rate. In the State where I come from, that kind of loan would not be collectible, because it is not a legal loan in any way, shape, or form.

I regret that fact because I stand here as one who wants to support some kind of assistance for the United Nations, but I am not going to vote to have the Senate void its responsibility. It does not make sense. This is no more in conformity with regular procedure and the concept of our financial responsibilities and procedures than if we were asked to provide $100 million to build a highway outside the United States, with no designation, no indication as to where it would go, or what places it was to connect, but just a highway, or if we were asked to provide $100 million to build a bridge somewhere, with no designation as to size, purpose, or location.

It seems to me the least we should do as legislators would be to decide just what kind of assistance we want to give to the United Nations, and then vote it up or down. We should legislate our convictions rather than delegate our responsibilities.

I speak as one who wants to give the United Nations assistance, but I do not want to have anything remotely or indirectly to do with voting a complete capitulation of the powers of the U.S. Senate and the defeat of its capacity to write rules and regulations with regard to making public funds available for expenditure by others.

To give some small meaning and direction and to give a stamp of congressional responsibility to this proposal, I propose an amendment that the additional funds which we provide beyond the initial $25 million, in any way we provide them, should be on the basis of one American dollar provided for every $2 provided from abroad, to maintain the 33⅓ percent of American participation in the financial affairs of the U.N. which has prevailed for a considerable time and which is considered by the United Nations itself to be appropriate and proper.

Instead of this, the so-called compromise proposal suggests the United States pay 50 percent of the total contribution plus $25 million. I say "pay" because it is not a loan; because it has no termination date, it has no interest rate, and it has no stipulation except to suggest a few restrictions on the way the United Nations can use the money we propose to give to it.

If this is a compromise, Madam President, I say in conclusion—because I do not wish to trespass further upon the time of the Senator from Idaho—I shall have much to say about it if, as, and when the ill-fated substitute ever comes before the Senate for serious consideration in its present form and language. If it is a compromise at all it is a compromise only because it says, on behalf of the Congress to the President of the United States, "We are going to eliminate all of the controversial features by giving to you a blank check to do what you wish in connection with providing assistance to the United Nations."

To me, Madam President, it is not the function of the U.S. Senate to run from its responsibilities by such a rapid action.

I send my amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, today we engage in a debate the outcome of which could profoundly affect the future course of American foreign policy.

The United Nations is in acute financial distress. It faces bankruptcy, brought on by the burden of its peace-preserving activities in the Congo and the Middle East. To pay the bills accumulating against it, and to meet the current costs of these special operations, the Secretary General, U Thant, has proposed, and the General Assembly has approved, a $200 million bond issue.

Finland and Norway have already purchased and received the first of these U.N. bonds. Finland has bought $1,480,000 worth; Norway $1,800,000; 19 other countries have pledged themselves to purchase a total of $45,785,000 of the bond issue, bringing the announced total, as of March 26, to $49,065,000.

Moreover, 11 additional governments, not yet announced, plan to purchase a total of $3,700,000 of these U.N. bonds, while 19 other governments have indicated they intend to respond favorably. More still are expected to follow suit.

It is against this affirmative action on the part of so many other countries that we in the Senate are now asked to pass upon the manner and extent to which the United States should respond to the U.N.'s appeal for help in this emergency.

The pending proposal would give the President discretionary authority to loan the U.N. up to $25 million; it would also authorize additional loans of up to $75 million to the extent this figure is matched by the aggregate amount of U.N. bonds purchased or agreed to be purchased by other nations.

Thus, though we may loan less, the bill would commit us to an outlay of no more than $100 million.

I am aware that $100 million is not an inconsiderable sum of money. There are very few private citizens in this country with personal fortunes which exceed this amount. The annual budget for my own State of Idaho is in the neighborhood of $100 million for all departments of the government.

But a proper perspective requires us to measure this figure upon the yardstick of our national budget. In this context, the amount we would loan to the U.N. is modest indeed.

It is less than one-seventeenth of what we are being asked to give away this year in military assistance abroad.

It is one one-five-hundredth of what we shall spend this year to maintain our own Armed Forces—being roughly equivalent to the cost of one armed Polaris submarine.

It is about one one-thousandth part of total Federal expenditures, from all budgeted and funded accounts, for the coming year.

So I cannot believe, Madam President, that it is the amount involved which occasions the controversy that has arisen over this proposal. It is easily within our capability to save the United Nations, if it is in our national interest to do so.

Many extremists in my State—in which I have been told there are some 300 cells of the Birch Society believe not only that the U.N. should be permitted to collapse, but also they see it as an evil, subversive force, even as an instrument of the Communist conspiracy.

I ask Senators to listen to excerpts from some of the bitter letters I have recently received from my home State:

> This world Organization may have been fine in theory, but seems to have become nothing more than an instrument of world communism, particularly in respect to this Congo fiasco. It is my personal opinion that we have bailed the bums out enough, and have almost spent ourselves into bankruptcy in the process.

Another correspondent writes:

> Since the U.N. is becoming more and more infiltrated and dominated by Communists and fellow travelers, we see a growing danger to the United States by remaining in it. Why don't we let the U.N. fold up, since it is Communist inspired? All we are getting is a lot of Communist stooges in this country that we can never get rid of, and no Communist country should ever have been allowed as a member. I can't see why we hang to Khrushchev's shirttail.

From another letter I read:

> The Communist conspirators who organized the U.N. were very clever inasmuch as control of the military forces of the U.N. has always been in the hands of the Soviet Union, forcing us to lose the war in Korea.

From still another letter I read:

> We are helping the enemies of freedom and friends of Russia in the Congo. The U.N. has not helped to keep down wars. It has helped promote wars. I am against the purchase of U.N. bonds. Let's get out of the U.N.

From another I read:

> As Idaho residents and voters, we are against the U.S. Government buying millions of dollars of U.N. bonds. Haven't we supported the Communists long enough?

Another letterwriter says:

> The U.N. is founded on sand, both religiously and financially. The rain is descending, the floods are coming, the winds are blowing, and they are beating upon that house. Shall we hold it up a little longer with $100 million of American tax money? If we do, our enemies will lose their votes and get out, but the house will still fall, because it is founded on the sand.

Still another constituent writes:

> Why not just drop out of the U.N. and spend the $100 million to build and man some more bombers? Believe we would get better results.

And another sums it up:

> It is my personal opinion that the U.N. is now and has been for some time merely a tool of the Communist governments of the world to further their goals.

Madam President, these letters betray desperation and dismay. The people who write them are deeply disturbed, the victims of a diabolical doctrine which answers every complex question with one stark concept: treason.

Why are we faced with difficulties abroad? Because, they say, the State Department is filled with traitors. Why are our schools beset with racial rancor? Because, they say, treason sits upon the highest bench of the land.

But let the Chief Justice and his associates be comforted, for the Presidency itself has not escaped the bite of this monstrous indictment. President Eisenhower, himself, we have been told, was a conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy.

Is it any wonder that people who would believe such insanities should be the first to turn upon the United Nations? They see the world as a vast Red sea, into which the United States, through betrayal, is steadily sinking. In such a fanciful world, the U.N. could only be regarded as a Communist tool.

What do we say to these people? Is it possible to reason with their fanaticism? I have tried to answer their fevered questions at open meeting in the courthouses of my State. But I have not reached through to them.

I have told them that the U.N., on its own voting record, has proved itself to be a friend of freedom—that no Soviet resolution actively opposed by the United States has ever been approved by the General Assembly—and they respond that this is but a clever play to disguise the true Communist character of the Organization.

I have told them that the Soviet Union has had to exercise her veto 99 times in the Security Council, to prevent it from taking action she thought inimical to Russian interests, while the United States has not yet had to cast a single veto vote—and they respond, with straight faces, that this proves U.N. procedures were set up to serve the Russians best.

I have told them that their slogan, "Get the United States out of the U.N., and the U.N. out of the United States" is just what Khrushchev would most like to see accomplished; that it was the shoe-pounding Khrushchev who only last year tried to bully his troika plan through the General Assembly, with the purpose of undermining the office of the Secretary General, so that the U.N. might be rendered as impotent as its predecessor, the League—and they grow angry and abusive, as they grope for the answer they cannot find.

No, Madam President, these anguished people can never be persuaded. Their minds are closed. But pity the country that permits such misguided zealots to steer its course.

Fortunately, we have evidence that the great bulk of our citizens are better balanced and better informed. Americans, by and large, do support the United Nations.

In February 1962, the American Institute of Public Opinion, of Princeton, N.J., revealed the results of its poll on the popularity of the United Nations.

Three separate questions were asked by Gallup Poll representatives. In all three cases, an overwhelming majority of Americans polled indicated strong support and confidence in the U.N. as this country's major hope for peace.

The vote of confidence cut across partisan, regional, and urban-rural differences. Here are the results:

The first question asked:

> How important do you think it is that we try to make the United Nations a success—very important, fairly important, or not so important?

	Percent
Very important	83
Fairly important	9
Not so important	4
No opinion	4

The second question:

> In general, do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face?

	Percent
Good or fair job	78
Poor job	12
No opinion	10

Third question:

> Do you think the United States should give up its membership in the United Nations, or not?

	Percent
Should not	90
Should	5
No opinion	5

These figures demonstrate how very broadly based is the general support for the U.N. in the United States today. They also make clear that the resistance to the pending proposal cannot be wholly attributed to the U.N. haters on either the radical right or the radical left, for their numbers are as weak as their arguments.

The rational resistance to the bond proposal comes from an entirely different segment of our citizenry—from reasonable people whose numbers are not really reflected in the poll to which I have just referred. These people are not hostile to the U.N., but they have a plausible argument to make against our purchase of U.N. bonds. Their position can be summed up as follows:

> We think the U.N. is well intended, but it has failed in its mission to keep the peace. It can't cope with the threat of big war, as the Berlin crisis demonstrates, and it hasn't even managed to prevent the outbreak of small wars, as the recent seizure of Goa by India makes clear.
>
> Where the U.N. has acted, it has often blundered badly, and its real accomplishments have been minor. We think it is worth the dues we pay into it, but only so long as the other member nations pay their dues also.
>
> If the U.N. is now facing bankruptcy, it is not our fault. We have paid our share, and more besides. It is up to the other countries in default to pay what they owe. If they don't, and the U.N. collapses, the guilt will be theirs, not ours, and the world will not have suffered any irreparable loss anyway.

Madam President, this viewpoint is so prevalent that it cannot be ignored. It is a manifestation of the widespread disenchantment with the U.N. which has inevitably resulted from overselling it to the American people in the first place.

The people of this country have been led to expect too much from the U.N. The Security Council can only act with the unanimous consent of its permanent members, the great powers; the General Assembly may pass resolutions, but cannot enforce them. The U.N. lacks intrinsic powers either to finance its operations or impose its will. Under the circumstances, the wonder is not that the U.N. has accomplished so little, but that it has accomplished so much. And the promise of the U.N. lies not with the past, but with the future.

It must have been with this in mind that the President said in his memorable inaugural address:

> To that world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support—to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective—to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak—and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run.

In his state of the Union message again this year, the President renewed our commitment to the United Nations with these words:

> But arms alone are not enough to keep the peace—it must be kept by men. Our

> instrument and our hope is the United Nations—and I see little merit in the impatience of those who would abandon this imperfect world instrument because they dislike our imperfect world. For the troubles of a world organization merely reflect the troubles of the world itself. And if the organization is weakened, these troubles can only increase. We may not always agree with every detailed action taken by every officer of the United Nations, or with every voting majority. But as an institution, it should have in the future, as it has had in the past since its inception, no stronger or more faithful member than the United States of America.

Let it be clear, Madam President, that we support the U.N. not because we believe it now to be any substitute for our own Armed Forces, our nuclear deterrent, our regional alliances, or our mutual assistance programs abroad. We know the U.N. alone is insufficient to preserve the peace of the world, but we want to see it live on, in the hope that it might continue to grow in strength and stature. It is, after all, the sole instrument through which the sovereign nations of the world can act to build better procedures for achieving the peaceful settlement of international disputes. It is the one forum that holds out the promise of ultimately replacing today's rule of violence with tomorrow's rule of law.

As Secretary of State Dean Rusk has observed:

> Inevitably, the United Nations must reflect in large measure the deep diversions of the contemporary world. But it also reflects the even deeper trends toward international community and the still deeper aspirations of peoples for peace, justice, and a more decent condition for man.
>
> Indubitably, the United Nations shares the risks and the weaknesses of the world environment in which it operates. But that simply means that it is relevant to the real world of the 1960's.
>
> Indeed, I cannot imagine the 1960's without something very much like the United Nations. Nor can I see any hope for a future world in harmony with our views without a central place for the United Nations.

To say this much is not to say that our foreign policy should be anchored in just one port of call. Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, emphasizes that our reliance is many faceted, with these words:

> Because we happen to be talking about the United Nations, let us not fall into the doctrinal error which is too common among the U.N.'s friends as well as its foes. People keep talking about the U.N. as if it were the only international peacemaking and community-building enterprise in which we are or should be involved. There are of course others, and they are crucially important too.
>
> The Atlantic community was born first as a concept. But the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Treaty, the Organization for European Cooperation and Development, have put institutional flesh on its bones. And the prospective partnership between the European Common Market and the great common market of North America is, for many of us, the most exciting single job of institution building now in progress.
>
> The Organization of American States is also engaged in building with new enthusiasm a very special community, based on the long tradition of hemispheric solidarity newly reinforced by the Alliance for Progress and the menace of a frankly Communist beachhead in the Caribbean.
>
> Our problem is not to choose one or another of these interlocking concerts of nations—the regional, the Atlantic, and the almost global. Rather, our task is to work through each grouping for such purposes, and at such times, as seems appropriate from the standpoint of our own national interest.

I think that these statements, Madam President, from the men who are presently charged with the direction of our foreign policy, place the role of the U.N. in proper perspective.

We accept the fact that the great issues of the cold war will not be settled by the U.N. Their outcome is too vital to the big powers to permit them to be decided by world opinion. Berlin is certainly in this class. So is nuclear disarmament. So, too, is the continuing problem of Communist China and its relationship to the world community. But all are subject to negotiation, and U.N. debate performs a signal service in pushing the great powers toward talking with each other about them.

Likewise, we accept the fact that the U.N. can intervene to prevent war among smaller nations only where the great powers concur. This straitjacket means, of course, that the U.N. can hope for limited success at best. Nevertheless, its record of accomplishment over the past 17 years is an impressive one that should be better known.

Here are some of the United Nations achievements in the field of first, international disputes; second, improving world health; third, helping the children of developing nations; and fourth, technical assistance.

INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

IRAN

In January of 1946, Iran informed the Security Council that the presence of Soviet troops on Iran territory interfered in its internal affairs.

Iran's charges were discussed in detail in the Security Council. By May of the same year, with U.N. help, Iran was able to report the withdrawal of Soviet troops from its territory.

INDONESIA

In July of 1947, Australia and India focused the Security Council's attention on fighting between the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia. A series of truces, negotiations, broken truces, and new truces followed. Ultimately, persistent U.N. negotiators met with success. From August to November 1949, a roundtable conference met in The Hague and with the assistance of the U.N. Commission for Indonesia, agreement was reached between the Netherlands and Indonesia. The conference members drew up a charter for the transfer of sovereignty which stated that the Netherlands unconditionally and irrevocably transferred complete sovereignty over Indonesia to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia and recognized the Republic as an independent and sovereign state. In December 1949, the formal transfer of sovereignty to the Republic took place.

GREECE

In December 1946, Greece asked the Security Council to consider the situation in the northern part of the country resulting from aid to Greek Communist guerrillas being given by Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. The matter passed from the Council to the General Assembly. The Assembly established an 11-member United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans to study the matter. The United Nations Special Committee ultimately presented a report to the Assembly showing that Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia had indeed been encouraging and helping Greek guerrillas in their attempt to overthrow the Greek Government.

The countries at fault were called upon to cease giving support to the guerrillas. United Nations observer teams were sent to Greece and by 1951, their efforts had contributed much toward restoring the situation in the north of Greece to normal.

CYPRUS

At the request of Greece in 1954, the General Assembly considered the right of the island of Cyprus to self-determination. Greece and the United Kingdom were at odds on the question of when and how Cyprus should be given its independence. Terrorism and bloodshed were rampant. A series of proposals and counterproposals were presented in the General Assembly at the United Nations which acted to encourage direct negotiations among the parties. In February of 1959, a settlement of the Cyprus problem was agreed upon in London between the United Kingdom, the Greek and Turkish Governments, and the representatives of the Greek and Turkish communities in Cyprus.

As to other disputes, the United Nations can take credit for the truce between India and Pakistan over the Kashmir, and for causing Red China to release 15 fliers held illegally after the Korean war.

An excellent example of the lawful settlement of international disputes under U.N. auspices can be found in a case now pending before the International Court of Justice involving an ancient temple on the border between Thailand and Cambodia. Both nations claim the land on which the temple stands, but rather than settle the issue by force of arms, they have submitted it to the Court, which is expected to rule on it this year. Meanwhile, Buddhists from both countries are free to worship there.

IMPROVEMENTS IN WORLD HEALTH

One of the United Nations' specialized agencies is the World Health Organization, known more familiarly as WHO. This Organization devotes much of its energy to eliminating devastating public health problems that shroud much of mankind in misery. The agency operates both on the level of the scientific laboratory and the actual sickbed. During the recent operation in the Congo, WHO doctors and nurses fought an outbreak of smallpox and controlled an epidemic of the deadly tropical disease kwashiorkor.

The Organization has studied and effectively limited tuberculosis in India. It has made a substantial reduction in malaria in southeast Asia that has affected 530 million of the 560 million people living there. It has helped substantially reduce cases of yaws in Indonesia and battled cholera in India.

HELPING THE CHILDREN IN DEVELOPING NATIONS

Under the auspices of the United Nations Children's Fund, called UNICEF, the United Nations in 1 year has vaccinated more than 15 million children against tuberculosis, protected 32 million against malaria, treated 3½ million and their parents for yaws, treated another million for trachoma and given milk rations to more than 5 million children and mothers. All of this and more has been done with a budget of somewhat less than $25 million, less than half of what New York City alone spends on its health and welfare.

TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

As many of the newly independent nations have learned, independence does not of itself bring with it the alleviation of centuries of poverty. Economic progress of a nation often requires special technical and economic assistance. The United Nations provides this help through its expanded program of technical assistance, Special Fund, and the World Bank, among other agencies.

In Jordan, the United Nations has cooperated in the construction of that country's only access to the sea, the small modern port of Aqaba, increasing that port's tonnage from 70,000 tons in 1953 to 680,000 tons in 1960. In Mexico, the United Nations has established a fellowship for training handpicked people from that country in various industrial skills. This program will supply chemists, biologists, and engineers to staff growing Mexican industrial operations. In Peru, the U.N. has established a civil aviation school for the training of air technicians and aircrews which will help that country maintain the all-important communications between the coast and the interior. In Nigeria, the U.N. is helping to locate and ultimately build a dam that will generate power, facilitate flood control, aid navigation, and to provide water for irrigation.

Africa represents the largest current concentration of United Nations assistance. Approximately 40 countries are benefiting from U.N. technical aid on this continent. This aid is targeted at helping the developing nations become strong, free, and stable nations which ultimately can make a growing contribution to the larger community of nations.

Madam President, I submit that this is no inconsiderable record for a struggling world organization of such limited resources as the United Nations. And it should be stressed that this 17-year record of beneficial accomplishment for the human race is not the cause of the fiscal crisis which now confronts that organization.

The U.N. is in trouble today because of the unusually high costs of two special, peace-keeping missions—the 5,000 men in the U.N. police force in the Middle East, drawn from 7 countries to keep watch over the Gaza Strip and the Israeli-Egyptian border; and the up to 20,000 men in the U.N. police force in the Congo, drawn from 21 countries.

Together, these peace-policing missions are costing the U.N. about $140 million a year. Each was instituted, in part, to prevent a direct confrontation between great powers of the kind that occurred in Korea. If we think the cost is high, then we should remind ourselves of the blood and treasure poured into Korea. An editorial entitled "Success Costs Less Than Failure," published in the February 10, 1962, issue of the Saturday Review, states the case better than any other I have seen. Allow me to quote from it:

> When the fighting ended in Korea in 1953, this was the reckoning: 800,000 Koreans homeless; 415,000 Korean soldiers dead; 56,000 U.N. troops from the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Turkey, Australia, France, Colombia, Ethiopia, Greece, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, New Zealand, South Africa, Thailand, and the Philippines dead.
>
> The dollar cost to the United States was $18 billion—and we haven't finished paying for it yet. The current expense of maintaining armed forces in Korea, as well as policing the truce, runs in excess of $100 million a year.

That is, incidentally, the amount we are now being asked to lend to the United Nations for all its needs.

> The question that many people asked about the Korean war at the time was whether the U.N. might not have been able to prevent it from occurring by having troops at the highly volatile dividing line between the two parts of Korea. In a more general way, of course, people have asked why the U.N. has to wait until a crisis develops into a shooting war before it is able to act.
>
> These questions are being answered today. For this is precisely what the U.N. has been doing in the Congo. All the elements of a super-Korea were present in the Congo in July 1960, when the Congo became an independent nation. The Congo is situated in the heart of Africa and has radiating power throughout a large part of the continent. It is one of the richest nations in the world in terms of material resources, being a prime producing center for copper, tin, uranium, and cobalt.
>
> The Congolese were not prepared for self-government. The result was the kind of disintegration that made it a potential arena of conflict among outside powers. Belgium's troops returned in an attempt to restore order. The Soviet Union sent arms, trucks, and planes to the Congo at the personal request of the then Premier, Patrice Lumumba. The United Nations sent troops to restore order and reduce the danger that the vacuum in the Congo would be filled by the Soviet Union or any other outside nation, large or small. The U.S. Government supported the action of the U.N. in the Congo both because of its commitment to an independent Africa and because Soviet troops in the African heartland might have forced a U.S. decision to go into the Congo with force of its own.
>
> In any event, the only agency in the world that was in a position to head off a showdown situation acted in time. It sent 20,000 troops. It also sent large numbers of teachers, engineers, doctors, dentists, lawyers, business and trade experts, agricultural specialists, road builders, mechanics, communications and transportation experts.
>
> Danger in the Congo has not been fully dissolved. But for the first time since July 1960, when the trouble began, affairs in the Congo seem to be in hand. The threat of the big-power confrontation has sharply diminished. The United Nations still faces an ordeal in the Congo, but it has already made its most important contribution to world peace since its founding.
>
> It costs money to fight a war. It also costs money to avert one. The cost of maintaining U.N. stabilizing operations in the Congo has been about $10 million a month. This is added to the cost of maintaining U.N. emergency forces in Gaza. As a result the U.N. will have an estimated deficit of almost $200 million by the end of 1962. The money has to come from somewhere. If it doesn't, the U.N. cannot continue. It is not a national sovereign government that can levy taxes or maintain a debt indefinitely. Therefore, the U.N. is asking the member nations to subscribe to a bond issue of $200 million. The money would be repaid over a 25-year period with an annual interest yield of 2 percent.
>
> The question now before the United States is whether it will subscribe to its full share. The United States, enjoying * * * [half] the world's income has a quota of half the full amount of the bond issue, or $100 million. This is equivalent to less than 1 cent for every $5 we put into national armaments each year. It is far less than the amount we write off each year in false starts in manufacturing military equipment or in planes or missiles that are obsolete even before they go into general production. It is less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the cost of putting a man on the moon. Finally, it is less than it cost to fight a war in Korea for only 1 week. Yet an attempt is being made in the United States to block the required appropriation of funds—not a gift, not an assessment, but a loan repayable with interest.
>
> What is being debated now is the cost of U.N. success. It might be useful to consider what the cost would be if the U.N. should fail.

This editorial makes it rather plain, Madam President, that the loan we are being asked to authorize, compared to the cost of the alternatives, is a bargain indeed.

But it does not follow that a bargain for the United States is also a bargain for the United Nations.

From the beginning, the cost of the Gaza Strip—UNEF—and the Congo—UNOC—operations has been assessed against every member of the United Nations by action of the General Assembly. In addition, the United States and other nations have made voluntary contributions, in cash and services, to reduce the burden on the smaller, less developed countries. However, the Soviets and their satellites take the position that they will pay only when they agree with the operation; they therefore have refused to pay their assessments to either UNEF or UNOC. The Arabs also do not pay for UNEF, and the French and the Belgians have declined to pay their share of UNOC. Although most of the smaller, less advanced nations believe the UNOC operation is important and necessary, many of them have been unable to keep up their payments on these special assessments on top of paying their regular dues. All these nonpayments have produced the cash shortage with which the United Nations is now faced.

As of November 30, 1961, the total unpaid contributions on all United Nations budgets, amounted to $104 million. The bulk of this sum represented nonpayment of UNEF and UNOC operations.

These deficits have thus far been met in a variety of ways, but always precariously. The United States, whose share of the regular assessed budget of the Organization is about 32 percent, has in fact contributed nearly 50 percent of the special assessments for these peacekeeping activities, in an effort to make up the share of those nations which cannot afford to contribute. The United Nations has also engaged in internal borrowing operations. This means that solvent accounts belonging to other specialized agencies of the Organization have been drawn down in order to keep the Congo and Suez operations from collapsing.

Plainly, it does not contribute to the soundness of the United Nations as a viable international organization for any single nation to assume half the cost of its current peace-policing activities. If we continue these handouts, it soon will be charged that the United Nations has become the handmaiden of the United States. We must not allow this to happen, and neither should the rest of the world. Moreover, the makeshift borrowing operations which have been resorted to cannot be continued indefinitely without serious impairment of other functions of the Organization.

To solve the problem, Acting Secretary General U Thant has proposed, and the General Assembly has adopted, a three-part financial plan. The plan—approved over the highly vocal, but ineffective, opposition of the Soviet Union and its satellites—is as follows:

First. The General Assembly voted a new appropriation, assessed against all members, to carry out the Congo and Middle Eastern operations through December 31, 1963, at the present level of expenditure. The votes were overwhelming: 67 nations voted for the Congo appropriation, and only 13 against, with 15 abstentions.

Second. The General Assembly has formally asked the International Court of Justice, at The Hague, for an advisory opinion to settle the question of whether assessments for peace-and-security operations are just as mandatory an obligation on member governments, under the United Nations Charter, as the regular budget contributions have always been. A favorable opinion, which we anticipate, would induce defaulting governments to pay up on all accounts, for fear of getting so far behind in their total contribution to the United Nations that they would be deprived of their vote under the charter's 2-year rule—article 19.

Third. The General Assembly authorized the Secretary General to issue $200 million worth of United Nations bonds, repayable at 2 percent over a 25-year period. Repayments will be an annual charge—of about $10 million—on the regular United Nations budget, which is assessed against all members.

The case for the United Nations bond issue can be summarized in this way:

(a) Nonpayers will still owe their dues. The bond issue does not bail them out. It merely bails out the United Nations cash position, while maintaining the obligation of every member to pay up its own accumulated debt to the United Nations.

(b) The bond issue would be large enough to solve the United Nations cash problem for this year and next.

(c) The bond issue would give the Secretary General, for the first time, a source of funds which could be drawn on rapidly in the event that a future emergency should require their use.

(d) The bond issue will be repaid out of the regular budget. The repayments are thus a binding obligation on all members, under the charter.

(e) By having the bond issue repaid out of the regular budget, the U.S. contribution for these special peacekeeping operations will be reduced from our present share of nearly 50 to 32 percent. For a time after July 1, 1962, our purchase of bonds will make it unnecessary to ask Congress for appropriations for UNEF and the Congo operations.

(f) The United Nations bonds can be sold to nonmembers—West Germany and Switzerland, for example—and to nonprofit institutions, though not, however, to the general public.

These reasons, it seems to me, make our purchase of the United Nations bonds the best possible method for solving the financial crisis now facing the United Nations; and I hope the President invests in them in exercising the discretion given him by the pending bill. That discretion will be subject to some definite limitations, approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which I think were fully justified.

The first is the addition of new language—section 2 of the bill—providing that the amount to be loaned by the United States shall not exceed by more than $25 million the amount of United Nations bonds purchased or agreed to be purchased by other nations.

This puts it up squarely to other non-Communist members of the United Nations to do their share in this rescue operation. The fact is that they are now responding well. I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in the RECORD, the list of governments which already have pledged themselves to purchase United Nations bonds, together with the amounts of each commitment, as of March 26, 1962.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 2

UNITED NATIONS BOND ISSUE

List of governments which have announced purchase amounts as of Mar. 26, 1962

Australia	$4,000,000
Austria	900,000
Burma	100,000
Canada	6,240,000
Ceylon	25,000
Congo, Leopoldville	50,000
Denmark	[1] 2,500,000
Ethiopia	200,000
Finland	[1] 1,480,000
Germany (West)	10,000,000
Iceland	80,000
India	2,000,000
Ireland	$300,000
Liberia	200,000
Malaya	340,000
Norway	[1] $1,800,000
Pakistan	500,000
Sudan	50,000
Sweden	5,800,000
Venezuela	300,000
United Kingdom	12,000,000
Total to date	49,065,000
Number of nations to date	21

[1] U.N. bonds paid for and received: Indications to date of pending action by other governments: 11 governments, not yet announced, plan to purchase a total of $3,700,000; 19 governments have indicated they will respond favorably; 19 governments have U.N. bond purchase under consideration.

Mr. CHURCH. The other changes, adopted by the committee, I myself proposed. They include language to require that the amounts due the United States in principal and interest on any loans we make shall be deducted from the sums assessed to us in the years to come for the regular budget of the United Nations. The purpose of this amendment is to insure that the loans will in fact be repaid on schedule. I think it is extremely important that this be done, not only to protect the investment of the United States, but also to preserve the financial integrity of the United Nations. It is possible that at some future date we could afford to treat the loans as a de facto gift, and to forgive the indebtedness; but the United Nations cannot afford to have this precedent established.

For this reason it is also significant that the committee in its report has made special reference to its understanding that the loans are not to be deemed a precedent for future financing. The loan proposal is submitted to the Senate as an emergency matter, to be carried through exactly according to its terms, without commitment, expressed or implied, that United Nations debt financing is to be regarded as a precedent for the future. A permanent solution to the United Nations financial problem must yet be found; and this emergency loan proposal will buy us time to find it.

Madam President, an alternative to the pending bill—an outright 3-year, short-term loan to the United Nations in the amount of $100 million—was considered in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and rejected by a close vote. Loaning no money, but continuing the kind of handouts we have been making during recent years was the other alternative.

The United States has been paying 47.5 percent of the cost of the U.N. peacekeeping operations. If we invest in U.N. bonds, our share will be reduced to 32.02 percent. If all U.N. bonds are sold and the issue is retired in 25 years, the U.S. cash outlay for the whole transaction would be $54.1 million.

If the U.N. tried to raise the same $200 million under the present pay-as-you-go formula, the U.S. cash outlay would be at least $95 million, and more if the United States cannot hold the line at 47.5 percent.

If U.S. participation in the bond issue were scrapped in favor of a 3-year, short-term loan, while the rest of the world bought $100 million of bonds, the U.S. cash outlay would be $83.7 million.

Our cash outlay for the bond issue would be less than for any other method of meeting the U.N.'s need.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a chart, setting forth these cost comparisons in detail, be included here in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 3

Cost comparisons for different methods of financing U.N. peacekeeping operations

U.N. bond plan—25 year, 2 percent, U.N. bonds:	*In millions*
Outlay:	
Initial U.S. purchase price	$100.0
Repayments to U.N.:	
Of $200 million principal at 32.02 assessment	64.0
Of $55 million interest at 32.02 assessment	17.6
Total U.S. cash outlay	181.6
Receipts:	
Repayment of principal	100.0
Payment of interest at 2 percent	27.5
Total U.S. receipts	127.5
Net U.S. outlay for U.N. bonds	54.1
Short-term loan plan—3-year, 2.9-percent loan:	
Outlay:	
Initial U.S. loan to U.N	100.0
Repayments to U.N.:	
On $100 million loan at 47½ percent	47.5
On interest on loan of $8.7 million at 47½ percent	4.1
On $100 million bonds purchased by other nations at 32.02 percent	32.0
On $27.5 million interest on bonds purchased by other nations at 32.02 percent	8.8
Total U.S. cash outlay	192.4
Receipts:	
Repayment of principal on U.S. 3-year loan	100.0
Repayment on interest on U.S. loan	8.7
Total U.S. receipts	108.7
Net U.S. outlay for U.N. financing	83.7
Pay-as-you-go plan—assessed contributions:	
Outlay:	
U.S. assessed contribution at 32.02 percent on $200 million	64.0
Voluntary contribution needed based on past experience	31.0
Total U.S. outlay for pay-as-you-go contributions	95.0

Mr. CHURCH. These comparisons should suffice to demonstrate that the bonds represent the best method available to us to meet the financial emergency which now faces the U.N.

The bonds give us the means not only to save the U.N. from bankruptcy, but to cure one of its most serious defects in the process—the failure of some member nations to pay their share of special U.N. peace-keeping missions, like those in the Middle East and the Congo.

As long as we continue to pay the share of these defaulting members—through voluntary contributions of our own—as we have been doing these past several years, the cost to the United States will be much higher, and the integrity of the United Nations, as the international organization it is meant to be, will be placed in ever-growing jeopardy.

The U.N. bonds will be repaid from the regular dues. Any member country falling more than 2 years behind on its regular dues may lose its vote in the General Assembly. For this reason, no member has yet fallen more than 2 years in arrears on its regular dues. The defaults which now threaten the U.N. with bankruptcy have occurred, not in the regular dues, but in the special assessments.

So the bonds will give us the lever we have needed to deal more effectively with the Communist-bloc countries within the U.N., a principal reason, no doubt, why these very countries so strenuously opposed the bond issue in the General Assembly. Through the bonds, we will be able to say to these Communist governments: "Either pay your share, or sacrifice your vote. Representation without taxation is also a form of tyranny."

I close, Madam President, with a statement of Adlai Stevenson, our distinguished United States Representative to the United Nations, who concluded his testimony before our Committee with these words:

> The basic character of the United Nations would be congenial to the United States in any era. But in the present era we face dangers which make it a vital necessity.
>
> If we were to neglect our own responsibilities in the United Nations, or if it degenerated because of financial failure or for any other reason into what Dag Hammarskjold called a mere "static conference machinery," then it would fail of its real purposes and might even be perverted to serve the purposes of its enemies. I do not think that is going to happen. I do not think the faithful members, including this country, will let it happen. Rather I expect that the United Nations will continue to adapt to changing requirements; and that it will prove far more creative and enduring in the drama of our time than the seemingly efficient but actually very primitive institutions of communism.
>
> And as an American I believe that, whatever the storms we may face in the years ahead, the United Nations will remain one of the chief elements in our country's security. For through its processes we can make the most of those common aims which bind us to the vast majority of mankind.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I want to compliment the Senator from Idaho for the splendid presentation of the case for the United Nations. I think he has done a very fine job, and a needed job.

Let me ask the Senator, who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and who sat throughout these hearings, does he not feel that favorable action on the pending measure is badly needed in order to support adequately the United Nations?

Mr. CHURCH. I would say that our failure to respond to the present need of the U.N. would put its peace-keeping missions in the Suez and the Congo in serious jeopardy, and would permanently weaken the United Nations itself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, unless some provision is made to take care of the special assessments which so many nations refuse to pay until and unless there is a court decision to the effect that the assessments are binding, there is simply no way of maintaining these peace and security operations. Is there?

Mr. CHURCH. I know of none except through direct intervention on the part of the United States, which, as our experience in Korea demonstrates, would be hundreds of times more expensive in money, and would involve a fearful cost in blood as well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is not the idea of the United Nations one of collective action rather than individual action?

Mr. CHURCH. It is, indeed, and the presence of the United Nations in crises which might otherwise involve a direct confrontation of the great powers has enabled it to snuff out fighting in the Middle East and in the Congo which might otherwise have spread into general war in which we ourselves could easily have been ensnared.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator well remembers the outbreak in the Middle East. Might not that outbreak have been a much more serious situation if it had not been possible to move into the area the relatively small U.N. military force?

Mr. CHURCH. The Middle East has long been regarded as the powder keg of the world, and a most dangerous situation could have arisen there without U.N. intervention; it could have involved the Soviet Union and the Communist world on the one hand, and all the Western World on the other; it could indeed have become an occasion for a third world war; but the U.N., as the one international organization available, made it possible to avoid that calamity.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Has not the armistice which has existed between Egypt and Israel been a rather uneasy armistice throughout the years since that time?

Mr. CHURCH. It has. No basic settlement has been reached between Israel and the Arab countries. I think most observers agree that, but for the presence of United Nations troops, the failure to settle the dispute might very well have led to renewed fighting.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The numerical strength of the United Nations force on the Gaza Strip, maintaining the armistice between the two countries, is approximately 5,000. I believe the Senator brought out in his statement that it was costing us approximately $11 million a year to maintain that force. Does not the Senator feel that is a very low price to pay for the maintenance of peace?

Mr. CHURCH. I think it is a bargain. Why we complain about the bargain prices we must pay for peace in these instances is something I find hard to understand. Why we do not more carefully consider how little it is costing us to prevent war in the Middle East and in central Africa, compared to what it would cost us were we involved in war there, is difficult to understand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The central African or Congo operation is a more costly operation than that on the Gaza Strip. For one thing, it is a much larger operation and entails many difficulties. However, even that operation is costing approximately $100 or $110 million a year. Does not the Senator feel that for the protection we have had against the real danger, the real threat of a breakout of a general war, to use his words, it again is a bargain price?

Mr. CHURCH. I most assuredly do. I think the Congo might have become another Korea. Korea cost us $18 billion. We are now being asked to loan the United Nations $100 million, which will be repaid to us, with interest, over the years. I do not know how a more graphic comparison of costs could be made than to look at what our involvement in war in Korea cost us compared to what it is now costing us to sustain the United Nations peacekeeping operation in the Congo.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was interested particularly in one thing the Senator brought out. I am not exactly sure, but I believe it was in the editorial from the Saturday Review, with reference to the efficacy of a relatively small United Nations force in trouble spots of the world, to prevent the outbreak of hostilities.

I am sure the Senator is aware of the fact that on two different occasions the Senate has voted to ask the U.S. Government to express the attitude in the United Nations in favor of building up and maintaining a permanent U.N. force, for the very reason mentioned.

I am very proud of the fact that I was the author of the resolution. The Senator will recall that on one occasion it passed the Senate unanimously, and on another occasion it passed, I believe, with only three or four votes against it. I am sure the Senator remembers that.

Mr. CHURCH. I remember it well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think it is good to keep that in mind.

The Senator from Idaho, incidentally, was a joint sponsor, and helped in the Committee on Foreign Relations to get the measure out of the committee. I am sure the Senator does remember it quite well.

There are one or two other questions I wish to ask. I know the Senator is weary from standing so long making his speech. I wish to ask this, because I think a lot of people overlook the fact. Is it not true that the United Nations moved into the Congo after the Communists had moved in and virtually taken charge?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes. The Senator is correct. The occasion for our great concern about developments in the Congo was that the Soviet Union was intervening there unilaterally, and threatened to establish a Communist base of operations in the heart of tropical Africa which could very well have ultimately influenced the course of developments in all the surrounding countries. Therefore, not only were we gravely concerned but also we properly turned to the United Nations as the one instrument acceptable to the African countries and to the other countries of the world as the agent, acting for all nations, to move in to put an end to the unilateral intervention of the Soviet Union and to establish peace and order there in the name of the nations of the world.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that the Communist world, under the leadership of Russia and with her satellites, has opposed the Congo operation ever since?

Mr. CHURCH. Ever since it became apparent to the Russians what the U.N. course of action would be in the Congo, the Soviet Union and its satellites have opposed that operation. They have refused to pay their assessments or to contribute their share toward meeting the costs of that operation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that when the resolution to which the Senator made reference came up in the last session of the General Assembly, to provide for the issuance of the bonds and asking for the opinion of the World Court, there were only 13 nations which voted against it, and that those were Russia, her satellites, and 2 other countries?

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is quite correct. I think we ought to lay more emphasis on the fact that Mr. Khrushchev came to this country last year and engaged in his furious shoe-pounding denunciations on the floor of the General Assembly because he was so distressed with the way the United Nations had blocked his ambitions in Africa and elsewhere. Those who cry that the United States should get out of the U.N. apparently do not realize that if we were to do such a thing we would play right into the hands of Nikita Khrushchev and of the Communist world. We would do the very thing that would most please Khrushchev, by helping him undermine the United Nations. The irony is that those who advocate we do this, do so in the name of anticommunism.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Idaho. Again I compliment him upon a most illuminating address.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAVITS. I think that would be fine.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the majority and minority leaders, which is the pending business, and is a well-advertised compromise to the President's proposal to buy $100 million of U.N. bonds.

Preliminarily, I think it is fair to say that in my view the proposal is an improved approach to the problem and reflects credit upon those who, by their efforts, have brought it about. Though there seems to be some question in the press—with which I do not agree—I believe the amendment represents a substantive difference of approach to the problem which is before us.

Let us remember that when we first considered this subject, it was to approve participation in a bond issue which was provided for by United Nations resolution; and the amendment proposes that we shall give the President authority, which he may exercise only if he receives an appropriation, to subscribe to a loan of $100 million, without specifying the terms.

The difference is a very important one because the provisions of the amendment would not bind either the President or the Congress to the U.N. bond proposal, but would give the President a new opportunity for negotiating the question, which the bill that the administration itself brought in did not give him. It seems to me that in view of the slight storm which has been raised by this question, the expression of view which was made by the majority leader, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and by others, as to the validity of the United Nations mission, the President may very well welcome the freedom of action contemplated.

Let us remember that I, too, had a similar proposal in mind when, very early in the stages of consideration of this question, I filed an amendment, which in effect was subsequently adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations, by which I sought to limit the amount of our absolute participation to $20 million—the Foreign Relations Committee made the amount $25 million—with the provision that we would buy additional bonds only on a matching basis if others bought bonds in an amount similar to our commitment.

The proposal was also in the direction of providing some leverage in order to see that a complete job for the U.N., instead of only a partial job, was done. I believe that the amendment which has been offered by way of compromise is directed along the same line, and is therefore very sound from the point of view of our Government. I shall expand upon that point in a moment.

There is nothing holy about the document. Other conditions, which are not in the measure now, may very well be interposed. It is very possible that such action may be taken. But I am confident that the general approach is the approach which the Senate will wish to adopt.

I should like to pay my tribute to the distinguished Senator from Vermont

[Mr. AIKEN], who is present in the Chamber. He is never given to vain expressions. When he offered his loan plan with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], he said that he was for the U.N. and that he was offering the proposal as a friend of the U.N.

It seems to me that the Senator from Vermont has vindicated that attitude in his willingness to arrive at the kind of compromise proposed which, it seems to me, would commit us to the cause of the U.N. and, at the same time, would approach the problem in realistic terms, in place of the specific financial commitment for which Congress was asked.

I think we have seen a very interesting and important development and, on the whole, an improvement over what we had before. I think great credit for the improvement must be given to our distinguished colleague from Vermont.

The question of the validity of buying bonds or making a loan, of course, will now be cast in loan terms. As to the advisability of making a loan which would enable the United Nations to conduct its business, I do not think there can be any question. It is almost an axiom that the United Nations is essential; and if we did not have it, we would have to look for some substitute for it.

But in my opinion that is only half the story. Perhaps the most important and dominant aspect of the whole question is the timing. For example, in respect of the views of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I have heard it stated that the President himself said that he could not disagree. Much as I love the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I disagreed with him because of the timing. We should not underestimate that problem.

I observe that the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], is now in the Chamber. I should like to say to him that I have rarely observed him shooting his arrows at the target as accurately as he did yesterday in discussing this question. He, too, emphasized the matter of timing. I believe that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has done us a service in calling to our attention the timing in a situation. As the Senate deliberates upon what to do with regard to a loan, I hope it will consider the question of timing, because we are at a moment in history when the Soviet Union and the coalition it leads is making a concerted effort to destroy the United Nations.

Let us understand that point. The Soviet Union is making a concerted effort to destroy the usefulness of the United Nations by every means within its control, including its advancing of the troika principle, "buttering up" elements in the United Nations which it is felt can lessen the influence of the U.N., efforts to exacerbate the areas of difference between different groups in the United Nations, and the assertion of Khrushchev that if the United Nations determines that it is required to do something and he does not want to do it, he will use force in order to prevent it from being done. Every calculated effort is being made to destroy the United Nations.

Of course, the Russians also desire to destroy it by denying it financial support, because, notwithstanding the fact that they are Communists, they understand, perhaps even better than we do, the value of money, the value of the hard coin of the realm, as is shown by their activities all over the world.

Therefore I feel that the most significant aspect of the important question of support for the U.N. is the timing. It is particularly important at this time, when it is so greatly needed.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I take exception to the statement that the Russians want to destroy the United Nations. I believe they want to preserve the United Nations as a launching pad for their propaganda missiles. They desire to destroy the effectiveness of the United Nations in achieving the purposes of which the United Nations was originally established.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree with what the distinguished Senator from Vermont says, as he defines the term, because I define it in the same way. The Russians would like to keep the United Nations as an organization essential to their purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. They do not want the United Nations to have any teeth or any capacity to maintain peace, in the terms in which we regard the maintenance of peace as an essential reason for our backing the U.N.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator from New York and I are in full agreement on what the Russians desire to do with the United Nations.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. I am pleased to have that interpretation of my remarks. I have precisely the same thing in mind.

So, Madam President, the importance of this action lies essentially in the element of timing. However, it is not only a matter of timing, but also a question of where the new nations of the world shall look for their leadership, whether they shall look to the United States or to the Soviet Union. The comment just made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont is pointed to that question. In other words, the Russians would like nothing better than to replace us in that position. I believe we still are without question the leader in terms of world leadership.

Madam President, the current burst of hostilities between Israel and Syria on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, the continuing tense truce in the Congo, the seemingly endless negotiations with the Soviet Union over disarmament—without the mediating hand of the United Nations any one of these conflicts between nations—quite apart from Laos, Vietnam, Berlin, Quemoy, and Matsu and other tension points not before the U.N.—could plunge the world into a nuclear war.

If the United Nations served no other purpose than this—to act in effect as a peaceful substitute for war in certain cases, as a free forum of nations where anger and hurt can find enough uninhibited expression to make killing unnecessary—then it is well worth the money and the effort that the United States is devoting to it. But the attacks on the United Nations not only by the Kremlin, but also by some of its friends here on the ground that it is imperfect, that it cannot always do what it sets out to do that we should give No. 1 place to our regional alliances in preference to the United Nations in the execution of our foreign policy—these arguments sidestep the essential facts regarding the United Nations and our relationship with it. The United Nations is our main reliance for maintaining peace in the world.

Madam President, these are not my assertions. They represent the considered policy of the United States as announced by President Eisenhower to the General Assembly in September 1960, and as announced to the General Assembly by President Kennedy last year. There is no great difference between our reliance upon the U.N. to maintain peace in the world, and our reliance on NATO and our other regional alliances as major instruments for security when peace is threatened, as well as for regional cooperation.

There is no conflict with respect to full and unqualified support by the United States of both of these essential instruments of our foreign policy, and I hope the President will again take the opportunity to clearly and firmly state this fact.

The United Nations occupies a vital place in the operation of our foreign policy, and it should command our full respect and support. In this supersonic atomic age, it is literally impossible to imagine what kind of a world this would be without a functioning United Nations.

For the new nations of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East the U.N. is indispensable. It is their place of recognition as world personalities. It gives them standing and responsibility, as well as practical help in many fields, without which their development would be materially slowed and chaos and reaction might be much more likely to occur in particular cases, the best case in point being, of course, the Congo.

Madam President, having said what I have just said, it is important to consider the views expressed by the majority leader yesterday, affirming that the one-nation-one-vote basis for action in the U.N. General Assembly, now that the Security Council is relatively impotent, creates "procedural distortion between the power to make decisions and the power, the will, and responsibility to carry out decisions." This is a real dilemma and if it continues could make us give consideration to weighted voting in the General Assembly of the type, for example, in effect in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund, which are also U.N. organs.

Before anything like that happens by way of an amendment to the United Nations Charter, which would require a long time and a great deal of work, we must do something in the meantime.

I should like to address myself to the question of what we are to do to the U.N. now under the circumstances and in view of the proper analysis of the situation by the majority leader.

I believe that we have learned another lesson from this dilemma, and that is to fight for our belief in the General Assembly, whether we win or lose, and to be less concerned about what the majority leader calls quite properly "vote victories."

If we fight for what we believe in even though it may be unpopular with the new U.N. members now constituting about half the votes in the General Assembly, we will have, first, self-respect; and, second, be more likely to call them to their responsibilities. Where I do not follow the line, for example, laid out by Senator JACKSON in his National Press Club speech is that it is necessary to downgrade the position of the U.N. in our policy below that which President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have recognized fully in order to achieve a greater impact and a greater sense of responsibility in that body. I feel we must fight our battles ardently in the U.N. but must continue to treat it as the main international body for the maintenance of world peace. I see nothing in all our policy including our support for the regional organizations which we adhere which is inconsistent with sustaining the position of the Nation toward the U.N. as expressed by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

This is a critical hour for the United Nations, and that means that it is a critical hour for all of us. The decision we are about to make here on this issue has real consequence for the free world. There is grave danger that unless we continue our support for the U.N.—as contemplated by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, who in 1960 and 1961 pledged our Nation's full support to the U.N. in addresses to the General Assembly—we will be serving notice on the new nations formed since the close of World War II to look elsewhere for their leadership and the full enjoyment of their nationhood.

It is the question of timing which so deeply disturbs me in connection with any such idea as that voiced by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and others to downgrade the U.N. to some other level than that which it now holds in American foreign policy. If that is done, we know where the new nations will look for leadership. It will not be to the United States. Such an outcome is unthinkable to our people and would be gravely inimical to the foreign policy of the United States.

So, we understand, in respect to the United Nations loan, that it will not be more than sufficient to carry the United Nations through perhaps another year or year and a half. We have every right to expect that in the intervening time there will be opportunity for the World Court at The Hague to decide that nations are liable for assessments voted in accordance with the activities of the General Assembly of the United Nations, such as the maintenance of peace in the Congo, or on the borders between Israel and the Arab States, or in other places where such activities may be undertaken.

The period of time when the U.N. is being adequately financed will also give us an opportunity to bring more thoroughly to the understanding of the new nations their sense of responsibility toward the U.N. If we let the U.N. go down the drain now for financial reasons, we shall have created a vacuum in the world. In my view, that will bring the danger of nuclear war infinitely nearer than it is today. One cannot be doctrinaire on that score. When there is in hand a piece of machinery which has so far been helpful in keeping us away from the terrible business of war since the end of World War II, and which has been useful in other situations, which have been recounted in great detail by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], one does not jettison it for the sake of $100 million or $200 million, or $500 million.

In addition, what is at stake is not only the U.N. and our position in the U.N; what is at stake also is the question of whether the new nations will turn to us for a position of respectability and standing or will turn to the Soviet Union. That is what is at issue, both in the bill now before the Senate, and in the U.N., in respect of the foreign policy of the United States.

I feel very strongly that in the highest national interest it is indispensable to the United States to maintain its position of leadership, which, whatever may be its challenge, and whoever may play upon it, is nonetheless ours in the world.

I deeply feel, in all good conscience, that it is infinitely better for the leadership to be vested in our hands for the good of mankind than to let it slip from our hands by some improvident action, which would let it pass into the hands of the other challenger who is waiting to receive it—the Soviet Union. I think that is what is at stake. I sincerely hope the Senate will vote favorably upon the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment, which is the pending question.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The U.N. and Us," published in the New York Times of April 1, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.N. AND US

The United Nations is changing. The number of member countries has more than doubled since the day in 1945 when 50 delegations signed the charter in San Francisco. As the new members, many from Africa, some from Asia, have come in, the balance of power in the Assembly had altered drastically.

Another change in the U.N., resulting partly from the increase in membership, is a bolder policy in time of international crisis. United Nations troops do patrol duty in the Gaza Strip and on the shores of the Gulf of Aqaba; and in the Congo they have been engaged in costly fighting.

Such considerations as these certainly had something to do with the attention that has been paid to the recent "independent audit" of the U.N. made in a speech before the National Press Club by Senator JACKSON, of Washington. Senator JACKSON may not have intended to attack the U.N.—or the crucial bond issue that now seems likely to pass—but what he said at the time he said it could only serve to damage the prestige of the U.N. in the United States and to undermine its influence at a critical moment in the history of both U.N. and the United States.

What Senator JACKSON said would have startled some of his great Democratic mentors, such as the late Woodrow Wilson, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, and others who hoped that out of the League of Nations and subsequently out of the United Nations might come a new concept of international comity. Let us bear in mind that the U.N. today, imperfect as it is, disappointing as it often is, full of tensions as it is, still is a diplomatic instrument such as never before existed in this world. As President Kennedy has taken pains to point out, we work easily and profitably through the Organization of American States, through NATO and through other less than universal organizations. But if we want to speak to 103 nations, we can find no better forum—no other forum than the General Assembly.

We seek for peace and security in our entire foreign policy, and this happens to be the one aspiration that is mentioned over and over again in the Charter. It is also the ultimate purpose of our alliances; and what Senator JACKSON fails to realize—or refuses to recognize—is that there is no contradiction, and must be no contradiction, between loyalty to our alliances and loyalty to the principles of the U.N.

In cases where there may seem to be such conflict—the case of Portugal and her colonial policy, for example—the conflict is not between loyalty to NATO and loyalty to the United Nations but rather between formerly blind support of an ally (even when the ally was wrong) and loyalty to the principles of the United States. To work with and through the Atlantic Alliance, the Organization of American States, and our many other treaties does not mean that we cannot or should not also work with and through the one organization existing on a global scale, the United Nations. We can and must do both.

What our foreign policy demands is not less use of the U.N. but a fuller development of its possibilities, both in the prevention of war and in the humanitarian, cultural, and economic fields. To downgrade the U.N., to undercut it, would be reopening the way to world chaos.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, first I commend the distinguished Senator from New York for his excellent statement and cogent reasoning relating to the attack on the United Nations and to the service which the United Nations performs in behalf of the United States and in behalf of peace, freedom, and justice throughout the world. The Senator from New York is well known for his keen understanding and broad knowledge of the field of foreign affairs. I salute him for the words of wisdom, prudence, and judgment which he has uttered in the Senate today. He has made a most helpful statement, one that the country will applaud, one that will strengthen the hand of the President of the United States and our representatives around the world, as we deal with the Soviet threat and with other problems which relate to the basic needs of our fellow human beings.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his gracious words about me; and I have had the pleasure and privilege of uttering similar words about him on other occasions.

The Senator is preparing to speak upon this subject today, and I know he will do so with his customary skill and eloquence. But one of the lessons to be learned from our brief interchange today is that we are reported constantly as being in great discord and opposition with each other. Many persons get an impression of confusion about our policy. But what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the deputy leader of the majority, has articulated is only an example of how, when the votes are counted, we sometimes find an amazing, but always an impersonal, unanimity of view tions. It is rare that upon questions of upon the really great, profound ques- this magnitude and depth we divide very narrowly. It is only in that spirit, in a representative sense, that I express my appreciation to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New York. The American people should clearly understand that the Senate of the United States, like the General Assembly of the United Nations, is a public forum, and that one of the primary functions and main purposes of the Senate is to afford opportunity for the statement of personal views, personal analyses of an issue, and personal conviction. On the bases of such exchanges of views and opinions, and the interchange of policy statements on the part of Members of the Senate and other public officials, the American Government ultimately formulates policy. This is the refiner's fire, out of which comes a solid, strong, durable public policy.

While Members of the Senate may, on occasion, disagree as to the means of approach and objective, I think it is fair to say that the overwhelming majority of the American people and their Representatives in Congress agree upon the objective and upon the institution that can help to attain that objective. The objective of our people is world peace with justice and freedom. One of the institutions we have designed to bring about that result is the United Nations.

The United States made a great contribution to the United Nations by reason of the fact that the U.N. was born in the United States at the Conference held in San Francisco. The early stages of the development of the United Nations were represented by the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. As a result of those preliminary conferences, and ultimately the Conference at San Francisco, the United Nations came into being. I mention this because I recognize, as does every other public official, that the news essentially comes from conflict; that news is usually generated by differences in points of view. This is proper and right; but sometimes the people are led to believe that there is a great difference of opinion, a great difference in policy, when in fact the difference is primarily that of detail.

I speak today about an issue that involves a great and true friend of the United States, a friend who has served us well in peace and in war, and who now faces a serious problem. That friend is the United Nations; and the issue is the financial support of the United Nations.

Our decision on this question will have a momentous effect on the foreign policy of the United States, on the future of the United Nations itself, and on the frustration of the Soviet drive to paralyze and bankrupt the United Nations whenever the U.N. does not agree with the Soviet course of action. This measure comes to the Senate at a critical time, a time when some people in our own Nation have seized upon the bond issue or the finance issue as an instrument of attack upon the United Nations.

There are three groups that discuss the United Nations in terms of criticism. One group is the Sino-Soviet bloc, which seeks to weaken and paralyze the United Nations and make it ineffective. I am sure the American people repudiate that approach to the United Nations.

Another group—one which we might call the radical right wing in American politics—simply does not understand the United Nations, never has subscribed by thought or conviction to the Charter of the United Nations, and never has really appreciated the work of the United Nations. In fact, it is the old isolationist group—the group that still struggles to crawl out of the caves of the 19th century. Its members never have seen the daylight of the 20th century. But, thank goodness, there are very few of them.

Then there is another group—the one which seeks to analyze constructively the United Nations. I should like to be included in that group, as a friend of the United Nations, and as one who understands that the United Nations has its limitations, and understands that it is the proper function of a public official and a private citizen in a representative democracy to make constructive criticism and constructive analysis of any public institution.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate have spoken in that vein—not as enemies of the United Nations, not as carping critics, not as those who would try to thwart the purposes of the United Nations or weaken it; but, rather, they have tried to understand it better, and to have the American people understand better the United Nations, and they have struggled to improve the instrumentalities of the United Nations. With the members of this group I have no basic argument, even though we may disagree as to whether their criticism is a valid one.

I myself, have particular criticisms of the United Nations—criticisms with which some others may not agree. At a later date I intend to discuss in much more detail the United Nations and its work and its relationships with American foreign policy. At this time I merely state that the United Nations needs friends—not just "yes" friends, but friends who will talk about it in an endeavor to strengthen it and help it overcome its difficulties, and will point out its weaknesses and its limitations, and then will propose programs to help strengthen it.

Madam President, I believe in a strong United Nations, and I believe that the American people want the United Nations strengthened. The American people do not wish to see the United Nations weakened or injured in any way because of arguments, made here in the Senate or elsewhere, in regard to ways to provide it with the assistance it needs today. Therefore, Madam President, what we say about it must be said with care and meticulous concern, lest our remarks be interpreted as a frontal attack on the United Nations and its work.

Nine out of ten Americans support the United Nations; and it behooves us to remember that fact when we consider this measure—in particular, when we consider the amendment so ably presented by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], which includes the recommendations of the Foreign Relations Committee, the recommendation of the administration, and new language which permits the President of the United States to utilize his authority as the chief spokesman of our Nation in connection with foreign relations in a way which will produce the most constructive results for our country and for the United Nations.

This proposal for $100 million of financing on the part of the United States will be passed by the Senate and by the House of Representatives; let no one make any mistake about that, Madam President. After all the sound and fury are over, after all the arguments have been stated, after all the newspaper articles have been written, after all the dissension that anyone could sow has been sown, then the Senate and the House of Representatives will overwhelmingly support this measure for financial assistance to the United Nations. I will tell you why that will happen, Madam President: It is because the American people would repudiate any Congress or any administration that did not do so. Sometimes—in fact, almost all the time, I think—the American people exhibit more political horsesense than do some of their official spokesmen. The American people want to have institutions dedicated to peace and dedicated to the search for justice and freedom. The American people know full well the limitations of the United Nations, because the United Nations is but a great big mirror of the world in which we live. If the United Nations looks a little bit disorderly, all we need do is look at the map or read the Associated Press news ticker or the United Press news ticker, in order to see what is going on in this world. Why should one think that an instrumentality of an international organization would be more orderly than the world it represents?

It has been said at times that there is not exactly a unanimity of opinion in the Congress of the United States; and some persons seem to think that is too bad. But I do not think so, because there is not unanimity of opinion or attitude in the United States itself; and ours is a representative form of government which represents the people, the body politic.

So, Madam President, in the same sense the United Nations is a big mirror of the world of which it is a part. Thus it is inevitable that there would be confusion, uncertainty, ambivalence, and even conspiracy. After all, Madam President, those things are occurring in the world; and the men who come to the United Nations as representatives of the various member nations are no different when they are in New York, at the United Nations headquarters, than when they are at home.

All I can say is that at the United Nations opportunity is afforded for persons who have convictions, ideals, practical proposals, and powers of persuasion to make some converts and to mold public policy and opinion. After all, we try to do likewise here in the Senate. Each Senator comes here as a representative of his own constituency. The members of his constituency stand behind him; and when he comes here to represent his own State, he comes with his own beliefs and with his own prejudices. Yet, Madam President, we know that in our work in Congress we make accommodations to the views of one another and we adjust our own points of view, and thus we include the broader picture, and serve as Senators of the United States, not only as Senators from our individual States.

I submit, Madam President, that the United Nations has much the same effect upon the representatives of its various member nations.

Madam President, the proposed bond purchase or financing measure which now is before us has but one purpose, namely, to save the United Nations from its present financial crisis. Today, the United Nations is at a crossroads in its career. I do not say that our vote by itself can rescue the United Nations. After all, that would take a good deal of hard work, planning, and care, for which the proposed bond issue is only a beginning.

The entire financial status of the United Nations calls for a full-scale, overall review. Our Government should be insistent on this. The amendment in the nature of a substitute provides just that sort of language. That proposal has, as one of its provisions the following:

> It is the sense of the Congress that the United States shall use its best efforts to promote a pattern of United Nations financing (including a vigorous program for collection of delinquencies on annual assessments of nations and maintenance of such annual assessments on a current basis) that makes unnecessary any future large-scale borrowing.

That language was added by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations after long and careful hearings on the proposal sent to us by the President. So we will look at the entire financial status of the U.N. In fact, the United Nations does it consistently.

I know in the hearings there was some talk about the fact that the full reports were not available on U.N. financing, and that point was well made, and because of it the provision I have just read was included in the bill.

I think it should be noted, however, that one reason why the information was not forthcoming from the U.N. Secretariat was that the Secretariat is seeking to get better contributions from many countries seeking to scale down what the countries claim are overcharges for services performed. Had the U.N. revealed the names of the countries with which it was having current negotiations, there would have been a prestige battle which would have weakened the authority of the U.N. Secretariat and could have caused nations now negotiating to take a much more adamant and firm stand.

The United Nations must put its financial house in order. S. 2768 provides that sort of instruction. I do say, however, that if we reject the pending proposal, the United Nations will surely be up against one of the gravest threats in its history. We cannot afford to take a chance at the very time the enemies of the U.N. are determined to weaken or destroy it.

When I speak of the enemies of the U.N., I speak of the man who took his shoe off and pounded the table in the General Assembly as an expression of his disdain and disrespect for the United Nations.

I ask my fellow Senators not to forget that the main attack against the United Nations has come from the Soviet bloc, and primarily from the Soviet Union. I do not want to aid and abet that attack. I know why the Soviet attacks the United Nations. It is because it does not fulfill Soviet aims. I know Mr. Khrushchev has said that when the United Nations takes an action that "we do not agree with, we will ignore it. We will not abide by it."

The enemy of the United Nations is the materialist. The enemy of the United Nations is the tyrant. The enemy of the United Nations is the oppressor, the warmaker. I do not want a voice raised in this country that will aid and abet that kind of attitude and action.

The United Nations is not a world government; it does not have big armies; it does not as yet have any power to attack; therefore, as we analyze the limitations of the U.N., let us not forget for a single moment that one of the purposes of the Soviet Union is to paralyze its enforcement powers. It has crippled the Security Council by the use of the veto over 100 times.

I ask my colleagues if they think the Soviet Union would have used the veto over 100 times if the U.N. was doing the bidding of the Russians.

I can well understand why the Soviet Union conducts attacks against the United Nations. If the United Nations had thwarted our foreign policy as much as it has the Soviet's foreign policy, I am sure Members of the U.S. Senate would likewise be opposed to the United Nations. After all, the U.N. has yet to pass a single major political action sponsored by the Soviet Union which we opposed.

We can, and shall by favorable action on the pending proposal, support the U.N. General Assembly resolution of December 20, 1961, and thereby give the U.N. a breathing spell to work out its own financial salvation.

We must not through any action or failure on our part unwittingly aid those who would cripple or destroy the U.N. The United Nations is under relentless attack from the Soviet bloc. While the Soviet Union obstructs every effort for disarmament or cessation of nuclear tests, it at the same time relentlessly pursues the course of disarming the United Nations by trying to destroy its peacekeeping function.

Madam President, the Soviet Union has sought to paralyze the U.N. through the troika. Secondly, it has sought to harass and paralyze the U.N. through the veto. Thirdly, it has sought to paralyze and weaken the U.N. through economic anemia—the failure of the U.N. to have money to do its job.

Why is the United Nations short of money today? Not because of the UNICEF—United Nations Children's Emergency Fund; not because of the World Health Organization; the United Nations is in trouble today financially because it has attempted to keep peace in the Middle East and because it is attempting to keep the peace in Africa.

Let me say for the RECORD that we had a little venture in the Middle East known as the Eisenhower doctrine, and it cost us $300 million in 1 year—$300 million in 1 year over and above the normal expenditures of our foreign policy in that area.

If we were to put 16,000 troops in the Congo, which is the present number of the United Nations forces there, it would cost us a minimum of $160 million, and it might cost some lives of American boys. Our contribution to the Congo today is under $50 million, and not a single American boy has lost his life there.

If anybody has a right to complain about the United Nations, it is the Swedes, who, by the way, contribute tremendously in money, who have given Dag Hammarskjold and Count Bernadotte to the U.N., who have given hundreds of their sons to the U.N., who have given hundreds of planes and guns to the U.N. Yet the Government of Sweden, a peace-loving government, has not complained a bit.

The Government of Ireland could complain. It has given its soldiers and it has given its money.

We have given only our money, and I hope the United States will never put money above the lives of its men.

I repeat, the little country of Norway could complain. It has given its soldiers and its money. I add that Norway has already paid up on its assessments and has bought U.N. bonds more than twice its annual U.N. assessments.

The Soviet Union has tried to accomplish its objective first by advancing the troika principle, which was devised to cripple the office of Secretary General, by denying the United Nations the necessary resources, by the use of the veto, by prolonged debate, by constant argument. Surely we have not forgotten the merciless, unscrupulous attack of the Soviets on Dag Hammarskjold.

I have not forgotten it. He was a man who gave his life for peace as surely as any man did who ever walked the face of the earth.

Having failed to destroy the power of the office of Secretary General, the Soviet Union now seeks to weaken the U.N. by denying it the necessary financial resources to do the job—in other words, cripple it or destroy it—either way serves the Soviet objective. I cannot imagine the Congress of the United States aiding or abetting these goals of the Soviets.

I can fully understand how we can have differences of opinion as to how we can best aid the United Nations. That is legitimate debate, and it has really been the debate in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor of the Senate.

I want to make it quite clear that this is an argument which is honorable and purposeful.

This is not an argument which would deny the United Nations the resources it needs. I wish to pin down the real meaning of the U.N. bond issue resolution or amendment which is before the Senate. It is not something we can cut, tailor, or alter according to our whim. It was passed by a clear majority of United Nations members after careful consideration by Acting Secretary General U Thant and some of the principal United Nations members.

Madam President, I wish to pin down something else. This particular resolution was supported by this administration. There has been some loose talk to the effect that somehow or other the President and the Secretary of State and the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations were not the prime movers of this particular proposal or were not in full support of it.

Madam President, it was the President of the United States who sent the message to the Congress asking the Government of the United States to buy $100 million worth of U.N. bonds, with 25-year maturity, at 2 percent interest. The President of the United States is in charge of our foreign policy. There is only one President and there is only one Secretary of State. They give orders. They lay down the guidelines. They have control over our delegation at the United Nations.

There are not two Departments of State and there are not two Presidents. There is President John Kennedy and there is Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Secretary Rusk is the agent of the President. These two men lay down the policy for the Government of the United States, at the United Nations, at SEATO, at NATO, at CENTO, and everywhere else. Any implication to the contrary does a disservice to the President.

The President is in charge. He is not a part-time President. He is not a half-time President. He is not a weak President. He is a full-time President. He is a hard-working President. He is an intelligent President. He is in charge of the foreign policy of this country. That includes the statements at the United Nations and the policies at the United Nations, including the American delegation at the United Nations. When the President feels he is not in charge there will be a change of policy and a change of delegations.

Madam President, this Senator is not going to buy the specious argument that somehow or other the President and the Secretary of State are only lukewarm for the bond issue, and somehow or other the Ambassador to the United Nations and his delegation are solidly for it. I am not going to buy the fallacious argument that this was "cooked up" at the U.N. and that there was no recipe, nor formula, and no direction from Washington, D.C.

I think too much of my President to say that, to think that, or to believe it. Those of us who have served in the Senate know he is not that kind of a man. I know that he is a "take charge" man. I know that the President of the United States understands the importance of the United Nations, or he never would have dignified it by his presence at the United Nations General Assembly last fall. At that time the President delivered before that Assembly one of the most brilliant, masterful, statesmanlike addresses ever delivered by any man in the history of this Nation, the address which is now commonly known as the "Peace Race" address.

How fortunate it is to have the United Nations so close at hand. How fortunate it is to have a President who understands its importance. How fortunate it is to have a President who understands that the United Nations is only one of many institutions through which we work.

We do not have dogmatic minds. We do not live by any superimposed doctrine. We do not have any kind of executive discipline over us. We have a foreign policy which operates through many mechanisms, including the United Nations, NATO, SEATO, the Organization of American States and bilateral arrangements. I think there are more than 44 countries with which we have mutual assistance pacts. None of these is exclusive of the others. All are related, and each has a role to play. It is wrong to pit one against the other.

Madam President, it would be wrong to say that all we needed was the United Nations. It would be equally wrong to say that all we needed was NATO. It is proper and right to say that a nation which has world leadership responsibilities should know of the world in which it works and lives and should utilize many means and many ways for the conduct of its foreign policy.

The real issue before us is the need for financial assistance for the U.N.

The principal votes in opposition to the U.N. resolution on December 20, 1961, authorizing the bond issue, were cast by the Soviet bloc, including the bloc's junior partner, Mr. Castro; and, I regret to say, by Belgium and France.

So this particular resolution of the U.N. was no casual recommendation. There was thorough discussion, and we in the United States supported it strongly.

Madam President, the real issue before us is the future of the United Nations. The question is, Do we want the United Nations to undertake peacekeeping operations? If we do, we must pay. The method of payment is the question before the Senate today. I find it painfully ironic that the U.N. now faces a threat from us, from the Nation that has been its chief support and strength. The irony deepens when we consider that the successes of the U.N. far outweigh its failures, that its usefulness to the United States and to the cause of freedom has never been more apparent, that its prestige in the family of nations has never been higher than it is today.

I add that our prestige in the United Nations has never been higher than it is today.

I have a list of achievements of the 16th General Assembly. I note that every one of those achievements relates to the policy laid down by President Kennedy. What a remarkable record of the basic achievements of the General Assembly it is to find that those achievements are in concert with or are identical with or are in the spirit of the observations and the recommendations of the President of the United States.

We have had a pretty good record there over the years.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks excerpts from a statement by Ambassador Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, on the adjournment of the 16th General Assembly, at a press conference at United Nations headquarters, relating to these achievements to which I have referred, some 18 in number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to quote the words of the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, in his testimony to the Foreign Relations Committee on February 7:

> I think it hardly needs saying that if the continuation of the United Nations is contrary to the true interests of the United States, one dollar would be too much for us to spend on it.

He went on:

> Yet, if the United Nations, even in its present imperfect form, were ever substituted from the arsenal of our diplomacy, I think many times its cost in dollars would then have to be added to our defense arsenal—

Not to speak, he added, of the loss of life this might involve.

I believe the U.N. is a vital arm of U.S. foreign policy and a strong brake, a strong restraint, upon the Soviet drive for world supremacy.

These statements have all been corroborated or supported by men like Ambassador Lodge and others who have served with distinction at the United Nations.

As Ambassador Stevenson said at another point in his testimony:

> Actually, there is a great power which is regularly outvoted in the General Assembly, but it is not the United States; it is the

Soviet Union, whose aim and actions so often inspire widespread distrust.

Mr. President, this is not the picture one gets from the radical right wingers, or its other intemperate critics.

If we listened to these "knights of negativism," we would think the United Nations was the Supreme Soviet in Moscow. Yet these vitriolic critics of the United Nations seem to be saying the same thing as the men in the Kremlin. Both say, "Get the United States out of the United Nations, and the United Nations out of the United States." Strange bedfellows these extremists of the right and the left. Let me quote from a letter I have received. I have received many letters like the one I am about to read. It is from a constituent:

> DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am informed that the United Nations Charter was drawn up by Molotov and Alger Hiss and was the result of careful Kremlin planning.
>
> One of the provisions of the charter is that the name of God would never be uttered in the United Nations.

I digress to say that I wonder if the writer has ever read the charter. Continuing to read:

> Therefore, since the whole thing was conceived in perfidy and masterminded by traitors, we could hardly expect anything else than the harvest of world chaos which it has engendered.
>
> The U.N. Charter was taken almost entirely from the phoney constitution of the Soviet Union. Under it our country has lost one struggle after another, while the Communists have succeeded in enlarging their slave empire from 200 million to nearly 1 billion.
>
> The U.N. is incapable of keeping the peace.
>
> In view of the above, we are respectfully requesting you to vote in favor of a companion Senate bill to H.R. 9567, and designed to take our country out of the United Nations.
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> ———— ————.

I do not state the name of the writer, because I want him to think the question over before he is cited in the RECORD by name. But that is the kind of poison that some of the most extreme, thoughtless, and irresponsible critics have made about the U.N. Thank goodness, only a small number of the American people have indicated any acceptance of that kind of extremism.

In another place the writer asks me to explain "what benefit our country is deriving from its membership" in the United Nations. I am delighted to tell him what benefit we have derived.

The writer will receive a copy of that part of my speech. Not once in the 17-year history of the United Nations has one of its decisions injured the vital interests of the United States. Not once in the history of the United Nations has the Soviet Union succeeded in passing a major political resolution of which we disapproved. Not once has President Truman, President Eisenhower, or President Kennedy had to rebuke the United Nations because of a decision by the U.N. that was contrary to our interests. The Soviet Union has come up to bat a thousand times and each time it has fanned out. If we had such a record as that, there would be a cry throughout the United States to get the United States out of the United Nations or the United Nations out of the United States.

The Soviet Union has had a very bad record of performance and accomplishment in the U.N. We have had a spectacularly good one. Does my correspondent think the Soviet Union liked being ordered out of the Azerbaijan in 1946? Does he think the Politburo shouted for joy in 1950 when the General Assembly passed the "Uniting for Peace Resolution"—thus bypassing the Soviet veto in the Security Council and opening the door to U.N. intervention in Korea?

Wholly aside from these actions, many Americans say they are fed up with the United Nations because it serves as a propaganda forum for the Communists.

This is the most common complaint. But if this is true for the Russians, it is equally true for us. The United Nations is one of the most effective means we have to convey our viewpoint to the rest of the world.

I have never been afraid to debate a single person if I had a good argument and a good case. I have never been afraid to debate on any platform or under any terms. But if one has a poor argument and no facts, he ought not debate any one, even under the most favorable terms. The United Nations General Assembly provides a forum for the Soviet Union. It also provides one for the United States of America. Those who are concerned over the use by the Soviet Union of the General Assembly for its propaganda are people of little faith in the United States and our ideals. We have a better argument. The United States and the free world have a better program for the world. We have much to tell the world. We have many good things to say. We ought to welcome the opportunity to confront the Russians in the parliamentary arena, in which we through tradition and practice are far more at home than they are.

We are fortunate to have such a forum in which the world can judge who is on the side of fairplay, justice, equal rights, and freedom.

The United Nations affords us the opportunity of direct contact with leaders of 104 nations. The United Nations Assembly affords us the opportunity to present the American case and the American policy directly and openly without the danger of it coming through misrepresentation and diplomatic doubletalk. Now we can state our case in the forum of the United Nations where friend and foe alike are confronted by facts and the advantage of personal persuasion. We have nothing to fear by face-to-face head-on debate or discussion with either a member of the Soviet bloc or any other nation.

Yet the same people who are worried lest the Soviet Union might take advantage of us in the U.N. are virtually advocating that we put the muzzles of our tanks up against the muzzles of their tanks. They are surely brave as they mouth their patriotic slogans in the plush luxurious surroundings of some country club lounge. It is a little safer for the American people to confront the Russians in the United Nations than it is to put the muzzle of one tank against the muzzle of another, even though the time may come when that will be necessary.

The United Nations today, Mr. President, represents a much larger share of mankind than it did in 1946.

Of course, the U.N. has changed since 1946. So has the world. The United Nations of 1946 was a rather well-established club, an organization of the older nations of the pre-World War II era. Since 1946 hundreds of millions of people have gained their freedom. New nations by the dozens have come into being. Nationalism is on the march. This is a different world from the world of 1946. This is the world of the atomic era. It is the world of the space era. It is the world of 110 or more nations. It is the world of anticolonialism. Of course the United Nations has changed.

Indeed, it has more than doubled in size since those early days. The U.N. started with 51 members, of whom only 4 had achieved independence since 1939. Today it numbers 104 members, 39 of which—one-third of U.N. membership—had no national existence prior to World War II.

We have always respected the views of the "nonalined" nations, even when we have disagreed with them. We have never treated abstention on an important question as a reason for ostracizing a given nation. We have always identified our basic interests and ideals with theirs. As a result, they have responded, I believe, in this same spirit. As proof of this contention, let me cite a few examples from the last session of the General Assembly.

The 16th General Assembly convened last September to replace Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, who had died in Africa on a mission on behalf of the United Nations. While Hammarskjold lived, he had been the target of partisan attack and virtual boycott by the Russians. Because of this fearless man who served the whole world, the Russians proposed a system to replace him, a sort of three-horse team, the troika. They said the U.N. should be drawn by a black, a bay, and grey, all pulling together without rein or driver, and actually pulling in different directions. What the Russians really wanted was to cripple the United Nations. With Hammarskjold's death, they seemed to have won a cheap victory.

But they did not reckon with the real independence of these new countries. A month and a half of confusing, tedious debate and negotiations reaffirmed the inviolability of the office of the Secretary General. When the Burmese Ambassador, U Thant, was elected to fill the remainder of Hammarskjold's term, there was no Soviet troika. It was agreed that U Thant would pick a number of deputies broadly representative of the major geographical divisions in the world, and it was understood that he would consult them on major decisions. But he remained a free agent, and has remained a free agent; a man with the reins, thanks to the neutrals who saw that the Soviet troika would obstruct their own desire for a voice in U.N. affairs.

Mr. President, the Soviet Union had not convinced the neutrals to weaken the U.N. To the contrary, they rebuked the Soviet Union, and they followed our leadership.

Since that time U Thant has proved to be a strong yet tactful Secretary General. He acted forcefully in the Congo, which has been stabilized to a remarkable degree. His action prevented a confrontation of great powers in the heart of Africa, and opened the way to peaceful settlement of that difficult situation.

This first success in the General Assembly was followed by several others. None was more gratifying to the United States than the defeat on December 15 of the Soviet resolution to expel the Chinese Nationalists from the seat claimed by the Peoples Republic of China. The Assembly voted 48 to 37, with 19 abstentions, to reject the Communist resolution in favor of Red China.

I might add that some of our NATO allies recognize Communist China. Some of the Scandinavian countries, which are very close to us, and are almost our blood relatives, have recognized Communist China. I do not agree with their decision in that regard. However, what I am pointing out is when the votes were taken we were able to command the necessary majority to defeat the Soviet Union on an issue where our own allies have not agreed with us, where our most trusted friends have disagreed with us.

So much for the lugubrious, head shaking, lip pursing predictions that the neutralist nations would hand Red China a seat in the U.N.

Then again on October 27, 1961, the General Assembly voted by an overwhelming 87 to 11—with one neutralist abstention—to appeal to the Soviet Union against the explosion of the 50-megaton bomb. As we all know, the Soviet bloc was alone in voting against this appeal, and the U.S.S.R. callously set off the bomb regardless of world opinion.

On November 8, the Assembly voted 71 to 11—with 15 abstentions—to urge acceptance of the United States-British position on a cessation of nuclear testing.

Here is a major foreign policy issue, an issue on which the Secretary of State went to Geneva only recently. Here is an issue upon which the President of the United States has taken an unequivocal stand; 71 to 11, the United Nations supported us, Mr. President. Has the United Nations been good for American foreign policy? I should say so. Has the United Nations betrayed us? I should say not. Has the United Nations left us in our hour of trouble? I say "No." Has the United Nations helped us? The answer is "Yes."

The great majority of U.N. members said there could be no effective test ban without a system of effective international controls.

This is the central disarmament issue of the day. This is a major foreign policy position of the United States. On that decision we won almost 7 to 1—71 to 11. I must say that criticism of the United Nations on that particular issue was unfounded. If it had done nothing else for us, it would be worthy of our respect and our attention.

In February, the General Assembly's First Committee quietly disposed of Cuba's arrogant and baseless charges against us. Cuba accused us of preparing new plans for aggression and acts of intervention. A Czechoslovak-Rumanian resolution to this effect was voted down 50-11 with 39 abstentions, and a Mongolian attempt to smuggle a watered-down version onto the floor was decisively beaten.

On a number of other issues—such as the United States-Soviet agreement on the principles of an 18-nation Disarmament Conference, such as a series of resolutions regarding international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space; such as President Kennedy's proposal to designate the current decade as a "United Nations development decade"; such as the reaffirmation of Angola's rights to self-determination—on all these the United States and the neutrals were in accord.

Mr. President, I make this brief review to show that we have nothing to fear from any so-called Afro-Asian bloc. If such a bloc really exists, it certainly has not been hostile to us.

Where can we better talk to this bloc of nations, these individual nations? Where better can we get to know their leaders? Where can we get a better testimonial as to the meaning of freedom and as to the meaning of our foreign policy than in the United Nations?

The story of the U.N. would not be complete without at least a brief mention of the specialized agencies of the world organization and the promising U.N. program of world economic and social improvement. The United Nations has developed an important capacity to promote economic and social growth in the underdeveloped world. Thus far the "United Nations decade of development" has had no headlines to speak of, despite the fact that it occupies the full time of 80 percent of U.N. employees. But if the political organs of the U.N. have shown a growing maturity, this is equally true, and perhaps more so, of the specialized agencies.

Most of the specialized agencies got off to a shaky start. But over the years they have grown stronger, painfully expanded their budgets, and gradually put together an extraordinary range of operational programs. The World Bank, for instance, is today a mature, respected, efficient organization—a $20 billion institution, belonging to 68 member governments, which plays a major role in the developing societies of Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

Mr. President, I think there is some place in the news for the fact that the World Health Organization is wiping malaria from the face of the earth. That the U.N. Children's Fund brought assistance to 55 million pregnant women and nursing mothers last year, and examined 75 million children for the yaws. That the six agencies of the United Nations are cooperating on a survey of the mighty Mekong River in southeast Asia. Through its economic development activities in the Mekong, the United Nations is helping to lay the basis for the world's greatest valley development project.

These are only isolated examples of the unsung but indispensable services of the United Nations. Other U.N. agencies are helping to develop statistics and knowledge of resources, to build research and training centers, to improve diets and health and the care of children, to improve worldwide weather reporting and the peaceful uses of atomic energy and a host of other scientific and commercial undertakings.

Mr. President, in the long run these economic and social functions are going to be the hallmark of the United Nations. The U.N. will help pool some of the resources of the affluent nations and distribute them where they can do the most good. Thanks to man's organizing and productive genius, the whole world is going to be a better place to live in. If the U.N. did this and nothing more, it would have my gratitude—and my vote.

As we all know, the United Nations has chosen a bond issue to pay for the costs arising out of its military and humanitarian operations in the Middle East and in the Congo. That is what we are debating today. In each of these cases, special assessments were levied upon all U.N. members. For the most part members of the U.N. have met their regular budgetary assessments, but several members have refused to pay for the Congo and Middle East operations. Countries pay their regular assessment, because if they are in default for the equivalent of 2 years' assessments, they automatically lose their vote in the General Assembly. No one, least of all the Soviet Union, wants to be disfranchised. Therefore, they pay up.

But in the case of the special assessments, there is as yet no penalty attached to nonpayment. I say "as yet" because this spring, thanks to the decision of the Secretary General and the General Assembly—with our encouragement and support—the International Court of Justice in the Hague is going to deliver an advisory opinion on this very issue. We are hopeful that the World Court will declare these special assessments for U.N. peace-and-security operations to be just as binding upon member states as are the annual membership dues. These assessments are levied by majority vote of the Assembly. A favorable World Court decision will mean, that any country failing to pay its share of the special assessments is going to lose or be put in danger of losing its vote, just as if it had not paid its regular assessments or bills.

But what are the elements of the U.N.'s financial crisis? The facts are that the major peace-and-security operations, the U.N. Emergency Force in the Gaza strip, and U.N. operations in the Congo, cost the U.N. about $140 million a year. Last December the General Assembly passed a resolution putting a ceiling of $10 million a month on U.N. expenses in the Congo. It also voted a special assessment of $80 million to carry the Congo operation to the end of June 1962. The Soviet bloc and the Arabs have refused to pay for operations in the Gaza Strip.

In the case of the U.N. operation in the Congo—UNOC—not only the Soviet bloc but two of our NATO allies, France and Belgium, refuse to pay.

Thus by the end of 1961 the United Nations found itself $94 million in debt. This included a few insignificant unpaid contributions on the regular budget plus a sizable debt for the UNEF and UNOC. Other unpaid bills inflated this debt to nearly $110 million.

It is perfectly clear that the U.N. can no longer dun its members with little or no hope of being paid in full. For one thing, the generosity of Uncle Sam begins to wear thin. Our share of the UNEF expenses in 1961—which totaled $19 million—was $7.9 million. Now we are not going to complain too much at this sum, because if we had had to put our own troops between the Israelis and the Arabs, it would have cost us far more—not to speak of the harm in terms of resentment and the danger of active Communist intervention in the Middle East and the possible loss of life. So we should be most willing to pay our share toward the cost of supporting the UNEF. On the other hand, we rightly resent the attitude of countries who benefit by this operation but who ignore their obligations.

The Congo operation is the same story on a much larger scale. In the summer of 1960, when it became apparent that U.N. intervention in the Congo was the only alternative to great power intervention and war in the heart of Africa, we proposed and supplemented U.N. action in the Congo.

The U.S. Government, under Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, has been a major sponsor of United Nations action in the Congo. The reason for that is that we do not want Soviet penetration. We know that the United Nations police force in that area of the world was the best answer to violence and disorder. We do not want to commit American troops to that area. If anyone has any doubt about how much it costs to commit American troops, let him take a look at South Vietnam, where we have only a few troops who are specialists in training missions; or take a look at Korea.

We willingly paid a larger proportion of United Nations' costs in the Congo. This has been a sound investment for world peace and American security. Our own troops were not involved, because it was rightly considered dangerous and undesirable for the troops of any of the great powers to be involved, but we did supply essential transportation of men and supplies. We did this at the same time that the Soviet Union was trying by every means to gain control over the Lumumba regime in Léopoldville. Last year, Mr. President, the United Nations Congo operation cost $100 million from January through October. Of this sum the United States paid $45.5 million—that is, almost 50 percent.

It is a modest sum compared with the $50 billion we are prepared to spend each year for total defense. Here is a comparison of what it would cost us to have 16,000 U.S. troops in the Congo instead of the 16,000 United Nations troops that are stationed there at this time. Instead of the $57 million we are spending for the United Nations operations in the Congo now, the cost, as I said earlier, of maintaining our own troops there—not to speak of the possible loss of American life—would be over $160 million a year. We are now spending, through the United Nations, only about $4 a year per Congolese citizen, whereas in the southeast Asian kingdom of Laos, which is barely one-tenth the size of the Congo and has a population barely one-seventh of Congo's population, we are spending $18.50 per Lao citizen.

We are asking—we are actually begging—for a neutral Laos. In the Congo, without the loss of an American life, without the loss of American prestige, our cost is approximately $4 per Congolese a year.

Mr. President, many people have been willing to send U.S. troops directly into the steaming jungles of Laos or Vietnam yet some of these same people are totally unwilling to settle for the much better bargain of U.N. intervention in the Congo. It might be well to compare the costs of the United Nations operations of keeping the peace with the tremendous expenditures in South Vietnam, where peace is threatened by Communist guerrillas and where we have been compelled to shoulder the burden alone along with the brave South Vietnamese people.

I do not want these remarks to be misunderstood. I support our program in South Vietnam. I merely say that when the costs are compared, the United Nations is a bargain.

This brings us back to the bond issue. As approved last December 20, the U.N. was authorized to issue $200 million worth of bonds repayable in 25 years at 2 percent interest. This procedure is not regarded as a precedent for bailing the U.N. out of its financial difficulties in the future. Rather, as the Secretary of State and as our Ambassador to the U.N. and as the President of the United States have all explained, it is expedient to tide the U.N. over until a regular means of working out a pay-as-you-go method of handling assessments for peace-and-security activities can be devised. To my mind, it is 100 percent better than the Congress voting a special U.S. contribution—a contribution which proportionately is far larger than our regular budgetary assessments—just to make sure that the essential functions of the United Nations are carried out. For, Mr. President, the interest and principal of this bond issue will be repaid out of the regular U.N. budget. That means that every nation, whether or not it buys the bonds, must contribute its share toward these repayments. Furthermore, it means that the principle of collective responsibility for the activities of the U.N. has been strengthened. This provision is self-enforcing, because it involves the loss of voting rights, and no country thus far has dared or cared to put its own voting privileges in jeopardy.

If only out of a sense of thrift, the United States should welcome the bond proposal. For one thing, if we were to go on making special contributions, our share would rise from 47½ percent to 50 percent to 55 percent, to 60 percent and so on indefinitely. Because of these rising costs the President, the Secretary of State, and our representatives at the U.N. have proposed a bond issue to us as a fair and proper means of financing these United Nations peacekeeping operations.

The bond issue is to be repaid by every member of the U.N., the repayment of principal and interest to be deductible from our regular United Nations assessment. One of the great advantages of the bond issue, considering it as a matter of dollars and cents, is that it will require us to pay only 32.02 percent of the interest and principal instead of the nearly 50 percent that we are now paying for UNEF and UNOC.

The U.N. bond proposal and the Senate resolution put the greatest pressure on other countries to pay their share. Let me point out, assuming a favorable ruling by the World Court, that the penalties for delinquent bond payments would be applied swiftly. There are about 10 countries which would be so far in default by 1964 that they would lose their General Assembly vote. These 10 countries would include the Soviet Union. So we see that the bond issue, fortified by a favorable decision of the World Court, would exercise a powerful sanction upon the defaulting nations.

We occupy a position of leadership in the United Nations. Leadership is costly. It is difficult. It calls for sacrifice and maturity. The fact that we are asked by our President to subscribe to a hundred million dollars of these bonds is one proof of our leadership and responsibility.

But the real test of our leadership in our determination to put U.N. finances on a long-range, self-sustaining basis. As I have stated before, the proposal to purchase U.N. bonds should not be looked upon as a precedent or as a final answer to the critical financial needs of the United Nations. We need a much firmer base than that.

The entire subject of U.N. financing demands immediate attention by member states. Possibly the decision of the World Court relating to the refusal or delinquency in payments of special assessments by member states may clarify the situation. However, if the decision is not helpful, then other action must be taken.

The U.N. might well consider means of raising independent revenue.

I invite attention to a study made by the International Industrial Development Center, of the Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park Calif. The study was made by Dr. Eugene Staley on the subject "Direct Revenue for the United Nations." Dr. Staley has outlined a program of direct revenue for the United Nations. I suggest its careful study by every Member of the Senate and of the other body.

Under date of February 21, I wrote to Dr. Staley. I received a letter from his secretary, which I shall read:

FEBRUARY 27, 1962.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Office of the Majority Whip,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: In response to your letter of February 21, Dr. Eugene Staley is presently in Europe on a special mission for the Ford Foundation. I am therefore enclosing two copies of the memo which he prepared on "Direct Revenue for the United Nations." Should you wish to have more copies, please let me know.

I am sending your letter on to Dr. Staley, as I am sure he will be gratified to know of your interest in his ideas.

Sincerely yours,

JEANNIE C. KIMBER,
Secretary to Eugene Staley.

Yesterday I suggested some means of independent revenue sources for the United Nations. These suggestions are, in the main, those proposed by Dr. Staley, of the Stanford Research Institute. We are indebted to Dr. Staley. I hope his study will be even more elaborate and more detailed, because further suggestions are needed.

Dr. Staley suggests that new sources of wealth which are being opened by advances in science and technology outside the jurisdiction of national states and not yet taxed by any national state may offer a means of financial assistance. I fully agree with him. The three important sources of potential revenue for the U.N. are space traffic and communication rights, ocean resources, and polar resources. These are the main sources which Dr. Staley's study emphasizes.

Action could be taken authorizing all exclusive U.N. tax rights to such new sources of wealth, even in advance of such sources becoming practicably usable. This would not, of course, provide an answer to the immediate financial problems of the United Nations. I think we must recognize that these proposals are somewhat for the future. But we also should understand that as science and technology progress further, these potential sources of new wealth could very well become effective and could very well become helpful. It is entirely possible that within a decade or two the United Nations might obtain substantial revenue from these sources of wealth—for instance, from space traffic and communication rights and from ocean resources and from polar resources. They could become sources of additional revenue which could be helpful in financing the operations of the United Nations.

Now let me be more specific:

First. Space traffic and communication rights. All of us are familiar with the proposals of our Government in regard to the use of orbiting satellites to relay telephonic and television signals. Surely this is of some financial value. We recognize that outer space does not belong to any particular country. Therefore it is possible that the United Nations could be given exclusive authority not only to license and regulate the use of outer space, but also to tax such outer-space traffic. I do not say such a proposal should be adopted immediately; but I say Dr. Staley's recommendation regarding this area is worthy of very serious consideration.

Outer space does not belong to any particular nation; outer space is international. So I think it very important that in the United Nations we take the lead in establishing some body of international law relative to outer space. Already there is international law in regard to the use of the high seas, and already there is international law in regard to airplane travel—that is to say, travel in inner space; but there is no body of international law relative to outer space.

A second specific source of revenue is to be found in ocean resources. I speak of those resources beyond the 3-mile limit or beyond the 12-mile limit. It soon will be feasible, using new technological advances, to drill for oil through the ocean bottom on the high seas. At least, our engineers tell us this is a very definite possibility. The United Nations should have the same rights to require a share in the production of oil wells on the high seas that any particular country has in connection with wells drilled in its own territory, or that our country has in connection with the continental shelf, or that our States have, according to present law, in what are called the tidelands.

Also, there are mineral-bearing nodules that cover thousands of square miles of the ocean floor. New developments in underwater equipment operated by remote control may very well make economically feasible the recovery of these nodules. Here is another potential source of income for the United Nations. It could be granted exclusive authority to license, regulate, and tax the exploitation of ocean resources outside presently recognized limits of national jurisdiction.

Again I point out that Dr. Staley, of Stanford University, strongly recommends this particular prospect; and I hope that at a later date we can have him appear before our Committee on Foreign Relations and there explore in greater detail some of these practical suggestions.

Finally, third, polar resources. Presently there is vast exploration of polar regions. At the present time we have considerable equipment in the Antarctic, and we have a number of scientists there—as we also have in the regions around the North Pole. We know there are mineral resources in both the Antarctic and in the Arctic areas. Perhaps landing rights or transpolar routes or mineral development rights may one day have revenue-yielding potentials. In other words, if an airport were constructed in the Antarctic, who would own it? It seems to me it is not beyond the realm of possibility that this area could well be designated, for purposes of landing rights and airport development, to the United Nations, and thereby the United Nations could obtain some revenue. It would seem wise to explore the possibility of an agreement conveying to the United Nations jurisdiction over, and rights to regulate and tax, the economic exploitation of all polar areas which are unclaimed or are in dispute. I think this entire matter should be looked into very carefully, in light of the Antarctica Treaty which the Senate ratified several years ago.

These proposals deserve serious study. The United Nations can learn from American history that the power to lay and collect taxes may well determine life or death. At least the United Nations can learn from U.S. history that some method of compelling nations to pay their assessments is required if an international body or international organization is to survive.

I believe that if this debate has done nothing else, it has at least pointed up one of the real weaknesses of the structure of the United Nations—namely, its financial weakness. We must do something about that. We have a great stake in the United Nations, and therefore we should take the lead in that effort.

Mr. President, I have tried to emphasize a few of the reasons why the purchase of United Nations bonds—or, to put the matter more precisely, why I believe the passage and the enactment of Senate bill 2768, with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]—is our best means at present for dealing with the United Nations fiscal crisis.

In my opinion the bond issue has four outstanding advantages:

First, the bond issue both affirms and enforces the principle of collective responsibility for United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Second, it reduces our share of the peace-keeping burden from nearly 50 percent to a more equitable 32.02 percent.

Third, the bond issue in no way forgives or erases the debts of countries which thus far have evaded their peacekeeping responsibilities. This means, assuming a favorable World Court decision, that delinquent countries will have to pay up fast, or else lose their vote in the General Assembly.

Finally—and I want to emphasize this at the risk of being repetitious—the bond issue is essentially an interim financing measure while the United Nations finds other and more reliable sources of revenue.

Mr. President, I have tried to touch on some of those potential sources of revenue. I grant that they are limited and that they look to the future. But at least they give us something on which to work; and in the meantime we should take the initiative in the United Nations in finding a way to put the United Nations operations on a sound financial basis.

With funds available for the next 2 years, the United Nations will have an opportunity to save itself from financial bankruptcy and political impotence. These are the best arguments I know for adopting the matching United Nations bond purchase proposal.

Mr. President, there is no need just to cite the Gallup poll in order to illustrate a nationwide consensus in favor of the United Nations. I have sifted a large sampling of newspapers, from New England to the Deep South, from the Midwest to the Far West. There was not a single region of the country in which articulate, pro-United Nations opinion could not be found.

I ask unanimous consent to have some representative newspaper editorials printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish Senators would note that these are not excerpts exclusively from the big city papers of our country. Several world-famous papers are represented; but the majority of these editorials are from alert, small-circulation newspapers serving local audiences. Through their press, the American people have registered their grassroots support of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from a statement by Ambassador Stevenson before the Foreign Relations Committee, on February 8, 1962, concerning the role of the United Nations in U.S. foreign policy, and particularly in regard to the relationship of the United States to the so-called nonalined countries and the Afro-Asian neutralist bloc.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE ADLAI E. STEVENSON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, BEFORE THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE, ON FEBRUARY 8, 1962

It hardly needs saying that if the continuation of the United Nations is contrary to the true interests of the United States, $1 would be too much for us to spend on it. On the other hand, a vigorous and effective United Nations is an important ingredient in the prescription for peace and security, and, therefore, the freedom of the American people. If the United Nations, even in its present imperfect form, were ever subtracted from the arsenal of our diplomacy, I think many times its cost in dollars would then have to be added to our defense arsenal. Nor do I care to contemplate the possible loss of life in avoidable conflict.

* * * * *

The United Nations in terms of our foreign policy, is, to begin with, a standard statement of the basic aims which the United States holds in common with the rest of the nations of the world—however much we may differ with some of these nations on other questions.

Not only our actions in the United Nations, but all our actions on the world stage, must be aimed at the fulfillment of those basic charter aims, or must at all events be consistent with them.

The United Nations is itself only one means for carrying these aims into effect. It is not the sole means. Indeed, the charter itself is full of reference to others. Article 33 calls for bilateral negotiation, arbitration, judicial settlement, and so forth, as the first obligations of nations involved in a dispute. Article 51 safeguards the inherent right of nations to individual and collective self-defense. Articles 52 to 54 deal with regional arrangements. Similarly the articles dealing with economic and social matters, and with the administration of non-self-governing territories, constitutes among other things pledges by the members themselves, simply as individual signatories of the charter, to follow certain standards of conduct and to promote certain aims.

* * * * *

There have been very many events of importance since the United Nations was founded, which were not clearly foreseen. It is therefore fair to ask whether the United Nations is able to cope with the new forces which we find in the world, and whether it can do so in a manner consistent with the purposes of the United States.

My belief is that the United Nations is an asset of incalculable value in coping with those new forces. It is doing so, and gives promise of continuing to do so, in a way which is manifestly consonant with the fundamental interests of the United States. This does not blind one to imperfections and mistakes which are inevitable in so complex an enterprise.

Let me recall briefly, then, some of the main forces which have been shaping world events in the past 10 years, and which provide the environment in which the United Nations has functioned. And let us see how the U.N. has responded.

Of all the new developments of the past decade, the one which has exerted the greatest impact on the United Nations has been the independence movement. It has added greatly to the membership. It has affected the agenda and the decisions of the organization. To appraise it properly it is best to consider first the other major forces with which the independence movement has interacted.

First, I would place the continued strength and influence of the United States. We have remained not only a great military and economic power but also, more fundamentally, a nation committed to certain universal moral ideals. What is still more important is our enduring determination to work toward an ever greater realization of those ideals, both at home and abroad. This is surely the deepest source of our national strength. If the United States had ceased to exert its share of moral leadership during the past decade, the world today would be a very tragic place.

In all the work of the United Nations the United States continues to carry its portion of responsibility. We do not control the United Nations. We never have. We have never aspired to. The very idea of one-power control would defeat the purpose of the organization.

But our position in the United Nations is preeminent. We are the host country to its headquarters. In accordance with our national product, we are the largest single contributor to its regular budget. Almost nothing happens in which the United States is not interested, and on virtually all vital questions we and the majority of members find common ground.

Indeed, in all the history of the United Nations I know of not one case in which the United Nations has injured the vital interests of the United States.

* * * * *

Since the death of Stalin and the end of the war in Korea, the leaders of the Soviet Union have not sponsored any new large-scale military aggression. And they have opened a few chinks in their closed society, through which the Russian people may begin to get rid of some of their poisonous suspicions of the world outside. These latter developments, however limited, must be counted a substantial gain for the whole world.

The United Nations has had something to do with this. It has been a factor in inducing the Soviet Union to shift away, in great part, from overt Korea-style aggression. There is the memory of the support which the United Nations gave to the defense of the Republic of Korea. What is more, bomb rattling has never been popular in the United Nations. Whenever the Soviets have shown this ugly face in the United Nations debates they have been least effective in getting votes and political support.

* * * * *

The United Nations has been midwife at the birth of many of the new nations and has striven with some success to ease the birth pains. This aid is desperately needed, because there are many perils in this swift transition.

One such peril exists in the apparent strategy of the Soviet Union, one of whose chief preoccupations is driving wedges between the nations of Africa, the Middle East and Asia on the one hand, and those of the West on the other. They fan distrust and racial hatred among the emerging countries, and hope to move into the vacuum created by the departing rulers. The defeat of that strategy in Africa, particularly in the Congo, is a great contemporary drama of the United Nations.

* * * * *

There is still another supposed danger which is more imaginary than real. That is the specter of the alleged "Afro-Asian neutralist bloc" in the United Nations, ganging up with the Soviet bloc to outvote the West.

Nearly half of the 104 members of the United Nations today are from Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. The assertion that all these countries vote together against the United States has no basis in fact.

* * * * *

Actually there is a great power which is regularly outvoted in the Assembly, but it is not the United States. It is the Soviet Union, whose aims and actions so often inspire widespread distrust. That has been true in the most recent sessions of the Assembly.

The underlying reason for the basic identity of interest between the United States and the majority at the United Nations is not far to seek. Unlike the Soviet Union, our purpose is not conquest but community—a community in which the small and weak need not fear the big and powerful.

* * * * *

It scarcely serves a useful end to judge the United Nations solely by the points at which it has failed. I often wonder whether those who judge it in this way would be happier if the United Nations had stood aside completely from the real, tough events of the world where failure is always a possibility.

Underlying all the questions at issue in the United Nations is the more basic question: what is the unifying purpose behind those efforts? What is the game we are playing?

As far as the United States is concerned, I believe the game at the United Nations is exactly our national style. It is a game in which it is not necessary to defeat and crush an opponent in order to score a point. In fact, the highest points are scored when a great action is taken with the greatest unanimity.

The United Nations is dedicated by its charter "to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations" in pursuit of certain common aims. The goals are clearly set forth—the promotion of international peace and security; the prevention of war; collective action against aggression; peaceful settlement of disputes; cooperation for economic and social progress in larger freedom; observance of international law and justice; and the advancement of dependent territories toward self-government and self-determination.

Taken together these aims constitute an enormous harmony of interest—a framework of standards of conduct within which a great deal of disagreement and friction can be contained, and an immense wealth of talent and resources combined for the common good.

* * * * *

This basic character of the United Nations would be congenial to the United States in any era. But in the present era we face dangers which make it a vital necessity.

If we were to neglect our own responsibilities in the United Nations, or if it degenerated because of financial failure or for any other reason into what Dag Hammarskjold called a mere "static conference machinery," then it would fail of its real purposes and might even be perverted to serve the purposes of its enemies. I do not think that is going to happen. I do not think the faithful members, including this country, will let it happen. Rather I expect that the United Nations will continue to adapt to changing requirements; and that it will prove far more creative and enduring in the drama of our time than the seemingly efficient but actually very primitive institutions of communism.

And as an American I believe that, whatever the storms we may face in the years ahead, the United Nations will remain one of the chief elements in our country's security. For through its processes we can make the most of those common aims which bind us to the vast majority of mankind.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent that an advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post on Thursday, March 8, 1962, entitled "Four Out of Five Americans Support the United Nations," sponsored by the U.S. Committee for the United Nations and the American Association for the United Nations, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR OUT OF FIVE AMERICANS SUPPORT THE UNITED NATIONS

The future of the United Nations is a major issue today in the United States. Are the American people losing faith in the United Nations? Are they no longer willing to give the U.N. their fullest support? The time has come to take the guesswork out of these questions. Here are some factual answers:

First, Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, took a poll of the people in his district.

One of his questions: "Do you regard the United Nations as the best hope for maintaining world peace?"

This was the result: Yes, 83.95 percent; no, 13.55 percent; no opinion, 2.50 percent.

Another: "Do you believe that the United Nations has been effective in maintaining a better understanding between nations in the past?"

This was the result: Yes, 79.01 percent; no, 16.05 percent; no opinion, 4.94 percent.

Another: "Do you believe that the purpose of world peace could be achieved through strengthening the United Nations?"

This was the result: Yes, 81.84 percent; no, 12.50 percent; no opinion, 6.02 percent.

Next, Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, sent a similar poll to the voters in his district.

One of the questions: "Do you think that the United Nations offers the best hope of keeping peace in the world?"

This was the result: Yes, 84.8 percent; no, 15.2 percent.

Another: "Do you think that further strengthening of the U.N. would be apt to advance the cause of world peace?"

This was the result: Yes, 87.6 percent; no, 12.4 percent.

Obviously, two congressional districts from the entire country are not enough of a sampling to warrant sweeping conclusions. But now consider the latest nationwide Gallup survey:

First question: "Do you think the United States should give up its membership in the United Nations or not?"

The answer: Should not, 90 percent; should, 5 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

Second question: "How important do you think it is that we try to make the United Nations a success—very important, fairly important, or not so important?"

The answer: Very important, 83 percent; fairly important, 9 percent; not so important, 4 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

Third question: "In general, do you think the United Nations is doing a good job or a poor job in trying to solve the problems it has had to face?"

The answer: Good or fair job, 78 percent; poor job, 12 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

Popular U.S. support for the United Nations is actually at an alltime high.

Does this mean that the American people believe that the United Nations is flawless or without weakness?

Certainly not. But this does not cause them to turn away from the United Nations. Just the opposite. It makes them determined to strengthen the United Nations by more effective use.

The American people would no more wish to dispense with the United Nations than to dispense with a fire department if a faulty traffic system prevented the fire engines from getting to the fires on time—or if the fire-fighting equipment itself was inadequate. They would do quickly whatever had to be done to provide effective, prompt fire-fighting protection.

The United Nations provides the only worldwide machinery in existence for resolving otherwise combustible disputes among nations—and for creating a workable system to strengthen the rule of law and order with justice.

How soon the United Nations becomes truly effective in these times will be determined not by what is subtracted from the U.N. but by what is added to it.

The U.N. is still the world's best hope for preventing World War III.

UNITED STATES COMMITTEE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS.
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, ON THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE 16TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, AT A PRESS CONFERENCE AT UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS

Here is the list of achievements of the 16th General Assembly as we see them:

1. Leading the list is the election of U Thant of Burma to act as Secretary General until April 1963, an action taken by the unanimous vote of 103 to 0.

By this historic step the General Assembly overcame a mortal challenge—a challenge to the continuance of the United Nations itself as an executive agent of the community of nations and as a friend and protector of small and weak nations.

Secretary General Thant has made an admirable beginning in his uniquely demanding post. By electing him the United Nations has assured the survival of the United Nations, and therefore the hope for peace on earth.

2. The seat of the Republic of China in the United Nations was safeguarded and reinforced, and the claim of Communist China to this seat was rejected, by a decisive vote of 48 to 37. This was the first direct test of this question since it first arose more than a decade ago.

3. The financial crisis occasioned by the Congo operation has been relieved, and may be on the road toward solution. The General Assembly has taken three important steps in the direction. It has voted, first, to ask the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion as to whether the assessments against member states to support the Congo operation, as well as the United Nations emergency force in the Middle East, create binding financial obligations on the member states. If the court says they are, this should stimulate payment by those now in arrears.

Second, it has further assessed the costs of the Congo operation and a UNEF through next June 30—in support of which the United States will pay its full share.

Third, the Assembly took the step—which has no precedent in United Nations history—of floating a $200 million bond issue to be subscribed by governments and eligible not-for-profit associations, and to be amortized out of the regular budget of the United Nations. This step will relieve the immediate financial difficulties of the United Nations and give us a breathing spell in which to devise a longrun solution.

The next four items on the list are especially important to the United States, not only because of their great bearing on world peace, but also because each of them was the subject of a proposal by President Kennedy in his address of September 25, and of a major initiative by the U.S. delegation at this session.

4. The Assembly laid the basis for new negotiations on disarmament—thus breaking the deadlock which began when the Soviet bloc walked out of the Geneva disarmament talks in June 1960.

5. The Assembly gave great attention to problems of nuclear weapons. It overwhelmingly endorsed the view of the United States and the United Kingdom that there is an urgent need for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons tests under effective international measures of verification and control. It thus clearly rejected the Soviet thesis for general and complete disarmament. This action by the Assembly was helpful in obtaining the resumption of test ban negotiations in Geneva.

6. No less important was the unanimous action of the General Assembly in designating the current decade as the United States had suggested, as the United Nations decade of development. Under this heading the world organization can now make a comprehensive, long-range attack on the needs for economic and social development which beset more than half of the human race. The contributions which the United Nations can make in this field, by its mobilization of talents and resources without any political strings, are of vital importance to this world objective.

7. As a consequence of further bilateral negotiation the Assembly was able to endorse unanimously a new start for the Outer Space Committee with the long-sought participation of the Soviet Union. Further, the Assembly approved the vitally important principle that outer space and the bodies in it are not subject to national appropriation and are subject to international law—including specifically the United Nations Charter. It further endorsed worldwide collaboration in the use of outer space for the advancement of weather forecasting and even weather control, and for worldwide radio and television communications by satellite—two especially promising technical fields from which all nations, whether advanced or underdeveloped, stand to benefit.

8. Three new nations from Africa and one from Asia were admitted into the United Nations as new members: Sierra Leone, Mauritania, Tanganyika, and Outer Mongolia.

9. On the question of the end of colonialism, the Assembly adopted a wise and forthright position reaffirming the goal which virtually all nations now accept, and appointing a committee of 17 nations to concern itself, on behalf of the General Assembly, with this great peaceful transition. In this action the United States was happy to find itself in the company of the great majority of members, with whom our anticolonial history and our contemporary interest give us a natural bond of sympathy.

10. The Assembly again resolutely faced the problem of Korea and the facts of alien Communist oppression of Hungary and Tibet—thereby showing that the United Nations will continue to raise its voice against injustice among nations, whether the Soviet Union objects or not.

11. The Assembly unanimously approved two resolutions for the economic and educational development of Africa. The resolution on education emphasized especially its importance in promoting economic and social progress. Both these resolutions, which were presented by African sponsors, arose from United States initiatives.

12. A world food program of $100 million was approved by the Assembly—a pioneer project proposed by the U.S. delegation, one of whose major aims is to support economic and social development, especially in agriculture. This will be the first multilateral food program in United Nations history. It will be jointly administered by the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization. The United States contribution of 40 percent of the foods used will be an effective addition to our country's own international food program.

13. A number of stubborn colonial or quasi-colonial problems in the non-Communist world received renewed attention from the Assembly—among them the problems of apartheid in South Africa, of the future of the mandated territory of Southwest Africa, of the refusal of Portugal to report to the General Assembly on administration of its colonies. In each of these cases, the Assembly expressed its judgment of the principles of human rights and of international law involved and thereby, we hope, helped to shape an eventual just solution.

14. In a number of very difficult and delicate disputes, notably that between Austria and Italy, and that of the Palestine refugees, we believe the restraint shown by the Assembly was wise and will help to keep the road clear toward eventual solution.

15. The independence and integrity of the Secretariat were decisively upheld. The Assembly repudiated the false notion that the Secretariat should represent equally three supposed "blocs"—Western, neutral, and Communist. It repudiated also the notion that Secretariat officials should reflect the political views of the governments of the countries from which they come.

16. The Assembly voted 99 to 2 to urge Portugal to grant self-determination to Angola—but wisely rejected a more inflammatory resolution on this subject. Significantly, the resolution which failed was put forward by the Soviet bloc; the one adopted was sponsored by 45 Asian and African countries.

17. The Assembly's action on the future of the Belgian Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi was equally wise and responsible. Realizing the vital importance of civil order and security, it rejected a Soviet demand that all Belgian troops be removed from the territory before independence comes next July. Both Belgium and the African countries showed commendable moderation on this issue.

18. In the Congo situation, the moderation of African countries was shown again in January when the Soviet Union demanded in the Security Council that the U.N. act immediately to subdue Katanga by armed force. The Soviets and their Rumanian satellite were the only two Council members voting for this proposal. The two African members, Ghana and the United Arab Republic, refused to go along.

None of these achievements would have been possible without some measure of support—often very solid support—from the countries of Africa and Asia, which now make up nearly half of the membership of the United Nations. The great resolutions of the Assembly require the discovery and definition of common ground between at least a good many of the nations from that part of the world and the rest of us from Europe and the Western Hemisphere.

There is an illusion in some quarters that the so-called Afro-Asian bloc always votes with the Soviet Union against the so-called Western bloc. That is three mistakes in one, since, in the first place, neither the Afro-Asians nor, in the second place, the Western nations vote mechanically as blocs in the United Nations—and as long as each member is free to think for itself they never will.

Furthermore, the record abundantly proves that the members from Africa and Asia have not been afraid to find themselves voting on the same side as the United States; indeed, on great issues they have been doing so very often.

The Soviets do the best they can to pit Africa and Asia against the West, and to side with the Africans and Asians. And one of the great untold stories of the United Nations—a story which I hope will one day be told in full—is the failure of this divisive strategy.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, Feb. 21, 1962]

U.N. BOND ISSUE DESERVES SUPPORT

There is a lot of mail coming into Washington opposing the purchase by the United States of $100 million worth of U.N. bonds. It comes from all sorts of people. Much of it emerges from far right organizations. Some comes from the Ku Klux Klan. The Watch Washington Committee, based in Ohio, has bombarded Congressmen with anti-U.N. mail.

Some voices maintain that the United States should not purchase any bonds until all members of the U.N. have paid their delinquent assessments. Others claim that the U.N. showed poor financial management in letting its working capital drop below its normal level of $25 million to near zero.

All sorts of objections can be raised. Admittedly, the U.N. is imperfect. It has made mistakes. It is, however, a basic essential to the possibility of future peace on earth. To exist side by side, the nations of the world must have a forum where they can debate matters of difference, develop programs for their common good—and authorize international police actions in troubled areas.

On the same day in December that the U.N. General Assembly passed a resolution authorizing the bond issue, it voted to ask the World Court to decide whether special assessments for the U.N. Middle East and Congo operations are expenses of the Organization under its charter. (It is in the levies for these operations that the bulk of the delinquency exists.) If the Court rules that these are official expenses under the charter nations like Russia and the Soviet bloc, which have refused to pay their share of the cost of these special operations, will have to pay up or lose their vote in the General Assembly. A decision on this matter is expected from the World Court this spring.

Meanwhile the U.N. has to have funds in order to go on. Senators ERVIN and JORDAN of North Carolina have shown statesmanship in announcing their intention to support the purchase of the U.N. bonds. Failure of the United States to back the bond issue would mean its defeat. It would strike a heavy blow at the U.N., making it necessary to discontinue the Congo operation just as that nation is beginning to emerge from its long period of chaos. This is what the Russians want.

As the President has pointed out, our investment in the bonds is one-tenth of 1 percent of our annual military budget. As Congress comes closer to a vote on this issue, North Carolina's Senators and Representatives deserve the support of all citizens who have convictions on this matter. This is no time for those who believe in world order to sit back. Fallible though it is, the U.N. is our hope and reliance as an international peace-keeping body. Write today.

[From the Smithfield (N.C.) Herald, Feb. 20, 1962]

OUR SENATORS EXPRESS FAITH IN UNITED NATIONS

Senator EVERETT JORDAN and Senator SAM ERVIN are giving us intelligent and responsible representation in Washington by their support of the President's position on the United Nations bond issue.

A Washington report tells us that there is a hostile flow of mail into the offices of the North Carolina Senators. This is regrettable. If we know what is really good for us and the world, we will show our gratitude to Senators who show their faith in the United Nations at a critical time when many Americans would deliver the international organization to the scrap heap.

The U.N.'s stabilizing operations in the Congo have cost $10 million a month. By the end of 1962 the U.N. expects to have a deficit of $200 million. It asks member nations to subscribe to a $200 million bond issue. The United States, which has 80 percent of the world's income, is asked to subscribe up to half of the bond issue. President Kennedy wants us to accept this $100 million quota. The money would be paid back over a 25-year period with interest.

There is serious opposition to the Kennedy position. Always enemies of the U.N. look for an opportunity to cripple or destroy the organization. Some Americans understandably are irritated by the refusal of Russia to pay its share of the cost of the Congo operation, which it opposed. Other Americans are reluctant to back the bond plan because they think the U.N. had no business intervening in the Congo. Still other Americans cite mistakes made by the U.N. in the Congo.

None of the arguments against buying the bonds, even if we admit they have validity, are sufficient to override the compelling argument in favor of the bond plan. The compelling argument is that the United Nations must be maintained and it must have full U.S. support if it is to survive. Failure to relieve the U.N.'s financial difficulty will seriously endanger the life of the organization.

The U.N. has imperfections. It has made mistakes and will make more mistakes, for imperfect human beings formulate its policies and direct its activities. But the U.N. is indispensable in the quest for world peace.

To refuse to support the President's position on the bond question is to play into the hands of the forces that seek destruction of the United Nations.

[From the Sedalia (Mo.) Capital, Feb. 23, 1962]

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Shall the United States buy the United Nations bonds is one of the main issues before the Congress at this time.

In a recent poll it was established that 85 percent of the American people believe in the United Nations and a large number of them are well informed about its purpose and what it is doing.

The preamble of the United Nations Charter says "To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" and in the short period of its existence, the United Nations has without question prevented war in some areas, and has stopped some conflagrations from developing into worldwide wars.

No one is getting from the United Nations everything he wants, but as one views the bus loads of people who visit the imposing edifice on the East River, he senses that there is an intangible something about the United Nations atmosphere which stimulates the hope of peace.

It is right that the passing of the bond issue should be related to the amount of bonds other nations buy. The United States should not be expected to carry the whole load, but if thoughtful, responsible people do not support it, no amount of political administrative or military skill and strength can save it.

The hope of the race is centered in the United Nations and it must be saved.

[From the Pittsfield (Mass.) Berkshire Eagle, Feb. 8, 1962]

Keeping U.N. Going Worth an Extra Outlay

Critics of the administration's proposal to buy half of the United Nations $200 million emergency bond issue are trying to portray it as an extravagant gesture, very unsound.

Does everyone realize, asks a New York newspaper, that $100 million at 6 percent interest would draw $16,400 a day? Or that an expenditure of $50,000 a year begun in Julius Caesar's time would amount to $100 million today?

Well, as a matter of fact we had not realized these things at all. Actually, they are irrelevant. More to the point, we would think, is the fact that the $100 million represents less than 60 cents for each of this country's 180 million inhabitants. Viewed in that light, the proposal is not extravagant at all.

For look what the 60 cents per capita will buy: An assurance that the United Nations will continue its policing operations in the Congo and the Gaza Strip; and a national pledge of faith in the U.N. as the best peace-preserving organization yet devised. Those returns on the investment make the expenditure of roughly one-thousandth of our national budget seem small potatoes indeed.

It would be better, of course, if the emergency bond issue were not needed, if the Communist-bloc nations and France would pay their full share of U.N. bills for the Congo and Gaza operations. Along with other U.N. supporters like Britain, Canada, and the Scandinavian countries, we are going to be picking up the tab for a bunch of countries that support the U.N. special operation only when it suits their national purposes. For the world organization's good as well as for the U.S. Treasury, it is too bad the need has even arisen.

But arisen it has, and it would be shortsighted not to meet it. Paying that extra $100 million to keep the U.N. solvent is not extravagance. It is sound commonsense.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, Feb. 7, 1962]

The Bond Issue and U.N.'s Fate

It is not exaggeration to say that the fate of the United Nations is in American hands. Congress decision to buy or not to buy U.N. bonds this year carries that much weight.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee began an inquiry yesterday that promises to sharpen the Nation's focus on what the U.N. can and cannot do; on the extent to which it serves the national interest as a principal avenue of foreign policy; on where its money comes from and where the money goes. The evident variety of opinions in Congress indicates the probe will be both thorough and valuable.

Yet the room for the bond decision is narrow in advance. Acting Secretary General U Thant, with American support if not American urging, proposed the $200 million bond issue to clean up bills incurred because a strange assortment of U.N. members refuse to pay their assessed shares of the emergency operations in the Gaza Strip and the Congo. Repayment and service costs on the bonds will become part of the general U.N. budget, assessed by formula and binding. Failure of any member to pay would be an open invitation to the General Assembly to deprive that member of its vote.

The Gaza and Congo operations, it must be noted, are outstanding examples of a world organization acting by majority rule as peace-keeper where national powers could attempt the same function only at the risk of violent clash. In the Congo, criticism can be justified on many grounds, but one can ask what other agency or power could possibly have stepped into that chaotic picture.

If the bond issue fails, these operations fail under financial blackmailing by nations that oppose them but have no better solutions to offer. And if the U.N. is thus undermined in the areas where it has served peace, its effectiveness in all its works is weakened.

We may hear a good deal during the Senate inquiry about U.N. failures in Hungary, Tibet, Goa, and the like; and there is some strong feeling that irresponsible use of the U.N. by immature nations could turn it counter to American interests. These are points worthy of a foreign policy debate, and this is as good a time as any to thresh them out. But the weight of evidence will show that the U.N. so far in its gradual and continuing development has done the United States far more good than harm. For the future, foreign policy is a flexible thing, but the evidence is strong that the United States can continue to use the U.N. without being used by it in the foreseeable future.

The point is that President Kennedy's plan to buy up to half the bonds would save the U.N.'s peace-keeping powers now. It would not necessarily commit this country to anything new. It would help clarify the assessment-paying obligations of all members, particularly in view of the pending World Court ruling on that subject. And it would preserve the Organization for future improvement, for which there is obvious room. Rejection of the bond purchase would be a premature admission that the dream of world organization was a fleeting nightmare. This is not the time for that admission.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Mar. 11, 1962]

U.N. Bonds Are Peace Investment

The public gives signs of being well out in front of Congress in its support of the United Nations. This positive attitude extends also to the proposal that the United States buy $100 million of U.N. bonds to underwrite U.N. peace-keeping operations in the Congo and the Middle East.

Various polls show opinion favorable to the bonds. Why Congress fails to get the message from the public we don't know. Yet the prospect is that the Republicans and some Democrats in the Senate are determined to fight the bond purchase. Its chances in the House are even less bright.

A $200 million fund to pay for the continuation of U.N. peace force is necessary. The General Assembly authorized the bond issue and the United States made a commitment through its delegation to take a share of it. Congress, of course, has the power, through its control of appropriations, to break that commitment. But this would be a tragic blow at the U.N.

And for what good reason? The bonds for which the United States is to subscribe would become a primary obligation of the United Nations, repayable out of the annual dues of the member nations. By this means the Soviet Union and other noncontributors to the Congo and Gaza Strip operations would be obliged to pony up their rightful share of the burden.

In the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week, the $100 million bond-purchase plan narrowly survived on an 8-to-7 vote. It now appears that the Senate's 36 Republicans will favor a substitute plan, possibly the Aiken-Hickenlooper scheme for a straight 2-year emergency loan. The difficulty with this is that it would require getting the General Assembly back into session to authorize it.

Peace has its price. The Senate should be realistic and vote to pay it.

[From the Pasco (Wash.) Columbia Basin News, Mar. 1, 1962]

United States Must Continue Support of United Nations

In view of Soviet reluctance to pay its share of United Nations dues and costs, should the United States agree to purchase $100 million in U.N. bonds to bail the world organization out of financial difficulty?

If the United States is to foster hopes that the U.N. ever will become an effective instrument of peace, it can hardly do otherwise. However, we would attach a rider to this authorization—that any nation not contributing its full share to the U.N. should lose its vote in the organization.

The U.N. charter calls for loss of voting powers for any nation delinquent in payment of dues beyond a certain period. But no provision is made for refusal to pay special assessments.

The Soviet Union is far behind in payment of both its dues and special assessments. The Russians refuse to contribute to the special operation in the Congo and have neglected to help support the emergency U.N. force guarding the Gaza-Israel frontier.

France, Belgium and other nations also have refused to pay their share of the Congo and other U.N. actions. As a result, the U.S. paid almost half of the amount needed in the Congo and more than 40 percent of the funds necessary to sustain the Gaza-Israel force. This country already is paying almost a third of the regular U.N. operation.

It is quite apparent that other nations, particularly the Soviet Union, must be held accountable for their lack of participation. The United Nations is not an American function; it is one which would be participated in equally by all nations in accordance with ability to pay.

For this reason a U.N. resolution stripping the voting powers of delinquent nations is in order. This probably would bring the Soviet government into the picture quicker than any other action.

But the overriding consideration is not the emergency $100 million the U.S. is asked to throw into the U.N. kitty. This is a ridiculously small amount when confronted with the potential good the U.N. could achieve as a world forum in which conflicts could be aired and perhaps resolved.

Opponents of the bond purchase may be expecting to much of the U.N. Though we have high hopes for the U.N., it is not, after all, a cure-all for world problems. Nor was it ever intended as such. For all of its troubles and lack of cooperation, however, it has achieved some important successes.

Certainly the United Nations has been effective enough to cause the Soviet Union to work hard for its demise, and this alone is a strong argument for sustaining it even though this may cause a disproportionate transfusion of American dollars.

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Journal and Guide, Feb. 10, 1962]

United Nations Bond Issue Is Vital

Not even the most ardent supporters of the United Nations, and of full U.S. participation in it, are enthusiastic about the plan to issue bonds to support peace forces in the Congo and the Middle East. The plan is conceded to be merely the lesser of two evils. It is a means of preventing the United Nations from being severely crippled by the failure of many nations to pay their assessments.

It is when one contemplates the greater of the two evils that the bond plan appears not only sensible but vitally necessary. If nations of good will decline to purchase the proposed $200 million bond issue, they will be in effect placing the United Nations at the mercy of selfish national interests.

Member countries not in sympathy with activities of United Nations forces have balked at paying their share of the expense. If they get away with it—that is, if the bond issue cannot be used to continue those activities—a most unfortunate precedent will have been established. Thenceforth, any nation that disapproved of United Nations undertakings in this or that area could help to thwart them merely by refusing to pay up.

It is important that Americans understand this. It is important that, even though they are displeased with the need to float the U.N. bond issue, they see it as a thing that must be done to keep the world body viable. It is important that they give their support to U.S. purchase of $100 million worth of bonds, as recommended by President Kennedy. Galling as it may be to have to bail out the U.N. because Russia and other members have withheld their payments, it would be even more disturbing to see the U.N. become ineffective.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Tribune, Feb. 6, 1962]

THOSE U.N. BONDS—A CRUCIAL ISSUE

Congressmen and other leaders of public opinion will have a strong obligation to resist the temptation of demagoguery or distortion as Congress considers a bond issue to restore the United Nations to financial stability.

Enemies of the U.N. who have consistently opposed America's involvement in world affairs through an international organization naturally will fight President Kennedy's request that the United States buy a large share of the bonds. These chronic foes of the U.N. will not prevail, however, unless the basic issues are distorted during the debate so that fair-weather friends of the U.N. find it easier to condemn than to explain.

The relevant facts are fairly simple, but there are more of them than ordinary citizens like to remember. Yet, public inattention to the details of this critically important proposal could pave the way for demagoguery which might cripple the U.N. almost fatally.

Citizens should bear in mind, first, that the financial crisis afflicting the U.N. has nothing to do with regular U.N. activities. These regular expenses are borne by all U.N. members on the basis of charges allotted to each. The United States, for example, paid $22.3 million in 1961 of those normal U.N. expenses, or 32.5 percent of the $72.7-million total. Some other nations were slow in paying their shares, and a few small nations have difficulty every year in paying their U.N. bills promptly. But no U.N. member nation objects in principle to paying its regular "dues."

The difficulty arises because some nations, notably in the Communist block, have refused to pay their share of the special costs involved in extraordinary peacemaking operations of the U.N. These nations argue that they should not have to pay for U.N. intervention to keep the peace in any war-threatened area unless they agree with the U.N. actions and policies there. In other words, they want to use the U.N. as an instrument of their own national policies, and refuse to pay their share of the costs unless the U.N. thus serves their own purposes.

This point of view has been advanced occasionally in the United States—usually by those anxious for the United States to drop its U.N. membership or to limit the U.N. to a debating society role. These critics in the United States pounced vigorously upon the U.N. role in the Congo, for example, when the peacemaking efforts there were going badly. They have been notably quieter since the central government has shown more stability week by week, whereas the anti-Communist leadership of the secessionist Katanga province demonstrated repeatedly again that its word is worthless and its troops are undisciplined, murderous mobs.

Even in times of stress, however, the steadfast foes and the fainthearted friends of the U.N. in the United States usually do not put financial teeth in their demands that the United States shall have the right to dictate U.N. policy in any intervention. That has been the position, however, of Russia and other Communist powers. It has been the position occasionally of other nations. The Arabs refused to pay their share of the 1957 U.N. mission to keep the Gaza Strip confrontation from exploding into global war. Belgium and France have refused to pay their share of the costs of U.N. intervention in the Congo.

* * * * *

The General Assembly of the U.N. already has voted to ask the International Court of Justice to rule whether the assessments levied to finance the peace-keeping activities in the Middle East and the Congo create obligations upon members, under the U.N. Charter, which all members are required to pay. The United States contends there is such an obligation. When the Court rules, that question will be decided. Some of the member nations may decide to defy the Court's ruling, of course, but that bridge should not be crossed until it is reached.

The General Assembly's call for a judicial decision was one of three actions it took to cope with U.N. financial dilemma. It also voted new appropriations, assessed against all members, to carry the peace-keeping projects through June of this year. This was to provide time for member governments to consider the third and major step.

The big step, of course, was to ask member governments to buy $200 million worth of U.N. bonds, repayable at 2-percent interest over a 25-year period. Repayments will be made out of regular budgets at the rate of $10 million per year.

President Kennedy has asked Congress to budget funds to enable the United States to buy up to $100 million of these bonds.

The bond issue will not relieve any nation of the obligation of paying its share of U.N. expenses. Actually, by spreading out the costs of the special peace-keeping missions over a 25-year period and repaying them out of regular U.N. budgets, the bonding procedure will reduce the U.S. share of these special mission costs. The United States now is paying 47½ percent of the cost of the Middle East and Congo missions. Under the bond arrangement, the U.S. share would be the regular U.S. assessment scale of 32 percent.

These bonds, to be sure, would not be adequate to cover the costs of future U.N. intervention actions on a major scale to keep peace in the world. But they would keep the U.N. solvent and in a position to grow toward new responsibilities. The area of U.N. action has been expanding steadily beyond the mere debating society phase. As U.N. forces—sometimes only a handful of mediators—have stopped incipient great-power wars at one trouble spot after another, the role of the U.N. has grown larger in the minds of men. The need for a world police force equipped and authorized to keep the peace has become more apparent year by year in this era of revolutionary change. And the U.N. success in that role, even though it has been critically handicapped by charter limitations and financial shortages, has shown all but the most stubbornly blind that the family of nations can keep the peace.

The future peacemaking power of the U.N. is directly and critically involved in the bonding proposal. The United States will throw away a generation of struggle toward a better international order unless Congress votes to do its share.—B.J.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Feb. 19, 1962]

IF WE ABANDON U.N., REDS WOULD BE HAPPY

President Kennedy has asked Congress for authorization to buy half of the U.N.'s $200 million emergency bond issue. Since the United States already has been paying about 50 percent of the cost of the Gaza strip and Congo police forces, it would as a practical matter serve to reduce our contributions.

There is, of course, resentment that the Soviet Union and its satellites have refused to pay their assessments for Gaza and the Congo and that France and the Arab States have reneged on some of their obligations. There is a strong vocal movement in this country, too, against our support of efforts to bring peace to the Congo.

We cannot force the Russians nor the other reluctant U.N. members to change their policies. But if we abandon the U.N. through lack of support and faith in what it stands for, the Soviets would have achieved a major effort—to destroy the U.N. itself or to reduce it to an agency it can control.

Three Scandinavian states have offered to buy $10.1 million of the bonds, the United Kingdom has pledged $12 million, and Canada $6.2 million. Surely the U.S. Congress will do its part to prevent a U.N. collapse.

[From the Keene (N.H.) Sentinel, Mar. 1, 1962]

U.N. BONDS

It is unfortunate that so many people, especially political leaders, take a negative stand on an issue before they really know what it's all about.

The United Nations bond issue is a current example.

The U.N. is in financial difficulty, and the 16th General Assembly authorized the Secretary General to issue $200 million worth of bonds, to be payable in 25 years. In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy said he would ask Congress to buy half of the bonds.

The President said: "This is clearly in our interest. It will not only keep the United Nations solvent, but also require all voting members to pay their fair share of its activities Our share of special operations has long been much higher than our share of the annual assessment—and the bond issue will in effect reduce our disproportionate obligation. And for these reasons, I am urging Congress to approve our participation."

What is the bond issue all about? Why is the U.N. in trouble financially? Why is it to our advantage, as the President said, to help keep the organization in good financial health?

The American Association for the United Nations, comprised of Americans of the highest character, has assembled the basic facts for the American public. It is of the utmost importance that those facts be widely circulated.

The U.N. budget is divided into three parts. The first contains the regular budget, which covers the expenses of the staff, the cost of the General Assembly and the three Councils, and the regular program. All member nations have, up to now, paid their assessments to meet this budget.

The second part of the budget consists of voluntary contributions. At a pledging conference last fall, 86 governments—including some underdeveloped countries—volunteered a total of about $100 million for a technical assistance program which operates around the world.

The third part of the U.N. budget is where the financial trouble lies. This is the cost of two emergency operations.

One operation is the maintenance of the U.N. forces in the Gaza Strip and the Sharm el Sheikh area to keep peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors. The other is the U.N. operation in the Congo, which, of course, is the greatest source of difficulty.

It is in assessing the emergency expenses of the Congo that a controversy arises between those who feel the assessments are not binding on the nations that do not want to pay, and those who feel that they are just as binding as the regular budget assessments because the actions that caused the expenses were voted by the Security Council or the General Assembly.

The bonds are designed to raise the money required to maintain these two peace-keeping operations.

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, Feb. 19, 1962]

U.S. PURCHASE OF U.N. BONDS MEANS AN INVESTMENT IN PEACE

If we were investment brokers, we wouldn't recommend that you buy a United Nations bond as a gilt-edged security. But the bonds are not up for sale to individuals—just to nations and maybe some nonprofit organizations. And whether it is wise for the United States to buy $100 million worth of the U.N. bonds, as proposed by President Kennedy, is quite another question.

The proposed U.S. share is one-half of the total of 25-year bonds at 2 percent interest to be issued by the U.N. They will be used to pay for special U.N. peace-keeping operations in the Middle East, where U.N. soldiers are a barrier between Egypt and Israel, and in the Congo.

This unusual method of financing was chosen because some U.N. members, including Russia and France, refuse to pay anything toward the $140 million annual cost of these operations. Many other members are in arrears.

The U.N. faced either bankruptcy or abandonment of its peacekeeping in Africa. It chose to borrow in order to keep U.N. soldiers on their Congo and Middle East patrols.

Opponents of the administration's bond issue request, in and out of Congress, advance this argument, in substance:

The bonds are a bad investment. If the U.N. can't pay its regular expenses, how can it hope to redeem bonds? Further, the U.N. Charter requires members to meet their financial obligations or lose their voting rights. That penalty should be invoked rather than asking Uncle Sam to make up others' defaults.

Anyway, opponents argue, the requested U.S. share is too high. The United States pays 32 percent of the regular U.N. budget, which is too much. Why should it take on 50 percent of the bond issue? And why don't other nations do more?

Besides, opponents continue, what good is the U.N. to the United States anyway? It is increasingly influenced by a bewildering variety of small African and Asian nations which too often vote with the Communists. The Congo operation is a mess, of little value to the United States.

Proponents of the bond-buying request reply in this fashion:

U.N. members, including Russia, do pay their share of the regular budget. Those in arrears aren't far enough behind to endanger their voting rights. But some nations opposed to the special U.N. operations in Africa insist they are not obligated by the charter to pay for this kind of U.N. project. That question is now before the World Court for a ruling.

Meanwhile, proponents argue, it is in America's interest to keep the U.N.'s Middle East and Congo patrols. For all their problems, they prevent the possibility of little wars becoming big ones, involving the United States and Russia with their nuclear weapons. They also serve as a shield against Communist takeover in these areas, particularly in the Congo.

The United States has been paying outright grants of nearly 50 percent of the cost of the U.N. peacekeeping operations. The bonds will be repaid from the regular budget, where Russia and others can't welsh on payments without risking loss of voting rights. Thus the United States will get back some 68 cents on each dollar it puts into U.N. bonds. If it had to keep bailing out the U.N. special operations with regular appropriations, as now, it would get no repayment.

The U.N.'s credit has been good, it is argued, as proved by its continuing repayment of a 1948 U.S. loan of $65 million to build the U.N. headquarters in New York. And if the U.N. goes out of business during the 25-year term of the bond issue, it will probably happen in the course of a nuclear war that will destroy most human wealth and civilization as we know it.

Finally, proponents contend, the United States is still making out well in the U.N. Red China has been kept out. Anti-U.S. resolutions from Cuba and elsewhere have been consistently beaten. The U.N. is certainly no cure-all, but it has much usefulness to U.S. foreign policy and it does much to preserve peace.

On balance, it seems to us that Congress has little choice but to go along with the President's request to buy $100 million in bonds, or at least a substantial portion of that sum. Many other countries are doing their part, some more than is proposed for the United States in proportion to national wealth. The United States should join them.

The alternative to the U.N. bond issue—as the alternative to the U.N. itself—could well be a greater risk of war and a big step-up in U.S. defense spending. This would end up costing the United States far more than the $100 million bond purchase asked to keep the U.N.'s peace dove flying.

[From the Waterloo (Iowa) Courier, Feb. 26, 1962]

BONDS ONLY WAY TO STABILIZE U.N. FINANCING

Criticism of the proposal that the United States should buy half of an emergency $200 million United Nations bond issue is usually based on the argument that the United States has already paid more than its fair share of U.N. costs.

It is true that the United States has paid more than its fair share. This country is currently paying 32.02 percent of the regular budget of the world organization. But the military operations in the Middle East and in the Congo are twice as costly as the regular budget. The United States has not only been paying its special assessments for these two projects but has also made large voluntary contributions to prevent the peace-keeping programs from collapsing. The U.S. contribution has equaled about 46 percent of the Middle East operation through this year and about 48 percent of the Congo military operation. In addition, the United States has paid about 39 percent of economic aid to the Congo.

So those who say the United States is paying more than it should have a good argument. What the critics fail to mention, however, is that the bond issue proposal represents the only possible way to reduce the American contributions to the regular 32 percent level. For the cost of repaying the bonds will be added to the regular assessments of U.N. members; and members who do not pay these assessments for 2 years lose their vote in the General Assembly. While Congress may wish to await a ruling of the International Court of Justice on this latter point, the bond issue represents the only possible way to put U.N. financing on a compulsory payment basis.

If France, Russia, or any other nation refuses to pay the regular assessments which include the bond repayment costs, then they would in effect be withdrawing from the U.N. And, in that case, their departure would be no great loss since they would be demonstrating no support for the principles on which the U.N. is founded. Moreover, if the troublemakers depart, it might be possible to amend the charter in such a way as to correct the defects which have been demonstrated since the organization was founded in 1946.

The United Nations at the end of 1961 had $113.9 million of debt, of which $30.3 million was owed to the United States, mostly for airlift operations in connection with the Congo. The $200 million bond issue will not be used to pay off this debt—that will be collectible from unpaid special assessments. But it will keep the peacemaking programs in operation and assure that future costs will be fairly paid by all members.

The alternatives, therefore, are to sell the bond issue or permit the United Nations to collapse.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer-Press, Feb. 23, 1962]

A NEEDED TRANSFUSION

Four Scandinavian countries and Great Britain already have committed themselves to purchase about 12 percent of the total issue of United Nations bonds.

Finland was the latest nation to pledge purchase of U.N. bonds. She has committed herself to nearly $1.5 million to help the international organization meet its financial obligations. This is twice Finland's assessed share of the regular U.N. budget.

Others who have pledged themselves to buy the bonds include Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. Together, the five nations will buy some $23.6 million worth.

President Kennedy has urged that the United States buy $100 million in U.N. bonds to help the U.N. solve its money crisis made acute by emergency actions in the Near East and the Congo. The request is now before Congress and deserves speedy action.

The U.N. is not a perfect organization. It has not lived up to all the high expectations many had of it when it was first organized—primarily because those expectations were based on the erroneous assumption that Russia would cooperate in all U.N. agencies and operations as she had cooperated with the West during World War II. This Russian failure plus the expansion of membership has changed the complexion of the U.N. But its basic purpose remains—to preserve the peace of the world. That it has done. It should be allowed to continue its efforts without the danger of dying of economic anemia—a disease the U.S.S.R. is doing all in its power to spread.

Five close friends of the United States already have offered to give a monetary transfusion to save the world Organization. The United States can do no less.

[From the Anderson (Ind.) Bulletin, Feb. 23, 1962]

THE LESSER EVILS

Many specific administration foreign and defense policies evidently are judged even by their makers and defenders as markedly imperfect in their service to the total national need.

Though perhaps without particular intent, President Kennedy in answering press conference questions underscores again and again what might be termed the partial undesirability of several key policies. He candidly ticks off their flaws.

Yet in virtually every instance he concludes that these policies must be pursued because: the alternative is worse.

Some principal examples he stresses:

This country prepares to resume atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons.

Since this means contamination of the air, Kennedy says no security for humanity can come from such tests. But he believes the danger to human beings must be even greater if we were, through inaction, to allow the Soviet Union to develop a nuclear antimissile missile which could nullify our deterrent power.

The United States keeps pursuing largely fruitless talks with the Russians over Berlin because, in the President's view, to halt them would be to announce the failure of negotiation in a perilous trouble spot.

The administration backs U.S. purchase of $100 million in United Nations bonds because, even though other nations are not bearing their share of U.N. expense, our refusal to carry this burden would see the "cause of freedom collapse in a whole variety of ways."

By the same token, the President says, we continue heavy outlays of foreign assistance to Asia, Africa and Latin America despite the fact we are economically strained by this effort. The alternative—little or no aid—would in his judgment open wide areas of the globe to the advance of communism.

In an ideal world, everybody would pay his U.N. bills, our Western European friends would contribute mightily to boosting the underdeveloped nations, the Russians would talk turkey on Berlin and would not prepare secretly for crucial nuclear tests in the atmosphere.

But since these circumstances do not exist, we have to deal with the frustrating realities.

Certainly this administration has no patent on effective ways of meeting these problems.

Still, those who believe they have better plans must either show persuasively how they would avoid dire alternatives—or try the nearly impossible task of suggesting that the alternatives posed by the Communist threat are not so grave as they seem.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want to compliment the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for a very fine, clear presentation, and I particularly wish to comment upon the part of the speech that dealt with the United Nations as a functioning organization, because I believe many persons overlook many of the relationships of the United States to and within that organization.

I was glad the Senator brought out the point that never in the years of its existence has a key decision of the United Nations gone against the United States. Did the Senator say that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did. It is a matter of historical record. It is an amazing record in light of the changes that have taken place in the United Nations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. When the United Nations started in October of 1945 there were 50 nations in it. Today there are 104 nations in it, and a great many of them have come into the United Nations within only the last couple of years.

I think the Senator stated in his remarks that we were concerned that some of the nations were really not prepared for self-government or for membership in the United Nations. Naturally, we were afraid of what they might do. I believe a great many persons throughout the country are laboring under the illusion that those new countries have been unfriendly to the United States. That certainly has not been borne out by the record in the United Nations; has it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. Thirty-nine nations, I believe, have come into the United Nations since 1946, in the postwar period.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator means nations that have recently become independent, I believe.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. More than that number have come into the United Nations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; 31 new nations that have recently come into independence have joined the United Nations. We were concerned, and justly so, as to whether some of those nations might be prepared to fulfill their responsibilities. Lo and behold, we have been able to work with them perfectly, and we have not suffered at the hand of the so-called Afro-Asian bloc. We have not been mistreated. We have had disagreements with them, but we have also had disagreements with our best and oldest friends over the Near East.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We advocated the United Nations moving into the Near East against our oldest allies, Britain and France, as well as Israel, the country which we were largely responsible for establishing. We were the first nation to recognize the new government of Israel when it was established. Yet when the time came that a moral principle was involved we moved against our allies. That was during the Eisenhower administration, as the Senator will recall.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Returning to the question of new nations, the Senator will remember that at the beginning of the last session of the General Assembly we were quite excited and alarmed over the prospects of admission of Communist China to the United Nations. The Senator will remember, first of all, our strategy was to get the question declared an important matter so that it would require a two-thirds vote to approve admission. We felt we had to do that because the majority of the nations would vote for admission. As a matter of fact, when the vote came, a majority voted with us, and less than a majority voted for the admission. A majority of the new Afro-Asian nations voted with the United States.

That was probably the key vote in the last session of the General Assembly. Was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It surely was. It was a vital vote to us. We were able to come through victorious.

Another vital issue was the question of nuclear testing and international inspection. The vote was 71 to 11 in favor of our position.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator knows that on the vote on the resolution providing for the issuance of bonds only 13 nations voted against it, and the Senator will recall that 10 of those nations consisted of Russia and her satellites, the 11th was Cuba, and 2 other nations had individual reasons for voting against it, Belgium because of the Congo mess and France because of the Near East operation. But the body of the opposition came from the Communist world. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator knows that the Communist nations have been the leaders among those who have refused to pay the expenses for the peace and security operations. The Senator will also recall, what a great many persons overlook, and I think it is something we ought to keep in mind with reference to the Congo operation, that President Kennedy stated in a news conference, I believe, at least he stated, that it was a difficult decision to back up the U.N. in the Congo operations when Katanga, and our friend Belgium, and Tshombe, who was a friend, were all concerned in it. Nevertheless, he felt it was the right decision because the Government of the Congo, the one Adoula heads now, was the government that was established by the conference which met at Brussels, and which was made up of representatives of the countries of the Belgium Congo and Belgium; and Tshombe was a member of that conference. Katanga had representatives in that conference, and they agreed to the decision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that immediately upon the Congo being declared independent, Russia moved in with full force?

Mr. HUMPHREY. She did. She sent in her technicians and agents.

Mr. SPARKMAN. She established an embassy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of unusual size.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And brought in planes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was the U.N. moving into the Congo that pushed Russia out.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And the Government of the Congo ordered the Soviets out of the country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, and they left.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Since that time the Congo has been moving, slowly at times, but certainly gradually, toward the establishment of a democratic government; and it has been the Congo operation which has created the major portion of the debt with which the the U.N. is plagued. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota on his very fine presentation, and I was going to say very fine defense, but I do not know that the United Nations needs defense. As the Senator pointed out, 80 percent of the people of this country, when quizzed in a Gallup poll, said they were in favor of keeping a vigorous United Nations. That sentiment came from every State and every section of the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is right. There was complete support from every section of the country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I deeply appreciate the words of the Senator from Alabama. He sponsored the resolution that was sent here by the administration for the U.N. bond issue, and held hearings in the committee.

I believe the Senator from Alabama sat through every hour and every minute of the hearings. They were exhaustive. They were extensive. I believe as a result of the hearings we learned a great deal about the U.N. operations. The hearings were very helpful to the members of the committee. I hope they were helpful to the Senate.

It is my view that the work of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], of the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], of the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]—and there may have been others who were primarily responsible for the amendment in the nature of a substitute—has produced a very workable, a very fair, and a very helpful proposal.

If the proposal can be passed—and I know it will be—it will permit the President of the United States a wide latitude in the use of the funds, yet it will lay down guidelines insofar as the future financing of the United Nations is concerned, as well as with respect to U.S. participation in the United Nations.

I believe this will give to the President of the United States a lever with which to bring a little more pressure to bear for a more orderly financial structure in the United Nations. At the same time, it will permit the President to fulfill the United Nations resolution of December 20, 1961.

We are indebted to the Senator from Alabama particularly for his careful attention to these problems and for the amendment in the nature of a substitute. I want the public to know of his good work.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota.

I should like to bring up one other point. I notice the Senator referred to the original resolution, which I introduced on January 30.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We gave notice immediately as to hearings. I do not remember the exact date on which the hearings started. The hearings started, I believe, either the day Ambassador Stevenson testified, or the day before. It was approximately February 7 or 8.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The hearings started February 6.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We gave notice of hearings. The hearings lasted more than a month. I remember that we even had to recess for the observance of Lincoln's birthday. We conducted hearings for a month. They were advertised freely. We made announcements in the RECORD. We made announcements. The newspapers carried stories. We invited anyone who wished to be heard to get in touch with the committee. We told everyone exactly how to address the committee in order to be heard.

Is the Senator aware of the fact that despite all that publicity and despite the fact that there were dozens of witnesses who asked to be heard, only one person out of the dozens or even scores spoke in opposition? There was no other, more than the one gentleman who appeared and asked to be heard in opposition. We threw the doors wide open. We invited anybody and everybody who wished to be heard to come. Only one man was heard in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not recall that, but now that the Senator refreshes my memory, I remember we commented about it in the executive sessions of the committee. The Senator did not take note of the fact that the committee sat in executive session on the resolution for days.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. The committee reported it on March 13.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; it had a great deal of consideration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There were 5 or 6 weeks, all told, of hearings and executive sessions for the consideration of the resolution. During all of that time, up until the executive session started, the record was open, yet only one person spoke in opposition.

I think it is well to keep in mind that one of those who gave approval to the proposal was a man whom I consider to be perhaps the outstanding expert in international governmental finances, Mr. Eugene Black, the President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation. He has done fine work with those agencies. The great success he has made certainly holds him up as an outstanding witness. He helped to work out the plan. He told us in a letter that he thought it was the best plan.

I believe the Senator from Minnesota mentioned the fact that a man who served for 8 years as our principal delegate at the United Nations during the administration of President Eisenhower, who also served as a delegate with me in 1950 at the United Nations and was a member of the Fifth Committee, the one which handles finances, wrote us a letter. I refer to Henry Cabot Lodge, a former Member of the Senate and former member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. In that letter he very highly praised the program the General Assembly had approved.

We likewise had a personal appearance by James Wadsworth, generally known as Jerry Wadsworth, who likewise served 8 years at the United Nations.

There were other outstanding witnesses, who certainly knew of what they were talking. Every one of them, with the exception of the one gentleman who said he was representing himself and not an organization—speaking his own mind—was in favor of the bond issue and in favor of U.S. participation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for calling these matters to our attention. The hearings surely did bring out a tremendous body of support for the bond issue, and also some very helpful information on the positive activities of the United Nations, as well as some of its limitations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thought the statement by Ambassador Stevenson as to the workings of the United Nations was one of the finest presentations the committee heard. He did not deal with the technical parts of the bond issue, but instead with the workings of the United Nations and the position of the United States in it. I was delighted that the Senator included excerpts from that statement in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that the address by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball at a foreign policy briefing conference in Washington, D.C., March 26, 1962, entitled "The U.N. and the Real World," may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.N. AND THE REAL WORLD

(Address by the Honorable George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, Department of State Foreign Policy Briefing Conference, Washington, D.C., March 26, 1962)

Statesmen, journalists, pundits, and politicians are fond of reminding us that these are times of rapid change and vast transformation in human affairs. It is well that they do, for the pace and pervasiveness of scientific, political, and social change have given a special character to the postwar world.

Yet it is not enough to recognize, as a general proposition, that change is taking place. We must define the direction of that change if we are to adjust our attitudes and policies to the shifting requirements of the times. For as the world changes, our conventional wisdom is called into question; inherited doctrine becomes obsolete; and human institutions perforce take on new forms and new functions: It requires all the perception and imagination we can muster, and then some, if we are to know even imprecisely what we are doing or where we are going.

This morning I want to talk with you about what we are doing and where we are going with one of the most ambitious and misunderstood of our postwar institutions: the United Nations.

I refer to the United Nations as misunderstood because the current discussion of the effectiveness and utility of that institution displays a wide area of difference as to its purposes and objectives. If one would look back to San Francisco in 1945 when the charter was being drafted and then look at the world today, the reason for this misunderstanding becomes apparent. The assumption—or at least the hope—that inspired the drafters of that noble document was that the great powers, allied in World War II, would be able to live in relative harmony and together police the postwar world. They could settle whatever differences arose among them within the forum of the Security Council.

As we know all too well, the effort to fashion one world with one treaty hardly lasted through the First General Assembly. The Soviet Union joined the United Nations in name only. Over the next 4 years the Iron Curtain slammed down to form a cage around one-third of the world's population, living on a great land mass that stretches from the Brandenburg Gate to the Yellow Sea.

The United Nations was thus frustrated in its original objective of serving as a forum for reconciling differences among the great powers. This has not, however, destroyed its usefulness, indeed its indispensability.

Instead the United Nations has found its postwar destiny in quite different and enormously effective endeavors.

That is why I thought it might be useful, in the few moments we have together this morning, to describe the major role that the United Nations has in fact played in this turbulent postwar decade and a half, and to suggest how the United Nations fits into the whole of American diplomacy.

II

The brief moment of time—less than a generation—since the end of the World War II has seen the world transformed. If one-third of the world population has been encircled by the Iron Curtain, in this brief period another one-third has made the eventful passage from colonial status to some form of national independence. Almost 50 new states have come into being; a dozen more are actively in the making.

Such a revolutionary movement on a worldwide scale has no precedent. The great changes of the past have taken place only over centuries; the sudden denouement of the 20th century anticolonial revolution has been compressed in a mere 15 years.

The breakup of the European empires meant the collapse of a longstanding system of world order. It meant the sudden rupture of old ties, the sudden emergence of new states, the sudden liberation of a billion people from colonial dependence. The world has never known a comparable political convulsion, so abruptly begun, so quickly concluded.

Even under the best of circumstances one could well have expected this to be a period of violent conflict, chaos, and vast bloodletting. But the collapse of the European empires did not take place in the best of circumstances—almost in the worst. For it took place in a world polarized between the great powers of East and West, where the Sino-Soviet bloc had everything to gain by the vigorous promotion of chaos.

The Communists tried hard to exploit the turmoil implicit in rapid change. They sought to capture and divert the nationalist revolutions into Communist channels. They did their best to turn political instability into political collapse, to rub salt into the wounds of racial antagonisms, to fan jealousies between the poor and the rich, to exploit the inexperience of the new governments, to capitalize on economic misery and to heighten tensions between new states and their neighbors wherever they existed.

In retrospect, of course, it seems extraordinary that, since the Red Chinese takeover in 1949, the Iron Curtain countries have failed in almost all their efforts to convert nationalist revolutions into Communist revolutions. In spite of the extension of the Communist conspiracy through highly organized local party organizations, in spite of the disruptive force of violent change, in spite of the political inexperience of the leaders of the new countries and the natural antagonisms between the new countries and their former colonial overlords, the greatest political upheaval of all time has still taken place within a fantastically short time span, with amazing smoothness and good will and with a surprising lack of bloodshed.

In this great process of change the interests of the great powers were at all times deeply involved. Lurking in the background of political changes all over the world was the disturbing question of relative big power advantage. Because of this the world has lived in constant danger that a jungle war in southeast Asia or a tribal conflict in the heart of Africa could become the occasion for a great power confrontation, and that what began as a brush fire could be fanned into a nuclear holocaust.

Yet this has not happened. Except in Korea, the direct confrontation of great-power troops has been averted.

This, it seems to me, suggests quite clearly one of the major roles of the United Nations. Unable to bring the great powers together, it has played a decisive role in keeping them apart. And all the while it has served as overseer of the vast and for the most part nationalist transformations which have been taking place all over the world.

In appraising the success of the United Nations, in appraising its usefulness to the United States, I think it is this standard of judgment that we should employ: How effectively has it facilitated the peaceful revision of the relations between the billion colonial peoples largely in the Southern Hemisphere and the billion economically advanced peoples in the Northern Hemisphere in the face of constant efforts of subversion and interference from the Communist powers that control the billion people behind the Iron Curtain?

III

One of the most frequently heard complaints against the United Nations is that it has precipitated change at too rapid a pace. By providing each emergent new state a voice equal to that of a great power, it is said, the United Nations has given an excessive impetus to the breakup of colonialism. As the new nations have gained in numbers and thus in votes in the General Assembly of the U.N., they have mounted pressures that have forced the colonial powers to move beyond the speed limits set by prudence. As a result independence has been conferred upon peoples unprepared for the complex tasks of nation building.

Evidence can be marshaled to support this thesis. Examples can be cited of nations born prematurely, nations lacking the educated elite to operate the difficult business of government, nations illogically conceived, with national boundaries that have little rational meaning either in ethnic or economic terms.

But, on the other side, there are powerful arguments for maintaining the momentum of change. When the world is faced with a convulsion so profound as the ending of colonialism, it is well to get the process just as quickly as it can be done peacefully. A great political and social revolution of this kind cannot be achieved without major adjustments, and in a world where half of the dependent peoples have achieved independence the lot of the other half must become increasingly irksome. Under such circumstances a long deferment of their own independence is likely to produce frustrations and bitterness that will impede and complicate their ultimate accommodation to the environment of free nations.

It must be recognized, of course, that the colonial era is not yet finally completed. There is still substantial unfinished business to be done. In the areas of Africa where many Europeans have made their homes, there remains the task of reconciling the rights of white minorities with the rights and aspirations of African majorities. The troublesome problem remains, moreover, of how to deal with the bits and pieces of former colonial systems—fragments that are themselves so small as not to fit neatly into the pattern of new nation states. There are altogether about 50 fragments of this kind. We ourselves are the administering power for several groups of Pacific islands under a United Nations trusteeship. We are seeking to devise appropriate long-term arrangements for these areas that will permit the maximum of opportunity for the peoples involved.

Yet if the colonial era is not concluded it is well on the way toward being so. The vast bulk of the population formerly under colonial rule has now achieved self-government. Certainly for the major powers of the West colonialism is largely a matter of history. With good luck the cease-fire in Algeria can mark another finished page.

By and large the major European powers—which are our natural partners in most of our activities—have either seen the transformation of their former colonial possessions into sovereign states or are in the process of doing so.

This has created difficult problems for them, but, for the most part, these problems have been met and solved more easily than had been anticipated. In spite of fears that the loss of colonies might enfeeble the colonial powers, this has not proved to be true. In fact one can say without being fanciful that, just as the shattering of their colonial systems—like the fission of the atom—has unleashed fierce energies, the former colonial powers, the great powers of Western Europe, are themselves generating vast forces, not through fissions but through the fusion of their economies in the European Common Market. In ceasing to think of themselves as the centers of individual colonial systems they have found a common destiny as Europeans. In undertaking the business of building a united Europe they have already developed a new prosperity, a new purpose, and the beginnings of a new relationship with the new nations carved out of their old empires.

We ourselves have a direct interest in the completion of the decolonization process, for, as colonialism becomes a dead issue between the peoples of the less developed countries and the major powers of Western Europe, the free world as a whole should become increasingly cohesive. President Kennedy has described the 1960's as a decade of development. Certainly the major powers of the West must devote themselves intensively over the next few years to assisting the newly emerging countries toward a level of political and economic independence that will enable them to play a constructive role in the family of nations.

In this endeavor it is essential that the major Western Powers be able to work closely together, just as they work closely together in resisting threatened aggression from the Communist bloc. In the past, however, the existence of colonialism has often proved an impediment to common actions or policies among the Western Powers. With its passing we should be able to look forward to a further and freer development of the Atlantic partnership, which is, after all, the hard core of free world strength.

IV

For most of the colonial peoples the end of the colonial ordeal marks the start of a new process, the conversion of nationalism into nationhood. Sovereignty is sometimes a heady wine. It encourages exuberant voices and sometimes irrelevant argument. But perhaps this is a function of growing up, a normal aspect of the transformation from dependent status to independence. Let us remember that we were ourselves a young, brash, and rather cocky nation at the end of the 18th century.

We should not, therefore, be put off by the fact that representatives of the new nations are sometimes given to irrelevant talk. Neither we nor they should permit it to obscure the relevant business that every new state has to tackle as it enters the age of engineering and economics.

In fact, instead of being irked by the occasional exuberance of some of the representatives of newer nations in the General Assembly, we should be eternally grateful to the

U.N. that the complex business of transforming almost 50 new states from dependence to sovereignty has, for the most part, been accompanied by speeches rather than by shooting. This is, I think, one of the striking achievements of our time.

In trying to understand the actions of the new nations we should realize that in their eyes the U.N. has a very special meaning. The immediate and natural ambition of every new nation is to establish its national identity. Membership in the United Nations has served this purpose; it has become the badge of independence, the credentials of sovereignty, the symbol of nationhood and the passport to the 20th century. When the delegation of a new nation takes its place in the grand hall of the General Assembly, that nation has arrived; it can look the world in the eye and speak its piece. And even if that piece may be discordant to our ears the fact that it can be spoken has helped to stabilize the postwar world.

Yet the U.N. is more than a place for letting off steam; it is also a school of politcal responsibility. While some of its members may represent closed societies, it is itself an open society. The General Assembly is staged for all the world to see, and performing upon that stage sometimes, though not always, helps turn demogogs into statesmen. How else can one explain the fact that at the last General Assembly the most anticolonial members of the United Nations decisively rejected a Soviet resolution calling for independence of all remaining dependent areas by 1962? They sponsored instead moderate and sensible resolutions for which we and most of our European friends could vote without reservation.

The growing sense of responsibility in the new nations is only partly the result of finding themselves on stage before a critical world. It is also the result of a growing conviction that the business of economic and social development in their own countries is tough and demanding. They find the problems of food and health, education and technology, enterprise and administration will not yield to repetitive slogans carried over from the fight for independence. And they discover, too, the need to develop a new relationship with the Europeans and with the North Americans.

The framework of the United Nations provides a basis for such a new relationship, a political system in which the less developed nations can have a full sense of participation, which makes possible a family of technical organizations whose international staffs can help conceive and carry out the development plans every people now expects its government to pursue with vigor.

V

In one aspect, then, the United Nations is an instrument through which the industrial societies and the less-developed nations can be brought together. In another aspect, as I have earlier suggested, one of the principal achievements of the United Nations had been to keep the great powers apart. It has accomplished this by bringing about the settlement of conflicts through conciliation and debate, and by interposing itself as the agency to keep the peace in areas where chaos might otherwise attract great-power intervention.

The U.N. was scarcely organized before it was involved in the difficult and dangerous business of peacekeeping—in Iran, Greece, Indonesia, Kashmir. Since then it has played a part in stopping aggression, threatened aggression, or civil war in Palestine, Korea, at Suez, in Lebanon, and in the Congo. In all of these conflicts the great powers had interests. In the absence of the U.N. they would in all likelihood have intervened to defend those interests. Intervention by both sides could have led to a dangerous confrontation.

The most recent, and perhaps most spectacular, of the trouble spots in which the U.N. has acted to prevent great power confrontation is, of course, the Congo. Here the U.N., with full U.S. support, interposed itself in the heart of Africa in the nick of time. The Soviet Union was already moving in, and we could never have stood by while they set up shop in the heart of Africa. The intervention of the U.N., difficult though it may have seemed at the time, prevented the chaos that could well have turned the Congo into another Korea. Today, by patience and effort, it is helping to bring about the conditions under which an integrated Congo Republic can work its way toward stability and peace.

I would suggest, therefore, that in thinking about the Congo and about other areas where the United Nations is brought in to keep the peace, we should ask ourselves this question: From the point of view of our national security, would it have been better to send in the American Marines, or to act with others to send in the United Nations in the name of the world community?

Obviously the U.N. cannot keep the peace without expense. Today, it has over 20,000 men in the field, patrolling the truce lines in the Middle East and keeping the lid on in the Congo. Manifestly this is the work of something more than a league of nations, more than a debating society grafted on a pious commitment to unattainable goals. It is the work of an executive agency of considerable capacity and skill, capable of performing pragmatic tasks, such as mobilizing, transporting, commanding, and supplying substantial forces in the field when an emergency arises.

VI

Much of the discussion about the United Nations has not been concerned so much with what it does as how its activities fit in with the larger purposes of our own foreign policy. To those of us in the Department of State who have responsibility for the formulation and administration of that policy the relationship is clear enough. The United Nations is an instrument of U.S. foreign policy just as it is an instrument of the foreign policy of every other member state. In addition the U.N. provides us with a mechanism by which we can seek to persuade other member states not only that they should agree with us on our foreign policy, but that they should express that agreement by actively supporting resolutions that accord with our own national objectives.

Because our policies have tended to be right and have thus appealed to the interests of other nations and because Ambassador Stevenson and his staff have displayed exceptional leadership, we have been remarkably successful in obtaining international approval of our own national policies.

This is illustrated clearly by the record of the last General Assembly—the 16th. You will recall that this Assembly convened last September in an atmosphere of somber crisis—the secession of Katanga Province in the Congo, the death of Dag Hammarskjold on a mission of conciliation, the Soviet Union's revival of its infamous troika proposal for a three-headed Secretary General, and the prospect of imminent bankruptcy.

Such was the state of affairs when President Kennedy addressed the General Assembly in September. He made a ringing affirmation of U.S. support and confidence in the future of the United Nations, and backed it up with three major initiatives.

The President laid before the membership a comprehensive U.S. plan for general and complete disarmament, made realistic by its insistence on a simultaneous improvement of international peacekeeping machinery. This put the U.N. in business again on this vital if frustrating subject—and seized the initiative for the United States on the issue of peace.

President Kennedy also called for an active program of U.N. activity on the peaceful uses of outer space. The General Assembly acted on this American proposal in a resolution that extended the charter of the U.N. to outer space and set up the Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, which began its work last week in an atmosphere unusual for the absence of cold war policies.

Finally the President called for a U.N. decade of development to speed economic and social growth in the less developed world. This was approved unanimously; a general goal of a 50-percent expansion in national incomes was adopted for the next decade; and a wide range of specific programs and projects is in the course of preparation.

Thus did the U.N. General Assembly respond to American leadership and react to American initiatives that are both in our own interest and in the interest of a great majority of the members.

Meanwhile the Assembly resolutely preserved the integrity of the Secretariat against Soviet attack; rejected the Soviet effort to replace Nationalist China with Communist China; drew up an emergency plan to restore financial order to its affairs; and dealt in a generally responsible manner with the emotional subject of colonialism.

VII

But if the United Nations is an instrument of U.S. policy it is only one of many instruments available to us. It is one of the tasks of the Secretary of State and his staff, when confronted with a particular problem, to select and utilize that instrument most appropriate for the purpose.

It is, therefore, important to be clear about what the United Nations does but what it does not do, what it is not as well as what it is. Charity on this score helps resolve the contradiction some people seem to find in American foreign policy, a contradiction between our reliance on the institutions of the Atlantic Community and our participation in the United Nations.

No such contradiction in fact exists. The founders of the United Nations recognized the necessity for regional institutions and explicitly provided for them in the charter. Indeed the charter calls upon members to seek settlement of disputes within the framework of regional institutions before they are brought to the U.N. at all.

In practice we use the various institutions to which we belong for quite different purposes. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is, of course, the backbone of our military defense of the free world against the Communist bloc. Through our own massive forces and through NATO we maintain the armed strength that is the principal deterrent to Communist aggression. But just as the U.N.'s capabilities are limited, so are NATO's. Quite clearly NATO could not have intervened in the Congo to restore order when Belgium withdrew. Only a world organization could do so without arousing anticolonialist emotions.

It is true that the United Nations cannot, by itself, maintain the peace between the major powers. It is equally true that NATO was not qualified to supervise the peaceful change from colonialism to independence. Their roles are quite different and distinct. Each is essential and, therefore, we support each for different reasons.

The same observation can be made with regard to the OECD—the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—which came into being last September. Through this Organization we are developing means for close cooperation in economic matters with the major industrialized powers on either side of the Atlantic. This kind of cooperation cannot be achieved within the larger framework of the United Nations. But the building of workable international relationships with the smaller, poorer countries requires arrangements in which the weaker nations can participate, with dignity, as full-fledged members, which is the secret of success of the World Bank, the U.N. Special Fund, and other worldwide institutions for technical aid and development lending.

I could, of course, go on to mention other regional arrangements in which we participate. The Organization for American States, for example, gives institutional form to the American system. And the Alliance for Progress provides for a massive cooperative effort between the United States and Latin America.

In view of the need for different instruments to serve the diverse purposes of our foreign policy I find the suggestion quite curious that by seeking to use NATO or the OECD as a means of cooperation with our European friends, we are somehow turning our back on the U.N. I find equally curious the belief that in seeking to work within the United Nations we are betraying our friendship with our Atlantic partners.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact of the matter is that in 41 key votes in the last General Assembly, the United States and a majority of the NATO members voted together 41 times. Members of NATO do not, of course, vote as a bloc at the United Nations; only Communist members vote consistently as a bloc. But if loyalty to a majority of our NATO allies within the United Nations is a test, the United States has proved the most loyal of all—and this record was made in an Assembly in which there were 14 major votes on so-called colonial issues.

I cannot understand the contention that the United States must make a choice between the U.N. and NATO, that we are compelled for some strange reason to put all our eggs in one basket. It seems to me a curious concept that in world affairs we can do only one thing at a time; that if we stand firm in one place we cannot move ahead in another; that if we are in favor of quiet diplomacy we must be against parliamentary diplomacy in the General Assembly; that if we are for a strong concert of free nations we must be against a strong world community; that if regional organizations are realistic world organizations are necessarily unrealistic.

It seems to me that the present maturity of our foreign policy lies precisely in our ability to stand firm against threats of aggression while simultaneously taking constructive initiatives to build a world free of the threat of aggression; building up the regional organizations of the Atlantic and Western Hemisphere communities while simultaneously supporting the world community represented by the United Nations; practicing at the same time bilateral diplomacy, regional diplomacy, and global diplomacy through the United Nations.

VIII

In this world of interlocking partnerships, the quality of our country-by-country diplomacy has to be supplemented with a diplomacy of regional organizations—and both must be complemented by our effective participation in the parliamentary diplomacy of the United Nations.

The U.N.'s New York headquarters has become, for the newer and smaller nations, the diplomatic capital of the world. Some of the smaller nations can hardly afford to be represented in more than a few capitals; but they are always represented at the United Nations. Thus if an African nation has business with Japan or India or Brazil, it is more than likely these days to tell its mission in New York to talk to the Japanese or Indian or Brazilian delegation to the U.N. And in the U.N. building itself, there were 2,217 meetings this past year in the ceaseless process of building relationships among 104 countries whose independence is declared but whose interdependence is essential.

This is why the U.S. mission to the United Nations bears such a heavy burden, and why its quality is so critical to the national interest. This is why there is a U.N. angle to so many different parts of American foreign policy. This is why President Kennedy reached out for a man of Cabinet stature and world renown to head the U.S. mission at the United Nations.

The center of decision and the source of instructions is Washington—on U.N. affairs as on all parts of our foreign policy. These instructions give considerable weight, as they should, to the facts and recommendations received from the U.S. mission to the U.N. And the combination of American ideas and initiatives, backed by American power and carried into action by American diplomacy, enables the United States to carry more weight in the United Nations than any member.

Because it does things we want to see done, and makes possible some relations with other countries we want to see established, and because it operates, in the words of the charter, as "a center for harmonizing the action of nations," the United Nations serves the national interests of the United States. It will, we believe, continue to do so as long as the United States is its leading member and exercises day by day, the year round, the function of leadership.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF VOLUME II OF HEARINGS ON S. 1129, TO STABILIZE THE DOMESTIC FARM LABOR FORCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 323, a resolution which was reported today from the Committee on Rules and Administration. This has been cleared with the minority as well as with the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, two thousand two hundred additional copies of volume II of the hearings on S. 1129, a bill to stabilize the domestic farm labor force, held by its Subcommittee on Migratory Labor during the Eighty-seventh Congress, first and second sessions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 323) was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no other business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 4, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, April 3, 1962:

THE SUPREME COURT

Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Edward C. McLean, of Connecticut, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Edward J. Dimock, retired.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

John W. Crimmins, of Kentucky, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky.

Mrs. Marion F. Baker, of Georgia, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 17, with headquarters at Savannah, Ga.

INSPECTOR GENERAL, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

John K. Mansfield, of Connecticut, to be Inspector General, Foreign Assistance.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

The following-named persons to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs for the terms indicated, and until their successors have been appointed and qualified:

FOR A 1-YEAR TERM

Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan.
James R. Fleming, of Indiana.
Dr. Mabel M. Smythe, of New York.

FOR A 2-YEAR TERM

Dr. Walter Johnson, of Illinois.
Dr. Roy E. Larsen, of Connecticut.
Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, of California.

FOR A 3-YEAR TERM

Dr. Luther H. Foster, of Alabama.
Dr. John W. Gardner, of New York.
The Reverend Theodore Martin Hesburgh, of Indiana.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 3, 1962:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Frank B. Ellis, of Louisiana, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Louisiana.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

William M. Burkhalter, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The following-named person, who was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the office indicated:

Raymond H. Dwigans, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Robert M. Ball, of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Social Security of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 4: 11: *That the life of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh.*

Almighty God, who art the light that reveals unto us the way of life and the love that renews our strength to follow it, inspire us to go forth into the hours of this day without fear or foreboding.

Grant that as we turn our thoughts, during this Lenten season, to the glorious scenes and gracious sayings of our blessed Lord, we may feel that He is our eternal contemporary, giving us the counsel and companionship we so greatly need.

We earnestly beseech Thee that we may hasten the dawning of that day when His noble and magnanimous spirit shall be incarnated and manifested in the character and conduct, the life and laws of all mankind.

In His name we offer our prayers and petitions. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday next to file a privileged report on the legislative appropriation bill for 1963.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

CONFERENCE ON SUPPLEMENTAL AIRLINE LEGISLATION

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in the April 2, 1962, issue of Aviation Daily there appeared a news item which I think demands clarification. The item refers to the pending conference on the supplemental airline bill of the House and the Senate. The story says, and I quote:

> There is apparently a move among the House conferees to let supplemental airline legislation die.

It goes on to say that we need the legislation, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be made eminently clear here that it is the deep and sincere desire of the House conferees to report a bill for final enactment. It is our duty to bring back to the House legislation which reflects the judgment of this House as voiced in the last session of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I think the record should be clarified to this extent and further to observe that whatever inaction exists in the conference on this bill at the present time is, in fact, the result of the impasse on the side of the conferees in the other body and not the conferees on the House side.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. CHOW CHUI HA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1934) for the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That for the purposes of the Act of September 22, 1959 (Public Law 86–363), Mrs. Chow Chui Ha shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 4 of that Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY R. GALOTTA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8946) for the relief of Mary R. Galotta.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF PRIVATE LAW 86–339

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10242) to amend Private Law 86–339.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Act entitled "An Act for the relief of Placid J. Pecoraro, Gabrielle Pecoraro, and their minor child, Joseph Pecoraro", approved June 11, 1960 (Private Law 86–339), is amended by inserting immediately before the last sentence thereof the following new sentence: "In the determination of such claims, the United States shall be liable to the same extent as if the United States were a private person, and as if the acts complained of had occurred in the State of New York.".
>
> SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any decision or order of the United States District Court for the Western District of New York in the case of Placid J. Pecoraro & Gabrielle H. Pecoraro, Individually and as Guardian ad Litem of Joseph Pecoraro, an Infant under the age of fourteen years, Plaintiffs, against The United States of America, Defendant, Civ. 9213, suit under such Private Law 86–339, as amended by this Act, may be instituted within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

> Page 1, line 8: After "such claims," insert "the exception of section 2680(k) of title 28, United States Code, shall not apply, and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT B. KASPAREK, ROBERT M. KEARNY, RICHARD A. STOKES, J. R. WHITEHOUSE, JR., AND HERBERT A. WOLFF, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2018) for the relief of Robert B. Kasparek, Robert M. Kearny, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) Robert B. Kasparek, the sum of $147.84; (2) Robert M. Kearny, the sum of $692.55; (3) Richard A. Stokes, the sum of $510; (4) J. R. Whitehouse, Junior, the sum of $885; and (5) Herbert A. Wolff, Junior, the sum of $325; all employees of the National Park Service at Everglades National Park, Florida. The payment of such sums shall be in full satisfaction of all their claims against the United States for compensation for personal property damages sustained by them when the Government quarters assigned to them were inundated on September 10, 1960, as a result of a hurricane: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ETHEL KNOLL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7332) for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

MISS GRACE SMITH AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9445) for the relief of Miss Grace Smith and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the employees of the General Services Administration named in the table set forth hereinafter are hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount set opposite their respective names. Such amounts represent the totals of overpayments made to such employees for pay periods ending within the period set forth in the table. The overpayments were made as a result of administrative error in that the employees were improperly paid at their former salary levels after reduction in grade.

Employee	Period	Amount
Miss Grace Smith	May 2, 1959–March 4, 1961	$341.77
Mrs. Josephine B. Nugent	April 2, 1960–September 17, 1960	246.00
Mrs. Ann L. Metzgar	March 7, 1959–March 18, 1961	1,132.80
Mrs. Ruth F. Scott	April 1, 1960–March 4, 1961	264.24

In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

T. W. HOLT & CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3825) for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JAMES L. MERRILL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5061) for the relief of James L. Merrill.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

JOINT PENSION PLAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7876) relating to the effective date of the qualification of the joint pension plan for employees of Local Unions Nos. 645, 1507, and 1511, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint pension plan for employees of Local Unions 645, 1507, and 1511, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, which was established by a collective bargaining agreement effective September 1, 1956, and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust, under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of said Code, for years ending on or after April 11, 1961, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under said section 401(a), and to have been exempt from taxation under said section 501(a), for the period beginning on September 1, 1956, and ending on April 11, 1961, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interest of its beneficiaries.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike "April 11, 1961" and insert "August 31, 1960".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELENITA K. STEPHENSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9285) for the relief of Helenita K. Stephenson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Helenita K. Stephenson, the widow of Richard D. Stephenson (Veterans' Administration claim numbered XC3277378), the sum of $5,144.29. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Helenita K. Stephenson against the United States for the difference between the amounts which would have been paid to her as death compensation from the Veterans' Administration for the period November 16, 1946, through July 1955, both dates inclusive, if she had been held eligible to receive compensation for such period, and the amount actually paid to the children of the said Richard D. Stephenson as death compensation for such period: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 6 and 7, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REV. PATRICK FLOYD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 193) for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Reverend Patrick Floyd may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIU SHUI CHEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 899) for the relief of Liu Shui Chen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Liu Shui Chen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROCCO CAMBREA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1372) for the relief of Rocco Cambrea.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)

(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rocco Cambrea may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rocco Cambrea may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, after the word "Act" change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act."

Beginning on page 1, line 11, strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEE KYONG JA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1533) for the relief of Lee Kyong Ja.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Lee Kyong Ja shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Cyril V. Long, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAIME ABEJURO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1700) for the relief of Jaime Abejuro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress, assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jaime Abejuro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER MARY AURELIA (CHIARA DI GESU)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3005) for the relief of Sister Mary Aurelia (Chiara Di Gesu).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sister Mary Aurelia (Chiara Di Gesu) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FELICJA SAULEVICZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5689) for the relief of Felicja Saulevicz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act the minor child Felicja Saulevicz shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Feliks Saulevicz, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out the language "Mr. and".

On page 1, line 7, strike out the words "citizens" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "a citizen".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MON (FRED) YOUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6344) for the relief of Mon (Fred) Young.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mon (Fred) Young shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALVATORE BRIGANTI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 971) for the relief of Salvatore Briganti.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Salvatore Briganti may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act. This Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after "Act" insert a comma and the following: "and the provisions of section 24(a)(7) of the Act of September 26, 1962 (75 Stat. 657), shall be inapplicable in this case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KAZUO ITO AND SATOMI ITO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1305) for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY ELIZABETH SIDOR POLKOWSKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1520) for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mrs. Therese Polkowska, a lawful permanent resident of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD YIN LIANG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1578) for the relief of Edward Yin Liang.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 650), Edward Yin Liang shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 25(a) of that Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FELIX LEDINA MENDOZA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1638) for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Felix Ledina Mendoza shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA ZAMBETOULLA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1841) for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Zambetoulla, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. Vasilios Christou, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Maria Zambetoulla shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROLAND FERNANDO MISHUTANI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1874) for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Roland Fernando Mishutani shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIDA MARY SORINO BOCCALERY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2101) for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 353(3) of that Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FRANCES MANGIARACINA AND HER CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1404) for the relief of Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina, and her children, Concetta Maria, Rosetta, and Tomasino.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

IRENE KEMENY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1650) for the relief of Irene Kemeny.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(3) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Irene Kemeny shall be held and considered to be (1) born in Hungary, and (2) the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Zoltan Herskovits, lawfully resident aliens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADELA GLICMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1651) for the relief of Adela Glicman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Adela Glicman shall be considered to be within the purview of section 4 of the Act of September 22, 1959.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "1959" insert: "and the provisions of section 24(a)(7) of the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 657), shall be inapplicable in this case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

T. W. HOLT & CO. AND/OR HOLT IMPORT & EXPORT CO.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 493, the bill (H.R. 3825) for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to T. W. Holt and Company and/or Holt Import and Export Company, the sum of $8,478.19. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the said T. W. Holt and Company and/or Holt Import and Export Company against the United States for repayment of excessive customs duties erroneously collected by the Bureau of Customs on canned meat imports from Argentina, which were imported by the said T. W. Holt and Company and/or Holt Import and Export Company between December 8, 1948, and July 3, 1950, and on which the customs duties were liquidated between January 9, 1951, and January 6, 1953: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 56]

Addonizio
Alford
Andrews
Avery
Barry
Bonner
Boykin
Casey
Celler
Coad
Corbett
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Denton
Dingell
Dowdy
Ellsworth
Evins
Fascell
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Hall
Hoffman, Mich.
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Kilburn
Kluczynski
McIntire
Morrison
Passman
Patman
Powell
Rains
Reece
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Colo.
Scott
Selden
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Thornberry
Ullman
Waggonner
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TEAGUE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], I ask unanimous consent that his subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 579 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10700) to amend the Peace Corps Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 579 provides for the consideration of H.R. 10700, a bill to amend the Peace Corps Act. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

At the end of its first year of operation it is too soon to evaluate the performance of the Peace Corps in terms of tangible accomplishment; however, the evidence as to the performance of the Peace Corps so far tends to confirm the soundness of the Peace Corps concept and to justify continued confidence in the leadership and administrative capacity of the Director and his staff.

There are as yet only 698 volunteers located in 12 countries, of which 136 are still in training. The attitude of foreign governments has been favorable. The first 12 countries where volunteers are now at work have asked that 3 times the number of volunteers now on hand be sent to them this year. In addition, agreements have been reached with 20 other countries for the implementation by this summer of projects requiring nearly 2,000 additional volunteers. In no case has any country indicated dissatisfaction with the Peace Corps. In all cases there has been a desire for more volunteers and an attitude that the experience so far has been encouraging.

The potential supply of volunteers appears to be adequate. Even after rigid screening no difficulty is anticipated in finding enough qualified volunteers to meet the planned requirements.

All the experience so far indicates that the volunteers adapt readily to the environments where they are working. They have been made welcome by the people with whom they are associated and appear to be popular. The State Department reports that the Peace Corps personnel have aided rather than impeded the conduct of our foreign policy.

H.R. 10700 authorizes the appropriation of not to exceed $63,750,000 in order that the Peace Corps may carry forward its program as recommended by the President for fiscal 1963.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 579.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If they are having no difficulty recruiting members for the Peace Corps, will the gentleman tell me why the Civil Service Commission has been asked to help recruit Government employees for this outfit?

Mr. DELANEY. The gentleman can probably get the answer to that question from the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs after this rule is adopted.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10700 comes to us for consideration at this time under a rule that has been amply specified and described by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. DELANEY].

I would like to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I am one of those who originally were rather doubtful of this program. I also have some reservations as to the cost. From what I hear, however—and I have made great efforts to find out—I understand that the cost, which is asked to be $63,750,000, is not high in view of the fact that it is presumed that we will have at least 10,000 of these Peace Corps members in the field in the fiscal year 1963.

I took the matter of costs up with the Director, Mr. Shriver, and he told me that he had very carefully asked missionaries and other people who, as we know, do this type of work and do it in a most economical manner, concerning costs, and found that in every instance they told him that the cost, which at the rate of 10,000 people in the field, would be roughly a little better than $6,300 per man, and was low according to their own estimates.

I feel also, and I think we should all consider, that this program is only starting. That is very obvious from the fact that at present time there are only about 700 such Peace Corps members in the field and that we expect well within the year to have 10,000. It would seem a mistake to curtail the program now until we know exactly what it may be capable of accomplishing.

For that reason, it came out of our Committee on Rules with a unanimous assent.

I believe there is every reason to hope that it will pass the House as it is proposed and that the Peace Corps will be given an opportunity to show and prove that young Americans can do as much in the field of foreign affairs by going out and living with the people of the various nations; not in segregated places, not in practically ghettos by themselves, or, as I heard recently of one group not in the Peace Corps who went to Bolivia and had a very elaborate swimming pool built for themselves in the wilds, while the people in the country did not have potable water to drink—I think that is the kind of thing that has done our relations with foreign nations great harm. These young people, on the other hand, are going to live economically among the peoples of the various nations. They are going to take what the people of those countries have, no more and no less. They will promote the skills they have in these countries. Among other things, many teachers will go, who can perhaps show the people of the world what the American philosophy and the American ideal is. This, of course, is what the Communists have done for a long time and, unfortunately, very, very successfully. Let us hope, therefore, that the Peace Corps may reflect honor on the people of the United States and do it for a good cause instead of an extremely doubtful and bad one.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] such time as he may consume.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a rule providing for the consideration of the so-called Peace Corps bill.

You will recall that this is a new project, which was instituted last year. I had considerable reservations about that matter when it came up last year and was not sold on it. I voted against it. I have taken care to read what I could about the performance of this program as it went along, and I am happy to say that I think they have done a good job. I think they have made a good start. I like the idea of getting these young folks of ours in there to mingle with the common people. Most of our diplomats do not have that personal touch with the man in the street in the countries to which they are assigned.

I believe the thing has worked well up to this time, and I believe we ought to give it the opportunity to show what can be done in the way of creating friendly personal relationships and contacts between the people of this country and the people of the other countries to which we are trying to be of assistance. For that reason, I am supporting the measure this year. I expect to vote for it, because we have launched the program.

These people who are going on the Peace Corps are assigned for a period of 2 years, I believe. They are at work now, but unless we have another appropriation to educate another class to go out the program automatically must come to an end.

I believe these youngsters are pretty thoroughly indoctrinated and pretty thoroughly educated as to where they are going and the kind of people they are going to meet up with. I think that is a great thing. Perhaps we could do well if our regular State Department got a little more education about the people with whom they are going to mingle and a little better knowledge of the countries to which they are going to be assigned.

On the whole I think it is up to now serving a useful purpose, and I think we should continue it further until we have an opportunity to see what happens.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. In reference to what the gentleman has said about the caliber of men going into the Peace Corps and taking into consideration the recent estimates of the fiscal 1963 budget indicating it is going to be out of balance probably some $3 billion or $4 billion, instead of having a surplus of $500 million, and recognizing we have an ever-increasing problem in the area of our balance of payments, would the gentleman suggest any way that we can increase taxes or something like that to pay for these bills? This is the doubling of one agency in 1 year. Do you not feel that is a rather drastic increase for just 1 fiscal year in a program of this kind when our fiscal situation is deteriorating so badly?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will be glad to try to answer the gentleman. This was not a 1-year program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think this operation has been tested enough so that Congress should double the appropriation to more than $63 million?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that was the burden of the question asked of me by the gentleman who was interrupted before I could answer him. I think I can answer you both in this way.

This is nothing except what was contemplated when the program was first started. As I explained before, they send these youngsters to school and educate them in the language if necessary, and give them some indoctrination as to the modes and customs and so forth of the people to whom they are to be assigned. That class lasts for a certain length of time, I believe 3 months, and after that they go to work. Then at the end of their period of service they are discharged so that if you do not educate the next class that is going in on the following program, then the program must come to a halt.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This is not exactly a labor of love on the part of these people. Can the gentleman give us any idea of the administrative costs of this agency? These are not all $9,000-a-year employees; that is the cost of a volunteer. What about the rest?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The salary is modest. I am not acquainted with the administrative setup here in Washington, but I expect like all other administrative setups it costs some money. But as I say, I am not familiar with the administrative end of it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the volunteers get $75 a month which is $900 a year. That is their salary. The $9,000 per volunteer includes all overhead costs, training, transportation, subsistence allowances, equipment, tools, and all other expenses.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That would all be set forth in the details of the administrative costs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that is all money out of the taxpayers' pockets and I do not believe I have heard the gentleman from Virginia answer the gentleman from Michigan's question as to where it is proposed to get the money for all these foreign aid programs.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am surprised that the gentleman should ask me that question because I have been asking that very question for a long, long time. When the time comes to discuss that question, I would like to say to the gentleman who interrogated me previously—when the time comes to answer that question, I expect to have a good deal to say. I am not happy about what is happening in the financial affairs of our country, and that fact is well known in this House of Representatives, I might say, and I do say something about the financial situation and criticize it frequently. I expect to have some data which I hope will convince the House before this session is over that instead of having a surplus in 1963, you are going to have a deficit which is going to be frightening, and the $10 billion increase in the debt limit which is now being asked for just is not going to cover the situation.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman, but not to discuss that subject at this time.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I just want to say I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Virginia and the record that he has made as far as fiscal affairs are concerned in this House since I have been a Member, for the last 10 years. But, I just raised this question because it has been bothering me, when I look at our fiscal situation and then find that we are raising the status of one agency and doubling it in 1 year. I just think it is too fast.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I hope you and I both may get the opportunity to discuss these fiscal affairs at some time at greater length, at a more appropriate time.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PILCHER. The gentleman knows that we are not starting the program this year. This program was started last year, and it was expected at the start to train about 9,000 people and that it would cost about what the present bill calls for.

Almost everyone in Congress knows my record on the foreign aid program. I have been around to these countries, I have seen what these Peace Corps kids do in this program. It does not cost as much as one missile sometimes costs. These people have nothing to sell but themselves when they go into a country like East Pakistan, a group of 25 or 35 of these boys and girls, carpenters, teachers, nurses, living with these people, selling America. This whole program is a gamble for world peace and to me this $60 million is well spent on this gamble, much better spent than the enormous amounts we hand out in the foreign aid program all around the world. They are out to sell America. I have confidence in these kids. I have talked to them. They are dedicated boys and girls. We are going to get some bad apples; you cannot have 9,000 boys and girls from every State in the Union without getting 1 or 2 bad ones, but the majority of these kids are dedicated, trained boys and girls trying to sell America at the grassroots level. My criticism of the foreign aid program is that we are not reaching the grassroots people. These Peace Corps boys and girls are reaching out at the grassroots level. I think it is a wonderful gamble. I am for it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I understand the administration is asking for an increase in the foreign aid bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We generally get a request for an increase, and the gentleman and others have done a good job keeping it down just as much as possible.

Mr. GROSS. I understand the administration has come in with a request for about $5 billion. The thing that concerns me is how we are going to increase the foreign giveaway program, double the spending for the Peace Corps, and all the rest of these things. You will have on tomorrow, a supplemental appropriation bill for another $25 million or $26 million for the United Nations. How are the taxpayers going to support all of these expenditures?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have deep sympathy with the gentleman's misgivings, which I share.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think Congress will reduce the foreign giveaway bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I suggest that the gentleman and I join up on this subject when the time comes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, so much of our foreign aid spending through the years has had the effect of supporting and perpetuating repressive-type governments whether they be pro-Communist or otherwise. The Peace Corps program is a hopeful contrast to the usual type of foreign aid. It permits person-to-person contacts which have the possibility of developing good will for the United States, which is so desirable, and perhaps furthering economic progress in foreign countries. I suggest that we finance the proposed increase in the Peace Corps by reducing other foreign-aid spending.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I recall 3 or 4 years ago handling the rule on the foreign-aid bill. At that time I told of an instance I had heard where a group of State Department employees were being sent overseas. They had worked in the Department for about 18 years. They were grade 10 employees.

Because of their incompetence they could not rise any higher. So they were sent overseas for a period of 2 years, and were guaranteed they would get a 2-point increase rating when they came back, which would be grade 12.

We all know that was a wrong system they were using in the State Department at that time. It was a wrong system then, it is a wrong system now, if they still use that type of system. We were sending people to foreign countries who were unprepared.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been for a program like the Peace Corps that has been in existence for only 1 year. It is a program of St. Francis, of Dr. Schweitzer, and our own doctor, Tom Dooley. Those programs have always been powerful. Two weeks ago I heard Mr. Shriver on television, and I think he did a tremendous job. He was able, erudite, learned. More than that, he was sincere and dedicated, and I trust the men who are under the leader of the Peace Corps will be as dedicated and sincere as he is.

Some years ago I had a small home up in New Hampshire. Across the street from me lived a family known as the Cronins. There were nine children. If any of you went to school in Cambridge, Mass., you will have heard of the Cronin restaurant. They ran a restaurant in Cambridge, and no one was ever turned away hungry, particularly students.

One of his children became a priest, Father Thomas Cronin. He is over in the Philippines. He sent a letter to a group of us, friends of his. I would like to read this letter to you in part because I think it is a great argument for the Peace Corps. It follows:

ST. FRANCIS XAVIER PARISH,
Kabankalan, Neg. Occ., November 13, 1961.

DEAR FRIEND: More than 300 Peace Corps men arrived recently in the Philippines. The impact of their arrival was greater than the impact of the 50-megaton bomb exploded by friend Khrushchev. And the fallout promises to be more effective still. This is the first time that a major power has crossed the ocean with books, not guns, brains not bombs, for peace in order to win a war.

This is the greatest export the United States has ever made. Better than sewing machines, TV sets, refrigerators, tractors, or jeeps. All the world loves the Irish. And well they might. For years the Irish have been exporting the most popular commodity on the market. Real live human beings. Mostly priests and nuns, who in one capacity or another end up teaching people of every shade of color in the human spectrum. And now the United States is catching on. The best the United States had to offer formerly was the cowboy with his six-gun. He was a likable guy. But he always did a lot of shooting. Out here 11,000 miles from Boston, people get impressions of America which are terribly unjust. For most of the people out here, America means Al Capone, Billy the Kid, Marilyn Monroe, divorce, two cars in the garage, and one lonesome baby in an overstuffed cradle in a jumbo-sized house. They like us all right.

A new image is taking shape. True, America has been helping people all over the world with food and clothing. But always, we send things. Now we are sending people, people whom the people of Asia can get to know as the real Americans. They will eat their food, they will sleep on mats in nipa huts, they will pet their babies. They will teach with their teachers, they will farm with their farmers, they will nurse with their nurses. One American living in a Philippine town is worth more than a whole boatload of corn. A boatload of corn is hard to digest, but a real live American, him they can love.

The United States has finally realized that superiority in the realm of material things is useless without the corresponding superiority in things of the spirit. To my mind nothing typifies that new attitude more than the Peace Corps. May their tribe increase.

Sincerely in Christ,

Father THOMAS J. CRONIN.

I think that is a tremendous letter. One of the most impressive letters I have ever read.

I trust the rule will be adopted and the bill passed.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10700) to amend the Peace Corps Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10700, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as you can readily see, H.R. 10700, to amend the Peace Corps Act, is short and simple. All it does is authorize an appropriation of $63,750,000 for the fiscal year 1963 to carry on the Peace Corps.

Last year the Congress authorized $40 million for the fiscal year 1962 and $30 million was appropriated. The authorization requested this year will make it possible for the Peace Corps, by the end of fiscal 1963, to have 6,700 volunteers in service in comparison with the 2,400 which will be in service on June 30, 1962.

In addition, the authorization will provide funds to hire the 1963 crop of graduates who will be hired and trained in July and August 1963—the first 2 months of fiscal 1964. This authorization will provide money to bring the total number of Peace Corps volunteers to just under the 10,000 mark by the end of August 1963.

The Peace Corps today is a going concern with 698 volunteers overseas on March 1, 1962, plus 222 more in training, making a total of 920. By June 30, 1962, it is planned to have 1,200 volunteers overseas and 1,200 more in training.

It is too early to evaluate the accomplishments of the Peace Corps. The first volunteers arrived overseas on August 30, 1961. There has not been time enough for anyone to assess the contribution which they are making in the countries where they are serving. It is possible, however, to say that the reports so far are favorable.

I know that many who voted for the Peace Corps last year did so with certain reservations. They believed that the idea was attractive, but they felt certain doubts as to whether it would really work. The record of the first year of operation of the Peace Corps has been most reassuring. Several of the problems which appeared to be most serious a year ago have failed to materialize. Others have been solved without difficulty.

One of the matters that concerned all of us was whether or not there would be enough qualified volunteers to carry out the program. The experience so far clearly indicates that there are. The Peace Corps had 10,000 applicants as of June 1, 1961, and 16,000 on December 31, 1961. Last January 2,400 applications were received, and during February 4,000 applications were received. It is expected that the monthly trend in applications will increase until the end of the current academic year. The Peace Corps is convinced that even after rigid screening, there will be plenty of high grade people to meet its requirements.

There have been appeals for Peace Corps volunteers on television and the radio, but these appeals have been directed toward securing people with specialized skills. The Peace Corps needs tractor mechanics and bricklayers, and finds it more difficult to establish contact with these people than it does with persons enrolled in colleges.

Another problem which concerned us a year ago was whether foreign countries would really want Peace Corps volunteers. The Peace Corps is now operating in 12 countries, and all of these countries have requested additional volunteers. Furthermore, 20 additional countries requested projects which the Peace Corps has approved. Still other countries have made requests which are under active consideration.

The Peace Corps volunteers have been popular in all of the countries where they are serving. They have known enough of the language to carry on a conversation, and they have adjusted themselves to the living conditions of the people with whom they are associated. There have been no incidents. The lost postcard in Nigeria has been the only widely publicized occurrence, and it did not reflect on the qualifications of the volunteer involved. It is the consensus of our ambassadors and the Department of State that the Peace Corps volunteers have aided rather than impeded the conduct of our foreign policy.

Last year some apprehension was expressed as to whether the Peace Corps would finance the maintenance and support of a lot of U.S. families overseas. The record on this point is most reassuring. Under the law Peace Corps volunteers cannot have dependents overseas so that the problem does not exist so far as they are concerned.

Volunteer leaders are permitted to have dependents with them, but the number of volunteer leaders is limited by law to a ratio of one leader to 25 volunteers. So far there are only 20 volunteer leaders altogether; only one of these is married and has no children.

The Peace Corps employees overseas, that is those performing the necessary administrative and support functions to keep the operation going, at present total only 52 employees.

In determining the financial requirements of the Peace Corps, it is necessary to recognize that the one objective of the Peace Corps is to maintain volunteers overseas. Its function is to provide people, not commodities.

It is currently estimated that all of the $30 million appropriated for fiscal 1962 will be obligated by June 30 of this year and that $10 million will have been expended. Nearly all of the $20 million remaining unexpended is obligated to fund contracts with universities and private agencies which run for a 2-year period.

As far as the 1962 fund is concerned, all will be obligated and the unexpended balance will be for firm contract commitments with universities and institutions.

The requirement for the $63,750,000 authorization for fiscal 1963 is made up as follows:

It will take $32,390,000 to finance Peace Corps projects which are already in operation or agreed to. In the 12 countries where the Peace Corps is operating at present with a total of 698 volunteers overseas, it is planned to have a total of 2,888 volunteers at work by the end of fiscal 1963. In addition, the Peace Corps has entered into agreements with 20 more countries to supply 1,991 volunteers during fiscal 1963. To these figures should be added 230 volunteers to work in projects which are now under negotiation. This means that 5,109 volunteers will be needed to fulfill the commitments already entered into or under negotiation by the Peace Corps for fiscal 1963.

In addition to this, the Peace Corps estimates that it will require $31,360,000 to finance additional requirements for volunteers which have not yet been programed or agreed to.

The Peace Corps is going to begin operations in 20 new countries during fiscal 1963. In the 12 countries where the Peace Corps is already in business, 3 times as many volunteers have been requested as were originally provided. There is every reason to believe that the 20 new countries will want more volunteers than are scheduled at present. Furthermore, the Peace Corps wants to be ready to finance programs in additional countries.

Mr. Chairman, all of the evidence indicates that the Congress ought to give the Peace Corps money necessary to continue with the program which it has planned. The Peace Corps has done a good job with the money already made available, and there is no reason to question the desire and the ability of Mr. Shriver and his organization to do a good job next year. The record of performance during its first year of operations justifies the continued support by the Congress of the Peace Corps.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked the question several times, but have not had the information to give a satisfactory answer; perhaps the gentleman can help me. Can the gentleman indicate what there is in the mission of the Peace Corps that could not be accomplished under the authority and the purpose of the mission of so-called point 4 under foreign aid?

Mr. MORGAN. The point-4 program is strictly a program for providing working technicians. These people, of course, come under the overall supervision of the State Department. The Peace Corps people actually live with the people with whom they are associated. They speak their language. They teach by doing. They are not advisers. They are workers. Our technical assistance program involves advising and guiding, rather than actually performing work which teaches by association and example.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, when the Peace Corps was first started I confess I was very dubious about it. They were always spoken of as though they were children and that there was not any chance of getting any judgment or any training into the Corps. I have followed it very closely. When I have had criticisms I have taken them directly to the office, have sat down with Mr. Moyers or other people in the office, or they have come to my office and we have discussed it. I found that in those areas where they had already heard these criticisms they were doing everything they could to eliminate the difficulty. I believe that out of all the people overseas there have been only four who have had to come home, two for health reasons; and that is really a remarkable record.

I had a letter very recently from a nephew of mine who was in Bangkok. He was there when the Peace Corps contingent first arrived. He is in a teaching capacity, setting up a library there for Chicago University. He said all of them at the embassy were a little nervous in anticipation. They did not know what these people were going to be like. He wrote that they came in very quietly and that they were speaking the language. Now, Thai is not the easiest language in the world. Many of them were exceedingly fluent in it. Of course, they took the Thai people by storm. They made no extra requests. They lived where they had been billeted around in the city. They behaved exceedingly well. They went right to work. They do not have the extras that State Department people have and they don't want them. They just go over there and work.

They do not have immunity and they do not want it. They want to be just people.

A little to my own surprise I find myself enthusiastic about the Peace Corps. I think it is very interesting to know that we now have volunteers in training or authorized to the number of 1,163. I also know something about one of the places where they get their training, which is up in Putney, Vt., the Experiment in International Living. Dr. David Boyce is head of that organization. They themselves have some 1,500 or more of their own training and purpose out in various posts throughout the world. The training Peace Corps people will get there will be quite proper, and they will be prepared to meet the difficulties and exigencies that they must meet.

In some of the places, such as in Tanganyika, they asked for engineers. That meant somebody over 18. To be an engineer you have to be well along in the twenties. We understand they are doing exceedingly well over there.

The Corps does not expect to go along without making some mistakes, without putting its foot into a hole once in a while. If it does, it will be perfectly frank about it. Their representatives will come to us or to others who can help them. They have no compunction at all about really asking for information, particularly criticism. Surely this is a sign of simplicity and earnestness of purpose.

In closing may I say to Mr. Shriver and all his coworkers that I congratulate them on the work they have done and the spirit of true service they have generated. All good luck in the year that lies ahead, and all power.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I asked the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. MORGAN] what it is that members of the Peace Corps are expected to do that cannot be done under point 4 of foreign aid. His time expired before our colloquy was completed, but his answer left considerable doubt on the question of duplication.

In a recent publication entitled "Aid in Action", which describes how the United States lends a hand around the world, it is stated:

> Over the past decade the United States—through technicians as well as through financial aid—has been extending a helping hand to nations all over the globe, nations not blessed with the same developed material wealth or the same technical and administrative skills which the United States enjoys.

The booklet then outlines, country by country, how American technicians have gone into the remote areas where they have been invited and there taught natives how to improve their lot by adopting American techniques and methods.

For example, it is stated that two U.S. technicians were sent to Ecuador. They had a double-barreled job: first, working with natives to find a way to control sigatoka; second, to train Ecuadoran technicians who would relay the information to the banana farmers.

A new spray, a fungicide, was developed and tested, and it was a success. After teaching the natives how to apply the spray, the point 4 technicians moved on to other assignments. It was a job well done.

In the Philippines, point 4 technicians aided by natives went into the rural areas to help train local officials and to help start community projects such as small irrigation schemes, salt ponds, water systems, improvement of poultry and swine, and so forth. In 5 years community development projects had sprung up in 7,000 communities.

The report refers to a project in Mexico. In order to make its extensive roadbuilding project a success, Mexico needed technical personnel, particularly workers trained in the operation and maintenance of heavy-duty machinery and equipment for highway construction. And so we helped organize a school where our better knowledge on the subject could be learned by the natives. And 1,500 students were trained there.

We sent a team of technicians to Ghana to teach the natives how to reclaim lands suffering from water shortage. The natives were taught how to build dams and repair old ones, along with access roads. Ponds were constructed and both livestock raising and farming benefited greatly, according to a report on that project.

There was another point 4 project in Taiwan; another in Nepal; another in Libya, where improved techniques of farming were installed, with good results.

In Peru our technicians helped teach natives better health measures, which reduced the incidence of silicosis in the mines from 14 to 4 percent.

There was also a project in Tunisia, another in Paraguay, another in Honduras where a roadbuilding project was a success. Point 4 has been active in India, in Lebanon, Nigeria, and in scores of other countries.

Ethiopia has been aided by point 4. So has Guatemala, Bolivia, Persia, and others too numerous to mention here.

I have referred to this report, Mr. Chairman, simply to illustrate the extent of technical aid under point 4—programs that have been going on for 11 years. The technicians, and I understand there are around 3,500 of them overseas at this time—go out into the jungles and the forests and the deserts to teach people and help them to help themselves. They also administer joint projects in cooperation with local governments. I am sure they do a good many things that the youngsters in the so-called Peace Corps do not do. But it is very plain that anything the Peace Corps can do the point 4 people can do—and thanks to more training, experience, and maturity—probably better.

Now, just what do we have before us here today? We are being asked to raise the Peace Corps authorization to $63.75 million. This calls for a vast expansion of a program that is admittedly a duplication of what has been carried on under point 4 for a decade.

If point 4 is a good thing, then why not expand it if need be? Why create and perpetuate a brand new agency to do precisely what point 4 is already doing? If point 4 needs more personnel, let that be considered. If point 4 needs more flexibility in carrying out its mission, let that be considered. If point 4 needs some of the spirit of youth—which we are told distinguishes the Peace Corps from other programs doing the same thing—then why not recruit some young people?

Why do we here in Congress support new agencies that are admittedly unnecessary? We all know the work of the Peace Corps can be carried on under point 4 just as well or better. Why allow ourselves to get swept off our feet by the glamor of something new that must have an alltime group of champion public relations people to sell it to the Congress and to the United States.

I have no quarrel with the Peace Corps. Surely it can do some good, and I am sure it has done some good. My quarrel is with the duplication of effort, the double expense of maintaining two complete agencies to perform what is or can be made to be the same mission.

The simple fact is that we have had a Peace Corps under foreign aid for 11 years. But it has been called point 4. But now we have two Peace Corps organizations. One is in the news, on radio, TV, movietone, magazines, and elsewhere. The other is not.

Under the Peace Corps we are sending millions of dollars abroad at a time when our gold reserves are growing dangerously low. We had better think twice before we commit this country to more of this spending abroad when it can be avoided and when it is for a purpose that can be accomplished without this expenditure.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this authorization, H.R. 10700.

As some of the other speakers have indicated, there were questions about the extent of this program that occurred to me when it originally was proposed and we voted the original authorization and appropriation. Those questions arose because of the rather intangible nature of the program and the somewhat vague outlines of a project that had not been a matter of experience before that time. But I speak today as one who has seen this program in operation, who has seen the people who are administering it and who are working in the field.

I had the privilege of being in South America last year. In Chile members of our subcommittee visited some of the locations where members of the Peace Corps were working. This visit gave me an understanding of the program and an appreciation of the type of persons who have been selected to work in this program that I never could have received from reading reports or from hearing testimony in hearings back here in Washington.

I found that these men and women were dedicated, they were serious and they were industrious. They were not the glamorous, diplomatic parlor type. They were excellent representatives of the United States and they had evoked a warm and favorable response from the people with whom they were working.

They were people who had had experience and training in rather mundane and simple activities here at home, but who in the context of the goals of the Peace Corps in the country where they were working were able to make contacts with young people and to give them experience with Americans and give them a training and an education which they could not have obtained otherwise. So I favor the continuation and expansion of this program.

I believe, too, that we should give credit here to Mr. Shriver and the others who have administered this program for the method of selection they have followed and for the type of people they have chosen.

This Peace Corps work in the field is a demanding job, the kind of job that cannot be done by everyone. But, the people who have been selected are highly and excellently qualified to do this kind of work.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would just like to express my appreciation to the gentleman for the first-hand report of his observations. I wish time would permit the gentleman to talk for an hour or more about his experiences. I have greatly appreciated hearing from the gentleman from Connecticut in detail about his personal experiences. The work of the Peace Corps in Latin America has made me prouder than ever to be a supporter of this program and has made me prouder that the University of Oklahoma is participating as one of the training institutions in the program. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that this program will definitely have a valuable impact in spreading the proper image of the United States. Of course, you may question where it stands in the scale of diplomacy with reference to the economic aid programs, the military assistance program and conventional diplomacy. One might well conclude that there were limits to its possible expansion. But, I believe it has demonstrated its usefulness to this point and that we are justified and warranted in authorizing the amount that has been requested by the agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have been looking at the hearings and I do not find a breakdown of the salaries paid in Washington, D.C. The so-called Peace Corps was created a year ago, it is my understanding that it was to be a labor of love and that the volunteers would get $75 a month and so on and so forth; that it would be a very austere program. Now we learn, as many of us suspicioned then, that this is a mighty costly operation; that it is rocketing from $30 million last year to nearly $64 million, or more than a 100-percent increase.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. It also doubles the personnel overseas and the money for training has to be doubled.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and, of course, somebody is digging up the money to pay for this latest international venture to allegedly help the downtrodden.

Now I find in the list of oversea salaries such as these:

The head of the Peace Corps in Ghana gets $14,900 a year—and I do not know how much else by way of allowances.

The head of the Peace Corps in Nigeria gets $17,250 a year—and I do not know how much more by way of allowances.

In the Philippines the head of the Peace Corps gets $17,250 a year, plus allowances.

This is not exactly a labor of love; is it, on the part of those running the show?

In Liberia, the top Pooh-bah of the Peace Corps is paid $16,320; in Malaya, $16,320; and in India, the acting head of the outfit gets $15,610. These salaries plus allowances for living quarters, transportation, and so forth.

Remember, this is the same Peace Corps that the Nation was told a year ago would accomplish so much and cost so little.

In Peru, Venezuela, Colombia, Thailand, El Salvador, Tanganyika, and Iran, the bosses of the Peace Corps each get $14,900 a year and, of course, allowances plus transportation for themselves and families.

Never forget that you were told a year ago what a bare-to-the-bones, austere enterprise this would be. It had to be that way, the New Frontier promoters said, if we were to successfully cast the spell of our down-to-earth image in all the remote localities of the world.

The record shows that it took no more than 12 months to get this show running true to form as far as salaries are concerned. The $1,400 a month, plus allowances paid to the Peace Corps directors in Nigeria and the Philippines is apparently about par for the New Frontier, especially when it is noted that there are a total of 107 Peace Corps-ites in Nigeria and 232 in the Philippines. Bear in mind that in each of these countries there is a deputy director bagging more than $12,000 a year in salary.

And it is even more interesting to note that there are 36 Peace Corps-ites in Malaya where the director draws down $16,320 per year and his deputy joins in the bossing of the $75 per month recruits at a salary of $14,665.

Recently, I was sent a clipping from a Columbus, Ohio, newspaper—a photograph which showed a family being sent by the Peace Corps from Boston, Mass., to the Philippines. The Peace Corps employee, John C. Cort, was accompanied by his wife and nine children. I have been trying to ascertain what it is going to cost the Government to educate these nine children in the Philippines and what it cost to get them all the way from Boston to the Philippines by plane, plus their belongings.

Mr. MORGAN. As I understand it, if they attend the regular Philippine schools there will be no cost for their education.

Mr. GROSS. I would be surprised if the Philippines is running free schools for foreigners.

Mr. MORGAN. There are many English-speaking schools in the Philippines.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman means there is no tuition cost?

Mr. MORGAN. The information I have is that there is no tuition if they attend the regular schools in the Philippines.

Mr. HAYS. You can explain it to the gentleman but you cannot make him understand it.

Mr. GROSS. I doubt very much if the gentleman from Ohio could shed much light on this subject, either.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HAYS. All I said was: "You can explain it to him but you cannot make him understand it if he does not want to."

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Ohio always has all the answers to all the questions that have ever been asked by anybody, any place, any time.

Mr. HAYS. Thank you.

Mr. GROSS. And so, having inserted himself into this discussion on a personal basis, I would like to nominate the gentleman from Ohio for the 5-H Club: Hell, How He Hates Himself.

Mr. Chairman, all I want to say in conclusion is I am opposed to a 100-percent increase in spending on the so-called Peace Corps. I do not think this organization has had time to prove itself. There is no reason why Congress should run this appropriation from $30 million to nearly $64 million.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I believe the question of why the amount has been raised to $63,752,000 can best be explained by what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] said earlier, and what Mr. Shriver stated before the committee.

This first year there were programs for 5,000 volunteers for a 2-year period. If the program is to continue then it becomes necessary for an additional 5,000 young people to be in training so that the program can have continuity. It is like a junior college where there will be a continuation and a continuity of students progressing through both years.

The question was asked earlier as to what contribution this was making toward a reduction of the balance of payments. I might state that the greatest portion of this money is expended here in the United States. Ninety-five percent of the money is spent in training, care, and feeding of the volunteers.

The gentleman from Iowa said he thought this was a labor of love. This is a labor of love for the volunteers who are participating in it.

It is a labor of love alone for country. I know there are all sorts of criticisms that have been leveled, but the fact of the matter is even those who supported the program last year with great reservation, and many of those who did not support the program with sincere reservations, have recognized that the people involved in this program are doing a dedicated service to their country.

I think this Congress can best exemplify its thanks and its faith by endorsing continuation of the program in the amounts sought in the bill.

There are professionals connected with the program. But by and large they are people who are on a voluntary basis who are offering their services to their country for 2 years. The professionals connected with it set an excellent example of dedicated civil servants. They give unflinchingly of their time and service far beyond the requirements of their employment.

I might also say that for the Director of the program it is a labor of love. He is serving without salary and rendering us outstanding service. I might say also he has endowed this program with a spirit of courage, of determination, and with a great desire to give a part of his life to the Nation's needs. His example has created an esprit de corps that should be an inspiration to all who represent the United States in foreign lands.

With regard to the question raised concerning the housing program for these volunteers, I must point out that they live as the people do in the countries in which they are serving. With regard to another question, I would like to state that in February 4,000 applicants asked to serve as volunteers in the Peace Corps. They were of the overall highest quality of people that have yet sought to serve.

Many of the volunteers under this program are serving in a teaching capacity. That is why it is necessary for the bill to be passed in the amount we are requesting so that this program may be scheduled for the coming school year. In reply to the previous gentleman, this program, I may add, differs from the technical assistance point 4 program, in that these people, these volunteers, are training others rather than providing technical services.

We are all familiar with the reaction to the Peace Corps in this country—its initial reception in an atmosphere of skepticism, or of conditional support based upon optimistic hopes, and how this has been transformed, in all but a few cases, to enthusiastic acceptance based upon actual experience. It is even more striking to find this transformation taking place overseas, and on the part of some of America's most severe critics.

Support for the Peace Corps, which was reserved at first to the traditional friends of the United States, has now spread to other countries and to every segment of their populations. The press, as well as government officials, has been generous in its praise. The Tanganyika Standard says of the Volunteers:

> Their experience here will contribute in no small measure to the sound shaping of Afro-American relationships. * * * We need the Peace Corps.

Vice President Palaez of the Philippines asserted:

> It may be that it is just such a type of assistance, rendered without any reference to the cold war, that may yield rich dividends in winning friendship and sympathy for the free world from the uncommitted nations.

It is impossible to measure the impact of the Peace Corps upon the grassroots elements of the population in these and other countries. But it is certain that the Peace Corps has brought a favorable impression of the United States to people and to places where little or no awareness at all has existed until now.

Perhaps the most impressive evidence of this—more dramatic than any enthusiastic editorial of speech by an official—is the fact that every single country which has received Peace Corps Volunteers has already requested more of them.

This is a degree of whole-hearted support which few American programs have achieved in so short a time. If the Peace Corps can continue to merit this support in the future as it has in the past—and I am convinced that it can and will—it will have added a significant new dimension to American foreign policy, and one which we cannot fail to recognize and to support ourselves.

There are hundreds of comments along the same line, and I think what we should look forward to is the spirit that is being implanted by these volunteers who come back to the United States better educated, better equipped, and in a better position to go forward in accepting their responsibilities of citizenship in this country. They will also leave in the country they have visited a small bit of America, an acorn of American understanding and friendship that will grow to a mighty oak of better understanding between nations. They are instilling .their friendship and understanding among those who in future generations will take the helm of leadership in the host country.

Mr. Chairman, this program is serving our country well, it is making an outstanding contribution to a better understanding in this troubled world.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DURNO].

Mr. DURNO. Mr. Chairman, certainly I do not think anyone in this body would deny that I am a conservative. I am just as interested in balancing the budget of the United States of America as anyone on this floor. However, I think this Peace Corps concept is a good concept. I supported the bill last year, and I think it deserves our further support this year.

I think that the development of the Peace Corps is a great tribute to Mr. Sargent Shriver. I have discussed this matter with him on several occasions. I think it is economically sound, and I would be happy to double the expenditure for the Corps which is exporting Americanism and not dollars to line political pockets. I would be happy to double this expenditure as long as it carries out the program that is being presently carried out. This is the kind of thing that we should be doing in America.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am again happy to support the Peace Corps this year, and I only hope that Mr. Shriver will continue to handle it and that it will continue in the same vein that it is now traveling.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I do not hesitate to say that last year I was one of the nearly 100 Members that opposed the Peace Corps bill. I have not concluded at this time to change my opinion. However, I would like to make a few observations about the operation of the Corps as I have witnessed it during the past year of its operation. As you know, last year the vote was to make this a permanent organization. Many of us were opposed to that procedure, because we thought it should have a trial run. And, I do not hesitate to say that there have, of course, been areas where I think it has been embarrassing to the U.S. Government, and yet, on the other hand, I think we are using a unique approach here, one that has been long coming, one that has been long overdue, and that is that we should approach this international program on a people-to-people basis and not on a government official basis; on a down-to-earth basis, where people understand each other.

Last February I directed a letter to the Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Shriver, and suggested to him that perhaps he should utilize a great wealth of talent in this country not now used; senior citizens, persons that are retirees or near retirement age, who possess a tremendous wealth of knowledge, maturity, and judgment, which I think could be quite helpful in a program of this nature. I am not prepared at this time to say that I would support a doubling of the appropriation and a doubling of the volunteers in this program, but I think in this area the senior citizens, persons that have been retired either voluntarily or involuntarily, that do have this tremendous wealth of experience and knowledge and maturity of judgment, could be utilized, which could also help to remove this onerous characterization such as "kiddy corps" or "youth corps," because America can be served by all walks of life and from each category. I received an answer from the Director to the effect that he is aware of the contribution that the senior citizens could make to this effort and that they are advertising in periodicals to try to attract volunteers in this age category.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, a year ago, when we were considering the legislation authorizing the Peace Corps, which earlier had been established by Executive order, a number of us on the Foreign Affairs Committee, myself included, had some serious doubts as to the wisdom of the program and as to the possibilities for its success.

Today, we can judge by the results to date and by the prospects for the period ahead, and I am sure that it can be fairly said that the Peace Corps is a success.

The bill which we have under consideration (H.R. 10700) was reported out by the unanimous vote of our committee, which is evidence of the evaluation by each of the members of the committee of the results which have been achieved.

We made no changes in the bill as introduced by our chairman. We approve the appropriation for fiscal 1963 of $63,750,000, which is an increase of $23,750,000 over the amount appropriated for this year.

This appropriation will enable the Peace Corps to have 6,700 men and women in service overseas or in training by the end of the next fiscal year. The Peace Corps therefore will be in a position to enter into contracts for and the training of 3,670 additional volunteers during the summer of 1963.

Wisely, I believe, the term of service of each volunteer will remain for the present at 2 years. What should be done later on this point can be determined by the results.

The Peace Corps has volunteers now in 12 countries, who have asked for them, and there are presently 698 Peace Corps volunteers in these host countries. In addition, summer projects involving a total of nearly 2,000 volunteers will be implemented in 20 other countries, who have requested their services. Candidates for most of these projects already are in training. Volunteers are being recruited at the rate of about 2,000 a month.

Thus, programs involving 4,879 volunteers have been put into operation or are firmly planned in 32 countries.

This, I think everyone will agree is a good start.

The things about which many of us were apprehensive a year ago have not happened. Other possible difficulties have been avoided, or if they did arise, have been handled in stride.

It may be that the Peace Corps is a real pioneer in demonstrating firsthand that the ideal of all of our foreign aid objectives, people-to-people assistance, can be achieved.

The first year of activity surely points to this, and of this all Americans can be proud.

The Peace Corps has shown in a small way what it can do. It has earned the right to be continued as this bill proposes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Johnson].

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10700—the Peace Corps bill. Last year I had the privilege of cosponsoring the original Peace Corps measure. I predicted at that time the Peace Corps, if properly organized and soundly developed, would make an invaluable contribution to the world's needs.

It has been my longtime conviction that a corps of youth in overseas projects could render a most needed and significant service abroad. Particularly in the developing programs of health, education, agriculture, and small industries at the village level, such youth could provide the missing link between highly specialized knowledge and the need to bring this knowhow into actual practice by villagers. These youths could indeed become the most effective carriers of our best America image abroad.

Gentlemen, this has come to pass. We are receiving an ever-increasing demand for our Peace Corps. I had the privilege to watch them at work last fall when I visited East Pakistan. May I say all of us owe these fine young people a rousing salute. From various parts of the world I have letters recommending the work of the Corps and its able Director, Sargent Shriver.

How well some of us can remember a year ago, when articles regarding the Peace Corps bore such titles as: "Potential for Tragedy," "Will the Peace Corps Be Too Young?" "Misgivings," "Pitfalls," and others too numerous to mention. But today, I am proud to say we have a growing corps of well trained and properly motivated American youth serving hand in hand with village people who themselves welcome this additional help on their most pressing problems and have furthered a new climate of international goodwill and cooperation.

The Peace Corps reflects at every level of involvement such basic concepts as mutual trust, human dignity, sacred leadership, and helping people help themselves. In short, I believe the Peace Corps reflects the best of our American traditions in community building without the intention of imposing any of our values or institutions upon others. Their true effectiveness has been shown by its ability in helping people in other lands to achieve their own best values in community development.

I sincerely believe the Peace Corps is our finest foreign-aid program, and I am delighted to have cosponsored this meritorious measure again this year.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. I respect the gentleman's sincerity and I understand that he has made a personal inspection of a number of these things. However, I have not been able to get an answer yet to my question as to just what the Peace Corps is doing, concretely tabulated and totaled, so that we know and can get our teeth into this problem and find out just how they are producing and in what detail.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. In answer to the gentleman's question, they have a broad program. They have 698 volunteers now in 12 host countries, another 2,190 are in training or entering training by August 31, 1962. In addition, the Peace Corps has agreed to implement by this summer projects involving a total of some 2,000 volunteers requested by 20 other countries. Some of our volunteers are teachers, others farmers, some carpenters, some health educators and sanitary workers, home economic experts, and so forth. We could list an endless series of functions. I would respectfully suggest that the gentleman from California could find a great list of projects on pages 65 through 96, inclusive, in the enlightening book, Peace Corps.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman, who is a member of the committee.

Mr. JUDD. May I suggest that the gentleman from California look on page 135 of the hearings. There is listed the categories of workers which include nurses, medical technicians, agricultural forestry, which is the second largest, home economists, and teachers.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd].

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill to continue the life of the Peace Corps.

Today we are faced with the choice of letting the Peace Corps continue to operate or putting it out of business. Basically, it is that simple. Last year at this time many voiced skepticism of this program. It was certainly a good idea, but many Members felt that it was not practical. They said it would not work.

In the past year we have had an opportunity to see the Peace Corps in operation. We know now that its members are serious, well trained, dedicated public servants determined to advance the best interests of their country. These are dedicated young and older citizens of this Nation who want to bring about a better, a more productive, and a peaceful world.

The Peace Corps has already written a proud record even in its first year.

Mr. Chairman, today there are 781 volunteers overseas, and by late fall there will be 4,100 in training or overseas. This is certainly a clear picture of what American ingenuity and hard work can achieve in 365 days. In this short time the Peace Corps has taken a positive step forward—through its actions—to prove to those throughout the world that America is sincere in its declarations for peace. They are proving that the pioneering spirit that forged this great country from the wilderness is still prevalent in its citizenry. This year the Peace Corps is asking for a budget of $63.75 million.

This is double what they asked for last year. The Peace Corps asked for $40 million and the Congress appropriated $30 million. With this $30 million, the Peace Corps will put 5,000 volunteers in the field by the end of this year. What they are asking for this year is the authority to add another 5,000 volunteers so they will have a repeating cycle for the coming year.

The Peace Corps, Mr. Chairman, is operating in 13 countries today and by the end of the next fiscal year, it is planned that operations will be underway in 30 foreign nations. These volunteers are not technical advisers who go into a host country and tell a farmer how to run his farm. No, they are farmers themselves who work side by side with their host country counterpart to help show those in need how to increase their individual statures. This is not a giveaway program in any sense of the term. We are not exporting dollars through the Peace Corps, we are exporting Americans with know-how and the frontier spirit to help others not as fortunate as ourselves.

I have a great personal interest in the Peace Corps for many reasons. There are 62 volunteers from Illinois serving overseas with the Peace Corps, of which there are 3 from my district. Aside from the volunteers, the Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., is a fellow Illinoisan. Those of us in Illinois are most proud of his achievements during the past year in making this idea work. He has shown real executive ability coupled with vision, courage, and determination. The success of the Peace Corps is in great measure a tribute to his faith in the ideal of international cooperation on the working level—field diplomacy in the best sense.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to have been a sponsor of the Peace Corps bill last year. Mr. Shriver, the members of the Corps have justified our confidence in them.

This bill has been approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee without a dissenting vote. I urge that this House grant the necessary authority for the Peace Corps to swing into high gear this year.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this bill to authorize appropriation of $63,750,000 for the Peace Corps in fiscal year 1963 has been well described and discussed and I think very constructively. Not much more needs to be said. Perhaps we ought to call attention to the fact that this is not a new program. It is an expansion of an existing program that had been in operation 5 years or more. Last year we gave it greater stature, broader scope, a new and more attractive name, more funds, greater resources, and a clearer mandate. It is a real source of gratification that Mr. Shriver and his associates and the volunteers have done so well in developing this program, the kind of thing that the Committee on Foreign Affairs for several years had been urging the executive branch to do. In our committee report on the Mutual Security Act of 1960 we said:

> It would be of very great value not only in creating a favorable impression of the United States but also in promoting sound and basic improvements in economic development if more places for such young people were found in oversea operations. The committee believes that the United States is failing to utilize one of its important assets by not developing a program for using such services.

There were several hundred young Americans with agricultural backgrounds working in Laos, Vietnam, and various other underdeveloped areas, usually in teams of two. But they were sort of lost or neglected in the midst of our bigger programs of building dams and dynamos, fertilizer plants, and highways and bridges. Americans do well with the tangibles. But we have repeatedly urged those carrying on the foreign aid program to pay more attention to the intangibles, the personal factor in our relations with other peoples. All along we have needed more people, not so obviously tagged as agents of a big and powerful government, to go into rural areas of other countries and work at the grassroots levels with the people and their problems—problems of health, education, transportation, growing of food, use of machinery, and so forth—to help people just because we Americans are interested in people and their well-being.

Governments are big and impersonal and distant and rigid. And they are suspect in these parts of the world. Most of them have not known good governments of their own. And those who for years were under outside powers were not too well disposed toward or trustful of the colonial governments of the West.

But something happens to people inside, there is a very different reaction, when a person from another country comes and lives close to them and works with them, a person who is not trying to throw his weight around, or to impress them with his power or wealth, or to impose his will, but who sits down with them and says, "What are your problems? They are ours too. How can we work together to meet your human needs on the everyday level?"

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay tribute to this administration, from the President down, for having the imagination and the initiative to expand and develop this program. He lifted it up so that it quickly caught the attention and support of our people, especially the attention of our youth, and gave it the better place that it deserves in the total overall efforts we are making overseas.

When the proposal came up last year several main questions were properly raised. One: What would be the reaction of countries to which these volunteers were to go? The answer is, overwhelmingly good. Not a one of the 12 countries where the Peace Corps is working has raised any serious objection or asked it to leave. Twenty more countries will be sent volunteers under this bill. Still others have asked that the program be extended to include them. The Director has been wise in not trying to go faster than suitable personnel can be selected and trained.

The next question was, What would be the response of the youth of America to this program? It has been fine. Anybody who knows our youth, and older people too, never had any doubt that they would respond magnificently to a call to give their time and skills and effort sacrificially to help people in need, of whatever race or country or culture. It gives them a deep sense of usefulness to be able to play a constructive and important part, in a world where so many things seem to be going wrong.

A third main question was, How would the volunteers perform in the field? Would they adjust satisfactorily to such new and strange and distant situations? Would they be able to go out from our colleges and cities, our farms, and industries, and make a go of it living on a very simple scale in villages, or small schools, in primitive surroundings, away from the speed and comforts of American life, and so forth? The answer to that question is already at hand. Most of them have adjusted very well.

One of the things we probably should have foreseen but did not quite anticipate is the greater need and opportunity in this program for what they are calling middle-level manpower. College-trained folks we always knew would be needed and would have an important place.

But sometimes college folks, with all their idealism and dedication, have not had much practical experience in working with their hands. And in many situations the great need is for the skills that people in the shops and on the farms of America have, people who have not realized what they have to contribute to their country, other than by paying taxes or serving in the Armed Forces.

So there is a shift in the recruiting for the Peace Corps. They are looking for and taking in more and more people who know how to make a diesel engine run or how to lay bricks or work as carpenters to help build better buildings, all sorts of manual skills that everyday Americans have in abundance. Persons with less than college training are discovering there is a need and an important role for them in this program. They can go abroad and make a tremendous contribution to other peoples and to their own country by sharing skills that do not require college degrees.

We also have in the Peace Corps many who are not just youth. If you look on page 135 of the report, you will find there are 6 already at work who are over 60 years old. This is an answer in part to the point raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE], regarding maximum use of even elderly people, who have particular skills or abilities or have demonstrated in their past work records special capacity to adjust to or serve in this kind of unusual situation. I do not know any other agency of our Government that is using as well as the Peace Corps this middle level of skill that we have in our country in such abundance.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the Peace Corps doing that the missionaries have not been doing through the years, at no cost to the Government?

Mr. JUDD. There is practically nothing the Peace Corps is doing that missionaries have not been doing in one place or another, to one extent or another. I can speak of that with a certain amount of personal knowledge. Missionaries often work in even more remote and difficult areas. They come even closer to the general population. But they do not have the resources to do many things that the Peace Corps can do, or as quickly. The church missions, or the American Mission to the Lepers, or the Overseas Blind, CARE, World Neighbors, World Literacy, the Christian Colleges—there are scores of these voluntary agencies that have grown out of American concern and American humanitarianism. They must continue. But the Peace Corps can, for example, send a whole team to the major university of a country that has just gotten its independence and is seeking to develop its education rapidly. The Peace Corps can put in a task force of trained teachers of substantial size, and attack that program as probably no mission board could. The mission board is always scraping the bottom of the barrel of contributions that come in from the churches. So the Peace Corps does not interfere with or compete with what mission boards or other voluntary institutions are doing. It supplements them and complements them. It can do particular projects better. It has more resources.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman recognize any point beyond which we cannot go in this country in the expenditure of money all over the world and still have a solvent United States?

Mr. JUDD. Of course, there are points beyond which we cannot go in spending. But this is not one of them. My guess is that it will save us money net; we can reduce the needs for foreign-aid funds by efficient use and orderly expansion of the Peace Corps. The more we can do with people who train, the less we will need to expropriate for exportation of far more expensive American projects and products, because as people are helped to increase their capacity and confidence, they will be able to solve more of their problems themselves with less costly help from us.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think it is good policy and good business on the part of the Peace Corps to send a man with a wife and nine minor children to the Philippines? How about the cost of transportation alone?

Mr. JUDD. I am not familiar with the particular case the gentleman has mentioned. I will be glad to look into it. But there is no program managed by men in which you cannot find something that is hard to explain or impossible to justify. I have never known anything that is perfect. But we must judge by the overall results. The Director, Mr. Shriver, has been very forthright in reporting to us things that go wrong or do not work, and trying to correct them.

I want to mention one more question that was raised at the beginning.

The people in charge were mostly young and full of enthusiasm. How much good judgment would they have?

I want to bear testimony that they have demonstrated they have plenty—plenty of level-headed down-to-earth commonsense. This is ultimately a tribute to the Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Sargent Shriver. He is a good salesman, as everybody knows. He is also a first-rate organizer and a good executive. He has the capacity to spot and select and secure good people. That is the first and finest qualification of a good administrator.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota has in a previous Congress introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Freedom Academy. This leadership provided by the gentleman from Minnesota has led to similar proposals on the part of many Members of this body. That is preliminary to this question: Does the gentleman from Minnesota regard the Peace Corps as an effective substitute for the measure seeking the establishment of a Freedom Academy, and similar measures?

Mr. JUDD. No, it is not an effective substitute. The Peace Corps has its important function and it is doing it well. But we shall never make real headway in winning the cold war until we develop appropriate schools or machinery for giving our people a better understanding of the nature, strength, and methods of the adversary we face and a better understanding of the forces and resources on our side. Something like the proposed Freedom Academy is necessary to train and develop real professionals in fighting this unorthodox war, a war of ideas, of economics, of politics, of education, of science, of art, of athletics, of propaganda, of deception, of subversion—total warfare.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this proposed authorization for the Peace Corps, as I did when the Peace Corps bill was originally before this House. Many of us have long urged this kind of people-to-people approach. The Peace Corps fills a great gap which was left by the foreign aid program. Foreign aid has been an important and necessary program, but it has always had the failing of not touching the daily lives of the very people it attempts to aid. The Peace Corps is a partial remedy. I hope, however, that we will recognize there are private groups that have for a long period of time been doing this kind of work and doing it very successfully. There is a project known as Crossroads Africa. It does a superb job. Private groups have the advantage of not having the label of "government" on them which even in the area of the Peace Corps at times has handicapped it. Private groups also, I might add, operate at a lower ratio of staff to workers. Government always has a tendency to become bureaucratic. I am glad the Peace Corps has tried to avoid this.

In Latin America there is a group called Accion which is doing wonderful Peace Corps work, but under private sponsorship. Mention should be made also of the great, long-established religious voluntary agencies. Hopefully, the day will come when this program can be totally non-Government. But, unfortunately, for the present anyway the resources of private groups are not sufficient. Private groups just cannot raise the funds to do the job as expansively as we would like. So, therefore, there is a real need for a Government program such as the Peace Corps. It provides the additional people-to-people contact that is needed beyond what non-Government agencies are doing and have been doing for years.

I would hope also that there would be a continuing stress on special skills. I think if the Peace Corps is going to be effective, it must have men and women in it who are highly qualified in specific areas. Teaching ability is number one. Technical know-how is another. I would continue to place a high degree of emphasis on languages. If these young people are not qualified to speak the language of the country to which they are assigned, then they are not doing the job that we are authorizing these funds to do. Languages have been downgraded in our system of training in this country—both with respect to our educational institutions as a whole and with respect to Government training programs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. Doyle].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I cordially support this program now as I did when it was originally submitted to us a year ago.

I then reasoned that it would be a refreshing and positive people-to-people program, and the statements of the committee this day, together with their very splendid analytical committee report, very clearly proves that such is the case. Besides that factor, as one which I extended a year ago when the bill was before us, would be true. The other factor, I then also reasoned would reasonably be a result, has also come to be a fact. That is, that it is being carried forward by and with the basic volunteer spirit of patriotic, vigorous, and vigilant American citizens who want to do something in their lifetime for world peace and the security and prosperity of our own beloved Nation.

I compliment the committee on its work in bringing this bill before us today. I compliment the distinguished director of the Peace Corps for everything I have heard and know about his direction of this important program is of good report.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, a part of the greatness of America has been its ability to meet new challenges with initiative and enterprising solutions. The rise of new nations of the world was the signal for such a challenge. President Kennedy was the first to suggest the creation of a Peace Corps, largely made up of young people willing to give their full services to their country for a period of time. The idea was, frankly, experimental both in its concept and in the possibility of its successful implementation. One of the questions obviously related to the availability of the kind of Americans willing to undertake the training and sacrifices for the work to be done.

The President picked Sargent Shriver to plan and to bring into being the Peace Corps in the face of obvious difficulties and obstacles. Only the most minor of mistakes have marred the record of achievement which has won plaudits from all who are familiar with the accomplishments as well as from many who previously had grave doubts as to the feasibility of such a program. There is ample testimony to the devotion and skill of Sargent Shriver in giving inspirational guidance to the development of the Peace Corps. There is ample evidence of the personnel involved living up to the high hopes and ideals of those who had faith that such dedicated people could be found in the United States.

In presenting this bill, the Foreign Affairs Committee has given the Corps a unanimous vote of support. It would be well to recognize that there is involved no wild effort to create a topheavy organization or an unwieldly one in the present authorization. The fact that it doubles the size of the Peace Corps is of itself a tribute to Mr. Shriver's wisdom in recognizing that it must make a small beginning and grow only upon the most sound foundation. That principle is maintained in this request.

We who had great faith in the project in the beginning welcome those who join us today who previously had doubts. It is proper that we salute and give a "well done" to those whose efforts have earned almost universal praise. Our prayers must be that the successors of tomorrow will continue the achievements of the past as the Peace Corps moves steadily forward in its fundamental purpose of bringing thoughts of peaceful cooperation to all mankind in an ever-widening area.

I shall vote for this bill, Mr. Chairman, with the greatest pleasure, and with the hope that our vote today may give Mr. Shriver the inspiration to continue what he has so well started.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 6½ minutes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, it really does not take much courage for someone who supported this program a year ago, as I did, to be for it now, but I do want to thank and to congratulate some of the people who did not support it a year ago, or who were skeptical of it—and I might say who had a right to be skeptical—for coming down here in the well and supporting this measure. I am thinking of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton], of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George], and of my colleague from Ohio [Mr. Devine], and my colleague from Virginia [Mr. Smith]. It takes a lot of courage to support something which you were doubtful about a year ago, or which you were against, and to come down into the well and say, "My doubts were wrong," or "I was wrong; the program has worked, and, therefore, I am for it."

And I think it is a testimony to Mr. Shriver, the Director of this program, that people who have strong opinions and who watch things very carefully, as do the people I have mentioned—it is a great testimony to him that they have stated today that they believe the program has worked. Let me say to you that if I thought the program had not worked I could just as readily find it in my heart to oppose it. But it has been one of the programs that we can be proud of. It has been a program to get people to work together. I say to you that I think it is significant that the bill came out of the committee by a vote of 24 to nothing, that there was not a single witness who spoke against it, that there has been very little opposition to it here today.

I would just like to tell you about one group that has recently gone to Brazil. I believe there were 43 in this group. One of them was a girl from my district. Some of these young people are college graduates but many are not, but all are 4-H Club leaders; every single one had been a leader of a 4-H Club. They are going to Brazil to help establish 4-H Clubs. They were given a month of intensive training in Portuguese here in Washington. Then they were given a month in Puerto Rico in tropical living and the kind of things they might be expected to meet in a tropical country. They are now going to the University of Brazil and will be given a full 2 months, 8 hours a day, 6 days a week, training in Portuguese. After that they will spend an additional 2 weeks living with Portuguese families. They will be equipped to talk with the people they work with; they will be equipped to go out and do a job.

I remember a long time ago, before I came to Congress, when I was on a county legislative body, the question came up of building a detention home in my county. The county judge wanted it—the juvenile judge. It was to cost $100,000. The county could ill afford it. I did not think the number of detainees warranted it. Instead, we gave them $10,000 to establish 4-H Clubs in the county. That brought criticism from the newspapers and from the juvenile judge. I answered that question by asking him if he had ever had a juvenile in his court who was a member of a 4-H Club. He had to admit that he never had. That quieted newspaper criticism and quieted criticism from the judge. So I have no hesitancy in sending these people out to establish 4-H Clubs. I am sure it will work.

If we can make that kind of contribution—I am like some of the others here—I will come in and support a doubling of this program again next year. I think it has been one of the most effective, one of the best programs we have ever inaugurated to try to get the story of America across to the people of other countries.

It is my purpose to ask for a record vote on this bill, and I hope we will have an overwhelming vote for a program that has worked so well.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to Mr. Shriver I, too, hope he will stay on with the same dedication he has in the past year, that he will continue to give this program the kind of supervision he has given it, the kind of scrutiny he has given it, so that next year when we come here with a bill, we can be just as proud of it as we are now.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. I want to congratulate my friend from Ohio for the splendid statement he has made, and I want to join him in expressing the hope that this program can continue to be directed by Mr. Shriver. But in the event something should occur that he could not, we would all like to hope it would have a man of the caliber and the character of Mr. Shriver to head it. I believe through the dedication of these young people we have been talking about the program has thus far proven itself to be our most effective weapon in foreign assistance.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman, and I concur in everything he says. Because of the close supervision and the enthusiasm the great directorship of this program is one of the reasons it has been an outstanding success.

I urge, because of bipartisan support in the committee, an overwhelming bipartisan vote for this piece of legislation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest of pleasure that I rise today to recommend approval of the pending legislation which would extend and expand the Peace Corps program. The Peace Corps was created at the suggestion of President Kennedy last year in order to fill a great gap in our foreign aid program, and to increase the amount of person-to-person contact which we have at the local level with the populations of the nations we are trying to aid.

This person-to-person contact is vital. Last December I had a chance to observe it firsthand and to see what a success one of the early Peace Corps projects has actually been. I traveled 900 miles up and down the central valley of Chile watching one of the first Peace Corps teams in action. Forty-five strong, including 16 young women, they had completed their training and were on the job.

When we created the Peace Corps last year we hoped to provide an opportunity for young Americans with energy and ideals to work directly with the people of the developing world. Peace Corps volunteers were to stay away from the capitals—often the only place visited by earlier foreign aid personnel—and instead make their impact out in the countryside.

Today, as we consider an extension of the program, it is relevant to ask if these young Americans were the kind that make us proud? Were they genuinely helping the impoverished Chilean peasants, or "campesinos"? And were they learning from the experience?

RESOUNDING "YES"

These are questions which the Congress is asking today, and they were the questions that I was asking myself last December in the back country of Chile as I visited team after team of the "Piscorinos"—the Spanish word they manufactured for themselves.

I am glad to report that my answer to all these questions is a resounding "Yes." The Peace Corps mission—to get through to the people, and to help them in their daily lives—is being accomplished. It is vital to renew and to extend this program.

THE PROBLEMS THEY FACE

It is a staggering problem which confronts the Piscorinos in the Chilean countryside. A well-watered valley, with the towering Andes in the background, it could be a paradise.

But there are troubles in paradise—poverty and ignorance, hunger and disease.

Poverty: The campesino's actual income is less than $100 a year. Our Peace Corpsmen are finding him too poor, often, to buy the glass jars he must use to preserve his vegetables.

Ignorance: Nine-tenths of the rural population is illiterate.

Hunger: Although this is the food-raising area, its productivity has not kept pace with the increasing population. The diet of beans and corn, sugar and rice, is not considered adequate.

Disease: Sanitation is almost nonexistent. Infant mortality is 25 percent. Recently a group of campesinos petitioned the landowner for a community latrine. The landowner turned them down, admonishing them that the drainage ditches were good enough for their grandparents, and should be good enough for them.

Injustice: A few thousand families own almost all the arable land, too often farmed inefficiently. The Chilean Government promises land reform legislation soon.

COMMUNIST SHADOW

But hovering over this timetable are the sweeping victories in the rural areas by the Communists in the March 1961, elections. Moscow controlled, the Chilean Communists became legal in 1958 after 10 years underground.

Today they control one out of eight seats in the Chilean Congress. And their strength is enough to have caused the Chilean delegate to the Organization of American States to abstain on the crucial vote to study anti-Castro measures in early December 1961. Every month that sees social and economic reform delayed sees further grievances for the Communists to exploit.

This almost hopeless outlook for the campesino has brought him in droves to the city. Here he is walled up in the "barriadas"—the shanty towns of Santiago and of most other Latin-American big cities. The filth and squalor in the barriadas is unbelievable, but thousands seem to prefer it to life down on the farm.

RURAL HULL HOUSE

The Piscorinos who are confronting this appalling example of human misery signed up for the project last spring. They trained at Notre Dame University in South Bend, Ind., from July 15 to September 15. After 6 weeks of on-the-spot orientation in Chile, they have been at work since late November.

On the job, the Piscorinos work as part of the Institute of Rural Education—IRE—a semipublic Chilean organization, which I can best describe as a sort of rural Hull House. Jane Addams in the Chicago of her day decided that, while perhaps she could not do very much about the underlying economic causes of human misery, she would try to prepare people for better days, and, meanwhile, make life a little more bearable.

The IRE recognizes that the growth of industry, better farming methods, land reform, and tax reform are all necessary before the lot of the campesinos will become tolerable. But, meanwhile, here and now, it seeks to develop the human material in the rural areas it serves.

EXPANSION PLANNED

IRE now operates throughout rural Chile in 12 centrales, or rural boarding schools—soon to be expanded to 17 with some help from the U.S. AID program. To each of the centrales come some 50 campesinos, aged 15 to 23, for a 3-month training course in community development.

This includes courses in reading and writing; improved farming, such as growing fruit trees or raising Angora rabbits; home economics, particularly cooking and preserving; child care; cottage industries, such as making a piece of furniture from the abundant bamboo; recreation, like volley ball.

To do the job at each centrale are a dozen or so dedicated young Chilean leaders and Peace Corpsmen, in about equal proportions. Some stay in the centrale and work with the boarders. Others go out into the zone—up to 70 miles out, where they live in the huts with the people for 2 weeks or more at a time.

These latter work with Chilean delegados, who are themselves graduates of the centrales and are now "back at the ranch" practicing what they have learned—with special emphasis on getting campesinos who have never been conscious of living in a community to work together on such projects as setting up a cooperative store, or digging a village well.

TWO-WAY STREET

The Piscorinos are pitching in cheerfully. At the centrale for boys at Malloco, James G. Coleman, 25, a Santa Paula, Calif., farmer, is showing the boys how to grow fruit trees. "I know more about pomology than they do," Jim told me, "but they are better with their hands. I am learning something."

Emery Tamor, 24, who recently obtained a teaching degree in California, has just helped the boys build a manger for the forthcoming Christmas celebration. He was unpacking a set of woodworking tools that had just arrived, the gift of CARE.

Roger Marshall, 28, who gave up a good job as flight dispatcher with Convair back in the States, likes his new $75-a-month job: "It was the best decision I ever made." Roger and a 4-year-old Chilean boy sound asleep on his lap as they ride home on a bus make an appealing picture.

HUSBAND-WIFE TEAM

The young Chileans who help run Malloco are equally remarkable. The centrale leader is 24-year-old Gonzalo Puga, son of a former Chilean Ambassador to the United States, and an agriculture graduate of Michigan State. He supervises the animal husbandry, while his young wife, Barbara—the daughter of the dean of the School of Architecture at Catholic University in Santiago—teaches the three R's.

Most of the Piscorinos speak serviceable Spanish. They uncomplainingly eat native food. At one girls' centrale in the south, near Chillan, there was a shortage of beds—14 girls, 6 beds—as well as a surplus of flies—no screens. Beds and screens have been ordered. Meanwhile, nobody grumbles.

An unwitting tribute to the Piscorinos' effectiveness is the violent attack on them made by the well-organized Communists in the area. The Communist paper refers to the Peace Corps as "agents of imperialism" and as "the 45 spies." At the Sanchina centrale, I asked Tom Paulick, 22, a Chicago political scientist and part-time electrician, how he was reacting to the onslaught. His answer struck me as sensible: "We just work that much harder at our job, and let it go at that."

Mr. Chairman, this kind of devotion to the job is typical of the Peace Corps representatives we have sent all around the globe.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps, in the opinion of those who are familiar with its record to date, has demonstrated that it deserves continued encouragement and support. I have been heartily in favor of this unique project and am pleased to endorse the bill for its continuance and expansion.

In its first year of operation, just ended, the Peace Corps, though a bold new experiment in international relations, has already proved that it has merit and promise. Those who ventured to predict its worth have been highly gratified. Their predictions have been justified. Those who viewed it with scepticism have been agreeably surprised. They have been generous with their praise. Those who withheld judgment have joined the ranks of its supporters. It has, in fact, been enthusiastically received both at home and abroad.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs gave its unanimous vote in ordering favorably reported without amendment the bill which we have before us providing for the appropriation for the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1963. This mark of approval was accompanied by words which bear repetition:

> There appear to be no developments during the first year of operation which give rise to any question of the soundness of the Peace Corps concept, or which indicate that its program is too ambitious.

This remark is particularly significant because the Peace Corps in the proposal stage had been branded as visionary and impractical. There had been accusations of sending boys on men's errands.

There has been happy proof that those of us who saw in it an inspiring and creative experiment with great promise were justified. Already there has been concrete evidence of substantial accomplishment and the good will that has been engendered even in its initial stages.

The 12 countries to which some 698 volunteers have gone within the first year have, without exception, requested that the numbers of Peace Corps helpers be increased. It is significant that the Peace Corps, which serves only in countries to which it is invited, has received more requests than it can fill. Though the numbers will be greatly increased in its second year, the emphasis is still upon quality. All indications are that the Peace Corps was brilliantly conceived, that the projects are wisely conducted, that the individuals, carefully selected, are performing most commendably, that the countries are benefiting, and that international relations are favorably promoted both at the grassroots level and on an intergovernmental scale. Furthermore, the benefits will redound to this country in a way not at first apparent. Returning volunteers will have a unique preparation for future service either at home or abroad, in private or public enterprise. Their background will be especially useful for serving their Government in foreign fields.

That tangential benefits to this country may derive from the Peace Corps program has been recently evidenced by a development in arrangements for the training of volunteers. Preliminary to their service abroad Peace Corps men spend a few months in training in colleges or universities which have been associated with the program. Within the last few weeks announcement has been made that seven universities in the Washington-Virginia-Maryland area are combining their facilities and resources for Peace Corps training purposes. Three universities are similarly pooling their resources for training Peace Corps volunteers in Latin America.

Besides the contemplated effect on Peace Corp trainees, unexpected and beneficial results derived from a specific training project lately undertaken among Indians in Arizona. Sixty-one candidates now training at Arizona State University for a community development program in Colombia were sent on a new experimental venture to the Pima and Maricopa Reservations. It was expected that the confrontation with a different culture would be valuable preparation for oversea service.

The trainees were spread out singly or in groups of two among the Indians and left to their own resources. In some cases the Indians had not even been told that they were to arrive. The boys had to use their own initiative in getting acquainted and also in finding something to do that would be useful.

The director of the project felt some apprehension as to how well the Peace Corps would be received. His concern proved needless. The results were impressive. The trainees made sincere friendships, were welcomed and praised by the Indians, and made substantial contributions to the community. Cement floors were poured, roofing was placed on houses, fences were built and mended, yards and houses were cleaned. The Indians, in turn, taught the boys skills they knew, working with tractors and teams of horses, and methods of irrigation.

The friendly reaction of the Indians was expressed in various ways. One of the older Pimas remarked that in the short time they were there—1 week—"those Peace Corps boys picked up more insight into our problems than other people have picked up in decades."

The coordinator of that project had this to say of the results of the reservation trip:

> The value of the stay and training on the reservation exceeded my fondest expectations. I don't know a single trainee who wasn't greatly enriched by the experience. Many of the younger fellows seemed to mature overnight and to catch the significance of the great mission and responsibilities that lie ahead in Colombia.

The missions and responsibilities of the Peace Corps will be varied from country to country and within the countries; but from all indications they will be highly useful to all concerned. The question before this House is whether or not the funding of them—the requested $63,750,000 for the fiscal year 1963 operations—is justified. I believe that it is amply justified and merits an enthusiastic response from the Congress.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I am not one who likes to admit my error. There are always plenty of others ready to call attention to my mistakes without my doing so myself.

However, there is said to be great joy over the repentance of one sinner, and accordingly, as one who voted last year against the Peace Corps, I wish to announce my intention to vote for it this year.

The Director, Mr. Shriver, has done a good job and is entitled to much credit. Last year I thought the Peace Corps should prove itself before Congress placed it on a permanent basis.

Frankly, I feel the organization now has proved its worth and so, as I said, I intend to vote for this bill.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have the privilege of rising today to pay tribute to a great and personal friend, a great fellow Illinoisan and a great American, the outstanding Director of the Peace Corps, Robert Sargent Shriver. Sarge Shriver has always been a dedicated man. He believes in putting forth every ounce of energy he possesses in any endeavor he undertakes, whether it be giving our youth a better education as a member of the school board of Chicago or giving youth an opportunity to weld American friendship and help to friendly nations around the world, as Director of the Peace Corps. Much has been said here today about the agency and the good work it is doing for our country. But, instead of talking on this subject I wanted to give you the benefit of my knowledge of the man. Sarge Shriver is to be complimented highly by all of us for his dedication, inspiration, and a lot of perspiration in pioneering and carrying out such an important program for America.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this bill. Those of us who supported this program last year at its inception, can feel both pleased and justified that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has strongly approved extending and enlarging the project. I feel sure that the Congress will do the same.

Last year the bill met considerable opposition. I spoke for it before the Rules Committee, where there was sharp questioning. It was, therefore, particularly gratifying to read the recent statement of the distinguished chairman of that committee that although he had been a "hard sell," he had now been won over to the program.

I congratulate the Peace Corps on its fine record during its first year, which abundantly justifies the extension and enlargement of its program which it is now seeking.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10700, which authorizes the appropriation of $63,750,000 in order that the Peace Corps may carry forward its program as recommended by the President for fiscal year 1963.

I was elated to read the encouraging language of the Committee on Foreign Affairs report stating that the evidence as to the performance of the Peace Corps so far tends to confirm the soundness of the Peace Corps concept, and to justify continued confidence in the leadership and administrative capacity of Peace Corps Director R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., and his staff.

Mr. Speaker, the attitude of foreign governments toward the Peace Corps has been favorable. The first 12 countries where volunteers are now at work have asked that 3 times the number of volunteers now on hand be sent to them this year. In addition, agreements have been reached with 20 other countries for the implementation by this summer of projects requiring nearly 2,000 additional volunteers. No country has indicated dissatisfaction with the Peace Corps. In all cases there has been a desire for more volunteers and an attitude that the experience so far has been encouraging.

I agree with the Committee on Foreign Affairs in its assessment that the record of the managers of the Peace Corps merits continued confidence, that the planned rate of expansion of the Peace Corps, is realistic, the Peace Corps cost estimates are reasonable, and that this authorization to expend $63,750,000 is justified. I urge that this bill be adopted unanimously.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of this measure. It is my firm conviction that the Peace Corps has admirably lived up to the expectations expressed in it when this House authorized its creation last year.

More than 3 years ago I publicly advocated the inclusion within our point 4 program a broad plan to enlist America's youth to act as our ambassadors of good will by applying their knowledge, training, American ingenuity, as well as typical American personality to the underdeveloped nations of the world. Hence, Mr. Chairman, you can realize how thoroughly pleased I was when the President first presented the Peace Corps concept to Congress. I strongly supported the legislation and the appropriation to carry out its objectives.

The Peace Corps received $30 million in its first fiscal year to bring approximately 5,000 volunteers into its service by December 1962. This job is being accomplished exactly as anticipated. It fulfills the schedule assured by the distinguished Director of the Corps, Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr. It has been administered economically and most effectively, to say the least, and its accomplishments are a matter of brilliant record which have been universally hailed. Certainly, this has been most favorable to U.S. interests abroad.

I understand the Corps is now receiving more applications from qualified American young men and women than at any time during the last year. It is receiving far more requests from foreign nations than anyone anticipated. And of tremendous significance, is the fact that all of the countries to which the Peace Corps has sent its volunteers, have, on the basis of the work its men and women have achieved, requested additional volunteers. Further, I understand other countries are asking for more volunteers than the Corps can possibly provide.

The budget request for next year far from meets the demands to keep pace with the ever-growing scope of activity and the strong desires of nations throughout the world to utilize this great facet of American ingenuity. The budget does, however, propose a reasonable compromise, making possible the participation of a sufficient number of Corpsmen which the Corps believes can be prudently managed.

It is most significant that the Foreign Affairs Committee has unanimously approved this bill which will make possible the continuance in service of the first 5,000 volunteers and bring into the Corps approximately the same number next year.

I fervently prevail on my colleagues in this House to give a resounding vote of endorsement to this great project which has so effectively reflected to the world the true pioneer spirit of America.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I was one of those who voted against the Peace Corps when it was before the House last year for its initial consideration. It was my feeling that it was not practical and that sending these young people to various parts of the world without their having the necessary maturity would be a waste of taxpayer funds.

I also stated that I hoped that the position which I was taking would prove wrong and that the Peace Corps would work out as an effective group as claimed by its sponsors.

It is my purpose today to admit that I was wrong as I think this group of young people are doing a fine job at a minimum of cost to the U.S. taxpayers.

They have proven themselves as far as I am concerned and I for one intend to vote for this pending bill.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, "Seek peace and pursue it," is a lesson from the Bible meant for the preservation of mankind. A lesson of great importance which cannot be overemphasized in these precarious times.

We, in America, can be proud of the action taken by President Kennedy on March 1, 1961, when he created, by a Presidential order, the Peace Corps. The U.S. Congress endorsed the President's move when, in September of 1961 it enacted legislation to appropriate $30 million to finance the Corps first year of operation.

Congress, in the Peace Corps Act, set forth this purpose:

> To promote world peace and friendship through a Peace Corps, which shall make available to interested countries men and women of the United States qualified for service abroad and willing to serve, under conditions of hardship if necessary, to help the people of such countries and areas in meeting their needs for trained manpower, and to help promote a better understanding of the American people on the part of the peoples served, and a better understanding of other peoples on the part of the American people.

Thus, it was Congress which gave meaning to the Peace Corps. A meaning that is synonymous with the spirit of our great country given to us by our forefathers.

But a purpose can prove to be shallow if it is not properly administered. Again we can turn to the President and say, "Well done," for he appointed as Director a man well qualified to select and lead the force of men and women needed to carry out the program that Congress decreed. I refer to my good friend and neighbor from Chicago, Sargent Shriver.

Mr. Shriver has proven to be a dedicated servant, both to the people who serve under him and to the people he serves. His understanding of the program can best be described in his own words. When someone asks him, "What is the Peace Corps?" he begins not with the concept or the organization or the program but with the men and women—they are the Peace Corps.

And who are these people? They are best described as being truly unselfish. Not seeking any personal glory but satisfaction in knowing that the part they play in this drama for the preservation of mankind is fulfilling a real purpose in life, twofold in its meaning. Imparting to the unfortunate the opportunity of knowledge, and creating the true meaning of freedom to the people with whom they are in contact.

The knowledge is not limited, for the volunteers are teachers, surveyors, farmers, engineers, skilled craftsmen, nurses, home economists, and doctors. And the manner of selecting these volunteers assures us that they are the carriers of our best values and ideals, which has always been a glowing example to the world, that independence means opportunity and prosperity.

They represent every State in our Union. They exemplify the wide variegation of American life. And they are willing to serve in any manner, in any place, and under any conditions. Sacrifice is their motto, and determination and idealism is their sword.

Their plight is not easy. For to qualify they must prove to be intelligent, energetic, salubrious, and benevolent. And if they are accepted, they must perform 2 years of hard work in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. This contribution can well be a much-needed arm of support in these critical times of the world.

Mr. Chairman, we are now considering legislation to enable continuation of the current Peace Corps program, and to authorize an appropriation for fiscal year 1963.

It is difficult to evaluate the performance of the Peace Corps in terms of tangible accomplishments at the end of its first year of operation. However, the performance of the Peace Corps, so far, confirms the soundness of its concept and justifies continued confidence in the leadership and administrative capacity of the Director of the Peace Corps and his staff.

Foreign governments are favorable to the service performed thus far by the Peace Corps. The first 12 countries, where volunteers are now working, have requested that we triple the number presently in their respective lands. Twenty other countries have agreed to use Peace Corps volunteers, nearly 2,000, in various projects. In no case has any country indicated dissatisfaction with the Peace Corps.

The volunteers are adapting to the environments where they are working, and they have been made welcome by the people with whom they are associated, and appear to be popular. The State Department reports that the Peace Corps have aided the conduct of our foreign policy.

Surely this indicates that a right step has been taken in the direction of solidifying our position in the world. Through the continuation of this project we can make this step a giant one. It can develop a bond of friendship with the other nations. A bond so strong that we may be able to relax from the tension of the Communist threat. It can play a very important part in the eventual peace amongst mankind, to insure future generations of kindness and not hate.

It is security we need, so let us not forsake any good plans to provide us this security. We have the leadership to continue the program—Sarge Shriver, a man who deserves every praise—and I strongly urge we enact this legislation before us.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Chairman, last year when the bill authorizing the Peace Corps was being debated here on the floor, I said in support of the bill that I honestly thought that history would show this to be the most significant piece of legislation to come out of the 87th Congress.

The brief existence of the Peace Corps has convinced me further that this is true. I am grateful for these people; young and old, men and women of all races and all religions who are of various professions, vocations and trades, who are devoted to the American way of life and are willing to spend a period of their life to make the world a better place in which to live.

Last October I met with some of our Peace Corps schoolteachers in Ghana. They were part of the 50 Peace Corps schoolteachers scattered throughout that nation teaching in their public schools. These Peace Corps schoolteachers are winning the hearts and the praise of the Ghanaian people.

I only wish that we had Peace Corps workers in every country of the world where democracy is facing a rocky road.

I realize full well the importance of a balanced budget and it is my sincere hope that this Congress will be able to cut unnecessary expenses and balance the budget. However, I am likewise convinced that in this bill we are authorizing one of the wisest expenditures possible.

This is also evidenced by change of heart of many Members of this body. Last year there was substantial opposition to this legislation. This year many legislators have changed their position from one of opposition to one of support.

The record of the Peace Corps speaks for itself. I am proud to again support this vital legislation.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I welcome this opportunity to support the Peace Corps legislation before us and to make a few observations on the program itself. The experience of the Corps during its first year, as well as the committee's experience during the hearings held last month, gives us every reason to be well pleased with progress made in this area. Therefore, I think it appropriate to combine a vote of confidence with a note of caution as the Peace Corps moves forward into its second year.

The most significant indication of the program's success is the reaction of the foreign governments in countries to which volunteers have been assigned. Since the purpose of the program is to aid these countries by making available to them the skills which we so abundantly possess and which they so desperately need, surely it is of paramount importance to know whether these governments feel they are in fact being helped. On this point there is no doubt. The response of the countries where Peace Corps projects are being carried out has been extremely favorable. In almost every case the host countries have asked for more volunteers than they presently have, and more than we can presently supply. Such a reaction confirms the approval voiced by these countries, not only for the projects which are underway but also for the young men and women who are involved.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to express my pride in the performance of our volunteers. I have already mentioned the high quality of work they have done, and the compliments which they have received from foreign governments. Equally notable—indeed, under the circumstances amazing—is the lack of unfortunate or embarrassing incidents which might have befallen Peace Corps workers. In this regard, I would make two observations. First, that such incidents will undoubtedly occur, and that a few must be accepted without raising a hue and cry to abolish the program. Second, if and when they do occur, a careful study must be made as to whether the volunteer involved is in fact guilty of a serious violation—and should be immediately removed—or whether the incident is the result of political agitation. For if the latter is true, the Peace Corps should stand firmly behind the volunteer. Let us continue to demand high standards of our representatives abroad, but let them know also that we are behind them and will not sacrifice them in the face of irresponsible or politically motivated criticism. So far this has not been a problem, and the supply of well-qualified volunteers remains high. Under the capable direction of Mr. Shriver and his staff, I am confident that the process of selection, training, and supervision will insure a continuing high level of performance from the agency.

The fact that foreign governments are pleased with our program and our volunteers is, in itself, insufficient grounds for continuing the program. For we cannot substitute foreign reactions, based upon foreign interests, for our own judgment as to whether or not the program advances the best interests of the United States. I am satisfied that the program to date has made a distinct and significant contribution to our efforts in the field of foreign affairs. It is interesting to note, for example, that the Foreign Affairs Committee did not feel that any changes were required in the bill which established the corps last September, and by unanimous vote supported the request to permit additional volunteers to enter the program. Despite a significant increase in the number of volunteers, departmental administrative costs increased only slightly, and the percentage of the budget allocated to administrative costs actually will decline in fiscal 1963.

By helping other countries to make progress in the most urgent areas of their national needs, we demonstrate in a most tangible and striking manner the spirit of concern which is truly a hallmark of our country. Much has been said of the Communists' advantages in the cold war, which are those of a closed society. However, let us not ignore our own advantages, especially the identity of interests between ourselves and the emerging nations. They wish to be politically independent and economically strong. We wish that also. The Soviets alone do not—for their historic goal remains Communist control of the entire globe.

Thus, as our young people unselfishly work together with the people of other nations, we aid their struggle to eliminate poverty, illiteracy, disease, and all the other circumstances which breed communism; and at the same time underscore the fact that our national interests are identical, that their hopes for freedom and higher living standards are shared not by the Communists but by the United States.

As we look ahead to the Corps second year I would like to add just a word of caution. Success in the past usually augurs success for the future, but only if we are alert to those special dangers which invariably lie in wait for newly established programs. In this case, two dangers in particular are to be feared: the danger of numbers and the danger of complacency. Any organization which begins as a small, dedicated group tends to grow in numbers, and as it does, tends to become less dedicated and less efficient. The level of quality goes down. Second, initial success often leads to overconfidence on the part of those who have succeeded, making them less alert to dangers and less receptive to justified and constructive criticism. Neither of these unfortunate results need follow; but only a recognition that these dangers exist and a determination to prevent them from becoming a reality are effective safeguards for the future. I trust that as the Peace Corps grows, it will remain the vigilant, receptive, and determined group it is today.

In the Bible we read that "man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word which proceeds from the mouth of God." In the same spirit, our foreign policy is not conducted by diplomats alone, but by every act of good will performed by our citizens at home and abroad. By harnessing the power of good will so basic to our people, the Peace Corps has advanced the cause of our neighbors and ourselves alike, and has proved in a dramatic way that the interests of the United States correspond with those of free countries the world over.

I therefore support the bill before us and shall continue to follow with close attention the progress of the Peace Corps in the year ahead.

The **CHAIRMAN.** All time having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that Act, is amended by striking out "1962" and "$40,000,000" and substituting "1963" and "$63,750,000", respectively.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a most heartening day. What has been said in this historic Chamber during the general debate on the Peace Corps bill is refreshing and convincing proof that in our United States of America when one does an outstanding work of dedication, glorifying his country and benefiting mankind, no barriers of party or other division disturbs the unanimity of acclaim. To Sargent Shriver, I am happy and proud to say a Chicagoan, was entrusted the dream of the American people to serve the peoples of less developed countries in the true spirit of self-abrogation. That dream he has returned to us a dream realized. His accomplishment is being acclaimed by Members on both sides of the aisle, by Members who had doubts about the success of the program a year ago as well as those who had faith from the commencement. All this constitutes one of the finest tributes I have ever heard paid to any man, and all this has been well earned by Mr. Shriver and the able members of his staff.

Mr. Chairman, I would join with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] in stressing that the Peace Corps is Americana, not all young, not all college graduates, not all of one race, one religion, one station. The heart of America is the composite heart of all our people. If you will turn to page 71 of the hearings, you will find Mr. Shriver's statement, in answer to my question, that 8 to 9 percent of the total volunteer peace force was composed of members of minority racial groups, and that about 15 to 17 percent were noncollege graduates, men and women who had skills but did not have academic degrees.

Then I asked him the other question, How about age? The cruelest discrimination in the world is discrimination against people because of their years. I am always concerned about that. Mr. Shriver said those people had not been forgotten, that some five or six of the Peace Corps volunteers were from 60 to 65 years of age, and they were doing such a terrific job, and setting such a hot pace for the younger volunteers, that more in the older age bracket were being recruited.

So, I would say one of the reasons this program under Sargent Shriver's magic direction has been such a success, a success that has won an unprecedented measure of applause, is because it has been a program based on the traditional American pattern, a program that recognizes all groups and enlists the dedication and the best efforts of each and every group.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia is one of those to whom the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] referred when he stated that there were those of us who opposed the bill creating the Peace Corps last year who are supporting it in 1962.

When I opposed the bill last year I opposed it just as honestly and just as sincerely as I support it today. At that time I had serious misgivings about this new project in the field of international contacts and international relations. I am glad that fears and apprehensions I had at that time have been proved to have been not well founded.

Shortly after I voted against this legislation last year I received a letter from a very close and dear personal friend of mine, Dr. I. S. Ingram, president emeritus of West Georgia College, Carrollton, Ga. His letter was not written in a critical tone, but it was very effectively written. Since then I have done exactly what Dr. Ingram asked me to do, and that is to reappraise my position on the Peace Corps.

Mr. Chairman, I think the members of the committee will agree with me that this Peace Corps work has not been perfect. I know that I agree with them that it has worked better than just reasonably well.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I think all of us can say, of course, that it has not been perfect, but it has been more nearly perfect, perhaps, than a good many projects that we have tried and maybe more than we had a right to hope for. I did not realize that the gentleman had changed his position, and I again want to say that it takes courage to change your position and to say that your fears were not realized and that "I am for the program." I want to express my gratitude and the gratitude of the committee to the gentleman for doing that and say to him that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I know, is going to keep close supervision over this program, and we hope it will prove as successful this year as it has last year, and we are sure that it will.

Mr. FLYNT. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say this, that the committee of this House on which I presently serve will also keep a watchful eye on this program, and as a member of that committee I intend to do my part to see that it does not fail either in whole or in part because it does not receive the necessary financial support when the appropriation bill comes up. It is my hope that the Peace Corps will go a long way toward promoting the kind of good international relations which we need desperately at this time.

It is my hope that the few mistakes that have been made will be corrected. I believe they will be and I intend to help.

Mr. Chairman, one reason that I opposed this program a year ago was because I thought that it would be an extravagant and an unnecessary duplication of services which were already being performed by other agencies. But I find that while this may have been true, by and large the results of this program have been better than I had anticipated a year ago. I am therefore glad on this occasion to say that I was at least partly wrong a year ago and I hope that this program will now succeed and will be a success.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Sargent Shriver, and to say that his very fair letter went a long way in helping me to arrive at the decision which I have made to support this bill. I want to commend him for his dedication to this program and for making it the success that I believe it has been.

One suggestion that I would make at this point would be that a few more well qualified Georgians be accepted for Peace Corps duty. I know of many such qualified citizens of Georgia who are anxious for an opportunity to serve under this program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], if I read correctly in the hearings that each of the volunteers now has a $10,000 insurance policy?

Mr. MORGAN. Each has an insurance policy and pays for his own insurance. It is deducted from his termination payment.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, is the report correct that they are getting a $10,000 death benefit insurance policy at a premium rate of $1.20 a month?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. It is a similar rate that those who are in the military pay.

Mr. GROSS. Is it $1.20 a month?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Approximately, depending upon the age at which they are participating in the program.

Mr. GROSS. Is the Government making any contribution to this insurance cost?

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman will yield further, it is handled on the same basis that the military participates in the insurance program. Because of the broad scale of those participating at a young age, the insurance companies are enabled to allow a reduced premium.

Mr. GROSS. I assume this is $1.20 per thousand of insurance?

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman will yield further, $1.20 per thousand. The $1.20 figure is a monthly payment for a full $10,000 premium. It can, however, be reduced in $1,000 segments. It is not a constant figure. It depends upon the age. It is a death benefit policy paid for by the volunteers themselves.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, but that is not the way your hearings read. One would gain the impression from reading the hearings that it is a $1.20 premium per month for $10,000 of insurance. It reads this way:

> For this purpose the full premium of $1.20 per month is deducted from the volunteer's termination pay.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is $1.20 per month.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but it does not say anything about $1,000.

Mr. Chairman, I still would like to know the administrative cost of the Washington office, if the chairman or some member of the committee can tell me. What kind of salaries are paid in Washington to the top brass of the Peace Corps and others? The hearings show some of the salaries paid in foreign countries, but not in the District of Columbia?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The average salary paid in the Washington office is $8,050 a year. There are a total of 20 so-called supergrades authorized in addition to the Deputy Director and Director of the Corps, who would be in a category above the grades which I just referred to.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know how many are employed in the Washington office?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. There are at present, I think, 223; I believe 270 is the most recent figure of permanent employees in Washington.

Mr. GROSS. At an average of $8,000 per year?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. That is a plush setup for something that started out to be a labor of love, I will say to the gentleman. If, as you say, the Peace Corps is paying an average of $8,000 per year salaries to only 220 or so employees it simply means there are many chiefs and not many Indians.

And this whole salary picture is made even worse by the fact that there are 20 supergrade employees drawing from $15,255 to $18,500 each per year, which are not figured in the $8,000 per year average. Is this the bare-to-the-bones, labor-of-love program that was sold to Congress last year?

In its report accompanying this bill to the House floor, the House Foreign Affairs Committee says:

> At the end of its first year of operation it is too soon to evaluate the performance of the Peace Corps in terms of tangible accomplishment.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in the light of this statement it is difficult to understand—with the Federal Treasury broke and borrowing billions of dollars—how Members of the House can vote to increase the spending on this venture from $30 million last year to nearly $64 million as provided in this bill for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, the Peace Corps staff overseas are there primarily to serve and to provide needed support to the volunteers. They cannot do this effectively if they are cut off in isolated communities, surrounded by a wall of privilege and wealth. While they are distinct from the volunteers in that they receive salaries, their service is toward the same ends as that of the volunteers, and they do not receive the other types of compensation—such as cost of living allowances and supplemental cost of living allowances, PX and commissary privileges, post transfer allowances, and APO privileges—which are designed to make up for the hardship of service overseas.

For the Peace Corps, its staff, and its volunteers, service abroad is not considered a hardship, and any indication that it might be is avoided. In striving to meet the purposes of the Peace Corps, the staff, like the volunteers, cannot afford to be separated from the citizens of the host country by privilege or by a sense of differentness.

There was a much-publicized case recently of a man with eight or nine children who went overseas to serve on the Peace Corps staff. Even this unusual example is costing the U.S. Government less than does a man, serving abroad with all of the usual allowances, who has a far less striking number of offspring.

Another example of the way in which the staff, too, contributes to the objectives of the Peace Corps is the doctors who are responsible for the health care of the volunteers overseas. These physicians are expected to contribute any of their time which is not required by the volunteers to institutions of the host country. Peace Corps doctors are contributing their services to hospitals, medical schools, and laboratories. Like the rest of the Peace Corps overseas, theirs is not an 8-hour day or a 5-day week. They are there to do a large job with a small staff and with none of the trappings which would be so detrimental to the work and to the objectives of the Peace Corps.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10700) to amend the Peace Corps Act pursuant to House Resolution 579, he reported the bill back to the House.

The **SPEAKER.** Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 317, nays 70, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—317

Abbitt
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Ill.
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Ayres
Bailey
Baldwin
Barrett
Bass, N.H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Breeding
Brewster
Bromwell
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Broyhill
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clancy
Clark
Coad
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Corman
Cramer
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, John W.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Durno
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fenton
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Granahan
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kitchin
Knox
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kunkel
Kyl
Landurm
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Loser
McCulloch
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mack
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Michel
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Milliken
Mills
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Perkins
Peterson
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Walter
Weis
Westland
Wharton
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—70

Abernethy
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Baker
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Brown
Bruce
Burleson
Casey
Cederberg
Colmer
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, James C.
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Everett
Fisher
Garland
Gathings
Gross
Haley
Harsha
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Horan
Jensen
Johansen
Kearns
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Laird
Lipscomb
McDonough
McMillan
McSween
McVey
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Meader
Minshall
Moore
Norrell
Pillion
Ray
Reifel
Rogers, Tex.
Rousselot
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherer
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Taber
Thomson, Wis.
Utt
Van Pelt
Weaver
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Winstead

NOT VOTING—49

Addonizio
Alford
Andrews
Aspinall
Avery
Baring
Barry
Bonner
Boykin
Celler
Corbett
Davis, Tenn.
Denton
Dowdy
Evins
Fascell
Gavin
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Hall
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Kluczynski
McIntire
Mailliard
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
Passman
Patman
Rains
Reece
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Colo.
Scott
Selden
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Thomas
Waggonner
Watts
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Alford against.
Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Whitten against.
Mr. Addonizio for, with Mrs. Reece against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Hall.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Huddleston with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Hull with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Merrow.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the McClellan Subcommittee on Investigations filed its report on gambling and organized crime last week in the Senate.

It is a very interesting report which tells us that illicit gambling is the chief source of revenue for organized crime. It further informs us that the underworld's gambling take amounts to $50 billion a year and it is used, in part, to finance criminal activities. Then it recommends the tightening and strengthening of laws aimed at professional gamblers and stiffer taxes and tougher penalties.

This, Mr. Speaker, is all very commendable. But, how far will it go in our losing battle against organized crime? The gambling situation today is no different than the bootlegging that went on during the prohibition days.

Like gambling, the illicit distilling, transportation and sale of alcohol during the bootleg era was also the chief source of revenue for organized crime. In those days, to cope with the alarming terrorism, gangsterism, corruption and illegal sale of alcohol, we did tighten and strengthen our laws—we did impose stiffer taxes and tougher penalties. But it did not stop the bootlegging nor the criminal activities. Only the repeal of prohibition and the subsequent regulation and control of the alcoholic industry put an end to the crime, corruption, and gangsterism that flourished during that era.

Now, I ask, Mr. Speaker, what is different in human nature today that did not exist during the prohibition days? Nothing.

The urge to drink was and still is a normal, human desire which we could not stop no matter how many laws we passed. And by the same token, the urge to gamble has been and will always be deeply ingrained in most human beings and no amount of laws will stop it.

So, Mr. Speaker, why can we not profit from the experience we had with prohibition? Only repeal of prohibition and Government regulation and control of the alcoholic industry brought an end to that terrible era, and, in addition, brought billions of dollars in taxes to our Treasury.

Why can we not accept the obvious and tap this underworld gambling revenue with a Government-run lottery. Mr. Speaker, a national lottery would serve the people's best interests by recognizing that gambling, like drinking, is a fact of life and human nature.

Mr. Speaker, a national lottery in the United States would cut into the underworld's gambling intake to the tune of over $10 billion a year. This tremendous revenue which would be taken from the professional gamblers would not only cut down their illegal profits but help our Government give tax relief to Mr. and Mrs. American Taxpayer and help reduce our national debt.

DISCRIMINATORY NO-SHOW REGULATIONS FOR FLIGHTS TO AND FROM PUERTO RICO

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, 1961, Civil Aeronautics Board regulations went into effect which allow Pan American, Eastern, and Transportation Corp. of America Airlines to confiscate all money paid for an economy class ticket to or from Puerto Rico if the passenger fails to show up. The reasons for a passenger's failure to arrive at the airport at flight time are not relevant. The only way he can avoid forfeiture is to notify the carrier or surrender the ticket a full 24 hours before flight time.

Mr. Speaker, this system is still in effect. It discriminates against thousands of New Yorkers who periodically visit their friends and families in Puerto Rico. This unfair provision also exploits those Puerto Ricans who seek to migrate to the continental United States.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, realizing the damaging consequences of the no-show regulations, opposed without success their approval. These forfeiture regulations only apply to flights to and from Puerto Rico.

The Civil Aeronautics Board recently has announced plans to institute the first no-show, no-go penalties on other domestic flights. However, under these plans, passengers who do not show up for flights after May 1 will forfeit 50 percent of their fares or $25, whichever is greater. Airlines which oversell space will pay to the deprived passenger a minimum of $25 and a maximum of 50 percent of the fare. But, these new regulations do not apply to the economy flights between New York City and San Juan, P.R.

Mr. Speaker, the no-show regulations for Puerto Rican flights violate our sense of decency and fairplay. Both the requirement of a 24-hour notice of cancellation and the amount of the penalty are excessive and discriminatory. The Congress should go on record as opposing these regulations. To that end today I have introduced the following concurrent resolution:

Whereas several domestic air carriers have filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board proposed agreements or tariff changes permitting such air carriers to impose charges on members of the traveling public for failure to use or cancel reserved space; and

Whereas in the case of certain air transportation services between New York City and San Juan, Puerto Rico, several domestic air carriers are permitted to impose what amounts to a 100 percent penalty on travelers who, for any reason, fail to use or cancel reserved space; and

Whereas the practice of imposing excessive charges for failure to use or cancel reserved space can prove to be discriminatory in cases where such failure occurs for reasons beyond the control of the traveler; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Board has ample authority under existing law to investigate the practices of air carriers and protect the traveling public from the imposition of excessive charges: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress vigorously disapproves the imposition by air carriers of excessive charges for failure to use or cancel reserved space on aircraft. It is the sense of the Congress that the Civil Aeronautics Board should exercise its authority under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to initiate such investigations as may be necessary to enable the Board to carry out its duties under such Act in a manner that will assure the traveling public adequate protection against the imposition by air carriers of excessive charges for failure to use or cancel reserved space. It is further the sense of the Congress that, in the conduct of such investigations, the Board should explore every avenue of action available to it under existing law to promote adequate and economical service by air carriers at reasonable charges, without unjust discriminations or undue preferences or advantages.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us want to see equal and fair treatment by the airlines for all our citizens. I hope this resolution will be afforded prompt and affirmative consideration.

THE LATE THEODORE LEONARD IRVING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that we come today to report to the House the death of a former colleague from the State of Missouri, Theodore Leonard Irving.

Mr. Irving was born March 24, 1898, in St. Paul, Minn. He was one of four sons of Edgar Lorenzo Irving and Florence Chapel Irving. Living is one brother, Vernon Aldrich Irving, of Havre, Mont.; deceased are Percy E. Irving and Kenneth Irving.

On May 4, 1918, he married Effie A. Bjornstad in Minot, N. Dak. From this union one son was born, Jerry Irving.

Mr. and Mrs. Irving left Minot, N. Dak., because of illness of their son, Jerry, and moved to California. There they stayed for 11 years, moving to Independence, Mo., in 1934.

He was an organizer for labor until 1940 when he was elected to business agent and president of local No. 264, a position he retained for 22 years.

During this time in 1948, Mr. Irving ran for and was elected to the U.S. Congress, taking a leave of absence from local No. 264.

Mr. Irving was a man of many facets. Although he appeared mild mannered and soft spoken, he possessed great courage and ability to stand up and take definite strong positions when truth and justice required it, which gained for him the complete respect of all who worked with or for him.

He was a generous benefactor and a true gentleman, one who would be even more humble because of the warmth and love shown here today.

He was a fellow man, always there with kind words, a warm handshake, a big smile to express his complete concern for people and their problems.

He will be sorely missed by his fellow man.

As a family man, Mr. Irving forgot all else and turned his loving care and thoughts home. He bequeathed to his family experience, tolerance, counsel, and endless devotion. One of his greatest joys was to talk to or be with his three grandchildren. He led his life in such a manner that he set examples for them without hypocrisy. He left them memories they will never forget as his love and compassion for mankind and nature, as God created it, was endless.

He leaves his wife, Effie A. Irving, one son, Jerry Irving; and 3 grandchildren: Theodore Leonard Irving II, 16 years; Jerralynn Diane Irving, 12 years; Lisa Patrice Irving, 2½ years.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan.]

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great shock that I learned of the death of a friend and former colleague in the House of Representatives by reading the notice in one of the St. Louis newspapers. On March 6, at a dinner meeting of Missourians given by the Missouri State building and construction trades membership, I saw Leonard Irving for the first time in 9 years and had a long, warm talk with him, reminiscing about the happenings which occurred during the year I spent working in his congressional office after the death of my husband and prior to my campaign for nomination to the U.S. House of Representatives. Leonard looked wonderful, said he had been ill but was feeling fine, and we had a delightful hour of conversation. He told me his wife, Effie, did not accompany him on this trip because he expected to stay only a few days. He was so happy to be able to have these few hours to spend with his former colleagues. Neither of us had any idea that within a span of some 24 hours he would be leaving this world. I did not know that he had been taken sick and had his fatal illness here in Washington until I read it in a newspaper.

Leonard Irving was a quiet man but he had many outstanding abilities. I discovered many of them while working in his office for that year, 1951 to 1952. He did much to encourage me during that time to make the race for the nomination to Congress from the Third Congressional District of Missouri. On numerous occasions he bolstered my morale; and he was very much aware of the difficult time I was having in the loss of a very dear, devoted, and wonderful husband.

No one can appreciate more than I the loneliness and sadness of having one's husband called to his eternal rest so suddenly. My deepest sympathy goes to his wife, Effie Irving, and to his son, Jerry. I know that as the years ease this pain of deep sorrow they will have many warm memories of their lives with him as husband and father.

The newspaper announcement of Leonard's fatal illness and death follows:

[From the Kansas City Star]

Trip Illness Fatal to Leonard Irving—Former Representative in Congress Dies on Visit to Washington—Became Sick in Hotel—Construction Union Official Had Gone to Capital on Business

Leonard Irving, former Representative in Congress and a longtime labor leader here, died unexpectedly this morning in Washington. He was 63 years old.

Irving, president of local No. 264 of the Construction and General Laborers union, flew to Washington Tuesday on union business. The union's national headquarters is in the Capital City.

BECAME ILL IN ROOM

Don R. Jarrett, assistant business representative of local 264, accompanied Irving. He said Irving became ill in his hotel room early today and a short time later was dead.

Irving, a Democrat, was first elected to Congress from the fourth district in 1948 and was reelected 2 years later. Running in the then newly redistricted fourth district for a third term, he was defeated by Jeffrey P. Hillelson.

Irving had served as president and business representative of the union since 1940. During the time he was in Congress, he took a leave of absence from his duties as business representative but returned to Kansas City to preside at the union's meetings.

Irving was a political darkhorse in 1948, when he was successful in his first bid for public office.

SEQUEL FOR CAMPAIGN

An outgrowth of that campaign, coming 3 years later after Irving had been reelected, was a Federal grand jury indictment alleging improper use of union funds in the campaign.

Irving was acquitted of all charges, however, after a trial in Federal court.

Irving's labor career put him in the news on frequent occasions and he testified at the 1953 congressional subcommittee hearings in Kansas City.

Last summer he was named as a temporary adviser to the Central Labor Council, which was attempting to write a new constitution.

TO HELM IN 1940

Irving moved to Kansas City in 1934 from Hollywood, Calif., and was active as a labor organizer here until 1940, when he became business agent and president of local 264, positions he has held since that time.

His son, I. J. Irving, is assistant business representative of the local.

In Hollywood, Irving operated the Naval Officers Club for 11 years.

Always a dapper dresser, Irving was named the "two-Cadillac Congressman" by political opponents in the capital.

Irving was born in St. Paul.

A Mason, he was a member of the Knights Templar and the Eastern Star at Williston, N. Dak., and of Ararat Shrine in Kansas City. He was also a member of the First Congregational Church of Williston.

Besides his son, he leaves his wife, Mrs. Effie Irving of the home, 9400 Wornall Road; a brother, Vernon Irving, Havre, Mont.; and three grandchildren.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling].

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Randall] for yielding to me. I would like to join the gentleman in his remarks with respect to our late former colleague, Leonard Irving. I was shocked at the news of his death. I had been with him only a relatively few hours before he died.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend the condolences of my wife and other members of my family to Mrs. Irving and Jerry Irving, his son.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in providing a proper eulogy to one of our former colleagues who has departed this life, of course there will be published in the Record at an approriate place, the formal detailed biography of a part of our friend Mr. Irving's life. But as the Member of this body that now represents the district which he served while a Member of Congress, and by one who knew the man personally as a fellow citizen of his home community, I hope I may be pardoned if we mention today for the Record, some personal observations about what we, ourselves, knew about our friend, Leonard Irving, as a person, a family man, and—above all—a good citizen of the city in which he lived.

I vividly recall the spring of 1948 when Leonard Irving decided to run for Congress for the first time. I was then on my first term as a member of the Jackson County court and had been approached by some friends to run for Congress. However, upon learning of the intentions of two of my friends to file for this office, all further consideration was abandoned, and I refused to let my own name be considered.

A close friend of mine was one of the contestants in that spirited campaign of August 1948, and the other principal contender was our late departed friend, Leonard Irving. Mr. Irving won that primary and his name appeared on the same ballot that fall with his and my fellow townsman, Harry S. Truman, in one of the most unusual election contests of all modern history.

We all know the outcome of that election on the national level, and as to Missouri we know Leonard Irving came to Washington as Representative of the Missouri Fourth District. He conducted a clean campaign, and after that hard fought primary, these two opponents became the very best of friends, and neither held any bitterness nor animosity. This is just another tribute to our former Congressman from Missouri—Leonard Irving.

In the 1950 primary, there were four additional candidates for the Democratic nomination, and as was always his nature and custom, he conducted a dignified, high level campaign. When the votes were tallied on August 1, 1950, it was found that Irving's count was more than the combined total of his opponents.

During his second term, we had occasion to visit the city of Washington and were received most cordially by our late friend. From others we have learned he was always a gracious host to his many constituents, both in the Nation's Capital and also in the home district.

Before coming to the Congress, he served as a business representative for organized labor; and after becoming a Congressman he prided himself on representing the laboring man, the man who earns his living with his hands. In fact, in the Congress he was sometimes described by friends as the "voice of the workingman," but his interests were not limited nor restricted to the workingman, rather he was truly a representative of all the people.

We have so many pleasant memories about our friend. For his campaign picture, he selected the one in which he was holding his pipe—his ever-present pipe. He owned a great many pipes, but they were always designed of modest proportions, yet of streamlined design, and added to his allover appearance of a clean-cut, honest, sincere man. His campaign picture did more than thousands of words could have done, because people read through the picture and saw a man of character—a man possessed of determination, perseverance, thoroughness—but at the same time one that was careful, cautious, and considerate of others. He was not conservative to the point where he was not progressive, but neither was he a radical or anything but responsible at all times.

From my association with Leonard Irving, I learned he was not a man who believed in sham or masquerade or in the tactics of a feint. He was not a demagog and abhorred the tactics of political chicanery. He wanted to be known for exactly what he was, a friend of the workingman first, and then a champion of all the principles that are embodied in our American democracy.

Mr. Irving could be described as a mild-mannered, kindly man, but when he made up his mind that a course of action would be a benefit and a help to his constituents, he could be transformed into a dynamo of energy, relentless, and with a drive powered by his genuine concern for the well-being of his people. Another paramount quality of this great man was his great and abiding sense of gratitude. He was most appreciative of life itself, and he appreciated friends and the value of friendship. He was one of the few men I have ever known, who never forgot a kindness he received from another.

In the Golden Acres area in Independence, Leonard Irving was known as a devoted family man. Although his schedule was always a busy one, he found time to enjoy his family and could often be seen outside his home working on his lovely yard. In order to accommodate his constituents and at the same time be near his family, he purchased a long house trailer which he parked near his home, and used it as a district congressional office.

Just as our former Congressman was devoted to his home, so was he a constant booster for his community. We recall he was always in the forefront of any worthwhile civil enterprise. In our own family, my wife, Mrs. Randall, was general of all solicitations for several years in independence for the Community Chest or what is now called the United Fund. In the very beginning, we learned we could always depend upon Mr. Irving and also Mrs. Irving, in the Golden Acres area. As a civic leader working in the interest of a good cause, he could always be depended upon, not simply to pull his own part of the load, but to act as an inspiration to other workers.

On Tuesday evening, March 6, the Business Trades Council held a reception at the Sheraton-Park Hotel for the Missouri delegation. We understood Mr. Irving attended this reception and it was a great misfortune that we somehow missed seeing him.

Providence always has a way to write a proper conclusion to the last chapter in a good man's life. After Leonard Irving became a Member of Congress, he became acquainted with our Nation's Capital and often expressed his love and appreciation for the beautiful city of Washington. And it was while in his beloved city that he was called to his reward. We firmly believe that had Mr. Irving been able to plan the final chapter of his life, it would have been very similar to that which transpired.

Leonard Irving was a lovable man—a man who made friends instantly with other people. Children took to him at once and while his pipe was his trademark, so was the fact that in his home area, his favorite dog was his constant companion. In most instances, a man who is kindly toward little children and animals—is a good man. This is true of Leonard Irving.

Mr. Irving loved his fellow man and gave unselfishly of his time and energy for those who needed a friend, and never missed an opportunity to say a friendly word or to extend a helping hand. He spent his entire life in serving people, and came to enjoy the warm friendship of thousands whom he had befriended. He was a man of stature, a man of ability, a conscientious man dedicated to improving the lot of his fellow man. The Kansas City Star accurately described Congressman Irving as a man of strength whose guide was principle and whose convictions were unshakable.

In the passing of our friend, Leonard Irving, the laboring man has lost a tried and trusted champion, and all of those who knew him, those of us here in the Congress, have lost a former colleague, a valued friend and associate, who was highly regarded and held in great esteem by all who knew him. To his fine wife and good son and to his immediate family we today extend our deep sympathy. May his soul, through the mercy of our Lord, repose in peace and be at rest.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks, and that any Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD with respect to the late Mr. Irving.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

I HAVE NO USE FOR A TRAITOR—COMMUNISM MUST BE STOPPED

Mr. **WICKERSHAM**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WICKERSHAM**. Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that praise should be given where deserved and criticism rendered where it can do some good.

For that reason I rise today to express the appreciation of the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Oklahoma to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and the Justice Department for their labors against the Communists in this country.

The court action on March 19, 1962, in New York State to prevent the loss of $381,000, plus penalties, owed to the Government in income and excessive-profits taxes by the Communist Party was well planned and should result in a saving of nearly $500,000 to our taxpayers. For this action the Justice Department deserves our praise.

The action against Gus Hall and Benjamin Davis, the top two Communists in America on March 15, 1962, for failure to register as required by the Internal Security Act of 1950, deserves our praise.

The conviction of Robert Soblen on July 15, 1961, for espionage; the conviction of Arthur Rogers Roddy on February 17, 1961, for espionage; the conviction of Irvin Scarbeck on November 8, 1961, for giving classified information to a foreign agent; the jailing of Philip Bart, organization secretary of the Communist Party, on March 7, 1962; and the jailing of James Jackson, editor of the Worker on March 9, 1962, all deserve our praise to the Justice Department.

All these actions and the many indictments of subversives in the last 14 months by the Justice Department deserve our praise and appreciation.

I believe the time has come for the Attorney General's Office and the full force of the Justice Department to be employed against the Communists who have failed to register as required by the Internal Security Act of 1950.

The time has come for action to be taken against those persons who control the labor unions that have been expelled by the AFL–CIO because those persons so expelled are members of the Communist menace. The Communists who dominate such unions, and who have failed to register, should be prosecuted now.

Harry Bridges, the president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, has been identified not less than four times by former members of the Communist Party in hearings before the House Un-American Activities Committee as a Communist. These four were Martin Berkeley on September 19, 1951; Louis Budenz on January 15, 1952; Manning Johnson on July 8 and 13, 1953; and Stanley B. Hancock on February 24, 1954.

Harry Bridges pleaded the fifth amendment before the House Un-American Activities Committee on April 21, 1959, when questioned if he were a Communist at the time he applied for a passport.

This very day the shipping from the west coast of this country is tied up by a strike. West coast shipping is vital to this country and to the defense of the free world. The Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union has been expelled by the AFL–CIO because it is Communist controlled. Harry Bridges controls this union.

I hereby call on the Attorney General to file action today against Harry Bridges under the Internal Security Act of 1950.

The American Communications Association has been expelled by the AFL–CIO because it is Communist dominated. This union provides the communications for our Government, including the Defense and State Departments. We should not confuse the Communications Workers of America, which is a member of the AFL–CIO, and of which our telephone operators are members, with this Communist-dominated American Communications Association.

In the event of a war with the Communist countries, this Nation could find itself depending on a Communist-dominated union such as the American Communications Association. The time has come for the Justice Department to file action against the Communists in the American Communications Association.

There is also the 8,000-member Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers' Union, which has been expelled by the AFL–CIO because it is dominated by Communists.

I hereby request the Attorney General to take action against all Communist-dominated union officials who have failed to register. The AFL–CIO has cleaned them out of their ranks, and it is now up to the Justice Department to bring them out into the open for all America to see.

I read with alarm the statement that was attributed to a top official in the Justice Department that there are only 8,000 to 12,000 Communists in this country. I request a full explanation of what he was saying when he said only 8,000 to 12,000 Communists.

The National Guardian, which has been identified by the House Un-American Activities Committee as the virtual official propaganda arm of Soviet Russia in America, has a paid circulation of 29,072. The editor, James Aronson, has refused to state that he is not a Communist in hearings before the committee. I call on the Justice Department to find out why persons would want to pay for the National Guardian if they were not Communists. I call for action against the editor for failure to register as a Communist.

The paid subscriptions for the Worker, the Communist newspaper for the east coast, is 16,239; the People's World, the Communist newspaper for the west coast, has 7,696 circulation; Mainstream magazine has 806 circulation; the Jewish Current has 3,262 circulation; Political Affairs magazine in New York has 1,045 circulation; and the New World magazine has 6,100 circulation. Unless the Communists are taking two and three copies of these publications, then there are more Communist subscribers than there are Communists, if we can accept this 8,000 to 12,000 figure.

What alarms me even more is the statement of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, when coupled with this 8,000 to 12,000 figure. Mr. Hoover said that for every known Communist there are 10 more willing to do his bidding. Does this mean there are 80,000 to 120,000 willing to do the bidding of the Communists in America?

Are the 8,000 to 12,000 Communists mentioned by the Justice Department official the card carrying kind of Communists? Just who are they and even more important, are they registered?

Now I grant you that these Communists, regardless of how many there may be of them, are not going to overthrow this Government, but they are the disciplined Communists who take their orders from Russia. They will be the ones to destroy our communications, sell our military secrets, corrupt our youth, and be the advance guard in the event of a war with the Communist countries.

I have no use for a traitor to this country. I have never been able to understand how an American could buy their ideas. I have no use for a Communist, fellow traveler, or their supporters. I voted for the Internal Security Act of 1950 requiring all Communists to register. We gave the Justice Department the law, and the Supreme Court has upheld that law. The Attorney General has been doing an excellent job fighting the Communists but the time has come for more action. Not just against the top brass or the known officials, but against the Harry Bridges, the Communists in the unions that were kicked out by the AFL–CIO, and the 8,000 to 12,000 hard core Communists that were referred to by the Justice Department official.

I praise the excellent leadership of the Attorney General in these last 14 months. I have no criticism of him. He is my friend, and I appreciate all his labors for this Nation. I not only want my son, who is now in the eighth grade, but all youth, middle aged and aged to be free from this Communist menace in this great country of ours.

If the Justice Department needs increased appropriations, more help, more laws, then just let us know. The American people are willing and I too am willing to stand up and be counted against communism.

H.R. 10650—REVENUE ACT OF 1962

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the House approved and sent to the Senate a tax bill which presumably had the support of the administration in general and the Secretary of the Treasury specifically. My conclusion that the administration favored the legislation that was then before the House stems from the contents of a "Dear Wilbur" letter expressly praising the bill, and from the fact that the administration's lobbyists were persistent, resourceful, relentless, and emphatic in the tactics they used to line up the unwilling Democratic recalcitrants in behalf of a bill embodying what is widely regarded to be bad tax policy.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the fateful and frightful final vote on this tax legislation, I made some observations on the floor of the House predicting that certain events would come to pass if the legislation received House approval. I now stand in your midst deserved of recognition as a political prophet and fiscal seer. My omniscience predicting duplicity and transiency on the part of the Treasury Department in regard to this tax bill has come true. The tax bill that the Treasury Secretary supported in the House of Representatives on Thursday, March 29, was the subject of substantial criticism by that same Secretary of the Treasury before the Senate Finance Committee in public hearings on Monday, April 2, 4 days later.

According to press reports, the Secretary of the Treasury, armed with horror cases, confused statistical data, and muddled economic thinking, appeared before a Senate Committee to in effect discredit the House-passed bill and urge the membership of the other body to do that which the House had refused to do. The Secretary has taken the bill number, H.R. 10650, which apparently is acceptable to him, agreed to the short title of the bill, which is the "Revenue Act of 1962," and then proceeded to criticize virtually everything else that follows in the bill. The theme of the Treasury's recommendations was to make the investment credit loophole bigger and better and the other provisions of the bill tighter and tougher.

Mr. Speaker, the question naturally arises from what I have said as to why this amazing performance by the Secretary qualifies me for any recognition as a soothsayer. The fact of the matter is that in my remarks of March 29, I predicted that the administration would be seeking substantial change in the bill; that the Treasury would disavow previous acceptance of compromise positions, agreed to by the administration to lure and entice House votes for this bad Treasury tax package. During my remarks at that time I said:

> The administration which wants to move this bill is promising almost all things to all men to get your votes on this floor knowing perfectly well that once you have sent it to the other body you will have lost complete control of it. Those of you who are planning to vote for the bill because of any of these scattered panaceas or because of some particular provision for which you may have a great enthusiasm are certainly risking great disillusionment.

I went on to say:

> Once the House passes this bill with these provisions in it we risk not recognizing them when they may return to us with the full administration proposals restored. This will be at a time when we will have little or no effective control over any provisions of this bill.

In regard to the fiscal implications of this legislation, I said:

> It will be a lame excuse to try to describe to constituents the last-minute razzle-dazzle in the Ways and Means Committee which was used to set up a smokescreen to the effect that the investment credit really would not cost anything at all that was noticeable. If it were going to cause the great administrative revolution that its proponents claim, it would have to be expensive. It is still expensive, but you are being fed a party line in every administration speech on this floor that it will do great things at just about zero cost. It is amazing how little regard some people have for the intellectual acuteness of Members of this body.
>
> What is at stake in this bill is a lot more than party loyalty. Basically, the public welfare is at stake. The only driving reason to pass this bill in this House is to save the faces of the administration, the Treasury, and of some American colleges at the expense of the public welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the administration is diligently at work seeking substantial changes through Senate action on a tax bill which the House passed only last week. The bill that passed the House was not desirable tax legislation, but if the Treasury endeavors in the Senate are successful, the legislation will be made considerably more objectionable.

The only thing that has changed in the last few days that bears on the consideration of this tax bill is the release of the budget estimates compiled by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. These budget estimates, which historically have proved consistently more accurate than Treasury estimates, point to the likelihood of a budgetary deficit in fiscal year 1963 in excess of $4 billion; and if the tax provisions of H.R. 10650 are approved, that deficit will approach $5 billion.

Mr. Speaker, as an established oracle, I wish that I could predict that H.R. 10650 would not receive Senate approval. The act of rejection would be in the public interest. Unfortunately, I anticipate that the administration will continue its policy of blind insistance on these poorly conceived tax changes. It is my hope, but not my prediction, that favorable action will not be forthcoming on this measure in the other body. It is my prediction that if the business community and other persons who believe in our free enterprise system fail to assert their viewpoint on this legislation, we will find the legislation going to the Executive for approval essentially in a form to which the Treasury would lend its wholehearted approval.

WHAT PILOTS SAY ABOUT NONSCHEDULED AIRLINES

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in light of S. 1969, a bill now before Congress which would give permanent status to nonscheduled airlines, I think it most appropriate that an article by Richard Slawsky entitled "What Pilots Say About Nonsked Air Crashes," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This article appeared in the April, 1962, issue of Stag magazine. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to place the article in the body of the RECORD:

WHAT PILOTS SAY ABOUT NONSKED AIR CRASHES

(By Richard Slawsky)

An air of gloom hung over the California State Polytechnic dressing room. The football season, now more than half over, had not been a successful one and now the low point had been reached.

Moments before, the final whistle had blown, sounding the end of a 50–6 thrashing at the hands of powerful Bowling Green State University. Sure, Bowling Green was one of the strongest small college teams in the Nation, but to travel nearly 2,000 miles and lose so badly, well, that was a bitter pill for the youngsters from San Luis Obispo. The trip home would be a long one.

Head Coach Leroy Hughes stopped by the locker of Halfback Jim Fahey to mutter a couple of words in consolation. The husky gridder managed a wan smile, then went back to packing his gear for the trip to the airport as Hughes moved on to the next boy.

Outside, the air over Toledo was no brighter than that in the locker room. Heavily laden clouds were starting to close in, and fog began to blanket the Ohio countryside as night came quickly.

By the time the team reached the airport and prepared to board its chartered airliner for the long flight home, the fog seemed almost impenetrable. Toledo Express Airport was almost completely closed in. But, nevertheless, the visitors climbed aboard and as the plane, an old, cumbersome-looking C–46, rolled to the end of the runway, the players, coaches, and fans, 45 in all, settled back in their seats.

Capt. Donald L. J. Chesher was at the controls of flight N–1244N. His copilot was Howard Perovich whose mother and sister-in-law were on board, coming to California to meet his bride of less than 2 weeks.

Visibility in the fog was absolutely zero. Even the nose of the stubby twin-engine plane was barely discernible from the cockpit. But Captain Chesher could take off if he wanted to. That was a pilot's prerogative. The airline, Arctic Pacific, was a small one with only four planes. It couldn't afford to have one tied up by weather.

Checking with the tower, the pilot got an encouraging report. Though the fog was heavy, it did not extend too far above the ground. He could climb out of it quickly and make the trip back on schedule. Coach Hughes came to the cockpit for a brief word and then returned to the cabin.

"The pilot has more in this than anyone else," he announced. "He wouldn't take any chances. We have nothing to worry about." Taking his seat in the rear of the plane, he fastened his seat belt as the heavily loaded ship started down the runway.

It gained precious speed, first slowly, then with assurance. Power surged to the propellers as they forced the big ship through the fog. Begrudgingly, it left the ground. Captain Chesher pulled back sharply on the controls, as though anxious to escape the tenacious mist.

Suddenly, barely 100 feet off the ground, engines started sputtering. Before the pilot had a chance to make a move, the left engine gave out and the plane pitched sharply. The tail dropped, the left wing caught the concrete of runway 070, and with a horrible, rending crash, the plane cartwheeled two, three times.

Flames, fed by a full load of fuel, raced through the wreckage even before the twisted mass came to a stop. The plane split in two, the tail section spinning away, coming to rest upside down. Miraculously, it did not burn. Survivors scrambled out of the debris, blinded by the fog, choking from the smoke. But they could only stand by helplessly and listen to the horrifying screams of those trapped in the burning front section. As the flames reached those inside, the screams stopped. Some of the survivors vomited.

Word of the tragedy raced across the Nation. Twenty-two aboard had been killed, including 16 members of the football team, the pilot, and the copilot. In the little California town, the 470-member student body of Polytechnic College were stunned. Girls cried openly, parents gathered at the school in a state of shock, grasping for word of survivors, praying that their boys had been spared.

Even before the smoke had cleared, teams of investigators from the Civil Aeronautics Board swarmed over the crash scene. What they found plying through the wreckage prompted Elwood R. Quesada, then Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, to announce circumstances surrounding the disaster "indicate a gross disregard for public safety and the regulations of the FAA." He immediately grounded Arctic Pacific.

The subsequent investigation took many months. When it was completed, Government officials had pieced together a condemning portfolio of evidence, revealing that at least 16 regulations had been violated by Arctic Pacific just prior to and during the brief, fatal flight.

Captain Chesher, it developed, had had his airline pilot rating revoked by the FAA for what the Agency termed a lack of care and judgment. The suspension had been stayed, however, by his appeal to the CAB for a review of the case.

It was further revealed that Arctic Pacific had been charged with 25 counts of specific violations of the Civil Aeronautics Act between 1957 and 1959. On July 11, 1959, the line pleaded guilty to 10 counts and the other 15 were dismissed by a Federal court.

A total of $16,000 in fines were levied against the nonscheduled airline. Two days before the Toledo disaster, attorneys for the firm had notified the FAA that Captain Chesher had been discharged. This, the line suggested, could be one reason for the Agency to reconsider and perhaps reduce the levy against them. Yet, just 48 hours later, the discharged pilot was flying an Arctic Pacific plane.

And flying it despite the fact that he had already exceeded the maximum allowable air time for pilots of 8 hours in any 1 day. Having flown the California Poly team to Toledo the day before the crash, he had picked up another load of passengers, flown them to New England, and returned to Ohio for the return trip to San Luis Obispo. It was for similar violations that his certificate had originally been suspended.

Further investigation revealed that the engine which failed shortly after takeoff had been purchased secondhand by Arctic Pacific and installed in the C–46 despite the fact that it was not even certified for that type of aircraft. It was found that 20 of the plane's 36 spark plugs were fouled after the crash, a possible cause of the sputtering engines.

It was also learned that the plane carried low octane fuel in its tanks, good enough for flying under normal conditions, but lacking the power for emergencies such as the one which developed.

Finally, not only did the pilot attempt to take off under extremely adverse weather conditions, conditions which would have been sufficiently bad to ground any scheduled airliner, but he did so knowing the plane was 2,000 pounds overweight.

Barely 12 months after the Arctic Pacific catastrophe, another nonscheduled airliner carried human life to a fiery end in a ravine near Richmond, Va. The Imperial Airlines plane which crashed last November 8, killing 74 Army recruits, again focused the spotlight of public attention on the nonskeds, a spotlight which has caused several operators to squirm and try to hide from its inquisitive brilliance.

The CAB's final report of its findings from that crash investigation has not been published. But it is known that on two previous flights, one just the night before, the plane involved had developed a faulty fuel pump, a defect that requires immediate grounding of the plane. One fuel pump had even been repaired with a part from a used car.

One item above all else links the two crashes. Both planes were owned by nonscheduled airlines—nonskeds, as they have been called. Since the November crash, that sobriquet has been charged with controversy. Even its meaning and application are being disputed.

They should, it is charged by many, not be permitted to continue shoddy, unsafe, nearly bankrupt operations which endanger the lives of their passengers. There are several well-run, financially solvent nonscheduled operations, but despite their facade of efficiency, they cannot dispel the stigma of lines like Arctic Pacific and Imperial.

The very existence of the nonskeds is threatened by upcoming congressional action. Following a rather horrendous record during the years just after World War II, the nonskeds were the subject of a 4-year investigation by the CAB. The verdict, announced in 1955, permitted the lines to provide "individually ticketed service (the same as scheduled airlines) not to exced 10 flights a month in each direction between any 2 points."

This decision was challenged by the scheduled carriers who finally took the battle to the courts. The legal battle ended 2 years ago with the decision that the CAB certification of the nonskeds was illegal. It was directed that Congress decide the fate of the nonskeds, a decision which has been postponed through temporary legislation permitting them to continue under the voided CAB directors.

That permission is due to expire April 20, however, and, in view of the attention focused on the nonskeds by the two crashes, Congress will not be able to avoid the problem. The question before the Senators and Representatives, when stripped of its legal mumbo jumbo, is simple: Should the nonskeds be permitted to continue operations?

This reporter attempted to find an answer to that question. Not from legislators or Government officials though, but from men who are in a position to know more about what goes on inside the small industry than anyone else: the pilots, copilots, and mechanics themselves.

The men proved surprisingly honest and objective in their appraisals of their livelihood. While they contended that cheating and rulebreaking was practiced by only a few of the nonskeds, they did admit that it existed, and that it was an open secret to all who were close to the industry.

Each had his own ideas as to what must be done to clean up the nonskeds and help them earn the right to operate and the respect of the traveling public. The opinions varied, but considered together, they provide the basis of what might well be the prescription needed by the lines to cure their ills.

One man interviewed was a veteran of more than 12 years of flying with the nonskeds, a career that takes him back to the formative years of the lines. A robust, jocular man, he spoke with a sage awareness of his chosen profession. Considered by his colleagues an outstanding pilot, he has seen or heard of all the tricks—the ruses used to skirt regulations and cover up violations. He hesitated to answer only one question asked by the interviewer: whether he knew or had heard of any instances of Federal inspectors deliberately overlooking a violation.

Reminiscing somewhat, he unfolded some of the history of the nonskeds and the trials and tribulations of their earlier days.

"This business really got started back after World War II. You had a lot of guys—flyboys—coming out of the service with a few years flying time, a few bucks in their pockets, and an itch to keep in the air. The schedules lines weren't in a position to hire them all, air travel being what it was in those days. So they had to find another way.

"It was pretty simple for a couple or three guys to get together, scrape up $15,000, and buy a used DC-3. There were so many of them on the market then, with the airlines buying four-engine equipment and the Army dumping some as surplus, that there was no problem finding wings. Once you had them, you were in business. At one time, I'll bet there were more than 500 different outfits flying around.

"Most of them didn't last more than 6 or 8 months. It usually took that long for the creditors to catch up with them. The whole thing was pretty slipshod and haphazard. Nobody seemed to care either, at least not until there were a few big crashes and people started to wonder what was going on."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—In 1949, fatalities on nonskeds averaged 17.87 deaths per hundred million passenger miles compared to a rate of 1.04 for the scheduled carriers.)

"That's when the CAA (the Civil Aeronautics Agency, forerunner to the present FAA-CAB setup) looked into things. It took them a few years, but they finally got it pretty well straightened out, at least on the books. But those first 4 or 5 years things were pretty hectic.

"Why at times it was so bad that the pilot would take up a collection from the passengers to buy gas. When that ran low, he'd pass the hat again. Most pilots handled the money then since they were usually partners in the line. If their plane carried 45 people, they would take charters for 35 or 40 and then sell the rest of the seats for whatever they could get from whoever they could. It wasn't unusual for a plane to sit on the ground for 6 or 8 hours while the pilot was out drumming up business.

"One guy even took a charter to South America, carrying vacationers, I think, and when he landed, sold the plane on the black market. When the people got back after a week touring the country, neither he nor the plane were anywhere to be found. I don't think he's been heard from yet."

But what of today? What are some of the tricks used by shady operators to circumvent the rules? How many of the nonskeds are good, substantial, honest operators and how many aren't? In answer to these questions, our informant said:

"I'd say that better than half of the nearly 30 nonskeds are what you would call reputable. None of them are getting rich, but they try to do a good job. Their maintenance is as good or at times even better than that of the scheduled carriers. And some of the pilots could fly rings around some of the big airlines guys."

Finishing his plug for the nonskeds, he turned to the other side of the picture:

"But some of the tricks they pull are real cute. One of the favorites is using 'ghost riders in the skies.' You see, there are regulations forbidding a pilot to spend more than 12 hours in the air or 8 hours at the controls in 1 day. It's a good rule because, let's face it, you can get pretty tired up there, even with auto pilots and that sort of stuff. Sitting in one place for a long time can really wear a man down.

"But it can get pretty expensive if a line has a couple of charters together and they have to put on an extra crew to take over after 8 hours. So what some lines have done is to put a crew down on the manifest as passengers even though they never do get on the plane. When the logbook is filled out, this fictitious crew has shared the flying time with the real one. I know one guy who was supposed to have been killed in a crash when all the time he was sitting in Kansas City lapping up beers. Got his wife so upset she damn near divorced him.

"I've heard of an official of one company who piled up more time as a ghost rider while sitting behind a desk than most of us do actually working. But as I said, it saves a lot of money, and that's a commodity that's mighty scarce in this business.

"Other tricks? Well, there's another outfit that was bothered by the FAA boys to set up a training school for their pilots. So they advertised for a chief pilot, claiming his major duties would be running the school. After they hired him, they'd give him the old bit about no money and tell him to forget the school for the time being. Thirty days later the inspectors would be back to see how things were going. When they'd start to raise the roof, the boss would shrug his shoulders, blame the new chief pilot and fire him. I think they went through six pilots in 6 months before the FAA cracked down.

"But let me repeat, these things aren't done by most operators, just the few who are out to make a quick buck and don't give a damn about the people they carry."

How about maintenance? Is it generally good? Do some operators literally get away with murder in the care they give their planes?

"Well, I'll have to admit that some do. I know I won't fly a ship that's been overhauled at certain shops. But these outfits offer cutrate prices and some operators jump at them.

"There are a lot of ways to get around the book on repairs. On a scheduled line I used to fly with—before I realized they were all tied up with seniority ratings and I was too old to get anywhere—we had a ship with a part kicking up a fuss. It wasn't enough to ground us, but it should have been fixed. So we got cleared from our origin to our destination expecting to have it repaired there. When we got there, the ship was turned right around and sent to another city without even being looked at. This went on for about 4 days before it finally got to a hangar."

Would a pilot take off in a plane knowing there was a defective part that could conceivably cause a real emergency, endangering not only the passengers but his own life as well?

"Yeah. It's surprising what some guys will do for money. That's one of the problems we are faced with; mercenary pilots who place the mighty dollar above their own skins. There is also the prospect of losing your job. Nobody would directly fire a pilot for refusing to take up a ship he didn't think was airworthy, but there are many ways a boss can get rid of you.

"I once refused to take a ship up and the boss fired the head mechanic. That was quite a few years ago and we got a new mechanic who's done a great job. But not everyone is like that."

What, then, must be done to rectify the situation? What steps must be taken? In what areas can the problems be best attacked?

"Well, as you may have gathered, the root of most of the trouble is money. If there could be some way devised to raise the level of financial responsibility of the men who own and operate nonskeds, many of these things wouldn't happen. I don't see why a guy who has run several lines into the ground and declared bankruptcy, leaving quite a few people holding the proverbial bag, should be able to turn up someplace else with different planes and a new name and be able to start all over.

"And then, of course, there are the rules. You know that old cliché about rules being meant to be broken? That cannot apply in this business, not where human life is at stake. The price is too high for people to pay. But the rules are there on the books. They need only be enforced properly. It may seem a strange thing to ask, but if the FAA would only police the lines more thoroughly, a lot of things wouldn't get by and a lot of these guys would be out of business."

We turned next to a copilot. A quiet, dignified man, he was almost the exact opposite of our first informant in both manner and appearance. His experience was not as extensive, but he had flown for some half-dozen nonskeds over the past 7 years. This was not a reflection on his flying ability but rather the demands of a family of five. He could not afford a long layoff and, when things got slow with one line, he was usually able to get work with another.

He, too, had seen quite a bit during his tenure with the nonskeds. He disagreed with his colleague's critical estimate of the number of shady or borderline operators in the industry. He preferred to estimate that at least two-thirds of the lines were run by reputable men who put safety first in their companies. But he could not deny that the other element did exist and was, in fact, threatening the very existence of the entire industry.

His favorite story involved a plane that ran into a little trouble during takeoff from an airfield in the Midwest. Its tail fell off.

"Fortunately, they hadn't gotten up too much speed so the plane wasn't severely damaged. The pilot put in a hurried call to the home office in the East and within 2 days a replacement arrived, all nicely crated.

"The mechanics took it out to the hangar to start repairs. As they were opening the crate, an inspector happened by. He noticed quite a bit of straw jammed in the box so he started pulling it out slowly. You can imagine his surprise when he came upon a family of field mice nestled in the haven. Needless to say, this aroused his interest. Closer inspection revealed that the replacement had the same defect to which the first accident had been attributed.

"Generally, though, I would have to say that the nonskeds I have flown with would not be guilty of things like that. Quite often, however, some lines do get out of hand. The FAA tries to do a good job, but the agency is understaffed and works under considerable pressure from other groups.

"There was, for example, the case of a rather large nonsked which had been the subject of a rather extensive investigation by the Federal authorities. From what I have heard, they were able to build up quite a case against the line and were about to institute proceedings when a high Government official, higher than the regulatory or enforcement agencies, stepped in and killed the whole investigation.

"The problems must be faced and solved, however. It does no good to sit around and talk about them, something must be done. And it would be a good start if some of the better nonskeds would do a little housecleaning of their own. The things that go on are no secret, everyone knows about them. The trouble is too few bother to try to do something about it.

"Besides internal reform, the Government could do a great deal to straighten things. They have tried, but too often with little or no success.

"There are, for example, two types of penalties that CAB can mete out to violators, suspension of certificate or fines up to $1,000 for each violation. The first is a long, drawnout affair and rarely resorted to except in the worst of cases.

"The CAB attempted 3 years ago to raise the maximum fine to $3,000. However, the Air Transport Association, the scheduled airlines lobby group in Washington, brought pressures to bear in Congress and the measure was defeated. It was a shame too, because it would have been a definite step in the right direction.

"Quite often, it might prove profitable for a line to knowingly violate regulations when it means the difference between getting a large charter or long trip, or losing it. The money they might make would easily pay for the fine if they got caught and still leave a profit. But if the fine were tripled, this could be eliminated.

"Financial responsibility is, of course, a great problem. There are some lines which owe their crews 3 or 4 months' pay. By that time a fellow has so much money involved, he can't afford to quit and lose it all. So he stays on, flying for promises rather than money. This certainly does not make him happy and insure that he will give top performance.

"A threefold attack, I think, encompassing internal reform, stiffer penalties for violators, and greater fiscal security would go a long way toward curing our problems. I just hope that people in key positions realize that these ills are not the plague of the entire nonsked industry, but just the practices of a few, and will act accordingly. It would be indeed unfortunate, not only from my somewhat prejudiced point of view, but for the scheduled carriers as well, if the nonskeds were put out of business.

"There are many of our jobs that they, because of the very nature of their operation, could not handle. They are having enough financial troubles of their own without assuming ours. Of course, there are many of our contracts they would love to have, particularly those with the military for flying recruits.

"But they would not want any part of our other work. And they would not be able to offer many of the benefits a nonsked does. Schedules tailored to our customer's needs, for example, or flexibility. And despite what some people claim, our equipment is far from antiquated when compared to that used by the regular carriers. The plane which crashed in Richmond, for example, has been called every bad name in the book. Yet the same type of aircraft is called dependable in the advertising of one of the major scheduled lines."

Next to be interviewed was a mechanic, licensed by the FAA to do maintenance on all types of piston engine equipment. His chief complaint was against the lines—scheduled and nonsked—for their failure to adhere to the rules of maintenance and also against the regulatory agency for its laxity in enforcing its own rules.

He brought to light an interesting point, one which, when presented to CAB officials aroused their interest but also brought confessions of ignorance. It involved reports of grievances filed with locals of the International Association of Machinists, the airline mechanics' parent union. Quite often, these grievances contain details of blatant violations of regulations, yet they are never submitted to the Government. According to the mechanic interviewed, there are hundreds of cases in the union files.

One was offered as evidence. It makes interesting reading (with names changed for obvious reasons):

"The union and the undersigned mechanic are submitting this grievance for the violation of the contract, article 1A, by Foremen Dale and Ross. Under this article it calls for work with the safety of the aircraft in mind and the cooperation on both sides without intimidation from the supervisors.

"Foreman Dale, in seeing an item, leaking scavenge [sic] oil line, called the mechanic to tell him how he wants item fixed. Stating to loosen line and insert a diagonally split O-ring behind the old seal and reinstall. (This was not in agreement with regulations governing such defects.)

"After inquiry about the procedure the mechanic told the foreman that he did not feel right in doing it in that manner. Wherewith the foreman stated he had done it numerous times before and the mechanic should not act stupid by not agreeing to it. Foreman then went and got Foreman Ross and both tried to get the mechanic to perform the job and sign items as told, and put item on the runup sheet. Ross stated that he had similar type item at the boondocks and had corrected it in a similar manner. He also stated that the mechanic is not to question the foreman's job instructions, that they have more experience than the mechanic and should just perform as told. Mechanic then informed the foreman that he would perform the job as requested, but would not accept any responsibility for the job by signing for it. Then he suggested to Dale to sign for it to which he replied that he could not. Then the foreman got another mechanic to perform the job.

"Later in the night the foreman reprimanded the mechanic for what he felt was not enough work done by the mechanic for the night and asked for an explanation. Mechanic stated that the foreman was in the vicinity all night and was able to see the job as it was performed. At which the foreman shook his finger under the mechanic's nose and said that he would eat those words.

"The following night the foreman approached the mechanic and told him he wished he could have seen the plane as it left for a flight and that there was no trouble."

This incident occurred in the hangar of one of the largest scheduled airlines. It and others like it should be sufficient to arouse the traveling public and the Government's regulatory agencies to see that proper steps are taken to insure that it does not happen again.

And it was by no means an isolated case. The union, in a recent meeting of its executive council, took under consideration several specific proposals submitted by conference committees. One, under the title of "Airworthy equipment," read:

"Licensed aircraft mechanics must receive broader legal protection in the performance of their duties. Such mechanics are required to certify that equipment on which they perform maintenance services is airworthy.

"Several instances have occurred recently in which mechanics were pressured by their supervisors to certify equipment they, as mechanics, considered not airworthy. In some instances, mechanics were discharged for their refusal to certify equipment they considered unsafe. The Federal Aviation Agency has failed to protect mechanics in the performance of their safety duties. The situation, as it exists, not only places mechanics in double jeopardy, but is a serious threat to air safety."

There, in the union's own words, published in its newspaper the Machinist on November 23, 1961, is a clear statement that these practices do exist on a wide scale, practices which, if continued, could take their toll of human lives.

Certain differences do exist in the rules governing the operation of scheduled and nonscheduled carriers. But where safety is involved, the FAA states quite emphatically that:

"The operating limitations of an aircraft and its maintenance in an airworthy condition are determined by the nature of the aircraft and not by the type of service performed by the carrier. In these respects there would be no difference between scheduled and supplemental air carriers, and the same standards of maintenance would apply to both."

The variations which do exist—the scheduled carriers operate under parts 40 and 41 of the Civil Air Regulations and the nonskeds are governed by part 42—have been established for economic reasons. There are certain aspects of the airline industry in which it would be impossible for a small organization to maintain facilities similar to those used by the larger lines.

Nonskeds, for example, are not required to establish their own maintenance facilities at all fields they service, since they could conceivably be called upon to fly into any airport in the Nation. They are, instead, permitted to contract for service with local organizations. This, of course, does open the way for them to shop for the bargain basement type of maintenance referred to earlier. It is possible to find shops which will overhaul an engine at half the cost it would normally require a scheduled carrier.

Another difference involves dispatching and communications staffs and facilities. While the regular lines must provide these services themselves, the nonsked does not have to. Quite often, it is the pilot himself who serves as dispatcher and weather analyst for a nonsked flight. The great majority of the men are well trained in these subjects, however, and except in cases like the Arctic Pacific crash, safety is not compromised by having them do it.

A definite program of reform is necesasry for the nonscheduled airlines if they are to be permitted to function as independent organizations. It is difficult to spell out exactly what it should include, but the suggestions offered by the men directly involved in the industry certainly seem worthy of serious consideration and could well form the basis for the final formula.

They are, in brief:

1. Internal reform initiated by the stronger, reputable members of the industry.
2. Stricter enforcement of Government regulations, particularly where they concern maintenance.
3. Stiffer penalties meted out to violators.
4. An industrywide review, encompassing both the scheduled and nonscheduled carriers, to establish new regulations and controls to assure the abolishment of past practices which skirted the law.
5. A review of the present regulatory setup with possible revisions to eliminate the onus of outside pressure group and political maneuverings.
6. A more tolerant and cooperative attitude by the scheduled airlines toward the nonskeds.
7. New standards of financial responsibility which must be met by officials of the lines to guarantee that the operation will not be conducted in a near-bankrupt fashion.
8. Closer scrutiny by the FAA in determining the suitability of an airline applying for certification.

If these proposals were to be implemented, they would undoubtedly go far toward preventing such tragic loss of life as took place in a lonely Virginia ravine and on a fog-shrouded Ohio runway. It is the obligation of the airlines and the Government to see that it be done.

COLLEGE SHUNS FEDERAL AID

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a cub newspaper reporter exactly 40 years ago this year, I heard for the first time the old journalistic adage that when a dog bites a man that is not news, but that when a man bites a dog, that is news.

I respectfully suggest that this venerable proposition has—or ought to have—a modern counterpart.

I suggest that it is scarcely news—and certainly no novelty—these days for segments of our society to seek—and indeed pressure for—so-called Federal aid.

By the same token, it seems to me that it is something verging on a sensational novelty for a prospective beneficiary of Federal aid not only to oppose the granting of such assistance, but actually to reject the proffered largesse.

With these considerations in mind, I believe that it is worthy of the attention of this House and of the American people that a number of independent, privately endowed institutions of higher education are openly and vigorously taking exactly this position with respect to so-called Federal aid to higher education, including private and church related colleges.

It is a matter of profound satisfaction and pride to me that one of the educational institutions with the courage, integrity, and dedication to principle necessary to such a stand is located in my own Third Congressional District of Michigan.

I refer to Hillsdale College located in Hillsdale, Mich.

On February 16, 1962, the board of trustees of this college unanimously adopted a resolution to "resist subsidization of its affairs by the Federal Government."

Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include the full text of this "declaration of independence" at the conclusion of this statement.

In view of this historic stand so atypical of much of the trend in higher education today—and in American life generally—I should like the House and the American people to know a little about this Michigan college.

It is located on an 80-acre campus midway between Detroit and Chicago in southern Michigan.

This coeducational college has a student body of 825, 40 percent of whom are women. Fifty percent of the students come from outside the State of Michigan. The college offers bachelor of arts and bachelor of science degrees; is fully accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges, and is a member of the Association of American Colleges. The college was founded in 1844 as an independent, church related—Baptist—college. It has pioneered a number of important educational principles and practices, including among others, these three points:

First. It has always offered instruction to all persons regardless of race, color, sex, or religion.

Second. It was the first college in Michigan and the second in the United States to admit women on a par with men.

Third. It promoted legislation governing teacher certification and was the first Michigan college to be so certified.

I venture the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that Hillsdale College in 1962 has undertaken still another, and perhaps its greatest, pioneering effort by taking this current courageous and forthright stand for educational independence of Federal Government subsidy and the inevitable Federal controls such subsidies involve.

I believe it is an appropriate part of this salute to Hillsdale College, headed by its outstanding and able president, Dr. J. Donald Phillips, to list the members of the institution's board of trustees.

I am particularly proud of the fact that one of the trustees is a distinguished colleague of ours in this House, the Honorable E. Ross ADAIR, Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Indiana.

Another outstanding trustee is the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, former distinguished Secretary of the Army and former Governor of Michigan.

The chairman of the board of trustees is Ralph C. Rosecrance, president, J. L. Clark Manufacturing Co., Rockford, Ill.

Other members of the board of trustees are: William H. Ball, vice president, Ball Bros. Co., Muncie, Ind.; Nelson B. Beaman, president, Universal Vise & Toll Co., Parma, Mich.; Mrs. Hall Blanchard, Jackson, Mich.; C. C. Buchanan, president, Hillsdale County National Bank, Hillsdale, Mich.; Paul H. Carnahan, president, National Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich.; Howard C. Davis, president, Davis Products Co., Niles, Mich.; A. A. DeLapp, insurance broker, Chicago, Ill.; E. A. Dibble, real estate-county supervisor, Hillsdale, Mich.; Ray E. Dillon, president, the J. S. Dillon & Sons Stores Co., Hutchinson, Kans.; Herbert H. Dow, manager, Plastics Fabricated Product Department, Dow Chemical Co., Midland Mich.; Ray R. Eppert, president, Burroughs Corp., Detroit Mich.; Dr. Arthur L. Farrell, executive secretary, Michigan Baptist Convention, Lansing, Mich.; Charles M. Foster, executive vice president, Service Steel Co., Detroit, Mich.; Mrs. Hugo Friedrichs, Hillsdale, Mich.; Mr. E. O. Galloway, Hillsdale, Mich.

Also, Dr. Tyrone Gillespie, assistant to the president, Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.; F. I. Goodrich, vice president, administrative, Eaton Manufacturing Co., Detroit, Mich.; E. C. Hayhow, publisher, Hillsdale Daily News, Hillsdale, Mich.

Gerald D. Hennessy, Hennessy's Drugstore, Hillsdale, Mich.; Donal Jenkins, vice president, Bank of the Commonwealth, Detroit, Mich.; John Jones, director of publications and publicity, Wierton Steel Corp., Wierton, W. Va.; Karl P. Katzenmeyer, Katzenmeyer's Hardware, Hillsdale, Mich.; Mrs. Frederick A. Knorr, Knorr Broadcasting Corp., Dearborn, Mich.; Dr. H. Frazyer Mattson, Hillsdale, Mich.; B. D. McIntyre, president, Monroe Auto Equipment Co., Monroe, Mich.; Robert D. Morrison, sales manager, Eaton Manufacturing Co., Detroit, Mich.; Dr. Harry S. Myers, recording secretary, National Council of Churches, Hillsdale, Mich.; Frederick W. Seitz, secretary and resident counsel, Brooks & Perkins, Inc., Detroit, Mich.; John D. Stoner, Monroe, Mich.; M. G.

Van Buskirk, executive secretary, Illinois Dairy Products Association, Chicago, Ill.; and G. Boyd Vass, president, Hayes Industries, Inc., Jackson, Mich.

Honorary trustees of the college include: Arthur F. Bassett, vice president, Bassett, Slavens & Associates, Royal Oak, Mich.; Mrs. Wilbur J. Carr, Washington, D.C.; Ernest C. Harris, retired, Deerfield Beach, Fla.; Richard Lloyd Jones, president, Tulsa Tribune, Tulsa, Okla.; and Dr. Fred B. Freeman, retired, Lansing, Mich.

There is much more which I would like to say in approbation of the historic and courageous stand taken by the trustees of the Hillsdale College.

I will limit my comment, however, to the observation that this action is a dramatic and heartening reminder of the truth once eloquently stated by the distinguished editor and commentator, David Lawrence, that "voluntarism is freedom's greatest vehicle of progress."

Voluntarism created Hillsdale College and the vast and vital system of independent higher education in this country.

It is heartening to see this reaffirmation and reapplication of the self-same principle.

It is noteworthy, as the foregoing list indicates, that more than a score of the Hillsdale College trustees are men occupying important positions of leadership in the field of business and industry. These are not starry-eyed idealists. They are individuals well acquainted with the problems of costs, budgets, and realistic financial problems.

They are aware that independent colleges face these very harsh and realistic problems and necessities. They are familiar with the fact, for example, that Hillsdale College itself cannot operate solely on the basis of income from its endowment and student fees and that this year, for example, the college is dependent upon voluntary, unrestricted contributions in excess of $300,000, to balance its operating budget.

They understand, in other words, that voluntarism imposes its price. But they obviously believe that educational independence in America is well worth the cost. May their tribe increase.

In lieu of any further comment on my part, I also insert the editorial comment of the Hillsdale (Mich.) News on the action of the Hillsdale College board of trustees. This editorial, incidentally, included the full text of the college's "declaration of independence."

Following is the text of the "declaration of independence":

Declaration of Independence, Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich.

Whereas Hillsdale College was conceived as an independent educational institution and dedicated to an educational philosophy embracing America's basic ideals; and

Whereas since 1844 it has remained steadfastly faithful to these concepts; and

Whereas the thousands of young men and young women who have studied here have been taught some fundamental truths; among these is that the freedom guaranteed them as citizens of this great country is the freedom to dream and aspire without limit and the freedom to fulfill their dreams and aspirations without interference; that our country's greatness is the result not of Government benevolence but rather of individual initiative and enterprise; that responsibility is the counterpart of independence; and

Whereas we hold these views to be as valid today as they were in 1844 despite the appearance and growth of a contrary philosophy based on Government paternalism; and

Whereas it is our conviction that this contrary philosophy is negatory to the traditional beliefs and teachings of Hillsdale College and is to be deplored as harmful to the continued development of our country both morally and economically: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it be the decision of the board of trustees of Hillsdale College to reaffirm its historic independence and to resist subsidization of its affairs by the Federal Government. Acknowledging that the possibility of failure is a concomitant of independence, the trustees place their trust in God and in the dedication and generosity of students, alumni and friends who share their views. With this help, and through their own continuing efforts, they are confident that the principles to which the college is dedicated will continue to be available to young men and young women seeking Christian higher education.

Following is the text of the Hillsdale News editorial:

Hillsdale College Takes Brave, Refreshing Stand on Subsidy

Hillsdale College will not be subsidized by the Federal Government.

At a time when the pressure for public funds has reached critical proportions Hillsdale's board of trustees makes its position clear in a forthright and brave declaration of independence.

It points out that the Federal-aid concept is contrary to the institution's educational philosophy and would compel a compromise with tradition.

It is a temptation for colleges such as Hillsdale to succumb to the lure of Federal subsidy. Finances are a nagging and perplexing worry for the schools' administrations.

This is especially true at Hillsdale where income from a small endowment and from student fees do not begin to meet operating costs. Each year it must raise thousands of dollars from alumni and friends to close the gap and finish in the black. This year the needed total is in excess of $300,000.

But Hillsdale has chosen to face its fiscal responsibilities the hard way. It's a stiff price to pay for independence. But in the opinion of the board it's a bargain.

This clearcut stand is a refreshing one to those who weary of mounting tax burdens and to those who believe that Government subsidy inevitably leads to Government control.

THE HONORABLE FRANK CHELF

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always gratifying to have one's esteem of any of our fine colleagues vindicated by expressions of admiration from others. I have recently run across a radio script regarding one of our most conscientious and hard-working Members.

The esteem in which Frank Chelf is held in Kentucky is better expressed than I can express it by the following excerpts from this radio program given several years ago over WLW in Cincinnati, Ohio, and an article from the Owensboro (Ky.) Messenger by Mr. W. E. Daniel, editor, as follows:

A Congressman who was left an orphan when he was 5, who years later, opened his own law office with only 50 cents in his pocket, and today is chairman of one of Washington's most important congressional investigating committees. That sums up Frank Chelf, the man who represents Kentucky's Fourth District and heads the subcommittee which is investigating the Department of Justice.

Frank is slightly built, fair haired and a bundle of energy. Even when he sits talking in his office he doesn't remain still. It's the desire to keep moving all the time that contributed so much to Chelf's rise from an orphanage near Louisville to Washington, D.C.

Chelf attended St. Mary's College High School but a year before graduating, returned to his old hometown of Elizabethtown and finished high school there. The next stop was Centre College and the Cumberland University at Lebanon, Tenn., for the study of law. "I'll never forget setting up my law practice in Lebanon, Ky. I came to that town with 50 cents in my pocket, a borrowed 1922 Kentucky statute and a letter of introduction from Judge George K. Holbert. Judge Holbert was sitting on the bench that my father had occupied as judge of the old ninth judicial district."

It was about this time that a man whom Chelf will never forget came to his rescue. This man was Ben Johnson, one of Kentucky's legendary figures. Mr. Johnson had just retired from Congress and had been appointed chairman of the Kentucky Highway Commission. One of his first acts with the commission was to name Chelf as his secretary.

After his days with the highway commission, Chelf took the plunge into politics on his own, running for prosecuting attorney of Marion County. He served three consecutive terms with a leave of absence to serve in World War II with the Air Force.

Chelf reached the rank of major, but late in 1944 was mustered out of service due to a physical disability. That same year he was elected to Congress, winning nomination in a field of nine and winning the general election with comparative ease.

Hard work is the key to Chelf's popularity with the voters back home. "I have an open-door policy that I hope to be able to continue as long as I am in public office," Chelf says in explaining his theory of public service. "Every time I am home there is a line of cars in front of my house. I want to see everyone. I want to see the voters, regardless of race, creed, or color. That's why they send me to Congress to work for them."

His work as chairman of the committee investigating the Justice Department has prompted his fellow committee members, Republican and Democratic alike, to praise him. A tribute paid him by Congressman Peter Rodino: "I think Frank Chelf is one of the fairest-minded men in Congress with a real judicial temperament—yet he never is afraid to call a spade a spade." Republican Kenneth Keating, the key Republican member of the committee, believes Chelf one of the fairest chairmen he has ever served with, even though the two men don't agree on political matters.

Although he only takes the floor when he has something definite to say, Chelf is known as a down-to-earth, salty speaker. He has a way of saying, in very simple, understanding language what many other men have labored through in heavy-handed prose. "I like to listen to Chelf when he talks," one of the official reporters of the House said the other day, "because CHELF has a Will Rogers' way of making his point hit home without using a sharp knife and without getting lost in technical terms."

As one Member of Congress, who has watched CHELF for a number of years, summed it up the other day, "It's a long, long road from orphanage to Congress, but FRANK CHELF has made the climb and is, I think, a better man because of it." Kentucky's FRANK CHELF is the best proof in the world that every boy in the United States can come up the ladder. His story is a story that the Voice of America can beam to the Iron-Curtain countries as the best example of democracy in action.

FRANK CHELF is not only an easy man to meet, but one you can't forget. A man of middle height, slender, keen, searching eyes, a voice that makes you listen, and a man of an abundant store of information, he is a fine conversationalist.

FRANK is a man the people believe in and will prove it by voting for him. My congratulations go to the Democrats of the Fourth District. He impressed me as a man of so much more than ordinary ability that he stands out. He is a human man, to whom the humblest of his constituents may go with a personal problem and come away knowing his Congressman understands. He is a real man of many excellent qualities, a man the State may point out as a spokesman.

I am sure I express the sentiment of all of FRANK's many friends in Congress when I say that we agree with this appraisal of his qualities as a man and as a legislator. He is the caliber needed in our Government.

THE 44TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESTORATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 18, 1962, the 44th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence was observed at a mass meeting of the friends and well-wishers of brave Lithuania, many of Lithuanian birth or descent, that packed Webster Hall in the city of New York to overflowing. I am extending my remarks to include the principal address on that occasion delivered by my colleague from Chicago, the Honorable WILLIAM T. MURPHY, Congressman from the Third District of Illinois.

CONGRESSMAN MURPHY'S ADDRESS ON THE 44TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RESTORATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE, DELIVERED IN NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 18, 1962

Lithuania has had not only a glorious but a tragic history extending back to the 11th century. Due to the fact she was isolated from the rest of Europe by dense forests, impassable swamps, numerous rivers, and the Baltic Sea, there exists little documentary evidence concerning the Lithuanians during the first 10 centuries of the Christian era.

The Lithuanians and Latvians of the 20th century are the descendants of the Aistian race, one of the eastern branches of the Indo-European family.

In the 11th century, Lithuania was a nation divided into many principalities. Threats from her neighbors were an important factor in bringing the principalities together into a united state.

Lithuanians' history is divided into five major periods, namely, the period as a Grand Duchy from 1225 to 1572; then as a Republic when it was united with Poland from 1572 to 1795; and when Lithuania was occupied by Germany and Russia from 1795 to 1915; and as a Republic from 1918 to 1940; and at present as a component Soviet of the U.S.S.R. since 1940.

In 1253, a delegate of Pope Innocent IV, crowned Mindaugas as King of a united Lithuania. In 1263 Mindaugas was murdered by Damantas.

The Gediminus dynasty began in 1316 as the rulers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. With the death of Sigismund Augustus in 1572, the dynasty which had ruled Lithuania for 2½ centuries became extinct. Two of the great rulers of this period were Vytautas and Jagaila.

On July 1, 1569, representatives of both countries ratified the Act of Lublin, uniting Lithuania and Poland. By the terms of the Union of Lublin, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland remained sovereign states as equal partners in a confederation, or a commonwealth, with one common ruler.

In reality, the Union of Lublin relegated Lithuania to the role of a junior member in this partnership, because the Poles outvoted the Lithuanians 3 to 1 in the Common Diet.

In 1573, Henry of Valois, son of Catherine de Medici and the Duke of Anjo, was elected King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania.

The Republic endured for over 200 years until the third and final partition by Austria, Germany, and Russia.

The period of 120 years during which the major portion of Lithuania remained under Russian occupation was characterized by the constant efforts on the part of the Lithuanians to regain their right to direct their own political, cultural, and economic destinies. Following the revolts of 1831 and 1863 the tsarist government attempted to replace the Lithuanian language and culture with Russian, but the Lithuanians resisted these attempts and remained faithful to their religion, language, and traditions. This policy was abandoned by Russia in 1905.

That portion of Lithuania which fell under German control was treated better by being allowed to maintain their language and customs. But with the rise of Bismarck in 1860 this policy was changed to one of Germanization of the people of Lithuania.

Russia's domination of Lithuania ended in 1915 during World War I when German armies overran Lithuania.

In 1917 the German Government authorized the Lithuanians to hold a congress with a membership of 200 delegates.

The congress recommended an independent Lithuania with its capital to be at Vilnius, and elected a council made up of 20 members.

On February 16, 1918, the council proclaimed an independent Lithuania based on democratic principles.

Independence was not yet a reality, however; as soon as the German troops evacuated Vilnius on January 15, 1919, the Red army entered the city and installed a Communist government.

The next year the Red army was driven out by the Polish Army, led by Marshal Pilsudski, and Lithuanian fighting units.

Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, recognizing it as an independent nation, and renounced forever all rights of sovereignty.

A dispute followed between Poland and Lithuania over the control of Vilnius, which the Lithuanians had designated as their capital even though the Poles represented a majority of the city's population. On February 3, 1923, the Council of the League of Nations gave Vilnius to Poland and Memel to Lithuania.

This action was recognized by the Conference of Ambassadors in Paris, but it was not accepted by Lithuania. This situation prevented normal diplomatic relations between Poland and Lithuania until 1938.

Under a provisional constitution, Antanas Smetona was elected the first President of Lithuania. The Constitution accorded freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication.

Mr. Smetona was President from 1919 to 1920 and from 1926 to 1940.

During the period of independence, great emphasis was placed on improving agriculture, the primary occupation of the Lithuanians. A land reform program was instituted with the result that Lithuania became a nation of small farmers. In addition, industrialization progressed.

In 1913 Lithuania had only 151 industrial plants with 6,600 employees, while in 1939 there were over 16,000 plants employing 33,000 workers.

Lithuania also made progress in social legislation, with a labor control law, the introduction of the 8-hour day, and various other social measures.

Great progress was made in education, whereas there were only 1,173 grammar schools in 1930, in 1939 there were 2,328. The number of secondary schools increased from 40 in 1920 to 123 in 1927. In 1938 the University of Vytatutas the Great had a student body of over 3,000.

In addition, Lithuania literature flourished. Writers found inspiration in the national folklore of Lithuania, and achievements were made in opera and music.

In World War II, Lithuania was one of the first countries to experience the aggression of both Hilter and the Soviet Union.

On June 15, 1940, the Soviets demanded formation of a friendly government and occupied the country.

In July 1940 a rigged election produced a congress which requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

On August 3, 1940, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

It is estimated that during this first Soviet occupation, Lithuania suffered the loss of about 45,000 people, as many Lithuanians fled and others were arrested and deported. Over 30,000 members of the intelligentsia were deported to Siberia on the night of June 14, 1941, and 5,000 political prisoners were executed when the Soviets forces retreated hastily under German attack.

When the tide of the war turned against Germany, Lithuania returned not to independence but to Soviet domination.

When the Soviets retook the country in 1944, some 80,000 Lithuanians fled to Western Germany. Another 60,000 were found in Eastern Germany and deported to Siberia. During 1945 and 1946 an additional 145,000 Lithuanians were deported. Still another massive deportation occurred when some 60,000 Lithuanians were deported in March 1949.

It is reported that since Stalin's death that about one-third of those deported have been permitted to return home. Most of the others, it is believed, perished in the meantime.

In reference to U.S. policy toward Lithuania, the United States recognized the independent Lithuanian Government on July 27, 1922, and it has never recognized that nation's incorporation into the Soviet Union.

It continues to maintain diplomatic relations with the representative of the former independent Government, which has a legation in Washington.

The Lithuanian World Congress, meeting in August of 1958 under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Community, adopted a unanimous resolution declaring that "Lithuanians continue to fiercely resist the alien rule of the Soviet Union" and asserting that "Lithuanians have not accepted and never will accept Soviet slavery." The resolution called upon the free nations to "reaffirm on every suitable occasion the inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people to national independence and individual freedom." It asked that the free nations "not be party to any agreement or treaty that would confirm or prolong the subordination of the formerly Lithuanian state."

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and a Member of the 87th Congress, I subscribe to the resolution and pledge adherence thereto.

H.R. 11074—TO PROHIBIT BROADCASTING OF BOXING MATCHES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 11074, to prohibit the broadcasting of boxing matches on either radio or television.

I have long been dismayed by the number of deaths and serious injuries which result from ring fights; the young men who come out of these fights maimed for life; I have long deplored this public slaughter that this morning claimed the life of Benny Paret. It seems incomprehensible to me that we can continue to allow this legalized murder to go on. If the boxing commissioners of the various States cannot, or will not, see that proper precautionary measures are taken then I cannot see any alternative but to have the Federal Government intervene.

Unfortunately we can only forbid the broadcasting of this mayhem and thus take some of the profit out of it. That, however, is what I intend to do, if at all possible. I urge the Congress to take immediate action to amend the Communications Act to prohibit the broadcasting on radio or televising of boxing matches.

The National Bureau of Vital Statistics of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, informs me that although statistics on deaths which occur as a result of ring injuries are difficult to keep because of the inconsistencies in reporting, they do know that eight fatalities did occur between 1954 and 1959.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, this figure shocks me. If one death had occurred during that period we might say that it was an unfortunate accident; but eight deaths is too many to accept as just the merest chance happening under the strictest possible supervision. To me eight fatalities indicates that supervision alone cannot prevent these incidents.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Whitener (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Fogarty.

Mr. Broyhill.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Latta) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Curtis of Missouri.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Boykin.

Mr. Feighan.

Mr. Wright.

Mr. Burke of Kentucky.

Mr. King of Utah.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 4, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1892. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) transmitting a report for January 1962 on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime-contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1893. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected aspects of the domestic uranium procurement program of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), June 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1894. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin irrigation districts, and to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 (57 Stat. 14), as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1895. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal subsection (a) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, limiting the area in the District of Columbia within which sites for public buildings may be acquired"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1896. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Gain Yuey Wong, A12671828, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 11062. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for a National Highway Academy; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 11063. A bill to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 11064. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 11065. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 11066. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 11067. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income exemption of $1,200 for an individual who is a student at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 11068. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide for the allocation of defense contracts to areas of substantial labor surplus; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 11069. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 11070. A bill to provide assistance in the construction of educational facilities for certain health professions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 11071. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, in order to afford educational assistance in certain cases beyond the age limitations prescribed in such chapter; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 11072. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to grant to any carrier of coal by pipeline, subject to any of the provisions of part 1 of the act, the right of eminent domain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11073. A bill to amend section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that a widow's annuity thereunder shall not be less than $100 or three-fourths of her husband's annuity, at death; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11074. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to prohibit the broadcasting by means of radio or television of amateur or professional boxing matches; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H.R. 11075. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 682. Joint resolution marking the first day of May 1962 in commemoration of the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.J. Res. 683. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide the right of States to establish their own election districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 458. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment by domestic air carriers of certain discriminatory practices in cases where members of the traveling public fail to use or cancel reserved space on aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing a Federal narcotics hospital in the New York metropolitan area; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make funds available for a shore protection project between Fire Island Inlet and Montauk Point; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 11076. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Georgetown, Colo., to Frank W. Whitenack; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 11077. A bill for the relief of Herman and Fani Fridman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 11078. A bill for the relief of Harold E. C. Clark, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 11079. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucile B. Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11080. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stella T. Pittman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 11081. A bill for the relief of Takeshi Morozaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 11082. A bill for the relief of Hidayet Danish Nakashidze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 11083. A bill for the relief of Severia Cortes Naranjo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

285. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Resolution of the County Officers Association, State of New York on Federal legislation to restore a proper Federal-State-local relationship in the field of public welfare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

286. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Dorothy Horton McGee, Locust Valley, N.Y., relative to supporting pending legislation to establish Alexander Hamilton's home "The Grange," in New York City, as a national monument in commemoration of Hamilton's historic role in the establishment of the Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

287. Also, petition of Lowell W. Morse, city clerk, Pacific Grove, Calif., relative to opposing any amendment of the Constitution of the United States which would subject the income from State and local bonds to a Federal tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

288. Also, petition of Mrs. Jo Bennitt, city clerk, Lakewood, Calif., relative to requesting continued exemption of municipal bond interest from taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

289. Also, petition of William Chris Mann, clerk, auditor and recorder, Markleeville, Calif., to oppose any movement which would have the effect of subjecting the income from State and local bonds to a Federal tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ethnic Ticket Balancing Weakens the Nation's Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1692

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address which I delivered at an open meeting of Theta chapter of Delta Epsilon Sigma, national Catholic scholastic honor society, at Providence College, Providence, R.I., on April 2, 1962:

Reverend fathers, lay members of the faculty, members of Theta Chapter of Delta Epsilon Sigma, friends and guests of Providence College, your invitation to speak here this evening and the citation which you have so generously given to me are both distinctions which I wish to acknowledge with sincere gratitude. And I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate those students of Providence College who have won the right to be chosen members of this society, which is dedicated to the promotion and recognition of scholastic excellence. As you are leaders in your college work, I am sure that you will help to fill the increasing need for leadership and men of ability in the complex world in which you will pursue your future careers.

It has been well said that "mountains culminate in peaks, but nations culminate in men." Without those who combine talent and hard work in order to reach their goals, no great nation could keep its position in the world for very long. This has always been true, but it is even more so in these days of rapid change and recurrent crisis. Shortly before his death, Pope Pius XI said to a friend: "The crisis we are experiencing is unique in history. It is no longer permitted to anyone to be mediocre." Certainly these wise words of a great and holy man should be taken to heart by everyone who is concerned with the future of freedom and the preservation of peace. Everyone in America has a special obligation to try to make the most of his abilities so that the whole country can raise the standards of its performance in the competition with communism.

We all can admire the spirit, the discipline, and the wonderful talents of men like our astronauts. But it is not enough for a few outstanding Americans to set their eyes on the goals of space travel. A landing on the moon, important as that is, cannot solve the question of the future destiny of freedom.

I seem to recall that after Columbus discovered America, the world had most of its old problems still unsolved. The historians present might wish to correct me on this point, but I think that they would probably agree that experience tends to prove that great explorations and revolutionary technical advances raise quite as many problems as they solve. Progress always has its price, and its price is getting higher all the time.

We in America have always believed, however, that the price of progress is well worth paying. And I am not just talking about dollars and cents. My long association with Federal support for medical research has, of course, made me well aware of the fact that we cannot push forward the frontiers of knowledge in any area without large expenditures of money. I have, on a few occasions, wished that this simple fact could be more widely appreciated. But even more important is the need for widespread popular understanding of how vital it is for our country to press forward in every area of national life. Scientific progress should be marked by an accompanying advance in the social, economic, and cultural fields.

This progress cannot be made on the basis of false or outmoded standards of judgment. Back in the Middle Ages it was, for example, believed that a man had a right to certain positions of power and privilege simply because he had been fortunate enough to be born in a family which had held a role of leadership for countless generations. The mere accident of birth generally determined the individual's opportunities in life. This false notion was rejected by our Founding Fathers and the principles of equal opportunity set forth by Jefferson were adopted as the American ideal. Yet, Abraham Lincoln in 1859 found it necessary to write the following words:

"The principles of Jefferson are the principles and axioms of free society. And yet they are denied and evaded with no small show of success. One dashingly calls them 'glittering generalities.' * * * And others insidiously argue that they apply to 'superior races.' These expressions * * * are identical in object and effect—the supplanting the principles of free government, and restoring those of classification, caste, and legitimacy. * * * We must repulse them, or they will subjugate us."

Lincoln had in mind the evil of slavery. That issue was settled by the Civil War, and I believe that we are now making good progress in making full civil rights a reality as well as an ideal for all Americans. Yet, the evil of group prejudices has by no means disappeared. In some areas it has, in fact, been increased as a direct result of the struggle for full civil rights. And although the election of President Kennedy showed that religious intolerance does not have the power which it once wielded, we are still a long way from being free from every form of bigotry. Far too many Americans still judge a man's worth by the color of his skin or by his religious preferences.

It is not, however, with these very obvious kinds of group prejudices that I am concerned in speaking to you this evening about the way that false or outmoded standards of judgment can harm the forward movement of our country today. Instead, I would like to spend a few minutes to discuss with you the discriminatory test of ancestry which has come to be applied to candidates for positions of public responsibility, not only here in Rhode Island but in other large metropolitan areas as well.

Commenting on the Republican ticket in last year's New York City elections, the Times had this to say:

"Once again it is crystal clear that religious and 'national' ticket balancing played a major part in determining the selections. We are sick and tired, and we believe the voters in this city are sick and tired, of party leaders paying as much attention to religious or ethnic background as to ability, and often more."

I believe that there are a great many people who would share these feelings. The truth is that what the Times referred to as national ticket balancing should become a thing of the past, because the conditions which originally caused it have largely ceased to exist.

The story of the United States, up until very recent times, was one of a series of waves of immigration. Here in Rhode Island the first settlers were mostly from the British Isles. Later, especially in the years between 1837 and 1857, most of the immigrants came from Ireland, and they played their part in building the Blackstone Canal and the railroads. Soon they also found a place in the local textile industry, where they were joined by many French Canadians.

Late in the last century, our State witnessed a rising tide of immigration from many parts of Europe, but in the years between 1890 and 1920 the greatest number came from Italy.

Each new wave of immigrants always experienced some discrimination. All were looked down upon by those who thought of themselves as the original Americans—a title which really belonged to the Indians. It is not hard for anyone to see how group thinking and group feeling grew up here. Housing was generally segregated along national lines, so that one section would be called an Irish neighborhood, while another was supposed to belong to the French, the Italians, or the Portuguese. The so-called old Yankee families had little or no social contact with other groups. Until 1928, when Rhode Island's property restriction on the right to vote was repealed, most of the political power in this State was in the hands of the descendants of the earlier English settlers. They controlled much of the economic and professional life as well.

All this, however, is largely history. I am sure that many who may be in this audience tonight are grandsons, or possibly the great-grandsons, of people who, because of their own experience of immigration, still naturally thought of themselves as representative of some distinct national group. But I am quite certain that no one in this room gives much thought to such group differences as once so clearly divided the immigrants from one another and from the descendants of the earliest settlers. The process of assimilation has created a country which is on its way to achieving a deeper fundamental unity of all groups.

The average American voter of today reflects this process of assimilation. Educated in our free society, he is not inclined to think of himself as a member of a special ethnic group. There are, unfortunately, those who suffer discrimination because of race or color. They are most certainly justified in their group efforts to win their due rights. But the descendants of the vast majority of the immigrants to America no longer need or desire special forms of ethnic representation in government.

Consequently, it is true to say that a political ticket that is balanced in terms of ethnic differences is as out of date as the horse-drawn fire engines that once rumbled over the cobblestones of our cities.

In the past in Rhode Island, as elsewhere, immigrant groups gained equality of opportunity for their children by using the power of their numbers to gain group representation. Political leaders recognized that this was necessary. Out of the various ethnic groups in Rhode Island there have come many distinguished men who, by their own accomplishments, helped their groups to gain their rightful place in the life of the community. Public service was an important path by means of which each wave of immigrants achieved their goals. It can be said that ethnic group activity in politics has done its work so well that it has now become unnecessary.

A group-bound mind is, in fact, a real handicap to a man who seeks to understand today's changing times. For over a hundred years, America was in many ways dependent upon Britain and Western Europe, not only for manpower but for ideas. Many who came here for a new life still depended upon their European cultural heritage. This is no longer true, for America now is not only more politically advanced than any other country of comparable size, but it is also recognized as the defender of Western civilization. Free men look to a united America as the leader in the struggle against communism. In that role which history has assigned us to play, we can simply not afford to allow ourselves to be divided into competitive ethnic groups, whose very reason for being belongs to the past.

James Madison spoke prophetically when he said, "Our country, if it does justice to itself, will be the workshop of liberty to the civilized world, and do more than any other for the uncivilized." Madison's words, projected into the 20th century, have a most appropriate application. We stand before the world as the standard of what men can hope to achieve together under democratic government. New nations in Africa and Asia may well see in our Federal Republic the answer to their own problems of unity in diversity.

Standing in the spotlight of free world leadership, and teaching the doctrine of equality of opportunity for all, we cannot afford to permit ourselves to be swayed by ethnic considerations in choosing men for positions of public responsibility. Equality of opportunity for public service demands that our political parties, our voters, and those who have the authority to appoint officeholders should not be swayed by group prejudices and group pressures. The test of fitness for public service in a democracy is the merit and proven ability of the individual candidate. To pose the test of membership in some ethnic group is, in effect, to deny the individual his right as a citizen to be considered on his own merits.

In an age when organizational and group activities are as important as they are today, a democracy needs to remind itself of the importance of the individual and of his rights to opportunity for personal advancement as an individual. We in America have always believed that a man should be able to rise by his own efforts to a position of leadership in our society. This is still our faith. As Dr. Henry M. Wriston put it: "Democracy is the political aspect of the assertion of the supreme importance of the individual. Once the individual is put at the center, the acceptance of tyranny and the readiness to exploit the poor and ignorant have been made impossible." In a democracy, each man has the right to be judged on his individual character and ability without regard to the question of who his ancestors may have been.

We are fast approaching the time when the great majority will recognize this truth. In another generation, the old group feelings of the great era of immigration will have largely disappeared. This does not mean, of course, that cultural societies dedicated to preserving the special contributions which the various national groups have brought to America should disappear. It would be a great misfortune if this should happen. Our country is a far richer place to live in because of the music, the literature, the customs, the art, and the ideals which have been brought here from many parts of the world.

Individual Americans have every right to be interested in the cultural heritage which their forefathers brought to this country. Those organizations which are dedicated to preserving the memory of the early colonists and the many places of historical interest such as we have here in Rhode Island are performing a valuable service. Equally important are the fraternal and social clubs that concern themselves with the special traditional interests and activities of the many ethnic groups that have made their historic contribution to the progress of this Nation.

No country that lacks knowledge and respect for its past can possibly understand the path it must take into the future. A nation without a sense of history is like a man with the disease called amnesia: he cannot tell where he is going because he does not know where he has been. The loss of memory means the loss of personal identity. Consequently, a nation whose people are not mindful of their history is a nation that really does not know what it is or what it should stand for in the world.

But a nation cannot live on memories. We cannot expect our ancestors to solve our problems for us. In choosing those who are to frame public policies for our own times, the question of who their grandfathers were is, therefore, not relevant as a contemporary issue.

The audience gathered here tonight undoubtedly contains a large proportion of young men who have real potentialities for public leadership. I feel confident that they will not wish to be judged as candidates of an ethnic group. As members of a national scholastic honor society they already belong to what is an all-American team. In professional or public life they will want to keep it that way.

And those of us in public life today who believe, as I do, that no candidate should be either chosen or rejected on the basis of his ancestry are looking to the educated youth of America for help. I do not believe in sitting around and waiting for history to take care of the problem. I believe that we can do something about it right now. We can speak up and say that so-called national ticket balancing does not truly represent the kind of community we want for ourselves and our children. We can and should object when appointments to public office are clearly made on the basis of ethnic pressures from well-established groups. And at the same time we can lend our support to the effort to bring full equality of opportunity to those groups in our society that are still the clear victims of discrimination.

It is vital for us to do so, for social mobility—or the opportunity to advance on the basis of personal accomplishment—is the lifeblood of our free society. As Woodrow Wilson said, real democracy "releases the energies of every human being." When those energies are misdirected or blocked by ethnic group classification, the strength of the whole Nation is diminished.

This has always been recognized in one way or another by our greatest national leaders. They have likewise understood that what George Washington called "inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachment for others" should, as he said, "be excluded" from American life. In his speech of retirement from public life in 1796, Washington reminded his fellow-countrymen of this basic truth: "citizens by birth or choice, or a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you, in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. * * * You have in a common cause fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess are the work of joint councils, and joint efforts of common dangers, sufferings, and successes."

I believe that today, even more than in Washington's time, this great and richly complex Nation needs to concentrate its affections in the name of American. Our common cause and our common danger as the leaders of free men in the nuclear age are considerations which must make us speed up the process by which ethnic group competition in public life will disappear and become entirely a thing of the past.

Burgeoning Business at American Printing House for the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BURKE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate and thank sincerely the able and respected gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the other distinguished members of the Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies of the Committee on Appropriations for their excellent and seemingly tireless work during the hearings on and consideration of H.R. 10904. We are indeed fortunate to have the services of these gentlemen who were able to bring out a unanimous report on this appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, necessary funds for many important programs are provided in H.R. 10904. One such program, I feel, is that carried on by the American Printing House for the Blind at Louisville, Ky. The work of the printing house may not be as well known as some other activities financed under this appropriation bill, but its importance to the Nation and to the children directly affected thereby cannot be overstated.

The American Printing House for the Blind is a nonprofit educational institution founded in 1858. Since 1879 the printing house has received annual Federal appropriations used in providing free braille textbooks and other educational materials needed for the education of the Nation's blind children. For many years only those blind students attending special schools and classes for the blind received the benefit of these materials. More recently the emphasis on educating blind children has changed from special schools to providing instruction in regular schools and classes with sighted children. During the 84th Congress the law was changed to permit Federal funds to be used for these materials in regular public schools and classes.

Mr. Speaker, the number of blind children in both regular public schools and special schools for the blind is increasing each year. In 1959 there were 12,024 blind schoolchildren. During the coming school year there will be 17,175 blind children among whom the 1963 appropriation must be apportioned. In 1961 the per capita annual Federal grant for these children had fallen to $27.77, the lowest figure in 9 years. The appropriation in H.R. 10904 will provide a per capita grant for 1963 of $40 first reached last year after enactment of Public Law 87-294. The total of these grants for 1963 will be $677,000.

In addition a maximum of $41,000 is provided for staff salaries and expenses relating to the advisory committees created pursuant to Public Law 87-294 to make recommendations as to how the education of blind children can be improved. Great progress has been made in developing educational materials for blind children. The Printing House has the facilities and the know-how to develop and manufacture these materials, whether they be braille texts, plastic maps and globes, braille slate and stylus, braille writers, talking books or other basic or supplementary matter. This appropriation, particularly that portion relating to the advisory committees, will make it possible for still greater progress to be made in the near future.

All of us who are interested in providing an opportunity for blind children to obtain an education comparable to that given sighted children are encouraged by this appropriation and are deeply indebted to the subcommittee.

Justice Denied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there is an old expression in the legal profession that "justice delayed is justice denied." There is very much truth in this, as indeed there seems to be in many common expressions if analyzed. The administrative processes of our Federal Government often give a justice that is long delayed.

One of the examples of this administrative delay is in the handling of actions under the Antidumping Act of 1921. The provisions of this act are to come into play when it is found that imported goods are being sold in the United States at prices below those at which they are sold abroad—when foreign products are being dumped on the American market. The remedy under this act to such dumping, and the resultant injury to American domestic industry, is the imposition of a differential duty, a special tariff merely to cover the differential in prices and eliminate the dumping aspect of the sales in this country. This is not protectionism in the classical sense of this word, but rather a shield against unfair competitive practices on an international scale.

The situations calling for the application of this act are fairly clear; the procedures for invoking its protection are, on the surface, relatively easy. Two steps are taken as preliminary factfinding in the administration of this act. First, the Treasury Department must find the existence of price differentials; then, this matter is reported to the Tariff Commission to determine if there is any injury to American industry. If there is an affirmative finding as to both the existence of suspected dumping and of injury, it is returned to the Treasury Department for the assessment of the differential duty.

The Tariff Commission is required to act in its function under the bill in 3 months. No time limits are placed on the Treasury, either in its factfinding role or in the suspension of regular tariffs, awaiting the determination of the possible special dumping duties, or in the assessment of them. As a result of there being no limits set for the time within which the Treasury Department may act, there has been great delay in the determination of these cases, the delay which denies justice. The delay affects both the domestic industry and the exporters, injecting confusion and uncertainty into the international trade field to the detriment of international commerce.

Legislation has been introduced by various members of this body to correct this situation by providing time limitations on the functions of the Treasury Department in such cases. I would certainly commend this proposal to the attention of the Congress.

How Would You Rate the Morale of Employees in Your Agency?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1692

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein a supplemental tabulation of returns on a questionnaire I recently circulated among registered voters in Virginia's 10th Congressional District.

The overall returns from the questionnaire were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Wednesday, March 21. However, the final question among my inquiries was addressed to employees of the Federal Government and asked, "How would you rate the morale of employees in your agency?"

I now have a detailed tabulation of some 7,400 responses to this last question wherein the respondents identified the agency in which they were employed. In the belief that this detailed tabulation might be of interest and perhaps benefit to personnel officers and others concerned with Government morale, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as part of these remarks in the RECORD:

	Total responses	Good	Percent	Medium	Percent	Poor	Percent
State	143	29	20.3	37	25.9	77	53.8
AID	71	8	11.3	26	36.6	37	52.1
USIA	68	27	39.7	28	41.2	13	19.1
Foreign Service	2	2	100.0				
Security	1					1	100.0
Agriculture	305	182	59.7	99	32.5	24	7.9
Farmers Home Administration	7	4	57.1	3	42.9		
Cotton Division	2	2	100.0				
Forestry Service	37	27	73.0	7	18.9	3	8.1
Agricultural Research Service	16	9	56.3	5	31.3	2	12.5
Farmers Crop Service	4	2	50.0	2	50.0		
Grain Division	1					1	100.0
Soil conservation	30	21	70.0	8	26.7	1	3.3
Office of Information	2			1	50.0	1	50.0
Agriculture Library	1	1	100.0				
Market service	20	14	70.0	3	15.0	3	15.0
Plant quarantine	1	1	100.0				
Stabilization and Conservation Service	4	3	75.0	1	25.0		
Federal Ext. Inc	7	4	57.1	2	28.6	1	14.3
REA	16	6	37.5	6	37.5	4	25.0
Foreign Agricultural Service	7	5	71.4	2	28.6		
Farm Credit Administration	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
Entomology Research Division	1					1	100.0
Economics Research Division	5	5	100.0				
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	1			1	100.0		
Veterans' Administration	202	85	42.1	84	41.6	33	16.3
Hospital	2					2	100.0
Finance Division	1	1	100.0				
Benefits Office	2			1	50.0	1	50.0
Navy	418	184	44.0	164	39.2	70	16.7
Bureau of Ships	131	47	35.9	52	39.7	32	24.4
CNO	10	3	30.0	4	40.0	3	30.0
Bureau of Weapons	145	39	26.9	65	44.8	41	28.3
Subsistence	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
NRL	74	41	55.4	26	35.1	7	9.5
NAVPECO	2	1	50.0			1	50.0
Bureau of Docks	49	3	6.1	28	57.1	18	36.7
Naval weapons plant	18	3	16.7	4	22.2	11	61.1
Bureau of Personnel	38	15	39.5	16	42.1	7	18.4
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	28	2	7.1	3	10.7	23	82.1
ONR	7	3	42.9	4	57.1		
Naval Medical Center	1			1	100.0		
Photo interp	1	1	100.0				
Bureau of Medical Surgery	5	1	20.0	3	60.0	1	20.0
ONI	8	2	25.0	3	37.5	3	37.5
Naval propellent plant	1			1	100.0		
EXOS	3	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
Hydrographic	12	8	66.7	2	16.7	2	16.7
Audit	2			1	50.0	1	50.0
NSS	1	1	100.0				
Comptroller	3	1	33.3	2	66.6		
NOL	6	1	16.7	5	83.3		
David Taylor Model Basin	10	4	40.0	4	40.0	2	20.0
Photo Center	5	1	20.0	4	80.0		
Communications	1	1	100.0				
Military Sea Transportation Service	4	2	50.0	2	50.0		
Naval material	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
GAO	133	37	27.8	43	32.3	53	39.8
GSA	221	75	33.9	84	38.0	62	28.1
Library of Congress	33	12	36.4	13	39.4	8	24.2
Small Business Administration	17	8	47.1	3	17.6	6	35.3
GPO	86	26	30.2	39	45.3	21	24.4
Export-Import Bank	5	3	60.0			2	40.0
CAB	15	10	66.7	4	26.7	1	6.7
National Gallery of Art	6	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3
National Academy of Science	1	1	100.0				
Army	519	162	31.2	245	47.2	112	21.6
Ordnance	72	26	36.1	19	26.4	27	37.5
AMS	61	19	31.1	26	42.6	16	26.2
Engineering	182	68	37.4	76	41.8	38	20.9
ERDL	124	44	35.5	40	32.3	40	32.3
ASA	23	10	43.5	7	30.4	6	27.1
AG	32	9	28.1	16	50.0	7	21.9
QM	24	8	33.3	5	20.8	11	45.8
Comptroller	6	3	50.0			3	50.0
Chemical engineer	23	9	39.1	7	30.4	7	30.4
DOFL	23	8	34.8	10	43.5	5	21.7
National Guard	14	3	21.4	4	28.6	7	50.0
Army Research Bureau	1					1	100.0
Transport	29	8	27.6	9	31.0	12	41.4
Tech Inst AG	6	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7
Fort Myer	6	1	16.7	1	16.7	4	66.7
COMP AG	15	4	26.7	8	53.3	3	20.0
Logistics	9	2	22.2	1	11.1	6	66.7
Office of the Secretary of the Army	9	2	100.0				
Finance	17	1	5.9	6	35.3	10	58.8
Photo AG	4	2	50.0	1	25.0	1	25.0
Surgeon General	12	5	41.7	4	33.3	3	25.0
Signal	44	17	38.6	13	29.5	14	31.8
Chief of Staff	6	5	83.3	1	16.7		
Reserve and ROTC	1					1	100.0
Audit	5	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0
IG	2	2	100.0				
Band	1					1	100.0
Treasury	88	43	48.9	31	35.2	14	15.9
IRS	150	68	45.3	64	42.7	18	12.0
Finance Division	2	2	100.0				
FDIC	10	6	60.0	2	20.0	2	20.0
Budget Bureau	17	15	88.2	2	11.8		
Public Department	6	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50.0

	Total responses	Good	Percent	Medium	Percent	Poor	Percent
Bureau of Engraving and Printing	38	14	36.8	12	31.6	12	31.6
Coast Guard	24	6	25.0	12	50.0	6	25.0
Customs	12	8	66.7	1	8.3	3	25.0
SEC	20	13	65.0	6	30.0	1	5.0
Council of Economic Administration	1			1	100.0		
Bureau of Accounts	2	1	50.0			1	50.0
Federal Reserve System	6	4	66.7	2	33.3		
Federal S. & L. Inf	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
Federal Home Loan Bank	2	2	100.0				
Defense	290	114	39.3	126	43.4	50	17.2
CIA	164	105	64.0	37	22.6	22	13.4
NSA	67	15	22.4	33	49.3	19	28.4
Finance and Accounts	1					1	100.0
AEC	25	9	36.0	12	48.0	4	16.0
Office of Secretary of Defense	58	27	46.6	16	27.6	15	25.9
NASA	46	30	65.2	12	26.1	4	8.7
Defense Supply Agency	31	13	41.9	8	25.8	10	32.3
Defense Traffic Management Service	9	5	55.6	2	22.2	2	22.2
Transportation Intelligence Agency	6	6	100.0				
Surplus Materials Division	1	1	100.0				
American States	11	2	18.2	6	54.5	3	27.3
Office of Emergency Planning	12	2	16.7	4	33.3	6	50.0
ICS	4	2	50.0			2	50.0
National War College	2	2	100.0				
Court of Military Appeals	1	1	100.0				
Selective Service	4	2	50.0	1	25.0	1	24.0
R. & D	2					2	100.0
ASTIA	7	5	71.4	1	14.3	1	14.3
Interior	102	54	52.9	35	34.3	13	12.7
Solicitor's Office	3	1	33.3	2	66.7		
FDC	13	4	30.8	5	38.5	4	30.8
Geological Survey	122	50	41.0	43	35.2	29	23.8
Arlington National Cemetery	3	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
ICC	59	29	49.2	18	30.5	12	20.3
FAA	276	91	33.0	89	32.2	96	34.8
FHA	48	18	37.5	20	41.7	10	20.8
FTC	24	10	41.7	6	25.0	8	33.3
Indian Affairs	8	6	75.0	2	25.0		
HHFA	24	13	54.2	8	33.3	3	12.5
Tariff Commission	10	5	50.0	5	50.0		
Bureau of Labor Statistics	1					1	100.0
Panama Canal	1			1	100.0		
FCC	43	22	51.2	16	37.2	5	11.6
Geo. intell. map	1	1	100.0				
Weather	39	15	38.5	16	41.0	8	20.5
Reclamation	9	4	44.4	2	22.2	3	33.3
National Park Service	25	16	64.0	7	28.0	2	8.0
Smithsonian	23	10	43.5	9	39.1	4	17.4
Airport	4	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0
Archives	8	2	25.0	2	25.0	4	50.0
Bureau of Mines	16	6	37.5	5	31.3	5	31.3
Park Police	5	3	60.0	1	20.0	1	20.0
Bureau of Land Management	3	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
Fish and Wildlife	8	2	25.0	2	25.0	4	50.0
Office of the Secretary of the Interior	1					1	100.0
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1			1	100.0		
Commerce	101	44	43.6	35	34.7	22	21.8
Public Roads	52	24	46.2	18	34.6	10	19.2
Patent Office	76	16	21.1	34	44.7	26	34.2
Census	16	9	56.3	3	18.8	4	25.0
National Inn Conc	2					2	100.0
Coast and Geodetic Service	28	10	35.7	11	39.3	7	25.0
Maritime Administration	24	18	75.0	4	16.7	2	8.3
Office Tech. Sec	1			1	100.0		
Business and Defense Services Administration	3	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
International business operations	3					3	100.0
Area Reder. Administration	1	1	100.0				
NBS	17	9	52.9	7	41.2	1	5.9
Air Force	294	117	39.8	110	37.4	67	22.8
Aerospace research	2	2	100.0				
Surgeon General	2			1	50.0	1	50.0
Bolling Air Force Base	4			2	50.0	2	50.0
A.C. & C	7	1	14.3	2	28.6	4	57.1
Information Center	6			2	33.3	4	66.7
Maintenance	1					1	100.0
Administrative services	1	1	100.0				
AFIC	19	3	15.8	6	31.6	10	52.6
OSI	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
Construction Division	1			1	100.0		
Engineering Division	1					1	100.0
Health, Education, and Welfare	109	54	49.5	39	35.8	16	14.7
St. Elizabeths	8	3	37.5	3	37.5	2	25.0
Public Health	34	19	55.9	10	29.4	5	14.7
Division of Vocational Education	1			1	100.0		
Public Housing	4			2	50.0	2	50.0
Office of Education	21	13	61.9	6	28.6	2	9.5
NIH	17	9	52.9	5	29.4	3	17.6
Food and Drug	13	5	38.5	6	46.2	2	15.4
National Science Foundation	5	5	100.0				
NEA	1	1	100.0				
Vocational rehabilitation	2	2	100.0				
National Cancer Institute	1			1	100.0		
District of Columbia General Hospital	1			1	100.0		
Post Office	256	61	23.8	105	41.0	90	35.2
Mail equipment shop	4	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0
Research and engineering	1					1	100.0
Fairfax	1	1	100.0				
Philat sales	1					1	100.0
Alexandria	5	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0
Arlington	11	1	9.1	5	45.5	5	45.5
Annandale	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
Springfield	1	1	100.0				
Falls Church	2			1	50.0	1	50.0
Herndon	1			1	100.0		
Rosslyn	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
Centerville	1	1	100.0				
Postal Transportation Service	1			1	100.0		
Labor	80	33	41.3	28	35.0	19	23.8
Bureau of Employment Security	4	3	75.0			1	25.0
NLRB	13	7	53.8	3	23.1	3	23.1

	Total responses	Good	Percent	Medium	Percent	Poor	Percent
USES	3	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
USMC	45	23	51.1	16	35.6	6	13.3
District of Columbia government	43	16	37.2	16	37.2	11	25.6
Public School	10	1	10.0	7	70.0	2	20.0
Department of Highways and Traffic	8	1	12.5	5	62.5	2	25.0
Department of Buildings	5	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	60.0
Correction	26	14	53.8	8	30.8	4	15.4
General Hospital	4	2	50.0	2	50.0		
Recreation	2	2	100.0				
Attorney's Office	1	1	100.0				
Metropolitan Police Department	13	3	23.1	4	30.8	6	46.2
Public health	6	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3
CD	2	1	50.0			1	50.0
Fire	6	2	33.3	3	50.0	1	16.7
Sewage sanitary engineering	3			3	100.0		
Unemployment compensation	5	2	40.0			3	60.0
Bureau of Prisons	2			2	100.0		
Welfare	5	1	20.0	3	60.0	1	20.0
DMU	1	1	100.0				
Parole	1					1	100.0
Capitol Architect	9	5	55.6	4	44.4		
Northern Virginia Regional Planning Commission	1	1	100.0				
Capitol Power Plant	3			3	100.0		
Justice	60	34	56.7	1	26.7	10	16.7
FBI	39	24	61.5	12	30.8	3	7.7
Supreme Court	1					1	100.0
U.S. marshal	1	1	100.0				
Court of Claims	2	1	50.0			1	50.0
Tax Court	6	3	50.0	1	16.7	2	33.3
District court	2	1	50.0	1	50.0		
House of Representatives	9	8	88.9	1	11.1		
Senate	9	7	77.8	1	11.1	1	11.1
White House	7	4	57.1	2	28.6	1	14.3
USCSC	59	17	28.8	28	47.5	14	23.7
Peace Corps	3	3	100.0				
Red Cross	2					2	100.0
Civil War Centennial	1					1	100.0
Bureau of Federal Credit Union	1	1	100.0				

Jack Brooks Sounds Keynote for Economic Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, each Member of the Congress is aware of many of the economic problems confronting our Nation which affect every businessman and every workingman. These problems often seem to feed upon one another and multiply among themselves until all that is apparent on the surface is a picture of confusion and hopelessness for the future.

We have long admired the work of our distinguished colleague from Texas, JACK BROOKS, for his untiring and demanding work as chairman of the Brooks subcommittee in effecting sizable savings for our taxpayers by demanding that we receive a full dollar's worth of good government for every tax dollar our National Government receives. Congressman BROOKS' work toward eliminating waste and inefficiency in some 15 Federal agencies has reflected outstanding credit not only on the Congress but also on the people of the Second Congressional District who support his courageous work.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have still another reason to admire the perceptiveness of our colleague, JACK BROOKS. In a speech which he delivered to the 11th Annual Management Conference at the Lamar State College of Technology on March 30, 1962, Congressman BROOKS struck straight to the heart of our economic problems and offered the people of his district clear guideposts which can guide the economic development of southeast Texas to new horizons of business and job opportunities.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this speech to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today so that each of us may profit from Congressman BROOKS' clear insights and unhindered vision.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JACK BROOKS, 11TH ANNUAL MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE, LAMAR STATE COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY, MARCH 30, 1962

Let me say first of all that I am delighted to have this opportunity to be with you here at the 11th Annual Management Conference. The fact that this is the 11th conference has particular significance to many of us here who worked together to create our 4-year Lamar Tech.

The bill creating Lamar Tech was approved 13 years ago this spring. This is the 11th anniversary of the 1st graduating class as well as the 11th anniversary of our 1st management conference.

The creation of Lamar Tech was a significant step forward in providing educational and economic opportunities for the people of southeast Texas. The progress Lamar has made in the past 13 years has more than justified the faith of those of us who worked to make this dream a concrete reality. And I believe it illustrates in an important way the importance of the close, working relationship between Government and business.

The State of Texas is making a vital contribution to the efficient management of our industries and businesses here in southeast Texas by providing a first-class college curriculum covering many of the subjects in which our plants and businesses must find trained graduates. It is now possible for the future executives of our industries and businesses to have been born, reared, educated, employed, and to rise to top management in their field—all right here in southeast Texas.

In a larger way, our National Government and business are very natural partners in our democracy. We are committed as a nation to the defense of freedom. Those of us who treasure democratic freedom have no choice, just as we had no choice in World War II. But if this commitment to the defense of freedom is to be meaningful, our Nation must be strong.

When business does well, and people who want jobs can find jobs, and our economy is growing fast enough to provide for our needs, our Nation is strong and we can equip ourselves to win on all fronts of the cold war against communism—the military front, the educational front, the trade front as well as the production front. When business activity and employment are high, our country does well. When our economy slumps, we all pay the price.

Another reminder of the importance of the relationship between Government and business is the understanding by all our citizens that our democratic form of government is irrevocably tied to our free enterprise economic system. Both are on trial for their lives (indeed, our lives) in the arena of world history. In order to succeed, our business community must prosper and our people must have an opportunity to work.

There is no question in any responsible person's mind that we must prove our free enterprise system, as well as our free election system, equal to the challenges which lie before us. Although there may be differences of opinion on how best to bring this country prosperity, responsible citizens know that if our economy prospers, the Nation lives: if our economy fails, we are dead.

Let's look for a moment at our current economic posture:

Our total national output of goods and services—our gross national product—has increased more than 8 percent in the past year—up to an annual rate surpassing $550 billion.

Consumer spending has risen in the past year $28 billion. This is an increase of 7 percent.

Personal disposable income now stands above the figure of $1 billion per day. This is an increase of 6 percent in the past year.

Corporate profits have increased to a total of about $47 billion per year. This is an increase in corporate profits of about 20 percent.

Expenditures for new plants and equipment have reached the annual rate of $36.5 billion. This is an increase of about 7 percent in the past year.

These advances in our economy are genuinely gratifying because they have been made in a period which reflects stable prices.

However, we have still with us some very serious economic problems which point up very vividly that our economy must grow and expand even faster in order to meet the challenges of our time.

The level of housing starts is not recovering as fast as we would like after the slump of 1960, but we may anticipate that the formation of new families will eventually accelerate the rate of new starts on homes.

Of even more serious nature is the continued high rate of unemployment. There are more than 4.5 million workers unemployed in our country. This is almost 7 percent of our total civilian labor force. Here in Jefferson and Orange Counties, while there are 108,000 persons employed, 7.6 percent of our labor force is unemployed. We have made some progress. A year ago at this time more than 9 percent of our workers here at home did not have jobs.

But at the present rate of growth of our national economy, it's not easy to be optimistic about further reducing unemployment unless we devote particular attention to this critically important problem.

Here are some reasons why:

Although 2 million workers were added to industrial payrolls during the calendar year 1961, there are still 4.5 million workers without jobs.

There are 800,000 teenagers out of school and out of work right now. There will be 26 million new young workers coming into the job market in this decade. Unfortunately, out of this 26 million, about 7.5 million are not going to have high school diplomas. These are the "drop-outs" that our parents, our teachers, and our school boards are deeply concerned about. This 7.5 million teenagers will enter the labor market as unskilled workers.

New production methods are, this year, already displacing 35,000 unskilled workers every week.

As you can see it's easy not to become overly optimistic about the employment situation.

It is fundamental to clear thinking about the economic issues of the cold war that we must rely on the strength of our free enterprise system in order to survive. We cannot outnumber the populations of the Communist-bloc nations, but we can beat them with quality, with know-how, and with efficiency.

We cannot turn back the clock to old production methods. Instead we must continually search for new and better and more efficient methods to produce. Automation has been an important answer to more efficient production, and no one can long defend any proposal to repeal automation. But at the same time no one can ignore either the human or the economic tragedy of millions of workers unnecessarily out of work and still more millions expected in the labor market.

Our task, then, is to find a way to utilize the God-given talents of these men and women so that they can find a good job and make a worthwhile contribution to our community. We can be absolutely sure that poor folks enjoy living as much as rich folks, and bank accounts aren't always an indication of a person's willingness to work his heart out for his family, or to want to do his part as an American.

Most of you already know that the Congress approved and the President signed, on March 15, a pilot program providing for the retraining of about 410,000 displaced workers so they might qualify for jobs in industries which need new workers. The Federal Government, the State governments, and businesses themselves can all cooperate under the provisions of this legislation.

I am delighted to report that, in approving this legislation, Congress did not create any new bureaus. I believe this program bears watching to see if something along these lines might be a significantly helpful approach to our unemployment problem.

Another perplexing problem facing our economy today is that of a favorable balance of payments having as many gold dollars coming into the United States as are going out.

Our problem is not that we import more goods than we export. As a matter of fact we exported last year $5 billion more in merchandise than we imported. Secretary of Commerce Hodges told me last week that this area exported about $130 million in petrochemicals last year. But this surplus is being more than offset by our military expenditures abroad, the 20 percent of our foreign aid not actually spent in the United States, by American capital investment abroad, and by American travel expenditures overseas.

The balance-of-payments deficit of 1960 of $3.9 billion was reduced by careful management to about $2.5 billion in 1961. But we still have a way to go.

One answer to the problem might be to renege on our military and economic commitments abroad; however, I do not think anyone seriously believes we can survive as a free island in a world left for the Communists to move in and take over.

Instead, the present administration and business leaders are convinced that the answer lies in our exporting more goods to make up the deficit. This emphasis on exports does not seem unreasonable. We export only 4 percent of our total national production. And if we increased our exports by just 10 percent, the balance-of-payments deficit would no longer be a problem.

In comparison with our exports of 4 percent of our national production, West Germany exports 17 percent, Canada exports 15 percent, and Sweden exports 21 percent of their national production.

Now, expanding our export market at this time has some unique problems. But if we do expand our export market, we shall also enjoy some unique advantages.

We all are aware that the principal industrial nations of Western Europe are uniting in a trade agreement known as the European Common Market. This means simply that they hope to eliminate tariffs among themselves as quickly as possible so that goods will flow between these European countries duty-free, just as we ship products freely back and forth across the Sabine River. As a matter of fact, they got the idea from us.

The European Common Market is potentially the largest market in the entire free world. Soon about 90 percent of the free world's industrial production may become concentrated in only two markets—the United States and an expanded European Common Market.

If we are to stay in business we must take adequate steps to be able to trade advantageously with the European Common Market—to sell them what we can produce most efficiently and buy from them what they can produce most efficiently. In this way we can win tariff concessions from them.

Here's a somber example of the type of competition the common market is already showing us: In 1960, before the common market tariffs were being lowered, West Germany imported 39 percent of a certain radio category from the United States and imported only 4 percent from Italy. Nine months later, as Common Market tariffs began to come down, we dropped from 39 percent to 20 percent of the West German market. Italian sales jumped from 4 percent to 25 percent.

Our signal opportunity to increase our exports, do business advantageously with the European Common Market, and further solidify the free world's economic position against Communist trade advances is being considered by Congress at this time. Under the proposed Trade Expansion Act, we would have the bargaining power we need to compete and cooperate with the European Commoh Market and at the same time safeguard our trade agreements with Japan and other free countries not included in the Common Market.

We all know that tariff agreements are pretty complicated, but every person here is aware of one import problem that hits mighty close to home. This is the problem of oil imports. It's a complex problem but it has a simple result. When we import large quantities of oil to be refined instead of refining our own oil, our domestic oil producers are severely affected. And the men who run the drilling rigs, the pumpers, the pipeliners, the oilfield equipment folks—are looking for jobs most of the time.

You can be sure that I'm working with every Member of Congress I know who is from an oil-producing State—Democrats and Republicans—to see if we can get a realistic limit imposed on oil imorts so our people who depend on domestic oil production for a job and a living will have an opportunity to work.

I believe a reasonable limit can be imposed without jeopardizing in any way whatsoever our bargaining position with the European Common Market.

In reviewing our National and State picture, we cannot escape the facts that we here in southeast Texas have a high stake in alleviating the unemployment problem, in finding a way to better utilize our manpower resources and in finding markets abroad for the products that we produce.

Jefferson and Orange Counties in 1960 had a population of about 300,000 persons. The best census bureau projections for 1970 predict that we shall have, in just 8 years, a population of about 400,000. If we need 115,000 jobs now for full employment, this means we will need about 170,000 jobs for workers in 1970. In the next 8 years our economy in Jefferson and Orange counties must produce from 50,000 to 55,000 new businesses and job opportunities. This is a large order.

These young people coming into the labor market must be educated and trained if they are not to flounder in a large pool of unskilled workers. And our economy here in southeast Texas must grow at an accelerated rate if there are to be jobs for skilled workers.

Here—as we began—I believe our Government and our business community are national partners.

In southeast Texas we are just beginning to tap the total wealth of our natural resources. Two hundred million dollars in new industrial expansion has been announced in Jefferson County since the first construction money on McGee Bend Dam was approved by Congress. The dam represents a sizable investment by the people of the United States in developing the Neches and Angelina watershed, but the industrial expansion which we can support when the dam is completed—and we have an almost unlimited supply of fresh water—will dwarf the initial investment.

I expect Congress to consider this summer authorization for the Corps of Engineers to dredge our deepwater shipping channels serving our heavy industries down to 40 feet. This is more efficient and effective utilization of our natural resources for economic growth. Ships which have to leave our ports and industries partly loaded to keep from scraping bottom will now be able to top off their holds and tanks.

Congress will also consider this summer authorization of a hurricane protection plan for the highly industrialized Port Arthur and south Jefferson County area. This program can not only protect the present investments we, our friends, and neighbors have in businesses and homes and jobs, it will encourage new business and new job opportunities for the south county area.

Each of these projects involves participation and contributions by local governmental bodies. And each is a sound investment in the economic future of our area, just as the creation of Lamar Tech has been.

These are graphic examples of the advantages of our Government and our business community working together, and there are others.

As a member of the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee, I have an opportunity to see firsthand the role of our Government in protecting the opportunities for businessmen to compete in the open market.

I have learned that the popular conception of our Government's role in antitrust matters as "antibusiness" is just not true. Roughly two-thirds of the complaints on antitrust violations come from businessmen themselves—businessmen who represent almost every conceivable area of the business community—both giant and small—and who are asking their Government's help in enforcing the well-recognized rules of the game.

As a Member of the House Government Operations Committee, I have seen firsthand the fantastic results of research projects, financed by Congressional appropriations, carried out by private companies and the findings later applied to both business and Government practices which save both investors and taxpayers substantial sums of money.

Our free society has demonstrated time and time again that our Government and our business community are logical partners in developing the maximum strength of our Nation.

Frankly, I believe that those persons who would incite our Government against our business community, and who would incite our business community against our Government, are attempting to hold back our people when we must move ahead.

Here in southeast Texas we have made genuine progress, but there is much that remains to be done. We have come this far through cooperation and hard work. We are laying a solid foundation for a "go economy" in southeast Texas. We must now finish this foundation and begin to build a new economic structure.

I am confident we will continue to work together and I am equally confident that all our people can prosper and remain free.

Thank you.

Blinded Veterans Association, Through Its Intelligent Programs, Carries Forward Worthwhile Work—The Rambler Is Quoted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Blinded Veterans Association reports that more than 40,000 veterans are visually handicapped as a result of their service in the armed forces of the United States. Five thousand of these veterans are now blind, and it is estimated that 4,000 more will go blind from their war and service injuries. They are presently going blind at the rate of more than 100 a year. Five thousand veterans know what blindness is, and, with the help of the Blinded Veterans Association, hundreds of them have brought to life BVA's motto, "that the blinded veteran may take his rightful place in the community of his fellows."

I am a member of the advisory board of the Blinded Veterans Association. It was organized in March 1945, at Avon, Conn., by a group of newly blinded veterans at the Advanced Army Rehabilitation Center for the Blind and chartered by Congress in 1958. From this small nucleus, an organization has developed that is recognized as one of the most dynamic and outstanding in its field. The association has an excellent record for its program of service, its cooperation with other organizations and Government agencies, and its high standards of fundraising.

For the past 17 years, the BVA has worked continuously for good rehabilitation services for all blind people. It was responsible for the establishment of the blind rehabilitation program at the Veterans Administration Hospital, Hines, Ill., in 1947. The training there has become a pattern for many State and private programs that are administered for the civilian blind.

In 1953, the BVA, with headquarters in Washington, D.C., established its field service program. Since then, over 2,000 blinded veterans have been interviewed and assisted by field representatives. These men have been helped in securing adjustments in their disability compensation or pensions; in obtaining needed medical care, social services, prosthetic equipment and sensory aids; in securing prevocational and vocational training; and in finding gainful employment. The field service program has demonstrated beyond doubt that blind persons who have the will to succeed, with adequate training and intelligently coordinated services, can find and hold gainful employment.

It is hoped that in the foreseeable future, all rehabilitated blind people will be judged on the merits of their abilities and will find employment in keeping with their talents and training. Today, many employers judge a blind person by these criteria, but there are others who think a blind person must do repetitive work or be placed in sheltered types of employment. In case after case, the association has disproved this. There are now blinded veterans who are machinists, electricians, and cabinetmakers. There are others who own their own businesses, teach school and do social work. There are also doctors, lawyers—and one Indian chief.

One phase—an important one—of employment for the blind veteran and nonveteran, is in the operation of small business units under the Randolph-Sheppard Act—Public Law 74-732—signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was my responsibility to have coauthored this measure when I served in the U.S. House of Representatives.

This legislation authorized the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons and to enlarge economic opportunities for the blind. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reports that in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, there were 2,332 blind persons operating vending stands in Federal and non-Federal buildings. The total sales amounted to $42,057,598 with a net profit to the operators of $8,376,408.

Although a picture of great accomplishment has been presented here, there are many cases that are incomplete. There are blinded veterans who, for one reason or another, have not yet been able to be placed in gainful employment. These men will continue to need a wide variety of services. Many suffer from multiple injuries. In addition to their blindness, some have sustained the loss of hearing or the loss of arms and legs.

And what about the 4,000 still to go blind? They can only await this major handicap with fear and anxiety. But once the shock of blindness has been suffered, they, too, can be helped along the road of total rehabilitation—moving from medical rehabilitation to prevocational training; from vocational training to competitive employment.

The Blinded Veterans Association has a good history and a merited reputation, but much work lies ahead. It is always ready to assist those persons who are going blind, by working with the Veterans' Administration, the State agencies for the blind, and many private organizations to see that each will receive the same services as those blinded during World War II and in Korea.

Interesting and factual information about the Blinded Veterans Association is in the Rambler's column from the Washington (D.C.) Star for November 20, 1961, which I ask to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Rambler Lunches With Blind Vets

(By George Kennedy)

"Luncheon, at 12:30," said Jim Chambers over the telephone. "We'll be seeing you."

The last was just a figure of speech, because Jim Chambers is blind. He had telephoned about the Blind Veterans of America, wanted the Rambler to meet George Gillespie, the new executive secretary.

"All our staff members are blind," Jim said. "We have only two sighted employees, clerical workers in the Washington office."

Jim turned out to be surprisingly young. He wore a wedding band on left-hand ring finger.

George Gillespie, a heavy-set man of 44, wore dark glasses. His nose and cheeks evidently had been rebuilt after severe head wounds.

Four years ago, when Jim was 19 and serving in the Army, he was blinded by the accidental discharge of a shotgun while hunting rabbits.

George Gillespie was in a truck in the Colmar pocket on the upper Rhine in January 1945 when a mortar shell exploded above it.

BVA employs six other blind vets who are stationed around the country. Blindness is increasing among our 22 million veteran population, sometimes from old war injuries, sometimes from peacetime accidents and often from diabetes.

At the end of the war there were 1,400 blind vets; now there are 3,500.

When a new case of blindness is reported to the Veterans' Administration, a BVA representative goes to the home and assures the family, the wife especially, that life is not over.

He encourages the man to accept retraining at the VA rehabilitation center for the blind at Hines, Ill., near Chicago.

"Blind veterans will never starve," said George Gillespie. "If blindness is service-connected, they get $309 a month. But they want to live normal lives. Most are married. They have children. They need to earn on their own."

"All through history people have been sorry for the blind. 'Alms for the blind' is a very old expression. It is only recently that efforts have been made to help the blind help themselves.

"It started with workshops where the blind made brooms, stuffed mattresses, or caned chairs. Improved machinery and plastics are denying this work to the blind, and maybe it's a good thing in the long run. We know now that the blind can be trained to do highly skilled and complicated work."

Jim Chambers said, "We have one member who assembles gear boxes for helicopters; another works on the assembly of missiles."

The BVA has an unusual angel, an organization known as the Bowlers of America. During the war, the bowlers, like other organizations, wanted to do what they could to help. They chose the rehabilitation for the blind as their field of service. They raised money.

After the war, when they realized how much blind veterans, who had been through the mill, were able to do for the newly blind, they gave the newly organized BVA $75,000. Since then they have given it $25,000 a year.

Maj. Gen. Keith R. Barney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, on March 31, 1962, my good friend, Maj. Gen. Keith R. Barney, Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction, is retiring. General Barney has done an outstanding job and has certainly been a friend, not only to Alabama, but to all of the States in the Union. General Barney's experience is wide and varied.

Before assuming his present duties in October 1960, General Barney was division engineer, Missouri River division, with headquarters in Omaha, Nebr. In this position, which he held from 1958 to 1960, he continued the authorized program of the Army Corps of Engineers for the development and control of the waters of the Missouri River Basin. He served as district engineer, Kansas City District, a part of the Missouri River Basin, from 1953 to 1955.

Between his tours of duty in the Missouri River Basin, General Barney was Director of Installations in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Washington, D.C. His other tours of duty in Washington included 3 years, 1950 to 1953, in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Military Construction, and 2 years, 1945 to 1947, as a General Staff Officer, War Department. Between these last two tours, he was Director of Installations, Pacific Air Command.

In World War II, General Barney assumed command of the newly activated 1120th Engineer Combat Group, which he took overseas and commanded throughout the European campaign. His decorations include the Silver Star, Legion of Merit, Army Commendation Ribbon with Metal Pendant, Legion of Honor (France), and the Croix de Guerre (France).

Prior to World War II, his assignments included a tour of duty as military assistant to the district engineer, St. Paul, Minn.

General Barney was born in Springfield, Vt., on July 17, 1904. He graduated from the local high school and then from the Phillips Exeter Academy. He was commissioned in the Army Corps of Engineers upon his graduation in 1926 from the U.S. Military Academy, West Point. He holds the professional degree of civil engineer from Cornell University, 1929. He is also a graduate of the Engineer School, Fort Belvoir, and the Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

General Barney is a fellow of the American Society of Civil Engineers and a registered professional engineer, District of Columbia. He is a former chairman of the board, Army-Navy Country Club. He has written articles for the Society of American Military Engineers and the American Society of Civil Engineers.

He is married to the former Frances McClymonds, of Pittsburgh, Pa. They have one son, 1st Lt. Keith R. Barney, Jr., TC–Res., presently on active duty at Fort Gordon, Ga.

I know all of you join with me in wishing General Barney well now that he is leaving Government service. Fortunately, General Barney will stay in the Washington area and will join an engineering concern here in Washington. We will all miss his words of encouragement and advice.

Dove of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, last month my native New Orleans pulled all the stops in staging one of the most exciting Mardi Gras celebrations in the history of that wonderful day. From all accounts it epitomized everything Mardi Gras in New Orleans has come to be down through the years.

As any Mardi Gras participant or onlooker can tell you, the success of the day depends in a large degree on the originality and staging of the many parades that roll through the Crescent City on that day. Traditionally the parades of Rex and the Mystik Krewe of Comus climax the celebration.

In the last few years, however, another parade has grown so much in stature that it deserves widespread and immediate recognition. I refer to the exciting and imaginative parades of the Elks Krewe of Orleanians and I think that this year's parade was their best yet. Nor am I alone in this thinking.

For example, one float in particular, entitled "Dove of Peace," was adjudged grand prize winner and needless to say this is not an honor to be treated lightly. The Krewe members who created this particular float are to be commended for the profundity of their theme and the daring and brilliant execution of the design.

It was a float that must be seen to be fully appreciated but it will give some small idea of its appearance to say that it consisted of a giant dove, an elaborate center piece carrying the float's title, and at the end of the float an enormous globe depicting the earth. As the "Dove of Peace" arrived before City Hall a large number of doves were released and I am told it was one of the most stirring moments of the 1962 Mardi Gras when the doves fluttered into the brilliant skies.

Although the Elks Krewe of Orleanians is comparatively young as carnival organizations go, it has probably made as much or more progress as any other carnival group in its 27 years of existence. New Orleanians have watched this parade climb the ladder of Mardi Gras recognition year by year and it is a credit to every member of the Krewe that this is so.

And now the "Dove of Peace" has climaxed their efforts. I know the Members of this House will join with me in extending our heartiest and warmest congratulations.

History and Scope of Communism and the Threats of Communist Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD the keynote address on "History and Scope of Communism and the Threats of Communist Aggression," which I delivered on March 30 at the American Strategy Cold War Seminar, sponsored by the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce, and held on the campus of the University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y.:

HISTORY AND SCOPE OF COMMUNISM AND THE THREATS OF COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, reverend members of the clergy, and my fellow Americans, the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Buffalo deserves the highest commendation for organizing this 2-day American Strategy Seminar. Your program reflects a keen awareness of the life or death challenge which confronts every citizen of the United States, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and 52 weeks in every year. It also heralds a determination to penetrate in depth the facts and realities of this challenge, to clearly identify the enemy, to understand the objectives and tactics of that enemy, and to generate a spirit of public dedication in support of the will to win the war which has been forced upon us.

The leaders of business, industry, religion, and education who have given their support to this seminar are deserving of an equal accolade. For they are the responsible leaders in any community—as they go, so goes the community—and as the communities throughout the length and breadth of our Nation go, so goes our Nation in its response to the challenge of the Red barbarians on the march. What your Government in Washington does on this vital issue is, and will continue to be, in direct proportion to what the people of our Nation demand be done. Government in the United States is the servant of the people and it cannot serve well or adequately unless the voice of the people is clear and loud on vital issues. There is nothing wrong with the body politic of the United States that an enlightened and articulate electorate cannot remedy. It has always been the role of responsible local leadership to crystalize issues directly affecting the welfare of the people in their community and to hammer out corrective programs of action directed at removing evil threats to local peace and security while advancing the common good. Organized, aggressive, Russian communism is a present threat to every citizen in every community in the United States. That is the nature of the war which has been forced upon us. I, therefore, congratulate the leaders of the city of Buffalo gathered here today, for meeting their responsibilities to the people of your city, to our Nation, and to the cause of freemen everywhere.

Karl Marx and his associate Frederick Engels took the theories and notions of a wide assortment of dreamers and malcontents out of the coffeeshops, beer halls, and dusty attics of Europe and brought them into the marketplace of human affairs. This they did by their publication of the "Communist Manifesto" of 1848, which was the first general and organized public statement of what a Communist should believe. For some time prior, the so-called Communists had been meeting and acting in a covert manner, loosely organized or I should say disorganized, because they lacked basic definition of purpose and the guidance of stated principles. Marx claimed the time had come for those who believed in communism to openly face the world, though those who so believed or thought they believed were but a handful of men, and to do so through an open statement of principles. That is the why of the manifesto, which was composed by Marx and Engels. It is interesting to note that in the introduction to the manifesto this bold but untrue claim was made; "Europe is haunted by the specter of communism." Europe of 1848 was certainly haunted by terrible injustices in the social order as a consequence of the industrial revolution and there was grave unrest among the working classes but there was no specter of communism because no one had, up to that time, given any definition to the term. Yet Marx and Engels engaged in the art of the grandiose claim before agreement had been reached among a handful of theorists on the meaning of communism and certainly long before the oppressed common man had even heard the term. This is an important point in the history of communism because it has been maintained and perfected as a technique by the Russians since 1918. The grandiose claim is still the most powerful weapon of the Russian Communists and their collaborators.

From 1848 to 1918, the theories of Marx and Engels remained as theories. The believers of Marx split off into countless sects in this long period of debate, recrimination, and accusation which marked the internal workings of the Communist believers for that period of 70 years. But the crackup of the Russian Empire of the czars in 1917–18, provided the first opportunity for those believers to test the theories of communism. Lenin, an exiled Russian living in Switzerland, was the leader of one Communist sect who had done extensive work on the organization aspects of Communist theory. He, with another handful of adherents, arrived in Petrograd at a time when the seat of imperial power was broken and a vacuum of government authority existed because the Russian people for centuries had grown accustomed to the despotic rule of the czars and were hence incapable of self-government. Lenin stepped into this vacuum with his totalitarian concepts for applying the theories of communism and the transition of power was completed in a relatively short period of time.

Once in power, Lenin devoted his first efforts to reconstructing the empire of the czars. This required wars of aggression against the many, newly independent nations which had broken out of the empire during the period of 1917 through 1920. It was in these circumstances that Lenin developed the techniques of war communism, that is war against all the non-Russian nations which were once under the colonial rule of the czars. These same techniques of war communism are now directed at every nation on earth—the objective being to make the entire world a colony of the Russians.

But Lenin ran into real trouble when he began to apply the social and economic theories of communism to the captive non-Russian nations of his reconstructed empire. He found they would not work, that they were contrary in a violent sense to the nature of man. We must, however, credit him with an all-out try—costing the lives of millions of people during the period of experiment.

In 1923 Lenin was forced to conclude that the economic theories of Marx must be abandoned and that it was necessary to seek the help of the free world capitalists to save the revolution from total collapse. He then announced a new economic policy which we now refer to as NEP, and under which the capitalists of the free world rushed to the rescue of the Russian despots. The so-called revolution was saved, but in all candor it must be admitted that the remedy once applied could not be abandoned by its users. That is why there is no communism in practice in the Soviet Union or elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain. Khrushchev openly admits this fact while at the same time predicting hat a Communist system will be established there during the next 20 years. This was his major boast during the recent 22d Congress of the Communist Party. At least he has dropped the 5-year-plan idea for a 20-year promise—he won't be around then, and hence won't be responsible for admitting another failure. Here again we find the Russians stalling for time. The fact is, and Khrushchev knows it as well as I do, the economic system of the Soviet Union is state capitalism with all the monopolistic features most pleasing to the new Russian barons in the Kremlin. The theories of communism have been made into myths—sort of lullabies to keep the Russian people in a stupor of ignorance and contented with their historic lot of servility.

Reasonable men must ask, "If there is no communism in practice behind the Iron Curtain, as Khrushchev openly admits is the case, what, then, is the enonomic and social structure of the empire? Well, I have already described what the economic system is. Now as to the social system. It can be summed up very quickly. It is no different in essential respects from the system of social injustice which existed for hundreds of years under the czars. All that has changed are the names and titles of the rulers, the state religion, and the line of succession to the seat of the czar. Believing this, as I do, I suggest it is time we stopped chasing shadows and stopped attempting to wrestle with myths and theories. It is time we got down to the business of engaging the real, live enemy. That enemy is Russian imperialism, not a new specter haunting Europe, but one which has haunted the civilized peoples of Europe for many centuries. Now it is our business because it haunts the present and the future of our free way of life.

So, for purposes of our discussion, when I mention communism please remember it is the mythical cover word for Russian imperialism. Hence, communism and Russian imperialism have the same meaning and I shall use the terms interchangebly.

Moreover, members of Communist parties anywhere in the world are nothing more than Russian agents, even though some of them may still believe they are chasing the utopian dreams of Marx.

The present epoch of great trial in which we live started with our political recognition of the Soviet Union in 1933. We can trace step after step, defeat after defeat in our dealing with the Communists, because we have refused or failed to understand or recognize the nature of the enemy we face. The Russian Communists have broken international agreements again and again, as Lenin directed years ago, "like piecrusts, made to be broken." Yet even today we continue to negotiate with these same rogues who are basically immoral and dishonest. They believe that the end justifies the means—and the end is imperial Russian rule of the world. These people will not change. We must accept this as a fact of contemporary life.

Fearful defeatists contend that we should not speak the truth about communism or Communists because we might offend them, or lose some point at a conference table, or provide grist for their propaganda machine. I want to see concrete evidence of anything we ever gained at a conference table with the Russians. They will hold an agreement only as long as it is in their own vital interests and not one minute longer.

If it suits the Communist purpose to negotiate—and they have been much more successful at this deadly game than we have—they will negotiate regardless of what we say or do. If negotiation does not suit their purposes, no sweet words from the West will induce them to negotiate. A lie to the Communists comes just as easily as a distortion for propaganda purposes. We must learn that the Communists react only to raw power, never to sweet and soft words. We must never judge them by our own normal intentions or reactions. They have no ethical or moral code. The only code they live by is the Communist code which says that any act is justifiable which promotes the cause of Russian communism.

Today the Communists control 26 percent of the world's land mass and 36 percent of the world's population. They have dragged 15 countries and 900 million people behind the Iron or Bamboo Curtain since World War II. They had destroyed the national independence of no less than 10 other nations before World War II.

Why have we, the strongest nation in the world, allowed this swallowing up of free and independent nations by the forces of Russian tyranny? I feel this has happened because we, as a people, have lost the feel for our own political heritage. We have become soft and secure on the fruits of the Founding Fathers. We have allowed a compromise of the great principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness under God. We have lost sight of the great spiritual values which motivated our Founding Fathers. We have not stood firm against any and all efforts to weaken the structure of representative self-government. In brief, we have not been acting like the informed, bold, and dedicated leaders who passed on the torch of freedom to succeeding generations of Americans.

Our national policies have been weak, vacillating, and aimless. Three main ideas have governed our policy. They were from 1947 to 1955, containment; 1955 to 1961, evolution, i.e., the mellowing of the Soviet Union into a peaceful Socialist state; and now 1961, escalation into general nuclear war.

The theory of containment of the Communist menace became national policy in 1947. This stated that communism contained the seeds of its own destruction, therefore if we contained it, it would destroy itself. This gave the Communists a base from which to operate, which was unmolested and unchallenged. They were able to consolidate their illegal base and build up their military and economic power. From this base they moved to new adventures on the international scene.

In 1955 a new tactic in the cold war was adopted by your Government. National policy was then based upon two pillars—foreign and international information programs. These were called positive-action programs. Since the policymakers of the period considered anticommunism as strictly negative, national policy concerning the Sino-Russian bloc could only go in one direction. It went from containment to the policy of encouraging changes within the Sino-Russian bloc by evolutionary processes. This change brought about cultural exchanges, trade with the Russians, aid to Poland and Yugoslavia, and visits to the United States by Mr. Khrushchev, Mikoyan, and other Russian Communist leaders.

The policy planners in the State Department sold our leaders on the idea that we should not attempt to win the cold war. By this, I do not mean that they wanted us to lose. They had the idea that we should not dare to win for fear that we might lose. So, they naively sought an accommodation with a conspiracy which they held would evolve into a peaceful Socialist state, but which in reality, can be trusted to do only one thing—to seek to bury us, as Mr. Khrushchev has vowed they will do.

There are many indications the fuzzy thinking of the State Department policy planners has been compounded by pouring in a top layer of accommodation sympathizers in high level positions of your Government. This is not something new. It has been going on without interruption since 1955.

Within the framework of containment and evolution there was a slight opening for some strong actions against the Russian Communists.

There is a possibility that this slight opening for positive political action may soon be closed tight. The present guidance within our State Department holds that we should be careful of any action against the Communists, since it might escalate into general nuclear war. Under this policy guidance, even an individual soldier may not fire back to defend himself, since it might escalate.

During the Korean war we were not allowed to fight for final victory, since it might have led to general war—so held the State Department. Now, it appears that we are not allowed to fight for any victory in the all-out war being waged against us by communism, since it might escalate into general nuclear war.

This newest version of national policy, escalation into general nuclear war, is a graduated extension of the policies of evolution and containment, with a new variation. The prior policies led us into defeat after defeat and the new policy of escalation offers high promise of leading us into the better Red than dead finality.

No victory has been ever achieved by fear. Fear paralyzes our every activity against the threats of communism. Even the deadly poison of Castro only 90 miles from our shore cannot be eliminated, because Khrushchev has exploded 50 atomic bombs and hinted that any efforts to effect change in Cuba might escalate. Too many high officials immediately run for their shelters and ask for more millions for bomb shelters at the slightest threat from Khrushchev. I ask you, if the wildest threats from Khrushchev and company do not escalate us into nuclear war then who is in charge of the escalator?

In spite of all the evidence of our softness and confusion, we can win the cold war and defeat Russian imperialism if we are determined to do so and establish a bold course of action for this purpose. Secretary of State Dean Rusk recently stated that any effort on our part toward victory in the cold war would only lead to a nuclear holocaust. This type of fearful reasoning will lead us into retreat, step by step, as we have been doing, to the point where there would be no choice left except surrender or nuclear war. No sane person wants to be backed into that corner. Let us make sure that shall never happen.

The American people deserve and are waiting for leadership toward another alternative—victory over Russian communism. Only the American people can bring about this change. I said earlier that in our country, government is the servant of the people. It is the people, therefore, who have the right to determine what the policies of their National Government shall be at any given time. This right of the people to determine national policies includes the right of the people to determine foreign policies. The principal means by which the people can exercise this right is through the ballot. But forceful expression of their desires by the innumerable means available to them is desirable at all times.

The American people can be deprived of their right to determine national policy only if the facts of the existence of alternative courses of action are withheld from them. If by some device or devices all but one course of action open to us is withheld from the public, the people then lose their right to participate in the formulation of policies. I maintain it is the duty of Government to fully inform the people on all courses of action open to us in meeting the Russian problem.

One point of view expounded by many individuals high in Government circles deliberately avoids a public examination of other avenues of action which might better serve our national needs and interests.

It is not so much the elected officials of your Government who engage in the take-it-or-leave-it approach to policy as the nonelected, but appointed or career employees thereof. They tend to know what is best for the people, much like the foreign offices in monarchies, and they too often feel they are above the electorate, and they are more often wrong than right.

When the public is deprived of a clear and understandable explanation of a national problem, a degree of apathy can be fostered which assures continuation of the monopoly on the making of policy by the favored few. This is especially true in the area of foreign policy which the bureaucrats are trying to wrap in mystery and intrigue.

An example of announcing a policy and shielding, from the public, of the full facts is the recent announcement by the Department of State on what they call the fragmentation of the Communist parties caused by the forces of nationalism. This in effect means that our policy toward the Russians will be based on the premise that the Russians have lost control of the non-Russian Communist parties of the world and that the forces of nationalism are affecting the internal cohesion of the Russian international conspiracy.

What are the true facts? Is the Russian government really losing control of the Communist parties of the world? Are the forces of nationalism affecting and weakening the Communist parties of the world? There can be no doubt that the most powerful political force in the world today is nationalism. That is the driving power behind the national independence movements in all quarters of the globe. But President Kennedy has warned that "the tide of self-determination has not yet struck the Communist empire." I agree with him, but the career people in the State Department do not.

We are not faced with a Nazi- or Fascist-type movement. Those movements could be compared with an octopus spreading its tentacles. Communism is a Banyan tree. From its roots spring trunks of trees often bigger and stronger than the original tree. Its roots travel underground. The mother tree remains Russian imperialism.

In my opinion, there is no sharp division between the Russian, Chinese Communists, Yugoslavs and Albanians. There is no hard intelligence which justifies claims of a deep rift between these groups. The estimates of a split are based upon the words and strange actions of the Communists, and no more. Since when could a Communist's words be relied upon or his strange actions be considered other than normal for an abnormal person.

The current theory of fragmentation of the Communist parties of the world is accompanied by an abundance of wishful thinking. In rebuttal to this theory, the present Russian activities in espionage and subversion speak an adequate answer. Those actions are well directed, effective, and well integrated into the Communist worldwide system which is tightly controlled by the organs of the Soviet Union. The control emanates from the foreign section of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The head of the foreign section is M. Suslov, a member of the Presidium of the U.S.S.R.

The Russian espionage and subversive network has made serious inroads into political, military, and industrial targets around the world. They control all the intelligence services of the satellite nations and work in close unison with the Chinese Communist agents. The Chinese Communists have an espionage and subversive office in East Berlin which is directed at Europe and the continent of Africa.

One tentacle of this system, for example, leads from Moscow to Prague to Mexico City. There it is directed south toward Central and South America and north toward the United States and Canada. Another tentacle runs from Moscow to Belgrade to Havana. The Yugoslavs are also exporting the Russian-Cuban type subversion to Central and South America.

The Communist intelligence and subversive system leaves little to chance and is supported by a number of parallel organizations. All the Russian instruments of espionage and subversion are now operating at full capacity.

In view of the above, it is fair to ask where is the fragmentation, how can the forces of nationalism weaken the basic espionage and subversive tasks of Communist parties throughout the world? This intelligence and subversion master plan is well controlled and close knit. Espionage and subversion are not ends in themselves, but only serve to further other more insidious plans. In this case world domination by the Soviet Union.

We cannot afford to sit back and wait for the Communists to evolve into a peaceful Socialist state; we must carry the political fight to the heartland of the Russian empire. We must realize that the Communists have declared total war against us and all the free peoples of the world. We are not in a cold war, but an all-inclusive war—political, economic, diplomatic and military. At this very moment, people in other parts of the world are losing their liberties and even their lives at the hands of Communists who are using subversion, terror, treachery, and deceit to attain their goal.

It is this attitude of sitting back and waiting for the Russian Communists to change, by some magic formula unknown to the general public, this wait-and-see attitude which has dominated our policies toward the Russian empire which in turn have caused a widespread spirit of frustration and disappointment among our people. Frustration and disappointment on such a massive scale is the primary cause, the stimulus for what is now being called thunder on the right. There are always individuals standing in the marketplace of human events who are quick to seize upon the negatives of contemporary affairs. Their actions soon identify them for what they are—opportunists. But the average citizen, who is concerned about the future of his country, whose intuitive sense tells him all that he believes in stands in mortal danger, who is moved by genuine patriotic intentions, can be made the innocent scapegoat of slogan branders. You and I know the nasty name callers are now busy as bees in the spring branding all those who dissent on the passive negative policies of evolution and escalation as "rightists" if not "Fascists." But this name calling will not get us out of the fix we are in and I hope it will not calm the voices of those who seek and master the facts about the origin, nature, and objectives of imperial Russian communism.

A massive effort is now being made to neutralize the body politic of the United States on the Russian question. That effort is directed by the manipulators of thought in the Kremlin and supported by their agents and organs of propaganda in the United States. They seek to make anyone who learns the truth about them and who dares to speak out against them appear as lunatics in the public image. In my considered judgment anyone who knows the facts on this vital issue would be acting like a lunatic if he does not speak out—to inform and warn his fellow citizens of the clear and present danger which confronts our Nation.

The sense of frustration and disappointment of which I speak will remain with us as long as the Russian imperial problem exists and our Government delays initiation of a political action program to bring about the orderly dismemberment of the modern-day Russian Empire. If our people were offered such a program, such a challenge, they would liquidate their frustrations in the healthy positives such a program would of necessity offer them. When we speak of the rising tide of expectations among the peoples of the world, let us not forget that the people of these United States are riding the crest of that tide. As members of a dynamic, free society they expect more from their Government in terms of positive political action programs on the international front than they have been getting in recent years. They are, I am sure, willing to take the risks involved to escalate the world into peace with freedom and justice for all men and all nations.

The Russian Communists consider a shooting war only an extension of political action—to be turned on and off as it suits their purpose. Many people and even some Americans are dying before Communist guns at this moment. Conflagrations caused by Communist treachery are now blazing in Laos, Vietnam, South Korea, Guatemala, Thailand, and the Congo. These wars are hot to the people facing Communist guns, yet our policymakers prefer to call it a cold war.

The firing squads in Cuba, mass starvation in Communist China, and the slave labor camps in the Soviet Union and the satellites are also part of a hot war where people die daily.

Any negotiation or accommodation with the Communists ends in appeasement or war. They leave their enemy no other alternative. Concessions provide them an opening for infiltration and subversion. What we need is a positive, overall strategy to win the war thrust upon us. If we don't dare win, then we don't deserve the right to be called the leader of the free world, and, worse, we will end up in chains as is always the lot of the timid when faced by the barbarian. We will win and survive as a free society only if the people of the United States and the majority of their duly elected representatives in the Congress demand victory.

The people of our Nation have the will and the tools with which to lay the foundation for a winning political offensive. We have a constitutional form of government which has given our people more freedom than any people have ever known. We have the finest churches, schools, and the highest per capita income in the world. Our technological capabilities are greater than all the rest of the world put together. We have the best system ever known to man, to sell. We need not apologize to anyone for our way of life nor is there need to prove our mettle. We need not prove our intentions to the world or coddle the neutrals. Our history as a nation speaks for itself. Our way of life is an open book of which we should all be justly proud. Let the peoples of the world see us for what we are, let them compare and learn; and then I would ask them to point to a system which gives more freedom and opportunity to the individual than ours provides.

We must maintain a Military Establishment second to none. We should never be lulled into the dangerous fallacy of unilateral disarmament. Let us not quibble over certain aspects of air power or antimissile capability. We need RB-70 and an antimissile, missile. We cannot afford to be without them.

Our homes and heritage are too precious to be jeopardized by petty political squabbles. We must insure a supremacy of power and destructive capability since these are the only things the Communists respect—force and power. We need not fear a nuclear holocaust, if we remain strong and powerful. The Communists will never start a war as long as there is clear evidence that they will lose.

A high official once told me that "Communism would not be difficult to destroy if we could get through the marshmallow curtain in our own Government." This marshmallow curtain is the internal threat of subversion and infiltration. The Attorney General today lists 283 Communist-front organizations and I have been informed that there are approximately 200 new fronts not yet listed; 185 of these are now under FBI investigation. These fronts can be more dangerous than the Communist Party. After the experience of the past we would be awfully naive to think that there are no Communist secret agents in our Government. To proceed on the wise premise that agents of Moscow will infiltrate our Government is a prudent policy. We are and must remain an open society. We have vulnerabilities, and precautions must be taken to identify and prosecute all agents of a foreign power who operate within or outside our Government.

There is no shortcut to victory. While we must carefully reckon with the possibility of a nuclear war, we must stop ignoring the piecemeal, salami tactics employed by the Russian Communist. Let us take a brief look at the results of these piecemeal, salami tactics: Cuba is a vassal state of Russia, British Guiana under Japan is moving in that direction, Brazil and Argentina are tottering, Mexico is ripe for plucking, Communist uprising and agitation in Guatemala, Costa Rica, Haiti, Honduras, Ecuador is a reality, and guerrilla warfare in Colombia and Venezuela is underway. This is on our doorstep. In Africa, Ghana is for all intents and purposes tied to Moscow, serious situations are arising in the Brazzaville States, Rhodesia, Angola, and the Congo.

The Arab States of Africa and the Middle East are being manipulated by the agents of Moscow. In southeast Asia we are awed by the so-called specter of the Chinese Communists with the "largest land army in the world of 3 million men." But the true story is that they could not even muster more than 20 combat-ready divisions, amounting to approximately 200,000 men. In spite of this, our policymakers are so frightened of the myth of Red China power that southeast Asia could very well fall to the Communists whenever they make a serious effort to take those countries. Fear can prevent the kind of bold leadership demanded by the bold ventures of aggressive communism on the march.

The fundamental cause of fear is ignorance of the facts relating to a given situation. People who seek the facts are not addicted to fear, nor do they engage in name calling. Knowledge is power and the knowledge you seek here today is the key to a sane and realistic policy toward the agelong Russian problem which in our generation we have come to call communism. I wish you every success in your mission here and the rewarding public work which I am sure will follow from your experiences during these 2 days of the American Strategy Conference. Thank you.

Mr. Jelesnik and the Salt Lake Philharmonic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1962

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the people of Utah and of the Nation can be justly proud of the life and activities of Eugene Jelesnik.

Mr. Jelesnik, conductor of the Salt Lake Philharmonic Orchestra, violinist and composer, left behind him the bright lights of Broadway just 17 years ago to live in the place he loves best, his now adopted State of Utah. Born in Russia on March 19, 1914, Mr. Jelesnik came to the United States with his mother when he was 11 years old to seek his musical future in the promised land. Shortly after his arrival, he received a musical scholarship through the New York Philharmonic, and pursued his career with one thing in mind—repaying his country for the privilege of being an American.

To Mr. Jelesnik, financial remuneration is only secondary to his art and service to his community. In Salt Lake

City where he now resides with his wife, Virginia, Mr. Jelesnik brought to Utah the old musical tradition of the "Pops concerts." His first concert was at the Liberty Park bandstand, overlooking the lake, on September 1, 1947. Since that date, these concerts have been repeated, much to the delight of music lovers. These concerts are presented free to the public and are sponsored annually by the city of Salt Lake and the parks department as a public service. For the past 10 years, Mr. Jelesnik directed, and still directs, the musical Pops concerts for the annual "Days of '47" celebration which commemorates the entry of the Mormon pioneers into the Salt Lake valley in 1847.

Every year during the Christmas holidays, Mr. Jelesnik assembles a group of entertainers for the annual Christmas cheer tour, which takes the performers to every major hospital and the blind center in the area.

Although he made a good living as a musician during World War II, he devoted much of his time in entertaining our GI's in connection with the USO camp shows, both in the United States and overseas. While waiting to go overseas, Mr. Jelesnik performed in every Army and Navy hospital in the United States. In February 1944 he left to go overseas and performed under fire on the "foxhole circuit" in the Mediterranean theater of operations. He played in the frontlines in Italy. For the 145 performances he gave before a total of 56,640 soldiers there, Mr. Jelesnik received from the War Department his most treasured possession, the Civilian Service Award Ribbon.

Mr. Jelesnik and his variety artists also traveled over 35,000 miles to entertain our soldiers in Korea, Japan, Philippine Islands, Okinawa, Guam, and Hawaii. Mr. Jelesnik's show, "Magic and Melody," was acclaimed as "one of the best, if not the best, entertainment units ever to play in Korea." For his tour of the Far East Command, Mr. Jelesnik received a Silver Medal Citation.

As a composer, Mr. Jelesnik holds an appointment to the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers. It was through his untiring efforts on behalf of the community in which he lives that public musical tributes were given to two outstanding Utahans and world renowned musical figures, Mr. Otto Harbach and Mr. Harold Orlob. Indeed, Mr. Jelesnik is a source of great pride for all Utahans. His great ability, enhanced by his desire to serve, has made him an outstanding figure in the field of music and in his community.

SENATE

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rabbi Harry Z. Sky, of Temple Beth El, Portland, Maine, offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, we stand at this moment at the crossroads of history—on one side, the looming shadow of destruction; on the other, the hopeful belief in a day colored by the fulfillment of the prophet's dream: No war shall be among you; no bloodshed shall disturb you. We ask that in these trying times we be aware of the destiny that lies within our hands. Though we may assemble to debate the future of this country, we are impelled to realize that its destiny is not only its own.

May we find within ourselves the courage, the faith, and the hope which these days of challenge require.

Let our fears—if fears we have—be still,
And turn us to the future!
Not only for the glories which the years
Shall bring us; not for lands from sea
  to sea,
And wealth, and power, and peace,
  though these shall be;
But for the distant peoples we shall
  bless,
And the hushed murmurs of a world's
  distress:

As we face this America which has been entrusted into our hands, may all of us, as citizens of the United States, ever realize that the vision of America is one that we, ourselves, will shape and fulfill.

To Thee, O God, we give thanks. These humble lips, which this day utter these words, bless Thee for having allowed us to live to see the day when a rabbi of a people long driven and persecuted has at last found for himself and his people a haven where no man threatens and no man denounces and no man destroys.

Bless these shores; bless its leaders; and may they ever have the faith and the courage and the hope to fulfill the destiny that is America. May this be Thy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 3, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1934) for the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 971) for the relief of Salvatore Briganti, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) requesting the President to designate the week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 852. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish medical advisory panels to resolve conflicts of evidence in questions involving service connection of disabilities or deaths;

H.R. 1372. An act for the relief of Rocco Cambrea;

H.R. 1533. An act for the relief of Lee Kyong Ja;

H.R. 1650. An act for the relief of Irene Kemeny;

H.R. 1651. An act for the relief of Adela Glicman;

H.R. 1700. An act for the relief of Jaime Abejuro;

H.R. 1811. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, relating to war orphans' educational assistance, in order to permit eligible persons thereunder to attend foreign educational institutions under certain circumstances;

H.R. 3005. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Aurelia (Chiara Di Gesu);

H.R. 3825. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 5234. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the restoration of certain widows and children to the rolls upon annulment of their marriages or remarriages, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5689. An act for the relief of Felicja Saulevicz;

H.R. 6344. An act for the relief of Mon (Fred) Young;

H.R. 7876. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the joint pension plan for employees of Local Unions 645, 1507, and 1511, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 9285. An act for the relief of Helenita K. Stephenson;

H.R. 9445. An act for the relief of Miss Grace Smith, and others;

H.R. 10068. An act to amend section 742 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the exchange of 5-year term policies of U.S. Government life insurance to a special endowment at age 96 plan;

H.R. 10242. An act to amend Private Law 86-339; and

H.R. 10700. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 852. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish medical advisory panels to resolve conflicts of evidence in questions involving service connection of disabilities or deaths;

H.R. 5234. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the restoration of certain widows and children to the rolls upon annulment of their marriages or remarriages, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10068. An act to amend section 742 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the exchange of 5-year term policies of U.S.

Government life insurance to a special endowment at age 96 plan; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1372. An act for the relief of Rocco Cambrea;

H.R. 1533. An act for the relief of Lee Kyong Ja;

H.R. 1650. An act for the relief of Irene Kemeny;

H.R. 1651. An act for the relief of Adela Glicman;

H.R. 1700. An act for the relief of Jaime Abejuro;

H.R. 3005. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Aurelia (Chiara Di Gesu);

H.R. 3825. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co., and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 5689. An act for the relief of Felicja Saulevicz;

H.R. 6344. An act for the relief of Mon (Fred) Young;

H.R. 7876. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the joint pension plan for employees of Local Unions 645, 1507, and 1511, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 9285. An act for the relief of Helenita K. Stephenson;

H.R. 9445. An act for the relief of Miss Grace Smith, and others; and

H.R. 10242. An act to amend Private Law 86–339; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1611. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, relating to war orphans' educational assistance, in order to permit eligible persons thereunder to attend foreign educational institutions under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 10700. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be Deputy Attorney General, vice Byron R. White, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

AMBASSADOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

ESTABLISHMENT OF A LAND CONSERVATION FUND

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COORDINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS RELATING TO OUTDOOR RECREATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

OFFICE BUILDING FOR HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide an office building for the Housing and Home Finance Agency (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

MEN'S CLUB OF PELHAM URGES SUPPORT FOR NEW HAVEN RAILROAD—RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I recently received a resolution from the Men's Club of Pelham, N.Y., in support of every possible effort to maintain and strengthen the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. Because many people of Pelham commute by train to New York City, the services of railroads, particularly the New Haven, are of vital importance. I share the concern of the members of this organization and hope that action will be forthcoming in the near future to alleviate the financial problems of the New Haven Railroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of the above-referred-to resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE MEN'S CLUB OF PELHAM

The committee on civic affairs of the Men's Club of the town of Pelham with regard to the problem of railroad transportation from Pelham to the city of New York respectfully submits that the maintenance of adequate commuter transportation by rail from Pelham to New York is essential to the character of the town of Pelham and to the maintenance of property values therein and therefore urges the Men's Club of the town of Pelham to adopt the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Men's Club of the town of Pelham respectfully petition the elected officials of the villages, town, county, State, and Federal Government that whereas in the opinion of the members of this club commuter rail transportation in the metropolitan area of New York City, particularly with respect to the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, must be maintained.

Therefore, the Men's Club of the town of Pelham respectfully urges upon the elected officials of all government bodies having jurisdiction that practical methods, including assistance by such governmental and municipal bodies, for the maintenance and improvement of the railroad commuter service, should be devised promptly and that these officials should act expeditiously to bring about such result in conjunction with effective and prompt material cooperation from railroad management and railroad labor; be it further

Resolved, That the Men's Club extend its support to activities directed toward studying the commuter transportation problem and the development of adequate remedies therefor, including cooperation on behalf of the Men's Club of Pelham with community and governmental bodies in adjacent areas; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Senators from the State of New York, the Cangressman from the 26th Congressional District, the Governor of the State of New York, the senator from the 30th senatorial district, the assemblymen from the 3d and 4th assembly districts of Westchester County, the county executive, the supervisor of the town of Pelham and the mayors of North Pelham, Pelham, and Pelham Manor.

William H. Frost, Jr.,
Chairman, Civic Affairs Committee.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 3006. A bill to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (Rept. No. 1324).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of February 1962. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the Record, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, FEBRUARY 1962 AND JANUARY 1962, AND PAY, JANUARY 1962 AND DECEMBER 1961

NOTE WITH REFERENCE TO PERSONAL SERVICE EXPENDITURE FIGURES

It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal services shown in table I of this report are for the month of January 1962 and that they are compared with personal service expenditure figures for the month of December 1961, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of February 1962 and are compared with the month of January 1962. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.

Internal reorganizations in the Department of Defense were reflected in personnel figures for the Department published and documented in the additional report of this committee on "Federal Personnel and Pay" for January 1962 and December 1961 (Committee Print No. 216 in this series). Changes in pay figure reporting following these internal reorganizations in the Department of Defense are reflected for the first time in this additional report.

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for February 1962 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In February numbered	In January numbered	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In January was	In December was	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,436,868	2,428,691	+8,177	$1,256,911	$1,216,613	+$40,298
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,375,969	1,368,628	+7,341	704,461	705,023	−562
Department of Defense	1,060,899	1,060,063	+836	552,450	511,590	+40,860
Inside the United States	2,271,858	2,264,196	+7,662			
Outside the United States	165,010	164,495	+515			
Industrial employment	568,426	566,698	+1,728			
Foreign nationals	169,620	169,544	+76	25,817	[2] 29,092	−3,275

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1962, and comparison with January 1962, and pay for January 1962, and comparison with December 1961*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	February	January	Increase	Decrease	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	91,910	91,312	598		$45,994	$41,842	$4,152	
Commerce [1]	28,923	28,563	360		17,683	16,230	1,453	
Health, Education, and Welfare	73,852	73,347	505		36,726	35,645	1,081	
Interior	54,308	54,026	282		30,467	28,340	2,127	
Justice	30,883	30,899		16	20,427	18,683	1,744	
Labor	8,138	8,089	49		4,665	4,234	431	
Post Office	579,606	580,433		827	284,332	316,866		$32,534
State [2,3]	39,223	39,011	212		19,350	18,322	1,028	
Treasury	84,911	80,763	4,148		46,871	42,745	4,126	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	444	441	3		263	256	7	
Bureau of the Budget	459	455	4		393	361	32	
Council of Economic Advisers	46	43	3		45	37	8	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	74	72	2		38	34	4	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	16	16			16	11	5	
National Security Council	42	43		1	34	32	2	
Office of Emergency Planning	474	476		2	368	389		21
President's Commission on Campaign Costs	13	14		1	4	5		1
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental relations	26	25	1		16	14	2	
American Battle Monuments Commission	407	413		6	84	79	5	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,809	6,783	26		4,998	4,552	446	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	603	603			399	373	26	
Civil Aeronautics Board	806	787	19		587	532	55	
Civil Service Commission	3,855	3,823	32		2,339	2,149	190	
Civil War Centennial Commission	6	6			6	4	2	
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			5	4	1	
Commission on Civil Rights	60	56	4		36	30	6	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	262	257	5		183	170	13	
Farm Credit Administration	237	235	2		173	158	15	
Federal Aviation Agency	43,558	43,315	243		29,678	26,942	2,736	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,372	1,360	12		957	831	126	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,262	1,274		12	845	755	90	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,145	1,144	1		754	692	62	
Federal Maritime Commission	149	145	4		110	96	14	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	357	355	2		315	288	27	
Federal Power Commission	897	898		1	646	583	63	
Federal Trade Commission	1,021	1,000	21		680	665	15	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	63	62	1		47	43	4	
General Accounting Office	4,725	4,728		3	3,031	2,792	239	
General Services Administration	30,725	30,685	40		15,113	[4] 13,804	1,309	
Government Printing Office	6,862	6,889		27	3,845	3,427	418	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,555	12,401	154		7,782	7,005	777	
Indian Claims Commission	20	20			21	16	5	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,395	2,398		3	1,632	1,490	142	
James Madison Memorial Commission	1	1			1	1		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	20,455	19,798	657		13,185	12,424	761	
National Capital Housing Authority	416	420		4	199	175	24	
National Capital Planning Commission	56	57		1	39	36	3	
National Capital Transportation Agency	87	81	6		54	46	8	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1962, and comparison with January 1962, and pay for January 1962, and comparison with December 1961*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	February	January	Increase	Decrease	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
National Gallery of Art	314	308	6		$135	$127	$8	
National Labor Relations Board	1,857	1,841	16		1,283	1,173	110	
National Mediation Board	143	139	4		124	126		$2
National Science Foundation	787	786	1		494	478	16	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	41	42		1	29	27	2	
Panama Canal	14,595	14,508	87		4,425	4,439		14
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	34	33	1		21	22		1
Railroad Retirement Board	2,101	2,116		15	1,164	1,053	111	
Renegotiation Board	191	203		12	193	198		5
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	159	154	5		103	91	12	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,226	1,210	16		826	737	89	
Selective Service System	6,789	6,804		15	2,210	2,020	190	
Small Business Administration	2,968	2,923	45		1,864	1,698	166	
Smithsonian Institution	1,175	1,163	12		604	547	57	
Soldiers' Home	1,031	1,032		1	343	345		2
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	58	56	2		44	41	3	
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	27			23	21	2	
Tariff Commission	269	269			197	180	17	
Tax Court of the United States	148	149		1	113	106	7	
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,267	18,429		162	11,130	10,338	792	
Texas Water Study Commission	28	28			17	16	1	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	74	63	11		42	31	11	
U.S. Information Agency	11,012	11,009	3		4,733	4,330	403	
Veterans' Administration	176,958	176,716	242		78,787	72,546	6,241	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,190	585	605		117	121		4
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,375,969	1,368,628	8,452	1,111	704,461	705,023	32,022	32,584
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			7,341				562	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,784	1,801		17	1,393	2,218		825
Department of the Army	387,483	387,745		262	191,243	182,995	8,248	
Department of the Navy	351,424	351,508		84	196,097	181,547	14,550	
Department of the Air Force	307,136	306,866	270		157,442	144,830	12,612	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,057	2,050	7		1,041		1,041	
Defense Communications Agency	124	121	3		76		76	
Defense Intelligence Agency	154	107	47		50		50	
Defense Supply Agency	[5] 9,487	8,627	860		4,197		4,197	
Office of Civil Defense	1,130	1,117	13		829		829	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	38	1		34		34	
Interdepartmental activities	31	35		4	19		19	
International military activities	50	48	2		29		29	
Total, Department of Defense	1,060,899	1,060,063	1,203	367	552,450	511,590	41,685	825
Net increase, Department of Defense			836				40,860	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [6]	2,436,868	2,428,691	9,655	1,478	1,256,911	1,216,613	73,707	33,409
Net increase, including Department of Defense			8,177				40,298	

---

[1] February figure includes 123 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[2] February figure includes 15,135 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 14,982 in January, and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The February figure includes 3,324 of these trust fund employees and the January figure includes 3,332.

[3] February figure includes 493 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 415 in January, and their pay.

[4] Revised on basis of later information.

[5] Includes 426 employees transferred from the Department of the Air Force.

[6] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1962, and comparison with January 1962*

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	90,813	90,234	579	
Commerce [1]	28,319	27,953	366	
Health, Education, and Welfare	73,348	72,842	506	
Interior	53,783	53,500	283	
Justice	30,545	30,560		15
Labor	8,054	8,007	47	
Post Office	578,206	579,031		825
State [2] [3]	9,926	9,839	87	
Treasury	84,306	80,173	4,133	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	444	441	3	
Bureau of the Budget	459	455	4	
Council of Economic Advisers	46	43	3	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	74	72	2	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	16	16		
National Security Council	42	43		1
Office of Emergency Planning	474	476		2
President's Commission on Campaign Costs	13	14		1
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	26	25	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	10	10		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,778	6,752	26	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	603	603		
Civil Aeronautics Board	805	786	19	
Civil Service Commission	3,853	3,821	32	
Civil War Centennial Commission	6	6		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6		
Independent agencies—Continued				
Commission on Civil Rights	60	56	4	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	262	257	5	
Farm Credit Administration	237	235	2	
Federal Aviation Agency	42,593	42,363	230	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,369	1,357	12	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,260	1,272		12
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,145	1,144	1	
Federal Maritime Commission	149	145	4	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	357	355	2	
Federal Power Commission	897	898		1
Federal Trade Commission	1,021	1,000	21	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	59	58	1	
General Accounting Office	4,658	4,664		6
General Services Administration	30,722	30,682	40	
Government Printing Office	6,862	6,889		27
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,383	12,233	150	
Indian Claims Commission	20	20		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,395	2,398		3
James Madison Memorial Commission	1	1		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	20,442	19,785	657	
National Capital Housing Authority	416	420		4
National Capital Planning Commission	56	57		1
National Capital Transportation Agency	87	81	6	
National Gallery of Art	314	308	6	
National Labor Relations Board	1,824	1,808	16	
National Mediation Board	143	139	4	
National Science Foundation	777	779		2

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1962, and comparison with January 1962*—Continued

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued				
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	41	42	--------	1
Panama Canal	159	158	1	--------
President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity	34	33	1	--------
Railroad Retirement Board	2,101	2,116	--------	15
Renegotiation Board	191	203	--------	12
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	159	154	5	--------
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,226	1,210	16	--------
Selective Service System	6,632	6,647	--------	15
Small Business Administration	2,926	2,884	42	--------
Smithsonian Institution	1,165	1,152	13	--------
Soldiers' Home	1,031	1,032	--------	1
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	58	56	2	--------
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	27	--------	--------
Tariff Commission	269	269	--------	--------
Tax Court of the United States	148	149	--------	1
Tennessee Valley Authority	18,260	18,423	--------	163
Texas Water Study Commission	28	28	--------	--------
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	74	63	11	--------
U.S. Information Agency	2,981	2,976	5	--------
Veterans' Administration	175,932	175,679	253	--------
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,314,913	1,308,420	7,601	1,108
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense	--------	--------	6,493	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,738	1,757	--------	19
Department of the Army	335,494	335,739	--------	245
Department of the Navy	327,631	327,818	--------	187
Department of the Air Force	279,026	278,335	691	--------
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,057	2,050	7	--------
Defense Communications Agency	118	115	3	--------
Defense Intelligence Agency	154	107	47	--------
Defense Supply Agency	[4] 9,487	8,627	860	--------
Office of Civil Defense	1,130	1,117	13	--------
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	39	38	1	--------
Interdepartmental activities	30	34	--------	4
International military assistance	41	39	2	--------
Total, Department of Defense	956,945	955,776	1,624	455
Net increase, Department of Defense	--------	--------	1,169	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,271,858	2,264,196	9,235	1,563
Net increase, including Department of Defense	--------	--------	7,662	

[1] February figure includes 123 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

[2] February figure includes 2,366 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,332 in January.

[3] February figure includes 446 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 369 in January.

[4] Includes 426 employees transferred from the Department of the Air Force.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1962, and comparison with January 1962*

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,097	1,078	19	--------
Commerce	604	610	--------	6
Health, Education, and Welfare	504	505	--------	1
Interior	525	526	--------	1
Justice	338	339	--------	1
Labor	84	82	2	--------
Post Office	1,400	1,402	--------	2
State[1,2]	29,297	29,172	125	--------
Treasury	605	590	15	--------
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	397	403	--------	6
Atomic Energy Commission	31	31	--------	--------
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1	--------	--------
Civil Service Commission	2	2	--------	--------
Federal Aviation Agency	965	952	13	--------
Federal Communications Commission	3	3	--------	--------
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2	--------	--------
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	4	4	--------	--------
General Accounting Office	67	64	3	--------
General Services Administration	3	3	--------	--------
Housing and Home Finance Agency	172	168	4	--------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	13	13	--------	--------
National Labor Relations Board	33	33	--------	--------
National Science Foundation	10	7	3	--------
Panama Canal	14,436	14,350	86	--------
Selective Service System	157	157	--------	--------
Small Business Administration	42	39	3	--------
Smithsonian Institution	10	11	--------	1
Tennessee Valley Authority	7	6	1	--------
U.S. Information Agency	8,031	8,033	--------	2
Veterans' Administration	1,026	1,037	--------	11
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,190	585	605	--------
Total, excluding Department of Defense	61,056	60,208	879	31
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense	--------	--------	848	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	46	44	2	--------
Department of the Army	51,989	52,006	--------	17
Department of the Navy	23,793	23,690	103	--------
Department of the Air Force	28,110	28,531	--------	421
Defense Communications Agency	6	6	--------	--------
Interdepartmental activities	1	1	--------	--------
International military assistance	9	9	--------	--------
Total, Department of Defense	103,954	104,287	105	438
Net decrease, Department of Defense	--------	--------	333	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	165,010	164,495	984	469
Net increase, including Department of Defense	--------	--------	515	

[1] February figure includes 12,769 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 12,650 in January. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The February figure includes 3,324 of these trust fund employees and the January figure includes 3,332.

[2] February figure includes 47 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 46 in January.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1962, and comparison with January 1962*

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,900	3,907	--------	7
Commerce	5,483	5,456	27	--------
Interior	8,104	8,141	--------	37
Post Office	256	252	4	--------
Treasury	5,150	5,155	--------	5
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	247	246	1	--------
Federal Aviation Agency	1,875	1,884	--------	9
General Services Administration	1,706	1,674	32	--------
Government Printing Office	6,862	6,889	--------	27
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	20,455	19,798	657	--------
Panama Canal	7,511	7,466	45	--------
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	126	126	--------	--------
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,360	15,542	--------	182
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,190	585	605	--------
Total, excluding Department of Defense	78,225	77,121	1,371	267
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense	--------	--------	1,104	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 139,850	[2] 139,981	--------	131
Outside the United States	[1] 4,450	[2] 4,456	--------	6
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	204,770	204,903	--------	133
Outside the United States	454	459	--------	5
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	139,209	138,319	890	--------
Outside the United States	1,468	1,459	9	--------
Total, Department of Defense	490,201	489,577	899	275
Net increase, Department of Defense	--------	--------	624	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	568,426	566,698	2,270	542
Net increase, including Department of Defense	--------	--------	1,728	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of February 1962 and comparison with January 1962*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force		National Aeronautics and Space Administration	
	February	January	February	January	February	January	February	January	February	January
Australia	1	1							1	1
Canada	36	37					36	37		
Crete	49	50					49	500		
England	3,709	3,322			81	72	3,628	3,250		
France	21,927	21,857	18,448	18,260	11	11	3,468	3,586		
Germany	80,851	80,785	68,028	67,904	85	85	12,738	12,796		
Greece	274	276					274	276		
Greenland	143	144					143	144		
Japan	53,035	53,491	18,728	19,057	14,354	14,517	19,953	19,917		
Korea	6,200	6,185	6,200	6,185						
Morocco	2,717	2,717			826	[1] 824	1,891	1,893		
Netherlands	52	55					52	55		
Norway	24	24					24	24		
Saudi Arabia	2	2					2	2		
Trinidad	600	598			600	598				
Total	169,620	169,544	111,404	111,406	15,957	16,107	42,258	42,030	1	1

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of February totaling 2,436,868. This was a net increase of 8,177 compared with employment reported in the preceding month of January.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1962, which began July 1, 1961, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1961—July	2,435,804	16,700	
August	2,445,078	9,274	
September	2,427,216		17,862
October	2,429,691	2,475	
November	2,437,709	8,018	
December	2,430,998		6,711
1962—January	2,428,691		2,307
February	2,436,868	8,177	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of February was 1,375,969 an increase of 7,341 compared with the January total of 1,368,628. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in February was 1,060,899, an increase of 836 as compared with 1,060,063 in January.

Civilian agencies reporting larger increases were Treasury Department with 4,148, National Aeronautics and Space Administration with 657, Virgin Islands Corporation with 605, Agriculture Department with 598 and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with 505. The largest decrease was reported by the Post Office Department with 827.

In the Department of Defense larger increases in civilian employment were reported by the Defense Supply Agency with 860 and the Department of the Air Force with 270. The larger decreases were reported by the Department of the Army with 262 and the Department of the Navy with 84.

Inside the United States civilian employment increased 7,662 and outside the United States civilian employment increased 515. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in February totaled 568,426, an increase of 1,728.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,436,868 civilian employees certified to the Committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 169,620 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during February who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in January was 169,544. A breakdown of this employment for February follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force	NASA
Australia	1				1
Canada	36			36	
Crete	49			49	
England	3,709		81	3,628	
France	21,927	18,448	11	3,468	
Germany	80,851	68,028	85	12,738	
Greece	274			274	
Greenland	143			143	
Japan	53,035	18,728	14,354	19,953	
Korea	6,200	6,200			
Morocco	2,717		826	1,891	
Netherlands	52			52	
Norway	24			24	
Saudi Arabia	2			2	
Trinidad	600		600		
Total	169,620	111,404	15,957	42,258	1

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MORSE, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. McGEE, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. HICKEY):

S. 3107. A bill to establish in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior a Board of Public Lands Appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRUENING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3108. A bill to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to automobiles for disabled veterans; and

S. 3109. A bill to amend chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, in order to authorize hospital and medical care for peacetime veterans suffering from noncompensable service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3110. A bill for the relief of Yeung Sing Li and Shee Lum Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (by request):

S. 3111. A bill for the relief of Ernst Haeusserman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (by request):

S. 3112. A bill to add certain lands to the Pike National Forest in Colorado and the Carson National Forest and the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 3113. A bill to waive section 142, of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee holding court at Winchester, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3114. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad rights-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 3115. A bill to authorize the admittance of the vessel, *City of New Orleans*, to American registry and to permit the use of such vessel in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3116. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Benjamin A. Canini, U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. MILLER):

S. 3117. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; and

S. 3118. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3119. A bill to provide coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for services performed outside of the United States by U.S. citizens in the employ of certain international organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING ON REVENUE ACT OF 1962

Mr. BYRD of Virginia, by request, submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Finance not to exceed 1,000 additional copies each of part one and all subsequent parts of hearings on the Revenue Act of 1962, held by that committee during the Eighty-seventh Congress.

A BILL TO CREATE A BOARD OF PUBLIC LANDS APPEALS IN THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Dworshak], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Long], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the junior Senator from Utah [Mrs. Moss], my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hickey], I introduce, and send to the desk a bill to establish in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior a Board of Public Lands Appeals.

In order to give other Senators an opportunity to join in sponsoring this measure, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks and that it be held at the desk until the close of business on April 10.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The bill (S. 3107) to establish in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior a Board of Public Lands Appeals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Gruening (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the bill seeks to provide for an objective review of decisions by the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey in the Department of the Interior. It would establish directly in the Office of the Secretary a Board of Public Lands Appeals, consisting of three persons. This Board, or skilled hearing examiners employed by the Board, would hear appeals from decisions rendered by the Bureau of Land Management concerning the uses or claims to public lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Appellants would be given an opportunity for a hearing either before a member of the Board or before a hearing examiner employed by the Board. The hearing would be held at a location convenient to the appellant. The Board's activities would be governed by rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior, and would be in accord with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. Final decisions of the Board would be appealable to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the land involved is situated.

While provision is made in the bill to have the Board's decisions be in accordance with the applicable regulations issued by the Secretary, a specific provision of the bill authorizes the Board to call to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior any inequitable, unjust, or unintended application of the law, so that he may have an opportunity to remedy the regulations issued.

As a Senator from a State having a large amount of land owned by the Federal Government—not only far more, actually, than that in any other State, but also far more percentagewise—I realize that the actions of the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey, in the Department of the Interior, concerning the uses of or claims to such lands, vitally affect many of the citizens of my State.

The many letters of complaint from Alaskans, which I have received over the years, concerning arbitrary action by officials of these two Federal bureaus indicate the need for the establishment of procedures to insure an objective review of the decisions made.

The laws and regulations governing the use and disposition of the public lands should be interpreted and applied uniformly and equitably.

This can be accomplished only if the initial decision is subject to objective administrative review, with ultimate recourse to the courts.

The Secretary of the Interior has been entrusted with the management of the public lands, and has been instructed by the Congress to permit their use for certain purposes, and their disposition under certain conditions.

Those conditions have been implemented by regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior. Their administration in the first instance has been delegated to the various land offices of the Bureau of Public Lands throughout the Nation. Appeals from local decisions are appealable to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management here in Washington; thousands of miles away from the scene of the action and the location of the land. There is no right to a hearing; and, so far as an individual who appeals is concerned, he cannot afford the costs involved in such a hearing here in Washington.

From the decision by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, a further appeal lies to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior. These appeals are handled by a special branch in the Office of the Solicitor of the Department. Here, again, there is no right to a hearing, and no practical machinery to bring the hearing to the place where the person who appeals lives.

Lack of an opportunity for a hearing is but one of the difficulties with the manner in which the Secretary of the Interior performs his functions with respect to the use and disposition of the public lands.

My second—and equally serious—objection to these operations is that there is no sharp division between the administrative power and the quasi-judicial power thus exercised in the name of the Secretary of the Interior.

Both the Associate Solicitor responsible for providing legal advice to the Bureau of Land Management and the Assistant Solicitor responsible for advising the Secretary of the Interior on the appeal from the decision of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management are responsible directly to the Solicitor.

Thus, the attorney advising on the initial decision and the attorney advising on the appeal are responsible to, and act under, the direction of the same individual, the Solicitor.

An individual appealing an adverse ruling must argue to an assistant solicitor, who is only a branch chief, that an individual standing higher in the bureaucratic scale—an associate solicitor and a division chief—was incorrect in his legal decision. That is certainly a most difficult case to argue. These two functions should be divided.

This is not the only Federal program in which this problem arises. It was one of the reasons for the enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act, which, however, exempted actions dealing with the public lands.

Such a procedure is, however, as much needed for public-land use and disposition as in the performance of many other functions of the executive branch.

An objective, impartial board along the lines of the one which we propose for the Department of the Interior could be established by administrative action. The Secretary of the Interior, although I have repeatedly urged him to do so, has not seen fit to act.

However, a board along the same lines has been functioning for many years in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It was established by administrative action with respect to the old-age survivors and disability program under title II of the Social Security Act. Surely a decision as to entitlement under that program is not necessarily more or less important than a decision as to whether a homesteader has complied with the provisions of the law, or a decision as to whether an applicant for an oil lease has similarly complied, or a decision as to whether an applicant for a grazing permit is entitled to it. A rebuffed and frustrated applicant for any of these public benefits should be entitled to an appeal to a tribunal which has in no way—either directly or indirectly—participated in the initial decision, or which can have its decision on appeal influenced by the maker of the original decision.

Those who seek, under the applicable provisions of the law, to use or obtain public lands should not be treated as though they were trying to deprive the Federal Government of something. The Congress has stated that the public lands may be used for certain purposes or may be disposed of under certain conditions. An applicant who complies with the conditions laid down should have his application granted. Applicants in Alaska, applicants in Oregon, applicants in Wyoming, or applicants in any of the other public land States are entitled to have those conditions interpreted uniformly and applied objectively.

I hope early hearings on my bill will be held, so that this much-needed administrative machinery can be established at the earliest possible moment.

EXHIBIT 1

S. 3107

A bill to establish in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior a Board of Public Lands Appeals, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior (hereinafter called the "Secretary") a Board of Public Lands Appeals (hereinafter called the "Board"), under the administrative control and supervision of a Chairman.

SEC. 2. The Board shall consist of a Chairman and two associate members, appointed without regard to the civil service and classification laws, and such other professional, administrative, clerical, and stenographic personnel as are necessary in conducting hearings and considering and disposing of appeals properly before the Board.

SEC. 3. Members of the Board (including the Chairman) shall be appointed by the Secretary, with the approval of the President, and shall receive compensation at the annual rate of $———.

SEC. 4. Any final decision of the Bureau of Land Management or the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior concerning the uses of or claims to public lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior may be appealed to the Secretary, and the Board shall hear and determine such appeals on behalf of the Secretary. Final decisions on such appeals, after giving the appellant an opportunity for a hearing at a location convenient to the appellant, shall be made by vote of a majority of the Board on the basis of the entire record.

SEC. 5. An appeal under this Act may be filed with the Secretary only by an individual, partnership, corporation, or other organization or a State (or political subdivision thereof) materially affected by the appealed decision.

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall establish rules and regulations governing the Board's procedures and activities, which rules and regulations shall be in accord with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001–1011).

SEC. 7. Hearings may be held before the entire Board or before a single member thereof or before an employee of the Board designated by the Chairman to conduct such hearings.

SEC. 8. The Board shall be bound in its decisions by the applicable regulations issued by the Secretary: *Provided,* That, if the Board finds that, as applied to a particular case or group of cases, the regulations issued by the Secretary would lead to an inequitable, unjust, or unintended application of the law, it shall recommend to the Secretary appropriate and legally justifiable changes in such regulations and shall delay its decisions on affected appeals until the Secretary has considered the changes suggested and has made a decision as to whether or not to promulgate such changes in the regulation.

SEC. 9. Appeals from final decisions of the Board shall be to the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the land involved is situated.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO CERTAIN NATIONAL FORESTS IN NEW MEXICO AND COLORADO

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would add certain tracts of publicly owned lands of the United States to national forests in New Mexico and in Colorado.

The text of this measure was drafted by the Department of Agriculture and was submitted to the President of the Senate by the able Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Orville L. Freeman. I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Freeman's letter transmitting the proposed legislation, and setting forth in detail just what lands and national forests are involved, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, it is to be noted that the lands, totaling some 223,000 acres in the two States, which would be added to our national forest system, already are in public ownership. They are adjacent to or adjoin the forests to which they would be added, and now are protected and managed in conjunction with those forests. As pointed out by Secretary Freeman, their inclusion in them would simplify administration and make accounting and other managerial details easier and more effective.

The measure recommended by the Department of Agriculture would appear a step forward in the conservation and development of one of the Nation's great natural resources, our forest lands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3112) to add certain lands to the Pike National Forest in Colorado and the Carson National Forest and the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, by request; was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1962.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill, "To add certain lands to the Pike National Forest in Colorado and the Carson National Forest and the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the draft bill be enacted.

The proposed legislation would encompass within the exterior boundaries of the Pike National Forest in Colorado about 18,100 acres and within the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests in New Mexico about 249,700 acres. These areas are now within land-utilization projects which for many years have been administered by this Department for land conservation and land utilization pursuant to title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 22, 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010–1012), and in part for forest and range research purposes.

The recommended bill would give national-forest status to about 223,000 acres of Federal lands within the described areas. These Federal lands adjoin or are adjacent to the national forests to which they would be added and now are protected and managed in conjunction with them. A portion of the land in Colorado additionally constitutes a part of the Manitou Experimental Forest, a Forest Service research area which also includes nearby Pike National Forest lands.

The bill would add to the Pike National Forest parts of the Fountain Creek land-utilization project and two small parcels aggregating about 84 acres presently used for forest and range research. It would add to the Carson National Forest the Taos land-utilization project and the easterly portion of the Sebastian Martin grant which is a part of the northern New Mexico grant land land-utilization project. Areas to be added to the Santa Fe National Forest are the Ojo de San Jose grant land-utilization project, the Juan de Gabaldon grant land-utilization project, the Polvadera grant, and the part of the Juan Jose Lobato grant which lies south of the Rio Chama River. The two areas last noted are parts of the northern New Mexico grant land land-utilization project.

The lands to be added to the Pike National Forest are similar in their resources to lands already in the forest, and are in the headwaters of the South Platte River. They are well suited to multiple-use management for watershed, timber, forage and wildlife purposes, and some of them have material values for public recreation. Some currently form a part of the Manitou experimental forest.

The lands to be added to the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests lie in the upper Rio Grande watershed. Careful protection and management to restore and maintain adequate vegetative cover is essential to reduce soil erosion and enhance watershed capacity. They present the same multiple-use management problems and opportunities as do the nearby national forests and currently are managed in conjunction therewith.

All of the lands with which the draft bill deals have been administered by the Forest Service since about 1938, except those in the northern New Mexico grant land project which were assigned to it for management in 1954.

In eight States, mainly in the eastern United States, some 380,000 acres of land-utilization project lands suitable for national-forest purposes recently have been given national-forest status by Executive orders. Since the addition of lands to national forests in Colorado and New Mexico is restricted by the limitations of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847, 848) and the act of June 15, 1926 (44 Stat. 745), the addition of the lands covered in the draft bill can be accomplished only by act of Congress.

Inclusion of these lands in the national-forest system would simplify administration. Accounting and other managerial details would be made easier and management generally made more effective.

A principal use of these lands is the grazing of domestic livestock by local people. Administration of this as well as other uses has been substantially in accordance with the policies applied to the national forests. Giving national-forest status to these lands will have no material effect upon the manner in which the grazing and other uses are permitted on them. The grazing permittees and other users can be assured that the addition of these lands to the national forests will not adversely affect them.

Enactment of the proposed bill would not affect the status of non-Federal lands in the areas, and would not add to the acreage of Federal lands. Local governments would continue to receive 25 percent of the receipts from the lands, for the benefit of public schools and public roads.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

ADMITTANCE OF VESSEL "CITY OF NEW ORLEANS" TO AMERICAN REGISTRY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize the transfer to the U.S. flag with coastwise privileges a vessel presently under Liberian registry. The vessel is a fast rail car ferry of the most modern design built in Japan in 1959. She is presently laid up in Florida.

I have always been a stanch supporter and defender of our coastwise laws against the intrusion of foreign vessels, either by service or by transfer. The vessel which is the subject of this bill, however, in my judgment, can make a substantial contribution to the needs of the people in Alaska and to the defense of this country.

As my colleagues may know, the Canadian railroads have announced a plan whereby Alaska-bound shipments originating in the Midwest will traverse the continent by Canadian railroad and then from Prince Rupert to Alaska via foreign-flag vessel. This Canadian proposal holds out the hope to Alaskans of improved service and more important reduced costs. At the same time it has the disadvantage of depriving American railroads and American steamship companies of much needed traffic and revenue.

If the bill I am introducing today is successfully enacted, the vessel will be purchased by an American company and put into trade between the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. She is, I believe, the most modern vessel of her kind and will be able to take rail cars directly from American railroads and carry them intact to Alaska.

Such a step will give to Alaskans American service at reduced cost and will not contribute to the unemployment or the loss of revenues in our country that would be occasioned by Canada dominating this traffic.

Mr. President, there can be no mistaking my primary concern that Alaskans should enjoy reduced freight costs, but as I said earlier, I am a supporter of the American merchant marine. If this bill is successfully enacted, it would provide not only a new lower cost for service but also make a substantial contribution to the trade and economic welfare of Alaska.

It will have the further advantage of providing an on-the-spot demonstration and a yardstick for evaluating the advantages of this type of unitized transportation. It will provide, in my judgment, therefore, a new form of transportation, an uplift to our defense capabilities, and we fervently hope a reduction in the freight costs that all Alaskans bear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3115) to authorize the admittance of the vessel, *City of New Orleans,* to American registry and to permit the use of such vessel in the coastwise trade, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO PROGRAM FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]—Senate Members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission—I introduce for appropriate reference the two bills which have today been transmitted to Congress by the President and Secretary of Interior to implement major parts of the Commission's report.

I ask that the bills remain on the clerk's desk for 1 week to permit any Senators who desire to do so to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, it is gratifying to those of us who served with the Commission during its 3-year study of our outdoor recreation resources that President Kennedy, Secretary of Interior Udall, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, Secretary of the Army Stahr, and others involved in the executive branch of the Government have rolled up their sleeves and, in the 60 days since the Commission reported, made real progress toward putting into effect some of the major recommendations of that very fine, bipartisan group.

I wish to underline the bipartisan nature of this whole effort. It was my privilege to author the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission bill in 1957. Senators from both parties joined me in that authorship, including Senators Murray, Watkins, Kuchel, Carroll, Barrett, Allott, Mundt, Morse, Neuberger, and Goldwater. A Democratic Congress passed the bill in 1958. Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed it and appointed the seven public members of the Commission, including Chairman Laurance Rockefeller, who served with four Senators and four Representatives—two from each party from each House. When President Kennedy was inaugurated, I suggested to him that he keep the public members appointed by his predecessor, and that was done. And now a Democratic administration is implementing the Commission's report with New Frontier vigor, and, if I may say it with a kindly and even affectionate meaning, with Old Guard support.

Several major steps toward carrying ou the report already have been taken administratively.

The Review Commission found that water is a key element in recreation. People like to swim in it, fish in it, and to boat and ski on it. Other people, who have no desire to get wet, nonetheless like to camp, to picnic, to walk, and just to sit and meditate beside a body of water. The Commission recommended that we realize the full recreational potential of all-Federal reservoirs by acquiring contiguous land and by operating the lakes to serve recreational purposes to the fullest feasible extent.

The Secretaries of Interior and Army, who preside over the major construction agencies involved, a month ago announced agreement on policies to assure optimum development of recreational opportunities at Corps of Engineers and Reclamation dams.

The Secretary of Agriculture has, in the administration's agricultural proposals, requested authority he needs to assure that small reservoirs developed under the Small Watersheds Act, will provide maximum recreational opportunities.

The Commission recommended the establishment of a Federal Bureau of Recreation in the Department of the Interior to administer programs of aid to States in recreation planning and land acquisition, to provide the States with guidance and leadership, to encourage the coordination of the programs and policies of the 20 Federal agencies which have some involvement in recreation, and to develop and maintain a national recreation plan embodying the separate plans of the States and Federal departments.

With the approval of the President and his colleagues in the Cabinet, Secretary of the Interior Udall has established such a Bureau of Recreation. He has transferred to it existing functions and authorities in the Interior Department and is requesting Congress, through the bills I have just presented, to provide the additional authorities needed for the Bureau to function as the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended.

In establishing the new Bureau of Recreation in the Interior Department, Secretary Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman have achieved a measure of cooperation between rival departments which some critics believed impossible.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission debated for some time about recommending the creation of the Bureau of Recreation in the Interior Department. There were advocates of an independent agency. They felt that an independent bureau could achieve greater cooperation from the various departments and agencies involved. But the Commission concluded that it did not want to contribute to the multiplication of independent agencies and, for that and other reasons, recommended that the Bureau be in the Interior Department.

Secretary of the Interior Udall has, in my judgment, made a splendid selection of a Director for the new Bureau—Edward C. Crafts, a capable and energetic Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, and a highly respected career man in the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Crafts will take to the new Bureau of Recreation not only the assurance of great leadership, but also an assurance of cooperation among units of government long regarded as implacable rivals in the recreation field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Department of the Interior announcement of the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the appointment of Mr. Crafts.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UDALL ESTABLISHES BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION IN INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Carrying out President Kennedy's instructions regarding the coordination of Federal outdoor recreation programs, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today signed an order establishing a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department.

President Kennedy has announced that Dr. Edward C. Crafts, of Chevy Chase, Md., is being appointed Director of the new Bureau. Dr. Crafts, a career Federal employee, is now serving as Assistant Chief of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended the creation of the Bureau in its January 31 report, and President Kennedy in his special message on conservation, transmitted to Congress on March 1, said the recommendation would be adopted.

In the message, President Kennedy said: "This Bureau will carry out the planning functions already assigned to the Department of the Interior and will administer the program of Federal assistance to State agencies. This new Bureau will serve as the focal point within the Federal Government for the many activities related to outdoor recreation."

In the same message, the President called for legislation to establish a program of matching grants for the development of State plans for outdoor recreation.

Dr. Crafts is a forester with 29 years of Federal service. A native of Illinois, he attended Dartmouth College and holds B.F., M.F., and Ph. D. degrees from the University of Michigan. His career began in forest and range research for the forest service in Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico, and forest economics research in California.

During World War II, he moved to Washington to become coordinator of Forest Service projects in timber requirements and supplies for the War Production Board, Office of Price Administration, and other defense agencies. Later he became director of forest economics research activities of the Forest Service.

Since 1950, he has been Assistant Chief of the Forest Service in charge of long-range program development, legislation, and congressional relations. He has also been on loan from the Forest Service, serving as administrative assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Federal-State relations.

Dr. Crafts is author of a number of articles, research, and technical notes, and directed the 5-year review of timber resources in the United States published in 1958 as "Timber Resources for America's Future."

He received the Distinguished Service Award of the Department of Agriculture in 1960. He is a fellow of the Society of American Foresters and a member of the American Forestry Association, Cosmos Club, Sigma Xi, Phi Kappa Phi, Phi Sigma, and Sigma Phi.

In 1949, he was adviser to the U.S. delegate to the Third World Forestry Congress sponsored by the FAO at Helsinki, Finland; and in 1960 served as chairman of the Economics Program Committee for the Fifth World Forestry Congress at Seattle, Wash.

Dr. Crafts is married and has a son who is a geologist, and a daughter now studying at the University of Michigan.

In recommending a new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission—a blue-ribbon Commission composed of outstanding conservationists and Members of Congress—said:

"There are now more than 20 Federal agencies with programs involving some aspect of outdoor recreation. A similar multiplicity is found among State agencies. While the programs of these agencies are generally well planned in themselves, little thought is given to the overall development of outdoor recreation throughout the Nation.

"There is at present no focal point for coordination of recreation policy, planning, programs, or management. Overall responsibility for initiating and guiding a national effort in outdoor recreation has never been explicitly assigned. After consideration of all possibilities, the recommendation for a new bureau in the Department of the Interior is made as the most likely to be accepted."

Secretary Udall created the new Bureau under the authority conferred on him by Reorganization Plan No. 3, approved by the 82d Congress in 1950.

Besides administering the current State cooperative services under 1936 legislation and the proposed State assistance program on which legislation will soon be submitted, the new Bureau will assist the Secretary in carrying out his Federal outdoor recreation coordination responsibilities, sponsor and conduct recreation research, conduct recreation resource surveys, develop a nationwide recreation plan, and disseminate outdoor recreation information.

Secretary Udall said a nucleus organization is being formed and a number of the functions of the Park Service's Division of Recreation Resource Planning are being transferred to the new Bureau. The new Bureau will coordinate recreational planning, rather than carry out land-management functions of existing agencies.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the two bills which I have sent to the desk are, first, a bill to clothe the new Bureau of Recreation with the legislative directives and authority it will need to promote effective State and Federal recreation programs, including a program of financial aid to the States in outdoor recreation planning; and, second, to establish a national land conservation fund which will permit the acceleration of Federal acquisition of necessary lands for park, recreation, forest and certain fish and wildlife purposes, including lands around Federal reservoir projects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a brief analysis of the two measures and their text.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in introducing the land conservation fund measure, I want to repeat a little fact of history which I do not believe can be repeated too often. It has been demonstrated many times in our experience that we can obtain desirable things—the things we need—in this country at different price levels.

If we provide them early, they can be provided quite cheaply. If we wait until there are competing demands for them, the price is high.

We cited examples of this in the report on the wilderness bill.

In 1935, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes got a report on the availability of seashore recreation areas on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. It recommended that the Federal Government acquire about 10 percent of all those coasts—400 miles—at an estimated cost of $12 million. A dozen separate areas from Maine to Corpus Christi, Tex., was involved. Only one was acquired—the Cape Hatteras Seashore Recreation area. It was actually acquired because of a private gift of $818,000 from the Mellon Foundation, which was matched by the State of North Carolina, the area purchased, and given to the Government.

The other areas have risen from 800 to 3,600 percent and more in value. Some are highly developed. All except a part of one of that original 12 areas—Padre Island off Texas—appears now to be priced beyond reach for public access.

We didn't acquire early, when the need was first apparent, so the price for seashore areas has gone up. It will go up more if we do not acquire needed shorelines now.

Last year we made provision for the acquisition of more than $100 million in wet lands which are necessary to maintain even a sporting chance for our hunters to bag a duck or a goose or two in the fall hunting seasons.

The swamps and marshes all once belonged to the Government. If someone a century ago could have foreseen the migratory wildfowl situation today, it would have been possible to set aside swamps and wet lands without cost to the Government. The price has advanced steadily ever since .

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has attempted to look ahead, not a century, but just four decades, to our outdoor recreation needs in the year 2000, and determine what we should be doing now to meet requirements a relatively few years ahead.

The Commission's projection of a threefold increase in outdoor recreation activity occasions four decades from now has been subjected to only one criticism—that it is too conservative.

It is conservative compared to other projections. As such, it is an excellent index or inventory of minimum outdoor recreation resources the country is going to have to acquire by the year 2000, and it affords us an opportunity to meet those requirements now, before the price goes up.

We can still meet some of the need from the public lands, without cost to the Federal Government. The Public Lands Subcommittee held hearings last Thursday and Friday on a magnificent canyonlands area of 300,000 to 1 million acres in southeastern Utah still in public ownership which will make an outstanding national park. The shorelines bill, passed by the Senate and pending with the House, provides for the Forest Service to make a survey of the national forestlands for desirable waterfront recreation areas and they should locate many, for the forests have more than 10,000 lakes, 80,000 miles of streams, and some seashore. Some lands are going to have to be bought. Unfortunately, our public lands are mostly in the West and recreation needs are greatest in the congested eastern areas. The price for some of the seashore areas, like the Cape Cod seashore area this Congress has already authorized, are going to be pretty high. They will be much higher later on.

There is going to be considerable expense involved in meeting outdoor recreation requirements even now. The faster we move, however, the more economically the job can be done and the more assurance there is that the needs will be met at all. Many desirable areas are already developed and priced beyond reach. California is paying as high as $7 million a mile for seashore now.

The cost factor is a major reason why I am gratified by the unity, cooperation between party members, between agencies of Government, and between State, local and Federal Governments in moving ahead with an outdoor recreation program.

I congratulate the administration on its prompt response to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report, and I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee expects to consider measures bearing on a recreation program just as expeditiously as possible so the legislative branch can match the promptness of the executive branch.

EXHIBIT 1

SHORT ANALYSIS OF OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES BILLS

1. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes.

Title I gives the Secretary of the Interior certain authority for research, coordination and planning of outdoor recreation programs substantially as recommended by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. These would be carried out by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Title II authorizes appropriation of $50 million for grants to States for 5-year programs to develop comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plans.

2. A bill to establish a land conservation fund, and for other purposes.

In general, the bill provides special financial arrangements for accelerating Federal acquisition of lands for park, recreation, forest, and certain fish and wildlife purposes, including additional lands around Federal reservoir projects.

The four revenue sources assigned to the program are:

1. Proceeds from new recreation user charges established by the President at all Federal recreation areas.

2. Proceeds from the sale of surplus Federal nonmilitary lands.

3. The 2-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline and motor fuels used in boats, now refundable;

4. The proceeds from an annual Federal tax on the use of recreation boats of $5 for boats 14 to 16 feet, and $2 for each additional foot in length.

These revenues will be deposited in a separate Treasury account. The President will transfer part to the general fund of the Treasury to help offset the cost of acquiring additional lands at Federal reservoirs for public recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. The balance will be transferred to the land conservation fund.

The bill authorizes an 8-year advance appropriation of $500 million to the land conservation fund. Any sums so advanced together with revenues transferred to the fund may be appropriated for land acquisition for parks and recreation areas, national forests, and special refuges to preserve species of fish and wildlife threatened with extinction. After 8 years, at least 50 percent of revenues to the fund will be used to repay advance appropriations.

S. 3117

A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured the availability and accessibility of such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable for the physical, spiritual, cultural, recreational, and scientific benefits which such outdoor recreation resources provide; and that timely and coordinated action is required by all levels of government on a nationwide basis to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit of the American people.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act except as the context otherwise may require—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) The terms "State" and "United States" include the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(c) The term "outdoor recreation resources" means land, waters, and associated resources in the United States, and interests therein, improvements thereon, and access thereto, including areas of historic significance and such forests, range lands, wetlands, fish and wildlife, and other natural resources as may serve other beneficial purposes, which provide, or may in the future provide, opportunities for outdoor recreation. The term "outdoor recreation" means the use and enjoyment of outdoor recreation resources.

TITLE I—RESEARCH, COORDINATION, AND PLANNING

SEC. 101. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized, after consultation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies concerned, to:

(a) Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory and evaluation of the outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States.

(b) Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources.

(c) Provide technical assistance to States and their political subdivisions with respect to programs relating to outdoor recreation.

(d) Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the acquisition and development of outdoor recreation resources.

(e) Sponsor and engage in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly, or by contract, grant, or cooperative agreements without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) when in his judgment such payments are necessary to facilitate such research.

(f) Formulate and keep current an integrated nationwide outdoor recreation plan which shall take into consideration the plans of Federal agencies, States, and their political subdivisions, shall set forth the current and foreseeable availability of outdoor recreation resources and the needs and demands of the public for the use and enjoyment thereof, and shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems and propose steps for their solution, identifying desirable actions to be taken at each level of government and by private interests. The Secretary shall report at intervals of not more than five years on such plan to the President for transmittal to the Congress. When the plan is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies of the report to the Governors of the several States.

(g) Undertake such studies and assemble and publish such information concerning outdoor recreation, either directly or by contract, as he deems appropriate, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 321n of Title 39, United States Code.

(h) Establish education and interpretation programs in cooperation with educational institutions in order to assist and encourage public use of outdoor recreation resources.

(i) Request any Federal department or agency for (1) such information, data and reports, and (2) such advice and assistance, as may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this title; and any department or agency which furnishes such advice or assistance may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement from the Secretary as may be agreed upon between the Secretary and the head of the department or agency.

SEC. 102. The complete files and records of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission shall be transferred to the Secretary on or before September 1, 1962.

TITLE II—PLANNING GRANTS TO STATES

SEC. 201. To assist the States in meeting their primary responsibilities to provide outdoor recreation opportunities to the populations they serve and to encourage comprehensive planning by the States, in cooperation with their political subdivisions, for effective outdoor recreation resource programs, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000,000 for grants to States to assist them in the preparation of comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plans, including the cost of training personnel for recreation planning and administrative responsibilities. Moneys appropriated hereunder shall be available until expended for payment to the States to assist each

State for a period of not more than five years in a planning program approved by the Secretary, in accordance with section 203, commencing not later than June 30, 1964.

SEC. 202. The sum authorized to be appropriated under section 201 shall be apportioned among the several States as follows: (1) one-fifth shall be divided equally among the several States; and (2) three-fifths shall be apportioned in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of the United States. The remaining one-fifth of such sum shall be available for grants to States, without apportionment as hereinabove provided, in such amounts as in the opinion of the Secretary may be required to meet the needs for outdoor recreation planning.

SEC. 203. (a) In determining the adequacy of any planning program submitted by a State for approval under this title, the Secretary shall consider whether such program—

(1) Designates a State agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") to administer the planning program.

(2) Provides for preparing and keeping up to date a comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan for assuring the availability and accessibility of outdoor recreation resources to its inhabitants in accordance with the purposes of this Act. The plan shall take into account relevant Federal resources and programs and shall be coordinated with any local, metropolitan, State or regional comprehensive plans, including those prepared with the aid of planning grants under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 461); and it may consist entirely or in part of components of an interstate plan developed in cooperation with agencies of another State or States.

(3) Sets forth the procedures to be followed in carrying out such planning program, with adequate provision for coordination with all Federal, State and local agencies having responsibilities in such fields.

(4) Provides that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Secretary from time to time may require to carry out his functions under this title.

(5) Provides such accounting, budgeting and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the program, and provides that, upon request of properly authorized representatives of the Secretary, accounting and other fiscal records pertaining to such administration will be made available for inspection by such representatives.

(b) Upon approval of the State planning program, the Secretary shall pay to such State from appropriations available therefor up to 75 percent of the first year's cost of such State program; not more than 50 percent of the second year's cost of such program; and not more than 35 percent of the annual cost of such program during each of the subsequent 3 years: *Provided*, That in no case shall the total of such grants exceed the amount available to such State under section 202.

SEC. 204. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall limit any authority of the Secretary under any other provision of law.

S. 3118

A bill to provide for the establishment of a Land Conservation Fund, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to provide for the timely and orderly acquisition of land resources for public outdoor recreation and other conservation uses.

SOURCES AND DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUES

SEC. 2. (a) The revenues realized from the sources listed below shall be set aside in a separate account in the Treasury of the United States:

(1) the proceeds from any fees established pursuant to section 5 and from any other similar fees as determined by the President, except as provided in section 9;

(2) the net proceeds (except so much thereof as may be set aside and obligated by authority of 40 U.S.C. 485) hereafter received from the disposal of real property, other than property of the Department of Defense, heretofore or hereafter disposed of under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended;

(3) the proceeds from taxes paid on special motor fuels or gasoline used in motorboats as provided in section 6 of this Act;

(4) the revenue from the tax on use of certain boats imposed pursuant to section 7 of this Act.

(b) The President shall determine from time to time a division of the total amount in the separate account between those amounts to be transferred to the Land Conservation Fund established under section 3 of this Act and those amounts to be credited to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such transfers and credits. In making such determination the President shall take into consideration the relative needs for funds (1) to help finance the acquisition of lands for the purposes specified in sections 3(b) and (2) to help offset the costs of acquisition of additional lands for public recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement at Federal and federally assisted reservoirs financed through project appropriations to water-resource agencies.

(c) The President shall allocate for each fiscal year revenues transferred into the Fund among the purposes specified in section 3(b).

(d) This section shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

LAND CONSERVATION FUND

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a separate fund to be known as the Land Conservation Fund (hereinafter referred to as the "Fund").

(b) The Fund shall be dedicated to the acquisition of lands or interests therein, except those associated with Federal and federally assisted reservoirs, (1) within the exterior boundaries of areas of the national park system, recreation areas, and other similar areas authorized to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the limitations and conditions of such authorizations, (2) within the national forest system, and (3) for national refuges authorized to be established by the Secretary of the Interior which are necessary to preserve species of fish and wildlife threatened with extinction.

(c) The Fund shall be available only in such amounts as may be determined in appropriation Acts, and shall then be available until expended.

(d) The Secretary of the Interior shall keep such accounts as are necessary for the Fund as a whole.

ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS AND REPAYMENT

SEC. 4. (a) In order to accelerate the conservation of the Nation's outdoor recreation resources, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the eight-year period beginning with fiscal year 1963 not to exceed $500,000,000.

(b) Funds appropriated each fiscal year pursuant to this section shall be accounted for, added to, and used for the purposes of the Land Conservation Fund.

(c) Funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be treated as an advance, without interest, to the Fund. Such appropriated funds shall be repaid, beginning with fiscal year 1971, to the general fund of the Treasury out of the Fund, and such repayment shall be made at least annually in amounts comprising at least 50 percent of the moneys received by the Fund under section 2: *Provided*, That in the event the full amount authorized by subsection (a) of this section is appropriated prior to the end of the aforesaid eight-year period, the repayment pursuant to this subsection shall begin with the next full fiscal year.

USER FEES

SEC. 5. (a) The President is authorized to establish entrance, admission and other recreation user fees at any land or water area administered by or under the authority of the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, and the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission (United States and Mexico) and at any land or water area within a project constructed under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, which is required to be open to the public. Any fees established shall be fair and equitable taking into consideration direct and indirect cost to the Government, benefit to the recipient, public policy or interest served, and other pertinent facts.

(b) The heads of departments and agencies are authorized to enforce the collection of any entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees established pursuant to subsection (a) of this section as to areas under their respective jurisdictions. Any violation of any rules and regulations pertaining to such fees shall be under the jurisdiction of the United States district court for each district in which the violation occurs, or by a United States Commissioner appointed by said court. Violations shall be subject to a fine of not more than $100 or imprisonment for not exceeding 30 days or both.

SPECIAL MOTOR FUELS OR GASOLINE USED IN MOTORBOATS

SEC. 6. (a) SPECIAL MOTOR FUEL USED IN MOTORBOATS.—Section 4041(b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to special motor fuels) is amended by revising the flush material following paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"In the case of a liquid taxable under this subsection sold for use or used otherwise than as fuel for the propulsion of (A) a motorboat or (B) a highway vehicle (i) which (at the time of such sale or use) is registered or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (ii) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, the tax imposed by paragraph (1) or by paragraph (2) shall be 2 cents a gallon. If a liquid on which tax was imposed by paragraph (1) at the rate of 2 cents a gallon by reason of the preceding sentence is used as a fuel for the propulsion of (A) a motorboat or (B) a highway vehicle (i) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of a State or foreign country, or (B) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, a tax of 2 cents a gallon shall be imposed under paragraph (2)."

(b) CREDITS AND REFUNDS IN RESPECT OF SPECIAL MOTOR FUELS.—Subparagraph (J) of section 6416(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits and refunds on certain specified uses and resales) is amended to read as follows:

"(J) In the case of a liquid in respect of which tax was paid under section 4041(b)

(1) at the rate of 3 cents or 4 cents a gallon, used or resold for use otherwise than as a fuel for the propulsion of (i) a motorboat or (ii) a highway vehicle (*a*) which (at the time of such use or resale), is registered, or required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (*b*) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway; except that the amount of any overpayment by reason of this subparagraph shall not exceed an amount computed at the rate of 1 cent a gallon where tax was paid at the 3-cent rate or at the rate of 2 cents a gallon where tax was paid at the 4-cent rate."

(c) Gasoline Used in Motorboats.—Subsection (a) of section 6421 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to gasoline used for certain nonhighway purposes or by local transit systems) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Nonhighway uses.—If gasoline is used otherwise than as a fuel in (1) a motorboat or (2) a highway vehicle (A) which (at the time of such use) is registered, or is required to be registered, for highway use under the laws of any State or foreign country, or (B) which, in the case of a highway vehicle owned by the United States, is used on the highway, the Secretary or his delegate shall pay (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline an amount equal to 1 cent for each gallon of gasoline so used on which tax was paid at the rate of 3 cents a gallon and 2 cents for each gallon of gasoline so used on which tax was paid at the rate of 4 cents a gallon."

(d) Highway Trust Fund.—Section 209 (f) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (relating to expenditures from Trust Fund) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Transfers From the Trust Fund for Special Motor Fuels and Gasoline Used in Motorboats.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay from time to time from the Trust Fund into the separate account from which funds are transferred to the Land Conservation Fund amounts as determined by him equivalent to 50 percent of the taxes received under section 4041(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to special motor fuels used as fuel for the propulsion of motorboats and under section 4081 of such Code with respect to gasoline used as fuel in motorboats."

(e) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TAX ON USE OF CERTAIN BOATS

Sec. 7. (a) Imposition of Tax.—Chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to certain other excise taxes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER E.—TAX ON USE OF CERTAIN BOATS

"Sec. 4491. Imposition of tax.
"Sec. 4492. Definitions.
"Sec. 4493. Exemptions.
"Sec. 4494. Cross reference.

"Sec. 4491. Imposition of Tax.

"(a) Imposition of tax.—A tax is hereby imposed on the use of any boat, with respect to each year in which such use occurs, at the following rates:

"(1) Overall length 14 feet or over but not over 16 feet, five dollars.

"(2) Overall length over 16 feet, five dollars, plus two dollars for each foot or fraction thereof in excess of 16 feet.

The over-all length of a boat shall be determined under methods set forth in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(b) By whom paid.—The tax imposed by this section shall be paid by the person who is the owner of the boat, or, in case the boat is owned by the United States, by the agency or instrumentality of the United States operating such boat.

"(c) Proration of tax.—If in any year the first use of the boat is after July 31, the tax shall be reckoned proportionately from the first day of the month in which such use occurs to and including the 30th day of June following.

"(d) One payment per year.—If the tax imposed by this section is paid with respect to any boat for any year, no further tax shall be imposed by this section for such year with respect to such boat.

"(e) When tax due.—Every owner of a boat subject to the tax imposed by this section shall before use of the boat, or at such other times as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe, pay the amount of tax applicable thereto.

"(f) Posting of evidence of payment of tax.—The Secretary or his delegate may under regulations prescribed by him require any person liable for the tax imposed by this section on the use of a boat to place and keep conspicuously on such boat evidence of payment of such tax.

"Sec. 4492. Definitions.—

"For purposes of this subchapter—

"(a) Boat.—The term 'boat' means any boat propelled by machinery, sail, motor, or any combination thereof, measuring fourteen feet or more in overall length, owned by a person who is a citizen or resident of the United States.

"(b) Use.—The term 'use' means use on waters in the United States, or within the three miles of the coast line of the United States.

"(c) Year.—The term 'year' means the one-year period beginning on July 1.

"Sec. 4493. Exemptions.—

"(a) State and local governmental exemption.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, no tax shall be imposed by section 4491 on the use of any boat by any State or any political subdivision of a State.

"(b) Exemption for United States.—The Secretary may authorize exemption from the tax imposed by section 4491 as to the use by the United States of any particular boat or class of boats, if he determines that the imposition of such tax with respect to such use will cause substantial burden or expense which can be avoided by granting tax exemption and that full benefit of such exemption, if granted, will accrue to the United States.

"(c) Boats used for trade or commercial fishing.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, no tax shall be imposed by section 4491 on the use of any boat used chiefly for trade or for commercial fishing. For purposes of this exemption the term trade does not include the lease of a boat without an operator for pleasure or recreational purposes.

"(d) Charitable or religious organization exemption.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, no tax shall be imposed by section 4491 on the use of any boat without profit by any charitable or religious organization exclusively for furnishing aid, comfort, or relief to seamen or any boat used by the Boy Scouts of America chiefly for training scouts in seamanship.

"(e) Nonprofit educational organization exemption.—

"(1) Exemption.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, no tax shall be imposed by section 4491 on the use of any boat used exclusively by a nonprofit educational organization.

"(2) Definition of nonprofit educational organization.—For purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the term 'nonprofit educational organization' means an educational organization described in section 503(b)(2) which is exempt from income tax under section 501(a). The term also includes a school operated as an activity or an organization described in section 501(c)(3) which is exempt from income tax under section 501(a), if such school normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly enrolled body of pupils or students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are regularly carried on."

"Sec. 4494. Cross reference.

"For penalties and administrative provisions applicable to this subchapter, see subtitle F."

(b) Mode of collection of tax.—Section 6302(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to discretion as to method of collecting tax) is amended by deleting "section 4481" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 4481 or 4491".

(c) Technical amendment.—The table of subchapters for chapter 36 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SUBCHAPTER E. TAX ON USE OF CERTAIN BOATS."

(d) Penalty.—Subchapter B of chapter 75 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended—

(A) By striking out "Sec. 7275." in the last section of this subchapter and inserting in lieu thereof "Sec. 7276.", and

(B) By inserting a new section after section 7274 to read as follows:

"Sec. 7275. Failure To Post Evidence of Payment of Tax on Use of Boats.

"Any person who shall fail to place and keep evidence denoting the payment of the tax on the use of a boat as provided in section 4491(f) shall be liable to a penalty equal to the amount of tax applicable to the use of such boat (unless such failure is shown to be due to reasonable cause). Where the failure to comply with the provisions of section 4491(f) shall be due to willful neglect or refusal, then the penalty shall be double the amount above prescribed."

(e) Effective Date.—This section shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The first use of a boat on or after such effective date shall be considered the first use for purposes of application of the tax on use of boats for the year beginning July 1 preceding such effective date.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

Sec. 8. In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands within the national forest system for recreational purposes or any other purpose for which such system is authorized to be administered.

REPEALING CERTAIN LAWS

Sec. 9. This Act shall not be construed as repealing any provision of law which provides that States or local governments shall share in the income from Federal lands; but all Acts or parts of Acts which provide that any of the land or water areas designated in section 5(a) of this Act shall be open to the public without charge, or that the expenditure of funds in such areas is restricted if charges are made or collected, or that any revenue realized from recreation user charges as authorized by section 5 of this Act at such areas shall be paid into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury are repealed.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 10. (a) The President may make such rules, regulations and orders as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the administration of the provisions of this Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Anderson (for himself, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Miller), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

S. 3117. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; and

S. 3118. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes.

SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE FOR U.S. CITIZENS EMPLOYED OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES BY CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for services performed outside of the United States by U.S. citizens in the employ of certain international organizations.

Under present law U.S. citizens employed by international organizations for services performed outside of the United States are not covered by the Social Security Act.

In 1960, the Social Security Act was amended to cover U.S. citizens employed by international organizations if their work was performed within the United States. However, the 1960 amendments did not extend coverage to U.S. citizens who were living and working abroad for such organizations.

It seems to me only fitting and proper that such citizens should be eligible to qualify under the Social Security Act. I fail to see any valid argument for denying Social Security coverage to U.S. citizens who are working for international organizations abroad while we grant coverage to U.S. citizens working for the same organization here in the United States.

Under the terms of the bill which I introduce today, the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized, at the request of any international organization—as defined in the International Organizations Immunities Act—to enter into an agreement to have the social security system extended to cover U.S. citizens employed overseas by such international organizations.

Coverage would be optional for those U.S. citizens working outside of the United States if they were employed by an international organization at the time it entered into an agreement with the Secretary of the Treasury.

Coverage would be compulsory for U.S. citizens who either (a) enter the employment of an international organization after an agreement with the Secretary of the Treasury has been filed; or (b) is working in the United States for an international organization at the time an agreement is filed with the Secretary of the Treasury and later works for such organization abroad.

I am pleased to state that an identical bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Francis E. Walter. I consider it a privilege to join with him in offering this legislation, and I am hopeful that it will be favorably acted upon in this session of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3119) to provide coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system for services performed outside of the United States by U.S. citizens in the employ of certain international organizations, introduced by Mr. Humphrey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PROUTY submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by Mr. Mansfield (for himself and Mr. Dirksen) to the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SCOTT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment (in the nature of a substitute) proposed by Mr. Mansfield (for himself and Mr. Dirksen) to Senate bill 2768, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2970, TO AMEND THE SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce that a hearing will be held on April 12, 1962, on the bill, S. 2970, to amend the Small Business Act with relation to the revolving fund.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on this bill are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, at the earliest possible date.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. JORDAN:

Address by Senator Talmadge, delivered before the annual meeting of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, at Palm Beach, Fla., on March 31, 1962.

By Mr. BURDICK:

Department of Agriculture press release relating to an address delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, at the Farm Policy Conference in Brawley, Calif., early in March.

PRIZEFIGHTING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from a distinguished retired Member of the Senate, Mr. O'Mahoney. It is an expression from an outstanding humanitarian, from a man of great personal courage and wisdom, whose life and work are now an inextricable part of the continuing record of the Senate. It is an expression of deep indignation and anger from a man of courage at the abuse of courage, the exploitation of courage in the prizefight ring, which just recently has led to the death of still another boxer, Benny Paret, in New York.

The former Senator from Wyoming calls for action in support of our distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] in his efforts to curb this commercialized brutality. I commend this letter from our former colleague to the attention of the Senate; and in order that it may be studied and pondered, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., April 3, 1962.

The Honorable Mike Mansfield,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mike: Emil Griffith, the new welterweight champion of the world, announced this morning, after he heard that Ben Paret, former welterweight champion, had died this morning at 2 o'clock, after having been beaten into unconsciousness 10 days ago in a New York prizefighting ring when he was hanging on the ropes, that he was sorry he had ever become a fighter.

This is an opportunity for the Congress of the United States to place on President Kennedy's desk a bill outlawing prizefighting. If the action is taken today by the Member of the Congress to introduce this legislation, the whole world can be aroused to the importance of our taking positive and immediate action to abolish those brutal tendencies in mankind which have led the whole world to the very brink of nuclear destruction.

Griffith's reaction was a natural and noble result of that prizefight, and if the American people are allowed to forget the brutality and the death of Paret it will be the responsibility of all our people when the next prizefighter dies as a result of this tolerated brutality we call the sport of prizefighting. It is not a sport. It is merely a moneymaking activity of those who maintain the prize ring and the scores of punch-drunk ex-fighters who have not been released by death as was Paret from their insensibility.

Senator Kefauver is now carrying on the necessary campaign to release the United States from the evils of this racket which will be restored if positive action is not taken at once. Let the Congress come to the assistance of Kefauver.

Sincerely yours,
Joe,
Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

A MONTANAN DISCUSSES THE PLIGHT OF THE FARMER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the administration's farm program is perhaps the most widely discussed issue in Montana at the present time. There are many forces at work. Constituent correspondence, both pro and con, has been extremely heavy.

The State of Montana is confronted with several unusual situations which are making it extremely difficult at this time to accept, without reservation, a farm program designed to meet national needs. Only a limited variety of crops can be grown in the State. Montana farmers are fortunate in growing varieties of hard wheat which are in demand, thus minimizing the surplus. The demand for feed grains, particularly barley, has rapidly reduced the store of feed grains in the area, already influenced by several drought years. These are but a few illustrations of the problems of the farmers of my State. They are concerned with how best their interests can be served, while at the same time they participate in a national farm program, required to control production and reduce surpluses.

Lee E. Schumacher, a farmer and rancher in Malta, Mont., has taken the time to put in writing his thoughts on the problems and misunderstandings about the farm situation. I found the article most reasonable and informative. I am certain that it will be of interest to my colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this short article printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How long can 10 percent of the population afford to feed the 185 million people who live in the United States?

How long can that 10 percent—the farmers—continue to produce the foods and fibers needed to sustain an ever-growing population when they receive only 38 cents of every dollar spent for the food they produce?

Heaven help the farmer who desires only a bit of land where he can raise his family amid healthful surroundings; where he can improve the land and provide food for himself and his fellow man.

Every man's hand seems raised against him.

People of the small towns, whose very existence depends upon his farming or stockgrowing operations, condemn attempts to equalize his burdens.

In the cities the farmer is labeled a burden on the taxpayer, a freeloader, a grafter after more and more Government aid, an individual who apparently does not have the know-how to make a living and therefore must be pampered and aided by Government subsidies—a source of political ferment and turmoil.

How strange that "subsidy" has become a word associated entirely with the farm program. The subsidy is the oldest economic principle writen into the laws of the United States, starting when the first Congress enacted tariff legislation in 1789. Before the railroads were built across the trackless Midwest, West, and Far West, the Government—between 1827 and 1866—granted 6⅓ million acres for canalways. Then came the railroads with 183 million acres granted to them to encourage transcontinental rail service.

From 1933 through 1959, total cost of the farm program, which has raised such a storm of protest and—according to the accusations of an unthinking public—helped the farmer amass a fortune at the expense of the overburdened taxpayer, was $6.9 billion. As if the farmer himself were not a taxpayer.

Compare this with World War II reconversion subsidies to industry totaling $43.3 billion. And we hear very little against the U.S. mail subsidies of $6.6 billion in only 12 years.

Out of every $1,000 spent on subsidies over 50 years, the farmer received $5. Is this helping the farmer get rich? The truth is that he is not getting rich from this, or any other source. He is in truth about to go broke.

In 1960, the national farm income per capita was at $986 as compared with $2,280 for nonfarm workers. That means for every $1 the farmer received in income, the nonfarmer got almost $2.40.

Yet a large part of the national income is derived from the farm; 4 out of 10 jobs are related to agriculture; 10 million people are working because of the farmer—storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising the products that come from the farms of America. Six million others work to supply the farmer with the machines, tools, power, and other supplies he uses in production.

Certainly the farmer contributes to the welfare of the Nation through his efforts to make a living.

From the farmer's viewpoint, the high prices he pays for the means of production seem a subsidy to nonfarm producers; the low prices he receives seem a subsidy to every consumer of the abundant food and fiber he produces.

Year by year, the number of farmers in the United States dwindles simply because they cannot make a living.

The farm boy, whose education in agriculture began with the 4-H Club or the Future Farmers of America—both encouraged and aided by local, State, and the Federal Government—has scant hope to become a farmer unless he inherits or marries land.

How can these boys secure land and face a future of rising machinery costs, labor costs, maintenance, fertilizer, and fuel costs? Statistics show that he will receive 2.3 cents for the wheat and ½ cent for the other ingredients that went into a 1-pound loaf of bread; that he will get 11 cents for a quart of milk, and 27 cents for the fibers that went into a business shirt which sells for $4.15.

The farm wages he can earn, the returns from his own farming offer little hope of either acquiring or paying for a farm. What then is the future for our farm boys? In a larger sense, what is the future of our American agriculture?

The farm problem has become a political football on a gridiron where the plight of the farmer, individually and collectively, has been forgotten in the larger question of who will win the national title—who will absorb whatever benefits might derive to the farmer in the form of more balanced programs.

We must call a halt to this political football game.

We can no longer delay reasonable action required to bring balance to our amazing agricultural productivity. How?

We must have reason. We must have concern. We must have awareness of the true position, the actual contributions, the dire need of our farmers for a balanced farm program. For a program that will enable farmers to gain a sound economic footing and take part in continuing national progress.

OSCAR AWARDS DUE FROM ACADEMY OF MOTION PICTURE ARTS AND SCIENCES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, among the many colorful annual events which people of America celebrate and observe is the interest-packed selection of outstanding performers, writers, directors, and others who are recognized for their effectiveness in maintaining the unparalleled high standing of our motion picture industry.

Every spring, just as Washington stages its Cherry Blossom Festival, marking the arrival of a new season, Hollywood looks back on the film year which has passed, and reviews its accomplishments. The ultimate act of this industry self-appraisal is the presentation of the coveted Oscar Awards by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences.

Our Hollywood-produced motion pictures have been for generations an effective medium of communication, as well as a source of refreshing entertainment and relaxation. In the worldwide struggle for men's minds, these films are even more valuable than in the past, because they portray American progress, accomplishments, institutions, environment, and aspirations. Hence, certainly many of those nominated for the academy trophies already have served as ambassadors of good will for our Nation.

The 34th annual presentation of these meaningful gold statuettes will be more than a gala social affair. The event when Hollywood honors its own leaders, occurring next Monday night, April 9, will be carried into millions of homes on the North American Continent through the combined radio and television facilities of the American Broadcasting Co. and the Canadian Broadcasting Co.

As always, it can be looked forward to for drama of its own unique type, pleasurable entertainment, and an illustration of how our film industry, in accord with traditional American adherence to private enterprise, serves a vast public need. I trust that my colleagues will watch and listen to the Hollywood festivities and will join in applauding the motion picture productions and personalities honored by all of our film colony.

THE SUBSTITUTE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS BOND ISSUE BILL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this morning I was somewhat disturbed when I read newspaper accounts purporting to give the position of the Senate Members of the Republican Party on the United Nations bond issue plan, particularly on the proposed substitute offered by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I think anyone who reads the statements published today in the Washington Post and the New York Times would have the impression—regardless of whatever may have been intended—that the Senate Members of the Republican Party oppose on a party basis the substitute offered by the majority leader and the minority leader.

This is borne out not only by the headline in the Washington Post which reads "GOP Opposes Compromise on U.N. Bond Plan," but also by the fact that both articles mentioned only those who spoke against the substitute or asked questions about it.

I do not know who gave the reports of the meeting, but I think, in all fairness, it should have been stated that there were a number who spoke in favor of the substitute, including our distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and myself, and others including the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

It is not so important to report who actually spoke in favor of or against the bill, but it was incorrect and wrong to give the impression to the country that the party as a whole opposes the substitute offered by the majority leader and the minority leader. It not only gives the incorrect impression about our party, but it gives to the country the idea that there is a substantial group in the U.S. Senate opposing the substitute.

I do not believe that is so. I believe, and I base the belief on talks with members of my own party, that if we vote 1 hour from now, or 5 minutes from now, on the substitute, a majority of Republicans would vote for it. We would support our leader. We would support the Senator from Vermont. I think that should be made clear.

I have no doubt, despite all the dire consequences that may have been predicted, that when the issue comes to a vote there will be a majority of Republican Senators who will vote for the substitute, supporting the U.N. Many of us have been for it all the time. I assume a large majority on the other side of the aisle will vote for it.

I speak because no vote was taken at our meeting in a party position; it was simply a discussion. I speak because I believe a majority on this side of the aisle will vote for the substitute.

I believe it is wrong to give the impression that a few members of our party, important as they are—and having the right to their own convictions—are leading all of us. They are not—and not on this issue.

We should get to a vote on this proposition and show to the country that a great majority in this body supports the substitute which has been worked out by the majority leader and the minority leader and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I agree completely with what the Senator from Kentucky has said. The people of the United States are not going to turn their backs on the United Nations. The people of the United States are not going to push the United Nations over the brink into disintegration and decay. Neither is the U.S. Senate, and neither is the Democratic Party or the Republican Party as represented in the Senate.

The roll, when it is called, will demonstrate that we on this side of the aisle, acting as Americans, are going to support the United Nations, with some honorable defections, and I am sure there will be some honorable defections in the other party as well.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I want to say that I am in accord with the fine remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and the distinguished Senator from California. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote now on the substitute or any modification of it. We on this side of the aisle and a large majority on the other side of the aisle are certainly going to do what is necessary for the United Nations, at this time of crisis. This country should be firm in its position of leadership and in its insistence that other U.N. members also live up to their responsibilities.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to compliment the Senator from Kentucky for raising this issue. I had decided to support the committee report, but if a compromise is to be substituted for it, in the best judgment of those who have worked closely on it, I intend to support that.

The important consideration is not so much whether the rate of interest should be 2 or 3 or 4 percent, or whatever the country has to pay for the money if it borrows it. Some of the countries have to pay 7, 10, and 15 percent. I am not impressed that we should try to fix the rate of interest here. I am content to give that leeway to the administration. The same applies to the question of the maturity of the bonds, whether it be 5, 10, 15, 20, or 25 years. The important point is to establish within the United Nations a discipline that will require repayment for the bonds out of annual dues members will have to pay.

I agree with what the Senator from Kentucky has said.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senators for what they have said. When the proper time comes I shall vote for the substitute as well a majority of Republicans.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY HON. JOAO GOULART, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF BRAZIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we shall shortly recess to go to the House of Representatives for a joint meeting to hear the address of the President of Brazil, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the proviso that the morning hour will be resumed after the Senate reconvenes, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the Senate, preceded by its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), its Chief Clerk (Emery L. Frazier), and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint meeting to hear the address to be delivered by His Excellency, Joao Goulart, President of the United States of Brazil.

(For the address delivered by the President of Brazil, see the House proceedings of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RESUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The joint meeting of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m., and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair).

ADDRESS BY KENNETH HOLUM, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, are we still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Mr. Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, delivered a speech on March 27 before the Wisconsin Electric Cooperative at Madison, Wis. This speech, in part, dealt with the problem of the tie lines between the dams of the Colorado River storage project, which is of great concern to my State. I believe the statement of the Assistant Secretary will be of great interest to the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY KENNETH HOLUM, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, SCHEDULED BEFORE THE WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, MADISON, WIS., MARCH 27, 1962

A year ago I was unable to attend your annual meeting. I am pleased you invited me again. You and I are deeply interested in the success of our cooperatives because we are concerned about the welfare of people. We share a common concern with the affairs of our Government. We have important questions to discuss when we get together.

A year ago, when you held your annual meeting, the Kennedy administration was 3 months old. Already the President had announced new power and resource development policies responsive to the needs of the times and the American people. Those policies were being put into effect all down the line. We began moving the idling engine of Government out of neutral and into forward moving gear once again.

Fifteen months have now passed since the Kennedy administration came into office.

We have solid accomplishments to talk about. You have learned that it does make a difference who is President of the United States. It does make a difference who is Secretary of the Interior.

You wanted a President who not only believed in "preference" but would say so. You have one. You wanted a Secretary of the Interior who would help you work out your power supply problems, and who would protect the rights of preference customers. You have one.

In 15 months this administration has achieved significant accomplishments in the power and resource field. We have a good record. Because I am proud of it I would like to mention some of the highlights of that record. Let's take a quick look.

The Missouri Basin project: A year ago the Department of the Interior had already extended the supplemental power program 2 years, through the fall of 1965. This decision is saving basin preference customers millions of dollars. More important, it has given the rural electrics needed leadtime to develop plans for meeting the critical power shortage problem they face in 1965 and beyond efficiently and economically. For over a year the Department has participated in coordinated power supply studies with the Missouri River Basin rural electrics. We have proposed significant transmission pooling arrangements, not only to meet the needs of these systems in 1970, but for the foreseeable future.

Alabama Electric Cooperative: The Southeastern Power Administration has signed a contract with this G. & T. to provide Federal hydropower for peaking and standby to use with their proposed steampower. As a result the co-op has obtained an REA loan to put in a 50,000-kilowatt steam unit and expand its service to additional cooperatives in the area.

Parker-Davis power reallocations: Three weeks ago Secretary Udall announced reallocation of the power output of these dams on the lower Colorado. The allocation is designed to meet the needs of preference customers in the area. One older rural electric co-op formerly denied Parker-Davis hydropower will now be served. Two brandnew cooperatives were given allocations. These cooperatives could not be proven feasible without this Federal power.

Central Valley project: Substantial bloc of power will be available to preference customers when Trinity project is completed. We're expediting this work building the necessary transmission lines, and we have already asked the preference customers to tell us their needs.

Surprise Valley Cooperative in California: Three years ago the Bonneville Power Administration agreed to sell this co-op enough power for its Oregon customers. At that time Bonneville refused to serve the greater portion of the cooperatives' load which is south of the border in California. This decision has been reversed. We intend to work out arrangements so that total load will be served by Bonneville.

Colorado Ute Cooperative: The Bureau of Reclamation has worked out an arrangement with this system, similar to that which we have offered Missouri Basin preference customers. We've made our extensive transmission system and other facilities available to the co-op and will provide standby. With those arrangements available, Colorado Ute can install a large economic 150,000-kilowatt unit in an area where fuel costs are cheapest. They can, and will, deliver up to 100,000 kilowatts of this power to customers 750 miles away over the facilities made available by the Department of the Interior.

Southeastern Power Administration: Barkley Dam will soon be completed on the lower Cumberland River. We are studying the resources and needs of the area with great care so as to accomplish maximum benefit from this project.

Passamaquoddy tidal project: A year ago, President Kennedy asked the Department of the Interior to review the report of the International Joint Commission on this proposed tidal project in the far northeast corner of the country. Our review to date indicates it may be economically sound to develop 1 million kilowatts of power as a peaking plant, utilizing extra high voltage transmission to load centers and axial flow turbines.

Pumped-back storage: This is the technique as you know, where you use off-peak energy to pump water to higher elevation for generation of power on peak when it is more valuable. Department-wide studies are being conducted to make certain that these resources are properly developed and the public interest protected. These studies may well result in substantial benefits for all power users.

Interconnection studies: Under the President's directive, the Department has initiated studies of extra high voltage interconnections between regions served by Federal power marketing agencies.

A five-man task force has completed its study and report on the proposed Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie. The technical significance of the report itself has been extremely noteworthy because it establishes that direct current transmission makes possible and economic the transmission of energy between points 1,000 and 2,000 miles apart. The electric load in Chicago is within practical transmission distance of the cheap lignite fuels in the Dakotas.

Great public benefits will come from this interconnection. President Kennedy has asked for money in this year's budget to begin necessary planning.

Other important interconnection studies are also underway in the Department of the Interior. One nearing completion is between the Bureau of Reclamation system in the Missouri River Basin and that of the Southwestern Power Administration. Another just beginning is between the Bureau's Missouri River Basin system and Bonneville Power Administration.

These interconnections will give us an opportunity to take advantage of the seasonal diversities and load patterns existing between regions, and the difference in hydrology of rivers. The final result is certain to be better use of our resources and substantial benefit to the public.

Worthy of note is our decision to close the bus at Fort Peck. When the bus has been closed, the eastern and western divisions of the Missouri Basin project can be coordinated electrically.

While our efforts, and you have supported them, for Burns Creek in Idaho and the Hanford reactor powerplant in Washington have been frustrated so far, this administration deserves credit for its strong support of these good projects. I can assure you that we are not resigned to accepting the waste inherent in either decision.

The administration deserves credit for pushing the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, its reversal of the previous administration's foot-dragging policy on Auburn Dam in California, and others as well.

There are those who measure an administration's power program by the length and size of the transmission lines it builds. In 1954, under the first Eisenhower budget, the Bureau of Reclamation used $32 million for transmission facilities. Under President Kennedy's 1963 budget the Bureau is scheduling expenditures of $60 million for transmission facilities. The 1963 Kennedy budget asks $35 million for transmission for Bonneville as contrasted with average appropriations of $20 million between 1954 and 1962.

SPA will be building transmission facilities again. The President's 1963 budget asks $7,210,000 for this item. The highest appropriation for this purpose under the previous administration was $1,480,000.

This is a partial list of forward-looking progressive programs in the field of electric energy that the Department of the Interior has instituted under the leadership of Secretary Udall.

Some of these decisions have nationwide significance. Others, like the transmission line under construction to Mission, S. Dak., solve a difficult local problem. All demonstrate that the administration is aware of the need for Federal leadership and participation if the Nation is to have the world's best electric system and one competent to meet the needs of the sixties.

The needs of your rural electric cooperatives and other preference customers, the needs of the Nation demand proper management of our water resources to meet the challenges of a growing population and expanding economy.

Certainly, the leadership which this administration has exerted in the electric power field the past 15 months, has encouraged the entire power industry to bring their systems up to date and make long overdue steps in long distance transmission.

This accelerated activity, by all segments of the industry, demonstrates the administration's effectiveness.

You are particularly interested in two substantial regional problems that require substantial attention from the Department. These are the Colorado River Basin and the Missouri River Basin.

You are familiar with the Colorado River storage project. I should like first of all to discuss the basic decisions which the Department recently announced concerning the project's transmission lines.

Last year the Department went to Congress and asked for money to build an all-Federal system. This request was made after the Department rejected power company proposals to wheel project storage power. Congress voted some $13 million to begin work on these lines. This real victory was accomplished because the rural electric cooperatives and other consumer-oriented groups stood and worked shoulder to shoulder with the Department.

In the conference report issued by the committees of Congress, the Department was authorized to proceed on the entire system—unless and to the extent the Secretary found it practical and in the national interest to enter into agreements with the power companies.

Subsequently, the power companies again approached the Department to determine the possibilities of working out mutually beneficial arrangements. After these discussions, five of six major power companies submitted letters of intent related to interconnection and exchange agreements to the Bureau of Reclamation. They were accepted and announced by the Secretary on February 20.

From the beginning, the Department clearly established certain criteria that had to be accomplished. Because of our victory in Congress, we were able to deal from a position of strength.

Let me summarize what we set out to do and what we have accomplished:

1. We set out to provide Federal interconnection of the project powerplants. We have done this.

2. We set out to provide for Federal interconnection of the Federal systems. We have done this.

3. We set out to provide at least the same degree and kind of service to preference customers as under the all-Federal system, without adverse effects on power rates. We have bettered this by additional delivery points and greater reliability of service.

4. We set out to provide not less than the same amount of irrigation assistance as under the all-Federal plan. We have bettered this by $77 million.

5. We set out to provide a transmission system in which service would be available on a common carrier basis. We have protected this in the arrangements with the companies to the same degree that capacity would have been available for this purpose under the all-Federal system.

The decisions we have made on the Colorado transmission lines are important in Wisconsin, and they are important in Montana. I am convinced that these were good decisions. You must make your own judgment. Make that judgment on the facts.

Remember there are great differences between the proposals the companies offered Secretary Seaton and those agreements which the Department recently announced.

Under the original company offer, the Federal Government would have built only about 33 percent of the proposed system. Most of the Federal hydroplants and transmission systems would have been interconnected by power company lines. The companies would have been in virtual complete control of the entire storage project.

Under agreements embodied in the companies' letters of intent, all the proposed Federal 230-kilovolt and 345-kilovolt lines will be constructed. The storage project dams and the Federal marketing areas will be interconnected with Federal lines. Instead of 33 percent, the Government will build 85 percent of the so-called all-Federal system.

All of the 1,200,000-kilowatt output of the dams will be delivered to preference customers at the same price, under the same conditions, and at more delivery points than under the all-Federal plan. No restrictions will be imposed on power sales to REA's and other preference customers by virtue of the interchange and wheeling agreements between the Bureau and the companies.

At this point you might say to me, "All this sounds good. But you are talking about what is contained in letters of intent and verbal understandings through negotiations. What about contracts?"

Formal contracts will be negotiated quickly. On February 20, Secretary Udall ordered completion of these contracts prior to the congressional appropriation hearings for the Bureau of Reclamation. He directed us to establish and maintain close liaison with preference customers throughout this period. We will write hard and fast contracts containing all the important points I have made. We have negotiated in good faith. I must assume the companies have as well. If, however, they do not agree to our basic criteria in the contracts, we will proceed with construction of a Federal system as previously planned.

The Department has made a sound decision from which the Government, the preference customers, and the people of the Colorado Basin will all profit.

Now let us turn our attention to the second region I mentioned—the Missouri River Basin—where in the eastern division we have important problems of power supply.

Considering anticipated load growth and installation of additional hydro facilities in Missouri River dams, we expect to run out of Federal power the fall of 1965. We have advised our customers. Despite this, in our view, we have a responsibility to work with our customers, to the end that they may obtain ample supplies of power to meet future needs at the lowest possible cost, and so that we may make maximum beneficial use of the federally owned facilities we administer.

The Federal transmission system, built to deliver Federal hydropower, will also deliver steampower. Everyone knows that substantial economies can be achieved if requirements can be pooled—permitting the construction of larger and more efficient units. These advantages are compounded if a source of cheap fuel is available. Dakota lignite, which may well be the largest supply of low-cost fuel in the Nation, should be used for this purpose.

Based on these conclusions we undertook joint studies with representatives of preference customers to analyze the transmission system and to work out plans for the most advantageous coordination of a steamplant with the Federal hydro system.

Due to navigation requirements, the Missouri River system has large quantities of energy during the summer months. Conversely, in order to conserve water and because of restrictions due to icing conditions, the quantities of energy available during the winter are limited. In addition, when the presently planned installations of hydro capacity are completed, a large block of capacity will be available for which there will not be ample energy through the year.

The river then may be said to have three kinds of power: (1) Firm, round-the-clock power, with capacity and energy to serve normal customers; (2) secondary energy, available mostly during the summer months; and (3) peaking capacity without energy, available during all of the year. Only those systems having generation can properly use secondary or peaking capacity.

The studies involving the coordination of steam and Federal hydro showed that by operating the steamplant at full load during the winter months, portions of the peaking capacity could be firmed up; that is, converted to firm power. This we consider to be a desirable objective.

In fact, the entire program seemed to offer great merit. In addition to obtaining increased quantities of firm power to serve future loads of the preference customers, it would result in development of the natural resources of North Dakota. Large quantities of low-cost power should be attractive to industry in an area of the country that urgently needs industrial development.

While these studies were continuing, 14 utilities operating within and outside the Bureau marketing area proposed an exchange arrangement. The utilities offered to deliver energy into the Bureau system during the winter (when there is lack of hydroenergy) and the Bureau would return this energy in the summer (when surpluses are available), thus firming up the peaking capacity of the Bureau. The Government, without additional investment, would have additional quantities of firm power for sale. The utilities would be making better use of their steamplants.

The Department has received another proposal designed to accomplish similar results from a group of cooperatives known as Basin Electric Cooperative. They plan to build a large steam generating plant in the lignite fields of North Dakota. Another group of cooperatives, the Lignite Power Cooperative group, is also addressing itself to this question.

At this point it is not clear to what extent the proposals are immediately or in the long run contradictory. Nor is it clear yet what the comparative costs will be.

Both proposals received have been referred to a special departmental team for study and evaluation. This is presently underway. They will be compared on their merits, their costs and overall results.

One point that has led to much misunderstanding should be clarified. Although we consider it desirable to convert peaking power and secondary energy to firm power and energy, it should not be assumed that the peaking power and the secondary power would have been wasted without the firming up arrangement. Peaking power was planned to be sold to those systems that were in a position to use it, and secondary hydroenergy is and would be used to replace steam generation.

Firming up of Bureau hydropower does not represent a windfall to the Government. It does, however, provide the Government with the opportunity to be of greater service to the preference customers.

When the facts are in, the Department will make its decision on the facts and in accordance with its responsibilities under the law. We must consider the best interests of the United States, the preference customers, and the region.

Without attempting to belabor you with all of the complexities of a difficult problem, I should like to note that desirable economic and social objectives must be weighed as we face up to decisions. They should not be ignored by the people of the region.

A program that promotes the development of Dakota lignite coal is a program that strengthens the region and the Nation, because it promotes the development and use of an important energy resource that is almost completely undeveloped.

As we develop this resource, we will almost certainly provide opportunities for economic growth in an area of the Nation that urgently needs this opportunity.

Advocates of proposals that develop lignite coal may well wonder why we consider proposals that in effect require an area of potentially cheap fuel to continue its reliance on energy imported from higher cost fuel areas.

Economic growth and resource development are sound policy goals. Better and more complete use of resources is an equally worthy goal. Certainly, any proposal that makes better use of machines and equipment in place must be considered and evaluated.

I have no intention that this should be a complete discussion of the merits of the various proposals we must consider. I suggest only that each has merit and deserves your consideration just as it will have ours.

I do not presume to advise you on the affairs of your rural electric systems. That is your business. But I believe my experience in the cooperative movement and now as a Government official has given me a good opportunity to study first the relationship of preference customer to Government, and now of the Government to preference customer.

The Department of the Interior has responsibilities to Congress, to you as preference customers, and to the American people. You, as electric cooperators, have certain responsibilities to your consumers, your communities, and to your Federal marketing agencies.

I believe we each have an obligation to recognize these responsibilities in our negotiations and business relationships. The rural electric cooperatives have a great opportunity to work with appropriate agencies of Government in solving your chronic problems of long-range power supply. We in the Kennedy administration want to do our part. Approaching our problems from the standpoint of mutual respect and cooperation, we will meet the challenges of the electric age.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JESSICA McC. WEIS

Mr. KEATING. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. My distinguished and delightful successor in the House of Representatives, Representative Judy Weis, recently delivered an address entitled "Which Way Us?" which is significant and worthy of wide distribution.

Mrs. Weis clearly depicts the challenge confronting the free people of the world, the challenge of international communism to the dignity of the individual. She regards the journey of Col. John Glenn as a solid demonstration of the accomplishments of our Nation and of our pride in our country and our system of free self-government.

As a final and key point, Mrs. Weis expresses her deep personal concern about the structure of our Government and about what she refers to as the trend toward "Federal centralization." She places special emphasis on the importance of strong local and State government and of active participation of citizens at the State and local level.

Madam President, I think this is a most important address, and I am pleased today to ask unanimous consent that the full text of Mrs. Weis' speech be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Which Way Us?

(Address of Representative Jessica Weis, Rochester, N.Y., at the spring workshop of the Western Monroe County (N.Y.) Teachers Association, Greece Olympia High School, March 19, 1962)

It is a pleasure and real privilege for me to be here with you this morning as your workshop sessions get underway. I emphasize the word "privilege" because you, as professional educators, are performing an enormously important service to our community. If in this way, by sharing a few personal observations and insights with you, I can contribute in a small way to the work you are doing, I am extremely happy to do it. Our children represent this country's most vital natural resource and each of you is to be commended for the personal interest you are taking in cultivating and developing this precious resource of ours.

* * * * *

The theme of your workshop—"Which Way Us?"—invites a glance into the telescope of time. But it isn't necessary to spin fantasies or gaze into crystal balls any more. We don't have to. We have enormous evidence before us of a future—an almost immediate future—beyond anything known to man since the dawn of time.

This is a future of great responsibilities and challenges for education.

It is a future of undreamed of adventure in the world of exploration.

It is a future almost without limitation in the field of technology.

As President Kennedy put it just a week ago, "A new age of discovery is opening for the human race." I share this view. From all indications we are clearly on the threshold of a new era of unprecedented technological and economic development throughout the world.

As you may know, I am not a teacher, though I am proud to say that my son is a professor of English at Ohio Wesleyan University. I do not intend to stand here and tell you how to be teachers and educators. Yet it is impossible to be in politics—and particularly to be a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives—without being in a very real sense an educator and interpreter of the important matters that transpire in Washington.

We in the Congress are deeply concerned with the progress of education and scientific inquiry. We are also gravely concerned about national survival itself.

To maintain our position of leadership in the world—a responsibility we cannot and dare not neglect—we are confronted with Federal budget expenditures for fiscal 1963 that total $92.5 billion over the amount estimated for the present fiscal year, and next year's requests are likely to be higher still.

As a Member of Congress I am eager to have you teachers understand the farflung meaning for ourselves, for the pocketbook of every American, of a budget total so immense.

I am eager to have you communicate this to the classes of young people whom you teach. Because what is involved here is the financial stability of our country as well as its national treasure.

Of this enormous treasure, for which our people have worked so hard, more than $52½ billion is estimated for the national defense alone. This is a savage bite out of our national budget. And our national budget is in turn an even more savage bite out of the American economy.

This budget I have just mentioned, which would have been shocking to our forebears—and some of its aspects are shocking to me today—is a budget that in its darkest pages reflects the cold war.

It reflects the struggle in which we are now caught—the struggle between a vicious, unconscionable, closed society, a tyrannical oligarchy, and an open and free society like our own. There is no denying the fact that hovering over our age is the threat of a war that can destroy civilization almost in the wink of an eye. This is a reality which we, and our children—your students—are going to have to face for a long time to come.

But at the same time there are other signs which represent a different future, a real glimmer of hope that out of our deep and disturbing troubles will come not disaster but a bright and wonderful tomorrow.

Our efforts to join with the European Common Market in a gigantic free world-free trade area represent one aspect of the promise which the future holds. The challenge of expanding world trade offers great opportunities for the future. So, too, do such undertakings as the Alliance for Progress, through which we hope to aid the nations of Latin America along the road to economic development and social reform.

Our extraordinary efforts in space, where we have been so proudly successful recently, is a perfect case in point as to what the future offers. This is an area of progress in which, as a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have a deep and profound personal interest. My work on this committee leads me to believe that we stand today on the threshold of a world that will give mankind a future more exciting than has been envisioned in our wildest dreams.

Think of the potential in the simple statistic that one of our astronauts has just sped through space at the rate of 17,500 miles an hour.

Think of the technological meaning of a space ship that can endure the kind of punishment to which the *Friendship 7* was subjected.

Think what it will mean for communication, and for education, when the entire world is instantly linked—by radio, telephone and television—through a worldwide communications satellite system.

Think of the vast expanse of man's scientific knowledge, from Galileo and Copernicus to Einstein and our galaxy of top level scientists today, that rests behind our space efforts. We are spending literally billions of dollars for research on the very frontiers of scientific knowledge and there is simply no way of measuring the benefits which we will reap in the years ahead.

In terms of the cold war and our race with the Soviet Union we can pride ourselves in the fact that since Russia launched her Sputnik I the United States has launched 67 satellites of all kinds and Russia has launched only 14. In the scope and sophistication of our space probes, we are well ahead of the Russians and even in the area of rocket thrust, where they now hold an edge, I am convinced that we are licking the problem.

But this is not a football game where all that is involved is making the highest score. What is involved behind all of this—behind our struggle with communism, our space efforts, our attempts at economic cooperation and all the rest—are the deepest moral values of men.

For in the final analysis, what we are trying to demonstrate to the world is that, at its best, our American system of government, with its strong emphasis on limited government and democratic free choice, is the finest system yet devised by man. And so as we look to the future, we must always be certain that our roots remain deep and well nourished. Dramatic changes will be taking place all around us in this new era. We must be certain that they do not alter our basic values.

In a sense, the problem is exactly what Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., said it was when he spoke in his compelling and simple way, of patriotism. Pure, unadulterated, unashamed patriotism.

Many of you, perhaps, were in school the day he spoke to the joint meeting of Congress. It was on Monday, February 26, when he said:

"I am certainly glad to see that pride in our country and its accomplishments is not a thing of the past."

He said:

"I still get a hard-to-define feeling inside when the flag goes by—and I know that all of you do, too. Today as we rode up Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House and saw the tremendous outpouring of feeling on the part of so many thousands of our people I got this same feeling all over again. Let us hope that none of us ever loses it."

What John Glenn said at that joint congressional meeting is essentially what I am trying to say here this morning. If we ever think of patriotism as something old-fashioned or corny, if we ever lose our sense of pride in our country, in our traditions, in the human decency inherent in the Constitution of the United States, we shall have lost those qualities that have made America what she is.

We shall have lost our soul as a people.

I hope that today I can strengthen your urge to communicate the full meaning of faith in the American heritage to the children who have been put in your charge. For this is the real key to the true meaning of our tomorrow. Reading, writing and arithmetic—your skills—are, of course, the tools, the indispensable instruments, for conveying our accumulated knowledge to the children who will, in the last analysis, constitute this tomorrow. But in this education, all of us must play an important role—not only as teachers, but as parents, as legislators and as citizens. The great strength of democratic self-government is, in fact, that we are all both teachers and pupils, constantly teaching and learning from each other.

* * * * *

This leads me to a final point. It is one about which I have some hesitancy, lest I seem to be interjecting a partisan political issue into my remarks. As a matter of fact, in my opinion, this is an issue for both parties.

It is the issue of Federal centralization.

It is the issue of making Washington and the Capitol the center of all problems.

It is the issue of weakening the individual, the city and the State, by ladling every issue, every problem, every situation, economic, legislative, financial, social, into the wide-open maw of the unwieldy, bureaucratically top-heavy, overburdened, and snowed-under Government in Washington, D.C.

Speaking as a Member of Congress, I want to emphasize that this is, for our democracy, one of the major problems of our time.

If the trend is allowed to continue, our freedoms will be slowly but surely abridged.

Our republican form of government will be steadily eroded under cover of disarming slogans.

Both our vigor and our solvency will be sapped by benefits and services that in growing measure will be politically motivated.

The fundamentals of democracy will be lost to us—to all of us—and perhaps to the whole free world—unless we do more and more in our own communities for ourselves and give less and less to a central authority.

History keeps telling us that the piecemeal surrender of basic values leads to spiritual receivership. Not complete bankruptcy but receivership, because I think our people will always salvage something out of their historic assets.

It's a sort of Gresham's law for the values of democracy. Under that famous law, bad money drives out good money. In the political world, because of their greater immediate appeal, the bad values of government paternalism drive out good values of citizens' vigor. And under no circumstances can the good values remain unaffected.

The philosophy of the central authority is the philosophy of tyranny. Not overnight, while motives remain sincere and only moderately political. But gradually things do not work well, abuses creep in, and, contrary to the workings of a system resting mainly on self-reliance, mistakes are seldom corrected. Eventually they can only be smothered by more power, and the end result is likely to be the tyranny that no one wanted and few really thought would come.

Now I know those who feel differently about this, who view Washington as the only place to solve our new and complex problems. I would charge none of them with evil intentions. I say merely that they cannot control their own promotions. There is nothing so insidious in political life as gradualism.

It is so easy and self-satisfying to give things to people. But where do you stop?—particularly when you are virtually asking beneficiaries to organize politically for more and more.

Maybe I am fighting an uphill battle, but by my estimate of the American character I don't think so. Today is not too late. For me, as it must be for you, tyranny is tyranny, whether it is the tyranny of an oligarchy, the tyranny of a dictator, the tyranny of a rampant, irresponsible majority, or the tyranny—and I emphasize this—the tyranny of a bureaucracy.

Yet the fact of the matter is that we are endangering the democratic process and the essential bulwarks of our freedom by channeling so much of the powers of government into a vast, constantly inflating and complicated maze of bureaus in Washington.

It is this fact which explains all the heavy fat in a massive Federal budget that is in size beyond anything hitherto known to government anywhere in the world at any period in human history.

We are, of course, confronted today with many challenges—the challenge of communism, the challenge of harnessing the free world's vast economic potential, the challenge of space and of scientific exploration. But there is also this other challenge which I have been discussing and which is too often ignored—the challenge of retaining our basic values in a time of turbulent change and of finding ways of meeting our new needs adequately without involving ourselves in the fatal hazards inherent in big government.

Meeting this challenge will require great patience and understanding. What I would urge you as teachers today is the teaching of a sense of discipline and restraint and self-reliance as a part of the learning which you impart to the young minds of the country. The greatest achievements in advancing basic human freedoms have taken place in America. These we must never lose and from this path we must never stray.

There is on the horizon a wondrous tomorrow, for America and for the whole free world. But it will only be what we ourselves make of it. I know of no group of dedicated Americans more gifted for making a major contribution to this tomorrow than the teachers of the United States.

THE U.N. BOND ISSUE

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I did not happen to be on the floor this morning just before the recess for the joint meeting. I understand some of my colleagues, including Senators COOPER, KUCHEL, BUSH, and KEATING, had something to say about the Republican conference of yesterday and the attitude of Republicans toward the compromise proposal put forward by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on the United Nations loan.

First, I wish to identify myself with the above-mentioned four Senators, and I am sure there are others who take a similar position. I state again, as I did yesterday, that I support this compromise.

What is even more important is to point out that strong support of the U.N. originated with Republican Senator Arthur Vandenberg in 1945, that Senator Vandenberg founded the bipartisan foreign policy of our Nation, that the preservation of the U.N. is one of the key elements of that policy, and that President Eisenhower in September 1960 dedicated the power, the majesty, and the resources of the United States to backing our position in the U.N. President Kennedy has done the same thing.

One of the most vital aspects of our national policy is the bipartisan foreign policy, and I believe my party should support it.

When we get into the debate, I shall have something further to say about that, but for the moment I think it is sufficient to say that if the press has represented to the country—and I, too, have seen these headlines—that the GOP takes such-and-such an attitude with respect to the United Nations, then I think the record should be set as straight as possible by as many persons as possible.

I express the expectation, as my colleagues did this morning, that a substantial majority of Senators on this side of the aisle will be found, when the roll is finally called, in support of what it takes to keep the United Nations actively and effectively in business.

TV BROADCASTER PRAISES CATV SYSTEMS

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, a few years ago there were several complaints made before the Senate Commerce Committee by television broadcasters against community television systems, commonly referred to as CATV systems. The areas where friction existed have largely disappeared, because local broadcasters and CATV operators have resolved their differences of their own free will.

My State of Pennsylvania has 204 CATV systems known to be in operation. This is almost three times as many as exist in any other State. At a meeting of the Pennsylvania CATV Association in Harrisburg last fall, I am told that there were about 14 broadcasters in attendance at all the meetings and they participated in the program. A good example of the fine relationship which exists between local broadcasters and CATV operators is the fact that the National Community Television Association, at its annual convention in San Francisco last June, awarded its coveted National Award for Distinguished Service to a broadcaster for the first time in its history. The distinguished recipient of the award was Mrs. Dorothy Mugford, promotion manager and CATV liaison for television station WNEP–TV, Wilkes-Barre-Scranton, channel 16, Scranton, Pa.

Another example of the cooperation and friendship existing between television broadcasters and CATV operators is the following article from Tele-Log of January 1962, which is the official publication of WGR–TV, channel 2 in Buffalo, N.Y. The article was sent to me by William Taylor, manager of PenNy TV, Inc., CATV systems serving Bradford, Olean, Clearfield, Allegany, and Eldred, Pa. The article is one of a series of monthly articles on CATV systems in that Pennsylvania area to appear in Tele-Log.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANNEL 2 SALUTES CATV OWNERS WHO CARRY WGR–TV

Every day, CATV systems deal directly with the most important people in television—the viewing audience.

To assist in bringing television's benefits to more people is the challenging—and very personal—task of America's 800 community antenna systems. As an industry, they supply multichannel master antenna reception services for more than 700,000 TV homes (1 out of every 61 TV households in the Nation).

Between these viewers and CATV systems exists a personal relationship which is unique in television. Known frequently by first names, CATV subscribers are served as the neighbors, friends, and fellow townspeople of the CATV operator. Located in towns with an average population of only 9,120, the public faith and community support resulting from dependable service are the truly rewarding and enduring features of the CATV industry.

Channel 2 is proud to have many CATV systems located near the fringe of our coverage area using our facilities to make television possible to thousands of homes that would not otherwise receive this media.

Television programs are as free as the air that carries them—for most of us. Just mount an antenna on the roof, or the top of the set, and there, at the twist of a knob, are the shows.

But nearly a million families in the United States pay to see television. Their TV programs are "piped" into their homes just like the electricity, water or gas, and they are billed every month for the privilege of viewing.

They pay the price gladly, even though they see the same programs the rest of us do.

Why do people pay to receive television service? In many cases, it's the only way they can get TV at all; in others, the only way they can get a satisfactory picture, or more than one channel. Television service is delivered to these million homes by cable from master antennas which serve entire communities.

Community antenna television service (often abbreviated CATV) started back in 1949, when the first wave of TV fever was sweeping the Nation and Milton Berle and Howdy Doody were becoming household names.

Television at that time was far from a nationwide service. There were fewer than 100 stations, and viewing was largely limited to areas around big cities. People beyond the range of these TV stations wondered what the excitement was all about—and longed to get in on it.

Astoria, Oreg., was one of those cities beyond TV's range. The closest station was in Seattle, 125 miles away. And high mountains stopped the signals, whose effective range was then only 50 miles at the most. A group of local citizens decided to do something about it. Some of them were engineers. They knew that TV signals travel in a straight line from the transmitter. Unlike lower-frequency radio waves, they don't follow the contours of the earth. It was impossible to pick up a TV picture in Astoria, but from the top of a nearly mountain reception of a distant station should be possible. Why not put a single antenna on the mountain to catch the TV signals and pipe them down to the city's homes by coaxial cable? The theory proved practicable.

When cable television came to Astoria, other communities isolated from TV stations by distance or mountains decided to look into the community antenna idea, and CATV spread rapidly to many previously non-TV areas.

As the number of TV stations increased to more than 550, the number of community antenna systems also grew. Today, more than 800 communities in the United States and 200 in Canada are served by these cable systems. With an average of 3 viewers per home, some 3,300,000 people now watch programs "off the cable."

Often, even after a local TV station opens up, cable systems continue to attract new customers. This is because most community systems now offer their subscribers a wide choice of channels. Some have as many as seven, and even supply hi-fi background music on an additional channel. And most CATV systems guarantee perfect reception on each channel—no ghosts or snow. They also offer subscribers freedom from unsightly and troublesome roof antennas.

To bring TV signals into town—to keep them crystal sharp—today's community antenna systems use specially designed powerful receiving antennas, one for each channel, aimed precisely at the transmitting station. When the TV signal is fed into the cable for its trip to town, it is "boosted" by an amplifier, and it is reamplified at about half-mile intervals. The operators of most CATV systems attach their cables to telephone poles (paying a rental to the phone company). The cables then branch off into customer homes and are attached to the subscriber's own TV set like any other antenna wire.

While most CATV systems use mountains or tall towers to enable them to "reach" a TV signal, some towns are still too far from the nearest stations. In these cases, the operators of CATV systems often rent long-distance microwave service—of the type used to carry network programs from coast to coast—to bring in signals from the nearest stations (which still may be hundreds of miles away).

The average community antenna system has about 1,200 subscribers, although some have more than 12,000 and others less than 100.

What do subscribers pay? The charge varies widely, usually from $2 to $6 a month, the average being about $3.50. Many CATV systems also charge an installation fee for the original hookup, running anywhere from $4 to $200.

There are over 25 systems that carry channel 2 in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ontario, Canada, making it possible for additional thousands of people to watch channel 2.

NEED OF FACILITIES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, recently, the Medford Mail-Tribune of Medford, Oreg., printed an editorial entitled "Two Quotations." It related to education, and the issue of whether there should be Federal financial support for elementary and secondary schools.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the February 11 edition of the Medford Mail-Tribune be printed here in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Two Quotations

Here are two quotations we ran across on the same day last week.

The first is from Frank Jenkins' column on Friday:

"Neither scholarships nor classrooms will necessarily produce more educated people. Only aptitude for learning and application to study on the part of the student can do that."

The other is from Senator Wayne Morse's weekly broadcast to the people of Oregon:

"The possibility of closing college doors to many qualified students is a very real one, because our teenage population is now approaching college age, and the facilities for higher education are just not large enough to accommodate them without rejecting large numbers of able and intelligent young men and women."

Both of the quoted statements are correct. They are not in conflict.

But Mr. Jenkins' statement (which preceded an extended dissertation on high taxes, costs, and so on, with little reference to need) is vastly incomplete.

Perhaps he had in mind James Garfield's statement:

"Give me a log hut, with only a simple bench, Mark Hopkins on one end and I on the other, and you may have all the buildings, apparatus and libraries without him."

This, of course, was a valid tribute to a great teacher. But it hardly accords with the realities of today's situation.

No, of course neither scholarships nor classrooms will make scholars out of dullards. But, without them, a great many potential scholars are going to remain, if not dullards, at least far below their potential. And that, in today's uneasy world, we cannot afford.

Both Mr. Jenkins and Senator Morse were talking about Federal aid to education proposals. Senator Morse is one of the chief sponsors. Mr. Jenkins fears that they will cost too much, take control of education too far away from home, water down the tax dollar by collection and administrative costs, and distribute tax money to locations where it was not collected.

We believe that Senator Morse, in his reading of the realities of the educational problems of today, is correct, and is doing his best to ameliorate the situation.

We believe that Mr. Jenkins, with his natural antipathy to high taxes and big government, is neglecting many facts and vastly oversimplifying the case—as he sometimes is prone to do.

Let us examine Mr. Jenkins' observations one by one:

Federal aid to education will cost too much. What is "too much" for an educated citizenry? Isn't it worth just about everything it costs? Isn't it worth at least as much as the amount Americans spend on tobacco and liquor each year? To us, the questions answer themselves.

Distant control of education. This is an understandable fear, and to the extent that certain minimum standards might well be set, is probably valid. But there are some areas where minimum standards should be set. For the rest, all Federal educational aid proposals leave day-to-day administration and curriculum selection strictly alone.

Watering down tax money. This is a phony, proven so. Costs of tax collection and administration on the Federal level are far less than they are on a local level.

Tax money to needy areas. This can be debated all day long, but the crux of it is whether this is all one nation or not, and whether children in poor States should be entitled to as good an education as those in rich States. We think they should be, and would be perfectly willing for some of our tax money to go to youngsters in Mississippi, as well as those in Oregon.

And that, as we see it, is the difference between Mr. Jenkins' views and Senator Morse's views.—E.A.

MEANS FOR PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, in these troubled times of international stress, a free exchange of thoughts is more important than ever before. One of the surest ways to accomplish this mutually beneficial interchange are the visits, between countries, of people in all walks of life.

We have already begun to bask in the warmer rays of international good will created by Mrs. Kennedy's just completed trip abroad. We all remember the further interest in Pakistan generated here by the visit of the camel driver, Bashir Ahmed, at the invitation of our distinguished Vice President. And let me hasten to add—so that it does not appear that we swapped a visit with our First Lady for a camel driver, that President Ayub Khan of Pakistan left a strong impression with us, on his recent visit.

Recently we had the pleasure of having Dr. Erich Mende, leader of Germany's Free Democratic Party and member of the Bundestag, introduced to us from the floor.

Now we anticipate the visit of the leader of another of Germany's major political parties, Dr. Heinrich von Brentano, of the CDU. These visits transcend party politics both here and abroad.

Dr. Von Brentano, during his year as Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, worked tirelessly along with Chancellor Adenauer, to bring the new Germany into alliance with the free world.

During these days of Communist aggression on all fronts, the free world needs these friends and allies. It is a good and encouraging sign to see the leaders of other nations visit our Capital and help us in planning our destinies so that mankind can remain free.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], for himself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the leader at any time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I call up my amendment in the nature of a substitute. I desire to offer it as a substitute for the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That the United Nations is hereby relieved of all liability for the repayment of obligations to the United States incurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act in connection with activities of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East and the United Nations military operation in the Congo. The amount involved shall be credited on any assessments or amounts chargeable to the United States as a member of the United Nations to defray the costs of said operations.

SEC. 2. From and after the enactment of this Act, no official of the United States or any other person acting in behalf of the United States shall be authorized to permit the use of any military equipment or materiel belonging to the United States or to order the participation of any person serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in any military action instituted by the United Nations unless and until such use or participation has been authorised by a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States if the Congress shall be in session. When the Congress is not in session, the President of the United States, by Executive order which shall be printed in the Federal Register, may loan military equipment or materiel not exceeding $15,000,000 in value to the United Nations if the President finds and so declares that such loan is necessary and in the interests of the security of the United States.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for the cancellation of certain indebtedness of the United Nations to the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for himself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I have examined very carefully the alleged compromise substitute that has been proposed for the committee bill. I have noted that it is sponsored by the leaders on both sides of the aisle. I realize that such sponsorship means that the so-called compromise substitute has very substantial support on both sides of the aisle. But to me the compromise is no more palatable than the original bill. In my opinion, it combines some new features that are worse than any that are contained in either the original bill or the so-called Aiken substitute. The compromise would abandon legislative responsibility. It would delegate to the President powers that were not delegated so completely in the original proposal and, overall, in my opinion it would give to the United Nations entirely too much money.

I have been urged to support the original legislative proposal or the substitute on the ground that the $100 million involved is a very small sum of money. I still have a great deal of respect for $100 million. I am well aware of the fact that it is not a large amount if it is measured against the amount that we appropriate for the defense of the United States. I am well aware that it is a relatively small amount when it is compared with the amount that the Congress appropriates each year, either for grants or for soft loans to other nations of the earth in what we euphemistically call our mutual assistance program. Because I think it carries too much money, and involves inherent danger to the future policy of this country, I am opposed to the substitute.

DISTORTED CRITICISM

As is often the case, in order to deter opposition and full and free discussion and examination of the measure, an effort has been made to paint any person who might question the wisdom of the proposal in any respect as being the enemy of the United Nations seeking to destroy the United Nations.

I was greatly impressed by the able and courageous speech of the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], in opening the debate on this question, when he expressed his belief in what was, of course, the original reason for the creation of Congress—that men should be entitled to express fully and freely their views on issues that are vital to this country without being castigated as ignoramuses or charged with being inspired by some ulterior purpose.

I have a great deal more confidence in the integrity of one who freely concedes the right of disagreement than I have for those who would paint black motives with a broad brush on any person who does not agree with their position. I compliment the majority leader on the speech that he made. I think it is a landmark in this Congress. It measures up to the very best traditions of the Senate. I hope it will do something to clear the atmosphere and permit objective discussion of these questions without immediately impugning the character of those who do not agree with everything that is proposed from any source—the White House, the State Department, the United Nations, or even in either House of the Congress of the United States.

I can say with complete truthfulness that I do not favor the abolition of the United Nations. I am not out to destroy the United Nations, and I would not impair any of its functions as contemplated in its original charter.

Recent events have made our membership in that organization of considerably less value than was the case at the time of our original ratification of the United Nations Charter. I bitterly disapprove of the precipitate and callous use of overwhelming military force, as was done in the state of Katanga last year, before all efforts at mediation between the parties had been exhausted. When we think about the length of time—running over weeks and into months—that we met and discussed with elements of the Communist world events in Korea and in Vietnam, it appears shameful that an organization that was created for mediation, negotiation, and the peaceful settlement of disputes should launch a military attack after the very limited effort that had been made to settle peacefully the difficulties in that troubled area.

In spite of my condemnation of that attack, I would not destroy the United Nations through bankruptcy or through inability to meet its bills. The purpose of my amendment is to enable it to carry on, though not in as lush a fashion as is provided in the substitute to which I referred.

ROLE OF UNITED NATIONS

I would be less than frank if I did not say that I do not agree with many of my correspondents who have written me hailing the United Nations as "a great bulwark for the peace and security of the United States." I have received resolutions from groups of intelligent people saying that the United Nations is the last hope of peace and the maintenance of our security. I cannot accept that thesis. I regard the United Nations as a useful institution. It is a place where men representing the conflicting ideologies of government that exist in the world today may meet and talk and seek the peaceful solution of problems.

I have been somewhat concerned that so many Americans in high places have made statements calculated to create in the minds of the American people such great faith in the United Nations that they would be willing to risk the future destiny of this country in the hands of the United Nations.

Madam President, anyone who undertakes to convince the American people today that we can safely depend on the United Nations as a bulwark against the enduring threat of world enslavement by communism is doing the people of this country a great disservice.

I hear comparisons made of the amount that we spend to support the United Nations and the cost of maintaining our Military Establishment. The inference is that we ought to abandon military spending and put that money in the United Nations.

If that day ever comes, we will indeed be undone in this country, and our identity as a great people will vanish.

I can honestly disclaim any desire to destroy the United Nations without being willing to surrender my even greater interest, and indeed my sworn duty as a Senator of the United States, to see that the people of the United States, so far as I can prevent it, are not misled into placing the perpetuity of our institutions and the maintenance of our freedoms in the hands of the United Nations and to rely upon it solely for our protection.

Despite the very eloquent remarks made in its support by those who envision the United Nations as having much more vitality than I attribute to it, I must say that I regard the United Nations as a very frail reed on which to rest in the hope of deterring aggression by any medium-size power, much less by a great power.

Madam President, while I do not wish to destroy the United Nations but wish to see it continue, and wish that it could have increased vitality and strength, I believe that we are a long way and many years, even decades, from the time when we can afford to put the protection of American institutions, and the individual rights and liberties that are enjoyed by the American citizens, in trusteeship to the United Nations.

As I have said, my principal concern about the proposed legislation is the amount of money that is involved. I am concerned because of the oftstated purpose, as restated no later than last week in an editorial in a newspaper in Washington, that the United Nations should have a substantial reserve of funds available in order that it might launch, without any delay whatever, the application of military sanctions such as it applied in the Congo.

I do not agree with that philosophy. I regard the attack that was made in the Congo, without exhausting mediation, as sheer aggression and unnecessary aggression. I disapprove of it. Whatever one can say about Russia suffering a defeat by that action, it was aggression, and military aggression, and the use of force which had the Soviet Union as its primary advocate in the United Nations.

I do not mean by that to say that the fact that the Soviet Union was leading the stampede to apply military force in Katanga influenced our position. I do say that our position was taken apparently out of the demand of some of the so-called newly emerging nations, such as Ghana, that the last white man had to be driven from the Congo or, indeed, from the soil of Africa, as some rulers in Africa demand, even if such person is a third or fourth generation citizen of the state in Africa in which he resides. I do not propose to put into the hands of Mr. U Thant, the Acting Secretary General, or anyone else serving as Secretary General of the United Nations, a large reserve of money in order that the machinery of the United Nations can again set in force an overwhelming military force against any other state or people of this earth before exhausting negotiation and mediation.

I opposed the war that ended in the conquest of Katanga. I oppose committing American boys and American equipment to that war, or tax money extracted from American citizens into any such reckless military attacks, without approval of Congress—approval that is expressly required and spelled out in what is called the United Nations Participation Act.

I am not trying to destroy the United Nations. I believe my amendment preserves it. It will avoid such precipitate and brutal action in the future. In addition, my amendment undertakes to preserve the law enacted by Congress in 1945, which stipulates the limitations of our participation in this organization.

From reports that have been circulating in the press about the alleged compromise, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has apparently changed his view somewhat as to the necessary financial arrangements which must be made to keep the United Nations in operation.

However, on March 15 this distinguished Senator, in an able discussion of his original substitute, laid before us in detail the current financial situation of the United Nations. He pointed out and sustained with figures the assertion that the United Nations is not presently anywhere near the verge of bankruptcy as proponents of this proposed legislation have so stridently proclaimed.

He stated that on the 31st day of December the United Nations owed $114 million. At that very time various members of the organization owed the United Nations about $93 million on various assessments and obligations that they had not paid. However, the distinguished Senator from Vermont pointed out that on the 1st of January, $142 million of ordinary operating assessments became due and owing to the United Nations.

The Senator informed us that his research indicated that about $67 million will be needed to carry the Congo operations through to the 1st of July. He contended—and I agree—that it is a safe assumption that at least $90 million of the large amounts owing the United Nations could be collected within a very short time and that this amount should be adequate to finance the United Nations past the time when an opinion will have been rendered by the International Court of Justice at The Hague to determine whether the $93 million of unpaid dues and assessments owing by 74 members of the United Nations are legal and binding.

The adoption of my substitute will release the United Nations from all of its indebtedness to the United States, its largest creditor. It has been exceedingly difficult to arrive at a precise figure of this indebtedness, but it is not less than $31,826,000 and it may amount to more than $40 million.

In addition, it will alleviate the financial crisis of the United Nations. So the U.N. evidently is adequately financed at the present time; unless they wish to start another military action, such as was launched in the case of Katanga.

The Senator from Vermont is one of the best informed men in the Congress on the question of international affairs and has represented us as a delegate at the United Nations, and he convinced me completely that the United Nations can maintain its financial integrity until the Court renders its opinion, even if Congress takes no action. It might just be a good lesson to some of our associates in the United Nations and prevent them from taking such precipitate action in the future.

I may say in passing that precipitate action by the United Nations and the abandonment of its declared role as mediator and peacemaker has been responsible for the largest part of its expenditures.

I would like to see it have time to plan and function as a peace-seeking body within the spirit of its charter rather than to look at a substantial bank balance largely extracted from the pockets of the American taxpayer and devise new military operations as a means of expending it.

My amendment is entirely adequate to bail out the United Nations and keep it from failing, but it does seek to deny that body the means of financing additional attacks against nations with Christian institutions of government and strongly opposed to communism such as that launched against Katanga.

My amendment also renews the provisions of the act of 1945 which would prevent this Nation's being brought into any armed conflict or war without the knowledge and approval of the Congress of the United States.

I have been amazed to see eminent lawyers quoted as saying that this provision is likely to be unconstitutional and an undue restraint upon Executive power. But, Madam President, my amendment contains no provisions which are new or startling, or radical, or unconstitutional. It states, in simpler terms that which has been on the statute books now for 17 years.

I refer to the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 as amended. Let me call the attention of the Senate to section 6 of this act. It reads:

> The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate

> act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said charter—

Let us remember that: No action of that kind can be taken unless there is an agreement with the United Nations that has been submitted to Congress—

> and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the Armed Forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That, except as authorized in section 7 of this Act, nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose Armed Forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

Madam President, it is my interpretation of that provision that before one American boy in uniform may be deployed by the United Nations, and before any assistance may be given to the United Nations in keeping international peace by military force, this action must have been a part of such agreements made between this Government and the Security Council, and must have been ratified by the Congress of the United States.

Let us see what is provided by section 7, which I believe was added by an amendment in 1949:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President, upon the request by the United Nations for cooperative action, and to the extent that he finds that it is consistent with the national interest to comply with such request, may authorize, in support of such activities of the United Nations as are specifically directed to the peaceful settlement of disputes and not involving the employment of armed forces contemplated by chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.

This section further provides that all Armed Forces of the United States furnished the United Nations upon its request must be noncombatants.

The act clearly provides that no combat equipment can be supplied pursuant to this act of Congress.

The assistance contemplated under section 7, passed as an amendment in 1949, relates solely to the peaceful settlement of disputes and does not relate to the use of armed forces as contemplated in chapter VII of the charter. This limitation is specifically stated in the first sentence of the section.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete United Nations Participation Act as amended, along with chapter VII of the U.N. Charter, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I was very much pleased with the remarks made earlier by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, in which he commended the position of the majority leader that we have the right of dissent on questions relating to the United Nations and other matters and to make, at the same time, a constructive contribution to the security of our country. Unfortunately, there are some who associate dissent with destruction.

Mr. RUSSELL. I so stated when I said that it now comes to pass that when some of us are in disagreement over any detail in certain areas, and when the role of Government is challenged on some matter, our words are criticized as those of an irresponsible individual who has no knowledge of the subject, or else as words of one who is undertaking to destroy the last best hope of peace on earth.

Madam President, for my part, I resent government by smear, which is getting to be all too frequent. I refer to attempts to intimidate Members of the Senate, to keep them from saying what they honestly believe—in other words, from living up to the oath they take on the rostrum in this Chamber when they are inducted into membership into this body.

I was glad to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator; and, Madam President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, the lead editorial published today in the Washington Star. The editorial deals with this aspect and other aspects of the very able speech delivered by the distinguished majority leader on the day when this measure was first presented to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia for the constructive attitude he has taken on this matter, as well as for the constructive attitude he has taken on all other matters relating to the security of our country. I know of no Member of this body who is more competent to speak on the broad subject of national security than is the senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Washington for his comment.

I may say that I regretted some of the criticism published in the press, directed to the very able speech on the United Nations which the distinguished Senator from Washington delivered before the National Press Club. I thought some of that criticism was in very poor taste and was based on very poor judgment.

Madam President, the assistance contemplated under section 7, which is the amendment of 1949, relates solely to the peaceful settlement of disputes, and does not relate to the use of armed forces as contemplated in chapter 7 of the charter; and this limitation is specifically stated.

Madam President, my amendment is very clear, and I do not see how there could possibly be any misunderstanding of it. The amendment simply reaffirms what already is the law of our land, and has been for 17 years; namely, the right of the Congress to be consulted before U.S. Armed Forces and U.S. materiel of war are committed to combat.

The amendment states that from and after its enactment, no official of the United States or any other person acting in behalf of the United States shall be authorized to permit the use of any military equipment or materiel belonging to the United States or to order the participation of any person serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in any military action instituted by the United Nations unless and until such use be authorized by Congress. The amendment also contains a provision that if Congress is not in session, the President is authorized to supply $15 million worth of military equipment—which is a broadening of the authority the President already has under existing law.

This amendment cannot in any way weaken the United Nations. Instead, the amendment should strengthen it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do I correctly understand that the position of the Senator from Georgia is that his amendment does no more than restate what the charter and what the law have previously stated?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. If the Senator from Indiana was here when the Senate passed the United Nations Participation Act of 1945—from which I have read—he will remember that it states that no U.S. Armed Forces can be committed except pursuant to negotiations initiated by the President and approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, I was here at that time; and I remember the debate on that subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, later on I shall deal more at length with that matter; but at this time I merely state that when that matter was under debate in the Senate, the President was at Potsdam, Germany, for the negotiations there; and at that time the proponents of the bill, in order to succeed in having the Senate pass it, finally had President Truman send here a cablegram in which he stated that under no circumstances would he commit U.S. Armed Forces or U.S. materiel to the United Nations without the approval of the Congress; and that cablegram was read on the floor of the Senate, and practically concluded the debate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, Madam President, I was in the Senate Chamber when that happened.

Is it the opinion of the able Senator from Georgia that violations of that law or of its intent have been occurring?

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and therefore it has been with some trepidation that I have ventured today into this field. Of course I do not know all the details. But I am of the opinion that if we have not violated that law, at least we have come very close, on more than one occasion, to violating it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, I think there is no question about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under this law, the use in any manner whatever of any U.S. military personnel by the United Nations, except in a noncombatant capacity, without the approval of the Congress is completely illegal, ultra vires, and is specifically prohibited by law, in addition to being specifically prohibited by one of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Of course, I know I sometimes irritate some of my friends by referring to that great document, because so many now regard it as outmoded and as being completely outworn and of no value today. But, Madam President, despite that, I remind them that the Constitution of the United States states that only the Congress shall have the power to declare war.

Madam President, if, when I suggest, as I am doing by means of this amendment, that we clarify this matter and restate the fact that the Congress is permitted to participate in these matters, it is said that such a suggestion is unconstitutional because it places limitations on the Commander in Chief, let me point out that those who say it is unconstitutional are about 17 years too late, insofar as this statute is concerned, and about 175 years too late insofar as the Constitution is concerned, for the original act placed no such limitations on the Commander in Chief; and, furthermore, the Commander in Chief then serving said he was perfectly willing to accept it. So my amendment does not contemplate any unconstitutional action.

Madam President, I believe this amendment will bring strength and vitality to the United Nations, because it will clarify the situations under which the United States may participate in keeping the peace around the world; and, as I stated a while ago, the amendment is, overall, in accord with article I, section 8, of the U.S. Constitution, which deals with the powers of Congress, and which declares in paragraph 11 that only Congress has the power to declare war, and provides in paragraph 16 that Congress has the power "to provide for governing such part" of the Armed Forces "as may be employed in the service of the United States."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to state a hypothetical situation, and then ask the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Georgia about it.

Disregarding for the moment the limitations the Senator from Georgia has described as being in the law passed in 1945——

Mr. RUSSELL. And also in the law as it was amended in 1949; and the Senator from Ohio will find that that is exactly the law, and has not been repealed. It has been shunted aside, but it has not been repealed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My hypothetical question is this: Let us assume that a revolt were to occur in Cuba, and that Castro were to request a mission of United Nations troops to subdue the revolt. The question comes before the Security Council and our Government vetoes the proposal to send in troops. The issue then goes before the General Assembly, and the General Assembly, with 104 nations, by a majority vote determines that United Nations troops shall be sent into Cuba to subdue a revolt against the Communist government.

What would be the legal effect of that vote in the General Assembly contravening the vote in the Security Council, and followed by a mission intended to subdue the revolt?

Mr. RUSSELL. I feel, Madam President, that I am not the best qualified man in the Senate to answer that question; but, as was pointed out by the distinguished majority leader in the able address to which I referred, he stated that due to the unconscionable abuse by the Russians of the veto power vested in the permanent members of the Council, the powers of the General Assembly had been greatly broadened. While I believe, and I think I am correct, it takes a two-thirds vote rather than a majority vote in the General Assembly, in my opinion, under the procedures that have been used in the United Nations of late, the vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly would commit the United Nations, if they found that it was necessary to preserve the world peace, to subdue the revolt to which the Senator has referred, despite the fact that this revolt might be supported by the hopes and prayers of at least 182½ million Americans.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been laboring with this issue because, by looking into the future, I envision that the General Assembly may determine to engage in certain relief and humanitarian projects. It may determine to send a mission of United Nations troops into a foreign country, with all the hazards and expense involved, and contrary to the possible judgment of the United States in the Security Council, the burden of financing those operations falling upon our Government, although we do not subscribe to what had been done.

Mr. RUSSELL. I share the Senator's views; and I shall deal with that subject in some detail before I conclude my remarks.

As I was stating, this amendment is designed to refresh the recollection of Members of the Senate and the House as to what is already the law. It just spells it out in a little more detail and gives the President power, which he does not have under the law, to use up to $15 million in military equipment if the Congress is not in session.

It will preserve some of the powers of Congress which so many Members of this body seem so anxious to delegate to others.

We have gone so far from our act in 1949 in abdicating our powers and seeking to flee from our sworn responsibilities that a simple restatement of something that is already the law in the United Nations Enabling Act, passed only 17 years ago, stirs up a great commotion in the press and in the Congress.

That is how far we have gone in 17 years by fleeing from our responsibilities and minimizing the position of the Senate and of the Congress of the United States in our scheme of government.

No wonder, Madam President, that the President can use so much equanimity to increase the powers of the executive and the judicial branches of the Government, when the Congress contributes so much to its own depreciation at every opportunity.

I am frank to say that my original opposition to forcing the taxpayers of the United States to pay the largest share of the costs of the military action in the Congo sprang from my conviction that that military action was launched prematurely, before it was necessary, and was carried out with unnecessary brutality after it was once initiated.

I also have a grave question as to the real motives of some of those who have been most active in pressing to have this action.

I fear, Madam President, we have not been very consistent in our approach to world problems. Both the President and the Secretary of State, and the preceding President and Secretary of State, and others in high position, have made many eloquent speeches, almost every time we have been visited by an official from one of the newly emerging nations, pointing out that this country is the child of a revolution, and therefore we have something in common with all newly emerging countries, and for that reason we are opposed to colonialism, even of the most benign type, practiced by our very best friends. Every visiting official has been met with that as a statement of policy.

CRUSH OF KATANGA

If that were a statement of policy to be consistently followed, it could be defended, but we have had no consistent foreign policy of our own in many areas. We permit ourselves to be influenced by the views of different rulers in other countries. Many of those countries are not friendly to the policies of the United States. While revolutions have been applauded in eloquent terms in every case except one, the idea was denounced and violently opposed in the case of Katanga. Despite our expressed dedication to the cause of revolution, and freedom of choice for people everywhere as to the kind of government they should have, we have made an exception in the case of Katanga. They were not permitted to have the revolution that we have supported in every other area, including some very bloody ones.

Not only were they not permitted to seek to control their own destiny, but the man who is the governor or president there, Tshombe, has even been denied the right to come to this country. We have permitted every other revolutionary to visit us. We have had committees for every other revolutionary. The one who led the forces in Angola, Africa, and perpetrated some of the most brutal crimes I know of, was brought into this country by a committee, and no questions were asked about whether he had a Portuguese visa. We offered every other revolutionary a visit here except Tshombe. For some reason or other, a curse has been placed on him, and he has not been permitted to come here.

The little province of Katanga, with military forces numbering about 10,000—mostly poorly equipped natives with some few whites who were born in Katanga and a few hired soldiers—which happens to be Christian in religion, anti-Communist in political view, and friendly to the United States in its outward relations, was made the target for an all-out military attack which killed large numbers of its people and destroyed a great deal of property.

Why was that brought about? It was because they would not immediately accede to a resolution sponsored by Ghana and one or two other countries, which demanded that they invite into Katanga the chaos, the confusion, and the barbarism which was in other areas of the Congo, by driving out immediately all of the Belgians who were helping Tshombe in the administration of his government.

The destruction of Tshombe's forces and the crushing of the independence movement in Katanga has been hailed somehow, again and again, as a great victory for the United States over the cause of communism. I have had considerable difficulty in assimilating and understanding that claim, because Russia led the general stampede in the United Nations, demanding precipitate military action in Katanga. I do not think it is to our credit that we were caught up in the movement and carried along by the mob.

If the Russians suffered a great defeat there, as we were told, it was a defeat which they inflicted willingly upon themselves.

I have here the record of the United Nations Security Council for November 24. There it is set forth so clearly and man may read and understand that under the aegis of Mr. Valerien Zorin, the Soviet representative on the Security Council, who was acting as president at that time, the Council passed a resolution calling for the immediate use of force to integrate Katanga against its wishes, so that it might enjoy its share of all of the chaos, death, and destruction that the rest of the Congo had been enduring.

There was no statement in the resolution that the last possibilities for negotiations had been exhausted, even though the United Nations was supposed to be dedicated to mediation, to negotiation, and to peaceful settlement.

The representative of the United States did, rather halfheartedly, offer an amendment to include all elements in the Congo, including separatist Gizenga, who at that time was the hope of the Russians for Communist rule in the Congo, but that resolution was vetoed by the Russian delegate on the Security Council. Whereupon, without our delegate resorting to the veto until further negotiations could be had, our country supported this Russian-inspired resolution which precipitated the military attack that destroyed Katanga.

This record of the United Nations demonstrates the point beyond any peradventure of doubt.

Indeed, Madam President, this action was so uncalled for that our delegate undertook to excuse himself. He said that he voted for the resolution very reluctantly, but that he did so in order that the Prime Minister of the Congo, Mr. Bomoko, might not be compelled to go home emptyhanded.

I submit, Madam President, that is a very poor excuse for launching military action by an organization created to preserve the peace. We have seen our people come back home emptyhanded several thousands of times from conferences all over the world. But to prevent Mr. Bomoko from going home without the means to bring about immediate settlement to an issue that at least should have been the subject of negotiations and mediation, why, our delegate joined in with the Russians and the rest of those supporting the resolution, and voted for it.

I wish to say, Madam President, that if what has occurred in the Congo, through the crushing of the freedom movement in Katanga, was a great defeat for the Communists, the Russians were not aware of it. They are not usually quite that stupid.

I am sure Members of the Senate are familiar with the letter which Mr. Zorin wrote to Mr. U Thant, the Acting Secretary General, in addition to the resolution, demanding that the attack be launched without delay. Of course, the puny forces of Katanga could not maintain themselves against the military might which was brought to bear against them. Included in those forces were some of the finest fighting men in the world. I refer to the Gurkhas.

GURKHA MERCENARIES

For a long number of years the Gurkhas have been the greatest mercenaries in all of military history. They furnish more fighting for a dollar than any other mercenaries have ever done.

I remember that in the dark days of World War II the allied attack up the boot of Italy was stalled at Monte Cassino and the Rapido River. We dumped bombs and artillery shells upon the abbey at Monte Cassino until it seemed that no creature could possibly be alive there. We then sent in an attack by one of the finest divisions in our army, the 36th Division, across the Rapido River. The Germans emerged from holes, set up machineguns, and mowed down our men by the hundreds.

The British then tried an attack. They sent in a crack aggregation. The same thing happened to them.

Finally a division of Gurkhas was brought up. With the craft of American Indians, they climbed the mountain at night and with their knives they slit the throats of every German sentry before the Germans knew anyone was around, and they slit the throats of most of the enemy who were there before the Germans were aware the Gurkhas were upon them. They are great troops and great fighting men. They come from Nepal.

Madam President, when I was in India during World War II, during the early dark days in 1943, when I had the honor to lead the only congressional committee which went out, I met a colonel who told me a story in connection with the Gurkhas. He said that when Lord Mountbatten was trying to get together the forces of the Allies, in the India-Asia-China sector, they finally sent a representative to the maharaja, and asked him if, in addition to the other troops he had already supplied, he could supply two regiments of Gurkhas. That was to be in addition to the other Gurkhas, and these were to be used as paratroopers. The maharaja said he thought he could, but asked exactly what the men were supposed to do, to determine whether he should be paid more for them than he would be paid for ordinary kinds of fighting. The British officer said to him, "Well, the paratroopers are taken up in airplanes and dropped from the air on the enemy or behind his lines in order to divert attention from the front." "Well," the maharaja said, "how high is the airplane when these men are dropped out of it, or jump out of it?" The British officer said, "They are at least 500 feet high." The maharaja said "You understand you will have to pay for a lot of soldiers. A good many of them will get hurt jumping 500 feet." The British officer then said, "They will have to be at least 500 feet up, or the parachutes will not open." "Oh," the maharaja said, "I had not understood they were to have parachutes."

That is how tough the Gurkhas are as soldiers. It is no disgrace to be defeated by the Gurkhas.

U.N. DISCRIMINATIONS

It is notable that until now the United Nations has, as in that case, enforced its resolutions and edicts against the weak and the helpless, such as those in Katanga, with great speed and energy and, as I have stated, with unnecessary brutality. However, the United Nations can be as silent as a sphinx and can act like a sphinx looking the other way when a strong and powerful nation flouts the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

Without regard to any action that we may take in the way of pumping American tax dollars into the United Nations, it is eventually doomed to failure if it continues to follow a policy of one law for the weak and no law whatever for the strong and powerful.

I regret that we were associated in the tragedy of Katanga with the men who perpetrated and still defend the rape of Hungary and Poland by the armored divisions of Soviet Russia by joining them in voting for the immediate military action to subdue Katanga. When the Soviet tanks crushed the lives out of the Hungarians who were seeking to find a way to freedom on the streets of their capital city of Budapest, the United Nations contented itself with a slight slap on the wrist.

When the sanctimonious Mr. Nehru launched overwhelming military forces against little Portuguese Goa without exhausting efforts at mediation or even the offices of the United Nations, not even a resolution of condemnation was forthcoming.

When Red China moved into Tibet and killed the people of that country, destroyed their religion, and forced them to come under Communist control, we expressed sympathy in the United Nations for the Tibetan people. But that was the extent of United Nations action when that hapless land was ravaged by the Communist Reds with all the savagery that was perpetrated by Genghis Khan.

Mr. Khrushchev has felt that he could safely flout the opinion of the United Nations and, indeed, the opinion of mankind everywhere. His most recent expression of contempt was the resumption of nuclear testing in the atmosphere, which was a clear breach of faith and implied agreement. Where, then, was the United Nations, even to give an expression of strong disapproval to his act?

In my view, in all candor, and it is a sincere view, and is not expressed in an effort to destroy the United Nations—if the United Nations is to be of any value to the human family on this globe, it must be prepared to denounce wrongdoing on the part of the strong, and it cannot content itself by launching military action against a weak and impotent state whose major sin was the desire to be free and independent.

There is little doubt that the fact that the United Nations used military action to crush Katanga without exhausting mediation was among the incidents that lent encouragement to Mr. Nehru in his military attack on Goa. Mr. Nehru at least had the justification of having supplied to the United Nations the fighting men I have described. They did the most effective fighting there, even though we are expected to defray a disproportionate cost of that expedition.

In addition, these incidents have a chain reaction. There is no question in my mind that the attack on Goa is encouraging Sukarno in his avowed intent to conquer by military action the Papuan inhabited Dutch New Guinea. He said he is willing to mediate, if the Dutch will announce in advance of the meeting that they agree with Sukarno. But such a surrender would be rather difficult for any people who have any self-respect.

Mr. Nehru is aware of the deference which everyone has been trying to show the newly emerging nations when he justified his military aggression against helpless Goa by the statement that the colored peoples of the earth all approved of what he had done. That statement immediately silenced everyone in official circles, as if colored peoples everywhere approved the idea that a little death and destruction through military aggression is a good thing.

Madam President, it is alarming to see the racial issue being drawn into almost every question under debate in the United Nations. I would have preferred to have some other Senator make that statement. It would have been more impressive than it is coming from me.

COLONIALISM

I am rather alarmed, even viewing the question objectively, to see our acquiescence in almost every proposal that is brought forward in the name of anticolonialism, without regard to the probable effect of destroying established government, even though colonial, and granting independence to people who are not ready for it.

The early picture of colonialism was a very sordid one. It was a picture of exploitation and imposition. Some of the colonial powers in this enlightened age have striven earnestly and have spent large sums of money in an effort to prepare people for independence. Recently Belgium undertook to prepare Katanga for independence. It spent a good deal of money to build schools and otherwise to prepare the people for self-government.

But the pressure against colonialism became so great that the horrors of the Congo were perpetrated on account of the Belgians leaving before the natives were really ready. They were concluding the second stage of a three-stage program to provide for the independence of the Congo.

I fear that it is a little early for us to assume that the destruction of Katanga has assured the extirpation of communism from the Congo forever. Despite the original United Nations resolution, adopted on demand of Ghana, unless some steps are made to bring back to the Congo—and I mean to every part of the Congo—a large number of Belgian technicians in government, in industry, and, indeed, in the military forces there, we will see that the United States will be called upon for increasingly large sums of money from year to year, over a long period of years, to provide for military occupation by the United Nations, which will be necessary as it is undertaking to rule the country.

We have been a party to the destruction of Katanga, in which there was real peace and order after independence and the withdrawal of the Belgians from the Congo. A great many of the Belgians, in good faith, stayed to work for the Congo Government. A great many missionaries of several denominations stayed there. However, when they were subjected to the reign of terror and brutality, and rapine and murder, which followed, the Belgians were compelled to send in a couple of regiments of paratroopers to restore order and to get their people out. That is what originally brought the United Nations forces into that area. The Congolese demanded that the United Nations come in to put the Belgians out. The Belgians were anxious to get out if they could get assurances that order would be restored, the murder and rape be halted, and that no more homes or churches be burned. Belgians were being driven from the homes they had built at their own expense. Nuns were being raped and people who had any religion at all were being killed. The Belgians wanted to get out. They were very glad to get out and to be relieved of responsibility there.

As one Senator, I regret that we have forced upon this helpless state of Katanga, where there was law and order, the condition that exists in the rest of the Congo. It is undoubtedly true, from reports I have had from there, that much of the Congo is going back into the jungle and to the primitive civilization that existed before the Belgians came in.

I suppose we will be called upon from year to year to finance the greater part of the United Nations operations, to try to keep the Government alive and to maintain some semblance of civilized life around the larger cities.

Still reserving the right to be critical of the United Nations, even though, as I have said, I do not wish to destroy it, I shall now discuss the matter of the one vote by one state in the General Assembly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have in my hand copies of resolutions adopted by the Security Council on January 13, 1960, dealing with the Congo; also the one adopted on July 22, 1960; also the one adopted on August 9, 1960. The premise for these resolutions I believe becomes very pertinent to the discussion advanced by the Senator from Georgia.

In the resolution of August 9, 1960, it is stated:

> The Security Council—

Then there follow a number of subparagraphs recalling its resolution of July 22, 1960, and noting certain things. Then it finally states:

> The Security Council reaffirms that the United Nations Force in the Congo will not be a party to or in any way intervene in or be used to influence the outcome of any internal conflict, constitutional or otherwise.

Mr. RUSSELL. They were repeating that up to the time the United Nations Force went into Katanga to put down what they called—they did not call those people revolutionists——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mercenaries.

Mr. RUSSELL. No—separatists. If they had been called revolutionists, we would have approved of the resolution, and we would have commended it highly. However, they were called separatists, and therefore they met with our condemnation and destruction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Ohio knows that when they sent the troops into Katanga, where there had been law and order, at the outset on the demand of the ruler of Ghana, our representative said the purpose of going up there was not to kill Africans; that it was a peaceful mission. However, it did not turn out that way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree that in practically every action that was taken it was reaffirmed that the United Nations troops were not in any manner to intervene or to be used to influence the outcome of any internal conflict.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator, of course, is correct. They stated that during the first fighting in Katanga. However, the hypocrisy of that position was so great, some of them finally did say that Katanga had wealth, and therefore it had to be brought into the Congo to support the rest of the country. In resolution after resolution they reiterated that these troops were not sent there to participate in any internal conflict between the people of the Congo, as to the government, or the division of the Congo. As I said a few minutes ago, the troops were sent originally at the request of the Congolese Government to get the Belgians out. The Belgians wanted to get out. They left immediately on the arrival of the first United Nations troops, or as soon as there were enough troops there to prevent the whites from being killed and the towns from being burnt or destroyed. Of course, they were still eating the flesh of some of the United Nations soldiers in the outskirts near Stanleyville; but the Belgians did get out. The whole purpose was supposed to be to get the Belgians out. They reiterated again and again that they were not there to take sides between any of the contending elements in the Congo.

Of course the central government sent its army into Katanga. They tried to bring Katanga back into line. Tshombe and his forces kicked them clear across the river, and they disappeared as a fighting force. That is when the United Nations went in to do their fighting for them.

I have my own theory, which I shall develop later in my remarks, as to the real reason for the first movement of large numbers of United Nations troops into the place where there was no murder, no raping going on, and where everything was at peace. I have a theory for it that I shall give later.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It raises the interesting inquiry that if they can go into the Congo and interfere with a domestic revolt, does it not follow that they can go into any nation to settle what are supposed to be domestic upheavals, and which reflect a dissatisfaction with the incumbent government, or with the economy, or the welfare of the people?

Mr. RUSSELL. In my opinion it is certainly contrary to the principles of the United Nations and the purposes for which it was formed. I think it is a distortion of those purposes and principles.

SUPREME COURT

Madam President, as I said a moment ago, I wish to discuss the question of one state—one vote in the United Nations Assembly. Within the past week, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a momentous decision. This decision undertakes to establish a national policy of permitting the Federal courts to redistrict and otherwise reapportion States in order to, as some of the press said in hailing the decision, "make one man's vote equal to any other's." It follows, of course, that if this is true within a State, the Federal courts have a right to redraw the lines of wards, and even precincts, within the cities of the States.

I readily admit that all of the apportionment laws prevailing in the 50 States do not appeal to my sense of fairness. Indeed, I have vigorously supported proposed constitutional amendments to change the method of selecting members of the electoral college in the interests of fairplay, because it has seemed to me that that change would be in the interest of fairness and equality. However, I deem it unnecessary for me to state that, under my concept of the Constitution, the Federal courts do not have the right or authority to put a State or city in a receivership and substitute some petty auditor, receiver, or other appointee of the Federal court for duly elected Governors, legislators, and other State officials. Life tenure for Federal judges is the only fragmentary semblance of the long-discarded doctrine of the divine right of kings found in our Federal Constitution. Some of the Founding Fathers were opposed to life tenure by appointment, but even the most ardent advocates of life tenure by appointment for Federal judges in the first 100 years of this Nations' life would have hotly denounced any contention that a petty appointee of a Federal judge could oust the officials of States and rule the people through one-man edicts and ukases that the Supreme Court says have the force of law in the matter of exercising the right of suffrage.

However, I realize that this is not an appropriate time to discuss this decision in detail. I have referred to it merely to make clear to all the irony of the fact that nearly all of those who hail the Supreme Court's most recent blow at our constitutional system as a great contribution to fairness and equality are the very people who are editorializing daily their support of the rotten borough system of the General Assembly under which the United Nations asserts its claims to power and world authority.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that a majority of the votes in the United Nations does not represent as large a population as resides in the metropolitan area of Paris?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not made that computation; but later I had intended to discuss that situation. I expect to give some comparative figures which I have calculated. However, I am pleased to know that my colleague from Georgia has made a study of this point.

Mr. TALMADGE. I have not explored that situation in detail, but I have read an article published in U.S. News & World Report, a publication which I believe my colleague will agree is a reliable journal, and the article asserted that a majority vote in the United Nations as it is presently constituted does not represent as large a population as resides in metropolitan Paris at the present time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly do not challenge that contention. I accept my colleague's statement and thank him for it.

Madam President, our present administration, which hailed the Court decision as a great landmark in the progress of mankind, has as yet manifested no concern over the inequities and unequal representation in the United Nations. Our President said at his press conference:

> The right to fair representation and to have each vote count equally is basic.

It would seem to me that if this rule should be applied in such drastic fashion within the United States, we should at least make some suggestion as to a fairer representation and proportionate vote in the Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. How can the Supreme Court of the United States possibly enforce a decision that a State must give representation in its legislature on the basis of population, unless the Supreme Court intends to assume the laying out of counties, the power to change the boundary lines of counties, and the power to prescribe election districts in the States, and to assume overall control of all election matters?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator from North Carolina is justified in assuming that all the propositions he has cited are embraced with the majority decision as handed down by the court. I had not intended to discuss that decision in detail at this time.

Mr. ERVIN. Can the decision possibly be enforced unless the Supreme Court assumes not only the laying out of county lines or the changing of county lines, but also control over the boundaries of election districts and school districts, and even the boundaries of the wards of municipalities?

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me that it would be necessary for the State or the city to be placed in receivership and then to let the court handle the question of redistricting.

Mr. ERVIN. Has not the Supreme Court, in handing down that decision, ignored State concepts dating back to the beginning of the Nation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have already said so. The Court's decision constitutes one of the most severe blows leveled at our constitutional system.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that for some years the Supreme Court has been handing down decisions which have had as their purpose the centralizing of power in Washington?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that being the trend. The Supreme Court has been doing that, and Congress, unfortunately and deplorably, has acquiesced in the action of the Supreme Court.

Mr. ERVIN. Has not the Supreme Court been placing itself in a position superior to that of the Federal Government itself?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Supreme Court has assumed powers that no other single branch of the Government has ever undertaken to exercise. It amends the Constitution by court order.

Mr. ERVIN. Did not the Supreme Court in the Watkins case undertake to tell Congress how its committees should function, so far as investigations were concerned?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is one of the cases which have gone far to cause Congress to lose face as an equal and coordinate branch of the Government.

UNEQUAL REPRESENTATION IN U.N.

Madam President, I was discussing the Court decision in the light of inequities and unequal representation in the United Nations. It is all the more necessary to consider how the character and appearance of the United Nations have changed since it was first created. The U.N. now has more than twice as many members as it had originally, and it is generally agreed that there will be approximately 20 new members in the near future. The protection once afforded by a permanent seat on the Security Council and the veto power has been greatly diluted, if not nullified, by the greatly increased power lodged in the General Assembly. Of course, that situation grew out of the unconscionable abuse by the Soviet Union of the veto power.

The United Nations has carried to the World Court, for an advisory opinion, the question of whether member nations must pay assessments for extra operations of the United Nations. The new nations which have changed the character and complexion of the United Nations do not have, between them, as many people as the largest member nation.

Indeed, that is an understatement in the light of the statement made by my colleague from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. I had not calculated it, but I know that two-thirds of them do not have as large a population as the single largest member nation.

However, by a two-thirds majority in the General Assembly, this body can change the basis of assessment and assess against the United States, on the grounds that we are the largest and wealthiest country on earth, assessments running into the billions of dollars to be expended on programs of which the majority of the people of the United States might bitterly disapprove.

This new group of so-called emerging nations were in a great hurry to bring military force to bear against Katanga. It is completely conceivable that they might order military action against some other nation that is friendly to us, opposed to Communism, and inclined to the principles of Christianity, as was Katanga. Even though such a nation might be not only one of our closest friends, but could also be an ally that we are bound by treaty to defend, the General Assembly would have the power to assess against us the greatest portion of the cost of carrying out a military attack on such a nation, if the General Assembly declared that necessary in order to maintain world peace, as was declared of the attack on Katanga.

These crusaders against disproportionate voting might well turn their attention to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

During the years I have served in this body, I have seen a great many tables and figures showing the alleged inequities which exist under some elective systems of States of the Union. Let us examine, for a moment, the disproportionate representation in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Only 3 members of the United Nations have populations exceeding 100 million people. The United States is one of those nations; yet, we have but one vote in the General Assembly. However, I am sure Senators will recall that before Russia would approve the Charter, Russia was wise enough to demand three votes in the General Assembly, and has them there today.

Our one vote represents a nation of 183 million people. Sitting with equal rights and equal power in the General Assembly is a representative, let us say, of Gabon. When a vote is had in the United Nations, each citizen of Gabon exercises 433 times the power that is exercised by the vote of a representative of the United States on behalf of one of its citizens. In other words, in the General Assembly the voting power of 433 Americans is equaled by that of 1 Gabonese.

A vote of Iceland in the United Nations, when considered from a standpoint of population, exceeds by 1,010 times the voice and the power of a citizen of the United States. Ghana's vote in the General Assembly represent 26 times the power per citizen of the vote of the United States.

In the case of Mali, it is 40 times greater.

The people of Togo have a voice in the General Assembly, per capita, which is 125 times as great as that possessed, per capita, by the people of the United States.

A citizen of Mauritania possesses there 231 times more power than a citizen of the United States.

In the case of Cyprus, it is 312 times greater than ours.

Luxembourg's vote is 554 times greater.

The vote of the Congo Republic is 218 times greater.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I think the Senator from Georgia has raised an extremely interesting point. I should like to ask him this question: If it is fair for the Soviet Union to have three votes—for example, for Byelorussia to be allowed one vote—does not the Senator from Georgia think it would be eminently fair for the sovereign State of Georgia or for the sovereign State of Texas to be given voting representation in the United Nations?

Mr. RUSSELL. Naturally, I think the sovereign State of Georgia is as much entitled to such representation in the United Nations as are some of the states which are represented there today. Furthermore, based on the resources and the size of the sovereign State of Texas, she should be entitled to two votes there. [Laughter.]

Of course, Mr. President, I shall not say how many votes Texas would have there if her representation there were based on the self-esteem of the people who live in Texas. [Laughter.]

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Does the Senator from Georgia have in mind the possibility that at some time the Supreme Court might start to find a way around the constitutional provision which gives my small but select State of New Hampshire as many Members in the U.S. Senate as the great State of Georgia or the great State of Texas has? Obviously, that constitutional provision does not measure up to the standard the Supreme Court has set in its last decision; and I am somewhat fearful that the Supreme Court might try to erode that power of the States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, if the Supreme Court were to succeed in abrogating the constitutional provision that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate, perhaps the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Vermont might join in an effort to have one Member of the Senate elected from their two States.

Furthermore, based on the electoral college, Alaska, with her population of approximately 200,000, would certainly exercise about three or four times the power per citizen that a citizen of the State of New York would exercise.

Mr. President, as I have said, a majority of the United Nations are today smaller nations, and in many cases newer nations; and this majority will be greatly increased in the immediate future.

We are already paying a larger proportion, per capita, of the operating costs, as well as of the special assessments, of the United Nations, than is any other member.

There have been no cries of protest, no shouts of outraged indignation, from the great equalizers, who have heaped praise and admiration upon the so-called Supreme Court for its most recent blow at our constitutional system.

I may say that many of these people are advocates of world government of one sort or another; and when one comes in contact with a really dedicated advocate of world government, one finds that such an advocate does not consider any cost to the U.S. taxpayers or any element of disparity in the United Nations or elsewhere.

I have been here in the Senate when, in the course of debate, Senators have risen on the floor and have pointed out that States representing, let us say, 60 percent of the population of the United States had only 12 or 14 Members of this body—I forget the exact figure used. But, bad as that is, it is not as bad as the case which can be made against the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I feel that our country is making a great mistake in being guided so often by expediency, instead of adopting, in its foreign policy, a definite principle to guide us in the United Nations and, indeed, in our foreign policy generally throughout the world. To be guided by expediency is incompatible with the role we should play as the greatest, most powerful, and most progressive civilization of the earth. Some of our representatives may feel that they are justified in abandoning their ideas of right and propriety in an effort to woo the votes of the newly emerging nations. Time and again we are told that people of color predominate numerically on this globe, and that at any cost we must maintain their friendship and their approval.

Mr. President, I desire to maintain the good will, the approval, and the friendship of every people of every race or creed throughout the world; but the shortcuts in which we have been participating, in proceeding in line with the spirit that the ends justify the means, will not, in the long run, serve our country well. Such a course will eventually subject us to blackmail in many forms that the American people will be unwilling to pay. Indeed, they are already paying blackmail in greater amounts than they should be called upon to pay.

STRANGE FOREIGN POLICY

We are living in a hectic and fast-moving world, Mr. President. Katanga may soon become a forgotten episode. But the fact that this great Nation has not had a specific foreign policy of its own, but can be bulldozed and blackmailed into supporting positions which, in our heart, we know to be wrong, will not be forgotten. It can only cause us to be looked upon with contempt and will eventually destroy our already decreasing prestige throughout the world.

Power is one element respected in every state and among every race and tribe upon this globe. If a nation has great power, but weakness of character to exercise it fairly and impartially, it will eventually lose the new friends for which we have sacrificed close friendships which have lasted over many decades and which have been sealed in blood in two world wars.

I have been very happy to see that so many men of wisdom and influence throughout this Nation are recognizing the need for a reexamination of the role of the United States in the United Nations. I repeat that I do not believe we should leave the United Nations or in any wise lessen our support of the original concept of this world organization. The United Nations was conceived originally as an instrument of negotiation and mediation for the settlement of differences on this earth by peaceful means, rather than by war. War was to be the last, final resort, after every other means had been exhausted. Every time the United States agrees to approve armed attacks instead of negotiation before all hope of peaceful settlement has been exhausted, we demean ourselves and weaken our influence throughout the globe.

I, of course, freely confess that we find ourselves in a new position within the United Nations. The fact that so many nations have been admitted to full membership before they were ready for self-government or before their economies were capable of supporting them has changed the whole complexion of this body. We have been, in a way, responsible for this by our denunciation of colonialism and by our urging the colonial powers to leave areas before the people of those areas were prepared for self-government.

Instead of a democratic or republican form of government, we find that many of these lands have already lapsed into a dictatorship. Unfortunately, any discrimination that we have shown between rulers who are endeavoring to maintain representative government and those who have established absolute dictatorships seems to be in favor of the dictators.

It is very hard for me to accept and approve the glowing tributes to the great democracy which exists in Ghana, which are being used to justify the partiality that we have shown that country in pledging the American taxpayers' dollars in order to assure the creation of a project which will cost almost $400 million in that nation. It is hard for our people to accept this when the press almost daily carries statements that the ruler of Ghana has filled the jails or driven into exile many of his political opponents and that he is exercising complete and dictatorial power in that land.

It is incomprehensible to me that those in charge of dispensing the billions of American tax dollars should have selected Ghana as the newly emerging country to provide a "showcase" of what the workings of democracy can do. The only democracy at work in Ghana today is that which is used by American taxpayers to raise the large sums that we are making available in our effort to set it apart from the rest of the world as an example of democracy.

I might amend that statement by saying I did see in the paper yesterday another slight token of democracy, when one of the members of the Cabinet in Ghana had finally induced his wife not to buy an $8,600 gold-plated bed to bring into Ghana with her. That is another evidence, I suppose, of democracy.

As a practical matter, the democracy obtaining in Ghana now is almost of the same brand of democracy that was enjoyed by Russia under the rule of the late Josef Stalin. Indeed, Nkrumah has gone further than Stalin and permits himself to be deified. I understand they teach in school that he is God. Why we should lavish such attention and shower so many tax dollars upon this dictatorship is completely beyond me. There are many other newly emerging countries where the people still have a voice in their government, and opposition and criticism are tolerated, and where people make up their own minds, that we could have made the objects of our bounty.

For some mysterious reason, Nkrumah has exercised tremendous influence, both in the Communist countries and in the West.

While I do not have the facts to establish it by evidence, there is no doubt in my own mind that the original action of Connor Cruise O'Brien in moving the United Nations into Katanga, where there was peace and quiet, to drive out what few whites remained there to help Tshombe with his government, was done by O'Brien at the demand of Nkrumah. I have a feeling he expected to be a beneficiary of the action by taking over the Congo and adding it to Ghana. He has had a great influence on our own African policy as it affects other nations, in addition to his capacity for extracting large sums of money from our representatives for Ghana herself.

I wonder if it will develop in the future that Katanga was sacrificed, not, in fact, for the welfare of the Congo, but as a part of a plan generated by the overweening ambitions of Nkrumah to extend his power over the substantial resources of that area as well as a start to become the strong man of all Africa.

It is very significant that the press has reported within the past few weeks that Connor Cruise O'Brien has gone to Ghana to become vice chancellor of the University of Ghana. It is unnecessary to ask why he was not rewarded with the chancellorship, because Nkrumah serves in that capacity, as he does in every other position of honor or power within that state.

Mr. President, there is another reason why the whole Ghanaian operation we are supporting appears to me to be fantastic, almost to the point of insanity.

It so happens that that country had an unusual and great advantage over many of the newly emerging nations, in that it was established with a substantial balance in its treasury. The British turned over to Nkrumah between $550 and $700 million at the time they divested themselves of all power of government and left Ghana. That is quite a large sum of money. If it had been properly used it could have served as the basis for economic development and for improving the health, the culture, and the welfare of the people of that nation.

Think how happy many of the other newly emerging states would have been to have had that amount of money in their treasuries to start with. Some of them could very likely have gone it alone with that amount of money, and would not have had to resort to blackmailing us into approving works projects, as Nkrumah blackmailed us in the case of the Volta development.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS IN BRAZIL

I hesitate to mention this today, and I do so with all due deference to our distinguished visitor from Brazil, but I must assert that it is incomprehensible to me why Brazil has been selected to be the first and principal beneficiary of the $20 billion Alliance for Progress program. I note in the press that the distinguished President has said here in Washington, D.C., that he is opposed to communism and to Castro. That, of course, is pleasing propaganda for the ears of the American people, but I cannot refrain from expressing my regret that some of that attitude was not reflected by votes and action at the Punta del Este Conference. Both there and in other meetings of the Organization of American States, Brazil has been very consistent in voting against every issue our Nation has espoused.

It seems to me that it would have been much more reassuring to our friends if we had selected some Latin American country which had been consistently friendly to us as the first country to receive huge grants of funds extracted from the American taxpayers.

I also feel that it is my duty to point out that the Alliance for Progress program was sold to the Congress and to the American people as a cooperative venture designed to bring about internal reformation of the economic, social, and political systems of our sister states in this hemisphere, and that those who made such reforms were to be the beneficiaries of this program.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have one more statement and then I shall yield.

I wish to modify my statement in regard to how the program was sold. It was sold to the American people on this theory. It is unnecessary to have any theory whatever to sell to the majority of the Congress any measure which has as its purpose transferring American tax dollars to foreign states. Members of Congress will vote for such a program without a theory.

I now yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Did the Senator from Georgia indicate the amount of money which has been allocated for aid to Brazil during the first year of the Alliance for Progress?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry; I do not have that figure.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It is $342 million.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is from the $500 million which is available.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from Georgia think that $342 million is an excessive amount to pay to one republic in South America?

Mr. RUSSELL. My friend from Idaho must forgive me for being old fashioned. I am one of those who still think we should consider our own interests, occasionally, in dealing with these questions. For my part, I say—and I say it with some regret, because the distinguished President of Brazil is in our country—that Brazil would have been at the bottom of the list to receive funds, so far as I am concerned.

I am more convinced of that since having read the address of the President of Brazil delivered an hour or so ago to this Congress. He says:

> If the Alliance for Progress is to depend upon an effort by the Latin American countries to achieve global planning with absolute technical precision in the economic and social fields and to eliminate beforehand certain factors of instability, we can introduce hindrances capable of impairing the urgency of solutions which cannot be put off. Such difficulties will mount if the Alliance fails to reflect, principally, the spirit of reciprocal trust and respect between the countries which comprise it, in line with the purposes expressed by the eminent President Kennedy.

In this country we would say there is considerable gobbledygook in the statement. I gather that the President of Brazil feels that all the talk which we have been given about tax reform, reform of economic systems, political systems, and perhaps other systems in South American countries does not amount to anything. So far as he is concerned, he does not intend to do anything about it.

I suppose he is doing that to assure that he will get the $342 million instead of the $120 million-odd I heard mentioned today.

It has been very noticeable that when a foreign country speaks out very sternly to us, we immediately brush aside any possible obstacles to get the money to them in a hurry.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. We are debating in this body this week the question of whether the United Nations needs this unusual financial help from the United States. The Senator from Georgia and every other Senator who is acquainted with the facts knows that if the United Nations has been losing its prestige and if it has become more impotent in its activities throughout the world, it is essentially because we have not insisted upon self-help and full cooperation from all the countries signatory to the United Nations Charter. We have deliberately caused this weakness to develop.

We are now asked to provide some emergency relief.

I ask the Senator from Georgia if it is not that the same likely thing will happen in South America, where, as every Member of the Senate knows, there is a great threat of Communist infiltration?

The President outlined the Alliance for Progress program, which requires drastic reforms in land and tax policies. The Senator from Montana, the majority leader, was a member of a group of which I also was a member which, last fall, visited in Brazil. I am sure the Senator will verify what I say. We found absolutely no evidence of any intention to implement the self-help features which were a part of the Alliance-for Progress program.

Today we are asked to embark upon another alarming program. Inevitably weakness will develop, unless we insist upon cooperative features. The Alliance for Progress program is foredoomed to failure if softness is displayed by our Government. We did likewise with respect to the United Nations. We have done it throughout the years in our foreign aid program.

I ask the Senator if there is not a likelihood that the same situation will inevitably develop in South America? By pouring in our billions of dollars, we shall not actually strengthen and fortify those countries, but we shall weaken them, because we shall encourage them to rely more and more upon financial aid provided by the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unless they carry out in good faith the reforms which were suggested by our President, the only effect of the program can be to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, and to engender more "buyers" of communism and unrest in those lands.

Mr. President, if we do not stand fast in requiring the recipients of these funds to make the reforms which have been so eloquently outlined by President Kennedy, it will be the most prodigious waste of American tax money in all history to send money into the South American countries.

What has Brazil done to bring about the reforms which have been so eloquently outlined and which were supposed to be the standard of eligibility of a country to be a beneficiary? The Senator says that Brazil is to be the principal beneficiary. A large sum was involved. I do not remember exactly what the sum was.

It so happens that I was in a small Central American country when it was announced that Brazil was supposed to receive $342 million of the $500 million. I had an appointment to see the President that same morning.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The original plan was to provide only $100 million for Brazil. How the amount increased from $100 million to $342 million I do not know.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amount involved was more than $100 million. It was last fall. The President of that country has been one of the best friends this country has ever had. He has shown friendship in every possible way, even to the point of risking the security of his country by doing so. He said that some Cabinet members had just left his office and, after hearing of the huge amount given Brazil, had told him—and he was inclined to agree—that the only way to get any money out of the United States was to denounce us on every possible occasion and to vote against us in the OAS and in the United Nations at every opportunity. He said he had never done so, but Brazil had, and Brazil was the principal beneficiary under the plan.

The President said that the purpose of the program was to create an economic and political climate in which every citizen might have a better opportunity to improve his lot in life, and in which the free enterprise system might flourish. I have not heard about the economic changes that have been taking place in Brazil. I do not say that such changes have not taken place, but they have not been reported in the American press. I read the newspapers very carefully. It is quite clear that the President's suggestion that American capital might be brought in to help those people provide jobs has not been taken very seriously, nor is the private enterprise system regarded with any particular favor in Brazil.

In the past 2 weeks two Brazilian utilities financed by outside capital have been expropriated.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not possible that the current liberality being displayed by the administration in providing foreign aid for Brazil and other countries may be reflected in the fact that during the first 3 months of this year we lost approximately 280 million gold dollars, and that during the last week in March, which is very recent, the loss of our gold dollars amounted to $100 million, the largest loss in a single week in more than 20 years? Is it not possible that a deliberate effort is being made to sabotage the solidarity and security of our financial system by handing out dollars that we do not have at a time when our gold dollars are going out of the Treasury at a rate faster than they have flowed for several years, notwithstanding assurances from the President and spokesmen of the administration that they are on top of the problem and have stopped the outflow of gold?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot believe that any responsible official of our Government is deliberately sabotaging our economy, but I think we are taking some steps that are very unwise. I do not challenge the integrity and good faith of any of those who are handling the program. But I do say that it is completely unjustified to select a country like Brazil and to pour out to that country vast sums of money while it is expropriating private property belonging to citizens of this country and Canada and refusing to conform to the standards that have been laid down.

Mr. President, instead of constantly increasing our program of shipping our dollars abroad, it is time for us to exercise some discrimination and to consider the interest and welfare of the American people. Under the bankruptcy laws of this country, as they existed at the time I was practicing law—which was a good while ago—if the same rule were applied to the Federal Government as is applied to an individual, this country would be hopelessly insolvent and could be forced into involuntary bankruptcy.

We have given away our assets at a time when we do not have sufficient gold to meet the dollar credits in foreign hands, and to assure the gold reserve of our currency at the 25 percent required by law. It would be impossible for us to meet the demands of our creditors for gold if they were all presented simultaneously.

I realize that there are many who think that a large national debt such as the one we have is a good thing for the country, and therefore they have no concern about having it increased from year to year. I have also heard able men make a strong case to prove that gold is a wholly unnecessary commodity to help sustain a stable economy in this country.

For my part, I cannot accept either thesis. To me it is the height of folly to increase continually our foreign spending program, particularly to Communist countries or neutralists who have no use whatever for us. I cannot refrain from feeling that to increase foreign aid and other foreign spending from year to year will make inevitable a day of accounting; and even if it is postponed for several years, it will present to the next generation problems that will be well nigh insoluble. When our economy feels the full impact of the shortsighted policy that we have pursued for the past 10 or 12 years, our institutions will be shaken to their very foundations; and, indeed, a complete change in our form of government could be brought about.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I was very much interested in the comments of the Senator about the basic concepts of reform that should underlie our contributions to the Alliance for Progress. I ask the Senator whether in his opinion one of those reforms was not the practice of fiscal integrity by the government concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I recall, that was one of the standards that was set. I do not remember all of them. I know that the general purpose was to bring about economic and political reform which would give the citizens of our sister republics a greater opportunity to enjoy some of the good things of modern-day life, and prevent the complete concentration of all the wealth of the country. I understand that unlimited resources are in the hands of a very small percentage of the people of some of those countries.

So far I have not seen any evidence of great enthusiasm on the part of many of those countries for making themselves eligible under the program. If we proceed to dump the money appropriated under the program into Brazil's lap at a time when the President of that country has said that there is doubt about whether it is wise even to attempt reform, we shall have killed any chance of inducing any reforms anywhere.

Mr. MILLER. What the Senator has said is also my understanding.

I should like to ask a further question of the Senator. In a program for the reformation of a government, so that it would practice fiscal integrity, reduce or minimize inflation, collect taxes adequately, and do the things that good businessmen do, would it not be relevant to inquire whether or not such a government was paying its bills to the United Nations?

Mr. RUSSELL. That would be one piece of evidence, at least.

Mr. MILLER. Would it not be relevant to inquire whether that nation had good intentions with respect to paying its bills under the Alliance for Progress program and with respect to repaying loans under the Alliance for Progress, and to ask for evidence of its attitude with respect to paying its bills to the United Nations? Would that question not be relevant?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that would be evidence as to the stability and intention of a nation to discharge its part in a cooperative venture such as is envisioned by the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, we defray almost one-half of all the expenses and assessments of the United Nations. Many other nations that are the recipients of our aid program are put in a position to pay their assessments because we have assumed the cost of so many of their domestic projects as to give them free money for this purpose.

I would be the first to oppose any suggestion that our country seek to impose its will by force upon any people, particularly a weak and new state with all of the problems of establishing government and building a viable economy. I do believe, however, Mr. President, that we have made a great mistake, which is being repeated year after year, of not giving specific recognition in our aid program to those nations who respect us and who, through a community of interests or of aims for our respective peoples, support us in and out of season in the United Nations and in other associations of states to which we are a party. If a country proclaims itself as a neutralist, we apparently accept the statement without question, even though it may consistently oppose us in every field of international relations and show strong friendship for the Soviet and never see anything wrong with Soviet behavior. In my view, those who are quick to suspect the United States and to close their eyes to the many untoward actions of Soviet Russia, in my judgment, are not true neutralists, whatever they may call themselves.

If we do not adopt a policy of recognizing our friends before we recognize our enemies before our dollars are exhausted and the last bar of gold has been taken from Fort Knox, we will find ourselves standing alone at some future day when we are confronted with the dire peril to our institutions and our people being overrun or destroyed by the Soviet Union.

In my judgment it would be a very healthy development for this country to examine what goes on in many of these countries who have posted on their front door the sign "Neutralist." It would be even better and would enhance our position in the United Nations and in all other organizations if we would begin to initiate some selectivity in our foreign relations which favors our friends. Every other country on earth measures its relations with the world in concrete and concise terms of its own national interest.

The hour is late. In my opinion we have already wasted many billions of dollars, but it is not too late to reconsider the course we have pursued to date and to initiate a program of our own, conceived in America and directed to the promotion of our own enlightened self-interest.

Coming down to the immediate issue, I submit that the substitute I have proposed is adequate to see the United Nations through its present financial difficulties. It will not put the stamp of approval upon precipitate military action which resulted in the conquest of Katanga and the death or maiming of so many of the men, women, and children of that tortured state.

It will be notice to the nations of the world that we expect other peoples to contribute more, not only to the operating costs of the United Nations, but, when they are able to do so, also to the stability and the development of the emerging nations.

It will avoid the danger, which to me is very clear and real, of providing the United Nations with a financial reserve for any future military action at a time when unstable forces are exercising undue influence in that body.

Above all, Mr. President, it restates the authority of the Congress of the United States to be consulted and to take action before our sons may be ordered to foreign lands to die in battle, perhaps, over issues that could be settled peaceably by a proper exercise of patience and persistence.

I believe it will help to restore our own self-respect and national dignity, and will help regain the respect of other nations of the earth. It will manifest our intention to continue to contribute to the peaceful settlement of disputes everywhere in the world, but will reaffirm our determination not to permit our sons, some of whom have been called into military service against their desires, to be used as gladiators in the arena of the whole world, unless such action has been found necessary in the manner prescribed by our Constitution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia for the high caliber of his approach to the pending question, which is the matter of a $100 million loan to the United Nations to see it through its temporary difficulties.

The Senator from Georgia has made a speech in the best traditions of the Senate, with respect to the proposal concerning the U.N. loan, which is now before us. He has made a distinct contribution to a deeper understanding of the real issues involved. He has stated again, as he has on many previous occasions to my knowledge, that he is not an enemy of the United Nations and that he does not want to see it destroyed.

I am delighted by the emphasis he has placed on the peacekeeping functions of that body. By his pointing out the difficulties which are inherent in the one-vote, one-state formula, there may in time be a correction, especially if greater stress is laid on peaceful settlement. This Nation, the great majority of the Members of the Senate, and the people of this country feel the U.N. has a worthwhile place in the affairs of mankind. There may be the beginnings of a return to accompanying decisions with responsibilities if we accept the United Nations for what it was meant to be in the charter. I am sure the great majority in this body is behind the idea of the concept of the United Nations and recognize its great worthiness, despite the changes which have occurred since its inception.

Perhaps through discussions such as this on the United Nations, it may be possible to bring about a reexamination of the role and the responsibility of the Security Council in the light of its original form, and perhaps a reassessment of the preponderant role which the United Nations General Assembly has undertaken in recent years, and undertaken, I believe, at the behest and to a large extent on the basis of the urgings of our own country.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia deserves to be commended and complimented for facing up to the problem and making his views known. We are in disagreement, as we both understand, on many aspects of this problem, but at least the Senator from Georgia has exercised the right of every Senator to give voice to his own expressions, to lay them on the table, and to present them to the Senate for consideration, for debate, and for a final vote. So again, my congratulations and my commendations.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will indulge me, I should like to repeat one of the oldest Latin maxims taught me by my father. He said that it is always sweet to be praised by those who are themselves praised. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

EXHIBIT 1

THE UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1945, AS AMENDED

(Text of Public Law 264, 79th Congress (S. 1580), 59 Stat. 619, approved December 20, 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, 81st Congress (H.R. 4708), 63 Stat. 734, approved October 10, 1949)

An act to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "United Nations Participation Act of 1945".

Sec. 2.[1] (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative and a deputy representative of the United States to the United Nations, both of whom shall have the rank and status of envoy extraordinary and ambassador plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative and deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and may serve ex officio as United States representative on any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies of the United Nations, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may from time to time direct.

(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint an additional deputy representative of the United States to the Security Council who shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such deputy representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the event of the absence or disability of both the representative and the deputy representative of the United States to the United Nations.

(c) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall designate from time to time to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations not to exceed five representatives of the United States and such number of alternates as he may determine consistent with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. One of the representatives shall be designated as the senior representative.

(d) The President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, but the representative of the United States in the Economic and Social Council and in the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations shall be appointed only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, except that the President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act, without additional compensation, as the representative of the United States in either such Council (A) at any specified session thereof where the position is vacant or in the absence or disability of the regular representative, or (B) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified session of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The President may designate any officer of the Department of State, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the absence or disability of the representative and deputy representatives appointed under section 2 (a) and (b) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter. The advice and consent of the Senate shall be required for the appointment by the President of the representative of the United States in any commission that may be formed by the United Nations with respect to atomic energy or in any other commission of the United Nations to which the United States is entitled to appoint a representative.

(e) Nothing contained in this section shall preclude the President or the Secretary of State, at the direction of the President, from representing the United States at any meeting or session of any organ or agency of the United Nations.

(f) All persons appointed in pursuance of authority contained in this section shall receive compensation at rates determined by the President upon the basis of duties to be performed but not in excess of rates authorized by sections 411 and 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, Seventy-ninth Congress) for chiefs of mission and Foreign Service officers occupying positions of equivalent importance, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated under subsections (c) and (d) of this section as a representative of the United States or as an alternate to attend any specified session or specified sessions of the General Assembly shall be entitled to receive such compensation.

Sec. 3.[2] The representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, when representing the United States in the respective organs and agencies of the United Nations, shall, at all times, act in accordance with the instructions of the President transmitted by the Secretary of State unless other means of transmission is directed by the President, and such representatives shall, in accordance with such instructions, cast any and all votes under the Charter of the United Nations.

Sec. 4.[3] The President shall, from time to time as occasion may require, but not less than once each year, make reports to the Congress of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein. He shall make special current reports on decisions of the Security Council to take enforcement measures under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, and on the participation therein, under his instructions, of the representative of the United States.

Sec. 5.[4] (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, whenever the United States is called upon by the Security Council to apply measures which said Council has decided, pursuant to article 41 of said Charter, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions under said Charter, the President may, to the extent necessary to apply such measures, through any agency which he may designate, and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, in whole or in part, economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication between any foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

---

[1] 22 U.S.C. § 287.

[2] 22 U.S.C. § 287a.

[3] 22 U.S.C. § 287b.

[4] 22 U.S.C. § 287c.

(b) Any person who willfully violates or evades or attempts to violate or evade any order, rule, or regulation issued by the President pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or, if a natural person, be imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both; and the officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation or evasion shall be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both, and any property, funds, securities, papers, or other articles or documents, or any vessel, together with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and equipment, or vehicle, or aircraft, concerned in such violation shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. 6.[5] The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate Act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the armed forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That, except as authorized in section 7 of this Act, nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

SEC. 7.[6] (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President, upon the request by the United Nations for cooperative action, and to the extent that he finds that it is consistent with the national interest to comply with such request, may authorize, in support of such activities of the United Nations as are specifically directed to the peaceful settlement of disputes and not involving the employment of armed forces contemplated by chapter VII of the United Nations Charter—

(1) the detail to the United Nations, under such terms and conditions as the President shall determine, of personnel of the armed forces of the United States to serve as observers, guards, or in any noncombatant capacity, but in no event shall more than a total of one thousand of such personnel be so detailed at any one time: *Provided*, That while so detailed, such personnel shall be considered for all purposes as acting in the line of duty, including the receipt of pay and allowances as personnel of the armed forces of the United States, credit for longevity and retirement, and all other perquisites appertaining to such duty: *Provided further*, That upon authorization or approval by the President, such personnel may accept directly from the United Nations (a) any or all of the allowances or perquisites to which they are entitled under the first proviso hereof, and (b) extraordinary expenses and perquisites incident to such detail;

(2) the furnishing of facilities, services, or other assistance and the loan of the agreed fair share of the United States of any supplies and equipment to the United Nations by the National Military Establishment, under such terms and conditions as the President shall determine;

(3) the obligation, insofar as necessary to carry out the purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of this subsection, of any funds appropriated to the National Military Establishment or any department therein, the procurement of such personnel, supplies, equipment, facilities, services, or other assistance as may be made available in accordance with the request of the United Nations, and the replacement of such items, when necessary, where they are furnished from stocks.

(b) Whenever personnel or assistance is made available pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (a) (1) and (2) of this section, the President shall require reimbursement from the United Nations for the expense thereby incurred by the United States: *Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances, or when the President finds it to be in the national interest, he may waive, in whole or in part, the requirement of such reimbursement: *Provided further*, That when any such reimbursement is made, it shall be credited, at the option of the appropriate department of the National Military Establishment, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the purposes for which expenditures were made.

(c) In addition to the authorization of appropriations to the Department of State contained in section 8 of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Military Establishment, or any department therein, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse such Establishment or department in the event that reimbursement from the United Nations is waived in whole or in part pursuant to authority contained in subsection (b) of this section.

(d) Nothing in this Act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure is prohibited by any other law of the United States.

SEC. 8.[7] There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the United Nations as apportioned by the General Assembly in accordance with article 17 of the Charter, and for all necessary salaries and expenses of the representatives provided for in section 2 hereof, and of their appropriate staffs, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, the Travel Expense Act of 1949, and section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1933, as amended, and, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, travel expenses of families and transportation of effects of United States representatives and other personnel in going to and returning from their post of duty; allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the Act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U.S.C. 118a); cost-of-living allowances for personnel stationed abroad under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; communications services; stenographic reporting, translating, and other services, by contract; hire of passenger motor vehicles and other local transportation; rent of offices; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111); allowances and expenses as provided in section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946 (Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress), and allowances and expenses equivalent to those provided in section 901(3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, Seventy-ninth Congress); the lease or rental (for periods not exceeding ten years) of living quarters for the use of the representative of the United States to the United Nations referred to in paragraph (a) of section 2 hereof, the cost of installation and use of telephones in the same manner as telephone service is provided for use of the Foreign Service pursuant to the Act of August 23, 1912, as amended (31 U.S.C. 679), and the allotment of funds, similar to the allotment authorized by section 902 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, for unusual expenses incident to the operation and maintenance of such living quarters, to be accounted for in accordance with section 903 of said Act; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State; all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5).

CHAPTER VII—ACTION WITH RESPECT TO THREATS TO THE PEACE, BREACHES OF THE PEACE, AND ACTS OF AGGRESSION

ARTICLE 39

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

ARTICLE 40

In order to prevent an aggravation of the situation, the Security Council may, before making the recommendations or deciding upon the measures provided for in Article 39, call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable. Such provisional measures shall be without prejudice to the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. The Security Council shall duly take account of failure to comply with such provisional measures.

ARTICLE 41

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

ARTICLE 42

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 43

1. All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special

---

[5] 22 U.S.C. § 287d.

[6] 22 U.S.C. § 287d-1.

[7] 22 U.S.C. § 287e.

agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

ARTICLE 44

When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a Member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfillment of the obligations assumed under Article 43, invite that Member, if the Member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces.

ARTICLE 45

In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, Members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in Article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

ARTICLE 46

Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

ARTICLE 47

1. There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament.

2. The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any Member of the United Nations not permanently represented on the Committee shall be invited by the Committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities requires the participation of that Member in its work.

3. The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. Questions relating to the command of such forces shall be worked out subsequently.

4. The Military Staff Committee, with the authorization of the Security Council and after consultation with appropriate regional agencies, may establish regional subcommittees.

ARTICLE 48

1. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

2. Such decisions shall be carried out by the Members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members.

ARTICLE 49

The Members of the United Nations shall join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.

ARTICLE 50

If preventive or enforcement measures against any state are taken by the Security Council, any other state, whether a Member of the United Nations or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of those measures shall have the right to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems.

ARTICLE 51

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 4, 1962]

MR. MANSFIELD ON THE U.N.

As a good friend of the United Nations, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD now has spoken out in significant and somber terms against certain weaknesses of the world organization. What he has in mind most of all is not its financial difficulties, which surely are serious enough, but its internal structural and political distortions, which are potentially very grave.

Similar concern has been voiced in recent weeks by such other stanch friends of the U.N. as Senators HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, AIKEN, of Vermont, and JACKSON, of Washington. Like Mr. MANSFIELD, and with good reason, they have asked stern questions about the wisdom and sanity of letting critical decisions be taken on the basis of "one-state-one-vote procedure in a General Assembly of 104 nations, ranging in population from 175,000 in the smallest to 407 million in one of the largest." Many of these member states are new, relatively primitive, politically unsophisticated, and otherwise woefully inexperienced or backward. Yet, in terms of voting, they have as much weight in the Assembly as our own country or the U.S.S.R.

Further, these international newcomers like to throw that weight around—often in an insufferably self-righteous manner, and quite recklessly and absurdly in relation to ancient, highly civilized lands. This amounts to a major U.N. weakness that has led Mr. JACKSON, for example, to speak out as he has against the highly dubious wisdom, if not fatuousness, of our own Government's policy—a policy aimed at currying the favor of world opinion—of voting with the mass of the fledgling, immature nations against NATO allies like Portugal and Belgium on issues such as Angola and the Congo. Certainly, in Mr. MANSFIELD's words, this is one of the distortions that threaten to make the United Nations innocuous at best or lead to its extinction at worst. To quote him further:

"That outcome is not what successive Presidents and Secretaries of State—of both parties—have said is in the best interests of this Nation. They have all stressed the importance of a strong and vital United Nations.

"Yet the prospect for such an outcome is there, and it is looming larger. It will not go away if we delude ourselves with the belief that it does not exist. It will not disappear if the Senator from Washington, the Senator from Iowa, and the Senator from Vermont are buried under an avalanche of highly unjustified criticism for having the temerity to discuss aspects of the problem.

"The possibility is ever present, under the one-state-one-vote formula, that we shall, at some time, find some involvement (in the U.N.) totally inacceptable. So we ask ourselves, What then? Do the lights then go out in the General Assembly, as they have already gone out in the Security Council? Do we then take the lead in putting them out?

"This * * * is the deeper crisis in the United Nations. It is the crisis of a moribund Security Council where, under the charter, decisions could be coupled realistically with the real and proportionate responsibilities of the various nations. It is the crisis of a General Assembly which has been subtracting from its enormous potential of moral force as it has presumed to add to itself the functions of the Security Council * * * under procedures which invite disrespect."

Coming from the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, these are words of more than passing import. He continues to be a strong supporter of the U.N., but he obviously is full of misgivings about its drift, and this reflects a widespread feeling in America. Other member nations, particularly the new ones, would be well advised not to pooh-pooh the significance of that fact. It could turn out to be much bigger than they may imagine at the moment.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the issue before us today goes far beyond the immediate question of the United Nations financial crisis. It goes beyond the specific method which may be adopted to empower the President to help overcome that crisis.

The underlying question is the place of the United Nations in our national policy, and the acceptance of responsibility for financial support of the United Nations by its members.

Last Sunday morning I had occasion to raise this question in a speech to the graduate student council of Catholic University. The title of my address was "The United Nations—Is It Worth It?" Commenting on the question of financial responsibility, I said:

> The United Nations isn't worth it unless it is worth it to the other nations as well as to ourselves. * * * It is fundamental that the United Nations is not worth it unless there is a chance that it can work, and it won't work unless its members believe in it and are willing to contribute to its resources and to give it support.

Mr. President, the basic objective of the proposed bond issue was to get the extraordinary expenses of the United Nations into the regular budget where the members would be subject to the charter penalty for failure to pay. I am in fundamental agreement with that objective, because I believe it is essential that the members of the United Nations, who have accepted the obligations of the principles of the organization, must accept financial responsibility. Both the committee recommendation and the compromise proposal meet the objective.

We should also note that however the loan or bond issue is handled, the ultimate effect of the shift in extraordinary U.N. expenses to the regular budget will reduce our proportion of the cost from 47.5 percent to 32.02 percent. This makes sense from our point of view and it makes sense from the point of view of the United Nations.

Mr. President, because of the questions which have been raised about the place of the United Nations in our national policy, and because my observations may serve a useful purpose in indicating the point-of-view of one Member of the Senate on this critical issue, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks to the graduate student council, Catholic University, April 1, 1962, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The United Nations—Is It Worth It?

(Remarks by Hon. Edmund S. Muskie, a Senator from Maine, to the Graduate Student Council, Catholic University, Washington, D.C., April 1, 1962)

The subject, in this form, was suggested to me by your program committee.

"The United Nations—Is It Worth It?"

My first response to the question in this form is another question: "Is it worth what?" Is there a cost, in connection with our association with the United Nations, with which we should be concerned.

Is the United Nations worth the financial support which we give to its regular budget? The regular budget for 1962 is a little over $74 million of which we will be assessed 32.02 percent.

Is the United Nations worth the cost of supporting its peacemaking operations in the Congo? The alternative might have been a direct confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. The cost of these operations, since their beginning in July 1960, has averaged out at about $10 million per month. Of this cost, the United States has contributed 47½ percent.

Is the United Nations worth the cost of supporting the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East? This operation has had the mission of stabilizing the situation in the Middle East since the Suez crisis and has had substantial success. This cost has been running at about $20 million a year, of which the United States has contributed 45.98 percent.

Is the United Nations worth the cost of supporting the various voluntary programs? For example, there is the United Nations expanded technical assistance program and special fund, with a 1961 goal of $150 million, and a United States share of 40 percent. Its purpose is to enlist the resources of other western nations to assist developing nations.

The United Nations Children's Fund, known as UNICEF, runs at about $22 million a year, with a United States share of 44 percent.

When we are asked, "Is it worth it?" is it these sums of money with which the question is primarily concerned? Are they so large as to be burdensome, in and of themselves? Although they are large sums from the point of view of the taxpayer, they are not excessive in the context of our own Defense budget of about $50 billion and our own foreign-aid program of $4 to $5 billion.

What, then, is behind the question? Does it refer to the effort in manpower and energy which might be used elsewhere, the frustrations and the disappointments with which the United Nations has been involved? I doubt that these have been of such a disproportionate order of magnitude when compared with the effort, frustrations, and disappointments which have been involved in other ventures designed to promote peace in the troubled postwar world.

"Is it worth it?" Is the questioner concerned with certain risks which may be involved in our association with the United Nations?

Senator Henry Jackson, of Washington, raised some questions along this line within the past 2 weeks which have stirred up controversy. He wonders whether or not the United Nations absorbs a disproportionate amount of the energies of our highest officials—often devoted to defensive actions, trying to defeat this or that ill-advised resolution, rather than on more constructive programs. He wonders whether or not the tendency to bring every issue to a vote tends to sharpen and even exaggerate points at issue and emphasize divisions of opinion rather than possibilities for agreement. He wonders whether or not the United Nations makes too much of talk and too little of deeds, thus "drumbeating every nerve-tingling issue." He wonders whether or not concern with the United Nations and its deliberations is given undue weight in our national policy formulation.

And so, Senator Jackson raises three questions:

1. Do our present relations with the United Nations assist the wise definition of our vital interests and the establishment of sound policies?

2. Do we sometimes defer to the United Nations in the hope we may somehow escape the inescapable dilemmas of leadership?

3. Are we failing to make the most of the United Nations by encouraging it to attempt too much?

These are not unfriendly questions. They are entirely appropriate questions. It cannot be successfully denied that the United Nations has fallen short of perfection. Under these circumstances, any questions intelligently designed and motivated to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations should be applauded, not criticized. It should be borne in mind that, if the answers to the questions raised by Senator Jackson were unfavorable to the status quo, we would not have proven that the United Nations has no value, but rather that its value would be enhanced if it were modified in some respects.

Is it worth it? The questioner may have had in mind the following: "In such an international organization isn't there an implicit diminution of our sovereignty, a dilution of our ability to defend ourselves and to insure our security which create an unacceptable danger to our vital interests?" The alternatives, of course, are isolationism or reliance upon the old power alliances, which themselves raise comparable questions of equal gravity.

I do not think we can really answer the question of the United Nations worth without giving some thought to the kind of world we would like to have and the obstacles on the road to achieving it.

The United Nations was born in 1942, when 26 nations signed the declaration which affirmed their union against the Axis Powers. The charter was signed by 50 nations in June of 1945 and went into force on October 24, 1945. There are now 104 members, not including Germany and Communist China, among others.

What were the aims of the charter nations?

Let us read the preamble of the United Nations Charter:

"We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women of nations large and small; and

"To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained; and

"To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom; and

"For these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors; and

"To unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest; and

"To employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples,

"Have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims."

Is it worth it? Certainly these aims are worth it. The peoples of the charter nations believed in them with a purity and clarity refined in the crucible of a war from which they were emerging.

If all the peoples of the earth today were given an opportunity to reply in concert to a question raising the worthwhileness of these aims, they would answer with a thundering, "Yea".

The real question, in my judgment, is not, "Is it worth it?", but rather, "Can it do the job?" I think we have demonstrated that if, through the United Nations, we are pursuing the noble aims of that organization, and, however slight progress toward them may have been in the past, we have prospects for some progress in the future, then the United Nations is worth it. The financial costs are worth it. The risks are worth it. But the "if" is a big one.

Can it work?

The four basic purposes of the United Nations as stated in the charter are (1) to maintain international peace and security; (2) to develop friendly relations among nations, based on the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples; (3) to encourage the achievement of international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character; and (4) to serve as a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

The most important of these objectives is the maintenance of international peace and security. But before we explore the performance and promise of the United Nations in that vital area, let us examine the record of the world organization in the other three categories of its purposes.

The development of friendly relations among nations is difficult to measure in objective terms. Like all human relationships, personal and collective, the relationships of nations are fluid. We cannot measure national interchanges in the same way we can chart the metabolism of an organism, the temperature of a furance, or the orbit of a satellite.

But we can say, I think, that an organization of nations which has grown from 50 members in 1945 to 104 members, today, demonstrates a substantial trend toward self-determination. The fact that each of these nations, large or small, has an equal voice in the General Assembly—no matter how inconvenient such equality may be for us from time to time—is a remarkable achievement in a world dominated by monumental power struggles.

The growth of friendly relations depends to a large degree on the successes we may have in breaking the ancient barriers of ignorance, suspicion, poverty and disease. Outside the halls of the General Assembly and beyond the chambers of the Security Council, the United Nations has carried out the mundane tasks of eradicating disease, easing hunger, caring for the refugees, providing for the needs of children, stimulating education, encouraging economic and fiscal stability, aiding scientific cooperation, and providing vehicles for international conferences and programs on such varied subjects as labor and civil aviation. Its Human Rights Commission has been a moral force in encouraging the recognition of such rights in many areas of the world.

The alphabets of WHO (World Health Organization), UNICEF (United Nations Childrens Fund), FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization), UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration), IRO (International Refugee Organization), SUNFED (Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development), ILO (International Labor Organization), and IMF (International Monetary Fund) represent a broad range of cooperative international ventures which would have been improbable if not impossible without the United Nations.

In my opinion, even if the United Nations had no other function than the stimulation of international cooperation in those areas of human need and interest unassociated with power politics, it would have a vital place in our world. In the long run, the relatively unpublicized work of the United Nations agencies in health, education, science, welfare, cultural interchange, economic development and adjustment, and human rights may be the most effective means of establishing true international understanding. Where men and women can work together for common goals which enhance the dignity of man they will learn the true meaning of brotherhood.

Increasingly, the United Nations is achieving its purpose of harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends, both through the cooperative agencies and organizations and the Economic and Social Council, and through the encouragement of such enterprises as the International Atomic Energy Agency and the International Geophysical Year.

It remains to be seen whether the United Nations will be able to harmonize the actions of the nations in the attainment of international peace and security.

Understandably, it is the peacekeeping or peacemaking machinery of the U.N. which carries the greatest burden of responsibility. It is in this area of activity that it is judged most severely.

The recent debate, apparently about to be resolved, over the proposed United Nations bond issue, highlights this fact. Part of the opposition to the bond issue is made up of those who oppose the United Nations per se. However, the chief participants in the debate, on both sides of the issue, have been those who believe in the United Nations but who disagree as to the best means for giving it necessary financial assistance at this time.

The chief criticism of the United Nations by those who have opposed the bond issue is that other nations are too ready to avoid their obligations to contribute, too ready to let Uncle Sam carry the load. They argue that the bond issue would encourage such nations to believe that Uncle Sam will bail them out always. It is argued by some of these critics that we should not enter into a long-term financing scheme until the United Nations is reorganized and payment of dues is made an absolute condition of membership.

On the other side of the question, the proponents for the bond issue argue that it would make support of such peacemaking operations as those in the Congo a part of the regular budget and thus bolster the principle or collective financial responsibility for United Nations operations; that repayment over 25 years would allow most members to pay without hardship.

Implicit, therefore, in all of these arguments, pro and con, is general agreement that the United Nations isn't worth it unless it is worth it to the other nations as well as to ourselves.

On this point, it is timely to refer to pertinent provisions of the United Nations Charter.

Article II of the Charter states:

"All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter."

The following provision is also found in Article II:

"All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter."

Article IV, containing the requirements for membership, is also pertinent:

"Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

All the present members of the United Nations, then, have accepted the obligations of the Charter, and have been found able and willing to carry out these obligations. Thus if the United Nations is worth it to them, there is no excuse for any failure on their part to support it.

In the very first session of the General Assembly in 1946 consideration was given to the question of assessing the costs of the organization. It was decided that, in general, costs should be shared on the basis of capacity to pay. The United States objected to the literal application of this standard for two reasons: (1) That because the equality of the sovereign members is recognized by equal votes in the General Assembly, no one state should pay a disproportionate share of the costs; and (2) it would not be good for one member to pay such a large share lest it have a predominating influence on the activities of the organization. And so, the General Assembly fixed a ceiling which started at 39.89 percent, which later dropped to 33.33 percent, and which is now 32.03 percent, on the amount which should be paid by any one member. It also fixed a floor of 0.04 percent.

Thus, it was recognized, at the very outset that the United Nations, if it is to succeed, must not be the financial ward of any one nation, and must be supported by all nations. However much we believe in its aims, we must recognize this principle as essential.

And so, it is fundamental that the United Nations is not worth it unless there is a chance that it can work, and it won't work unless its members believe in it and are willing to contribute to its resources and to give it support.

There are two other serious questions affecting the United Nations which ought to be considered by anyone interested in evaluating its future potential.

First, do we rely too heavily on the international organization in situations that affect our national interests? Is there a serious risk in entrusting the pursuit of important national interests to a mechanism the next twists and turns of which one cannot predict?

I doubt that these questions can be answered by a generalization. Only a case-by-case review of the crises, which have confronted the world since the United Nations was created, would give us a valid answer. I am sure that following such a review, it might be concluded that, in some instances, we have relied upon the United Nations too little, and in others, too much. I think it has been our general policy to use it as another tool, an important tool, in the arsenal for peace.

The United Nations Charter itself recognizes this—that in the world of reality in which we live, the Organization itself will not be, and should not be, the exclusive tool. The charter recognizes regional arrangements such as NATO, and the Organization of Latin American States.

We have continued to use the normal channels of diplomacy and other approaches to nations with different points of view in an effort to accommodate those differences and to relieve tension.

To put all of our eggs in the United Nations basket would be a serious mistake. The United Nations cannot yet carry that kind of responsibility and it would be suicidal for us to entrust that kind of responsibility to it.

Therefore, it is highly appropriate that we review the charter and our experience under it, with a view to determining whether it is as effective a tool as present world conditions would permit.

And then there is the second question which I would raise, as I close. In a world dominated by the two superpowers is it reasonable to expect that an organization, which has no being outside of the members, can be an effective force for peace?

On this point I would like to suggest the following observations:

1. World opinion, whatever it is, does influence, and has demonstrably influenced, both of the superpowers. The United Nations is the best forum in existence for mobilizing such opinion.

2. The world constantly changes. New alinements of nations spring up. Old ones break down. Other forces, potential or actual, of a dimension to give the major powers pause, spring into being. Only a few illustrations are necessary to make the point. The European Common Market, with its rapidly accelerating economic force and its potential political cohesiveness, cannot be ignored by either of the superpowers. Red China, with its increasing independence of the Soviet Union, represents another change. The developing nations with their hundreds of millions of restless, yearning, underprivileged peoples, are an explosive force which can create havoc in the world if not directed into constructive channels.

3. Technological and scientific changes can shift the balance of power in the world overnight.

4. Internal changes, within the boundaries of the superpowers themselves, can affect the national goals and intentions.

And so, even the superpowers, as they face the uncertainties of the future, cannot regard themselves as self-sufficient. They cannot afford to be reckless. They must be concerned with the intentions, the growth, and the resources of nations other than themselves.

Is the United Nations worth it? Its aims, as stated in the preamble of the charter, certainly are.

There is no alternative means to seek those aims. If we were to abandon the United Nations we would have to create other similar means. We cannot isolate ourselves from the problems of the world. We cannot isolate ourselves from the impact of those who might seek to destroy us. We cannot isolate ourselves from the millions over the globe whose aspirations motivate them to break out of the prison of their present circumstances. Being of the world, we must be a part of it.

It is not easy to recall instances of United Nations successes. But there have been such. Most of them have related to its activities outside its peace machinery. Even with respect to the objective of maintaining the peace, in all fairness, I think it can be said that the world would be in a far worse state than it is but for the existence and the efforts of the United Nations Organization since 1945.

It is well to recall the frustrations and disappointments which plagued the Founding Fathers of our system of government in the years between the victory at Yorktown and the adoption of the Constitution. Those were the years when, for the first time in the history of the world, freemen were given an opportunity to choose their form of government and to govern themselves.

Their first choice, the Articles of Confederation, was a poor one. For lack of proper authority in the Central Government, national problems were neglected. The Thirteen Colonies began to emerge, not as a single nation, but as 13 nations, jealous of each other, erecting trade barriers against each other, creating competing currencies, and contributing rapidly to a declining prestige abroad. On both sides of the Atlantic, serious questions were raised as to whether or not it was possible for freemen to govern themselves.

So strong did the doubts become that veterans of Washington's army pleaded with him to make himself king.

When the forefathers gathered in Philadelphia, their primary concern was to find a practicable means for freemen to consider common problems and to arrive at common decisions. Their second choice was a good one. And since that time, this country has survived and prospered and grown in influence throughout the world because the means have proven to be practicable.

I am not suggesting that a central world government is the answer. That is too easy a parallel to draw and a dangerous conclusion to reach. I am saying that we have demonstrated that a government of law, under which people of diverse background and problems may reach common decisions, is possible.

The fact that the United Nations has not proved to be a perfect instrument—and indeed it has been a very imperfect instrument—is not a reason to abandon it. Rather, we should continue to work at it as the Founding Fathers did at Philadelphia to define the means for meeting the objective. Sovereign nations of different traditions, races, problems, resources, and goals must learn to live together under international law. Not only do I think this is not too much to hope for, but, on the contrary, unless there is some hope for it, there is no future for mankind.

Mr. HRUSKA obtained the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire with that understanding.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding to me for a brief statement. For reasons which I have explained to him, I desire to speak at this time concerning the subject which has been under discussion for several days.

Mr. President, I believe in making every necessary sacrifice and taking every action essential to the preservation of the United Nations. An association of the nations of the world to substitute law for war has been the dream and the hope of humanity beginning with The Hague peace conferences, continuing through the ill-fated League of Nations, and, after World War II, embodied in the United Nations. The questions presented by the President's proposal to purchase U.N. bonds and by the various substitute and alternative proposals advanced, have caused me deep concern and long and painful consideration.

The money involved, even though it must be borrowed by us, does not greatly disturb me. If it would help preserve the United Nations as an effective instrument for peace, the financial expenditure is indeed almost trifling. There are other questions, however, that are not trifling.

The first is whether it will benefit the United Nations. The U.N. cannot be a potent force unless it commands the respect and support of at least the great majority of its members. Some 80-odd member nations are at present in arrears in their dues or assessments. Obviously the majority of these could pay them if they thought it worth while to do so. This does not indicate confidence in, or respect for, the United Nations. It will not restore such respect if the United States condones the apparent indifference of all these members by taking over, in even greater degree than our present large quota, the support of the U.N. Indeed, it will have, in my opinion, exactly the contrary effect and be a further blow to U.N. prestige. This might not be true if it were merely a loan on definite terms for a definite time. I would willingly vote for that. The method of issuing long-term bonds, with the United States buying the major portion of them, only too obviously means that we shall be assuming an increasing share of the burden as time goes on. We shall be financing projects, including actual warfare, that the United States and its representatives to the U.N. may or may not approve. It is fatuous to believe that the present bond issue would not be followed by others, because this one would merely tide over the present emergency. Furthermore, if the United States, as a long-term policy, assumes a disproportionate share of the cost of the United Nations, our enemies and ill-wishers will use it as an argument that the U.N. is our own instrument in international affairs. This would be a further blow to the influence of the U.N. Thus, my own chief concern and my own principal reason for doubting the wisdom of embarking on the bond-purchase method is for the welfare of the United Nations rather than our own.

As the various compromises and substitutes have been advanced and discussed, another grave objection developed in my mind. One feature of almost every suggestion is that Congress surrender to the President carte blanche authority to obligate the United States and pledge its credit, in most cases without definite restrictions as to amount, terms of repayment if any, and time. To be sure, under the Constitution the President has important and, in many cases, exclusive powers in dealing with foreign relations. The purse strings, however, are constitutionally in the hands of the people's Congress and should remain so. We must earnestly seek to preserve the U.N. as an international tribunal, but if, in our zeal to do so, we permit a world organization to undermine the fundamental separation of the executive and legislative branches of our Government, we are destroying our own freedoms. If we destroy the checks and balances that preserve the freedoms of our own Republic, there is little left for us to contribute to free government throughout the world.

At this point and in the confusion of proposals and counterproposals, I am not prepared to define exactly what steps I shall vote for or against, but it is my hope that I may have the opportunity to vote for some form of direct loan to the United Nations, the terms and limits of which will be clearly defined and which will not obligate us to assume disproportionate responsibilities in the future. I further hope that I may have the chance to vote for a form of assistance that clearly reflects the intention of Congress to retain its control over all such expenditures in the future.

I shall be most reluctant to vote for any measure that does not preserve these two elements.

The increasing pressure by our people that we give immediate and adequate aid to the United Nations at this time is, in my opinion, reassuring. It means that the people of the United States and Congress which reflects their will can be relied upon to take allwise and necessary measures to preserve the United Nations. Therefore, there is no need of our adopting a means which would abrogate the powers and responsibilities of Congress and surrender them to the Executive.

ALASKA STEAMSHIP RATES "UNJUST AND UNREASONABLE," FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION'S EXAMINER FINDS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have on previous occasions taken the floor to call to the attention of the Senate the great burden borne by all Alaskans because of excessively high steamship rates. I have in the past pointed out the major role played by the Alaska Steamship Co. in the boosting of these rates.

It must be remembered that Alaska is not contiguous to the remainder of the United States. It is dependent upon water carriers for the receipt of the staples of life. And, over the years, dominant among these water carriers, has been the Alaska Steamship Co.

In April 1958 Alaska Steamship Co. rates were raised 15 percent.

In January 1960—less than 2 years later—the Alaska Steamship Co. sought to institute an additional 10-percent increase.

In the meantime, Alaska had been admitted to the Union, and as its elected representatives, the Alaskan congressional delegation protested vigorously. The Governor of the State, the Honorable William A. Egan, instructed the attorney general for the State, Ralph Moody, to contest the proposed increase before the then Maritime Board, which had responsibility for both regulating and promoting transportation by water carrier. The attorney general retained as the State's able local counsel, the Washington, D.C., firm of Chapman & Friedman.

A suspension of the effective date of the proposed rate increase was requested, but in vain. The rate increase was permitted by the Board to go into effect on January 10, 1960, although the Board did issue an order requiring the amount of the increase to be kept in an escrow account to be returned to the shippers if the increase were not allowed.

During the course of the hearings before the hearing examiner it was brought to light that this escrow account was not established by the Alaska Steamship Co., but no action was instituted to establish such an account.

Yesterday, the hearing examiner issued his preliminary report. I am pleased to note that the hearing examiner has found that the increased rates of the Alaska Steamship Co. "have not been shown to be just and reasonable for the future." That is good. It shows progress. Alaska's history is of rate increase after rate increase for water transportation being granted automatically.

I am, however, disappointed, as no doubt Alaskans generally will be, that the hearing examiner found the "increased rates as specified are not shown to have been unjust, unreasonable, or otherwise unlawful during the pendency of this proceeding." I find it most difficult to follow this reasoning which concludes that the rates were not unjust, unreasonable, or otherwise unlawful in the past 2 years that they have been in effect but become such in the future. I shall await with great interest and much hope the action of the Maritime Commission in reviewing the hearing examiner's recommendation as to the higher rates charged in the past.

I am also at a loss to understand the reasoning by which the hearing examiner takes it upon itself to recommend to the Board that the order that the respondents shall keep account of all freight moneys received by reason of the increased rates and make refund of any increased charges in excess of those determined to be just, reasonable, and otherwise lawful should be vacated. In view of the fact that the Board originally refused to stay the rise in rates but attempted to soften the blow upon the people of Alaska by creating the escrow fund, the recommended nonaction in regard to these overpayments during the last 2 years is hard to understand.

I was pleased that in accordance with the statements which I have made in the past concerning the uses of funds derived from Alaska shipping could bear scrutiny to note that the examiner recommended:

Alaska Steam claims as operating expenses donations of $39,620 in 1958 and $10,500 in 1959 made to Skinner Foundation Trust. The latter was created about 1956 by the officers of Skinner Corp. to receive the charitable contributions of Alaska Steam and its affiliates, and to disburse the receipts for charitable purposes in the various cities where any of the corporations might be called upon for contributions to organizations such as the Salvation Army, United Good Neighbor Fund, Boy Scouts of America, American Cancer Society, and National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. The trust was established to create a fund for charitable purposes from which contributions could be made annually without regard to the profit position of the particular participating companies in any one year, and to earn income on any funds held between time of receipt and time of disbursement which would enhance the value of the contributions. While the contributions shown above by Alaska Steam, and similar contributions by its affiliates, are for a laudable purpose, they cannot be deemed to be operating expenses chargeable to the Alaskan trade, since to do so would impose upon the shipping public a double burden of meeting not only their own civic responsibilities but those of the contributors to Skiner Foundation Trust as well. The examiner, therefore, quite properly recommended that these donations must be disallowed as operating expenses.

The initial decision by the hearing examiner in this case is long and complicated and must be studied further carefully in order to examine all its implications and ramifications.

MRS. JELIZA PRENDIC MILENOVIC

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives amending S. 270.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. BURDICK in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 270) for the relief of Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on June 29, 1961, the Senate passed S. 270, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary.

On August 22, 1961, the House of Representatives passed S. 270, with an amendment to provide merely for the cancellation of outstanding deportation proceedings.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 270.

The motion was agreed to.

DESIGNATION OF WEEK OF MARCH 25, 1962, AS VOLUNTARY OVERSEAS AID WEEK

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate Concurrent Resolution 61.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) requesting the President to designate the week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week, which were, to strike out the preamble; on page 2, line 7, strike out "March 25, 1962," and insert "April 9, 1962,", and to amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution requesting the President to designate the week of April 9, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on March 16, 1962, the Senate passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 61, requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of March 25, 1962, as Voluntary Overseas Aid Week.

On April 2, the House of Representatives passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 61 with amendments, changing the date of Voluntary Overseas Aid Week from the week of March 25, 1962, to the week of April 9, 1962, and striking from the resolution the preamble.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 61.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 193. An act for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd;

S. 899. An act for the relief of Liu Shui Chen;

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito;

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska;

S. 1578. An act for the relief of Edward Yin Liang;

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Felix Ladina Mendoza;

S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla;

S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani;

S. 2018. An act for the relief of Robert B. Kasparek, Robert M. Kearny, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.;

S. 2101. An act for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery; and

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the pending business. How will this country extend financing to the United Nations? Will it be along the lines outlined in the proposed substitute, or in the manner indicated by the various amendments which have been printed and now lie on the desks of the Members of the Senate.

The issue is not whether the United Nations as an organization is worthy, whether it is discharging its mission, or whether it has failed therein. The issue is not even whether the United Nations should receive financial help from the United States—for it is fairly well understood that such help will be forthcoming.

The question before us is the kind of help and the conditions under which it will be extended. The other subjects are worthy of consideration, but they should be debated at the proper time and place.

Earlier this afternoon the Senator from Georgia stated his criticism of the United Nations. He was constructive in nature. It was keen, and was quite perceptive in probing many of the activities of the United Nations. On March 20, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] delivered a splendid address to the National Press Club. On Monday of this week, the distinguished majority leader discussed the development of the United Nations and the place it has on today's scene.

All these analyses are to be encouraged, as they focus national attention on basic issues regarding the future of the U.N.

The issue now before us, however, is not whether financial help should be extended to the United Nations by the United States. From the expressions which have been made during the debate on the floor and from discussions elsewhere, it is clear that the overwhelming sentiment of the Members of the Senate is that the United States should give financial help to the United Nations.

The question that is before us now deals only with the terms and conditions under which that help shall be extended. It is on this question that I shall speak at this time.

First of all, the President's original proposal called for a $100 million appropriation for the purchase of United Nations 25-year bonds which would pay 2 percent interest. As debate on that issue ensued, there was a counterproposal—which later came to be known as the Aiken-Hickenlooper substitute. It called for a 3-year loan of $100 million at the average rate of interest currently being paid by the Government which probably would be near 3 percent.

During the time this counterproposal was being formulated, there was substantial, persistent, and very logical criticism of the President's original proposal. That criticism was well documented by Senators who were eminently qualified to speak as experts in the field of foreign relations. The points made by these Senators were well taken, and they found growing support.

Then, Mr. President, suddenly—almost overnight—there was the astonishing and almost electrifying announcement: "A compromise." We were told of a meeting of the minds between the defenders of the original proposal and supporters of the substitute. Since that time there has been a tendency to forget all the suggestions which were so well voiced and all the criticisms which were so soundly advanced. Now they are thrown aside.

Mr. President, it has already been stated several times here on the floor of the Senate—but I should like to repeat it—that what is called "a compromise" is no compromise at all. It has been truly a surrender, a complete capitulation. The so-called "compromise" calls for authority to appropriate $100 million to be loaned to the United Nations. No interest rate is specified; in fact, no interest is required. No term is specified. No maturity is specified. No requirement or limitation by way of repayment terms is made; nor is there any condition regarding the making of annual payments.

During the debate on the so-called "compromise," a bond was defined as a loan; and under the terms of the "compromise" the President is to be free—without any kind of restraint or limitation—to purchase up to the proposed maximum of $100 million.

Mr. President, obviously the so-called "compromise" is no compromise at all. It would give the President more than he requested in the first place. The so-called "compromise" would concede everything for which the opposition contended. In effect, after the President asked for a white horse and was offered a black horse, the black horse was shot, and the President was given two white horses. Now, we hear that arrangement being called a "compromise."

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I will not support the so-called "compromise." I was convinced by the arguments made by the opponents of the proposed 25-year bond issue. When that proposal was first considered, they argued very well against it, and their arguments were persuasive.

No reasons are stated now why these objections are no longer to be considered applicable. In short, I still believe them to be sound. Certainly there should be guidelines and some reasonable limitations. Congress should not abdicate its responsibilities in making them clear.

The Senator from New Hampshire stated the case well when he said, just before I began these remarks, that of course the President is in charge of our foreign policy. It should be in the hands of one man, namely, the Chief Executive of our Nation. But, by the same token, the Constitution which defines the responsibility for handling foreign policy, also charges the Congress with the responsibility for producing revenue and for the appropriation thereof.

So I say, Mr. President, the Congress should not abdicate their responsibilities, particularly when the alternative invites such loose and risky handling of the people's money.

What are some of the objections which have been voiced to the purchase of $100 million worth of these U.N. bonds?

Under the substitute proposed, a bond is considered as a loan. The President may buy these 25-year bonds, as originally proposed, and very likely will do so. Those bonds have been the subject of substantial criticism, as I have mentioned. Nowhere is it as well compiled as in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Report No. 1277 on Senate bill 2768, on "Purchase of United Nations Bonds."

To get the full benefit of these reasons, I ask unanimous consent that they be set forth in the RECORD at this point, starting with line 13 on page 6 to and including paragraph numbered 11 on page 7 of the report.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members who objected to approval of the 25-year bond proposal, however, made the following points:

1. Present and potential financial difficulties for the United Nations arise from the failure of many nations to pay assessments for peace and security operations which were undertaken with their political support. Thus, in the case of the Congo, some 70 states supported United Nations actions there, but 62 states have failed to make contributions to the costs of the Congo operation. If the United Nations is to get such operations on a sound financial basis, the sooner the better. Approval of the bond issue, rather than some short-term financial alternative, will discourage, rather than encourage, this result.

2. The answer to the United Nations financial difficulties must be found by promoting cash payments on their past assessments now from members who feel a sense of obligation to keep the United Nations operating as a multilateral organization.

3. A short-term loan, or a grant, would provide time for the United Nations to receive the advisory opinion of the World Court, determine the effect of that decision on collection of arrearages for the Middle East and Congo operations, and develop a means of keeping the United Nations operating on a cash basis.

4. Although the bond issue is said not to be a precedent, and the bond resolution so provides, there is clearly the danger that if the United States buys half of the $200 million issue there will be a great temptation for this method of financing to become the practice in the United Nations. It is therefore better not to start down that road.

5. The bond issue simply postpones the day when United Nations members who have readily voted for the organization to undertake expensive operations become equally responsible about paying the bill. The bond issue tends to encourage the irresponsible nations to think they can continue shifting an undue burden to others. While it is true that 58 nations voted in favor of the bond resolution, 13 voted against it and 33 states abstained or were absent, indicating that perhaps as many as 46 states did not support the bond idea.

6. The rate of interest to be paid on the bonds, 2 percent, is too low, considering that interest rates in the United States on Government borrowings is in the neighborhood of 4 percent (which is a lower rate than prevails in most other countries).

7. If the United States buys half of the bond issue in order to "provide leadership" there is a serious hazard that too many other countries will wait to see whether that amount might not suffice.

8. It would be wise not to decide now whether the United States should buy bonds because the World Court has not rendered its opinion. There is the possibility that the Court opinion will not be favorable, in which event a far more substantial bond issue would undoubtedly be required. On the other hand, assuming that the Court will render an entirely favorable opinion, there are many states now in arrears which, when faced with such a Court decision, will be willing to pay their past debts and will be willing to put the Middle East and Congo operations back on a pay-as-you-go basis without resort to the use of the bond proceeds.

9. Rather than get bogged down in long-term indebtedness the United Nations should reconsider its decision of December 1961 in the light of the World Court decision ex-

pected in early summer. Meanwhile the United Nations could borrow on a short-term basis from the United States and other nations until it can come to agreement on a new assessment policy for peacekeeping operations.

10. Those who supported a substitute for the purchase of United Nations bonds pointed out that purchase of one-half of the total United Nations issue would involve a net cost to the United States of $108,634,480. The following table is a summary of U.S. receipts and disbursements calculated on an annual basis.

U.S. receipts and disbursements on purchase of ½ of $200,000,000 bond issue of the United Nations

	In	Out
Principal amount of U.S. purchase		$100,000,000
3.9 percent interest on annual balances of U.S. borrowing for bond purchase		54,740,400
32 percent (U.S. share of U.N. regular budget) of United Nations 2-percent interest costs ($56,144,000) on annual balances of entire bond issue		17,966,080
32 percent of United Nations repayments of principal		64,000,000
2 percent United Nations interest payments to United States on outstanding annual balances	$28,072,000	
United Nations repayment of principal to United States	100,000,000	
Total	128,072,000	236,706,480
Net cost to United States		108,634,480

11. In lieu of the purchase of 25-year United Nations bonds, an amendment in the nature of a substitute was considered. That amendment would have authorized a 3-year loan to the United Nations of not to exceed $100 million at a rate of interest substantially equal to the average rate of U.S. Treasury borrowings—currently about 3 percent. Adoption of this proposal, argued its proponents, would relieve the United Nations of its current financial difficulties and provide an adequate period of time to receive the opinion of the World Court and then determine what, if any, action might be required.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, let us note that these points were made in a constructive spirit. They were made following hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee on this proposal. These objections and criticisms were made for the purpose of improving the situation.

The Aiken-Hickenlooper amendment, contained in paragraph 11 on page 7 of the committee report, was proposed by two Senators, who have served as delegates to the United Nations, are very friendly to that organization as they have recently stated and ably demonstrated, and have had long years of conscientious and notable service on the Foreign Relations Committee.

Neither they, nor those who act and speak on any such important and far reaching a measure as the one we are now considering, do so lightly or ill advisedly. In the report and on this floor they dealt telling blows to the idea of long-term bonds.

A principal objection to the purchase of the bonds is that it would tend to prevent the U.N. from continuing as a truly multilateral organization. Inevitably it would cause the organization to become constantly more dependent upon the beneficence of the United States. It was stated on the floor in the debate, as found on page 4664 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> If we show a willingness to pick up the tab for every project for which the 104 members, or the majority of 104 members, of the United Nations see fit to appropriate, then we shall have a permanent job so long as the U.N. lasts, and we shall be expected to pay those costs indefinitely.

At another point in that same speech, it was said:

> But the American people are fed up with supporting an organization which is willing to vote its convictions, but not willing to give token support to the action which it has voted.

The nonpayment record of the United Nations members has been recounted often in recent weeks. I will refer to it again briefly to make the point clearer in the present context.

Seventy members out of eighty-two then in the U.N. voted for the resolution endorsing U.N. action in the Congo and appealing to "all member governments for urgent voluntary contributions to a U.N. fund for the Congo."

Sixty-two of those nations have paid nothing toward the so-called voluntary contributions.

During the entire calendar year 1961, the United States was the only Nation which paid its voluntary contribution.

Out of the 99 members who were assessed for the Congo operation for the period covering January 1 to October 31 of 1961, only 25 have paid their assessment in full.

Also, in 1961 the United States donated another $15 million, which was used to reduce by 80 percent the Congo assessments of 75 nations.

It is for this reason that it is well to note the language at page 6 of the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

> If the United Nations is to get such operations on a sound fiscal basis, the sooner the better. Approval of the bond issue, rather than some short-term financial alternative, will discourage, rather than encourage, this result.

The report also points out that "there will be a great temptation for this method of financing to become the practice in the U.N. It is better not to start down that road."

> The bond issue—

The report at page 6 continues—

> simply postpones the day when United Nations members who have readily voted for the organization to undertake expensive operations become equally responsible about paying the bill. The bond issue tends to encourage the irresponsible nations to think they can continue shifting an undue burden to others.

And I read further:

> If the United States buys half of the bond issue in order to "provide leadership" there is a serious hazard that too many other countries will wait to see whether that amount might not suffice.

Mr. President, I quote quite extensively here in order to give the full tenor of the reasoning which has been advanced against long-term bonds. None of these reasons has any less application to the situation now before us. These objections are just as inescapable now as they were before the formulation of a so-called "compromise." Yet, under this plan the President may still purchase the long-term bonds, and will be given more latitude than he would have had under the original proposal.

The question may well be asked as to whether the bond issue will encourage irresponsible nations to continue to shift their burdens to other nations.

And, Mr. President, it goes further than that, as developed in the following colloquy between the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Vermont, at page 4667 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 21:

> Mr. MORTON. In any event, we cannot predict what might happen in the future that would require the U.N. to go into some special operation. But we do know that once we start on a funded debt, and a long-range bond issue for financing it, it will become standard operating procedure.
>
> Mr. AIKEN. It certainly will be. We cannot tell how many places in the world the United Nations might vote to establish police or military operations. Such operations could be established even in the Western Hemisphere. The situation in Argentina does not look too good. The United Nations could intervene in Cuba or in any other part of the world, and every time they would intervene they would increase the costs of the United Nations by so many additional millions or hundreds of millions of dollars, assessing us to bear the lion's share of the cost, or else expecting us to purchase the lion's share of the bonds if the U.N. goes permanently and completely into a deficit financing program.

There we have the conclusions of two men who are experts in this field. Here is the Senator from Kentucky, who served as an Assistant Secretary of State with great credit, and the Senator from Vermont who has served not only as a delegate to the United Nations but who has also served so creditably through the years as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The basis for the fears they express is still present. There is nothing new about the so-called compromise bill which would lessen them. In fact, the compromise would increase whatever apprehensions there were before.

It was said in the debate in later days, at page 5646:

> This proposal gives the President a leverage over the financing of the U.N. which he could not have had under the original bill.
>
> This proposal does indeed put great responsibility upon the President, but, in my opinion, that is where the responsibility belongs.

In short, the Executive is to be given unrestricted freedom of action, and that is exactly what the Congress must fully realize. It certainly is no argument for the bill—but rather a devastating argument against it.

Would the issuance of bonds solve the U.N.'s problem? The opponents did not think so, for at page 4666 of the RECORD it was stated:

> If the U.N. should succeed in selling $200 million of bonds, it would have to call for further methods of financing within 2 years' time.

This objection is just as sound now as it was when those words were uttered on March 21.

The merits of a short-term loan, to give to the United Nations an opportunity to set its fiscal house in order, are as strong now as they were when the proposal was first advanced which virtually authorized the President to act without guidelines or conditions spelled out by the Congress and without any restriction or limitation whatsoever imposed upon the authorization.

In the original Presidential message on this subject, on January 30 of this year, these words are to be found:

> I ask that the Congress act now to back the U.N. by authorizing the purchase of these bonds. Failure to act would serve the interests of the Soviet Union * * *.

Whatever else these words may mean, certainly they express a strange attitude on the part of those urging long-range financial assistance. They reveal as well a peculiar misconception of the basic reasons why a short-term loan was offered as an alternative to the proposal. In either respect, the interests of responsible legislation will not be advanced by such remarks.

The action which we are considering, is of considerable moment because it also contains the possibility of a precedent.

The request is made by the United Nations for $200 million. Within 2 years, according to those who know the subject, the United Nations would be compelled to call upon some other method, or upon an extension of this method, for further financing. There is the Middle East operation. There is the Congo operation. There are other areas as to which a majority of the General Assembly might vote for an expenditure of funds. I have already read that proposition from the colloquy between the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken].

It would be well to remember the precedent of the 4-year Marshall plan which was proposed in 1947. It was to be a 4-year plan, involving a few billions of dollars. As I remember the figure, it was to be approximately $19 billion, plus perhaps $2 or $3 billion to be procured from the World Bank.

Now, 15 years and $75 to $100 billion later, there is a constant demand for even more billions for the foreign aid program, which is crushing the American taxpayer and thwarting our ability to function as an effective leader in the world and as a solvent, self-governing Republic.

We cannot say that it could not happen. It has happened. It happened once, and there is no reason why we should think that it is not likely to happen to the United Nations.

In that connection, I wish to say there have been a number of criticisms of the United Nations as such. It is my recollection that the Senator from Montana, the distinguished majority leader, in his remarks on Monday of this week pointed out that the United Nations has become quite distorted from its original concept. The Security Council was intended to serve as an arbiter, as a balance wheel, in handling situations which might develop to threaten the peace of the world.

The General Assembly was not designed for that purpose.

Yet, as times goes on, we have found the General Assembly becoming more involved with such problems. In a desperate effort to prevent total war, it has become a marketplace for trading votes. As was said by the Senator from Montana, it appears to be a place strikingly similar to the steps of the county courthouse, where men engage in trivial politics.

Mr. President, unless we take great care, this trend is going to continue. There will be further trading of votes and further incursions upon the domain of the Security Council, in an effort to cause the United Nations, which has 104 members and 104 votes, to fulfill the declarations of its charter. This problem certainly should be approached with caution. Expedient solutions should be spurned.

Mr. President, the Senate should reject this specious compromise. We should act prudently in undertaking to extend financial assistance to the United Nations. There should be some guidelines and conditions. There should be an effort on our part to deal with realities and to look beyond the moment in formulating a plan to see the United Nations through its financial straits.

Several alternatives have been proposed which would give this direction. Earlier this afternoon the Senator from Georgia proposed one. There are various other substitutes and amendments pending. No doubt more will be offered.

The Senate has the responsibility of devising a plan that sets out the essential conditions which will insure the success of the loan. The situation calls for better treatment than the pending compromise if the United Nations is to be preserved as a strong, truly multilateral organization with an ability to make true progress toward its declared goal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] desires to speak. Before he does so, however, I shall take only a few minutes to say that today there was delivered to me a letter from the President of the United States, copies of which have been made available for Senators and the press. I think it might be well to read the letter into the Record in order that we may have it before us, and in order that all Senators may have an opportunity to know its contents. It is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

April 3, 1962.

Hon. John J. Sparkman,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear John: In response to your inquiry concerning the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment introduced yesterday as a substitute for the U.N. bond issue bill (S. 2768 as reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee), I am glad to make clear my view that it is a wholly satisfactory substitute. It upholds Presidential responsibility in foreign affairs with just the right combination of discretionary authority and legislative guidelines; and I appreciate the good intentions of those Members—such as Senators Aiken and Dirksen—which led to this new version, and the good faith with which they have subscribed to it.

I want to assure the Members of the Senate that the funds made available under this measure will be promptly used, as necessary, in this or the next calendar year in the manner most likely to minimize the outlays of the United States, maximize the contributions of others and put the essential operations of the United Nations on a sound financial basis. The money will be loaned in such a way as to insure repayment of both principal and interest in annual installments; and, as stated in section 1 of the substitute, it shall be the intention of the executive as well as the legislative branch that the proceeds not be used to relieve other U.N. members of their obligations to make good on past assessments on which they are in arrears. I might add that it is equally clear that these proceeds are not to be used to pay the assessments of other members.

I am also in agreement with the intention stated in section 4 of the substitute that this Nation use its best efforts to strengthen the pattern of U.N. financing in such a way as to make unnecessary any future large-scale borrowing. Steps to be taken in pursuit of this goal would include efforts to improve the administration of fiscal affairs in the Secretariat and constituent agencies and bolster the existing fiscal office and officers. In addition, as a supplement to the present annual report to the Congress on United Nations affairs, I shall ask the Department of State to make a semiannual report setting forth all the fiscal operations of the United Nations, including but not limited to assessments, arrearages, and payments on the principal and interest of all U.N. loans, together with such other information as will indicate, among other things, the status and prospects of United Nations financing and the progress being made in fulfilling the objectives set forth in this section of the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute.

In conclusion, I want to stress again how harmful it would be to repudiate this arm of American foreign relations at this time—and how helpful the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute would be in demonstrating bipartisan unity in these matters. My personal congratulations to you for the fine job you have done in providing leadership on this measure.

Sincerely,

John F. Kennedy.

I believe that a careful reading and study of the letter will demonstrate that it answers a good many of the questions that Senators have been inclined to raise as to how the proposed authority would be used.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. It was with great interest that I read the letter. I was hoping that the text of it would come to my attention before I made my remarks. It seems to me that this letter does not in any way obviate the necessity for the Senate to place in the bill some of the guidelines and standards to which I have referred in my principal remarks. I believe that it would be a sorry state of affairs, indeed, if 10 years from now the World Court should be called upon to construe the terms of a loan that had been made in 1962 on the basis of Senate bill 2768 and the letter read by the Senator from Alabama. The citation that would be presented to the Court at that time might be as follows:

> The authority is Public Law X, which is the outhgrowth of the bill S. 2768 and a let-

ter from the White House dated April 3, reading thus and so.

If the President has in mind insuring repayment of both the principal and interest in annual installments, that would be a good provision to insert in the bill. I am sure he would not object to its being inserted.

If this is the President's intention, surely it would do no harm to put the provision in the proposed legislation which we are now considering. Notwithstanding the letter, the arguments made for passing a measure containing standards and guidelines which reflect the composite judgment of the elected representatives of the people are sound, and such provisions should be included.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, with the indulgence of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from New York briefly. The Senator from Texas is waiting.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, have read the letter. It goes a long way toward justifying the so-called compromise, and to answer the points which have been made against it.

First, the statement has been made that the amendment does not mean anything. The President has shown that under its provisions his hands would be free from the resolution of the United Nations with relation to bonds. The President has indicated that under the amendment he would have freedom of action. I hope very much that the amendment will be agreed to, and I hope that a majority of my party will vote for it and support the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in that effort.

The letter shows that the President's hands are untied with relation to the specific terms of the original bill, which was specifically related to the U.N. resolution.

Second, the President has undertaken commitments which the amendment would require him to undertake. Those relate to the payment of the obligations, including assessments, of other members which might be in arrears.

He has done one additional thing, which a great many Senators who are for the U.N. have wanted done. He has undertaken to keep us apprised of the status of payments and arrearages in the U.N. The President has undertaken a specific obligation to that effect.

Therefore, I believe that the importance of the letter is that it accepts a number of the important conditions which are contained in the amendment. It is one thing to set down conditions for a President who does not have to observe them. It is another thing to ask him to do something. But it is a very different thing when he pledges himself to take the action desired. Two parties are required to make a contract. He is the other party. He has now made a commitment. So I think his action has demonstrated that the compromise submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] did, as we who are friends of the compromise bill believe, do something and, too, the President has undertaken some very real obligations in deference to that position.

I hope very much that the letter will help any Senators who might be wavering on the question to decide to vote in favor of the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe that many of the commitments included in the President's letter are couched in vague and ambiguous terms, and his letter in no way mitigates or ameliorates my reservations or opposition to the proposed substitute.

The President has proposed that the United States loan $100 million to the United Nations.

The answer given the President is of tremendous importance. It extends far beyond the sum of money, although the initial expenditure may be only the beginning.

In the period 1946-61, the total United Nations budget amounted to $3,430,990,000. Of this amount, the United States contributed $1,617,093,000, or 47.13 percent. The precise financial details have been presented and reviewed in the course of this debate. I shall not rehash the figures, except to say that we have put in far more than any other single nation and nearly one-half the amount put in by all member nations, and the present financial crisis of the U.N. arises from U.N. operations in the Congo and the persistent refusal of some countries, including the Soviet Union, to pay their share of U.N. operational costs.

My remarks are not addressed to the final precedent that might be established if the President's proposal is accepted, although it is a bad one.

The U.N. raises the need for this loan because of a radical change in its character—a change in which the U.N. has become an instrument of war instead of the instrument of peace it was designed to be.

United Nations troops, with the backing of the United States, have apparently beaten Moise Tshombe, the President of the Katanga Province of the Congo.

Tshombe is friendly to the West. He seeks preservation of a capitalist economy. His area was the richest and most politically stable in the Belgian Congo.

It seemed a strange paradox that he should feel our wrath.

As a result, many bewildered people at home and abroad have asked what the U.N. has become.

I shall not try to repeat our explanation here in detail. Briefly, it is that the former Belgian Congo cannot exist without the comparatively well developed and rich Katanga Province. Therefore, although Tshombe is pro-Western, he must subordinate himself to Cyrille Adoula, an avowed neutralist and bitter critic in the past of the United States. The question might be asked: Why not make Adoula subordinate to Tshombe, since the latter is our friend, and since Katanga is the richest and strongest portion of the Congo?

Such a logical question would encounter, I am afraid, more doubletalk and explanation reminiscent of the Orwellian phrases, "War is peace"; "slavery is freedom," and so on.

In any case, through force of arms, the U.N. has imposed a restive peace upon the Congo. An atmosphere of melancholy tranquillity seems to prevail there, which sullen tribal partisans may, in their frustration, turn into bloody violence with a vengeance at any moment. The American people are asked to pay a major portion of the cost of military operations that precipitated this atmosphere of rancor and uncertainty. The time has come to look at this strange situation and to seek to understand its significance.

For some time now, the people of this country have been apprehensive of developments in the U.N. Over the years the character of the organization has changed as new nations have been added to the original 51. The U.N. began under a handicap with the Soviet Union insisting upon the veto power in the Security Council over any proposal to which it objected. Even so, the United Nations has been portrayed to the world, and in particular to the people of the United States, as the best hope of world peace. How many happy illusions did we entertain in the embryo days of the U.N.

In the early days of the U.N., the United States clearly exercised tremendous influence within that body. The Soviet Union frequently used its veto power—99 times to be exact—to block proposals it did not like. It did so quite brazenly.

We have never used the veto, apparently because of our considerable awe of some nebulous thing called world opinion. Our actions in the U.N. and elsewhere often seem to be taken, not on the basis of what is best for the United States, or the free world, or our major allies, or the general enhancement of our geographic and strategic posture in the cold war, but on the basis of what the so-called uncommitted nation may think about us.

Curiously enough, the Soviet Union's use of the veto has not made that nation the pariah one might assume. Instead, by some strange process, the Russians seem to have steadily increased in influence and power in the U.N. and elsewhere in the world. Coincidentally, our power and influence at the U.N. and elsewhere has steadily declined.

How could this have happened when we have tried so hard to please? Our motives and conduct will stand the most intense scrutiny. We have given away and spent billions upon billions in an effort to win friends and influence people. Why then have our virtues and good intentions been so poorly rewarded?

In 1945 there were 51 U.N. members. In 1962 there are 104 U.N. members, there are 23 Asian nations, and 29 African nations, many of them newly emerged from colonial, protectorate, trusteeship, or mandate status.

Our stand against so-called colonialism, consistent and adamant, has brought many of these new countries into being. In most instances, the birth clearly is premature. The facility for self-rule is not something easily come by, even for some of the most economically progressive, highly cultured, and civilized people with strong ethnic homogeneity and national aspirations. It is unthinkable that we should expect people who are for the most part illiterate and impoverished with no evolving tradition of self-rule to govern themselves wisely and well. We are deluding ourselves if we think a tribally oriented people can be easily welded into a unitary state. The folkways and mores of a society cannot be lightly or quickly overturned. The passionate desire for the privileges and immunities of autonomy are not enough. Nor should we be beguiled into mistaking the ambitions of a few tribal overlords or articulate native politicians and demagogs as the nationalistic aspirations of a whole people. But that has not deterred us from our role as midwife in these premature deliveries.

Much of the chaos in the Belgian Congo results because the country was not and is not ready for self-government, That does not prevent us from bringing pressure on Portugal to get out of its West African province of Angola. Even though Angola is more ready to run its own affairs than was the Congo, it still has a long way to go.

Aside from the moral aspects, there are other explanations for our attitude toward colonialism. We take the position that colonialism in Africa and Asia will end in any case; that there are forces loose in the world which mean its destruction.

Undoubtedly, old style colonialism in Asia and Africa is out of date. Undoubtedly also, many areas once dominated by European nations would have become independent regardless of what we said or did. Just the same, the situation in each African or Asian colony is different. This impetuous rush toward independence, willy-nilly, has pitfalls, and deep ones. We have already learned that in the Congo.

In some other countries, colonial rule has been replaced by dictatorship; other of the new nations are leaning toward communism. Some other African states, which were states before the U.N. came along, are feudal in nature, and in them the masses are exploited ruthlessly.

The definition of colonialism appears to be changing in some parts of the world.

Once it meant the domination and exploitation of a territory by an outside and alien power.

Now, to the U.N. and to the United States also, it apparently means the control of an Asian or African territory by a European or pro-Western government.

Last September almost 24 so-called uncommitted nations met at Belgrade in Yugoslavia. In addition to Yugoslavia, the countries represented were India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic, Cambodia, Morocco, Tunisia, Afghanistan, Lebanon, Ethiopia, Burma, Iraq, Ceylon, Sudan, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, the Congo Republic, Yemen, Cyprus, Somali Republic, Ghana, Guinea, and Mali. Also represented was Communist Cuba, whose commitment against the United States has been restated over and over again. All in all, we have given this group more than $6 billion in aid, including more than $2 billion to Yugoslavia. Over and over again our leaders here emphasized the importance of the so-called uncommitted nations. Their friendship, good will, and possible assistance were held to be of transcendent importance.

If the alinement of these countries should be decisive in the world struggle now going on, we are in a deplorable situation indeed. The countries showed the utmost consideration for the feeling of Soviet Russia. They failed to denounce the nuclear tests by Soviet Russia, tests which the Russians had been preparing for months while they talked disarmament. They did, however, say that the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay "affects the sovereignty and integrity of Cuba." Nothing whatever was said about the domination by Soviet Russian of Eastern Europe, which is colonialism at its very worst, yet the allegedly neutral countries asserted that the claim of the Algerian rebels to the French-held Sahara Desert territory was a just one. Not only that—the uncommitted nations offered, if necessary, to help the rebels.

The countries meeting at Belgrade overlooked Red China's conquest of Tibet, but they demanded immediate evacuation of French armed forces from Tunisian soil.

There was no mention of India's refusal to permit a plebiscite in Kashmir. But the 24 insisted upon immediate freedom for Angola from Portugal.

Since the September meeting, Nehru, darling of the liberals and the apostle of peace, shocked his followers by attaching Goa, which had been Portugese territory for almost 500 years. There was an outcry. This is dying down. More and more often we hear that Portuguese intransigence—whatever that means—forced Nehru into violence. Eventually, in the distorted looking glass of our liberals, the Portuguese may bear most of the blame.

As one justification for the U.N. loan, we are told that capitalism and democracy have won a tremendous victory in the Belgian Congo. With Tshombe, the pro-Westerner, beaten, there is relative calm. There have been no rape and murder headlines out of the Congo for weeks. This situation is presented as proof of the wisdom of our course. We are, however, jumping to some very hasty conclusions—as we have before, I might add. Our Congo policy is a gamble, a risky, complicated, and hazardous gamble and will continue to be so for an indefinite period.

The man we are backing, Cyrille Adoula, is at best a neutralist. He visited the United States not long ago and was received at the White House. But, since that time, he has announced that he will visit Moscow sometime this year. Moreover, at the U.N., he paid tribute to Lumumba, the slain Communist Congo leader. He also indicated he was ready to assist actively in the effort to drive, forcibly, the Portuguese out of Angola. In the past, he has criticized the West and the United States in terms which causes one to wonder where he stands and what his future course will be.

One thing seems certain. We have assumed a responsibility in the Congo which will cost us heavily. Nevertheless, Adoula has become our ward, and the proposed $100 million in a U.N. loan is just the beginning. He will cost us much more—if he does not turn against us and aline himself openly with the Communists.

Why are we so hostile to Tshombe, the pro-Westerner, and so tender toward Adoula, the neutralist? If we look closely into this matter we find that Tshombe, being friendly to the West, has encountered the hostility of the other new African nations. "Africa for the African," they say.

Perhaps Tshombe naively felt that his friendship for the West would cause us to help him. He knows better now. He incurred the ill will of the Asian-African bloc which dominated the U.N. This bloc dictates not only to the U.N. but also to the United States. They wanted Tshombe whipped and, obediently, we helped to whip him.

Invariably in Africa, when East and West clash, the United States takes sides against the West. We have done so time after time. So has the U.N.

Tshombe is simply a case in point. The course is being doggedly and vigorously followed even though it has become foolish and reckless almost to the point of insanity. We seem to be bent on the creation of power vacuums which the Communists rush in to fill.

Our attitude in the United Nations, our doctrinaire hostility to what we term colonialism, is based in part on idealistic notions: the world is changing, and this change is felt everywhere; the exploitation of weaker peoples should cease.

Our policies show most clearly in our attitude toward the African Portuguese province of Angola. And the Angola affair illumines the bias of the U.N.

On March 15, 1961, Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., voted in the Security Council for a resolution calling for an inquiry into conditions in Angola. In so doing, we sided with Soviet Russia, Liberia, Ceylon, and the United Arab Republic. The resolution lost, since it required an affirmative vote of seven and Britain, France, Chile, Ecuador, and Nationalist China abstained.

There was surprise and even consternation to find us lined up with our mortal enemy, Russia, against Portugal, a NATO member and long-time friend and ally.

This was just the beginning. On March 15, an army of terrorists swarmed across the border from the Congo into northern Angola. They tortured, raped, butchered, and murdered without mercy. They killed between 1,000 and 1,500 men, women, and children in the space of a few hours. Many others were badly wounded. The brutality in Angola far exceed anything seen during the Mau Mau outrages in Kenya.

The Portuguese fought back—that is, after they recovered from the first wave of horror and shock. When I say "Portuguese," I do not mean simply Europeans. I mean Africans as well, for the Portuguese have pursued a multiracial policy for generations. They drove the terrorists back.

Meanwhile, the attack on Portugal at the United Nations continued. On April 20, 1961, the General Assembly of the U.N. voted 73 to 2 for the establishment of a special committee to investigate conditions in Angola.

Before this subcommittee could make any move toward an inquiry, another resolution was introduced by Liberia in the Security Council. It called upon Portugal to "desist forthwith from repressive measures in Africa." It was approved by the Security Council, and for the third time in succession the United States voted with the Soviet Union against her ally, Portugal.

The vote to censure Portugal for "repressive measures" was, actually, a vote to censure the Portuguese for defending themselves and their wives and children. Arthur Krock, the distinguished columnist of the New York Times, aptly termed it a "form of lynch law." So it was. We showed a callous indifference toward the butchery of Portuguese women and children. We became badly upset and raised our voices in horrified protest when the Portuguese killed some of their assailants.

The vote can be explained only on the grounds that we had decided to back the Afro-Asian bloc at the U.N. under virtually any conditions short of outright subscription to the stated aims of Communist imperialism.

We have done so consistently since, voting on January 30, 1962, for a U.N. resolution calling upon Portugal to give Angola its independence.

One of the Angolan terrorist leaders is a man named Holden Roberto, who also has a number of aliases. He has been in and out of the United States for several years, having been in New York only a short time ago. The State Department will not permit Moise Tshombe to enter this country, but Roberto is welcome.

Roberto was quoted in a July 1961 issue of Le Monde, a Paris newspaper, as saying that the murder and torture of women and children during the March invasion were deliberate. The author of the article, one Pierre de Vos, says he commented to Roberto:

> The insurgents are accused of the worst of horrors, and there is proof of tortures perpetrated upon Portuguese men, women and even children, in the areas around San Salvador do Kongo [in northern Angola]. Do you deny the fact of these massacres?

He continued that Holden Roberto said with no hesitation:

> No, it's all true, and regret it more than I can say. But there is a reason behind all those horrors and the world has got to understand us.

There is no indication that Roberto has ever denied this interview. Nor has Roberto's record affected the support given him in this country by other groups and organizations. Yet, our own State Department lets this terrorist murderer come and go freely. Roberto's record has not affected his support by several American organizations. One of the most vocal is the American Committee on Africa, of New York. This organization, which lists among its national committeemen, many prominent Americans, including Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., of the White House staff, apparently backs Roberto all the way.

When he was last in the United States, Roberto held a press conference under the auspices of the committee. In its annual report of May 31, 1961, the American committee calls this man, the man who ordered or at least acquiesced in the torture, murder, and rape of women and children, a "distinguished and eloquent leader."

It appears from its activities that the American Committee on Africa, which issues hate literature against the Portuguese, is the agent of a foreign power or powers. It supports the Angola terrorists with propaganda, and probably with funds also. Yet, the American Committee on Africa has never registered as a foreign agent. In fact, it has applied to the Bureau of Internal Revenue for tax-exempt status.

The Soviet Union has supported with great enthusiasm the move to dismember Portugal, a stanchly anti-Communist nation. The Russians, it might be pointed out, are not in the habit of supporting movements and causes which benefit the Western nations, and, in particular, the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frank Howley, retired, now vice president of New York University, visited Angola in May 1961. In an interview published in the New York World-Telegram on July 27, 1961, he said:

> The current uprising against Portugal in Angola is a part of a Communist conspiracy to gain control of the rich African province.

Lord Home, British Foreign Secretary, has charged the Communists with the responsibility for the atrocities in Angola.

Communism thrives on chaos and confusion. The strategy of the Russians and Chinese is to create disruption in Africa wherever possible. This is necessary for a Communist takeover. That is why the U.N. policy toward Portugal and the United States policy toward Portugal are backed and approved by the Soviet Union.

Louis Lomax, a reputable Negro writer and journalist, in his book, "The Reluctant African," reported Tom Mboya, a prospective Prime Minister of Kenya, when the British colony becomes independent, as stating as follows:

> The Europeans know they are finished in Kenya. Now all they want to know is if we're going to pay them for their land. The civil servants know they are done here. Now all they want to know is whether we are going to give them a pension. Every day they stop me on the streets and they ask me: "Mr. Mboya, are you going to take our land? Are we going to be compensated? Are we going to get pensions?"
>
> I tell them: "Don't ask me to pay you. Tell your troubles to Macleod (the British Colonial Secretary). Let him pay you. As far as we are concerned, the Europeans have lived off the fat of the land. They have had their compensations and their pensions * * *"
>
> Then the Europeans want to know if they can stay on in Kenya. I tell them: "Sure * * *." But if they stay on, they must get out of politics. We are going to have an all-black Parliament, and an all-black government. We are going to divide our land among our people. If the Europeans want to stay, they can stay on as squatters. If they want to work, they can work for us.

These bombastic and inflammatory statements are made, although Europeans and European developments are the economic heart of Kenya. Four-fifths of Kenya's exportable farm produce in 1960 was produced on farms owned by Afro-Europeans. Kenya is heavily dependent upon Afro-European civil servants, doctors, lawyers, and engineers. Mboya does not care about that. He wants African domination—and then he will no doubt turn to the United States for funds to repair the damage.

In supporting nationalism in Africa, our Government tries to pretend that the end of colonialism means, almost immediately, a new, freer and fuller life for the masses. The contrary is very likely to be true.

In his book, "Africa, Angry Young Giant," Smith Hempstone, author and journalist, points out:

> Only the fuzziest thinkers among those Americans and Britons who interest themselves in African affairs can still equate the granting of political freedom to small groups of vociferous African nationalists with the extension of social and personal freedom to the masses of this tortured and ancient continent.

Our views seems to be that oppression and exploitation in Africa are not so bad after all, if African rulers are oppressing the African masses.

In the wake of the freedom wave sweeping Africa, there are some developments which should serve as object lessons. During the debate on Angola, spokesmen for Ghana and Guinea, both strongly oriented toward communism, charged that the United States was permitting NATO arms furnished Portugal to be used against the terrorists in Angola. In view of our support of anti-Portuguese elements over the world, this was most unkind. But, then, gratitude is not always forthcoming when it should be, as many individuals and nations have learned. Among them is Portugal, which let us use her almost invaluable bases in the Azores, and has given them to us for use since the war. Portugal also has been a friend in other ways. Our reward is to tell her she should be dismembered, truncated, and stripped of African provinces she has held for hundreds of years.

Statements by spokesmen for many of the new African nations about independence, constitute chauvinism and demagoguery. All the troubles of Africa are blamed upon the Afro-European. The lag in African development until colonialism is ignored; the development of Africa by European nations since, including Western education of most African leaders now shouting for freedom, are all overlooked.

The diversity of peoples in Africa—Bantu, Bushman, Hamite, Asian, Semite—are dismissed as no problem. No importance is given the primitive state of millions of tribesmen, or their age-old feuds which will erupt as the Afro-Europeans are driven out. Even in Kenya, there are other tribes than Tom Mboya's Kikuyu, including the fierce Masai. The skills and financing needed to develop the resources of the new states are waved aside under the spell of nationalism, hatred of the Afro-European. Afro-Europeans are blamed for all the African's troubles, including malaria and leprosy.

There is little talk of responsibility or of the patience and discipline necessary for orderly advancement. Many of the leaders live on a lavish and profligate scale, despite the poverty of their peoples. The President of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah, is restoring an ancient Danish castle on the coast as an official residence. Another Presidential palace is under construction, and he is adding two wings to his private residence—each wing being bigger than the original house. Meanwhile, several hundred of Nkrumah's political opponents are lying in jail, and Nkrumah flirts with communism.

On the West African Ivory Coast, President Felix Houphouet Boigny has just installed a new residence and Government center at a cost of $16 million.

Although we are asked to vote a $100 million United Nations bond issue to pay largely for United Nations expenses in the Congo, 40 of Cyrille Adoula's ministers last year voted themselves new homes, fine cars, and rather generous cash allowances.

The hierarchy in many African countries that live in large measure on our aid, live high, wide, and handsome. They travel with expensive retinues; they buy big embassies, embassies far out of line with their needs. The prodigality of many of their diplomats is a byword, and is at the expense of their masses—and of our own taxpayers. Yet, we back these governments to the hilt. If there are injustices in Africa, it does not seem to matter, just so long as it is Africans who are the oppressors.

The theory that the United Nations has preserved and is preserving world peace is, Mr. President, preposterous. War is proceeding all around the world: in Algeria, in Laos, in Vietnam. India has just concluded the conquest of Portuguese Goa. The United Nations did not prevent the Korean war; it could not deter Communist rape of Indochina, and Tibet, nor the crushing brutality of the Hungarian repression. It is helpless before the Berlin crisis. It is useless in disarmament proceedings. Its accomplishments are suspect. On the occasions when it claimed victories for peace, the United States manipulated the strings.

Now the United Nations itself goes on the warpath. The only question is, Where will it strike next? Will we support Adoula if he tries to drive the Portuguese out of Angola? On the basis of what we have done in the past, that is entirely possible. Day by day, its policies and purposes grow more perilous from the standpoint of our national security.

If the United Nations is to continue, we must insist that it become a responsible body. It must not be an agency which has one standard for Russian and Red Chinese colonialism, and another for colonialism involving the Western European countries. Other countries must pay their fair share of the costs. But there are no signs that the United Nations will become such an institution. It is rapidly on the way to becoming a liability to the United States, if it is not already a liability—and a big one, at that.

It is time this country regained its sanity. A policy of anticolonialism, if followed with commonsense, is a good one. We should give the new states all the help possible. In turn, they should recognize their responsibilities, their dependence on Western technical skills, education, and financing.

There are simply too many people in this world who think in terms of the privileges and immunities of citizenship and autonomy, and not in terms of the responsibility that is a concomitant of self-government.

Ventures such as the United Nations has undertaken in the Belgian Congo are ill advised and, if repeated, will destroy the U.N. completely. What do we have now that Adoula is temporarily in the ascendancy in that unfortunate country? Have we achieved victory, or do we have a heavy burden on our hands? Let me quote from an article by Albert J. Meyers in the U.S. News of February 26, 1962:

> There are other signs of the Congo's inability to function as a going concern. One of the main highway bridges in town has been out of service since last April, when it was damaged by floodwater. No one seems able to repair it.
>
> Away from the cities, there is an almost complete lack of security in the interior. Bands of Congolese "soldiers"—who actually are no more than irresponsible thugs—roam the countryside at will, pillaging, destroying, killing.
>
> After almost 2 years of independence, the Congo still is a place of violence and slaughter where no man's life is worth much. By now, the murder and mutilation of priests, the rape of nuns and other forms of brutality seem almost commonplace after innumerable visits to the Congo. It's gotten so nothing really surprises me anymore.
>
> Who's ahead? The Congo crisis still is a thing of major importance to the United States and the West. A monumental struggle between the United States and Russia is taking place here even though, at least on the surface, the United States appears to be well ahead.
>
> Officially, the United Nations controls the Congo. But, actually, it does so only after a fashion. It is bogged down by the obstacles placed in its way by Afro-Asian and Communists at U.N. headquarters in New York. Here in the field, the U.N. seems unable to make real decisions that are necessary to get things done. The U.N. undoubtedly has forestalled complete chaos, and probably kept a hot war from breaking out. But it has not been able to solve the Congo's basic problems.
>
> At stake is control of the Congo by either East or West, since the U.N. can't do it, and the Congolese control nothing.
>
> Right now, the United States is in and the Russians are out. But the West-leaning government of Premier Cyrille Adoula has to solve many problems in order to survive.

I do not agree at all with all the assessment made by this distinguished journalist, but it points out that even an objective analyst, one who is not a partisan like myself regarding the U.N. notes that we do not really have a substantial upper hand in the Congo.

We should recognize, at the same time, that it will be a long while indeed before many of these new African nations become a real factor in the world power struggle. A vote in the General Assembly of the U.N. does not make Chad, Dahomey, Gabon, Somalia, Mauritania, and so forth strong countries. Our mouthing that we must help the African countries because they are uncommitted, our frenzied preoccupation with victory at the U.N., represents schizophrenia, self-hypnosis. Slogans and idealistic words do not conquer problems.

On the one hand, we are talking about achieving a rapprochement with the European Common Market as a means of strengthening ourselves against the common enemy. On the other, we are conducting ourselves at the U.N. in a fashion which would indicate that we want to sever our European connections, to destroy NATO, and to hazard our national destiny on winning and holding African and Asian nations, whose favor is fickle, and whose allegiance could mean very little after all.

Let us then reappraise our United Nations policies. We must not allow it to dictate our foreign policy. The responsibility for free world leadership is ours. We should not abdicate that leadership. Let us keep before us at all times the best interests of the United States of America, and its citizens. Let us be mindful of the aspirations for freedom by peoples everywhere. For if we fail, the era of freedom is over, and a long era of human slavery will begin.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as those of us who have listened realize, there is one certain prediction we can make about an institution such as the United Nations, and that is, it is always going to be in serious difficulty.

The debate in the Senate these past few days relates to its financial difficulty, and I hope the discussions and our ultimate action will not serve the cause of those who would view the demise of the United Nations as a happy day.

We will always have those who scoff at the concept of international rule of law and do their best to snarl American cooperation with the United Nations. There is little hope that these isolationist tigers will ever change their stripes. But it seems to me that they do not represent the most immediate danger to the United Nations today.

What worries me more is the discouragement and apathy among those who once could be counted upon as United Nations supporters.

Certainly, all of us feel disappointments at times at the way things sometimes go, but one who asserts he is now totally discouraged must have started out with an exaggerated notion of what the United Nations reasonably could be expected to do.

It seems to me the achievements, the successes won by the United Nations, ought to be more generally recognized; and I would include Korea among them, and would add the Congo and points intermediate.

In these areas it is my feeling that the United Nations has thwarted Soviet ambitions. For Soviet Russia to want to render the United Nations impotent or to destroy it can be understod. But this country and others in the field should resist this Soviet purpose by every means.

Of course, things do not always go our way in the United Nations. We vote "yea," and other nations vote "nay." We "go," and they will not "go." It is just part of the frustration that when man steps toward the moon, it is a Russian man first.

We have plenty of trouble just reconciling our own national interests and convictions with those of our allies. When we add to this the problem of coping with Soviet maneuvers in the United Nations, for some people it seems just too much.

But Soviet power, symbolized in the United Nations by its veto, would be a threat to us whether there was a United Nations or not. To confront that power in the form of a veto in the Security Council is better than to meet it in the shape of a jet in the Congo. This may oversimplify a difficult problem, but to me the point is basic and it suggests no course for us other than the fullest response to the present United Nations need.

Again, for the Soviet Union to try to rule or to ruin the United Nations makes sense. It would gain from civil wars in areas like the Congo or the Middle East or Korea. But neither the death of the United Nations nor the division of the Congo into small warring states would serve United States policy or the cause of world peace. Failure on our part to refuse financial help to the United Nations now or to condition it in such a fashion as to make it unworkable or needlessly cumbersome would be inexcusably shortsighted. History's verdict would be very harsh if this were our course. For this reason, among others, I hope we shall promptly enact a measure which does reflect our understanding of the kind of world in which we live and the need to maintain an effective organization of the nations in our most important assignment, the preservation of peace.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Metcalf in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished minority leader and I have tried to clear this proposal with every Senator who is vitally interested or who will be in the chamber when the request is made.

I ask unanimous consent that debate be limited to 2 hours on amendments to the pending proposal; that 3 hours be allocated to the Russell amendment in the nature of a substitute; and that 6 hours be allocated to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask a question.

The Senator used the word "proposal." The "proposal" is an amendment offered by the majority leader and the minority leader, which is before the Senate; and the "substitute" is the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia. Will the Senator define, therefore, so that it may be clear what he means, the word "proposal"?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The "proposal" is the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill, S. 2768, to authorize the purchase of United Nations bonds.

Mr. JAVITS. Do we correctly understand that if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to—and I certainly favor the unanimous-consent request—there will be 6 hours of debate on the bill; 2 hours of debate on every amendment to the bill, including the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute; and 3 hours debate on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]?

As I understand the situation, that is the unanimous-consent request. The Senator has defined "proposal" to be the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment in the nature of a substitute. Therefore, the Senator may have in mind some other arrangement.

If I may repeat, the unanimous-consent request would provide, as I understand, 6 hours on the bill—not on the "proposal" but on the bill——

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Two hours on the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute, or on any other amendment either on the desk or which may be offered, the time to be divided in the usual manner; and 3 hours on the Russell amendment in the nature of a substitute. Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. The limitation would begin, if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to by the Senate, at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, April 5, 1962, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, debate on the pending substitute proposed by Mr. Russell (3-27—B) be limited to 3 hours, and that debate on any other amendment or substitute, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is understood that the time limitation will begin at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time limitation will begin at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations tonight, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SAVING THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE ROLE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in this morning's New York Times there is a most timely and excellent editorial in support of the United Nations financing measure which is now before the Senate.

I believe this editorial cites more cogently and concisely the case for the pending proposal than any argument heard today. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Saving the U.N.'s Peace Role

The Senate is scheduled to vote today on the U.N. bond measure that will go far to determine the future role of both the United Nations and the United States in world affairs. The measure would empower President Kennedy to rescue the United Nations from financial bankruptcy.

The bond issue, to which 22 other nations have already subscribed more than $50 million, is necessary to cover deficits incurred for military operations in the Middle East and the Congo. Its success still depends on congressional action, which will also decide whether the United Nations can continue to act as an executive peace enforcement agency or whether it must shrink to a mere debating society, as the Russians desire. Congressional repudiation of the project would be a major blow to the prestige not only of the United Nations but also of the United States, thrusting additional burdens for free world defense upon us.

Despite all this, the measure faces a battle in the Senate because many Republicans refuse to follow their own leadership; and the action of the House is unpredictable. This opposition can be explained only by a strange blindness both to the financial aspect of the bond plan and to the role of the United Nations itself. It is true that the deficits are due to the refusal or failure of more than two-thirds of the members to pay their special assessments for the military operations. The question of their obligation to do so is now before the World Court. Meanwhile, the deficits must be met. The Republicans propose to meet them by a 3-year loan; but since the United Nations could not possibly repay such a sum in so short a time it would still be bankrupt at the end of that period. But the bonds would be repaid from the regular budget to which all members must contribute their allotted share or lose their vote and possibly their membership.

Behind the financial argument is a deeper feeling, akin to a new nationalism and isolationism and found in both parties, which looks askance at the United Nations and would disentangle the United States from it. Yet the U.N. has made possible the more or less peaceful liquidation of the Western colonial empires and it has also kept the big power blocs apart and thus helped avert another world war. If it had not been for the United Nations, American troops might now be fighting Soviet bloc troops in the Congo. A United Nations collapse as a peace enforcement agency or a retrenchment in American support for it could still bring this about. These are the practical considerations—as distinct from the groundless fears—that the Senate and House will have to keep in mind when voting on this crucial measure.

BROADCAST ON UNITED NATIONS BY PAULINE FREDERICK

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President recently I had the privilege of listening to a broadcast over the NBC Network entitled "Emphasis: United Nations," by Pauline Frederick.

Pauline Frederick is a very able and skilled commentator, and specializes in commentary on the work of the United Nations. The broadcast made on March 9 relates to the United Nations Organization pledge of loyalty, as well as to the high caliber of the employees of the United Nations.

I wrote to Pauline Frederick March 9, and I complimented her on the fine broadcast she had presented that day. I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the broadcast and my letter be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the transcript and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Emphasis: United Nations

This is Pauline Frederick.

Walk into the tall glass house here on the East River—the Secretariat—at night, or on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, and people are always working. Someone is doing research, someone is adding figures, someone is writing, many are getting caught up with details they never find time for in a 40-hour week. And, of course, the Secretary-General and his top advisors usually put in a lot of overtime.

As a matter of fact, all levels of jobs are represented by the extra-hour workers, and most of them toil voluntarily. Not only are they not drawing double-time, or golden-time pay, but they are throwing the extra work into the hopper free.

Most other places on this island of Manhattan, bosses grumble about secretaries arriving just in time for the coffee-break and quitting on the dot of five.

No doubt some of these reports on the working habits of New Yorkers are exaggerated. But it is true that in most of Manhattan, after six in the evening and on weekends and holidays, office buildings are as empty as haunted houses.

But transfer some of these late-to-the-office, early-to-come home executives and employees, to jobs at the United Nations and drones probably would be transferred to beavers. The lights are never out in the glass house.

In the cafeteria one late evening I wondered, "Why," aloud. A man from the Netherlands sitting opposite, answered: "I suppose you Americans would say 'corny,' but working at the U.N. is more than a job. It gives purpose and reason for existence."

Who are these people who constitute the permanent work force of the U.N.? In the first 2 years the overwhelming majority was Americans. There was an understandable objection—a cry of unfair representation, so in 1947 the Assembly adopted a plan of recruitment to improve the geographical distribution of the staff. Working now at the Secretariat here in New York there are 3,226 persons from some 85 countries. These do not include more than 2,000 U.N. employees abroad.

Members of the organization pledge loyalty to the U.N. and are not permitted to receive instructions from member governments. This injunction is observed more in the breach by the Communists who always remain Communists.

Each employee received a guide for a standard of conduct which, among other things, lists service to the broad ideals of peace, economic and social progress, and the promotion of cooperative and friendly relations among nations of the world.

There is one particularly strict rule: Staff members may not accept "any honors, decoration, gifts, or marks of favor from any government or from any other source external to the Organization."

The code book concludes: "Integrity, international loyalty, independence and impartiality, and the subordination of private interests of the Organization are daily requirements."

In other words, those who work for the United Nations are expected to be true international civil servants.

March 9, 1962.

Pauline Frederick,
NBC News,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Miss Frederick: First of all, I want to express my thanks and appreciation for the wonderful reporting that you do on United Nations activities. All of us who are concerned about the U.N. are indebted to you for your objective and responsible reports.

Second, I would like to have you send me a copy of your news broadcast for the morning of March 9 where you spoke of the dedication of the U.N. employees. You may recall you emphasized how many hours these employees worked, and you also called to our attention the code of conduct which is required of the U.N. employees.

Again my thanks.

Sincerely,

Hubert H. Humphrey.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I take this opportunity to thank Pauline Frederick and NBC for the excellent coverage of United Nations activities over that network.

PROGRESS IN POLAND ON USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH BUT DELAYS ELSEWHERE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was with great pleasure that I have noted the agreement by the United States Government and Poland for the use of $2 million in Polish zlotys for the support of cooperative medical research and medical information projects.

This agreement represents a significant milestone in the long history for the use of these so-called soft currencies for a variety of constructive purposes abroad.

It was just 4 years ago, on February 19, 1958, that I first sponsored an amendment to Public Law 480 to permit the use of American-owned foreign currencies for the support of scientific research overseas.

The need for such use had become increasingly evident in the course of my work as chairman of a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations.

On June 30, 1958, Congress approved Public Law 85–477, setting up section 104(k) to Public Law 480. This provision authorized use of foreign currencies owned or controlled by the United States to support scientific research—as well as scientific information activities abroad.

It was not until the 1961 and 1962 fiscal years that Congress actually appropriated funds to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the purchase of foreign currencies for this purpose.

During these 2 years, progress has still been relatively slow. The new United States-Polish agreement represents, therefore, a considerable advance.

As a New York Times article of Monday, April 2, stated, the negotiation of the agreement with Poland has required patience, understanding, and skill. I commend both the American and the Polish authorities who have devoted themselves so fruitfully to this task.

SLOW PROGRESS ON OVERALL PROGRAM

Now, with regard to the $1.6 million previously agreed upon for other projects elsewhere, important work is underway. The epidemiology of malnutrition is being studied in Pakistan; problems of hypertension in Israel; research on vegetable protein supplements against malnutrition in India; metabolic studies on anemia in Egypt; botanical-type studies for pharmaceutical research in Brazil.

In addition, since January, funds have been obligated for exceedingly important field trials of vaccine against cholera under the auspices of the SEATO Cholera Research Laboratory in Dacca, Pakistan.

The problem, however, is that so little use, relatively speaking, has thus far been made of what has come to be known as the Humphrey amendment.

I suggest to the National Institutes of Health, the U.S. Public Health Service, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Defense, and all other departments engaged in medical research and scientific research that there be a well-balanced program of research, using the soft currencies available. Those currencies lose their value under inflation unless they are put to work. For the life of me I cannot understand why we take pride in hoarding those foreign currencies only to find out a year later that inflation has destroyed anywhere from 5 to 50 percent of their value. It seems to me that we would be better off to put them to work.

Here, we see that 3¾ years after an amendment reached the statute books, a mere trickle of funds is being used. It consists of $1.6 million previously, supplemented now by $1.2 million for NIH projects in Poland—and by $800,000 for Bureau of State Services and National Library of Medicine projects in Poland.

Yet, hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars worth of these foreign currencies have been sitting and have been subject to erosion by inflation.

The delay is not due, by and large, to medical scientists.

On the contrary, American and foreign scientists have invariably been enthusiastic on behalf of carrying out section 104(k). Regrettably, however, in many of the developing countries, the Ministries of Finance have been reluctant to permit use of soft currencies for other than major economic projects—in contrast to use for social, health, and related projects.

Invariably, when a Ministry of Health has proposed a particular medical project in partnership with the United States, the former has been delayed or turned down by Treasury-type authorities in foreign countries.

Here, in our own country, the U.S. Bureau of the Budget has not always been sympathetic to fullest use of section 104(k); nor, in all frankness, has the Congress.

What is in my judgment an unnecessary restriction was imposed when Congress required specific appropriations for individual agency requests for foreign currencies.

Those are currencies that we already have, currencies that have accrued to us because of the sale of surplus agricultural commodities.

Meanwhile, however, in the executive branch, while NIH programed $8.76 million in the 1961 and 1962 fiscal years, it actually processed only $1.6 million.

The result is that in the 1963 HEW appropriation bill, the administration requested for the Public Health Service $6.2 million less than the $9 million which Congress appropriated last year.

PROGRESS IN REVERSE

In other words, only $2.8 million is appropriated in the bill now pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

This, I say in all frankness, is not progress.

In other words, nearly $2,800,000 is appropriated in the bill now pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee. This, I say in all frankness, is not progress. It is not even smart. Frankly, I think it indicates a kind of economic retrogression. It is progress in reverse. It is going backward as regards section 104(k).

Let me make clear that the money is there. The question of appropriation is nothing but a bookkeeping arrangement. It merely keeps someone busy purchasing a pen when he might be a great deal better off if the authorities got busy and spent the money before it was eroded away by inflation. The money is there. It is in the account of the U.S. Government, and will only be wasted away by delay, lack of planning, and a lack of a sense of urgency.

NIH is now restudying the whole program, I understand, in the light of the scientific and administrative problems which have been encountered.

It is my personal hope that there will be a vast expansion in the use of these foreign currencies for international health activities. This will require the most sympathetic understanding within the legislative branch, within the executive branch, in the United States, and within the recipient foreign countries.

I digress to point out that we must negotiate with each foreign country. It is perfectly understandable that the ministry of public works in a foreign country would like to get available foreign currency for a new road. Anyone who has visited foreign countries knows full well that one of the major problems is the health problem. Some of those currencies could be used very well to combat disease. For example, in India they could be used to combat cholera. They could be used in many parts of Africa for a pure water supply. People in those governments would sometimes like to get the currencies for their particular problems. The trouble with the requests of the medical authorities and the ministry of health in those countries is that they generally end up at the bottom of the priority totem pole. I hope the authorities will get busy and give the problem more attention.

The United States-Polish agreement is an important step forward.

It is the type of step which I envisioned in 1958.

It is the type of action which scientists throughout Western Europe enthusiastically praised when I met with WHO authorities in Geneva and later with experts in France, the United Kingdom, Finland, Norway, and elsewhere.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the New York Times article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICANS TO HELP POLES IN SCIENCE RESEARCH PACT

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 1.—The United States will finance a $2 million medical research program by Polish and American scientists under a recently signed agreement with the Polish Government.

This, the first such undertaking with an Iron Curtain country, calls for collaboration by research scientists of both countries on 10 laboratory projects. These range from the functional organization of the brain to the causes of prenatal malformation in children.

The agreement between the U.S. Public Health Service and the Health and Social Welfare Ministry of Poland came after nearly a year of negotiating. These discussions survived the crisis incident to construction of the Berlin wall and a deterioration in the political relations between the two countries.

Most of the research work will be done in Poland by Polish scientists. In addition to preparing for periodic reports on results, the agreement calls for visits to Poland by collaborating scientists of the National Institutes of Health.

AMERICANS TO VISIT POLAND

The American team will spend about a month each year working in Poland with selected authorities there checking their procedures and results. It is expected that these visits will be returned by Polish experts, who will do laboratory work at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md.

All 10 research projects involve problems in which the scientists of both countries have an intense mutual interest and in which investigations are already underway.

For the United States, the agreement also helps ease an acute shortage of qualified research scientists as well as giving an opportunity to contract for exacting laboratory work at bargain prices. All the Polish scientists assigned to the projects were well known to officials of the Public Health Service and the National Institutes.

Aside from any immediate results of the research, Polish science is expected to benefit from experience gained with American equipment and techniques. Medical research in this country would also be expected to benefit from Poland's rich heritage of scientific inquiry. In most of the laboratory projects covered by the agreement, for instance, investigators in the two countries have been seeking similar objectives from different approaches.

A possible uniting of the two could mean greater progress in less time.

A tough-minded American Ambassador, Jacob D. Beam, and a chance meeting of an American and Polish scientist were instrumental in bringing about the joint research program.

Ambassador Beam negotiated in 1960 an agreement for the use of U.S.-owned counterpart funds that grow out of the "sale" to Poland of American surplus farm products. The local currencies accumulated in this way are available for a variety of purposes, including the advancement of science in the country purchasing the surplus products.

Normally funds of this kind are not repaid to the U.S. Treasury. But Ambassador Beam had included in the Polish agreement a stipulation that any counterpart zlotys remaining unspent by the United States after 10 years had to be returned to this country in dollars. In this respect the agreement is the only one of its kind.

When Congress authorized the Public Health Service to use $2,117,000 of the counterpart zlotys in Poland, the Warsaw government was eager to cooperate since all its foreign exchange is rationed for limited essential purchases.

In addition to their traditional pride of scientific achievement, the Polish scientists are expected to be as eager as the Government to show results from the present collaboration.

The basis for such cooperation had been laid long ago by the efforts of the Rockefeller Foundation in bringing young Poles to this country for training in American laboratories.

This rapport reached up to the institutional level through the chance meeting here 5 years ago of Dr. H. E. Rosvold, chief of neuropsychology at the National Institutes, with Dr. Jerzy Konorsky, professor of neurophysiology to the Nencki Institute of Experimental Biology in Warsaw.

WORKING ON SAME PROBLEM

Dr. Rosvold's facility in Polish led to a lively conversation in which it was discovered that both men were working on the same problem but from different approaches. Both wanted to know why animals developed definite behavior patterns following minor alteration of the brain structure or changes in the composition of brain cells.

Dr. Konorsky went back to Poland, but by regular correspondence exchanged theories and laboratory results with Dr. Rosvold. The latter then sent Dr. Mortimer M. Mishkin, his chief aid, to Warsaw to work with Dr. Konorsky. The basis of the collaboration to be made formal later, was firmly established.

But it took the patience and perseverance of Dr. Richard L. Masland, director of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, who headed an eight-member team of American negotiators, to complete the agreement. This was made with the Polish Ministry of Health and its advisory committee of 21 Polish scientists.

FERTILE STUDY GROUND

Poland is considered especially suitable by Public Health officials for conducting the laboratory investigations. Several factors contributed to this conclusion. For one thing Poland requires that an autopsy be made after every death.

For another, Poland, for reasons not known, has the world's highest incidence of stomach cancer. Thus, it should be possible to set up a sound cancer registry. The autopsy records also should provide accurate information about diseases of the blood vessels.

One 5-year project will investigate the "clinical and laboratory characteristics of muscle disease," including miasthenia gravis and muscular distrophy. Another authorizes "neuropathological studies of all forms of encephalitides in Poland."

Through use of radioactive isotopes another project will investigate brain edema or swelling induced by capillary permeability, or leakage of substances through blood vessels supplying the brain.

Isotopes also will be used to study the frequency and duration of strokes, with a view to making earlier identification of incipient strokes and opening the way to therapy.

Another cancer study will concentrate on test tube or culture growth of cancerous body tissue.

One of the few 2-year projects will be devoted to histochemical research concerning arteries of the Circle of Willis.

This involves the circular bunch of arteries at the base of the brain and the still mysterious ways in which it provides and controls the amount of nourishment for the brain.

One of three projects for which covering agreements have not yet been signed by the Polish authorities concerns that country's war-stricken water supply system and the identification and control of chemical contaminants of the atmosphere.

The air pollution study would be carried out in the heavily industrialized Krakow area of Poland.

THE EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT IN THE STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the recently announced agreement on an employment contract in the steel industry constitutes a noteworthy example of effective collective bargaining in which public opinion strongly influenced the results achieved. This agreement, involving an industry so basic to our economy, will do much to promote orderly progress in economic recovery under conditions of price stability. All who were involved in the negotiations merit commendation for demonstrated economic statesmanship in the public interest.

The role of the President of the United States in the stabilization of steel prices and then in steel wage contract negotiations was most significant. In my view, the action taken by President Kennedy in these regards constitutes one of his most outstanding performances in the public interest.

Last fall President Kennedy invoked the full weight of the prestige of the Presidency in an effort to avert a widely heralded general increase in the price of steel. An automatic wage increase was scheduled under an existing labor-management contract. The fact that this increase in wage cost was not followed by a general price increase represented a break in the pattern that has generally prevailed in recent years.

The degree to which the President's intervention may have influenced the steel companies in their decision can not be precisely measured. Unquestionably, however, the President, serving as the focal point for an expression of the national interest, effectively brought to bear upon steel company officials the concern of the American people about another inflationary increase in the price of steel.

A similar objective was sought by a number of my colleagues and myself who discussed on the floor of the Senate in August last year the adverse impact upon our economy which would be brought about by another increase in the price of steel. We endeavored to emphasize that the public interest—and the long-range interests of both the steel industry and its employees—would be best served by a hold-the-line policy with respect to steel prices and the negotiation of noninflationary labor-management contracts.

When the President appealed to steel industry officials last fall, he made it clear that he would urge restraint upon leaders of labor with respect to the contract provisions they might seek during negotiations for a contract to replace the one expiring on June 30, 1962. The President followed through on this pledge. His appeal, both to labor and to management last winter and, particularly, his intervention to bring about initiation of negotiations well in advance of contract expiration, has culminated in agreement upon what is generally considered a noninflationary contract a full 3 months before the present contract terminates.

I repeat, Mr. President, that President Kennedy's performance in this matter has been outstanding and extremely effective. But there is, of course, no guarantee that similar efforts on his part will be equally effective in the future. The prestige of the Office of the Presidency is tremendous. However, there is a limit to the number of times Presidential influence, standing alone, can with equal effect be used to resolve a problem that is recurring in nature. We must face the fact, Mr. President, that the successful conclusion of steel negotiations this spring may have only postponed resolution of the underlying issue, for the urge for higher profits is ever with us, and a similar crisis over steel wages—and prices—comes up nearly every year. Each time the outcome affects the entire country.

The outcome of periodic labor-management negotiations in the steel industry affects such diverse matters as the future value of our savings and investments, the price of a new car, the interest rate on a home mortgage and the flow of gold overseas. Each round of these negotiations is a crucial event in the battle against the inflationary spiral which has plagued us since the end of World War II. When steelworkers demand and win a substantial wage increase this is generally used by management to justify higher steel prices. When stalemate results in long and costly strikes, the effect on our economy and on the national defense effort is of serious proportions.

Consequently, I suggest that now is an appropriate time to take a careful look at the ground rules under which these recurring negotiations are conducted to determine whether some improvement can be made for the sake of the public interest.

Mr. President, steel is the basic commodity upon which most of our industrial capability depends and its price is a bellwether of our economy. In the past 12 years there have been 11 increases in steel prices. Their effect was concretely demonstrated in a study made in 1959 by Dr. Otto Eckstein for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress. This analysis showed that 40 percent of the rise in the wholesale price index of all manufactured goods from 1947 to 1958 was chiefly due to the fact that steel prices rose faster and farther than all other commodity prices.

The evil consequences of inflation are a matter of public concern for many reasons. Individuals—particularly retired people—suffer severe hardship as the purchasing power of their savings and pensions shrinks. When every dollar earned buys less each year, the pressure for wage increases mounts, in turn aggravating inflation. Interest rates are pushed up and small businesses have trouble obtaining loans needed for growth. Furthermore, inflation seriously threatens our foreign trade. We have not yet been priced out of many foreign markets; but we are faced with the need to increase our exports, and that is hardly possible if our commodity prices keep rising.

Steel is one of several large American industries dominated by a Big Three or Big Four on one side and a powerful labor organization on the other. In such industries prices do not fluctuate in the classic response to supply and demand. They are arrived at by tacit agreement among the industry's leading companies and are known in modern economic parlance as administered prices.

How this system operates in the steel industry was closely studied in 1957 by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the

Judiciary. At the conclusion of an extensive investigation, the committee urged the President to issue a call for voluntary restraint by labor and management.

The situation at the time was critical: consumer prices had risen 60 percent since World War II, industrial production had dropped 15 percent, and unemployment had risen to more than 5 million. However, President Eisenhower declined to intervene. Rather, he chose to heed the vocal demand that the Government should keep hands off and let the free forces of the marketplace shape the outcome. In September 1957 the index of finished steel prices showed an increase of nearly $4.40 a ton over June. Yet in this same period the demand for steel was relatively low and there was much unemployment in the industry. At that time and in subsequent years the industry has operated at far less than its productive capacity.

Obviously steel prices are set, not by the normal equating of supply and demand, not by the forces of a free competitive market, but by the leaders of big steel. There has not, in fact, been any real price competition among domestic steel producers since the organization of the United States Steel Corp. The Gary dinners—at which price agreements were at one time formally announced—are no longer held. But an equally effective system now serves to establish base prices for many different categories of steel such as cold rolled sheets or hot rolled bars with agreed "extras" for differences in specification within each category.

A rise in steel prices automatically triggers markups in steel-using commodities and also creates a psychological climate which affects prices in other industries. Similarly the outcome of wage negotiations in steel sets a pattern for other fields. Our position in world markets is also sharply affected. From 1953 to 1958, for example, our share of world steel exports fell from 18 percent to 12 percent; during this period our steel export prices rose 20 percent more than those of our foreign competitiors.

The traditional economic regulator in a free market economy is competitive pricing—a regulator not now operating in many industries, of which steel is the most important. In my view this situation is bad for our country's economic health. But admittedly it is not an easy problem to solve.

One remedy would be to restore competition to the steel industry through a more vigorous application of the antitrust laws. There is some doubt, however, that the Government can—on a long-range basis—retain the high-powered legal staff such a program would involve. Antitrust action can be helpful, but it is not a complete answer.

In addition, students of management and industrial engineering raise serious questions as to the desirability of atomizing an industry whose very bigness has important advantages of efficiency and productivity if they can be exploited in the public interest. In any case, restoring competition would be a task of many years which would afford no immediate relief.

The advantages of bigness are discussed by the distinguished economist, Gardiner Means, in his new book, "Pricing Power and the Public Interest." But Mr. Means also shows, by analyzing the testimony in the 1957 Senate hearings, that past steel-pricing policies have not been in the public interest, despite the claims of industry leaders. He then recommends a far-reaching and novel program—the creation of a new legal category midway between the monopoly industry and classical free enterprise. This new type of industry—of which steel is a prime example—he calls a collective enterprise. He proposes an incentive plan which would reward both the managers and workers in such industries for responsible behavior. It is based on a system of bonus payments earned through economically sound performance. In effect the managers of such enterprises would become trustees for the public rather than for their stockholders, and steel prices would be determined by sound economic criteria rather than by the quest for immediate high profits. Mr. Means has formulated in detail the legislative steps needed to put his proposal into effect. It is a challenging concept well worthy of close study. However, he concedes that—even if so novel an idea proved acceptable—it would take a decade or more to put it into operation.

Meanwhile, I believe that our Government—as the agent of our whole society—has an immediate and urgent duty to devise machinery which will serve to keep steel prices and wages within reasonable limits.

How can this be done?

I know of few people who favor a system of Government price and wage controls in peacetime, even for industries in which prices are now set by the arbitrary decisions of their leaders. But I believe it would be possible to use the great weight of public opinion to prevent steel prices and wages from getting too far out of line with prices and wages in more competitive sectors of the economy. To do this we need some new machinery to complement strong leadership by the President.

The goal should be not to set specific prices and wages, but to break up the price-wage-cost chain reaction in which every price rise is used to justify a wage increase, which in turn is followed automatically by yet another price boost. The need, as I see it, is for a two-way channel of communications whereby the public can be adequately informed on all aspects of prices, wages, and profits; and industry and labor leaders, in turn, can learn in no uncertain terms the judgment of the public on price and wage policies. Underpinning such a plan must be the Government's determination to use its legal powers to enforce and implement the judgment of society.

At present, we are not getting information which is too helpful—or even consistent from either labor or management. Both groups "inform" the public by flinging wildly contradictory accusations at one another. During the 1959 steel strike, for example, management proclaimed that employment costs had risen, since 1941, almost 10 times faster than shipments per man-hour worked; to avoid bankruptcy they had no choice but to raise prices. Labor flatly asserted the opposite. Since 1955, they saids, payroll costs—for all employees, not just production and maintenance workers—per ton of steel shipped rose by only $9.31 a ton. Prices per ton rose by $34.18, or almost four times as fast.

Each side rushed to saddle the other with responsibility for inflation. "It now costs you $2.07 to buy what a dollar bought in 1940," management commiserated at the time of the strike, adding that "the major cause of this inflation has been the steady rise in employment costs." But labor maintained that the leaders of big steel could keep their pacemaking prices down while continuing to take home more money than the average man dreams of. United States Steel, labor argued, could have cut its prices $18 per ton in the first quarter of 1959 and still earned a net profit—after taxes—"equal to an annual rate of return of $6.8 percent on net worth."

Mr. President, making it possible, first, for the public to know what is going on in the steel industry and, second, for steel employers and employees to know what the public wants done about it is clearly a sizable job. It could, I think, best be undertaken by a quasi-public rather than a Government organization. Partisan politics would thus be kept out of the picture. The new body might be called a National Consumers Advisory Board. It should include representatives of the press, big and small business, labor organizations, academic institutions, religious groups, welfare organizations, service organizations and the like. It should be a permanent organization, chartered by the Federal Government with a permanent staff and secretariat paid from Government funds.

Local or regional problems could best be considered by boards also set up at those levels. But when a national problem arises, such as the price of steel or the wage level for the whole industry, the national board should operate with the advice of local and regional boards on anticipated local effects and sentiment. A major function of the boards at all levels would be, of course, to disseminate their views and findings in order to mobilize public support.

Since the activities of the national board would cut across many departmental lines, it should report directly to the President. Upon its recommendations the President might—as he did last September—use his influence to persuade the steel companies that it is not in the national interest to raise steel prices. Or he might use conclusions of the board to buttress an appeal for restraint, such as he urged upon labor leaders this year. The formal support of an alerted and informed public would, I believe, do much to promote the success of such efforts in the future.

Of course, public opinion not backed up by the power—or the likelihood—of action might not be sufficient to hold the wage and price line. If persuasion fails, the President has other tools available.

He has the antitrust laws. He may recommend legislative action.

But we ought carefully to forge and organize an additional tool, of the type I have described, which would enable the President to maximize the influence of public opinion which has just been demonstrated to be an effective instrument of national policy in labor-management relations. Thus we may avoid the necessity—or at least make less frequent the need—for more direct Government action.

The process here outlined is a halfway house, between price, and wage fixing by the Government, and allowing industry leaders a completely free hand. This compromise will not please devotees of the free market visualized by Adam Smith. But in fact such a market does not exist. We have long had a "mixed" economy. Government regulation of tariffs, transportation, and utility rates, minimum-wage laws, and farm-price supports, for example, already interfere with a so-called free market economy. So do non-Government actions such as arbitrary price fixing by industry leaders. Indeed, there has never been a time in the entire history of the Western World when the so-called free market operated as visualized by Adam Smith. There have always been public restraints—operating through agencies of Government as well as through nongovernmental agencies of society—on prices and pricing policies, and I am amazed at the number of academic economists who do not seem to realize this. Nor does my proposal fit into an authoritarian system where most decisions of importance are made by the Government. This is certainly not wanted by most Americans.

Other countries which share our political and social philosophy have used methods similar to the one I have suggested to keep prices and wages in line. Britain, for example, has adopted a pause in wage increases. The Netherlands has had, since World War II, a board which can legally veto negotiated wage settlements. Austria has a wage-price commission which has successfully resisted big increases in prices and wages, although the commission has no court-enforcible authority; it can only make recommendations. West Germany does not now have formal machinery of this sort, but the German employers' confederation favors establishment of a committee of economists to recommend wage-price policies. In the Scandinavian countries, although there is no formal machinery, there is close cooperation among government, employers, and union leaders in holding down prices, especially in export items.

Americans are a practical people. Pragmatism is our philosophy. I do not think we need to make the hard choice between a resumption of inflation and strict Government controls. But we may be forced to choose between these alternatives unless we find a way to curb private self-interest and to guard the public welfare.

Mr. President, I am drafting and will shortly introduce in the Senate a bill to authorize the establishment of a National Consumers Advisory Board which would function generally as I have outlined in these remarks. In my opinion, this subject merits active consideration by the Senate and by the House of Representatives. I hope the successful conclusion of the recent negotiations in the steel industry will not operate to lull us into inaction. Indeed, we should take advantage of the time afforded by the new steel contract to devote deliberate consideration to effective measures to preserve free collective bargaining in a competitive private enterprise economy.

SERVING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AT SOCIAL FUNCTIONS IN THE CAPITOL AND SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article written by Milton Berliner and published in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, April 3, 1962, including also the statement which appears under a picture of the senior Senator from Oregon that is published along with the article. I may say humorously that I am sorry the picture cannot be reprinted in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article and title of the picture were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

J.F.K. Takes a Peek at Old Stamping Ground—"That's the Way It Was When I Left"

(By Milton Berliner)

President Kennedy just couldn't resist it. As he walked down the corridor alongside the Senate Chamber yesterday, he looked through a door and spotted Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, in the midst of one of his famous late-afternoon harangues to an almost empty Chamber.

The President hesitated, pushed the door open a bit and walked into the Chamber four or five steps.

He leaned forward, pointed to Senator Morse and said something.

The Senator grinned and resumed his speech as President Kennedy turned and walked out the door.

HIS REMARK

When he emerged he was asked what he had said to Senator Morse.

"I said, 'That's the way it was when I left the Senate,'" the President replied.

Just before he had paused to kid Senator Morse, President Kennedy had been a guest of honor at a party Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, gave to mark the opening of the new Senate reception room.

The President chatted with Senators and Cabinet members there for 20 minutes but did not so much as glance at the table where the bar had been set up.

Someone attributed his abstinence to the fact that Minority Leader Everett Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, had warned him when he arrived that Senator Morse, at that very moment, was addressing the Senate on the evils of serving liquor in the Capitol.

HAD INVITATION

Senator Morse, of course, had been invited to the party but he had told Senator Mansfield that he would not be seen anywhere that liquor was served.

And Senator Morse told the Senate that such activity should "be stopped forthwith."

"Official action should be taken by Congress," he said. "Members should stand up and be counted—and let them answer back home."

Incidentally, a goodly number of Senators who did attend the reception drank nothing stronger than ginger ale.

Picture Caption

Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, told the Senate yesterday he would not be seen where liquor was served. But back in 1960, when he was campaigning for the District's Democratic convention votes, he was happy, as this picture shows, to pose behind the bar of a local bistro.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now read a letter I have written under date of April 4, 1962, to Mr. John O'Rourke, editor of the Washington Daily News:

April 4, 1962.

Mr. John O'Rourke,
Editor, Washington Daily News,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. O'Rourke: My attention has just been called to the story that appeared in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, April 3, by Milton Berliner. Accompanying the story is a picture with the printed caption, "Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, told the Senate yesterday he would not be seen where liquor was served. But back in 1960, when he was campaigning for the District's Democratic convention votes, he was happy, as this picture shows, to pose behind the bar of a local bistro."

Both Berliner's story and the caption under the picture are typical of the biased and slanted journalism of your paper. I have long since ceased to expect either fair or accurate reporting from Berliner when I happen to be the subject matter of his articles.

In my speech of April 2, I pointed out that a social policy "has been developing in the Senate with increasing frequency in recent years. I believe it ought to be stopped. I refer to official and semiofficial and, I understand, sometimes unofficial use of the physical facilities in the Capitol and in the Senate Office Buildings. I do not know about the House, and I would not purport to advise the House.

"There is a growing social pattern of holding affairs in rooms in the Capitol and in the Senate Office Buildings at which hard liquor is served. In my opinion it cannot be justified. In the opinion of millions of American citizens it constitutes a desecration of public facilities in the Capitol and in the Senate Office Buildings. It ought to be stopped forthwith. At least I think that official action should be taken by Congress and that Members of Congress should be asked to stand up and be counted on the issue.

"I close my comments by saying that I will not knowingly attend such an affair; and if I find myself in such an affair, and hard liquor is being served, I will immediately absent myself from such an affair, because I do not think it is good public policy."

The picture of me which you published had no connection with my 1960 campaign in the District of Columbia. It was taken in a downtown restaurant where I stopped one morning for breakfast. While I was eating breakfast at the counter, the proprietor introduced himself to me and said that we was pleased to have me patronize his restaurant for breakfast. He then asked me if I would object to his taking my picture to add to his collection of pictures of public officials who from time to time have patronized his restaurant.

In the course of our conversation, I told him that when I was in college, I worked for a time behind a soda and sandwich counter in Madison, Wis. That caused him to suggest that I stand behind his soda and restaurant counter for the picture, and as the picture shows, I placed my hand on the soda jerk.

Contrary to your caption of the picture, I was not standing behind a bar although I noticed after I was in the restaurant that there was next to the restaurant and soda counter a liquor bar, as is true of a very large percentage of the restaurants in Washington.

The obvious intent of your story and picture was to seek to leave the impression that my practices do not conform to my statements about the liquor issue. Such snide and yellow journalism explains in part the reason for the fact that journalists, as a profession, are held in such low esteem and rightly so, by so many people. People do not approve of trickery, be it manifested in journalism or any other human endeavor.

My protesting the use of Capitol and Senate Office Building facilities for affairs at which hard liquor is served is due no doubt, in part, to the fact that by conviction I am a teetotaler but also due to my many observations during my 18 years in the Senate that the high consumption of hard liquor in Washington, D.C., is a disgrace to the Nation.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, tomorrow I shall submit a resolution for reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The resolution will propose that no facility of the Capitol or Senate Office Buildings that is used for public purposes or for official or semiofficial affairs, or for any affair of a social or a semisocial nature conducted by any group under the sponsorship or auspices of a Senator, may be used if hard liquor is served at such affair. I wish to provide an opportunity for Senators to stand up and be counted on this issue. In my judgment, the people of the United States are entitled to have a yea-and-nay vote. I shall do my very best to try to obtain a yea-and-nay vote before this session of Congress adjourns.

I shall have more to say on this subject at a later time; but since I am speaking on the subject at this time, I wish to add this statement: I hold to the point of view that the high consumption of hard liquor in the United States is one of the curses of this country at the present time. In my 18 years as a Member of the Senate, I have seen public officials destroy themselves by permitting themselves to be victimized by alcoholism.

I believe that as public officials, so far as our public conduct is concerned with respect to the consumption of liquor, we have an obligation to set an example to the youth of the country. I think it is important that as public officials we not flaunt before the public the consumption of hard liquor.

Someone has asked me, "Will you take that position if you go to someone's cocktail party or social affair?" My answer is that that is quite different from a public affair.

Any hosts or hostesses of mine certainly have a right to conduct their social affairs in accordance with their pleasure; and at those affairs I have a right to limit myself to tomato juice or soft drinks of other natures, as a teetotaler. But, Mr. President, no one will change my course of action because of the social habits of very dear friends of mine in regard to private affairs.

But in the case of affairs in the Capitol of the United States or in the Senate Office Buildings—which are public affairs—when they are using public facilities, then I am going to stand for my conviction in regard to this matter, because I think that is wrong.

Of course, I may be defeated. If I am defeated, and if my resolution is rejected, and if it is decided by the Senate that liquor may be served here, that decision will be the privilege of the Senate, and also its responsibility.

Mr. President, I am very greatly concerned about what I have observed in this town, during my 18 years of service in the Senate, as regards the liquor traffic. The statistics I have seen indicate that the District of Columbia has the highest per capita consumption of hard liquor of any area in the Nation. If I am in error about that, I wish the record to be corrected; but all the statistics submitted when this matter has been discussed before have borne out the observation I have just now made.

However, regardless of whether the per capita consumption of hard liquor in the District of Columbia is higher than in any other part of the country or not, it is certainly too high, in my judgment, for the good of the Nation; and I do not think that, as Senators, we should be setting an example of flaunting the consumption of hard liquor at Senate affairs conducted in the Capitol or in the Senate Office Buildings.

Of course it is up to the House of Representatives to decide what it wishes to do in regard to its affairs.

Mr. President, I am satisfied that I am speaking about a very delicate matter about which people have very deep feelings; and resentments can easily be stirred up, and many people will be inclined to take the position that one really has no right to seek to regulate the social habits of others. I do not intend to do that, Mr. President. But I do say, as a Senator, that in my judgment the people of this country, through their representatives, have a right to have this matter decided by formal action, so that the people of the Nation can then decide whether their representatives took formal action of which they approve. I think my colleagues will be surprised to discover the strong body of opinion in this country, even on the part of the social cocktail drinkers themselves, that will agree that it is one thing for them to give a private cocktail party, and it is quite another thing to make use of public facilities, as an official affair connected with the Senate of the United States, for a cocktail party.

But even if I do not prevail, at least I shall have put the Senate in a position where it will have to decide this matter officially; and of course I would take the position—and rightly so, I think—that inaction on my resolution would be subject to the interpretation that apparently the Senate wanted to continue a growing social trend which I have observed in recent years—namely, to turn some of the Senate affairs in the Capitol and in the Senate Office Buildings into a social cocktail hour.

That was not true when I first came to the Senate, 18 years ago; I cannot remember that in the first years when I was here, there was any official or semiofficial affair in the Capitol or in the Senate Office Building at which hard liquor was served. I know of no good reason why this trend should develop.

Therefore, Mr. President, on tomorrow I shall submit my resolution; and I am advised by the Parliamentarian that such a resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, for appropriate action.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 4, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 193. An act for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd;

S. 899. An act for the relief of Liu Shui Chen;

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito;

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska;

S. 1578. An act for the relief of Edward Yin Liang;

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza;

S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla;

S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani;

S. 2018. An act for the relief of Robert B. Kasparek, Robert M. Kearnym, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.; and

S. 2101. An act for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at 11 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 5, 1962, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 4, 1962:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be Deputy Attorney General, vice Byron R. White.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 4, 1962:

AMBASSADOR

Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hebrews 12: 2: *Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith.*

O Thou God of all wisdom, our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress know that daily they are challenged by many unsolved problems and many unsettled issues.

Grant that, cheered and encouraged by a vision of Thy nearness and greatness, they may bear clear and confident witness that they are striving to know Thy way and to do Thy will.

Show us how we may preserve and promote the moral and spiritual values and may we never be numbered among the cynics who would have us believe that all the higher ideals and aspirations are foolish and futile.

Help us to understand that our days and years, whether few or many, afford us the glorious opportunity for the culture of our souls, created in Thine own image and with a capacity to be like Thee in spirit. Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The message also announced that Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, had appointed the Senator from New York, Mr. KEATING, a member of the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy in place of the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. CASE, resigned.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to order of the House of March 29, the Speaker declares a recess of the House subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY JOAO GOULART, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE UNITED STATES OF BRAZIL

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of Brazil into the Chamber: The gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT; the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SPARKMAN; the Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL; the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER; and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN.

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the Republic of the United States of Brazil.

The President of the Republic of the United States of Brazil, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is a great pleasure, and I deem it a high privilege and honor, to present to you His Excellency, the President of the Republic of the United States of Brazil. [Applause, the Members rising].

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE UNITED STATES OF BRAZIL

President GOULART. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Senators, and Congressmen, I feel greatly honored to speak from this rostrum and transmit to the representatives of the American people the greetings of the Government and the people of Brazil. This is the second time that such a privileged opportunity has been accorded me by act of fate. The first occasion was in 1956 when, as Vice President of my country, I came here at the invitation of your own Vice President at that time, the distinguished Mr. Richard Nixon, and today I do so again in compliance with another invitation, which I have had the honor of receiving from the eminent President of the United States, Mr. John Kennedy. The relations between our two countries go back to the era of our independence, and they have been intensified in more recent times, as we have fought side by side in the two World Wars, in defense of democracy and freedom. [Applause.]

Never have those relations been dimmed by attritions or by misunderstandings, even though at times we may have supported diverging views. [Applause.]

It is my deep conviction that good and well-defined relations between Brazil and the United States are both desirable and necessary. It seems to me essential, in terms of a democratic continental affirmation that there be always a perfect understanding between the two greatest nations on this hemisphere. [Applause.]

Brazil and the United States shaped their democratic conscience over the course of their struggles for independence, and ever since they have been engaged in a century-old effort to implant and perfect a form of representative government, based on the supremacy of a written constitution, on respect for the autonomy of states and on the guarantees of individual rights. [Applause.]

While this similarity in political organization breeds identical sentiments as to the defense of legality and the preservation of public freedoms, there is, at the same time, between our two countries a profound diversity in socioeconomic conditions which has led us down different paths, at a different pace, to achieve identical objectives.

The Government and the people of Brazil have spared no sacrifices in order to overcome backwardness and underdevelopment. We are trying to establish a harmonious development throughout the country to correct regional imbalances and avoid state of destitution in certain areas and raise them to the level, for instance, of the State of São Paulo, where the per capita income is higher than that of some of the highly industrialized countries.

In the struggle for development and for our economic emancipation, we have suffered the influence of adverse factors, which we are determined to overcome. There are permanent imbalances in the system of trade relations between countries having an adverse economic development, with prejudicial reflexes on the economically weaker countries. We can eliminate or at least attenuate these imbalances, through conventions and agreements based on friendly arrangements and the adoption of realistic formulas.

The monetary inflation in Brazil, of which so much has been said both in our country and abroad, is not a local phenomenon; it coincided with the wartime economy, when the old economic-financial structure suffered the impact of abrupt changes in our allies' supply and demand.

During the war years the prices of our export products were frozen at levels that were much below their real value. When normal trade conditions were reestablished, it became possible for the countries of Europe, and others whose economies had been ravaged by war, to eliminate inflation and restore prosperity. To this end they were favored during the period 1948-52 by the massive help received from the American economy which sustained, through loans and grants, not only the former Allies but also the former enemies, allowing them quickly to recover and even to surpass their previous levels of agricultural and industrial production. Once their industries were rebuilt, those countries began to trade under the particularly advantageous conditions under which the exporters of manufactured goods operate.

The Latin American countries, with their war-born inflation, remained devoid of any plan of international cooperation for the recovery of their agriculture and the development of their industries, depending exclusively upon the export of their primary products for the restoration of their trade. The story of the growing deterioration of the terms of trade of commodities with manufactured goods is well known to all. From year to year, the same number of bags of coffee or of cocoa or of cotton buys a lesser quantity of the same type of equipment or of manufactured products. While our primary products have remained exposed to a continuing fall in prices, the index of growth of our population has increased at such levels that Brazil is expected to possess 200 million inhabitants by the end of this century. Notwithstanding such adverse factors, Brazil has been maintaining a growing rhythm in the increase of its per capita income and of the national product. This notable effort for development is due above all to the unlimited reserves of energy and sense of patriotism of the Brazilian people.

It is true that we have secured appreciable bank loans at normal rates of interest and for regular terms, granted chiefly by financial agencies of the United States—and of this the Brazilian people is fully aware, as it is also aware that the eradication of the difficulties which we are now undergoing depends upon our work, our energy, and our sacrifice.

We feel, gentlemen of the Congress, that our destiny is in our own hands, and we keep our eyes open to find the adequate solutions for the development of Brazil. The political awareness of the leaders in government and of the people themselves is keenly awake to the fact that the fight for development is the fight of the people. In pursuance of this purpose, we are engaged in the realization and implementation of basic reforms, among which the agrarian reform is paramount. We recognize the importance of the foreign contribution to the process of our development.

I have repeatedly said that we nourish no prejudice against foreign capital and the technical collaboration of the more advanced countries. We desire this cooperation and will assure its full freedom within the legal limits established and under the inspiration of Brazilian ideals. [Applause.] Only a short time ago I reaffirmed these very same concepts, in an address which I made to the American Chamber of Commerce in Rio de Janeiro where I was guest of honor at a reception organized on the occasion of my departure from Brazil.

As a country now in a phase of full expansion, Brazil offers broad possibilities to foreign private enterprise desirous to cooperate loyally for its development. In the matter of public utilities services, there are certain areas of friction which should be eliminated, all the more so because through a natural phenomenon, beside creating disagreements between the granting authority and the concessionary, they are not rarely a source of misunderstanding between friendly countries.

Brazil hailed with confidence the announcement of the new policy of the United States toward Latin America, as expressed by President Kennedy in the Alliance for Progress and having Operation Pan America, a Brazilian initiative, as one of its historic milestones. We see in the Alliance for Progress the formulation of a plan for global cooperation, which Latin America has awaited since the termination of the Second World War, and which, once carried out, should have for our hemisphere the proportions and significance which the Marshall plan had for the countries of Western Europe. [Applause.] The lack of initiative of this magnitude made it extremely difficult for the countries of the hemisphere to stabilize their economies. Thus, the Alliance for Progress has significantly been placed within the framework not only of its economic aspects but also of its social aspects as your Chief Executive emphasized in these highly significant words, "those who make peaceable revolution impossible will render violent revolution inevitable." I cannot conceal, however, my fears as to the difficulties in implementation. If the Alliance for Progress is to depend upon an effort by the Latin American countries to achieve global planning with absolute technical precision in the economic and social fields and to eliminate beforehand certain factors of instability, we can introduce hindrances capable of impairing the urgency of solutions which cannot be put off.

Such difficulties will mount if the Alliance fails to reflect, principally, the spirit of reciprocal trust and respect between the countries which comprise it, in line with the purposes expressed by the eminent President Kennedy. I wish to reaffirm the identification of my country with the democratic principles which unite the peoples of the West. Brazil forms no part of any politicomilitary bloc, but it abides by its freely assumed international commitments. Brazil's international action responds to no other objective than that of favoring, by all means in our power, the preservation and strengthening of peace. It is our belief that the ideological conflict between East and West cannot and must not be decided by military action, for in the event of a nuclear war, even if we managed to save our own lives, whether in victory or in defeat our very reason for living would be obliterated. The end of the dangerous emulation in armaments in comity of relationships must be sought through negotiations.

Brazil believes that a noninimical contact between the democratic world and the socialist world can be beneficial to the knowledge and coordination of experience of all. It is our hope that these contacts will make it evident that representative democracy is the most perfect of all forms of government and the only one compatible with the protection of mankind and the preservation of human freedom. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the Congress, I have used simple and direct language to express the thought of the Government and the people of Brazil on the more timely problems in our relations as good and longstanding friends. This is the same kind of language that two great Presidents—President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and President Getúlio Vargas—in times that were crucial for the history of mankind, when they found efficient and friendly forms of mutual understanding. I place my trust in God, and I feel certain that we can contribute to the peace and happiness of the world, eliminating economic slavery, despotism and fear, and guaranteeing popular freedoms and personal security within a democratic and representative political system.

Thank you, Mr. President.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m., the President of Brazil, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess of the House may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PENNSYLVANIA HOME RULE ASSOCIATION, IN THE FACE OF AN ADVERSE REPORT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, DEFENDS MY BILL, H.R. 8612, PROVIDING FOR THE NATIONAL HOME RULE ROAD PROGRAM

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since the introduction, on August 9, 1961, of H.R. 8612 at the request of my good friend and constituent, Mr. Thomas S. Stephenson, president, Pennsylvania Home Rule Association, Altoona, Pa., there has been widespread interest in the legislation. It has been described as the national home rule road program, because it proposes amendments to the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 which would channel all Federal gasoline and automotive excise taxes into the highway trust fund. These taxes would be used for road improvement purposes and would spur improvements on all classes of public highways.

On March 2, 1962, the U.S. Department of Commerce, through its Under Secretary, Edward Gudeman, advised Chairman Wilbur D. Mills, of the House Committee on Ways and Means, of its opposition to H.R. 8612.

The position of the Department of Commerce reveals the Kennedy administration's attitude in opposing any further amendments to the Federal Highway Act of 1956. The letter from the Department of Commerce follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. Wilbur D. Mills,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is in further reply to your request for the views of the Department of Commerce concerning H.R. 8612, a bill "To amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, and for other purposes."

The proposed legislation, which would be cited as the "national home rule road program," would provide that the entire amount received from Federal gasoline and automotive excise taxes would be placed in the highway trust fund and used for road improvement purposes. It would be provided that all public highways would be eligible for Federal aid, with 60 percent of the Federal funds available in the highway trust fund to be used for improvement of the Federal-aid systems and 40 percent for improvement of State highways and local roads and streets not designated as a part of any Federal-aid system. With respect to the latter, 50 percent of such funds would be expended by the State on State highways not designated as part of the Federal-aid highway system and 50 percent would be allocated by the State to those of its political subdivisions having jurisdiction over local roads and streets. The bill also would remove the present matching requirements of Federal-aid highway legislation so that Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to each State would be expended by the State or political subdivisions thereof without necessity for the States or their political subdivisions contributing funds toward highways constructed or improved under the legislation.

The Department of Commerce would be strongly opposed to the pending bill.

With respect to the provisions of the bill providing that all Federal gasoline and automotive excise taxes be placed in the highway trust fund, your attention is invited to the special message of the President concerning highways, dated February 28, 1961, which opposed transferring certain automotive excise taxes to the highway trust fund and recommended that financing of the highway program should be continued on a pay-as-you-go basis, supported by the user taxes specified in the Highway Revenue Act of 1956. These recommendations of the President were closely followed in the enactment of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1961 under which additional revenues were provided to finance the completion of the Interstate System and the continuation of the program for improvement of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions.

If legislation such as H.R. 8612 were enacted, estimated revenues totaling over $1.6 billion annually, now accruing to the general fund, would be transferred to the highway trust fund.

The remaining provisions of the bill are entirely inconsistent with the fundamental concepts of Federal-aid highway legislation as developed by the Congress over a period of 45 years. Experience during these many years of Federal-aid highway operations has demonstrated the desirability of providing for the improvement of designated Federal-aid systems. It is apparent that funds would be widely dispersed and that an uncoordinated pattern of improvement would result if there were no requirement for system improvement. In fact, the requirement for system improvement was first incorporated in the Federal Highway Act of 1921 and has remained unchanged in principle.

Under the provisions of H.R. 8612, however, 40 percent of the Federal-aid highway funds could be expended without regard to system development or continuity of route improvement. The Department of Commerce considers that the expenditure of public funds in this manner would be highly undesirable and could readily lead to misuse of Federal-aid highway funds. We firmly believe that the public would not be receiving the greatest possible benefit from its highway dollar under such provisions.

In connection with that portion of the bill which would remove the present matching requirements of Federal-aid highway legislation, it is stressed that, as a result, the volume of Federal-aid highway work which could be performed would be reduced substantially. Under the present law, the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban funds authorized to be appropriated by the Congress must be matched on a 50 percent Federal-50 percent State basis, and interstate funds must be matched on a 90 percent Federal-10 percent State basis. Under Federal-aid authorization levels for the fiscal year 1963, the program reduction resulting from a recision of State matching requirements would amount to nearly $1.2 billion annually.

Beyond this fact, there is to be considered the longstanding principle of Federal-State cooperation in the Federal-aid highway program. This Department believes it is essential that State or local funds contribute to the costs of projects financed from Federal-aid funds, except in certain special cases now authorized by law, as a means of insuring good highway administration. Prudent and efficient supervision of Federal-aid highway projects is much more likely to result at the State or local level if State or local funds are being expended together with the authorized Federal contribution.

The Department of Commerce believes that the provisions of H.R. 8612 are in direct conflict with the fundamental concepts which have been so recently supported by the Congress and the President in the enactment and approval of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 and strongly opposes the enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there would be no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
Edward Gudeman,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the following letter which I received, dated March 28, from Mr. Thomas S. Stephenson, of the Pennsylvania Home Rule Association, Altoona, Pa., in which he takes issue with the negative position of the Department of Commerce regarding H.R. 8612.

Pennsylvania Home Rule
Association,
Altoona, Pa., March 28, 1962.

Hon. James E. Van Zandt,
1104 New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Van Zandt: Thanks for your letter of March 12 requesting our views on objections raised by the Department of Commerce to your bill, H.R. 3612, to provide a national home rule road program.

In analyzing the objections raised by the Department of Commerce, it is obvious that the author of the Department's objections had distorted the provisions of the bill and ignored its objectives and, in particular, the benefits that would accrue to the people in every State and congressional district in the Nation by enactment of the measure.

The basic provisions of the bill would:

1. End the diversion of motor revenues.
2. Guarantee the motorists a balanced highway improvement program on all classes of public roads—Federal, State, and local.
3. Promote the civic welfare of every community in every congressional district in the Nation.
4. Help to restore national prosperity by providing employment for several hundred thousand men on the roads and streets and in the roadbuilding material, equipment, and allied industries.
5. Enhance real estate values in every community where road improvements are made.
6. Promote the building of new homes, stores, shopping centers, offices, and service stations, as such construction always follows road and street improvements. This would provide additional employment in the building and allied industries.
7. Provide additional employment in the factories and farms that would produce the food, clothing, household, and other necessities that would be bought by those employed in the program.

All the foregoing objectives could be attained by Congress by enacting H.R. 8612, because this bill requires that all Federal gasoline and excise taxes be placed in the highway trust fund to be used exclusively for road improvement purposes. Sixty percent of the trust fund, the same amount as is now used, would be allocated for improvements on the Federal-aid system. The other 40 percent would be allocated to the States, one-half to be used for State highway improvements and the other half to be allocated by the States to their political subdivisions on a 60-percent mileage and 40-percent population basis for the improvement of local roads which are not on the Federal-aid system.

The Department of Commerce objects to the use of the now diverted funds for the improvement of the State and local road systems that are not on the Federal-aid system.

Its spokesman said, "The Department of Commerce considers that the expenditure of public funds in this manner would be highly undesirable and could readily lead to misuse of Federal-aid highway funds. We firmly believe that the public would not be receiving the greatest possible benefit from its highway dollar under such provisions."

This statement obviously is intended to mislead the Members of Congress, since it is not in keeping with the facts or the record.

The Department's charge that State and local road officials would misuse Federal funds comes with poor grace, when its Federal-aid policies are being subjected to an investigation by the Blatnik committee of Congress, which already has exposed corruption, waste, and downright graft in the Federal-aid program. Here is a quote from disclosures as published in a national magazine:

"Minnesota Representative John Blatnik estimates a large slice of the $41 billion highway bill is stolen by grafters."

Here is another from the same article:

"One investigator estimates a graft between 10 and 20 percent, a minimum of a $100,000 take a mile, or $4.1 billion for the whole network."

The foregoing are only samples of the findings of the investigators. Yet, the Department of Commerce spokesman is telling the Members of Congress that State and local officials might misuse Federal funds and the public would not be receiving the greatest possible benefit from its highway dollar.

The record shows that local officials and State highway officials give the motorists more highways for the dollar than they receive under the Federal-aid program. In fact, it is our opinion that the allocation of the $1,700 million of diverted funds to State and local roads would result in a minimum of more than 60,000 miles of road improvements annually.

The Department spokesman had overlooked one important point in his loose statements: The funds allocated for the improvement of State and local roads and streets would be subject to the same rigid laws regulating the expenditure of State and local funds for highway improvements.

The highway officials of the various States are either elected or appointed. The local officials, in the counties and other political subdivisions that would receive a share of the funds, are elected by the people.

The Department of Commerce spokesman for the Federal-aid bureaucracy, in making such rash accusations against the honesty, integrity, and ability of State and local officials, discloses little regard for the intelligence of elected officials, and it appears that they have the same opinion of Members of Congress or they would not have resorted to so many distortions of the provisions of H.R. 8612.

The Federal highway bureaucracy is not adverse to spending an average of $1 million per mile for the Interstate System, which is estimated by the Bureau of Public Roads to carry only 20 percent of the total highway traffic when it is completed in 1975. Yet, the same officials object to the proposal in H.R. 8612 to provide that the $1,700 million of diverted funds be made available for improvements on the State and local systems, which now carry 34 percent of the total highway traffic, or 15 percent more than the Interstate System will carry when it is completed at a cost of $41 billion.

Motorists throughout the country are becoming aroused over the deplorable condition of the public road system. They are finally becoming alerted to the diversion policy of the Federal Government, which is shortchanging them out of tens of thousands of miles of road improvements annually. They also are becoming aware that the matching provisions likewise are robbing them of improvements on the State highway systems. Many of them long have been aware that they are not getting their money's worth and they are being irked more than ever by dispatches published in their newspapers disclosing that hundreds of millions of dollars that they pay in Federal automotive taxes are being used to build, yes, superhighways in foreign countries, when they cannot get the improvements they need on the State and local roads that are not on the Federal-aid system.

The following is a sample and is a quote from a recent newspaper dispatch: "Washington—The World Bank's first loan to Venezuela, $45 million, will help to finance two express highways and cut transportation costs."

It is not hard to understand the feeling of the motorists when they read such reports and realize there are millions available for express highways in foreign countries, but no money for the roads used by American motorists who are paying the multi-billion-dollar tax bill.

The matching provisions of the Federal-aid policy are directly responsible for the deplorable condition of thousands of miles of State highways. The matching provisions penalize the districts that need help the most. They must either put up the matching money or lose the Federal aid their taxpayers help to pay. Rather than lose it, they must put up money that is needed for State highway improvements. This forces neglect of the State roads that are not on the Federal-aid system and will, if the present policy continues, cost the taxpayers additional billions of dollars for reconstruction through the forced neglect by the notorious matching provisions.

On the face of it, the matching provisions constitute a ridiculous policy. Why should the people of any State put up from 10 to 50 percent of the State highway funds to get back only part of the money their motorists pay into the Federal Government in automobile excise taxes?

The Federal Highway Bureau policymakers, of course, do not want the matching provisions eliminated and the allocation of Federal-aid funds made directly to the States. Not because less roads would be built, but because the matching provisions give them greater powers to control, not only the expenditure of Federal-aid moneys, but over $1 billion of State funds, too.

These bureaucratic controls in Washington are ridiculous in that they violate the basic principles of States right and home rule. Why should State and local officials be controlled from Washington by the Federal highway bureaucracy? Certainly the local officials know their people's needs better than Federal highway officials who could not know anything about local road problems.

The Commerce Department spokesman places great stress on the charge that the allocation of Federal funds for State and local road improvements "would be widely dispersed and that an uncoordinated pattern of improvements would result if there were no requirement for system improvement."

This is a ridiculous assertion, in view of the fact that it would be impossible for any road officials to build all highways first. They must build, and have been building, the most important roads and adding to them as funds are available.

The Interstate System policy, controlled by the Bureau of Public Roads, has been the subject of public and congressional criticism for the widely scattered improvements on the Interstate System. No public road officials—Federal, State or local—can build a 10-mile stretch of highway, regardless of its importance, if there is only enough money available to build 1 mile. But the Commerce Department, in its statement, is evidently trying to impress Congress by the inference that only State and local roads would be constructed on a scattered pattern.

The Department also places some stress on the argument that H.R. 8612 would change the Federal-aid highway setup. It doesn't change any part of the Federal-aid program, excepting the matching provisions. What it does provide for is that the 1,700 million collected in motor taxes and now diverted be allocated to the States and political subdivisions for the improvement of State and local roads not on the Federal-aid system.

In conclusion, we hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will take prompt action and report H.R. 8612 for a vote in Congress, and that the bill may be enacted at this session of Congress in time for the 1962 construction season, so that several hundred thousand men may be put to work on the greatest State and local road improvement program in the Nation's history.

Cordially yours,
Pennsylvania Home Rule Association,
Thomas S. Stephenson,
President.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal of the Pennsylvania Home Rule Association for a national home rule road program as embodied in my bill H.R. 8612 would mean, as Mr. Stephenson says in his letter, the creation of the greatest State and local road improvement program in the Nation's history. Therefore, it is hoped that the House Committee on Ways and Means will schedule hearings on H.R. 8612 so that the measure may be considered on its merits.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Addonizio
Alford
Andrews
Ashley
Auchincloss
Avery
Bailey
Barry
Bolling
Bonner
Boykin
Breeding
Brewster
Coad
Cooley
Corbett
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Dingell
Dole
Dowdy
Evins
Finnegan
Flynt
Ford
Gavin
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Hansen
Harrison, Va.
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Inouye
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Kearns
Kee
McDowell
McIntire
McMillan
Moorhead, Pa.
Morrison
Moulder
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
Passman
Patman
Powell
Rains
Reece
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
St. George
Santangelo
Scott
Scranton
Selden
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Stafford
Thompson, N.J.
Tollefson
Whitten
Wickersham
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Yates

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-eight Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and pending the motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 11038, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I will try to be brief so that Members desiring to do so may have time to express themselves on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we bring to you today a bill of some 55 or 56 items covering about 25 agencies and bureaus. Bear in mind that this is the second supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1962, which ends on June 30, 1962, in other words, in about 2 months. We submit this supplemental bill to you for your consideration, asking you to give us your help. All the members of the subcommittee are here and we will endeavor, individually or collectively, to give you all the information you wish, knowing you are entitled to it. We want to cooperate with you. We well know that we are representing you in this matter.

As I stated, there are some 25 agencies and departments involved in this bill. In terms of appropriations it amounts to $431 million. The bill has been reduced under the budget estimate about $116 million.

The estimate calls for an increase in employment, in round figures, of 860 or 870 employees. Your committee recommends to you a reduction in the number of employees to about 500. May I ask our colleagues to refer to the committee report It is not too long; it is concise and to the point. If you will look at the table you will note that most of the items have been reduced. There are some three or four items that have not been reduced. One of them is the Forest Service. It has been a tremendous year for fires involving some 8 or 10 of our Western Mountain States. It is the habit of the Congress to make a token appropriation of about $5 million for fighting fires, and the remainder of the cost is covered at the end of the year in the form of a deficiency. That is what this is, $37 million. That money has been spent and, of course, we have our very able and genial friend from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who probably knows as much about this item, if not more, than all of the rest of us combined. He will be glad to explain it.

I think I should mention to you that in reading the bill you will find the phrase "Salaries and expenses," in about 15 or 16 items through roughly 25 percent of the bill. That is Bureau of the Budget nomenclature. In fact it does not represent additional jobs but is for what we call Wage Board pay increases. In round numbers there are about 15 of these items throughout the bill in practically one-quarter of all the agencies. I think I should go into a little detail about that.

You will recall that the Congress about 2 years ago, late in 1958, passed a law that made it mandatory—get that, mandatory—that these Wage Board pay increases be paid. Paid when?

Well, to make a long story short, it was about 60 days after they had accrued. So the Bureau of the Budget in its practice sets up most of these Wage Board increases in the form of a deficiency. If you will read the President's budget, regardless of who he is or which party he belongs to—it is the same procedure. You will note in the budgets a statement for 1959 or 1963 that Wage Board increases will be sent later in the form of a deficiency. So you have some 15 or 16 of those items in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I do not want to take too much time. All of our colleagues on the committee are here, and we will endeavor individually or collectively to give you all the information that we have, and we will do it with great pleasure.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Texas will give us a little explanation of the amount of $400,000 appearing on page 9 of the bill. It says the amount recommended includes $400,000 for inauguration of an African medical program and for an African Administrative Service Center. Will the gentleman give us a little explanation of that?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. The State Department is attempting to save money by setting up a little medical unit for our own people over there rather than having to fly them a thousand or 1,500 or 2,000 miles. I believe that our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], will give you the details you want on that.

Mr. HALEY. This is, then, for personnel employed in various agencies of the Government?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; for our own people.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. The committee refused to grant an appropriation of $330,000 to the Maritime Commission. The new Maritime Commission assumed all the regulatory powers and duties of the old Maritime Board. That involved violations of the Shipping Act, the protection of American flag carriers, bringing disciplinary proceedings against ship owners, the passing on rates, if unjust, only on in-board traffic, and examining conference reports.

In addition, by a new law which we passed, the Maritime Commission must screen all conferences, they must supervise all tariff filings. About 30,000 tariffs have been filed. Each tariff contains dozens of articles. They must prevent retaliation by one flag carrier against another, and retributions. They must determine whether rates, not only inboard but outboard, are fair and proper. They must check on the conferences and all actions under those conferences. They must license freight forwarders. There are a thousand applications pending abroad. They must conduct 240 hearings, and this is very important, which were the result of the workings of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, where we unearthed 240 violations of the Shipping Act.

All of these burdens have been cast on the members of the new Maritime Commission, and it is quite essential that they have additional personnel beyond what they heretofore have had. They are willing to cut their requests from $330,000 down to $175,000. I have had a little chat with the gentleman from Texas, and I hope that after our sort of gentlemen's agreement, he will use all reasonable efforts to bring about some relief in that regard. Am I correct, sir?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to our beloved colleague, and certainly the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], that when he comes to this floor and gives us the benefit of his good judgment and his wisdom, I am going to listen to him. As he pointed out, his committee, the great Committee on the Judiciary of the House, put in many long hours on an overdue matter that should have been attended to a long time ago in the old Maritime Administration. As he has so well pointed out, the functions have been split up now between the Administration and the Commission. This Commission has one duty, as you well pointed out. You put that duty on them. To sum it all up, it is rates. By virtue of your good, strong statement, may I suggest to the gentleman that we will cooperate with him. Let this go to the Senate, because you only have about 2 months remaining in the fiscal year. Bear in mind, this is a deficiency appropriation. They have 153 employees now. We will go to the other side and we will ask your help. I think we will work out something that is satisfactory to my able and distinguished friend.

Mr. CELLER. Well, that is a very splendid answer, and the gentleman, as usual, is always kind and most reasonable.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is aware, I assume, that the Congress made an appropriation for the Seattle World's Fair.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; $9.9 million.

Mr. GROSS. Nine million nine hundred and seventy thousand.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not think that New York would be well served with about the same amount of money?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, we had a different estimate. We have a different crowd. We have 66 foreign countries already that have asked for space. After all, Seattle is a great city. I love the people. There are no finer people in the world. But, after all, you know, New York is about 10 or 15 times as big.

Mr. GROSS. Well, the gentleman does not believe in discriminaton, does he?

Mr. THOMAS. Not if I can avoid it.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question.

Mr. THOMAS. You can ask me anything you want.

Mr. GROSS. I understand there is some $25,616,000 in the bill for the United Nations.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I have been unable to learn, from reading the hearings, whether this is an assessment or whether this is supposed to be a contribution, voluntary or otherwise.

Mr. THOMAS. It is what we call a voluntary assessment. It is not a regular contribution.

Mr. GROSS. Is there really such a thing as a voluntary assessment?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, it depends on what emphasis you put on the word "voluntary." The U.N. is trying to get it out of the member nations. That is where the rub comes.

Mr. GROSS. On page 317 of your hearings, you list a scale of assessments.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; set out in black and white, showing who is in default and who had paid and so forth and so on.

Mr. GROSS. On page 318 you list the United States-Congo account contribution statement as of December 31, 1961. Then following this comes uncollected contributions.

Mr. THOMAS. These are all listed there. Our part is $153 million, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. GROSS. On page 319 there is listed a contribution as the result of the Congo ad hoc account.

What I want to know is specifically how this $25,616,000 is to be listed. Is it a contribution? Is it an assessment or the result of an assessment and contribution, an ad hoc account, or what is it?

Mr. THOMAS. In the final analysis it is an assessment against everybody, and they are trying to get every nation to pay up. That is the long and short of it.

Mr. GROSS. At another place in the hearings I believe Mr. Cleveland called it a voluntary contribution.

Mr. THOMAS. Call it voluntary or involuntary, they are trying to get it out of everybody.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to arrive at some designation for this $25 million. That is the best information you could get from the State Department?

Mr. THOMAS. If we put it up and the House votes it, it is going to be voluntary.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that the amount carried in the pending bill, $25,616,000, is exactly 32.02 percent of the Congo operation costs of $80 million by way of a special assessment, covering the period from November 1, 1960, to June 30, 1962.

Now, in addition to this amount there was or will be a voluntary contribution by the United States to the Congo operations expenses in the sum of $11,400,800 taken out, as I recall, of the foreign aid bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And, would the gentleman say that the 32.02 percent, or 32.05 percent, whichever it is——

Mr. ROONEY. Thirty-two and two one-hundredths.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman say that the 32.02 percent is by United Nations agreement, and is in conformance with the treaty?

Mr. ROONEY. It is an assessment, as the testimony, which I am sure the gentleman is familiar with—and again I commend him for reading the testimony with regard to all of these appropriation bills—indicates, if we do not pay the present amount contained in the bill, to wit, $25 million-plus, we will lose our vote after it becomes in arrears for a period of 2 years. This, to me, indicates that it is not a voluntary assessment.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. But under article 19 of the Charter of the United Nations, if we paid any part of our assessment we would retain our vote for a good deal longer than 2 years?

Mr. ROONEY. I will agree that there is some abracadabra about this sort of thing, about paying part of it. I am one who is very disappointed that the Soviet Union and the satellites and a lot of other people up in New York in the United Nations are permitted to have use of their vote as they do without having to pay the arrears that they owe, as admitted in the hearings on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman from New York is not saying that I am using abracadabra in quoting the United Nations Charter?

Mr. ROONEY. No, and I never intended such, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that the regulatory duties of the Federal Maritime Commission have not been reduced. On the contrary, these duties have been greatly expanded by acts of Congress or its committees.

The Federal Maritime Commission's request for a supplemental appropriation of $330,000, later reduced to a request for $175,000, was denied on the grounds that most of the duties of the Commission had been transferred to another agency, the Maritime Administration—House Report No. 1548, page 4. This must be clarified. In 1961, under Reorganization Plan No. 7 of that year—House Document No. 187—all of the regulatory functions of the former Federal Maritime Board were transferred to the Federal Maritime Commission. All of the promotional functions of the former Maritime Administration and certain promotional functions of the Federal Maritime Board were transferred to the new Maritime Administration. However, the Commission, whose request has been denied, retained all the regulatory functions of its predecessor, the Federal Maritime Board.

According to the Federal Maritime Commission, after the reorganization plan, the new Federal Maritime Commission retained only $1,266,000 of the original $9,300,000 appropriation for the Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Board. This $1,266,000 was to cover salaries and expenses relating only to regulatory activities which had previously been conducted by the Board and were in the future to be carried out by the present Federal Maritime Commission.

This was supplemented by an additional amount of $40,000 to cover only the salaries of two new Commissioners, the Commission having five members where the Board had only three.

Thus, the $1,306,000 figure cited in the report on H.R. 11038, as I understand it, is money for only regulatory functions formerly carried out by the Federal Maritime Board.

The new Commission did not lose any of these regulatory functions. Indeed, it gained many more. Nor is this the case of an agency which is asking for money because it found new things to occupy its time under existing statutory authorization. This agency has a greater workload because Congress and congressional committees have directed it to undertake new responsibilities and to discharge present duties in a more effective manner. Thus, during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the following events occurred:

First. Congress passed Public Law 87–346, the most extensive revision of the Shipping Act, the basic regulatory statute, since 1916. Public Law 87–346 requires the Commission to approve dual rate contracts which meet certain standards. The Commission must screen these contracts to determine if they comply with detailed safeguards set up to protect the shipper. If the Commission does not have adequate staff to fulfill this duty, the whole basis upon which Congress approved Public Law 87-346 will be subverted and shippers will be harmed.

In addition, the new Commission has been given the duty of overseeing the filing of a multitude of additional tariff changes filed by common carriers in the foreign trade of the United States. Formerly, only tariff changes on outbound movements had to be filed. Now inbound and outbound rates must be filed. I understand that almost 30,000 separate changes are being filed pursuant to this requirement.

Finally, the Commission has obtained statutory authority, which its predecessor did not possess, to disapprove rate changes which are so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the foreign commerce of the United States. This is very essential in order to protect American business against unreasonable rates, which in the past according to the Antitrust Subcommittee report, may have impeded the flow of American exports.

Second. Congress enacted Public Law 87-254 which requires licensing freight forwarders. I understand that 1,000 such forwarders have applied for licensing.

Third. The Antitrust Subcommittee completed a 3-year investigation in which 240 matters were referred to the Commission or its predecessor. These matters involved grave abuses of shipping laws, conference agreements, and other practices detrimental to our foreign commerce, which the Commission must examine.

Fourth. The Antitrust Subcommittee issued a 400-page report to the House—House Report No. 1419—containing many recommendations for more effective regulation and new studies in the public interest.

This report reveals a story of abuses, discriminations, and predatory practices whose primary effect has been to hurt American shippers, the American-flag merchant industry, and the public. At the root of the problem is the failure of the Federal Maritime Board to be an effective regulator. A whole chapter—chapter XI—is devoted to describing the problems of the Board and urging its successor, the Federal Maritime Commission, to greater efforts. Clearly a large part of this problem has been understaffing. Finally, the Antitrust Subcommittee report makes numerous conclusions which call upon the Commission to assume new responsibilities and make extensive studies to protect the American public against unreasonable rates and practices. Thus, Congress and, in particular, the House of Representatives and its committees, have made a tremendous effort and spent a great deal of time in trying to provide for more effective regulation of the ocean freight industry, which is exempt from the antitrust laws. All this work and effort will go up in smoke and the public will be completely unprotected if the Commission does not have the resources to do the job. For all the legislation we have passed and the recommendations we have made basically depend upon an effective Commission.

If, as a result of the failure to obtain its minimal requirements, the Commission is unable to operate effectively then the newly amended Shipping Act will be flouted, as it has been in the past, and the design of Congress, as well as the efforts of the Antitrust Subcommittee to improve conditions in the industry, will be frustrated. Moreover, it has been shown that where the Commission does not have sufficient staff to enforce the law the bite of the Shipping Act falls primarily on U.S.-flag shipping lines, whose books and records are in this country, while foreign-flag lines are able to evade compliance with the act. This uneven administration of the act is highly detrimental to our merchant marine. Thus, in the interest of the U.S. merchant fleet and American shippers, I urge that the needed appropriation be made.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I must say that I am not at all satisfied with this bill, for the very simple reason that with the exception of four or five items in this bill, the other requests for funds from more than 20 agencies could very well be absorbed by the agencies with previously appropriated funds, funds that have not been obligated nor expended out of the fiscal year 1962 appropriations. I was very much opposed to the creation of a Deficiencies Committee in the first instance. However, it was created some 6 or 7 years ago.

I was not the only one who opposed the creation of the subcommittee. I speak authoritatively when I say that a great majority of the members of the Committee on Appropriations were opposed to it. But it was created. Here is the bad thing about it. The requests for supplemental funds come from the multitude of boards, commissions, and departments of Government, to the Congress through the Bureau of the Budget to this Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations. The regular subcommittees which hold hearings for days and weeks and months during every session of Congress and often when Congress is not in session, hence they know more about what these agencies of the Government should have in the way of appropriations than any single subcommittee can possibly know, because those members on those respective subcommittees, which number 13 in addition to this one, many of them have sat for years and years listening to the requests of these different departments and agencies of the Government which number in the neighborhood of 1,000, even though we have abolished a few hundred from 1953 to 1960 inclusive.

It is just ordinary, common business sense to have those regularly established subcommittees on appropriations hear and consider these great requests for supplemental funds instead of having those requests come to this special subcommittee.

The facts are that there are only four items or six at the most in this bill which by any stretch of the imagination should have supplemental funds at this time; the Maritime Commission, for which there is $20 million in this bill. That is for subsidies under law to our great oceangoing liners, that we subsidize so that they can compete with foreign shipping companies. That item is mandatory. But even that item could wait until the regular committee acts.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I wish to back up the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] 100 percent in this matter. We have in this bill two items that have no more business than a flea in being here on what we call a deficiency bill. I refer to two of the three items having to do with agriculture.

Here we have $2,500,000 for the extension of the screw worm eradication program, which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and our subcommittee have dealt with for years. There is a brand new extension many of us have not had a chance to study. We are being bypassed entirely. This is the first I have heard of this. We have had gentlemen from the Department of Agriculture before us in the last month, and they never said a word about this new proposal. I think this ought to be stricken out of this bill, just to maintain at least the authority of the various subcommittees involved.

I resent a thing like this, and as far as I am concerned I intend to try to strike it. I feel that the gentleman is absolutely correct in this matter, if we are to have regular order in appropriations. After all a deficiency bill means deficiencies; it does not mean the beginning of new programs.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman has expressed my feelings and, I will say, the feelings of a great majority of the Committee on Appropriations. He has just cited a fair example of what is customary practice in this whole matter pertaining to the deficiency committee of the House.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I asked the gentleman to yield while the subject raised by the gentleman from Minnesota is still fresh in our minds. I agree with what the gentleman from Iowa is saying and what the gentleman from Minnesota has just said. I am perfectly willing to strike the item. As a matter of fact, I did not think it ought to be in here, either, but we questioned the department witnesses very carefully and they assured us that the time to start working on this screw worm pest eradication is early in the spring, and that the severe winter suffered by the southwestern part of the country rendered the situation ideal to start on this program. They had diverted some funds from other programs, and they wanted to replenish those funds in this deficiency bill. The money in this bill is to carry that program for the entire calendar year.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is exactly right. There is no law or rule or regulation on the books of our Nation which would prohibit the Department of Agriculture from spending funds out of already appropriated funds for this purpose. If someone thinks up some new idea or there is a possibility that they can get an appropriation through the Congress by some hook or crook, they do not hesitate one minute to come to Congress and try to get it, and they generally get about what they want.

I must say in all fairness to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas], that I am certainly not critical of him, because no one could do a better job in chairing this committee than our able colleague from Texas. It is a most difficult committee to chair, this committee.

There is another fund here of $25 million which I think we could justly appropriate now for disaster relief, an appropriation to the President for such catastrophes as floods, hurricanes, and windstorms—all acts of God—which must have immediate attention and ready funds.

With reference to grants to States for public assistance, we, the people of the United States, under law have agreed to pay social security payments in certain amounts. That fund has run out for 1962; they need $80 million; that is a must.

Then we have another item here for $80 million for research and development for the space agency and the space administration. It is a most difficult thing for any Member of the Congress to say that they shall not have all the funds they need since we have this world problem on our hands. I hope history will record that this is money well spent. However, we did strike out $65 million which they asked for the purchase of land in Mississippi and, I think, some land in Texas and some land in Oklahoma, and a considerable amount of land on the periphery of the Cape Canaveral area. But, that was not authorized and we simply did not feel the committee should appropriate or initiate appropriations for anything that was not already authorized by law.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take any more time except to say that by the time this bill clears the other body and is signed by the President, there will not be more than 2 months remaining of the fiscal year 1962. So time is not much of an element in the consideration of this matter. That is why I say we could strike almost everything out of this bill except the items I just mentioned without hurting anyone and without putting the brakes on any agency of government.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. First of all, I want to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, for the comprehensive presentation he has made here today. I would ask my colleague to elaborate a little further in regard to the $2½ million item for the eradication of the screw worm. In reading the record, on page 7, of the second supplemental appropriation hearings, 1962, we find that this money is for the initiation of a program. I wonder why at this late date we have to put this money in this deficiency budget and why we cannot wait until Mr. Andersen's committee reports the agricultural appropriation bill to the House and provide the money for that program in that bill?

Mr. JENSEN. I must point this out to the gentleman, that the infestation of the screw-worm fly is a great threat to the stock grazers of the United States. It is almost as bad a threat as the hoof-and-mouth disease which cost us millions upon millions of dollars to eradicate in Mexico to keep the disease out of the United States.

The thing I am more critical of than the appropriation at this time of $2,500,000 is the fact that no member of the Department of Agriculture did not mention this matter to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture. Is that a correct statement? I ask the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. That is correct; and, as far as I know neither the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] nor I were consulted in any way.

Mr. JENSEN. I must say that I would not like to see this item stricken from the bill now because we need to get at this job of eradicating that screw fly, unless the gentleman from Minnesota feels that his committee will provide the necessary funds.

Mr. CONTE. I can go along with the gentleman; I can see the need for the eradication of the screw worm, but I cannot see how putting $2,500,000 in this deficiency bill is going to help that program.

Also I feel it has brought out that what they need here is personnel, about 80-some employees for assistance to eliminate the screw worm. The record shows they have some 90,500 employees in the Department of Agriculture. Why can they not transfer the 80 people needed in this program from other agencies of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly the thought that occurred to me and I asked that very question.

Mr. CONTE. Did the gentleman get an answer to it?

Mr. JENSEN. In this bill there were requested 857 additional employees over and above what they now have on the payroll. We left 509. Do you realize, my colleagues, that these 509 employees will cost the American taxpayers over $3 million, in addition to the 2,500,000 people already on the payroll at a cost of $16 billion annually? I ask how much more of this can the American taxpayers take?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Does the gentleman know the request from the Department of Agriculture for this program was $3 million. The committee cut it back to $2,500,000. We depend on the good judgment and the commonsense of the gentleman from Iowa in matters pertaining to the farm program.

I might say that this is not a new program. This initiates a new program in the southwestern part of the United States, but this is a program that has been carried on in the southeastern part of the United States for some time. The fact of the matter is that this is a program that ought to be started in the spring for that is the time when this insect pest can be controlled much better.

This committee put this item in the bill because the committee felt, and the testimony in the hearings will show, that this program will save millions of dollars. It is not a new program; it is a program that was initiated many years ago. We appropriated a deficiency a couple of years ago for the very same program for the people of the southeastern part of the United States, and we are doing it in this bill for the people in the Southwest.

Mr. JENSEN. I must say that the gentleman from Massachusetts has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Let me read this telegram which appears on page 14 of the hearings, a telegram from the Honorable Joe Kilgore. Now Joe Kilgore is a very fine man. He wired the chairman of this subcommitee:

> Attached herewith you will find telegrams from several Texas organizations expressing their interest in and support of the $3 million supplemental appropriations request for the establishment of a screw worm eradication facility at Moore Field, Mission, Tex.

Why was not the gentleman from Mississippi or I or some member of the committee given some information relative to this? This is a new program for this part of the country, designed to expend $9 million to create a barrier between Mexico and the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. I want to beg my able and distinguished friend's pardon on behalf of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen] and the other members of the subcommittee, including myself. We should have consulted the gentleman, and I humbly apologize, and I assure him that in the future we will do that. We thought it was an urgent item, because they want to get started before the fly hatches out in June and July. We cannot quibble with what the gentleman says. I humbly apologize, and I ask the gentleman's forgiveness at this time.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I forgive the gentleman, but I do not intend to let this item remain in the bill, if I can help it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, there are several items in this bill I would like to discuss with the committee. In going through the bill, the first one I come to is an item of the Department of Commerce which has to do with the New York World's Fair. I hope to attend the New

York World's Fair, and I hope to enjoy it. But I just wonder whether or not we have gone too far in this matter of fairs when this item comes before a Deficiency Subcommittee in the amount of $25 million and the item has never been before a legislative committee. It is claimed to be authorized by the so-called Hays-Fulbright bill. Not one of these items that we have in here has ever been considered by a legislative committee. There are over $10 million in the bill for a building which is going to cost about $44 a square foot. There are hundreds of thousands of dollars in here for travel. Those are items we did not examine, and they have never been examined.

In this deficiency bill we are appropriating not for 1962 but appropriations to carry us through 1966. There is no deficiency or emergency in a situation which is asking for an appropriation through 1966. It is true this has been reduced to $17 million, but we thought we owed it to you to bring to your attention that this is being appropriated without the consideration which we generally give to items of that size.

You will hear that New York has appropriated approximately $30 million as its share to this fair, but may I point out to you that New York City and the fair are going to charge adults $2, and there is an estimated income of about $140 million that will be taken in. But so far as the Federal Government is concerned, with its $25 million investment they are asking for, no taxes will be paid, there is no return to the Federal Government.

I think we should take a good look at this item.

May I point out to you also that before the day is over there is going to be another $3 million item in a separate bill, so they tell me, to pay the policemen in New York City on an entirely different matter.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman does not want to overlook the fact that after they build this $10 million building there is $100,000 in here to pay for tearing it down.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is quite right. There is money to tear it down, and it is going to be occupied for a matter of 6 months out of each year for 2 years.

Now, I must move along here. I should like to call one other matter to the attention of the committee, and this comes under the GSA building of courtrooms. These 73 new judges that we authorized here last year have gotten to be pretty expensive, my colleagues. We have a situation in Boston, for instance, where we are doing some remodeling to put a judge on the bench, and it is going to cost us approximately $1.1 million to get this courtroom in shape. There are two new judges in California, and I understand it is going to cost about $1,360,000 to get these courtrooms in shape. In my own northern district of Ohio, in a court I am very familiar with, I was very much surprised to find the remodeling job for that building to cost $460,000. I say to you that these 73 new judges, that we needed in such a hurry here last year, have been very, very expensive to the American taxpayer.

I go now to the one question which the gentleman from Florida raised some question about, and that is in the State Department, which goes to the medical center in Africa. I have supported this program and will continue to support it. We have a very serious health condition in Africa so far as our people in the State Department are concerned. There have been deaths of officers; ambassadors have been flown out of there seriously ill because of the contagious diseases in the tropics and those areas, because of lack of sanitation. I think we owe it to them, and it will be much cheaper than flying them in military planes to Germany or back to the United States to get proper medical attention.

The one item which has been deleted in this bill which I want to discuss is a matter that seems to grow constantly, and that is the question of the $64,000 which we deleted from this bill for the Public Affairs Division of the Department of State.

Mr. Chairman, I call to the attention of the committee the fact we have deleted $64,000 from the State Department Division of Public Affairs.

The use of Federal funds for the purpose of influencing legislation before Congress is unlawful under section 1913 of title 18, United States Code. It would seem that the time is long past when we should initiate proceedings to stop this unauthorized and illegal expenditure of public moneys.

The practice within the State Department has increased in recent months. The use of funds to propagandize for the administration's trade plan is appalling.

The idea of selling a program to the public with the hope the public will sell it to Congress is perhaps as old as Congress itself. But when government takes over this lobbying job you have the dangerous and unwholesome attempt of thought control which would of course endanger the future of the Republic.

We discussed this at some length during our subcommittee hearings, and following is an excerpt of the record:

> Mr. Bow. Mr. Chairman, I think this follows this part of the record: Mr. Rowan, you say you want the American people to know the administration policy and you are going to tax all the taxpayers to do that. You say with regard to reciprocal trade agreements you are going to get the administration's policy across. Who is going to pay to get the antiadministration policy to the American people?
>
> Mr. Rowan. Well, there are a great many critics of the policy who are managing to get that information out but we feel that it is a service to those who oppose this policy when we place before the critics of this policy the individuals who are advocating this program. If those who oppose this new program write us and say, "What are you up to? We have some doubts about it. Let us face the people who are advocating this." We feel the responsibility to put our people before them to answer questions.
>
> Mr. Bow. Don't you think the stamp of the American Government carries a great deal more weight than can be mustered by those who oppose it, and when you use taxpayers' funds in addition to the Government behind this, that it carries more weight? Do you think this is a proper function?
>
> Mr. Rowan. Congressman, I do not regard propaganda as a proper function, but we are not in the field of propaganda.
>
> Mr. Bow. Are you telling both sides of this story?
>
> Mr. Rowan. We are trying fundamentally to explain what the administration's proposal is and why it is what it is.
>
> Mr. Bow. But you are telling just one side of it, are you not, Mr. Rowan?
>
> Mr. Rowan. Admittedly, Congressman, we do not print pamphlets to argue against the administration's proposal.
>
> Mr. Bow. Or if I made a speech against it you would not circulate my speech to the same group of people that you send Secretary Ball's speeches to, would you?
>
> Mr. Rowan. I must say if we got a request for one of your speeches I would make every effort to get it.
>
> Mr. Bow. If you get a request, yes, but you don't get a request for all of these speeches that you send out of Secretary Ball's.
>
> Mr. Rowan. No, but we get a great many requests.
>
> Mr. Bow. And you get lists you send them to. You would not send my speech out to that same list, would you?
>
> Mr. Rowan. Well, these are people who——
>
> Mr. Bow. Answer my question, please, sir.
>
> Mr. Rowan. No; we would not send your speeches to people on that list.
>
> Mr. Bow. The purpose of this drive you are making is to get your story across to the American people. You are hoping by reason of the American people reading this particular side of the story and reading your pamphlet that they in turn will bring pressure upon Congress to pass this legislation; is that not your very purpose of it?
>
> Mr. Rowan. Well, we hope that the American people will come to the conclusion that this is in the national interest, and in the process of democracy I guess they would make their views known to Congressmen.
>
> Mr. Bow. That is one of the purposes of it, isn't it?
>
> Mr. Rowan. Well, it is not directly an effort to pressure Congressmen, but that is a purpose in effect.
>
> Mr. Bow. It is one of the purposes, and it is what you are driving at?
>
> Mr. Rowan. Yes, that is correct.
>
> Mr. Bow. That is true of the briefing conferences, the speaking engagements and the current documentation. The whole purpose of the $64,000 you are asking for all falls into this category, doesn't it?
>
> Mr. Rowan. Yes, it all does.

It would seem to me that even though you might not concern yourself with the merits of pending legislation you should be interested in the subject of unlawful and improper activities of Federal agencies and their employees in the use of public funds, attempting to influence the Congress for or against pending legislation.

It is not unlawful or improper for officials or employees of the Federal Government to express opinions or to impart factual information if distinguished from propaganda.

I am sure some may ask how we may differentiate between information and propaganda; may I submit the following definitions:

Information: The act or process of communicating knowledge; to enlighten.

Propaganda: A plan for the propagation of a doctrine or a system of principles.

We find that Government propaganda is designed, in most instances, to make the individual believe he is thinking for himself. In fact, however, Government propaganda distorts facts, with such authority that the person is prejudiced or biased in the direction which Government propagandists wish to lead national thinking. It is the authority and the supposed objectivity of Government which leads people to accept, without question, the words released by Government officials and agencies. Propaganda in its crudest form appeals to emotion only. Government propaganda is frequently only slanted, but accomplishes the same result. An individual might be wary and critical of material coming from a special interest group. He knows such groups have an ax to grind, but he will consider as gospel truth, if the Government says the identical thing, because he thinks Government officials are impartial.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the State Department and many other agencies of Government, their personnel and their employees have gone beyond the limits of their proper duty of providing factual information to the people and the Congress and have engaged in propaganda supported by taxpayers' money to influence legislation now pending before the Congress.

I think it is time, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress take action against these illegal expenditures.

Mr. ALGER. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, a State Department pamphlet called Together We Grow Strong, is being distributed widely showing U.S. dependence on world trade. The views are absolutely erroneous and distorted, calculated to support the President's trade bill. On page 9 entitled "Autos and imports," we are told that there would be no autos in the United States for long if we did not have 31 imported items: One of these is petroleum from Kuwait. Everyone knows we are not dependent for imported oil to make or use autos. So the State Department is not only propagandizing for the trade bill but is doing so fallaciously.

I think that the House will be shocked at the practices to be undertaken by State Department personnel according to this article from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of March 13 written by David Sentner, the able chief of the Hearst Headline bureau here. I am sure that every Member of the House without exception will object to the processes outlined and their implications.

Pals of Congress

(By David Sentner)

The State Department isn't exactly muzzling its officials as to the good warp and woof in the administration's foreign policy.

Assistant Secretary for Public Relations, Frederick Dutton, who used to be in the White House, has issued a directive to State Department chiefs to be palsy walsy with Members of Congress. Dutton is now the go-between via the State Department and Congress. Every Government agency has this type of lobbyist.

The new guide-your-Congressman system began working following a recent memo by Civil Service Commissioner John Macy which declared that it was the positive obligation of Government officials to make speeches before interested persons and groups explaining and defending administration policies.

Although Republicans in Congress charge this comes mightly close to violating the Hatch Act prohibiting political activities of Federal employees, CSC Chairman Macy insists this is only guidance for Government career men.

Dutton maintains State Department officials are merely engaged in education.

A SYSTEM

It is quite an educational system Dutton has worked up. In a recent unrecorded conference with bureau heads he suggested certain methods for merchandising to Congressmen the State Department view on such subjects as trade treaty and the marketing of U.N. bonds. These latter measures are facing tough sledding on Capitol Hill.

A further inside look into the Dutton educational system reveals the following curricula:

Speeches, articles, and news items should be prepared for a selected group of Senators and Congressmen who could be trusted to present them as their own ideas.

Under no circumstances was the Department to appear as the source for this material and any written transmittal must indicate it was requested and not pressed on the Member of Congress.

THEY TELL HIM

The Member of Congress used in this program would be told what to say and when to say it in order that the Department remain in full control of the handling and timing of the story.

Almost every Member of Congress has a regular newsletter he sends to his constituents. The writing style of the particular Congressman should be carefully studied and imitated in any item infiltrated into his newsletter.

Congressional liaison commander Dutton shows he is an excellent administrator as well as educator. He has established a central file of all congressional contacts by officers of the State Department.

Every officer has been instructed to fill out a card concerning any meeting or contact with a Member of Congress or a member of a congressional staff.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I might say that the gentleman could right now walk out in the foyer, read the ticker tape, and he will find out that this effort is being spearheaded, in part, by the President of the United States when today he had the chairman of the State ASC committees together at the White House and told them that although he knew it was against the law, they should be vocal in their support of the administration's farm proposal, as advocated by the Freeman-Cochrane proposal.

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for bringing out this point. Some of us have been investigating the use of Government funds on these White House conferences that were held throughout the country last fall, and also the operation of this administration in the problem of health care for the aged.

Mr. Chairman, there are many areas involved, and I think this administration should review its actions in light of what the laws are, because there are some of us, at any rate, who are determined to put this out to the public.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] that I appreciate his comments. I am hoping that what we have said today may cause some of them to take a look at section 1938 of title 18, which provides for the criminal offense for doing this, and provides for removal from office of those who engage in this kind of practice. There is an admission now on the record that this is the very purpose of the use of this fund.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, I might say that also the Civil Service Commission is involved because of the manner in which this administration has been having civil servants get into this kind of propaganda business. It is unfair to those people, and is also endangering their careers.

Mr. BOW. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], if he has forgotten the days when that great leader from Hollywood, Mr. Eric Johnston, had entertainment at Government expense down around the Statler and the Carlton Hotels in behalf of the foreign aid programs of President Eisenhower?

Mr. BOW. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman, if the gentleman will yield to me another minute or two. I, too, can remember, and I was critical of it then. I remember also back in the days of the Truman administration when there were a number of times when Tom Clark, the Attorney General, was asked to bring action against those using these funds for that purpose. I remember that very well. So, this has been going on, but it is growing.

The thing that disturbs me is that it is not limited to an isolated case such as that of Eric Johnston. This is happening in every department of Government.

I would like to say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] asked me to refresh my memory. I have refreshed my memory, and recall that among those who were propagandizing back in the days when socialized medicine was under discussion was one Wilbur Cohen, who is back in a job today in the medical care program, and funds there are being used the same as in other areas.

Mr. ROONEY. Surely, the gentleman is not opposed to medical care for the aged?

Mr. BOW. I am certainly not opposed to such care. I am for the Bow bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I was not here earlier to hear the discussion with respect to an item in the bill having to do with appropriations for the Maritime Commission. It is my understanding, since I have entered the Chamber, that there is a general understanding that the funds which the Maritime Commission has asked for will probably be taken care of in the conference. I am not sure what kind of commitment the chairman of the subcommittee or the committee has made. With the understanding that the House conferees will not oppose these funds in conference I shall not offer an amendment to provide the funds in the House.

As one who opposed very strenuously Reorganization Plan No. 7 which created the new Maritime Commission, I want the record to show that I should hope that at least a part of the funds which the new Commission has asked for will be granted. One of the reasons I opposed the Reorganization Plan No. 7 was that it would require additional employees. As you recall, the plan had the following effect upon the old arrangement: It divided the functions into promotional functions and regulatory functions. The promotional functions were vested in the new Administrator and his assistant, and the regulatory functions were vested in a new five-man Commission.

It was obvious to me at the time—and this was not the only objection I had to the plan—that it would be absolutely necessary for the new Commission to have additional employees. The Congress created this new Commission and now it ought to permit it to function. Otherwise there would have been no point in setting it up. Although I was opposed to the plan I sincerely trust that somewhere along the line in this supplemental bill at least a portion of the funds which the new Commission has asked for will be given to them.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the Chairman of my committee.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington I am sure will recall that prior to the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 7, in various committee hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, it was brought out clearly from time to time that the Maritime Board was not enforcing the regulations that were on the statute books with respect to ocean and other waterborne commerce.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman is correct when he indicates that the Board did not have sufficient employees to supervise and oversee the operations of the shipping lines.

Mr. BONNER. Since the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 7 and just prior thereto, there were two additional acts put on the books that would require more personnel and more service from the now Maritime Commission.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct.

Mr. BONNER. That is, the licensing of freight forwarders and brokers; and other matters.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. And the dual rate bill.

Mr. BONNER. I am sure that this subcommittee will take that into consideration when they go to conference, unless the other body raises this amount to some extent when the bill is considered in the other body. I hope the subcommittee will do that, because it is meritorious.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman. The point I wanted to make is that the House adopted Reorganization Plan No. 7 and now they ought to implement it. I say that as one who opposed the plan, but as one who wants to see it function properly and adequately now that it is in effect.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, last year Congress appropriated $86.6 billion and this sum was $12 billion more than had been appropriated during the previous year. Then last year Congress, in acts other than on appropriation bills, authorized back-door spending in an amount of about $19 billion. These sums do not include the $9 billion which is an automatic charge upon the Treasury for the interest on the national debt. If you add all those items up it will come to about $115 billion that Congress made available to the executive departments for spending during the fiscal year 1962. But ink was hardly dry on the regular bills before we had the first supplemental appropriation bill in August of 1961. That bill contained over $1 billion in supplemental funds.

The bill you are considering today is labeled the second supplemental bill for 1962, but in fact it is the third, because you will recall back in January, before we had hardly gotten underway with this new session, we were met with a request for additional funds for the Veterans' Administration to take care of defaulted VA mortgages because foreclosures had increased by about 50 percent above the number estimated back last year when predictions about the strength of the economic recovery were a little more rosy than it turned out to be. We provided in that supplemental bill $55 million for the Veterans' Administration for its education and training program for Korean veterans. Then we permitted a transfer of $115 million from the VA direct loan fund to the loan guarantee fund in order to enable the Veterans' Administration to take up these defaulted mortgages.

You have before you today what I consider to be the third supplemental request for funds made in this fiscal year. But do not think it will be the last one, because there was sent to the Senate yesterday still another request for additional supplemental funds, and we will have that bill here before this session is over.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. While the gentleman is talking about the transfer, I wonder why there is an item in the bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, when the Secretary, appearing before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, told us that we had appropriated $102 million last year more than they could use and that amount was frozen. I understand they have released some $15 million of that, but there is still some $80-odd million remaining. Why did you not transfer that money rather than make new appropriations?

Mr. JONAS. Does the gentleman have reference to the National Defense Education Act, or what item?

Mr. YOUNGER. Any of the amount transferred. The Secretary says he had more money than he could use. Why did you not transfer that to items where the money is needed rather than appropriate new funds?

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman from California is giving some information we did not have. Each program stands on its own feet and the Budget Bureau did not request any transfers in this program.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. I just want to echo what the gentleman from North Carolina has told our distinguished friend from California. Of course, the programs in this bill have their own appropriation. Had the Budget Bureau requested a transfer we certainly would have considered it, but it would have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. JONAS. When we talk in terms of millions and billions, and we are now approaching the trillion figure, I become lost as I am sure many other people do. We all have our favorite illustrations of what a billion dollars is, but I heard one the other day that I think I will repeat, albeit with some trepidation as I look about the floor and count the number of our lady colleagues presents: "If you had a million dollars and gave it to your wife with the authority to go out and spend $1,000 a day, she would be back at the end of 3 years wanting more money. But if you gave her a billion dollars with the same authority, you would not see her again for 3,000 years." That is how much a billion dollars is.

I think the time has come when all of us ought to begin thinking about how much a billion dollars is. We not only owe nearly $300 billion in direct interest-bearing obligations, but this debt is increasing daily. The daily statement of the U.S. Treasury for March 28, 1962, shows that the national debt, that is the part of the national debt which is subject to the debt ceiling, was $297 billion on March 28, 1962, as contrasted with $287 billion just a year ago. In other words, we have increased the interest-bearing national debt by more than $9 billion in just 9 months. The interest on this national debt is $9 billion a year and that takes 11 cents out of every dollar Uncle Sam receives in revenue. In other words, that leaves Uncle Sam with only 89 cents out of every dollar he receives to defray the cost of national defense and security and carry on all of the other programs in which the Federal Government is engaged.

Frequently, when alarm is expressed over the mounting public debt and our tendency to continue spending more money than we have and to borrow money in order to pay current obligations and expenses, someone invariably says, "That is due to the fact that we must have a stepped-up national defense, and the increased spending in the Defense Establishment of this country is responsible for the increased spending." If that were true, I would say I am willing to bankrupt this country if it became necessary in order to protect and defend the citizens thereof and to maintain our security. But the facts show that that is just not true. I refer you again to this daily statement of the Treasury which shows the amount of cash withdrawals, that is the amount of money drawn out of the Treasury by the different departments and agencies of Government since this fiscal year began last July 1. This statement shows that cash withdrawals during the last 9 months exceeded cash withdrawals during the previous corresponding 9-month period by $8.2 billion.

However, the amount of the increase in spending for the Department of Defense was only $2.6 billion of that $8½ billion. The agency which spent the next highest amount more than it spent in the preceding year was the Commodity Credit Corporation which withdrew from the Treasury of the United States $1,297 million more during the last 9 months than it did during the corresponding 9 months in 1960-61. "Oh," somebody will say, "what about NASA and the Atomic Energy Commission and all of these other activities that are closely allied to national defense?"

This daily statement of the Treasury shows that the increase in withdrawals on the part of the AEC during this period was only $80 million over the amount withdrawn in the preceding year. NASA withdrew $400 million more than the preceding year; and HEW $480 million. The rest can be charged up to purely civilian activities.

While I am alarmed over our dwindling gold supply, over the mounting national debt, and over our deliberate policy of deficit financing, it is quite evident that the responsible officials in the executive branch of the Government, as well as the majority of the Members of Congress, are not equally alarmed. If they were, surely steps would be taken to put our financial house in order. So perhaps I am wrong in my feeling of alarm over these trends. Perhaps the Government can spend the country into prosperity; perhaps there is no danger in our continuing loss of gold; perhaps the Government can continue to spend more money than it takes in and maintain a sound and stable currency; perhaps the Government need never pay its debts but can continue to borrow money to pay for current operations without running into trouble; perhaps inflation is, after all, a blessing, and cheap money will be good for the country. There must be room for arguments on these points because otherwise the wise men in the executive branch of the Government would stop sending programs to Congress calling for increased spending, for increased payrolls, and for additional borrowing. And other wise men in this House and in the other body would join together and put a stop to this sort of thing.

I make no pretense of being an economist. I was born and raised in a small town but from my youth up was taught that the way to get ahead in the world was to work hard, spend less than I made, pay my debts and put aside something for a rainy day. I have had some slight experience in business and out of that experience I know that any enterprise will go broke if it continues indefinitely to spend more than it takes in. I just have the old-fashioned idea that in this respect government is like a family and a business enterprise.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman believe that the responsibility for the fiscal solvency of this Nation rests with the Executive and the Congress?

Mr. JONAS. I certainly do. I say that in the matter of fiscal responsibility primary responsibility rests upon the Executive, because he is the man who sends these programs up to us, whose agents argue for them before committees saying that the fate of the Nation depends upon these programs. Then the second and I believe at least equal responsibility rests upon the Congress because the Constitution vests Congress with the power of the purse. We can stop this wild spending whenever Congress decides to stop it.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman agree that the Treasury Department is having great difficulty in selling bonds? That redemptions are taking place at a greater rate than the sale of bonds?

Mr. JONAS. I agree with the gentleman and refer him to the daily statement of the Treasury. It ought to be thoroughly read and digested by every American citizen every morning if he is interested in the solvency of the United States.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman and commend him for his fine statement.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, several months ago I requested available space transportation aboard a Military Air Transport Service plane to Greece in order to plead for the life of a young Kansan, Roger Ranney, 27 years of age, of Chanute, who is awaiting execution before a Greek firing squad. Ranney was convicted of allegedly murdering two Greek sailors whose bodies have never been found. As his Congressman, I had hoped to see the King and plead for his life.

I was refused transportation by Military Air Transport Service on one of their regularly scheduled flights because I am not a member of the military Reserves; however, I have recently read that the First Lady's gift horse, Sardar, is being flown from Pakistan to the United States aboard a Military Air Transport Service plane.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to inquire whether or not Sardar is a military reservist, or in the Reserve.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Iowa. [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago there was some discussion of the use of Government employees to carry the torch for the New Frontier in speeches throughout this country. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] called attention to the fact that something along this line was done under the Eisenhower administration.

I would like to remind the gentleman from New York and the Members of the House that about 4 years ago, when it was developed by the appropriations subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] that $400,000 had been spent for this purpose by the Eisenhower administration, largely in behalf of an extension of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, I came to the floor of the House and offered an amendment to cut the President's contingency or emergency fund from which the $400,000 was taken for the purpose of carrying on this campaign. I regret to say that it was largely the votes of the gentlemen on your side of the aisle—there were votes from this side, too—but largely the votes from your side of the aisle that defeated my amendment to take $400,000 from the Eisenhower fund. In this regard I play no favorites.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is indicating that the amendment was overwhelmingly defeated. I do not get his point.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman I cannot recall whether it was overwhelmingly defeated or just defeated, but it was defeated. The point is that when the Eisenhower administration engaged in the business of using Federal employees to influence legislation before Congress I tried to do something about it. I would like to say something else concerning this matter. I do not recall that a Republican Chairman of the Civil Service Commission ever issued an order calling on employees of the Federal Government to go out—some in violation of the Hatch Act, if there is such an act left—and carry the torch for the Eisenhower administration. I do not recall a Republican Chairman of the Civil Service Commission doing that. But it was not so long ago that Mr. Macy, present Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, a Democrat, issued such an order, and I say some of the activities under the New Frontier in this respect are illegal.

Now, getting to this bill. I was unavoidably absent on the telephone for a few minutes, and I do not know whether there was any reference made to it or whether the $100,000 requested for security equipment in the State Department, the money having been used last year, apparently by Chester Bowles and others for conferences attended by Chester Bowles and his wife and the foreign ambassadors and their wives, for parties and so-called conferences.

Can someone tell me whether the $100,000, or whatever the amount is, is in this bill?

Mr. ROONEY. That amount, $100,000, was appropriated last year in the regular bill for the State Department. The money was not used for security purposes. It was used for other purposes which were unbudgeted. As a result, the present committee handling this supplemental appropriation bill has seen fit to delete any funds for this purpose in the present bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that. If we are going to appropriate money for the State Department for security purposes and the money is being spent for the purpose of wining and dining and conferences, I am going to look with a jaundiced eye on State Department security appropriations in the future. I am pleased to hear that the committee has taken this money out of the bill.

On the last page of the bill I note $210,000 for additional salaries and expenses, apparently for the Secret Service. I wonder if this is made necessary in whole or in part because of the traveling proclivities of this administration, including Mrs. Kennedy?

Mr. THOMAS. Do you want the story?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I would like to have it.

Mr. THOMAS. No salaries are in this; it is all traveling expenses, and it was created by virtue of the fact that you have a very popular President of the United States, a very popular Vice President of the United States, with their two lovely wives, and a very beautiful little child by the name of Caroline.

Mr. GROSS. While the gentleman is on his feet, can the gentleman tell me whether Secret Service men ride in the helicopter that goes down into Virginia to take Mrs. Kennedy to ride to the hounds down there? Can the gentleman tell me about that?

Mr. THOMAS. I would not be a bit surprised. We have had some complaints from some people that they do not like the Secret Service following them everywhere they go, but we told them that after all that is the law and we expect them to carry out the law.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Is it true or is it not true that 15 Secret Service men were considered necessary to accompany Mrs. Kennedy on her recent trip to India and elsewhere?

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is the correct amount. They tell me it keeps these people jumping.

Mr. GROSS. I thought that probably would be the case.

On page 12 of the bill I note that there is a deficiency appropriation of $100,000 for referees. Do I understand that these are referees in bankruptcy?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. These are additional clerks for the referees in bankruptcy. There was before the committee a request for 60 additional clerks for the remainder of the current fiscal year. The committee realized that the work of these bankruptcy referees has increased each and every year since 1900 or 1901 and has allowed 30 of the 60 requested.

Mr. GROSS. As a matter of fact, you began in one of the numerous deficiency bills last year to beef up the offices of the referees in bankruptcy, is that not true?

Mr. ROONEY. That is all indicated in the written hearings, and I am glad the gentleman is familiar with it. We put the fact right on the table. We had no alternative. We had to get this bankruptcy work done. These are only lower grade people. These are not political jobs. They are lower grades.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but it is to beef up the bankruptcy courts.

Mr. ROONEY. I would not say beef it up. If they asked for 60 and we allowed 30, we are skeletonizing their program.

Mr. GROSS. You are not skeletonizing bankruptcies, because your hearings show that since 1950 the number of persons going bankrupt has jumped——

Mr. ROONEY. That all occurred during the Eisenhower administration, if the gentleman will look at the record.

Mr. GROSS. Just a moment. For the last 10 years bankruptcies have increased 560 percent. In the 12 months ending June 30 of this year, during the Kennedy administration, an estimated 172,000 persons have filed for bankruptcy. Ninety percent of today's bankruptcies originated with individuals and not businesses, as was the case a decade ago, and bankruptcies are costing individuals and creditors up to $5 billion a year. This in the name of Kennedy administration prosperity.

And, under the New Frontier, the rate is accelerating, is it not?

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman vividly recalls year after year of the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, how I stood down there in the well of the House and commented on the increases in bankruptcies from year to year during that period of time.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is entitled to make the observation he has made here today. I know none of us like to see bankruptcies increase. However, these are mostly small bankruptcies, all personal bankruptcies rather than business bankruptcies.

Mr. GROSS. Well, is the shock any less when some little fellow loses everything he has got, and is forced into bankruptcy?

Mr. ROONEY. No; I think these are all vountary bankruptcies that the gentleman is referring to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to my friend who hit the sawdust trail yesterday.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I voted against that bill last year, it is true, but there is an old spiritual that is often spoken down in my country which says: "The longer the light holds out to burn, the vilest sinner may return."

I wanted to ask the gentleman this: I just came in, and I wondered if the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] had made reference to an item here in the report, which is astonishing to me, of $400,000 for the inauguration of an African medical program?

Mr. GROSS. No.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Do not tell me that that item escaped your eagle eye?

Mr. GROSS. You find quite a little discussion of this program in the hearings, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It seems to me we are having enough trouble in this country with medical programs without going to Africa to find more.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I can answer the question of the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I want to explain that this item of $400,000, that part of this item of $400,000, is to start an African health program for American personnel as the result of many serious illnesses which have required those suffering from these illnesses to be flown to Rhine Main in Germany and other places in Europe, perhaps, a couple of thousand miles away.

Mr. GROSS. I never saw one of these programs that somebody could not find a very cogent reason for it in debate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am just wondering why, if we have such bad health down there in Africa, we do not come home?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have one other question concerning this United Nations business. I find on page 308 of the hearings this statement, that the $25,616,000 is requested for 2 months, from May 1, 1962, and on page 309 of the hearings, under "Computation of Estimates," I find the U.S. share of the $80 million assessment is for the period of November 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962, $25,616,000.

Now, which is it? Is it for 2 months or is it for the period from November 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. It is for the period from November 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to page 268 of the hearings, and this highly enlightening colloquy that occurred:

> Mr. Rooney. Will the allowance of this $210,000 add any personnel to the payroll?
>
> Mr. Rowley. No, sir.
>
> Mr. Rooney. These are all expense moneys?
>
> Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir, for the Presidential family.
>
> Mr. Rooney. How many people do you presently have traveling with the First Lady?
>
> Mr. Rowley. I think approximately 15, sir.
>
> Mr. Rooney. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.
>
> Mr. Thomas. Mr. Jonas?
>
> Mr. Jonas. I have no questions.
>
> Mr. Thomas. Thank you very much.
>
> Can you get by with $200,000?
>
> Mr. Rooney. Say "Yes," fast.
>
> Mr. Rowley. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. Thomas. Thank you very much.

Then I went from the hearings to the bill and I found the $210,000 still listed. The committee did not even take the $10,000 out after they got Mr. Rowley to agree that it could.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Sure, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. That was in about 2 seconds that we saved $10,000.

Mr. GROSS. No; you did not, because you have $210,000 in the bill. You did not save a dime. Instead of saving $10,000 for the taxpayers of this country, you let him off the hook.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see that this supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, contains an item of $25 million for disaster relief and assistance to the States and local governments under authorization of Public Law 875.

While I do not agree with the estimate that $24,800,000 will be required for the allocations to the disaster areas as an overall amount, yet I am encouraged to believe that more will be forthcoming as the committee report states that this is an estimate for required allocations during the balance of the fiscal year. It is becoming more and more evident to both the State agencies and local governments how difficult it is to estimate the cost of the replacement and repair of public facilities. In New Jersey alone, it has been estimated that the total damage to all public facilities will eventally reach $75 million. In fact, the New Jersey State Senate as recently as last week passed a resolution petitioning the Federal Government to allocate this amount of disaster funds for the State of New Jersey.

Even now, after the claims of some municipalities have been formalized and filed with the Department of Civilian Defense and Disaster Control, it has been discovered that some damage not known of in the preparation of the claim was omitted. I have been informed by the Office of Emergency Planning, acting on behalf of the President under the disaster relief program, that past experience has shown that the damage is never as great as originally estimated. I certainly hope that this is the case, but I would much rather have too much in the fund than too little.

I do hope that with the additional appropriation of $25 million, added to the balance on hand of $10,363,000 as of March 13, it will be sufficient to meet all claims. In any event, the door should be kept open for further assistance if need be.

SMALL PRODUCERS PROGRAM RECEIVES GREEN LIGHT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to express my deep appreciation to the Members of this body for their vote today in support of the full sum requested by President Kennedy to finance the first year's operation of the lead and zinc stabilization program for small producers.

With the $4,880,000 thus provided, assuming the other body adds its approval, thousands of lead and zinc miners across the country are assured of employment during 1962. For many miners it will be the first work they have had since the mines began to close in this country several years ago. I know this will be the case in my own district in Oklahoma and in several adjoining counties in Missouri and Kansas.

Appreciation is particularly due the President and the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, and their fine assistants, who have worked hard to get this program underway at the earliest possible date.

The thanks of the miners also go to the gentleman from Ohio, Mike Kirwan, for his sympathetic and helping hand with this program, and to other distinguished members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee headed by the gentleman from Colorado, Wayne Aspinall. Thanks are also due to the able chairman of the subcommittee handling today's bill, the gentleman from Texas, Albert Thomas, and other members of his subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, this program by no means provides all the answers to the serious problems of our domestic lead and zinc industry, and no sponsor for it has made such a claim.

It is a long-awaited helping hand desperately needed by the small mine operators and the miners who work for them, and as such is sincerely appreciated as an interim measure while our Nation develops a long-range domestic minerals program.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this second supplemental appropriation bill of 1962, especially the appropriation of $17 million of Federal contribution for the World's Fair in New York City which opens on April 22, 1964. I regret that the subcommittee felt that the $25 million requested was not justified. The fair is dedicated to man's achievement on a shrinking globe in an expanded universe, his invention, discoveries, arts, skills and inspiration.

Interest in the New York World's Fair of 1964 is worldwide: 63 nations have expressed an interest as exhibitors. At least 11 nations have already signed a contract. Ten nations have selected sites, and contracts are in the hands of appropriate officials for signature.

An interesting and exciting development is the offer of His Holiness Pope John through His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, to lend to the Fair the statue of "The Pieta," by Michaelangelo, the greatest of the Italian sculptors. There are at least four great statues of the Pieta in Italy, but the one presently located in St. Peter's Church in Rome is incomparable. No marble work of art possesses the elegance, the simplicity and the grandeur as does this marble display of sorrow, depicting the Virgin Mary holding in her lap the body of her Son who sacrificed His life to redeem mankind.

I have gazed on this masterpiece many times and have always experienced a tingling sensation with every look. I would like to point out for future observers, inasmuch as guide books and few people are aware of this added feature, that on one breast of the Holy Mother there can be observed the face of a newborn babe and on the other breast the outline of a skeleton. The symbol is obvious to Catholics and those familiar with Christian doctrine. When one realizes that Michaelangelo wrought this masterpiece at the tender age of 23 years, one becomes aware that artists are gifted with mystical talent which perseverance and hard work can only dramatize. The more than 70 million people who are expected to visit the New York World's Fair have a wonderful treat in store for them and I am grateful to Pope John for generously offering to the American world, especially New Yorkers who cannot visit Rome, the chance to see what is in my opinion the world's greatest sculptural masterpiece.

The New York World's Exhibit of 1964 bids fair to surpass the features of Brussels, Moscow, and Seattle. I trust that this measure will be approved.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, line 1:
>
> "Title I. Department of Agriculture
>
> "agricultural research service
>
> *"Salaries and expenses*
>
> "For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', for 'Plant and animal disease and pest control', $2,500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1963: *Provided,* That the foregoing amount shall not be available for conduct of any screwworm eradication program that does not require minimum matching by State or local sources of at least 50 per centum of the expenses of production, irradiation, and release of the screwworm flies."

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Andersen of Minnesota: On page 2, strike out lines 3 to 12 inclusive.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, what I am discussing here today has to do with the basic integrity of the subcommittees dealing with appropriations. Mr. Chairman, I resent the beginning of a $9 million program—this is not just $2.5 million—it is the beginning of a $9 million program extending over the next 3 years, yet it is included in what is supposed to be an emergency or deficiency bill.

All of the Members here know that when they come before our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, we give them courteous treatment; we listen to their requests. We do the best we can. I do not think there is a better chairman on any subcommittee on appropriations than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. We are always courteous.

I am surprised that my good friend from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] becomes a party, unknowingly I am sure, to the start of a $9 million program concerning which Dr. Popham and his associates had not even appeared to testify before our subcommittee.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I will be glad to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, just wherein has this humble subcommittee committed any error? This item was sent over to the subcommittee from the Bureau of the Budget. This committee has been duly organized and set up to handle these items. We again humbly apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Will the gentleman agree to my amendment? That would be the best apology that I know of.

Mr. THOMAS. We have a duty and a responsibility here, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has explained. I am not a farmer. He lives in one of the great farming communities of the world, as does the gentleman from Minnesota. This screw-worm is fixing to hatch out in the spring. If you are going to have any relief, now is the time to have it; do not wait until June or July or August of this year. If you want to help the farmers, go on and help these people. After all, these are matching funds.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Has the gentleman finished, on my time?

Mr. THOMAS. I should be glad to yield the gentleman whatever time he wants, if I have that right.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I would have to get it by unanimous consent.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield. I want to show the gentleman where he is wrong in this particular instance.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman does not want to hurt part of Louisiana, all of Texas, all of Oklahoma, all of Arkansas, and all of New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman talks about $9 million. I do not know where he gets that figure. These are matching funds. There is only $2½ million in here and if it were to go for 2 years, I do not see where it would come to over $5 million.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit me to continue?

Mr. THOMAS. It is the gentleman's time. He yielded to me.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I just want to say how necessary it is to approach a situation of this kind through the subcommittee which really knows what this problem is all about.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, you know your subject matter.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Let me answer the gentleman. If the gentleman will turn to page 3 of the hearings, he will see there that the Department of Agriculture has $800,000 a year, right today, to do all this work of scattering sterile screw-worm flies throughout that area. Look at page 3 of the hearings. The gentleman did not know that. The gentleman admits that he did not know that.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not admit anything. Do not put words in my mouth.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] does not even know that the Department of Agriculture wrote a letter to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and myself and asked permission to take $800,000 of its present existing funds and proceed with the scattering of these sterile flies. Look at the bottom of page 3. No harm is done by doing that. The work is progressing. On page 9 the gentleman from Texas himself asked this question of Dr. Popham:

> What is your best guess will be required over the 3-year period in which you think you can get the job done to do it like you have done it in the Southeast?
>
> Dr. POPHAM. We think it would take approximately the same amount in the fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

Here it is only 2 months before July 1. They have $800,000 available, and here you are coming in with a $9 million program over the next 3 years. I realize you people did not have an opportunity to study the problem, but I am not objecting to that. I think it is irresponsible procedure to take away from the proper subcommittee its due authority. We have done everything we could to promote this great eradication work. We did it for the Southeast. If it comes to the feasibility of establishing an artificial barrier between Mexico and the United States, let us at least have the privilege in our subcommittee of having these folks come before us and tell us something about what they want done. But no, here we are being committed to an appropriation of $2.5 million. I think the gentleman will agree with me it is a little bit unfair to our subcommittee, and I plead for the commonsense of the House to leave it to the jurisdiction of the proper subcommittee to take care of this very important work.

Mr. THOMAS. We certainly do not want to usurp any jurisdiction that the gentleman may have. We went to the full committee and presented this item. My very able and distinguished friend was there, and he did not mention it.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I was not there; I am sorry.

Mr. THOMAS. It is a little bit embarrassing to the gentleman——

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. No; it is not embarrassing at all.

Mr. THOMAS. For a member of the committee to get up and raise that point after the action has been taken. We would have been glad to turn it over to you. As a matter of fact, we have more work to do now than we wanted.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. The gentleman from Texas is a very able gentleman. He is a lovable gentleman, as he has often said to others. The gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Mississippi were unable to be at that particular meeting that morning. Neither of us was advised in advance that that particular item would be in the bill. Right now I am attempting on behalf of the gentleman from Mississippi and my subcommittee to defend the integrity of my subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. It is not only unfortunate that the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota was not at the full committee meeting to raise the question, but insofar as his viewpoint is concerned, it is also unfortunate that he offered an amendment instead of making a point of order here in the Committee of the Whole today. I suspect a point of order might have been successful but it is now too late.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. May I say to the gentleman from New York that the gentleman from Minnesota will always make his own decisions as to his procedure. I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, in the name of fairplay to remember that the Department has $800,000 it is using now for this purpose. Remember, there are only about 2 months between now and July 1. Remember that my subcommittee on appropriations has not yet completed hearings. So in the name of fairplay, I hope this item will be stricken.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN].

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota.

The question was taken; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 46, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Participation in New York World's Fair

For expenses necessary to provide for United States participation in the New York World's Fair, as authorized by the provisions of the Act of September 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 527), including compensation of a United States Commissioner, who shall be appointed

> by the President, at a rate not to exceed $19,500 per annum, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $17,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, President Kennedy himself in person at his office today suggested to all 150 members of State agricultural stabilization and conservation committees that they become active participants in politics in behalf of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's farm program, presently pending in the Congress.

This is the way the wire services reported it:

> President Kennedy today delicately suggested to members of the State agriculture stabilization and conservation committees that although they are prohibited by law from lobbying for specific farm legislation, they should not permit Members of Congress to be "lonesome."

We have long known that the political-minded former Governor of Minnesota, now serving as Secretary of Agriculture, has been making an organizational effort to convert the vast operations of his Department into a vast political machine in the rural areas.

It has long been known to us from the type of legislation Secretary Freeman has recommended that he aspires to have us delegate to him extraordinary powers to make him virtually czar of agriculture. If he had his way, he would make our farmers economic peasants under his control and political pawns for the Kennedy administration.

I never thought, however, that the President of the United States would in effect condone this action. I never thought that a President of the United States would tell employees that they should not allow a legal prohibition against lobbying for legislation to deter them in such effort.

This is indeed "government by propaganda" that has been ushered in by President Kennedy with his Madison Avenue technique. President Kennedy is attempting to persuade the independent American farmer to give up his birthright for a mess of Freeman-Cochrane pottage. This the American farmer will never do.

We regret that the President of all of us should in this manner stoop to conquer the free will of a free people.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am reliably informed that the State agricultural stabilization and conservation committeemen from all over the United States were called in to Washington for the specific purpose of lobbying for the Freeman omnibus farm bill and that they did not pay their own expenses here on this trip.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Has the Clerk concluded reading page 3 of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read page 3.

Mr. GROSS. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. I make a point of order against the following language beginning in line 16 and ending in line 18:

> Including compensation of a United States Commissioner, who shall be appointed by the President, at a rate not to exceed $19,500 per annum,

I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, and is so stated on page 9 of the report of the committee accompanying the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is good.

The agency states that this position would be considered in addition to the 10 persons authorized to be employed without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act.

The act itself sets up 10 positions. What makes it subject to a point of order is that the agency admits that it is not 1 of the 10 but is the 11th job and so it, as the 11th job, is subjected to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

The gentleman from Texas concedes the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out the figure "$17,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$10,000,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not dwell on this subject for more than a minute or two.

As everyone knows, this $17 million is an appropriation for the New York World's Fair. My amendment would reduce this amount to $10 million, or just $30,000 more than the $9,970,000 allotted by the Congress to the Federal Government for support of the fair at Seattle, Wash. It is that simple. I see no reason why we should vote more money for New York City in the State of New York for a fair than we voted for Seattle, Wash.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, we are not going to detain the Committee long. We will try to dispose of this amendment expeditiously. I do hope that the amendment offered by our distinguished and beloved friend from Iowa will be voted down.

There was a budget estimate for $25 million. We combed it carefully; we reduced the amount to $17 million. There are 66 foreign nations all expressing an interest in this fair. Innumerable citizens of the United States are interested. I am biased, I do not mind telling you, on behalf of the great State of Washington. We gave them $9,900,000. New York is about 15 or 20 times larger. So let us not try to put this on a comparative basis.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to point out the testimony on page 70 of the printed hearings in which General Potter, executive vice president of the New York World's Fair Corp., testified:

> Mr. Jensen, I will say this: The U.S.S.R. is going to spend something like $20 million on their exhibit.

This is at the New York World's Fair. Surely our Nation, our Federal Government, should be properly represented there. I am sure the Committee of the Whole will vote down the pending amendment and appropriate the $17 million to get the construction and activities started.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and, on a division demanded by Mr. GROSS, there were—ayes 35, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to the proposed $10 million building that is to be built by the Federal Government at the New York World's Fair and the item of $100,000 to tear it down at the end of 2 years.

At the time of the authorizing legislation for the Seattle Fair, I was a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and insisted that the U.S. structure be a general-type building so that it could be of use to the community later. There were proposed plans of a very advanced design that I strongly objected to and do in this New York proposal. This is a ghastly and economic waste.

I believe that same policy should be advanced here, and I would urge the New York World's Fair organization and our U.S. Department people to change their minds and not build a special type of building that will only be good for 2 years and then will cost $100,000 to tear it down. I would strongly recommend the erection of a type of building that would be of permanent civic use, educational use, or health use in the local community.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the World's Fair in Seattle, it may be that the fair in New York will be more costly, may be bigger, but I want to assure the Members of the House that it will not be better, and I extend a personal invitation to all of you to come out and see Century 21 this summer. The fair starts April 21 and will run for at least 6 months. Come out and see the space needle, the monorail transportation system, the science exhibit, and above all the wonderful scenery out in God's country. You will see for yourselves that I do not speak idle words when I say the Century 21 will be the finest of all fairs.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Defense Educational Activities

For an additional amount for "Defense educational activities", for capital contributions to student loan funds, $16,155,000.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: On page 6, after line 13, insert: "Payment to school districts. For an additional amount for payment to school districts, $15,707,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to our distinguished colleague that in my judgment this is perhaps the most popular item that comes before the House. Since we have been sitting here today our colleagues have come from both sides of the aisle requesting some relief along this line. May I ask my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], does this only include maintenance and operation, or does it include any additional construction funds?

Mr. BOLAND. This is purely for operation and maintenance under Public Law 874.

Mr. THOMAS. If that is true, and there are no additional construction funds, may I respectfully suggest to the committee that it would be well to buy this amendment.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I understand that this is the $15 million which the Department of HEW testified was needed for the impacted areas for fiscal 1962 to meet 100 percent of the entitlement. In the appropriation bill which passed the House just a week ago we included 100 percent entitlement for 1963. Now, the figure that is presently in the 1962 appropriation act was the estimate of the Department a year ago. Their estimate was supposed to take care of 100 percent of the entitlement. I cannot understand why the administration is willing to send up a supplemental budget request for items such as the New York World's Fair, which is an item that is not of a supplemental nature or a deficiency nature, not related to fiscal year 1962, but is unwilling to take care of the educational program which was adopted by this House with only 30 Members voting against. I did not support the formula used in this program as approved last year, but I think there has been a commitment made here, and I think the Kennedy administration has not lived up to its commitment which it made when President Kennedy signed this bill last year.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin. As he well understands, this is a problem which not only occurred during this administration; it is a problem that occurred during the last administration. I appreciate the gentleman's support.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will make up the deficiency of 8 percent in the fiscal year 1962 appropriation to implement Public Law 874. It deals with payments to federally impacted school districts for operation and maintenance. Local school districts and school committees have budgeted on the basis of 100 percent entitlement under Public Law 874. Failure of the Congress to provide these funds can and will have a serious effect on many communities. We ought to keep our commitment to them and we can do it by supporting this amendment.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure and a duty for me to support the amendments which are offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] and by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] to the pending second supplemental appropriation bill, 1962, because they make possible an act of simple justice to the towns and school districts which are entitled to Federal assistance because of the impact upon their public schools of Government activities in the vicinity.

The amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] will add $15,707,000 to the funds available for disbursement under Public Law 874 for the 1962 fiscal year, and the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] will fulfill the same objective under Public Law 815.

In my district, Mr. Chairman, these two amendments are more important to the people of my district than anything else in this bill.

More than half of the towns in my district qualify for Federal assistance under Public Law 874, and nearly as many under Public Law 815. The children are there. The towns and school districts have to provide classrooms, teachers, and the requisite facilities for them, and more than a decade ago the Congress decided that they were entitled to be reimbursed for the extreme financial burden which has been placed upon them by the impact of Federal installations.

The towns and school districts, even as the Federal Government and other governments, are required to make up their budget for a year ahead. They are required to levy taxes to meet the requirements of the budget. They hire teachers by the year, the same as they have to buy fuel for the schoolhouses, buy other supplies and services to cover the entire year, and must have the money to pay for them.

Yet the administration persists in acting miserly toward these school districts, which number almost 4,000 across the country. The obligation is recognized, but we do not pay them what we owe. For no good reason that I can see, the entitlement for every district is cut down from the amount the law says they should get, to some arbitrarily determined lesser amount.

If the time ever comes when this House believes the assistance provided under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress no longer is desirable or necessary, we may be sure that the House will say so, clearly and unequivocally. Until that time, we should pay the towns and school districts 100 percent of what we say we owe them, not 92 percent, or 85 percent, or any other part of the whole amount.

Last week, Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to join with the other Members present, when we voted an appropriation bill which contained money which the committee had added, so that for fiscal 1963 the qualified towns and school districts will receive all of the funds which is due them under the formula for entitlement.

This was real progress. I am very glad we took the action which we did, and I congratulate the committee, and the Members of the House for passing the legislation.

Let us now be just as fair by passing these amendments which will provide 100 percent of the entitlements for 1962.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOW to the amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: Change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That none of these funds may be paid to any State or local educational agency as a result of any child, in attendance at a school operated by such agency, who lives on non-Federal property.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to the amendment I think is very clear. It would provide that the impact funds would be paid only in those areas where the children are living on Federal property and where you have a truly impact area. I know how unpopular it is to speak against the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I think it is a matter that should be called to the attention of the committee each year, and I have done it. But I hope some day the legislative committee will correct this law so it will be a truly impacted areas bill.

Now, what we are voting on here today is not in the President's budget. I have seen Members here in this House in the last week walk down the aisle because it was the President's program. Today I am supporting the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, by voting against what he does not want. It is not in the budget. I am going to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that a great deal of this money that we are going to appropriate is not for impacted areas, not for areas where the military has gone in or where the Federal Government has gone in, but a great portion of it is going across the river to Alexandria, up and down the river into Maryland and into areas that are not impacted such as Chevy Chase, where your employees' children go to school. They will receive a large part of this. If you ever had

Federal aid to education, this is it. Let me give you one glaring example:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether anyone in this House realizes that Public Law 874 costs the taxpayers of the United States $501.04 because a United Airlines pilot with five school-age children, residing in Prince William County, Va., takes off and lands at Washington National Airport.

This is the extent to which Public Law 874 has been abused by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in cooperation with the local school districts.

We are told that we must subsidize the schools because of the impact of children whose parents work on Federal reservations or for the Federal Government.

Did any of you know that the law was so all inclusive that it could subsidize the children of a man whose only connection with the Federal Government is that he lands a plane at Washington National Airport and perhaps carries an FAA inspector in the cockpit now and then? I doubt it.

If the same pilot moved to Arlington County it would cost us $670.60 per year.

And may I say in passing that the pilots from whom I have learned these startling facts are bitterly opposed to the system. They are substantial property owners, longtime residents of their communities, some of them farm operators, whose income and tax contributions to the community and the State of Virginia probably are above average. They do not believe it is morally right for the county to collect a Federal subsidy because of their children, but it is collected nonetheless.

I cite this as the most shocking extension of Public Law 874 to come to my attention in years, and I have been opposing this program for many years, but it is really no more shocking than the fact that my secretary costs the Federal Government $200.38 per year because he works in a Federal building and has two children in school in Virginia.

There is no doubt but that these men and thousands like them have had an impact on the Virginia and Maryland communities near Washington, but it has been a positive and worthwhile impact. They are contributing to the community; they own property and pay taxes; they patronize local merchants; and their impact is one of increasing prosperity for the community.

Mr. Chairman, if we amend this law and make it truly an impact areas law, then I would certainly go along with it, because there are such areas. But when we talk about economy and responsible fiscal programs, it seems to me that this is one at which we should take a good, hard look, instead of paying for the construction and granting Federal aid to education to the people in Maryland and Virginia and along the rivers, which are not impacted areas caused by an impaction of military personnel, but people who own their homes the same as the hardware man who lives next door.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is the place where my amendment should be adopted, and then it would make it a truly impact areas bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The situation that confronts us today has nothing to do with the continuation of this program. It is carrying out an obligation of the Congress last year when we put money in the budget to pay the several districts 100 cents on the dollar, and ended up by paying them 92 cents out of the dollar. This has nothing to do with the 1963 appropriation. It is just to make good a commitment of the Congress for this current fiscal year.

Mr. BOW. I admit that to the gentleman. We went $58 million over the budget in 1963. In this program now we are being asked to go over the budget again—$58 million in 1963 and an additional $15 million now.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me remind the gentleman from Ohio that the Defense Department has engaged in and has launched several new defense projects. For instance, when this bill was passed and renewed, there was little known about Cape Canaveral. All of that work had an additional impact. So, what could the Department do except meet these emergencies as they came up in the hope that the Congress would do what it has done over the past fiscal year and give them some additional money?

Mr. BOW. I think if the amendment to the amendment is carried it will take care of that situation where we have an impact on Federal property.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I think all of us in the House appreciate the persuasiveness of the arguments of the gentleman from Ohio. I think he is right, but not in this particular instance. I think this is not the way to go about it. I think he makes a very good argument, but I think the time to take care of the problem which he points out is when this law comes up for extension. I think it expires in 1963 and we will have to vote an extension of the law at that time. Why not do it at that time?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman this question? He will recall that this extension was brought up last year under suspension. There was no chance for the gentleman from Ohio to attempt to amend the bill. It was brought up under suspension and, of course, with the great popularity of the program, it passed. We could not amend it. I hope some day the legislative committee will give us a chance to amend it and make it a proper impacted-area law.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. Chairman, in 1958, Congress extended authority to make payments for "A" category children under Public Laws 815 and 874 on a permanent basis, and extended the provisions authorizing payments for the other categories of Federal impact to June 30, 1963. The present administration recommended to the Congress for consideration last year a reduction in payments in both Public Laws 815 and 874 for "B" category children—primarily those children who live in a taxable home with a parent employed on Federal property—from the present 50 percent of the local contribution rate to 25 percent of that rate, and proposed some other amendments which would reduce the total cost of these programs. While I believe that some savings could be made by amendments which would restrict payments to those school districts where the need is not urgent, the Congress did not see fit to accept the recommendations of the administration. Instead, in the very last days of the session last year, Congress extended these expiring provisions without amendment for 2 additional years. At the same time, the appropriation made to carry out these acts was $15,707,000 less than the amount necessary to pay full entitlements under Public Law 874, and $7,092,000 short of meeting the estimated requirements under Public Law 815.

With the $231 million currently available, the Office of Education can pay only 92 percent of the estimated entitlements of the eligible districts for current operating expenses under Public Law 874, and can approve only 87 percent of those eligible construction projects under Public Law 815, with the $54,850,000 appropriated for this program. The total amount needed is $247 million under Public Law 874, and $61,942,000 under Public Law 815.

As I said before, I am in favor of some amendments which would reduce the cost of these two programs. At the same time I firmly believe that when the Congress has had an opportunity to act on amendments which would reduce the cost, but has not taken that action, school districts have a right to expect that the entitlements due them under the law will be paid. Furthermore, I believe that the Congress has a moral obligation under the situation which I have described to appropriate the full amounts necessary to pay 100 percent of the entitlements under these two programs.

When Congress extended these two laws without amendment the school districts expected that they would receive full entitlements and planned their budgets accordingly. Now when the appropriation is sufficient to pay only 92 percent of the costs, they have nowhere to turn to find this additional 8 percent. They must either try to find the money somewhere now and make it up in additional taxes next year, or drastically curtail their school programs. In my State of Rhode Island, for example, 22 federally impacted school districts will provide free public education for an estimated 2,000 "A" category children who live on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property.

They also will provide free public education for 8,700 "B" category children the current school year. The estimated full entitlements for these 22 districts amounts to $2,120,000. With the appropriation currently available they will receive $169,653 less than this amount, or $1,951,026. In order to make up this difference which they have counted on in making their budgets these school districts will have to raise their tax rates, in one case as much as 1.28 mills.

The town of North Kingston, for example, is depending on Federal payments to make up almost 40 percent of its total budget. It will be short $39,000 if full entitlements are not paid. This is equivalent to the full salary of an estimated six teachers for 1 year. The town of Middletown school committee is entitled to approximately $400,000 in a total operating budget of a little over $1 million. It will be short $34,000 if full entitlements are not paid. At this time of year, when the tax rate has been set, where will the school officials turn to make up this deficit?

Estimated increase in local tax rate if 3 percent and 19 percent reduction in Federal (Public Law 874) payments for fiscal years 1962 and 1963, respectively, are not restored for State of Rhode Island

Name of district (1)	1961 assessed valuation ¹ (2)	1962 estimated ent. 100 percent (3)	1962 estimated ent. 92 percent (4)	Difference (5)	Estimated increase in local tax rate (in mills) required to equal amount shown in col (5) (6)	1963 estimated ent. 100 percent (7)	1963 estimated ent. 81 percent (8)	Difference (9)	Estimated increase in local tax rate (in mills) required to equal amount of loss shown in col. (9) (10)
Newport school system	$90,009,400	$450,106	$414,097	$36,009	0.40	$515,082	$417,216	$97,866	1.08
Town of Middletown School Commission	26,726,490	428,014	393,773	34,241	1.28	497,988	403,370	94,618	3.54
Town of Tiverton School Commission	23,168,109	23,417	21,544	1,873	.08	26,622	21,564	5,058	.21
Town of East Greenwich School Commission	20,868,772	44,888	41,297	3,591	.17	50,716	41,080	9,636	.46
Town of North Kingston School Commission	43,065,960	491,163	451,370	39,293	.91	573,605	464,620	108,985	2.49
Town of Portsmouth School Commission	22,786,460	152,453	140,257	12,196	.53	175,993	142,554	33,439	1.46
Town of Jamestown School Commission	17,500,000	24,252	22,312	1,940	.11	27,552	22,317	5,235	.29
Coventry School Department	43,648,787	94,604	87,036	7,568	.17	107,733	87,264	20,469	.46
Warwick School Commission	251,439,671	176,063	161,978	14,085	.05	199,591	161,669	37,922	.15
Town of Westerly School Commission	42,211,000	55,520	51,078	4,442	.10	63,057	51,707	11,350	.26
Town of Charlestown School Commission	5,922,252	7,488	6,889	599	.10	8,680	7,031	1,649	.27
Richmond School Commission (Shannack)	6,149,374	4,412	4,059	353	.05	5,178	4,194	984	.16
Town of Narragansett School Commission	25,453,435	13,635	12,544	1,091	.04	15,238	12,343	2,895	.11
Hopkinton School Department	9,904,742	16,528	15,206	1,322	.13	18,668	15,121	3,547	.35
West Greenwich School Department	3,900,200	3,088	2,841	247	.06	3,540	2,867	673	.17
Town of Warwick School Department	² 43,091,968	45,131	41,521	3,610	.08	51,327	41,575	9,752	.22
Town of Smithfield Department of Public Schools	31,254,190	8,593	7,906	687	.02	9,719	7,872	1,847	.05
Bristol School Commission	49,186,465	13,892	12,781	1,111	.02	15,775	12,778	2,997	.06
Exeter School Commission	9,360,231	6,903	6,351	552	.05	8,090	6,553	1,537	.16
South Kingston School Commission	40,903,269	44,374	40,824	3,550	.08	50,406	40,829	9,577	.23
Foster School Department	6,733,940	5,057	4,652	405	.06	5,749	4,657	1,092	.16
Charibo Reg. H.S.D., Richmond	16,838,355	11,098	10,210	883	.05	12,864	10,420	2,444	.14
Total		2,120,679	1,951,026	169,653					

¹ As shown in application of school district for fiscal year 1961.

² Assessed valuation 1958–59, 1959–60, or 1960–61 available in application from school district.

These school districts will find it impossible to obtain sufficient funds to carry out their school program as planned for the current school year. The same situation will exist in almost every other State. There is not a single one of the approximately 4,000 school districts in the United States eligible for payments under this law that will not be adversely affected by failure of this Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to pay full entitlements.

Under Public Law 815 the Office of Education has already processed and found eligible approximately 49 urgently needed construction projects requiring a little over $7 million which have a priority of less than 10 and which cannot be met with the present appropriation. The additional appropriation for this program is required so that these school districts can start construction of school facilities to house federally connected children who have been sent to their districts for work on essential Federal projects. I believe it is incumbent on this Congress to appropriate the full amount needed under these two laws.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], both of whom oppose the appropriation for these two programs, come from congressional districts which have no federally impacted school districts. However, the State of Ohio, on the whole, has 137 school districts eligible for an estimated $5,718,000 in fiscal year 1962. In North Carolina, 29 impacted school districts are eligible for $5,473,000. If this additional appropriation is not made, the Ohio districts will lose $387,200, and the 29 districts in North Carolina will lose $187,800.

These districts will have no way this late in the year to make up this deficit.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Is it not a fact that a great many of these school districts that would be affected by the amendment offered by my beloved friend from Ohio [Mr. Bow] have already made commitments and that they have to pay these bills before July 1 and have no way of getting their money except through the enactment of this legislation, which was promised to them by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. FOGARTY. If the House votes for the Bow amendment, we are breaking a moral obligation to every school district that takes advantage of this appropriation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program with which we are all familiar. We cannot add anything to our knowledge about it now. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST. GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the motion to include in the deficiency appropriations bill the necessary amounts to pay full entitlements to the federally impacted school districts.

I am aware of the problems of the school departments in my district. I believe it is incumbent on the Congress of the United States to pay full entitlement to those schools that qualify for payment under the law, which in my district are as follows:

	Entitlement	Amount scheduled	Deficiency increase
Newport	$450,106	$414,097	$36,009
Middletown	428,014	393,773	34,241
Portsmouth	152,453	140,257	12,196
Jamestown	24,252	22,312	1,940
Tiverton	23,417	21,544	1,873

At this time I also wish to state my belief that this session of Congress should take steps to extend Public Laws 874–815; otherwise several of my school districts will be preparing next year's school budgets against a law that will run out part way through their fiscal years.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Downing] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative from Virginia's First Congressional District, which, as you well know contains a heavy federally connected population, I am deeply interested in doing everything that can possibly be done to assure provision of the highest kind of education for the children of our Nation's Federal employees.

The public school superintendents in all districts have for many years been working diligently to raise public educational standards to an optimum level. Budget factors, of course, comprise a significant aspect of effort in this area. We all agree with high educational standards; some of us do not always agree on the budgetary levels necessary to achieve high educational standards.

However, school superintendents in my district face a particularly urgent budgeting difficulty because of the heavy federally connected population on the lower peninsula of Virginia. In several of my school districts, approximately 40 percent of the enrolled pupils have parents who are federally connected. You are, of course, very well aware that Federal property produces no tax revenue for a local school district. Consequently many of the school superintendents in my district face each budget preparation period with a possible built-in loss factor of approximately 40 percent. It is the express purpose of our Federal impacted aid program to assist localities to provide a high level of education for the children of federally connected parents. Congress has established a very strong precedent in support of the principle that the Federal Government has a direct obligation to assist local school districts prepare their annual budgets with Federal impacted relief payments in mind.

I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the school districts in my area, as well, I am sure, as the districts in other areas, operate on exceedingly tight budgets. Each one of the public school superintendents in my district has prepared his current fiscal year budget in the sincere expectation that his school district would receive a full impacted relief payment from the Federal Government. There is no way to reduce a tight school budget without very significantly hindering the educational process. I personally believe that it is important that all of our children—certainly the children of our fine force of civil servants and our military personnel—be given the best possible education in our public schools. Obviously, the best will not be possible on a drastically reduced budget.

Therefore, I am personally very hopeful that it will be possible for us to provide for a 100-percent appropriation for Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. I believe that the Federal Government has incurred this obligation and I believe that our children's educational needs demand that we in the Congress help the Federal Government fulfill its full obligation. I have every faith and confidence in my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, and I fervently hope that they will join me in voting to restore the full Public Law 815-Public Law 874 appropriation for the current fiscal year.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore the 8-percent deficiency in the appropriations for aid to impacted area schools for the current year.

It is indeed unfortunate that a degree of uncertainty as to what amount our school districts will receive from year to year under this law presents an additional problem to the communities in preparing their school budgets. Most certainly when limited funds are available to begin with it is practically impossible in some cases to provide sufficient funds for operating the school systems in the event Congress fails to act.

I fully realize that in normal congressional appropriation procedures it is also difficult to determine in advance how much is needed and the reluctance on the part of Congress to overappropriate funds for any program. Yet, since this program has met with substantial approval on the part of the Congress it seems that the communities should be able to plan their budgets on the basis that the Congress will meet their responsibility to fully fund the program.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted and believe that it will, since the record over the period of years is full of information justifying the necessity for and the fairness of this program.

I think attempt to exclude the Washington area schools from this program is so ridiculous that it should be overwhemingly rejected by the membership and is not even worthy of comment.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of the amendment which will provide for a supplemental appropriation for the administration of Public Law 874 as I am deeply concerned about the failure of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to meet 100 percent entitlement.

This failure of the Federal Government to meet an entire obligation which it has assumed places some of the school districts in my district in Missouri in a very precarious position as the 1962 school budget has already been approved. Many, many school districts all over the Nation are coming out on the short end.

We are committed to these districts, and we must fulfill our moral obligation by paying our bill in full. When full entitlement is not met, we are responsible for depriving the various school systems of some phase of educational need or advancement. At a time such as this, when educational standards are unusually high and financing the same must be done on a bare minimum scale, the Federal Government can and must pay its bill in full.

My interest is to provide the best educational opportunities available for the youth of our Nation, and I greatly feel it is our duty to see that full entitlement is made available.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] to H.R. 11038, providing for a supplemental appropriation for the federally impacted school districts.

In the State of Utah there are eight school districts which annually receive Federal assistance under the so-called federally impacted area legislation, which assistance amounts to in excess of $2 million.

In view of the fact that the current debate on Federal aid to education has called up the argument that all Federal aid to local school districts carries with it a threat to academic freedom, and in view of the fact that this argument strikes at the heart of the federally impacted area school program, I make the following observation. Two years ago I wrote a letter to the respective superintendents of each of the school districts in Utah receiving Federal aid under this program. Remember, Mr. Chairman, that this program had been in operation for some 10 years, and that much of this money had gone to pay teachers' salaries. In my letter I asked the question whether or not the receiving of Federal money had in any way interfered with the academic freedom of the recipient of that money, or of any teacher within that district. The answers which I received were unanimously in the negative. Not one single superintendent expressed himself that the Federal aid received was in any way destructive of the traditional academic freedom which is so characteristic of our educational system.

I feel that the Record should show clearly, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that as far as Utah is concerned, no one can argue in good faith that the federally impacted area school legislation constitutes a threat to our educational system. I support it, and urge all Members of the House to support the pending amendment.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Chairman, I strongly endorse the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, and urge the support of my colleagues to restore 100 percent of the funds to which school districts are entitled.

The present situation places the Congress in the position of failing to fulfill a commitment made years ago and this failure is causing untold hardships on the schools of this Nation. It is one thing to tell a school district that you can expect a certain amount and then be certain that the school gets it. It is another to tell them to expect a certain amount of money and then fail to provide it. The school budgets for this year were made out long ago and expenses were programed on the basis that the Congress of the United States would meet the responsibility it assumed. Expenditures during the year were predicated on this fact. Now, in entering the fourth quarter, our schools find themselves short of funds to complete the year. This is no small matter, Mr. Chairman, and when you take the effects on New Mexico and multiply them nationwide you have some idea of what is happening. New Mexico has 49 school districts who, as of this moment, are short $517,556 in meeting obligations for the rest of this fiscal year. One school district alone is short over $125,000 and this district is in an area where the Government has about 25,000 Government employees sending their children to school.

Mr. Chairman, the issue, it seems to me is simple. Either we are going to meet our obligations or we are not. Either we are going to approve legislation and provide necessary financing or we are not. Either we are going to support education or we are not.

There are many ways to economize, Mr. Chairman, but failing to fulfill a commitment is not one of them. Again, I strongly urge the support of my colleagues in approving this worthy amendment which will maintain the integrity of this body.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in vigorous support of the amendment to bring to 100 percent the entitlements for payments to our schools in federally impacted areas.

These schools have not come to us, hat in hand, asking for doles from the public Treasury. They are asking us, as honorable men, to live up to our obligations under Public Laws 815 and 874. These laws, in essence, call for in-lieu-of-taxes payments in areas where school costs have skyrocketed because of Federal installations. Because of the increased burden thus placed on local taxpayers, the Congress long ago determined that the Federal Government must assume its rightful share of the school tax burden. It is a matter of the Federal Government owing a debt to communities. Our schools are entitled to collect that debt.

The amendment which the gentleman has introduced is the same as my own bill, H.R. 10935, which would bring entitlement up to the full amount due for the current fiscal year. My fifth district is composed of a number of rapidly growing communities faced with sharp increases in capital outlays for new schools as a result of Federal installations. Mr. John Glenn, superintendent of the Bedford Public Schools in my district, tells me that the Bedford community is spending money for new schools at the rate of one new school every 2 years, and will continue at this rate over the next 4-year period at least. This is typical of those areas where Federal installations are accelerating the problems involved in the extremely rapid expansion of school population.

We have heard a great deal from the administration about the need for all-out Federal aid to education and school construction. That is not today's debate, but it makes me doubly astounded at the administration's cold shoulder to the current request that Congress appropriate the full amount to which impacted school areas are already entitled under law.

I urge my colleagues to vote to bring up to 100 percent the entitlement the Federal Government owes our schools in impacted areas, and without which many of these schools will not be able to continue to operate to the benefit of our schoolchildren.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There is no matter of more importance to the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland than the continued full operation of Public Laws 815 and 874.

Each year since I have been privileged to be a Member of Congress, it has been necessary for me to insist that the Federal Government honor its responsibilities to those communities that are impacted by Federal activities. The deficiency that will be provided for by Mr. BOLAND's amendment arose as a result of an incorrect estimate at the time the fiscal 1962 budget was submitted to the Congress by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The public school educators in my district have expressed concern and disquiet over the operation of this program for some time. The issue before this body is, once again, quite simple: Does Congress legislate or do we sit back and allow our legislative responsibilities to be assumed by the Bureau of the Budget?

Our school administrators, relying upon Congress as they had every right to do, made their plans 1 year in advance for the succeeding school year. Traditionally, schoolteachers are evaluated on their teaching performance and new contracts are offered in the spring for the coming fall term. School budgets are made up at this time and uncertainties about Federal contributions continue to add greatly to the problems of our already burdened teachers and administrators.

I would like to read into the record at this point statements made by Mr. William S. Schmidt, Superintendent of Schools in Prince Georges County, which demonstrate quite clearly why I feel so deeply that Congress must not fail to live up to its responsibilities under Public Laws 815 and 874:

> The U.S. Office of Education also reports that there is an insufficient appropriation to approve projects for building construction, and that this deficit amounts to $7,092,000. Under the present funds which have been appropriated, the Office can only approve projects with a priority index of 10 or above. Any project with a priority of less than 10 must wait for approval of a deficiency appropriation.
>
> We have just been advised by Mr. Lilywhite of the Office of Education that we have two projects pending approval, both of which fall below the priority index of 10.
>
> You can well appreciate my concern for these funds for school construction when you realize that Prince Georges County is estimating an increase of 7,000 additional students for the 1962-63 school term. Any help or assistance which you can give to the passage of these deficiency appropriation bills would be greatly appreciated.

Similar problems of equal importance will be experienced by all other counties in the Fifth District of Maryland. Therefore, I am confident that we today will live up to our responsibilities by approving Congressman BOLAND's amendment.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts to add funds to permit the United States to honor its commitments to local school boards throughout the Nation. My own bill, H.R. 10807, is directed at doing the same thing.

I am strongly opposed to this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio to limit the effect of the Boland amendment. If this proposal were to be adopted by this House I think we would be guilty of a breach of faith.

My own district has been mentioned in this debate as the recipient of funds under the impacted area program. This is true, and we believe that we earn every penny we receive. The facts support this conclusion.

By every standard, irrespective of whether the children reside on or off Federal real estate, the National Capital area is truly an impacted area. The activities of the Federal Government in this area creates strains on local budgets not present when commensurate activities are carried on by tax-paying private enterprise. Thus the impacted area program is entirely justified.

In the interest of fairness I would add a word as to the propriety of this amendment at this time. The fact that there is a deficiency in no way reflects upon the incumbent Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. As a matter of fact, there has been a deficiency appropriation for this program in 10 out of the past 11 years. In some cases the amount has been more than double the sum contemplated by this amendment. The failure to predict the exact needs of the program with accuracy seems to have been a bipartisan problem.

I urge bipartisan support to resolve the difficulty and pay our honest debts.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of the gentleman's motion to add $15 million to this bill presently before us for the impacted school districts in our Nation. To approve this will be to keep faith with these impacted school districts who have definitely planned to receive the total amount of their entitlement under our representation a year ago that they would receive such. Furthermore, there is a continuing need for these impacted school districts to receive the full amount of their entitlement.

It may be true, as the gentleman from Ohio said, that there are many places where there are children who do not live on Federal reservations; but, that does not justify in my mind denying the school districts wherein all or almost all of the children involved are children of necessary Federal employees but whose families live off of the reservation. Most of these families live off the Federal reservation because there are no places for them to live on the reservation. This is true in the great 23d Congressional District of California which I represent and every one of the impacted school districts in my congressional district have communicated to me they must needs rely upon the receipt again of the balance of their entitlements which amounts to about 10 percent of the total amount which they were promised and upon which they have relied upon receipt thereof.

Before this day on occasions I have spoken to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] of this continuing need in my congressional district, and I appreciate him and his associate on the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] bringing this matter to the floor at this time. I believe the House will overwhelmingly vote for the gentleman's motion to include $15 million additional in this bill. I certainly shall, and I urge every Member of this House to do it in the interest of good faith with these impacted school districts and on account of the very urgent continuing need for same.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the amendment to include the sum of $15,707,000 in the supplemental appropriation bill for the administration of Public Law 874 which relates to maintenance and operation of public schools in federally impacted areas.

The record shows that I have always been a consistent supporter of the programs embodied in Public Laws 874 and 815. This has been the case because I believe the Federal Government has a distinct responsibility to assist those school districts whose enrollments are increased as a result of Government contracts bringing production workers with their families into such areas. I feel, therefore, that the Federal Government should not forgo its responsibility by failing to provide appropriations in full for those who are entitled to benefits under the law.

I urge all Members of the House to join in supporting this amendment.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to express my support for the amendment to the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1962 proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland]. I deem it entirely appropriate that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be required to spend 100 percent of the sum appropriated by Congress for Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. School districts having to absorb children of Federal employees who do not pay local school taxes are entitled to the financial assistance which these laws provide.

I hasten to advise that while I definitely support this amendment I am reserving judgment on final passage of the bill itself.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I vigorously support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] to appropriate sufficient funds to permit the payment of full entitlements to local school districts under Public Laws 815 and 874.

The Federal impactment program has been in existence since 1951, a period of more than 10 years. During this time the affected school districts have prepared their annual budgets with the expectation that Federal aid provided for under Public Laws 815 and 874, as extended, would be forthcoming. If the supplemental appropriation now under consideration is not approved these school districts will undergo deficit financing and their operations will be seriously affected.

In the 14th California District, which I am privileged to represent, no less than 17 elementary, high school, and junior college districts are adversely affected by the reduced entitlements. The increased expenditures involved are entirely attributable to student population influxes due to Federal activity.

For my district, this Federal assistance is substantial. Figures provided by the Office of Education show that for the 1962 fiscal year, the 17 districts involved are eligible for entitlements totaling $1,678,344 under Public Law 874 for operation and maintenance. The 8 percent deficiency will reduce this amount to $1,544,071, leaving a total shortage of $134,273 in operating funds.

It should be further noted that the impactment in the 14th Congressional District lies principally in three military installation complexes. I refer to the areas of Edwards Air Force Base, the Naval Ordnance Test Station at China Lake, and Naval Air Station, Lemoore. It goes without saying that the activities at these stations are making noteworthy contributions to our defense effort.

However, the existence of military bases takes land off the tax rolls and reduces the ad valorem tax base. It is for this reason that the assistance provided for in the impactment program is vitally needed.

The principle involved here has repeatedly been approved by the Congress. It was reiterated as recently as last year when the authority for the program was extended. We must recognize our moral obligation to appropriate the necessary funds.

At this time, I would like to include in the Record a list of the 17 local school districts in the 14th California District which have a stake in this appropriation. There follows the identity of the districts, followed by figures representing the full 1962 fiscal year entitlement under Public Law 874, the 92-percent allocation, and the amount of the shortage if the Boland amendment is not adopted:

China Lake Joint School District, $444,230, $408,692, $35,538.

Southern Kern County Unified School District, Rosamond, $33,287, $30,624, $2,663.

Muroc Unified School District, Edwards, $505,918, $465,445, $40,473.

Three Rivers Unified School District, $11,316, $10,411, $905.

Central Union Elementary School District, Lemoore, $147,747, $135,927, $11,820.

Lemoore Union School District, $16,479, $15,161, $1,318.

Indian Wells Valley Union School District, Ridgecrest, $71,631, $65,901, $5,730.

Kern County Joint Union High School District, $268,233, $246,774, $21,459.

Mojave Unified School District, $18,715, $17,217, $1,498.

Lemoore Union High School District, $55,542, $51,098, $4,444.

Hanford Elementary School District, $40,932, $37,657, $3,275.

Island Union School District, $1,587, $1,460, $127.

Reef-Sunset Union Elementary School District, $3,581, $3,294, $287.

Hanford Joint Union High School District, $13,878, $12,767, $1,111.

Armona Union School District, $3,479, $3,200, $279.

Woodlake Union High School District, $6,009, $5,528, $481.

Kern County Joint Junior College District, $35,780, $32,917, $2,863.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Boland amendment be adopted.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that this proposed amendment should be adopted. Education is and should be the No. 1 concern of our Nation during these very difficult times of international stress and strain. I know that in 1961, in my own congressional district, cash payments made under the so-called impacted area bill amounted to $443,248. If this amendment is adopted, it will mean that an additional $34,659 will be allocated to my congressional district. This in no small measure should aid in keeping local taxes from climbing even higher than they are now. If this amendment is not adopted, the State of Massachusetts itself will lose over $660,864.

It seems clear to me that there is no logical reason why the Federal Government should not continue to reimburse the local communities for the taxes lost to the municipalities from tax-free Federal installations. While I feel this measure is more in the nature of stopgap legislation than a permanent solution to our educational problems, it certainly is a step in the right direction, and I hope that this amendment will be adopted by the House today.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by Mr. Boland and ask leave to revise and extend my remarks.

My colleagues, this is a justified and morally obligated amendment. I trust you will support it.

Our progress as a nation depends directly upon our advancement in education. Our hopes for economic growth require the greatest development of our youth's capabilities. A successful educational system, as you gentlemen know, requires adequate financing. The quality of the students depends in large measure on both the quality and the relative quantity of teachers and facilities. As one who is vitally interested in the education and welfare of our youth, I feel that this is an area wherein the Federal Government may enter as a matter of right and it certainly has a strong moral responsibility to meet its obligations in this field.

The school systems all over the country have drafted their budgets in contemplation of this anticipated appropriation. This Congress last year authorized this expenditure to the fullest yet only 92 percent of the sum authorized by Congress was appropriated. Our obligation is to live up to this commitment and appropriate this balance due to the schools of our land. Without this money many of them will have to curtail their schedules. They would be incapable of continuing on a competitive basis with other school districts.

The world emphasis is on education, science, and knowledge. When we are striving to maintain our superiority over the rest of the world and when we are trying to make available for every talented young person the opportunity to receive an education, it certainly is inconsistent to cut off the means that would help make this goal attainable.

Again, gentlemen, failure of Congress to appropriate the full amount of funds set forth in this amendment will place us in an unconscionable position. I urge you to give your wholehearted support to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Contributions to international organizations

> For an aditional amount for "Contributions to international organizations," $25,616,000.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BRUCE: On page 14, strike out lines 13, 14, 15, and 16.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, it is with a certain amount of apprehension that I rise at this point because I do recognize the emotion that is involved in the hopes and aspirations of all of us in the organization known as the United Nations.

I do not believe, even though I am a freshman, that I can be accused of being a Johnny-come-lately on this question of the Congo, because on September 12 of last year I spoke to the House on the question of the Congo and had this to say:

> I beg the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives—I beg anyone and everyone in this Chamber to lend their influence toward raising a cry that an investigation, not necessarily of subversion but of a repetition of failure of policy, be carried out right now in regard to the Congo. It cannot wait until next year. The time for action is now, not when it is too late. I beg my colleagues to listen—now.

That was on September 12 of last year.

Again on January 25 of this year, I rose to warn of what was happening in the Congo. I must share the sentiments expressed by that outstanding columnist, William S. White, in an article in the Evening Star of December 11 when he said:

> It is a terrible thing to have to say, when one's own country is involved. But there is a sick, lost feeling over what is being done by the United Nations in the Congo, with the full support of the United States.
>
> For the first time in his life, one correspondent cannot find it honestly possible to back his Government—under whatever party's control it might be—in a crisis abroad. Through no amount of effort can he make himself believe that what is going on is just, or in our national interest, or in the interest of the free world generally.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the proposed appropriation of $25,616,000 to pay the U.S. contribution to the United Nations for its special assessment of the cost of military assistance in the Congo. I can think personally of no other description of this money—horrible though it may sound and offensive though it may be—than to say that it is blood money.

I have here for all of you to see some pictures of the horrors inflicted on this newly emerging nation by the so-called army of peace. I ask you to join me, if you can, and look at the body of this baby with its arm shattered at the shoulder.

Look at this face, a bloody pulp of what was once a human being in a hospital, a victim of indiscriminate mortar firing and bombing. I ask you to join me and look at this 87-year-old woman shot point blank in the neck by United Nations forces who broke into her apartment and shot her, unarmed.

Look at the body of her son, unarmed, shot at point blank range.

I ask you to look at the ambulance with the Red Cross markings, the victim of "peace in the Congo."

Look at the body of the nurse who was in that ambulance.

Do you call this peace? You call this justice? You call this an example for emerging nations?

Gaze, if you can, on the body of Madame Vroonen, one of these Red Cross workers. Take a close look at it too.

Have we now become so cold and so callous even in this body, the House of Representatives, that we will not take the time to investigate properly and study what is being carried out in the name of peace? But, would we rather hide behind slogans of misguided policy and wash our hands before the multitude like Pontius Pilate?

You say, "You are excited"—I am. I sat in my office month after month after month and I listened to missionaries who were there on the scene, Protestant and Catholic—I have listened and spoken with doctors who were on the scene—they know what happened, they were there, they are not engaging in guesswork. Has any appropriate committee of this House taken the time to sit and listen to the eyewitness accounts of these people?

My staff and I, as I have said, spent endless hours doing just this.

Has our civilization reached the point of callousness where the clever use of words has dulled our conscience and rotted our moral fiber?

I come before this House not to argue—there is no point to argument and throwing names back and forth—but rather to plead for a renewed sense of responsibility.

The world is on fire, why add to the flame?

Have we adopted as our policy now the philosophy outlined by Columnist Max Lerner in the December 8, 1961, issue of the New York Post where he says, "Once the U.N. has decided, wrongly or rightly, that a certain political solution is necessary for peace, it seems to me it must be imposed."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. BRUCE moves that the Committee do now rise and report back to the House the bill, H.R. 11038, with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. BRUCE. I ask my colleagues—can we ignore the words addressed to the civilized world on February 20, 1962, by the rector of the University of Elisabethville, J. Frenkiel, under the heading "I Protest and I Accuse," when he says:

> Before the face of the civilized world, I protest against the atrocities committed in Katanga and particularly in Elisabethville in December 1961. They were far too numerous, and all classes of the population suffered from them. But I shall limit myself to the blows endured by the university. I am thinking of Mr. Derriks, a member of our Conseil Supérieur, and of his 87-year-old mother, savagely murdered in their own house. I am thinking of Professor Coureaux, whose assassination I have just related.
>
> I protest against the sickening disappointment inflicted upon us by the U.N. organization. All people who feel respect for civilized values greeted the birth of that institution with enthusiasm, because its ideals of justice, progress, and peace were in harmony with their own aspirations. They are now constrained to acknowledge the vanity of their hopes. The U.N. now appears in our eyes as a nameless power, whose action is not dictated by any lofty ideal, but solely by orders issuing from certain pressure groups. Moreover, the amplitude and the character of that action depend mostly on men whom a capricious administration appoints to posts of responsibility for ridiculously short periods and haphazardly, irrespective of their qualifications and previous experience.
>
> The lack of proportion characteristic of such action is only equaled by its incoherence.
>
> At this point I will not refrain from paying homage to the clearsightedness and understanding of several U.N. high officials on the spot. Unfortunately, their attitude is efficient only within the tight limits set by orders from above, and not infrequently results in their being transferred.
>
> Because of this anonymity and incoherence, my protest would be vain if I only addressed the United Nations. My accusations, therefore, are directed against less nebulous objects.
>
> I accuse all those who, perhaps unwittingly, have taken part in any way in the transformation of an international organization

> for peace and justice into a blind and unmanageable war machine.
>
> I accuse all those who have made it possible to introduce the horrors of modern war to the very heart of this African Continent, barely awakening to liberty and independence. They have brought to Africa the most despicable image of Western civilization, an image made up of indiscriminate mortar fire and murderous air bombing.
>
> I accuse those who, in order to create that destructive power, have too often recruited, in various countries, gangs of men solely attracted by the hope of booty, rape, and murder. Under cover of a higher ideal, for which they do not care, they have introduced into this part of Africa people who, in normal times, should fill the prisons of their native countries.
>
> Finally and most of all, I accuse those who, inspired by ideological motives or, what is even worse, by basely material interests, have supplied the funds and other means without which such misdeeds would never have been possible.
>
> In this respect, I am deeply sorry to have to mention the Government of the United States of America, whom I do not confuse with the American people. As a sincere democrat, I am particularly distressed at feeling obliged to stigmatize the leaders of the great young Republic which I used to consider as the foundation and the bulwark of our rights and aspirations as free and civilized human beings.
>
> But in the present circumstances, my distress must make room for my duty as a man who loves justice and freedom and as the responsible director of an institution whose task is just to safeguard and promote and bring to fruition the values of civilization.
>
> Nobody would dream of denying that a cultural institution in Africa must survive, at any price, under whatever circumstances, because it is an indispensable factor of development in African countries. That is why it is the duty of the rector of the University of Elisabethville to proclaim his indignation at the situation created in Katanga, so that this state of affairs may come to an end, and in order that such errors may never be committed again elsewhere in the world.

I may have offended some. If I have, I am sorry. But the time has come, now, not next week or next year, for us to once again act in the tradition of Americans, proud of our heritage, acting with meaning behind the words "peace" and "justice." When our constituents have the opportunity to view these pictures, and view them they will, can we justify the use of their hard-earned income dollars for the perpetration of such sickening and immoral policies? If we vote this money today, we compound the already present guilt and, in effect, we in this body become accessories to the crime that has been perpetrated on innocent people in the Congo.

We may call it justice; we may call it peace; we may call it progress. I call it barbarism; I call it criminal; I call it slaughter; I call it murder.

Every man must follow his own conscience, but let us be sure that it is not an escape from conscience—that we are not merely justifying our role by saying, "they did it; I didn't." The truth is that without our finance, without our complicity, without our approval, without our airlift, without our equipment, and without our policy support, this could never have happened. We can either vote this money today and put our stamp of approval on what has happened, or we can withhold it for the time being and launch the most thorough, far-reaching investigation in the history of the U.S. Congress, both into our own State Department and into the operation of the United Nations, itself, so that before it is too late, we may revise our policy and regain our sanity.

For those who have been slaughtered in the Congo as a result of our actions, we can only say, "May God forgive us." But for the days that lie ahead, we must be willing, not to just shrug our shoulders and repeat these tragic errors, but to act with courage and responsibility, with honor and a sense of justice, with truth and a renewed dedication to the principles upon which our own Republic was founded.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman rise in opposition to the preferential motion?

Mr. ROONEY. I do, Mr. Chairman, but I submit this consent request.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the pending amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE], and wish to point out that it is a dangerous amendment. It would come close to taking the United States out of the United Nations.

As I have previously explained, this $25 million is to cover the U.S part of the United Nations police expenses in the Congo. As of February 27, 1962, 16,919 troops from 21 countries were placed at the disposal of the United Nations in the Congo. There are those who are involved or concerned with the internal politics of the Congo—I am not—but I do know that to take the United Nations troops out of the Congo would mean leaving the Congo to the Soviet Union and permitting its agents to take over, and you may be sure they would do it in no time.

In the interest of the United States we merely want law and order in the Congo. We want the people to have a stable government, a stable democratic government. This money is currently owing by the United States and it must be paid. It has nothing to do with the bond issue. The period to be covered by the bond issue would not begin until this coming July 1. This, as I said previously, would cover the cost from November 1, last, to June 30, 1962.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that when the committee exercises its good and calm judgment with regard to the pending amendment it will realize the innate danger connected with it. We must rely on the United Nations. This is to our advantage as Americans, and I believe 90 percent of the American public realizes that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the preferential motion and the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the entire bill be concluded in 15 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman cannot reserve time to a committee under a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the entire bill be concluded in 15 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. You cannot close debate on the entire bill until the whole bill is read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman from New York that there is an additional paragraph that has not been read. The gentleman from Texas, of course, may offer such a motion on the pending paragraph.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to 15 minutes.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. LAIRD.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 112, noes 74.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] has made some very serious charges here before this body regarding atrocities in the Congo. He presented some photographs to substantiate his charges. I wonder if the gentleman would be good enough to tell the House the source of those photographs?

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I will be glad to tell the House the source of the photographs. One of them appeared in the regular public press. Others have been handed to me by sources from the Congo itself.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentleman like to identify those sources from the Congo?

Mr. BRUCE. I will be very glad to do so when the investigation which I have asked for is called, to present full evidence before the committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentleman at this time like to identify the sources from the Congo that provided the photographs which he presented to the House today?

Mr. BRUCE. I would be delighted to present them to the proper committee of this House.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman do it now?

Mr. BRUCE. I have answered the gentleman. I will give them to the committee when they call a hearing on this entire matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But the gentleman has tried to influence my judgment and the judgment of others on this amendment. I would like for the gentleman to identify the source of these photographs now. We are going to vote on this amendment, in just a few minutes. I am asking the gentleman to identify the source of those photographs so I can make a proper evaluation of the amendment.

Mr. BRUCE. They have been published in the public press, many of them.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman identify the sources from the Congo for this House now?

Mr. BRUCE. I have no idea who made the photographs, but can the gentleman deny the Red Cross ambulance?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am not denying anything in the photograph. I have asked the gentleman for about the 10th time to tell this House what is the source of those photographs, who delivered them to the gentleman for presentation to the House?

Mr. BRUCE. They have been handed to me by various individuals, many individuals.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman name some of them?

Mr. BRUCE. I would be glad to do that before a proper committee of this House.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have to make a judgment on this amendment now. I have seen these photographs. In order to make a proper judgment, I am asking the gentleman to give us the source of those photographs.

Mr. BRUCE. I have answered the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] the House of Representatives? Does the gentleman feel he can demand everything?

Mr. PUCINSKI. No, sir.

Mr. TABER. It looks like it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I had not yielded to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber].

Mr. TABER. I would not think you would.

Mr. PUCINSKI. As one Member of this House, I am being asked to make a judgment on this amendment. So are the other Members here being asked to judge the merits of this amendment. The gentleman from Indiana has produced some atrocity picture to influence our judgment on the amendment. I certainly have a right to ask the gentleman from Indiana to identify the source of those photographs, where they come from, what sources in the Congo delivered them to the gentleman for presentation to this House. It is obvious from this colloquy that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bruce] does not want to disclose to this House where those pictures came from.

Mr. BRUCE. I have told the gentleman that I will present them to any committee of this House that is interested in looking at them, and the source of them.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But it is quite obvious that this House is not going to know what is the source of those photographs before a judgment is made on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Utt].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the time has been limited it is impossible for me to cover the subject matter. I might say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] that I was prepared yesterday when the bill was put off until today. This is the very last item on the agenda, and I am a little unhappy that there are so many people who do not want to hear the truth, so many people who want to cut off debate before there is an opportunity to go into the entire matter.

The gentleman from Indiana could have explained those pictures had you not cut off the debate, but not in the 1 minute that you are trying to get him to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say that I was going to direct my remarks not to the Congo, although I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bruce]. I would say that we have had many murders which have been committed by U.N. troops. However, I wish to direct the attention of this House to who runs the United Nations, who is giving the orders, and to whom this money is being turned over, and those to whom we are going to turn over the $100 million bond money this year and each year thereafter as long as the U.N. has the power to put an assessment on the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, I can tell you that the power of the United Nations has shifted from the Security Council to the General Assembly. That is what people are afraid of. Fifty-five nations with less total population than the county of Los Angeles and the county of Orange in southern California put together, have 55 votes, and we have no vote from California. That is why they are concerned. They can bypass the Security Council. The American veto is no good any more. The Russian veto is no good any more.

Mr. Chairman, the Congo operation was carried on in violation of article 43 of the United Nations Charter. They bypassed the Security Council where it could have been vetoed by any one of the five nations.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I hope to take a special order and go into the management of the United Nations as to the Secretariat and the Assistant Secretariat, and other Communists that are running that apparatus in the State of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the motion to shut off debate because I think that as long as the issue has been raised it is important to have it out and debate it. I think we should have more time. I know there are many from my side of the aisle who would like to take strong opposition to the amendment offered by our colleague from Indiana [Mr. Bruce]. It is a very dangerous amendment.

Others may disagree, but in my opinion if you want to see the Congo awash in blood the way to do it is to lock out the United Nations. What we are doing in our support of the U.N. in its efforts in the Congo is maintaining the right of the policeman to be on the beat. That is all it is. Naturally, there are people who do not like the policeman who has got a stick in his hands and carries a gun; but the fact of the matter is that were it not for the United Nations the Congo would be a bloody pulp at the present time; and on top of that, the Soviet Union would be firmly entrenched. It was because of U.N. efforts that the Soviet Union was forced to withdraw with its tail between its legs. Those pictures, Mr. Chairman, are not the issue. The issue is the attack upon the integrity of the United Nations. We do not kid ourselves that the original high hopes that people had for the U.N. have been met. But times change and circumstances change. When the U.N. was founded it was thought of as an institution which would bring the great powers together. It has served a different role. It has become the one institution which has been able to keep the great powers apart—to keep them from each other's throats.

While attacking the Congo, the same voices attack the role of the United Nations in the Middle East. Were it not for that blue flag flying over no man's land between the Arab and Israeli land in the Middle East, I can assure you that that part of the world would be in explosion by now, triggering off a major war throughout the entire world.

So think carefully before hasty judgments are made on this amendment. In view of the fact that debate has been shut off, which I think is regrettable, all the more reason to vote down this amendment. If we want to have a free-for-all on the floor of the House of Representatives on the role of the United Nations, let us have it; but let us have it under proper circumstances in which the matter can be aired and all sides will have sufficient time to state their point of view.

I for one believe that a very solid case can be made to the effect that the United Nations today is serving a more important role than even its founders envisioned for it when it was first brought to birth in 1947.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to burden the Record at this point with a long and detailed refutation of the tirade against the United Nations operation in the Congo by the previous speaker. But I do urge those who read these remarks to keep in mind that few authorities, in or out of Government, in either political party concur with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bruce] as to what has happened in the Congo in the last year.

The fact is that there is in the Congo today a stability and peace that was not known before the U.N. operation. I wish also to call attention to the fact that this peace and stability were gained without the loss of one American serviceman, although it was not without its cost in suffering and lives. If there had been no United Nations, I submit that the Congo today would be a Communist stronghold on the continent of Africa, or it would be a battleground for American and Communist fighting men.

Perhaps smaller in terms of dollars, but equally vital to the maintenance of a peaceful world, is the U.N. operation in the Middle East. Three years ago, I was privileged to tour this area, and to see firsthand the extremely precarious state of peace in this historic area of the world.

Today, as it has been since 1949, the U.N. special force is the only barrier between these suffering people and a clash of arms. The threat of war, never more than a gunshot away, still hovers over the Middle East. The U.N. troops there stand ready to discourage and resist armed aggression—but they cannot do so without our financial support. To turn our backs on this effort would be to turn our backs on the millions of innocent citizens of those troubled nations. Without our help and without the U.N. force, there can be no solution in the Middle East, save war, chaos, and Communist takeover—or a massive U.S. military commitment to prevent it.

Surely, this is a solution none of us can afford.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bruce amendment striking out the $25,616,000 this bill appropriates for an additional assessment by the United States to the United Nations in respect to financing the costs of the United Nations operations in the Congo.

As a member of the Special Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies, I sat in on the hearings and listened to the testimony of the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, regarding this item. He explained quite clearly why this money should remain in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the integrity of Congolese independence and American support of this independence is making it possible for a moderate government to develop and govern the whole of the Congo and to maintain law and order in the former Belgian colony. In order for a moderate, non-Communist government to develop in the Congo as a whole, that government has to be able to unify the Congo. This means bringing Katanga Province in as a part of the Congo. The only really modern issue in the Congo is unification. If the moderates in Léopoldville cannot unify the Congo then the radicals and the Communists will brush the moderates aside and take over the country. The Congolese have to solve this problem. But, it is in our interest to help them solve it. This is what we have been doing and this is why this appropriation is needed. No one likes a cop standing over them with a big billy club, some of the opponents to United Nations intervention in the Congo will tell you. The United Nations troops are merely trying to help the Congolese maintain law and order. If the U.N. troops were not in the Congo, believe me, Communists troops would be policing the area and they would not be quite as gentle on the Congolese natives. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, we should comment briefly on methods and procedures of drawings from the International Monetary Fund under this international monetary agreement. In the event that any one of the 10 eligible and participating countries may wish to draw from the resources of the Fund and have access to the funds provided by these new lending arrangements, the drawing or participant country would consult the Managing Director of the Fund and all of the 9 major participants. The Fund's policies and procedures, of course, continue to apply. Where the Fund's resources require supplementing by borrowing in order to meet a situation as determined by the Managing Director, he would, in consultation with the participants, propose the total amount to be borrowed and the amounts of each currency. The participants would then discuss among their membership the proposal of the Managing Director. While unanimity is always desirable on such proposals, in the event that this is not possible a voting procedure would decide the question of lending to the Fund. The country proposing to draw on the Fund would not be eligible to vote and a decision would be reached by two-thirds majority of the other voting participants and a three-fifths majority of their votes weighted according to lending commitments of each participant. However, a participant nation which itself has a balance-of-payments problem and is losing reserves would not be expected to lend to the Fund. In this manner the right of each participant to safeguard its own position is recognized. On the other hand, appropriate weight is given to collective judgment on the needs of the international monetry system.

Here again we should emphasize that the arrangements outlined are limited to the 10 member governments representing the major industrial nations of the free world and does not extend to the entire membership of the International Monetary Fund.

Any loans made to the Fund will carry a 5-year maturity, bearing interest at 1½ percent annually plus an initial transfer charge of one-half of 1 percent. Use of the Fund's resources by a participant government would be subject to the usual terms—3 to 5 years repayment, a service charge of one-half of 1 percent, and annual charges varying with the size of the drawing and its duration. A drawing participant is expected to make earlier repayment if its balance-of-payments position has improved, and if such repayment occurred, the Fund would also make advance repayment to lender nations. A participant which made loans to the Fund but later encountered a balance-of-payments need can be assured that it will be able to obtain prompt repayment from the Fund.

The new arrangements which will be effective for a period of 4 years—unless extended by the governments involved—become operative upon completion of the legislative and other requirements enabling formal adherence of at least seven participants with commitments totaling $5.5 billion. Essentially the U.S. Congress and the parliaments of the nine other major industrial nations are involved in acceding to these international arrangements. H.R. 10162 proposes the authorization on behalf of the United States.

The international arrangements cannot become operative without the adherence of each participant with a commitment greater than $500 million; thus favorable action on the part of the U.S. Congress through H.R. 10162 and our executive branch, as well as that of the governments of France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom, are required to enable this advantageous step to be taken in the interest of the stability of international currencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 14, line 16, change the period to a comma and add the following: "but expenditures from this appropriation by the Department of State shall be limited to a sum not in excess of 32.02 per centum of the aggregate payments to the United Nations pursuant to the resolution (agenda item 55) adopted by the General Assembly thereof."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order against this amendment is not good, because this is strictly a limitation. It does not go to the scope of this bill. It does not disturb any agreement or any treaty. This is in conformance with the intent and the purpose of this appropriation. I challenge the gentleman to show wherein this amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, does not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] call upon the executive department for extra duties; and does it not refer to outside matters?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. I thought the Chair would help the gentleman to make his case.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Harris). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] offers an amendment to this paragraph, to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] has made the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair has carefully read the bill and observes that the very purpose of the amendment is a limitation. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I must be very brief about this since time has been limited. This $25,616,000 is a 32.02 percent contribution, assessment, call it whatever you want, I cannot get a definition of exactly what it is from the members of the committee themselves. This $25,616,000 is 32.02 percent of the $80 million that is supposed to be put together by all the member nations of the United Nations for the support of the so-called police force in the Congo.

What is more reasonable than to say—use any country you want to—if Finland, for instance, puts in $100,000, we will put up our 32.02 percent out of the $25,616,000; or if some other country puts up $1 million, we will put up our 32.02 percent.

This is in conformance with the agreement adopted as Agenda Item 55 of the session of the United Nations shortly before Christmas last year. This is strictly in conformance with the resolution that was adopted at that time. Is there anything more fair than to say, "When you put up your money we will put up the 32.02 percent out of this $25,616,000"?

I am surprised that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] would limit debate, as he has, on this bill at this time, in view of the fact that the House was through with business yesterday afternoon when this bill was previously scheduled to come up at about 2:30 or 3 o'clock. Why the rush today? I do not know whether you have bought yourselves some free time or not. You might be voting on this bill tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the pending amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] be voted down. It would hamstring the orderly procedures of the United Nations. The United Nations needs this money immediately to pay the expenses of these troops from 21 countries. They have to be paid. The bill is currently due. This total, as I have previously said, covers the period from November 1, 1961, last fall, to June 30. To do anything other than pay it would seriously interfere with our membership in the United Nations, the United Nations itself and its orderly procedures.

I ask that the pending amendment be voted down.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished friend from New York for his contribution and also thank my distinguished friend from Iowa. They are two very intelligent and very sincere men. I also want to commend our distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay], for the forthright statement he made.

I have no quibble with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bruce], and certainly none with my friend, the very able and distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Utt]. In fact, he sends out more mail through my district through the frank than I do; but I still have a great admiration for him. He is a most valuable Member. But I hope sometimes he will plow around my district and just apply his talents to the other districts. But let us be serious about this. This is a most serious subject. My friend, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, under normal circumstances would not be too far wrong. But, my colleagues, I ask you to realize, as we all know, that this thing is teetering in the United Nations, and Khrushchev is doing his best to kill this. We know we have a very controversial item pending for some more funds, but let us not rock the boat at this time. Let me quote my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay], again, "Let us not rock this boat." We could be doing some very bad things here, if we do that.

So far as I am concerned, I will trust the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] and my beloved and levelheaded friend on the other side, the gentleman from Ohio, Frank Bow—they represent this body on most of these matters.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do you mean what you say about this 32.2 percent as our contribution? That is the question involved here.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish my colleague would not put words in my mouth. I wish my colleague would permit me to speak for myself.

Mr. GROSS. Is this 32.02 percent just window dressing?

Mr. THOMAS. This is not window dressing. We know what the percentage of contribution is. We also know that some payments are in arrears and we know there are 17,000 troops over there now and we do not have a single one. These troops are all from smaller nations. Let us not rock this boat.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross), there were—ayes 75, noes 127.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Harris, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Gross moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 14, line 16, change the period to a comma and add the following: "The expenditures from this appropriation by the Department of State shall be limited to a sum not in excess of 32.02 per centum of the aggregate payments to the United Nations pursuant to the resolution (agenda item 55) adopted by the General Assembly thereof."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 153, nays 235, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—153

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Alexander
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Baker
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blitch
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Bromwell
Brown
Broyhill
Bruce
Burleson
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dominick
Dorn
Downing
Durno
Fenton
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Forrester
Fountain
Garland
Gathings
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Horan
Ichord, Mo.
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Kitchin
Knox
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McMillan
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Murray
Norblad
O'Konski
Passman
Pelly
Pilcher

Pillion
Poage
Poff
Ray
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rousselot
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer
Schneebeli
Short
Shriver
Sikes
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Winstead
Younger

NAYS—235

Addabbo
Albert
Anfuso
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Bailey
Baldwin
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Chelf
Chiperfield
Church
Clark
Coad
Cohelan
Conte
Cook
Corman
Curtis, Mass.
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dooley
Doyle
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Gary
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Hull
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Kowalski
Kunkel
Lane
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Loser
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Mack
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Mathias
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Milliken
Mills
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Perkins
Peterson
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Shipley
Sibal
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Wallhauser
Walter
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Wickersham
Widnall
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—48

Addonizio
Alford
Andrews
Avery
Barrett
Barry
Boykin
Byrnes, Wis.
Celler
Cooley
Corbett
Davis, Tenn.
Dowdy
Evins
Fascell
Finnegan
Ford
Garmatz
Gavin
Grant
Halleck
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Johnson, Md.
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kilburn
Kirwan
McIntire
Madden
Merrow
Morrison
Moulder
Patman
Rains
Reece
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Colo.
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Thompson, La.
Vinson
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Kirwan against.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Mrs. Reece for, with Mr. Barry against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Alford with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. WILSON of California, and Mr. SCHERER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GUBSER and Mr. BELL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on official business when the quorum call was made today and missed it by approximately 5 minutes. I wish the RECORD to show this fact.

THE PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, when the House took action to amend the Peace Corps Act, I was unable to be present because of my attendance at a White House luncheon in honor of the President of Brazil. Had I been present, I would have joined the overwhelming majority of my House colleagues in support of H.R. 10700.

Last year, when like legislation was before the Congress, I had my reservations concerning it. However, after several conferences with Director Robert Sargent Shriver, who had administered the program up to that time, I was convinced of his sincerity of purpose and his personal capabilities in directing the program. Accordingly, I gave it my support with the understanding that I would reserve final judgment until the end of the first year of its operation.

I have been most pleased with the project to date and with the fine leadership given to it by its director and its staff and the outstanding services that the Corpsmen themselves have given in other countries. I have no doubt but what this contribution to world relations will be one of the most constructive that this country will have. I am, of course, hopeful that it will not be overplayed or undersold, but that it will gain strength as the months come and go in the modesty of its approach and in immeasurable results that can and will be obtained.

PROHIBITING U.S. FOREIGN AID TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, we all know of the old expression about "robbing Peter to pay Paul." In Latin America, it seems we may have to revise that old saw to: "Let's rob Peter to pay Peter."

In recent weeks we have heard much of the expropriation of American property in Brazil. Yet, we continue to talk about huge foreign aid moneys being funneled into that country. But for what purpose? To be used to seize American-owned properties? Or to be used for the betterment of the Brazilian people?

A Brazilian newspaper supplied one answer:

> How can those in charge of the Alliance for Progress program justify to the American taxpayer the granting of long-term financing which in the final analysis will be used to pay for the expropriation of American investments in Brazil?

Brazilian officials are asking for plenty of U.S. dollars. These include Gov. Leonel Brizola of the Brazilian State of Rio Grande do Sul, who on February 15 expropriated the Companhia Telefonica Nacional, a subsidiary of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., whose headquarters are in New York City.

The settlement was $400,000 in cruzeiros. This is absurd. Local appraisers

2 years ago valued the property at approximately $7 million.

This, of course, is not the only example. And predictably, other American companies are fearing similar seizures, precisely at a time when we are trying to stimulate foreign investment.

An important point to remember here is that seizure begets seizure. And can we honestly approve, by idly sitting by, the confiscation of American property? Of course not. Even worse, we are preparing to pat the seizers on the back and say, "Good job, fellow. Good job."

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, to firm up our backbone and our policy. The seizures in Brazil are currently capturing the limelight, but that is by no means the end of it all. If we sit idly by and watch confiscation of American property in Latin America—without ample and fair compensation—it will most certainly encourage similar seizures around the globe.

I am today introducing a bill—by no means the first—to put the issue squarely on the barrelhead. The bill would amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit assistance under that act to the government of any country which has not established equitable procedures for compensating U.S. citizens for loss of property by confiscation.

Now, when President Joao Goulart of Brazil is in Washington for a visit with President Kennedy, is the time for the United States to take a stand and serve notice that we are not the suckers so many of the world's people are beginning to think we are.

I wish to read a telegram to Secretary of State Rusk by the president of International Telephone & Telegraph Co.:

> We are greatly disturbed by press reports that the U.S. Government is prepared to give its blessings to a plan devised by the Brazilian Government calling for the takeover and payment of utility properties over 15 years without any indication that the bonds or any other instrument will have any U.S. Government or equivalent financially acceptable guarantee of payment or protection against devaluation or inadequate interest rates at local levels. Without such guarantees or protection such instruments would be worth less than 50 cents on the dollar. We feel compelled to warn you of the incentive there would be to further expropriation or takeover throughout Latin America if such an inadequate payment plan should receive the blessing of the U.S. Government.
>
> The effect would be so potentially disastrous to all other U.S.-owned property in Latin America that we can scarcely believe that the plan is being seriously contemplated. But as you know reports of the plan have been carried in the responsible press of the United States without refutation.
>
> We are of the opinion that any plan if it is to have U.S. Government approval should contain the following essentials:
>
> 1. Seller must be permitted freedom to negotiate terms of sale including the same freedom to choose to reinvest or export the proceeds as is accorded local citizens.
> 2. Proceeds of sale should be in cash or if not—any bonds or instruments issued in connection with deferred payments must be readily marketable at par.
> 3. There must be maintenance of value on deferred local currency payments with interest at the going local rate and guarantees by the Government.
>
> The acid test is that if the bonds or other instruments cannot be converted to cash at full value the company has not been paid. For these reasons we think it is dangerous to talk of a general plan for all of Latin America or for even one country, as problems vary not only between countries but within any one country depending upon the franchise, type of utility, historical background, etc. Any talk of general plans for takeovers or expropriations will lead to unwarranted assumptions in other countries which will be costly to U.S. investors not only in utilities but in other fields as well, particularly mining and petroleum.
>
> We are sure you realize that present nationalist tendencies in several Latin American countries are such that little encouragement is required for confiscation or other takeover of foreign investments in cases where no problems have previously existed. Any approval by the U.S. Government of a general plan which provides for takeover of foreign property with little or no immediate payment could well precipitate by example irresistible nationalist demands for similar action throughout South America.

RETIREMENT OF W. T. "BILL" HEFFELFINGER

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has lost one of its outstanding civil servants with the retirement of W. T. "Bill" Heffelfinger as Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. Bill Heffelfinger began his work at Treasury as a messenger in 1917 at the age of 14 and has now ended a genuinely great career with the Department after almost 45 years of continuous service. His experience, conscientiousness, grasp of financial matters and his integrity made him a valuable assistant for Secretaries of the Treasury of both political parties. And in his service for administration after administration he typified that which is best in our civil service system.

Secretary Dillon, in reluctantly accepting Bill Heffelfinger's decision to retire, told him:

> Your contributions to the work of the Treasury, in the fiscal and many other areas, have been outstanding and in many ways unique during this period.

Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs Robert V. Roosa said:

> Mr. Heffelfinger combines a knowledge of the entire range of government accounting systems with a deep understanding of the objectives of the fiscal process. Because of this particular ability, his counsel has prompted many of the innovations in Treasury policies and procedures over the past quarter century.

Bill Heffelfinger's fine work was well known to the Nation's banking community and in recent months he concentrated much of his attention on efforts designed to alleviate the Nation's critical international balance of payments problem.

He was a native of the District of Columbia who was educated at Southeastern University. He was promoted to the position of Assistant to the Under Secretary of Treasury in 1940 and was named Fiscal Assistant Secretary in 1955.

In 1956 Bill Heffelfinger received the Career Service Award from the National Civil Service League, an honor bestowed on those who operate in the best traditions of the Federal service. It was an award well placed on a man who carries with him into retirement the respect and admiration of not only his fellow workers but also of the citizens he served.

As chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee it has been my privilege to observe the work of this dedicated Federal official over a period of years. I take this opportunity to give him the accolade which he has so richly merited and to express to him the gratitude and best wishes of myself and a grateful people for a job well done by a good and faithful servant.

STAFF MEMBERS OF HOUSE COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

THE DEMOCRATIC CHARGE THAT THE COAL INDUSTRY HAS NO FUTURE IN THE ECONOMY OF PENNSYLVANIA IS RIDICULOUS SINCE CURBING THE UNRESTRICTED FLOOD OF FOREIGN RESIDUAL OIL BY EXECUTIVE ORDER CAN RESTORE COAL TO ITS RIGHTFUL PLACE IN THE ECONOMY OF THE KEYSTONE STATE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 23, the executive director and secretary-treasurer of the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers Association revealed that the State of Pennsylvania has, for the first time in the annals of the Nation's coal industry, fallen into third place among the bituminous coal producing States. Robert T. Laing told a joint State government commission meeting at Huntingdon that bituminous coal output for Pennsylvania in 1961 fell to approximately 62 million tons and thus relinquished second place to Kentucky. It is a sad commentary on how the industry upon which Pennsylvania's industrial might was built has suffered under unrealistic policies on the part of the Federal Government. In retrospect, we realize that it was Pennsylvania's coal which fueled the fires for the entire Nation's industrial progress during the last century and well into the 1900's. Coal still accounts for almost a quarter of the total energy provided by fuels and waterpower, but the figure would be substantially higher if inequities that abound on the competitive fuels market were eliminated.

Coal began to replace wood as a source of heat more than 200 years ago. In 1763, during the seige of Fort Pitt by the Indians, Captain Ecuyer, the commandant, wrote that during a lull in the enemy's offensive, he led a party of 60 soldiers across the Monongahela River to get in a supply of coal. Gradually coal was used more and more in the smithing trade. During the revolution anthracite was shipped to Carlyle for use by armorers.

Anthracite was introduced into blast furnaces for making iron about 1830 and soon began to replace charcoal in the pig iron industry. Meanwhile, bituminous coal's versatility was becoming recognized on the other side of the Alleghenys. During the early 1800's bituminous coal was used for domestic heating, brickmaking, and blacksmithing. In 1808 a gristmill in Pittsburgh installed a steam engine, and 3 years later the first steamboat was built to operate on the Monongahela River. Ironworks arose at various junctures in the coalfields of western Pennsylvania. Glass plants and a variety of factories began to make their appearance. The Pittsburgh Gazette of November 7, 1833, listed 87 kinds of industries—including flour mills, gun factories, papermills, and rolling mills. Most of them used steam engines. Pennsylvania was moving faster than any other State on the way to industrial progress, and coal was the propelling force.

Bituminous coal production in Pennsylvania went over the million ton mark in 1845, and by 1880 had moved beyond 20 million tons annually. Meanwhile, the anthracite industry was developing even more rapidly, reaching an output of a million tons in 1837 and exceeding 20 million tons in 1872.

Mr. Speaker, these statistics may appear irrelevant to some of my colleagues, but they reflect very clearly the part that coal has played in the development of our State and our country.

Shortly after the turn of the century the bituminous coal mines of Pennsylvania began to produce upwards of 100 million tons per year, while anthracite's annual contribution averaged in excess of 60 million tons each year for the first half of this century. Trouble for these two great fuels industries began shortly after the conclusion of World War II. By now a new philosophy had been adopted by the Federal Government. Despite the great contributions of the men and boys from our mining communities to the cause of victory in Europe and Asia, their interests were subordinated to the desires of foreign flags by the time the shooting had stopped. In 1949 both the anthracite and bituminous coal industries in Pennsylvania were confronted with an economic menace which threatened to—and did—drive thousands of the working force of our State into the ranks of the unemployed.

Foreign residual oil had begun to take its deadly toll. Members of Congress who were serving in 1950 will recall hearings on both sides of the Capitol to determine just what impact alien oil would have on the domestic economy. I testified. So did many representatives of coal and railroad management and labor, as well as independent oil people. Here is a quotation from the testimony of Harry See, who represented the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen:

> In the last 3 years, from February 1947 to February 1950, the number of men employed by the railroads of America has declined from 1,368,285 to 1,170,192, a decrease of 198,093. While we do not ascribe all of this enormous increase in railroad unemployment to any single cause, we cannot escape the obvious significance of an increase in oil imports of almost 400,000 barrels a day in the same 1947–50 period.

Frank Earnest, Jr., who was then president of the Anthracite Institute, made this observation:

> It is axiomatic that in a given area a certain amount of energy is required to meet the needs for heat, light, and power. In this particular area (eastern seaboard) energy is supplied chiefly from bituminous coal, anthracite, oil, gas, and water power. If part of this area's energy requirements is to be supplied by oil from foreign sources, it follows that American labor formerly necessary to produce the energy must inevitably be reduced.

Here is a significant figure, Mr. Speaker. It was offered by Mr. Joseph T. Berta, who was president of the Pennsylvania Coal and Coke Corp. and is now president of the Pittston-Clinchfield Coal Sales Corp.:

> My company, in January 1, 1947, employed 1613 men * * * January 1, 1949, 1605 * * *. As of May 10, this year, we have a total of 878 men. The other men are off the payroll.

I cite the residual oil record as a glaring instance of Federal policy that prevents the coal industry from obtaining a more equitable share of the national fuels market. Residual oil imports have increased fivefold since the first postwar year. The bituminous and anthracite coal industries have in consequence experienced tremendous losses. Output has dropped drastically. From 57 million tons in 1947, anthracite production slipped to less than 18 million tons in 1961. At the same time bituminous coal production was declining from 147 million tons to 62 million tons; thus the alarming situation which finds our State's industry in third place among the Nation's producers. I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that Kentucky has also had a fine record in its mining industry, yet the fact remains that the coal is available in Pennsylvania for use in the heavily populated and highly industrialized east coast markets. Our State has in the past two centuries produced more than 8¼ billion tons of bituminous coal and about 6 billion tons of anthracite, yet Pennsylvania has another 35 billion tons of mineable anthracite and bituminous coal reserves.

With this rich heritage, Pennsylvania stands ready to provide low cost heat and power for the industrial growth that must come with increasing population and higher standards of living. To permit a foreign fuel to deprive Pennsylvania's citizens of the opportunity to earn a livelihood while preparing for this economic upsurge of the future impinges upon the constitutional rights of those citizens. Last Thursday, March 22, Thomas Kennedy, president of the United Mine Workers of America, testified before the House Ways and Means Committee. After describing the cruel effects of excessive foreign residual oil shipments into this country, he said:

> I wonder—indeed, every member of the United Mine Workers of America wonders—if the benefits that accrue from residual imports are worth such social and economic decay.
>
> We cannot as a nation stand this burden indefinitely. The consequences are too far reaching, the results too serious to contemplate. America must decide whether or not to plunge an entire section of the country into social and economic oblivion unheard of in our times.
>
> It is a fateful decision to make, a decision which can decide the future of this Republic.
>
> Yet, today coal miners suffer, coal communities languish, and the entire coal industry pauses as those charged with the responsibility of protecting and promoting the welfare of this Nation deliberate and consider their fate, whether that fate be to live and work as American citizens, or to descend the long road to economic destitution.
>
> As we continually increase our imports of residual oil, we still talk of economic growth. Even as a foreign energy source strangles the domestic coal industry, and even our own oil industry, plans are being laid for the millenium that is to come.
>
> But we must ask: Where will the impetus originate? Certainly not from the coal-producing regions of the country. Obviously not from the coal miner who must face the future with a great deal of apprehension. Nor can we look to the coal operators to invest further billions of dollars to make coal as efficient and as modern as it must be to serve the growing energy needs that any economic growth presupposes.
>
> Instead, while we talk of growth we must look to the underlying sickness that pervades the energy industries of our Nation. We must take cognizance of the virtual destruction that faces coal and oil and associated industries.
>
> For we cannot talk of economic growth while allowing entire basic industries to perish before unfair competition. We cannot speak of prosperity while at the same time fostering economic privation. It just cannot be done.
>
> It behooves those who are charged with the economic future of this Nation to become aware of what has been happening to the basic coal industry of this Nation. As we talk of economic progress and as they plan for such progress, they must be prepared to protect that basic industry which is the source of all progress. Any other course would be sheer economic folly.

Mr. Speaker, the recent increase in residual oil quotas granted to importers by the White House is inimical to the welfare of the residents of Pennsylvania and other coal-producing States. It needs to be rescinded, for there was no basis whatsoever in granting this favor, which amounts to an additional $35 million per year sales order, for the international oil crowd. There was no shortage of fuel. The importing companies have, in fact, been conducting a market campaign to widen their consumer area while contending that the volume of imports has been insufficient to meet demands of regular customers. Despite the fact that some imported oil is now being shipped inland as far west as the Harrisburg area, there has been ample supply on the seaboard itself. Let me insert the following comment from the March 15, 1962, issue of Platt's Oilgram:

> Atlantic coast: Net reseller prices for heavy fuels are off in varying amounts at some eastern locations today reflecting discounts in effect and spot availability—see other story this issue.—[Not printed in the RECORD.]

> Some heavy-fuel suppliers indicate they are meeting latest drop in prices (see March 14 Oilgram). Action is described as appraisal of product's easing trend, especially at reseller truck and barge levels. These adjustments, they conjecture, brought on relative changes at the cargo level.
>
> At New York, many sources agree that spot lots of heavy fuel are more readily available now than they've ever been since the start of mandatory import restrictions. The day of premium offers for spot delivered cargoes is in the past. In fact, with the end of the current allocation period approaching, some suppliers still haven't used up their "tickets." Furthermore, there are indications that some "tickets" may be unused at the end of the allocation period.
>
> Gasoline markets edged lower in portions of New England, Pennsylvania, and New York today—see other story this issue. [Not printed in the RECORD.] Distillate markets show little change. Resellers continue to satisfy only immediate needs. As a result, spot interest is dull.

No, Mr. Speaker, the recent increase in residual oil import quotas was as unnecessary as it was unfair. I recognize that the administration, at least as represented by its U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, has written off a large segment of coal industry operations from all future activity. He made this statement on February 9:

> Historically, this is an area built on coal and farming. It has a wonderful tradition and a proud history, and no one would be happier than I if the future of coal and farming in central Pennsylvania is as bright today as it was 100 years ago; but I suggest we must look stark facts in the face. That day is dead. It is gone. It's never going to come back and there's nothing we can do to resuscitate this. We can do something to shield the shorn lamb from the harsh cold wind. We can mitigate the plight of the family farmer. We can bolster, to some extent, the soft coal industry; but we are never going to be able to bring those occupations back to the proud state they occupied when this part of Pennsylvania was being built and became great. Rather we must look to new economic sources of wealth, create them if you will, to make this area a future worthy of its marvelous past.

If foreign oil is permitted to come in and wipe out the jobs of coal miners, railroaders, and the many other skilled and unskilled workers whose income is dependent upon the coal industry, then there is no question but that revival of mining in areas that are victimized by these imports may seem an insurmountable task. But I refuse to stand by and see the economy of our State surrendered. I would remind my friends who feel otherwise about the coal industry to study the statement made last week by The Honorable Thomas Kennedy, former Lieutenant Governor of the State of Pennsylvania. He said that residual oil imports are taking 3 million man-days of work from our coal miners each year and that the loss in wages amounts to $73 million. If Pennsylvania were able to regain its share of this volume of business, it would enjoy an automatic economic upturn throughout coal communities, railroad centers, and in every business house where the employees of these and skilled industries do their trading.

I commend the president of the United Mine Workers for his forthright message. I assure him that I for one will continue to do everything possible to give the coal industry of Pennsylvania its rightful opportunity to resume the economic role which it filled so effectively in days gone by.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

DEACTIVATION OF CERTAIN NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE DIVISIONS

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense after consulting the President is pronouncing tonight at 6 o'clock the deactivation of four National Guard divisions and four Reserve divisions. This is a recommendation of the Department of Defense which will have to be considered by the House Armed Services Committee and also by the House Committee on Appropriations. The House will act on the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense on the Monday before Easter. It is my hope that the Congress will take action to see that the plans of the Department of Defense are not put into operation.

The Reserve divisions which have been affected and would be affected unless the Congress acts are the 103d Army Reserve Division, the 79th Army Reserve Division, the 49th Army Reserve Division, and the 96th Army Reserve Division.

The four National Guard divisions involved in the recommendations of the Department of Defense to be abolished are the 34th National Guard Division of Iowa and Nebraska, the 35th National Guard Division of Kansas and Missouri, the 51st National Guard Division of Florida and South Carolina, and the 43d National Guard Division of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

It is my hope that the Congress will take action to see that this program to abolish these divisions is halted and that both committees, the House Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, will take action to see that these plans as announced by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, are not carried forward.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on Armed Services, chairmaned by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]—I happen to be the ranking minority member of that committee—is planning to launch an investigation of the military Reserves on April 10. They have tried to do this on several occasions and the Congress has stopped them. If I know the membership of the Committee of the House Armed Services as a whole, we will reject this order also.

Mr. LAIRD. It is very difficult to explain to the members of the 32d National Guard Division and the 49th National Guard Division who have been called on active service who see these armed Reserves and National Guard divisions being ordered up and others abolished by the Department of Defense at this particular time. It is my hope your committee will go into this thoroughly, and I am sure the Defense Appropriations Committee will do the same, so that this will not be carried forward.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

I wonder how those who have been called up for active duty and taken from their families feel about the 51st Division in Florida, for instance, and these other reservists and other divisions now being proposed to be dismantled?

Are we to assume that the Berlin crisis is over with? Is this an indication that the great national emergency for which these thousands or hundreds of thousands of boys were called up no longer exists? What is the on-again-off-again advantage? This 51st Division in Florida has been on again, off again, in the last 5 or 6 years. It is one of the finest divisions in the United States. It gets the highest rating in training and in maneuvers of any division in the United States. The 51st Division has been on again, off again. How are we going to have any effective National Guard? How are we going to have a unified national defense policy? How are we going to convince the American people that there is a national emergency if we are taking people away from the guard and Reserve units? How would the gentleman interpret this action?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In connection with the calling up of the Reserves and all the confusion that has developed since, according to Mr. Gilpatrick, a mistake was made when they called them up. This has resulted in confusion. Of course I cannot speak for the subcommittee as a whole, I can speak for myself. But may I say we intend to ask some very penetrating questions; first, why the call up of the Reserves; and, second, why are we abolishing these Army Reserve divisions and National Guard divisions? I think we are going to encounter the same thinking we encountered here in connection with the authorization of ships, planes, and missiles a few weeks ago. Now the Department of Defense thinks that missiles should now take over. We in the Armed Services Committee do not believe that missiles can take over, that we must have conventional strength, which means manpower.

Mr. CRAMER. According to statements made a while back, we were beefing up our conventional forces so that we could fight brush fires. The National Guard is as well trained and is as well equipped for doing this job as any outfit in the country.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Certainly in February and March of last year, the Secretary of Defense and others told the American people through statements made to the House Armed Services Committee that they had the greatest and most powerful war machine that dollars and cents could assemble to give security to the American people. Then, in a matter of weeks, they were asking for $3.4 billion to beef up the military establishments.

Mr. CRAMER. I wonder if this is not also perhaps the beginning of an effort to nationalize the entire Defense Establishment of this country, to take from the States, which I think is a serious matter, the only arm they have to handle emergencies within the States, and the need for trained personnel. I thoroughly favor the National Guards in the States.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. There has been an effort to do away with the Reserves, and this could be the first step.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I only want to say that I am sure that the Iowa delegation in Congress is very much interested in the outcome of the investigation being carried on by the Committee on Armed Services and will be interested tomorrow in voicing our protest and displeasure at the action which I understand has been taken by the President.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BROMWELL. I should like to add to the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa and call to the attention of the House the fact that two of the eight divisions mentioned by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], when he made this announcement, happen to be from the State of Iowa, the 34th National Guard and the 103d Reserve Division. This bears some scrutiny.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 570

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I want to associate myself with the remarks made about this sudden and apparently unwise decision by the administration and assure the House that at a future date I will have some further things to say about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on something else that is also of great importance to this House and which has to do with increasing the effectiveness of this legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1962, I took the floor of the House to explain the provisions of House Resolution 570 which I have introduced to increase the minority representation on the professional staffs of the committees of the House and subcommittees thereof. Since then, I have received expressions of encouragement and support from many of my colleagues and from the press. For example, in the Washington Post dated April 2, 1962, there appeared another of a series of thoughtful and perceptive articles supporting my position by the distinguished commentator, Mr. Roscoe Drummond. For the benefit of my colleagues, I will insert this column at this point in the Congressional Record:

A Needed Reform—Minority's House Resolution 570

(By Roscoe Drummond)

At last things are beginning to move a bit to reform the crippling anemic minority-party representation on the powerful staffs of the congressional committees.

A bill is now before the House of Representatives—House Resolution 570—designed to force reform if the Democrats will not cooperate voluntarily. It springs from the initiative of Representative Fred Schwengel, Republican, of Iowa, who has been in Congress long enough to know when something is wrong and not so long as to think nothing can be done.

Schwengel makes a simple, reasonable, and workable proposal. He proposes that whenever the minority party members of a regular congressional committee are dissatisfied with the size of the professional staff available to them, they may, by majority vote, require and must be given 40 percent of the professional and clerical positions on the committee staff.

This is a good beginning. One special merit of House Resolution 570 is that it permits discriminating reform. Thus those few committees such as the House and Senate Foreign Relations Committees, which have a truly bipartisan or nonpartisan staff and where the minority is well satisfied with the arrangement, would not be affected.

It is encouraging to note that when Schwengel took the floor of the House last week to advocate his bill, several Republicans who had not heretofore shown an active concern with this problem rose to be heard. They were not speaking just to persuade the Democrats that something needs to be done—or else; they were serving notice on their own leadership that if it doesn't take hold of this reform soon and put its energies behind it, there is going to be a party revolt.

"An intolerable situation," is the way Schwengel describes the disproportionate staff available to the Democrats compared with that available to the Republicans on most committees.

It is revealing that when Representative Schwengel began the debate on committee staffing last week, not a single Democrat rose to question or challenge his arguments.

Most of the letters I have received from Democratic chairmen of congressional committees, or their aids, show a similar disinterest in the merits of the issue. When the information provided me by Members of Congress cites only one minority employee on the professional staff, I am told with great satisfaction that the figure should have been two.

Surely the issue isn't whether the professional staff of a particular congressional committee stands 12 to 1 or 11 to 2 against the minority party.

The fact is that the imbalance is extreme. It is unjust and inequitable. It is harmful to the functioning of the two-party system. Unless the Democrats expect to control Congress forever, I should think they would be wise to accept staffing reform.

In my address last week, I limited my discussion to that portion of the resolution which deals with standing committees and the basic unfair division of the professional staffs which are so loaded against the minority party as to constitute a national scandal of the first magnitude. At the conclusion of my remarks, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kearns], the ranking Republican member of the House Labor Committee and an early battler for reforms, inserted into the Congressional Record a tabulation which showed that during the first session of the present Congress the various committees of the House had a total of 538 employees selected and appointed by the Democrats as against a total of 20 such employees selected and appointed by the Republicans.

My criticism is directed not at the competency of the professional staffs on these committees but at the present practice of long standing whereby the majority party has had almost full authority to select employees of their own choosing, with a little effort at fairness by giving the minority a few staffers of their own. There was a time, perhaps, when this practice was a good one because control of the Congress fluctuated between the parties and, therefore, the employees were not likely to be all of one political preference. However, due to the long control of both Houses by the Democratic Party, I believe there is a political impairment which works to the advantage of the majority and the decided disadvantage of the minority. It is unrealistic and naive to believe that an employee hired by one party will not be loyal to that party which pays him his salary. The old adage "whose bread I eat, his song I sing," is as applicable today as it was in the ancient days of Greece and Rome.

The fact remains that committee staff employees are paid out of public funds appropriated by the Congress to enable each party through the committee system to perform its constitutional function in a representative form of government. This function necessarily means that each party often does represent a different point of view and is entitled to an adequate staff to develop different legislative programs and alternatives. It should be noted that these funds are not appropriated from the private purses or the campaign coffers of the party which happens to control Congress—in this case the Democratic Party. The present practice of the Democratic Congress in riding roughshod over the rights of the minority, does not serve the public interest. The long opposition to reform on a partisan basis, can only be attributed to the fact that my brethren on the other side of the aisle are aware that this is one way to keep us in perpetual minority and that is not in the public interest. This is so unfair and untenable a position that it smacks of what may be colloquially referred to as "dirty pool." The present system both in theory and practice is not unlike our Federal civil service system in the executive branch of the Government under the New Frontier. Both were originally based on the admirable principle that professional career employees ought to be free from the corrosive influences of politics and the spoils system. However, due to long control of the executive branch by the New Deal, the Fair Deal and now the New Frontier, our civil service laws have become little more than a legal way of freezing into permanent status a multitude of partisan Democrats. And now that this is done, there are disturbing reports in the press that the administration has every intention of using these career employees for partisan political purposes by permitting them, through civil service rulings, to propagandize the domestic policies of the New Frontier. Both situations are fast becoming intolerable and are matters which ought to engage the concern of both Houses of the Congress and both parties.

My resolution does not make it mandatory that there be a more equal division of staff employees where present conditions are satisfactory to the minority members on the committees. After all, the minority whose members' rights and prerogatives are at stake, is the best judge of whether present conditions are satisfactory or not. Where a majority of the minority members of a standing committee are satisfied with the essential nonpartisan nature of the committee and its policy, for example, say, Foreign Affairs, there would probably be no changes needed. However, in other cases, a dissatisfied majority of the minority members of a standing committee could exercise their rights guaranteed by the rules of the House as amended by House Resolution 570. The question has been raised, What specifically could the minority do and do better if my resolution were passed?

While many Members of the Congress and many students of government might disagree or might lay more or less emphasis on the points I will suggest, I venture to point out that my experience indicates to me that there are many things that the minority staff could do and could do better if my resolution were adopted. Here are a few of them:

First. They could gather information on the history of the legislation before the committee. Oftentimes this would be very helpful and a very reliable guide for us to use as we prepared other answers to the problem or amendments to the bill under consideration.

Second. They could have adequate time to counsel with authorities and with people who would be affected adversely and otherwise by the new legislation.

Third. They could help the minority to find competent authorities to testify on the pros and cons of the legislation before the committee.

Fourth. They could help prepare questions designed to bring out valuable and pertinent information necessary to consider the legislation.

Fifth. When and if a bill is voted out of the committee and opposed by the minority, the minority should have competent and adequate help as well as plenty of time to write the minority reports so that the minority views could be thoroughly and adequately understood by all the Members of the House when the bill comes to the House floor. Oftentimes the minority is unable to use all of the time allotted to the minority because of inadequate staffs and research. Further, the minority staff could help members of the minority prepare the statements for the House floor which would be designed to more adequately bring out the shortcomings as viewed by the minority and present positive answers that the minority has found as a result of their own research.

Six. Oftentimes, when new legislation is introduced it is necessary to follow closely the effects of the legislation that has been passed with the view of finding the shortcomings, omissions, and impractical application of the legislation in certain instances with the view of being prepared through observation and study to present adequate and effective amendments in future sessions of the Congress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss the section of my bill which would become section 2, rule XI, clause 32, if adopted, and point out that essentially the same rule would apply to special or select committees and subcommittees which are truly bipartisan in fact as well as in theory.

However, again where a select or a special committee is bipartisan in theory but not in fact, as is the Special Subcommittee on the Federal Aid Highways program of which I am a member, then my resolution gives the minority a right under the rules to have assigned to them upon request one-half of the staff if needed to carry out the legitimate functions of the subcommittee as the minority sees it.

There is nothing new about my claim that the Highway Subcommittee is partisan in nature and denies the minority members equal voice in its policies and procedures. This subcommittee was stacked against the Republicans 13 to 6 when it was constituted in September 1959 and has paid little or no attention to the wishes of the Republican members until after a decision has been made.

During the last session of the present Congress, I introduced House Resolution 111 which was designed to correct this imbalance in membership along more nonpartisan lines, but this resolution was never reported out of the Rules Committee. In an attempt to make the subcommittee into a truly special or select committee I advocated in this resolution that the membership be composed of six members from each party, to be appointed by the Speaker, with the six members of the majority party to select a chairman and the six members of the minority party to select a vice chairman. As a model for my resolution I had adopted the best features of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Advantages in the Labor or Management Field which had four members from each party and for 3 years performed a notable and essentially nonpartisan service to the Congress and the American people in its investigations in this sensitive area. The rules of the select committee which I believe ought to be a model for all special or select committees and subcommittees, including my own, provide, in part, as follows:

> 1. The chairman shall have the authority to call meetings of the committee. This authority may be delegated by the chairman to any other member of the committee when necessary. The chairman, except with the permission of the vice chairman, shall not schedule any public hearing or series of public hearings outside the District of Columbia without giving at least 48 hours notice thereof to the members of the committee.
>
> 2. Should any four members of the committee request the chairman in writing to call a meeting of the committee, then, in the event the chairman should fail, neglect, or refuse to call such meeting within 5 days thereafter, such four members of the committee may call a meeting by filing a written notice thereof with the vice chairman of the committee, who shall promptly call a meeting of the committee, notifying each member of the committee in writing.

I believe it is a consensus of opinion of the minority side of our Highway Investigative Subcommittee—it is mine, at any rate—that with an adequate staff we Republicans could make a more substantial contribution to the vital work of this subcommittee, and, without the adequate staff we are prevented from doing so. Take for example the recently concluded public hearings involving wrongdoing in the Federal aid highway program in the State of Massachusetts.

On March 9, 1962, our subcommittee concluded 18 days of public hearings which proved the existence of a number of criminal conspiracies among lawyers, some State officials, individual fee appraisers and some landowners, many of whom were political influence peddlers and fixers, to defraud the Commonwealth and therefore the Federal Government out of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and perhaps millions, by fraudulently inflating the value of right-of-way acquisitions for interstate highways which involved the participation of Federal funds to the extent of 90 percent. This investigation, conducted for about 2 years, was under the direction of the chairman and the majority on the subcommittee which could and did outvote or ignore the minority, when we demanded that the investigation be expanded to include other areas of outrageous scandals in the Federal Highway System in the State such as the use of consultant engineering fees for bribes and political kickbacks and the area of the performance of construction contracts. These two areas are already a matter of public record and known to anyone who reads the Massachusetts newspapers.

In one recent case alone, a contractor on a Federal aid project was overpaid, perhaps fraudulently at that, an amount estimated to be $300,000. The hearing was limited to the acquisition of right-of-way and all of our protests to the contrary were set at naught. In fact even now, I know of nothing that has been done to develop these serious matters for a future public hearing. Minority contribution is neither invited nor welcome and by no stretch of the imagination can it be said that we are operating on a nonpartisan-and-nonpolitical basis. With one-half of the staff at our disposal, as my resolution provides, and with a vice chairman chosen by the minority with a right to call a public hearing where a timely demand is denied as provided in House Resolution 111 and the model rules of procedure referred to above, the minority could carry out its mandate if necessary by concluding these investigations and by calling a hearing. Under present circumstances, however, we are without the ways and means of doing a job which I believe is expected of us by both the Congress and the taxpayers of both the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The same can be said for many other less sensational but nonetheless important problems in the Federal aid highway program which are in need of exploration and some solution. I have, for a long time, repeatedly proposed that our highly competent investigatory staff be broadened to include competent highway engineers who could study some of the complicated and enormously costly engineering problems which confront us and which, if solved, I believe would result in a savings to the taxpayer which could be estimated in the hundreds of millions of dollars. But here again without an adequate staff and without a voice in the policy and practice of our subcommittee, Republican protests amounts to little more than a futile exercise in rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the reasonable and fairminded members of both parties to support my resolution and that it not be dismissed with the cynical observation that I am merely a member of the minority party which wants to share the wealth of the staff which the majority now controls and shows every sign of keeping, or to put it in other words, I am hollering because "it looks like my ox is being gored." This is decidedly not the case. I am insisting upon nothing more than what I believe to be the rights of my party who represent a point of view presumably shared by a substantial segment of the taxpayers who just barely missed electing a Republican President in the election of 1960 by less than a quarter of a million votes, even assuming such unlikely prospects as an honest vote count in Cook County, St. Louis, the Texas border country and other points on the compass east and west, north and south. The problem I am addressing myself to strikes at the very foundation of a representative form of government and the committee system of Congress necessarily is on trial. The tides of political fortune ebb and flow, Mr. Speaker, and we should not lose sight of the fact that today's majority most certainly will be tomorrow's minority. Therefore, I hope the Rules Committee will vote out this bill and that the House, regardless of political considerations, will pass my resolution and will thereby write a basic rule of fairness into the rules of this deliberative body which cannot later be ignored or circumvented.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a letter by the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Jensen; a letter from Mr. Arthur L. Peterson, Director, Ohio Wesleyan University, the Ben A. Arneson Institute of Practical Politics, Delaware, Ohio; and a letter from Mr. William E. Miller, Republican National Committee:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 3, 1962.*

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: I have your letter of March 28, relative to House Resolution 570, and the need to provide authority for the engaging of more minority staff personnel for House committees requiring them.

This is a proposition I have advocated for some time; however, I have always hoped it could be worked out through comity between the majority and minority sides of the committees, rather than through formal Chamber action.

Essentially I support the political spoils system, and am quite willing to concede the appointive plums to the winning side. But your arguments in your letter, and the testimony presented during your remarks and rejoinder colloquy on the floor March 29, are extremely persuasive.

I do feel that the minority should have at least a modest supply of help available to inquire into matters perhaps considered too delicate for the majority to probe into. No person or group is overly energetic about exposing any weaknesses in its own system. Thus a majority party normally concentrates its efforts on promoting its philosophy.

The majority is entitled to that preferred position by virtue of winning elections. And the responsibility of leadership goes with them. But minority rights deserve some protection, and that is where your resolution comes in.

I don't know whether 40 percent is a realistic figure or not, but I would suspect it is a trifle ambitious. When you appear before the Rules Committee on behalf of your measure be prepared to compromise that ratio downward.

You have cited two blue-ribbon examples of overwhelming imbalance in committee staffing, Labor and Government Operations. These are traditionally among the most politically minded committees in the House, so it is no surprise that they are topheavy with majority appointees.

The same condition does not obtain on the Committee on Appropriations. Our clerks are selected objectively without regard to political label. As a minority member I can usually expect just as much help from the staff in finding out what I need to know as if I were on the majority. Any failure in this process is not because of a politically motivated unwillingness but mostly because even our large staff is not always sufficient to handle its voluminous work.

You are a member of the policy committee. I hope this proposition has been carefully considered by the policy members and the ranking members of all committees. Before you risk an adverse vote such as happened to a similar proposal in the Senate, please be certain there is no other "gentlemen's agreement" type solution which can be reached.

Any concessions you might win in arm's length discussions with the separate committee chairmen might represent a satisfactory gain, whereas if House Resolution 570 fails of passage you might find even the friendliest chairmen not amenable to awarding another position or two, to the minority.

These are my thoughts on the matter, FRED. You can use them any way you deem fit. When your resolution gets to the floor it will get my vote. My endorsement of your proposal in principle is total; any diminution of ardor is merely a recognition of the realities of Capitol Hill politics.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1962.

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: It is no secret that since the end of the Eisenhower administration, Republicans in the House of Representatives, and the Senate too, have been handicapped by grossly inadequate Republican representation on committee staffs.

This is a matter of extreme urgency because the condition is so serious it can undermine the very effectiveness of even routine functions of Republican Members of the House.

I am sure we all realize that under our two-party system this wide disparity between Republican and Democratic staff operations is not good for the Nation as a whole.

I would commend your own vigorous efforts to remedy the situation. At the same time I would express the hope that all our Republican colleagues in the House will give their thoughtful attention to your House Resolution 570 relative to the subject in question.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. MILLER.

OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,
BEN A. ARNESON INSTITUTE
OF PRACTICAL POLITICS,
Delaware, Ohio.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHWENGEL: I read, with deep interest, your speech on the floor of the House of Representatives of March 28.

Your commitment to a strong two-party system and your willingness to patiently examine all possibilities in American politics which will lead to the strengthening of that system have earned you the respect of political scientists from coust to coast.

Too often the glamour of candidates and the excitement of major issues have obscured the importance of such details as congressional committee staffing.

But there is not an ex-legislator in the land who would for one moment underestimate the importance of staff research in terms of the development of alternative courses of action in a given field of legislation or in terms of the influence these substantive experts can and do have on policy development. When one party controls the resources of research alternate plans of action are often not developed and evidence contrary to that which is favorable to the majority position on any given committee never sees the light of day.

Your resolution (H. Res. 570) would benefit both major parties because it would guarantee both of them an opportunity to search out the facts upon which a responsible program and a responsible opposition must be based. Your plan, indeed, will in truth benefit representative government itself because it will help safeguard the presentation of the multiplicity of views on any given issue which represent the American consensus.

Pluralism has come to be regarded as one of the outstanding strengths of our way of life. But our pluralism depends on the expression of diverse views. Expression in the Congress, to be effective, must be based on sound research. And research, often, is only seriously attempted on the committee staff level. For all of these reasons it is my most earnest hope that the House of Representatives will give careful consideration to your thoughtful proposal as contained in House Resolution 570, and that this resolution will pass. We will all gain.

ARTHUR L. PETERSON, *Director.*

Mr. Speaker, this week a Mr. Jack Linge, of Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa, and William Ashley, of State College, Cedar Falls, Iowa, through a program that brings young college students who have a special interest in government to Washington for a week of study and observation, have given thorough study and consideration to the provisions of this legislation. I am glad to say that they give enthusiastic support to this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I congratulate the gentleman for the interest he has shown in what I think is one of the major matters so far as our system of law is concerned in the legislative processes, and I think Mr. Drummond and I think you likewise are rendering a great national service in showing that on a party line basis the committee staffs are stacked, sometimes 90 to 95 percent, in some instances 100 percent, without minority representation. If, in fact, this is a two-party system body, then certainly if the job is going to be done in committees, both Republicans and Democrats should have enough of a working staff to get the job done. The gentleman is aware of the running battle that has been going forward on the Special Investigating Committee on Federal Aid Highways. I know the gentleman is familiar with the fact that it took us 6 months when the committee was set up about 2½ years ago to get a single staff member, and that was accomplished only after lengthy protest. And then we ended up by getting 1 minority counsel and then a little while later we got 1 clerk, and that is where we are today—1 minority clerk and 1 counsel, and the majority has about 29 or 30 staff members, numerous counsel, numerous investigators, a budget for 2 years of nearly $750,000, to carry on these investigations. Now, I think it is impossible, and I think the gentleman will agree, will he not, that it has been almost impossible for the minority to carry on its proper functions through this special investigating committee by being denied an adequate staff with which to do the job. Does not the gentleman agree with me? He is on that committee.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, I agree with the gentleman completely, and I am glad to have the gentleman join me in making those pertinent observations and calling attention to the very sad situation that prevails in that subcommittee or special committee that can do a great job; a much more important job and effective job, even though the gentleman will agree with me that we do have a very good committee staff at this time. But, we are not exploring all the areas or doing the job as completely as many of us think we should.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is aware of the fact that on this committee, even though we have a minority counsel, that minority counsel is treated as a stepchild almost as much as the minority members.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman will yield further, he is not permitted to see the files, he is not permitted to look at the investigative material, he is not permitted to consult with the majority staff on investigations underway and get any information from them. Of course, he does not have the power of subpena. He has no tools with which to work. When it comes to making an investigation, the majority refuses to permit him to attend any of the investigative functions or participate in them. Therefore, that approach renders him almost useless from the standpoint of participating in the investigation.

Does the gentleman think that is the way to properly run the railroad?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It certainly is not. Later on in my remarks I shall call attention to that again, and reveal my experience for whatever benefit it may be, and give the House the benefit of my thinking, and some further suggestions on that.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Iowa knows that the gentleman from Washington is very much pleased by the interest that the gentleman from Iowa has shown in this problem. It so happens that the gentleman from Washington is on a committee where there is rarely any partisan difference. But the gentleman from Washington has been very much interested in trying to evaluate the continuing erosion of legislative powers and responsibilities under the Constitution to the executive branch. The gentleman from Washington has wanted to evaluate the various proposals that come over to the various committees and have them studied. The gentleman from Washington has been unable to find any clerical help on the various committees sufficient to give the gentleman the information that he needs in order to arrive at some conclusion as to what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington wants to commend the gentleman from Iowa and to say that he hopes the gentleman will persist, and to assure the gentleman that the gentleman from Washington will help him in any way he can.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentlemen very, very much. I want to say to the gentleman that he has brought up a very important point that has not been thought of by me as I have studied and researched into this very important area and I thank him very much.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman. I hesitate to interrupt the gentleman from Iowa before he has had an opportunity, really, to present his own evidence. But I should like to commend the gentleman from Iowa for pointing up a problem which I think is deserving of consideration by all Members.

As the gentleman knows, I happen to serve on two committees. I know the value of a professional staff which does not have any partisan flavor at all, as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think that on some of the other standing committees of the House there is equally good staff representation, and there is no particular concern about the problem which we are discussing today. That is whether the minority does not deserve and should not be able to claim as a matter of right greater staff personnel than it is presently allowed.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I feel so strongly about this is because I also happen to be a member of the House Education and Labor Committee. As has already been said, with respect to that committee, the staff at present is roughly twice the size that it was just a year ago. I checked with the committee yesterday and found that they have 10 on their so-called permanent staff and 30 on their investigating staff. Unfortunately, the increase in the size of the committee staff has not resulted in any additional strength for the benefit of the minority members of the committee. Quite the contrary is the case. The present chairman of that committee as early as January 16, 1961, advised the minority that unless long-distance calls were approved in writing by the chief clerk, they would be charged to the individual making the calls. He also advised the minority that if the chief clerk was not notified, the charges would then be doubled. The very next day the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], advised that a copy of all telegrams and cablegrams must be filed with the chief clerk.

Needless to say I do not know if such a regulation could be enforced, and I doubt very much whether those suggestions were followed. However, in the months that followed serious trouble did develop. It began, I think, perhaps because certain rooms which the minority had had since 1949 were considered needed by the majority and a request was made for them; plus also a threat that if the rooms were not given up the minority staff would be reduced. The minority quite naturally refused to accede to this demand but because of that, or shortly thereafter, on October 16, the chairman advised that by October 31 last year the minority clerk would be released. This action was vigorously protested but one of our two experts then on the payroll on the Republican side was of necessity, not by the desire of the minority, transferred to the majority payroll in lieu of having his services terminated. I might add that he left the Hill since that time.

I say this because it does demonstrate that we face a very real problem of getting a job done. We are faced with the necessity of preparing minority reports, unfortunately, on some of the legislation which has been approved by the committee and at the moment we only have 2 individuals on our payroll as compared to a total of 40, and it has been up as high as 48, I believe, within the last 2-year period.

If we could look at that staff that is presently employed by our committee as a professional staff with no partisan flavor I would feel less disturbed about the situation than I do. But the fact of the matter is that not only has the staff been approximately doubled but, to the best of my knowledge, there is only one, or perhaps there are two members on the majority side who were employed by the committee as recently as the end of 1960. It is that situation, that kind of turnover, without any justification except, perhaps, that we have a new chairman, which worries me. And it is for that reason that I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is doing a fine job in calling attention to this problem.

I recognize that in some of these areas there may be reason to move slowly, not to jump to conclusions about the necessity for a 40-percent representation by the minority, or some other percentage. But I think, generally speaking, the gentleman's resolution would be salutary. I do not think it would necessitate the removal of good people who are working on a nonpartisan basis in such committees as the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, but where there is a problem I think it would do a good deal to rectify the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and I want to point out lest somebody misunderstand the objective of this resolution, that the 40-percent representation that this calls for only happens when the majority and the minority both are in favor of that proposition, so this would not necessarily upset any arrangements and understandings in committees where they now have a completely bipartisan situation.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I should like to commend him for the job he has done on this important subject. I am pleased to have become a cosponsor of the gentleman's House resolution because I think it is skillfully drafted and its point is well taken, and if adopted by the House of Representatives would serve an extremely important purpose.

I am sure that our distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] would be on the floor if he possibly could, because he is deserving of high praise for his original leadership in this whole area of pointing out the importance of bringing about conditions under which minority opposition can function as a true minority opposition should function.

I think that one has to add to what the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] said on the extremely important point he made about the Committee on Education and Labor. The figures he gave and the situation that he describes are to me shocking. I add to that by pointing to my own committee, the Committee on the Judiciary, which has a somewhat comparable problem.

Before describing it, I hasten to say that the majority staff of that committee is of the highest possible caliber. They are top lawyers, good men, nonpartisan. The fact of the matter remains, however, that they are a majority staff and they do the bidding of the majority side.

Subject to correction, I would guess there are approximately 15 professionals on the majority side, and at the moment there is only 1 on the minority side. There is room for two. As I understand the complexities of the accounting involved, we have only one at the present time. This is a very serious situation, because, although you cannot equate the two situations, there is something akin between the legislative and the judicial process in that truth is finally achieved by the process of debate and opposition.

Our system works on a committee system. Whether we like the committee system or not is beside the point; we have one, and this is how we operate. The only way the committee system can operate properly, as the gentleman from New Jersey pointed out and as the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] has remarked, is if there is the process of professional examination of the issues as they come by. You do not get that in our system in the absence of proper staff work. The committee members are too busy, they have too much to do. The problems are too complex and growing more complex every day and every week.

I sometimes think I am a student of the parliamentary system. Just a couple of weeks ago I was in England and had the thrill once again, as I always find it thrilling, to go through the House of Commons and the House of Lords and to examine their structures. They have the benches oppose each other, the majority on one side and the minority on the other. The ministers of Government, who are all Members of the House of Commons, sit on the front row. Across from them are their shadows, the full-time opposition, whose job is to oppose, and I say "oppose" in the broad sense, to question and to bring forward alternatives when it is necessary to do so. We do not have the parliamentary system. The only thing we do have is the committee structure. But if the committee structure is to operate in the basic interest of the United States it is absolutely essential that it be so constructed that the technique of arriving at the truth can be perfected. Right now it is not even close to being perfect because of the absence of the proper minority staff.

I might add also that on the Committee on the Judiciary, in the most important and powerful subcommittee of all, into which the distinguished chairman funnels most of the controversial legislation, the division between members is 2 to 1, whereas many of us think the division ought to be a higher ratio for the minority. So add to that the one minority counsel, the only one we have, with the majority having 15—we do not often have trouble about that, because we do not often have violent disagreements on the committee—but it is important that every subject that comes before the committee have the test of an opposition at least examining to see whether we have arrived at the best solution in the best interests of the country.

So I think the gentleman from Iowa is performing a great public service in what he is doing, and our friend from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], in being a part of it, and all those who have expressed on the floor a desire to improve our system, as well as those who could not be here this evening to chip in. They are performing a very important service, one that becomes more important every day that goes by because of the complexities of the legislative process in this country today.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks and his great contribution to the discussion we are having on this subject today.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BOLLING. I know, because in my pleasant association with the gentleman from Iowa on the Civil War Centennial Commission, that the gentleman from Iowa is a good historian, but I am sure he is aware that the 79th Congress passed the Legislative Reorganization Act which provided, in effect, for professional staffs on the various committees of the Congress.

I am sure he is also aware of the historic fact that the Congress that succeeded the 79th Congress was the 80th Congress and that most of the staffing that was done under that act was done in the 80th Congress, and that in a great many of the committees of the House today the same staffs still exist. The question that the gentleman's point of view raises in my mind is this: Is he, in effect, saying that the Legislative Reorganization Act was in error in its provision for a nonpartisan professional staff and is he, in effect, in his resolution retreating to the earlier method of having professional or nonprofessional partisan staffs? That would be my question. I am curious as to whether the gentleman is aware of that history and whether his purpose is to move back to the era before 1946 when the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I should like to say, first of all, it is a pleasure to serve with the gentleman on the Civil War Centennial Commission, and I can say of him that he is an apt student and is performing a fine service on that committee.

Now in answer to the gentleman's question, I want to assure the gentleman I have studied that act and studied the records and the discussions that were entered into at the time that legislation was passed. I think it was good legislation, but I am also convinced that our experience has indicated in certain instances people have gotten political and become biased and unfair. I think we have developed some evidence to show it is unfair and inequitable in many instances.

I Want to point out, too, that my bill, if passed, will not upset the arrangements whereby we can have a truly bipartisan setup, and I have explored in those areas among the minority and have their assurance that they would not take advantage of the provision of this bill, if it were passed.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOLLING. I do not wish to embarrass the gentleman. I am one of the relatively rare Democrats in this House who has had the pleasure of nominating a Republican for a position on a commission and the Republican is now in the well, of course. So I have no intention of embarrassing my friend. But, my friend is a very fair man and I know he would not suggest that this is the only occasion in congressional history that this situation has developed. He would be perfectly willing, I am sure, to admit that similar complaints were made in private and some in public in, I think, the 80th and the 83d Congresses.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I think that is true, I agree, and the mistakes we made are mistakes that we, on the minority side, ought to admit. I admit there were some mistakes, but I have a feeling, and after serious thought and a lot of research and study, that this legislation would improve the situation and improve the legislation that was adopted in the 79th Congress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The gentleman is very gracious in yielding so freely of his time, but I do think that this subject is of considerable interest to a number of us. This mention of the 83d Congress brings to my mind the fact that I have some statistics here about the size of the staff when the Republicans were in control of the 83d Congress, on the Committee on Education and Labor. There were at that time 10 employees, 2 of whom were assigned to the then minority, the Democrats. The total amount of funds appropriated or authorized for committee expenditures was the magnificent sum of $50,000. I need not add over the 2-year period, currently our committee has had appropriated for its use $633,000. I might say what disturbs me is not whether or not we should have professional staffs. Of course, we know the provisions of the reorganization act and the advisability of professional staffs is obvious to anyone who has had contact with the men and women who serve on or for such committees as the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations.

Where you get into a controversial complex area such as is represented by both education and labor it seems to me obvious that you need not only to have quality personnel—and I am not arguing against the quality of the people who are presently employed by that committee—but you need adequate minority representation.

As an example of what I mean, let me say there have been a myriad of bills which would provide Federal aid to some aspect of education. A great many of those bills have been highly controversial. Those that have gotten beyond the subcommittee or at least by the full committee presumably will have committee reports prepared for the use of the membership. Under such circumstances I think it is essential that the members of the committee who are busy with other responsibilities have some good assistants, practical people who have had considerable background in the field of education and in the field of labor. I regret very much the necessity of our losing a very valuable man who had acquired knowledge and who had knowledge before he came to the House in the field of education, because of the arbitrary, in my opinion, effort on the part of the majority to increase still further its hold over the minority.

It seems to me, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], has pointed out, that the legislative process is not going to function adequately unless a good basic groundwork is done in the committee, and when you have a controversial field the staff is bound to comply with the pressures or the suggestions of the majority, and they will almost inevitably do just that. The tendency is to ignore or overlook the needs of the minority, and it is just that that we are attempting to point out, not attempting to set back the clock nor the provisions of the Reorganization Act or any such thing.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further comment?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I agree entirely with the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. What must be added in further answer to what the distinguished gentleman from Missouri asked and which was answered in part by the gentleman from New Jersey, is this: Face the facts. The fact is that in many cases the special staff has become the private property of the chairman or the ranking minority member. This is what has happened, and one useful purpose of the gentleman's reference is that it makes it abundantly clear that a minority staff—and I would suppose the same would be true of the majority staff—is the property of the whole minority and is to be of professional men working on the affairs of the committee as a whole. It does not have to answer solely and only to a single person. That is the fact we have to face up to.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, and I thank the gentleman for making his very pertinent observations in answer to the question the gentleman from Missouri raised a moment ago.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am very glad to yield to my distinguished and able colleague from Iowa.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the gentleman on this resolution and on the remarks which he has just made in support of it, and venture a brief observation. This resolution makes good commonsense. This is, perhaps, in the long run, its strongest recommendation. I would not pose as an expert in the field of political science. I do believe, with every fiber of my being, that the genius of free institutions rests in diffusion of power. It seems obvious that the attrition of the staffs of our committee for the minority membership is but a portion of a great wave which has concentrated power in fewer and fewer hands in this country over the course of recent years, and as such it is to be regretted and deplored and opposed by such resolutions as this.

The Founding Fathers were wise and they saw to the diffusion of power by counterpoising it as in the system of checks and balances which characterizes the Government under the Constitution; in the adversary system of litigation; in the two-party system of Government which arose as a completely free institution. If power is to be counterpoised it must have the instruments of action.

More specifically, I think, Mr. Speaker, is this observation to the point. As one of the newer Members of this body I have been struck—and I can speak freely—I have been struck by the difference in committee work which is manifested on the floor of this House. Some of the great committees in the House come in with finished committee work; fine, carefully planned legislation, ofttimes in a very technical area, but legislation which has obviously been carefully prepared and thoroughly digested. Whether the credit goes to the staffs, the membership, or the chairman, is difficult to say. I suppose in each case it is all three. But there are also committees of this House which bring in committee work—that is to say, legislation to the floor of this House—which represents quite the opposite and which usually comes a cropper in the well; legislation which is often criticized; and, Mr. Speaker, we all recall times when legislation has been virtually written on the floor of this House. Never does a debate take place but what ideas come forward which are worth listening to on both sides of every issue. Oftentimes ideas are presented apparently for the first time on the floor of this House which recommend themselves to thoughtful and reasonable people as worthy of consideration in the premises. But the votes are taken and the gavel falls, the legislative process rolls and it is too late to look into them. This is one of the functions of a minority, to look at the other side and to find desirable amendments and work them up.

I daresay it goes without saying that this cannot be done on the floor of this House, nor can it be done effectively by the minority committee members working on their own.

We have heard many, many statements made from this rostrum in the past month as to the extreme circumstances in which our great Nation finds itself these days. This is no time to be cavalier about minority representation; this is no time to applaud any jungle situation, no matter how it arises, which says, "I will gut you and you can gut me if you get the chance." The questions are too delicate, the welfare of too many people is at stake, to be anything but extremely cautious and extremely conscientious in the preparation of legislation.

I again want to commend the gentleman on this resolution and to wish him well.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution and for his kind and gracious comment.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague [Mr. SCHWENGEL] in his remarks concerning the need to remedy the present inadequate method of staffing House committees. I commend him upon the introduction of his resolution, House Resolution 570, which would correct the present discrimination against the minority and hope to introduce a companion bill.

We cannot maintain good government, proper representation of the people we represent when the minority party in Congress, whichever one it may be, is handicapped by lack of adequate and sufficient professional help on the committees. This matter should be of vital concern to both parties because the present imbalance wherein the committee staffs are heavily weighted in favor of the majority party, could set a precedent that would be equally disadvantageous to the other party when the political climate changes as it is certain to do. This is a matter beyond party politics, however, because it strikes at the heart of the proper functioning of the committee system without which Congress itself would become ineffective.

There is a proper balance that can be achieved on the committee staffs and it is toward this end that I join with my colleague from Iowa.

There are many occasions and issues that are noncontroversial, nonpolitical, or bipartisan. It is possible that there will not always be the need for a percentage Democrat-Republican staff affiliation. There should be, however, a recognition that there are many political situations where in fairness there must be staff available for either party. Otherwise two-party government will suffer and merge into one party.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. **BOW**. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the interest shown in my proposal for medical care for the aged by those 25 or more colleagues who have now introduced the legislation.

This is convincing evidence of their sincere interest in the health problems of the aged, and of their desire to work out a solution that will be of benefit to everyone over age 65, utilizing the facilities of the voluntary health insurance organizations of the United States and of an existing Federal agency, in a manner consistent with the dignity and independence of each individual.

As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] pointed out several weeks ago in a speech in the Record, there are several hundred health insurance policies now available to people of age 65 and older, and 53 percent of all Americans in this age group have some form of health insurance protection.

I believe it is in the public interest to extend this protection to every elderly citizen who wishes it, and that it is proper for the Federal Government to assist and encourage them.

If my proposal is enacted, every elderly person, regardless of income or his prior medical history, can avail himself of one of the comprehensive medical care insurance programs outlined in the bill.

Benefits superior to those offered in any other legislation will be provided by H.R. 10981 through a system of medical care insurance certificates issued by the Treasury Department, and tax credits.

Regardless of his income, any American 65 or over can be assured payment of his hospitalization, surgeons fees, convalescent home treatment, nursing services, and other benefits.

Unlike other proposals, the Bow plan is completely voluntary. It does not require action by State legislatures. It contains no "means test." It is based upon a completely confidential relationship between each individual and the Treasury Department, the health insurance carrier of his choice, his doctor and his hospital. It does not discriminate. It is a true free enterprise plan to help Americans take care of themselves.

HERE IS HOW IT WORKS

I propose that every American 65 or over file a Federal income tax return whether or not he owes any tax. A simple, easy-to-file return is proposed.

If an individual or a married couple owes no tax, the Treasury Department will give a medical care insurance certificate. The certificate may be used to obtain the kind of medical care insurance the citizen desires. The insurance carrier, in turn, will receive payment of the premium cost, up to $125 for an individual, or $250 for a couple, by presenting the certificate to the Treasury.

The two basic policies outlined in the bill will be available for this amount, regardless of any previous illness, on a guaranteed renewable basis.

If your Federal income tax is less than $125—$250 for a couple—the tax will be forgiven and a medical care insurance certificate will be issued to make up the difference between the amount saved on taxes and $125—$250 for a couple—so that the citizen may obtain health insurance. For example, I owe the Government $50 income tax. My tax is forgiven and I receive a medical care insurance certificate worth $75, so that I may take my $50 and the certificate and obtain at least the basic medical care protection provided in my bill.

These provisions guarantee that every individual can have good medical attention with Government assistance—and he can have the medical attention of his own choice with benefits, including doctor's fees, far superior to any provided in any other bill.

INCENTIVES OFFERED

The Bow plan encourages those who can afford to do so to provide their own insurance protection, or to provide it for their elderly relatives, offering a $125 tax credit, to be subtracted from the income tax an individual owes, to all who take advantage of this opportunity. For example, I owe the Federal Government $275 in income tax. My wife and I—both 65—have health insurance. Two hundred and fifty dollars is our tax credit, and we pay the Government only $25 income tax.

There is a growing trend in the United States toward the purchase of health insurance for retired employees by their former employers. The Bow plan encourages this practice by offering the same $125 credit to the employer who provides health insurance for his retired employees.

CHOICE OF BASIC INSURANCE

The Bow bill outlines two basic medical care plans for the elderly.

One provides complete payment for hospitalization, surgeon's fees, convalescent home care, and nursing service within limits based upon the average needs of elderly people. This plan begins payments with the first dollar of medical care cost, and is particularly helpful to those of very low income.

The other provides somewhat more extensive benefits with the patient sharing part of the expense after having paid a deductible.

Both policies are available on a guaranteed renewable basis to any person 65 or over without regard to any previous illness.

They are carefully prepared so that they can be offered by any insurance company, nonprofit insurance carrier, or group practice organization within the dollar limits set by the bill, though allowing little if any profit to the carrier.

I have been asked whether the bill supplants or is in conflict with the Kerr-Mills Act. It is not. To the extent that the insurance coverage provided to elderly people will pay for their hospitalization, surgical care and certain related expenses, the States and the Federal Government will be relieved of much of the expense they might incur under the Kerr-Mills Act. But there will be occasions when not all of an individual's medical expenses can be covered by insurance, and the Kerr-Mills Act, where it has been implemented, can continue to be helpful and will, in fact complement my plan.

ADVANTAGES OF THE BOW PLAN

The Bow bill has many advantages over the Kennedy administration proposal as introduced by Representative King and Senator Anderson.

The Bow bill—H.R. 10981—would provide health care benefits to all persons 65 years of age or older whereas the King-Anderson bill would be available only to aged beneficiaries of the OASI program. The Bow bill would provide basic benefits under insurance policies which meet certain approved standards, for surgical benefits ranging at least up to $300 whereas the King-Anderson bill would not cover the cost of any surgery. While the King-Anderson bill requires an aged person to pay the first $90 of his hospital expenses, the Bow bill specifies first dollar coverage. Inasmuch as the Bow bill provides at least these distinct advantages over the King-Anderson bill in the basic health care area, and since most of the other basic benefit provisions of the two bills are essentially the same, the Bow bill should be preferred by the senior citizen and the average taxpayer.

The Kennedy-King-Anderson bill requires increases in the already burdensome social security tax on gross income. The Bow bill is financed within the general Federal budget, with the amount required offset in large part by the medical care deductions, nearly $1 billion yearly, now being taken by taxpayers over 65.

SUMMARY

Several million elderly Americans need assistance to meet the cost of illness in old age. Others will welcome encouragement in obtaining better medical care insurance. My bill, unlike any other proposal, will take care of everyone, the only basic requirement being that each person file an income tax return.

My plans offer adequate and comprehensive protection.

My bill is the best solution to date of the problem of health care for the aged.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the bill of which the gentleman is the original author came to my attention only a relatively few days ago and, from the study I have been able to give it in those few days, it looks to me like a good approach to the problems that have concerned me for a great many years, including the controversy in this body over the so-called Forand bill some years ago. Recognizing the need, as so many of us have for so many years, I want to join in praising the gentleman from Ohio in coming up with something that looks to me as if it would provide greater services to those who need this protection without the disadvantages that might accrue if we should go to another large Federal bureaucracy to operate this type of program.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his foresight and I associate myself with his remarks. He has rendered a great service to this country. I know he has worked and studied long hours on this legislation. Much work has gone into developing the mechanics of this bill and you are to be heartily congratulated on authoring this legislation. It will prevent this country from falling into the devastating clutches of socialized medicine and I know that you, as I am, are interested in preserving that almost sacred patient-physician relationship and the high caliber of medical care and practice we now enjoy in this country.

I feel that by supporting this legislation once again we have demonstrated that we are interested in the welfare of this country and its senior citizens, that we are interested in the rights of individual citizens and the free-enterprise system without the intervention of the Federal Government.

This is a constructive, progressive piece of legislation that takes great strides toward helping the individual solve his problems through his own initiative. I again commend the gentleman and say that I am proud to be associated with the gentleman in this legislation.

I have carefully analyzed the Bow bill and am so firmly convinced that it is the answer, the proper answer and the truly American way of meeting this problem that I have introduced a companion bill, H.R. 11039.

This legislation provides a purely voluntary method of meeting the medical problems of our senior citizens.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for introducing this legislation. I think that he, after a lot of study and research, has found a practical solution to problems that must be dealt with.

I want to tell him also that I have read with interest the material he has sent to me and read the bill several times. I have taken the liberty of sending copies of the bill to interested people in my district, people in the labor movement and retired people who have some misgivings about several propositions before the Congress. I have reason to believe if we are to get some real support for this legislation—at least I am hopeful that this will happen—I am looking forward to further discussion of this. I sincerely hope that we will have a chance to discuss it on the floor when and if it is reported out of the committee.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 weeks, we have been overwhelmed in my office with responses to my opinion poll, which was distributed throughout the Second District of Minnesota, and was also reproduced in a number of newspapers in the district. In addition to widespread mailings to people regardless of political affiliation, I urged the voters in my regular radio broadcasts to write in for copies of the questionnaire if for some reason they did not receive one.

The task of tabulating these returns is still going on, and will for a time. However, in view of the discussions now going on about medical care for the elderly, I have had a special check made on the responses to two questions, and I must say that the results are revealing of strong sentiment on the part of the voters in my district.

Here is the way the vote went:

First. Do you favor a medical care plan for the elderly under social security?

The vote was 14 percent in favor and 86 percent opposed.

Second. Or do you favor continuing development of private plans along with the present Federal-State system?

The vote was 84 percent in favor and 16 percent opposed.

I should add that many responses included additional comments, the burden of which was: We do not want a compulsory, nationwide system which will pay hospital bills for people whether they need help or not; any plan to be of any help should provide some sort of assistance with doctor bills as well as hospital bills, but we do not want a Government agency telling us how to do it; and we realize that with many people there is real need of help, and there must be some way to provide it.

As a result of such responses as these, and as a result of giving a good deal of thought and attention to the problem which we know exists, I, along with many of my colleagues in the House, am introducing a bill which in my opinion is the best answer yet advanced to this problem.

I know that it will not meet with favor from bureaucrats because it does not create Government jobs, nor set up fancy Government machinery. Its strength is in simplicity, its workability, its direct approach to the problem while maintaining our excellent private insurance system and permitting our people to deal with their own problems.

Essential provisions of the bill are: a tax credit up to $125 for the cost of premiums paid on an approved medical care plan—a credit which may be taken by the elderly person who buys the policy for himself or his wife, or by a relative who buys the insurance for the elderly person. In other words, the tax due would be reduced by the amount of premiums paid for medical care insurance for the elderly, up to $125. And, in the situation where the person involved does not have a tax liability up to $125, a medical care insurance certificate will be issued which may be used to pay premiums on such a policy.

This will give the people complete freedom of choice in selecting the nature and extent of insurance coverage, and will at the same time leave it to the individual to arrange for such protection. The proposed credit will provide suitable coverage under any one of the many excellent private plans now in effect, or others being developed.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill dealing with a problem of paramount concern to all Americans. Under provisions of the bill, comprehensive medical care will be provided for every elderly American 65 or over.

I understand several of my Republican colleagues are introducing similar bills today. I am most gratified with these efforts and I sincerely hope that this Congress takes action in a sound manner with the problems of our elderly's medical cares.

The bill I am introducing today provides for voluntary participation. No action is required by State legislatures; no means test is necessary; there is no discrimination. It is a true free enterprise plan which allows Americans to take care of themselves.

I am convinced that the administration's medical care plan, tied to social security, is not best for America.

Under today's bill, benefits will be provided through a system of medical care insurance certificates, issued by the Treasury Department, and tax credits. For example, if a person's Federal income tax is less than $125—$250 per couple—the tax will be forgiven and a medical care insurance certificate will be issued to make up the difference between the amount saved on taxes and

$125—$250 for a couple—so that the citizen may obtain health insurance. The certificate may be used to obtain the kind of medical care insurance the citizen desires. The insurance carrier, upon presentation of the certificate to the Treasury Department, will then receive payment of the premium cost—up to $125 per person.

It guarantees that every individual over 65 can have fine medical attention, including his choice of benefits such as doctor's fees.

The plan encourages those who can afford it to pay for their own insurance. A person could provide it for his elderly relative, offering a $125 tax credit to be subtracted from the income tax an individual owes. A similar tax credit would be allowed an employer who provides health insurance for his retired employees.

Two fundamental medical care plans are outlined in the bill.

First. Providing full payment for hospitalization, surgeon's fees, convalescent home care and nursing service within limits based upon the average needs of the aged.

Second. Providing more extensive benefits with the patient sharing part of the expense.

The bill, contrary to the administration proposal, contains no pathways to socialized medicine or federally controlled medical care. The establishment of a huge, new Federal agency is not required. It depends solely on existing health insurance programs and an existing Federal agency.

We hope serious consideration is given to this proposal.

THE ONWARD MARCH OF PROGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this is a call for action. The poet wrote of soldiers, but he might have been thinking of Americans:

> In the great hour of destiny they stand
> Each with his feuds, and jealousies, and sorrows.
> Soldiers are sworn to action.

And effective action requires unity and harmony, as well from the nation as from soldiers.

From the beginnings of the Republic, it has been the destiny of America to defend the general good of all peoples everywhere against the onslaughts of privilege and discrimination. The battle breaks out anew on a different front in succeeding ages. Advantage and favor, repulsed in one sector, find new approaches to selfish gain. If we hesitate but a moment, the common interests of common men sicken and are buried under the avalanche of renascent reaction.

The enemy of progress takes a different form in each new assault. One day he may assume the form of control of conscience and religion; the next he may attempt to exclude all from the control of government except the privileged; again, he may take the guise of overwhelming and selfish economic power. But in all ages the battle is the same: It is the struggle of the good life for all against private avarice.

Progress in a great state involves the formulation of broad and comprehensive policies to combat general evils. Within the framework of these grand policies exists the possibility of many little policies to combat little evils. Such evils are little only in the sense that they affect only relatively small groups. We are inclined to give them precedence in our thinking because they seem to be the ones which impinge on our most vital problems. For them we are willing and eager to fight. And therein lies our danger. A battle is fought for major objectives. It little matters that we win a skirmish here and there if the great war goes against us. Win the whole war and you will find that the smaller matters adjust themselves to a changed environment.

> Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.

In this age, knowledge and science and empathy have advanced hand in hand far into what was once unknown and inscrutable. We have the necessary understanding and the necessary technology to reduce human misery in much of the world, particularly in the United States. It remains only to put technology and knowledge into operation against specific instances of inequity and maladjustment.

A great struggle requires a great leader. We have one. We chose him against what seemed insurmountable odds in 1960. He is today a world figure, intelligent, energetic, courageous, and untinged with greed for either power or wealth. Already, world opinion is hanging on his word and watching his every motion. He has brought into association with himself a group of men dedicated to the common good, men widely skilled and knowledgeable in every field of human thought and endeavor. Together, they have mapped out a plan for economic and social advancement which is hailed in all corners of the earth as the New Frontier. It is indeed a New Frontier of advancement into a kindlier and more just and richer life. It applies all our toil-won knowledge and experience to the solution of problems hitherto deemed insoluble—which were in fact insoluble because we lacked the resources to apply a practical solution. And still some of us dawdle in picayunish bickering over details of the program, while a hopeful and possibly a startled world is recognizing him as the looked-for preserver of posterity and the best hope of modern civilization.

The resurgent forces of inherent human greed seem to feel that the coming battle is the most crucial in all history. They must win this time, or else relinquish wide sections of the field to justice and compassion and succor for all men. There is inevitable a struggle unprecedented for ferocity and ruthlessness, both at home and abroad. Our opponents are assembling and grouping every resource of money and weapon and guile.

I say to you, let us get enthusiastically and energetically behind our chosen leader. A solution of the major problems which beset our times, the problems arising from subversion of democracy, both internal and external; the problems arising from corruption in productive and in public life; the problems arising from our admitted efficiency in producing while we still remain naive in distributing; the problems arising from pockets of want and misery in our domestic economy, exaggerated by the similar problems, mountainous in size, which curse entire foreign societies. These are the solutions which demand priority in our political and social planning. Once these problems have been licked, we may look forward with confidence to an adjustment of the more local problems which exist primarily because of the presence of the major problems. This is no time for quibbling or delay. Let us aline ourselves with forces that are moving ahead.

All our strength is in our union. All our danger is in discord.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] and I have the honor to represent this House, is engaged in improving the relationships among the Federal, State, and local governments. It is with pleasure that I call my colleagues' attention to an appraisal of the Advisory Commission's accomplishments during its first 2 years of existence. Let me note, however, that it gives the Commission somewhat more credit than it deserves with regard to two particular points. Specifically, the idea that municipalities invest their idle funds to earn interest income did not originate with the Commission. Some local governments have been doing so for years. The Commission takes credit only for studying the problem, for identifying the States in which local units lack the authority to do so, and for drafting a simple statute which would meet the need. Secondly, the legislation authorizing the Internal Revenue Service to make its personnel training facilities available, on a reimbursement basis, to the tax enforcement staffs of State and local governments is not yet an accomplished fact. I am hopeful that it will receive the favorable consideration of the Congress in the near future.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the body of the RECORD a report on the work of the Advisory Commission on

Intergovernmental Relations which appeared in the Daily Bond Buyer, Monday, April 2, 1962.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON VIEWPOINT

(By John Gerrity)

WASHINGTON.—Should President Kennedy, an accredited practitioner of the art, ever want for a continuing case history of pragmatism in government, he need only take a 3-minute walk from his White House desk.

Less than a city block from the Executive Mansion, along the western fringe of Lafayette Park, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations holds forth, an almost incredible homogenizer of widely divergent and often conflicting interests between the States and local governments and the Federal Government.

IMPRESSIVE RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

Now entering its third full year of existence, this agency that is tiny by every Washington criterion, except accomplishment, is also unique by comparison with the hundreds of others that are here.

Indeed, the Commission has been unique in many ways from its very beginning. Not alone because it works on a shoestring budget, or because its membership is made up of representatives of all levels of government, and not just from the Federal level, or that it seems to thrive in an atmosphere where anything approaching anonymity verges on heresy.

UNIQUE LIMITATION VERSUS BROAD, MULTIPLE ALLEGIANCE

More significantly, from its start to this very day, its activities have been tempered by a constant awareness of the limitations implicit in the first word of its title—advisory.

It has no power to command, as others do; nor even to criticize. It is a creature of Congress. But it owes its allegiance—in terms of performance—not only to the Federal Government, but to the 50 States and to their 90,000 political subdivisions, 35,000 of which are cities and towns of all sizes and kinds.

It has no blunderbuss, nor even a rifle, to train on targets of ineptitude or ignorance; on the maladroit or the maldoers wherever they may be in any of these many governmental units.

ROLE AS INITIATOR IS CONFINED TO SUGGESTIONS

Thus, it cannot even take, or receive, credit when any of its suggestions are translated into action. For credit, when it is merited, must go to those who do what they have been advised to do.

It can act only as a catalyst to bring forth the best that is latent in the thousands of differing ambitions and aspirations that all who govern in scores of different ways must have for the governed.

Consequently, it must seek to bring together without foment or force thousands of Americans who are charged in one way or another with the custodianship of the affairs of other Americans—and who have little else besides that in common.

MEETING GROUND OF MAJOR AND MINOR OFFICIALS

Hard as it may be to believe, it is nonetheless true that today the Commission is the only forum in the Nation through which a school superintendent can speak to a Senator, or a councilman to a Cabinet member, and do so within the official imprimatur of the law of the land.

Without the Commission there would be no absolute means of communication if only because there is virtually no other encompassing organization and still less unity between other organizations.

Yet despite its seeming lack of power the Advisory Commission has recorded a remarkable record of achievement in its short life—and this it has done, using mainly two effective weapons: The power of commonsense and the power of good example.

WEAPONS WIELDED WITH SUBTLETY AND SUCCESS

And by wielding these weapons with the deft subtlety that is the hallmark of the successful soft sell, it has managed to accomplish—and to get others to accomplish—a host of achievements that no amount of thunder and bombast could do. Thus, for example, it is understandable today that hundreds of American communities have come to accept as commonplace the fact that they can add to their community revenues the incomes derived from the investment of temporarily surplus tax receipts or moneys received from the sale of municipal bonds.

Yet the genesis of this happy state of affairs serves to illuminate the kind of function the Commission is able to render to its constituencies.

CIVIC PROJECT FUNDS HELD WELL IN ADVANCE

For years it had been common knowledge that a city or town, about to embark on some civic project customarily held well in advance a large portion of the funds necessary to finance that project.

It made little difference whether these funds flowed from bond sales, tax revenues, or, as in most cases, a combination of both.

They were on hand—often as much as 6 months to a year before they would have to be expended.

COMMISSION RAISES QUESTION OF INVESTMENT

Taking due note of the fact that this was a relatively common practice, the Commission raised what seems today a painfully simple question:

Why can't communities that have such funds on hand invest them in short-term obligations or as other investors do—and thereby earn not only additional income but add to the national cash flow?

The result was the expected. In a remarkably short time an analysis was made of the conditions that would have to be met to permit such short-term investing, safeguards to be ensured, and legislative means to do the job where required.

MOST STATES ADOPT INVESTMENT LAW

A model law—it took only a single page—was written. Today this law, with occasional minor changes to reflect parochial needs, is on the books of most States, and still more are expected to adopt it during the next legislative year.

Another illustration involves the universal problem of tax administration.

Few communities today, hard pressed as they are to find efficient personnel and often limited by tight budgets, can find the time or the means to train competent tax administrators.

Yet in more instances than not, the local tax office is but yards away or sometimes in the same building as are the Federal tax offices.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE EXTENDS AID

To the Commission is seemed preposterous that the Internal Revenue Service, which helps scores of nations throughout the world to establish and maintain efficient modern tax administration systems, could not provide an identical service for American communities.

An inquiry produced the information that minor changes in the Federal statutes to permit local communities to employ Federal instructors, with the provision that any revenues earned by such activities would be netted against the service's expenses, would have to be made.

In almost a trice this was done—again with a single page from the Advisory Commission.

IMPROVEMENT IN LOCAL TAX WORK NOTED

Thus today, the quality of local tax administration is being rapidly improved, solely because the commission is intolerant of a system which tends to block the interchange of assistance and information between the Federal and State Governments.

Another perennial problem involves the question of State aid to local communities. In the absence of any better criteria, most States base their contributions to localities on a loose assumption of need that is determined by the amount of property taxes each community may collect.

In other words, the flow of funds from the State capital is largely determined by what each potential recipient receives in property taxes.

DANGEROUS RESULTS FROM STATE PRACTICE

This common practice has produced a not too surprising result that has become dangerously widespread:

Many local jurisdictions, in order to acquire larger amounts from their respective State governments, have deliberately set about wrecking their local property tax structures and systems, purposely to shave the volume of tax receipts collected.

While the Commission is well aware of this practice, it obviously could bring about few corrections if it were to indulge in pious protests, or if it started a tub-thumping propaganda campaign. Activities such as these, if noticed at all, would stimulate little more than scorn.

COMMISSION SEEKS PROOF OF PRACTICES

Rather in its characteristic way, the Commission has set about building its case reasonably confident that, when the States are confronted with the proof they themselves really want, commonsense will dictate a speedy retreat from a behavior pattern that is only a cut above nonsensical today.

Consequently, at this very moment Dr. Frederick F. Bird, who earned an enviable reputation as a tax expert at Dun & Bradstreet, is surveying some 10 or a dozen States, quietly accumulating evidence of countless activities that run counter to the public weal.

When the research is done, Dr. Bird will write his paper, and all it will require then is just one State to follow his and the Commission's recommendation.

STATES TEND TO FOLLOW THE LEADER

Shortly thereafter, the parade toward better administration of a vital problem will begin, for the individual States, no less than any other group, are susceptible to the contagion of follow the leader.

Still another instance concerns the tragic abuse of the concept of Federal grants-in-aid to the States and local communities.

To be sure there have been literally hundreds of protests in the past from the outraged, the discriminated against, the payers and the payees—in short, virtually everyone.

CAUSE OF DIFFICULTIES GOES UNSOUGHT

But the end product of these accumulated complaints is as hard to find as the shadow of a past smile, mainly because no one had bothered to find out the basic cause of the difficulties.

For instance, surprising as it may be, the Federal Government today still supports programs for grants-in-aid begun as far back as 1879. Some of these programs are obsolete; some functions have been absorbed by larger activities of more recent date, and in some instances the aid program has long since ceased—but the money keeps rolling out.

However, the Commission which recently completed an exhaustive study of the good and the bad in grants-in-aid, has prepared a bill now before Congress, that is startling in its simplicity.

CONGRESS SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE

Since Congress must approve each grant-in-aid whatever its purpose may be, the Commission reasoned that Congress should also be responsible for reviewing its own acts.

Consequently, the current bill provides (and its passage is deemed likely) that every 4 years the appropriate committee must review and reexamine whatever specific programs it originated.

Moreover, the bill states that every grant-in-aid will end automatically after 5 years, unless Congress specifically extends its life.

TEN MAJOR PROJECTS ALREADY COMPLETED

These are but a few of the Commission's "quiet" accomplishments in its relatively short lifetime. In all, it has completed 10 major projects of a similar nature. Some are now being used; more will be utilized as the legislative machinery is forthcoming.

It has before it an ambitious program, covering 14 of the more common problems confronting a nation that is composed for the most part of city dwellers. They run the gamut from local problems in industry location to the disposal of surplus Federal land holdings; from taxation of all kinds to basic administration.

COMMISSION IS NOT A POWER SEEKER

Recently reconstituted with a new panel of members, the commission is not, as some might suppose, seeking new domains to conquer.

On the contrary, it has quite enough to do with those that already exist.

IF OUR REPRESENTATIVES DO NOT LOOK OUT FOR OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS, THE CITIZENS ARE HELPLESS

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mrs. Harold C. Schofield, 2680 North Moreland Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, wrote me such a forceful letter recently that I feel impelled to share it with you. She urged that the Congress must talk strong and act strong and stand for something positive. Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote her message pertinent to all Members of this House:

> Many of us also feel very strongly that powers to alter tariffs should not be given to any President. Certain rights and functions have been reserved by the Constitution to be exercised by Congress and those include treaty arrangements, tariffs, and specific appropriation of funds. These are duties and privileges of the House and Senate and should be delegated only by Constitutional amendment by vote of the States. I do not believe that the Constitution provides for the giving away of its own powers by Congress to a person or department of the Government simply by its own vote.
>
> Perhaps I am wrong. If so I should be glad to be informed.
>
> Gradually the power and prestige of the House is declining as it fails to maintain its prerogatives and passes its powers on to others, either by yielding to pressure to spend beyond our income and thus weakening our economy, or by allowing the President to spend large undesignated sums at his discretion.
>
> If our representatives in Congress do not look out for the national interests, the citizens are helpless.
>
> Your constituency is solidly behind you but are counting on you for positive action in these matters.
>
> Very sincerely,
>
> Irene P. Schofield.
> (Mrs. H. C.)

CONGRESS SHOULD UNDERTAKE INVESTIGATION OF STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Rousselot] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have publicly stated that I feel Congress should undertake an investigation of the State Department. Today, I introduced House Resolution 586 providing for an investigation of the Department. My resolution reads as follows:

H. Res. 586

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the personnel and policymaking practices, procedures, and methods of the Department of State, with a view to recommending such changes therein as may be required to implement more advantageously and rapidly the response of the United States to world developments, and to insure that the best interests of the United States are being served in its struggle with communism.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpena may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

The investigation which I contemplate would not be a witch hunt, as some people would claim. It would be a carefully planned inquiry into the role of the Department in developing and executing foreign policy and how the Department has performed in this all-important role.

At crucial periods in our battle against the international Communist conspiracy, the Department has promoted policies which manifest a serious lack of understanding of the nature and aims of communism.

We know that communism is the antithesis of a free, capitalistic society such as ours. The Communist seeks to subvert and destroy every vestige of individual political and economic freedom. Yet, our State Department condones the giving of aid, military as well as economic, to Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia.

We know Communists are untrustworthy. They are completely amoral. To them the end justifies the means. Yet, our State Department continues to support the formation of coalition governments in the Congo, Laos, and South Vietnam with Communists or pro-Communists in key posts.

We know that Communists regard socialism as a transition stage toward the fulfillment of their primary goal, namely, total state control over the individual and the means of production and distribution. Yet, our State Department seems to support the belief that socialism can best solve the problems of emerging nations.

There are others in Congress who feel as I do. We are not alarmists. We only seek to find out what must be done to enable our State Department to represent the capitalist or American viewpoint more effectively.

Mr. Bryton Barron, former Chief of the Treaty Staff of the Department of State, is in the process of writing a book which he will title "The Untouchable State Department." In the first chapter of the book, Mr. Barron discusses the need for a congressional investigation of the Department. This chapter was copyrighted in 1962 by Bryton Barron. The text of the chapter follows:

The Untouchable State Department

(By Bryton Barron, author of "Inside the State Department")

CHAPTER I—THE CALL FOR AN INVESTIGATION

Whenever there is a discussion of the situation in the State Department, someone is sure to throw up his hands in despair and exclaim that nothing can be done about it because employees of the bureaucracy are "wired into" their jobs and cannot be removed. I propose therefore at the very outset of this writing to correct that impression.

To demonstrate the ease with which staff members of the State Department, even veteran civil service employees, can be ousted almost overnight—and without too much difficulty—when those in power really have a mind to do so, I might cite the case of two historians who were summarily ousted a few years back because they had embarrassed the Department by protesting (1) the suppresion and multilation of the record of secret diplomatic deals, and (2) the collapse of the promised housecleaning. But more to the point were precedents earlier set by Secretary Dulles in dealing with two key policy advisers.

Precedents for housecleaning

The precedents I suggest as a basis for necessary action relate to officers in the Foreign Service, which makes the cases the more noteworthy, since under the Wriston plan adopted for the Department, most of the policymaking positions in Washington—except, of course, the relatively few held by political appointees—are filled by Foreign Service officers, as are also the diplomatic posts overseas. It is likewise noteworthy that these rulings do not rest on loyalty and security grounds—which latter, even when warranted, are often difficult to establish.

Each was the case of an officer who had been involved in the China debacle and who was ousted because he had, in brief, failed to measure up to proper standards of performance and judgment. Here, in other words, were precedents that should have been followed in succeeding years in view of the failure of other State Department advisers to exercise proper judgment, as reflected in the continuing disastrous trend of foreign policy. The first of these cases was that of John Carter Vincent, who was forced into retirement in March 1953. Mr. Dulles did not label the official as a "security risk" nor did he challenge Mr. Vincent's loyalty; instead the Secretary announced this simple conclusion: "Mr. Vincent's reporting of the facts, evaluation of the facts, and policy advice during the period under review show a failure to meet the standard which is demanded by a Foreign Service officer of his experience and responsibility at this critical time. I do not believe that he can usefully continue to serve the United States as a Foreign Service officer."

Similarly, in the case of John Patton Davies, Jr., who was fired in November 1954, the Secretary did not find the officer disloyal "in the sense of having any communistic affinity or consciously aiding or abetting any alien elements hostile to the United States," but Mr. Dulles went on to say that "Under the present Executive order on security, it is not enough that an employee be of complete and unswerving loyalty. He must be reliable, trustworthy, of good conduct and character." Mr. Dulles added: "The members of the Security Hearing Board unanimously found that Mr. Davies' lack of judgment, discretion, reliability raises a reasonable doubt that his continued employment in the Foreign Service of the United States is clearly consistent with the interests of national security. This is a conclusion which I am also compelled to reach as a result of my review of the case."

Secretary Dulles' action in these cases was a step in fulfillment of the 1952 pledge to the American people that "we shall eliminate from the State Department and from every Federal office all, wherever they may be found, who share responsibility for the needless predicaments and perils in which we find ourselves." His language in the two cases may have been milder than critics desired, but there can be no denying that his procedure was effective—it got the men out of the Department, which was the important thing.

Wrong elements in saddle

Unfortunately, the pressures from the men who remained around Mr. Dulles in the Department, as well as pressures from without, soon wore down his resolve. The housecleaning collapsed early in the Dulles period, and the forces and individuals that precipitated the original mess regained control in the State Department. The Nation paid dearly for this in the disastrous years that followed—in Cuba, Berlin, and Laos—and in the shocking record of later personnel actions by the Department. We find, for example, that Robert Strong, who, according to sworn testimony, sent out misleading reports from Formosa helpful to the Communists, was subsequently given a superior service award by the Department; that Victor Purse, who accepted a new automobile for his wife as a tip from a foreign monarch for services rendered in an official capacity, was similarly given, subsequently, a superior service award; that Roy Rubottom, who was in charge of this country's relations with Latin America during the period that a Red base was set up 90 miles from our shores and who, incidentally, telegraphed the Governor of California not to execute a convicted sex offender in that State because it might arouse a mob in some Latin American country, was subsequently given a choice ambassadorial post; that William Wieland, who, according to sworn testimony, was helpful to Castro in the takeover in Cuba, was not fired but was instead given a promotion by the Department.

In a later chapter I tell of glaring cases in which our experts on foreign policy have, to use Mr. Dulles' words, failed to meet the standard properly demanded of men of their experience and responsibility at this critical time and should therefore have been removed from office. Why have they not been removed? Why have the architects of disastrous policies been retained, promoted, protected? The American people are entitled to know the answers to such questions.

Congressional action urged

Since successive Secretaries of State have failed to effect the housecleaning which Dulles started and then dropped, the public has no choice but to call on Congress to step in and make a full-fledged investigation of this and other aspects of the situation in the State Department.

Such an investigation by Congress was proposed by Representative RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH in a House resolution which he submitted early in 1962, which would provide that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs "conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices, of the Department of State, with a view to making such recommendations as may be necessary in order to implement more advantageously and rapidly the response of the United States to world developments, and to insure that the best interests of the United States are being served in its struggle with communism." In recommending approval of his proposal, the Indiana Congressman declared:

"Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are today worried, perplexed, and vitally concerned with the negative trend of the U.S. global struggle with the Communist conspiracy to enslave the world * * *.

"The responsibility for the American response to communism lies with our Department of State.

"There has been open and honest criticism from many segments of our population, questioning the wisdom of this Department in bringing the full American capability into action against our greatest foe in history.

"Limiting ourselves to recent developments only, we are reminded of the U.S. setbacks in Laos, Cuba, Berlin, Vietnam, and other trouble spots.

"There is also much concern about the granting of foreign aid to Communist countries which profess independence of Moscow.

"Americans are also disturbed about some aspects of American participation in United Nations activities which often reflect programs and policies detrimental to our interests.

"With these developments in mind, it appears that a close scrutiny of State Department planning and personnel is in order with the aim of insuring that the best interest of America is obtained at all times in the continuing struggle with our Communist enemies."

It is recognized, of course, that the submission of the resolution by Congressman ROUDEBUSH is no guarantee that the investigation will be conducted. The proposal may die in the Rules Committee; for partisan political reasons it may fail of approval in the House; even if approved by the House, it may suffer from lack of support in the committee which would be charged with the task. This last-mentioned danger is illustrated by the fate that has befallen the investigation by a Senate subcommittee into the censoring of anti-Communist warnings from the speeches of our military leaders. It is an open secret that several members of the Senate Armed Services Committee had little interest in Senator THURMOND's revelations and only voted for the investigation because they dared not go on record against it in the face of the overwhelming demand from the grassroots. And when the Pentagon and the White House resorted to the Executive fifth amendment (the claim to Executive privilege) in order to prevent the Senators from interrogating the officials who had done the censoring, the subcommittee chairman accepted the White House gag with such alacrity that even the Washington Post chided him for it.

In the case of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which would conduct the probe of the State Department under the terms of Congressman ROUDEBUSH's resolution, the voting record of the committee chairman, THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania, is in no wise encouraging. Neither is that of the chairman of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations, WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio, to which subcommittee the task might be referred. The CSA voting index shows both MORGAN and HAYS with zero ratings in support of measures of this type, while the ACA index gives them a mere 9 percent and 16 percent, respectively, in support of constitutional principles.

Fortunately the concern of the folks back home regarding the situation in the State Department has already been voiced by some of Congressman ROUDEBUSH's most distinguished colleagues.

Wrote Congressman H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, in his report to his constituents on January 10, 1962:

"One of the most important items of business the new Congress should tackle immediately is to force a thorough shakeup and reorganization of the State Department.

"The desperate need for this action was made clear in connection with the Cuban invasion fiasco. But to the initiated in Washington the need has been abundantly clear for several years. Not only has the State Department failed time after time to properly assess foreign developments and thereby failed to make immediate and proper decisions, but it has repeatedly dictated to all other departments and agencies of Government.

"It is now known that the Federal Bureau of Investigation made available to the State Department in 1958, months before the revolutionary government in Cuba took over, a report which then branded Castro and his leading henchmen as disciples of Marx and Lenin.

"This report was buried in an office headed by William Wieland, director of Caribbean and Mexican Affairs. Neither Secretary of State Dulles, his successor, Christian Herter, nor the then President Eisenhower were made aware of the FBI report.

"But when the facts did become known, what happened to Wieland? Instead of being fired for burying a report which would have put Eisenhower and his Secretary of State on notice that Castro was a disciple of the Kremlin, Wieland, as is usual in the State Department, was promoted to another job in the same department with a substantial increase in pay.

"When Presidents and members of their Cabinets reward this kind of stupidity, incompetence and worse there is something rotten and it isn't, as the old saying goes, in Denmark."

Congressman BRUCE ALGER, of Texas, is similarly on record as follows:

"It's time to call the State Department to account. Much of our bungling in international affairs may be because we are slowly becoming the victims of a supergovernment known as the State Department. Many of our mistakes in foreign policy in recent years may be traced directly to decisions of the State Department, often made in defiance of known facts or in opposition to the administration in power. It is imperative that we find out now who is running the State Department and who is responsible for its policies. Only a brief recitation of the failures of the State Department shows they resulted in the loss of China to the Reds, the slow, steady march of communism through Asia, the loss of Laos, and the loss of Cuba right on our doorstep. It is time we call a halt to bungling with a thorough investigation of the State Department and its personnel."

The grim realities which I sketched in my book, "Inside the State Department," are increasingly being recognized. Certain elements sought to suppress that book, but it has nonetheless continued in demand, and a fifth printing will shortly be necessary.

Mounting indignation

There are many indications of the mounting concern of the American public on this issue. A petition circulated from New York reads:

"For some years past our foreign policy has been against the best interests of the United States and has caused this country irreparable harm.

"China and Cuba are two outstanding examples. To quote Senators JAMES O. EASTLAND and THOMAS J. DODD, respectively, chairman and vice chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, in a statement in the press:

"'Cuba was handed to Castro and the Communists by a combination of Americans in the same way that China was handed to the Communists.'

"The responsibility for these decisions appears to rest with the State Department, principally with lower level officials.

"Who are these individuals? Are they merely innocent, misguided persons? Or are alien influences operating among them? At any rate the country is in dire danger.

"Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, said in an address delivered in June 1960:

"'The condition clearly calls for a housecleaning of such elements in the Department of State, and their replacement with officials more conscious of their oath of office, which binds them to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, as well as the just and indispensable rights and authority of the Congress.'

"The time for a thorough investigation and for such a housecleaning is long past due. As American citizens we demand that it be made thoroughly and as promptly as possible."

Typical of the indications of public concern was a radio broadcast by Kent Courtney calling for "public hearings to determine who and what is wrong in our State Department." The commentator, who is publisher of the Independent American newspaper and national chairman of the Conservative Society of America, brought out that the State conventions of the American Legion in both California and Texas had called for an investigation of the State Department.

Along the same lines was a leading article some months back in the Reader's Digest, in which the writer said:

"Since the days when we were told that the Chinese Communists were mere agrarian reformers, too many men in the State Department have persisted in the dangerously wistful belief that if we don't annoy the Reds, they are bound to see how well meaning we are and will stop harassing us. Incredibly, this philosophy has infected the highest quarters of our Government. And all the while the Kremlin, teasing our naive desire to reach an understanding through the outworn traditions of polite negotiation, toys with us by hot and cold maneuvering as it inches forward toward total victory."

Dissatisfaction with the State Department is, incidentally, not confined to any one element in the body politic. Note, for example, how the weekly magazine, the Reporter, chose to advertise its issue of March 15 of this year:

"The Reporter tells how General Clay took the Berlin situation firmly in hand—before his hands were tied by the State Department. It shows how most of his positive moves were undermined or countermanded * * * how the State Department's soft stand belies it hard words * * * how one disillusioned West Berliner summed up the city's attitude by suggesting that the United States next retaliatory tactic against new Communist harassment might be a hunger strike."

Indicative of the temper of the times is a sharply worded resolution of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies which has come to hand as this is being written. The resolution calls for exhaustive inquiries of the type which Congressman ROUDEBUSH proposed for the State Department and asks that Congress "make known that no excuses, no evasions, no poor memories or pretehded anonymity, no shielding by higher-ups to protect political party names, no sudden transfers to distant posts will be tolerated; and that any official, of whatever rank, who attempts to frustrate or hinder the Congress in the exercise of its constitutional powers to investigate will be subject to impeachment. The coalition, it should be added, coordinates the efforts of more than 100 patriotic, civic, and fraternal societies with millions of members in the aggregate.

Many of the Nation's great newspapers—and here I particularly call to mind the New York Daily News, the Chicago Tribune, the New Bedford Standard-Times, and the Brooklyn Tablet—have long given editorial support to efforts to clean up the State Department. Others are joining in the demand for an investigation, as is illustrated by the following from the Arizona Republic:

"It is necessary only to point out that time and again, for whatever reason, persons or groups in the State Department have been guilty of incompetence at best and treason at worst, in situations ranging from the misinformation about Mao Tse-tung's agrarian reformers to misinformation about Fidel Castro's agrarian reformers.

"We believe, therefore, the Government owes it to all Americans to discover why we have staggered from blunder to blunder, from defeat to defeat, and find who is responsible. Only in that way can the State Department regain the respect and support of the American Nation."

Surgical operation advised

The realization that steps must be taken to correct the situation in the State Department is reflected in recent issues of the Reader's Digest and the Saturday Evening Post. In an excellent article in the former for January 1962, Frank L. Kluckholm, a veteran journalist who served in an official capacity in the Department in the last administration, tells how the present setup is failing us in the cold war, concluding with these words: "We must shake up the system at the State Department and bring about some real reforms. Now." Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, is quoted in the article as follows: "I believe that the time has come for a critical review of this entire situation. Those responsible for briefing us into disaster after disaster should be dismissed or transferred to nonpolicymaking posts where their penchant for wrongheadedness can do no harm."

In the Saturday Evening Post for March 3, 1962, Stewart Alsop writes on "The Trouble With the State Department," which trouble he attributes to the system.

One of Mr. Alsop's most significant proposals, presented, so he tells us, after his having talked with the present Secretary of State, two former Secretaries of State, and dozens of other knowledgeable people both in and out of the Department, calls for a "surgical operation." He reports that George Kennan, who, according to the accepted belief, is one of the two or three most brilliant men the State Department career service has produced, believes—now please note this—"that the State Department might well operate more effectively with half as many people." Mr. Alsop further reports that when Dean Rusk took over as Secretary of State, Dean Acheson suggested that former Secretary of Defense Robert Lovett and Acheson himself should perform a surgical operation on the bureaucracy, to cut the staff by 30 percent. Rusk, we are told, demurred.

This is of more than passing interest to me personally, as well as to the taxpayer, because when the administration changed hands in 1953, I spelled out a 50-percent cut, which I urged, in a memorandum to the incoming Under Secretary for Administration. Mr. Dulles was, in fact, committed to something of the kind, for his party platform had pledged that "we shall sever from the public payroll the hordes of loafers, incompetents and unnecessary employees who clutter the administration of foreign affairs."

The pledge not having been fulfilled, I renewed the recommendation when I testified before congressional appropriation committees following my retirement. Representatives of the bureaucracy loudly pooh-poohed the idea, and a witness for State, an appointed official who barely knew his way around the Department, denounced my proposal as "irresponsible"—the latter term being a favorite bureaucratic cuss word. Now we know not only that Dulles was pledged to a drastic cut but also that even George Kennan and Dean Acheson, both the idols of many in the Department, also favor a "surgical operation". Yet year after year the Department has requested increased funds for additional personnel, and the Congress year after year has acquiesced in the mounting payroll.

A few years ago when certain shortcomings of the Department were attributed by spokesmen to a cut in funds, with the blame thereby shifted to ROONEY (Congressman JOHN ROONEY, of Brooklyn, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee which handles State Department requests), the retort from ROONEY was a boast of how generous he had been with the taxpayers' money. Said Mr. ROONEY:

"Take the Foreign Service Institute. In 1952 we gave it $1,245,000; the next year the Republicans cut it to $768,000. In 1955, when we got back in, we gave it more than $2 million. Last year, $4,679,000. Who's doing any slashing there? Holy cat.

"And while we're at it, let's take up that consulate matter; let's take a look at the appropriations for 'Salaries and expenses'—90 percent of the whole budget. In 1953, the Department got $65,600,000. Last year they got $98,088,000. You call that slashing?"

And while I am at it, let me bring the story of ROONEY's munificence more nearly up to date. In the hearings for the current fiscal year, it is revealed that the expenditures for "Salaries and expenses" for the year ending last June 30 had risen to $121,496,183 out of a total grant of $278,528,804. To think that Cordell Hull used to operate the Department on a mere $17 million.

By December 31 of last year, the Department of State—which has already outgrown its new building, the largest office building in Washington—had a total on its payroll, at home and abroad, of almost 40,000 employees—39,084, to be exact. This figure, which includes the staff engaged in the foreign giveaway programs, was supplied by the Congressional Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Quite understandably, the writer for the Saturday Evening Post put the need for a "surgical operation" at the head of the list of things to be done. He contends, however, that in the absence of authorization from Congress, a general overhaul cannot be effected, because of present Foreign Service, civil service, and veterans' legislation. He argues that when the State Department is hit by a RIF—reduction in force—the good new people go, while the drones, as he terms them, protected by veterans' legislation and seniority, stay on.

A congressional investigating committee would do well to explore the considerations just mentioned and come up with appropriate legislative measures. But more imperative is the need for the removal, without further delay, of the John Carter Vincents and John Patton Davies of the present day, following the precedents set by the late John Foster Dulles, as outlined earlier. If any renewal of legislative authority is necessary in this connection, it should be provided forthwith.

The reporter for the Saturday Evening Post, evidently reflecting the views of Acheson, Kennan, and others of that school of thought, would go so far as to have top officials authorized to hire, fire, and promote as they pleased. The Dulles precedents were set without so broad a grant. Despite the admitted defects in the present machinery, there are still a goodly number of Americans who would hesitate to give a completely free hand to very many of the top officials of the Department in recent memory.

Watchdog committee essential

One sad lesson which the American people must surely have learned through the years from the Teapot Dome scandal, the Hiss case, the China debacle, and the Cuban disaster is that the executive branch of the Federal Government cannot be trusted to cleanse its stables. Pressure from Congress always becomes necessary to get the job done. Nor can the task be safely delegated to a single official, as has been repeatedly demonstrated in the failures in past attempts at housecleaning. John Foster Dulles made a start at it, but he soon yielded to pressures both inside and outside the Department; before long he was backing the very elements he was pledged to purge from the rolls. Donald B. Lourie, a successful businessman and former all-American quarterback, was given a post in 1953 specially created by Congress with a view to correcting the situation, but he encountered so much resistance that he chucked the job after a year and went back to private life. To Scott McLeod, who came into the Department with powerful backing on Capitol Hill, was given the task of eliminating security risks, but he, too, succumbed to pressures and eventually chose to "play with the team." Fresh hopes were raised when the son of Herbert Hoover was brought in as Under Secretary, but he was crowded out before he had accomplished anything. From this recital there is only one possible conclusion: Congress must set up a watchdog committee to follow developments and see that the housecleaning job really gets done.

Must get at the truth

If a full and complete investigation is to be conducted—and there is little point in having anything less than that—the congressional committee must have full access to pertinent documents, for only in that way can responsibility be fixed with certainty. It would be folly for some higher-up to assume a coverup role when, on interrogation, it developed, as it did when Under Secretary Ball appeared before the Senate investigators of the censoring of military men, that the higher-up official in reality knew nothing about what had been going on in his Department. The committee could hardly hope to get at the truth about the Cuban disaster, for example, by talking with Secretary Rusk; the William Wielands and the Roy Rubottoms must be quizzed.

The difficulty is heightened by the extent to which the policymakers have succeeded in suppressing official papers dealing with diplomatic activities. When Congress in 1953 ordered the publication of the full record of our foreign relations brought up to date, the Department promised to comply. This record was then some 17 years in arrears, so much so as to be worthless for current purposes. Some fragmentary collections of these papers had, to be sure, been released, as in the case of the infamous China white paper, but these heightened public suspicions. Today the situation is even worse, for now the record is further than ever in arrears. As a sop to critics, the Department has assembled and reprinted formal documents released on various occasions, but the basic purposes of our policy planners, which would show up in working papers, remain hidden.

When Donald Dozer and I revealed some years ago that the Department was deliberately dragging its feet in this matter, the coverup artists were violent in their denials, as was to be expected. Time has substantiated our charge. In the same connection I testified that the published record, as in the case of the Yalta papers, was being doctored. Department officials were emphatic in asserting that nothing whatever of importance had been omitted. Some time later, however, they got around to admitting that there might have been one or two little deletions—but nothing, absolutely nothing, of any importance. Among the deletions finally admitted were papers dealing with the problem of the Berlin corridor, which is hardly a subject of minor importance these days.

Papers on Teheran and Potsdam were finally brought out last year, but even this was not done until after a citizens' committee had taken the matter up directly with men on Capitol Hill and with President Eisenhower himself. But the truth about the China debacle is still hidden, and the record as a whole is now not 17 but a full 20 years in arrears and unavailable.

In the course of House appropriation hearings in 1960, some years after my revelations regarding the censoring of the official diplomatic record, Congressman FRANK BOW of Ohio interrogated a Department spokesman at some length to determine to what extent not only individuals within the Department but foreign governments as well can cause documents to be suppressed. The Congressman was forced to the unhappy conclusion that what is given out to the American people is limited to what the officials feel the public should be told.

I have always been glad that I left the Department under circumstances that permitted no doubt as to my opposition to developing trends in the bureaucracy. The circumstances validated my right to speak out in the years that have followed. After I testified before the House Appropriations Subcommittee to urge a housecleaning and a 50 percent cut in personnel, the bureaucracy and its fellow travelers struck back in an attempt to smear me. I had been "insubordinate," they said. The state of affairs in the Department being what it was, the assertion that I had revolted could, I believe, be taken as a compliment. I was "disgruntled," they said. Friends of recent years who know what a relief it was to me to leave the alien atmosphere of the bureaucracy can laugh at that one. The net result of the smear attack on me, as Bill Buckley pointed out in the National Review at the time, was that my book was sent into another printing and I received many additional requests to speak to interested groups across the land—and wonderful audiences they were.

Of my experiences in the Department, and likewise those of my colleague, Donald Dozer, I think that Senator Jenner summed up the situation well when he wrote in this connection: "Every man in our Government who attempts to make it a policy to safeguard America and support the nations which wish to remain free, will encounter the unforgiving enmity of the group in high places who are determined to carry on, by revolution, by assembly line, the slow but unceasing construction of the world collectivist state."

The danger analyzed

Because of my having served so many years in the State Department, both before the days of Alger Hiss and thereafter, and because of my known opposition to communism, I often receive appeals for help in identifying the Red cell or cells which inquirers assume to be the source of our troubles there. This is something best left to the FBI. Scott McLeod, himself a former FBI agent, once stated that he had found not one Communist in the State Department in his years at the head of the security work there.

If in this we are referring to card-carrying Communists as such, then I feel that we tend to miss the issue, for our primary concern must be with the policymakers. Soft on communism many of the latter obviously are, but that is not to say that they are actually Communists at heart. But here let me say that I doubt that any Red agents straight from Moscow could possibly do more harm to America than has been done, and is being done, by these officials of the Department, unwittingly or otherwise, through the disastrous policies which they have devised, recommended, and promoted in recent years.

To carry this thought further I cannot do better than to quote from the Indianapolis News, where Stan Evans, who knows the Washington scene from his days on the staff of Human Events, conducts an able editorial column. The following statement is a classic on the subject:

"Subversion, as the recent defections from the National Security Agency demonstrate, is indeed a danger—much more so than the liberals would have us believe. But it is not the principal danger—and it is not what most anti-Communists refer to when they say the real problem is internal.

"The internal danger, instead, is liberalism itself. It is the complex of beliefs, slogans, and biases which substitutes disastrous illusions for the hard imperatives of realistic policy; which bemuses the American mind with reveries of world opinion and understanding with the Communists, and which pursues fantasies designed to win the cold war by giving billions of dollars to Communist nations. It is the mentality which has led America into the paths of weakness and delusion and which has handed the Kremlin one victory after another.

"It was the internal threat of liberalism, for example, which needlessly betrayed anti-Communist governments in Poland and Yugoslavia; which made fantastic concessions to Stalin at Yalta and Teheran; which told us Mao Tse-tung was an agrarian reformer, and consigned 600 million Chinese to the living death of communism; which portrayed Fidel Castro as a Latin George Washington and turned Cuba over to the Kremlin; which at this moment is helping undermine the anti-Communist regime of Moise Tshombe in the Congo.

"In each of these episodes, a policy of minimal intelligence would have thwarted the objectives of the Communists. Instead, in each one the Communists won or are winning a major victory, thanks to our liberal-directed policy. * * *

"The United States today is by far the strongest nation in the world. If its strength is used intelligently, it has, even today, little to fear from communism. What it does have to fear is the likelihood that, under the liberal stewardship, its strength will not be used, or will be used stupidly, or worst of all, will be used to defeat anti-Communists and aid pro-Communists (as has been the case in the Congo)."

Spotlight those responsible

In any investigation of the State Department too much time should not be spent with the top officials, for it is the men down the line, the area officials, the career men, who do the work and actually make policy. I have observed this fact under many Secretaries of State. Newspaper accounts tend to give an entirely false impression, and it takes sworn testimony, as in the hearings on the Cuban debacle, to bring out the realities of the situation. Said our former Ambassador to Cuba, Earl Smith, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on August 30, 1960:

"I have learned from experience and observation that in our system the actions by the lower echelon and those who are influential in the lower echelon form our policy, and when those higher act upon them, the policies have already been determined by events."

Many veteran observers have testified likewise. Cordell Hull, who served as Secretary of State longer than any other man has ever done, wrote in his memoirs regarding the key role of the desk officer in the making of policy. John Foster Dulles was the one Secretary of State who was assumed to be an exception to the rule in this regard, but when one of the news magazines was permitted to have a reported stay with Mr. Dulles throughout a full working day in the Department, it was found that he was in constant consultation with his specialists. obviously guided by their recommendations.

Recently the following item appeared in U.S. News & World Report:

"On the question of who really runs the U.S. Government, a top-ranking Kennedy appointee remarked: 'Those of us with big titles sign the mail, but career officials of the civil service run the show.' "

In January 1949 John F. Kennedy, now President of the United States but then a Congressman from Massachusetts, declared with reference to the foreign policy at that time: "It is of the utmost importance that we search out and spotlight those who must bear the responsibility for our present predicament." The principle is as valid today as it was in 1949. The executive branch having failed to deal with the situation, the burden now rests with the Congress. Because of the uncertainties of congressional action, however, and because of the bias of much of the press and TV, one who knows about the mess at firsthand, as I do, owes it to his country to help shed light on the situation.

While it is not feasible within the covers of this one book to spotlight every one of the hundreds of policymakers on the payroll of the Secretary of State, one chapter, as previously stated, will survey a few of these careers. The reader will then be in a better position to say for himself whether men of the type indicated should be retained and promoted, as in the past, or dealt with as were John Carter Vincent and John Paton Davies.

Remember, they praised Alger Hiss

The general public—and Members of Congress as well—would be well advised not to take pronouncements from the bureaucracy at anything like face value. Recently Congressman JOHANSEN, of Michigan, declared that he was fed up and for many reasons, one being that he was "fed up with American officials deliberately lying to the Nation and the world—as, for example, denying in U.N. debate that we had intervened in Cuba and later admitting to the press that we had trained, financed and equipped the Cuban invaders." In a subsequent chapter I enumerate a long series of similar instances in which our foreign-policy officials have deceived the American people.

Nor can the evaluation by diplomatic officials of their own colleagues be trusted. After all, did not a whole coterie of them testify to the spotless character of one Alger Hiss?

Extremists at the top

Having made clear that it is the career officials, rather than the political appointees upon whom the spotlight of an investigation needs to be turned, we can discuss the top officers and new men brought in with the recent change of administration without overplaying their role. According to the writer in the Saturday Evening Post, there were in the State, at the time he wrote, 74 officials in this group, the Kennedy appointees. As a former Rhodes scholar myself, the first thing that hit me as I went down the list was the frequency with which the names of other Rhodes scholars appeared on the list. First there is the Secretary of State himself, a former Rhodes man; and then we come to George C. McGhee, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs; Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs; and Walt Whitman Rostow, Counselor and Chairman of the Policy Planning Council—all of them Rhodes men, with still others on down the list.

Quite frankly, this is too much of a good thing. Most of these particular officials are of the extreme left wing, ADA school of thought. Moreover, the recent utterances of Senator FULBRIGHT, the most widely known of Rhodes scholars, with his disparaging remarks about the Constitution, his belittling attacks on our military leaders, his readiness to surrender our sovereignty as a Nation, and his open advocacy of what constitutes a virtual dictatorship in the United States, have deeply shocked millions of good Americans who could think of no other explanation for such reasoning than the fact that FULBRIGHT had been trained at Oxford as a Rhodes scholar.

If it was Oxford men that Mr. Kennedy wanted, it might have been far more reassuring to the public if he had brought in, instead, two whose names come to mind, namely, Frank Holman and Alexander Dick. Holman is a former head of the American Bar Association and the man who authored the Bricker amendment and led the fight for its adoption. The other gentleman is a New York lawyer who led a group of Rhodes men in the fight to retain the Connally reservation. There, for a change, we would have men—both of them Rhodes scholars—who believe 100 percent in constitutional principles and the American way of life.

It may be, of course, that Mr. Kennedy thought that the presence of so many Rhodes men would kindle an "intellectual" air in what someone once termed "a den of thieves." But in sober truth it must be conceded that in the initial winning of a Rhodes scholarship, the way the system is operated, the facile type rather than the profound thinker has the advantage; and I do not recall that any of Kennedy's men in State won more than an ordinary degree at Oxford or made any great splash in doing so.

The official record of the first man on the list fails to inspire any particular confidence. Fulton Lewis has reminded us that Dean Rusk, as Assistant Secretary of State under Dean Acheson, 'parroted the line, just before the Korean war, that the Chinese Communists were 'agrarian reformers,' revolutionaries much like the American Founding Fathers."

Mr. Lewis also recalls that when the Korean conflict broke out, "Rusk was instrumental in keeping the United States from going all out to win the war. He vetoed the Joint Chiefs' suggestion that battle-trained National Chinese troops be brought into the war, and helped persuade President Truman to prevent General MacArthur from going across the Yalu."

I recall first meeting Mr. Rusk when he came into the Department to take over the post formerly held by Alger Hiss. As chief of the treaty staff at the time, I was called in to advise the new official briefly on certain points. There was nothing on that or subsequent occasions to suggest that congressional investigators should be awed by Dean Rusk's views on current matters.

Another of the Rhodes men on the list of appointed officials, Harlan Cleveland has met with severe criticism on his role in the Congo matter.

Non-Rhodes men in the group of appointed officials include George Ball, the Under Secretary of State, and G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, who as Governor of Michigan led his State into virtual bankruptcy. Ball revealed his utter ignorance of what was going on in the Department in his initial testimony before the Stennis subcommittee. As for "Soapy," I doubt that anyone takes him seriously in his present role.

The turnover among political appointees to the Department is usually rapid, as in the case of Chester Bowles, who lasted only a few months in the No. 2 spot. Not infrequently the men with the high-sounding titles are bewildered by the bureaucratic maze and the ramifications and complexities of foreign policy. Dependent on their advisers at every turn, they are soon taken in by the clever operators in the Department—and, no change having been made at the working level, the policies continue much the same from one administration to the next.

Trouble traced to the system

Some observers attribute our troubles in the Department to certain aspects of the system, to the exclusion of factors which I have reviewed in the foregoing, such as the activities and influence of men like John Carter Vincent, John Patton Davies, and William Wieland. By the term "system," as employed in this particular sense, is meant the cumbersome bureaucratic machinery—the delays and uncertainties, the flood of memorandums and other papers, and the unending round of committee meetings—as well as the nice mixture of noncontroversialness and colorless semicompetence—which, as all agree, has rendered the Department seemingly incapable in recent years of rendering prompt and effective action.

The articles in the Reader's Digest and the Saturday Evening Post to which I have referred dwell at some length on depressing aspects of this system, which could be summed up in the question of the White House aid who could not get from the Department certain policy information he needed. "What the devil do these people do all day?"

It is a question which I have often been asked and one which I answered in my book, "Inside the State Department." I will have more to say regarding the system, particularly with respect to certain of its truly vicious aspects, in a later chapter. I do not share Kennan's view that nothing can be done to correct this situation. Cutting the staff down to a reasonable size would be a big step in that direction. The present cumbersome procedures came with the overstaffing. The Post writer admits as much when he says: "Ten or fifteen years ago, before the system really took hold, it required a day or two to get approval for routine negotiations. Now it often requires 6 to 8 weeks. The man-hours devoted to really grave issues stretch into eons."

It is to be hoped, however, that neither the public nor any congressional committee will allow attention to be diverted too long by matters of procedure or organization setup. It is a well-established axiom that any system will work if the right men are on the job. If we will oust the appeasers and install in their places men who believe in American principles with all their hearts and are determined that we shall win the cold war, the State Department can regain its proper role, never fear.

An alarming parallel

Use of the term "the system" brings up something which merits the most earnest attention in any investigation of the State Department. I refer to the widespread fear in large segments of the American public that the thinking of the State Department is dominated by an outside unofficial body, the Council of Foreign Relations (the CFR); that the council, with its interlock in radio, TV, and major elements in the press, along with other similar organizations, is responsible in large measure for the adoption and pursuit of the policies which have proved so disastrous in recent years; and that council members hold key posts in the State Department and elsewhere throughout the Federal Government.

These charges have been documented at some lengths in the weekly Dan Smoot Report. Himself a former FBI agent, Dan Smoot is one of the keenest present-day commentators on public affairs and has a wide following in many parts of the country.

I am not certain that my own observations within the Department over a long period of years tend to support this concept of the CFR role. I found that the Department itself, rather than any outside group, serves as the base for the policy planners and that it uses the CFR and similar outfits to help spread the official gospel and the dream of a world socialist state. Except for unfortunate dependence on the New York Times, as in the Cuban matter, the desk officers are, in fact, in large measure insulated from the mainstream of American thought by their preoccupation with alien points of view.

One need not accept all the implications of the indictment of the CFR, however, to recognize the possibility of a dangerously close parallel between the present-day role of the CFR and that of the Institute of Pacific Relations (the IPR) some years back. To indicate what I mean, I need only quote the following from the findings of the special Senate subcommittee which investigated the IPR in 1951:

"IPR activities were made possible largely through the financial support of American industrialists, corporations, and foundations, the majority of whom were not familiar with the inner workings of the organization.

"The names of eminent individuals were by design used as a respectable and impressive screen for the activities of the IPR inner core, and as a defense when such activities came under scrutiny.

"The IPR possessed close organic relations with the State Department through interchange of personnel, attendance of State Department officials at IPR conferences, constant exchange of information and social contacts.

"During the period 1945–49, persons associated with the Institute of Pacific Relations were instrumental in keeping U.S. policy on a course favorable to Communist objectives in China.

"The net effect of IPR activities on United States public opinion has been such as to serve international Communist interests and to affect adversely the interests of the United States."

Infiltrating the military

Infiltration of the Armed Forces with appeasers from the State Department is another charge which should be looked into by congressional investigators, particularly now that Foreign Service officers are increasingly being detailed as advisers—some critics use the term "political commissars"—at military posts. The assignment of Roy Rubottom to the Naval War College is a recent case in point.

"To impose Mr. Rubottom on dedicated officers of the U.S. Navy, studying naval strategy at the War College in Newport, R.I., is an outrage," declared the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C. The editor continued: "Officers who know the story of State Department mishandling of Fidel Castro will rightly resent Mr. Rubottom's assignment as an 'adviser.' For a naval officer, running a ship aground usually means the end of a career—at least the end of opportunity for advancement. But Mr. Rubottom ran the whole United States aground on the political shoals of Cuba—and he is rewarded with an ambassadorship and a chance to advise future leaders of the U.S. Navy."

One heard similar protests expressed when it was learned that Robert Strong had in 1958 been assigned as a faculty adviser at the Army War College at Carlisle, Pa. This officer, as was noted earlier, was, in sworn testimony before a congressional committee prior to the recent assignment, charged with having sent reports out of Formosa—in his capacity as our top diplomat there—which were misleading and helpful to the Communists.

It is recalled in connection with these assignments that John D. Hickerson was sent to the National War College in Washington as deputy commandant in 1953, later going to Finland as Ambassador. Prior to the National War College assignment, Hickerson, a veteran Foreign Service officer, had come under fire from a congressional committee in connection with the hiring of undesirables by the U.N. at a time when he was the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of relations with the U.N. It was alleged that the Department had been slow in supplying adverse information about Americans on the U.N. staff. Subsequent publication of the Yalta papers brought to light a memorandum by Hickerson in 1945 recommending extensive concessions to Stalin.

Difficulties which our top military leaders have had with State Department advisers are clear from the record. General Wedemeyer mentions the "entirely justified suspicions" which General Hurley had of the State Department political advisers which the former had on his staff. General Wedemeyer adds: "Today, reading through the reports sent to me and to the State Department by Davies, Service, Emerson, and Ludden, it seems obvious not only that their sympathies lay with the Chinese Communists, but also that they were either consciously or unwittingly disseminating exaggerated or false, Communist-inspired reports concerning the Nationalist Government designed to stir up all manner of Sino-American distrust."

Similarly, Gen. Mark Clark, who had served in both Europe and the Far East, wrote that he "could not help wondering and worrying whether we were faced with open enemies across the conference table and hidden enemies who sat with us in our most secret councils."

The reader will find the following from the Economic Council letter of last December 15 particularly enlightening in this connection:

"Almost unnoticed so far in the discussion, is the determination of the foreign policy planners, from their base in the State Department, to take over policymaking in defense and limit our military men to technical questions only—those having nothing to do with whom we should fight, or when or where or how.

"The role of the foreign policy planners in military policy is further confused by the deep ideological split between the two branches of government, on communism. The State Department has for over 20 years been soft on communism, while most of our military leaders are firmly anti-Communist. The foreign policy planners do not argue for communism. Not at all. Their line is to say that enemy is international communism. Any hint of communism here at home is stupid or wicked. The military are therefore obliged to raise the matter of communism here at home, in government, politics, and other public opinion forming agencies. To make the confusion complete, the planners make every effort to put their sympathizers into the top civilian jobs in the Defense Department."

In recent months the State Department censors have been deleting warnings of the Communist danger from the speeches of our military leaders, while at the same time the Reds have been spreading their tentacles throughout Latin America—this from their base in Cuba, 90 miles from our shores, which they gained with the help of State Department officials.

There are, indeed, many reasons why an investigation of the State Department has become imperative.

Mr. Speaker, that Congress should take a careful look at State Department operations is only too obvious. The investigation should be a carefully planned effort to find out what we must do to make the Department a more effective instrument for the execution of our foreign policy.

If the Department is to be staffed with people who are adequately prepared to cope with the problems which confront our Nation overseas, a Foreign Service Academy such as I propose in my bill H.R. 7291 must be established. The Academy which I have proposed would—

First, provide a 5-year program of study, covering in depth, first, three basic languages; second, the history, cultures, and customs of nations in which students at the Academy may serve; third, extensive U.S. history and governmental processes; fourth, psychological warfare, including instruction in Communist propaganda techniques; fifth, survival in jungle and remote areas; and, sixth, military strategy and its relation to diplomacy.

Second, be coeducational, admitting students who, first, have demonstrated high scholarship and leadership qualities; and, second, pass a rigorous mental and physical admission in the same manner that candidates for admission to the Military Academies are appointed.

Third, exchange teachers with the Military Academies in order that future military and overseas civilian representatives, including State Department Foreign Service officers, can better understand and respect each other's problems.

Fourth, confer the bachelor of arts degree for the first 4 years and the master of arts degree for the fifth year.

To conclude, Congress must investigate State Department operations with the view to recommending changes which will enable the Department to execute our foreign policy more expeditiously and effectively. Moreover, a Foreign Service Academy such as I have proposed must be established in order to train personnel for the Department who are capable of meeting the problems which we face overseas, especially those created by the international Communist conspiracy.

INDIAN CLAIMS AGAINST THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I believe anyone who has any knowledge of Indians and the Indian problems of America will agree with me that one of the most disgusting articles to appear in print in recent years is one appearing in the March issue of Life magazine over the authorship of Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General of the United States, entitled "Buying It Back From the Indians." This young man, brother of the President, who has been traveling all over the world, telling peoples of other nations what they must do and how they must get their own house in order, tells the world in this article how surprised he was to find that the United States must still pay for lands and property taken by force from the Indians, for which settlement has never been made by the Government.

The whole article, Mr. Speaker, is written with a view of making light of the Indian claims against the Federal Government. It was really quite humorous to young Bobby to find that there have been some 370 claims filed before the Indian Claims Commission. It seems strange to me for him to set forth the fact that in 15 years only 33 of these claims have been finished, that 10 others are on appeal to the U.S. Court of Claims, and that some 76 are nearing completion and about 200 in various stages of trial.

Mr. Speaker, the reason these claims have not been settled is, because, as young Bobby indicates, the Federal Government has gone to every extreme in attempting to prove that the Indians are wrong, that the white man owes no money for the lands and property that he has taken from the Indian, that the Federal Government is not under obligation to keep its treaties with the Indian people.

Mr. Speaker, if the American Indian were located on any island in the world, or in any country in the world, other than within the United States, this same Federal Government would be flocking to that shore with boatloads of money trying to force them to take the cash and to use our gold and our currency to build up their economy—not so, Mr. Speaker, when these people live within our borders.

Peoples all around the world, who are of equal living standards, who are in similar economic conditions, and who are even less interested in becoming civilized and raising their standards of living to those of the non-Indian people in the United States, are having billions of dollars dumped in their laps, year after year, through a program known as foreign aid but when it comes to aiding and assisting the Indians within the borders of America the Federal Government will give them nothing and Mr. Kennedy and his trained staff of assistants are taking every case to the highest court in the land to keep from paying the Indian the damages that are justly due to him.

Mr. Speaker, I assume the purpose of this article was to be cute and to make interesting reading for those who know nothing about Indians and the Indian problem. I suppose it may be interesting reading and quite light and trifling for a young man whose father is a multi-multi-millionaire and who has never wanted for anything, for a young man whose brother has become President of the United States and has appointed him to one of the most important Cabinet spots in America. To him it is funny. To him it is humorous to even think that someone who formerly owned property, who formerly owned territory, who formerly owned these regions, and who were driven out by force, should now have the audacity to ask compensation from this great Federal Government. To him it is probably humorous to imagine that the great-grandfathers of the Sioux Indian people who lived in the State of South Dakota, for example, and who made a firm and binding contract with the Federal Government, believing that their contract and their treaty was as good as the gold behind it, only to find that neither the contract nor the treaty are worth the paper they were written on, and Bobbie's job is to get the courts to agree with this "treaty breaking" philosophy of the Department of Justice.

These are the things the young Attorney General tells the people of America were such a surprise to him. Why should the Indian people lay claim in damages for their lands?

In the article he says:

> Another determination necessary in the Indian claims may be the most difficult of all: How much was the land in a specific area worth at the time it was acquired by the white man?

This, Mr. Speaker, is one of the most unfair questions that can be asked. Mr. Speaker, the price of land is or should be determined by what a willing seller is willing to accept from a willing buyer. In not one single instance, Mr. Speaker, has there been the case of a willing seller and a willing buyer. In every claim before the Indian Claims Commission the Indians were not willing sellers, they were forced to sell, they were forced to move, they were forced to flee at the point of a gun. Neither was the Federal Army nor the white settlers a willing buyer. They took the land at the point of a gun. Yet the young Attorney General writes a voluminous article, telling about the numbers of attorneys he has working in the Archives, digging through old files, attempting to arrive at a fair market price for this land, at the time it was taken.

You can be sure, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has no one digging through the Archives attempting to represent the Indian people in trying to determine what would be just and fair for them, having been routed from their homes and forced to suffer from the inclemencies of winter storms and blizzards. No one is digging through the Archives attempting to compensate these people for these hardships suffered by them.

The young Attorney General has not indicated that he plans to hire any help to dig into the meaning of some of the treaties with these Indian people, treaties wherein the Federal Government agreed to provide assistance for the Indians so long as the water shall flow and the grass is green.

Possibly the Attorney General could find something humorous in those phrases if he tried. The Indian people can be sure of one thing, this young Attorney General will be turning all of his efforts and all of his talent toward defeating them in court, rather than paying them in justice.

In his article the young Attorney General had this to say:

> In a second case involving income from canoes, one Chippewa complained to the Commission about a personal loss, even though the Indian Claims Act does not provide for individual claims. He held up a picture of an enormous canoe. He said it would hold 20, and judging by the picture there was no doubting him. "You've ruined my business," he said. "I used to get $5 a head for taking people over the rapids. Now the rapids are gone." The rapids, near Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., had been eliminated by construction of locks on the St. Mary's River.
>
> "The white man may have taken away your business," responded Mr. Barney, appearing for the Government, "but he also gave you your business in the first place."

The young Attorney General is using this example, Mr. Speaker, to make the Indian look silly before the reading public. It is no doubt true that this Indian had a large canoe that would hold 20 people and that he made a good living taking tourists over the rapids near Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. It may be real funny to the young Attorney General to think that he would come before the Claims Commission asking damages for the white man having taken away his business from him. This may seem real funny to him and to many of his readers.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that while the young Attorney General was writing his article and getting it sold to Life magazine, his brother, the President of the United States was writing another article. This article was a message to Congress in which the President of the United States asked the American taxpayer to give him the authority to cut tariffs or completely dispense with tariffs, permitting imports to come into this country from every foreign country in the world and then he asked Congress to provide subsidies and direct payments to the businesses and industries and firms that would be damaged by such competitive imports. In this message that the President was writing to Congress he not only asked Congress to subsidize the industries injured but also to subsidize the labor that was put out of jobs and the communities that were injured by both the industry being damaged and the labor being thrown out of work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it was a real scream for the youthful Attorney General to have an Indian come to the Federal Government and ask for a subsidy, because his industry had been injured by Federal manipulation, but it is strictly good business for the youthful President of the United States to come before Congress and ask for assistance to other industries injured by Federal manipulation of trade and tariffs. Is there so much difference between turning off the trade spigot and the water spigot in this river?

Certainly there is a difference, Mr. Speaker. In one instance we are dealing with our own people—good American citizens. In the other instance we are dealing with foreign investors and foreign industrialists and attempting to provide a market for them. When the young Attorney General tells about one person who is injured by Federal action this is a joke and sufficiently humorous to be able to sell his article to a large publishing company.

When the other brother provides a parallel situation it is dead serious and he claims the subsidies must be paid to American industries and American labor and American communities in order to protect the American economy.

The young Attorney General continues in his article by saying:

> And yet I have to remind myself that in this area the spirit of the New Frontier must be tempered to cope with the unique problems of the old frontier—and these are not simply legal problems.

I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether this is intended as a witticism or a statement of a fact. If it is a witticism it is a very humble attempt and if it is a fact then Congress should begin to take action.

If the New Frontier is to serve the Indian people as the old frontier did, then the Indian people had better get atomic warheads on their arrows and head toward Washington because in the old frontier the Army moved westward with the pioneer. They rounded up the Indians and placed them in concentration camps and then down through the years they forced the Indian to live on these concentration camp areas. In later years they became known as Indian reservations—the poorest, the most worthless soil of any land in the area.

It was 50 years ago that the Federal Government established what is today known as "foreign aid" on all of these Indian reservations and after 50 years of foreign aid in which the purpose of the Government was to bring the Indian people up to the standard of living of the non-Indian people they are beginning to discover that the system has been wrong for 50 years, that it has been a complete failure, so this system that has proven worthless and valueless, this system that has wasted two generations of Indian people, is now being copied by the State Department and tried again in every country in the free world.

Yes, the youthful Attorney General, who was so surprised when he moved into his office to find that the Indian people might have the intestinal fortitude to claim payment for that which is rightfully theirs, now must remind himself that in this era the spirit of the New Frontier must be tempered to cope with the unique problems of the old frontier.

Mr. Speaker, if the Kennedy boys are so hard up financially that they must use the prestige of their offices to sell this kind of tripe to the publishers of the Nation, working on taxpayers' time and putting the proceeds from the sale in their own private pockets, they should at least vent their humor on someone and some group other than the Indian people.

They scream about civil rights and the minorities in the South but they make money and sell magazine stories by tearing down the minority groups in the North.

Mr. Speaker, this, in my judgment, is an unpardonable sin.

COMPLACENCY IN UNITED STATES AS TO DANGER OF COMMUNISM

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of the series of excellent articles being written by former Vice President Nixon appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday, April 3. There is a final article to come.

Mr. Speaker, the gist of Mr. Nixon's article is that there is a complacency in the United States as to the dangers of communism here at home, coupled with diverse opinions on the subject, ranging from J. Edgar Hoover's deep concern to Robert Kennedy's statement that the Communist Party in this country has only 10,000 members and is a political organization of no danger in the United States. This amounts to still another example of the left hand of the administration not knowing what the right is up to, or how it feels about a given situation. I believe that the time has come for the Congress to take action designed to root out the dangers from within and to eradicate the Communist menace with every available weapon.

I do not feel that I can add very much to what Mr. Nixon says about our lack of concern with this very great danger, since his recommended eight-point program very candidly tells us what we must do. However, I should like to tie into his program a piece of legislation that passed the House in the 86th Congress and again nearly a year ago, and that has been awaiting Senate action since. That is my bill, H.R. 3247, to amend section 2385, title 18, United States Code, to define and broaden the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act of 1940, which outlaws conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States.

Identical bills passed the House in the 85th and 86th Congresses and, as I said, my bill passed last May 15, in each case without opposition. It is a bill that has the approval of the Department of Justice, and I am strongly hopeful for positive Senate action before long, since the menace of communism grows stronger with each passing day.

Mr. Speaker, since the Smith Act was passed, the Communists have not relented in their efforts to organize groups and cells dedicated to the purpose of overthrowing our form of government. Although the Smith Act states that organizing groups for this purpose is illegal, the Supreme Court of the United States subsequently decided, in the case of *Yates* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 298), that the term "organize" as used in the act referred to the original organization of the Communist Party in this country, rather than to any subsequent continuous, organizing, and, of course, the pinks and the fellow travelers and the rest of their ilk have had a field day since.

The Smith Act, as written, made it a crime for a person to commit any of three defined acts. The first was to knowingly or willfully advocate the overthrow, by force or by violence, of any Government in the United States; the second was to organize any society or group to teach or advocate the violent overthrow of any such Government; the third was to be a member of or affiliated with any such society or group.

The Yates case involved the question of whether 14 known Communists had violated the first 2 parts of the act. The defendants had been convicted after jury trial on a single count of indictment charging them with conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Government by force and violence and with organizing groups for the same purpose. Their convictions had been affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The Supreme Court of the United States reversed the convictions and held that as to "advocacy" there must be actual incitement to action, and that the term "organize" referred only to the official organization of the Communist Party and not to a continuing process of organization. In the opinion of the Court, that took place in 1945 when the Communist Political Association was disbanded and reconstituted the Communist Party of the United States. The indictment, returned in 1951, was therefore barred by the 3-year statute of limitations.

The Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives studied the legislative history of the Smith Act, and concluded that the term "organize" was intended to mean a continuous process of organizing groups and cells and of recruiting new members and not merely the original organization of the Communist Party or some other party or society whose aims are inimical to the security of the United States. The trial court in the Yates case had instructed the jury that the term "organize" included such things as "the recruiting of new members and the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of any society, party, group, or other organization." The committee has concluded that this definition adequately expresses the original intention of Congress when it enacted the Smith Act, and the bill recommended by the committee contains substantially that language.

The necessity for immediate action to counteract the effects of the Yates decision is borne out by a report received by the subcommittee from the Department of Justice outlining the history of Smith Act conspiracy cases since the decisions in Yates against United States. The following seven such cases have been reversed by courts of appeal, at least in part based upon the Yates decision's definition of "organize":

First. Bary case, Denver, 10th circuit (248 Fed. 2d 201): Seven defendants; August 23, 1957.

Second. Sentner, St. Louis, eighth circuit: Five defendants; April 4, 1958.

Third. Brandt, Cleveland, sixth circuit: Six defendants; May 23, 1958.

Fourth. Welman, Detroit, sixth circuit: Six defendants; March 25, 1958.

Fifth. Kuzma, Philadelphia, third circuit: Ordered the acquittal of four and authorized retrial of five; November 13, 1957.

Sixth. Fujimoto, Hawaii, ninth circuit: All seven defendants ordered acquitted; January 16, 1958.

Seventh. Huff, Seattle, ninth circuit: The convictions of all four defendants who had appealed were ordered reversed. One of the defendants in this case did not appeal but served her sentence, and therefore her conviction still stands; January 16, 1958.

The Government was authorized to retry the following six cases in which a total of 39 defendants were involved:

Yates	10
Bary	7
Sentner	5
Brandt	6
Welman	6
Kuzma	5

The Department of Justice reports that the Government dismissed the Kuzma and Yates cases, involving a total of 15 defendants, partly on the Yates definition of "organize." Still under consideration are the remaining four cases involving 24 defendants. In addition, the Government, since the Yates case, has also dismissed, in part due to the "organize" definition in Yates, two conspiracy cases involving 17 defendants, which had not been tried at the time of the Yates decision.

In reply to an inquiry on the part of Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, the author of H.R. 8867, which is identical to H.R. 13272—both bills are identical to H.R. 3247, 87th Congress—the Department of Justice reported as follows:

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEATING: This is in response to your letter of July 7 in regard to the Department of Justice position with respect to the bill (H.R. 8867) to amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the term "organize" as used in that section, intended to deal with one aspect of the problem raised by the Supreme Court decision in *Yates* v. *United States*.

H.R. 8867 redefines the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act (18 U.S.C. 2385). The proposal would include within the term "organize" the recruiting of new members, the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of such society, group, or assembly of persons. In the Yates case the Supreme Court stated that Congress intended that the term "organize" does not include such activities as the recruiting of members, organizers of clubs within the framework of the Communist Party, and so forth, and that in its view the Communist Party was organized in 1945 and therefore evidence as to its organization was barred after the 3-year period of the statute of limitations.

The bill would redefine "organize" in the terms for which the Government contended in that case and would be beneficial in any future Smith Act conspiracy prosecutions.

The Department of Justice favors enactment of this legislation.

As both Mr. Nixon and Mr. Hoover have freely warned, immediate action is necessary if we are to wipe out this cancer upon our society. Therefore, I hope that we can look forward to favorable reaction to the eight-point Nixon program, and I am confident that if the Senate will take favorable action on H.R. 3247, the combined assault on the Commies will have the desired effect, which is to get rid of them once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, the article by former Vice President Nixon follows herewith:

ALL THINKING AMERICANS SHOULD JOIN FIGHT ON U.S. REDS; PROGRAM OFFERED

(By Richard M. Nixon)

(Tenth article in a series of 11)

Because of the irresponsible antics of some self-styled experts on anticommunism, national attention for months has been directed to the subject of how not to fight communism in the United States. It is time now to direct attention to the even more critical problem of how to fight communism at home. Because if there is one thing that is more harmful to the national interest than exaggerating the internal Communist danger, it is ignoring it or downgrading it.

I will suggest here a program of how to mount a responsible attack upon communism and Communist influence within the United States.

First, we must recognize that there is a danger. As Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, pointed out recently, there seems to be "a concerted campaign to establish the conclusion that there is no internal threat from communism in the United States. The idea that there is no danger from communism contradicts the records of the congressional committees. It rests on the absurd premise that the United States, the prime target, is alone among the nations of the world exempt from concerted Soviet subversion and infiltration."

What is the magnitude of the danger?

J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI stated in a recent speech:

"I would like to be able to report that the internal enemies of our society have virtually disappeared—that they have faded into the dim past like the dangers of the wagon trail and the Northwest frontier. But this is not so. * * * From the depths of our criminal and subversive underworlds, strong enemies—deadly enemies—continue to challenge the right of decent Americans to live in freedom and dignity under God. * * * The Communist threat from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within.

"The latter is reaching into the very heart of America through its espionage agents and a cunning, defiant, and lawless Communist Party, which is fanatically dedicated to the Marxist cause of world enslavement and destruction of the foundations of our Republic."

On the other hand, Attorney General Robert Kennedy in a Los Angeles press conference on March 24 pointed out that the Communist Party had only 10,000 members and characterized it as a "political organization of no danger in the United States."

And the California Federation of Young Democrats reflected their estimate of the internal Communist threat when they recently passed abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and repeal of the State law requiring State employees to sign loyalty oaths.

Which of these estimates of the threat of communism in the United States is most accurate?

The weight of evidence overwhelmingly support Mr. Hoover's conclusion.

To say that the Communist Party, because of its small membership, is of no danger in the United States is more than a misinterpretation of numbers; it is a misinterpretation of history.

Have we learned no lesson from the Hiss and Rosenberg cases, from the espionage activities of Klaus Fuchs in Great Britain, from the spy ring in Canada or from Robert Sohlen and Irving Scarbeck most recently in the United States? The Communists do not need great numbers to steal state secrets.

Equally important, if not as dramatic as spying, is the alarming success of U.S. Communists in planting and spreading ideas that have affected U.S. policy. For example, Communist fronts and Communist dupes sold the idea of Mao Tse-tung as an agrarian reformer—a propaganda line which considerably influenced our China policy with disastrous effects.

To ignore 10,000 American Communists, in short, would be as foolhardy as to underestimate the Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam because they are only a few thousand. Communists around the world operate as an elite corps, not as an infantry division.

The fight against communism within our borders should be joined by every thinking American, regardless of political party. It should not be left by default to those who overestimate or underestimate the danger.

As a minimum program for dealing with communism in the United States, I would suggest the following:

1. The establishment of a privately financed national foundation, headed by men of great prestige and experience, which would be equipped to extend a seal of approval to responsible groups and organizations fighting communism, after a thorough examination of their personnel, programs, and financial records.

The private citizen today is in need of some trustworthy guidance in this area. This foundation should be completely nonpartisan. This is not a matter in which Americans should divide as Republicans or Democrats. Too many groups today are confusing the fight against communism with a variety of extraneous political, economic, and social issues.

2. Education at the school-age and adult level on Communist tactics, aims, and purposes—including high school courses on the contrasts between communism and the principles of free societies, implemented first by the selection of authoritative textbooks and the training of teachers.

The great problem in America today is not too much patriotism or too little patriotism, but too little knowledge—knowledge about communism and about our own way of life.

3. A similar educational program made available to all Americans traveling or living

abroad (privately or in Government service) so that they could better serve as ambassadors of freedom throughout the world.

4. Vigorous and strict enforcement of the Subversive Activities Control Act, which requires all Communists to register with the Attorney General, so that they may be labeled properly for what they are.

5. Public support of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI in the investigation of Communist activities. Those from the far left who have made Hoover into their personal whipping boy will one day discover how scrupulously his methods have upheld civil liberties while doing a superb investigating job.

6. Public support of investigations by legislative committees in this complex field, including those of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the investigating committees of State legislatures. Legislative investigative committees sometimes make mistakes; and when procedures are improper they should be corrected.

But I would suggest that those who have been calling for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities may one day examine its procedures and discover them to be as fair or more fair than the procedures of other investigating committees which have had their support. The anti-Communist arms of our Government deserve support and constructive suggestions from the press and public, not just carping criticism.

7. Public support of loyalty and security programs for Federal, State and local employees whose government employment is a privilege, not a right.

8. Denial of the use of tax-supported schools and institutions for speeches by any individuals who have defied the registration provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act or who have refused to testify before legally constituted grand juries or legislative investigating committees.

I have limited this article to a discussion aimed primarily at the subject of dealing with the danger of communism at home. In my next and last article in this series I shall discuss what I believe are the actions we should take to deal with communism abroad.

A NEW TRAIN FERRY FOR ALASKA

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Seattle has long enjoyed the name of "Gateway to Alaska" because of its unique geographic position. The Puget Sound area has a natural advantage in water-surface transportation to the great 49th State.

Steamship service to and from Alaska, however, has had its problems. Some 80 steamship lines have engaged over the years in business between Alaska and the Pacific Northwest ports only to find that economic difficulties and other obstacles were too much and as a result these operators failed and were forced to discontinue service.

The principal problem has been one of high costs due to the fact that most of the traffic was northbound and return cargos were only available during certain seasons of the year. Also many communities that require service in Alaska do not offer a sufficient volume of freight to justify the maintaining of year-round service.

The people of Alaska have realized that transportation is the key to the development of this great State and have long sought lower cost and speedier shipping.

Meanwhile, the waterfront interests of Seattle, together with the business firms that have enjoyed long business relations with customers in Alaska have been seeking some means of retaining Seattle's position as a shipping point for the northland. To hold this business maritime interests of Seattle have looked for some new means of speeding service and holding down shipping expenses.

At one time the Alaska Steamship Co. made an intensive study of the economic feasibility of constructing a train ferry but found that present construction costs were so high that it was not financially possible to proceed. Meanwhile, Alaskan interests have sought by various means to improve their transportation and at times have become exasperated that Seattle shipping interests failed to show any progress.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I met in Seattle with a group of representatives of labor and management interested in this problem. I pointed out that Alaska's interests are Seattle's interests and that renewed study should be given toward providing Alaska with better transportation. I called attention to the fact that the railroads that serve the Pacific Northwest and maritime labor and management all had a great stake in Alaska's development. I noted that unlike the State of Hawaii and the Far East, Alaska did not have a joint rail-water freight rate from the East and Midwest. I also said that Seattle's attitude on transportation could not be negative and must be competitive. I said I was opposed to the exception that existed in favor of Canada as against the requirement that all coastwise service between American ports be by American-flag vessels. On the other hand, I frankly stated that I recognized that Seattle would have to offer Alaska something better than monopoly or we could not expect to retain our past relationship as terminal for Alaskan ports.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that today announcement is being made by the Alaska Steamship Co. of plans for establishing a new train-ship service which I am confident may well be Seattle's answer to Alaska's problem.

It would appear that a fast modern train ferry between the rail belt of Alaska and Seattle represents a joint rail-water type of speedy low cost freight service that Alaska has needed.

The president of the Alaska Steamship Co. is announcing that his company has acquired the *City of New Orleans* which can haul 56 rail cars including piggyback and container on the basis of regular 3-day service from Seattle to Whittier.

The *City of New Orleans* has been registered under the laws of Liberia. A member of the Alaska congressional delegation, Senator Bartlett as well as Representative Tollefson and myself are today introducing legislation which will provide for the documenting of this vessel so it can engage in coastwise trade as provided in section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916. Under American registry this 18-knot vessel which is the only special purpose vessel of its kind available can provide consumers and shippers with a type of service which will contribute to the development of Alaska. I am sure that when the facts about this new service are made public the significance of this transportation development will be widely supported by all those who have Alaska's interests at heart.

I am hopeful that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, on which I have the honor to serve, will consider promptly legislation to authorize the admittance of the *City of New Orleans* to American registry. Meanwhile, I think that the bill, which is introduced both by an Alaska and a Washington State Member of Congress, should be recognized as important to all sections of the United States that have business firms that do business in the 49th State. Also, of course a seatrain operation will benefit our military and defense departments in the transporting of their freight and other requirements.

I have long tried to assist our own American shipyard and skilled labor. In this case I wish a suitable new vessel could be built for this purpose but the economics are such, I am satisfied, that there is no alternative to using the *City of New Orleans*. When all facts are available I am confident there will be no opposition to the bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. Mack, for 5 days, on account of illness in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Roosevelt, for 15 minutes, on April 5, 1962.

Mr. Staggers, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, following the legislative program of the day and other special orders on April 11, the following gentlemen may each address the House for 1 hour:

Mr. Utt.
Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Bruce.
Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Younger.
Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Meader.
Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Wilson of California.
Mr. Becker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Bow to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

Mr. WALTER and include a letter he wrote to the Librarian of Congress.

Mr. HAGEN of California.

Mr. KITCHIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Bow) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KYL.

Mr. FINO in two instances.

Mr. JOHANSEN.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BOLLING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 193. An act for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd;

S. 899. An act for the relief of Liu Shui Chen;

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito;

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska;

S. 1578. An act for the relief of Edward Yin Liang;

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza;

S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla;

S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani;

S. 2018. An act for the relief of Robert B. Kasparek, Robert M. Kearny, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.; and

S. 2101. An act for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 3, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1352. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Aniello;

H.R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Prischl Rogers;

H.R. 1492. An act for the relief of Ernest John Large;

H.R. 1671. An act for the relief of Edvige Cianciulli;

H.R. 2180. An act for the relief of Eugene C. Harter;

H.R. 2684. An act for the relief of Mohan Singh;

H.R. 3105. An act for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a minor;

H.R. 3376. An act for the relief of George A. McDermott;

H.R. 6082. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vartanus Uzar;

H.R. 6216. An act for the relief of Theodore T. Reilmann;

H.R. 6276. An act for the relief of Athanasia Dekazos;

H.R. 6343. An act for the relief of Mrs. Izabel A. Miguel;

H.R. 6740. An act for the relief of Teofilo Estoesta;

H.R. 7676. An act for the relief of George W. Ross, Jr.;

H.R. 8422. An act for the relief of Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll);

H.R. 8780. An act for the relief of Dr. Carl F. Romney;

H.R. 8781. An act for the relief of Walter Singlevich;

H.R. 8947. An act for the relief of Harry A. Sebert;

H.R. 9612. An act relating to the elections under section 333 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the shareholders of the G. L. Bernhardt Co., Inc., of Lenoir, N.C.; and

H.R. 10573. An act to grant the American Numismatic Association perpetual succession.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 5, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1897. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of maintenance of tracked combat vehicles at Fort Bragg, N.C., Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1898. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the financial and administrative activities relating to the development and construction of the Dulles International Airport, Federal Aviation Agency, September 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1899. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: San Gabriel River (western area), California; South Fork Blackwater River, Mo.; Indian Wash, Colo.; Mulbery Creek, Tenn.; and Rocky Comfort Creek, Ga., pursuant to section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1900. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected activities of the low-rent housing program in the nine-State area administered by the San Francisco Regional Office of the Public Housing Administration (PHA), Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA) (H. Doc. No. 383); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1901. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the ninth report of the Department of State on its activities under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 81-152, as amended) covering the calendar year 1961, pursuant to title IV, section 404(d), of the law; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1902. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: North Branch of Forest River (supplemental), North Dakota, and Florence area, Arizona, pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committtee on Public Works.

1903. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide an office building for the Housing and Home Finance Agency"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1904. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1905. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11027. A bill to amend the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 11084. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 in order to authorize geothermal steam leases under the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 11085. A bill to increase the rates of basic pay, retirement pay, retainer pay and allowances for quarters and subsistence for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11086. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for additional commissioners of the United States Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 11087. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 11088. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 with respect to property rights in inventions; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 11089. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 11090. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code in order to provide the death penalty for the sale of narcotics to children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 11091. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 11092. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11093. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to provide for a National Highway Academy; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 11094. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 11095. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 11096. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 11097. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 11098. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 11099. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 11100. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize special consideration for certain disabled veterans suffering blindness or bilateral kidney involvement; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H.R. 11101. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H.R. 11102. A bill to replace the existing tariff schedules and trade agreements provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 11103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 11104. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to prohibit assistance under that act to the government of any country which has not established equitable procedures for compensating U.S. citizens for loss of property by expropriation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 11105. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 11106. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 11107. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 11108. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the furnishing of hospital care to war veterans 70 years of age or older without requiring that they submit a statement under oath of their inability to defray necessary expenses; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. VAN PELT:

H.R. 11109. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 11110. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 11111. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain lands in the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 11112. A bill to provide a right of ingress and egress across national forest lands to all persons owning property within the boundaries of such national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 11113. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 11114. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 11115. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and related sections of the National Housing Act, as amended; to provide judicial review of decisions of the Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 11116. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 11117. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 11118. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 11119. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 11120. A bill to provide for the medical care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.J. Res. 684. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide the right of States to establish their own election districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H. Res. 586. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct an investigation of the personnel and policy-making practices of the Department of State; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H. Res. 587. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the appointment of professional and clerical staffs of the committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 11121. A bill for the relief of Agnese Brienza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 11122. A bill for the relief of Edward J. McManus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 11123. A bill for the relief of Hyung Jin Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 11124. A bill for the relief of Fidel Villanueva Magbitang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 11125. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Blanche M. Napier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 11126. A bill to authorize the admittance of the vessel, *City of New Orleans*, to

American registry and to permit the use of such vessel in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 11127. A bill for the relief of Ernst Haeusserman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 11128. A bill for the relief of Winston Lloyd McKay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 11129. A bill for the relief of Rosa Macri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 11130. A bill to authorize the admittance of the vessel, *City of New Orleans*, to American registry and to permit the use of such vessel in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

290. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Ray Killian, executive secretary, Arizona Interstate Stream Commission, Phoenix, Ariz., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that solutions to the saline problems as have arisen in the Mexicali Valley, Mexico, be sought strictly within the limits of the existing treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Plight of the Cotton Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record the text of an address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, Mr. Talmadge, at the annual convention of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute in Palm Beach, Fla., on Saturday, March 31, 1962. Senator Talmadge made a penetrating analysis of many of the problems facing the textile industry, and his address was extremely well received by those attending the convention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of Remarks of U.S. Senator Herman E. Talmadge, of Georgia, Before the Annual Meeting of the American Cotton Manufacturing Institute at Palm Beach, Fla., Saturday, March 31, 1962

My friends, I have a deep appreciation for this great and vital industry whose guidance rests in your hands. It is inescapable, for I'm a Georgian.

It is your industry in which some 95,000 Georgians earn their daily bread.

It is your industry to which more than 85,000 Georgia cotton farmers sell their product.

It is your industry that keys countless other industries and businesses to such an extent that perhaps there isn't a Georgia family whose welfare isn't affected by your activity.

The conclusion is clear. As a Member of the U.S. Senate, any contribution I might make for the benefit of your industry will be also a contribution to the welfare of the State I have the honor to serve.

To go a step further, however, let me say I sincerely believe that any contribution that anyone might make for this essential industry will stand as a contribution to the welfare of our Nation.

And this view, you can be assured, is being taken by my colleagues in the Senate. Believe me, your industry is not without friends in the Congress. This fact has been demonstrated in an unusually unique and effective way in both Houses of the Congress during the past year or so.

There is a growing awareness of the unsound, unfair, and intolerable situation the American textile industry has been plunged into by Government policies.

Here we have an industry that virtually stands alone as a showcase of the American concept of free enterprise, yet one that has been damaged by cumulative Government policies that can be characterized charitably as careless but more accurately as stupid.

Since World War II we have seen the American textile industry retain its basic competitiveness, continue to turn out superior products at minimum prices, place on the market the results of the most modern research, meet consumer demands, and then find itself in trouble. Why?

We have seen textile jobs fall from more than one and a quarter million in 1947 to around 840,000 today. Production of cotton goods has plummeted. Prices have shrunk. Profits have fallen. Textile mill stocks are selling below their book value. Why?

That's the big question, ladies and gentlemen. Why?

The answer, or rather the explanation for this incredible, shocking situation, is to be found where our national policymakers gather.

The American textile industry, moreso than any other industry, has had to live and try to grow trussed in a governmental straitjacket. This happened, not because it had become unruly or ugly or dangerous, but primarily because the attendant—the policymaker—was unwilling to face up to the facts and deal with them intelligently.

You will remember that a few years ago the U.S. Senate established a special subcommittee to investigate everything that has happened to the industry. And the conclusion, in essence, was that most of its problems stemmed from Government policies and, by the same token, solutions would have to come from Government action.

A start in this direction was made just about a year ago. You will recall that my colleague from Rhode Island, the Honorable John O. Pastore, reactivated his Textile Study Committee to update all pertinent information and renewed its recommendations to the executive branch of the Government.

In turn, President Kennedy took some rather unprecedented steps to move in on some of the basic problems of this industry, particularly as they relate to policies of Government. He appointed a special Cabinet-level committee, headed by the Secretary of Commerce, to explore the situation and make recommendations to him. An interagency textile subcommittee was formed, headed by the Assistant Secretary of Commerce. For a period of months there was intensive activity in the executive branch of Government, given full support and encouragement by those of us in the Congress, and aimed at coming up with a plan of action.

It was, and continues to be, an unusual situation. I do not recall a previous instance where any American industry has received such concentrated interest and attention at the highest levels of Government—both within the legislative and executive branches. It is a tribute to the national significance of your industry and to the manner in which you and your representatives have gained public understanding and recognition for your situation.

The result, of course, was the so-called President's textile program, and the steps that have been taken under it.

Now, I would like to convey to you an assessment of what has been done and what remains to be done for the President's program to become genuinely meaningful to the industry and to the Nation. And I can assure you that most, if not all, of my views are shared by my colleagues in the U.S. Senate and our friends in the House of Representatives.

First, the Treasury Department's action in having the Internal Revenue Service revise the depreciation schedules for the textile and apparel industries represents a concrete contribution toward strengthening the industry. This, coupled with an investment incentive proposal in the pending tax bill, can be regarded as an important plus, and I am sure is already stimulating new interest in plant improvement and modernization. This is an objective you have sought for years, and its attainment is a major victory.

Then there were the international trade arrangements, dealing only with cotton textiles, with which you are familiar and which certainly appear to become another plus. My colleagues and I, however, are fully cognizant of the fact that the international arrangements will stand or fall upon the character of enforcement given by our Government.

There must be no loopholes. There must be strict adherence to the terms and intent of the arrangements. There must be no departure from the position that, first and foremost, the interests of the American textile industry must be served.

Those of us who have watched closely the development of these arrangements are encouraged by recent actions of the U.S. Government in enforcing its rights under the program. Such positive action, right now in the beginning, is vital as a signal to the rest of the world that the United States means business. In all candor, I must say that this is a new and strange departure for our Government, and I hope it isn't too good to last.

Now, I understand there are some indications that the administration will move shortly in an effort to bring some order to free world trade in fibers other than cotton—woolens, worsted, manmade fibers, and silk. This is essential. There was never the slightest indication in the President's program that it was to apply only to cotton products, important as they are.

The textile industry of the world today is so complex, so interrelated, that a partial solution will create distortions that will plague both you and the Government from now on. The problem is not resolved on the basis of a piecemeal solution, and those of us in the Congress will not rest on the subject until there is action across the board.

Many of us in the Congress share a view widely held in this audience. That is, if the Office of Emergency Planning were to rule favorably on the case now pending before it, the way would be clear for the President to deal quickly and forthrightly with problems on all fibers. In fact, the authority given to him by such an action would make it much easier and simpler for him to do whatever is necessary to complete his textile program.

It should be remembered that one aspect of the international arrangements concerned a change in attitude by the nations in the European Common Market toward Asian textile exports. The Europeans have been keeping their doors closed to the Japanese and Asian output. They let the U.S. market bear the brunt of the low-wage imports from these countries.

It is to the credit of U.S. negotiators that they were able to persuade the Common Market countries to lessen the Asian pressure on the United States by opening up their markets. This facet of the arrangement is of vital importance to Japan and the other countries of the East, and they make themselves look selfish and ridiculous when they threaten not to sign the arrangement if the United States takes certain other actions.

There is no question but that Europe represents an important market for American industrial and agricultural products. But let it not go unnoticed that the Common Market was established in part for the purpose of protecting the economies of the participating nations against all outsiders, not for the purpose of throwing wide open their doors to the rest of the world.

Now let us turn our attention to another item of unfinished business as we chronicle the results of the administration program for dealing with the Nation's textile import problem.

You may recall that last May 2 the President's pronouncement included these words—and I quote:

"I have directed the Department of Agriculture to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the cost to U.S. mills of the adverse differential in raw cotton costs between domestic and foreign textile producers."

Almost 3 months later, by direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the raw cotton cost differential between U.S. mills and foreign mills increased from $30 to $42.50 a bale.

Those of us in the Congress, and especially those of us on the Agriculture Committee of the U.S. Senate, were fully aware of the fact that a bad situation had worsened.

It strengthened my conviction that a farm bill I had offered to the Senate was on the right track. Its purpose was to free the farmer to sell his product on a market that could seek its own levels under the law of supply and demand. It is my view that the most efficient and economical way under such an arrangement would be to provide compensatory payments on basic commodities to farmers equal to the difference between the market price and 100 percent of parity.

In effect, such a program would have enabled our own textile mills to buy American cotton at the prevailing world price, thereby eliminating entirely the two-price system.

In my opinion, it is very unfortunate that the regional politics of this whole farm policy situation are such that any legislation along this line has not been able to gain momentum, even though there is substantial support among many Members of Congress.

This being true, there obviously is only one way to comply with the President's directive to the Secretary of Agriculture—that is, to offset the disparity between the United States and world prices for cotton by placing on all cotton product imports a fee equal to the difference in price, as reflected by the raw cotton export subsidy.

As you well know, the Secretary of Agriculture made such a recommendation to the President; the President acted on the recommendation by initiating a Tariff Commission investigation of the subject; the required hearings have been held; and we now await the findings and recommendations of that body. In my opinion, an undeniably impressive case has been made for such an offset import fee.

My friends, let me say this, simply and clearly, for one and all, including our friends in Japan, to understand: The cotton cost equalization fee must be established.

And, at the risk of digressing, let me just say another word about our Japanese friends.

Personally, I resented very much the Japanese textile industry's intervention in the section 22 case before the Tariff Commission. To my way of thinking, this is a case of the Japanese interfering with the internal affairs of the United States.

Many of you here, I am sure, recall the efforts we went to in the postwar days to help Japan get back on her feet, back in the textile business and many other businesses. To be sure, Japan's friendship is important to us. But her textile industry went beyond the bounds of good order in raising a worldwide clamor of protest against our Government's efforts to correct an intolerably unfair situation here at home.

Some press articles would lead us to believe that Japan would attempt to frustrate the international textile trade arrangements if our Government establishes a cotton cost offset fee. This is incredible, but should it come to pass, I assure you it will not go unnoticed on the part of the U.S. Congress.

I repeat, it is imperative that the raw cotton cost equalization fee be established as a matter of equity and justice for you manufacturers, for the benefit of our cotton farmers, and in the interest of the general public.

My interest in this particular issue grows out of my official duties. It is my privilege to serve on the Finance and the Agriculture Committees of the U.S. Senate. And these committees have responsibility for helping to shape the Nation's foreign trade and farm program legislation.

Within a matter of weeks my committee is going to have an opportunity to examine and pass upon proposals for the law under which the United States will engage in foreign trade in the years to come.

The measure we will consider will be whatever bill the House of Representatives enacts. The House Ways and Means Committe, as you know, is presently holding hearings on the administration's proposal. And there is little likelihood that the administration bill as originally drafted will emerge from the House without change.

There is no doubt in my mind but that it is in our Nation's best interests for our trade legislation to take note of the development of the European Economic Community. It poses tremendous problems for us, not only from an economic standpoint but also with respect to Soviet Russia's announced purpose to use trade as a weapon in the cold war.

President Kennedy is correct in wishing to have a trade law that will permit the United States to expand its exports and thereby share in the growing prosperity within the Common Market. It is logical for him to seek broader authority to cope with trade problems in a fast-changing world situation.

For my part, however, I am gravely concerned over the failure of provisions in the present trade agreement act to protect individual American industries from debilitating injury as the result of indiscriminate imports.

It was heartening to see the President, only about 10 days ago, approve Tariff Commission recommendations for higher duties on imports of certain carpets and glass. This was an occasion where the executive branch of the Government permitted the intent of Congress to be served. This hasn't happened too often in recent years; this was a refreshing, encouraging change. And I hope sincerely it was the beginning of a trend.

It is inconceivable to me that the Congress, while fully in accord with the need for up-to-date trade machinery, would strip away all safeguards against destruction of American industries.

Our farmers, workers, and investors simply cannot be subjected to downward trends in employment, production, sales, prices, and profits while inventories, material costs, labor costs, and imports go skyward. Not if we are to maintain a healthy, expanding, and prosperous economy in our land.

I need not tell you that manufactured articles cannot compete under a system of free trade where the cost of labor is a paramount factor. Our products just cannot compete with those from Europe and Asia where their labor costs range from one-fourth to one-tenth of ours.

It is my conviction that the remedy for this does not lie in placing unemployed American workers and distressed American industries on the Government payroll. There must be a more reasonable and workable prescription. And it is my opinion that the success or failure of President Kennedy's proposed trade expansion program hinges upon the safeguards it provides for American jobs. There is no reason why such provisions, thoughtfully and carefully developed, should be inconsistent with the objectives of a new trade policy.

A Bill To Authorize Life Imprisonment or the Death Penalty for the Sale of Narcotics to the Youth of This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which would authorize life imprisonment or the death penalty for the sale of narcotics to the youth of this country.

The objective of this bill is to safeguard our Nation's youth, which is another way of saying, safeguarding this Nation's future. In the words of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover:

> Of all the corrupters of youth, none is more terrible than the dope peddler who entices children to try narcotics. Such a calculated assault on the standards of our youth should be met by a force of good within each community, united behind stern law enforcement and punishment.

Stern law enforcement and stern punishment are the most effective universally recognized way to curb the flow of illicit drugs. But the penalties that we have put into the law for the sale of narcotics, especially for the sale of drugs to minors, are not commensurate with the vicious crime which is committed. It is important to note in this regard that the narcotic problem is to a great extent a juvenile problem, since most, if not all, addicts acquire the habit during their teens. At present, the pusher who sells drugs to a minor is liable for a minimum jail sentence of only 10 years. This term is only 5 years longer than that which applies to pushers who sell to adults.

My bill would amend section 7237(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any person who sells drugs to a minor may be subject to life imprisonment or death. While the penalties I propose are severe, nobody will deny that the purveyor of this "living death" should get less, or that such a penalty is not commensurate with the crime.

The U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics has gone on record time and again to the effect that "strong laws, good enforcement, stiff sentences are the necessary foundation upon which any successful program must be predicated." And that makes good sense, as all of us know from the enactment of the Lindbergh Act and the more recent aircraft piracy legislation, both of which authorize the death penalty and both of which have had the desired deterrent effect. The insidiousness of narcotic addiction with its terrible implications to the individual, and indeed to the Nation as a whole, requires similar forceful treatment. Stern penalties must be written into our statute books. Without them the courts do not have the tools to implement the program to wipe this crime from our communities.

Unlike other proposals in this area, my bill does not lump the narcotic traffic and everything and everyone related to it as a criminal activity; it is aimed solely at the pusher, and not the affected person on whom this traffic feeds.

For the sake of our children and our Nation's future, I commend this proposal for your immediate and serious attention.

Future of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, early in March, Chairman ANDERSON, of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, put in the RECORD an exchange of letters with the Secretary of Agriculture on the continuing need for irrigation. In his letter, Secretary Freeman made it clear that to produce our food requirements in 1980 on fewer acres, we will need better, upgraded acres capable of producing 56 percent more on each acre under cultivation.

The Secretary subsequently made an address at the Farm Policy Conference in Brawley, Calif., in which he elaborated on the irrigation situation.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, copy of a Department of Agriculture release on his address.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT A FARM POLICY DINNER AT BARBARA WORTH COUNTRY CLUB, BRAWLEY, CALIF., MARCH 3, 1962

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said today in Brawley, Calif., in the Imperial Valley, that sound reclamation and irrigation projects and the land adjustment proposals of the food and agriculture program for the 1960's are compatible with each other.

The Secretary based his statement on three foundation facts:

1. To attempt to balance production with market needs by eliminating sound reclamation and irrigation projects would be tantamount to deliberately promoting inefficient use of agricultural resources.

2. Réclamation and irrigation have a highly necessary role to play in the wise present and future use of national land and water resources.

3. Most of the farm products coming from irrigated land are not the ones for which there are serious overproduction problems.

Speaking at the opening of the Imperial County Fair, Secretary Freeman noted that 95 percent of the cropland in Imperial County is irrigated. The average value of the land and buildings comprising the 1,300 farms in the county is more than $200,000—twice the average for California as a whole and several times the average farm value in the United States.

"There is no conflict between sound reclamation and irrigation and the proposed A–B–C–D farm program," the Secretary said. "The crops grown on reclaimed and irrigated land are not primarily crops that are seriously in surplus.

"It is only through reclamation and irrigation that many areas in the West can have agriculture at all. Production from these acres is essential to both local and regional economies. More than 150 crops are grown on irrigated lands in the West, many of them not produced elsewhere in commercial quantities.

"It is unsound to suggest that the current imbalances which exist in some crops could be corrected by squeezing off water resource development in one section of the country.

"The same attitude is expressed by some who feel that the problem of overproduction could be solved by squeezing out farmers who have inadequate resources or by cutting back the investment in research. All such proposals avoid the basic question raised by the technological revolution in agriculture and none of them would solve the problem of production exceeding efficient use.

"Irrigation makes it possible for farmers to diversify to crops which are more profitable and in current market demand.

"As we look to the longtime future there is no question but that reclamation and irrigation must go forward. The concept fits logically into the abundance, balance, conservation, development approach. Certainly there is an urgent need for planning the future use of land to assure agricultural abundance and balance, while at the same time providing for conservation and development. We must plan now for farming, for recreation, for forests, for wildlife, for efficient use of limited water supplies, and for a land reserve before the acres are gobbled up and we have passed the point of no return in terms of future wise land use.

"Finally, there never has been, is not now, and I do not see how there ever can be, a sound argument for planned inefficiency in agriculture. Whatever short-term benefit might conceivably be derived from the standpoint of balancing supply and demand through inefficiency would be far more than offset by the waste of human, natural, and manmade resources. Our entire economy rests in large measure on a foundation of increasing agricultural efficiency, and the future progress of that economy will rest on further increases in farming efficiency.

"The technological revolution in agriculture has brought great rewards to the economy of the Nation. It has provided American consumers with more and better food at lower real cost than the people of any other nation have ever enjoyed. It has brought sustenance to hungry people throughout the world. The one real difficulty is that it has not brought adequate rewards to the farmers who produce this abudance. Problems of surpluses and low farm returns have blinded us to the tremendous productive success of our agriculture that has become the envy of most of the world.

"The problems exist because we have not been able to match the rate of advance in productivity with commensurate advances in social, political, and economic engineering that are necessary if we would make full use of our abundance.

"Research and education—yes, and mechanization and irrigation—have taught and enabled the American farmer to produce abundantly, but we have not yet learned how to manage that abundance in the best interest of all. Agricultural and industrial science has shown us that we can produce more abundantly than we can consume, but social science has not yet shown us how to engineer this efficient productivity to benefit the farmer producers, whose incomes average far below those of the nonfarm producers in the economy."

Representative Collier, of Illinois, Addresses American University Marketing Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KYL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address delivered by my colleague, the Honorable HAROLD R. COLLIER, of Illinois, at the Third Annual Conference on Business-Government Relations in Marketing, sponsored by the American University, on March 30. Representative COLLIER, who was an advertising and sales promotion executive prior to his election to the House of Representatives, looks at the problem of the business and Government relationship from "both sides of the fence" and provides an objective study of the subject. His remarks offer nutritious food for thought as Congress deliberates on many issues which will have a deep impact upon marketing procedures in the months ahead.

The address follows:

BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT IN MARKETING

(By Hon. HAROLD R. COLLIER, of Illinois)

The subject of this conference is as vast in its scope as the entire operation of this Nation's economic system. This sounds like an exaggeration, but is it? Speaking of government on one hand, in its broad sense, we have the greatest centralization of power in a single entity existing anywhere in the free world. While marketing, on the other hand, is properly defined as the aggregate of functions involved in transferring title and in moving goods from producer to consumer, including among others, buying, selling, storing, transporting, standardizing, financing, risk bearing, and supplying market information.

Hence the relationship between the two demands the closest cooperation and coordination in serving the public interests. Congress, in its wisdom, created the prime regulatory agencies and vested in them the power to regulate interstate commerce. Congress alone passes the laws which govern in varying degree the many facets of marketing; and it is incumbent upon the regulatory agencies to enforce these laws entirely within the realm of the intent of Congress. Obviously, if this were not the case, a regulatory commission or board would have the power to completely ignore regulations essential to the public interest in one extreme or virtually destroy any process of marketing on the other.

Since the Government must properly act to police the Federal statutes in many fields of commerce, it is entirely understandable that the performance of its enforcement duties generates allegations of hostility. But, of course, enforcement procedures in almost any field are accompanied by feelings of hostility on the part of those who are involved.

However, it seems to me that the Federal Government, its agencies, and the Congress have a certain responsibility, that of contributing to a healthy climate in which legitimate free enterprise can flourish. Laws which provide tools of too stringent control and harassment directly affect public confidence and create a business environment which is reflected in the marketing processes.

On this chord, let us briefly examine some of the legislation which I know is of deep concern to one segment or another of our marketing system.

Yesterday, for example, the House passed the Revenue Act of 1962, an omnibus bill which embraced many areas of tax revision. I suggest that each of you gentlemen in the advertising field acquaint yourself with its contents as your professional responsibility to yourself. For example, it provides for more stringent regulations in establishing your entertainment expenses for tax purposes. And you will have to interpret a variety of expressions such as "reasonable allowances" and "expenses directly related to the active conduct of a trade or business."

Of primary interest, I know, is the pending revision of our trade policies. While the final composition of the legislation to replace the expiring Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1958 is yet unknown, the basic proposal of the administration as outlined in President Kennedy's recent message will naturally require reappraisals and reevaluations of certain marketing procedures in many industries. While Congress for the most part recognizes the problems inherent in dealing with the European Common Market, it likewise recognizes the effect which it is going to have upon certain segments of our economy. To assume that government action can absorb the shocks wherever they occur through subsidies or doles, is wishful thinking. To further assume that it will provide a bonanza of immediate increases of foreign markets for American-manufactured products would be a gross miscalculation, too.

Certain businesses have already shown a sensitivity to the anticipated impact of sweeping changes in our trade and tariff policies. Others directly concerned see it as a boon to our participation in the world market. On a long-range basis we are faced with no easy series of adjustments; but we must move forward, nevertheless, in our broad national interest; and business and industry are sure to find in the final legislation a need to revise certain marketing procedures.

One item of legislation which is pending before our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—one which most certainly strikes at the core of our marketing processes—is House bill 8830. This would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain practices, pending completion of the Federal Trade Commission's proceedings. The legislation itself is well meaning and basically designed to protect the consumer as well as foreclose the prolonging of any violation during the time hearings are being conducted by the Federal Trade Commission.

On the other hand, such legislation could cause irreparable damage before the defendant in such proceedings could establish his case.

The bill further states that under certain conditions the court could issue an order directing compliance with any temporary cease and desist order issued by the Commission and that failure to obey such an order of the court may be punishable as a contempt thereof.

You are all aware of the proposal before Congress that would change the drug patent law and would force holders of new drug patents into compulsory licensing for the manufacture of a new product at a fixed royalty after 3 years from the time of issuance of a new patent. As you know, patents are now protected for 17 years. Presently the proposal would be restricted to the drug industry but it most certainly has implications of precedent which can hardly be ignored in retrospect. There is no question that such legislation, if enacted, could, by reason of precedent, be broadened to include many types of patents.

Just yesterday the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce approved a bill which, if enacted, will require by law that television manufacturers include on all television receivers shipped in interstate commerce a unit for receiving both VHF and UHF signals, regardless of whether a particular consumer wants or needs the facility. There is a very good possibility that this bill will be enacted into law during this session; but there is a great deal less probability that Congress will act to eliminate the 10-percent Federal tax on television receivers to compensate for the inevitable increase in the cost of manufacturing only all-channel sets for shipment in interstate commerce.

It is normal for proponents of stringent regulatory legislation to point to malpractices of some individuals or companies in justification of their position. And none of us here are so naive as to believe that there isn't merit to this argument. More often than not, however, it is usually a case of requiring all business operations to suffer for the sins of a few who insist on making false advertising claims or engaging in some unethical practice or another.

In summary, let me say that management has before it the task of self-discipline, an area in which there is always room for improvement. And I hasten to assure you that this is applicable to Congress, the agencies and the Government itself, for that matter. But that is another subject.

The fact remains that it is the responsibility of the legislators and the agencies of Government to protect the consumer, just as it is the duty of business and industry.

Because the American business community is and always has been fiercely competitive, there is a great degree of consumer protection provided. And I have found from my own personal experience in this field that the American consumers are a pretty astute lot. More business firms have failed because the American consumer would not tolerate mistreatment or malpractice than have been forced out of business by legislation or regulation. Granted, there are always consumers who are gullible and who will be victimized by misrepresentation; but I am prepared to believe that these are the exception rather than the rule and I also believe that most successful businesses remain successful because they render a service or a product in which the public has confidence. For it is elementary that when any enterprise operates in a manner that destroys public confidence in it, it is destined to failure.

At the same time, we all recognize that Government has a solemn responsibility to protect the consumer, too. But in this process, we must guard against legislation and practices that force business to operate in a climate of public suspicion and skepticism, or in an atmosphere of constant uncertainty.

The fact that Government today, through legislative channels and executive action, is applying artificial respiration to resuscitate some industries which it has helped to strangle through regulation and legislative controls is in itself significant.

The gigantic and vitally important business of advertising in this most productive Nation is one which requires mutual understanding and cooperation between its participants and Government. For only if this exists can we expect to achieve the goal to which we are all dedicated, that of expanding our gross national product to preserve and improve a standard of living which has been the highest for the greatest number of people of any nation in history.

The National Lottery of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to bring to the attention of this body the national lottery of Greece. A nation does not have to be large in population or size to realize the tremendous benefits of a national lottery. All that is required is a little commonsense.

Greece is a small nation, and one not overly blessed with natural resources. The Greeks work hard to earn their money, and they know a good revenue device when they see one.

In 1961, Mr. Speaker, the Greek national lottery took in over $15 million—almost $3 million more than the previous year. The profits amounting to almost $3½ million were applied by the Government to the support of welfare, education, science, and archeology.

Mr. Speaker, why can we not be as wise as our foreign friends and capitalize on the normal human urge to gamble? A national lottery in the United States can easily and painlessly pump into our Government coffers over $10 billion a year in additional revenue which can be used to bring tax relief to our wage earners and start reducing our big national debt.

Post Office Gives Its Side of a Controversy Over the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the magazine and third-class mail interests are continuing their campaign against a reasonable adjustment of postal rates to meet the mounting postal deficit. One of their recent weapons is an article in the current issue of Reader's Digest. The Honorable J. Edward Day, Postmaster General of the United States, has answered this Reader's Digest article in the April 9 issue of U.S. News & World Report. Mr. Day's presentation is so factual and forceful that I have asked leave to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

POST OFFICE GIVES ITS SIDE OF A CONTROVERSY OVER THE MAILS

(By J. Edward Day, Postmaster General of the United States)

Myths, as everyone knows, die hard. Somehow cold facts never seem to be as attractive as legend. Some people simply prefer comfortable and familiar distortion to prosaic but demonstrable fact.

Sometimes legends serve a useful purpose. The familiar story of George Washington and the cherry tree has taught generations of American children a memorable lesson in truthfulness.

Sometimes legends serve a less laudable purpose. So it is with the hoary myths surrounding the Post Office Department. The Reader's Digest editorial, reprinted recently in U.S. News & World Report (in the issue of Mar. 26, 1962) dredges up once again the fanciful notions—almost all of them wrong—which do a great disservice to 582,000 proud, resourceful members of a vast but highly efficient communications system.

But more important is the disservice done the 54 million American households who use this system and, as mail users, can and do bear their share of the cost of its operation.

I speak so forcefully of myth versus fact in the postal service from a unique position—that of a Postmaster General who came to the management of this Department directly from a top executive position in one of America's largest corporations.

My management experience—first in business, now in Government—convinces me that any sound American business would do well to employ the kind of men and women who make up our postal service.

Our employees take pride in their increasing efficiency. They might be amused, for instance, at the Reader's Digest mention of the advanced technology of the Netherlands post office. There, the average Dutch postal worker handles the equivalent of 95,000 letters per year, while his much-maligned American counterpart, measured on the same basis, handles a volume of 121,000.

Since 1950 the volume of mail has increased 44.1 percent, but total man-years of employment have increased only 19.5 percent. Clerk employment alone has increased only 13.9 percent.

But I am heartened to find so many areas of agreement between the publishing industry and the Post Office Department.

We both agree that postal rates must be increased and postal costs must be carefully controlled.

We both agree that magazine-newspaper publishing is more than a business. The public interest is certainly served by the widest possible dissemination of news and information.

We both agree that publications should have a concessionary rate.

We both agree that magazine publishing these days is a precarious business at best.

We both agree that modernization and mechanization of the postal service are vital.

We both agree that the bulk of the cost of the proposed first-class increase would be borne by industry and commerce—as would the cost of the second- and third-class increases.

Our areas of agreement don't end here.

The Reader's Digest noted: "If a businessman were presented with the problem of putting the Post Office on a sound basis, he would take one obvious step at once: He would eliminate from postal expenses all costs for the many functions which are in every sense a public service."

I am the businessman who was presented with this problem. I did eliminate public service costs from postal expenses.

To review a bit, the Postal Policy Act of 1958, enthusiastically endorsed by the publishing industry, identified the areas of public service. But, up until 1961, the Department was quite content to ignore the intent of the Congress, clearly expressed in the 1958 legislation.

We, on the other hand, concluded early in our administration that the intent of the Congress should be implemented. For the first time, we successfully advocated proper recognition of these public service costs which should not be properly charged to the regular users of the mail.

If the previous pattern of cost determination were followed, ignoring the clear intent of the law, allowances for public services in 1963 would be about $74 million.

We have determined these allowances—to be deducted from costs charged to mail users big and small—properly total $247.8 million. Not surprisingly, we find the publishing industry agreeing with us on this more liberal and realistic approach.

But here, unfortunately, the area of agreement ends.

The Reader's Digest and other magazines need be concerned only with their own self-interest in regard to the adjustment of postal rates.

I cannot.

Let's make it clear what we mean when we discuss an increase in second-class postage. We propose to charge 1 cent more for each copy of a magazine or newspaper, such increases to become effective in two steps, 1 year apart.

At present, publications mailed at the regular rate pay 25 percent of what it costs us to handle them.

The Reader's Digest pays 2½ cents per copy mailed.

In other words, at the same time we ask the letterwriter to pay 5 cents instead of 4 cents, we ask the Reader's Digest to pay only 3½ cents instead of 2½ cents.

The Reader's Digest would shift the burden of increase in postal rates—which all agree are needed—to users of first-class mail to lighten the burden on second class, which is used for distributing their product. We cannot agree. I have the responsibility of being sure that the needed increases are fairly distributed among all the users of the mail.

Let us look at the economics of publishing. Magazines today are faced with new competition for the time and attention of their traditional audience. It is true that a number of magazines and newspapers have gone out of business or merged with others.

It is also true that a substantial number of new publications have gone into business and seem to be thriving. For example, such publications as TV Guide—third-largest magazine in the mails—American Heritage and Sports Illustrated are among some 30 magazines that have begun publication in the last 10 years.

The impressive list of successful new publications suggests strongly that factors other than postal rates determine the success or failure of a magazine.

A study by J. K. Lasser published by the Magazine Publishers Association indicates that second-class postage consumes just over 3 percent of total magazine revenues. Profits account for 1.7 percent of revenues.

Other costs run something over 95 percent. Most businessmen would be inclined to look at the vast area of 95 percent of an industry's cost for symptoms of its difficulty. Few managers, I think, would concentrate their efforts just in the 3-percent segment.

In an effort to solve immediate financial problems, magazines are placing greatest reliance on advertising revenues. In order to improve their revenue from advertising, they find it necessary and desirable to seek the largest possible circulation. With large circulation they can charge higher rates per page to their advertisers.

As a consequence, magazines are bending every effort to secure more and more subscribers. This is expensive.

For example, the Reader's Digest, which spends $3.2 million for postage to deliver the magazine to the subscriber, spends $4.4 million to solicit still more subscribers through the use of circular advertising mail.

The reader of a magazine who buys a year's subscription pays a lower per-copy price than the casual newsstand purchaser. Recently, in the race for expanded circulation, publishers have made special promotional subscription offers at substantial discounts below the regular subscription price. For instance, today the special offers have become the rule rather than the exception, with about half of all subscriptions being sold at the special rate. Some magazines have as much as 80 percent of their total circulation sold at special rates.

For example, the Reader's Digest has a special-rate offer, introduced in its current issue. The single-copy price at the newsstand is 35 cents. The cost of each copy bought at the regular subscription price is 33½ cents. But the current special offer brings the cost down to 17 cents per copy. This is 18 cents less than the newsstand price and 16 cents less than the regular subscription price.

The Reader's Digest only has to reduce the amount it is now giving away in discounts from 18 cents to 17 cents or from 16 cents to 15 cents in order to cover the added postage costs on a very large segment of its circulation.

According to the most recent publication of the Association of National Advertisers, the Reader's Digest, for example, sells 98.5 percent of all its subscriptions on terms under their basic subscription price.

The real question seems to be: Are lower rates for mailing magazines being used to serve the public interest or are they being used to increase the revenue from advertising by means of higher advertising rates based on artificially swollen circulation?

Merchandisers quite frequently sell products at discounted prices to build volume. On the other hand, if the discounted prices, in spite of the volume they create, reach the point where they wipe out profit, the merchandiser cannot logically turn to his Government for subsidy.

Yet the current position of the magazine-publishing industry, if we are to accept its plea that magazines be excused from paying their share of increased postal rates, is exactly that.

Such an approach to merchandising is not, in my opinion, sound business or good government.

The editors of the Reader's Digest quote John Fisher, editor of Harper's, as follows: "I just can't believe that the Government actually intends to destroy magazines such as Harper's, the Atlantic Monthly, the Reporter, Commentary, Commonweal, and Saturday Review."

The Post Office does not intend to destroy any magazines. That certainly is not our purpose. In proposing rate increases we cannot properly choose any user or any type of magazine as deserving particular or special consideration. The courts, including the Supreme Court, have ruled that, so long as its content does not violate the law, the Post Office cannot pass judgments as to the value or quality of the publication.

Value judgments are made by the reader when he chooses which of the 12,000 diverse magazines being published he will buy and read. This is as it should be.

There are one or two other observations I would like to make about specific points raised in the Reader's Digest.

A paragraph states that "several national accounting experts have recommended that the Post Office cost system should be overhauled to end the issuance of inaccurate, thoroughly misleading figures about profits and losses on the various classes of mail." This, too, is one of those myths that persist in the face of fact. The cost-accounting system is a convenient target for attack, when the actual target is not the system but the inescapable conclusion from its findings. The several national accounting experts apparently are not familiar with the discussion, debate, and legislative history on which the Post Office accounting system is based. These experts are apparently not familiar with the conclusion reached by such highly qualified people as Price Waterhouse & Co., which has testified to the soundness and accuracy of the cost-ascertainment system.

FOR A BALANCED POSTAL BUDGET

The Reader's Digest suggests that, even after the postal rates are increased, a deficit will remain because "red ink is waiting in the wings" in the form of increased pay for postal workers. Actually, President Kennedy's overall budget recommended an increase in postal rates sufficient to cover a deserved increase for postal employees. For the first time in history, an administration has simultaneously taken the initiative in both of these areas. The result of enactment by the Congress of both rate and pay legislation as proposed by the administration would be not barrels of red ink, but rather the first deficit-free peacetime postal budget since 1916.

Fiction and fact again appeared in an untidy intermixture when the Reader's Digest chose to say: "It is obvious that by ending the horse-and-buggy methods * * * by installing mail-handling machinery of all kinds, the Post Office could save tremendous sums of money."

I suspect that even the Reader's Digest would concede the way the mail was handled 100 years ago would not give them today the distribution system that makes possible the virtually simultaneous delivery of their magazine each month in millions of homes—at 2½ cents per copy.

As far back as 1922, mechanized sorting equipment was being tried out by the U.S. Post Office. Many of our offices today have modern machines to speed the flow of mail and eliminate the menial drudgery of our employees. As fast as they are developed—and proven practical—new mechanical aids are added to our postal system.

We have a high degree of mechanization in 27 of our major post offices which handle about 34 percent of our total mail. Extensive mechanization is practicable only in our larger offices with their heavy, concentrated mail volume.

Meanwhile, foreign postal systems look to us—not the other way around—for the latest in postal mechanization. For example:

"The United States has made the most advances in research and development * * * as compared with all other members of the Consultative Committee on Postal Studies," according to L. T. Hoolboom, Superior Director of Posts, the Netherlands.

"The most advanced mechanization seen in any postal system," said Stanley Scott, Assistant Director of Mechanization and Building, London, England.

"We got numerous suggestions from your postal laboratory and your mechanized post offices for future development of mechanization and automation in our postal service." Franz Vierling, Post Director, Bundesministerium, Bonn, West Germany, wrote recently.

Like any business, we buy and use only proven machinery in those applications where volume and utilization make such usage practical. Like any business, we are devoting talent and money to research. Through our new challenge to industry program, we are enlisting private industry in the challenges of postal mechanization.

The Reader's Digest vaguely implies, perhaps in frustration, that some presently unused machine, installed simultaneously in each of our 35,000 offices, would magically create a new mechanized era of mail handling.

The concentrated engineering talent of the free world has yet to develop such machines. When—and if—such mechanical marvels do appear, the U.S. postal system will be the first to utilize them.

But, in the meantime, we have a gigantic day-to-day responsibility. So long as letters, addressed in everything from a child's scrawl to computer type, must be read several times to move them on their way, men—not machines—will be the heart of the postal system.

So long as Americans continue to be the world's most literate people and most voracious readers, magazines and newspapers that satisfy their subscribers' wants will sell by the million. And the Post Office will continue to deliver them at concessionary rates reflecting their public interest value.

So long as the U.S. Post Office continues to fill its unique dual role as a contractor to mail users and a service to the public, our rates will have to reflect those twin responsibilities.

The postal-rate bill, passed by the House and now pending before the Senate, does just that.

In providing for $691 million in new revenues, it will give all users of the mail a fair and equitable share of the cost of the service they enjoy without violating the historic and justified concessions granted publishers and others.

In earmarking $248 million for public service, the legislation will realistically acknowledge the postal and nonpostal costs of running this Department in the public interest which should not be borne by mail users.

Since the days of Ben Franklin there have been those who raised strident voices claiming that the postal revenue deficiency would somehow be resolved if only the Post Office were "modernized," or "energized," or "streamlined," or "automated."

The Reader's Digest seems to envision a robot clanking up to your house and mine, delivering our mail and our Digest mechanically, getting our signature on insured packages, opening a slot in his enameled chest for collecting postage due, petting the dog with a cold metallic hand and chatting about the weather, perhaps via prerecorded tape.

WHY MAIL COSTS ARE RISING

The dreamers of such dreams choose to ignore a number of the very wideawake facts which I have outlined briefly here. The costs of running a modern and efficient postal service for the benefit of all mail users are rising because of the greater and greater use of our service by more and more people.

Our choice is not between the letter carrier who brings the mail every day and a robot who might replace him—but between a mail service paid for by those who use it or paid for by all of the taxpayers.

Staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter sent by me to the Librarian of Congress:

APRIL 4, 1962.

Mr. L. QUINCY MUMFORD,
Librarian of Congress, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MUMFORD: The Library of Congress report inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1962, at page 5354, leaves an entirely erroneous impression regarding the staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am chairman.

Had you given any consideration to your responsibility in preparing such a statement, you would have ascertained that the staffing of this committee is entirely different from the impression your report gives.

This committee, as you should know, consists of five members of the majority party and four of the minority party, in order that it may function as free from political influence and restraint as our system of government can devise. The positions on the staff of this committee are not held by reason of political preference, and no member of the staff is considered as a "majority employee" or a "minority employee." In order to preserve the absolute freedom of staff action, such political classifications are not made with regard to the members of the staff of this committee.

The true situation relative to the staff of this committee will be briefly stated. Of the 14 key positions on the staff, 7 are occupied by Democrats and 7 by Republicans. Six of these individuals, three being Democrats and three being Republicans, have held positions with this committee for more than 13 years.

A more detailed statement of the facts is set forth below:

Richard Arens, Republican, was appointed the first director of the committee during the 84th Congress, and upon his resignation, effective September 1, 1960, Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., Democrat, who has served as counsel for the committee since the 81st Congress, succeeded to the position of director. Gwendolyn Lewis, Republican, was appointed administrative assistant to the director (Arens), in 1957, 85th Congress, and continues to occupy that position. Counsel and cocounsel, both Democrats, were appointed during the 86th Congress. The record clerk, a Republican, was appointed during the 79th Congress. The director of research, a Republican, was appointed during the 85th Congress. The head of the files and reports section, a Democrat, was appointed during the 79th Congress. The head of the editorial staff was appointed during the 84th Congress. Of the investigative staff of six, one, a Republican, was appointed during the 79th Congress; two, one a Democrat and the other a Republican, were appointed during the 80th Congress; a fourth investigator, a Republican, was appointed during the 83d Congress, and of the remaining two, one, a Democrat, was appointed during the 85th Congress, and the other, a Republican, was appointed during the 86th Congress.

I need hardly suggest that you make an appropriate amendment to your report setting forth the facts as given to you in this letter, and that it be given as full publicity as your original report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

The War We Are Waging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday evening I had the honor of addressing an American strategy seminar in Buffalo, N.Y., sponsored by the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce under the chairmanship of Mr. John R. Owen, Jr.

I believe that public information and educational activities typified by this 2-day seminar are an important contribution to the understanding and resolute will essential for victory over the forces of international communism. I commend the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce for its activities on this score.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of my address, "The War We Are Waging":

THE WAR WE ARE WAGING

My fellow Americans, we are at war.

Those responsible for planning and conducting this American strategy seminar are aware of that fact. This 2-day seminar testifies to that awareness.

I am honored to be a guest in this Buffalo area, ably represented in the Congress of the United States by my colleagues and good friends, Hon. WILLIAM E. MILLER, Hon. JOHN R. PILLION, and Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI. I am also honored to share a place on your program with Congressman PILLION and Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Ohio, keynoter of the seminar, as well as with the other distinguished speakers.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, we are at war, and I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge and pay tribute to the joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives on June 12 last year by Congressman PILLION, "expressing a declaration of war against the 98 Communist Parties constituting the international Communist conspiracy" and pledging the United States and all of its resources "to the defeat and destruction of the Communist parties of the world." I support and commend the realism of that joint resolution and its declaration of intent.

The most heartening aspect of this American seminar is its completely nonpartisan—or perhaps more accurately bipartisan—character. It is not going to matter one whit whether we are Democrats or Republicans if we do not win the war in which we are engaged.

Before I proceed further in my discussion, I offer two brief observations.

The first is that Americans can do one thing that Khrushchev, without their aid, can never do.

They can defeat the United States.

They can do it in many ways or combinations of ways—through ignorance, apathy, superficial thinking, intemperate suspicion, overtrustfulness, shortsighted selfishness and greed, undisciplined generosity, timidity and cowardice, or through simple default.

Your presence here tonight is a token of your awareness of this harsh fact and an earnest of your determination that this shall not happen.

One further comment:

A decade ago, in testimony before a joint Senate committee hearing, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur voiced his faith in America with respect to the global conflict with international communism.

He summed it up in a single sentence of five eloquent words:

"I have confidence in us."

I share that faith. And so, I am sure, despite some rude setbacks, do you.

It is in that spirit that I address you tonight.

The subject I am assigned tonight is vast and complex. The best I can hope to do is to develop my comments around a number of simple propositions—each one of which I can discuss only very briefly.

International communism confronts us with a totally new kind of enemy, engaged in a new kind of war, seeking a new kind of total victory.

The several propositions which I will offer are for the purpose of elaborating and illustrating this basic premise.

Proposition No. 1: Communism is not something to be dealt with as if it were merely an idea.

It is not to be dealt with as if it were merely an idea because it is not merely an idea.

To be sure, Communist dogma and strategy and goals involve ideas and ideologies.

As Eugene Lyons has so aptly said:

"Communism has become an engine of power, an apparatus of destruction, which has our destruction as its primary goal."

Unless we face up to this fact, we can expect that any counterstrategy we devise will miss its target and prove self-defeating.

International communism—whatever else it may be and it is too many things to recite them in detail here tonight—is all-powerful government in its ultimate and most ruthless form, operating by internal subversion and external aggression, bent on complete world domination, and employing all of the apparatus and techniques of brute force, blackmail, infiltration, propaganda, treachery, deception, brainwashing, liquidation and all of the other methods of protracted warfare.

Let me add two observations to underscore the point that communism is not something to be dealt with as if it were merely an idea. Early in this seminar you viewed the Pentagon film, "Challenge of Ideas."

Whatever your personal evaluation of this film, I submit that any merit it possesses is pretty well sabotaged by the title itself, "Challenge of Ideas." At best this is a fragmentary and therefore gravely misleading definition of the challenge we face.

The true symbol of the challenge we face is not the debating society but the firing squad.

Communism is not merely an idea but a very simple challenge and ultimatum to be enforced by brute force or by the threat of brute force: either acquiescence and total capitulation to the victory of international communism or liquidation.

I stress this point for a further reason.

Quite understandably the inclination of young Americans particularly is to regard all movements as being primarily subject matter for discussion and debate. In many cases young people, and many adults, view the Communist movement in this light. Unfortunately for the true Communist, the movement is not a matter of discussion but of dedication. Of course the Communists would accept adherence won by persuasion but they make unmistakably clear that those who are not persuaded are to be compelled by naked power with liquidation as the sole alternative. We are confronted, therefore, not with theory but with tyranny and brute force.

Do you doubt that? Then ask the Hungarians, the East Germans, the people of China, and the Cubans.

Proposition No. 2: The claim that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is "just another political party" is a dangerous falsehood.

And that claim is also an attractive bait for the gullible.

Let's give it a cold, hard look.

In 1959 the Communist Party, U.S.A., marked its 40th anniversary. In that connection a prominent spokesman of American communism, Mr. Herbert Aptheker, editor of the Marxist magazine, Political Affairs, wrote an article for a Moscow Communist publication issued in October 1959 reviewing the history of the party in the United States.

In this article Mr. Aptheker praised the Communist Party, U.S.A., because even in its difficult first years "it came out in support of Soviet Russia." He pointed out that "after the Hitlerite attack on the Soviet Union, the Communist Party [in the United States] aimed all its efforts at increasing the contribution of the United States to insuring victory over the enemy." He didn't mention that prior to that attack the party had denounced American war efforts as "imperialistic activity."

Finally, while criticizing certain "opportunists" in the Communist Party, U.S.A., who fell away after Soviet Russia's ruthless suppression of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters in 1956, Mr. Aptheker boasted that "the rank-and-file members of the party * * * did not adopt the road of treason."

Note that language and its clear meaning. For him, as for all American Communists, treason does not relate to the United States but to a violation of loyalty to Soviet Russia.

Just another political party?

Moreover, Mr. Aptheker in this same article singled out for special praise as a loyal Communist leader, the late Comrade William Z. Foster, chairman emeritus of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Now let me quote a statement from a book written by this Amercan Communist leader, William Z. Foster, in 1949:

"When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come as surely as the sun rises—the Government will not be a capitalistic government but a Soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Just another political party?

Another commentary on this false and dangerous claim.

Back in 1934 a member of the Young Communist League was on trial—and was convicted—for activities in connection with a riot in Minneapolis. Here are some questions and answers from the record of that trial:

"Question. But you would prefer the Russian—you would prefer to be in Russia?

"Answer. I prefer America with a Soviet government.

"Question. Are you willing to fight and overthrow this Government?

"Answer. Absolutely.

"Question. And you are willing to take up arms and overthrow the constituted authorities?

"Answer. When the time comes, 'Yes.'"

So what, you may ask. That was in 1934. Here is "So what."

That Young Communist League member was Gus Hall. In December 1959, this same Gus Hall was elected general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

He still holds that post.

At long last, in June of last year, the U.S. Supreme Court officially affirmed what the Congress many years before had spelled out; namely, that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is not "just another political party" but is a part of a foreign based and controlled international program of conquest.

Proposition No. 3: International communism is a unique combination of "enemies, foreign and domestic" and for this reason current debate as to whether the threat is external or internal is totally unrealistic.

The threat of the international Communist conspiracy cannot be described or accurately appraised on an either/or basis but only on a both/and basis. Of course, it is an external threat.

But the techniques of subversion, espionage, sabotage, and propaganda are likewise internal threats—real, unremitting, persistently active, and potentially deadly.

On this point I quote the ablest American authority on the subject, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover:

"Some 200 known or suspected Communist-front and Communist-infiltrated organizations are now under investigation by the FBI. Many of these fronts are national in scope with chapters in various cities throughout the United States.

"They have infiltrated every conceivable sphere of activity: youth groups, radio, television, and motion picture industries; church, school, educational and cultural groups; the press, nationality minority groups and civil and political units."

Also, in a speech delivered only 4 months ago in Washington, Mr. Hoover said:

"The Communist threat from without must not blind us to the Communist threat from within. The latter is reaching into the very heart of America through its espionage agents and a cunning, defiant, and lawless Communist Party, which is fanatically dedicated to the Marxist cause of world enslavement and destruction of the foundations of our Republic."

One final word on this matter. In an address last April, President Kennedy pointed out that armies and nuclear armaments served primarily as the shield "behind which subversion, infiltration, and a host of other tactics can steadily advance." Mr. Kennedy was speaking specifically of Communist methods in Latin America and the Far East.

Can anyone be so unrealistic to suppose for a moment that the United States—prime target of Communist designs of conquest—is immune from these tactics and these efforts of the international Communist conspiracy.

Proposition No. 4: An attempt to evaluate the Communist threat solely or primarily in terms of the number of avowed or identified adherents is equally fallacious and dangerous.

In other words, it is foolish and potentially fatal to hold that there is nothing to fear about communism in this country because there are so few Communists—only a few thousand party members. This glib premise flies in the face of the history of the international Communist conspiracy.

Communists today constitute only 3 percent of the population of Soviet Russia. Moreover, 33 million Communists in a worldwide network control 40 percent of the population of this globe—900 million people—and honeycomb the vital control centers of the societies of the remaining 60 percent of the world population.

As the great American and great Democrat who heads the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Chairman Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, has said, communism is not to be compared to two or three drops of red ink added to a large jug of water and immediately diluted to the point that it fails even slightly to discolor the water.

Addressing a patriotic rally in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, Congressman Walter added:

"A true analogy [is] the vast and complicated electrical wiring system in this hotel. This wiring system can be shortcircuited by a single disruption at a control point."

It didn't require very many dedicated Communists to deliver our nuclear secrets to Soviet Russia.

Bear in mind also the further ominous fact that the Communists themselves boasted, as Mr. Hoover has pointed out, that for every one formal party member in the United States there are 10 fellow travelers, sympathetic nonmembers, and dupes who serve the Communist cause.

The peril is not to be measured merely by arithmetic.

Proposition No. 5: "This is neither the time for inaction nor vigilante action; the job of curtailing and containing communism is one for legally constituted authorities with the steadfast cooperation of every loyal citizen."

This fifth proposition is a quotation from a public statement last year by J. Edgar Hoover.

I wish to draw two or three specific conclusions from the premise stated by Mr. Hoover.

1. The starting point for "the steadfast cooperation of every loyal citizen" is an understanding of the international Communist conspiracy, its objectives and its methods, both domestic and foreign.

That is precisely the value and the urgency of such seminars as this.

2. There are numerous "legally constituted authorities" which share in the job of curtailing and containing communism.

These include the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Defense Agency, the intelligence services of the three military departments, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

With respect to the last two named agencies—the investigating committees of the Congress—I should like to make one point. Despite the propaganda to the contrary—much of it Communist-inspired—these two committees are a safeguard against vigilantism and not its creator. They serve the dual purpose of recommending legislation against Communist propaganda and subversion and of informing the Congress and the American people as to the facts about communism.

3. In that connection, I should like to call attention to the statement of the Supreme Court in the 1959 Barrenblatt case—a statement by the way never quoted by those dedicated to the abolition of these two legislative committees:

"That Congress has wide power to legislate in the field of Communist activity in this country, and to conduct appropriate investigations in aid thereof, is hardly debatable * * * In the last analysis this power rests on the right of self-preservation * * * Justification for its exercise in turn rests on the long and widely accepted view that the tenets of the Communist Party include the ultimate overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence."

To suggest that these two essential functions can be performed by the FBI and the other agencies of the executive branch is, of course, completely mistaken. Their role in combating communism is entirely different. They operate under restrictions of secrecy which would make them virtually useless to the legislative branch.

No one suggests, of course, that, because we have the FBI and the Department of Justice, and other investigative and law enforcement agencies dealing with interstate crime, labor racketeering, antitrust violations, or other criminal or antisocial activities, there should be no legislative committee investigations in these fields. This fallacious argument is not heard except with relation to legislative investigations of communism and subversion. The argument falls on its own weight.

4. Mr. Hoover's warning against vigilantism is a timely reminder that we must always differentiate between treason and dissent; between conspiracy and heresy; between loyalty and incompetence or wrongheadedness. This means, in simplest terms, that we must avoid reckless and indiscriminate charges of communism, and on this point Mr. Hoover has some further very sound advice:

"There exists today in our land a vital rift which the Communists are exploiting. Unfortunately, this involves certain people across the country who engage in reckless charges against one another. The label of 'Communist' is too often indiscriminately attached to those whose views differ from the majority * * *."

This warning goes not merely to the matter of accuracy and fairness and to the need of avoiding the cry of "Wolf! Wolf!" but to even more fundamental considerations.

Weakness, incompetence, wrongheadedness, mistaken policies, are not necessarily treason, but they can be as fatal and as deadly as treason.

But the point is that the method for dealing with weakness, incompetence, wrongheadedness, and mistaken policies are entirely different from those for dealing with treason, disloyalty, subversion, and so on. The former falls in the field of political action. The latter falls in the field of legislation, law enforcement, surveillance, and exposure.

We ilily serve the cause of anticommunism if we mistakenly confuse either the offense or the corrective measures.

Proposition No. 6: Whatever serves the cause of communism serves that cause regardless of motives.

I interject this proposition because of the very harsh fact and real peril of parallelism.

I interject this proposition as a stern reminder to those of the so-called extreme left and those who are unconscious dupes of the Communist cause.

This is not primarily an area subject to correction by law or even by the exposures of legislative committees.

It is rather a matter of citizen responsibility and conscience.

But certainly not everyone who advocates a viewpoint which coincides with the international Communist line is therefore a Communist or a traitor.

But the point is that advocates of policies which do parallel the Communists can unwittingly and unintentionally serve the Communist cause. I think it is only a matter of fairness and reciprocity that those who assert their undoubted right, for example, to advocate recognition of Red China or unilateral suspension of nuclear testing, be willing to accept in good grace the equally undoubted right of other citizens to point out the parallelism and to continue to conclude that such advocacy does in fact serve the Communist cause.

It is one of the crimes of international communism that this is the inevitable consequence.

Proposition No. 7: It is imperative that we have straight thinking regarding the matter of suspicion in this conspiratorial age.

We are frequently told these days, and particularly by the enemies of the House Committee on Un-American Activities that anti-Communist organizations and activities and even the exposure of Communists by legislative committees tends to create an unhealthy divisive and dangerous climate of suspicion and that the effect is to make Americans distrustful of their neighbors.

Frequently this aura of suspicion is linked in these denunciations with that Communist-invented term "McCarthyism."

The accusations go even to the length of suggesting that this epidemic or contagion of suspicion is virtually psychopathic.

Now I should like to address myself to just two aspects of this matter of suspicion.

Insofar as there is suspicion, it would seem reasonable to raise the question as to the genesis of that suspicion. Let me use a homely illustration:

Suppose that I happen to attend a gathering in one of the large reception rooms in a Washington hotel to which room admission is gained only through one door and only by ticket. As I enter the room I take my pocketbook from my pocket, remove the ticket and present it and thereupon replace my pocketbook in my pocket.

A short time later I find the pocketbook is missing and after a quiet search fail to locate it anywhere, I reluctantly advise my host that there apparently is a pickpocket among his guests. In consequence of my complaint, my host turns indignantly upon me, accuses me of creating suspicion, and sees to it that I am promptly ejected.

Now it would seem to me that there is some basis for alleged confusion and illogic in the mind of my host in charging me with being the cause and source of the suspicion. I am naive enough to believe that the real offender—so far as suspicion has been created—is the pickpocket. Furthermore, added to the insult of being ejected is the injury which I continue to suffer in not regaining my pocketbook.

Without torturing the analogy, I cannot conceive of anyone who would be more interested in condemning me for creating suspicion and in diverting condemnation to me, than the pickpocket himself.

Again, it is one of the crimes of international communism that by its conspiratorial and subversive activities it creates the somewhat logical suspicion that there are Communists and that they do indulge in conspiratorial activities and subversion.

Let us carry the examination of this matter of suspicion one step further.

Are we not in danger of ignoring and minimizing the survival value and imperative of suspicion?

Is it an exaggeration to say that the parents who teach their children not to accept rides from strangers, or the safety experts who warn against picking up hitchhikers are in truth creating, or at least laying the basis for suspicion and distrust?

And isn't this a healthy, necessary, and vitally protective type of suspicion? I think the answer is obvious.

Now, of course, if a guest in every gathering, however selective, views his associates as actual or potential pickpockets or if there is a disposition to impute Communist affiliations or leanings to everyone who expresses a political, economic, or social view contrary to our own, we may well have a case of psychopathic suspicion.

Here again, I venture the suggestion that the constituted authorities dealing with the facts and machinations of the international Communist conspiracy—including legislative investigative committees, instead of creating vigilantism and generating indiscriminate suspicion, actually serve, if we will but take the time to read and ponder their findings, to discipline suspicion and keep it from getting out of hand.

Proposition No. 8: It is imperative also that we have straight thinking regarding the matter of human greed, particularly as it relates to the class war propaganda of the international Communist conspiracy.

Incidentally, this matter goes to an idea aspect of international communism and its class war propaganda.

Let me explain what I mean.

In his farewell television address to the American people at the close of his first visit to the United States—when we generously made available to our declared enemy our vast communication facilities and no one bothered to claim equal time to refute his vicious propaganda—Mr. Khrushchev said something on this score:

"Human greed is a terrible thing. Did you ever know a millionaire who didn't want to become a multimillionaire?"

This was indeed a touching homily on the sinfulness of human selfishness, avarice, and covetousness delivered of a quiet Sunday evening by a grandfatherly appearing old scoundrel who himself—and in the system he represents—epitomized another and vastly more terrible form of human greed which has never scrupled at mass murder to accomplish its unholy purposes.

Of this other and infinitely more dreadful type of human greed—the grasping greed of the totalitarian state and the ruthless dictator—Mr. Khrushchev of course said not a word. Which was to be expected.

But then, as I have indicated, neither did any top-ranking spokesman for America. Which to me is unexpected and inexplicable.

Surely someone ought to have said at once—in paraphrase of Mr. Khrushchev's words—"Human greed is indeed a terrible thing. Did you ever know of a dictator who didn't want to tighten his totalitarian grip or extend and expand the scope and sway of his domination?"

It was against this very form of greed that our Founding Fathers sought in this constitutional Republic to provide lasting safeguards.

I am not unfamiliar with the manifestations of greed for wealth. But I'll take the millionaire eager to become a multimillionaire—under a system of freedom and self-government which can curb his avarice—in preference any day to the dictator and the centralized totalitarian government which leaves freemen and freedom defenseless.

Let Mr. Khrushchev preach his sanctimonious class warfare on other soil hereafter.

Proposition No. 9: It is imperative that we have straight thinking regarding the popular cliche that "it is better to be talking than shooting."

Winston Churchill's picturesque version is, "jaw, jaw, jaw, is better than war, war, war."

Now there is just enough truth to this proposition to make it plausible and appealing. It is one of those half-truths potentially more misleading and dangerous than an outright untruth.

And of course it is a risky business for anyone to challenge the statement—as I indeed do challenge it; risky because it subjects the challenger to the charge that he prefers war—nuclear war, no less—to talk, conferences, and negotiation. And this opens the way to the epithet "warmonger."

This glib cliche that "It's better to be talking than shooting" is a dangerous half-truth precisely because—standing alone and without qualification—it ignores the crucially important fact that talk can be just as perilous, just as fatal to the cause of justice, to national security, to the survival of our freedoms as war itself. It is possible that freedom, justice and even life itself may better survive war than talk—if, in that talk, we say or believe or trust the wrong things.

You can suffer diplomatic defeat as disastrous as military defeat. You can surrender as completely and abjectly at the conference table as on the battlefield or under an atomic holocaust.

Talk can be as catastrophic as war itself—for one reason because Soviet Russia has amply demonstrated the accuracy of the warning given by Democratic Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby in 1920 that the leaders of the Soviet regime "have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings." Incidentally, 50 or 52 major agreements to which the United States has been a party have been broken by Soviet Russia since we extended diplomatic recognition in 1933.

Talk can be as catastrophic as war itself in this age of scientific propaganda for another even more crucial reason. As a prominent English authority on communism has so aptly pointed out, the Communists have deliberately "decided to harness the fear of war instead of war itself to the Communist cause."

This analysis of Communist strategy, one that I believe to be appallingly accurate, adds up to a strategy of blackmail—nuclear blackmail.

And this underscores the catastrophic potential of talk.

We talked at Yalta.

And the direful consequences of that talk can be magnified at future Yaltas if we become enamoured with the efficacy of talk alone.

There is one form of talk which I regard as particularly dangerous and fatal. It is the kind of talk by supposedly responsible public officials, of either the executive or legislative branch, and for that matter on the part of nongovernmental communication media, which announces to our enemies the steps we do not intend to take in behalf of our defense and national security. I am sure that I do not have to document for this audience the fact that we have had, from time to time, that kind of talking and from the highest sources in our Nation.

Proposition No. 10: Finally, we must be alert to, and vigilant against, the insidious doctrine of fatalistic inevitability and helplessness which can only serve to sap our courage, paralyze our wills, and neutralize our power.

We must be equally alert to and vigilant against this insidious doctrine whether it has its origins in the international Communist conspiracy or whether it has its origins in inept and foolish counsels of weakness in our own midst.

The only kind of disarmament that Khrushchev or international communism are really interested in is the moral and spiritual disarmament of their enemies and principally of the United States. Time permits only the briefest documentation of this warning and this peril.

As one example, I quote from a New York Times editorial of Wednesday, April 16, 1961:

"One reason for the hesitant mood is the tragic dilemma facing a democratic society which, with all its imperfections, espouses certain moral principles as pursuing its own advantage under the law of the jungle. While the Soviets seek to stir up revolution and war against us wherever they can—even to the perfidy of the Hitler-Stalin pact—we must seek to discourage anti-Communist revolts in order to avert bloodshed and war. We must, under our own principles, live with evil even if by doing so we help to stabilize tottering Communist regimes, as in East Germany, and perhaps even expose citadels of freedom, like West Berlin, to slow death by strangulation."

Here is another example:.

This is a statement by Dr. Kenneth A. Foreman which appeared in the October 1961 issue of the Presbyterian Outlook:

"Freedom * * * or fight * * * is not the alternative any more. * * * The alternative now is 'peace' with slavery, or total destruction."

It is not my wish in the slightest degree to violate the bipartisan or nonpartisan character of these remarks or of this seminar. Yet I must offer my respectful disagreement with the statement of the Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, made on the floor of the Senate July 24, 1961, when he said:

"Apparently we have not yet fully accepted the fact that there are no absolute solutions, that we can hope to do little more than mitigate our problems as best we can and learn to live with them."

I have only two comments to offer regarding this statement.

I do not profess to know what Senator FULBRIGHT means by "absolute solutions." I do believe that his statement, however intended, can contribute to the philosophy of fatalistic futility which can, in turn, sap our courage, paralyze our wills, and neutralize our power.

I am sure that if Senator FULBRIGHT were lost in a forest with a working compass in his pocket, he would accept the relative solution offered by that compass instead of resigning himself to helplessness because he had no absolute solution.

I suggest also that it is fortunate that medical science has not been paralyzed into immobility because it has no absolute solutions. Doctors, to be sure, have found no absolute solution to the fact of death, but they have defeated, and do defeat, death countless times. They have eliminated scourges. They have increased life expectancy. They have not only mitigated problems—they have solved them. They have not merely enabled men to live with physical handicaps and problems—sometimes, in truth, that is all that is possible—but they have eliminated these ills and removed the handicaps. Are we to ask or expect any less of statesmanship?

I am deeply disturbed by the frequent rebukes of those who, it is alleged, glibly offer "simple solutions." It is very easy, I suspect, to equate this rebuke with a resignation to the fact that there are no solutions.

I quote, for example, Chalmers M. Roberts in his December 23, 1961, article on "Thunder on the Right." Mr. Roberts offers the premise that "In today's vastly complex world, major international problems admit of no neat solutions soothing to the international ego." Mr. Roberts adds:

"In the simpler world of the past, American power could be, and was, brought to bear and was, in itself, or with the unwritten British alliance, sufficient to accomplish all our purposes in international affairs. But gunboat diplomacy is dead; in the newer age risk of direct action by a great power entails the risk of suicide.

"In such a complex world those with the easy explanation and the simple solution appeal to the many who are frustrated with insolubility."

Mr. Roberts cites as a typical attitude of these "frustrated Americans" those who "want to know why if we can't smack the big devil in Moscow, why can't we swat the little devil in Havana."

While I admit that Cuba is a graphic and appallingly dangerous "exhibit A" as to the consequences of both incredible blunders, of "too little and too late" in terms of action which could have been effective at minimum cost had it been taken timely, and as to the example of cumulative effect of misinformation, miscalculation, lack of courage, paralysis of will and neutralization of power. I happen also to think that, late as it is, it is not too late for decisive action, but I cannot pursue that matter further here except to say that since October 1959, I have been detailing specific suggestions for a progressive course of firm and decisive action with respect to this bastion of international communism so near our shores.

I share with Clare Booth Luce the view that "the chain of destiny is forged link by link, and so is the chain of captivity." I share also the appraisal recently given by Roscoe Drummond, the distinguished columnist:

"Fear of war has almost continuously paralyzed Western policy [since the end of World War II] but fear of war has not paralyzed Communist policy.

"If we continue to be afraid of nuclear war while the Soviets are not afraid of nuclear war, we are going to end up losing diplomatically what we fear to lose in a nuclear war. If we keep stepping back from the Moscow-created brink every time Mr. Khrushchev says: 'Give us a little something more or you will get yourselves destroyed by war'—we will keep on losing the cold war and getting nearer to actual war."

Nuclear blackmail can be frustrated by the simple expedient of refusing to be blackmailed.

Progressive steps, including declaration of contraband, total embargo, and military intervention can be taken if necessary to liberate Cuba.

Nuclear testing can and should be resumed.

Unilateral concessions can be rejected.

Futile—or even worse, peace at any price—negotiations can be foregone.

Domestic Communist machinations can be, and are being, kept under surveillance, and exposed and countered by effective measures. Captive nations can be encouraged and aided in their quest for the recovery of their freedom.

Capitalism—including American capitalism—given reasonable safeguards and encouragement, can wage effective war against the inroads of the slave system of communism.

The American people can be rallied to the support of policies of "firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right."

To General MacArthur's declaration of faith, which I quoted at the outset, "I have confidence in us," I add his words of warning and challenge delivered on the battleship *Missouri* at the surrender at Tokyo Bay: "It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been necessary that I spend a great deal of time in my congressional district; however, I return to Washington to cast my votes, and this week I returned to vote on some important measures—among them being additional authorization for our Peace Corps program—and a supplemental appropriation bill.

Included in H.R. 11038, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1962, which passed the House and which I supported, is an appropriation of $80 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development. This includes $50 million to increase development effort on the Saturn program, $9 million for additional vehicle development costs on the Centaur, and $26 million to begin program development of a 1-million-pound-thrust engine primarily for the Nova second stage. While these funds will not complete the program on these items, it will enable a balanced program to be pursued.

Mr. Speaker, recently it has come to my attention that there has been distortion from several sources, not alone in North Carolina, regarding a vote taken in 1959 on an authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and since this is apparently an underhanded method of creating unfavorable publicity by distorting the record of those who have supported the space program, I welcome this opportunity to set the record straight since I have been included in this campaign of distortion, stating that I did not support the space program in 1959.

The statement has appeared in the press that "If Congress had followed Mr. KITCHIN in 1959 Colonel Glenn would not have orbited the earth yet," also stating that I "voted against appropriations for the space program."

I did not in 1959, or at any other time, vote against an appropriation bill for the space agency. I have voted for each appropriation bill brought to the House of Representatives for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I shall continue to give this program my unqualified support.

I have voted for the authorization bills for NASA, with the exception of one, and this was not a vote against the space program, but a vote against the parliamentary procedure by which this measure was brought to the floor. Many Members opposed the bill at this time, and I feel sure for the same reason I did, the parliamentary way in which it was brought up for passage, not under normal procedure, but under a procedure known as suspension of the rules, which limits debate to only 40 minutes, 20 minutes to each side, and under this procedure, no amendments are allowed to the bill. Under this procedure, Members have little knowledge of what is in a bill, or what they are called upon to vote, except the relative few who helped to draft the legislation. It has always been my policy on all legislation, whatever the subject, to study the measure carefully, listen to full debate on the floor, and then cast my vote accordingly.

There are many who oppose this procedure of bringing bills to the floor, rather than the legislation itself, when the full facts are not available. In fact, a check of the votes on this particular authorization bill indicates that the gentleman from Missouri, Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House; the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, chairman of the House Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee; and the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative HALE BOGGS, the No. 3 man in the Democratic leadership, as well as the Democratic whip; and other Members of the North Carolina delegation, also voted against the procedural aspect apparently for the same reason I cast my vote.

I have supported our authorization and appropriation legislation for military and civilian space programs since I have been in Congress, and I shall continue to do so.

Bakersfield, Calif., Chamber of Commerce Effectively Helps Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1962

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the bedrock of any free society with a representative form of government based on honest uncoerced elections and a democratic social structure is the existence of large numbers of privately owned and operated business ventures. The owners and operators provide the energy, inventiveness, and variety of viewpoint necessary to a free enterprise economy, and indeed to a successful operation of government.

Unfortunately, the growth of monopoly business and government practices and policies threaten the life of our small business establishment. An awareness of this fact has produced much talk about the needs of small business, but, too often, such talk is like discussion of the weather—much is said about it, but nothing is ever done about it.

It is refreshing, therefore, to discover an agency that has done something. I refer to the Greater Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce, which serves the major population complex at the southern end of California's San Joaquin Valley.

The success story begins with the establishment by the chamber of a military affairs committee in response to the location in Kern County of two major military installations, Edwards Air Force Flight Test Center and the Naval Ordnance Test Station.

This committee was designed to assist the military mission and the community simultaneously.

As a result of the efforts of this committee under the able chairmanship of William B. Rea, a local business leader, a military procurement department of the chamber was established to provide a link between the military establishments and business firms in Bakersfield and other areas of Kern County, which were potential sources of services and supplies to such establishments.

This department fortunately was not a paper tiger. Under the directorship of Charles Carr, an action program began.

Meetings were held with military procurement officials for the discussion of the mutual problems of buyer and seller. Military procurement officials were apprized of the capability of local suppliers through plant visits and other devices. The chamber department was constituted as a liaison agent between buyer and seller.

As a result the respective military establishments arrived at a favorable appraisal of the local supply capability and implemented that appraisal with increased blanket purchase orders. The end result has been an increase in the value of services and supplies procured in the county of Kern with a flexibility of procurement which is of value to the Government.

The benefits of this program are greater than the commercial advantages to the buyer and seller. They include a general improvement of relations between what amounts to a Federal military family and a host civilian community. The end result will be better military morale and greater military efficiency.

The program has received favorable acknowledgment by General B. H. Schriever, Commander, USAF Systems Command.

In a memorandum—dated November 27, 1961, directed to his subordinate commander, entitled "Opportunities for Small Business Concerns"—he states "3. It is also recommended that the members of your staff, whose work brings them in contact with local chambers of commerce, suggest to such civic organizations that they establish their own programs to keep small business concerns informed on opportunities for doing business with local military procurement activities. For example, the Bakersfield Chamber of Commerce employs an individual who devotes full time to liaison work between AFFTC, other governmental agencies and small concerns in the local California area. Through this medium, information on bids and requests for proposal is obtained and disseminated throughout the local small business community. This type of effort on the part of the chamber of commerce has increased competition and the participation of new small business firms in AFFTC procurements."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Thessalonians 5: 21: *Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*

O Thou prayer-hearing and prayer-answering God, grant that in the atmosphere and attitude of the noonday prayer we may receive the blessing of a faith that looks beyond the shadows which so frequently darken our thoughts and feelings.

Lift us by Thy spirit into those lofty heights and zones of vision and fellowship with Thee whence cometh our help and strength to carry on faithfully and courageously.

We earnestly beseech Thee that in these days when nations seem to be struggling on in chaos and confusion we may hold fast those spiritual resources by which alone mankind can be held together.

May all the members of the human family be given that unity of insight and inspiration which will bring them into a kinship of common aspiration, common duties, and a common destiny.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 4, 1962, the President approved and signed a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4130. An act to provide assistance to Menominee County, Wis., and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 270. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic; and

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to designate the week of March 25, 1962, as "Voluntary Overseas Aid Week."

The message also announced that pursuant to section 4355 of title 10, United States Code, the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. ELLENDER, the Senator from Maine, Mr. MUSKIE, and the Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, as members of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy.

Pursuant to section 6968 of title 10, United States Code, the Vice President appointed the Senator from Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON, the Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBERTSON, and the Senator from Delaware, Mr. BOGGS, as members of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

Pursuant to section 9355 of title 10, United States Code, the Vice President appointed the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. MCGEE, the Senator from Nevada, Mr. BIBLE, and the Senator from Iowa, Mr. MILLER, as members of the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy.

Pursuant to section 194 of title 14, United States Code, the Vice President appointed the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. LONG, a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

Pursuant to section 1126c of title 46, United States Code, the Vice President appointed the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH, a member of the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy.

DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN FREIGHT FORWARDERS AS CARRIERS OF BONDED MERCHANDISE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 3508) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, relating to the inclusion of air freight forwarders and international air freight forwarders in definition of freight forwarders of bonded merchandise, with committee amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand the gentleman has a series of bills, four or five of them?

Mr. MILLS. There are four bills reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GROSS. These bills have been reported unanimously by that committee?

Mr. MILLS. Each of them; yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 551 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1551), is amended by striking out "or any freight forwarder, as defined in section 402 of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act (U.S.C., 1940 edition, supp. III, title 49, sec. 1002(5))," and inserting in lieu thereof "any freight forwarder (as defined in section 402 of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 1002(5)), or any air freight forwarder or international air freight forwarder authorized to operate as such by the Civil Aeronautics Board."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 551 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1551), is amended by striking out 'or any freight forwarder, as defined in section 402 of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act (U.S.C., 1940 edition, Supp. III, title 49, sec. 1002(5)),' and inserting in lieu thereof 'or any freight forwarder authorized to operate as such by any agency of the United States,'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 3508, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means and which was introduced by our colleague, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, is to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to designate any freight forwarder, authorized to act as such by any agency of Government, as a carrier of bonded merchandise for the final release of which from customs custody a permit has not been issued.

Section 551 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended—19 U.S.C. 1551—deals with carriage in bond of merchandise not finally released from customs custody. As originally enacted, section 551 authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to designate as carriers of bonded merchandise only common carriers who owned or operated railroad, steamship, or other transportation lines or routes. Public Law 285, 79th Congress—59 Stat. 667—broadened this authority to permit the Secretary to designate freight forwarders under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission to handle bonded merchandise in transit. No other freight forwarders were authorized to be so designated.

Aside from the fact that when the Congress considered this amendment to section 551 in 1945, other freight forwarders—such as airfreight forwarders—were not so prominent in this field as they now are, there apparently was no reason why the privilege was limited to freight forwarders under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. In any event, your committee believes that the Secretary of the Treasury should be authorized to extend the privilege of handling bonded merchandise to any freight forwarder licensed to act as such by any agency of the Government, subject to such regulations and terms as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe and subject to his discretion.

The Committee on Ways and Means received favorable reports on this bill from the Departments of State, Commerce, and Treasury.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending passage of H.R. 3508, as amended.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the legislation which has just been approved by the House is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to extend the privilege of handling bonded merchandise to any freight forwarder who is licensed to act as a freight forwarder by a Government agency. The Secretary of the Treasury is also authorized to issue regulations and prescribe such terms as he may find to be necessary.

Under existing law the Secretary is authorized to designate as carriers of bonded merchandise only freight forwarders under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. In considering this legislation, the Committee on Ways and Means received favorable reports from the Departments of Commerce, State, and Treasury. The committee membership was unanimous in recommending favorable consideration of H.R. 3508.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and the author of each of the bills that will be called up, and that I, as chairman of the committee, be permitted to extend our remarks immediately following the passage of each of these bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

EXEMPTION OF FOWLING NETS FROM DUTY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6682) to provide for the exemption of fowling nets from duty.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Whereas it is the declared policy of the United States of America to foster the conservation and proper utilization of its natural resources, and whereas the effecting of such policy depends upon the increase in knowledge about wildlife, including birds, to be found from time to time within said United States, which knowledge must in turn rest upon study and research; and

Whereas the taking of birds by qualified persons for banding and other scientific or educational purposes is an essential and integral part of such study and research, is already subject to regulation by said United States, and should be fostered as a means of preserving and enhancing the natural resources of said United States; and

Whereas increasing the availability of fowling nets used in taking birds will greatly aid such study and research; and the importation of such fowling nets exempt from duty by including such nets in the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, will increase the availability of such nets and will not result in equitable competition against or otherwise harm in any respect domestic industry and commerce: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph 1725 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U.S. Code, title 19, sec. 1201, par. 1725), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"PAR. 1725. (a) Nets or finished sections of nets for use in otter trawl fishing, if composed wholly or in chief value of manila.

"(b) Nets or sections or parts of nets, finished or unfinished, of whatever material or materials composed, for use in taking wild birds, under license issued by an appropriate Federal or State governmental authority."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 11, strike our "birds," and insert "birds".

Strike out the preamble.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 6682, which was introduced by our colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, and which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to provide for the entry, free of duty, of nets or sections or parts of nets, finished or unfinished, of whatever material or materials composed, for use in taking wild birds under licenses issued by an appropriate Federal or State governmental authority.

H.R. 6682, as amended by your committee, would transfer from the dutiable to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930 articles which are known as "fowling nets." Fowling nets are used by organizations and persons engaged in banding of birds. The nets are used to temporarily capture birds and are designed to facilitate quick banding and release of the birds. Birdbanding activities, which are carried out primarily under the coordination and sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Interior, assist interested parties in learning more about bird distribution, population, and migration and their determinants. For example, banding of blackbirds, which in some areas are exceedingly detrimental to cereal crops, has resulted in establishing the area from which the harmful birds originate, which in turn makes it now possible to apply control measures without indiscriminate destruction of blackbirds.

Birdbanding activities are primarily carried on by volunteer workers who receive no pay for their activities. The records obtained as a result of these activities are turned over to the U.S. Government and are used in research. The Government supplies the bird bands and the record forms. Each volunteer bander supplies his own traps or nets, bait, and other equipment necessary for him to perform the banding function.

The Department of Commerce advised your committee that to the best of its knowledge fowling nets are not produced in the United States. Your committee received favorable reports on H.R. 6682 from the Departments of State, Treasury, Interior, and Commerce.

Your committee believes that there is no reason why the United States should levy a duty on these articles which are so vitally needed in this worthwhile work and which are apparently not produced in the United States.

Your committee is unanimous in recommending the passage of H.R. 6632, as amended.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the legislation that has just passed the House would amend the Tariff Act so as to transfer fowling nets from the dutiable list to the free list. As the name implies, fowling nets are used to capture birds and are specifically used in catching birds for banding purposes.

Birdbanding activities generally are conducted in cooperation with and under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Interior so as to increase our knowledge of birdlife.

During the consideration of this legislation, the Department of Commerce informed the committee membership that according to the best available information fowling nets are not produced in the United States.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending approval of this legislation.

TARIFF CLASSIFICATION FOR LIGHTWEIGHT BICYCLES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8938) to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That paragraph 371 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:
>
> "For the purposes of this paragraph and any existing or future proclamation of the President relating thereto, only bicycles with frames (not including the wheel forks) consisting of all straight tubing (commercially known as diamond frame bicycles), shall be classified for duty purposes in any tariff classification for 'bicycles having both wheels over twenty-five inches in diameter, if weighing less than thirty-six pounds complete without accessories and not designed for use with tires having a cross-sectional diameter exceeding one and five-eighths inches': *Provided,* That any bicycles which, except for this amendment, would have been classified for duty purposes under the tariff classification described above, shall be classified for duty purposes under such other provision of paragraph 371 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as heretofore or hereafter modified pursuant to any proclamation of the President, which describes such bicycles."
>
> "SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the foregoing amendment shall be considered as having been in effect continuously since the original enactment of section 350: *Provided,* That for the purposes of including a continuance of the customs treatment provided for in such amendment in any trade agreement entered into pursuant to section 350 prior to the entry into force of the amendment pursuant to subsection (b), the provisions of section 4 of the Trade Agreements Act, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1354), and of sections 3 and 4 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1360 and 1361), shall not apply.
>
> "(b) The foregoing amendment shall enter into force as soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury, but in any event not later than ninety days after the passage of this Act."

With the following committee amendments:

> Page 1, line 4, strike out "amended," and insert "amended by inserting '(a)' after 'Par. 371.', and ".
>
> Page 1, line 5, before "For" insert "(b)".
>
> Page 1, line 7, after "the" insert "front and rear".
>
> Page 1, strike out line 10 and in line 11 strike out "over twenty-five inches in diameter," and insert: "as 'bicycles with or without tires, having wheels in diameter (measured to the outer circumference of the tires) over twenty-five inches,".
>
> Page 2, line 4, strike out "amendment," and insert "subparagraph,".
>
> Page 2, line 10, strike out the quotation marks.
>
> Page 2, line 22, strike out the quotation marks.
>
> Page 3, strike out "Treasury, but" in line 2 and all of lines 3 and 4 and insert: "Treasury following such negotiations as may be necessary to effect a modification or termination of any international obligation of the United States with which the amendment might conflict, but in any event not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 8938, which was introduced by our colleague, the Honorable Ross Bass, and which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to amend paragraph 371, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and modified, to insure that for the purposes of that paragraph and any existing or future proclamation of the President relating thereto, only bicycles with frames, not including the front and rear wheel forks, consisting of all straight tubing shall be classified for duty purposes under any provision for bicycles with or without tires, having wheels in diameter—measured to the outer circumference of the tires—over 25 inches, if weighing less than 36 pounds complete without accessories and not designed for use with tires having a cross-sectional diameter exceeding 1⅝ inches.

Pursuant to the authority given to him in section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the President in 1947 proclaimed a modification in duty to reflect a trade agreement concession on certain bicycles provided for in paragraph 371 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as modified. These bicycles were described as follows for the purposes of the trade agreement concession:

> Bicycles with or without tires, having wheels in diameter (measured to the outer circumference of the tire):
>
> Over twenty-five inches—
>
> If weighing less than thirty-six pounds complete without accessories and not designed for use with tires having a cross-sectional diameter exceeding one and five-eighths inches.

The committee is convinced that the record made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, the agency which heard interested parties before the trade agreement negotiations in question were started, shows that this trade agreement concession was intended to cover bicycles which are commonly known as diamond frame bicycles; that is, bicycles with frames, not including the front and rear wheel forks, consisting of all straight tubing.

In 1954, the domestic producers of bicycles introduced a new bicycle style, featuring a curved tubular frame, which they called the middleweight bicycle. This model proved popular with consumers. Its popularity led foreign manufacturers to imitate this style of bicycle. However, the foreign producers found that if they mounted tires normally used on typical lightweight bicycles on curved tubular frame bicycles they could get the benefit of the lower rate of duty applicable under the trade agreement concession to typical lightweight bicycles. The customs authorities decided that the typical lightweight bicycle provision was not, by its own terms, limited to bicycles with straight tubular frames and accordingly, any bicycle meeting the stated specifications as to weight, diameter of wheels, and size of tires was classifiable thereunder, irrespective of the type of frame of the bicycle.

The passage of H.R. 8938 will insure that any provision for typical lightweight bicycles in paragraph 371 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as modified, will be applicable only to such typical bicycles, that is, straight tubular frame bicycles. The bill will consequently result in requiring a reclassification to another appropriate provision of paragraph 371, as modified, of those types of bicycles which are not typical lightweight bicycles, but which, nevertheless, are presently being classified under the provision therefor.

Your committee unanimously recommends the passage of H.R. 8938.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, this legislation pertains to the tariff classification for lightweight bicycles. During the consideration of this legislation, information was presented to the committee suggesting that bicycles that were in fact not lightweight bicycles were entering the United States under the lightweight classification instead of as mediumweight bicycles. It is the purpose of this legislation to correct that problem.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending favorable consideration of this legislation to the House.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in connection with H.R. 8938, that just passed, may I say that this bill seeks only to insure the application of the original trade agreement intent—1947—that bicycles classified as "lightweights" shall have frames—not including the front and rear wheel forks—of all straight tubing.

The record before the Committee for Reciprocity Information conclusively demonstrates that this was, in fact, the correct and proper intent of the trade agreement negotiators—see House Report No. 1255, 87th Congress, 1st session, at page 2.

Passage of H.R. 8938 will permit all bicycles which were originally intended to come in at the lower lightweight duty rate to continue to come in at that lower rate.

As the practice directly contravenes the 1947 trade agreement intent, curved tubular bicycles of American middleweight design will no longer be permitted entry into the United States at the low lightweight duty rate. This is as it should be and follows from the initial understanding and subsequent statements of all parties, including foreign manufacturers, importers, and domestic producers.

Calling as it does for the application of the original trade agreement intent, this bill is of a distinctly just and equitable nature. In these circumstances, a proper lightweight tariff classification should be worked out prior to the negotiations of further general tariff reductions.

SALE PRICE FOR MANUFACTURERS EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8952) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4216(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to special rule for determining constructive sale price) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Subparagraph (C) shall not apply in the case of articles taxable under section 4111, section 4121, or section 4141."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer on or after January 1, 1959.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "1959" and insert "1962".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the Excise Tax Technical Changes Act of 1958 provided that in determining the base for the computation of manufacturers excise taxes, a constructive sales price could be used where sales were made to retailers or to consumers if sales were also made at the wholesale level. However, this provision applies only if the normal method of sales within the industry is not to sell articles at retail, to retailers, or to both. This bill provides that this latter restriction will not apply in the case of the manufacturers excise taxes on refrigerators and related items, on electric, gas, and oil appliances, and on radios and television sets and related items.

This bill, therefore, amends section 4216(b)(2) of the code, which contains the special rule for determining constructive sales price, to provide that the provision limiting the application of this rule to those industries where the normal method of sales of the articles is not at retail or to retailers—or a combination of the two—is not to apply in the case of articles taxable under the three sections referred to above; namely, sections 4111, 4121, and 4141.

This bill has been reported unanimously by your committee.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11027) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 344(n) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the figures "1961" where they first appear therein and inserting the figures "1962".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DRUM CORPS WEEK

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I seek approval of House Joint Resolution 654, designating the week of July 15 to July 21, 1962, as "National Drum Corps Week."

With the good weather season, we enjoy the sight and sound of the brilliantly uniformed drum corps that march in parades, and give color and dash to many other public events. As we are stirred by the music and the precision maneuvers, we think of the long hours of practice that are required to perfect this group technique. The pride of the youngsters in their talent and skill is a wholesome development that deserves widespread recognition and appreciation.

Few people realize that more than 100,000 youngsters throughout the Nation are rehearsing 15 hours a week on the music and the drills that lead to the polished proficiency of a good drum corps. To qualify for membership in a drum corps requires hard work, cooperation with others, and self-discipline.

No less an authority than J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has complimented the Drum Corps News for promoting interest among youngsters in this activity. Drum corps offer a healthy outlet for the energy of youngsters; give them a feeling of accomplishment; and strengthen character through wholesome group effort.

The Drum Corps News which is published in Lynn, Mass., is the only drum and bugle corps newspaper in the United States. It is read from coast to coast by over 8,000 people—twice monthly. It is the clearinghouse for information on equipment, news, and pictures of interest to twirlers, color guards, drummers, and buglers; and details of the many competitive events that the regular press does not carry.

Participation in a drum corps affords opportunity and encouragement to young people. It is a constructive experience that helps them to become good citizens. It is one form of insurance against juvenile delinquency.

In recognition of the contributions by all who are engaged in this activity, I urge approval of House Joint Resolution 654 that will designate the week of July 15 to July 21 as "National Drum Corps Week."

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 60]

Abbitt
Addonizio
Alford
Andrews
Avery
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Barrett
Barry
Blitch
Bow
Boykin
Brewster
Celler
Clark
Coad
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Dingell
Dowdy
Fascell
Finnegan
Gavin
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Halleck
Hays
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Inouye
Johnson, Md.
Jones, Ala.
Kearns
Kee
Keith
Kilburn
McDowell
McIntire
Macdonald
Morrison
Morse
Murray
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Patman
Peterson
Powell
Rains
Reece
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Rostenkowski
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Slack
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Steed
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Van Pelt
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. DOC. NO. 384)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

An efficient and dynamic transportation system is vital to our domestic economic growth, productivity, and progress. Affecting the cost of every commodity we consume or export, it is equally vital to our ability to compete abroad. It influences both the cost and the flexibility of our defense preparedness, and both the business and recreational opportunities of our citizens. This Nation has long enjoyed one of the most highly developed and diversified transportation systems in the world, and this system has helped us to achieve a highly efficient utilization of our manpower and resources.

Transportation is thus an industry which serves, and is affected with, the national interest. Federal laws and policies have expressed the national interest in transportation particularly in the last 80 years: through the promotion and development of transportation facilities, such as highways, airways, and waterways; through the regulation of rates and services; and through general governmental policies relating to taxation, procurement, labor, and competition. A comprehensive program for transportation must consider all of these elements of public policy.

During the last session of Congress, action was taken to place our Federal-aid highway program on a sounder fiscal basis. Initial steps were taken to improve the operations of our regulatory agencies through reorganization. A beginning was also made toward meeting the needs of our cities for mass transportation. By Executive order, I recently assigned to the Department of Commerce authority for emergency transportation planning.

But pressing problems are burdening our national transportation system, jeopardizing the progress and security on which we depend. A chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation has evolved from a history of specific actions addressed to specific problems of specific industries at specific times. This patchwork does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology of the past half century or the parallel changes in the structure of competition.

The regulatory commissions are required to make thousands of detailed decisions based on out-of-date standards. The management of the various modes of transportation is subjected to excessive, cumbersome and time-consuming regulatory supervision that shackles and distorts managerial initiative. Some parts of the transportation industry are restrained unnecessarily; others are promoted or taxed unevenly and inconsistently.

Some carriers are required to provide, at a loss, services for which there is little demand. Some carriers are required to charge rates which are high in relation to cost in order to shelter competing carriers. Some carriers are prevented from making full use of their capacity by restrictions on freedom to solicit business or adjust rates. Restraints on cost-reducing rivalry in rate making often cause competition to take the form of cost-increasing rivalry—such as excessive promotion and traffic solicitation, or excessive frequency of service. Some carriers are subject to rate regulation on the transportation of particular commodities while other carriers, competing for the same traffic, are exempt. Some carriers benefit from public facilities provided for their use, while others do not; and of those enjoying the use of public facilities, some bear a large part of the cost, while others bear little or none.

No simple Federal solution can end the problems of any particular company or mode of transportation. On the contrary, I am convinced that less Federal regulation and subsidization is in the long run a prime prerequisite of a healthy intercity transportation network.

The constructive efforts of State and local governments as well as the transportation industry will also be needed to revitalize our transportation services.

This administration's study of long-range transportation needs and policies convinces me that current Federal policies must be reshaped in the most fundamental and far-reaching fashion. While recognizing that a revision of the magnitude required is a task to which the Congress will wish to devote considerable time and effort, I believe the recommendations below are of sufficient urgency and importance that the Congress should begin consideration of them at the earliest practicable date. If direct and decisive action is not taken in the near future, the undesirable developments, inefficiencies, inequities, and other undesirable conditions that confront us now will cause permanent loss of essential services or require even more difficult and costly solutions in the not-too-distant future.

A BASIC NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

The basic objective of our Nation's transportation system must be to assure the availability of the fast, safe, and economical transportation services needed in a growing and changing economy to move people and goods, without waste or discrimination, in response to private and public demands at the lowest cost consistent with health, convenience, national security, and other broad public objectives. Investment or capacity should be neither substantially above nor substantially below these requirements—for chronic excess capacity involves misuse of resources, and lack of adequate capacity jeopardizes progress. The resources devoted to provision of transportation service should be used in the most effective and efficient manner possible; and this, in turn, means that users of transport facilities should be provided with incentives to use whatever form of transportation which provides them with the service they desire at the lowest total cost, both public and private.

This basic objective can and must be achieved primarily by continued reliance on unsubsidized privately owned facilities, operating under the incentives of private profit and the checks of competition to the maximum extent practicable. The role of public policy should be to provide a consistent and comprehensive framework of equal competitive opportunity that will achieve this objective at the lowest economic and social cost to the Nation.

This means a more coordinated Federal policy and a less segmented approach. It means equality of opportunity for all forms of transportation and their users and undue preference to none. It means greater reliance on the forces of competition and less reliance on the restraints of regulation. And it means that, to the extent possible, the users of transportation services should bear the full costs of the services they use, whether those services are provided privately or publicly.

For some 75 years, common carriage was developed by the intention of Congress and the requirements of the public as the core of our transport system. This pattern of commerce is changing—the common carrier is declining in status and stature with the consequent growth of the private and exempt carrier. To a large extent this change is attributable to the failure of Federal policies and regulation to adjust to the needs of the shipping and consuming public; to a large extent it is attributable to the fact that the burdens of regulation are handicapping the certificated common carrier in his efforts to meet his unregulated competition. Whatever the cause, the common carrier with his obligation to serve all shippers—large or small—on certain routes at known tariffs and without any discrimination performs an essential function that should not be extinguished.

Considerable research and analysis, going far beyond our present findings, will be required before we know enough about the costs and other characteristics of various forms of transportation to guarantee the achievement of these objectives in full. In the meantime, it is clear that the following fundamental reforms in our transportation policy are needed now.

PART I. INTERCITY TRANSPORTATION

Our system of intercity public transportation—including railroads, trucks, buses, ships and barges, airplanes, and pipelines—is seriously weakened today by artificial distortions and inefficiencies inherent in existing Federal policies. Built up over the years, they can be removed only gradually if we are to mitigate the hardships that are bound to arise in any program of far-reaching adjustment.

As an initial step, I am requesting the Chairmen of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Maritime Commission to meet at frequent intervals to discuss regulatory problems affecting the various modes of transportation and to seek coordinated solutions in the form of legislation or administrative action that will improve the regulatory process.

(A) EQUAL COMPETITIVE OPPORTUNITY UNDER DIMINISHED REGULATION

(1) Bulk commodities: At present, the transportation of bulk commodities by water carriers is exempt from all rate regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act, including the approval of minimum rates; but this exemption is denied to all other modes of transportation. This is clearly inequitable both to the latter and to shippers—and it is an inequity which should be removed. Extending to all other carriers the exemption from the approval or prescription of minimum rates would permit the forces of competition and equal opportunity to replace cumbersome regulation for these commodities, while protecting the public interest by leaving intact the ICC's control over maximum railroad rates and other safeguards (such as the prohibition against discrimination, and requirements on car service and common carrier responsibility). While this would be the preferable way to eliminate the existing inequality, Congress could elect to place all carriers on an equal footing by repealing the existing exemption—although this would result in more, instead of less, regulation and very likely in higher though more stable rates. Whichever alternative is adopted, these commodities are too important a part of carrier traffic to continue to be governed so unequally by Federal rate regulation.

(2) Agricultural and fishery products: An exemption similar to that described above, and now available only to motor carriers and freight forwarders, relates to agricultural and fishery products. This exemption from minimum rates should also be extended to all carriers. Here, too, the ICC should retain control of maximum railroad rates and certain other controls to protect the public interest in those areas where there is no effective truck or water carrier competition to keep rates down.

The combined effect of extending these bulk and agricultural exemptions will be to reduce drastically and equalize fairly the regulation of freight rates in this country. Freed to exercise normal managerial initiative, carriers will be able to rationalize their operations and reduce costs; and shippers should consequently enjoy a wider choice, improved service, and lower rates.

(3) Intercity passenger rates: The traveling public, like the commercial shipper, is also uninterested in paying higher rates to subsidize weak segments of the transportation industry. Chronic overcapacity and deficits can be ended in the long run only in an industry made fit, lean, and progressive by vigorous competition and innovation. But this is not possible as long as Federal agencies fix uniform minimum rates for passenger travel. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact legislation which would eventually limit the control of intercity passenger rates to the establishment of maximum rates only. In the case of the airlines, it may be preferable to initiate this program on a gradual or temporary basis under existing authority.

To prevent the absence of minimum rate regulation under the above three proposals from resulting in predatory, discriminatory trade practices or rate wars reflecting monopolistic ambitions rather than true efficiency, the Congress should make certain that such practices by carriers freed from minimum rate regulations would be covered by existing laws against monopoly and predatory trade practices.

While the above three recommendations relate to the most critical—and controversial—problems of unnecessary or unequal regulatory curbs on transportation, other changes in the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act are needed consistent with these same principles. I recommend that legislation be enacted to—

(4) Assure all carriers the right to ship vehicles or containers on the carriers of other branches of the transportation industry at the same rates available to noncarrier shippers. This change will put the various carriers in a position of equality with freight forwarders and other shippers in the use of the promising and fast-growing piggyback and related techniques;

(5) Repeal the provision of the Interstate Commerce Act which now prevents a railroad from hauling cargo it owns. The need for this provision, which goes back to the days of oppressive railroad monopoly, has largely passed; and its current effect is to handicap the railroads in competing with other modes of transportation. The antitrust laws can insure protection against the possible abuse by a railroad of its dual status as shipper and carrier; and

(6) Direct the regulatory agencies to sanction experimental freight rates, modifications and variations in existing systems of classification and documentation, and new kinds or combinations of service.

(B) CONSISTENT POLICIES OF TAXATION AND USER CHARGES

The same accidents of circumstance that have molded our transportation regulatory policies and programs have largely determined specific transportation taxes. As a result, inequities have developed and in some instances have persisted for many years.

(1) Transportation excise tax: I have already recommended repeal of the 10-percent passenger transportation tax. This tax, a vestige of World War II and the Korean war, has undoubtedly discriminated against public transportation in favor of the automobile. I again recommend repeal of this tax to improve the competitive position of intercity railroad and bus passenger transportation systems, which generally are not publicly supported, and to clear the way for an equitable system of user charges for aviation.

(2) Aviation: For commercial airlines, I have suggested (a) continuation of the 2-cents-per-gallon net tax on gasoline and extension of that tax rate to all jet fuels; and (b) a 5-percent tax on airline tickets and on airfreight waybills. By delaying until January 1, 1963, the effective date of all proposed changes as they affect aviation—including the repeal of the passenger tax for the airlines—ample time will be allowed for review by the Civil Aeronautics Board of any tariff adjustments that may be required by the carriers to recover the cost of user charges on fuel. The ticket and waybill taxes will be passed on directly to ultimate users.

For general aviation, such as recreational flying and company planes to which ticket and waybill taxes would not be applicable, a fuel tax of 3 cents per gallon is recommended as a minimal step toward recouping the heavy Federal investment in the airways.

All of the above taxes—in effect user charges—will recover only about half of the annual cost of the Federal airways system which is properly allocable to civil aviation. Total airways costs, which are approximately $500 million annually, have risen steadily in the past decade and will continue to grow as airways facilities and services are improved to accommodate future air traffic. Repeal of the 10-percent passenger tax as it now applies to aviation should not become effective, therefore, until the recommended user charges are in force for all segments of civil aviation.

(3) Inland waterways: Also in the interest of equality of treatment and opportunity, the principle of user charges should be extended to the inland waterways. A tax of 2 cents per gallon should be applied to all fuels used in transportation on the waterways. The recommended effective date, January 1, 1963, will allow time for review by the Interstate Commerce Commission of any adjustments that may be necessary in common carrier rates. This deferral is recommended even though the bulk of inland waterways traffic is carried by unregulated rather than regulated carriers.

The new tax should include an exemption similar to the current exemption from taxation accorded to gasoline and ships' supplies for vessels employed in the fisheries, foreign trade, or trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States or between the United States and any of its possessions. Vessels in domestic trade using facilities and routes similar to those engaged in foreign trade and vessels in coastal trade which are too large to use the intracoastal waterways should also be exempted.

This administration recognizes the responsibility of the Government to maintain and improve our system of inland waterways. Over $2 billion of Federal funds has already been invested in capital improvements. Expenditures for operating and maintaining the waterways are about $70 million annually, even though only a small fraction of the traffic consists of common carriers which serve all shippers and the general public. The users of the waterways include some of the largest and financially strongest corporations in the United States today, and it is surely feasible and appropriate for them to pay a small share of the Federal Government's costs in providing and maintaining waterway improvements.

(4) Income taxes: Another effort to improve equity in taxation is being taken by the Treasury Department, which is reviewing the administrative guidelines now governing depreciation rates in the transportation industry. The objective of this administration will be to give full recognition to current economic forces, including obsolescence, which in their impact upon the lives of depreciable assets may affect quite differently the different modes of transportation and, therefore, their competitive relationships. In addition, I recommend that the Internal Revenue Code be amended to increase from 5 to 7 years the period during which regulated public utilities, including those in transportation, can apply prior year losses to reduce current income for tax purposes.

(C) EVENHANDED GOVERNMENT PROMISE OF INTERCITY TRANSPORTATION

To achieve a better balance of Federal promotional programs:

(1) I urge favorable consideration of legislation proposed by the Civil Aeronautics Board last year to make the domestic trunk air carriers ineligible for operating subsidies in the future. These carriers provide more passenger miles of transportation service than any of the other common carriers; and, while they are experiencing temporary overcapacity and have recently sustained financial losses, they have bright prospects for longrun growth and prosperity which should make them permanently independent of Government support.

(2) With respect to other aviation subsidies, the Congress has limited to $6 million the funds available in fiscal 1962 for the payment of operating subsidies to the three certificated helicopter services; and the Appropriations Committees have requested the Civil Aeronautics Board to prepare a schedule for the termination of these subsidies. I endorse this position and seek the extension of this principle. I am asking the Board to develop by June 30, 1963, a step-by-step program, with specific annual targets, to assure sharp reduction of operating subsidies to all other domestic airlines as well, within periods to be established by the Board for each type of service or carrier. Rigorous enforcement of the Board's use-it-or-lose-it policy and further development of the class rate subsidy plan which the Board initiated in January 1961 with the cooperation of the local service carriers would clearly facilitate this objective. The development of single airports to serve adjacent cities, or regional airports, is also clearly necessary if these subsidies are to be eliminated and if the Federal Government and local communities are to meet the Nation's needs for adequate airports and air navigation facilities without excessive and unjustifiable costs.

(3) The Federal Government is a major user of transportation services. To assure the greatest practical use of the transportation industry by Government, I am directing all agencies of the Government, in meeting their own transport needs, to use authorized commercial facilities in all modes of transportation within the limits of economical and efficient operations and the requirements of military readiness.

(4) I also recommend that the Post Office Department be given greater flexibility in arranging for the transportation of mail by motor vehicle common carrier.

(5) Last year the Congress extended until June 30, 1963, the authority by which the Interstate Commerce Commission has been guaranteeing interest and principal payments on emergency loans to the railroads for operations, maintenance, and capital improvements for which the carriers cannot otherwise obtain funds on reasonable terms. A similar law by which the Government guarantees loans for aircraft and parts being purchased by certain certificated air carriers will expire this year. Since the Department of Commerce is already a focal point for Government transportation activities and since, in the interest of program coordination and consistency of policy these activities should be further consolidated, I recommend that the railroad loan guarantee authority, and the aviation loan guarantee authority if it is extended, be transferred to the Department of Commerce. These problems are not regulatory in nature and are clearly separable from the chief functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, and can be acted upon more expeditiously by an executive agency.

(D) PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(1) Mergers: A great resurgence of merger talk has occurred in the railroad and airline industries in the last several years, and major mergers have been proposed in recent months in both industries. The soundness of such mergers should be determined, not in the abstract, but by applying appropriate criteria to the circumstances and conditions of each particular case. This administration has a responsibility to recommend more specific guidelines than are now available and more specific procedures for applying them.

Accordingly, I have directed the formation of an interagency group to undertake two tasks: first, after proper consultation with interested parties, to formulate general administration policies on mergers in each segment of the transportation industry; and second, to assist the Department of Justice in developing a Government position on each merger application for presentation before the regulatory agencies. This group will consist of agency representatives designated by the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the heads of other agencies involved in a particular case. Under the chairmanship of Commerce, this group will examine each pending merger in transportation on the basis of the following criteria and others which they may develop:

(1) Effective competition should be maintained among alternative forms of transportation, and, where traffic volume permits, between competing firms in the same mode of transportation.

(2) The goals of economical, efficient, and adequate service to the public—and reduction in any public subsidies—should be secured by the realization of genuine economies.

(3) Affected workers should be given the assistance to make any necessary adjustments caused by the merger.

(2) Through routes and joint rates: For many years some regulatory agencies have been authorized to appoint joint boards to act on proposals for intercarrier services; but they have taken virtually no initiative to foster these arrangements which could greatly increase service and convenience to the general public and open up new opportunities for all carriers. I recommend, therefore, that Congress declare as a matter of public policy that through routes and joint rates should be vigorously encouraged, and authorize all transportation agencies to participate in joint boards.

(3) I have requested the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of General Services to make the fullest possible use of their statutory powers, and I urge the enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary, to encourage experimental rates and services—to explore every promising simplification of rate structures—and to encourage the development of systems that will make rate ascertainment and publication less costly and more convenient. These experiments will be pilot studies for a more general simplification of rates and for the application of new kinds of service to transportation in general.

(4) I am requesting the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, in cooperation with the Interstate Commerce Commission, to develop and urge adoption of uniform State registration laws for motor carriers operating within States but handling interstate commerce. The Congress should, consistent with this effort, give

the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to enter into cooperative enforcement agreements with the various States, covering both the economic and the safety aspects of highway transportation.

(5) I recommend that all common carriers, including freight forwarders and motor carriers, be required to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates.

(6) Finally, I recommend that the civil penalty now imposed on motor carriers for failure to file required reports be substantially increased; that the same civil penalty be imposed for violations of safety regulations and for operating without authority; and that the safety regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission should be made fully applicable to private, as well as to common and contract carriers, so as to clarify the ambiguous situation prevailing at present.

PART II. URBAN TRANSPORTATION

I have previously emphasized to the Congress the need for action on the transportation problems resulting from burgeoning urban growth and the changing urban scene.

Higher incomes coupled with the increasing availability of the automobile have enabled more and more American families, particularly younger ones with children, to seek their own homes in suburban areas. Simultaneously, changes and improvements in freight transportation, made possible by the development of modern highways and the trucking industry, have reduced the dependence of manufacturers on central locations near port facilities or railroad terminals. The development of improved production techniques that require spacious, one-story plant layouts have impelled many industries to move to the periphery of urban areas. At the same time the importance of the central city is increasing for trade, financial, governmental, and cultural activities.

One result of these changes in location patterns has been a change in the patterns of urban travel. Formerly people traveled mainly along high-density corridors radiating to and from downtown. Today traffic patterns are increasingly diverse. Added to traditional suburb-to-city movements are large crosstown flows which existing mass transportation systems are often not geared to handle. Also, the increasing use of automobiles to meet urban transportation needs has resulted in increasing highway congestion, and this has greatly impeded mass transportation service using those highways.

This drastic revision of travel patterns in many urban areas has seriously impaired the effectiveness and economic viability of public mass transportation, which is geared to the older patterns. A steady decline in patronage and a concomitant rise of unprofitability and financial problems have occurred. This has been particularly true of rail commuter and street car services limited to particular routes by fixed roadbeds.

To conserve and enhance values in existing urban areas is essential. But at least as important are steps to promote economic efficiency and livability in areas of future development. In less than 20 years we can expect well over half of our expanded population to be living in 40 great urban complexes. Many smaller places will also experience phenomenal growth. The ways that people and goods can be moved in these areas will have a major influence on their structure, on the efficiency of their economy, and on the availability for social and cultural opportunities they can offer their citizens. Our national welfare therefore requires the provision of good urban transportation, with the properly balanced use of private vehicles and modern mass transport to help shape as well as serve urban growth.

At my request, the problems of urban transportation have been studied in detail by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce. Their field investigations have included some 40 metropolitan and other communities, large and small. Their findings support the need for substantial expansion and important changes in the urban mass transportation program authorized in the Housing Act of 1961 as well as revisions in Federal highway legislation. They give dramatic emphasis, moreover, to the need for greater local initiative and to the responsibility of the States and municipalities to provide financial support and effective governmental auspices for strengthening and improving urban transportation.

On the basis of this report, I recommend that long-range Federal financial aid and technical assistance be provided to help plan and develop the comprehensive and balanced urban transportation that is so vitally needed, not only to benefit local communities, but to assure more effective use of Federal funds available for other urban development and renewal programs. I recommend that such Federal assistance for mass transportation be limited to those applications (1) where an organization, or officially coordinated organizations, are carrying on a continuing program of comprehensive planning on an areawide basis, and (2) where the assisted project will be administered through a public agency as part of a unified or officially coordinated areawide transportation system.

(A) Long-range program: Specifically, I recommend that the Congress authorize the first installment of a long-range program of Federal aid to our urban regions for the revitalization and needed expansion of public mass transportation, to be administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I recommend a capital grant authorization of $500 million to be made available over a 3-year period, with $100 million to be made available in fiscal 1963. Only a program that offers substantial support and continuity of Federal participation can induce our urban regions to organize appropriate administrative arrangements and to meet their share of the costs of fully balanced transportation systems.

This Federal assistance should be made available to qualified public agencies in the form of direct grants to be matched by local, non-Federal contributions. For rights-of-way, fixed facilities, including maintenance and terminal facilities, and rolling stock required for urban mass transportation systems, grants should be provided for up to two-thirds of the project cost which cannot reasonably be financed from expected revenue. The remaining one-third of the net project cost would be paid by the locality or State from other sources, without Federal aid. The extension and rehabilitation of existing systems as well as the creation of new systems should be eligible. In no event should Federal funds be used to pay operating expenses. Nor should parking facilities, except those directly supporting public mass transportation, be eligible for Federal grants.

While it is expected that the new grant program will be the major Federal support for urban mass transportation, it is important to have Federal loans available where private financing cannot be obtained on reasonable terms. I therefore recommend removal of the time limit on the $50 million loan authorization provided in the Housing Act of 1961. Federal loans would not be available to finance the State or local one-third contribution to net project cost.

Although grants and loans would be available only to public agencies, those agencies could lease facilities and equipment or make other arrangements for private operation of assisted mass transportation systems. The program is not intended to foster public as distinguished from private mass transit operations. Each community should develop the method or methods of operation best suited to its particular requirements.

A community should be eligible for a mass transportation grant or loan only after the Housing Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are necessary for carrying out a program for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area.

The program I have proposed is aimed at the widely varying transit problems of our Nation's cities, ranging from the clogged arteries of our most populous metropolitan areas to those smaller cities which have only recently known the frustrations of congested streets. There may, however, be some highly specialized situations in which alternative programs, for example, loan guaranties under stringent conditions, would be better suited to particular needs and the Congress may, therefore, wish to consider such alternatives.

(B) Emergency aid: Time will be required by most metropolitan areas to organize effectively for the major planning efforts required. Even more time may be needed to create public agencies with adequate powers to develop, finance and administer new or improved public transportation systems. Meanwhile, the crisis conditions that have already emerged in some areas threaten to become widespread. Mass transportation continues to deteriorate and even to disappear. Important segments of our population are thus deprived of transportation; highway congestion and attendant air pollution become worse; and the destructive effects upon central business districts and older residential areas are accelerated.

In recognition of this serious situation, I also recommend that the Congress, for a period of 3 years only, authorize the Housing Administrator to make emergency grants, (a) where there is an urgent need for immediate aid to an existing mass transportation facility or service that might otherwise cease to be available for transportation purposes, (b) where an official long-range program for a coordinated system is being actively prepared, and (c) where the facilities or equipment acquired under the emergency grant can reasonably be expected to be required for the new long-range system. This emergency aid should not exceed one-half of the net project cost. Upon completion of an acceptable areawide transportation program within 3 years, these emergency projects, if a part of the ultimate system, should qualify for the balance of the regular Federal assistance available under the long-range program.

(C) Role of highways: Highways are an instrumental part of any coordinated urban transportation program, and must be an integral part of any comprehensive community development plan. Accordingly, I have requested the Secretary of Commerce to make his approval of the use of highway planning funds in metropolitan planning studies contingent upon the establishment of a continuing and comprehensive planning process. This process should, to the maximum extent feasible, include all of the interdependent parts of the metropolitan or other urban area, all agencies and jurisdictions involved, and all forms of transportation, and should be closely coordinated with policymaking and program administration.

Progress has already been made in coordinated transportation planning for metropolitan areas through the use of funds made available under both Federal highway and housing legislation. To increase the effectiveness of this effort, I recommend that the Federal-aid highway law be amended to increase the percentage of Federal funds available to the States for research and planning. Legislation will be submitted to effectuate this change and to provide that (a) these funds should be available for planning and research purposes only; (b) the funds be matched by the States in accordance with statutory matching requirements; and (c) any funds not used for planning and research lapse.

In addition I recommend that the Federal-aid highway law be amended to provide that, effective not later than July 1, 1965, the Secretary of Commerce shall, before approving a program for highway projects in any metropolitan area, make a finding that such projects are consistent with comprehensive development plans for the metropolitan area and that the Federal-aid system so developed will be an integral part of a soundly based, balanced transportation system for the area involved.

Highway planning should be broadened to include adequate traffic control systems, parking facilities, and circulation systems on city streets commensurate with the traffic forecasts used to justify freeways and major arterial roadways. Provision for transit and highway facilities in the same roadway, permissible under present law and already tested in several cases, should be encouraged whenever more effective transportation will result. Moreover, I have requested the Secretary of Commerce to consider favorably the reservation of special highway lanes for buses during peak traffic hours whenever comprehensive transportation plans indicate that this is desirable.

To permit the State highway departments greater flexibility in the use of Federal-aid highway funds to meet urban transportation needs, I further recommend that the Federal-aid highway law be amended to permit more extensive use of Federal-aid secondary funds for extensions of the secondary system in urban areas.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to consult regularly regarding administration of the highway and urban mass transportation programs, and to report to me annually on the progress of their respective programs, on the needs for further coordination, and on possibilities for improvement.

(D) Relocation assistance: Last year in a message to the Congress on the Federal-aid highway program, I called attention to the problems of families displaced by new highway construction and proposed that the Federal highway law be amended to require assistance to such families in finding decent housing at reasonable cost. The need for such assistance to alleviate unnecessary hardship is still urgent. The Secretary of Commerce has estimated that, under the interstate highway program alone, 15,000 families and 1,500 businesses are being displaced each year, and the proposed urban mass transportation program will further increase the number of persons affected.

To move toward equity among the various federally assisted programs causing displacement, I recommend that assistance and requirements similar to those now applicable to the urban renewal program be authorized for the Federal-aid highway program and the urban mass transportation program. Legislation is being submitted to authorize payments of not to exceed $200 in the case of individuals and families and $3,000 (or if greater, the total certified actual moving expenses) in the case of business concerns or nonprofit organizations displaced as a result of land acquisitions under these programs.

(E) Mass transit research and demonstrations: Further, I believe that progress will be most rapid and long lasting if the Federal Government contributes to economic and technological research in the field of urban mass transportation. These research activities should be an integral part of the research program described later in this message. Important parts of this program should be carried out by the Housing Administrator directly, through contract with other Federal agencies, private research organizations, universities and other competent bodies, or through the allocation of funds to local public agencies for approved programs.

To facilitate this approach, I recommend that the $25 million authorized last year for demonstration grants be made available for broad research and development undertakings, as well as demonstration projects, which have general applicability throughout the Nation. That amount, plus an additional $10 million from the proposed capital grant funds for each of the years 1963, 1964 and 1965 should suffice for these purposes. These funds, together with research funds available under the Federal-aid highway program, can contribute to substantial advances in urban transportation.

(F) Interstate compacts: Finally, since transportation in many urban areas is an interstate problem, I recommend that legislation be enacted to give congressional approval in advance for interstate compacts for the establishment of agencies to carry out transportation and other regional functions in urban areas extending across State lines.

PART III. INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORTATION

We should endeavor, to the maximum extent feasible, to (a) gear international transportation investment to the requirements of our peacetime international trade and travel, and (b) provide incentives to users that will channel traffic to those forms of transportation that provide desirable service at the lowest total cost. The most critical problems associated with these policies are in the national defense area. Determination must be made as to whether the number and types of ships and aircraft adequate to meet long-range peacetime needs are also adequate to meet probable military emergencies, and if they are not, how best to meet these additional requirements.

(A) Merchant marine: In the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the U.S. Government made a new start on the vexing problems of the American merchant marine in the face of repeated failure to improve its condition both before and after World War I. Subsequently, other aids in the form of cargo preference legislation, various "trade-out" "trade-in," and tax incentives devised to stimulate new construction, and a mortgage insurance program with up to 87½ percent Federal guarantees were added to the arsenal of protection against the industry's exposure to low-cost foreign competition.

In spite of these aids, subsidies required for both construction and operations under the 1936 act have steadily increased. Operating subsidies will rise from $49 million in 1950 to over $225 million in 1963. Ship construction costs in U.S. yards are now approximately double those in Japanese and German yards. For this reason and because of an acceleration of the program beginning in 1956 to replace war-built cargo ships, Federal expenditures for new ship construction will rise to a postwar high of $112 million in 1963.

At my request, the Secretary of Commerce has undertaken a study of the current problems of the American merchant marine. This review will involve such specific issues as the state of coastal and intercoastal shipping and the costs of service to our noncontiguous territories. It will also consider more fundamental questions of long-term adjustment: Are the criteria adopted in 1936 as guides to the establishment of essential trade routes and services relevant for the future? Are there alternatives to the existing techniques for providing financial assistance which would benefit (a) the public in terms of better service and lower rates and (b) the operators in terms of higher profits, more freedom for management initiative and more incentive for privately financed research and technological advance? What research and development efforts are most likely to increase the competitiveness of our merchant marine? Can defense readiness requirements be met adequately by greater reliance on the reserve fleet and the ships of our allies under NATO agreements? Would a smaller reserve fleet be adequate? Are the international arrangements pursuant to which world shipping operations are carried on conducive to the stability of the industry, fair but effective competition and adequate service?

I have also asked the Secretary of Defense to provide the Secretary of Commerce with estimates, under a range of assumptions as to military emergencies, of what active and reserve tonnages of merchant shipping should be maintained in the interest of national security. In addition, I have established a Cabinet level committee, chaired by the Secretary of Labor, whose study will include the flags of convenience and cargo preference issues. When the findings and conclusions of these studies become available, I shall send to the Congress appropriate specific recommendations concerning our maritime program.

In the meantime, I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to implement fully section 212(d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, for securing preference to vessels of U.S. registry in the movement of commodities in our waterborne foreign commerce; and I have directed all executive branch agencies to comply fully with the purpose of our cargo preference laws.

I have also recommended a stepped-up research program for developing ways and means of increasing the competitive efficiency of our merchant marine and related industries. Of particular significance in this effort will be the application of the principles of mass production, and the standardization of ship types and ship components, for reduction in the cost of new vessel construction. Also, I am urging that sound development in technology and automation be applied to merchant shipping as rapidly as possible, fully recognizing and providing for the job equities involved, as a major program for enhancing the competitive capability of our merchant marine.

(B) International aviation: An interdepartmental committee, headed by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and including representatives from the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Bureau of the Budget, was established at my direction last July to undertake a study of U.S. international air transportation policies and problems. This study is presently underway, and will be completed in late summer. Concurrent with this policy study, the Bureau of the Budget is conducting a study of the organizational structure within which Government agencies carry out activities concerned with international aviation. Once these studies have been completed and evaluated, an administration policy on international civil aviation will be enunciated, with responsibilities assigned to the agencies involved according to statutory requirements.

PART IV. LABOR RELATIONS AND RESEARCH

(A) Labor relations: Technological advance in transportation must be explored and developed if we are to meet growing requirements for the movement of people and goods. New equipment often requires new skills, sometimes displaces labor, and often requires retraining or relocation of manpower. An overall reduction in manpower requirements in transportation is not inevitable, however; and the new Manpower Development and Training Act will help those transportation workers in need of new jobs or new skills.

For the long-range benefit of labor, management, and the public, collective bargaining in the transportation industry must promote efficiency as well as solve problems of labor-management relations. Problems of job assessments, work rules, and other employment policies must be dealt with in a manner that will both encourage increased productivity and recognize the job equities which are affected by technological change. The Government also has an obligation to develop policies and provide assistance to labor and management consistent with the above objectives.

(B) Research: To understand the increasingly complex transportation problems of the future, to identify the relationships of social, economic, administrative, and technical factors involved, to translate scientific knowledge into transportation engineering practice, to weigh the merits of alternative systems, and to formulate new, improved, and consistent policies—we need information that can evolve only from a vigorous, continuous, and coordinated program of research. Yet, in the field of transportation where we have many unfulfilled opportunities, research has been fragmented, unsteady, inadequate in scope and balance.

Scientific and engineering research will bring to all forms of transportation the benefits of new high-strength, low-cost, and durable materials, compact and economical powerplants, new devices to increase safety and convenience—improvements which have characterized the development of jet-propelled aircraft. Experiments in the maritime field have resulted in the development of a nuclear-powered merchant ship, the NS *Savannah*, which has already begun test cruises, and a hydrofoil ship, the *Dennison*, which is nearing trial runs. Transportation on land, as well as in the air and on the seas, can benefit from accelerated scientific research.

Economic and policy research will improve knowledge about the functioning of our transportation system as a whole and about the interrelation of the major branches of the industry. It should consider the new demands for transportation, the changing markets and products being handled, and the need for speed and safety. For instance, such research can consider the handling of freight as a system beginning in the shipper's plant and ending with the delivery of goods to the very doors of his customers—using new packaging, containerization, and cargo-handling methods that will take full advantage of new economies and convenience.

Taking advantage of new techniques that would provide convenience and efficiency, we must consider the impact of different forms of transportation investment on economic development; we must combine and integrate systems to take advantage of the maximum benefits of each mode of travel; we must now consider the Nation's transportation network as an articulated and closely linked system rather than an uncoordinated set of independent entities.

Just as a transport system must be built and operated as a whole, the different areas of transportation research must be coordinated within an overall concept. With the advice and assistance of the heads of the principal Federal agencies concerned with transportation and members of my own staff, the Secretary of Commerce is undertaking a broad evaluation of research needs in transportation and of the appropriate methods to meet these needs. I look to the Secretary of Commerce to develop a comprehensive transportation research program for the Government for later consideration by the Congress. Once such a coordinated and policy-oriented research program is underway, it will produce a flow of information of the kind that we must have to implement a comprehensive public policy on transportation.

Improved statistics for private and Government use are also urgently needed. The 1963 budget repeats a request made by the previous administration for funds to prepare for a census of transportation. This census will make an important beginning to supplying these much-needed data. I urge early favorable action on this request.

CONCLUSION

The troubles in our transportation system are deep; and no just and comprehensive set of goals—which meets all the needs of each mode of transportation as well as shippers, consumers, taxpayers and the general public—can be quickly or easily reached. But few areas of public concern are more basic to our progress as a nation. The Congress and all citizens, as well as all Federal agencies, have an increasing interest in and an increasing responsibility to be aware of the shortcomings of existing transportation policies; and the proposals contained in this message are intended to be a constructive basis for the exercise of that responsibility.

The difficulty and the complexity of these basic troubles will not correct themselves with the mere passage of time. On the contrary, we cannot afford to delay further. Facing up to the realities of the situation, we must begin to make the painful decisions necessary to providing the transportation system required by the United States of today and tomorrow.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 5, 1962*.

TRANSPORTATION MESSAGE AND 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today is a memorable day in commerce and transportation in the United States for it is a memorial day, we are celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission which was the first step taken by our Government toward bringing about the regulation and some degree of comity in the transportation of property and people in the United States.

It is also significant that on today, this 75th anniversary, the President of the United States sent to the Congress a message on transportation. I want to compliment the President on the message. It was a bold, factual message, facing up to the problems of transportation, the first time I believe we have had such a presentation made to the Congress, certainly during the years I have been here.

The President, in my judgment, in submitting to the Congress this transportation message, called to our attention the need for some action that would help to preserve our common carrier system. Everyone in the country who knows anything about the common carrier transportation problems knows we have got to do something to strengthen it because the requirements of this great country of ours, the needs of our people, make it necessary that we have a sound common carrier transportation system in this country. It will be the purpose of our committee to go into and analyze that part of the transportation message that will be transmitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of a statement I made today at the exercises celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is indeed a great pleasure for me to be here on this happy and memorable occasion to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission. No other independent regulatory agency in the Federal Government can match its record of accomplishment and longevity. Indeed, in point of time the Commission preceded three Federal executive departments, namely, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is a most interesting and historical fact, that both the Commission and this Nation were born exactly 100 years apart out of the necessities of commerce. The immediate and motivating force which impelled our forefathers to adopt the Constitution in 1787, was the necessity to regulate commerce between the States, to rescue it from the embarrassing consequences of a multiplicity of State laws, and to provide for a national system of uniform regulation. Although such commerce, in the early days of the Republic, was insignificant, our forefathers could see very clearly even then that its regulation had to be achieved by a Congress of States, if the independence won by the States, following the Revolutionary War, was not to be lost through internal bickering amongst themselves, over tariffs and trade barriers to commerce.

Likewise, the compelling reason for the Congress, in 1887, to take the unprecedented step of creating an independent agency to regulate the railroads, was the necessity to regulate overland commerce between the States, and to rescue it from the widespread abuses that developed in the absence of a national system of uniform regulation. The authority to regulate was there under article I, section 8, clause 3, of the Constitution, but it was not used up to that time except for water transportation.

I think it appropriate on this historic occasion to review briefly some of the conditions leading up to this event.

During the early days of our Republic, such little commerce as there was between the States, was conducted mostly by coastwise vessels and vessels on the rivers, lakes, and interior streams. There was very little land traffic, particularly of an interstate character, and, even so, it was governed by the rules of common law. The exceptional regulations, if any were called for, were made by the individual States.

The jurisdiction of the Congress over commerce within the limits of the States, was not very clearly understood until the U.S. Supreme Court, in 1824, rendered its historic decision in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*. In that case it was authoritatively and finally determined that the waters of a State, when they constituted a highway for interstate and foreign commerce were, so far as concerns such commerce, within the legislative jurisdiction of the Congress.

Consequently, exclusive rights for their navigation could not be granted by the States where the waters were located.

So far as rail commerce was concerned, the Federal Government did not affirmatively exercise its right to regulate it for a long time, leaving such regulation up to the States. However, like all good things in life, there are individuals who will soon take advantage of a situation for personal gain, and to the detriment of the public. And, so it happened, that abuses developed in the railroad industry. There was widespread discrimination between places and persons. There were special rates, rebates, underbilling, and free passes for favored persons. There was the sale of worthless securities, and the granting of public land and credit, by public officials, to railroad corporations for worthless schemes.

Many railroads built in sparsely settled territory and, lacking sufficient volume of traffic to support themselves, undertook a fierce struggle for survival by undercutting the rates and charges of competing lines. Rate wars became rampant, each carrier trying to underbid the other, with little regard for cost considerations. Thus it was reported that, in the late 1860's, cattle were moved from Buffalo to New York City for $1 per car, and the first-class rate for shipments from Chicago to New York City varied between 25 cents and $2.15 per 100 pounds. Now and then attempts were made by the carriers to reach agreements to stabilize the rates, but, human nature being as it is under our good, old American system, such agreements were of very short duration.

The individual States attempted to regulate the railroads beginning about 1870 through the establishment of State regulatory commissions. This was particularly true in the Midwest, where the granger movement was strong. However, State regulation proved to be unsatisfactory, and in 1886 such regulation was dealt a deathblow by the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Wabash, St. Louis and Pacific Railway Company* v. *Illinois* (118 U.S. 557). In this case the Court held that the regulation of interstate commerce from the beginning to the end of the shipment was exclusively confided to the Congress. Since approximately three-fourths of the railway tonnage, at that time, was interstate in character, the effect of this decision was to leave unregulated the great bulk of railway traffic.

Bills to regulate the railroads began to appear in the Congress as early as 1868, and, by 1886, some 150 such measures were introduced in the House and the Senate. At the time of the Wabash decision, great progress had been made in both Houses of the Congress toward the passage of regulatory legislation.

In fact, both the House and the Senate had passed independent bills to achieve this purpose, and the bills were in conference at the time of this decision. The effect of the decision was to stimulate the conference committees into further action, and they agreed upon a bill early in 1887 which became "an act to regulate commerce," pursuant to which the Interstate Commerce Commission was created.

In the very limited time available I cannot, of course, discuss the details of this act, or any of the subsequent amendments to it. I would, however, like to point out that approximately 1,200 railroad companies with 135,000 miles of track, and an investment in road and equipment of $7¼ billion became subject to regulation under this law in 1887.

Today the Interstate Commerce Commission regulates not only railroads but also water carriers, oil pipelines, motor carriers of passengers, and property, and freight forwarders. The total gross investment of these carriers (including private car lines) is $46½ billion, and the net investment is $33⅓ billion.

The character of the problems facing the transportation carriers, subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, are radically different today from the situation which prevailed 75 years ago. At that time the railroads reigned supreme. They had a virtual monopoly of intercity transportation of freight and passengers. Today their monopolistic position has disappeared. They have to compete with the trucks, water carriers, pipelines, and freight forwarders for freight business; they have to compete with the private automobile, buses, and the airlines for passenger business. The competition is very keen. The Congress, the Commission, and the other departments of the Federal Government are keenly aware of this situation, and we are all continuously striving to help toward developing a sound and efficient transportation system to serve the public.

For any successful and worthwhile venture, someone with vision, ability, determination, character, and integrity must inevitably be responsible.

I think it therefore appropriate to make some reference here to the great men who made the Interstate Commerce Commission, throughout the years of its existence, one of the most respected agencies of the Federal Government—the Commissioners, themselves, and their excellent staff.

In regulating the basic transportation agencies of this country, the Commission has exercised tremendous power over industry and commerce, and has, directly or indirectly, affected the lives of every one of us. It has become a vital factor in our national lives.

By and large, the Commission has done an excellent job throughout the years. It was a pioneer in the field of rate and service regulation and administrative procedure. The high degree of public confidence in the Commission was achieved through hard work and excellent administration of the laws delegated to it by the Congress. One of the principal reasons for this achievement is the excellent choice of appointments to the Commission, both at the Commissioner level and the staff level. Many Commissioners have been reappointed after their first term in office, and this continuity of tenure is exceedingly good policy, because in the highly complex field of rate and service regulation, there is no substitute for experience.

Many men of great ability have served on the Commission. I would like to mention just a few, limiting myself to the deceased members only. As examples of the high type of men who contributed so much to so many, there were Thomas M. Cooley—the first Chairman—Charles A. Prouty, Balthazar H. Meyer, Clyde B. Aitchinson, and Joseph B. Eastman. These are the men who provided the fundamental interpretation of the laws, provided the leadership and direction in this difficult task. These are the men who had broad vision and experience. Their names will always be remembered in the annals of the Commission, and the transportation industry.

Commerce is the lifeblood of this Nation. It is the sinews which have kept our States together since the early days of our Republic, and have made us great. It has provided the strength and the sustenance to build our Nation to become the most powerful nation on earth.

The congressional delegation of authority to the Commission, to regulate a highly significant portion of this commerce, presents the Commission with both an opportunity and a challenge to administer the laws with justice, and wisdom, and courage, so as to best serve the public. I have every confidence that the Commission will continue to measure up to this opportunity and challenge, as it has done in the past.

I thank you.

REIMBURSEMENT OF EXTRAORDINARY EXPENSES TO THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 575 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4441) to authorize the appropriation of $3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the Fifteenth General Assembly of the United Nations. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George], and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 4441. This is to compensate New York City policemen for the extraordinary duties that they performed during the 15th General Assembly at the time Khrushchev and 16 other dignitaries of foreign states came, without notice, to attend a session of the United Nations. Constant and careful consideration was carried out by the State Department and the Police Department of the city of New York. Many of the foreign dignitaries came on short notice. They were not the official guests of the U.S. Government with planned itineraries and programs. They came and went from their residences or offices without prior notice to the police authorities. This presented an especially difficult and delicate assignment, which was handled very well by the police department.

Mr. Speaker, the government of the city of New York provided protection 24 hours a day for a period of 30 days. The amount involved, which is straight overtime, is $3,063,500. Certainly, there is a moral obligation to reimburse the city of New York for these expenses. We realize that this should not happen again, and I want the House to know that this shall not constitute a precedent.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides for 1 hour of general debate and an open rule. I know of no objection to the rule and I therefore urge its adoption.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4441 comes to us under an open rule and 1 hour of general debate. This measure will pay to the city of New York $3,063,500.

Mr. Speaker, the only question that seems to arise is whether this amount is too great or too small. In the first place, there are several bills pending which would provide for the payment of $4,404,000. There is also a bill pending which would provide for the payment of $1.5 million. So it would seem to me, as we look over the figures, that this bill is what everyone seeks to do as far as I can see, and that is follow a middle of the road course.

Mr. Speaker, a great many people I know are going to deplore having to pay this money to the city of New York. But it seems only just, Mr. Speaker, that this should be done. The U.N. is located in New York City. Whether we think it should be there or not, frankly, has nothing at all to do with the price of eggs. Whether the New York City Police Department should be charged with the care and protection of these people, these VIP's, if you please, who come from other countries, and who are in many cases not desired at all as guests of the city of New York, is another question that we are simply not here to discuss. They come here, first of all, at their own desire and insistence. It seems that if they are the guests of anyone, they must be considered, in part, at least, guests of the Federal Government. It is the Federal Government that must issue the visas. It is the Federal Government that is in charge of their coming.

Mr. Speaker, the New York City police force acquitted itself magnificently. Everyone is agreed on that. The New York City police ran great danger, did a great deal of overtime work and, on the whole, it was a rather thankless task. Mr. Speaker, I attended some of the sessions and I can assure you that the people in general were not very sympathetic to such guests as Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Castro. Only the other day I saw in one of the papers that Mr. Castro intends to come again, if you please, to New York City and I suppose he will come if he so desires and we will be put to this same inconvenience, to use a very moderate term.

These foreign representatives are here as guests of the U.N., not even of the United States. And this is just a thought, Mr. Speaker; maybe the U.N. should have its own police force paid for on a pro rata basis. But that is something we cannot take into consideration in this bill. Here we are paying for services that have been rendered and they have been well rendered.

Of course, the idea of the U.N. paying for police protection or paying, for that matter, for anything else, is like trying to cure a cold in an icebox. I do not think we can look forward to that.

I was very glad to hear my colleague from New York [Mr. Delaney] say that he hoped and believed this would not be a recurring charge. I think it is something that the Congress ought to take under consideration with the utmost care. These situations are going to arise again, Mr. Speaker. In a year or two we will be faced with a problem of this nature again and I am not at all sure that this is the proper way to cope with it. Maybe some other form of legislation can be devised. Maybe something can be done on a fairer basis. But there is no question in my mind at least—and I am not prejudiced; I do not live in the city of New York nor do I vote there—that the city of New York is owed this money and largely owed it by the Federal Government.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4441) to authorize the appropriation of $3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4441 with Mr. WILLIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement. I feel that I would prefer answering the questions which I anticipate.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to insert in the body of the RECORD prior to the vote statements relating to the bill H.R. 4441.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Rules for clearing H.R. 4441, which would reimburse the city of New York, by way of an ex gratia payment, in the sum of $3,063,000, for extraordinary expenses incurred in rendering police protection during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations.

The bill which is before the House was introduced by me on February 16, 1961. Public hearings covering 62 printed pages were held on May 17, 1961, by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The subcommittee recommended favorable action and on August 23, 1961, the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported H.R. 4441 in House Report 1020. At the time of the committee hearings six similar bills calling for varying authorizations were considered. I believe that H.R. 4441 was reported by the committee due to the fact that the authorization which it carries is the exact amount of moneys which was expended by New York City.

BACKGROUND TO H.R. 4441

Looking back to September and October 1960, we will recall the fear engendered when it was announced that Khrushchev, Tito, Gomulka, Castro, Kadar, Nasser, and 10 other heads of state, not to mention their entourages, would personally attend the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations. We would do well to recall that the U–2 and RB–47 incidents had occurred shortly before the arrival of these national representatives to the U.N. session. In addition, these leaders of the Communist empire continued to make false condemnations against the United States and our allies. To say the least, the tempers of many groups in the United States, and particularly New York City, were extremely short.

The physical safety and well-being of these heads of state, while in New York attending the 15th General Assembly, were of paramount importance. Any situation endangering the lives of these individuals could have created an incident of dire proportions. The problem was then one of insuring the safety of these visitors. I am sure that the protection of these visitors was discussed and coordinated with all agencies of government—local, State, and Federal. I realize this cooperation played a major role in the success of the mission.

In considering this bill I hope that you will have in mind the excellent discharge of duty by the Police Department of the city of New York during this emergency. I hope you will also bear in mind that we all prayed that no incident would occur. I believe we would have been willing at that time to commit ourselves to the payment of a much greater amount to avoid an unfortunate incident. We now have the opportunity to assume our responsibility.

WHAT THE BILL COVERS

The unprecedented security problem created by the presence of these heads of state in New York City required the furnishing of complete protection to them, on a 24-hour basis during the 26 days involved. As a result 7,700 police officers were placed on special assignment during the emergency. This number of men constituted one-third of the entire department. The entire force gave up their days off and worked 60 hours per week instead of the normal 42 hours.

A typical example of the protection given by the police department is that received by Fidel Castro when he arrived at Idlewild Airport. On his trip from the airport to the city, the New York Times reported that the caravan consisted of motorcycles and a car containing 3 officers with submachineguns in the lead, one police car on either side of Castro's car, a bus with 60 policemen to the rear and 4 patrolmen stationed at every overpass en route along the parkway. When he arrived at his hotel, 200 policemen were on guard.

All the difficulties which the police department faced were compounded by Castro's unexpected move from the Hotel Shelbourne to the Hotel Theresa and Khrushchev's unexpected visit to Castro at the Hotel Theresa. On these occasions, it was necessary to shift hundreds of men to new assignments on the shortest of notice.

In the past the police department has given its men extra days off to cover hours of extra duty. The tremendous number of extra days off which would have had to be granted to cover the extra time which the General Assembly session involved rendered this method impractical. To follow this method would have meant stripping the city of needed police protection for several months. It was thus decided that the men would be paid on a straight-time basis for the extra hours worked. These are the moneys which this bill would reimburse to the city.

As the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, said in his testimony at page 7 of the hearings:

> Remember, this was no meeting behind the barricades of Yalta, or in the desert atmosphere of Casablanca, or the military security of Potsdam. This was a meeting of world leaders for peace, and world troublemakers, in the melting pot of New York where every nation represented by a troublemaker had, in New York, at least hundreds of his fellow citizens whom he or his government had persecuted and driven into exile.
>
> As mayor of the city, I knew these men who put in these 1 million hours of overtime deserved at least some financial compensation, the only thing we could give them apart from a vote of thanks.

In addition to the mayor, Hon. Abraham D. Beame, the then budget director of the city of New York and now the comptroller of the city of New York, Michael G. Birmingham, chief of staff of the police department, city of New York, and four of our distinguished colleagues, Hon. Kenneth B. Keating, Hon. James J. Delaney, Hon. Seymour B. Halpern, Hon. John V. Lindsay, and Hon. William Fitts Ryan gave testimony at the hearings. The Executive, both under the previous administration and the present, has endorsed this legislation to the extent of $1,500,000. Apparently, the Executive and the Department of State are of the opinion that some dangerous precedent would be created if the Federal Government met the entire expense—while no such precedent would be created if only a partial reimbursement were made. As indicated at pages 52 and 54 of the hearings minutes the committee could not accept such viewpoint, nor can I as sponsor of this legislation.

AMOUNT OF AUTHORIZATION

As I have pointed out, the authorization requested covers the exact out-of-pocket expenses incurred by the city of New York on a straight-time basis. At pages 35 to 47 of the hearings there is inserted the duty assignments and accounting methods utilized by the police department in arriving at the authorization figure.

LEGAL ASPECTS

Pursuant to agreement dated June 26, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the headquarters of the United Nations—incorporated in Public Law 357, 80th Congress, 1st session; 22 U.S.C. 287—the appropriate American authorities are required to furnish police protection in the area surrounding the headquarters district and to delegates of the United Nations. The agreement provides in section 1, subdivision b:

> The appropriate American authorities means the Federal, State, or local authorities in the United States as may be appropriate in the context and in accordance with the laws and customs of the United States, including the laws and customs of the State and local government involved.

Pursuant to the decision in *People* v. *Carcel* (150 New York Supp. 2d, 436), the Police Department of the City of New

York is an appropriate American authority. The agreement further provides at section 11:

> The Federal, State, or local authorities of the United States shall not impose any impediments to transit to or from the headquarters district of (1) representatives of members or officials of the United Nations. * * * The appropriate American authorities shall afford any necessary protection to such persons while in transit to or from the headquarters district.

The agreement continues at section 16:

> (a) The appropriate authority shall exercise due diligence to insure that the tranquillity of the headquarters district is not disturbed by the unauthorized entry of groups of persons from outside or by disturbances in the immediate vicinity and shall cause to be provided on the boundaries of the headquarters district such police protection as is required for these purposes.

It is thus apparent that the Police Department of the city of New York had at least a moral obligation to furnish the protection involved. The question becomes one of what organ of government has the ultimate responsibility for the furnishing of this protection and the resulting obligation to pay the expenses thereof.

Section 25 of the agreement provides:

> Wherever this agreement imposes obligations on the appropriate American authorities, the Government of the United States shall have the ultimate responsibility for the fulfillment of such obligations by the appropriate American authorities.

From a reading of section 25, it would appear that the Federal Government has the primary obligation to furnish protection to the United Nations and the delegates. From a practical viewpoint, it must be realized that the U.S. Government is not equipped to render such services. Therefore, it is not illogical to take the position that the city of New York was in fact acting as an agent or on behalf of the U.S. Government in rendering the extraordinary police protection required. Under such circumstances, there would be a strong moral obligation on the part of the U.S. Government to reimburse the city for the expenses incurred.

At the hearings there arose the question of financial benefit to New York City as a result of the presence of the headquarters of the United Nations. The statistics concerning the question are at pages 23 to 26 of the hearing minutes. Analysis indicates that the city of New York contributed $25,806,300 toward the building of the United Nations headquarters. The United States contributed an interest-free loan of $65 million. The interest cost on this loan is about $28 million. Thus the city of New York paid almost as much for the establishment of the U.N. headquarters as did the U.S. Government.

The annual costs to the city of New York are $3,439,300 in loss of real estate taxes and $1 million for policing. The estimated increase in revenues as a result of the presence of the U.N. is approximately $900,000 per year. Thus it costs the city of New York some $35 million each year as a result of the presence of the U.N. In addition to the figures cited there is a substantial yearly real estate tax loss on the real estate owned by the member nations for the use of their delegations.

Finally, I wish to point out that ever since the establishment of the headquarters of the United Nations at New York City, the police department has furnished additional protection to the headquarters district, foreign delegates, and the buildings occupied by foreign delegations. All of these services have been rendered on a day-to-day basis without compensation and will continue to be furnished in the future.

The motivating factor behind the bill before the House is that the services rendered in connection with the 15th General Assembly were unusual and extraordinary in nature and as such should be paid for by the Federal Government. I respectfully urge that the House approve H.R. 4441 without amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to thank the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. Morgan] for permitting this bill to be brought to the floor. I also want to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell], the chairman of the subcommittee, for holding hearings and writing a very excellent report, and also putting together one of the most perfect hearings that makes available all the facts.

I should like to review briefly the circumstances at the time the General Assembly was held in New York. H.R. 4441 as reported authorizes a payment to the city of New York for expenses incurred by that city for police protection during the 15th Assembly. At that time Communist activities were being carried on against our Government and our civilization. At that time President Eisenhower had to cancel a trip to Japan because of Communist activities.

The General Assembly meets annually. The heads of 16 nations, as explained by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Delaney] arrived in New York City with little advance notice. The State Department did the best it could to inform the city authorities when these people would arrive.

I do want to say that the city of New York organized itself into an operation for the security of these visitors. It set up plans whereby the entire police force of the city of New York was put on the alert. More than 22,500 city police were compelled to give up all vacations, all time off and work an average of 59 hours per week.

This bill reimburses the city for the extraordinary expenses incurred in providing the maximum security. I feel that I should explain to you how the sum of $3,063,500 was arrived at. This represents, Mr. Chairman, the actual cost paid by the city of New York to the police. Instead of their 5-day workweek they worked 7 days a week. This involved more than 22,500 men for 2 days extra each week for almost 4 weeks. Official police records show that the police put in slightly more than 1 million hours of overtime. At the rate of $3 an hour, this involved the payment of $3,008,500. To this $58,000 must be added for overtime paid to the transit police. The actual cost to the city was $3,063,500.

If one includes the cost of supporting equipment, added pension costs, and the like, the city paid out almost $6 million. The exceedingly large amount of overtime could not be paid by the usual method of compensating time. To do this would strip the city of essential protection for several months.

This bill is limited to the payment only to the actual outlay made by the city of New York for the overtime costs during the visits of the heads of state and the uninvited guests who came to attend the 15th Assembly.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. On page 9 of the hearings, Birmingham stated that the personnel cost was $4,805,000, yet, the bill requests only $3 million. What is the discrepancy there? I do not understand the discrepancy.

Mrs. KELLY. The discrepancy there comes about because the city of New York computed overtime at time and one-half but this bill is only asking for reimbursement at the regular rate of pay.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. From what the gentlewoman from New York has said it would appear that the request is about as modest as it could be under the circumstances. It would seem to me to be unthinkable that this expense should be borne by the city of New York alone and not by the entire country. I, for one, certainly want to express my support for the bill sponsored by the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. He is always so just.

Mr. Chairman, there are two further questions which I wish to discuss before yielding to my colleagues. In the hearings there is a very excellent breakdown of the entire operation on page 35. On page 41 there is an explanation of the number of man-hours involved, which point I have already touched upon.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring up the reason why New York City bears this expense. On page 15 of the hearings the fact is brought out that the city of New York has assumed the obligation to protect those who come to the United Nations. This is in pursuance of an agreement made by the Federal Government at the time of the establishment of the United Nations. This agreement mentions that the appropriate authorities shall exercise due diligence to insure the tranquillity of the headquarters of the United Nations. The appropriate authorities in this case refer to the city of New York. This is the key to the responsibility of the city of New York.

On page 54 of the hearings, there is this testimony which I call to the attention of my colleagues:

Mr. Judd said this:

> We entered into an agreement that gives us ultimate responsibility for providing protection and if the city of New York for whatever reason doesn't or can't do that, the United States has to do it.

I think we would have to send in the Marines; that is all there is to it. So that strengthens their case in my opinion, because they did do the job, we didn't have to do it. Had they not done it, we would have had to.

To which Mr. FARBSTEIN said: "That is correct."

So, Mr. Chairman, I think since we in New York had this unusual experience, it is only fair that the Federal Government reimburse the city of New York for that amount.

I have already discussed the difference between the amount of $4.8 million mentioned by the gentleman from New York and the amount in my bill.

Some confusion as to the exact amount has undoubtedly arisen from a preliminary report of costs made to President Eisenhower immediately after the month of these visits. I cannot establish whether this breakdown of costs was solicited or gratuitously furnished. In this report that I submit for the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, the amount mentioned at that time was slightly less than $5 million, although they also brought out the $6 million plus. But the reason for the discrepancy is that all the bills were not in at that time. I submit this for the RECORD.

(The matter referred to follows:)

THE POLICE COMMISSIONER,
City of New York, October 31, 1960.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Knowing your interest in the problems faced by the police department during the current session of the United Nations General Assembly, I am taking the liberty of reporting to you on the cost of our operations during the emergency period from September 19, 1960, to October 14, 1960.

As you know, this department bore the primary responsibility for providing security at the United Nations area itself, guarding the many foreign chiefs of delegations in their residences and in their travels throughout the city, and in regulating the crowds, demonstrations and other unusual occurrences directly inspired by the presence in the city of these critical security risks.

A complete report rendered to me today indicates a total cost to the city as follows: $6,364,000, if the overtime compensation is computed on the basis of time-and-a-half rates; $4,896,000, if overtime compensation is computed on the basis of regular salary rates.

These total sums consist of two main categories:

First, the amount attributable to compensation for overtime: $4,404,000 at time-and-a-half rates, or $2,936,000 at regular rates.

Second, the cost of equipment and personnel transferred, in the main, from regular police duties to special details relating directly to the United Nations General Assembly, and the cost of personnel whose normal vacations were suspended until after the emergency period, amounting in the aggregate to $1,960,000.

With respect to the first category, it should be pointed out that during the emergency special duty hours were in effect, requiring all members of the force to perform duties greatly in excess of the normal 42-hour week.

With regard to the second main category of $1,960,000, only a small portion of these costs were extra costs in the sense that they would not have been otherwise incurred; however, the equipment and personnel represented by these costs were diverted from their standard function of police protection throughout the city to the special function of protecting the United Nations and the individual security risks who were attending the General Assembly.

To recapitulate:

	At time-and-a-half rates	At regular rates
Overtime	$4,404,000	$2,936,000
Services and equipment:		
Cost of equipment	91,000	
Cost of personnel diverted from regular duties	1,204,000	
Cost of suspended vacations	665,000	
	1,960,000	1,960,000
Total cost	6,364,000	4,896,000

I should like to draw your particular attention to the funds necessary to provide compensation for overtime hours of duty. Under consideration both of law and of good conscience, it is imperative that the members of the force be compensated for their overtime duty by financial means. In fairness to the people of the city it would not be proper to grant compensation by means of days off. The magnitude of the necessary vacations would strip the city of necessary police protection for months to come, thus seriously jeopardizing the safety of the community.

Please be assured that I deeply appreciate your interest in securing reimbursement for the city and compensation for the individual members of the force for their impressive services on an overtime schedule.

If any further information is desired, I, of course, am ready to provide it any time.

Faithfully yours,

STEPHEN P. KENNEDY,
Police Commissioner.

(This letter sent to: President Eisenhower; Hon. John J. Rooney, U.S. Congressman, Washington, D.C.; Hon. Christian Herter, Secretary of State, Washington, D.C.; Mr. James Hagerty, press secretary to President Eisenhower, Washington, D.C.; Mr. John W. Hanes, Jr., Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, U.S. State Department, Washington, D.C.; Senator Jacob Javits, Washington, D.C.; Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Washington, D.C.; Senator Mike Mansfield, Washington, D.C.; Mayor Robert Wagner, New York City.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to submit a letter from the then director of the budget of the city of New York in the amount of $3,063,500 for straight time only. He states that he believes this cost is the correct amount that should be reimbursed.

(The matter referred to follows:)

CITY OF NEW YORK,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
New York, N.Y., January 23, 1961.

Hon. EDNA F. KELLY,
House Office Building,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDNA: Pursuant to our telephone conversation relative to the added costs of police services during the sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations from September 19, 1960, to October 14, 1960, please be advised that the city has paid the uniformed forces for overtime incurred at the rate of straight time only, a total of $3,063,500. We believe that this cost is properly one for which the city should be fully reimbursed by the Federal Government since it was due to the necessary security coverage required for the foreign emissaries during this period.

I might note that the police department had worked up figures which not only included the foregoing cost but other costs incidential thereto aggregating a total of $4,896,000.

I hope that the foregoing information will serve your purpose.

Sincerely,

ABE BEAME.

Mrs. KELLY. When the new administration—the Kennedy administration—came in, they endorsed the proposed payment of $1,500,000 to the city of New York by the Federal Government that had previously been proposed by the Eisenhower administration. I was in communication with the White House, and from the Special Assistant to the President, Mr. Lawrence F. O'Brien, I received a letter, the last paragraph of which reads as follows:

> The administration's views on this matter will be communicated by the Bureau of the Budget in the near future and will reflect agreement with the principle of an ex gratia payment to compensate the city of New York for part of the additional expenses. The amount of the payment ultimately authorized and appropriated rests, of course, with the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, because of my feeling that the full amount is due the city of New York, in simple justice I hope you will consider that the Federal Government has a responsibility in sharing the cost.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Can the gentlewoman from New York tell the House whether any effort has been made to collect part or all of this amount from the United Nations?

Mrs. KELLY. To my knowledge this has not been attempted. However, we in the United States assumed that responsibility. I feel this share ought to be paid by the Federal Government. We hope that such unusual circumstances as caused this extraordinary expense will not happen again.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the 15th session of the United Nations General Assembly which began in September 1960 is now remembered by most of us as the occasion when Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev of the Soviet Union banged the table with his shoe.

The fact that we remember this session for that reason and not because of a serious incident with major international repercussions is due to the skill and competence of the New York Police Department. In the early days of the session there were 10 heads of government with their entourages in New York. Included in this number in addition to Khrushchev were Castro and Janos Kadar, Minister of State from Hungary.

This was a period in which there were demonstrations against these and other foreign dignitaries whom many people dislike.

It was necessary to provide protection for visiting dignitaries not only in the vicinity of the United Nations itself, but at their places of residence in various parts of Manhattan Island as well as during their travels through the streets of New York City. The New York police force took this matter in its stride. The people of the United States accepted the performance of the New York City police as a matter of course without any realization of the magnitude and difficulty of the task which had to be performed.

Except for those directly concerned, no one realized that in order to do the job which had to be done, the entire New York police force worked a 7-day week for a period of 26 days, from September 19 to October 14, 1960. The normal week for a New York policeman is 5 days. The city of New York paid in cash for this overtime at the regular hourly rate with no time and a half or other overtime premium of any kind. Normally overtime service by the police force is compensated in extra time off. It was impossible to handle this situation in the customary manner because of the large number of men involved. If compensatory leave had been granted, the number of policemen on duty would have so diminished as to endanger the safety of the city.

This expenditure for overtime pay for the police force amounted to $3,063,500. The calculation is based on detailed records kept by the New York Police Department and submitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and included in the printed hearings.

The emergency situation which confronted the New York police force in September 1960 had not been anticipated and there was no provision for the extra expense in the city budget. The city of New York has requested the Federal Government to share this financial burden. The $3 million provided in this bill does not represent the total cost of policing the United Nations. The city of New York does not request that the Federal Government assume all of the cost which it has to bear in order to provide protection to the United Nations. The city maintains that it was confronted with an unprecedented and unanticipated problem, that this situation arose because of international developments, and that its satisfactory handling was important to the foreign relations of the United States.

The legal obligations of the United States for providing necessary protection to persons while in transit to or from the Headquarters District in New York City are summarized in the committee report on page 3 and are discussed in considerable detail in the printed hearings. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has not attempted to arrive at a conclusion with respect to the legal issues involved. It would appear to the committee, however, to be only fair and reasonable that the Federal Government should share in the extra financial burden which circumstances entirely beyond the control of the New York City authorities forced upon the New York police force.

The Government and the people of the United States are indebted to the city of New York for the excellent job which was done in protecting the foreign visitors during this critical period. The city government acted promptly and effectively, and did everything that was necessary. No questions were asked as to where the money was coming from. The city government went ahead and did the job. It seems only fair that the Federal Government recognize the value of the service which was performed and share in the cost.

I urge the approval of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us how many people the State Department has in its security force?

Mr. MERROW. I cannot give the exact figure but I am sure they have other duties than giving police protection on the streets of New York City.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand it, the State Department has a security force larger than the Secret Service of the United States. Were these people on the job in New York City?

Mr. MERROW. I believe they were probably busy with their normal duties and it was necessary to have this additional work done by the police force of New York City.

Mr. GROSS. Ethiopia has one of the largest contingents in the United Nations Police Force. Would the gentleman agree that Ethiopia might be invited to bring its troops over, that we are paying for anyway, the next time and police the city of New York if the city of New York is not capable of doing it?

Mr. MERROW. The U.N. is in New York, and New York is capable of providing adequate police protection.

Mr. GROSS. How about the United Nations paying the bill to the city of New York?

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I should like to say in response to the question, that the sovereignty of the city of New York is involved in this problem. We can take care of anyone who comes to New York. This, however, involved an added burden of extraordinary proportions to the city. Outside the United Nations the city of New York is responsible.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. The question asked by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa carries with it the implication, and he is suggesting, that there be a Federal police force, which would be objectionable to many of us. To suggest that the State Department have a statutory Federal police force used to police a situation of this kind would be dangerous and an unwarranted interference with State and local obligations.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I want to comment upon a remark made by the gentlewoman from New York, if I might have her attention. I understood the gentlewoman to say that the responsibility basically for policing outside of the property of the United Nations rests with the city of New York.

Mrs. KELLY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I respectfully direct the attention of the gentlewoman to the provision in Public Law 357, which says:

> Wherever this agreement imposes obligations on the appropriate American authority—

In this case I assume you regard New York City as one of those appropriate authorities—

> the Government of the United States shall have the ultimate responsibility for the fulfillment of such obligation.

Mrs. KELLY. This is the agreement that you are quoting from made between the United States and the United Nations. The appropriate American authorities in section 25 of the agreement is the Government of the United States but I call the gentleman's attention to section 1(b) of that same agreement which defines "appropriate American authorities" in another context.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] upon his forthright statement here today in support of the pending bill authorizing the reimbursement of the $3,063,500 to the city of New York.

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 4441. I wish to say that I think it is most equitable and fair that we recognize our obligation to New York City. It was an unusual situation, a real emergency, which the police of the city of New York played an important role in; 22,000 men were called out in a period of a week, and they did a wonderful job.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, in 1960, during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations, the municipal authorities of the city of New York shouldered an unprecedented and highly dangerous responsibility: that of protecting the heads of state and other leaders of a great number of countries who had come to participate in the general debate of the Assembly. Among these leaders were distinguished figures, but several were Communists, or dictators of other kinds, hated by many American citizens, including thousands of New York refugees, because of their tyranny and ruthless disregard for human life and human rights.

This responsibility went far beyond the ordinary duties of a city government and a city police force, for it involved protecting the honor, and indeed the vital interests, of the United States itself.

Many of us, I know, viewed the arrival of these heads of totalitarian countries with apprehension and dismay, recalling only too well that it took only one well-aimed assassin's bullet to trigger World War I. It is no exaggeration to say that a historical accident of the same kind in New York, in the fall of 1960, might well have had the same effect.

That such an accident did not occur may have been due to the well-organized, competent, and extraordinarily effective work of the New York City authorities, and particularly to the exhaustive labor of its police department. With little advance warning, the police department mobilized all of its resources to make doubly sure that those attending the U.N. General Assembly, friend and foe alike, should have ample personal protection. To do this, it canceled leaves, extended hours, assigned extra duties. During the emergency period a large percentage of the entire police force was engaged in United Nations-related duties.

When the United Nations was founded 17 years ago, the Congress adopted a unanimous resolution inviting the organization to locate its headquarters in this country. Among the various regions in the United States vying for the honor of being host to the United Nations, New York was chosen because of its cosmopolitan character and its many attractions and conveniences.

New York is honored to have United Nations headquarters located within its boundaries. But more than this, the people of the United States are, I am sure, honored to have the United Nations located within their country. I can safely say that the citizens of New York have welcomed and welcome the establishment of the United Nations on the East River and I am sure that the people of the United States are proud that New York has, in a way, become a world capital, to which national leaders from all over this globe must come to transact important business.

The city of New York has done much to facilitate the work of the United Nations and mutually satisfactory relations have been established between this international entity and the city authorities. New York, I can say with conviction, has fulfilled its duties.

But the Federal Government also has duties toward the United Nations. The President and Senate approved the United Nations Charter. The Congress adopted the United Nations Participation Act and approved a headquarters agreement with the United Nations. The Congress invited the United Nations to locate in the United States.

The people of the United States as a whole have a duty as hosts to the United Nations.

Justice and equity dictate that the city of New York should not be expected to bear alone the relatively heavy financial drain attendant upon policing such highly charged meetings as that of the last U.N. General Assembly. The citizens and municipal authorities of New York City do not shirk their part of the responsibility; but it is not their responsibility alone. Rightly, it is a shared responsibility, it is a responsibility of the Nation. For it is the Nation which would bear the consequences of any failure to meet obligations which the Nation incurred in housing the United Nations.

I, therefore, strongly urge the Members of this House to support H.R. 4441 and give the city of New York the moneys that it actually laid out to carry on this work in protecting these dignitaries and characters who came to this country.

I urge that this bill be given serious consideration, because if this bill is not passed, if reimbursement is not made to the city of New York, I do not know what the attitude of the city will be at a next meeting. They could very well turn around and say to the State Department and to the Congress, "These are your visitors, you assume the responsibility; you take care of them."

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4441, to authorize the appropriation of $3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations.

All of us remember that in September and October 1960, during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations, an unprecedented situation developed in New York City. The heads of many of the world's largest nations were present in New York in connection with the meeting of the General Assembly. Among those present were Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev of the U.S.S.R.; Fidel Castro, Prime Minister of Cuba; Janos Kadar, Minister of State of Hungary; and others who were not personally popular in the United States.

In order to provide police protection for the more than 10 heads of state and their entourages during the 26-day period from September 19 to October 14, 1960, 22,000 men of the New York Police Department went on a 7-day week instead of following their normal 5-day week schedule. The city of New York has paid these policemen for their overtime at their regular hourly rate of compensation. There was no premium for overtime such as time and a half.

This bill authorizes the payment of $3,063,500, the amount of money paid to New York policemen for their overtime service.

The normal practice in New York City is to compensate the police force for overtime by allowing equivalent time off. Considering the large number of men and the length of time involved, this procedure was considered to be impracticable. In this case it would have been necessary to have so many policemen on leave that the protection of the city might have been endangered.

The New York City Police Department had had no reason to prepare in advance for the situation with which it was confronted in September 1960, and had made no provision in its budget to finance an operation of this magnitude. They met the situation in a praiseworthy manner and did the job that had to be done for which they deserve the congratulations of the entire Nation.

The city of New York has requested that the Federal Government share the extraordinary expenses which it incurred in providing this very important protection to the heads of state visiting the United Nations; and after considering various recommendations and proposals as to the amount which the Federal Government should contribute, the Committee on Foreign Affairs recommends the sum of $3,063,500, which is the amount actually paid to members of the police force for overtime.

This is not the total cost to the city of New York for providing police protection to the United Nations. Detailed records were kept by the New York police of their operations and expenditures which are set forth in the published record of the committee hearings on the bill. The city has requested and the committee recommends that only part of the cost of providing police protection to the United Nations should be contributed by the Federal Government, and I think all of us recognize that the provision of such police protection should be primarily the responsibility of the city of New York.

All this bill does is to authorize a payment to meet this special situation. It does not deal with the sharing of responsibility for police protection to the United Nations in the State.

The city of New York had to meet an extraordinary situation for which its budget did not provide. The New York City police force met its responsibility in a commendable manner which contributed to the successful conduct of U.S. foreign relations. I believe that the Federal Government should come to the aid of the city of New York in this instance and I urge the approval of this bill.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO].

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4441, a bill introduced by my colleague, the Honorable EDNA F. KELLY, to authorize the appropriation of $3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations.

All of us recall that an extremely large number of chiefs of state and heads of government were in attendance at this Assembly. Their presence provoked demonstrations that made it necessary to mobilize the New York police on a round-the-clock basis for several weeks. In order to accord these visitors the necessary protection, the New York police force put in many hours of overtime to perform this needed service.

The police were placed into duty by circumstances outside the control of the city authorities. Many of the heads of government were considered hostile by many groups of the citizens of the United States, particularly Khrushchev, Castro and several others. Under the agreement between the United Nations and the United States, the Federal Government has the ultimate responsibility for protecting the United Nations Headquarters District and its vicinity. We are, thus, indebted to the city of New York for its unexcelled management in avoiding any untoward incident.

The exemplary service of New York's Finest has been recognized in congratulatory messages from the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary General of the United Nations and many other tributes from individual nations. It is quite proper that their service be recognized financially as well.

It should be remembered that the slightest laxity on the part of New York's policing activity could have led to a major international incident and catastrophe. The value of their service cannot be measured in money alone. Should any harm have befallen any of these heads of states, we could be in a useless war today.

It should be noted, also, that in many other nations throughout the world, this service is generally and customarily performed by the armed forces of that nation.

What is being sought here is not profit, but rather deserved reimbursement. It is my pleasure at this time, Mr. Chairman, to commend the police of New York City who performed so ably under the great leadership of Mayor Robert F. Wagner and I urge my colleagues that logic and justice dictate speedy enactment of Congresswoman KELLY's bill, H.R. 4441, to reimburse the city of New York for the extraordinary, unprecedented expenses incurred in a most sensitive task on behalf of our Nation.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of this Committee to Public Law 357 of the 80th Congress. I tell this Committee that the question is not whether we are obligated to pay this sum to the city of New York, but whether the sum is an accurate one.

Mr. Chairman, under section 25 of Public Law 357 this Government is obligated to furnish protection to the United Nations and to the delegates of the United Nations. This Government sought the assistance of the city of New York. The city of New York thereupon became an agent of this Government, in this instance, to furnish this protection. Therefore, the question is not whether we are obligated, but for how much. The sole question is whether the sum requested is a fair one. There being no dispute as to the sum requested under this bill, I submit, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that there is no question before this House except to pass this legislation.

I compliment the Honorable EDNA KELLY of New York for introducing this legislation and urge its passage.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of this bill and I am pleased to associate myself with the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] in the advocacy of this legislation. This is a good bill; it is a fair bill. This is not merely a matter of reimbursing the city of New York for its extraordinary expenses in connection with the historic U.N. General Assembly meeting in the fall of 1960, but it also serves as direct recognition to the gallant policemen themselves for their admirable work in providing protection and maintaining public order during that sensitive and hectic period.

In principle, I believe there can be no serious opposition to the general proposition that the United States should make some ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses during that tense month when Khrushchev was banging his shoe on the table and Castro was plucking chickens in respectable hotels. The protection of these unruly guests required skilled and continuing police protection and this was provided with exemplary skill by my city's "finest."

The U.S. Budget Bureau heretofore has stated that it had no objection to approving a $1.5 million reimbursement which would cover some of the city's direct expenses.

But this is hardly enough in view of the tremendous cost incurred in this vast security operation. Actually, the money offered amounts to less than half the $3,063,500 which the then director of the budget for New York City, the Honorable Abraham D. Beame, said the police force was paid out of an overburdened municipal treasury at straight-time pay rates for what has proven to be exhaustive overtime work. Actually, I do not think this bill H.R. 4441 goes far enough. I would like to see the Government include overtime pay, as covered in my bill H.R. 3443, in its contribution to the city so that these dedicated police officers can receive what is rightfully due them. This would make a total appropriation of $4,404,000 instead of the $3,063,500 as provided in the bill before us.

As John S. Cassese, president of New York City's Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, so significantly has pointed out, members of the force worked as many as 30 consecutive days with no time off. In addition, there were numerous instances in which the members performed 16 hours of duty within a 24-hour period. In view of the hardships borne and the conspicuous devotion to duty by the police, this compensation appears to be entirely reasonable.

When New York City was chosen as the seat of the United Nations, no one realized the unusual problems of police protection which might arise as a result of having a large international organization, including many foreign delegations with diplomatic immunity, located in the heart of our metropolis. We all hope that the item to reimburse the city for its direct costs during last year's U.N. crisis will not be recurrent. It may well be, however, that future developments will require some regular method of sharing the costs incident to U.N. operations in New York City, and that the Federal Government may, in time, regularize its responsibility in this field as it has already done in connection with the support of public schools in the so-called federally impacted areas. However, I do not propose, at this time, to argue the necessity or the desirability of such an arrangement.

New York City's policemen rose to the emergency and the whole country was justifiably proud of them and of the outstanding job they performed in controlling a dangerous and explosive situation and successfully protecting those who had come to the U.N. for the deliberate purpose of provoking violent incidents.

Let me point out that this is no time to be shortsighted expressing the Nation's gratitude to this fine body of men by adequately compensating the city for its expenditures for this protection. This is not a matter for precise bookkeeping but for a broad and generous gesture in according well-justified reimbursements. Surely the people of America want to share in this significant expression of gratitude to the real heroes of the New York summit meeting of September 1960.

These magnificent policemen were not on duty for lengthy periods of continuous stress solely as representatives of New York City alone. In actuality, they stood their posts fully conscious of the fact that their responsibility could affect the security of America and the peace of the entire world. Their excellent demeanor and accomplishments reflected directly and brightly on the entire United States. Every one of our 180 million citizens were the beneficiaries of this mammoth job of protection. This was a task thrown on the broad shoulders of New York's Finest by the intention of the leaders of organizations and nations dedicated to unrest, disorder, and aggression, to converge on the fall, 1960 meeting of the United Nations. Consequently, they became uninvited guests of the United States.

They came, in effect, to hold a convention of disorder and unrest on the threshold of the organization—of which they are members—designed to combat it.

They literally, by their tactics, thumbed their noses at the democracy, peace, order, and even, I might add, civilization itself. It was the New York Police Department, thrown into the role of agents for the whole of the United States, to meet the challenge. And meet it they did—above and beyond the call of duty.

In this light, I can see no valid reason why the Federal Government should not reimburse New York City for the wages it advanced in the cause of world peace and national defense. And as I said, this still falls far short of the actual expenditures.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I was wondering whether or not the city of San Francisco does not have a legitimate claim, because it went to considerable expense to protect Mr. Khrushchev when he visited that city. The cost there was somewhere around $200,000, with the extra police, and so forth, which the city had to provide. I am thinking of offering an amendment to this bill to give $200,000 to the city of San Francisco. Does not the gentleman think that would be a proper amendment?

Mr. HALPERN. No. Let me answer the gentleman this way. The

United Nations is located in New York City. This was not a question of merely protecting Khrushchev and company. This was more than a question of maintaining peace and order in the city of New York. These world figures, including the despots who have been mentioned today, were the guests of the United States, not just an individual city. We had several dictators, several men of questionable character, of ideologies which were bound to enrage the public. The police did a yeomanlike job and, as I said before, I believe a strong case has been presented for the city of New York, acting in this instance as agent for the United States, by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly].

Although I do not believe it has, if San Francisco feels it has a good case they should submit the matter to the Department of State in due course. I do not know whether they have done so. But the issue before the House today is the reimbursement to the city of New York.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, according to the hearings, the Assistant Secretary of State said that this would establish a very bad precedent and that they were opposed to this kind of legislation.

Mr. HALPERN. I do not see how it can possibly oppose the principle of the bill especially when the Department of State and the Nation had so much at stake by the kind of protection given these world figures.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gilbert].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4441.

First of all, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from New York and the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the excellent work they have done in connection with this bill. The gentlewoman from New York is to be congratulated upon her foresight in introducing this bill, which is reasonable and fair in every respect, and I am grateful to the committee for reporting favorably thereon.

It has been shown and it is recognized that a great financial burden was borne by the city of New York as a result of the 1960 session of the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations, since this session was attended by a large number of chiefs of state and heads of government. The highly unusual and unprecedented circumstances which surrounded this session of the Assembly, presented a grave problem and the city of New York was called upon to meet tremendous responsibilities. Our great city of New York met the challenge successfully, but we were alert to the fact that any situation endangering the lives of the heads of state could have created an incident of awesome proportions.

The extraordinary and unprecedented expenses referred to in H.R. 4441 constitute the overtime payment to members of the Police Department of the city of New York. For 26 days the New York Police Department, numbering over 22,000 men, was required to work 7 days a week instead of the normal 5-day workweek. The $3,063,500 for which authorization is requested, was distributed to members of the New York police force on the basis of straight time rates for the overtime which they performed in protecting the high-ranking Government officials during the 26-day period when they visited the United Nations in New York. This bill would now provide for reimbursement of these moneys to the city of New York.

I think a word of congratulation and gratitude is in order; the city of New York furnished adequate protection to the most controversial persons ever attending any United Nations General Assembly; the fine men on our police force gave up their days off and worked 60 hours per week instead of the normal 42 hours, and with efficiency and success carried out their heavy duties.

The Congress should now fulfill its moral obligation and reimburse the city of New York for the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses it was called upon to bear.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, the first bill I introduced in this House, H.R. 2447, on January 12, 1961, was to reimburse the city of New York for the unusual expenses it incurred in providing police protection for the United Nations and the visiting heads of state attending the 15th General Assembly from September 19, 1960, to October 14, 1960. During that period the New York City Police Department provided remarkable around-the-clock protection at a time of unusual tensions. That session will long be remembered for bringing to the United States at the same time Khrushchev, Castro, Tito, Nasser, and others.

With the tensions of the cold war and the number of Communist country refugees in New York City, I am sure you can imagine the tremendous task the New York City Police Department had in providing protection and in keeping order. The police commissioner assigned 7,700 men in connection with the United Nations. However, 7,700 men could not accomplish the task on a normal schedule of duty. Normal duty hours are an 8-hour tour for 5 days. Then a policeman is off duty for 56 hours before he reports to work on a different tour. In order to provide proper police coverage for the entire city as well as the United Nations, it was necessary for 22,500 men to work overtime for the duration of the emergency and for the police department it was an emergency. The 22,500 men worked 8-hour tours for 7 days straight, with only an 8-hour rest period at the end of the 7 days—a 59-hour workweek. They performed 21 tours of duty in 20 days. Lieutenants, captains, and inspectors were on 24-hour call.

As we all know, in spite of mass demonstrations, large crowds and bitter feelings, no harm came to the heads of state or any other United Nations personnel. I am sure all of us agree with Elmer Hipsley, a State Department security agent, who told Commissioner Kennedy that it was the finest job ever performed by any police department anywhere.

The New York City Police Department estimates that the policemen worked 1 million extra hours to protect the heads of government and to maintain order in the United Nations and other areas visited by these personages.

My bill, H.R. 2447, would have reimbursed the city the sum of $4,404,000. This represents the time-and-one-half rate for overtime.

H.R. 4441, the bill under consideration today, reimburses to the city $3,063,500 which represents the cost of overtime wages calculated on a straight time basis which the city actually paid to the members of the police department.

I regret that the dedicated policemen and policewomen will not be compensated at the rate of time and a half. I feel strongly that they are entitled to be compensated at the accepted overtime rate of time and a half which is incorporated in our national labor policy.

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that passage of this bill will not make up to the city the loss of police protection sustained during this period. The New York City Police Department estimates that the cost of equipment and personnel diverted from regular police duties to special details relating directly to the United Nations General Assembly, including the cost of personnel whose vacations were suspended, amounted to an additional $1,800,000 or more. This bill provides only about 60 percent of the actual cost to New York City.

Mr. Chairman, as a Representative from New York City, I am proud that the United Nations, mankind's great experiment and hope in international relations, is located in our town. New York City welcomes the United Nations. However, the benefits from the presence of the United Nations on U.S. soil are shared by the entire Nation. Therefore, it is logical and just that one city should not be required to bear the financial burden of providing police protection under unusual and extraordinary circumstances.

I believe in equity and justice New York City should be compensated for its out-of-pocket expenses; and I might add, that the dedicated police force be compensated at time and one-half.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, almost all of the trouble that has been mentioned occurred in the congressional district I represent, which houses the United Nations, as well as all of the embassies to the United Nations, as well as all of the delegates, some of whom were the source of some of the difficulties we had in New York during the meeting of the 15th General Assembly.

I support this bill. I do so on the ground that in any international body of this kind the sovereign has the underlying basic responsibility to the host. With that responsibility go certain obligations.

Let us be clear we are not talking about a Federal responsibility to do the actual policing. That would never be the case, and hopefully in this country never will be. The question is: Who picks up the tab; who is going to pay the bill?

The agreement with the United Nations is clear. The sovereign has the ultimate responsibility. In connection with the International Labor Organization in Switzerland and the League of Nations before that, the local canton government does not pay the expenses of the necessary policing. The central government pays.

Basically I would approach this problem differently. I testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and introduced a bill which embodies a different concept. I am not going to offer it as a substitute, however, as I know very well it would be most unpopular and would be rejected. It would provide for permanent legislation, and permanent legislation is often troublesome. It would provide that the United States would pay one-third of any extra identifiable cost connected with the policing of the institution of the United Nations. In actuality this would work out to a lesser amount than is contained in this bill.

The reason I think that permanent legislation with the division of one-third Federal and two-thirds local is sensible is that once you agree to the proposition that there is Federal responsibility, which I think there is, it does not make too much sense to make it a one-time deal. There is no logic in that, particularly. But if you agree that the United States as the host country has an ultimate responsibility to make some contribution, then it seems to me there is no logical reason why there should not be permanent legislation with a fair division of the cost. Now why do I suggest that New York take two-thirds and the Federal Government one-third? The reason why as a practical matter is because the city benefits from having the United Nations there, from tourism, trade, and so forth.

However, knowing that permanent legislation would be impossible, I think that this proposal that the Foreign Affairs Committee reported out is fair, reasonable, and sensible. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I support the bill.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. I have just a couple of questions that I would like the gentleman to answer if he is in a position to do so. First, do you know whether or not the city of New York has paid the policemen for the time put in on this?

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes; the policemen have been paid by the city of New York.

I should like to add this additional point. The police protection that New York was required to provide, drained off anywhere from one-third to one-half of the police force of the city of New York. My own congressional district suffered terribly as a consequence. Crime went up. Organized gangs were able to go around looting and doing various things because there was not sufficient police protection. They were all on overtime duty around the Embassies.

Mr. DEVINE. The second question I would like to propound to the gentleman, if he is in a position to know, is this: Does the New York City Police Department have a system known as the compensatory leave system in effect which many police departments have across the Nation?

Mr. LINDSAY. I am unable conclusively to answer the gentleman's question, but I see my colleagues from New York on the majority side nodding their heads in the affirmative.

Mr. DEVINE. In effect, the compensatory leave requires a man who has worked overtime rather than being paid cash for the time he served to take a comparable period of time off during the course of the year.

Mr. LINDSAY. Apparently, the answer to the gentleman's question as to whether the New York City Police Department has a compensatory leave regulation is in the affirmative.

Mr. ROONEY. That is my understanding. They do give time off to recompense the policemen for overtime work, but in the situation which existed in the city of New York in the fall of 1960 it was impossible to allow policemen to take compensatory time off because it would have left the city with no police protection at all. It would have stripped the city of needed police protection for several months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I support this measure, H.R. 4441, authorizing appropriations of $3,063,500 to reimburse the city of New York for the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations.

I commend our colleague, the able gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], for her efforts in this matter.

During those hectic days the New York City Police Department acted beyond the call of its duty. A visitor in New York City in those days during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations seeing the police officers on the alert and stationed 6 feet apart from each other maintaining peace and order might believe he was in Paris, France, on July 14, on Bastille Day. The city was like an armed camp and the police officers were on the alert for trouble, and there was plenty of trouble around. More than 70 people were arrested for disturbances.

When the Police Department of New York City throw up the police cordon night and day around the United Nations where a robust Russian was threatening speakers with his shoes, or was protecting the chicken plucker cackling and doing his farming in the Hotel Shelburne on 37th Street or the Hotel Theresa on 125th Street, they were protecting not only Khrushchev, Castro, and Gomulka and communistic leaders but also the entire people of America and of the free world. They were protecting by their actions the cornhusker from Iowa and Nebraska. They were protecting the cottonpicker from Texas and Arkansas. They were protecting the beet grower from Arizona and Nevada. They were protecting the fruitgrower in the San Fernando or Napa Valley of California. They were protecting the cliffdwellers in the big cities of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and Detroit. If the police department had failed in their duty to protect these uninvited visitors, we might have experienced a situation comparable to that which happened when Archduke Francis Ferdinand was assassinated at Sarajevo. This is not a farfetched possibility, but was almost a reality.

I watched many of these New Yorkers and Americans and wild-eyed people cursing and screaming at Khrushchev in the United Nations on that very rainy morning when he arrived. One of these irate and wild persons was a minister from my district, a 6-foot-3-inch Hungarian who remembered the slaughter of his family in Budapest by Khrushchev. This mild reverend had hatred in his heart and murder in his eyes. If the opportunity presented itself or if he had a chance to get at Khrushchev, he would have sought to tear him limb from limb or kill the butcher of Budapest. Many others in the crowd, their tempers frayed by the drizzling rain and the memory of wrongdoing to their kinfolk, felt the same way and were bent on mayhem or murder. The police action prevented all of them from carrying out their illegal but understandable desires.

During those days between September 9 and October 14, 1960, many Cubans paraded up and down enjoying the antics of infidel Castro. Other Cubans remembered how the bearded giant from Cuba who promised so much and did so little, that their friends and relatives had been shot down and killed beside the wall. These Cubans, if they were not prevented by the New York police, would have wreaked vengeance upon Mr. Castro. The New York City police's devotion to duty and around-the-clock service prevented any incident or harm to these men. The New York City police did their duty and much more. Many worked overtime. Leaves were canceled and they recognized their responsibility. We, in New York City, did not ask these foreign characters to visit us in New York City or in the United Nations. By international rules, they had a right to come to the United Nations and we had a duty to protect their persons. We were responsible for their safety and the safety of America. It cost the city of New York millions of dollars during these days for an extra million man-hours. These were not ordinary expenses. We, therefore, ask a gratuitous or an ex gratia payment. For the American people, for Congress, to refuse this payment would be an act of ingratitude. To grant this payment would be doing simple justice. I trust that this bill will pass.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, on September 15, 1960, I made this public statement:

> Like the trusting victims of a slicker salesman, many Americans are making a belated discovery of the fine print in the legislative contract whooped through Congress nearly a decade and a half ago, implementing the United Nations charter and establishing the permanent seat of the U.N. in New York City.
>
> Occasion for this tardy and rude awakening, of course, is Mr. Khrushchev's pending

> arrival as a self-designated Soviet delegate to the U.N. General Assembly session, convening Tuesday, and his consequent uninvited and unwelcome return to our shores.
>
> There are second thoughts among some officials of the U.S. Government about the wisdom of having the United Nations headquarters in New York, where Communist leaders can come to get the world's most potent sounding board for their propaganda.

At this moment I am not going to attempt to discuss the point further but hope to have additional time when the bill is read for amendment, when I wish to direct certain questions to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4441 introduced by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

I believe this legislation is justified because of the extraordinary situation to which it refers. It is an extraordinary situation in that the country as a whole, as has already been indicated, is proud that the United Nations is located in America, in New York State, and in the great city of New York.

I think we may have forgotten that the event this bill refers to was the occasion when Mr. Khrushchev, addressing the General Assembly of the United Nations, took off his shoe and began to pound his desk. When the leader of the Soviet Union took that unprecedented kind of action no one could know what the consequences might be. Certainly every step had to be taken to protect Mr. Khrushchev and also to protect the people of New York.

Only yesterday of course we received the word from Mrs. Drew Pearson that the reason Mr. Khrushchev did what he did was that earlier when he had pounded his fist on the desk he had broken his watch, and so to protect his new watch he took off his shoe and pounded the desk with his shoe. But we did not have that kind of high-level intelligence at the time in New York City.

The city of New York did a fine job in rising to this occasion. It did not ask for help and did not hesitate to furnish all the manpower needed, around the clock. In doing so they performed a service not only for the people of New York but for the entire Nation, as New York City always has done when the occasion arises, and as she is doing even today when she is host to the President of Brazil, whom we hosted here yesterday.

Great credit must go to the city of New York for the great contribution she is doing for our foreign policy; and so we, as the legislation says, out of gratitude, ex gratia, should therefore pass this pending legislation and reimburse the city of New York the extraordinary sums they spent to protect the people of our country.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I had intended merely to rise and state my support of the bill believing it was justified in view of the fact that the city of New York handled in the finest fashion a difficult situation that could well have gotten beyond control if it had not been for the extraordinary policing provided.

However, I must say now, I have never heard so much talk by the proponents, that could cause many Members to oppose it, who might have voted for it. When you bring in overtime, when you bring in permanent legislation, you try to bring in everything but the kitchen sink. When you have a bill that is justified and should be passed, do not bring up a lot of extraneous things to kill it.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation. It is justified.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House a remark that the distinguished mayor of the city of New York made during the period of time he testified before the committee. He said:

> I say to you, honestly and sincerely, that more even than our Armed Forces, for that limited period of time, the guardians of the peace of the world were the 24,000 men of the New York City police force.

I take it for granted that we will assume our obligation to the country and to the Nation for the work these policemen did in the interest of the country. I strongly urge the adoption of H.R. 4441.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill under consideration, H.R. 4441.

This bill was introduced by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable EDNA F. KELLY, of Brooklyn, N.Y. Its purpose is to reimburse the city of New York for expenses incurred during the 15th United Nations General Assembly in the fall of 1960. You will recall that that was the session which was attended by all the top leaders and heads of state of practically all countries in the world. The contingent of the Communist bloc was headed by Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union, and in this contingent was also Fidel Castro, of Cuba.

I cite these facts, Mr. Chairman, to show how tense and explosive was the situation during the weeks from September 19 to October 14, 1960, in the New York area with all these controversial figures present there. We were most fortunate that, with the exception of a few minor incidents, no other major incidents took place which could have resulted in tragic consequences.

If credit is due anyone, it is due to the wonderful job done by the New York City Police Department and its thousands of men in police uniform, whom we proudly call New York's Finest. The director of the budget in New York City estimated that the police put in over a million extra hours of overtime during those few weeks in guarding the heads of state at their residences, in going and coming from the United Nations meetings, and at other occasions.

I prefer to think of it not merely in terms of giving up their personal comfort, their time for leisure, and time for sleep and rest, but in terms of a great contribution to the security of our Nation and to the maintenance of peace in the world. It was one of the toughest security jobs anywhere, under difficult circumstances, under great tension and the constant threat of an unprovoked incident or outright provocation.

The least we could have done was to recognize this contribution on the part of New York City's police by a payment for the extra time they worked. A sum of $3,063,500 is requested in this bill, and this was the amount actually distributed by the city to the policemen. The city budget director estimated that if the full amount were to be paid to these men it would amount to about $6 million. We are only asking for the amount actually paid out by the city, something which New York cannot afford because of its difficult financial situation.

Mr. Chairman, the amount requested is not an exorbitant sum. Let us look upon it as an investment in peace and security. It certainly would have been much more costly if New York City had said that it cannot assume the responsibility and the protection of all these heads of state under such tense circumstances and the U.S. Government would have had to bring into New York 10,000 or 20,000 military personnel for purposes of protection. Think of the cost involved in transporting so many men to and from New York, maintaining them there with food and lodging, and other expenses.

This is a just request. I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANFUSO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Are we to understand that you did not invite them? Are we to understand in addition that you do not want the U.N. headquarters in New York?

Mr. ANFUSO. I said we did not invite these people. This is not our obligation.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I think all that could be said has been said in support of this measure. May I be so presumptuous as to speak on behalf of the city of New York in order to indicate to this House that we are gratified with the unanimity of support here for this bill. If this were a proposition being submitted for the first time as to whether or not we should assume this kind of an obligation, some might be inclined to vote against it. I am happy to note that practically every Member is in support of this legislation in order that this obligation to the city of New York should be fulfilled and this money authorized for repayment to the city of New York for a job well done by its police force and by the entire city government.

This obligation was assumed by the U.S. Government when the Congress enacted Public Law 387 in the 80th Congress. The ultimate obligation to keep the peace and protect foreigners having business with the United States is that of the Federal Government. In this instance, New York City was merely the agent of the United States of America.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, just as Washington is the center of diplomacy of the world, we in New York are proud that our city is the center wherein the Congress of the world, known as the United Nations, meets. We are very proud that New York City was chosen as the center of world activity because I can think of no area that better befits the activities of the United Nations.

We have housed the delegations of the various countries of the world without any fuss or fanfare. As a cultural, financial, educational, and entertainment center, New York has afforded the various delegates the means whereby they could enjoy to the fullest their diverse leisure moments.

New York is the melting pot of the world, it is both the gateway to the West and the welcoming place of the immigrants.

It is in New York that stands the Statute of Liberty with the storied words:

> Keep ancient lands, your storied pomp.
> Give me your tired, your poor,
> Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.
> The wretched refuse of your teaming shore.
> Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me.
> I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

We in New York are ever ready to welcome and give protection to all visitors.

The convening of the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations brought with it the unprecedented attendance of heads of governments, some hostile to our people. Yet, as the home of the United Nations, it was our obligation to protect even Khrushchev and Castro. In order to protect these gentlemen and others, the authorities in the city of New York alerted its police force. This force worked ceaselessly for weeks on end during the concentration of the heads of state of many nations. As the mayor of the city of New York, the Hon. Robert F. Wagner, Jr., said in a formal statement on December 8:

> The extraordinary services of the police has been recognized in congratulatory messages from the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary General of the United Nations, and many other tributes from individual nations.

The mayor of New York suggested that in a sense the peace of the entire world was involved and called this police effort Operation Security. It cannot be denied that no greater effort could have been expended or more protection logically given to the delegates.

However, I believe that it is only fitting and proper that the services rendered by the city through its police force be recognized financially in the form of reimbursement for extraordinary payment made by the city fathers out of funds it cannot afford to spend.

The then Secretary of State, the late Christian A. Herter, in a letter to our late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn on January 12, 1961, said:

> The circumstances which existed during the early weeks of the Assembly session would make it inappropriate to expect the city of New York to bear this additional expense in its entirety.

And so we come before you with this bill whereby we seek to reimburse the city of New York for expenditures of about $3 million to cover the extraordinary cost of this police operation. The direct cost of manpower and other than personal services involved in the protection required in the United Nations areas and in consulates and other areas amounted to almost $5 million. The city is not seeking reimbursement for added out-of-pocket cash payments caused by this emergency situation. This involves about $3 million which it distributed to policemen for overtime at straight time rates only. The city does not provide in its budget funds for such extraordinary emergency situations. Consequently it was necessary to borrow this more than $3 million by the issuance of budget notes which must be repaid. The city can ill afford to absorb this additional cost which is properly Federal responsibility.

Under agreement made between the United Nations and the United States regarding the headquarters of the United Nations, the appropriate American authorities are required to furnish police protection in the areas surrounding the headquarters district and to delegates to the United Nations. This, we in New York are very pleased to do. This we have done ever since the United Nations was first established in 1947, for we feel it is a moral obligation on the part of the city to furnish the necessary protection. The question then becomes, what organ of government has the ultimate responsibility for the furnishing of this protection and the resulting obligation to pay the expenses thereof.

As agent for the United States, New York cheerfully assumes its burden. All it asks is reimbursement for the extraordinary expense of police protection for a job well done.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this bill at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,063,500 for payment to the city of New York. The said appropriation shall be considered an ex gratia payment to assist the city of New York to defray the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses which the city incurred in affording protection to visiting chiefs of state and heads of government during the Fifteenth General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want, first of all, to salute the New York City Police Department for the magnificent job it did with respect to the situation we are discussing here today.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct one question to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly]: If I understood the gentlewoman correctly in an earlier colloquy, the gentlewoman said she believed that if this sort of situation were to again occur, she would favor requesting United Nations payment in part or in whole.

Is the gentleman correct in his understanding?

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we should wait that long. I think at this time our delegates to the United Nations should be so directed to deal with this problem prior to another incident.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentlewoman. I associate myself completely with the view that there should be action taken now. But I do raise very seriously the question as to why that proposal should not have been raised with respect to this expense, and not with respect only to subsequent expenses.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Just briefly. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think the answer to that question is that there is an agreement which, in effect, says that the United Nations is not responsible; that this is the responsibility of New York City, or the American authorities.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman. That may well go to this particular proposition.

In that event, I would suggest that not only should the matter be taken up forthwith by our delegation to the United Nations with respect to subsequent affairs, but there should be steps taken, both in the General Assembly and by the Congress of the United States, to revise those provisions of the agreement bearing upon that point.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to one other matter. There is stated in the report that this action today does not set a precedent. Yet the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino] concluded his remarks by the statement that if we do not take this action, he could not say what the attitude of New York would hereafter be. I cannot reconcile these two statements. I shall not say that it was an implied threat. I cannot reconcile that sort of statement with the allegation that this does not set a precedent, because the only possible import of that statement is that if we do pay for it this time, we will give the city of New York reason to believe that we will pay for it the next time. Otherwise, I see no significance, no logic, and no point to the remark of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield, briefly?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman familiar with the language on page 3 of the committee report which expressly states that the committee reported this bill out, "with the reservation that in recommending favorable action, such action shall not constitute a precedent for reimbursement in the future for the same or similar purposes"?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am entirely familiar with that. I have seen that kind of statement written into hundreds of committee reports, and I have seen the practical effect to be that a precedent was established. The very point that I am making, I will say to my very good friend from New York, is that I cannot reconcile this no-precedent claim with the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO] to the effect that he does not know what New York City will do next time if we do not pay this. The only import of that is that if we pay this we are then giving New York City assurance that they will be taken care of the next time, which to me gives solid substance to the charge that I am making, that this is to become a precedent-setting action.

I am not so sure—and I know this is not the time to solve all the problems—if we are going to continue to have a United Nations that this and many other situations that have developed constitute the best possible argument for some sort of an international District of Columbia for this international agency, so that we are not seceding and abdicating a geographical and political area of sovereignty of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this has been a pretty rough week for the taxpayers of America. On Monday the House obligated $2 billion for the International Monetary Fund. On Tuesday the Peace Corps dug into the taxpayers for nearly $64 million, a 100 percent-plus increase in the appropriation for that outfit. Yesterday the taxpayers were clipped another $25½ million for the United Nations and $17 million for the New York Fair. These are only some of the high spots.

The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] in speaking on this question under the rule said that the question is whether this $3 million is enough or too little. I respectfully submit to my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], that as far as I am concerned the question is whether we ought to give New York City anything. And I do not think we ought to give them a dime for this purpose.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. It seems to me that under the provisions of this bill I am quite sure that the gentleman will agree on considering what the city of New York was obliged to do that they must be paid something. There are three different sums that we can consider. It seems to me it is a question whether we are going to give the largest sum, the medium sum, or the lowest sum.

Mr. GROSS. And I add: nothing at all.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. But then my friend is always very definite and I am afraid the House of Representatives is not always as definite.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, too; and I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks.

We had Khrushchev out in Iowa shortly after he was in New York. We assembled our police forces out there, took our highway patrol off the highways, jeopardizing safety on the highways, and if I remember correctly, used some elements of the National Guard.

Strange as it may seem, we are not now here on the House floor bleeding at every pore and pleading that you reimburse the State of Iowa for the unusual expense of having Khrushchev on our hands.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I trust the gentleman is not comparing the Iowa State police force with New York's Finest.

Mr. GROSS. We will compare with you any day.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Is it not true that you had the expenses but you did not have the permanent benefits financially that New York realizes from the presence of the United Nations?

Mr. GROSS. Of course.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Does not the gentleman agree that the citizens of New York ought to be willing to take the bad and pay for it as well as all of the good they get?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly they should, but they want to eat their cake and have it, too. Let me point out to the Members of the House that in 1956 several cities vied with each other to get the national political conventions, which are of short duration as compared with the United Nations, which goes on and on and attracts hundreds of thousands of visitors to New York City every year. These visitors are an important source of income to New York.

In 1956 the city of San Francisco put up $1 million for the Republican National Convention at San Francisco. The Democrats held their convention in Chicago in 1956. The city of Chicago paid $1 million into the Democrat kitty to get that convention for only a few days.

In 1960 the Republican National Convention went to Chicago. The city of Chicago again put up $1 million to get it. Apparently it is good business. In 1960 the Democrat National Convention went to Los Angeles, and Los Angeles put up $750,000 and the State of California another $750,000 to get that convention for only a few days. There were unusual police expenses in all those cities at all of those conventions. They paid for those bills, too.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I should like to say that the city of New York loses upwards of $3 million each and every year in taxes by having the United Nations there. All of that land and the building is tax free. The city of New York loses $3 million a year in taxes.

Mr. GROSS. How did they come to locate the United Nations in New York if the city of New York did not want it?

Mr. MULTER. That is beside the question.

Mr. GROSS. No, it is not.

Mr. MULTER. The fact of the matter is that the city of New York makes and has made a major contribution to keep it there.

Mr. GROSS. New York City asked for this Tower of Babel and got it. Now you want the taxpayers of the Third District of Iowa and the taxpayers of every other municipality and State in the United States to bail you out by paying your bills despite the rich harvest of income that you reap.

Mr. MULTER. All we want is for the U.S. Government to pay its obligation.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute; this is my time. This is not a Federal obligation. I hope the city of New York does what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] suggested might be done or perhaps should be done. I do not want to put words in his mouth. He suggested if there was a referendum, the citizens of the city of New York would vote the United Nations right out of town. Why do you not hold that referendum and get them out of there, if you do not like to pay your legitimate bills?

Mr. MULTER. I think the gentleman is not quoting the gentleman from New York correctly. I do not think the city of New York could vote it out. This is an international body.

Mr. GROSS. What does Mr. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary, International Organization Affairs, Department of State, say about this, as printed in the hearings? He says, among other things:

> This agreement does not fix the responsibility on the Federal Government for the payment of these costs.

He says:

> New York sought to be the host city; it derives tremendous advantages in the way of prestige from this status and tremendous commercial advantages. The property values in the area of the United Nations have increased enormously as a result of the location of the U.N. in New York City.

Do you still want the taxpayers of the Nation to pick up your bills in New York City when the State Department says this is not the responsibility of the Federal Government?

I swear I think that what we ought to do is to pass a bill, if that is necessary, to remove the torch from the hand of the Statue of Liberty and insert in lieu thereof a cup—a tin cup.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I want to say that that on this occasion I agree with the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is not very often that you do and I am glad to have that information.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. And since the gentleman brought up the matter of Mr. Khrushchev coming to Iowa and he might have raised trouble in my district, and also in view of the fact that the gentleman brought up the possibility of comparing the police force, and, of course, the enforcement officers of Iowa, my home State, I think I should say a word about that and remind him, I believe, and I think the gentleman from Iowa will agree with me, that all our enforcement officers beginning with the justices of peace, including the city police and the deputies and the detectives and the sheriffs and their deputies and the State control and all their systems, probably all outrank the police force in that great metropolis, and have great ability, and in this instance they went beyond the call of duty and in almost every instance wherever this party went to carry out their responsibility of their office and contend with the problem that prevailed and they did it very well.

Mr. GROSS. The difference is that the State of Iowa and their representatives in Congress are not here today asking for a handout for having carried out a task that was our responsibility.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. No, no, it never occurred to them to do that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman again yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say the National Guard was called out in Iowa on Khrushchev's visit?

Mr. GROSS. If I remember correctly some elements of it were used.

Mr. ROONEY. Who paid for the National Guard?

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute now. Let me respond in my own way. You are operating on my time.

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, I would not in any way try to take advantage of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure of that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 2, line 2, after the word "Nations", and before the period, insert "and shall constitute settlement in full for all such future pleas that may be made by the city of New York to the Federal Government."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I always offer amendments that are easily understood. This will simply say to the city of New York that in the future, you take care of your bills; as long as you have the Tower of Babel on your hands, you take care of your bills. That is all this does. I am not going to vote for the bill, but I think if there is any danger—and I cannot conceive of it passing—but, if there is any danger of the bill passing, I think the House ought to adopt this amendment just to shut this water off as of now.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. If I understand this amendment, it does not preclude two or three of my small cities in my congressional district which Khrushchev dishonored with his visit from putting in a claim of a few hundred or a few thousand dollars which means as much to them as $3 million does to the city of New York.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, no, you could offer your bills.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. They can still go ahead and ask the Congress to reimburse them?

Mr. GROSS. That is right, but knowing the gentleman from California, I doubt he would do so.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. If I understand the import of the amendment, it is that there will be one go-round for every community or city—one crack at the Federal Treasury?

Mr. GROSS. This would not preclude any other State or city from asking for a handout. It just says to the city of New York—Congress is not going to answer any more of your pleas for money for this purpose from the busted Federal Treasury.

Mr. JOHANSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman misunderstood the point I was trying to make. This does not preclude any other community from having one crack at the Treasury; is that correct?

Mr. GROSS. That is correct, but I do not think that will happen.

Mr. JOHANSEN. In other words, any other community can come in and ask to be reimbursed for expenses incident to the visits of Communist scum to this country?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, it is hard to believe that the city of New York, having dipped into the Federal Treasury only yesterday for $17 million for the New York Fair, would be right back for another $3 million today. This city is fast becoming a luxury that the badly bent taxpayers of the Nation can ill afford. Maybe the whole area ought to be turned over to the United Nations and policed by the mercenaries we have hired for the Congo and in the Middle East.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that when the city of New York is concerned it is always open season. I think I can stand here as something of a neutral; I do not live far enough away from New York City to think that everything they ask for is wrong, but I do live far enough away to state to you that not 5 cents of this money will come to the community I represent.

I think in all fairness when we picture on the floor of this House the city of New York as the Statue of Liberty with a tincup looking for a handout from the Federal Government, we might consider that this is a two-way street. Let me ask you how many millions and hundreds of millions of dollars the people of the city of New York have paid into the various farm subsidy programs when many of the people there have never seen a cow unless it was hanging from a hook?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would the gentleman deny that many Members of this House from New York voted for these subsidies which he is not proposing to throw out?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Exactly; and it is exactly the point that I am making, because we voted in this farm legislation time after time to help—or we thought to help—other people with our taxes, and we did not get very much in return.

I will simply say this, however, New York and the New York police force has the responsibility time after time to meet unusual situations, but it does not come here asking for reimbursement in those situations. New York responded to an extraordinary situation a short time ago, a situation that had an impact on every person in this country.

This is not a precedent. I am sure that New York and its police officers will continue to take care of unusual situations, but in this case what they did was for the benefit of every man and woman in the United States.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I said I would offer an amendment on behalf of the city of San Francisco. I realize, of course, that an amendment of that kind would be subject to a point of order, and there is no use fanning the air. But I do think that a bill of this kind is going to open the floodgates to a lot of legislation. I think the city of San Francisco and the city of Los Angeles are just as entitled to reimbursement for the extraordinary expense they were put to as is the city of New York.

I think also that this House if it does anything ought to reimburse the city of San Francisco for the expense the city was put to in connection with the riots out there when our own committee met in San Francisco. It cost the city $250,000 to repair the city hall after those riots and pay for the police.

If we are going to open the floodgates all the way through then there is going to be no limit. I think our city of San Francisco is just as justified as is the city of New York.

I was rather surprised at the stand taken by our good colleague from New York to the effect that they now are dissatisfied with the presence of the U.N. headquarters. That seems to be the substance of their arguments as I gathered it from the colloquies that have taken place here this afternoon.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield.

Mr. LINDSAY. I think the gentleman is not correct in saying there is dissatisfaction with the presence of the U.N. in New York. Speaking as the Member who represents the district where the U.N. is located I feel it is a great benefit to us in every way and we are glad to have it there.

Second, the gentleman's point would be well taken in respect of other cities in the United States, except that the United Nations is a completely sui generis situation. There is nothing like it in the whole of our country. It is the only international body we have, and we are the host country. I think it is hard for Members to realize what it is like to have this heavy concentration of ambassadors to the United Nations in our city, making it in effect a kind of enclave. There is a huge burden involved here. The city of New York is pleased to take up most of that burden, but in this particular instance it was so overwhelmingly and so completely beyond the capacity of the city of New York to pay for, that, because of its international character, we have a right to come to the United States Government and ask for help.

Mr. YOUNGER. Does the gentleman consider that the United Nations there is a violation of the Monroe Doctrine?

Mr. LINDSAY. Not at all. The United States is the host government. Any time representative international institution of this kind is in a country, that country is the host and that country has the obligation to provide police protection. That is basic international law, I might add.

Mr. GROSS. And it makes business good for the Waldorf Astoria and the other hotels in New York to have these foreign Pooh-Bahs throwing our money around.

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes. The benefit far outweighs the $3 million cost. I feel legislation of this kind, regardless of the international aspects of it, is a piece of legislation that will lead to a lot of other bills being offered in the Congress for payment. I do not see how we can justifiedly turn them down.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to disassociate myself from those who are opposed to the United Nations being in the city of New York. I am happy to have it there, and I hope it will continue its good work.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House that the city of New York in 1960 paid in revenue to the Federal Government over $5.66 billion. We representatives of the city and State of New York vote, and willingly vote, for aid to every State and city in this Nation, and we will continue to do that regardless of what happens on the floor this afternoon.

I think the pending amendment is not justified. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. KELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to compliment the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. Kelly], upon her brilliant presentation of this important legislation here today. I should also like to ask if it is not a fact that the meeting of the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations did not actually cost, insofar as police protection was concerned, over $6 million, and that the $3 million plus included in the pending bill would really reimburse the city of New York only to the extent of 50 percent of the actual cost?

Mrs. KELLY. The gentleman is correct. I made that statement in my earlier statement on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 76, noes 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, in New York City at the United Nations Assembly in October 1960, there were great tensions. The meeting there of many heads of state created a potentially explosive situation in the city itself. The following list will give some idea of the reason for the excitement. Among those present at the General Assembly were Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev of the U.S.S.R.; President Antonin Novotny of Czechoslovakia; Wladyslaw Gomulka, member of the Council of State and head of the Polish Government; Janos Kadar, Minister of State of Hungary; Todor Zhivkov, member of the Presidium of the Grand National Assembly of Bulgaria; Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, member of the Presidium of the Grand National Assembly of Rumania; Mehmet Shehu, President of the Council of Ministers of Albania; Dr. Andre Sik, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Hungary; Andrei Gromyko, Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R.; Fidel Castro, Prime Minister of Cuba, and President Broz-Tito of Yugoslavia. During the same period, President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Harold Macmillan of Great Britain, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India, President Achmed Sukarno of Indonesia, President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, King Hussein of Jordan, President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic, and Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Chief of State of Cambodia.

A healthy proportion of these men are dictators of countries in which thousands of ancestors and relatives of the citizens of New York suffered and are still suffering the tortures of the intolerably oppressed. Their wild harangues, and caustic and abrasive remarks in the Assembly exacerbated to a marked degree the feelings generated against them. At mass meetings, protesting against the presence of many of these men, scores and scores of resolutions of condemnation were passed. Because of threats, there was reasonable fear for the personal safety of those in attendance at the General Assembly. The United States, through authorities in New York, was duty bound to offer utmost protection to the lives and property of these people—protection from damage to their persons, to embassies, chanceries, ministries, offices, and residences of these men.

Thus, this was an extraordinary burden placed upon the mayor of the city of New York and his police department. But the illustrious mayor of the city promptly recruited police strength and siphoned from other parts of the city of New York, policemen and police reserves so that a great army of police could be concentrated in and around the United Nations all during that exciting period. Many of these brave policemen were required to work overtime. There were many arrests made for disorderly conduct and for even graver crimes. Windows were broken, rotten eggs were thrown. One man attempted to crawl over the United Nations fence with a so-called Molotov cocktail in his possession. If it had exploded, there would have been involved a catastrophe, the implications of which are plainly imaginable. In a particular fracas, as the result of the presence of Castro, a 9-year-old girl was shot and killed in a restaurant near the United Nations. The defendant was convicted. It was during this critical time that New York City was plagued with the so-called Sunday bomber, adding to an already overburdened police responsibility. Fortunately, the bombings were stopped.

Because of the matchless conduct of the police, none of the dignitaries were injured. The good name of the United States remains unimpaired, and the fair name of New York City remains unblemished.

This was done by the city of New York at considerable cost and the bill now being considered would authorize the appropriation of a little over $3 million as payment to the city of New York by way of defraying a portion of the extraordinary and unprecedented expense incurred by the city because of this extra police protection.

I am informed that the State Department has already approved the purpose of this bill. This approval is embodied in a letter sent to the former Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn by former Secretary of State, Christian A. Herter, under date of January 12, 1961. Under the agreement between the United Nations and the United States regarding the headquarters of the United Nations—see agreement dated June 26, 1947, Public Law 357, 80th Congress, 1st session, 22 U.S.C. 287—we find the following under section II:

> The Federal, State, or local authorities of the United States shall not impose any impediments to transit to or from the headquarters district of (1) representatives of members or officials of the United Nations. The appropriate American authorities shall afford any necessary protection to such persons while in transit to or from the headquarters district.

And under section 16:

> (a) The appropriate American authorities shall exercise due diligence to insure that the tranquility of the headquarters district is not disturbed by the unauthorized entry

> of groups of persons from outside or by disturbances in the immediate vicinity and shall cause to be provided on the boundaries of the headquarters district such police protection as is required for these purposes.

Wherever the phrase "American authorities" is used, it most certainly embraces the Police Department of the city of New York.

While there is no contractual obligation on the part of the United States to pay these extraordinary expenses, there is indeed a moral obligation to reimburse the city of New York. To do otherwise would be inequitable.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4441 which authorizes an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations.

The Police Department of the city of New York during this period was actually performing a Federal duty and giving protection to avoid any incidents which would be of international importance—they did a magnificent job. Many policemen were required to work beyond their normal hours and during their regular "time off" periods.

I believe this payment would also show our gratitude to one of the finest police enforcement agencies in the United States, the New York City Police Department, for its exemplary conduct under trying circumstances.

The city of New York has on many occasions expended its own funds in the greeting of foreign dignitaries and continues to be a showplace for our country to many world travelers and visitors.

The sum in question should be given to New York City not only as just compensation for added expenses incurred but also in recognition of its endeavors to promote free and cooperative world relationships.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4441.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the Congress is under obligation to make an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations. It is hard to approve the bill in the amount of $3,063,500. It should have been reduced to the amount, $1,500,000 approved by both the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations. But I believe the other body will make the appropriate reduction if we send the bill to it today; and to recommit the bill would kill it.

Mr. Chairman, during hearings on the bill last year, I inquired into the precise nature of the obligations the U.S. Government assumed when in 1947 it entered into the agreement with the United Nations regarding establishment of the United Nations headquarters in the United States. It is clear under section 25 that, "the United States shall have the ultimate responsibility for the fulfillment of such obligations by the appropriate American authorities."

The "appropriate authorities" in this case are the city of New York and its police force and "such obligations" includes "any necessary protection to such persons while in transit." "Such persons" are of course, the delegates to the U.N. from other countries—in this instance Mr. Khrushchev and his henchmen from practically all of the Communist satellites of the world.

As I said in the hearings, page 54:

> We entered into an agreement that gives us ultimate responsibility for providing protection, and if the city of New York cannot do that, the United States has to do it. Because they did do the job, we did not have to do it. Had they not done it, we would have had to.

Mr. Chairman, if New York City had not spent a large additional amount of its own funds for its extra police protection during those weeks, the U.S. Government would have had to do something like send in the Marines—at greater cost. We must congratulate New York City and its police for doing an exceptionally good job of protection, and I think we have no honorable choice except to make this ex gratia payment in fulfillment of an obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WILLIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4441) to authorize the appropriation of $3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations, pursuant to House Resolution 575, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Bow moves to recommit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs the bill H.R. 4441.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 143, nays 217, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—143

Abernethy
Alexander
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Bates
Battin
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brown
Bruce
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Church
Clancy
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Davis, James C.
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dominick
Downing
Durno
Ellsworth
Fenton
Findley
Flynt
Ford
Fountain
Fulton
Garland
Gary
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Haley
Hall
Hardy
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Horan
Hosmer
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Mack
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Morse
Mosher
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Konski
Passman
Pelly
Poff
Quie
Ray
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rousselot
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scranton
Short
Shriver
Sikes
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Teague, Calif.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Utt
Van Zandt
Waggonner
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Whitener
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Winstead
Younger

NAYS—217

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Bailey
Bass, Tenn.
Becker
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Breeding
Brooks, Tex.
Broyhill
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Chelf
Chiperfield
Cohelan
Conte
Corman
Curtis, Mo.
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, John W.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Diggs
Donohue
Dooley
Dorn
Doyle
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forrester
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Harding
Harris
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Holifield
Holland
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kowalski
Landrum
Lane
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Loser
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
Merrow
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Monagan
Montoya
Morgan
Morris
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murphy
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Norrell
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Shipley
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Weis
Wharton
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wright
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—76

Abbitt
Addonizio
Alford
Andrews
Avery
Ayres
Barrett
Barry
Blitch
Boykin
Brewster
Byrnes, Wis.
Celler
Clark
Coad
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dingell
Dowdy
Fascell
Finnegan
Gavin
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Halleck
Hansen
Harrison, Va.
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Kearns
Kee
Keith
Kilburn
Kirwan
Lennon
McIntire
McMillan
Mason
Meader
Moorhead, Pa.
Morrison
Murray
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Patman
Peterson
Powell
Rains
Reece
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Colo.
Rostenkowski
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Sibal
Slack
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Taber
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Van Pelt
Walter
Watts
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.
Yates

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Meader.

Mrs. Granahan with Mr. Sibal.

Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Barry.

Mr. Harrison of Virginia with Mr. Kearns.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mrs. Reece.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Peterson with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Taber.

Mr. **NELSEN** changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. **HALPERN** changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 207, nays 153, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—207

Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Bailey
Bass, Tenn.
Becker
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bonner
Brademas
Breeding
Brooks, Tex.
Broyhill
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Chelf
Cohelan
Conte
Cook
Corman
Curtis, Mo.
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, John W.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Diggs
Donohue
Dooley
Dorn
Doyle
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Farbstein
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forrester
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Harding
Harris
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Henderson
Holifield
Holland
Inouye
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kowalski
Landrum
Lane
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Loser
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Matthews
Meader
Merrow
Miller, Clem
Miller,
 George P.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murphy
Natcher
Nix
Norrell
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Weis
Wharton
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wright
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—153

Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Andersen,
 Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Bates
Battin
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bow
Bray
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brown
Bruce
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clancy
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Davis,
 James C.
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dominick
Downing
Durno
Ellsworth
Fenton
Findley
Flynt
Ford
Fountain
Fulton
Garland
Gary
Gathings
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Hardy
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hemphill
Herlong
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Horan
Hosmer
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Mack
Marshall
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Moorehead,
 Ohio
Morse
Mosher
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Konski
Passman
Pelly
Poff
Purcell
Quie
Ray
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rousselot
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scranton
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Utt
Van Zandt
Waggonner
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Whitener
Winstead
Younger

NOT VOTING—76

Abbitt
Addonizio
Alford
Andrews
Avery
Ayres
Barrett
Barry
Blitch
Boggs
Boykin
Brewster
Cederberg
Celler
Clark
Coad
Cooley
Corbett
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dingell
Dowdy
Fallon
Fascell
Finnegan
Garmatz
Gavin
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Halleck
Hansen
Harrison, Va.
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Kearns
Kee
Keith
Kilburn
Kirwan
Lennon
McIntire
McMillan
Mason
Morrison
Murray
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
Patman
Peterson
Rains
Reece
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Colo.
Rostenkowski
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Slack
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Taber
Thompson, La.
Van Pelt
Walter
Watts
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois for, with Mr. Whitten against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Harrison of Virginia against.

Mr. Addonizio for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Alford against.

Mr. Barry for, with Mrs. Reece against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Wilson of Indiana against.

Mr. Keith for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Finnegan with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Brewster with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Mason.

Mrs. Granahan with Mr. Taber.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mrs. **BOLTON** changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. **WILSON** of California. Mr. Speaker, I was not in the Chamber when this last vote was taken. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 204 OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

Mr. **ELLIOTT**, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 589, Rept. No. 1555), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

REPORT ON H.R. 1159 TO AMEND THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 590, Rept. No. 1556) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1159) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6 per centum differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders, and all points of order against said committee amendments printed in the bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader as to what the legislative program is.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman, may I advise the House that there is no further business for the balance of this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day. There is no District of Columbia business.

Tuesday, H.R. 10788, a bill to amend section 204, Agriculture Act of 1956 relating to the regulation of textile imports will be called up.

On Tuesday there is an Illinois primary and any rollcall votes except on rules on Monday or Tuesday will go over until Wednesday.

Wednesday, the legislative appropriation bill for 1963 will be called up.

Thursday and the balance of the week, H.R. 1159—vessels, 6-percent differential, Pacific coast shipbuilders.

There is the usual reservation, of course, that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Any further legislative program will be announced later. I would like to advise the House that we expect to be able to announce additional business for next week sometime early in the week.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman give us any information, if he has any available information, concerning the Easter time recess. Can he fill us in a little about that at this time?

Mr. ALBERT. The Easter recess will begin at the close of business on Thursday, April 19. We are not able to advise the House at this time as to the duration of the Easter recess, but I hope to be able to give my colleague and the House this information early next week.

Mr. ARENDS. Might I express the hope that the news you give us will be good news?

Mr. ALBERT. I share the hope of the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON APRIL 11 AND 18

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday, April 11 and Wednesday, April 18.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the appropriation bill is being carried over from next Tuesday to next Wednesday?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And that is because of a city election somewhere?

Mr. ALBERT. It is not a city election according to my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. Is it a State primary?

Mr. ALBERT. If I am properly informed, it is the Illinois primary.

Mr. GROSS. That is a statewide primary?

Mr. ALBERT. That is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. And not a municipal election?

Mr. ALBERT. That is my understanding. We do not customarily put over rollcall votes otherwise.

POSTPONEMENT OF ROLLCALL VOTES TO WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, while we are on that subject, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcall votes except on rules and on procedural matters and, of course, this does not apply to quorum calls, on Tuesday next may be put over until Wednesday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, still reserving the right to object, I have been through this parliamentary process before and I have lost the floor by yielding for unanimous consent requests.

Mr. ALBERT. I asked the gentleman if he would yield.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and I am still reserving the right to object to this request, Mr. Speaker. Now there will be no session tomorrow, on Friday; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I assume that is very much in order in view of the fact that the New York delegation will want a long weekend to celebrate having obtained $20 million from the U.S. Treasury in the last 2 days. I know that the Federal Treasury is busted and will borrow several billion dollars this year. I had not previously known that New York City could not pay its bills; that it was so poverty stricken it could not pay for its own promotions. The best news of the day is that there will be an Easter recess. I plan to go home and commiserate with the taxpayers of the district I represent.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. There are two consent requests pending. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VOTES POSTPONED TO WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1962

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that any vote had on Monday or Tuesday of next week, except on a rule or quorum calls be postponed to Wednesday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POORLY PRINTED HEARINGS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish you and the Members would look at the hearings that have just come to the floor on the bill H.R. 4441 and see how you can read them. They are so badly printed that it is practically impossible to read some pages at all. I would like to suggest that something be done about a poor job like this. If the machinery is no good, throw it out and get new. If the paper is too thin, print it on better stock, but let the work be of such nature that we can read it and use it when it comes to us.

AMEND UNITED STATES CODE TO IMPROVE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AND DISCIPLINE IN ARMED FORCES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the American Legion, I have today introduced a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, in order to improve the administration of justice and discipline in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

This bill was originally introduced in the 86th Congress by my beloved and esteemed late colleague, the Honorable Overton Brooks.

The bill is designed to improve the system of justice and discipline for all the Armed Forces and I am hopeful that it may be assigned for early hearings so that the views of the Department of Defense, the individual services, the American Legion and other veterans' organizations, and all interested parties may be adduced and suitable legislation provided to improve the code and strengthen the system of justice for all the armed services.

TRANSPORTATION MESSAGE AND 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and that my remarks may be included in the Record at the point immediately following the message of the President on transportation this morning, and I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a brief speech I made this morning in connection with exercises celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL AIR CARRIERS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to terminate the operating authority of the supplemental air carriers.

It has been repeatedly pointed out on the floor of the House, in the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 1969, by Members of the other body, and by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia that the operating certificates of these carriers are illegal.

The Congress in Public Law 86-661 generously granted a 20-month reprieve to consider whether the supplemental airlines should be continued and, if so, on what basis. During this 20-month period of investigation and deliberation, it became clear that the vast majority of the members of this supplemental group are unfit for a variety of reasons which include law violations, unsafe and negligent operations, substandard maintenance, unsound financial conditions, and false and fraudulent filings with the Civil Aeronautics Board or the FAA.

These supplemental operations have resulted in shocking airline disasters at Richmond, at Toledo, at Shannon, and elsewhere.

The supplementals have evaded over a million dollars in Federal taxes and defaulted on hundreds of thousands of dollars of debt owed to the Government for fuel and supplies.

The supplementals have stranded passengers abroad, illegally rebated tickets, delayed or completely failed to make passenger refunds. Their schedule reliability has been substandard.

The supplemental combines have systematically flaunted the law and operated scheduled service illegally.

Mr. Speaker, the details of all these violations have been set forth at length on the floor of Congress, before several congressional committees, and in the press, and are well known. I will not, therefore, go into any further details at this time.

The House passed a supplemental bill in the last session of Congress which with certain additional strengthening provisions constitutes a reasonable solution. The other body passed a bill which includes three grants of authority to the supplementals which are unacceptable. There is no public need for the authority. There is no economic need by the supplementals for the authority. These three grants would embroil the airline industry in ceaseless abuse and litigation and would invalidate the safety and enforcement amendments sorely needed to reform the supplementals.

In the meantime, the 20-month reprieve has expired. The supplementals are operating under their illegal certificates pending Supreme Court review or enactment of permanent legislation.

My investigations of the supplementals raised grave doubts in my mind whether there is any justification for the existence of the supplemental carriers. I now have no doubts.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress faces a grave problem. These supplemental carriers cannot be permitted to continue their present illegal and dangerous operations. Neither can we accept the Senate position. Under these circumstances the bill which I have today introduced is the only means by which we can protect the public, and maintain order in the Nation's air transportation system.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill introduced today by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative Francis Walter, providing for termination of supplemental air carrier certificates issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is my understanding that the certificates would become null and void within 60 days after the date of enactment of the bill.

I know my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania has been very much concerned, as I have been, about the unsound financial arrangements and unsafe flying practices of supplemental air carriers.

That the CAB has allowed these carriers to continue doing business even though Public Law 86-661 expired on March 14 last is indeed disturbing—this law gave congressional sanction to supplemental air carrier certificates issued by the CAB only until the expiration date. To my mind, the CAB has demonstrated casual disregard for the will of Congress as expressed in Public Law 86-661.

Mr. Walter's bill certainly reflects my views relative to what should be done about supplemental air carriers now doing business. I compliment my distinguished colleague for introducing this necessary and entirely appropriate measure.

THE LONG-AWAITED MESSAGE ON TRANSPORTATION IS FINALLY BEFORE THE CONGRESS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, now that the President's long-awaited message on transportation is before the Congress, I trust that we may finally get on with the vitally urgent task of making sense out of this Nation's muddled and often contradictory transportation policies and laws.

Although some of us may disagree as to detail, we would all agree, I believe, with the central thesis of the President's message that transportation is absolutely vital to the Nation's economy and security, that major segments of transportation are in serious trouble, that their troubles derive in no small part from the failure to gear transportation policies and laws to changing conditions and needs, and that further delay in arriving at sound solutions would seriously jeopardize our essential common carrier system to the detriment of the Nation as a whole.

Essentially the same warnings have been sounded by many of us in the Congress for years, and it is most heartening to find that the administration's independent analysis has reached substantially the same conclusions.

Especially commendable, I believe, is the President's recognition of the numerous grave inequities which exist in transportation as the result of what he has properly described as a chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation. Clearly, the agricultural and bulk commodities exemptions to which the President refers are outstanding examples of these inequities and warrant the earliest attention by Congress.

Other and equally grave inequities result, as the President has also pointed out, from the use by commercial carriers of publicly provided transportation facilities either entirely without charge or without fair and adequate charge. As to this and many of the other inequities referred to in the President's message, I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that corrective legislation, largely embodying the principles and approach which the President recommends, already have been introduced in both Houses of the Congress and await only our attention.

On the subject of user charges on inland waterways, for example, I have introduced H.R. 586 and H.R. 2963. Repeal of the bulk and agricultural commodity exemptions or extension of the exemptions to railroads are provided for in H.R. 1823, H.R. 1824, and H.R. 5595. Repeal of the 10-percent Federal tax on passenger fares, also recommended by the President, is the objective of H.R. 142 and no fewer than 18 other House bills. In fact, in the President's message, there is scarcely a single recommendation or problem that is not also the subject of one or more concrete proposals now before us.

The President has appropriately pointed out that the difficulty and the complexity of these basic troubles will not correct themselves with the mere passage of time and that the Nation cannot afford further delay in arriving at sound solutions. I could not agree more. And I would add, as I have on other occasions, that failure by Congress to come to grips with these basic problems now would constitute gross dereliction of duty and abdication of responsibility, to the detriment of the great American public, whose interests we are sworn to uphold.

IMPLEMENT THE FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1956

Mr. **WALLHAUSER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution of the New Jersey State Legislature.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WALLHAUSER.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey.

This resolution concerns the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 and calls attention to the fact that the Congress of the United States has failed to appropriate the funds necessary to implement the act.

In its resolution, the State legislature calls upon the Congress to enact the legislation necessary to fully implement the act. I fully concur with this request.

Such an action, I firmly believe, will be in the common interests of all of the States of our Union and its peoples.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of the resolution, adopted by the State Legislature of New Jersey, at this point in the Record:

Joint Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation To Implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in 1956, enacted the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas the Congress found in said act that "in the case of recurring natural disasters, including recurring floods, insurance protection against individual and public loss is not always practically available through private or public sources"; and

Whereas the avowed purpose of said act was to establish a program of Federal insurance and reinsurance against the risk of floods and to encourage private insurance covering such flood risks; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore failed to appropriate the funds necessary to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas since 1956 there have been numerous disasters, storms, and floods in many of the States of this Nation, causing untold damage to public and private property; and

Whereas in the State of New Jersey, as a result of the storm and flood of March 1962 alone, the damage to public and private property will exceed $100 million; and

Whereas the public and private losses suffered as a result of such storms and floods has caused widespread distress and hardship adversely affecting the general welfare without regard to State boundary lines; and

Whereas much of said distress and hardship could have been avoided, reduced or guarded against if the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 had been properly and adequately implemented at the time of its original passage; and

Whereas it is in the common interest of all of the States of this Nation to support the program of insurance protection provided for in the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; and

Whereas the President of the United States has stated his approval of this program and willingness to implement its provisions as soon as the necessary funds are provided: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact the legislation necessary to fully implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956.

2. The Secretary of State shall transmit forthwith a duly attested copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Senators from New Jersey, and to each Member of the House of Representatives of the United States elected from New Jersey.

3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

H.R. 11072, A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. **KING** of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KING** of Utah. Mr. Speaker, having introduced H.R. 11072, the bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order that coal pipeline companies may be granted the privilege of eminent domain, I should like to explain the need for quick congressional action on this measure.

One of the few industries to keep the price of its product static through the long siege of inflation during recent years, the Nation's bituminous coal industry has unfortunately failed to benefit materially from the outstanding service. The average selling price of coal at the mine was $4.99 per ton in 1947. Despite a very substantial increase in coal industry wages and in the costs of equipment and supplies, that very same product is now available at the mine for $4.67 per ton. Actually, it is not the same product; it is a better, more efficient product inasmuch as preparation plants that have been put into service over the past 15 years greatly improve coal's combustion efficiency.

What has been happening to the coal industry as a consequence of its willingness to invest in the interest of progress? While the average man-day output of bituminous coal has moved from 6.26 tons per man-day in 1938 to more than 13 tons at the present time, coal sales do not in any way reflect the coal industry's successful efforts to modernize, and to offer a better product, and hold prices far below the general index. In 1947 the bituminous coal industry established a new production record, 630 million tons, and the following year the total output was just short of 600 million tons.

For a number of reasons over which the industry itself has no control, a lack of demand kept bituminous coal production at scarcely 400 million tons in 1961. Meanwhile, total energy requirements have risen 34.9 percent since 1948.

In view of the fact that there is not going to be any stopping the spiraling demands for energy—not only to take care of increasing population but also to provide better standards of living—coal must find a means of capturing its share of the growing markets if the industry is to remain sound, if it is to be ready under emergency conditions, and if it is to be depended upon over the long range.

One way for coal to assert itself in new markets is for it to keep its delivered price down below the cost of energy equivalent from other fuels. A step in this direction took place several years ago when a 110-mile coal pipeline was put into operation in eastern Ohio. Since that time it has been transporting more than a million tons of coal annually to an electric utility plant. Engineers have decided that this method of transportation is feasible and practical over much longer distances and over almost any type of terrain. Presently there is under consideration a plan to connect the electric utility markets of the east coast with the coal fields of West Virginia by a pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, last month a number of coal industry representatives presented testimony to the California Public Utilities Commission regarding the availability of coal for use in that State. Witnesses included Mr. W. J. O'Connor, president of the Independent Coal and Coke Co., of Salt Lake City, and Mr. Earl Evans, president of the Utah-Wyoming Coal Operators Association. Several methods of making electric power from Rocky Mountain coal available on the west coast were discussed, and it is generally conceded that in the not too distant future California will be an important coal customer.

I want to help establish this new market for intermountain coal as quickly as possible. Construction of the pipeline from our coal fields to California will forge an important link between our great coal resources and coast markets. Certainly if a coal pipeline will work in the East, it will work in the West. I feel it is important at least that Congress open the way for such an undertaking by giving to the coal carrier the same right of eminent domain that is already available to oil and gas pipelines. I recognize that there has been some opposition in State capitals of the East to granting this privilege, but I do not anticipate any such attitude in our part of the country. At the present time there is no coal being moved to California, so no other method of transportation would lose business if a coal pipeline were created to bring our product to the Pacific coast. It would be all new business and its beneficial impact upon the economy of our mining regions would be a welcome development for Utah. Our State's rich veins contain 46 billion tons of recoverable coal reserves, and we want to see our coal industry revived. The 7½ million tons of coal produced in Utah in 1947 dwindled to 4½ million tons in 1960 and recovered only slightly last year. I know that my colleagues can appreciate the injurious effects on the economy that come when business is off to this extent. Whatever new measures can be introduced to enable our coal industry to recover should be explored closely and acted upon as quickly as possible. I believe that the pipeline has great potential and that Congress should approve of H.R. 11072 quickly and positively.

FLYING HORSE

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, apparently, Sardar has more influence than a Congressman. Yesterday, as shown on page 5929 of the Congressional Record, I asked for and was given permission to speak out of order and addressed the House about the fact that I had been refused a seat on a regularly scheduled Military Air Transport Service plane flying to Greece where I had hoped to plead for the life of one of my constituents who is imprisoned there, awaiting execution before a firing squad. I was refused transportation because I am not a military reservist. I went on to point out that the First Lady's gift horse, the honorable Sardar, was being flown from Pakistan to the United States by this same Military Air Transport Service, as reported in the Washington Post. My inquiry then was whether or not Sardar is a reservist or merely in reserve.

Today, when I sought to read about the exploits of Sardar in the Congressional Record, I discovered that my remarks are not printed. Frankly, this is not surprising in view of the fact that my speech was not ghostwritten by Ted Sorenson, the man who has generously offered to plug, er, excuse me, I mean ghostwrite about the Kennedy family for members of the press. But then, of course, I realize that Sardar must be a horse of unbridled influence, and I am wondering if the President is horsing around with the idea of creating a Department of Horse Affairs and naming the honorable Sardar to the new Cabinet, er, post position, which would no doubt be a stable position in this administration.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, with Attorney General Bobby flying around the world, maybe the administration seeks to attempt to balance the budget by utilizing this flying gift horse, in which event perhaps the Congress should not look a gift horse in the mouth. Thus, on second thought, I offer my humblest apologies to the honorable Sardar and I further suggest, in the interest of economy, that he sow his wild oats in the rose garden.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 2, I was absent from the House on official business. Had I been present on rollcalls Nos. 54 and 55 I would have voted "yea."

GOV. NORMAN ERBE, OF IOWA, PROTESTS REALINEMENT OF 34TH INFANTRY DIVISION AND 103D INFANTRY DIVISION

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, immediately on the heels of the Department of Defense notice that certain National Guard and Reserve units will be realined, all members of the Iowa delegation received a telegram from the Honorable Norman Erbe, Governor of Iowa, expressing his shock and surprise that the 34th Infantry Division and the 103d Infantry Division are among those selected for realinement. Under leave to extend remarks, we, the Members of Congress, wish to call attention to Governor Erbe's telegram and to express our concern about this action. We feel that final action should not be taken until these plans can be reviewed in detail by the appropriate committees in Congress, at which time public hearings can be held and the spokesmen for the people most directly affected given an opportunity to testify on the implications of this move.

We are sure that Governor Erbe, as well as other midwestern Governors, will want to testify, and we will surely want to reserve time to express ourselves in more detail than time permits today.

The Governor's telegram follows:

Des Moines, Iowa.

Hon. Fred Schwengel,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I have been advised that news has been released that the Department of Defense and the Army are reported ready to send to Congress a plan eliminating four National Guard and four Reserve divisions and that the divisions considered most in jeopardy include the 34th Infantry Division, a National Guard division, and the 103d Infantry Division, a Reserve division, major parts of which division are located in the State of Iowa. I am shocked that the Department of Defense would consider eliminating the 34th Infantry Division, a famous National Guard division, with more days of combat credit in World War II than any other division in the American Army.

Units of the Army National Guard in my State are at the highest levels of mobilization readiness ever achieved. Eliminating these two divisions from the troop list is certainly not in keeping with the maintenance of the national defense posture in the face of the present critical world situation. I respectfully urge immediate reconsideration of this action.

Norman E. Erbe,
Governor of Iowa.

REPORT OF CAB ON SOURDOUGH AIR TRANSPORT

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Rousselot] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention a report—Docket No. 12026—recently issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board which reveals the precarious financial condition of Sourdough Air Transport, a supplemental air carrier. This report substantiates my belief that the CAB has been lax in enforcing its economic rules and regulations respecting supplemental air carriers.

In light of S. 1969, a bill to provide for a permanent class of supplemental air carriers, which has gone to conference, I think my colleagues in Congress will be interested in the CAB report. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the report at this point in the Record:

Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C.—Sourdough Air Transport, Docket No. 12026

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF SOURDOUGH AIR TRANSPORT FOR RENEWAL OF ITS CERTIFICATE AS A SUPPLEMENTAL AIR CARRIER

Initial decision of Examiner Richard A. Walsh served April 2, 1962, upon John J. Kiak, Kiak & Gerth, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., for Sourdough Air Transport; George N. Kenyon, Jr., Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., for the Bureau of Economic Regulation.

Exceptions to this decision may be filed within 10 days after the date of service. If exceptions are filed, briefs may be filed within a further period of 10 days. If no exceptions are filed, the decision shall become the decision of the Board 20 days after expiration of the time for filing exceptions unless the Board, within said 20-day period, makes an order constituting its final disposition of the proceeding or providing for further review.

INITIAL DECISION OF EXAMINER RICHARD A. WALSH

Preliminary statement: This proceeding involves the application of Sourdough Air Transport, Inc. (Sourdough), for renewal of its certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing it to engage in supplemental air transportation. Sourdough was issued its certificate on January 28, 1959, in the Large Irregular Air Carrier Investigation [1] for a period of 2 years from the date of issuance. Although the certificate would have expired on January 28, 1961, it was continued in force under section 9(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act by the timely filing of an application for renewal on January 6, 1961. Leave to intervene was granted to American Airlines, Inc., Northwest Airlines, Inc., Pan American World Airways, Inc., and Trans World Airlines, Inc.

After due notice to the public and to all interested parties public hearings were held in Seattle, Wash., and in Washington, D.C., and briefs have been filed by applicant, TWA, and Bureau counsel.

The issues: The only issue in this proceeding is whether Sourdough now possesses the necessary qualifications under section 401 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to warrant the renewal of its certificate to engage in supplemental air transportation. The Board in its decision in the Large Irregular Air Carrier Investigation, supra, authorized one group of carriers to engage in such service for a period of 5 years and another group of carriers whose qualifications were less impressive for a period of 2 years. Its purpose in limiting the latter group to 2-year authorizations was to permit reexamination and review at the end of such period of the qualifications of this group of carriers, without reference to the question of need for the service, to determine whether they were still qualified to engage in such transportation.

Sourdough was awarded a certificate for the shorter period because its overall qualifications were borderline in nature. Although it had been inactive for several years prior to the Board's decision, its good compliance record and proposal for resumption of service weighed heavily in its favor and served to compensate to a considerable extent for its somewhat unimpressive overall qualifications.

Description of applicant: Sourdough is a partnership consisting of Anton R. Johansen and his wife, Dorothy V. Johansen. Its principal office is located at their home address in Seattle, Wash. Both Mr. and Mrs. Johansen participate actively in the carrier's operation. Both have backgrounds of experience with various Alaskan air carriers dating back to 1931. Mr. Johansen has been general manager of Sourdough since 1947 and Mrs. Johansen has been his assistant.

When Sourdough presented its evidence in the Large Irregular Carrier case in the fall of 1955 it owned one wrecked DC-3 aircraft which Mr. Johansen purchased in the preceding July for $75. This airplane was carried on Sourdough's books at a value of $200,000. It has not since been repaired and at the present time parts of the aircraft are located in Nome, Alaska, Los Angeles, and Seattle. During the hearing of his case in 1955 Mr. Johansen estimated the cost of repairing this aircraft at $50,000. It was to have been repaired immediately but nearly 7 years have passed and still it has not been done. In view of the age of the aircraft, the locations of its parts, the cost of putting it in flyable condition, and the limited resources of Sourdough and the Johansens, there is considerable room for doubt that this aircraft will ever be repaired. Another DC-3 aircraft allegedly owned by Mr. Johansen's wholly owned Kearn, Inc., was damaged in an accident in 1955 while under lease to Currey Air Transport. This aircraft was partly repaired by Volitan Aviation, Inc., but nothing further has been done on it since 1957. However, regardless of the present condition of this aircraft, it would not be available to Sourdough in any event since Mr. Johansen pledged it as security for a $5,000 loan from the Insurance Finance Corp. of California, which has not been repaid and title thereto has since passed to the finance company. Accordingly, neither at present nor in the foreseeable future would either of these aircraft be available to Sourdough for use in supplemental service. Another aircraft, a DC-4, was being held in trust by Mr. Johansen for Mr. T. D. Smith. This aircraft was being operated under lease by Stewart Air Service and no contention was made that it would be available to Sourdough for use in its service.

Operations since January 1959: Since receiving its certification in January 1959 Sourdough has operated in only 10 of the 36 months which followed. Only 10 roundtrip flights were operated during the entire year 1959. These were alleged charter flights operated between Burbank, Calif., and Las Vegas, Nev., for the Dunes Hotel in August 1959. This operation terminated when its leased aircraft was damaged in an accident and returned to its owner.

During July through November 1960 Sourdough operated approximately 56 flights, most of them for the Forest Service, under an oral agreement with Flightcraft, Inc., of Portland, Oreg. Pursuant to this agreement Sourdough on or about June 26, 1960, leased a DC-3 aircraft from Flightcraft and on the following August 1 it negotiated a passenger agent agreement with Flightcraft appointing the latter Sourdough's agent for the solicitation and development of passenger business. The negotiations which led to these agreements began some time in May 1960 following an unsuccessful effort by Flightcraft to obtain a part 45 operator's certificate from the Federal Aviation Agency. Its application for such certificate was rejected because of the common carriage implication of the service which Flightcraft contemplated operating. Prior to the rejection of its application the U.S. Forest Service had indicated an interest in utilizing its DC-3 aircraft acquired earlier at a bankruptcy sale, if and when Flightcraft obtained a part 45 certificate. After its rejection Flightcraft approached Mr. Johansen with a plan to conduct operations under Sourdough's certificate which Mr. Johansen thought might not be permissible so the leasing arrangement and passanger agency agreement were agreed upon instead. Under its arrangement with Sourdough, Flightcraft was able to engage in all of the services which it had theretofore been unable to operate including those for the U.S. Forest Service and various colleges in the Pacific Northwest which Flightcraft had solicited prior to its arrangement with Sourdough.

The lease for the DC-3 is more or less the standard dry lease obligating the lessee to pay all of the operating expenses of the aircraft, including insurance premiums and maintenance charges. Mr. Johansen testified that Sourdough paid all of the expenses incident to the operation but the evidence points quite clearly to the contrary. During the time this arrangement was in effect all revenues received from the operation were deposited in Flightcraft's account and all operating expenses were paid from this account. Operations were conducted out of Flightcraft's base at Portland and all crew members with the exception of one individual had been employees of Flightcraft immediately prior to the consummation of its arrangement with Sourdough. Flightcraft obtained aircraft insurance, paid the insurance premiums, and provided maintenance for the aircraft. A record of all revenues and expenses incident to the operation was kept as part of its own bookkeeping system at its office in Portland. Flightcraft prepared and sent billings to Sourdough customers in its own name and it prepared the withholding tax statements for all of the employees used in the service.

All of the traffic allegedly carried by Sourdough was solicited and provided by Flightcraft. Nearly all of the service was performed for the Forest Service and for certain members of the Northwest Conference of Colleges which was either solicited or arranged for by Flightcraft before entering into its agreement with Sourdough. Flightcraft provided Mr. Johansen with office space at Portland without charge and, although Mr. Johansen testified that he had made frequent trips to Flightcraft's office in Portland during the period here involved, Flightcraft's records disclose that he was reimbursed for travel expenses to Portland on only one occasion and there is no evidence here to indicate that any part of the operation was conducted subject to his supervision or control.

Mr. Johansen testified that Flightcraft received the revenues and paid the operating expenses merely as a matter of convenience to Sourdough. He contends that it was actually Sourdough's money that was being used since expenses paid in Sourdough's behalf were offset on Flightcraft's books against revenues received in its behalf. Flightcraft's records, however, reveal a series of so-called advances made to Mr. Johansen from a point of time antedating the leasing and passenger agent agreements until the end of November 1960 when the arrangement was terminated. Advances of $250 each were made to Mr. Johansen on May 27, 1960, June 4, 1960, and July 21, 1960, while two advances totaling $250 were made on July 5, 1960. Advances of $500 each were made on July 29, September 1, October 1, November 1, and November 30, 1960. These advances were made without regard to whether the operation was showing a profit, since net income therefrom during the 5-month period amounted to only $2,213. Mr. Johansen testified that these advances were actually personal loans made to him by Mr. King, president of Flightcraft, rather than to Sourdough. However, he testified later that they were offset against Sourdough's earnings.

---

[1] Docket No. 5132 et al., Order No. E-13436, dated Jan. 28, 1959.

Another item of revenue which is somewhat hidden in obscurity is a nonoperating revenue item in the amount of $17,748 appearing in Sourdough's December 31, 1960, profit and loss statement, which supposedly represents the amount paid Sourdough by Flightcraft for the use of Sourdough's flight personnel. Mr. Johansen testified that this item had nothing whatever to do with the operation conducted by Sourdough under its arrangement with Flightcraft because the flight personnel involved were not utilized in that service.

The logic of this explanation is most certainly not readily apparent since Sourdough had been inoperative for nearly a year prior to its arrangement with Flightcraft. The possibility of Sourdough having a roster of pilots and copilots under these circumstances appears so remote that some explanation would be in order. Inasmuch as Flightcraft was engaged in fixed base operations at the time it would appear to have been in a better position to obtain pilots than Sourdough who allegedly received a profit of $7,748 on the transaction. Mr. Johansen's explanation serves only to cloud rather than clarify the matter but viewing it in the light of the other cash advances made to Mr. Johansen by Flightcraft, especially since the majority of them were made periodically in round sums of $500 each, it is evident that this was just another means of paying Sourdough rent for the use of its certificate.

In summary it might be observed that there are only two things that identify Sourdough with the Flightcraft operation, that is, the flights were operated under Sourdough's certificate and the Flightcraft DC-3 aircraft was placed on Sourdough's operating specifications. The bookkeeping procedures employed by Flightcraft were adopted to lend the color of legitimacy to the operation but Mr. Johansen's own testimony is illuminating on this point because when Flightcraft made its proposal to rent the certificate Mr. Johansen suggested that the leasing arrangement be employed instead.

Sourdough was inactive from November 1960 when the Flightcraft operation terminated until May 1961 when it resumed operations under a so-called lease-charter arrangement with Malcolm Robertson, owner of Southeast Airlines (Southeast), a part 45 operator whose headquarters were at Philadelphia International Airport. Southeast at the time was engaged in transporting Army and Marine recruits on a contract basis in regularly scheduled service from northeastern cities to military camps in the southeastern part of the United States. Under its arrangement with Mr. Robertson, Sourdough subleased Southeast's DC-3 aircraft N16067 on or about May 3, 1961, and chartered the aircraft back to Southeast on or about May 10, 1961, for use in the latter's operation. Also, on May 10, 1961, Sourdough signed a ticket agency agreement with Sky Coach Air Lines Agency, which was signed on the latter's behalf by Malcolm Robertson's brother, J. J. Robertson. The sublease was to have remained in effect 6 months from date but was terminated on or about the following July 1 when the aircraft was returned to its owner, the Lesavoy Foundation. Although as a part 45 carrier Southeast had no authority to carry common carriage traffic by operating flights with this aircraft under Sourdough's certificate, it could carry official military traffic southbound and individually ticketed military traffic on return trips.

During the first 6 weeks of operation under this arrangement the aircraft was used to carry recruits between Pennsylvania cities and camps in South Carolina. The operations were identical to those performed by Southeast as a part 45 operator for a period of approximately 18 months prior to the lease-charter arrangement. Southeast's service for the Marine Corps was operated on a regularly scheduled basis and, although Mr. Robertson understood that he was permitted to carry individually ticketed military passengers, he was informed later by the Board that part 45 operators had no such authority. In an effort to become associated with some carrier who had such authority Mr. Robertson offered Mr. Johansen an equity in Southeast's aircraft in exchange for an interest in Sourdough. The lease-charter arrangement was agreed upon instead, which in all important details was virtually identical to its arrangement with Flightcraft.

The evidence shows that all of the flights were operated by Southeast but reported as Sourdough flights. Southeast provided Mr. Johansen with office space at Philadelphia International Airport, the charge for which was allegedly assessed against Sourdough's revenues. Southeast received all of the revenues from the Sourdough operation and paid all of the direct and indirect expenses. The operation was conducted under the direction and control of Southeast and by Southeast employees and there is no evidence here to connect Mr. Johansen with the physical operation of the service. A record of the operating revenues and expenses was maintained in Southeast's books in accordance with directions received from Sourdough's accountant in Seattle. Although Southeast's books do not reflect payments having been made by Southeast to Sourdough or Mr. Johansen, Mr. Robertson testified that he had paid Mr. Johansen between $1,800 and $2,000 during the period May through August 1961, and that he still owed Mr. Johansen several thousand dollars. In this connection the evidence shows that no moneys were paid to Southeast or Mr. Robertson by Sourdough and there were no transfers of funds between Southeast and/or Mr. Robertson on the one hand, and Sourdough and/or Mr. Johansen on the other, as a result of the lease-charter arrangement except the personal advances made by Mr. Robertson to Mr. Johansen.

When operations resumed in September 1961 Sourdough leased the aircraft directly from the Lesavoy Foundation. The lease was executed in Sourdough's behalf on September 1, 1961, by Melvin Chapman, a Southeast pilot, who, like the other Sourdough flight personnel, received his salary from Southeast. Operations under this arrangement terminated in November 1961 when the aircraft was returned to the Lesavoy Foundation.

Except in one or two instances all of the flights operated under Sourdough's certificate carried Army and Marine recruits from northern points to military camps in the South. A number of those, operated in September 1961, carried recruits which Imperial Airlines had been committed to carry but which Sourdough carried at Imperial's request. Mr. Robertson testified that most of the recruits which Southeast carried southbound returned to their homes upon completion of basic training a few weeks later at their own expense. Although there is some conflict in Mr. Robertson's testimony concerning the real purpose behind his arrangement with Sourdough[2] it is clear that his primary interest was in carrying revenue passengers on return trips, even though it might have had the incidental effect of helping Sourdough obtain a renewal of its certificate. Southeast suspended service in August 1961 at which time Mr. Robertson became Imperial's traffic agent, a position which he held until Imperial's fatal accident at Richmond, Va., in November 1961.

Sourdough submitted financial statements for both the carrier as such and for the partners, Mr. and Mrs. Johansen. As of June 30, 1961, Sourdough had assets totaling $29,242 consisting principally of current assets in the amount of $6,930, representing the amount allegedly owed Sourdough by Southeast, and flight equipment, $20,000, representing the book value of the wrecked aircraft which Mr. Johansen purchased in 1955 for $75. This aircraft has not since been repaired and parts of it are located in three widely separated places. In view thereof and in consideration of the probable cost of restoring it to flyable condition,[3] and in view of the fact that no effort whatsoever has been made during the intervening years to repair it, there would appear to be considerable doubt that this aircraft would have any value and for this reason it should not be carried as an asset on the carrier's books.

Sourdough's liabilities as of the above-indicated date consisted of notes and accounts payable totaling $11,975. Net worth was computed at $17,266, representing the owner's investment and accumulated earnings. However, in view of the uncertainty of the amount and collectibility of the Southeast debt and the dubious value of the carrier's wrecked aircraft, it appears that Sourdough would have a negative rather than a positive net worth which may amount to as much as $9,000, depending on how much, if any, of the Southeast debt Sourdough may be able to collect.

The financial position of the partners while somewhat better still leaves much to be desired for such a substantial undertaking as a supplemental air carrier operation. Their home, certain personal property, and household furnishings account for $35,500 of their $63,585 net worth. The assets include an item of $25,000 representing an estimated book value of the Kearn, Inc., aircraft which also was damaged in an accident in 1955 and has not been repaired.

This aircraft was partially repaired by Volitan Aircraft Co. in 1957 but work on it has never been completed. It is still in Volitan's shop in California; however, title thereto has since passed to the Insurance Finance Corp. of California because of Mr. Johansen's failure to repay a personal loan of $5,000 obtained from that company in 1959.

Inasmuch as the finance company rather than Mr. Johansen now holds title to the aircraft, the partners obviously were in error in listing it as an asset. However, even assuming that Mr. Johansen should regain possession of the aircraft, it would cost a minimum of $30,000 to place it in flyable condition. Since neither aircraft has been repaired after a period on nearly 7 years it appears safe to conclude that Mr. Johansen either does not have the money to repair the aircraft or they are not worth repairing.

After eliminating the estimated value of this aircraft the partners would have a net worth of approximately $38,500 instead of $63,858 which is only slightly more than the estimated value of their home, certain personal property, including cash, and household furnishings.

Sourdough's future operating plans contemplate the operation of civilian and military charter and contract services, including individually ticketing, sightseeing tours, foreign transportation, and charter flights for the U.S. Forest Service. It is presently considering the acquisition of a DC-6 aircraft either by lease or lease-purchase but its plans for doing so are very vague and indefinite.

---

[2] Mr. Robertson testified variously that the arrangement was designed to help Sourdough obtain a renewal of its certificate from the Board; that he had hoped to obtain a carrier to take over Southeast's operation; and that he wanted to merge with some carrier that could carry recruits on return trips.

[3] Mr. Johansen estimated that the repairs would cost approximately $35,000, a figure substantially below his earlier estimate of more than $50,000 given in the proceeding entitled "In the Matter of the Investigation of Interim Operating Authorization No. 37," Docket No. 8682, which was dismissed by the Board Nov. 9, 1959, Order No. E-14620.

Conclusions: The evidence here attests quite strongly to the Board's wisdom in the large irregular air carrier investigation of limiting carriers with borderline qualifications to 2-year rather than 5-year supplemental certificates. Since March 31, 1956, Sourdough's financial position has deteriorated from a positive net worth of $19,545 to a negative worth of several thousand dollars. Although Mr. Johansen testified in two Board proceedings dating back to the fall of 1955 that the aircraft would be repaired and restored to service, nearly 7 years have elapsed and they still have not been repaired. In view thereof and because of the rather difficult financial position of Sourdough and the unimpressive financial position of the partners, it is doubtful that these aircraft will ever be repaired and restored to service.

Other than the aircraft provided Sourdough under its arrangements with Flightcraft and Southeast neither Sourdough nor Mr. Johansen has had any aircraft of their own for the operation of supplemental air service since receiving the supplemental certificate. Sourdough has no immediate plans for acquiring other aircraft for use in its service and it appears that neither it nor Mr. Johansen has sufficient financial resources to enable the carrier to operate in its own right instead of renting its certificate to others.

Notwithstanding Sourdough's contention to the contrary, it is apparent that after having become convinced that he would never be able to operate the service himself, Mr. Johansen decided to utilize the certificate for purposes of profit whenever and wherever the opportunities arose even if it meant trifling with the law and losing his certificate for noncompliance with the act and the Board's regulations. The Flightcraft and Southeast operations are clear cases of Sourdough having rented its certificate for profit and the so-called advances made to Mr. Johansen by Flightcraft and Mr. Robertson were nothing more than rental payments for its use. Aside from this, even if it were true, as testified to by Mr. Robertson, that he entered into the lease-charter agreement with Mr. Johansen as a means of helping obtain renewal of his certificate, the arrangement would still constitute a rental of the carrier's certificate since it enabled Southeast to engage in common carriage service in violation of section 401 of the act.

The extent of Sourdough's role in either operation was the loan of its name and certificate to Flightcraft and Southeast and the placing of their aircraft on its operating specifications. In all other respects the operations were exclusively those of Flightcraft and Southeast. Through the use of Sourdough's name and under color of its certificate they were able to engage in common carriage and other services which they were not authorized to perform.

On the basis of these facts, it is apparent that Sourdough not only lacks the necessary financial and operational ability to qualify for renewal of its supplemental certificate, but that it lacks compliance disposition as well. The rental of its certificate to Flightcraft and Southeast enabled these companies to engage in air transportation although their qualifications to engage in such service has never been determined by the Board. Furthermore, it contributed to their violations of section 401 of the act by reason of their having engaged in such transportation without authority from the Board.

The Board had occasion to deal with the same type of problem in its decision in the large irregular air carrier investigation, wherein it found Central Air Transport unqualified for supplemental air carrier authority for having rented its certificate to other carriers. It characterized the carrier's actions for having done so as serious violations of the act and because of the recurring nature of the violations, it found the carrier lacking in compliance disposition and denied its application for a certificate.

Finally, Sourdough contends that the Board lacks jurisdiction to grant a renewal of the certificate since the court has held that it had no jurisdiction to grant it in the first place.[4] The answer to this contention is that the court's mandate setting aside Board Order E-13436, authorizing supplemental air service, has been stayed so that the Board has never lost jurisdiction over the matter. For this reason Sourdough's contention is rejected and its motion to defer further procedural action in this case is denied.

On the basis of the foregoing facts and all of the evidence of record it is found:

That Sourdough Air Transport lacks the necessary financial and operational ability to warrant renewal of its supplemental air carrier authority.

That by reason of having rented its certificate to Flightcraft, Inc., and Southeast Airlines, Sourdough Air Transport has manifested a disposition of noncompliance with the provisions of the act and the Board's rules and regulations and has demonstrated that it cannot be entrusted with supplemental air carrier authority.

That the application of Sourdough Air Transport for renewal and/or an extension of its supplemental air carrier authority is denied.

RICHARD A. WALSH,
Hearing Examiner.

ANTI-RED CLAUSE IN POSTAL RATE INCREASE BILL

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, among the people in this country who are most interested in the Communist propaganda problem are those whose heritage is behind the Iron Curtain. These are the people who are most subjected to Communist propaganda, especially the redefection material which boldly attempts to lure them back to the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain.

These are the people who know of the deceit of the Communists, who truly realize the nature of the Communist movement, and who constitute the bulwark in this country against the nefarious schemes of the Communists and those who wittingly or unwittingly do the Communists' bidding.

Accordingly, it was with much interest that I received a copy of a telegram sent President Kennedy by Mr. Erik A. Dundurs, president of the Council for the Liberation of Captive Peoples From Soviet Domination. Mr. Dundurs commented on statements by the President relative to Communist propaganda.

I think these comments are both pertinent and interesting. They get to the heart of the matter, and I commend them as bearing directly on the basic reason behind the overwhelming House approval of language to ban the free or subsidized delivery of Communist propaganda.

Mr. Dundurs' telegram follows:

POSTAL RATE INCREASE BILL AND ITS ANTI-RED CLAUSE

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is in reference to the postal rate increase bill and your remarks made at the press conference on January 24 as reported in the January 25 issue of the Minneapolis Morning Tribune.

It is indeed unfortunate that you questioned the usefulness of a House approved anti-Red clause made a part of this bill.

Your reasoning, that it would damage U.S. interests more than it would help them, is not acceptable to the citizens of the United States who know communism first hand by direct and personal experience.

I am deeply disturbed about your allegation that there has been a drop in the amount of mail coming in from the Soviet Union.

The tide of propaganda from behind the Iron Curtain is mounting, not receding.

According to the information at my command, the Soviet Union is accelerating and diversifying its means to flood the American people with its unsolicited, filthy, and slanderous propaganda at our expense, and thanks to the appeasing attitude of our executive branch of Government.

I have physical proof about the ingenious methods of the Soviets, whereby up to three letters a day have reached a single recipient, all of them in envelopes of different color and with different or no name listed as the sender, but all containing vicious propaganda material, unquestionably from the same source.

None of this material bears labeling as Communist propaganda, required by the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

I have also physical evidence about a new trend in the evil Soviet propaganda scheme. Within the framework of an anti-anti-communism movement directed by Moscow, unscrupulous Soviet writers have fabricated stories about the rebirth of fascism and are assailing Americans active in anticommunism work as active members in an organized Fascist movement, capable of committing crimes more atrocious than the ones committed by Hitler and Himmler.

This scare technique is designed to pit man against man and to seed disunity and distrust among the American people.

To add more force to their presentation of scare, the writers have accused the same Americans, many of them prominent members of the clergy, on charges ranging from murder to treason, allegedly committed during World War II.

The above material, in letter-size booklets and under the disguise of innocent-looking envelopes, is distributed throughout the Nation through the courtesy of the U.S. Post Office.

I have delivered specimens of this material to the FBI for study.

May I suggest to you, Mr. President, a simple test to check the scope of the Soviet propaganda barrage, intensified after your executive order of March 17, 1961, took effect.

By Presidential appeal, every American receiving unsolicited Soviet propaganda material would redirect it to a receiving center designated by you, for a period of 30 to 60 days.

At the end of this period you would have first-hand proof of the mounting tide of Communist propaganda.

I challenge your statement, that if there is also an effort made by the Communists to deny us the use of the mails, it is going to present problems for many Americans.

This statement is inaccurate and misleading to say the least.

---

[4] *United Air Lines, Inc.* v. *CAB*, 278 F. 2d 446.

We have never had the privilege to use the Soviet mails for our political propaganda, even if it were sent as first-class mail, registered and insured. This is a proven fact beyond dispute. What problems could it consequently present for many Americans?

Does a free society have to leave itself totally exposed to an unending brainwashing and slander, unsolicited and at its own expense?

Since reciprocity can never be expected from the Soviet Union, how long should we tolerate its unilateral abuses?

I have written to you on this subject last April, after you had issued your executive order on March 17, creating a vacuum for additional tons of vicious propaganda material.

After receiving my letter from the White House for consideration and reply, Assistant Attorney General J. Walter Yeagley answered it on May 10. It stated in part that in the absence of Federal legislation, the Government maintained procedures to curb foreign political propaganda had been challenged as being without adequate legal foundation.

Now, after the House has approved a postal rate increase bill that carries the ban on Communist mailings and would provide the legal basis for enforcing it, the administration questions its usefulness.

I appeal to you, Mr. President, to reconsider your stand in the light of above fact, so that this shameful situation can be corrected.

I am also appealing to the Members of the U.S. Senate to vote for the bill as passed by the House.

I am prepared to testify and to present proof on my above statements, if I were asked to do so.

Your reply is cordially solicited.

Respectfully,

ERIK A. DUNDURS,
President, Council for the Liberation of Captive Peoples From Soviet Domination.

WAYZATA, MINN.

PRESIDENT OF BRAZIL, JOAO GOULART

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at the point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 days this Nation has entertained and honored as a guest the President of Brazil, Joao Goulart. We, as a people, have held out the hand of friendship to President Goulart and to the people of Brazil during this visit and, in a more tangible way in the past through the millions of dollars we have given to that country. We have made no demands upon Brazil. We do not seek to impose our will upon that country. We are not sending secret agents there as revolutionaries, assassins, or agents provocature to destroy President Goulart and his Government. Yet, how does President Goulart react to our acts of friendship, to the help we have given in the past and have offered in the future for his people?

In the published reports of his talks with President Kennedy and here in the House yesterday when he addressed a joint session of Congress, he expressed no great appreciation, he made no offer to stand shoulder to shoulder with us in defense of the freedom of his people and ours, he gave no guarantees even that he believes in the freedom and liberty of his own people. Rather, his attitude bordered on the belligerent in his demands for more money from the people of the United States while at the same time telling us he is opposed to ridding this hemisphere of the Communist menace posed by Soviet-controlled Cuba, in his plea that we should not attempt to win the cold war against the Communist conspiracy to enslave the world, but rather should accept the hollow and false pronouncements from Moscow as gospel truth and relax our efforts to expose the Communist plot to enslave the world.

On top of this brazen approach in attempting to dictate U.S. policy, President Goulart made even more astounding proposals. He served notice that his government will expropriate all American-owned property in Brazil and will pay whatever price his government decides. Even though, from recent experiences with expropriation in Brazil we find that that price is merely a mockery—something like $400,000 for the $8 million property of the International Telephone & Telegraph Co.—they will not even pay for that with money from Brazil, but with the dollars ponied up by American taxpayers.

Just what has the United States to gain from such a friendship? Why should American working men and women toil and sweat and deny their own families the good things of life to help finance a government that will not bring about liberty and justice for its people, but will rather engage in a dangerous lovefest with Communist Castro and Soviet Russia.

We do not want to buy the friendship of Brazil, but I think it is only reasonable that if that country is willing, even anxious, to accept our money, the least we can expect is that they will not help our enemies.

Perhaps it is not too strange that President Goulart takes this attitude in view of the political connections of his brother-in-law, Governor Brizola, of Rio Grande do Sul, the leading exponent of friendship with communism and expropriation of the property of U.S. citizens. Perhaps there is some connection between President Goulart's easy acceptance of getting along with the Communists and his press secretary, one Raul Riff, who, it is reported, has been arrested many times for Communist activity, dating back to 1935 when there was a Communist uprising in Brazil.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what President Kennedy offered President Goulart from the U.S. Treasury and, judging from other conferences in which our Chief Executive has engaged, we probably will never know exactly what commitments have been made, but I think this Congress should declare itself in no uncertain terms as to the conditions to be met before we give away any more of the taxpayers' money to a country which may actually be lined up against us if the Soviets decide to have Castro move against the people of this hemisphere. I think the people of the United States are entitled to a clear and forthright statement from President Kennedy and from the State Department as to just what kind of a government we are supporting in Brazil and if the President agrees that the United States should finance the seizure of the property of American citizens by foreign governments. As for me, I intend to vote against giving any money to any government which will not declare itself on the side of the free world in a contest which will determine whether or not mankind will be free or slave.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the United States stopped letting itself be kicked around for every time we permit this to happen it invites further kicking around and in the end can mean only defeat for the United States.

STAFF MEMBERS OF HOUSE COMMITTEES

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, today I am further supporting my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] by joining him in introducing a resolution to increase the minority representation on the professional staffs of the committees of the House and subcommittees thereof.

In my opinion this body faces no more important decision than this one because, unless the minority party has adequate staff help on committees to properly discharge its duties, we do not have true representative government and the people are the losers. As has been pointed out by others who have taken the floor on this issue, the present situation regarding committee staffing is scandalous. The majority party, through its long tenure in control of Congress, has developed a hierarchy of professional help which makes it more and more difficult for the minority to present its views on legislation of vital concern to all the people.

Ours is not a one-party system. The very strength of this Republic has been based on the fact that under every administration preceding this one there has been a vocal and effective loyal opposition. Alas, we now face a grave danger, a threat which could mean the end of government by the people and the substitution of government by a powerful Executive or dynasty. Already we have seen what is happening to the once proud civil service system which is being subverted by this administration to a propaganda arm of the President where civil servants are directed to conduct themselves to the end of improving the public image of the President.

If we continue and increase the present imbalance of committee staffs, the rout of representative government will be complete, no effective opposition to the plans and programs of the administration will be launched and the people will be subjected to the rule of a single individual who will become, whether or not he wills it, a dictator.

The resolution I have introduced, therefore, lends itself to the strengthening of true representative government as it enables the minority to present the opposing position to administration proposals. The resolution does not upset the makeup of any committee which is presently meeting the demands of nonpartisan or bipartisan efforts on the part of committee staffs. It merely affords the opportunity on those committees where the minority members are not being served adequately to bring about a change in committee personnel to assure proper staffing for the minority party.

I think the majority party is taking a very shortsighted view if it opposes this resolution. Their opposition would make it appear that they never intend to relinquish the role of the majority, indeed, that they will use the imbalance of committee staffs to perpetuate their control of the Congress. There could be a public reaction toward this line of thinking because the American people are extremely jealous of representative government and were they to become aware that their interests are not being served by the present makeup of committee staffs, the present majority could easily become the minority and the victims of their own practices. Both parties will be protected for all time from the ambitions of any leadership which may be tempted to tamper with the machinery for orderly legislative processes by the enactment of this resolution and I hope the Members of the House will take speedy and positive action to amend this rule.

IS IT THE VOICE OF AMERICA?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Derounian] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have no knowledge of the kind of job being done by Edward R. Murrow, as Director of the U.S. Information Agency. I was very much concerned to read a letter from a constituent whose daughter is now in Sweden and who has therefore had the opportunity of witnessing the kind of propaganda on our country that Mr. Murrow is sending overseas. Her letter speaks for itself and I now submit for the Record both Mrs. Benter's note to me and her daughter's correspondence.

Are we going to let this kind of thing continue, while we lose opportunity after opportunity of informing the world, not what Edward R. Murrow thinks of America, but what the average citizen proudly knows to be the real America?

Here is Mrs. Olga Benter's letter:

> Bayville, Long Island,
> *April 2, 1962.*
>
> Dear Mr. Derounian: I am sending you part of my daughter's letter from Sweden. She is a college graduate and has been working in cancer research in a hospital. (I was born in Sweden but am a U.S. citizen for many years.) She is proud of her country and she would like to see some beautiful parts of her country shown on TV, but I don't know whom to contact. Can you do something about this and let us know whom to write to?
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Olga Benter.

And here is the excerpt from Eleanor Benter's letter to her mother:

> On TV the other night they had a documentary from America about a town that calls itself a typical American smalltown. The town was Princeton and I thought, oh, what a lovely town to show to Sweden. But the town was Princeton, Ky. It was a real farmer, hillbilly town way out in the sticks somewhere with all the old pig farmers and hillbillies with dozens of children running around. I was so angry about it because people over here have some very strange ideas about America and Americans to begin with, and this film certainly didn't help much. Oh well, the next week they had a documentary on Chicago and showed mostly scenes from the Bowery with all sorts of drunks lying around and policemen arresting narcotics addicts. If I were a European and saw these films I'd never go to the States. I almost feel like writing to someone about it because the people here only know what they hear and see on TV, about the United States and don't really understand our way of life and philosophy. They think that the Federal Government can run the States just as easily as the Swedish Government runs Sweden. But when you tell them that there are a half million more people in New York City alone than in all of Sweden they are very surprised and begin to realize the great difference between the countries.

THE FORGOTTEN CHILD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we frequently talk about the forgotten man but rarely do we even think of the forgotten child.

I am not much better than many others in this regard and might well be giving the subject just as little thought except for the fact that I have been honored with the chairmanship of the 16th Annual Cavalcade of Stars to be held at Madison Square Garden on June 7, 1962. This is the annual fundraising function for the benefit of retarded children under the sponsorship of the Shield of David Institute of New York.

A very fine discussion on the subject of mental retardation appears at page 222, et seq of the hearings conducted on January 3, 1962, before the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare of the House Committee on Appropriations.

The startling thing is that the latest figures show that more than 10,000 mentally retarded children in this country are receiving special clinical care. Seventy-five percent of them are children under 9 years of age. Less than 150 of them under 1 year of age can get any governmental assistance. Less than 1,800 children between the ages of 1 and 4 years can get any governmental assistance, and less than 2,500 between the ages of 5 and 9 can get any such assistance.

In other words, except for philanthropic institutions such as the Shield of David Institute, maintained entirely by voluntary contributions, all the rest of these children under 9 years of age have no means of obtaining any care or attention except in those rare cases where the family is wealthy enough to hire special attendants for the child.

Last month the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Memorial Foundation announced a magnificent gift to Stanford University School of Medicine to advance research in this field. In announcing that gift, R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, who together with his wife administers the foundation, said that mental retardation is one of the Nation's most pressing medical and social problems, afflicting 3 percent of the population. He said that the ultimate research aim is discovery and elimination of the causes.

Until recent years parents of a young mentally retarded child were offered little community assistance with the overburdening social, psychological, as well as medical problems that confronted them. Society's attitude was characterized by indifference to the problem as well as a lack of facilities for rendering help to these children and their families. Parents were left to their own devices to struggle as best they could, with the problem of securing adequate and concrete help for these children.

In New York City, several well-established diagnostic clinics specifically for mentally retarded children existed in a number of hospitals. However, facilities to implement and follow up the recommendations of clinic personnel in order to enhance the training and educational opportunities for these children had been slow in development. Such services as existed were scattered, disorganized and incomplete.

The Institute for Retarded Children of the Shield of David, in the fall of 1954, was organized to fill the training and educational gap that existed for young retardates inadmissible to the public school systems. In an integrated program, under one roof, there was provided a licensed psychiatric clinic with full diagnostic facilities, a school of special education with an adjunct speech therapy department, a department of psychology integrated with the school system, staffed with full testing and counseling personnel, a social service department, and such peripheral services as structured research, home visiting team, dental and ophthalmological care, together with various other services that were organized as the needs became evident.

The institute was designed under philanthropic auspices, to be available to all families, regardless of color or creed, and to meet the desires of families who wish to keep their children at home, but need assistance to enable them to develop their potential. Simultaneously, the program was designed to implement the concept that severely retarded children—those known as trainable retardates—can respond to an organized training program which is augmented by psychological services for the parents.

For the parent, therefore, the services of the institute begin with a casework interview that has many facets centering simultaneously on child and family. This includes a detailed medical and psychological history of the child's development, a picture of the child's functioning as seen by his parents, and of the child's place in his family. An overall assessment of the parents' psychological status, attitudes, and aspirations for the child and for their siblings is also obtained.

For the child, the service of the institute begins with a complex diagnostic evaluation with as many objective tools as are now at the disposal of the professional field, supplemented by a clinical evaluation of the child's social and educational capacity. The institute's diagnostic procedure represents an effort to establish a comprehensive picture of the child's functioning. A thorough medical examination specifies the physical deficiencies and the limitations with which the child must cope, and his physical assets and the status of his neurological development. Staff specialists investigate the hearing, visual, and dental conditions. Deficiencies in these areas relating to the child's functioning and subclinical pathology are frequently discovered and corrected.

Such unnoticed conditions have often produced a psychological overlay of difficulties for the child, which in turn have become inseparable from and part of the total picture of the child's functioning and behavior. An exact evaluation of the child's speech status is contributed by the speech pathologist who evaluates the child's awareness of speech and communication and the level of his readiness for speech development. A specialist in education assesses the child's social adaptability, his learning pattern, his capacities in self-care compared with his chronological age.

In a staff diagnostic conference these findings are exchanged and analyzed among the examiners and social workers, under the guidance of the chief psychiatrist, in an effort to arrive at an etiological and dynamic diagnostic formulation about the child, and to project a treatment program for both child and family. These are considered within the context of all that is known about the psychological and emotional factors in the child and family, and contribute to the prognostic statement that can be made about him.

In those instances where a definitive statement about the child's availability for training or about his emotional problems cannot be made, doubts are resolved in favor of placing the child in school, on a trial basis, so that he can accommodate himself gradually and that the staff may have 3 to 6 months for extended observation which may yield more diagnostic clues. For these children, as well as for others with complex and undefined diagnostic pictures, individual psychotherapy may be offered in conjunction with the school program.

The social worker interprets these findings to the parents who are seen together for this purpose. A realistic appraisal of the child's capacities and an estimate of his future abilities as far as they can be projected are discussed. In this interpretation the institute's immediate program and the ways in which the home situation can be integrated with the efforts of the school are considered.

For children from birth to 4 years of age the institute offers a home training program in which the mother regularly sees a caseworker plus specialists in education and speech development who offer guidance as to the child's readiness for training and the methods of training which the parents can undertake at home. A staff nurse visits the very young child in his home weekly to offer demonstration and guidance to the parents.

For children between the ages of 4 and 12, the institute offers a day school program. The overall objectives of the school program are to train in self-care, with special attention to toilet training, dressing, and feeding; to develop speech, and to provide the opportunity for socialization for the child with his peers. The entire organization of the program is designed as a therapeutic one. The period of attendance can range from 6 months to 5 years, as long as the child continues to demonstrate progress in growth and development.

The grouping of the children is homogenous, as far as possible, for ability, for physical needs, for size and for personality needs. Special teaching materials and techniques have been devised to deal with specific perceptual problems, to limit distraction and to enlarge attention span. The groups are small enough to enable the teacher to give each child individual attention and observation and to become aware of his individual pattern and rate of learning. The teacher is sensitive to distinguish between resistance and inability to perform; to respond to the occasional flashes of understanding and awareness which a given child exhibits when emotional tension is reduced; to the need for repeated stimulation, approval, and encouragement which the child requires.

Experience in the institute has made it quite clear that the most dramatic and meaningful assistance to many parents is in the development of the child's ability to communicate. Although speech therapy, for the most part, had not heretofore been considered a valid service to retarded children, the institute engaged a speech pathologist for diagnostic purposes and to develop a program of individual therapy designed to enhance the child's capacity in this area. Now the institute has a full-time staff of speech therapists to give individual speech sessions, on a regular basis, to the majority of its school population. Goals for each child are set in accordance with the estimate of his capacity. The response of the child to the personal relationship established between him and the therapist may be a significant contribution to his emotional growth.

The caseworker is the coordinating force among all the specialists in the school and integrates their services with the dynamics of family life. She maintains an active relationship with each family of a child in school. The psychological concept underlying this service is that the parents of a handicapped child have problems which affect all family members and which call for special adjustments in their daily living. Parents respond to the knowledge of the child's retardation with the personality strengths and adequacies with which they meet other crises in their family life; sometimes, of course, these strengths need to be released and made accessible to them. In accordance with their emotional and intellectual awareness, parents become involved with a treatment relationship of varying depth and significance. With the caseworker the focus of attention moves from an initial emphasis on the child's adaptation in the school program, to the more subtle and significant areas of the place of the child in his family. The therapeutic services available to the parents consist of two different types of aid, individual counseling and group therapy.

The institute, since its inception, has admitted 757 children, of which approximately 20 percent have graduated to the public school classes for trainable children. Others have moved on to State or private residential facilities and by virtue of the training received at the institute, have been better able to adjust and be accommodated at such residential facilities. A small group of children who have exhausted the benefits of training and the possibility of further development and growth have remained at home with their parents.

The major gains for the children have been in areas directly related to educability. Children have made significant gains in terms of their own development, in the areas of emotional adjustment, decreased distractibility, and in various curricular skills, as well as in speech and language development.

Parents as a group were much better acquainted with factual information regarding retardation as a result of which they experienced far less guilt in connection with it. In addition, there is evidence of significantly greater understanding on the part of the parents of the capabilities and limitations of the child. Unrealistic goals and plans have been relinquished, and more realistic and substantial plans undertaken. In the clinical evaluation of the staff, problems in many of the homes reached satisfactory resolutions. Homes that had been fraught with marital discord achieved a better harmony.

In the broadest sense the mentally retarded child is no longer the forgotten child and the problem of his care is receiving public attention. Nevertheless, this is an area where knowledge, techniques and interest are still in relatively early stages of development. The institute represents, in New York City, the place where concrete services and daily practices in the development of the trainable child are a reality. The response to the challenge that severely retarded children represent must come on various fronts simultaneously. The institute embodies the hope that discoveries and contributions in medicine, psychiatry, psychology, education and social work will be consistently integrated and utilized by the various specialists for the needs of the whole child and for the community.

"THE LIBERAL PAPERS"

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body are aware of the controversy raging since publication of "The Liberal Papers" last month. Despite statements made in personal interviews, published reports still do not make entirely clear that no Congressman, including myself, has any responsibility for any of the ideas presented in the various essays which comprise the volume. Equally important, no contributor had any responsibility for the contribution of another contributor. A true parellel to the situation is the position of the National Press Club in inviting diverse speakers to address the Members at luncheon meetings. No individual members, or the Press Club as an entity, take responsibility for, nor is any endorsement implied for the speakers' opinions.

At the request of Doubleday, I acted as editor and wrote an introduction to the book, wherein I made clear, and I read:

> The primary function of these essays is to reopen the political forum and reinstitute the dialogue of politics in our attempt to lead to new directions in public policy.

A further quotation seems to me to be particularly pertinent:

> I am hopeful that such controversy which might be attendant to the publication of these and other essays will not be ad hominem, but will be related directly to the arguments themselves.

However, this is now the situation-accusations are being made to the man; to his principles, interests and passions, rather than to reasons of truth or logic.

One of the contributors to "The Libberal Papers," David Riesman, has given me permission to read to you his letter of March 30, 1962 to Mr. Pyke Johnson, Jr., editor in chief of Anchor Books. Mr. Reisman has stated the matter in an objective manner. His letter follows:

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: A reporter from the Harvard Crimson, the undergraduate paper, interviewed me on March 26 concerning Republican attacks on Democrats identified with "The Liberal Papers" that you published, and in the light of this discussion, I thought I would like to set forth one contributor's reaction.

It may or may not be relevant that I have never been active in party affairs. Indeed, save for my concern in recent years with respect to nuclear policy and foreign policy, I have occupied myself entirely with research and teaching, and for better or worse, have never served as an adviser or "braintruster." What I have done since I began teaching (as I indicated in my introduction to Stimson Bullitt's "To Be a Politician," which you also published) is to try to persuade students to interest themselves in civic and political matters, and to consider political careers. And in this role I have been as eager to have able and dedicated students work with the Republican as with the Democratic Party; it goes without saying that as a teacher and scholar I've never considered it my task to promote the fortunes of either party.

Many of the ablest undergraduates at colleges throughout the country with whom I have spoken share the common American prejudice against politicians. This is as true of students who plan to go into business or law as of students who are considering careers in teaching, medicine, or research. In combating this snobbish prejudice, "The Liberal Papers" will be useful if the book can illustrate what my own experience teaches me; namely, that Congressmen are interested in having ideas discussed, whatever their own attitude toward concrete proposals and whatever their choice of issues on which to work and fight. As I said to the Crimson, the Harvard Law School doesn't stand behind Jimmy Hoffa or Castro, one a prospective and the other a past speaker before the Harvard Law School Forum. But the Harvard Law School, like any reputable body, will defend the right of speakers to express ideas that might have a bearing on American policy.

Indeed, it seems to me that Republican attacks on "The Liberal Papers" as subversive make it look as if these Republicans don't want any discussion of possible innovations, as if indeed they believe that the administration knows best what should be done and that we are no longer a representative democracy in which debate is permitted.

Furthermore, the charge that 35 Democratic Congressmen are advocating surrender to the Communists by sponsoring the book seems false on two counts. I myself don't feel I am sponsoring the book by appearing in it (I have, in fact, not had a chance to read all the contributions of my fellow authors), and I would consider it a violation both of good sense and of freedom of the press if I had to see to it that no fellow author in a book to which I contributed could be attacked by anyone with access to the mass media. I myself had only the most casual contact with the Congressmen, speaking to a group on one occasion in an open discussion which I found refreshing and alive and of which I speak in the paper with my coauthor. And in the second place, and much more important, when Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER says that the proposals outlined in "The Liberal Papers," "not only repeat the Communist line—they go beyond the Communist line," I think we have entered a very dangerous climate if Communists can destroy an idea merely by supporting it—not that in fact they would support the highly critical remarks made about the Communists in what I have written.

The comparison apparently made by Republican Chairman MILLER between "The Liberal Papers" and the John Birch Society's blue book seems to me wildly far-fetched. The blue book is a secret document, which people like myself have not been able to obtain. Even so, several Congressmen have identified themselves with the John Birch Society or have accepted its support, since it is well-financed, has access to the mass media (despite its continuous suspicion of, and attacks on the media), and can swing voters in southern Ohio, southern California, and elsewhere.

In contrast, "The Liberal Papers" and the scattered academicians and writers who have contributed to them cannot help any Congressman, most of whom have made plain their lack of any connection with the book; such a book comes out of no organizational or partisan secret society but out of the free play of ideas in the country at large—and would probably have been lost sight unseen but for these attacks. Actually, it is just such attacks by Republican leaders that made it difficult for me to do what I have repeatedly done in talking with students and colleagues, namely, to make clear the difference between the genuine conservatism of many leading Republicans and the conspiratorial fear of ideas among some of the newly founded radical rightwing groups. It is characteristic of members of the latter, when they picket a meeting, to reply to newspapermen's questions as to their identity by saying "I am a loyal American," handing out a mimeographed statement, and implying that they fear to give their names lest those ever-present "comsymps" get them. This 5th amendment of the rightwing has nothing in common with historic Republican tradition. Thus, it is precisely such men as Republican Chairman MILLER who in practice make efforts to link the Republican Party with the John Birch Society while seeming piously to denounce such efforts.

It will be a sad day for America when a Congressman can get in trouble because he has read a book—whether the Blue Book or any other book. Books and the men who write and read them can be destroyed in other ways than by burning.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID RIESMAN.

I ask my colleagues seriously to see whether any of them can truly take real issue with the principles which Mr. Riesman has so clearly set forth.

Finally, may I reiterate that no Member of Congress, no matter what his political or group affiliations may be, had anything to do with the publication of "The Liberal Papers," except for myself as previously stated. At the request of Doubleday I wrote an introduction to the book and acted as editor in the deep and sincere belief that if we are to achieve as a nation an understanding of the issues which face us internationally, we must understand all sides and review as many views and opinions as possible.

I have practiced this in my own life as fully as possible. I read Republican views and I have even carefully read and digested the Blue Book by the founder of the John Birch Society, Robert Welch. I hope this does not make me suspect as a Birchite, and I repeat, a citizen who will listen to only one side of an issue is not truly well informed and therefore not in a position to make the best judgment.

On the other hand, the willingness to examine all sides does not imply weakness or detract from the ability of the individual to maintain the highest of principles and ideals according to his or her own individual view. That is our fundamental American principle. Those who are attempting to forge a political weapon against individual Members of Congress do not seem to understand this. Unfortunately, they are following one of the basic concepts of communism. Some may remember the Communist censure and violent attacks against Boris Pasternak and the novel, "Dr. Zhivago." The implications are clear, and I hope will be heeded.

TRADE EXPANSION BILL— (H.R. 9900)

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks now the Committee on Ways and Means has been holding hearings on H.R. 9900, the so-called trade expansion bill.

All members of the executive branch who have appeared before us have given testimony in general terms only and have been unprepared to give details when certain committee members questioned them. Today, there appeared before our committee a Mr. Eugene Stewart, counsel for the Man-Made Fiber Products Association, Inc., who discussed the bill thoroughly. He stated what the implications of the bill would be and made constructive suggestions regarding amendments to it.

Whether or not we agree with Mr. Stewart, he was an outstanding witness.

Because of the refusal of this administration to give the facts to the American people, I submit herewith the prepared testimony of Mr. Stewart:

STATEMENT TO THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON BEHALF OF THE MAN-MADE FIBER PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Eugene Stewart. I appear as counsel for the Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City. It represents the principal producers of manmade fibers except glass fibers.

POSITION ON THE BILL

We oppose the bill.

We endorse fair trade between nations and fair competition between the products of nations. Expansion of trade on this basis is obviously in the best interest of the United States and its allies.

H.R. 9900 will promote neither fair trade nor free trade. The conditions indispensable for the latter do not now exist, and could not be made to exist without change in basic U.S. policies pertaining to immigration, minimum wage, and maximum hours of work, which we do not advocate. There is nothing in the bill which would assure the minimum ground rules needed for fair trade, either in the United States or in export markets.

THE BILL IS DIRECTED TO THE LEAST IMPORTANT MEANS OF EXPORT EXPANSION

The regulation of imports to assure fair competition between foreign and domestic products can no longer be based on tariff adjustment. The United States, with duties averaging 12 percent on industrial products, is fourth lowest of the nations of the world in the level of its duties.

The recently concluded Dillon round of GATT negotiations will lower U.S. industrial duties to about 10 percent.

Our duties have been reduced so low that in the Tariff Commission's peril point investigation preceding the Dillon round, it was determined that nearly 40 percent of the items on which concessions had been requested by other countries could not be further reduced without causing or threatening serious injury to the U.S. industries concerned.[1] On items requested by the EEC, 75 percent were already at the peril point.[2] These findings by the expert factfinding body on tariff matters are of major importance in view of the broad and unprecedented grants of tariff-cutting power which the bill would give to the President for use in negotiations with the EEC. The Congress cannot know how many of the remaining items which the Commission found were not yet at the peril point would be brought below the point of serious injury by the reductions authorized by the bill. Significantly, H.R. 9900 would eliminate peril point findings.

In Europe, quotas, embargoes and licensing regulations are the chief barriers to international trade, including U.S. exports. These would not be reached by an exchange of concessions in the form of duty reductions.

PROPER RELATION OF TARIFF POLICY TO DOMESTIC FISCAL POLICIES

Discipline in both the public and private sectors of the economy is required to make our industries competitive in world trade.

Tariffs as adjustable cost factors for imports are necessary in varying degrees to assure fair competition between foreign and domestic goods in the U.S. market, given the obvious fact of different cost bases, here and abroad. But there are many cost factors affecting domestic production which are influenced by Government policies. To reduce one cost factor affecting imports, tariffs, while encouraging or causing an increase in costs for domestic production through Government policies, can only result in handicapping U.S. goods in competing with foreign products.

We need a comprehensive study of the domestic cost consequences of inflationary pressures created by continued governmental deficits, and of the systems of taxation, State and Federal, which place our industries at a cost disadvantage with foreign competitors.

Until these factors are adjusted, with other cost-inducing public policies, so as to afford domestic producers with cost reductions equal in magnitude to proposed tariff reductions, the stimulation of imports resulting from such tariff reductions will inevitably be harmful to the domestic economy.

THE BILL ASKS THE CONGRESS TO ABDICATE ITS RESPONSIBILITIES

H.R. 9900 requests Congress to abdicate its powers and responsibilities under the Constitution, by granting the President absolute discretion to reduce or eliminate duties without any limiting standards. It also would deny to the judiciary the right to exercise its power of review to protect U.S. investors, industries, and workers against destruction of their property and employment rights by arbitrary Executive action.

So great and unlimited would be the President's discretionary powers under the bill, that it would, if enacted, change the relationship of Government to business and labor, both in the field of international trade and in the field of domestic production and employment, from a government of laws to a government of men.

For example, by empowering the President to remove completely all tariff duties (under the EEC 80 percent of world export value test, and under the provisions relating to agricultural commodities and products thereof, to tropical agricultural and forestry commodities and the primary products thereof, and to any duty 5 percent or less), even where he is advised by the Tariff Commission that widespread economic dislocation and unemployment would result, the bill gives the Executive the power to pass sentences of economic death on some industries.

Second, when his actions have created such distress, the bill would grant to the President power to allow or deny tax relief to the distressed industries. Just as the power to tax is the power to destroy, so the power to alter decisively the cost factors governing competition between foreign and domestic products by reducing or eliminating duties and granting or denying tax relief to affected industries, can also become the power to destroy.

If we are to preserve our constitutional system, such power must be reserved to the Congress and denied to the President. Congress can, of course, delegate. But the Constitution allows only a carefully defined delegation governed by explicit standards and the necessity for findings that Executive action will satisfy these standards.

This bill contains no such standards, and contemplates no such findings. It makes Presidential discretion, not congressional guidelines, the absolute test. The Congress cannot easily reclaim the powers it improvidently gives away. What it grants today by a single majority vote of each House may require a two-thirds majority tomorrow if the struggle is made to reclaim the lost powers from an unwilling President.

THE BILL WOULD EMPOWER THE EXECUTIVE TO REORGANIZE THE U.S. ECONOMY

The bill contemplates a high degree of Government planning in the selection of the industries whose tariffs are to be reduced or eliminated, in the retraining and relocation of workers who lose their jobs and in the attempt to salvage by conversion to other lines of manufacture some of the industries suffering economic disaster as a result. Thus, it will lead to close control by Government agencies of both domestic manufacture and employment, with corresponding control of production, prices, and wages.

Reduction or elimination of duties will be the means, but bureaucratic reorganization of the domestic economy will be the end result of this bill.

By giving the President the sole power to choose the industries, workers, and communities which shall receive the full brunt of duty-free competition from the products of lower cost countries, and the further power to select from those industries the ones which he will assist by tax relief and other forms of adjustment assistance, the bill would give the President unrestrained power to determine without reference to the Congress the future development of the U.S. economy. There is no statement in the bill of any guiding principles which must be observed by the Executive in the formation and execution of policies for the growth or retardation of particular industries and communities. The Congress is asked by the bill simply to give the President carte blanche to determine that as yet unidentified U.S. industries, workers, and communities are to be retarded or eliminated as a means of satisfying the desires of the brisky expanding European Economic Community for U.S. markets.

THE BILL WOULD EMPOWER THE EXECUTIVE TO LINK OUR ECONOMY WITH AN INTERNATIONAL CARTEL SYSTEM

According to a statement of Valery Giscard d'Estaing, French Minister of Finance (the New York Times, Mar. 28, 1962), the application for tariff-free trade between the EEC and the United States will require many new international rules in fields other than tariffs. He declared that modern industrial nations such as those of the FEC could accept free trade only if they committed themselves to common policies and rules in many aspects of the economy besides trade. This, as he emphasized, is a key principle of the Treaty of Rome, less than one-fifth of whose 248 articles deal with tariffs.

The realism of the French is instructive regarding H.R. 9900 because they are participants in the economic policies which characterize competition or the absence thereof in Europe. The French Minister of Finance speaks knowledgeably, therefore, when he warns that international agreement will be required on "coordination of major investments, 'moralization' of international competition, creation of a joint body with power to prevent and punish 'disloyal' commercial practices, solution of the problem of agricultural surpluses," and a common policy toward the rest of the world. Acceptance by the United States of the requirements enunciated by the French Minister would call for an abdication of U.S. sovereignty to an international tribunal by trade agreement, not subject to ratification by the Congress.

---

[1] Report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, "Foreign Economic Policy for the 1960's," Jan. 17, 1962, p. 22.

[2] Statement of Sidney Zagri before the Ways and Means Committee, Mar. 27, 1962, p. 8.

Succinctly the Minister laid emphasis on the consequences of a free trade approach as envisaged by administration policy: "For wherever economic liberty is extended must appear a common economic policy."

It has been a common practice of European cartels to control competition by limitation of production, price fixing and allocation of markets. The common economic policy mentioned by the French Minister can realistically mean only that the United States must be prepared to accept as part of the international economic system it seeks to create through tariff elimination the workings of the highly developed European cartel system. There is no indication that the EEC nations intend to eradicate the cartel system. The Treaty of Rome significantly provides for the prohibition of "private cartels and other restraints unless they foster the improving of production or distribution or technical and economic progress." Few cartels will be eliminated on the basis of that test. There are other exceptions in the Treaty of Rome to preserve those who fail to qualify under this provision.

Thus, in giving the President special duty-eliminating power for negotiations with the EEC, H.R. 9900 contemplates and intends that ultimately the United States will participate in Europe's international cartel trading system. In effect, the bill commits the United States to the achievement of the purposes of the cartels, notwithstanding the obvious fact that in operation and purpose, the cartels conflict with U.S. policy against combinations in restraint of trade.

THE BILL CONTEMPLATES GOVERNMENT PRICE CONTROL

Under Secretary of State Ball has indicated that under H.R. 9900 the administration would attempt to bargain with European nations to prevent them from fixing agricultural prices of their presently subsidized crops in a way which would cause excessive production and exclusion of U.S. exports. He espouses an international price structure on low-cost agricultural imports through a system of variable levies which would fix the price of each imported commodity at the level of the common internal price. Further, Mr. Ball indicated that the administration was prepared to use tariff concessions on industrial products to achieve this purpose.

Thus, to establish a uniform price structure for agricultural commodities in Europe in order to benefit U.S. agricultural exports, the administration would use the authority granted by H.R. 9900 to reduce industrial tariffs below their impending 10-percent average duty level or eliminate them entirely. To dispose of agricultural surpluses, increased imports of industrial products, and increased unemployment in selected industries would be caused. To the dollar cost of our agricultural programs, the administration now proposes to add the human and economic costs of unemployed and uprooted industrial workers, distressed industries, and depressed communities.

Similarly, the administration frankly states its intention to use the tariff reducing or eliminating authority of the bill to place pressure on domestic price levels to bring about "lower prices." The significance of these declared intentions should not be underestimated. In an address in New York City on October 12, 1960, President Kennedy frankly acknowledged: "Frequently imports may be only a relatively small percentage of our domestic market, 2 or 3 percent, but it breaks the price for the other 97 percent."

It is plain that the administration intends to use the considerable authority requested in H.R. 9900 to apply this principle of price control by increasing imports in broad product categories, as an experiment in price control both in domestic and foreign markets.

THE BILL PERPETUATES A BARGAINING DISADVANTAGE BY FORFEITING LEGISLATIVE RATIFICATION

The problem of negotiating effectively with other nations would be aggravated by the limited ad referendum authority of foreign delegates whose actions are subject to legislative approval, in contrast with the Executive's power to commit the United States to trade agreements without referral to Congress.

As an example, the German negotiators must secure the approval of GATT actions by the German Parliamentary Foreign Trade Commission. Other foreign countries, members of GATT, also negotiate with the United States on an ad referendum basis; i.e., on the clear understanding that they are not bound by concessions granted until their appropriate legislative body ratifies the actions of their negotiators.

A recent illustration of the disadvantage which the United States suffers in this respect is shown by a statement of Maurice Brasseur, Foreign Trade Secretary of Belgium (dispatch, Brussels, Daily News Record, New York, Mar. 28, 1962) that his Government "has firmly decided to impose restrictions on United States exports to Belgium by means of annulling existing, or contemplated concessions," in retaliation for the action of the President in accepting the Tariff Commission's finding of injury and recommendation for a restoration of the statutory tariff on Wilton and velvet carpets. M. Brasseur pointed out that Belgium has not yet ratified the recent GATT agreement (the Dillon round of tariff reductions), or the International Cotton Textile Agreement. Thus Belgium has room for maneuver.

To bargain as an equal in this respect, the U.S. negotiators should also be required to secure congressional ratification of trade agreement actions.

H.R. 9900's grant of total power to the President is contrary to actual parity of negotiating power between nations, since other nations possess a measure of flexibility through legislative ratification proceedings which we lack due to the Executive's insistence that his actions be above congressional recall.

THE BILL UNSOUNDLY REVERSES PUBLIC POLICY BY INTENDING THE CREATION OF WIDESPREAD INJURY

The use of the powers requested in H.R. 9900 would injure the United States. The content and structure of the bill admits as much. Nearly two-thirds of the bill is devoted to machinery and measures for attempting to adjust, retrain, relocate and succor injured workers and firms.

Throughout the history of the trade agreements legislation, Congress and the Presidents concerned have stated that the authority granted to the Executive for the reduction of duties would be used selectively so as to avoid causing serious injury to domestic producers and workers. Now in a sharp reversal of policy this bill proposes that injury occur and creates several forms of disaster relief to deal with the distress on a large scale. The peril point and escape clause provisions, established "to make assurance doubly sure" that injury would not occur, are replaced by provisions which are not designed to prevent serious injury to workers or industries.

The trade agreements made under the existing safeguards cannot be considered completely unsuccessful. The United States has consistently exported more merchandise than it imports. No compelling reason is given for the reversal of our long established "no injury" policy. The balance of payments crisis which some cite as justification for a revolution in our trade agreements machinery and authority is the product not of our trading experience on merchandise, but of two entirely unrelated factors: the continuing large expenditures by the United States for foreign military assistance and economic aid; and the action of foreign countries in placing the dollars received from the United States in their ever-growing reserves rather than spending those dollars for additional goods and services from the United States.

During the presidential election campaign the President, then Senator, Kennedy recognized this situation in remarks made in a telecast on October 4, 1960:

"Actually, as far as trade, we have a favorable balance of trade. In the last 12 months we are selling abroad more than we are importing, and that is true of steel as well as other products. One of the reasons of course, I am frank to say, is because the German and Belgian mills are overordered and it takes a longer time to get orders than it does from the United States. But at least for the present now we are selling abroad in steel as well as other commodities more than we are importing. But I do think it is a matter that we should concern ourselves with. The unfavorable deficit is due to the fact that we are paying troops abroad to maintain bases, giving foreign aid. That is what is hurting. The balance of trade this year is all right."

In view of our favorable balance of merchandise trade, it must be recognized that H.R. 9900 represents a calculated intention to create domestic unemployment in selected industries in order to increase imports sharply and thus to provide more dollars for an enlargement of our merchandise export surplus to help meet our balance-of-payments deficit. In view of the existing unwillingness of foreign countries to expand their dollar receipts for exports from the United States, it is doubtful that these extreme measures would have any effect except to increase the burgeoning foreign claims against our gold reserve.

It is important that we also recognize that the EEC nations and other countries who would benefit from the reduction or elimination of U.S. duties are for the most part suffering from acute labor shortages, in contrast to our persistent high level of domestic unemployment.

It is shocking that the administration should propose a bill which intends to create additional unemployment in the face of the recognition by the Department of Labor itself that unemployment "is proving to be one of our most intractable domestic problems."[3] Furthermore, weak job recovery in manufacturing is one of the principal reasons cited by the Department of Labor for continued high levels of unemployment, long after the turning point in economic activity was reached in 1961.[4]

So grave is the economic distress resulting from unemployment in many parts of the country that at the very time that this committee is considering an unemployment generating bill like H.R. 9900, another committee of the House of Representatives (Public

---

[3] "Unemployment in the Early 1960's," Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, appearing in report, Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, Joint Economic Committee, Nov. 29, 1961.

[4] Ibid., p. 53.

Works) is considering an urgent request from the President for the immediate approval of a $600 million public works program. This request results from the realization by the administration that the forecasts of its economists concerning the pace of economic activity in 1962 were too optimistic and that drastic measures are required to cope with the many pockets of distress caused by persistent unemployment.

The same Government economists now forecast that the actions to be taken under H.R. 9900 would create more jobs than they destroy. There is a major difference in this type of forecast. Errors in economic projections can be corrected by adjusting forecasts to the facts. But errors which result in the liquidation of industries, and in the creation of unemployment and distress in communities dependent upon idled manufacturing plants are not so readily corrected. Under H.R. 9900, these errors once committed are beyond recall. One of the conditions imposed by section 305 of the bill for any restoration of duty is that "prolonged and persistent inability of firms to operate at a profit" exists "on a widespread basis in the industry" affected. This realistically means that the injured firms would be bankrupt before relief could be granted. At that point relief would be futile.

Retraining of workers as proposed by the bill has been demonstrated by private industry to be impracticable. The Department of Labor itself has recently reported that our unemployment rate, now at its highest level since 1940, is due in part to the inability of workers displaced by industrial shifts to be reabsorbed into other jobs immediately. There is, in the words of the Department, "a very pronounced and continuing trend toward fewer jobs in agriculture and fewer blue collar jobs in manufacturing, mining, and transportation."[5] The Department states that mobility may be exceedingly difficult and structural unemployment may be of very long duration.[6] Among the basic changes cited by the Department in its analysis of structural unemployment are the possible decline in an industry because of foreign competition and the relocation of an industry in a different geographical area.

In the face of these known conditions pertaining to persistent unemployment, at disturbingly high levels in the United States, and the marginal results from retraining, it is madness to propose an unemployment-generating departure from our trade agreement policies. This is particularly true when the basis of the proposal is a mixture of assumptions and hope that the dollars received by foreign nations for the increased imports which would be stimulated under the new approach would be spent for increased U.S. exports in a measure sufficient to offset the resulting domestic unemployment, and sufficient to offset the foreign aid dollars so tenaciously held in the reserves of foreign countries.

CONGRESS CANNOT KNOW THE FULL MEANING OF THE KEY CONCEPTS IN THE BILL'S UNPRECEDENTED DELEGATION OF POWER

(a) Composition of EEC: Important powers would be given the President by H.R. 9900 for use in negotiations with the European Economic Community. The life of this authority would be 5 years. The composition of the EEC will change during that period. Section 246 of the bill defines the European Economic Community as all countries which at the times in question are committed to achieve a common external tariff through this instrumentality. Many nations have applied for membership in the EEC; others, for associate status. According to one source there are now some 31 nations actually or potentially represented in the EEC, including some former colonies of present members.

Congress cannot know, therefore, when it considers H.R. 9900 what particular grouping of countries will determine the scope of the power which the bill would grant to the President for dealing with the EEC and for making the various determinations based upon its composition and the trade of its members and associates.

(b) Categories subject to duty elimination: Section 211 of the bill empowers the President to eliminate duties entirely on commodity groups in which the exports of the EEC and the United States account for 80 percent or more of world export value. Obviously, the increases in the nations identified with the Common Market, as explained above, will affect the range of products subject to this total duty removal authority.

There are other uncertainties which make it impossible for the Congress to know which categories of products it is subjecting to future duty-free treatment under this delegation:

1. Since the basic concept of the peril point and escape clauses of the existing law would be eliminated by H.R. 9900, and the matter of items reserved from duty change left entirely to the discretion of the President without any statement of guiding principles, the Congress cannot know what product categories, if any, would be removed from the scope of this power due to any consideration of the economic consequences involved in transferring them to the free list.

2. The definition of product categories subject to duty elimination in negotiations with the EEC under this bill would be in accordance with a United Nations publication, the Standard International Trade Classification. This publication is subject to revision from time to time without regard to the wishes of the United States. These revisions could narrow or broaden the category descriptions. Thus the Congress cannot know now what the authority it would delegate really means, or what it would mean at those times in the next 5 years when the President would undertake to reduce or eliminate duties on SITC categories in negotiations with the EEC. This great uncertainty as to exactly what authority the Congress would be giving to the President under section 211 of the bill results from the fact that the definition of the categories, and hence the scope of the authority delegated would be placed in the hands of an international body without limitation.

Furthermore, the Standard International Trade Classification commodity descriptions do not conform to our Tariff Act commodity descriptions, nor to those used in our trade agreements. Finally, they do not conform to the commodity classification descriptions used in our foreign trade statistics. Thus, the exact content of the Standard International Trade Classification descriptions is unclear. Their scope is vastly greater than any of the commodity descriptions which have been used in either our tariff law or in our trade agreements to identify the dutiable treatment to which U.S. imports are subject.

3. The computation of world export value for the purpose of determining which commodity groups fall within the 80-percent test referred to above is itself uncertain. The revised Standard International Trade Classification indicates that countries accounting for 20 percent of the value of world trade do not subscribe to the classification. Hence it will be impossible in any event to have complete statistical information available to make the 80-percent determination. An even greater uncertainty is produced by the fact that under the statistical practices of our own Government, as well as EEC nations, there are included in the value of exports reported under Standard International Trade Classification classifications, the value arbitrarily assigned to exports of surplus agricultural commodities and other products donated to less developed countries. The value of exports by gift is not an appropriate part of the measurement of factors used to determine the transfer of commercial articles imported into the United States from the dutiable to the free list.

4. To add to these formidable uncertainties which prevent the Congress from knowing the full scope of the authority it is asked to delegate by H.R. 9900, section 211 provides that the 80-percent test is to be calculated on the basis of a representative period. This may be any interval of time following December 31, 1956, and extending up to any of the moments of time at which the President, from time to time, may determine to act.

While the bill provides for the President to be advised by the Tariff Commission what it thinks the representative period should be, he is not obliged to accept such advice. The President may select as short or as long a period as he wishes. He can select different periods for each category on which he proposes to negotiate. A more uncertain standard could not be imagined.

Under H.R. 9900 the President's advisers would be free to rummage in the foreign trade statistics extending over a period of years to select those months, quarters, or years in which export values fortuitously would serve to bring as many categories as possible within the 80-percent test. Thus, by the representative period language of the bill, the President is left free to maximize the power delegated under section 211 to effect a total elimination of duties in negotiations with the EEC.

5. One of the greatest uncertainties under section 211 is that Congress cannot know what industries and commodities will be affected under the Standard International Trade Classification commodity classifications. Hence the Congress cannot know the full significance of the authority granted to the President to eliminate duties on all articles in such categories.

The enormous scope of the Standard International Trade Classification product descriptions will inevitably result in subjecting many industries whose products are within the scope of a single broad Standard International Trade Classification category description to elimination of duties on the basis of statistics having little or no relationship to trade in their products. A few illustrations should suffice to make this point:

(i) Standard International Trade Classification Group 512 covers all organic chemicals. This defines a group of products numbering in the thousands representing the highly interdependent production of an industry the majority of whose products were not known 10 years ago, and a great part of whose products 5 years hence are only just now coming into commercial production. At any moment of time which the President might select under the wide-ranging representative period authority, only a relatively few products would be importantly involved in export trade statistics. Under the 80-percent test, the trade in those products would serve to expose the entire product line, present and future, of this essential industry to duty-free import competition.

(ii) Standard International Trade Classification Group 651 covers all textile yarn and thread, regardless of fiber. Thus, the completely separate manufacturing industries engaged in the spinning and throwing of silk, wool, cotton, flax-hemp-ramie, manmade fiber, and glass fibers could suffer the total elimination of duties on competitive imported products on the basis of export value statistics concentrated in only one or a few of these product lines. The export statistics on flax, hemp, and jute yarn, for example, could influence an 80-percent determination affecting cotton or wool yarns.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 79.

[6] Ibid., p. 69.

(iii) SITC Group 653 covers broad-woven fabrics whether knitted or woven, composed in whole or in part of silk, wool, linen, jute, or manmade fiber. Members of this committee are aware that jute fabrics are generally produced in different mills than wool and worsted fabrics. The mills producing silk fabrics are distinct from both of these. There is a large production of jute fabrics in this country for use as backing for carpets, linoleum, bagging, etc. The mills weaving and knitting manmade fibers are an important segment of the textile industry. There is but slight relation between woven fabrics of glass fibers and crocheted fabrics of silk or manmade fiber, or between fabrics of horsehair or jute, and knitted fabrics of wool. Yet under the standards of section 211 of H.R. 9900 the value of exports of one type of fabric may be used as a measure on which duties on the others may be eliminated. Jute fabric exports may serve as a factor for reduction of woolen and worsted duties. There is no rationality in such an approach to duty reduction or elimination.

(iv) SITC Group 841 covers all clothing and apparel regardless of fiber content, and whether composed of knitted or woven fabrics. The group includes inexpensive articles, such as those made from cotton fabric as well as expensive custom-tailored garments produced from costly worsted fabrics. This category also covers all clothing including clothing made from all natural and manmade fabrics as well as apparel of leather and of rubber. The relationship of exports of apparel of rubber to handkerchiefs, and of leather apparel to women's knitted underwear is not adequate to supply a measure for the reduction or elimination of duty on one based on the value of exports of the other. All of the products falling within this vast range will be made vulnerable to total loss of duties on the basis of exports recorded for the relatively few products which were exported in volume.

The selective negotiations required under existing law permitted an evaluation to be made of the economic consequences to the industry and workmen affected by changes in duties applying to particular commodities. Under H.R. 9900 it will be impossible to measure economic consequences to all of the diverse manufacturing industries included within the broad SITC classifications. The only certainty that attaches to this feature of H.R. 9900 is that many industries which cannot be known to the Congress when it passes on the bill can be subjected to severe injury on the basis of a category which includes trade in products totally unrelated to their operations.

(c) Trade with Communist nations:

The United States has a long-established public policy against the export of goods to Communist bloc nations which would strengthen their ability to commit aggression. Section 211 of H.R. 9900 would include the value of all exports from the United States and the EEC including such strategic commodities exported by the EEC to Cuba, Red China, Yugoslavia, Poland, Russia, and other Communist countries. In identifying the commodity groups subject to total elimination of duties by the President, the Congress cannot now know what significance EEC exports of strategic articles to Communist nations would have in the application of the 80-percent test. It can be certain that virtually every category will include some articles which are strategic. Congress therefore cannot know whether the authority it is asked to grant to the President in section 211 would not in fact be used contrary to the public policy in the Battle Act by giving substantive effect to commerce which we have forbidden to our own merchants and have tried unsuccessfully to persuade our allies in the EEC to similarly forbid.

It is probable that U.S. production of strategic goods will be subjected to increased imports in a damaging volume as a result of the elimination of duties under the authority in section 211 because illicit trade in such articles with the Communist bloc becomes a part of the statistical determination under which the commodity classifications subject to section 211 are identified.

This bill contains other provisions actually or potentially favorable to the Communist countries. Section 248(c) repeals section 11 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 providing for an embargo against the importation into the United States of furs and skins from Russia and Communist China. This reversal of policy is consistent with the recommendations of a preinaugural report prepared for the President by a group under the chairmanship of the present Under Secretary of State, George Ball. That report, according to press accounts, favored the grant of authority for the President to suspend the embargo on furs and suspend discriminatory tariff treatment for Soviet bloc imports.

The repeal of section 11 of the 1951 act accomplished one portion of the Ball task force recommendations.

The extension of most-favored-nation treatment to Soviet bloc imports, recommended by the Ball task force, could be accomplished for at least some Communist countries by the President's determination of the countries subject to section 231 of the bill. Under Secretary of State Ball declined to give the committee a categorical answer as to whether or not he was in favor of U.S. trade with Communist nations. He appeared to find a distinction between Yugoslavia and Poland on the one hand and Soviet Russia on the other. This may imply a disposition on the Under Secretary's part to suggest to the President that imports from Yugoslavia and Poland should be granted most-favored-nation treatment in accordance with the tenor of the task force report to President-elect Kennedy. As the bill is drafted Congress cannot know to what extent the President might relax the existing public policy withholding most-favored-nation treatment from Communist bloc imports.

(d) Duty elimination on products of agricultural commodities:

Under section 212 of the bill the President may under a trade agreement with the EEC eliminate duties entirely on imports of all products of agricultural commodities if he decides that such action would tend to maintain or expand U.S. exports of either the products in question or the commodities from which they are produced.

The Congress cannot know at the time it considers this bill how expansively the President will interpret the broad concept of "products of agricultural commodities." Products of raw cotton include innumerable articles such as apparel, house furnishings, fabrics, etc. Products in finished form for sale to consumers fall within the scope of this provision. To what extent are finished articles composed in part of products of agricultural commodities also subject to duty elimination? It would always be possible for the President to rationalize that duty-free treatment of finished articles made in whole or in part from an agricultural commodity could tend to maintain or expand U.S. exportation of the agricultural commodity, such as raw cotton.

It is only necessary to reflect upon such key agricultural commodities as cotton, wool, cereals, fruits, meat, tobacco and sugar to visualize the far-reaching extent of the power which section 212 of the bill would grant to the President. Cotton textiles, wool products, shoes, confectionery, beer and alcoholic beverages, wines, tobacco products, edible oils, industrial alcohols and processed food products are among the most sensitive items of foreign trade. They could all be placed on the free list if the President chose to so interpret section 212. So versatile is our industrial economy in utilizing agricultural materials and the products thereof that it is impossible for the Congress to know the exact extent of the power involved in section 212 to place on the free list manufactured articles containing agricultural products.

(e) Quantitative restrictions:

H.R. 9900 is directed essentially to negotiations on tariff duties. It is acknowledged that the principal barriers to U.S. exports are the quantitative restrictions and other nontariff measures imposed by foreign countries against U.S. exports.[7] After nearly 30 years of trade agreement activity in which the level of U.S. duties has been reduced from an average of 50.1 to 12.2 percent, the United States finds itself in a position where the concessions it has received from other countries have been substantially nullified by quotas, embargoes, licensing regulations, exchange controls and other nontariff measures.

Congress cannot know when it considers H.R. 9900 whether the authority which would be granted to the President by the bill, if enacted, would not similarly be wasted by the nullification techniques practiced on a wide scale by our trade agreement partners.

(f) The myth of the 5-year staging period for reductions in duty:

The notion has been sponsored by the administration that H.R. 9900 contemplates reductions in duty spread over 5 years. There are four important bases on which some of the reductions or eliminations of duties authorized by H.R. 9900 could take effect in less than 5 years:

1. Any duty equivalent to 5 percent ad valorem or less may be eliminated forthwith.

2. Duties on tropical agricultural and forestry commodities and the primary products thereof may be eliminated forthwith.

3. Any reduction in duty of 25 percent or less may be effected forthwith.

4. Any duty may be reduced in any one year up to 5 percent ad valorem.

Only on duties now amounting to more than 40 percent ad valorem will 5 years be required to effect a 50 percent reduction in duty. The great majority of our duties today are less than this amount.

It is impossible for the Congress to know to what extent, if at all, the administration would choose to use the authority in H.R. 9900 so as to distribute the reductions or elimination of duty over 5 years. It is clear that in many, if not the majority of instances, this asserted 5-year staging period will not, or need not under the bill, occur at all.

THE MYTH THAT THE BILL CONTAINS PERIL-POINT AND ESCAPE-CLAUSE REMEDIES

Administration spokesmen have sponsored the notion that H.R. 9900 retains peril-point and escape-clause procedures. The fact is that the provisions of the bill which would replace the repealed peril-point and escape-clause procedures of existing law are not designed or intended to prevent the actual or threatened serious injury to workers and industries to which the existing remedies apply.

These remedies in present law are, as this committee well knows, the results of many years development reflecting the most careful balancing of competing interests. Their origin and purpose lie in the plain desire of both the Presidents and the Congress in past extensions of the Trade Agreements Act to make certain by positive law that the tariff reducing power entrusted by the Congress to the Executive would be used as the Congress itself would use it if changing tariff rates by legislative act, i.e., to provide for increased access to foreign markets for U.S. exports while at the same time preventing serious injury to domestic industries and workers.

---

[7] See "Trade Restraints in the Western Community," Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, Dec. 1, 1961. See also Fifth Annual Report of the President on the Trade Agreements Program, August 1961.

These provisions recognized that the industries and workers who might be benefited by an expansion of exports have no greater claim on the attention of Government than the industries and workers who might be harmed by the expansion of imports which would stem from the tariff cuts used to pay for concessions abroad. Recognizing the tremendous latitude for bargaining which our many hundreds of tariff provisions provide, the Congress directed, through the peril-point and escape-clause procedures, that those particular provisions which immediately prevented serious injury or the threat thereof were not to be reduced. If past reductions produced import injury, the duty level of the particular provisions concerned was to be restored. For compelling reasons based on the national interest, the President was permitted to make exceptions to this statutory rule, but the President was required to explain his reasons for doing so to the Congress.

This bill would discard these carefully developed provisions. In lieu of the actual peril-point findings of present law, section 221 of the bill would provide for advice by the Tariff Commission. The distinction between a finding, which must be followed unless an explanation is given to the Congress, and "advice" is obvious. Advice may cheerfully be ignored; findings of injury may not.

The basis of the advice itself will silence the Commission's voice. In lieu of present law's test of actual or threatened serious injury as shown by a decline in employment, earnings, production, and the like, section 221(b) of the bill requires the Commission to see the probable existence, in combination, of the following factors: "on a widespread basis in the industry of significant idling of productive facilities of firms, of prolonged and persistent inability of firms to operate at a profit, and of unemployment or underemployment of workers."

The substance of each of the clauses quoted above virtually precludes the Commission from speaking until it sees the extinction of an industry. To make the Commission's silence more deafening, the bill requires that each of the indexes of disaster be found probable. The conjunctive requires as much.

Anyone who has had any experience in business knows that the significant idling of productive facilities of firms on a widespread basis in the industry would not occur unless some supervening economic disaster of staggering proportions would occur. Increased imports would have to produce the same effect as a nationwide no-holds-barred strike before the Commission could speak. But this is not all; there must also exist prolonged and persistent inability of firms to operate at a profit. This language is descriptive of bankruptcy. Prolonged and persistent inability of this sort means prolonged and persistent losses. Since this condition too must exist on a widespread basis in the industry, the entire industry would have to be bankrupt before the Commission could even advise the President. Even then, the President may ignore the advice. This is a remedy?

The provisions of the bill which seemingly are intended to replace the escape clause are sections 301 and 305, so far as industries are concerned. The many pages of other provisions dealing with loans, grants, retraining assistance, etc., are not in any degree a substitute for escape-clause relief, since they accept the fact of serious injury. Instead of adjusting imports to remove the injury, they attempt to pacify the workers by a form of dole, and bureaucratic decisions enforced by monetary allowances that the workers should go somewhere else and learn some new trade, regardless of age, talent, family or community ties.

First of all, section 301 makes it clear that ordinarily an industry suffering import injury will not be helped by regulation of the offending imports. This will be done only in extraordinary cases; hence a new term "extraordinary relief" is used.

The term is well chosen. The conditions specified in section 305 are so unlikely or impossible of practical application that it will indeed be "extraordinary" if action is ever taken under section 305. To cap the curious essence of this provision, section 351 of the bill provides that such "extraordinary relief" as the President may grant under section 305 will ordinarily lapse by force and effect of the bill in 4 years.

So it is clear that sections 301, 305, 351 are not even related distantly to today's escape clause.

The hurdles to be leaped by an industry under these provisions are similar to the impossible conditions of the so-called peril-point advice of section 221, except they are even more impossible—if there are degrees of impossibility. Before action could be taken to restore duty reductions or eliminations, the industry concerned must prove that increased imports have already caused on a widespread basis, the significant idling of plants, prolonged and persistent inability of the firms in the industry to operate at a profit, and unemployment or underemployment of workers; or that imports "immediately threaten to cause" such an inseparable trinity of total disaster. How can it be found that imports immediately threaten prolonged and persistent inability of firms on a widespread basis in the industry to operate at a profit? How can anyone read "immediately" as a modifier of "prolonged and persistent"?

But there is more. If an industry whose firms have suffered prolonged and persistent losses, whose plants have been significantly idled, and whose workers are unemployed or underemployed is still in existence and able to muster the financial and managerial effort to launch an investigation before the Tariff Commission, it must first go through a period of unspecified duration in which it makes reasonable efforts to adjust without success. Since the idling of plants and prolonged period of losses must occur before the reasonable efforts to adjust are made by the industry, the period required for the latter would seem to bring any ordinary group of firms subject to the discipline of profit and loss accounting to the stage of liquidation before all the conditions precedent to Tariff Commission consideration could be satisfied.

The "modified" escape clause offered by the bill is thus seen on close examination to be no remedy at all. It is a delusion.

THE MYTH THAT THE DUTY-ELIMINATION POWERS IN THE BILL ARE DESIGNED FOR THE EEC

The bill contains four different kinds of authority for the complete elimination of duties (secs. 211, 212, 213, and 202). Three of these are stated to be for use in trade agreements with the EEC or in connection with commitments by the EEC. The notion thus is fostered, that duty elimination under these powers is a matter for assessment primarily in terms of United States-EEC trade.

Unfortunately, the most-favored-nation principle of the bill, section 241, will automatically make all duty eliminations or reductions granted to the EEC available to Japan and other low cost nations of the world.

Japan has demonstrated the industrial capability of mass producing virtually any article of importance in international trade. Japan's cost base is lower than that of Europe. Not only will Japan reap the full benefit of all concessions granted by the United States to the EEC, but she will not be required to take any action in reducing her own duties or in dismantling the system of import licensing and exchange control regulations which so effectively block out many U.S. exports.

Finally, Japan's cost advantage over Europe will cause the EEC's peyments (such as they may be) for our reductions or eliminations of duty to be unrequited, as Japanese imports will preempt Europe's opportunities in the U.S. market.

In view of Europe's recalcitrance in extending most-favored-nation treatment to Japan (witness the reservations still in force under article 35 of GATT), it is inevitable that Japan will reap the benefits of European tariff trading with the United States. From the point of view of United States industries and workers, however, the Japanese competition will be more drastic and severe simply because Japan's cost advantage is so much greater than Europe's, though the latter's edge over U.S. costs is significant in itself.

The point is that the bill launches unprecedented new duty elimination powers on a wholly false premise. To the many uncertainties already described in this statement, there must be added the inability of Congress to know whether any of the drastic actions it is asked to authorize for the benefit of the Common Market would ever prove to be anything other than an accelerated means of turning the United States market for manufactured goods over entirely to Japan and other low cost nations of Asia.

THE BILL DIRECTLY CONFLICTS WITH MANY PUBLIC POLICIES ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS

The bill directly conflicts with many public policies established by Congress:

H.R. 9900 directly contradicts at least five major pronouncements of public policy established by the Congress:

1. Section 6 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 declares in unmistakably clear language that no duty reduction "shall be permitted to continue in effect when the product on which the concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products."

This is the cornerstone of our trade agreements program. Without proof of necessity; without respect for the affirmance of that principle by Presidents Truman and Eisenhower and three Congresses, the administration brushes it aside as though the careful consideration given by so many to that principle is unworthy of its acceptance. The large burden of proof which should be required by anyone substituting Federal bureaucratic planning of the economy and the dole for the maintenance of existing industries, jobs, and communities is dismissed by statements which amount to no more than the fact that other nations would be happier in negotiating with us if the Congress would declare in advance that the President may give them everything they want without exception.

2. Sections 2 and 15 of the Fair Labor Standards Act declare that the movement in commerce of goods produced by workers paid wages below our legal minimum or under hours exceeding our maximum hours permissible without payment of overtime, is detrimental to the health, efficiency, and well-being of our workers, burdens commerce, and constitutes an unfair method of

competition. The act does not allow such goods to be shipped or even offered for shipment in commerce. Violations are punishable by fine and imprisonment.

It is common knowledge that virtually all foreign goods imported into the United States are produced abroad under conditions where the workers are paid less than our legal minimum wage, and frequently under hours which exceed our legal maximum hours without payment of overtime. The tariff provides the only means for adjusting the labor cost content of such goods so that their movement in commerce in the United States will not produce the effect prohibited by the Fair Labor Standards Act. As that Act makes clear, the very movement in commerce of goods produced under such conditions threatens the well-being of our workers.

Nevertheless, the administration is proposing by H.R. 9900 not only to reduce duties without any attention to this public policy, but worse, to eliminate duties entirely on at least four broad categories of articles.

When the fair labor standards amendments were enacted last year, the Members of Congress were concerned that the increase in our legal minimum wage could injure industries whose wage scales were directly affected. The Congress expressed its concern by incorporating a new provision in the law requiring the Secretary of Labor to investigate unemployment caused by foreign competition (sec. 3, Public Law 87–30). The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare showed its concern by considering the possibility of injury from imports and extensively commenting on the subject in its report on the bill (S. Rept. 145, 87th Cong.). The report admitted that "the position of low wage firms competitive with foreign producers may tend to be adversely affected if a minimum wage change were to result in higher prices." It concluded that "it may be expected that a moderate increase in the minimum wage will not have extensive adverse effects on the ability of U.S. firms to compete with foreign producers." But note well, how closely balanced the committee's judgment was: It obviously conceded that some adverse effects would occur. The committee's judgment was premised on the status quo of the cost factors, including tariffs, which were involved.

Now the administration, in the face of the concern expressed in the course of congressional action on increasing the minimum wage, proposes to affect drastically the cost relationships, by the elimination of many duties, and the reduction of others by 50 percent.

Here indeed is a classic example of one arm of the Government not knowing what the other is doing. To what purpose the public policy in the Fair Labor Standards Act against even allowing goods produced under substandard conditions to move in commerce, if all adjustment factors for imported goods in this class are to be swept aside? The Congress with equal logic could repeal the Fair Labor Standards Act. To what purpose the anxious attention by Congress to the harmful effects on our industries and workers of an increase in the minimum wage vis a vis foreign competition, if during the very same Congress the administration proposes distortions of the competitive (cost) relationships even more drastic than the increase in the minimum wage, namely, the elimination of all duties?

3. Section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 declares it to be the policy of the United States to use all of its resources to create "conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

H.R. 9900 directly conflicts with this policy, because it will cause unemployment in a definite known way, namely, as a result of the great increases in imports it intends to create. It provides elaborate machinery to attempt to offset this by retraining workers and moving them to other places of work in the face of the Department of Labor's opinion that this technique is of only limited effectiveness. It indulges the hope that employment would be generated in export industries, in the face of the certain knowledge which it has that foreign nations tend to place dollars received from the United States in their reserves rather than increasing their expenditures for U.S. exports. Consequently, H.R. 9900 violates the spirit of the Employment Act.

4. Section 2 of the Small Business Act of 1958 declares that the economic well-being and security of the Nation cannot be realized unless the actual and potential capacity of small business is encouraged and developed.

H.R. 9900 works directly contrary to this policy by asking for authority to eliminate duties on industrial products of interest to the EEC (and to Japan, as explained above). The consequences of this are visualized by the draftsmen of the bill, as shown by the elaborate machinery provided in the bill to retrain workers and move them to labor markets where the few industries able to compete with the EEC and Japan are located. Statements of administration spokesmen make clear that these are the automated efficient mass production industries. By their very nature, considering the large aggregations of capital required for the creation of the automated mass production facilities characteristic of those industries, the new havens of employment for the import-unemployed will be industries which cannot be classified as small business. By definition, the small business concern cannot command the aggregations of capital needed for mass production facilities of this class. Hence, the bill will encourage and accelerate movements in the direction of mergers, combinations, and creation of large business, and the elimination and destruction of small business. In concept and operation, the bill will undermine the public policy expressed in the Small Business Act.

5. Section 2 of the Area Development Act of 1961 declares it to be the policy of the Congress to overcome unemployment and underemployment in communities suffering substantial and persistent misfortune of this type by assisting in the establishment of stable and diversified local economies and by developing and expanding new and existing facilities rather than by merely transferring jobs from one area of the United States to another. The report of the House Committee on Banking and Currency (H. Rept. 186, 87th Cong.) eloquently sets forth the reasons why retraining and relocation of workers (such as envisaged by H.R. 9900) is an unacceptable policy:

"However, the basic fact remains that it is illogical to expect a community hit by the loss of basic industry and bearing the burden of high unemployment to lift itself by its own bootstraps. One of the inevitable results of persistent and substantial unemployment is an erosion of community assets and public revenues. * * *

"Your committee rejects the view that nothing should be done to aid communities and areas with basic economic problems. It disagrees completely with those who feel that the Government should sit by and let unemployment force people in these hard-hit places to abandon their homes and move elsewhere in search of jobs. Not only is this a callous attitude which ignores the feelings of the people involved but it is a shortsighted attitude. Tremendous sums are invested in homes, schools, and other facilities in these areas, as well as in factory and commercial structures, and it would be wasteful indeed to simply abandon them. Our growing Nation needs all its productive facilities and every effort must be made to put them usefully to work.

"The migration of workers from distressed areas is not an adequate answer to the problem. Families are often reluctant to leave their homes and social ties while businessmen find it difficult or impossible to transfer their investment in plant and equipment from one place to another. Moreover, such migration often entails considerable hardship. For example, it frequently happens that a worker will move to another city in search of employment. Often he moves by himself since he cannot afford to take his family with him. He may find a job at first but often the job is not satisfactory because he lacks the appropriate skills, and he runs the further risk of lacking seniority or security in his new job. In a time of general economic contraction this worker may find himself quickly unemployed and forced to return home. In effect, this community must bear some of the unemployment problems of other cities."

The policy of the Area Development Act is to try to create conditions in the localities where unemployment exists which will stimulate employment. The thrust of H.R. 9900 on the other hand is to try to move workers away from their communities to those more sophisticated labor markets where the highly efficient mass production industries operate. The policy of Congress now is to place great value on existing communities, and the homes, churches, businesses, and factories in those communities. The policy it is asked to enact by H.R. 9900 is to place little or no value on existing communities or facilities, but rather to uproot their citizens, move them away, and leave a disabled shell of a community behind.

Many communities are dependent upon the production of a single commodity or class of commodities by a small business concern, or by a plant of a multiproduct, multiplant large corporation. The large company may survive the liquidation of one line of its business, and of the plant involved in its production, without suffering the prolonged and persistent overall losses specified in the bill. But the workers in that single plant, and their community where it is located, cannot similarly survive.

The existing trade agreements law with its central concept of avoiding serious injury to industries and workers is fully consistent with the save-the-community approach of the Area Development Act. H.R. 9900 is in clear conflict with both.

CONCLUSION

H.R. 9900 should not be enacted.

Without cause it scraps the whole body of legislation on which our trade agreements program is based.

It sacrifices the painstaking balancing of competing interests achieved by two Presidents and three Congresses in developing the safeguarding peril-point and escape-clause procedures in 1951, 1955, and 1958.

It would result in abdication by the Congress of its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign commerce; it supplies no guiding or limiting standards for the unprecedented delegation of authority its duty eliminating and reducing provisions entail.

H.R. 9900 in its text and in the premises on which it is based is contrary to the statements of President Kennedy during the presidential campaign, and before the Ball Committee preinaugural recommendations that (a) "sweeping changes in our foreign trade policies are not necessary" (letter to Gov. E. F. Hollings, Aug. 31, 1960); (b) "I supported the peril-point and the escape clause, both of which are in the present Reciprocal Trade Act. I would not suggest additional legislative action, however, on reciprocal trade" (TV broadcast, Portland, Maine, Sept. 2, 1960); (c) "I don't want to see any domestic industry driven to the wall by excessive imports and that is my general view" (TV broadcast, Portland, Maine, Sept. 2, 1960); (d) "not only has inflation kept us out of markets abroad, it has priced us out of markets here at home. For example, as the result of the near doubling of steel prices in the last decade, the United States—a nation with the largest steel-producing capacity in the world—has imported substantial quantities of steel and steel products. For it is, in many cases, cheaper to buy steel overseas and ship it here than to buy it from domestic producers. More than a year ago a high financial official of the Government was quoted in the Wall Street Journal as saying, 'the Germans and the Swedes—and even the Japanese—can lay down barbed wire and nails in Duluth at less than the U.S. manufacturers can sell it. And we make steel in Duluth'" (address, Philadelphia, Pa., Oct. 31, 1960); (e) "I believe that we can protect our domestic industry within present laws, with Presidential leadership, with a knowledge of the problem, with effective workings between the President and the State Department and countries abroad, and with the provisions in present reciprocal trade laws if vigorously, effectively, and responsibly administered" (address, New York City, Oct. 12, 1960); and (f) "there are laws on the books for the protection of agriculture and for domestic industry. I hope we will have a President of the United States who is knowledgeable about those laws, who is interested in them, who is concerned about them, who works with the Congress on these subjects, and also uses his great powers and influence here and abroad in order to stimulate successful trade" (address, New York City, Oct. 12, 1960).

It is contrary to the advice given by former President Eisenhower in commenting on the Nation's foreign trade policy following a conference with former Secretary of State Herter on December 15, 1961:

"While there are difficulties, of course, I am convinced that a steady, gradual liberalization of trade restrictions, with adequate consideration for possible injury, can yield solid benefits for the American economy."

It ignores the major influences on domestic costs exerted by the inflationary pressures of deficit financing and other governmental policies.

It contradicts major public policy established by the Congress in the areas of fair labor standards, full employment, small business, area redevelopment, and foreign trade.

It unrealistically focuses on reduction of U.S. tariffs, now nearly the lowest of all industrial nations, to open markets for U.S. exports ignoring the major barriers to such trade of quotas, licensing regulations and the like by which our trading partners have nullified past agreements to admit our exports.

It intends extensive injury to the U.S. economy and contemplates reorganization of the economy by bureaucratic fiat in callous disregard of the fate of the American workers, industries, and communities injured.

It pledges the United States to partnership in the European cartel system, and proposes to remove all tariff equalization factors which now assist in protecting American business, workers, and consumers from the European and other international combinations in restraint of trade.

It contemplates Government price control in both domestic and foreign markets.

Its key provisions defining the scope of delegated power are vague, indefinite, and subject to exclusive interpretation by the President so that Congress cannot know the full extent of what it is asked to delegate.

It grants dictatorial power to the President over the domestic economy and foreign commerce, without recourse to the Congress, and prohibits any judicial review thereof.

It reverses U.S. policy prohibiting or penalizing trade with Communist nations.

It invites spendthrift use of our negotiating wealth by making all reductions and eliminations of duties granted the EEC freely available to Japan and other low-cost nations of the world.

It authorizes the President to take irrevocable steps toward complete free trade in defiance of known economic facts which show, on theoretical grounds, that the conditions for free trade do not and cannot exist in the United States, and which, on practical grounds, show that economic disaster to countless U.S. workers, industries, and communities is inevitable, if the requested authority is used.

RECOMMENDATIONS, TO BE CONSIDERED AS A UNIT

1. Strike out everything after the enacting clause.

2. Extend the present trade agreements law for a 4-year period.

3. Within present law, give the President additional authority to reduce duties by 20 percent, to take effect 5 percent a year.

4. Strengthen the existing peril-point and escape clause provisions by requiring a finding of actual or threatened injury by the Tariff Commission whenever there exists, or would be imminent, a combination of either (a) a decline in the share of the market supplied by domestic production and a decline in the domestic price level or in domestic industry earnings; or (b) a decline in the share of the market for domestic products and a decline in employment or wages paid in the domestic industry.

5. Provide against the sapping by excessive imports of the rate of growth of industries, by adding to the peril-point and escape clause, as alternate bases for action, circumstances characterized by an increase in imports, the continued expansion of the domestic market, but a decline in the established rate of growth (as shown by investment, earnings, sales, employment, or wage payments) of the industry producing like or competitive products.

6. Direct the President to make a determined use of legislative tools already at hand designed to promote the expansion of U.S. exports without the necessity for new duty reductions. These include section 338 of the Tariff Act of 1930; section 350(a)(5) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; and the provisions of our trade agreements, such as article XXIII of GATT providing for action to prevent or correct nullification of concessions received.

7. Establish a congressional commission, adequately staffed on nominations by the majority and the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, to make a comprehensive study of all the factors relating to our foreign trade position, including:

(a) The development of the EEC;

(b) Our balance-of-payments situation;

(c) The state of foreign reserves of dollars, and the extent to which these reserves could be urged to return in the form of payments for exports;

(d) Discrimination against U.S. exports;

(e) The use by the President of statutory and trade agreement remedies to counteract same;

(f) The effect of discriminations against exports of third countries on the volume of imports into the United States;

(g) The practicability of further tariff concessions under most-favored-nation rules considering the situation of low cost countries vis-a-vis EEC concessions;

(h) The extent to which restrictions imposed by EEC countries against low cost countries forces excessive volumes of imports from the latter into the United States;

(i) An analysis of inflationary influences created by Government policies affecting the cost position of U.S. industries vis-a-vis their principal foreign competition;

(j) An analysis of foreign and domestic costs and prices from the point of view of the adequacy of existing U.S. tariffs to make fair competition in the U.S. market possible; and

(k) A thorough analysis of the effect which elimination of industrial duties would have on domestic employment and on investment in plants and community facilities.

The report of this body should be made 3 years from the date of the bill's enactment, so that it will be before the Congress and the public for thorough study and consideration in any further extension of the trade agreements law 4 years hence.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Walter, from April 6 through April 16, 1962, on account of official business, to attend the 15th session of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

Mr. Brewster (at the request of Mr. Lankford), on account of illness in family.

Mr. Battin from April 6 through April 16, 1962, on account of official business, to attend the 15th session of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Derounian, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Fino and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. Kelly, to insert in the remarks she made today extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. Bennett of Florida in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Tupper.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Latta) and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Schneebeli.

Mr. King of New York.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Bailey.

Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Lesinski.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 270. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic; and

S. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 4, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 9, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1906. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1907. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the management and disposition of acquired properties as administered by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 10786. A bill to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 10946. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 589. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10788, a bill to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956; without amendment (Rept. No. 1555). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 590. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1159, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders; without amendment (Rept. No. 1556). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 11131. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 11132. A bill to terminate the authority of supplemental air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DURNO:

H.R. 11133. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to terminate the authority to suspend the marking requirements with respect to sawed lumber and timber, certain poles of wood, and bundles of shingles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 11134 A bill to provide a right of ingress and egress across national forest lands to all persons owning property within the boundaries of such national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 11135. A bill to require the establishment of an appeals procedure in matters related to the sale of timber from national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11136. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773, 7 U.S.C. 624) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11137. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 11138. A bill to amend section 4142 (relating to the definition of radio and television components) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio:

H.R. 11139. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 11140. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by FHA-insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 11141. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, in order to improve the administration of justice and discipline in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 11142. A bill to amend sections 1612 and 1613 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that where a veteran eligible for educational benefits on account of Korean conflict service has reentered military service, such service shall not be counted as part of the periods within which his education must be begun and completed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 11143. A bill to amend section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with regard to furnishing court quarters and accommodations at places where regular terms of court are authorized to be held, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 11144. A bill authorizing the modification of the project for flood protection on Blackstone, Mill, and Peters Rivers, in Woonsocket, R.I.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 11145. A bill to repeal subsection (a) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, limiting the area in the District of Columbia within which sites for public buildings may be acquired; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11146. A bill to provide an office building for the Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 11147. A bill relating to certain facilities and improvements of the United States and the rights of the United States in and to certain real property situated in Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. Res. 588. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the appointment of professional and clerical staffs of the committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H. Res. 591. It has been the commercial policy of the United States to recognize appellations of origin applicable to foreign and domestic products, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALLHAUSER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey memorializing Congress to appropriate the funds necessary to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting certain pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 11148. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Dobrich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 11149. A bill for the relief of Franklin D. Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 11150. A bill for the relief of John Korakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1962

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, who knowest our necessity before we ask, and our ignorance, limitations, and fallibility in asking, have compassion, we beseech Thee, upon our infirmity; strengthen us in all noble impulses; and daily increase in us the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel, knowledge, and true godliness. Dowered with privileges and with the stewardship of power as no other Nation, may our high estate be to us Thy summons to protect the weak and exploited, that through the potent ministry of this Republic of freemen, all peoples of the earth may be blessed.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1962.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 4, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 4, 1962, the President had approved and signed the following joint resolutions:

S.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Caryl P. Haskins as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 11027. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H.R. 11038. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 270. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic; and

S. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 11027. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 11038. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Public Health Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee.

The Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Finance were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. SPARKMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO PAY CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 84)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States in the amount of $1,065,929 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN CALIFORNIA, MISSOURI, COLORADO, TENNESSEE, AND GEORGIA

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on San Gabriel River, western area, California; South Fork Blackwater River, Mo.; Indian Wash, Colo.; Mulberry Creek, Tenn.; and Rocky Comfort Creek, Ga. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency for the period January 1 through June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Secretary of State transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on its activities under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF TRACKED VEHICLES AT FORT BRAGG, N.C.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on the review of tracked vehicles at Fort Bragg, N.C. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSITION OF ACQUIRED PROPERTIES, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of management and disposition of acquired properties, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, March 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED ACTIVITIES OF LOW-RENT HOUSING PROGRAM IN THE NINE-STATE AREA ADMINISTERED BY THE SAN FRANCISCO REGIONAL OFFICE, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected activities of the low-rent housing program in the nine-State area administered by the San Francisco regional office, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated March 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of financial and administrative activities relating to the development and construction of the Dulles International Airport, Federal Aviation Agency, September 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF GOVERNMENT HOUSING RENTAL RATES AT LOS ALAMOS, N. MEX., ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of Government housing rental rates at Los Alamos, N. Mex., Atomic Energy Commission, September 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN NORTH DAKOTA AND ARIZONA

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on the north branch of Forest River (supplemental), North Dakota, and Florence area, Arizona (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

LIMITATION OF AREA IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WITHIN WHICH SITES FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS MAY BE ACQUIRED

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal subsection (a) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, limiting the area in the District of Columbia within which sites for public buildings may be acquired (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of New York, favoring the enactment of House bill 4222, to provide medical care for the aged, financed through increased social security taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission, Phoenix, Ariz., relating to the salinity of the waters of the Colorado River delivered to the Mexicali Valley of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3120. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of May 29, 1884; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3121. A bill for the relief of Dinh Khon Ngo (also known as Robert (kun Ting) Wu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 3122. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to encourage the formation of regional agencies to develop comprehensive plans for meeting, through balanced and integrated highway and commuter transportation systems, the transportation needs of metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 3123. A bill to provide an office building for the Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 3124. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Gustave M. Minton, Jr., U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 3125. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernst Badian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3126. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3127. A bill to provide for the establishment of a municipal arts council representative of local nonprofit organizations and institutions, including educational organizations and institutions, in the District of Columbia with active programs in the arts, to set aside for such local cultural activities 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COORDINATION OF MASS TRANSPORTATION AND HIGHWAY SYSTEMS OF THE URBAN AREAS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote the coordination of the mass transportation and highway systems of the urban areas of the nation.

The bill is intended to bring about the development, by State and local initiative, of balanced and integrated programs to meet the transportation needs of the country's urban areas.

Federal planning grants are already available under Section 701 of the Housing Act for use in formulating land-use plans, including plans for transportation. Too, the Community Facilities Administration, under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, is required to administer the new loan program available for purchase of transportation facilities and equipment in keeping with the needs of a balanced mass transportation system.

But as desirable as these programs are in themselves, and I believe that they are, the stimulus to bring about comprehensive planning as provided by existing law has not been sufficient, particularly in the field of transportation.

The bill I am introducing today would:

First. Require that locally initiated land-use plans developed with Federal assistance under Section 701 shall include comprehensive transportation plans.

Second. Authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to designate specific urban areas whose transportation needs can only be met by coordinated highway and mass transportation systems.

Third. After a 3-year period, require that all Federal financial assistance available for mass transportation purposes and highway construction within an urban area designated by the Administrator be granted only if the Administrator determines that the purpose of such assistance is consistent with a comprehensive transportation plan for such areas locally developed and approved by the Administrator.

As I have indicated, Federal planning grants are currently available for those communities, counties, States, and interstate agencies which want to plan on a regionwide basis for the comprehensive use of their available land. This bill requires that comprehensive transportation plans be included in such land-use plans. The bill is based on the principle that the Federal Government is willing to help those who seek to help themselves. It recognizes the fact that land-use plans developed on an areawide basis ought not to be handed down by Washington.

But, at the same time, the bill could cut off the funds it makes available for mass transportation as well as for highways through urban areas unless these locally developed plans make sense to the Housing Administrator.

For many decades, the Federal Government has been putting up half the money for urban, primary, and feeder roads. And since 1956, Federal aid has leaped to 90 percent for interstate highways. In New Jersey alone, in the current fiscal year, the Federal Government has allocated about $80 million for highways, most of it in urban areas.

Besides that, the Federal Government has available nationally another $75 million for the first year of a new program to help rehabilitate commuter railroads. And there has been talk about broadening this Federal program to provide new rolling stock and equipment. In his budget message this year President Kennedy asked for another $100 million for more Federal loans for this purpose. A basic purpose of my bill is to designate someone—in this case the Housing Administrator—to decide where these programs are going and to coordinate them with plans for other forms of mass transportation and urban roads.

If both the Federal urban road and mass transportation programs are to proceed in completely parallel directions, we may not be making the wisest use of our resources in the search for sound solutions of our transportation problems in urban areas.

Of course, in some areas, parallel development of these systems might be in order. In others, rapid transit, rather than major highway construction or vice versa, may suit a specific situation. As I have indicated, what this bill basically aims to accomplish, in addition to attempting to promote the growth of areawide plans, is to give the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency a vantage point from which the use of Federal funds to promote transportation may be objectively reviewed.

In developing a local transportation plan there would be opportunity for coordinating present and future highways and existing public transit facilities with new subway, express bus, monorail, or other rapid transit facilities.

I feel that planning for an entire metropolitan area is most desirable, among other things, to reverse the present wasteful trend toward the purchase of obsolescent or outmoded rail passenger cars and equipment; to curb the present uncoordinated competition for the primacy of one transportation system over others, highways, for example, as against modern rail, rapid transit and bus commuter service. My bill is designed to permit the tailoring of specific solutions to the practical needs of each metropolitan area.

Future Federal transportation programs, as well as those now on the books, would come within the provisions of this bill. That is to say, their availability for an urban area designated by the Administrator would depend upon the Administrator's determination that it is consistent with a comprehensive transportation plan for such area approved by the Administrator.

In my judgment it is fundamental that comprehensive areawide transportation programs should be worked out so as to insure the most effective use of any large-scale Federal assistance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of my bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3122) to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to encourage the formation of regional agencies to develop comprehensive plans for meeting, through balanced and integrated highway and commuter transportation systems, the transportation needs of metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by—

(1) striking out the fifth sentence of subsection (a);

(2) redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) as (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and

(3) adding after subsection (a) a new subsection as follows:

"(b) Planning assisted under this section with respect to metropolitan and other urban areas shall include the preparation of comprehensive urban transportation surveys and studies, and the preparation, review, and, when necessary, the revision of comprehensive urban transportation plans to aid in solving problems of traffic congestion, facilitating the circulation of people and goods, and meeting transportation needs in such areas. The Administrator shall designate those metropolitan or other urban areas where he determines that the solution of such problems can be solved only on an areawide or regional basis by an agency of the type specified in paragraph (2) of subsection (a). The Administrator shall utilize the authority conferred by this section to encourage the formation of such an agency to perform planning functions for each such area, and to assist any such agency to develop at the earliest practicable date comprehensive plans for meeting, through a balanced and integrated highway and commuter transportation system, the transportation needs of the area. Subsequent to three years after the effective date of this subsection, the Administrator shall not extend any assistance under (1) section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to any mass transportation demonstration project in any area designated under this subsection, (2) section 202(a)(2) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to provide transportation facilities or equipment to serve any such area, or (3) any other provision of law now or hereafter in effect authorizing Federal assistance to provide mass transportation facilities for any such area, unless (i) an agency of the type hereinabove described performs metropolitan or regional planning for such area, (ii) such agency has prepared and maintained on a current basis comprehensive plans, approved by the Administrator, for meeting, through a balanced and integrated highway and commuter transportation system, the transportation needs of such area, and (iii) the provision of such assistance is in furtherance of, or consistent with, such plans."

SEC. 2. Section 106 of title 23 of the United States Code (relating to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for the Federal-aid highway systems), is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) All surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates submitted to the Secretary under this section which relate to any proposed project in any metropolitan or other urban area designated by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator') under section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 shall, prior to the approval thereof by the Secretary, be submitted by him to the Administrator for review. No such project shall receive the final approval of the Secretary unless the Administrator determines, and certifies to the Secretary, that the proposed project is consistent with any comprehensive plans which may have been developed by an agency of the type described in section 701(a)(2) of the Housing Act of 1954 for meeting, through a balanced and integrated highway and commuter transportation system, the transportation needs of such area: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall not certify any such project in any such area subsequent to three years after the effective date of this subsection unless such plans have been developed for the area involved and the proposed project is considered, as determined by the Administrator, with such plans."

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] introduced a bill, intending to ask that it lie at the desk for a week to enable other Senators who may wish to do so to become cosponsors. However, he forgot to ask unanimous consent that that be done. I now ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk for a week for that purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHARTER ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 287) to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

EXCLUSION OF INTERCOASTAL SHIPPING FROM JONES ACT RESTRICTIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 3, 1962, the names of Mr. CHURCH and Mr. GRUENING were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3105) to provide that the law limiting the transportation of merchandise in the coastwise trade to certain U.S. vessels shall not apply to such transportation between a port on the east coast of the United States and a port on the west coast of the United States, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER on April 3, 1962.

NOTICE CONCERNING H.R. 10431, AN ACT TO REVISE, CODIFY, AND ENACT INTO LAW TITLE 37 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES"

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the subcommittee now has under consideration H.R. 10431, 87th Congress, 2d session, and the acompanying report thereon, House Report No. 1399, regarding the revision and codification of the laws relating to the pay and allowances of the uniformed services, such bill having passed the House of Representatives. Such revision deals with title 37 of the United States Code.

The purpose of this notice is to advise any and all interested parties of the consideration of this legislation by the subcommittee and that the subcommittee desires to have any statements or comments relating to the proposed legislation. The subcommittee realizes that the enactment of such a codification is a major project and that a codification is limited to the revision and codification of existing law only, so that there will be no change in the statutes under discussion as they now exist. The statements or comments requested are for the purpose of allowing any and all persons to express a view as to whether or not in the proposed legislation, H.R. 10431, there has been a change in existing law.

The subcommittee desires that such statements or comments be forwarded to the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, room 226, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., on or before May 18, 1962.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE CONCERNING H.R. 10433, AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO INCORPORATE RECENT LAWS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the subcommittee now has under consideration H.R. 10433, 87th Congress, 2d session, and the accompanying report thereon, House Report No. 1401, regarding certain amendments to the laws relating to the armed forces, having passed the House of Representatives.

The purpose of this notice is to advise any and all interested parties of the consideration of this legislation by the subcommittee and that the subcommittee desires to have any statements or comments relating to the proposed legislation. The statements or comments requested are for the purpose of allowing any and all persons to express their views as to such amendments.

The subcommittee desires that such statements or comments be forwarded to the subcommittee on revision and codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, room 2226, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., on or before May 18, 1962.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE CONCERNING H.R. 10931, AN ACT TO REVISE, CODIFY, AND ENACT INTO LAW THE GENERAL AND PERMANENT LAWS RELATING TO AND IN FORCE IN THE CANAL ZONE AND TO ENACT THE CANAL ZONE CODE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the subcommittee now has under consideration H.R. 10931, 87th Congress, 2d session, and the accompanying report thereon, House Report No. 1509, regarding the revision and codification of the general and permanent laws relating to and in force in the Canal Zone and to enact the Canal Zone Code, having passed the House of Representatives.

The purpose of this notice is to advise any and all interested parties of the consideration of this legislation by the subcommittee and that the subcommittee desires to have any statements or comments relating to the proposed legislation. The subcommittee realizes that the enactment of such a codification is a project of great magnitude and that a codification is limited to the revision and codification of existing law only, so that there will be no change in the statutes under discussion as they now exist. The statements or comments requested are for the purpose of allowing any and all persons to express a view as to whether or not in the proposed legislation, H.R. 10931, there has been a change in existing law.

The subcommittee desires that such statements or comments be forwarded to the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification of the Committee on the Judiciary, room 2226, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., on or before May 18, 1962.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, as chairman.

THE TIGHTROPE REPORT AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION BY THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I believe Senators will be interested in several recent developments within the Federal Aviation Agency.

Senators know of my view that the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 vested in the Agency extraordinary powers of rule making and enforcement in dealing with those engaged in civil aviation in this country. Senators know also of my continued, and upon occasion critical, interest in the activities of this Agency, particularly as they relate to the methods and spirit in which the rulemaking and regulatory functions have been discharged.

I am pleased to note and to advise Senators that one of the early and principal steps taken by the new Administrator of the FAA, Mr. Najeeb Halaby, was to ask an independent group of recognized experts to take a critical look at FAA rulemaking and enforcement procedures. Organized under the name of Project Tightrope, this group consisted of Mr. Lloyd N. Cutler, a prominent Washington attorney, who served as its chairman; Mr. John Floberg, vice president and general counsel of Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., and a former Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air; Mr. Louis J. Hector, a Florida attorney, and former member of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Mr. Frederick B. Lee, a former Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; Mr. Gerhard P. Van Arkel, a Washington attorney, and former General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board; and Mr. Alfred B. Fitt, who is Deputy Under Secretary of the Army for Manpower. For a period of some 6 months this group made an exhaustive study of these sensitive and all-important Agency functions. Its report on FAA rulemaking and enforcement procedures was formally received by Administrator Halaby on November 21, 1961.

The Tightrope report, in effect, vindicated those of us in the Congress and in the aviation industry who expressed uneasiness over the vast power given the Federal Aviation Agency Administrator over the right of the individual to fly his own airplane.

I repeatedly expressed my alarm over this condition, in sessions of the Aviation Subcommittee and on the floor. In January 1960 I told the subcommittee that the FAA's power to institute charges and adjudicate them violated every conception of the Anglo-Saxon law and justice. Let me quote one of my observations made at that time in committee:

> We have the FAA Administrator making the rule, then he turns around and acts as judge, jury, and prosecutor. Then you have an appeal to him, not only in reference to whether the rule is sound, but whether you are guilty under the rule. I have grave misgivings about being given the right to appeal to the man who ruled against me in the first place.

I should also like to call attention to a statement I made on the floor of the Senate on May 18, 1960, during a speech on the treatment of licensed pilots by the Federal Aviation Agency:

> Mr. President, I continue to be distressed at what I feel to be arbitrary actions by the Federal Aviation Agency in the matter of treatment of licensed civil pilots under the authority granted to the FAA Administrator by the Congress in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. Senators may recall the tragic series of midair collisions that prompted a review of the then existing Civil Air Regulations and resulted in enactment by the 85th Congress of the Federal Aviation Act, which placed extraordinary powers in the hands of a single man—the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. At that time, I expressed concern with regard to the vast power that would be lodged in one individual, but the act was passed most expeditiously in the overall interest of safety. It may be recalled that testimony before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee indicated the desire of the aviation industry to cooperate in the legislative overhaul of our Civil Air Regulations. Misgivings were voiced by aviation leaders concerning certain aspects of the appeals provisions of the Federal Aviation Act and the thought was expressed that recourse to the Congress would be utilized if a reasonable period of operation indicated that some modification or amendment of the act was required.

I also pointed out that an accused pilot stood guilty until he could prove his innocence; that his avenue of appeal was extremely limited, due to the fact that the act gave the Civil Aeronautics Board authority to hear an appeal to determine whether the action against the airman was correct and proper under the terms of the rule established, in the first place, by the Administrator.

Again, I quote from my speech before the Senate on May 18, 1960:

> In practical operation, we have discovered that the rights of an individual pilot receive less consideration under the administration of the Federal Aviation Act than would be accorded the most common criminal in a court of law. Substantial and upright citizens of this country, who are active civil pilots, 380,000 by the last count of the Federal Aviation Agency, are subject to being charged with a violation of the regulations under the present enforcement program of the Agency and thereafter stand guilty until they can prove their innocence.

J. B. Hartranft, Jr., president of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, expressed concern over the lack of a system of checks and balances in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, when he testified before the Senate Aviation Subcommittee in January 1960. The AOPA consists of 87,000 members who are the owners and pilots of nonairline civil aircraft. It was these thousands of airmen who felt keenly the lack of such safeguards in the act. Mr. Hartranft said:

> The lack of a system of checks and balances and adequate appeal machinery that will afford an impartial hearing for a pilot is the greatest single area of the Federal Aviation Act that needs clarification. When the act of 1958 was put in final form and passed by the Congress, a provision was included in section 609 for appeal to the Civil Aeronautics Board with regard to airmen and aircraft certificates. We soon discovered that this did not give the Board the authority to review or take any corrective action on a rule or regulation, but merely allowed the Board to hear an appeal with respect to

> whether or not the action against the individual was correct and proper under the terms of the rule. Thus, the Board could not consider or take any action with regard to correction of a faulty or unsound rule. We also discovered that it was relatively simple for the FAA to amend any rule under which they were receiving adverse rulings from the Board on actions against individual certificates.

The AOPA president at that time also made a plea for a fair and impartial hearing for airmen accused under regulations promulgated by the FAA, which, as I previously stated, also acts as judge and jury in such cases. He said:

> It is imperative that civil pilots so accused—who are, after all, American citizens—have access to due process of law, before a fair and impartial hearing. The sixth amendment of the Constitution describes the safeguards we seek. The present FAA may be a good deal more vigorous, forceful and streamlined than its predecessors, but it also is encroaching upon the right of individuals to get justice under our democratic processes. George Washington said it: "The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism."

Statements such as those made by Mr. Hartranft and myself were the natural aftermath of an enforcement crackdown, such as was instituted at the command of General Quesada, then FAA Administrator, in 1958. Thousands of charges—many of which should never have been filed in the first place—clogged the FAA machinery and created chaos in American aviation, particularly among the owners and pilots of nonairline civil aircraft. Tightrope appropriately noted this Quesada crackdown in its October 1961 report, as follows:

> In March 1959, Administrator E. R. Quesada ordered an enforcement crackdown. The results were apparent almost at once. The 12 months ending June 30, 1959, saw a 50-percent increase over the previous year's violations filed, from 2,092 to 3,128, and in the next 12 months the inspectors turned up 4,448 cases. The flood continued at a rate of 400 new cases a month until November 1960, when, for reasons discussed below, Administrator Quesada called a halt.
>
> The Washington enforcement staffs of the Flight Standards Service and of the General Counsel simply could not cope with the burst of activity by the inspectors. The new volume of cases being fed into a very complicated multiple review system soon choked it almost completely. The time taken to process a violation from start to finish gradually and steadily grew until in the first quarter of 1961 the average was 10 months.
>
> Distressing as this was to all concerned, it also developed that much of the Washington enforcement effort was being wasted on cases that never should have reached the top of the system. During 1960, while the Washington backlog was swelling from 485 to 689, of the cases completed 55 percent were closed without action. (This same ratio has continued during the first 5 months of 1961. Whether it continues after the last of the pre-1961 cases has been completed will soon show whether the "crackdown period" produced more activity than it did results.) Another 23 percent were closed by reprimand, a sanction reserved for "minor and unintentional offenses" and so trivial as to be unreviewable by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Tightrope also commented on the futility and unfairness of the filing of many trivial charges against airmen. In fact, this portion of the report expresses my opinion exactly:

> No matter how scrupulously fair is the treatment of individual cases, an agency which ultimately drops so many of the proceedings it starts, and which takes so long to lay a hand on those it does laboriously decide have violated the regulations, must expect the fairness of its system to be questioned.
>
> It is not fair to make the aviation industry worry about and cope with so many charges that come to naught; nor is it fair to remain silent for 10 months and then discipline an airman for a "minor unintentional" and presumably long since forgotten offense.

An editorial in the May 1960 issue of the AOPA Pilot, which I shall quote in part, clearly defined the conditions Tightrope talked about in its report a year and a half later. Entitled "In the Interest of Safety," the editorial stated:

> The FAA is presently using this phrase ("in the interest of safety") as its primary justification for harassing civil aviation—all of it, from the airline pilot to the farmer—on all sides, usually in a manner that can only be construed as reckless, once one studies the facts. The issue involving the forced retirement of the 60-year-old airline pilot is already a well-known example of FAA arbitrariness—"in the interest of safety." So is the proposal to ban the family physician, again without a shred of factual justification. There's more to come, and the only ground rules are that they can and will do anything that strikes their fancy—"in the interest of safety." The FAA's Bureau of Aviation Medicine has fast become an empire all its own, and age limits and other limitations are already being looked at for all pilots, not just airline.
>
> If the average person could see how far the FAA's police state has already gone "in the interest of safety" he would be frightened, not merely uneasy as so many now are. FAA agents have closed in on all sides, from the airlines to the smallest light-plane manufacturer. An AOPA member who's a fixed-base operator in Pennsylvania complained about the way he was being pushed around by FAA personnel; and an FAA civilian official from New York and an Army lieutenant colonel from FAA headquarters in Washington descended on the man at his home, complete with a tape recorder. General Quesada himself deplored the tape recorder when we told him about it.
>
> In Minnesota another member was charged with a violation because he misunderstood an inquiry from an FAA communications station and didn't give them his full street address. In Kansas an FAA agent showed up at a busy airport with a bathroom scale—to weigh people arriving and departing in private aircraft, hoping to catch someone with an overload. The top engineer of one of the country's leading general aircraft manufacturers recently told AOPA that, since FAA took over, the cost of performing many routine engineering tasks to the satisfaction of arbitrary Government agents has doubled. He bitterly went on to point out that he once refused to hire the very FAA engineering expert who now held a life-or-death grip on his company, due to his lack of qualifications.

The Tightrope Committee verified the conclusion that many of us did earlier: that the FAA Administrator had tremendous power and, if he so chose, could penalize an airman for an alleged infraction of the regulations, and could develop his case later. After assessing the power of the Administrator, the Tightrope Committee in its report says:

> In short, the Administrator was given the power in all certificate actions to punish first, then justify his action at a subsequent trial. This power can be likened to the edict of the Queen of Hearts: "Sentence first—verdict afterward." However, carefully such power is used, and we do not suggest that it has been abused thus far, we think it is too much power for the Administrator to want or to wield. We think that, except when the accused waives a trial, the Administrator ought to have to prove the guilt of the accused first in formal proceedings, then impose the punishment.

Again, I call attention to testimony given in 1960 by Mr. Hartranft, who questioned the infallibility of the Administrator:

> We do not embrace the doctrine of infallibility of the Administrator; we do not embrace the theory that "the king can do no wrong"; we do not believe in these archaic doctrines—and neither did our Founding Fathers—which are totally foreign to our democratic system of government whether we are regulating the commerce of the sea, land commerce, or commerce of the air.

In the same statement, Mr. Hartranft also told the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, back in 1960:

> In the enforcement of safety rules, it has been publicly stated that the FAA policy is to be "fast, firm, factual, and fair." Unfortunately, the last two ingredients; namely, "factual" and "fair," appear to have been lost in the zeal to be fast and firm. Under the present administration of the Federal Aviation Act, a pilot may be charged with an alleged violation of the regulations and be given only the alternatives of paying a compromise fine (usually nominal) or taking his case to a Federal court. Presentation of the facts to the FAA—who may have filed the charge, who investigates the charge, who judges the case, who levies the penalty and who may have promulgated the rule—usually has no noticeable effect on the outcome of the case.

In its eagerness to crack down on civil aviation, in keeping with General Quesada's mandate, the FAA even got crossed up in its own procedures. What originally were intended to be only reports showing the activity of one bureau, Air Traffic Management, turned into instruments of harassment when they reached another bureau, Flight Standards. To Mr. D. D. Thomas, Director of the Bureau of Air Traffic Management, goes credit for stopping what would have been a comedy, had not so many unsuspecting pilots been ensnared in the FAA's regulatory machinery. Details of this "snafu" were given in an article appearing in the June 1960 issue of the AOPA Pilot, which reported a meeting between AOPA and FAA officials on the agency's enforcement drive. The magazine said:

> Ironically, the meeting developed the fact that some of the "ridiculous" enforcement resulted from the well-meaning efforts of the Bureau of Air Traffic Management to obtain evidence that the millions of dollars being spent for air traffic control and navigation facilities was a good investment for the taxpayers as well as for the aviation community. Here is the story:
>
> Each year, FAA has to justify to the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget its requests for funds. A few months ago the Agency decided that it would be a good idea to have on hand some specific examples

> showing how ATM facilities and personnel were assisting users of the airspace. An instruction went out to controllers, communications specialists, and other field personnel asking them to report instances where unusual services were rendered fliers.
>
> When the busy controllers and communications people got around to writing reports there was only one FAA form available for such purpose. That was form 304A. It turned out that form 304A was a lethal weapon as far as quite a few flyers were concerned. Containing an original and six carbon copies, form 304A is widely distributed within the Agency once it is filled out. It is labeled "Federal Aviation Agency Incident Report." Now, "Incident Report" means only one thing in the FAA. It is a signal that somebody has done some wrong and that corrective action is indicated. The only instruction the form contains follows in part:
>
> "The following is a description of either an accident or of an incident, which adversely affected the operation of this air traffic control facility. It appeared advisable to prepare a formal record, and a copy is being forwarded to acquaint you with its particulars. It is requested that, as necessary, these details be brought to the attention of the pilot or individuals involved. We hope that, through review, recommendations leading toward action to prevent recurrence of incidents of this type will be obtained."
>
> Needless to say, the Bureau of Flight Standards took to heart the message carried on the interoffice form and started scanning the reports for violations. AOPA told the FAA officials that the spurt in violations filed on trivial in-flight occurrences was making many pilots extremely reluctant to use FAA communications and navaid facilities, particularly radar. Greatly perturbed over the turn its efforts to show how it was aiding pilots had taken, the Bureau of Air Traffic Management took immediate steps to halt the use of form 304A for its evidence of effectiveness. In the future, such reports will be written in straight narrative form and will go directly to ATM.

While overenthusiastic enforcement, the lack of restraints on enforcement officials, and absence of meaningful appeals were of pressing concern to every person who flew an airplane, the rulemaking procedures themselves were disturbing to many in the industry and to some in Congress. I have often expressed myself on the system which allows this regulatory agency to enact rules, at its discretion and often without justification, that vitally affect the lives of thousands. I have suggested on several occasions that the Congress should set up an aviation code, similar to the motor vehicle codes found in many States. Tightrope's conclusion—that FAA's rulemaking practices were responsible for a large amount of the criticism leveled at FAA in the past—is entirely correct. Tightrope said:

> The committee quickly concluded that the major public complaints against FAA rulemaking were historical and stemmed from a small number of controversial rules abruptly promulgated early in the Agency's life.

Again, quoting testimony of Mr. Hartranft of the AOPA, given before the Senate Aviation Subcommittee in January 1960:

> A matter which has caused considerable dissatisfaction on the part of industry with the administration of the Federal Aviation Agency under the act of 1958, is the lack of advance consultation and coordination with industry, prior to legal promulgation of proposed rulemaking. As you gentlemen know, the unsatisfactory operation of the old Civil Aeronautics Administration within the framework of the Air Coordinating Committee, led to the inclusion of language in section 301 of the act of 1958 to prohibit the Administrator from submitting his decisions for the approval of any committee, board, or other organization created by Executive order. We were among the critics of the old CAA–ACC relationship and we wholly support the inclusion of this provision in the Federal Aviation Agency Act. It is unfortunate that the zeal of the FAA staff to comply with this mandate from the Congress has apparently led to an interpretation that has effectively prevented adequate advance consultation with industry prior to institution of formal rulemaking procedures.
>
> This has created a great area of dissatisfaction on the part of general aviation and has caused an untold amount of bitterness, wrangling, and unnecessary work on the part of all concerned. AOPA, and others in industry, repeatedly have requested the FAA to seek the advice of knowledgeable persons and organizations outside of Government in order that the decisions of the Administrator, when made, may be based upon the best knowledge available throughout the aviation community.

Here is a part of the solution to this problem, as suggested by Tightrope:

> 3. Notices of proposed rulemaking: Notices of proposed rulemaking by the Agency are now published in most cases only at the end of the rulemaking process, after the Agency staff has discussed the matter in question with all interested parties and has reconciled or reached a judgment on all controverted issues. In almost all cases, the Agency has largely made up its mind before a notice of proposed rulemaking is issued, and the notice and subsequent comments are almost formalities.
>
> In our opinion, it would be preferable for the Agency, whenever feasible, to utilize that portion of the Administrative Procedure Act which provides that a notice of proposed rulemaking shall include "either the terms or substance of the proposed rule or a description of the subject and issue involved," APA section 4(a) and issue a notice when a matter first comes under consideration by the Agency for possible rulemaking.
>
> Such early notices do not, of course, preclude a second publication of a proposed rule for final comment just before it is promulgated. We can see no great hardship or waste in such double publication, and it would insure ample opportunity to all to comment throughout the rulemaking procedure.

Mr. Halaby's committee also suggested that greater use be made of public hearings in the rulemaking process. I quote:

> 5. Oral argument on proposed rules: The policy standard used in determining whether to have public oral argument following issuance of a notice of proposed rule should be reconsidered. Too often the standard has been, "Are we in the Agency likely to learn anything from a public hearing?" Since its answer to this question was usually "No," the Federal Aviation Agency has not held many such hearings.
>
> In our judgment the Agency should also consider the possibility that the public learns something from public hearings, and that however boring they may be to the man conducting them, they are quite valuable in gaining support for the Agency's proposals or, at the very least, an acceptance of its good motives.
>
> By "hearings" we do not mean evidentiary proceedings. We mean open conferences at which the Agency would present its proposals and their justification, and the members of the public in attendance could then in turn have their say. There is a justifiable complaint in some cases that the public is not adequately informed by the rulemaking notice as to the Agency's actual basis for action and thus has no real opportunity to comment on the Agency's reasons. A presentation by Agency officials at a public hearing thus serves a most useful purpose.

An excerpt from an article appearing in the March 1960 issue of the AOPA Pilot shows clearly the regard held by General Quesada's regime for the public hearing:

> The FAA held a public hearing—its first in 14 months' operation—on a proposed rulemaking.
>
> Up for discussion was FAA's draft release 59–2, which would require all examinations for third-class certificates to be made by FAA-designated medical examiners. The term discussion is used rather loosely here. Only the witnesses offered evidence. The Government Agency's justification for its move to take away from the family doctor the right to make these examinations was limited to its brief allegations printed months ago in the thinly circulated, official Federal Register.
>
> A frequent complaint heard by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY's subcommittee earlier in the month, when that group's hearings were going full swing, was that the FAA was prone to make rules in the name of safety without showing there was a need for more restrictive rules.

The magazine article referred to above was a report on a public hearing held on January 14, 1960, on a proposed rule that would require private pilots to get their third-class medical certificates from physicians especially designated by the FAA. Disregarding the opposition expressed by industry leaders and many doctors, the rule was enacted anyway.

Why was the instrument of public hearing practically ignored in the early days of FAA? The following excerpt from another article in the AOPA Pilot explains FAA's attitude, which Tightrope later criticized:

> In addition to the innovations in the revised part 29 itself, final action on the regulation clarified to some extent FAA's position in regard to requests for public hearings in the matter of the Agency's rulemaking procedures. A request for such a hearing on the proposed changes in the medical standards for airmen was made by AOPA and the National Association of State Aviation Officials. Although no formal turndown of these requests was made by FAA, the changes in the CAR were made without such hearing being granted. However, the following explanation of FAA's action in not granting a hearing is contained in the preamble of the document signed September 4:
>
> "It is the opinion of the Administrator that the changes being incorporated in this amendment eliminate, to the greatest practicable degree consistent with safety, all the features of the proposal to which objection was expressed. In addition, in evaluating the comments received, with particular reference to the professional knowledge represented by the comments, it is the Administrator's opinion that they give overwhelming and authoritative support to the medical standards being adopted in this amendment. It does not appear, therefore, that a public hearing would serve any useful purpose and the Administrator does not deem such a hearing to be necessary in the public interest."

Regarding FAA's justification for its new regulations, an editorial entitled

"Dictatorship?" in the December 1959 issue of the AOPA Pilot, pointed out that little justification was given for its regulation radically changing the medical standards for private pilots. The magazine said:

> Most glaring of this year's case histories to AOPA, of course, is the arbitrary manner in which the FAA has railroaded into being the new medical rules. They didn't care a damn what anyone else thought, they said so frankly, and ordered the new rules into being with hardly a shred of factual evidence to support their actions—another fact which they candidly admit.

President Kennedy also was concerned, prior to his election, with the situation in the Federal Aviation Agency, as evidenced by the following statement which he gave to the Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association:

> As private aviation has expanded the horizons of business, so has it expanded the horizons of politics.
>
> It was only because of civil aviation that I was able to continue my work in the Senate and campaign vigorously in the preconvention primaries.
>
> In my earlier campaigns—both in Massachusetts and traveling across the country for Democratic candidates—I have compiled, I think, an impressive amount of flying time.
>
> I am fortunate enough to own a Convair, which I use quite extensively. Lately, however, I am confined to charter flights of larger planes due to the large number of staff and press accompanying the campaign.
>
> Long hours in the air and an intimate association with pilots have made me fully aware of the activities of both the AOPA and FAA. I was one of those concerned about coordinating aviation activities in one agency.
>
> My Democratic colleague and campaign associate, Senator CLAIR ENGLE, of California, has expressed great concern over some of the powers concentrated in the hands of the FAA as a result of legislation we passed in the Congress in 1958.
>
> I know of his belief that an adequate review of FAA decisions, affecting the 330,000 civil pilots, is not provided by the Federal Aviation Act. An AOPA'er himself, Senator ENGLE believes pilots are being deprived of inherent rights belonging to all Americans.
>
> As a friend of civil aviation, I can assure you that Senator ENGLE's views will get a full and fair hearing by a Democratic administration.
>
> I, personally, see a threefold problem at this time.
>
> One concerns the balance needed between the rules and regulations required for safety and the guarantee of civil rights of private pilots.
>
> The second is the question raised by AOPA about former military men filling the top civil positions in aviation.
>
> The third is the lack of public awareness of the percentage of air time recorded by civil aviation as related to commercial aviation and the resultant apathy toward civil aviation.
>
> These problems will be considered by a Democratic administration and fair answers provided.
>
> Growing use of private aviation for pleasure and business provides one of the new horizons on our New Frontier of the sixties.
>
> I congratulate AOPA for being one of the pioneers of this New Frontier.

Following his election, President Kennedy very carefully reviewed a long list of candidates for the position of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. His selection of "Jeeb" Halaby started a move to restore confidence in the FAA. Mr. Halaby's appointment of the Tightrope Committee was clear evidence that he shared President Kennedy's concern about the FAA rulemaking and enforcement procedures.

Acting with dispatch upon the recommendations of the Tightrope committee, Mr. Halaby has created, by Agency order, a panel of hearing officers who are responsive directly to him, and who are authorized to act for him in enforcement cases. Beginning February 1, certificate holders against whom violation action is initiated looking to the suspension or revocation of their certificates, are being given an opportunity to request a hearing before one of these independent hearing officers. Upon such request, the matter will be set for an early hearing at a location convenient to the certificate holder, and the Agency Counsel who has initiated the certificate action will bear the burden of proof in presenting evidence and witnesses to substantiate the charges made against the certificate holder. The latter will have full opportunity to confront and cross-examine the witnesses and to present testimony on his own behalf. Upon a full record thus made before him, the assigned hearing officer is authorized to decide the case and to issue an order on behalf of the Administrator. This procedure does not, and of course cannot, deprive any certificate holder of his right of appeal to the CAB, a right which was preserved to him in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. If a certificate holder is not satisfied that he has obtained a fair measure of justice from the Administrator's hearing officer, he may appeal. In doing so, he may either rely upon the record which was made before the FAA hearing officer, or he may ask for a new hearing either wholly or in part before the CAB. This forward-looking step on the part of the Agency should do much to dispel the "punishment first—trial later" approach to enforcement cases and to enhance the appearance of fairness which, as Tightrope observed, is so "vital to public acceptance of any governmental regulation and enforcement system."

In relation to the rulemaking processes of the Agency, Administrator Halaby has moved apace to carry out in large measure the recommendations of the Tightrope report. He has established an Agency Regulatory Council, of which he himself is Chairman; and he has created, and filled, the post of a Vice Chairman, who will serve as Executive Director of the Council, and will devote his full time to assuring that the rulemaking processes of the Agency undergo high-level surveillance and are responsive to the principal objectives outlined by the Tightrope study group.

Members of the Council will be top officials who are most particularly concerned in the rulemaking processes of the Agency, including the General Counsel, the civil air surgeon, and the directors of the flight standards service and the air traffic service. Upon call from the Chairman or Vice Chairman, this Council will not only advise with respect to rulemaking policies and practices, but will also counsel the Administrator as to the justification for any significant or potentially controversial rule, as well as resolve or advise him with respect to differences of opinion which may arise internally within the Agency. The principal thrust of the Council's role, as well as of the duties assigned by the new Executive Director, is to assure that there is justification in depth for all rules which may hereafter be issued and affect the regulated aviation public. At the same time, attention will be given to the processes by which these rules are produced, in order that public petitions for rulemaking will be responsibly handled and the public's views will be sought and fully considered. As yet, it is too early to assess the full impact upon the rulemaking processes of the Agency, and the product thereof; but it appears that the Agency has embarked upon a course which may be welcome, indeed, to those who in the past have been critical of these processes.

The Administrator is to be commended for having had the courage to invite an independent group of experts to evaluate and report upon this sensitive area of the Agency's activities, then for releasing this report to the public, and, finally, for taking these specific and constructive steps to implement the report's principal recommendations. We shall watch with great interest their development.

PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE NATIONAL ARMIES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the distinguished majority leader to the statement I am going to read, because I think it has great bearing on the debate which is taking place in this Chamber now. I did not see this article in any of the Washington papers, the article to which I shall call attention, although undoubtedly it was there; nor did I see it in any of the New York papers. I was first told about this by a friend of mine in Los Angeles who called me yesterday and said he had the article on his desk. A search for the article in the papers here was unsuccessful, but yesterday afternoon my local paper from Phoenix, Ariz., arrived on my desk. It was the March 31 issue of the Arizona Republic, and carries the UPI byline from Geneva of that date.

I want to read this article and ask the majority leader if he is aware of it; and, if he is, if he knows whether the statement is true or not.

I have written, and had carried by page, a letter to Secretary of State Rusk and Mr. Foster, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, asking them about it, because while I am sure the UPI quotes reliable sources, sometimes they are unreliable. I read the article:

> UNITED STATES SEEKS ELIMINATION OF ARMIES
>
> GENEVA.—The United States will submit to the Geneva Disarmament Conference a plan calling for elimination of national armies within 9 years and their replacement by a United Nations force, reliable sources said yesterday.
>
> The American plan is to be submitted to the 17-nation group to counter a Soviet draft

> treaty for general and complete disarmament within 4 years, introduced when the Conference opened here 2 weeks ago.
>
> It was understood Secretary of State Dean Rusk and William C. Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, were meeting in Washington with their principal advisers to put the finishing touches on the plan.
>
> The West complains that the Russian 4-year plan gives the Russians an undue military advantage in the early stages and does not include specific and detailed proposals for international controls to insure each nation destroys its arms on schedule.
>
> The American plan was said to include these precautions as well as a U.N. peace force to maintain international law and order as national defenses are torn down.
>
> The Soviet plan omits any mention of a standing peace force.
>
> At yesterday's session the Soviets tried to commit the United States to total disarmament within 4 years but American negotiator Arthur H. Dean told Soviet delegate Valerian Zorin "you cannot build a house without a blueprint."
>
> Zorin suggested the Conference start taking up the Russian plan point by point and when Dean put the brakes on the proposal Zorin warned that the Conference might be heading into another impasse.
>
> Dean proposed instead the 17-nation group set up subcommittees to consider such specific problems as how to end nuclear weapons production, how to destroy or reduce nuclear delivery vehicles, including ships, submarines, planes, and rockets, and how to verify such measures.
>
> "These are not problems of language but of substance," Dean said.
>
> Zorin rejected the subcommittee suggestion, first made by Rusk, and said "these problems cannot be solved separately. If we are going to have general and complete disarmament they must all be dealt with at the same time and in stages."
>
> Zorin said the Soviet Union is ready to discuss any plan put before the Conference, a statement interpreted by Western observers as a challenge to the United States to bring forth its own proposals.
>
> British Minister of State Joseph Godber, speaking after Dean had rejected the Soviet proposals, said general agreement on certain basic issues must be reached before they can be put into treaty form. He particularly insisted that subcommittees study detailed problems.
>
> As expected, Poland, Bulgaria and Rumania lined up behind the Soviets in demanding point-by-point consideration. Neutral Brazil came out in favor of the American approach. India and the United Arab Republic, the only other speakers, were on the fence.

The query I wanted to put to the distinguished majority leader was just this: Does he have any knowledge of a suggestion being submitted, or a plan to submit such a suggestion, to the Geneva Conference, that the United States turn over its military to the United Nations?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, I want to reply that this is the first indication I have had that a proposal of this nature is being considered, if one is being considered. I certainly would not question the reliability of the UPI as a news gathering organization. I do not know to what reliable sources it refers, but, if I understand the import of what the Senator from Arizona has said, it is to the effect that a proposal has been made by the American delegation that within a period of 9 years, national forces of all countries, will be disbanded and their places taken by a United Nations armed force.

A question of that nature is one which merits the most serious inquiry and study. I have never heard anybody on the floor of the Senate, or, for that matter, in this country, make a declaration going that far, which would seek to abandon our own national forces. I do recall that the Senate and the House of Representatives, a few years ago, under the distinguished leadership of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], did pass a resolution to the effect that we believed there should be a United Nations armed force on a standby basis, so to speak. But certainly no one has, in the very remotest manner or way, suggested that there should be a disbanding of national armies or forces.

So I am delighted that the Senator from Arizona has called this matter to the attention of the Senate. I am delighted he has taken the matter up personally with the Secretary of State. I am sure all of us will be interested in the reply he receives. I assure him that I, too, will take it up with the Secretary of State, and see that a reply either affirming or denying this particular proposal is forthcoming as quickly as possible.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I was quite sure he was not aware of this development, because, for some reason or other, it was not displayed prominently in the press in the East.

It has received rather prominent display in the press of the West.

I might say that the article stated, "will submit," and did not state they have already submitted it. This was quoted from what we call reliable sources. We know sometimes they are not.

I, too, have no reason to disagree with the accuracy of the UPI. I, for one, feel that the United Nations, to be effective, is going to have to have a standby force. I have often advocated it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Arizona voted and spoke in favor of it several years ago.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

I notice the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] coming on the floor. He is handling the bill before the Senate. I know he will be interested in this, because it will have some bearing on the matter we are debating.

I may say to the Senator from Alabama that the matter to which I was addressing myself was a UPI story that appeared in western papers. I have not found it in the papers available to me here. The effect of the story was that "the United States will submit to the Geneva disarmament conference a plan calling for elimination of national armies within 9 years and their replacement by a United Nations force, reliable sources said yesterday."

Realizing that the story said it came from reliable sources, I have asked Secretary Rusk and the head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency about this.

I was wondering if the Senator from Alabama had any knowledge of such a proposal.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I can only say I know absolutely nothing about it. Anything I say now is purely speculative and gratuitous.

My own individual thinking is, if that is the full story, that what is suggested would be wholly impractical. I do not see how there could possibly be an abolition of national armies and a sole reliance placed upon the United Nations.

In that connection, I have urged for many years, as I think the Senator from Arizona knows, that there be a small police force at the command of the United Nations for the purpose of doing police duty, not for engaging in wars and fighting and combat other than that which is entailed in police duty. It would be a relatively small force.

The Senate unanimously voted in favor of that a few years ago, and at a second time in another Congress I believe a joint resolution to the same effect was passed through both Houses. It has become the policy of the United States to advocate a police force for use by the United Nations, but certainly nothing considered would envisage anything like the proposal mentioned.

I am stating my personal views, and I know absolutely nothing about the story.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator for his observations. I asked him to comment because he is so important in the present debate. I agree completely with the Senator about the need for a police force in the United Nations. I have advocated that often myself, and in fact I have voted for it whenever it has been before the Senate.

I pray the story is not true, for I cannot imagine any member of our Government ever suggesting that we should do away with our Armed Forces within a period of 9 years, or 90 years, but if the account is accurate, I am sure that what is suggested would meet with the complete disfavor of the people of this country.

I hope I shall get the reply I seek within a few hours, because the matter is to be a subject for discussion this afternoon, and I trust there will be a denial, or at least a complete explanation by Secretary Rusk and Mr. Foster.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield further, the Senator may know or may not know that Secretary Rusk is now appearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have just come from that hearing. That was the reason for my being slightly tardy. I am sure the Secretary is not available at the present time and will not be available until the hearings are concluded for the day.

ANTITRUST PROCEEDINGS ARE PERTINENT TO THE CAB'S PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH AN AIR TRANSPORTATION MONOPOLY IN THE STATES-ALASKA SERVICE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, recently, on the floor of the Senate, I called attention to the attempt by the Civil Aeronautics Board to create a monopoly situation with respect to air service between Alaska and the lower 48 States.

When an agency of the Federal Government seeks to limit air service to an area one-fifth the size of the other 48 States to one carrier it is time that other agencies of the Federal Government charged with the enforcement or the oversight of the enforcement of our antitrust laws should take a good hard look at such a proposal.

In his message to the Congress today, the President says with respect to mergers in the transportation field:

"Effective competition should be maintained among alternative forms of transportation, and, where traffic volume permits, between competing firms in the same mode of transportation."

It is clear from the Civil Aeronautics Board's order in Pacific Northwest-Alaska Air Service case—Docket No. 13463—that the Board is seeking to eliminate Pan American Airways from Alaska altogether, although Pan American was the pioneer in establishing service between Alaska and the lower 48 States, as well as being an unsubsidized carrier; to limit Northwest Airlines to merely stop off-and-on passengers incidental to its service to the Orient; to merge Pacific Northern Airlines and Alaska Airlines and to limit service from the lower 48 States to Alaska to service by this merged airline.

It is my conviction that such a result would not be in keeping with the objective outlined by the President in today's message on transportation.

In order that the antitrust features of the Board's proposed action may be properly reviewed, I have directed a letter to the Attorney General asking that he intervene in the case to protect the interests of the people of the other 48 States who should not be forced to rely upon the services of one airline in reaching the whole of the 49th State.

I ask unanimous consent that the communication which I addressed to the Attorney General be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 2, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
The Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: On March 19, 1962, the Civil Aeronautics Board issued Order No. E-18120 (Docket No. 13463) proposing a drastic revision in airline service between the lower 48 States and the State of Alaska. The Board's announced concept of the best manner in which Alaska should be connected by air with the other States is through one airline—a merged Pacific Northern Airlines and Alaska Airlines—with limited access through Northwest Airlines.

Except for limited access by motor over the Alaska Highway, Alaska-bound passengers are dependent on air transportation. If the Board has its way, those passengers will be dependent on one airline to reach an area one-fifth the size of the United States.

It does not seem to me that the powers granted to the Civil Aeronautics Board were intended to be so exerised as to result in such a large area being served by one carrier. I appreciate the fact that the Board can prevent ruinous competition among airlines. But that is not the situation here involved. If the elimination of competition were the function of the Board, then the simplest way to achieve that objective would be to grant an absolute monopoly to one company. That would not be tolerated with respect to the lower 48 States. Why should it be tolerated for the 49th State?

My purpose in writing you at this time is to request that you intervene in this matter on behalf of the United States to make certain that any decision of the Board properly represents the provisions of the antitrust laws enacted by the Congress.

I am enclosing copies of my remarks I have made on this subject on the floor of the Senate.

With all best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

THE PROPOSED TRADE BILL

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, as a Senator from the State of Maine I am very much concerned over the economic growth of our country. My State has been plagued by unemployment for many years and I realize that we must encourage general economic growth if we are to overcome many of our own economic difficulties.

I recognize that expanding international trade represents one important facet of the President's efforts to stimulate a dynamic domestic economy. However, although I agree with this objective, I think there are substantial problems involved in the trade bill, H.R. 9900, which must be resolved.

Last year, I introduced S. 1735, the Orderly Marketing Act. This proposed legislation would give the President the power to enter into trade agreements with exporting countries restricting the importation of commodities to a certain percentage of our domestic market where such commodities are produced at a substantially lower labor cost than applies in the United States. My bill has the twin advantage of defining injury far more explicitly than in existing trade legislation and of adopting the principle of permitting exporting countries to share in our expanding domestic market even in cases where our domestic industries are threatened with injury. I believe that trade legislation must take into account the peculiar problems of those industries which require high labor imports which compete with low wage industries in highly industrialized countries. In interstate commerce, we have used the minimum wage law to insure fair competition, as well as to protect workers from substandard working conditions.

In international trade we cannot impose a minimum wage requirement, but we can adjust trade in commodities produced by foreign industries with substandard wages so as to minimize the impact of such competition.

To take this position is not to embrace the cause of protectionism. It is, I believe, a realistic approach to our trade problem.

I have been very much encouraged by the attitude taken by the shoe industry on this issue. This industry, as well as others in the State of Maine is confronted by rapidly expanding imports from low-wage countries. The industry has substantial reason to be concerned over import threats. In spite of this, they have taken a very balanced and reasonable approach to the trade problem.

Today, Harold O. Toor appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means to testify on H.R. 9900. I was gratified by Mr. Toor's endorsement of S. 1735, my "Orderly Marketing Act" bill.

Because of the pertinence of Mr. Toor's statement to the debate on the national trade policy, I ask unanimous consent that his testimony be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF HAROLD O. TOOR FOR THE U.S. SHOE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, APRIL 5, 1962

I am Harold O. Toor, treasurer of the National Shoe Manufacturers Association, president of H. O. Toor Shoe Corp., and chairman of the board of the Freeman Shoe Corp. I am representing the National Shoe Manufacturers Association, the New England Shoe & Leather Association, and the St. Louis Shoe Manufacturers Association, which together include over 500 manufacturers producing at least 90 percent of all the footwear made in the United States.

The shoe manufacturing industry of the United States recognizes the necessity of a policy and a program of trade expansion, full employment, and a vigorous healthy economy as a national objective. We endorsed and supported the proposed Orderly Marketing Act of 1961, under which foreign manufacturers would share in the growth of our domestic market.

We would like to support the proposed trade expansion bill, H.R. 9900. We have grave doubts, however, that we could survive as a healthy industry under this proposed legislation unless there are improved safeguards for businesses such as ours which face increasingly severe competition from imports.

The leather shoe manufacturing industry is made up of approximately 850 companies with over 1,300 factories. These are located in communities represented by 262 congressional districts in 38 States.

It is not generally realized that shoe manufacturing is one of the most highly competitive industries in the United States. The intensive competition prevailing is reflected by the fact that the average wholesale factory value of shoes as measured by the Department of Commerce was $3.80 per pair in 1961, compared with $3.44 in 1950. Over 58 percent of the women's shoes sold each year retail below $6 a pair. Over 60 percent of all men's dress shoes retail under $10. And over 72 percent of all children's shoes retail under $6.

These shoe factories provide the major support, or at least are important contributors to the support, of the economic life of hundreds of communities. In Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, for example (according to the three-digit Standard Industrial Classification for 1959), shoe manufacturing was the largest manufacturing industry employer; in Missouri, it was the 2d largest; and in Wisconsin and Pennsylvania, 11th.

Shoe manufacturers and their suppliers have an annual payroll of somewhere between 350,000 and 400,000 employees, and the activities of these workers, it is estimated, have a direct or indirect effect on the welfare of a million or more citizens in these communities.

If imports continue to expand at the current rate then the total for 1965 would amount to 76.6 million pairs, or 11.7 percent of an estimated 1965 output of 630 million pairs. We believe this is a conservative calculation.

If imports of an estimated 68 million pairs of canvas-rubber footwear are added to leather imports, then total imports would represent 20.4 percent of the estimated U.S. production in 1965 of 710 million pairs of leather and canvas-rubber footwear.

We estimate that for every 10 million pairs of nonrubber footwear produced in the United States there are jobs for 4,100 workers in shoe manufacturing and for another 1,400 in the supplying trades, or a total of 5,500.

Imports, on this basis, will have absorbed a good part of our normal growth and displaced well over 30,000 jobs in the domestic shoe manufacturing and supplying industries over the period 1956 to 1965.

The question may be asked: How can this happen if the shoe industry in the United States is a modern industry, has built at least 80 new plants with over 3½ million square feet of space since 1950, is keenly competitive, is alert to changes in markets, and possesses an excess capacity of over 100 million pairs per year? The answer is simple.

Imports are increasing rapidly because there are wide differences in wage rates between the United States and the shoe-exporting countries of the world. It is simply a case of lower priced labor in foreign countries competing against higher priced labor in America. Wages in the United States are anywhere from two to five times wages in important shoe-exporting countries.

The technical structure of shoe manufacturing in the exporting countries is almost identical with our own. New and modern plants have been built with our aid. Shoe machinery and shoe technology are universal today. No one advanced country enjoys any substantial advantage over the other in machinery and methods. The rate of productivity, furthermore, in the larger factories making shoes for export in these countries is comparable with ours even though they make more of their components than we do and employ more people for what we would call unnecessary operations.

This is why the shoe manufacturing industry is vitally concerned with maintaining its present duties. These are the lowest of any important trading country in the world. Any reduction in our duties would speed up imports. Some countries now very easily jump the hurdle of our tariffs. As these tariffs become lower, other "runners" will also be able to jump over them.

A comparison of tariff schedules of the United States with those of foreign countries indicates further that there has been little reciprocity in previous trade negotiations. We believe at this stage of world industrial development that the United States must insist in its negotiations upon real reciprocity.

In summary, the footwear industry is an essential industry whose products were rationed in World War II. We believe it is necessary to establish some market arrangement for footwear similar to that outlined in S. 1735 which would provide for a sharing of our domestic market growth with foreign footwear producers on an orderly basis.

We recognize that Congress may pass a trade expansion program. We urge, therefore, that certain safeguards for domestic industry be included in the final form of such trade legislation. Our suggestions are as follows:

1. There should be incorporated in the bill a procedure establishing general specifications, without a preliminary determination as to national security, which would serve as guides to negotiators in developing orderly marketing arrangements for such industries as shoes with high labor content. Congress should enact specific provisions which would empower the Executive to negotiate and proclaim agreements establishing equitable market sharing arrangements where the facts and circumstances justify them.

2. The escape clause provisions of existing law should be preserved and strengthened.

3. The Tariff Commission should, under section 221 of the proposed bill, be directed to hold hearings and to report to the President in advance of negotiations the level of duty or import restriction on any article or categories of articles below which domestic producers of such articles would suffer serious injury from importation. The President should inform Congress where reductions are made in tariff duties or restrictions below such levels. Provision should also be made for industry advice and counsel in negotiation with other countries in conformity with the practice followed by other countries.

4. We approve the reaffirmation of the most-favored-nation principle contained in section 241 and 242 of Joint Resolution 9900. There has, however, been a lack of reciprocity in past trade agreements and a failure to enforce reciprocity by suspending most-favored-nation treatment with respect to any country which discriminates against U.S. commerce or pursues other policies that subvert the most-favored-nation principle. We submit that the principle of reciprocity should be rigorously enforced in future negotiations.

5. We approve the provisions of section 222 of the proposed bill which requires the President to reserve from negotiation for reduction or elimination of duty any article on which escape clause or national security proceedings are in progress. In addition, we would recommend that articles be reserved from negotiation until the President receives the advice of the Tariff Commission under section 221 of the proposed bill.

6. We recommend that section 212 of the bill be clarified to exclude footwear as an agricultural commodity or product thereof.

Finally, the American shoe industry goes on record as being in step with a recognition of the need for trade expansion—to help our own country and, doing so, to help the economy of friendly nations. We ask of Congress this consideration—a fair chance to survive as an industry in competition with countries having wage levels far below ours.

SUMMARY OF CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK ECONOMIC STUDY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, when controversy arose in my State about the best use of the area I propose for the Canyonlands National Park, the National Park Service asked the Bureau of Economic and Business Research of the University of Utah to make a full economic study of the question. The bureau did so, taking a sharp, objective look at the present economy of the five counties surrounding the proposed park, at the importance of tourism in the area today, at the probable number of visitors the new park might attract to the area and the amount of money they would spend, and finally at the present and possible future use of the natural resources within the boundaries of the proposed park.

In analyzing these data, the bureau took into consideration the rapid and growing demand for outdoor recreation, and the impact of that demand on other national parks, particularly those in areas as remote as Canyonlands.

The report has now been completed and released. Anyone who studies it dispassionately cannot help but conclude that it has been drawn with care and accuracy. I should like to discuss some of the estimates offered and conclusions reached, and to comment briefly on them.

The report shows that beyond any doubt, the best primary use of the spectacular area in question is for a national park. A park would bring both more money and more prestige to Utah. It would pour more than $10 million annually into southeastern Utah in new tourist spending with 15 years, and $16.5 million annually in 25 years. The report states:

> Total expenditures of visitors to the new park, as well as expenditures of the National Park Service should total $10.7 million during the first 5-year construction period. These expenditures will create personal income in the geographic area of the park of approximately $3.2 million during this 5-year period If indirect income, which will be created by the respending of the $3.2 million of directly created income, is included, the total monetary impact will amount to $5.6 million.
>
> By the 15th year of operation, 10 years after the completion of the construction period, total visitor expenditures should amount to over $10 million. In that single year, personal income created by these additional visitor expenditures and wage and salary expenditures of the National Park Service should result in direct total personal income created in the area of about $3 million. Thus by the 15th year, sufficient growth will have occurred that the total for the 1 year will be almost equal to the total for the first full 5 years of the park's existence.
>
> By the 25th year, total visitor expenditures should amount to over $16.5 million annually, with total personal income directly created amounting to $4.7 million.
>
> During the first 25 years of operation, it is expected that cumulative expenditures of visitors to the park and expenditures of the National Park Service should total almost $220 million and that the new personal income created because of these park and visitor expenditures should amount to almost $65 million for the 25-year period.

These estimates do not include expenpenditures by private individuals for tourist facilities outside park boundaries—motels, guest ranches, service stations—or for concessions within the park for boating, jeep trips, guides, and so forth, because of the difficulty of arriving at an approximation.

The report estimates that the park would be attracting 250,000 visitors annually within 6 years, 500,000 visitors a year in 10 years, and more than a million a year in 25 years. The daily expenditures of these visitors is estimated at $7, which is the average daily expenditures of present tourists in Utah, and the average length of stay in the park is estimated as 2 days.

The Bureau found the problem of accurately estimating the size of future tourist crowds a difficult one. These are the factors which were considered:

First, the designation "national park" and the high and unique appeal of Canyonlands would have considerable drawing power.

Second, existing patterns show tourists travel some distance to visit national parks. The report points out:

> It was found, for example, that 74 percent of the visitors to Grand Canyon National Park came from localities more than 500 miles away. Within a radius not much greater than this, particularly on the Pacific coast, there are presently large concentrations of population * * *. Thus the distance of the new park from large population centers should not be a serious handicap.

This point is elaborated in another section:

> Virtually all tourists visiting Canyonlands would come by car * * *. The relative distance of Canyonlands from major population centers means that it would get very little use by tourists making 1-day or even weekend trips (although Salt Lake City and Denver are within feasible weekend driving range). On the other hand, this remoteness from population concentrations does not seem to have prevented heavy tourist use in other cases where the intrinsic value of the tourist attraction was high, e.g., Carlsbad Caverns and Mesa Verde National Park. Of the visitors to Grand Canyon National Park, according to one estimate, 97 percent came from homes more than 300 miles away, and 74 percent came from more than 500 miles away. For Glacier National Park the figures were 77 percent and 57 percent, respectively.

Third, a comparison of traffic flows and attendance at other parks indicate that there are presently enough out-of-State cars on major transcontinental highways to generate an immediate attendance of 150,000 visitors to the new park as soon as it is opened. The report states:

> Traffic flows along U.S. 40 was the source of some 142,000 visitors to Dinosaur National Monument in 1960. The out-of-State flows on U.S. 50 in the vicinity of Canyonlands is heavier than on U.S. 40 near the Dinosaur Monument. It should also be borne in mind that U.S. 50 will become Interstate Highway 70, probably within the next 5 years, and will provide the shortest route from Denver to southern California, and the fastest route from Chicago to southern California. Thus, a substantial increase can be expected.

Fourth, by the time facilities and access roads are completed within Canyonlands, important new highways will have been built or hard-surfaced, and traffic flows on them will have increased traffic generally to the "golden circle" of national parks and monuments—the name applied to the outstanding concentration of scenic, archeological, and recreational outdoor attractions in southern Utah, northern Arizona, western Colorado, and northeastern New Mexico.

> For example, Arches National Monument is expected to attract 230,000 visitors by 1970; Mesa Verde National Park, almost 500,000 visitors, and most important of all, Glen Canyon recreation area will be attracting almost a million visitors a year by the 1966–1967 date.

Fifth, the climate of Canyonlands has many advantages—warm with an abundance of sunshine in the day, but no humidity, and cool nights.

Sixth, the increase in the demand for outdoor recreation which has been spelled out in great detail in the recent report of the Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission, indicates that space for outdoor living will be at a premium in coming years. It has been predicted that cars will be bumper-to-bumper on highways leading to our outdoor recreation spots.

In making the projections about Canyonlands, the Bureau naturally had to make many assumptions—assumptions that National Park Service construction of facilities and access roads would go forth on schedule, and that other important roads outside the park—such as the road from the park's north entrance to U.S. 160 north of Moab, and the road from the park's east entrance to U.S. 160 near Monticello—would be hard-surfaced. The Bureau also assumed that U.S. 70 will be completed, that the park when established will contain all the presently proposed scenic, scientific and recreational factors attractive to visitors and that developments in the Glen Canyon recreation area will proceed on approximately the same scale as at present.

I think it is safe to make these assumptions—I am convinced that the majority of the people of Utah want the Canyonlands National Park and they favor making all of the adjustments and undertaking all of the developments necessary to make it a success. I am confident also that the National Park Service will move as fast as appropriations allow to open up and improve the park area.

The Canyonlands controversy in my State has mainly swirled around the question of alternate uses for the land which would be encompassed within the park borders. The park would be approximately 30 miles long by 15 miles wide, or about one-seventh the size of Yellowstone. All of the land is now owned by the Federal Government or by the State of Utah. There would be no cash acquisition cost to the Federal Government. State lands would be exchanged for Federal lands located elsewhere in the State, which Federal lands are extensive and valuable. The State would benefit in being able to acquire valuable lands "blocked-up" to facilitate administration. Present State lands in the park area are noncontiguous and some are so remote as to be almost inaccessable.

One alternate use of the park area would be for grazing. The report states:

> Although the forage resources of the park lands are not great, large acreages are presently used for grazing, particularly for the grazing on Federal lands of 683 cattle, 6,436 sheep and 18 horses. The animal unit months of range use on Federal lands amount to 11,865 AUM's, for which annual grazing fees amount to about $2,254. There is also grazing on approximately 11,000 acres of State land, with fees approximately $275. Road and range improvements (reservoirs, spring development, corrals, storage facilities, etc.) have been made by the Bureau of Land Management in cooperation with local range users in the amount of about $6,000.

This means that the area is now sustaining about 10 sheep and 1 cow per every 500 acres. Thus, grazing is not now and never would be a major use. However, I realize that the right to graze sheep to even this limited extent is most valuable in an arid State like Utah, and I do not propose to take from anyone this right without allowing ample time for readjustment. My bill protects all present grazing rights for 25 years and for the lifetime of any member of the immediate family of the present holder of the right.

Since forage is scarce and water is limited to riverflows, this is not an area of abundant fish and game. The report puts it this way:

> There is reported to be Channel Catfish and other warm-water fish throughout the river system. On the land there are a small population of mountain sheep, a rather abundant number of beaver, fairly large numbers of mule deer, especially along the riverbeds, and substantial populations of chucker partridges.

Should—at any time—any of these species of wildlife become too populous for the limited forage in the park area, my bill provides for a controlled hunt.

The pervading issue on alternate use of the park is, of course, whether there are minerals of great value below its rugged surface. The report recognizes that this is the crux of alternate-use objections:

> The potential of mineral resources within the proposed park requires careful evaluation. The existence of possible mineral resources within the area have become significant because of the extensive uranium, petroleum, and potash developments in recent years within the southeastern Utah area.

Since I recognize the vast importance of not "locking up" any mineral resources there may be within the park, and placing them beyond possible development as they are needed, my bill leaves locatable minerals open to location, entry and patent—inclusive of land containing minerals—and would permit exploration for deposits of minerals subject to lease. The bill then provides that the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe regulations for mining and drilling to preserve the "scenic, scientific, and recreational values of the area."

The report has this to say about the bill's approach on mining:

> The provision of the bill departs somewhat from past national park policy which restricts or prohibits nonconforming use. It should be noted, however, that mining is permitted in Mount McKinley National Park in Alaska. Valid oil, gas, and mineral rights and leases covering some lands in the Everglades National Park in Florida were recognized at the time of the park establishment; other mineral rights have been provided for by the act of October 10, 1949 (63 Stat. 733), which was enacted after Everglades National Park had been established. Three national monuments (Glazier Bay in Alaska, Death Valley in California, and Organ Pipe Cactus in Arizona) and one additional memorial (Coronado in Arizona) permit mining under regulations by the Secretary of the Interior.

The report then attempts to evaluate the mineral potential within the proposed park, and to forecast the possible revenue from it for the State of Utah. Following are excerpts:

> Within the last 2 years an extensive potash deposit has been in the process of being developed by the Texas-Gulf Sulphur Co. at a cost of approximately $30 million. This is located on the Colorado River in the Cane Creek area which is situated within about 5 miles of the northeast corner of the park. A shaft for the development of an underground mine is being constructed as well as a mill and railroad facilities into the area to transport the finished product out.
>
> A recent U.S. Geological Survey study indicates that potash probably exists within the park. Whether or not the deposits are in commercial quantity can only be determined by further drilling and exploration.

I understand that the Texas-Gulf Sulphur Co., the mine and plant now going into production, will probably produce enough potash from Cane Creek and Seven Mile to meet our needs for many years—but, of course, we always need to know where future supplies are.

The report continues:

> The last production of uranium from within the park was in 1957. Prior to that date there was relatively small production from about five mines in two locations. Uranium prospects during the period of uranium exploration were discovered at 10 other locations. In the area immediately surrounding the park there has been production from 22 locations and prospects at an additional 2 locations. Thus the possibility of unknown deposits exists.

Again, I feel I should point out that there is almost no demand for new domestic sources of uranium at this time.

As to other minerals within the park area, the report says this:

> The mineral records of San Juan County at Monticello were analyzed and a tabulation made of all "active claims." Active claims for the purposes of this report were designated at those filed in 1960 and 1961 as well as older claims on which assessment work has been done for these 2 years. Although only half of the data have been analyzed at this writing, the results show only a total of * * * 54 active claims fell within the area of the proposed park.

The most vigorous opposition to the park has been based on the contention that there may be great reservoirs of oil and gas under its acres.

The report has this to say:

> Virtually all of the area within the park is at present under oil and gas lease. There have been a total of 11 wells drilled within the park and there is one producing well brought in within the park boundaries during February, 1962, with a daily producing capacity of 600 barrels.

I feel I should interpose here to state that I have amended my bill to exclude the well and the area around it from the park. The well is located on the northeast border—it was necessary only to adjust the boundaries by a few miles to eliminate it from the park.

The report continues:

> Since 1955, 62 wells drilled in the area surrounding the park have resulted in three producing wells in the Big Flat area immediately to the north of the proposed park.
>
> Another indication of oil and gas interest in the park is the unit agreements which have been effected. Within the general area, a total of 30 unit agreements have been made. Some have been terminated, but six are in existence in the area immediately outside the park and one exists within the park.
>
> Geologists interviewed in the preparation of this report have stated that oil and gas prospects within the park are good, but they also said that the extent and size of any discovery cannot be determined at this time.

The report then tries to answer the big if in the park controversy. What if there is oil under Canyonland? How much would it be worth?

This is the conclusion the experts in the Bureau drew:

> In making such an analysis a careful study was made of the value to the State of Utah and the local area if another Aneth oilfield (Utah's major oilfield) were discovered within the park. If such a discovery were certain, the economic value would total about $156 million. About half of this or $78 million would accrue to the State (in the form of royalty payments, severence tax, and corporation franchise tax) and the balance of these benefits or $78 million, would accrue to the local area (in the form of property taxes and wage and salary payments). If there were only a 50–50 chance of finding another Aneth oilfield within the proposed park area, a prudent man would be willing to pay only half the total value of a "certain" oilfield. If there were only a 25-percent chance of finding such a field, the value would be worth only about one-fourth of the full amount.
>
> Oil drilling experience throughout the United States may be used upon which a probability calculation of finding a large oilfield may be based. The American Petroleum Institute reported that in the years 1952 through 1955 (for which data are available) 5 of the 14,178 new field wildcat wells drilled resulted in the discovery of fields with a reserve of 50 million barrels or more. It is calculated on the basis of this discovery experience that the value of the probability of finding a large field within the Canyonlands is worth about $2.2 million. To this value of the "chance" of finding a large oilfield must be added the $2.2 million benefits to the local area because of exploration expenditures. Thus the probability value of the economic benefits to the area of finding a field the size of Aneth is estimated to be about $4.4 million. This probability value of $4.4 million of an uncertain oilfield can be compared with the economic value to the local area which would result from a park.
>
> However, a comparison can be drawn between a certain oilfield and a proposed park not just between an uncertain oilfield and a park. One would need to measure the income stream produced by both over a given period of time. As noted above, the benefits which would accrue to the local area from a large oilfield were estimated at about $78 million. On a relatively modest scale of operation, the local income produced by the park during the period of construction and the first 25-year period of operation would amount to about $65 million, but in another 3 years, with no increase in use, it would have produced an amount equal to the $78 million. The difference would be that the oilfield at the end of its life would be exhausted whereas the park would go on producing income into the indefinite future.
>
> If actual park visits should prove to be higher than the estimated visits, the economic impact of park attendance would be even greater than indicated. If the attendance estimates of this report are high, or if interrupted by periods of decreased attendance, it would take longer for the income stream from tourist spending to equal the benefits to the local area of an oil and gas development.

After carefully analyzing all the data available, there is only one sensible conclusion that can be drawn from the economic study on Canyonlands—which is that the economic potential to Utah from the park is greater than from any other use. There is an assured income in tourist dollars that such a magnificent and widely advertised national park would bring. It would be foolish to turn down those tourist dollars, along with the prestige and splendid recreational opportunities for Utahans and all other Americans which the park would provide on the gamble that unlimited mineral prospecting and drilling for oil might, on some distant day, turn up a great strike—a strike larger and more rewarding than any found yet in Utah. No park or little spot parks would lose for Utah an assured continuing income from tourists, and would not assure mineral production. Canyonlands National Park would assure tourist income and permit continued exploration for minerals as a secondary use which would not injure or degrade the park.

The area proposed for the Canyonlands National Park amounts to less than three-fifths of 1 percent of Utah's 54.3 million acres. But this small area could have the almost magic drawing power of a national park. The Moss bill would open up an area which is now almost inaccessible and which only a handful of people have ever seen.

It would bring a new surge of prosperity to the five Utah counties closest to the park and better times to all Utah. It would literally be a "mint" according to the Salt Lake Tribune news story on the economic report.

And finally, it would give to the people of these United States a new and unique area for play and recreation—an area which is almost indescribable in its unsullied beauty and grandeur, in its majestic sweep and timelessness. I will continue to do everything within my power to create the Canyonlands National Park.

U.S. TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years, the U.S. transportation system, serving as an economic lifeline, has grown into a great, intricately complex, water-rail-road-air network for trade and commerce.

Realistically, the Nation has found it difficult to adequately coordinate transportation policies administered by separate agencies and pertaining to differing modes of transportation.

Representing the Great Lakes region, I have a special interest in improving and updating national transportation policies.

The St. Lawrence Seaway, completed in 1959, opened a new door of trade opportunity for the great industrial-agricultural complex of the Midwest.

Unfortunately, however, governmental and nongovernmental trade patterns have not yet been adequately revised to take full advantage of the seaway route for trade and commerce. The creation of more uniform policies throughout our system would, I believe, result in fairer treatment of all segments of the economy and areas of the Nation in the shipment of goods under Federal programs, millions of dollars in savings to U.S. taxpayers, and provide for more efficient and economical nongovernmental, as well as governmental, transportation.

For these reasons I, joined by seven other Senators earlier this week, urged the release by the President of a Department of Commerce study on U.S. transportation system completed in November 1961. The purpose was to enable the Nation to utilize the information as a launching pad for efforts to improve practices and procedures.

The President's message on transportation today—coincidental in timing—will, I hope, provide a key to improving such procedures and policies for better meeting the ever-growing needs of the Nation.

I request unanimous consent to have the jointly signed letter printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. John F. Kennedy,
President of the United States.

Dear Mr. President: We, as Senators from the Great Lakes region, respectfully urge release of the study by the Department of Commerce of U.S. transportation policies—which, we understand, was completed in November 1961.

Over the years, the U.S. transportation system—serving as an economic lifeline—has grown into a great, intricately complex, water, road, rail, air network for trade and commerce.

Realistically, the Nation has found it difficult to adequately coordinate transportation policies—administered by separate agencies—and pertaining to differing modes of transportation.

Representing the Great Lakes region, we have a special interest in improving and updating of national transportation policies.

The St. Lawrence Seaway—completed in 1959—opened a new door of trade opportunity for the great industrial-agricultural complex of the Midwest. Unfortunately, however, governmental and nongovernmental trade patterns have not yet been adequately revised to take full advantage of the seaway route for trade and commerce.

Recognizing this situation, we recommended, in 1961, a special study on Defense Department policies relating to the shipment of military goods overseas. In response, the Department appointed a special task force to undertake a comprehensive analysis of its shipping procedures and policies. Completed in January 1962, the study revealed that—within the Department—there exists a wide range of differing practices and often uncoordinated policies.

Let us cite some examples. According to the study: Wide discrepancies exist in inland freight rates; e.g., as between Midwest to Atlantic and gulf ports; and Midwest to Great Lakes ports; there were instances in which procurement agencies failed completely to consider Great Lakes ports in their contracting procedures for shipment of materials; there is a lack of information outlets to governmental shippers on the advantages of Great Lakes Seaway shipping; approximately $840,000 could have been saved by use of Great Lakes ports for shipment of military cargo during 1961—if all factors were considered—including making available adequate amounts of American-flag shipping.

The creating of more uniform policies, then—not just within a single department, but throughout our system—would, we believe, result in: Fairer treatment of all segments of the economy and areas of the Nation in the shipment of goods under Federal programs; millions of dollars in savings to U.S. taxpayers; and provide for a more efficient and economical nongovernmental, as well as governmental, transportation system.

For these reasons, then, we respectfully urge early release of the Department of Commerce study of U.S. transportation which, we understand, awaits your approval.

If adequate in scope, analysis, objectivity, and constructive recommendations the study, we believe, will provide a key to improving procedures and policies for better meeting the ever-growing needs of a rapidly progressing nation.

With appreciation for the consideration we know you will give this matter, we remain,

Sincerely,

Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Frank J. Lausche, of Ohio; Patrick V. McNamara, of Michigan; Vance Hartke, of Indiana; William Proxmire, of Wisconsin; Stephen M. Young, of Ohio.

ADDRESS BY HON. THEODORE R. McKELDIN BEFORE PILGRIM CHAPTER OF DeMOLAY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record the remarks of the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin to the Pilgrim chapter, Order of DeMolay, in Harrisburg, Pa., on March 31, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Theodore R. McKeldin, Pilgrim Chapter, Order of DeMolay, Harrisburg, Pa., March 31, 1962

In the past three decades I have left my home many times to keep speaking engagements over the length and breadth of this country, but when I come to Harrisburg to visit with the Pilgrim chapter of DeMolay, it is not like leaving home at all; indeed, it is like coming home.

Since 1939, when I addressed your anniversary banquet in the old Harrisburg Consistory Building, I have been with you at your annual dinners a full score of times—missing only three in all the intervening years—and I missed those three only with great reluctance because of the pressures of official business or for other causes that could not be surmounted at the times.

I say I missed them with great reluctance because I truly have come to enjoy these visits—and to keep up with old acquaintances—and to make new friends as your order grows with the rising generations.

Even before 1939—the year before—in 1938—I was close by, in Hershey, to address the annual Conclave of the Associated Chapters of DeMolay in Pennsylvania.

Through those wonderful years, I have made many friends among you—some active now in the prime of their lives and their years of accomplishments—some with the happy satisfaction of years of community building and human advancement behind them—and some of fond memory who have gone to their heavenly rewards.

I would like to name all of those friends, even as I see many of you seated before me, and with me here at the head table. Time, of course, prohibits that. But two stand out in my pleasant and grateful thoughts tonight as I know they stand out in your affections. One, happily, is among us—a great leader—a great Mason of national note and accomplishment—a great pioneer of DeMolay. He is, of course, the esteemed Wilbur L. Minich, the adviser of Pilgrim chapter—and the only member of the original advisory council who still is associated with the chapter.

He assumed that office with the founding of the chapter on March 3, 1925—only 6 years after the Order of DeMolay was founded in Kansas City, Mo., in 1919. And since that date more than 4,300 boys and young men—15 to 21 years old—have been initiated into the chapter and the great aims and purposes of the order. What a magnificent tribute to man. What a wonderful succession of generations he helped to launch or maintain on the high road of patriotism—love of home—love of family—and respect and understanding between parents and children.

The honors that have come through the years of his labors have been well deserved by Wilbur Minich. He was invested with the Honorary Legion of Honor and the Cross of Honor by the supreme council. He was awarded the Founder's Cross by the late Frank S. Land, the founder of DeMolay. He was district deputy of the supreme council for southeast central Pennsylvania from 1932 to 1959. He received the 33d degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry in Boston, Mass. in 1948. And he is a past officer of all York Rite Masonic bodies in Harrisburg. When he was worshipful master of Harrisburg Lodge No. 629, I was honored to be the 40th anniversary banquet speaker on May 12, 1943. A great man among the great of Freemasonry, and I know that all of you join me in my tribute to him tonight.

Unhappily, the other who stands out so vividly in my memory among these familiar scenes is with us no more—but he will live as long as there is Masonry and an Order of DeMolay in Harrisburg. He will live in his works, his accomplishments and his contagious enthusiasm which never can die. He, of course, was Ralph M. Lehr.

Ralph Lehr became a member and chairman of the advisory council of Pilgrim chapter in 1937, and served in that capacity until he died a year ago last month. There was another Mason to warrant our pride in the great organization and the men who made it great. I know I was proud of his friendship—proud, indeed, of just knowing him as I attended the induction ceremonies in Philadelphia when he became grand master of Masons in Pennsylvania in 1954. In that year, too, he was invested with the DeMolay Honorary Legion of Honor. He had become a 33d degree Mason in the Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry in Cincinnati in 1943. He, too, held office in all the York Rite Masonic bodies in Harrisburg. I was the speaker at his banquet in 1930 when he was worshipful master of Harrisburg lodge.

Yes, there is a great role to be played by Freemasonry and DeMolay in the precarious and dangerous years that lie before us—and if we are prepared to cope with the part, it is because of the leadership and inspiration we are receiving today from such men as Wilbur Minich—and because of the undying lessons of love and loyalty and faith in our God that came to us from men like Ralph M. Lehr.

SMITH KLINE & FRENCH FOREIGN FELLOWSHIPS FOR MEDICAL STUDENTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am delighted that three medical students from Pennsylvania have been awarded Smith Kline & French foreign fellowships for medical students.

They are William E. Lathan, a student at Hahnemann Medical College, whose mother, Mrs. Stanley E. Lathan, resides at 5313 Kershaw Street, Philadelphia Pa.; Lewis Merklin, Jr., a student at Temple University School of Medicine, whose parents, Dr. and Mrs. Lewis Merklin, reside at 42 Derwen Road, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.; Joel J. Nobel, a student at the Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, whose mother, Dr. Golda R. Nobel, resides at 2006 Delancey Place, Philadelphia, Pa. They will spend several months during 1962 working in Ilesha, Nigeria; New Delhi, India; and Kathmandu, Nepal, respectively.

I understand that 92 American medical students have received Smith & French fellowships since the program was originated. It sends senior medical students to remote areas of the world for about 10 weeks of work and study. They learn how medicine is practiced in different lands. They study diseases which are rare in the United States and learn at first hand how acute is the need for medical knowledge in other countries. Not the least of their roles is to serve as good-will ambassadors for our country abroad. The program is sponsored by Smith Kline & French Laboratories and is administered by the Association of American Medical Colleges.

I congratulate the students on their achievements and Smith Kline & French for its important contribution to person-to-person diplomacy of the highest order.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

News release from his office, dated March 21, 1962, and distributed to all North Dakota newspapers, radio and television stations, dealing with sundry agricultural subjects.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE

Under the previous order, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted under the unanimous-consent agreement be under the control of the Senator who will be in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], instead of under the control of the majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator in charge of the bill now before the Senate, I yield from the time on the bill such time as the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] desires.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am grateful to my able friend.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized.

HOLLYWOOD MOTION PICTURE AND TELEVISION MUSEUM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on June 1, 1961, I had the honor to report on the first phase of the efforts of the Hollywood Motion Picture and Television Museum Commission, an official agency of the county of Los Angeles, the chairman of which is a distinguished leader in the motion picture industry and my good friend, Mr. Sol Lesser.

Members of the commission and other local government officials met at that time with representatives of many schools and educational institutions in southern California. They sought to elicit suggestions so that this museum, which is being established to record the achievements of these two great mediums of communication, might make a true cultural and educational contribution to the people, both young and old, of my State and Nation.

I was pleased to be helpful in enlisting the support and cooperation of Secretary of Defense McNamara and the armed services. The Department of Defense has cooperated wholeheartedly with the commission. As a result, a Government film and tape section will become a permanent part of this museum. This is fitting recognition of the fine work which has been done in this area by the various armed services as well as other Government departments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two letters pertaining to this particular aspect of the project be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
HOLLYWOOD MOTION PICTURE AND
TELEVISION MUSEUM COMMISSION,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 21, 1962.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: I have the honor and considerable pleasure of reporting to you:

1. The Los Angeles County Commission for the Hollywood Motion Picture, Television, Radio, and Recording Museum made the attached report from our governmental film and tape committee a part of our permanent minutes:

"As an expression of the gratitude of the Hollywood Museum Commission to Hon. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, and to all those whose names are listed in the report."

2. Our commission also adopted the recommendation:

"The Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County be informed of this action of our commission with the request that the chairman of the board of supervisors express, to the Secretary of Defense, appreciation on behalf of the people of Los Angeles County."

3. The Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County approved this recommendation of our commission and the public expression of gratitude in the letter of March 15, 1962, from the chairman of the board of supervisors to Hon. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense.

Our gratitude to Secretary McNamara, to you, Senator KUCHEL, and to all the others listed in the report of our committee, is now a part of the permanent records of our commission and of our Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

We believe that our citizens should know when there is such cooperation in the creation of a public service institution as our Hollywood museum.

Sincerely,

SOL LESSER,
Chairman, Hollywood Museum Commission.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
HOLLYWOOD MOTION PICTURE &
TELEVISION MUSEUM COMMISSION,
Los Angeles, Calif., March 7, 1962.

Mr. SOL LESSER,
Chairman, Los Angeles County-Hollywood Motion Picture & Television Museum Commission, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the committee on governmental film and tape, I am pleased to report to you that the effective establishment of the Government film and tape section of the Hollywood Museum is fully assured.

The visiting public from all over the United States and from all parts of the world will find here, when the Hollywood Museum is completed and open to the public, historical and educational collections and exhibits demonstrating the outstanding achievements and service, over the years, of our military service units in motion pictures, television, radio, and recording arts.

We state, without hesitation, that we are assured of all this, because of the remarkable and wholehearted cooperation we have received from the moment the Secretary of Defense received your original request.

You, as chairman of the museum commission, attended some of the meetings and witnessed the dedication and inspiring understanding of representatives of the U.S. Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force who are working on this project.

Their cooperation and inspiration are insuring that the Hollywood Museum shall also become a national monument honoring the men and women of our Armed Forces who are rendering such outstanding service in the great field of communications. It will also assure a tremendous educational stimulus to adults and children alike.

Therefore, we earnestly recommend that this report be noted in the minutes of your meeting as a record of gratitude to the following:

Hon. Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, who so fully understood our public purpose and gave leadership and inspiration to the whole program.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, U.S. Senator from California, for his advice and active cooperation.

Hon. Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), who has designated the means and personnel by which our aims are already being realized.

Mr. Bertram Kalisch, Chief, Audio-Visual Division of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, for calling the first meeting at the Pentagon and for organizing and counseling the work of this committee from the very beginning.

Also to the following people who have represented their respective units effectively and who are rendering the creative service that assures the high order of success of this operation:

Department of Defense personnel, Pentagon: Mr. Donald Baruch, Office of the Under Secretary; Mr. Norman Hatch, Office of the Under Secretary; Mr. James A. Moses, Army Pictorial Service; Lt. Col. T. J. Saxon, U.S. Marine Corps; Maj. Robert Loesch, U.S. Army; Maj. John Walker, U.S. Air Force; Lt. Dale Patterson, U.S. Navy.

U.S. Naval Photographic Center, Anacostia: Capt. Howard W. Crews, U.S. Navy, commanding officer; Mr. Walter Evans, Naval Film Production Office.

Armed Forces personnel, Los Angeles—military liaison group to the museum: Col. James Chesnutt, U.S. Army, chairman; Brig. Gen. James Hunter, U.S. Air Force; Col. Lothar Sibert, U.S. Army, Armed Forces Radio and Television Service; Capt. Pierre Sands, U.S. Navy, Navy Motion Picture Office; Lt. Col. Robert Blauvelt, U.S. Army; Lt. Col. Clement Stadlen, U.S. Marine Corps; Lt. Cmdr. Frank Coghlan, U.S. Navy.

Museum governmental film and tape committee: William Burke, 1961 commander, American Legion; Alfred Chamie, treasurer, Motion Picture Producers Association; Bart Conrad, Freelance William Hendricks, Warner Bros. Studio; Frank McCarthy, Twentieth Century-Fox Studio; Peter Smith, MGM Studio.

Sincerely yours,

JULIAN LESSER,
Chairman, Governmental Film and Tape Committee.

IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS ENTITLED TO AID—LET THE CONGRESS LIVE UP TO THE LAW

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for too long a time conflicting convictions and differing opinions have frustrated earnest efforts to frame legislation which would bring the most effective cooperation of Federal, State, and local agencies to meet the crisis and to remedy deficiencies in public education in America.

I deplore the inability of sincere, determined citizens to reach agreement on a sound, equitable plan to avert tragic neglect of the growing generations who are being shortchanged in the form of overcrowding, inadequate attention, part-time sessions, and insufficient facilities.

While an impasse appears to have been encountered in dealing with the broad public education problem, the Congress repeatedly has recognized a particular obligation upon the Federal Government to assist in the construction and operation of schools in what have been termed "federally impacted districts." There are some 4,000 of these in our Nation and the number of pupils is growing annually at a rate making it almost impossible to obtain current statistics.

The Congress last year saw fit to enact legislation continuing the impacted aid program, in simple justice to hard-pressed, overburdened districts which must accommodate substantial numbers of children of parents in the Armed Forces and employed in Federal service.

Experience has demonstrated that the funds appropriated last year are insufficient to make full payment of the entitlements to school districts under the law which we enacted in solemn recognition of an undeniable duty.

Within a few days, a supplemental appropriations bill will be before this body, to supply urgently needed funds to avert assorted deficiencies and to meet unexpected needs during the current fiscal year. This measure will be a vehicle by which the Congress can do simple justice to those harassed school superintendents and boards of trustees who will find it impossible otherwise to bridge the gap between revenues and expenses.

I trust that the Senate will acknowledge our moral obligation and provide in that bill the required $15,707,000 to avert an otherwise severe cut in payments under Public Law 874, providing aid for school operations, as well as $7,092,000 to prevent a smaller but no less painful shortage in funds for construction assistance under Public Law 815.

The failure to include a total of approximately $23 million in the supplemental bill will do violent injury to taxpayers in every one of our 50 States. With the largest number of federally connected students, my own State of California inevitably will be most grievously affected.

I have been furnished with tables showing the precise amounts required in each category of funds to do justice to each individual State. I ask unanimous consent to include these statements as part of my remarks. I invite my colleagues to compute the degree of hardship which will be imposed upon their own constituents and the children attending their schools.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Payments to school districts by State, Public Law 874, as amended, fiscal year 1962 (estimates)

[Dollars]

State or territory (1)	Amount available fiscal year 1962 appropriation (2)	Total estimated requirements fiscal year 1962 (3)	Difference, col. 3 −col. 2
Total	231, 293, 000	247, 000, 000	15, 707, 000
Alabama	4, 968, 700	5, 323, 700	355, 000
Alaska	7, 444, 800	7, 985, 400	540, 600
Arizona	5, 002, 900	5, 366, 200	363, 300
Arkansas	1, 043, 500	1, 119, 300	75, 800
California	39, 500, 400	42, 338, 000	2, 837, 600
Colorado	6, 108, 500	6, 552, 100	443, 600
Connecticut	2, 005, 200	2, 150, 800	145, 600
Delaware	934, 300	952, 800	18, 500
Florida	7, 189, 800	7, 632, 800	443, 000
Georgia	7, 326, 000	7, 757, 800	431, 800
Hawaii	4, 849, 100	5, 201, 200	352, 100
Idaho	1, 647, 800	1, 767, 500	119, 700
Illinois	3, 573, 100	3, 829, 800	256, 700
Indiana	1, 003, 800	1, 076, 700	72, 900
Iowa	784, 200	841, 100	56, 900
Kansas	5, 233, 700	5, 613, 800	380, 100
Kentucky	4, 451, 800	4, 555, 800	104, 000
Louisiana	991, 400	1, 063, 400	72, 000
Maine	1, 797, 900	1, 928, 300	130, 400
Maryland	8, 957, 000	9, 607, 500	650, 500
Massachusetts	6, 553, 800	7, 006, 100	452, 300
Michigan	1, 437, 600	1, 521, 700	84, 100
Minnesota	561, 100	601, 800	40, 700
Mississippi	1, 611, 900	1, 729, 000	117, 100
Missouri	2, 561, 100	2, 747, 000	185, 900
Montana	1, 690, 000	1, 812, 700	122, 700
Nebraska	2, 049, 800	2, 198, 700	148, 900
Nevada	1, 513, 800	1, 623, 700	109, 900
New Hampshire	1, 299, 200	1, 393, 500	94, 300
New Jersey	4, 084, 700	4, 376, 600	291, 900
New Mexico	5, 000, 500	5, 363, 600	363, 100
New York	5, 694, 400	6, 074, 400	380, 000
North Carolina	5, 285, 500	5, 473, 300	187, 800
North Dakota	407, 000	436, 600	29, 600
Ohio	5, 331, 700	5, 718, 900	387, 200
Oklahoma	7, 934, 900	8, 511, 100	576, 200
Oregon	997, 500	1, 069, 100	71, 600
Pennsylvania	5, 376, 300	5, 743, 500	367, 200
Rhode Island	1, 951, 000	2, 120, 700	169, 700
South Carolina	3, 717, 100	3, 978, 700	261, 600
South Dakota	2, 085, 300	2, 236, 600	151, 300
Tennessee	2, 315, 400	2, 483, 500	168, 100
Texas	13, 303, 600	14, 269, 700	966, 100
Utah	1, 979, 100	2, 122, 800	143, 700
Vermont	111, 700	119, 800	8, 100
Virginia	18, 313, 900	19, 472, 800	1, 158, 900
Washington	8, 823, 000	9, 463, 700	640, 700
West Virginia	136, 500	146, 400	9, 900
Wisconsin	650, 200	697, 400	47, 200
Wyoming	792, 900	850, 500	57, 600
Guam	817, 700	877, 100	59, 400
Puerto Rico	1, 930, 000	1, 930, 000	----------
Virgin Islands	55, 900	60, 000	4, 100
Wake Island	105, 000	105, 000	----------

Construction aid by State, Public Law 815, as amended, fiscal year 1962 (estimates)

State or territory (1)	Amount available fiscal year 1962 appropriation (2)	Total estimated requirement fiscal year 1962 (3)	Difference between cols. 2 and 3
Total	$54, 850, 000	$61, 942, 000	$7, 092, 000
Alabama	1, 427, 300	1, 646, 400	219, 100
Alaska	2, 361, 100	2, 447, 300	86, 200
Arizona	1, 379, 500	1, 552, 900	173, 400
Arkansas	542, 900	626, 300	83, 400
California	7, 923, 200	9, 039, 900	1, 116, 700
Colorado	478, 400	551, 800	73, 400
Connecticut	690, 200	796, 200	106, 000
Delaware	----------	----------	----------
Florida	433, 100	499, 600	66, 500
Georgia	816, 000	941, 300	125, 300
Hawaii	1, 515, 600	1, 748, 300	232, 700
Idaho	523, 700	604, 100	80, 400
Illinois	84, 800	97, 800	13, 000
Indiana	769, 200	887, 300	118, 100
Iowa	273, 900	316, 000	42, 100
Kansas	1, 693, 400	1, 845, 900	152, 500
Kentucky	886, 700	907, 700	21, 000
Louisiana	----------	----------	----------
Maine	1, 061, 600	1, 147, 800	86, 200
Maryland	1, 904, 800	2, 197, 200	292, 400
Massachusetts	1, 104, 800	1, 166, 900	62, 100
Michigan	2, 575, 900	2, 971, 400	395, 500
Minnesota	12, 800	14, 800	2, 000
Mississippi	798, 300	920, 900	122, 600
Missouri	1, 433, 200	1, 522, 700	89, 500
Montana	886, 300	1, 022, 400	136, 100
Nebraska	593, 700	684, 900	91, 200
Nevada	258, 800	298, 500	39, 700
New Hampshire	286, 700	330, 700	44, 000
New Jersey	848, 600	978, 900	130, 300
New Mexico	3, 509, 400	4, 048, 200	538, 800
New York	2, 020, 800	2, 300, 000	279, 200
North Carolina	991, 400	1, 143, 600	152, 200
North Dakota	677, 700	781, 700	104, 000
Ohio	619, 600	714, 700	95, 100
Oklahoma	1, 988, 200	2, 267, 300	279, 100
Oregon	572, 900	660, 900	88, 000
Pennsylvania	----------	----------	----------
Rhode Island	171, 200	197, 500	26, 300
South Carolina	729, 000	814, 800	85, 800
South Dakota	566, 400	653, 400	87, 000
Tennessee	207, 000	238, 800	31, 800
Texas	2, 886, 700	3, 329, 900	443, 200
Utah	452, 900	522, 400	69, 500
Vermont	----------	----------	----------
Virginia	2, 023, 500	2, 272, 800	249, 300
Washington	1, 450, 100	1, 618, 600	168, 500
West Virginia	----------	----------	----------
Wisconsin	20, 400	23, 500	3, 100
Wyoming	$169, 600	$195, 600	$26, 000
Guam	1, 124, 700	1, 297, 400	172, 700
Puerto Rico	195, 000	195, 000	----------
Virgin Islands	----------	----------	----------
Wake Island	----------	----------	----------
Technical services	900, 000	900, 000	----------

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, less than a year ago, in trying to stave off threatened undermining of the schools which educate federally connected children, I told this Senate that "local school districts ought not to suffer the heavy additional financial blow which is about to fall upon them. Property owners in most instances cannot bear the burden." With gratification, I joined in passage of a bill which did promise to ward off such a blow. And now, because the executive branch was unable to prevent such action by Congress, we find that the injury is about to be inflicted by failure to request a supplemental appropriation.

I submit, Mr. President, that if the administration still feels the Federal Government does not have the obligation which I—and an overwhelming majority in both this and the other body—feel it does, the honest, the truly American way is to renew efforts to change the basic law, not to rob our children. To ignore the basic fact that 1961 estimates have been exceeded and to decline blithely to request funds necessary to discharge an obligation is, in my view, unconscionable as well as tragic.

Since it became obvious available funds will be 8 percent short of the total needed, and apparently the requested 1963 total would mean an even greater deficiency next year of about 19 percent, I have been deluged with pathetic appeals from my State. School authorities up and down California have described to me in graphic terms the frustrating problem confronting them. The California State superintendent of public instruction as early as February warned me of the consequences of failure by Congress to vote these deficiency appropriations. I ask unanimous consent that his letter to me may be printed as part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Sacramento, Calif., February 27, 1962.
Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: In a letter dated February 15, 1962, from me, your support to meet the current year's deficit in Public Laws 874 and 815 by a supplemental appropriation was urged. The letter indicated, and we understood that such a supplemental appropriation was being recommended by the U.S. Office of Education. Additional information received indicates that no such recommendation will be made by that agency.

It seems apparent that independent congressional action must be taken to amend a current appropriation bill if full entitlement under the law is to be made available to federally impacted school districts. The current year's deficit in Public Law 874 funds amounts to about $15.7 million in total and means $2.5 to $3 million to California school districts educating pupils connected with federally owned property.

We further understand that the amount to be appropriated for fiscal 1963 is the amount now appropriated for fiscal 1962. This means an impending deficit in fiscal 1963 of 19 percent. California districts will receive more than $6 million less under Public Law 874 than the entitlement computed under the law would lead them to anticipate.

We are sorry that our prior understanding of the facts proved incorrect. We urge you to take any appropriate action that will result in an appropriation permitting the payment of full entitlement under Public Laws 874 and 815 for fiscal years 1962 and 1963.

Sincerely yours,

ROY E. SIMPSON.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, from the literally scores of telegrams, letters, and resolutions reaching me from California, I have received a new insight into the importance of this program. For instance, I should like to point out that in Alameda County any welshing on our promised assistance will be felt in 28 of 35 districts, four-fifths of them all. In the important naval-base city of San Diego, with the greatest number of federally connected students in a single community of the Nation, these funds cover the cost of educating 25 percent of the regular daily attendance.

The Congress cannot overlook the fact that school districts, following our extension of the law last year, made their plans and formulated their budgets with rightful expectation the Federal Government would keep its word. This was emphasized to me in one letter which said:

> We plan our educational program on anticipated income from three major sources: Federal, State, and local. Staff members are employed, and materials, supplies, and equipment are purchased on these budget estimates. When one source of budgeted revenue is curtailed, it creates a tremendous financial problem because prior commitments have been made.

Another school board tells me it has "already made cutbacks in our budget for the 1962–63 fiscal year and unless we can expect receipt of some form of Federal aid we will have to make still further reductions." And still another comments they "cannot complete our educational program planning and cannot accurately determine our budget because of the deficiency problem." The story is well told in a sentence from a school official adjacent to Vandenberg Air Force Base saying:

> Eight thousand and forty-six dollars and sixty-five cents is a lot of money to a small school district that has a rather low tax valuation and that must provide for federally impacted children.

Doubtless comments of these types could be multiplied many times by worried education officials in every section of this land. In my view, the figures which I have received speak eloquently of the reason why these supplemental funds must be voted.

FALLOUT SHELTER SCHEMES—LET US STOP FURTHER WASTE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] as much time on the bill as he may desire.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I believe I shall need 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, last August in the midst of the Berlin crisis, the President requested and the Congress appropriated $207,600,000 for surveys for fallout shelters in Government buildings. At that time I reluctantly opposed the administration and attempted unsuccessfully to strike that appropriation from the Department of Defense appropriation bill. It was my belief then and it is now that this expenditure will prove an utter waste of taxpayers' money.

At that time no hearings were held in the Senate Committee on Appropriations regarding this request. The Secretary of Defense himself admitted that the subcommittee involved was not afforded the opportunity of giving its customary and careful consideration to this appropriation. Although the international situation is no less critical, the hysteria and fear of last summer have subsided. We can now calmly appraise the results of this hastily approved appropriation.

I assert that not one American is one whit safer in event of nuclear war as the result of this $207 million expenditure. Furthermore, the appropriation of this vast sum of taxpayers' money has in no way deterred the aggressive intentions and actions of Communist dictators.

What has been accomplished? First, many people made a great deal of money. It encouraged all kinds of commercial exploitation by shelter builders, many of them fly-by-night concerns, whose salesmen went from door to door showing movies of nuclear explosions and frightening people into buying shelters and stocking them with food they often could not afford. Contractors and grocers have benefited.

Many of these contractors are legitimate businessmen taking advantage of a good opportunity. Some, however, crawled out from under the rocks to prey on their neighbors' fears and anxieties. To attest to this fact one has only to see some of the advertisements for fallout shelters under investigation by the Federal Trade Commission.

In the Washington Evening Star of March 26, 1962, there appeared an excellent article by Sylvia Porter, one of our country's leading financial commentators, entitled "1962's Consumer Gyps." Miss Porter points out the fact that the most lucrative consumer gyp item in 1962 was fallout shelter program schemes. I commend this outstanding column to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that this portion of it relating to fallout shelters be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 26, 1962]

CONSUMER GYPS OF 1962

(By Sylvia Porter)

When publicity about fallout shelters was reaching crescendo a few months ago, a Long Island salesman set up a firm called U.S. Fall-Out Shelters, Inc. Its salesmen, representing themselves as connected with civil defense authorities (untrue), talked homeowners into paying up to $1,000 toward the construction of shelters and pledged the work would be completed within 2 weeks.

In most cases, construction wasn't even started. The firm has now been enjoined from engaging in "fraudulent and illegal acts."

Still at the top of the consumer gyp parade in 1962 are home improvement rackets—and fallout shelter frauds are the latest twist. In 1962 alone, the estimate is unscrupulous contractors will fleece the American public out of at least $1.5 billion. While fly-by-nighters are a fringe of the home improvement industry, they're growing fat with profits because the market is constantly expanding, the crooks are, as the fallout shelter gimmick indicates, impressively imaginative, and the American public remains astoundingly naive.

BAIT AND SWITCH

Inexpensive fallout shelters also are being used as a lure in the old "bait and switch" game. You'll see an ad for a shelter at low cost, say under $200, and if you send in an inquiry, a salesman will come to your home. He'll debunk your need for a shelter, tell you to spend your money instead on a "basement playroom which will be just as safe and an investment, too." If you take the bait and switch, you may be sure your playroom will cost much more than $200.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Incidentally, when President Kennedy took office, Leo A. Hoegh, Director under the Eisenhower administration of the now defunct boondoggling Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, left for Chicago to become vice president in charge of sales of the civil defense shelter building program of the Wonder Building Corp. According to a recent report, Mr. Hoegh and Wonder Building have been reaping a rich financial harvest. While in public office, Mr. Hoegh consistently urged Americans to build fallout shelters. This is the same ex-Governor of Iowa who, when he was denied a second term by the citizens of Iowa to the $12,000 per annum position as Governor of that State was rewarded by appointment to a $22,500 position as Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Also, an insidious moral twist has crept into our national thinking. Theologians, philosophers, and everyday citizens are pondering the question as to whether it is proper to kill one's shelterless neighbor or his children should they attempt to enter your shelter in event of a nuclear attack. This is not just idle talk. Reams of articles, pro and con, have been written on it. Leading churchmen and thinkers of all faiths have spoken out on it.

Mr. President, there was a time in our history when it was taken for granted that neighbors would come to the aid of one another when disaster threatened. It was this spirit which helped build our country and make it great. It is a sad commentary on our times that anyone constructing a fallout shelter should be quoted as threatening to shoot a neighbor's child if that child tried to enter his shelter at a time of emergency and panic. Yet many men have made such statements. Of course, such men would not be fit persons to help rebuild an America devastated in an atomic attack.

This year the administration has requested $695 million for civil defense purposes, $460 million of which is earmarked for Federal incentive grants for shelter construction in selected community buildings. It is my hope that before we embark on such a useless, if not foolhardy, program, we carefully review this proposal and its consequences.

May I say at the outset that it is my fervent belief that fallout shelters would be of little, if any, protection in a nuclear war. Few could object to the journey of mankind back into the caves if it were known that these shelters would defend us in an atomic holocaust. This is a very, very slim possibility. Those making it to their shelters in the 15 to 20 minutes available—if our warning systems are perfect, and they are not near that today—would await probable entombment by the pulverizing blast of the bomb or suffocation from the firestorms expected to follow the blast.

During the Second World War, 60,000 residents of Hamburg, Germany, perished in their shelters from suffocation caused by firestorms as a result of an intensive bombing raid on July 27, 1943. This raid was infinitesimal in its destructive power compared with that of one atomic bomb with a one megaton yield.

It is estimated that the lethal radioactive fallout from a 10 megaton thermonuclear explosion would cover several thousand square miles. The resulting firestorm would cover an area of 5,000 square miles. Our cities would be blazing pyres and a mass of radioactive debris. Shelters in the target area would be crushed. Any who managed to escape these blazing tombs would be killed by the firestorms and explosions raging for miles around.

There is no reason to expect that an enemy who hopes to knock us out with one massive blow, would be so merciful as to use just one 10 megaton explosive on a given target. There would be no outside help arriving, no medical supplies, food, water, or transportation. Any who managed to survive and to climb back into the world would find it knee deep in radioactive debris. What was left of our cities would be an uninhabitable desert. Death would merely be delayed. Radiation would probably eventually catch up with those in shelters far enough away from the blast area to escape demolition.

A national shelter program would have to be concentrated in our major cities which hold not only the bulk of our population but the keystone of our social and industrial structure. Yet, it is precisely in these cities that these shelters would be least useful, if they have any use whatsoever.

One eminent scientist wrote a syndicated series of articles about his $30 backyard shelter. This very same shelter was completely destroyed in the brush fire in the Los Angeles area a few months ago. A thermonuclear explosion would not be a brush fire. Another prominent physicist asserted that an adequate shelter would cost from $3,000 to $5,000. The Federal Government says $150. There are all kinds of conflicting estimates both as to the effectiveness and the cost of these shelters. The public is bewildered and confused.

Mr. President, I would not be opposed to a shelter-building program if I thought there was some probability that it would be of real use in saving American lives. However, even those favoring such a program have testified that to be at all effective it would require an eventual expenditure of anywhere from $50 billion to $200 billion.

The very real problem of obsolescence also exists. It is quite apparent from the extensive advances being made today in rocket and nuclear technology that any shelter program would conceivably be obsolete before it was half completed. Then, there is also the possibility of even more deadly types of warfare—chemical and biological warfare. Certainly, were an aggressor to unleash the horror of a thermonuclear war, he would have no misgivings about using other methods equally as terrifying. Modern warfare is keyed to hunt down the civilian wherever he is. Morality in warfare would be a thing of the past. All of the deadly diseases—and some not even known to the public at large—are now in the arsenals of the major powers primed for instant use.

Unless we are prepared to embark on such a vast gamble it seems futile to me to waste additional hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars on schemes which are, in reality, nothing more than expensive doses of psychological pablum for a frightened and bewildered public seeking some way out of the dilemma of our times. It would be far better to spend this money strengthening our Armed Forces and our retaliatory capability so that no aggressor would dare attack us.

Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, in commenting on fallout shelters some months ago said:

> I don't think I would put that much money into holes in the ground to crawl into, that I would rather spend more of it in offensive weapons in the first place.

In my opinion this expenditure is impractical because it will offer no protection worth mentioning at a cost that would be a tremendous burden on our economy. It is also dangerous in that it fosters the delusion that there is some measure of security in a nuclear war. We cannot bury our heads in the sand and refuse to realize the consequences of such a disaster.

The truth is that people living far enough away from the blast area might be able to protect themselves for the first 48 hours of intense radiation, perhaps even the first 2 weeks. After that their chances for survival are indeed slim. It has been estimated that the radioactive cloud from a single relatively small nuclear bomb may be expected to cover an area downwind for fully 200 miles. No one knows how many bombs would fall or what weather conditions would be at that time. This is only one of the innumerable unanswerable "ifs" involved in a massive shelter building program.

It is my fervent hope that those now charged with the responsibility for protection of our civilians in time of war will immediately embark on a vigorous and continuing campaign of education on realistic self-protection in a nuclear war using all media of communication at our command—television, radio, newspapers, magazines, and our schools.

Furthermore, no reasonable person would object to the Federal Government's advising citizens on the type, effectiveness, and cost of various fallout shelters. A modest amount of money could be appropriated for research and dissemination of this information. If the individual citizen then wants to build his own shelter and feels that he lives in an area where it could possibly be of some use to him and his family, perhaps as a recreation room, that is his business. He would be putting his money in circulation by helping a building contractor.

Mr. President, it may seem unbelievable, but at this late date there are still some civil defense officials advocating the thoroughly discredited theory of evacuation of our cities. Secretary of Defense McNamara himself suggested that the Cuyahoga County, Ohio, civil defense organization abandon its policy of evacuation. Cleveland, Ohio's largest city and the seventh largest in the Nation, is located in Cuyahoga County. As late as December 11, 1961, John J. Pokorny, well paid civil defense director of that county, said his office is still in favor of evacuation.

Only a few months ago, in Cuyahoga County, the citizens of Cleveland were urged, in case of disaster, to evacuate that city and flee toward Lorain, 25 miles distant. At the same time the citizens of Lorain were told to evacuate Lorain and run to Cleveland. If that were to happen, there would be the worst traffic jam anyone has ever experienced.

It was our hope that when the boondoggling Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization was abolished and its functions transferred to the Department of Defense, that such muddled thinking and planning would go with it. Apparently, this has not happened. At local and State levels the same political hacks are still riding the civil defense gravy train. If our Nation's mayors and Governors seriously believe that this program is urgent, why have not these boondogglers been replaced with men of stature and competence?

President Kennedy has called for sacrifice in this time of emergency. Surely, it is not too much sacrifice for Americans to provide protection for themselves and their families. It is the duty of their Government to advise them on how to do this—if such a thing is possible—but not to do it for them. Our forefathers in settling this land and in pushing back the frontier knew this well.

All of us can be proud of the thousands of patriotic Americans who, as volunteers, gave their time and effort often at great risk to themselves in times of flood, fire, and other natural disasters. These Americans have, and always will, continue to help their neighbors regardless of the doubtful leadership of paid civil defense officials safe behind desks.

Mr. President, I urge the administration to reevaluate this problem. Mass evacuation was offered as the panacea only a few years ago, but it is now seen as an illusion. Fallout shelters are no better. The basic fact about nuclear war is that organized society cannot survive it. No amount of warnings, sermons, or reams of type will change this fact. It would be wiser to face the truth squarely than to evade it by talking of the survival of some individuals.

Let us not dig holes in the ground to hide in while waiting for the conquerors to come. Let us do what we have done before. Let us strengthen our tremendous power of retaliation, so that no dictator will dare attack us.

The President's desire to offer Americans some form of survival insurance in event of nuclear attack is laudable. Certainly some sensible forms of catastrophe planning are in order. However, I assert that it is not sound planning to divert substantial resources and effort into a program which offers very little true assurance and which could well assume the proportions of a boundless boondoggle, and which encourages a cruel illusion of security.

It is better for us to face the fact that no modern society can survive all-out nuclear war, than to delude ourselves by inadequate efforts to try to assure the survival of some individuals. All agree that we live in a grim period of international anarchy. However, we must not allow this to cloud our judgment regarding defense of civilians. We should not embark on expensive schemes that will prove of no real value in event of war. The civil defense requests should be carefully scrutinized before additional taxpayers' money is wasted.

I expect to oppose any such appropriations for civilian defense shelter surveys and construction.

We have already wasted more than $1,100 million on civil defense as conducted by the now happily defunct Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. We should call a halt to further waste of the taxpayers' money.

OUR FOREIGN AID GIFTS SHOULD BE PROPERLY ADVERTISED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Texas such time as he may require.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the things that has contributed so heavily to the strong belief of millions of Americans that the fat should be cut out of foreign aid is covered by what we find in the New York Times of April 4, 1962, where there appeared a very cogent editorial on this subject, entitled "Pattern of Economic Aid." It points out that in 1960 the United States granted $8 billion in foreign aid and that the Communist bloc granted $178 million. However, through their success in advertising, they have created the impression in many countries that they were spending more on foreign aid than we were.

The United States does not get the maximum benefit in tangible friendships and cooperation on vital free world goals from tax funds spent on aid to other countries.

Americans are the unchallenged leaders of the world in the field of advertising; advertisers sing to us on television and on the radio; they dot our highways and byways with words and pictures; they fill whole pages in our newspapers and magazines and inundate our mailboxes.

Nowhere in the world can a distributive economy be found that is woven so thoroughly about advertising as in the United States.

There is an ironical side to the fact that the United States, world leader in advertising and communications, has never been successful in calling to the attention of the world its own vast program of economic aid to underdeveloped countries.

The apparent failure of the United States in this regard has given a solid basis to criticisms of the foreign aid program by the American taxpayer, who foots the bill.

It is the responsibility of our Government at the national level to see to it that, where aid is given, due credit is obtained for the United States.

Our Nation also has a responsibility to combat the distortions of Communists in foreign countries who level unrelenting and often unanswered attacks on private American investments abroad, which have played a vital role in development of the very countries which allow, and sometimes encourage, these attacks.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from the New York Times of Wednesday, April 4, 1962, entitled "Pattern of Economic Aid," which tells in a few simple, well-chosen words how the Russians have seized a giant's share of the credit for a pygmy's share of aid.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATTERN OF ECONOMIC AID

A useful perspective on the pattern of economic aid to underdeveloped countries is provided by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's latest report. The clearest fact to emerge is that the developed free world nations are enormously ahead of the Communist bloc in providing economic aid of all kinds: $8 billion against $178 million in 1960. But few people are cognizant of this tremendous disparity.

One cause of the disproportion between reality and the propaganda image is the Communists' skill in exploiting such help as they do give or promise. In effect, Moscow sells the same horse over and over again. A great fuss is made when there is agreement in principle for Sovet aid; another propaganda celebration occurs when a total commitment and program are finally agreed upon; a third round of credit grabbing takes place when the first Soviet technicians and machinery start arriving in the recipient country, and so on until a particular project is finally completed. The more businesslike West does not expend nearly so much energy and effort upon squeezing every bit of propaganda advantage out of the aid it provides.

Another reason for the difference between reality and image is the fact that a substantial portion of Western aid is not viewed as such by influential elements in some underdeveloped countries. The $2,400 million in private direct investment in these nations during 1960 is regarded with suspicion by the Communists and the extreme nationalists. Both groups condemn such investment as exploitation, slavery, robbery, and the like. The advantages in employment, income, and technical training which such private investment brings are often lost sight of, though the wiser leaders of underdeveloped countries fully understand the indispensable role of private investment in creating the conditions of real economic progress.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES ARE NEEDED FOR DEFENSE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the United States is spending more money and expending more effort to maintain a strong national defense and retaliatory power than on any other single governmental function.

Defense expenditures are a necessity to survival now, and there are no signs of immediate change.

Proposed expenditures in the national budget for the fiscal year of 1963 call for 63 cents of each dollar to be spent on national defense, international affairs, and financing space research and technology, all related in their importance to the survival of the United States as a free country.

For national defense alone, the 1961 expenditure was $47.5 billion; the estimate for 1962 is $51.2 billion; and for 1963, a total of $52.7 billion. The cost of the guard is very small out of this total. The National Guard is an im-

portant and essential part of our national strength.

Of the total of 44,371 Army National Guardsmen called to active duty in October of 1961, the Texas Army National Guard provided approximately 22 percent; of the 9,898 guardsmen called to duty in Texas, only 117 were delayed in reporting to duty because of hardship or other reason.

Recently, I received a letter from the National Guard Association of Texas, signed by Maj. James M. Rose, president, setting forth the views of 8,000 members of the Texas association.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Major Rose printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS,
Austin, Tex., March 26, 1962.
Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: In behalf of the 8,000 members of the National Guard Association of Texas, I want to strongly voice this association's opposition to any action by Congress or the Department of Defense which would reduce the number of Army divisions currently allotted to the National Guard of the United States in the Reserve component troop basis.

I am attaching a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted at our 3d annual conference at Galveston on March 3, 1962.

Two of the many vital factors which prompted the Army affairs committee of the National Guard Association of Texas to sponsor this resolution are as follows:

a. Elimination of any National Guard division will significantly impair the combat potential currently available to the United States.

b. It is contrary to the public interest to destroy trained organizations which would be available for deployment in a relatively short time for general war and/or mobilization, when such war or mobilization would require the organization of numerous divisions, the cadres for which would have to be obtained from existing units.

We are acutely aware of the high cost of maintaining an adequate national defense in this space age. However, when you compare this with the value we all place on liberty and our American way of life, this cost loses its significance. We do not believe this is the time to be reducing our military forces and thus our capability to resist Communist aggression. We do believe we should obtain the maximum from the dollars we spend and it is already a matter of record that our Army and Air National Guard force is provided at only a fraction of the cost required for similar Regular units. The present active duty use of thousands of Army and Air Guardsmen is proof of the need for the National Guard as has been the situation in every crisis since 1775.

It is not necessary to dwell upon the history or exemplary record of the National Guard divisions serving in all wars fought by the United States since 1775. The National Guard is more than a tradition—it is the bulwark of our national defense.

May I solicit your support in behalf of the Army National Guard and respectfully urge you to oppose any action by the Congress or Department of Defense which would eliminate any Army division currently allotted to the National Guard of the United States.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. ROSE,
Major, Texas Air National Guard,
President.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this letter constitutes a powerful argument for maintaining the number of Army divisions currently allotted to the National Guard of the United States in the Reserve component troop basis.

Mr. President, cuts in the Reserves were announced today. I hope they are not carried out.

A ready National Guard is a barrier to the constant push of the Communist powers, and a bulwark for freedom.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution submitted by the National Guard Association of Texas, which clearly states the reasons for vigorous opposition to any action by the Congress or the Department of Defense which would reduce the number of Army divisions currently allotted to the National Guard of the United States in the Reserve component basis, and similar opposition to the withdrawal of either of the two Army divisions currently allocated to the State of Texas.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF TEXAS RESOLUTION

(Submitted by the Army Affairs Committee relating to the possible loss of National Guard divisions, and particularly the loss of a Texas division, through Department of Defense reorganization of the Reserve component troop basis)

Whereas recent news releases from the Department of Defense indicate that reorganization of the Army will withdraw six to eight divisions from the Reserve component troop basis; and

Whereas these news releases further indicate that the National Guard may have as high as four divisions withdrawn, if such reduction of Reserve component troop basis follow this plan; and

Whereas if such reduction is imposed upon the National Guard, it is logical to assume that States with two divisions organized would probably be first to be considered for loss of a division; and

Whereas National Guard divisions were organized at the request of the War Department in 1945 before any U.S. Army Reserve divisions were organized; and

Whereas the approved policies of the War Department of 1945 concerning Reserve components missions provided that the required number of combat divisions be organized and maintained by the Army National Guard, indicate that it was clearly the intent of the War Department to rely upon the National Guard for its Reserve division force, and for the Army Reserve to furnish only those units needed that could not be furnished by the Active Army and the Army National Guard; and

Whereas National Guard divisions have long histories in all wars fought by the United States since 1775 and eight National Guard divisions have served in three wars; and

Whereas the elimination of any National Guard division would significantly impair the combat potential currently available to the U.S. Army because of the superior strength, state of training, and status of equipment when compared to a division of the U.S. Army Reserve; and

Whereas the loss of either Texas National Guard division would be contrary to the best interests of the State of Texas in heritage, integrity, and community economy; and

Whereas it is contrary to the public interest to destroy trained organizations which would be available for deployment in a relatively short time for general war and/or mobilization, when such war or mobilization would require the organization of numerous divisions, the cadres for which would have to be obtained from existing units; and

Whereas, the U.S. Conference of Governors, representing the chief executives of all States, consistently has opposed any action which would adversely affect the combat potential of the National Guard: Now, therefore, be it,

Resolved, That the National Guard Association of Texas, in general conference assembled this 3d day of March 1962, at Galveston, Tex., vigorously opposes any action by the Congress or the Department of Defense which would reduce the number of Army divisions currently allotted to the National Guard of the United States in the Reserve component troop basis, and particularly opposes any such action which would cause the withdrawal of either of the two Army divisions currently allocated to the State of Texas; and be it further

Resolved, That the president of the National Guard Association of Texas be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretaries of Defense and Army, the Director of the Budget, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of Congress, and all duly elected Senators and Representatives to the Congress of the United States from the State of Texas, and to the president of the National Guard Association of the United States,

JAMES M. ROSE,
Major, Texas Army National Guard,
President.

PEOPLE OF TEXAS FAVOR PADRE ISLAND PARK NOW

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most gratifying experiences of this session has been the way so many of the best known newspapers in Texas have spoken out strongly in favor of a national seashore recreational area on Padre Island, off the south Texas gulf coast.

I first introduced the bill to create a national park on Padre Island in 1958 and have been working for it ever since. This year, the bill, S. 4, has advanced out of the Senate committee by more than a 2-to-1 majority and is expected to be before the full Senate for action shortly.

I wish to quote what some newspapers in Texas are saying about the Padre Island bill.

First, let us consider this comment from the Houston Chronicle in Houston, near the gulf coast:

> Congress should pass Senator YARBOROUGH'S bill, the President should sign it and the Park Service should get busy. When it is finished, there will be a magnificent park close to Houston—a treasure that can slip away if we fiddle.

Now let us move upstate to Abilene, in Central West Texas, where the Abilene Reporter-News had this to say in an editorial on March 8:

> A national seashore on Padre Island would become a major tourist attraction with more than local appeal.

And the Abilene paper added:

> Only national development can achieve this, and there is no reason to back off from it on any political philosophy of Federal intrusion into State affairs.

The Abilene Reporter-News then pointed to the success of the national parks systems in other places and said that the appropriations for Texas State parks have always been meager.

The Corpus Christi Caller-Times, summed up the State versus national development argument in these words, in an editorial on March 9:

> The alternative to the national park is no park on Padre Island.

The Corpus Christi Caller-Times has long been a vigorous advocate of a national park on Padre Island.

The Texas Observer, published in Austin, said in an editorial on March 9:

> The time for a showdown on Padre Island has arrived.

The Texas Observer has been one of the earliest and strongest advocates of the Padre Island National Park.

The Big Spring Herald, in Howard County, west Texas, said in an editorial on March 8:

> Padre Island, if preserved for future generations, could be one of those major attractions that would draw heavy tourist traffic. Those coming into Texas to it would have to traverse almost the full length of the State and thus every town and city would benefit.

On March 2, the Beaumont Journal, in Beaumont, southeast Texas, stated of the Padre Island bill:

> Congressional approval is a long step nearer.

The Beaumont paper has also been a strong supporter of a national seashore park on Padre Island.

There are many others. The Paris News in Lamar County, near the Oklahoma line, endorsed a national park on Padre Island with the following editorial comment:

> Texas has on Padre Island a natural phenomenon worth preserving in its natural state, and developing as only the National Park Service can do as a pleasure and educational attraction for all Americans.

The Paris News:

> Who, among those who have seen them, have not thrilled and been benefited for having seen Yellowstone and other great parks? What kind of price are they worth? Should the State of Wyoming have borne the burden of developing that for the whole Nation, even if it could?
>
> Americans have, from the beginning of the automobile age, planned their vacations to see the marvelous national parks of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Arizona, Washington, California, and New Mexico, just to list a few. In going there, they also saw the States and regions where they are located.
>
> This is a byproduct, and an important one, that would accrue to Texas if Padre Island were developed into a national seashore.
>
> Texas is entitled to the support of its congressional delegation, regardless of party lines, in behalf of this need.

The Houston Press, another long time supporter of the Padre Island Park stated in an editorial shortly after the bill was voted out of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

> Committeemen studied the matter long and hard and—for the most part—at firsthand. An overwhelming committee majority saw it as the press has seen it ever since it started its fight for Padre:
>
> That a substantial part of Padre's raw and untouched majesty of sand-sea-sky should be preserved for all the people of this Nation for all time.
>
> This was a big victory for U.S. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the National Park Service, and for the people of Texas as well as the Nation.
>
> Many more must be won.

The Wichita Falls Times, in an editorial March 21, stated:

> The question boils down to whether the Federal Government or the State government should undertake the project.
>
> That answer is not difficult to find. Any Texan just has to ask whether this State has adequately located and developed parks and recreation areas with the opportunities it has had in the past. It has not.

The Wichita Falls paper summed it up this way:

> It would be fine if Texas already had recognized its potential and had done something about developing the area. It has not and to defeat the Federal proposal now is to lengthen the odds that it can be preserved in time. More use and better publicized possibilities exist if it is incorporated in the Federal program. These are advantages which State development proponents are overlooking in trying to confuse the issue.

The Temple Daily Telegram, endorsing S. 4 in an editorial on March 25, stated:

> The Yarborough bill would save the best and still not squeeze out private enterprise.
>
> Senator YARBOROUGH's plan is sound and in line with National Park Service recommendations. Congress should give it prompt approval.

Mr. President, these editorial comments, ranging from the Gulf of Mexico to the Oklahoma State line, are indicative of the widespread public support in Texas for a national seashore park on Padre Island.

The New York Times has also endorsed the bill. On March 11, the New York Times stated in an editorial:

> Here is one of the finest of our undeveloped shoreline areas that can yet be saved for the public. Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH is sponsor of a good Padre Island bill that has been cleared by Committee and is ready for Senate passage. The plan advocated by the Texas Senator is sound and in line with the Park Service recommendations. It deserves prompt approval.

Mr. President, here is written newspaper evidence of strong public support for a national seashore park in Texas. I urge support of Senate bill 4.

AMENDMENTS TO TAX BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], I submit for appropriate reference an amendment to H.R. 10650.

The amendment has a twofold purpose:

First, it provides for a three-step reduction in the depreciation allowance for oil and gas with a 2½-percent reduction for each year for the next 3 years, bringing it down from its present level of 27½ percent to 20 percent.

The second provision of the amendment permits a simultaneous three-step reduction in the overall limitation on individual income taxes from its present limitation of 87 percent, bringing it down to 60 percent over the 3-year period.

The combination of these two proposals would effectuate a long overdue correction in our existing tax structure and would make this adjustment with an actual gain of revenue to the U.S. Government.

For example, in the first year the depreciation allowance on oil and gas would be reduced from 27½ to 25 percent, and the estimated revenue gained from this action is $75 million.

At this same time the maximum effective rate limitation on individual income taxes will be reduced from its present 87 percent to 75 percent, which would result in a loss of revenue of $25 million, thus representing a net gain to the Treasury Department for that year of $50 million.

The second year the depletion allowance for oil and gas would be reduced from 25 to 22½ percent, thus providing additional revenue over present law of $160 million for that year.

Simultaneously, the effective rate on individual income taxes would be further reduced from 75 to 65 percent, which action would result in an estimated revenue loss of $80 million.

Thus as the result of this combined action the Federal Government would gain $80 million.

Effective the third year and for each year thereafter the percentage depletion rate would be reduced from 22½ to 20 percent. The estimated revenue gain resulting over present law by bringing the depletion rate on oil and gas down from the present 27½ percent to the 20-percent level would be $250 million.

At the same time, beginning with the third year, the maximum effective rate limitation on individual income taxes would be further reduced to 60 percent. The revenue loss by reducing this maximum effective rate limitation on individual income taxes from its present 87 percent to 60 percent is estimated at $130 million.

The net effect of the adoption of this twofold amendment would be that at the end of the 3-year period the present 27½-percent depletion allowance on oil and gas would be reduced to 20 percent and the present overall limitation on individual income taxes would be reduced from its 87 percent to 60 percent with an annual net gain to the U.S. Government of $120 million.

One of the main arguments in support of the need of the present 27½-percent depletion rate for oil and gas has been that under our existing tax structure, which runs as high as 91 percent—with an overall 87-percent limitation—has been that without some special incentive men of wealth would not venture their capital for the narrow margin of gain of 9 or 13 percent. On that point they have a valid argument, and it is for that reason that we have combined this proposed reduction in the depletion allowance with the simultaneous reduction in the overall limitation on individual income taxes.

The most important feature of this amendment is that its adoption would provide a more equitable distribution of the tax load in America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated January 7, 1961, signed by Colin F. Stam, Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, in which the estimates as to the revenue of the different sections of the amendment are outlined.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL
REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, June 7, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: As you requested the staff has prepared a draft of an amendment (attached) to reduce the overall maximum limitation on individual income tax from 87 percent at present to 60 percent over a 3-year period, and to lower the rate of percentage depletion in the case of oil and gas wells from 27½ percent at present to 20 percent also over a 3-year period.

With respect to the overall limitation on individual income taxes, the draft provides for a three-step reduction, at 1-year intervals, commencing in 1962. For taxable years beginning in 1962, the rate would be 75 percent; for taxable years beginning in 1963, the rate would be 65 percent; and for taxable years beginning in 1964 and thereafter, the limitation would be 60 percent. The staff estimates that these changes in the overall limitation would cause a reduction in revenues to the Federal Government in the amounts shown in the following table.

[In millions of dollars]

Maximum effective rate limitation (percent):	*Revenue loss*
75	$25
65	80
60	130

The draft also provides for a three-step reduction in the 27½-percent depletion allowance for oil and gas, at 1-year intervals, commencing in 1962. Under the draft, for taxable years beginning in 1962, the rate would be 25 percent; for taxable years beginning in 1963, the rate would be 22½ percent; and for taxable years beginning in 1964 and thereafter, the rate would be 20 percent.

It is extremely difficult to estimate the effect of small changes in the depletion rate for oil and gas, because we do not have the data we need concerning the present effect of the 50-percent limitation, and because the data on depletion claimed on individual income tax returns is incomplete. Consequently, our estimates for your proposal are rough.

Tax year	Proposed depletion rate for oil and gas	Estimated revenue gain over present law
	Percent	*Millions*
1962	25	$75
1963	22½	160
1964	20	250

I hope this will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance and was ordered to be printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, the time for the quorum call not to be charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of that United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment submitted by Mr. MILLER to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute was read, as follows:

At the end of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 4. In order to encourage preservation of the financial solvency of the United Nations which is being threatened by the failure of some member nations to pay currently their assessments and/or contributions to the United Nations, no assistance shall be furnished under the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (other than supporting assistance under chapter 4 of part I, assistance from the contingency fund established under chapter 5 or part I, and military assistance under chapter 2 of part II), or any other law authorizing assistance to foreign countries (other than military assistance, supporting assistance, or assistance from the President's contingency fund), to the government of any nation which is more than one year in arrears in its payment of any assessment by the United Nations for its regular budget or for peace and security operations, unless the President determines that such government has given reasonable assurance of paying (independently of such assistance) all such arrearages and placing its payments of such assessments on a current basis, or determines that such government, by reason of unusual and exceptional circumstances, is economically unable to give such assurance."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am not averse to having this amendment considered; but I believe I must, in good conscience, state that the amendment does not fit in with the unanimous-consent agreement, which provides that all amendments must be germane. However, I shall not press the point, although I think I should bring it to the attention of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask the distinguished majority leader whether he has any objection to my offering this amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, I have no objection; but I would not want it considered as establishing a precedent, because the amendment was pending before the unanimous-consent agreement was reached. However, I call attention to the fact that, based on the agreement, there is a question about whether the amendment is in order. However, I shall not press it.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. MILLER. Do I correctly understand that the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], is properly before the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, it is properly before the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Then am I correct in understanding that it is in order for me to proceed now with my amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, if no objection is raised. If objection is raised, the Chair will proceed to rule.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to obtain a little clarification in regard to the possibility of objection. I was under the impression that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the so-called substitute was in order, regardless of objection. Does the Chair's ruling mean that if any Senator objected to consideration of the Miller amendment at this time, the objection would prevail? I have no objection, but I should like to obtain clarification on this point. I thought the amendment to the substitute was in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. So far as the Chair has been informed, the amendment to the amendment is in order. No objection or point of order has been raised, so far as the Chair knows, on the ground that the amendment to the amendment is not in order. In the absence of such a point of order, the Chair assumes that the amendment to the amendment is in order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Chair has stated "no objection or point of order has been raised"——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair meant to say that no point of order has been raised.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I clearly understand the situation if no point of order is raised.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was in error in using the word "objection." The Chair meant to say that no point of order has been raised.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well; then I understand, and I thank the Chair. I merely wished to obtain clarification on that point, for I did not think an objection could lie against the amendment to the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will yield briefly to me——

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was actually printed and tendered before the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into yesterday. The distinguished Senator from Iowa could easily have objected to the agreement when it was proposed; and I believe we should make sure that the majority leader and I fully understand each other in connection with this matter. Consideration of the Miller amendment to the substitute will not constitute a precedent. Instead, I believe that under the circumstances it can be considered as an accommodation. Certainly we try to be fair to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the distinguished Senator from Iowa have a right to offer this amendment as a matter of right, as a Senator of the United States, rather than by grace of any agreement? As I understand the rules of the Senate, the amendment in the nature of a substitute which has been offered by the two leaders must be perfected before the vote is taken on the other amendment in the nature of a substitute; and the Senator from Iowa has a right, as a Senator of the United States, to offer any number of amendments, as he may see fit, to the substitute which has been offered by the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, let me comment briefly on the point which has been raised by the Senator from Georgia. I do not wish to push my amendment to the extent of standing on my rights as a U.S. Senator. My point merely is that if this amendment can be accommodated to the situation without delaying the taking of action by the Senate, I hope that can be done, because if it cannot be done, I shall be forced to revise my proposed procedure, and to offer my amendment to the main bill; and I understand that would be in order.

All I am trying to do is to accommodate my procedure to the best interests and convenience of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think we ought to say, for the benefit of all Senators, that a full understanding of this matter has been arrived at. We are not questioning the right of the Senator to offer any other amendment. We are trying to protect the rules of the Senate so that this procedure could not be used as a precedent later. The amendment was lying on the desk before the agreement had been reached. There is no question about that. The Senator has a right to offer it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Chair clarify what was stated by the Senator from Georgia? I thought he made a point on the question of germaneness and whether there was an interdiction against nongermane amendments in the agreement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct; there is not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, it does not involve the grace or sympathy of the leadership one bit. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Georgia is correct, as always, that the Senator has a right to offer an amendment. The question of germaneness has not been raised as to this Miller amendment, and since it was not raised, there is nothing for the Chair to rule on.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Chair will indulge me, the Senator from Illinois assumed the amendment was not germane. In my opinion, the amendment is germane.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not have to rule, because the question was not raised as to whether the amendment is germane.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

I have heretofore had the feeling that this action on the bill and on the amendments is somewhat premature, because there is pending before the World Court the question which the United Nations General Assembly referred to at the last General Assembly meeting last fall.

The question before the World Court is whether or not assessments for such operations as the Congo operations are in the same category as regular contributions to the United Nations for the purposes of the Charter of the U.N. The idea is that if the World Court issues an advisory opinion which holds that the assessments are in the same category as regular contributions, there are a good many nations which are delinquent in their assessments and which will lose their vote before the United Nations.

I know that the proponents of the pending bill have every confidence that the World Court will so rule. However, we all know that no one ever knows how a court or judge is going to rule until after the ruling has come out.

Moreover, we have long maintained a policy that a legislature should not take any action which might be calculated to interfere with the independent thinking of the judiciary. We had that proposition before us during the debate on the Du Pont tax bill, and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] made a strong argument that we should take no action on the Du Pont tax bill at that time until after the Federal court in Chicago had taken certain action with respect to the case pending before it.

I can understand that if the United States, through the Congress, authorizes the purchase of United Nations bonds, it might have some impact on the otherwise independent thinking of the World Court. It is for that reason that I would prefer to have all of these matters await the outcome of the decision of the World Court. At that time the air would be cleared and we would know what the answer was in the matter of whether special assessments are in the same category as annual contributions. We may hope this will be the ruling of the Court, but I suggest we do not know, and any action on this bill prior to the Court's ruling may have an impact on what should otherwise be a completely independent judicial decision.

But, be that as it may, the amendment I have offered to the so-called Mansfield-Dirksen substitute to the main bill, to which I had originally offered my amendment, is designed to establish a policy, so far as our dealing with other nations is concerned, in the matter of foreign aid.

We have for many years been proclaiming our complete support of the United Nations. I point out that in my public statements, and I believe in my voting record, it is very clear that I am among those who have wholeheartedly supported the United Nations.

I have also taken exception to some statements which have been made to the effect that, merely because one might be opposed to a particular bill, therefore he was opposed to the United Nations. This is the same type of argument we heard in the debate on the so-called Department of Urban Affairs proposal. However, it became clear that the mere fact that someone opposed the so-called Department of Urban Affairs plan did not therefore mean that he was opposed to cities or opposed to Negroes. Mr. President, this question is not that simple. I do not know of any Member of the Senate who does not support the principles of the United Nations Charter, and I do not know of any Member of the Senate who does not want to see the United Nations succeed. But all of us are deeply concerned about the fact that the United Nations is not going to succeed unless it has the lifeblood with which to operate, and that lifeblood is its revenue. No government can long last if its revenue sources are cut off—if its taxpayers do not pay their bills. This is the problem before us.

The problem I see in the main bill, and in the substitute, is that there is nothing in them calculated to provide for the leadership of the United States in encouraging other members of the United Nations to practice fiscal integrity before the United Nations.

Some point has been made that the bill, as reported to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee, is an improvement because it authorizes the purchase of $25 million of bonds and authorizes the purchase of another $75 million of bonds on a matching purchase basis with other nations.

While I think it is a slight improvement, the bill, as well as the substitute, is merely treating the symptom; it is not getting to the root of the problem, and the root of the problem is that many other nations are not paying their bills.

With respect to the matching proposal, I do not know of a single nation which is behind in its payments to the United Nations which is offering to buy bonds. I would suggest that any nation which is behind in its payments to the United Nations and which offers to buy bonds is not in good faith. I think that before they offer to buy bonds they should get right with the United Nations and pay their bills.

So the main bill is calculated to get nations which are already practicing fiscal integrity before the United Nations to buy bonds. That is not the problem. The problem is to get the laggard nations to pay their bills.

My amendment does not affect military assistance, supporting assistance, or the President's contingency fund.

In effect, it relates only to development loans and development grants. The amendment would not affect loans to private individuals or to private corporations, but only loans or grants to governments, and, more particularly, to those governments which are more than 1 year in arrears in payment of their assessments and contributions to the United Nations.

The Congress has already established the policy set forth in the last section of the substitute amendment. Some point has been made that the substitute amendment is an improvement. It recites that the Congress is concerned about the financial situation before the United Nations and will exercise its best judgment—and it calls upon the President to exercise his best judgment—to work out some solution to the financial crisis before the United Nations.

This does not change our policy one bit. This has long been the policy of the United States and of every administration since the United Nations began. I cannot see any change in our policy. I am quite sure all nations of the world know that the position not only of the Congress but also of the President of the United States is that the United Nations should be on a sound financial basis and that those nations which are not paying should pay. That is our policy. The problem is to implement that policy.

In the Foreign Assistance Act which Congress passed last year it was declared that the policy of the Congress is to recognize the importance of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, and it was urged that all other countries able to contribute join in a common undertaking to meet the goals of our foreign assistance program.

I invite the attention of the Senate to an editorial entitled "A Bankrupt U.N.," which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald as early as November 4, 1960. The editorial states in part:

> It would be a dreadful commentary upon the sense of world responsibility if the principal agency of international security were allowed to go broke. That is a very real possibility for the United Nations, as Secretary General Hammarskjold has warned pointedly in his appeal for $20 million in cash by the end of the year.

I point out that additional editorials and articles on this subject can be found in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 12, pages 16372–16376.

This is not a new problem. At least, it is not a problem which has come up suddenly. In 1960 it was recognized that the United Nations was headed for a financial crisis. I called the attention of my colleagues to this fact in the last session, when we were debating the foreign aid bill. We all had assurance that the problem was recognized and that something was going to be done about it. But nothing has been done, except some very excellent work on the part of the Acting Secretary General, Mr. U Thant, who has, I am told, bent over backward to try to collect the outstanding arrearage accounts from the various member nations. However, the results have been very disappointing.

The U.N. is headed for a financial crisis. In fact, it has a financial crisis. The United Nations is headed for bankruptcy if action is not taken soon.

A point has been made that my amendment would, in effect, make a collector of dues out of the United States. Any time someone wishes to defeat proposed legislation, he can hang a label on it; but that is not responsive to the argument. I cannot imagine anything which would be worse than for us to pass legislation which would make the United States a collector of dues for the United Nations.

On the other hand, I think we have an obligation, as the leaders of the free world, at least, to administer our foreign aid in a manner which will encourage nations to get right with the United Nations.

It has been said that we can lift our voices in the proper channels in the United Nations and urge adoption by the United Nations of machinery for collection of dues, and that this should be done and payments should be kept up to date. These are fine words, Mr. President, but fine words mean nothing when they are not implemented, and the implementation has not yet occurred.

Favorable action either on the bill or on the substitute will continue to represent fine words. There is not one scintilla of leadership, with respect to the nations which are behind in payment of their assessments in encouraging them to get right with the United Nations.

Mr. President, I have a chart entitled "Examples of Nations in Arrears in Congo Operations Assessments," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXAMPLES OF NATIONS IN ARREARS IN CONGO OPERATIONS ASSESSMENTS

	Arrearages for Congo operation assessments	Economic assistance (fiscal 1961)		Military assistance (fiscal 1961)
		Grants	Loans	
		Million	*Million*	*Million*
Poland	$678,553 (1961) 663,517 (1960)	$5.1	None	None
Italy	2,228,826 (1961) 1,089,718 (1960)	25.6	$9.3	$171.5
Spain	184,250 (1961) 450,417 (1960)	43.7	72.5	63.3
France	4,746,601 (1961) 6,399,772 (1960)	None	7.9	47.8
Iceland	7,925 (1961) None (1960)	6.6	1.6	None
Cambodia	7,925 (1961) 19,373 (1960)	24.2	None	6.6
China	2,481,426 (1961) 1,446,543 (1960)	74.3	42.0	115.3
Indonesia	93,115 (1961) 113,815 (1960)	16.4	8.9	None
Yugoslavia	69,341 (1961) 169,512 (1960)	31.5	116.4	None
Philippines	85,191 (1961) None (1960)	19.5	87.4	----------
Greece	45,567 (1961) 55,696 (1960)	32.2	12.6	51.0
Iran	41,605 (1961) 25,853 (1960)	30.5	75.3	55.1
Jordan	7,925. (1961) 19,373 (1960)	67.3	1.0	3.3
United Arab Republic	69,398 (1961) 154,982 (1960)	$51.2	$84.6	None
Afghanistan	11,887 (1961) 14,529 (1960)	35.8	None	$1.2
Argentina	219,911 (1961) 268,797 (1960)	None	68.0	12.1
Brazil	202,080 (1961) 247,002 (1960)	24.5	270.1	32.9
Chile	53,492 (1961) 65,383 (1960)	30.2	108.5	8.5
Colombia	61,417 (1961) 75,069 (1960)	7.6	82.0	4.0
Mexico	140,064 (1961) 343,866 (1960)	4.6	27.8	1.2
Venezuela	99,059 (1961) 121,079 (1960)	.2	26.9	10.3
Sudan	11,887 (1961) 14,529 (1960)	9.4	None	None
Morocco	27,736 (1961) 343,866 (1960)	70.0	43.0	None
Ghana	13,868 (1961) 16,951 (1960)	2.6	None	None
Nigeria	41,605 (1961) None (1960)	10.2	None	None

EXAMPLES OF NATIONS NOT IN ARREARS IN CONGO OPERATION ASSESSMENTS

		Millions	*Millions*	*Millions*
Somali Republic	----------	$4.2	None	None
Senegal	----------	3.6	None	None
Liberia	----------	6.7	$40.8	$1.2
Turkey	----------	$100.0	$133.0	$129.0
Japan	----------	2.9	46.6	77.8
Thailand	----------	24.8	None	20.9

Source of arrearages: U.N. Secretariat statement on the collection of contributions as at Feb. 28, 1962.

Source of assistance: ICA Office of Statistics and Reports, obligations, and commitments, July 1, 1945, through June 30, 1961 (preliminary).

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the chart sets forth examples of nations which are in arrears in Congo operations assessments for the years 1961 and 1960. A number of countries are listed on the chart, but it is not all-inclusive.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The 15 minutes allotted to the Senator from Iowa have expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. The chart sets forth examples. It also sets forth the economic assistance and the military assistance which the United States has furnished to these countries during the fiscal year 1961.

I invite the attention of the Senate to a few of the examples given.

First, let us consider the situation with respect to Poland. During 1961 the United States gave to Poland $5.1 million, not in loans, but in grants. While Poland was receiving our taxpayers' money, the Government of Poland did not see fit to pay $663,517 of its assessments for the Congo operation for 1960, and $678,553 for 1961.

At the same time, the Somali Republic was given $4.2 million in aid—less than Poland received from us. However, the Somali Republic is practicing fiscal integrity before the United Nations, and that country has no arrearages so far as the Congo operations are concerned. I suggest that the Government of the Somali Republic might wonder whether it profits them, in view of the way Poland is getting along, to practice fiscal integrity before the United Nations. They are treated the same, yet Poland is behind in its payments.

I cannot see any activity, any legislation, or any administrative declaration of policy which would indicate that the Somali Republic is going to be treated in a different manner. I do not say that we should never give to Poland or to any other nation some assistance, but the point is that nations which are in arrears should not be treated the same as nations which are paid up.

Another disappointment is Italy. During 1961 Italy received loans of $9.3 million and grants of $25.6 million, yet during the same time Italy was in arrears in United Nations payments. In 1960 Italy was over $1 million in arrears in its payments for the Congo operations, and Italy is $2,228,826 in arrears for the 1961 assessments.

It may be suggested that because of the economic situation in a country it cannot afford to pay the assessments for the Congo operations. I think it should be made very clear that the allocation of the assessments among the nations is on a fair and equitable basis, taking into account their economic situations.

It would not do, for example, for Cambodia to say that it could not afford to pay its assessments. In 1961 we gave—not loaned, but gave—to Cambodia $24.2 million, and also $6.6 million in military assistance, yet Cambodia failed to pay $19,373 for 1960 and $7,925 for 1961. After all we have given Cambodia, I do not think anyone would suggest that, from an economic standpoint, that country could not afford to pay $26,000 or $27,000 for the Congo operations.

I suggest that it is not a question of economic necessity or economic vicissitude that has resulted in this situation with respect to most of the countries to which I have referred. It is a matter of principle. I do not know what the principle is, but it is certainly not the principle of supporting the United Nations and practicing fiscal integrity before the U.N. I think it is high time that, in administering our foreign aid program, we should see to it that the principle of supporting the United Nations receives priority.

I point out that on the same continent, while Somali was receiving $4.2 million in grants and practicing fiscal integrity with the United Nations, Nigeria received grants totaling $10.2 million and still fell behind in its 1961 assessments for the Congo by $41,605. Japan received $2.9 million in grants and $46.6 million in loans. It is current in its payments. It is practicing fiscal integrity before the United Nations. On the other hand, Morocco received $70 million in grants and $43 million in loans and fell behind $27,736 in its 1961 assessments and $343,866 in its 1960 assessments for the Congo operations.

Thailand received $24.8 million in grants and is current in its assessments. Afghanistan, on the other hand, received $35.8 million in grants and still is in arrears.

These nations should not be treated alike. We cannot say to all of them, "Practice fiscal integrity," and then in administering our foreign aid program, say that it does not make any difference.

As I said, I believe it is high time for the United States to gear its foreign aid program into support for the United Nations as a matter of policy. Such action would tie in well with our national policy as exemplified in the Alliance for Progress. Our policy under the Alliance for Progress is that we will extend foreign aid to Latin American countries in order to enable them to engage in self-help programs for the betterment of their peoples. But we have attached a string. The string is that those nations must institute programs to reform their economic, political, social, and tax structures so that in fact there will be a self-help program which will result in a better standard of living for the people. That is a sensible approach. I have not heard any criticism of that string on the floor of the Senate. And yet someone may suggest that the pending amendment would tend to coerce nations into practicing fiscal integrity. I have not heard any statement about coercing the Latin American republics into practicing fiscal integrity so that they will not have inflation.

I do not think that "coerce" is the proper word. It is not a word applicable to the amendment, and it is not applicable to the Alliance for Progress. The proper word is "encourage" or "leadership." It seems to me little enough to encourage the recipients of our foreign assistance to practice fiscal integrity before the United Nations.

I can in clear conscience vote for the substitute amendment or for the main bill if my amendment is a part of those measures. I can in clear conscience go to the taxpayers in my State and ask them for their hard-earned tax money to help promote our foreign aid program; I can ask them to use their hard-earned tax money to buy bonds before the United Nations, provided they have the assurance that we will not pay lipservice to fiscal integrity before the United Nations and do something about exercising leadership to encourage other nations to practice fiscal integrity before the U.N.

But absent such assurance, it is asking a great deal of our taxpayers to pay millions of dollars in foreign aid to nations that will not even pay a few thousand dollars to practice fiscal integrity before the United Nations.

I believe that nations which are keeping up with their payments before the United Nations and practicing fiscal integrity should receive our help. Nations which are unable to do so because of economic situations might well continue to receive our assistance. My amendment would give the President of the United States the opportunity to make such a determination. I have provided in my amendment that if the President determines that exceptional or unusual circumstances exist which from an economic standpoint prevent a nation or government from paying its obligations to the United Nations, there will be no problem about its receiving foreign aid from the United States.

My amendment would also give the President further discretion by providing that if the President should determine that a nation which is in arrears has given reasonable assurance of becoming current in its payments, we will continue to give that nation foreign aid. I believe these are reasonable discretionary powers to give to the President.

I do not favor a meat-ax approach by saying, "Cut off all foreign aid." I favor giving the President some discretion on this subject. At the same time, I do not think we ought to give the President carte blanche authority to give foreign assistance to nations which are not practicing fiscal integrity before the United Nations. For example, if a nation is not willing to pay its bills before the United Nations, how can we possibly give our taxpayers the assurance that such a nation would repay loans that we might make to it? I think it is time for us to cease paying lipservice, no matter how dedicated and conscientious it may be, to fiscal integrity before the United Nations, and implement the principle by taking a little leadership, which my amendment would provide.

Mr. President, I shall be very happy to yield for the purpose of answering questions.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield such time as the Senator requires.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion of the distinguished Senator from Iowa with reference to the pending proposal. It seems to me that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is in the spirit of the philosophy that has been urged upon us in the consideration of the main bill, which is to promote ways and means of compelling all of the participants in the United Nations to make their proper contribution, to eliminate the free riders, and to bring down the percentage that is paid by the taxpayers of the United States to support the United Nations. The amendment seems to me to be very reasonable. If I ever had any criticism of the amendment, it would be the fact that it contains too many loopholes. The distinguished Senator would take from the bill the provision by which we could exercise the encouragement of which he speaks on the members of the United Nations in the way of "military assistance, supporting assistance, or assistance from the President's contingency fund," which is a very considerable portion of the so-called mutual aid foreign assistance program.

It would also give the President very wide discretion, under which he could exclude the application of the amendment to any country that happened to be in arrears in its payment to the United Nations.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The distinguished Senator, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, knows that there are times when, from the standpoint of military necessity, other factors might well be overlooked. I should like to point out that this was the reason why the Senator from Iowa excepted military assistance and supporting assistance from the coverage of the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand the reasons behind it. As the Senator has stated, there are times when military assistance is important. I might suggest that that could have been put within the President's discretion, as in the other instance. In any event, the Senator's amendment is in keeping with the whole purpose of the program before us, and that is to compel all members of the United Nations to contribute to its support. We have been told time and again that the bonds would become an obligation of the entire United Nations, and that the payments by the several member states for the retirement of the bonds would be put in the same category as the maintenance cost of the United Nations. Certainly the Senator's amendment is no more coercion than the other practice, because they freely admit that they intend to coerce the member nations into the bond issue by making the payments on the bond issue a part of the operating cost of the United Nations, about which there is no question with respect to a member being suspended if it does not pay its dues over a period of 2 years, I believe.

It seems to me that the authors of the bill should accept the amendment. It is in keeping with the purposes of the bill. It is an effort to encourage all member nations to recognize their obligations to the United Nations, as well as their right to participate in its affairs and to enjoy such protection as it affords.

I shall support the Senator's amendment. I hope the authors of the bill will accept it.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his kind remarks and for his additional observations. I point out that during the debate on the foreign aid bill in the previous session, a similar amendment was offered by me to the foreign aid bill. One of the points raised against it was that the amendment did not belong in the foreign aid bill. The amendment was defeated, as I recall, when 66 Senators voted against it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Iowa will probably be told that the amendment does not belong on the pending bill either. When measures of the kind now pending are brought to the floor of the Senate they are considered sacrosanct, and it is almost sacrilegious for any Members of the Senate to suggest an improvement on the handiwork of those who prepared the original bill. During my service in the Senate I have seen hundreds of essential amendments killed under the stress of that argument. I have been in the Senate long enough, however, not to be impressed by that argument.

Mr. MILLER. There is probably more germaneness in my amendment to the main bill or to the substitute than there was with respect to a certain bill that was passed in the Senate last week, when a constitutional poll tax amendment was added to the Alexander Hamilton bill.

Last year we were told that the amendment should not be added to the foreign aid bill. I do not know what we will be told today. We may well be told that it does not belong on the pending bill. I am quite sure that it belongs somewhere. The sooner we nail it down somewhere the better. I believe that the pending bill is the appropriate vehicle on which to set forth this policy, because the only reason for the pending bill is the fiscal crisis of the United Nations, and the pending amendment seeks to do something about it. Does the Senator from Georgia agree with me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I congratulate the Senator on seeking to find an appropriate place to enforce simple morality on the part of our associates in the United Nations. I hope he will continue to pursue his efforts with zeal. There ought to be a place somewhere for an expression of encouragement of morality and living up to responsibility by people everywhere in the world.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the time situation?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to know the situation with regard to the time on the amendment or on the bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time did the Senator from Iowa consume?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa has consumed 47 minutes. The Senator from Alabama has a full hour remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Chair.

I appreciate the spirit in which the Senator from Iowa has offered his amendment. I know that he is interested in fiscal integrity as to the member nations of the United Nations. I know that is the purpose for which he has offered his amendment.

I do not agree with the Senator from Iowa as to this being the proper way to obtain fiscal integrity. I go along with the Senator from Iowa in the feeling that sufficient effort has not been made in the past in the United Nations to get the nations to pay up. I say that on my own. I must admit that I do not know how hard the U.N. has worked on it, but I have the feeling that a better record could have been made than has been made.

Yet I believe we must be practical. We recognized this problem in the Foreign Relations Committee, and we discussed things that we might do after we had disposed of the pending measure, first in trying to get our delegation to inform us as to certain things that were going on, and second, to urge our delegation to get the Secretary General to exert greater effort toward the collection of dues.

I invite the attention of my friend from Iowa to the fact that most of the figures he quoted were from 1961. The 1961 year of the United Nations has just ended. A great many nations pay their dues on the basis of a fiscal year. Many fiscal years have not run out. I do not know, but it is possible that an up-to-date showing would indicate that the United States is in arrears, because we conduct our business on a fiscal-year basis. Our fiscal year ends on June 30. The United Nations conducts its affairs on a calendar-year basis. I recall that the Senator from Iowa has used the 1960 figures. I believe we could find a better guide in the year 1961.

I am not saying this for the purpose of belittling the fact that certain nations are behind in their payments. In my presentation on the opening day of the debate I gave the number of nations that were behind, and how much they were behind. Every effort ought to be made to have them catch up.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before I yield, I remind the Senator that in the letter from the President which I read into the RECORD yesterday he makes this statement. The Senator will find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 5906. I will give the Senator time to turn to the letter, in order that he may follow me. I hope he will read the whole letter. I ask the Senator to refer to the third paragraph, in which the President says:

> I am also in agreement with the intention stated in section 4 of the substitute that this Nation use its best efforts to strengthen the pattern of U.N. financing in such a way as to make unnecessary any future large-scale borrowing.

Now follow the details:

> Steps to be taken in pursuit of this goal would include efforts to improve the administration of fiscal affairs in the Secretariat

and constituent agencies and bolster the existing fiscal office and officers.

Then the President goes on to say that he will submit to Congress a semiannual report on all the fiscal affairs of the United Nations. I mention that because while the Committee on Foreign Relations did not follow the method suggested by the Senator from Iowa, we decided on one which I believe will produce results. This is borne out by the statement of the President himself. I certainly would not use coercion in condemnation of the Senator's amendment, but I do not believe that the method proposed by the committee would be as coercive as this.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator from Alabama realize that when I was referring to the arrearages in 1961 and 1960, the source of my figures was the statement of the United Nations Secretariat on the collection of contributions as of February 28, 1962; and that for the year 1961, the period runs only from January 1 to October 31, 1961; it does not cover November and December?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to have that information; I did not realize that that was true. But the point is that if a payment was due to the United Nations during fiscal 1961, that amount might be payable, so far as the nation is concerned, in a fiscal year that is completely different from that of the U.N. That is true of the United States. If an assessment against us was payable in 1961, the appropriation would have been made for the following fiscal year—that is, fiscal year 1962. Sometimes the second half of our assessment is not payable until the second half of our fiscal year. For that reason, there have been times when the United States has been shown as delinquent because of the inconsistency between the fiscal year of the United Nations and the fiscal year of the United States.

I do not make a point of that. Some nations are behind in their payments; there is no question about it. As the Senator from Iowa has said, this question was raised in connection with the foreign aid bill last year. There was a yea-and-nay vote on it, and the vote was 66 to 24, as I recall. I stated at that time something that certainly is true at this time: that by this method we would be penalizing the very countries which we seek to help.

The Senator has a provision at the end of his amendment this year which he did not have in the amendment last year. It gives the President the right to exempt countries if he finds that for some reason they have not been able to meet the requirements. We are really dealing with the collection of U.N. debts, and by this amendment we would be making the President of the United States the bill collector for the United Nations. I do not believe we ought to follow that course. I think the course which is outlined in the President's letter is a much better method.

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, if agreed to, would penalize the very countries which most need help. It would let go scotfree Russia and all the other Communist countries. The amendment would not touch the Communist countries, except perhaps Poland, which the Senator from Iowa mentioned. I am not sure it would even affect Poland. Our relief for Poland was given largely under Public Law 480, and probably included some equipment. The Senator simply referred to the relief as a grant. I do not know if he has a breakdown to show what the grant consisted of.

Also, his proposal would let France go scotfree. France is one of the great powers that have declined to pay the assessments; although it is believed that if a favorable decision is handed down by the World Court, France will pay the special assessment, just as it pays its regular assessment.

Another country that has disagreed with the operations in the Congo is a very good friend of the United States. I think the Government of that country has become more realistic recently, and I hope someday it will be back in step. The country is Belgium. The proposal of the Senator from Iowa would not affect Belgium, because we do not extend aid to Belgium. It would not affect the richer countries of the world, because we do not extend aid to them. The Senator's proposal would affect only the countries to which we extend aid; and they are the very countries we wish to help. His proposal would go after those countries hammer and tongs, but would not touch the other, bigger countries, such as those I have named. I simply do not believe that his proposal provides a realistic approach. I do not believe it is as good an approach—and I say this in deference and with complete recognition of the absolute sincerity of the Senator from Iowa—and I do not believe it seeks to solve the problem in a realistic manner.

The proposal of the Committee on Foreign Relations is a much better approach. This is confirmed in the letter of the President, which I read a few minutes ago. I think the Senator from Iowa will see a much better record a year from now. I think he will then be able to place in the RECORD a much better showing than is true today.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I echo the sentiments of the Senator from Alabama about what we are seeking to achieve. I know he is sincere in his statements. I know he was sincere last year in the debate on the same subject with respect to the foreign aid bill. Certainly we are all sincere. The only trouble is that we are not getting action.

The Senator from Alabama suggests that a year from now we will have before us a report which will show a great improvement so far as the fiscal position of the United Nations is concerned. I pray that we will. But we do not have a better one today than we had at the time of our last debate on this issue.

I am not quite as sure as the Senator from Alabama that an all-out effort has not been made by the U.N. and its officials and our delegation to the U.N. As I said earlier, Acting Secretary General U Thant is engaged in an intensive effort to try to have the laggard nations pay their bills, but the results have been most disappointing.

I have read the letter from the President, to which the Senator from Alabama has referred. I am pleased to note that the President is in agreement with the policy set forth in the substitute bill. But the point I made earlier in my argument is that there is nothing new about this policy. It is a policy that every President and every Congress have followed since the formation of the United Nations. I do not see that a thing has been added. It is said that steps to be taken in pursuit of the goal of a sound fiscal situation would include efforts to improve the administration of the fiscal affairs of the U.N. Secretariat. I am not certain what that means.

I am not sure that merely a reshuffling of the administrative officials within the U.N. Secretariat would change the attitude of the government of a nation in some other part of the world with respect to paying its bills to the United Nations. Perhaps more billings would be sent out; I do not know. But I cannot see that this would change the position of any nation in that connection.

The President's letter also says that we shall bolster the existing fiscal office and officers of the United Nations. I am not sure what that means. I hope the Senator will spell out what it means. Does it mean that, in effect, more revenue agents for the United Nations will be going around, attempting to collect its bills? I do not know what it means. But I suggest that even if a whole army of revenue agents for the United Nations were sent all over the world to collect its bils, they would not be able to collect one additional cent if the Nations concerned did not want to practice fiscal integrity. Certainly that would not happen even if the President of the United States himself were to proceed to visit the various countries in an endeavor to collect the bills for the United Nations; and I am sure the Senator does not contemplate having that done.

All we seek is authority for one of our foreign aid administrators, when dealing with some other nation, to determine whether this nation can, while maintaining its economic integrity, pay its bills to the United Nations. If it cannot, the negotiator would send to Washington his determination to that effect. But if it can, the negotiator would advise that country that the taxpayers of the United States—those in Alabama, those in Iowa, and those in other States—are not going to send any of the U.S. foreign aid to such a country until it begins to practice fiscal integrity before the United Nations. In other words, we mean to have such nations engage in more than lipservice in connection with the Charter of the United Nations. We want more than that; we want action, and we want it soon. In fact, it is long past due.

So, Mr. President, I close by stating that I appreciate the fact that the Foreign Relations Committee has considered this matter and has recognized the seriousness of the problem, and I also appreciate the fact that the President of the United States wants something done about it. But I suggest that unless something other than what is called for by the substitute or by the main bill is done, we shall not be taking action to cure the evil which exists. I believe we have a great opportunity to practice some leadership in connection with our foreign-aid program, by encouraging nations in arrears to "get right" with the United Nations.

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. COOPER addressed the Chair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I had promised to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall be glad to wait, if the Senator from Kentucky prefers to speak at this time.

Mr. COOPER. Not at all.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. What time is now to be yielded?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. President, I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to both the amendment of the Senator from Iowa and the Russell amendment. I should like to discuss first the Russell amendment—and I say this with all due respect to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa—because the Russell amendment goes to the very heart of the bill, whereas the Miller amendment deals with problems existing in the United Nations—problems which I shall discuss in a few minutes.

Mr. President, the Russell amendment goes to the very heart of the bill which relates to the proposed $100 million loan to the United Ntaions; and the vote to be taken on the Russell amendment has very properly been regarded as a most important vote, and undoubtedly it will set the climate in this Chamber for the other votes which will ensue.

Mr. President, the reason why the Russell amendment is so very important is that it deals, in effect, with the very existence of the United Nations itself—a subject which, basically, has not been under consideration in this Chamber since the time when the United Nations Charter was confirmed by vote of the Senate. Once the charter was confirmed, normally that would have been the end of Senate consideration of that basic subject. But by means of the Russell amendment we are now confronted with an opportunity to act directly in relationship to the United Nations itself, by means of a contract which in effect calls for a loan by the United States to the United Nations; and in that connection the Congress would make funds available by means of a regular appropriation. In that way the United States would give assistance which could help save the United Nations itself.

Mr. President, I believe the entire Nation will watch with great care the votes cast by Senators on the Republican side of the aisle when the Russell amendment is voted on, because as the debate has developed there have been, on this side of the aisle, expressions which might give rise in the country to a fear that stirrings of the old attitude of isolationism may be occurring. However, it is my deep conviction that such an attitude has been removed from political life in our Nation, and does not today represent the main body of American political opinion. Therefore, I hope very much that Senators on this side of the aisle will show that decisively when the vote is taken; and I hope very much that a majority of the Republican Senators will back the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] in the arrangements which have bene made, which have resulted in the fundamental issue which is before us.

Mr. President, I believe that many Senators in considering the Russell amendment have failed to realize the size of the issue it involves, as compared with the actual direct action which would result if the amendment were adopted. The Russell amendment really involves the issue of whether the United Nations itself will be sick financially or whether it will be reasonably well financially. That is a very important issue; and certainly the Soviet Union would like nothing better than to be able to put the United Nations into a position of fiscal bankruptcy. In fact, as I shall show in a few minutes, the Soviet Union is directly responsible for the fiscal problem of the United Nations which now exists.

So, Mr. President, it will not be enough for our country to give the United Nations a slight blood transfusion—which is what the Russell amendment would do—so as to enable the United Nations to live from today until tomorrow, but continue to be in financial difficulty. Certainly that would be the result, because even if the United States were to forgive this debt, the United Nations would still be in financial difficulty. In short, what is needed is to have the United Nations place its feet on a solid road for at least a year or two, so as to be able to deal adequately with its finances, which right now constitute its major headache, and at the same time have an opportunity, through a finding by the World Court and by means of action by its members, to bring itself abreast of its financial responsibilities.

So, Mr. President, the Russell amendment suffers by reason of the fact that it would still leave the United Nations in an emergency financial condition; and, as I view the matter, such a situation would be very inimical to the interests of the United States. In my opinion, by granting the United Nations what is—in view of the size of our budget and the importance of the issues at stake—a very small sum of money, namely, the difference between $38 million and $100 million—and, Mr. President, mind you, most of that would be handled on a matching basis, happily, as the Foreign Relations Committee has worked out that matter, and as I, myself, sought to have it worked out—the United Nations would thus be freed of its fiscal emergency problems, and then would be able to face the particular issues being raised by various Senators, regardless of whether they favor or oppose the Russell amendment. In short, as a result of such action the United Nations would then be able to deal in a far more effective way with problems such as those of the General Assembly, the mounting of troop movements in various parts of the world, such as in the Congo, and so forth.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if the Russell amendment is defective on that ground—and I believe that is a fatal defect—the Russell amendment is even more defective in section 2, because that part of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia would require Congress to declare war every time the President wanted to help the United Nations in any of the very necessary ways in which it would from time to time be likely to need help. Section 2 of the Russell amendment would require that the Congress take favorable action on a resolution stating that it is the desire of the Congress to help the United Nations; and such a procedure would play directly into the hands of the very techniques which have been used at various places in the world in order to embarrass and cause difficulty to the United Nations. Certainly we wish to avoid such situations—for instance, those in Laos or in Vietnam, where the Communists have used methods of infiltration and subversion, although without causing a general war. Certainly we must be in a position to counter such developments. We do not wish to be thrown into actual war every time a situation similar to Vietnam or the Congo or Berlin develops. Yet section 2 of the Russell amendment would compel Congress either to act to that extent in such situations, or else be powerless.

So it seems to me the question involved in the Russell amendment is a much larger one than the question of making a loan to the United Nations; and I believe that the decision reached by the Senate in regard to the Russell amendment will, indeed, be a very fateful decision, insofar as the United Nations is concerned. In fact, favorable action by the Senate on the Russell amendment could well be a fatal decision, in my opinion, for it could well gravely endanger our entire posture in connection with international affairs, and could do so to a much greater extent than could possibly occur in connection with any question involved in making a loan of $30 million or $160 million or $200 million to the United Nations. That is the real force of the Russell amendment, and that is the real reason why in voting on it we shall be voting on a fundamental question, and not by any means a question of small import to the usefulness of the United Nations.

I have respect for the argument of the need for having in the General Assembly an effective body if it is going to be the principal forum of the United Nations, and I have a great respect for the criticisms and analyses made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the distinguished Senator from Washington, and other Senators, with respect to the imperfections and deficiencies of the U.N.

All those discussions have a part in showing this country where it is going, or how it operates, or where it should go.

But in my opinion that is an extremely different thing from adopting a section which will commit the responsibility of Congress very much against the kind of foreign policy we have to pursue now in view of the constant Russian and Chinese Communist threats in terms of limited war and actions.

The very thing we do not want Congress to do is pass a joint resolution every time one of these incidents requires cooperation or activities in the U.N. Once Congress passes a joint resolution of that kind, then these incidents cannot be confined to their proper limits as incidents, but they will become major emergencies as between our country and the Communist bloc.

So, Mr. President, I think the Russell amendment should be rejected very decisively for the reason that it extends the ambit of this debate far beyond its proper compass and commits it to a course of action gravely inimical to what ought to be the bipartisan policy of our country, by general agreement.

Now I desire to comment on the Miller amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he goes to the Miller amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand the Senator advocates committing American men into military actions instituted by the United Nations without Congress participating in any degree.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think the Senator from New York recommends any such thing.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought he did.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to answer, if I may, because Congress can always act if it wants to stop the President, either by censure resolution, or not providing the money, or otherwise asserting its power.

I am against passing a law which will make the President come to Congress for a joint resolution, which is tantamount to an American declaration of war, every time this country wants to participate, in the interest of international peace, in some U.N. action.

The Senator from Georgia does not confine his amendment, as I read it, to manpower. It extends to military material as well. So it does not affect just manpower. It may very well be that manpower forces of our Nation will not be committed at all, but, if the amendment is adopted, committing military equipment or materiel will also require a joint resolution, as I read it. I think that to commit us to a policy of that kind would be inimical to our best interests.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is entitled to his opinion. The Constitution gives Congress very broad power in committing American men to battle. Is the Senator familiar with section 6 of the United Nations Participation Act passed in 1945?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not remember it offhand. Will the Senator read it?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the section which provides for participation of American Armed Forces in conjunction with others in the United Nations. Section 6 reads as follows:

> The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate Act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 of said charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the armed forces, facilities, or assistance provided for therein: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements.

In 1945, when we implemented our approval of the United Nations Charter, we said the President could not commit men or facilities or materiel to combat with the United Nations without appropriate act or resolution of Congress.

I have offered the amendment in the language I have employed to bring to the attention of the Senate how far we have gone in abdicating our responsibilities and our sworn duties. It is practically the same language as exists in the 1945 act. It has the same effect the existing law has. Yet the Senator finds some horrendous threat to the peace and security of this country in letting the Congress of the United States, when it is in session, participate in the action of the Chief Executive in sending the young manhood of this Nation to their death or to be maimed in any quarter of the globe.

Mr. JAVITS. In the first place, the Senator from New York has advocated no such thing, because the Senator from New York has pointed out that the amendment would cover materiel or equipment as well as manpower.

Mr. RUSSELL. The original bill does that.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New York will get to the Senator's statement with respect to the United Nations Participation Act. The United Nations Participation Act, in section 6, referred to the scheme of organization of a permanent U.N. police force which was to be negotiated among the nations, and which is something that has never been done. It is that over which the Congress wished to keep control, and the Congress is quite right, because that is not an incident similar to the condition in the Congo, or Vietnam, or some other place. That is a basic commitment, of a permanent character, of forces of the United States to the United Nations on a general basis. I agree with that. This is not the same thing the Senator from Georgia is providing for.

This section is tied in with section 7, or at least chapter 12, of the United Nations Charter, which provides for action by the United Nations, on an open basis, whatever may be decided as proper action by it with respect to threats to peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression.

In short, it is one thing to have Congress retain control as to what shall be done in devoting an element of the American military forces to a permanent type of police force to the United Nations. This is another matter. It deals, on a case-by-case basis, with individual incidents such as have occurred in Vietnam and the Congo, and may occur elsewhere.

In one case, that of section 6, this is a major, deliberate decision by the United States to commit, on a permanent basis, as a fundamental basis of policy, some of its forces.

In the other case it is an exercise by the President, on a foreign policy basis, which we could stop at any time, of participating with other nations in some actions adapted to a particular incident affecting the foreign policy of the United States.

Though it is ancient history, I may mention that in our gunboat diplomacy in Latin America and other parts of the world our President did not come to Congress to ask whether it wanted that particular thing done. The President acted under his power as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

It is all right to make lurid statements about the fact that we may send American boys here or there to their deaths, but would we rather send them en masse, in the millions or in the hundreds of thousands? Or, instead, would we prefer to adopt the policy, which may cost some lives—and of course we understand that, and it breaks our hearts to even think of it—which is designed to minimize the danger by localizing and minimizing incidents, instead of leaving it up to the Congress to pass joint declarations that we wish to engage in massive participation.

What would we expect the Russians to do if the Congress of the United States should pass a joint resolution to send American troops to the Congo? Should we expect the Russians to sit and twiddle their thumbs? I should say not. They would consider it to be a major element in the mobilization of our country's forces.

It is a great thing in the United States that any Senator—and certainly a Senator as distinguished and important as our colleague—can present any amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 more minutes from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is very important for us, as Senators, to carefully examine what is proposed in all of its implications, in the face of world events, and to address ourselves to the problems, as I did this morning.

I am deeply moved by the implications of the amendment. I think it is an extremely important amendment, worthy of extended debate on the floor of the Senate, if Senators feel they wish to be enlightened on it further, because I think it would commit the United States to a very major policy which could lead us into very, very serious labyrinths, dead ends and dangers. I should be remiss in my duty as a Senator if I did not say so.

Mr. President, I now wish to take a minute or so on the Miller amendment.

The Miller amendment, in my view, presents certain difficulties. I know the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] yields to no one, and he need not do so, in regard to deep concern about doing the right thing with respect to the United Nations financial situation. I do not question his good faith or his sincerity in making any statement. I do not feel that he is trying to embarrass or to encumber any element of our relations with the United Nations.

The point I wish to make is that the Miller amendment would require mandatory action by the President, since it uses the word "shall" on page 1, line 5, whereas the President does have today, as evidenced by his letter, a complete discretion in regard to a matter of this kind. The President could, if he so chose, withhold economic aid from a nation, if the President felt that nation was outrageously refusing to honor its United Nations obligations, as a matter of the policy of the United States. I think that is the best way to leave the situation

I remind Senators that the World Court has not yet acted, so if we should adopt the Miller amendment we would be giving the President a mandatory directive before the advisory opinion comes from the World Court; we should be tying the President's hands with respect to many other nations than the ones which are really causing the problem. If we examine the arrearages in respect to the special operations in the Congo, we see that the ones which are really causing the problem are those in the Communist bloc, which owe over 50 percent of the total arrearages. Those include the Soviet Union, Poland, Rumania. France and Belgium are also involved, and they would not be reached by the amendment.

If we take the two groups together, they account for a large portion of the arrearages. I have tried to make a quick calculation, and I am perfectly willing to have it corrected. In respect to the 1961 Congo assessments of something like $35 million, some $25 million or $26 million is accounted for by the Communist-bloc nations, which are not going to be reached, and by France and Belgium, which are not going to be reached.

The amendment would tie the President's hands in a mandatory way, with respect to many nations, quite apart from the main ones which are causing the difficulty, and this will cause us difficulty. It is really something like shooting at a relatively small target with a very big gun.

The President has discretion. He has indicated in his letter that he proposes to use it and to use it effectively. In my view, with the greatest of respect for the sincerity and desires of the Senator from Iowa, which I know are of the highest in this regard, I think it would not be wise—and I use that word advisedly—to agree to the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the nice comments made by my good friend from New York. I wonder if the Senator could perhaps tell us what he has in mind when he says that the President would be taking certain action.

I asked the Senator from Alabama what the President's letter entailed. I cannot see anything specific in it. It talks in terms of enlarging the Secretariat and constituent agencies and of bolstering the existing fiscal office and officers.

I know the President is deeply concerned about this whole problem, but he has been deeply concerned ever since he took office. President Eisenhower was deeply concerned. The arrearages have gone up. They are particularly acute now.

I wonder what the Senator has in mind by way of action by the President, other than what he has been discussing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes from the time on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that yielding of time? I am glad to yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from New York from the time on the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I did not control that time, or I would have yielded it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Two points are involved. The first point is that the President is now committed, as shown by his letter, to see to it that every 6 months the Congress is given a report on arrearages, which will make those arrearages public and call them to the attention of the Congress. Because the President will report to the Congress, it will give Members of Congress an opportunity to do what we are so expert at doing, to protest very vigorously if we feel the program is not being handled properly.

Second, I think the whole purport of the President's letter is that the United States will do what it has not done before, that it will interest itself in a diplomatic sense in the matter of the payment of assessments, arrearages, et cetera to the United Nations. The President will not use any of the money he may lend to the United Nations to bail anybody out. He makes that clear.

The clear implication is present in the letter that the United States will address itself as a nation, with all the great facilities it has, toward seeing to it that a much better record is made. There is a commitment to do better, on our part, in a diplomatic sense, which is contained in the agreement to make reports to the Congress, which is important, I think, first, as giving to us a window on the situation, and, second, a platform from which to protest if we feel the program is not being handled properly.

For those two reasons I made the statement I did.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate "the window," and I appreciate the reports, but I have not had any difficulty in getting reports heretofore. It seems to me there has been a widespread coverage of the fiscal crisis before the United Nations by the press, going back to 1960. In fact, in the fall of 1960 many of the leading newspapers and magazines pointed out that by the fall of 1961 there would be a desperate crisis before the United Nations.

I appreciate the opportunity to receive more reports more often, but I am not concerned about the fact that we shall be able to make speeches on this subject or that we may become exercised about the situation; I am more concerned about the attitude of the member nations to whom we are giving assistance. I am particularly concerned about those nations to whom we are giving assistance who are practicing fiscal integrity, who will wonder why they receive the same kind of treatment that some other nation which is not practicing fiscal integrity is receiving.

If we had some assurance from the President of the United States that in our foreign aid program this would be a policy it would be helpful. If the President would indicate that this would be a policy, I would not necessarily feel inclined to push my amendment, but we have received no assurance like that whatsoever.

In this situation, I suggest to the Senator from New York that, although we may have high hopes, a year from now we shall not be in a much better situation than the one in which we find ourselves today.

I am interested in some practical results. I know the Senator from New York is interested in practical results.

I cannot see anything in the proposed legislation before the Senate—and, frankly, I cannot see anything in the President's letter—which would assure me or my people that there will be any practical results from the proposed bill or the substitute, because I believe the President, the Congress, our delegations to the United Nations, and our foreign aid administrators have already, long since, been trying to get something done in this regard. I am confident they have been doing their best. I think it will require a more positive policy to be enunciated by the Congress and that is the purpose of the Miller amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I say to my colleague that since we have gotten the letter from the President, I think Congress has made itself very, very clear on the positive policy.

Our debate constitutes a very strong record in the direction of positive policy, but I think we would be shooting with a very big gun at a relatively small target should we mandatorily require the President to end aid, unless he accounts for it in some better way than he is now doing, to countries with respect to which our whole national interest may strongly dictate that we should give aid, notwithstanding U.N. arrearages. He has that discretionary power anyhow.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would it be in order for me to use any time on my substitute amendment at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time on the amendment of the Senator from Iowa would have to be disposed of first before time on the amendment in the nature of a substitute of the Senator from Georgia could be used. However, time on the bill could be used.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the amendment to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, yesterday I heard the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] say that he felt some trepidation in addressing the Senate on the subject we are considering because it was one which was primarily within the cognizance of the Foreign Relations Committee.

If the Senator from Georgia, with his long record of distinguished service, felt trepidation, it is evident that, in increased measure, I would also feel trepidation. Yet all of us must represent the people of our States, regardless of the committee on which we serve, and because the subject is so important, I have interested myself in it and wish to express my views on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

I have the greatest respect for the Senator from Georgia. We may talk about arrearages, and the methods that should be used to secure payment of the assessments owed by members of the United Nations, but the basic issue that is really before the Senate, it seems to me, is this:

Will the Congress reject the recommendations of the President of the United States, and make it impossible to solve the financial crisis in which the United Nations finds itself?

I think that it must be admitted that we can meet the present crisis by loaning the U.N. $100 million, and yet another crisis may arise again 2 years from now. We may again have to decide whether support of the United Nations is more important than the loan of several million dollars. But today we must face the question, Will we provide the loan, without which it will be impossible for the U.N. to continue its security operations in the Mideast and the Congo? Failure on our part would lead, if not immediately, inexorably, to the liquidation of these U.N. operations.

If we do not furnish support we must remember what will be at stake. It is possible that the operation in the Mideast may fail, and the United Nations operation in the Congo.

Perhaps some people would like to see these U.N. operations ended. But speaking as a Republican, I know that the U.N. operation in the Mideast goes forward partly because President Eisenhower made in 1956 his historic decision that the United States would not join with its historic allies—the United Kingdom, France, and a great friend of this country, Israel—in the use of force. He declared that the United States would support the principles of international law, and the Charter of the U.N. to which we have adhered, and that the Mideast problem must not be solved by force. The U.N. operation was enlarged in the Mideast because of this decision of President Eisenhower.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time have we remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. As much as the question has troubled many people, I ask Senators to consider the alternative if the United Nations had not decided to act in the Congo at the request of its Central Government, the only government which had been established by law. If the United Nations had not acted in the Congo, it is possible that the Soviet Union might have intervened. If this had occurred, the United States might have been required to face a much more difficult decision—whether the United States should intervene with arms and force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

M. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that at the time of the creation of the new government of the Congo, the Soviet Union did, in a sense, intervene? Did not the Soviet Union send its diplomats, planes, and equipment to that country in an effort to play a very significant part in the affairs of the new country, but eventually was forced out of that country by the central government?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct.

I believe the full story of the establishment of the government of the Congo is not widely known. Before the Congo became independent, the leaders of its provinces, including Tshombe, met in Brussels and agreed to the establishment of a central government. The basic law under which the Congo operates today is one that passed by the Belgian Parliament, which declared the Congo would be unified under a central government. Its Parliament was elected as a central government. Then the secessionist movements began in Katanga and other provinces. But under the basic law there is no legal government other than the central government. But whatever it is, if the United Nations had not intervened, it is wholly possible that the Soviet Union, which had tried to intervene, would have remained in the Congo and would have encouraged and supported the secession.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that after the Soviet Union was in effect forced out of Leopoldville, the capital of Central Congo, it returned to the eastern province in which Gizenga, the follower of Lumumba, was in power, and the Soviet Union was implanted in that area?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. It was the Central Government which forced the Soviets to leave.

I do not think it is known that at one time the cabinet of Tshombe asked, or made a decision to ask, that, with Gizenga, the aid of the Soviet Union be sought. I do not mean to say that Tshombe participated in the decision, but his cabinet once determined to seek the support of the Soviet Union.

If the Congress refuses to aid the U.N. and if the Congo operation fails, it is possible that the Soviets will be back, as they were before they were forced out by the Central Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. The pending amendment is critical. If the amendment of the Senator from Georgia were adopted, its practical effect would mean the death knell of the operation in the Congo, and perhaps in the Mideast. Perhaps I should not say that it would mean the end so far as the Mideast operation is concerned. Its adoption would seriously cripple the United Nations. We may not agree with everything it has done—and we do not—but I cannot conceive that any of us would want to weaken, and witness the deterioration or death of, the United Nations.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. It has been repeated time and again that the Communists were preparing to take over the Congo apparently by some kind of military coup. However, no evidence whatever has been presented, other than the flat statement of Senators, that conditions in the Congo were greatly different from those prevailing in any of the other African countries. The Russians have sent large missions and have sought to infiltrate all of them. So far as I am advised, the situation in the Congo was not different from that in any other African country. The Communists are ceaselessly infiltrating the whole world in maintaining large numbers of people in their missions, which are always used for the purposes of propaganda and subversion.

I cannot understand the constant inferences that the Soviets had singled out the Congo on the west side of Africa as their target of military attack. Such intelligence sources as are available to me do not indicate that the Russians were preparing to send military force into the Congo any more than into any of the other African States.

Mr. COOPER. I did not mean to say that the Soviets would send in military forces. I meant to say that the Soviet Union could bring great missions into the Congo, with the purpose of supporting secession and a broadened civil war. That would be to their liking.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield some time to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. I would be glad to use my own time, but under the Parliamentarian's ruling, I am precluded from using my own time.

I wish to say, in answer to the Senator from Kentucky, that apparently he and I have been reading different official documents. I do not believe there is any question that the Communists were trying to support the separatist movement of Gizenga in Oriente Province, and that they were demanding every day in the United Nations that steps be taken to crush Katanga and Tshombe. I have before me a transcript of the proceedings of the meeting of the United Nations Security Council of November 26, 1961, when the final resolution was adopted to direct military forces into the Congo to crush Tshombe and Katanga Province. It shows that the mover of the resolution was Mr. Valerian Zorin, who, as the Russian representative, was the author of the resolution. It shows that our own representative, Mr. Stevenson, tried to amend it to include Gizenga. That proposal was vetoed by the Russians. Our representative voted for the resolution, stating that he did so reluctantly. I have before me the statement that our representative made. This is the final statement before the delegates proceeded to vote on the Russian resolution for military action to destroy Katanga and Tshombe. Our representative, Mr. Stevenson, said:

> Before proceeding to a vote I should like the privilege of saying a word in explanation of the position of my Government. We will vote for the three-power resolution, as amended—with great reluctance—so that the Foreign Minister of the Congo, Mr. Bomboko, will not return to his tormented country emptyhanded after all these days of talk. We appreciate the efforts of so many delegations, and virtually all of the members of this Council, to get unanimity on a satisfactory comprehensive mandate for the Secretary-General. We deeply regret the Soviet vetoes and are disturbed by what they imply for the future of the Congo. In spite of these vetoes of paragraphs desired by the representative of the Congo, and clearly defining the authority of the Secretary-General, we will vote for this resolution because we believe that the Council should take a firm stand against the activities in the Katanga and specifically in support of the Central Government.

Mr. President, I say to his credit that our representative offered an amendment to bring Gizenga within the purview of the same resolution. He received the vote of every member of the Security Council except Russia. Mr. Zorin voted against it and stated that, this being a vote cast by a permanent member of the Council, the resolution was lost.

My objection all the way through to the Katanga military action has been that it was ordered by this resolution. I have heard the statement made over and over again that this was a great defeat for the Russians.

Mr. Zorin followed up the resolution with a letter to Mr. U Thant, demanding that the U.N. move immediately into Katanga with all the military forces at its command. The Soviets feed on confusion and dissension within nations and between nations everywhere. That is always grist for their mill. My primary objective to the brutal assault on Katanga was that it was done by the United Nations, an organization which was represented to Congress as one which was to undertake to solve problems by mediation and negotiation. In this case it moved with the utmost expedition, with overwhelming force, and with unnecessary brutality, resulting in the death of women and children, the destruction of hospitals, and the death of people driving ambulances on the streets of Elisabethville. They moved in without exhausting all the possibilities of mediation and negotiations, and they did so on the motion of the Soviet Union.

Yet Senators tell us that the Soviet Union suffered a great defeat when Katanga was conquered.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. **AIKEN**. I have been reading the proposed amendments which are printed and are on our desks. I find some of them have a great deal of merit. They contain provisions which I would like to see written into the act. However, we must face facts. I do not believe that any of these amendments would get enough votes to be adopted. That was the case of the amendment which was proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and myself. Had we had the votes to adopt the amendment, we would not have agreed to any compromise. We have agreed to a compromise, and we did so because we did not have the votes. If we had offered the amendment and if it had been defeated, the bill which would have been approved by the Senate would have carried the directive to the President to buy $100 million worth of bonds at 2 percent interest. I do not like that either.

When we do not have enough votes to accomplish what we seek to do, we should do that for which we can get the votes. The compromise proposal was as far as we could go. The compromise does vest great power in the President; but unlike the original bill, it does not direct him to buy $100 million worth of bonds at 2 percent. It leaves the question with the President, and he has the power to do what the proposed amendment would write into the bill. For instance, he can determine the interest rate on the loan. He can determine the duration of the loan. He can use this power of authority to lend $100 million to require the United Nations to make a real and determined effort to collect assessments before letting them have the money. He would have the power to do what the amendments which do not have votes enough to be adopted would require him to do.

In effect the compromise bill warns the President to use this power wisely.

I do not know whether the President will use this power wisely or not. I hope he will use it wisely, because he can go a long way toward improving the financial condition of the United Nations if he uses the power provided in the compromise bill as he will have the authority to do.

Having helped to work out the compromise amendment, I shall stay with it. I say again, though, that several of the proposed amendments are meritorious from my point of view. Nevertheless, we must face the fact that we do not have enough votes to adopt them. Therefore, let us adopt the compromise amendment.

The bill will then go to the House, where I understand the hurdle will be somewhat higher than in the Senate.

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I yield back the rest of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller].

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Is it correct to state that the proposal on which the Senate is about to vote is not the Russell amendment in the nature of a substitute but the Miller amendment?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator is correct. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "nay."

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 78, as follows:

[No. 34 Leg.]

YEAS—15

Butler
Byrd, Va.
Capehart
Cotton
Dworshak
Eastland
Gruening
Johnston
Miller
Murphy
Robertson
Russell
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower

NAYS—78

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Wiley
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—7

Chavez
Engle
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Long, La.
Neuberger
Williams, N.J.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes on the amendment to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and, incidentally, may I say, I am delighted, and I am sure every other Senator is, to see him back on the Senate floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I voted against the amendment offered by my beloved colleague from Iowa primarily because I thought that it could be considered an invitation to some nations to become delinquent in their dues and then expect to come to Uncle Sam to enable them to pay their dues, and thereby create a situation that should not exist.

Mr. President, from what one hears and reads, a speech at this time will change no votes. But as students of today and tomorrow read what is said here, there may be some value in recording one's thought at this time when a vote nears on an issue that has enduring implications.

Although some might see in a vote against the so-called compromise plan a vote unfriendly to the United Nations, for myself I specifically disclaim such an attitude. It was my resolution in the House of Representatives in 1945 (H. Con. Res. 75) which was approved there on December 10, 1945, and concurred in by the Senate on motion by my distinguished predecessor, Senator Gurney, next day, which invited the homeless organization to make its headquarters in the United States.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] will recall he had a similar resolution pending in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but in the interest of prompt action, when the infant United Nations was floundering, he specifically supported prompt concurrence in the action of the House.

I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks the proceedings of the House of Representatives on December 10, 1945, and of the Senate on December 11, 1945, dealing with the adoption of the resolution which I had introduced, inviting the United Nations to make its headquarters in the United States, may follow my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, subsequently I urged and supported the initial appropriation of $75 million to get the headquarters underway.

So, I speak as an early and continuing friend of the United Nations.

The basic reason why I shall not vote for the so-called compromise bond-or-loan proposal is that this falls too clearly within the danger zone predicted for the United Nations when its headquarters was located here, namely, that tendering and acceptance of such a disproportionate share of its financing from one country tends to make the U.N. beholden to that country and establishes a bad precedent for future action.

At the time when it was proposed that the United Nations locate within the United States, many people feared this would tend to make the United Nations subservient to, or dominant in, the foreign policy of the United States.

I may say that a distinguished Member of the Senate the other day, in a speech before the National Press Club, expressed some fears in that regard, so these fears have been brought out to some extent in practice.

If I recall correctly, the then President, Harry S. Truman was among those who felt some misgivings on that score, but he waived them for the sake of getting the organization on to a functioning basis.

The United Nations, Mr. President, should not be in the vest pocket of the foreign minister or secretary of state of any member nation—nor cornered in the portfolio of the treasury of any single country, either. The pending proposal does not go that far, but it does, in my judgment, make the United Nations too largely dependent upon one nation, that is, the United States, and creates for us in future crises a weakening of independent judgment. It also would create a precedent for other members to vote obligations and undertakings while sending the bill to Uncle Sam.

We would become, to a greater extent than I think wise, the bailer-out for unhappy adventures.

Mr. President, the question of the extent to which a society of nations should undertake to pass judgment on civil and internal affairs of other countries came to my attention early. Forty-six years ago this spring, as a sophomore in college, it was my privilege to participate in an intercollegiate oratorical contest held at Lake Mohonk, N.Y., in connection with a conference on international arbitration.

At that, for me, unforgettable experience, I heard an impromptu debate between William Howard Taft and William Jennings Bryan, upon the merits of a League To Enforce Peace. Mr. Taft was the immediate past President of the United States; Mr. Bryan was Woodrow Wilson's recently resigned Secretary of State.

I recall that the point which Mr. Taft sought to make quite clearly, because it was the problem point then, became the problem point for the League of Nations later and is the problem point for the United Nations today.

"Some folks," Mr. Taft said, "object to the word 'enforce.' They think the organization should be merely a League for Peace." Mr. Taft urged retention of the concept of enforcing peace.

But though in idealism the enforcement of peace sounds attractive, the blunt lesson of history is that the enforcer is likely to be regarded as having predatory interests by people against whom the enforcement takes place.

This was so when the Holy Alliance fell apart. It was so when Prince Metternich's theory of legitimacy for the status quo failed. It was the stubborn rock of suspicion on which the League of Nations grounded.

The Senate of the United States refused to adhere to the League unless we retained the right to determine for ourselves whether affairs were internal or external and whether they involved a surrender of national sovereignty. And without the Pepper reservations we would not join the simply named League of Nations, although the enforcement of peace was not a rigid provision of its covenant.

The lessons left by those experiments presumably were solidly learned.

I recall hearing Henry Cabot Lodge, while ambassador to the United Nations, speaking in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on the 10th anniversary of its birth, say that the principles of sovereignty for which his grandfather had contended in the historic debates on the League of Nations had been accepted as the premise on which the Charter of the United Nations was written. This was that major decisions on the use of force rested in the Security Council where the permanent members held veto power.

And, for myself, I am of the opinion that the shifting of such decisions to the General Assembly was an unfortunate resort to expediency.

The current problem as to whether nations delinquent in their dues or assessments may vote might be resolved, I suggest, by requiring, first, that motions to employ the United Nations Emergency Forces in any situation be once and for all declared to be "substantive matters" to pass which a two-thirds majority is needed and, second, that no member be permitted to vote on "substantive matters" unless that nation is current in its payment of all dues and assessments.

It remains desirable, I think, to have as many of these problems of peace enforcement as possible settled in the Security Council. Only when the Security Council lacked sufficient unanimity for effective action should the decision go to the General Assembly. But there the basic rule should be that any peace enforcement action must be regarded as a substantive matter, that a two-thirds majority must approve it before action is taken. Beyond that, the vote on such matters requiring a two-thirds majority for approval should be taken only among those members whose dues and obligations are paid for the current year.

A matter neither commanding adequate unanimity of support for approval by the Security Council nor commanding a two-thirds majority of the dues-paying members of the General Assembly for effective action would not be a matter for United Nations action, but should be left to such regionally interested powers as might feel compelled by reason of regional interest to take action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the final analysis, a nation whose self-interest dictates that it take police action must answer to the public opinion of the world as to whether its action is right. Such a rule, I submit, would have a salutary effect on problems such as now exist and others that may arise. For, Mr. President, if there is one thing the United Nations needs today it is to learn fiscal responsibilty.

Many of my colleagues will remember the one-man teacher on that subject who used to remind the House of Representatives almost daily that bills incurred have to be paid. His name was Bob Rich, a Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania. His favorite speech had one ringing question: "Where are you going to get the money?"

The United Nations needs nothing more badly today than it needs a lesson on fiscal responsibility; that when expeditions are undertaken, they must be paid for.

And, Mr. President, if there is no other way for the lesson to be learned, it might be the part of wisdom and experience to let the creditors of the United Nations today, including the United States, to continue to carry the accounts until the debts can be retired in a normal set-aside from annual revenues.

At least, I hope that the expression of these observations may help to induce some caution against courses that could carry the United Nations down the road to destruction by over-extension into ill-advised adventures.

Mr. President none of us wants to delay the advent of world peace.

The brutality of war is etched vividly in the memory of every Member of the Senate through some experience or other. Many have seen war's inhumanity on the field of battle itself. Others have seen it in the mountainous cemetery of a million bodies at Verdun and Ypres. Others have felt it in the walled city of Old Warsaw or the reminders of Hiroshima. All have known the anguish of broken families and orphaned children. A hundred place names remind us of the supreme sacrifice of young Americans from the bloodied beaches of Normandy to the bitterly won islands in the Pacific, sacrifices that touched every home in America.

Our response to the call of people for peace should employ the lessons of experience in molding and developing international organization and action. It is my judgment that in this area we should move forward but not too rapidly.

We must not forget that were there no right of revolution our own country would not have been born; that where there is no opportunity for peaceful change there will be change by force; that young nations may be expected to have some growing pains even as we did under the Articles of Confederation before we adopted a Constitution to form a more perfect union; that even so lovely a thing as the United Nations needs to learn the lessons of fiscal responsibility and to adapt its programs to its pocketbook and its commitments to its capabilities.

This generation is seeing a new age born—the age of space—but there will remain for all time the nature of men and nations. By applying the lessons of history to the problems of the present, and by recognizing the place of the Infinite in the shaping of events, we shall reach the true grandeur of the United Nations.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House of Representatives, Dec. 10, 1945]

PROCEEDINGS ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 75

UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the morning press reports that the vote of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations Organization on whether or not the headquarters of the United Nations will be in the United States is to take place by the middle of the week; but reports over the weekend indicate that there is some uncertainty among the members about voting because there is lacking an official statement on the part of the United States as to its desires in the matter. Naturally the United Nations want to have an official expression to indicate that the headquarters will be welcome here.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the leadership to the fact that on the 5th of September I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 75 which proposed that the United Nations be and hereby are invited to locate the site of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America. In view of the pendency of this question in London by the middle of the week, I hope the leadership will call for immediate consideration of the resolution.

[From the RECORD of House proceedings later in the day, Dec. 10, 1945]

UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 75.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the United Nations be, and hereby are, invited to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED NATIONS INVITED

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, by the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 75 unanimously, the House of Representatives gives to the United Nations an official and hearty expression of welcome to place the headquarters of the new world organization in the United States of America.

As I stated in my remarks earlier today, the United Nations' Preparatory Commission sitting in London will vote by midweek on item No. 1 of its executive committee proposals which recommended that the headquarters of the new world organization be placed in the United States. The press reports this morning indicated a hesitancy on the part of some members of the Preparatory Commission to vote since there has been "lacking an official statement of the United States desires on a UNO site."

Adoption of the resolution should settle any uncertainty on that score, and I feel certain that it represents the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the United States in saying: "That the United Nations be and hereby are invited to locate the site of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America."

This resolution was introduced in September following the unanimous action of 44 of the Nation's 48 Governors in adopting a similar statement when meeting at Mackinac Island. The only reason congressional action has not been taken earlier, it may be said, is that shortly after the resolution was introduced, a subcommittee of the Preparatory Commission voted overwhelmingly to place the headquarters in the United States, and it was here thought that any formal action by the Congress might be considered out of place as dealing with a matter already acted upon by UNO.

In the past 2 weeks, however, representatives from various communities of the United States appearing before the Preparatory Commission in London have reported that some of the Commission's members were under the impression that the headquarters were not wanted in the United States. When the press, this morning, carried such a suggestion, with the vote of confirmation pending this week, it occurred to me that an official statement should be made at once, and could be made by the adoption of the resolution which I had introduced.

Upon consultation, I found that the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCormack, and the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Martin, and the Speaker the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. Rayburn, were of the same opinion, provided immediate action was agreeable to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

That committee was just adjourning its session when I reached the committee room and presented the matter to the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Bloom, and the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Eaton. The chairman immediately placed the resolution before the committee, which promptly and unanimously voted approval.

The action of the House of Representatives now in passing the resolution by unanimous consent adds further to the wholehearted character of the invitation extended and will be appreciated, I am sure, by the members of the United Nations Organization and its Preparatory Commission.

It is not my purpose at this time to discuss any particular site. I merely wish to say that there are many suitable places in this vast country for a headquarters, and to the one that the United Nations chooses, the United States bids a hearty welcome in the earnest hope that such a location will contribute to the great purposes of the United Nations Organization.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. Jonkman asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

[From the proceedings of the Senate on Tuesday, Dec. 11, 1945]

INVITATION TO LOCATE SEAT OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, there has just been messaged over from the House of Representatives House Concurrent Resolution 75. I ask that the concurrent resolution may be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 75), as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the United Nations, be and hereby are, invited to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America."

Mr. HILL. I inquire if the Senator from South Dakota is going to request immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GURNEY. It was my intention to make a short explanation and then ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from South Dakota is a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I wonder if he has had an opportunity to discuss this matter with the chairman of that committee.

Mr. GURNEY. In answer I may say I not only had a chance to discuss it with him, but it was also considered by the committee, and I received permission to ask that it be considered on the floor of the Senate this morning, if I could get unanimous consent to that effect.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I was a little late in getting to the Committee on Foreign Relations because I had to attend first a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs and I did not hear the discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee, but, as I understand the Senator from South Dakota, the committee authorized him to call up the resolution and ask for action by the Senate at the earliest practicable moment.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator's statement is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Preparatory Commission is now sitting in London and intends to vote tomorrow on a site for the United Nations Organization. Therefore, while this is a concurrent resolution and is not intended to do more than to convey the sentiment of both Houses of Congress, still it will be a semiofficial invitation that the United Nations Organization's capital be located in the United States.

I wish to say that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations this morning approved the concurrent resolution and authorized me to ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the resolution which was adopted by the House yesterday. I therefore express the hope that the Senate will concur in the resolution.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this morning the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted for House Concurrent Resolution 75, inviting the United Nations Organization to locate the seat of the Organization within the United States of America. This afternoon the Senate is about to adopt this resolution which was agreed to in the House yesterday. The concurrent resolution was introduced on September 5, 1945, by Representative CASE, Republican, of South Dakota.

I am, indeed, happy that in a few moments this resolution will have been adopted by both Houses. For the benefit of the RECORD, however, I should like to note these facts.

On July 12, 1945, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, designed for the same purpose, namely, to invite the United Nations Organization to locate its headquarters in the United States of America. House Concurrent Resolution 75 is identical in wording with my own Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, submitted a month and a half previously. I spoke on the floor of the Senate on this subject on July 12 and also a week later on July 20, 1945.

May I call attention to the fact that this was long before the conferences had reached the final stage for the making of the decision as to where the seat of UNO was to be located? Today the decision hangs in the balance as to whether the seat of the Organization will be located on the free soil of America or on the strife-torn soil of Europe.

I humbly feel that if the Senate had taken action on my own resolution in the period following its introduction there would have been less doubt as to the final decision of the United Nations in this important matter. Instead, the Senate did nothing for 4½ months.

Representative CASE submitted his resolution on September 5, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee reported it on December 10, the same day that it was adopted by the House.

It is good that the resolution has now cleared both Houses, but I feel that I would be remiss in my responsibilities if I did not point out the fact that the unfortunate delay in acting on my own resolution has left the issue of the location of the seat of the United Nations Organization in doubt at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the House concurrent resolution.

The resolution was concurred in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I rise primarily to welcome my distinguished colleague [Mr. CASE of South Dakota] back to the Senate after his recent illness. I rejoice, with the rest of my colleagues, to find him recovered, answering roll calls again and to know that we shall continue to have on the floor of the Senate, the benefit of his able mind and his active participation in the serious counsels with which we shall be confronted. It is good to have my distinguished colleague back on the job again.

I also compliment my colleague on the very penetrating address which he gave on this very difficult question. I emphasize one point he made in dramatizing the implied dangers in blank check legislation of any kind pointing up especially the dangers of blank check legislation in the field of international relationships.

It seems to me my colleague stressed a point which has not been sufficiently considered in the debate so far; that is, he has called attention to the position in which this kind of blank check financial concession would place the United States vis-a-vis the United Nations. Once there is given to any nation, including our own, the power to tend to dominate the activities of the United Nations—by veto, by dilatory tactics, or by the power of the purse—I think there is a tendency to destroy the activities and to defeat the ideal of the United Nations. If we pass this so-called substitute without refinement, without spelling out guidelines—and thereby through approving the substitute give to our President the right to negotiate, to dicker, and to jockey with the United Nations as to how much money they would get, under what terms they would get it, the length of time involved, the amount of interest to be paid—at least those who oppose our way of life on the other side of the curtain would have some evidence and substance by which to charge that we are preparing to try to push the United Nations around. To give our President the power to convey or to withhold loans, to give him the power to determine whether the interest rate is exorbitant or almost nonexistent, to place him in position to bargain and barter——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. To give the President the power to negotiate with the U.N. on the basis of whether he will extend the U.N. loan for 100 years, for 25 years or for 5 years would provide those who would do us in with propaganda a Pandora's box of arguments that the Congress of the United States has given to its President the right to try to control, to determine, and to direct the activities of the United Nations by the power of the American purse.

I salute my colleague for emphasizing that argument. I think the U.S. Senate, before it finally approves supplemental financial aid to the United Nations—which I hope it will appropriately and prudently do—should recognize we do damage to the United Nations if we give any individual in the United States an undefined bargaining power which our critics can say can be used by the United States to pervert the United Nations policy, to direct it or to control it.

At least partially in the direction of trying to restrict that kind of latitude, of trying to limit that kind of blank check legislation, of trying to let the whole world know on what basis we propose to aid the United Nations, I have submitted an amendment designated

"4-3-62—A" which, at the appropriate time, I expect to call up and to discuss. My amendment limits the proposed unlimited latitude of the President and prescribes that the United States shall provide this supplementary assistance on the same basis that we provide our regular contributions to the United Nations; namely, that we provide 33⅓ percent of the total.

But I think we have a senatorial responsibility if we are going to prevent the accusation accompanied by a substance of evidence that we are building here a great big American ramrod by which to push the United Nations around or let it starve. In lieu of that, we had better legislate in the open with precision and with detail, so that friend and foe alike will know precisely what kind of fiscal relationship we expect to establish with the United Nations. It should not be an effort which can be distorted by propagandists in unfriendly areas of the world as conveying the authority to bribe or to browbeat other countries to do our bidding in the United Nations or suffer the financial consequences.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield the Senator 1 additional minute.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senate should assume the responsibility of writing a precise, clear and understandable financial arrangement with the United Nations. I would hope that the U.S. Senate should long ago have outgrown the tendency to write blank-check legislation even on domestic affairs. I shudder to think that we may today start initiating at this time a tendency to write blank-check legislation in the international sector.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I allot myself 10 minutes. I had hoped to have voted on my amendment ere this. I had not planned to make any other statement with respect to the amendment, but I walked into the Chamber when the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] had the floor. I listened to him for a while. I wondered what he was discussing. At one stage in his remarks he said that he was referring to the Russell amendment. I did not recognize it from his description.

Since the description was so distorted as to confuse me, I am sure it would confuse the readers of the Record. I am therefore compelled to make a brief statement and point out some of the inaccuracies in the Senator's argument.

Among other things, he strongly implied, if he did not say, that if the Senate agreed to such an amendment as the one I have proposed, American troops would be illegally in Vietnam. The Senator knows or he ought to know that the American forces in Vietnam are not there under any ruling, order, law, or regulation that is even remotely connected with the United Nations. They are there under a law that was passed by Congress with respect to military training missions under the Mutual Assistance Acts many years ago. Their presence in that country has no connection whatever with the United Nations. The question as to the size of the mission and other questions of that character are not spelled out in the law. My amendment would have absolutely no effect on such missions as that in which we are now engaged in Vietnam.

The Senator undertook to brush aside section 6 of the bill, which clearly states that no troops, military facilities, or equipment shall be furnished except pursuant to an agreement made by the President and approved by the Congress. He said that provision would have nothing to do with sending them in, if a fire broke out in a country.

I wish to read briefly from Report No. 717, 79th Congress, of the Committee on Foreign Relations when they reported the bill to determine whether there was any restriction placed on the President of the United States:

> USE OF ARMED FORCES
>
> Section 6 of the bill concerns the important question of the supply of armed force to the Security Council. It deals with two problems in this respect which were the subject of considerable discussion during the course of the consideration of the charter in this committee and in the Senate last July.
>
> The first part of section 6 would authorize the President to negotiate a military agreement or agreements with the Security Council for the purposes and within the limits prescribed by article 43 of the charter. While in constitutional terms, the prior authorization of the Congress is not needed to enable the President to negotiate an international agreement—particularly when such an agreement is necessary in order to give effect to existing treaty obligations—the committee believed it desirable that on a matter of this scope and importance the Congress should record its views in advance. In this way the President may proceed with full assurance that the Congress as a whole desires an agreement to be entered into on this subject. At the same time the bill, by providing that the Congress shall approve any such agreement or agreements as may be negotiated, insures that the Congress will have full opportunity to pass upon the terms and provisions thereof.
>
> The bill provides that such approval by Congress shall be expressed by appropriate act or joint resolution. During the debate in the Senate on the charter last July, there was considerable discussion as to whether the military agreements should be considered as treaties or whether they might be approved by the Congress through the joint resolution procedure. The preponderant view was that the latter procedure was preferable since the agreements would be entered into for the purpose of giving effect to the obligation assumed by this country under article 43 of the charter to make available to the Security Council the armed force necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Under this view, the precise details of the obligation—such as the exact amount of the forces to be contributed and the places where they are to be stationed—is not a matter for treaty consideration but for legislative sanction by the Congress under its constitutional powers to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces (art. 1, sec. 8, pars. 12, 13, and 14 of the Constitution). There were those who expressed a preference for the treaty method of considering these agreements, but all were agreed on the basic proposition that the military agreements could not be entered into solely by Executive action. On the last day of the debate in the Senate, July 28, the President, then attending the Potsdam Conference—

And that refers to President Truman—

> sent a message to the Congress in which he stated that "When any such agreement or agreements are negotiated, it will be my purpose to ask the Congress by appropriate legislation to approve them." The committee believes that it is desirable to determine this question once and for all, and that it is appropriate to specify that the military agreement or agreements should be submitted for approval to the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first paragraph appearing on page 9 of the committee report to which I have referred likewise be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the paragraph was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> In order that there may be no doubt about the availability of our Armed Forces, the committee believed it wise that the Congress should in this legislation confirm its view that the President has the power and obligation, in compliance with our undertaking under the charter, to make the forces provided in the agreements available to the Security Council. This act on the part of the Congress will contribute not only to public understanding within the United States but will also serve notice upon the world that as a nation we are prepared to carry out our obligations promptly and effectively. At the same time the committee felt it important to make it clear that nothing contained in the statute should be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purposes, armed forces in addition to such as may be provided for in the military agreements.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from New York then referred to the proviso in section 7. It so happens that the proviso was added by amendment in 1949. With respect to that language the committee said:

> MAIN PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENTS
>
> The main purpose of the amendments is to add greater flexibility to the U.S. representation in the Security Council and to strengthen our representation to meet the increased volume of work handled by our United Nations mission at Lake Success.

I ask Senators to listen to the following statement:

> A new section 7 reaffirms and clarifies the authority of the President to authorize the detail to the United Nations of a limited number of personnel of the armed services for noncombatant purposes and the furnishing by the National Military Establishment of equipment and assistance in connection with the activities of the United Nations.

All of this statement makes interesting reading. I refer to page 5, and I read the following sentence:

> The committee also notes that the assistance provided by section 7 is limited to U.N. activities directed to the peaceful settlement of disputes under either chapter VI or VII of the charter, but does not apply to activities involving the employment of armed forces by the U.N.

In other words, the committee at that time said that unless these agreements had been made and approved by the Congress, nothing could be furnished in the event armed forces were employed by the United Nations, unless the act had been approved by the Congress. I direct the attention of the Senate to the language of the committee report, which reads as follows:

EFFECT OF NEW SECTION 7

The new section 7 is designed, therefore, to clarify the authority and the terms under which services and supplies may be made available to the U.N. by the United States, so as to eliminate any question regarding control, the right of personnel to receive allowances, and the right of the United States to seek reimbursement. Nothing in this bill obligates or commits the United States to detail personnel or to lend equipment in any circumstances; that is a matter entirely in the discretion of the President. The President may comply with a request by the U.N. for personnel and equipment upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be appropriate, and only when he finds that it is consistent with the interests of the United States to comply with such request. The committee also notes that the assistance provided by section 7 is limited to U.N. activities directed to the peaceful settlement of disputes under either chapter VI or VII of the charter, but does not apply to activities involving the employment of armed forces by the U.N.

DETAIL OF PERSONNEL

The bill limits to 1,000 the number of U.S. military personnel which may be detailed to the U.N. at any one time. In the past, the maximum number detailed at a given time was about half this figure, but it appears desirable to anticipate the possible needs of the foreseeable future.

While assigned to the United Nations, and subject to the control of the United Nations for the purposes of a particular operation, military personnel detailed retain all their rights as members of the Armed Forces of the United States. The bill assures that the individual will suffer no loss from being assigned to the United Nations, that he will retain the rights and perquisites which pertain to his status as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States acting in the capacity to which he is assigned by the United States, including ordinary military allowances, insurance, and disability benefits. At the same time the bill would permit administrative arrangements whereby the United Nations might undertake to pay some of the allowances directly to the individual.

LOAN OF SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

The bill also provides for the loan to the U.N. of the fair share of the United States of any supplies and equipment needed in connection with the activities of the field commission. The equipment contemplated by this provision includes transportation and communication equipment used by the Armed Forces. No combat equipment would be supplied pursuant to this section. It is also contemplated that the United States might offer services of a noncombatant character, such as the furnishing of transport facilities to carry personnel and equipment or to maintain liaison. It should be noted that the bill establishes that the United States shall supply a fair share of equipment and supplies contributed to the U.N. in a particular operation. This is not intended to impose a strict limitation, but only to assert the principle that assistance to the U.N. is an obligation of all members. The committee is aware, of course, that in some instances, the United States might have to be or even wish to be the primary source of such assistance.

REIMBURSEMENT TO UNITED STATES

Ordinarily, assistance rendered to the U.N. under these provisions will be on the basis of reimbursement to the United States for any direct and additional expenses which the United States may incur as a result of granting such assistance. This is not intended to include a charge for the loan of equipment, or other costs not attributable to the U.N. operation, such as the salaries of the military personnel which the United States would have paid even if these individuals had not been assigned to the United Nations. The committee also recognized that there may be exceptional circumstances in which a requirement of reimbursement might impede the operation of a commission, or be otherwise contrary to the interests of the United States. The committee decided, therefore, that reimbursement shall not be an absolute condition and that the matter can be left to the discretion of the Executive.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE BY UNITED STATES

It should be reemphasized that the assistance contemplated under section 7 of the amended bill relates solely to the peaceful settlement of disputes and does not relate to the use of armed forces as contemplated in chapter VII of the charter. This limitation is specifically stated in the first sentence of the new section.

The House committee report contained practically identical language.

So I say that the language which the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] denounced as being such a violent limitation on the President is not any stronger than the law has provided since 1945, at a time when Congress had some self-respect, when it was willing to assume its duty to maintain our Armed Forces and to meet its constitutional duty to commit those forces to combat, and before it had become so supine and spineless as to delegate every portion of our constitutional authority to almost any little bureaucrat who may come in here and ask for it.

I said there is a limitation on the President. I wish to point out this very carefully worded language in my amendment:

SEC. 2. From and after the enactment of this act, no official of the United States or any other person acting in behalf of the United States shall be authorized to permit the use of any military equipment or materiel belonging to the United States or to order the participation of any person serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in any military action instituted by the United Nations unless and until such use or participation has been authorized by a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States if the Congress shall be in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield myself an additional minute.

There is nothing new in this provision which will circumvent the power of the President any more than the existing law does. To be perfectly frank about it, I put this provision in the amendment to see how many Senators and how much of the press would rise up and say, "Here he is, trying to tie the President's hands," when it has been the law of the land ever since 1945.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee, on the Russell substitute.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the pending amendment has introduced into the debate matters upon which I feel I should address a few remarks to the Senate.

Before doing so I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact I have just had delivered to me on the floor of the Senate a rather lengthy cablegram from Mr. Moise Tshombe, President of the provincial government of Katanga. I do not believe it has any particular bearing upon the pending issue, or that any such bearing was intended. However, lest someone think I am trying to suppress a message from Mr. Tshombe, I will leave it here on my desk for all my colleagues in the Senate to read.

First I should like to say a few words with respect to the amendment offered by the distinguished and able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Then I should like to express a few sentiments with respect to the United Nations action and the U.S. support of those actions in the Congo.

The amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia contains two sections. The first section proposes to abolish or to waive the $30 million debt which the United Nations owes to the United States. This is entirely unnecessary. Under the original United Nations Participation Act of 1945, the President of the United States has the authority to waive this obligation on the part of the United Nations.

Adoption of the amendment would, in my opinion, constitute an outright refusal of the United States to participate in the United Nations bond issue. It would repudiate the United Nations bond plan. It would preclude the purchase by the United States of any United Nations bonds, and this at a time when 53 other nations as of April 5 have either bought, agreed to buy, or pledged almost $62 million of the proposed issuance of United Nations bonds.

Second, the amendment would not permit the lending of any money to the United Nations. It would provide no money whatever to the United Nations to relieve its financial difficulty.

I hope that the Members of the Senate will realize the gravity of the amendment if adopted. It would not provide $1 of new money for the relief of the financial predicament of the United Nations. It may be that the Senate, after careful consideration, wishes to do that. I submit that it would be a serious step.

As is true with many other Members of the Senate, certain United Nations actions, both in the Congo and otherwise, have not been to my liking. However, let us consider the alternatives. Suppose that the United Nations falters and falls into bankruptcy over the Congo. What are the consequences? First, the Prime Minister of the Congo, Mr. Adoula, and the head of the provincial government of Katanga, are now in the midst of delicate negotiations, as attested to by the cablegram to which I have just referred. If the Senate should today refuse to provide a single dollar in assistance to relieve the financial predicament of the United Nations, I venture to suggest that such action would torpedo the negotiations now underway in Léopoldville.

Serious as that consequence might be, the amendment also provides a repeal of a portion of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended, I believe, in 1949.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has addressed some remarks to the Senate regarding the power of the

President to use U.S. troops. I call to the attention of the Senate that the amendment of the distinguished Senator not only applies to the use of troops of the United States, but goes further than that. Let me read from page 2 of the amendment:

> From and after the enactment of this act, no official of this Government or any other person acting in behalf of the United States shall be authorized to permit the use of any military equipment or materiel belonging to the United States.

The materiel and equipment now in use by the United Nations in the Congo is largely of U.S. origin. So let no one be misled: The adoption of this amendment, if finally written into the law, would foredoom the United Nations program in the Congo.

What would the consequences of such action be? Perhaps our memories are a little short. Perhaps we should review, even briefly, the reasons for the presence of the United Nations in the Congo and the U.S. support of that program.

The leading Belgian statesman of today, M. Spaak, conceded in a speech to the United Nations that Belgium had not properly prepared the people of the Congo for independence before independence was granted. To whatever degree one may assess the onus for that, the fact stands that almost immediately after the granting of independence to the Congo under a provisional constitution, rioting broke out, law and order broke down, and insurrection of the armed forces occurred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Not only was there insurrection in the armed forces of the so-called central government in Léopoldville; there was insurrection in Katanga, where several blocks of Elisabethville were burned and pillaged and razed. Rape, murder, pillage, theft, and rioting broke out rather generally throughout the Congo. Tribal warfare became bitter and bloody. Perhaps the most serious threat was from the so-called armed forces themselves.

What happened then? The Government of the Congo cabled an emergency appeal to the United Nations to send forces to reestablish law and order. But not only did the Government of the Congo petition for intervention by the United Nations; the Government of the Congo several days later also sent the following cablegram to the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev:

> We have to ask the Soviet Union's intervention should the Western camp not stop this aggression.

This was in response to the return of Belgian troops. I do not wish to criticize Belgium for returning troops, because the lives and property of Belgian citizens were in danger. Indeed, Belgians were already losing their lives, not only in Léopoldville, but also in Elisabethville and other places. Nevertheless, there was a violent reaction in the Congo to the return of Belgian troops.

Former President Eisenhower rejected intervention by the United States. He said:

> Any assistance to the Government of the Congo should be through the United Nations and not by any unilateral action by any one country, the United States included.

So the decision was made—and I think rightly—that the United Nations should undertake the mission to restore law and order to those people so newly independent, but found so unqualified for it.

But the Soviet Union did not feel that way. Lest Senators forget, soon after independence the Soviets were pouring equipment, men, political agents, and money into the Congo. Every Ilyushin arriving was loaded with political agents and instruments of subversion. There they hoped to establish a beachhead of communism in the heart of Africa.

What followed? The late Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations, called upon the Soviet Union to stop its political aggression and subversion. The Soviets refused to stop. Mr. Hammarskjold, in an act of courage, but an effective action, closed all the airports in the Congo to all air traffic except that of the United Nations.

Then the President of the Congo, Mr. Kasavubu, who, in my opinion, has not been given sufficient credit for the courage of his acts—and I think the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] will concur with me in this statement—went to the radio station and fired Lumumba. It was President Kasavubu, acting on his own, who directed Colonel Mobutu to tell the agents of communism to get out of the Congo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I shall not trespass upon the time of the Senate to review the situation in detail. Permit me to conclude by saying that I believe the relative success of the United Nations operation in the Congo—tragic as that operation has been in a number of instances, with its mistakes, with its heartaches—has been the greatest defeat administered to Khrushchev in a decade. The Congo is not now a beachhead for communism in the heart of Africa.

We have not supported the secession of Katanga; we have opposed it. There is no legal basis, there is no moral basis, there is no practical basis for the secession of Katanga, any more than there is a legal, moral, or practical basis for the secession of northern Katanga, where some Balubas have wanted to secede from the Province of Katanga; any more than there is a supportable basis for the secession of Oriental Province or Kasai Province. We have supported the unity of the Congo; we have supported the peace of the Congo; and we hope ultimately that this will result in the economic prosperity of the Congo.

The Congo operation has not been without bloodshed, without mistake, or without blame; but, overall, it has been more successful than we had any right to expect. It is a program which has been supported by both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. It is a program which has been endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the membership of the United Nations.

Now we have come to the pass where the United Nations will become bankrupt without additional funds. The U.S. representative to the United Nations proposes a bond issue as a means of financing; it is a borrowing of money. Fifty-three nations have now agreed to buy their reasonable proportion, their reasonable share, of the bonds. It is proposed that the United States do likewise.

The pending amendment would forbid the lending of a single dollar, the purchase of a single bond, or the furnishing of any new money whatsoever.

Mr. President, let us make no mistake about it: We are about to vote on the question of stopping or continuing the program of the United Nations in the Congo and in various other parts of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am authorized to speak for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in connection with allotment of the time.

I now yield myself—for the Senator from Georgia—10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, first I wish to commend and compliment very highly the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for the preparation of his amendment, for the preparation he has made on this subject, and for the presentation of the points involved in his amendment in the course of the very fine speech he made yesterday. Unfortunately, at that time I was unable to be in the Chamber, due to the pressure of other duties, although previously I had made a firm statement to the effect that I would be here on the floor.

Mr. President, it has been quite a number of years since I first came to the Senate; that was in 1947. But from that time until this, there has not been a real debate on the floor of the Senate in regard to the United Nations. From that standpoint alone, certainly this amendment has served a good purpose. During that period of time the United Nations has greatly increased the size of its membership. At first its membership comprised only 51 nations. Since then we have passed various statutes dealing with it and we have formulated various policies in regard to it.

The original plan was that the United Nations would operate primarily through the Security Council. Since that time the membership of the United Nations has increased, until today it includes 104 nations. Thus, its membership is now more than double what it originally was.

As an illustration of how little the legislative branch of our Government—including the Senate—has had to do with the United Nations, I point out that we have had virtually nothing to do with it during the period when its membership has more than doubled, although our country has paid, now pays, and is assessed with, approximately half of its operating costs. However, I am not complaining about that.

I shall speak quite briefly, and I wish every Senator might have a chance to state exactly how he feels about the problems involved in the United Nations—problems which, as we know, have no absolute answers.

Certainly I do not favor destruction of the United Nations. After all, I was one of its original sponsors—at a time long before I became a Member of this body; and I then shared, with so many others, too many illusions about how much the United Nations would be able to accomplish. Along with the others, I am disappointed because the United Nations has not been able to accomplish more—even though I realize that originally we expected too much of it. We know that a large part of the responsibility for its limited accomplishments is due to the failure of the Russians to go along with its real purpose.

But the point I make at this time is that our entire group of laws dealing with the United Nations needs to be reviewed and reevaluated in view of the changing world conditions and the changing membership of the United Nations, and the better knowledge we now have of that Organization.

The financial matter under consideration is, I believe, incidental; but if we now pass over and more or less sweep under the rug all the problems to which I have referred, which definitely affect the United Nations, by merely agreeing to a bond issue, and if we thus postpone to some uncertain future time the making of these necessary evaluations, I believe we shall lend uncertainty to the future of the Organization, and shall tend to weaken it, rather than strengthen it.

So it is my plea that we evaluate these matters now—not only the financial problems, but also others which go with them.

Today we are operating, insofar as the United Nations is concerned, under laws which no longer apply, and which do not meet the problems which have arisen.

So I welcome the debate, as far as it goes; and certainly the Russell amendment stops things as they are now, and provides that such problems can be dealt with, so that the United Nations can continue.

The Russell amendment will solve the financial problem in part, and will throw all the other problems into an issue subject to reevaluation.

Let me refer quite briefly to the pertinent laws to which I have referred—for instance, section 287(d) of title 22 of the United States Code. It provides certain authority with reference to special agreements worked out with the Security Council. However, that law does not function today, because there can be no such agreements with the Security Council.

The same section also states that an agreement is necessary in order to make it applicable. Therefore, we have to disregard that part of section 287(d).

So, Mr. President, after all, we are forced to rely on one rather obscure part of section 287(d) of this title of the code—one which provides that the President has authority to make available, upon request, personnel in a noncombatant capacity, not to exceed 100 troops at any one time, and certain nonmilitary facilities. It seems to me that the slimness of that authority constitutes one of the best arguments which can be made here in favor of a reappraisal of the entire matter, in view of the new problems, so as to provide modern law which will apply on a sounder basis.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield briefly to the Senator from Arkansas, although I am speaking in limited time, and I have another appointment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I know the Senator from Mississippi has great respect for the traditional procedures of this body. Is it not proper for an amendment of this seriousness to be presented to the appropriate committee? Yet, as the Senator from Mississippi knows, it has not had any committee consideration, and it does involve, as he has pointed out, a very serious question. Will he not agree that such a question should be subjected to committee consideration, committee hearings, and testimony in committee, before the Senate acts on it?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; it would suit me much better if the matter had been presented to the appropriate committee, and certainly I do not mistrust the committee or anything of the sort. I assume that if the Senate were to adopt the amendment now, such action would very quickly result in some extensive hearings and studies, not only by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but also by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I also assume that no such proposal would become law until it had received more extensive study by very fine, capable, and well-qualified minds.

I point out that this is the first time, during all the years since Senate ratification of the United Nations Charter, that there has been substantial debate on the floor of the Senate in regard to the United Nations. I do not favor killing the United Nations. I think someday we may have to build up an outside organization, in order to try to take the place of the United Nations in the free world. However, I do not want to try to cripple the United Nations now, in the least.

But the Russell amendment constitutes a way to consider the subject; and we shall not do so if we proceed otherwise from year to year, and thus sweep the problems involved under the rug.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Mississippi will yield further, let me ask whether he agrees that section 2 of the Russell amendment is quite irrelevant to the new subject matter of this measure?

Mr. STENNIS. At the beginning of my remarks, I believe, I said that two questions are involved. One of them is the financial question. The other is a reevaluation of our laws which relate to the United Nations. The Russell amendment touches both of those subjects, and puts both of them squarely at issue.

The Senator from Mississippi thinks they should have far more extensive consideration and determination than the bond issue solely will have, particularly in its present form.

Mr. President, my time is limited. There is one further point I wish to mention. The Senator from Mississippi has been greatly impressed by the experiences of certain members of our Armed Forces who have been sent out on United Nations missions. They were not intended to be truly combat missions, but those men have been shot at. They have been under fire indirectly, but they are shot just the same. I still cling to the old-fashioned opinion that when any man is in one of the U.S. services and wears an American uniform, the American uniform is supposed to go with him and protect him wherever he goes, or whatever his mission is.

When we abandon that policy, we show weakness all over the world, and we lay the groundwork for a much more serious situation.

Only 18 months ago, two fine Air Force captains, one of them being from the State of the Senator from Tennessee, personally told me in my office, at my request—it was not as a result of their complaint—about flying a United Nations cargo mission, in a U.S. plane, into one of the places of trouble. As they went into the area, they learned that the rest of the crew had been captured. They, too, were captured and thrown into prison. As they lay huddled on the floor, soldiers came in to where they were, sticking their bayonets into the latrine, where they were imprisoned, and cursing and hitting them. A little Korean nurse intervened, and, through her influence, they were saved. They were not killed, but were brought back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield myself 1 more minute.

We vote into law a Selective Service Act that puts these men in the service, and then we send them all over the world. We should affirm, with more definite agreements than are now in effect, and before this situation goes any further, certain positive policies within the United Nations, or preferably within the United States, that the power of the United States will follow these men wherever they go, so long as we put a button with the letters "USA" on their uniforms, and assure them that they are entitled to the absolute protection, in any way it can be given, of the power of the United States and of its fighting forces.

My plea is for a reevaluation of the applicable statutes and policies, as well as financial features of the law. The Russell amendment puts them in issue.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, when the Senator from Mississippi completes his statement, I should like to ask him a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Mississippi is chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. I am very much concerned over a statement in the paper today concerning the National Guard. I was about to ask the Senator if he cares to say whether his subcommittee is to hold hearings on the order which was issued by the Army. I will not press the question if he has not given it any thought.

Mr. STENNIS. I read the headlines in the newspapers. That is as much as I know about the subject. I would naturally consult with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services to see if he intends to take up the question.

Mr. BUSH. I discussed it with the chairman of that committee [Mr. RUSSELL]. He suggested that I ask the Senator from Mississippi the question. I shall not press the Senator for an answer. I suggest that the Senator consider holding hearings.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I know of his interest in the subject. We shall review the situation, and I shall confer with the Senator from Connecticut.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield me some time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Not more than 5 minutes. I was hoping the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would be present in the Chamber. I have sent a page boy to find him.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Perhaps the Senator from Arizona can start speaking, in the hope that the Senator from Georgia will later come into the Chamber.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I live in eternal hope; and, knowing the Senator from Georgia, I am sure he will come.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much time does the Senator from Arizona wish?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Five minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] entering the Chamber. I wished to address myself very briefly in support of his amendment and to point out a news release that came to me from my hometown newspaper, the Arizona Republic, carrying the dateline Geneva, UPI, March 31.

I shall read first from the amendment itself, and then from the release, and ask the Senator from Georgia if he is not fortified even more than ever in the conviction that his amendment should be adopted.

The amendment of the Senator from Georgia reads, in section 2:

> From and after the enactment of this Act, no official of the United States or any other person acting in behalf of the United States shall be authorized to permit the use of any military equipment or materiel belonging to the United States or to order the participation of any person serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in any military action instituted by the United Nations unless and until such use or participation has been authorized by a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States if the Congress shall be in session.

Mr. President, I discussed the news release to which I have referred earlier on the floor with the distinguished majority leader and with the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is handling the bill on the floor; and both of them admitted, as I had to admit, that all they know about it is from the clipping I received.

Before I read it, let me say that this morning I asked both Secretary Rusk and Mr. Foster, who is Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, if there is any truth to the story. It is now 3:15 in the afternoon, and I have received no answer. I have been told that they are trying to get an answer. I suggest that such a major pronouncement as this should be pretty well known to the Agency.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me read the article first. Then I shall be happy to yield.

The article reads:

> The United States will submit to the Geneva disarmament conference a plan calling for elimination of national armies within 9 years and their replacement by a United Nations force, reliable sources said yesterday.
>
> The American plan is to be submitted to the 17-nation group to counter a Soviet draft treaty for general and complete disarmament within 4 years, introduced when the conference opened here 2 weeks ago.

I shall not bother with the rest of the article, because I put it in the RECORD earlier today; but the thing that disturbs me, if there is any substance to the UPI statement coming from Geneva, is that not only is the amendment of the Senator from Georgia needed, but the Congress should take a hard look at any suggestion that the United States abandon its military forces within 9 years in favor of their conversion into a United Nations force.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this is the first I have heard of such a suggestion by an official of the Government. I admit that the Constitution of the United States has lost its appeal to a great many people, particularly Members of Congress and some of the judiciary, but such an aim could not be accomplished without still further distorting or forgetting the Constitution, or winding up by putting it in the Smithsonian Institution along with other abandoned articles, without its being changed.

The Constitution says that is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States. I can assure the Senator that, as one Member of this body, I shall oppose with all my strength any proposal which would disband the Armed Forces of the United States, which, after all, are what is maintaining world peace. We can talk all we please about the various agreements—and I have supported most of them, and support them now—but the element which is maintaining peace and preventing a major war today is the armed might of the United States of America, led by the Strategic Air Command. If ever we were to subscribe to any such theory as that, the world would be quickly taken over by the Communists, who teach, as they do, that it is a noble thing to tell a lie if it serves the purposes of the Soviet Government.

I would rather approve the 4-year disarmament, if it carried complete inspection, than to adopt any such policy as the Senator has read.

The number of those who favor one world and one government, who proudly proclaim themselves as being very liberal when construing the Constitution of the United States, is increasing considerably, but I do not believe that the people of the United States would tolerate any such thing as that for 5 minutes, anywhere along the line, if made by any man in public life today—and we have some very popular figures. Our people do peculiar things at times, but, after all, basically they are very sound. If we were to submit the American people to any such agreement as that, it would put this country at the mercy of the Soviet Union, and to do so it would be necessary to transform the way of thinking of the majority of the people of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Missouri in the chair). The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Georgia. He gave the answer I expected him to give.

I wish to reiterate my statement that if the statement to which I have referred is true—and I am not saying it is, though it is stated that it came from a reliable source—we should know about it. It is now 3:20 o'clock in the afternoon. I have had no notification from the State Department or from the Disarmament Agency that the story is incorrect. I suggest again that any policy of a major nature such as this should be known all down through those organizations, and we should not have to wait for Mr. Rusk or for Mr. Foster to return to his office.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would think that the executive branch might believe it to be of advantage to take some one Member of the Congress into its confidence on a matter as momentous as this. Some years ago Congress was a coordinate and equal branch of the Government. Of course, it is not today, because we have surrendered so many of our duties, responsibilities, and prerogatives. However, I find it difficult to believe the executive branch would have embarked on any such scheme as that without at least having told our distinguished majority leader something.

Mr. MANSFIELD rose.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have stated earlier in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Arizona that I knew nothing about this story. The Senator's pronouncement on the floor is based on a UPI dispatch, which is based in turn on reliable information. This

Together with the staff I have been trying to analyze the charter of the United Nations. I have concluded that ultimately the General Assembly, with 104 members, has not only the power to make commitments in the matter of social and welfare operations, but also in the matter of maintaining peace and committing troops of the United Nations supplied by the member nations. Under the charter the General Assembly can determine what social and welfare programs shall be promoted. The General Assembly also has the ultimate power to fix the budget and to allocate the cost to the member nations in the amounts that the General Assembly sees fit.

Coming to the second phase of possible operations, we consider the peace enforcement practices, such as are now being undertaken in the Gaza Strip and in the Congo. In the first instance, the Security Council has the power to determine whether troops shall be committed. If one nation in the Security Council vetoes the action, that commitment cannot be made. It can then be taken up by the General Assembly. On the basis of past precedents we must accept the fact that the General Assembly, consisting of representatives of 104 nations, can make a commitment when two-thirds of those nations vote in favor of it. The General Assembly can also fix the budget and determine how the budget shall be proportionately borne by the member countries.

What does that mean?

In 1945, when the United Nations was established, there were 51 members. Today there are 104. Togo, Mali, Ghana, and Senegal, as well as other nations of comparable size, have an equal vote with that of the United States. That very statement declares and indicates the inequity of the situation as it prevails in the casting of votes in the General Assembly.

Various students of the United Nations have recommended certain methods of curing this inequity in the General Assembly. No progress can be made because the Soviets will not allow the question to come to a disposition. Therefore, I say that a review of this subject must be had. A great deal of talk has been heard about the question being brought before the World Court on the question of the mandatory nature of the obligations that will be incurred in these special operations. I say to my colleagues in the Senate, "Do not rejoice too much over what the World Court is going to declare. If the World Court declares that each nation is mandatorily bound to pay for the operations in the form of social and welfare programs and to pay for the operations of military use to achieve peace, what will be the position of the United States in the General Assembly, with 1 vote out of 104?"

That question is likely to arise in the future. For that reason I say that a revision and review of the whole organization will have to be made.

I now come to the proposal of the Senator from Georgia. My feeling is substantially in accord with his. I cannot, however, feel that this vital issue should be determined upon the basis of a discussion such as has taken place on the floor of the Senate in the past 2 days. I am positive in the judgment which I have expressed. The subject is so crucial that I become frightened when I say that I am sure.

I think that review was needed. It ought to be held with full-scale committee meetings, arguments, and the submission of proof. Then we can decide upon a proposal which will not leave us in the helpless position of having a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly and committing our money and our troops, although the United States votes against the commitment.

Now to summarize: I am thankful to the Senator from Georgia for raising this issue. I had not known that he had examined into it. However, I had asked the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations to prepare answers to certain questions which I propounded on the subject of the power of the General Assembly and the power of the Security Council. I think the questions are pertinent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the questions I submitted and the answers received, because I believe they are informative and reflect correctly the powers of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTION 1

Does the Security Council or the General Assembly, or both, have the power to determine what peace projects—such as the Gaza and the Congo operations—and what aid projects shall be undertaken and financed by the U.N.?

Answer

All economic and social questions, including aid projects, are under the authority of the General Assembly. Peace-keeping operations, on the other hand, may involve the Security Council as well as the General Assembly, since both have some power under the provisions of the U.N. Charter to consider situations which threaten peace. The Security Council has primary responsibility and jurisdiction in such cases.

Article 39 of the charter provides as follows:

"The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Action by the Security Council, however, has often been stymied by the Soviet veto and, as a result, the General Assembly has assumed a greater importance in peace and security questions. Its authority for this role is contained in article 10 of the charter, which provides:

"The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present charter, and except as provided in article 12, may make recommendations to members of the United Nations or to the Security Council or to both on any such questions or matters." [1]

You may recall that after the Korean aggression the General Assembly adopted the uniting for peace resolution by a vote of 52 to 5 and 2 abstentions. It provided that if the veto prevented the Security Council from exercising its responsibilities for maintaining peace the General Assembly: "shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security." [2]

QUESTION 2

Does the General Assembly or the Security Council, or both, have the power to fix the budget and allocate the share that the member nations shall contribute?

Answer

Article 17 of the charter gives the General Assembly exclusive power to fix the budget and allocate each member's share. Article 17 provides as follows:

"1. The General Assembly shall consider and approve the budget of the organization.

"2. The expenses of the organization shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly.

"3. The General Assembly shall consider and approve any financial and budgetary arrangements with specialized agencies referred to in article 57 and shall examine the administrative budgets of such specialized agencies with a view to making recommendations to the agencies concerned."

QUESTION 3

If the World Court decides that the cost of special operations are mandatory obligations of the member nations, and if the U.N. Charter gives the power to the General Assembly to determine what special projects shall be undertaken and to fix the budget for the financing of such special operations, what protection does the United States have against being an unwilling participant in an operation to which it does not subscribe?

Answer

The World Court opinion on this matter would, of course, be advisory; the Court has no power to enforce its rulings. Its opinion, however, would be an authoritative statement of international financial obligations.

There are a number of safeguards which the United States would have against being an unwilling participant in an operation recommended by the General Assembly to which the United States did not subscribe:

1. The primary safeguard is that such an operation could not be recommended by the General Assembly without approval of two-thirds of the members present and voting. In other words, the United States would need only one-third of the votes plus one to stop such an operation. It is difficult to envision such an occasion in which the United States would not be able to rally at least this much support.

2. Secondly, the United States could not withhold funds for such an operation. The effect of this action, of course, would be that the United States would eventually lose its vote in the General Assembly. In the meantime, however, a substantial portion of the funds for the operation would not be available unless other nations assumed United States obligations.

3. As a last resort the United States could withdraw from the organization.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this subject should be reviewed. I do not believe it ought to be disposed of in the manner that has been proposed on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, I shall reluctantly not join with the Senator from Georgia, although I think he has performed a notable service in bringing this issue before the Senate.

---

[1] Art. 12 prohibits the Assembly from making recommendations on any matter while the Security Council is functioning in respect to it, unless the Council so requests.

[2] The General Assembly shall be called into session for this purpose "if requested by the Security Council on the vote of any 7 members, or by a majority of the members of the United Nations."

One more word, because I think this situation will prove to be significant in the future. Do not rejoice if the World Court decides that levies made by the United Nations are a mandatory obligation upon each member nation. That decision may be a sword with a two-edged blade, and it may eventually become under the present powers of the General Assembly, a bane instead of a balm.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to say in his presence that I believe the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has rendered a noteworthy service to the Senate. It was not possible for me to hear his entire address on this subject; but subsequently he was kind enough to point out to me some of the sections in the law which are applicable. Not only is the Senator from Georgia probably the most brilliant parliamentarian in the Senate; but in my opinion, he is one of the most courageous Members of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is necessary for me to leave the Chamber, but before I do so, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his compliment.

Mr. ALLOTT. I mean it from my heart. I find myself in this particular instance torn between the desire to vote for the amendment and not to vote for it, because we seek the accomplishment of certain objectives which I do not believe the amendment will quite achieve.

On many occasions within the last year I said I thought it was time for the United States to reappraise its relationship to the United Nations. I said this despite my continuing feeling that the United Nations represents the last instrument on earth at present by which a real world order may be achieved, an order of principles and perhaps an order of law, outside of our own strength.

While I cannot support the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, I can understand the reasons for his offering it. I should like to cite two examples that have occurred in the last year in the Government of the United States with relation to the United Nations. They are examples of why we in Congress need to have extensive hearings and extensive debate, not only upon our relationships with the United Nations, but upon what the role of the United Nations is.

In the early part of last year, our representative at the United Nations committed the United States to a contribution of $100 million for the Congo operation. It was a substantial assessment, and it was proposed while Congress was in session, while the Committees on Appropriations of both the House and the Senate were here. Yet nothing was said either to the chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations or to the Committees on Appropriations themselves about this commitment.

When the subject arose before the committee in connection with the supplemental appropriation bill last year, the answers of the State Department were, indeed, feeble. First they said, "Well, we felt we had a right to make the commitment, because the money could be taken out of the President's emergency fund." But when the commitment of $10 million a month from January through October was carefully considered, it was learned that not enough money was left in the President's emergency fund to fulfill the commitment. When the Department recognized that fact, Congress later supplied the money by way of a regular appropriation.

Another explanation given by the State Department representatives at that time was that the United Nations understood the proposal was not a commitment; but the fact is, according to my understanding of the situation, that while we may be formally asked to recognize appropriations that have been made later, for all practical purposes our representative in the United Nations has made a commitment for $100 million which Congress must back up. This was later extended. We provided more than $120 million up until the first of this year.

This is not to say, nor do I say or imply, that I do not approve of the United States and the United Nations backing the Congo operation. I feel that that operation has resulted in a net benefit to us and to the world. However, I do say that it is high time the State Department recognized the fact that it cannot bypass Congress when Congress is in session. There can be no justification for not at least keeping the Committee on Appropriations informed when such commitments are made.

Another example occurred later in the year, at Punta del Este. The senior Senator from Georgia cross-examined the representatives of the State Department at great length when we had learned the outcome of the conference. Senators know what appeared in the newspapers. They will recall reading that the United States had committed itself to giving the South American countries, under the Alianza Para Progresso—the Alliance for Progress—$20 billion in the next 10 years. The Constitution provides that an appropriation of $20 billion or any other amount must come from Congress. Under our system of government, only Congress can appropriate money.

So far as I know, the type of commitment that was made at Punta del Este was never discussed with any member of the Committees on Appropriations, even though Congress was in session at that time. So last year, while Congress was in session, and while the members of the Committees on Appropriations were here, these two large commitments were made, commitments which bound, for all practical purposes—I say that again: bound for all practical purposes—the participation and the activity of Congress. I leave out of the discussion, only for the time being, the question whether the money which will go to South America will ever produce benefits for the United States, because at the rate and in the manner in which it is being expended, I do not believe it will.

I must say in all frankness that when the representatives of the State Department came before us, they said that it was not a $20 billion commitment to South America and Latin America; that it was only a $12 or $14 billion commitment. But the fact is that it was published all over the world that the commitment was for $20 billion; and in the eyes of the world, that is the amount for which the United States is committed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to associate myself with the remarks the Senator from Colorado has made.

Personally, I should like very much to support the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Georgia; but I do not feel that I can do so at this time.

The United Nations should be made the subject of a thorough study by the Congress; but the subject is of such great importance that we should not attempt to act on it this afternoon.

About 2 weeks ago, at Wichita, Kans., I attended a meeting at which our former Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, spoke; and on that occasion he stressed the importance of the bond issue to the United Nations, and also stressed the question of whether the United Nations should or could continue as an instrumentality for peace.

I think the remarks of the Senator from Colorado are very important and timely, and I thank him for them.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator from Kansas recalls that at the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee, after the discussion of this question, I suggested that the committee do what has been suggested; namely, study the problem and hear again from our chief delegate to the United Nations and from others involved, and hold sessions of sufficient scope to explore these questions thoroughly. I still feel that that should be done, and I am rather hopeful that it will be done.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, in conclusion, if this amendment has served no other purpose, at least it has served to focus the concern which I believe most of us feel about whether the United States has the correct relationship with the United Nations. It has also served to focus attention upon the format of the United Nations, as it now exists, and to suggest that this format is due for a good hard look.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] will hold such hearings, because in that case, if this amendment results in nothing but such hearings, at least the presentation of this particular amendment will have been of great value to us.

I believe the time has come, in connection with the relationships between the State Department and the Congress, for the State Department to take Congress into its confidence, and even once in awhile, to pay heed to Congress as a coequal branch of the Government, especially if the State Department is to make long-term commitments involving the funds of the United States. We have seen a great sufficiency of examples where the Congress has been skirted. It is high time that the executive branch recognize that it is the duty and responsibility of Congress to appropriate funds in advance, not to approve, after the fact, commitments made for us.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I congratulate the Senator from Colorado for his statement. I have supported the United Nations down the line, and I hope to be able to continue to support it. However, the Senator's last remark is most apt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado may proceed for 1 more minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield further to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, apparently the United Nations or certain of our representatives have undertaken to arrogate to themselves the privilege of committing the United States without consultation with the Congress, and sometimes without consultation with the executive branch of our Government. This is one example of such self-authorization which seems to have been assumed by our representatives to the United Nations. So I believe we should seriously consider a review of the increasing and expanding separation of the activities of our country's representatives in the United Nations from the Congress and from the executive branch of our Government.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Iowa. I thoroughly agree with him.

I now yield back the remainder of the time made available to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. RUSSELL. So am I, if we may have the yeas and nays ordered on the question of agreeing to my amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], as a substitute for the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Kerr], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Kerr], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 72, as follows:

[No. 35 Leg.]

YEAS—21

Bennett
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Capehart
Cotton
Dworshak
Eastland
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hickey
McClellan
Murphy
Robertson
Russell
Smith, Maine
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—72

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Sparkman
Symington
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—7

Anderson
Chavez
Curtis
Hruska
Kerr
Long, La.
Neuberger

So Mr. Russell's amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, are there further amendments to be offered?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, I have an amendment. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 2, lines 4 and 5, of the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment in the nature of a substitute, it is proposed to strike out "or agreed to be made."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall use very little time in explaining the amendment and why it was offered.

In the committee there was considerable discussion about whether the United States should buy $100 million worth of bonds outright or whether it should begin at a base of a $25 million purchase and then agree to match dollar for dollar purchases made by other countries. I offered an amendment which would have achieved that objective.

When the amendment in the nature of a substitute was finally drafted, instead of providing for matching dollar for dollar the purchases actually made by other countries it was written into the amendment that the United States would not only match dollar for dollar the purchases actually made but also the purchases agreed to be made.

My amendment contemplates striking out that language which declares that the United States will match dollar for dollar the purchases agreed to be made but not executed.

Yesterday I made inquiry about the status of the prospective purchasers, pledgers, and those who promise to be pledgers. The figures submitted to me showed that three countries have made purchases. They are Denmark, Norway, and Finland. Those three countries purchased $5.7 million worth of bonds. That fact is fixed and unchangeable.

There were 20 nations, as of yesterday, which had pledged to purchase $43,785,000 worth of bonds.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That statement now should be 22 nations, and the amount pledged should be $52,755,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The figure has changed since yesterday.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. Italy came in, with a subscription of $8,960,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concede that is, in all probability, the fact.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield for the purpose, I ask unanimous consent to have a table which shows bond purchases by other nations as of April 4, 1962, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 5, 1962.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: An up-to-date list of U.N. bond purchases by other countries is attached. It adds an $8,960,000 purchase by Italy as informally made public at a press conference by Fanfani March 29 and learned here just this week.

Total purchases and pledges by 35 other nations now is $61,704,354.35.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON.

Bond purchases by other nations

As of April 4, 1962, we have been advised as follows about other nations' plans to purchase bonds:

Actual purchases:	
Denmark	$2,500,000
Finland	1,480,000
Norway	1,800,000
Total (3 nations)	5,780,000
Publicly announced pledges:	
Austria	900,000
Australia	4,000,000
Burma	100,000
Canada	6,240,000
Ceylon	25,000
China	500,000
Congo (Leopoldville)	50,000
Ethiopia	200,000
Germany	10,000,000
Iceland	80,000
India	2,000,000
Ireland	300,000
Israel	200,000
Italy	8,960,000
Liberia	200,000
Malaya	340,000
Pakistan	500,000
Sierra Leone	10,000
Sudan	50,000
Sweden	5,800,000
United Kingdom	12,000,000
Venezuela	300,000
Total (22 nations)	52,755,000
Specific but unannounced pledges (10 nations): Nations that have notified us confidentially that they plan to buy bonds in the amount of	3,169,354
Grand total, purchases and pledges (35 nations) (both announced and unannounced)	61,704,354

In favor of issue—no specific amount (18 nations): Nations that have indicated a favorable response, without signifying an amount.

Issue being actively considered (21 nations): Nations that have the question under active consideration.

Do not plan to subscribe (10 nations): Nations that have indicated that they do not plan to subscribe.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The figures given to me by the State Department showed that as of yesterday the aggregate of bonds actually purchased, pledged to be purchased, or promised to be pledged to be purchased later, was $52,755,000. Of the $52,755,000 in the aggregate, $5,780,000 worth of bonds actually had been purchased by Norway, Denmark, and Finland. Twenty nations had pledged to purchase $43,785,000.

Many of those 20 nations have soft currencies. At least 10 of the 20 do not have hard currencies, but have soft currencies. Those nations cannot execute their pledges. They will not be able to execute them, according to their statements, until 1963, when, through some business operations, they will acquire hard dollars as a substitute for their soft currencies.

In addition to the two items that I mentioned, pledges in the amount of $3,179,354 were to be made. That statement brings us to the following proposition: The purpose of the proposal that we buy on a matching basis was to insert in the bill an instrumentality that would act coercively upon the members to buy. We did not want the member nations to think that in consternation and panic we would pick up the tab regardless of what the other 103 nations did. The State Department admits that there are nations that have pledged but will not be able to execute their pledges until 1963. What I suggest is that our purchases of bonds in excess of the $25 million of bonds be tied dollar for dollar to the amount of bonds in dollars bought by other nations, and that we do not tie our subscription into a future promise.

I point out further to the Senate that many of the member nations that have pledged and do not have the necessary hard dollars to meet their pledges are now substantially in arrears in the payment of their obligations to the United Nations. If those nations could convert their soft currency into hard dollars in 1963, under my amendment we would match their purchases in 1963.

As now written, the bill does not at all conform to the arguments that were made in the committee. The agreement was that we would match dollar for dollar the purchases actually made. But as the bill is now written, we would buy and match not only on the basis of purchases actually made, but on the pledges and the promises of pledges.

I should like to leave with the Senate a further thought. In the committee we added up what would be the prospective amount that would come into the United Nations under my amendment. The figures are as follows: We would purchase $25 million worth of bonds absolutely. At that time there was in prospect $43 million of actual purchases by other member nations. We would match those $43 million of purchases, and in the aggregate we would double the $43 million and produce $86 million. So we arrived at the conclusion that, at the least, the United Nations would obtain $111 million.

Since that discussion there has been the disclosure that some countries would like to buy but will be unable to buy. I suggest that for the good of the United Nations and the character of the members we ought to match dollar for dollar the purchases actually made and not dollar for dollar the purchases promised to be made.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assure the Senator from Ohio that I thoroughly agree with him on his amendment. I see no reason whatsoever for including in the amendment the words "or agreed to be purchased." As I interpret the provisions before us, we would buy the first $25 million worth of so-called bonds without any matching. At the present time $5,700,000 worth of bonds have been purchased by other countries. If the proposal should pass, we could, immediately thereafter, buy an additional $5,700,000 worth of bonds, and as rapidly as other countries bought bonds, we could buy bonds.

But under the present language of the bill, which provides for pledges to buy bonds at some future time, we would proceed to buy bonds merely on the promise of other countries that at some time in the future they would buy bonds when, as, and if they had the necessary money to do so.

I do not believe that such procedure would protect the financial integrity of the situation at all. I thoroughly agree that the words to which the Senator's amendment is directed should be stricken from the amendment. I know there is great sentiment for the United States to continue to finance the United Nations willy-nilly every time it gets into a hole. We are expected to pick up the tab. But it is time for us to take a very careful look at the question and begin to safeguard the interests not only of the United States, but actually the interests and the integrity of the United Nations itself, by requiring some fiscal soundness and responsibility in that organization and in most of the countries that make it up. So I will support the Senator's amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am grateful to the Senator from Iowa for his encouraging words. We ought not to put the State Department in the position of saying to other countries, "You do not have to purchase. All you have to do is promise to purchase; and if you promise to purchase, the United States will put up an amount equal to the amount you promise to buy."

I think that is a dangerous situation and ought not to be tolerated. I do not think my statement can be challenged. The discussion in the committee was that we should buy on the basis of what the other nations would actually buy, and not on the basis of what they might promise to buy.

Probably a situation has arisen in which it is feared that many countries cannot now buy but would buy if they could. We ought not to tie our kite to such an unstable situation.

I have described my amendment, and I now ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I rise in opposition to the amendment. It sounds on its face as if we certainly ought to adopt it. We might say, "Why not?"

When the amendment is examined into carefully, we find there are some good reasons why it should not be adopted. Without in any way knowing what was in the mind of the Senator from Ohio—and I had no way of knowing because he had not caused any amendment to be printed—I caused to be printed, on February 15, 1962, an amendment to the bill in precisely the words which were contained in the bill as reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and which are contained in the bill now, except that the amount I fixed was $20 million instead of the $25 million in the bill.

So at the very least I claim the right to share in the parentage of the amendment.

I point out that the State Department, notwithstanding its original opposition, finally took a pretty good view of the amendment and indeed said—and I have asked the permission of the Senator in charge of the bill to repeat the statement which I am about to quote from the report of the State Department:

> In some respects the concept of matching plus an additional amount which may be used to purchase bonds at the discretion of the President may be advantageous in our continuing efforts to reaffirm the principle of every member responsibility in the United Nations.

I emphasize the words "at the discretion of the President." When I drafted the amendment, the idea was to leave $75 million in the discretion of the President to match other purchases, because the amendment provides that we shall buy at present an amount not to exceed $25 million, unless additional purchases are matched by others.

Obviously, the President has discretion. If that is not enough, we now have double discretion, because the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment itself is a completely discretionary amendment so far as the President is concerned.

Therefore, there is discretion, first, in the language of section 2 of the bill itself, and, second, there is added discretion because the whole thing is discretionary with the President of the United States.

So, Mr. President, why do I object to these words being taken out? I will tell the Senate why I object. They were in my amendment, and they are in the bill now. I am a businessman, too. I have met payrolls, and I understand what an obligation means.

I understand that there are countries which perhaps may not be able, exactly on the minute or on the hour, to deliver their checks to the Secretary General.

We talk about the U.N. and the dignity and importance to its members. We talk about the dignity and importance of the State Department of the United States. I say two things in that connection. First, we have no right to doubt the intelligence or the good faith of the State Department or of the President in shopping around and approaching countries to make commitments which the State Department and the President know will not be performed by these countries. I refuse to believe that any President of the United States or any Secretary of State of the United States will do any such thing. I have no right to assume anything like that. I do not know of any Secretary of State or any President who in his right mind would do any such thing.

Second, and very importantly, we are talking about small nations and about their dignity and their responsibility, and the fact that we want them to believe that they are important people, and that we want to give them a sense of nationhood and a sense of importance.

Yet, Mr. President, it is proposed that the Senate now doubt their good faith to meet their commitment by striking these words out of the bill.

If the bill had come to the Senate without them, I would not have argued to put them in. However, they are in the bill now. It is proposed that we strike them out, because, it is argued, some nations will not honor their commitments. It would be a great mistake on our part to strike these words. I do not believe it will make a difference of as much as $10,000. I do not believe that the President or the State Department is softheaded. The words are in there now. Whether they should have been in there in the first place is immaterial. The whole thing is not that important. It will not make a great financial difference. They are there now. We must bear in mind what the implication is of striking out those words. It is a very serious reflection on the small nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. This would be a very unwise course to take by the Senate at this time, especially when it is such a serious matter to the small nations.

I respect the Senator from Ohio enormously. In my opinion this was a very wonderful thing for him to do. He told me in advance what he had in mind, even before I filed my amendment. I think it is great. I am very pleased that it is here. It is hardheaded, and it should be here. However, as long as the language has come out of the committee this way, I would say to my friend from Ohio to himself consider the implications which we would raise by striking out those words with respect to commitments. I do not believe it is worth doing it. In all deference and respect and honor, I do not think it is worth it. I believe we would be taking something out of the bill which has significance and importance. We would be indicating our doubt as to whether a particular country would keep its commitment. We can safely leave all that to the discretion of the President and the State Department. I have criticized them before, and no doubt I will again. I do not believe there are any angels. But this is a very hardheaded thing, and they are not going to lead us into any cul-de-sac on an issue of this character. We can safely leave it to the doublebarreled discretion that we now have established. We should not give any idea to some person who will get up in the United Nations and say, "You see what these Americans are like. You have to give them cash on the barrelhead. They will not trust a nation who is a member of the United Nations."

I say it is not worth it. I ask my friend from Ohio to think it over. He did a great thing when this went through the committee and when it survived in the Dirksen-Mansfield substitute, which I believe should be adopted overwhelmingly. Let us not do anything to spoil what is already a good thing, when, in all sincerity, it will not make any material difference.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe there is an aspect involved here which transcends what has been mentioned by the Senator from New York. Many people in the United States are complaining very sincerely about the burdens that we are assuming. I believe we should assure them that we are trying to perform our duty by asking every other nation to meet its corresponding responsibility. I believe a mistake is made when we give to the world the idea that, regardless of what they do, the United States will pick up the tab. That is the actual fact. If we look at the testimony given before the Foreign Relations Committee, we find that there are probably 75 nations which are delinquent in their payments, and have been delinquent for some time. I am not the one who is creating these facts. These facts exist. They stand as granite, and neither the Senator from New York nor the Senator from Ohio can change them. The overwhelming evidence is that the nations will not pay. The people of the United States know that to be a fact. My mail is overwhelming in asking me to repudiate the whole thing.

I do not believe that it would be a sound procedure to follow. I believe the world would be worse off if we did not have a United Nations. It has served a useful purpose, and its service can be intensified to greater richness if we show a purpose to perform our obligations and at the same time anticipate that the other nations will perform their obligations.

I believe the Senator from New York implied that there may be some strength in what I propose. However, he argues that it will be productive of no good. On that subject both of us are looking into the future. Neither one of us can foretell what will happen. However, I believe that, as good a lawyer as the Senator from New York is—and I hold him in high respect—if he were drafting a document in his own law office, would he tell his client to accept the kind of loose language that is now in the bill?

I would wager that he would say to his client, "This language creates a problematical situation. It requires no certainty of action. The other party can do whatever he wants to do after committing himself to make the purchase. However, you must pay."

I venture to say that he would call his client into the side office and say to him, "You cannot obligate yourself on this kind of uncertain and nebulous basis."

That is all I am asking that we do. We will buy $25 million worth of bonds to start with. We will match dollar for dollar up to $100 million on purchases made by other nations, not the promises made by other nations.

That is my case. I am ready to vote.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment. I hope the Senate will not agree to it. This language was contained in the bill which was considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was included in the amendment proposed to us by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] this morning. It was in the proposal for the loan of $25 million and the matching above that point. It has been a part of the language all the way through the consideration of this subject. It is in the language of the substitute offered by the two leaders of the Senate. It was in the bill and in the substitute and in every consideration which came before the various conferences which were held to negotiate a settlement of the question.

It was understood and agreed when we left the last conference that we would stand on the substitute offered by the two leaders, without amendment. I do not believe the substitute should be amended.

First of all, if the language is stricken, it will mean that instead of the United States making a substantial purchase, as it could do now on the basis of the $62 million which has been publicly pledged, it would have to make bond purchases of relatively small amounts, or at least bits and pieces, as we moved along. I do not favor that kind of operation. I believe the amendment of the Senator from Ohio should be defeated.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time, and I do yield it back.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. On this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 36 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Allott
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Capehart
Case, S. Dak.
Cotton
Curtis
Dodd
Dworshak
Eastland
Fong
Goldwater
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Hill
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Mundt
Murphy
Pell
Robertson
Russell
Scott
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—64

Aiken
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Douglas
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickey
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Symington
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—7

Anderson
Bennett
Chavez
Hruska
Long, La.
Neuberger
Young, N. Dak.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute is open to further amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The amendment to the amendment was read, as follows:

On page 2, line 3, after the word "Act" insert a comma and the following: "including amounts obtained through the sale of United Nations support bonds under section 5,".

On page 2, line 5, before the period insert the following: "and shall in no event exceed $100,000,000".

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) For the purpose of providing an opportunity for the public to provide support for the activities of the United Nations, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to issue special obligations of the United States, designated as "United Nations support bonds", in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to the United States savings bonds except that United Nations support bonds shall mature not more than twenty-five years from the date as of which issued, and shall be issued on a discount basis such as to afford an investment yield not in excess of 2 percentum per annum, compounded semiannually, when held to maturity.

"(b) United Nations support bonds shall have a face value of $25, $50, $100, $500, and $1,000 when held to maturity, and may be issued in such other denominations as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time determine.

"(c) Payments by the United States Government to the holders of United Nations support bonds shall be made only out of amounts deducted by the United States under section 3 from annual payments of its assessed share of the budget of the United Nations. Payments by the United States Government to United Nations support bond holders shall be contingent upon the maintenance by the United Nations of the state of assessment upon the United States at a level not in excess of 32.02 per centum of the total ordinary budget of the United Nations as established by the United Nations General Assembly at its sixteenth session in 1961.

"(d) Amounts realized by the Secretary of the Treasury from the sale of United Nations support bonds shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury, and shall be available only for use in making loans to the United Nations pursuant to the authorization contained in the first section of this Act."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to authorize and direct the issuance of special obligations of the United States to be designated as United Nations support bonds.

The purpose of the bonds issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, which would have a face value of $25, $50, $100, $500, and $1,000, when held to maturity, is to permit individuals to contribute to the cost of this phase of support of the United Nations.

There is a limitation in my amendment, as follows:

> Payments by the United States Government to United Nations support bond holders shall be contingent upon the maintenance by the United Nations of the state of assessment upon the United States at a level not in excess of 32.02 per centum of the total ordinary budget of the United Nations as established by the United Nations General Assembly at its sixteenth session in 1961.
>
> (d) Amounts realized by the Secretary of the Treasury from the sale of United Nations support bonds shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury, and shall be available only for use in making loans to the United Nations pursuant to the authorization contained in the first section of this Act.

The limitation or contingency of 32.02 per centum of the total budget in the form of U.S. assessments is inserted to make sure that assessments shall not be increased against us. As is generally well known, over a period of time, our assessments have decreased, beginning with 40 percent, to an amount of 32 percent.

In view of the great increase in the membership of the United Nations, it is my view that the contributions of the United States should not be increased, but reduced.

Mr. President, the administration has recommended that the Congress authorize the U.S. Government to purchase United Nations bonds and appropriate the necessary funds to do so in the amount of $100 million. The Committee on Foreign Relations after extensive consideration of this request reported a variation of that request and now the distinguished majority and minority leaders have offered a substitute proposal. The provisions of that proposal are well known to the membership and it is not here necessary to dwell on them.

In order to place this request in some perspective, it is well to review the contributions which the United States has already made toward the establishment of this world organization. It is generally recognized that during the years of World War II, our Government devoted considerable effort toward the drafting of the principles which were finally accepted, first at Dumbarton Oaks and later at San Francisco, as the Charter of the United Nations. The United Nations Yearbook for 1946–47 reviews the origin of this organization. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this official U.N. document may be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> In a resolution the Inter-American Conference suggested that the following points be taken into consideration in the formulation of a definitive charter of the proposed international organization:
>
> (a) The aspiration of universality as an ideal toward which the Organization should tend in the future;
>
> (b) The desirability of amplifying and making more specific the enumeration of the principles and purposes of the Organization;
>
> (c) The desirability of amplifying and making more specific the powers of the General Assembly in order that its action, as the fully representative organ of the international community may be rendered effective, harmonizing the powers of the Security Council with such amplification;
>
> (d) The desirability of extending the jurisdiction and competence of the International Tribunal or Court of Justice;
>
> (e) The desirability of creating an international agency specially charged with promoting intellectual and moral cooperation among nations;
>
> (f) The desirability of solving controversies and questions of an inter-American character, preferably in accordance with inter-American methods and procedures, in harmony with those of the General International Organization; and
>
> (g) The desirability of giving an adequate representation to Latin America on the Security Council.
>
> The Government of the United States, on behalf of itself and the other sponsoring governments, on March 5, 1945, invited the governments that had signed or adhered to the United Nations Declaration and had declared war against Germany or Japan to send representatives to the San Francisco Conference, officially known as the United Nations Conference on International Organization, beginning on April 25, 1945.

Mr. SCOTT. The United Nations came into being with the support of all of the American people regardless of their party affiliations. Many of our own citizens, say nothing of those in other lands, may be unaware of the role our Government played in providing a permanent home for the United Nations in this country.

The Republican 80th Congress, sometimes referred to by some as a "do-nothing Congress," cooperated with President Truman in enacting the necessary legislation to make it possible for the present headquarters building to be located in New York City. Once again, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the 1947–48 yearbook may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The General Assembly, during the second part of its first session, on December 14, 1946 (resolution 100(I)), decided to locate the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in New York City and to accept a gift of $8,500,000 from John D. Rockefeller, Jr., for the purchase of the site bounded by First Avenue, East 48th Street, the East River, and East 42d Street. The Secretary-General was requested to report to the members on or before July 1, 1947, on plans, requirements, and costs relating to the headquarters. A headquarters advisory committee was set up to advise the Secretary General. The Secretary General, with the advise of the committee, and the New York City authorities shortly thereafter reached a general understanding regarding the development which the city and the United Nations would carry out both inside and around the site.
>
> On February 26, 1947, the President of the United States signed a bill providing for the exemption of the Rockefeller gift from the Federal gift tax. The next day the Governor of New York signed a series of bills, drafted according to the recommendations of the United Nations, authorizing the Governor to cede jurisdiction over any land required by the organization to carry out its functions, exempting the United Nations property from taxation, authorizing the city of New York to purchase or condemn any property necessary for the headquarters and to regulate advertising devices and amusement enterprises in the areas near the site, and making it a criminal offense for any person to possess or use an identification card issued to another person by the United Nations.
>
> On March 25, 1947, the United Nations received the Rockefeller gift and on April 13 the Secretary General accepted formally, in a public ceremony, the contributions of the city of New York. The city's gift included, among other concessions, the transfer of several plots of land and exclusive rights to the waterfront between 42d and 48th Streets. Later, in August, the city transferred the New York City Housing Authority building on the site to the United Nations on lease-purchase.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, still a further contribution toward the establishment of the United Nations was provided by the authorization of an interest-free loan from the U.S. Government to finance the cost of construction of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations. An agreement between the Secretary General and the U.S. representative, Warren R. Austin, was signed on March 23, 1948. It set forth the terms of this loan by our Government of $65 million which would provide payments starting July 1951 through July 1982. Of this entire sum of $65 million, only $20 million has fallen due, and the United States will await payment of $45 million before this loan is completely discharged in 1982.

I quote directly from the Yearbook of the United Nations, which states:

> All amounts payable to the United States under this paragraph will be paid out of the ordinary budget of the United Nations, to the Secretary of State of the United States in currency of the United States which is legal tender for public debts on the date such payments are made.

Inasmuch as approximately one-third of the ordinary budget of the United Nations is paid by the U.S. Government, we are, in effect, making a gift of at least $21 million to the world organization, assuming that other countries finally pay their regular assessments, by the time this loan is discharged in 1982.

Mr. President, I cite these facts to show that the American people have always placed great faith in this world organization in the hope that humanity would be spared the horrors of a holocaust such as we experienced during World War II.

At the time the United Nations Charter was signed, its membership was comprised of 51 nations; today it includes 104. We are now confronted with a strange spectacle of a world organization of 104 nations with 44 of them, each having the same voice in the General Assembly as the United States, in arrears of either their special or ordinary assessments. I might add, Mr. President, that it has been said that a citizen of one of the new nations has a voice equivalent to 400 Americans.

Furthermore, the Congo operation which is the cause of the present difficulty is largely being financed by the U.S. Government, which has assumed approximately 47.5 percent of the cost largely because the Communist bloc—as well as some other countries—have refused payments of their duly assigned assessments because they disagreed with the United Nations action in the Congo.

Although the U.S. share of the 1947 budget and working fund apportionment was established at 39.89 percent of the total, the 1962 budget with many new nations included in the U.N. membership, still provides that we be assessed with 32.02 percent, or roughly one-third of the total ordinary budget of the United Nations. The Soviet Union which has been responsible for so many of the difficulties that have been experienced in making the United Nations an effective instrument for world peace, has been assessed with 14.97 percent of the total budget.

Over and above the ordinary United Nations budget, a number of special programs are financed by voluntary contributions of member nations rather than by regular assessments on all the members. The generosity of the American people, which has been suported by the Congress and the executive branch, shows that we have consistently borne the major share of these activities.

For example, in the case of the United Nations Expanded Technical Assistance Program—ETAP—and Special Fund, the United States is assuming 40 percent of total government contributions. In the case of the United Nation's Children's Fund—UNICEF—in 1962 we are to assume 44 percent of the cost. As we consider the special funds for limited areas of the world, such as the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees—UNRWA—we find that our Government is assuming 70 percent of total government contributions. Another special activity outside of the ordinary budget is the United Nations Emergency Force—UNEF—which was first mobilized during the Suez crisis in 1956. Here again, U.S. contributions represent 45.98 percent of the total.

By the end of 1961, the United States had assumed $23 million of the $34 million actually contributed to the United Nations operations in the Congo merely to provide economic assistance. This represents 68 percent of the total. United Nations costs for its military program in the Congo from July to December 1960 totaled $60 million, of which the United States contributed 49.94 percent. From January to October 1961, the costs were $100 million, and again we contributed 47.51 percent. From November 1961 to June 1962 the military costs are estimated at $80 million, of which we will contribute 46.27 percent. The aforementioned statistics are from information on the operations and financing of the United Nations, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 87th Congress, 2d session, February 6, 1962.

In other words, Mr. President, the total military costs of the United Nations operations in the Congo are estimated at $240 million, and 47.7 percent of this expense will be borne by the American taxpayers. It is expected that after July 1, 1962, future Congo military costs will be financed from the proceeds of the proposed $200 million U.N. bond issue.

In appraising the cost of the United Nations to the American people, it is imperative that everyone realize that the various specialized agencies in most cases are financed outside of the ordinary budget. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the estimated 1961 contributions by the United States to each of these activities as well as the percent of the total funds which our payments to the world body and its specialized agencies represent.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. contributions to the United Nations, specialized agencies, and special programs, 1961 estimate [1]

[In thousands of dollars]

	Contribution	Percent
A. Permanent organizations assessed budgets:		
United Nations	$22,333	32.51
Food and Agriculture Organization	2,999	32.51
Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization	33	14.14
International Civil Aviation Organization	1,371	32.95
International Labor Organization	2,449	25.00
International Telecommunication Union	324	10.39
United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization	4,677	31.46
Universal Postal Union	29	4.29
World Health Organization	6,070	31.71
World Meteorological Organization	118	19.03
Subtotal	40,403	
B. United Nations Emergency Force	7,916	41.66
C. United Nations operations in the Congo:		
Military	47,510	47.51
Economic	18,512	[2]
Subtotal	66,022	
D. Special programs financed by voluntary contributions:		
International Civil Aviation Organization, joint support program	658	27.21
United Nations Children's Fund	12,000	46.00
United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—aid to Africa	1,000	66.49
United Nations expanded technical assistance program	17,813	40.00
United Nations High Commissioner for refugees program	1,300	33.33
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East	23,500	67.48
United Nations Special Fund	18,812	40.00
World Health Organization:		
Community water development program	175	100.00
Malaria eradication program	4,000	90.72
Research program	500	100.00
Subtotal	79,758	
Total	194,099	

[1] Information on the operations and financing of the United Nations, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 87th Cong., 2d sess., Feb. 6, 1962, pp. 73–74.

[2] Total pledges from other governments are not complete; therefore, the U.S. percentage cannot be determined at this time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in measuring the true impact upon our own budget of a U.S. loan to the United Nations on the financing of U.N. bonds, it is necessary for us to appreciate that the U.S. Treasury was offering long-term securities in January, 1962, which provided interest payments at a rate of 3.9 percent. The difference between this rate of interest and the interest-free loans which our Government provided to construct the United Nations headquarters will represent a very substantial additional cost to our taxpayers by the time the original loan has been fully repaid.

This same reasoning would also apply to a proposed loan to the United Nations—or the financing of a bond issue—that will yield the U.S. Government less than it must pay in the open market. Those who advocate that the Senate should adopt this measure stress that it will reduce the present U.S. assessment for the United Nations Congo military operations from 47.51 percent of the total to 32.02 percent. This saving is based upon the difference between our present share of the Congo operation and our share of the United Nations ordinary budget. In any event, any sums loaned by the United States, our Government will be required to repay one-third of principal as well as approximately one-third of the interest charges that will accrue over the period of the loan.

Of necessity, U.S. costs will exceed the face amount of any loan or bond purchase because of three factors:

First. The interest rate the United States will receive from the United Nations may be less than it must pay to secure the funds themselves, unless some rate is fixed.

Second. The United States must not only pay one-third of the interest accruing to the United States, but also one-third of that to other lending nations.

Third. In addition to paying one-third of our own loan to ourselves we must pay approximately one-third of repayments to lending nations.

The International Court of Justice, which includes judges from Communist and neutralist nations, has been asked to render an advisory opinion on the question of whether assessments against member states for the Middle East and Congo operations are binding upon member states under article 17(2) of the Charter of the United Nations. If the Court decides that such assessments must be paid as part of the regular budget the nations that are more than 2 years in arrears of their total obligations to the United Nations, which would then include these military activities, could be denied their voting privileges under article 19 of the charter. If such a decision is rendered, a serious question may occur as to whether such nations will accept the inclusion of these operations in the ordinary budget in future years.

It is important to note that 70 states supported United Nations activities in the Congo; yet at the present time, 62 of the 104 member nations have not contributed anything to the cost of these operations. This clearly indicates that many countries apparently believe that the entire cost of maintaining peace should be assumed by the major powers.

If the United Nations adopts such a policy, it would no longer be a multilateral organization.

As President Kennedy stated in his message to the Congress on January 30 urging approval of this bond issue:

> For without the bond issue, either the United Nations executive arm will wither or the United States will be compelled to pay a larger share of the costs of operation than is reasonable for any one member of an international organization.

I certainly endorse this view that our financial contribution to the world body must be a reasonable one.

It is my understanding that budgetary matters are decided by two-thirds of the General Assembly present and voting—plenary session. Thus, the Soviet influence could be felt in this body to exclude such assessment as part of the regular budget. The only other alternative to perpetuate the United Nations is to invoke article 6 of the charter which provides that:

> A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

Mr. President, any attempt to use article 6 would be vetoed by Soviet Russia, but this much is clear: The United Nations must require its members to meet their financial obligations as well as their moral and political obligations if the United Nations is to retain the respect of the world and the power to exercise even its limited authority. Many countries will not pay if they find that the United States and a few others will foot the bills.

There are grave doubts as to the effectiveness of an organization which is so lax in the administration of its revenues that it cannot secure the universal support of its members. Even the humblest social organization requires its members to keep dues paid up to date or face suspension or expulsion. Now it appears that the loftiest of human organizations has chosen another course, to ask the paid-up members to pick up the bad debts of the deadbeats.

As my colleagues well know, during the Korean crisis the Security Council was deadlocked, and a procedure was devised whereby the General Assembly could supplant the Security Council if a two-thirds majority of the members chose to do so under a resolution which has been described as "Uniting for Peace." Unfortunately, with the admission of many new states which have been unable or unwilling to distinguish between the aspirations of the United States and the Soviet Union for the self-determination and economic development of new countries, it is my fear that the General Assembly has given indications of being an ineffective reed to provide world leadership in implementing the provisions of its charter.

It appears to me that if the peoples of the world in whose name the United Nations Charter was originally drafted are to play an effective role in securing a more reasonable attitude toward the United Nations on the part of their own governments, they should be encouraged to participate in providing temporary assistance to the United Nations in its hour of crisis.

Mr. President, it was interesting to me to find that my distinguished colleague from Vermont, Senator AIKEN, in a report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee brought up a most interesting point. As a member of the U.S. delegation to the 15th session of the General Assembly of the U.N., Senator AIKEN was assigned to the Fifth Committee, which deals with administrative and budgetary matters. The Senator in his report states:

> Since the failure of several nations to pay their assessments had seriously impaired the working capital fund of the United Nations, it appeared necessary to authorize the Secretary General to borrow funds with which to carry on.
>
> A resolution submitted to the fifth committee would have authorized the Secretary General to borrow from special funds available for programs sponsored by the United Nations, from member governments, or from other available sources, meaning commercial lending agencies.
>
> The delegate from India moved to strike out the authority to borrow from private sources. He was supported by Russia and several other states. The motion was defeated in committee by a narrow margin. The General Assembly, however, sustained the Indian motion and as of now the Secretary General can only borrow from United Nations special funds at prevailing rates of interest and from member governments.

Because of my concern as to this reasoning and its effect on the bond issue, Mr. President, I mistakenly asked the State Department in a letter dated January 19, 1962, for its interpretation of the reasoning behind the Indian motion. In fact, the Indian motion took place a year before consideration of the bond issue, but it is interesting to note the reply I received from Assistant Secretary of State, Harlan Cleveland, in a letter dated January 30, 1962. I quote:

> With respect to your question as to authorizing the Secretary General to borrow funds from nongovernmental sources, this was indeed considered both in the United Nations and by the executive branch of the Government. However, the resolution authorizing the issuance of United Nations bonds restricted sales to state members of the United Nations, its specialized agencies and of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Under certain conditions bonds may also be sold to nonprofit institutions. This appeared to be the wiser course because sales of bonds to individuals involves many problems which could not be carefully evaluated during the pressures of the General Assembly when the organization faced an acute financial crisis.

Yet, Mr. President, the Charter of the United Nations in its preamble states:

> We the peoples of the United Nations determined—
>
> To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and
>
> To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and
>
> To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and
>
> To promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom. (Yearbook of the United Nations, 1946-47, op. cit., p. 831.)

Throughout our own history, whenever our Nation was threatened by external agression and it was necessary to supplement Federal revenues by the issuance of bonds, we always made it possible for every citizen to support our national effort. Even schoolchildren were given the opportunity to buy savings stamps in order that they might feel they were playing a personal role in our country's destiny.

In recent years, billion-dollar appropriations have become so common and intragovernmental transactions have been accepted as the normal order of business that I seriously question whether most Americans are fully aware of the implications of the steps we are about to take.

Mr. President, many of our citizens are understandably concerned that should the U.S. Government subscribe to this proposal we may be setting a precedent for future lending to other United Nations activities of unlimited scope.

This substitute provides under section 3 that the U. S. Government shall deduct from its assessed share of the United Nations ordinary budget each year the amount it is entitled to receive for both principal and interest from that Organization pursuant to the terms of this proposal. I raise the point that some member nations might continually ask for "special reviews" of their rate of assessment in hopes that the U.S. share might be upped so as to circumvent this provision.

The U.S. rate of assessment set at the 16th session of the General Assembly is now set at 32.02 percent of the ordinary budget. At this point, Mr. President, I should like to state for the RECORD the U.S. rate of assessment since the United Nations was established.

In calendar year 1946-49, 39.89 percent.

In calendar year 1950, 39.79 percent.

In calendar year 1951, 38.92 percent.

In calendar year 1952, 36.90 percent.

In calendar year 1953, 35.12 percent.

In calendar years 1954-57, 33.33 percent.

In calendar years 1958-61, 32.51 percent.

In calendar year 1962, 32.02 percent.

The world organization has grown—new countries are securing the benefits of membership including a vote equal to our own. Under such a process eventually there should be a continuing reduction in our share of the United Nations budget. Under no conditions, should our portion of the budget be increased.

American citizens believe that United Nations activities are deserving of their support and accordingly, they should be given an opportunity to subscribe individually to a security issued by the U.S. Government to assist the United States in this financing proposal.

I shall now explain my amendment:

This amendment would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue special obligations of the United States designated as "United Nations support bonds" in accordance with the provisions of the law applicable to U.S. savings bonds except in the case of these United Nations support bonds they will not mature more than 25 years from the date they are issued and that they will be issued on a discount basis such as to afford an investment yield not in access of 2 percent per year compounded semiannually when held to maturity.

These bonds would have a face value of $25, $50, $100, $500, and $1,000 when held to maturity. It is provided in my amendment that payments to the holders of these bonds will be made only out of amounts deducted by the United States under section 3 of the substitute proposal, which provides that there will be deducted from the annual payment of the assessed share of the United States of the budget of the United Nations an amount equal to the corresponding annual installment of principal and interest due to the United States on account of the loan made pursuant to section 1 of the substitute. My amendment further provides, Mr. President, payments by the U.S. Government to United Nations support-bond holders are contingent upon the maintenance by the United Nations upon the United States of an assessment not in excess of 32.02 percent of the total ordinary budget of the United Nations as established by the United Nations General Assembly.

The reason that I have included this contingency is that it is my understanding that the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1946 decided "the cost of the organization should be shared on the basis of capacity to pay." As I have pointed out the General Assembly fixed the first U.S. percentage contribution at 39.89 percent and subsequently reduced this to 33.33 percent and finally in 1957 decided that the percentage of the highest contributor—namely, the United States—should eventually be reduced to 30 percent. The U.S. percentage of 1962 is 32.02 percent. As the scale of assessments is fixed by the General Assembly and remains in effect for 3 years, it is my understanding that the U.S. percentage of contribution to the regular budget will be reviewed again in 1964. I further understand that the present percentage of assessment for all of the member nations will be subject to a special review this year because of the allegations of the Soviet Union and other countries that assessments were too high.

Thus, Mr. President, it is my feeling that although the Congress should give interested individuals and organizations an opportunity to purchase bonds that would support the United Nations, the U.S. Treasury should not be put in a position of a surety for this loan or bond purchase if the United Nations General Assembly by a two-thirds majority should decide that the United States percentage of contribution should be raised from its percent rate. I have pointed out, Mr. President, that the United States pays more than its share on a general assessment basis and supports many of the operations of the United Nations, which do not come under the regular budget.

I point out that this amendment would not limit the repayment by the United States to these bondholders if the annual budget of the United Nations should be increased because of that organization taking on additional functions or because of higher expenses of conducting its present operations. It only affects the payment of principal and interest on these bonds if the United Nations should increase the percentage contribution of the United States for its regular assessment. I am sure that all Americans feel that we have contributed a fair share to the United Nations, and I am doubly sure that no American would advocate that the U.S. percentage of contribution should be increased. It is for this reason that I have included this provision in the amendment, as I do feel that the purchasers of such bonds would be the strongest advocates of the United States continuing its present rate of contribution.

My amendment also provides that the money realized from the sale of United Nations support bonds shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury and shall be available only for the use in the purchase by the United States of United Nations bonds on a loan to the United Nations.

In closing, I hope that the Senate would favorably consider my proposal. It in no way limits the Executive from the purchase of United Nations bonds or making a loan, but it does give the individual American citizen an opportunity to express his support of the work that the United Nations is doing. It also gives the individual bond purchaser an opportunity to express his desire that the present percentage of contribution of the United States to the United Nations should not be increased. I would hope that the many who have expressed a desire that the Congress act favorably on this measure would welcome such an amendment and that those Members of the Senate who have so strongly advocated the purchase of these bonds or the making of a loan join with me in seeing that my proposal is included in the legislation now before us.

Since we have been discussing measures by which the United Nations could be helped in its financing problems, I would like to call attention to one proposal offered by nine other Senators and myself with reference to peace-keeping operations in the Palestine area.

We have proposed the United States announce its position in favor of direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. Should this come to pass, it would relieve the United Nations of one of the most costly of its operations.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a letter sent on March 27, 1962, to the Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: When the United Nations Security Council considers on Wednesday the recent border incidents between Israel and Syria, we respectfully urge that the United States announce its position in favor of direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States.

Since the United Nations was founded, the unresolved Arab-Israel conflict has been on the U.N. agenda in one form or another. Each year some specific problem has been considered. Often—as in the case of the recent Israel-Syria border actions—the matter under consideration has involved the loss of human life and the destruction of property.

But the discussions have never been able to bring the disputing parties together around a peace table to settle finally the 14-year-old dispute that has sapped the vitality of the Middle East.

During the past session of the United Nations General Assembly, 16 nations proposed a resolution which called on Israel and the Arab States to settle questions in dispute by direct negotiations.

The United States voted against this resolution, which was defeated. In explaining the U.S. vote, U.S. Ambassador Francis T. P. Plimpton said, in part:

"The United States had made clear from the outset its opposition to anything that might end to divert attention from that simple, direct, and constructive initiative. This, of course, means that we shall be obliged, regretfully, to oppose such other proposals whether in the form of other resolutions or amendments to our draft, as would tend in any way to obscure or cut across that initiative."

Since the U.S. resolution on the Palestine Conciliation Commission passed, there is no longer any tactical reason for avoiding a motion to encourage direct negotiations.

Israel has repeatedly offered to negotiate directly with the Arab States. The Arab leaders consistently oppose this plan because they refuse to take any action that would seem to recognize the State of Israel.

The U.S. position is clear in the matter. An Arab-Israel peace has been stated often as a fundamental goal of American foreign policy.

As recently as 1960, this objective received the endorsement of both major political parties.

The Democratic platform said: "We will encourage direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations."

The Republican platform said: "With specific reference to Israel and the Arab nations, we urge them to undertake negotiations for a mutually acceptable settlement of the causes of tension between them."

This Nation has every reason to implement its stated goal of peace in the Middle East. It is clearly in the interest of all people in that important part of the world.

We hope that the U.S. delegation in the U.N. will be able to assert this position during the Security Council debate.

Sincerely yours,
HUGH SCOTT, JACOB K. JAVITS, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, PRESCOTT BUSH, KENNETH B. KEATING, THRUSTON B. MORTON, CLIFFORD P. CASE, WINSTON L. PROUTY, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. I am grateful to the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

I point out that it had been my intention to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania. He has seen the amendment, and he was perfectly willing to modify his amendment in accordance with my thinking. However, I understand that arrangements have been made whereby hearings will be held on the various amendments which have been submitted, or which have been under consideration, by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania, and myself.

Let me say at this point that I believe the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania has an amendment which has been offered and which would provide for the issuance of so-called peace bonds at a 2-percent interest rate.

It seems to me that is a very hopeful enterprise, but not likely to be very successful, because I doubt if people would buy bonds of that character which pay only 2 percent.

I had in mind including a 2-percent tax exemption on the bonds. They thereby would have some appeal to quite a number of people, particularly in the high income brackets, who might be persuaded to purchase quite a few of the bonds.

I had in mind a second amendment, more or less in the nature of a "sense" resolution, which would suggest to the President that he conduct a study in order to determine if it is possible for the United Nations to issue its own bonds, which would be salable to the general public, and would also carry the tax exemption feature.

I think that is a more realistic approach. I hope the suggestions may have a hearing.

I understand all these amendments will be withdrawn and will be given consideration by the committee. Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am about to yield, but first, commenting on what the distinguished Senator from Vermont has said, I wish to say that if we have certain assurances on behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee, it will be my intention to withdraw the amendment, subject to the opportunity to have the proposal made at length, and perhaps more carefully, before the committee.

I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

On February 7 Senators Humphrey, Neuberger, Williams of New Jersey, Young of Ohio, Douglas, Long of Hawaii, Smith of Massachusetts, Hart, and I introduced S. 2818, to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor, and to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States to participate in the purchase of a special Treasury issue of "peace bonds."

That bill was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee before the United Nations bond issue proposal was reported from the committee.

I have since been endeavoring, not without success, to obtain administration support for that bill.

When the U.N. bond issue came to the floor, I caused that bill, S. 2818, to be revised in the form of an amendment to the pending legislation.

I had intended to offer that amendment as a substitute for the amendment of my able colleague from Pennsylvania, and I have had some conversation with him about this subject.

I should like to know from the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator in charge of the bill, whether he would be willing to accept and consider either of these amendments and what course of action he suggests.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield to me for the purpose of answering that question——

Mr. SCOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have had the privilege of discussing these amendments, which are very similar, with each of the three authors, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, and the junior Senator from Vermont. I have stated that personally I am in sympathy with the objective of the proposals, but I do not believe that the proposals should be tied to this measure.

I have taken it upon myself to discuss the subject with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. Fulbright], and he has assured me that, if the Senators would not press their proposals at this time, the Foreign Relations Committee would be very glad to consider the question as a separate matter, so we could have all three proposals before us.

I have also discussed the question with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], who was cosponsor of one of the bills, and who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. We all agreed that, if the Senators would not press their proposals at this time, we would be very glad to take them up in the Foreign Relations Committee as a separate matter.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, whom I see in the Chamber, whether he would be willing to permit hearings on these proposals.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I assure the Senator we shall do it as soon as it is convenient to do so.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for that assurance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment which I had expected to propose may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proposed Amendment to S. 2768

(Amendment proposed by Mr. Clark to the amendment (3-29-6—A) offered by Senator Scott to the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of United States by authorizing a loan to the United Nations and the appropriations of funds therefor)

Strike from line , page , to the end and insert the following:

"United Nations Peace Bonds

"Sec. 5. (a) For the purpose of providing an opportunity for the public to provide support for the activities of the United Nations, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed for a period of five years following the date of enactment of this Act to issue special obligations of the United States, designated as 'peace bonds', under Section 22 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, except that peace bonds shall mature not more than twenty-five years from the date of issue, and shall be issued on a discount basis to afford an investment yield not in excess of 2 per centum per annum when held to maturity. The total amount of peace bonds outstanding at any time shall not exceed a face value of $100,000,000. The bonds shall be redeemable at any time in accordance with a preassigned schedule of values. The Treasury Department shall make peace bonds available for purchase through the same market channels as savings bonds, but the Department shall not undertake any promotional efforts on behalf of the peace bonds.

"(b) Peace bonds shall have a face value of $25, $50, $100, $500, $1,000 when held to maturity. No person or business entity may purchase or hold peace bonds with a face value in excess of $10,000.

"(c) Amounts realized by the Secretary of the Treasury from the sale of peace bonds shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury, and shall be available for use by the President of the United States in support of the activities of the United Nations."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Arkansas for their willingness to consider this subject. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared not to offer my amendment in view of the strong representations of the leadership and the assurance that the committee is willing to have the proposals considered. Therefore, I shall not call up my amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I conclude by saying that much of the purpose of the colloquy was to clarify the understanding reached by persons of originally different opinions on both sides of the aisle, in order to promote action upon and passage of the United Nations legislation.

I appreciate the courtesy shown to all of us. I have developed, on our side of the aisle, evidence that there is considerable sympathy toward the approach suggested in my amendment.

I thank the Senator from Alabama and the distinguished Senators on his side of the aisle who have assured us we shall have a hearing.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the text of the amendment I had intended to offer.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proposed Amendment to S. 2768

(Intended to be proposed by Mr. Prouty to the amendment (in the nature of a substitute) proposed by Mr. Mansfield (for himself and Mr. Dirksen) to the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing a loan to the United Nations and the appropriation of funds therefor)

At the end of the Amendment, add a new section as follows:

"Sec. 5. (a) It is also the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States shall endeavor to make such arrangements as may be necessary to provide an opportunity for the public to purchase

United Nations bonds issued in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in the Annex to the Resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 20, 1961 (General Assembly Resolution 1739 (XVI)).

"(b) It is further the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States shall consider forthwith the desirability of exempting from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States all payments of principal and interest received by the holders of United Nations bonds, and shall report to Congress on the same at the earliest possible date."

Mr. PROUTY. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, and other Senators.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I withdraw my amendment with the understanding that the proposed substitutes and amendments thereto have also been withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the so-called Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment at the desk, identified as 4-3-62—A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, lines 3 to 5, it is proposed to strike out "shall not exceed by more than $25,000,000 the aggregate amount of loans made or agreed to be made by other nations" and to insert in lieu thereof "shall not exceed $25,000,000 plus an amount equal to 50 per centum of the aggregate amount of loans made or agreed to be made by other nations";

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this is not a very complicated amendment and it should not require much time to discuss it. In two different respects it goes to the very heart of the problem, however, which confronts the Senate in connection with the United Nations bond proposal.

I appeal to Senators who believe that the function of the Senate is to legislate rather than to delegate authority. Senators who believe in that doctrine will wish to have some voice in determining the terms of the loan or gift and the extent to which the United States will participate on a percentage basis in the supplemental financing of United Nations debts, obligations, membership fees, and assessments.

For a long time we contributed to the United Nations 47 percent of the total of its requirements from the Treasury of the United States. After many years of careful consideration by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, aided at times by the Appropriations Committee of the House, we have been able to reduce the U.S. participation from 47 percent to roughly 33⅓ percent.

Sometimes, on some assessments and some contributions, that has been a little less than 33⅓ percent; sometimes it has been a litle more. At least it has come to be recognized as a standard formula that in financing the operations of the United Nations the part which, in the opinion of the United Nations, should rightfully be paid by the United States is approximately 33⅓ percent.

The proposal before us in the nature of a substitute—the ill-named compromise—would change this percentage formula very sharply, and would change it in the wrong direction. What we are asked to do is to pretty well determine whether in the future the United States will continue to participate on the 33⅓ percent ratio and formula which has been so laboriously attained, finally, by action of the Senate Appropriations Committee or whether, by one fell swoop, we shall increase the expectancy of the United Nations, and probably our contributions thereto, to 50 percent or more, which the language of the amendment suggests will be our share in this particular financial effort.

I say "the language" because the arithmetic of the proposal goes far beyond 50 percent, since the United States would contribute an unmatched first $25 million and, after that, 50 percent of what is to follow. Out of the $200 million, if we agree to the substitute, the United States might well find that it is contributing substantially more than 50 percent of the total in supplementary finances to the United Nations.

This is a very simple amendment, which involves two considerations. First, do we in the United States Senate wish to convey and delegate to the President, or to someone named by him, the power to negotiate and determine what is to be the U.S. percentage, with the mandate of the Senate that we have given acquiescence to a percentage formula of 50 percent and, in addition to that, a $25 million initial contribution? Do we wish to spell it out, or do we wish to delegate the authority? Do we wish to legislate the provisions, or simply to delegate the authority to solve the problem? That is the first question. As for me, I want the Senate to legislate—not capitulate.

I believe we have the responsibility to legislate, so that all the world, friend and foe alike, may know exactly what we mean; so that propagandists of unfriendly countries cannot distort our meaning, our purpose, or our proposal; and so that friendly countries will know exactly what we propose to do. Also, I feel the American taxpayer has a right to know what is being done and by whom.

Mr. President, before my time runs out or Senators leave the Chamber, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Secondly, having decided whether we wish to legislate or merely to convey the problem elsewhere, we must ask ourselves what formula we wish to have written into the law; whether it shall be 50 percent plus or 33⅓ percent, on which we have insisted heretofore as being a proper percentage, after cutting a percentage point here and a fractional percentage point there. We have worked long and hard in the Appropriations Committee to come within the formula which the United Nations itself believes to be proper in measuring the U.S. share of contribution.

On both of those points I stand with those who think we should legislate specifically. I stand with those who think we should perpetuate the 33⅓-percent formula rather than knock it out by one quick action, and thereby to find ourselves plagued for many years to come with the precedent established whereby we shall suddenly pick up 50 percent of the tab plus, rather than 33⅓ percent of the tab, which is rightfully our share.

So I ask Senators to approve the amendment. I do so as one who would like to vote financial assistance to the United Nations, provided it can be done within the formula we have developed and by specific terms. However, I do not intend to vote for assistance to the United Nations if it will mean that suddenly the United States is to become the exchequer to the extent of over 50 percent of the U.N. expenditures, and if it means that henceforth, instead of working, as we have in the past, to spell out a percentage formula, we are to convey to a different branch of the Government the right to negotiate, to barter, and to spend money which under the Constitution should be appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I had planned to yield 13 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], but while he is on his way to the Chamber I yield myself 1 minute.

I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief analysis of the effect of the Mundt amendment, setting out some of the variations in amounts that the United States contributes to the operations of the United Nations. Many people have the idea that the United States contributes a very large percentage of all operations of the United Nations. It is true that, when measured across the board, the United States makes a considerable contribution, but with respect to the regular budget our contribution is 32 percent. There are some activities in the United Nations to which we contribute as little as 4 percent.

So the percentage varies from activity to activity. I believe this analysis will be helpful to Senators. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUNDT AMENDMENT (3-23-62—A) TO S. 2768

1. The amendment would change the matching formula in the committee bill so that, after the first $25 million of bonds purchased by the United States the President would be authorized to buy half as much as purchased by other nations instead of an amount equal to the amount purchased by other nations.

2. The effect of the amendment is to put a limit of $58.3 million on U.S. bond purchases instead of $100 million, as provided in the committee bill. This would allow a maximum U.S. share of 29 percent of total bond purchases instead of 50 percent, as proposed in the committee bill.

3. Senator MUNDT's premise is that 32 percent is the maximum share of any U.N. activity which should be paid by the United States; 32.02 percent is the share we are paying of the regular U.N. budget which finances the General Assembly, Security Council, and the Secretariat. U.S. contributions to other

activities vary greatly. We pay 71 percent of the Palestine refugee program and 4 percent of the Universal Postal Union. The United States has paid 47 percent of the Congo costs; 32 percent through assessed contributions and 15 percent in voluntary contributions.

4. The 47 percent which the United States pays of the Congo cost is a negotiated figure. U.S. representatives argue we should pay less; others argue that the U.S. should pay more than 47 percent. Many countries believe that the United States and other big powers should pay higher percentages for peace and security operations than big powers pay for the regular budget because under the Charter the Security Council has primary responsibility for keeping peace. The United States cannot truthfully say that this position is without merit.

5. The bond proceeds will be used for the Congo and Middle East operations. The percentage of the total of bonds that we buy should be somewhere near the same proportion that we have been paying toward these operations. Failure of U.N. efforts in the Congo and Gaza Strip would endanger U.S. security.

6. Even though the U.S. buys 50 percent of the bonds now, over the 25-year period of the bonds we shall pay only 32 percent of the cost of the bonds. This is because the bonds will be repaid out of the regular U.N. budget to which the United States contributes 32 percent.

KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION PROJECT, ILLINOIS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield a half minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in January 1961, I introduced a bill (S. 520) to authorize the canalization of the Kaskaskia River, Ill. This measure, which has the approval of the Chief of Engineers and the Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, passed the Senate during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. It is now pending before the House Committee on Public Works.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article from the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, under date of March 30, 1962, relating to the announcement of plans for the location of five industrial plants in that area of southern Illinois as soon as Congress authorizes this important navigation project.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Five Major Industries Will Build Plants in Kaskaskia River Area

Plans for construction of five industrial plants along the proposed Kaskaskia River project in Illinois and worth $200 million were to be announced at a Belleville dinner Thursday night.

The plants would be built as soon as Federal authorization for canalization of the river is obtained and would be in addition to the previously announced $132 million construction of a powerplant by the Illinois Power & Light Co. and a Kaiser Aluminum Co. plant.

Emil Burgard, chairman of the Kaskaskia Industrial Development Corp., said representatives of the five industries would disclose detailed plans for the plants at the corporation's annual dinner at Augustine's Restaurant.

The plants will be built in an area about 50 miles from St. Louis in southeastern St. Clair County and in Randolph, Clinton, and Washington Counties.

Mr. Burgard said he could not identify the industries involved prior to the dinner because the announcement was a surprise for persons attending the dinner, including Gov. Otto Kerner, who was to be main speaker.

The canal project is estimated to cost $60 million and is now pending in the U.S. House of Representatives. It has passed the Senate.

It is part of the overall Kaskaskia Valley development program which includes a $40 million dam and reservoir under construction at Carlyle and a $30 million dam and reservoir at Shelbyville.

The Kaskaskia would be canalized 50 miles upstream from its mouth above Chester, Ill., in Randolph County to make it a navigable stream. Dams and reservoirs would make it usable most of the year.

Portions of the acreage needed for the plants already have been purchased by the companies, Mr. Burgard said. The firms have indicated they would start construction soon after the Government approves the canalization, he said.

Mr. Burgard, a Fayetteville real estate dealer, said Kaiser has acquired about 4,000 acres near Chester for plant purposes and coal rights to 50 square miles of land east of Fayetteville.

Mr. DIRKSEN. These five plants are in addition to the construction of a powerplant which was announced some time ago.

Mr. President, it is projects of this nature that provide a positive answer to our unemployment problem. Long after temporary measures have been exhausted, these industrial plants will be providing jobs, providing income, and adding to the economic well-being of southern Illinois. A great number of counties in southern Illinois have been designated as depressed areas under the provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act. In view of the excessive high rate of unemployment and the acute need for jobs in that area of the State, it is my hope that the House Public Works Committee will take prompt favorable action on S. 520. Delays mean postponement of jobs for southern Illinois.

It is heartening to note that the Governor of Illinois joins me in my desire for action on the bill. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record an article dated March 30, 1962, from the Illinois State Journal at Springfield, together with an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat dated March 31, 1962, outlining the views of our Governor on this proposal.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Illinois State Journal, Springfield, Ill., Mar. 30, 1962]

Kerner Sees Boom When River Opens

Belleville.—Gov. Otto Kerner said Thursday night eventual opening of the Kaskaskia Valley to river traffic "should ignite an industrial explosion" without equal in southern Illinois' history.

Kerner said canalization of the lower Kaskaskia River, coupled with construction of reservoirs at Carlyle and Shelbyville, would provide an ideal situation for economic growth and expansion.

The reservoir at Carlyle is under construction and the one at Shelbyville is in the planning stage.

"Once an adequate water supply for domestic and commercial needs is guaranteed and a route for water transportation is assured, southern Illinois will have the necessary material around which it can build a great industrial team," Kerner said.

The governor's remarks were made before the second annual meeting of the Kaskaskia Area Industrial Development Association.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, St. Louis, Mo., Mar. 31, 1962]

Kaskaskia's Industrial Explosion

Illinois Gov. Otto Kerner added to his previous warm endorsement of the Kaskaskia Canal project a prediction that its development will create an "industrial explosion unparalleled in southern Illinois."

Many organizations are to be commended for supporting legislation making possible the $60 million project. The measure has passed the U.S. Senate and is pending in the House. The advantages which will be felt in southern Illinois, through the widened river passage to the Mississippi, will be enjoyed also by the St. Louis area and southern Missouri.

Southern Illinois economic lag and unemployment problem could not help but spread its impact throughout the triangle marked by St. Louis, Terre Haute, Ind., and Paducah, Ky.

Already several large industries from the Middle West have taken options on land in the Kaskaskia River watershed for factories.

Illinois is moving rapidly with the Kaskaskia project—a $40 million dam and reservoir at Carlyle, and a $30 million dam and reservoir at Shelbyville.

Such aggressiveness should provide a prod for St. Louis to get going with development of the Meramec Valley, a project that should have been undertaken a decade ago.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS PURCHASE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2768) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 13 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond].

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is not in the best interest of the United States to finance the United Nations to an extent greater than its legal obligations and assessments. The United States is foremost among the members of the United Nations in faithful payment of regular dues and special assessments. The regular share of the United States, as arrived at by the General Assembly, in all operations of the United Nations is 32.02 percent. Not only have we been unfailing in meeting our obligations, but we have gratuitously donated large sums to the United Nations over and above this share. The United States is now contributing approximately 47 percent of the entire budget of the United Nations. When any 1 nation out of a total membership of 104 nations contributes such a disproportionate share to the finances of the United Nations, the need is clear for a reevaluation of the operations of that organization.

The financial crisis of the United Nations is not the cause, but merely one manifestation of the sickness which besets that organization. The fiscal deficit is a reflection of initial defects and the subsequent degeneration of the

United Nations. To adopt a stopgap remedy such as this would contribute little toward its salvation. The need is indicated for a major reorganization designed to get to the root of the problem and prevent recurrences of similar difficulties in the future. Among other things, the prompt payment of dues and minor assessments must be made an absolute condition of continued membership in the United Nations.

In addition, the scope of United Nations activities and purposes will have to be revised so that membership will be worth the pro rata payment of dues and minor assessments. The opportunity for interference in the internal affairs of any state, such as that which occurred in anti-Communist Katanga, must be eliminated.

The United Nation's operations in the Middle East and in the Congo are the primary causes of the financial distress of that organization. I am one of the multitude who protested strongly at the act of blatant aggression committed against Katanga in the Congo. In my opinion the intervention there constituted a flagrant attack upon the integrity and security of a sovereign state. It was an abusive misuse of military might in an effort to force that state into a central government controlled in large part by Communist-inclined leaders. It was a violation of the spirit which the people of the United States and the Senate of the United States assented to when it ratified the Charter of the United Nations. If it was not a violation of the charter itself, then there is an inherent flaw in that document which needs to be altered.

The intervention in the Congo was undertaken in the name of peace. At the end of World War II, when the United Nations came into existence, peace was foremost in the minds of all men. The ravages of war were so fresh in our memory that the word "peace" was the clarion call. The United Nations was envisioned as the vehicle through which the goal of a peaceful world order could be achieved. Now aggression and armed intervention has been undertaken in the name of peace. Freedom and self-determination, which were denied the people of Katanga in the name of peace, would certainly be a more worthy goal for the United Nations to seek.

It must be remembered that peace can be obtained at the same time that all mankind is enslaved. "Peace" and slavery can go hand in hand, but freedom is the antithesis of slavery, and freedom should be the ultimate aim of government by the people everywhere.

A major portion of the funds which would be made available to the United Nations should Congress give its approval would be used to defray the expenses of the Congo operation. The money in excess of that amount, however, would provide a fund to finance future aggression by the United Nations undertaken in the name of peace.

This would be tantamount to giving approval to the U.N.'s actions in the Congo and encouraging them to engage in aggression of a similar nature in the future. This is the equivalent of inviting the United Nations to forcefully intervene in the internal affairs of any country which is determined by the Security Council to pose a threat to the peace. To take such action in the name of peace is to make a mockery of the word "peace."

What then is the proper role for the United Nations? Mutual understanding and trust between nations is a prerequisite for a world in which peace and freedom prevail. Any action or movement calculated to undermine this relationship between nations may be a threat to only freedom and not at the same time threaten the peace. Since the United Nations was not conceived in the idea of securing and extending the blessings of liberty to all mankind, but merely "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" it must play a marginal role in the conduct of the cold war. The threat to the liberty of the portions of the world which remain free is real and imminent, and the United Nations has proved itself to be inadequate to accept the challenge with any degree of success.

In these perilous times, the true measure of the United Nation's role as an instrument of the foreign policy of the United States must be determined by the degree to which it conforms to our needs. The action by the United Nations in the Congo was in direct contravention to the stated principles for which the United States stands. It prevented self-determination for the people of Katanga and therefore deprived them of their liberty in that regard. To lend approval and financial assistance to operations of the United Nations which are in direct conflict with the principles upon which our foreign policy is, or should be, based is a grave error. Our actions in giving support to violations of these principles must speak as loud as our words in advocating them. Such inconsistencies can only result in decreasing the respect other nations have for us.

Mr. President, it is premature for Congress to be even considering such a proposal at this time. The World Court has been asked for an advisory opinion as to whether the assessments for the Middle East and Congo operations are binding upon member states. A decision is expected sometime in the early summer, but the Court could decline to pass on the matter if they determine it to be a political rather than a legal question. Under the United Nations Charter, advisory opinions from the World Court are limited to legal questions, and they may pass on them even though they are presented in the abstract. The question which has been put to the Court involves the interpretation of a treaty provision and will probably, therefore, be considered an essentially judicial task. The World Court advisory opinion may not sustain the United Nations power to collect these special assessments. A ruling of this nature would place the United States in an untenable position in its chances for repayment in the event Congress authorizes participation in the present scheme. The other member nations of the United Nations could justifiably decline to pay that share of their future dues which would be used to repay the U.S. loan. This would necessitate increasing the assessment of every nation with the eventual result of the United States repaying itself the money which they had advanced.

In any event, the prospects for repayment of any advance are dim as long as the United Nations continues to be constituted as at present. As of December 31, 1961, the total arrears in member states' assessed contributions to the United Nations for the regular budget, and for the special operations, amounted to $93,820,856. It would have undoubtedly been greater had not the United States donated large sums above their regular share. The United Nations had net cash resources of $15.5 million and a total unpaid obligation of $129.4 million. The unpaid obligations include rather substantial sums owed to various surplus and special accounts of the United Nations. If these facts paint a rather confused picture of the fiscal affairs of the United Nations, it is but further evidence of the overall confusion which exists in that body.

Mr. President, there have been many proposals advanced to bail the United Nations out of its financial difficulties. With possibly one exception, they fail to get at the crux of the matter in that they offer only stopgap remedies. If it is the judgment of our country that the United Nations has a potential worth saving, we should channel our efforts toward seeking a meaningful and lasting solution for its problems.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from South Dakota is ready to do likewise.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes. First of all, let me say I am happy to have confirmation, as I knew I would have it, from the acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that our overall contribution to the major portion of the U.N. expenditures is 32 percent. In reality, my amendment is even a little more generous, because it provides for one-third. It maintains the traditional formula of 33⅓ percent of our contribution to the U.N.

I believe this is a much more serious issue than many of us, perhaps, have stopped to analyze and realize. Sometimes we are imbued with slogans and labels and headlines when we read that a happy compromise has been effectuated. If we do not look into the language of the compromise, it may seem like a happy, propitious, peaceful solution of the problem.

In analyzing the original U.N. bond proposal, and comparing it with the substitute we now have before us, we see that the proposal we have before us belies the description "compromise."

At least, the original U.N. bond proposal had the virtue of being specific, and gave us an opportunity to know for what we were voting or what we were about to amend, or what, perhaps, we might decide to oppose.

The substitute, is, indeed, a congressional capitulation. Rather than a compromise, it could better be described as a cascade of concessions because Congress has retained nothing, but has delegated everything. We move away from the traditional 33⅓-percent posture to the posture that the U.N. will be costing us more than 50 percent.

I believe we should go further than spelling out that we will retain the 33⅓-percent formula. However, I shall not press the other points at this time.

I believe that prudent and proper parliamentary procedure would indicate that we spell out the interest rate. This Congress has been accused before, with some justification, of being the most irresponsible Congress fiscally in the current century. We manifestly do nothing to refute that indictment when we start appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars, to be loaned to people in other lands at a visionary interest rate to be fixed, we hope, somewhere, sometime, by somebody. We could very well wind up with no interest rate at all. I believe that prudent and proper parliamentary procedure would indicate that if we are to lend this money, at least we should fix the maximum length of the loan.

Taxpayers of America should have a right to insist upon the protection of the Constitution. If we are to enter into the international banking business, we ought to fix the interest rate, at least, and we certainly should fix the maximum termination date. This we do not do in the so-called compromise substitute. We merely say, "Let them have it on the promise that we will learn about it somewhere else when somebody has decided what should be done."

I do not believe that that is the kind of approach a responsible parliamentary body should take. If we were lending a $10 bill to a neighbor in Maryland, that is one thing. However, when we are lending $100 million to an international organization, it seems to me it is a sad reflection upon the attitude we take toward fiscal affairs in this great Congress when we fail to spell out and identify the fiscal guidelines.

Despite the fact that I fear the amendment will be defeated, although I hope it will not be defeated—I know that the skids have been greased, and I know that the clamor is on, and I know it is hard to obtain the attendance of Senators at this hour of the evening—speaking for myself and my conviction, I would indeed be derelict if I did not call attention to what I think is a manifestation of a careless and capricious custody of the public pursestrings on the part of the Senate.

I hope the Senate will approve my simple amendment and retain the percentage formula which traditionally has been considered right by the United Nations.

If my distinguished friend from Alabama will yield back the remainder of his time, I shall be glad to do likewise.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MUNDT. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the compromise substitute offered by the majority leader and the minority leader.

I am glad the issue before us will be resolved on a bipartisan basis and that there is wide backing from both sides of the aisle for the substitute plan. This is the way it should be.

Strong bipartisan support is indispensable if we are going to participate effectively in the United Nations. Unfortunately, some people lose sight of this basic principle. When this occurs we are hurt, and so is our useful role in the United Nations.

I especially want to pay tribute to my able colleagues, Senator MANSFIELD, Senator SPARKMAN, Senator DIRKSEN, Senator AIKEN, and Senator HICKENLOOPER for the sensible and constructive way in which they joined forces in working out the bipartisan substitute.

The funds raised by the United Nations under the loan-bond arrangement will be used mainly to finance the expensive operations of the United Nations in the Congo.

Let us be candid about the situation in the Congo. It is a new experience to have the United Nations conduct a military effort of this type. It is a difficult kind of operation, and there are disturbing and unhappy aspects to it. The situation may deteriorate before it improves.

We are in for much more trouble in the Congo, and there is a long way to go before the effort can be called a success.

Whatever reservations anyone may have about the Congo operations, the United Nations is deeply involved in the Congo. I am sure that no one can seriously want to use the power of the purse to force a halt. There is no good alternative at this time to continued support of the operations in the hope that law and order may be established in the Congo and that the Congo may be given a chance to make a start as a unified and independent state.

Mr. President, I am deeply troubled by the fact that so few members of the United Nations have met their share of the cost of the United Nations operations in the Middle East and the Congo. It is a sign of trouble in an organization when its members refuse to pay their dues. I believe that our Government should make great efforts to change this state of affairs. I am much more concerned about the principle involved than I am about the sum of money. One member should not, as a matter of principle, act as an organization's financial angel.

I intend to vote for the compromise measure to help meet the financial needs of the United Nations in the coming period. However, I hope that this debate will make it clear that the Senate is acting to meet an emergency and that its action does not set a precedent for the future.

I regret that there was not timely consultation last fall with the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe a better way of meeting the financial problem of the United Nations might have been found. But there was a failure to consult, and we now face a condition, not a theory.

Faced with this condition, I believe the compromise before the Senate is the best we can get, and I support it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time and to ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield back the rest of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The Senator from Alabama has asked for the yeas and nays. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 67, as follows:

[No. 37 Leg.]

YEAS—24

Allott
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Capehart
Case, S. Dak.
Cotton
Curtis
Dworshak
Eastland
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
McClellan
Miller
Mundt
Murphy
Prouty
Robertson
Russell
Smith, Maine
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—67

Aiken
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Sparkman
Symington
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—9

Anderson
Bennett
Chavez
Ellender
Hruska
Kerr
Long, La.
Neuberger
Young, N. Dak.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on my own behalf, I call up, to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, an amendment originally filed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], on behalf of himself, myself, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. I am calling up the amendment on my own behalf because, as I understand, the Senator from Vermont is not now joining in offering this amendment, and I am not sure whether the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is. So I call up the amendment on my own behalf. It is identified as "3-16-62—A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The amendment submitted by Mr. HICKENLOOPER to the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute was read, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, without fiscal year limitation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not to exceed $100,000,000 which shall be available for the making of loans to the United Nations. Any such loan shall mature not later than June 30, 1965, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be substantially equal to the average rate, as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan, on outstanding marketable public debt obligations of the United States of comparable maturities.

"SEC. 2. Amounts received from the repayment of principal and payment of interest due on such loans shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing loans to the United Nations and the appropriation of funds therefor.'"

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not intend to take any appreciable amount of the time of the Senate, but I am greatly concerned about the direction which this particular financial transaction may be taking. Originally I felt that the U.N. was in serious financial straits. I joined in the amendment to lend the United Nations $100 million at current rates of interest, or, as stated in the amendment at a rate, "to be substantially equal to the average rate, as of the last day of the month preceding the making of the loan, on outstanding marketable public debt obligations of the United States of comparable maturities," and that such loans shall mature not later than June 30, 1965.

The provisions of the pending amendment are well known. I believe it is a method of placing a substantial incentive in the hands of the United Nations to meet its financial straits. It postpones the payment of the debt for the loan for 3 years from June 30 of this year. Three sessions can go by. The various nations can stimulate themselves to put their financial houses in order and pay up their arrearages, at least partially. So far as I am concerned, if the countries in arrears showed good faith and sincerity in paying the arrearages, I would have no objection to an extension of the unpaid portion of the loan for a reasonable period of time after the 3-year period, in order to assist them.

I offer the amendment because a great many Members of the Senate have signified to me that they would like this kind of approach. They consider it to be a businesslike approach to the affairs of the United Nations, as opposed to the long-drawn-out 25-year bond proposal, which a number of Members of this body oppose. They think this amendment would cause the United Nations to tighten its fiscal and financial affairs and cause the various countries to meet their obligations by contributing money to the United Nations if they want to vote in it, and thereby make it a viable organization. I think it is a sound, businesslike approach.

I may say in advance something that perhaps is bad forensics in debating procedure, but I am not unnecessarily deluded into thinking that the amendment will carry. However, I am offering it for the benefit of Senators who want an opportunity to vote on the proposal and who have expressed themselves on it. I am offering it to give them an opportunity to vote to assist, for a period of time, in a substantial, material way, the United Nations, based on a businesslike approach and an approach which I think would stimulate the United Nations to put its house in order, and which would be of material assistance.

The substitute which was offered by the Senator from Montana, the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Illinois, the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], was originally designed, I believe, to meet a loan theory rather than a bond theory. The words referring to bonds were deleted in the amendment, but I have been greatly concerned about the interpretation by certain spokesmen close to the White House who have chortled that the so-called substitute was more than the administration originally asked.

I am also concerned by the fact that the President's letter of yesterday, which I looked for with some eagerness and anticipation, said absolutely nothing as to how the transaction would be handled. It was a completely unsatisfactory letter so far as I am concerned.

I still hope that, if the compromise is accepted, the President will exercise his discretion and use the loans on a basis of reasonable and justifiable rates of interest.

However, I have offered the amendment, and do not care to discuss it further.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the Senator from South Dakota correct in understanding that a basic difference between this amendment and the reported substitute is that the Senator's amendment would require the interest rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, to be substantially equal to the average rate at which the United States has borrowed money?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct; and the amendment now before the Senate amounts to a 3-year loan, at the average cost of money to the Government as expressed in the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did the Senator give consideration to placing in his amendment section 3, which is contained in the other substitute, which would provide for deductions from the annual payments of the assessed share of the United States of the budget of the United Nations an amount equal to the corresponding annual installment of principal and interest due the United States?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. It was considered, but it was deemed not necessary, because this transaction would be a 3-year loan. If payment were to be deferred for a longer period, I think the annual checkoff of the obligations of the U.N. to the United States to be applied against our assessments would be a desirable addition. I do not think it is desirable in this amendment because it provides for a 3-year loan, and not a long-term loan.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the Senator's proposal, is there anything mandatory, or is it merely an authorization for an appropriation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is an authorization for the appropriation to the President of $100 million, a part or all of which he may lend.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But it would be subject to review by the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. I shall support the amendment in the full knowledge, as the Senator from Iowa has said, that it will not carry. In substance, the amendment is the suggestion I made last February when the question arose. I feel that something has been accomplished. I feel that the substitute offered by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois is far better than the original measure or the measure as reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There are sections in the substitute proposed by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois which make clear the intent of Congress, and I think give some notice to our colleagues in the United Nations that we are not going down the primrose path of long-term deficit financing or from one crisis to another, and pick up the tab.

I would have preferred the approach taken by the amendment of the senior Senator from Iowa. I realize, however, that we must accommodate ourselves to parliamentary realities.

I shall vote for the amendment, knowing that it will not prevail, and then I shall support the substitute offered by the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. I have much the same feeling, I believe, that the substitute offered by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois has within its framework the opportunity for the President to make a realistic, businesslike transaction, without going the 25-year-bond route and without going the 2-percent-interest route.

If the President takes such a position, I shall have no quarrel with his discretionary action, if there is a substantially shorter term than 25 years. If there is a more realistic interest rate than 2 percent, I am willing to trust the President's discretion in that connection. I feel that if the President elects to make a 25-year loan and to buy bonds, and if he elects to loan the money at 2 percent, that will not be in keeping with the substantial view of the Congress of the United States, or the substantial wish of the Congress of the United States.

We must have some trust and confidence in the President. If he does not do things the way we wish, we can criticize his action at a later date. I hope this program will be operated on a businesslike basis and not on such a basis that other countries may expect that they can continually default on their payments to the United Nations and the United States will come along and pick up the check year after year after year, to the detriment, to the deterioration, and to the erosion of the strength and dignity which ought to be a part of the United Nations and of the nations that compose it.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 4 minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the hour is late. I am one Senator who rarely takes the time of the Senate for remarks, particularly with respect to measures which do not come from my own committee.

I was one of those who importuned the Senator from Iowa to offer the amendment or the substitute even though it had been discarded, and even though the hope of its being agreed to is very slim. I appreciate the fact that the Senator has offered it.

I am not suggesting that it was not the part of wisdom for those who originally supported this measure to agree to a compromise.

I wished to see it offered because I am one—and I think there are others—who, before the Senate reaches a final vote on the measure before it, wishes to have an opportunity to vote to lend to the United Nations exactly and precisely what the President has indicated the U.N. needs at the present time; namely, $100 million—the exact amount—but to lend it to the United Nations directly as a loan from the United States of America for a time certain and at a rate of interest which would reimburse the United States for the amount it pays for the use of this money.

Mr. President, it has been a long road. I am one who is a liberal in foreign affairs, who has followed this road ever since I came to the Congress in 1947. I voted for and supported the Greek-Turkey aid program. I voted for and supported the Marshall plan. I have voted for and supported our foreign aid policy down through my 16 years of service. I am willing to support and to hold up the hands of the United Nations.

I have stated steadfastly to my people and to everyone else that we should not withhold from the United Nations the full support of the United States of America, because in that Organization, formed to replace war with law, reposes the hope and the dream of humanity.

It is my opinion that we do not aid the United Nations, that we do not build self-respect of the United Nations, that we do not build respect of the world for the United States when we allow our own constitutional methods, our own checks and balances, the safeguards of our Republic to be ignored and to slip through our fingers.

I want to see the loan made, and I wish to vote for a method of making it that will keep the purse strings of this Republic where they belong, in the hands of the Senate and in the hands of our sister body. When the President comes to the Congress, as is his duty, entrusted as he is under the Constitution with the conduct of foreign affairs, and says to the Congress: "It is my opinion that we need so much money for this country, for that country, and for the United Nations," in my belief it is our duty to consider it carefully and to give him, to the best of our ability, so far as our conscience permits, what is required, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican. He is our President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it is a far different thing to hand over blanket authority to the Executive. We have been doing that more and more and more. Those who have studied the course of events in the last few years are painfully aware of the fact that the Congress of the United States and the Senate, with all its tradition, has gotten into the habit of "passing the buck" to the President of the United States willingly, and sometimes even when he hardly asks for it, handing decisionmaking over to him.

I certainly respect the earnest desire of those who have framed what is called a compromise, but if Senators will read through its pages they will see expressions such as "it is the intent of the Congress" and "it is the sense of the Congress." One almost finds "it is the hope of the Congress" that the President or someone else, will cause the United Nations to improve its financial practices. The proposal protests that this action is not to be a precedent for further surrender of the purse strings by the Congress of the United States.

To paraphrase a famous statement:

> The substitute doth protest too much, me thinks.

Why did that statement have to go in? It is because in the hearts and minds of Senators who are aware of the traditions of this body there must be the feeling that we are in danger of taking a further long step down the road of releasing control of the purse strings from the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I have gone almost as far as I can go down the road of indiscriminate giving to foreign nations, until they have come to feel they have a vested right in the money of our taxpayers.

I still wish to do the things which are necessary to build and to maintain the free society of nations and to keep the United Nations effective, but from now on I shall insist as far as my vote and influence permits that the Congress of the United States knows exactly how much is being given, for what it is being given, and for how long. I want the Congress to set the ground rules.

For that reason I wished an opportunity to vote for this amendment. For that reason I fear I shall, with great reluctance, be compelled to vote against the so-called compromise. I must say I would rather vote for what the President asked in the beginning than for this vague delegation of authority which, with all respects to its distinguished authors, confers almost unlimited power to the President.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish we had the time and the disposition to discuss these basic issues in the deliberative manner I think they merit.

I shall vote for the Hickenlooper amendment for precisely the reasons stated with such eloquence by my distinguished friend from New Hampshire. Like him, for a long time, I consistently supported the United Nations, the foreign-aid program, the ECA program, the Marshall plan, and all the rest. I have been somewhat active in regard to programs beyond that, dealing with the exchange of people and the development of collective security systems and programs for preserving peace.

It seems to me, however, that there comes a time when Senators who respect their oaths of office and who wish to measure up to their responsibilities should not be asked to buy a cat in a bag in connection with an important issue of this kind.

Senator Cotton's argument is four square with the argument I made in connection with the offer of my amendment, when I suggested that we reduce to one-third our contribution, because such a contribution would be in conformity with our established practice. I am happy to note that well over one-third of Senators voting voted in support of my position on that amendment.

I hope that the Senate will vote for the Hickenlooper amendment. The amendment would provide the aid for the United Nations that it needs. But we would be doing so as a responsible legislative body spelling out the terms. We would know for how long the loan would run. We would know how much it would be. We would know the rate of interest. We would remove from Communist countries the propaganda temptations to say that instead of helping the United Nations, we are building up some kind of blackmail opportunity by our Federal Treasury and the White House to coerce other countries to come our way and to dicker for a better proposition. We cannot buy friends in the United Nations that we are unable to win on the merit of our leadership. It seems to me that unless we are merely willing to vacate the traditional high position that the Senate has in international affairs, we had better accept the Hickenlooper substitute instead of simply delegating everything, without definition, without specification, to another branch of the Government. I hope the Hickenlooper amendment is adopted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall try not to use the 12 minutes. I rise to say that I intended originally to support the Aiken-Hickenlooper amendment to the bill. When the compromise offered by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois was put forward, and we received a letter from the President supporting it and setting forth the course of action he intended to pursue with relation to that substitute, I determined to vote for it.

As I believe both the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] have said, we must always remember that the question will come before the Committee on Appropriations. The Appropriations Committee is limited, to a certain extent, in its discretion if we provide the authority requested at this time. But we shall have an opportunity to look the situation over and then insert provisos if we think that the Executive is not carrying out the purposes of the amendment in the form of a substitute on which we shall now vote.

Several things came to me very strongly in connection with my decision. We must remember that the United Nations is a valuable, if imperfect, force for good in the world and it merits our continued support. When we talk about its role in our foreign policy, it is, of course, necessary to place it in its proper perspective. In this connection there are several underlying thoughts which to me are fundamental.

First, our foreign policy must always be determined on the basis of what is in the best interests of our country. To forward our foreign policy and work out our understandings with other countries we can, and should, work through the U.N. when it is helpful to do so. But we must not permit the United Nations to dominate us in what we believe is fundamental to the best interests of the United States. That is the spirit on which I voted for the original United Nations Charter, and that is the spirit in which I feel we should work with the United Nations today.

The question before the United Nations at the present time is how to finance it. We have found that the United States is now not only paying its share of the 32.5 percent, but by voluntary contributions has raised that amount to almost 50 percent of the cost of the undertakings in the Congo and Suez operations. That situation has come about because while 70 nations voted for the Congo operation, only 25 countries have paid in full their Congo assessment for 1961 and only 12 others have paid part of their obligations. That means that 62 nations have paid no part of their obligations, even though 70 members voted for the Congo operations.

The question before us is a fundamental one: How is the United Nations to carry on? Where is the money coming from to enable it to maintain its missions in the Congo and in the Suez, and to continue its regular activities? There are honest differences of opinion among us as to how that should be done. The original request was for a 25-year bond issue. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr Aiken] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] provided for a 3-year loan. On a business basis I believe a 3-year loan would probably be the better proposal if we are not certain what will happen with relation to our financial relations in the United Nations in the future. But at the same time we must realize that the United Nations will not be able to pay up in 3 years, and therefore a long loan is probably advisable.

I believe that the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute is of value because it would leave within the discretion of the President the decision as to how much of the amount should be a bond issue and how much should be a short-term loan or any loan that the President might see fit to make.

In his letter the President has stated affirmatively that he would try to do two things, both of which were contained in the amendments I submitted. I did not offer them because I believe their provisions are contained in the President's letter.

One was to put the United Nations in a better financial status, to have an officer who would be responsible to see that the United Nations lives within its financial obligations in order that it may know how it stands financially at any moment.

The other amendment that I submitted, which I believe would be helpful—and its provisions are also covered in the broad language of the President's letter—would prevent the money that we loan at the present time from being used as a part of a voluntary contribution to pay up the assessments of other nations which may not live up to their financial obligations in future undertakings.

We should remember that we are counting on the fact that the Court of International Justice will make a decision with respect to whether assessments for special operations are, in fact, a part of the regular operations of the United Nations and therefore mandatory. We do not know whether that decision will be favorable or not, but we hope and believe that it will be. So that question is involved in the whole situation. It becomes very important to have the proposed loans in such shape that, if the decision is against us, we can take another look at the problem as it arises at that time, which may be within 3 years.

I therefore say that the compromise, which is favored by the Executive and the leaders in this body, together with the supporting letter of the President, is the means by which we can be most satisfied that the difficult problem of financing the United Nations can be carried out at this time. The President in his letter said:

> It shall be the intention of the executive as well as the legislative branch that the proceeds not be used to relieve other U.N. members of their obligations to make good on past assessments on which they are in arrears. I might add that it is equally clear that these proceeds are not to be used to pay the assessments of other members.

With respect to my suggestion that the fiscal section of the U.N. be strengthened by the designation of a minister of finance, he writes of the intent of this Government to pursue efforts "to improve the administration of fiscal affairs in the Secretariat and constituent agencies and bolster the existing fiscal office and officers." He also set forth his intention to increase the knowledge of the Congress about U.N. finances by asking the State Department to prepare a semiannual report setting forth all the fiscal operations of the U.N., "including but not limited to assessments, arrearages, and payments on the principal and interest of all U.N. loans."

In view of these assurances I have decided not to press my amendments. These are matters perhaps better left to the discretion of the President, in view of his expressed interest in these goals.

I am pleased by the President's statement that he will seek to follow "legislative guidelines" and exert every effort "to minimize the outlays of the United States, maximize the contributions of others and put the essential operations of the United Nations on a sound financial basis."

This is a serious and complicated problem for which there is no easy solution. In my judgment, however, the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute, supplemented by President Kennedy's letter constitutes the best plan advanced. Therefore, I shall support it.

In closing I would like to emphasize my conviction that our relations with other nations in the world must be based on policies which will protect us and our security and advance future opportunities for peace in the world as we see them, with the futures of our children and grandchildren in mind.

For these purposes we will want the U.N. to be an effective organ for discussions, helpful action supported by all the nations who are its members. If this is to be accomplished, these nations must carry out their obligations to the U.N. and not expect the United States to carry their financial burden. If, in the days to come, the U.N. is to be the working reality for peace which all hoped it would be when it was established, it must have more than the professed support of its members. It must have their financial backing also.

I join with others of my colleagues who believe that this debate has been helpful not only in providing us with a better understanding of the U.N. and its obligations, but also in conveying to other member nations a clearer picture of our feelings toward the U.N.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to one phase of the substitute concerning which I have considerable feeling. We already understand that commitments have been made to buy United Nations bonds of 25-year maturity, at 2-percent interest, in the amount of approximately $62 million. If we were to fix an interest rate, it would be the equivalent of 4 percent at the present time, under the amendment now under discussion.

Other nations would then be tempted to say—and they would be foolish if they did not—"We will lend our money at the cost of the money to us at this time."

What rate is paid for money in Great Britain, Mr. President? It is 6 percent. What is paid for money in Latin American countries? They have already committed themselves to buy some of these bonds. They are paying 11, 12, and 15 percent.

What would we be doing if we were to get away from the 2-percent interest rate? We would be running up the cost of the bond issue to the United States, because we would be paying approximately one-third of the cost of retiring these bonds, and approximately one-third of the cost of the interest. If we say that we will set a 4-percent interest rate, we certainly cannot blame any other nations for saying that they will fix the interest rate at the rate their money costs them.

I would reject this interest rate formula simply on the basis that it is bad business for the United States. We would be much better off with a lower interest rate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I do not like to detain the Senate at this late hour. However, earlier today on two occasions I referred to a statement in a newspaper dated the 31st of March, datelined Geneva. I read from it, and I shall do so again very briefly:

> The United States will submit to the Geneva Disarmament Conference a plan calling for elimination of national armies within 9 years and their replacement by a United Nations force, reliable sources said yesterday.

I recognize that at the time it was attributed to "reliable sources." However, since that time, I wrote to Secretary Rusk and to Mr. Foster, who is the head of the Disarmament Agency. Until a few minutes ago I had not received a reply from either gentleman. However, I do have one from Mr. Foster, which I have just now received.

Because I told both the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who is handling the bill on the floor of the Senate, that I would make the contents of any answer I received known to the Senate, I ask the indulgence of the Senate to read this rather short letter. It reads:

U.S. Arms Control and
Disarmament Agency,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1962.

Senator Barry Goldwater,
New Senate Office Building,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Goldwater: This is in reply to your letter of today which was brought to my attention shortly after noontime. In it you ask me certain questions concerning the U.S. position at Geneva and ask me to comment upon a UPI story which appeared in the Arizona Republic.

The U.S. position at Geneva is based on the program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world proposed by President Kennedy on September 25, 1961. I am enclosing a copy of this program. It contemplates that disarmament would take place in three stages. It also proposes a U.N. Peace Force which would be established in the second stage and progressively strengthened in the third stage. On March 15, 1961, at the Geneva Conference, Secretary Rusk stated that, given faithful cooperation, the first stage in this program could be completed within 3 years. The United States has not, at this time, made any proposal with respect to the length of the other two stages.

It is anticipated that at the end of stages I and II there would be a transition period in which countries would determine whether to proceed to the next stage. This would depend on whether all countries were complying with their obligations, and whether effective international control had been established. Since countries cannot be expected to disarm unless the international political atmosphere warrants it, the United States would doubtless also want to see whether further evolution had taken place toward a peaceful world in which international disputes were settled without recourse to threats of war.

The executive branch is preparing a draft outline of provisions for a disarmament treaty. Appropriate committees of Congress have already received briefings on the course of the Geneva Conference negotiations and on the substance of the U.S. program which such an outline would follow. Further consultation with Congress is planned before the draft outline is offered to the Conference in Geneva.

Sincerely yours,

William C. Foster.

Mr. President, I do not consider this an answer, either in the affirmative or in the negative. It is the usual bureaucratic gobbledygook, in which nothing is said. Long ago I discovered that in this Government whenever one gets an answer which is more than one page long, someone is trying to beat around the bush.

There are several interesting statements in the letter that I should like to call to the attention of the Senate this evening. At this time we are considering a proposal involving the United Nations. I am convinced that the United Nations has not always acted in the best interest of the United States, and I do not have the confidence in the United Nations that some of my colleagues have in it. I wish that were not so.

I shall not read the three-stage proposal. Instead, I ask unanimous consent that a booklet containing it may be printed in its entirety at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the booklet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Freedom From War—The U.S. Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World

INTRODUCTION

The revolutionary development of modern weapons within a world divided by serious ideological differences has produced a crisis in human history. In order to overcome the danger of nuclear war now confronting mankind, the United States has introduced at the 16th General Assembly of the United Nations a program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world.

This new program provides for the progressive reduction of the warmaking capabilities of nations and the simultaneous strengthening of international institutions to settle disputes and maintain the peace. It sets forth a series of comprehensive measures which can and should be taken in order to to bring about a world in which there will be freedom from war and security for all states. It is based on three principles deemed essential to the achievement of practical progress in the disarmament field:

First, there must be immediate disarmament action: A strenuous and uninterrupted effort must be made toward the goal of general and complete disarmament; at the same time, it is important that specific measures be put into effect as soon as possible.

Second, all disarmament obligations must be subject to effective international controls: The control organization must have the manpower, facilities, and effectiveness to assure that limitations or reductions take place as agreed. It must also be able to certify to all states that retained forces and armaments do not exceed those permitted at any stage of the disarmament process.

Third, adequate peacekeeping machinery must be established: There is an inseparable relationship between the scaling down of national armaments on the one hand and the building up of international peacekeeping machinery and institutions on the other. Nations are unlikely to shed their means of self-protection in the absence of alternative ways to safeguard their legitimate interests. This can only be achieved through the progressive strengthening of international institutions under the United Nations and by creating a United Nations peace force to enforce the peace as the disarmament process proceeds.

(There follows a summary of the principal provisions of the U.S. program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. The full text of the program is contained in an appendix to this pamphlet.)

SUMMARY

Disarmament goal and objectives

The overall goal of the United States is a free, secure, and peaceful world of independent states adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law; a world which has achieved general and complete disarmament under effective international control; and a world in which adjustment to change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

In order to make possible the achievement of that goal, the program sets forth the following specific objectives toward which nations should direct their efforts:

The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations peace force;

The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations peace force and for maintaining internal order;

The institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations; and

The establishment and effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations to insure compliance at all times with all disarmament obligations.

Task of negotiating states

The negotiating states are called upon to develop the program into a detailed plan for general and complete disarmament and to continue their efforts without interruption until the whole program has been achieved. To this end, they are to seek the widest possible area of agreement at the earliest possible date. At the same time, and without prejudice to progress on the disarmament program, they are to seek agreement on those immediate measures that would contribute to the common security of nations and that could facilitate and form part of the total program.

Governing principles

The program sets forth a series of general principles to guide the negotiating states in their work. These make clear that:

As states relinquish their arms, the United Nations must be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to assure international security and the peaceful settlement of disputes;

Disarmament must proceed as rapidly as possible, until it is completed, in stages containing balanced, phased, and safeguarded measures;

Each measure and stage should be carried out in an agreed period of time, with transition from one stage to the next to take place as soon as all measures in the preceding stage have been carried out and verified and as soon as necessary arrangements for verification of the next stage have been made;

Inspection and verification must establish both that nations carry out scheduled limitations or reductions and that they do not retain armed forces and armaments in excess of those permitted at any stage of the disarmament process; and

Disarmament must take place in a manner that will not affect adversely the security of any state.

Disarmament stages

The program provides for progressive disarmament steps to take place in three stages and for the simultaneous strengthening of international institutions.

First Stage

The first stage contains measures which would significantly reduce the capabilities of nations to wage aggressive war. Implementation of this stage would mean that:

The nuclear threat would be reduced:

All states would have adhered to a treaty effectively prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons.

The production of fissionable materials for use in weapons would be stopped and quantities of such materials from past production would be converted to nonweapons uses.

States owning nuclear weapons would not relinquish control of such weapons to any nation not owning them and would not transmit to any such nation information or material necessary for their manufacture.

States not owning nuclear weapons would not manufacture them or attempt to obtain control of such weapons belonging to other states.

A commission of experts would be established to report on the feasibility and means for the verified reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles.

Strategic delivery vehicles would be reduced:

Strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles of specified categories and weapons designed to counter such vehicles would be reduced to agreed levels by equitable and balanced steps; their production would be discontinued or limited; their testing would be limited or halted.

Arms and armed forces would be reduced:

The Armed Forces of the United States and the Soviet Union would be limited to 2.1 million men each (with appropriate levels not exceeding that amount for other militarily significant states); levels of armaments would be correspondingly reduced and their production would be limited.

An Experts Commission would be established to examine and report on the feasibility and means of accomplishing verifiable reduction and eventual elimination of all chemical, biological, and radiological weapons.

Peaceful use of outer space would be promoted:

The placing in orbit or stationing in outer space of weapons capable of producing mass destruction would be prohibited.

States would give advance notification of space vehicle and missile launchings.

U.N. peacekeeping powers would be strengthened:

Measures would be taken to develop and strengthen United Nations arrangements for arbitration, for the development of international law, and for the establishment in stage II of a permanent U.N. peace force.

An International Disarmament Organization would be established for effective verification of the disarmament program:

Its functions would be expanded progressively as disarmament proceeds.

It would certify to all states that agreed reductions have taken place and that retained forces and armaments do not exceed permitted levels.

It would determine the transition from one stage to the next.

States would be committed to other measures to reduce international tension and to protect against the chance of war by accident, miscalculation, or surprise attack.

States would be committed to refrain from the threat or use of any type of armed force contrary to the principles of the U.N. Charter and to refrain from indirect aggression and subversion against any country.

A U.N. peace observation group would be available to investigate any situation which might constitute a threat to or breach of the peace.

States would be committed to give advance notice of major military movements which might cause alarm; observation posts would be established to report on concentrations and movements of military forces.

Second Stage

The second stage contains a series of measures which would bring within sight a world in which there would be freedom from war. Implementation of all measures in the second stage would mean:

Further substantial reductions in the armed forces, armaments, and military establishments of states, including strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and countering weapons;

Further development of methods for the peaceful settlement of disputes under the United Nations;

Establishment of a permanent international peace force within the United Nations;

Depending on the findings of an experts commission, a halt in the production of chemical, bacteriological, and radiological weapons and a reduction of existing stocks or their conversion to peaceful uses;

On the basis of the findings of an experts commission, a reduction of stocks of nuclear weapons.

The dismantling or the conversion to peaceful uses of certain military bases and facilities wherever located; and

The strengthening and enlargement of the International Disarmament Organization to enable it to verify the steps taken in stage II and to determine the transition to stage III.

Third Stage

During the third stage of the program, the states of the world, building on the experience and confidence gained in successfully implementing the measures of the first two stages, would take final steps toward the goal of a world in which:

States would retain only those forces, nonnuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. peace force.

The U.N. peace force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.

The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. peace force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes.

The peacekeeping capabilities of the United Nations would be sufficiently strong and the obligations of all states under such arrangements sufficiently far reaching as to assure peace and the just settlement of differences in a disarmed world.

APPENDIX

The nations of the world—

Conscious of the crisis in human history produced by the revolutionary development of modern weapons within a world divided by serious ideological differences;

Determined to save present and succeeding generations from the scourge of war and the dangers and burdens of the arms race and to create conditions in which all peoples can strive freely and peacefully to fulfill their basic aspirations;

Declare their goal to be: A free, secure, and peaceful world of independent states adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law; a world where adjustment to change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations; a world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control and where the resources of nations shall be devoted to man's material, cultural, and spiritual advance;

Set forth as the objectives of a program of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world:

(a) The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations peace force;

(b) The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations Peace Force and for maintaining internal order;

(c) The establishment and effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations to ensure compliance at all times with all disarmament obligations; and

(d) The institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

Call on the negotiating states:

(a) To develop the outline program set forth below into an agreed plan for general and complete disarmament and to continue their efforts without interruption until the whole program has been achieved;

(b) To this end to seek to attain the widest possible area of agreement at the earliest possible date; and

(c) Also to seek—without prejudice to progress on the disarmament program—agreement on those immediate measures that would contribute to the common security of nations and that could facilitate and form a part of that program.

Affirm that disarmament negotiations should be guided by the following principles:

(a) Disarmament shall take place as rapidly as possible until it is completed in stages containing balanced, phased and safeguarded measures, with each measure and stage to be carried out in an agreed period of time.

(b) Compliance with all disarmament obligations shall be effectively verified from their entry into force. Verification arrangements shall be instituted progressively and in such a manner as to verify not only that agreed limitations or reductions take place but also that retained armed forces and armaments do not exceed agreed levels at any stage.

(c) Disarmament shall take place in a manner that will not affect adversely the security of any state, whether or not a party to an international agreement or treaty.

(d) As states relinquish their arms, the United Nations shall be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to assure international security and the peaceful settlement of differences as well as to facilitate the development of international cooperation in common tasks for the benefit of mankind.

(e) Transition from one stage of disarmament to the next shall take place as soon as all the measures in the preceding stage have been carried out and effective verification is continuing and as soon as the arrangements that have been agreed to be necessary for the next stage have been instituted.

Agree upon the following outline program for achieving general and complete disarmament:

Stage I

A. To establish an International Disarmament Organization:

(a) An International Disarmament Organization (IDO) shall be established within the framework of the United Nations upon entry into force of the agreement. Its functions shall be expanded progressively as required for the effective verification of the disarmament program.

(b) The IDO shall have: (1) a general conference of all the parties; (2) a commission consisting of representatives of all the major powers as permanent members and certain other states on a rotating basis; and (3) an administrator who will administer the organization subject to the direction of the commission and who will have the authority, staff, and finances adequate to assure effective impartial implementation of the functions of the organization.

(c) The IDO shall: (1) insure compliance with the obligations undertaken by verifying the execution of measures agreed upon; (2) assist the states in developing the details of agreed further verification and disarmament measures; (3) provide for the establishment of such bodies as may be necessary for working out the details of further measures provided for in the program and for such other expert study groups as may be required to give continuous study to the problems of disarmament; (4) receive reports on the progress of disarmament and verification arrangements and determine the transition from one stage to the next.

B. To reduce armed forces and armaments:

(a) Force levels shall be limited to 2.1 million each for the United States and U.S.S.R. and to appropriate levels not exceeding 2.1 million each for all other militarily significant states. Reductions to the agreed levels will proceed by equitable, proportionate, and verified steps.

(b) Levels of armaments of prescribed types shall be reduced by equitable and balanced steps. The reductions shall be accomplished by transfers of armaments to depots supervised by the IDO. When, at specified periods during the Stage I reduction process, the states party to the agreement have agreed that the armaments and armed forces are at prescribed levels, the armaments in depots shall be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

(c) The production of agreed types of armaments shall be limited.

(d) A chemical, biological, radiological (CBR) experts commission shall be established within the IDO for the purpose of examining and reporting on the feasibility and means for accomplishing the verifiable reduction and eventual elimination of CBR weapons stockpiles and the halting of their production.

C. To contain and reduce the nuclear threat:

(a) States that have not acceded to a treaty effectively prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons shall do so.

(b) The production of fissionable materials for use in weapons shall be stopped.

(c) Upon the cessation of production of fissionable materials for use in weapons, agreed initial quantities of fissionable materials from past production shall be transferred to nonweapons purposes.

(d) Any fissionable materials transferred between countries for peaceful uses of nuclear energy shall be subject to appropriate safeguards to be developed in agreement with the IAEA.

(e) States owning nuclear weapons shall not relinquish control of such weapons to any nation not owning them and shall not transmit to any such nation information or material necessary for their manufacture. States not owning nuclear weapons shall not manufacture such weapons, attempt to obtain control of such weapons belonging to other states, or seek or receive information or materials necessary for their manufacture.

(f) A nuclear experts commission consisting of representatives of the nuclear states shall be established within the IDO for the purpose of examining and reporting on the feasibility and means for accomplishing the verified reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles.

D. To reduce strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles:

(a) Strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles in specified categories and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be reduced to agreed levels by equitable and balanced steps. The reduction shall be accomplished in each step by transfers to depots supervised by the IDO of vehicles that are in excess of levels agreed upon for each step. At specified periods during the stage I reduction process, the vehicles that have been placed under supervision of the IDO shall be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

(b) Production of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be discontinued or limited.

(c) Testing of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be limited or halted.

E. To promote the peaceful use of outer space:

(a) The placing into orbit or stationing in outer space of weapons capable of producing mass destruction shall be prohibited.

(b) States shall give advance notification to participating states and to the IDO of launchings of space vehicles and missiles, together with the track of the vehicle.

F. To reduce the risks of war by accident, miscalculation, and surprise attack:

(a) States shall give advance notification to the participating states and to the IDO of major military movements and maneuvers, on a scale as may be agreed, which might give rise to misinterpretation or cause alarm and induce countermeasures. The notification shall include the geographic areas to be used and the nature, scale and time span of the event.

(b) There shall be established observation posts at such locations as major ports, railway centers, motor highways, and air bases to report on concentrations and movements of military forces.

(c) There shall also be established such additional inspection arrangements to reduce the danger of surprise attack as may be agreed.

(d) An international commission shall be established immediately within the IDO to examine and make recommendations on the possibility of further measures to reduce the risks of nuclear war by accident, miscalculation, or failure of communication.

G. To keep the peace:

(a) States shall reaffirm their obligations under the U.N. Charter to refrain from the threat or use of any type of armed force—including nuclear, conventional, or CBR—contrary to the principles of the U.N. Charter.

(b) States shall agree to refrain from indirect aggression and subversion against any country.

(c) States shall use all appropriate processes for the peaceful settlement of disputes and shall seek within the United Nations further arrangements for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and for the codification and progressive development of international law.

(d) States shall develop arrangements in stage I for the establishment in stage II of a U.N. peace force.

(e) A U.N. peace observation group shall be staffed with a standing cadre of observers who could be dispatched to investigate any situation which might constitute a threat to or breach of the peace.

Stage II

A. International Disarmament Organization:

The powers and responsibilities of the IDO shall be progressively enlarged in order to give it the capabilities to verify the measures undertaken in stage II.

B. To further reduce armed forces and armaments:

(a) Levels of forces for the United States, U.S.S.R., and other militarily significant states shall be further reduced by substantial amounts to agreed levels in equitable and balanced steps.

(b) Levels of armaments of prescribed types shall be further reduced by equitable and balanced steps. The reduction shall be accomplished by transfers of armaments to depots supervised by the IDO. When, at specified periods during the stage II reduction process, the parties have agreed that the armaments and armed forces are at prescribed levels, the armaments in depots shall be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

(c) There shall be further agreed restrictions on the production of armaments.

(d) Agreed military bases and facilities wherever they are located shall be dismantled or converted to peaceful uses.

(e) Depending upon the findings of the Experts Commission on CBR weapons, the production of CBR weapons shall be halted, existing stocks progressively reduced, and the resulting excess quantities destroyed or converted to peaceful uses.

C. To further reduce the nuclear threat:

Stocks of nuclear weapons shall be progressively reduced to the minimum levels which can be agreed upon as a result of the findings of the nuclear experts commission; the resulting excess of fissionable material shall be transferred to peaceful purposes.

D. To further reduce strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles:

Further reductions in the stocks of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be carried out in accordance with the procedure outlined in stage I.

E. To keep the peace:

During stage II, states shall develop further the peace-keeping processes of the United Nations, to the end that the United Nations can effectively in stage II deter or suppress any threat or use of force in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations:

(a) States shall agree upon strengthening the structure, authority, and operation of the United Nations so as to assure that the United Nations will be able effectively to protect states against threats to or breaches of the peace.

(b) The U.N. peace force shall be established and progressively strengthened.

(c) States shall also agree upon further improvements and developments in rules of international conduct and in processes for peaceful settlement of disputes and differences.

Stage III

By the time stage II has been completed, the confidence produced through a verified disarmament program, the acceptance of rules of peaceful international behavior, and the development of strengthened international peace-keeping processes within the framework of the U.N. should have reached a point where the states of the world can move forward to stage III. In stage III progressive controlled disarmament and continuously developing principles and procedures of international law would proceed to a point where no state would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened U.N. peace force and all international disputes would be settled according to the agreed principles of international conduct.

The progressive steps to be taken during the final phase of the disarmament program would be directed toward the attainment of a world in which:

(a) States would retain only those forces, nonnuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. peace force.

(b) The U.N. peace force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.

(c) The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. peace force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes.

(d) The peacekeeping capabilities of the United Nations would be sufficiently strong and the obligations of all states under such arrangements sufficiently far reaching as to assure peace and the just settlement of differences in a disarmed world.

Mr. GOLDWATER. There are some very interesting parts included in the first stage. For example, we would reach the point where strategic and nuclear weapons delivery vehicles would be reduced.

I wonder if we cannot find some of the opposition to the B-70 and RS-70 from the administration standpoint in this aim of strategic delivery vehicles being reduced in the first stage.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to read this pamphlet, if they have not read it already. It is entitled "Freedom From War. The U.S. Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World."

I ask Sentaors to read it because I am rather fearful that we are already engaged in unilateral disarmament without our knowing it. I cannot think of a better document on unilateral disarmament than this one, which has been prepared by the State Department.

Disarmament is a goal that all of us want to reach. It will probably come at some time. However, in my estimation, for the United States to pursue unilateral disarmament at this time would constitute a bigger favor to communism than a Communist revolution would in this country.

I am not satisfied with Mr. Foster's answer, and I have so informed him. I have asked him for a plain yes or no answer to the question: Was a proposal made at Geneva which would indicate the elimination of national arms within 9 years?

I hope I get it; and if I get it, I will certainly place it in the Record. What confuses me is the last sentence, which states:

> Further consultation with Congress is planned before the draft outline is offered to the Conference in Geneva.

This indicates that statements have been made in Geneva to the effect that we have such a program and intend to follow it.

Again I apologize to the Senate for having taken so long to discuss this question; but I was keeping my promise to both the majority leader and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], both of whom agreed this morning, in the Chamber, that this was the first information they had on the subject. Also, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] stated that it was his first information. All of them agreed that it would be an unthinkable procedure. Yet there seems to be in the archives of the State Department—in fact, it has not even reached the archives yet, because no one seems to have obtained it—a rather complete outline for accomplishing exactly what the statement by the UPI says was suggested by our officials.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at the time I offered the amendment which has been called up by the Senator from Iowa in his own name, it was a good amendment. I believe it has served a good purpose. The bill which was before the Senate was a rigid bill. It virtually directed the President to purchase $100 million worth of U.N. bonds at a 2 percent interest rate. That was not at all satisfactory to me, and I do not believe it was satisfactory to many other Members of the Senate.

However, as time went on, it appeared that if we continued to press this amendment, we would suffer defeat and the result would be rigid legislation which would only authorize or virtually direct the purchase of United Nations bonds. Therefore, when the White House indicated its willingness to modify its position and accept a modification of the language of the bill, I welcomed the opportunity to agree upon a substitute or compromise with its representatives.

The substitute is not written as I should like to have it; but it is the best we can do. That is why I have committed myself to support the substitute compromise offered by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Montana. For the same reason, I cannot vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, which I originally submitted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it costs not merely money, but also life, to wage war. The people of the United States are prepared to pay the cost of endeavoring to wage the peace. In the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the people of the country and of the Members of the Senate, the United Nations, with all its faults, has accomplished good for the cause of a just peace in the world.

I agree with the statement of the Senator from Vermont. A useful purpose has been served by the amendment which he and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] originally sponsored as a substitute for the recommendations of the President.

I also pay my respects to the great Republican leader of the Senate, Everett Dirksen, and his counterpart on the other side of the aisle, the Democratic leader, Mike Mansfield, for joining in offering an amendment in the nature of a substitute which will unquestionably be adopted overwhelmingly by the Senate tonight.

I wish to make the point that Senators who vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will, with their affirmative votes, approve a loan of $100 million to the United Nations. Those who on the passage of the bill support the position taken by the Republican leader and the Democratic leader will likewise approve the recommendation to lend the United Nations up to $100 million.

The difference is that the amendment now before the Senate would require the money to be paid in 3 years; whereas under the language of the substitute measure the Congress would authorize for the President of the United States a flexibility and a leeway to represent the U.S. Government in making the loan, provided, however, that in no instance shall more than $25 million be lent unless other countries match our purchase dollar for dollar.

I shall not, with my vote, tell the United Nations that in 3 years the United States wants its $100 million back. I shall vote for the amendment in the nature of a substitute which has been so excellently prepared by the leaders on both sides of the aisle; the proposal which would authorize the President of the United States, in time of United Nations fiscal travail, to come to the assistance of the United Nations and to demonstrate that, along with the small countries which have already purchased the United Nations bonds, the United States will play its honorable part.

Those are the reasons which prompt me to oppose the amendment which is now before the Senate and to look forward to voting, with the great majority of the Members of the Senate, for the Dirksen-Mansfield substitute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I do not wish to delay the Senate; but I wish to join with the Senator from California in his remarks about that aspect of the proposal. I associate myself with the remarks about the part which the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana, the majority leader, and the distinguished Senator from Vermont have played in reaching a bipartisan agreement on this very difficult problem. I wish to add one further element to the statement made by the Senator from California, which makes the point very concisely.

The one further element is that the program which is presented in the so-called compromise retains the plan to create a situation in which those who have heretofore refused to pay their part of the special assessment will have pressure brought upon them to pay. This, I think, will be very persuasive upon them.

There are those who say we should not do this; that those nations will get out of the United Nations. I do not believe they will do so at all. I do not think they wish to do it, any more than we wish to get out of the United Nations. They merely disapprove of this particular activity and refuse to pay the special assessment.

The compromise retains the very element of enabling the United Nations to bring pressure to bear. This would bring our part back to one-third in the regular budget. So in addition to what the Senator from California has said, this is a very important element.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay the Senate longer. I think every Senator understands the issue. So far as I am concerned, there is no disputing the question that the United Nations probably needs $100 million. But to me, the question is as to the way the program will be administered and the question of safeguarding the obligation, so that it will not be used as a means of using the United States, from year to year, as would be done with the 25-year bond issue, to bail out the United Nations when various countries fail to meet their obligations. This amendment provides a better approach than does the substitute. That is the issue. We have discussed it.

So far as I am concerned, I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time; although I assume the Senator from Alabama may have a statement to make.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I was highly impressed with the brilliant presentation made by my old friend of the 80th Congress, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. No one has presented his side of the debate more clearly than he.

However, the irrefutable logic of the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] provided a complete answer. Similarly, the able minority whip, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], made another clear, lucid presentation. If I had heard none other than those three speeches, the whole atmosphere would be clarified for me.

This is one of the finest hours of the U.S. Senate. Senators of both parties, on both sides of the aisle, are now about to come together in an historic agreement for the good of our Nation and the good of the United Nations.

I intend to vote against the Hickenlooper amendment. I commend the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for the constructive work he has done in the past few weeks. I am confident that I express the views of Senators on both sides of the aisle who have been studying this problem carefully, and also the views of our majority leader and the views of our minority leader, who have arrived at this solution. The Mansfield-Dirksen amendment should receive overwhelmingly approval.

I believe the solution is a good one for the United States. I believe it is a good one for the United Nations; and I know it is important that we provide this financial flexibility to the President of the United States as he seeks to encourage other members of the United Nations to fully meet their duties and obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. I also take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation for the patient, dedicated, intelligent leadership of the majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD. The floor management of this important bill was superb. As always the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama, JOHN SPARKMAN, directed, with great skill, patience and logic, this important bill to what I believe to be a most successful conclusion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the debate has been conducted on a very high plane. I believe it should be stated for the RECORD that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the author of the pending amendment, did not agree to the compromise when it was called to his attention. Neither did he disagree; he kept an open mind.

However, I point out to my colleagues that insofar as the leadership on both sides is concerned, when Members are elected to those offices, Senators place a certain amount of trust, confidence, and faith in them.

There was nothing devious, underhanded, or under the table in the negotiations in seeking to bring about an honorable compromise; and there is nothing devious or underhanded in connection with the Hickenlooper amendment, either on the part of those who oppose it or on the part of those who favor it. The difference of opinion is an entirely honest one.

I express the hope that the compromise which has been arrived at with the knowledge and the consent of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]—and he is a distinguished leader—will be accepted tonight by the Senate, and that in the meantime the amendment now pending will be defeated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am ready to do likewise.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield time to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished minority leader such time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, thus far I have taken no part in the debate on the question that is occupying the attention of the Senate.

I have been reflecting a little on its historical aspects, as well as on the issue immediately before us.

I hold in my hand the yea-and-nay vote taken in the Senate at the time when the United Nations Charter was confirmed by the Senate on July 28, 1945. It is a rather impressive vote. Eighty-nine Members of the Senate voted in favor of ratification of that charter in its treaty form. Two Senators voted in opposition to ratification. Five Senators did not vote. I presume that when the United Nations Charter was ratified and when the imprimatur of the Senate was placed upon it, with it went the high hopes of the Members of the Senate and the high hopes of all the other people of the country.

Mr. President, that was nearly 17 years ago. Since then the United Nations has had some rather rocky ups and downs and has pursued a tortuous course. As I look back, I admit that I did my full share of rock throwing when things of which I did not approve happened. That is in the nature of things. But as I grow older, I develop more tolerance; and I believe that a confraternity of nations, starting from scratch, is not unlike an infant that has to toddle its way until its legs become strong and it can fight its way in the world.

So there have been 17 years of history with respect to the United Nations.

I can wax as eloquent as any other Senator in taking exception to the things that have happened in the Congo; and I can take exception to the attitude of India—a little sanctimonious, perhaps—when, without consultation, she moved into a Portuguese territory, the proprietorship of which had not been contested for 4½ centuries; and to this good hour the United Nations, through its officialdom, has seemingly not protested; or, Mr. President, if they have protested, it has been done in a weak and an enervated voice. So I could add my share of criticism.

But, with the world constituted as it is today, with all the fever and flames of controversy upon every firmament at this good hour, I doubt whether the United Nations could possibly be constituted again at this time, and perhaps it could not be done in another 50 years. I do not want to see that effort, which began 17 years ago, falter.

There are people at home who do not like my attitude, believe me.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Illinois is not the only one in that situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I have a definite feeling about the United Nations.

When Lincoln delivered his second inaugural address from the portico on the east front of the Capitol, he said that some would make war in order to see the Nation survive, and others would accept war rather than see it perish.

Today, we are in the same moral situation. There are those who would like to see the United Nations perish. There are those who wish to see it survive. I am one of the latter group.

So I have lent my best talents and what feeble endowment and patience I have to this effort, along with the very distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], in the hope that we could send forth to all the world a message and an assurance that at long last the Senate of the United States had acted justly, in order to effect a rescue operation—if that is what it is to be—and at the same time utter some kind of warning to those with whom we are associated in this confraternity that we are not quite satisfied with what they have done in the fiscal field.

We forget that the Charter of the United Nations is not now before us. Here on the floor of the Senate, we cannot amend the Charter of the United Nations. I have grave doubts that we shall ever amend the charter. If one has any doubt about that, let him look at the amendatory provision of the charter, which calls for two-thirds in order to initiate and another two-thirds in order to approve, and consider the complex of the 104 nations under the charter. It seems clear that there would never be approval.

So we had better walk on eggs a little before this institution founders. A rocky road is ahead; we shall find ourselves on it a little later. The Secretary General of the United Nations is only acting until 1963. At that time that problem must be dealt with. Will the Soviet Union then renew its troika proposal? I do not know. But certainly that problem must be resolved.

The funds now proposed to be made available will help for a period of 15 months, and then there will be another problem.

I am glad that Adlai Stevenson said, when he spoke this year before the General Assembly, "Let us go home and do a little praying about it and let us search our souls."

Mr. President, perhaps we had better search our souls before we get through.

I will not charge my conscience with any act or deed which would contribute to the foundering of the United Nations, because I do not know how I would then be able to expiate that sin of commission to my grandchildren.

Mr. President, I have not been flattered by some of the speeches which have been made on this floor during the past few days. It was said in a formal speech that this substitute was a specious proposition. That statement is an affront to me. I know what the word "specious" means, and I do not take such a statement lying down.

Incidentally, that was said from my side of the aisle.

Mr. President, what is specious about this proposal? Is the timing specious? I recast the substitute, and we had it out with those from the other end of the avenue. I said I did not want a roaming authorization which would go on forever and forever; I wish to see it nailed down.

What did the President say in his letter? He said:

> The funds made available under this measure will be promptly used, as necessary:

We asked him to put the words "as necessary" in that letter. I leave it to the Senator from Alabama. He said further, "in this or the next calendar year," and the President has put a shortened limit on it over and above what I was willing to agree to.

The President's word in a written letter is his bond, and I am willing to accept it as such.

It is said that no time factor is involved. It is nailed down better than anything that came out of the committee.

Is it the $100 million that is involved? More is spent for lipstick in 1 year in the United States than that amount. Yet here is an agency dedicated to the business of finding and isolating the causes for war, in the hope that peace may be preserved.

I speak as a soldier who once served on the Western Front, under fire, in World War I. I know what a scourge war is. I do not want to see it come to my grandchildren.

Is it time that causes concern? The time has been specified more than once in the President's assurance.

Is it the money? I believe the Senate voted for development aid, in August of last year, an amount of $7,200 million. By a majority of 66 votes, we approved that measure. We are going to provide $7,200 million to the individual nations who are in this great confraternity that we call the United Nations, and here we are asking for $100 million to keep it afloat. So it cannot be a question of money.

Is it the terms, as my distinguished friend from South Dakota pointed out? I try to remember what we do. I want to treat the President of the United States as fairly as the Senate treated my President when he was in office, when in 1955 he asked for the Formosa resolution. I remember the diligence of the distinguished Senator from Oregon as he discussed this question.

What did we put in that measure? We said in the resolution, "the President of the United States be, and he is hereby authorized, to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary." Did we put manacles on him? Of course, we mentioned the Pescadores and Formosa and related areas, but what else did we say? We said the resolution shall expire when the President shall determine. We did not say in 90 days or 6 months. We had some faith in Dwight Eisenhower; and I have not forfeited my faith in John Fitzgerald Kennedy. I am willing always to trust the President, because I think he has a sense of responsibility.

We hear talk about the terms. There is an acknowledgment in the letter to the effect that repayment of both principal and interest in annual installments shall be taken into account. It says nothing as to interest, or how much. In the Mutual Assistance Act of 1961 the language that the Senate approved was that the President is authorized to make loans payable as to principal and interest in U.S. dollars on such terms and conditions as he may determine. No interest rate is provided. There is no requirement as to payment. There is no indication of the maturity of the loans to be made. We gave the President the power and said, "Here is $7,200 million to be loaned over a period of 5 years."

We got more than that in connection with this proposal, I think, and so I do not quarrel.

It is said that there must not be a precedent. Does any Senator wish to confess on the Senate floor that he does not control his own vote and his own independent judgment, no matter what comes along, when he talks about precedents? I am not throwing any precedent out the window. I suppose I have flaunted many out of a high-storied window when they did not suit my purpose. I felt I was voting and operating as an independent Member of the Senate, trying to serve my constituency and my country; and I think I am trying to do so now.

I do not expect too much. The United Nations will have a tortuous road. Senators should not deceive themselves on that score. There are many problems ahead of us. Who knows what may come out of this effort.

When Dean Acheson managed to get the uniting-for-peace resolution some years ago, it became the springboard and helped the General Assembly, by a two-thirds vote, to overcome and override the Security Council veto. The United Nations took an entirely different form, and we must live with it. But I do not want to see the organization foundering. I want to see us make a little effort. Consider the complexion of the General Assembly. There are 104 votes in the General Assembly.

Perhaps it was facetious—I do not know—but allusion was made, in the course of debate, to the Supreme Court decision that resulted from a complaint from Tennessee with respect to apportionment in the legislature. That argument was followed up by the argument, "Suppose we apportioned the United Nations in that way; we would have many more votes." Today it is one voice, one vote. The smallest nation has a vote. We have a vote. But we have a permanent place on the Security Council. Have those who said that thought about it? Suppose some time Russia should assert that right also? If the votes were based on population, consider the population of other countries. What do we suppose would happen if, God forbid, China came into the organization? We would really be down. We must think "down the road" a little. Those are some of the problems which will confront the United Nations.

I want to see the United Nations survive. I want it to be an effective instrumentality and do all the things recited in the preamble of the charter. There are no nobler objectives to which a nation could direct itself.

When we consider a great fraternity of nations which increased from about 50 in 1945 to 104 in 1962, with all the specialized agencies and commissions, all the work that is being done, and the new functions being performed, perhaps it is not strange or so terrible, after all, that the U.N. stumbles a little. Our job is to extend a helping hand, and that is to be done through the President of the United States.

It has been said, "Buy bonds." I point out that the word "loan" or "lend" appears in the substitute. It does not say anything about bonds. We do not have to buy them if there is another way. But we give the conductor of our foreign policy the flexibility that is so indispensable when we are dealing with such an unpredictable problem. So if it does not work in this direction, it will work in another. The President has assured us in his letter what he will do, and that assurance satisfies me. I point out that I "cooked up" an amendment at 2 o'clock in the morning as I was puzzling over this problem. I got up and sat down at the typewriter in my apartment. What did I want?

I thought we ought to have a better report on the fiscal affairs of the United Nations. I thought it should be considered. I favored a quarterly report. So I wrote that down.

This is what the President said:

> In addition, as a supplement to the present annual report to the Congress on United Nations affairs, I shall ask the Department of State to make a semiannual report setting forth all the fiscal operations of the United Nations, including but not limited to assessments, arrearages, and payments on the principal and interest of all U.N. loans, together with such other information as will indicate, among other things, the status and prospects of United Nations financing.

What more could one ask? What more could he say? I was quite satisfied.

I do not know who is the fiscal officer, but I had hoped there would be some improvement, remembering some of the days when I was on the Appropriations Committee and Cabot Lodge was our representative. I was not always too happy when Cabot Lodge came before us to justify the United Nations budgets. We asked him many questions. There was a good deal of scolding and fussing in that committee. I thought "Is the United Nations in this difficulty because it has no good fiscal officers?"

I made a suggestion. This is what is in the President's letter:

> Steps to be taken in pursuance of this goal would include efforts to improve the administration of fiscal affairs in the Secretariat and constituent agencies.

What more could I ask? There it is. I shall not detain Senators longer. With me, Mr. President, this is not merely a financial question. This is a moral question. We must stand up and be counted in our own generation. It does not make any difference what the mail from back home says to us. We are expected to be students and to pursue the study of this subject with all the documents and books and records at our command. The average citizen cannot do it. He picks something off the front page, or the views of some columnists, but that does not tell the whole story. It is up to us to stand up and be counted.

When Edmund Burke, one of the greatest parliamentarians and legislators of all time, was asked about his relations with his people, he said:

> You must pay attention to them and give heed to and counsel with them, but at long last, when it comes time to best serve your constituency, then you must render your independent judgment, based upon your conviction, for if that fails, you do indeed betray your people.

I shall not do it. I have a couple of grandchildren in Tennessee. Senators have heard me say this before. I have often said to audiences that they carry a terrible handicap because, I say, "That's where 'Estes the Bestes' lives." [Laughter.]

That statement is born of sheer affection. They are in Tennessee. They are growing up. They will be the custodians and trustees of this country when they grow up. I want them to have a country free, solvent, and secure like the one their granddad had. Along with it, I want to vouchsafe to them as a legacy the last best hope of peace. What greater contribution can we make to those who will come after us than to enable them to summon up out of their souls all the talent the Lord gave them in an atmosphere of peace to achieve whatever a free country has to offer.

So in the interest of peace and in the interest of the continuing effort which must go on I earnestly hope the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] will not prevail, after the work we have done, and I hope that the substitute which bears my humble name and the name of the distinguished majority leader will prevail, and that in good spirit we can send this measure to the House of Representatives for further consideration, so that the nations of the United Nations will no longer be in doubt as to where the United States stands in respect to its interest in the United Nations and in respect to its determination that this effort shall not fail if human ingenuity and some money can make it succeed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I have been a Member of the Senate for 11 years. This evening I have heard one of the finest speeches ever delivered in the Senate. I congratulate the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] as a substitute for the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 72, as follows:

[No. 38 Leg.]

YEAS—20

Butler
Carlson
Case, S. Dak.
Cotton
Curtis
Dworshak
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Scott
Smith, Maine
Talmadge
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—72

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—8

Anderson
Bennett
Capehart
Chavez
Hruska
Long, La.
Neuberger
Russell

So Mr. HICKENLOOPER's substitute amendment for the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On what question are the yeas and nays called for?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the substitute amendment is agreed to by voice vote, will there be a yea and nay vote on the substitute, even though the vote will be on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be an opportunity for a yea and nay vote after third reading.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. May I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may request the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on the bill I yield to the Senator from Arkansas such time as he may desire to take.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there is no disagreement on the proposition that the United Nations is in serious financial difficulties. Neither is there disagreement with the observation that a good many Americans are troubled not only with respect to how the financial difficulties of the United Nations may be met, but about the role of the U.N. in the foreign policy of the United States.

Should our discussions of the bond proposal develop into an appraisal of the role of the United Nations in U.S. foreign policy, I suspect our debate will tend to ignore some of our national frustrations which may tend to color and distort our view of the United Nations.

Hindsight now suggests that most Americans were unduly optimistic of the role of the United Nations in world politics. In the Senate only two negative votes were cast against ratification of the United Nations Charter. Today, however, a good many Americans are inspecting the U.N. with eyes that are out of focus or colored by prejudice. The United Nations is neither as potent as some believe, nor as impotent as others believe.

While some Americans are frustrated because the United Nations has not become a world government, others are frustrated because it shows too many attributes of power. To put it another way, the U.N. has come farther in 16 years than some have wanted, and not as far as others have desired.

I suggest that Members of the Senate in deciding how to vote on the issues posed by the bond proposal and the various substitutes that may be offered should be clear in their own minds as to precisely what the United Nations is, and what it is not.

We should be clear in the first place that the United Nations is not a perfect instrument in an imperfect world. It is not a device which can be used always to implement the foreign policy of the United States; but neither is it a device to implement the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, or any other state. And by the same token, the United Nations is not an instrument that can be used to force the United States to move in directions which we do not conceive to be in our national interest.

For some reason, Americans who worry about the United Nations seem to fall into one of two categories; they are either so intensely pro-U.N. that they do not see its faults, or they are so vigorously anti-U.N. that they fail to see its virtues. I suggest the truth is somewhere between these extremes. The U.N. has both virtues and faults. It is our job in this debate to determine whether this organization, with its virtues and its faults, is to be kept in business. More specifically, we must decide whether we are to help the United Nations meet the costs of intervening in two special type situations—the United Nations action in the Middle East, and the United Nations action in the Congo.

If we approve the proposal to assist the United Nations, we will continue U.N. intervention in those specific situations. Furthermore, by implication, we will indicate that it would not be improper for the U.N. to intervene in similar situations in the future. If we reject this proposal, we will be saying, in effect, that U.N. forces should be withdrawn forthwith from the Middle East and from the Congo and that the United States would be willing to live with the consequences of those withdrawals.

I am aware that there are strong differences of opinion in this country over the wisdom of the United Nations action in the Congo, and somewhat lesser differences of opinion over the wisdom of the United Nations action in the Middle East. I would point out, however, that U.N. intervention in the Middle East was consummated during the incumbency of President Eisenhower, with the support of the Democratic Congress; and that the U.N. action in the Congo was inaugurated during the incumbency of President Eisenhower, and is strongly supported by President Kennedy.

The fact that both American political parties have supported these actions of their elected representatives does not make those U.N. interventions right. However, that fact should at least shift the burden of proving them wrong to those who would deny that those interventions served the interests of the United States.

I do not propose at this time to examine in detail the nature of United

Nations intervention in either the Middle East or in the Congo. It should be noted, however, that both situations involved serious danger of irrevocable confrontations between the great powers and the very real possibility of uncontrolled escalation into nuclear warfare. Had the U.N. not been available to stand between the great powers or, to put it more bluntly, had the U.N. not proved a stumbling block to Soviet aspirations in the Congo and the Middle East, we might now be confronted with serious Communist penetration of those two areas. We should note further that the troops stationed in the Middle East and in the Congo are not American troops; neither are they Soviet troops. It is the smaller members of the United Nations which have supplied military forces for the Middle East—about 5,000—and for the Congo—15,000 to 20,000. It is these troops that are bearing the brunt of what is at best an onerous duty, and at worst involves the supreme sacrifice.

Now there may be some who take the position that a few American marines could do the job better, quicker, and cheaper. But I am sure of one thing, that direct American intervention in either of these trouble spots would have invited intervention by other great powers and would have stirred nationalist, anti-American sentiment to fever pitch in these areas.

In short, Mr. President, it does seem to me that U.N. forces in each of these areas has contributed to the maintenance of peace and to the independence of these states. We have not sought to establish U.S. hegemony in these areas; but neither have they been captured by the Communists.

If the United States were now to withdraw its logistic and financial support from the U.N. actions in the Middle East and the Congo, United Nations forces would be compelled to withdraw. The vacuum that would thereby be created would invite three types of consequences. One consequence would be the bloody renewal of fighting between the opponents, each seeking arms and support from whoever would help. Another possibility would be the immediate stationing of substantial numbers of American troops in these areas. The third possibility would be outright Soviet intervention.

I prefer the continued presence of United Nations forces in these areas to any of the alternatives. And if United Nations forces are to stay in these areas, they must receive support, including support from the United States.

There remain two questions. First, whether it is in our national interest to keep in being in the United Nations an instrumentality which may be used in similar situations in the future. Second, if so, then is the proposal before us one which provides a reasonable means of meeting the costs of these peace-keeping functions.

Few would deny that there may be situations in the future when United Nations intervention of the type now going on in the Middle East and in the Congo will be in the national interests of the United States. For example, the time may come when U.N. intervention in some way in the Berlin situation may be required; similarly there may be situations developing in southeast Asia which might suggest the rationality of United Nations action there. I am not prepared to support measures which would scuttle forever the possibilities of U.N. action, as distinguished from U.N. talk.

In this connection, it is well to keep in mind that the magnitude of U.S. contributions to the United Nations have been such that it would be most difficult, if not impossible, for the United Nations to mount an intervention over the protests of the United States, and without our assistance.

On the second point—whether the proposal now before us is a reasonable means of financing the Middle East and Congo operations for the next 18 months—I can only say that I have not been able to figure out a better method. While it is seldom in the affairs of man that everything works out as planned, a purchase of United Nations bonds at this time, or a loan to the United Nations, will provide a breathing spell during which the organization can seek more certain methods of financing not only the Middle East and Congo operations, but of financing similar operations which may need to be undertaken in the future. Furthermore, the action of the General Assembly in seeking an opinion from the World Court, which over a period of time may compel members to pay their past assessments on pain of losing their vote in the General Assembly, should assist the United Nations in paying bills past due.

And finally on this point, the retirement of U.N. bonds or the repayment of loans by including repayments as a part of the regular United Nations budget should reinforce the principle that power must be related to responsibility. If every member of the U.N. is to have one vote and if rollcalls are to determine United Nations policies, then members who insist on the right to vote must accept the responsibility of backing up their votes with resources insofar as those resources may be called upon on the basis of their capacity to contribute. Some of the poorer states may be able to give only token support to United Nations operations of the type we have been discussing. But if it is an attribute of sovereignty and independence to vote, it is likewise a responsibility of independence to accept responsibility for the consequences of such votes.

In conclusion, the broad decision before us is whether or not we are to abandon the United Nations. It does seem to me that the United Nations, even though confronted by a most difficult situation brought on partly by its increase in membership, nevertheless is still able to play an important part in preventing war. It also seems to me that the proposal before us is not an unreasonable way to finance the peacekeeping functions of the United Nations. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

CONSTRUCTIVE COMPROMISE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as the Senate nears final action on a measure to meet the financial crisis of the United Nations, there is no evidence that the controversy over this issue is dead. There is no evidence of unanimous Senate support for any position. But, as has been often said in discussions of the United Nations itself, we live in a real world. Honorable men differ. Unanimity is rare indeed and often somewhat suspect.

What we all have every reason to welcome, however, is the manner in which Senators of both parties have studied the issue thoroughly and come up with a number of new and valuable proposals to make our financial help to the U.N. more effective. Basically, all Americans are concerned over the fact that many—in fact most—U.N. members have not been paying their full share. All Americans are concerned over the fact that the Soviet veto has virtually paralyzed the Security Council. All Americans are concerned over the role being played by the General Assembly—not because we do not like new nations which are not as strong as we—but because the General Assembly has not been living up to the standards of a responsible deliberative body, because it has too often been a forum for the exchange of propaganda rather than facts, for the trading of votes rather than the honest resolution of differences. All Americans are concerned with the threat of a U.N. double standard—whether it differentiates between Communist or non-Communist, Afro-Asians or Europeans, new countries or old ones, black areas or whites ones—whether it judges issues on prejudice and propaganda, or on facts. All Americans are concerned when the U.N. votes along any standard other than truth and justice.

And finally, Mr. President, the vast majority of Americans are concerned to insure that the United Nations does not merely go on as it has in the past, but rather that it tries to repair its flaws and to face the challenges of international affairs with new strength.

The Senate debate and consideration of the issue and the final compromise which has been reached have provided the American people and in fact the whole world with a new opportunity to appraise the U.N. The compromise bond proposal is not perfect, for despite the President's letter to Senator SPARKMAN, we do not know how he will finally act, whether he will permit long- or short-term loans and at what interest.

But it has the real merit of giving the President sufficient authority to contribute to the bond issue and at the same time to negotiate on other terms as warranted. If other nations are ready to buy their share of bonds, there may be no need for any short-term U.S. loan. If other nations hold back—still expecting us to foot the bill—they may be surprised and they may discover—I sincerely hope they will—that we expect a full and fair return on any additional short-term loan.

The United Nations can serve the free world well in a number of areas, but it should never be regarded as an American charity, to be supported by the largesse of U.S. taxpayers. If that happens, it will be doomed. The Mansfield-Dirksen proposal is one possible way to avoid that fate; it was conceived and developed as a bipartisan, nonpolitical measure in the national interest of the United States and in the international interest of the whole free world and of the U.N. itself.

In that spirit, I give it my full and vigorous support.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I shall support the legislation on which we shall now vote.

We have frustrated the Communist efforts to obstruct and neutralize the United Nations. In this connection, permit this personal observation: We must, if we are to avert the unparalleled disaster of nuclear war, maintain the vision of what the United Nations must become, an effective agency for bringing the rule of law into international affairs.

In addressing a meeting of a unit of the American Association for the United Nations at Charleston, W. Va., on December 8, 1961, I made a statement appropriate to reemphasize. It is this:

As armaments continue to spiral upward we live in ever increasing danger of war by accident or miscalculation. In this atmosphere of uncertainty and increasing tension the ultimate testing time of freedom is just now beginning.

The unity which we must create among the free nations will not remain viable if predicated solely upon a shared antagonism to communism. It must be built on the firmer foundation of a community of aims and aspirations among our allies. And this will require a greater degree of intellectual honesty and hard self-scrutiny than we have heretofore given to the task.

In saying this, I declared last December that I specifically refer to the practice in recent years of the United States depending too heavily on the United Nations as an arena in which to conduct our foreign policy. Too often our willingness to take problems to the United Nations has been a cloak for our own lack of policy. In so doing, we have not strengthened the United Nations, and we have not served the cause of freedom by posing problems which could not be solved in that forum.

I am not suggesting that we go it alone. I am recommending, however, that we be scrupulously honest in our appraisal of our own ideals and in the capacity of the United Nations to serve them. We do no disservice to the United Nations when we acknowledge that, as presently constituted, there are some problems it cannot solve. Indeed, we may help preserve the United Nations and allow it to grow strong if we do not prematurely overburden it.

I believe there is a cognizance by the present administration of the need for such a reappraisal of our country's role in relationship to that of the United Nations. This is reflected in the realistic measure which we shall approve in this forum tonight.

Mr. PELL subsequently said: Mr. President, I believe that the compromise formula worked out by the Democratic and Republican leadership with regard to U.S. participation in the purchase of U.N. bonds is an excellent one in every way.

From the viewpoint of our military interests, it provides the wherewithal to continue operations such as the United Nations emergency fund in the Middle East and the United Nations operations in the Congo. These are operations that must be carried out not only for preservation of peace in the areas concerned, but for the preservation of peace in the world as a whole. Yet these are operations that can be more economically and better politically performed by the United Nations than by the United States. And, because of our own prosperity and from a material viewpoint, we have perhaps the most to lose and hence, the largest stake in this keeping of worldwide peace.

Moreover, from a material viewpoint, if this compromise proposal is accepted, we will be paying approximately 33 percent of the total cost for such operations, instead of the almost 50 percent that we pay now.

Naturally, it is always unpleasant to pay money for anything. But, if ever there was a type of service that was worth its weight in more than gold, it is these keep-the-peace operations that have been performed underneath the U.N. umbrella. Accordingly, I intend to vote for this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators in control of the time yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on the passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it proper for Senators to record their votes in any way except from their seats in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a matter of custom for them to answer from their seats.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I insist that the custom be followed.

Mr. LAUSCHE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], are absent on official business.

I also anounce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business, and his pair has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 22, as follows:

[No. 39 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Butler
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Sparkman
Symington
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—22

Byrd, Va.
Case, S. Dak.
Cotton
Curtis
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Goldwater
Johnston
Magnuson
McClellan
Miller
Mundt
Murphy
Robertson
Russell
Smith, Maine
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—8

Anderson
Bennett
Capehart
Chavez
Hruska
Lausche
Long, La.
Neuberger

So the bill (S. 2768) was passed, as follows:

S. 2768

An act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, without fiscal-year limitation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $100,000,000 for a loan to the United Nations. It is the intent of the Congress that the proceeds of the present loan shall not be used to relieve states members of the United Nations of their obligation to pay arrearages on payments of any United Nations assessments.

Sec. 2. The amount of money to be lent to the United Nations pursuant to authorization contained in the first section of this Act shall not exceed by more than $25,000,000 the aggregate amount of loans made or agreed to be made by other nations.

Sec. 3. There shall be deducted from the annual payment of the assessed share of the United States of the budget of the United Nations an amount equal to the corresponding annual installment of principal and interest due to the United States on account of the loan made pursuant to section 1.

Sec. 4. Nothing herein shall be regarded as authorizing the United States to participate in any future United Nations borrowing. It is the sense of the Congress that the United States shall use its best efforts to promote a pattern of United Nations financing (including a vigorous program for collection of delinquencies on annual assessments of nations and maintenance of such annual assessments on a current basis) that makes unnecessary any future large-scale borrowing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I announced the schedule of proposed legislation, I wish to congratulate and commend the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], who managed with such great skill and understanding the bill which has just passed the Senate; the distinguished minority leader, who was a tower of strength in the consideration of this measure all the way through; and the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], who showed his understanding and his tolerance of the difficulties involved in the consideration of this particular measure. To those three Senators should go most of the credit for what was accomplished tonight.

I also compliment Members of the Senate, who voted either for or against the bill, because they acted from the basis of their honest judgment; they did what they thought was best in the light of their own consciences.

I am delighted that the bill has now passed the Senate and will leave us shortly.

Again, I extend my deepest thanks to the three Senators who so ably managed the work in behalf of the bill, and to all other Senators, regardless of how they voted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no greater or more effective weapon than the brilliant tolerance and understanding of the majority leader. He is never in a hurry; he takes everything in his stride. He is patient with every viewpoint. I know of no instrumentality so contrived to get good results as the quality which he has in such rich measure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I join with the majority leader in his high commendation of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] for the magnificent work they have done in connection with the bill.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to add two more names to the list of those who deserve high honors, namely, the majority leader himself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright]. I know that if it had not been for the leadership of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Arkansas in the committee, when they assisted the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] at all times, as I feel certain the Senator from Alabama would be the first to testify the bill would have had difficulty in committee. Also wish to thank another Senator for the help the committee received from him. I refer to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken]. His statesmanship once again was a great service to the Senate.

I think a very effective blow was struck in the passage of the bill tonight in support of peace through the one organization in the world which, in my judgment, offers mankind its best hope for substituting the law of reason for the jungle law of force—that is, the United Nations and its procedures. But if the United Nations is to work, it must have resources and finances with which to perform its services of trying to maintain, peace in the world. So the Senate tonight, in my judgment, has in effect repledged its faith in obtaining international peace through the procedures of the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I agree completely with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon concerning the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. Fulbright].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I join in the statement of the majority leader. The distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], with whom I have had a long association, both on the Committee on Foreign Relations and on the Committee on Banking and Currency, deserves all the credit for the management of the bill. I was in my own State on political business during the hearings. The Senator from Alabama deserves credit not only for the action of the committee in considering the bill, but also for his management of the bill on the floor of the Senate.

I commend the Senator from Alabama and all other Senators who participated in the debate for having moved this excellent piece of legislation through the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate all the good things which have been said about me by my colleagues in the Senate. However, for just a moment I wish to point up something else. It is something to which I really intended to call attention in the course of the debate on the bill, but events moved so well and so fast that I did not have time to do so. I refer to the nonpartisanship with which the bill was considered in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and which is so characteristic of that committee. I have served under five or six chairmen of that committee, and during all that time the same thing has been true. The business of the committee is always approached on a nonpartisan basis.

When the committee was holding its executive session, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] made the statement that he did not wish to see reported to the Senate a bill which might be passed by a very narrow margin and might be fought out largely on partisan lines. He said that whatever bill was reported to the Senate, or whatever bill the committee agreed upon, ought to be a bill which would leave the committee with practically the unanimous support of the committee. The committee approved the bill with only one opposing vote; there was not even a rollcall. We have witnessed the same type of nonpartisanship on the floor of the Senate. That augurs well for the foreign policy of the United States.

I hope and believe the Senate will continue to show that type of nonpartisanship in the handling of foreign affairs, and I trust that that will be true throughout the entire Government.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 384)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pell in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to urban mass transportation. The message has been read in the House of Representatives, and, without objection, the message will be referred to the Committee on Commerce, without reading, and printed in the Record.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

An efficient and dynamic transportation system is vital to our domestic economic growth, productivity and progress. Affecting the cost of every commodity we consume or export, it is equally vital to our ability to compete abroad. It influences both the cost and the flexibility of our defense preparedness, and both the business and recreational opportunities of our citizens.

This Nation has long enjoyed one of the most highly developed and diversified transportation systems in the world, and this system has helped us to achieve a highly efficient utilization of our manpower and resources.

Transportation is thus an industry which serves, and is affected with, the national interest. Federal laws and policies have expressed the national interest in transportation particularly in the last 80 years: through the promotion and development of transportation facilities, such as highways, airways, and waterways; through the regulation of rates and services; and through general governmental policies relating to taxation, procurement, labor, and competition. A comprehensive program for transportation must consider all of these elements of public policy.

During the last session of Congress, action was taken to place our Federal-aid highway program on a sounder fiscal basis. Initial steps were taken to improve the operations of our regulatory agencies through reorganization. A beginning was also made toward meeting the needs of our cities for mass transportation. By Executive order, I recently assigned to the Department of Commerce authority for emergency transportation planning.

But pressing problems are burdening our national transportation system, jeopardizing the progress and security on which we depend. A chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation has evolved from a history of specific actions addressed to specific problems of specific industries at specific times. This patchwork does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology of the past half-century or the parallel changes in the structure of competition.

The regulatory commissions are required to make thousands of detailed decisions based on out-of-date standards. The management of the various modes of transportation is subjected to excessive, cumbersome, and time-consuming regulatory supervision that shackles and distorts managerial initiative. Some parts of the transportation industry are restrained unnecessarily; others are promoted or taxed unevenly and inconsistently.

Some carriers are required to provide, at a loss, services for which there is little demand. Some carriers are required to charge rates which are high in relation to cost in order to shelter competing carriers. Some carriers are prevented from making full use of their capacity by restrictions on freedom to solicit business or adjust rates. Restraints on cost-reducing rivalry in ratemaking often cause competition to take the form of cost-increasing rivalry—such as excessive promotion and traffic solicitation, or excessive frequency of service. Some carriers are subject to rate regulation on the transportation of particular commodities while other carriers, competing for the same traffic, are exempt. Some carriers benefit from public facilities provided for their use, while others do not; and of those enjoying the use of public facilities, some bear a large part of the cost, while others bear little or none.

No simple Federal solution can end the problems of any particular company or mode of transportation. On the contrary, I am convinced that less Federal regulation and subsidization is in the long run a prime prerequisite of a healthy intercity transportation network. The constructive efforts of State and local governments as well as the transportation industry will also be needed to revitalize our transportation services.

This administration's study of long-range transportation needs and policies convinces me that current Federal policies must be reshaped in the most fundamental and far-reaching fashion. While recognizing that a revision of the magnitude required is a task to which the Congress will wish to devote considerable time and effort, I believe the recommendations below are of sufficient urgency and importance that the Congress should begin consideration of them at the earliest practicable date. If direct and decisive action is not taken in the near future, the undesirable developments, inefficiencies, inequities, and other undesirable conditions that confront us now will cause permanent loss of essential services or require even more difficult and costly solutions in the not too distant future.

A BASIC NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

The basic objective of our Nation's transportation system must be to assure the availability of the fast, safe, and economical transportation services needed in a growing and changing economy to move people and goods, without waste or discrimination, in response to private and public demands at the lowest cost consistent with health, convenience, national security, and other broad public objectives. Investment or capacity should be neither substantially above nor substantially below these requirements—for chronic excess capacity involves misuse of resources, and lack of adequate capacity jeopardizes progress. The resources devoted to provision of transportation service should be used in the most effective and efficient manner possible; and this, in turn, means that users of transport facilities should be provided with incentives to use whatever form of transportation which provides them with the service they desire at the lowest total cost, both public and private.

This basic objective can and must be achieved primarily by continued reliance on unsubsidized privately owned facilities, operating under the incentives of private profit and the checks of competition to the maximum extent practicable. The role of public policy should be to provide a consistent and comprehensive framework of equal competitive opportunity that will achieve this objective at the lowest economic and social cost to the Nation.

This means a more coordinated Federal policy and a less segmented approach. It means equality of opportunity for all forms of transportation and their users and undue preference to none. It means greater reliance on the forces of competition and less reliance on the restraints of regulation. And it means that, to the extent possible, the users of transportation services should bear the full costs of the services they use, whether those services are provided privately or publicly.

For some 75 years, common carriage was developed by the intention of Congress and the requirements of the public as the core of our transport system. This pattern of commerce is changing—the common carrier is declining in status and stature with the consequent growth of the private and exempt carrier. To a large extent this change is attributable to the failure of Federal policies and regulation to adjust to the needs of the shipping and consuming public; to a large extent it is attributable to the fact that the burdens of regulation are handicapping the certificated common carrier in his efforts to meet his unregulated competition. Whatever the cause, the common carrier with his obligation to serve all shippers—large or small—on certain routes at known tariffs and without any discrimination performs an essential function that should not be extinguished.

Considerable research and analysis, going far beyond our present findings, will be required before we know enough about the costs and other characteristics of various forms of transportation to guarantee the achievement of these objectives in full. In the meantime, it is clear that the following fundamental reforms in our transportation policy are needed now.

PART I. INTERCITY TRANSPORTATION

Our system of intercity public transportation—including railroads, trucks, buses, ships and barges, airplanes and pipelines—is seriously weakened today by artificial distortions and inefficiencies inherent in existing Federal policies. Built up over the years, they can be removed only gradually if we are to mitigate the hardships that are bound to arise in any program of far-reaching adjustment.

As an initial step, I am requesting the Chairmen of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Federal Maritime Commission to meet at frequent intervals to discuss regulatory problems affecting the various modes of transportation and to seek coordinated solutions in the form of legislation or administrative action that will improve the regulatory process.

(A) EQUAL COMPETITIVE OPPORTUNITY UNDER DIMINISHED REGULATION

(1) Bulk commodities: At present, the transportation of bulk commodities by water carriers is exempt from all rate regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act, including the approval of minimum rates; but this exemption is denied to all other modes of transportation. This is clearly inequitable both to the latter and to shippers—and it is an inequity which should be removed. Extending to all other carriers the exemption from the approval or prescription of minimum rates would permit the

forces of competition and equal opportunity to replace cumbersome regulation for these commodities, while protecting the public interest by leaving intact the ICC's control over maximum railroad rates and other safeguards (such as the prohibition against discrimination, and requirements on car service and common carrier responsibility). While this would be the preferable way to eliminate the existing inequality, Congress could elect to place all carriers on an equal footing by repealing the existing exemption—although this would result in more, instead of less, regulation and very likely in higher though more stable rates. Whichever alternative is adopted, these commodities are too important a part of carrier traffic to continue to be governed so unequally by Federal rate regulation.

(2) Agricultural and fishery products: An exemption similar to that described above, and now available only to motor carriers and freight forwarders, relates to agricultural and fishery products. This exemption from minimum rates should also be extended to all carriers. Here, too, the ICC should retain control of maximum railroad rates and certain other controls to protect the public interest in those areas where there is no effective truck or water carrier competition to keep rates down.

The combined effect of extending these bulk and agricultural exemptions will be to reduce drastically and equalize fairly the regulation of freight rates in this country. Freed to exercise normal managerial initiative, carriers will be able to rationalize their operations and reduce costs; and shippers should consequently enjoy a wider choice, improved service and lower rates.

(3) Intercity passenger rates: The traveling public, like the commercial shipper, is also uninterested in paying higher rates to subsidize weak segments of the transportation industry. Chronic overcapacity and deficits can be ended in the long run only in an industry made fit, lean and progressive by vigorous competition and innovation. But this is not possible as long as Federal agencies fix uniform minimum rates for passenger travel. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact legislation which would eventually limit the control of intercity passenger rates to the establishment of maximum rates only. In the case of the airlines, it may be preferable to initiate this program on a gradual or temporary basis under existing authority.

To prevent the absence of minimum rate regulation under the above three proposals from resulting in predatory, discriminatory trade practices or rate wars reflecting monopolistic ambitious rather than true efficiency, the Congress should make certain that such practices by carriers freed from minimum rate regulations would be covered by existing laws against monopoly and predatory trade practices.

While the above three recommendations relate to the most critical—and controversial—problems of unnecessary or unequal regulatory curbs on transportation, other changes in the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act are needed consistent with these same principles. I recommend that legislation be enacted to:

(4) Assure all carriers the right to ship vehicles or containers on the carriers of other branches of the transportation industry at the same rates available to noncarrier shippers. This change will put the various carriers in a position of equality with freight forwarders and other shippers in the use of the promising and fast-growing piggyback and related techniques.

(5) Repeal the provision of the Interstate Commerce Act which now prevents a railroad from hauling cargo it owns. The need for this provision, which goes back to the days of oppressive railroad monopoly, has largely passed; and its current effect is to handicap the railroads in competing with other modes of transportation. The antitrust laws can insure protection against the possible abuse by a railroad of its dual status as shipper and carrier.

(6) Direct the regulatory agencies to sanction experimental freight rates, modifications and variations in existing systems of classification and documentation, and new kinds or combinations of service.

(B) CONSISTENT POLICIES OF TAXATION AND USER CHARGES

The same accidents of circumstance that have molded our transportation regulatory policies and programs have largely determined specific transportation taxes. As a result, inequities have developed and in some instances have persisted for many years.

(1) Transportation excise tax: I have already recommended repeal of the 10-percent passenger transportation tax. This tax, a vestige of World War II and the Korean war, has undoubtedly discriminated against public transportation in favor of the automobile. I again recommend repeal of this tax to improve the competitive position of intercity railroad and bus passenger transportation systems, which generally are not publicly supported, and to clear the way for an equitable system of user charges for aviation.

(2) Aviation: For commercial airlines, I have suggested (a) continuation of the 2-cents-per-gallon net tax on gasoline and extension of that tax rate to all jet fuels; and (b) a 5-percent tax on airline tickets and on air freight waybills. By delaying until January 1, 1963 the effective date of all proposed changes as they affect aviation—including the repeal of the passenger tax for the airlines—ample time will be allowed for review by the Civil Aeronautics Board of any tariff adjustments that may be required by the carriers to recover the cost of user charges on fuel. The ticket and waybill taxes will be passed on directly to ultimate users.

For general aviation, such as recreational flying and company planes to which ticket and waybill taxes would not be applicable, a fuel tax of 3 cents per gallon is recommended as a minimal step toward recouping the heavy Federal investment in the airways.

All of the above taxes—in effect user charges—will recover only about half of the annual cost of the Federal airways system which is properly allocable to civil aviation. Total airways costs, which are approximately $500 million annually, have risen steadily in the past decade and will continue to grow as airways facilities and services are improved to accommodate future air traffic. Repeal of the 10-percent passenger tax as it now applies to aviation should not become effective, therefore, until the recommended user charges are in force for all segments of civil aviation.

(3) Inland waterways: Also in the interest of equality of treatment and opportunity, the principle of user charges should be extended to the inland waterways. A tax of 2 cents per gallon should be applied to all fuels used in transportation on the waterways. The recommended effective date, January 1, 1963, will allow time for review by the Interstate Commerce Commission of any adjustments that may be necessary in common carrier rates. This deferral is recommended even though the bulk of inland waterways traffic is carried by unregulated rather than regulated carriers.

The new tax should include an exemption similar to the current exemption from taxation accorded to gasoline and ships' supplies for vessels employed in the fisheries, foreign trade, or trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States or between the United States and any of its possessions. Vessels in domestic trade using facilities and routes similar to those engaged in foreign trade, and vessels in coastal trade which are too large to use the intracoastal waterways, should also be exempted.

This administration recognizes the responsibility of the Government to maintain and improve our system of inland waterways. Over $2 billion of Federal funds has already been invested in capital improvements. Expenditures for operating and maintaining the waterways are about $70 million annually, even though only a small fraction of the traffic consists of common carriers which serve all shippers and the general public. The users of the waterways include some of the largest and financially strongest corporations in the United States today, and it is surely feasible and appropriate for them to pay a small share of the Federal Government's costs in providing and maintaining waterway improvements.

(4) Income taxes: Another effort to improve equity in taxation is being taken by the Treasury Department, which is reviewing the administrative guidelines now governing depreciation rates in the transportation industry. The objective of this administration will be to give full recognition to current economic forces, including obsolescence, which in their impact upon the lives of depreciable assets may affect quite differently the different modes of transportation and, therefore, their competitive relationships. In addition, I recommend that the Internal Revenue Code be amended to increase from 5 to 7 years the period during which regulated public utilities, including those in transportation, can apply prior year losses to reduce current income for tax purposes.

(C) EVENHANDED GOVERNMENT PROMOTION OF INTERCITY TRANSPORTATION

To achieve a better balance of Federal promotional programs:

(1) I urge favorable consideration of legislation proposed by the Civil Aeronautics Board last year to make the domestic trunk air carriers ineligible for operating subsidies in the future. These carriers provide more passenger-miles of transportation service than any of the other common carriers; and, while they are experiencing temporary overcapacity and have recently sustained financial losses, they have bright prospects for longrun growth and prosperity which should make them permanently independent of Government support.

(2) With respect to other aviation subsidies, the Congress has limited to $6 million the funds available in fiscal 1962 for the payment of operating subsidies to the three certificated helicopter services; and the Appropriations Committees have requested the Civil Aeronautics Board to prepare a schedule for the termination of these subsidies. I endorse this position and seek the extension of this principle. I am asking the Board to develop by June 30, 1963, a step-by-step program, with specific annual targets, to assure sharp reduction of operating subsidies to all other domestic airlines as well, within periods to be established by the Board for each type of service or carrier. Rigorous enforcement of the Board's use-it-or-lose-it policy and further development of the class rate subsidy plan which the Board initiated in January 1961, with the cooperation of the local service carriers would clearly facilitate this objective. The development of single airports to serve adjacent cities, or regional airports, is also clearly necessary if these subsidies are to be eliminated and if the Federal Government and local communities are to meet the Nation's needs for adequate airports and air navigation facilities without excessive and unjustifiable costs.

(3) The Federal Government is a major user of transportation services. To assure the greatest practical use of the transportation industry by Government, I am directing all agencies of the Government, in meeting their own transport needs, to use authorized commercial facilities in all modes of transportation within the limits of economical and efficient operations and the requirements of military readiness.

(4) I also recommend that the Post Office Department be given greater flexibility in arranging for the transportation of mail by motor vehicle common carrier.

(5) Last year the Congress extended until June 30, 1963, the authority by which the Interstate Commerce Commission has been guaranteeing interest and principal payments on emergency loans to the railroads for operations, maintenance, and capital improvements for which the carriers cannot otherwise obtain funds on reasonable terms. A similar law by which the Government guarantees loans for aircraft and parts being purchased by certain certificated air carriers will expire this year. Since the Department of Commerce is already a focal point for Government transportation activities and since, in the interest of program coordination and consistency of policy these activities should be further consolidated, I recommend that the railroad loan guarantee authority, and the aviation loan guarantee authority if it is extended, be transferred to the Department of Commerce. These problems are not regulatory in nature and are clearly separable from the chief functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, and can be acted upon more expeditiously by an executive agency.

(D) PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(1) Mergers: A great resurgence of merger talk has occurred in the railroad and airline industries in the last several years, and major mergers have been proposed in recent months in both industries. The soundness of such mergers should be determined, not in the abstract, but by applying appropriate criteria to the circumstances and conditions of each particular case. This administration has a responsibility to recommend more specific guidelines than are now available and more specific procedures for applying them.

Accordingly, I have directed the formation of an interagency group to undertake two tasks: first, after proper consultation with interested parties, to formulate general administration policies on mergers in each segment of the transportation industry; and second, to assist the Department of Justice in developing a Government position on each merger application for presentation before the regulatory agencies. This group will consist of agency representatives designated by the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the heads of other agencies involved in a particular case. Under the chairmanship of Commerce, this group will examine each pending merger in transportation on the basis of the following criteria and others which they may develop:

(1) Effective competition should be maintained among alternative forms of transportation, and, where traffic volume permits, between competing firms in the same mode of transportation.

(2) The goals of economical, efficient, and adequate service to the public—and reduction in any public subsidies—should be secured by the realization of genuine economies.

(3) Affected workers should be given the assistance to make any necessary adjustments caused by the merger.

(2) Through routes and joint rates: For many years some regulatory agencies have been authorized to appoint joint boards to act on proposals for intercarrier services; but they have taken virtually no initiative to foster these arrangements which could greatly increase service and convenience to the general public and open up new opportunities for all carriers. I recommend, therefore, that Congress declare as a matter of public policy that through routes and joint rates should be vigorously encouraged, and authorize all transportation agencies to participate in joint boards.

(3) I have requested the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of General Services to make the fullest possible use of their statutory powers, and I urge the enactment of such additional legislation as may be necessary, to encourage experimental rates and services—to explore every promising simplification of rate structures—and to encourage the development of systems that will make rate ascertainment and publication less costly and more convenient. These experiments will be pilot studies for a more general simplification of rates and for the application of new kinds of service to transportation in general.

(4) I am requesting the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, in cooperation with the Interstate Commerce Commission, to develop and urge adoption of uniform State registration laws for motor carriers operating within States but handling interstate commerce. The Congress should, consistent with this effort, give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to enter into cooperative enforcement agreements with the various States, covering both the economic and the safety aspects of highway transportation.

(5) I recommend that all common carriers, including freight forwarders and motor carriers, be required to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates.

(6) Finally, I recommend that the civil penalty now imposed on motor carriers for failure to file required reports be substantially increased; that the same civil penalty be imposed for violations of safety regulations and for operating without authority; and that the safety regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission should be made fully applicable to private, as well as to common and contract carriers, so as to clarify the ambiguous situation prevailing at present.

PART II. URBAN TRANSPORTATION

I have previously emphasized to the Congress the need for action on the transportation problems resulting from burgeoning urban growth and the changing urban scene.

Higher incomes coupled with the increasing availability of the automobile have enabled more and more American families, particularly younger ones with children, to seek their own homes in suburban areas. Simultaneously, changes and improvements in freight transportation, made possible by the development of modern highways and the trucking industry, have reduced the dependence of manufacturers on central locations near port facilities or railroad terminals. The development of improved production techniques that require spacious, one-story plant layouts have impelled many industries to move to the periphery of urban areas. At the same time the importance of the central city is increasing for trade, financial, governmental and cultural activities.

One result of these changes in location patterns has been a change in the patterns of urban travel. Formerly people traveled mainly along high density corridors radiating to and from downtown. Today traffic patterns are increasingly diverse. Added to traditional suburb-to-city movements are large crosstown flows which existing mass transportation systems are often not geared to handle. Also, the increasing use of automobiles to meet urban transportation needs has resulted in increasing highway congestion, and this has greatly impeded mass transportation service using those highways.

This drastic revision of travel patterns in many urban areas has seriously impaired the effectiveness and economic viability of public mass transportation, which is geared to the older patterns. A steady decline in patronage and a concomitant rise of unprofitability and financial problems have occurred. This has been particularly true of rail commuter and streetcar services limited to particular routes by fixed roadbeds.

To conserve and enhance values in existing urban areas is essential. But at least as important are steps to promote economic efficiency and livability in areas of future development. In less than 20 years we can expect well over half of our expanded population to be living in 40 great urban complexes. Many smaller places will also experience phenomenal growth. The ways that people and goods can be moved in these areas will have a major influence on their structure, on the efficiency of their economy, and on the availability for social and cultural opportunities they can offer their citizens. Our national welfare therefore requires the provision of good urban transportation, with the properly balanced use of private vehicles and modern mass transport to help shape as well as serve urban growth.

At my request, the problems of urban transportation have been studied in detail by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce. Their field investigations have included some 40 metropolitan and other communities, large and small. Their findings support the need for substantial expansion and important changes in the urban mass transportation program authorized in the Housing Act of 1961 as well as revisions in Federal highway legislation. They give dramatic emphasis, moreover, to the need for greater local initiative and to the responsibility of the States and municipalities to provide financial support and effective governmental auspices for strengthening and improving urban transportation.

On the basis of this report, I recommend that long-range Federal financial aid and technical assistance be provided to help plan and develop the comprehensive and balanced urban transportation that is so vitally needed, not only to benefit local communities, but to assure more effective use of Federal funds available for other urban development and renewal programs. I recommend that such Federal assistance for mass transportation be limited to those applications (1) where an organization or officially coordinated organizations are carrying on a continuing program of comprehensive planning on an areawide basis, and (2) where the assisted project will be administered through a public agency as part of a unified or officially coordinated area-wide transportation system.

(A) Long-range program: Specifically, I recommend that the Congress authorize the first installment of a long-range program of Federal aid to our urban regions for the revitalization and needed expansion of public mass transportation, to be administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I recommend a capital grant authorization of $500 million to be made available over a 3-year period, with $100 million to be made available in fiscal 1963. Only a program that offers substantial support and continuity of Federal participation can induce our urban regions to organize appropriate administrative arrangements and to meet their share of the costs of fully balanced transportation systems.

This Federal assistance should be made available to qualified public agencies in the form of direct grants to be matched by local, non-Federal contributions. For rights-of-way, fixed facilities, including maintenance and terminal facilities, and rolling stock required for urban mass transportation systems, grants should be provided for up to two-thirds of the project cost which cannot reasonably be financed from expected revenue. The remaining one-third of the net project cost would be paid by the locality or State from other sources, without Federal aid. The extension and rehabilitation of existing systems as well as the creation of new systems should be eligible. In no event should Federal funds be used to pay operating expenses. Nor should parking facilities, except those directly supporting public mass transportation, be eligible for Federal grants.

While it is expected that the new grant program will be the major Federal support for urban mass transportation, it is important to have Federal loans available where private financing cannot be obtained on reasonable terms. I therefore recommend removal of the time limit on the $50 million loan authorization provided in the Housing Act of 1961. Federal loans would not be available to finance the State or local one-third contribution to net project cost.

Although grants and loans would be available only to public agencies, those agencies could lease facilities and equipment or make other arrangements for private operation of assisted mass transportation systems. The program is not intended to foster public as distinguished from private mass transit operations. Each community should develop the method or methods of operation best suited to its particular requirements.

A community should be eligible for a mass transportation grant or loan only after the Housing Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are necessary for carrying out a program for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area.

The program I have proposed is aimed at the widely varying transit problems of our Nation's cities, ranging from the clogged arteries of our most populous metropolitan areas to those smaller cities which have only recently known the frustrations of congested streets. There may, however, be some highly specialized situations in which alternative programs, for example, loan guarantees under stringent conditions, would be better suited to particular needs and the Congress may, therefore, wish to consider such alternatives.

(B) Emergency aid: Time will be required by most metropolitan areas to organize effectively for the major planning efforts required. Even more time may be needed to create public agencies with adequate powers to develop, finance and administer new or improved public transportation systems. Meanwhile, the crisis conditions that have already emerged in some areas threaten to become widespread. Mass transportation continues to deteriorate and even to disappear. Important segments of our population are thus deprived of transportation; highway congestion and attendant air pollution become worse; and the destructive effects upon central business districts and older residential areas are accelerated.

In recognition of this serious situation, I also recommend that the Congress, for a period of 3 years only, authorize the Housing Administrator to make emergency grants, (a) where there is an urgent need for immediate aid to an existing mass transportation facility or service that might otherwise cease to be available for transportation purposes, (b) where an official long-range program for a coordinated system is being actively prepared, and (c) where the facilities or equipment acquired under the emergency grant can reasonably be expected to be required for the new long-range system. This emergency aid should not exceed one-half of the net project cost. Upon completion of an acceptable areawide transportation program within 3 years, these emergency projects, if a part of the ultimate system, should qualify for the balance of the regular Federal assistance available under the long-range program.

(C) Role of highways: Highways are an instrumental part of any coordinated urban transportation program, and must be an integral part of any comprehensive community development plan. Accordingly, I have requested the Secretary of Commerce to make his approval of the use of highway planning funds in metropolitan planning studies contingent upon the establishment of a continuing and comprehensive planning process. This process should, to the maximum extent feasible, include all of the interdependent parts of the metropolitan or other urban area, all agencies and jurisdictions involved, and all forms of transportation, and should be closely coordinated with policymaking and program administration.

Progress has already been made in coordinated transportation planning for metropolitan areas through the use of funds made available under both Federal highway and housing legislation. To increase the effectiveness of this effort, I recommend that the Federal-aid highway law be amended to increase the percentage of Federal funds available to the States for research and planning. Legislation will be submitted to effectuate this change and to provide that (a) these funds should be available for planning and research purposes only; (b) the funds be matched by the States in accordance with statutory matching requirements; and (c) any funds not used for planning and research lapse.

In addition I recommend that the Federal-aid highway law be amended to provide that, effective not later than July 1, 1965, the Secretary of Commerce shall, before approving a program for highway projects in any metropolitan area, make a finding that such projects are consistent with comprehensive development plans for the metropolitan area and that the Federal-aid system so developed will be an integral part of a soundly based, balanced transportation system for the area involved.

Highway planning should be broadened to include adequate traffic control systems, parking facilities, and circulation systems on city streets commensurate with the traffic forecasts used to justify freeways and major arterial roadways. Provisions for transit and highway facilities in the same roadway, permissible under present law and already tested in several cases, should be encouraged whenever more effective transportation will result. Moreover, I have requested the Secretary of Commerce to consider favorably the reservation of special highway lanes for buses during peak traffic hours whenever comprehensive transportation plans indicate that this is desirable.

To permit the State highway departments greater flexibility in the use of Federal-aid highway funds to meet urban transportation needs, I further recommend that the Federal-aid highway law be amended to permit more extensive use of Federal-aid secondary funds for extensions of the secondary system in urban areas.

I have asked the Secretary of Commerce and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to consult regularly regarding administration of the highway and urban mass transportation programs, and to report to me annually on the progress of their respective programs, on the needs for further coordination, and on possibilities for improvement.

(D) Relocation assistance: Last year in a message to the Congress on the Federal-aid highway program, I called attention to the problems of families displaced by new highway construction and proposed that the Federal highway law be amended to require assistance to such families in finding decent housing at reasonable cost. The need for such assistance to alleviate unnecessary hardship is still urgent. The Secretary of Commerce has estimated that, under the interstate highway program alone, 15,000 families and 1,500 businesses are being displaced each year, and the proposed urban mass transportation program will further increase the number of persons affected.

To move toward equity among the various federally assisted programs causing displacement, I recommend that assistance and requirements similar to those now applicable to the urban renewal program be authorized for the Federal-aid highway program and the urban mass transportation program. Legislation is being submitted to authorize payments of not to exceed $200 in the case of individuals and families and $3,000 (or if greater, the total certified actual moving expenses) in the case of business concerns or nonprofit organizations displaced as a result of land acquisitions under these programs.

(E) Mass transit research and demonstrations: Further, I believe that progress will be most rapid and long lasting if the Federal Government contributes to economic and technological research in the field of urban mass transportation. These research activities should be an integral part of the research program described later in this message. Important parts of this program should be carried out by the Housing Administrator directly, through contract with other Federal agencies, private research organizations, universities and other competent bodies, or through the allocation of funds to local public agencies for approved programs.

To facilitate this approach, I recommend that the $25 million authorized last year for demonstration grants be made available for broad research and development undertakings, as well as demonstration projects, which have general applicability throughout the Nation. That amount, plus an additional $10 million from the proposed capital grant funds for each of the years 1963, 1964, and 1965 should suffice for these purposes. These funds, together with research funds available under the Federal-aid highway program, can contribute to substantial advances in urban transportation.

(F) Interstate compacts: Finally, since transportation in many urban areas is an interstate problem, I recommend that legislation be enacted to give congressional approval in advance for interstate compacts for the establishment of agencies to carry out transportation and other regional functions in urban areas extending across State lines.

PART III. INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORTATION

We should endeavor, to the maximum extent feasible, to (a) gear international transportation investment to the requirements of our peacetime international trade and travel, and (b) provide incentives to users that will channel traffic to those forms of transportation that provide desirable service at the lowest total cost. The most critical problems associated with these policies are in the national defense area. Determination must be made as to whether the number and types of ships and aircraft adequate to meet long-range peacetime needs are also adequate to meet probable military emergencies, and if they are not, how best to meet these additional requirements.

(A) Merchant marine: In the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the U.S. Government made a new start on the vexing problems of the American merchant marine in the face of repeated failure to improve its condition both before and after World War I. Subsequently, other aids in the form of cargo preference legislation, various trade-out, trade-in, and tax incentives devised to stimulate new construction, and a mortgage insurance program with up to 87½ percent Federal guarantees were added to the arsenal of protection against the industry's exposure to low-cost foreign competition.

In spite of these aids, subsidies required for both construction and operations under the 1936 act have steadily increased. Operating subsidies will rise from $49 million in 1950 to over $225 million in 1963. Ship construction costs in U.S. yards are now approximately double those in Japanese and German yards. For this reason and because of an acceleration of the program beginning in 1956 to replace war-built cargo ships, Federal expenditures for new ship construction will rise to a postwar high of $112 million in 1963.

At my request, the Secretary of Commerce has undertaken a study of the current problems of the American merchant marine. This review will involve such specific issues as the state of coastal and intercoastal shipping and the costs of service to our noncontiguous territories. It will also consider more fundamental questions of long-term adjustment: Are the criteria adopted in 1936 as guides to the establishment of essential trade routes and services relevant for the future? Are there alternatives to the existing techniques for providing financial assistance which would benefit (a) the public in terms of better service and lower rates and (b) the operators in terms of higher profits, more freedom for management initiative, and more incentive for privately financed research and technological advance? What research and development efforts are most likely to increase the competitiveness of our merchant marine? Can defense readiness requirements be met adequately by greater reliance on the reserve fleet and the ships of our allies under NATO agreements? Would a smaller reserve fleet be adequate? Are the international arrangements pursuant to which world shipping operations are carried on conducive to the stability of the industry, fair but effective competition and adequate service?

I have also asked the Secretary of Defense to provide the Secretary of Commerce with estimates, under a range of assumptions as to military emergencies, of what active and reserve tonnages of merchant shipping should be maintained in the interest of national security. In addition, I have established a Cabinet level committee, chaired by the Secretary of Labor, whose study will include the flags of convenience and cargo preference issues. When the findings and conclusions of these studies become available, I shall send to the Congress appropriate specific recommendations concerning our maritime program.

In the meantime, I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to implement fully section 212(d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, for securing preference to vessels of United States registry in the movement of commodities in our waterborne foreign commerce; and I have directed all executive branch agencies to comply fully with the purpose of our cargo preference laws.

I have also recommended a stepped-up research program for developing ways and means of increasing the competitive efficiency of our merchant marine and related industries. Of particular significance in this effort will be the application of the principles of mass production, and the standardization of ship types and ship components, for reduction in the cost of new vessel construction. Also, I am urging that sound development in technology and automation be applied to merchant shipping as rapidly as possible, fully recognizing and providing for the job equities involved, as a major program for enhancing the competitive capability of our merchant marine.

(B) International aviation: An interdepartmental committee, headed by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and including representatives from the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Bureau of the Budget, was established at my direction last July to undertake a study of U.S. international air transportation policies and problems.

This study is presently underway, and will be completed by late summer. Concurrent with this policy study, the Bureau of the Budget is conducting a study of the organizational structure within which Government agencies carry out activities concerned with international aviation. Once these studies have been completed and evaluated, an administration policy on international civil aviation will be enunciated, with responsibilities assigned to the agencies involved according to statutory requirements.

PART IV. LABOR RELATIONS AND RESEARCH

(A) Labor relations: Technological advance in transportation must be explored and developed if we are to meet growing requirements for the movement of people and goods. New equipment often requires new skills, sometimes displaces labor, and often requires retraining or relocation of manpower. An overall reduction in manpower requirements in transportation is not inevitable, however; and the new Manpower Development and Training Act will help those transportation workers in need of new jobs or new skills.

For the long-range benefit of labor, management, and the public, collective bargaining in the transportation industry must promote efficiency as well as solve problems of labor-management relations. Problems of job assignments, work rules, and other employment policies must be dealt with in a manner that will both encourage increased productivity and recognize the job equities which are affected by technological change. The Government also has an obligation to develop policies and provide assistance to labor and management consistent with the above objectives.

(B) Research: To understand the increasingly complex transportation problems of the future, to identify the relationships of social, economic, administrative and technical factors involved, to translate scientific knowledge into transportation engineering practice, to weigh the merits of alternative systems, and to formulate new, improved and consistent policies—we need information that can evolve only from a vigorous, continuous and coordinated program of research. Yet, in the field of transportation where we have many unfulfilled opportunities, research has been fragmented, unsteady, inadequate in scope and balance.

Scientific and engineering research will bring to all forms of transportation the benefits of new high strength, low cost and durable materials, compact and economical powerplants, new devices to increase safety and convenience—improvements which have characterized the development of jet-propelled aircraft. Experiments in the maritime field have resulted in the development of a nuclear powered merchant ship, the N.S. *Savannah*, which has already begun test cruises, and a hydrofoil ship, the *Dennison*, which is nearing trial runs. Transportation on land, as well as in the air and on the seas, can benefit from accelerated scientific research.

Economic and policy research will improve knowledge about the functioning of our transportation system as a whole and about the interrelation of the major branches of the industry. It should consider the new demands for transportation, the changing markets and products being handled, and the need for speed and safety. For instance, such research can consider the handling of freight as a system beginning in the shipper's plant and ending with the delivery of goods to the very doors of his customers—using new packaging, containerization and cargo handling methods that will take full advantage of new economies and convenience.

Taking advantage of new techniques that would provide convenience and efficiency, we must consider the impact of different forms of transportation investment on economic development; we must combine and integrate systems to take advantage of the maximum benefits of each mode of travel; we must now consider the Nation's transportation network as an articulated and closely linked system rather than an uncoordinated set of independent entities.

Just as a transport system must be built and operated as a whole, the different areas of transportation research must be coordinated within an overall concept. With the advice and assistance of the heads of the principal Federal agencies concerned with transportation and members of my own staff, the Secretary of Commerce is undertaking a broad evaluation of research needs in transportation and of the appropriate methods to meet these needs. I look to the Secretary of Commerce to develop a comprehensive transportation research program for the Government for later consideration by the Congress. Once such a coordinated and policy-oriented research program is underway, it will produce a flow of information of the kind that we must have to implement a comprehensive public policy on transportation.

Improved statistics for private and Government use are also urgently needed. The 1963 budget repeats a request made by the previous administration for funds to prepare for a census of transportation. This census will make an important beginning to supplying these much-needed data. I urge early favorable action on this request.

CONCLUSION

The troubles in our transportation system are deep; and no just and comprehensive set of goals—which meets all the needs of each mode of transportation as well as shippers, consumers, taxpayers, and the general public—can be quickly or easily reached. But few areas of public concern are more basic to our progress as a nation. The Congress and all citizens, as well as all Federal agencies, have an increasing interest in and an increasing responsibility to be aware of the shortcomings of existing transportation policies; and the proposals contained in this message are intended to be a constructive basis for the exercise of that responsibility.

The difficultly and the complexity of these basic troubles will not correct themselves with the mere passage of time. On the contrary, we cannot afford to delay further. Facing up to the realities of the situation, we must begin to make the painful decisions necessary to providing the transportation system required by the United States of today and tomorrow.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 5, 1962.*

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED FORCES, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1279, H.R. 9751.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1963 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

AIRCRAFT

For aircraft: For the Army, $218,500,000; for the Navy and Marine Corps, $2,134,600,000; for the Air Force, $3,626,000,000, of which amount $491,000,000 is authorized only for the production planning and long leadtime procurement of an RS–70 weapon system: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1962, restrictions on the fund authorization contained in Public Law 87–53, approved June 21, 1961, for the procurement of aircraft, will no longer apply.

MISSILES

For missiles: For the Army, $558,300,000; for the Navy, $930,400,000; for the Marine Corps, $22,300,000; for the Air Force, $2,500,000,000.

NAVAL VESSELS

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $2,979,200,000.

Sec. 2. Section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, or after December 31, 1962, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the research, development, test, or evaluation of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such dates."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is no intention of proceeding with the consideration of the bill tonight; it will be the pending business of the Senate on Monday. There will be no yea-and-nay votes on Monday. If there is a possibility that the bill may be passed on that day, it will be passed. If the bill is not passed on Monday, I hope it may be passed on the following day, Tuesday.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations may file a report on the Peace Corps bill while the Senate is in adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, following the consideration of H.R. 9751, it is the intention of the leadership to call up Calendar No. 1227, H.R. 3008, for the relief of Hom Hong Hing, also known as Tommy Joe; and tentatively Calendar No. 1195, S. 4, to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore.

USE OF CIVIL SERVANTS AS LOBBYISTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, yesterday Mr. Charles Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, very properly expressed strong objection to the recent action by the Kennedy administration in spending $75,000 of the taxpayers' money for the purpose of bringing members of the State ASC committees to Washington for the purpose of lobbying for the Kennedy farm program.

I commend Mr. Shuman for denouncing this arrogant attempt of the administration to use civil servants as lobbyists for his legislative program. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Shuman's press release condemning this action printed in the Record, as well as an editorial published in today's Washington Daily News entitled "Unlawful Farm Lobby," and an editorial published in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled "Career Men as Advocates?"

There being no objection, the press release and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington, D.C., April 4.—American Farm Bureau President Charles B. Shuman today protested to President Kennedy the use of taxpayers' money to propagandize taxpayers' representatives in Congress.

Mr. Shuman noted that members of State agricultural stabilization and conservation (ASC) committees had been summoned to Washington—at taxpayers expense—for a 2-day meeting on April 3 and 4 to instruct them on administration farm legislation. He estimated the total travel and per diem cost at about $75,000, and charged that some of the ASC men have been looking up their Congressmen.

In a telegram to President Kennedy, Mr. Shuman stated: "We protest as improper, the use of public funds for paying travel and per diem expenses of State ASC committeemen at a secret meeting called in Washington by the Secretary of Agriculture." He added: "One apparent purpose of the meeting was to develop a propaganda campaign and to lobby Members of Congress in support of the administration farm bill. Even if they had paid their own expenses, organized lobbying by Government employees is a dangerous and deplorable practice."

Mr. Shuman called the meeting "the latest exercise of the administration's rather frightening technique of using Federal funds and Federal employees to promote Federal programs and even proposed legislation for Federal programs.

"Alongside such a massive and expensive propaganda campaign to bury all opposition," Mr. Shuman said, "the nickels and dimes of voluntary organizations are small change."

ASC committees are U.S. Department of Agriculture representatives in the States and counties who administer Federal farm programs. The State committees are appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture and serve at his pleasure.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 5 1962]

Unlawful Farm Lobby

By law, members of State committees set up to supervise farm acreage allotments are prohibited from lobbying for specific farm legislation. But apparently this law doesn't mean much to President Kennedy or to Orville Freeman, his Secretary of Agriculture.

To begin with, it was unusual enough for the administration to invite the committeemen—who really are political appointees to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee—to Washington at taxpayer expense. The American Farm Bureau thinks the 2-day shindig yesterday and the day before will cost you and me $75,000. Some of the guests even flew first class, a practice now discontinued by many American corporations because a tourist-class airplane seat is about as comfortable and is cheaper.

Then after they arrived, the President suggested to the committeemen ("delicately," one wire service commented) they use their stay to lobby for his farm bill. "We hope you will see Members of Congress and acquaint them and the Senators. We don't want them to be * * * lonesome."

Coming from the boss himself, this sounds like a direct order to flout the law.

It also sounds as if the Kennedy-Freeman farm bill is in trouble. This is good. It should be defeated, because it is too costly and (probably more important) because it won't solve our farm problems.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 5, 1962]

Career Men as Advocates?

Senator Williams has good reason to complain about the ruling of Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., of the Civil Service Commission, to the effect that career officials may explain the position of the administration on proposed legislation before interested public groups. The ruling clearly suggests that professionals in the career service may be used by the administration to support its legislative program before Congress. If civil servants are drawn into such controversies, they will obviously lose their standing as neutral public servants and thus become vulnerable to political attack when there is a change of administrations.

The impropriety of drawing career men into controversies over pending legislation becomes obvious from the ruling of Attorney General Robert Kennedy on this subject. The Attorney General says that, although it is legally permissible for a Government employee to explain the administration's view, it would be a "serious impropriety and a distinct breach of his duty as a career official to use his official position publicly to oppose the policy of the administration he serves." Of this latter statement there can be no doubt. Only chaos could result from career employees running around to address public groups in opposition to what the administration is asking Congress to do.

How can it reasonably be argued, then, that such employees should speak up in favor of the President's program? If they are to address public groups at all on pending legislation, surely they should be free to express their candid views. The only reasonable course is for them to remain aloof from political controversies if they wish to retain their standing as career men in the Government service. Explanation of the President's program is the business of policymaking employees who do not work under the inhibitions of the career service.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to the District of Columbia home rule bill which I have introduced. The Record should contain this brief explanation, because the bill probably will be acted upon within the next week or 10 days.

My amendment seeks to modify one section of the home rule bill in its original form and in the form in which it had been introduced by me and the late Senator Matthew Neely, of West Virginia. My amendment seeks to modify one section of my home rule bill.

Mr. President, my bill in its original form, and also in the form in which it was introduced by the late Senator Matt Neely, of West Virginia, provides for nine councilmen for the District of Columbia, to be selected from three wards, but with the vote to be citywide.

I have made a rather comprehensive study of the practices in municipalities across the country, as regards the election of councilmen. I find that in an overwhelming majority of the cities the councilmen are elected on a ward basis by the residents of the wards from which they come.

I have also checked into a good many things in connection with this subject matter in the field of municipal government; and I find that it seems to be the overwhelming consensus on the part of the authorities that the election of councilmen on the basis of participation by the citizens of the wards gives the best participation by the people in their government, in connection with the problems which arise in connection with the government of the cities, ward by ward.

Therefore, I have offered this amendment, for appropriate reference to the Committee on the District of Columbia; and I modify my bill accordingly.

I think the amendment is a sound one; and I hope the amendment will be incorporated in the bill which finally is reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SERVING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN THE SENATE WING OF THE CAPITOL OR THE SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday I assured the Senate that today I would submit a resolution dealing with a very delicate problem which I discussed 2 days ago, and again yesterday—namely, the problem of permitting the serving of hard liquor in the Senate wing of the Capitol or in the Senate Office Buildings, at official or semiofficial affairs or at affairs which really are conducted under the permission of the Senate.

I have prepared such a resolution. It reads as follows:

> *Resolved*, That rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to Regulation of the Senate Wing of the Capitol) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:
>
> "3. The serving of alcoholic beverages shall not be permitted within any portion of the Senate Wing of the Capitol, or any portion of any office building set aside for the use of the Senate, other than a room or suite which is assigned for occupancy by a Member or officer of the Senate for the transaction of the business of his office. As used in this paragraph, the term 'alcoholic beverage' means any alcoholic beverage containing more than 24 per centum of alcohol by volume."

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be held at the desk until the close of the business of the Senate next Tuesday, if the Senate meets on that day; or until the close of the business of the Senate next Wednesday, in case the Senate does not meet next Tuesday, or until the close of the business of the Senate next Thursday, in case the Senate does not meet on either Tuesday or Wednesday of next week; and I ask that the resolution remain at the desk that long, available for cosponsorship by other Members of the Senate who may wish to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in my comments about the resolution; but, because I think it will have some bearing on the matter of cosponsorship, I wish to make this statement tonight about the resolution:

To my great pleasure, although my surprise, a very large number of Senators—and, Mr. President, in my judgment, when one uses the word "large" in connection with the Senate, it means at least a dozen or more Senators—at least a dozen or more Senators have come to me, today, and have said to me—and now I paraphrase their statements, but do so accurately: "WAYNE, if you ever get a vote on your resolution, I will vote for it, because you are dead right."

Several Senators spoke to me about a most unfortunate incident which apparently occurred last night in the Capitol, after permission was obtained to use some facilities of the building for a reception in connection with the Cherry Blossom Festival; and the facilities could not have been obtained except by the intervention of a Senator. There were taken into that reception three cases of hard liquor; and apparently the resulting drinking was of such a nature that it has caused a considerable amount of adverse comment and has caused embarrassment to the Senator involved.

I warn the Senate that this practice, which has developed in the last 2 or 3 years, is going to rise to plague and embarrass this body if we do not put a stop to it right now; and it is going to result in a public reaction in this country—once the American people come to understand the situation—that will, and should, do great damage to the prestige of the Senate because the American people have every right to resent a policy of the Senate which, in effect, turns the Capitol and the Senate Office Buildings into a saloon on those occasions when these drinking parties—and I understand that the affair last night could better be described as a drinking bout or brawl—occur in buildings paid for and maintained by the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. President, in my judgment this is wrong. If Senators want to give drinking parties, there are places where they can give them; they can rent reception rooms at hotels. But I, for one—and I am satisfied that millions of Americans will agree with me—do not think the Capitol of the United States, or the part of it over which the Senate has jurisdiction, or the Senate Office Buildings, insofar as these public rooms are concerned, should be desecrated by the serving of hard liquor at so-called official or semiofficial Senate affairs.

Let me warn the Senate about another problem that will come up. Some prohibition is going to have to be placed upon this matter. Some system will have to be set up for the giving of consent or the denying of consent for the use of these facilities. The legislative representative of one of the very large industries of this country came to me, today, and said to me what these Senators have said. He said, "Senator, you are completely right about the position you are taking in regard to the use of the public rooms of the Capitol and the Senate Office Buildings for affairs at which hard liquor is served." He said, "Let me tell you what you will be confronted with if you don't get this stopped." He pointed out to me that this could not be done 2 or 3 years ago; but he said, "You are going to have one industrial or commercial group after another start putting pressure upon a Senator or both Senators from their States, in order to get the Vandenberg Room or the new reception room or the Caucus Room or some other room made available for the holding of what will be called a reception, using that Senator or group of Senators as the official sponsors of the affair, but the money that will supply the liquor will come from the lobbyists, and they will use these social affairs in their attempts to proselyte the affairs of their industries within the Senate of the United States. How are you going to stop that? Where are you going to draw the line?"

Another Senator came to me today and said, "You know what this is going to lead to? Yesterday a constituent of mine came to me and asked me if I could not get the use of the new reception room in the Capitol for a reception for the wedding of his daughter." He said, "You know what that reception would involve." He said, "I feel I can turn that one down, but you are going to get into many areas where it is going to be difficult to draw the line."

Let me say to the Rules Committee that it will have a job, if it does not stop this, in preparing rules and regulations that we Senators can follow when requests are made for the use of these rooms for one purpose or another.

My solution is a direct and simple one, impartial and uniform in its applicability. The answer is going to be a flat, "No, you cannot use any of these rooms for any affair, if part of the purpose of the affair is to serve hard liquor for the function."

You will be surprised, Mr. President, how that would reduce the requests for the use of the rooms. Tell them to go to the hotels. Let me say, somewhat facetiously and goodnaturedly, that I should obtain a great deal of support for my resolution from private enterprises in the District of Columbia, hotel associations and everybody else that might rent rooms for receptions and affairs of the nature of which we are coming to give here in the Capitol and in the Senate Office Buildings.

Mr. President, I shall put the resolution on the desk, under the request that I have made, and I hope other Senators will cosponsor it.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has already indicated that he will. I think the other Senator from South Carolina may.

I have a word of plea for the Rules Committee. I was a little surprised to hear so many of my colleagues say, "You will never get it out of the Rules Committee."

That raises another issue, Mr. President. It raises another parliamentary issue as to whether or not, when a Senator, or a group of Senators, offers a resolution or a bill to be considered by any committee of the Senate, he or they may be confronted with an attitude in this body that it will be bottled up in that committee. I think the Rules Committee will give, by a very early date, a clear answer to that charge, because that charge is a reflection on every member of the Rules Committee, and I think it is an unwarranted reflection.

When that argument was made to me, and I named members of the Rules Committee, I said, "Don't tell me that these colleagues would resort to that sort of parliamentary tactic to prevent this resolution from getting to the floor of the Senate for a vote."

I say to the Rules Committee that that is a common charge, and I think it ought to be answered very quickly by getting this resolution back to the floor of the Senate, once it is referred to committee, for early debate and vote.

This is the type of resolution on which there does not have to be a very long hearing. We know pretty well, as individual Senators, whether we are for or against this proposition, whether or not, as Senators, we think the public policy ought to be or ought not to be making available the public rooms of the Capitol and the Senate Office Buildings for drinking parties, to put it bluntly.

If I should ever find myself in a position where any resolution or bill of mine were being bottled up by any committee, I think every member of such a committee knows that the senior Senator from Oregon has not been a student of the rules of the Senate for 18 years to take that kind of strategy or tactic against him lightly. I have sufficient confidence that the rules of the Senate can be so applied, if I run into that kind of opposition, that we shall probably be able to get the matter before the Senate for a vote by use of other rules of the Senate, if necessary. But I am not going to assume that that is ever going to be necessary, for I have complete faith in the fairness of the members of the Rules Committee; and I am satisfied that when the resolution goes to the committee, it will come back to the floor of the Senate either with a favorable or adverse report, and the Rules Committee will say in effect, "We are willing to let this matter of policy be determined by the Senate."

It is in that spirit that I send the resolution to the desk, under the terms that I have offered it, and I hope, when the period for the signing of cosponsors has run out, we shall find there are several names on the resolution as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 325) submitted by Mr. Morse (for himself, Mr. Johnston, and Mr. Thurmond), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PRAISE FOR MRS. KENNEDY'S GOOD-WILL TOUR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite my colleagues' attention to a recent broadcast by the noted commentator, Alex Dreier, in regard to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy's good-will tour.

Mr. Dreier voices the opinion, shared by the overwhelming majority of the American people, that Mrs. Kennedy performed a valuable service to her country by making the trip.

Those few individuals who have attempted to discredit our First Lady's trip are finding out to their dismay that such attacks are being considered for what they are, mean and petty sniping at a great lady who represented our country so well.

I only wish that we could have more such ambassadors of good will to help erase the false image of America which, most unfortunately, too many people of other lands have.

I join in saluting the First Lady for the service she rendered to our country by this arduous trip.

I ask unanimous consent that Alex Dreier's radio broadcast appear at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Commentary by Alex Drier

> The hue and cry against Jacqueline Kennedy's good will trips—and admittedly, it is more sniping than hueing and crying—is reminiscent of some of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's earlier junkets here, there, and everywhere.
>
> Every anti-F.D.R. columnist in the country made jokes about Mrs. Roosevelt's trips. But everywhere she went that curious, idealistic, and dedicated lady made friends for her country.
>
> I believe that Jacqueline Kennedy is doing the very same thing, making friends for the United States. And her assets are obvious: She is charming, she is beautiful, she is perfectly groomed, she is obviously cultured and conducts herself with grace and dignity.
>
> What could be more frustrating to the political opponents of President Kennedy. Many of these, of course, were certain that wife Jacqueline was going to be anything but an asset to her husband. They had complained that Kennedy himself was too young when he was campaigning. But grudgingly they conceded that he had suddenly grown older after those now famous TV debates. But they still had Mrs. Kennedy's youth to hang their prejudiced hats on. As one slightly reckless observer of the modern scene put it, "Who needs a young woman in the latest fashions visiting these underdeveloped countries where there are so many poor people?" It's a good question, and I think the answer is "We do." The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Mrs. Kennedy was a tremendous success everywhere she went. And don't kid yourself about the poor people. They don't expect to see President's wives in rags any more than they expect to see their own rulers and public officials in rags.
>
> One of the more ridiculous charges leveled at Mrs. Kennedy has been that she hasn't got out and mixed with the people. This is one of the most inane assertions we've ever heard of. What ruler of any country ever gets out and actually mixes with the people? Local security never allows it. A Khrushchev or a Kennedy—or their wives and public officials—are guarded by legions of sharp-eyed security men.
>
> Once any public official—or his wife or family—has reached a certain status, his freedom to mix with John and Mary Doe in any country, is gone forever.
>
> I think Mrs. Kennedy is doing a fine job of representing her country. She is no average American, and nobody ever thought she was. She is the President's wife, and she looks and dresses and acts the part. Nobody expects more, and few could expect less of her than that.
>
> If Jacqueline Kennedy were Mrs. Nixon—or Mrs. Anybody Else—we would be happy to see her making the trips she has made. In far too many places we have the undeserved reputation of being a warlike nation. Sending a pretty, youthful young lady abroad is one of the best ways in the world to dispel that fiction.
>
> What very well may be griping some columnists and commentators is that when 1964 rolls around they not only are going to have to beat John Kennedy, they are also going to have to beat Jacqueline Kennedy. And it's going to be a tough daily double to beat, trips or no trips.

TRIAL OF PRISONERS OF WAR BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Fidel Castro's Cuban state prosecutor, according to press dispatches, has told us what the recent courtyard trial in Havana is really all about.

Every fairminded person and every Member of the Senate will reject these and other such crass attempts to brand the United States as the real defendant in Havana. Nevertheless, we are deeply concerned over the plight of the nearly 1,200 men now awaiting the verdict of Cuban justice. Our heart goes out to them. We gave them supplies and we helped make possible their training. They sought to free their country from the grip of dictatorship. It was an act of heroism and patriotism.

These facts are well known to all of us. I will not rub salt into old wounds by discussing whether we should or should not have taken this or that course of action. Such speculation belongs to history.

My purpose in speaking today is threefold: First, to remind us that we cannot and will not disavow the brave men captured at Playa Girón last year; second, to commend these men for their honorable and dignified comportment at the mass trial in Havana. They have behaved like brave men. There was no repetition of the Moscow show trials of the 1930's, when the defendants outdid themselves to confess their alleged guilt and to make up crimes of which they were not even accused. No; the brave Cuban exiles have conducted themselves as courageous and dedicated patriots of their beloved Cuba and the cause of freedom.

Finally, I want to add my voice to the chorus of appeals from statesmen and leaders throughout our hemisphere for humane and lenient treatment of the prisoners. In particular, I wish to commend the Council of the Organization of American States for the resolution it passed last Thursday, on the initiative of the Foreign Minister of the Dominican Republic, appealing for a just and impartial trial.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record, at the conclusion of my statement, this resolution together with the note of March 27 of the Dominican Secretary of State for Foreign Relations, Mr. Bonilla Atiles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is particularly fitting that the Dominican Republic should have taken this humane initiative. It is a country which only recently has freed itself from a dictatorship of the right different only in form, and not in substance, from the totalitarian dictatorship of the left now governing its sister Republic of Cuba. No one should know better than the Dominicians themselves the truth of the saying that "men forgive what they have lost on the field of battle, but never what they have lost on the scaffold."

For the sake of the prisoners and their relatives, for the sake of justice and respect for international law, Premier Castro should take these words to heart while he ponders the sentences to be imposed on his 1,179 prisoners.

Exhibit 1

Trial of Prisoners of War by the Government of Cuba

(Resolution adopted by the Council at the special meeting held on March 29, 1962)

The Council of the Organization of American States,

Considering:

The grave concern in all sectors of the American community over the trials that the Government of Cuba has begun of the prisoners of war captured at the time of the expedition at Playa Girón; and

The note that the Secretary of State for Foreign Relations of the Dominican Republic addressed to the Chairman of the Council March 27, in which he requests the making of an "appeal to public opinion and to the conscience of the peoples of America to aid in insuring to those prisoners, taken in an act of war, all of the measures that might assist in their defense, and very particularly those that refer to the impartiality with which they would be tried in regularly constituted courts and surrounded with the legal guarantees that are recognized as indispensable by civilized people,"

Resolves:

1. To express, on behalf of the governments and peoples of America, its strong hope that these trials may be conducted with the strictest respect for human rights, and hence that the accused may be given the guarantees and resources established in the laws of this hemisphere.

2. To acknowledge the contribution that the governments have made or may make, individually, toward achieving the humanitarian aims sought through this resolution.

3. To express its gratitude to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights for the keen interest it has taken and is taking in the fate of the prisoners whose trial has begun.

March 29, 1962.

Note Addressed to the Chairman of the Council of the OAS by the Secretary of State for Foreign Relations of the Dominican Republic

Delegation of the Dominican
Republic to the Organization
of American States,
Washington, March 27, 1962.

Mr. Chairman: I have the honor to address you for the purpose of requesting that a special meeting of the Council of the Organization of American States be convened in conformity with article 9 of the regulations of that body, in order to submit to its consideration, in compliance with instructions that have been given to me by the President of the Republic and of the Council of State, a matter of the greatest importance and urgency.

The matter to which I refer relates to the fate of the prisoners captured by the Government of Cuba on the occasion of the expedition at Playa Girón in April of last year. In view of the imminence of the initiation of the trial by the Government of Cuba, the Government of the Dominican Republic wishes to make a motion to the Council of the Organization that, in harmony with the lofty principles that gives form to the inter-American system and taking into account the standards of modern international law, it address an anxious appeal to public opinion and to the conscience of the peoples of America to aid in insuring to those prisoners, taken in an act of war, all of the measures that might assist in their defense, and very particularly those that refer to the impartiality with which they would be tried in regularly constituted courts and surrounded with the legal guarantees that are recognized and indispensable by civilized people.

Thus it is not a question of any action by the Council of the Organization of American States that might in any way affect the respective positions taken by the governments with respect to the case of Cuba, but simply and plainly that, in view of the high status of that body and with all of its moral authority, to call attention to the grave concern of the peoples of America for the destiny of those prisoners.

As our people eagerly desire social justice it is necessary for them to react whenever they look upon the uncertainty of the life and freedom that are its basis. It is impossible for the Dominican people, who suffered in their own bodies the brutalities of the Trujillo tyranny, which had no respect for the life of the invaders of Puperón, Constanza, Estero Hondo and Maimón, to remain impassive before what could happen in Cuba, and they therefore make this fraternal appeal to the peoples of America through their representatives at the Organization of American States.

Accept, sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

J. A. Bonilla Atiles,
Secretary of State for Foreign Relations of the Dominican Republic.

VISIT BY PRESIDENT GOULART OF BRAZIL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the visit to this country by President Joáo Goulart of Brazil has strengthened the ties of friendship which have long bound our nations and peoples together. We extend our sincere thanks and good wishes to President Goulart and the people of Brazil.

President John F. Kennedy's return visit to Brazil this fall will, in turn, underline our appreciation of those ties, and recognize the great Brazilian Republic's role of leadership in this hemisphere with her example of adherence to the most civilized principles of democracy.

President Goulart, before a joint session of the Congress, demonstrated his administration's understanding of the purposes and prospects of the alliance for progress. His remarks show Brazil's determination to move forward in our hemispheric efforts for freedom and social justice.

President Goulart emphasized Brazil's adherence to Western democracy and her right to chart her own course in world affairs in accord with those principles, a right we recognize as sovereign and basic. He restated Brazil's desire for disarmament and peace, and indicated support for the disarmament controls necessary to assure progress toward these ends.

I was pleased by the joint communique issued by the two Presidents and their declaration of support for a program of fair compensation for public utilities transferred to Brazilian ownership; and we note the program to assure opportunity for reinvestment in other segments of the Brazilian economy and the encouragement of investment and industrial developments.

The Presidential communique underscored their support for a Latin American Free Trade Area, and a world price stability for coffee, both achievements which would do much to strengthen and quicken the economic development toward which the alliance for progress is directed.

The visit of President Goulart has provided the opportunity for frank and useful exchanges of views between other officials of the two Governments. I mention in particular the opportunity for discussion of mutual foreign policy interests with Foreign Minister San Tiago Dantas and for talks with Finance Minister Walther Moreira Salles on Brazil's economic and financial problems.

Close cooperation between the United States and Brazil on all international matters is of vital interest to both countries and the Western Hemisphere. The official visit of this friend from Brazil has served the cause of mutual understanding and hemispheric unity. President Goulart, by his humble and friendly manner, has gained the respect and admiration of the American people.

We appreciate the candid, direct words of President Goulart, knowing this to be the manner of the closest of friends. We are able to take from his frankness a greater understanding of Brazil's problems, and our own.

The Brazilian leader's visit here has been characterized by openness of expression, mutual understanding, rededication of basic principles, and obvious devotion to the kind of progress both our citizenry wish and demand. I submit that no better indication of the great similarity between our peoples and countries is possible, and that we of the United States of America are grateful for this dramatization of an enduring friendship upon which we rely, and which we value greatly. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the communique of President Kennedy and President Goulart be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the communique was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of Kennedy-Goulart Communique

The meetings of the President of the United States of Brazil and the President of the United States of America during the past 2 days have been marked by a spirit of frankness, cordiality, and mutual understanding. During their talks the two Presidents examined relations between their two countries with respect to topics of worldwide and hemispheric, as well as bilateral, concern. On the conclusion of these extremely fruitful talks, they agreed to publish the following joint communique:

They reaffirm that the traditional friendship between Brazil and the United States has grown through the years as a consequence of the faithfulness of the Brazilian and the American peoples to common ideals of representative democracy and social progress, to mutual respect between the two nations, and to their determination that both Governments work together in the cause of peace and freedom.

The two Presidents declared that political democracy, national independence and self-determination, and the liberty of the individual are the political principles which shape the national policies of Brazil and the United States. Both countries are joined in a worldwide effort to bring about the economic progress and social justice which are the only secure foundations for human freedom.

DISARMAMENT DISCUSSED

The Presidents discussed the participation of their countries in the Geneva disarmament talks and agreed to continue to work to reduce world tensions through negotiations insuring progressive disarmament under effective international control. Resources freed as a result of such disarmament should be used for peaceful purposes which will benefit peoples everywhere.

The two Presidents reaffirmed the dedication of their countries to the inter-American system and to the values of human dignity, liberty, and progress on which that system is based. They expressed their intention to strengthen the inter-American machinery for regional cooperation, and to work together to protect this hemisphere against all forms of aggression. They also expressed their concern that political crises in American nations be resolved through peaceful adherence to constitutional government, the rule of law, and consent of people expressed through the democratic processes.

The Presidents reaffirmed their adherence to the principles of the charter of Punta del Este and their intention to carry forward the commitments which they assumed under that charter.

They agreed on the need for rapid execution of the steps necessary to make the Alliance for Progress effective—national programing to concentrate resources on high priority objectives of economic and social progress; institutional reforms, including reform of the agrarian structure, tax reform, and other changes required to assure a broad distribution of the fruits of development among all sectors of the community; and international financial and technical assistance to accelerate the accomplishment of the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

The President stressed the important role which trade unions operating under democratic principles should play in advancing the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

EACH STATES PURPOSES

President Goulart stated the intention of the Government of Brazil to strengthen the machinery for national programing, selection of priorities, and preparation of projects. President Kennedy indicated the readiness of the U.S. Government to assign representatives to work closely with such Brazilian agencies to minimize delays in project selection and the provision of external support.

The Presidents noted with satisfaction the effective cooperation of the two Governments in working out an agreement for large-scale U.S. support of the Brazilian Government's program for development of the northeast of Brazil. They expressed the hope that this program would provide a fruitful response at an early date to the aspirations of the hard-pressed people of that area for a better life.

The President of Brazil stated the intention of his government to maintain conditions of security which will permit private capital to perform its vital role in Brazilian economic development. The President of Brazil stated that in arrangements with the companies for the transfer of public utility enterprises to Brazilian ownership the principle of fair compensation with reinvestment in other sectors important to Brazilian economic development would be maintained. President Kennedy expressed great interest in this approach.

The two Presidents discussed the efforts which the Government of Brazil has undertaken for a program of financial recovery, aiming at holding down the cost of living and assuring a rapid rate of economic growth and social development in a context of a balanced economy. The Government of Brazil has already taken significant action under this program.

The Presidents agreed that these efforts, effectively carried through, will mark an important forward step under the Alliance for Progress. The Presidents welcomed the understanding recently reached between the Brazilian Finance Minister and the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, under which the United States is providing support for the program which has been presented by the Government of Brazil.

In order to promote the expansion of Latin-American resources, the two Presidents indicated their support for the Latin-American free trade area and their intention to speed its development and strengthening.

The two Presidents discussed the major aspects of the problem of raw materials and primary products. They decided to give full support to the competition of a worldwide agreement on coffee, which is now in process of negotiation. They will jointly support representation to the European Economic Community looking toward the elimination of excessive excise taxes which limit the sales of such products and custom discrimination which reduces the ready access to European markets for the basic products of Latin-American origin.

In conclusion, the two Presidents agreed that their exchange of views had confirmed the close relations between their two Governments and Nations. President Kennedy reaffirmed his country's commitment to assist the Government of Brazil in its efforts to achieve its people's aspirations for economic progress and social justice. The two Presidents restated their conviction that the destiny of the hemisphere lay in the collaboration of nations united in faith in individual liberty, free institutions, and human dignity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to an address by President Goulart, of Brazil, on March 23, 1962, prior to his visit to the United States, delivered at the American Chamber of Commerce luncheon, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSLATION PRESIDENT GOULART'S SPEECH ON MARCH 23, 1962, AT AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LUNCHEON

The honor that the American Chamber of Commerce bestows on me, at this time, inviting me to participate in this luncheon in which its members, on the eve of my trip to the United States, are entertaining me with so much cordiality and so much esteem, is a manifestation that greatly moves me and for which I wish immediately to express my gratitude.

I understand the scope and meaning of this gathering. And as if I were already on the threshold of your great country, to which, despite specific differences that separate us, we are bound by ties of the most expressive tradition of good neighborliness, I will invoke your customary objectivity in order to use with you that direct, frank language that should be characteristic of the tone of relations between friends who wish and need to continue being friends.

Opposed by temperament to the language of protocol, I prefer the dialog of charity and sincerity, even though it may seem, on superficial examination, less diplomatic and less courteous.

I assure you that the Brazilian Government neither nourishes the least prejudice, nor cultivates any kind of preconception of ill will toward those who represent or defend the interests of foreign capital.

Personally, I see in you gentlemen intelligent men of business who invest capital in our country and who, naturally, must obtain adequate remuneration for the financial resources so employed in order to cover the risks that you run. This is a matter of business, and it is a right that we fully recognize. But just as we acknowledge and are grateful for the pioneering activity of the great commercial complexes that help us to conquer and expand our internal market, introducing and diffusing new methods and new relations between buyer and seller, in the distant corners of our country as well as in the capitals, we are opposed to those who come and isolate themselves from the fellowship of the Brazilian community and try neither to understand nor to interpret our feelings and aspirations.

With regard to investments, it is also natural that they be protected by guarantees in order that they may be applied on a growing scale. In sum, we wish to give to businessmen the tranquility they need in order to work. In the same way, this tranquility must be maintained in an effective manner for Brazil, for the progress of our country.

What you gentlemen cannot fail to consider also, and I am certain that you do it, is the matter of what is suitable to our country, which should always be in the forefront.

We believe that investments should be selected in the joint interest of Brazil and the investors, rigorously guaranteed, but also directed, with regard to their end result, to the path of what is most in keeping with our development policies. And in this connection it is certain that I would be neither truthful nor sincere with you if I were to tell you that, as a Brazilian and as the man having responsibility for the government, that I place every proposed type of investment on the same plane. A proposal, for example, to establish an industry to produce knickknacks, or some merely intermediary or speculative activity on the one hand; and on the other, some basic or necessary economic enterprise in which your know-how and your resources may fill the empty spaces of production indispensable to progress—these cannot represent the same thing.

I acknowledge that, in classic terms, it is very logical for the investor to insist on his preference for the activity that will render him the most profit and that, to this end, he will try to employ his capital in such a way. We must all understand, however, that Brazil must reserve to herself the right to establish her own rules and that so long as she offers security, tranquillity, and profit potential to foreign investment, she must not forgo her prerogative to direct it in accordance with her development needs.

Gentlemen (Americans or whatever other nationality you may be)—and I wish, in the awareness of the responsibility of my office, to make this declaration in the most unequivocal manner—you may be sure that there does not exist any attitude of suspicion or prejudice toward the entry of foreign capital that is sincerely disposed to help us in the fight for our economic emancipation.

With regard to the return of capital to the country of origin, or the remittance of profits, all you gentlemen should bear in mind that this had to do with an operation that involves important national interests and that, therefore, it is not possible to proceed in a disorderly fashion. We have the sincerest concern about assuring guarantees to capital, in order that it continue with us, that it become a part of Brazil and remain here in the fight for our national development.

It is for this reason that in relation to this problem I spoke up in the last message that I sent to the Congress with respect to the need for a statute defining and insuring the limits for action of foreign capital, and appealed for the finding of a just solution in the interest of Brazil. And such a solution will be that which seeks to eliminate xenophobia toward outside resources and elements that collaborate honestly in our economic life, and also prevent exploitative action against our economy itself, which wishes to help and to be helped, but will never again be colonized.

My conviction is that this is the best way to find a common denominator that will be a stimulus to foreign capital that will always and truly represent support and incentive to Brazil and its progress. We wish the investor to be comfortable in our country, that he become wealthy, but that his enrichment result in, above all, the enrichment of Brazil and that it never represent our impoverishment. I know that this is your feeling also.

Another point that I feel the obligation to take up at this meeting is that which refers to the sector of public services.

We have had in the past the collaboration of foreign know-how, business capacity and capital, directed particularly to the sector of the carrying out of such services. Water supply and sewage systems in the large cities, railroads, electric power, streetcars, harbors, navigation, telephones, and many other public services in this country were the products of the pioneering spirit of foreign enterprises which came to settle in Brazil and brought here skills and capital for the stimulation of our progress through the process of public service concessions. It is not to be denied that that process, in which private initiative and the public authority contracted to cooperate for the best provision of services indispensable to the public, marked the first great experiment in the joining of public and private efforts toward the realization of great tasks, and that it produced fertile results.

The truth forces us to confess, nevertheless, that the evolution of circumstances contributed to the system's ending by exhausting itself, leaving behind broad, vast areas of misunderstanding and friction among public opinion, concessionary authority, and the concessionaires, and by a very natural phenomenon of transference, poisoned the very relations between our country and the foreign governments, especially the one most represented in this area, that of the United States.

Now is not the time, at this luncheon, to analyze the causes that led to such a situation, among which the most dispassionate analyst would emphasize, principally after the abandonment of the so-called golden clause that was the attitude necessarily taken in defense of legitimate national interests by the great President Getulio Vargas, the disharmony between rate schedules in an expanding inflationary economy and the incontestable disinterest on the part of capital and investors in the amplification of these services, with the loss of their capacity to expand and meet the development needs of the country. From all this resulted the situation that may be corroborated by anyone who examines it. Enterprises that played a significant role in the economic history of our country are today frozen in sectors fundamental to our development without the possibility of attending to the needs of our expanding economy and a growing clientele for public services. Services and enterprises, therefore, begin to deteriorate and become continually more deficient.

No one can deny in good conscience that, save for rare exceptions, public service concessions in general work badly in Brazil, work inadequately and insufficiently.

And although it is admitted that the rates that they collect are not the most favorable, the truth is that the people, ill-served, retain their right to proclaim that they pay dearly, in relation to their purchasing power, for bad service.

You gentlemen know that I and many others responsible for national policy have made such statements from public rostrums. And I did not change when I became President; on the contrary, my conviction of the need for a solution to just popular complaints in this important sector was reinforced.

I am not a man to retreat from my positions when I believe them to be right and when I believe that they reflect the popular interest. But neither do I wish, as one of those responsible for national tranquillity, as Chief of State, to cause you uneasiness or panic, which would only aggravate common difficulties in the present and in the future.

In sum, gentlemen, I wish to be faithful to my past and to my convictions. I wish to meet the interests of the people halfway, without ever betraying my freely assumed commitments to them. I am certain, however, that these popular yearnings can be satisfied without provoking inadvisable reactions here or abroad, especially in the countries, the men and the groups which have invested or will invest in Brazil. I believe that here, too, we can and must find a common denominator that, while keeping in the foreground the interests of Brazil, will not ignore those of concessionaire enterprises.

Without bluster, but facing up to important national interests, we can meet the people halfway, without trampling on those who live in our country and invest their capital here. If those public services, for various reasons, can no longer discharge their task of giving the public good service, if the companies themselves maintain that they are not obtaining satisfactory results, and since we wish that the capital that is now here continue here in untroubled areas where it can make its maximum contribution to national progress, it will not be difficult to agree upon a solution, which satisfying important national and popular interests, will not creat difficulties or injure investors or capital whatever their country of origin. And especially, gentlemen, when such questions involve the interests of two countries, which, because of their identification with the democratic ideal, have in this hour more than in any other an obligation to avoid misunderstandings and clashes in their daily relations, as is the case with the United States and Brazil, the problem that presents itself is a simultaneous summons to the capacity for decision on the part of those governments, to their good sense, and to the capacity to understand on the part of the interested parties.

I am sure that you will understand my language as that of a man of his times who, interested in preserving his ideals of a convinced democrat, knows that he can establish a dialogue of such a kind with the present Government of the United States, submitting himself to the perception and sensitivity of a leader of the new generation who so many times has called for the formation of a world community, where freedom of decision will exist, where men can live in accordince with their own wishes, in conditions which will allow them to amplify their economic opportunities and increase social justice, and where the nations can make their own decisions within the framework of their own cultures and traditions.

In line with this understanding, I am certain that the Brazillar Government and people, whose democratic maturation has been well proved in recent times, will be able concretely to demonstrate that they value and welcome, under conditions of security and incentive, foreign investment that comes to cooperate with us, as well as the investors themselves, who will be considered our friends, and who will be requited.

In accordance with this orientation, convinced that relations between states only flourish in the measure that the respective peoples understand and incorporate them in the roots of their feelings, I can assure you that, as for me, I will spare no efforts to the end that, through eliminating obstacles, frank language, without subterfuge, will lead the people of Brazil and the people of the United States to an identity of aims in the field of their mutual interests, since both, each in its own way, need no more than an effort to demonstrate that they believe in the democratic ideal as the irreplaceable instrument of action among free nations.

Gentlemen, with sincerity in our aims and without hidden motives, let us work together for the future and for the greatness of this country which wishes to see you tranquil, which wishes to see you involved in the fight we are carrying out for the development and emancipation of our country—which wishes to see you tranquil in our Brazil, which wishes to see you ever more a part of our life, of our society, and of the extraordinary effort we are making for the development of this country, which also wishes to see its country and its children with a better life, wishes to see its children independent, within a country ever more sovereign, free and independent.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO FILE REPORT DURING RECESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee may be authorized to file its report on the Peace Corps bill while the Senate is in recess or adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced for appropriate reference, an administration bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Agency to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas. I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bill lie at the table through April 10 so that other Senators who wish to cosponsor the measure may do so.

Mr. President, this bill represents an important effort to carry on the beginning that was made last year with passage of the Housing Act to help develop, as the President stated:

> The comprehensive and balanced urban transportation that is so vitally needed, not only to benefit local communities, but to

assure more effective use of Federal funds available for other urban development and renewal programs.

In his message to Congress President Kennedy said:

> To conserve and enhance values in existing urban areas is essential. But at least as important are steps to promote economic efficiency and livability in areas of future development. In less than 20 years we can expect well over half of our expanded population to be living in 40 great urban complexes. Many smaller places will also experience phenomenal growth. The ways that people and goods can be moved in these areas will have a major influence on their structure, on the efficiency of their economy, and on the availability for social and cultural opportunities they can offer their citizens. Our national welfare, therefore, requires the provision of good urban transportation, with the properly balanced use of private vehicles and modern mass transport to help shape as well as serve urban growth.

It goes without saying that this legislation is the result of intensive and painstaking study by the administration, Members of Congress, independent consultants, and interested organizations and individuals. In addition the Senate and the House have conducted extensive hearings on the subject for the last 2 years. And, finally, the legislation bears the imprint of the knowledge acquired by the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the administration of the $75 million grant and loan programs enacted by Congress last June as part of the Housing Act.

I am sure the Members of the Senate remember, with a strong sense of personal loss, the contributions made by the late distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Styles Bridges. As chairman of the Republican policy committee, Senator Bridges joined last year in sponsoring a forerunner of this legislation, S. 345, and in his statement to the Banking and Currency Committee during hearings on the bill, Senator Bridges said:

> I trust that before this session of the Congress is concluded we shall be able to say that in the field of domestic problems one of the most aggravating and serious was that of mass transportation and that this Congress recognized it and passed legislation necessary to alleviate this important and critical problem.

Were the Senator still with us today, I believe he would agree that the problem remains most aggravating and serious. I, too, hope that before the 87th session of Congress comes to a close, we will be able to say that we have passed legislation necessary to alleviate this important and critical problem.

THE URBAN HIGHWAY PROGRAM

To fully understand the critical importance of the urban transportation problem, it is necessary to examine the Federal interstate highway program. It seems to me that one of the most important facts is that about $20 billion of the $41 billion program is scheduled for urban highway construction. For example, a total of $2.7 billion in Federal aid has been authorized since 1953 for interstate highway construction projects in the Washington metropolitan area. A total of $106 million has been authorized for the Cleveland metropolitan area. In Boston the figure is $84 million. Atlanta is getting $78 million. Seattle is getting $61 million. For Los Angeles, $411 million. For Houston, $101 million. For Minneapolis, $124 million. And so on down the list of metropolitan and other urban areas across the country.

Now this program of urban highway construction is vitally essential to meet a whole variety of needs—national defense, interstate commerce, the afternoon shopper, the traveling salesman, the doctor who must use his car, for the movement of truck freight in the metropolitan area, for countless commercial purposes, for visits to the suburban homes of friends, for weekend vacation travel, and for rush hour commutation of people who, because of the location of their homes or their place of work could never be adequately served by mass transportation service of any kind. In addition urban highways will be necessary in many smaller and even large metropolitan areas to provide the right-of-way for express bus service where grade-separated transit is not feasible. The existence of the highways, of course, will not guarantee the provision of adequate express bus service, but they will make it physically possible.

But despite the wide range of needs urban highways can and will serve, it is becoming increasingly clear that there is one mammoth problem that highways and automobiles alone cannot hope to meet, except at prohibitive cost or without profoundly changing the face and function of the metropolitan area, and in particular the central city. That is the morning and evening rush hour travel from home to work.

And it is largely this 20-hour-a-week rush hour need that has forced the allocation of $20 billion of the $41 billion interstate program for urban highway construction.

For example, here in Washington, a 4-mile stretch of Shirley Highway is going to be widened from four to eight lanes at an estimated cost of $20 million. The reason is simply that this highway is a nightmare of traffic congestion 2 hours in the morning and 2 hours at night. The rest of the day, the road operates at just over one-half of its practical capacity, which in turn is substantially less than its maximum possible capacity. And at night you could almost use the highway as an auxiliary landing strip for the National Airport.

As another example, there are now six bridges crossing the Potomac, with two more on the way by 1965. All of these bridges are extremely overcrowded during rush hours, but even the most congested, Key Bridge, operates at about half capacity the rest of the day. Similar examples can be found in practically every other urban area in the country.

The point, of course, is not so much that our urban highways are underused except during rush hours, but the social and economic implications of attempting to meet rush hour traffic demands exclusively by highways and automobiles, especially where modern mass transportation can provide a feasible alternative.

URBAN HIGHWAY COSTS

In the first place, urban highway construction is extremely expensive, averaging between $5 million and $20 million a mile in built-up areas. For example, the 15-mile inner loop proposed for the Nation's Capital will cost $300 million. In Philadelphia, a 22-mile highway along the Delaware River will also cost $300 million. In Boston, a 12-mile turnpike into the downtown area will cost $180 million. And to build the proposed highway, scarcely more than a mile long, across lower Manhattan will cost $100 million. In contrast, this $100 million which will provide just a little more than 1 mile in Manhattan might provide 50 miles or more of highway in the outlying suburbs or around the metropolitan fringe or between cities where in the not distant future these highways will be badly needed and where people will be extremely dependent on their automobiles to get around.

But the per-mile cost of highways in heavily built-up urban areas is not the only problem. After you build the highway, it then becomes necessary to improve and widen the local street system to handle the cars pouring off the limited access artery. This, plus the highways themselves, creates tremendous problems of family dislocation. As the President noted in his message, the interstate highway program is displacing 15,000 families and 1,500 businesses every year. I understand that this is about the same number as are being displaced by the urban renewal program. Then there is the loss of parks and trees along the street and other amenities so essential to a livable urban environment. Air pollution increases, and the city's tax base dwindles as tax ratable property is replaced by nontaxable concrete and asphalt. And when you get all through, you still have the gigantic problem of finding places for all the cars to park—a job which is not only very expensive, but which also carves away the very commercial and cultural attractions that caused the demand for access in the first place.

To give an indication of downtown parking costs, the Washington Post recently observed:

> The $2.46 million civic center garage in Brooklyn, N.Y., provides space for 693 cars at a cost per space of about $3,556. The $4 million Grand Circus Park garage in Detroit holds 1,125 cars at a cost per space of around $3,902. The $4.1 million Auditorium Plaza in Kansas City has room for 1,050 cars at a cost per space of $3,905. The $3.2 million Mellon Square garage in Pittsburgh has places for 890 cars at a cost of about $3,636 per space. The $8.3 million Grant Park garage in Chicago has room for 2,100 cars at an average cost per space of about $3,952.

And, of course, the prize example is the garage proposed right here on Capitol Hill which, as the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has pointed out, will cost $41.9 million for some 1,900 cars. This averages out to a handsome price of $22,089 per parking space.

Lastly, there is the question of traffic control costs. Last fall New York City started a program to alleviate traffic congestion in the area of Manhattan south of 20th Street. According to a report in the New York Times, the project "involves a central control room that receives reports of developing traffic congestion from policemen in 15 radio cars, 15 men on motorcycles and 1 police helicopter."

It perhaps should be pointed out that there are more policemen working to reduce traffic tie-ups in lower Manhattan than there are people in the entire Federal Establishment working on the problem of improving mass transportation throughout the country.

CARS UP, TRANSIT DOWN

But this is not the end of the story, because in the background are two trends which may well turn what is now a very serious problem into a full-scale crisis. One trend is the rapid rise in automobile ownership. At present there are about 70 million registered vehicles in the United States. In 15 short years, this number is expected to rise to well over 115 million, with most of the increase occurring in the metropolitan areas. In fact in many areas the cars are multiplying faster than the people. In itself this is fine, but it could become a first-class catastrophe if, lacking any mass transportation alternative, it becomes necessary for more and more people to use those automobiles to get to and from work each day.

And this possibility is becoming more and more likely because the other important trend is the equally rapid decline and deterioration of mass transportation service. In fact in the last 10 years, ridership on all forms of mass transportation has declined 38 percent.

However, it is important to point out that most of this decline has occurred during the offpeak hours and on weekends. Rush-hour ridership has held up very well, and is turning upward in many areas. As a matter of fact, grade-separated transit is beginning to show an absolute increase in ridership and bus ridership seems to be leveling off from its previous decline.

PEOPLE WILL RIDE TRANSIT

In the few areas where positive efforts have been made to improve transit service, the results have been very impressive indeed.

The New York subway system, which is undertaking a modernization program, had an increase of 20 million riders last year over the year before.

Several years ago, the Boston & Albany Railroad, down to about 3,000 riders a day on its Highland branch line, was petitioning strenuously to eliminate all its service. The Boston MTA took over the 11-mile line, linked it up with the subway system, turned it into a rapid transit-type operation, provided some fringe area parking, and now the line is pushing the figure of 30,000 riders a day, despite the fact that it does not operate on exclusive right-of-way.

In 1959, Philadelphia, one of the real pioneer cities in the field of mass transportation, entered into a contract with the Pennsylvania Railroad to provide more frequent service at lower fares on a line running out to Chestnut Hill. This Operation Northwest, so-called, proved so successful, increasing ridership 30 percent and reducing by 400 the number of cars coming into the downtown area each day, that similar operations were instituted on other lines, and equally successful increases in ridership occurred. The program has been so successful, in fact, that the suburban counties are becoming interested in joining with the city in extending the new improved service out beyond the city line. All told, the five experimental operations are now carrying 6.2 million riders a year—an increase of 44 percent in ridership over pre-Operation Northwest years.

Chicago can point to two significant developments. The first being the almost unprecedented phenomenon of a railroad making money on its commuter service, although I understand that recently the service has begun slipping back into the red with the opening of a parallel highway. The railroad is the Chicago & Northwestern, under the aggressive and farsighted leadership of its chairman, Ben Heineman, who is providing modern, clean, and courteous service to the commuter and an even more important service to the city of Chicago. The second development was the construction of a rapid transit line in the median strip of the Congress Street expressway. This line, which is operating at only 25 percent of capacity is already carrying more rush-hour traffic than the highway itself, which is operating at full capacity at rush hour.

Thus, there is no question that mass transportation can and does provide an absolutely essential rush-hour service.

WHY TRANSIT IS ESSENTIAL

The reason this service is essential is simply that the alternative costs would be staggering. For example, the American Municipal Association has estimated that if the five cities of New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and Cleveland were to lose just their rail commuter service it would cost $31 billion with 30-year, 4 percent financing to build the highways necessary to serve a comparable number of people.

And in addition to the direct alternative costs, there would be all the indirect but related social and economic costs that I discussed earlier.

In study after study, the same conclusions have been reached.

Here in Washington, an extensive transportation survey found:

> By 1980, under a dominant transportation system, 12 to 18 lanes would be required to carry traffic from the Capitol to Wheaton. The Inner Loop would require 14 lanes. Several other corridors would require more than eight lanes. Not only would the cost be great but excessive damage would be done to residential communities and to the character of the central area of the Nation's Capital. These findings led to the conclusion that, in the absence of substantially improved public transit, the highway system needed to serve the projected traffic volumes is hardly feasible from the engineering standpoint, and is certainly out of the question from the viewpoint of desirable regional development.

During Senate hearings on mass transportation legislation 2 years ago a representative of the Georgia Department of Commerce testified:

> In Atlanta, the northern portion of the expressway currently has 6 lanes, but has traffic sufficient to warrant 16 lanes. By 1970 this need will have jumped to at least 36 lanes. By no stretch of the imagination is it physically or financially possible to build such a facility.

That is why, as the President put it, "Our national welfare requires the provision of good urban transportation, with the properly balanced use of private vehicles and modern mass transport."

That is why we must have transit as well as highways, using each to their greatest natural advantage.

THE PROBLEM

The problem, however, is twofold.

In the first place, private bus, transit and rail carriers are finding it increasingly difficult to break even, much less make a profit, on a 20-hour-a-week basis. And if they cannot break even, they cannot stay in business. The railroads are especially burdened with heavy capital costs for facilities and equipment. But even bus companies are plagued by similar problems, as illustrated by the difficulties of the Fifth Avenue Coach Line in New York City, which is similar to problems faced by bus companies in hundreds of other cities across the country, large and small. Caught in the squeeze of rising capital and operating costs, and declining patronage, the private carriers, bus and rail, must resort to raising fares, trimming service, and deferring maintenance—which simply drives away more riders, and accelerates the downward spiral.

This may be all right from the standpoint of the carrier, but it deprives a large segment of our population, which does not have direct access to an automobile, of an essential service, and of course it puts enormous strains on the community to provide alternative service.

Parenthetically, it is worth noting that in 26 metropolitan centers with populations of 500,000 or more, about 40 percent of the households do not own cars. To all the people who are too young, too old, too poor, or too infirm to have access to a car, mass transportation is quite important.

The only solution to the downward spiral I have mentioned is the injection of public funds to bridge the financial gap standing between the transit carriers and the needs of the community.

THE FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY

But at this point a second problem arises. When State or local governments begin searching for an answer to a particular traffic problem, they are faced with the overwhelming powerful economic fact that in most cases they need put up only 10 percent of the cost for a highway solution. Whereas they must contemplate bearing 100 percent of the cost of a transit solution, whether it involves improving a rail line, buying a new fleet of buses, providing fringe area parking, establishing a downtown distributor system or whatever.

Obviously this situation is not conducive to the establishement of a balanced urban transportation system, utilizing transit where it is logically needed and using a highway where it is logically needed.

There are, of course, a number of other reasons why this problem involves a considerable measure of Federal responsibility.

For one thing, the problem of providing adequate mass transportation service has long ago spilled over local political jurisdictions. In fact it has spilled over a good many State boundaries. Some 53 of our 200-odd metropolitan areas either border on or cross over State lines. The financial difficulties of the State and local governments are even more acute than the jurisdictional difficulties. Most of our cities are faced with rising service costs and declining tax bases. State and local debt has risen 15 times faster than Federal debt since the war.

And finally there is the very great national importance of traffic congestion. It has been estimated that traffic jams cost the Nation about $5 billion a year in time and wages lost, extra fuel consumption, faster vehicle depreciation, lower downtown commercial sales, lower taxes, and so forth. It is also clear that traffic congestion discourages private investment in central cities, and thereby makes the task of urban renewal that much more difficult and costly. The former mayor of Philadelphia, for example, testified last year that Philadelphia businessmen told him that they would be willing to invest $500 million to $600 million over their present plans if they had some assurance that something would be done about traffic congestion. Officials of a nonprofit organization here in Washington called Downtown Progress, who are attempting to revitalize the downtown area, have frequently stated that the key to their efforts is the construction of the proposed rapid transit system.

Traffic congestion also adds to the cost of moving freight in the metropolitan area, because trucks have to compete for clogged street space with the automobile. Who knows how many truck drivers simply park on the outskirts of the metropolitan area and wait until the rush hour is over? Those who do come straight in are faced with incessant stops and starts, which are not only time consuming but extremely expensive. I understand that some trucking firms have set up depots at the fringe of the metropolitan areas, where truck loads are divided into smaller vehicles which can maneuver more quickly and easily in traffic congestion. This, too, adds to the total cost we must all pay for our goods and materials.

Safety is another factor. In fact it was one of the primary factors that led to president of the Standard Oil Co. of California to endorse the ambitious San Francisco rapid transit program, because use of the highways during rush hours exceeded the limits of reasonable safety. And, of course, the more accidents that occur, the steeper the insurance premiums become.

And last but not least there is the intense irritation and frustration I am sure we have all felt when we get caught in a traffic jam. If for no other reason than to provide a little better peace of mind for the automobile commuter, I believe this legislation is warranted.

BENEFITS OF TRANSIT

Looking at the other side of the coin for a minute, I firmly believe that a program of assistance to improve mass transportation service can significantly help alleviate traffic congestion and reduce total urban transportation costs. At the same time, I am confident that any expenditure for mass transportation will more than pay for itself in many different ways. I mention Mayor Dilworth's testimony, and there is even more concrete evidence of the beneficial effect of transit improvements on property values.

Toronto is the only city in North America actively engaged in the construction of a rapid transit system at the present time. In 5 years since the opening of the subway line there, assessed valuations along the route rose 17 percent more than in the city as a whole and this amounted to a difference of $88 million in assessed valuation. With the same tax rate, the tax yield from this increase was $4 million, which was enough to amortize the annual debt service on the project.

But I should emphasize that the ability of transit to improve property and commercial values is not limited by any means to the downtown areas of central cities.

TRANSIT VITAL TO SUBURBS

With proper planning, transit as well as highways can be as great a boon to the suburbs as to the central city. It can be a vital positive tool to help curb suburban sprawl, which profits no one, and help structure better patterns of suburban development. A good illustration of how this might work can be seen in the year 2000 plans for the Washington metropolitan area.

In an effort to curb the present aimless, haphazard and inordinately expensive sprawl that characterizes current development at the fringe of this metropolitan area, the planners and officials have recommended a so-called corridor plan, with future development radiating out from the present fringe in five or six corridors, separated by wedges of open space. More compact and economical development in the corridors would be encouraged by placing high-speed rapid transit and highways down the centers of the corridors, like spokes on a wheel, tying the suburbs to the central city. With this kind of development, suburban officials might have some hope of providing necessary school, utility, police, and other community services at considerably less cost than would be possible under a pattern of widely scattered, low-density development. And with these rapid transit and highway arteries, industry locating out in the corridors could be assured of access to a labor market throughout the metropolitan area.

I think it is important to point out that the bulk of the population increase is occurring and will continue to occur in the outlying portions of the metropolitan area, and it is increasing much too fast for the central cities to cope with anything but a small fraction of it. And with the population increase will come commerce, industry, and public services of all kinds.

This fact, combined with the growing capacity of residential, commercial, and industrial developers to lay out whole new communities in one fell swoop, offer unparalleled opportunities to coordinate transit and highway systems with these land-use developments to create new suburban environments with a vastly higher level of diversity, variety, comfort, efficiency, productivity, and attractiveness than we have ever been able to achieve before.

This is why highways should not be the sole concern of the highway engineer and why transit should not be the sole concern of the transit operator. There is a great challenge here as well to those who are vitally concerned with housing, urban renewal, community facilities and the urban environment generally to achieve the kind of urban society commensurate with 20th century standards.

PROBLEM OF THE SMALL TOWNS

Mr. President, my comments so far have been directed primarily to the medium- and larger-sized urban areas. But it would be a mistake to conclude that mass transportation is a problem of concern only to those larger areas. Part of the problem is that the larger cities usually command more national publicity. But I recently came across an editorial from the Fairmont, W. Va. Times. The editorial, commenting on a fare increase by the local bus company, noted that "more than 100 bus companies have been forced out of business in West Virginia within a little more than 10 years. Only 28 are still in operation, counting both city and suburban lines. Between 1955 and 1959 alone, the number of passengers hauled on West Virginia local lines dropped 35.3 percent."

What has happened in West Virginia has been happening throughout the country.

The American Transit Association, which represents about 80 percent of all the bus and transit service in the United States, compiled statistics showing that exactly 145 transit companies have completely abandoned service since 1954. The figure is much larger for the period going back to the end of World War II. These abandonments have occurred in such cities and towns as Little Rock, Ark.; Alhambra, Calif.; Denver, Colo.; Middletown, Conn.; Pocatello, Idaho; Kankakee, Ill.; Wichita, Kans.; Hannibal, Mo.; Great Falls, Mont.; Tulsa, Okla.; and so on down the list.

In addition, another 150 companies have been sold in the same period, for a total of about 350 companies sold or abandoned since 1954. In some of the cities, the service has been restored, but almost invariably at a greatly reduced level, accompanied by higher fares and reduced wages. In 83 cases no replacement has been made at all.

The American Transit Association estimates that there are about 60 cities of 25,000 population or more which have no public transportation service at all. Many of our smaller cities and towns are experiencing rapid rates of growth, and they are beginning to taste the first bitter fruits of traffic congestion. But growing rapidly or not, these cities and towns all have a sizable portion of their residents who have been seriously inconvenienced by the loss of public transportation service. And, of course, there is always a need for standby or emergency public transportation service.

This legislation is designed to help assist in the solution of mass transportation problems wherever they occur, in large cities or in small, and I believe the legislation will be equally beneficial to both.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Without going over the bill section by section, I would like to comment on a few major provisions of the bill. The legislation places primary reliance on grant assistance, supplemented by the existing loan program. There are several reasons for this. In the first place, any effort to meet the problem exclusively with a direct loan program would involve a much more serious impact on the Federal budget than the proposed matching grant program. In the second place, many highly desirable projects that might be assisted would not be sufficiently self-supporting to make a loan useful and would require a grant to fill the gap. Thirdly, a large direct loan program would tend to preempt rather than encourage private commercial investment, which is absolutely essential to the success of this program.

It is important here to describe how the grant program would work. In general, it would be similar to the urban renewal grants. In other words, the grants would be designed to trigger the desired private investment. They would not apply to the total cost of the project, just as the urban renewal grants are limited to the cost of reducing the price of land to the point where private redevelopment becomes financially possible.

In this case, the Federal grant would share only two-thirds of the net project cost—that is, that part of the project cost which cannot be financed from revenues.

To give an actual, and I believe typical example, the Delaware River Port Authority recently received approval to begin construction of a 12-mile rapid transit line between Philadelphia and the Camden suburbs. This project will cost about $50 million. One-half the cost, or $25 million, will be covered by the issuance of bonds supported by the estimated revenue of the system. The port authority is making a grant of the remaining $25 million out of its surplus funds.

If those surplus funds had not been available, the project might have been financed by a Federal grant of $16.5 million and a State or local grant of $8.5 million and the grants could be further spread over the construction period, which is usually several years.

Thus the Federal grant would not be two-thirds of $50 million, but two-thirds of $25 million. I believe, therefore, that the amounts requested in this bill, while by no means excessive in terms of the magnitude of the job to be done, will be adequate to stimulate an enormous amount of progress throughout the country in a field I believe is in urgent need of help.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

There being no objection, the section-by-section analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION BILL OF 1962

SECTION 1

Short title: Section 1 of the bill would provide that it may be cited as the "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962."

SECTION 2

Findings and purpose: Section 2(a) of the bill contains a finding by the Congress which describes the increasing concentration of the Nation's population in urban areas, which generally include several local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States. It would declare that the deterioration or inadequate provision of urban transportation facilities, intensified traffic congestion, and the lack of coordinated transportation and other development planning is jeopardizing the welfare and vitality of urban areas, the satisfactory movement of people and goods within such areas, and the effectiveness of housing, urban renewal, highway, and other federally aided programs.

Subsection (b) of this section would state that the purposes of the act are (1) to assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods; (2) to encourage the planning and establishment of areawide urban mass transportation systems needed for economical and desirable urban development; and (3) to provide assistance to State and local governments and instrumentalities thereof in financing such systems, to be operated by public or pr.vate agencies as determined by local needs.

SECTION 3

Federal financial assistance: Section 3 of the bill would authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make grants or loans, subject to limitations in the bill, to assist local public bodies in financing the acquisition and improvement of mass transportation facilities and equipment. These could be used in urban mass transportation service or in coordinating such service with other urban transportation. Terminal facilities, rights-of-way (but not public highways), buses and other rolling stock, and other needed real or personal property would be eligible for assistance. The loan authority in this section would be limited to the unused amount of the present $50 million mass transportation loan authority.

Although an applicant for a loan or a grant under this section would have to be a public body, it would not have to operate the transit facilities and equipment itself. The applicant could, for example, acquire buses and lease them to a private transit company, or it could contract with the private transit company for the company itself to acquire the buses and operate them according to an agreed-upon program. Title to such buses could remain in some cases in the hands of a third party, such as in an equipment trust transaction.

In all cases, however, the applicant public body would have to have satisfactory continuing control over the use of the property acquired or improved and, together with any private transit company or other associated parties, would have to have satisfactory legal, financial, and technical capacity to carry out the proposed project.

Also, the Federal assistance could not be used for operating subsidies. An assisted project would have to consist of the provision of new, or the improvement of existing, transit facilities and equipment.

SECTION 4

Long-range program: Section 4 of the bill would set forth the terms and conditions regularly applying to the loans and grants authorized under section 3. Except as provided in the emergency program described below under section 5, no such loan or grant could be provided unless the Housing Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are needed for carrying out a program, meeting criteria established by him, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area.

This does not mean that such a program has to set forth a specific schedule for a series of detailed projects, which together would comprise a complete transportation system for the urban area. Urban planning and development, especially in metropolitan areas where many jurisdictions may be involved, is inevitably very complex and must be carried on as a continuing and evolving process. It does mean, however, that a transportation plan must have been prepared which sets forth the basic framework of the highway network and the mass transportation system needed for the urban area, that the proposed project is needed for this mass transportation system, that there is a program for the establishment of the system, and that the system will be administered either by one agency or by officially coordinated agencies. Also, the proposed transportation plan itself must have been prepared by an organization, or officially coordinated organizations, carrying on a continuing areawide program of comprehensive planning, under which comprehensive plans for the urban area have already been prepared in sufficient detail to provide a satisfactory basis for the highway and mass transportation plans.

Section 4(a) of the bill would authorize the immediate appropriation of $100 million for grants under section 3 of the bill for fiscal 1963, $200 million for fiscal 1964, and $200 million for fiscal 1965. Advance or progress payments could be made on account of any such grant.

Where the planning and organizational requirements described above are met, section 4(a) of the bill would authorize the Housing Administrator to provide Federal grants in accord with a formula which is designed to take into consideration the availability of revenues to meet debt service on proposed projects, and is also designed to require the locality itself to provide a matching grant in addition to any revenue financing for the project. These Federal and local grants would be based on the net project cost of the project, defined as that portion of project cost which the Housing Administrator ascertains cannot reasonably be financed from revenues. A Federal grant could be made for up to two-thirds of this net project cost.

The locality would be required to provide the remainder of the net project cost from sources other than Federal funds and—by the definition of "net project cost"—other than anticipated revenues. This would ordinarily be done through the issuance of bonds based on the taxing powers of the local government, transit authority, or other local public body. If this local contribution were later reduced by the use of surplus project revenues then a corresponding refund would have to be made to the Federal Government in the same proportion as the original Federal and local grant. Surplus project revenues could instead be used to reduce fares or increase service, if the locality so chose.

Section 4(b) of the bill would specify that, where the planning and organizational requirements described above have been met, loans may be made under section 3 of the bill subject to the same restrictions and limitations (set forth in section 202(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955) that apply to the present temporary mass transportation loan program. These provisions establish the interest rate according to a formula which presently produces a rate of up to 3⅝ percent, permit loans to be amortized over 40 years, provide for deferral of up to 50 percent of the interest on a loan for up to 10 years in certain cases, specify that loans shall be made only where financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms, and require that the loans be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure repayment. The unobligated balance of the $50 million authorization for loans under the present temporary mass transportation loan program would be made available, without expiration date, solely for loans under section 3 of this bill.

Section 4(b) would also specify that such loans are to be available only for projects for which no Federal grant is made under section 3. It is expected that, in the case of projects for which there are matching Federal and local grants, those grants would be made sufficiently large to provide the coverage necessary for the revenue-based portion of the financing to be obtained on reasonable terms in the private market. Federal loans would therefore be authorized only for projects which can be entirely financed from revenues, without any Federal and local grants.

SECTION 5

Emergency program: Section 5 of the bill would provide that, until July 1, 1965, loans and grants could be made under section 3 of the bill in emergency situations even though certain of the regular planning requirements in section 4 had not been met. These emergency loans and grants could be made where (1) the program for the development of a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system is under active preparation although not yet completed, as required by section 4; (2) the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought can reasonably be expected to be required for such a system; and (3) there is an urgent need for their preservation or provision. An example of such a situation would be where adequate land-use and other comprehensive development plans have not yet been prepared for an urban area or where a general urban transportation plan for the area, coordinated with such development plans, has not been completed, but the proposed project would assist an existing transportation system which in all probability will continue to be needed and which is in urgent danger of losing needed rights-of-way or in urgent need of modernization. Emergency loans would be made under the same terms and conditions as regular loans, including the prohibition against a loan for a project receiving a grant.

The emergency Federal grants would be for one-half rather than two-thirds of net project cost. In the case of such an emergency grant, the local contribution would therefore have to be one-half of net project cost. However, if a project did meet the full planning requirement within 3 years from the time of such a grant, section 5 provides that the project would then qualify for an additional grant equal to the difference between a two-thirds grant and a one-half grant—i.e., an additional grant of one-sixth of net project cost.

The same proportional refund provisions would apply to these grants as to a regular two-thirds grant.

SECTION 6

Research, development, and demonstration projects: Section 6 of the bill would authorize a research, development, and demonstration program for all phases of urban mass transportation. Demonstration grants could be provided under the new program without the present restrictions against grants for over two-thirds of project cost or for major long-term capital improvement. Research and demonstration projects could also be carried on directly by the Administrator, or through other Federal agencies, public or private institutions, or individuals, as appropriate. The unobligated balance of the present $25 million demonstration grant authority would be made available to finance such projects, plus up to $30 million of the new $500 million grant authority under section 3.

In carrying out these provisions the Administrator would be authorized to request and to receive any appropriate data or information, from public or private sources.

SECTION 7

Relocation requirements and payments: Section 7(a) of the bill would require, for any project assisted with a loan or grant under section 3, that an adequate relocation program is being carried on for families displaced by the project, and that an equal number of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings are being provided in areas of comparable desirability and convenience, at prices which the displaced families can afford.

Section 7(b) of the bill would authorize relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced from projects assisted with a loan or a grant under section 3. No local contribution would be required for these grants. They would be financed from the Federal grant funds authorized to be appropriated in section 4 of the bill. These payments would cover otherwise uncompensated reasonable and necessary moving expenses and actual direct losses of property except goodwill or profit. Payments could be up to $200 in the case of an individual or family and could be for a fixed amount. Payments could be for up to $3,000 (or, if greater, the total certified actual moving expenses) in the case of a nonprofit organization or business concern.

SECTION 8

Coordination of Federal assistance for highways and for mass transportattion facilities: Section 8 of the bill would provide that the Housing Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce shall consult on general urban transportation policies and programs and shall exchange information on proposed projects in urban areas.

SECTION 9

Interstate compacts to implement comprehensive urban planning: Section 9 of the bill would amend section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 to broaden the advance congressional consent now provided in that subsection for interstate compacts or other agreements relating to urban development. Section 701(b) now provides only for the establishment of agencies or for other cooperative interstate efforts relating to comprehensive planning. The proposed amendment would provide also for the establishment of agencies or for other cooperative efforts in carrying out mass transportation or other urban development programs.

SECTION 10

General provisions: Section 10(a) of the bill would apply, to activities carried on under this bill, certain administrative provisions found in section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950. These include the prevailing wage and overtime provisions in section 402(b) of that act, under which prevailing wages, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accord with the Davis-Bacon Act, and time-and-a-half for overtime, would be required to be paid to all laborers and mechanics employed on projects assisted under this bill.

Section 10(b) of the bill would—

1. Define "States" to mean the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States;
2. Define "local public bodies" to include municipalities and other political subdivisions of States; public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States; and public corporations, boards, and commissions established under the laws of any State; and
3. Define "Administrator" to mean the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Section 10(c) of the bill would set forth a general authorization for appropriations of funds necessary to carry out all functions under the act, with the exception of loans under section 3, which are to be financed through the existing Treasury borrowing authority. Funds appropriated for other than administrative expenses would remain available until expended.

COMMERCIAL SPACE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on March 29, 1962, the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly began hearings on the antitrust and monopoly aspects of the various proposals to establish a commercial space satellite communications system.

Our opening witness was the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] who made one of the most brilliant statements that I have heard in a long time. He explained in clear and concise language the many considerations that should be thoroughly studied before any decision is made to give away hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to a private monopoly.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR RALPH YARBOROUGH BEFORE THE SENATE ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPACE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Chairman, it is an honor to appear before this distinguished subcommittee this morning as it begins another in its great series of inquiries in behalf of the public interest. I think it entirely appropriate that this Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee should begin to gather evidence on the monopoly implications of the great new potential business of communications by earth satellites. We are at the brink of another great forward step in communications technology; now is the time to determine to what extent we wish Government policies to encourage true American business competition in this new enterprise. Let me stress that this is a new venture, a turning point, as were the Panama Canal, or the Atomic Energy Commission in their inception. We have here no established pattern either of Government ownership or private ownership that should be followed; instead we must rationally determine the best course, and follow it.

ONLY ONE SYSTEM

Technical and economic factors indicate that for the foreseeable future there will be only one satellite communications system for commercial use. For this reason it is inevitable that there will be a national monopoly in the field of satellite communications. It must be borne in mind that we are not confronted with a choice between Government ownership and private competitive free enterprise. The question which Congress must decide is whether we are to have a satellite system owned and operated by the Government for the benefit of all the people or whether we are going to turn this vast potential resource over to a private monopoly to be operated primarily for the financial benefit of a relatively small segment of the population—a favored few.

Let me emphasize here that the question is not one of being for or against the participation of the existing communications companies and equipment manufacturers in this great technological venture. We will need their help, their great technical competence and experience, to obtain the maximum benefits from a communications satellite system. We will welcome their partnership as they freely compete for business, but the question is who will have economic control, who will reap the cream of the returns on the major investments already made and to be made.

GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT

A workable satellite communications system is possible only because of vast expenditures of taxpayers dollars. By the end of fiscal 1963 NASA and the Department of Defense will have spent more than $470 million on satellite communications alone. Estimates of the cost to the taxpayers of our space program to date run as high as $25 billion. Without these billions that have been spent on the space program, our communications technology would be of little value.

John H. Rubel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, has said:

"About 90 percent, I would say, of the problem associated with the communications satellite system really doesn't have much to do with communications, Mr. Chairman. It has to do with launch vehicles, it has to do with spacecraft that you put into orbit, it has to do with controlling those spacecraft when they are up there in orbit, it has to do with the life of electronic and mechanical equipment in space. All of these are technologies and techniques that are being developed by the Department of Defense, partly as part of our communications satellite efforts, but not exclusively so * * * I just can't imagine that this kind of effort could successfully be undertaken by any organization other than both the NASA and the Department of Defense."

There has been some confusion as to the role played by private companies in the financing of research in the field of space communications. So that there can be no mistake on this matter, I would like to refer to a recent statement of Dr. E. C. Welsh, Executive Secretary of NASA. He stated:

"The taxpayers have financed in excess of 90 percent of this space communication competence."

Regardless of any decision which may be made relating to ownership the Government will continue to carry out research and development that is essential to a satellite communications system. James E. Webb, NASA Administrator, recently testified as follows:

"It is contemplated that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will continue to do active research and development on the technology involved in using communications satellites and the tie-in with communications satellite systems.

"The (communications) industry is not capable of doing the research that we do. For instance, these boosters are very expensive, and the only way you really find out if equipment works is to send it on a rocket out and put it up and work it."

U.S. expenditures on our space program for the next 10 years are expected to be in the range of $35 billion, including our project to put a man on the moon. And even the space research involved in our moon shot will be directly related to our understanding of space communications problems.

Clearly the American people as a whole have supplied most of the investment for making satellite communications possible. Advocates of private ownership have expressed views that members of the general public, having made the program possible, should now be allowed to invest additional money in a private corporation in order to share in the profits of a satellite system. The logic of this limited view escapes me. It is my belief that all the American taxpayers who have contributed so much already should receive the benefits of their investment automatically and directly.

GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT

The Government will be deeply involved in the operations of this satellite system. Under both plans proposing private ownership the Government still would be required to—

1. Furnish launch vehicles.
2. Launch the satellites and provide launch crew and associated services.
3. Consult with the private corporation regarding technical specifications for satellites and ground stations and in determining the number and location of such facilities.
4. Coordinate continuing governmental research and development with the activities of the private corporation.
5. Insure that the satellite system established is technically compatible with existing facilities with which it will interconnect.
6. Insure that present and future access to the system on an equitable and nondiscriminatory basis is made available to all authorized communications carriers.
7. Preserve competition in the field of supplying goods and services to the corporation.
8. Supervise any change in the internal structure of the private corporation.
9. Insure that opportunities are provided for foreign participation in the system.
10. Insure that the corporation provides communication services to areas of the world where such services may be uneconomical, if it is determined that providing such services would be in the national interest.
11. Regulate the ratemaking process.

The plan advocating the more widespread ownership also provides for extensive State Department supervision of foreign negotiations.

With so much essential governmental involvement, why should the system be turned over to a private monopoly?

ONE COMPANY DOMINANCE

If a private corporation is created to own the satellite system, it will be dominated by A.T. & T. Senator **KEFAUVER** has appropriately described the position of A.T. & T. among the communications carriers as that of an elephant dancing among the chickens. But this is no ordinary elephant we are dealing with. This is a very, very large elephant. It has assets of approximately $25 billion; equal to those of General Motors, Standard Oil of New Jersey, and United States Steel combined. Twenty-five billion dollars, an amount equal to one-twentieth the gross national product of our entire United States or one-twelfth of our total national debt.

I make these comments not out of prejudice against this company, or the individuals who run it; I am sure they endeavor to operate in the public interest so far as their nature as an organization operated for profit will permit. But however benign this near monopoly, we cannot rationally expect them to act other than in the historic economic pattern of monopoly.

Under the plan which limits ownership to communications carriers, dominance by this corporate giant is clearly inevitable. Its size alone would be sufficient to insure dominance, but there are additional factors. First, it will be the major commercial user of the system. Second, the other carriers are dependent on this corporation for oversea and other long-distance cables.

An alternative plan relies on the possibility of broader participation in the ownership in the hope of avoiding this dominance. The hope is illusory. As a technical matter there is nothing in the proposal to insure that there will be widespread private ownership. Dr. Welsh, Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, has testified that the communications carriers are expected to put up the biggest part of the necessary investment. Mr. Nicholas Katzenbach, of the Department of Justice, pointed out that there is no assurance that money will be forthcoming in substantial amounts from sources other than the carriers. He stated that if this is the case "the carriers will in fact control the corporation with token investments in class A stock and make the bulk of their investment in class B, or in some other securities which are issuable under section 304(c) of the bill. Under these circumstances the administration proposal would result in substantially the organizational form proposed by the Kerr bill, and supported by the telephone companies."

The problem is still deeper. Assuming as we must that the carriers will put up a substantial portion of the investment needed by any private satellite corporation, widespread distribution of the remaining stockownership would merely facilitate control of the corporation by a smaller percent of the ownership interest.

It is highly probable that the single largest investing carrier would be capable of dominating a private satellite corporation even without a single director on the board. This would be possible because of (1) its power to supply and withhold necessary investment funds, (2) its extensive use of the system, and (3) the dependence of other carriers on this giant monopoly.

Thus, the alternative plan does not escape the problem of dominance by a single private monopoly. It is impossible to avoid the problem under any plan where the satellite system is owned by a private corporation.

If the satellite system is to be put on a sound economic basis, it must operate at or near capacity. In statements advocating ownership of a private corporation in proportion to use, Mr. Dingman, executive vice president of A.T. & T. commented on the extent of his company's use as follows:

"We would figure that on a usage basis we would have to put up 75 to 80 percent of the investment of the satellite."

If that corporation were to withhold its use of the system, relying instead on its own facilities, a private satellite corporation would necessarily have to charge rates so high that users of the satellite system would not be able to compete with it. This is entirely possible, for the FCC has no power to require any carrier to use the satellites.

A Government corporation, with the public interest as its primary motivation, would be able to set rates to insure immediate utilization and maximum long range efficiency. Under Government ownership, the satellite system can be operated in a way that will stimulate competition in the communications industry. If the Government owns and operates the system, it can lease the facilities to all communications carriers on an equitable and nondiscriminatory basis, thus making for vigorous competition among the communications carriers.

This would accord with our historical attachment to competitive principles and our deep-seated hostility toward monopoly. We should avoid any step that would lead to the establishment of a system of monopoly privilege and the eventual eroding away of national sovereignty. A very considerable amount of competition is possible here and it is my firm belief that we should make all practical use of competition. That is the real way to have free enterprise.

PROCUREMENT

The satellite system will have to buy enormous amounts of equipment. Most of the communications carriers, who are the major prospective investors in the private corporation, are in the business of manufacturing and supplying such equipment.

Under private ownership, the equipment suppliers who own stock in the other corporation will almost inevitably tend to favor their own interests in supplying the satellite corporation. If ownership is limited to the carriers, as proposed under one plan, there will be little opportunity for competition is supplying equipment to the satellite corporation. Chairman Newton Minow of the FCC has stated that "the danger of such abuses is also inherent in unrestricted ownership."

FCC regulation of a private monopoly is inadequate protection in this area since the FCC is not experienced in insuring competitive bidding.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

It is essential that a truly global communications system be developed and made operational at the earliest possible date. Moreover, we must continue to advance the frontiers of scientific knowledge and make maximum use of new discoveries as soon as they are available. Any private monopoly will have an inherent conflict of interest in the rapid development and expansion of the satellite system. Under the domination of a single large corporation there will be a natural tendency for the private satellite corporation to delay the introduction of technology that would render huge investments in existing equipment obsolete. This is normal behavior for a private monopoly, and the problem exists no matter how widespread the ownership may be.

The fact that we have an efficient communications system in the United States today should not be our only standard for judgment. If we could have had a better system through the encouragement of competition in the field of equipment manufacture and supply or among the communications carriers themselves, we, as a nation, are poorer on two counts for not having it: First, the American people have been denied the advantages of an even better system; second, we have needlessly compromised our traditional belief in competition as the most efficient guiding force in a free economy.

ANTITRUST VIOLATIONS AND EXEMPTIONS

Both the plans proposing private ownership will result in a joint venture of companies that are currently supposed to be competing with each other. Through such a joint venture these companies presumably will be able to avoid competition with respect to their communications and manufacturing activities related to the satellite corporation.

As a matter of fact there appears to be good reason for believing that the only reason legislation is necessary to establish a private corporation to operate the satellite system is to grant an exemption from the antitrust laws to the communications carriers.' Testimony before the Senate Space Committee brought out the point that there is apparently nothing in existing law which would prevent a single private corporation from launching its own communications satellite. It would, of course, need a license from the FCC if it wanted to send messages in interstate commerce. There would be no need for special legislation to authorize the granting of an appropriate license.

If Congress is being brought into the picture simply for the purpose of conferring upon the communications carriers the privilege of engaging in anticompetitive behavior under governmental protection, the issue should be clearly presented and discussed in those terms.

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS

International cooperation is inherent in satellite communications technology. From the beginning President Kennedy has pointed out the necessity of using the system to its fullest potential, including cooperation with other countries and the provision of services to economically less developed areas. The establishment of the system will require extensive negotiations with nations through the world on a multilateral basis. These negotiations will be very complex and can only be conducted at the intergovernmental level.

It would be folly to delegate to a private monopoly the duty of shaping and directing American foreign policy in this or any other area.

CONCLUSION

Two plans have been submitted to Congress which propose the establishment of a private monopoly. Although the two proposals differ somewhat in detail, they are essentially one and the same in terms of the ultimate consequences. Justice Department officials have admitted that the status of the proposed private corporation under the antitrust laws is unclear. This problem requires study and consideration in order to clarify the issues.

There is one issue, however, which is perfectly clear now. If the communications satellite system is turned over to a private monopoly, it will constitute the biggest giveaway in the history of the United States.

The profits from an investment of billions of taxpayer dollars will be channeled into the pockets of a relatively privileged few. This shocking and unconscionable result can be avoided by retaining ownership of the satellite system by the Government and thereby insuring that the benefits will be available to all the people.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 5, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 270. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic; and

S. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the previous order, until Monday, April 9, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

How Far Can We Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the current hearings of the Ways and Means Committee on legislation intended to authorize more liberal trade agreements have brought forth many compelling arguments and illuminating statements on the importance of free trade upon the economy of the United States. A point that we cannot overlook, and one that has also been emphasized in the hearings, is the danger of going too far and too fast at the risk of jeopardizing the economy of some industrial areas which already have suffered considerably through the competition of imports from nations which have the wage factor decidedly in their favor.

One of the most enlightening statements in this latter category has been made before the Ways and Means Committee by our colleague, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN, who represents the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut. He has made the point, and I think it is an important one, that it appears the full brunt of a liberalized trade program is borne by districts like the one he represents, which is in the highly industrialized Naugatuck Valley where rubber footwear, plumbers' brass goods, clocks, common pins, and bicycles have been produced in large quantities over the years by skilled workers who have come to recognize from experience the employment and economic problems created by reduced tariffs and increased imports.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include at this point the statement made by Congressman MONAGAN on April 2, 1962, before the Ways and Means Committee.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT, BEFORE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE CONCERNING H.R. 9900, APRIL 2, 1962

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to appear in connection with H.R. 9900.

I applaud the objective of the administration in seeking through this legislation to increase our trade with other nations of the world. Certainly, we want to stimulate that trade and to keep our allied nations economically sound and proof against Communist infiltration.

At the same time, however, we should not liquidate our own industries in order to stimulate imports of foreign products.

It is clear, therefore, that free trade cannot be considered in the abstract, but must be considered in relation to the peculiar conditions of cost and production in the industries affected and the social effects of trade regulation.

I represent a district whose industries have felt the impact of low-cost foreign imports increasingly for many years. When we speak of the effect of broader trade, we speak from experience because this broadening process has been going on for over 10 years.

The industries in our district have been badly hit by imports. The domestic production of watches has practically ceased and the clock industry has been substantially reduced. Imports of rubber footwear have risen from 2 to 52 percent of the domestic market in less than 10 years. The share of our district in the domestic bicycle business has been practically eliminated. One of our local factories has discontinued its manufacture of plumbers' brass goods. Our pin manufacturers have had such difficulty that the Tariff Commission recently recommended the increase of tariffs from 20 to 35 percent. The imports of foreign pins have increased 50 percent since 1957 and presently constitute one-third of the domestic market.

Sometimes it appears that the full brunt of the liberalized trade program is borne in districts like mine. While other sections of the country may benefit, the question must be raised as to the justification for eliminating industries and jobs and creating the very sort of depressed areas for which we legislated in the last session without some idea as to the subsequent balance of business and employment in the country.

The natural effect of reduced tariffs and increased imports has been to close factories and to create substantial unemployment in our section of Connecticut. One of our major cities is an area of persistent and substantial unemployment and another has an unemployment rate sufficient to qualify as such. The largest city in the district, and another of the smaller ones, are presently characterized as areas of substantial labor surplus.

The hundreds of millions of dollars which are spent on production for defense provide a temporary strong economic cushion in other sections of our State, but the prospect of the conditions which would exist if these defense contracts were terminated and the deterioration of our industries through imports allowed to continue, is not a pleasant one to contemplate.

For our typical industries, it is no answer to say that we must increase our imports since the disparity in production costs makes it impossible for our industries to compete on even terms with producers in the Common Market, for example.

Nor is it any satisfaction for us to be told that we will have the benefit of retraining provisions, Government loans, and subsidies. These are cumbersome and, at best, long-range attempts to solve this problem, and they could affect only a small segment of our population.

We prefer to retain the industries and jobs that we have at the present time and we feel that our section has already contributed sufficiently in the liberalization of international trade. The objective of reviving foreign industry after the war has been attained.

The people in my district do not object to the idea of broader trade, but they do object to the uneven character of its impact and to the speed of implementation of this policy.

It is the lack of control over the process of liberalization that is included in H.R. 9900 that gives us most concern. Already, under the provisions of existing law, we have had a steady decrease in business and employment and we have been faced with a consistently increasing wave of low-cost imports from countries whose wage rates are a fraction of ours. We know from experience that even the present escape clause and peril point procedures do not guarantee remedial action and may be disregarded by a President. In fact, these provisions have been disregarded by Presidents of both parties in the vast majority of cases which have come to them for consideration.

I introduced in this session H.R. 8850 which sought to tighten up the peril point and escape clause procedures with the objective of making the findings of the Tariff Commission binding upon the President and with the purpose of broadening the test of injury to domestic industry under which protective action might be taken.

It is my belief that the sections of H.R. 9900 which markedly extend the authorization to enter into trade agreements are much too broad and I believe it essential to the reasonable protection of our industry and employment that these sections be tightened up. Under them, there is no requirement that the President follow the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, and control of trade is further removed from Congress.

I urge the committee to revise H.R. 9900 to place reasonable restrictions upon the authority to enter into trade agreements and I hope that the committee will consider standards of the type set forth in sections 3, 4, and 7 of my bill, H.R. 8850.

I hope that the committee will also consider legislative regulations which will provide for a standard of exclusion of low-wage foreign products which will relate the restrictions on such imports to foreign wage conditions as compared with those in the United States. This method attacks the point where the real conflict exists.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 1028, which gives the authority to make such a determination to the Secretary of Labor upon consultation with the Tariff Commission. However, it is not the method which is important, but the recognition of the fact that it is in the difference between our productive cost, wage rates, and working conditions and those of exporting countries where the real problem lies, and it is to this difference that attention should be directed.

In summary, therefore, it is clear that H.R. 9900 would have a widespread and damaging effect upon business and employment in my district and in the State of Connecticut. I do not want to be parochial about this matter, and I do recognize the need to maintain reasonably free trade, but I do feel that the broad provisions of the proposed bill should be cut down for the adequate protection of the industries which have furnished the economic foundation for our communities for generations. I sincerely hope that the committee will find a formula, perhaps in line with that which I have suggested, which will enable us to move toward the objectives of the President without sacrificing the economic base of many sections of our country.

Remarks of Hon. Robert W. Hemphill Before the Southeastern Milk Marketing Clinic, Chattanooga, Tenn., March 30, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an address before the Southeastern Dairy Marketing Clinic at Chattanooga, Tenn., made by Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Member of Congress from the Fifth District of South Carolina, on March 30. Mr. HEMPHILL is a vigorous, articulate, determined, and persuasive advocate of the views and desires of his constituents. I am sure his views will be of interest to many in this body.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA, BEFORE THE SOUTHEASTERN MILK MARKETING CLINIC IN CHATTANOOGA, TENN., MARCH 30, 1962, AT 9:30 A.M.

Mr. President, my good friend VERNON THOMSON of Wisconsin, members of the Chattanooga Area Milk Producers Association, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to be with you today and feel privileged to be on your program. I could not come to the romantic city of Chattanooga, with all the nostalgia the very name inspires to all of us of privileged southern origin, without paying homage, engaging in admiring salute to a great American, the Congressman from this district, the Honorable JIM FRAZIER. Since I have been in the Congress, I have come to know him as an able and dedicated legislator, and his service inspires, even demands, my respect. I am proud to know him and serve with him.

Since I come from an area in which the production of milk is increasing and the quality is second to none in the Nation, I have every sympathy with your problems; every admiration for your contribution to the food and welfare of this Nation; and to the agricultural economy of your State and region. From a personal standpoint, I am not in the milk production business, but I was taught to milk a cow at a very early age and I reckon with and appreciate the hard work and demanding care incidental to the milk production—a hard way to make a living—and 7 days a week at that.

In this session of Congress, we are again faced with some demand for legislation to impose upon the milk production industry, and especially the smaller producers, the burdens, the regimentations, of Federal control of milk inspection. If the legislation were to pass, Federal control of milk inspection would affect all fluid milk for the simple reason that all milk is either in or affected by interstate commerce.

The proponents of the legislation, and it is significant that they come from one particular area of the country, seek to impress us with the arguments that they wish the high health standards now contained in the U.S. Milk Ordinance and Code to continue. The facts are that this so-called high health standard is accepted in most of the States, especially in our section of the country, and is accepted not as the highest, but the lowest or minimum standards permissible for milk whether in local or interstate shipment.

Under the previous administration we held hearings on H.R. 3840 which sought to legislate and provide that any milk which met the requirements of a Federal milk sanitation code, as promulgated by the Surgeon General under the auspices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, could not be excluded from any State or fluid market in the United States. It was significant that the proponents of this legislation, who, for the most part, with exceptions of those who have been replaced by their constituency, or the proponents of this session of Congress, ignored the years of study and application made by local, county, and State health departments, ignored the high standards which have resulted, and sought to use the interstate commerce approach as a vehicle for a new and unneeded, useless Federal bureaucracy.

When a Member of Congress introduces a bill on any subject, it is referred to the appropriate committee. The clerk of that committee, for the chairman of the committee, writes to each executive agency or department interested and asks for a report on the legislation. I was interested in the reports on this legislation, made under the Republican administration, since that was my first acquaintance with the inequities of this proposed legislation. In 1960, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a bureaucracy anxious to enlarge its powers over milk producers as well as in other fields, favored the legislation because of what it termed "trade barriers allegedly formed by health regulations." The Department of Commerce had the gall to state that it favored the legislation as a "new approach to protect the public from unsanitary barriers." I can only criticize this last as bureaucratic bungling as there was a complete lack of testimony given and expected of any "unsanitary barriers." The Justice Department criticized the legislation because of the inclusion of the term "interstate shippers" which the Justice Department criticized as being too vague and which could include individual farmers, haulers, and some other persons.

The Justice Department ably ferreted the scope of this legislation. If a Federal bureaucracy is put in charge of milk sanitation in this country, every producer will be affected and regimented, and the gradual elimination of the small producer will amount to a question of time.

The Agriculture Department, on April 28, 1960, gave a rather significant report, and I quote from it:

"There is no indication in the findings that public health is endangered under the present system of State and local sanitary inspection. * * *

"We, therefore, question the desirability of using a Federal public health measure and program as an instrument to eliminate or minimize undesirable trade barriers to the interstate movement of milk. * * *

"We seriously question the need for invasion of State and local governments desires, rights and responsibilities. * * *

"Substantial volumes * * * are now moving freely in interstate commerce.

"We are also concerned as to the Federal cost inherent in * * * program * * * we visualize Federal appropriations of a substantial amount."

These observations I have just quoted are significant in our approach today, pinpoint major concerns.

We are fortunate that we are aware of the Russians' failure in agriculture, else we would be plagued with the cry that the Russians are getting ahead of us in milk productions and we need this bureaucracy to stay ahead of the Russians. This vehicle of propaganda is a common source of transportation for weak programs which certain eggheads in Washington seek to create and strengthen by legislation in the Nation's Capitol today.

In 1961, reports under a new administration are somewhat different. The report from the Department of Justice quotes the title of the bill, relating that the act is supposed to protect the public from unsanitary milk and milk products shipped in interstate commerce. The Justice Department does not, however, point out any unsanitary aspects of the various local administrations in the country, but says, "the legislation would eliminate certain barriers to free interstate shipment of milk."

It is, therefore, obvious that the title is wrong and that the legislation is under a false front, a false front of sanitation.

The report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare pursues the hypocrisy. I quote two paragraphs which gives the hypocrisy away.

"This Department has consistently held that health regulations should not be used as domestic trade barriers to the interstate shipment of milk and milk products of high sanitary quality. At the same time, we recognize the public health gains that have been achieved through State and local sanitary control of milk supplies and the continuing need for such control. In accordance with these views, the Public Health Service has long advocated the adoption of uniform milk sanitation regulations which, if correctly applied, would result in safe supplies of milk, and to this end has developed a model milk ordinance and code for voluntary adoption by interested State and local governments. This model ordinance presently serves as the basis of milk sanitation regulations in 36 States and has been adopted by more than 1,900 local jurisdictions.

"Moreover, H.R. 50 has important public health implications. It would assure milk and milk products of high sanitary quality to jurisdictions receiving milk and milk products under its provisions. In many cases, it would lead to improvement in the sanitary quality of the local supply as well. Despite the vast improvement in the sanitary quality of milk that has accrued from State and local milk sanitation programs, there still remain areas where sanitary quality of milk and milk sanitation practices do not meet our presently recommended standards. In such areas, we believe it inevitable that the immunities conferred by the bill, together with the prestige attached to compliance with the Federal standard, would inspire both industry and official milk sanitation agencies to seek the necessary improvements in their own control programs. Consequently, we are certain that the bill would result in added health protection for a substantial segment of the Nation's population."

As legislators, we are concerned that the executive branch of the Government should participate in this endeavor when there is no call from the public. Washington, of course, would direct. Washington could enjoin. Washington would regiment, and Washington would manipulate and the small producers of this country would find themselves unable to compete. That is the objective and that is the purpose and no amount of frills can disguise it.

Has there been any evidence that the local agencies have not done a good job in the area of milk sanitation?

The record speaks for itself: Dr. John Andrews, allegedly representing the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers, had to admit at the 1961 hearings that his State of North Carolina had done an excellent job and that private enterprise in North Carolina was against the legislation.

This idea has some popularity with State public health officers who have been brainwashed by the U.S. Public Health Service. Too many of these State public health officers want to get under the Federal umbrella of high pay, low production, low effort, abundant holidays and substantial retirement. The proponents speak of high inspection fees, yet they would substitute high paid bureaucrats for the present system.

The consumers of milk have made no demand, and I am sure they want no Federal control or interference. It is the consumer who will pay the bill and the consumer who will suffer if the health standards are lowered, local incentive will be destroyed and a general discouragement of State and local attempts will evolve.

Secretary Freeman could not, or did not, name any consumer groups for this legislation when he testified before our committee in August of 1961.

Let us turn briefly to the testimony of Dr. John D. Faulkner, Chief, Milk and Food Branch of Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, when asked by Chairman Harris about the purpose of this bill.

"The Chairman. And that is the only purpose of this legislation, then, is it not?

"Mr. Faulkner. I would say that there were two purposes in the legislation, sir, as I see them. And one would be to prevent the use of health regulations in a way to prevent the movement or obstruct the movement of milk on health grounds when such health grounds were not justified. That would be what I would say would be the primary objective of the bill."

I was amazed to hear, and I quote from page 152 of the hearings, Mr. Ivan A. Nestingen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, make the statement: "There is one point that should be made. When you say that this bill takes away the sovereignty the State has in this effect, the State need not participate under this bill if it does not want to." Such a statement is either deliberately misleading, or smacks of the lack of care as to what might be said to get the legislation, so long as its enactment was procured.

Before you buy the propaganda line, examine carefully the fallacy that the local boards will continue to function as they do now. Examine carefully the rationale that Secretary Freeman, who would shackle the milk industry with marketing orders, was pushing the legislation.

Examine carefully the fact that a majority of the States of the Nation are opposed to this legislation.

Determine whether you would surrender local protection for the purpose of gaining Federal control, if this could be said to be a gain.

I do not believe you want this monstrosity. Leaving aside the question of Federal control, where do we find evidence that the country as a whole will benefit, that you as producers will benefit, or that the consumers will benefit? The facts of the case are against the enactment of this legislation. The jury I am sitting on has so far turned down the proposal. I hope you are against this iniquitous idea and the legislation I have discussed.

Tribute to a Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, there have been many excellent tributes written in regard to the historic orbital flight and personal achievement of Col. John Glenn. America, today, can point to this tremendous achievement and be proud, proud not only of the scientific victory but proud also of Americans like Colonel Glenn who stood recently before a joint session of Congress and humbly said, "I still get a hard-to-define feeling inside when the American flag goes by."

One of the finest tributes I have read concerning Colonel Glenn was written by my friend and colleague, the Honorable Frank Becker, of the Third Congressional District of New York. His article appeared in the April issue of the American Legion magazine, Oceanside, N.Y., and I am happy to call it to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

The article follows:

Tribute to a Hero

(By P.C.C. Frank Becker)

America has a new hero. And what a hero.

I have been somewhat annoyed over the years with our young people when they seemed to hero-worship loose-living movie stars, swivel-hipped singers, and a variety of other "heroes" with questionable credentials, but now the Nation has a new hero who has captured the imagination and admiration of young and old alike. In fact, we have seven heroes.

As Astronaut John Glenn sat in his capsule atop the Atlas missile, each of us vicariously shared his apprehension. Figuratively, each of us shared the cabin with him as he orbited the earth, and what a wonderful feeling of exhilaration we experienced when we learned that he was safely aboard the recovery ship.

It was a great day for America.

Besides the immense pride I have in our Nation's scientific achievement, I have a warm feeling of pride about the kind of man Colonel Glenn is. As a dedicated husband and father, as a man of religious conviction, as a dedicated patriot, as a hardworking member of our Armed Forces, as a man of modesty and humility who shared the spotlight with other members of the space team, Colonel Glenn personifies the best in American manhood.

I have become increasingly concerned over the years that patriotism and honor of the American flag have been on the wane. The feeling seems to be that this kind of sentimentality is "old fashioned" and has no place in our sophisticated society today. I am most happy to report that Colonel Glenn is an "old fashioned" American. In appearing before Congress, this steel-nerved marine said he was glad to see that pride in our country and its accomplishments are not a thing of the past. He said, "I still get a hard-to-define feeling inside when the flag goes by and I know you do too. Today, as I rode up Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House and saw the tremendous outpouring of feeling on the part of so many thousands of people, I got that same feeling. Let us hope that none of us ever loses that feeling."

I jumped to my feet with my fellow Members of Congress and cheered. I, too, hope that Americans will never lose that feeling.

Later, our space hero matter-of-factly told a congressional committee in response to a question, that he had made his peace with God years before he was launched into space.

"I feel we should live all our lives every day as though that were going to be the last day. Now, I fall so far short of this every day that it is pitiful, but we come back and keep trying the next day anyway.

"But * * * my religion is not a fire engine, and not something that I call on in an emergency, and then put God back in the woodwork in His place at the end of a particularly stressful period.

"We try to live every day as best we can, and I think that is the way. I would say the same thing happened on the [space] mission. My peace had been made with my Maker for a number of years, and so I have no particular worries along that line."

Here, indeed in John Glenn, America has a real hero. One we hope all our young people will try to emulate.

Friendship 7's triple orbit of the earth was the high point of a monumental effort which has been going on for many years. Successful performance of the Atlas missile in 1957 was an important milestone. Effort has been intensified since 1959 when the astronauts were selected and began their training.

Now that we have accomplished this important objective, Khrushchev has said that the Soviet Union and the United States should cooperate in our space efforts. Isn't it strange that similar offers made previously by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy fell on deaf ears in the Kremlin? If the Soviets have, in fact, orbited a man around the earth, why didn't Khrushchev make his generous offer to share space data then? Now that he feels we might have some valuable information from which the Soviets would benefit, Khrushchev puts away his club and dangles his "carrot" before the West.

I hope our country will not be gullible enough to be duped into giving the Soviets any of our hard-won space information.

Revenue Act of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with a motion made by Mr. MILLS in relation to the Revenue Act of 1962, granting general leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to submit the following statement:

When the Revenue Act of 1962, H.R. 10650, was debated on the floor last week, I was unavoidably absent. On a motion to recommit, I had a general pair with Congressman ANDREWS, of Alabama, and on final passage I was not paired.

I wish to state at this time that if I had been present, I would have voted "yes" on the motion to recommit and would have voted "no" on final passage.

I believe that there are too many inequities in this bill in its present form and I am unequivocably opposed to this legislation.

News Release From Office of Senator Young of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the contents of one of my recent news releases.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Feeding starving pheasants and other wildlife with Government surplus grains should meet with the approval of just about everyone. Game biologists believe, however, that unless such feeding is undertaken only in long periods of deep snow and very cold weather, it could do more harm than good. I sponsored and secured passage of this legislation last year in cooperation with wildlife interests in North Dakota.

Unfortunately, as is the case with many other worthy programs, it will appear as an expenditure in next year's Department of Agriculture budget although it will only slightly increase this budget estimated at $5.8 billion. It would be more easily understood if the feed costs were charged to the Fish and Wildlife Service. Congress and the Bureau of the Budget insist on the more simple procedure of having the Commodity Credit Corporation pay for all such programs and then be reimbursed by Congress the following year. Many critics of agriculture who list all its expenditures as subsidies to farmers are either unaware of these fiscal policies or do not want to understand them. As a result, millions of people have come to believe that farmers are actually receiving subsidy checks for the entire amount of the USDA budget. The following are a few of the items contained in this budget which are often erroneously charged as subsidies to farmers:

1. Food for peace. (This is for CCC stocks of food sold to hungry nations of the world. We accept their currencies and reloan most of it for development programs in recipient countries	$1,389,000,000
2. Gifts of food for famine relief throughout the world	300,000,000
3. Surplus food bartered for strategic war materiels	250,000,000
4. Loans to REA and RTA (repayment record nearly 100 percent)	370,000,000
5. FHA loans to farmers who are unable to secure credit elsewhere (repayment record of more than 90 percent)	198,000,000
6. School lunch and milk distribution program	271,000,000
7. Surplus food to school lunch and for charitable purposes	235,000,000
8. Sugar program (self-financing from duties and excise taxes)	87,000,000
9. Wool support program (self-financing from duty on imported wool)	70,000,000

While all these huge sums are charged as subsidies to farmers, they are either repaid, self-financing, or of greater benefit to urban people than they are to farmers. The Extension Service with its home economics program and girls' and boys' 4-H work is as popular with urban people as farmers. Soil conservation to assure abundant future supplies of food and fiber is everybody's business.

Agriculture research has been of untold benefit to everyone. It has been directly responsible for reducing the incidence of tuberculosis and brucellosis in humans due to nationwide campaigns to eradicate the disease in cattle, and for developing large-scale inexpensive methods of producing penicillin. From 1947 to 1957, the cost of penicillin was reduced from about $1,400 to $100 a pound. Other results are the development of starch sponge for hospital use which absorbs blood and facilitates clotting and the development of dextran, a vital blood plasma extender, used successfully in Korea as a substitute for human blood plasma to reduce serious incidence of infectious hepatitis. Much of this has now been made a part of our civil defense program.

Agriculture research can claim many accomplishments in the field of producing more healthful and nutritious foods. There is an equally impressive list of accomplishments in the field of utilization research such as the recent development of fast-drying linseed oil emulsion paints of high quality and the many plastics from farm surpluses. There are improved insecticides and weedicides. Through plant breeding research, better and higher yielding varieties of almost every crop have been made possible. This, coupled with the ingenuity, efficiency, and hard work of farmers, has made possible the most abundant supplies of food and fiber at the lowest prices ever attained by any nation in the world.

Tribute to Hon. G. Oberdan Rizzo—Writer, Lecturer, Poet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, amongst our trials and tribulations over domestic and foreign problems, we seldom find time to reflect on the basic American and what has made this country forge ahead. Some of the greatest contributions came from people who were rarely if ever heard from, for their efforts were not accepted or realized until years later when the full value of their contribution was realized.

I therefore bring to the attention of the House today one who merits such plaudits, who is still among the living, a real American who realizes only too well and with much more vehemence the virtues of our country than many who in these days take for granted their heritage.

The man in question is Dr. Gaetano Oberdan Rizzo, who in the 1920's fled from Italy to escape Mussolini's Fascist soldiers and came to this country where he became an American citizen. He has established himself in this country and around the world.

Dr. Rizzo's fame as a writer, lecturer, and poet is renowned throughout the world. For over 40 years he has been a freelance journalist. He is a contributing editor to approximately 50 newspapers and magazines and is the editor and publisher of the monthly magazine Il Mondo Libero, "the free world," a cultural magazine.

Prominent writers such as Robert Mandel have written articles lauding Dr. Rizzo for his significant contribution to the world of literature.

In 1960, the authorities of the University of Puerto Rico requested Dr. Rizzo to translate the five books of the poet laureate of Puerto Rico, Obdulio Bauza, from Spanish into Italian. The publication, Calabria Letteraria, considered the translation more beautiful than the original works.

Many academies, newspapers, magazines and universities have honored Dr. Rizzo with doctorate degrees for excellence in poetry.

The Gold Legion of Rome under UNESCO proclaimed him honorary counsel, presented him with an academic gold medal; the academy Tiberine proclaimed him poet laureate.

Dr. Rizzo has directed his writing talents to informing the peoples of the world of the cultural, social, and economic way of American life. As a direct result of this, he has received hundreds of invitations to lecture on America and also to receive personally special recognition in Italy this year.

He has been invited to lecture at the Rome Exposition, an equivalent of our World's Fair, between May 26 and June 10, 1962.

Casa Materna, similar to our Boys Town, in Portici, Italy, has invited Dr. Rizzo to speak. The International Academy of Nicastro, Calabria, wishes to personally honor Dr. Rizzo for his achievements in poetry as well as bestowing upon him the Grand Collare of a grand knight.

The Chamber of Deputies of the Congress of Italy wish to present a gold medal to him personally.

Those of us who know Dr. Rizzo's contributions in promoting democracy, brotherhood, and humanity, and the cultural and spiritual aspects of life realize how truly deserving he is of such recognition.

Approximately 400 poets, writers, and critics from all over the world have recognized his works by highly praising his significant contribution to the abovementioned causes. During World War II our Government called upon Dr. Rizzo to inform the Italian people about the values of democracy and freedom. He accomplished this through organizing groups, lecturing, and writing editorials.

Through his untiring efforts an orphanage was established in Italy approximately 5 years ago. Italy has honored him on many occasions as a humanitarian poet. He has been awarded the international first prize by the writers academy in Argentina for his poetry because of the humanitarian sentiments.

In October 1961, during the poetry festival in Paris, France, 1 day was dedicated to the reading of Dr. Rizzo's works and General de Gaulle telegraphed his congratulations.

Dr. Rizzo is a modest man in spite of his world recognition as a humanitarian poet, patriot, and civic-minded citizen.

Italians can be rightly proud of his accomplishments and the United States appreciative of his efforts to spread good will and understanding throughout the world through his writings.

The National Lottery of Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House, the Ghana national lottery which was first established in 1958.

The gross receipts in 1961 amounted to $1,200,000 which, considering the size and population of this new nation, was very significant. The net income to this country came to $400,000 which went into the general revenue account.

Ghana is a poor country and a national lottery offers needed revenues which are a help for this small nation.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is a big, rich country which has developed gambling into a $50-billion-a-year industry. Only through a national lottery can we legally cut into this illicit revenue. A national lottery in the United States can pump into our Federal Treasury over $10 billion a year in new revenue which can be well used to cut our high taxes and start reducing our national debt.

Hon. Robert C. Byrd, of West Virginia, Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 26, the District of Columbia Welfare Association honored my good friend, our former colleague in the House, the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia, the honorable Robert C. Byrd.

It was my privilege to participate in the ceremonies. I include as a part of my remarks the brief words I spoke on that occasion:

> People of Washington are very fortunate in having a man of Bob Byrd's caliber, of Bob Byrd's honesty and integrity, as the guardian of their fiscal affairs. I know Bob Byrd's work on appropriations for the District Department of Welfare has been badly misrepresented in some quarters in Washington. What Bob Byrd has been trying to do is what everybody in the past has failed to do—he has tried to find out what happens to the welfare dollar, how it is being spent, whether it is being wisely spent, whether it is going to people who are not deserving as opposed to people who are in real need.
>
> I know that there is always a hue and cry from conscientious people who fear any hard look at welfare, who feel that any probing would "upset the applecart." But if one never picks up the rug to clean out the dust and dirt that might accumulate under it, then one cannot say that one's home is clean. By the same token any fear of lifting the lid on the Welfare Department to see what dust and dirt might have accumulated under it is condoning uncleanliness and unwholesomeness that might be prevalent in the Department. It takes a man of great courage to force down critics who are quick to see evil in any probe of welfare.
>
> Bob Byrd has never been a coward. He has never shirked his duty where he saw his duty to be, and I can tell you that the Department of Welfare will be a better Department, a more efficient Department, a Department better oriented to meet the needs of people who are worthy of relief, as a result of Bob Byrd's action.
>
> The commendation that you are affording Bob Byrd today is one that he richly deserves. His job as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Government Appropriations is in truth a thankless job. I know that he has devoted countless hours to this task; in fact, I know that he has worked far into the night for countless nights, and on countless weekends as well, in order to give the people of Washington the very best kind of fiscal responsibility.
>
> I want to add my voice to those of you here today in commending Senator Robert C. Byrd for his conscientious work in behalf of the District of Columbia government.

Army Reorganization, Its Effect on Chemical, Biological, and Radiological Research, Procurement, and Posture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest rewards of congressional service is the close friendship and appreciation for colleagues with whom we associate in our work. The gentleman from Florida, Bob Sikes, is one whom we all love and respect for his leadership for the welfare of our country. He has particularly served his country well in his knowledge and understanding of defense problems and their solution. Our country is safer today because of the wisdom and leadership that Bob Sikes has given us in the field of defense. It is therefore with pleasure that I insert in the Record the following address by Congressman Sikes, which he made at the Armed Forces Chemical Association dinner, March 6, 1962, and which is found in volume XVI of the Armed Forces Chemical Journal:

Sikes Sees Challenge in Army Reorganization

(Address of Congressman Robert L. F. Sikes, at Armed Forces Chemical Association dinner, New York City)

The subject originally given to me tonight is the Army reorganization; its effect upon our chemical, biological and radiological research, procurement, and posture. Now, that is quite a lulu of a subject. It should effectively scare away all but the most dedicated. However, it appears that this is a subject which should be discussed because this group has a very keen interest in the Army reorganization. This is particularly true because reorganization is to be an actuality. The date for rejection by the Congress already has passed. Therefore, good or bad, the reorganization is upon us

I took the position that there is considerable question about the advisability of such a reorganization. It involves a transfer of 3,500 Army staff officers from their present status to a new status within an 18 months period. The cost is estimated at $11 million with no certainty of savings at some time in the future. With continuing crises in Berlin and in southeast Asia and heavens knows where else in that 18 months period, this seems to me a poor time to engender additional confusion by reorganization. I suspect this is not even the Army's baby, since it was developed by budget officers within the Department of Defense rather than in the Department of the Army. However, the Army, when questioned on this, has been quick to place the blessings of legitimacy upon this offspring by insisting it is indeed an Army product. Now let me talk more specifically about the Chemical Corps and reorganization.

At the present time, the chief chemical officer provides for the decisionmaking level of the Department of the Army the only focal point for direction of the Department of Defense effort toward achieving capabilities in the fields of chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) warfare. The chief chemical officer holds a statutory position established in the National Defense Act of 1920 in recognition by Congress of the requirement for a specific element of the Department of the Army responsible for research and development, manufacture, procurement, and supply to the armed services of chemical warfare material, the organization, equipment, training and operation of chemical troops and such other duties as the President might from time to time prescribe.

Thus, despite the organizational layers above the chief chemical officer in the current organizational structure of the Department of the Army, there does exist now a focal point at the national level for stressing the need for adequate considerations of these weapons systems and defense against them. In addition, he exercises command supervision, centralized direction, and control of a completely integrated CBR organizational structure in the field.

The reorganization as proposed would have eliminated the chief chemical officer and, to me, fractionated the mission and programs of the Chemical Corps. The research, development, and production functions are relegated to the Munitions Command; the field testing and evaluation function is placed within a separate test and evaluation agency; supply and maintenance of these highly specialized munitions and equipment are absorbed in the Supply and Maintenance Command; the responsibility for developing new doctrine, preparing and revising field manuals and tables of organization and equipment prescribing requirements for new material and conducting war games, is transferred to the Combat Developments Command; the training functions, which include specialized Chemical Corps schools, are made a responsibility of the Continental Army Command;, and the career development and management of technical specialists, both officer and enlisted, pass to a consolidated officer of personnel operations. Under this plan, there would have been no provision for monitoring from an overall point of view the CBR mission, functions, and responsibilities.

I fully believe that to follow such a plan for the reorganization of the Chemical Corps could result in its destruction as an effective branch of the service just at the time when its importance is becoming much more widely and fully recognized.

The U.S. Army today is the only military organization of the free world which has a retaliatory CBR capability, limited as it is. The CBR posture of the Department of the Navy and the Air Force is completely inadequate. This situation exists both in our own forces and that of allied nations, and is the direct result of their lack of organizational emphasis on CBR weapons systems and defenses. This is not true behind the iron curtain. There the need for adequate organizational emphasis on CBR matters has been recognized by the Soviet Union, and they do have a significant CBR capability. It is not better than ours, but it is bigger and the Russians have been taught more about defense in CBR.

The Chemical Corps is an organization which requires specialization as much as any other service. To bury this agency under many layers of officialdom could in my opinion spell its death knell. This would be a most serious thing to contemplate if in the future there should be a chemical or biological attack on this country or upon our allies.

Now, quite obviously, those of us who recognize the importance of the Chemical Corps have not been idle. Realizing quite early that such key people as Senator Russell and Congressman Vinson, who head the Armed Services Committees in the Senate and in the House respectively, were not disposed to fight the reorganization as a whole, we saw the necessity for developing alternative proposals insofar as the Chemical Corps is concerned. Almost as soon as the proposed reorganization became known to the public, I personally drafted communications to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and the Chief of Staff of the Army—among others. Possible alternatives were suggested in which the Chemical Corps would be better served and so would the nations. These suggestions were not original with me, and certainly mine were not the only representations made.

I think you will be interested in quotations from the responses which I have received. On February 7, the Secretary of Defense wrote me as follows:

"The matter of the CBR capability of the Department of Defense has been of particular concern to me over the past year. As you know, we have taken steps recently to strengthen this capability. In the fiscal year 1963 budget we have raised research and development to $146 million, from its fiscal year 1962 level of $78 million. We have also added a new Deputy Director (Chemistry and Engineering) of Defense Research and Engineering who will have major responsibilities in this area.

"In our increased emphasis on CBR, we are, of course, building on the well-recognized past achievements of the Chemical Corps. (By this term I mean not only the Chemical Corps as a branch of the Army which the new organization will retain, but the technical service establishment of the Chief Chemical Officer, which will have its functions redistributed.)

"However, I must say that, while in my judgment the Chemical Corps has itself accomplished a great deal in the past, the offensive and defensive CBR capabilities of our Army forces as a whole, as reflected in their actual organization, doctrine, and materiel, seem to me to leave much to be desired. I feel that the CBR know-how and interest which have been maintained in the Chemical Corps have not been adequately infused into the Army itself.

"I attribute this condition primarily to the fact that in the existing Army organization the combat arms of the Army are structurally separated from the technical services, particularly in the critical fields of combat developments, research and development, and training. The object of the new organization is to couple CBR expertise much more closely into the actual process of organizing, training, and equipping Army forces.

"For example, I consider it an organizational improvement that the new Combat Developments Command will take over the present combat development functions of the Chemical Corps. This will assist in providing a more effective CBR input into Army doctrine and organization. Similarly, the fact that the Continental Army Command will take over the present Chemical Corps training function should materially assist in increasing the effectiveness of the CBR training of all our officers, enlisted men, and units—not simply those of the Chemical Corps.

"We are particularly eager to integrate more closely CBR with other Army materiel development. Placing present Chemical Corps and Ordnance Corps materiel functions in one command will certainly facilitate the development and production of those advanced weapons which call for the closest integration of chemical and ordnance technologies.

"Like you, we recognize that the CBR capability of the Army is a national, indeed a free world, asset. We have been concerned from the outset of the studies on Army organization that the CBR asset which has been painstakingly built up within the Army not be adversely affected by this reorganization. However, I think the Army has taken steps to insure that the integrity of this asset will be preserved. The Chemical Corps remains as a branch of the Army, with its officer personnel management separately identified within the Office of Personnel Operations, and its special schooling and training preserved. The Chemical Corps materiel establishment will remain intact as the CBR Agency of the Munitions Command, within the Materiel Development and Logistic Command. As you recommend, there will be established a general officer position, Director of CBR, within the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations. The Army believes that this General Staff position will be more effective than the present position of the Chief Chemical Officer, in assisting the Army in taking fully into account CBR capabilities in all areas of activity.

"In summary, let me say that we agree with you that the invaluable CBR asset which the Army now possesses must be preserved; we believe we not only will maintain but will improve the Army's CBR capability; and we believe also that the capability will be more a part of the Army and the Department of Defense, in reality, than it is today."

The Secretary of the Army responded in a similar vein. In part he said:

"The advisability of the reorganization was carefully considered by the study group that made the initial recommendation and subsequently reviewed by the Chief of Staff, other key staff personnel and myself. I fully recognize the vital nature of the chemical, biological, and radiological (CBR) missions of the Army in support of the Department of Defense and the free world. This recognition is borne out by the decision to establish a focal point within the General Staff for CBR planning and related activities. A separate identifiable element is to be established under the Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations to insure continued emphasis in these matters. The upgrading of this function from Special Staff status to the General Staff level clearly demonstrates the Army's recognition of the importance of CBR.

"Under the new Army organization, the horizons of officers assigned to the Chemical Corps will be considerably broadened by their utilization in the U.S. Army Materiel Development and Logistic Command, the U.S. Continental Army Command, the U.S. Army Combat Development Command, the Army General Staff, and the Office of Personnel Operations in the Army Special Staff.

"But, most importantly, we intend to see to it that the Army's key role in the CBR field is both protected and expanded. The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research and Development will take a continuing and intense interest in this field as will the Office, Chief of Research and Development. The Chief of Staff and I will follow it closely. He and I have had a number of conversations on this subject recently, and we are considering additional possibilities for insuring that the CBR field is exploited to a much greater degree and that the fine talent in the Chemical Corps is utilized to the optimum."

Then, more recently there is word that the Defense Department is considering a plan to establish an Armed Forces Special Weapons Agency to direct CBR warfare. It would parallel the Defense Support Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency. It is the brain child of General Stubbs who sees it as a single integrated organizational element responsible for all aspects for CBR preparedness for the entire Department of Defense. This plan failed to receive the blessings of the Department of the Army, but it has been picked up by Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense, and under his aegis the plan is receiving careful scrutiny at top levels.

NEW LEVEL

So the Chemical Corps is not to be put out of business under the reorganization. Its new level of operations may not be as satisfactory or as successful as the present one. But, a door is opened, an opportunity is presented and if the challenge is accepted, the mission of the Chemical Corps may well have greater importance in the overall scheme of things.

Now, what is the reason for an Army reorganization? To give the Devil his due, there must, of course, be justification. This is not just an idle shift of men and billets. It is patterned somewhat after the Air Force and Navy reorganization of some years back and somewhat after the German General Staff plan. In the words of Secretary Stahr in response to a question from me in congressional hearing:

"The principal purpose is to give us better management, to eliminate or minimize duplications of effort, fragmentations of authority, responsibility and operations, to give us an organization that is more responsive to the needs of the combat troops, to give us a clearer fix of responsibility in a number of major tasks which are now somewhat fragmented.

"One of the basic elements of the concept is to reduce to the minimum the number of operating tasks that have somehow grown up in the General Staff so that they can give more attention to basic planning, programing, policymaking and supervision of the overall Army effort. This means some of the actual operating things which have been done in the Headquarters Department of the Army will be moved to these field commands, which to my mind is a sound organizational concept."

One of the principal reasons given to me for the reorganization is that this will help to put an end to the inexcusable system whereby we require 8 to 10 years to perfect weapons or equipment through design to manufacture and delivery to troops while the Soviets do it in 4 or 5; that it will do this through direct line of responsibility from concept to actuality.

In a word, we have reorganization of the Army and of the Chemical Corps. But we also have assurance from top to bottom that the Chemical Corps is not to be downgraded, buried and forgotten. Even so, this could happen if Chemical Corps personnel allow it to happen. It is up to those of us who recognize the importance of the Chemical Corps to carry our message to Garcia. We are being pushed—not very willingly—out of the shell of our own particular little world. Then let us accept this new opportunity to enrich the broader world of the military services with the leavening of the Chemical Corps.

The story of the Chemical Corps and of CBR is not a familiar one to most people. From World War I until very recent years it has been almost a subject forgotten except in the minds and in the hands of a few dedicated people. In some quarters it became a bad word and there is reason to believe a considerable part of this is due to the skilled work of Communist propagandists who want this Nation weak in defense against chemical and biological warfare. Now the pendulum is swinging the other way. We can keep it swinging. This is the time to fight for the mission of the Chemical Corps.

PROPER DEFENSE

The people of the United States are mentally conditioned to accept 37,000 deaths and many more thousands of injuries from automobile accidents in a single year. The public accepts the fact that millions could be killed in the first exchange of nuclear weapons with accompanying untold destruction. Yet many under the skillful tutelage of dedicated leftwing publications shudder in horror at the thought of the use of chemical and biological weapons—do not even want to consider the necessity of attaining a proper defense against them. Those who saw the devastation and the death wrought in Germany and Japan by conventional weapons even before the day of atomic weapons should shudder instead at the possibility of the repetition of this kind of warfare. I recall, also, that it was largely the American taxpayer who rebuilt the world after the destruction of World War II and who rehabilitated the survivors of that war. The total cost in billions is staggering.

By contrast, chemical and biological warfare can leave a nation with all its resources intact and undamaged. It can leave a nation with its people comparatively unharmed and alive but temporarily incapacitated for fighting. Talk about your humanitarian aspects, what greater contrast can we offer. A bare handful of planes can seed this city with biological agents sufficient to infect the total populace, and so can a half-dozen enemy submarines off our coast or a few dozen enemy agents quietly driving around the city with disease micro-organisms being fed into the atmosphere through the exhaust fumes of their vehicles.

PROGRAMS

CBR has its lethal aspects as well. War is not a humane business. But, by way of emphasizing the human characteristics that I have mentioned, let me tell briefly of two or three particularly significant programs of many which now are under study. Let's talk first about incapacitating agents. These are compounds which have physical or mental incapacitating effects which are of short duration. These agents are not new. Riot-control agents, such as tear gas, also incapacitate. We've used these for years. Chemical compounds which produce incapacitation may be subdivided into two broad classes, those which produce temporary mental incapacitation, in effect, controlling a person's will to resist; and those which produce physical incapacitation such as severe discomfort, amnesia, paralysis, or immobilization for a significant period of time. We have an odorless, colorless compound which can be injected into the atmosphere and breathed, or taken into a person's body through food and water, to so impair a man's ability that for hours or days he could not land a jet, or fire a weapon, or operate a communications system, or give intelligent commands. Men so affected do not win battles.

Work also of great significance is being done by the Chemical Corps Biological Laboratories in the field of molecular genetics. In a brilliant contribution we are told that hereditary information is written into highly polymerized molecules of nucleic acid which are contained in the nucleus of a cell; we know the complete alphabet of letters of the hereditary language; we know how the cell "reads" and obeys, to the letter, the set of hereditary instructions; and we know that the same language is used for all kinds of living things. Insofar as human destiny is concerned, the importance of these scientific findings is without parallel.

This means that scientists now foresee a means to control micro-organisms causing diseases by breeding into the micro-organisms exactly the characteristics that are desired. A strain of a normally virulent disease can be developed which is so mild that it can be used as a virus against the disease. Or a new strain of a disease can be developed which will be immune to known vaccines. Possibly over the long pull some diseases can be bred out of existence. Bacteria can be made more or less resistant to antibiotics. All of this has tremendous significance to the medical profession. Of course, you have long known that the work of the Chemical Corps is not altogether related to the field of warfare. Great contributions have been made through the years to medicine and to public health by the Chemical Corps.

We know how to destroy the food supply of the Communist world—and they know how to destroy ours—but their food supply is highly susceptible because of limitations in supply and variety which we do not have.

Now when you hear a mounting crescendo of horror at this thought—remind your audience that a hungry man can help to overthrow his oppressors, gain food, and a new future of freedom. But a man burned to death with napalm or blown to bits with nuclear weapons has no future.

We live in an exciting age. The spectacular achievements of Colonel Glenn and his associates have given America new pride and new buoyancy. People are looking ahead. We have learned to expect the spectacular, but we have to remember to keep one foot on the ground. Today's great accomplishments are possible because of the values that were established in the long ago. The solid values which make America thrive and endure were founded in the Constitution and engrained in the thinking of our people during the formative years of the Republic. The faith of our fathers and the courage of our fathers gave us this land. But now it is our land and what we do with this land will determine its tomorrow, or whether there will be a tomorrow for America. So, I want to talk for a little while about our country and about the responsibilities that each of us has to it.

RESPONSIBILITIES

In this there is no greater responsibility than that of maintaining the institution of representative government in a nation where citizenship is a high privilege and a serious responsibility. In all the big complex structure which makes up the U.S. Government, the Congress is the only part which is close to the people and is in fact the voice of the people. But whatever the branch of Government—and for effective operation of a democracy the three great branches of government must be separate and coequal—government in a democracy is no stronger or no weaker than the public which it represents. Americans can have whatever government they want if they are willing to work for it and only if they are willing to work for it.

Now, what is it we must be willing to work for? I have indicated that I want this Nation to be strong militarily and that means a strong defense regardless of cost. There are no second-place winners in war. We must have a balanced defense with strength in all categories. We have been too long like a man with one hand tied behind him. Now, with a buildup in conventional war capabilities, we are better prepared to fight with both fists. Mr. Khrushchev knows these things as well as we. For this reason primarily, he has been easier to talk to in recent months.

STRONG DEFENSE

Granted that we will have a strong defense, I am not disturbed by any threat which may arise from abroad if also we make certain that we are strong as a people and strong as a government. There must be recognition by the majority of people of an essential requirement for soundness in government, for a government which sees beyond minority or selfish demands, for a government that can say no when the good of the Nation requires it. There must be certainty that those who produce goods or capital are encouraged to continue to do so; that the worker is a man who prides himself on his skill, a man who is willing to do a day's work for a day's pay, not a man who is a faceless number in a racket-controlled union; that the taxload which must be borne be borne fairly by all for without this we cannot protect this Nation's credit and insure its necessary operations and its defenses. In no other way than these can we retain the self-determination and free enterprise which gives people a choice of government and a good government.

Is there nothing else? Are these all the things that are required? No. The stool has yet another leg. Sometimes, I think it has been the weakest one. This is a requirement for diplomacy which can wield the strength of America for the definite purpose of thwarting and circumventing communism; a diplomacy which can be as effective as we know America's military forces can be effective. This we have not had in recent years. We are still in the process of growing up to the fearsome responsibility of being the leader of the free world's diplomatic forces. We haven't quite learned that when you deal with communism, you are in a fight to the death; that we can't afford to be good to people who really intend our destruction. We simply haven't had a strong enough foreign policy. We fought over Korea—settled for a stalemate and half the country. We watched our allies give away half of Vietnam. The Reds overran half of Laos and now negotiate for the remainder. Cuba went down the drain even though the Communists had to leapfrog 5,000 miles of Western strength—even though we have a strong military base on the island itself. With a record like this, why shouldn't Khrushchev have expected concessions on Berlin?

There had to be a change. In the past year there has been change. It has not been a major change, but change is perceptible.

We have not yielded on Berlin. We are gradually uniting the hemisphere against Castro in Cuba. The Communists have not got the Congo. The Communists have not got Laos. The situation there is dangerous, but better than it was a year ago. There is split between China and Soviet Russia. It may grow and China is in trouble, bad trouble. And, we are growing in strength and in prosperity.

WHY WEAKER?

All of this is but a beginning. There must be new spirit, new determination all along the line in our diplomatic forces. There has been too much business as usual, too much of trying to get along with everybody, hurt no feelings, wound no sensibilities. That is not leadership. Leadership also means kicking the lethargy out of the lethargic; insistence upon quid pro quo from those who are recipients of American aid. If we need to resume nuclear testing in the atmosphere in order not to be surpassed in nuclear weapons capability, then whose business is it but ours? Certainly, we know the Russians have no intentions of talking seriously about disarmament. We have tried time and again to get an agreement. So, why weaken ourselves by waiting and hoping. Leadership means insistence upon a more effective role for the U.N.; a more realistic attitude toward those friends who really stand by us: less generosity with American dollars for the neutrals who work both sides of the street.

This is what America wants. We are not frightened people. We are the descendants of brave men and women who founded a nation and forged its beliefs in blood and steel. American character has not changed. The spirit and the courage and the heritage are here, and with belief in the Eternal God, our people will weather the tests of the future just as we did those of the past. I saw Admiral Burke stand with tears in his eyes as the President pinned one of our highest decorations on him and heard him say: "It is a wonderful thing to live in a country which will give to a simple farm boy the opportunity I have had." This country gives that opportunity to all of its sons and daughters. That is the difference which makes this country worth fighting for. The struggle for freedom is a never-ending struggle. Each generation must earn its own right to freedom. We are an essential part of our generation's fight for freedom.

GOALS

Yes, there is work to be done; work to be done by each of us. And, if the outlook sometimes is confused and the goals on the far horizons hard to define, I like to think of words given to us by Allen Drury who wrote "Advise and Consent."

"In terms of a standard now desperately embattled in the world, one kind of greatness in a nation can be assessed by the answer to the simple question: Are its people free? Freedom, of course, is not an easy thing; it is the most difficult of all forms of government.

"In that testing, the great Republic of the West still stands supreme, battered though she is by the vicious and incessant onslaughts of her enemies and the occasional confusions and wearyings of will of her own citizens. Her freedom is not perfect—but it is a long sight better than that of most of her contemporaries. Her liberties are not everywhere as thorough and complete as they should be—but compared to the grimly laughable mockeries of liberties that go on in Russia and elsewhere, they shine like a tenfold beacon in the night. Her errors are those of the goodhearted; her ineptitudes those of a contender who cannot yet quite conceive of the utter corruptions of the utter evil arrayed against her. She is awkward at times, blundering at times, shortsighted at times, at times hesitant and uncertain and almost willfully stupid. She is, now and again, an object of ridicule to a carping world, and, upon occasion, an object of scorn.

"But she is free.

"Few other nations in this sick and shabby century can make that claim."

I think all that we have said about chemical and biological warfare can be summed up in a statement by Dr. Thomas M. Rivers: "It is a contemplation fraught with terror and with hope—the fear of vast and tragic consequencies if such knowledge is misused, the hope of a better, healthier world within our reach. It is not for the scientists to shrink from the truth for fear of what other men may do with it. Nothing worthwhile in this life has ever been produced through fear alone or by turning our eyes away from that in nature which has been revealed to us. If there is danger in truth, I believe our only safeguard lies in the further pursuit of more of it."

Little-People-to-Little-People Program Is a Hopeful Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I remember that our beloved colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Hon. PETER W. RODINO, JR., spoke to us interestingly earlier this year on a conversation that he had had with his 10-year-old son, Peter. This concerned the possibility of young people throughout the world working together in a little-people-to-little-people program, which would preserve freedom for their generation and generations to come. We are admonished by Jesus that except that we become as little children we cannot enter the Kingdom of

Heaven. There is something special about the outlook of children toward the eternal things of life. Sometimes I feel that children are the only ones who see most clearly the most important things of life. Next to them are perhaps their mothers. We fathers are sometimes very slow to find lasting solutions to the problems which beset mankind.

I want to congratulate young Peter Rodino on his thought that young people in America might help to bring the world together in more peaceful pursuits and in more lasting security and freedom. I wish him every success in this and I have a feeling that perhaps his efforts may be much more important than he can possibly imagine.

I am reminded of the passage of the Peace Corps legislation when so many people seemed to sneer at it and even condemn it as being un-American, while in fact, it has been a very susbtantial aid to America and a very substantial aid to the security and peace of our world.

Good luck, Peter.

To Amend the Peace Corps Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 5, 1962

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I regret that due to circumstances beyond my control, I was unable to be present on April 3, during the debate, to register my strong support for the continuation and expansion of the Peace Corps.

The overwhelming vote by the Members of this body for the Peace Corps is testimony to the growing body of its friends in the House. We are pleased to join the continuing chorus of approval from abroad by the people of those countries who have received these voluntary ambassadors of good will. The record of this program in its first year has been excellent. Its aims, its operations, its administration, its personnel, all reaffirm the wisdom of its establishment. It reminds us that new approaches to international understanding and cooperation can be fruitful and serve jointly the best interests of the United States and peoples abroad.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in the heat and burden of days that drain our strength and demand our best, amidst the clamor of busy cares, we seek a quiet cloister of the soul where spirit with spirit may meet.

We seek that elixir of living water which alone can refresh and restore our bodies and spirits, saving us from physical exhaustion, from spiritual impoverishment, from the numbness of routine, from cynicism and bitterness of heart.

Through the sincere expression of differing appraisals in this Chamber of deliberation, may the final wisdom that charts the Nation's course in these perilous days, yet days big with challenge, be higher than our own.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 5, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS, AS AMENDED—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 385)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 15th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 9, 1962.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3508. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended;

H.R. 4441. An act to authorize the appropriation of $3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations;

H.R. 6682. An act to provide for the exemption of fowling nets from duty;

H.R. 8938. An act to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles; and

H.R. 8952. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3508. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended;

H.R. 6682. An act to provide for the exemption of fowling nets from duty;

H.R. 8938. An act to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles; and

H.R. 8952. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 4441. An act to authorize the appropriation of $3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

JOINT SESSION ON APRIL 12 TO HEAR ADDRESS BY THE SHAH OF IRAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, on Thursday, April 12, there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses, at which time the Senate will join the House of Representatives, in its Hall, for the purpose of hearing an address by the Shah of Iran.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Rights of Self-Government for the Virgin Islands

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the popular election of the Governor and Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands, for the transfer to the government of the Virgin Islands of the assets and obligations of the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

Supplemental Report on Interstate Commerce Commission Activities, 1937–62

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report on Interstate Commerce Commission activities, 1937–62 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Extension of Law Relating to Free Importation of Certain Personal and Household Effects

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for 2 years the existing provisions of the law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

Coordination and Development of Federal and State Programs Relating to Outdoor Recreation

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relating to price supports for milk

"Whereas milk is recognized as one of the most basic food commodities and is necessary for the health and well-being of all citizens; and

"Whereas it has long been recognized that because of the many problems involved both in production and marketing of milk that it is necessary for the Government to guarantee through price supports a fair and equitable return to the producer of milk; and

"Whereas without such price supports the producers of milk would be forced into other activities, with the result that the public would be deprived of a proper supply of this basic food; and

"Whereas under the provisions of law providing for price support for whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities (sec. 1446, title 7, U.S.C.), unless the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a given parity price is necessary in order to assure an adequate supply of these products, the statutorily guaranteed price will not be effective after March 31, 1962; and

"Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture in making such determination should carefully consider not only the immediate supply available but the supply which can reasonably be expected in the future; and

"Whereas if such support price is lowered, such lowering will drive from the market innumerable producers, which would endanger the continuation of an adequate supply; and

"Whereas a determination of the adequacy of the supply of any commodity, and particularly milk, must, in a nation as large and diversified as the United States, be based not only on the immediate situation but also on the overall long-range situation if the public is to be assured of the continuous supply required for its health and well-being: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to take all action possible to safeguard the future supply of milk by continuing the present level of price supports, and particularly that the Secretary of Agriculture give proper consideration to the fact that any lowering of such price support level will require many producers to cease such production; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, to the President and Vice President, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Senate Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and to the chairman of the House Standing Committee on Agriculture, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relating to reduction of pensions of veterans in State veterans' homes

"Whereas House Resolution 869, introduced by Congressman Olin E. Teague of Texas, would amend section 3203 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans entitled to a pension, who are being maintained in State veterans' homes, shall receive reduced pensions at the rate of $30 per month; and

"Whereas enactment of this legislation would not only reduce pensions to such veterans, but would also seriously affect the operation of State veterans' homes which now, or in the future, may charge veterans for care: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the legislature of this State respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose the adoption of this legislation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to the selection of the city of Antioch as a site for an experimental saline water conversion plant

"Whereas the northerly shore of Contra Costa County, upon which the city of Antioch and its extensive industrial developments are situated, has historically enjoyed an available supply of fresh water throughout most of the year; and

"Whereas that supply has steadily deteriorated, due to salt water intrusion, caused by upstream water diversions and storage on the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries, with the attendant threat to growth of municipal communities and industrial developments in Contra Costa County; and

"Whereas the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has taken the position that salinity control is not a proper function of the Central Valley project, and has only tacitly agreed that releases from Shasta Dam, the only present means of controlling salinity encroachment, will not be diminished until Contra Costa County finds another solution to its problem; and

"Whereas economical conversion of saline to fresh water could solve this county's problem by supplying an adequate amount of water for domestic, agricultural and industrial uses as replacement for water lost through upstream diversions; and

"Whereas the Antioch site is an ideal one for a conversion plant since the seasonal variations in salinity of offshore water and the many varied uses in and near Antioch for fresh water, will provide ideal conditions for making economic analysis of the conversion process: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States, and the U.S. Department of the Interior, to take such action as may be necessary for the selection of the city of Antioch as a site for an experimental saline water conversion plant; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to Federal aid for State veterans' homes and hospitals

"Whereas there are 33 State veterans' homes and hospitals in the United States; and

"Whereas existing facilities for hospital, intermediate, and nursing home care are wholly inadequate to care for the ever-increasing number of older veterans suffering from serious chronic disabilities requiring medical and nursing care; and

"Whereas new construction, modernization, additions and improvements at State veterans homes are urgently needed to replace old and obsolete structures and to provide new facilities; and

"Whereas House Resolution No. 270, introduced by Congressman B. F. Sisk, of California, and House Resolution No. 3182, introduced by Congressman Olin E. Teague, of Texas, at the request of the National Association of State Veterans Homes, have been introduced in the current session of Congress to assist States, through Federal aid subsidies, to finance, in part, capital outlay expense; and

"Whereas financial assistance from the Federal Government to provide such facilities for the older veteran is urgently required in California due to the tremendous number of war veterans residing in the State; and

"Whereas this State, alone, cannot finance the cost of providing hospital and nursing home facilities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and to appropriate money to provide States with Federal aid subsidies to finance, in part, the construction, modernization, additions and improvements of State-operated veterans homes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relating to Federal subsidy for portion of operating costs of State nursing homes for veterans

"Whereas House Resolution 9565, introduced by Congressman Olin E. Teague of Texas, by request, would amend section 641 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of a portion of the cost to the States, operating State veterans homes, of furnishing nursing home care to veterans of any war: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the legislature of this State respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and appropriate money to provide States with Federal aid subsidies for the payment of a portion of the cost of furnishing nursing home care to veterans in State-operated veterans homes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to deductions from Federal payments to State veterans' homes

"Whereas House Resolution 9737 has been introduced at this session of Congress by Congressman Clem Miller, of California; and

"Whereas this legislation has been introduced to amend section 641 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that deductions shall not be made from Federal payments to a State veterans' home because of amounts collected from the estates of deceased veterans and which are used for recreational and other purposes not required by State laws; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration, by administrative order, effective April 1, 1961, now requires the States to report said collections, and a like amount is deducted from Federal aid payments: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation as proposed in House Resolution 9737, which provides: 'No reduction shall be made under this subsection by reason of the retention or collection by a State home of any amounts from the estate of a deceased veteran if such amounts are placed in a post fund or other special fund and used for the benefit of the State home or its inhabitants in providing—

" '(A) Educational, recreational, or entertainment facilities or activities;

" '(B) Operation of post exchanges; or

" '(C) Other activities or facilities for the benefit of the home or its inhabitants, which are not specifically required by State law, including the cost of any necessary insurance to protect the property of such fund or any of its facilities'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Resolution 21

"Resolution relative to Federal aid for State Highway Route 115

"Whereas State Highway Route 115, from San Jose, in Santa Clara County, to Patterson, in Stanislaus County, via the vicinity of Mount Hamilton, is the only east-west connection between the San Joaquin Valley and the seacoast between the Altamont and Pacheco Pass, a distance of over 50 miles; and

"Whereas this route, although a part of the State highway system, has not been accepted for maintenance by the California Department of Public Works, and is presently maintained by both Santa Clara and Stanislaus Counties; and

"Whereas this route would be of inestimable value as an avenue of escape should there be a need for dispersal of the citizens concentrated on the heavily populated peninsula below San Francisco in the case of an atomic attack or other disaster; and

"Whereas the highway is now designated as the only escape route directly eastward from San Jose in the civil defense operations plan of the State of California; and

"Whereas in addition to its national defense benefits, if improved, the highway could be of great economic and recreational benefit to the coast counties and the northern part of the San Joaquin Valley, in particular, and to the Nation generally; and

"Whereas because of the heavy commitments of the State of California in its construction and maintenance of highways, money is not available to substantially improve or reroute this highway in order to provide an adequate connection between the coast counties and the San Joaquin Valley for the smooth flow of traffic in case of enemy attack or natural disaster; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the President and the Congress of the United States are respectfully memorialized to provide Federal funds for the highway between San Jose and Patterson; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative of the State of California in the Congress of the United States.

"Attest:

"J. A. Beck,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Resolution 60

"Resolution relating to the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal project

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, with letter dated January 15, 1962, forwarded to the Congress of the United States reports recommending the early authorization of the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal project and related units; and

"Whereas the facilities to be constructed are vitally needed to supply water to areas within Placer, Sacramento, El Dorado, and San Joaquin Counties; and

"Whereas the supplemental water which will be made available by the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal project is urgently needed, in part, to preserve the use of large acreages of highly productive farmland which is now endangered by a rapidly falling water table and a lack of adequate surface water supplies; and

"Whereas the proposed facilities are necessary for the full development of the American River as a working unit of the Central Valley project; and

"Whereas these facilities will provide much needed additional flood control protection for the city of Sacramento, along the lower regions of the American River, along the Sacramento River, and within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta; and

"Whereas the entire State of California will benefit from the proposed project by additional flood protection for the capital city of the State and by the provision of an adequate supply of water for an important agricultural and urban area of California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Assembly of the State of California commends the Secretary of the Interior for recognizing the urgent need for the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Assembly of the State of California urges appropriate action, particularly by the U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and by the U.S. House of Representatives Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, directed toward the early authorization and construction of the Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal project; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be transmitted by the clerk of the assembly to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the U.S. Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to the chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States."

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Resolution 11

"Resolution relative to enactment of House of Representatives bill 10144 providing for a Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act

"Whereas a bill, H.R. 10144, providing for a Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act was introduced on February 7, 1962, in the House of Representatives of the United States; and

"Whereas this bill would make it unlawful for employers, employment agencies, and labor organizations, engaged in commerce, to discriminate on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry, or age, except insofar as religion or age may reasonably relate to the qualifications for employment; and

"Whereas this bill would further provide for a Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to promote the purposes of this act; and

"Whereas such discrimination is contrary to American principles of liberty and equality of opportunity, is incompatible with the Constitution, forces segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, foments industrial strife and domestic unrest; and

"Whereas such discrimination also deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, endangers the national security and the general welfare, and adversely affects the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California*, That the Assembly of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Resolutions adopted by the city councils of the cities of Healdsburg, Maywood, and Vernon, all of the State of California, protesting against the enactment of legislation to impose a Federal tax on the income derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 3128. A bill for the relief of Dr. Virginia Valenzuela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 5, 1962,

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably with an amendment, on April 6, 1962, the bill (S. 2935) to amend the Peace Corps Act, and submitted a report (No. 1325) thereon.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO MARKETING QUOTAS ON IRISH POTATOES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of March 22 and April 2, 1962, the names of Senators MANSFIELD, ENGLE, JORDAN, ERVIN, CARROLL, and SMITH of Massachusetts were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3050) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE on March 22, 1962.

AMENDMENT OF CLAYTON ACT, RELATING TO RAILROAD MERGERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 3, 1962, the names of Senators GRUENING, MCCARTHY, BURDICK, DOUGLAS, BARTLETT, and MORSE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3097) to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give full force and effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidations and mergers until December 31, 1963, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators) on April 3, 1962.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THURGOOD MARSHALL TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, SECOND CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, April 16, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Thurgood Marshall, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Text of recent radio broadcast by himself over Wisconsin radio stations, on the subject of the need for youth development and antidelinquency programs.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

First annual Jefferson-Jackson Day speech by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, at Huntington, W. Va., sponsored by the Democratic Women's Club of Cabell County, made on Saturday, April 7, 1962.

GERMANY AND BERLIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a reprint of an editorial from the Hearst newspapers which was written by Mr. William R. Hearst, Jr., the editor in chief. It is entitled, "New Look at Germany," and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial is written with a refreshing perspective and detachment, and advances some very interesting and useful new thoughts on Germany and the problems of peace in that region. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, and that two speeches of mine on the subject of Germany and Berlin be printed in the RECORD immediately following the editorial. I think this editorial and the speeches might well be studied in juxtaposition. Mr. Hearst has written his editorial as a possible solution to the problem as it might look if it were viewed as the earth is viewed from an airplane 6 miles up in the sky. The speeches contain some of the details of a solution which appeared to me when I viewed the German problem from a much lower level, and some time ago. Both the editorial and the speeches focus on the same fundamental problem. Both represent an effort to find a way to a peaceful solution of a dangerous and highly complex difficulty. I do not know to what extent the solution proposed by Mr. Hearst may have applicability to the present situation; but I, for one, welcome its addition as a most helpful contribution to the discussion of this issue.

There being no objection, the editorial and the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW LOOK AT GERMANY

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

LOS ANGELES.—Flying across our country at 600 miles an hour, 6 miles above the earth, puts everything down below you in a different perspective.

Big cities become villages—great lakes shrink to ponds—enormous valleys of the Midwestern States become merely a patchwork quilt—the magnificent snow-covered Rocky Mountains just white ridges—the Grand Canyon only a jagged crack in the desert.

As for people: They are so small you can't even see them.

Gradually it occurred to me that if everything we think of as big down there is really relatively small, so perhaps are the problems. Perhaps, if you get far enough away from everything, you will see it in a different way. So I mused.

Take for instance Berlin and Germany. The root of the problem is that it is our city in their territory. It is obvious that we can't move the city—but can we remove the boundaries? In other words: reunify, reunite Germany.

Now there is nothing new in that, I know. So let's look closer at why we don't do it.

The reason, as everyone knows, is that the Russians say they won't stand for a reunified Germany. And why won't they? (Well for once they are telling the truth when they admit that they fear a reunified, rearmed Germany.)

The key word there is rearmed. So what about a unified, unarmed Germany?

The Russian forces could be lined up on its eastern border and NATO on its western border; and, should either side be tempted to take advantage of the situation, the opposite side would pitch in. After all, that situation exists today.

Thinking of an unarmed, united Germany, the idea of its being a sort of ward of the United Nations came to mind. And with a united Germany, why not make Berlin the headquarters for the United Nations Organization?

It would, I think, further dissuade anyone so inclined from making a pass at the territory.

Visionary? Perhaps, but remember that the most constant threat to world peace is the nose-against-nose contact of the free and Communist worlds in Germany, which makes any idea worth considering.

There may be plenty of holes in the practical application of this one, but it is a way of pulling the smoldering fuse from the bomb of Germany.

Let's do a little speculation on the whys and hows of a United Nations Germany.

Start by facing the need for doing something about the German question before it does something to us.

The Germans are a notably energetic, industrious people with a record in this century of high competence in peace and war. Perhaps the bitter defeat of their aggressive role in two world conflicts has taught them that conquest by arms won't work.

Geographically you cannot take Germany out of the military arena, so why not take the military arena out of Germany?

A hint of how well that could possibly work can be found in Austria, where East and West stood glaring toe to toe after World War II until a successful agreement to neutralize the country was signed in 1955. The treaty by which the same powers as now occupy Berlin gave Austria independence also guaranteed democratic government and military neutrality.

To show how much that meant to the Russians, they created their satellite organization, the Warsaw pact, 1 day before Austrian independence.

Austria hasn't been a problem since then, and Messrs. Kennedy and Khrushchev can move in and out of Vienna with nobody getting alarmed.

The German problem is more tense and disentanglement would be more delicate. But it would be folly therefore to shrug it off as insoluble and remain indefinitely in slugging stance.

A main purpose of neutralizing Germany politically and economically as U.N. territory would be to remove the hostile armed forces of East and West to points separated by the width of the country. But let's not believe we could neutralize the minds of the German people as individuals.

They would continue to have sympathies, and the odds are most of them would sympathize with the West. They should be allowed to express their sympathies by serving in the armed forces of the external regional groups—either NATO to the West or the Warsaw pact to the East.

In fact it would be to the West's disadvantage to rule that out, for, as things are today, the West Germans are a mainstay of NATO.

As for a U.N.-governed Germany itself, it seems to me it would be proper to have a permanent U.N. armed force based there as the only armed force on German soil, available for such trouble-shooting tasks as the U.N. now must call on volunteer nations for—like the trouble in the Congo.

Another problem would be that Germany, relieved of the economic burden of armament, would have too big an edge over other nations in world trade. After all, it was the postwar disarmed period that helped give West Germany its present prosperity.

Why not just have a United Nations Germany, instead of maintaining its own national armaments, pay the tab for a U.N. armed force? That would also take care of the recurrent U.N. financial crisis of paying for task forces.

As I mentioned at the start, this is an idea literally from out of the blue. Utopian it may be, but the core of it seems to me like a possible way out of the continuing dilemma of Germany. Surely all the approaches to the problem so far have failed to relax U.S.-Soviet tension. A fresh look can't hurt.

———

THE COMING CRISIS IN GERMANY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me preface my remarks with this assurance to the Senate: I am not an alarmist. I measure most carefully the words I am about to speak. In that context, I express to the Senate my belief that just ahead lies the most critical period which the United States will have had to face since the conflict in Korea.

The crisis, Mr. President, is coming in Germany. Specifically, it is coming in Berlin. Indeed, it may have already begun. For years now, the seeds of that crisis have lain dormant in a divided Germany. They have been held in check only by a kind of mutual acquiescence. The Western Powers have not wished to disturb the seeming stability in Germany. Since the Berlin blockade, the Soviet Union has not seriously threatened it. A few years ago, uprisings of East Germans shook the stability, but did not break it.

Those who have thought at all about the German situation have known for a long time that the surface calm would not last. The existence of two German authorities in what is one Germany has been, from the end of World War II, a makeshift arrangement. The Western Powers have recognized it. The Soviet Union has acknowledged it. The German leaders know it.

The key question has never been, Will Germany be unified? The question has long been, When and how will Germany be unified? Those of us who have urged an initiative in American policy with respect to Germany have been aware of this distinction. When I addressed myself to this subject in the Senate in May 1958, I had the distinction very much in mind. Because I did, I tried to deal in the specifics of an American initiative. In suggesting, last May, alternatives to present policy, my thought was that when the status quo gave way, as surely it must, the changes ought at least to hold promise of leading to the strengthening of freedom in a peaceful Germany.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I wish to apologize for interrupting so soon the remarks of the Senator from Montana, because I believe that the address he is delivering will be a most significant one. But I wish to say that, characteristically, in his opening remarks the Senator from Montana has pierced to the nub of the issue. Conditions in Germany are going to change. Germany will not indefinitely remain divided against itself. Germany will not indefinitely continue to be garrisoned by foreign troops.

It seems to me that those who say our foreign policy must be inflexible overlook the fact that ours is not a static world.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think the Senator from Montana rendered us a service when, a year ago, he emphasized the fact that conditions in Germany would be changing, and that we must be prepared to face up to those changes if we are to cope effectively with them. Flexibility in our foreign policy is a must. A steel blade bends. Pig iron breaks.

I wish to thank the Senator from Montana for coming forward at this stage in the developing Berlin crisis with a speech which will be helpful in giving guidance to all of us, to the President, and to the Secretary of State, in our common effort to solve that crisis for the benefit of the free world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank my friend from Idaho.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Montana yield briefly to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we have just returned to this Chamber from a most impressive joint session with the other body, in connection with the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. At the joint session, during a brilliant address by the great writer and poet, Carl Sandburg, he had occasion to quote a sentence from Abraham Lincoln, which I believe is pertinent today in connection with the splendid address which my friend, the Senator from Montana, is making on the German question. Lincoln said:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present."

I wish to congratulate my friend, the Senator from Montana, for the fine address he is making on the German problem.

However, I would not be true to myself if I did not register a slight dissent from some of the comments which have been made with respect to the Secretary of State.

It is unpleasant and unrewarding to say unkind things about a man who is in physical pain, who has shown great physical courage, who is unquestionably a patriot, who is a man of great dedication to the public interest; but I would feel untrue to myself if I did not register on the floor of the Senate a dissent to the statement that he is indispensable to the conduct of our foreign policy in the immediate future. I call attention to what I have said on other occasions with respect to this matter.

I hope that these comments will be taken in good part, and that it will be understood that I make them only because I cannot remain silent when it might be indicated that I was in accord with what has been said.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has just said. I commend him for his honesty and his integrity. Of course, I recognize that it is not a new viewpoint on his part, but that he has been consistent in his views in this respect for some time. I would point out, however, that the immediate danger, as I see it, is the Berlin and the German situation. No one knows more about those situations at the present time or is better prepared to lead the allies in meeting them than is the Secretary of State. On that basis, as well as on other bases, I wish him well. I wish him a speedy recovery. I anticipate that in the not too distant future he will resume his duties, and will act, not as his own agent, but as the agent of the President of the United States, in conducting foreign policy.

Mr. CLARK. Obviously, I do not wish to engage in a colloquy of extended duration with my colleague at this time. I should like to be recorded as very much hoping and praying for Mr. Dulles' immediate recovery; but I cannot agree that there are not in the State Department others as well or better qualified than the Secretary to carry on the German negotiations. I appreciate that this is a situation on which the distinguished Senator from Montana and I disagree. I shall desist from further comment on this particular phase.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall desist, also.

Mr. President, I repeat, in suggesting, last May, alternatives to present policy, my thought was that when the status quo gave way, as surely it must, the changes ought at least to hold promise of leading to the strengthening of freedom in a peaceful Germany.

We did nothing, Mr. President. We took no initiative. We went on in the familiar vacuousness, in the familiar patterns of policy patterns devised years ago, in another setting, under another administration. We did not face the fact that that policy was adequate to maintain a semblance of stability in Germany only so long as all directly concerned acquiesced in the continued division of that nation.

That is water under the bridge. We did not choose to act in a positive fashion to change the status quo. Now, the Russians have chosen to break it. They have chosen to make the break at Berlin. They have said, in effect, that, after the spring of 1959, the situation will no longer be as it has been in that city. They are quite right, Mr. President. Things will no longer be the same in Berlin or anywhere in Germany. If there is any certainty, it is that the situation in Germany at the close of 1959 will be far different from the present situation. We are approaching the beginning of the end, the beginning of the end of two Berlins and of two Germanys.

The question, as I have already observed, was never, Would Germany be unified? It was, When and how would Germany be unified? We may now have begun to comprehend the when; the actual process of unification is likely to begin this year. Only one question remains: How is Germany to be unified? Will it be by conflict, by negotiation, or by some mixture of the two? That is the question which is impelling us and the rest of the world toward the coming crisis in Germany.

CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE GERMAN CRISIS

The responsibility for establishing binding foreign policies to deal with the impending crisis, the coming change in Germany, rests with the President and his Secretary of State. Let there be no doubt on that score, in this body, at home, in the executive branch, or abroad. It is not for the Senate to direct the President in this matter. The President will have to make his own decisions, with the assistance of the vast resources of the executive branch. When he speaks officially on Germany, however, he will be speaking for all of us, whether or not we agree with what he says. There is no other way under the constitutional system of the United States.

To say that is not to constrain upon the Senate a silence in these matters. On the contrary, since we shall be bound, since the people of the United States shall be bound, by what the President and his Secretary of State do or fail to do in the coming crisis, the obligation of the Senate to debate, to discuss, and to advise is real and it is compelling.

The Senate of the 86th Congress was not constituted so that it might ignore pressing domestic questions. How much less, then, can we remain silent on the life-and-death matters of foreign policy? The President and the Secretary of State have given no indication that they would have this body turn its back on the crisis in Germany. On the contrary, I note that the Secretary of State has already sought counsel of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relation [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I commend the Secretary for his initiative. The brilliant chairman of the committee has much to contribute to the development of policy for the situation in Germany.

If the Senate is to meet its responsibilities, Mr. President, we must form, through debate and discussion, an understanding of the situation as it is, and as it is evolving in Germany. We must also discern clearly the stakes of the people of the United States and of freedom in that situation. We must advance, finally, ideas for consideration in formulating the foreign policies which are to safeguard the vital interests of our people.

These are the thoughts which have led me to these remarks on the coming crisis in Germany. I make them in the spirit of responsible Democratic cooperation with a Republican administration in a matter of vital concern to all the people of the United States.

TWO GERMAN AUTHORITIES IN ONE GERMANY

Let me begin by exploring the significant realities in Germany, as I see them. The basic reality, Mr. President, is that there are two political authorities in one Germany. That is a contradiction which cannot and will not stand. There is one Germany. And there are compelling historic and practical reasons which require that the unity of that nation begin to emerge without delay if there is to be peace in Europe and in the world.

I stress the point, Mr. President, that when we speak of the two Germanies we are really speaking not of two nations but of two political authorities. Each of these authorities presumes that it is the wave of the future in all Germany. Each seeks to draw the whole of the German people into its orbit.

To be sure, there are profound differences between the West German Government in Bonn and the East German Communist regime in Pankow. The Bonn government is based upon principles and practices of democracy which are consonant with those of other Western nations and are expressly supported by the inhabitants of West Germany. The Pankow regime exists by the methods of authoritarianism which come from the East. Its source of authority lies in the will to power of those who wield the authority and the acquiescence—however sullen—of the repressed people of East Germany. Its survival depends, to a far greater degree than anything we know in the Western democracies, on military and police power—its own and the Soviet Union's.

The West German democratic government exists. It is there, at Bonn, and the Communists are not going to wish it away or subvert it away. It is going to stay as long as the people in that zone sustain it and as long as the Western nations remain committed to its protection against military aggression from the East. We cannot ignore the fact, however, that the East German regime also exists. It is there at Pankow, and German Communists run it, even though Russians may pull the strings from behind the curtain. Unfortunately, I see no evidence that the Western nations are going to wish away or subvert away that East German political authority in the practicable future.

If neither side can be wished away, or subverted away, how then is the division of Germany going to be made to disappear? How is a unified Germany, this essential Germany, this inevitable Germany, going to emerge? There was a time, perhaps, when it might have been reasonable to hope that the Russians and German Communists would soon find it too costly to maintain their control in East Germany. For years we have waited for this promised development. We have waited for the Russians and their campfollowers to fold their tents and steal away.

What we must ask ourselves now is whether there is any realistic basis for hoping that this development will come about in the practicable future? I regret to say that such public indications as there are suggest that the Pankow regime, with Soviet support, is consolidating its position, that its authoritarian hold on East Germany is, if anything, more secure today than it was a few years ago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With respect to the last thought expressed, the Senator from Montana has stated that the authoritarian hold on East Germany is now greater than it was before. Will the Senator deal a little more in detail with that, and state whether the hold is the result of the power of the Communists, or whether it is the will of the people that they be held by the Communists?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should be delighted to try to answer my distinguished friend from Ohio. I can say, of course, without equivocation that the present status is not the desire or the will of the people. The source of my statement is the U.S. News & World Report, the issue of February 13, 1959.

I read from page 67, at the bottom:

"East Germany's Communist government has just published official figures on its planned expenditures for 1959."

Before I read further I wish to say that all the information I have in my presentation has appeared in the public print. There is nothing secret or official about what I am saying, and it simply represents one Senator's opinion as to what I think is the most difficult and dangerous question of today.

I continue with the quotation from the U.S. News & World Report:

"West German financial experts, looking into the Reds' figures, in the budget and out of it, make a startling discovery.

Military spending by the East German Reds in 1959 is to be 30 percent higher than military spending planned by West Germany. Yet the Reds say that West Germany is threatening the peace of the world."

That is what I mean when I say that the Pankow regime is more secure, not in a political sense but in a military sense. They have been strengthening themselves on a military and paramilitary basis. Of course, the 22 to 28 Soviet divisions are still in East Germany.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with the Senator. My inclination would be to believe that the people of East Germany, if they had the opportunity, would unshackle themselves of the hold which the Soviet has upon them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct. I have been told that the figure would run as high as 95 to 96 percent of the East Germans who, if they had the opportunity to vote, would vote against the present Ulbricht regime.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the fact is that the Soviets and those of East Berlin who agree with the Soviets are applying constantly heavier pressure in the development of the military?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is all very well to hope, as a general principle, for the disappearance of totalitarianism. We have held that principle for decades, but we have also had to live in a world which has contained since its beginning and still contains many totalitarian regimes.

No, Mr. President, a valid policy on Germany, now, must be built on more than the hope of the eventual disappearance of German totalitarianism. It can only be built on the premise that Germany, in one way or another, is going to unify and it is going to begin to unify soon. Further, it can only be built on the premise that that unity in Germany, if it is to come in peace, is likely to fall short of the ultimate goals set for it by both the Communist nations and the free nations—the goal, on the one hand, of a Communist totalitarian Germany, and the goal, on the other, of a fully representative democracy in all Germany.

Until a few months ago there might have been a possibility of evading that reality for a while longer by assuming that the status quo of division in Germany might go on indefinitely. But the prospect of evasion is now narrowing rapidly in the wake of Mr. Khrushchev's announcement of the coming Soviet withdrawal from Berlin. The blunt fact is that soon either negotiations leading to German unification in peace shall begin in earnest or there shall begin in earnest the use of force to that end.

BERLIN—THE CORE OF THE COMING CRISIS

This brings me to a second matter which we must explore, Mr. President, if we are to see our way clearly in the impending crisis. That is the question of Berlin. It is at Berlin, divided Berlin, and along the western routes of access to the city, that the first indications of the conflict leading to war or the success of negotiations leading to stable peace are likely to appear in the coming months.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to review the historic circumstances surrounding the present difficulties of the Western position in Berlin. It is simple enough to find fault with what was done or not done by political and military leaders years ago. It is as easy, as it is pompous, to pass angry judgments on others, with the prop of hindsight. That process will serve no useful purpose in this situation.

Nor shall I take the time of the Senate to review the legal status of our position in Berlin. Some may find solace for our difficulties in legalism. Even the Russians sought justification for their actions in it. But legalism is at best a dubious way to deal with an explosive situation, when there are, as there are in this situation, two opposing judges, two opposing judgments, and two opposing instruments of mass destruction for enforcing the judgments.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish the Senator from Montana would discuss in a little greater detail the element of legalism being introduced. I have my own understanding of it. I think we are advocating the proposition that there are certain legal obligations rooted in agreements which we have made in the past, and that in making our demands we insist upon adherence to those obligations. Does the Senator mind discussing that question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Ohio is correct. References have been made to the agreements made at Potsdam relative to the occupation of Berlin.

References have been made to the agreement entered into by Gen. Lucius Clay, at that time commander of our forces in Germany, with the Soviet authorities, by means of which we were guaranteed by the Soviet authorities access by rail, by road, and by air, from the western zones in Germany into the western sectors of Berlin.

Then, as I recall—and I believe the Senator will corroborate me on this—some sort of agreement was made by Mr. Phillip Jessup and a Russian representative whose name I cannot recall at the moment, which agreement Mayor Willy Brandt brought to our attention at the luncheon held in the Foreign Relations Committee room the other day. If I remember correctly, he stated that out of these Jessup-Russian consultations and agreements, which brought an end to the need for the allied airlift into Berlin, also came an agreement that we be allowed continued access. He suggested that we look into the agreement to which he referred as the agreement of 1949. Unfortunately I have not had an opportunity to do so yet.

But there are these agreements, or alleged agreements, which give us the right to go in and to maintain access between the western zones and the west sector of Berlin.

The Russians predicate their claims on similar agreements, which they say were made at Potsdam and elsewhere.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is the position of the Senator from Montana, then, that the problem is more involved and far graver in its possible consequences to world peace than mere adherence to those agreements would justify. We must go beyond that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct, because in my opinion the potentials involved in this situation are terrible and tremendous.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It does not much matter now how we got to Berlin, or why the Russians have no legal right to ask us to leave. What does matter, Mr. President, is why we need to stay in Berlin, and stay there we must. We are, bluntly, in a highly difficult and dangerous position in Berlin. Great sacrifices may be entailed in remaining. We had better understand clearly now the significance of maintaining our position there. We had better understand now what is vital and what is not vital in that position to the people of the United States and to freedom.

The administration has responded to the Russian proposals on Berlin by reiterating a longstanding view of the Nation. It has said, as the Democratic administration before it said, that we will not be driven from the city. The position of this Government, to stand firm in Berlin, has been endorsed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is supported by Democrats and Republicans alike in the Senate.

It is a sound position. Only it is not enough. It is not enough to say, Mr. President, that we are standing fast in Berlin. That is a slogan, not a policy. Nor is it enough, Mr. President, to stand fast merely to demonstrate our determination to maintain our legal interpretation of the situation as against the Soviet Union's.

Nor is it enough to say that we stand fast in Berlin so that we may continue to demonstrate in the heart of Communist Germany the material superiority of freedom or free enterprise over Communist collectivism. To be sure, there is a striking contrast between West Berlin and East Berlin, but I doubt very much that the people of the United States will countenance the sacrifice of a single human life for the purposes of propagandistic demonstrations in Berlin. And before this year is out many lives may have been spent in Berlin.

No, Mr. President, it is not for reasons of legalism or propaganda that we stand fast in Berlin. The Western nations are in Berlin because Berlin belongs neither to East Germany nor West Germany; it belongs to all the German people. We are in Berlin because some Germans may not look to Bonn and others to Pankow for leadership, but all Germans will soon look to Berlin. We are in Berlin to see to it that when that city is once again the capital of all Germany, as it surely will be, the concept of freedom in peace will not be absent from the scene. If that concept were to disappear from Berlin, the citadel of German nationalism, sooner or later it would disappear from all Germany. Then, sooner or later, the torch would be lit in Germany, whether by German hands or some others, to set Europe and the world aflame once again. That torch was lit twice in Berlin in the past, and twice the world has paid an enormous human price. To see that it is not lit again is in the essential, the vital interest of this generation and future generations of the people of the United States.

That, Mr. President, is the reason which beyond all others, justifies the taking of the great risks which we may soon be called upon to take at Berlin and along the western routes to the city. We are in Berlin in order to get out, but to get out only on condition that the German political forces which stand for freedom in peace have a sure footing and equal chance to survive and to grow on their merits in the future capital of all Germany.

I support fully the position of this administration on the necessity of standing fast in Berlin. I question, however, the adequacy with which we have related that position to the changing situation in Germany. I question a policy which provides that not only do we stand fast in Berlin, but also implores or demands that the Russians stand fast. After years of trying to get the Russians out of the innumerable places into which they sprawled after World War II, it is indeed strange to hear that we are insisting that the Russians must not, indeed cannot, leave Berlin. That is a most peculiar position to say the least; and the Russians obviously have no intention of obliging us by remaining.

It is clear what is afoot there. In a few months hence, the Russians will leave East Berlin despite our demands or urging to the contrary. East Berlin will then be, once again, a German city—Communist, to be sure, but, nevertheless, German. By contrast, West Berlin will retain the appearance it now has, the appearance of a Western enclave in the heart of Germany, for there are thousands of Allied officials and military personnel in the area. The contrast will not be lost on German nationalists in East or West Germany.

Further, Mr. President, if we are to hold this enclave without struggle, it will be at the sufferance of the East German Communist authorities. If they do not choose to accommodate us, then we shall in all probability have to fight our way through to Berlin, not against Russians, but against Germans. Even if this course does not lead to a great conflict, the repercussions in Germany will be profound. Among Germans, as among others, blood may prove thicker than ideologies.

As I said, there can be no quarrel with the need to stand fast in Berlin. I do question, however, a policy which does not anticipate the developments which I have just outlined and fails to take steps to mitigate them.

I question, too, a policy which presumes as our policy does that the Great Powers of World War II—the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States—can bring about German unification. There may have been a time when such a course was possible. If it ever existed, however, it was years ago when Germany lay devastated and prostrate. It was years ago, in the freshness of the common sacrifices of World War II and in the measure of mutual respect and tolerance which these sacrifices engendered.

Those years are gone. The time is not today. Today, there is little respect between this Nation and the Soviet Union except the fearful respect which the military power of the one may generate in the other. Today, Germany is neither devastated nor prostrate; it has become once again the most dynamic nation in Western Europe.

No, Mr. President, the erstwhile Allies, the divided Allies of World War II, are not in a position to ordain a unification in peace for a revitalized Germany. At most, they may be able to contribute to that unification by rethinking their own security needs in anticipation of its inevitable development. At most, they may be able to contribute to unification by exercising such influence as they may possess to encourage the Germans themselves to reach a reasonable procedure on unification and by sanctioning that procedure if it is sound. It is the Germans, themselves, however, who will make the decisive decisions on unification, if they are to be made in peace.

FREE ALL-GERMAN ELECTIONS

Further, Mr. President, I question, in present circumstances, a policy which presumes to lead to the peaceful unification of Germany solely on the basis of free, all-German elections. I say now what I said last May on this point, only with more emphasis. Events have moved a long way since this policy was devised and the bell no longer has an altogether recognizable sound when it is rung over and over again in the same fashion. A German political authority has emerged in the West. Another political structure has appeared in the East which is manned by Germans, even if it is not directed by them. Whatever we may think of this structure, there is no reliable indication that it is going to go away peacefully, of its own accord.

There are now military and paramilitary German forces in both East and West Germany. How are these forces to be integrated in peace? Is this a problem that can be solved by free, all-German elections, at least without extensive preparations by the Germans who officer these opposing forces?

There are differing economic and social structures functioning in Western and Eastern Germany. How are these structures to be fused in peace? Can they be harmonized by free, all-German elections, at least without extensive preparations by those Germans who operate them?

I cite these problems as examples. There are no doubt others of a similar nature. A policy which advances no thought on how they are to be met does not begin to meet the realities of the German situation. If the unification of Germany is essential and inevitable and if it is neither our responsibility nor in the interest of this Nation to seek that unity by force, then I submit that a policy which merely clings to an unrealizable slogan of free all-German elections, which does not pursue German unification by other means, is no policy at all. It is a straitjacket. It is an excuse for immobility. It may well lead down the blind alley of an unnecessary conflict of disastrous diplomatic retreat.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I take it, from what the Senator has stated, that the efforts to procure an overall election of citizens of East and West Germany have thus far proved to be futile.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The East Germans will not consent to have an election under which their people can give expression to the type of government they want. Based upon the fact that that objective is an unrealizable objective, an overall free election, the Senator from Montana suggests that other means should be explored to procure a solution of the problem. I wish the Senator would comment on that point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe that the position of the Western Powers on the question of all-German elections is one which stands no possibility in the immediate future, and perhaps in the indefinite future, of achieving any degree of success. Therefore we should try to work out other means.

As I shall indicate in the course of my speech, there are contacts in existence between the East German Government and the West German Government. These contacts are made on an interzonal basis, and are tied up with commercial intercourse and trade commitments. I would hope that in considering the idea of elections, we might be able to explore, perhaps, ideas other than all-German elections, even though they are the most desirable, and I should like to see them come to pass, and we might try to break it down—and the sooner the better—so that the East Germans could express themselves at the polls, perhaps just in East Germany, and declare to the world where they want to go. In that way they might get out from under the yoke the Ulbricht government, which is exercising despotic and complete control over 17 million Germans in East Germany.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Montana clarifies my mind on the subject. In other words, all of us want a free election under which the people themselves would decide the type of government they desire to have.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Absolutely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, every effort in that direction has been rebuffed, and it is therefore necessary to find other means of trying to reach an agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the idea. The Senator is correct. Every effort to achieve an all-German election has failed because of the insistent and dogmatic "nyet" of the Soviet Union.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do I understand correctly the position of the Senator from Montana to be that, while he adheres to what we have advocated so long, that is, free elections for all of Germany, and the idea of a unified Germany, he recognizes the very practical difficulty of having that under present conditions? Therefore he says that perhaps we ought to make ourselves more flexible and start exploring some other way, and that there might be held a separate election in East Germany and a separate election in West Germany, and thus perhaps there could be agreement upon some kind of independent government in each of the two areas, with the idea that eventually, as he says, because blood is thicker than water, with teamwork the two temporary Germanys will combine themselves into one overall united Germany some time in the future, even though we know not how far in the future.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The purpose of my speech today is to suggest, respectfully and constructively, some possible alternative which may be of value to the Department of State, or out of which may come ideas which would be worthwhile toward the bringing about of a solution to this most difficult problem.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Montana. He spoke about the rigidity of our position in the past. Undoubtedly it has been rather rigid, so rigid that perhaps our country, as well as a great part of the world, was rather shocked recently when Secretary Dulles suggested there might be more flexibility than we have given to the idea, and when he suggested there might be methods other than free elections for the solution of the problem. Is it not true, and would not the Senator agree with me in this, that perhaps we have oversimplified the matter in assuming that a reunification could be easily brought about between the two Germanys?

I may say that about 3 years ago I had the pleasure of attending an international conference at Garmisch in Germany. The conference was made up of people from all the NATO countries, representatives of governments, officials, business people, economists, Members of Parliament, and so on, and one of the German Ministers with whom I had quite a long talk made the point to me, the first time I had ever heard it mentioned, that reunification is not a simple matter. As has been pointed out by the Senator from Montana, it might have been a relatively simple matter several years ago, right after the war. But since that time the two Germanys have grown away from the conditions which the Senator has so well described in his speech. They have grown away from some of the incentives which might have pushed them together.

Furthermore, different enactments have taken place. For instance, the Minister of the Bonn government said to me, "This may sound strange, coming from me, but East Germany has a social security system which in many respects is better than ours."

Mr. MANSFIELD. It also antedates our own.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Although I was speaking of the social security of West Germany, it is also true that theirs antedates ours, too.

East Germany has a system which is in many respects better than that in West Germany, so the East Germans could not be asked to give up their system of social security, workmen's compensation, and land reform.

The Senator from Montana, I believe, heard me ask the mayor of West Berlin the other day that very question, and he heard the mayor's comments, to the effect that to bring the two Germanys together, whenever it may be done, will necessitate the resolving of differences and the making of allowances between the two governments. As I understand, that is exactly what the Senator is talking about. He is speaking of the necessity on the part of those concerned to be ready to consider and to negotiate with reference to all the changes which have taken place throughout the years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I commend the Senator from Montana for making this very able speech and calling to our attention a matter which is not only of tremendous importance but also of great timeliness. After all, the ultimatum will expire on May 28, which is not far off. It has been suggested since the ultimatum was made that perhaps there will not be absolute adherence to that exact date. Nevertheless, we are approaching the day when Russia will leave Berlin.

I think the Senator is correct in saying that Russia will leave, and that the United States will be placed in a rather ridiculous position if we try to keep Russia there, when, as a matter of fact, we have been saying to the world for many years that she should get out of the different countries which she occupies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union has already withdrawn some of its troops and a considerable number of the dependents of those troops. So it does not appear that Russia was fooling when it delivered its ultimatum. I hope that the United States will do, as I feel certain we are doing, everything possible to develop alternatives and to consider ways and means to meet the situation, if and when it arises, when the deadline occurs, as the Senator from Alabama has pointed out, on May 27.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Senator from Montana is exactly correct. Certainly we should be exploring all the alternatives. I think the Senator will agree with me that we ought not simply, easily, and quickly reject any proposal which is made, but that we should be willing to let the world know that we are willing to sit down and negotiate concerning every proposal which may come from either side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I hope both the Soviet Union and the United States will get away from the automatic reactions of the proposals which one country makes to the other. Usually the answer is an automatic "No." Once in a while "Maybe" or a "Perhaps" and occasionally a "Yes" would be useful. I think in that way we might begin, at least on the marginal level, to do away with some of the differences. If we can do that, perhaps we can work our way upward to an eventual solution of the bigger problems.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The other day, in the talk with the mayor of West Berlin, I was greatly encouraged by his reasonableness in wanting to explore every avenue which might lead us out of darkness into the light and to an assured peace for those people. May I ask the Senator from Montana if he has given any consideration to the ability of the Soviet Union, after it has once withdrawn its troops, to jump in again because of its closeness to this area of East Berlin?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have, indeed. If the Senator will bear with me, I shall discuss that subject briefly when I come to the ninth point in my recommendation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Montana.

MILITARY WITHDRAWAL IN GERMANY AND CENTRAL EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Finally, Mr. President, I question a policy which appears to regard as sacrosanct present military arrangements in Germany and Central Europe. I can understand, I can accept, I can support the concept that Western Germany's ties with Western Europe are essential to the peace of Europe and they must not be broken. Within that concept, however, I cannot comprehend a view which seems to hold inflexibly to the present form and extent of German rearmament. We have accepted and even encouraged rises in the German military contribution to NATO in certain circumstances in the past. I do not see that we cannot accept and encourage declines in that contribution in other circumstances in the future.

Security needs are ever-changing needs. Western German rearmament is not an end in itself. It is for the purpose of the defense of German freedom in common with the defense of the freedom of the Western community. It is not for the purpose of keeping rigid the tables of organization and the projections of presumed needs by the military command of NATO. These projections, in any event, have not been met for years and the world has not yet come to an end.

The nature and extent of German rearmament and of non-German armaments on German soil, in short, is one area of the problem of unification in which reasonable proposals for negotiation, wherever they may originate, ought not to be rejected out of hand. That is especially the case if these proposals are related to the reduction of military power throughout central Europe. I know full well that the Russians may have no intention of withdrawing from the Eastern European States in any circumstances. Nevertheless, I can see no reason to make it easier for them to justify their remaining by a seeming intransigence on our part. I cannot see that the road to the eventual freedom of states like Poland and Czechoslovakia is made easier by such a process.

RUSSIAN ROLE IN THE COMING CRISIS

Mr. President, let me turn now to the question of Russian intentions in the coming crisis in Germany. In this matter there is only one certain course. Whatever they may do, we must assume that the Russians are acting to enhance the position of the Soviet Union and that of totalitarian communism throughout Germany and Europe. We must also assume that they will use whatever methods they believe will lead to these ends, not excluding aggressive war. The Russians may blow hot or they may blow cold. They may down a plane on their border one day. They may release a blocked convoy the next. We cannot know with certainty why they act as they act at any given moment.

We cannot know with certainty the purport of Mr. Mikoyan's recent visit to the United States. We cannot know with certainty the meaning of Mr. Khrushchev's comments on a thaw in the cold war. They may be meant to provide a setting for successful negotiations. They may be meant simply to confuse or beguile.

If they do confuse, if they do beguile, however, we shall have no one to blame but ourselves. We ought to be able by this time, years after the ill-fated Geneva Conference of 1955, to distinguish between the conciliatory gesture and the act of conciliation. Those of us who come from the cold country have learned through bitter experience that winter thaws can be followed by summer frosts. The promise of spring in February is not the same as the coming of spring in May.

There is, as I say, no way of knowing with certainty what some particular Soviet gesture or other signifies. What we can know, Mr. President, is that they are all, good or bad, peripheral to the crisis which is coming in Germany. Mr. Mikoyan's visit is not going to free us from that crisis. Mr. Khrushchev's thaws will not do it. Increased Soviet-American trade has little relation to it.

If we are to be prepared to face this crisis in Germany it will be best not to become distracted or obsessed by the twists and turns of Soviet behavior. It will be best to keep our eyes on Germany. The fundamental question of policy for us is not so much what the Russians are looking for in Germany. We know what they are looking for; and they may very well seize it while we amuse or fascinate ourselves by trying to interpret the charades of Russian behavior.

No, Mr. President; more important, far more important, to us is to know what we ourselves are seeking in Germany. We must bring to this crisis not only courage, but also conviction. We must bring to it a positive and understandable policy which meets our essential national needs and the essential needs of freedom.

THE ESSENTIALS OF A WESTERN POLICY IN THE COMING CRISIS

As I noted earlier in my remarks, it is not for the Senate to direct the President and the Secretary of State in the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States. But it is a responsibility of Senators to try to contribute constructively—and I wish to repeat the word "constructively"—to the policies which govern those relations. It is in that sense, Mr. President, that I seek, in these final comments, to express the thoughts which this exploration suggests—thoughts on the essentials of a sound Western policy for the coming crisis in Germany. I have no crystal ball. I have no secret information. I have not been coached by anyone, nor have I been asked by anyone to deliver this speech. What I suggest may not be valid in the light of the greater understanding of others. It is one Senator's views, based upon what he has read, what he has heard, what he has tried to reason. It is, in short, the course which suggests itself to me on the basis of the understanding which I have been able to draw out of the confusion and complexity of the German situation. I can be—and may well be—wrong; and I stand ready to accept a better illumination of the problem through discussion and debate in the Senate. For whatever they may be worth, however, I outline the following points as essentials of a sound Western policy on Germany.

First. It is essential, Mr. President, that forces representing the concept of freedom in peace not be driven out of Berlin. They need, at the least, to remain on a basis of equality with the forces of totalitarian communism in the future capital of Germany. If those forces are to have a chance to remain in peace, a Western initiative for peace is essential.

Second. It is time to call upon German leaders of the two Berlin communities—East and West—to begin serious efforts to unify the municipal government and public services of that city.

Third. To that end, Mr. President, it would be helpful to enlist the conciliatory services of the Secretary General of the United Nations. If agreement can be reached by East Germany and West Germany to establish an all-Berlin government, then it will be desirable to replace both Soviet and Allied forces with a United Nations interim police force composed of contingents from nations not directly involved. That force might supervise the agreement, and might see to it that all the routes of access to the city remain open until Berlin once again becomes the capital of a peaceful, unified Germany. It may be that in the Berlin microcosm there may evolve patterns of unification which will be applicable to the larger problem of all-German unification.

Fourth. If this approach or some such approach to a unified, neutralized Berlin fails, Mr. President, then it is essential that the forces representing the concept of freedom in peace in Berlin remain in Berlin, regardless of whether the Russians leave. Let them go, if they will. I would not wish to see this country a party to any insistence that they stay.

Fifth. At the same time, however, the forces representing freedom in Berlin must be Germanized as rapidly as possible. It is time to think seriously of replacing the thousands of allied military personnel in Berlin with German militia, fully supported by NATO guarantees.

Sixth. Some may regard discussions between Germans of the West and Germans of the East as tantamount to recognition of the East German Communist regime. Some who regard as appeasement not only talk, but even thought, which apparently is alien to them, on the serious problems of the Nation, may even go so far as to label with this stamp of political chicanery any proposals of meetings between East and West Germans. Let them do it, Mr. President; it is their privilege.

But let me say this: If talk constitutes recognition or appeasement, then we have appeased and recognized Communist China, because a representative of this Government has been talking on its behalf, on and off, for years, with a Chinese Communist representative in Geneva and Warsaw. If talk constitutes recognition or appeasement, then the West Germans have recognized and appeased Pankow for years. The fact is that East Germans and West Germans have worked out practical agreements of various kinds between the two zones of Germany. As early as 1957, West Germany's exports to East Germany for the year totaled $201 million. During the first half of 1958, $125 million in trade moved in each direction. That kind of trade, Mr. President, does not take place without talk.

I do not know what the theory of international law may be. I do not know whether talk is tantamount to recognition. I do know that, as a practical matter, we have talked with, but have not recognized, Communist China. West Germans have talked with and traded with, but have not recognized, Pankow. What is involved in the coming crisis in Germany is not a classroom problem on the theory of international law. It is the life or death problem of peace or war. The stake is the lives of tens of millions of human beings, Americans included.

I cannot see that there is going to be any peaceful solution of this problem without a great deal of talk—between Germans who are in authority in the Federal Republic and Germans who purport to be in authority in the eastern zone. It seems to me essential, moreover, that this talk cover the whole range of problems of unification of the two zones, the whole range of problems involving the harmonizing of the political, economic, and military systems of the two zones.

Seventh. There is a point beyond which the search for peace can lead to the jeopardizing of freedom. Regardless of whatever agreements emerge, it seems to me essential that the people of East Germany have some genuine choice in the form of control which is exercised over them. There must be provision for the protection of the rights of all peaceful political forces in all Germany. All-German elections may not be essential—although I think them highly desirable—but at least there must be a chance for men and women of Eastern Germany, as well as those of Western Germany, to express themselves and their political preferences and to participate in political affairs without the threat of terror.

Whatever may be the details of the fusion of the two zones, they are best left to the Germans of the two zones. The Germans are likely to know better than anyone else what will suit them and what is possible among them. Furthermore, it is inconceivable that at this late date the erstwhile allies of World War II can work out these details on their behalf.

Eighth. The contribution which the Western allies, as well as the Soviet Union, need to make, if there is to be peace, is to guarantee, for a period of time, the kind of unified

Germany which may emerge from discussions among the Germans. What the former allies need to do is to see to it that a unified Germany neither is subjected to military pressures from its neighbors, nor becomes a source of military pressure to its neighbors.

Ninth. To that end, Mr. President, it is essential to include within the scope of our policy the search for agreements which, while they do not compel a severance of West Germany's numerous ties with Western Europe, may lead to limitations of armaments throughout Germany and central Europe. Also needed are agreements which will pull back the so-called ultimate weapons and the armed forces of both East and West from the points of eminent contact in Germany and in central Europe. In short, Mr. President, it seems to me essential that our policy, NATO's policies, do not exclude a careful consideration of the Rapacki plan, the Eden plan for a demilitarized zone in middle Europe, or similar proposals in connection with the unification of Germany. Perhaps the best way to consider these matters would be to predicate them on reasonable agreements which may emerge from the Geneva Conferences on Surprise Attacks and the Suspension of Nuclear Tests.

Now getting back to what the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] mentioned a while ago, he asked, I believe, if I recognized the significance of a pullback and how it would benefit the Soviet Union. I do recognize that in some kinds of pullback the Western Powers would receive the worst of it, but I think we ought to recognize also that if there is to be any possibility of peace, we shall have to make some concessions; this might be one of them. We need to recognize that in so doing, if a withdrawal, based on a reasonable solution were brought about, we would be the ones who would take a loss in position, since the Soviet divisions, in going back to the heartland, would be in striking distance and would be better prepared than we would be to carry on any military activity in that area. But we have to develop give and take by starting from the bottom and working upward. If we do not get out of the position of rigidity, I believe the situation in Berlin and in Germany will become worse, and the bases on which there can be peace will become fewer and fewer.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with the statement of the Senator. In my opinion, there is a condition existing in which, if the Soviet Government continues to dictate to the government of East Berlin, it will be impossible to bring about a reconciliation of East and West Berlin. Soviet Russia will not tolerate it. Based upon the adamant position of Soviet Russia, and based upon the rigidity of the situation as described by the Senator from Montana, while the matters about which I have spoken are highly desirable, I agree we should look for other avenues to escape the great holocaust which seems to be threatening us in the future. I, for one—and I believe confirmation has been given to this view by the mayor of West Berlin—would want every avenue explored, talks had, continued talks, in the hope that some solution may be found.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I have taken a great deal of the Senate's time today. I have tried not to take it lightly. I have done so because it is clear that this administration, following the example of its predecessor, has committed the Nation to stand fast at Berlin.

It is a resolve well taken. Since we cannot yet perceive to what extremity of sacrifice it may lead in the months ahead, I have felt it essential to try to set forth for the consideration of the Senate my understanding of what is involved in the coming crisis in Germany. I am grateful that in this crucial time the Senate's principal Member in these matters, the outstanding Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is a man with such a deep understanding and intelligent grasp of the international forces that play on the Nation. I hope that he will make his voice heard; I am sure that the President and the Secretary of State will listen most carefully. I would hope, further, that between them will evolve a policy that all of us, as Americans, will be glad to support.

Most important, Mr. President, I hope that the President of the United States, his Secretary of State, and the Congress will fortify the resolve to stand fast in Berlin with the conviction which only a positive policy for peace can give it. The Secretary of State has spoken of mutual concessions. Those are calm and wise words for this moment in time, with the clouds of radioactive death waiting to envelop the earth. I hope, deeply, that they will lead to a positive policy for peace. It is that kind of a policy for which rational men everywhere are waiting. It is that kind of a policy which they will be able to comprehend and to which, if need be, they will be able willingly to consecrate their lives.

The policy has yet to be formed. It needs to be formed soon. If it is formed, the concept of freedom in peace will not perish in Berlin, in Germany, or in the world.

A THIRD WAY ON BERLIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, as anticipated by the President, the talks in Vienna did not produce any significant change in the situation at Berlin. Strip the newspaper accounts of their sensationalism and one thing is clear: The situation in Berlin is where it was in the fall of 1958. It is unchanged despite the Geneva Conference of foreign ministers in 1959. It is unchanged despite the friendly meeting at Camp David in 1959 and the furious meeting in Paris in the aftermath of the U-2 incident. There were no spirits at Vienna, only the hard facts exchanged without embellishment. There was only a high degree of soberness coupled with the personal courtesy of leaders, without which nations cannot hope to find a way to peace, today, any better than when diplomacy first began.

In this sense the Vienna talks were useful. They swept away the chaff. They revealed to both Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy the hard kernel of the problem. They revealed, too, that the problem confronts us in substantially the same form as it did when it first appeared more than 2 years ago.

I suppose we may regard the fact that the situation in Berlin is unchanged after 2 years, and that the crisis has been postponed for 2 years, as some sort of achievement. In early 1959, a military showdown appeared imminent to me, as it did to most observers, unless the policies and attitudes of a decade and a half would begin to change. The showdown did not take place.

It was forestalled by an almost continuous round of subsummit and summit conferences and visitings back and forth and hither and yon. The crisis has stirred again from time to time during this past 2 years but it has not erupted. Because it has not, does not mean that it will not. If the present positions of the parties concerned remain unchanged, sooner or later this crisis postponed, this crisis avoided will cease to lie dormant.

What is involved at Berlin is not some obscure situation, distant from our concern or the concern of the Soviet Union. Berlin is at the core of these concerns. Berlin is the level which may ease Europe toward a more durable security or push the Western nations and the Soviet Union into a new vortex of irrationality at whose center lies the graveyard of humanity.

In these circumstances, we owe it to ourselves to examine the position which we have assumed with respect to Berlin. The leaders of the Soviet Union are obligated to do the same. Both sides owe it to the people of the world. The responsibility which we have, Madam President, and which the Soviet Union has, is not merely to reassert positions already assumed and which are obviously irreconcilable. The responsibility is to seek to determine whether or not there is a third way on Berlin which corresponds more accurately to the needs of Germany today, Europe today, and the world today—indeed, a third way which meets more fully the contemporary needs of both the Soviet Union and ourselves.

We can make this exploration only if we see clearly what the present positions are and what they imply.

Together with Britain and France, this Nation is pledged to maintain an allied presence in West Berlin and to defend the people of that half city. The other members of the NATO have endorsed this position.

I do not think there is any misunderstanding of what we are pledged to do, either at home or abroad. Nevertheless, let us restate the position to be certain that it is not misunderstood either at home or abroad. Let us restate it without provocation, without bombast. Let us restate it, as I am sure the President did at Vienna, in all soberness: We will not be driven, pushed or barred from fulfilling our responsibilities to ourselves and to freedom in Berlin by any nation, half nation, group of nations or whatever. Such measures as may be necessary to assert that responsibility will be taken.

This is what we say in the phrase: Stand firm at Berlin. The full implications of these four words had better be understood in the Senate, in the Congress, and throughout the Nation. They had better be understood now. The range of this commitment extends from a beginning of words of firmness, to a midpoint of expenditure of immense resources and enormous taxes and other sacrifices, to a final pledge of the lives and fortunes of every man, woman, and child in the Nation. We are not engaged at Berlin with the fast draw and wax bullets of television any more than the Russians are engaged in a harmless game of chess. In the last analysis we are engaged now, as we have been at Berlin, with the whole future of the United States. In this day and age and in this situation, the words "standing firm" carry no other than this ultimate implication.

I say this with no desire to disturb the serenity of the Senate. I say it only that we may be clear on the meaning of the words we use. I say it in order that we may comprehend more accurately the immense burden which rests on the shoulders of the President of the United States. He will make the decisions and he must make them in this awesome context. I trust and I am confident that those of us with public responsibilities—in Government and out and especially the press and other news media—will remain cognizant of this burden during the next few months.

Let me set forth next my understanding of the position to which the Soviet Union adhears in the Berlin situation. It is, so far as I am aware, unchanged as is ours, except in time schedule since it was first announced in November 1958. I should like to state that position in substance without sensationalism and as objectively as I can delineate it from the accounts which have appeared in the press. The Soviet Union intends to withdraw from its World War II occupational responsibilities in East Berlin and it insists that the Western powers must do the same in West Berlin. It proposes to turn over East Berlin to the East German authorities, presumably as part of a separate peace treaty with the East German government. It offers to join in a guarantee of a new status for West Berlin as a free city within that state. And if I am not mistaken, Mr. Khrushchev has added to this position a further contention that the Soviet Union will come to the military aid of the East German authorities in the event that the Western Powers refuse to accept this change and continue to assert their present responsibilities in West Berlin in opposition to the wishes of those authorities.

These two positions, then, form the substance of the Berlin crisis now dormant but which, at any time, may become active. We insist, in effect, on the continuance of the status quo in Berlin for the present and, presumably until such time as Germany is unified. The Russians are intent upon changing the status quo in a particular fashion in the near future, regardless of the eventual solution of the question of German unification.

I know that we intend to maintain our position. I do not lightly assume that the Soviet Premier does not mean what he says with respect to the position of the Soviet Union, despite the postponements of the actual act of Soviet withdrawal during the months and years since November 1959.

My own view of this situation, however, is not one which depends on whether the Soviet Premier means what he says or does not mean what he says. It is based upon my personal estimate of the changing situation in Europe and the world and it is based upon what I believe to be the rational interests of this Nation in the light of those changes.

I have long questioned and I continue to question a status quo which places us in the position, in effect, of pleading with or urging the Russians not to withdraw their military forces from the westernmost point of penetration which they reached in Europe in the wake of World War II; yet, our present position on Berlin requires that we do precisely that. Further, Madam President, I do not think we can safeguard most effectively our own interests or advance the interests of peace when we insist upon remaining directly under a Communist sword of Damocles, as is now the case in Berlin, if a rational alternative may be found to that position through diplomacy. Further, I have long questioned and I continue to question a position on Berlin which was assumed immediately after World War II and has been maintained unchanged despite the enormous changes which have occurred in both parts of Germany and in Europe since that time.

Finally, I question, as I have long questioned, a position which, through subordinate irresponsibility, error or provocation on either side invites the precipitation of a nuclear conflict.

We prove our courage, our steadfastness, our determination when we insist, as insist we must with all that insistance implies, that we shall not permit the Russians or anyone else to dictate unilaterally the terms under which this Nation and its allies shall discharge the responsibilities which were assumed in Berlin in the wake of World War II. We would prove little more than the inertia of Western leadership, however, if we insist that the status quo in Berlin is sacrosanct. We prove little more than the sterility of our diplomacy if we insist that the status quo at Berlin cannot be changed even by mutual agreement leading to a new situation, which is neither that which now exists nor the alternative which the Soviet Union propounds. It seems to me, Madam President, that if we are to be not merely courageous but intelligently courageous that is precisely the course we must pursue. We must seek a third way in Berlin which may better serve the interests of all the parties concerned—of the German people no less than other Europeans, of the United States no less than the Soviet Union, and of that great stretch of the world with its hundreds of millions of people to whom Berlin is but a name, if it is even that.

I would not wish to preclude, Madam President, any proposals to this end which may originate in any quarter. Indeed, it would be helpful, in my opinion, if the Senate discussed this matter at length. I suggest, moreover, that this discussion might profitably begin now before the relatively dormant crisis in Berlin comes alive once again. We can think now of its many implications with a measure of detachment and deliberation. If we wait for the moment of heat, it may be too late to think at all.

I repeat, Madam President, I do not wish to preclude any ideas or proposals, regardless of their source, which may promise a rational solution of the problem of Berlin. For my part, however, I believe that the third way lies in an honest recognition of the fact that it is too late in the game to expect that Germany will be reunified in peace by fiat of' the United States, France, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia as was expected 15 years ago. Yet, this assumption continues to underlie our position with respect to Berlin. If the assumption is invalid, then the continued garrisoning of Berlin by the forces of these four nations loses much of its significance as a temporary occupational measure which was all it was intended to be when these garrisons were established a decade and a half ago.

However, Berlin—not only West Berlin, but all Berlin—does not lose its significance in terms of ultimate German unification. Berlin remains the symbolic hope of that unification and I do not think it is unreasonable to assume that it will one day again be the actual capital of a unified Germany. It seems to me that the German people will have the best opportunity to find the way to unification in peace and the outside powers will make a significant contribution to the search, if they will act now to remove Berlin—all Berlin—from the clashes of the cold war into which it has been driven by the events of the postwar years. If we must live, as it now seems likely, for an indefinite period with a divided Germany, then, peace requires that Berlin—all Berlin—be held in peace and in trust until the day of unification. Its status must be reconstituted so that Berlin will be the hope for peaceful German unification rather than the prize for German unification by other means which it has now become.

This conversion of Berlin will not occur under Mr. Khrushchev's proposal to turn only West Berlin into a free city. Even if the rights of the Western presence to that half-city were insured beyond a shadow of doubt, even if guarantees of the safety of the Western enclave were inviolate, it does not seem to me that this arrangement would be satisfactory. For it would reduce this enclave to a sleepy quasi-foreign anachronism, and it would leave Berlin—symbolic Berlin, unifying Berlin, Capital Berlin, German Berlin—in the hands of a militant German minority. It would give an enormous and inadmissible amplification throughout Germany to the present small voice of the East German minority government at Pankow. It would invite German nationalism throughout Germany to adhere to the German Communist standard flying in East Berlin. That is a handicap which freedom cannot allow. It is a concession which does not accord with the needs of peace in Germany or the essentials of peaceful competition between communism and freedom.

I do not believe, Madam President, that the way to peace can be found either in the maintenance of the status quo in Berlin or in the change which Mr. Khrushchev proposes. A third way may lie in the creation of a free city, not in West Berlin alone, but in the creation of a free city which embraces all Berlin—the Communist East no less than the free western segment of that metropolis. Let this whole city be held in trust and in peace by some international authority until such time as it is again the capital of Germany. Let the routes of access to this whole city be garrisoned by international peace teams in the effective pattern of those now operating between Israel and the Arab States. Let this interim status of free city be guaranteed by the NATO and Warsaw-pact countries.

Let Bonn and Pankow subscribe to this arrangement and pay its costs in appropriate shares. Let these changes be incorporated in specific written agreements. Then, perhaps, we may have the beginning of a durable peace in Berlin and the healing of the cleavage in Germany and Europe.

I know, Madam President, that to bring about this change in Berlin after the division of that city has hardened over many years may seem an immensely difficult, political, and diplomatic undertaking. But is it not, really, an infinitestimal task when compared with the full implications of an essay in military solution with what comes after it?

I realize, too, Madam President, that this approach may evoke no response from Mr. Khrushchev. But do Mr. Khrushchev's reactions, whatever they may be, dissolve us from our rational responsibilities to ourselves and to the world in this situation? Do not those responsibilities require us to explore fully and vigorously any and all avenues of peace even as we steel ourselves for what must come if the way to peace cannot be found?

I make these suggestions, Madam President, as one Senator from the State of Montana, and I make them on my own responsibility. I make them in full recognition of the present position of this Government which, if it is unchanged will be my personal position when all the words are exhausted. I make them, however, in the belief that this present position is not enough, even as the present Soviet position is not enough. Our present position on Berlin, even unchallenged by the Soviet Union, leads only in a circle endlessly repeated as it continues to recede from the changing realities of Germany and Europe, until it now promises to become at best irrelevant and at worst a stimulus to catastrophe. The Soviet position on Berlin, unchanged, in my opinion, is also headed toward complete irrelevance unless before that point is reached, it precipitates a military conflict by accident or design.

The implications of what I have tried to say to the Senate, then, are clear. Sooner or later, the Western nations and the Soviet Union must seek a new way, a third way, to solution of the Berlin problem along the lines which I have suggested or some other. Unless this search is pursued with energy and dispatch and to fruition, sooner or later Berlin is likely to become the pivot of a new disaster for mankind.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPEDITION OF UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION TRANSMISSION FACILITIES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 205.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Represenatives to the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART IV—GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION BROADCASTING FACILITIES

"Declaration of purpose

"Sec. 390. The purpose of this part is—

"(1) to assist (through matching grants) the several States to survey the need and develop programs for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, and

"(2) to assist (through matching grants) in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

"Authorization of appropriations

"Sec. 391. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding $520,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until July 1, 1967, for payment of grants with respect to which applications, approved under section 392, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1966.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding $25,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of paragraph (2) of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available for payment of grants for projects for which applications approved under section 393, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1967.

"Grants for surveys

"Sec. 392. (a) An application by the State educational television agency of a State for a grant for carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390 shall be approved by the Commissioner if the Governor of such State, or the legislature of such State by a duly adopted resolution, certifies to the Commissioner with respect to such application—

"(1) that any grant made to such State by the United States for carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390 will be matched by an equal amount of State funds; and

"(2) that such grant and such State funds will be used exclusively for making a survey of the need for any utility of additional educational television broadcasting facilities, and for the development of a program by the State educational television agency, for the construction of such facilities, which is based on such survey.

"(b) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year under subsection (a) of section 391 the Commissioner shall pay to each State which has an application approved under this section an amount equal to one-half of its expenditures during such year in carrying out the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 390; except that the total paid to any State under this section may not exceed $10,000. Such payments shall be made in advance on the basis of estimates by the Commissioner, and with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made.

"(c) The Commissioner shall encourage area or regional surveys, and development of appropriate construction programs, for areas including any part or parts of more than one State and for such purposes he shall modify the requirements of subsection (a) to the extent he deems necessary to permit and facilitate financial and other cooperation between the State educational television agencies of the States involved.

"Grants for construction

"SEC. 393. (a) For each project for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities there shall be submitted to the Commissioner an application for a grant containing such information with respect to such project as the Commissioner may by regulation require, including the total cost of such project and the amount of the Federal grant requested for such project, and providing assurance satisfactory to the Commissioner—

"(1) that the applicant is (A) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof, (B) the State educational television agency, (C) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues, or (D) a nonprofit organization consisting solely of entities referred to in the preceding clauses of this paragraph and which is organized solely to engage in educational television broadcasting;

"(2) that the operation of such educational television broadcasting facilities will be under the control of the applicant or a person qualified under paragraph (1) to be such an applicant;

"(3) that necessary funds to construct, operate, and maintain such educational television broadcasting facilities will be available when needed; and

"(4) that such television broadcasting facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

"(b) That total amount of grants under this part for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities to be situated in any State shall not exceed $1,000,000.

"(c) In the case of any State with respect to which an application has been approved under section 392, an application for a grant under this section for a project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities in such State shall be submitted through the State educational television agency of such State; and in such case the Commissioner shall not approve such application under this section unless such agency concurs in or approves such application and, if a State construction program has been developed as provided in subsection (a)(2) of section 392, certifies that such facilities are included in, or construction thereof would be consistent with, such program.

"(d) The Commissioner shall base his determinations of whether to approve applications for grants under this section and the amount of such grants on criteria set forth in regulations and designed to achieve (1) prompt and effective use of all educational television channels remaining available, (2) equitable geographical distribution of educational television broadcasting facilities throughout the States, and (3) provision of educational television broadcasting facilities which will serve the greatest number of persons and serve them in as many areas as possible, and which are adaptable to the broadest educational uses.

"(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Commissioner shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding (1) 50 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project, plus (2) 25 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of any educational television broadcasting facilities owned by the applicant on the date on which it files such application; except that the total amount of any grant made under this section with respect to any project may not exceed 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Commissioner to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project. The Commissioner shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine.

"(f) If, within ten years after completion of any project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities with respect to which a grant has been made under this section—

"(1) the applicant or other owner of such facilities ceases to be an agency, officer, institution, or organization described in subsection (a)(1), or

"(2) such facilities cease to be used for educational television purposes (unless the Commissioner determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation so to do),

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of such facilities the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facilities are situated) of such facilities, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facilities.

"Records

"SEC. 394. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this part shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out his functions under this part, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Commissioner and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this part.

"Definitions

"SEC. 395. For the purposes of this part—

"(1) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(2) The term 'construction', as applied to educational television broadcasting facilities, means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus (including towers, microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, mobile equipment, and video-recording equipment) necessary for television broadcasting, including apparatus which may incidentally be used for transmitting closed circuit television programs, but does not include the construction or repair of structures to house such apparatus.

"(3) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(4) The term 'State educational television agency' means (A) a board or commission established by State law for the purpose of promoting educational television within a State, (B) a board or commission appointed by the Governor of a State for such purpose if such appointment is not inconsistent with State law, or (C) a State officer or agency responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within the State which has been designated by the Governor to assume responsibility for the promotion of educational television; and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the term 'Governor' means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"(5) The term 'nonprofit community educational television organization' means a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is broadly representative of schools, colleges, and universities, and educational, scientific, civic, and cultural institutions and organizations, located in the area to be served by educational television broadcasting facilities, and which was organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting.

"(6) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association, means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"Provision of assistance by Federal Communications Commission

"Sec. 396. The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this part as may be requested by the Commissioner. The Commissioner shall provide for consultation and close cooperation with the Federal Communications Commission in the administration of his functions under this part which are of interest to or affect the functions of such Commission.

"Rules and regulations

"Sec. 397. The Commissioner is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part, including regulations relating to the order of priority in approving applications for projects under section 393 or to determining the amounts of grants for such projects.

"Federal interference or control prohibited

"Sec. 398. Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to the bill, agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Cotton, and Mr. Case of New Jersey the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NO "TINCUP" FOR US

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last Thursday, the House of Representatives passed a bill to reimburse the New York City police force for extraordinary expenses incurred guarding Khrushchev and Castro in 1960 at the United Nations. As the sponsor of a companion Senate bill, I am delighted that this legislation has passed its first test and I look forward to its consideration in the Senate.

The House bill appropriates $3,063,500 to the city of New York, representing reimbursement at straight time rates for overtime hours put in by members of the New York City police force during the period of the opening of the 15th General Assembly.

Total cost to the city of New York of this special U.N. service was approximately $6.5 million, which included overtime pay, clerical, and administrative services and the cost of vehicles and other special precautions. The amount approved by the House would only cover costs which can clearly and without any question be considered as beyond regular operating costs of the city of New York police force.

Mr. President, money cannot repay the policemen of New York for the superb manner in which they carried out their duties at the convening of the 15th General Assembly. They lived up to their reputation as New York's Finest. Many members of the force were away from their homes and families for long hours, day and night. They did an outstanding job in averting the unpleasant incidents ordinarily associated with the presence of so many unpopular Communist leaders. Their efforts constitute a service, not only to the city of New York, but to the Nation as a whole.

True, a share of the responsibility of protecting delegates and visitors to the United Nations rests with the city. The city wanted the United Nations located at Lake Success and derives benefit from its presence there. However, the special and unforeseeable circumstances of 1960 surpassed the city's obligation. Therefore the responsibility must be shared by the Nation as a whole, acting in its capacity as leader of the free world and host country to the United Nations.

Mr. President, this legislation is and has been a completely nonpartisan effort. The principle involved has received the blessing of former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. Bills to reimburse the city of New York have been introduced in the other body by Congressmen Ryan, Celler, Halpern, Lindsay, and Congresswoman Kelly. I introduced the companion measure in the Senate with the active support and cosponsorship of my distinguished senior colleague from New York, Senator Javits.

Mr. President, following the introduction of this bill I was in close touch with the Department of State, which has written to me as follows:

> There is no doubt that the additional cost of police services imposed upon the city of New York was unprecedented and unforeseen and, for that reason, it would be inappropriate to expect the city to bear this expense in its entirety.

Many will recall the tremendous concern prevailing at the time of Khrushchev's visit to New York. An incident occurring at that time could inflame and aggravate world tensions and create international havoc.

When Castro arrived at Idlewild Airport the New York Times reported that his cavalcade was led by a motorcycle and a car containing three officers with submachineguns. Two policemen flanked his car, a bus with 60 policemen followed and four patrolmen were stationed at each bridge along the route. Two hundred policemen were waiting at his hotel when he arrived. This is not routine police protection. The average diplomatic visitor to the city of New York, even a head of state does not receive or require such heavy protective efforts.

Mr. President, when this measure was debated in the House one of its opponents said that the torch held by the Statue of Liberty should henceforth be represented by a "tincup" if this bill was enacted. His analogy is completely inaccurate. To portray the financial relationship between New York State and the Federal Government, it would be more appropriate to replace the torch with a check book and a fountain pen. We have been paying Uncle Sam's bills for activities which do not benefit New York for years.

In 1959, for example, 8.3 percent of the Federal taxes paid by New Yorkers were returned to New York State in the form of Federal payments to State and local governments. The gentleman who made the "tincup" statement comes from a State which received twice as much, 15.2 percent. In 1959 Wyoming received 32.3 percent, New Mexico 27.3 percent, and the only State with a percentage lower than that of New York was New Jersey, with 6.4 percent. We do not hold a "tincup." We never have. It is about time New York State got a fair shake from the Federal Government, and that is all we ask.

Consider the contingents which descended on New York City in September and October of 1960—Khrushchev, Tito, Gomulka, Castro, and Kadar. This was shortly after the U-2 and RB-47 incidents. Relations were strained. The temperature of the cold war was rising steadily. The job of protecting these "two-bit" dictators, many people believed, was impossible. Nevertheless, the police force of New York City did the job and did it well. We owe them a real debt of gratitude, for an incident during those visits might have been catastrophic. The amount requested in the legislation which has passed the House and which I have introduced in the Senate is reasonable and fair. I urge the Senate to give its immediate attention and favorable action.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 10, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 9, 1962:

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Justice M. Chambers, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, vice Edward A. McDermott.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

J. Herbert Hollomon, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce. (New position.)

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be commanders in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Jalmer O. Brown
James Cavahaugh
Rodman W. Vaughan
Arnold J. Larsen
Frederick B. Thatcher
William B. Durham
Hamlett I. Allen
Theron H. Gato
Charles F. W. Cullison

The following-named person to be lieutenant commander in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Alvin J. Boxwell

The following-named person to be lieutenant in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Clement H. E. Kerans, Jr.

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Harry Andrew Allen
John Knight Andrews
George Eddings Archer, Jr.
William Leon Avery
Albert Frank Baker
Clifford Eugene Banner
Robert Andrew Bastek
Peter Michael Bernstein
Raymond Demetrius Bland
Richard Carl Blaschke
Robert Kent Blaschke
Thomas Walter Boerger
Harold Lance Bonnet
William Andrew Borchers
David Thomas Boyle
Robert Frederick Boysen, Jr.
John Wentworth Brittain
Larry Dennis Brooks
Philip Jeffrey Bull
Carl Henry Burkhart
David Kevin Carey
Louis Michael Casale
George Anthony Casimir
David Raynor Coady
Walter Melbourne Coburn
Richard Vincent Consigli
Joseph Lawrence Crowe, Jr.
Laurence Joseph Dallaire, Jr.
John George Denninger, Jr.
Joseph Patrick Dibella
Joseph Henry Discenza
Lance Arthur Eagan
Joseph Robert Finelli
Arthur Richard Gandt
David Shaw Gemmell
James Franklin Greene, Jr.
Richmond Dean Greenough, Jr.
William Scott Haight
Glenn Edgar Haines
David Wade Hastings
William Colbert Heming
Arthur Eugene Henn
Peter Christian Hennings
Stephen Henry Hines
Eugene Hornstein
Raymond Jerry Houttekier
Kwang-Ping Hsu
Norman Henry Huff
Herbert Miller Hurst
Harry Nelson Hutchins III
Thomas Patrick Keane
Don Michael Keehn
Thomas Joseph Kenney
Frederick Arthur Kelley
Richard Joseph Kiessel
Daniel Tobias Koenig
James Henry Lightner
Thomas Henry Lloyd, Jr.
Neal Mahan
Robert David Markoff
George Edward Mason
John Thomas Mason
John Michael McCann
Robert Edward McDonough, Jr.
James Charles McElroy
Thomas Peter McGann
Thomas Francis McGrath III
James Andrew McIntosh
Alexander Clark McKean, Jr.
Timothy George McKinna
Arthur William Mergner, Jr.
Wade Mulford Moncrief, Jr.
Francis William Mooney
Charles Wesley Morgan
Stewart Brandhorst Morgan
James Lowell Mueller
William Stewart Murray
Michael Owen Murtagh
Peter Thomas Muth
Richard Brien O'Keefe
Leonard Joseph Pichini
Ronald Martin Potter
David William Proudfoot
David William Robinette
Edward Kenneth Roe, Jr.
Allen Edward Rolland
William Henry Roth
Jon Patrick Ryan
Joseph Henry Sanford
Lawrence Michael Schilling
Michael Joseph Schiro
John Callup Schmidtman
Richard Eugene Shrum
Frederick Damien Smith
Joseph James Smith
Thomas David Smith
Anthony John Soltys
Theodore Arthur Somes
Elmer Sorensen, Jr.
William Harry Spence
Wayne Paul Stevens
Hugh Lafayette Thomas, Jr.
Henry Bradley Traver
James Alexander Umberger
Joseph Louis Valenti
Harvey Landin Wahnquist, Jr.
James Lee Walker
William James Wallace, Jr.
Thomas William Watkins III
Thomas Samuel Whipple
Daniel Michael White
Jack Warwick Whiting, Jr.
David Hart Whitten
David Harold Withers
John Anthony Wuestneck
Ronald Charles Zinzer

The following-named person to be chief warrant officer, W-4, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Joseph A. Nartonis

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officer, W-2, in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Richard D. Borden
Marlan H. Murphy
Louis DeBernardi, Jr.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, in accordance with the provisions of section 520(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

Alton W. Hemba, of Mississippi, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John F. Archer, of California.
Richard. C. Barkley, of Michigan.
Robert L. Barry, of Pennsylvania.
Natale H. Bellocchi, of New York.
Norman M. Bouton, of Indiana.
A. Donald Bramante, of Virginia.
John R. Countryman, of New York.
Miss Marie R. de Gunzburg, of New York.
Eugene Klebenov, of Massachusetts.
James E. Leader, of Delaware.
William K. Mackey, of the District of Columbia.
Andrew J. Pierre, of New York.
Gilbert F. Rankin, of California.
Frederick S. Vaznaugh, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Michael J. Barry, of New York.
William W. Beyer, of New Jersey.
Richard A. Christensen, of Wisconsin.
John R. Davis, of New York.
Peter Jon de Vos, of the District of Columbia.
Charles F. Dunbar, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Henry A. Engelbrecht, Jr., of Maryland.
Ronald D. Flack, of Minnesota.
Carmen L. Gentile, of Massachusetts.
John L. Gibson, of Iowa.
Miss Dixie L. Harrington, of Iowa.
Miss Ruth M. Held, of New York.
M. Charles Hill, of New Jersey.
Miss Carolyn M. Kruschke, of Minnesota.
Edward A. Mainland, of California.
Paul M. Meo, of Massachusetts.
Robert P. Myers, Jr., of California.
Thomas M. T. Niles, of Kentucky.
Ernest D. Oates, of California.
Arthur M. Odum, of Texas.
Walter E. Stadtler, of New York.
Carl Taylor, of Vermont.
Joel D. Ticknor, of New York.
Thaddeus C. Trzyna, of California.
Frank Tumminia, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Gilbert F. Austin, of Washington.
John H. Backer, of North Carolina.
James P. Burke, of Maryland.
James D. Conley, of Indiana.
Robert M. Gilkey, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Benjamin H. Jackson, Jr., of Rhode Island.
William A. K. Jones, of the District of Columbia.
Barry R. Nemcoff, of Pennsylvania.
Robert L. Nichols, of New Hampshire.
Ralph G. Seehafer, of Virginia.
Laurence Sharpe, of Illinois.
Robert B. Warner, of Michigan.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

James E. Bradshaw, of Tennessee.
Earl Monroe Dennis, Jr., of Virginia.
Arthur P. Frizzell, of Maine.
Thomas J. Gunning, of Wisconsin.
C. Clark Rumrill, of New York.
Creed Davis Tucker, of Illinois.

Arthur M. Niner, Jr., of New Jersey, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a vice consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

David H. Blee, of California.
Charles O. Coudert, of Connecticut.
Charles B. Fahs, of New Jersey.
John P. Horgan, of Virginia.
Lloyd L. Lee, of Hawaii.
Alan D. Wolfe, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service Staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

William C. Kirk, Jr., of Florida.
Frederick W. Shaffer, of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Corinne W. Spencer, of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Philippians 2: 5: *Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.*

Almighty God, may this moment, set aside for prayer, be one of high and holy communion when in fellowship with one another we are brought, by Thy spirit, under the sovereignty of the mind of Christ, His humility and obedience, His purity and peace.

We acknowledge sorrowfully that we are living in a world where many are distressed and disappointed, turning their eyes upon the ground whence no help can come rather than heavenward and unto Thee in whom all the perplexing questions and lofty aspirations of our hearts find their answer.

Grant that in response to the winsome overtures and persuasions of our divine Lord we may open widely the windows of our minds to the truth that sets us free and the love that never fails but makes us equal to all the demands of our day and generation.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 5, 1962, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2768. An act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor.

JOINT MEETING TO RECEIVE THE SHAHANSHAH OF IRAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday, April 12, 1962, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting his Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the military construction bill H.R. 11131.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 385)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 15th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The WHITE HOUSE, *April 9, 1962.*

HOW TO CHOKE OFF A RECOVERY: THE FEDERAL RESERVE DOES IT AGAIN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the recovery from the 1960 recession, promising until a few months ago, shows serious signs of petering out.

The administration has predicted a balanced budget for fiscal 1963 based upon revenues from a projected gross national product for the calendar year 1962 of $570 billion. But now, according to Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, gross national product for the first half of 1962 is not meeting expectations. Thus, tax revenues will be below those expected, and the precariously balanced budget will be out of balance. Colin Stam, of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, has already estimated a fiscal 1963 budget deficit on the order of $4 billion.

Unemployment, too, has not been reduced as fast as hoped. It now looks as if we would not be able to reach our modest goal of a 4-percent unemployment rate until the second half of 1963, if then. While the present unemployment rate of 5.5 percent is below peak recession levels, a long-term unemployment has just recently begun to increase again.

The rate of nonfarm housing starts, seasonally adjusted, has steadily declined every month from October 1961.

Consumer purchasing has not expanded at the rate hoped for by Government economists.

While our international payments situation has been improving, the progress made can well be frustrated by our lagging recovery rate. Foreign central bankers are particularly sensitive to an unbalanced budget in the United States—even though they are used to looking the other way when their own budgets do not balance. If we want to keep the confidence of Europe's central bankers, we must do the best job we know how to attain the adequate growth rate which alone can bring about a balanced budget.

What is causing the trouble? What is the reason our recovery is slowing down?

The biggest single reason, Mr. Speaker, is that the Federal Reserve System is up to its old tricks.

Twice before in the last 8 years, the Federal Reserve System has applied the brakes before the economy, emerging from a recession, had a chance to get rolling again. As a result millions of man-hours were lost through unemployment; vast plant capacity went unused; and our growth rate staggered and broke, rather than turned upward.

In the 1954 recession the Federal Reserve System, very properly, made available to the banking system net free reserves on the order of $500 million. By 1955, with the country emerging from a recession, the Fed decided to apply the brakes. Net free reserves—the true unused lending capacity of the banking system—were lowered to around $300 million, and later, in 1956 and 1957, the banking system was actually placed in a net borrowed position.

By 1958 we had another serious recession, and the Fed—locking the stable after the horse was stolen—then raised net free reserves again to $500 million. But by the autumn of 1958 recovery had started. So the Federal Reserve promptly lowered its net free reserves so that 1958 saw the banks once again in a net borrowed position.

I do not wish to seem a partisan in my criticism of the Federal Reserve System for choking off recovery from the 1958 recession. Let us take a look at what two prominent Republican economists had to say about the Fed's performance.

W. Allen Wallis, dean of the Graduate School of Business at the University of Chicago, was Vice Chairman of President Eisenhower's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth. In a speech last May, Mr. Wallis said:

> The Federal Reserve Board tightened up the money supply in 1959 overvigorously and overpromptly as a move against inflation. But the inflation wasn't there.

Arthur Burns was Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under the Eisenhower administration. Last April, Mr. Burns, taking a backward look at the Fed's monetary performance, accused the Federal Reserve of choking off business recovery in 1959 by tightening credit with excessive vigor.

On June 1 and 2, 1961, the Joint Economic Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, was conducting its annual review of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, was before the Committee. I congratulated Mr. Martin and the Federal Reserve System for helping to combat the recession of 1960 by maintaining net free reserves, as it had done for the first half of 1961, at the level of $500 million. And then I said:

> I would like to express the hope that the Federal Reserve from here on out will keep its free net reserves in the banking system at something like the present level of half a billion until we get the unemployment rate down, not to 6 percent, not to 5 percent, but to some lower percentage, call it 4, if you like, which will enable the economy to grow, and us to make a dent in unemployment (hearings, p. 100).

Chairman Martin replied:

> Well, I appreciate your comments, Mr. Reuss, and I want to say that the Federal Reserve deplores the unemployment situation just as much as you do, and is just as anxious as you are to lower it.
>
> I cannot forecast what the future policy of the Open Market Committee will be, but I will certainly bear in mind your comments, and I am sure that all the members of the Open Market Committee will be very glad to have your observations. But I am absolutely convinced that, in the overall picture, artificially cheap money would not contribute to reducing the unemployment picture.

To which I replied:

> I am not for artifically cheap money, but just for the kind of money you are now producing, and should keep on producing until unemployment is down to a manageable level.

Much to my delight, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve System then proceeded to keep free reserves at around the $500 million level for the months following that June 1, 1961, colloquy. Free reserves, at the $549 million level in June, were still at the $517 million level in November. The recovery continued nicely.

Practically all through 1961, the Fed Open Market Committee, which—by buying or selling securities in the open market—controls the level of reserves of the banking system and thus the money supply, pursued this adequate-money policy. As the minutes of the Open Market Committee meeting every 3 weeks show it wisely decided to let well enough alone through June and July and August and September and October and November 1961.

But, alas, this performance was too good to be true. On December 19, 1961, the Fed returned to its old habit of choking off recovery, learned in 1955 and 1959. The Open Market Committee issued an economic policy directive for a somewhat slower rate of increase in total reserves than during recent months, and with emphasis on continuance of the 3-month Treasury bill rate at close to the top of the range recently prevailing.

To their credit, Govs. G. H. King, Jr., and George W. Mitchell voted against the directive on the grounds that the time had not yet arrived for any modification of policy in the direction of less ease.

The new tight-money policy was not long in taking effect.

The 90-day Treasury bill rate, which was at 2.4 percent in November 1961, promptly jumped up to 2.75 percent, where it has since remained.

The money supply, which had been increasing steadily throughout 1961 and had reached a peak of $144.9 billion in December 1961, declined in January and February 1962. In the second half of February, the last date for which we have figures, money supply had dropped to $144.2 billion, a decrease from December of $700 million.

Free reserves likewise felt the onslaught of the new tight-money policy. By February 1962, they had dropped to $424 million. They rebounded slightly to $444 million by February 14, and have been lower ever since. Free reserves were $350 million on March 8, $353 million on March 22, and $369 million on March 28, 1962. This low level of free reserves means that great numbers of banks, particularly city banks, are "loaned up"—without any ability to lend money, except as an old loan is paid off, or as securities from their portfolios are sold. Indeed, in February, commercial banks had to sell $1.2 billion of U.S. securities, at least partly in order to meet even a small part of the demands of businessmen, homebuilders, consumers, and other loan applicants.

Now, it is perfectly true that in the last few weeks the interest rate on long-term U.S. bonds, and on other long-term securities, has softened slightly. This softening, however, has been in spite of, not because of, Federal Reserve monetary policy. Investors have become somewhat more pessimistic about the economy's growth rate, and are hence switching from stocks to bonds, which raises bond prices and lowers bond yields.

The Federal Reserve System, I regret to say, is at it again. Having tasted the heady wine of tight money when the economy was recovering in 1955 and 1959, it has now reached for the same old bottle again just as the economy was beginning to recover.

The remedy is clear. The Federal Reserve System ought promptly to repeal its destructive policy decision of December 16, 1961, and supply the economy with adequate credit—net free reserves at least at the $500 million level. Two bouts with the tight-money bottle in a decade are enough.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give me the answer to a question that has been troubling me for some time: Why the $50 million that was used to buy 245 million French francs on March 1 of this year did not come out of the International Monetary Fund rather than out of funds controlled by the Federal Reserve System? Can the gentleman tell me why?

Mr. REUSS. I think I can explain the Federal Reserve System's position in that. The International Monetary Fund does not buy and sell foreign currency for the account of any one of its member countries. If a member country wants to acquire foreign currencies for its own purpose, it has to buy these itself. The Treasury of the United States since 1933, pursuant to the Treasury Stabilization Fund that has been set up for that purpose, does, therefore, deal in foreign currencies. As far as I am concerned, this is a salutary function. The Federal Reserve got into this business only recently.

It will interest the gentleman from Iowa that I and other members of the Committee on Banking and Currency expressed a good deal of interest in just what the Federal Reserve was doing when Mr. Martin appeared before us within the last month. We wanted to be very sure, and I know the gentleman from Iowa will agree with our philosophy there, that Congress retain some knowledge of and control over what the executive departments were doing. As the result of that inquiry we wrote into the report of the House Committee on Banking and Currency on the payments legislation that was before this body last week a very definite requirement that the Secretary of the Treasury, the politically responsible officer in this country, charge himself with the responsibility of setting and formulating our international economic and financial policy with particular regard to this matter of buying foreign currencies, so that the Congress would have one place to look to and so that uncoordinated activities could not go on.

In specific answer to the gentleman's question about the $50 million purchase in French francs which was made just a few weeks ago, I think that that purchase probably was in the national interest. I think that is so because 3 or 4 weeks ago turned out to be a time when the franc was purchasable at a fair exchange rate. I think it is well to have in our kitty some foreign currency so that if the dollar should once again be placed under strain we can do what we can to bail it out.

However, and now I come to what I think is the more appropriate answer to the gentleman's question, the primary duty of helping maintain the dollar as an international reserve key currency is and should be on the International Monetary Fund. It is significant that in the past this country, the United States, has been a very generous participant in the International Monetary Fund. Now that the dollar itself has international problems, it is only meet, right, and proper that the International Monetary Fund help us more than it has in the past. The purpose of the payments agreement which was passed by this body last week was to impose that kind of obligation on the International Monetary Fund.

Mr. GROSS. Let me get this straight. Is it possible to use the funds from the International Monetary Fund for the purpose of buying other countries' currencies in order to defend the position of or stabilize the dollar in the international money market?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, it is. Technically this is true right now. However, the purpose of the payments agreement legislation which went through this body last week was to get additional funds into the International Monetary Fund. The unhappy truth is that today the Fund holds only negligible quantities of French francs, Italian lira, West German deutschemarks, and other very strong continental currencies. Under the agreement which this body of the Congress ratified, the International Monetary Fund would put itself in a position where it may lay its hands on $3 billion worth of these key continental currencies, leaving aside pounds sterling and of course our own currency, the dollar. When that is done, and I hope it is done quickly, then it will be true that this country can avail itself of the offices of the International Monetary Fund to get its hands on currencies like French francs.

When that happens, I would hope that we would use the International Monetary Fund for that purpose, and not feel it so necessary to buy these currencies ourselves out of our own dollar stabilization fund.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, with the Federal Reserve using $50 million as it did on March 1 of this year to buy French francs; is that not contributing to and widening the imbalance of our dollar transactions rather than helping?

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman's Midwestern horsesense arithmetic is very good as usual. This is a criticism I have of infinite activities by either the Treasury or the Federal Reserve to buy foreign currency. In a sense it is bootstrap lifting, because we have to buy the foreign currency with dollars. In defense of our money experts, I would say this:

There are times when in a particular week the dollar looks strong and the franc looks relatively weak and when it may make sense to get a few of these foreign currencies into our kitty. But I think the gentleman is on essentially sound ground when he says, you cannot lift yourself by your own bootstraps, if you spend $50 million to buy francs, you are $50 million shy on your balance of payments to the extent that you have done that. I think the gentleman, by the same token, would agree that this technical operation, if conducted by competent people who know what they are doing, can moderately help us in the central problem that we are confronted with, which is, as the gentleman, I am sure, would agree, getting and keeping a sound full-employment economy at home, and bringing our international payments into balance, and then seeing that raids and runs on the dollar are warded off by the kind of international cooperative action which does not place all the burden on Uncle Sam. Would the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I certainly do. I am pleased to hear the gentleman state that, after all, it comes back to the integrity of the dollar, and that we can best maintain the integrity of the dollar by taking care of our finances reasonably and logically with balanced budgets in this country. It seems to me that this is where we must maintain the integrity of the dollar—here at home. I want to say to the gentleman, I did read the hearings, with a great deal of interest, and particularly the questions which the gentleman from Wisconsin asked of Mr. Martin as well as Mr. Dillon on the subject—and, perhaps, I stated it wrongly—of the divided authority to use our money in an attempt to stabilize the dollar in the international money market. I agree completely with the gentleman that this ought to be concentrated in one place so that we will know precisely what we are doing.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman. I do not think the gentleman misstated matters when he referred to the divided authority. That is the way the situation has developed. I think the Congress by timely action made clear its desire to have that authority concentrated.

URBAN TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on an issue which President Kennedy dealt with in his message on transportation delivered to the Congress recently. I refer to one of the most urgent and important domestic issues facing the Nation, namely, that of urban transportation.

Mr. Speaker, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Commerce have recently undertaken field investigations of the problems of urban transportation. Their findings support the need for substantial expansion and significant changes in the urban mass transportation program authorized in the Housing Act of 1961.

Based on these studies, the President, in his message on transportation, has urged the Congress to provide Federal financial aid and technical assistance to help plan and develop the comprehensive and balanced urban transportation that is so vital to the great majority of our citizens. I join with President Kennedy in urging your support of such a viable Federal program which has such an important bearing on the future financial and economic well-being of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the problem of traffic congestion in our great metropolitan areas—the great urban centers of our Nation which are, at once, home for three-quarters of our population, the centers of our culture, research, and education, the headquarters for our great corporate endeavors, and the wellspring of our Nation's wealth.

It is ironic in an era in which we are making stirring advances in space transportation that the problem of ground transportation in Metropolis, U.S.A., lies festering and unattended. Colonel Glenn traveled halfway around the earth last February 20 in less time than it takes millions of our workers to travel from their homes to their jobs.

We can look forward confidently to still greater advances in space transportation. But our prospects of unsnarling the traffic jams on our metropolitan highways and freeways are dismal unless this Congress provides the same kind of leadership and assistance that put our Nation's space program into orbit in a period of only a few short years.

A variety of factors have contributed to the congestion problems now facing our urban centers, three of which seem to stand out as particularly important. First is the great population explosion the United States has experienced in the past 20 years. But even more significant than the overall increase in the number of people is the fact that the bulk of population growth is occurring in our metropolitan areas, particularly in the outlying regions of these areas. Half of our urbanites now live in "Suburbia" compared to 1 in 3 in 1950. This rapid expansion of metropolitan fringe areas has greatly increased the strain on the transportation facilities of our great urban centers and is threatening the fiscal solvency and economic survival of core cities.

Second, Federal housing activities and programs have accentuated this dispersal process. In particular, Federal home loan guarantee programs have promoted single family home ownership in suburban areas at the expense of the central cities. The growing scarcity of urban land has pushed these suburban housing developments further and further away from the economic employment hubs of our metropolitan regions. The lack of Federal programs to encourage the provision of suitable housing alternatives in downtown locations for middle income families has given additional impetus to the exodus of many city families. As a result a distressing number of older cities are becoming ghettos of low income and minority families, the tax base of these cities has become seriously eroded and urban transportation problems multiplied.

Last, the Federal highway air program by encouraging ownership of private automobiles has contributed to the decline in public transportation facilities. It is now increasingly evident in most cities that facilities for both private and public transportation are needed if traffic congestion downtown is not to stifle our urban centers. Traffic jams in our city streets are now costing the Nation some $5 billion each year in lower downtown commercial sales, lower tax revenues, lost time and wages, extra fuel consumption, and faster vehicle deterioration.

All these problems are accentuated in my home State of California, which will become the most populous State in the Nation before the end of this year.

The problem of traffic congestion in California centers in the two great metropolitan regions of San Francisco and Los Angeles, which account for nearly three-quarters of the State's total population and for some $21 billion of the State's total assessed valuation of $29 billion.

In a very real sense, California's economic future is highly dependent upon the economic vitality of San Francisco and Los Angeles metropolitan areas. And the economic health of California is, of course, of direct concern to the Federal Government in many important ways.

Thus, the traffic congestion—particularly the morning and evening peak hour congestion—which today threatens to strangle the economy of these regions should be a source of great concern to all of us.

We have not been idle, I can assure you, in our efforts to cope with these problems. Next to education, California annually spends more on highways and freeways than for any other purpose. This State money combined with Federal aid highway grants have enabled California to develop what is generally acknowledged to be the finest freeway and highway system in the world. And we are continuing this program with all vigor.

But despite our herculean efforts and enormous outlays of Federal and State money, we are unable to keep up with the mounting population of people and cars. We long ago came to the conclusion that facilities for the private automobile alone are not enough, and that our highways and streets must be augmented and complemented by superior rapid transit systems.

We are so convinced, in fact, that our metropolitan freeway plans have been based on the assumption that rapid transit systems will be operating in the San Francisco Bay area and the Los Angeles area by 1980.

Both of these great metropolitan regions have made great progress toward building rapid transit systems. In the case of the San Francisco Bay area, a step-by-step program designed to produce the most modern rapid transit system in the world has been underway for more than 10 years.

It has been a decade of pioneering work. The plans which have been developed by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District have won acclaim from transportation experts throughout the world. For, in essence, these plans provide the first public transportation system ever developed which is able to provide transportation superior to the private automobile and to serve the entire metropolitan region.

Mr. Speaker, it is expected that these plans will be presented to the voters in the San Francisco Bay area at the general election this coming November. It is this schedule which lends a great urgency to our consideration of aid for metropolitan mass transit systems.

Mr. Speaker, transportation authorities throughout the country concede that the fate of rapid transit plans in the bay area could well determine the future of rapid transit planning in other metropolitan areas. If the bay area plans succeed, that success could well mean an immediate renaissance in public transportation everywhere. If these plans fail, efforts to develop new and improved public transportation systems could be set back immeasurably.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the success or failure of the rapid transit plans for the San Francisco Bay area becomes a national issue of great importance.

The issue in the bay area will be decided squarely on a basis of money. The people of the bay area, time after time, have indicated their desire for a rapid transit system to work with their freeways. The question remaining if whether they will be willing to cast a 60 percent majority vote in favor of increasing their property taxes to pay the estimated $790 million cost of the proposed system. As you can well realize, Mr. Speaker, obtaining the required 60 percent majority on an issue of such major proportions will be a most difficult problem.

If prior to the time the issue comes to a vote this Congress has taken meaningful action to make available the same type of financial aid which it already is making available for highways, urban renewal, and other major problems, I am sure that the chances of passing the bond issue will be increased tremendously.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the November vote in the bay area could well be a test case nationally for rapid transit. Therefore, I believe, it behooves this Congress to hasten its consideration of transit aid legislation and do everything in its power to insure the success of the San Francisco system.

I also urge this Congress to formulate a national policy for a coordinated and balanced transportation system. If we can do this, Mr. Speaker, I believe future historians will record our action among the most important accomplishments of the 87th session. Only by combining the efforts of all levels of government and promoting more comprehensive metropolitan area planning in the field of urban transportation can we solve this urgent problem of 20th-century urban America.

STOCKPILING OF U.S. FOREIGN AID FUNDS

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, from the recapitulation provided by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and the recent report filed by the Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Program, it is rather obvious that the State Department and the recipients of U.S. generosity are stockpiling our foreign aid funds.

According to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana—and he should know; he is chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee—there is approximately $10 billion available in foreign aid funds for obligation and expenditure for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1962. This is not all the foreign aid available by any manner of means; yet the administration is asking for another $4.9 billion for fiscal 1963.

All of these funds will not be disbursed during 1962, leaving an enormous sum available for later distribution.

Our foreign aid program is directly related to our balance-of-payments deficit; and, unless the outflow of gold and dollars to foreign nations is drastically reduced, our generosity could wreck our own economy.

This survey team of the Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Program recently sent to Korea, Vietnam, and Turkey reported stockpiling procedures of foreign aid funds in those countries.

The mission of this team was to search for evidence of waste as well as failure to accomplish anticipated results.

Many deficiencies observed by this team were not made public because the Executive classified them as secret for fear of giving undesirable information to our enemies or for fear public exposure of them would jeopardize our relations with friendly governments.

Although the survey team did not review every obligation of funds it found many that were carried over from year to year, some as much as 5 years, when they were not utilized as scheduled. The survey team reported that these actions had the effect of stockpiling funds on the chance that they might ultimately be used.

The survey team stated in their findings that 5 years have now passed since the signing of the original project agreement for a dam in Korea and little of a tangible nature has been accomplished. Funds have been obligated in the amount of $6 million, only $15,000 has been liquidated and a balance of $5,985,000 is still being held.

Another project involving $9.7 million obligated since 1958 is being held in abeyance while local officials make up their minds what to do.

The subcommittee reported that the United States should not go ahead with financing a plant until responsible officials are sure what they want done. The holding of several million dollars to finance construction for a period of years while officials make up their minds does not appear to be justified, however. And with this, I concur.

The report indicated that some $10 million was being held for future highway use without a precise program or specific commitments for its use in Vietnam. Here again it appears that funds are being stockpiled for future but undetermined uses.

The subcommittee report stated that the survey team discovered in Turkey, expired procurement authorizations with large uncontracted balances being retained as valid obligations. One such instance was a procurement authorization for construction, mining, conveying equipment, and parts. It has $71,000 uncontracted at June 30, 1961, which should have been deobligated and returned to the U.S. Treasury.

Another reported instance was a procurement authorization for fertilizer in the original amount of $2.5 million. Of this sum $1,290,263 was being held as a valid obligation although it was uncontracted and the contracting and delivery dates had expired.

All of which indicated that little if any control or check is made by the United States of these authorizations after they have been once been issued. Add these disclosures to what is being withheld from the public and you have an unconscionable situation as far as the taxpayer is concerned.

These revelations by such a cursory examination or inquiry indicate that in all probability there are vast hidden reserves available in all countries receiving our aid and that they are being stockpiled for future use.

All of which points up the fact that a much needed reappraisal of our foreign aid program is long overdue. Unless we call a halt to this stockpiling of foreign aid funds and put some rigid controls on our generosity, we are soon going to find the dollar valueless.

We have to stop taking care of the rest of the world and put our own affairs in order.

DEVELOPMENT OF OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL RESOURCES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St. Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the two bills which I am introducing today have been recommended by the President for the purpose of expanding and improving the recreational resources of this Nation.

The first of these measures is a bill to provide for the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to States for outdoor recreation planning. This legislation is based on an extensive and thorough study by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission which emphasized the fact that good outdoor recreational opportunities for all Americans depend on an effectively planned, well coordinated effort on the part of the Federal Government, the States, and private citizens. In addition to legislative action, the President's executive order creating an Outdoor Recreation Advisory Council, and the Interior Secretary's establishment of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation within that Department will be of great assistance in carrying out the recommendations of the Commission.

This proposed bill will confer on the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation the appropriate authority to make a national recreation program effective. Also, it would authorize $50 million in grants over a 7-year period to help the States plan well-rounded outdoor recreation programs.

Some of the functions assigned to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation would be the encouragement of the program itself, the maintenance of a continuing inventory of outdoor recreation resources and needs, the administration of State assistance and the encouragement of interstate cooperation, the carrying on of research and the publication of information, the preparation of a nationwide recreational program, the establishment of educational programs to make the people of our country aware of the advantages of outdoor recreation, and the promotion of cooperation with other agencies in carrying out the program.

While the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended funds for planning, land acquisition, and loans to help States to meet the matching payments, the bill I am introducing suggests only planning grants at this time. After the various studies have been made, we can better evaluate our remaining needs in this area.

If this measure is enacted, the type of program envisioned by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission can become a reality.

The second measure I am introducing—a bill to establish a land conservation fund—is intended to complement the first measure.

There is need for a fiscally responsible means of financing the eventual acquisition of land for outdoor recreational purposes. This bill establishes or authorizes the needed new revenue sources. These sources include:

First. Proceeds from entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees on Federal land and water areas.

Second. Proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus nonmilitary real property.

Third. That portion of the gasoline excise tax for gasoline used in boats which is now refundable under existing law.

Fourth. Revenues from a new system of annual Federal user changes on recreation boats.

A portion of the revenues realized from these sources would be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury to help offset the costs of acquiring additional lands for public recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement at Federal reservoirs, financed through project appropriations to water resources agencies. The remaining revenues will be transferred to the land conservation fund established by the bill. The legislation also includes advance appropriations of $500 million so that the program can be begun without delay. The money will be repaid from the sources mentioned. Other recommendations made by the President in his transmittal letter accompanying the draft bill are likewise included.

The importance and urgency of these two measures dictate that they be acted upon without delay. The health and happiness of our Nation can be enhanced by the expansion and development of America's outdoor recreational advantages.

A SCHOOL FOR FORGOTTEN CHILDREN

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 5, I commented on an important health problem that our Nation is facing: The care and training of the forgotten child, the more than 10,000 mentally retarded youngsters who are in need of special care.

It is one of the unfortunate facts of life that we frequently forget those in our midst who are not adequately endowed, because of the accidents of birth, to cope with their environment and provide for themselves. There are those who care, however, and the Institute for Retarded Children of the Shield of David is composed of people who care and who are working constantly to help the mentally handicapped and to find the causes and cure of mental retardation.

In connection with their efforts I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article "School for Forgotten Children," which appeared in Today's Health for July 1961:

A School for Forgotten Children

(By William R. Vath)

Donny was 8½ the day his parents took him on his first ride in a taxi. Quiet and withdrawn, but quick to smile, the tow-headed youngster seemed a little bewildered as the cab pulled up in front of its destination at 1800 Andrews Avenue. He'd never been this far from home before, and the ride through Manhattan was a new and different experience for him.

The third son of a $90-a-week hardware store clerk, Donny had never been farther away from home before than the supermarket on the corner. And that had only been three or four times when his mother couldn't find someone to watch him. He'd never been to school, either—though both his older brothers had started in first grade when they were 6.

But these things didn't bother Donny. Nor did the fact that he hadn't learned to speak more than a dozen or so words. He did have one reason to be proud, however: he was toilet trained, had been now for almost a year. But Donny felt no pride. Nor did he know or feel hardly any of the emotions of an 8½-year-old boy.

For Donny was mentally retarded. Diagnosis: congenital cerebral defect.

His mother and father knew those words well, and what they represented, though they understood nothing of how this defect came about or why it had to be Donny who was born this way.

Ever since their family doctor had suggested, when Donny was barely a year old, that they put him somewhere he could get special training, the parents had looked for that "somewhere" they could afford on a budget of $90 a week. They couldn't bring themselves to apply for a place in a State school—their consciences would never let them do that.

So Donny stayed at home, while his family endured the pain, the confusion, the frustrations of every parent of a mentally retarded child—and, most of all, the feelings of guilt that they weren't doing something for him. Now it was getting worse; the other boys were growing up and Donny was becoming a burden for them too.

Then the parents heard about the Shield of David Institute for Retarded Children. They heard that here a family could pay as little as $1 a month for special schooling, speech therapy, tests, individual psychotherapy, and counseling services.

Of all the tragedies of parenthood, one is perhaps most stark and painful: The day a mother and father learn that their child is mentally retarded. For of the multitude of human ailments, none is more beclouded with mystery nor so complicated in its origin and range of diagnostic categories.

A classification of these various categories in the Journal of the American Association of Mental Deficiency takes 110 pages. Most of the victims fall into categories where very little is understood of the cause of their illness: mongolism, congenital cerebral defects, and those whose causes aren't even classified.

To most stricken children today, mental retardation is a lifetime handicap. Except in certain disorders, and providing diagnosis comes early enough, medical science with its present knowledge cannot hold out hope for a cure—only help in training and educating.

To the parents of a severely afflicted child, it means confusion and frustration as they seek aid in trying to do something for the youngster. It means an unending struggle to educate the child in the simplest of tasks—speaking intelligible words, dressing himself, toilet training.

And retardation often means a double tragedy, for multiple handicaps are frequent—bones and muscles that are warped and useless, eyes that don't see properly, ears that don't hear as they should, emotional problems.

And even when they come to realize that only the skill and guidance of professional personnel can help their child, the average parents have trouble finding facilities within their financial means. Training becomes unattainable.

It was to help fill this desperate need that the Shield of David was organized in New York City in 1954. A nonsectarian organization (65 percent of patients are Christian, 35 percent Jewish), it has effectively combined a day school for the training of severely retarded children with a social work guidance program for parents.

Donny's parents were welcomed that first morning by the institute's clinic director, Dr. Joseph Michaels, who introduced them to the school psychologist, a social worker, and a pediatrician. During a long interview, these staff members asked many questions about Donny and conditions at home, and answered many of the parents' questions about the institute.

They explained that the institute's services are divided among three specific areas:

1. For parents of children from birth to 4 years, a home training program, along with parental guidance and casework service.

2. For children from 4 to 7, a daily school training program in an effort to help these youngsters become eligible for special classes of the public schools.

3. For children from 4 to 12, a school-training program geared to their intellectual level and with a view to helping them become ready for public school or other facilities. Donny would be included in this third category.

Of the institute's current active registration of 158 children from all economic groups and all sections of the metropolitan area of New York, 96 attend a part-time day school. Operating 5 days a week from 9 to 5, September through June, the school has 2-hour sessions either in the morning or the afternoon for most of its students. There are also 2 groups of about 15 children who attend a full-day program.

About half of those attending the school are picked up and delivered by chartered buses; the others provide their own transportation or live close enough to walk to school.

The 62 children enrolled in the home-training program (infants to age 4) are visited 1 day each week by either a public health nurse or a teacher.

Donny's parents learned that fees at Shield of David are determined after interviews with a social worker assigned to the case, and depend upon the family's income, size of family, and special expenses involved. At the institute, there are usually 12 to 15 families on the department of welfare rolls. These cases pay the minimum fee of $1 monthly, which is subsidized by the department of welfare. Another 10 percent of the cases pay the maximum fee of $50 a month. The remaining 80 percent pays between $1 and $15 a month. An initial diagnostic fee is charged for all patients; it ranges from $5 to $15, depending on individual circumstances.

Parents' fees supply only 8½ percent of the institute's $200,000-plus annual budget. The remainder comes from membership auxiliaries (about 25 percent), the National Institute of Mental Health (about 25 percent), contributing organizations (about 10 percent), and other miscellaneous sources.

The real heart of the entire program, the staff psychologist explained, is the service to parents in helping them understand the child's condition, the daily areas of conflict and stress which parents experience, and the problems of the relationship of the retarded child to other members of the family.

Ready to assist in this demanding task is a professional staff of 34, including a psychiatrist, a pediatrician, an ophthalmologist, a dental consultant, 3 psychologists, a public health nurse, a speech pathologist, 4 speech therapists, a casework supervisor, 4 psychiatric social workers, an educational director, an educational consultant, 11 teachers, a student teacher, and 2 social work students.

After the interview with Donny's parents, the pediatrician took Donny to the diagnostic clinic for a physical examination and psychiatric testing. Diagnosis is complex and difficult; normal psychological tools do not exist for testing retarded children since the normal rules of psychology do not apply to them. Thus, no diagnosis is attempted the first day. Donny's parents learned that this would be decided later at a staff diagnostic and treatment conference, where each case is comprehensively evaluated.

The clinic staff has seen, over the years, the whole range of known and determinable factors in retardation, including those caused by prenatal or postnatal infections, trauma, and metabolic disorders. Among the multiple handicaps they've tried to help have been impairment of sight and hearing, convulsive disorders (including all forms of epilepsy), psychiatric impairment (i.e., emotional and behavioral disorders), motor dysfunction (including all forms of paralysis and unusual muscle movement).

For the past year and a half, the institute has provided full dental care for most of its patients, since care for youngsters with some special conditions is not readily available in the community. For a standard fee of $60 per child, the program includes a complete examination of the teeth and oral cavity and a routine reexamination in 6 months.

Because of the unique nature of the patients for dental work, all rehabilitative treatment is done under anesthesia in a single session. This includes fillings, extractions, and such restorative and rehabilitative procedures as can be accomplished in an office setting. The institute's dental consultant has invented new instruments and devised new procedures specially adapted to work with handicapped and uncooperative patients.

Aside from prescriptions for tranquilizers in some cases, all special or additional medical attention—such as an electroencephalogram, orthopedic aid, and hearing aids—is referred to family physicians. In welfare cases, a report is forwarded to the appropriate treatment clinic.

The staff report merely makes recommendations; it is entirely up to the family physician to use the information the way he sees fit. These reports are, however, followed up through liaison with the personal physicians by caseworkers. Institute policy prohibits staff members from seeing any patients on a private basis.

When Donny was admitted to the school a few weeks later, his parents were cautioned not to expect immediate improvement. It takes 6 to 8 months of observation to form a clinical picture of each patient. In the meantime, individual goals are established for each child, and a program specially suited to him is developed. Youngsters are graduated into classes by their level of functioning—never by age—with about eight children to one teacher.

The overall target is to help each patient develop his maximum capacities. For some, this may mean the ability to speak the simplest words and to respond to simple words and symbols. For others, it may mean fairly rapid graduation into a special low-IQ class in a public school, and then on to occupational training which may eventually enable them to earn their own living.

Patients are grouped according to individual ability and personality and the emotional and training needs of each. Groups vary from passive, withdrawn youngsters to the more aggressive, stimulated, and responsive. Some classes are made up of children with more predominant emotional disturbance or those with pronounced perceptual difficulties.

The 15 patients who attend the full-day school sessions have been introduced to a reading-readiness program and are progressing to more abstract concepts such as letters of the alphabet and color differences.

Donny's teachers were guided by the psychologist's original analysis, and as the weeks went by, the boy was reexamined periodically to detect areas of change and to provide clues for further concentration.

For some children, individual play therapy sessions with a psychologist are recommended to help introduce them to group situations and to drain off excessive aggression that can't be tolerated in a group of classmates.

Donny's mother and father enrolled in one of two group therapy sessions. Meeting in the evening with other parents, they found they could test and reexamine the awareness they had gained through individual counseling and could express and share some of their feelings of isolation and difference from the rest of the world. They met regularly with the teaching staff and participated in educational forums where training procedures were discussed.

From the outset, Donny took part in the school's speech and language program. Children arrive at the clinic with a variety of communication problems: hearing handicaps, difficulty in articulation, echolalia (echoing words and phrases spoken to them), or the almost exclusive use of gestures rather than words. This last was one of Donny's biggest troubles.

In addition to individual sessions with a speech therapist, the boy sat in on group storytelling, choral speaking, and speech games, and learned to work with speech-music materials.

Helping both child and parents adjust to the school is the job of a central member of the clinic team—the caseworker. From the moment Donny was enrolled, she was in frequent contact with the boy's family—asking questions, putting together a general picture of his development and history and his family's social and psychological values, as well as counseling, advising, and answering the many questions this new experience prompted.

Since the casework contact is a condition of the child's attendance in the institute's school, some parents at first strongly resist becoming involved in the service. They feel they've done their part in applying for concrete help, and to them, the school is the fulfillment of that need.

The idea that they, as parents, contribute to their child's development or retardation is an alien concept to some mothers and fathers. They'd prefer to confine the problem to the child's specific condition rather than accept the fact that mental retardation is a family situation which must be met with the personality, strengths, and resources with which any problem in living must be met.

It's the caseworker's job to help the family achieve this maximum mental health as well as to provide the direction and knowledge which parents need to plan for their retarded child. The caseworker interprets for parents the school staff's general thinking and evaluation of the child's capacity. She also reports to the teaching and clinical staff on conditions in each child's home and changes in parents' attitudes. This enables the staff to know details of the family situation which affect the patient's development and behavior.

Preparing the family for the child's discharge is another important duty of the caseworker. In Donny's case, the school was the first separation of child and family—as it is in many instances—and from the school a more permanent separation will be possible. By the time Donny is ready for discharge, his family will have been helped to a better awareness of his capacity and needs, and they will come to recognize their own emotional problems and attitudes toward Donny. Thus they will be able to plan constructively for these problems and attitudes.

This will leave the parents with less guilt and less dissatisfaction about what they've been able to do for their boy. When the day comes that they must decide whether to send Donny to a State school or to keep him at home, their decision will represent the healthiest balance for all members of the family.

Or, should a child progress sufficiently to move on to special classes in a public school, the caseworker will be on hand to offer help with the fears and uncertainties that are bound to arise with this new step.

Another important function of Shield of David is research. This is concentrated on finding out how to improve and supplement the institute's services so that more and better help may be given to retarded children and their parents. Underway is an extensive study of the value of working with children of preschool age. The group therapy sessions for parents are also a part of the institute's research; investigators want to know to what degree such therapeutic services improve the child's condition.

Research findings are being toted up on a recently ended 3-year study, and already some general trends are appearing. While most of the children studied do not appear to have improved significantly in strictly intellectual functioning, they have made major gains in social development and self-care. Researchers also note marked improvements in motor development and speech.

Preliminary findings indicate that parents, too, have benefited. They have adopted more positive and constructive attitudes toward the child and his problems and find the home and family situation less tense and stressful than before.

Other products of research at Shield of David are experimental curriculums for infants and for the home training and school groups. Teacher qualifications and competence are being studied in a search for new guideposts in this area. Training procedures and new approaches to psychological evaluation are also being developed.

Difficult decisions are commonplace at the institute. Each staffer is aware of the frustration endured by parents earnestly seeking some relief. Yet not all retarded children profit from the school's services. Some must be rejected in favor of those who can gain most. (During the first 11 months of 1960, 44 of the 64 new children diagnosed were admitted.)

Early experience has taught the institute, for example, that a child of 8 to 10 years who has not yet learned to speak or who is not toilet trained is a very poor candidate for appreciable improvement in these areas. Nowadays the school prefers to concentrate on younger children, even those of severe limitations, whose behavior patterns make them more receptive to learning.

Some of the children rejected are referred to a State school, where they can get the treatment they need in a residential psychiatric setting. Some, though retarded, can profit most from association with normal children in an unspecialized nursery, such as a neighborhood day school. Others, it is felt, cannot gain from the institute's program because they need to be away from unhealthy home situations, or because they need more specialized training than the school's part-time program offers.

As the institute has grown, in both size of staff and number of patients, its reputation has spread. Other agencies, such as schools and hospitals, ask to use its facilities; students in this field come to learn; professionals come to observe. Serving as a steady spur to greater efforts is another sign of growth; a constant and growing waiting list.

The dedicated specialists at the Shield of David toil daily in jobs that are at once tremendously satisfying and unending. They are helping a few hundred people find the best emotional solution for the total family in the face of a tragic personal problem. But they are also pioneering in new methods and adding to man's store of knowledge new facts and techniques that may help hundreds of thousands of mentally handicapped and their families. Their research is bringing closer the day when the veil of darkness shrouding the human brain will be torn away and the glare of scientific knowledge will dissolve more of its mysteries.

Yet no one knows better than the people at the Shield of David the mighty challenges ahead.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LANDRUM, for 90 minutes, on Tuesday, April 10.

Mr. THORNBERRY, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, April 10.

Mr. REUSS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. THORNBERRY) for 1 hour, tomorrow, April 10, 1962.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. LINDSAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THORNBERRY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. HEMPHILL.

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. INOUYE.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2768. An act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds and the appropriation of funds therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 10, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1908. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a copy of the "Interstate Commerce Commission Activities, 1937–1962," which is a supplement to the 75th annual report of the Commission, transmitted January 10, 1962; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1909. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor and government secretary of the Virgin Islands, for the transfer to the Government of the Virgin Islands of the assets and obligations of the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1910. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1961 regular and special sessions, pursuant to the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1911. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to permit applications for entry under the public land agricultural laws to be filed only for lands designated as open to such application, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1912. A letter from the president, Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America, transmitting the Annual Report of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America for the calendar year of 1961, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1913. A letter from the president, Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America, transmitting the Annual Auditor's Report of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America for the calendar year 1961, pursuant to Public Law 642, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1914. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(d) of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216), and pursuant to rule XL of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1915. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217), and pursuant to rule XL of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1916. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1917. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend for 2 years the existing provisions of the law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 3, 1962, the following bill was reported on April 6, 1962:

Mr. STEED: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 11151. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted April 9, 1962*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11131. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8031. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to give the Federal Communications Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus; with amendment (Rept. No. 1559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOULDER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1589. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the issuance of radio operator licenses to nationals of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1668. An act to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields; with amendment (Rept. No. 1561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOULDER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1371. An act to amend subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit the Commission to renew a station license in the safety and special radio services more than 30 days prior to expiration of the original license; without amendment (Rept. No. 1562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOULDER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 683. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 1563). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 3, 1962, the following bill was introduced April 6, 1962:

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 11151. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

[*Introduced and referred April 9, 1962*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 11152. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States and its territories and possessions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 11153. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States and its territories and possessions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 11154. A bill to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, to require that licensees be bonded to insure that all reparation orders are paid; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 11155. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to assist in compensating for the hazardous and arduous nature of employment in certain occupations, and for the decreased life expectancy of persons engaged in such occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 11156. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to assist in compensating for the hazardous and arduous nature of employment in certain occupations, and for the decreased life expectancy of persons engaged in such occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11157. A bill to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to permit loans to be made under that act to part-time students in institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11158. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 11159. A bill to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the ex-vessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 11160. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11161. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11162. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 11163. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act in order to extend for 5 additional years the period during which funds for the construction of the National Cultural Center may be obtained, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 11164. A bill to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin irrigation districts, and to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 (57 Stat. 14), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 11165. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11166. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 11167. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 11168. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 11169. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 11170. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 11171. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 11172. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11173. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 11174. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 11175. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 11176. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 11177. A bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 11178. A bill to amend section 2318 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (relating to reservation of mineral lands) to prohibit sales of gold by the United States for nonmonetary purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11179. A bill to provide that the price at which the Coast and Geodetic Survey sells aeronautical radio navigation charts and certain related material to the public shall not be less than the total cost thereof; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 11180. A bill to provide that the National Capital Planning Commission shall undertake a study to determine the best possible location for the National Cultural Center; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to price supports for milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the selection of the city of Antioch as a site for an experimental saline water conversion plant; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to west coast shipbuilding; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal aid for State Highway Route 115; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 11181. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN:

H.R. 11182. A bill for the relief of Lawrence E. Bird; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 11183. A bill for the relief of Isabel K. Lanning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 11184. A bill to authorize the admittance of the vessel *City of New Orleans* to American registry and to permit the use of such vessel in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

291. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Walter C. Peterson, city clerk, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to opposing Federal income taxation of the interest derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

292. Also, petition of Marjorie Merritt, city clerk, South Pasadena, Calif., relative to opposing legislation that would place an income tax on the income from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

293. Also, petition of Isabel L. Dedmore, city clerk, Maywood, Calif., relative to opposing legislation for Federal taxation of interest derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

294. Also, petition of F. A. Ziemer, city clerk, Vernon, Calif., relative to opposing legislation for Federal taxation of interest derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

295. Also, petition of Hisao Uema, president, assembly of the village of Kadena, Okinawa, requesting the return of administrative authority of Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

First Annual Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner at Huntington, W. Va., Is Addressed by Senator Randolph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, more than 400 persons attended the first Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner which the sponsoring Democratic Women's Club of Cabell County held on Saturday, April 7, 1962. This dinner will be an annual event in Huntington.

Russell Dunbar, a prominent Huntington attorney and active participant in Democratic Party affairs, was toastmaster, and the official party organization was represented by the Democratic State chairman, Robert P. McDonough, of Parkersburg; by the associate Democratic State chairman, Mrs. Thelma Hall, of Madison; and by the Cabell County Democratic chairman, Hanley Morgan. And my good friend and colleague Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH was the principal speaker.

Also present and appropriately recognized were Representative Ken Hechler, of Huntington, who ably represents his district; Hon. Milton Ferguson, mayor of Wayne and a former State tax commissioner; and Mrs. Hilda Long, publisher of the Huntington Advertiser, a daily afternoon newspaper, the editorial policies of which are vigorous in their espousal of the principles of the Democratic Party and the programs of the administration; and C. H. Koontz, of Charleston, legislative auditor for the West Virginia Legislature.

Although official business prevented Mayor John Durkin, of Huntington, from remaining for the program of the evening, he was present to extend official greetings to the visiting guests and to extend congratulations to the sponsoring Democratic Women's Club of Cabell County, the officers of which are the following:

Mrs. Andrew Kitchen, president; Mrs. Kemp Cottle and Mrs. Joe Gessner, vice presidents; Mrs. John Edwin Greene, treasurer; Mrs. Charles Adkins, secretary; and Mrs. Homer Chapman, corresponding secretary.

State Chairman McDonough, in introducing Senator RANDOLPH, referred to the latter as "Mr. Ready Democrat" and noted that the Senator has pledged active participation in the party's campaign effort in this year's elections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the speech by my colleague at this significant event.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, OF WEST VIRGINIA, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, HOTEL FREDERICK, HUNTINGTON, W. VA., SATURDAY, APRIL 7, 1962

Mr. Toastmaster, Chairman McDonough, ladies of the host Women's Democratic Club of Cabell County, and fellow Democrats, it is with gratitude that I acknowledge the privilege afforded me to address this significant gathering.

The officers of the sponsoring Women's Democratic Club of Cabell County inform me that this is the first of what they pledge will be an annual Jefferson-Jackson Day observance in Huntington. Congratulations not only for this splendid beginning, but also for the determination to carry forward into the future.

Real progress has been made and is being made by our country under the aggressive leadership of President John Kennedy and Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON.

But in assessing the measure and the quality of this progress we should give adequate consideration to the fact that the Kennedy administration has been in office approximately 2 weeks less than a year and a quarter.

In that relatively short span our administration truly has our Nation on the move again. This is so because the Democratic President and Vice President, working with the Democratic Congress, accepted willingly the challenging struggle of the unfinished business of America.

And, my fellow Democrats, ours is an administration imbued with the spirit of the Democratic Party which, although the oldest political party in existence, is still the youngest in this country measured by vitality.

Ours is the party of youth and the administration exemplifies this characteristic under the leadership of a President who sees our country and the world in terms of the tomorrows while not relying entirely on the yesterdays.

* * * * *

It is because the Democratic Party surveys the present in terms of the future that, with only mild interruptions in the past 30 years, we have merited the confidence of the majority of the American people. There is justice in this condition, for our party itself has confidence in the citizen and in the American future.

These qualities—youth, optimism, confidence in the frontiers of the future—lie at the heart of the American spirit and of the

Democratic Party. It was this spirit which again resulted in the mandate of the electorate having been given to our party in 1958 and in 1960.

It is this purpose which continues to animate the Democratic Party and provides it with new vigor and new ideas.

DEMOCRATIC VICTORIES AHEAD

And this purpose, translated into performance, will bring the deserved victories which will be ours in the elections this year—and again in 1964.

The party of the administration in office and in control of the Congress is expected to lose seats in the legislative bodies in an off-year election. But this is not going to occur in 1962. I predict that when the results are tabulated in all States and in all congressional districts there will emerge larger Democratic majorities both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

And in the elections 2 years hence, President Kennedy and Vice President JOHNSON will be reelected—not by a narrow margin, but by a very substantial plurality.

I do not make these prognostications frivolously, and I do not fashion them from the fabric of pure partisanship.

Bear in mind the remarkable fact that an administration elected by less than 51 percent of the voters enjoys, just slightly more than a year later, a poll rating of approximately 80 percent. This rating has been earned by reason of a record of dedication to duty and real performance.

But, my fellow Democrats, I am not in any degree inviting or suggesting a resting on the oars. We dare not contemplate such a luxury.

PROGRESS EXCELLENT, BUT MORE WORK AHEAD

The record of progress under the alert and aggressive Kennedy administration is excellent. However, there are goals yet to be accomplished. There must be significant additions to the audit of performance in the months and years immediately ahead—and these additions, in some instances, will not be easy to achieve. They will come to fruition only as a consequence of further diligent effort by all of us who believe in the principles of the Democratic Party and who labor to construct meaningful programs for the common good on the foundation of these precepts of our party.

And, of course, it is a time-honored requirement that even the wisely conceived and the best constructed program must have public acceptance and appreciation. We must all work harmoniously and vigorously in efforts to encourage the broadest possible public consensus for the programs of our party. At the bedrock, however, must be efficient and effective party organization and stimulation of voter participation in maximum degree.

So, there is work to be done by each and every one of us. We must all join in meeting these requirements or the victories on the bright horizon will fade into the shadows of the gloom of frustration.

* * * * *

What are some of the major challenges faced and the significant achievements realized by our country during the first year of the new President?

We have an administration which has boldly moved ahead in the field of our relations with other nations.

And notwithstanding turnovers and uneasiness in the domestic political affairs of a number of Western Hemisphere countries, we are justified in asserting that there has been a strengthening of our friends in this hemisphere through the launching of the Alliance-for-Progress program.

We have stood firm at Berlin in the face of threats and bluffs.

We have buttressed NATO by increasing our own strength and by persuading other nations to do likewise.

OUR ROLE IN THE UNITED NATIONS

We have frustrated the Communist efforts to obstruct and neutralize the United Nations. If we are to avert the unparalleled disaster of nuclear war, maintain the vision of what the United Nations must become—an effective agency for bringing the rule of law into international affairs.

In addressing a meeting of a unit of the American Association for the United Nations at Charleston, W. Va., on December 8, 1961, I made a statement appropriate to reemphasize. It is this:

As armaments continue to spiral upward we live in ever increasing danger of war by accident or miscalculation. In this atmosphere of uncertainty and increasing tension the ultimate testing time of freedom is just now beginning.

The unity which we must create among the free Nations will not remain viable if predicated solely upon a shared antagonism to communism. It must be built on the firmer foundation of a community of aims and aspirations among our allies. And this will require a greater degree of intellectual honesty and hard self-scrutiny than we have heretofore given to the task.

In saying this, I declared last December that I specifically refer to the practice in recent years of the United States depending too heavily on the United Nations as an arena in which to conduct our foreign policy. Too often our willingness to take problems to the U.N. has been a cloak for our own lack of policy. In so doing, we have not strengthened the United Nations, and we have not served the cause of freedom by posing problems which could not be solved in that forum.

I am not suggesting that we "go it alone." I am recommending, however, that we be scrupulously honest in our appraisal of our own ideals and in the capacity of the United Nations to serve them. We do no disservice to the U.N. when we acknowledge that, as presently constituted, there are some problems it cannot solve. Indeed, we may help preserve the United Nations and allow it to grow strong if we do not prematurely overburden it.

I believe there is a cognizance by the present administration of the need for such a reappraisal of our country's role in relationship to that of the United Nations.

PEACE CORPS ACCLAIMED

Perhaps one of the most significant of all achievements the cause of world peace and to identify our country's peaceful efforts and objectives more closely with other countries—especially with the struggling new Nations—was the establishment of the Peace Corps and the beginning of projects during the first year of this infant but fast-maturing agency.

I was a firm believer in the concept of the Peace Corps from the beginning of efforts to bring about its creation. That my name is associated with those of other cosponsors on the legislation which brought the Peace Corps into being is one of the most gratifying developments of my career in the Congress.

It is evident that the Corps has helped to restore, in many underdeveloped sections of the world, the vision of America as a nation committed to the improvement of the life and enhancement of opportunity for all people. And it is heartening to know that in the House of Representatives, where the original Peace Corps measure faced much hostility, there is a popular readiness to grant this vital new agency an increase of more than 100 percent in appropriations and a threefold increase in personnel to enable it to expand its most purposeful endeavors.

In its first year, the administration, with the cooperation of the Congress, doubled the acquisition rate of Polaris submarines, doubled the production capacity of the Minuteman missile, increased by 50 percent the aircraft on ground alert, and doubled the strategic military manpower reserve. These have been significant gains in our country's efforts to bolster our deterrent capability and thus enhance the cause of peace.

Vice President JOHNSON has aptly said, "We have stopped strolling in the space moonlight and have started running toward the moon." It has been a year of big decisions and one of magnificent progress in the field of space and astronautics, including not only Col. John Glenn's successful triple orbiting of the earth, but marked also by the fact that we launched in 1961 eight times as many earth satellites as did the Russians. Furthermore, in communications, weather, and navigation, we have made very important scientific strides.

DOMESTIC ECONOMY PROGRAMS BOLD

While achieving the numerous accomplishments so important to our country in its external affairs and in the areas of security and science, the administration and the Congress have taken bold and adventurous steps to improve our domestic economy.

The West Virginia delegation in the Congress has made noteworthy contributions to the support accorded administration proposals, and I give assurance that we have had a real measure of cooperation from the White House and most agencies and departments of the executive establishment.

I am privileged to pay tribute to the high degree of devotion to duty and to the faithfulness of my Democratic colleagues—Senator ROBERT C. BYRD and Representatives KEN HECHLER, CLEVE BAILEY, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, ELIZABETH KEE, and JOHN M. SLACK, JR.—to the principles of our party and the best interests of both the State and the Nation as expressed through their actions in the Congress.

The pace of progress in the vital areas of congressional and administration efforts to improve the economic status of our country and its citizens perhaps has not been as rapid as some of us had hoped.

But again we must take cognizance of the fact that our domestic economic problems have been long in the making and the present administration has been on the scene less than 15 months.

Even though we may manifest impatience in expressing our hopes and expectations concerning domestic economic progress, we should not overlook the fact that at the end of the first year of this administration there were a million more people working than at the same time the prior year. And income from wages and salaries advanced 7 percent while, at the same time, net farm income increased by more than a billion dollars, or approximately 6 percent.

Last month, the President, in speaking of a February drop in unemployment, remarked: "I think this economy has more vitality in it than some of its premature mourners." He was able to point to the fact that the number of unemployed in the Nation declined by 120,000 to 4,543,000. This represented a 19-month low of 5.6 percent of the work force—still too high, of course, but an improvement.

It is essential that we look realistically at some economic facts.

The American economy has shown a capacity to grow at an average annual rate between 4 and 5 percent, without inflationary strain, during periods other than depression or war. This growth rate is measured by changes in total national production; States in uniform dollars.

OUR INADEQUATE GROWTH RATE

But during the period 1953–61, the average annual growth rate was only 2.5 percent, or hardly better than half the rate required—in view of the ever-accelerating technology—to absorb increases in the labor force and in productivity per man-hour.

This unsatisfactory record has been compounded of a fairly rhythmic succession of booms, periods of stagnation, recessions, and inadequate recoveries.

The deficient growth rate has led to a chronically rising level of unemployed manpower. Indeed, the peak of each boom thus far reached since 1953 has found us with more unemployment than the peak of the immediately preceding boom, and the trough of each recession has found us with more unemployment than the trough of the immediately previous recession.

It is my privilege to be a member of the Senate Labor Committee's Sucommittee on Employment and Manpower. I assure you that the facts reaching us demonstrate very clearly that unemployment, far from being concentrated in a few sectors of the economy, has become generally distributed throughout most of the important areas of the economy. And we find, too, that a very large and consistent increase in the chronic level of idle plant capacity have accompanied the chronic increases in idle manpower.

What is the outlook for improvement in the economic picture based on business spending on factories and equipment? Fortune magazine estimates spending in this area of economic activity will be at a rate of $40 billion. If this rate develops as forecasted, the previous peak record established in 1957 will be exceeded and the increase will measure 15 percent over 1961.

Fortune's experts emphasized—and economists in Government agree—that conditions are right for the businessman to add zest to the economic recovery for these reasons:

First, the need for investing in modernization of plants and in cost-saving production equipment is imperative.

Second, the cash to finance the construction is available.

Third, the Government is taking vital steps to encourage the spending.

Fourth, the usual tendency of businessmen is to expand their spending budgets over initial plans during a period of business advancement.

The real answers, of course, are months away—but the prospects seem to be reasonably favorable.

* * * * *

INDUSTRY MUST MODERNIZE

Standpatism, lethargy, and obsolescence are the enemies of progress in this age of advancing technology and rapid change. Investments in facilities and equipment—in other words, modernization and expansion—by American industry will be the key to the continuing success of democracy and the free enterprise system in the competition with communism.

We must have not only the men to match our times but, also, the forceful leadership within our business community which will forge a future filled with a challenge to achieve and the faith to accomplish our country's goals and better serve the national interest and the cause of peace.

We have an administration which is aggressive and progressive. And I have faith that the end product of the labors of the 87th Congress will be conducive to a bolstering of the businessman's outlook and planning.

But the American who holds the key to whether our country's current economic upswing stays strong through 1962 and well into 1963 is in considerable degree, the U.S. businessman.

If the businessman comes through with a sharp stepup in his spending for new plants and modern equipment in the months ahead our economy will be stronger. The upturn, which began precisely a year ago, will have the power to continue for a long time.

If the businessman, however, invests only subnormal totals in factories and equipment, we are in for trouble. Once more the upturn will falter, and we will be facing the threat of the fifth recession of the post-World War II period uncomfortably soon.

The American consumers have done and are doing their part in sustaining the advance by increasing their spending. Likewise, government at every level—Federal, State, and local—also has been performing and is performing its part in aiding the economic recovery by broadening expenditures.

But the expansion induced by Government and the consumers is a year old.

Consumers are not going to continue boosting their spending if the economy shows signs of sliding again.

So the conclusion to be reached is that the next stimulant must come from higher business spending.

WEST VIRGINIA ECONOMIC PICTURE

With reference to our West Virginia situation, there are both elements of encouragement and discouragement in the latest State department of employment security report.

The favorable factors are these: At mid-February, 527,400 persons were employed throughout the State, representing a gain of 100 from mid-January and 600 over the previous year. Total unemployed numbered 76,100, a drop of 8,100 during the month and 29,300 lower than a year ago.

Unfavorable, however, is the fact that the civilian labor force dropped to an estimated 603,500, which is 28,700 lower than mid-February 1961. This indicates extensive outmigration of our workers.

Meanwhile, however, there is a measure of encouragement to be read in the March issue of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.'s "Business in West Virginia" summary, which reports:

"Business activity in West Virginia advanced on a broad front in February. The second consecutive strong monthly increase further confirmed the opinion that December's pause was a temporary one." It was noted, too, that more than a year has passed since the bottom of West Virginia's recession in December 1960, and there was reassurance in the declaration that "the index of gross State product has already risen 10 points during the recovery and now exceeds the level achieved in 1957—a strong year for the economies of West Virginia and the Nation. The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate, which reached 17.4 percent during the recession, has dropped to 9.9 percent of the labor force."

In line with the unfavorable element of the employment security department report, the telephone company summary also includes the realistic observation that "job openings in the State, however, have been insufficient to absorb most jobless workers who, it is generally believed, have migrated to other States. Thus, employment has barely exceeded the low point of the past recession."

This bears out the national experience; namely, that the peak of each boom thus far reached since 1953 has found us with more unemployment than the peak of the immediately preceding boom, and the trough of each recession has found us with more unemployment than the trough of the immediately previous recession.

OUR PROGRAM NEEDS

It is clearly indicated, therefore, that there must be acceleration of economic growth at both the State and national levels. It indicates, too, that there is need for the Area Redevelopment Act program signed into law by the Democratic President after prior vetoes by his predecessor of the other party. It attests to the requirement that the loan activities of the very helpful Small Business Administration be accelerated at the more realistic pace being maintained by SBA under this administration. It means that the manpower retraining features of the Area Redevelopment Act and the sweeping new Manpower Utilization and Training Act passed by Congress and signed by the President last month provide important tools to be brought into action with dispatch and vigor. It means that there is validity in the President's recommended long-range antirecession public works program with its provision for partial implementation at the earliest possible date. It means—especially for West Virginia and other coal-producing States, that the Government's coal research programs must be accelerated, as the present administration gives evidence of being determined to do.

These are purposeful programs intended to aid industrial, economic, and manpower development. No one of these programs alone will perform a miracle, but in combination they will be helpful. They have to do with business and industrial expansion and manpower utilization. Thus, they are meaningful in the sense that they are keyed to both the improvement of economic growth and the affording of new job opportunities. The element of "dole" is not present in these programs.

In West Virginia our foremost needs are industrial expansion and diversification. This is not a statement of new need. These have been our obvious requirements for a number of years, and especially since the mid-1950's when rapid mechanization of coal mining brought an acceleration of manpower displacement in that basic industry.

It is indicated and it is appropriate that a tribute be paid to the efforts of many dedicated citizens of our State and helpful citizens of other States who have been devotedly and vigorously assisting in the aggressive campaign to bring about the industrial expansion and diversification so vitally needed.

STATE ADMINISTRATION, LEGISLATURE AND PARTY LEADERSHIP MERIT PRAISE

And here, too, I am privileged to express a special sense of gratification concerning the outstanding accomplishments of our Democratic State administration under the persuasive leadership of Gov. Wally Barron, and with the vigorous cooperation of the Democratic legislature. Together, they have faced trying conditions with courage, boldness, and imagination. They have fashioned and implemented programs and instrumentalities which give promise of providing lasting solutions for grave problems.

I commend especially the establishment of the West Virginia State Department of Commerce and the creation of a Washington Liaison Office staffed by a special assistant to the Governor. Those of us representing our State in the Congress have reason to know and to be grateful for the work of these new offices and the capable services being performed by Commerce Commissioner Hulett Smith and the Governor's Special Assistant, Paul Crabtree.

The fact is that Hulett and Paul are symbols of the seldom before duplicated quality and degree of cooperative spirit which prevails between the Federal Government and the State government—and between the State's Democratic Party headed by Bob McDonough and the National Democratic Party and the Kennedy administration.

The esprit de corps engendered by these relationships are of inestimable value to our people and will doubtless augur well for the future of the Democratic Party in West Virginia.

Knowing of the real affection President Kennedy has for West Virginia and being aware of his expression of sympathetic interest in our problems, we have doubtless been too prone to expect quick, miracle-type solutions through Federal Government intercession and actions.

Make no mistake about it, my fellow West Virginians, we have been accorded recognition and a substantial measure of assistance from our national Government. But we must bear in mind that the laws and regulations which apply to the other 49 States also apply to West Virginia in matters such as the negotiation and awarding of Government contracts, the making of loans, and the awarding of grants.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS HELP EMPLOYMENT

With a helpful degree of sympathetic understanding and a more cooperative spirit prevailing in Washington, our businessmen and industrialists are coming more and more to bid competitively and to negotiate with a reasonable degree of success for Government contracts. Consequently, we are no longer the almost totally overlooked and nonparticipating State in this area of activity which has real potential for improving our economic status and job opportunities for our workers. This is attested to especially by the substantial defense and non-defense prime contracts won competitively during the past year by Marietta Manufacturing Co. of Point Pleasant, by the FMC Corporation Ordnance Division of South Charleston, by the Carroll Division of Watson Electronics at Martinsburg, and by the Hercules Powder Co. at Rocket Center near Keyser. New employment afforded under these contracts will exceed 3,000 jobs.

We have reason to be optimistic that other prime contracts will be awarded to firms producing or planning to produce in West Virginia in the near future to provide even more jobs.

Another favorable development during the past year has been the location within our State of branch production units of well established prime defense contractors, notably, facilities of the aircraft and missile industries for the first time—Lockheed at Clarksburg and North American Aviation at Princeton; the highly diversified Melpar, a division of Westinghouse Air Brake, at Fairmont; and Harrington and Richardson's West Virginia Ordnance Co. subsidiary at Wheeling to produce under that Massachusetts company's defense contracts.

We are gratified to have Kaiser Aluminum expanding extensively near Ravenswood, to have Corning Glass increasing operations in our State, to have Virginia Electric & Power Co. installing a huge new operation in Grant County, and to have the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway substantially augmenting the staff and payroll here in Huntington by concentrating talent and activities in the former Government-surplus plant it acquired within the past year. There are many other plants I could list.

We have considered where we have been during the first year and a quarter of the present Democratic administrations in Washington and Charleston. Now where are we going?

We must induce and enable our businessmen to expand, to outthink, to outmanage, and outproduce our adversaries. We must rally our workers to make the best of everything with efficiency and at the lowest cost.

TRADE, TAX, AGED CARE MEASURES

This means we must have a more modern trade program—but one which will be equitable and just to domestic industries and American workers, whether producing for export or for domestic markets in competition with imports from abroad.

It means, too, that the tax program to be passed by the Congress must likewise be a modern one which will enhance our national growth and be equitable.

Medical care for the aged should be strengthened. I stand with the administration for expanding the social security system to provide insured coverage for all senior citizens eligible or to become eligible to participate in that system. The national chairman of the other party admitted a few days ago that existing programs for care of the aged are inadequate. He does not yet join us in favoring the social security approach—but he and his party seem to be withdrawing reluctantly from their former no retreat policy.

Antirecession legislation should be provided, and a cornerstone seems to me to be the public works program proposed by the President, and now including a plan for immediate implementation of an employment acceleration measure similar to one I joined Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and Senator PELL, of Rhode Island, in cosponsoring in the 1st session of this 87th Congress.

I associate myself with a recent remark by our Vice President in which he declared that we have a long way to go—a hard way to go—but we are moving. We have begun, as President Kennedy admonished us to do in his world-acclaimed inaugural address. And if we will close ranks our party will be remembered and our country will be preserved.

Needed: Youth Development and Antidelinquency Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the youth—of Wisconsin and America—represent one of the greatest, most precious assets of our national life.

The future of our Nation—of freedom itself—of the ideals in which we believe: All of these values depend upon our youth of today—our leaders of tomorrow.

We, as adult citizens, however, must ask ourselves: Are we creating a national climate for best utilization and development of the great reservoir of energy, imagination, and talent—as well as morality—of youth; or, is present-day environment allowing dissipation and waste of this priceless human resource?

Recently, I was privileged to discuss the outlook in these fields in a broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today there are more than 66 million boys and girls under 18 years of age—the hope of America of tomorrow.

As a nation, however, we have a special concern for, and interest in, the more than 12 million youth between 12 and 17 years—the teenagers. Why? At this age, these boys and girls are emerging from the shelter of homelife into the outside world.

However, let me make this clear: Graduation into society should not, and must not, provide an excuse for either: (1) Abdication of the responsibility of parents; or (2) for society to develop spoon-feeding pampering programs.

The challenge, rather, is to create the kind of programs to progressively absorb the developing capabilities of youth into useful activities, both in homelife and in the community.

The time has passed when our youth can be expected, in a taken-for-granted kind of way, to easily or automatically integrate into our society. Rather, this can be accomplished successfully only by careful, creative, farsighted planning.

Among other things, we need to (1) encourage adult interest in, and leadership for, this gigantic challenge; (2) provide greater opportunity for participation in civic, church, recreational, and other activities; and (3) opening new job opportunities. Despite the fact that the Nation still has 4 million adult unemployed—for whom we must find jobs—we must also plan for jobs for the 26 million young folks entering the labor force in the next 10 years.

As well, this involves earlier beginnings of vocational training—to equip youth for useful employment.

The Nation, if it fails to create such positive programs, however, can expect that delinquency—instead of being reduced—will grow.

Following a recent study, the allegation was made that we waste a million kids a year. Such a vast army of jobless, useless—and sometimes placeless—youth, could be real social dynamite—a wellspring of delinquency and crime.

Unfortunately, the high rate of delinquency among youth often is preceded—or accompanied—by adult, and, yes, even community delinquency.

Naturally, this does not absolve our young folks, themselves, from utilizing their God-instilled sense of morality and responsibility. Nevertheless—it does demonstrate that the pointing finger of accusation at youth, sometimes can correctly be turned around—requiring a soul searching in adult behavior, mores and moral conduct—and, yes, laws.

For these reasons, then, we also need realistic efforts to discourage delinquencies, including the following:

1. Reemphasize that any delinquency efforts—first and foremost—are the responsibilities of the home—the parents of America.
2. Expand positive efforts by the churches, schools, teachers' association, fraternal, service, and other groups to carry on youth development programs.
3. Modernize our courts and penal correctional institutions to meet the unique problems in this field.
4. As necessary, strengthen Federal laws to prohibit traffic of weapons, narcotics, obscene literature, and other such materials falling into the hands of young folks.
5. Encourage higher standards of presentations through television, radio, magazines, books, and other media.

In attempting to create more effective youth development programs, our society also must not fail to stress—in its news reporting and community recognition programs—that more than 95 percent of our youth are conducting themselves dutifully, constructively, and usefully as keystones in home and community life.

The National Lottery of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House an example of cultural advancement through gambling revenues. I refer specifically to the national lottery of Finland where the proceeds are divided between the National Opera, the National Theatre and the Ministry of Education.

Finland is a small nation of a little over 4 million persons, but size notwithstanding, it is noted for cultural and artistic attainment. The Finns are not a rich people, and they find it difficult to provide for the sustenance and promotion of their cultural heritage. They are quite dependent upon the national lottery as a means to this end. There is no evidence that they find this money somewhat tainted, for unlike many Americans they are not plagued by pious hypocrisy in these matters.

The national lottery of Finland brings in over $4,330,000 a year based on the 1961 figures. About one-third of this money goes to the treasury in the form of revenue. The lottery in this country is a small operation but produces big results.

Mr. Speaker, if we were not blind to human and financial reality, we could learn quite a bit from the Finns. A national lottery in the United States could bring a tremendous lift to our taxpayers. We could, painlessly and voluntarily, raise over $10 billion a year in additional revenue and apply it toward tax cuts and reduction of our national debt.

Proposed Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives three bills dealing with civil rights.

President Kennedy in his state-of-the-Union message this year stressed the importance of human rights, and emphasized the fact that there is still much to be done in the field of civil rights.

My first bill provides for the abolition of the literacy test and other performance examinations as a qualification for voting. Such arbitrary and unreasonable discrimination has no place in our democracy, although unfortunately it has been used as a means of depriving many of our citizens from exercising their right to vote. As I pointed out in a statement recently before Subcommittee No, 5 of the House Judiciary Committee, 19 States have literacy requirements, including my own State of New York. The law in New York is restrictive in that it requires voters to be able to read and write English. It is most unfortunate that this requirement thus works to prevent so many of our Puerto Rican citizens who are literate in Spanish but not in English from participating in elections. This was estimated as affecting some 200,000 Puerto Ricans in 1961. When Puerto Ricans were granted U.S. citizenship 45 years ago they were permitted to choose between English and Spanish as the official language; and to penalize them now for making a free choice is certainly most unfair and undemocratic.

In its 1961 report the Civil Rights Commission indicated that in some instances voting discrimination on racial grounds was practiced by requiring voters not only to be able to read and write, but to give a "satisfactory interpretation" of the Constitution, and to calculate their age to the very day.

My bill will protect the right of all citizens, including the Puerto Ricans, to participate in Federal elections if they have at least a sixth-grade education, regardless of race, creed, or color. It will prevent the misuse of so-called literacy tests in some of our Southern States in keeping qualified Negroes from voting, but would also protect the right of the individual State to make literacy a qualification for voting.

My second bill provides for the prompt desegregation of public schools. It is most appropriate that the Congress of the United States enunciate the law of the land in spelling out the decision of the Supreme Court in 1954, which held that there should be no segregation in public schools. President Kennedy has pointed out that a strong America requires the assurance of full and equal rights to all its citizens, of any race or of any color, among them the right to free public education.

This bill would provide that assignment of all students to public schools would be made irrespective of race or color, and would require every school board to adopt a desegregation plan within 6 months from the date of enactment of the bill. It permits the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, if called upon to do so, to render technical assistance to school boards in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of such desegregation plans, and to grant financial assistance where necessary to carry out such plans.

One of the main provisions of the bill would authorize the Attorney General of the United States to institute a civil action against any school board which fails to put into effect a plan of school desegregation within the time specified.

Our public school system must be preserved and strengthened, and no child should be denied his right to a free public education because of his race, color, creed, or national origin.

The third bill calls for the establishment of the Civil Rights Commission as a permanent agency within the executive branch of the Government, and requires the submission of a yearly report to the President and the Congress on its activities of the preceding year and on any recommendations for further action. The Commission has done a remarkable job in the past in bringing to light some of the problems of discrimination in this country, and in bringing about a realization of the national objective of equal rights and equal opportunities for all our citizens. It can certainly continue its work in the field of human rights, thus guaranteeing that there will be no denial of constitutional rights to any of our fellow Americans.

As the leader in the effort to establish man's dignity as an individual, entitled to certain basic rights and freedoms, we must prove to the entire world, particularly to those countries behind the Iron Curtain and to those on the brink, that the United States is a land where such freedoms and the rights of each and every individual are respected and protected by the highest standards of justice. If we are to continue to preach democracy, freedom, and equality to the rest of the world, the Congress must fulfill its responsibilities and enact strong laws which will absolutely guarantee these rights regardless of race, ancestry, color, religion, or national origin.

I therefore urge that the House of Representatives give prompt and favorable consideration to these measures.

The Great Economic Issue Today: Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, in our struggle with the Communists, the United States has often been lectured "to get off the defensive and seize the initiative." However, as President Kennedy noted:

> While this is not an unreasonable urge, its concrete application is more difficult. In the military area, the initiative rests with the aggressor—a role that we shun by nature and tradition and our alliances are largely, therefore, defensive. In the paramilitary arenas of subversion, intimidation, and insurrection, an open and peaceful society is again at a disadvantage. But there is one area in particular where the initiative can and has been ours—an area of strategic importance in which we have the capacity for a still greater effort—the area of economic policy.

The Marshall plan, point 4, and the Alliance for Progress are examples of our initiative in this area. These programs were devised not only to thwart communism but to strike a blow for freedom.

THE GREAT ECONOMIC ISSUE TODAY: TRADE

The great international issue today—one with far greater consequences than any foreign aid program—is the U.S. trade policy. Our trade policy affects our national security, for our military and economic commitments abroad must be paid for by a favorable balance of trade. Our trade policy affects every sector of our economy.

The crops grown on 1 out of every 6 acres by the American farmer is sold on the foreign market. Sixty percent of our rice, 49 percent of our cotton, 45 percent of our wheat, and 42 percent of our soybean production are exported.

We export twice as many manufactured products as we import. Since 1945, machinery, vehicles, wood, paper, and chemical exports from the United States have doubled. One out of every three workers in manufacturing is employed in a firm that exports. Thousands more owe their jobs directly or indirectly to exports.

Our export industries are our strongest, most efficient, and highest paying growth industries, and not our lowest paying industries. A good example is U.S. coal—almost $55 million was sold to the Japanese in 1960 and 1961. The U.S. coal miner is paid 8 times more per hour than a Japanese coal miner, but he produces 14 times as much coal so that the real cost per ton of U.S. coal is far smaller.

Today, about 60 to 65 percent of our imports do not compete with the goods we produce. Forty percent of our imports are raw materials. More than 90 percent of our manganese or chrome ore for our steel mills is imported, as is 84 percent of the bauxite for our aluminum.

To state it more graphically, if the United States stopped trading abroad, the shortage and price rise would make these items virtually nonexistent: coffee, cocoa, spices, anything in tin cans, aluminum kitchenware, new radios, television sets, telephones, washing machines, and cars.

While exports represent about 3.9 percent of the gross national product in 1960, or about $1 out of every $25, American exports account for more than one-sixth of the world commerce.

TRADE IN PERSPECTIVE

What do all these statistics mean? It means that the United States is consuming more raw materials than our land is capable of producing; that we are not self-sufficient in a wide variety of minerals; that exports are crucial to the prosperity of many of our farmers and some segments of industry. Furthermore, the U.S. needs for raw materials will increase, for the rate of population increase in the United States is among the highest of the world's major countries.

We are the world's largest trading nation and many free world countries depend on our imports and exports. We, in turn, must look to exports to pay not only for our raw materials but to help us pay for our other oversea expenses such as maintaining troops in Berlin; to pay for our aid to less developed countries; to pay for the deficits caused by the outflow of American capital to tax-haven nations.

In 1959, the United States ran a deficit in its balance of payments of $3.7 billion; in 1960 it was $3.9 billion. In 1961 this deficit is estimated at over $1.5 billion. This deficit will grow unless it is offset by foreign investments in the United States and a favorable balance of trade.

But more important, trade will determine the size and shape of the free world. Japan, Canada, Philippines, Chile, Venezuela, Peru, India, Uruguay, Liberia, Pakistan, and other free world countries must have access to new markets for their raw materials and new manufactured goods if their economies are to expand to meet the demands and needs of their people, and if their new industries are to be successful. If the free nations do not offer growing trade opportunities with the West—opportunities which will allow them to pay eventually for their needs with exports—these countries will be forced to turn to the Communist bloc for their market.

THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

In the sixties, some 90 percent of the free world's industrial production may soon be concentrated in two great markets: The United States and the European Economic Community, popularly known as the European Common Market. The United States has a population of 185 million and a gross national product of $500 billion. The European Common Market, including the United Kingdom which has applied to become a member, has a population of 250 million and a gross national product of $245 billion. The U.S. exports to Western Europe account for one-fourth of our total exports.

Ever since the end of World War II, the U.S. policy has been to support greater European unity. Our aim was twofold; to curb the kind of European nationalism which led to two World Wars by encouraging the establishment of a common economic system, and to help create a strong Western Europe which would help guard the security and prosperity of free nations. The pooling of French and German coal and steel production under a common authority was one step toward that direction.

The Marshall plan brought the statesmen of these nations together. The United States asked them to determine not just the needs of their respective countries, but the needs of Western Europe.

In 1958, six European nations—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg—signed a treaty to bring about a European economic community. The treaty members pledged to: First, remove tariffs and other trade barriers among themselves; second, create a uniform system to regulate trade between themselves and the rest of the world; third, abolish restrictions on the movement of labor, capital, business enterprises and services within the new community; fourth, coordinate monetary and fiscal policies in order to promote high employment and stable prices in each country; and, fifth, establish a common agricultural policy.

The Common Market nations set a timetable of 12 to 15 years to accomplish the reduction of tariffs. Trade barriers among the original six members have been reduced by 50 percent at the beginning of 1962, nearly 2 years ahead of schedule. Other countries, notably former colonies of members of the Common Market, were accepted as associated states and have free access to the Common Market.

For Alliance for Progress countries, the special concessions made to former European colonies, particularly the African states, accentuate Latin America's trade problems, for both continents produce cotton, coffee, bananas, and other fruit.

The Common Market with its common external tariff wall against the rest of the world, presents a serious threat of discrimination against American exports and against the goods of free nations such as Canada, Japan, and countries in Latin America.

How much of a handicap this tariff will be, depends on the imported product and Europe's demand for it. The Common Market has indicated its willingness to bargain down its external tariff in exchange for trading concessions with outsiders, particularly the United States.

Hence, whether or not these two enormous markets in the free world will grow apart and engage in a trade war or whether they will expand the flow of trade and thereby stimulate and strengthen the respective economies will be determined by the trade policy of the United States.

HAWAII AND FOREIGN TRADE

Foreign trade has a direct impact on the life and livelihood of the American people in every State. Any change in tariffs could bring about serious dislocations in a State's economy causing the closing of some plants and unemployment with all its social problems.

It is difficult to gage the exact effect of world trade on Hawaii. Recently, the tariff on Hawaiian pineapple was raised in the Common Market. This move was not unexpected, for pineapples from French territories have had a distinct advantage over Hawaii in sales to Common Market countries. However, this increase in tariff could mean a further loss of the West German market which, heretofore, was the leading oversea buyer of Hawaiian pineapple products.

The extent to which Hawaii is involved with international trade should be emphasized. In 1960 Hawaii exported $44 million of agricultural products, or roughly 15 percent of the islands' total agricultural produce. Included were $41.5 million for field crops, $1.1 million for livestock and livestock products, $984,000 for fruits and nuts, and $377,000 for vegetables.

In 1960 exports of manufactured goods from Hawaii were estimated at $15.5 million. This is less than 1 percent of the gross State product. But over 23,000 workers or over 9 percent of the labor force are employed by manufacturing establishments reporting exports of $25,000 a year or more. These firms range from Dole Corp., Libby McNeill & Libby, California Packing Corp., to California Ink Co., Pacific Chemical & Fertilizer, Honolulu Iron Works, to smaller apparel and furniture companies.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires in June. If our exports are to retain and expand their position in the world market, and if the aim of our foreign policy is to bring about this greatest advance in increased living standards, especially in newly developed areas, our trade policy must be revised, not extended.

The United States needs a trade policy that grants new authority first, to negotiate broad trade agreements rather than one that negotiated item by item—a bargaining technique obsolete in many cases; second, to exchange tariff concessions; and, third, to increase trade to strengthen our balance of payments.

Of utmost importance is the retention of the most-favored-nation principle which would assure our other trading partners that any tariff concessions would be extended to them.

The new Trade Act should also contain some kind of trade adjustment program to give prompt and effective help to those firms and workers who face genuine hardships as a result of competition from increased imports. The aim of such a program would be to help firms modernize their equipment and plants, to help firms and workers move into lines of work in which they can compete more effectively.

I feel that the United States should equip itself to meet the challenge and the advantages that the European Common Market offers by adopting a liberal trade policy. The alternative is to retreat from some oversea commitments which are vital to the security of the free world. This is unacceptable.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District of Texas, April 7, 1962)

The second supplemental appropriation passed with House membership refusing to go on record (not enough Members arose to support the demand for a record vote). Earlier, on a motion to recommit, the bill failed 235 to 153. I voted to recommit to limit the U.S. portion of the United Nations payment. It seems wrong to me for us to pay $25 million toward the Katanga-Congo dispute, when other nations are failing to do their part. For that matter, the time is long overdue when each nation should bear the same share as every other or those, like the United States, contributing more should have a larger vote percentage to match their contribution. As in the U.S. income tax, so in the United Nations—the Communist doctrine is followed from each according to ability to pay, to each according to his needs. So we continue to belittle success and achievement and aggrandize inability, a sure way to stultify the accomplishment of a world of self-respecting and respectful neighbors. Freeloaders, do-gooders, something-for-nothingers are part of this pattern, hardly a sound basis for a realistic world of hard knocks. The appropriation bill, totaling $431.8 million, highlighted again our worsening fiscal position. As the Kennedy spending demands grow the deficit increases, and now we learn the gross national product and tax income will be less than anticipated. The deficit widens even more.

The Peace Corps amendment, asking Congress to up the next year's expense from the earlier request of $40 to $64 million, passed, 316 to 70, although many Members felt the program too new for accurate evaluation and increase. It appears that Government is moving into private missionary efforts, including YMCA, YWCA, and others. At the outset few realize the ultimate domination of Government when participating in joint projects. In this instance, private and religious missionary work will be replaced. Few, if any, know where the Peace Corps is going. Many Members, even proponents, agree the foreign aid program is long overdue a general review and overhauling. The buildup for its continuation and expansion is beginning.

President Goulart, of Brazil, proved again the adage "the best defense is a good offense." Instead of apologizing or defending the expropriation of American industry he proclaimed that other property will be taken and paid for, if, as, and when he sees fit. For this, the United States wined and dined him and gave him the key to the Treasury. Apparently, he will get $100 million or more as a gift. Castro's success has undermined U.S. prestige and property throughout this hemisphere, until every Latin American nation is further prey now to Communists and anti-U.S. sentiment. We now further aid and abet our demise by lauding the expropriators and rewarding them by grants of money. It's almost too fantastic to be believable and some say Mr. Kennedy's popularity is greater than ever. Meanwhile, Cuba is arming militarily with Russian planes, tanks, and artillery. The United States complacently rests easy 90 miles away. Ninety miles is no missile gap. And the Monroe Doctrine is dead.

A public works pump priming $600 million to help unemployment has been asked by the President even as Congress is asked to consider a $2 billion standby fund to combat future recessions. The pump priming failures of the past have taught this administration little, it seems. Public works projects fail since the unemployed are not in these areas, by trade or geographically, and, worse yet, recessions are encouraged by the tax take of the Federal Government from the taxpayer to pay for these projects. Where's the money coming from? is still the appropriate question.

Floor debate on the administration's propaganda to support legislation asked of Congress brought to light shocking power plays by the President and his lieutenants. Not only is the taxpayers' money spent incorrectly for this purpose, but the propaganda is false and misleading. The administration admits (p. 5926, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 4) distributing material widely to explain and support the legislative requests. In debate I pointed out the State Department's widely distributed pamphlet called Together We Grow Strong, which says that U.S. auto industry could not exist without oil from Kuwait. Other equally fallacious representations about world trade are being distributed to accompany our present consideration of the Trade Expansion Act. It is becoming quite apparent that administration claims of a freer trade bill are absolutely misleading and erroneous.

Muzzling of the press is a danger today, greater than ever before. The portrayal of this situation in the U.S. News & World Report, April 9 issue, is a real eye opener. The title, "The Kennedy Image, How It's Built," could be reentitled "A Dictator's Demands of the News Media." Here again, the naive idealistic average citizen who thinks "it can't happen here" is unaware of the real danger, it seems to me. When a news reporter is threatened or punished by being denied news material because he failed earlier to depict the President as he wished to be depicted, news control is complete. The problem today is now one of both sides of the issues getting through to the people. When you realize that the liberal or radical side, such as Keynesian economics, Fabian socialism, communism, the ADA views, and labor leaders' legislative observations do get complete coverage you can estimate the brainwash of our people. Unfortunately, there are too few conservative media, writers and commentators.

The imbalance of the professional staffs of the House committees which are loaded with Democratic appointees poses a serious threat to good government and proper representation of all the people. This week I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 588, to insure that the minority party is given adequate staff help on all House committees. House committee figures have been collected to show that staff members responsible to the Democrats total 462 while only 39 staff members on House committees are responsible to the Republicans.

Speech by Hon. Vernon W. Thomson, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on the 30th of March of this year, the able and distinguished Congressman from the Third District of Wisconsin, the Honorable VERNON W. THOMSON, former Governor of the great State of Wisconsin, and I were on a program at the Southeastern Dairy Marketing Clinic, held at Chattanooga, Tenn. He and I discussed there the pros and cons of the proposed Federal milk sanitation legislation, and his people who favor that legislation can rest assured that he was, as he always is, a determined advocate of their cause. He made a magnificent presentation and I am happy here to include it in the RECORD, as presented by him:

PRESENTATION BY CONGRESSMAN VERNON W. THOMSON AT THE SOUTHEASTERN DAIRY MARKETING CLINIC, CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

I am a Representative in Congress from America's Dairyland, the State where men are men and the dairy cow is queen. Let me put this into perspective for you. The U.S. Department of Agriculture tells us, for instance, that our friends in South Carolina produced 540 million pounds of milk in 1961; in Georgia, 1,032 million pounds were produced; in Tennessee, 2,347 million; while in Wisconsin we produced last year 17,997 million pounds of milk. In terms of cash farm income from milk, in South Carolina it represents 6.9 percent; in Georgia it represents 6.4 percent; in Tennessee, it represents 15.4 percent; while in Wisconsin it represents 53.7 percent of cash farm income.

In my capacity both as Governor of Wisconsin and as a Member of the House of Representatives, I have been deeply and directly concerned with the promotion of a sound and prosperous dairy economy for my State and our Nation.

I would like to present to you the viewpoint of the Wisconsin dairy producer on this vital issue of milk sanitation legislation. First, let me say that I have absolutely no desire, nor do the dairy farmers of Wisconsin, to hurt the farmers of Tennessee, New York, Texas, or any other State. It is just a fact of life in this world in which we live that some groups are always anxious to preserve the status quo. This situation not only exists between different groups on different commodities, but it has been apparent many times right within the dairy industry itself. It has happened not only on the national level, but, I think we can all fairly say, it has also happened within our own States. The dairy industry as a whole is one of the most important ones in America today, and I think we can all agree that it is faced with some very serious problems. Of course there are a variety of causes for this, but I submit that one of the most important causes of our trouble is and has been the erection of artificial trade barriers that are not based on common sense or sanitary standards.

We in Wisconsin do not seek to gain any unfair advantages over local dairy farmers in other areas of America. Dairy farmers located next to large metropolitan markets have a number of advantages based simply on geography. Now, if all our Wisconsin dairy farmers could resettle around the city of New York or around the cities covered by the now existing 81 Federal milk marketing orders, they would have no cause to complain. Unfortunately, however, they are not, so they must ship milk from long distances, pay expensive transportation costs and then face an uphill fight for markets which in many instances are dominated by unduly restrictive local economic barriers acclaimed as sanitation standards: Such as requiring a certain model of drinking cup in a barn by Chicago, requiring a certain exterior finish on bulk tanks in Pennsylvania, longer legs on bulk tanks than the 3–A standards in Louisiana, 400 cubic feet of air space per stanchion in Maryland, while Washington, D.C., requires 600, Ohio requires gutters 16 inches wide and 8 inches deep, while Nevada prescribes 14 inches wide and 4 inches in depth. Washington, D.C., requires individual cloth towels which are laundered and sanitized after each usage or a single service paper towel to wipe the udder of each cow. Nevada requires the milk house to be windward from the barn, while California requires a two-room milk house. Many municipalities refuse to accept milk produced or handled under the supervision of other jurisdictions having substantially equivalent dairy standards, such as Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans. The innumerable variety of inspections per year required by different jurisdictions and the impossible and costly duplication of inspections (Wisconsin, 23) are but a sampling of the conflicts of regulation and the multiplication of costs and uncertainties faced by a farmer attempting to qualify to serve an out-of-State market.

Let's take a look at this basic issue in the perspective of time, the past, the present, and the future. Restrictive trade devices, as you know, are nothing new. They have been devised and erected since the beginning of man's first venture into commerce and trade. They still exist in many shapes and forms today in all parts of the world. They existed in 1776 when the American Colonies threw off the yoke of English oppression and formed our great Nation.

The early efforts of the Founding Fathers, as you know, resulted in the Articles of Confederation, which in effect represented a customs union. Later, when the device proved to be ineffective, the Constitution was adopted, making the United States truly a political union. Even in the days of the Confederation, tariffs, trade restrictions, and taxes were recognized as unhealthy for a prosperous economy. The Constitution specifically protected free trade among the States and a large body of constitutional law has been built on the proposition that no one State can discriminate in commerce against her sister States. This principle of encouraging the free flow of goods and commodities in interstate commerce has allowed our Nation to grow and prosper.

It lets Detroit make our cars, and it lets Iowa raise our hogs. It lets Milwaukee brew our beer, and it lets California and Florida produce our oranges, and Tennessee produce Jack Daniels. The Constitution doesn't prevent other States from making cars, raising hogs, brewing beer, or growing oranges, of course, but it allows the most efficient and economical producers in Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, California, Florida, and Tennessee to do so by prohibiting the other States from erecting restrictive and burdensome barriers to the free flow of the goods and commodities.

The Wisconsin dairyfarmer then simply asks, "Why not let me have the opportunity to produce dairy products more efficiently?"

So much for the past. Let's look at the present in regard to dairying. The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, the law under which Federal milk marketing orders are established, has a provision in section 2(C)(5)(G) which states:

"(G) No marketing agreement or order applicable to milk and its products in any marketing area shall prohibit or in any manner limit, in the case of the products of milk, the marketing in that area of any milk or product thereof produced in any production area in the United States."

This provision was inserted into the law many years ago by the late Representative August Andresen, of Minnesota, who for over 30 years served on the House Committee on Agriculture.

This amendment was accepted by Congress for the very reason that it was the clear congressional intent that trade barriers should not be built up in this country between various sections of the Nation in the marketing of milk. It is still on the lawbooks today but, unfortunately, it is not being realistically enforced. If the Administration farm bill now pending before Congress were passed in its present form, even this provision would, in fact, be nullified.

What, then, the Wisconsin dairyfarmer asks, is the difference between a policy of prohibiting or limiting the marketing of milk in any one area of the country and prohibiting or limiting the marketing of oranges in any one area of the country? Is it any more justifiable for a local segment of the dairy industry in Hawaii, for example, to prohibit Wisconsin milk than it would be for orangegrowers in an Alaskan hothouse to prohibit the sale of California oranges in Alaska?

The marketing problems of our Wisconsin dairyfarmers is only one aspect of the problem, of course. Its twin is local sanitary standards. The proposals in Congress to establish a uniform standard to prevent discrimination in this regard are both fair and reasonable.

The standards proposed in those bills are high standards. The Public Heath Service model ordinance and code, which is the standard in those bills, was developed with the aid of a national advisory committee of experts in public health, dairy, and veterinary science.

Since the code was first established in 1924, it has been revised 12 times to keep abreast of modern techniques and new scientific knowledge. These standards are currently in effect in over 1,900 communities and 35 States. It is a standard which provides consumers with a high degree of protection which is of vital importance, particularly in view of the importance of milk to growing boys and girls.

It is a standard of long standing in the State of Wisconsin. It is a standard that guarantees the basic purity and quality of the product produced, and let me add parenthetically that you must not delude yourselves with the fiction that the purity or quality of the product produced in any one of your States is superior to that produced in the greatest dairy State in this Union. It was and is essential to the maintenance of our preeminent position that we establish and maintain and improve every phase of agriculture required to meet the most rigorous standards established anywhere, that policy is vital to competitive agriculture. We have no intention in Wisconsin of being a residual supplier only, and we willingly accept the challenge to meet any standard of purity or quality and compete against anyone for the most efficient production.

I, too, believe in States rights and local responsibility, but I would not stultify the importance of those terms by using them as a shield to protect the uneconomic entrepreneur.

So much for the past and the present. Let us move to the future for dairying in America. In many ways it is a bright future, even though beset with problems. New science and technology is coming into play each day. Our universities and experiment stations are finding better ways to produce, market and use nature's most perfect food. The development of whole milk powder and canned sterile whole milk is just in its infancy. Perhaps in this new technology lies the answer to some of our problems if—and I stress this is a big "if"—new and more ingenious restrictive devices aren't adopted to affect the new technology.

These restrictive devices aren't the wave of the future—they are the wave of the past. As illustrated by the present economic developments in Europe, the wave of the future is for expanded trade. The nations in the Inner Six of the European Economic Community are now forming a customs union to break down ancient trade barriers between their nations. Like the Articles of Confederation in our Nation's early history, the Common Market is seeking to allow the free interchange of goods and commodities between its members, thus allowing the most efficient producers in that area to produce free of restrictions. The development of the European Common Market is of vital significance to our Nation. We have a huge stake in the prosperity and strength of Europe. If we are to be in a competitive position with the Common Market, we, too, must reject the same type of restrictive devices that protect Italian Fiats from German Volkswagens and Texas milk from Wisconsin milk.

In conclusion, let me say this: Realistic sanitation legislation is an absolute must for the economic survival of the most efficient dairy farmer. It need not be Federal legislation if all or most States adopt fair and reasonable provisions and do not exercise their local police power to unduly burden and obstruct milk marketing under the guise of acting to promote public health standards. We in Wisconsin would like the opportunity to provide the metropolitan consumer with a high standard product. We are blessed with the weather, the topography and the skills of generations of efficient dairy families. We merely wish to compete fairly and economically with other areas blessed with geographic proximity to urban markets.

Quality Stabilization Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am hereby submitting a statement made by me before the special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee at the beginning of their hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 159, known as the quality stabilization bill. This is a companion bill to H.R. 10335 filed by me and identical bills filed by five other Members of the House of Representatives.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN, FIRST DISTRICT OF INDIANA, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE RELATIVE TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 159

Mr. Chairman and members of the special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, I am grateful to the chairman and members of this committee for your decision to hold hearings this week on the quality stabilization bill, Senate Joint Resolution 159. Your cooperation demonstrates that you are much concerned over the devastating methods of merchandising in recent years that is causing a great damage to the manufacturers, retailers, and consumers throughout the country.

Basically, the quality stabilization bill offers a major step in curbing dishonest practices that are misleading the consumer in merchandise values. It spells out bait advertising, deceptive pricing, and published misrepresentations of the product, as reasons why a manufacturer may protect the property rights in his brand name or trademark.

The public will be helped by the enactment of the quality stabilization law since the established price and quality symbolized by the brand name will be a standard from which it may judge the competitive values of products. The consumer will be guarded against the loss-leader operator who uses the honored brand name or trademark to build store traffic at the expense of his more honest competitors, while recouping his loss at the same time on overpriced, inferior, and blind merchandise.

OPERATION

If the owner of the trademark elects to come under quality stabilization, the retailers and distributors must cooperate with the owner or manufacturer in maintaining the stabilized price of that trademarked product. This enables the manufacturer to continue to build quality into his stabilized brand-name product. If the retailer violates the provisions of the quality stabilization law, the brand-name owner can revoke the retailer's right to use the brand name. If the distributor violates the revocation order, the brand-name owner (the manufacturer) can then institute a Federal civil suit for damages.

This legislation will call for no Government bureaucracy or department to supervise or enforce the quality stabilization law. The law is 100 percent optional and the manufacturer, retailer, wholesaler, or consumer can choose to come under or stay out of quality stabilization. It provides a wholly meritorious and worthwhile opportunity for quality products to be distributed through quality-conserving resellers.

NOT FAIR TRADE

Since its introduction last January 1961, the merits of this proposed legislation have come to the attention of thousands upon thousands of manufacturers, distributors, retailers, and consumers. This bill is not fair trade legislation and is not a price-fixing measure.

The quality stabilization bill has now become one of the most widely publicized and acclaimed measures that await action in this session of Congress. In our long and critical struggle against communism, the American system of free enterprise must be our major weapon. Business failures in recent years and the growing lack of protection for consumer purchases must be given consideration by this Congress. The marketplace is rapidly becoming infested with the so-called fast buck merchandisers.

OPTIONAL

In giving the manufacturer the optional right to control his trademark, safeguards are also established for the distributor, the retailer and, most important of all, the consumer. It is imperative in considering the bill, that you fully realize that its use by the manufacturer, retailer, and consumer is optional. No product can be stabilized under the proposed quality stabilization law unless competitive products are available to the consumer. And sale or purchase of a product stabilized under the proposed law is also completely voluntary on the part of the distributor, the retailer, and the consumer. It is of fundamental importance that this bill be recognized as one not aimed at harming any legitimate business, but as a measure of economic benefit to all.

BUSINESS FAILURES

The Senate Small Business Committee has reported that small business failures (bankruptcies—businessmen giving up the struggle for survival) climbed in 1960 to the highest point since 1933 and the great depression. The House Small Business Committee, in its December 16, 1960, report entitled "Status of Small Business (1948–1958)," 86th Congress, 2d session, made this frightening statement:

"Most small retailers discontinue businesses without going through bankruptcy. This explains why, of the 139,000 who discontinued business in 1959, only 6,873 showed up among the business failures."

There are about 2 million retailers in America: 88 percent of them operate in only one location from one store; 70 percent individually own their own businesses. These are not huge outfits—over 75 percent have annual sales under $100,000.

There are 165,000 merchant wholesalers in the United States: 91 percent of them are active owners of unincorporated businesses; 71 percent operate from only one building.

It is the well-known brand names—brands with a reputation for reliability—that are taking it on the chin. If these brands did not have such an excellent reputation, do you suppose they would be of interest even for one minute to the discounter who needs a traffic builder for his kind of selling?

We cannot permit the further degeneration of the brand-name system of distribution. We must arrest the growing rate of failure of small business in this country. We must give the incentive to the manufacturer in this country to build toward excellence, and we must protect the consumer from junk merchandise.

Quality stabilization covers specific areas in which a manufacturer can control—that is, prevent—the unfair use of his own property—his trademark—by the reseller. These areas are:

1. Intentional misrepresentation as to make, model, size, age, etc.
2. Bait and switch merchandising tactics.
3. Price.

To repeat, it is not compulsory that the brand-name owner use the law.

MECHANICS OF USING THE LAW

The manufacturer who does elect to use the quality stabilization law will publish a specific retail price at which his trademarked product must be sold. He has this right so that he may protect the quality of the product, the good will of his brand name, the ethical reseller and the consumer. This is not to say that the manufacturer cannot change his specific price. Not at all. Competition is promoted—not restricted—by the quality stabilization bill, and the interaction of competitive forces will insure that the manufacturer's price represents fair value or else that manufacturer will be forced out of his business. Any price established under this law will be at the manufacturer's peril. This is the way the free enterprise system should function.

If a retailer knowingly violates the published policy of the manufacturer by engaging in any one or all of the three specific practices named in the bill—price deviation, bait and switch tactics, misrepresentation, then the manufacturer may revoke the right of that offending retailer to make any further use of the manufacturer's name, brand or trademark.

The quality stabilization bill is not a one-way street. It imposes an obligation on the manufacturer as well. The bill states that lack of due diligence in revoking the rights of competing resellers known to the trademark owner to be committing similar acts of unfair competition will constitute a valid defense against any action brought under this law.

With the enactment of the quality stabilization bill, the reseller and the public will know where each manufacturer stands as to policy and quality consistency. The manufacturer no longer will have the convenient excuse that he cannot protect good resellers against unfair competition.

FOUNDATION ESTABLISHED BY SUPREME COURT

The quality stabilization bill contains none of the usual fair trade language. There is no provision for contracts; as the bill is wholly predicated on the owner's property rights in his good name; there is no dependence on a nonsigner clause as is the case with fair trade.

The essential difference is that fair trade enforcement is to compel a dealer to raise his prices for a product, while under the quality stabilization bill, the action is one akin to trespass—to stop a reseller from abusing a manufacturer's property right in his trademark.

The quality stabilization bill simply provides that when a trademark is abused, the trademark owner may deny that unfair reseller further use of the brand name or trademark. Essentially, it is a confirmation by Congress of the unanimous decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Old Dearborn Distributing Co.* v. *Seagram-Distiller's Corp.* (299 U.S. 183 (1936)), that the manufacturer possesses property rights in the good will symbolized by his trademark. The bill describes how the manufacturer may protect his trademark as it moves along the channels of distribution.

CONSTRUCTIVE COMPETITION INSURED

The quality stabilization bill leaves the Sherman Act intact. Any group of manufacturers or wholesalers or retailers who abuse the quality stabilization bill to effect illegal collusive price fixing between themselves would be courting the same prosecution as the heavy electrical firms and their executives experienced not long ago in Philadelphia.

To underscore that the quality stabilization bill will promote competition, it must be emphasized repeatedly that the manufacturer alone must make the basic marketing decision—whether to stabilize his price, as a means of restoring and improving quality, or to rely primarily on price alone to attract customers. It is after all, his brand and his reputation which is at stake. Only he can make the decision.

Wholesalers and retailers will be free, too, to determine whether they wish to handle products of stabilized quality or a competitive unstabilized one. They may elect to handle top brand lines which are stabilized and others on which they can vary the price. It is their decision. If they elect to handle the quality stabilized brand, they must respect the law and the manufacturer's established policy. This means that the reseller may not abuse the brand name by misrepresentation as to make, model, size, age or other details of the quality-stabilized brand, by bait and switch merchandising techniques or by selling that brand name product at other than the manufacturer's specific price.

THE CONSUMER'S INTEREST

This legislation safeguards the consumer. This committee is not unmindful of the situation that results when an unprincipled retailer can take advantage of a product by running a loss-leader ad. For every dollar spent by the misguided customer who is brought in on account of this ad, sacrificing a brand name or a trademark of some producer, that customer spends an estimated $9 for inferior products at the regular or higher price. Now, what happens? It does not take long until that honored product loses customers. Soon the loss-leader advertiser drops the brand name product and picks up another quality product to temporarily pack his store with unsuspecting customers. It is operations of this kind that the quality stabilization bill will control by protecting the customer, the producer, and the small retail man.

We need protection for the small retailer, the consumer, labor, and for the man who invents a product or spends his adult life and great sums of money to establish a brand name or trademark.

Enactment of the quality stabilization bill will result in availability of products in which the public can have confidence—confidence in their stabilized price and in their quality. Customers can buy that which they seek: quality and price, or, price alone. The retailer, by offering both quality stabilized and unstabilized brands, can give the consumer an excellent mix of durable, high quality products and products of lesser quality whose prices fit his pocketbook or his limited needs.

I feel confident that there will be many brands, made by reputable manufacturers, which will not be stabilized even though some of their brands are stabilized. The quality stabilization bill will affect discount merchants only as to the products the manufacturers place under quality stabilization and then, only as to the brand name thereof. On those products the manufacturer will have the legal and equitable right to protect his property. But the discounter is optionally free to handle quality stabilized products along with merchandise that he does not elect to come under quality stabilization.

It is not the purpose of the quality stabilization bill to put anyone out of business. Indeed, it is my conviction that it will reduce the number of small businesses whose owners find it necessary to liquidate. I predict that enactment of the quality stabilization bill will result in a drastic drop in the number of small business failures.

Obviously, the buying public will benefit from this bill. For the first time in a number of years, the consumer will have a standard against which to measure quality. The quality stabilization law will also give protection to the consumer against entrapment and unwise purchase of the loss-leader merchant specializing in bait-and-switch tactics.

HELP RESTORE EMPLOYMENT

In urging speedy consideration of this bill by this committee, I direct your attention to the fact that unrestrained price slashing is rapidly disabling labor, industry, resellers, and the public. Our entire economy will continue to deteriorate at a time when leading economists and statesmen agree we need, instead, economic growth to strengthen our Nation for survival.

I represent the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana. In recent years purchasers and small retailers have been asking me what can be done to reestablish confidence in retail marketing. Unemployment in my area is critical.

Enactment of this quality stabilization legislation will contribute more toward restoring employment than any other legislation that can be enacted by Congress. When a manufacturer is forced to make 15 men do the work of 20, and is forced to employ cheaper and less-skilled labor as well as inferior materials, both American labor and the American consumer are injured where it hurts most. Smaller manufacturers of trademarked products have been forced to close their factories or downgrade the quality of their products to suit the high pressure, falsely advertising retailers, as a means of staying in business. This type of retailer may be few in number but they are powerful and heavily financed, and growing in size and number every day.

Enactment of the quality stabilization bill will give manufacturers the confidence to build better products instead of cheaper products with poor quality.

This bill will give the bargain seeker an opportunity of knowing what is a bargain by placing a standard of value as a gage.

NONPARTISAN

This is strictly nonpartisan legislation. Ten U.S. Senators of both parties have cosponsored quality stabilization, and seven Members—from both parties—have introduced the bills in the House of Representatives.

I am hereby submitting with my statement the list of more than 50 national trade and professional organizations that have endorsed this quality stabilization bill:

Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc.

National Retail Hardware Association.

National Retail Furniture Association.

National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers.

National Appliance & Radio-TV Dealers Association.

National Sporting Goods Association.

National Office Machine Dealers Association.

Retail Jewelers of America.

Master Photo Dealers & Finishers Association.

Independent Garage Owners of America.

Toy Wholesalers' Association of America.

Wholesale Stationers' Association.

National Stationery & Office Equipment Association.

National Wholesale Jewelers Association.

American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association.

Archery Manufacturers & Dealers Association.

National Association of House to House Installment Companies, Inc.

Marine Manufacturers Safety Equipment Association.

Gift & Decorative Accessories Association of America.

Sporting Goods Jobbers Association.

Billiard & Bowling Institute of America.

American Watch Association, Inc.

Automotive Service Industry Association.

Fountain Pen & Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers' Association, Inc.

National Wholesale Hardware Association.

Watch Material Distributors of America.

National Association of Bedding Manufacturers.

The National Association of Shirt, Pajama & Sportswear Manufacturers.

National Industrial Distributors Association.

Christian Booksellers Association.

National Small Business Men's Association.

National Congress of Petroleum Retailers.

National Shoe Manufacturers Association.

Wallcovering Wholesalers Association.

American Research Merchandising Institute.

American Retailers Association.

National Art Materials Trade Association.

Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association.

National Shoe Retailers Association.

Northamerican Heating & Airconditioning Wholesalers, Inc.

American Watch Manufacturers Association.

National Association of Women's & Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.

National Audio-Visual Association, Inc.

National Bicycle Dealers Association, Inc.

National Office Furniture Association, Inc.

National Outerwear & Sportswear Association.

The Automotive Warehouse Distributors Association. Inc.

National Frozen Food Association, Inc.

American Association of Small Business.

National Association of Glove Manufacturers.

National Association of Retail Druggists.

Paint & Wallpaper Association of America, Inc.

National Marine Products Association.

Retail Tobacco Dealers of America.

National Association of Tobacco Distributors.

National Retail Farm Equipment Association.

Conference of State Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries.

American Pharmaceutical Association.

I thank you.

Chemical Progress Week, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House that April 9–13, 1962, is being observed nationally as Chemical Progress Week.

It is the ninth annual observance. This year's theme, "New Worlds Through Chemistry," is more than just a slogan to the men and women of the chemical industry. It implies the industry's vital role in America's race to the stars, and it applies to exciting advancements in other chemical products—from synthetic fibers to miracle drugs.

PROGRESS THROUGH RESEARCH

Chemical Progress Week spotlights the continual advancements made by the chemical industry to contribute to healthier, more comfortable, safer lives for every American.

Each year more than 500 new industrial chemicals are developed in the laboratories and research departments of more than 12,000 producers in the industry. Chemical companies on an industrywide basis spend more of their own money on research—outside Government grants and private endowments—than any other U.S. industry. In 1961, the chemical industry allotted approximately $800 million for basic and product research.

For every 10,000 persons employed in production facilities in the chemical industry, there are 623 working in research—the highest proportion of any U.S. manufacturing industry.

PROGRESS THROUGH GROWTH AND DIVERSIFICATION

Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., the national trade association of the industry, reports that the chemical industry is fourth in size in terms of assets—$26 billion—among U.S. industries; fifth, in terms of sales—nearly $30 billion last year.

But, despite the size of the industry, the combined sales of the three largest companies account for only 17 percent of total industry sales. And nearly 65 percent of the industry's plants employ less than 20 people each. In all, some 830,000 men and women are employed in America's chemical industry.

Nor is the industry content to stand still. Last year, according to U.S. Government figures, the chemical industry spent more than $1½ billion on new plants and equipment.

In my State of West Virginia, there are 41 establishments employing 40,577 people; with an annual payroll of $256,738,000. West Virginia ranks 12th in the chemical manufacturing industry.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Micah 7: 7: *Therefore I will look unto the Lord; my God will hear me.*

O Thou who canst lift us out of weakness into power and out of weariness into peace, may we daily be blessed with the faith that will make us faithful.

Grant that we may seek diligently and covet earnestly Thy divine wisdom and strength for the duties and responsibilities of our high calling.

Inspire us with devotion and dedication to that which is noble and true in order that we may have within our hearts the throb and thrill of Thy joy which the world cannot give or take away.

Endow us with that magnanimous and sacrificial spirit of our Saviour who never spared Himself in the great mission of giving to needy humanity the morning wonder and glory of a new day.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 205) entitled "An act to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs," agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CENSURE OF ISRAEL

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Security Council of the United Nations has voted to censure Israel for its part in last month's Lake Tiberius incident on the basis of a U.S. introduced and actively supported resolution.

This resolution was introduced despite clear evidence that Syrian guns had fired first upon Israel shipping in clearly recognized Israel waters and that the shooting was repeated despite Israel's complaints to U.N. truce supervisors.

The U.S. delegation to the U.N. pressed vigorously for a one-sided vote of censure in the face of disputed testimony by Maj. Gen. Carl C. Von Horn, Chief of Staff of the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization, regarding the presence of Syrian fortifications along the Israel-Syrian frontier.

Israel has presented facts to indicate a heavy buildup of Soviet-made weapons by Syrian forces along the frontier area which gives rise to a question of alternate Syrian intentions against Israel.

The unilateral condemnation of Israel leaves unpunished Syria's hostile actions, and could serve as an open invitation to Syria to resume its harassment of Israel shipping. It can only lead to a further aggravation of an already tense situation.

The United States has repeatedly and firmly expressed its support and deep commitment to an effective peace in the Middle East.

Therefore, I am today introducing a resolution requesting the Secretary of State to furnish to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, full and complete information with respect to the motivation, and underlying reasons, for the sponsorship by this country and support before the Security Council of the U.N. of the censure of Israel which occurred on April 9, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 63]

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Anfuso
Barrett
Battin
Blitch
Boykin
Breeding
Brewster
Buckley
Cahill
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Church
Coad
Collier
Curtis, Mass.
Dawson
Derwinski
Dingell
Dooley
Dowdy
Dwyer
Fascell
Finnegan
Flynt
Fulton
Gavin
Grant
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Huddleston
Jarman
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kelly
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Lankford
Libonati
Macdonald
Michel
Miller, George P.
Moulder
Murphy
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Patman
Powell
Pucinski
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts, Ala.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Rousselot
St. Germain
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Steed
Thompson, N.J.
Van Pelt
Walter
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.
Yates
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-seven members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REGULATION OF TEXTILE IMPORTS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 589 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 589 calls up for consideration H.R. 10788, a bill which amends section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. This bill comes before the House under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act authorizes the President to negotiate agreements with foreign governments providing for limitation of imports of any agricultural commodity or products, including textiles or textile products. Section 204 also authorizes the President to issue regulations implementing those import agreements.

But before discussing the details of the amendment to this section, let me sketch briefly the background of the problem with which the bill deals; namely, the rise in cotton textile imports.

During the 4-year period from 1934 to 1938, cotton textile imports into the United States from all sources averaged $39.7 million annually. In 1954 the total was $76.2 million. In 1955 the figure was $123.8 million.

By 1960, the value of cotton textile imports has reached $253.5 million, or more than a quarter of a billion dollars. During this period I have just covered there was a considerable change, of course, in the value of the dollar. But even in terms of what the economists call constant dollars, the imports more than quadrupled from 1934–38 to 1960.

And, what is more of a danger signal, in 1960, for the first time in 45 years, U.S. imports of cotton products exceeded exports.

Stated another way, in terms of raw cotton, the quantity of manufactured products coming into the United States increased more than five times in the 6 years ending in 1960. Imports of cotton manufactures that year were 573,000 bales, as compared with 101,000 in 1954.

This trend that I have been discussing has taken its toll on cotton farmers, textile workers, and on textile management alike.

Realizing the complex and very serious problems facing the cotton and textile industry, President Kennedy on May 2 of last year announced a seven-point program dealing with the import problem.

Point 6 of that program called for the Department of State to arrange a conference with the principal textile importing and exporting countries to seek an international agreement under which trade in cotton textiles could be controlled. That meeting was held in Geneva, Switzerland, last July and the result was a 1-year agreement which lasts until September 30, 1962. The President's authority for enforcement, insofar as the participating countries are concerned, is section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

At a meeting in Geneva of the Cotton Textile Committee of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the representatives of 19 nations concluded a long-term cotton textile arrangement.

This arrangement is for a period of 5 years beginning October 1, 1962, replacing the current agreement. Under terms of the new agreement, the United States or any other nation threatened by market disruption in textiles, or any category thereof, may freeze imports for 1 year at the level of the first 12 of the preceding 15 months. If this disruption condition continues, the freeze may be extended for yet another year. Following that, increases in imports are confined to 5 percent a year.

The countries which participate in this new agreement cover 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles. The President of the United States has authority under section 204 to issue regulations to implement this agreement as far as participants are concerned. But he does not now have the authority to prevent countries which account for the balance of world cotton trade from interfering with the new agreement.

H.R. 10788, the bill called up under this rule, would give the President the authority to protect the agreement against the small minority of textile exporting countries who are not participants. Conceivably, the beneficial effects of this long-sought agreement could be nullified without this bill.

The bill is simple and it merely adds to section 204 the following language:

> In addition, if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be concluded under the authority of this section among countries accounting for a significant part of world trade in the articles with respect to which the agreement was concluded, the President may also issue, in order to carry out such an agreement, regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of the same articles which are products of countries not parties to the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished Committee on Agriculture, and its able and distinguished chairman, Mr. Cooley, for its fine work on behalf of the cotton and textile industry.

Mr. Speaker, the cotton industry, embracing as it does, cotton growers, textile workers, and millowners and managers, deserves to have this legislation passed as a matter of equity and justice.

I urge adoption of House Resolution 589.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me why this bill is limited to cotton and cotton textiles when there are many other industries that are just as seriously affected by imports as is cotton and the cotton industry?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will say to the gentleman that I think it might be better that his question be directed to a member of the legislative committee that had the bill under its jurisdiction. This bill deals with the cotton and textile industries. Perhaps there should be other bills dealing with other industries.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Elliott], a member of the Committee on Rules, has adequately explained the provisions of this rule, so I shall not discuss them further at this time. Instead, I would like to discuss this legislation and its background, if I may.

In the beginning may I say that as one who has always believed that some tariffs and export duties were necessary in order to protect American industry and labor from unfair foreign competition; as one who has consistently voted against the extension of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which is not reciprocal in any sense of the word, and under which we have seen a great many industries and a great deal of American labor injured as the result of agreements made under that act; and as one who has watched with alarm and concern the arrangement that was made some time ago to permit certain foreign countries to purchase surplus owned——

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 64]

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Anfuso
Auchincloss
Barrett
Battin
Blitch
Boykin
Breeding
Brewster
Buckley
Cahill
Cannon
Casey
Celler
Chelf
Church
Coad
Collier
Colmer
Curtis, Mass.
Dawson
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dooley
Dowdy
Downing
Dwyer
Fallon
Fascell
Flynt
Fulton
Gavin
Grant
Hansen
Harding
Harrison, Va.
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Jarman
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Lankford
Libonati
McCulloch
Madden
Michel
Miller,
George P.
Moeller
Morrison
Moulder
Murphy
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Patman
Pfost
Philbin
Powell
Pucinski
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts, Ala.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
St. Germain
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Van Pelt
Walter
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.
Yates

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty-four Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REGULATION OF TEXTILE IMPORTS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] is recognized.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, to resume the remarks I was making at the time a quorum call proceedings interrupted me, let me say, I have been gravely concerned over the arrangement which has been in effect some time under which we were selling our Government-owned surplus cotton to textile manufacturers in foreign countries for 8½ cents a pound less than American manufacturers of textiles could purchase the same cotton here at home.

I have always believed that was wrong—I still believe it to be wrong, and it is my understanding that this legislation is designed to help correct that situation.

I have noticed throughout the years under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act that quite too often, and I believe it includes the cotton textile industry, that when some injured or aggrieved industry complained and asked for relief from the Tariff Commission from certain agreements that had been made with foreign countries relative to the importation of foreign products that quite often the Tariff Commission would grant the relief requested, and then the matter would go to the President.

As I understand it, usually upon the advice and counsel of the Department of State, the rulings or the decisions of the Tariff Commission would be set aside, and you all know the effect. It was usually done upon the proposition, or upon the basis, or under the argument, that to take such action to protect American labor and industry might make some foreign country, some foreign government, some foreign manufacturer unhappy, perhaps even angry at the United States, and that the people of that foreign country would no longer love us, as some seemingly think we must make everyone do, rather than to respect us.

So I can understand fully why, a few months ago, under the leadership of that very skilled parliamentarian and legislative tactician, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. VINSON, Members of this body from the cotton-producing States, from the States that have great cotton textile industries located in them, organized to endeavor to see what could be done to relieve them of this unfair foreign competition arrangement, so as to protect the textile industries here in this country. That occurred, of course, about the time, if my memory serves me correctly, the President was sending to the Congress a message on foreign trade in which he was requesting, in spite of the fact that under the reciprocal trade agreements we had on the average reduced import duties and tariffs on foreign products coming into this country by about 75 percent, that Congress give him authority to reduce tariffs by another 50 percent, and in some instances to eliminate them entirely. So it has been quite a coincidence that a peculiar situation has developed here recently in connection with this legislation. So, all of a sudden, after this a great protest swelled up—and I think rightfully so—under the leadership of the gentleman from Georgia, against what was being done to the textile industry as a result of such unfair foreign competition, under this arrangement whereby American Government-owned surplus cotton could be purchased by foreign manufacturers at 8½ cents a pound less than the American manufacturers could purchase the same cotton here in this country.

As a result of all this, somehow or other, the administration began to take a great interest in the cotton textile industry, and the problem was taken up by GATT at Geneva. I have seen and read with a great deal of interest the reports made by our own departments here as to just what was said and done there. Rather peculiarly, if the information I receive is correct, the reports we get of what went on at GATT, as to the agreement that was made with some 18 foreign countries making textiles that come in such increased volume into this country, have not been exactly the same, in wording, intent, or purpose, as the claimed understanding of the other nations that participated in that Conference.

But that is not all. Some other peculiar situations have also developed. This bill came in, as you know, with administration support, on March 15. It was reported out of the Committee on Agriculture on March 27, after some very short hearings which were held on March 22. It just happens, you know, that while this bill was reported on the 27th, the so-called administration-sponsored tax bill came to the floor of the House on the 28th of March.

I have read with a great deal of interest—it was just a sort of happenstance of course, but a peculiar sort of situation—that in the report the Assistant Secretary of State for the Acting Secretary of State, on page 3 of the report, under date of March 22, suddenly reversed the position that had been taken by the State Department for so many years, by our Federal Government, by the administration, by the White House, and came out for a protective tariff on cotton textiles. Believe it or not, that is the old McKinley doctrine. If you remember, sometimes some of us who want to protect American industry and labor from unfair foreign competition are called McKinleyites because we are for needed protective tariffs. It is very peculiar, it is quite different, of course. But suddenly, one week before the new tax bill that the administration sponsored came to the floor for consideration the State Department, through the Assistant Secretary of State speaking for the Secretary of State, comes out and endorses this protective tariff bill. The administration now says "you must enact this legislation in order to give proper protection to the cotton textile industry."

Rather peculiar, is it not, that the report on this bill was ordered printed on March 27 just the day before the tax bill was called up. Just a happenstance, of course, just a peculiar coincidence, but they tell me that on that same morning of the 28th, and on the morning of the 29th, and all day long both days, when the tax bill was before the House, there were a great many telephone calls from the Southland. So many, I understand, the phone companies may pay an extra dividend because of the business generated by certain leaders in the textile industry and in the cotton-producing sections of that part of the country, calling Members of Congress, to them to vote for the new tax bill because "we have legislation pending in which we are greatly interested. We are sure we will have administration support for that legislation." Of course they were referring to this bill now before us.

I cannot say whether all of those things are exactly so or not, but they fit into a pattern, do they not, a peculiar pattern? Just a happenstance, of course that these events all fall in line, one after the other, like dominoes which fall over when you push them. Of course all we have to do is to look at the RECORD of March 28 and 29 to see how effective this type of activity had been to influence another legislative decision, and to help mold House action.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If we pass this New Frontier bill, evidently it has the blessing of the White House as well as the State Department, does the gentleman think it would be unfair for the endorsers of this legislation that they might be called isolationists?

Mr. BROWN. I do not know. But they might be accused of being followers of William McKinley.

Mr. GROSS. He was known as an isolationist, was he not?

Mr. BROWN. I would not say exactly that, because he did do a few things which were not in that direction, but he did put the best interests of this Republic ahead of those of other countries. Rather peculiarly, I also understand that some of the opposition from some of the Members from the oil States to the tax bill may have disappeared after some similar understandings were reached as to what might be done relative to the importation of foreign oil into this country. But I do not know; I cannot say that any deal has been made. Oh, I hate to think anyone would resort to dealing in politics, dealing for votes, but I do say that somehow or other a great many votes were changed on one side of the aisle very suddenly. I do say I have had a number of Members of this body tell me they had been approached to change their position on the tax legislation because of the sudden and urgent request from certain interests in their section of the country. So all of this is rather peculiar, is it not, if you just check the dates and the actions that have been taken all around on this legislation now before us. The charges are still going out over the grapevine telegraph that deals have been made to get a great block of votes for certain administration bills in return for administration support for this cotton textile bill. I did not sit in on any conferences which may have been held. But, I do want to congratulate the very able and distinguished parliamentary leader, the old veteran of this House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], for again doing an effective job of gaining his way in obtaining proper protection, as he believes it, I am sure, for the textile industries in his own section of the country.

May I express the hope, whenever we get to the place it may be necessary for some of us in the minority to ask for proper protection from unfair foreign competition for our own industries in our own sections of the country, that we may have the same united support from the gentlemen on the right-hand side of the aisle that the gentleman from Georgia has been able to get in connection with this whole matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Well, this bill did not take a trip to the rose garden, did it?

Mr. BROWN. I am not sure who has been in the rose garden, but this bill has not come out smelling like a rose.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The gentleman knows that there are many other commodities besides textiles that are being adversely affected by unfair tariff rates under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and that the House Committee on Ways and Means is presently considering that whole problem. Why, if what the gentleman says is true, has this particular commodity been singled out?

Mr. BROWN. The gentleman will have to judge that for himself, if he looks at the record a bit but he may determine there was quite a change in position on trade policies made very recently, at a very strategic moment, as far as certain legislation before this House has been concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule because this bill has not received proper consideration and, as a matter of fact, this whole issue—and this is a very broad and important issue—is presently before the Committee on Ways and Means. Secretary of Commerce Hodges was testifying before us just this morning, and we will go back this afternoon and get further testimony from him. He made the statement at the time that the reason he did not state anything about this in his March 12 testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means was that he did not know about it. His attention was called to the Department of Commerce letter in the committee report dated March 9. The whole section 204 is a very broad one. It does not affect just agricultural products; it is anything that is made from agricultural products and it includes textiles, which just does not mean textiles out of cotton but manmade fibers.

President Kennedy has said the trade legislation now pending before the Ways and Means Committee is one of the most important things in setting our foreign economic policy to come before us in a decade. I agree with him. This section 204 should be repealed. Certainly. It certainly should not be amended to broaden its powers or gut anything we in the Ways and Means Committee do in this field of reciprocal trade.

Mr. Speaker, we spelled out very carefully in that act the peril-point procedures, the escape-clause procedures, and industries affected by defense. In the present bill before the Ways and Means Committee some 40 pages deal with trade adjustments to take care of alleged injury through foreign imports. This section 204 makes a joke out of all this. What does section 204 say as far as an industry is concerned that has a case to present to present its case? What machinery does it have compared to these other techniques? It says, as follows:

> The President may whenever he determines such action appropriate—

How did this ever get into the law? Most members of the Ways and Means Committee know nothing about this. In fact, we asked Secretary Hodges under what authority these textile arrangements were being made. I have tried to trace back the legislative history. Let me say this: This House never debated section 204. It was put in on the Senate side. An amendment came back on this in conference. I have just been looking at the conference report, and it was not even called to the attention of the House in the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I tried to determine what legislative history there might have been on this on the floor of the Senate. Apparently none. This is a very important and serious piece of legislation. It ought to have thorough hearings. The hearings were available 10 minutes before we took the floor of the House today. The report, incidentally, was just available at the time of the request for a rule. As has been pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the thing was thought up beginning on March 9, 1962, because it was found out that the President, after conducting these negotiations in Geneva and making this deal—long term, I might remind my colleagues—he found out he did not have the necessary authority. So, having done it, he has come in here to the Congress to get authority which he did not have at the time. This I submit is very bad legislation, and we should not even consider it.

This matter ought to be gone into by this House very thoroughly, or through the committee of the House to which the jurisdiction is assigned. Actually, this jurisdiction is that of the Ways and Means Committee, and I do not think there is anyone here who would deny this is so, if they read section 204.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture only gains jurisdiction of this amendment to section 204 because this was put in an agricultural bill—I again say on the Senate side—without its having been brought to the attention of the Members on the House side.

Mr. Speaker, if this were not so basically important to our whole foreign economics, I would not be so excited as I am about it. But this—I again emphasize—renders meaningless the work that we are doing in the Ways and Means Committee in trying to spell out escape clause proceedings, peril points, the defense adjustment section, and so forth. We shall get into these trade adjustment sections of the newly proposed bill. All right; I have had a great deal of sympathy for the textile people. Indeed, I still have. But this is government by men, gentlemen. Do the Members of the House realize what is going to happen, and what is happening? An industry that is affected, whether it is glass, pottery, or whatever it is, cannot come in under the law. It can come in only at the discretion of the President—whoever comes before him. At least in the escape clause proceedings we tried to spell out how anyone could come in and what their rights were. There are no rights allowed except as the "dictator" in this sense, because that is what we make of the President—unless he says "yes, I will help the textile people or whoever."

Mr. Speaker, I asked Secretary Hodges just a few minutes ago in our Ways and Means Committee hearings what sort of procedures there were under section 204. He could not tell me. I said then, "Can you tell me what procedure the textile industry followed in having their case heard, and not having that of lead and zinc or any of these other industries, as well as the labor unions which are affected.

Gentlemen this is one of the worst pieces of legislation, section 204, I have seen in my 12 years in the Congress.

It is about as serious a thing to the future of this country as I can think of; and I am shocked to find that Secretary Hodges says that it has the approval of this administration.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Did I understand the gentleman correctly that when the Secretary of Commerce was testifying before the Ways and Means Committee in behalf of the administration's reciprocal trade bill he confessed that he did not even know that his own Department had sent this letter that appears in the committee report, endorsing this piece of protectionist legislation before us?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is what his testimony was just about an hour ago. And frankly, I was shocked, because he said he did not know and that is why he had not gone into it with the Ways and Means Committee. Then the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] was interrogating him and pointed out the date of the Commerce Department's letter. Granted, the Commerce Department's letter was not signed by Secretary Hodges; it was signed by Edward Gudeman, Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I just want to associate myself with the gentleman from Missouri in the remarks that he has made. He is 100 percent correct in every respect.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

LATEST CASTRO PROPOSAL TO EXCHANGE 1,179 POLITICAL PRISONERS FOR $62 MILLION IS EXAMPLE OF CUBAN PRIME MINISTER'S GROWING ARROGANCE—UNITED STATES SHOULD RESIST EFFORTS TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY SUCH PROGRAM OF EXTORTION AND BLACKMAIL

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, last May 17 Fidel Castro made his abortive proposal of tractors for prisoners. In answer to that request by Fidel Castro for tribute, suggesting blackmail, proposing that because of the invasion the United States should indemnify Cuba and the Communists, finally the administration, after going along with the proposal, disowned it. Now we find this year Fidel Castro, through a tribunal proposing, not tractors, but Yankee dollars for prisoners; Yankee dollars that are negotiable and can be spent for more war materiel to help build up the arsenal on this Communist Cuban island 90 miles from the shores of this country.

Why my concern about that? It is only because I am concerned not only with Communist infiltration and growth in this hemisphere, but I am concerned about our American people, I am concerned about the tobacco workers in my district who are being asked to make a substantial sacrifice. One thousand of them are out of work today in order to help to prevent American dollars from going to Communist Cuba, to bolster the Communist regime of Castro, who is in as bad a financial position as he has ever been and who has got to have American dollars to get out of it. But the workers in my district, these tobacco workers, 1,000 of them who are unemployed, and 5,000 of them will be before not too long, are asked to make a sacrifice so that Yankee dollars will not go to Fidel Castro. They felt that Cuba should be brought under the embargo provisions of the law and the President of the United States even went so far as to use the Trading With the Enemy Act, on my request, to see to it that third nations would not be able to import cigars into this country, cigars made from Cuban tobacco.

And the other day the President issued an order that money orders could not be mailed to the Cuban people, which had amounted to half a million dollars a year, in order to prevent the drain of dollars. Yet we find the administration now issuing visas to exiles, to refugees, to permit them to go to Fidel Castro's Cuba and to negotiate the matter of the payment of over $60 million, four times as much as Fidel Castro asked for in tractors, the last time, in order to provide Castro with the dollars that he needs to keep communism going in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to it, as equally opposed as I was when I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 322, against tractors for prisoners. I am opposed to dollars for prisoners, particularly when the American people are being asked to make a sacrifice in order to keep dollars from going to Fidel Castro and the Communists.

This is becoming an annual affair. A year ago, Castro asked the equivalent of $15 million in exchange for some 1,200 lives. Today, he asks for better than $60 million to save an equal number. The inescapable conclusion is that Castro, by quadrupling the size of the ransom, merely demonstrates that his arrogance has been multiplied by four.

Castro says he has 1,179 political prisoners involved in this newest proposition. For them he asks prices ranging from $25,000 for the lower ranked ones to as much as a half million dollars for the so-called leaders, but all adding up to something approximating $62 million. Reports have it that either Castro gets the ransom, or the prisoners face up to 30 years in prison.

I must, because of this choice, challenge the administration to take the only possible stand—millions for defense but not a dime for tribute.

While we must sympathize with the plight of the prisoners and their families, the elementary fact is that neither the United States nor its citizens can participate in any such continuing process of extortion and blackmail. Once we rescue the 1,179 lives involved in this swap, I fear that Castro will merely clap an equal number into prison and demand another ransom, or at least demand ransom for the estimated 20,000 other prisoners still languishing in Cuban jails.

We should not fall for Castro's obvious blackmail which, if we acknowledge the ridiculous judgment of his kangaroo court, is the resumption of relations with the United States. This time, we have two more sound reasons for refusing to pay tribute—first, the knowledge that he will not kill the prisoners because of the obvious repercussions that would be felt throughout the Western Hemisphere—and second, the fact that he may be down to his last few pesos.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite concerned with the business of individuals dealing with the Cuban Government in such a serious matter, whether under the aegis of the U.S. Government, or as individuals or committees or what. I am not so sure but what we have a very grave situation on our hands, since the administration has apparently given its stamp of approval to negotiation of this latest Castro scheme by issuing visas to the exiles from Cuba who just this week flew to Havana to negotiate for the release of these prisoners. It seems to me that negotiations by anyone in the United States as to this situation bring up a question of possible violation of the Logan Act. It further strikes me that providing funds to the enemy is a violation of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

And since the administration has just invoked the latter in order to finally plug the loophole that allowed Cuban products to come into this country via a third country, and because of the aforementioned action of the Post Office Department in banning the exchange of postal money orders between the United States and Cuba, it would seem that progress was being made in order to rid this hemisphere of Castroism, but suddenly the administration again reverts to the softness-on-communism approach by issuing visas to Cuban exiles dedicated to securing the release of the 1,179 prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, the Castro star dims more each day, and he is running out of money. Thus, the American people should take advantage of his growing weaknesses and refuse to participate in any such scheme of blackmail, in order to provide him with sufficient funds to keep himself in power and to pay off his debts to his Communist allies.

I do not believe the 1,179 prisoners would favor this blackmail either, when the effect is to keep the dollars going to Castro at a time when he is weakening, and thus subvert the very cause of freedom for which they indicated their approval by their willingness to lay down their lives.

REGULATION OF TEXTILE IMPORTS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, to me it seems a shame that so little attention is being given to this bill, with only 1 hour in which to debate the rule and, as I understand it, only 1 hour in which to debate the legislative content of the bill.

I might add, too, that less than 1 hour was devoted to this bill by the Committee on Agriculture. It came to the committee before noon. I had no advance knowledge of it. Maybe my colleagues did. The hearings were very brief. There was very little discussion. The printed hearings, as has been mentioned, were not available until shortly before noon today.

If you will examine the printed hearings on the bill you will see that they include 23 pages, much of it in very small type, and they include the text of the long-term cotton textile arrangement which this bill is supposed to authorize the President to conclude. How the Committee on Agriculture could possibly adequately consider this proposal, not even having at hand the text of the arrangement the bill was devoted to, I cannot imagine.

I invite your attention to page 12 of the hearings, section (c). It closes with a very interesting sentence:

> If such trade is frustrating the operation of this arrangement, the participating countries shall consider taking such action as may be consistent with their law to prevent such frustration.

It seems to me that language like that should be thoroughly explored by the committee before any authority is enacted to carry out such an arrangement.

In my questioning of one of the witnesses before the committee I raised the question as to whether the President actually had authority to enter into bilateral agreements such as entered into at Geneva. The witness responded that the President had multilateral authority because the word "government" had an "s" after it; it was plural.

There is still doubt in my mind and in the minds of many people as to whether this section 204 intended to authorize simply bilateral arrangements or whether it was to be multilateral. A point like that surely should be clarified before the Committee on Agriculture before it is presented to the House.

H.R. 9900 would give the President increased authority to lower trade barriers by reducing tariffs through multination cartel deals. Our tariffs are already so low in relation to the other free nations that we have very little to bargain with. This bill shows the true intent of the administration in developing trade policy. Quotas are to be the tool for trade control in the future.

This bill would give the President almost unlimited authority. It would deal not just with cotton textiles. It would deal with any agricultural commodities or agricultural products as well as textiles and textile products. That covers a wide area.

This bill deserves more thorough committee action. The rule should be defeated.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to disillusion anybody, but I am not so sure the gentleman from Georgia had everything to do with this proposal because I read to you now a letter received on July 20, 1961. That was a little ahead of the moment when these negotiations started with the House Members and a special committee which I attended. This particular document says, and I read:

> MANCHESTER, ENGLAND.—Textile manufacturers are now complaining that the U.S. raw cotton gifts and textile deals with so-called backward countries is unfair competition and we in America are to blame.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the House is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. DENT. It is all right. They do not want to hear it. Even when I was a boy, Mr. GROSS, my father used to say I can talk to you, but if you do not want to listen, I cannot make you hear me. I read further:

> Hong Kong manufacturers [probably getting rich at our expense] have joined the Hong Kong labor unionists in a big howl against us because we want to adapt reasonable protection against unlimited imports of textile which has forced huge losses in the United States of jobs and investments.

The reason I read that to you is to call to your attention what is being done by this legislation. The textile Members of Congress who come from textile States think they are getting something that they suggested. Well, do not be fooled, gentlemen, you are getting exactly what the participating countries in the Geneva agreement demanded. They demanded that we curtail the imports from the underdeveloped countries which have been our babies, as it were, in this free world that we are fighting for because they said they would not sign an agreement with us for any length of time unless we cut our imports from the underdeveloped countries where we were developing textile productivity. Now the countries that signed this agreement had to have a promise that we curtail the imports from these countries and that is all this does besides legalizing an act which I think died in 1958 insofar as the authority for this particular action is concerned.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I understand this bill does something for the textile industry. What I want to know is—does it do anything for my coal miners and pottery workers and glassworkers?

Mr. DENT. If we pass this legislation, it not only will not do anything for your pottery and glass workers, it will do something to them.

Mr. HAYS. Then I had better vote against it; would you not say?

Mr. DENT. Because this legislation is relief for the textile people. They deserve the very best protection that they can get. If anybody here can salve his conscience saying that this is not protectionist legislation, then he has a mighty thin conscience to salve because you cannot go to a cocktail party in the afternoon as a free trader and get drunk in a common barroom at night as a protectionist. That is what we are doing. We are voting protectionist and flying the flag of free trade. I have never made any bones about it. I am interested in the glass workers and I am interested in the pottery workers and I am interested in the ceramic tile workers just as you are interested in the textile workers and just the same as I am interested in your textile workers. I am going to give you a vote on the premise that you are going to be just as interested in the workers in my district as I am in yours.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. You can give them your vote, but do not vote under the impression that they are going to reciprocate.

Mr. DENT. It has been the history of the reciprocal trade agreements that they have not, but I have made no agreement. I am depending on their conscience.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I want to apologize to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for not giving him credit for the effort he has made to protect American industry and labor from unfair foreign competition. But, does not the gentleman believe that the present administration is now following the same program and the same trade policy in this particular instance as was followed under the protectionist theories which obtained during the administration of President McKinley?

Mr. DENT. Well, under President McKinley they campaigned under the program of three P's—peace, prosperity, and progress. But since that time there have been three P's invoked—pressure, promise, and purchase.

Mr. BROWN. May I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10788, the regulation of textile imports bill, is designed to close up a dangerous loophole in section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

That act authorized the President to negotiate international agreements relating to the export to, and the import by the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textile or textile products. Because it was drafted primarily with bilateral agreements in mind, the existence of necessary power in the President with respect to nonparticipants in a broadly based multilateral agreement is questionable. In both the 1-year cotton textiles arrangement presently in force and the long-term cotton textiles arrangement, expected to come into force with substantially the same participants on October 1, 1962, provisions permit the United States to take action to prevent trade with nonparticipants in the arrangements from frustrating the purposes of the arrangements. Since countries accounting for 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles are participants, the same authority which the President has already been delegated by section 204 should clearly be extended to nonparticipants to prevent the minority of countries which choose to stay out of the arrangements from thereby gaining an advantage over the countries which participate in them.

The enactment of this bill would involve no additional expenditure by the United States.

The Secretary of Commerce requested the introduction of H.R. 10788, by means of an executive communication to the Speaker of the House. Its enactment has been recommended by the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Labor.

It should be noted that the Interagency Textile Administrative Committee on which the Department of Labor is represented, has studied this bill and has recommended its enactment.

Representatives of producer and textile groups appeared at the hearing on the bill and testified in its support. It is particularly significant that there were no opposition witnesses.

This bill will permit the President to issue regulations which will make the provisions of the agreement relating to cotton textiles effective also against the small minority of cotton textile exporting countries which are not parties to the agreement. In the absence of such authority it might be possible for such countries, although their exports now constitute only a small portion of the total, to increase their exports to such an extent as to nullify the voluntary action of the cooperating countries.

It is a form of insurance against the undercutting of markets that would have an adverse effect upon world trade.

Because textile groups support H.R. 10788, and because there is no expressed opposition to the bill, nothing stands in the way of its prompt enactment.

This is legislation that will benefit our cotton textile industry.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule which makes in order consideration of legislation which is long overdue. I will not undertake to recount again for my colleagues the plight of the textile industry; we have done that on so many occasions.

Recently at Geneva a multilateral agreement resulted. Without this legislation the action taken at Geneva will be a nullity, because with all the good intentions and efforts of the signatories to the Geneva agreement we will still have this continuing threat of the elimination of textile jobs in America if other nations not parties to that agreement can unload excessive amounts of textiles upon the American market.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. DENT. Does not this legislation mean that we are nullifying the favored-nation clause insofar as the textile industry is concerned?

Mr. WHITENER. I may say to the gentleman that I come from a district which perhaps has more textile employees and more spindles in place than any other congressional district in America. By reason of that I have been particularly concerned with the textile situation. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that many of us are appreciative of his efforts of a broader nature in this problem of imports. I know something of the travail of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the light of some recent occurrences, and certainly have great interest in the position which he has taken. I can also say this to the gentleman. All of us from the textile area have a great appreciation for the painstaking effort of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to fully develop for the record the facts on this problem of textile imports as well as of other imports. I think I might say with some accuracy that the work of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his special subcommittee has resulted in a more intelligent attitude being taken toward the textile industry, and I quite agree with our friend from Pennsylvania that as we face these issues in the coming days we should not be too quick to forget our friends who have stood by us as we fought together to protect the jobs of American people.

I think it must be said and must be admitted that this legislation which we have before us is designed to do that very thing. It is in a restricted field, I admit. But, my friends, the textile problem was the only area in which the Committee on Agriculture could have acted, because they were amending a section of the Agricultural Adjustment Act which relates strictly to textiles. I regret that it does not include some of these other beleaguered industries for which I have the greatest sympathy.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER.** Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 264, nays 76, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—264

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Alford
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Brooks, Tex.
Brown
Broyhill
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Clark
Cohelan
Colmer
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Dominick
Dorn
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Durno
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fenton
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Friedel
Gallagher
Garland
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Hosmer
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Keith
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kunkel
Landrum
Lane
Lennon
Lesinski
Loser
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
McSween
Macdonald
Mack
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matthews
Merrow
Miller, Clem
Milliken
Mills
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murray
Natcher
Norrell
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Perkins
Peterson
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reece
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weis
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Wickersham
Williams
Willis
Winstead
Wright
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—76

Adair
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Ashbrook
Barry
Becker
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bray
Bromwell
Broomfield
Bruce
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Clancy
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Ellsworth
Findley
Fino
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Hall
Harrison, Wyo.
Hiestand
Johansen
Kilburn
Knox
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McVey
MacGregor
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Moorehead, Ohio
Mosher
Nelsen
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Konski
Pelly
Pillion
Ray
Robison
Roudebush
Rousselot
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer
Shriver
Taber
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Utt
Wilson, Calif.

NOT VOTING—96

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Anfuso
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bailey
Barrett
Battin
Blitch
Boykin
Breeding
Brewster
Buckley
Cahill
Casey
Chelf
Church
Coad
Collier
Curtis, Mass.
Dawson
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dooley
Dowdy
Dwyer
Fascell
Finnegan
Flynt
Frazier
Fulton
Gavin
Grant
Hansen
Harding
Harrison, Va.
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Herlong
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Jarman
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kelly
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Lankford
Libonati
Madden
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, George P.
Morrison
Moulder
Murphy
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
Patman
Pfost
Philbin
Pucinski
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts, Ala.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
St. Germain
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Van Pelt
Walter
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson, Ind.
Yates

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Libonati with Mrs. May.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Harrison of Virginia with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Frazier with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Brewster with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Huddleston with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Teague of California.

Mrs. Pfost with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. St. Germain with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Shelley with Mrs. Church.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a lot has been said about this section of the law which we are trying to amend, section 204. The gentlemen who have discussed it obviously are not familiar with the history of section 204. It was not put in in the Senate. It was put in in conference when the House and Senate members were conferring on H.R. 12, which was later vetoed by President Eisenhower. I had an amendment prepared which I submitted in conference myself.

I was prompted to offer the amendment because a gentleman from Japan was here in the city of Washington and he had knocked on just about every door in this great city trying to arrange to confer with someone about textile imports coming into this country. He went from department to department and finally came to my office. I do not know who directed him to my office. But when he discussed this problem with me I assured him of my cooperation, because he stated to me frankly that he was aware of the fact that they could not burden our economy in America by unlimited large quantities of textile imports into our market. So after discussion with him and appreciating the difficulties which he had encountered, I brought this amendment to the attention of the conferees and it was adopted, in 1956.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for throwing light on it. I think the gentleman would agree that there is nothing on the subject in the House first. Am I correct on that?

Mr. COOLEY. The section was put into the bill in conference.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think there was something in the Senate version. Let me refer to the Senate reports of the 84th Congress, 2d session, 1956. On page 7 it sets out the committee report, Senator ELLENDER's report on the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Section 204 of that bill, and I can read it because it is only three lines, says:

> Agreements limiting imports—Section 204: The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign governments in an effort to limit the export to the United States of agricultural commodities or products including textiles or textile products.

So I imagine your amendment then was in effect in lieu of this section that was in the Senate bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been fairly well discussed and I shall not attempt to discuss the details of it further. I do want to say, however, that it is unusual in that the bill is supported by the Department of Commerce, by the Secretary of State, by the Secretary of Labor and by the Secretary of Agriculture. So four departments of Government have gone on record as supporting this measure. It also has the support of the Director of Foreign Trade and of the National Cotton Council of America, Mr. Read Dunn; Mr. Robert C. Jackson, executive vice president, American Cotton Manufacturers Institute; Mr. Stanley Nehmer, Deputy Director, Office of International Resources of the Department of State; Hon. Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce; Robert C. Sherman, Director, Cotton Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture; William F. Sullivan, president, Northern Textile Association.

I have a telegram from Robert T. Stevens of the J. T. Stevens Co., also in support of the measure.

I do not recall that there was any opposition to this bill when it was considered in the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Did the committee give public notice that there were going to be hearings on the bill because many people who have testified before the Committee on Ways and Means in the past 2 or 3 weeks expressed deep concern against this, including representatives of textile workers.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know how much notice was given but, certainly, there was no effort to close the doors of our committee room against anyone who wanted to appear either in support of the bill or in opposition to it. This is supported by the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. CARL VINSON, who heads up the cotton textile committee group here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I was not suggesting that the committee was trying to hide it, but I was simply trying to point out that on a thing as important as this is, and this is an important measure, it is important to give public notice out so that people who are concerned may know about it.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman. It is very important. I think this is a very important measure because the President must have this authority if he is to be able to protect the integrity of the Geneva agreement which has been signed by 19 nations. I hope the House passes the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In other words, he does have the authority?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly. If you read section 204, it says he has the right to enter into agreements with governments—not one government, but with governments. So this is a multilateral agreement. I do not think there is any question about it at all.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If he does not need the authority, then you do not need the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. This is for the purpose of trying to control nations that are not signatories to this agreement.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] may extend his remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported out of the Committee on Agriculture without a record vote with most members supporting the legislation.

The purpose of this bill is to augment the recent international cotton textile agreement made at Geneva, Switzerland, by our Nation and 18 other cotton-textile importing and exporting countries.

The bill gives the President the authority to restrict imports into the United States from nations which are not parties to the Geneva pact. The administration contended that in the absence of this legislation nations which are not signatories to the Geneva pact would be in a position to nullify the voluntary action of the nations that did participate in the international agreement.

Apparently there is some inconsistency between this legislation and the President's recommendations for freer trade under proposed amendments to the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. It is argued that this legislation in the context of the Reciprocal Trade bill's various escape clauses and exceptions, should not create another significant exception to the basic policy of the United States trading with all friendly nations freely and equitably.

As the committee report indicates, the Geneva agreement would encompass some 90 percent of the world trade in textiles. In the hearing on this bill the committee did not explore the effect on the 10 percent of the nations who are not involved in the Geneva pact.

Under the circumstances, I suggest that the committee give its most serious consideration to the legislation now before us.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation would serve to correct an irregularity implicit to section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, an authority which permits the President to enter into short- and long-term agreements on imports of textiles or textile products into the United States.

These agreements are bilateral and, in effect, multilateral in nature, with 18 such agreements having been arrived at with the United States and other countries. It was under this authority that President Eisenhower negotiated the first 5-year quota agreement with Japan in 1956.

There are, however, about 10 or 15 percent of the textile-trading countries that have not moved forward to become signatories to those agreements negotiated between the United States and other countries. And, ironically, these minority nations—who are important textile-trading countries—would derive benefits over and above those enjoyed by the majority countries signing agreements with the United States. Unlike the signatory countries they would, for instance, be free to operate clear of limitations on their textile exports into the signatory countries, including the United States.

This legislation would, then, correct an inequity which presently attends the program for long-term and short-term agreements on imports of textiles into the United States. It would do this by providing that if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be concluded under the section 204 authority, the President would be permitted to make applicable to nonsigning countries limitations on textile imports into the United States comparable to those in effect for those countries that sign agreements with this country for a textile trade program.

Mr. Chairman, last summer and again this winter agreements have been reached pertaining to imports of cotton textiles into the United States, these agreements being scheduled to be in effect until 1967. In addition, the United States will, in the future, enter into agreements with other countries with relation to imports of wool and manmade fiber textiles.

Because H.R. 10788 will act to strengthen the textile trade provisions of section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, I strongly urge its approval by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Section 204, does it not, also covers more than agricultural products; it covers the wide range of manufactured products.

Mr. McINTIRE. I think it does, and in that context they would be related to agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The point I want to make is the same question I asked Secretary of Commerce Hodges just 2 hours ago, and it is this: If this is good procedure for taking care of agricultural products and something that is manufactured from them such as textiles, to what extent can other industries, and I will list some of them, be given protection? Would the gentleman care to comment on that? Does the gentleman think this will be expanded to include everything?

Mr. McINTIRE. The gentleman from Maine will be happy to comment, for he has never supported the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to commend the gentleman for maintaining a consistent position; but I should like to point out that the President's proposal on reciprocal trade, H.R. 9900, starts out with a preamble that is directly in opposition to the philosophy the gentleman has expressed; yet Mr. Hodges says that this action on the part of the Kennedy administration is entirely consistent with these objectives. I think the gentleman is being consistent. I think we will find gross inconsistency, however, on the part of the administration.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is it not true that we are nailing down here today by the passage of this bill, and establishing on solid ground a quota system for the textile industry?

Mr. McINTIRE. I think that is a fair, concise statement, and the limitations under these agreements are very definitely quota limitations, not only by volume but by category of goods.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In the past, year after year, we have been told a quota system could not work, but now we are agreeing for the textile industry it can work and should work. Is that correct?

Mr. McINTIRE. Certainly the context of the agreement would support the gentleman's observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to direct a question to the gentleman from Maine.

Is it the gentleman's understanding that the other nations which are parties to the Geneva Agreement have already agreed to the terms of that agreement? Are they already bound by it or is this something that is still very indefinite and very much up in the air?

Mr. McINTIRE. I would say to the gentleman while I cannot be definite in my observation, it is my understanding that at the Geneva negotiations a basis of agreement was reached. In fact, one might say a format of the details of the agreement was reached. As to the time when the signatures should be on the document, it is my understanding they have until October in which to become signatories of the agreement. It was negotiated as a memorandum, but it was to be embodied in the agreement as each individual nation signed. It is generally understood that most of them will sign, but there is no firm commitment they will each sign by the time this agreement is to go into effect. But presumably the authority is there.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman. So much emphasis is being placed on tariff cuts that very little attention has been given to the nontariff means of restricting trade. The nontariff tools are actually more widely used than tariffs. Tariffs have declined in importance radically in recent years. Indeed in the case of the United States tariffs have declined to the point where most tariffs are no longer substantial enough to give us bargaining tools to work with in negotiation in the Common Market or elsewhere. If we are really interested in increasing our exports and in promoting friendly trade relations, we should examine our own protection policies, most of which are nontariff in character.

This bill before us is a prize example. It would permit the President to work out international trade cartels for any agricultural commodity or product. It would authorize the President to slam the door on all imports from nations which are not parties to the deal. The President would have final authority. His authority and the agreements that he could conclude would not be subject to review by either House of Congress. I might raise the happy prospect that one of these days we may have a different occupant in the White House. Perhaps his attitude on tobacco would not favor the present tobacco program. This bill would give any future President—because there is no time limit—the authority on his own initiative to work out deals to rig the world market in tobacco, in wheat, in livestock, in any agricultural commodity.

This bill is actually intended to offset the disadvantage to American textile mills caused by the 8½ cent per pound subsidy on our own raw cotton exports. That is the root of the trouble. American mills must pay 33 cents a pound for cotton while foreign mills buy the same American cotton for 24½ cents. Thus, the action of the Government to support cotton prices at an artificial level is the root of the problem.

We have been trying to live in a never-never land where we can continue to enjoy the beauties of the competitive world market place without accepting its inherent rigors and responsibilities. In the eyes of our friends abroad, subsidies on exports of American cotton amount to dumping. This is harmful to underdeveloped countries whose main opportunity to earn foreign exchange lies in selling agricultural commodities.

I raise a question for you to think about. What is the effect of this bill on our trade relations with the Philippines, with South American countries, with the emerging countries of Africa?

Our present cotton program—of which this deal is a part—is harmful to American processors because they are denied access of lower world prices for raw materials.

It heaps a double burden on the consumers. They must pay artificially high prices for consumer items and at the same time cough up the taxes for the subsidies which lead to those high prices.

It is harmful in the long run to the American farmer because it tends to restrict world markets. It tends to make him less competitive, less efficient, and worst of all, it places his destiny in the hands of bureaucrats who would have the authority to rig and rerig world markets ad infinitum.

We should stop trying to treat effects and get at the real cause of our trouble. In the interest of all concerned, the cotton subsidy should be brought to a realistic level, and Secretary Freeman has the authority to do this under existing legislation.

Rather than broaden the authority of the President to rig world markets for a countless number of commodities and items, we should strike section 204 from our law.

Some mention was made of the fact that the American Cotton Textile Manufacturing Institute supports this bill. I call your attention to Newsweek magazine, April 9, this week's issue, page 25, reviewing the happy events for President Kennedy in the prior week.

This was represented as one of those happy events; and I quote:

> Endorsement of his tariff program by leaders of the Nation's textile industry—the nor-

mally protectionist American Cotton Manufacturer's Institute, meeting at Palm Beach.

Reference was made to the fact that Secretary Freeman endorsed this bill. This is the same Secretary of Agriculture who pointed to our "successful cotton program" as the pattern which we should adopt in developing programs for other agricultural commodities.

Mr. Speaker, do we have ahead in other commodities the same series of events which has brought us to this very difficult problem in cotton? The cotton program is hardly a successful pattern to follow.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN].

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, this bill would amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to facilitate the implementation of multilateral agreements covering the trade in cotton textiles. But does this amendment not also carry an air of cross-purpose legislation? Under the bill the President would be given the power to fix regulations to cover the removal or entry of cotton textiles from countries not a party to these agreements. He already has such authority under present law in regard to countries which are parties to these agreements.

This additional Executive power can be considered to be another lever to be used against the American producer despite the agreements that are made to help the American producer. This two-edged sword would appear to be in complete opposition to previous legislation passed to enable the President to make favorable agreements that would aid rather than hurt the American textile industry. This power coming at this time when H.R. 9900, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is receiving great attention, can be considered to be an administration attempt to hold a powerful weapon to insure favorable backing from the textile industry for the administration's new concepts in trade agreements.

My main argument is that appointed people in the executive branch of Government are going to be making these decisions instead of the elected representatives of the people.

For proof and a knowledge of the problems involved ask the producers of livestock and meat products what relief they received when they tried to prove undue hardship due to imports of these products during a period of low domestic prices.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following my remarks of a few moments ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out a few things already in the debate on the rule, but I am glad that in my interrogation of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], some legislative history was finally brought out. Up until then there was none.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that the House, of course, never did consider the merits one way or the other of section 204 when it was put in the law back in 1956.

Mr. Chairman, as a reference and so that we may refer to it in the future, in House Report No. 2077 of the 2d session of the 84th Congress on the farm bill at that time, there was no section 204. This is simply for reference.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. After the President vetoed H.R. 12, the Committee on Agriculture brought in another bill which did not contain the portions objectionable to the President. I do not know what the number was, but maybe the gentleman from Missouri has it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is H.R. 10875, Mr. Chairman.

Then, here is the other thing I wanted for the RECORD: In the Agriculture Act of 1956, the May 22, 1956, conference report, there is a statement by the managers on the part of the House and nothing is said in here about this section. Furthermore, in looking at the Senate debate, which will be found at page 8495, May 18, 1956, when the Senate was considering section 204 there actually was an amendment offered in regard to rice, which was rejected, but there was no discussion at all on this section. In other words, there was no legislative history to go back and try to find out whether the authority intended was bilateral or multilateral, which is the reason this particular amendment is before you.

In the letter of the Secretary of Commerce he said he did not know; that it was questionable whether there was this authority.

Mr. Chairman, here is a major piece of legislation in respect to our Reciprocal Trade Act and our Trading Act which this House has never debated. Now it comes before us with an opportunity to consider it and we will not even dig into it at this time. I intend, by the way, to offer an amendment to this bill which will eliminate section 204. Here is the gist of the problem: This is a relief section. I am pleased, frankly, that the textile people are able to get relief.

But the point is, how do you get relief under this section? There is nothing spelled out in the way of machinery as to how some other industry can get relief. And this is what I asked Secretary Hodges just a couple of hours ago. I said, "Mr. Secretary, what mechanics does this industry or does a labor group use in order to get relief?"

"Well," he said, "there are not any." And, of course, there are not any. It simply says that whenever the President determines he may take this action.

The Committee on Ways and Means spent considerable time trying to set up the procedures for the peril point, for the escape clause, or the defense aspects of this problem. I have criticized the previous administration as I criticize this one, but granted that machinery to provide relief has not been used, or it has been abused, if anything; here we are coming along looking at a piece of legislation where relief of the most extreme sort is granted, but it goes only to the textile people. How does anyone else claim relief?

Mr. Chairman, do you not see that this is government by men and not government by law? And once you go to government by men this Congress might just as well fold up and go home; you have got a dictatorship. And the fact that these powers are used in this fashion—life or death over this industry or that one; this one shall survive and that one shall die, when no administrative machinery or judicial machinery has been spelled out, means just what I have indicated.

Mr. Chairman, I have been able finally to get, to some degree, into this agreement at Geneva, and let me tell you what it means. It means that we go back to the 1960 census figures in order to determine how much of textiles and from what country can come into what ports; how much into Boston, how much into New York, how much into Los Angeles, how much into Charleston, S.C. When you get into this kind of thing you have an international cartel that is controlled by political bureaucrats who are not responsible to the people in any sense. Talk about freeing trade; nothing could be more damaging to the trade by stifling it, and by going back and freezing the economy in 1960.

I happen to feel that there is an area where we need to spell out machinery in our trade laws. We must talk about fair trade. Our textile people have not had fair competition. I have been in their corner on this. But the textile people have sold out principle, because they can get this immediate protection.

This business of government by men is disturbing to me. Last year, one day at 8 o'clock at night, I took the floor of the House on the question of the Du Pont tax relief bill, to point out that here was another example where we had a complicated problem of the involuntary divestiture of holdings due to the antitrust laws. We could have corrected it by general legislation that would have enabled any company that was in a similar situation to follow certain procedures. But this administration had sent orders down that it was only for Du Pont, and if anyone else in addition to Du Pont were included, they would veto it. That is government by men, Mr. Chairman. We sought to do last year what we have known for years we had to do. We have to amend the laws in regard to depreciation of property. And yet the textile people were singled out and given liberalized depreciation. I am glad they were, they were entitled to it. But it was not done by law; it was not by law that they were given it, because there are hundreds of other industries that are entitled to the same relief who did not get it. They were singled out; they were brought in and given this liberalized depreciation.

There is only one course of action available to us, to get back to government by law and not by men, and that is to repeal section 204 and hope that in the Committee on Ways and Means we can spell out some meaningful procedures whereby any industry, however little, any union, however little, can come in and present its case and know that they have rights, rights by law, and not something that a wise bureaucracy can give them or not give them, dependent on whims at the time. Look at the political implications involved in this thing, that "If you will do this for us, then we will go ahead and grant you this protection, but woe betide you who oppose this administration or any administration. We will not give it to you."

Mr. Chairman, this is the most serious matter, as I say, that I have seen in the 12 years that I have been in the Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the United States has traditionally exported more cotton textiles than it imported throughout the years. That pattern was reversed in 1960. In 1960 $621,400,000 of cotton textiles and various other textiles were imported into this country. Our exports in textiles for 1960 were only $509,300,000, or a $112 million loss in balance of payments on this item alone.

There is reason behind these imports exceeding the exports. In the first place, foreign labor costs are much less than we pay our labor in this country. Another reason is that some of these countries have quite a bit of volume output. They have a high productivity. Especially in Japan does that situation exist.

Who is at stake here with respect to this legislation? In the first place, the cottongrower is vitally concerned with what we do here today. For many, many years the export of raw cotton exceeded the actual consumption by the mills in this country. That trend was changed in the early 1930's, however. The cotton merchant is interested in this matter because he wants to sell cotton to the mills. The manufacturer of cotton textiles is vitally concerned with this legislation because he is at a serious disadvantage in view of these higher costs he runs into in trying to compete with the low-cost labor in other countries. But most important, the laboring man himself is most vitally concerned with this legislation because of the fact that he wants to continue to be employed in the mills. In 1947 there were 1,100,000 textile workers in this country. By 1958 that 1,100,000 had dwindled to 800,000 workers, or a reduction of 28 percent.

Let us look for a moment at this legislation. It was sent down by the Department of Commerce by executive communication to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who transmitted it to Chairman COOLEY, who introduced the bill.

This legislation is needed badly, because at the Geneva meeting there were 18 signatories to this arrangement affecting the imports of cotton textiles. There are a few countries that were not brought into that arrangement, amounting to some 10 percent of the volume of these textiles that are entering this country. That 10 percent could disrupt, that 10 percent could have a most adverse effect on the 90 percent that we attempted to correct by the arrangement that was entered into at Geneva. It would frustrate the agreement, if something is not done to amend the act to give the President this authority to write regulations affecting those countries who were not participants to the arrangement. Now I do not see anything that should make for undue excitement over this bill.

Section 204 was written into the Agricultural Act of 1956. It was signed into law by President Eisenhower along with its other provisions. Doubtless the Congress knew it was in there or it would never have approved it in the conference report on that bill in 1956. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] made an appeal to the House by innuendo. He made no charge—he did not, but he just said that probably there was a timing involved here with respect to the date of early March when the executive communication was sent to the Speaker early in March and followed by the introduction of this bill, which was about the time a vote was taken on the tax bill. But these negotiations had taken place for many weeks in advance of that time in Geneva. These signatories, of course, were not concerned over a vote on the tax bill or with respect to any other vote in this House. They voluntarily entered into this agreement and signed it. What we are trying to do is to bring all of the countries that import textiles into our country under this arrangement so that they, too, would be affected and would not disrupt the arrangement of the 90 percent of the total volume of these imports.

I do trust, Mr. Chairman, that the legislation will be approved.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, regardless of how we feel about the merits or demerits of passing legislation by this method, there is one thing we must remember and that is unless we do something in this particular area, the time will come when, and it will not be too long, we will not have any textile industry left. It might interest you to know that we have lost in exactly 14 years, 330,000 employees in the textile industry and we have closed 844 mills in that time. If you go into the picture of textiles, you will find that the wage levels are probably the deterring factor in our attempts to export as of the last 10 years. For instance, in the last 10 years we have drifted in certain specific exports of domestic products to where we now export less than 7 percent of our volume and we import a percentage of our total production as high as 51.2 percent. The wages paid run anywhere from 36½ cents for the highest paid inspector as against an American inspector getting $2.25, down to 25 cents an hour for those who work in the production end dealing with specific jobs on the floor. That is 25 cents, I remind you, as against our lowest wage of $1.50.

In the entire industry from New England all the way down to the Deep South the impact of imports and exports on employment in the textile industry make up the double blow this indispensable industry has received from imports. This is borne out by the record. Only because of the fact that a militant group has insisted this industry got some relief under the Office of Defense. Based upon the records of the hearings held before the subcommittee I headed last year, I am of the opinion that today we would be insufficiently supplied with our own production of textiles to wage any kind of war this country might engage in. We cannot pursue the policy we have in the past without destroying this industry. Remember that when you sell $1 million of cotton but import $750,000 of cotton content in textiles you are the loser and not the gainer, although in dollar volume you might seem to be the winner.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have refreshed my recollection with reference to the legislative history of section 204 which is now under discussion. When the bill H.R. 12 was in conference in 1956, I prepared and presented to the conferees section 204. After a discussion in conference, the amendment I offered was accepted. After the bill containing section 204 was approved by both Houses, H.R. 12 was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Thereafter I introduced H.R. 10875, and on page 32 of that bill which was introduced April 30, 1956, you will find the same explanation, and in our committee report on H.R. 10875, which was filed April 30, 1956, you will find on page 8 the same provision and a discussion of it.

I do not understand how the gentleman can say that this provision has not been frankly and fairly put before and discussed in the House. The gentleman was here in 1956. I am certain I do not recall that this section was controversial, and I am surprised that the gentleman's being so disturbed over it now.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am very happy to get this additional legislative history. I have read the other reports but I did not find the section in the bill which the House considered. The gentleman has the report in front of him. May I ask what the section number was? I leafed through this somewhat hurriedly and may have missed it.

Mr. COOLEY. In H.R. 10875 it appears under the title "Agreements Limiting Imports," section 203.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It was section 203 at that time.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I will check through it again. I will say this to the gentleman, that I think the members of the Ways and Committee will admit that I was a member. Certainly I had not heard of anything like this being in the bill or I would have been disturbed over it at that time. I was not aware of this until about 3 or 4 weeks ago when we began our hearings on the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will look at page 43 of the report on H.R. 12 he will see it was discussed in the report.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have been interested in legislation which actually became law. I am not referring back to H.R. 12.

Mr. COOLEY. In that report on H.R. 12 we discussed it, and it was discussed in the report on the other bill that I introduced, H.R. 10875.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If that is so, then I am in error.

Mr. COOLEY. The legislative history clearly indicates that the President was authorized to negotiate multilateral agreements.

We say in the report "foreign countries." In the law we say "foreign governments."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman is correct, then we do not need this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, we do. I do not think the gentleman understands the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, I do.

Mr. COOLEY. It has been stated that the purpose of the bill is to give power to the President he does not now have to control imports from countries other than the signatories to that agreement. I made it perfectly plain.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I will read from a letter in the committee report written by the Acting Secretary of Commerce, where it says:

> Because it was drafted primarily with bilateral agreements in mind, the existence of necessary power in the President with respect to nonparticipants in a broadly based multilateral agreement is questionable.

The people who are asking for this bill themselves say that is so, whether you have more than one bilateral trade agreement. I am quoting from the letter of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. COOLEY. The provisions of the original section 204 gave authority to the President to negotiate and to consummate multilateral agreements with foreign countries. I know what was intended, because I drafted and presented the amendment which was adopted and which became section 204 in the bill, H.R. 12. The bill now under consideration only gives the President additional power and authority to deal with countries which are not parties to the multilateral agreement recently signed in Geneva. Much good was accomplished by the unilateral agreement with Japan, and much more good should be accomplished by the multilateral agreement recently consummated in Geneva.

I repeat, that the authority which we now propose to give to the President would enable him to protect the integrity of the Geneva agreement. Without this authority, other nations not signatories to the agreement might flood our markets with imports and completely destroy the effect of the agreement. We understand the provisions and the purposes of the pending measure. Legislative history shows that Congress intended to give to the President the right to negotiate multilateral contracts or agreements with foreign countries.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Then we had better send the bill back for more consideration.

Mr. COOLEY. We are pleased with the bill and regret very much the gentleman is not pleased with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I take this time first to thank the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and his entire committee for this bill and for considering the problem of our textile people; and I want to thank also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for his contribution to and help to an industry which is so depressed.

On page 15 of the hearings on this bill we find what this bill is all about, in case there is any question in your mind. The Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Price, upon being asked by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], "How do these people go about gaining an advantage over the participating countries?" answered: "Due to a lack of present legal mechanism there is no action that can be taken by the President or by the executive branch to enforce a request for restraint from a nonparticipant. Therefore, a nonparticipant could flood the market in any given category for textile products without being able to prevent them."

So the question is simply this, whether you sit on this side of the aisle or that side of the aisle, or whether you have textiles in your district or not, do you want the President to have the power to prevent the importation of textiles, which can be a pattern for other industries which may be affected? I hope there will be a pattern for all industries affected. Or do you want to say to the textile people, let our friends and our enemies bring in all they want.

I have not been here very long, but I have voted for power dams, irrigation projects, and things of that nature in places in the Far West where I have never been. I have never asked, "What are my people getting out of it?" I did not do that because this is my country and I want to help every part of my country and I want help when I need it.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I happily yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, a fighter for rights and preservation of the textile industry and its people.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman referred to the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture. I think it may be well to call to the attention of the House an answer which the Assistant Secretary of Commerce gave to a question asked by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]:

> Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Price, how do you reconcile the restrictive arrangement anticipated under this authority with the administration's goal of freer trade?
>
> Mr. PRICE. The long-term arrangement does provide, Mr. Congressman, for a considerable freeing of world trade in cotton textile products. For example, the European Economic Community has agreed, as part of the long-term arrangement, to double its taking of textiles over the 5-year period from the five principal developing countries.
>
> As far as this country is concerned, obviously, we have a most vital interest in the 2,100,000 employees of this industry, which is one of the two largest employers of labor in this country. It is an industry which has suffered some considerable decline in past years, and we are desirous of shoring it up to the extent that we can.

I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina will agree with me that it is high time that we do some shoring up of this industry.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman, and I agree with him thoroughly. He is always on hand to help when textile problems are the issue.

We have to realize that we have a lot of industries in America, and tomorrow I may be voting to help some other industry because it is an American industry and American jobs are at stake, and I am not going to have a "dog in the manger" attitude because it does not help my particular section. I think that should be the consideration here.

This is not the overall textile question. The legislation today only closes one gap, one loophole in the Geneva agreement. As a matter of fact, it honors our word, and implementation of our word given in those agreements.

In 1960, while campaigning, I told the textile people of South Carolina that the Republicans had never done anything for the textile people and never intended to. The Eisenhower administration made a lot of false and vacant promises and the only time they ever showed any interest in the textile people was in the hope of either getting some favorable vote from those of us in the textile areas or some campaign money for the Republican Party. Today, I find the Republican Party is again fighting against the best interest of the textile people—they are saying, "What is in it for me"? I, in turn, tell them what is good for the textile industry is good for the country. This they ignore and I intend to tell my people again of the antagonism of the Republican Party against the textile people. A vote against this legislation is a vote against the textile industry and the textile people from Maine to Florida, from Georgia to Texas and Arkansas.

I strongly urge the passage of this legislation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Sixty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Ashley
Auchincloss
Barrett
Battin
Blitch
Boggs
Boykin
Breeding
Brewster
Buckley
Cahill
Chelf
Church
Collier
Corman
Curtis Mass.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dowdy
Dwyer
Fallon
Fascell
Finnegan
Flynt
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gavin
Grant
Gubser
Hansen
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harsha
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Herlong
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Huddleston
Jarman
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kelly
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
McVey
Michel
Miller, George P.
Morrison
Moulder
Murphy
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Patman
Philbin
Pillion
Powell
Pucinski
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts, Ala.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
St. George
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Tollefson
Van Pelt
Walter
Weis
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.
Yates

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 10788, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 337 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask whether or not our friend from Maine has further requests for time.

Mr. McINTIRE. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended by inserting the following after the first sentence thereof: "In addition, if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be concluded under the authority of this section among countries accounting for a significant part of world trade in the articles with respect to which the agreement was concluded, the President may also issue, in order to carry out such an agreement, regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of the same articles which are the products of countries not parties to the agreement."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 1, line 5, after the word "if" strike out "a multilateral" and insert "an".

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, it seems clear from the discussion on the floor today that the President already has authority to enter into multilateral agreements. I am sure my colleagues agree with me that we should not clutter up our statute books with unnecessary words. The effect of this amendment is simply to take out the word "multilateral" and leave the authority of the President as it was in the original section 204.

I would like to invite the attention of my colleagues to a statement made by the Secretary of State on February 21. He said:

> Either we believe in capitalism, in the freedom of individual enterprise, or we do not. And we do not if we hold with massive government intervention to distort and freeze the market. If we look to government to rig the game, we may as well look to it to play the hands.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the language of the bill now under consideration which reads as follows:

> In addition, if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be concluded under the authority of this section among countries accounting for a significant part of world trade in the articles with respect to which the agreement was concluded.

It is clear to me that the word "multilateral" should be retained in this bill; because, if it is stricken out and "unilateral" put in the bill the President might conclude an agreement with only one nation involving only a small part of world trade in one commodity or article, and certainly you would not want to give the President the power conferred by this provision to impose restrictions on all the other nations of the world. This only comes into play when multilateral agreements have been concluded and covering transactions involving a substantial part of world trade in the particular commodity.

Mr. FINDLEY. If it will serve to clarify the matter, my amendment did not use the word "unilateral." My amendment will simply take out the words "a multilateral." Those two words will come out.

Mr. COOLEY. Then it will read: "If an agreement has been"——

Mr. FINDLEY. Correct.

Mr. COOLEY. It would also give the President the power to deal with all the other nations of the world.

Mr. FINDLEY. You would give him the authority intended to be conveyed to him in the original section 204, whatever that authority amounts to?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Would not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois greatly increase what is alleged to be the arbitrary power of the President, in that it would allow the President to promulgate these regulations dependent upon only one agreement anywhere in the world; whereas the bill, as the committee has brought it before the House, simply provides that the President may maintain effectively the agreement he has made with nations that represent a substantial portion of the imports?

Mr. COOLEY. A significant part in world trade.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: Page 1, line 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is hereby repealed."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, some have asked me whether or not this amendment will gut the bill. The answer is, of course it will. The purpose is to prevent the gutting of the Reciprocal Trade Act. Certainly, gentlemen like the gentleman from Maine, who are strongly in favor of protectionism and would seek any means they could to bring this about, will take a different position. But we are going to have on the floor of the House, I expect sometime around the first of May, a Reciprocal Trade Act with proposals and philosophies that are directly contrary to this particular section 204, particularly as it is amended. I might even say to those who are protectionists, that in certain respects I join with them because I feel that free trade is based upon fair trade, and in order to get free trade we have to spell out some of the things that amount to fairness, and we have not had fair trade, particularly in the field of textiles. There has not been reciprocity.

I have tried for years to spell out procedures in reciprocal trade, the escape clause, the defense clause, and others, which would permit industry and labor to come in and present their case as they see fit and as they could do according to law and get relief. I regret that they have not been able to in the past.

Again speaking for those who seek to have protection, this kind of clause, section 204, as I tried to point out in my remarks in general debate, is one that gives you no protection at all. It is turning power over to whoever is the executive. He does not have to give you relief. As a matter of fact, he can konk you under this clause and can sell you completely down the river. This is a two-edged sword. Do not think it is one way simply because the textile people were able to work this deal out. They can turn right around on you next year and gut you.

I say that this kind of government by men, which this provides, instead of a government by law, is exceedingly dangerous. This is a vote that I hope we can get on the record, and I wish that the Members would read and consider very carefully how they vote on this amendment and this legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder why the gentleman who just addressed the House did not oppose section 204 when it was originally enacted in 1956. Now, pursuant to the authority contained in section 204, in which Congress conferred upon the President the right to negotiate settlement agreements, the President entered into those agreements, consummated and concluded the agreements.

President Eisenhower used section 204 very successfully with Japan and the agreement has worked well. Japan has lived well within the limits of those self-imposed quotas.

Now, would we not be in a ridiculous position to allow representatives of our Government to go all the way to Geneva and negotiate a settlement agreement under authority conferred by Congress, and then come back here today and find we have repealed the authority?

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. I appreciate the gentleman's concern relative to the authorizations under section 204. Mr. Chairman, negotiations under this provision have been made before and additional negotiations have been made more recently in Geneva. It is a most serious action on the part of the Congress to rescind outstanding legislation. We are here not for the purpose of repealing existing law but simply to amend existing law to provide that it be made more effective in supporting the agreements which were made under section 204.

Now, I join with the gentleman from Missouri in his concern relative to government by men, but I would call his attention, as I know he is well aware of the fact, that under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the escape clauses provide that the aggrieved parties may appear before the Tariff Commission and that the Tariff Commission recommendation then goes to the President, and the President has the authority—one man in this instance—under that act to decide what action he shall take on the basis of the facts and the recommendations referred to him by the Tariff Commission.

Now, it is true that the procedures under section 204 are certainly not in the same context, but I would point out to the committee that the textile industry has proceeded under the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. They have proceeded under the provisions of section 22 in which they made the case that their commodity was suffering from impact of imports, which had a bearing on price support programs on cotton. I appreciate the points made by the gentleman from Missouri, but I would certainly urge this committee not to support this amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman said the procedures under section 204 are different from those under these other sections of the Reciprocal Trade Act. Might I ask the gentleman if it is not true that there are no procedures at all spelled out in section 204?

Mr. McINTIRE. I would agree with the gentleman from Missouri that there are no procedures under section 204. However, I am certain that when we review all of the approaches that are provided in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for correction, then all of this would be a part of the analysis of any Chief Executive before he would proceed under section 204.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of the House should realize the tremendous authority that is conferred to the President under section 204. He has ample authority under this section to rig the world market in any agricultural commodity, in any agricultural commodity product, in any textile or textile product. This section is far more fundamental to our trade policy than the bill that is now before the Ways and Means Committee. It would confer far greater authority upon the President. It would place no time limit on that authority. It provides no congressional review whatever. It authorizes a discriminatory, punitive type of trade restriction.

Mr. Chairman, if we want to strengthen private enterprise and promote free trade relations, this section moves in exactly the opposite direction.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending bill and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, 2 minutes reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending bill and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, 2 minutes reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. COOLEY and Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 51.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take this time simply to thank the gentleman from the South for assisting me in clarifying a couple of issues. I have here a copy of H.R. 9900 which has been called the most important bit of legislation to come before the House in the last decade. Section 102, the statement of purposes, says:

> SEC. 102. STATEMENT OF PURPOSES.
>
> It is the purpose of this Act, by lowering trade barriers through trade agreements affording mutual benefits, to stimulate the economic growth of the United States, maintain and enlarge foreign markets for the products of United States industry and agriculture, and make available to the hope of the United States a greater variety of goods at lower prices; to strengthen economic and political relations with the European Economic Community and foreign countries through the development of an open and nondiscriminatory trading system in the free world; to assist in the sound economic progress of countries in the earlier stages of economic development; and to counter economic penetration by international communism.

And so on.

Frankly, as I have read this bill since its introduction I have asked myself, "How could you possibly vote against such a noble statement of principle?" And then today we have presented for us the answer, because this deathless prose which appears in H.R. 9900 was apparently not in complete good faith.

On page 2 of the hearings on the bill which we are debating today, H.R. 10788, we find that that bill was introduced at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, contained in an executive communication to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Its enactment has been recommended by the Departments of State, Labor, and Agriculture. Representatives of producers and textile groups appeared at the hearings on the bill to support its enactment; and there were no opposition witnesses.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, this has been a day of decision for me. Here we have two divergent, almost diametric propositions, the second supported by almost every department of the Federal Government and by my esteemed and respected friends from the South who need help. So I am going to vote in their behalf today in favor of this bill. This probably means that in the interest of consistency I shall not be able to support the other program which will come up later. Certainly, in their endorsement of H.R. 10788, the various executive departments have taken all logic out of any argument they may conveniently make later in support of H.R. 9900.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if I may submit a parliamentary inquiry, does the Chair wish to dispose of the pending amendment first? I have an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman's amendment a perfecting amendment?

Mr. GROSS. No; it is an amendment to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be a perfecting amendment, the Chair will state.

Mr. GROSS. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 1, line 12, strike out the period and quotation marks and insert a colon and add the following: "*Provided, however,* That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this section until such time as the President has negotiated agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the United States from foreign countries of the following commodities: Beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, and dairy products."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply bring all the farmers of this country under whatever benefits there are in this bill. I am sure

Members of the House are interested in the welfare of the farmers of Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota, and all the great food producing States as well as the cotton farmers of the South.

My quarrel with this bill is that it is in the nature of special privilege legislation for the cotton farmers and cotton textile people. It is protection for them that is denied others. I believe in protection for Americans and I might even be susceptible to being argued into supporting this bill if my good friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] would walk down the primrose path to the rose garden in the well of the House and tell us today that when extension of the Trade Agreements Act comes up for consideration soon, he will support provisions in that act to stop the importation of ham from Communist Poland and elsewhere, beef imports from South America and Mexico, the importation of frozen lamb from Australia and New Zealand and many other products of this nature from all over the world. I would be delighted to see my friend hit the sawdust trail, today and tell us we will have his support when the rest of the farmers of America need it. I do not believe he is going to accept my invitation.

My amendment is reasonable. It will spread the good things of life to all the farmers of this country, not just a comparatively few in the South. I am a protectionist for all and I urge adoption of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 46, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 1, line 12, after the word "agreement" strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 shall expire after June 30, 1963."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is worth while to take notice of the fact that on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa only two Democrats rose in favor of the amendment which would have brought equal rights to the farmers of America.

The purpose of the amendment just read would be to put a time limit on the vast authority to rig world markets which would be conveyed to the President under this bill. It seems to me unwise on the part of the Congress to grant to the executive department such vast authority without time limit and without providing any congressional review. My amendment simply would prevent any agreements under this section after June 30, 1963.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I only want to say I hope both amendments will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, pursuant to House Resolution 589, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FINDLEY moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 10788, to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, is hereby repealed."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. The motion to recommit as presented to the desk is not the one read.

The SPEAKER. Does the Chair understand the gentleman to say that the motion to recommit was incorrect, or that the gentleman intended to offer another motion to recommit?

Mr. GROSS. The motion read was incorrect.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the action taken on the motion to recommit will be vacated.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers a motion to recommit which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FINDLEY moves to recommit the bill to the House Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the bill to the House forthwith with the following amendment: "On page 1, line 12, strike out the period and quotation marks, insert a colon, and add the following: '*Provided, however,* That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this section until such time as the President has negotiated agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the United States from foreign countries of the following commodities: Beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, and dairy products.'"

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present and object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House previously entered into further proceedings on this bill will be postponed until tomorrow.

Does the gentleman withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. I did not hear the Chair's ruling on whether or not a quorum was present. Will the Chair advise me what the parliamentary situation is with respect to the point of no quorum?

The SPEAKER. The parliamentary situation is that the point of order was withdrawn, and that pursuant to the order of the House of last Thursday, further consideration of the bill is postponed until tomorrow.

OUR NATIONAL POLICY AND CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, no civil defense program can hope to succeed unless it is closely related to the entire constellation of our national policies. I propose to discuss the foreign policy objectives of the United States; the major foreign threats to their accomplishment; the military response of the United States to the Communist challenge; and then to place civil defense within this context.

I. OUR NATIONAL GOALS—PEACE, FREEDOM, AND JUSTICE

Liberty and independence are, of course, our guiding objectives. This Nation was born in revolution to secure these goals, and we are still strongly committed to their preservation here on this continent, and to their worldwide dissemination.

Our basic goal remains the same—

President Kennedy noted in his second state of the Union message—

> [It is] a peaceful community of free and independent states, free to choose their own future and their own system so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others.

This objective informs every national action we take. To reject it would be tantamount to a rejection of our heritage and our way of life.

In working to keep our independence, we will do everything in our power to support the freedom of others. We will not abandon other freedom-loving nations simply to save ourselves. Our moral duty to our ideals and practical political necessity compel us to adopt this course. We have, therefore, not given up hope for the future liberty of those nations which presently suffer under communism's tyrannical rule. Our yearly proclamation of Captive Nations Week indicates our continued refusal to forget the nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Nor are we willing to cut our close ties with our allies for material gain or short-term security.

> To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share—

Said President Kennedy in his inaugural address to the Nation—

> we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends.

We display this loyalty by adhering to NATO and by encouraging the economic and political integration of Europe.

THE NEW NATIONS

We also welcome the many new nations which are today asserting their independence after long years of colonial domination—in some cases lasting centuries. We harbor no aggressive design on their desire for freedom. Indeed, we have given our wholehearted support to some 40 new nations, embracing about a billion people, in the past 15 years. We sympathize with the natural desire of peoples everywhere for national independence. We hold no brief for colonialism of any sort—whether of the old style characterized by Kipling's "White Man's Burden" or of the new brand adopted by Khrushchev and the Soviet Union. Adlai Stevenson has captured the sprit of our opposition to colonialism and our support for the many Asians and Africans who are striving to secure their new-won freedoms, in saying:

> Americans do not fear the winds of change and the winds of freedom which are blowing across so much of the world. To us they make a wonderful sound. And as the seeds which they carry take root and grow, we will feel that America's great purpose in this world is being fulfilled.

Freedom and independence for the new nations must be accompanied by economic growth, social justice, and political democracy. Our aid programs, our Peace Corps, and our diplomacy are directed toward these ends.

We support the United Nations as a vehicle of peace and eventual international order. Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—Presidents of both parties—have all emphasized the deeply felt loyalty of the Nation to the United Nations. Since its inception over 16 years ago, the United Nations has had no stronger or more faithful friend than the United States. Our fealty has not gone unrewarded. The effective way the United Nations has handled such problems as the Congo, Suez, and the North Korean aggression has clearly vindicated our initial faith in it.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE U.N.

In supporting the U.N. we pledge ourselves to peace and the principle of peaceful settlement of international conflicts. As President Kennedy has said, the United Nations is our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace. It provides an international forum where the views and grievances of every nation, large or small, may be aired. It supplies a framework within which international disputes may be amicably settled or adjusted without any nation being compelled to resort to force to achieve its objectives.

Lastly, our peaceful intentions are concentrated on a sincere desire to end, or at least to control, the ever-expanding arms race on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Mankind today possesses the power to destroy itself unless differences among nations can be peacefully resolved. The awful specter of nuclear war with all its attendant suffering and misery hangs over our heads like a sword of Damocles. Never before in the history of man has there been a more pressing need for the successful adoption of an effective worldwide disarmament agreement. And never before, with a world torn by ideology and political interests, has the goal of a peaceful world seemingly been more distant.

THE PROSPECTS FOR DISARMAMENT

Nevertheless, this Nation must seize every honorable opportunity to reach a disarmament agreement with the Communist world. The stakes are nothing less than the future of the Nation and of all mankind. It is comforting to know that the President is making every effort to secure a workable disarmament agreement based on an effective inspection system. Congressional acceptance of his Disarmament Agency proposal and his continued pronouncements in favor of a just and honorable end to the arms race reinforce his abiding commitment to the cause of peace. While the prospects of reaching an arms accord are not bright, especially in light of the Soviet Union's resumption of atmospheric atomic testing, we must, as the President has perceptively observed, never fear to negotiate in the name of peace. Success in the field of disarmament, apart from the broader settlement of political differences which have stimulated a massive arms buildup in the first place, will have an important impact on any civil defense program we might develop. We will happily revise downward our estimate of requirements for a truly effective national civil defense effort if we can reach some acceptable agreement with the Soviet Union on disarmament and arms control.

II. THE GOALS OF WORLD COMMUNISM

Although we might like to have it otherwise, our experience with the Communists since World War II can lead us to only one conclusion: that the future we face will be one of protracted conflict rather than of peace. It is important therefore that we understand our adversary. Without such knowledge, we cannot hope to meet the many threats which the Communist camp poses for the free world.

A dispassionate appraisal of the historical record since 1945 will, I submit, expose the true aim of Communist tactics and strategy—world domination. A review of Communist words and deeds over the past 17 years will also reveal the alarming lengths to which Communist leaders are willing to go to achieve this ultimate goal.

THE STALINIST PHASE

Since World War II, our relations with the Soviet Union and the Communist world may be divided into two distinct phases. The first stage lasted from 1945 to the death of Stalin in 1953. This period was marked by the militant, aggressive extension of Communist power and influence around the world. The ideological thrust for the Communist movement throughout this period was primarily furnished by Stalin's interpretation of Marxist-Leninist doctrine. Stalin conceived the world as divided into two irreconcilable camps—one Communist, the other capitalist. The Soviet Union was the indisputable leader of the Communist world; the United States, the foremost power in the capitalist world. Stalin was convinced that a violent collision between these two forces was inevitable—a position very similar to the one now held by the Chinese Communists. Since he was certain that the so-called unchangeable laws of history dictated the ultimate victory of communism, he looked with favor upon the prospect of wars. He fully accepted the Leninist position which was vigorously stated by the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International in 1928.

> The overthrow of capitalism—

Affirmed the Congress—

> is impossible without violence; that is, without armed uprisings and war against the bourgeoisie. In our era of imperalistic wars and world revolution, revolutionary civil wars of the proletarian dictatorship against bourgeoisie, wars of the proletariat against the bourgeois states and world capitalism, as well as national revolutionary wars of oppressed peoples against imperialism are unavoidable.

The occurrence of World Wars I and II served to confirm Stalin's view of the eventual triumph of communism. He saw these wars as clear examples of the inner decay of capitalism as a social, political, and economic system. To him, Nazi Germany marked the final hour of the capitalist world. Nothing, he felt, could save it after the collapse of the Hitler regime.

STALIN CONSOLIDATES RUSSIAN EXPANSION

Having adopted this warlike doctrine, Stalin was quick to apply it to the chaotic circumstances following the end of World War II. The Red army proved to be a remarkably efficient instrument of his design for world conquest. For the first time in Western history, Russian armies occupied after World War II half of Europe, from Poland and Eastern Germany in the north to Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria in the south. Political control soon followed in the wake of military domination over this vast and strategically significant area. Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia lost their independence and were completely absorbed into the Soviet Union. In November 1945, Marshal Tito, a Moscow puppet at that time, established a Communist regime in Yugoslavia. Two months later, the Albanian Communist Hoxha, a strong Stalinist follower who has recently come under sharp attack from Khrushchev over the policy of de-Stalinization, announced the formation of an Albanian People's Republic. Liberty was next squashed in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Poland. These forceful seizures finally culminated in the overthrow of the freely elected Czechoslovak Government in 1948. Here, the Red army and the machinations of subversive elements joined forces to tilt the Czechoslovak nation into the Communist camp.

The Communists were no less active in Asia. Communist elements made a strong bid to fill the vacuum left by the defeat of Japan. In the Philippines, Government troops battled with Communist Huk forces which were deeply lodged in the jungles. In Malaya, British authorities fought for almost a decade to rid the nation of Communist guerrillas which terrorized villages throughout the countryside. The newly established Republics of India, Burma, and Indonesia were equally hard pressed by Communist agitators.

THE KOREAN INVASION

But the most alarming development for American and free world security arose out of the loss of China in 1949. For more than 20 years, Communist and Nationalist forces fought a long, bitter civil war for the control of the Chinese mainland. Through armed force and guile, the Communist rebels led by Mao Tse-tung finally drove the Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek from the shores of China to the island of Formosa. Our objective of a free, democratically governed China—a goal we had cherished since the open-door policy of William McKinley—was destroyed by the Communist takeover.

The loss of China set the stage for the final Stalinist grasp for power—the North Korean invasion of June 1950. Aided by strong Soviet material support, North Korean and Chinese Communist troops fought a combined force from 16 nations under United Nations command. The defeat of the Communist aggression in Korea and the subsequent death of Stalin brought down the curtain on this phase of the cold war.

KHRUSHCHEV'S PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

We are now in the Khrushchev phase of the cold war. Although his firm belief in the ultimate triumph of communism is the same as Stalin's, his approach to the cold war and the tactics and stratagems he will employ are remarkably different. The most fundamental difference lies in Khrushchev's appeal for peaceful coexistence between the Communist and Western camps. He has adopted this policy because he is convinced of two things: that nuclear war would be destructive to either side in such a conflict, and that the Communist objective of world domination can be achieved by other, less violent methods. It should be emphasized, however, that peaceful coexistence does not mean, though it may seem to imply, that Khrushchev has abandoned his zeal for communism or its goals.

Khrushchev is certain that what he calls the correlation of world forces has now tipped in favor of the Communist bloc. In his January 6, 1961, speech, he justified his policy of peaceful coexistence as a valid policy on the basis of four factors: the growing economic and political power of the entire Communist bloc; the decline of colonialism; the formation of a new pro-Soviet grouping of powers from the emerging states in former colonial areas; and the alleged continuing decline of the West's relative military, economic, and political strength.

While the Communists have become more wily in their approach to world control, they still appear willing to use physical force to accomplish their objectives. Khrushchev and his top subordinates have threatened on a number of occasions to send Russian missiles against the free world. He has been particularly truculent over the question of West Berlin. Moreover, Communist forces are menacing the integrity of South Vietnam and the establishment of neutral Laos. And who can ignore the clever, gradual Communist takeover of Cuba?

COMMUNIST MILITARY POWER

Communist military might today is formidable—and it is growing. Soviet striking power is impressive. The Institute of Strategic Studies states that the Russians have in the neighborhood of 50 to 200 operational ICBM's on station. It has an even larger number of IRBM's trained on European targets and on our NATO bases. Complementing this missile fleet is a large, long-range bomber force comprising about 1,200 heavy and medium bombers, which closely compare with our B-52 and B-47 bombers. Other military aircraft, totaling about 20,000 in strength, rounds out Soviet and satellite air capability.

But it is in the area of ground forces that the Communists have a large, though not decisive, edge on the free world. Recent Soviet increases in Red army power will, according to some estimates, result in a total force of 3,800,000. The Chinese Communists and Warsaw Pact nations can furnish over 3 million more ready and well-trained troops in any future conflict. These Communist forces are well equipped with the latest tank, artillery, and field missiles. Total tank strength of the Soviet Army alone is estimated at 20,000.

These air and land forces are further bolstered by an ever-growing Communist capability on the seas. The Soviet Navy, which is presently manned by about 500,000 officers and men, has increased from a total tonnage in 1940 of 600,000 to 1,600,000 in 1961. This makes the Soviet Union the most powerful seapower in the world after the United States, which possesses about 4 million tons. The main source of Soviet sea strength lies in a submarine fleet that numbers about 430 units.

A POSSIBLE RIFT?

A realistic civil defense program must take this huge military establishment, and the continuing manifestation of Communist aggressive designs, into account. These two factors urge us to adopt a comprehensive civil defense program. We cannot wait for the signing of an effective arms control agreement, nor for some internal split in the Communist camp. Neither event may occur.

Indeed, we should especially guard against any false optimism about a possible rift between the Chinese and Russian Communists. While we would welcome such a development, we cannot base our military and civil defense programs on such a calculation. It is useful to remember Mr. Richard Lowenthal's observations on the Moscow-Peiping crisis in a recent article in the New York Times magazine.

> We know from the experience of the Western Alliance—

He reminded us—

> that such conflicts can always be adjusted by compromise where both sides have an overriding interest in common—that even serious disagreements among allies are often set aside so as to present a common front against the main enemy.

To the Communists, that main enemy is the United States.

III. OUR MILITARY DEFENSES

We have not stood idly by while the Communists have built up their military forces. We have responded with a defense system that is today unequaled in the history of the world. The principal purpose of this defense force is to maintain the peace. It is not intended to provoke war. Consequently, our military strength has been based solidly on the concept of deterrence.

Our deterrent posture seeks to prevent the Communists from using force to gain their objectives. We are attempting to deter Communist military aggression on three broad fronts. Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric recently summarized our defense posture in tough, hard terms:

> First, we continue to rely on our strategic nuclear weapons to convince a would-be aggressor that he could not emerge standing from a general war of his own instigation and we are keeping those weapons up to date. Secondly, we are rapidly strengthening our conventional weapons and increasing our ready reserve of trained manpower, to give us an improved, third choice between all-out nuclear retaliation and retreat. Thirdly, we are endeavoring to strengthen and improve the military defenses of our friends in the world in accordance with their needs, with special attention to preventing or confining limited wars, subversion and guerrilla-type insurgency.

Let us take these three parts of our defense program and examine each closely:

OUR STRATEGIC DETERRENT

First. Our strategic deterrent force is principally composed of heavy and medium bombers and an expanding and increasingly reliable number of long-range missiles. Our intercontinental bombers number nearly 1,700, including 630 B-52's, 55 B-58's, and 1,000 B-47's. Our B-52 bombers, the mainstay of our long-range bomber fleet, are being equipped with Hounddog and Skybolt missiles which will give these aircraft a standoff capability. These air-to-surface missiles will make it possible for our bombers to destroy enemy targets from thousands of miles away.

For long-range missiles, we can rely on the Polaris, the Atlas, the Titan, and the Thor. Six Polaris nuclear submarines, each armed with 16 nuclear warhead missiles, now patrol the seas of the world keeping the peace. That means a total of 96 Polaris missiles are on station. We also have about 48 Atlas missiles on operational status and the deployment of the first squadrons of Titan ICBM's in underground concrete silos has already begun. Planned yearend estimates call for the deployment of a total of 225 Atlas and Titan missiles. These missiles will join another 60 Thor intermediate ballistic missiles and about 30 Jupiter IRBM's which have been placed, respectively, in the United Kingdom and Italy.

This force is only a beginning. More strategic striking power is being developed. Funds are already available to increase the number of Polaris submarines to 29 by the end of fiscal 1963. The President's defense requests for this coming fiscal year call for authority to raise the number of Polaris submarines to 41. When this goal is reached, the Nation will have over 650 Polaris missiles on station.

On land, the Minuteman missile is fast overtaking the Atlas and the Titan as our main source of surface missile power. Accelerated production and deployment of the solid-fueled Minuteman missiles is one of the major features of the Kennedy administration's military program. The first of 600 Minuteman missiles will begin taking their place in underground silos sometime next year. In all, by the end of fiscal 1963, we will have 220 Polaris and Minuteman missiles at our disposal.

OUR DEFENSES AGAINST BOMBERS AND MISSILES

Elaborate measures are also being taken to protect this expanding retaliatory force against enemy sneak attack. Over one-third of our strategic bomber forces is today on 15-minute ground alert, and the fiscal 1963 budget calls for the continuous airborne alert of one-eighth of our heavy bomber capability. Defense against enemy bombers is based on a combination of manned interceptors and surface-to-air missiles, with warning provided by our radar networks which stretch across Alaska, Canada, and our northern frontier. The President's new defense budget requests funds for emergency manual operation of the SAGE system which controls the firing of our antiaircraft missiles, and for the dispersal of our manned interceptor force. The Nike-Hercules system aimed at enemy attack planes will also be expanded and improved.

Defense against enemy missiles grows apace, too. The ballistic missile early warning system—BMEWS—is scheduled for completion sometime next year. The BMEWS line is capable of giving our defense and offensive forces up to 15 minutes warning of an ICBM attack. This time period will hopefully be extended by the development of the Midas and the Samos satellite systems. When operational, the Midas satellite program will consist of a number of satellites traveling in different north-south orbits across enemy areas. Each Midas satellite will be equipped with infrared sensors to detect heat from the exhaust flames of missiles as they are being fired. The Samos, on the other hand, will act as a reconnaissance vehicle and will perform some of the same valuable functions which were previously discharged by the U-2. A completed BMEWS-Midas-Samos system might work in the following way: Samos cameras will spot suspicious enemy movements; BMEWS stations will direct Midas infrared sensors to the area; and Midas findings will be quickly relayed back to BMEWS headquarters which will, in turn, notify our strategic and defensive forces of an impending attack.

To supplement this warning system, top priority is being given by the administration to the development of an effective antimissile-missile system. Our best hope in this field is the Army's Nike-Zeus. Successful test flights of the Nike-Zeus at Point Mugu, Calif., one of our major missile research sites, encourages the view that we may yet be able to develop a workable antimissile missile. As you know, the Nike-Zeus uses an electronic brain on the ground to think for it. A missile track radar relays control commands from the guidance center to the missile to direct it automatically to its target.

OUR CONVENTIONAL FORCES

Second. Flexibility in our military posture is being achieved through a steady, sure buildup of our conventional forces. A large conventional capability will enable us to apply military counterforce against Communist aggression that will be proportionate to the Communist force which has been engaged and to the value of the political and geographical stakes at issue. Such a conventional force will give us more leeway in deploying our military forces. In the face of a Communist military move against Western interests, we will not be forced to choose between nuclear holocaust or an essentially ineffective conventional military response.

The President has recently announced the creation of two more Army divisions, bringing our total number to 16. Army manned strength will stand about 1 million men at the close of the next fiscal year. Thanks to the patriotism and devotion to duty of the Wisconsin and Texas Guard divisions, the Nation now possesses the equivalent of these 16 divisions. As soon as adequate replacements can be found through the draft and stepped-up volunteer recruitment, these guard units, which were activated late last year, will be returned to Reserve status—hopefully before next September.

An enlarged procurement program will supply our conventional forces with the latest equipment. In the next year, the Army will buy increased quantities of heavy machineguns, more self-propelled artillery and battletanks, and conventional munitions. In addition, it will purchase nearly 40,000 tactical trucks, a large variety of support vehicles, and about 600 aircraft, including Caribou transports and several types of helicopters. Ground forces will be furnished large quantities of surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles, including the Hercules, Hawk, and Redeye air defense missiles; the Honest John, Little John, Sergeant, and Pershing tactical missiles; and antitank missiles.

Air and sea support for our conventional land force is also considerable—and increasing. We will maintain about 56 Air Force and Navy troop carrier and air transport squadrons, while Air Force Reserve components will operate an additional 65 squadrons which can be quickly activated in times of national crisis. Better working air support for military ground action will be achieved through the recently organized Strike Command which integrates tactical air power and Army infantry and armored units operations.

COUNTERGUERRILLA FORCES

Third. Last, we are trying to create an entirely new kind of military-political deterrent against the outbreak of so-called unconventional war. The wars which are presently being fought in Laos and South Vietnam are guerrilla wars.

Franklin Lindsay keenly distinguished conventional warfare from this new type of conflict.

> The objective of conventional combat—

He writes in the January issue of Foreign Affairs—

> is to win control of a state by defeating the enemy's military forces in the field. In contrast, the strategy of unconventional forces must be to win control of the state by first winning control of the civilian population.

To combat this new Communist challenge, we must have forces which are capable of fighting in small cadres, of great mobility; and of almost superhuman resourcefulness to live off the land where they fight.

The Communists have successfully built such guerrilla war organizations. We must match them in this area. Failure here may mean the slow erosion of our position throughout the underdeveloped countries of the world.

Only large numbers of trained antiguerrilla forces will accomplish the task of preserving our foothold in Asia. The administration has taken steps to increase the number and power of such forces.

A combined team of Army and Marine Corps forces, closely associated with a broad economic aid program which strikes at the evils which breed guerrilla war in poorly developed nations, can, if built soon, be a decisive deterrent force in the cold war.

IV. OUR CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The best protection against an enemy attack is an international rule of law under which disputes among nations are settled by peaceful processes. The next best is an adequate deterrent force.

> We will deter an enemy from making a nuclear attack—

President Kennedy has said—

> only if our retaliatory power is so strong and so invulnerable that he knows he would be destroyed by our response. If we have that strength, civil defense is not needed to deter an attack. If we should ever lack it, civil defense would not be an adequate substitute.

But we must face the unpalatable contingency of all-out nuclear war because deterrence may fail, or because an enemy, through accident, irrationality, or escalation, drags us into an atomic war which we do not want. The possibility of nuclear war makes the need for civil defense very pressing and urgent. We must plan today to build an effective civil defense organization, a national defense program that touches every city and hamlet of the United States. Tomorrow may be too late.

BLAST AND FIRE

We should have no illusions about the difficulty of our problem. In the wake of a wide range of possible enemy nuclear strikes against the United States, we will face a harsh, hostile world. Our environment, which we presently take for granted, will be shattered, or, at the very least, gravely altered. The blast and thermal effects of nuclear weapons will be appalling. A 5-megaton burst at ground level would destroy most buildings within 2 miles or so of the point of explosion; its blast and heat effect could be felt for 18 miles. The radius of destruction for a 20-megaton weapon, which can be easily delivered to target, will, of course, be even more devastating.

There is also the possibility that large-scale fire storms will start in our cities and throughout our forest and grassland regions. Millions will perish in these awful conflagrations. You will remember that about 60,000 people died from the roaring inferno which was created by the incendiary attack over Hamburg during World War II. How much more serious will fire damage be after a nuclear attack against the United States?

But blast and fire cover a limited area compared with radioactive fallout which may extend over tens of thousands of square miles. After a ground blast the radioactive particles descend within a half hour; most of the lethal effect occurs in the first 48 hours.

Moreover, the fires and explosions attending an enemy nuclear strike will cause widespread soil erosion and floods. These changes within our natural environment will bring further misery to millions. Nor should we overlook the fact that great numbers of dead and injured, the loss of firefighting equipment and personnel, and mountains of debris will make fire control very difficult and decidedly hazardous.

Our medical services will be severely taxed. Thousands of hospitals and medical centers will be laid waste; large numbers of our physicians and nurses will be killed or incapacitated; disease will spread rapidly; infection-carrying insects and rodents, which appear to have a greater immunity to radiation than humans, will multiply and endanger plant, animal, and human life.

THE CIVIL DEFENSE RECOMMENDATIONS

Our economy will suffer a devastating blow. Communications will be seriously damaged; railroad and air facilities will be obliterated; our fleets of trailer trucks decimated; innumerable bridges and roads made impassable; and billions of dollars worth of industrial plants consumed in nuclear flames. Our governmental units at the local, State, and Federal levels will be, in many cases, completely eliminated; or left only partly intact. Public order and morality will be greatly challenged, and looting and pillaging may spread rapidly.

A strong, effective, thoroughly trained civil defense organization will be needed to cope with this level of destruction and desolation. President Kennedy has proposed an expanded civil defense effort to deal with some of the problems which will be faced during, and after, an atomic attack. In fiscal 1962, President Kennedy received about $250 million for the civil defense program, and requests for fiscal 1963 total $695 million, sums greater than the combined total of all civil defense expenditures over the past 11 years.

The principal feature of the President's civil defense recommendations is his fallout shelter program. It consists of four major parts: the survey and marking of 50 million shelter spaces across the country; the improvement of existing shelter spaces; the Federal construction of shelters; and equipping and supplying them. Furthermore, depending on congressional approval, $460 million of the $700 million requested will be used to provide a Federal incentive program for the construction of community fallout shelters in schools, hospitals, and public welfare institutions.

And adequate fallout shelters can save lives.

Radioactivity itself does not contaminate the air. You can breathe freely after the particles have settled to the ground, even in an area of heavy fallout. Tightly sealed fallout shelters need only an air intake pipe with a filter or shield to prevent actual particles of fallout from being drawn into the shelter.

Fallout does not contaminate water, once the actual particles have settled to the bottom of the tank or system. Eating food that is grown in radioactive soil will not kill you, although it may increase your chances of succumbing to a fatal disease a decade or two later.

THE CASE FOR GROUP SHELTERS

There are several reasons why group shelters are preferable to family shelters in many circumstances:

First. A larger than family-size group is better prepared to face a nuclear attack than a single family, particularly if some members are away from home at the time of the attack.

Second. There is more opportunity to find first aid and other emergency skills in a group, and accumulated radiation exposure from necessary short trips out of the shelter after the attack can be distributed among more people.

Third. Group shelters could provide shelter for persons away from their homes at the time of air attack.

Fourth. Group shelters can serve as a focus for integrated community recovery activities in the postattack period.

OBJECTIONS TO FALLOUT SHELTERS

I am not impressed by the objections one hears to the proposed fallout shelter program:

First. "Fallout shelters won't save anyone, since the Soviet Union can kill everyone in the United States with blast and fire." This is taking seriously the rash threat made recently by former Soviet Ambassador Mikhail Menshikov. But at least an equally reasonable assumption is that a Soviet attack would not attempt to annihilate, or succeed in annihilating, all Americans. And if it did not, fallout shelters could save millions of lives. A fire escape on a building may not save your life if the building explodes; but it will save your life if the fire is such that you can use the escape.

Second. "Fallout shelters will make Americans resigned to the inevitability of nuclear war, and hence make them rashly demand that we start war first, or cravenly demand that we surrender." This argument goes both ways, and it thus kills itself. I should think it much more likely that fallout shelters would bring home to us the hideousness of nuclear war, and thus make us want to support our Government vigorously in its search for an honorable third choice between holocaust and surrender.

Third. "Fallout shelters, by giving the illusion of security, will make the American people bellicose." By now, unrealistic claims of the protection afforded by fallout shelters—such as Life magazine's assertion that they would save 97 percent of the American people—have been pretty well exploded. Responsible leaders must continue to make clear to the American people that nuclear war would be devastating. Even so, a few million lives seem to me worth the trouble of saving.

Fourth. "Fallout shelters, by regimenting people, will destroy democracy here." Nonsense—both Britain and British democracy survived in the air raid shelters of World War II. Democratic little Denmark has today one of the best shelter programs going.

Fifth. "Fallout shelters will cause Russia to start a war in the belief that we are preparing for war." If Russia is going to be panicked into war, I would think that our bombs, our missiles, and our Air Force would be a much greater panicker than a civil defense program.

We should not let a program of fallout shelters blind us to the necessity of building a strong defense, and of ceaselessly working for peace. But neither should hysterical argument blind us to the fact that fallout shelters could save some lives, and life is precious.

For myself, as an individual, burrowing in the ground like a mole does not appeal; but as a legislator, I am not about to dismiss lightly the possibility of useful public shelters.

THE NEAR WARNING SYSTEM

Other parts of the President's program include a new nationwide warning and detection system. It is now recognized that siren warning systems have serious drawbacks. They often cannot be heard, and most people are indoors—out of reach of the siren's sound. Consequently, the NEAR system which will permit home hookups to warn of enemy attack at a nominal cost to the householder is being developed. As a supplement to NEAR, the Defense Department will provide standby power equipment for 1,300 broadcasting stations and backup radio communications for wire line links between those stations and local and regional civil defense headquarters. Radiation detection kits for some 90,000 monitoring stations will be distributed in addition to the 50,000 already equipped.

Small expenditures are also planned for civil defense research and development, and modest sums are planned to aid State and local governments with personnel and administrative costs incurred in civil defense activities. An enlarged civil defense training program will be undertaken.

There can be no doubt that President Kennedy's civil defense proposals represent the most sweeping and far-reaching recommendations for civil defense that have ever come from the White House. Yet there exists a serious question whether they are adequate to the task of mitigating the effects of nuclear war and of controlling the postattack environment so that rescue and recuperative operations can be quickly undertaken and expeditiously carried out. The fallout shelter program, although significant, is not intended to diminish the destruction wrought by the blast and fire effects of nuclear explosions.

Before we go too far along the road toward a national fallout shelter system, we might usefully examine the proposal made by the gentleman from California, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee, that the Nation should adopt a blast shelter program. Experts estimate the cost of such a program at about $20 billion, depending on the number, size, and dispersal of such protective redoubts. We can certainly afford a blast shelter program, even at such a high cost, if we can be convinced that it will save substantially more people. I think that we have a right to ask the administration to clarify the advantages of a possible blast shelter program so that the Nation can decide what sort of policy it is willing to adopt.

EVACUATION

Nor should we reject the technique of population evacuation too quickly. I am aware that civil defense officials are not very enthusiastic about this method because of the many, obvious, and serious difficulties involved in making it work. Nuclear war leaves little time for the effective implementation of an evacuation policy. Nonetheless, one can conceive of situations in which an effectively organized evacuation plan might serve very useful purposes. For example, the Russians might evacuate their cities and present us with a surrender ultimatum, or localized wars might give signs of being expanded.

In these instances, it might be important for us to evacuate our cities as quickly as possible before an enemy missile attack strikes us.

If we pursue an evacuation plan under certain contingencies, we should then give considerable thought to the identification of evacuation-reception centers and for the sustenance of civilians when they arrive at these predesignated spots. The Holifield subcommittee discovered in 1960 that no plans were made for provisioning—designated evacuation-reception areas—with the basic supplies and equipment which would be required to sustain an evacuated population at even the barest level of subsistence. With fallout capable of killing for hundreds of miles downwind from where the bomb strikes, fallout shelters are needed in evacuation areas.

We have not done much to overcome this incisive criticism over the last 2 years. In Wisconsin, in fact, our evacuation roads are well marked; but practically nothing has been done to keep people alive once they get to where the road leads. For Wisconsin and the Nation, a top priority is to put into effect a plan for evacuees that would work tomorrow.

POSTATTACK RECOVERY ORGANIZATION

One final point: We have today an urgent requirement for a realistic, nationwide postattack recovery organization. The Defense Department's "Fallout Protection" booklet noted:

> State and local governments have the operating responsibility for civil defense. The responsibility for organizing community civil defense protection falls on the States and, through them, on local government units.

No one can deny that the State and local governments have a primary obligation to take the initiative in civil defense operations. No one who respects our Federal form of government would want the Federal Government intruding into every facet of local life. Yet a nuclear war will not be localized. It will cut across city, town, and State boundaries.

Perhaps only islands of governmental units will remain, and, then, only in fractured form after a nuclear strike. Who will then lead from our fallout shelters? Who will direct emergency rescue activities? Who will assume responsibility for the national recovery and recuperation program?

While State and local units have an indispensable role to play in the postattack environment, if we want to preserve as much of our way of life as possible, we should recognize a Federal role, too. We need stronger relations between Federal, State, and local civil defense officials. We need a preexisting organizational framework composed of men who already know what they will do in the postattack situation. In this respect, we might well examine the effort which the military Reserves can contribute to the rebuilding process. There is much to be done about the problem of postattack recovery before we can be satisfied with our accomplishments in civil defense.

BEYOND CIVIL DEFENSE

All of us here are deeply troubled about the future. We would be delighted to turn our attention to something else than civil defense. Nuclear war is not a pretty business. Millions would die in such a holocaust. Every honorable effort must therefore be made to bring the cold war to an end which will not jeopardize our freedom or the freedom of others. We have a profound moral responsibility to take every precaution to forestall the eruption of a nuclear war.

We must work and pray for a better world in which civil defense will not be needed. The path we must walk has been clearly marked out for us by President Kennedy in the closing words of his first inaugural address:

> With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to meet one of Buffalo's most prominent attorneys, Mr. John Lord O'Brian, and I take great pleasure in extending felicitations upon his 50th anniversary of admission to the bar of the Supreme Court.

As he appeared before the Court last week, Chief Justice Warren paid special tribute to Mr. O'Brian upon his anniversary and warmly greeted the 87-year-old attorney with words of praise for his outstanding service in the law profession and to our Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial that appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on April 4, 1962:

MAN OF JUSTICE

> Chief Justice Warren suspended the business of the Supreme Court Monday to make a felicitous gesture. He paid the tribute of the bench to one of the truly distinguished men of the American bar—John Lord O'Brian, completing a half century of practice before the highest Court.
>
> The Buffalo and Washington attorney, now 87, was warmly congratulated by the Chief Justice for having served the Court over the years "in the highest sense."
>
> Dedication to his profession in the grand tradition of American justice has been his life. But his personal interests have been submerged many times at the request of six Presidents of both parties who called on him when there was a particularly difficult task to be undertaken.
>
> John Lord O'Brian has dignified his profession and enriched the Nation by his devotion to the welfare of both.

I also include an article written by a reporter of the Buffalo Evening News, Frank Fortune, who witnessed the Supreme Court's special tribute to Mr. O'Brian:

U.S. Supreme Court Honors Attorney John Lord O'Brian—Chief Justice Warren Commends Buffaloian on 50-Year Practice Before High Tribunal

Washington, April 3.—John Lord O'Brian, 87, was tendered a special tribute in the U.S. Supreme Court Monday in recognition of the 50th anniversary of his admission to the bar of the Court.

Mr. O'Brian, a Buffalo and Washington attorney who has held key positions in Government under both Republican and Democratic Presidents, came before the court to sponsor the admission of a junior member of his Washington law firm.

As Mr. O'Brian approached the bench, Chief Justice Warren leaned forward and said:

"I am told by our clerk that this is the 50th anniversary of your admission to the bar of this Court."

"That is true, Your Honor, and it has been one of the highest privileges," said Mr. O'Brian.

Then the Chief Justice observed:

"Few men in history have had a longer or more active practice before this Court.

"During all these years, you have served the Court in the highest sense.

"I wish for you many more years as a member of our bar, and with it continued happiness."

U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Security Council of the United Nations voted in favor of a United States-British resolution censuring Israel for its reprisal raid against Syria. It is regrettable that the only tangible result of recent U.S. policy in the Middle East is a resolution which is negative in approach and which does not in any way aid in the search for peace in that area. Until the Arab States recognize the existence of Israel, tensions in that troubled area will continue. The heart of the problem is the refusal of the Arab States to make peace with Israel. U.S. policy must be affirmatively and vigorously directed toward the good of achieving peace in the Middle East. It is time for the State Department to come up with positive plans instead of negative resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the following New York Post editorial for April 9 which discusses the real issues:

A Bankrupt Policy Revived

There is tragic symbolism in the Anglo-American resolution of censure that the U.N. Security Council is being asked to vote against Israel for its reprisal raid against Syria. President Kennedy's representatives have been able to come up with no better formula than to reaffirm the censure resolution of January, 1956, that was drafted by the representatives of President Eisenhower. But the Eisenhower Middle East policy in 1956 was a failure. It did not halt the chain of actions and reactions which culminated in the Suez disaster.

Surely we have a right to expect a more affirmative and forceful policy from this administration. Yet the one theme that has gone unmentioned in the current Security Council debate is the need for a peace settlement in the Middle East. This repeats the sterile pattern of the last General Assembly when the United States shunned a 15-power resolution calling for direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States.

Why this timidity about the subject of peace? The Arabs won't hear of peace; will the rest of the world become accomplices to their intransigence? They remain unwilling to recognize the fact of Israel's existence; is that not a challenge to the U.N., which long has numbered Israel among its members? The Arab States do everything short of war to make Israel's life intolerable and openly prepare for another round; can these acts be considered outside the Council's jurisdiction?

Can the Council condemn Israel for measures it regards as defensive if it ignores the transcendent issue of the Arabs' unwillingness to make peace? A failure to censure Syria in this regard will be a failure to dispense justice even-handedly.

In defense of the Eisenhower policy of 1956, it could be argued that behind it was the insistent, purposeful effort of Dag Hammarskjold to move the area from precarious truce to some form of stabilization.

If there is any such grand design today it is not apparent, although the resolution does not speak of augmenting the powers of the U.N. Truce Supervisory Organization in the area.

Israel's resistance to measures that would strengthen the scope and authority of the U.N. operation inside its borders is understandable. Today under U Thant, U.N. powers in the Middle East are exercised impartially; tomorrow the situation may be different. Another Secretary General or a different voting alinement in the U.N. might transform its operation in Israel into an instrument of its destruction.

Nevertheless, we do not believe Israel's salvation lies in reprisal and in keeping the U.N. at arm's length. That policy came close to being self-defeating in the past. To venture again onto that slippery slope would be risky.

If risks are to be taken, let them rather be in conformity with the U.N. Charter and in ways that will strengthen the peace-keeping powers of the world organization. Israel's nervousness about the U.N. may be understandable, but cooperation with the U.N. and obedience to the charter are less of a leap into the dark than defiance.

But those who ask Israel to take risks in the interests of peace and stability should themselves show some courage. At the very least, the Security Council should call upon Syria and Israel to begin direct negotiations on the problems outstanding between them.

A call for peace talks can never be out of order, and there's a larger question:

What about the Russians and their ambitions? The Soviet should be challenged to cooperate in a stabilization program. If great power disengagement in central Europe is a legitimate subject of discussion at the summit, no less so is disengagement in the troubled Middle East.

CONGRESSIONAL EYES ON BELGIAN VISIT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of hundreds of members of this body, and of many thousands of people all over the country, will follow with keen interest the developments of the next few days as a prominent Belgian diplomat visits the Nation's Capital and lunches with the President.

The mission of the distinguished Belgian, according to the Associated Press on April 7, is to discuss developments of the European Common Market with President Kennedy and other top officials.

In the background of the visit, as publicized by Associated Press on April 3, is a stiff note from officials of the Common Market calling on the United States to reconsider its decision to impose higher tariffs on carpets and glass. The note, according to the news report, also warned that bilateral trade concessions might be jeopardized unless the U.S. decision is rescinded.

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that we will have in this situation a perfect test case of the effect of the Common Market negotiations, and the construction given them by our own administration and our friends abroad, with reference to the solid statutory safeguards for American industry placed in existing law by the Congress.

Much more is at stake than the domestic sheet glass and carpet industries, who under existing law have made a solid case before our Tariff Commission and thereafter obtained from a sympathetic and understanding President the tariff adjustments recommended by the Commission. These adjustments, let no one forget, were virtually mandated by a finding of substantial injury from imports.

Our friends from Belgium now ask our President to rescind this wise and long-awaited decision, notwithstanding its legal and equitable justification under our laws and procedures.

The President will surely extend every courtesy to his distinguished visitor.

Just as surely, out of respect for our own solidly based escape-clause procedures and the merits of the case for glass and carpet workers in this country, the President will politely but firmly refuse to change course.

This, I am sure, is not only the conviction and hope of dozens of Members of Congress from glass- and carpet-producing districts.

It is also the faith and the prayer of thousands of American working men and women in these industries who were heartened and cheered, only a few days ago, by the President's announcement of his decision.

THE HONORABLE LESTER HOLTZMAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is my proud privilege today to speak of our former colleague, Lester Holtzman, recently advanced to the position of supreme court justice of the State of New York.

Mark Twain once said, "So live your life that when you go even the undertaker will be sorry." I am sure that when former Congressman, now supreme court justice of New York, Lester Holtzman, goes, even the undertaker will be sorry.

He is the type of man for whom we all have deep affection.

He is a politician in the very best sense of that word—in the Disraeli sense—where wisdom, diplomacy, realism, precisement of expression, oratory, integrity, are all delicately balanced.

There is nothing mysterious about Lester. He is an openhearted, unpretentious, humble gentleman. We honored him when he was in the House because he honored us. We honor him now after his elevation to the supreme court bench of the State of New York. I am happy to have this special order to say something about this good man. His name is like an acrostic, you spell it from the left to the right or the right to the left, up or down, it spells goodness.

He has ever been a lover of justice—justice, the bread of the Nation—because all hunger for it.

Lester has endeared himself to all of us, primarily because of his good fellowship and his amiability. His years of service with us inspired us to have even greater affection for him.

He is a man who in the words of Grover Cleveland represents "public office as a public trust." I particularly like Lester because he is unafraid—unafraid at times even when he is alone. He knows that ofttimes a man with courage is a majority.

Lester never tries to be anyone but himself. He allows each additional day to help him to grow more like himself.

Although he sustained, some years ago, a physical infirmity he had the indomitable will to overcome it. He never seems to suffer from combat fatigue. His unflagging spirit is ever present. His is the best example of the process of a congressional career. It is an endless process. You continually turn the last page of a chapter of an assignment to be confronted with another chapter of tasks to be completed. He knew this. He recognized that a congressional career is not a mere course to be finished or a prize to be achieved. It is continuous and involves "blood, toil, tears, and sweat."

He has left on the tablets of our congressional memory a good name. Does not the psalmist say: "Better is the fragrance of a good name than the perfume of precious oils." Lester Holtzman has a good name.

We all remember his fine sense of humor.

To all of us and to his dear ones and to his immense public in New York he is a man of good character, and character really is what you are when no one is looking. Lester is indeed worthy and good even when unattended, when alone.

I have also observed his wise practicality. He has realized that he must take the bitter with the sweet, that if you want the rose you must put up with the thorns.

Charles de Gaulle, French President, said:

> We may well go to the moon soon, but that is not very far. The greatest distance we have to cover still lies within us.

In other words, one must know oneself. Lester does. He knows the long, arduous, spiritual road to travel within himself. I have often watched Lester within the confines of the Judiciary Committee, of which he was a splendid member. He there made manifest wisdom and caution. He knows that the fool often crosses the stream while the sage ponders.

Lester is ever alive to wrongs and human suffering. He is never limp in the face of injustice. When there is a wrong to be righted he becomes intensely active, like the clanging and clamor of fire engines dashing to the flames.

He knows and respects human dignity, hence his avid support of welfare legislation, social security laws, public housing and slum clearance, Federal aid to education, and a square deal for labor, as well as child guidance and welfare.

I have often noted him glow with pride at the mention of his charming and benign wife Mae, his splendid son Matthew, and his vivacious, beautiful daughter Joy. I am happy to call all of them friend.

I herewith append some biographical data on former Congressman, now Supreme Court Justice Lester Holtzman.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON THE HONORABLE LESTER HOLTZMAN, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK

Born June 1, 1913, in New York, N.Y. Son of Isidore and Rebecca Holtzman, immigrants from Poland, both naturalized citizens of the United States. Moved to Middle Village in 1916.

Education: Graduated from P.S. 87, Queens County, at 12½ years of age, in 1926. Attended Newtown High School in Elmhurst for about 2 years when forced by circumstances at home to seek employment. Continued education and completed same in 1930 at Eastern District Evening High School in Brooklyn, working at various jobs during the day. Completed during the evening 5 years at St. John's Law School, and graduated in 1935 with a degree of LL.B. Honor student at St. John's Law School; president of senior class, St. John's Law School; member of student council-faculty association, St. John's Law School; recipient of Indianhead Award, St. John's Law School.

Profession: Duly admitted to practice law in the State of New York in December 1936 in second judicial department, after having served required clerkship. Entered general practice of law in Middle Village in 1936. Has been in actual continuous practice of law since date of admission to bar. Admitted to practice before U.S. Supreme Court April 23, 1956. Now associated with member of firm of Holtzman, Sharf, Mackell & Hellenbrand, with offices at 120–10 Queens Boulevard, New Gardens, Long Island, N.Y.

Marital and family status: In 1936, married the former Mae Gress, and has two children: Joy (Mrs. Ira M. Adler) and Matthew. Owns home and resides at 64–49 Elwell Crescent, Rego Park. Long Island, N.Y.

Congressional background: Elected Member of the U.S. House of Representatives in 1952 for the 83d Congress (1953–54) from the Sixth District, New York, defeating Republican incumbent. Reelected to 84th, 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses. Recipient of Democratic and Liberal Party endorsements for Congress. Formerly member of House Committee on Government Operations, House Committee on Armed Services, and House Committee on the Judiciary which has jurisdiction over matters involving civil rights, antitrust enforcement, immigration and nationality, bankruptcy, claims, State taxation of interstate commerce, etc. Also as a Member of Congress was appointed by Speaker to the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N.Y.; member of the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission; assistant Democratic whip for New York State. Has sponsored and supported legislation regarding mutual security, expansion of social security program, increase in minimum wage, strengthening of civil rights, liberalization of immigration and nationality laws, increased deductions and broader exemptions from income tax, an adequate defense program, low-flying planes, public housing, antireligious persecutions, statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, increased benefits for veterans and dependents, extension and increase of unemployment compensation benefits, pay raises for Federal employees and military personnel, liberalization of Civil Service Retirement Act, etc.

Additional activities—professional, charitable, civic, and political: In the past has been chairman, Young Israel Kew Gardens Hills building drive; chairman, Queens Tuberculosis Society drive; official headquarters for Red Cross drive established in office; president of Middle Village Chamber of Commerce; counsel to Property Owners Association of Middle Village for 10 years; president, Hebrew Institute, Middle Village; captain, auxiliary police, Queens County Civil Defense; former president, Queens Division, American Jewish Congress; presently member of governing board of National Division, American Jewish Congress; member, board of directors of New York World's Fair Corp.; honorary member, Kew Gardens Hills Regular Democratic Club; officer and member of the board of James M. Phillips Association; Democratic captain and county committeeman for 18 years; delegate to judicial convention. Member of following organizations: American Bar Association; New York Bar Association; Queens County Bar Association; Queens County Criminal Courts Bar Association; Blackstone Lawyers Club, of Ridgewood; Knights of Pythias; the Queens Elks, Affiliated Young Democrats; B'nai B'rith in Rego Park and Jackson Heights; member of board of directors of Rego Park Jewish Center, Kew Gardens Hills Jewish Center, Congregation Sons of Israel (Middle Village); sponsor of Yeshiva University.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. It is my privilege to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join the distinguished dean of the New York delegation and our many colleagues in this tribute to an outstanding former Member of this body, the Honorable Lester Holtzman.

In accepting an appointment to the New York State Supreme Court, Judge Holtzman moves from the legislative to the judicial phase of our system of government.

In departing from the House of Representatives he leaves behind a legacy of wisdom and respect which will be long remembered by all of us privileged to know him.

We will miss Judge Holtzman's good counsel.

We will miss his knowledgeable approach to legislative questions.

We will miss his special competence in matters within the realm of the judiciary.

We will miss him as a good friend and a great American.

But we take solace in the fact that Judge Holtzman's exceptional abilities will not be lost to public service.

He will continue to serve in the cause of justice, preserving and insuring the ideals of our great Nation.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and genial dean always does nicely the nice things. This afternoon is no exception. Today the chairman has dealt fairly with a fine character in the person of our former colleague, now Supreme Court Justice Lester Holtzman.

Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to join with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] in paying tribute to our fellow New Yorker, Lester Holtzman.

When Justice Holtzman began his service in Congress in 1953, I came to know him and to develop a great respect for his qualifications as a man and as a lawyer. As a member of the bar for years, I have met innumerable lawyers and I have been able to discern in some of them the qualifications that contribute to greatness in the legal profession. These qualifications are all present in our good friend, Lester Holtzman.

The Supreme Court of the State of New York is one of the busiest judicial tribunals in the country and service on the bench in that court requires a fine legal mind, a judicial temperament, as well as a knowledge of and a feeling for one's fellow man. Lester Holtzman combines these characteristics to an unusually high degree. I know that as a member of that bench he will have many opportunities to put to use these fine qualities. The people of Queens County are fortunate in having such a judge presiding in their highest court.

Along with my colleagues here in the House, I wish all success in his new career to our dear friend, Lester Holtzman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, desire to join the Members of the House in saying a few words about our former colleague, Lester Holtzman, who has since ascended the supreme court bench of the State of New York.

An able citizen, a good father and husband, a great legislator, a true friend with a keen sense of humor, an excellent companion—what else can one say in describing a man? One must go far to find a more delightful person than Lester Holtzman.

I trust that he will find many years of joy in his newly chosen profession as jurist. His capabilities are such that he will find no difficulty in fitting into the new niche that life has carved out for him.

It was a great and sincere pleasure to have served with him as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join in this deserving tribute to former Congressman Lester Holtzman, who now graces the New York State Supreme Court as one of its justices.

I was privileged to meet Judge Holtzman at the very beginning of the 83d Congress, in January of 1953. He and I had been elected to our first terms to Congress in the November 1952 election. From the very beginning of our acquaintance I saw in Mr. Holtzman certain qualities not frequently nor ordinarily found in men in public service. I found him to be warm, generous, understanding, able, and he was certainly dedicated to his office. He served in this House for 9 years, and during that period of time I probably was closer to him than any other Member.

Although we are of opposite political faiths, our friendship grew stronger because I found him to be an honorable man, I found him to be a good family man, and I found him to be a human person.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Holtzman understands people. He likes people and has never turned his back to anyone seeking his help or his advice. As a matter of fact, Judge Holtzman and I were roommates during his 9 years here in Washington. I miss him very much. As a matter of fact, I believe every Member of this House who knew him well misses him.

His ability, his intelligence and knowledge of the law placed him in a position of prominence in his home county and State. These qualities were readily recognized, and last November he was elected to the high court of the State of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join and make this a bipartisan tribute in extending to his wife, Mae, and to his son, Matthew, and to Lester, my best and sincerest wishes, and may they enjoy health, happiness, and good fortune for many, many years to come.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to join with my friends of the New York State delegation in paying tribute to the Honorable Lester Holtzman, a Member of this great body for 9 years and now a justice of the New York State Supreme Court.

Lester always impressed me by his gracious and mild mannerisms and his firm convictions. He had a tremendous personality, and it always was a pleasure to be in his company.

I am confident that Lester will be an excellent jurist just as he was an excellent legislator in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, when our esteemed colleague, the Honorable Lester Holtzman, was elected to the New York Supreme Court bench in 1961, the Congress lost one of its most valuable legislators.

I have been closely associated with him for many years; I value our friendship, and because I know him so well, I can truthfully state that Lester Holtzman is one of the most sincere, dedicated men ever to have served in this body.

He served in the Congress from 1953 to 1961, where his ability as a brilliant lawmaker was evident; as a member of the important Committee on the Judiciary he rendered outstanding and conscientious service in the consideration and disposition of proposed legislation before that committee.

You will agree with me, I know, that he was always a perfect gentleman, kindly and friendly to all. He was noted for his deep interest in his constituents, his consideration of them, and his devotion to his duties in behalf of his country and the people he represented. His honor and integrity, his unfailing good humor and thoughtfulness of others, endeared him to all of us, and to all who know him.

Lester Holtzman proved himself to be an outstanding legislator while a Member of the House of Representatives. He is now proving himself to be one of the ablest men on the supreme court bench of the State of New York; his judicial demeanor, his sense of fairness, his patience, his fine legal mind and astuteness in interpretation of the law, his ability to recognize what is just and equitable, all enable him to deal fairly with those who come before him and to dispense justice as provided under the law.

His presence is missed here in the Halls of Congress. I wish him, from the bottom of my heart, many years of happiness and gratification in his duties as a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York, our distinguished colleague [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join the distinguished and beloved dean of the New York delegation, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, in his commendation of our distinguished former colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Holtzman. However, I should at the outset say that our dean's reference to the quotation from Mark Twain prompts me to observe that I am here to praise Lou Holtzman, not to bury him.

During his years of service as a distinguished Member of this House, I came to know of Judge Holtzman's many capabilities. He will undoubtedly carry out the duties of his office as a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York with the same devotion, loyalty, and integrity with which he served his constituents of the Sixth Congressional District in Queens.

I have certainly missed my good friend, Lou Holtzman, since his election to the bench last fall and take this opportunity of extending congratulations and very best wishes to him and his charming wife, Mae. They have the Rooneys' prayers for many, many more years of continued success, good health, and happiness with their fine children.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and my colleagues in this House, in paying a tribute to our good friend and former colleague, Lester Holtzman.

Mr. Speaker, Lester Holtzman is a unique man. He possesses all the attributes that make for greatness.

As a representative of the people in the Congress of the United States, Lester served with rare distinction. He was an unusually able Congressman. He combined the rare qualities of statesmanship and brilliant legal talent with a magnetic warmth, personal charm, a fantastic and irrepressible sense of humor and an inate political acumen. The record of his years in Congress reflect the magnitude of his concern for the problems of the people of his district and of the country.

As a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Lester Holtzman is already distinguishing himself as a master of jurisprudence, as a humane, humble, scholarly and wise jurist—winning respect and admiration on both sides of the bench.

I have been privileged to know Lester for almost 20 years. It has been a fine, warm, and inspiring friendship. In a way, my association with him is perhaps more unique than that of any others in his vast legion of friends. I have been both a competitor and an ally.

As good friends we found ourselves competing for the same public office. I refer to the congressional campaign of 1954. As the then State senator who represented a portion of Lester's district, I was named by my party to run against Lester for the seat he captured in 1952.

It was a hard campaign. We both gave our all to it. He was a formidable foe. He knew the office; he handled the issues like the champ that he was; and above all, he knew the people and they knew him. Lester won that election and I could not have lost to a better man.

Four years later I ran for Congress in my present district which covers the major part of my old senate district. This time I won and became a colleague of Lester's.

We served together, representing adjoining districts for 3 years. Then a great and well-deserved honor was bestowed on Lester. His fine ability, his talent for the law, his human understanding, his even temperament, his levelheadedness, his enlightened outlook, were recognized by his party and he was nominated for the supreme court in the 10th judicial district, comprising Queens, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties.

He presented a dignified, high-level campaign, based on his record and ability to cope with the high office. The field of candidates was outstanding. When the votes were counted, Lester scored the highest number. The vote reflected the esteem, the confidence, and the affection the public holds for Lester. The magnitude of his triumph is still the talk of the tricounty judicial district.

It is only fitting that we, his colleagues, pay him this homage on the floor of the House. I am sure he knows how we all feel. But we want all of the American people to know of the admiration and affection his colleagues have for him. I am privileged and pleased to join in this most meaningful tribute.

I am proud of my friendship with this fine gentleman and his lovely wife Mae, and I want to extend to both of them and to Joy and Matthew my warmest compliments and my heartiest best wishes for many, many years of success, health, and happiness.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a former colleague of Mr. Justice Holtzman, and a member of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. TOLL].

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, it was a real delight to be associated with the distinguished gentleman from New York, the Honorable Lester Holtzman. I served with him on Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary and was able to observe his unusual ability and his complete dedication to his work as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. His searching questions frequently brought out the background information which was desired on pending matters which were the subject of investigation.

Our colleague was a very pleasant companion, and constantly enlightened the spirits of his colleagues with stories in a lighter vein. I admired his strong affection for the distinguished and learned chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER. The chairman was constantly supported by our colleague, Lester Holtzman, and materially contributed to the successful administration of the committee. I hope that Judge Holtzman is successful in his new post on the bench.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the worthy successor of Justice Holtzman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a very great privilege to join with my many colleagues today in tribute to a man I greatly admire—my predecessor, Hon. Lester Holtzman, who was a Member of this body for 9 years before leaving the end of last year to ascend to the supreme court bench in New York State.

Much has been said in praise of him, and much more can be said—all richly deserved by one who is held high in the esteem of all who have come to know him.

Lester Holtzman was born in New York City, the son of immigrant parents fiercely proud of the opportunities offered them and their children in this wonderful land of ours. From early childhood Lester worked hard and long to help his parents and to improve himself. As a youngster he worked during the day to help his family, and went to school in the evenings in order to secure an education. He attended St. John's Law School where he was president of his senior class, a member of the student council-faculty association, a recipient of the Indianhead Award as an outstanding student, and from which he was graduated with honors.

He was actively engaged in the practice of law in Queens County from 1936 until his resignation from Congress and his elevation to the bench the first of this year.

Active in many circles, he was chosen to run for the House of Representatives in 1952, and accomplished the most unusual feat of getting elected as a Democrat despite the Eisenhower landslide that year. His steadily mounting majorities indicated the high regard his constituents had for his ability. I am told that in the House he easily won the affection and admiration of all because of his calm, friendly, and unassuming manner, his attention to details, and his desire to be helpful and cooperative. His interest in public affairs, his commonsense approach to all problems, and his dedication to his responsibilities mark him as a man who has won the complete respect and warm friendship of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I most wholeheartedly and sincerely wish Lester Holtzman every possible success and good fortune in the future. He deserves no less.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO].

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to our former colleague, Hon. Lester Holtzman, who resigned from this body to accept the responsibilities of justice of the Supreme Court, State of New York.

Lester Holtzman was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1952 with a plurality of less than 500 votes. In the election of 1960 he received a plurality of 74,210 votes. In my opinion, there is no better testimonial to the quality of his service to his district than the citation of these figures. Lester served his people well, they appreciated it, and gave him their vote of confidence on election day.

It is my belief that each freshman Member of this body has a few friends, in the beginning, to whom he turns for advice and counsel as he learns the functions and workings of this great House of Representatives. Lester represented the district adjoining mine, and I naturally turned to him when I needed help. He always found the time and was most helpful. He is a true friend in every sense of the word.

We miss Lester Holtzman greatly, but we are happy for him that he is back in New York, working in the cause of justice, and with his beloved family. Our loss is the gain of the judicial system of the State of New York.

I join with my colleagues in wishing for Judge Holtzman and his family a long, healthy, and happy life.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the dean of the New York delegation [Mr. CELLER] and our other colleagues. Despite the flowery encomiums and high praise that have been lavished upon him, in essence Lester Holtzman was a simple and a good man. He knew no evil, he saw no evil, and he did no evil. He was always looking for the finer things in the hearts and in the personalities of his friends and his colleagues.

A few years ago, despite personal misfortune, he persevered and returned to the Halls of Congress applying himself assiduously and diligently to the work that he loved. He was an able advocate and a fierce fighter. He appreciated the opportunities to work for the people of his community, his State, and his country. He had an incisive and brilliant legal mind. I enjoyed Lester Holtzman as did my colleagues for the witticisms and the jokes he told so well and the happiness which he brought to us with his stories, seasoned and sprinkled as only he could tell them, in dialect. No person in this House, I believe, could give people a belly laugh as did Lester Holtzman. He was a humorist in the finest sense of the word and despite the trials and tribulations of the work that we, as Members of the House are engulfed in, he made our tasks lighter. He was a successful lawyer and advocate. He had a brilliant mind. I know that when and as the litigants in his court come before him seeking justice at his hands, they will find in Judge Holtzman, our former colleague who now graces the supreme court bench of the State of New York, a humane and honest weighmaster, and to him I wish all the things that he wishes for himself and his family. I know his wife and son are proud. Very few people realize that Lester Holtzman has not yet reached the age of 50. May he reach the age of retirement and then look back with the wisdom that he will learn for the next 20 years and remember that he, too, was once a Congressman and that we still love him.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from my city of Brooklyn, my worthy colleague [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it is opportune and gratifying that we join on the floor of the House today in honoring our former colleague, Mr. Justice Holtzman, of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. It is his right and his reward that those of us who shared his counsel, were enriched by his companionship and stimulated by his zeal, join in this tribute. His years of service to his district and to his Nation are etched in bold letters in the annals of this great body. But more than that, the memory of his persistence in the course of justice, his deep awareness on behalf of human rights, and his temperate approach to the most vexing of problems left us guidelines that we may easily follow. By reason of his great contribution as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary it is a natural extension of his labors and a climax to his efforts that the people of the Empire State choose him to sit in judgment on the bench of consummate jurisdiction, their supreme court. He brings to his new assignment a modest and ennobling posture, a wealth of understanding of the intricacies and complexities of the law and an abiding affection for his fellow man which should augur a new and illustrious career to be engrossed upon the page of history he has written as a Member of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, and my other colleagues from New York in honoring our former colleague, Lester Holtzman, for his splendid record of service to his congressional district, his State and country. Lester Holtzman was a dedicated and conscientious Representative, and it was a pleasure for me to know him as a friend and associate in this House.

He was a true liberal who courageously stood up for civil liberties at the height of the hysteria of the 1950's.

Now Lester Holtzman is bringing to the New York State Supreme Court great wisdom which flows from his wide experience and training. I wish Justice Holtzman a successful and happy career as a jurist. I know his great social conscience will always guide him.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the eminent statesman from New York, particularly upstate New York, Mr. SAMUEL S. STRATTON.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy, indeed, to join with the distinguished dean of our delegation and the most respected chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], in paying tribute to our colleague and to a man whom all of us knew as a friend, a man who I know was a strong right arm of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in discharging the work of that committee. It is difficult to add to the remarks and tributes that have been paid to Lester Holtzman, our former colleague who is now on the supreme court bench of the State of New York. But, I would like to add my own brief tribute.

I had the pleasure of knowing him as a quiet, able, and very effective legislator. Besides that, he was, as has already been testified to, a very warm and genuine friend.

I well remember when I came here as a freshman Member of this body the trouble that he went to in advising me and helping me to orient myself to the responsibilities of a Member of this body. I well remember one bit of advice that Judge Holtzman gave me as a freshman Member. He said, "Don't worry about some of the other things that you are told to worry about when you try to make up your mind on a particular vote." He said, "Just remember this. Vote your convictions and then you can go home with a clean mind and a clean heart and explain to your constituents why you voted the way you did and you will not have to worry about the consequences." Certainly the record of support that he got in his district I think has borne out the wisdom of the very sound philosophy on which he based his performance as a Member of this body.

I feel sure that with that same approach and that same dedication to his convictions and to the principles which he represented here he will be a distinct and able member, as indeed he already is, of the Supreme Court of the State of New York; and we who have the privilege of serving with him wish him and his family well in his new responsibility.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to that solid citizen from Long Island, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, the 10th Judicial District of the State of New York comprises three counties, Queens, Nassau, and Suffolk. Queens is the largest in population, Suffolk the least. During the election of 1961 I had the privilege of serving as a sort of unofficial campaign manager in Suffolk County for Lester Holtzman in his candidacy for the supreme court.

Lester conducted his campaign without ever entering the county of Suffolk, so I am entitled to all of the credit for the magnificent showing he made there. Six candidates, all worthy men, were engaged in a contest for three seats, and of the six candidates, Lester finished sixth in the area where I was running his campaign.

When all of the chips were counted, however, in all of the counties involved, Lester ran first of the six candidates, and for this no one is entitled to the credit but Lester. He ran last in my county only because he was not known there; he ran first in his county because he was.

No one who has been exposed to his broad grin, his infectious laugh, or who has heard him speak seriously on serious subjects could fail to appreciate the warmth and the depth of the man.

No one who has been befriended by him has failed to be enriched by that experience.

No one who watched his attention to his constituents and his dedication to his Nation while he served here in Washington could fail to appreciate the wisdom of his Queens County constituents in sending him here.

Our loss, here in Washington, is a serious one. It is compensated for, however, by the knowledge that today Lester is serving a far larger number of people in his capacity of justice of the supreme court, and by the further knowledge that he is serving them well. No one who knows Lester Holtzman would expect him to be capable of serving with anything but his best.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to a very dear friend of mine, and a dear friend of Lester Holtzman, we having served with Lester in the Judiciary Committee. I refer to that splendid Representative from the Rockies, the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members in paying tribute to a former outstanding member of our Judiciary Committee, Lester Holtzman. It was my privilege to serve with him on Subcommittee No. 5, of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is the chairman. In that subcommittee we dealt with many problems involving civil rights, antitrust, and various other interesting and important pieces of legislation proposed for presentation to the Congress.

I always found Lester Holtzman was diligent. He attended to the business assigned to him; he attended the meetings regularly; when he was involved in an investigation he oftentimes cross-examined witnesses and brought out many facts which reflected his knowledge and ability to ascertain whether or not whatever the witness was presenting was the truth and to the best interests of the Congress and of the Nation. Lester Holtzman performed an outstanding service to the Congress of the United States while he served here. He represented his constituents well. He had a great learning in the judiciary field, and I am sure that the people of the great State of New York are very fortunate in obtaining his services as a member of the higher court of that State. I know that as long as he occupies that position he will perform those services in a fair and impartial manner.

To you, Lester, we are hopeful we will have many well-rounded decisions from your court in the future.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues from New York and other Members who have spoken in relation to Lester Holtzman, formerly a Member of this body. Everything they said about him is absolutely correct.

Mr. Holtzman was a man who was a dedicated legislator, one who endeared himself to his colleagues by his very fine and noble philosophy in relation to his fellow man.

His years of service in this body will long be remembered because of the marked contribution he made to the strengthening of our country and to the passage of sound, progressive legislation in connection with his many votes which contributed to a strong America and a firm foreign policy. He served well in this body. He will serve equally as well as a member of the judiciary of the great State of New York.

No matter where Mr. Holtzman is or where he might be or in what position he might serve, Mr. Holtzman will make the maximum contribution humanly possible. While I was very, very sorry to see him leave this body, nevertheless in his new parkway of public service in the judiciary of the great State of New York, Mr. Holtzman will render great service and he will be one judge who will recognize the frailties of human nature.

I extend to him and Mrs. Holtzman my very best wishes for their success and happiness for many years to come.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my gratitude, and I am sure Lester Holtzman will do the same, to our beloved Speaker for his remarks.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, all too often we have occasion to eulogize Members who have been removed from our midst by death. Today it is a real pleasure to speak of a former Member who is very much alive.

On December 31 of last year, our former colleague, Lester Holtzman, resigned from the House to assume his duties as a justice of the Supreme Court of New York, to which office he was elected by a large majority of the voters of the judicial district embracing Suffolk, Nassau, and Queens Counties.

Lester's career has been in the best American tradition. The son of Polish immigrants who became naturalized citizens, he is self-made and has won success the hard way.

His ability was evident early in life. He was an honor student at St. John's Law School, from which he was graduated in 1935, and was president of his senior class. Admitted to the bar of the State of New York, he practiced law continuously until his resignation from the House.

Lester first entered Congress in 1952 and was reelected with continuously increasing pluralities to the 84th, 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses. While in the House, he was a valued member of the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Armed Services, and, at the time of his resignation, the Committee on the Judiciary.

Here in the House we knew Lester Holtzman as an extremely able legislator, a warm and sincere friend, and a most delightful companion. We will miss him, but we can be confident that he will serve on the Supreme Court of New York State with distinction and honor. I am sure that he has the best wishes of all of us in his new office.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion I am very happy to have the opportunity to add a few words to those spoken here, expressing my admiration and respect for our former colleague, Lester Holtzman, now a justice of the New York State Supreme Court. Along with many others who dealt with him while a Member of the House, I had occasion to learn at firsthand of his fairness of mind and balanced temperament. Certainly no man was ever better fitted for the judicial bench, and we may anticipate, I am sure, that we will hear of an outstanding career being recorded in the discharge of his new responsibilities.

The people of New York State may confidently expect him to be both firm and fair, as we have known him to be. My congratulations and best wishes go with him, and my firm conviction that his work will inevitably strengthen the foundation of our constitutional government on which has been erected the structure of traditional American equal justice under law.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with our distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, in paying a well-deserved tribute to our former colleague Judge Lester Holtzman upon his election to the New York State Supreme Court.

Judge Holtzman served in this body with great distinction over a period of 9 years. He represented the Sixth District in Queens and he represented it well. He had sponsored and supported legislation to promote the best interests of the Nation at home and abroad. During his years in Congress he served on several important committees, beginning with Government Operations, then Armed Services, and in the latter years on the Judiciary Committee under the able chairmanship of Representative CELLER, the dean of the New York delegation.

Judge Holtzman brings a good deal of legislative and juridical experience which should be of great help to him in his duties on the bench of the highest court in our State. He has a keen mind, a noble heart, and a gentle disposition. I know he will render good service to the people of New York in his new post. The people of New York have great trust in him and they have voted for him in large numbers.

I want to take to this occasion to extend to Judge Holtzman my warmest greetings upon his elevation to the State supreme court and to wish him many long and active years of good health and good achievements.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it affords me deep personal pleasure to have the opportunity to pay tribute to my very dear friend, the Honorable Lester Holtzman.

It is fitting that we in this body acknowledge the notable contribution rendered by Judge Holtzman during his years of service here and express the respect and esteem felt for him by all his colleagues.

The saying that no man is a hero to his valet surely is generally applicable to roommates. Perhaps the best measure of Judge Holtzman's statute is that several years of sharing an apartment with him here in Washington only deepened my affection and admiration for him. He is a true gentleman whom I am proud to claim as a friend. My association with him has enriched my life and I shall always cherish the years of service with him. The House this year seems empty without him although we are fortunate to have such a fine young man as the gentleman from New York, Congressman ROSENTHAL, as his successor. Judge Holtzman's friendly personality, keen sense of humor, and marked ability endeared him to all his colleagues. His combination of intellectual power and understanding heart superbly fit him for his exacting judicial post, and we in the House know he will perform his new duties with the distinction that characterized his service as a legislator. Judge Holtzman served his district and his country in a highly creditable fashion, and he has left an enviable record of accomplishment. We can look forward to his equally distinguished judicial career to which he has brought such outstanding personal and professional qualifications.

My association with Judge Holtzman has been one of the pleasant rewards of my career in the House, and I am gratified at the heartfelt commendation paid to him today by his colleagues who came to know him well and thus hold him in so high regard. Judge Holtzman takes with him the best wishes of all of us, and the assurance of our lasting friendship.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the sad aspect of the otherwise happy occasion of our reconvention in this Chamber each January is the absence each time of some of our distinguished professional colleagues and esteemed personal friends.

In odd years, absence often represents the ebbing of a political tide, which 2 years hence can flood again. In odd and even years, absence may tell the tragedy that has taken a great American not only from our company but from the district and the Nation he represented in such a dedicated and effective manner.

Then there are other times, when the sadness that surrounds us gives way to pleasure as we hear of a new service a colleague will now perform. So it was last fall, when I learned of the elevation to the New York State Supreme Court of a Member whose association I enjoyed, whose counsel I respected, whose friendship I cherished. We in this Chamber shall all miss Lester Holtzman. I shall miss him just a little more than most of you, for I was privileged to serve with Lester on the Judiciary Committee, and on the Antitrust Subcommittee of that committee.

A keen and brilliant student of law, Les Holtzman is all of that. And his selection for the bench assured New York of a man well qualified intellectually for the sensitive and important post he holds. But more than a highly skilled technician, Les has always been a warm, compassionate human being, not simply tolerant of a point of view different from his own, but eager to hear and weigh that point of view and, if it was just, accept and advocate it over his own.

From my personal and perhaps not altogether unselfish standpoint, I am sad that Lester will no longer be by my side, at the committee or dinner table. For, as Shakespeare described such a man:

> Here is a dear and true industrious friend.

But for the State of New York and her citizens who have cause to appear before the bench on which he sits, I am happy in the knowledge that they will be accorded true justice. For, in the words of Avon again, here sits "an upright judge, a learned judge."

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve not only in the House of Representatives with our distinguished colleague, Hon. Lester Holtzman, but on the Committee on the Judiciary as well, where I became very well acquainted with him, and learned to admire him and respect his ability as a lawyer. While he is a gentleman of warm personality and keen wit, the welfare of his constituents was always uppermost in his mind, and he devoted himself wholeheartedly to his work in Congress.

It is always a matter of regret to see an able colleague leave the Halls of Congress, but I am certain that I express the sentiments of other Members of Congress when I say that we take special pride in the knowledge that the ability and legal talents of one of our colleagues have been recognized.

Mr. Holtzman possesses the judicial temperament which well qualifies him for the high office he now occupies as a justice in the New York Supreme Court. He is a gentleman of integrity and exceptional legal ability and will bring to the New York State Supreme Court wisdom, dignity, experience, and knowledge of law which will make him an eminent jurist.

Lester Holtzman has already scaled the ladder of success, and I am certain he will continue his distinguished career and bring further honor to himself and the State of New York. I wish him abundant good health and happiness in the high office to which he has been elevated.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure for me to take this opportunity to join my chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], in paying tribute to an esteemed former colleague, Lester Holtzman, of New York. I am not from New York but in the 3 years during which I served with former Congressman Holtzman on the Judiciary Committee I came to value his friendship and assistance. It was with a sincere feeling of loss that late last year I learned that he was leaving the Congress in order to become a justice of the Supreme Court of New York. I have no doubt that he will serve his State in his new judicial capacity as honorably and as well as any man. Nonetheless, the Congress, the Judiciary Committee, and I will miss him very, very much. My fondest wishes go out to Lester in his new and distinguished assignment to the bench of New York.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, dean of the New York congressional delegation, and many of my colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable Lester Holtzman who served in the National House with high honor and great distinction from 1952 until he resigned last December to accept appointment as a judge on the New York Supreme Court.

I came to the Congress with Les Holtzman. Through the years he has been one whose friendship I value most highly; an excellent legislator, and a legal authority. He is eminently qualified and superbly fitted for his new position. His background in the legal profession since his admission to practice law in the State of New York in 1936 and his active continuous practice of the law since that date provides him with tremendous legal knowledge and assures him the same high standing as a New York judge as he established in the Halls of Congress.

We wish him well.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my friend from New York, Lester Holtzman, who served as our very able and distinguished colleague in the Halls of Congress.

Although we regret losing his counsel here in the House, we certainly want to extend to him our best wishes in his years ahead as a justice in the New York State Supreme Court.

As a Member of Congress, Lester Holtzman served the best interests of his Nation. Very unselfishly, and after thorough review, he could be counted upon to support legislation which would ultimately benefit the entire Nation. Even though there might not be any direct benefits accruing to his particular district or State, Lester Holtzman was quick to recognize that as the Nation moves forward, so do the States and the people.

To the west—where reclamation projects have been, and continue to be, of vast importance to future growth and development—Lester Holtzman has been a devoted friend. We shall not readily forget the support which he, and other Members like him, gave us over the years.

In conclusion, I want to extend my personal gratitude and best wishes to a distinguished public servant and personal friend.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of honor that I join today in the tribute to our former colleague, Lester Holtzman, who is now serving as a justice in the New York State Supreme Court.

Lester Holtzman was elected to the 83d Congress in November 1952 and from then until the time of his retirement last December he made an enviable record as a Member of the House.

During this time I had the opportunity to know of this record personally for it was my privilege to serve with him on the House Committee on Government Operations. Everything he did on that committee showed his industry and his devotion to the public interest.

Although he could work long and hard for the principles in which he believed, he had a strong sense of humor which won him a host of true friends on both sides of the aisle.

I know that his career on the bench will be a long and fruitful one. His sense of justice will make him a splendid judge.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, Lester Holtzman came to Congress in 1952, and when he was elevated to the bench in 1961, he left many friends in the House of Representatives. We miss his good humor and warm, friendly personality. He was a very able Member of Congress and had a large circle of admirers. Lester and I received our law degrees from the same law school—St. John's in Brooklyn. He became a successful lawyer, a distinguished Congressman, and now his great legal ability has been further recognized by his election to the New York State Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my congratulations and best wishes for continued success to my good friend, Judge Holtzman. May he and his family enjoy many years of good health and happiness.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues today in honoring a former Member of this body, the Honorable Lester Holtzman.

From the time Lester Holtzman came here in January of 1953 I have considered him my friend and I believe that he has considered me his. He has now embarked upon a new career. This time, however, he will be judge instead of advocate. His elevation to the bench is well deserved and congratulations barely convey the feelings of his colleagues upon the happening of this happy event.

Lester Holtzman, a native son of New York City, started his career of public service immediately after graduation from St. John's Law School. He has been actively engaged in the practice of law—which is certainly a public service in itself—and notably successful in the exercise of many civic and community responsibilities. He has been chairman of the Greater New York fund drive; chairman of the tuberculosis fund drive; and president of his local chamber of commerce, a small indication of his dedication to the well-being of his fellow men.

After five successful and rewarding terms as a Member of this body Lester Holtzman has achieved an honor which will add luster to his already distinguished career. I happily join our colleagues in wishing him well.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and my other colleagues who have paid tribute to my good friend, former Congressman Lester Holtzman, of New York.

During 4 years of service with Congressman Holtzman on the Judiciary Committee I developed a great appreciation for his outstanding legal ability, his character, and his devotion to duty. These characteristics displayed by Lester Holtzman will contribute greatly to the outstanding service which I know that he will render as a judge of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

I am delighted that my good friend has attained one of the highest honors that can come to any member of the legal profession. He is thoroughly deserving of the recognition which has come to him, and I join in congratulating him even though I do feel a sense of loss that he is no longer with us to serve here in this House.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tribute to former Congressman Holtzman and congratulate the people of New York warmly on his elevation to the supreme court bench.

In my service in the House, I had come to know Lester as a warm and gracious gentleman whose contributions to the deliberations of the House were always considered and practical. He has a warm sense of fairness, a fine and astute legal mind and has been a good friend.

Anyone who reviews his biography recognizes how Lester won his success in the true American tradition of hard work and brilliance. He preserved his humility and tolerance throughout the successive steps upward in his career, the greater responsibilities and the more difficult challenges. We in the House will miss him but I know the people of New York will benefit from his wisdom and compassion.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of pride that I join the Members of the House of Representatives in paying tribute to an esteemed former colleague, the Honorable Lester Holtzman, of New York, who has recently advanced to the position of a justice in the supreme court of the State of New York.

All who know Lester Holtzman hold him in great esteem and high affection. It was a great pleasure and privilege to have known Lester, both as a colleague in the House and as a personal friend. Much has been said by my colleagues in recounting Lester Holtzman's outstanding record of achievement as a Member of the House from 1952 to 1961. Much more can be said about his accomplishments, but it is difficult to capture in words the essence of his warm personality and humanitarian spirit.

The keen wit and light touch of Lester Holtzman will be missed by all who had the honor of knowing him. Through his humor, we gained new insights, new perspectives, not possible from any other source.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations to a former colleague on his elevation to the position of judge of the New York State Supreme Court. I am sure that the experience he gained while he served with us as a member of the Judiciary Committee will distinguish his service on the highest court of the Empire State.

Representative Lester Holtzman was one of the most able and popular Members of this House. His sense of humor relaxed many a situation that was deadlocked by tension, and he helped us by his rare human insight to solve difficult problems that appeared to be insoluble.

Lester came to us in 1952, and was reelected to the 84th, 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses. Representing a portion of Queens County, N.Y., he was a man well versed in the social and economic problems of a metropolis. At an early age he saw the pressures which life in a city bring to bear upon the human conditions. His was a middle-class district and the problems of his constituents taught him the virtue of avoiding extremes. By heritage and training he acquired the compassion which is the secret of wisdom.

On the Judiciary Committee this talent was soon recognized. When in doubt on any question, we came to rely upon his integrity and his sound judgment. In lighter moments and perhaps sensing the shape of things to come, his friends would call him "Judge." It is fitting, therefore, that he has found his true calling.

Those who know him are certain that he will become an eminent judge of his home State's supreme court. And they know he will find personal fulfillment in that responsible position which is essential to the security and the progress of civilization.

His former colleagues are proud of Judge Lester Holtzman, and wish him every success.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague on the Judiciary Committee is now sitting as a judge of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

As a distinguished member of the committee he reflected a high sense of legalistic judgment in the consideration of the voluminous legislation considered for recommendation to the House. His ability to discern the true value of legal presentments as a contribution to procedures of the courts or the protection of the legal rights of the citizenry attest to his superior ability as a trial lawyer.

His constancy in the support of civil rights legislation and every question touching upon the rights of the accused emphasize his leadership as a true defender of human rights.

His fine sense of humor relaxed the committee at times when the debates became personal and acrimoniously bitter. He is a fair and fearless man. He loves life and people. His background dictates understanding of the problems of the metropolitan city community. He is a humanitarian who believes in helping people to develop into productive citizens. At an early age he witnessed the disappointments suffered by the masses in life's struggle.

He is a strong champion of the weak, but at the same time expecting those who seek remedial aid to accept their responsibility to society. He fought against special laws and against special groups of malfactors that prevented the protection of innocent men.

The committee lost one of its most talented and respected members. His broad wisdom in the law will enrich the supreme court bench of New York State. We, his colleagues, are proud of his election by a rewarding electorate.

Although the Congress has lost directly the services of a great advocate—yet gracing the bench with his distinguished fellow jurists of the Supreme Court of the State of New York will give him the opportunity to gain the eminence that his scholarly attainments will contribute to the decisions of this high tribunal—may God bless him in his future legal pursuits to give a greater service to the people with honor and integrity.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the elevation of our former colleague, Lester Holtzman, to a position on the New York Supreme Court, was the result of a wise choice. In the House of Representatives he was known as an able lawyer, a wise counselor, a hard worker, and a dedicated servant of the people. He will undoubtedly rate high as a judicial officer.

Having known Lester Holtzman throughout his service in the House, it was my pleasure to enjoy his friendship and to watch with interest his energetic devotion to his work. Affable, friendly, gifted with a sense of humor, Lester is always welcome in any company. I shall look back upon my acquaintance with him with pleasant memories, and shall always look forward to hearing good news of his success and progress in his chosen profession. We are all proud of him and wish him the best.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the life and character of our former colleague, now Justice Lester Holtzman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'Hara of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LANDRUM-GRIFFIN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Landrum] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thornberry] may be recognized at this time and that I may be recognized immediately following him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ELECTION OF THE HONORABLE LYNDON B. JOHNSON TO CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thornberry] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago today the people of the 10th Congressional District of Texas, which I have the privilege of representing here in the House, in a special election elected to the House of Representatives the Honorable Lyndon Johnson, who now serves the Nation as its distinguished Vice President.

Lyndon B. Johnson was no stranger to the Congress when the people of the 10th District recognized his talents in choosing him as their representative. He served as a congressional secretary to the Honorable Richard Kleberg, a Representative from Texas, for 5 years. Later he was appointed State administrator of the National Youth Administration for Texas, the post which he held when he was elected to the House.

Lyndon Johnson's distinguished service in the House for almost 12 years is recognized by all who were associated with him in the House. Immediately upon his membership in the House he became a member of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, where he made a lasting contribution to the preparedness of our Nation's defense for World War II.

Subsequently, when under the reorganization plan the legislative subcommittees on defense were reorganized into the House Committee on Armed Services, he became a member of that committee and continued his valued work in connection with defense legislation and defense preparedness.

In 1948, he was elected a U.S. Senator from Texas. His colleagues immediately recognized his great qualities of service and leadership and he was selected by his colleagues as the majority whip of the Senate in the 82d Congress. Later he was elected to become the youngest Senate floor leader on record and went on to become one of the best known and most distinguished Senate majority leaders in our Nation's history.

The record he made as majority leader of the Senate is well known to all of us and history will record the tremendous contribution he made to our Nation as the majority leader in one of the most difficult and trying times in our Nation's history.

All of us are familiar with the historic national election in 1960 in which Lyndon B. Johnson conducted a campaign throughout the entire United States, bringing the issues to the people everywhere and resulting in his election as Vice President of the United States.

Those of us who have watched closely the career of Lyndon B. Johnson have never ceased to be amazed at his great energy and almost unbelievable capacity for work. So accustomed have we become to his great achievements that it seems only natural that now, on the 25th anniversary of his election to the Congress, he is recognized as the hardest working Vice President our Nation has ever had.

One of the most important assignments our Vice President has is Chairman of the National Space Council. When he spoke at the Waldorf Astoria luncheon for Astronaut John Glenn in New York a few weeks ago, Mr. Johnson graciously acknowledged the contributions of others which made Glenn's flight possible. What Mr. Johnson modestly failed to mention was his own important role. The Vice President also neglected to point out that he served as chairman of the first Senate Space Committee, and therefore had a leading part in the great space accomplishments of which our Nation is so justly proud today.

Another of our Vice President's important roles is Chairman of the National Advisory Committee on the Peace Corps. So successful has the Peace Corps been in demonstrating its worth in an almost unbelievably short time that the House recently showed its great faith in the Peace Corps' mission by doubling last year's appropriations.

But the Vice President has not merely left it to the Peace Corps to extend the hand of international friendship and good will. During his first year in office, he personally visited 13 foreign countries. At the request of the President, he went to Africa to head the U.S. delegation for the celebration of Senegal independence; to southeast Asia to negotiate agreements with heads of state to strengthen defenses against Communist aggression and improve the economy of these states; to West Berlin to represent the President at conferences on the Berlin crisis; and to Sweden as head of the U.S. delegation attending the funeral of Dag Hammarskjold.

All of this has been in addition to his regular daily work in connection with his membership on the National Security Council, his attendance at Cabinet meetings, and his frequent—almost daily—invitations to White House conferences and briefings.

As if all this were not enough to qualify him as the busiest Vice President in history, Mr. Johnson, I believe, regards as one of his most important assignments the chairmanship of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Recent reports of this Committee's work make it apparent that it is going to do far more than just exist the way similar committees have tended to do in the past. It is making a sincere and effective effort to bring our American ideals closer to reality.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in the 10th Congressional District of Texas take great pride that this great American began his illustrious career of public elective service 25 years ago when he was elected by that district to this body, the House of Representatives of the United States, and we congratulate him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago today there was elected to this body from his congressional district in Texas the present Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson.

From the time of his early arrival in this body he was marked for leadership by his colleagues as a dedicated legislator, one who possessed the qualities of leadership and one who would make a name for himself in the Halls of Congress.

From a new Member we have seen Lyndon B. Johnson, by his great ability and courage, make rapid progress as a Member of the House, as a Member of the Senate, as majority leader in that body, and one of its greatest, now as Vice President of the United States.

There are few in the history of our country who have had such a consistent and rapid rise, and deservedly so, as our dear friend, Vice President Johnson, for he is not only a legislator of great ability, keen vision, a sound progressive with extraordinary courage, but his loyalty to country, party, and friends is most significant.

As Vice President of the United States, he is a close associate of our great Chief Executive, President John F. Kennedy. The Vice President is not only devoted to President Kennedy, but he is a team man. The country is most fortunate in having President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson in the two key positions in our Government, because they both abundantly possess to a marked degree the qualities of leadership so essential at all times but particularly during this trying period of the history of the world. As an American, I am happy our country and the free world has this team of mental giants and men of outstanding ability.

As an individual, I am happy, because for many months preceding the last Democratic National Convention my candidates for the nomination for President and Vice President, respectively, were John F. Kennedy and LYNDON B. JOHNSON. And, how happy our late beloved friend, Sam Rayburn, would be if he were with us in person today, for LYNDON JOHNSON was more than a protege of Sam Rayburn's; he was like a son. The friendship that exists between the Vice President and me is close and permanent. It is a friendship I value very much and which I shall always cherish.

I am happy to join with my colleagues in congratulating and honoring Vice President JOHNSON on the 25th anniversary of his election to the Halls of Congress, and my congratulations are also extended to that sweet wife of his, Mrs. Johnson, whose love and advice and counsel have always been an inspiration to him. The Vice President is still a young man with many years of public service ahead of him, not only in his present position but in other positions of great responsibility.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] in this tribute to the great Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON. I am happy that the gentleman has taken this time for this purpose. LYNDON JOHNSON was first elected to Federal office as the Congressman from the 10th Congressional District in Texas.

LYNDON JOHNSON is one of the great men of this generation. More than that to me, he is my friend. There is no person whom I hold in higher esteem or for whom I have deeper personal affection.

When I first came to Congress, I had the honor to serve with LYNDON JOHNSON here in the House; and from the time I first saw him, it was evident to me that he was an extraordinary man. He stood out then as he does today even among big men. He served in this House for almost 12 years before he was elected to the U.S. Senate. Within 4 years after entering the Senate his enormous abilities won for him the esteem of his colleagues, and he was elected their majority leader. He filled this position in a way which can only be described as remarkable.

The manner and the degree to which he was able to forge legislative records in the Senate with a hair's breadth majority—and during a time when the executive branch was under the control of the opposite party—must be counted among the most successful legislative accomplishments in the history of any parliamentary body. In fact, I have heard our great and lamented late Speaker, Sam Rayburn, say many times that he considered LYNDON JOHNSON to be the greatest party leader in the history of the Senate.

I am proud also to be able to say that in southeastern Oklahoma, where I have the honor of living, LYNDON JOHNSON is one of the most loved and respected men in public life. He is a product of the great Southwest, and we are proud that he is one of our kind. But beyond this he is a great man, a great American, and a world figure of the highest order. While he has had an extraordinary career, one that has spanned a quarter of a century in Federal elective service, he is still a relatively young man; and it is my honest belief that his greatest service, his most distinguished years, are still ahead.

I wish the Vice President, his lively wife, Mrs. Johnson, and their lovely daughters much happiness in the years to come, and I know I speak for all Americans in expressing the hope that he may continue to be of further service to our country in the future.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, at the age of 29, a young man was victorious in a special election for a vacancy in the House of Representatives from the great State of Texas.

He was not a newcomer to Washington for he had received his law school education here and had also made a deep impression on many Members of the House as an administrative assistant to a Texas Member.

Thus, he came to Washington as a Member of the House from Texas with a considerable background in the legislative process.

He became a member of the Naval Affairs Committee and it was soon apparent, not only to me as chairman of that committee, but to all the members of the committee, and many other Members of the House, that here was a man who was destined for greater achievements.

And, Mr. Speaker, LYNDON JOHNSON has not disappointed any of us who predicted, many years ago, that he would go far in the career to which he has devoted his entire life, the art of good government.

I have known LYNDON JOHNSON during the 25 years that he has been a Member of Congress. My respect and admiration for his ability, his leadership, his integrity, his determination, and his amazing capacity to mesh divergent views into a sound compromise, continues to grow with each passing year.

In 1947, when the Naval Affairs Committee and the Military Affairs Committee were combined into the Armed Services Committee, LYNDON JOHNSON became a senior member among the Democratic members of that committee.

The respect and admiration that he had established as a result of his tireless efforts in behalf of naval supremacy, was even further strengthened and solidifed by his outstanding work on the Armed Services Committee, where he soon became an acknowledged expert in all phases of defense problems.

By 1948 he had become a seasoned veteran of the House of Representatives and was ready for the next advance in his amazing career—that of being a candidate for the U.S. Senate.

As all of us know, he was elected to the Senate in 1948 by the slimmest possible majority, but he had accomplished this feat, which many thought impossible, by determination, unparalleled energy, and by convincing his constituents that he truly had an amazing grasp of the problems of government.

But his election to the U.S. Senate was merely another step in the spectacular career of this truly outstanding individual, for in 1953 he was elected Democratic leader of the Senate. As majority leader of the Senate, he made a record unparalleled in the history of the Senate.

Finally, in 1960, he agreed to become John F. Kennedy's running mate, and he was elected Vice President of the United States.

Those of us who know LYNDON JOHNSON are never surprised by his accomplishments, for his future was apparent from the day he became a Member of the House of Representatives.

This is true because he is a man of his word.

And I can state from personal knowledge that he is one of the best informed men in government today. Perhaps the secret of LYNDON JOHNSON'S success, in addition to his dedication and devotion to the cause of good government, is the fact that he always knows the subject matter which he discusses.

When LYNDON JOHNSON speaks, he speaks from knowledge. He has at his fingertips the facts that justify his position; but in addition, he understands the other side of every problem. If the occasion requires a reasonable compromise, he is always willing to bring together conflicting viewpoints.

LYNDON JOHNSON is one of the most conscientious and most dedicated public servants ever to sit in the Halls of Congress or to serve as Vice President of the United States.

He has made a deep impression upon all who know him and I will not be surprised, at some future date, if destiny holds in store an even greater achievement.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor, and it gives me great personal pleasure to say a few words on this happy occasion, in high praise of our tremendously respected, admired, and beloved Texas Vice President of our country.

Actually, it might properly be said that this is really the Vice President's 30th year of congressional service to the people of Texas and to all Americans, since his work on the Hill began in 1932 as secretary and administrative assistant to the Honorable Richard M. Kleberg, who represented the 16th District of Texas, at that time. When he was serving in that capacity, the Vice President made a notable contribution to the morale of the staff employees of the Congress by serving as the speaker of the "little congress," which was composed of secretaries and administrative assistants to the Members.

As the longtime chairman of the Small Business Committee of the House, it has been my privilege and pleasure to work with the Vice President on many legislative projects and proposals for the benefit of the small business community of the Nation. For instance, early in the life of the Small Business Administration, the then Senator JOHNSON introduced legislation to give the Administration authority to make loans to small business concerns which had suffered substantial economic loss as the result of droughts. It was necessary for him to pursue his legislative proposal through two Congresses, but he was finally successful in obtaining its enactment, which resulted in the relief of many hundreds of small businessmen, who before had been able to obtain no help under such circumstances.

In the 2d session of the 85th Congress, the future Vice President was the chief sponsor of S. 3651, a companion bill to my H.R. 3191, to create a small business capital bank system, to provide for long-term credit needs of small concerns. Senator JOHNSON continued to support this measure actively, with the result that, in 1958, it was passed as the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. Since that time, the Small Business Administration, pursuant to the authority granted by that law, has licensed well over 500 small business investment companies, which have been of invaluable assistance in lending financial aid to small concerns throughout the country.

LYNDON JOHNSON, throughout his career as a Congressman, Senator, majority leader of the Senate, and Vice President of the United States, has always been a stanch champion of the small businessman and of the little man throughout America and the world. When the occasion demands, he can be a most forceful and dynamic leader; but, as hundreds of thousands of the world's great and common people alike know, he is also a kind man, a sympathetic and understanding man, and a generous man, who has always relied more upon his friendships and his powers of persuasion than upon his position to achieve his objectives. Our Vice President is one of the great Americans and certainly holds a place in the heart of Texas equal to that of all of the other great men whom Texas has given to America.

I am most happy to add my voice to those of my colleagues and the rest of the world in congratulating and offering my most sincere good wishes to our Vice President on his silver congressional anniversary.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago today the 10th District of Texas elected a new Congressman. Although I then represented and still represent the adjoining 11th District, and although I had served in the Texas Legislature for 10 years and had spent considerable time in Austin, I was not acquainted with the new Member. Actually, he had been in Washington most of the time I was in Austin and had gone back to Texas about the time I came to Congress.

In due course this new Member came to Washington in company with President Roosevelt who visited Texas shortly after the election and who already knew the Congressman-elect and considered him a close friend. LYNDON JOHNSON was assigned an office directly across the hall from the suite I then occupied in the old building. We immediately became friends, and I have cherished that friendship ever since.

That was at the time the REA was just getting into serious operation. I have always been interested in the work of that agency, but I quickly found that LYNDON knew considerably more about it than I did. I also found that he was interested in every activity and that if he did not then have all of the knowledge that he wanted about a subject, he soon acquired it. LYNDON was close to President Roosevelt because the President recognized in him an able young man. He had been here only a relatively short time when the President offered him the position of Administrator of the REA. LYNDON very wisely rejected it and stayed in the Congress. His service was interrupted by a short tour of active duty during World War II.

Of course, long before LYNDON went to the Senate he was recognized as an effective leader in the House. Almost upon his arrival in the Senate he was named the official Democratic leader of that body, a position he held until his election as Vice President.

LYNDON is now known the world over. His friends in Washington all accept him as a world statesman, but he still takes a keen interest in the affairs of his home State, and of course his home State properly takes a keen interest in his activities on the national stage. LYNDON is now clearly the second man in the Nation as far as the people of the world are concerned, but he has never lost interest in the charcoal burners and the goat raisers of the hill country of Texas.

Texas gave this Congress its most outstanding Member in Speaker Rayburn. It has probably contributed more outstanding Members in the last two generations than any other section of the country, but no man has come to this Congress and moved up more rapidly and consistently than has our Vice President. I am happy to have enjoyed his friendship during these 25 years of progress.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my several colleagues, and particularly those of the Texas delegation, in paying tribute to a great fellow Texan and an unexcelled leader of our present day.

To me, Vice President JOHNSON is a man of simplicity, dealing with the most complicated and intricate problems.

I think one of the first things which anyone who has an association with LYNDON JOHNSON must observe is his dedication. He is dedicated to his responsibilities in Government, he is dedicated to his family and friends, and to our great State of Texas. It has always been my feeling that a man who was dedicated, who was conscientious, who did bear in mind his responsibilities constantly and who sought to do the right thing, would usually do the right thing. I believe this to be true with LYNDON JOHNSON.

It has always amazed me that he is able to pay attention to what is ordinarily considered to be little things. But he must also subscribe to the theory that big things are made up of many smaller matters, just as the fallen sparrow becomes matter in the earth again. He knows where the political sparrow falls and is ever mindful of the concerns and the interests, the happiness and the troubles of his friends. In my long association with him, he has always been willing to share and bear the troubles and the satisfactions of his associates and colleagues.

The 15 years or more in which I have been associated with Vice President JOHNSON have been a rich experience. While observing the 25th anniversary of the election of the Vice President of the United States to the U.S. House of Representatives, I feel justified in taking advantage of the occasion to express deepest appreciation to him for his loyalty, his helpfulness, his cooperation in matters of mutual interest to give the best possible service to the people whom we represent, and also for the privilege of his personal friendship.

I know there are many people all over this land of ours who join with us who have the opportunity to speak a few words today in extending good wishes and gratitude to the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many well deserved and highly complimentary statements are being made today concerning the outstanding accomplishments of our beloved former colleague and fellow Texan, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States. He is far more than a Vice President is expected to be. He is truly bearing a tremendous share of the responsibility which falls on the shoulders of the President and his official family.

He has become an international figure. In his visits around the world he has spread friendliness and confidence and history may well show that he has done more to promote good will toward our country than any man of our generation. These are only a few of the characteristics which have made LYNDON JOHNSON great. I could recite other attributes of greatness all the rest of this day and still not touch on them all. I wish to add just one thought as to why he is what he is. It is well known to his friends that he is and has always been a prodigious worker. He works all the time. Sometimes those of us who are somewhat senior to him in years have taken it upon ourselves to try to slow him down. Invariably he agrees with us that he should but invariably he does not do any such thing. All those of us who love him can do is to shake our heads and say that we do not see how he does it, and then, like good friends, we do the best we can to help him. More power to him and a personal salute from me to him on this 25th anniversary of his coming to the Congress.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is little about the life and outstanding accomplishments of the Vice President of the United States that is not already well known by every American. The fact that he has responded to the call of duty as a Member of the House of Representatives, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, as Democratic leader of the Senate and as Vice President is a point of special pride to those of us who have supported him in each of these public responsibilities.

Twenty-five years ago the principal problems which beset our country concerned the health of our domestic economy. LYNDON JOHNSON came to Congress and put his shoulder to the wheel to help put our country back on its feet again.

After World War II the battlelines of the cold war quickly began to form and LYNDON JOHNSON carried his keen interest in the defense of our country to the Senate with him. As the race in space technology got underway, LYNDON JOHNSON as Democratic leader of the U.S. Senate was first away from the starting line encouraging our Nation to move forward as quickly as possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we stand together in fighting the battles for freedom and decency in the world on many fronts under the leadership of our Commander in Chief, LYNDON JOHNSON'S horizon of duties and responsibilities reach toward every country of the free world.

It is good to know that our country can still raise up leaders to meet the new challenges of our time—leaders like LYNDON JOHNSON whose vision and capacity have grown with the problems of our Nation.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, it has been said of our friend, the Vice President, that he acts as if there would never be a tomorrow. There is truth in this characterization, as those of us know who have ever worked with LYNDON JOHNSON on any project. But it is a limited truth.

It is true that LYNDON JOHNSON is not in favor of wasting time. He is not notable for putting off until afternoon what he thinks should be done in the morning.

But he knows there is a tomorrow, all right. In a very real sense, it may be said of this man that all during the 25 years he has held elective office he has been looking toward all the tomorrows and trying to anticipate the problems they will bring.

LYNDON JOHNSON'S entire adult life has been one of public service. His trademark, one might say, is dedication to the job at hand—and his vision always goes beyond the immediate job, projecting itself into a future that JOHNSON believes, and can make others believe, will be every bit as challenging and rewarding as any past era that may be chosen as the brightest in our history.

Our Vice President is not a man who has patience with the defeatist doctrine that the United States already has hit its highest peaks and will be mainly on the downgrade from now on. He believes, and his faith stands out in all he does, not only that there will be a tomorrow—but, also and more important, that tomorrow can be better. And he has a remarkable talent for inspiring others to a similar belief and for causing them to work with him to make it come true.

This House, closest of all our governmental institutions to the American people, has abundant reason to be proud of this graduate. And, of course, being a Texan, I naturally feel that I am among those Members who have particular reason to feel pride in his accomplishments of the past quarter century and in his continuing determination to work hard today to insure that there will be a tomorrow—the right kind of tomorrow for America and the world.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting that we should take this time today to observe the 25th anniversary of our great Vice President's first coming to Congress. We all should be grateful to our colleague, Mr. THORNBERRY, for having reserved this time for this purpose.

The service LYNDON B. JOHNSON has rendered to his country during this quarter of a century has been singular in many respects. Always and in everything, LYNDON JOHNSON'S outlook has been constructive. His dedication has been unswerving. His attitude has been positive, not negative. He has sought first the good of his country, and has brought to the public service as keen and alert a mentality as we have seen or are likely to see. To these he has added a bounding energy which refuses to be abated.

LYNDON JOHNSON began to make his mark very early after coming to Congress. His skills at human relations soon were recognized. He had been in the House of Representatives for only 4 years when the death of our late beloved Senator Morris Sheppard created a vacancy to which many in our State urged him to aspire. So outstanding had been his service that then, in 1941, as only a two term Member of the House, LYNDON JOHNSON came within a mere handful of votes of being elected to the U.S. Senate. I vividly recall one statement publicly made by LYNDON JOHNSON during the course of that campaign. He said that if it should ever become necessary for him as a Senator to vote to send American men into the war then raging in Europe and Asia, "LYNDON B. JOHNSON will leave his seat in the U.S. Senate and go with them."

Before that year had ended, the sneak attack at Pearl Harbor catapulted us into that most devastating of all wars. True to his word, LYNDON JOHNSON left his seat in the House of Representatives to serve in the Navy. He became, in fact, the very first of many Members of Congress to enter the armed services in that time of national need.

This has been in one sense typical of the services rendered his Nation by LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Without asking the cost to himself, he has characteristically plunged in and applied the great skills at his command to doing the job that needed to be done.

Not to be denied, he was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1948 at the age of 39. His truly outstanding service there is such recent history that it needs little recitation or repetition at this time. In the Senate, he was the youngest man ever elected as the leader of his party, and was the only Senator ever so elected during his first term in that body. I think it is no exaggeration to say that LYNDON B. JOHNSON was certainly the most effective Senate majority leader in this century, and quite probably in the entire history of the U.S. Senate.

But it is not a time for eulogy. The entire story of LYNDON B. JOHNSON has not yet been written. This quarter century of service which we observe today is, I feel, but prolog to the great service which lies ahead of him. In his trips abroad representing the President of the United States at the direction of the President, Vice President JOHNSON has demonstrated that same unrivaled skill in dealing with people which elevated him to a stature of such preeminence in the U.S. Senate. His is a skill and a dedication which we sorely need in the councils of the world, and I salute and applaud the wisdom of President John F. Kennedy for utilizing this great skill to the utmost in behalf of our Nation.

LYNDON JOHNSON is still a young man. I am convinced that his greatest service to our Nation lies before him.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay tribute to one of the greatest living Americans of our time—the Vice President of the United States. When LYNDON JOHNSON first came to the Congress 25 years ago, all who knew him knew that he was destined for great things and for positions of high responsibility. No one, of course, could know that one day he would be the Vice President of the United States and that he would grace that office with an ability and distinction that would win for him the admiration of Americans and freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. His limitless energy and determined drive have marked him as a doer of great things, but, more than anything else, his sincerity and dedication to purpose have endeared him to the hearts of his fellow men everywhere. Our country and our world is a better, safer, and a more secure place because of him, and people of high and low station have come to rely heavily upon his fair and cool judgment.

The pace and progress of our great Nation has been to a great extent the stature of the great Americans that it has produced over the years. This being so, we can all take comfort in the knowledge that the presence of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON establishes beyond doubt that the country's ability to produce men of distinction, determination, and ability remains undiminished. It is well recognized that in this great American we have a man of outstanding statesmanship—capable of handling the intricate problems of domestic policy as well as the delicate problems of our international relations. Our great President has seen fit to share his responsibility with this outstanding American and the Nation cheers the wisdom of his choice. It is understandable that all Texans share a special pride in this remarkable native son who has demonstrated as much as any man that he truly possesses the enviable ability to "walk with kings and yet not lose the common touch."

Mr. Speaker, I most sincerely congratulate Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON on the completion of 25 years of service to our country, and I predict many, many more years of devoted effort in the cause of the Nation to which he has dedicated his life.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to request that a speech recently delivered by the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the Vice President of the United States, be included in my extension of remarks.

Texas has produced great men to serve our Nation; certainly our National Capital, Washington, is a better witness to this than some of us newcomers. One of the greatest men—if not the greatest—to emerge from my native State is LYNDON JOHNSON. This speech reflects the basic force that has made Texas great: the contribution to its common wealth by men of all racial and ethnic backgrounds. In unity and with the common cause of liberty to fight for these men of diverse background gained victory.

On this day, when our Vice President celebrates his silver anniversary, so to speak, of his emergence into the national scene, these remarks of his are a testimonial of the man.

Let us all wish him well and Godspeed and sustenance in all he does.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY UPON RECEIPT OF 1961 ANTIDISCRIMINATION AWARD, AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS, OF BALTIMORE, MD., APRIL 3, 1962

TO ADVANCE HUMAN DIGNITY

I accept this honor with a reluctance that goes way beyond modesty. I remember so well the remark made to me many years ago by a wise old Texan. "Young man," he said, "just remember that how many awards and honors you have isn't the real sign of greatness. It's how many you deserve."

I can't think of any honor I've ever wanted to deserve more than this one. I cherish the very thought that I have contributed in some measures to spreading liberty and opportunity to more of our citizens.

Yet, I know deep in my heart that I have done only what any responsible Vice President should do. I have done only what millions of dedicated Americans are doing and trying to do.

That is why I have come with reluctance.

I accept this honor in good conscience only because I view it as a token of appreciation and encouragement to those Americans, including members of the American Jewish Congress, who have worked so long to make the American dream a thing of life.

But I could never view this plaque as a tribute to me alone. You see, I got my "reward" for my efforts against discrimination long before tonight.

My reward has been an increased understanding and appreciation of what my country stands for and must be.

My "profit" has been a sharper awareness of what it is we offer when we Americans speak to the world.

MANKIND IN CHANGE

In the last several months I have been in many countries on several continents. I have seen many faces in that great mass of mankind which is caught up in turbulent change.

I have seen people who most of all need hope.

I have seen people who are yearning to be free.

I have seen people who are struggling to break the bonds of poverty, illness, and illiteracy.

You cannot work for long with the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity without achieving a better understanding of the forces that are most powerful among these people in far-distant lands.

After all, the goal of our human rights organizations is to provide for our own citizens the hope and freedom that we hold forth as a goal to these masses in other lands.

Perhaps I can explain how much I really have gained from work in this field by talking a bit about a magazine article I read years ago. It was written by a man named Libby Benedict.

He pointed out that when someone slurs Negroes, Jews, or Italians, many people often respond by saying, "Look at Ralph Bunche," or, "What about Einstein?" or, "Have you heard of Toscanini?"

Benedict made what seemed to me a vital point when he said that while these defenders of Negroes, Jews, or Italians mean well, they have the wrong approach. Let me quote Benedict:

"What a minority group wants is not the right to have geniuses among them, but the right to have fools and scoundrels—without being condemned as a group.

"Every group has about the same proportion of wrongdoers. But when wrongdoers belong to a minority group their number is magnified in the minds of other people. Minorities would gladly give up the reflected glory of their great men, if only the world didn't burden them with the ignominy of their scoundrels."

OUR OWN RIGHTS

It seems to me that if any people could take that lesson to heart it would be us Americans. For who among us has not felt the sting of being in a minority at one time or another?

I make that point only as a reminder that when we stand up against bigotry we are not being charitable to "other" groups. We are protecting our own liberties, our own precious rights to be judged as individuals.

I am sure that the President, and the many others who are giving such courageous leadership to efforts to achieve true equality of opportunity for all our citizens are doing so because they know that only in this way can they insure that their children will be free.

Why should our Government be so concerned about racial injustice?

There are some hard, practical considerations that none of us can overlook:

Our country and the whole free world is confronted with an immense challenge.

It is a challenge that stretches from the rice paddies of Vietnam to the rain forests of Africa to the steamy villages of Latin America—right on the farthest reaches of outer space.

To meet that challenge in triumph we shall need every resource this Nation can muster.

We shall need the intellectual genius, moral strength, political astuteness, oratorical skill, mechanical know-how—all these and many things more we shall need.

We must remember, as Harry Emerson Fosdick once said, that "Democracy is based upon the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people."

Whatever may be offered by a lad trapped in the slums of Harlem, or a youngster isolated on an Indian reservation, or a boy struggling along on a midwestern farm—whatever each can offer, the Nation must receive.

I think one of the most moving tributes to democracy and human freedom that I ever read was the statement by Chaplain Roland B. Gittelsohn a few years ago when he dedicated the 5th Marine Division Cemetery on Iwo Jima. He said:

"Somewhere in this plot of ground there may lie the man who could have discovered the cure for cancer. Under one of these Christian crosses, or beneath a Jewish Star of David, there may rest now a man who was destined to be a great prophet * * *. Now they lie here silently in this sacred soil, and we gather to consecrate this earth to their memory * * *.

"Here lie officers and men, Negroes and whites, rich men and poor * * *. Here are Protestants, Catholics, and Jews * * *. Here no man prefers another because of his faith, or despises him because of his color. Here there are no quotas of how many from each group are admitted or allowed. Theirs is the highest and the purest democracy.

"And many living among us, the living, who * * * lifts his hand to hate against a brother, or thinks himself superior to those who happen to be in the minority, makes of this ceremony and of the bloody sacrifice it commemorates, an empty, hollow mockery."

That is a remark which reflects brilliantly the principles of morality, of religion, of respect for human worth, on which this Nation was founded.

MORAL OBLIGATION

Each generation has an obligation to keep those principles alive.

Each generation is obligated to expand their impact, to make them more meaningful to more people.

You and I know what the obstacles are.

John Stuart Mill once wrote that, "The despotism of custom is everywhere a standing hindrance to human advancement."

We see the painful truth of this as we observe efforts to erase from our society the blot of racial and religious discrimination.

And I say this with no "holier than thou" attitude. We all have been influenced by the ideas, the assumptions, the likes, the dislikes, of our fathers and grandfathers. Each of us is to some degree a victim of our environments.

What we must do is free ourselves, and help to free each other, from the ignorance, the outmoded notions, that are incompatible with a free society in an age of nuclear weapons and space vehicles.

The recent flight into the distant yonder by Colonel Glenn was just one dramatic example of the extent to which we can overcome ignorance if only we devote the necessary resources and energy to the job.

We can also rip the veil of mystery from the dark outer spaces of human behavior if we will devote the necessary effort to finding ways in which the human race can live within a true brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

The Federal Government did not hesitate to take on leadership in a scientific effort where our goal is truly the stars.

I say that the Federal Government must be equally zealous in its leadership of the effort to solve the problems of the human mind and spirit.

One problem is that scientific progress is so easy to identify.

HATE IS NOT INEVITABLE

Progress in the field of human relations is often difficult to see or measure.

And when conflict is so much more newsworthy than amity, people are likely to become lethargic, to fall victim to despair.

But I am not prepared to accept the notion that racial or religious hatred and conflict are inevitable any more than our forefathers were prepared to accept muddy roads and horses and buggies as an inevitable part of life.

We have got to believe that we can make this country a foremost example of what is possible for all the world.

We must have confidence that we can make ours a society in which men and women of all races, religions, and backgrounds can live under conditions of mutual respect and of true equality of opportunity.

I believe that we can.

ROAD TO PROGRESS

You see, I came to Washington from Texas some 30 years ago. I remember what Washington was like then. I remember how difficult it was for a Negro to get a Government job of any importance or prestige.

We have come a long way in those 30 years.

You know, I got a sharp, personal reminder of what has been happening in this country recently when I went to San Antonio to urge the people to elect HENRY B. GONZALEZ to Congress.

We made whistle stops all over town. Late in the day we stopped near a big supermarket. I was given an eloquent introduction by a Negro who has been a friend for many years.

Then, if I may be modest enough to say so, I got up and delivered what I hoped was a good speech.

As the meeting broke up a middle-aged Negro gentleman stepped up to the pickup truck on which I stood and said:

"Mr. Vice President, I was born two blocks from this spot. And I've lived here all of a long life. But let me tell you that never in the wildest night did I dream that I'd live long enough to have a white Texan Vice President of the United States come to this corner, be introduced by a Negro, and get up and appeal to the people to vote for a man named Gonzalez."

That was a sharply touching moment for me, because until that remark was made I was completely unaware of what really had taken place, or of how much it signified in the way of change.

Yes, there's been a lot of change in the last 30 years. But there's room for a lot more.

I pledge to you on behalf of the President that we're going to produce more progress in the first 4 Kennedy years than the country made in all those 30. I pledge you that.

But I appeal to you and to the other citizens of this community: join in the fight.

Government cannot do the job alone. It ought not to try to do the job alone.

ISOLATION HAS VANISHED

You know, I am sure, that large portions of America once were so isolationist that the people there cared little what happened beyond the shores of the United States.

The America of isolation has vanished. Housewives, barbers, cabdrivers, and clerks from one end of the Nation to another are preoccupied with questions of world affairs.

"Who's ahead in Africa, the Communists or the United States?" they ask.

Or, "What about this revolution that's stirring up so much trouble in Latin America?"

Mr. and Mrs. Average American must realize that deeply involved in the crises that beset Africa, Asia, and Latin America is this question of equal justice. This fundamental human yearning for dignity is at the very heart of so much of the turmoil with which we and others are grappling.

In summing up, let me again express my appreciation for this honor. I have given you many reasons why I have engaged in these activities that you seem to think worthy of special mention.

I must conclude by giving you the only reason that should really matter in the long run.

I am against bigotry and discrimination because I think they are wrong.

I am for human understanding, for equal justice, for equality of opportunity because I think they are right.

May this country always be the kind where a man needs, and the people demand, no greater explanation than this.

I thank you.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of Texas owe a very real debt of gratitude to the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, for this great Texan has dedicated almost half of his life to the service of the United States and the people of his home State of Texas.

This long and distinguished period of service began 25 years ago today, on April 10, 1937, when the Honorable Mr. JOHNSON was elected to the House of Representatives from the 10th Congressional District of Texas in a special election. The people of his district reelected him as their Representative to the 76th, 77th, 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses.

In 1941, just 3 days after the terrible attack on Pearl Harbor, Vice President JOHNSON enlisted in the U.S. Navy and was commissioned lieutenant commander. He was, I believe, the first Member of Congress to volunteer his services in the Armed Forces. For 7 months he served as special emissary for President Franklin D. Roosevelt to Australia and New Zealand. While serving in the Navy, Mr. JOHNSON was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry under fire. He still holds the rank of commander in the U.S. Naval Reserves.

Mr. JOHNSON's service, both as a legislator and an outstanding Navy officer, was honored by the people of Texas on November 2, 1948, when they elected him to the U.S. Senate and again elected him to the Senate in 1954 and 1960.

During his time of service, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, Mr. JOHNSON consistently and successfully maintained an interest in and fought for the best interest of the citizens of his home State of Texas.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, most fitting and appropriate that the Honorable Mr. JOHNSON was elected Vice President of the United States on November 8, 1960, for he has, and rightly so, gained a reputation throughout this great land as an outstanding and able leader. His abilities have earned him respect as the greatest Vice President in the history of our Nation. He has contributed more of himself and his ideas than any Vice President in history. The respect of his colleagues in the U.S. Senate was shown when they elected him Democratic leader of the Senate in 1953, a position he held until he became Vice President.

Since my election to this body, Mr. Speaker, the Vice President has shown me every courtesy and has been of great assistance in my assumption of the duties of a U.S. Representative. I value his friendship highly. I respect his leadership capabilities.

The remarks by my colleagues, I feel, are most appropriate, for this great Texan and great American most surely deserves the respect, admiration, and honor of all Americans.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago today, the voters of the 10th Texas District elected a new Congressman. The man elected was LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, of Johnson City.

Although he had served as a congressional secretary, this young man had never before offered for public office. His election to this high office at age 28 was even more remarkable, for his home county had been a part of the 10th District only 2 years. But then, everything about LYNDON B. JOHNSON is remarkable.

He exemplifies the Horatio Alger story with a political theme. When he completed high school, he started to college at Southwest Texas State College with barely enough money to register. By hard work and initiative, he earned his education. His last college job was secretary to the college president.

After a short term as a teacher of public speaking at Houston, he entered the political field as a secretary to Representative Dick Kleberg. It was while he was on this job that he made the greatest contribution to Washington and to his own success, for it was here that he met, wooed, and married Lady Bird Taylor, of Karnack, Tex.

In 1935 LYNDON JOHNSON at the age of 27 was selected as State director for a new program to help young people through the depression by providing part-time jobs so that they could finish high school or college and vocational training for those young people who were not in school. This program was the National Youth Administration of Texas.

In this position JOHNSON put together an organization of young men who have remained his stanch friends during the nearly 30 years which intervened from that day to this. I am happy to say that I was privileged to be included in this group.

Until this good day there remain in Texas more than 100 beautiful roadside parks on Texas highways constructed by the National Youth Administration. Nearly 100,000 young people received vocational training through the medium of part-time jobs provided under the direction of LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Through his leadership and his accomplishments with this organization, he attracted the attention of the business and political leaders not only in the Austin district but throughout the State of Texas. It was while he was in this position that he first came to the attention of two men who later had a great influence on his career, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Congressman from the Fourth Texas District, Sam Rayburn.

I shall leave to others the success story of LYNDON JOHNSON in the House, in the Senate, and as our distinguished Vice President. Suffice it to say here that during the 25 years that LYNDON JOHNSON has been in Washington, he has carved a place in history. For here he is in his element as a persuasive and masterful leader. His ability to resolve differences between various individuals and factions is unequaled.

Probably, his greatest personal asset is absolute devotion to those with whom he serves—be it the President or the janitors in his office. He is always willing to give more than he asks of anyone.

The nomination for the Vice Presidency was neither solicited nor desired, but when the challenge came, LYNDON JOHNSON accepted the responsibilities with all the fervor that was in him.

To that high office he has brought new luster. To his home State of Texas he has brought great honor. To his country and the Democratic Party he has brought devotion and ability equaling and surpassing the magnitude of the vast responsibilities placed on him in this time of crisis.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I was in the Texas Legislature in Austin, Tex., 25 years ago when Vice President Johnson made his first race for Congress. I recall visiting him at his headquarters in Austin. He was dynamic and forceful then; he is more so now. Previously I had met him at Baylor University when Vice President John N. Garner was honored by Baylor University in the fall of 1936.

Throughout more than 25 years I have known our great and distinguished Vice President. This has been a rich and rewarding experience for me.

No man works harder and plans with more precision than our friend we honor and congratulate today.

Vice President Johnson is a good man and an able man, one who has excelled in countless ways. He is an accomplished legislative leader, and a very great and successful Vice President.

No man in the past 25 years has more consistently battled for a strong defense system for America than Vice President Johnson. In many respects he has led the way to strengthen and keep America strong. Moreover, we know that he has been unusually successful in pushing forward at a rapid rate our space program.

Vice President Johnson has fought a good fight in behalf of freedom and freemen. He always has kept faith with the people of this great Nation and those who love liberty and freedom around the world, and it goes without saying that he has not finished his course. In the many years of public life he has ahead of him, we know this star of the Lone Star State will continue to be an outstanding force for good and will continue to make great contributions to bring about those realities that are essential to the American way of life at its best.

We all wish for Vice President Johnson and his charming family the greatest happiness and success in the years ahead.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in eulogizing Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson on the 25th anniversary of his election to the House of Representatives.

The Vice President is my neighbor and my friend. The L.B.J. ranch, situated as it is on the banks of the beautiful Pedernales, in Gillespie County, is in my congressional district. He grew up in those hills, and he has always been a part and parcel of the community life in that neighborhood. There he is known, respected, and appreciated. I recall that 2 or 3 years ago I had occasion to spend a night with him. After dinner that evening, after hearing of some illness in the neighborhood, he got into his automobile and called at two or three of the farm and ranch houses in the vicinity. They were gentle, kindly, humble people. At each place he visited briefly, chatted amiably, calling people by their given names, and made it clear that he was concerned about their welfare and wanted to make certain that no one was being neglected in any way.

To me that typifies the true Lyndon Johnson and serves to depict the human side of his very busy life. It is a pleasure and an honor to me to join in these expressions here today. As a Member of the House of Representatives, as a U.S. Senator, and now as Vice President, Lyndon Johnson has made his mark as one of the most able and respected statesmen of this day.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, a quarter of a century ago on this date Lyndon B. Johnson was elected to the House of Representatives from the Austin, Tex., district. Washington was a familiar place to Lyndon B. Johnson at that time. He had served in Washington for quite a number of years as the secretary to Hon. Richard Kleberg of the Corpus Christi district. Long before his election to Congress, he had demonstrated traits of character and leadership which marked him for a role of importance in the affairs of government.

The career of Lyndon Johnson has been one of the most interesting and successful in the history of our country. He served the people of his district with indefatigable industry and zeal in the House of Representatives. He increased his stature in Washington and in Texas. He was elected to the Senate in 1948. Here he continued to show remarkable qualities of leadership. In rapid succession he became whip, minority leader, and majority leader of the Senate. As leader of the Senate he won national and international acclaim. He now serves with great distinction and versatility as our Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in the record of accomplishment of my good friend and fellow Texan, Lyndon B. Johnson, and I want to join my colleagues on this 25th anniversary of his election to the House in commending him for the outstanding services which he has performed for the State of Texas and the Nation as a whole.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in with my colleagues in paying tribute today to a great American and public servant, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon Johnson, on the occasion of a quarter of a century in the service of his country.

Much has been written about this great man, and I am sure that anything I might say here would be superfluous. Suffice it to say that I deem it an honor to have worked with him when he was a Member of the Senate and consider it a privilege to have served in the same delegation with him. In his 25 years of public service he has seen and has helped history to be written. He is now Vice President of the United States, and I believe the written words on the Archives of the United States may be applied to Mr. Johnson very fittingly—"What is past is prolog"—as I am sure that in his present capacity he will go on to greater heights and leave his name indelibly written on the pages of American history.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it affords me great pleasure to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our distinguished former colleague and Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon Johnson. I have served with the Vice President for 25 years. In my humble judgment, by any yardstick, he is one of the most able men that it has been my pleasure to serve with. His ability and attainments place him at the top of the ladder with all Americans. I wish for him many, long, useful, and happy years of continued success.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago today there emerged from Texas a fresh, new voice in American Government. As the Representative of the Tenth Congressional District of Texas, as U.S. Senator from Texas, and as the Vice President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson has served his Nation and people with distinction.

On this occasion of recognition of his quarter century of public service in Congress, I join with my colleagues, members of the Texas delegation, and millions of well wishers in every country in the world who extend Vice President Johnson praise for his achievements and good wishes for the future.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in congratulating Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson on the 25th anniversary of his election to the U.S. Congress.

For a quarter of a century now, Lyndon Johnson has served his country and his native State of Texas well, first as a Member of the House of Representatives, then as Senator and Senate majority leader, and now as Vice President.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, he was distinguished among his colleagues for his limitless energy and firm determination, for his sincerity and dedication to the service of the people.

As a Member of the Senate, Vice President Johnson continued to grow as a statesman and gained renown as a man capable of handling complex problems of domestic policy, as well as the delicate questions of international relations. The Democratic Party leaders quickly saw the potential of Lyndon Johnson, and in rapid order he was elected whip, minority leader, and majority leader of the Senate.

In the last post, he carved a place in history for himself as an able parliamentarian and the most effective leader of the Senate in this century. His work as majority leader rightfully gained him national and international attention and acclaim.

Today Lyndon Johnson continues to serve the country as he has always done, faithfully and with a deep sense of responsibility to the welfare of the Nation. As second only to the President among the luminaries of the administration, Lyndon Johnson has distinguished the office of the Vice Presidency by his stature, abilities, and capacity for hard work.

It is a tribute to his talents that the President has given him the position of leadership in an area of greatest breadth and challenge—space. As chairman of the National Space Council, he has had a leading part in the great space accomplishments of which our Nation is proud.

The Vice President's role as Chairman of the National Advisory Committee on the Peace Corps has been reflected in the success of that worthy project. Together with Astronaut John Glenn's epic flight, the success of the Peace Corps has lifted the prestige of the United States abroad and the morale of Americans. No small share of the credit for this must go to LYNDON JOHNSON.

Since taking office, the Vice President has bettered U.S. relations abroad through the warmth of his personality. His visits to 13 foreign countries have been distinguished by his ability to communicate person to person with the common people, as well as the leaders, of other nations. This faculty was best demonstrated by his simple gesture of inviting a Pakistani camel driver to visit him on his Texas ranch. The good done by this spontaneous offer has resulted in immeasurable good will for our country.

But the LYNDON JOHNSON story is far from an end. In future chapters over future decades he is certain to add considerably to his impressive accomplishments and make for himself a firmer, broader place in history as a servant of the people.

Toward this end, together with his host of friends, I add my wish of continued health, happiness, and God's choicest blessings.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members so desiring may extend their remarks at this time and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE LANDRUM-GRIFFIN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, on September 14, 1959, the President of the United States approved the first major change in the Nation's labor-management laws in more than a decade. His signature brought into being Public Law 86-257. That law is officially known as the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959—it is more popularly known as the Landrum-Griffin Act.

The vast majority of Members now serving in Congress remember well the monumental efforts required to assure passage of this labor reform statute. Many Members will also recall that similar efforts attended the passage of its predecessor, the Taft-Hartley Act, 12 years before.

There may, in fact, be some special significance to this 12-year interval. For it was only after 12 years of the 1935 Wagner Act that Congress enacted the Taft-Hartley law in 1947. Then, 12 years later, in 1959, the Landrum-Griffin Act became law.

We must now look back, therefore, more than 25 years to assess thoroughly our present situation with respect to labor laws, their administration, and enforcement. And in these past 25 years it is doubtful that any area of domestic concern has commanded more public attention or generated greater emotion than has labor-management legislation. The extraordinary difficulties which beset Congress in passing constructive labor legislation are well reflected in the fact that during this past quarter century Congress has acted only twice in this field—once every 12 years in a field which admittedly has needed constant attention. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will not wait again for 12 years if events show—as indeed they are already beginning to show—that earlier action is called for in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, the Landrum-Griffin Act was not put together casually or quickly. Years of experience, months of hearings, weeks of debate, and long days of conference went into its drafting. Intricate problems involving specialized industries were exhaustively considered. Every aspect of it was earnestly and thoroughly debated. Thus it was that public policy was hammered out in the crucible of the legislative process. Thus it was that Congress reflected clearly and emphatically the will of America when it passed the Landrum-Griffin Act.

The adjudication of cases under this act has been entrusted by Congress to the National Labor Relations Board. That Board is a creature of Congress, but the public policy reflected in the law is established by Congress.

The importance of adhering to congressional intent is a matter of compelling importance in all laws. In no area is it more vital than in labor legislation. This is a complicated field, highly charged with emotion and closely linked with the public welfare.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, we who serve on the legislative committee to which labor legislation is assigned have come—unhappily—to one major conclusion. And that is, that the need for congressional action seems always to keep pace with the manner in which the intent of Congress is frustrated and circumvented by decisions of the National Labor Relations Board.

I want to emphasize that in discussing this subject today we are not talking about the reporting and disclosure provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act—the so-called financial provisions of that law. Those provisions, in the main, are handled by the Department of Labor. Our comments are directed instead at the National Labor Relations Board, and at its decisions, particularly during the last year, in unfair labor practice cases. Members of the House will recall that the National Labor Relations Board is charged under Landrum-Griffin, as it was under the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley law, with the job of deciding whether, on a particular set of facts, an unfair labor practice has been committed.

The law spells out in definite terms the conduct which constitutes these unfair labor practices. Unfair labor practices are clearly defined. They are carefully enumerated in the law. This point, Mr. Speaker, is most important. It underscores the fact that the Labor Board has no policymaking authority in these cases. Congress, not the Labor Board, determines America's labor-management policy. Congress, not the Labor Board, has defined the unfair conduct which the law prohibits. Congress gave to the Labor Board the job of deciding only whether the well-defined terms of the law are violated. This is a judicial role, not a policymaking role. But notwithstanding all this, the Board seems determined to make policy—to legislate, if you please. Board spokesmen now proclaim publicly that theirs is a policymaking function.

Clearly, a review of this situation is now in order. It is time for Congress to take stock of where we are—and how we got there.

Mr. Speaker, let me first review very quickly the history of labor legislation since 1935. In that year, when Congress passed the Wagner Act, it did so to give employees equal bargaining power with their employers. But, in the 12 years of the Wagner Act, the pendulum swung to the other extreme, and union power became the unchecked force. This was partly because the Wagner Act itself was one sided—it spelled out unfair labor practices for employers only, none for unions. But that was far from the only reason for the pendulum's swing. Much of the imbalance under the Wagner Act was the fault of the NLRB. It stemmed from the failure of that agency to adopt an evenhanded and impartial approach to its duties. In any event, after 12 years there had developed a situation under which all too often employees, employers, and at times the entire national economy were at the mercy of union pressures.

In 1940, and again in 1946, Congress sought to amend the Wagner Act to deal with one-sided Labor Board operations. These efforts failed. Then in 1947 Congress finally succeeded in the task of amendment, with passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. In that law Congress felt that in prohibiting unfair labor practices by unions as well as employers, a balance would be achieved which would serve the public interest.

This, however, was not to be. We saw the work of Congress undone in major degree by tortured interpretations of the law, and by ingenious innovations to circumvent the intent of Congress. Very soon there resulted a whole array of loopholes through which the prohibited practices again became commonplace.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that Labor Board decisions may be appealed to the courts. It is equally true, however, that the courts defer to the so-called expertise of the Board, and have been reluctant to upset its decisions. In practical effect, therefore, the Labor Board is all too often a court of last resort—and when it carves out a loophole in the law that loophole invariably stays open.

Perhaps the most notable of these loopholes have been those in the area of secondary boycotts. Congress in 1947 thought it had banned all forms of secondary boycotting. In fact, any reasonable reading of the 1947 statute and its history leads inescapably to that conclusion. However, the ingenious innovations and tortured interpretations by the Board soon demonstrated that Congress in 1947 did not foresee the nimble footwork of the Labor Board.

When the Landrum-Griffin Act was passed in 1959, Congress thought it closed these loopholes. I am sure the President also thought so when he approved the bill. In fact, there could have been no doubt in the mind of the American public either, because we all recall the tremendous clamor and insistence from all over America—demanding that we deal, and deal effectively, with the abuses which were so widespread—especially the abuses of secondary boycotting and blackmail picketing. However, the pattern of decisions over the past year would indicate that once again Labor Board actions are frustrating the intent of Congress.

This is the reason we have today undertaken to acquaint the House, and the American public, with the facts of this developing situation.

Let me emphasize here that in pointing to this unhappy condition it is not our purpose to retry in the House those cases which give rise to our concern. We do not consider it a proper function of Congress to litigate such matters on the floor of the House.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. With pleasure, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the preliminary remarks which the gentleman from Georgia has made. I want it clearly understood that our discussion today will focus upon only a part of the Landrum-Griffin Act and the administration of that part of the act by the National Labor Relations Board.

The Landrum-Griffin Act consists of seven titles or parts. The first six titles, which deal with such matters as union elections, trusteeships, reporting, and disclosure, are under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports in the Labor Department. As I have said on a number of occasions, there is reason to believe that, on the whole, the Labor Department has been doing a good job, and no criticism of its efforts should be inferred from our discussion today.

It will be recalled that title VII of the Landrum-Griffin bill contained important amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act which is administered by the NLRB. We address ourselves today only to that portion of the law.

Mr. Speaker, I wish also to emphasize that by calling attention today to some of the recent decisions handed down by the National Labor Relations Board, it is not our purpose to retry those particular cases.

Indeed, it would not be proper or appropriate for Congress to assume a judicial function with respect to particular cases. I was a stanch advocate of this same principle as a member of the ad hoc—Pucinski—subcommittee appointed last year to investigate the procedures and operations of the NLRB.

For example, I objected then, and I would object again, to congressional interrogation of witnesses who have previously testified before the Board if conducted for the purpose of reviewing or reexamining into the merits of a particular case decided by the Board.

It is important to our very system of government under separated powers that Congress should respect the right of every judicial officer to make his decisions secure in the knowledge that he will not be subject to a later inquiry into the mental processes by which he arrived at particular decisions. To say this, however, is not to foreclose a Member of Congress from expressing disagreement concerning decisions made or to comment upon them.

If the Constitution made anything clear, surely it is that policymaking is primarily a function of the Congress. To be effective in the performance of that function, it is essential that Congress at least observe whether, and to what extent, its policies are actually being implemented and carried out.

The pattern of recent decisions by the NLRB gives rise to a serious concern that policies laid down by Congress, in the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts, are being distorted and frustrated, to say the very least.

The decisions themselves are startling enough. However, when viewed in the light of some recent extrajudicial pronouncements by Board members, there is reason to wonder whether the NLRB—which was created by Congress—even concedes the constitutional authority of Congress to formulate and establish policy in the labor-management field.

For example, my attention was focused recently upon a press release issued February 10, 1962, by the National Labor Relations Board. It is entitled "Member Brown Views Labor Board as Policymaking Tribunal."

The press release refers to an address delivered by Mr. Brown and reports, among other things, this comment by the Board member:

> In my view the Board is unquestionably a policymaking tribunal.

In discussing and analyzing Board decisions since April 1961, he also said:

> The present Board has freed itself from the self-inflicted dedication to per se rules.
>
> Fixed rules are easy to apply and provide the parties with knowledge upon which to predicate their actions. These are desirable results and must, of course, be accorded some weight. Certainty necessarily follows from the implementation of mechanistic rules, but it is a superficial certainty destined for disrepute.

When read in the light of its recent decisions, this extrajudicial pronouncement seems to articulate quite candidly an attitude on the part of some Board members which indicates very little regard for either the policymaking role of Congress or the doctrine of stare decisis.

Let there be no mistake about the fundamental issue, then, which underlies our discussion here today. The issue concerns responsibility for determining public policy.

This is an issue which should be of concern to every Member of this body, whatever his political persuasion and whatever his personal views may be on labor-management policy.

It is indeed distressing to review recent Labor Board decisions and find it necessary to report that the intent of Congress is actually being frustrated and circumvented.

First, I should like to comment upon the secondary boycott provisions of the law, and some recent decisions which purport to apply those provisions.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing the secondary boycott problem, let me say that too often there is a tendency to think of it as a partisan matter—as something done for one side and taken away from the other. This is not the case. Congress has concerned itself with secondary boycotts because the public interest is involved. As a matter of national policy, Congress determined that labor disputes, and the effects thereof, should be circumscribed and confined to the principal, or primary, parties involved; otherwise, in a highly integrated economic society, such as ours, each dispute could easily involve many, many employees of many employers who are not parties to the dispute. The public would be the loser.

Restrictions against secondary boycotts are in the best interests of unions, too. The secondary boycott is a weapon used primarily by a small minority in organized labor—a minority that too often has built its strength with strong-arm methods and a disregard for the rights of individual workers. The legitimate interests of American working men and women are not fostered by such tactics—and the abuses of a few give an unfair and distorted picture of the many.

The secondary boycott is a totally indefensible, un-American weapon which utilizes the concept of "guilt by association." By its use, a union makes warfare against its "enemy"—the person with whom it has its dispute—by inflicting economic damage upon the friends and business associates of the "enemy." Congress in the Taft-Hartley law intended to ban all secondary boycotts. The late Senator Taft, who sponsored that law in the Senate, said this about boycotts during the Senate debate in 1947:

> It has been set forth that there are good secondary boycotts and bad secondary boycotts. Our committee heard evidence for weeks and never succeeded in having anyone tell us any difference between different kinds of secondary boycotts. So we have broadened the provision dealing with secondary boycotts to make them unfair labor practice. (Legislative History, Taft-Hartley, vol. 2, p. 1106.)

This clearly is what Congress had in mind. However, through the years the Labor Board has not followed the congressional mandate. Instead, the Board carved out sizable boycott loopholes. For example, the Taft-Hartley law prohibited boycotts induced through the employees of any employer, boycotts through a concerted refusal to do certain things, and boycotts through a refusal to work on goods in the course of employment.

Although it was the intent of Congress in Taft-Hartley to ban all secondary boycotts, the Labor Board somehow found ways to circumvent that intent.

Typical of the loopholes was a strange holding that boycott activity was not concerted if carried out by a series of individual acts—*NRLB* v. *International Rice Milling Company, Inc.* (341 U.S. 665). Still other decisions permitted boycotts by finding that certain people did not fall within the technical definitions of "employer" and "employee." Accordingly, agricultural and railroad employees could be made the targets of secondary boycott action.

In 1959 Congress moved to close such loopholes by adopting the Landrum-Griffin amendments to the Taft-Hartley boycott language.

At the time the Landrum-Griffin bill was introduced, I made the following comment about this provision on the floor of the House:

> Present law provides that it is unlawful for a union to induce or encourage "employees of any employer" to engage in a strike or concerted refusal to do their work for one of the forbidden objects listed in section 8(b)(4)—such as to force their employer to cease doing business with a primary employer. Since farm laborers, railway labor, and supervisors are not employees within the meaning of the act, unions may now without penalty induce them tc engage in secondary boycotts. This bill corrects this by changing the word "employees" in the phrase quoted above to "any individual employed by any person." (Legislative History, Landrum-Griffin, vol. 2, pp. 1522-1523.)

In short, we clearly sought to prohibit a union from inducing "any individual employed by any person" to engage in a secondary boycott. But now we find the Labor Board literally deciding that in some circumstances an "individual" is not an "individual."

Admittedly, this takes quite a bit of doing. But this Labor Board has done it.

In the *Carolina Lumber* case (130 NLRB No. 148, 1961) the Board permitted a boycott by holding that the word "individual" applied to some supervisors but not others. In the Board's view, this depended on how high the supervisor ranked in the management scale. The result is that one supervisor on a construction job may be an "individual" while another supervisor on another job may not be an "individual." In another case—*Operating Engineers Local 324* (131 NLRB No. 36, 1961)—the Board allowed the boycott ban to be circumvented when it said a supervisor was an "individual" at one moment but was not an "individual" the next—depending apparently on whether his boss was on the job with him or temporarily away.

Frankly, the Board decisions are bewildering. What broader language could Congress possibly have used to make its intent clearer? Of course, in construing the laws of Congress, the Board is not limited to a look at the words of the statute itself. However, in addition to the literal language of the law, there is extensive legislative history—the hearings, the reports, and the floor debates—generally pointing up a clear intent on the part of Congress to ban secondary boycotts and close loopholes—not to encourage a search for new loopholes.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is more to be told. In another decision which threatens to put the dictionary out of business, the Board recently permitted a secondary boycott by holding, in effect, that a radio station produces the automobiles that are advertised in the station's commercial—*Electrical Workers Local 662 and Middlesouth Broadcasting Co.* (133 NLRB No. 165, 1961).

I might say that this pronouncement by the Labor Board will come as a real surprise to the auto industry in my home State of Michigan, not to mention the broadcasters.

In still another case, it permitted a secondary boycott by ruling that a man who distributes candy and tobacco is the producer of these items—*Teamsters Local 537 and Lohman* (132 NLRB No. 67, 1961).

To illustrate the trend of these Board decisions a little more clearly, Mr. Speaker, it may be helpful to discuss some of the background of the problem raised by the two cases just mentioned.

During the course of the deliberations of the conference committee on the Landrum-Griffin Act, a so-called publicity proviso was placed in section 8(b)(4) of the act. As first suggested by the then Senator Kennedy, the proviso was much too broad. I participated in redrafting the language; the words were carefully chosen and the proviso, as adopted, is explicit and should be very limited in its application.

The proviso states a very limited exception to a general rule. That exception, which is spelled out precisely in the proviso, provides that where the primary employer is the producer of a product, and that product is distributed by another—or secondary—employer, the union may truthfully publicize that fact by means other than picketing so long as the publicity does not affect the performance of services at the establishment of the secondary employer.

In adopting this proviso, it was not the purpose of Congress to encourage or legalize secondary boycotts generally. The proviso protects only limited appeals to the public at the establishment of a secondary employer under circumstances which are spelled out with precision.

Let me emphasize again that the publicity proviso in section 8(b)(4) is a very limited and a very precise exception to a clear general rule. The crying need for effective protection against secondary boycotts, as much as any single factor, was the motivating force behind title VII of the Landrum-Griffin Act. Frankly, I will confess that I was reluctant at the time of the conference to agree even to this limited proviso for the reason that I was concerned, even then, that the Board might seize upon it as an excuse for opening unintended loopholes.

Just as I feared, and despite the precise, limiting language which was worked out, the Board is now applying it to all sorts of situations—even to situations where no product is involved.

The point is illustrated by the *Middlesouth Broadcasting* case where there was no product flow whatever from the primary employer-broadcaster to the secondary employer who sold automobiles and only sponsored commercials on the radio station. If the union wanted to conduct a primary consumer boycott against a broadcaster, it could do so directly by simply urging people not to listen to the particular station without involving secondary employers and their employees who distribute no product produced by the broadcaster.

As I have already said, the proviso was carefully written. It should not be loosely construed. It applies only when the primary employer manufactures a product and a secondary employer distributes that product. Moreover, even in that circumstance it should not be construed so as to permit general or unlimited pressure to be applied against the secondary employer-distributor.

All of us will concede that in the application of any law to varying factual situations, close borderline situations will be confronted. However, I think Members of the House will agree that new heights of absurdity have been reached when a Federal agency literally determines, in order to make the proviso apply, that a radio station produces automobiles.

Let me cite one other development to indicate the extent to which the Board's views on this publicity proviso are being extended. At the Peter Paul plant in Oakland, Calif., an independent union was certified by the Board. Another union sought to replace the independent union, but was appropriately enjoined from picketing the plant. Then it instituted a nationwide drive against Peter Paul and its products urging other unions and their members not to buy those products. A complaint did not issue, because "the activities complained of fell within the permissive limits of the second proviso to Section 8(b)(4)." Presumably this means an "outside" union can have a lawful, primary dispute with an employer even though the Board has certified another union as the representative of the employees. And, presumably it also means the "publicity" proviso is being seized upon to protect a purpose directly contrary to the spirit and letter of the law—namely, forcing an employer to recognize one union while another is already certified—see *Peter Paul, Inc.* (20 GC 253-4)—no appeal from decision by the General Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, the lengthy congressional hearings which preceded the Landrum-Griffin Act revealed that the boycott was a favorite weapon of gangsters and racketeers who gained control of some labor unions. If ever there was a resounding call from all over America, it was the call in 1959 upon Congress to prohibit secondary boycotts. And yet here we are—less than 3 years later—compelled to report that the Labor Board seems bent on undoing the very changes made by Congress in 1959 to prohibit secondary boycotts.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out also that in addition to the secondary boycott cases already referred to, the Board has handed down a series of boycott decisions which should prove a special boon to Mr. Hoffa and his Teamsters Union. These cases hold that a union may follow and picket trucks at their various delivery stops—even though the owner of those trucks has a fixed, permanent place of business where the union may picket to advertise any dispute it has with him. This new line of cases reverses the Board's holding in the *Washington Coca Cola* case (107 NLRB No. 299). There the Board held it unlawful to picket trucks during delivery stops to customers, if the trucking employer had a place of business which could be picketed effectively.

In its first step away from the Washington Coca Cola doctrine, the Board said a union could picket a secondary employer while employees of the man with whom it had a dispute were working at that secondary location. This was the *Plauche Electric* case (135 NLRB No. 41). In that case, while the primary employer did have his own full-time business headquarters, his employees spent most of their working time at the secondary location. However, in the *Houston Armored Car* case (136 NLRB No. 9) the Board fully expanded the theory of the roving boycott. In the Houston case, the employer was an armored car company whose business was delivering money. He had a business headquarters, and his drivers returned their six times a day. The union could and did picket the headquarters. However, the Board permitted the union to follow the armored cars around the city, picketing them at delivery stops along the way. The consequences of this approach are grimly obvious to the trucking industry of America and the people who depend on that industry. The uncalled-for assist the Board has given Mr. Hoffa and his henchmen will be equally obvious.

Mr. Speaker, in Landrum-Griffin we made it an unfair labor practice for a union and an employer to enter into a hot cargo contract. The hot cargo practice was, of course, a major offshoot of the secondary boycott abuse. Not satisfying ourselves with a prohibition against the carrying out of hot cargo agreements, we said the mere making of such contracts was unlawful. We declared further that all hot cargo clauses existing at the time the law was passed would be void and unenforcible.

My understanding is that the Board initially followed a line of decision which would carry out congressional intent. However, it may well be that the Board has since undone much of that constructive early approach. In the *Minnesota Milk* case (133 NLRB No. 123, 1961) the Board seems to indicate it will examine each hot cargo contract as it comes up. Now, obviously, we do not quarrel with the proposition that each case should be decided on its own facts. However, I would like to ask this: If the Board intends to determine hot cargo legality on a case-by-case basis does this mean—as the Minnesota Milk case in part suggests—that hot cargo contracts will be treated as lawful contracts until there is evidence of their application in an unlawful manner?

If this is to be the Board's approach—and the Minnesota Milk case suggests it may well be—then, Mr. Speaker, it is just the approach that will make the hot cargo a heavy weapon in the hands of those who would abuse it—and no one need be reminded of the extent to which it was abused prior to the Landrum-Griffin Act.

If it is no longer to be an unfair labor practice to enter into a hot cargo agreement, then we will have returned to the very situation we moved to correct. For we learned that it was the small employer, the businessman without financial power to resist, who was invariably singled out and made the victim of a hot cargo provision. Now, if the making of these agreements is not to be unlawful, we will again see the hot cargo abuse become widespread in the very areas where the capacity to resist it is lowest—in the very areas Congress wanted especially to protect when we wrote the provision to outlaw all such agreements.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, where the emerging trend of Board decisions merits careful scrutiny is the area dealing with free speech. The legislative history is replete with references to the fact that the Taft-Hartley guarantee of free speech was not impaired; that is free speech was in no way diminished by the Landrum-Griffin Act. And here, perhaps, a quick review of legislative history is in order. As Members of the House will recall, the Wagner Act made no reference to free speech. Board decisions under the Wagner Act effectively prevented employees from hearing both sides of the story during an organizing campaign. It became practically impossible, as a result of those decisions, for an employer to mention union matters to his employees. The Taft-Hartley law moved to correct that, providing that an employer could discuss union affairs with his workers—as long as he neither threatened them nor made special promises to them.

And, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize that this process of erosion goes forward every day, the Congress should also know that only last week the Board disinterred an old and discredited device for interfering with an employer's right to talk freely with his own employees. I refer to the *May Company* case (136 NLRB No. 71). In the May case the Board revived its discarded Bonwit Teller doctrine of more than a decade ago. Essentially the *Bonwit Teller* case (96 NLRB No. 73) held that an employer could not discuss union matters with his workers on his own time and property unless he gave equal time and equal facilities for the union to reply. That theory, most of us thought, had been overridden and forgotten in the intervening years. But not so with the NLRB. In the May case the Board said the employer, a department store owner, was unfair in making three speeches 3 weeks before the election, and refusing to let the union use the store for the same purposes—even though the union could and did talk with his employees by telephone, through radio announcements, through newspaper advertising and in visits to the employees at their homes.

In the Landrum-Griffin Act Congress made no change in the law's free speech provisions. These provisions, therefore, still say that if the employer's statements carry no threats or improper promises then his remarks cannot constitute an unfair labor practice in themselves, nor may they be used as evidence that other acts constituted unfair labor practices.

Mr. Speaker, decisions to date have not done total violence to the free speech guaranty, but the Board evidently cannot resist the temptation to tinker with this very fundamental right. For example, in two recent cases involving employers' remarks to employees, the Board did not find that an unfair labor practice had been committed. However, because of the employers' statements it set aside elections—which the unions lost—and ordered that new ones be held. In one of these cases—*Somismo, Inc.* (133 NLRB No. 131, 1961)—the Board held that the employer interfered with the election when he said the union's promises were ridiculous, and that if the union demanded the benefits it was promising the company might have to go out of business. In the other case—*Cole Mfg.* (133 NLRB No. 130, 1961)—the Board held that the employer interfered with the election when he said prior organizing efforts had resulted in the loss of business and that business would improve and working conditions would be better if the union lost.

Admittedly, the law does not say anything about setting aside elections where questions of free speech are involved. I mention these cases, therefore, only to ask whether they indicate a developing trend in the wrong direction.

However, the *Worth Mfg.* case (134 NLRB No. 40) adds a new and dangerous dimension. It indicates a return to the discredited practice of viewing an employer's utterances in the light of what the Board has called "all of the surrounding circumstances." In the Worth case, this meant that lawful speech and other lawful conduct—occurring separately—were coupled to support a finding that an unfair labor practice had been committed. If this is to be the Board's standard regarding free speech—and I fear that events promise it will be—we will have returned to the pre-Taft-Hartley situation when an employer could not safely express to his employees any views or opinions on labor matters. The inevitable result was then—and will be again—that during an organizing campaign employees were forbidden to hear both sides, and could not, therefore, secure the full information necessary for an intelligent and informed decision.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recall for Members of the House that in 1959 the public and the Congress were deeply disturbed over the abuses of blackmail picketing. I should like to ask my friend from Michigan to discuss the experience to date with Labor Board decisions affecting provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act which were designed to outlaw the practice of blackmail picketing.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I should like now to consider certain Labor Board decisions affecting provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act which were designed to outlaw the practice of blackmail picketing.

Here again I am forced to say that decisions have not supported the intent of Congress.

In the *Calumet Contractors* case (133 NLRB No. 57, 1961), the Board permitted one union to picket in an effort to force an employer to adopt that union's standard contract—even though the employees were already represented by another union which was certified by the Labor Board. Apparently, the Board's reasoning was based on the notion that such picketing was lawful if the outside union merely goes through the motions of disclaiming intent to seek recognition from the employer.

In a later case (*Houston Building Trades*, 136 NLRB No. 28), the Board cast off any sign of earlier restraint and extended its Calumet theory to apply to organizational picketing as well.

At this point, it should be emphasized that section 8(b)(7) applies to picketing where "an" object is to force or require recognition or bargaining. Obviously, it was intended that the provision should apply even though the picketing may be carried on for other purposes as well.

In the *Crown Cafeteria* case (135 NLRB No. 124), the Board reversed its own earlier decision. It had rejected the union's argument that picketing for recognition became protected activity if the picket signs merely indicated a purpose to inform the public that the employer was "nonunion."

In its first *Crown* decision (135 NLRB No. 124), the Board said that to accept this union contention would be to render the statute "meaningless, at the whim of a picketing union." However, in its later decision of the same case, a majority of the Board reversed the earlier decision and adopted the union's argument—thereby opening wide the very loophole which the Board itself had pointed out in its first decision. Under the latter ruling, it would appear that proscribed recognition picketing can be legalized if the union merely includes on its signs a statement that the employer is "nonunion," or does not have a contract with the union doing the picketing.

In still another case, a majority on the Board said that picketing, otherwise proscribed, will be permitted if the union, when it files an election petition, merely files also an unfair labor practice charge against the employer. (*C. A. Blinne*, 135 NLRB No. 121.) Here the Board said it would not act against the picketing while an unfair labor practice charge is pending—even though the charge is groundless. In its decision the Board said:

> The fact that a timely petition is on file will protect the innocent union, which through mistake of fact or law has filed a groundless unfair labor practice charge.

This is an astounding invitation extended by the Board to circumvent the law. The very theory suggested by a majority of the Board was considered and flatly rejected in the conference on the Landrum-Griffin Act. The one limited exception to this statement was spelled out with precision and provides only that a charge based upon section 8(a)(2), will constitute a defense if there is reason to believe the charge is true.

Members of the House will also recall that we intended in the Landrum-Griffin Act to prevent one of the most flagrant of all blackmail picketing abuses—the practice of picketing after a union had lost a Labor Board election. On this point, Mr. Speaker, I would recall my own comments at the time this provision was introduced:

> The NLRB has attempted to give some relief to employers and employees victimized in such situations by holding it an unfair labor practice for a union to picket for recognition after it has lost an election. While such relief seems called for, nevertheless the courts of appeal are in conflict as to whether the Board has even this limited power. (Legislative History, Landrum-Griffin, vol. 2, p. 1523.)

In the Landrum-Griffin Act we sought to deal with this problem by prohibiting such picketing where a valid Labor Board election had been held within the preceding 12 months. But it appears that this congressional directive was not clear enough for the Labor Board. Let me illustrate. In one case (*Bachman Furniture*, 134 NLRB No. 54) the Teamsters Union consented to a Board election—and lost. Thereafter the union tried to have the election set aside claiming the employer had committed an unfair labor practice. The Board's regional director refused to set the election aside pointing out that the union had consented to the election after the employer's alleged misconduct had occurred. The employer, the union, and the Board's regional director then entered into an agreement settling the union's charge of unfair labor practice.

However, less than a month after all this had transpired, the Teamsters Union threw up a picket line around the employer's place of business. He promptly filed a charge for picketing within 12 months after a valid Board election. The Board dismissed the complaint, apparently accepting the Teamsters' claim that they were not seeking recognition—but were picketing just for the "satisfaction of letting the people know" that this employer had committed an earlier unfair labor practice.

In order to regulate "blackmail" organizational picketing, we provided in the Landrum-Griffin Act a speedy election procedure.

In a recent case, the Board found that a union was picketing for recognition and organization. It ordered an expedited election, and the union lost. However, the union continued its picketing. Then, on reconsideration, the Board decided to apply its Crown Cafeteria doctrine and held that since the union's signs said the employer was nonunion, the picketing was protected after all. Then, the Board reasoned, since the picketing was protected it should not have held the expedited election. Thus, it concluded, since the election should not have been held, how could this be picketing within the 12 months following a valid election?

And, as befits such an outlandish holding, this case was one where the employees voted unanimously against the union. (*G. R. Kinney Company, Inc.*, 136 NLRB No. 24.)

Mr. Speaker, incredible as it may seem, the Board, with the application of strained and tortured reasoning, has handed down a series of decisions which, in their total effect, operate to legalize many of the picketing and boycott abuses which Congress, through the Landrum-Griffin Act, sought to eliminate.

Mr. LANDRUM. In another significant development, Mr. Speaker, the Board indicates it will limit an employer's right to use economic pressure on his own behalf during a strike. This, despite the fact that as recently as 1960, the Supreme Court ruled that "the use of economic pressure by the parties to a labor dispute is part and parcel of the process of collective bargaining." (*NLRB* v. *Insurance Agents International*, 361 U.S. 477.) The Insurance Agents case held that the Board had no authority to "act at large in equalizing disparities of bargaining power between employer and union"—and no right to police for the parties their choice of economic tactics.

By attempting to do so, the Board—in the words of the Court—was moving into an "area of regulation which Congress had not committed to it." Now, however, in two 1961 decisions (*Erie Resistor Corporation*, 132 NLRB No. 51, and *Crestline Company*, 133 NLRB No. 30) the Board displays its disagreement with the policy enunciated in the *Insurance Agents* decision. In the *Erie* case it denied the employer's right to grant so-called super-seniority to strike replacements, because of the economic pressure on the union to end the strike. In the *Crestline* case the Board said an employer could not change employees' benefits during collective bargaining negotiations—even after the prior contract had expired. It held that such changes might put economic pressure on the union and the employees to accept the employer's proposals.

It would seem, therefore, that the Board is unwilling to accept the fact that true bargaining must be a two-way street, and that both sides should be free to use lawful economic pressures on each other.

Mr. Speaker, in our discussion today we have singled out patterns of Labor Board decisions in recent months which give rise to our concern. We believe the developing trend of future decisions will bear close watching.

I should like to reiterate—on behalf of myself and my colleague from Michigan—that it is not our intention to retry any of these cases on the floor of the House.

It is, however, our intention to publicize what the Labor Board is doing; to focus attention on patterns of decision which conflict with the intent of Congress.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the text of the press release referred to in my earlier remarks is as follows:

[Press release, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C.]

MEMBER BROWN VIEWS LABOR BOARD AS POLICYMAKING TRIBUNAL

Gerald A. Brown said Friday night he views the National Labor Relations Board, of which he is a member, as a policymaking tribunal which must be sensitive to the changing patterns of the economic scene, within limits set by judicial review of the five-man Board's decisions.

Speaking before the Duke University Institute on Labor Law, Mr. Brown reviewed decisionmaking developments since last April, when he joined the Board which administers the Nation's basic labor relations statute.

The Board member, discussing recent decisions and analyzing changes during the period, said that "the present Board has freed itself from the self-inflicted dedication to 'per se' rules."

"It is hoped," he said, "that this resurrected freedom to act on the merits of individual cases will enhance responsible decisionmaking and better enable the Board to serve the public interest which the act was intended to promote.

"This is my opinion even though recognizing that some 'per se' rules have existed since the early days of the statute, and others may be justified. The difference, however, is not only one of degree. The significance is primarily one of approach."

Mr. Brown, who rose through the ranks of NLRB employees and was appointed to the Board after 14 years' service as regional director at San Francisco, set out his concept of the agency while discussing recent decisions which have modified and altered certain previous doctrines.

In his first public address as a Board member, Mr. Brown said:

"The NLRB is charged with the promotion of a public policy which is, in essence, the encouragement of collective bargaining as the democratic method of solving labor problems. * * * The unique fact that day-to-day relationships among employers, employees, and unions persist even after the litigation and that the Board's resolution of a given dispute will do much to shape these future relations should not be disregarded. Board decisions should therefore be directed at providing pragmatic solutions. * * *

"In my view the Board is unquestionably a policymaking tribunal. Given an awareness of this fundamental truth and in the absence of any ill-conceived attempt to disavow authority, we will be one step closer to responsible decisionmaking. Under this system changes are inevitable. Changes should come when a prior good policy becomes outmoded or upon recognition that a prior rule was not sound to begin with or has not worked out as expected, or when experience indicates better approaches."

Mr. Brown said the Board's policymaking authority is limited by the effective check of judicial review.

He cited the April 17, 1961, decisions of the Supreme Court which set aside the Board's Mountain Pacific and Brown-Olds doctrines.

"Under these Supreme Court interpretations," Mr. Brown said, "hiring hall arrangements were no longer illegal per se. Evidence of discrimination rather than an automatic presumption was necessary to find an unfair labor practice. Furthermore, even assuming the existence of an unlawful closed-shop arrangement, employee-union members were no longer automatically entitled to reimbursement of union dues and initiation fees. Evidence that union membership was influenced in violation of the act was now an indispensable element. In a word, the bubble had finally burst and with it these so-called per se rules floated to their timely demise.

"I attach particular significance to the Supreme Court's aforementioned tacit indictments of these 'per se' rules, perhaps as much because they coincided with my appointment to the NLRB as because they echo my emphatic belief that independent analysis on a case-by-case basis must be substituted for mechanical rules.

"Fixed rules are easy to apply and provide the parties with knowledge upon which to predicate their actions. These are desirable results and must, of course, be accorded some weight. Certainty necessarily follows from the implementation of mechanistic rules, but it is a superficial centainty destined for disrepute."

Discussing his participation in Board decisons the last 10 months, Mr. Brown asserted: "The normal demands of any transitory age, moreover, cry out for an attitude of flexibility. My initial actions as a Board member have been directed at the attainment of this goal. * * * In my opinion, the Board's most recent decisions depict a definite movement away from the rubber stamp of 'per se' cases. This trend has manifested itself in an impressive variety of representation and unfair labor practice cases."

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON TRANSPORTATION

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on transportation, submitted to Congress last week, represents a long stride forward. I welcome it particularly because it embodies and strongly supports much of my own thinking in this area. I feel particularly sensitive to these problems because I have lived with them for a number of years, both in the Connecticut State Senate and as a Member of Congress. In Connecticut, and in particular Fairfield County, which I am honored to represent, we are greatly aware of the most critical aspects of this problem. A large portion of the population of my district is dependent directly on the New Haven Railroad for getting to work in New York City. The entire population is dependent on this railroad, directly and indirectly, for its economic stability. The railroad is in bankruptcy, its future largely dependent on wise decisions by Federal, State, and local governments. The Federal Government is already deeply committed financially to the welfare of the railroad.

This is the most serious local problem in Connecticut. I came to Congress with the implied commission from the voters of my district to do everything I could to help solve the problem. I have long urged the formation of a compact between my State and the State of New York to form the basis of a regional solution to the commuter problem. In April of 1961, I introduced H.R. 6705, which envisioned the creation of such a compact, with the door left open for other interested States to join. This bill adopts the unusual principle of providing for congressional approval of an interstate compact in advance not only of any such compact but even of beginning negotiations for such a compact. Nevertheless, I felt that the unusual and urgent circumstances required this stimulation from the Congress. Accordingly, I was most gratified to have the President's strong endorsement of the principle of advance approval incorporated as a part of his message on transportation.

I was also glad to see him urge repeal of the excise tax on passenger travel. In February of 1961, I introduced H.R. 4465, that would repeal this tax. There were other identical bills. At that time, the administration and the Democratic majority in Congress were opposed to this, although it had solid Republican support in committee. I hope the Ways and Means Committee will discharge this measure in the near future and I have written the distinguished chairman of the committee to that effect.

As a further concrete reflection of my continuing concern over the present state of governmental policies to the transportation industry, I also introduced H.R. 8364 last July. This calls for a national transportation policy and provides specifically for the Secretary of Commerce to undertake a census and analysis of all transportation so that we in Congress as well as the President might know exactly the relationships of the Government to all aspects of the transportation industry.

This survey would encompass all governmental regulations and assistance programs. It is essential that we have before us precise information before we take broad corrective action. We should know whether we may be giving too much assistance to one form of transportation and whether other forms are being unduly penalized. This is an extremely complicated task but I have been assured by persons conversant with the problem that it can be done and well done.

In addition, I welcome the President's proposal for research and development of more efficient and modern commuter facilities. The problems of safely transporting large numbers of daily travelers through the growing urban and suburban congestion are very great. We must not let them strangle us before we can solve them. Therefore, I was most encouraged by the President's endorsement of this approach as well.

Now that we have received the transportation message, which fits pending legislation so squarely, let us get on with the job. Few domestic problems are as important at this time.

A CRACK IN A SOCIALIST ILLUSION

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing and reading much these days about Government-sponsored medical programs. It behooves those favoring Federal intervention into this field to be advised of the side effects of socialized medicine in England. An editorial in the Wall Street Journal of April 10, 162, discusses one of these side effects—a dwindling supply of British doctors. The editorial follows:

A CRACK IN A SOCIALIST ILLUSION

Every poll that has ever been taken in Britain shows that the majority of people there are in favor of their socialized medical program where all is free and no man need worry about a doctor's bill.

So if popularity is the test, it has been a political success. But now there is beginning to appear an ominous crack in the happy illusion that the British have, by socializing their medicine, thereby banished their medical cares. Doctors' bills have vanished. Now the doctors are vanishing, too.

The fact of a dwindling supply of British doctors in Britain is now unquestioned; it has been the subject of worried discussion in economic and medical journals, in magazines and newspapers and in Parliament. The article we publish this morning from the British Medical Journal is typical of some of the widespread concern.

Briefly, here is what has happened:

In the early years of the National Health Service young British students entered the medical schools in their accustomed number and some of the schools even showed an increase in total enrollment. The figures on the licensing of new doctors in Britain also were increasing. All seemed to be well, and in 1957 the Government planners were even urging an immediate reduction in the number of medical students.

Suddenly everybody woke up to the fact that British medical students weren't converting themselves into British doctors. Increasing numbers of them were going off to Canada, Australia, America and other backward places where a doctor is not in effect a government clerk. Meanwhile, doctors from India, Africa, and other emerging nations—some of whom studied in Britain, some of whom studied in their own countries—came to Britain and found ready posts in hospitals vacated by the British doctors going elsewhere.

So while a statistician might find the situation little changed by the advent of socialized medicine, the fact is that the British medical situation has changed dramatically.

Today about one half of all emergency surgery in Britain, to choose one measurable example, is done by non-British-trained doctors. More intangibly but importantly, the professional journals are full of criticism of the quality of British medical practice.

So there is now in Britain a great hullabaloo about what to do to get more able young Englishmen to be English doctors. Yet there are very few so far to ask the simple question: Why should a young English boy want to be an English doctor?

The training for medicine is one of the longest and most arduous of any career. To go through it a young man must be moved by many motives. But those would surely include a desire to make a good living, to enter a profession where he could be his own master and not a hired employee, to have the self-satisfaction of being respected by his community as "the doctor" has ever been. And not the least of the motives is a desire to give to the sick person who comes to him the best care he can provide.

British socialized medicine has taken away every one of those motives, without exception.

The young British doctor, for all his years of study, is paid like a clerk. He is not a "professional man" but a government functionary, and in becoming so he loses the status the doctor once had. He is not his own master even in the practice of his skills. Finally, because the "free" care crowds his anteroom he cannot give to the patient before him the time, energy, and care he would like to as a good doctor.

Why should anybody be surprised, under such a system, that the able young men are looking elsewhere? Or that thoughtful men should begin to be troubled about the quality of medical care?

Whether all this will in time affect the popularity of the medical program in Britain, we do not know.

But watching it all from afar, we can't help but reflect that here is one place above all where bright and shining promises can cheat the unfortunate while they happily suppose they are counting their blessings.

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. Celler] in paying tribute to our friend and former colleague, Judge Lester Holtzman. I had the pleasure of serving on the House Judiciary Committee while Lester Holtzman was a member of the committee.

I and all of us on the committee had the highest regard for Lester Holtzman. We valued his professional approach to every problem, and his courtesy and kindness to all of his colleagues.

Not only was he a good Congressman, but Lester Holtzman always brought to the Congress, and to us, a sparkle of humor and a wit that cheered our lives. We can always use more of this. Lester is never unkind. He sees the good side of everyone. And he is always ready to extend a helping hand to a colleague.

We miss Lester Holtzman in the House of Representatives. I often think of him as we meet in Judiciary Committee and on the floor of the House, and I recall with many pleasant memories the associations that we had.

Judge Holtzman will be an excellent judge, and will bring credit to the judiciary as he did to the Congress. We wish him lots of luck and happiness.

THERMOMETERS OR THERMOSTATS

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Paul F. Schenck, our distinguished colleage of the Third District of Ohio, and with whom I have the pleasure of serving with on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and who has served diligently and most constructively as a member of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, recently gave a most inspiring talk before the Cincinnati Engineering Society. I should like to insert his talk in the Record at this point:

Mr. Chairman, members of this distinguished engineering society, and guests, it is well for me to explain right in the beginning that I am not an unusually good or even an average good public speaker, because these facts will become all too evident to your analytical and engineering-type minds as we go along. In fact, it would seem my principal function here tonight is sort of a "warmup man" to prepare you for the really important and specific engineering paper which is to be delivered by my very good friend, Vernon MacKenzie, who is properly recognized as one of the outstanding authorities in his field.

Mr. MacKenzie comes from a city which many believe, depending upon your individual point of view, of course, is the real air pollution center of the entire Nation. Some unkind folks have the effrontery to suggest that the exhaled air pollutants from Washington create a more dangerous fallout than could possibly occur from nuclear testing because thus far, at least, no shelter has yet been engineered to protect the trusting and unsuspecting souls of our great Nation against the subtle yet nonetheless real dangers emanating from the seemingly never ending stream of spoken and printed words. Here is a real challenge for you engineers. Seldom has it been so necessary to create and develop a really workable protection for the benefit of all mankind now and in the future. So, if I can develop a thought or two that you might feel is worthy to be remembered, even after you hear the scholarly and technical discussion which will be presented by my good friend, Vernon MacKenzie, I shall feel amply rewarded for not having wasted your time entirely.

I am not, of course, an engineer and, therefore, I have no hesitancy in thinking and talking with you for a little while about some engineering problems. That would seem to be par for the course.

More than 40 years ago my dad and I were in the automotive tire, battery, and service business. During those days when tires were guaranteed for 3,000 miles we had no hesitancy in cutting an entire section out of a tire, building it back up, and vulcanizing a new section in place. Those were the days also when a 6-volt, 11-plate battery sold for $38 and so we would regularly tear them down, replace wornout plates, or install new red cedar separators. Those were the days too when, if the engine knocked when power was applied, we called it a carbon knock. This was a simple repair, too, because we would just unscrew spark plugs, turn the crankshaft over until the piston was on top dead center of the power stroke, drop a lighted match in the cylinder, turn on a jet of pure oxygen from a big pressure tank and burn out the carbon. If we happened to warp a valve or two—who cared—it was only a 2- or 3-hour job at 50 cents an hour to grind the valves. The trained and experienced ear of the mechanic was all that was necessary to determine a whole lot of things such as the cause of an engine knock or whether or not each cylinder had the same powerful exhaust noise.

If the old cork float in the carburetor didn't shut off properly, it was quite simple to remove it and give it a few coats of shellac to make it as good as new. No one worried about gum or varnish in the carburetor because there was none.

Some 40 years ago some of us got an idea that if we could suck the unburned gasoline vapor—no one called it unburned hydrocarbons then—from the crankcase back through the carburetor by a cheap flexible tube we could get a little better gas mileage. And so the idea of burning up blowby gas is not new and while it is a step in the right direction, it is not a solution.

No one ever thought of the front end of an automobile as having geometry. If the front wheels had a tendency to cut in under the car when we turned around or went around a corner, all we had to do was to bring out a big heavy wrench with a handle about 6 feet long, put it on the front axle and bend it up a little—just a 50-cent repair job and it was 50 cents only because a man had to stop doing something else and lug a heavy wrench out to the street while the folks sat in the car. Not so, of course, any more. Now we must have a front end alinement rack at $9 or $10 per. A very able young man in Dayton by the name of Charles Kettering first took the crank off of a cash register and replaced it with an electric motor. Then it seemed to him there should be a better way to start an automobile engine than to get out in front of it on a muddy road and by hand cranking run chances of either breaking an arm or getting run over. So he invented the starter and a whole new electrical system for ignition, lights, and horn. Anyone should have been satisfied after doing these things, but not Boss Kettering. He never stopped wondering about things and trying to find answers. So he began to wonder about engine knocks. He and his friend, Tom Midgley, thought if some way could be discovered to increase engine compression and thus engine power, smaller engines could be used And so they worked out a way to take a picture of the explosion inside a compression chamber. They felt that if the characteristics of the explosion could be changed by adding something to the gasoline they would have the problem licked. After a great many experiments tetraethyl lead was developed and ethyl gasoline came into being. Boss Kettering, Tom Midgley, and their associates did solve many problems and, as so often is the case, they created new ones. If either of them were alive today they would be right in the middle of our discussions on air pollution here tonight.

Back in 1956 our original Committee on Highway Traffic Safety conducted some hearings in Detroit on many of our very important problems in connection with the urgent need for greater highway safety to stop the slaughter and terrible injuries of people on our highways. This is a subject which I hope you will consider in future meetings, because of its extreme importance. Many things need to be done in this field. While we were in one laboratory, however, I saw some carburetor tests being run and became interested all over again in automotive exhaust gases, so I determined to do something about it if possible.

With the full cooperation of my good friend and colleague, Congressman Kenneth Roberts, of Alabama, chairman of our committee, we scheduled some hearings and we developed some startling information. These hearings became the basis for several bills I introduced in the Congress on this subject and finally my bill, H.R. 8238, was approved and signed into law by President Eisenhower, on June 8, 1960.

This bill, the first on this subject to be introduced in the Congress and enacted into law, and is known as the Schenck Act, Public Law 86-493. Under this law the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service is authorized and directed to conduct research to determine the substances in automotive exhaust gases which are harmful to human health. This work has been carried forward under the very capable supervision and direction of our good friend, Vernon MacKenzie, and his associates. He, I know, will describe these operations and results in some detail and I want to express my personal appreciation and my pride and satisfaction with the very wonderful results which have been accomplished by all the scientists and the engineers who have worked on this very important question. I also want to assure you that I have complete confidence in the engineers and scientists in the automotive industry and I know that once the problems are defined, workable and completely satisfactory methods will be developed to adequately meet these problems. Of this, I have absolutely no doubt.

Last week President Kennedy sent the Congress a message calling for some additional legislation to protect consumers' interests. I am glad that I was able to anticipate the automobile exhaust air pollution problem over 2 years ago and that proper steps have been taken. It is a source of personal satisfaction to me to note that President Kennedy stated that additional legislation does not appear required at this time.

The harmful effects of automotive exhaust gases is receiving a great deal of much warranted attention now and for this I am grateful.

Testimony before the Appropriations Committee last year indicated that air pollution causes $7.5 billion loss annually in damage to vegetation, livestock, metals, and other materials. This can be shown to be factual. Damage of $3 million has been reported every year since 1953 in the Los Angeles area alone. Again, one area in the State of Washington supported 2,000 cows prior to the establishment of an industrial plant. Result of air pollution on vegetation? Now only 100 cows can be raised in the area. Many other States have been similarly affected—Florida, Idaho, Montana, New Jersey, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah—just to mention a few. So there are serious economic effects in addition to those on health.

And now in the brief time remaining to me and with your indulgence, I would like to discuss politics with you. Much as I would like to discuss partisan politics with you, I shall not encroach upon your friendship at this time and so I would just like to make the best nonpartisan Republican appeal that I can.

As professional and trained engineers, you are all well acquainted with and know the functions of thermometers and thermostats. I would like to ask each of you a personal question and ask each of you to make your own decision in the privacy of your own heart and conscience. Which are you? A thermometer which just takes note of the conditions around you and goes along with whatever they are, or are you a thermostat which triggers a change toward more favorable conditions and then tries to maintain those conditions.

With your indulgence, I would like to raise some questions and give you some information so that in the privacy of your own thoughts you can make some personal decisions as to whether you want to be a thermometer and just go along or a thermostat that seeks to get some measure of control within applicable limits. If you are a thermostat, just where or between what points will you personally decide to take whatever action you deem appropriate?

Time will not permit me to go into much history but I invite you to go back and read the history of the Greeks and the Romans. There are some very bright spots in the histories of these two great cultures and there are some very dark spots.

You will find in the history of both that their finest hours and their greatest achievements came during the period when their citizens had the freedom of choice and self-determination—when their people could, would, and did decide to do things through their own decisions and by their own initiative, determination, and actions. But this takes courage and willpower, and determination, and a willingness to abide by sound principles in the best interest of all.

And then there came the Dark Ages in both of these great cultures in the history of the Greeks and the Romans. This came about when the people said we are tired—we don't want to look after ourselves—we want others to look after us and care for us—so won't you feed, clothe and shelter us? This change in attitude—this willingness to depend on others was all that was necessary for new leaders and opportunists to rise up and to say—sure, we will take on the responsibilities which have been yours—we will make the decisions—just do as we say. And so began the Dark Ages when people became subservient to the leaders—when they lost their opportunities for self-determination and the culture, the influence, the growth, and the importance of these great peoples who had done so much in the past sank nearly into oblivion and while the world moved forward they moved back and back.

Is there a parallel, my friends? You decide. One hundred and seventy-five years ago this coming September, the Constitution of the United States, the greatest document in the history of the governments of the world, was signed. Have you read it recently? It will pay you. It won't take long. There are only 7 articles and 23 amendments. Do you remember the preamble?

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Note this carefully—it is a Government of people—not States.

Well, under this great Constitution of the United States many very precious freedoms, opportunities, and privileges were provided for us, and all too many of us have taken them for granted. Many of them are being eroded away—it is much later than we think. No government—ours or any other type—will work by itself. We, the people, must make it work for us or it will dominate us.

You say "I haven't got the time for politics; I don't want to get into such things." I say to you, my friends, each of you has too big a stake in the future of our Nation to assume any such attitude.

There is the very serious question of maintaining our American way of life through the exercise of our many precious freedoms. We must determine for ourselves what we want from our Government and how we can best gain the desired results. This leads inevitably to costs and costs are met through taxes.

Taxes are just not so many dollars we must pay, but we should also think about them in terms of how much time, effort, and work is required from each of us to earn the taxes we must pay. When we begin to consider taxes, not alone as just dollars, but as the amount of personal time and effort we must devote to earn these taxes, then we begin to look at them in a different light.

Let me put it just a little differently. Have you any idea how many tax dollars are required from just those of you who live in Hamilton County alone to pay the costs of our Federal Government in just this one year? I don't mean the other costs of local, State, and school taxes—I mean just the cost of our Federal Government alone. Well, my friends, you may be surprised to learn that in addition to all the other taxes you pay for the operations of your local government, your State government, and your public schools, you who live here in Hamilton County alone will pay more than $432 million this year in Federal taxes alone. How much business and how many man-hours will be required to pay this $432 million in tax dollars? Some of you expert slide rule operators figure that one out.

But this is not all. In 1930 when the population of the United States was about 123 million there were about 588,000 Federal employees. Today our population is nearly 185 million, a growth of about 62 million, but we have more than 2.5 million Federal employees and this includes another increase of nearly 132,000 employees compared with June 1961, less than a year ago.

Well, I could go on and on, but you know what I mean. The constant increase in Federal bureaucracy in addition to the costs adds more and more controls over each and every thing we do each day and these supervisory policymaking bureaucrats are appointed, not elected officials, and, therefore, they are not responsive to the will of the public. On the other hand, we have thousands of extremely well qualified, very competent and completely dedicated Federal employees who are doing a magnificent job in the public interest.

Where is the point of diminishing returns beyond which our Federal Government should not go? This is the real question and the question each of us must study, be well informed, and take a position. Are you just a thermometer willing to go along, or are you a thermostat determined to do something about it? We will continue to have good government at all levels only so long as great numbers of our people maintain an active and well informed interest in the affairs of government.

I hear a lot of complaining every day and some of it, of course, is justified but what are we willing to do about it?

Our great United States is the greatest Nation in the world in which to live. We are second to no other nation in any respect in spite of some of the gloom some try to spread. Sure there are some things wrong, but there are a great many other situations which are right. More progress has been made and more products have been developed in the United States than in any other nation in the world. We should be proud to be Americans, we should walk tall as Americans, and when we look at the great flag of our Nation we should not look at it as just so much cloth arranged and colored in a certain way, but we should regard it as the symbol of all that our great Nation means to each of us.

H.R. 11158, URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 9, 1962, I introduced H.R. 11158, a bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas.

This bill embodies the proposals made by President Kennedy in his transportation message to the Congress of April 5, 1962. It is designed to fill six basic needs in the solution of the urban transportation problem as follows:

First. A long-range program of Federal aid to urban regions for the expansion of mass transit facilities by providing $500 million over a 3-year period with $100 million to be made available in fiscal year 1963. Grants would be made for up to two-thirds of the project cost, the remaining one-third to be provided by the locality or State.

Second. Emergency aid by authorizing the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make emergency grants for a 3-year period where there is an urgent need.

Third. Coordination of highways and mass transportation planning.

Fourth. Monetary relocation assistance to those whose dwellings or businesses are displaced.

Fifth. Federal contributions to the necessary economic and technological research in the mass transportation field.

Sixth. Advance congressional approval for interstate compacts for the establishment of agencies to carry out transportation and allied regional functions in urban areas extending across State lines.

H.R. 11158 has been referred to the Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee of which I have the honor to be chairman. I intend to announce the hearing dates very shortly. I urge all those Members who desire to testify or to submit statements or to arrange for the attendance of witnesses to advise the committee accordingly without delay.

Following is a section-by-section analysis of the bill:

Section 1. Short title: Section 1 of the bill would provide that it may be cited as the "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962."

Section 2. Findings and purpose: Section 2(a) of the bill contains a finding by the Congress which describes the increasing concentration of the Nation's population in urban areas, which generally include several local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States. It would declare that the deterioration or inadequate provision of urban transportation facilities, intensified traffic congestion, and the lack of coordinated transportation and other development planning is jeopardizing the welfare and vitality of urban areas, the satisfactory movement of people and goods within such areas, and the effectiveness of housing, urban renewal, highway, and other federally aided programs.

Subsection (b) of this section would state that the purposes of the act are (1) to assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods; (2) to encourage the planning and establishment of areawide urban mass transportation systems needed for economical and desirable urban development; and (3) to provide assistance to State and local governments and instrumentalities thereof in financing such systems, to be operated by public or private agencies as determined by local needs.

Section 3. Federal financial assistance: Section 3 of the bill would authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make grants or loans, subject to limitations in the bill, to assist local public bodies in financing the acquisition and improvement of mass transportation facilities and equipment. These could be used in urban mass transportation service or in coordinating such service with other urban transportation. Terminal facilities, rights-of-way (but not public highways), buses and other rolling stock, and other needed real or personal property would be eligible for assistance. The loan authority in this section would be limited to the unused amount of the present $50 million mass transportation loan authority.

Although an applicant for a loan or a grant under this section would have to be a public body, it would not have to operate the transit facilities and equipment itself. The applicant could, for example, acquire buses and lease them to a private transit company, or it could contract with the private transit company for the company itself to acquire the buses and operate them according to an agreed-upon program. Title to such buses could remain in some cases in the hands of a third party, such as in an equipment trust transaction.

In all cases, however, the applicant public body would have to have satisfactory continuing control over the use of the property acquired or improved and, together with any private transit company or other associated parties, would have to have satisfactory legal, financial, and technical capacity to carry out the proposed project.

Also, the Federal assistance could not be used for operating subsidies. An assisted project would have to consist of the provision of new, or the improvement of existing, transit facilities and equipment.

Section 4. Long-range program: Section 4 of the bill would set forth the terms and conditions regularly applying to the loans and grants authorized under section 3. Except as provided in the emergency program described below under section 5, no such loan or grant could be provided unless the Housing Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are needed for carrying out a program, meeting criteria established by him, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area.

This does not mean that such a program has to set forth a specific schedule for a series of detailed projects, which together would comprise a complete transportation system for the urban area. Urban planning and development, especially in metropolitan areas where many jurisdictions may be involved, is inevitably very complex and must be carried on as a continuing and evolving process. It does mean, however, that a transportation plan must have been prepared which sets forth the basic framework of the highway network and the mass transportation system needed for the urban area, that the proposed project is needed for this mass transportation system, that there is a program for the establishment of the system, and that the system will be administered either by one agency or by officially coordinated agencies. Also, the proposed transportation plan itself must have been prepared by an organization, or officially coordinated organizations, carrying on a continuing area-wide program of comprehensive planning, under which comprehensive plans for the urban area have already been prepared in sufficient detail to provide a satisfactory basis for the highway and mass transportation plans.

Section 4(a) of the bill would authorize the immediate appropriation of $100 million for grants under section 3 of the bill for fiscal 1963, $200 million for fiscal 1964, and $200 million for fiscal 1965. Advance or progress payments could be made on account of any such grant.

Where the planning and organizational requirements described above are met, section 4(a) of the bill would authorize the Housing Administrator to provide Federal grants in accord with a formula which is designed to take into consideration the availability of revenues to meet debt service on proposed projects, and is also designed to require the locality itself to provide a matching grant in addition to any revenue financing for the project. These Federal and local grants would be based on the net project cost of the project, defined as that portion of project cost which the Housing Administrator ascertains cannot reasonably be financed from revenues. A Federal grant could be made for up to two-thirds of this net project cost.

The locality would be required to provide the remainder of the net project cost from sources other than Federal funds and—by the definition of "net project cost"—other than anticipated revenues. This would ordinarily be done through the issuance of bonds based on the taxing powers of the local government, transit authority, or other local public body. If this local contribution were later reduced by the use of surplus project revenues then a corresponding refund would have to be made to the Federal Government in the same proportion as the original Federal and local grant. Surplus project revenues could instead be used to reduce fares or increase service, if the locality so chose.

Section 4(b) of the bill would specify that, where the planning and organizational requirements described above have been met, loans may be made under section 3 of the bill subject to the same restrictions and limitations (set forth in sec. 202(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955) that apply to the present temporary mass transportation loan program. These provisions establish the interest rate according to a formula which presently produces a rate of up to 3⅝ percent, permit loans to be amortized over 40 years, provide for deferral of up to 50 percent of the interest on a loan for up to 10 years in certain cases, specify that loans shall be made only where financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms, and require that the loans be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure repayment. The unobligated balance of the $50 million authorization for loans under the present temporary mass transportation loan program would be made available, without expiration date, solely for loans under section 3 of this bill.

Section 4(b) would also specify that such loans are to be available only for projects for which no Federal grant is made under section 3. It is expected that, in the case of projects for which there are matching Federal and local grants, those grants would be made sufficiently large to provide the coverage necessary for the revenue-based portion of the financing to be obtained on reasonable terms in the private market. Federal loans would therefore be authorized only for projects which can be entirely financed from revenues, without any Federal and local grants.

Section 5. Emergency program: Section 5 of the bill would provide that, until July 1, 1965, loans and grants could be made under section 3 of the bill in emergency situations even though certain of the regular planning requirements in section 4 had not been met. These emergency loans and grants could be made where (1) the program for the development of a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system is under active preparation although not yet completed, as required by section 4; (2) the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought can reasonably be expected to be required for such a system; and (3) there is an urgent need for their preservation or provision. An example of such a situation would be where adequate land-use and other comprehensive development plans have not yet been prepared for an urban area or where a general urban transportation plan for the area, coordinated with such development plans, has not been completed, but the proposed project would assist an existing transportation system which in all probability will continue to be needed and which is in urgent danger of losing needed rights-of-way or in urgent need of modernization. Emergency loans would be made under the same terms and conditions as regular loans, including the prohibition against a loan for a project receiving a grant.

The emergency Federal grants would be for one-half rather than two-thirds of net project cost. In the case of such an emergency grant, the local contribution would therefore have to be one-half of net project cost. However, if a project did meet the full planning requirement within 3 years from the time of such a grant, section 5 provides that the project would then qualify for an additional grant equal to the difference between a two-thirds grant and a one-half grant; i.e., an additional grant of one-sixth of net project cost.

The same proportional refund provisions would apply to these grants as to a regular two-thirds grant.

Section 6. Research, development, and demonstration projects: Section 6 of the bill would authorize a research, development, and demonstration program for all phases of urban mass transportation. Demonstration grants could be provided under the new program without the present restrictions against grants for over two-thirds of project cost or for major long-term capital improvement. Research and demonstration projects could also be carried on directly by the Administrator, or through other Federal agencies, public or private institutions, or individuals, as appropriate. The unobligated balance of the present $25 million demonstration grant authority would be made available to finance such projects, plus up to $30 million of the new $500 million grant authority under section 3.

In carrying out these provisions the Administrator would be authorized to request and to receive any appropriate data or information, from public or private sources.

Section 7. Relocation requirements and payments: Section 7(a) of the bill would require, for any project assisted with a loan or grant under section 3, that an adequate relocation program is being carried on for families displaced by the project, and that an equal number of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings are being provided in areas of comparable desirability and convenience, at prices which the displaced families can afford.

Section 7(b) of the bill would authorize relocation payments to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced from projects assisted with a loan or a grant under section 3. No local contribution would be required for these grants. They would be financed from the Federal grant funds authorized to be appropriated in section 4 of the bill. These payments would cover otherwise uncompensated reasonable and necessary moving expenses and actual direct losses of property except goodwill or profit. Payments could be up to $200 in the case of an individual or family and could be for a fixed amount. Payments could be for up to $3,000 (or, if greater, the total certified actual moving expenses) in the case of a nonprofit organization or business concern.

Section 8. Coordination of Federal assistance for highways and for mass transportation facilities: Section 8 of the bill would provide that the Housing Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce shall consult on general urban transportation policies and programs and shall exchange information on proposed projects in urban areas.

Section 9. Interstate compacts to implement comprehensive urban planning: Section 9 of the bill would amend section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 to broaden the advance congressional consent now provided in that subsection for interstate compacts or other agreements relating to urban development. Section 701(b) now provides only for the establishment of agencies or for other cooperative interstate efforts relating to comprehensive planning. The proposed amendment would provide also for the establishment of agencies or for other cooperative efforts in carrying out mass transportation or other urban development programs.

Section 10. General provisions: Section 10(a) of the bill would apply, to activities carried on under this bill, certain administrative provisions found in section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950. These include the prevailing wage and overtime provisions in section 402(b) of that act, under which prevailing wages, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accord with the Davis-Bacon Act, and time and a half for overtime, would be required to be paid to all laborers and mechanics employed on projects assisted under this bill.

Section 10(b) of the bill would—

(1) Define "States" to mean the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States;

(2) Define "local public bodies" to include municipalities and other political subdivisions of States; public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States; and public corporations, boards, and commissions established under the laws of any State; and

(3) Define "Administrator" to mean the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Section 10(c) of the bill would set forth a general authorization for appropriations of funds necessary to carry out all functions under the act, with the exception of loans under section 3, which are to be financed through the existing Treasury borrowing authority. Funds appropriated for other than administrative expenses would remain available until expended.

THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT AND OUR AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Clem Miller] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, our fruit growing, processing, and shipping industries have very serious problems relating to the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962. We are also experiencing great difficulties in our efforts to negotiate with the European Common Market, and the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade.

I include in the Record two informative and responsible statements by spokesmen for these industries.

They furnish excellent background to the perplexing problems facing us today. They point up particularly concern we have for the role of the State Department in carrying on these negotiations. They do not content themselves with criticism but pose constructive alternatives that we well may profit from. Their amendment, which would equalize the trade between our country and foreign nations—concessions which the United States grants to other nations must also be returned by these foreign nations—can only be described as "fair play." It is essential our products not be discriminated against. This amendment goes a long way in ending the threat of such discrimination. For that reason, I endorse it; I shall support it, and do all in my power to insure its adoption. Some have said that our California products are expendable because of other competing interests. Responsible officials have stoutly denied that this is the case. The amendment we are supporting will go a long way to establishing this as congressional policy so that there may be no argument. The statements follow:

Summary of Testimony of Ernest Falk, on Behalf of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council, Before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, April 5, 1962

I am appearing today on behalf of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council, representing the major part of the fruit industry of the United States, including more than

80,000 growers from all over the United States: citrus from California, Arizona, Texas, and Florida; apples from 27 States; pears from Oregon, Washington, and California; grapes from California; and prunes from California and Oregon. The council also represents processors and shippers of these commodities.

The council membership includes the California-Arizona Citrus Industry, California Grape & Tree Fruit League, Canners League of California, Dried Fruit Association of California, Florida Canners Association, Florida Citrus Commission, Florida Citrus Mutual, International Apple Association, National Apple Institute, Northwest Canners & Freezers, Northwest Horticultural Council, Texas Citrus & Vegetable Growers and Shippers, Texas Citrus Mutual.

The farm value of these crops is estimated at $1.2 billion with a retail value after packing and processing of nearly $4 billion. Approximately $250 million are exported annually. This export market, largely in Europe, has traditionally been a significant outlet for United States fresh and processed fruits. It was developed with fruit of superior quality; it has not been a dumping ground for occasional surpluses. Prior to World War II nearly 10 percent of the fresh fruits and 25 percent of the processed fruits produced annually in the United States were exported.

Following World War II most European countries prohibited or restricted imports of U.S. fruits in order to reserve their limited dollar exchange for products they thought more essential. Many of these restrictions were continued long after there was any currency shortage justification under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The result of these nontariff barriers was to negate the benefit of lower duties previously negotiated under the GATT.

The council testified at the hearings on trade agreements legislation in 1955 and in 1958. It stressed the need to obtain removal of these barriers to trade in order to make reciprocal trade truly a two-way street. We supported extension of the Trade Agreements Act even though, for U.S. fruit and fruit products, the act had not worked in the way it was intended and our products had been discriminated against.

One of the major purposes of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958 was to enable the negotiation of favorable tariffs with the European Economic Community. The recently announced EEC common external tariffs, agreed upon at GATT negotiations, and the provisional Common Market fruit and vegetable policy are a great disappointment to us. Tariffs on important segments of our trade (for example, dried prunes, fruit juices, and canned pineapple) were fixed at higher rates than the average of the duties of the member countries. This at a time when reductions were supposed to be negotiated. We are also concerned from study of the provisional Common Market fruit and vegetable policy, that the EEC countries intend to continue or indeed increase their nontariff barriers.

The United States must make certain the tariffs negotiated with the EEC will not be nullified by nontariff barriers.

Our principal recommendation is that the Congress should make certain that access for U.S. horticultural products into the Common Market and other foreign countries is improved. To do this, the President should take special precautions to insure that tariff concessions are not offset by quotas or other import restrictions.

The legislation should provide that whenever the EEC or any foreign country takes action to nullify or impair concessions, equivalent withdrawals will be made by the United States. Similar action should be taken against countries who refuse to remove existing unjustifiable barriers.

The legislation should prohibit the President from making any future concessions available to any country that has unjustifiably nullified or impaired concessions previously granted to the United States without having made adequate compensation therefor.

This recommendation is made because experience has demonstrated that representations on the part of the United States have not succeeded in modifying or removing some of these nontariff barriers, despite GATT obligations for their removal.

Continuing representations have taken place over the past several years in an endeavor to seek relaxation of quantitative or seasonal restrictions on imports of fresh apples and pears in most western European countries, on winter grapefruit and processed orange and grapefruit products in the United Kingdom, and on imports of most horticultural products into France. Despite these, little significant progress has been made. Representations alone have not brought about removal or even reductions of these barriers.

Another recommendation is that the United States modify its most-favored-nation policy for tariff concessions. We suggest that tariff concessions be available only to those countries who have tariff agreements with the United States or are members of the GATT. We cannot understand why countries who do not reciprocate with the United States should receive the benefit of our tariff concessions.

Also, we believe that the most-favored-nation policy should be modified so that concessions may be withdrawn from countries that treat us unfairly.

We recognize the danger to trade involved in a mutual withdrawal of concessions. Also, we know that retaliatory measures alone will not guarantee us reasonable access. But, lack of progress in the removal of these trade barriers has persuaded us that measures stronger than those heretofore used are required if we are to obtain continuing reasonable opportunities to export.

We feel the necessary stronger measures can come only from legislative direction and mandate. Only when foreign countries are convinced that they can no longer successfully take advantage of the United States will they live up to their commitments; reciprocal trade can then become a reality. Apparently, congressional action is necessary to establish such a firm trade policy.

Without this, we see no reason to grant authority for future tariff reductions. We, therefore, oppose title II in its present form.

Summary of Statement of Robert McArthur, Chairman, California Prune Advisory Board, on Behalf of the Board and the Dried Fruit Association of California, March 29, 1962

First, may I give you a word about the dried fruit and tree nut industries in California, of which we are a part. There are some 39,830 growers of record, producing 10 commodities in the categories of dried fruits and tree nuts. The 5-year average production of these commodities amounts to 502,259 tons with an average farm value of $163,588,000. This is farm value only or the value of the raw product as it is delivered to the handler's plant. The processed value will exceed $200 million.

We are here today to present to you the case of California and Oregon prunes as it relates to the European Common Market. We include Oregon prunes because a large portion of these are processed and shipped from California plants.

Let me say here and now, so there will be no misunderstanding in spite of what we may say here, that we are in complete harmony, and fully subscribe to the concept of a European Economic Community, otherwise known as the Common Market. We feel as any right thinking American should, that this has been one of the greatest advances of this century of our civilized world. We rejoice that it has had to date such a marked success. We recognize what a tremendous bulwark the European Economic Community will be for the Western World against communism. We realize the full significance of its economic impact where its gross national product now exceeds $200 billion and that it provides a market for food, fibre, and manufactured products of some 170 million people. These are people whose standard of living is rising with each milestone passed on the road to true European integration. We are justly proud of the part played by the United States in the establishment of this unprecedented economic and political unit.

President Kennedy has recently submitted to Congress H.R. 9900, otherwise known as the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. We have traditionally supported the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and expect to support with perhaps some modification, the new Trade Expansion Act. We represent an industry whose very existence depends on foreign trade. In fact, a large share of today's orchards were laboriously planted and carefully brought into production for the export market.

Earlier this month, an official announcement was released by the White House giving the results of the negotiations at the Geneva Conference under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The results are grievously disappointing and the industry is particularly disconcerted over the fact that the tariff on California and Oregon prunes has actually been doubled in several of the most important export markets of Europe, viz, West Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands.

We are incensed over the discriminatory tactics used by the Common Market countries for the purposes of negotiating at the Geneva Conference. The formula adopted by the European Economic Community for setting the common external tariff was to be an arithmetical average of existing tariffs of the six countries involved, as of January 1, 1957. These tariffs were: West Germany, 8 percent; France, 22 percent; Italy, 15 percent; Benelux (a customs union), 8 percent; thus averaging out 13 percent. Therefore, the point at which tariff negotiations on prunes should have started was 13 percent.

However, France held out for an arbitrary tariff of 18 percent regardless of the prescribed simple arithmetical formula, and it was on this basis that negotiations were conducted, which culminated in an agreement to fix the external tariff for prunes in the Common Market at 16 percent.

We call attention to the fact that the tariffs in each of the member states were negotiated and agreed upon, with concessions made from the United States in return, at previous GATT conferences. All concessions given by the United States to secure the bound tariffs in the above-named countries were disregarded at the 1961 Geneva Conference.

Of even greater importance and more disturbing is a provision contained in the recently announced agricultural policy decisions of the European Economic Community. The provision referred to will permit Common Market countries to impose additional fees in addition to the fixed tariff when in their judgment, import prices fall below a reference price of the Common Market. In effect, this can mean the complete exclusion of certain California farm products, including prunes, from access to Common Market countries.

It is apparent that France, and perhaps Italy, have set the pattern for this unreasonably high tariff on California and Oregon prunes. Currently both of these countries combined cannot produce more than 10,000 tons of prunes annually, which prunes have less consumer acceptance than those produced in the United States. The six Common Market countries alone have a potential consumption of an estimated 60,000 tons of prunes, of which the United States should be allowed to ship a fair share.

California is now producing an average of 152,000 tons of prunes annually, more than four-fifths of the world's total supply. Production will be an estimated 200,000 tons by 1965. We have historically shipped 40 percent of our production in export and exclusion of our products from the nations of the European Economic Community will be nothing short of disastrous to the growers of California and Oregon prunes, and the communities in which they live.

We again make it clear and emphasize that as an industry we are mindful of the economic and political importance of the European Economic Community to the Western World, that we should give it our wholehearted support and encouragement. However, we urge the Congress to insist that it not be permitted to become a fortress of protectionism against our Nation which has given so generously of its wealth and resources to establish it. We urge the Congress, and our Departments of State, Commerce, and Agriculture, not to allow the tariff barriers and walls which are crumbling within the Common Market to be rebuilt around its perimeter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. **Thompson** of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. **Hays**), for today, April 10, 1962, on account of official business.

Mr. **Dingell** (at the request of Mr. **Albert**), for today, on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. **Stafford**, for 2 hours, on April 16.

Mr. **Cramer**, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. **Flood** (at the request of Mr. **Landrum**), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, April 11.

Mrs. **Green** of Oregon (at the request of Mr. **Landrum**), for 1 hour, on Monday, April 16.

Mr. **Hemphill** (at the request of Mr. **Landrum**), for 1 hour, on Tuesday, April 17.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the **Congressional Record**, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. **Ryan** of New York and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. **Lindsay**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Riehlman**.

Mr. **Fino**.

Mr. **Berry** in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. **Landrum**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **Celler**.

Mr. **Cohelan**.

Mr. **Anfuso** in two instances.

Mr. **Peterson**.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 11, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86-472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86-628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency and dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, covering expenditures for the previous calendar year. The consolidated report is to be forwarded to the Committee on House Administration, which, in turn, shall print such report in the **Congressional Record** within 10 legislative days after receipt. There is submitted herewith a supplemental report from the House Committee on Banking and Currency:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Abraham J. Multer:											
Austria	Schilling	5,488.50	210.71	4,139.45	159.21	609.20	23.43	1,287.85	49.53	11,525	442.88
Transportation to Austria as representative to World Bank meeting in Vienna, Austria.							709.90				709.90
Azores			1.00		4.50				2.00		7.50
Italy	Lira	71,088	114.47	118,700	191.14	193,800	312.07	39,270	62.27	422,858	679.95
Hawaii	U.S. dollar		86.94		206.26		42.00		46.15		381.35
Papeete	do		61.00		92.35		49.00		15.00		217.35
Nandi			27.30		22.40		25.17		6.77		81.64
New Zealand	Pound	[1] 177.16	496.05	20.17.8	56.51	12.16	34.05	15.16	42.45	224.66	629.06
Australia	do	119.03.8	267.84	115.14	248.07	13.38	30.11	17.16.8	38.63	264.73	584.65
Transportation purchased by State Department.	Deutsche mark					2,657.34	666.00			2,657.34	666.00
Total			1,265.31		980.44		1,891.73		262.80		4,400.28

[1] Item includes lodging, meals, and transportation as charged to me by New Zealand Government Travel Service, without breakdown.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) $4,400.28

Brent Spence,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency.

Apr. 4, 1962.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1918. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend the temporary extended unemployment compensation program, to increase the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for taxable year 1964, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1919. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1920. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the misassignment and ineffective utilization of Ready Reserve personnel in the XV Corps, 6th U.S. Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1921. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 526), as amended, relating to the establishment of a register of names in the Department of Commerce of certain motor vehicle drivers"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1922. A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

1923. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office U.S. Courts, transmitting the annual report of statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts and other pertinent data for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 53 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 81); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 147. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4856. A bill to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n); without amendment (Rept. No. 1568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5149. A bill to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding; without amendment (Rept. No. 1569). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 641. Joint resolution designating February 20 of each year as John Glenn Day; without amendment (Rept. No. 1570). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1585. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9752. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in Greece in 1963, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11032. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion; without amendment (Rept. No. 1564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11033. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary; without amendment (Rept. No. 1565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11034. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296 relating to the badge of the American Legion; without amendment (Rept. No. 1566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 505. An act for the relief of Seymour Robertson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 508. An act for the relief of John E. Beaman and Adelaide K. Beaman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SHRIVER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 704. An act for the relief of Marlys E. Tedin and Elizabeth O. Reynolds; without amendment (Rept. No. 1573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2151. An act for the relief of Harvey Burstein; without amendment (Rept. No. 1574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2319. An act for the relief of Harry E. Ellison, captain, U.S. Army, retired; without amendment (Rept. No. 1575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LINDSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2549. An act for the relief of Edward L. Wertheim; without amendment (Rept. No. 1576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6021. A bill for the relief of Lt. Don Walsh and Lt. Lawrence A. Shumaker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BATTIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6386. A bill for the relief of Cleo A. Dekat; with amendment (Rept. No. 1578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7617. A bill for the relief of John W. Schleiger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8321. A bill for the relief of Maj. Clara May Matthews; without amendment (Rept. No. 1580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9466. A bill for the relief of Sfc. Jesse O. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 1581). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9782. A bill for the relief of Col. A. A. Watson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1582). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10026. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick and Peter D. Power; without amendment (Rept. No. 1583). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10314. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MORRIS (by request):

H.R. 11185. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 11186. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Academy for Public Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 11187. A bill relating to certain facilities and improvements of the United States and the rights of the United States in and to certain real property situated in Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 11188. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to purchase industrial and commercial evidences of indebtedness to promote certain industrial and commercial loans in redevelopment areas by lending institutions in order to help such areas plan and finance their economic redevelopment and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 11189. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 11190. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Development Corps to provide healthful outdoor employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources to timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local public service employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11191. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 11192. A bill to encourage the development, initiation, and expansion of occupational safety programs in the States through grants to States for such purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 11193. A bill to amend section 165 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of certain casualty losses attributable to natural disasters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 11194. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 11195. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 11196. A bill to change the name of Garza-Little Elm Reservoir, located in Denton County, Tex., to Lake Lewisville; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 11197. A bill to amend Public Law 86-184, an act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 11198. A bill to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 11199. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 11200. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States and its territories and possessions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 11201. A bill to authorize free post office service for certain patrons and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 11202. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 and to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 11203. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 11204. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for bidding for the building of construction-differential subsidy ships on a regional basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.J. Res. 685. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a joint committee of the two Houses of the Congress to study all matters relating to national strategy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.J. Res. 686. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide the right of States to establish their own election districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 592. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Res. 593. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information with respect to the reasons underlying the U.S. sponsorship and active support of the censure of Israel by the United Nations Security Council; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H. Res. 594. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the appointment of professional and clerical staffs of the committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an international exposition in San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing the confidence of the people of Hawaii in the United Nations and urging its financial support by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the enactment of the President's public welfare program (H.R. 10032); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 11205. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fidel Rodriguez Cubas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 11206. A bill for the relief of Stephen You (Chun Pai Yu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11207. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Sushil K. Mukherjee and son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 11208. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios and Lola Dimas and daughter, Mary Dimas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 11209. A bill for the relief of Jorge Shojiro Mukoyama, Misuzu Theresa Mukoyama, and Takumi Frederico Mukoyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 11210. A bill for the relief of Donato Panella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 11211. A bill for the relief of Kee Leung Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 11212. A bill for the relief of Maria Giusseppa Fantauzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 11213. A bill for the relief of Peter Carson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 11214. A bill for the relief of Wang Chen-Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

296. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry G. Bartsch, executive secretary, Hackers Association of Washington, D.C., relative to the petition of Cabell Daniel Moody, secretary of the Hackers Association of Washington, D.C., relating to the operation of taxicabs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

297. Also, petition of Roger L. Sarratt, clerk of the council, New Orleans, La., relative to endorsing and requesting the enactment of H.R. 10898 and H.R. 10901; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

298. Also, petition of Gwen Wiesner, city clerk, Garden Grove, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of interest derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

299. Also, petition of Margery L. Ames, city clerk, Chico, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of interest derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

300. Also, petition of Lucille W. Randolph, city clerk, Gardena, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of interest derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

301. Also, petition of George W. Smith, city clerk, Monterey, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of interest derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

302. Also, petition of Ruth S. Hogan, city clerk, LaVerne, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of interest derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

303. Also, petition of Gladys R. Wallin, city clerk, Petaluma, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of interest derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

304. Also, petition of Takeji Akamine, chairman, Okinawa Prefectural Reversion Council, Okinawa, relative to requesting the return of Okinawa to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Richard R. Potter, D.D., pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Staunton, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who art infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, look upon us with mercy in this fleeting, fragile hour. We know not what a day may bring forth, nor how to handle it when it comes. We haggle over issues of the moment, and jockey for positions of prestige and power; and soon both our day and our way are gone. But deep down we know that Thou art God and we are the people of Thy pasture, the sheep of Thy hand. Without Thee, we stumble and fall; we go astray and are lost. Lead us, we pray, with kindly light, and let Thy rod and Thy staff protect and comfort us. Grant wisdom to the Senate, and let righteousness and peace, justice and honor, freedom and truth, be the products of its deliberations. Bless these Senators, and enable them to know Thee and do Thy will. Let Thy blessings be upon all our land and all our leaders, making us a people acceptable in Thy sight and usable in Thy world. For this we pray in the name of Jesus Christ, through whom Thou didst bless all men, and who is, himself, King of kings and Lord of lords. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 9, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader about the business of the Senate for the remainder of the week and, insofar as he can inform the Senate, what proposed legislation may be contemplated for consideration during the following week; and at the same time I should like to ask him about any modification in plans for the Easter recess.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the questions asked by the distinguished minority leader, let me say that the unfinished business is Calendar No. 1279, House bill 9751, the military procurement bill. It is anticipated that we will set aside the consideration of this bill today, and proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1195, S. 4, the Padre Island bill. If action on that bill is not completed by the close of business today, we will return tomorrow to the consideration of the military procurement bill. Following action on that bill, we will again consider the Padre Island bill. When both bills are completed, we expect to take up Calendar No. 1288, Senate bill 2935, the Peace Corps bill. That will be either at the end of this week or at the beginning of next week.

Other bills for consideration prior to Easter are Executive Calendar No. 5, Executive K, 87th Congress, 1st session, the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1960, which was reported unanimously from the Foreign Relations Committee; Calendar No. 1281, House bill 10607, the tariff reclassification bill; and possibly Calendar No. 1043, Senate bill 495, amending the Trading With the Enemy Act.

In addition, other bills may subsequently be scheduled.

It is the expectation of the leadership—and I have discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader—that the Senate will go out on Thursday evening, April 19, to return on Monday, April 23, for a pro forma meeting.

The regular business of the Senate will commence again on Tuesday, April 24. Members may make their plans accordingly.

We anticipate that in the week following the Easter recess, we shall begin debate on the literacy test proposal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Merely for clarification, that would mean that the literacy test bill would then be set down as the business of the Senate for Tuesday, April 24, would it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Tuesday or any subsequent day in that week.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE OF LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on April 10, 1937—exactly 25 years ago today—the people of the 10th District of Texas went to the polls to choose a successor to Representative James Buchanan. The campaign had been a vigorous one, to put it mildly. For a while it had been without any clear-cut issue; but when one of the 10 candidates announced that he was offering himself to the voters as a wholehearted supporter of President Roosevelt's New Deal, the issue was made. The other nine candidates simply turned their guns on him, and vied with each other in heaping calumny on him, and on the administration. The result of the election is well known: The object of this calumny was elected, and began an unparalleled career in the American Congress.

LYNDON JOHNSON was, at the time of his first election to Congress, 28 years old. He was, as he is now, a tall, lanky man whose easy stride belied terrific sources of energy. He had been in Washington for several years as secretary to Representative Richard Kleberg, of Texas; he had been speaker of the "Little House," an organization of secretaries and clerks in the other body; and he had returned to Texas as State director of the National Youth Administration—helping to put the young men of the depression years to work on useful projects. Senior members of the administration already had their eyes on him; and upon his election, that April day 25 years ago, the President himself, fishing off the Texas coast, invited his young supporter to return with him on the train to Washington. There began a relationship that LYNDON JOHNSON has often described as father-son. It was mutually beneficial: Representative JOHNSON and his hill-country district in Texas gained immeasurably from it; and the President received, in that administration and in succeeding ones, the vigorous support of an increasingly influential Representative in Congress.

LYNDON JOHNSON continued to serve his district after President Roosevelt's death, in 1945. In 1948, he won an uphill victory over the incumbent Governor, in a campaign for election to the U.S. Senate. Few adult Americans need to be told about his record of service since that day. In 1953, after 4 years in this body, he was elected Democratic leader—in my opinion, the best leader the Senate has ever had. He held that post for 8 years, with great merit to himself and great benefit to the country. In 1960, he was, by common consent, one of the indispensable architects of Democratic victory. And since that year he has given the country the same high standards of enlightened public service that he provided during his years as a Member of this body.

Today, as Vice President of the United States, as Chairman of the Space Council, as Chairman of the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities, and as Chairman of the Advisory Council on the Peace Corps, LYNDON JOHNSON looks back over 25 years of elected service to his country. It is a record he can be proud of. It has fully justified the confidence of Franklin Roosevelt, and of his friends in the 10th District of Texas, who, 25 years ago today, sent this highly promising young man to the Congress for the first time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if Columbus could return and could see this country, he might fall into the habit of indulging in a cliché, by saying, "How time flies!" But, Mr. President, Columbus would be wrong, because time does not fly. Time is just a motionless medium; and it is we mortals who fly through time. As we make that journey, we make history. So people make history.

And you, sir, have made history. I remember you well—and this has to be personal—when you were secretary to a beloved Representative from Corpus Christi—Dick Kleberg, with whom it was my pleasure to do a long chore of duty in South America, and who, in my judgment, was one of the most gracious and kindly persons ever to be sent to Congress.

I think, sir, I remember you before that. I think I remember you when you were on duty at a door in the House long ago. You see, that is probably one of the privileges that the older has when he speaks about the younger. But you went from doorkeeper to secretary, and then to Congress, and I believe my esteemed friend from Montana forgot to mention this: I thought I saw you in a Navy uniform at one time. I am sure there was a "hitch" in the interest of your country.

Then I remember the affectionate relationship that developed between you and that great, beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn. I was one of his pupils, like you, for a long period of time; and deeply was I enriched, and much did I learn. So we walked that way for a long time. Then, in the nature of things, it was my high privilege to come here and walk with you again.

What a great, and durable contribution you have made to your country.

I think during the debate, or series of debates, Lincoln had with Stephen A. Douglas, at Alton, Ill., he was led to say he was grateful for having had an opportunity to be heard on the durable questions of the age, and while he might sink to obscurity sometime, he hoped he might have made some telling blows in the cause of liberty.

In making a personal assessment, I should say I know of your devotion to your country, and I know of the times when only the two of us, drinking a decaffeinized beverage called Sanka, would let the heart speak in that rather intimate fellowship as we talked of the ideals we cherished and the work we hoped we might consummate before our time came to an end.

I salute you as a great public servant and one whose fidelity to freedom and to the great, moving ideals of the Republic has never, in the quarter century, faltered once.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader with regard to the 25 years of service in the Congress and in his present position of the distinguished Vice President.

I was sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives in January 1935. Therefore, when the distinguished Vice President arrived at the House in 1937, I was, so to speak, on the reception committee.

I learned to know him at that time. I observed his ability and his dedication to service. One thing the Vice President has been noted for during all of his public service has been his willingness to work hard. That to me was the determining factor in his great success.

As I look back on the early days, I know he did all he could to secure the enactment of legislation that the then President Franklin D. Roosevelt was advocating, some of which was most controversial. I never remember a time when the present distinguished Vice President was not taking a hand and devoting his time and energy toward the enactment of the legislation. When I was sworn in as a Member of the U.S. Senate in November of 1950 I was again privileged to serve with our distinguished Vice President as a Member of this body.

I regard him as one of my choice friends. It is a pleasure always to work with him. I congratulate the distinguished Vice President on his 25 years of service to his country.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to join with other Senators in commendation and congratulation to the Vice President for his 25 years of invaluable dedicated public service to the country as a Member of the House and of the Senate, and now as Vice President of the United States.

Certainly it was a great privilege for all of us to serve with him when he was elected as majority leader of the Senate. Even though he did not have more than a majority of one, he was, nevertheless, able as the leader of this body, with strong opposition, to get reasonable people together and pass legislation for the good of the country.

We then had a Democratic-controlled Congress with a Republican administration, but I think, because of his leadership and because of the fact that he developed the theme of responsibility in Government, telling Republicans and Democrats alike that we had to go forward with the Nation's business irrespective of party label, much of the credit for what was accomplished, belongs to the majority leader. His task was not an easy one, but through his guidance and unselfish efforts the Nation benefited.

I know the Nation owes him a great debt of gratitude because it was his vision and imagination which made possible the establishment of the committee on space matters, at a time when few persons, if anybody, was thinking much about the problems of space. It was the then Senator from Texas, the majority leader, who had the vision, wisdom, and foresight to see that we had to compete in space accomplishments. It was as a result of his energy and his idea that the space program was created which today our country is so justly proud of. Col. John Glenn could not have gone in orbit, in my judgment, if it had not been for the action of the majority leader, the now Vice President.

Throughout these years, one of the greatest privileges of my life has been to know him, to watch him, and to observe his great contributions to his State and to his Nation. He has carried out his responsibilities of the office of public trust in the highest and noblest traditions of this great Nation.

I know in the job he now holds he will continue to render great public service, not only to his State and the Nation, but to the free world. It has been a great privilege to be able to call him my friend. I congratulate him and wish him well in all future endeavors.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I came into the Senate Chamber practically at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I did not hear all the comments but all that was said I am sure was factual, kind, and, what is more, what was said speaks of a life that has meant much to his State, to the Nation, and to the Senate.

I have been a Member of the Senate 23 years. I remember when the distinguished Vice President became majority leader. I marveled at the way he handled the parliamentary situations that confronted him. I marveled at the way he would smile at Republicans and Democrats alike. When matters seemed most difficult, the majority leader, not on the floor, but in associating with Senators, was able to accomplish his purposes.

I am sure, however, that all that he has done has not been accomplished by his own efforts alone, but as a result of encouragement from his very sweet wife and daughters. They have been an inspiration to him. The result has been that he has gone forward and attained the grand results he has accomplished.

So I join with all Senators who have spoken, and trust that the distinguished Vice President will have at least 25 more years in the service of his country, because he is a humble public servant.

I would ask only one thing of him, that he turn to the request I made some years ago that we have available a loud speaker system, because it is very difficult to hear what he and the minority leader say when they speak. I say in all seriousness, Mr. Vice President, it would be wonderful if you would turn your energy to accomplishing that one thing. Those who are in the galleries cannot hear, and even Senators in the back rows cannot hear what is going on. I understand you do not realize it, but you will pardon me if I take this opportunity, while you are smiling, sir, to suggest that we should get into operation a system which will make it possible so that those in the galleries and the Senators themselves can hear what is said in the front row and at the desk.

Again I join with your countless friends in offering congratulations. I do not know that you have any enemies, because you have a way about you that sort of dissolves enemies. I join with your countless friends, with other Senators, in wishing you good health—that is the big thing, good health—and a continuity of service in your Government.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join in this acknowledgment of the brilliant 25 years of service of the distinguished Vice President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of this body.

I could feel free, I suppose, to comment on the way in which I first learned to know you. That was in the pages of a history book, as we studied the articles of the New Deal, the emergence of the philosophies of Franklin Roosevelt, and a courageous young man from Texas who came to the Congress to support those principles. I choose today to stress instead one other point of emphasis, which is my observation in this body in the few years since my arrival after the election of 1958.

LYNDON JOHNSON came to my State in that critical campaign of 1958, under a considerable handicap and with some risk, to strike his blows for what he believed in, in my behalf I shall always treasure the personal indulgence he made possible for me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I fully understand the deep appreciation of the Senator from Wyoming for the assistance he received from our beloved friend from Texas. I congratulate him.

Does the Senator think I might eventually succeed in getting the Vice President to accept one of my invitations to come to Oregon and to help me in Oregon? I know what a valuable supporter he is. I wish to have the Senator from Wyoming know that I shall make a little speech, shortly, on my own appreciation of the statesmanship of the former Senator from Texas. The comment the Senator made about the great help the Vice President was to the Senator from Wyoming caused me to say I should like to get some of that help, too, and if the Senator can persuade him to give me some assistance I shall be most grateful.

Mr. McGEE. I am the master only of my own disposition, I say to the Senator from Oregon. I shall be glad to accept an invitation from the Senator from Oregon, in return for the favor the Senator rendered to me when he appeared on my behalf in my campaign.

I hasten to add, Mr. President, that the campaign promise Lyndon Johnson made across the country to an unknown number of new Senators was that if they were elected and sent to this body he, as the majority leader, would guarantee to each of them one major committee assignment. That did a great deal not only to raise the morale of the new arrivals, but also to give them added stature. There was a surplus crop from that election of 1958. Fifteen of us came to the Senate in a single political move in our history.

Lyndon Johnson changed the traditional operations of this body. He kept his word. He gave to each of us, as freshmen, an important and significant role to fill in this body. As one of those freshmen, I know of no other single move which could have made us a part so quickly of the responsibilities which characterize the Senate of the United States. It is that point in particular which seems to me to loom large in the relationships which many of us have come to enjoy and to respect with the now distinguished Vice President of the United States.

Indeed, as the Senator from Wisconsin intimated, the Vice President has a way of winning the trust, the respect, and the following of all men; even those who disagree with him. I think he is ever mindful of a bit of advice of Abraham Lincoln. When somebody upbraided Lincoln for being willing to talk to his enemies and to be seen with his critics, Lincoln stated: "Well, gentlemen, do I not destroy my enemies when I make them my friends?"

This indeed has been the rich philosophy and the successful conduct of the distinguished Presiding Officer of this body, the Vice President of the United States. I join sincerely in the tributes paid to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to say, along with the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming, who has just taken his seat, that when the Vice President was a Senator from Texas he came to Massachusetts to make a political speech. He went into South Boston, which is a stronghold of Democratic votes, and in the 1960 elections I received more votes in South Boston than I ever had received there before. I congratulate him. I hope he will come to Boston many times more.

Mr. President, I am also glad to join with the many friends of the Vice President in congratulating him upon his 25th anniversary as a Member of Congress. In the House he gained practical experience. With that experience, he came to the Senate well informed on domestic and foreign problems. His colleagues on the other side of the aisle made him their majority leader. He truly was a leader, and succeeded in getting things done. He can be proud of his work as majority leader of the Senate.

I also wish to say a word on the personal side, which also appeals to so many of us. He was friendly, easy to approach, and helpful in many ways. With Mrs. Johnson to assist and guide him at home, with his lovely daughters to make him happy, I know that he will have many more useful years not only as the Presiding Officer in the Senate but also as a Vice President who takes an active part in the affairs of state and, as such, has helped to establish better and more friendly relations with other countries during his tours abroad. I join in congratulating him and wishing him many more years of useful public service.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in expressing my personal tribute to the Vice President, who is now in the chair, on the 25th anniversary of his arrival in the Congress. His service has been distinguished and devoted to the public interest. He warmly deserves the tribute of the Nation which he is receiving today.

I cut my political teeth in the Senate under the Vice President. From him I have learned much. We have not always agreed, but most of the time we have.

To me he has personified the finest traditions of the Senate and the best traditions of aggressive leadership which results in getting things done. I am happy to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Vice President—a great public servant who, in his present role, is contributing very much to the peace of the world, the security of our country, and the happiness and advancement of all American citizens.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in expressing warm feelings for the Vice President on the occasion of his 25 years' service anniversary. There is nothing that I can add to the tributes paid to him.

I have known him during all of those 25 remarkable years—22 years we have served together. We were elected to the Senate in the same year. We served on the Naval Affairs and Armed Services Committees in the House together. When he left the Senate to become Vice President, we were serving on the same committees together—Appropriations, Armed Services, and Space—and the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. In fact, with Senators Bridges and Stennis, we were the only Senators to have all four of these committee and subcommittee assignments.

So I think I probably know Lyndon Johnson as well as does any Member of Congress. And what I think of him is probably best summed up in what he has said about me repeatedly—that when in 1948 he won the Democratic nomination for U.S. Senator in Texas, by the thin margin of only 85 votes out of a million votes cast, and when there were threats to keep him from being seated in the Senate, he said he was sure of one Republican Senator who would vote to seat him, Margaret Chase Smith.

In like manner I observed in 1954 and 1960 that I was sure of one Democratic Senator who would not come into Maine and seek my defeat, and that was Lyndon Johnson.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join with Senators in congratulations to the Vice President on 25 years of public service. He is a man of inspiration to us all for his boundless energy, his great enthusiasm, and his profound convictions. He has fought in many battles—some with me—but they have always been a joy because I knew I was dealing with a good sport and an outstandingly fine American, as sincere as I was, in everything that he attempted. It is one of the great ornaments of American public life that, without any derogation in the intensity of our views or our adherence to our own parties, we can close ranks, as we often do on questions of foreign policy and domestic policy, in wishing all happiness and good health, and giving all due praise to so distinguished an American as our Vice President.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in saluting and congratulating the man who, as of today, has given 9,131 days, or 25 years, in the service of his own Government of the United States, having served in the legislative and executive branches of that Government.

When the history of this century is written, the name of Lyndon Johnson will rank high among the honor roll of Americans who have made substantial contributions to the political, social, and economic progress of our country. His work in the House of Representatives, in the U.S. Senate, and as Vice President of the United States has been singularly marked by soundness of judgment, honesty of heart, and humility of spirit.

Carlyle once said:

> Great men are the commissioned guides of mankind.

Certainly, the refining aspects of Lyndon Johnson's political leadership in the Senate have been a guide and an inspiration to all of us. The flow of his energies, united by commonsense and enhanced by a warmth of personality, have made his influence upon this legislative body a brilliant achievement in the conduct of parliamentary government.

Lyndon Johnson has been my good friend, and I feel enriched by his friendship, just as the people of the United States have been enriched by his 25 years of service in their behalf.

As I think of Lyndon Johnson I think of William Wordsworth's question, "Who is the happy warrior?" Wordsworth might well have been thinking of a man like Lyndon Johnson when he penned "The Character of the Happy Warrior." I like to think of our Vice President, the capable presiding officer of the Senate, as epitomizing the spirit of Wordsworth's lines:

CHARACTER OF THE HAPPY WARRIOR

(By William Wordsworth)

Who is the happy Warrior? Who is he
That every man in arms should wish to be?

—It is the generous Spirit, who, when brought
Among the tasks of real life, hath wrought
Upon the plan that pleased his boyish thought:
Whose high endeavours are an inward light
That makes the path before him always bright:
Who, with a natural instinct to discern
What knowledge can perform, is diligent to learn:
Abides by this resolve, and stops not there,
But makes his moral being his prime care;
Who, doomed to go in company with Pain,
And Fear, and Bloodshed, miserable train!
Turns his necessity to glorious gain;
In face of these doth exercise a power
Which is our human nature's highest dower;
Controls them and subdues, transmutes, bereaves
Of their bad influence, and their good receives:
By objects, which might force the soul to abate
Her feeling, rendered more compassionate;
Is placable—because occasions rise
So often that demand such sacrifice;
More skilful in self-knowledge, even more pure,
As tempted more; more able to endure,
As more exposed to suffering and distress;
Thence, also, more alive to tenderness.
—'Tis he whose law is reason; who depends
Upon that law as on the best of friends;
Whence, in a stage where men are tempted still
To evil for a guard against worse ill,
And what in quality or act is best
Doth seldom on a right foundation rest,
He labours good on good to fix, and owes
To virtue every triumph that he knows:
—Who, if he rises to station of command,
Rises by open means; and there will stand
On honourable terms, or else retire,
And in himself possess his own desire;
Who comprehends his trust, and to the same
Keeps faithful with a singleness of aim;
And therefore does not stoop, nor lie in wait
For wealth, or honours, or for worldly state;
Whom they must follow, on whose head must fall,
Like showers of manna, if they come at all:
Whose power shed round him in the common strife,
Or mild concerns of ordinary life,
A constant influence, a peculiar grace;
But who, if he be called upon to face
Some awful moment to which Heaven has joined
Great issues, good or bad for human kind,
Is happy as a Lover; and attired
With sudden brightness, like a Man inspired;
And through the heat of conflict, keeps the law
In calmness made, and sees what he foresaw;
Or if an unexpected call succeed,
Come when it will, is equal to the need:
—He who, though thus endued as with a sense
And faculty for storm and turbulence,
Is yet a Soul whose master-bias leans
To homefelt pleasures and to gentle scenes;
Sweet images! which, wheresoe'er he be,
Are at his heart; and such fidelity
It is his darling passion to approve;
More brave for this, that he hath much to love:—
'Tis finally, the Man, who, lifted high,
Conspicuous object in a Nation's eye,
Or left unthought-of in obscurity,—
Who, with a toward or untoward lot,
Prosperous or adverse, to his wish or not—
Plays in the many games of life, that one
Where what he most doth value must be won:
Whom neither shape or danger can dismay,
Nor thought of tender happiness betray;
Who, not content that former worth stand fast,
Looks forward, persevering to the last,
From well to better, daily self-surpast:
Who, whether praise of him must walk the earth
For ever, and to noble deeds give birth,
Or he must fall, to sleep without his fame,
And leave a dead unprofitable name—
Finds comfort in himself and in his cause;
And, while the mortal mist is gathering, draws
His breath in confidence of Heaven's applause:
This is the happy Warrior; this is He
That every Man in arms should wish to be.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I wish to add a few words to pay my deference and devotion and to manifest my sincere and real affection for the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

I regard him as one of the truly great men of our time. He has always worked for the welfare of the people and as a legislator over the years worked untiringly to help them attain security and contentment. I foresee for him an even greater future as a public servant, in addition to the fact that for 25 years LYNDON B. JOHNSON has outstandingly served his country in both a legislative and an executive capacity. All Americans in every part of the Nation should reflect upon the service of this great public servant. I am sure they wish to join with us today in paying our simple respect and manifesting our great affection for our great Vice President, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

As I recall—and my recollection is very distinct on this subject—I first came in contact with our great Vice President back in late 1940. I have served four terms as Congressman at Large in the House of Representatives; 1940 was not a good year for our candidates in Ohio for statewide offices from the Governor down, and they were defeated by majorities of approximately 200,000 in favor of members of the Grand Old Party, of which the Vice President and I do not happen to be members.

In that year Ohio elected two Congressmen at Large. My running mate was defeated. However, I happened to squeak through, due to the generosity of the Ohio voters.

I received a fine telegram, followed by a fine letter, from Representative LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, asking what service he could offer me. I am sure the Vice President does not remember it, but I recall it very distinctly. I responded by saying that I was so happy to be reelected as a Representative at Large, I would ask him to please help me get an office in the Old House Office Building, and that any office would be satisfactory, even one beside the furnace room. The Vice President, then a Texas Congressman, secured for me a good office—not one next to the furnace room.

For the 2 years in which I served in the 77th Congress, he was my friend and adviser. We came to know each other well. In 1950, I met with defeat and returned to Cleveland to practice law. When, in 1958, I was elected to the U.S. Senate, and in early December, came to Washington, I was a freshman Senator; although, to paraphrase language I have heard on occasion from the lips of the Vice President himself, I was not so young as I used to be or so old as I hope to be, still, I was a freshman Senator. When Senator JOHNSON, as the majority leader of the Senate, asked me what he could do for me, he also said a very fine and gracious thing, which I shall always remember: "You are the youngest looking 69-year-old man I have ever seen." I said, "There is just one thing I would like: I would like to be appointed to membership on the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences." The majority leader, who is now the Vice President of the United States, said, "You'll be assigned to that committee." I was, and I have served on that committee since that time.

On this occasion, when we are congratulating the Vice President and in reality we are also congratulating the people of the United States for having had the services of this great legislator and executive for a period of 25 years—I wish to say that as a member of that committee I have tried not to let the Vice President down. I have attended every meeting of the committee.

Mr. President, in joining with other Senators as we speak of our genuine affection and respect for our great Vice President, I shall end my remarks by reading an item of a newsletter which I send to Ohio, and which, it just happens, reached every newspaper office in Ohio and about 30,000 citizens of Ohio yesterday morning. The newsletter which I myself write is entitled "Straight From Washington." I have sometimes tried to add a light touch to it, because we are living in a grim period of international anarchy, and if a light touch can be added here and there, it seems to me that that is helpful. The next to the concluding paragraph of the newsletter is entitled "Troubles." It reads as follows:

> Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON is proving to be a strong right arm of our Chief Executive. He is entrusted with tremendous responsibilities in connection with our space and missile effort. Also, he is frequently sent abroad on short notice for important missions for our President. Washington gossip has it that the Vice President goes out to Andrews Air Base and tells the pilot, "Go anywhere—we got troubles all over."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] for deferring to me, so that I may speak at this time.

It is a genuine personal pleasure and privilege for me to add words of tribute, respect, and admiration for the Vice President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, who is also a very dear and close friend.

Twenty-five years ago a young man came from the hill country of Texas to the Congress of the United States. He was well acquainted with Congress because of his service in Washington in other areas of the Government, and indeed in congressional secretarial or clerical service. The young man who came to Washington became a friend and stanch supporter of one of the truly great men of America—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I have felt that if one wanted a character reference for public service, he could not have a better one than to be known as a friend, confidant, and supporter of the late and beloved President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Those were critical, crucial days; days of depression, days of war, days of recovery, days dedicated to the achievement of peace. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, then Representative JOHNSON, was deeply involved in all those troubles and achievements. As an administrator in the National Youth Administration, he carried out one of the vital policies of our Government. As a Representative in Congress, he supported the President in his efforts to build a program of economic recovery and to strengthen the Nation for the trials which were to come in the war years. This is a remarkable record.

As a U.S. Senator, LYNDON B. JOHNSON came to this body in the same year that I did—1949. I shall never forget the hand of friendship and fellowship which he extended to me. We come from different backgrounds and different parts of the country. Yet I think we are kindred souls in the sense that both of us work for the people, believe in the people, and strongly believe in our institutions of representative government.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, now our Vice President, taught every new Member of the Senate to look upon the Senate as an honored and respected body. I remember the numerous times when, as majority leader of the Senate, he stood at this desk and called upon the Democratic Party to be a responsible party—constructive, progressive, responsible. I believe that that measure of progressive responsibility, or responsibility with a progressive philosophy, stood us well in the elections of 1954, 1956, 1958, and 1960, as the Democratic Party built majorities in the Senate.

The former majority leader—as is true of our present majority leader—revealed to us that we can fight hard for our programs, never sacrifice our convictions or principles, and still act without demagoguery; we can act with responsibility. During these trying days, the American people want responsibility from their public officials. They are perfectly willing to have each of us express his views as we wish. The American people expect that to be done in this Chamber. There will be a diversity of opinion and even of philosophy. But, above all, the people expect us to act responsibly toward one another and responsibly in our role of rendering public service toward influencing the people of the country.

I could go on, and I should like to. However, I shall mention only one or two other things.

First, the family of the Vice President has been a source of pride and inspiration to him. I knew his beloved mother; I know his wife, to whom we affectionately refer as Lady Bird; his daughters; and the other members of his intimate, personal family. They have all been sources of encouragement, inspiration, and comfort to the Vice President, and he has honored them at all times by his personal and his public actions. And I have had the privilege—and Mrs. Humphrey, likewise—of knowing this family. We love them dearly.

I should like to add that the young Congressman to whom I referred, who came to the House of Representatives 25 years ago, came with convictions about people that have stood him well. There is not a grain of prejudice or intolerance in the makeup of LYNDON JOHNSON, and I am glad I can say this to him publicly. This sense of respect for people has placed him in a unique position in American public life. The greatest achievements in the field of civil rights were written in Congress while LYNDON JOHNSON was the majority leader of the Senate. Here is a Texan, a southerner, an American, who led the fight for achievement in the field of civil rights. Here is a great Texan and a great American who, as Vice President, is now giving genuine and effective leadership to the cause of equality of opportunity. In this particular instance it is in the field of employment; but it goes deeper than that; it goes throughout the whole fabric of our society. And he stands, as the Senator from Ohio has stated, as the strong right arm of the President, in carrying out the commitments of the Democratic platform, and, more than that, in carrying out the commitments of democratic philosophy—and I mean both the philosophy of the Democratic Party and democratic philosophy generally—human, real equality, and the realization of equality of opportunity.

I salute the Vice President for his acts of courage and conviction and character, because today America needs in high places people who are tall and great and big in their convictions, particularly as they touch the fields of equality and respect for human dignity.

So I salute the Vice President. I thank him for his 25 years of service. I hope he will have 25 years more of public service, because America needs him; the world needs him; and, besides that, his friends need him, too, and like him.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, 25 years ago this day the newspapers of the country informed the people that on the eve of his 75th birthday, Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, of the U.S. Supreme Court, declined to make any statement with reference to retirement, although he had been expected to do so.

Twenty-five years ago this day the Supreme Court of the United States concluded its hearing of arguments challenging the constitutionality of the Social Security Act.

Twenty-five years ago this day, Mr. President, there were many rumors, reported by the newspapers, that President Roosevelt intended to reduce the price of gold.

The headlines on that day, Mr. President, in the Washington newspapers, told of the sitdown strikes in the automobile industry, and of the civil war which then was raging in Spain.

The Washington Star published this story, too:

> Youthful LYNDON B. JOHNSON, from a hospital where he was operated on for appendicitis, 2 days ago, happily received reports of an emphatic victory over seven opponents, and said he considered the result a vote of confidence in Mr. Roosevelt and his programs.

Mr. President, I would join the Senator from Ohio in extending congratulations more to the people of the United States than to the Vice President himself, upon the attainment of his 25th anniversary of public service, because the people of the Nation have benefited greatly from and have profited from his work in the Congress—both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate—and from his service now as Vice President of the United States, where his career is in flower. You will note, Mr. President, that I did not say "in full flower," because so long as you are in public life, sir, you will continue to mature, to grow, and to give greater and more beneficial service to the people of this Nation.

Mr. President, a while ago the Senator from Wyoming told us how it was that you came into his State, in the 1958 campaign, and gave him and his backers added impetus and more cause to campaign harder, when you gave assurance that if he were elected—as happily was the case—you would see to it that he received one important committee assignment. And you did that, of course, in your role then of majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

Unhappily, in that year you did not have an opportunity to come to my own State of Alaska. But let me assure you, sir, that you will be welcome there either during a campaign year or at any other time. The people of Alaska would like to have you visit them.

So no assurance beforehand was given me that if I were elected to the Senate I would receive at least one important committee assignment. However, the fact is that LYNDON B. JOHNSON, as majority leader of the U.S. Senate, saw to it, after I was sworn in as U.S. Senator, that I received not one but two important committee assignments—in fact, I should say three, because I consider assignment to the Select Committee on Small Business, of which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who now is in the Chamber, is chairman, to be a vitally important committee assignment.

I believe all this points up, as perhaps nothing else could, the interest which the then majority leader of the Senate, who today is Vice President of the United States, took in each of the new Members of the Senate and in the areas, the States, and the regions they represented.

I have—perhaps more than most—reason to salute the Vice President upon this day—first, because our association was commenced a long while back. Last November, he completed 30 years of service to the people of the Nation, because in November 1931, he came to Washington as a congressional secretary. During some of those years—from 1933 to 1934—I was serving in a like capacity.

During all this time it has been my privilege to take, as it were, an objective position in evaluating LYNDON B. JOHNSON and in watching him grow and become a greater and a more effective leader.

Mr. President, there is another and an even more important reason why I should pay tribute on this day to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON. It is because, in all truth, if it were not for him and if it had not been for the late great Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, I would not be here today. More important, Mr. President, if it had not been for you and for Speaker Rayburn, Alaska would not now be a State, because either of you or both of you could, without any difficulty whatever, have said "no" instead of having said, as you did, "yes" to the proposals to bring the Alaska statehood bill before the House of Representatives and to the floor of the Senate in 1958. If you had said "no" instead of having said "yes," as you did—you would not have suffered any political inconvenience whatever.

So I have, as I have noted, a special reason to rise with my colleagues and give my evaluation of the Vice President on this day.

Mr. President, during the time I have been a Member of Congress, some persons have criticized me for being what they have termed too pro-JOHNSON. Others have criticized me for being what they have considered too anti-JOHNSON. I think this is oversimplification. It is not easy or proper to place one in one of these two camps. But if I had to bear a label, it would gladly be that of being in the Johnson camp, because in my time of service here, and even before, I came to realize that the then majority leader, now Vice President, was striving for the best interests of the entire Nation. As the Senator from Minnesota noted, some of the most progressive, the most progressive, and the only legislation for ever so long on the subject of civil rights, was initiated and pushed through to a successful conclusion by LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

I think it is a happy conjunction that the man to whom we pay our respects today can be Vice President and at the same time maintain this association with a body which he led for so long, and which he loves so dearly, by being President of the Senate.

All of us know the magnificent and massive contribution he has made in these perilous days to the welfare of our country. By his actions, deeds, intelligence, the force of his personality, and his leadership. Because of these qualities our Nation is becoming all the stronger all over the world.

In conclusion, I merely wish to note again and refer to the newspapers of 25 years ago this day. The book which then led the best seller lists had a title which I think has a peculiar, particular, and appropriate connection with what we are saying here today. The title of that book was "How To Win Friends and Influence People."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I realize other Senators wish to speak. I did not want this opportunity to pass, however, without extending my congratulations to the Vice President upon his completion of a quarter century in the Congress and as Vice President of the United States.

I have been interested in hearing the Senator from Alaska tell us some of the things that were in the newspapers and the headlines and what the best seller was 25 years ago. I was sitting here, trying to remember what happened at that time.

I remember that I had come to the House only 3 months or a little more before the election was held in Texas. I knew the predecessor of my friend, the Vice President, Mr. Buchanan, who was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. Representative Buchanan died. This young man in Texas, who was NYA Administrator, and who had served here on the Hill as a secretary to Representative Kleberg, got into the race. We began hearing something about the race down there and about the large number of candidates who were running.

Just prior to that time, I believe it was on the 5th day of February 1937, President Roosevelt had proposed to the Congress of the United States a provision to make some changes in the Supreme Court. We were right in the midst of the Supreme Court fight. The fight carried on in the Senate was very bitter. Fortunately for a good many of us in the House, the Senate decided to take the brunt of the fight, and not throw it to the House. I listened to many of the debates in the Senate. Joe Robinson sat in this seat near me as majority leader of the Senate, and he was actively engaged in the fight. I remember the part Joe O'Mahoney took in it. It was a tremendous fight. It is hard for many of us to realize today what a tremendous struggle it was.

After it had run quite a long time, the majority leader, Senator Robinson, unfortunately, died. Following his death, Senators and the President of the United States were able to get together and work out a settlement of the dispute, and the bill was enacted which is the law today.

Right in the midst of that fight the campaign in Texas was going on. The word went out over the country that this young man down there was coming out flatfooted for the program of the President of the United States, even such a controversial matter as I have mentioned. It made quite an impression on Congress and on people throughout the country. Then, on election day, news came that he had defeated all the candidates, he had led the field, he had won the race. Somehow or other, it had a tonic effect.

Mr. President, it is so easy to find fault with a President of the United States, whoever he may be. It is so easy to find fault with his program. It is so easy to become critical of his program and of the President of the United States. It takes something to stand up and fight for the program and not be discouraged because the whole program is not achieved overnight.

I had a young political science college group in my office earlier. They were asking me questions. One of the questions was, "How do you feel about President Kennedy's administration? Do you feel he has accomplished what he said he would back in his campaign?" I said, "No, and I suppose he never will." Browning, I think it was, said:

> Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp,
> Or what's a heaven for?

Emerson, I believe it was, said we should hitch our wagon to a star. In other words, goals should always be out there, whether they are immediately attainable or not.

LYNDON JOHNSON was a young man who dared to stand up for the program of the President of the United States and of the party of which he was a part.

I could go on and say many things, but I merely desire to indicate that I personally appreciate the extraordinary service he has rendered his country over the 25 years. I congratulate him for it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, 25 years of service to one's country in the arena of political action is a distinction that comes to very few men. When the service begins in the ranks and then is rewarded by successive elevation to offices of ever higher responsibility, the man so chosen is entitled to an exceptional recognition.

Our Vice President was first elected to the House of Representatives, where his record won him subsequent election to the Senate. His first term as Senator from Texas had not yet expired before his Democratic colleagues, recognizing his singular qualities of leadership, designated him as their minority leader. Two years later victory for the Democratic Party at the polls opened the way for LYNDON JOHNSON to become majority leader of the Senate.

When I came to the Senate, in January of 1957, LYNDON JOHNSON had already been acknowledged as one of the most effective majority leaders in recent times. That year, with the hazardous, thankless, but nonetheless necessary and courageous role he played in moving through to enactment the first civil rights bill in some 80 years, LYNDON JOHNSON proved himself to be one of the great Senators of all times. It is fitting that he should now occupy the second highest office in this land. He has earned it by 25 years of sterling silver service to his country, rendered always in faithful conformity to his own standard of values, which he once expressed in this way: "I am a free man, an American, a U.S. Senator, and a Democrat—in that order."

I am only sorry that the dimensions of my tribute fail to match the dimensions of the man to whom it is directed, but I sincerely salute the Vice President on his silver anniversary. The country has reason to be proud of him, even as he has given me so much reason to be proud to call myself his friend.

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON: A QUARTER CENTURY OF ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, 25 years ago a slender young man, known in National Youth Administration circles and in Washington, D.C., but virtually unknown in Texas, announced for Congress in my home district, the Austin district, the 10th Congressional District of Texas. It was a special election, high man take all. LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON boldly ran as an avowed supporter of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. None of his numerous opponents would so declare himself.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON led the ticket; he won. And Texas Gov. James V. Allred introduced the newest Congressman to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, then on a fishing trip off Galveston. LYNDON B. JOHNSON became a stanch New Deal Congressman, a stanch Democratic Congressman.

We all know of his growing prestige and influence in the Government from the day he first came to Congress. Always the confidant of Presidents, he was never more influential than today.

In this rise to power and to success, to influence, and to fame, LYNDON B. JOHNSON's family played a notable role, and I believe that he would want each of them to have his or her share of the honor and the credit that goes to him today. I say to the occupant of the chair, I not only believe it, but I know he wants his family to have its share of the credit and the honor. I have heard him pay tribute to them often.

His father, Samuel Johnson, long a member of the Texas Legislature, was a wise political counselor. The Vice President grew up in a home in which government and politics were part of the daily living; as everyday a subject as the weather is in a farm family. He learned at an early age to forecast political climate.

His mother, Rebekah Baines Johnson, descendant of Baptist preachers and teachers in Texas, and a grand lady by all our Texas traditions, honored by all Texans whatever their political party or religious affiliations, was a devout Christian and loved her Bible as LYNDON's father loved his politics.

In Washington, the brightest stars in LYNDON B. JOHNSON's crown are his devoted wife and daughters. Mrs. Lyndon Baines Johnson, "Lady Bird," has been at his side in every contest, with all her mind and soul. Their charming daughters, Lynda Bird and Lucy Baines, complete the family circle. Their charm and graciousness add much to the overall good will that the Vice President and his family have won as a family, in the exacting life of the second highest office in the land.

Only one other Texan, John Nance Garner, ever reached so high an office; none has gone higher.

Upon checking the Congressional Directory, I learned that only five of our colleagues in the Senate have served in the Senate for as long as 25 years. Only 28 Members of the House of Representatives have served there a quarter of a century. Only a handful more, combining service in the House and Senate, have attained a total of 25 years' service in the Congress of the United States.

At the beginning of his second quarter century of service since his first election to the Congress, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON displays all the energy and drive of that first race in 1937, which I saw him make in the 10th Congressional District, where I was serving as a State court judge at that time.

This is so true that writers now are speculating on the extent of additional accomplishments in the coming second quarter of a century. All are certain that more high public service lies in store for him.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, it is my privilege to join my distinguished colleagues and friends in paying tribute to a great Texan, a great leader, a great American, a great citizen of the world. I think the people of Hawaii, the Aloha State, have some reasons for being a little more aware of his distinguished career and his contributions different from those of the people of many other States, because the Vice President was intimately associated with helping Hawaii to attain two very great ambitions.

The first was statehood. Though a great many people had worked toward that end and had made their contributions, the fact remains that when statehood for Hawaii became an accomplished fact it was due very largely—I will say overwhelmingly—to the driving interest and purpose of the Vice President. We shall never forget it.

We in Hawaii had another great ambition. We wished to see established in the middle of the Pacific, in Hawaii, a great international institution. Again, a great many people had a part, but there came a day when the then majority leader of the Senate turned his interest toward it, with the result that we have it.

In Hawaii there is something else with which we associate the Vice President. Hawaii will never be a great State from the standpoint of wealth, in the sense many of the States are wealthy, but we have something there that we treasure—what we call the spirit of aloha, of friendliness.

I assure the Vice President we include him in that circle. In the future, when he visits Hawaii he will be greeted by the loveliest leis that can be made from our beautiful Hawaiian flowers, by our magnificent ocean beaches, by our majestic mountains—and we have them, of course—but, above all, he will be welcomed into our homes and our hearts.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the career of the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON is a unique and remarkable one. Its duration, which is marked today with these well-deserved tributes, is but the least important or noteworthy facet of that career. Even so, as the junior Senator from Idaho said, 25 years of service in the Halls of the U.S. Congress is an achievement given to only a few men.

The political talent of the young Representative from Texas was soon recognized. The political talent of the new Senator JOHNSON from Texas was even more quickly recognized, both because of his more mature administration, which naturally came from his experience and training in the House of Representatives, and also because of his desire for service and the driving force of his personality. I think our distinguished Vice President reached the zenith of his service as majority leader, though the position which he now is honored to hold is the more exalted one. As majority leader, Senator JOHNSON achieved a greater niche in the Hall of Fame than any other leader of the Senate has ever attained. He served his State well. He served his party well. He helped to forge the sinews of victory in the presidential and congressional campaigns of 1960. Still a young man, still filled with vigor, enthusiasm, and political talents, his service of the country will yet be great. I offer my sincere congratulations to him.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I extend my congratulations to the distinguished Vice President from my State for his 25 years of service to his country. As the successor to his seat in this august body, I acknowledge that he has set a standard of ability and skill that some aim to equal, and some may reach for, but very few can ever achieve.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is by happy prerogative that we, the Members of the Senate, address the arbiter of our oratory as "Mr. President." It is a title that never seemed more fitting than when the people of America decided that it would be an honor that belonged to LYNDON JOHNSON.

I venture to say that both sides of the aisle felt that this was a part of a victory in which all of us in the Senate could share. I venture to say that it would be something of a loss for all of us in the Senate—that the Senate would be something less than we had known—if the figure of LYNDON JOHNSON did not regularly lend itself to the deliberations of this body

Here we saw the growth of our colleague to greatness. We here saw his response to responsibility. It was the responsibility of the leadership of the majority when the Presidency of the Nation was vested in another political party. His was a leadership to conceive, to coordinate, and to compromise, if you will, two schools of thought with yet one common task, the security of our country in the dimensions of equity, prosperity, and peace.

LYNDON JOHNSON here displayed the talents which gave him the right—yes, the duty—to offer them to the service of his countrymen at their free election, their choice for the challenge of the Presidency, to advance from the leadership of the Senate to the supreme leadership of our great country.

Within his political party—my party, too—the choice was between good men. LYNDON JOHNSON was a man to compete without rancor and to concede without bitterness. He could proudly accept second place as proof of the sacrificing service that was his goal in the first place.

LYNDON JOHNSON has given new distinction and new dimension to the Office of Vice President. He has been Ambassador Extraordinary for America everywhere on earth. He has made a beginning of extending our influence into the realms of space, but he himself has remained the self-same, down-to-earth LYNDON JOHNSON who has earned from us a response that began in respect and culminates in affection.

He can walk with kings, and will talk with the lowliest. Everybody everywhere accepts him in the image of an American where all men are equal—kings and camel drivers and Congressmen.

This is no new LYNDON JOHNSON—not different from the man who moved among us with direction, discussion, debate, diplomacy. He is the same LYNDON JOHNSON—master of the spoken word, keeper of his given word.

No one of us has a proprietary right to monopolize any eulogy of LYNDON JOHNSON. But each of us has his special right of recollection. Each has some prized personal connection of affection in which we know this great American in his simplest and sincerest character as a treasured friend.

These occasions, perhaps, are too personal to be recited here for the record. But they will be forever treasured in the humble hearts captivated by the natural gallantry of LYNDON JOHNSON and the sincere graciousness of his lovely lady.

It is easy to understand the delightful impress they make for themselves and for our land in places high and low, in places far and wide.

In this family of the Senate it gives us a sense of personal possession that we can claim her because of our claim upon him. It is a sweet privilege to say today that we know them, love them, and honor them both as we mark LYNDON JOHNSON's silver anniversary in the Halls of the Congress.

To LYNDON JOHNSON and his lovely lady I extend my sincere congratulations.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, while we remember the 25 years that LYNDON JOHNSON has spent in the Congress of the United States, I wish to recall a time a little earlier than 1937. I wish to go back to a time 30 years ago. I did not then know him well. I merely knew of him when Representative Dick Kleberg brought him here to work with him in 1932. It was perfectly typical of the man who was to be our great leader in this body that, after he had been a while with Representative Kleberg, LYNDON JOHNSON changed his mind and wanted to be a doorkeeper so he could come to know all Representatives who were in the Congress.

My acquaintance with the Vice President began in 1935, when he returned to Texas to become the head of the National Youth Administration in that State. At the same time it was my privilege to be the National Youth administrator in the neighboring State of New Mexico. Every time there was any sort of regional meeting or national gathering I had an opportunity to watch the then administrator of NYA in Texas and to become appreciative of his may talents.

Not long after that time a vacancy occurred in the House of Representatives. With characteristic drive, LYNDON JOHNSON decided to make a try for the office. That drive was successful, and so 25 years ago he came here to succeed Representative Buchanan.

The story of his 25 years of service is indeed an inspired one. He had been in the House of Representatives for some time when I came into it in 1941. But I then learned that Members of the House of Representatives had appraised him correctly, not only as a powerful leader, but also as a great future leader.

The great longtime Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, once said to me that the House of Representatives was the fairest jury before which a man could be tried, and in 99 cases out of 100 would render an absolutely correct verdict. The House of Representatives tried LYNDON JOHNSON and found him well qualified for leadership. It gave him every opportunity for influence in that great body.

Subsequently, we entered a great war, and LYNDON JOHNSON decided he could best serve the country outside of the House of Representatives. He spent some time in uniform, and after a short time the insistence came that he return to Congress.

We were glad to have him come back, after he had done his mililtary duty, and also, certainly, to have the benefit of his experience in the work connected with military affairs, then being handled by the Congress.

It is strange how these things continue to come along. I recognized that we had a great contest in 1948. I was a candidate for election to the Senate, and so was he. Again I was pleased to see the great work which he did in his campaign and as a Member of the Senate after he assumed his responsibilities.

Then came a period when we had some rough times in the Senate. The majority control in the Senate was extremely close, and the situation required an individual who knew how to handle people and who knew how to work with people, and who was a master in the work of the science of politics. The Democratic Party turned to LYNDON JOHNSON and placed its responsibilities with him. It was when he was majority leader that we really began to realize the talents which this able man possessed. We knew how he was able to work out what political writers call political miracles. As someone has said, a man who wakes to find himself famous was never asleep in the first place; LYNDON JOHNSON was working all the time.

Of course, all this did not suddenly happen. I recall one time when I was doing some work late in an evening, around 11:30, and the telephone rang. I recognized the voice on the line as that of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON. He said, "I have something that I think you should do tomorrow." We discussed the matter. Then I said, "LYNDON, you should not have things like this on your mind before you go to bed."

He said, "Where do you think I am?"

I said, "I hope you are at home."

He said, "I am in the office."

I had complained about having to work at 11:30 at night. He was not complaining. He was still in his office. What he was doing was not for the benefit or welfare of LYNDON B. JOHNSON. It concerned the progress of the Democratic Party and its situation in the Senate.

Now we are glad to see that these passing years have been pleasant to him and have been made pleasant for us by the Vice President as the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I can only say to him now, as I have said on many occasions, that he makes us proud of that association by the fine way he is doing his job and by the excellent way in which he cooperates with the President of the United States and by the way he expresses his feelings toward the other Members of the Senate who are connected with him in this body.

These have been 25 fine years. I cannot look forward to another 25 years, but I shall look forward to as many of them as I shall have here for a continuation of this fine association with the Vice President.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join so many colleagues in paying tribute to Vice President JOHNSON on the 25th anniversary of his election to the Congress.

I first met LYNDON JOHNSON 28 years ago, when he was the Director of the National Youth Administration in Texas and I held the same post in Connecticut. As I have watched his career since then, my admiration and respect for him has steadily grown. I have been proud to have him as a friend, in good times and in difficult times, and, like so many others who have spoken today, I wish to voice not only my admiration for a great political leader, but also my personal affection for a good friend.

It was given to LYNDON JOHNSON to lead the Democratic majority in the Senate during a Republican administration.

This divided system, under which the people reposed the executive power in one party and the legislative power in the other, posed a serious threat to effective government during a critical period of our history.

It was to be LYNDON JOHNSON's task to mediate the differences within his own party; to compromise the disputes between Democrats and Republicans; to resolve the differences between the Congress and the administration; and somehow to achieve out of all this potential chaos a program of accomplishment and advance for the American people.

To this great task he brought a faith in the American political system; a rare insight into the human personality; an infinite capacity for hard work; an enduring patience; a vast experience in life; an essential patriotism; and, above all, a towering strength of character.

He accomplished the seemingly impossible task laid upon him. Under his leadership the Democratic majority was able to lay before the American people its views, its goals, its differences with the opposing party, and yet the Democratic Congress was able to cooperate with the Republican administration in enacting those measures on which both parties could find some common ground.

For years LYNDON JOHNSON was under the steady sniping attack of those in the country who preferred to create political issues rather than pass responsible legislation, and from those who wished to see the Senate used, not as a deliberative body to govern the Nation, but as a propaganda forum to set the stage for the next campaign.

Always he pursued the path which placed the national interest first, and which placed the larger interests of his party above the temporary gain of the hour. For this he will be remembered as one of the great men of our history, who performed an indispensable service to the Nation.

We may say confidently that his greatest honors are in the future; his greatest achievements are still to come; and his greatest contributions to the Nation he has served so well are yet ahead.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing to the Vice President my sincere congratulations for his brilliant and magnificent record of statesmanship. The history of our country will always be greatly indebted to him.

My first close association with the Vice President was when he served in this body as chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate. We were then both members of the Armed Services Committee.

I would have the RECORD show, as I have said in so many places in the United States over the years, that the security of the United States is much stronger because of the great, dedicated service LYNDON JOHNSON performed for the people of this country, when, objectively, impartially, and judiciously, he investigated each one of the issues that came before our subcommittee.

He did not hesitate, when strong action was needed to be taken with regard to some failure on the part of the Pentagon to live up to its full responsibility; but he did it in a manner so constructive that he won the respect and cooperation of the Pentagon in accomplishing what all of us had in mind toward strengthening the security of our country.

There are many fields of activity in which the Vice President has made great contributions. I particularly wish to point out the contribution he has made in the field of civil rights. How well I know the fairness with which he always tackled that subject during his service as majority leader in the Senate, a subject which at best is a difficult one and always one that stirs up a great controversy.

I heard him say many times that, after all, when we bring about a situation in this country where the privilege of voting is made available to all the people, we will have in a large measure solved most of our civil rights problems. I still think he is right about it.

The President has placed him in charge of a very important assignment, to see to it that there shall not be, as far as the Government and Congress are concerned, any discrimination because of race, color, or creed. Here again, judiciously and fairly, he has worked with the great business concerns of the country which seek contracts with the Federal Government, and has been making magnificent forward strides in bringing an end to discrimination, in connection with the awarding of Government contracts, in the field of civil rights.

I had a little fun with the Vice President earlier this afternoon, when I interrupted the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] and asked him, when he was thanking the Vice President for the assistance he had been to the Senator from Wyoming in his election a few years ago, if he thought there was any hope that the Senator from Oregon might have such assistance in the future.

So that no one may misjudge the record, let me say that the Vice President of the United States has been of great assistance to the Senator from Oregon, time and time again, in making clear to the people of Oregon, through various media, the very close association that exists between us.

I can assure you, Mr. Vice President, that a warm, cordial welcome awaits you in the State of Oregon, in the months ahead, when you yourself select the time which will give us an opportunity to welcome you to my State.

As I close, I offer hearty congratulations to you upon your 25 years of service in the Federal Government. It is my hope and prayer that you will have many more years of such dedicated service and statesmanship for the benefit of the people of your country.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, there are many reasons why I have been grateful for the opportunity to be in the Senate, but in a personal sense none more than the privilege given me now to join with other Senators in expressing congratulations to the Vice President of the United States, our Presiding Officer, on the occasion of this anniversary.

On such occasions as this, there is an understandable tendency to stress personal relationships and experiences. "Reminiscing" would be the adjective or description. This is always interesting and pleasant and appropriate; but it suffers—if that is the word—from the emotion which is friendship; and it reflects the responses to a personality. Especially is this the case on an anniversary occasion of one of the most colorful men of our time. With other Members of this body, I could recount exciting personal experiences, experiences that will live with me always; reasons that I have to be grateful and appreciative for personal kindnesses.

But history and those who write it treat such matters as just footnotes. More important to history are the public actions of the man. In the case of the remarkable American whom we honor today, they will chronicle his understanding of the role which the legislative branch must play at midcentury and his skill in devising means whereby this role may be filled. Certainly they will identify LYNDON B. JOHNSON as one who first saw and persuaded Congress to see that this earth has become just a tiny star in the vastness of conquerable space; who now guides our steps into space—giant and peaceful steps.

The complete selflessness of his service to the President of the United States earns the admiration of all observers. History will acknowledge this and many other constructive public acts. If not greater than each of these, surely no less will be history's report on this man who energized, directed, and made effective the efforts of the Federal Government to insure equality of opportunity for all of its citizens. It will note that it was a Texan, proud and sensitive of the traditions of his great State, who successfully appealed to the pride and sensitivity of all Americans to insure that this free society practice what long it had preached.

Few men in American life have shown a greater concern for the problems of human and civil rights than LYNDON B. JOHNSON. His regional origin, his youthful experiences during the deprivations of the great depression, the many levels of his public responsibility in Congress and now as Vice President of the United States, his leadership at the national level and on the world scene, have contributed each in their special way to his special understanding. When President Kennedy issued his Executive order prohibiting discrimination in Federal employment and by Federal contractors, he asked the Vice President to serve as chairman of a high-level committee of Cabinet officers and prominent citizens from industry, labor, religious and civic life. The record of the President's Committee during its first year of activity has been an outstanding one. It has been deeply encouraging to all of us who have been seeking to make our economy a modern economy—one that fairly and fully utilizes the talents and the skills of all Americans without regard to race, religion, or ancestry. Shortly after accepting this assignment from the President, the Vice President called together the presidents of 50 leading corporations of America. The following day he called together the presidents of our great labor organizations. He asked and he got pledges from them that our Government would have their cooperation in overcoming the remaining barriers to equal job opportunity that we have been working on since the days that President Roosevelt first created a Fair Employment Practices Committee during World War II. In the field of Federal employment, Cabinet officers have told me that the Vice President has personally worked with each of them, urging them and helping them to make sure that their internal operations are such that Federal employees can move into promotions and new jobs commensurate with their skill. They have told me that he has encouraged them to go out into the community to give leadership to the development of new attitudes that would encourage qualified people to apply for and make their skills available to the public service. I have had members of the President's Committee tell me that the Vice President has made this assignment a matter of personal interest to all of them.

It is this personal determination that is so characteristic of the Vice President. In the past year he has been combining his personal conviction in the equality of men with the development of a new vigor in our national policy. The pieces of progress on which this new policy is being built are beginning to show. Job opportunities are expanding and racial segregation is being eliminated. LYNDON JOHNSON'S Committee has already acted upon more complaints in one year than his predecessors did in 6 years. His committee, under his leadership, is beginning to do something about these problems when they are brought to the fore. It is this vigor which is giving new hope that we can make the kind of progress that our space age demands. Lyndon Johnson understands this and is bringing his full experience to bear to help our Nation understand it and benefit from it.

I can only add, as have other Senators, that we hope the years allotted to you will be many and full. We know that this Nation in the future will have great need for your talents.

As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] has said with respect to his State, you will be welcome in Michigan, also, and we hope your visits will be many.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, this is Vice President Johnson's silver anniversary as an elected public official. As all of us know, silver adds to its luster through constant use. Our distinguished Vice President comes to this anniversary untarnished, and with a special gleam brought out by years of hard work and service on behalf of his native State and country.

I have served under him during his terms as majority leader in the Senate, and it is a pleasure to continue my service during his term as Vice President.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to join with my colleagues in saluting him on this happy occasion.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, early in his career Lyndon Johnson won the love and respect of two great men: Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Sam Rayburn. President Roosevelt left the scene too soon to see the full realization of his faith in Lyndon Johnson. But Sam Rayburn had the pleasure of seeing him grow into a statesman of great distinction. Sam Rayburn had an uncanny instinct about men. No one proved that better than did Lyndon Johnson.

James Reston once wrote in the New York Times:

> Other Senate leaders with large majorities and powerful Presidents have pushed through more legislation but it has seldom, if ever, happened that so much controversial legislation has gone through a divided Government with so few cuts and bruises.

This sums up in a few words the masterly job that Lyndon Johnson did for his country. It explains also why Senators on both sides of the aisle felt such a deep sense of loss and emptiness when Lyndon Johnson closed his desk in the Senate last year. The people of the country had the same feeling. Whatever their political persuasion, they knew that when the chips were down Lyndon Johnson had never let personal ambition or partisanship preempt what was good for the country. The poet Robert Frost put Lyndon Johnson's philosophy very simply recently when he said:

> I think people should be more patriotic than partisan.

Lyndon Johnson will go down in history as one of our greatest majority leaders. He will also go down in history as the first man to prove that a Vice President can do as much for his country as a majority leader can.

I cherish the opportunity of having served in the House and in the Senate with Lyndon Johnson. My congratulations and good wishes and my deepest affection to Lyndon on this occasion.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to one of our greatest living Americans. It was a great day for me when I met Lyndon Johnson and became one of his friends. His record of service to his country in these 25 years now just past is one of the most outstanding ever made by one man.

We came to the Senate together in January 1949. His record here for 12 years was unexcelled by any Senator in history.

He became the greatest majority leader in history.

His service in the all important field of national defense was impressive indeed.

He was a foremost leader in soil and water conservation.

More than any other Senator he recognized the imperative need for our country to excel and lead in the exploration and conquest of space both for peaceful purposes and the national defense.

He was the father of the Nation's present program for peaceful utilization of space.

He is a great Vice President, loyal to his Chief, devoted to his country, and dedicated to its greatest social and economic progress and to its complete preparedness both to insure its own defense and to meet its responsibilities as the leader of the free world.

Mr. President, I join my colleagues in saluting and paying tribute to my cherished friend, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I join with my colleagues and all the friends and admirers of Lyndon Johnson in expressing to him heartiest congratulations and best wishes upon the observance of his 25th anniversary of service to his State and Nation.

As a Congressman, as a U.S. Senator, as Senate majority leader and now as Vice President, Lyndon Johnson has given unselfish devotion to his duty as a public servant. No man in modern American history has been more instrumental in influencing the policies of Government than he.

Lyndon Johnson has set a new high standard of public service and it is my earnest hope that this Nation and the world will have the benefit of his wise counsel and dynamic leadership for many years to come.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, 25 years ago today, the esteemed Vice President of the United States was elected to Congress at a special election in his native State of Texas. In the last quarter of a century of service to his State and his Nation, Lyndon Johnson has rung up a list of achievements that gives eloquent testimony to the caliber of this most remarkable man.

Actually, his service in Washington commenced 30 years ago when he served as secretary to Representative Richard Kleberg. Later he became Texas Administrator of the National Youth Administration, and in 1937 he won his seat from the 10th Texas Congressional District over a field of nine other candidates. Lyndon Johnson ran as a New Deal Democrat, and early caught the eye of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He remained a stanch and true friend of that great leader through the ensuing years.

Immediately after voting for the declaration of war on Germany and Japan in December 1941, he was in the uniform of his country as the first Member of Congress to enter the armed services. For his outstanding contributions as a fighting man he received the Silver Star for gallantry in action on a flight over New Guinea.

Lyndon Johnson continued in the House until his election to the Senate in 1948. He was promptly recognized as a man of unlimited talents and energy.

In 1951 his Democratic colleagues unanimously elected him party whip, and 2 years later he was chosen minority leader—the youngest in party history. When the Democrats gained control of the Senate after the 1954 elections, Senator Johnson became the majority leader, and how he performed in that capacity is a matter of record that cannot be embellished by mere descriptive phrases. He was a leader in every sense of the word and has left an indelible mark upon the annals of this body.

Through all his political career he has had at his side his lovely Lady Bird. Mrs. Johnson is not only gracious and charming, but has rare perception and insight. The couple are doubly blessed with their active teenage daughters, Lynda Bird and Lucy Baines.

As I said earlier, Mr. President, Lyndon Johnson's qualities of leadership are well known. Less known but of equal importance is his great capacity for friendship and human understanding. His warmth, his genuine respect for the opinions of others and his deep sense of loyalty all combine to endow Lyndon Johnson with a mantle of greatness. I have learned much from this man, but most of all I have learned to appreciate his strength of character, his abiding sense of justice, and his fierce dedication to those principles that keep alive the spirit of democracy in this greatest of all nations.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, this is a great and significant day. It marks 25 years since Lyndon Baines Johnson came to this Capitol as an elected official.

My personal acquaintance with this distinguished statesman covers but a fraction of that time. But I feel I know the Vice President well. There are few things I would deny him if he were to ask. And I like to think there are few things he would deny me if I asked. This is true for the present and the future because it was true in the past and because the Vice President is, essentially, the man who came here 25 years ago.

It was 4 years ago that the then Senator Johnson came to my State to help me in my race for the Senate. I drank from his cup of wisdom and drew sustenance during those lean days. And many times have I returned to the well of wisdom and sustenance.

When I came to the Senate, our party was the majority, yet we did not control the Presidency. For 6 years it was so. Only the wisdom and understanding of a man like our Vice President could make this Government work under such trying conditions. There was no obstructionism. There was no vindictiveness. There were no impediments. There were alternatives and compromises.

Compromise, I learned from this great American, is not retreating from principle. It is the art of the possible. It is making two divergent sides—each with principle and sincerity—come together on some common ground.

When our Vice President went around the world on behalf of the President a year ago, even his most hard working detractors admitted that he was one of our best ambassadors of good will. For Vice President JOHNSON has the essential element of greatness so often missing from the men who are otherwise learned, skillful, and important. He is human and humble. He is no stuffed shirt. If he is not typically American, he is typical of true American greatness.

Sometimes, when we are away from the telephones and the business of Washington and we reflect upon the history of this Republic, some of us delve into supposition. What is it the framers of the Constitution really meant? How can a cumbersome and complicated Government such as ours work? How can we divide authority and responsibility and splinter it among parties, places and peoples? How can we take both sides of our aisle and multiply our problems by both sides of the aisle of the other House and multiply again by the executive and judicial branches and again by 50 States and get an answer of 1?

It takes a man like LYNDON JOHNSON.

When I indulge in these thoughts, I come to the conclusion that the Founding Fathers—if they foresaw the complications—must have known that there would be a LYNDON JOHNSON among us. One of the most important and powerful men in the world, he never lets us forget that he was a frontier boy, a poor lad, a schoolteacher, a congressional staff member and a true tall-in-the-saddle son of the Southwest. He is truly American. I am proud to know him, proud to serve with him.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is a happy privilege to associate myself with the timely, eloquent, and sincere comments of the Senators who praised the achievements, the devotion to duty, and the superb leadership of LYNDON JOHNSON.

I was a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives when the people of the 10th District of Texas exercised excellent judgment in sending LYNDON JOHNSON to that body as successor to Representative James Buchanan. We recognized immediately his many talents and appreciated his friendly and persuasive characteristics. It was readily apparent that we had a colleague with outstanding ability and a knowledge of the legislative processes acquired as a diligent student and as secretary to former Representative Richard Kleberg of Texas.

My service in the House with Representative LYNDON JOHNSON, as with many other present Senate colleagues who were then in the other body, was a privilege and a responsibility which I enjoyed and shall always hold in cherished memory.

When, in 1958, West Virginians elected me to the Senate to complete the unexpired term of the late distinguished M. M. Neely, I was aware of the responsibilities involved. But I was happy in the knowledge that I would again be serving at the side of my friend and former colleague who had come to be recognized as one of the Senate's all-time superior majority leaders.

As my colleagues who have served in the other body know, there is a considerable readjustment and reorientation necessary when one assumes the duties of membership in the U.S. Senate. But this task was made all the easier by the tall, friendly, patient, and persuasive Texan whose leadership it was a pleasure to follow.

It seems appropriate to make note of the fact that when the other party was in the majority in 1953, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON was elected minority leader. Despite some dire predictions from a high level in the elections of 1954 that a Democratic Congress under a Republican President would bring on virtually a political war, our party was returned to majority status. To the lasting benefit of the country and to the credit of our party, the dire predictions were proven unalterably wrong by the philosophy of constructive and responsible leadership of Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON and the Speaker of the House, the late Sam Rayburn.

The record of the Senate under the Johnson leadership has been one of a steady achievement.

As the youngest majority leader in the history of the Senate when first elected to that post, and as leader during the longest period of divided government in our country's history, LYNDON JOHNSON met and conquered a range of difficult and complex problems seldom experienced by any prior legislative leader.

The record of his accomplishment is, in large measure, the basis on which our majority in the Senate has continued to grow in strength during these past difficult years. It has been the basis on which the Democratic Party was victorious in 1960 with LYNDON JOHNSON at the side of John F. Kennedy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. With the indulgence of the Senate, the Chair wishes to say that he does not deserve the generous statements made by his associates, led by the majority leader and the minority leader, but should like very much to be worthy of them. The Chair appreciates them greatly and will do all in his power to deserve what has been said.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Extension of Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Program

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the temporary extended unemployment compensation program, to increase the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for taxable year 1964, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Land Acquisition Program at Cape Canaveral, Fla.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the land acquisition program for the expansion of launch facilities at Cape Canaveral, Fla.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on Modification of Cyclotron at University of California

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed modification of the Atomic Energy Commission's 88-inch cyclotron, and modification of the University of California's 184-inch cyclotron; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Continuation of Authority for Regulation of Exports

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Misassignment and Ineffective Utilization of Ready Reserve Personnel in the XV Corps, 6th U.S. Army

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the misassignment and ineffective utilization of ready reserve personnel in the XV Corps, 6th U.S. Army, dated April 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Guarantee to Electric Consumers in Pacific Northwest of First Call on Electric Energy Generated at Federal Plants in That Region

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Applications for Entry Under Public Land Agricultural Laws

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit applications for entry under the public land agricultural laws to be filed only for lands designated as open to such application, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Laws Enacted by Legislature of Virgin Islands

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1961 regular and special sessions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Disposal of Federally Owned Properties at Los Alamos, N. Mex.

A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"JOINT RESOLUTION

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6—relative to the control of European starlings

"Whereas the European starling (aptly named Sturnus vulgaris) is not only a bird of most disagreeable habits in his noisy, unmelodic call and messy roosting habits, but is also a serious agricultural pest; and

"Whereas this bird represents a serious danger to agriculture, particularly as to grains, cherries and grapes, and quite seriously with regard to figs, olives, pears, apples, peaches and all types of bush berries; and

"Whereas this obnoxious bird also, on the basis of all available evidence, appears to be a carrier of disease, including foot-and-mouth disease, histoplasmosis, toxoplasmosis and psittacosis; and

"Whereas until recently the populations of starlings in California were merely migrating populations, which, although creating seasonal problems, are of minor importance compared to resident breeding population and the tremendous damage and problems that can be created by the latter; and

"Whereas such a breeding population would now seem to be established in California to the extent that large winter flocks of up to 50,000 birds have been observed with a virtual explosion in this population imminent due to the more favorable climatic condition in California: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take all immediate steps possible, including dissemination of information, which will aid in preventing further damage by starlings, not only to the agricultural economy of California but also to the agricultural economy of adjoining States in which the starling is likely to migrate; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 10

"Joint resolution relative to price support of milk

"Whereas milk is one of the most vital of all food products to the health and welfare of the citizens of this country; and

"Whereas the many problems in the production and marketing of milk are such that in order to insure an adequate supply governmental assurance of an adequate price for such milk is necessary; and

"Whereas the producers of milk subject to price support in California and throughout the Nation are presently experiencing extreme economic difficulty; and

"Whereas any reduction in the present support price would undoubtedly result in many producers who are presently forced to sell at less than production cost having to cease production and leave the business; and

"Whereas any reduction in the present support price could also drastically affect those producers of grade A milk who are also supplying milk the price of which is directly related to such support price; and

"Whereas unless immediate action is taken the price support level will drop from $3.40 to $3.11 per hundredweight on April 1, 1962: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to take all action possible to maintain the present price support level of milk for manufacturing purposes at its present level for at least so long as is necessary to properly study and evaluate all factors relevant to providing adequate protection to the suppliers of this vital commodity; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 11

"Joint resolution relating to the hunting of mourning doves

"Whereas the mourning dove is one of the most important and most numerous of all migratory game birds in the United States; and

"Whereas legislation amending the Migratory Bird Treaty Act has been submitted in Congress to prohibit the hunting of mourning doves; and

"Whereas there is no evidence that the mourning dove population has been reduced by hunting anywhere in California and in fact there is evidence that mourning doves are more widespread and numerous than in past years, with an estimated average population on September 1, annually, of 18 million birds, of which 6 million could safely be harvested although only about 2 million are actually taken; and

"Whereas doves are taken each year in California and provide a hunting sport that is available to many hunters, with almost 200,000 persons annually engaging in this activity; and

"Whereas present Federal and State laws and regulations provide adequate protection for mourning doves, as evidenced by their increased numbers over previous years: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested not to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to prohibit hunting of mourning doves; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution relative to pensions for veterans of World War I

"Whereas Congressman DENTON has introduced H.R. 3745 which would provide a pension for World War I veterans whose income is under $2,400 annually, if they are single, and $3,600 annually, if they have dependents; and

"Whereas one of the principal domestic problems in all areas of the Nation is the care of the aged, the importance of which is emphasized by the fact that there are now approximately 16 million men and women over the age of 65 years; and

"Whereas of this number, about 2 million are those who served in the armed forces of the United States during the first World War, and whose present circumstances are below the average for the Nation, which fact may be traced in part to the service rendered their country during that war; and

"Whereas these veterans have not enjoyed the extensive benefits accorded their younger brethren who served during World War II and who were given the opportunity for training at Government expense and assistance in securing home and business loans; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has not given any general pension to the veterans of World War I: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States is urged to enact H.R. 3745 to alleviate the dire conditions in which those who made the sacrifices for this country, in their youth, now find themselves; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of the California delegation in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 4

"Joint resolution relative to an international exposition in San Francisco

"Whereas 1965 will be the 50th anniversary of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition held in San Francisco in 1915; and

"Whereas San Francisco has grown and enhanced its position as a gateway to the Pacific and Latin America in those 50 years; and

"Whereas 1969 will be the 30th anniversary of the holding of the San Francisco International Exposition; and

"Whereas no more auspicious time and site could be selected for emphasizing our historic ties with the free countries of the Orient and of Latin America; and

"Whereas the consummation of an international exposition in San Francisco will be dramatic enough in scope to fix world interest on the State of California and San Francisco in particular: now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to designate the city and county of San Francisco as the site of an international exposition in the period between 1965 and 1970; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 13

"Joint resolution relative to the international exposition

"Whereas for the first time a full-scale international exposition will be held in the dynamic, progressive and world-known city of Long Beach; and

"Whereas this World's Fair to be held at Long Beach will present a major departure from the traditional format of international expositions by putting cardinal emphasis upon the talents, attainments and aspirations of the people of all participating nations, rather than simply exhibiting the mechanical developments of various countries; and

"Whereas the exposition will encompass the five phases of man's life in the realms of living, learning, working, moving, and playing, and the exposition will exhibit the various cultures of the nations of this planet earth; and

"Whereas the international exposition shall have as its foundation the dignity of man, and portray to all the world the advantages enjoyed by a people living under a government which derives its powers from and with the consent of the governed; and

"Whereas the international exposition for southern California to be held at Long Beach in the year 1966 will depict the role of arts and sciences, commerce and industry as it applies to the life of mankind on the planet of earth; and

"Whereas pier J will be the spectacular site of this international exposition: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to designate the World's Fair, to be held at pier J in Long Beach, Calif., in 1966, as an international exposition; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 26

"Resolution relating to memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing for medical care for the aged under the social security system

"Whereas the President of the United States has asked Congress for legislation establishing a system of medical insurance for our aged citizens financed under the social security system; and

"Whereas Congressman CECIL KING, of California, and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, have introduced such legislation in Congress; and

"Whereas there is a time honored tradition in America of caring for our aged citizens when their productive years are over, and this tradition has been carried out through legislation establishing and consistently broadening the social security system over the past 27 years; and

"Whereas great numbers of our senior citizens living on fixed incomes can ill afford the ever rising cost of adequate medical care during the years in their lives when medical needs are the greatest: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California*, That the Assembly of the State of California urges and endorses the immediate enactment by Congress of legislation generally following the principles of the King-Anderson bill establishing a system of medical insurance for our senior citizens under social security; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress from this State, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Vice President of the United States in his capacity as Presiding Officer of the Senate, and to the President of the United States."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 1440

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the President's public welfare program (H.R. 10032)

"Whereas the President of the United States has submitted legislation to the Congress designed to strengthen and to render more realistic the Nation's public welfare program; and

"Whereas H.R. 10032, incorporating the provisions of the President's public welfare legislative program, is of vital import to the welfare and well-being of more than 7 million Americans whose lives are intimately touched by public welfare assistance; and

"Whereas H.R. 10032, if enacted, shall revitalize the administration and philosophy of public welfare by enabling and assisting the individual States in administering public assistance child welfare programs geared toward prevention, rehabilitation, and intensive case-work service; and

"Whereas the sound and progressive concepts underlining H.R. 10032—concepts calling for increased Federal financial participation in services and administrative costs; expansion and improvement of child welfare services; incentives aimed at the gradual elimination of public assistance residency requirements in each of the States and toward the establishment of community work and training programs within public assistance; authorization of protective payments; increase in adequately trained public assistance personnel; extension of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents; extension of increase in Federal share of public assistance payments; and the option to States of combining, under a single plan, adult programs for aid to the aged, blind, and disabled—offer a promising opportunity to Rhode Island and to each of its sister States to more fully meet the challenges of public welfare of the sixties: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned to enact H.R. 10030; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States; the Honorable Wilbur Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House; the Honorable John F. Fogarty, Congressman from Rhode Island; the Honorable Fernand J. St. Germain, Congressman from Rhode Island; the Honorable John O. Pastore, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island; and the Honorable Claiborne Pell, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island, earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to secure passage of H.R. 10032."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 22

"Concurrent resolution expressing the confidence of the people of Hawaii in the United Nations and urging its financial support by the United States

"Whereas the people of Hawaii represent and support the cause of mutual understanding among the diverse peoples of the earth; and

"Whereas the United Nations is the one political organization in the world which is based on the common bonds and aspirations of peoples in all portions of the globe; and

"Whereas we recognize that the United Nations offers the best chance for containing the violence which historically has accompanied the formation of new nations; and

"Whereas the United Nations has incurred extraordinary expenses in its assigned task of making peace among rival claimants for power in the Congo; and

"Whereas delinquencies in the payment of assessments by member nations have caused deficiencies in the budget of the United Nations; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has been asked to make a 25-year loan of $100 million bearing 2-percent interest, to the United Nations, to help tide it over this period of financial stringency; and

"Whereas voices of doubt and suspicion have been raised against this loan, questioning the value of the United Nations in terms reminiscent of the obscurantist isolationism which frustrated the United States after World War I in its relationships with the world community; and

"Whereas American participation in this loan has both symbolic and practical importance to the United Nations; and

"Whereas Hawaii's voice should be heard in this national debate, to reaffirm our desire to strengthen the hand of the United Nations in guarding the peace throughout the world: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the delegation from Hawaii in the Congress of the United States is respectfully but urgently requested to support the proposal that the United States subscribe to a loan to the United Nations sufficient to meet the fiscal needs of the world organization; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Senator OREN E. LONG, Senator HIRAM L. FONG, and Congressman DANIEL K. INOUYE."

Resolutions adopted by the City Councils of the cities of Petaluma, Chico, Gardena, San Luis Obispo, La Verne, and Monterey, all of the State of California, protesting against the enactment of legislation to impose a Federal income tax on income derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Hackers Association of Washington, D.C., Inc., signed by Henry G. Bartsch, executive secretary, transmitting the petition of Cabell Daniel Moody, secretary of that association, praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION GRANTING CERTAIN PENSIONS TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

"Whereas it has been the policy of the United States to assist its veterans by granting them a pension, in consideration of their services in the Armed Forces of their country in time of war; and

"Whereas there has been no general pension granted to veterans of World War I: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting a pension of $100 a month to veterans of World War I; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth, and to each member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 22, 1962.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"Clerk.

"Adopted by the senate in concurrence, March 27, 1962.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

NEW YORK STATE COUNCIL OF MACHINISTS OPPOSES STRATEGIC TRADE WITH SOVIET BLOC—RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there is mounting public protest against the present policies of the United States and the West with regard to trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc. An increasing number of Americans are expressing their deep concern over the extent to which Western products and technology are being used to build up the military and economic strength of the Communist bloc.

Recently, the 34th semiannual convention of the New York State Council of Machinists adopted a resolution calling for a change in our present export-control policies. The delegates to this convention represented approximately 100,000 members of machinists' locals throughout New York State.

Joseph Drago, president of Local Lodge 893 of the International Association of Machinists, has been spearheading the machinists' drive to prevent the export of highly technical machinery and economically strategic materials to the Communist bloc. His efforts and the strong resolution of the International Association of Machinists deserve the highest commendation. I hope that the administration and Congress will give full support to the pleas of the International Association of Machinists and other groups for a more realistic export-control program. It is time to call a halt to the flow of strategic goods to countries which have threatened "to bury us."

Mr. President, I know that the resolution of the International Association of Machinists will be of interest to many of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD and that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Whereas the Soviet Union and its satellites are working toward the destruction of the free world's capitalistic system; and

Whereas Khrushchev's policy is to use the free world's industrial capacity against itself; and

Whereas the machine tool industry in the United States is on the verge of collapse as a direct result of the Communists' plans to copy, build, and undersell the United States; and

Whereas the present U.S. export-control policy allows such heavy industrial machinery items such as iron and steel mill products (needed for the construction of tanks, planes, and submarines), electrical machinery and apparatus (needed for guidance systems in intercontinental missiles), construction, excavating, and related machinery (needed for higher Berlin walls, and carving out airstrips in Laos and North Vietnam), paper pulp and paper processing machinery (certainly not used to print Bibles or ballots), aircraft parts and accessories (no explanations needed), and enriched uranium (needed for building 50 megaton bombs); and

Whereas U.S. Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, after a thorough investigation, including a European trip, states: "In recent years the United States and our free world allies have made a substantial contribution to Communist growth and power by being major suppliers of advanced technology and machinery to the Sino-Soviet bloc"; and

Whereas Congressman THOMAS M. PELLY, of the State of Washington, has remarked in the House of Representatives on the export of U.S. goods to Iron Curtain countries, "To my mind, this is a sorry loss and a sad commentary on the patriotism of some exporters, who put personal gain above love of country and, in cooperation with fuzzy thinking bureaucrats in the Department of Commerce are trading with the enemy and furnishing vitally needed material for building up the Communist military potential"; and

Whereas U.S. Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, has stated that at one time he was very much in favor of trade with the Sino-Russian bloc because he felt it would reduce tensions and foster better cooperation between the United States and the Communists, has now changed his views and is introducing a bill to the Senate to cut out this trade; and

Whereas the Senate Internal Security Committee is planning to resume its hearing on this vital issue in the near future: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates to this 34th semiannual convention of the New York State Council of Machinists instruct the secretary to notify the New York Senators of the United States, and Congressmen, to introduce or support legislation which will change the present export-control policy that permits the export of highly technical machinery and economically strategic materials to the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Adopted April 1, 1962.

RESOLUTION OF MO-ARK BASINS FLOOD CONTROL AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the board of the Mo-Ark Basins Flood Control and Conservation Association, a resolution was adopted urging adequate appropriations to expedite the early completion of the necessary investigations, surveys, advance designs, planning, and engineering of the Bureau of Reclamation projects in these river basins.

The proposed projects play an important part in the control of water runoff in these river valleys.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Inasmuch as the President and other high governmental officials have recently emphasized the desirability of expediting and expanding the Federal public works program in order to bolster the economy of our area and other areas through increased employment and job opportunity and there are a large number of important civil works projects of permanent benefit to the area both under the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Corps of Engineers in the Missouri, Kansas, and Arkansas River Valleys where engineering, planning, investigation, and surveys have not been completed to the extent where construction contracts could be awarded and additional job opportunities afforded and the appropriation of the necessary funds to complete such engineering work by the aforesaid Federal organizations should be promptly made: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the board of the Mo-Ark Basins Flood Control and Conservation Association at a special meeting held in the Town House Hotel in Kansas City, Kans., on March 22, 1962, That the representatives in Congress, both Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, from this area, be urged to take whatever steps may be necessary to secure adequate appropriations to expedite the early completion of the necessary investigations, surveys, advance designs, planning, and engineering of the various flood control and water resources projects, including pollution control and sewage treatment projects now pending or suggested in these river valleys and that members of the Subcommittees on Water Resource Appropriations of both the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives be alerted to the desirability and necessity of making available sufficient funds at the earliest possible date in order that construction funds could be appropriated for immediate action to accomplish the objectives above mentioned in relation to increased employment and job opportunities in the area.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By **Mr. ANDERSON**, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 2522. A bill to defer the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project (Rept. No. 1326).

By **Mr. EASTLAND**, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H.R. 11027. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 1327).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By **Mr. ANDERSON** (for himself and Mr. PASTORE) (by request):

S. 3129. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By **Mr. CLARK**:

S. 3130. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to purchase industrial and commercial evidences of indebtedness to promote certain industrial and commercial loans in redevelopment areas by lending institutions in order to help such areas plan and finance their economic redevelopment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Morse, Mr. Lausche, and Mr. Kefauver):

S. 3131. A bill to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3132. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the death of George Gershwin; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3133. A bill to authorize loans by the Federal Government to local public school systems whose funds have been withheld or withdrawn by State or local governments because of the desegregation of one or more schools in such systems; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Dirksen):

S. 3134. A bill to fix the rates of basic compensation of employees of the Senate press, periodical, radio and television, and photographers galleries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 3135. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Charles Edward Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 3136. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNamara when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 3137. A bill for the relief of Edward J. McManus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 3138. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for research to determine criteria and means for abating objectionable aircraft noise; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 3139. A bill making an authorization for an appropriation to provide for the expenses of a joint select committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to study the problem of local self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Prouty when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3140. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth J. Padilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3141. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to relinquish to the State of New Jersey jurisdiction over any lands within the Fort Hancock Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3142. A bill for the relief of Michael J. Venezia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the first abovementioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3143. A bill to amend section 660 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the misuse of common carriers' funds derived from commerce, in order to expand the coverage of such section; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3144. A bill for the relief of Marcello Chiovelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3145. A bill to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia to give the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their duly designated representative authority to transfer title to motor vehicles when the only assets of a decedent's estate consist of not more than two motor vehicles;

S. 3146. A bill to amend the act concerning gifts to minors in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3147. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMPETITION IN THE STATE AND MUNICIPAL BOND MARKETS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to introduce more competition into the State and municipal bond markets in order to reduce the interest rates States and municipalities must pay to finance capital improvements.

Last year State and local indebtedness increased by $5 billion, as it has in each of the preceding several years. The amount of State and local debt outstanding at midyear was $72.5 billion—about three-fourths of which represented local government obligations.

These figures indicate the weight of the burden of debt amortization on State and local budgets. Any step which can help reduce the rate of interest these governments must pay is of tremendous importance to State and local governments and their taxpayers.

The bill which I have introduced would authorize commercial banks to underwrite and deal in revenue bonds.

At the present time, commercial banks may underwrite and deal in general obligation bonds—that is, bonds which are secured by the general revenue resources of the issuing State or local governments—but are barred from dealing in bonds which are backed only by the earnings from governmental enterprises.

The consequence is that a limited number of investment dealers have a monopoly on the underwriting of revenue bond issues. A large part of the capital market is not now being tapped.

This bill has the support of the American Municipal Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and many State municipal organizations, including the Pennsylvania League of Cities.

In 1961, commercial banks represented about 53 percent of the whole municipal bond market mechanism in America. They were the principal underwriters and distributors of 72 percent of all new general obligation bonds and notes sold in 1961, based on par value. But more than one-third of all State and municipal bond financing today takes the form of so-called revenue bond financing, from which commercial banks are excluded.

This exclusion, I submit, is based on conditions which existed in the bond market at the time of the passage of the Glass-Steagall National Banking Act in 1933 which no longer exist today. During the intervening years the whole nature of revenue bond financing has changed radically.

Until the end of World War II, the volume of revenue bonds was relatively small and tended to be concentrated on certain unusual types of projects, such as toll bridges. Thus, with a number of exceptions, revenue bonds were considered greater risk investments than so-called general obligation bonds.

For a variety of reasons, there has been a major shift in municipal financing. More and more, new types of revenue bonds are being used in place of what once would have been general obligations. However, these revenue obligations are quite different than the former high-risk type of bonds. Basically they are general obligations in different form, and in previous years would have been called general obligations.

Today, for instance, many States have set up authorities which float bonds to build schools, office buildings, highways, bridges, water and electric plants, etc. The legislature then appropriates sufficient money to the authority out of general tax receipts to amortize the bonds. This type of revenue bond financing has increased sharply in recent years.

It is obvious from the legislative history of the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933 that the intent was to get the commercial banks out of promotional, speculative, development projects, and more specifically out of the corporate and foreign bond business. It was not until 1939 that "revenue bonds" were defined and a ruling made that the banks would not participate in such financing. As I have pointed out, the nature of revenue bond financing has altered sharply since then.

Subsequent developments have demonstrated that Congress has drawn the distinction in commercial bank bond participation between private and sound public financing. It has approved commercial bank activity in such high grade public bonds as those of local housing authorities and those issued by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—World Bank—Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal National Mortgage Association, home loan banks, and the bonds of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The proposed legislation permits commercial banks to underwrite, trade, and deal in municipal bonds only to the extent national banks can invest in such bonds under the National Banking Act. It provides the following safeguards:

First. The bonds must be of high quality with a proven record of earnings.

Second. They must be publicly offered, have satisfactory trustee arrangements and all the other factors that make an issue qualify as a sound investment.

Third. The amount of bonds of one issue which a bank may own or be obligated to buy is limited to 10 percent of the bank's capital and surplus. The risk to the depositor is thus eliminated, since only a fractional percentage of the bank's capital funds, and not the depositors' funds, are involved.

In summary, Mr. President, State and local governments need the broadest possible market for their growing volume of securities. The broader the market the greater the competition, the lower the interest rate. The problem will grow as the volume of financing continues to increase. The growth of State and local bond borrowing is indicated by the following table:

Year:	*Amount*
1945	$818,781,000
1950	3,693,604,000
1955	5,976,503,000
1960	7,229,500,000
1961	8,344,512,000

Revenue bond financing, from which commercial banks are now automatically and arbitrarily excluded, runs about one-third of the total market, as follows:

Year	Total new issues of State and municipal bonds	General obligation bonds	Revenue bonds
1945	$818,781,000	$615,381,750	$203,399,250
1950	3,693,604,000	3,093,681,000	599,923,200
1955	5,973,503,000	4,244,089,000	1,732,414,000
1960	7,229,500,000	5,034,680,000	2,194,820,000
1961	8,344,512,000	5,761,505,000	2,583,007,000

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a table showing the volume of State and local government revenue bonds issued in the past 4 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the table will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3131) to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Clark (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The table presented by Mr. Clark is as follows:

State, State-agency and local government revenue bonds issued in the past 4 years which are acceptable for bank investment and would have been eligible for bank underwriting under the proposed legislation

State	1958		1959		1960		1961	
	Number of issues	Amount (thousands)	Number of issues	Amount (thousands)	Number of issues	Amount (thousands)	Number of issues	Amount (thousands)
Alabama	6	$12,110	12	$80,064	5	$102,775	8	$43,000
Alaska	2	4,273	1	7,500	2	3,450	1	3,800
Arizona	1	4,880	4	19,100	2	10,630	2	5,000
Arkansas	1	5,300	2	10,300			1	1,530
California	8	62,900	14	113,750	10	81,690	11	129,700
Colorado	2	10,500	1	6,000	2	17,750		
Connecticut	1	3,250	1	62,500				
Delaware					1	9,000		
Florida	26	84,745	35	144,022	30	166,780	22	77,155
Georgia	8	51,420	6	14,637	4	7,550	14	128,000
Idaho	2	2,850	1	4,350			1	1,700
Illinois	12	82,580	6	37,915	5	11,990	3	56,325
Indiana	17	65,645	16	64,500	13	21,729	14	49,520
Iowa	3	10,500	1	1,500	3	6,930	4	9,045
Kansas	1	1,000			1	8,000	1	5,100
Kentucky	4	6,025	8	21,224	11	34,240	10	50,727
Louisiana	4	15,111	4	6,700	4	14,450	8	24,015
Maine	1	1,000						
Maryland	3	30,400	3	28,336	3	34,184	3	30,792
Massachusetts			1	71,750	1	9,600		
Michigan	7	117,995	8	105,950	10	110,735	11	122,475
Minnesota	1	1,200	3	27,636	1	48,820		
Mississippi	5	16,900	7	24,900	3	14,400	3	12,822
Missouri	4	13,887	1	7,500			3	12,553
Montana	2	7,000	2	2,500				
Nebraska	2	16,000	2	28,042	2	4,250	4	26,200
New Jersey	2	16,890	2	17,415	2	2,000		
New Mexico	1	2,000	1	2,203	1	1,350	3	6,240
New York	7	112,400	9	556,530	7	289,800	7	311,363
Ohio	8	135,355	5	34,975	7	13,665	4	68,850
Oklahoma	1	20,500			1	62,750	3	11,265
Oregon					1	25,500	2	6,360
Pennsylvania	45	205,232	50	192,257	43	181,591	51	273,922
Rhode Island					1	2,000		
South Carolina	2	3,200	3	8,950			2	3,800
South Dakota	1	2,050						
Tennessee	3	16,500	4	8,095	2	5,270	4	8,000
Texas	19	67,510	26	91,353	17	49,474	21	95,195
Utah					1	1,600	2	2,700
Virginia	1	6,150			1	41,700	1	27,500
Washington	9	52,090	8	220,165	12	122,945	8	25,294
West Virginia	2	3,679	2	6,840	3	6,075	3	11,150
Wisconsin	4	25,225	6	26,315	1	15,000	8	49,070
Hawaii	1	12,500	3	28,000	2	8,500	1	3,000
Puerto Rico	2	40,000	1	20,000	3	35,440	1	22,000
Total	230	1,348,752	259	2,103,774	218	1,581,613	245	1,712,168

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF GEORGE GERSHWIN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in honor of a great personality, I send to the desk a bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of stamps in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the death of George Gershwin. George Gershwin was a man who, in the cultural annals of our country, should have a very unique place. He was born in 1898, and at the age of 21 he had already written his first major musical work for the Broadway theaters. A very few years later he was responsible for what history will record as a great shift in musical idiom. If it is not already historic, I think it will be. He showed that jazz could be the subject of serious composition as performed by serious symphonic orchestras. He showed that jazz was an art form in itself, and a form which has since been followed in the world.

One has but to mention the Rhapsody in Blue, Concerto in F, Porgy and Bess, and An American in Paris to record some of the great musical compositions of which we are very proud.

I had the privilege of attending the 25th anniversary tribute to George Gershwin at Carnegie Hall on March 18, 1962. It was a magnificent celebration. I ask unanimous consent that a list of officers of the concert committee of that great celebration, together with a biography of George Gershwin, may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list of officers and biography were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Officers of Concert Committee

Chairman, Mr. Nicholas D. Biddle; cochairmen, Mr. and Mrs. Robert D. L. Gardiner, Mr. and Mrs. Leopold Godowsky, Mrs. Horace E. Dodge II; cochairmen—women's committee, Mrs. Averell Clark, Mrs. Denniston L. Slater; chairman, men's committee, Mr. Lonsdale F. Stowell; and coordinator, Mr. Henry F. Ayres, Jr.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

George Gershwin was born in Brooklyn, N.Y., September 26, 1898, the son of Morris and Rose Bruskin Gershwin. Most of his early boyhood was spent on the lower East Side of Manhattan where he attended public school, was champion roller skater of Forsythe Street and fought in the street fights engaged in by the kids of the neighborhood. He began studying the piano at the age of 12. His first teacher was a Miss Green. Later he studied with Charles Hambitzer who, quick to recognize his talents, taught him harmony and introduced him to the works of Chopin and Debussy. He attended the High School of Commerce for a short period. During that time he was official pianist for the morning assembly exercises.

At the age of 15 he became a pianist in the professional department of Jerome H. Remick & Co., publishers of popular music. His salary was $15 a week. This job involved pounding the piano 10 to 12 hours a day. When he offered a song of his own composition he was told, "You're here as a piano-player, not a writer." He gave up the job and soon had his first song published, for which he received $5. This was in 1916. The song was called "When You Want 'Em You Can't Get 'Em, When You've Got 'Em You Don't Want 'Em," with lyrics by Murray

Roth. Shortly after, he became rehearsal pianist for the Dillingham-Ziegfeld production "Miss 1917." During a Sunday night concert at the Century Theater where "Miss 1917" was playing, Miss Vivienne Segal introduced two of his numbers which brought him to the attention of Max Dreyfus, then head of Harms, Inc., music publishers. He signed with Dreyfus at $35 a week. Although he had many more flattering offers he decided that his place was with Dreyfus who was not only a publisher of musical comedies and operettas but also a fine musician and a student of the classics. During this time he continued his musical studies with Edward Kilenyi and then Rubin Goldmark. There was rarely a period in his life when he was not studying. His last teacher was Dr. Joseph Shillinger.

In 1919 he wrote his first complete score for Broadway in the musical comedy produced by Alex Aarons, "La La Lucille," although before this he had contributed interpolations to various other musical shows. That same year he wrote his first big song hit, "Swanee," for which Irving Caesar wrote the words and which Al Jolson sang in "Sinbad."

From then on Gershwin's rise was rapid. Beginning in 1920 he wrote, among other things, the music for "George White's Scandals" for 5 consecutive years. It was in the fourth of this series, in 1923, that he attempted a work more extended than the usual 32-bar form. It was a short one-act opera called "135th Street," and in it may be found the beginnings of his later creative expressions. Paul Whiteman was in the "Scandals" of 1923 and was so impressed with the quality of the music that he later, in 1924, invited George to contribute to the now historic concert at Aeolian Hall, February 12, 1924, where the "Rhapsody in Blue" was first played.

Deems Taylor wrote, following the playing of the "Rhapsody" that Gershwin was "a link between the jazz camp and the intellectuals." After the worldwide success of the "Rhapsody," leading composers began to experiment with jazz.

Presently the New York Symphony Society commissioned Gershwin to compose a work of symphonic scope. As a result the "Concerto in F" was heard at Carnegie Hall with Walter Damrosch conducting and the composer at the piano. Incidentally, this was the first work that Gershwin orchestrated himself; all he had ever done in this line was a number or two in "Primrose," an operetta he wrote in London.

Beginning in 1924 with "Lady, Be Good," he composed for Aarons and Freedley seven musical comedies (with lyrics by his brother Ira) "Tip-Toes," "Oh, Kay," "Funny Face," "Treasure Girl," "Girl Crazy," and "Pardon My English."

In 1928 he wrote "An American In Paris" which was first performed by the Philharmonic-Symphony Society, again under Damrosch. Curiously enough, the typically French sections were written in New York while the American "blues" section was written at the Hotel Majestic in Paris.

In 1926 Edgar Selwyn told George S. Kaufman he would like him to do an entirely new type of musical with the Gershwins. "Strike Up the Band" was the result and was hailed with delight by the few but the many thought it far too bitter. With the assistance of Morrie Ryskind it was rewritten in 1930 and was the first of the three satirical operettas done by the quartet of Kaufman, Ryskind and the Gershwins. The second was "Of Thee I Sing," which was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1932 (produced by Sam H. Harris) and was followed by "Let 'Em Eat Cake" in 1933.

Mr. Gershwin often appeared at the Lewisohn Stadium concerts of the Philharmonic Symphony in New York as soloist composer, and conductor. One program devoted entirely to his own works, given August 16, 1932, attracted an audience of over 18,000 which set a record for this stadium. At Ravinia Park and other stadiums and concert halls his appearance usually broke local records for attendance. In the year 1936 he had more performances of his works played by symphonic organizations than did any other American composer.

Perhaps his most ambitious work was "Porgy and Bess." He first got the idea of making an opera of Du Bose Heyward's novel some 9 years before it was finally produced as such for he had found on writing Heyward that a dramatic version was being readied for the theater. In 1933 he and Heyward got the New York Theater Guild to sponsor an operatic version. With Ira helping on the lyrics and Rouben Mamoulien directing, the opera opened to great acclaim in Boston, then played 16 weeks in New York and was followed by a road tour. It will be seen in full in Los Angeles in February 1938 under the sponsorship of Merle Armitage. Also a European presentation is being readied.

Hollywood called in 1930 and the picture "Delicious" resulted. In the summer of 1936 he again appeared in Hollywood to do "Shall We Dance?" For Astaire-Robers, "A Damsel In Distress," now in production and was working on the "Goldwyn Follies" when the collapse occurred which 2 weeks later proved to be caused by a tumor in the brain. He died Sunday morning, July 11, 1937, in Los Angeles at the age of 38.

Besides his music, Mr. Gershwin was also interested in painting. He became an ardent collector. Also about 1928 he himself began to paint, and was considered exceedingly capable by professional critics. Early this year he completed portraits of Jerome Kern and Arnold Schoenberg.

Mr. JAVITS. I point out that here, too, is an Horatio Alger story, as George was born in Brooklyn, spent most of his life on the lower East Side—I know that life well, since it was my own origin—and rose to the great height of world recognition as an artist and composer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3132) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the death of George Gershwin, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special series of postage stamps, of such appropriate design and denomination as he shall prescribe, in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the death of George Gershwin. Such stamps shall be first offered for sale to the public at New York City, N.Y., on as early a date as practicable during the calendar year 1962.

FEDERAL LOANS TO CERTAIN LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on March 21 I introduced a bill to authorize the Federal Government to make grants to local school districts to cover the cost of drawing up desegregation plans and the cost of preparing school personnel to deal with the problems incident to desegregation.

Today I am introducing a bill which deals with a more serious obstacle in the path of the desegregation of our Nation's schools.

It would provide Federal loans to local school systems whose normal revenues have been cut off by their State or county government because they attempt to desegregate. The terms of these loans would be worked out by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on a flexible basis to be adapted to the immediate need.

These loans will enable desegregating school districts to keep their schools in operation until such time as State and county governments are brought, through one means or another, to recognize the futility of their resistance to the Constitution and to the moral insistence of the American people that equal rights and opportunities be extended to all Americans.

There are a number of instances, and they will multiply in the future, in which local school boards are trying to desegregate in compliance with the Supreme Court decision but are prevented from doing so because State or county authorities cut off the funds that are necessary to operate local schools.

The most publicized instance of the denial of funds to a school board preparing for desegregation occurred in New Orleans, where those who would obey the law were blocked by those who would not. There were similar occurrences in Virginia in 1958 and in Arkansas in 1957.

In Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina no measures have been taken toward school integration. One reason for this is the widespread belief in these States that any school board attempting to desegregate its schools will lose the State assistance that is necessary to maintain local schools.

We have here a rather novel political problem which is that State governments are blocking the attempts of local school districts to comply with the Federal Constitution. In the long run, the courts will strike down these interferences but in the short run, the Federal Government can speed desegration by making available to localities the funds denied them. Local school systems would thus be able to operate their schools until such time as court decisions reopen the closed sources of revenue.

We must look upon these attempts to circumvent the Supreme Court desegregation decision as a sort of last-ditch resistance that will pass away. Devices of this kind will succeed for a time but we know that in the end, desegregation will prevail. It must prevail if our Nation is to continue its progress toward ever fuller realization of the concepts of equality, liberty, and individual dignity which gave it birth.

Our task, in the meantime, is to speed the process as much as we can and at the same time to prevent thousands of schoolchildren from becoming victims of tragedies such as the total shutdown of the school system in Prince Edward County, Va.

This is a modest proposal but it meets a specific demonstrated need and could have a great effect in hastening the general desegregation of our Nation's schools. We know that once desegregation is successfully carried out in any new locality, it will spread rapidly in all directions.

This bill is designed to enable those local communities that wish to comply with the law of the land to do so, and by their example, to speed the day when boys and girls in every community in this land can expect and receive the inheritance envisioned for them at the founding of this Nation: fair treatment, equal rights, and an honest chance to compete on even terms for their share in the promise of American life.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3133) to authorize loans by the Federal Government to local public school systems whose funds have been withheld or withdrawn by State or local governments because of the desegregation of one or more schools in such systems, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HIGHWAYS, FISCAL YEARS 1964 AND 1965

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce to the President of the Senate—explaining the bill—be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3136) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter presented by Mr. McNAMARA is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1962.

THE HONORABLE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Commerce submits herewith as a part of its legislative program for the 87th Congress, 2d session, a draft of a proposed bill: "to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes."

The Department of Commerce recommends enactment of the proposed legislation by the Congress.

The draft bill, which is designated the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962," would carry out the recommendations made by the President in his transportation message which has just been submitted to the Congress, and would provide for levels of authorizations proposed in the 1963 budget for the Federal-aid highway program. Its broad purpose is to provide the necessary authorizations for continuation of the Federal-aid highway program and for other Federal highway and road construction programs in the Departments of Commerce, Interior, and Agriculture, and to strengthen and improve the role that the Federal-aid highway program will play as part of the President's program to assist in the planning and development of comprehensive and balanced urban transportation.

The draft bill provides for authorizations of $950 million for the Federal-aid primary and secondary highway systems and their extensions within urban areas for each of the fiscal years 1964 and 1965. This level was recommended by the President, to the Congress in his special highway message of February 28, 1961. It represents an increase of $25 million for each year over the $925 million authorized for each of the two previous fiscal years, and is consistent with the national interest expressed in section 101(b) of title 23, United States Code.

The bill also includes authorizations for the fiscal year 1964 and for the fiscal year 1965 to continue programs for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian reservation roads and bridges, and public lands highways. In addition, authorizations for a new program are proposed for public land development roads and trails for the development, protection, administration and utilization of lands and resources administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior. Proposed authorizations for these programs, together with amounts previously authorized for fiscal years 1962 and 1963, are shown in the enclosed schedule. Additional justification will be provided by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture for those direct road programs within their jurisdictions.

A major objective of this bill is to increase the effectiveness of the Federal aid highway program as an instrument of Federal assistance for strengthening and improving urban transportation. In order to achieve this objective, the President has recommended in his transportation message that four amendments be made to Federal aid highway law. These proposals have been incorporated into this draft bill and are described below.

A new program of Federal assistance is proposed for families and businesses displaced as a result of Federal-aid highway construction comparable to existing provisions under urban renewal legislation. The Bureau of Public Roads estimates that about 15,000 families and 1,500 businesses will be displaced each year in the next 6 to 8 years by the completion of the Interstate System alone. Section 3 of the bill amends Federal-aid highway law to redefine the term "construction" to specifically include relocation payments and administrative expenses incurred by the States in providing assistance, as an appropriate cost of right-of-way acquisition for highway projects. This section also authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to require assurances by the State highway departments of feasible temporary relocation methods and of the availability of suitable dwellings to accommodate displaced families, and to approve Federal-aid participation in State relocation payments, with specified limitations, for reasonable and necessary moving expenses and actual property losses not otherwise compensated.

Certain States are finding it increasingly difficult to improve the extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system into urban areas because of the higher priority for the use of available urban funds on the improvement of arterial streets in these areas. Under existing law, secondary funds are not available under certain conditions for use in urban areas and, as a result, in many cases secondary routes are improved up to the urban limits, and urban funds are not available for their improvement within these urban limits. Section 6 of the bill would remove the present limitation on the use of Federal-aid secondary funds for financing extensions of the secondary system in urban areas.

A major objective of national transportation policy in the use of Federal assistance programs should be to encourage and facilitate the development by States and local communities of balanced transportation systems consistent with long-range comprehensive development plans. In order that this objective may be expeditiously carried out, certain modifications of the basic Federal-aid highway legislation are considered highly desirable. Accordingly, section 7 of the bill would require, as a condition to the approval of a highway program involving a metropolitan area, that State and local agencies undertake transportation planning on a continuing basis which should be consistent with adequate comprehensive development plans prepared for such metropolitan areas.

This provision, we believe, would encourage balanced transportation planning and improve the quality of general metropolitan planning. It would in no way delay the current Federal aid highway program. Reasonable time would be allowed for the States and local communities to establish the continuing planning process that would be required and to produce the plans to which their highway systems would conform. The cooperative working arrangements undertaken by the Bureau of Public Roads with States and localities in the area of transportation planning will permit the Federal guidance and leadership necessary to achieve the objective of sound and uniform transportation planning in metropolitan areas.

In order to stimulate additional highway research activities in the Federal-State cooperative areas, provisions of existing law regarding the use of Federal aid highway funds apportioned to the States for planning and research purposes are revised significantly by section 8 of the draft bill. Generally, this section provides that the amount of funds available for all forms of highway research would be increased, highway planning and research funds would be matched by the States, and the funds if not so used for these purposes would lapse.

More specifically, an additional one-half of 1 percent would be made available for highway research purposes from funds apportioned to the States for the Federal aid primary, secondary, and urban programs. This additional one-half of 1 percent, together with State matching funds, would amount to almost $10 million annually, and would be in addition to the present 1½ percent which is currently being used for both highway planning and highway research.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

C. D. MARTIN, JR.,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Schedule of existing authorizations for direct Federal highway and road construction programs and proposed authorizations under draft bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program	Existing authorizations		Proposed authorizations		
	1962	1963	1963	1964	1965
Forest highways	$33.0	$33	------	$33	$33
Forest development roads and trails	35.0	40	$10	70	85
Public land development roads and trails	------	------	------	2	4
Park roads and trails	18.0	18	------	22	25
Parkways	16.0	16	------	16	16
Indian reservation roads and bridges	12.0	12	------	16	18
Public lands highways	3.5	3	------	3	3

AIRCRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. The purpose of this amendment is to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to conduct and encourage research to determine criteria for and means of abating objectionable aircraft noise. He would be authorized to do this within the Federal Aviation Agency or in cooperation with any other public and private agencies.

Mr. President, the problem of aircraft noise is an increasingly serious one. Those who live near airports can testify to the increased air traffic over the last decade. Moreover, jet flights are now being introduced at airports across the Nation. Millions of dollars are being spent to expand runways to provide for jets. Next to nothing is being spent to preserve the comfortable homes and quiet neighborhoods in communities near our large airports.

Mr. President, 20th century America certainly cannot ban the airplane. There is also no point in locating airports so far away from the people who use them that it takes longer to get to the airport than it does to make the flight.

It is not enough merely to set flight patterns that minimize noise in residential areas or establish ceilings for flight. Undoubtedly, these regulations do some good, but, at best, routing patterns provide a measure of relief from the worst noise nuisances, limited by wind, weather, and other flight requirements. They are not a cure.

Mr. President, the real gravity of the noise abatement problem has been underscored by the Supreme Court decision of early March. In a unanimous decision, the Court held that property owners must be compensated when low flights make property so useless as to constitute a "taking" of the property for public use. The Constitution requires that just compensation be provided for any property so taken. By a 7-to-2 vote the Court held that an agency operating an airport was liable for compensation payments under these circumstances. Suits have already been filed against the New York Port Authority, which operates New York's International Airport at Idlewild, and other agencies and municipalities all over the country. More suits are expected.

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not consider aircraft noise an insoluble problem. I find it hard to believe that a nation which can send a man three times around the world in space is still unable to devise a method for quieting the operations of a jet or propeller plane.

Mr. President, I am aware that, even without this legislation, the Federal Aviation Agency is taking its first tentative steps forward. In cooperation with NASA, the FAA last July began a program to define and rate noise levels so that standards can be established, both for individual engines and for airport areas. FAA is apparently also on the verge of letting contracts in a long-term supersonic transport engine development program, which will include work on internal engine contours designed to reduce noise at the source.

The purpose of this legislation is to spell out, beyond any doubt, in the text of the Federal Aviation Act, the responsibility of the Agency in this area. Its purpose is to give the full weight of congressional support to noise abatement efforts and specifically to direct the Administrator to move forward with vigor and imagination to meet this challenging problem. I know full well that we cannot legislate a solution to the noise problem. But we can and should write clearly into the legislation our deep interest in and support for an accelerated and expanded program of aircraft noise abatement efforts. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3138) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for research to determine criteria and means for abating objectionable aircraft noise, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 312 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"NOISE ABATEMENT RESEARCH

"(d) The Administrator shall conduct, and encourage, cooperate with, and render assistance to, other appropriate public or private agencies or organizations in the conduct of research to determine means for establishing practical aircraft noise criteria and for abating objectionable aircraft noise. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subsection the Administrator may make grants, contracts, or other arrangements without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529 and 41 U.S.C. 5)."

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE PROBLEM OF THE PROPER FORM OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill which would establish a joint select committee of the Congress, consisting of three Senators and three Members of the House, for the purpose of studying the problem of the proper form of local self-government of the District of Columbia.

The bill, in addition, would authorize appropriation of the sum of $50,000 for expenses attendant upon the business of such joint committee for the purpose of hiring necessary assistants.

The bill requires that the committee prepare a report, including a suggested form of self-government of the District together with reasons for its conclusions. That report would be required to be submitted to the Congress not later than January 1, 1963.

I am convinced that there is some necessity and justification for the matters contained in this bill and I shall discuss them at length and in some detail at a later time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3139) making an authorization for an appropriation to provide for the expenses of a joint select committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to study the problem of local self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

JURISDICTION OVER LANDS WITHIN FORT HANCOCK MILITARY RESERVATION, N.J.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enable the Federal Government to retrocede jurisdiction to the State of New Jersey in the area of Sandy Hook, N.J., now under lease to the State for use as a State recreation area.

This bill would remove a technical difficulty that still remains despite the close cooperation among State and Federal officials on all steps taken to make this area available to the State.

Sandy Hook was, until an agreement was signed in recent months, reserved by the Army for military purposes. Fort Hancock is on this peninsula; so are several nike missile bases. Last summer however—with the help of the President, Secretary of the Interior Udall, and the Department of Defense—the State was successful in convincing the Army officials that a 460-acre area on the peninsula could be leased to the State for recreation purposes. The State will prepare detailed plans, too, for the possible use of other parts of Sandy Hook for similar development if military needs permit.

We in New Jersey appreciate the cooperation of the many Federal officials who have helped in this project. Several of them were present at the recent dedication ceremonies for the first recreation area. It was a memorable occasion.

However, one technical item remains. I have been informed by the New Jersey State Department of Conservation and Economic Development that, when Sandy Hook was originally given to the Federal Government, jurisdiction over the area was given up by the State and turned over to the Federal Government.

This means that, while the State has the lower part of Sandy Hook under lease, it has no jurisdiction thereon. Any kinds of crimes committed would have to be referred to the F.B.I. State officials would have no authority to make any arrests or do any other type of police activity.

And so it is necessary for the Federal Government to retrocede jurisdiction to the State. I might point out that previous Federal legislation has authorized the Department of the Army to take similar action in other cases. The bill I introduce today is identical with one passed by Congress in the case of the State of Illinois in connection with the Fort Sheridan Military Reservation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3141) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to relinquish to the State of New Jersey jurisdiction over any lands within the Fort Hancock Military Reservation, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 660 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO MISUSE OF COMMON CARRIERS' FUNDS DERIVED FROM COMMERCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend section 660 of title 18, United States Code, in order to protect the funds and property owned or transported by common carriers in interstate commerce. Under existing law, officers, directors, and employees of interstate transportation companies are subject to Federal prosecution if they misappropriate moneys or property in commerce.

There is, however, a growing trend in transportation toward the use of independent contractors to perform services once performed by employees. Existing Federal law is not applicable to these independent contractors. As a result, many interstate carriers have not been able to get protection from theft or embezzlement.

Several cases have been called to the attention of the Commerce Committee involving conversion of the funds of a common carrier. Because of the multi-State nature of the operations, it is impossible to identify in which State the criminal act occurred. Therefore, no State has been able to prosecute and the offender had to answer to no law. This situation and its variations have been repeated many times.

Mr. President, my purpose in introducing this measure is twofold. Common carriers are currently experiencing some critical financial problems. The crimes which would be covered by the broadened scope of Federal criminal law represent an area where the carriers involved have been helpless to stop the depletion of their assets. Adoption of this proposal and some prosecutions pursuant to its terms would have a healthy deterrent effect.

In addition to conserving transportation capital, this measure would also reduce charges to the public, for in the final analysis shippers and consumers will find that they bear the burden in the form of increased rates. In the same way that the cost of labor and fuel and capital equipment is passed on to the public, the cost of criminal acts depleting common carrier revenue is passed on. This should be stopped, and it can be.

I sincerely trust that the committee to which this measure is referred will act promptly and favorably on this measure which undoubtedly is in the public interest.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3143) to amend section 660 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the misuse of common carriers' funds derived from commerce, in order to expand the coverage of such section, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO PROVIDE A CREDIT FOR INVESTMENT IN CERTAIN DEPRECIABLE PROPERTY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 10650) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARTKE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 10650, supra, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

CREATION OF BOARD OF PUBLIC LANDS APPEALS IN THE OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 4, 1962, the names of Mr. BIBLE and Mr. CHURCH were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3107) to establish in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Interior a Board of Public Lands Appeals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators) on April 4, 1962.

SERVING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN SENATE WING OF THE CAPITOL OR THE SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 5, 1962, the names of Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 325) to amend rule XXXIV to prohibit the serving of hard liquor in Senate wing of the Capitol or Senate Office Buildings, submitted by Mr. MORSE on April 5, 1962.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of G. Griffith Johnson, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that the committee will hear public witnesses on the foreign assistance program for 1963 beginning at 10 o'clock Wednesday morning, April 18, in room 4221, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF IRVING BEN COOPER TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing scheduled for Thursday, April 12, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., on the nomination of Irving Ben Cooper, of New York, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of New York, has been postponed to Thursday, May 3, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON BILLS PENDING BEFORE RETIREMENT SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Retirement Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 10, at 10:30 a.m. in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building on the following measures:

S. 2362 and S. 387, bills to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes.

S. 1337, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to increase, in the case of children attending school, from 18 to 21, the maximum age for receiving benefits under such act.

S. 2937, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for increases in annuities, eliminate the option with respect to certain survivor annuities, and provide for interchange of credits between the civil service retirement system and the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act.

Persons wishing to testify on these measures can make arrangements to do so by calling CApitol 4-3121, extension 5451.

Other members of the subcommittee are the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

Article containing an account of the history of journalism in Dunklin County, Mo., published in the Daily Dunklin Democrat, at Kennett, Mo., on April 2, 1962.

PROPOSED COMPENSATION TO NEW YORK FOR EXTRA POLICING DURING UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to express my support for the position taken in the Senate by my colleague [Mr. KEATING] yesterday on the bill which has come over from the other body relating to the reimbursement of New York City for unusual expenses incurred in 1960 in the police arrangements to protect the leaders of other countries, notably the leaders of the Communist bloc, when they attended the United Nations General Assembly session, now historic, in that year in New York. Such leaders included Khrushchev, Tito, Nasser, Gomulka, Castro, and Kadar.

I can add a word of special testimony in this respect. I was a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I was the sponsor of the U.N. building laws, by designation of my venerable chief, Representative Eaton, who was then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I had a great deal to do with the headquarters agreement and all the laws which relate to the U.N. occupancy of that area.

I can testify that it was fully contemplated at that time that if we did have a serious security problem, New York would handle it, but it would do so as the agent for the Nation. That point was very fully recognized.

New York receives advantages for having the U.N. in New York. So does the United States, and so does the world.

New York does not send in a bill every Wednesday, or every time important visitors are received or important meetings of the U.N. are held. But anyone who was in New York at that time—and I lived there and observed the situation myself—realizes what a tense situation existed at the time of the 1960 session. We know that a particular concentration of leaders with big names could be and were endangered, as we all knew. Therefore it was a special and unusual situation which I believe, in all justice, calls for the reimbursement which the other body has voted, and which I hope very much we, with similar understanding, will vote, too, recognizing that it is sometimes the case that a great city like New York acts as trustee for the Nation with great credit. It has great financial problems, greater than those of any other city in the world, probably, because of its size, complexity, and other problems which we all know only too well. I hope very much that favorable action may be taken at an early date on that bill.

LOWELL MASON'S GRACE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, every year on the opening day of the baseball season in Washington, Lowell Mason, a former member of the Federal Trade Commission, gives a luncheon. This year the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and many Members of the House and Senate were in attendance.

On each of these occasions, Lowell Mason reads a grace that is fitting and outstanding.

I ask unanimous consent that the grace given this year be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the grace was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOWELL MASON'S GRACE

Lord we thank Thee for the bounty of this table—
The salt from the sea, the bread, meat, and drink,
From valley, plain, and mountain
All grown by men whose hands we have never grasped, faces we have never seen, voices we have never heard.
Lord we thank Thee for a greater bounty—
For the bounty of friendship at this table,
Not the frivolous friendship born of similar habits, language, and appetites—
But for friendship born of strong differences of opinion and high respect for common aims.
These are the legislators, we see them face to face.
They give us their hands, their voices are our voices.
Lord we thank Thee for even a greater bounty—
Not alone for the friendship of those who stand momentarily by our table—
But those who stand eternally by our shoulders—
Mr. Sam, Styles, Andy, Bob Taft, Vandenberg, La Follette, Paul, and a great host of others who,
"Have put off their shoes—softly to walk by day within our thoughts." [1]
Lord, for all Thy bounty.
We give thanks.

FARM LEGISLATION AND VIEWS OF ACTUAL FARM OPERATORS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as this session of Congress considers farm legislation, I think it is important that we get the views of actual farm operators who work and cooperate with the programs day in and day out.

A group of Greeley County, Kans., farmers met on March 9; and after discussing the present program, as well as prospective programs, they submitted to me a copy of the minutes of the meeting.

I ask unanimous consent that the minutes of the meeting be made a part of these remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the minutes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINUTES OF GREELEY COUNTY, KANS., FARMERS ON VIEWS OF FARM OPERATORS

An impromptu meeting was held on Thursday evening, March 29, 1962. The purpose of the meeting was to ascertain the opinions of those present with regard to the present Federal farm programs as they apply to Greeley County, Kans.

It is believed that a large majority of those present were agreed as follows:

That the present acreage allotments for Greeley County are inequitable for two reasons:

A. By 1951 it had become a standard practice in Greeley County to summer fallow nearly all land which was to be planted to wheat. Therefore, the acreage available to wheat had been reduced by approximately one-half before the period used for apportionment started. Other areas have adopted the practice at a later period and thereby increased their production on the larger bases apportioned to them.

B. Drought conditions and early spring rainouts materially curtailed feed grain production on many farms in the county during the years 1959 and 1960 which were the years used as a basis for feed grain program allotments.

This point might be summarized by stating that in this particular area the feasibility of planting any particular crop during any particular growing season is dependent upon the vagaries of the weather. This statement is much more true in western Kansas than it is in eastern Kansas. Because of the well known wind erosion problem farmers in Greeley County need more flexibility than is permitted under the present program.

It is believed that the above-mentioned inequities could be corrected and the desired flexibility obtained by adoption of the following:

1. Readjustment of feed grain base, using Greeley County ASC records on the 10 years

---

[1] Hugh Orr's "They Softly Walk."

preceding the first year of feed grain controls.

2. Combining the wheat and all feed grain bases, including milo, barley, rye, silage, or feed, after readjustment of feed grain base.

3. Permit the planting of any crop or any combination of crops on the combined base. Only one harvest of the base acres to be permitted in 1 year. But, for example, if entire base is planted to wheat and wheat were destroyed before feed grain planting time, feed grains could be planted on base acres and harvested.

4. It is believed that there is no surplus of the quality of wheat that is normally produced in Greeley County. Therefore producers should be permitted to plant all of their combined base acres to wheat if they desired to do so. They would then be permitted to sell the wheat produced on their wheat base acres on the open market under price supports. However, if production on the wheat base acres falls below the established Greeley County average they will be permitted to market enough of the wheat produced by them, on nonwheat-base acres, to bring them up to the normal Greeley County average. Other nonwheat base acre wheat could be sold at feed grain prices and under feed grain price supports, or carried over under bond or certificate to be sold in a future crop failure year as milling wheat under the county average quotas.

5. That because of the size of normal operations and the large number of nonresident landowners, each farm should be considered to be a separate unit for the purposes of determining compliance in any program. In other words, some landowners may desire to participate in the program and some may not.

6. That the combined base should not go below 50 percent of the total cultivated acres of any farm.

7. That since wheat harvest in Greeley County normally does not start until around July 1, the plowup date on excess acreage under the existing wheat program should be extended to June 1.

It is believed the above would:

1. Permit operators to engage in many more desirable soil conservation practices.
2. Permit operators to plan ahead because the suggested program is far less complicated.
3. Reduce problems of administration.
4. Reduce cost to the Government.
5. Not increase surplus.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE INSTITUTE OF RADIO ENGINEERS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, on March 28, 1962, David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America, made a most interesting and profound address. I ask unanimous consent that the address be placed in the body of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by David Sarnoff, Chairman of the Board, Radio Corp. of America, Institute of Radio Engineers Golden Anniversary Banquet, New York City, March 28, 1962

The occasion that has brought us together tonight—the golden anniversary of the Institute of Radio Engineers—is, indeed, a happy and significant one. And for many of us, it is deeply moving.

Our personal histories and professional careers—compounded of victories and defeats, of hopes fulfilled or thwarted—are closely woven into the history of the Institute of Radio Engineers. The half century we commemorate is filled with dramatic developments in communications and with heart-warming memories of close personal relationships, of cherished friendships, and of comradeship in creative enterprise.

In considering what I might appropriately say tonight, my first impulse was to speak of the remarkable accomplishments of the organization and its membership. But even the most condensed recital of that crowded period would exhaust the time allotted to me, and it would also run counter to our tradition of looking to the future rather than the past.

There is one historical vignette, however, that needs to be recalled. This picture, still unblurred after 50 years of exposure, is of a venturesome trio of pioneers who met in 1912, in Whyte's Restaurant on Fulton Street, in New York City, to found the Institute of Radio Engineers.

They were indeed a select and inspired group, these explorers of the newly opened world of wireless, and they deserve honorable mention tonight: Alfred N. Goldsmith, John V. L. Hogan, and Robert H. Marriott. They became the argonauts for a new era of scientific adventure, and were quickly joined by other pioneers whose work and dedication laid the foundations for the worldwide growth of the Institute of Radio Engineers. From the labors of those early innovators have grown the science, art, and technology of electronics, encompassing the universe of matter and energy, from invisible to infinite.

Those of us who subscribed to the institute's first declaration of purpose: "To advance the art and science of radio transmission," were moved primarily by a vision of what this interplay of electrical and magnetic forces could mean to human progress. Even with the primitive instruments of that day, tapping out coded messages, we sensed a power to convey men's thoughts, voices, and ultimately their images, across the barriers of space and time. We conceived the Institute of Radio Engineers not merely as a forum for the dissemination of new principles and concepts, but as a forge in which we could test, mold, and temper the character of our infant technology in an atmosphere of free scientific inquiry.

In a personal sense, I can relate the growth of our technology to two events, one at each end of the 50-year span. In 1912, as the Institute of Radio Engineers was being formed the SS *Titanic* struck an iceberg and was sinking in the Atlantic some 1,500 miles from our shores. As the wireless operator at the Marconi station on the roof of the Wanamaker store in this city, it took me 72 hours, with the equipment then available, simply to receive the news of the disaster and the names of the survivors.

Last month, using modern communications equipment, we were able to maintain almost continuous two-way contact with an astronaut who traveled 81,000 miles in space in less than 5 hours—about the same length of time it took me to travel between my home in New York and Washington, D.C.

On that day, I happened to be traveling by train to a White House meeting with President Kennedy and through the media of home television, car radio, pocket radio, and hotel television, I kept fully informed on Colonel Glenn's epic journey. Listening to my pocket radio, I recall walking from my compartment to the dining car at the other end of the train. In the few minutes this required, Colonel Glenn flew from the Hawaiian Islands to the Pacific coast—a distance of some 2,500 miles.

Such is the measure of progress in communication and flight made in the 50 years of Institute of Radio Engineers' life.

I recall, as do others here tonight, our spirited discussions during the early IRE organizational meetings on the choice of a name. There was a strong disposition to prefix the letter A—standing for American—to IRE. Finally, the decision was made that the Institute of Radio Engineers should and would be truly international in scope.

Fifty years have validated the wisdom of that decision. Nearly one-eighth of the Institute of Radio Engineers' 100,000 members today come from nations outside the United States and its possessions, grouped in 26 sections around the globe. In 105 countries or territories, from Aden to the Antilles, the symbol of Institute of Radio Engineers denotes an active membership.

Since 1930, it has been the custom for a Vice President of the organization to come from a nation other than the United States. In 1957, in fact, neither the President nor the Vice President of the IRE was a resident of our country. During this half century, the IRE has been an adviser, a participant, or a sponsor at countless international conferences for the advancement of electronic communications.

The nature of our science has dictated in some measure this pattern of growth on a global scale. The electron itself recognizes neither natural nor man-made boundaries, and the art of electronics has emerged as a rich mosaic to which many men from many nations have made important contributions.

As we enter our second half century, the chief obstruction to the pursuit of our founding aims is the political conflict that dominates our times. It is a type of obstruction inherent in the Communist system, which views science as an instrument of ideological as well as physical warfare, and which relentlessly bends it to that purpose. It is the antithesis of the IRE's founding concept of a universal and free science, a partnership global in scope and aims.

In my judgment, a clear understanding of this fact, and of its implications for the future, is indispensable not only to the membership of the IRE but to all who believe in free science and free society. If our cherished concept is to prevail, then we must act resolutely to place it in the service of freedom itself. This, indeed, is the great challenge of our second half century.

To meet it, we must first recognize realistically that the leaders of Communist technology are functionaries of a political apparatus wholly committed to the subjugation of freemen and the destruction of free societies. Communism operates on the principle that science is a basic instrument of state policy, a policy geared to world domination. While Mr. Khrushchev and his associates change faces on many issues, they have never deviated from their relentless pursuit of this objective.

As part of their politico-scientific approach, the Communists, by concentrating heavily in the areas of space and military atomics, have cultivated the claim that their science is superior in all respects. But this is a false claim. Actually, their scientific and technological capabilities are more limited than most of the world realizes. I am convinced that we can, if we so determine, demonstrate both the qualitative and quantitative superiority of free science across the board.

To do this, however, we must have a far more systematic and effective mobilization of the free world's scientific resources than our present informal alliance provides. We must concentrate our talents and facilities for scientific victory for peace, just as we have organized the forces of NATO for military defense. And we must do so with the sanction and support of the principal governments of the free world.

What are the resources that can be mustered for such an effort?

Among the 500 million persons within the Atlantic community alone there is a gigantic reservoir of scientific and technological strength unmatched in aptitudes, skills and creativity.

Over the past quarter century, there have been 34 Nobel prize winners from the United States in the fields of physics, chemistry, medicine and physiology; 44 from Western Europe, and only 5 from the Soviet Union. Since the beginning of the century, the ratio of Nobel prize winners is 175 to 6 in favor of the West.

Western Europe today possesses an impressive array of gifted men devoted to searching out basic scientific principles. Its universities and scientific centers—Goettingen, Oxford, Cambridge, the Sorbonne, Milan, Delft, Upsala, Copenhagen—are wellsprings of creativity in key research areas. To pace its own economic growth, Western Europe also is moving swiftly into the development and industrial application of basic knowledge.

The United States in recent years has contributed a substantial share of the world's finest creative thinking. It excels today in the experimental approach, in the richness and variety of its facilities, in unrivaled opportunities for putting concepts into application.

These diverse strengths on both sides of the Atlantic complement and support each other. On the one hand, few European nations, even collectively, possess the resources to pursue such vast and expensive undertakings as the exploration of space. For lack of opportunity, immensely talented scientists in these countries are consequently not utilizing their abilities to the utmost.

On the other hand the United States, largely because of its own swift advances, is gradually depleting its storehouse of fundamental scientific knowledge—the springboard for further technological progress. The demand for basic principles seems to be outpacing the supply.

Through more extensive basic research, we must expand our scientific knowledge and channel its flow into other areas of the world for the support of freedom's needs.

This can best be accomplished, I believe, through the creation of an organization which I would call the Free World Community of Science—an organization where competence is the only visa, and capabilities are fitted together for maximum results without regard to nationality.

The United States might properly take the lead in establishing such an organization, which initially could embrace the nations of Western Europe, North and South America, Australia, and Japan. Any countries which permit free scientific inquiry unhampered by political ideology, would be welcomed.

This community of science could include scientific leaders in the major areas of the physical and life disciplines from each participating nation. Established on a permanent basis, it could be responsible for proposing key research areas, initiating specific research and development projects, coordinating the resources essential to their implementation, and creating, wherever desirable, specialized international research institutes. It should function with a minimum of political direction, and with its financial support contributed by the member nations.

Organizations such as the IRE could play a vital role in the development of the community of science; first by proclaiming their support of it and then by counselling on organizational problems during the formative phase. It would also be within their province to proposed suitable projects, to recommend the most qualified scientists and engineers, to help evaluate progress, and to suggest promising avenues of exploration. There are many organizations here and abroad which possess the qualities of technical competence, objective appraisal and political independence necessary to make useful contributions.

Even today we could place certain areas of research under a canopy of common free world scientific interest. In each area, breakthroughs would change human life for the better and would manifest to all mankind the scientific leadership of the West.

I have grouped them into five broad categories which range across the natural laws of life, matter and energy, and involve some of the most critically pressing human and physical problems of our time.

1. Genetics and heredity: We have begun the assault on the innermost mysteries of the life process—decoding the nucleic structure of the living cell, its activities, differentiations and transmitted characteristics. Knowledge of these basic life functions might make it possible ultimately to alter or modify cellular structures. This could lead in turn to the elimination of bacterial or viral diseases, and conceivably to more useful strains of plant and animal life.

2. Communications and space: In our own area of primary interest—communications—we are now in the planning and early development stage for a cosmic system of interconnected high-level synchronous satellites, low-level satellites, ground stations and networks. Such a system will enable us to furnish every type of communication to every place on earth, to space vehicles and to the planets beyond. Whenever man ventures from this planet, science is challenged with the supreme task of providing him with the means of seeing and talking with his fellow men wherever they may be.

Recently the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, through Colonel Glenn and Project Mercury, dramatically demonstrated the potentialities of space for peaceful purposes. It is axiomatic that when a vacuum is unsealed, there is an inrush of air. As the vacuum of outer space is unsealed by our intrepid astronauts, we must mount a Western team effort to insure an inrush of freedom.

Another area of infinite promise for scientific collaboration in this general category is weather control. The success of the four Tiros television weather satellites has already indicated the possibility that we can vastly strengthen the defense of person and property against the turbulence of the skies and the seas.

Where there are resources and individuals in the free world capable of significant contributions to these new dimensions of science, they should be joined to the sum of a united effort.

3. Conversion of saline to fresh water: Two-thirds of the peoples of the earth live in areas that are water-starved. For millions of them, the presence of a few feet of water spells the difference between life, bare existence, or death. The nations which offer an efficient, low-cost process for large scale purification of salt or brackish water will possess a weapon as potent as space ships in the battle for men's allegiance. President Kennedy has said rightly, that this is as important as landing on the moon.

4. New sources of food: Barely one-sixth of the world's people are well fed, and nearly half exist in a state of subnutrition or malnutrition. In the areas where food deficiencies are greatest, the rate of agricultural production has been slowest.

In 20 years the population of the earth will increase by 1 billion, and 40 years from now it will total 6 billion. For every plate of food on the table today, there must be two plates by the year 2000—and most of that second plate can come from the world's oceans.

Acre per acre, the oceans can sustain at least as large a plant crop as the land; yet, the harvest of the sea today provides less than 1 percent of the human diet. The oceans offer an immediate challenge to our proposed community of science for improving food supplies by transforming fishing from a nomadic pursuit to an organized farming activity, including the scientific processing of highly nutrient algae and plankton for food purposes.

5. New sources of energy: Research in atomics, electronics, and other fields, is now providing us with the means to convert solar energy, fossil fuel energy, and atomic fission energy, directly into electric power. And through further research we shall ultimately learn how to make practical use of nuclear fusion energy. When that day comes, we shall be able to tap the limitless energy sources in the oceans.

Before too long, many isolated parts of the world will have sources of electricity that will not require large central power stations and extensive transmission systems. When we learn how to convert all forms of matter into energy for practical uses, we will have at our disposal the maximum force in nature. It will then be possible to cleave new coastlines, level mountain ranges, and transform the Sahara or our southwestern deserts into irrigated gardens.

To quicken the pace of these explorations, I suggest the establishment of an international data processing center to assemble, digest, translate, and make available promptly the essential data contained in the volumes of technical papers being published around the world. This year alone, the total of such papers will approach 60 million pages. Concealed in this mountain of information are thousands of ideas for new materials, products, and processes that could be invaluable to our progress in science and technology.

Tonight, I have attempted to outline only a concept and the directions it might take. I realize that the implementation will require time, effort, a degree of willingness to forsake parochial interests, and a firm faith in the future of free nations. While it would be necessary, for security reasons, to exclude certain activities of a scientific nature that relate to national defense, this would not contradict the broader and peaceful purposes of the new scientific alliance.

In January, President Kennedy told the Congress: "The Atlantic Community is no longer concerned with purely military aims. As its common undertakings grow at an ever increasing pace, we are, and increasingly will be, partners in aid, trade, defense, diplomacy, and monetary affairs."

To these, I believe, we must now join the partnership of science.

As the founders of the IRE recognized half a century ago, the concept of isolation in science is illusory and in the end self-defeating. We can no longer afford the luxury of American science, or British, French, Italian, or German science, if the individual parts are smaller than the sum. We must mobilize all of free science into the race for supremacy over the forces governing the universe. We cannot afford to fall behind in this race. The Communist challenge to the free world on the military, economic, political, and psychological fronts demands that we hold first place in science and technology.

Four centuries ago, Francis Bacon said: "Knowledge is power." Amended for the 20th century, his words might read: "Scientific knowledge is world power."

The dominant task that our organization faces in the next 50 years is to help translate scientific knowledge into power—power that can safeguard human freedom and justice, that can make life more rewarding and more secure for men everywhere. For the IRE, I am confident this golden anniversary will prove to be another commencement.

ECONOMIC VALUE OF WYOMING'S SHEEP AND WOOL INDUSTRY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is often difficult to assess the value of a particular segment of a State's economy without the assistance of some definite guideposts.

In the day-to-day press of events it is easy to lose sight of just how important a single industry can be to a State's economy.

I was, therefore, gratified to receive a special report, which served to reemphasize the importance of a vital part of Wyoming's great agricultural industry, the sheep and wool industry, prepared by a former colleague, Prof. Glenn Roehrkasse.

This report is a survey made possible by the University of Wyoming's division of agricultural economics, and with the cooperation from the Wyoming Wool Growers Association.

This survey indicates that the total Wyoming dollar benefit from sheep and wool equal more than $71 million.

I think the Wool Growers Association has performed a valuable service in initiating this study which should be of considerable interest to many people, and I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ECONOMIC VALUE OF THE WYOMING SHEEP AND WOOL INDUSTRY TO WYOMING'S ECONOMY

(By Glenn P. Roehrkasse)

The sheep and wool industry is one of the important agricultural industries in the State. Wyoming's agriculture income in 1960, in terms of cash receipts plus the value of home consumption, amounted to $178,498,000. Approximately 17.34 percent of this income comes from the sheep and wool industry, or about $30,948,000. Actually this industry in terms of cash receipts is the second largest single agricultural income producer in Wyoming, being exceeded only by the cattle industry.

While it is possible to determine, in terms of cash receipts, the relative value of this industry to the total Wyoming agriculture, it is an intricate task to determine the economic value of the industry to Wyoming's economy. Nevertheless, the purpose of this report is to present the results of an investigation into what is the economic value of the Wyoming sheep and wool industry to Wyoming's economy.

Wyoming's economy is made up of the aggregate economic activity of all its people. Money income is generated by money expenditures. Every time a dollar is spent by someone to purchase goods or services, this dollar represents an income for the person who receives it. The economic activity in the State is generated in two separate ways: First, economic activity within the State can be brought about by intrastate purchases and sales. That is, when people within the State purchase goods and services from in-State sources, they generate economic activity by increasing the circulation of in-State money. Secondly, economic activity within the State can be brought about by importing new money (by exporting goods and services). The new money then further generates economic activity through intrastate sales and purchases. The economy of Wyoming cannot be considered as an isolated one, since goods and services are exported from the State as well as being imported into the State. These imports, which are purchases made outside the State by people within the State, represent leakages to the State's economy.

The effect of any industry on a State's economy can be resolved by determining the amount of new money that comes into the economy from the exporting of goods and services and then tracing the flow of this money through intrastate transactions until the money actually flows from the economy in the form of leakages.

In order to analyze the impact of the sheep and wool industry on Wyoming's economy, it is necessary to have data available on the total income received and on the total expenditures made by the industry in the various industry sectors of Wyoming. An estimate was made of the total income received and the total expenditures made by the industry during the calendar year 1960. These estimates are presented in table 1. That year was chosen because data were available for 1960 on the distribution of expenditures between various industry sectors of the State.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated total income received and total expenditures made by the Wyoming sheep and wool industry in the various sectors of Wyoming, based on 1960 data*

Income:	
Sheep and lambs	$17,003,000
Value of home consumption	140,000
Wool	9,428,000
Government payments	4,377,000
Total income	30,948,000
Expenditures:	
Agriculture (hay, grain, etc.)	2,373,000
Manufacturing (lumber, etc.)	345,000
Transportation and utilities	1,013,000
Farm product handlers (elevators, feed dealers, etc.)	1,999,000
Wholesale (bulk dealers, etc., e.g., gas and oil)	1,616,000
Retail (general merchandise, building materials, implements, autos, etc.)	4,753,000
Services (personal services, business and professional, etc.)	136,000
Finance (banks, investment companies, insurance companies, etc.)	244,000
Contractors (building and other)	739,000
Local government (taxes)	1,337,000
State and Federal Government (State taxes and leases)	494,000
Household (hired labor, operators' income, profit, etc.)	13,262,000
Imports (purchases outside the State of Wyoming)	2,637,000
Total expenditures	30,948,000

The expenditures of the industry, as presented in table 1, indicate the amounts that were spent in the various industry sectors during 1960. For example, the industry purchases $2,373,000 worth of agricultural goods (hay, grain, etc.) from the agricultural sector. They also spent $4,753,000 in the retail trade to purchase ranch supplies, building materials, ranch equipment, etc. All the other expenditures can be interpreted in a similar manner.

The expenditures listed under the household sector include a hired labor charge of $7,684,000, which leaves only $5,578,000 for the operators' income and profit. It has been assumed that Federal income taxes will be paid by the household sector. The import sector denotes all expenditures that have been made outside the State of Wyoming, whether these expenditures were for purchasing feed, sheep, trucks, or otherwise.

The expenditures made by the sheep and wool industry, as shown in table 1, indicate the direct effect the income received by the industry has on the economy of the State. However, these direct effects are not the total contributions of the industry to the State's economy. In order to determine this total effect, it is necessary to evaluate the indirect effects the original income of the sheep and wool industry has on the State's economy. These indirect effects are generated as the original income moves by successive spending cycles through the interrelated industries of the State's economy until it eventually leaks away to sources outside of Wyoming.

A study has recently been made by the division of business and economic research on the economy of southwestern Wyoming. This study, which made use of the techniques of input-output analysis, serves as the basis for estimating the total impact (both direct and indirect effects) that the original income received by the sheep and wool industry has on the State's economy. The estimated direct and indirect effects that accrue to each industry are presented in table 2. These are the total benefits that accrue to each industry after the income received by the sheep-and-wool industry has had a chance to complete the cycling process through the entire economy.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated total business and revenue produced in the various industry sectors of Wyoming due to the Wyoming sheep and wool industry, based on 1960 data*

Industries:	
Agriculture (hay, grain, etc.)	$3,257,000
Minerals (oil, gas, coal, etc.)	552,000
Manufacturing (lumber, etc.)	1,236,000
Transportation and utilities	3,591,000
Farm product handlers (elevators, feed dealers, etc.)	2,167,000
Wholesale (bulk dealers, etc., e.g., gas and oil)	5,380,000
Retail (general merchandise, building, material, implements, autos, etc.)	19,358,000
Services (personal services, business and professional, etc.)	2,581,000
Finance (banks, investment company, insurance company, etc.)	1,598,000
Contractors (building and other)	1,523,000
Total business produced	41,243,000
Other activity (noncommercial):	
Local government revenue	2,242,000
State and Federal Government revenue	3,932,000
Personal income (labor income, operators' income, profit, etc.)	24,212,000
Total business and revenue produced	71,629,000

It is estimated that $30,948,000 of income to the sheep and wool industry will generate approximately $41,243,000 of commercial business. Moreover, this same income will produce an additional $6,174,000 of local, State, and Federal Government revenue and $24,212,000 of personal income. Thus, an income of $30,948,000 produced a total of $71,629,000 of business and noncommercial revenue. Almost one-half of the total business produced went to the retail trade. That is, retailers received $19,358,000 out of $41,243,000 (the total business produced). A considerable part of the total business received by the retail trade is due to the secondary effects, since the sheep and wool industry's direct purchases from the retailers were only $4,753,000 (table 1).

The sheep and wool industry is an important contributor to the economy of Wyoming, since most of the income received by the industry represents new money coming into the economy. Practically all the production from the industry is exported outside the State of Wyoming for further processing. This income, which the industry receives from exporting its production outside the State, is largely spent within Wyoming (table 1). Thus, most of the income received by the industry enters the State's income stream, generating new income as it moves throughout the State's economy until eventually it leaks to sources outside the State.

While the sheep and wool industry may not be the largest single agriculture income producer within the State, nevertheless, the industry does make a significant contribution to Wyoming's economy. First of all, since the industry exports practically all of its production, it is responsible for importing new money into the State. Secondly, since most of this new money is spent within the State, it is injected into the State's income stream to generate additional income through intrastate economic activity.

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL: GOOD WILL AND GOOD BUSINESS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday, April 9, 1962, the Sixth Regional Conference on International Travel held under the auspices of Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges and the U.S. Department of Commerce, was held at Dallas, Tex., this one for the six South Central and Southwestern States of Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

A most beneficial regional conference was held with a notable keynote address by the Honorable Luther H. Hodges, an informative speech by the Honorable Voit Gilmore, Director of U.S. Travel Service and speeches by approximately six other persons.

Due to requests for my remarks at that meeting, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point a copy of my remarks at this regional conference at Dallas, April 9, 1962, titled "International Travel: Good Will and Good Business."

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL: GOOD WILL AND GOOD BUSINESS

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Hodges, distinguished officials, guests, it is an honor and a duty, but also a high personal privilege to participate in this major regional southwestern conference on international travel. The new U.S. policy of encouraging foreign tourists to visit America has tremendous potential for good. It is good business, it is sound economics, it is first rate diplomacy. If it succeeds, we will stabilize the movement of gold to and from our Nation, thus strengthening our currency, and we will build new bridges to international understanding, higher and stronger than any now being built. A million more visitors from abroad in these United States each year will carry home more good will for America each year than all the diplomats you can find striped pants for.

Increasing numbers of people from Mexico, Central and South America, Europe and Japan have become prosperous enough to plan foreign travel and many are eager, if encouraged, to visit our land. Moreover, many of these countries now have relaxed their currency restrictions on travel abroad, making it timely for us to encourage more people to come to the United States for temporary travel.

The stimulation of more foreign tourism is definitely in the national interest. This program will make very significant contributions both to better international relations and to the American economy. The passage of the International Travel Act of 1961, which established an enlarged travel office in the Department of Commerce and of which I am cosponsor, will do much to further these objectives. As a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, I attended hearings on the bill. It is a vital law, in a vital area of national interest.

I think it fortunate that this program is under the jurisdiction of the Commerce Department—which is out for tourists and doesn't have to delay to negotiate treaties. The Office of International Travel was placed under the jurisdiction of a department that already had an Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, who, under the Secretary of Commerce, presides over the Advisory Committee on Export Policy, the Bureau of Foreign Commerce and the Office of International Trade Fairs.

It is fortunate, too, that this "Visit U.S.A." program is being created at a time when we have as Secretary of Commerce a man of exceptional energy, vision and ability. Some historians have said that the Commerce Department has had only one great secretary: Herbert Hoover. Others have said that Texas' own Jesse Jones was the greatest Secretary of Commerce, but the historians of the future, whether they say the Commerce Department has had one, two, three or more great Secretaries, will always have to include Luther H. Hodges as one of the great ones. America is the gainer that this tourism program is under his direction.

Since passage of the 1961 act, I have been in Europe, Asia and Africa. My experiences there in the fall of 1961 have confirmed my belief in the need for a more active U.S. travel promotion program as a means of increasing international understanding. In view of the continuing world strife we cannot afford to overlook any contribution to the easing of world tensions. Making it possible for more of the ordinary citizens of the world to come into personal contact with each other is one of the most effective ways of promoting understanding between peoples of diverse cultures, races and nationalities.

Tourism and other programs which bring foreigners to our shores are also the best antidote for the propaganda attacks of our enemies. As you know, the Communists are sowing seeds of mistrust in the minds of people abroad. This can best be combated by encouraging more people to come and judge for themselves the true character of the American people and our democratic institutions.

Realizing this, our Government has sponsored a number of exchange programs under the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright Acts and other special legislation. These programs have already yielded benefits far in excess of the funds invested in them. There is every reason to believe that the "Visit U.S.A." program can be equally productive. The sharing of ideas through personal contact strengthens genuine understanding and the mutual respect basic to the peace and security of the free world.

In my 5 years in the Senate, I have met in seminars in Washington with many groups of foreign students, studying in America. These are informal, unpublicized, off-the-cuff, frank study sessions. We generally ask them what they like best and least about America. Members of every group, including students from Canada, Australia, England, Europe, Africa, South America, and Asia tell us that they have been surprised, amazed, pleased by the innate kindness and goodness of the American people; that they and the people generally where they live, had their ideas of America molded by American movies and American TV films, and that our movies and TV films shown abroad had created an almost worldwide image of Americans as a drunken, evil, violent, oversexed people. These foreign students are relieved and pleased to find Americans kind, courteous, friendly, sympathetic and helpful, a churchgoing, God-fearing, law-abiding people with their ideals hitched to stars of goodness, as well as celestial travel. These foreign students tell us in Washington that our movies and TV films of crime, vice, sex, and evil exported and shown in their countries do Americans more harm than all the Communist propaganda they hear.

Foreign tourists in the United States will see what these foreign students see, if we but act toward all foreign visitors as we do toward these foreign students. If we could increase the number of foreign tourists visiting America by 1 million per year, the intangible good will values would be incalculable. All the billions we pour out in foreign aid may fall on fallow ground unless the people aided know what kind of people we are.

We can also expect equally important economic benefits from a stepped-up tourist promotion program. Our gold reserves are down to something over $16 billion, from a high of about $23 billion a few years ago.

A substantial slice of the imbalance of payments with the resultant decline in our domestic gold balances is caused by the excess of American tourist spending abroad over the comparatively small amount of foreign tourist travel in America. The tourist trade costs little to produce, yet it is one of the world's primary means of distributing wealth across State and international boundary lines.

Although tourists spend money largely for food, lodging, gifts, clothing and local transportation, these activities in turn provide income for almost every conceivable type of supplier, distributor, artisan, businessman, and professional. Hotels, for example, return 85 percent of every tourist dollar they receive to the local economy in wages and expenditures for food, drink and supplies to operate the hotel and for miscellaneous expense.

Texas can have an important role in this new foreign tourist promotion program. The sheer size and variety of the State offers almost unlimited possibilities to tourists. Texas has distinctive sights like the primitive harshness and color of the Big Bend country on the southwestern border, the solitude of the Big Thicket in east Texas, the rugged peaks of the Davis Mountains, the long stretch of white beach on Padre Island, the free expanse of the big ranches, the third largest cavern in the world, as well as growing and thriving cities like Dallas, Houston, and Fort Worth, and a city of cultural blend like San Antonio. These attractions are familiar to many of you—they should be seen and appreciated by many more.

Sun, sea and sand give the Texas gulf coast all the ingredients of another type of vacation paradise. Padre Island, which stretches from Corpus Christi nearly to the mouth of the Rio Grande has already proven to be a mecca for those who love open beaches, while fishermen, hunters, and sailing enthusiasts find equal delight in the coastal marshes, bayous and beaches of this area.

I have sponsored a bill, S. 4, to create a national park on 88.5 miles of Padre Island, which has been favorably reported out of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The establishment of such a recreation area will immeasurably benefit this region of Texas, and the whole State, as well as international tourism. Recent studies of the economic effects of establishing national parks has shown that they significantly enhance the economy of the region as well as preserve the area's natural, scenic, and recreational values.

The use of Padre Island as a national park will likewise generate new income and employment for service industries in the area.

Why do I bring in Padre Island at this point? It is because of the tremendous importance of our national parks in our appeal to international tourists. Some foreign students tell us that the National Park System was the most impressive thing they saw in America; that it represented to them a government concerned with the well being of its people and appreciative of the forces of creation. Even students from Australia have told me that, of all the things they saw in America, the national parks and their management impressed them most, and gave them an ideal to carry home; something to try to emulate in their own land.

Of the more than 100 independent nations of the earth, 78 are each smaller than Texas, while 72 each have less population than Texas. So, on area and population alone, Texas is destined to have an important role in our international tourism picture. Geographical location assigns it an even more important role.

With a 1,000-mile long common boundary with Mexico along the Rio Grande, we in Texas hold the tourism door for Mexico's 35 million people, largest in Latin America save Brazil. Many of Mexico's citizens want to visit Texas. In the past, some have wondered if they would be welcome. It is our opportunity to let them know that they need hesitate no longer. The welcome mat is out to our closest neighbor, and Dallas, home of the greatest State fair in the Nation can lay out the finest welcome mat of all.

As the U.S. Travel Service moves toward its goal of doubling the number of foreign tourists in our country in the next 4 years, Texas must prepare all of its display windows with special care.

Because of its location, Texas has the most unique opportunity of all our States to improve our relations with Latin America. We should encourage this by making sure these people receive a warm welcome and are treated with true Texas courtesy and hospitality while they are here.

If we succeed, these visitors will take home a good impression that will have more influence on their opinion of the United States than anything else that can be done. The best voice of America is the voice of her people on the streets, in the churches, in the market places, on the highways and on the airlines, all across this broad land.

It is up to us to help the United States take advantage of this vast untapped market and unique opportunity to further the cause of peace and freedom.

OUR STAKE IN SAMOA

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, Congress and the Kennedy administration are making vigorous efforts to overcome the past neglect of American Samoa. This neglect was detailed in a report which Senator GRUENING and I made last year following our study of conditions there pursuant to Senate Resolution 330, 86th Congress. The Honolulu Advertiser recently printed a series of stories by reporter Jack Teehan giving an up-to-date report on American Samoa and the steps being taken to meet our responsibilities in that important Polynesian possession. The importance of Samoa is outlined in an editorial from the Advertiser of March 30, 1962. Since much remains to be done, I invite the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to the editorial entitled "Our Stake in Samoa." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR STAKE IN SAMOA

If Hawaii is to offer real leadership in the Pacific, now is the time for us to look to the south—to American Samoa.

Hawaii, as a Washington economic consultant noted in the Advertiser series by Jack Teehan, has a real stake in the U.S. possession.

The real future of many Samoans lies here in Hawaii and on the mainland. Today, because of our neglect, most of the Samoan youth are not properly educated and are unequipped to compete in a modern society.

Too many of them are headed for menial jobs, state welfare rolls or worse.

The eyes of Congress have been opened wide to the prevailing conditions in American Samoa, thanks to men like Senator Oren E. Long, Samoa's Governor H. Rex Lee, and Representative Michael Kirwan, of Ohio, to name a few.

Money is pouring into the islands from Washington—some $25 million to be spent there in the next 3 years.

These funds will provide American Samoa with the skeletal framework for a basic economy

The money will finance essential schooling, medical care, highways, powerplants and agricultural aids needed to put American Samoa on its feet and headed in the right direction.

Governor Lee hopes to flesh out this framework with more small industries and a thriving, selective, tourist business.

His goal is to make American Samoa a model community in the South Pacific and the hub of Polynesia. This community would help all its South Pacific neighbors, providing the many resources and training facilities which they lack.

It is essential that these goals be fully realized. We must "put our money where our mouth is" and follow up words with deeds to show that there are practical sides to the American dream.

Nor can plain political considerations be overlooked. We cannot afford another Cuba. The Soviet Union has already made political overtures to the independent state of Western Samoa, which has more than five times the population of American Samoa and is but 45 minutes away by plane.

We are now making positive moves to counter any Soviet influence in the area even though initial technical aid offers from Moscow were rebuffed.

Within 2 years our educational TV system will blanket Western Samoa and a U.S. radio station will be heard throughout most of Polynesia.

If we can follow this up with concrete assistance, including public health training and research to stamp out diseases which afflict humans, animals, and plants, we will make many new friends.

Hawaii, as the most advanced part of the mid-Pacific, can play an important role in this program.

A team of lay and government experts from Hawaii working with Governor Lee, could make a special feasibility study to determine just how Hawaii can help fill the needs of American Samoa.

Aid is needed in many fields, including medical, public health, agriculture, education, public works—the list is almost endless.

Hawaii has the men and the skills to get the job done. The Congress finally is doing its part—and must continue to, with adequate appropriations. Now Hawaii should give what it has to give, that special brand of Polynesian understanding and aloha which can come only from our Islands.

"CAPITOL CLOAKROOM"

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on March 20, the CBS Radio program "Capitol Cloakroom" began its 15th year on the air.

My distinguished colleague from Minnesota, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, was featured on the anniversary program.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of this broadcast be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CBS RADIO'S "CAPITOL CLOAKROOM" BEGINS 15TH YEAR ON AIR MARCH 29 AND CHALKS UP BROADCAST NO. 700

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 20, 1962.—"Capitol Cloakroom," CBS Radio's oldest continuous public affairs interview program, begins its 15th year on the air Thursday, March 29, with its 700th broadcast.

Heard for the first time on the CBS Radio network March 31, 1948, "Capitol Cloakroom" in its 14-year history has presented the views of hundreds of members of Washington officialdom—Senators, Representatives, Cabinet members, ambassadors, labor leaders, Governors, political party chairmen, foreign secretaries, and other leading political figures who have been in the Nation's Capital.

Among "Capitol Cloakroom's" most prominent guests have been President John F. Kennedy, who appeared at the time he was a Senator, and former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman, both of whom were heard on the program by special recording.

Taking its name from a Capitol Hill institution, "Capitol Cloakroom" is devoted primarily to the affairs of Congress. The present officers of the Senate have been heard on the program—Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, Democratic Whip HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Republican Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and Republican Whip THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California.

Among leaders of the House of Representatives who have been guests are Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, Democratic Whip HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, and Republican Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana.

Because the great majority of its guests are Members of Congress, "Capitol Cloakroom" frequently originates in the House and Senate Radio Galleries in order to accommodate its distinguished interviewees.

Following the March 22 program, U.S. Senators will have been guests a total of 581 times, including special appearances of 42 new Senators as they arrived in Washington. Members of the House have appeared 109 times.

Presidential Cabinets have been represented on the program 55 times and, in addition, there have been interviews with 24 ambassadors and 108 other officials.

Though its format on special occasions has included more than one guest, "Capitol Cloakroom" generally presents a prominent figure facing penetrating questioning by three CBS news Washington correspondents, with Charles von Fremd as anchor man. The interview is completely unrehearsed as guest and reporters consider the top issues of the day.

CBS news Washington correspondents who rotate in conducting the informal interviews are Wells Church, Nancy Hanschman, George Herman, Roger Mudd, Paul Niven, Robert Pierpoint, and Neil Strawser.

"Capitol Cloakroom," produced by Ellen Wadley of the public affairs staff of CBS news, is broadcast on the CBS radio network Thursdays. In Washington, it is heard on WTOP Radio Sundays at 7:05 p.m., e.s.t.

"CAPITOL CLOAKROOM"

(As broadcast over the CBS Radio network, March 29, 1962)

Guest: The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, U.S. Senate, Democrat, of Minnesota.

Correspondents: Charles von Fremd, Nancy Hanschman Dickerson, and Roger Mudd.

Producer: Ellen Wadley.

Mr. VON FREMD. Senator HUMPHREY, is there a way out of the arms race peril?

Mrs. DICKERSON. How will the Supreme Court's decision on reapportionment affect the Democratic Party?

Mr. MUDD. Senator, what are the prospects for the administration's major legislative proposals?

ANNOUNCER. "Capitol Cloakroom." From the Nation's Capital, CBS Radio brings you the 700th presentation of "Capitol Cloakroom," a spontaneous and unrehearsed transcribed interview with an outstanding public figure. This week's guest is Senate Democratic Whip HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. He meets with CBS News Correspondents Charles von Fremd, Nancy Hanschman Dickerson, and Roger Mudd.

First we hear from Mr. von Fremd.

Mr. VON FREMD. Senator HUMPHREY, welcome once again on "Capitol Cloakroom" which, if you will permit us to boast just a little bit, is another anniversary day for the oldest program of its kind on the air. With this broadcast we begin our 15th consecutive year on the air and our 700th program.

You are no newcomer to "Capitol Cloakroom." In fact you were our guest on this same date a year ago. We know from past experience you have got much to say in answer to our questions, so let's begin with that chronic nagging one: As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the chairman of the Disarmament Subcommittee, do you think there is a way out of the arms race peril?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, can I first express just a personal note. I want to say "Happy birthday" to "Capitol Cloakroom," and happy birthday on this, its 15th year and this, the 700th program. I think I have been on a good number of these programs and I have always enjoyed the privilege.

Mr. VON FREMD. Thank you very much, Senator; and so do we.

Senator HUMPHREY. Now, to your question, "Is there a way out of the arms race?"

I am sure that every reasonable and sensible person believes there must be a way found to curb the ever-growing arms race. Of many reasons for this, the arms race within itself is a risk, it poses a threat to world peace, particularly if that race gets out of balance with one side getting the ascendency.

Furthermore, the burden of the costs of the arms race in terms of the utilization of physical and human resources is becoming intolerable in many areas of the world and is beginning to take a heavy toll even in a rich and prosperous country like our own. Is there a way out? I felt that the recent conference at Geneva, which is still underway, but particularly the participation by our Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, indicates that there may well be a way out because, despite all of the intransigence of the Soviet Union in such areas as Berlin and the violence that is taking place in Vietnam, there was a degree of calculated moderation on the part of the Soviet diplomats at Geneva and particularly on the part of Mr. Gromyko.

There apparently is a feeling that some way out must be found, and I believe that that way out will not come by arguing over old problems, but starting to find some new areas of contact and of understanding. And one of those would be Soviet-United States cooperation in the field of outer-space research and development and scientific exploration. This is a new area.

Now, outer space can either become a battleground of the great powers or it can become a laboratory of cooperation and we are at the breakpoint right now, this year. If we can decide through the auspices of the United Nations, for example, for multilateral international cooperation in the field of outer-space research and exploration, I think we will have had the first opening for curbing the arms race, because we will curb it in a new area of conflict; namely, outer space.

Secondly, I think that we ought to press very seriously this matter of the prevention of accidental war. I have talked about this before. The modern machines of war, with electronics and with automation, make it possible for both mechanical and human error to precipitate a major global conflict. Some breakdown in communications could cause this. Therefore, there must be every possible way taken to prevent accidental war.

I have proposed a conference of the military leaders and the scientific leaders of the United States and the Western allies, the Soviet Union and her allies on this one subject of how do we prevent accidental war? What precautions can we take? What do we know that the Soviet Union is doing to prevent accidental war?

We have no information. We know that we have taken some very definite precautionary steps but we ought to know what the other side is doing, too.

Mrs. DICKERSON. Senator, while these things are going on, the United States still has said that we will resume nuclear tests next month in the atmosphere. Do you think that there is any alternative for U.S. resumption of those tests if the Russians do not agree to an inspection ban, and they don't seem to be agreeing to that now? Is there any alternative for us?

Senator HUMPHREY. I don't think so. We've made a decision. I believe the decision was taken after the most careful thought and consideration. The President of the United States has as his first obligation the protection of American security, the protection of this Nation. He is the Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief. I know that the President and our defense officials and our scientists examined very carefully the recent Soviet tests. I know that men in the field of science who are basically opposed to the extension and expansion of nuclear weaponry and particularly nuclear tests came to the conclusion after examining the results of the findings on Soviet tests that it was necessary for our country to have another series of tests unless the Soviet Union would immediately agree to halt any further testing and any further developments in nuclear weapons; even that is a calculated risk. I want to be very frank with this audience that, even if the Soviet Union were to sign a nuclear test prohibition treaty today, with proper inspection, that we are still running a risk because of the great advances which the Soviets made in their recent test series. But everything is a risk and you have to take some risks about a risk, so that's what we were perfectly willing to do, so I think the President would have to go forward with these tests.

Now, there may be some way that we can bring them under reasonable control. We might very well, since the Soviet has threatened itself to have further tests, try to come to some agreement as to the number of tests. And, between the two powers.

And, secondly, we might want to come to an agreement as to—if there are to be any further tests after this series, of reducing that number of tests. There may be something that we could approach.

Mrs. DICKERSON. Well, Senator, you talk about risks and you say we must take them. Do I infer that you think that since the Russians latest series of tests they are ahead of us? Do you personally think they are in the matter of the kinds of nuclear testing?

Senator HUMPHREY. No, I don't think that the Soviets are ahead of us in quantity of weapons, nor do I think they are ahead of us in basic quality or sophistication, at this time. I do feel, however, that the recent Soviet tests which were of an exploratory nature may very well have laid the scientific base for very significant Soviet advances in the next year or the next 2 years. And, if that is the case, then our margin of superiority over the Soviets could be liquidated or lost. And while I am very concerned about the arms race and the so-called balance of power with all of the risks involved in that, I think an even deeper and greater concern would be over the imbalance of power and imbalance in the hands of the Soviets or of the Sino-Soviet bloc. I think that this would threaten peace as nothing else could. So we are, what we are doing today is, we are hanging on desperately in the quest for peace by the use of power. In the meantime, we are appealing through every known channel of diplomacy and contact to the Soviets and to the Communist area to halt the arms race before it gets completely out of hand.

I think that this appeal must be made, and it must be made with ever new vigor and new—with continuing sincerity. Whether there will be any response, who knows?

Mrs. DICKERSON. Well, as everyone knows, the Russians said if we test, they are going to start testing again. And you said just a second ago that you are concerned about the balance with one side getting the ascendancy. Can't the case be made that by our testing we are forcing them into testing again because they are worried about the balance?

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes, the case can be made on that basis, and some people have made it.

I would say, however, that at the present time the Soviet Union is harder pressed than the United States is in terms of its ability to maintain the defense or the arms struggle. I'd like to develop that point for just a moment.

It was my view during recent years that we neither had a disarmament policy nor an arms policy. What we did, we coasted. We had a defense budget about big enough to take care of minimum needs without any sacrifice on the part of our people, and it was big enough so that the Soviets could pay for it without any real breakdown of their economic structure.

Now we have put the pressure on in recent months. We have improved our defense system. We have given greater flexibility and mobility to our military forces. We have really plowed into the Defense Establishment billions of dollars of new capital. This is causing difficulties for the Soviets. If they are going to keep pace, it means that they must divert capital from much-needed domestic programs. They have a shortage of capital far beyond what we have. They are going to have to make up their mind in the Soviet Union—do you want tractors or are you going to have more missiles?

Mr. Khrushchev is right now, it seems to me, at a point where great decisions are being made in the Soviet Union and those decisions may very well mean a continuation of the arms race, or they may mean, if we are firm, and if we are not—I don't want us to be bellicose or arrogant—but just firm and dedicated, if we pursue a course of strength I think we may very well compel the Soviet Union to reevaluate this arms race that they are in and they may very well want some disarmament in order to be able to fulfill their objectives on the domestic scene.

Remember, the Soviets have made great promises to their people and to the world, and the Soviet Union now stands before the world with an agriculture that is a failure, with a 7-year plan that is behind, and with a 20-year proposal that doesn't have a prospect of success.

Now, the Soviets understand the importance of propaganda and psychological warfare, and I think Mr. Khrushchev is going to have to come to a decision within the next 12 months as to whether or not he is going to scrap a 7-year plan, forget his speech about the next 20 years of the Soviet Union and how they are going to surpass the United

States, or have to engage in the arms race even more than he is at the present time.

Mr. Mudd. Senator, the Senate is going to have to make a decision pretty soon on this U.N. bond issue. I would like to ask you what is wrong with Richard Russell's proposal that the U.N. be relieved of repaying this $38 million to the United States?

On paper this looks like a pretty good plan.

Senator Humphrey. Well, if that was all there was to it, it wouldn't be so bad; but Mr. Russell's proposal doesn't mean to give life to the U.N., it means to give it a sort of patriotic and historic burial. It will just leave the U.N. stripped because what he also said was, of course, that this would have to be as a credit to any further obligations on the part of the United States to the U.N. And, furthermore, he indicated that any action on the part of the U.N. that related to military action would have to come back to the Congress of the United States for approval.

Now, we haven't been engaged in any U.N. military action except in Korea. The United States has only been engaged in that particular military action. And, may I say that the U.N. helped the United States; after all, the attack in Korea was an attack on American forces, it was an attack upon an American ally and upon a vital area in the world to American security. And the fact that the United Nations joined with us in the defense of South Korea was an advantage to the United States and I think also to the peace of the world.

Mr. Russell's proposal is not designed to strengthen the United Nations. It is designed to leave the United Nations financially prostrate because the United Nations needs capital now, it doesn't just need forgiveness of our share of the United Nations' indebtedness to us, it needs about $200 million worth of capital if it's going to continue its peacekeeping operations.

And what disturbs this Senator is that the United States of America has a great stake in the ability of the United Nations to enter into peacekeeping operations. We were the author of the peace resolution in the General Assembly in 1950, at the time of the attack in Korea. We bypassed the veto of the Security Council. We gave the General Assembly the authority to commit U.N. power and U.N. forces and U.N. nations to areas of defense and areas that needed police action.

This was our proposal and for years we thought this was one of the most astute and most far-reaching and far-seeing proposals in our diplomacy. Here is the United Nations now performing peacekeeping functions in the Middle East, and the Middle East is still a powder keg. The recent Syrian-Israeli clashes indicate this. Here is the United Nations attempting to keep the peace in Africa, and it's doing a fairly good job. If either one of these areas breaks out into open hostilities without the United Nations there to do police action, one or the other big powers will be there, either the Soviet Union or the United States; and if we meet the Soviet Union head on in the Middle East, it's World War III. If we meet the Soviet Union head on in Africa, it's World War III.

The fact that the United Nations is doing this job of keeping the peace is in the vital interest of the United States. It's not only in our interest in terms of saving the peace, of saving our country, but of saving our men and saving our dollars. I, for the life of me, can't understand why anybody would want to cripple the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations unless, unless you just sort of feel that this world isn't what it is. This is the world of the 20th century. This is not the world of Metternich, and this isn't the world of George Washington, and it isn't the world of the 19th century, it's the late 20th century with the world in revolution and violence and disorder, and the United Nations performs the vital function of the policeman in many areas.

Mrs. Dickerson. Senator, we have been talking about decisions being made. The Supreme Court recently has made a decision on the Tennessee case, the effect of which will be to give city voters a greater voice in State governments which have long been dominated by rural areas. Now the Democrats are traditionally much stronger in the cities. How will this recent Supreme Court decision affect the Democratic Party nationally?

Senator Humphrey. Well, Mrs. Dickerson, it seems to me that the first thing that this decision does, is to fulfill the purpose of our Constitution; namely, the establishment of truly representative government.

Now, there has been a hue and cry in this country for a good long time that power is gravitating to the National Government, that Washington, the Government in Washington, has been taking over the responsibilities that ought to be local, and that Government is getting too far away from the people; and that the National or the Federal Government is getting too big and that State governments are losing their effectiveness and their powers are being usurped by the Federal Government.

There is a degree of truth, of course, to all of these charges. But we might ask ourselves, why has this happened? And one of the reasons that it's happened, and not the only reason; but one of the reasons that the Federal Government grows bigger and stronger is because State governments have been unresponsive to local needs. And what the Supreme Court has said, it has served warning upon States, upon citizens in States, it has served warning upon the leaders, the political leaders in State governments to put their house in order, to give representative government a truly representative meaning; and not to have a representative government in the form of a legislature that no longer represents the population.

I happen to think that this decision, instead of developing, or instead of exaggerating the power or increasing the power of the Central Government in Washington, will do much to increase the power of State governments. Because the day that State legislatures are reapportioned, the day that legislatures really reflect the makeup of the population in a State will be the day that State governments will take on more responsibility in their own particular area. And when that happens, you will have a decentralization of power, and I think government will become more meaningful and more representative and more responsive to the needs of the citizenry.

So, this is a great decision in the long run. I think it will act, I think it will precipitate some very important action.

Now, as far as the political implications are concerned, well, out my way Democrats win in the country. We win in the cities, too, thank goodness, but our main problem has been in the smaller, what we call the smaller towns.

I don't think there is any guarantee that Democrats, or the Democratic Party, will be naturally victorious in the cities or industrial areas. We have lost industrial areas.

Robert Taft was quite a Republican leader around this part of the world. He was a great Senator and he was a great political leader. He carried industrial areas in Ohio that were highly unionized. I think what you really need to take into consideration about this decision is not what it does to the political parties as such, but what does it do for government, and this decision is a good government decision. It has done more to bolster representative government than any decision that I have read for a long time, or heard of. And I might add to those who feel that the Supreme Court is usurping some powers here, that the answer to that is, Put your own house in order.

Mr. Mudd. Senator, is the Democratic Party, and this administration, going to be able to go to the voters this fall with a good legislative record from this Congress?

Senator Humphrey. Yes. From the 87th Congress, yes, from both sessions. We had a very good record in the first session of the 87th Congress and I think we will have a good record in the second session. We are right now at that point in the proceedings of the Congress where legislation really starts to move.

Mr. Mudd. Are you gloomy about the prospects of any of the major proposals from the White House, take medicare or tax reform or the tariff program in particular?

Senator Humphrey. Well, you have selected three very important ones. I would say that the tax reform measure will most likely go through after quite a bit of anguish and gnashing of teeth and oratory, but I believe that the basic provisions of the President's proposal on tax reform will be adopted.

Mr. Mudd. It's being chopped up in the House, or an attempt is being made——

Senator Humphrey. Well, they have been chopping at it, they haven't chopped it up and it's the same old woodchoppers; you would have expected this; this is nothing, there is nothing sensational about this.

I am interested, however, in noting how the Republicans are attempting to chop out of the tax bill the investment credit feature which is really probusiness, which is designed to stimulate business, which is a great tax relief for American business. And yet the party of business, supposedly, the Republican Party that has hoodwinked many businessmen into believing that it was for them, now finds, these businessmen now find that the party is revealing its true colors, its just an "aginer," just plain against the administration's program.

Now, as far as the foreign trade bill is concerned, it will pass.

Mr. Mudd. Will you have a woodchopper's ball out on the floor of the Senate on that one?

Senator Humphrey. Yes. I expect that you can look forward to these normal developments of the political arena. But when we are all through, the mighty oak of the President's program of foreign trade will be there, with most of the limbs on it, may I add.

Mr. Mudd. This metaphor has gotten enormous. [Laughter.]

Senator Humphrey. Medicare, you mentioned——

Mr. Mudd. Yes.

Senator Humphrey. This will be the hottest political issue, I think, in Congress. It will be the most, the one that has the greatest amount of emotion and explosiveness attached to it. I'll just simply say this: I hope that we will pass medicare, that is, the program of hospital and nursing home care for people aged 65 and older under the terms of social security. We are going to have a vote on it. The American people want it. The young people want it. They want it for their—for their elders, they want it for this country, and if the Congress does not pass the hospital and nursing home care program, all I can say is every Congressman will have to face the political music when he goes home because, make no mistake about it, this is the most important and the most volatile, and I think the most sensitive political issue that has ever been before this Congress in this administration. And we are going to fight this one through. We want this program. If we don't get it this time, we'll make it a political issue in November and we will go to the people. We'll ask the people to repudiate those who voted against it and we will ask the people to support those who voted for it or who pledged their vote for it. I think there is no other way to face up to this.

Mr. von Fremd. Senator Humphrey, we only have about 45 seconds left. I would like to ask this one:

Some strange things are happening across the country, if we believe the pollsters. The Democratic Party is—is on the increase in popularity, it seems from border to border—this despite the fact that the incumbents lose on off years. What do you think this means?

Senator Humphrey. I think it means a great Democratic victory in November. President Kennedy is popular, his program is popular. The Democratic Party has proven itself to be a reasonable, responsible, progressive party. We have a program; we are taking that program to the people. The opposition, the Republican Party, is, as I said before, is chopping away, whacking away, it's against it. It has no program and very frankly can't make up its mind whether it has a leader, and without a leader and without a program I don't think you can expect to get much public support.

Mr. von Fremd. On that note we've run out of time.

Thank you very much, Senator Humphrey, for being with us once again on "Capital Cloakroom."

ALLOWANCE OF ADVERTISING COST AS A CHARGE AGAINST DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, last year I was pleased to provide some leadership on an amendment to limit the allowance of advertising cost in trade publications as a charge against defense contracts—Public Law 87-144. It is my understanding that a great needless expense to the American taxpayer has been eliminated as a result of the passage of this amendment.

Recently, I conferred with Lawrence E. Hartwig, Chairman of the Renegotiation Board of the United States, in regard to what their policy should be in the light of this recent legislation. I am happy to inform my fellow lawmakers and the interested Government agencies and private organizations engaged in defense work that the Renegotiation Board has change its own regulations to conform with this policy.

I ask unanimous consent that a certain subchapter of the Renegotiation Board regulations—part 1459—be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Part 1459—Costs Allocable to and Allowable Against Renegotiable Business

MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

1 Section 1495.7(b). "Advertising" is amended in the following respects:

(a) The heading of paragraph (b) is deleted and the following is inserted in lieu thereof: "Advertising in fiscal years ending on or before March 31, 1962."

(b) A new paragraph (c) is inserted to read as follows:

"(c) Advertising in fiscal years ending after March 31, 1962.—(1) Items of advertising expense incurred solely for (i) the recruitment by the contractor of personnel required for the performance by the contractor of obligations arising under a renegotiable contract or subcontract, (ii) the procurement of scarce items required by the contractor for the performance of a renegotiable contract or subcontract, or (iii) the disposal of scrap or surplus materials acquired by the contractor in the performance of a renegotiable contract or subcontract, are recognized as costs allocable to renegotiable business in accordance with the method of accounting found by the Board to be acceptable under section 1459.1(b). The costs of publishing catalogs, technical pamphlets, house organs and other similar publications are not, for the purposes of this paragraph, considered advertising expenses; for the treatment of such expenses, see section 1459.8(f)."

(2) Other advertising expense is allocable to renegotiable business as follows:

(i) In the case of renegotiable business performed under subcontracts, advertising expense will be allocated thereto provided that the products sold under such subcontracts are substantially the same as those sold in such subcontractor's normal commercial business. In the allocation of such advertising expense consideration will be given to (a) the volume of nonrenegotiable business in the year under review as contrasted with the subcontractor's normal volume of commercial business, and (b) the total amount of such advertising expense in the year under review as contrasted with the subcontractor's normal advertising expense.

(ii) In cases in which it can be demonstrated that a prime contractor or subcontractor engaged in renegotiable business to the detriment of its normal commercial business in the year under review, and thereby incurred the risk of loss of its competitive position in the industry concerned, the Board will allocate to renegotiable business that portion of the prime contractor's or subcontractor's normal advertising expense which the Board deems properly attributable to the effort by the prime contractor or subcontractor to forestall such loss of competitive position.

2. Section 1459.8. "Other costs, expenses, and reserves" is amended by adding a new paragraph (f) to read as follows:

"(f) Publications.—The costs of publishing catalogs and technical pamphlets designed to aid users of the contractor's products, and house organs and other publications directed to labor and personnel management and relations, are recognized as costs allocable to renegotiable business in accordance with the method of accounting found by the Board to be acceptable under section 1459.1 (b)."

(Sec. 109, 65 Stat. 22; 50 U.S.C. App. Sup. 1219.)

THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the pace of today's world is so fast that it is seldom possible for us to make an objective appraisal of the real position our country finds itself in during this period of history. It requires a masterful understanding of the past, and a vision of the really worthwhile goals of man, to be able to pinpoint our present position with cool detachment and chart a course into the future that will bring us to the destination we truly hope to reach.

Such a work appeared on the editorial page of last Sunday's Kansas City Star. Roy A. Roberts, author of this editorial, is a longtime newspaperman, whose vast experience over a great many years, and intimate acquaintanceship with many of the great political leaders of both parties, have given him the knowledge and understanding necessary to making such an appraisal. His extremely thoughtful article, entitled "Some Thoughts on the State of the Union," shows great perceptiveness.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the Record, so that my colleagues in both Houses of the Congress, and as many people as possible throughout the country, will have it available for reading, study, and reflection upon the challenges he has so clearly defined.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Some Thoughts on the State of the Union

(By Roy A. Roberts)

Just where does the United States stand in the world today?

It is a question which we should be asking ourselves over and over. After a recent and too-short trip to Washington, I am convinced more than ever that America needs to examine itself closely, to face up to the stark, naked facts of life, as unpalatable as the process may be.

Bluntly, you can put it this way:

The United States is still the most powerful single nation in the world.

But no longer does it stand alone in leadership, calling all the shots and making all the decisions. The plain truth is that decisions, today, must be made in the light of conditions which are wholly beyond our control. You can say, without exaggeration, that we are no longer the master of our own destiny.

To a degree, I think this fact accounts for some of the bewildered thinking in Washington and throughout the country. The truth of our times has by no means been accepted universally. We live in a new era, and that is an understatement. It is also an era which renders obsolete many preconceived concepts of government and politics.

Consider a few of the significant changes in our national position:

No longer does the United States possess a national economy in which the effects of our actions need be considered no farther than the water's edge. We have entered a global economy with its deep and far-reaching implications.

We still think of ourselves as the richest nation on earth. We are. But we are also a debtor nation, facing serious problems of international finance. You sense that this consideration is influencing Washington thinking more than any one factor. It is a restraining influence in all fiscal and budgetary matters.

If we are still the richest Nation, we also remain the most powerful. Yet the United States is being challenged as it has never been challenged before by world communism. The United Nations, once in Washington's pocket as an agency of foreign policy, has passed beyond our control. Even in the Atlantic alliance, we find ourselves frequently persuading, not just leading. We cannot act independently of our partners, or tell them what to do. Our allies do not always accept the U.S. position as meekly as they once did. It may jar us as a people, but more and more decisions must be tailored not just to the U.S. picture, but to the entire global situation. We may and do still lead; but there is a significant and historic difference.

Today, the United States has the greatest working labor force in history. Yet there is also a nagging hard core of unemployment. The rapid advance of automation is partly responsible for this. And while man has devised the machines that make automation possible, he has by no means solved the social and economic problems that are its byproduct.

If we are in the midst of industrial revolution, we are also witnessing a virtual technological explosion on the farm. We move at an accelerated pace into the era of farm modernization, with vast repercussions on the entire economy. At the same time the process of urbanization is accelerating.

Political power is moving from the rural areas to the cities. This is something that has been discussed for some time; but now, unmistakably, it is here.

We are also rushing pell-mell into the age of science and of space. It is exciting, exhilarating, but it is much more than a spectacle and we are much more than mere spectators. No man could predict the ultimate effects of the great force of science on civilization.

Such, in broad strokes, is the picture of our country today. For better or worse, that's it.

And because these changes have come so suddenly, almost within the last few minutes from the long viewpoint of history, we have not, as a people, begun to grasp their full significance.

Look back a mere 2 years, to the political conventions of both parties in 1960. There was a common theme: We are in the sixties now. A new era. A new frontier. New horisons. New challenges. Break with the past. Move into the rising sun.

Of course, most of this was window dressing, designed, at Los Angeles and at Chicago alike, to creat an image. For the obvious fact is that the platform of each party, before it was written, was hopelessly antiquated. Model T concepts for the space age.

In the 1960 campaign, the Democrats emerged victorious. Quite naturally, our attention should focus on that party and on the government it is providing for these changing times. And immediately we discover a paradox. In Washington, I sensed that the President's chief handicap today is this: For three decades his party has been thinking in terms of the New Deal and the Franklin D. Roosevelt era. But, in 1962, the philosophy of the New Deal is as obsolete as the Harding-Coolidge days that preceded it. It simply will not work any more.

The New Deal philosophy, to a large degree, was based on the principle of dividing up, through taxation, the good things of life. It also assumed that the panacea for any and all ills was the quick expansion of Government into every field.

I am not going to debate, in 1962, whether the philosophy worked in 1932. Suffice to say, it doesn't today. In the Roosevelt era we lived in a national economy which no longer exists. Then the implications of a sharp tax increase, of wage boosts in excess of productivity, of higher prices, of Government deficits—all stopped at the water's edge. We were selling largely to ourselves.

Today, the United States must look to world markets to find an outlet for its increased gross national product. And, as we look abroad, we discover a sharply competitive world. By now we should have learned the obvious truth: A nation can price itself out of the market. And we should know, too, the dangers of the profit squeeze which can apply the sudden brakes to a free-enterprise economy. It is elementary. Not enough investment capital is flowing back into the productive machinery. Expansion of the Nation's industrial plant has been slowed.

Look at the economy, today, on paper: It is sound, certainly; but soundness alone does not promise a major increase in the rate of growth. This picture in effect points to the failure of the New Deal economic theories.

At the end of World War II we had all the world markets. We had the gold.

In only a few years, we find ourselves fighting a tough battle for world markets—not to gain new ones, but to hold the old ones. We are constantly aware of the continuing threat to the gold supply.

Look abroad, for a contrast. You see the nations of the European Common Market, largely built up with U.S. aid after the war. Collectively, they have achieved a much faster rate of growth in productivity than has this country. And in some instances, European national treasuries have carried much heavier welfare programs than has the Treasury in Washington.

But here is a point which we miss sometimes. We think of ourselves as the leading nation of capitalism. We tend to speak of "socialist" Europe. But Europe's postwar recovery has been built, not on socialism, but on sound, incentive capitalism. The profit system has been properly honored as the sure device to feed a rapid flow of venture capital back into the industrial complex. By contrast, the United States has lived on in the New Deal heritage of tax-and-spend.

True, the Common Market nations with their low living standards and their heritage of wartime destruction, needed almost everything, as the United States did several decades ago. They, too, may feel this slowup of expansion in due time. Moreover, they have been sheltered by the United States which has assumed the chief burden of free world defense. This has permitted the European nations to operate with less of a tax load on business—certainly a much smaller load than anything we know in this country.

In a consideration of European growth, another factor must be remembered. Today, the market nations and their neighbors on the Continent, as well as Japan, are operating with virtually new industrial plants. The war wiped out the old factories. In the United States, we have our new plants with intricate, automated equipment. (And we have the headaches as well as the benefits of automation.) But a large part of our industrial equipment is obsolescent if not obsolete. Productivity suffers.

So you find a political paradox: A Democratic administration attempting to coax Congress into giving business a tax-credit incentive to accelerate plant replacement and modernization. But it has run into opposition both from Democrats steeped in new dealism, and from a substantial part of the business community.

Back to Europe for a moment and a footnote to the history of our times. The fact is, the Common Market bloc, not the United States, not Communist Russia for all its self-advertised expansion, provides the significant chapter of economic development in this postwar period.

Because this is so, the prosperous United States finds itself, today, knocking at Europe's door, seeking a basis for working more closely with the Common Market. We knock not because we are motivated to assist Western Europe, but to protect ourselves, and to act also as a spokesman for Japan and the South American nations which are so dependent upon us.

Stand clear of the European Common Market, and we will, eventually, be frozen out. At least, that is the way most people in Washington see it. And this fact illustrates most vividly, I think, the changing position of the United States in the world today.

I doubt, quite frankly, that Mr. Kennedy will obtain all of the new trade authority that he seeks. To the degree that this authority is lessened, the United States may be hampered as it attempts to deal with the Common Market. But you have to be realistic and recognize the deep emotional impact that trade legislation has always had in this country.

Generally, the business community is split down the line on the trade proposal, with probably most business people for it. Labor and farm groups are definitely in the camp of more liberal trade. They are recognizing the obvious: That while the new trade program may create some disadvantages and injure some localities, there is no alternative. It is essential to the Nation's future.

Again, let's look at the picture on paper—this time the fiscal picture of the Nation. It appears to be strong enough. Our investments abroad far outweigh European investments in this country. But there is a startling and little understood difference in the character of the two.

For the most part, U.S. credits and investments abroad are either frozen or in permanent productive plants. Actually, the U.S. encouraged this form of private investment to help Europe get back on its feet. Now, quite frankly, we wish we had some of the money and some of the plants back in this country.

On the other hand, much of the European capital in this country—and it runs into the billions—is in the short-term money market. It is fluid. It is also an important factor in our economic pattern. The American dollar, of course, is recognized as the free world's chief unit of exchange.

But it must be protected. If confidence in the dollar is lost, this fluid European capital could be withdrawn almost overnight. It could precipitate a dollar crisis and a crash that might make the 1929 debacle look like an exercise in full prosperity.

In the United States, do we fully accept the imperative of protecting the dollar? I am not sure that we do. Certainly the World Bank and other international monetary agencies have for some time looked askance at the symptom of extended deficit financing in this country. They keep a close watch on the possibility of more inflation. Those in charge of our monetary policy know this. The President knows this. But it is doubtful if Congress, the President's party, or even the country as a whole fully appreciates this hard fact of monetary life today.

Why, only a few years ago it seemed that the United States was going to be choked with its own gold supply. You heard jokes about the need for a dozen more Fort Knoxes to hold the surplus. It's different now, because of our enormous commitments abroad. We must protect the gold reserve against further drastic runs; but we must again be realists and recognize that under the relentless pressures of communism, we cannot pull back into an economic fortress America.

This problem of the dollar, of gold, of the balance-of-payments deficit—and really, it is only one problem with many facets—is always with us. And it unquestionably exerts great restraint on our monetary and fiscal policy.

Such pressures, in the New Deal era, would have created their false panacea: peg Government bonds and print more Federal Reserve notes against them, thereby diluting the currency. It was the path of inflation. But of all the routes that are being tried in Washington these days, I am certain that the administration will not follow this one. It has not been suggested. Perhaps with a strictly national economy, this printing press solution could be argued. But not today. We are again reminded that we live in a truly global economy.

Just where is the President in this picture? Where does he stand in this period of great change?

In the first place, I sensed, on my trip to Washington, that he definitely knows the score. He understands what these changes mean to America. And certainly I do not think that John F. Kennedy is reliving the New Deal days.

Yet the President is, in a very real sense, buffeted from two sides. On the one side, among his advisers, are the spenders, who believe that all things are attainable once the Treasury taps are opened wide. They believe in more and bigger governments. And they fight for their beliefs in administration powwows. On the other side are some hard-core, sound-money, very practical realists who know that we must constantly watch not only the domestic economy but the great, wide world. And they recognize that the national growth rate which we must have can be attained only by stimulating business and providing the incentive to investment. These realists do not, as do their opposites, regard profit as an evil word.

I got the impression in Washington that the President's sympathy is with the spenders, with the development of welfare programs. But his sympathy is tempered by an acceptance of reality. He knows that you simply cannot do, today, all the things that might seem desirable.

Above all—and I say this in no derogatory sense—the President is a politician, and a smart one. Of course government is a science of politics and compromise. Mr. Kennedy can project what he would like to do but he knows that if he goes too far in seeking his goals, he may lose his hold on party and country. A President who has lost command at home is powerless as a world leader. John Kennedy does not intend to lose his grip.

The recent steel settlement is probably a perfect example of the way he would chart the economy, if he could. The 25-hour week recently won by the New York electricians is a clear-cut example of what he does not want.

Yet of course the problem is not as simple as black and white. Decisions must be made in view of politics and of reality. I think, generally, that you can place the decisions to come in four general categories. On the President's mind constantly are:

Defense, which has an undisputed priority and over which, really, there is no argument.

Unemployment, over which there is great argument.

The need for greater national growth.

Budget balancing and the need for protecting the dollar.

Each consideration presents staggering problems. But for our purposes, we can disregard defense. As I said, there is little room for argument here. We must spend what we must spend. The other three items in this catalog of Presidential concern are, I think, closely interrelated. Personally, I do not think that you can establish a priority. For example, the surest route to full employment is to stimulate national growth. And we cannot have, in this global economy, a healthy rate of national growth if the dollar deteriorates further.

A President, however, must make decisions. And if Mr. Kennedy, for example, should turn to spending and welfare programs as a means to cure unemployment, he would be running the risk of more deficit spending. A President must also be politically sensitive. In the Kennedy camp are the labor leaders, and more and more they have been pressing for action on unemployment. They think of action in terms of additional public work programs, more spending, more government. There is increasing talk of the need for a shorter workweek.

Yet spending, shorter workweeks, and what have you would also be a drag on national growth, which is essential if we are to be able to finance successfully the programs that labor seeks. A vicious circle.

So you see the President resisting the drive for a shorter workweek, and attempting to satisfy the pressures of the spenders by providing modest public works programs in depressed areas. It is a path of compromise. I think you will see more and more of such compromise. The question is one of emphasis. Quite frankly, I do not think that the President can provide a program that will satisfy the many pressure groups without running a deficit next year. It may not be a disastrously large deficit and it may represent a limited victory for fiscal soundness. But I suspect that the deficit will come. It will be of some size.

For not the least of the President's problems, I suggest, are the throwbacks to the New Deal who still inhabit Washington and Capitol Hill. They are capable of exerting great pressure. And right now, at least, the congressional picture is more the product of pressure groups than of party labels. If you do consider party labels, you have to recognize that much of the Democratic thinking, in Congress, still reflects the Rooseveltian philosophy. And the Republican leadership, to a large degree, has tended to scatter its fire all over the place.

So you have the global picture as seen by a visitor to the Nation's Capital. The problems of this new era may seem staggering. Yet, they are staggering, I suggest, only to the degree that we fail to understand them. The world is, in a sense, remaking itself before our very eyes. We have the choice of accepting today or living in the past.

And I am confident that with due self-examination, with a recognition of our changing position in the stream of history, the United States will make the right decisions. At the moment, we do not grasp the full meaning of change, and this accounts, to a large degree, for our national frustration which, in turn, leads to the extremism of both left and right.

We need only understanding and perspective. For no one can convince me that the United States is a tired, wornout, aged nation. Indeed, it is by no means a fully developed country.

We may look at our history and see the proof of the American system and its startling success. Whatever its faults, our free enterprise democracy has produced plenty, even a surplus. By contrast, the totally planned system of the Soviet Union and Red China has produced scarcity. Too much is preferable to too little.

With full bounty, the American system has produced a most generous people, and a people with a genius in which we must have faith. Their destiny has not been fulfilled. I am confident that, with an understanding of this new world in which we live, we can move on to even greater heights.

ACADEMY AWARDS, 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am certain the majority of my colleagues joined with most of the Nation last evening to watch the telecast of the 34th annual awards of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. It is natural that I should take a measure of pride in this event, for the heart of the American motion picture industry is located in the State of California.

I am sure, too, that those of you who saw the Oscar Awards shared my pride when the top award went to a motion picture that was American in type, in character, and in spirit. The locale was America, the theme was America, the music was America, and the young people who gave it charm, style, and distinction were American.

If I emphasize this point it is only because I believe this film is an outstanding tribute to American motion picturemaking. In no way does it lessen our warm congratulations to those gifted artists and craftsmen from other lands who shared in last night's awards.

While some two dozen awards in various categories were made last evening honoring men and women from all over the world, I want to mention only the principal winners. These award winners are:

Best motion picture: "West Side Story," Mirisch Pictures, Inc., and B. & P. Enterprises, Inc., United Artists.

Best directing: Jerome Robbins and Robert Wise for "West Side Story."

Best motion picture actor: Maximilian Schell, in "Judgment at Nuremberg."

Best motion picture actress: Sophia Loren in "Two Women."

Best supporting roles: Rita Moreno and George Chakiris, both for their roles in "West Side Story."

Best screenplay: Abby Mann for "Judgment at Nuremberg."

Best original screenplay and story: William Inge for "Splendor in the Grass."

Best foreign language film: "Through a Glass Darkly," A. B. Svensk Filmindustri, Sweden.

FREE ENTERPRISE HORSESENSE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the role of a Senator who tries to write some good American free enterprise horsesense into administration legislation in this session of the Congress becomes more and more discouraging.

That is true with respect to nearly all administration proposals, but one of the most glaring examples, in my opinion, has to do with foreign aid, which is such a "sacred cow" it has become an untouchable, as far as the White House is concerned.

Despite the continuing opposition of some of us who long ago sensed growing public resentment toward year after year foreign spending, it has become apparent that this administration will put the pressure on again for approval of its foreign aid budget of nearly $5 billion.

So, I tried in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to inject into the bill some provisions which make sense.

First. Deny aid to any country expropriating American-owned property.

Second. Require that part of foreign aid money be spent in the United States.

Third. Require that foreign aid money be earmarked for private enterprise.

I will continue, Mr. President, to fight for these principles because they are strictly American free enterprise horsesense. But, it is already apparent that these are not the principles with which this administration agrees, because Secretary Rusk has opposed me at every turn. The story of how he has done so is related in an article entitled "Red China and Soviet Clashes Cited by Rusk" in the April 5, 1962, edition of the Washington Star. I ask that the article be included as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Red China and Soviet Clashes Cited by Rusk

Red China and the Soviet Union have become rivals in dispensing foreign aid, Secretary of State Rusk reported today.

The two big Communist powers also have clashed on trade policy and are competing for leadership of Communist parties outside the Soviet bloc as well as within, Mr. Rusk told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as it began hearings on President Kennedy's foreign aid bill.

Mr. Kennedy is asking a $4,878 million appropriation for foreign aid in the 1963 fiscal year and $2,125 million in new authorizations.

In the past 7 years the Sino-Soviet bloc, Mr. Rusk said, has committed only $4.4 billion in economic aid and $2 billion in military assistance. Only a fraction of these commitments have been filled, he reported.

OPPOSES CAPEHART IDEA

Mr. Rusk opposed a suggestion by Senator Capehart, Republican, of Indiana, that Congress write into the foreign aid bill a provision that any nation expropriating American property without full compensation would lose its economic and military aid from the United States.

The United States "can't quit and go home," Mr. Rusk said, because some nation expropriates holdings of private American investors. Other means are available to seek guarantees against expropriation without compensation, Mr. Rusk told Senator Capehart.

A Brazilian state recently took over an American-owned telephone company against the advice of Brazil's Central Government. Mr. Rusk reported he is encouraged that a settlement can be reached with the Brazilian Government.

Senator Capehart also suggested writing into the foreign aid bill a provision that countries receiving American aid for making purchases outside their own country should use their aid money to buy in the United States.

Mr. Rusk also resisted this proposal. Some purchases by aid recipients in third countries results not only in a higher yield per dollar but provide dollar exchange for the third countries to buy in the United States, he said.

JUDGMENT DEFERRED

Mr. Rusk deferred judgment on a third Capehart suggestion that the United States earmark a percentage of its grants and loans to underdeveloped countries for investment in private enterprises. The Secretary observed that a number of loans for rural and housing developments, however, have the effect of bolstering private enterprise.

Senator Capehart warned that the American people are concerned about U.S. expenditures of $89 billion on foreign aid since World War II while only $4 billion has been spent on flood control and $27 billion on highways in the United States.

The Federal debt is larger than all the other countries in the world combined, the Senator said.

Senator Symington, Democrat, of Missouri, questioned the huge aid program for India, which he said released Indian funds for building a gigantic military establishment.

Mr. Rusk replied that if the United States and other Western Powers did not provide India funds for its economic development, India would still use its meager resources for military requirements.

ELIMINATION OF NATIONAL ARMIES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as I promised last Thursday during debate on the U.N. bond measure, I am placing in the Record a second reply received from the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which seeks to explain a UPI story datelined Geneva, March 31, calling for elimination of national armies within 9 years. Mr. Foster says the newstory is wrong on two counts: first, it is oversimplified; and second, the time period in question is 3 years, not 9, and this refers only to the first stage of the disarmament program.

I should like to draw out several of the points made in this letter for your special consideration. Last Thursday the complete disarmament program was made a part of the Record and you may recall that the seven main titles of stage I are: To establish an international disarmament organization, to reduce armed forces and armaments, to contain and reduce the nuclear threat, to reduce strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles, to promote the peaceful use of outer space, to reduce the risks of war by accident, miscalculation and surprise attack, and to keep the peace.

This is surely a great deal to hope to accomplish in 3 years and to use Mr. Foster's words, a gross oversimplification, if taken literally. Suppose Russia were to give its faithful cooperation though I feel sure not one Member of this Chamber would accept this, what then of two foreign powers now laboring to give birth to their own nuclear capability, France and Red China, neither of whom were in attendance at the recent Geneva Conference. How is it possible to take a position on this stage I when two of the principals have refused to acknowledge its existence?

The final paragraph of this letter concludes by pointing out that the executive branch believes that the "revolutionary development of modern weapons within a world divided by serious ideological differences has produced a crisis in human history." The premise expressed is that weapons have caused the crisis. Experience and history tell us otherwise. They show us, in unmistakable truth, that men—not conditions or things—cause all human crises. While the outward conditions of life have changed radically, the basic problems of our times are no different than they were in Washington's or Lincoln's time. It is too easy to say that the development of modern weapons in a divided world has produced a crisis in human history and that, therefore, we must at all costs find means of reducing warmaking capabilities. The crisis is in human relationships and is not likely to lessen if we, as a nation, adopt the idea that our possession of modern weapons is the root cause of trouble throughout the world.

I now wonder just how far we have, unilaterally, already gone in carrying out the aims of stage I. Appendix I of the First Annual Report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency begins:

> Report of the Governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the 16th Session of the United Nations General Assembly on the Results of Their Exchange of Views on Questions Relating to Disarmament and to the Resumption of Negotiations in an Appropriate Body, Whose Composition Is To Be Agreed Upon.

Attached to this report is a joint statement—United States and the U.S.S.R.—of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations, dated September 20, 1961, which was placed before the U.N. at this time.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the joint statement from the appendix be inserted in the Record and call especial attention to item 8 of appendix I that—

> States participating in the negotiations should seek to achieve and implement the widest possible agreement at the earliest possible date.

Skipping down a few lines you will see the sentence:

> And efforts to insure early agreement on and implementation of measures of disarmament should be undertaken.

This ties in directly with that part of stage I, to reduce strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles, subtitle (b) of which says:

> Production of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be discontinued or limited.

Last Thursday in connection with this disarmament stage I, I remarked that I wondered if we cannot find some of the opposition to the B–70 and RS–70 in the above referred to discontinuation and limitation of nuclear weapons delivery systems. Mr. Foster's letter has done nothing to remove these doubts.

There being no objection, the letter and appendix were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Arms Control
and Disarmament Agency,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1962.

Hon. Barry Goldwater,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Goldwater: I regret that you feel that my reply to your inquiry of the morning of April 5, 1962, was not responsive.

The UPI story datelined Geneva from the March 31, 1962, Arizona Republic which was forwarded with your first letter states that "The United States will submit to the Geneva Disarmament Conference a plan calling for elimination of national armies within 9 years and their replacement by a United Nations force."

This statement is incorrect in two respects. First, it is an oversimplification to say that our plan calls for the elimination of national armies.

The U.S. position at Geneva is based upon the program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world which President Kennedy proposed on September 25, 1961, and which was enclosed in my earlier letter. This program calls for the reduction of armed force levels to 2.1 million by the United States and the U.S.S.R. in the first stage. It also calls for ultimate "disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their establishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations peace force." This disbanding would not take place, however, until the third and last stage of disarmament; not until we were assured that other countries had taken and were taking similar steps, not until other measures had been carried out by all countries to assure the security of all in a disarmed world. Moreover, it would not apply to those forces retained by nations "to preserve internal order."

Second, at the present time it is not contemplated that our proposal would specify a precise figure such as 9 years within which this disbanding would inevitably take place.

The September 25, 1961, program does not state the length of any of its three stages. On March 15, 1962, Secretary Rusk stated at the Geneva Conference that, given faithful cooperation, the first stage could be completed within 3 years. No position with respect to the other two stages has been stated.

The United States rejects the Soviet view that arbitrary time limits can be established in advance for a total program of disarmament. The period of time required is a function of the measures to be taken, their verification and the necessary transition from stage to stage. Whether countries determined to proceed from the first to the second, or the second to the third stage would depend on whether other countries were complying with their obligations, and whether effective international control had been established. Moreover, as my earlier letter stated, countries cannot be expected to disarm if the international political atmosphere does not warrant it. In this connection, the United States would wish to see whether further evolution had taken place toward a peaceful world in which international disputes were settled without resort to force or threats of force.

The executive branch is preparing a draft outline of provisions of a treaty to carry out the September 25, 1961, program. As I indicated in my earlier letter, we have already consulted with appropriate committees of the Congress, and further consultation is planned. You may be assured that this Agency intends to comply with section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, which provides:

"That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

Let me conclude by pointing out to you that we in the executive branch believe that the revolutionary development of modern weapons within a world divided by serious ideological differences has produced a crisis in human history. The September 25, 1961, program is intended to achieve greater security for the United States by providing for the progressive reduction of the warmaking capabilities of nations under effective international control, and simultaneous strengthening of international institutions to settle disputes and maintain the peace. The U.S. program does not call for unilateral disarmament; it specifically requires that arms and armed forces be reduced by both sides in a manner that will not affect adversely the security of any state.

Sincerely yours,

William C. Foster.

Appendix I

Report of the Governments of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the 16th Session of the United Nations General Assembly on the Results of Their Exchange of Views on Questions Relating to Disarmament and to the Resumption of Negotiations in an Appropriate Body, Whose Composition Is To Be Agreed Upon

In accordance with their statements of March 30, 1961, at the 15th session of the U.N. General Assembly, the Governments of the United States and the U.S.S.R. wish to inform the members of the General Assembly of their exchange of views on questions relating to disarmament and to the resumption of negotiations in an appropriate body, whose composition is to be agreed upon.

1. The exchange of views took place in Washington, D.C., from June 19 to June 30; in Moscow from July 17 to July 29; and in New York from September 6 to September 19, 1961.

2. As a result of the exchange of views, the two Governments submit a joint statement of agreed principles which they recommend as guidance for disarmament negotiations when such negotiations are resumed. The text of these agreed principles is attached hereto in the form of a joint statement of the two Governments.

3. The two Governments were not able to reach agreement on the composition of a negotiating body prior to the 16th General Assembly.

Attachment: Joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations.

September 20, 1961.

Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations

Having conducted an extensive exchange of views on disarmament pursuant to their agreement announced in the General Assembly on March 30, 1961,

Noting with concern that the continuing arms race is a heavy burden for humanity and is fraught with dangers for the cause of world peace,

Reaffirming their adherence to all the provisions of the General Assembly Resolution 1378 (XIV) of November 20, 1959,

Affirming that to facilitate the attainment of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world it is important that all states abide by existing international agreements, refrain from any actions which might aggravate international tensions, and that they seek settlement of all disputes by peaceful means,

The United States and the U.S.S.R. have agreed to recommend the following principles as the basis for future multilateral negotiations on disarmament and to call upon other states to cooperate in reaching early agreement on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world in accordance with these principles.

1. The goal of negotiations is to achieve agreement on a program which will insure that (a) disarmament is general and complete and war is no longer an instrument for settling international problems, and (b) such disarmament is accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

2. The program for general and complete disarmament shall insure that states will have at their disposal only those nonnuclear armaments, forces, facilities, and establishments as are agreed to be necessary to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens; and that states shall support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. peace force.

3. To this end, the program for general and complete disarmament shall contain the necessary provisions, with respect to the military establishment of every nation, for—

(a) Disbanding of armed forces, dismantling of military establishments, including bases, cessation of the production of armaments as well as their liquidation or conversion to peaceful uses;

(b) Elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological, and other weapons of mass destruction and cessation of the production of such weapons;

(c) Elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction;

(d) Abolishment of the organizations and institutions designed to organize the military effort of states, cessation of military training, and closing of all military training institutions;

(e) Discontinuance of military expenditures.

4. The disarmament program should be implemented in an agreed sequence, by stages until it is completed, with each measure and stage carried out within specified time limits. Transition to a subsequent stage in the process of disarmament should take place upon a review of the implementation of measures included in the preceding stage and upon a decision that all such measures have been implemented and verified and that any additional verification arrangements required for measures in the next stage are, when appropriate, ready to operate.

5. All measures of general and complete disarmament should be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any state or group of states gain military advantage and that security is insured equally for all.

6. All disarmament measures should be implemented from beginning to end under such strict and effective international control as would provide firm assurance that all parties are honoring their obligations. During and after the implementation of general and complete disarmament, the most thorough control should be exercised, the nature and extent of such control depending on the requirements for verification of the disarmament measures being carried out in each stage. To implement control over and inspection of disarmament, an International Disarmament Organization, including all parties to the agreement, should be created within the framework of the United Nations. This International Disarmament Organization and its inspectors should be assured unrestricted access without veto to all places as necessary for the purpose of effective verification.

7. Progress in disarmament should be accompanied by measures to strengthen institutions for maintaining peace and the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means. During and after the implementation of the program of general and complete disarmament, there should be taken, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, the necessary measures to maintain international peace and security, including the obligations of states to place at the disposal of the United Nations agreed manpower necessary for an international peace force to be equipped with agreed types of armaments. Arrangements for the use of this force should insure that the United Nations can effectively deter or suppress any threat or use of arms in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

8. States participating in the negotiations should seek to achieve and implement the widest possible agreement at the earliest possible date. Efforts should continue without interruption until agreement upon the total program has been achieved, and efforts to insure early agreement on and implementation of measures of disarmament should be undertaken without prejudicing progress on agreement on the total program and in such a way that these measures would facilitate and form part of that program.

September 20, 1961.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED SERVICES, 1963

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be read by its title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for armed services, and for other purposes.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1195, Senate bill 4.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 4) to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GORE obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me at this time, if it is understood that in doing so he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

THE SAN LUIS AGREEMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had planned to speak later this afternoon, and at some length, in opposition to the Department of the Interior contract on the San Luis project. I shall make that speech tomorrow or at the next meeting of the Senate. But this afternoon I wish to have certain basic material printed in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of my resolution of April 2.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 322) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES. 322

Whereas the Senate on May 12, 1959, during consideration of S. 44, a bill relating to the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, struck from such bill section 6(a) which provided as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) The provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to water deliveries or to the use of drainage facilities serving lands under contract with the State to receive a water supply, outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled 'San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project', dated December 17, 1956."; and

Whereas by such action the Senate clearly expressed its will and intent to the effect that it was unwilling to exempt any part of the San Luis project or any waters flowing into and out of the San Luis Reservoir from applicable provisions of Federal law; and

Whereas the House of Representatives concurred in the action of the Senate by passage of S. 44 without incorporating in such bill any provision comparable to section 6(a); and

Whereas a proposed agreement between the Department of the Interior and the State of California has been submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate pursuant to Public Law 86–488 and is now before that committee for its consideration; and

Whereas that agreement, if approved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, would result in effectuating the policy contained in section 6(a) set out above and would counteract the expressed policy and intent of the Congress; and

Whereas in view of the determination by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that hearings on the proposed agreement will not be conducted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate is hereby requested (1) to adopt a committee resolution expressing its disapproval of the proposed agreement between the Department of the Interior and the State of California heretofore submitted to the committee pursuant to Public Law 86–488, and (2) to notify the Department of the Interior that any such agreement hereafter submitted to the committee should conform to the policy and intent expressed by the Congress in enacting Public Law 86–488.

Mr. MORSE. This morning I appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and made a statement in opposition to the San Luis contract, and I urged the committee to reject the contract for the time being, until a thorough legal analysis of the contract can be made.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement of this morning be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS ON SAN LUIS AGREEMENT APRIL 10, 1962

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish first to express my appreciation to the chairman of this committee for affording me the opportunity to appear here this morning and express my views on Senate Resolution 322, relating to the San Luis contract, which I introduced with the cosponsorship of Senators DOUGLAS and PROXMIRE. I am aware of the fact that the committee had previously decided not to hold hearings on the San Luis contract and I am therefore grateful to the chairman and to the committee for reconsidering the matter.

It will be recalled by some members of the committee that in 1959 this committee unanimously reported a bill, S. 44, which authorized construction of the San Luis project which is adjacent to, and a unit of, the Central Valley project in California. It will also be recalled that the Senate after 4 days of debate decided to delete from the bill a provision (section 6(a)) which exempted the so-called State service area from the 160-acre limitation. This limitation, which has been in the Reclamation Act of 1902, limits the amount of water purchased by one person to that amount sufficient to irrigate 160 acres, or 320 acres in the case of husband and wife. The purpose of this law is to distribute benefits from Federal subsidies as widely as economically practicable, with special reference to the family farm.

My resolution is consistent with the intent of the Senate in 1959 when it refused to exempt the State service area. The Secretary of the Interior has, in effect, by signing the San Luis contract which exempts the State service area altered the policy of the Congress by doing what both the House and the Senate refused to do.

It may well be that a majority of this committee may agree with the decision of the Secretary of the Interior, but I am sure that if the committee's review of this important problem indicates that the contract under consideration violates the intent of the Congress, it will not hesitate to return the contract to the Department with its stamp of disapproval.

Today we are in somewhat the same position we were in on May 5, 1959. Then we had before us a bill; now we have before us a contract, an instrument which will carry out the purposes of the bill. The bill and the contract are part and parcel of the same problem. The contract merely seeks to effectuate the purposes of the legislation. But an extraneous matter has intruded itself into the contract. I refer to that part of the bill which was deliberately and after lengthy debate excised from the legislation.

Since discussing this subject on the Senate floor on April 2, I have had reviewed again the contract between the State of California and the Secretary of the Interior. It was published in the RECORD on the same day that the debate took place, and appears at pages 5717 to 5721 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. By this time I hope that every Senator has had an opportunity to examine the document.

The San Luis contract reinforces the arguments which the Senator from Illinois and I made against the original bill before section 6(a) of S. 44 was deleted. Consequently, I hope action is taken to hold up automatic approval of the contract until every Member of the Senate has had an opportunity to read and study this contract. I call the committee's attention to the component parts of the joint service facility as set forth in the contract. These consist of the:

1. San Luis Dam and Reservoir.
2. San Luis forebay, related dam, and related wasteway.
3. San Luis pumping-generating plant.
4. San Luis Canal, but not including water service turnouts and check structures and other appurtenances specifically associated with such turnouts.
5. Flood retention basins, floodways, outlet channels, wasteways, equalizing reservoirs check structures, and other structures as necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of the San Luis Canal.
6. Mile 18 pumping plant.
7. Switchyard and related electrical facilities at San Luis pumping-generating plant and at mile 18 pumping plant, including any necessary transmission facilities between such plants. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 2, pp. 5717–5718.)

Is it not significant that the U.S. Government is going to construct all these facilities? Engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation will design and build the San Luis Reservoir, the canals and other facilities. There is nothing in the contract on this point to indicate that it's a State project. No, it is obviously a Federal project.

I am aware, of course, that the contract provides that the State of California will be called on to contribute an "equitable" portion of the cost. What is this equitable share? According to section 16 of the contract, "The State shall pay 55 percent and the United States shall pay 45 percent of the actual cost of construction." Obviously, the Federal share of the cost of joint-use facilities is very substantial.

How are the benefits divided? I call the committee's attention to section 19(a) which indicates that at the reservoir, the State's part of the project, will receive 52.38 percent of the water and at the most distant reaches of the project, the State will receive up to 84.43 percent of the water. Here are the percentages listed in the contract, appearing at page 5719 of the April 2 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"OPERATION AND USE OF JOINT-USE FACILITIES

"19. (a) The rights to use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities ar allocated as follows:

	"State share (percent)	Federal share (percent)
Feature:		
San Luis Reservoir	52.38	47.62
San Luis forebay	52.38	47.62
San Luis pumping-generating plant	52.38	47.62
San Luis Canal, reach 1	52.38	47.62
Mile 18 pumping plant	54.20	45.80
San Luis Canal:		
Reach 2	54.20	45.80
Reach 3	60.17	39.83
Reach 4	75.41	25.49
Reach 5	84.43	15.57"

Upon the basis of these figures it is clear that the rights of California are carefully protected to the hundredth of a percentage point.

In reading the record of the hearings on the San Louis project in 1959, I recall a somewhat prophetic comment by my colleague, Mr. ULLMAN, from my own State.

Congressman Ullman remarked that California people were very tough bargainers. I am wondering who wrote this contract. Did the representatives of the economic interests in California write it? This contract protects with great exactness, as I have indicated, the interest of those who will benefit. The question which the members of this committee should consider is: Does it adequately protect the interest of the United States?

I call the committee's attention to another provision of the contract which relates to the definition of the State service area. The State service area is defined as an area outside the Federal San Luis area. I know of no one who, up to this hour, has precisely defined the boundaries of the State service area. I presume it can be any area which can be connected by a canal to the San Luis Reservoir or the San Luis Canal. Is it possible that the proponents of the legislation and authors of the contract refrained from defining the State service area so that the big landowners under what might be called "water gerrymandering" would get all or nearly all of the water?

It is well known that because of the free interest provision of the reclamation law, the power subsidies and nonreimbursable features such as flood control, that water from Federal projects is much cheaper than irrigation water purchased from State or private projects. I am wondering if the interest of the people of California is protected adequately by this contract. The general taxpayers of the United States are to be saddled with the costs of the noninterest provision in regard to the Federal San Luis area. Are the taxpayers of the State of California going to have to bear additional burdens mainly for the benefit of the big landowners? This is also a question the committee should also consider, because after all, the taxpayers of California are citizens and taxpayers of the United States.

I call the attention of the members of the committee to the portion of the contract which states that the joint-use facilities shall be designed and constructed by the United States in such a manner as to permit the integration and continued operation with other units of the Federal Central Valley project. I further call the attention of the committee to that part of the contract (section 20) which provides that all of the joint-use facilities may be transferred, for operation and maintenance purposes, to the State of California. This transfer is contingent only on the agreement of the State authorities and the United States.

I ask this question: Are those who actually wrote this provision into the contract planning to eventually take over operation and maintenance of the San Luis Federal unit?

I call the committee's attention to the provision (18a) in the contract which says that if Congress fails to appropriate money the "State may elect to assume control of the joint-use facilities and complete construction of such facilities for its own use."

Last week on the Senate floor I developed this point regarding application of the limitation to water in Federal canals and ditches which was set forth in the Warren Act as follows: "*Provided*, That water shall not be furnished from any such reservoir or delivered through any such canal or ditch to any one landowner in excess of an amount sufficient to irrigate 160 acres."

I also arrived at the conclusion that under existing law the 160-acre limitation must be applied if Federal benefits are received. I do not believe anyone who carefully reads this contract can logically conclude that there will be no Federal benefits accruing to water users outside the Federal San Luis unit. This point seems crystal clear. The existence of the San Luis Reservoir and its appurtenances, at the cost of a substantial amount of the Federal taxpayers' money, would benefit California; otherwise the State would build the project entirely at its own cost.

Finally, I will briefly emphasize two major points.

In the Ivanhoe decision the U.S. Supreme Court said the purpose of reclamation is to "benefit people, not land" and to distribute these benefits "in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals."

This is indeed the worst time in history from the viewpoint of those who may benefit from our reclamation program to breach the family farm provision of our reclamation law. Taxpayers in the humid East and in the Midwest will be prejudiced against worthy reclamation projects if this contract is approved.

The cause of reclamation will be associated with great subsidies to factories in the field, to great landowners such as the Kern County Land Co. and others who fatten on the misery and exploitation of migrant labor. There is a great moral issue here as well as an economic one. I quote from a recent communication of Father Vizzard of the Catholic Rural Life Conference:

"It would be tragic if by action of this administration conditions should develop in this country which would call forth the rejoinder, 'physician, heal thyself'; for if the Solicitor's opinion is allowed to stand it will open the door wide to increased and more tenacious land monopoly in California.

"Acceptance of the Solicitor's opinion would be gravely disappointing and impossible to explain to those who are convinced that the family farm and not land monopoly deserves support of public policy."

Mr. Chairman, I have also prepared a detailed legal analysis of the Solicitor's opinion of December 26, 1961, on the San Luis agreement. Time will not permit me to read this opinion to the committee, but I ask that it be included in the hearing record at this point in my remarks. I urge that it be studied seriously by every member of the committee, before final action is taken on this contract.

Because of the importance of this hearing, and the widespread interest it has prompted, I ask that the hearing of today be printed and that copies be made available to those who are interested.

I am indeed grateful to the chairman and the members of the committee for the time you have allotted for my testimony.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have made a legal analysis of the contract, and I offer it now. It is under the headline "Illegality of the Agreement Dated December 30, 1961, Between the United States of America and California, Respecting the San Luis Project." I ask unanimous consent that this legal memorandum be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hart in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Illegality of the Agreement Dated December 30, 1961, Between the United States of America and California, Respecting the San Luis Project

Bases of the improvident and illegal contract dated December 30, 1961, entered into between the United States of America and California "For the Construction and Operation of the Joint-use Facilities of the San Luis Unit" are misconceptions of the law. Those erroneous concepts are reflected in the opinion dated December 26, 1961, of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior declaring inapplicable the so-called 160-acre limitation of reclamation law. Reference in that connection is made to the fact that Secretary Udall has done that which the Congress unequivocally and intentionally refused to do. At a time when the Nation is moving steadily toward land and water monopolies, Secretary Udall accelerated the process by unprecedented and unwarranted action.

An analysis of the Solicitor's opinion as it relates to the contract for the San Luis project dispels any doubt that the principles enunciated in Senate Resolution 322 should be adopted.

Initial error contained in the Solicitor's opinion stems from his conclusion as to the import of the legislative history of the San Luis Act. On the subject the opinion declares:

"In my opinion the legislative history clearly indicates that Congress did not intend to require application of Federal acreage limitations by striking sections 6(a) and 7."[1]

Not only is that quoted declaration contrary to fact but the opinion subsequently rejects the thought there expressed. There is only one conclusion clearly expressed in the legislative history. It is this:

Congress expressly rejected all efforts to exempt the San Luis project from the excess land provisions of the reclamation law. Congress accomplished that express rejection of the efforts to exempt the San Luis project from the acreage limitation when both the Senate and the House struck this provision from the bills before them:

"The provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to water deliveries or to the use of drainage facilities serving lands under contract with the State to receive a water supply, outside of the Federal San Luis unit service area described in the report of the Department of the Interior, entitled 'San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project,' dated December 17, 1956."

Any effort to read into the legislative history any other interpretation than that just expressed is doomed to failure. Yet the opinion is based upon the concept that "Congress * * * (clearly) did not intend to require application of Federal acreage limitations by striking sections 6(a) and 7." Remove that fallacious keystone from the opinion and it collapses, taking with it the agreement between the United States of America and California.

Keeping in the forefront the last quotation from the opinion reference is next made to this statement from it:

"In the debates on the San Luis Act the principal issue was the elimination of provisions expressly exempting the State service area."[2]

That quoted excerpt is the proper analysis of the legislative history, pointing up the error earlier expressed in the opinion on page 1, that Congress "clearly" did not intend to make applicable the excess land provisions when it rejected the attempts at express exemption. Logical sequitur of the last quoted succinct statement would be the application of the following principle of statutory construction, earlier alluded to by the Solicitor:

"Normally, when an exemption is removed from a bill before enactment, the presumption is that the legislative body intended the law to apply in the situation described in the exemption."[3]

Thus the opinion at page 24 places the correct analysis upon the legislative history; cites the appropriate principles of construction on page 7, which seemingly should be controlling—and then reaches an opposite conclusion. In fine, that approach is the hallmark of the opinion.

---

[1] Solicitor's Opinion, Dec. 26, 1961, p. 24.

[2] Solicitor's Opinion, p. 24.

[3] Solicitor's Opinion, p. 7.

Next the opinion states: "There was no clearly expressed consensus as to what reclamation law would mean with the exemption eliminated."[4]

Import of that sentence is not entirely clear. It does, however, reflect a circumstance in which the Solicitor recognizes he would have been legally sound in declaring applicable to the San Luis project the long-established precepts of the land policies of the National Government, which are geared to preserving the family-size farm. Rather than pursuing that course he rejected the policy and struck a blow for land and water monopolies.

There then follows this pertinent statement: "* * * a common denominator of legislative intent can be derived from the debates. 'First, Congress intended that no benefits were to be conferred on the State service area by Federal investments without carrying the burdens of Federal law.' "[5]

Here again, the opinion's hallmark: Correct analysis of the legislative history, correct interpretation of the law—wrong conclusion.

The quotation from the opinion invites reference to (a) the San Luis Act; (b) the contract entered into between the United States of America and California pursuant to that act; calls for this inquiry: Can it be logically asserted that Federal investment confers "no benefits on the State service area"?

Negative response is demanded to that question. From the language of the act it is abundantly manifest that the Federal investment actually makes possible the facilities which are used to deliver water to the ephemeral State service area, wherever that area may be located. When Congress is requested to expend huge sums of Federal funds to build a project—albeit in cooperation with the State—it is absurd to rule, as does the opinion, that Federal investment does not confer "benefits upon the State service area."

Pertinent in that connection is this recitation from the agreement between the United States of America and California:

"4. Whereas the State and Federal acts previously referred to authorized the (a) coordinated operation of certain San Luis unit facilities, known as joint-use facilities, and (b) an equitable sharing of the costs of these facilities by the State and the United States;".

What is meant by the "equitable sharing of the costs"? There is a single answer to that query: Federal investments conferring benefits upon the lands to be served by the facilities to be constructed. What are those facilities? A large and costly dam to be built using Federal investments. A canal 107 miles long using Federal investments. Numerous appurtenant facilities and structures to be built using Federal investments—Federal investments in materials; Federal expenditures in paying employees to design and build the main and appurtenant works.

Federal investments—whether in whole or in part—confer benefits upon the service area of the State. Test of the correctness of that conclusion: Withdraw the Federal investments and there would be no facilities to bring water to the State service area, wherever it may be.

Again from the agreement, this proviso:

"Sharing of costs of construction—

"16. The State shall pay 55 percent and the United States shall pay 45 percent of the actual cost of construction * * * of the San Luis project."

When the United States of America pays 45 percent of the costs of construction of a project, it makes a Federal investment; a Federal investment from which enures huge benefits to the State service area. Any doubt on the proposition is removed by concise recitations from the agreement:

"17. * * * (d) Upon completion of construction and transfer of the joint-use facilities * * * the United States shall submit to the State a final accounting of all costs and expenses incurred in connection with such construction, the amount of the total costs to be borne by each party and the total contribution made by each party."

As a consequence the contract requires that a balance be struck as to the extent of the Federal investments which benefit the State service area.

Not only does the agreement of December 30, 1961, provide for Federal investments to benefit the State service area, it—and somewhat incredibly in view of the Solicitor's opinion—spells out with specificity the measure of the benefits on a percentage basis which the State service area will receive. In that connection this clause is most enlightening:

"OPERATION AND USE OF JOINT-USE FACILITIES

"19. (a) The rights to use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities are allocated as follows:

	"(55 percent State investment) State share (percent)	(45 percent Federal investment) Federal share (percent)
Feature:		
San Luis Reservoir	52.38	47.62
San Luis forebay	52.38	47.62
San Luis pumping-generating plant	52.38	47.62
San Luis Canal, reach 1	52.38	47.62
Mile 18 pumping plant	54.20	45.80
San Luis Canal:		
Reach 2	54.20	45.80
Reach 3	60.17	39.83
Reach 4	75.41	24.59
Reach 5	84.43	15.57"

The Federal investments; the allocations of benefits derived from the San Luis project, all as set forth above, must be read on the background of this statement from the opinion:

"Section 2 of the Warren Act standing alone requires the application of acreage limitations where the United States cooperates with an entity (here the State) in the construction of irrigation facilities even where no Federal subsidy is extended to the lands served by the entity."[6]

Once again the opinion correctly states the law. However, having attained the high plateau of sound reason from which there could emanate but a single conclusion—the applicability of the 160-acre limitation to the State service area, it topples into its most grievous error. For, declares the opinion:

"We should not precipitate a conflict with a State which Congress was careful to avoid, unless such conflict is necessary to carry out national policy."[7]

It is impossible to perceive any basis for the statement just quoted. Does it necessarily follow that there is a Federal-State conflict by reason of a historical policy stemming from the Homestead Act? That inquiry is especially pertinent in view of the fact that much of California was settled by reason of effectuation of the policy of maintaining family-size farms. Dissipating the Solicitor's fallacious reasoning as to Federal-State conflict; indeed, the rationale of his entire opinion is this statement by the Highest Court:

"From the beginning of the Federal reclamation program in 1902, the policy as declared by the Congress has been one requiring that the benefits therefrom be made available to the largest number of people, consistent, of course, with the public good. This policy has been accomplished by limiting the quantity of land in a single ownership to which project water might be supplied. It has been applied to public land opened up for entry under the reclamation law as well as privately owned lands, which might receive project water. (See Taylor, "The Excess Land Law: Execution of a Public Policy," 64 Yale L.J. 477.)

"Significantly, where a particular project has been exempted because of its peculiar circumstances, the Congress has always made such exemption by express enactment."[8]

Failure of the Solicitor to cite the above-quoted and emphasized statement from a case squarely in point, tends further to cast doubt upon the correctness of his opinion.

Final reference is made to the agreement which was executed by the United States of America and California by reason of the opinion reviewed above. It is impossible to contemplate an arrangement which is more prejudicial to the United States of America; beneficial to California. There passes to California control of a vast Federal investment paid for by all the people. Undoubtedly that the contract is the opening wedge for the seizure of the entire Central Valley reclamation project. Nowhere in the document is there a means of determining the actual extent of Federal responsibility in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. It is impossible, moreover, to ascertain with any degree of certainty the full obligation which the National Government incurs by this wholly one-sided arrangement.

It follows necessarily that the Secretary of the Interior could not abandon the fundamental precepts of the reclamation law in regard to the acreage limitation and to contract with California that:

"19. (b) The State shall not be restricted in the exercise of its allocated right to the use of the capacities of the joint-use facilities for water service outside the Federal San Luis unit."

As a consequence Congress should refuse to approve the contract in question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in essence, I have analyzed this contract both from the standpoint of the reclamation law of 1902 and from the standpoint of the Warren Act of 1911. In my opinion the contract between the Department of the Interior and California is not a sound one. I consider it to be an illegal contract, in violation of both of these basic laws of the United States, particularly as regards protection of the 160-acre limitation.

Mr. President, all I am seeking is a postponement of final consideration of this contract until the Senate, through its Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, can conduct its own legal analysis of the contract. I think the Senate owes this to the people of the United States and that it would lead to renewed negotiations between California and the Federal Government. The result could be a different contract.

At this time I wish to point out—as I did this morning, when I appeared before the Interior Committee—that no one can tell us where the California State service area will be, under this contract. The first thing we should insist on is, of course, that we have a blueprint of exactly what the contract will cover.

---

[4] Solicitor's Opinion, p. 24.

[5] Solicitor's Opinion, p. 24.

[6] Solicitor's Opinion, p. 28.

[7] Solicitor's Opinion, p. 28.

[8] *Ivanoe Irrig. Dist.* v. *McCracken,* 357 U.S. 275, 292 (1957).

Second, California has some great responsibilities in connection with this matter, if it is to get the important benefits which will flow to it under the San Luis contract. I am satisfied that the contract, if put into effect, will constitute a windfall to the great land corporations of California, many of which own millions of acres of land. I put all that data in the RECORD on April 2; and I believe the matter must be studied from the standpoint of the unjustified and undeserved windfalls of which these great land corporations will be the beneficiaries.

Next, Mr. President, I warn the Senate to look out for this contract, because in my judgment it will turn out to be pretty much of a source of municipal water supply for town after town in California. These towns might very well turn out to be the beneficiaries of substantial Federal subsidies, because of the fact that over $200 million of Federal funds have gone into the San Luis project in the first instance.

I think all these legal aspects of the matter need to be explored fully. That is why I urge postponement of the contract.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee very much for his courtesy in yielding to me.

I close by saying to the Senate now—as I said this morning to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—that we had better give heed to the telegram which was sent to this body by Governor Brown, of California, on May 7, 1959—a communication which in my judgment had a good influence on the Senate at that time. The Governor of California sent it to the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], to be delivered to the Senate. The telegram reads as follows:

> SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *May 7, 1959*.
>
> Senator CLAIR ENGLE,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Having seen many statements in the press regarding the application of the Federal reclamation laws to the San Luis project, I wish to reiterate what I have said in the past regarding this matter. Upon the basis of my own legal analysis and that of all my legal advisors I am convinced that the Federal reclamation laws do and will apply to all Federal facilities and service areas of the San Luis project. In addition, with or without the language contained in section 6(a) under S. 44, the Federal reclamation laws do not and, in my view, should not apply to the State facilities and State service areas of the project. I am, and I believe that the California Legislature also is, opposed to any unjust enrichment or monopolization of benefits by owners of large landholdings as a result of either Federal or State operation.
>
> However, I feel that the handling of this matter, insofar as State activities are concerned in relation to this project or other State construction, should come as a result of State legislation. I intend, at an appropriate time and before contracts are executed, to take this matter up with the California Legislature in order to preclude the undesirable results which I have described, but I firmly believe that this matter should not delay either Federal or State authorization or construction.
>
> EDMUND G. BROWN,
> *Governor.*

The California people got the authorization, but now they want the contract. I say most respectfully that good faith requires California's making clear to us the limits of its State service area, and justifies our insisting also that these monopolies, these large land corporations, do not get the windfalls to which I have referred. The only way in which that can be done is for the California Legislature to give that guarantee to the people of the United States. But the California Legislature has not done so. At the hearing this morning a witness on behalf of the State of California said that in 1961, some bills to this effect were introduced, but were not passed. Mr. President, why should they have been passed? If they think they can get the contract without passing such legislation, of course, they are going to try to get the contract, and not pass the bills.

Mr. President, the Senate should hold the Governor of California to his telegram of May 7, 1959, and the Senate should make clear that no contract will be issued until California lives up to what I consider to be a reasonable contract to expect of California, and proceeds to give us the assurance to which we are entitled, as regards what is covered by the so-called State service area. California should also guarantee that these large land corporations and monopolies are not going to be the beneficiaries of the Federal subsidy to the tune of about $200 million of the funds of all the taxpayers of the Nation, which they have poured into the San Luis project. Whenever California is willing to do that, I will then say, let us go on with the contract.

I close by saying that I do not intend to stop fighting in this controversy; and, for whatever they may be worth, I shall make my services available to those who will join in the fight against this determined attempt to do damage to the 160-acre limitation. I intend to fight for as many years as may be required until finally we get this issue before the Supreme Court of the United States. I am satisfied that once we get it before the Supreme Court, both the reclamation law of 1902 and the Warren Act of 1911 are bound to be so applied by the Supreme Court as to reverse the Department of the Interior and its Solicitor, insofar as this contract is concerned.

THE PORTLAND, OREG., UNION-INDUSTRIES SHOW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Portland, Oreg., from May 25 through the 30th, will be the site of the now-famous Union-Industries Show. It is produced by the AFL–CIO Union Label and Service Trades Department. Joseph Lewis is the show's director, and also is secretary-treasurer of this important department of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

This unique exhibition is an excellent example of labor-management cooperation. Joseph Lewis is one of the leading exponents of teamwork between union workers and managers of industries, and this event is a graphic demonstration of union-made goods and union services. It shows how employees and employers can work together for the benefit of all Americans. It proves that union labels, shop cards, and service buttons are the symbols of good will among unions, industry, and the consuming public.

This will be the 1962 AFL–CIO Union-Industries Show, open to the general public, admission free, with its more than $22 million worth of action-packed all-union displays showing virtually all the crafts and skills and services of union workers and the products and services of fair management.

The Union-Industries Show will occupy all usable exhibit space in the splendid exhibition facility of the Portland Memorial Coliseum, with its total floor space of over 100,000 square feet. Capital prizes and souvenirs to be awarded the thousands who will attend organized labor's colorful extravaganza will be worth more than $80,000.

Staged each year in a different major American city, the Union-Industries Show is sponsored and produced by the AFL–CIO's national union label and service trades department, and is known worldwide as "the show with a purpose."

Why do labor unions, their fair employers, and so many agencies of the Federal Government put so many thousands of dollars and so many man-hours of toil into producing this the world's largest labor-management exhibition and then throw the doors open to everyone—with free admission and nothing to be sold or offered for sale?

Of course, it is a tremendous effort to build better business for the union employer; but, most of all, it is to let the world know of the harmonious relations existing between labor, management, and Government in our free society under this system of free enterprise.

So, Mr. President, Portland is the place to be, from May 25 through May 30 of this year. And the AFL–CIO Union-Industries Show is the thing to see. Against the spectacular background of Mount Hood's towering 11,245 feet—only 89 minutes from the magnificent Pacific Ocean—and surrounded by reminders of the history of our Nation's farthest frontier, you will enjoy viewing organized labor's greatest effort for the year. Visit the City of Roses and come to the 1962 Union-Industries Show.

CHEMICAL PROGRESS WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this week, April 9 to April 13, is being observed nationally as Chemical Progress Week. This week has been set aside to spotlight the many fine advancements made by the chemical industry and its thousands of workers to contribute to healthier, more comfortable, safer lives for every American. The chemical industry has made a vital contribution to our race for outer space, as well as in the development of synthetic fibers and miracle drugs.

This important industry provides us with many of the goods essential to our health, food, clothing, shelter, transportation, communication, defense, and other needs. The chemical industry converts raw materials into more than 10,000 chemical products in more than 12,500 plants operated by thousands of chemical manufacturers. In New York State, we have 1,500 chemical industry establishments, employing 64,000 people.

For every 10,000 persons employed in production facilities in the chemical industry, there are 623 working in research—one of the highest proportions of any U.S. manufacturing industry. The chemical industry has always depended very greatly upon basic research and development.

I am happy today to give recognition to the progress made through the efforts of the chemical industry. Through their purposeful research, Americans have been able to enjoy a better life; and through their research for the future, Americans live in a better world.

TRIUMPH OF THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on the broad international scene there are substantial indications that the tide of world events, unfavorable for us in a succession of discouraging events, may have turned and that the cause of freedom is now on the ascendancy. As the cold war continues on through its second decade, a sense of confidence seems to be returning to the West. Spirits are recovering and faith in our capacity to influence the course of events has been bolstered. This has not been brought about by dramatic victories. Instead, the West is coming to grips with the realities of the cold war struggle.

The change cannot be measured in terms so dramatic as a rollback in the Iron Curtain or the collapse of an entrenched Communist regime. Nor is there any discernible softening in Communist attitudes or objectives. It is, rather, that the free world, and particularly the United States is now moving more determinedly and with a greater sense of confidence.

Before undertaking to analyze what I consider to be an improvement in our overall position, let us examine briefly the background and the general course of world events which has led us to our present situation. After the defeat of the Axis Powers in 1945, the world again seemed safe—just as it had seemed after the First World War. The United States then enjoyed a position of political, economic, and military strength unequaled in modern history or any other time of history. Both our major allies and our enemies in that conflict lay devastated by the war. No nation, indeed, no combination of nations, was in a position to challenge the United States in terms of political, economic, or military power.

But even with all our power and peaceful intent, the short-lived euphoria was totally shattered in the late 1940's and early fifties. As James B. Conant put it:

> The coup d'etat in Prague, the Berlin blockade, the Korean war demonstrated the kind of world in which we lived, a divided world, and the division was broad and deep. The issue was freedom.

The emergence of a Communist Soviet Union as a major industrial and military power that frankly sought to expand its totalitarian control was a fact that could not be denied or ignored.

Though slow and reluctant to acknowledge that peace was not secured, we responded to the challenge of world leadership with the creation of NATO and a far-flung alliance system which remains an essential part of our defense posture today. At the same time, the Marshall plan went into effect, releasing European talent and energy to rebuild half a continent and to eliminate conditions which made the area vulnerable to Communist subversion. At great expense, we lavished upon friend and former foe, for their rehabilitation, for their growth beyond prewar standards, and for their armament or rearmament funds in huge amounts—many billions of dollars greater than the total extracted from the vanquished by the victors in all former wars combined.

Yet peace was still not to be. Imperialism surged from Moscow, and even more recklessly from Peiping.

We met the challenge of Korea in the only way it could be met—with armed force. Working through the United Nations, we fashioned a new concept of collective action to resist aggression. But we emerged from that conflict without decisive victory and without adequate new policies to meet changing world conditions.

The policy of military containment was continued, shoring up existing military bases around the periphery of the Communist bloc and establishing new ones. Bilateral military pacts were signed with as many nations as possible, be they fledgling or mature. More often than not, there was little real mutuality in our mutual security agreements.

The post-Korea period was characterized by the slogans "more bang for a buck" and "massive retaliation." These described a doctrine—though not really a policy—which if pursued to its logical conclusion could but ultimately reduce our military alternatives to a choice between nuclear war and withdrawal.

There were slogans, too, to describe our objectives. Chiang Kai-shek was unleashed so as to permit him to reconquer the mainland of China. And there were rash words about liberation of Eastern Europe.

The containment policy which had held the line in Europe—though no one was "liberated"—did not work as well in southeast Asia. Communist penetration of the Indochinese peninsula forced the collapse of the French empire in that area. It seemed to some that communism, or regimes sympathetic to communism, would inevitably engulf the whole of that area so rich in resources and whose people were so ripe for exploitation.

Western unity was strained, on some occasions almost to the breaking point. Our major NATO allies launched an ill-fated military action in the Middle East and we were embarrassed that they would take so serious and so ill-advised a step without even consulting us.

During the 1950's we engaged in summit conferences which produced hopeful language that proved to be devoid of substance. Somehow the failure to achieve diplomatic solutions to world problems was, by intense Soviet propaganda campaigns, turned into diplomatic defeats for the West.

There was a sense of frustration and audible grumbling among our people. Burning with a will to win, many despaired for want of sufficient policy and direction.

The emphasis on foreign aid shifted from Western Europe and Japan, where it had been demonstratively successful, to the so-called underdeveloped nations, some of them in theretofore obscure areas of the world. This outpouring of aid seemed but an ineffective effort to secure the unreliable loyalty of autocratic regimes.

In 1957, the Russian feat of launching a satellite captured the imagination of the world. There was no question at that point that Russia was ahead in the race into space. Russia's known superiority in rocket thrust lent some degree of credence to the claim of technical superiority over the West. Then, too, the Soviets made much, propagandawise, of their claim that the rate of economic growth in Communist countries exceeded our own.

In the eyes of our friends, U.S. policy appeared negative, with our action limited, almost always, by the necessity to react to Soviet initiative. There was real doubt, at home as well as abroad, as to whether we meant what we said and said what we meant. No one doubted that we were opposed to communism, but there was sometimes doubt as to what kind of world we were striving to create or what kind of world we would create if we could. Among other things, we were showing ourselves as impaled upon the horns of that old pragmatic dilemma; whether we should support a colonial ally when we doubted it was morally right, or to support a genuine nationalistic movement when we were apprehensive about its future orientation. We preached democracy and individual freedom, but we often granted aid to support despotic regimes which used our aid further to oppress the peoples for whose welfare our aid was given.

As a result of all this, the standing of the United States in the eyes of the world declined during the last half of the 1950's. Yet—and in spite of sputnik—there had been no sudden or dramatic change in economic, political or moral strength of the United States and the Sino-Soviet bloc. Rather, there appeared to have occurred a slow erosion of the United States prestige because of increasing doubt about this country's understanding of world developments and its capacity for and will to exercise world leadership.

Perhaps U.S. prestige and confidence reached its nadir and Soviet prestige reached its zenith at the Paris Summit Conference in May 1960. We had agreed to participate in this summit conference when there was little evidence or hope that anything constructive could be achieved. This, of course, was the conference which Khrushchev angrily and abruptly terminated before it could get underway, bitterly denouncing the United States for the U-2 incident. At the same time, he withdrew an invitation previously extended to President Eisenhower to visit the Soviet Union.

There followed, then, Khrushchev's rude performance with his shoe at the United Nations and his demand for "troika" control of all international organizations. His conduct at Paris and later at the United Nations, and still more recently Russian action in resuming atomic tests while negotiations were pending at Geneva, served to impress the minds of neutralists and others with the cold purpose of Soviet leaders.

I do not suggest that these incidents, or any one of them, in and of themselves, brought about a turning point in the trend of the cold war. Just as the decade of the fifties witnessed no single dramatic defeat for the West, there has been no single readily identifiable victory or incident to serve as a historical milestone. But it does seem to me that the period of time in which they occurred may represent a turning point in the effectiveness of Russian tactics in the formulation of world opinion.

The turning of the tide, which I seem to perceive, may prove to be transitory or illusory. But I believe the facts at hand indicate that our situation is definitely improved, both in terms of our capacity and will to win the struggle and in terms of confidence in our leadership at home and abroad.

As opposed to our wavering posture of the fifties there is now a perceptible hardening of our position, a firmer measure of support for our policies, a clearer understanding of our problems, greater confidence in the strength we are prepared to bring to bear in the East-West struggle.

President Kennedy's performance has contributed materially to an image of vitality, strength, and determination. But this is by no means the sole element. Bold words and courageous action are essential, but standing alone they are not enough. The hardened position of the West has been and will be effective only to the degree that we possess the economic and military strength to back it up.

The countries of Western Europe and Japan have been restored to a position of industrial strength. This has been accomplished in substantial part with our aid, under policies formulated in the administration of President Truman and continued under Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. At home, we are once again demonstrating our ability to rebound from economic recession, whether Democrat or Republican be in the White House. The military buildup, which is now coming into fruition, is the culmination of programs initiated under President Eisenhower and which have been accelerated under President Kennedy.

The increasing support for the U.S. position in the United Nations is in consequence of policies whose broad outlines have been consistent under both Democratic and Republican administrations. These actions and programs, let me emphasize, are bipartisan in origin and support.

There is no gainsaying the fact that rapid expansion of the United Nations up to 104 members has created problems, and that there is room for improvement in the organization's financial and administrative arrangements. Yet, the fact remains that the United States has never lost a crucial vote in the history of the organization, while the Soviet Union has felt compelled to use its veto power 100 times. Recently the United Nations has decisively repulsed the Soviet troika scheme, overridden the Soviet opposition to intervention in the Congo, and it has rejected a move to seat the Communist Chinese by a larger margin than in the previous year.

The usefulness of the U.N. in our divided world has become increasingly apparent and the wisdom of our support for this institution has been regularly demonstrated—dramatically so in the case of the Congo.

The United States has always been both idealistic and realistic in its view of the U.N. We have looked for no panacea or world government. Rather, we have envisaged an institution which would preserve vitally important means of communication and conciliation among sovereign countries in a dangerously revolutionary world, which would at least encourage its members to live up to the ideals of the charter, and which would accept global peacekeeping tasks to the extent that the membership was able to support them. The record on these counts generally is a good and encouraging one.

During the period since May 1960, we have suffered some setbacks and, undoubtedly, there will be others. There is no question, for example, about the misstep made with regard to Cuba. But there is considerable debate about the nature and extent of the error. There is room for doubt that any policy beyond quiet diplomatic moves could ever have made progress toward a solution of the Cuban problem. In any event, much of the lost ground has been recouped since the so-called invasion attempt. The Organization of American States, at its recent meeting at Puna del Este, voted to exclude Cuba from that Organization and agreed that Castro's brand of communism is wholly incompatible with the inter-American system. Political and economic isolation may well prove to be an effective remedy for the Cuban malady.

Despite the Cuban incident and slow progress in other problem areas of the world, the fact remains that, since 1960, the free world position has not been nibbled to death in scattered spots around the globe. Long-range U.S. policy and programs, I believe, reflect a clearer understanding of the problems and a more realistic approach to their solutions.

I have said that there was no single readily identifiable event which marks the turning of the tide and that we have achieved no major single triumph which would be said to foretell our ultimate victory. Nevertheless, there is evidence which is cumulative in nature which, it seems to me, demonstrates that things are going better for us than they have in the past decade.

Let me recite some of the things which have occurred since the U-2 incident in May of 1960.

Last year, the Western cause benefited from the meeting between President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev in Vienna. When that meeting was announced, I thought that President Kennedy had made a mistake. I am happy to say that events proved me to be in error. All reports indicate that this was a most realistic confrontation. It must have been a shocking experience for President Kennedy, who had been hopeful of finding some means of accommodation between the East and West, to learn in a face-to-face discussion that Khrushchev was as hard as nails and utterly unyielding.

But President Kennedy reacted in the right way. Upon returning from Vienna, he set in motion action to give tangible evidence of the firmness of our policies. Our buildup of military strength was augmented and accelerated by callup of the Reserve Forces. We have added almost $4 billion to previously planned military budgets of the current and following years. We have maintained and increased our strategic nuclear deterrent capacity, but instead of continuing to depend almost totally upon nuclear weapons we have provided greater balance to our military posture by adding to the strength of our conventional forces, both in terms of numbers and in terms of their operational readiness. We are now in a position to respond effectively to a wider variety of military challenges that the Communist bloc might put forward.

Yet, because this country above all is dedicated to peace—though not at the price of freedom—we have now created an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This has been done in the belief that, especially compared with the investment in armaments, a mere fraction of our national talent and imagination has hitherto been brought to bear on the potential benefits that may be realized in arms control measures.

The political unity of the free world nations has been strengthened. Frequent consultations with our major allies have done much to reverse the pattern of disunity that was apparent during the Suez crisis.

In addition to efforts to achieve a greater degree of political unity, we have encouraged the nations of Western Europe to move rapidly to make the Common Market a reality and we are moving in concert with them to marshal the economic resources of the free world for maximum strength to apply to the economic challenge.

The Berlin crisis and the larger problem of Germany's future remain basically unchanged and combustible. But I believe the Kremlin is now convinced that we mean business when we say that we are determined to maintain our position there. The conviction carried by the Western defense posture has permitted us to keep the diplomatic door ajar without arousing cries of appeasement. Though we remain willing to negotiate, any element of softness is no longer discernible either to the Soviet or to others.

In South Vietnam the West is expressing its determination in a very tangible way. Though I acknowledge some misgiving in this instance, there can be no doubt as to the boldness and vigor of the undertaking.

Without question the U.S. decision to resume nuclear tests reflects the determination inherent in our policy. Whatever feeling the Kremlin may have entertained that our national security could be compromised by Communist propaganda campaigns, our strength and firm determination must surely now be the subject of an agonizing reappraisal by the Soviets.

The action taken at Punta del Este, followed by our complete trade embargo with Cuba, will serve further to isolate Castro and constitutes a new approach to the vexatious Cuban problem. Its example will not go unnoticed elsewhere.

Other profoundly important developments should be noted within this overall context. Remedying the past lack of concentrated effort to attend to the urgent problems of the Western Hemisphere, this country and its Latin American friends have gone into partnership through the Alliance for Progress to relieve poverty and overcome social injustice in the great continent to the south. Already we have made commitments of more than $900 million in loans and grants to assist in housing, educational, economic, health, and other programs in Latin countries. There are bound to be serious difficulties in carrying out such a program—a program which is in fact dedicated to peaceful revolution. Yet—and whether or not the Alliance program had been established—there was bound to be a revolution in South America. By putting forth the Alliance we have accepted this fact and have dedicated ourselves to promoting and molding the inevitable changes into channels more peaceful and humane than violent and brutal.

In the Dominican Republic a dictator has been ousted with reasonably good prospects for the development of a democratic government. Political anarchy and economic collapse, those twin cupbearers to communism, have been averted and there are indications that far-reaching development programs will shortly be getting underway in that country.

The energy, idealism, and old-fashioned decency of American youth have been directed into creative and constructive channels by the newly established Peace Corps. One of the best measures of its success is that demand from other countries for Peace Corps volunteers far outruns the supply. Our young people are not just giving, but receiving, the knowledge and cultural sympathy needed to bring nations closer together in human terms, as they already have been made interdependent through 20th century means of communication and transportation.

In the Congo the Communist bloc has suffered a major setback. Developments in this former Belgian colony have been the subject of great confusion. Doubt has been expressed, in all sincerity, as to the correctness of United States and U.N. Congo policies. Yet those who doubt the wisdom of the U.S. policy in support of U.N. Congo action should pause to consider the alternatives.

It should be remembered that at the time of U.N. intervention conditions of political and economic anarchy prevailed in the Congo. The Communist bloc was moving in to pick up the pieces. Had this move succeeded, the free world position in all of Africa would have suffered perhaps an irretrievable loss. But because of the U.N. operations, the bloc did not succeed. We are certainly not out of the woods, but the prospects for a stable and independent central Congolese Government look better today than at any time since the painful birth of the Congo as a nation.

On the psychological and propaganda front, the magnificent orbital flight of Colonel Glenn has narrowed the Soviet lead in space exploration, which has caused us embarrassment since the days of the first Sputnik in 1957. This success is important, not so much for what was done, but because of the way in which it was done. To undertake so difficult a feat before the very eyes of the entire world is in sharp contrast with the secrecy that surrounds Soviet effort. Achievement of success with literally hundreds of millions of people glued to their television and radio sets following each development cannot but have had a deep impression upon the world.

Meanwhile, we see increasing evidence that communism is beginning to show its seams. Shortages of goods and food are so serious that high Communists talk publicly about private ownership of livestock and private incentives. What heresy. And with more emphasis on education more political stirring in Russia is evident. Soviet leaders today keep an eye on public opinion and sentiment among the Russian people—and other heretic development.

Ideological differences between the U.S.S.R. and Red China become crucially important and cannot easily be papered over. Their differences affect not only the Communist bloc nations but also the policies and strength of Communist parties outside the bloc. Both in Russian and in Red China, communism has failed its most basic objective—the production of food. Recrimination about who is responsible is published widely in the world press, and Soviet officials are summarily fired for failures.

Mr. Khrushchev has been unable to point to any significant victory, either military or diplomatic, with which to divert attention from Communist problems on the home front. Here a word of caution may be in order. In the short term, the current difficulties within the Communist bloc could result in dangerous adventures by one or the other of the two major partners aimed at distracting attention from domestic difficulties. In any case, we should not—indeed must not—base our own policies on hopes of the collapse of Communist regimes. Yet their mounting failures and the unrest of their people can hardly be described as the wave of the future, at least not very convincingly.

All of these things, taken together, add up, I believe, to substantial improvement of the U.S. position and the free world position in the cold war. Admittedly, the margin is not great, and the issues are fearsomely complex and not liable to early and final solutions, yet the evidence is accumulating that the corner has been turned. Most important of all, we are moving with firmness, courage, and confidence. Our people have the will to win and our policy and our determined purpose is to win the goals of peace and freedom.

The problems and challenges which still face us are of tremendous proportions. Much remains to be done to bring about a clearer enunciation of our broad objectives. We have not resolved our policy dilemma with respect to the remaining colonial areas and our foreign aid program still suffers from lack of realistic direction and still remains afflicted with much short-range expediency.

On balance, however, we are moving forward and I believe there is a basis for caution optimism. Yes, Mr. President, I believe that the prospects for peace, security, and freedom, are brighter today than they have been at any time in recent years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Will the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend and compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for making the speech he has just completed making. To me, this is the kind of speech which has been long overdue. The Senator is to be commended for the honesty with which he has approached the subject and the candor which he has displayed in covering it. He has done a distinct service in trying to avoid the pitfalls, one way or another, and in endeavoring to keep the feet of the Nation, so to speak, on the ground, where they belong. It is a speech which has been long overdue.

Mr. GORE. I thank my distinguished friend.

PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE, TEXAS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 4), to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Padre Island, Tex., is the third area to be considered by the Senate during this Congress for development as a national seashore. Last year we passed legislation establishing Cape Cod, Mass., and Point Reyes, Calif., as units of the national park system. Each of these areas differs from the others in many respects but they share one important feature—they provide this country and its people an outstanding setting for outdoor recreation. While much has been said on the subject in this and other forums, I cannot stress sufficiently the importance of proceeding rapidly with the acquisition and development of those areas in our Nation that have a potential as recreation resources.

The suitability of the Padre Island area for inclusion in our national park system has been examined very carefully by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Hearings were held in Texas in 1959 and public hearings on the subject were conducted here in Washington in 1960 and 1961. Several members of the committee have visited the island on inspection trips. Padre Island is truly a unique area. There within a few miles of the city of Corpus Christi we find mile after mile of excellent beach and sand dunes, topographical features that are in growing demand by the public. Unfortunately, as public demand is increasing at an amazing rate the availability of such areas for public use is decreasing at an alarming rate.

It is the judgment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that Padre Island should be established as a national seashore. This area has marvelous credentials for such development and I am hopeful that the Senate will act favorably on the pending bill, thus providing on the gulf coast the type of recreational facilities the Congress has already authorized at Cape Cod on the Atlantic coast and, I am confident, will authorize at Point Reyes on the Pacific coast.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nevada, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, has spent a good many hours and days in conducting hearings on this legislation. He has made a personal inspection of Padre Island. We appreciate the contribution he has made in this respect and I know he shares my enthusiasm for this legislation which he has reported to the Senate from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I appreciate the words which have just been spoken by the chairman of the committee on this very important piece of legislation. I have a short statement which I should like to make. I see the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] on the floor, and shall not suggest the absence of a quorum, as I was about to do, because he has returned to the floor.

Legislation authorizing the development of Padre Island, Tex., as a unit of the national park system has been pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs since June 27, 1958, in one form or another. The bill presently before the Senate, S. 4, proposes to develop some 88 miles of the island as a national seashore.

Padre Island is a typical barrier reef extending some 117 miles along the Texas gulf coast from Corpus Christi on the north almost to Mexico on the south. The island varies in width from a few hundred yards to approximately 2 miles. Separating the island from the mainland is Laguna Madre, a bay having a maximum width of about 10 miles and a maximum depth of about 9 feet. Through the Laguna Madre has been dredged the Intercoastal Canal.

Padre Island is the longest island or barrier reef along the shores of the United States. While the island is quite uniform in elevation, irregular sand dunes, some up to 40 feet high, parallel the beach on the gulf shore and appear elsewhere on the island in lesser dimensions. Padre Island affords excellent, broad, and gently sloping beaches for many miles, particularly in the northern section along the gulf within the proposed boundaries. The climate is comparable to that of southern Florida. Because of the gradual slope of the gulf shore along the island, the area is ideally suited to swimming, surf fishing, and other types of beach recreation.

With the exception of those portions of the island that are subject to periodic inundation, the plant life is largely that type of vegetation typical of dunes areas—sea oats, ragweed, and other such shrubs and grasses. Grazing of cattle is presently carried on but would be terminated eventually if seashore status is accorded this area.

There are no commercial activities or developments within the suggested seashore boundaries other than petroleum production and the grazing of livestock I have just mentioned. There are no urban developments whatsoever.

S. 4 authorizes the acquisition of approximately 328,000 acres of land and waters. Of this total, 57,000 acres are fast lands, 124,000 acres are subject to inundation, and 147,000 acres are water surface acreage. It is estimated that approximately 112,000 acres are privately owned and the balance is owned either by the State of Texas or its political subdivisions. Title to lands owned by the State or its political subdivisions could not be acquired without the consent of those owners.

This is specifically written into the bill, S. 4, which is now before the Senate for consideration.

The legislation limits land and water acquisition costs to $4 million.

Oil and gas are currently being produced within the proposed seashore boundaries. The island also serves as a base for the directional drilling of wells which bottom in the Gulf of Mexico outside the proposed boundaries. The production from such wells is carried by underwater gathering pipelines back to the island for separation processes and transshipment.

The mineral estate in the lands of Padre Island is of great value. The production potential of the areas adjacent to the proposed seashore is also very substantial. Inasmuch as the contiguous areas are State owned, the revenues arising from mineral production therein are pledged to the permanent school fund of the State of Texas. Production on privately owned lands within the proposed boundaries of the seashore also provides revenues to the State of Texas in the form of income and severance taxes.

Inasmuch as mineral exploration and production on Padre Island is carried on in a relatively unobtrusive fashion and in recognition of the importance of providing for the continuation of this type of commercial activity, S. 4 has been amended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in a manner that will permit the fullest possible development of the mineral resources of the general area. The owners of mineral interests in the proposed seashore will be permitted to retain them. Development of these interests will be permitted to proceed in the future under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

As a means of guaranteeing the most economical development of the valuable petroleum resources of the areas immediately adjacent to the seashore, S. 4 prevents the acquisition by the Secretary of all grants, leases of or easements in land on Padre Island in effect on the date of enactment of the bill which are reasonably necessary for the exploration, production, development, or transporting of oil and gas minerals both within the seashore and the areas contiguous thereto. Representatives of the oil and gas companies operating on Padre Island have assured us that they are completely satisfied with these guarantees.

As I have pointed out previously, Padre Island is an excellent site for surf fishing. The surrounding waters abound in a variety of species. Both sport fishing and commercial fishing would be permitted in seashore waters under management arrangements with the State of Texas. While big game animals are not present on the island, the Secretary has authority under section 6 of this bill to authorize the hunting of migratory waterfowl.

Mr. President, areas in this country which have the recreational potential of Padre Island are fast disappearing into private ownership. This is a vast area of beaches ideally suited for public use. Land values on Padre Island are appreciating at a very rapid rate.

Mr. President, it seems to me—and I think it was the feeling of the majority of the members of the committee, also—that now is the time to preserve this area for the enjoyment of the thousands upon thousands of citizens whose recreational needs could be accommodated on Padre Island.

The interest of the senior Senator from Texas in this project has been unflagging. He has been persistent in his efforts to move the proposed legislation forward, first in the subcommittee, then in the full committee, and now, finally, on the floor of the Senate, where the bill is today, for what I hope will be the final, successful action on this particular piece of proposed legislation. The senior Senator from Texas is to be commended for the splendid work he has done on this very important proposal for a national seashore at Padre Island.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate the able senior Senator from Nevada for his excellent statement; for his chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Public Lands; and for the careful hearings he has held on the bill.

I also congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. They have attended extended hearings; they have been on the land; they have visited Padre Island; they have studied the issue so carefully that I find they know more about it than do many persons who live right near that area. I commend them for their diligence, for the study they have made, and for their complete mastery of this subject.

Mr. PROXMIRE obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield, provided he does not lose the floor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin desires to make a statement which will take about 10 minutes; and that at the conclusion of those remarks the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] will offer a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent—and this proposal has been cleared, I believe, all the way around—that when the motion to recommit has been offered, there be a limitation of debate of 1 hour on the motion, the time to be divided equally between the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do I correctly understand that the unanimous-consent agreement relates only to the motion to recommit?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Other amendments will be offered to the bill; but the time to be under control relates only to the motion to recommit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the Senator from Illinois desire to have a limitation on other amendments?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That cannot be ascertained until the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] comes to the Chamber.

U.N. DANGER FROM SENATORIAL ATTACK RECALLS SENATE DESTRUCTION OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it was a group of articulate and prestidigitous Senators who by their words and actions in effect gutted the League of Nations in the 1920's. The League represented the finest flowering of idealism in international affairs up to its day. It was the inspiration and highest goal of President Woodrow Wilson. It had wide popular support in the United States, and in nearly every nation of the world. Undoubtedly it had defects, but at the time it was conceived and created, it represented the world's best hope for peace.

Yet the League was destroyed before it ever really came into being. It was destroyed because the Senate of the United States refused to ratify the League covenant. It was destroyed in large measure because Senators who sincerely wanted peace toured the country calling attention to the League's possible defects, charging that this organization was both useless and dangerous. By poisoning the well of public opinion, these Senators prepared the way for the premature burial of the League.

I cannot help feeling that today's critics of the United Nations, although extremely able men—certainly many of the ablest men in the Senate—are performing a similar disservice to it. By placing a heavy public emphasis on the potential inconveniences that membership in the United Nations may involve us in, these critics draw attention away from the organization's actual accomplishments.

In that connection, I call attention to an excellent article entitled "How United States Fared in the U.N.: Scorecard on 10 Issues," written by Martin G. Berck and published in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, April 8, 1962. I read from the article:

HOW U.S. FARED IN THE U.N.: SCORECARD ON 10 ISSUES

(By Martin G. Berck)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Whatever the justification for Washington's increasingly critical view of the United Nations, it does not stem from U.S. defeats here in the headquarters of the world organization.

The fact is that in recent months defeats have been remarkably few. On some issues we have done not badly; on most issues we have done amazingly well.

Of course the record does not supply the complete answer to all doubts as to the future. In the longer view one must start with a truism, that putting 104 politicians in one great hall does not automatically create a parliament of man. The truth is readily enough seen in State legislatures or in Congress. Yet here in the General Assembly is a far more diverse mixture from which far less political harmony can reasonably be expected.

Out of 51 U.N. members in 1946, only 11 were from Africa or Asia. Afro-Asian nations today number 51 of the U.N.'s 104 members, diluting Western and Latin American voting strength, giving vigorous impetus to U.N. action on so-called colonialism questions, and causing deep anxieties among America's colonial partners.

Issue by issue, frequently there are heated clashes on matters grandiose and picayune, but there is one all-embracing principle guiding delegates from the lowest spot in Upper Volta to the innermost point of Outer Mongolia. That is national interest.

The question then is how often the United States has managed to swing a majority of other nations into line with its views, or has found the majority stand compatible with American interests.

The first and most critical test of the current General Assembly came last September with the plane crash in Africa that killed Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, and many feared it threatened to bring down the whole U.N. framework with him.

Soviet shoe pounding and table thumping the previous year had signaled the start of a Russian fight to liquidate the Secretary General's job and replace it with a veto-handcuffed troika, marking the end of an independent Secretariat.

But the Russians had to back down, chiefly because the Afro-Asians shunned the troika idea and overwhelmingly endorsed the American position that you get nowhere with three horses running in different directions.

Facing isolation, the Communist bloc had to link hands with the rest of the world organization. The result was the unanimous election of a mild-mannered Burmese, U Thant, who subsequently found occasion to confirm the American view that he was tough and canny enough to pilot the world organization in the Hammarskjold tradition and then some.

Here is the score on the principal issues:

CHINA

Pundits had predicted that Communist China's admission and Nationalist China's ouster was almost assured. After the first full-dress debate in a decade, the General Assembly adopted the American position that a two-thirds vote was necessary to change things, then defeated a Russian proposal to do so by a vote of 37 in favor, 48 against, with 19 abstentions. Diplomats were astounded at the anti-Communist margin.

NUCLEAR TESTS

Despite the timidity of the Belgrade conference of neutralists in condemning resumption of nuclear testing, 87 countries decried the announced Soviet intention to blast a 50-megaton bomb. Only the 11 Communists (including Cuba) opposed the Assembly resolution. From leftist, oft-befuddled Mali came the only abstention.

Another measure calling for a test ban passed by 70 to 20, with the Communists, the United States, and Britain forming an unusual lineup' in the defeated minority. Burned once, the United States said it could not go along with another uninspected uncontrolled test moratorium.

Then the Assembly called for a test ban treaty "under an effective and impartial system of verification" to make it vetoproof and cheat-free. This time the United States voted with the winning majority of 71. Only the Communists opposed.

The United States withheld support from other measures lacking ironclad guarantees against Soviet cheating, supported ones that so stipulated.

DISARMAMENT

Unanimous resolutions set the stage for the Geneva disarmament talks, which, however futile, permitted the United States to steal Soviet thunder by endorsing the principle of general and complete disarmament. It also gave the neutralists a more realistic appreciation of the American position that this can never be more than a popular slogan or a pious hope without meaningful international guarantees.

OUTER SPACE

The Assembly unanimously resolved that international law applies in outer space, and celestial bodies are not subject to national appropriation. This means that any hammer and sickle emblem planted on the moon by the Russians cannot form the basis of a territorial claim. In addition, the groundwork was laid for international cooperation in outer space projects in meteorology and communications.

APARTHEID AND SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. President, one of the most striking victories, but one of the least remarked and least noticed, was that with regard to apartheid in South Africa. The article states:

Largely through Asian influence, a Soviet move to punish South Africa with sanctions was beaten down. Then the assembly, by 97 to 2, condemned South Africa's racial policies but carefully avoided rash action, refuting charges that the assembly is dominated by Afro-Asian irresponsible extremism.

COLONIALISM

And I think this may be part of the heart and soul of much of the opposition to the United Nations—

Drastic Communist measures calling for immediate independence of all territories, however ill prepared, punitive measures against Portugal on Angola, an untimely withdrawal of Belgian troops from Ruanda-Urundi, all were defeated or forced to be withdrawn, largely because a majority of Afro-Asians favored the more moderate approach advocated or supported by the United States.

What passed, with American support, were measures aimed at bringing about a rapid but step-by-step end to colonialism, an expression of self-determination for Angolans, and an attempt to bring Ruanda-Urundi to independence without courting another Congolese explosion.

By large majorities, the Assembly also took account of oppression in Tibet, Hungary, and North Korea.

CUBA

A lengthy and stormy debate in the Assembly's main political committee on Cuba's charges of new American aggression produced not a single vote outside the Soviet bloc to sustain them or even to take official notice of them. Repeated attempts to revive the charges in the Security Council and challenge decisions taken by the Organization of American States also got nowhere.

ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

A decade of development program to hasten industrial growth and combat illiteracy, hunger, disease, and land reform was proposed by the United States and unanimously approved. Also strongly favored by the United States were plans to establish a world food program and a capital development fund.

BOND ISSUE

Bailing the U.N. out of a financial crisis stemming largely from the refusal of the Communists, France, and Belgium to pay for the U.N.'s peace-keeping operations in the Congo and the Middle East necessitated the floating of a $200 million bond issue. So far, 26 countries have purchased or pledged amounts totaling $54,661,175. The Kennedy administration, author of the plan, seeks authorization from Congress to buy up to $100 million worth.

CONGO

Of course, one of the most striking and dramatic victories has been with regard to the Congo, although, of course, it has been misinterpreted. It seems to me that as regards the Congo, we won a clear-cut victory in the United Nations; and it was an astonishing performance because, in my judgment, it avoided what could have been a confrontation between the United States and Russia under extremely difficult circumstances, or an appeasement of the Russians, which could have led to the destruction of freedom in Africa, Asia, and perhaps elsewhere in the world. But, instead, the independence of the Congo has been supported in Africa and in many other areas, thanks to the United Nations.

I believe the United Nations has proven itself an effective instrument of peace and has proven that U.S. foreign policy with regard to the United Nations has been not only constructive and idealistic, but also eminently successful. I think there is much to be praised about the United Nations, as I have indicated; and I think most of the Members of this body will endorse much that the United Nations has done.

The remainder of the article reads as follows:

Last fall, the Security Council strengthened the Secretary General's hand to deal with secession in Katanga. He indicated he would also use these powers to meet rebellion centering around leftist Antoine Gizenga, whose movement subsequently fizzled. When the Soviet Union went to the Council last January to squelch the increasingly promising chances of a peaceful end to Katangese secession and demand a new round of shooting, it failed to get even Afro-Asian support.

Despite what many regard as an impressive list of American triumphs in the U.N. at a time when the United States no longer commands an automatic majority, a rattling reexamination in Washington seemed bound to come.

Most vexatious is the assumption that American security interests in NATO are in conflict with U.N. considerations. It is not forgotten that the United States parted company with the British and French over Suez, the French on Algeria, the Belgians on the Congo, the Portuguese on Angola, and have given the Dutch less than full support on New Guinea, and the British on Southern Rhodesia.

Discontent engendered within the alliance over colonial matters gave rise to misgivings in Congress. But no one has suggested that NATO therefore will run aground. It won't, because military and political interests of NATO members far outweigh colonial concerns. Nor can it be taken for granted that these policy problems would not still be there—and in spades—even if the U.N. tipped over into the East River.

The point that American Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson finds necessary to hammer home is that it is a mistake to pit the U.N. against NATO. Both are instruments to serve American interests.

HAS KEPT PEACE

At the same time, it must be admitted that it is not always an easy matter to strike a balance between the two on an urgent colonialism issue.

As an executive agency, an independent power whose role some would curtail, the U.N. can point to war stopping or peace keeping in the Gulf of Aqaba, the Gaza strip, on the Syrian and Jordanian borders, in Kashmir, Lebanon, Laos, and, most notably, the Congo, all with varying degrees of success.

What this means for the United States is that American and Soviet troops were not propelled—as they might have been—into direct confrontation that could develop into a major war.

The big, sometimes bumptious, occasionally disorderly glasshouse of lengthy speeches and thick documents is a cause for concern because it is growing in ways that cannot be precisely charted.

But the United States regards its long-range security interests as based on maintaining free and independent countries throughout the world. If this is a goal that the world in general approves—and it is hard to see how it can be otherwise—then the prospects for the U.N. cannot be too gloomy.

Furthermore, Mr. President, a few days ago James Reston, head of the Washington bureau of the New York Times, wrote an article which was published in the Times; and the article is most instructive in regard to the United Nations, because in the article Mr. Reston points out that Senators who have attacked the United Nations as not being representative seem to have forgotten that the Senate of the United States itself is not the most representative body in the world. Mr. President, I am proud of the Senate, and I am very glad to be a Senator. But I think there is no doubt that an entirely representative basis is not necessary in order to have effective a democratic republic or an institution like the United Nations that serves as an instrument of peace, morality, and reasonable representation.

For instance, Alaska has, in effect, approximately 20 times the representation in the Senate that Wisconsin has, and about 80 times as much as New York has. Obviously there is no equality of representation in the Senate; yet that was the main point of criticism advanced the other day by several Senators against the U.N. Actually, Mr. President, any student of the Senate and also any student of the United Nations could easily criticize both institutions from that point of view.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Reston be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 5.—Many of the criticisms of the United Nations in the U.S. Senate are true. Let us admit it: the U.N. has not achieved peace or justice. It has not ended the wars in Laos or Vietnam or the Congo. It has soaked the rich to help the poor. It gives equal voting rights in the Assembly to small states and large states. It plays politics with great events. And darned if that is not precisely true of the U.S. Senate as well.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, complained the other day that it was unfair to have the same vote in the Assembly for the little countries as for big countries. Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, pointed out yesterday that little Gabon had as much voting power as the United States, which has 433 times as many people.

Hard cheese, said the Senator (who did not rush to support the Supreme Court's recent reapportionment decision), but this, of course, is what happens in the U.S. Senate. Montana with 674,767 people in the 1960 census, Georgia with 3,943,116, and New York with 16,782,304 all have two votes in the U.S. Senate and Mr. MANSFIELD, of Montana, is majority leader of the place, and a good one, too.

UNFAIR, UNEQUAL, IMPERFECT

Life is unfair, as President Kennedy observed the other day. And unequal, too, but it is unequal and unfair and imperfect everywhere, including the U.S. Senate. The Armed Services Committee, which Senator RUSSELL heads, hasn't stamped out war in Laos, Vietnam, or the Congo either, and Georgia hasn't rejected its share of Federal funds raised in those big States like New York.

The Senators who oppose bailing out the U.N. because of its failures are making some good points, but they don't go far enough. They liked the U.N. when the United States controlled the voting. They approved bloc voting in the U.N. when those two unlikely characters, Nelson Rockefeller and Adlai E. Stevenson, established the bloc-voting practice back there in the first U.N. meeting in San Francisco and London in 1945–46. But our blocs are not so large now and this is a problem.

We are in danger of losing control of the Assembly and even of seeing it used against the principles of the U.N. itself. The Senators are right in saying that the U.N. cannot deal effectively with direct confrontations between the great powers, that the Security Council is paralyzed in such cases by the veto, and that the General Assembly is an increasingly capricious and unwieldy political instrument.

But so is the U.S. Senate. Also, it was a U.S. Senator, Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan, who turned the U.N. General Assembly into "the town meeting of the world"—his phrase—and the U.S. Senate that rejoiced at the transfer of peace-enforcement power from the Security Council to the Assembly.

This transfer of power revolutionized the U.N., but the United States did it, and it was no secret then that the colonial empires were being liberated and the size of the General Assembly increased. What is ironical, and even vaguely amusing now, is that Senators, of all people, should be complaining that the Assembly talks too much, that it trades votes, that it is untidy financially, and that it is not the answer to all the world's problems.

As Churchill said when the Germans got bogged down in the winter of the Soviet Union, "They should have known that it snowed in Russia." The Senators are no doubt justified in rebelling against the tiresome State Department and White House cliché that the United Nations is "the last great hope for peace in the world"—it is no such thing—but all parliamentary bodies tend to be oversold. Even the U.S. Senate is constantly being advertised, usually by Senators, as "the greatest deliberative body in the world."

WHAT IS THE U.N.?

What is deliberative about the present Senate debate on the U.N. and world affairs? It is talking as if the U.N. somehow had some mysterious power of its own, that it can stop aggressions in Goa that Senators themselves don't want to send U.S. troops to stop, that in some curious way it is responsible for the world's problems instead of merely reflecting those problems.

The U.N., however, is not wholly unlike the Senate. It is not responsible for friction in Berlin, any more than the Senate is responsible for unemployment in Detroit—probably not as much. Both merely mirror the problems placed before them and deal with them imperfectly in an obviously imperfect world.

Besides, Senators had better be careful about refusing to pay for political mistakes. For if this idea were to spread, they might soon be as broke as the U.N. itself. They voted $300 million for Laos, which vanished in the jungle fogs changing nothing. But they have to go on, and they will, because the alternatives are worse. Like the General Assembly, the Senators like to talk, but in the end they seldom have the courage of their prejudices.

FOREIGN AID TO TITO SUPPORTS OPPRESSION SHOWN BY REARREST OF DJILAS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Sunday it was reported that Milovan Djilas, who is a dissenter in Yugoslavia, has once again been arrested—although he has been ill—by the Communist government of Marshal Tito, and has been thrown back into jail. Dr. Djilas has protested very vigorously both Russian communism and Yugoslav communism. As a matter of fact, recently he published an article in which he attacked the Soviet Union for crushing the Hungarian revolution, and stated that that meant the beginning of the end of communism, including the "Titoist brand."

Obviously, Mr. President, the arrest of Djilas was for the purpose of preventing the release of a book he has written, and which is ready for release in New York.

Recently two excellent editorials dealing with this matter have been published. But they do not however make the point that I am making—namely, that when the subject of aid for Yugoslavia comes before the Senate, this year, there should be—as I hope there will be—strong opposition by Senators.

The arrest of Djilas was—on the basis of the best information I have seen—because what he has written might be embarrassing to Khrushchev, as well as to Tito. It is obvious that there is no opportunity for freedom in either Soviet Russia or Yugoslavia. Freedom is ruthlessly suppressed. This development testifies, once again, to the fact that Tito is supporting the Soviet regime, and that he will continue to do so, as he has in the past, against the interests of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I hope Congress will seriously consider this situation when it considers the foreign aid bill.

In connection with this matter I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the New York Times and the editorials dealing with this subject printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALKING OUT OF TURN

The Yugoslavs may have a special form of communism separate from the Soviet brand; but as soon as one begins to think of them hopefully as approaching membership in the free world, one gets a fresh demonstration that an all-powerful state is necessarily tyrannical. The news that Milovan Djilas is back in prison is simply a reminder that no dictatorship is inclined to consider itself sufficiently firmly established to tolerate dissent or unorthodoxy.

Mr. Djilas seems to be an inveterate dissenter. He seems also to be a man of extraordinary hardihood and courage. Released from prison on parole a little more than a year ago—on terms, it is said, that forbade his writing about politics—he must have gone to work at once on a new book entitled "Conversations With Stalin" containing highly controversial material not altogether agreeable to Yugoslavia's dictator, Marshal Tito. He has now been arrested, at any rate, under the terms of a recently adopted statute forbidding the publication of documents harmful to the state. Such a statute effectually precludes the expression of any political opinion not approved by the powers that be.

The specific nature of Mr. Djilas' offense is not yet clear. It is reported that his book, dealing with the men around Stalin, says some uncomplimentary things about Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev. If this is the real reason for imprisoning Djilas, it reveals a good deal about the independence of Yugoslavia; no doubt it is prudent for little tyrants to be careful of the sensibilities of big tyrants. The arrest of Djilas reveals a great deal, too, about life in Yugoslavia. Indeed, Djilas in jail speaks far more loudly and eloquently than Djilas at liberty.

THE YUGOSLAV CENSORSHIP

Though the Yugoslav Government has given no public reason as yet for its decision to rearrest Milovan Djilas, the circumstances make plain that this action was closely connected with the scheduled early publication here of Djilas' latest book, "Conversations With Stalin." The book presents evidence that Stalin was primarily responsible for the cold war.

How ironical it is now that Tito's Communists in Yugoslavia, whom Stalin tried to destroy a decade ago, should now in effect rush to the aid of Stalin's memory by trying to stop the publication of this volume and to punish its author. Presumably the political motivation is President Tito's fear that this new evidence against Stalin may damage Premier Khrushchev in the delicate fight between Stalinists and anti-Stalinists among the world's Communists.

The use of police methods to try to still Milovan Djilas' pen by a Yugoslavia that prides itself on relative liberalism contrasts unfavorably even with Moscow's treatment of Boris Pasternak, who was at least not imprisoned for publication abroad of "Doctor Zhivago."

Another important issue is raised by the decision of the American publishers of Djilas' book to postpone publication and to withdraw galleys which had been distributed among book reviewers. The latter action took place last week on the same day that the president of the publishing firm had conferred with a Yugoslav information official here.

The publisher's solicitude for Mr. Djilas' welfare is understandable and commendable; but from the record of Djilas' past bravery, we must assume he knew the risks he was running in writing and sending abroad this book, and was willing to bear the consequences as part of his personal battle against the totalitarianism he loathes. We seriously question the advisability of permitting governmental pressure—by Yugoslavia or any other government—to prevent publication of a book that could well be a major historical document.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 8, 1962]

DJILAS' WORDS OF PROTEST BROUGHT HIS DOWNFALL

(By Russell Porter)

Milovan Djilas, who was arrested in Belgrade yesterday apparently because of a book he has written about Stalin, was for many years a close friend and associate of President Tito.

But he has been a critic of communism, including the Yugoslav dictator's brand, for the last 10 years. He has written several books demanding more democracy in Yugoslavia and criticizing the drive for power and privilege of the Communist leaders.

His book, "The New Class," published here in 1957, expounded the theory that the Communist overthrow of capitalism inevitably developed a new class of exploiters of the people.

His new book, "Conversations With Stalin," deals with talks between Stalin and M. Djilas during and after World War II, before Yugoslavia broke with the Soviet Union. It was reported the Tito regime was upset at the possible adverse effect of the book on its current relations with the Soviet Union.

Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., had announced the book for publication May 16, but said yesterday it had been indefinitely postponed.

William Jovanovich, president of Harcourt, Brace & World, ordered the postponement Friday because he felt the situation needed to be studied further. He said he had talked with Drago Bujica of the Yugoslav Information Office here Friday, but declined to tell what had been said.

Mr. Jovanovich said he was seeking a visa to go to Belgrade Wednesday. He has not heard from M. Djilas about the arrest, he said. M. Djilas wrote to him that he was planning the book after his release from prison in 1961, and he made two trips to

Belgrade to discuss it with M. Djilas in 1961 and 1962, he went on. He received the manuscript last December.

Mr. Jovanovich said that he owned the world rights to the book and that no serializations or foreign editions would be authorized for the present. The book has not been fully printed and bound, he added.

Before and during World War II, M. Djilas served 3 years in a Yugoslav prison cell, fought in the Spanish Civil War, was a member of the Communist underground in Yugoslavia and a partisan leader.

After the war he helped Marshal Tito build and operate the Communist system in Yugoslavia. He was formerly chairman of the National Assembly.

When Marshal Tito broke with Stalin in 1948, M. Djilas stood near the top of the Titoist heirarchy and acted as the chief Yugoslav propagandist. He continued to occupy a high place in the regime until 1953, when he broke with Marshal Tito.

BUREAUCRACY SCORED

He charged at that time that the Yugoslav Communist bureaucracy was preventing the development of democracy and asserted that Communists were not necessary to lead the way to socialism.

Marshal Tito stripped M. Djilas of his government posts and party offices in 1954. A year later, M. Djilas again incurred official wrath because of an exclusive interview he gave the New York Times, elaborating on views the regime considered heretical. He was sentenced to 18 months in jail in 1955, but the sentence was suspended and he was put on 3 years' probation.

The country house that had remained at his disposal despite his loss of high party and government rank was taken from him. He and his family then moved in a small flat in Belgrade.

He was arrested again in 1956 after the New Leader, an anti-Communist Socialist journal in New York, published an article by him attacking the Soviet Union for crushing the Hungarian revolution. He said it meant the beginning of the end of communism, including the Titoist brand.

This time he was sentenced to 3 years in prison. While in jail he completed "The New Class," which was smuggled to this country for publication. After its publication he was retried and sentenced to 9 years in prison, but he was pardoned in 1961.

Excerpts from Mr. Djilas' book were published in the New York Times on April 2 in C. L. Sulzberger's column on foreign affairs. They indicated that Stalin announced the start of the cold war at a Kremlin dinner party in 1944 by saying: "This war is not as in the past; whoever occupies a territory also imposes on it his own social system."

M. Djilas quoted Stalin as having said: "Churchill is the kind who, if you don't watch out, will slip a kopeck out of your pocket" and "Roosevelt dips in his hand only for bigger coins."

According to the author, Stalin also said: "The war will soon be over. We shall recover in 15 or 20 years and then we'll have another go at it."

M. Djilas said Stalin told him in 1948 that "the West will make Western Germany their own and we shall turn Eastern Germany into our state."

He also quoted Stalin as having said Yugoslavia should "swallow" Albania. Stalin also said the Chinese Communists were right in fighting Chiang Kai-shek after the Japanese surrender, and the Russians were wrong in advising them to reach an agreement with him.

TO FIND TRUTH, ABANDON CONFORMITY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently Leo Rosten made a magnificent speech at the National Book Awards, in New York. It was the best received address in the history of the awards. His address was entitled "On Finding Truth: Abandon the Straitjacket of Conformity."

In the course of his speech, Mr. Rosten stated:

> The most practical things in this world of ours are not dynamos, nor mechanisms, nor computers, nor aircraft; the most practical things are ideas. It is always from some curious abstract, "daydreaming" egghead that our marvelous gadgets come.
>
> The contempt of "practical" men for curious men, or of "realists" for "just theoreticians," rests on nothing more than ignorance. The one thing that curiosity can never be, is idle.

Mr. Rosten concludes his magnificent speech in these words:

We Must Learn

> We must learn to seek change without violence. Always change, and never violence—not even in words, much less in deeds.
>
> We must try to understand each other by reconciling ourselves to the fact that most of us never really mature; we simply grow taller.
>
> We must meet fanaticism with courage, and idealism with caution.
>
> We must be skeptical of that which is promised, but not proved.
>
> We must be strong enough to be gentle.
>
> We must know that life will always have unbearable stretches of loneliness, and that we can never truly be understood—even by those who love us; that we cannot completely understand someone else, no matter how much we want to. We must moderate, therefore, our demands on others.
>
> We must have the courage to live without absolutes, without dogmas, the courage to seek imaginative escapes from the straitjackets of conformity, knowing—with Emerson "Whosoever would be a man, must be a nonconformist."
>
> We must learn to meet life in a series of tentative and impermanent approximations, knowing that the final goals may never be reached, that the last truths may be forever unknowable, but that life holds nothing more precious than the process by which, to the fullest stretches of which man is capable, we stretch the mind and the heart.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech by Mr. Rosten be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On Finding Truth: Abandon the Straitjacket of Conformity

(By Leo Rosten)

(Note.—This is the text of an address, "The Free Mind," made by Mr. Rosten at the National Book Awards in New York recently. It was the best received address in the history of the awards. Mr. Rosten's latest book, "Captain Newman, M.D." is on the best-seller lists now.)

We live among madmen. We are surrounded by those who believe in witchcraft. The most critical problem which freemen face today is to get some of their cocitizens to listen—to listen to that which seems to threaten them. For the right to talk involves the duty to listen.

We are all raised so that we confuse a way of thinking with the way of thinking. We must all try—desperately hard—to see things not as we are but as they are. The function of the thinker, the scientist, the writer, the editor—indeed, the function of the freeman and the free mind—is, stubbornly and painfully, to try to find truth—truth as it is, not as we want it to be, or hope it to be, or prefer it to be. The wife at the cocktail party who said indignantly to her husband, "Darling, don't you think you ought to stop drinking? Your face is already beginning to get blurred," suggests the singular capacity of human beings to project onto the outer world that which might more properly be examined within.

To be free means to have made a deep and incontestable commitment to the self: to love ideas, to examine them, to explore them no matter where they lead; to test what is new, even what is threatening. For wisdom is not much more than the capacity to confront dangerous ideas with equanimity.

IDEAS—PRACTICAL THINGS

Now, there is a special irony in what I am saying. Not so long ago, in these United States, the target of political disdain and political contempt was that pathetic, that unrealistic, that useless person—the egghead. Everyone in this room, I take it, is an egghead. You may remember that our then Secretary of Defense, in turning down a project for basic research, dismissed it with this historic comment: "Basic research is when you don't know what it is you're trying to find out." Now, aside from the appalling syntax, which suggests that the Secretary had not taken the trouble to learn how to construct a sentence in his native tongue, no idea can be more absurd; for if there is anything that research, or thought, or exploration are incapable of being, it is useless. In one sense, no experiment ever fails (it tells us that some factors do not necessarily correlate).

The most practical things in this world of ours are not dynamos, nor mechanisms, nor computers, nor aircraft; the most practical things are ideas. It is always from some curious abstract, "daydreaming" egghead that our marvelous gadgets come.

The contempt of "practical" men for curious men, or of "realists" for "just theoreticians," rests on nothing more than ignorance. The one thing that curiosity can never be is idle.

Now, the freeman, the curious man, will always disturb his society, because he will always confront freshly what is conventional. He will always dare to reexamine what seems to others to be "obvious." The writer and the thinker are engaged in a lifelong struggle to free themselves from the prisons of the familiar.

Isn't it an astonishing fact that it wasn't until the 15th century that men invented perspective in painting, and tried to get others to look into, and not just at, a picture? Isn't it astonishing that it wasn't until the late 19th century that painters had the courage to do what every child has done (and had beaten out of them by fond teachers and parents)—put colors into shadows. Isn't it astonishing that it wasn't until Cezanne that men dared to try to reverse the illusion of perspective, so that a picture could seem to come out toward us? Doesn't it seem to you extraordinary that it wasn't until the impressionists that men discovered that cool colors seem to recede and warm colors seem to move forward, and that color can be used to gain the illusion of depth?

Today it is impossible for you or me to look, to see, as we would have looked or seen before strange, curious, original, and revolutionary men taught us how to see differently from the way we did before. It's impossible to look at a building, or a bowl of fruit, without paying tribute to that new vision which was given to us by Monet, or Cezanne, or Picasso, or Braque.

HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS

And if this is true in the field of what seems so simple—the visible, the real, that which is right in front of our eyes—how much more true is it in the arena of ideas?

For how many thousands of years did men see the sun rise in the east and move across the heavens? They saw the sun move, just as we see the sun move. And they assumed that it is the sun that moves—until someone, some curious, dreaming, idle egghead, surely long before Copernicus, took an amazing, imaginative leap and asked, "Wait. What if I were on the sun? Would it not look as if it is the earth which is moving? And, if this is so, how do we know which, in fact, is moving? And how can we test it? How can we find out? How can we prove it?"

Throughout the history of the human race, men have been tortured and killed, despised and attacked, for asking just such questions, for daring to suggest that the prevailing folklore may be wrong. It is these men—the men who resist the crippling effects of conventional education—who confront the known as if it is new. It is these men who make the reality which we inherit, and who will change the reality which our children inherit.

THE FALLING APPLE

Consider Isaac Newton, who asked, not "Why does the apple fall?"—that was known—but, "How far out does gravity reach?" And, "Why do objects attract each other without some intermediary medium? What is mass? What is force? What is inertia?" "When you press a stone," said Newton, "the stone presses back."

Or Harvey, who asked so simple a question: "But where does the blood go? Where does it come from?"

Or Darwin, who asked, "But where do human beings come from?"

Or Lobachevski, who said, "Is a straight line always the shortest distance between two points? On a curve? On the globe?"

Or Rutherford, who had the astounding temerity to say, "Can it be that inside this tiny, tiny thing called the atom, is recapitulated the universe itself, with a sun and planets and lots of space?"

Or Einstein, who asked, "What do we mean by 'simultaneous'? How can two things occur at the same time, if we do not allow for the fact that we are on a moving object when we observe them?"

Or Sigmund Freud, who looked at children, who listened to people, and who said, "Mistakes are not accidental. Dreams are not absurd. Symbols have meaning. It is possible both to love and to hate. There is a world below the known and the conscious."

DARING TO QUESTION

Each of these men was doing what? He was daring to confront the prevailing model with skepticism. He was daring to question the mythologies by which we live.

Our life is dominated by myths, from which only the thinker, the writer, the philosopher, the scientist, the freeman can truly liberate us.

Here are some myths which we all believe, unless we make an effort to examine them:

There is the myth: "Facts speak for themselves." Now, this is perfectly idiotic. Facts don't speak at all; facts are meaningless until they are arranged, patterned, analyzed, interpreted. For years, out in the borough of Queens, they used to advertise: "Come to Queens and live longer." They proved that the death rate in Queens is substantially lower than it is in Manhattan. Now, the death rate is the same everywhere, if you wait long enough, 100 percent. It was true that, per 100,000 people, fewer seemed to die in Queens in any given year than in Manhattan. But this was so for a good reason: They didn't have very good hospitals in Queens—and when people got sick, they came to New York, where they died.

Do the facts speak for themselves?

There is the myth that you should always tell the truth. Now, I submit that life would be intolerable if people went around telling each other the truth all of the time. You can't always tell the truth to a child, or to your wife, or to your parents. There are times when it is kind not to tell the truth.

THE LEFT AND THE RIGHT

There is the myth that the extreme left and the extreme right, politically, are violently and unalterably opposed to each other. But the far left and the far right have much more in common with each other than either does with the middle. We can understand political behavior better if we distribute opinions not on a straight line, but in a circle, so that the extreme right and left meet, as indeed they do—since both believe in suppressing ideas, in throttling freedom, in using violence, in making no distinction between ideas and heresies, between treason and dissent. Both say that some books and some men and some ideas are dangerous. Of course, they are; democracy is a dangerous way of living. But the suppression of ideas is worse. In the midst of terrible crises no less severe than ours, the men who founded this country adopted the Bill of Rights. They were not afraid of the free exercises of free minds. They knew that freedom isn't freedom if it is confined to that which is inoffensive; that there is no freedom when controversy has been abolished. This country was not founded by cowards.

There is the myth that security is the highest social good. Well, the most secure place in the world is a prison—but who wants to live there?

There is the myth I hesitate to utter—so outlandish is it—that men and women are equal. This is madness. The fight for equality under law has led to a conclusion which is biologically and psychologically insupportable. Men and women belong to different races, as different as Eskimos and Hottentots. It is impossible for any man truly to enter the universe of a woman, or for any woman truly to grasp and sense and empathize with the internal structure of the male.

Little Johnny sent a note to the girl next to him in school, a typical masculine note: "Dear Mary, I love you. Do you love me? (signed) Johnny." And he got back from Mary a lovely, feminine note: "Dear Johnny, I do not (underlined three times) love you. Love, Mary."

UNHAPPY CHILDHOOD

There is the myth that you can explain neurotic behavior by attributing it to an unhappy childhood. But all childhood is unhappy; all childhood is charged with uncertainty and fear, with conflict and frustration, with unbearable rage and unattainable desire. It makes little sense to talk about unhappy childhoods unless we ask why some people emerge from childhood with their productive capacities enriched, while others remain paralyzed by unresolved and infantile dilemmas.

There is the myth that it is wrong to spank a child. Well, for about thirty years, I think, we were tyrannized by this cliche. Now, I assume that civilized people don't say, "Dear, let's have some fun. Let's beat up the kids." The relevant question, surely, is this: If you are angry enough, for whatever reason, to want to strike a child, what do you do with that anger? I submit that if you do not spank the child, the alternatives you leave him are pretty horrible. For the child knows that the parent is angry; and what can the child think? "Oh, he's mad; he's real mad. If I were that mad, I'd hit; I'd kick; I'd bite; I'd chew; I'd knock him down; I'd cut him up. But he doesn't. Oh how much better he is than I. Will I ever be that good?" Or, "He's mad. He'd really like to slug me. Why doesn't he hit me? I know why he doesn't hit me. Because if he ever let go, he'd kill me—which is what I suspect he's been wanting to do all along." Or, "When will he become human? What do I have to do to make him like other parents?" And so on. We can only celebrate the insight of a departed colleague, George Bernard Shaw, who once said, "Never strike a child in cold blood."

There is the myth that children should adjust to their group. Well, is the group worth adjusting to? Are there not some who are meant to be alone, who are meant not to be well-liked, who are meant not to be popular? If you want your children to be popular, I'll tell you how. Tell them to ask people for advice. Don't listen to the advice; don't take it; just ask—and everyone will love you and think you are wise and good.

ON HANDLING LEISURE

There is the myth that a 35-hour week is better than a 40-hour week, that more and more leisure is desirable. But I suspect we have not begun to learn how to handle the leisure we already have. The American weekend has become a prolonged exercise in the destruction of time: Frantic drinking, barbecuing, infidelity, reckless driving, all by people bamboozled into thinking that the American way of life means: Don't ruminate; don't think; fill up every free moment with strenuous relaxation.

There is the myth that every problem has a solution. But some problems will never be solved, and can only be reshaped and reformed. Do you want an example of a problem which can never be solved? It's illustrated by Groucho Marx, who once resigned from a country club with these words, "I don't want to belong to the kind of club which accepts people like me as members." This, in vulgar form, is a fair example of what Bertrand Russell calls the set paradox.

There is the myth that eloquence means widsom, that the articulate are able. Some of the most articulate people I know wouldn't know how to operate a newsstand. And I would hate to have our country run by, say, painters, or musicians, or even by poets. Wisdom is often found in the dry and noneloquent analysis of reality.

And finally, there is that myth to which so many of us are beholden—that the purpose of life is to be happy. I know of nothing more demeaning to man that this narcotic pursuit of "fun." People no longer say, "Goodbye." They say, "Have fun!" Now, where was it written that life can ever be easy, or free of conflict or pain? Those who want the refuge of happiness can find it in tranquilizing pills, or in senility.

There was a time when men were permitted the dignity of depression, when we were permitted moods, and preoccupation, and uncertainty. But under the vulgarized diffusion of psychiatric "insights," we are all made to think that, not only must we be happy, but we must never feel depressed. Even worse—you must feel guilty about feeling depressed.

MOODS AND SYMPTOMS

We are no longer allowed to have a mood without having it interpreted as a "symptom." We are no longer permitted to be ill without raising grave suspicions that we are, in fact, "sick" (as in "sick-sick-sick"). We can no longer say that someone needs help without meeting superior and knowing smiles: "Help" doesn't mean aid, any more; it means "cure."

The purpose of life is not to be happy—but to matter, to be productive, to be useful, to have it make some difference that you lived at all.

I end this happy occasion with a little creed, a creed to which, in my judgment, all freemen must forever hold fast. We must forever oppose hysteria and error, even when error is wrapped in patriotism, even when error is embraced by those we like. We must learn that those we like are not always right, and those we don't like are not always wrong; for an idea has nothing to do with who is for it or who is against it.

WE MUST LEARN

We must learn to seek change without violence. Always change, and never violence—not even in words, much less in deeds.

We must try to understand each other by reconciling ourselves to the fact that most of us never really mature; we simply grow taller.

We must meet fanaticism with courage, and idealism with caution.

We must be skeptical of that which is promised, but not proved.

We must be strong enough to be gentle.

We must know that life will always have unbearable stretches of loneliness, and that we can never truly be understood—even by those who love us; that we cannot completely understand someone else, no matter how much we want to. We must moderate, therefore, our demands on others.

We must have the courage to live without absolutes, without dogmas, the courage to seek imaginative escapes from the straitjackets of conformity, knowing—with Emerson "Whosoever would be a man, must be a nonconformist."

We must learn to meet life in a series of tentative and impermanent approximations, knowing that the final goals may never be reached, that the last truths may be forever unknowable, but that life holds nothing more precious than the process by which, to the fullest stretches of which man is capable, we stretch the mind and the heart.

THE DEFICIENCIES OF THE MERCHANT SHIP CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in this day and age, we frequently face great difficulty in placing first things first. I sympathize with those in high places who have the responsibility of assigning priorities, in order of rank, to our national objectives. By and large, I find little with which to quibble. But, in our intense preoccupation with matching or besting the Russians on a wide score of long-range fronts, we may be unwittingly overlooking an area in which our avowed enemy could soon surpass us, to our detriment from both a short-range and long-range standpoint. I refer to the lifeline of our commerce by sea—our privately owned merchant marine.

This is, of course, sound reason for the Russians' latter-day interest in a maritime capability. It is an instrument of economic as well as psychological warfare—to say nothing of its advantage as a defense auxiliary. Starting from scratch in the post-World War II period, the U.S.S.R. has built a merchant marine which threatens to overshadow all other maritime powers throughout the world. From all accounts, even as the Kremlin devotes all-out efforts to putting a man on the moon ahead of the United States, its race for commercial seapower supremacy continues to be pressed vigorously.

Shipyards behind the Iron Curtain are busy, and orders for the construction of additional freighters to carry the hammer and sickle to all areas of the globe have been placed with shipyards in some free nations.

By contrast, the United States seems to struggle annually with its conscience where a merchant marine is concerned. And, regrettably, the maritime industry seems always to be the first target of retrenchment efforts when budget crises arise. Disregarded at such times are the views of various Presidents of the United States who, particularly in this century, have emphatically declared the merchant marine to be absolutely essential to the best interests of our country.

Bearing out such official views is the incontestable fact that the 5,000 cargo vessels built at such huge costs under wartime pressures were a major factor in the allied victory in World War II. Winston Churchill and U.S. military leaders in that war are agreed on that. However, such wartime building programs create peacetime problems of vessel obsolescence which twice have burdened our economy and impaired our competitive capacity vis a vis the maritime fleets of the world.

It was to avert this threat of mass obsolescence, and to assure maintenance of our merchant marine at top efficiency that the current phased program of vessel replacement was developed by the Maritime Administration in 1958. Unfortunately, in the 5 years of the program, the minimum annual goal of 25 new vessels was achieved only once, in fiscal 1961. The current year program was allowed to bog down to the point where only seven new vessels were to be contracted for, but there was such a howl of protest, countrywide, that six vessels for the Moore McCormack line, scheduled to be placed under contract in early July, were advanced to June in the scheduling. Thus fiscal year 1962 will see only 13 vessels placed under contract, a far cry from the 30 vessel minimum, later scaled down to 25, which had been deemed essential annually if the replacement goal were to be achieved.

What of fiscal 1963? Well, more than $90 million of funds authorized for spending in fiscal 1962 were carried over to fiscal 1963, and supplemented by $50 million of new funds, to provide for building 18 new vessels. Thus the 2-year total of 31 vessels placed under contract, would be just one vessel above the original contemplated annual number, 30.

In effect, the Budget once again has failed to provide the funds necessary to attain the national maritime policy so often proclaimed in statutes, of "a merchant marine sufficient to carry * * * a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce * * * capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war * * * and composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels." At a rate of 31 vessels in 2 years, it would require 12 years to replace the remainder of the present subsidized fleet. Final contracts would be placed in fiscal 1975, for delivery in fiscal 1977. This would require retention in service of vessels as much as 30 to 33 years—which assuredly would not represent the "best-equipped, safest and most suitable types of vessels" envisioned in the national policy enunciated in the 1920, 1936, 1946, and other statutes.

This replacement program sequence bears eloquent testimony to the back-of-the-hand treatment usually applied by the Administration to the merchant marine. The program was developed by the Maritime Administration, the agency established by Congress to carry out the national policy for an "adequate * * * modern * * * safe" commercial fleet. At that time, and for many years before, the normal life of a commercial passenger liner or dry cargo vessel was accepted universally as 20 years. Beyond that, lack of modern features, increasing repairs, and so forth, were felt to make vessels over 20 years of age uneconomic.

Then budget difficulties arose—and suddenly, under the previous administration, the theory was advanced, and finally enacted into law, to set the normal vessel life at 25 years. Now under this administration, it develops that replacement of vessels on a 25- to 30-year basis becomes entirely feasible. Thus vessel life is lengthened from 20 to a possible 30-year span—and minimum annual replacement goals are lowered from 30 to 25, to 13 in fiscal 1961, and 18 for fiscal 1963. Concurrently, budget appropriations for Government's participation in the program go down, down, down.

At the same time the Nation is told by Government's mobilization planners that our merchant shipping fleet is inferior in many respects.

At this point, in my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an appraisal of "Ocean Shipping To Support the Defense of the United States," prepared just about 1 year ago by Vice Adm. John Sylvester, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations—Logistics.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCEAN SHIPPING TO SUPPORT THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

INTRODUCTION

The United States must be prepared today—and throughout the foreseeable future—to deal immediately and effectively with any emergency that may be forced upon us. We must be ready at all times to fight limited wars, or general war, or to support our foreign policies under tense conditions short of actual conflict.

The prosecution of war might employ the full range of our Nation's resources. Our entire industrial capability is available to be integrated into our overall national defense effort. To support sustained combat operations and to project our military power overseas, our Armed Forces would rely heavily upon American industry. Our maritime industry would play a central role, supplying the raw materials to feed domestic industries and carrying the bulk of our troops and their equipment and supplies to oversea areas.

The strategic importance of ocean transportation in wartime dictates that the United States must have under its control sufficient active merchant-type shipping to promptly meet our initial emergency sealift requirements.

Our present capability to handle this task is marginal at best. The slow rate of progress made in the replacement of aging vessels has left us facing the 1960's with a largely obsolescent merchant marine. Orderly shipbuilding programs and replacement programs should be instituted without further delay.

It is often proposed that we rely on our friends among the European maritime nations to provide our emergency shipping needs We should keep in mind that the interests of the United States are global, and emergencies may well arise wherein our interests would not be identical with those of our European allies. Even within the NATO framework it appears probable that the combined requirements of the NATO nations will exceed the total capabilities of the NATO shipping pool.

BACKGROUND

At the outbreak of World War I, shipping available for charter to American interests suddenly became extremely scarce. Charter rates skyrocketed. We were forced to hastily improvise a shipbuilding program which was both costly and inefficient, and peak production was not reached until after the war ended. We learned in World War I that the law of supply and demand is real. We were subjected to the same lesson again in World War II.

The primary mission of the American merchant marine is the task of transporting our domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of our foreign export and import ocean trade. Our industrial economy is now dependent on sea transportation for the importation of vast amounts of petroleum, metal ores and other raw materials, and for the exportation of finished products. No other type of transportation can meet these tremendous requirements. It is imperative that the world's foremost trader control sufficient merchant shipping to transport what we need, when and where we need it. This is true from the standpoint of our emergency requirements, and it is also valid when we consider the outflow of dollars in payment for foreign-controlled shipping services.

A collateral and extremely important mission of the American merchant marine is the maintenance of a posture of strength and readiness that will contribute to our national security. In the event of either limited or general war we would require the services of a large number of merchant-type ships to meet our military, industrial, and civilian demands.

It is important that the ability to meet our anticipated wartime needs be insured to the maximum practicable degree in peacetime by the ready availability of active, privately owned merchant ships employed in gainful ocean commerce. Only actively employed merchant ships can provide the rapid response required. Further it is only the active merchant marine that will provide in peacetime the employment for skilled American seafarers in sufficient numbers to allow effective wartime personnel expansion of our maritime effort. The magnitude and quality of active U.S. commercial tonnage in peacetime will determine, in the event of a future war, whether or not we will be required to initiate crash programs for shipbuilding and personnel procurement. Even so, we cannot presume that time will be available.

REQUIREMENTS AND AVAILABILITIES

Periodic evaluations of merchant shipping requirements and availabilities are made jointly by the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Similar joint appraisals are made by the Maritime Administration and the Navy Department.

These evaluations of shipping availabilities have consistently shown that the United States does not have sufficient active merchant shipping to meet our initial needs for general war, even when we combine the total of U.S.-flag and U.S.-controlled foreign-flag shipping. Consequently, our estimated total capabilities must include planned early activations from the National Defense Reserve Fleet—under optimum assumed conditions which make no allowances for possible damage to shore facilities. Some allowance is made for cumulative losses of shipping from enemy action.

It is expected that a new joint Navy-MARAD review of merchant shipping requirements, and availabilities will be completed this summer. The last such joint review was conducted in May 1959 and updated in mid-1960.

Our sea transportation resources for limited war are currently under review and reappraisal by the Department of Defense for determination of the present capability of sealift to support military requirements under varying limited war conditions. Pending this reappraisal, these resources are considered as quantitatively adequate in the tanker category. Qualitatively, particularly in terms of cargo ship speed and characteristics, much improvement is highly desirable.

The degree of promptness with which sealift responds in an emergency will have an important impact on the eventual outcome. A limited war crisis could well become a race against time to evacuate nationals, to redeploy troops, and equipment, or to augment and resupply existing forces overseas. To be prepared for such situations, we must rely on the ready availability of active modern merchant ships of all types.

PRESENT CAPABILITIES

Existing inventories of sealift resources under U.S. flag, as of January 1, 1961, are summarized below:

	Number	Deadweight tonnage
a. Dry cargo ships:		
Operational	703	7,586,900
Reserve fleet	[1] 1,387	14,146,300
Total	2,090	21,733,200
b. Tankers:		
Operational	373	7,121,500
Reserve fleet	86	1,083,700
Total	459	8,205,200
c. Passenger ships-transports:		
Operational	47	[2] 71,301
Reserve fleet	107	[2] 259,233
Total	154	[2] 330,534

[1] Includes about a thousand Liberty ships of little or no wartime value, recommended for scrapping.

[2] Passengers (emergency capacity).

Additional sealift resources consisting of certain active vessels under the so-called flags of convenience as of January 1, 1961, are as follows:

	Number	Deadweight tonnage
a. Cargo ships:		
General cargo and reefer	97	941,500
Bulk cargo	71	1,728,600
Total	168	2,670,100
b. Tankers	282	8,360,600
c. Passenger transports	5	[1] 7,900

[1] Passenger emergency capacity.

The active U.S. flag sealift capability is comprised of active merchant ships under U.S. flag and merchant-type ships operated by the Military Sea Transportation Service (MSTS).

The additional sealift resources listed consist of certain foreign-registered merchant ships considered as under "Effective U.S. Control" for emergency use. The term "Effective U.S. Control" applies to selected American-owned ships which have been registered by their owners under the so-called "flags of convenience" (Panama, Liberia and Honduras), in order to reduce operating costs. In such cases, the Maritime Administration has negotiated agreements with the parent shipping companies in the United States to make these ships (which in the main are large tankers and bulk ore carriers) available to the U.S. Government in the event of a national emergency. The Department of Defense and the Maritime Administration consider that such ships can be reasonably expected to be available and are therefore under "Effective U.S. Control."

The vast proportion of our U.S. flag merchant tonnage was constructed under the World War II building programs: 79 percent of our dry cargo and 54 percent of our tanker tonnage are in the 15- to 19-year-old age bracket. Nearly all of these ships were mass produced for specific wartime purposes. Many of their design features were matters of expediency rather than choice. They have long been outmoded from the standpoint of modern design.

The capabilities shown as comprising the national defense reserve fleet may be misleading. It should be pointed out that about 1,000 of the dry cargo ships are slow-speed Liberty types of extremely limited usefulness. Over 300 Liberties have already been sold for scrapping under approvals to select and scrap 780 of the poorest quality ships. Their marginal value did not warrant the cost of further preservation efforts. Of the 107 transport/passenger ships, 51 are 17 knot C-4 austerity transports and 23 are 15.5 knot Victory troopships.

We can look forward to further depreciation of the overall potential of the reserve fleet—from the standpoints of both quantity and quality. Consequently, there is an obvious need that the reserve fleet be upgraded by the trade-in of aging ships under orderly replacement programs. This requirement goes hand-in-hand with the need to modernize our active merchant fleet.

DRY CARGO SHIPS

Only 1.7 percent of the U.S.-flag tonnage of dry cargo ships are under 5 years of age. Only 5.9 percent are from 5 to 9 years old. This latter age group includes the Mariner class ships, that were built by the U.S. Government, plus a few modern container ship conversions. The 20-knot C-4 Mariners, which can do 23 knots if required, represent an impressive step forward in cargo ship design. Their performance has been highly praised by several private operators, to whom 29 of the ships were sold. Three of these ships have been converted into passenger ships. The defense sealift value of the Mariner class ships is very high.

With regard to future construction of dry cargo ships, the Department of Defense recommends that the design characteristics listed below be incorporated to the maximum degree that is commercially practicable:

(a) Speed: When built under construction-differential subsidy contracts and certified as being suitable for economical and speedy conversion into naval auxiliaries, dry cargo ships should have a sustained sea speed of 20 knots or better. Dry cargo ships certified as otherwise suitable for the use of the U.S. Government in time of war on national emergency, should have the maximum sustained sea speed possible consistent with the commercial utilization of the ship. Where construction subsidies and/or national defense allowance are not involved, the owners are encouraged to build into the ships, the highest commerically economical speeds.

(b) Other characteristics: The most practical and useful types of general-cargo vessels, from a military point of view, appear to be those having the capacity and characteristics of the C-3's and C-4's (particularly Mariners), of Maritime Administration design. However, much is to be desired in the matter of modernization with respect to cargo handling equipment and methods. Cargo vessels should be designed and equipped to load and discharge, using their own gear, in one-half the time now required by the existing C-3's and C-4's. At least one hatch of each vessel should be served by a "jumbo" boom of 60 tons capacity and all hatches should be equipped with 10-ton booms. There is a definite need for a limited number of heavy lift ships equipped with oversized hatches and cargo booms capable of lifting up to 150 tons.

(c) Special type cargo ships: Roll-on/roll-off ships on the order of the USNS *Comet* as well as ships with partial roll-on/roll-off capability offer advantages in meeting requirements for the oversea movement of mobile military equipment such as wheeled and tracked vehicles. Additionally, we encourage the continued development of "container cargo" ships, which are designed to carry containerized and prepalletized cargoes. Further construction of such ships in peacetime would increase active capability and afford operating experience. U.S. shipyards would also gain construction experience which would enable them to commence early production under an emergency situation.

TANKERS

American shipowners have built a good number of modern tankers in the past few years—some constructed in the United States for registry under U.S.-flag but most built abroad for registry under foreign flag. Of the U.S.-flag tanker tonnage, 26.5 percent is under 5 years old. These new ships range in speed from 16 to 18 knots. Consequently, the overall quality of our total tanker capability is much better than the dry cargo category.

The tanker building program should continue in order to provide orderly replacement of aging ships. It is recommended that future tanker construction incorporate design features as indicated below:

(a) Speed: Where national defense allowances are made, and the ships are certified as suitable for speedy and economical conversion into naval auxiliaries, tankers should be capable of a sustained speed of 20 knots or more.

(b) Other characteristics: Although tankers of larger DWT capacity can be utilized to a limited extent, the recommended general characteristics of commercial tankers most suitable for military purposes are 25,000 to 32,000 DWT, capable of carrying several types of petroleum products. At the same time, there is still a requirement for smaller tankers of about 17,000 DWT to handle products to and from limited terminal facilities. All new commercial tankers should have the ability for transfer of their cargo at sea to provide a limited fueling-at-sea capability. Further, this capability should be added to existing tankers when it is feasible to do so. The expense of the necessary modifications and equipment are relatively small, in the magnitude of $17,000 per ship. Tankers so equipped will be capable of replenishing fleet oilers at sea or in unimproved harbors. Under emergency conditions, such tankers could provide fuel directly to combatant fleet units.

PASSENGER SHIPS/TRANSPORTS

Seven new passenger ships have been built since World War II and three have been converted from Mariner class cargo ships. The seven new ships are the 25-knot *Constitution* and *Independence*, the 33-knot *United States*, the 20-knot *Santa Paula* and *Santa Rosa*, and the 21-knot *Brasil* and *Argentina*. The Mariner conversions are the 20-knot *Mariposa*, *Monterey*, and *Atlantic*. These ships have contributed significantly to our maritime prestige and to our defense readiness.

Additionally, the 19-knot *President Cleveland* and *President Wilson* were converted from troopships. These ships, however, are basically World War II types. They form a part of the older, and major segment of our total trooplift capability, which is not fully suitable for possible future emergencies. The majority of our ships are old, deficient in speed, and lacking in other features that are important in minimizing the hazards of moving troops by sea.

There is an urgent need to improve the quality of our trooplift potential, and in this regard the construction of the two authorized but unfunded superliners should be expedited. For ships that will be employed in wartime to transport personnel through areas in which hostile modern submarines may be operating, it is necessary to set much higher standards of performance and safety than would be required for ships carrying dry cargo and fuel.

(a) Speed: Speed is the best defense that merchant ships can employ against an enemy. The faster the target, the more difficult it is to hit with submarine torpedoes—or to pin-point with aircraft-launched missiles. Fast ships can be operated independently over more devious routes than is possible in convoy operations. This complicates the search and attack problems of enemy aircraft and submarines. Studies and analysis confirm that vulnerability to submarine attack is significantly and progressively reduced as speeds of 20 to 25 knots and greater are attained.

Troopships constructed in the future, and passenger ships suitable for conversion into troopships, should be capable of a sustained speed of 25 knots or greater. In no case should their maximum sustained speed be less than 20 knots.

The Department of Defense has consistently and repeatedly urged that all new merchant-type shipbuilding incorporate the maximum speed that is economically practicable. In this regard, it is important that our merchant ships be commercially successful. To be of immediate use to the Department of Defense in an emergency, they must be operating commercially at the time they are first needed.

(b) Other features: Emphasis on added speed should not obscure the significance of other national defense features which can be built into a merchant ship. High standards of compartmentation reduce vulnerability to enemy hazards by localizing damage. Various preventative measures increase a ship's resistance to the spread of fire. Special mountings minimize breakdowns of essential machinery under shock.

Endurance adequate for round-trip voyages at maximum sustained speed is a vital factor in wartime. Additional fuel capacity, the size of distilling plants, the storage space for provisions, and many other design aspects have an important bearing on endurance. Many of the foregoing factors, aside from improving the wartime utility of a ship, also assure safer, more versatile and reliable performance in peacetime commercial operations.

FUTURE OUTLOOK

The subsidized segment of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet amounts to 313 berth line ships. They operate over essential trade routes under mandatory voyage scheduling procedures dictated by the Maritime Administration. Several unsubsidized shipping companies have applications pending for Governmental subsidy.

The rate of replacement of subsidized ships is much slower than that considered necessary to avoid future obsolescence "in block." The replacement program for fiscal 1962 has been set at 14 ships; proper replacement even on a 25-year life basis, will require 25 to 30 ships per year.

The 85th Congress authorized, but did not appropriate funds for, the construction of two large high-speed passenger ships—one of 33 knots and one of 30 knots speed. Construction of these two ships would significantly improve our trooplift potential. They would almost double our active capability in the important speed range of 25 knots and above.

The rate of progress of the building programs will depend on actions taken in the future with respect to construction-differential subsidies. It is hoped that it will be practicable for future governmental subsidy funding to keep pace with the contractual schedules for replacement.

Our unsubsidized shipping companies operate approximately 600 ships under U.S. flag. Few unsubsidized operators, if any, have either a comprehensive or a long-range plan for the replacement of aging ships on an orderly time schedule.

Over the past year, increasing pressure has been exerted against "flags of convenience" by maritime labor organizations through the courts and the labor relations boards. This pressure is making it less and less practicable for American owners to operate their ships under "flags of convenience." This raises the question as to what steps should be taken to insure the continued availability of these ships for purposes of national defense. It is important to note that well over half of the tanker tonnage available to United States control is registered under the flags of Liberia and Panama.

Prior to the outbreak of World War II, the part of our shipping that was engaged in the coastal and intercoastal trade was the largest segment of the U.S. merchant marine. At that time nearly 700 ships took part in the carriage of our deepwater domestic trade. Shortly after our entry into the war, practically the entire coastal and intercoastal merchant fleet, which at that time represented about 60 percent of our total ocean-carrying capability, was put into service, usually transocean, directly supporting the war.

With the domestic deep-water fleet engaged, worldwide, in supplying the Allied Armed Forces, the domestic trade which they formerly carried was absorbed by other modes of transportation. The domestic deepwater common carriers have never regained their former status. Only 3 companies with a total of 15 ships are currently furnishing common carrier service. One of these, the Luckenbach Steamship Co., has announced its intention to terminate its intercoastal service, which will leave only 10 ships in this trade.

Ships engaged in coastal and intercoastal trade occupy a particularly significant position relative to the emergency use of transportation. Ships in the coastwise trades are the most readily available for emergency usage of any ships in the U.S. merchant fleet. In their normal operations they are always close to U.S. ports, ready immediately to handle such high-priority movements as may be necessary. Of course, to be available for immediate use, these ships must be active and operating commercially at the time they are first needed.

At the onset of a major, nuclear war, the domestic deepwater fleet would be uniquely fitted to act as a link between our coastal cities during the period of likely disruption of systems of land transportation. A large percentage of the ships in domestic trade would be at sea at any given time and would therefore be most likely to escape damage. Their ability to provide communications and transportation between coastal cities during the period just after an attack could be highly important. Systems of land transportation in the United States are especially vulnerable at many focal points. The ability of the domestic deepwater fleet to provide essential coastal and intercoastal movements of priority material might well be crucial. A number of the ships of this fleet are especially adapted for rapid cargo handling, giving them an increased value at such a critical time.

EMERGENCY EXPANSION

One basic factor to be considered in the development of specific construction programs is the necessity for the maintenance of a sufficient number of private shipyards in operation to form the base for expansion in time of war to meet large ship construction and ship repair programs. The Department of Defense has emphasized that the existence of these active privately owned shipyards, together with the skills of the shipyard workers and the capabilities of the tools, equipment and facilities, is essential to the national defense.

SUMMARY

Under the most optimistic assumptions, and on a quantitative basis only, the United States still possesses a marginal capability to carry out the sea transportation tasks of a general war.

There are serious qualitative deficiencies in our overall sealift capability, particularly in the dry-cargo ship and the transport-passenger ship categories. The further aging of outmoded ships will aggravate this situation.

The present rate of new shipbuilding will not offset the rapidly approaching block obsolescence of the vast proportion of U.S.-controlled merchant-type tonnage—both active and reserve. There is an urgent need for increased emphasis on orderly ship construction.

The continued depreciation of ships in the National Defense Reserve Fleet without cyclic purification will soon generate serious quantitative deficiencies in our total sealift capability.

Crash building programs in wartime can only be avoided by maintaining a modern and adequate maritime posture in peacetime.

CONCLUSION

In order for the United States to maintain adequate merchant shipping to meet our initial wartime needs, it is important that the ships of both subsidized and nonsubsidized operators be periodically replaced under orderly and progressive programs. In so doing, every advantage should be taken of recent and future technological developments. Cargo-handling equipment and propulsion plants should be further improved—with a view to reducing the transit and turnaround times of commercial shipping.

Our shipbuilding programs should be farsighted in order that ships contracted for in coming years will be actually competitive throughout their economic lifespan. Ships built with foresight will be more readily adaptable to speedy and economical conversion into naval auxiliaries, or otherwise suitable for naval use in the event of war.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 4, 1961.

DEAR MR. HOOD: The President has asked me to acknowledge your letter of November 28. The importance of seapower to the vitality and strength of the Nation is so well acknowledged it needs no demonstration. We cannot permit this element in our strength to deteriorate.

The state of the Union message is not yet being drafted, but we appreciate having your suggestion for consideration.

Sincerely,

MYER FELDMAN,
Deputy Special Counsel to the President.

SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., November 28, 1961.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: History records that no leading world power has long retained its position without seapower—the sum total of ships, weapons, shipyard capacity, and geography which enable a nation to use the sea advantageously during war and peace. It records that a world power cannot long survive without the means to support its own commerce and trade. It is a historical fact that as a nation's total seapower deteriorates, so does its foreign trade—and so does it as a world power. The sun has set on many nations who permitted—perhaps unwittingly—their foreign trade and shipyards to vanish as a result of national apathy in the face of international competition.

But, the Soviet Communist empire is apparently not unaware of these basic historical facts, and according to late dispatches, is making positive efforts to increase its foreign trade and to correct its seapower deficiencies. It is becoming more and more obvious that they intend to solidify their place as a world power by becoming strong in foreign trade and on the seas.

In view of the extraordinary challenges now faced by the United States, we have noted, with increasing concern, reports indicating that the Federal Government is considering abandonment, either temporarily or permanently, of the time proven procedures—subsidies if you will—which make it possible for the United States to have in-being those indispensable components of seapower—an adequate merchant marine and a supporting shipbuilding and ship repair industry. We find these reports incredible, and feel they cannot be safely ignored.

Your convictions as to the role of the United States in promoting the cause of freedom for all mankind have been ably, forcefully, and widely voiced. Yet, the United States—the cornerstone of the free world—is permitting elements of its seapower to be deficient from both a qualitative and quantitive standpoint. That is exactly what is happening in terms of our merchant marine, and we cannot believe you will sanction a further dilution of the Nation's seapower.

Without a subsidy equalization for maritime purposes, ships carrying the U.S. flag cannot compete with lower cost foreign competition; and without this assistance, the U.S. merchant marine will be unable to continue as a customer of U.S. shipbuilding and ship repair yards. While a ship is generally built at the water's edge, countless hours of employment for American working men and women go into the production of materials, components, and services which flow from practically every area in the Nation to the shipyard. In terms of shipyard employment versus employment in supporting activities, an equivalent number of man-hours of work, and frequently more, are performed in areas remote from the coast.

We hope that as part of the discussion of foreign trade in your forthcoming state of the Union message to the Congress, now undoubtedly in preparation, you will include appropriate remarks on the essentiality of an adequate U.S. merchant marine and a sound shipbuilding and ship repair industry in its support. By so doing, you can effectively allay fears that this country will scuttle its merchant marine, and you can energize the passage and approval of suitable legislation and appropriations to insure that this country has an adequate maritime capability to meet any and all uncertainties in the future.

The Shipbuilders Council of America is composed of shipbuilders, ship repairers, and allied suppliers from all sections of the United States, and we fervently hope you will personally give attention to the vital importance of merchant ships and shipyards in-being in these critical times.

Respectfully yours,

EDWIN M. HOOD,
President.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I call my colleagues' attention to this discouraging account of our maritime capability. In summary, it is poor. I find no evidence that the deficiencies mentioned have been corrected or improved in the last 12 months.

One conclusion in this report is deserving of particular emphasis. It reads as follows:

The present rate of new shipbuilding will not offset the rapidly approaching block obsolescence of the vast proportion of U.S.-controlled merchant-type tonnage—both active and reserve. There is an urgent need for increased emphasis on orderly ship construction.

My colleagues will note the reference in the passage I have just read to "orderly ship construction." Here again, though a vessel replacement program under Federal auspices has been underway, I find no evidence that it has been conducted in an orderly fashion. In the first year 15 ships were built, 14 the next, 13 the next, and 31 the next; 13 are scheduled to be placed this year, with the expectation that contracts for 18 vessels will be awarded in fiscal year 1963. This is hardly a healthy diet for the Nation's shipyards—nor could it be called an orderly program by which the shipyards can do any reasonable degree of forward planning which is so essential to the retention of essential skills and which is so essential for the continued employment of American working men and women.

Across my desk recently passed copies of correspondence on this subject from a shipbuilding labor executive to the Secretary of Labor, and I request unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC COAST METAL TRADES
DISTRICT COUNCIL,
San Francisco, Calif., January 4, 1962.

Subject: Federal Maritime Commission budget proposals for shipbuilding funds.

Hon. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GOLDBERG: On behalf of the 10,000 families who make their living in shipbuilding and ship repair on the Pacific coast of the United States, I ask leave to bring to your personal attention a combination of circumstances and apparent Government policies which are a threat to jobs for these 10,000 American families and which, in the opinion of many, constitute a threat to our national security.

This commences with a threefold report first circulating about 5 weeks ago, to the effect that:

1. Department of Commerce is considering freezing all shipbuilding funds for the balance of fiscal 1962, which would affect contracts for several ships scheduled to be bid during this period.

2. A high-placed administration official has recommended a 3-year moratorium on any further ship construction in the Federal Maritime Commission's fleet replacement program, which is designed to build 30 ships per year to 1972.

3. An outside study, prepared for and submitted to the Federal Maritime Commission, points out the opportunities for savings in Federal appropriations by having American merchant vessels built abroad in foreign shipyards—with foreign labor.

Since this report first circulated, repeated inquiries have been made of the Department of Commerce, all of which have elicited the same reply—

1. That Department of Commerce has not issued and does not plan to issue orders discontinuing use of shipbuilding funds,

2. That Commerce cannot estimate the number of shipbuilding contracts that will be let next year,

3. That Commerce plans are proceeding on the "assumption that a goodly number of American ships will be built in American shipyards during the next few years with the aid of construction subsidies."

No comments have been made concerning the reported 3-year moratorium or the citation of savings that could be made if we built our ships in foreign yards with foreign labor.

As the chief operating official of the Pacific Coast Metal Trades Council, I have made an earnest effort to determine just what the facts are. I respectfully submit to your office that the following is an accurate description of the situation facing our union members today:

1. The Congress and the executive branch of our Government in 1957 embarked on a long-range fleet replacement program, aimed at building 30 ships per year to replace our World War II built ships, now obsolete.

2. In reliance on this program, thousands of families, hundreds of small businesses, and numerous large shipbuilding yards, made heavy financial commitments, which for the families as well as the companies cannot be amortized unless this program goes forward to completion or substantially to completion.

3. Now, however, these same families and business organizations are faced with a full 6-month period—from January 1 to about June 30, 1962, during which only one ship will be contracted for.

4. This gap in the shipbuilding program, while now in terms of contract signing, will in the months ahead turn out to be a period of unemployment in the shipbuilding trades in the United States, and a serious gap in the replacement program, which Defense Department officials have repeatedly stated is so important to our national security. Shipbuilding cannot operate on a stop-start basis and be efficient.

5. We are informed on what we believe to be reliable authority that this threat to jobs and national security has resulted from:

(a) A willingness on the part of some steamship operators to postpone—or "stretch out"—the performance of their contracts with the Maritime Commission to replace their World War II ships with new vessels built in American yards.

(b) An equal willingness for, and even implied urging by certain Commerce Department officials, of a slowdown in the program, instead of some effort to adhere to the 30 ships per year objective.

Most alarming of all, we are reliably informed—and Commerce officials have broadly hinted—that in the budget proposals now being discussed with the White House, no funds whatsoever will be requested for shipbuilding for fiscal 1963. This reportedly is on the ground that the 6-month gap outlined above has left some $120 million over in this year's appropriations which can be used in 1963. Obviously if this occurs, no extra funds would be available in 1963 to make up for a half year of no contracts in 1962.

We are not military people, and we know that military decisions are not the province of our Department of Labor. However, we cannot help but be astonished when our Nation embarks upon a long-range fleet replacement program with the full endorsement of the Defense Department and after a few halting years of operation, we find the program scuttled by some mysterious indifference or desire to smother it—all of this at a time when the Congress and the administration are calling for full speed ahead in every other area of defense.

We have no desire to suggest the involvement of your Department in matters not in the realm of labor's interest. And should inquiries by you result in a determination that your Department has no legitimate interest in this matter, we should not expect your Department to pursue it further. In view, however, of the extraordinary circumstances surrounding this important defense program, and its impact on American jobs—plus the overtones of building foreign with foreign labor, we respectfully request that you make such inquiries as you deem appropriate and furnish us with what information you feel can properly be passed along to our members.

Yours very truly,

Thomas A. Rotell,
Secretary-Treasurer, Pacific Coast Metal Trades Council.

January 10, 1962.

Hon. Arthur J. Goldberg,
Secretary of Labor,
U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.:

This supplements Rotell letter January 4 to you relating FMC shipbuilding funds. Since that letter the undersigned have had brought to their attention publication entitled "Weekly Outlook Letter" for January 6, 1962, published by Simmons Boardman Publishing Corp., 30 Church Street, New York, and National Press Building, Washington, D.C. Page 1 of that publication attributes to Federal Maritime Administration revised bid dates on total of 18 ships for 3 lines. Original bid dates are listed, as well as new revised dates. Significantly, when the new contract award dates are revised backward the same number of days each of the bid dates have been revised forward. Contract award dates for all of these 18 ships fall into fiscal year 1962, rather than in fiscal 1963, as per following table:

Line	Ships	Bid opening		Contract date	
		Old	New	Old	New
United States	7	Mar. 30	May 15	June 25	Aug. 10
Lykes	7	Apr. 3	July 26	June 26	Oct. 18
Grace	4	Mar. 4	July 2	May 21	Sept. 18

This is so startling a coincidence it obviously raises inference these revised dates were deliberately contrived to push a total of 18 ships over the June 30, 1962, line into fiscal 1963, thus enabling Commerce Department to forego requesting any shipbuilding funds in budget reportedly to go to Congress January 18. On page 3 our letter January 4 we reported being reliably informed, and reported broad hints by Commerce Department officials, that no shipbuilding funds would be sought for 1963.

In view above circumstances we respectfully request you obtain if possible answers to following questions:

1. Who initiated these delays resulting in a famine for second half fiscal year 1962?

2. By what authority were these delays contrived?

3. Did Defense Department approve these delays?

4. What action can be taken to reinstate original bidding and contracting dates?

5. If impossible reinstate original bid dates can new dates nonetheless be revised again and thus these 18 ships be reinstated as part of 1962 fiscal year?

We believe it essential these 18 ships be reinstated in fiscal 1962. If not, will be only 7 ships awarded this year as against 31 the year before. We completely in accord governmental economy, but as long as Defense Department endorses strong merchant marine, and as long as untold billions are appropriated for missiles, rockets and highly controversial moon shots, we will insist on continuation of at least this threadbare shipbuilding program of 30 ships per year.

Respectfully submitted.

Pacific Coast Metal Trades District Council,
Gordon Puckett,
President.
Seattle, Wash.
Thomas A. Rotell,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.
San Francisco.
Henry McCarthy,
Vice President.
Portland, Oreg.
M. E. McLaren,
Vice President.
Seattle, Wash.
Joseph Ziff,
Vice President.
San Francisco.
A. J. Timmons,
Vice President.
Huntington Park, Calif.
John Starke,
Vice President.
Tacoma, Wash.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the vessel replacement program has several very important facets of vital importance to the prosperity and security of our country, as well as to the economy of the thousands of skilled craftsmen in the 12 shipyards—4 of them on the west coast—which currently build oceangoing vessels.

After long investigation and study by responsible committees of the Congress, at various times in the past half century, Congress has declared it to be in the national interest to have at hand at all times, a modern, privately owned merchant marine adequate for the needs of peace and of war. The vessel replacement program now underway constitutes the soundest, most adequate, most economical approach to implementation of that policy that our country has ever embarked upon.

I think it is a mistake to slow down that program on the theory that vessels can be modern, safe, and competitive when they are long past what has been accepted generally as the normal, economic vessel lifespan. We not only must have in being at all times the adequate, modern commercial fleet that our national maritime policy envisions, but, as a necessary companion and support of that adequate fleet, we must have in being at all times a modern, well-equipped shipbuilding industry, capable of meeting any emergency needs of the future.

I believe we are failing to implement the national maritime policy both as to an adequate merchant marine and as to an efficient shipbuilding industry when we move at half speed in the replacement program as we are doing.

I speak not only for our west coast shipyards but also for the entire strategic shipbuilding capacity of our Nation when I say we cannot, we must not, in our concern for a future in outer space, take from our maritime industry the support it needs to meet the problems of the present day.

I hope the Congress will see fit to remedy the deficiency in the maritime budget for fiscal 1963 by providing additional funds for vessel construction that will put the vessel replacement program back in stride.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE, TEXAS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 4) to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the pending business is Senate bill 4. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be adopted en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 5, line 4, after the word "of", to strike out "his" and insert "the improved"; on page 6, line 14, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "may" and insert "shall"; in line 16, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "oil and gas"; in line 19, after the word "of", to strike out "the" and insert "such", and in the same line, after the word "minerals", to insert "from beneath the surface of those lands and waters and the land and waters adjacent thereto"; after line 22, to insert:

"(d) Any acquisition hereunder shall exclude and shall not diminish any right of occupation or use of the surface under grants, leases, or easements existing on the effective date of this Act which are reasonably necessary for the exploration, development, production, storing, processing, or transporting of oil and gas minerals that are removed from outside the boundaries of the national seashore or from the lands or waters within the boundaries of the national seashore and the Secretary may grant additional rights of occupation or use of the surface for the purposes aforesaid upon the terms and under such regulations as may be prescribed by him."

On page 7, line 9, after "Sec. 6.", to insert "(a)"; after line 20, to insert:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, land and waters now or hereafter included in any migratory bird refuge within the boundaries of the Padre Island National Seashore shall continue as such refuge under applicable laws and regulations, but such lands and waters shall be a part of the seashore and shall be administered by the Secretary for recreational uses not inconsistent with the purposes of such refuge under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. Nothing in this Act shall limit the power of the Secretary to acquire lands and waters for any migratory bird refuge."

And, on page 8, line 7, after the word "be", to strike out "appropirated" and insert "appropriated"; so as to make the bill read:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That in order to save and preserve, for purposes of public recreation, benefit, and inspiration, a portion of the diminishing seashore of the United States that remains undeveloped, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to take appropriate action in the public interest toward the establishment of the national seashore set forth in section 2 of this Act.

"Sec. 2. The area comprising the portion of the land and waters of Padre Island situated in the coastal waters that is described below is designated for establishment as the 'Padre Island National Seashore':

"Beginning at a point one mile northerly of North Bird Island on the easterly line of the Intracoastal Waterway; thence due east to a point on Padre Island one mile west of the mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico; thence southwesterly paralleling the said mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico, a distance of about three and five-tenths miles; thence due east to the two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on United States Coast and Geodetic Survey chart numbered 1286; thence along the said two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on United States Coast and Geodetic Survey charts numbered 1286, 1287, and 1288 for a distance of approximately eighty-five miles; thence westerly crossing Padre Island to the easterly line of the Intracoastal Waterway at a point northerly of Three Island; thence northerly following the easterly line of the Intracoastal Waterway as indicated by channel markers in the Laguna Madre to the point of beginning.

"Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to require by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, the land, waters, and other property, and improvements thereon and any interest therein, within the area described in section 2 of this Act or which lies within the boundary of the seashore as established under section 4 of this Act (hereinafter referred to as 'such area'). Any property, or interest therein, owned by the State of Texas or political subdivision thereof may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized to pay for any acquisitions which he makes by purchase under this Act their fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, who may in his discretion base his determination on an independent appraisal obtained by him.

"(c) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property located within such area and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area. The properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, provided that the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

"Sec. 4. (a) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage in the area described in section 2 of this Act, that is in the opinion of the Secretary efficiently administrable to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall establish the area as a national seashore by the publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

"(b) Such notice referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall contain a detailed description of the boundaries of the seashore which shall encompass an area as nearly as practicable identical to the area described in section 2 of this Act. The Secretary shall forthwith after the date of publication of such notice in the Federal Register (1) send a copy of such notice, together with a map showing such boundaries, by registered or certified mail to the Governor of the State of Texas and to the governing body of each of the political subdivisions involved; (2) cause a copy of such notice and map to be published in one or more newspapers which circulate in each of the localities; and (3) cause a certified copy of such notice, a copy of such map, and a copy of this Act to be recorded at the registry of deeds for the county involved.

"Sec. 5. (a) Any owner or owners (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as 'owner') of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain the right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner, the death of his spouse, or the day his last surviving child reaches the age of twenty-one, whichever is the latest. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. In any case where such an owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right may during its existence be conveyed or leased, in whole, but not in part. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

"(b) As used in this Act, the term 'improved property' shall mean a private noncommercial dwelling, including the land on which it is situated, whose construction was begun before September 1, 1959, and structures accessory thereto (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as 'dwelling'), together with such amount and locus of the property adjoining and in the same ownership as such dwelling as the Secretary designates to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of such dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use and occupancy. In making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use and occupancy in which the dwelling and such adjoining property has usually been enjoyed by its owner or occupant. The amount of such adjoining property to be so designated by the Secretary shall in no case be less than three acres in area, or all of such lesser amount as there may be, except that the Secretary may exclude from the amount of adjoining property so designated any beach or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such beach or waters as the Secretary may deem necessary for public access thereto.

"(c) When acquiring land, waters, or interests therein for the Padre Island National Seashore, the Secretary shall permit a reservation by the grantor of all or any part of the oil and gas minerals in such land or waters, with the right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land or waters as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of such minerals from beneath the surface of those lands and waters and the land and waters adjacent thereto, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

"(d) Any acquisition hereunder shall exclude and shall not diminish any right of occupation or use of the surface under grants, leases, or easements existing on the effective date of this Act which are reasonably necessary for the exploration, development, production, storing, processing, or transporting of oil and gas minerals that are removed from outside the boundaries of the national seashore or from the lands or waters within the boundaries of the national seashore and the Secretary may grant additional rights of occupation or use of the surface for the purposes aforesaid upon the terms and under such regulations as may be prescribed by him.

"Sec. 6. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the property acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes', approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535); as amended and supplemented, and in accordance with other laws of general application relating to the national park system as defined by the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496); except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, land and waters now or hereafter included in any migratory bird refuge within the boundaries of the Padre Island National Seashore shall continue as such refuge under applicable laws and regulations, but such lands and waters shall be a part of the seashore and shall be administered by the Secretary for recreational uses not inconsistent with the purposes of such refuge under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. Nothing in this Act shall limit the power of the Secretary to acquire lands and waters for any migratory bird refuge.

"Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act; except that no more than $4,000,000 shall be appropriated for the acquisition of land and waters and improvements thereon, and interests therein, and incidental costs relating thereto, in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 8. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby."

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move that S. 4, the bill to establish Padre Island National Seashore, be recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I suggest the absence of a quorum——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TOWER. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make some requests without the time being counted against the time allotted under the agreement, and that likewise the time taken for the call of the roll under the suggestion of the absence of a quorum not be taken from the time allotted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

There are some very compelling reasons why Senate action on the proposed national seashore on Padre Island be postponed until the next Congress. There is considerable opposition to the present bill in my State of Texas, and it is, I think, soundly based.

Presently, there is an active working committee of the Legislature of the State of Texas which is trying to solve problems of ownership, mineral rights, school funds, and so forth. They are preparing a report for the next session of the State legislature.

I would like to read a wire that I received from the chairman of that committee, Mr. Grainger McIlhaney. I note for the benefit of my friends on the other side of the aisle that the Texas Legislature is made up almost entirely of Democrats. There are 109 Democrats and 2 Republicans. At the time the committee was established, there were no Republicans. There are no Republicans serving on the committee.

The telegram reads as follows:

> As chairman of the legislative land study committee which consists of five house members appointed by the speaker of the house pursuant to house resolution passed during the regular session, 57th session of the Texas Legislature, our committee has been checking into problems involving Padre Island and Laguna Madre which comprises all the acreage in the proposed national seashore area and described in the Yarborough bill, the Young bill, and the Kilgore bill. My committee strongly urges that all action on the proposed national seashore project be withheld during this session of Congress because of problems of ownership of the surface and mineral rights due to survey problems and title questions.
>
> GRAINGER W. MCILHANEY,
> *Chairman, Legislative Land Study Committee.*

I should also like to read into the RECORD the statement by the land commissioner of the State of Texas, the Right Honorable Jerry Sadler. Also, I might note for the benefit of my friends opposite, the Democrats, that this is a statement he made to the members of a committee that was appointed by the Governor of my State to look into the feasibility of establishing a State park on Padre Island. The Governor who appointed the committee is the Right Honorable Price Daniel, a Democrat, and a former Member of this body, who appointed this committee with instructions that they should study the feasibility of making a State park on Padre Island.

Before I read Mr. Sadler's statement to that committee, I should like to note it is my understanding that it has been the policy of the administration to act cooperatively with State governments on conservation, recreation, and park matters.

There seems to be a strong likelihood that the State will act to make Padre Island, or a portion of Padre Island, a State park area. This would take the responsibility away from the Federal Government and would accomplish the objective sought in the Senate bill now pending.

I should like to read this statement by the land commissioner to the special committee.

STATEMENT BY JERRY SADLER TO LAND COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, members of the Padre Island Committee, I am happy for this belated opportunity to discuss the future of Padre Island. I trust all of you understand why I missed the first meeting. It was not from choice, I assure you.

I have a specific duty here, of course, to protect the interest of the 2,500,000 boys and girls who attend our public schools. That is no longer only a mineral estate with a potential of $1 billion. The Reagande la Garza Act provided for industrial development of the area also, with all revenues going to the public school permanent fund. The beaches of Padre Island are State school property as well as its adjacent waters.

There is another reason for opposing the National Seashore Act which I have not divulged until this time. There is great doubt as to the area of school estate which would be handed over to the Federal Government. The figure of 200,000 acres has been bandied about with the conclusion that another 100,000 acres would somehow be acquired from private owners of the island proper.

Those are other men's figures, not mine. In fact, I am asking the attorney general to take action to determine the area of State ownership on the island and its vicinity, and verification of my claim would change these proportions considerably.

I contend, after study of U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey charts Nos. 1286, 1287 and 1288, that the attorney general can recover for the State no less than 70,000 acres now held by private ownership, including some producing oil area, wells actually out in the water and production by directional drilling.

Such recovery would mean a giveaway of at least 250,000 State acres instead of 200,000 and would jeopardize even a greater potential of State school wealth. For the National Seashore Act provides for Federal regulation of all mineral development and it is high time its backers stopped pretending otherwise.

And certainly it behooves this committee to recommend that no consideration be given this national seashore area proposal until Padre ownership is determined.

I will be happy to illustrate on what grounds I ask this action by the attorney general. The present owners of the island proper hold title from a Spanish land grant of the 18th century to Nicholas Balli, a priest of Matamoros. The grant was for 11 leagues or 48,708 acres. According to the Fuente survey of 1828, the island proper contained 49,382 acres.

Then came the survey of 1941, which showed Padre's area to be 135,213 acres. We know from field notes filed in the land office that this survey is in error. One crew started running the west line of Padre from the north while another group worked up from the south. They were exactly 2.51 miles apart when they drew even. It was necessary to project a line of that distance from their surveys to join.

Using the three U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey charts previously mentioned, our engineers calculated Padre's present area to be 65,000 acres.

If an actual survey confirms this claim, then the State will recover some 70,000 acres from the private owners whose rights under the Balli grant extend only to the line of mean higher high tide.

However, I do not wish to leave the impression that the size of the area involved might change my feeling about this proposed giveaway. Even 1 acre of State school land would be too much. Already such giveaways in the so-called public interest have stripped the State school domain down to one-fortieth of the surface area allotted in the constitution of 1876 and its mineral estate to one-fifteenth of the original size.

Both the Governor and attorney general, the other two members of the school land board, have supported my position that the National Seashore Act jeopardizes the billion

> dollar mineral potential of the Padre area. Of course, it precludes any industrial development whatsoever.
>
> I have heard the weak arguments that the national seashore proposal recognizes the State's mineral ownership and that regulation by the Secretary of the Interior will not affect development. I do not believe that it will work for one government to own the minerals and another to control them. That is like giving your daughter in marriage but regulating when the groom may kiss his bride.
>
> It takes only commonsense to realize that any revenues lost to our public schools because of Federal regulations of this area would be balanced by direct taxes levied in Texas school districts.

Mr. President, my reason for reading that was to show the character of the opposition in my State, and to cite some pertinent facts which I think are very significant in connection with this issue. I think the statement pretty well expresses the sense of general opposition to this measure in my State.

There are many other reasons, I believe, why we should further consider the measure and not pass it in this Congress. The bill which has been proposed, as Senators will note by looking at the map against the wall, comprehends an area including quite a bit of mudflats and tidelands which are not needed and which, for the most part, are not suitable for recreation, which cannot very well be developed.

I point out further that the area comprehended by the bill is actually too large, 88.5 miles. This is contrary to the consensus of thinking about how much area should be comprehended by a park on Padre Island.

There is currently pending in the House of Representatives a bill authored by two Representatives from the districts affected, both of whom are Democrats, Representative YOUNG and Representative KILGORE. The bill provides for a substantially smaller area, comprising approximately 65 miles.

A further fly in the ointment is the fact that the State legislature in 1959 approved the idea of a national seashore park comprising only about 45 miles, which is represented by the small area outlined in blue on the map against the wall.

I think, certainly, we must take into consideration the views of the State legislature, of the Governor, of the land commissioner, and of the two Representatives in Congress from the area affected. For the benefit of my friends on the opposite of the aisle, I note they are all good Democrats, with good Democratic backgrounds. I think we should take cognizance of their feelings on this issue.

I further note that the Navy uses a portion of Padre Island as a target area for bombing practice. It is estimated it would cost approximately $202,000 to replace the Navy target range. A question has been appropriately raised, "Where would the range be located?"

About the only suitable area in the vicinity, near the Corpus Christi Naval Station, would be in the middle of the King Ranch, and I tremble to think what might happen if we tried to take over a portion of the King Ranch.

I believe it should further be noted that the cost figure cited, the maximum authorized appropriation for the Padre Island cost, is totally unrealistic. Only $4 million is to be set aside. The more conservative estimates I have heard with respect to land value run from $8 million to $10 million. Some estimates run even very much higher, up to $45 million or $50 million.

I have communicated with a real estate appraiser, who claims that values which average $1,000 per acre are realistic, based on actual land transactions on Padre Island. The figure stated of $4 million, to buy out the private lands, is too small. I point out that the Secretary of the Interior guesses it would cost twice that much. It is an unrealistic figure.

Further, no provision is made for a highway which would run the length of Padre Island. Right now the only means of ingress and egress are on both ends, the northern and southern ends of the island. This means that the area, which is supposed to be accessible to tourists and to people who wish to use the beaches and the seashore, really is inaccessible by highway. There is no provision in S. 4 for the construction of a highway. There is no provision for funds for a highway, and no authorization for it.

Many people might go into the area, without the highway, perhaps in private automobiles or even in jeeps or in trucks, or vehicles of that type. These people would, to a certain extent, actually be in danger. The weather along Padre Island is not always the best. It is good most of the time. Most of the time it is sunny, nice, and warm and salubrious, but of course tropical storms are very capricious. They come up without too much warning. The tide situation in the area is uncertain. It is fraught with a certain amount of danger for someone going into the area who is not familiar with the area.

Unless we provide for adequate ingress and egress I think we would be placing in jeopardy lives of people who are unsuspecting tourists. As the minority views note, there is an ancient doctrine of an attractive nuisance which might apply, which might make the Federal Government liable under lawsuits involving millions of dollars with respect to loss of life or property, in the eventuality of acts of God over which man has no control.

Mr. President, I do not think it is unreasonable to suggest, in the light of the very sound arguments which have been raised against action on the bill at this time, that the bill be recommitted to the committee.

I favor the creation of a park on Padre Island. I would hope that the people of Texas would take this on as their responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I hope the people of Texas will assume this as a responsibility. I believe they will. I believe they will make adequate provision for the type of park that I think everyone would be proud of and would want to visit. A substantial portion of the island should be left open for commercial development. It could mean a very great deal to the economy of that area of our State for much of it to be open for commercial development.

I note that during the past winter the frost damaged our citrus crop in the lower Rio Grande Valley. It has left a gaping void in our economy down there. People in the area are looking forward to some potential commercial development. The chambers of commerce of virtually all the valley towns have opposed the enactment of S. 4 at this time. Certainly the views of those citizens should and must be taken into consideration.

In the light of the facts that have been presented here, I believe it would be wrong for us to plunge into the project headlong. For one thing, 200,000 acres of the proposed area, most of which are mudflats, are held by the State of Texas; and the Federal Government might have considerable difficulty in acquiring the land described and comprehended by the bill. One very highplaced State official told me in no uncertain terms that the State of Texas had no intention of yielding up the 200,000 acres to the Federal Government.

So I urge that the bill be recommitted to the committee so that it can be given more study, so that it can be perfected, and so that the elements in opposition and the arguments against the enactment of the bill can be taken into consideration. In the event of the failure of the State to act next year, we can perhaps pass a Padre Island Park bill that will be more acceptable to everyone.

If the State of Texas fails to act, I for one will acquiesce in and support the creation of a national seashore park on Padre Island, but not under the terms of the present bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I only hope that we do not inherit consideration of the bill again. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has given as much attention to the acquisition of Padre Island as it has, I believe, to all the rest of the park proposals that we have had during the present session. We have created the Cape Cod National Seashore, which had been attempted many times before. We spent some time on that subject. We passed a bill to create a Great Basin National Park. We worked on a bill to create a park at Point Reyes, Calif.

The time that has been spent by individual members of the committee on the proposed Padre Island Park probably exceeds all the time spent on the other projects I have named.

It may be that the State of Texas has not had a sufficient opportunity to make a full presentation. Time after time Gov. Price Daniel has been invited to testify. All he would have to do would be to board a plane, come to Washington, and tell us that he has a different view than the one entertained by the committee. I make the same statement with relation to Jerry Sadler, the land commissioner. At least three different times he was invited to appear before the committee and give testimony. If he wishes to give testimony, the door is open.

If the bill should be referred back to the committee, we might again send telegrams to Governor Daniel and Land Commissioner Sadler, and again neither might put in an appearance. There is no point in repeating the same process again and again.

I was very much interested in what the junior Senator from Texas said about the interesting situation that might arise if one government had the surface rights in the area and some other government the mineral rights. That is not an unusual situation in the public-land States of the West. In the State of the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], and in the States of many other Senators, we constantly see a situation in which the Government grants certain lands for schools and reserves the mineral rights, and we observe two Government agencies involved, one owning the land and the other the mineral rights. That combination occurs frequently. Such a procedure would not give us any trouble in this particular instance.

I do not know how we could compute what the size of the park should be in advance of its creation. It is true that the Senate bill contemplates 88 miles of park. It is also true that the House bill proposes a park comprising 65 miles. In the legislative process such differences are not unusual. Time after time the Appropriations Committee of the House will pass a bill containing one set of figures, and when the bill comes to the Senate, the Senate proposes another set of figures. That does not cause government to break down.

The two Houses of Congress go into conference on the question and try to harmonize their different views. The conference committee comes out with a compromise that takes into consideration the views of both Houses.

In this particular instance the same thing could easily happen. The Senate might pass a bill proposing a park consisting of 88 miles of land. In its wisdom the House might pass a bill containing 65 miles. The committees of the two Houses might meet and decide on one figure. It might accept the upper limit or it might accept the lower limit. What the conference emerges with will be a compromise figure that will be satisfactory to Congress.

A highway the length of the island has been proposed. I do not know about that project. I was in Corpus Christi on Friday of last week. At that time I had an opportunity to discuss the question with certain individuals. They were not particularly interested in the project. One man had a very strong view. He said, "Whatever you do, don't build a highway." I was surprised. I thought he was the one individual who would want a highway.

He said, "Do not build a highway. Let them come in from the north; let them come in from the south; but leave the rest of the area as a wilderness for a long time to come.

There again we have a difference of opinion. There are people in Texas who feel that there should be a highway the entire length of the park.

I was in Corpus Christi at the time a desalinization plant was opened at Freeport. I believe that was approximately 14 months ago. I flew down there with a group of people from the great State of Texas to see that fine plant in Freeport start. I went across to Corpus Christi, where, as I recall, a meeting was held. Many persons were present. There was a large group. I have forgotten the exact hall in which the people were gathered.

But those people seemed to be enthusiastic for the establishment of such a park. I know that the Representative from that area was present. While he did not agree with us in relation to the size of the park desired, he certainly recognized, I am sure, the overwhelming sentiment of the folks there that the park should be created.

On the basis of frequent visits of that nature the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has decided that the bill should be reported to the Senate. When it reaches the floor of the Senate and is acted upon, the Senate can work its will. It can do as it wishes.

I ask only that the bill be not recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, again to tie up our deliberations for a long time to come. The distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is about as persistent a pleader as I have ever encountered. Day after day after day he would stop me in the hall and say, "When is my bill to be considered?"

I do not want him back again. I want to be footloose from him. I wish to have the measure acted upon so as to avoid the situation which has existed for a long time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. How would the Senator feel if a motion were made to refer the bill to another committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not want to have the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs invaded. I would feel better at night if I knew the bill was somewhere other than in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Seriously, we have given the bill all the consideration that it merits. We have given it every hearing the bill should have.

We have tried in every reasonable way to find what needs to be done with the bill. The bill was considered a long time during the previous session of Congress. Therefore, I believe we have given it due consideration.

I am not worried over the fact that two individual governments may be involved. And I am not worried about the cost of the project. I have heard figures that it would cost $4 million, $8 million, $40 million, or $75 million. I believe someone suggested that the cost might be twice $50 million. The valuation of land on the tax rolls in that area should be ascertained. I am sure the land is assessed for what it is considered to be worth, and the assessment does not approach the figures about which we are talking.

What would happen if we passed a bill contemplating the expenditure of $4 million, and the price tag was higher than that? In the past few years, one of the things we have learned is that a great many people are interested in recreation and will contribute to the acquisition of recreation areas.

Some time ago there was a desire to acquire an area at Cape Hatteras. There was not sufficient money to acquire the area. The State of North Carolina wanted to contribute a certain amount of money, but it was limited. Representatives of the Park Service flew Mr. Paul Mellon to the area in order to show him the wonderful possibilities. They said, "This area ought to belong to the Federal Government."

They carefully explained to Mr. Mellon that the land was in two tracts, and that the two tracts should be acquired, that it ought to be in the ownership of the Federal Government, but the State of North Carolina could acquire only a portion of it.

The Park Service man who was with Mr. Mellon told me the story. He said that he seemed to make no impression on Mr. Mellon. He kept pleading with him to do something about it. Silence prevailed in the plane. Mr. Mellon sat quietly for sometime. Finally he looked over to the Park Service representative and said, "How would you like the money? In one check or two checks?"

That was the only question in Mr. Mellon's mind.

He felt this ought to be used for the public benefit and should be acquired for that purpose. He made a very substantial contribution to it.

We can compare this issue with what happened up at Cape Cod, where people were willing to put up money to make sure of the acquisition of a fine recreational area for the benefit of all the people. When Yellowstone Park was created, it was referred to as a public pleasuring ground. These areas are that, Mr. President. They become public pleasuring grounds. They are not places that are roped off, in which only certain groups of people can bathe and enjoy themselves. They become public in every sense of the word.

I only say that in this particular instance we have some very fine precedents that we can follow. A great deal of work is being done in this area to establish fine things. I recognized that probably of all the States in the Union there is no

State that has in it so many fine philanthropic citizens as has the State of Texas, that has as many private foundations with so many endowments for the benefit of the people.

I say that I am sure, if the price tag goes over $4 million, we will find some people there who will say this is desirable for the benefit of the whole Nation, and will make a contribution. We will find that someone will make it possible if the price tag goes up. I believe that the $4 million price tag may be satisfactory. Of course it may not be. There was a considerable amount of testimony to the effect that the price tag may go higher than $4 million. If in the House, in the judgment of two of the Members there, the price tag is inadequate, they can amend the bill in the House, and then it can go to conference, where the matter can be ironed out.

I do believe, Mr. President, that this bill should not be referred back to the committee, but, instead, should be passed by the Senate.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to express my regrets to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the committee, if I felt impelled to speak to him on so many occasions. I do want to tell him, however, that it was in response to the persistent demands of the people in my State. I have a file of papers before me, which are only a part of the many editorials and papers that I have received on this subject of Padre Island. They come from the Red River area all the way south to Corpus Christi, and across the State as far as Abilene. No other problem has aroused such public interest as this one has in the 5 years that I have been in the Senate.

For example, so far as the State running it as a State park is concerned, I refer to the most recent three very careful hearings of the able subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Public Lands. That committee has had a great deal of experience.

I refer to page 46 of the last hearings, held on April 11 and 13, 1961. There we find a resolution which was adopted by the Texas State Park Board on December 14, 1959, when the board went unanimously on record as being in favor of a Federal national seashore recreation area. They reconsidered this action on the 10th of April 1961, 14 months later, and again reaffirmed the action, when the State Park Board of Texas unanimously endorsed this Federal park project.

There is no sentiment for the creation of a State park simply because the people down there do not have enough money with which to set it up.

On the same page of the hearings we find a report of April 10, 1961, by Mr. Robert W. Baker, a State senator from Harris County, Tex., who is the chairman of the Legislative Beach Study Committee. It was a joint study committee of both houses of the legislature. It adopted a resolution unanimously endorsing the 88-mile proposal.

In the closing days of the session of the Texas State Legislature of 1961, a bill was being considered to agree to the Federal Government creating this park. This is printed in the senate journal for the 57th Legislature of the State of Texas, regular session, for Monday, May 29, 1961.

The bill passed the Senate of the State of Texas on May 15, 1961, setting out the field notes that we now have included in S. 4. It passed the bill by a vote of 24 to 6, agreeing to the creation of this Federal area, with the field notes in it, as I say, along the intracoastal canal on the west and the Gulf of Mexico on the east. That passed the senate, as I have said, by a vote of 24 to 6, on the 15th of May. It passed the house of representatives, also calling for the creation of this Federal seashore area of identical size, on the 26th of May 1961, by a vote of 127 to 7.

The conference committee reported the bill, signed by the conferees of the house and the senate of the Legislature of Texas, which agreed to the 66½-mile-long park.

The legislature was bound by the constitutional limitation providing that the session had to end on a certain night. One State senator from Texas filibustered the bill to death. He kept it from being passed by filibustering against it, even though it had passed the senate by a vote of 24 to 6 and the house by a vote of 127 to 7. That shows the overwhelming support for this bill by the people of Texas, because in spite of all the lobbying against it, and in spite of all the cries against it, it passed by such overwhelming votes in both houses of the State legislature.

With reference to the telegram read by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] with reference to Mr. McIlhany, chairman of the Legislative Land Study Committee of the house of representatives, appointed by the speaker of the house, as the able Senator from Texas has stated, that telegram from Mr. McIlhany proceeded on an erroneous assumption. It said that there may be litigation over titles. Of course, there may be disputes about titles. However, the passage of the pending bill does not prevent disputing claimants from disputing titles. The Government does not have to pass a law for that to happen. The money would simply be impounded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I telegraphed Mr. McIlhany, chairman of the Legislative Land Study Committee, as follows:

Hon. GRAINGER W. MCILHANY,
Chairman, Legislative Land Study Committee, House of Representatives, Austin, Tex.:

I congratulate your committee on its work in seeking to safeguard interests of Texans in Padre Island. However, passage of the Padre Island bill S. 4 will not need to be delayed because of possible title controversies at the State level. If litigation as to ownership of surface areas results there, any Federal payments for acquisition may be paid into court pending outcome. Mineral interests are not touched by the bill, so Federal action has no effect on where royalty income may be paid. I shall forward you a copy of the Senate committee report when it is available next week.

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

After that wire was sent, the Land Commissioner said that there would be entitlement to royalties. The answer is the same. There is nothing in the bill to prevent the disputants from litigating as between each other. The oil will be owned as before. There is nothing here which will bar any people from litigating private titles. Despite the concern expressed by the Land Commissioner and others, I feel that they should not have such concern, because these matters will still be possible of being the subject of litigation, and the rights of all people will be fully preserved.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I wish merely to reemphasize and underscore the statement that was made by the distinguished chairman of the full committee. Certainly this is one piece of legislation that should not be recommitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for further study. This has been studied since 1958. About three field trips have been made to the area. As chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee I have visited the area. I know that the chairman of the committee has been there. Other Members of the Senate have visited this area also, including many distinguished Senators from the other side of the aisle. We have tried to work out a bill with a minimum of difficulty and controversy.

It is also interesting to note that in connection with most of the national park bills and national seashore bills the question of size invariably comes up. Many advocates of the Padre National Seashore would like to provide a larger national seashore than 88 miles. Some want 110 miles or 117 miles. Some want to shrink it to about 55 miles. This matter has been inherent in practically all national seashore legislation and national park legislation with which I have been associated.

It was true of the Cape Cod bill; of the Point Reyes bill; of the Great Basin bill; it is true of proposed legislation which is now pending in the Senate; it is true of the canyonlands bill. It is a part of the business of legislating and arriving at a firm decision after a careful analysis and study.

The points raised by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] were all carefully considered by the committee, not merely in one session, but in a number of sessions. There were actual inspections in the field by various members of the committee.

I feel that a thorough, workmanlike job of studying this proposal in its various forms, in accordance with the many suggestions that have been made, has been undertaken by each and every member of the committee. The bill represents the composite view of a majority of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I hope that the motion to recommit will be rejected.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The question is not whether there should be a park on Padre Island. I think everyone is agreed as to that. I think the disagreement comes, for the most part, over the size of the park and its utility. Much has been made of the fact that this area will afford a recreational facility; yet there is no provision for the construction of a highway which would give to the park utility as a recreational center. Without a highway, there will be no utility.

I am aware of favorable action by some State agencies and legislative bodies concerning this proposal some time ago; but there has been a change of heart. Now they are considering and looking into the proposal more carefully.

A legislative committee wired me only recently:

> Please do not pass the bill at this session.

I have received telegrams from various chambers of commerce which oppose the bill. For example, one such wire has come to me from the chamber of commerce in the valley. It reads as follows:

> BROWNSVILLE, TEX., *April 5, 1962*.
>
> Senator JOHN TOWER,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> Every chamber of commerce in Cameron, Willacy, and Hidalgo Counties has passed a resolution opposing Senator YARBOROUGH's seashore bill. Also the Valley Chamber of Commerce has passed a resolution in opposition. We therefore hope you will do everything in your power to defeat the seashore bill by YARBOROUGH.
>
> W. VERNON WALSH.

Mr. Walsh is a prominent Democrat in that area.

The two Representatives in Congress from this area are in disagreement about the bill. Why cannot we, then, postpone action on it until a more propitious time?

What is wrong with having the State operate the park? It seems to me it is a good idea. I think we ought to laud a show of initiative and responsibility on the part of the citizens of the State, rather than to insist, "No, you cannot do things for yourselves; the Federal Government will do it for you, whether you like it or not."

I hope this is not the attitude which will prevail. I hope the bill will be recommitted for serious consideration.

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall support the motion to recommit, just as I voted against reporting the bill from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I wish to make several things plain. First, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] who is in the Chamber, probably will recall that the first time he ever mentioned the Padre Island Park on the floor of the Senate, I supported his proposal. I see no reason to change my fundamental view about the park. But when the establishment of a park is being considered, other questions arise: Who will create the park? How will it be done? How large will the park be?

Later, depending on the outcome of the motion to recommit, I intend to offer certain amendments which I believe are necessary.

Second, I point out that contrary to what has been done heretofore, the Department of the Interior has completely refused even to commit itself as to the construction of highways. The map at the side of the Chamber shows Padre Island. It has a rather peculiar shape from the standpoint of geological formation. It is a long island, to which there is access only from the north end, at Corpus Christi, and from the south end, through Port Isabel.

Not only do I base my remarks on what we heard in the testimony—and I believe I sat through all the hearings; but as recently as December I went to the area and viewed it myself. I interviewed witnesses with whom the committee staff had put me in touch before I went there.

When I arrived, I was contacted by other people on the south part of Padre Island, who felt they had never had an adequate opportunity to present their views to the committee. I do not believe they had been forbidden or precluded from appearing; but perhaps because they were not so aware of the significance of the proposal or were not adequately informed about it. Nevertheless, on the lower part of Padre Island, I found an almost unanimous opposition, not to the concept of a park itself, but to the concept of a park as provided in S. 4, which the Senate is considering today.

With respect to highways, there is one responsibility the Senate or Congress cannot escape; that is, that when a national area is created, while there may be different ideas as to what constitutes a national seashore and a national park, we cannot overlook responsibility for the safety of the lives of the people who visit the area. On the one hand, it is argued by the proponents of the bill, that what must be done is to create a park which people can enter. On the other hand, they argue that a highway down the length of Padre Island cannot be maintained because the waves and storms would wash it out.

Mr. President, it is exactly those waves, those storms, those hurricanes, to which the area unfortunately is subject at times, which will imperil the lives of the hundreds—yes, perhaps thousands—of persons who will visit that area unless adequate roads are provided.

I maintain that the Government, including Congress, will bear on its shoulders the responsibility for the death of any child, any family, or any member of a family who enters that area after it has been established as a national seashore, because we will, in effect, have invited the public to enter. When we invite them to a national seashore, which is the equivalent of a national park, we are, for all practical purposes, the guarantors of their safety and health.

There is another thing which has been glossed over so lightly that one would not know it even existed. I believe there are five military installations, worth about $250,000, located on the island. As a part of these installations are several target areas. The installations include a naval station at Corpus Christi and Air Force fields at Harlingen and other places. They use the target ranges which are shown at a distance of about 50 miles, just above the black line on the map. It is a live-impact area. It is not a location where small bombs are dropped, which give off a little puff of powder where they hit. Live bombs are actually dropped, and they are dropped by beginning students. The location is well within 35 miles of the area which the bill provides for the national seashore.

What will be done? The $250,000 is glossed over so lightly that one would think it had been rubbed with wax. Yet we know that if the bill should be passed in its present form, the expense to the Government will run into millions of dollars to reproduce the bombing areas which are necessary for the flying fields in this part of Texas. This is true, first, because the place where land can be obtained is primarily owned by the King interests, which lie immediately west of the island. The King interests are not likely to give it up easily, and certainly not inexpensively.

Second, everything on the installations will have to be moved to the new areas.

Third, the target areas would be at far greater distances from the bases than they are from the present bases. So there would be increased operational expenses. It is almost literally true that today the target areas are reached by the planes as they come off the end of the runways; almost immediately they do their target bombing.

As to the cost, I wish to say that the argument which the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the distinguished chairman of our committee, made is persuasive as regards the costs. However I do not believe in putting in a bill what I do not mean, and, I do not believe that a single member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs today would settle for 2½ times the stated $4 million cost of the bill. In fact, I do not believe anyone would settle for a $10 million cost, although I would be happy to see the Federal Government reach this bill's objective if it does some day become law, and if Texas does not build the park—for $10 million. However, I do not believe the Federal Government can even begin to avoid keeping the cost to $10 million.

On the north there is undeveloped land, and on the south there are county parks. One park is very well developed.

There has been debate here about the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Let me say that the areas where people stay and camp there are nothing for anyone in the United States to be proud of. There are other parts of the Cape Hatteras Seashore where the Park Service has done well. But I wish to say that the county park at the south end of the island would make the place where people stay at Cape Hatteras National Seashore look like the slums of a big city. I say that because I have been to both places; I have seen them, and I know what I am talking about. The county has not only this park; it is also developing another one, 5 miles above it; and it has promises of land above that, and it intends to develop that land into a park.

Mr. President, why hurry about this matter? Why not put it off until we know what the cost will be? We have heard the officials skirt the cost item in connection with this matter.

Let Texas act if it will. I think it will do a better job than anyone else could do.

Mr. President, in closing—and, Mr. President, let me inquire how much time remains available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Metcalf in the chair). One minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall do the best I can in that time.

Mr. President, one other point I wish to make in connection with this matter is in reference to the talk about wilderness areas. It is ridiculous for anyone to suggest that more than 1 person in 100 would carry water—and it would be necessary to carry water—and food and camping equipment and fishing equipment while he marched more than 1 mile down the hard sand areas there, to reach a wilderness area. It is ridiculous to suggest that many persons would ever make the attempt. A strong, able-bodied person might hike 4 or 5 miles over normal terrain; but, Mr. President, believe me when I say that hiking in such sand is no cinch. So the wilderness argument falls flat.

All in all, Mr. President, certainly the bill should be recommitted. I do not believe adequate time was given for proper consideration of these matters. Certainly the arguments raised against the bill did not receive what I thought was adequate consideration. Perhaps I was not sufficiently persuasive. But under the circumstances the bill should be recommitted, and these matters can be taken up later on.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Chair, and I also thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, obviously it is absurd to talk about this area as a wilderness area, because a wilderness area usually has three or four access points, whereas this area has only two access points, and they are approximately 125 or 130 miles apart. Who would walk—and this is the criterion which is applied to wilderness areas, into which one must either walk or ride a horse—60 miles from either one end or the other of this Texas coastal area?

Mr. President, I have stated the essential arguments against the bill. Certainly the bill should now be laid aside or recommitted until we find what Texas wants to do about this matter.

In this situation we find that the two Senators from Texas are taking different sides on the matter. We also find that both Members of the House of Representatives who are affected by this matter—one from Corpus Christi and the other from lower down, at Laguna Madre—both oppose the bill. Under the circumstances, it seems to me to be clear that the proper thing to do is to recommit the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time under my control. I understand that the time under the control of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Then, Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The junior Senator from Texas desires to have the yeas and nays ordered on the question of agreeing to his motion to recommit; and I would join in the request to have the yeas and nays ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] to recommit the bill. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hickey], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hickey], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case], and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 40 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Aiken
Allott
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Bush
Capehart
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Javits
Keating
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith, Maine
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—45

Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carroll
Chavez
Church
Clark
Dodd
Engle
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Jordan
Kefauver
Kerr
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Sparkman
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—16

Butler
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Douglas
Ervin
Hickey
Hill
Johnston
Kuchel
Magnuson
Morse
Moss
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Symington

So Mr. Tower's motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "4-10-62—A," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 4, between lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(d) (1) The Secretary is authorized and and directed to establish and maintain such roads as are necessary for the safety of the users of the said National Seashore and is specifically directed to establish a road through the entire length of said Seashore area with access roads to the mainland from

> the North end of the Island and from the South end of the Island.
>
> (2) The Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, such lands, waters, and other property, and improvements thereon and any interest therein, as he may determine necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

Mr. ALLOTT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of one-half hour on each amendment, half the time to be controlled by the proposer of the amendment, and half the time to be controlled by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my first amendment, before a time limitation is set.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. For the benefit of Senators in attendance, I do not plan to speak for more than about 10 minutes. If they wish to govern their own time in accordance with that, they may do so.

Mr. President, the amendment has only one purpose. I believe it is a purpose which the Senate of the United States cannot ignore.

The amendment provides:

> The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish and maintain such roads as are necessary for the safety of the users of the said national seashore and is specifically directed to establish a road through the entire length of said seashore area with access roads to the mainland from the north end of the island—

Which would be near Corpus Christi—

> and from the south end of the island.

Which would be near Port Isabel or Brownsville.

> The Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, such lands, waters, and other property, and improvements thereon and any interest therein, as he may determine necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

I start upon the premise, as I stated earlier, that I support the first words of the senior Senator from Texas, stated on this floor, about Padre Island. I believe it should be a park. If the State of Texas wishes to make it a park, I would welcome having the State take jurisdiction, condemn the land, and make a park of it.

If it is necessary for the United States to establish the seashore, I shall support that when we can get the proposal trimmed down to the proper form and get the proper provisions in the bill.

The bill does not now contain a provision for a road. Hearings were first held upon the proposal on December 14, 1959. I wish to read from page 7 of the hearings, from the statement of the senior Senator from Texas himself, in which he quoted the Department of the Interior, in subsection 2(b):

> In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of the park, the Secretary of the Interior shall construct and maintain therein such roads, trails, markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

For some reason, between 1959 and 1961 the Department of the Interior has decided against even mentioning roads in the bill.

We all know the national parks. We have all been in them hundreds of times. Now the national seashore concept is coming along, which is a little different. There is to be set aside areas for the future recreation of citizens of our country.

From the standpoint of shape and location, Padre Island is a very peculiar area for a national seashore.

The area is well over 150 miles in length. At the present time access may be obtained to it only by a road at the very top end of the island. The island is composed entirely of deep sand and dunes. It is nearly impossible—indeed, for the average driver, it is impossible—to drive any distance even on the east shore of the island without bogging down his car. The vehicles in which I made my trips on the island were all specially prepared vehicles, either Jeeps or standard passenger cars which had been beefed up with extra springs and shock absorbers, 9.50 tires instead of 7.50 tires, oversize radiators, and that sort of thing.

What I have said will give Senators some idea of the problems confronting visitors to the island.

Suppose a man, his wife, and little children had entered the area at the north end of the island over the causeway at Corpus Christi and had traveled 10 or 12 miles down the beach. Suppose a storm should come up? Of course, they would hurriedly try to get out. We all know what it is like to drive in beach sand. Cars get stuck. What could be done for such a family?

Let me give the Senate an idea of what such people would face in that area in a storm. I am reading from Technical Memorandum No. 78 of the Beach Erosion Board, Office of the Chief of Engineers, published in 1956 and describing Padre Island:

> It was once more or less continuously walled just back of its gently sloping beach by a chain of vegetated (15- to 25-foot) foredunes with low gaps. The gaps between the dunes were the sites of washover floods of storm surges. Landward from the beach, the channels remain and lead to the branching distributary channels of the washover fans or deltas.
>
> Surges of hurricanes between 1930 and 1945 followed by drought from 1948 to 1955 have lowered the surface of the island, lowered and eroded the dunes except in areas in the extreme northern part, and largely destroyed the grassy cover which once supported cattle ranching. The area of bare migrating dune fields has been much expanded.

I have described the type of land to which we would invite people. I realize that the area has great recreational value, but it would have no recreational value unless measures were taken to protect the lives of those who might come to the area. Such protection could be afforded only by providing adequate highways.

On page 13 of Technical Memorandum No. 78 the Office of the Chief of Engineers states that the rate of flood occurrence on Padre Island is one in 4 years, probably one in 3 years. The rate of maximum floods is one in 40 years, probably one in 30 years.

Continuing to read from the memorandum:

> The lists, table (table 3) and map (fig. 4) summarize information on floods that have affected Padre Island, including the writers' inferences that certain storms without flood records probably flooded the island. This flooding varies from a mere reactivation of the washover channels by floods from 3 to 4 feet above mean low water to broad floods accompanied by extensive wave-and-current erosion of dunes under surge heights of 5 to 11 feet.
>
> Erosion and the action of salt waters followed by a drought of record length and severity have greatly changed the appearance and economic productivity of the island. Cattle were not run on the southern half of the island after 1945 and ranching at the north end has more recently been still further reduced because of loss of grass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Padre Island is an area in which bad storms will occur once in every 3 years or once in every 4 years. It is an area in which even a skilled driver, unless he has special equipment, cannot drive down the beach with any assurance of getting back.

The argument is made, "We will take that subject up later."

Are we going to pass a bill which would not protect the people whom we invite into the area? Are we going to leave it completely unprotected?

I have been in the area. I have been over the island. I drove over 35 or 40 miles of its length. I flew over it in a plane at almost stalling speeds so I could see exactly what had happened to the island. Today it is easy to see that the floods and hurricanes of last year washed the dunes and eroded the beaches as far back as 200 feet.

Are we going to invite Americans into such an area, an area into which they cannot come without special esquipment, and in which severe storms may come up suddenly, or are we going to protect them? I say we have an obligation to protect them, and the provision of the amendment would protect them.

Between 1956 and the present time there have been four hurricanes in the area, causing $500,000 damage to parks, $380,000 to roads, $130,000 to Government property, and $240,000 to private property, making a total of $1,250,000 worth of damage in the past 5 years.

That is the meat of the argument. The Park Service representatives have said, "We cannot maintain a road the whole length of the island."

Why not? If the floods and storms are so bad that the Park Service cannot maintain a road, would we invite American families into the area and leave them stranded? Could we have 100 or 1,000 helicopters in the area when a storm is on its way in order to lift automobiles out of the sand in which they might be stuck so that they and their families could reach safety?

I have stated some of the arguments that are used. The Park Service representatives have argued against themselves in saying they cannot maintain a road through the area. Yet they say, "We want to establish Padre Island as a national seashore."

During the early part of the month of December I visited the area. Frankly, I went there because statements of the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and others at the hearings—not what I knew myself—had disturbed me very greatly.

I was very much concerned about the safety factor and about the feasibility of a great part of this park as a seashore recreational area. Therefore I went down there myself. The junior Senator from Texas put in the RECORD a little while ago numerous telegrams from the chambers of commerce of all the valley towns in the southern part of the valley, including the Rio Grande Chamber of Commerce. They are all in opposition to the bill unless it provides for a road.

When I was asked down there—and I had not planned originally to go there, but was urged, and almost clubbed into going down to the lower part of the island by some of the local people—I said, "I will be happy to come."

They said, "Whom can we ask in?"

I said, "Ask anyone in who wants to make his views known."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I understood that the unanimous-consent agreement called for thirty minutes on each side. I will conclude in two minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be glad to ask for more time for the Senator.

(At this point Mrs. NEUBERGER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a list of the people who met with me at the Padre Island site.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

James Stillman, M.D., Brownsville, Tex.; Don E. Duncan, Brownsville Herald, Brownsville, Tex.; Don Morns, Brownsville, Tex.; Pete Smith, Port Isabel, Tex.; Ted Hunt, Port Isabel, Tex.; Edith C. Baines, Port Isabel, Tex.; N. N. Housewright, San Benito, Tex.; Gayle D. Wilhite, AIA, architect, Brownsville, Tex.; Glenn McGehee, chamber of commerce manager, South Padre Island, Tex.; Harold Bowman, manager, Sea Island Hotel, South Padre Island, Tex.; Robert E. Fowler, Brownsville, Tex.; Al McGehee (park director, Cameron City), Port Isabel, Tex.; Rhea Blasig, San Benito, Tex.; Jack Galloway, KCBT-TV, Harlingen, Tex.; Fletcher Robertson, Valley Newspapers; Dan Benito, Steve M. Clark, Ray Kasper, KBOR and Associated Press, Brownsville, Tex.; D. N. Segal, Brownsville, Tex.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, at that time I asked them, "How do you feel about this?"

At first they said, "We would rather see it developed by the county or the State." There was not one person in that whole group who said he wanted the park without a road.

So we come back to this as a matter of commonsense. Here is an area which can be very critical so far as storms are concerned. Here is an area which has no road. Yet we are going to establish a national seashore without making it a policy to provide for a road. My amendment would require that a road be built.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield myself 5 minutes. I wish to state, first of all, that I am one of those who urged the Senator from Colorado to go to Padre Island so that he might come back with his viewpoint, whether it was the same as mine or different. We have worked together on many seashores. We find controversies in each one of them and we find different viewpoints. However, I know of no one who is more dedicated to his work than the Senator from Colorado, and I wish to compliment him for the diligence he shows in connection with each one of these issues.

I would answer the argument of the distinguished Senator from Colorado in support of his amendment with the words of the Secretary of the Interior himself with respect to this particular problem, which he presented to the committee in the hearing held on April 11 of last year, with particular reference to whether or not a road should be built. The Secretary of the Interior answered as follows:

> With regard to development plans for the island, I can speak only in generalities. Decisions on the specifics of development can properly come only from long study and actually living in an area and observing public use of it. Padre Island is no exception to this. That is why we believe it would be very unwise now to involve this important conservation legislation in a decision on the concept of a through road down Padre Island.
>
> Such a commitment would be premature, first of all, because no one has made a detailed study of the feasibility and the cost of such a road. As you know, some parts of the island are narrow, low, and subject to washover at times of storm. The maintenance, repair, need, and the benefits to be expected from such a road are among the factors that we have not determined.
>
> Secondly, the conservation and public use purposes of the proposed national seashore go beyond the mere construction of a through highway. The conservation and public purposes include adequate access to considerable portions of the area by people riding in automobiles, but the purposes also include the preservation of wild landscapes, marshes, dunes, beach, native plant and animal life and the feeling of spaciousness, away from the sights, sounds, and smells of automobile traffic. There are millions of people in the United States who are interested in the preservation of wild, unspoiled, undeveloped places in the out of doors. A national seashore should provide undeveloped areas for these people as well as adequate roads and other facilities for people who do not wish to get away from them. It seems to us that it would be an unwise use of the resource if we now were to make a decision that the whole island must be opened by a through road. We think wise planning dictates that decision to be made after living with the national seashore, if it is authorized, for some years and then base our decision on experience and facts which will be available then but which are not yet at hand.
>
> If the Padre Island National Seashore is authorized by the Congress, there need be no question that there would be adequate access to it, since it would be our obligation to encourage public use and enjoyment of the area consistent with preservation of the inherent characteristics for which it is nationally significant.
>
> The access which we do see as clearly needed for public use if a Padre Island National Seashore is authorized, is an adequate unobtrusive system of roads tied in with the access causeways at each end of the island and serving a carefully planned pattern of national seashore campgrounds, picnic areas, beach facilities, appropriately placed boat and fishing docks, visitor centers, and other park facilities designed to make visits to the national seashore more meaningful and enjoyable.

I am convinced that the Secretary of the Interior will build adequate roads on Padre Island to make access available to the people who are attracted to the national seashore. I am certain that he is just as much interested in the safety of the people who go down there as is the Senator from Colorado.

I believe that if we check through national park bills, certainly the ones that have come out of the Interior Committee in the time that I have been a member of it, it will be seen that in no instance, to the best of my knowledge, was an attempt made to direct the Secretary of the Interior where he should build a road system within any of the parks.

This was true of Cape Cod National Seashore Park. It was true of the Point Reyes National Seashore Park, which has been passed by the Senate and is now pending in the House of Representatives. It seems to me there is ample authority in the law now for the building of needed access roads to take care of the safety and the needs of the many people who would be attracted to Padre Island.

There was a difference of opinion on this point, but the majority of the committee felt very positively that there was no need for building a through road from the northern end clear down to the other end of the island, almost to its southernmost point, about 120 or 125 miles away.

Madam President, I should like to inquire how much time is left on my side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 3 minutes to the senior Senator from Texas, because reference has been made to the inclusion or exclusion of this provision of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, before the Senator yields time, will he yield for a question?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is it not true that recently before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee Secretary Udall, in testifying for the Canyon Lands National Park, requested $17 million for roads and for development of the Canyon Lands Park?

Mr. BIBLE. I believe that is true. The overall figure in the development period of some 7 or 8 or 10 years was $17 million. I think certain parts of it included access roads. However, there is no request made to the committee that specific language be written into the bill providing that a road be built thus and so.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator referred to the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior. Is it not a fact that the Department of the Interior has been studying this matter for a period of some 20 years and yet at the hearing testified that they were not yet prepared to set up a comprehensive plan.

Mr. BIBLE. I believe they have not arrived at a comprehensive plan. The statement I have read made that clear. It will depend on how the island will develop. Then adequate access roads would be provided.

I yield the balance of the time to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, how much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes remain.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, I ask for only 3 minutes of that time.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record that part of the hearings on S. 4, held before the Subcommittee on Public Lands on April 11, 1961, beginning with the third paragraph on page 36 and continuing through the end of the fifth paragraph on page 38. That part of the hearing deals with the cost of the highway down the middle of Padre Island. It includes a letter from D. C. Greer, State highway engineer of Texas, under date of April 7, 1961. The letter is addressed to Hon. Oscar C. Dancy, county judge of Cameron County.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> I think we ought to let them get the minerals out, but not let that prevent us from establishing a national seashore recreation area. Even with the most rigid conservation, this will be produced out before many now living have passed away, in my opinion. This is a transitory thing. I don't think the facts that the minerals are to be produced should deny the greater long-range park that we envision. The minerals are exhaustible, and will be used, but the inspirational appeal of the natural seashore, unchanged by bulldozers and man, is inexhaustible and will live as long as man.
>
> There are some who contend that any Padre Island legislation passing the Congress should provide—and proposals have been advocated in Texas to this effect, they will oppose it unless it provides—that the Federal Government build a highway the length of the island linking Corpus Christi to Brownsville. Mr. Chairman, that is no new idea. The Texas Highway Department engineer, DeWitt Greer, has been urged many times over the years to construct a highway the length of the Padre Island. He has made surveys and they showed that the very minimum cost of such a highway with a nondurable asphalt roadway would have cost $2.8 million back in 1954. All know what was happened to construction costs since. The Texas Highway Department surveys indicate that a minimum-quality light asphalt-top highway the length of the island would cost $6 million. Such a highway with reinforced concrete paving, which is really needed for such a storm-exposed island highway, would cost $9.5 million for two lanes. Because of the storms and tides, he estimates 15 to 20 percent of this highway would have to be rebuilt every year. That is why the State of Texas has not done it.
>
> We think it is wholly unreal, for the State of Texas because of this extremely high cost and the extreme cost of the upkeep and the questionable need has refrained from constructing this island over a period of several years. With a great need for Federal funds, I cannot conscientiously endorse or urge such an expenditure at this time. Perhaps in the future some such length may be justified by the economics of that time. I would not oppose it if it is. This expenditure would so increase the cost of the proposed national park seashore by many millions of dollars as to virtually prevent us from having such a seashore.
>
> I do not believe that the question of preservation of one of America's last great seashore areas for all Americans should hinge on whether the Federal Government agrees to build a multimillion-dollar highway which the State of Texas refuses to build because of the State's finding of nonfeasibility.
>
> Mr. Chairman, I offer for the record a communication from the Texas Highway Department, D. C. Greer, State highway engineer, dated April 7, 1961, addressed to Judge Oscar C. Dancy, county judge of Cameron County, giving the estimates of this cost of the proposed Padre Island highway up and down the island.
>
> Senator Bible. What are the costs as of today? Is this the $9.5 million figure?
>
> Senator Yarborough. Updated from 1960, 106 miles, $9,540,000, covering the reinforced concrete pavement, two lanes only, he said each major storm would require rebuilding 15 to 20 miles of the road. He stated orally that the high tides would stir up the shore each year.
>
> Senator Bible. The letter may be made a part of the record.
>
> (The letter referred to follows:)
>
> Texas Highway Department,
> *Austin, Tex., April 7, 1961.*
>
> Hon. Oscar C. Dancy,
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Judge Dancy: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of April 6.
>
> As requested, I am enclosing a sheet giving the desired information with reference to the proposed Padre Island highway. Also, as requested, I am sending a copy of same to Senator Yarborough.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> D. C. Greer,
> *State Highway Engineer.*
>
> ---
>
> Proposed Padre Island Highway
>
> From Port Isabel Causeway to Nueces County Park, length 108 miles.
>
> The 1954 estimate by consulting engineers for the two-lane road 6-inch shell-sand mixture on native sand and light asphalt top, $2,800,000.
>
> State Highway Department estimate in 1960 (up-dated from 1950) 106 miles for $6 million for 8 inches of shell-sand base and light asphalt top.
>
> Each major storm would require us to rebuild 15 to 20 miles of road.
>
> State Highway Department estimate of 1961 (updated from 1960) 106 miles for $9,540,000 covering reinforced concrete pavement—two lanes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, Mr. Greer states that it would cost $9,450,000 to build a two-lane highway the length of the island. That would be more than the estimated cost of the park. Also, he estimates that due to storms and floods it would be necessary to rebuild from 15 to 20 miles of the road each year.

The testimony also shows that year after year, the State Highway Department of Texas has been urged by some persons in Texas to build the road, but that the State has not built it because it would be very expensive to do so.

Not only would the amendment of the Senator from Colorado require the National Park Service to build the road through 88 miles of park; it would also require the Park Service to build a road the full length of the seashore area, with access roads to the mainland from the north end and from the south end of the island—at both ends of the 117-mile-long highway. Thirty-two miles of the highway would be over private lands and would enhance the value of the lands at each end. In other words, the amendment of the Senator from Colorado proposes that the Federal Government reach into the pockets of the taxpayers to add millions of dollars to the value of private land each year.

Madam President, under date of March 28, 1962, I received a letter from the Department of the Interior, signed by John A. Carver, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The letter reads, in part, as follows:

> Dear Senator Yarborough: The question of a road down the full length of Padre Island is one to which we have given considerable thought. It is estimated that the road would cost at least $9 million to build and that as much as one-fifth of it would be lost to storms annually. We know of no studies that show convincingly that there is need for such a road and we know of no national park project heretofore authorized by Congress which was made contingent upon the construction of such a road.

I point out that the Park Service builds roads in other national parks. I continue to read:

> Secretary Udall stated in his testimony before the Senate committee that the Department, if the proposed national seashore is authorized, would expect to make adequate portions of the area accessible to the public and that it would be desirable to live with the project, so to speak, for a number of years before anybody would be in a position to determine whether the proposed through highway should be built. A copy of the statement which the Secretary made before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is enclosed for your convenient reference.

That has been referred to and is in the Record. I continue to read:

> There is no slightest doubt in our minds that, if the proposed national seashore is authorized and established, adequate portions of it will be made accessible by roads for people traveling in automobiles. The

> purpose of the seashore proposal is to preserve an outstanding area for appropriate forms of public use and enjoyment. The whole national park conservation program gives assurance that the proposed national seashore will be a public use area. If the project is authorized, detailed plans will be formulated for the facilities required for public use and such detailed plans will have to be based on careful consideration of such factors, among others, as public safety and preservation and public enjoyment of the variety of recreation attractions for which the island is noted.

The Department is giving consideration to the public safety. I have been on that island, not only at each end, but at Mansfield Pass. When boats go through the pass, one can step off and walk to either side from the middle.

The letter concludes:

> Establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore without a through road would not preclude construction. A through road could be built on the island at any time that it was found to be in the public interest to do so.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
> *Assistant Secretary of the Interior.*

Madam President, causeways are sought to be built in the middle of the park. The Park Service should have an option as to how it will develop roads for the best service of the people. It should not be straitjacketed at this time.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, will the Senator yield me time?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, with respect to the hearing on this authorization bill, we know that the Park Service has been studying the proposal for about 20 years. Now there is great urgency to push this political bill through the Senate, when every Member of this body who knows its background realizes that the sound, constructive body at the other end of the Capitol will take no action on the bill during this session of Congress.

Why this urgency if the Park Service will take another 10 or 15 years to study and determine what roads should be built, or how human beings can enjoy a park having the necessary recreational facilities on the island?

Why not wait another 10 years? Why push the bill through now, if it will take another decade to determine the feasibility of utilizing the resources of a seashore park?

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I have no word to the effect that the bill, if it passes the Senate, will not pass the House and become law. I hope it will. It might be tailored or altered somewhat in size or amount. Amendments might be adopted so as to send the bill to conference. However, I hope that the bill will be enacted in its present form.

As to the road problem, the Secretary of the Interior now has ample authority, if the area should become a national seashore, to plan the necessary access roads. He has said he would do so. The letter just read by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] indicates that he will do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on both sides has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 41 Leg.]

YEAS—24

Allott
Beall
Bennett
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dworshak
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Prouty
Saltonstall
Scott
Tower
Wiley
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—58

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bible
Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Church
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Engle
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Butler
Byrd, Va.
Capehart
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Douglas
Ellender
Hickey
Hill
Johnston
Kuchel
Magnuson
Morse
Moss
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Symington

So the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I call up my amendment, and ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. ALLOTT is as follows:

> On page 2, beginning with line 4, strike out all through the period on line 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "Beginning at a point one mile northerly of North Bird Island on the easterly mean low water line of Laguna Madre; thence due east to a point on Padre Island one mile west of the mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico; thence southwesterly paralleling the said mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico, a distance of about three and five-tenths miles; thence due east to the two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on United States Coast and Geodetic Survey chart numbered 1286; thence along the said two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on United States Coast and Geodetic Survey charts numbered 1286, 1287, and 1288 for a distance of approximately forty miles; thence westerly crossing Padre Island to the easterly mean low water line of Laguna Madre; thence northerly following the easterly mean low water line of Laguna Madre to the point of beginning."

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I should like to make two statements for the benefit of Members of the Senate. First, I do not contemplate asking for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. Second, I shall take not to exceed 10 minutes on the amendment. So far as I know, the bill will then be ready for passage. I know of no other amendment.

I asked unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment because it is technical in language, but the purpose of it is very clear. It is to reduce the length of the park from 88.5 miles to 43.5 miles.

If any Senator should be looking at the map in the rear of the Chamber, the black lines are misleading, because they do not indicate the length of the park. The red lines, which go almost from the very bottom to the very top of the map, represent the boundaries of the park.

There are several reasons for offering the amendment, and I shall give them briefly.

First and foremost, the people who live in the southern part of this region want the park limited to this area. I have previously placed in the RECORD the names of persons who, when I was there, supported this proposal. The junior Senator from Texas has already placed in the RECORD telegrams from chambers of commerce and others who also oppose the proposal in the bill.

In addition, I offer the amendment primarily because it represents the considered views and judgment of Representatives YOUNG and KILGORE, Members of the other body from the two districts involved.

I believe none are better able to judge what is best for their own particular districts than are those two gentlemen; and both have introduced bills in the House of Representatives to reduce the length of the park to 65 miles—20 miles under the present limit. My amendment reduces the length of the park to 43.5 miles.

The next reason, to state it very cogently, is that, with the rejection of the amendment which was just offered by the Senator from Colorado, regarding roads, the Senate cannot afford to take upon itself moral responsibility for the lives of those who are going into this roadless area. The Senate has eliminated provision for roads. I assure the Senate that the bill will never come out of the other body without a provision for roads.

The pending amendment would mean that people would not get into the farther reaches of the area where they could not possibly get out in the event of need.

The next reason why the amendment is offered is that it eliminates the mud flats between Padre Island and the mainland of Texas on the west side of the island. This area is not apparent on the map, without close scrutiny, because the map is not constructed that way. As the bill provides, the red line is the line along the eastern side of the Intercoastal Canal.

There is absolutely no reason for taking that area into the park on Padre Island. In the first place, it belongs to the State of Texas, and it cannot be taken unless the State of Texas agrees to it, and a good number of officials of the State of Texas have asked us to defer action on it. In the second place, the area is nothing but mudflats, and in some cases they are 4 and 5 miles wide.

If we as Members of the Senate can sensibly exercise our duties and obligations by taking into a national park large areas which are nothing but mudflats, I think we have lost a few of our "marbles," and certainly our sense of what constitutes recreation value.

That is all I have to say about the mudflats. I could find much land in the country on about the same level of desirability as the mudflats—land which people would be glad to donate to the United States for a park.

One of the most cogent reasons for offering the amendment to reduce the length from 88.5 miles to 43.5 miles is that after the 50-mile mark, which is just about the point where the active bombing range is, there are no real sand dunes until one arrives within 10 miles of Port Isabel at the lower end of the island. That area is left out in the amendment. In the intervening area are some low dunes, most of which are 3, 4, and 5 feet tall. One can stand on the beach on one side and look over to Laguna Madre on the other. This is the area where the greatest danger from floods, hurricanes, and high tides lies.

In my opinion, it is by far the least desirable part of the area for a national park or national recreational area. Much of the beach is rough, consisting of rock, shell beaches, and is therefore not nearly as suitable for swimming as other areas. In many places it is completely undesirable for swimming and recreation of that kind. Fishing may be engaged in, if one could get there; but now we have no roads, so people cannot reach the area.

The lowest 30 or 35 miles is that kind of area, which is not particularly suited for a national seashore. It does not have high dunes, or the type of grass found in the upper 50 miles of the area. It is unthinkable to me that the Federal Government would be spending money to acquire that land, which is so unsuitable for a recreation area. For this reason I have offered the amendment. It would eliminate the mudflats of Laguna Madre.

The remarks of members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs first drew my attention to the problem, before I had even seen the area. The remarks of members of the committee convinced me that there should be a good look at the problem. I took the look.

I believe the majority of the people in this portion of Texas, in the Rio Grande Valley, think this area should not be included. I know that all the people with whom I talked think so. There was an open invitation for anyone who wished to talk to come in and talk. I know that all those with whom I spoke believed unanimously that this area should not be included in a national seashore.

This area is particularly susceptible to storms. As the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs said a while ago, this is the area in which we would have to keep rebuilding the roads. It is not a suitable place to invite Americans. When we create national seashores, we invite Americans to visit them. They will be our guests. We will establish the area. It will be our responsibility to look after the safety of citizens. The area involved does not meet the criterion of safety. The area does not meet the criteria which a national seashore should meet. I urge that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. The amendment was offered to the committee. The arguments before the committee were substantially the same as the arguments which have been given to the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

The question as to the size of the national park or seashore is, as I have previously indicated, one of considerable concern to any committee.

When the proposed legislation first came before the Congress it was suggested that the length of the park be established at some 110 miles. The size was later shrunk to the present proposal in S. 4, 88.5 miles.

I believe the bills which have been introduced in the House of Representatives call for an area of approximately 50 miles or 55 miles in length.

This question was carefully considered by the committee, as the size of the Cape Cod National Seashore was carefully considered, as the size of the Point Reyes National Seashore was considered, and as the size of the Great Basin National Park was considered.

The position of the committee was in favor of the proposal as submitted to it by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who had spent many days, months, and years sponsoring the project and moving it forward to the point it has reached today.

In complete honesty, I say again that this is a question of judgment. I do not think anyone can say with finality that the area should be 88.5 miles, 75 miles, 70 miles, or 50 miles. The composite opinion of the majority view on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was that the size of the national seashore as contained in S. 4 is amply justified, and that the area is of great national significance. This seashore proposal was presented by the President of the United States in his state of the Union message as one of the three national seashores which should move forward in this particular session of the Congress.

I hope the amendment will be defeated. I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator from Colorado is prepared to do likewise.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I do not think we are operating under a time agreement, but I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BIBLE. I thought there was a limitation on all three amendments. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ALLOTT. I cannot hear the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield it back.

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 4) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I have discussed this question at some length this afternoon. I told the senior Senator from Texas 3 years ago that I was in favor of the idea of a national seashore at Padre Island. I still am. I find the bill, however, without the two amendments, utterly unacceptable.

Since I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote on passage of the bill, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I shall vote against the passage of the bill, because I do not wish to be responsible for what may happen in future years, when people come into an area in which there will not be adequate roadways. We shall be inviting hundreds of thousands of people to come to this area by establishing it as a national seashore. I do not wish to have the lives of any of those people on my hands. Therefore, I shall vote against passage of the bill.

I wish to make perfectly clear now what my vote will be, so that there will be no question in the future as to how I voted on the question of passage of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I shall vote against passage of the bill. I think the Senate is initiating a new program which will have ramifications far beyond what we may expect. My vote will be "nay."

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record immediately prior to the passage of the bill a resolution by the Cameron County Democratic Executive Committee.

The Cameron County Democratic Executive Committee, composed of elected Democratic precinct chairmen from all parts of Cameron County, at the last regular meeting at the county courthouse adopted the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY CAMERON COUNTY DEMOCRATIC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Whereas we believe that a portion of the natural wealth and beauty of Padre Island should be preserved so that it may be enjoyed by our children and our grandchildren; and

Whereas this executive committee believes that the future growth and prosperity of this county and the entire Rio Grande Valley would be greatly stimulated by a national seashore reaching into Cameron County; and

Whereas we believe that these objectives cannot be realized unless the national seashore extends into Cameron County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee expresses to the Congress of the United States and all of our representatives therein our sincere hope that a Padre Island National Seashore bill will be adopted by both Houses without delay, and that there be included within the seashore that largest possible area consistent with the requirements of private development, and that in any event the south boundary of the seashore extend into Cameron County so that the people of this county may enjoy free and unrestricted access to the seashore and may benefit by having the opportunity to be hosts to the flood of visitors which will undoubtedly result from the creation of this great national recreation area.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record immediately prior to passage of the bill an article from the Corpus Christi Caller of February 16, 1962, which quotes Mr. Frank E. Masland, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Board on National Parks, as having said that a national seashore area on Padre Island of much less than 88 miles would be ridiculous.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CHOICE SEASHORE SITE—PARKS ADVISER HITS 65-MILE PADRE PLAN

(By Cliff Lawhorne)

A national seashore area on Padre Island of much less than 88 miles would be ridiculous, Frank E. Masland, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Board on National Parks, said here yesterday during an all-day tour of the island.

Masland, whose Board advises Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, said a seashore area preserve of no longer than 65 miles would not be desirable.

Masland toured the island with Dr. Clarence Cottam, director of Rob and Bessie Welder Wildlife Foundation and president of the National Parks Association. They were accompanied by County Judge Noah Kennedy, County Commissioner Robert N. Barnes, and County Building Superintendent Leslie Chappell.

Masland said Padre Island is "beyond question one of the most choice seashore areas still available on the entire U.S. coastline" for a national preserve.

He said that if a national seashore area designation for Padre Island "did not prove to be one of the biggest businesses in the State, it would be the exception."

A bill to establish a national seashore area on Padre Island could "get through Congress without much trouble if there were some unanimity (in the Texas delegation) in regard to it," he said.

Senator Ralph Yarborough, of Texas, has introduced a bill calling for an 88-mile seashore area, and Representative John Young, of Corpus Christi, and Representative Joe Kilgore, of McAllen, have bills calling for a 65-mile-long preserve.

"All legitimate differences to the establishment of a national seashore area can be settled unless there is an adamant local position for a through road," Masland said.

He said the National Park Service "does not want a road and so far as I see it this is the only bone of contention."

The National Park Service is interested in providing access roads to the seashore area if it is established, he said.

"A seashore area is designated for preservation and use of the public," Masland said. "If a through road were put on the island, there would be all use and little preservation."

Masland also said the pending seashore bills protect Texas oil interests in the Laguna Madre, which is included in the area proposed for a national seashore area.

"The schoolchildren of Texas have nothing to worry about. The Federal Government is not going to take any of their money from oil revenues," he said.

Masland said regulatory measures on oil exploration are designed only to prevent companies from destroying the natural beauty while drilling for oil.

CANAL ISSUE

He also said he sees no great controversy with the intracoastal canal. "I feel this is an area of compromise. The channel should be preserved and there is enough room between the mud flats and the channel for compromise."

Masland toured 40 miles down the island, to Big Shell. He and the others not only inspected the beach areas but made periodic side jaunts behind the sand dunes and over to the Laguna Madre side of the island.

He took pictures of all portions of the island visited.

"Padre Island looks like an entirely different island than that I visited 2 years ago," Masland said. "Hurricane Carla has, in many respects, improved it.

"There is nothing else like this. I think it should be preserved in all its natural beauty. It is unique to begin with. It's big enough. Its scope is sufficient. It is compatible with preservation. There is no doubt in anybody's mind in the National Park Service as to the appropriateness of this island in the park system."

FORWARD LOOK

He said the proposed national seashore area would not just meet the needs of today "but the needs of tomorrow."

"I don't know of any instance when a national park has not proved to be a tremendous—not just a modest but a tremendous—economic advantage to the area in which it is established," he said.

Masland said that at Cape Hatteras, recently designated as a national seashore area, a number of high-class motels have been developed nearby.

"I can see the same thing here exactly," Masland said. "This is a tremendous area for recreational purposes and there is ample opportunity for contiguous private development at both ends."

Masland, of Carlisle, Pa., is a manufacturer, homebuilder, and banker and has extensive farm holdings. He is a director of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia and a number of large concerns.

He and his wife are staying here with Mr. and Mrs. Harry B. Lankford, 3402 Ocean Drive. Mrs. Masland and Mrs. Lankford are cousins.

SUPERIOR SITE

Cottam said during the tour that Padre Island "in my opinion is the greatest area in the Nation for a national seashore area."

Chappell, who drove a power wagon for the tour, said Masland and Cottam are the first persons he has taken on an inspection of the island "who really wanted to see it."

"Most of those I have driven went down about 6 or 7 miles and said they had seen enough," Chappell said. "These men wanted to see as much as possible and they spent all day doing it."

Judge Kennedy, who is a member of Governor Daniel's Padre Island Study Committee, explained developments on the State level as they pertain to the proposed park proposal. He told Masland he definitely is for a Federal preservation on the island.

Both Kennedy and Barnes, in whose precinct a portion of Padre Island lies, acted as guides for the visitors. Sun Oil Co. acted as host for the group at the firm's Yarbrough (Murdock) Pass station.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 4) was passed.

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I wish to have the Record show that I voted against passage of the bill. I wish to have the RECORD further show that I voted against passage of the bill for the reasons expressed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. I wish to be associated with the remarks the Senator made on that point.

I ask unanimous consent that these remarks may be printed in the RECORD immediately after passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Madam President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED SERVICES, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for armed services, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 11, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 10, 1962:

STATE DEPARTMENT

G. Griffith Johnson, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Lionel Charles McGarr, O17225, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, O15513, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Robert Jefferson Wood, O18064, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the rank of general.

Maj. Gen. John Hersey Michaelis, O20328, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. William White Dick, Jr., O18384, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Dwight Edward Beach, O18747, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Kennedy Aid Protests Barring of Red Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, when the Senate Judiciary Committee is considering the qualifications of Mr. Byron R. White to serve as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, they might do well to inquire into the statements made by him in a letter to Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, under date of March 5, 1962.

As reported by the Associated Press, Mr. White as Deputy Attorney General objected to the House amendment prohibiting the distribution of Communist propaganda through the mails, setting out five principal reasons.

One of the reasons is, "Even assuming an adequate definition, the legal and administrative problems involved in enforcement would be so substantial as to raise serious doubts as to its legality and efficiency."

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the United States is spending some $62 billion to defend itself from communism by force, can it be said that a few million dollars would not be well spent in hiring staffs to sort, sift, and dispose of propaganda intended to destroy this Nation from within?

Even 1 percent of the $62 billion spent on defense from without could well be spent on defense from within. This would cost only $620 million and would go a long way toward relieving unemployment.

Another reason given by Mr. White is, "It is inconsistent with the tradition of an open society which has characterized the history of this country and which the first amendment to the Constitution reflects."

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary must determine what Mr. White means by this statement. Is this his own personal feeling, or is he just mouthing the opinion of the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy?

Is the Senate of the United States going to approve the appointment of an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court who would permit a "Trojan horse" to be wheeled into every library and home in the Nation?

Does this man believe that in order to have an "open society" we must permit lies and misinformation to be fed into the minds of our students and citizens, at the expense of the American taxpayers? Just what kind of thinking is this, Mr. Speaker? What kind of decisions might we expect from men going onto the highest court in the land who hold these beliefs?

Another point he made is, "It is apt to do substantial injury to the international objectives of the United States." I do not care to comment upon this statement. Suffice it to say that I sincerely urge the Senate committee to check carefully into the theory of an appointee for this high post who believes that to stop the pouring of tons of Communist propaganda into this country would be apt to do substantial injury to the international objectives of the United States.

The Associated Press report on this matter is as follows:

KENNEDY AID PROTESTS BARRING OF RED MAIL

The Kennedy administration feels that legislation aimed at keeping Communist propaganda out of the mails is "objectionable in its present form."

It was learned that this administration view was expressed in a letter written March 5 by Deputy Attorney General Byron R. White to Senator JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina. Senator JOHNSTON is chairman of the Senate Post Office Committee, which is considering the legislation.

Mr. White referred to a House-approved bill which would increase postal rates by about $690 million a year.

In passing the measure, the House wrote in an amendment by Representative CUNNINGHAM, Republican, of Nebraska, to prohibit the Post Office from handling any mail that the Attorney General determines to be Communist political propaganda.

WHITE LISTS REASONS

"Even though we are sympathetic with the motivation for (the amendment)," Mr. White wrote Senator JOHNSTON, "the administration opposes its enactment in its present form for a number of reasons."

Mr. White listed these reasons for opposition to the amendment:

"1. It would deprive even those in our country who have a legitimate reason to receive foreign Communist political propaganda, however defined, of the opportunity to do so.

"2. It does not provide an adequate definition of Communist political propaganda.

"3. Even assuming an adequate definition, the legal and administrative problems involved in enforcement would be so substantial as to raise serious doubts as to its legality and efficacy.

"4. It is inconsistent with the tradition of an open society which has characterized the history of this country and which the first amendment to the Constitution reflects.

"5. It is apt to do substantial injury to the international objectives of the United States."

ADVANTAGE NOTED

In his 17-page letter, Mr. White said those with legitimate reason for receiving Communist political propaganda include teachers, students, specialists in Communist affairs, newspapers and newspapermen, libraries, and scientists.

Mr. White told Senator JOHNSTON the Cunningham amendment also would give Iron

Curtain countries an excuse to curtail or ban mail from this country. He noted that President Kennedy said in a news conference last January 24 that this country sends seven times as much mail behind the Iron Curtain as it receives from there.

Grain Storage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of western South Dakota are being forced to lose $1,351,171 in cash revenues as a result of the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture to call in the 1958 farm-stored wheat. They are losing thousands of additional dollars because of the decision of the Secretary to call in the 1959 farm-stored barley and the 1960 farm-stored rye. This, Mr. Speaker, is revenue the farmers could in good conscience have expected rather than having this grain called at this time and placed in commercial warehouses.

In a letter from the Washington office to all State ASC offices in the Nation under date of March 19, 1962, the Secretary said, "Also, it is well to note that the storage situation has improved because of more construction and accelerated disposal programs." It is understandable, Mr. Speaker, that the Department has probably agreed with commercial warehouses and large storage companies that if they would increase their storage capacity, the Department would see to it that these additional storage capacities were kept full. The result is, Mr. Speaker, as was stated by the Secretary in his report, they probably have provided more construction and this is the reason that farm-stored grain is being called at this time.

If the Department has made these agreements with the big storage outfits, then there is little the small farmer can do except to give this source of revenue to the large commercial outfits.

Insofar as wheat is concerned, the situation is a little strange because today there is in storage 1,023,162,812 bushels as compared with commercial storage at this same time last year of 1,000,593,449 bushels. By the same token, farm stored wheat today totals 53,428,590 bushels as compared with 114,445,551 bushels at this time last year. In other words, Mr. Speaker, some 23 million bushels has already been called in and has already gone into central warehouses for storing, pulling it off the farm, taking that revenue away from the farmer, when the cost to the Government for farm storage is exactly the same as the cost to the Government for commercial storage.

Some of the farmers in my county are beginning to wonder if this great bureaucracy here in Washington is actually a Department of Agriculture or a department of commercial storage. They are beginning to wonder just whose chestnuts are being pulled out of the fire; they know they are not theirs.

In their letter of March 19, they indicated that the farm storage program was intended only to meet a shortage of commercial warehouse space. This, Mr. Speaker, was not the intent of Congress in passing these on-the-farm storage programs. Congress intended that the grain should be kept on the farm where it belongs. Congress intended that it should be kept there in the event of some natural emergency and as a safe storage place for the Nation's food supply in the event of war. Apparently this administration feels the danger of war is over, or at least there is less concern about having the food supply equally distributed across the Nation. One wonders how long it would take an enemy with nuclear warheads to blast every large grain terminal filled with wheat into oblivion.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, if it had been the intention of the Department of Agriculture to call in this farm-stored wheat and feed grain, would it not have been the fair thing to have notified the farmers last fall that the Department intended to call in this grain? If this had been done, the farmers could have sold this grain on the open market last winter at a somewhat higher price than the initial loan. This would have given the farmer a little more money for his grain, and it would have alleviated the Government of all the additional cost of handling and the continued storage in commercial warehouses. In most of the Great Plains area, the farmers feel it is to their benefit to keep this grain on the farm as a protection for the coming year should the next year be a short productive season.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, insofar as barley, oats, and rye are concerned, this grain which is in storage is simply imported grain or the offset from imported barley, oats, and rye. Each year the Department of Agriculture publishes a complete compilation of the domestic production, the total disappearance, and the imports of all grains. If anyone is sufficiently interested to take the time to total these figures on an adding machine, they will find that during the past 10 years we produced in this country 3,774 billion bushels of barley and that our disappearance during those 10 years was 3,774.5 billion bushels. They will also be surprised to learn that we imported 206 billion bushels. In other words, if there are 206 billion bushels of barley in storage today, all of it has been imported because our disappearance was greater than our production.

If they are interested in running up the figures on oats, they would find that our production during the past 10 years was 12,359.8 billion bushels, and that our disappearance was 12,586.8 billion bushels, or 227 million bushels greater than our production, and that we imported 221.6 billion bushels besides. The domestic production of rye was 252,114 billion bushels, the disappearance was 287,802 billion bushels, or some 35 billion bushels more than we produced, and our imports were 44,250 billion bushels.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, all of the feed grains—barley, oats, and rye—in storage today have either been imported or are the offset from imported grains. In spite of this fact, Mr. Speaker, in the Secretary's letter of March 19, he said, "The failure of the programs (since 1952) to keep production in line lead to a large buildup of stocks creating an imbalance with available storage capacity." The imbalance, Mr. Speaker, was created not by overproduction, not by any failure of the farm program, but purely and simply from imported feed grains, and yet even the Secretary of Agriculture is beating the farmers of America over the head trying to make them believe that it is their overproduction which is causing him his headaches.

Mr. Speaker, following is a complete tabulation of domestic production, total disappearance, and imports of barley, oats, and rye for the past 10 years with the exception that the 1961–62 figures are estimates. These figures are compiled and printed annually by the Department of Agriculture and are available to anyone who would care to take the time to study them. They are very conclusive proof that any barley, oats, or rye in storage has been imported during the past 10 years. The tabulation is as follows:

Production, disappearance, and imports, 1952–62

[Millions of bushels]

	Domestic production	Total disappearance	Imports
	Barley		
1952–53	228. 2	290. 3	24. 9
1953–54	246. 7	275. 2	38. 3
1954–55	379. 2	265. 1	24. 1
1955–56	401. 2	344. 0	28. 3
1956–57	376. 8	443. 0	26. 5
1957–58	437. 2	393. 1	24. 4
1958–59	475. 2	420. 6	14. 3
1959–60	422. 4	468. 0	17. 9
1960–61	427. 1	458. 2	5. 3
1961–62	380. 0	417. 0	2. 0
Total	3, 774. 0	3, 774. 5	206. 0
	Oats		
1952–53	1, 217. 4	1, 314. 2	68. 6
1953–54	1, 153. 2	1, 255. 3	79. 8
1954–55	1, 409. 6	1, 353. 6	20. 0
1955–56	1, 503. 1	1, 461. 9	3. 1
1956–57	1, 163. 2	1, 286. 5	16. 8
1957–58	1, 301. 0	1, 241. 1	24. 5
1958–59	1, 415. 5	1, 376. 2	3. 5
1959–60	1, 052. 0	1, 154. 3	2. 0
1960–61	1, 150. 8	1, 095. 7	1. 3
1961–62	994. 0	1, 048. 0	2. 0
Total	12, 359. 8	12, 586. 8	221. 6
	Rye		
1952–53	16. 146	19. 377	5. 56
1953–54	18. 894	23. 644	13. 47
1954–55	25. 935	27. 954	3. 45
1955–56	29. 055	32. 200	3. 39
1956–57	21. 155	34. 641	3. 42
1957–58	27. 243	27. 325	3. 26
1958–59	32. 186	32. 561	3. 30
1959–60	23. 100	29. 500	4. 20
1960–61	32. 500	31. 600	2. 70
1961–62	25. 900	29. 000	1. 50
Total	252. 114	287. 802	44. 25

The Long View of Our World and Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I had the great privilege, along with Senator CLAIR ENGLE and Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER, of being in Alameda County and the Seventh District of California, the district I am honored to represent, and on the campus of my alma mater, the University of California, with the President of the United States.

In his memorable address to more than 90,000 persons in the university's Memorial Stadium, an address which was the high spot of this great university's 94th charter day ceremonies, the President made an eloquent and characteristically thoughtful appraisal of developments in our world and of the basic principles of our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I submit the President's speech for the RECORD.

The speech follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S SPEECH AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

This is a great anniversary of a great university. It is in fact a double anniversary. One hundred years ago this July Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act, establishing a nationwide system of land-grant colleges and universities. Six years later the University of California received its charter; and, from the moment of its foundation, its remarkable contributions to State and Nation have proven the wisdom of the land-grant college program.

The first graduating class at Berkeley produced, I am informed, a Governor of California, two regents of the university, a college professor, a clergyman, a State assemblyman, and assorted lawyers, engineers and civic leaders—all out of 12 graduates.

Today, you are doing nearly as well. When I observe the men who surround me in Washington—when I reflect that the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Ambassador to India are all graduates or former students of this university—I am forced to confront an uncomfortable truth, and so are you: that the New Frontier may well owe more to Berkeley than to Harvard.

This has been a week of momentous events around the world. The long, painful struggle in Algeria drew nearer to solution. Both nuclear powers and neutrals labored at Geneva to renew the quest for disarmament. The Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union and the United States met once again on the subject of Berlin. The Congress opened hearings on a trade bill of far-reaching importance to the growth and strength of this Nation and the Atlantic Community. And my wife had her first and last ride on an elephant.

But history may well remember this week for an act of lesser immediate impact—the decision by the United States and the Soviet Union to seek concrete agreements on the joint exploration of space.

Experience has taught us that an agreement to negotiate does not always lead to negotiated agreements. But should such a joint effort be realized, its significance could well be tremendous.

In terms of space science, our combined knowledge and efforts can benefit the peoples of all nations; joint weather satellite systems to provide more ample warning against the destructive powers of storm—joint communications systems to draw the world closer together—and cooperation in space medicine research and space tracking operations to speed the day when man will explore the moon and even beyond.

But the scientific gains a joint effort would offer might be small compared to the gains for world peace. For a cooperative Soviet-American effort to space science and exploration would emphasize the interests that unite us instead of the conflicts that divide us.

It offers us an area in which the stale, sterile dogmas of the cold war can be left literally a quarter of a million miles behind. And it would remind us on both sides that knowledge, not hate, is the passkey to the future—that knowledge transcends national antagonisms—that it speaks a universal language—that it is the possession, not of a single class, a single nation or a single ideology, but of all mankind.

I hardly need to emphasize the pursuit of knowledge here. Your faculty includes more Nobel laureates than any other faculty in the world—more in this one community than our principal adversary has received since the awards began in 1901.

I am happy to pay honor to those winners who are here on the platform today—and to the community which has sought and sustained them. And I know that the University of California will continue to grow as an intellectual center because your presidents, your chancellors, and your professors have rigorously defended that unhampered freedom of discussion and inquiry which is the heart of the intellectual enterprise and the soul of the free university.

We may be proud as a Nation of our record in scientific achievement, but at the same time we must be humbled by an understanding of the interdependence of all knowledge. I am certain that every scholar and scientist present today would agree that his own work has benefited immeasurably from the work of men and women in other countries.

The prospect of a partnership with Soviet scientists in the exploration of space opens up exciting prospects of collaboration in other areas of learning. And cooperation in the pursuit of knowledge can hopefully lead to cooperation in the pursuit of peace.

Yet the pursuit of knowledge itself implies a world where men are free to follow out the logic of their own ideas. It implies a world where nations are free to solve their own problems and to realize their own ideals. It implies, in short, a world where collaboration emerges from the voluntary decisions of nations strong in their own independence and their own self-respect.

It implies, I believe, the kind of world which is emerging before our eyes—the world produced by the revolution of national independence which is today sweeping everywhere across the earth.

I sometimes think that we are impressed too much by the clamor of daily urgencies. The newspaper headlines and the television screen give us the short view. They so flood us with stop-press detail that we lose sight of the grand movements of history. Yet it is the profound tendencies, and not the passing excitements, that will shape the future.

The short view gives us the impression as a nation of being shoved and harried, everywhere on the defense. But this impression is surely an optical illusion. From the perspective of Moscow, the world today may seem even more troublesome, intractable, and frustrating than it does to us.

The leaders of the Communist world are not only confronted by acute internal problems in each Communist country—the failure of agriculture, the rising discontent of the youth and the intellectuals, the demands of technical and managerial groups for status and security. They are confronted in addition by profound divisions within the Communist world itself—divisions which have already shattered the image of communism as a universal system guaranteed to abolish all social and international conflicts, the most valuable asset which the Communists had for many years.

Wisdom requires the long view. And the long view shows us that the revolution of national independence is a fundamental fact of our era. This revolution cannot be stopped.

As new nations emerge from the oblivion of centuries, their first aspiration is to affirm their national identity. Their deepest hope is for a world where, within a framework of international cooperation, every country can solve its own problems according to its own traditions and ideals.

It is in the interests of the pursuit of knowledge—and it is in our own national interest—that this revolution of national independence succeed. For the Communists rest everything on the idea of a monolithic world—a world where all knowledge has a single pattern, all societies move toward a single model, all problems have a single solution, and all roads lead to a single destination.

The pursuit of knowledge, on the other hand, rests everything on the opposite idea—on the idea of a world based on diversity, self-determination and freedom. And that is the kind of world to which we Americans, as a Nation, are committed by the principles on which this republic was formed.

As men conduct the pursuit of knowledge, they create a world which freely unites national diversity and international partnership. This emerging world is incompatible with the Communist conception of world order.

It will irresistibly burst the bonds of Communist organization and Communist ideology. And diversity and independence, far from being opposed to the American conception of world order, represent the very essence of our vision of the future.

There used to be much talk a few years ago about the inevitable triumph of communism. We hear such talk much less now. No one who examines the modern world can doubt that the great currents of history are carrying the world away from the monolithic idea toward the pluralist idea—away from communism and toward national independence and freedom.

No one can doubt that the wave of the future is not the conquest of the world by a single dogmatic creed, but the liberation of the diverse energies of free nations and freemen. No one can doubt that cooperation in the pursuit of knowledge must lead to freedom of the mind and of the soul.

Beyond the drumfire of daily crisis there is arising the outlines of a robust and vital world community, founded on nations secure in their own independence, dedicated to freedom of choice, and united by allegiance to world peace and justice.

It would be foolish to say that this world will be won tomorrow, or the day after. The processes of history are fitful, halting, and aggravating. There will be frustrations and setbacks. There will be times of anxiety and gloom.

The specter of thermonuclear war will hang over mankind; and we must heed the advice of Oliver Wendell Holmes of "freedom leaning on her spear" until all nations are wise enough to disarm safely and effectively.

Yet we can have a new confidence today in the direction in which history is moving.

Nothing is more stirring than the recognition of public purpose. Every great age is marked by innovation and daring—by the ability to meet unprecedented problems with intelligent solutions.

In a time of turbulence and change, it is more true than ever that knowledge is power; for only by true understanding and steadfast judgment are we able to master the challenge of history.

If this is so, we must strive to acquire knowledge—and to apply it with wisdom. We must reject oversimplified theories of international life—the theory that American mission is to remake the world in the American image.

We must seize the vision of a free and diverse world—and shape our policies to speed progress toward a flexible world order.

This is the unifying spirit of our policies in the world. The purpose of our aid programs must be to help developing countries to move forward as rapidly as possible on the road to genuine national independence.

Our military policies must assist nations to protect the processes of democratic reform and development against disruption and intervention.

Our diplomatic policies must strengthen our relations with the whole world, with our several alliances and with the United Nations.

As we press forward on every front to realize the flexible world order, the role of the university becomes ever more important both as a reservoir of ideas and as a repository of the long view.

"Knowledge is the great sun of the firmament," said Daniel Webster. "Life and power are scattered with all its beams."

In its light, we must think and act not only for the moment, but for the century. I am reminded of the story of Marshal Lyautey, who once asked his gardener to plant a tree. The gardener objected that the tree was slowgrowing and would not reach maturity for a hundred years. The marshal replied, "In that case, there is no time to lose, plant it this afternoon."

Today a world of knowledge—a world of cooperation—a just and lasting peace—may well be years away. But we have no time to lose. Let us plant our trees this very afternoon.

Financial Problems of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the proposal of a bond issue to enable the United Nations to cope with its grave current financial problems has generated much healthy and democratic discussion among the voters of Utah's First Congressional District which I represent.

As a result of these discussions I have received a number of letters from constituents asking for a variety of information bearing directly or indirectly on the general subject. To make sure that I would have the latest data available for replying to these letters, I compiled a series of broadly representative inquiries and addressed them to the chief U.S. representative to the United Nations requesting the pertinent facts on the points involved.

I do not doubt that my colleagues in this House have been or will be in receipt of somewhat similar letters from their constituents, hence I believe it will be helpful to them and other regular readers of the RECORD if I ask permission to insert therein the response my request elicited from the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson. My thought is that thereby I may spare colleagues the need of correspondence covering much the same factual ground and also obviate the requirement for much duplicative paper work on the part of our delegation's U.N. staff:

1. What will happen to the United Nations if we do not purchase these bonds to meet the special assessment?

Answer: "It would probably be necessary to call a special meeting of the General Assembly to consider alternative possibilities of raising the money."

2. If we refuse is there any alternative means of meeting the present financial obligations of the United Nations? If so what are these alternatives.

Answer: "Many alternatives were considered before the bond issue was decided upon. They included out and out loans, having the Security Council members foot the bill, etc. These were rejected as being less feasible and less desirable than the bond plan."

3. What is the amount of the total annual budget of the United Nations?

Answer: "The 1961 expenditures of the United Nations under the regular budget were estimated at $72.7 million. Total estimated expenditures for 1961 for the United Nations Specialized Agencies and special programs amounted to $450.6 million. About $100 million of this was for the Congo operation and about $19 million for the Emergency Force in the Middle East. Contributions of the United States were $22.3 million to the regular budget and $194 million for the special programs."

4. Under the present prorated assessment arrangement why is the United States with only one vote in the General Assembly forced to pay 32 percent of the UN's regular budget while Russia with three votes in the Assembly pays less than 15 percent?

Answer: "The total Soviet assessment (U.S.S.R., 14.97; Ukraine, 1.98; Byelorussia, 0.52) is 17.47 percent. The Charter of the United Nations provides for one vote for each member. Assessments are based on ability to pay under the charter. The United States share is less than it would be if a strict ability to pay formula were used. It has been estimated that on an ability to pay formula our share would be closer to 40 percent. In 1957 the United Nations General Assembly approved an eventual decrease in our assessment to 30 percent which will become the maximum contribution of any one member to the ordinary expenses of the United Nations (Resolution 1137, 12th session). These contributions are determined by a body of professional statisticians who make up the Committee on Contributions of the United Nations. An interesting sidelight is that the U.S.S.R. recently demanded a recomputation of its assessment, claiming that it is being assessed too much in the light of its ability to pay. The U.S.S.R. was thus forced to admit that its grandiose claims of economic might and rapid growth were false."

5. What is the record of the Communist bloc of nations in making payments for their share of the regular annual U.N. budget? Have they at any time been in arrears? If so, how often and what length of time?

Answer: "No country, including the Soviet bloc, has refused to pay its assessments for the regular budget and Soviet bloc countries have been paying these assessments within the required 2-year period. On February 28, 1962, Communist bloc countries owed the following amounts on their contributions for the 1961 regular budget:

U.S.S.R	$1, 568, 843
Ukraine	247, 436
Byelorussia	54, 008
Albania	3, 535
Bulgaria	
Czechoslovakia	
Hungary:	
1960	116, 442
1961	259, 841
	376, 283
Poland	218, 569
Rumania	50, 347
Total	2, 519, 021

"Since February 28, the U.S.S.R., Byelorussia, and Rumania have paid the above amounts. As will be seen from the above figures only Hungary owes an amount from 1960. As a generalization, all bloc countries pay their budget assessments completely by the middle of the year following the year in which the assessment was made."

6. Are they now in arrears and how much?

Answer: "The answer contained in '5' above."

7. How much does the Communist bloc owe the United Nations for special assessments for emergency operations in the Middle East and the Congo operation?

Answer: "The countries of the Communist bloc named in answer to question 5 above owe the amount of $44,432,220 for their portion of the assessments for operations in the Middle East and the Congo."

8. Out of the total membership of the U.N. how many nations have refused to pay their share of these special assessments?

Answer: "To our knowledge, only 13 countries have refused to pay their Congo assessments: the 10 Soviet bloc countries, Cuba, France, and Belgium. However, an additional 49 countries have not yet paid for a variety of reasons. Refusals to pay for UNEF total 15: the Soviet bloc plus 5 Arab States. An additional 15 have not yet paid for other seasons. Of these nine are recently admitted African states all of which have unusual financial problems."

9. Will a penalty be imposed upon nations refusing to pay the special assessment?

Answer: "Yes, if the International Court of Justice holds that these assessments are expenses of the Organization as defined by article 17 of the United Nations Charter. Article 19 of the charter provides for the loss of the vote in the General Assembly when a member's arrears 'equal or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years.' Some countries, including the Soviet bloc, have refused to pay their special assessments for peace and security operations in the Middle East and the Congo because they contend these are not expenses of the Organization as defined in article 17."

10. If yes, upon what rule or law of the United Nations will such a penalty be based.

Answer: "Upon the basis of article 19 and the Court decision discussed above."

11. Has an advisory opinion been requested from the World Court?

Answer: "Yes, the International Court of Justice has been asked to render an advisory opinion on the mandatory character of the special assessments of the United Nations operations in the Middle East and the Congo."

12. If so, when is it expected that an opinion will be rendered?

Answer: "This summer."

13. Is it true that a nation may lose its vote in the General Assembly by being more than 2 years in arrears on its regular dues? If yes, for what period of time and with what result as to voting rights?

Answer: "In the opinion of the United States and the majority of members article

19 applies to the total of all 'expenses of the organization' and should therefore not be applied only to the regular budget, but should include the Middle East and Congo assessments."

14. If the World Court finds that member nations must pay special assessments or lose their vote, would it still be necessary for the United States to purchase $100 million of the bonds?

Answer: "Yes. The proceeds from the bond issue and from the collection of arrearages are both needed if the United Nations is to meet its unpaid bills as well as the costs of continuing its Middle East and Congo operations. These costs are estimated at $210 million from July 1, 1962, to December 31, 1963, and the full $200 million from the bond issue is really needed for these costs alone. However, it will undoubtedly be necessary to use some of these funds to pay back debts at least until the arrears can be collected."

Mr. Speaker, by way of a footnote to Ambassador Stevenson's letter, I think that the role or burden of the United States in supporting the U.N. appears in better perspective when it is remembered that while this country accounts for only some 6.2 percent of the world's population, we own almost 50 percent of its wealth, according to estimates for the last calendar year. In other words, the pooled financial resources of all the rest of U.N.'s 103 members are less than what we command, for there are physically significant segments of the world which do not figure in this financial comparison since for various reasons they are not U.N. members.

History of Journalism in Dunklin County, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD V. LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, with its "Spirit of '75 edition" of Monday, April 2, 1962, the Daily Dunklin Democrat, published at Kennett, Mo., began its 75th year of service to the people of the southeast Missouri-northeast Arkansas area.

Among the congratulatory messages received by the Daily Democrat's publisher, Jack Stapleton, Jr., was one from a former newsman, who has more recently received national recognition in another profession. That message was as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.

JACK STAPLETON, JR.,
Publisher, the Daily Dunklin Democrat,
Kennett, Mo.:

I was pleased to learn that your newspaper is observing its 75th anniversary. This is certainly a significant event. I know you will continue in the years to come to exercise your skill and judgment in permitting your readers to receive full and fair coverage of the news.

With all best wishes.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

This same edition of the Daily Dunklin Democrat also carried an excellent account of the history of journalism in Dunklin County, Mo., which traces the development of bringing the printed news to the people west of the Mississippi, in the early days. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD, so that all my colleagues will have an opportunity to read and enjoy it as I have.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DDD HAS LONG HISTORY OF SERVICE TO MO-ARK AREA

Journalism in the form of the printed word was introduced west of the Mississippi River and to Missouri in 1808 with the printing of the first edition of the Missouri Gazette in old St. Louis by Joseph Charless. This pioneer publication heralded in several ways the birth of Missouri journalism with its humble beginning, Democratic philosophy, endurance and influence.

Some 11 years later in 1819, the first newspaper in southeast Missouri—actually, the second one published in the State outside St. Louis—was begun in Jackson. The Missouri Herald brought the printed medium to a section of the State which was still largely undeveloped, but whose need for news was just as great as today.

Dunklin County was not established as a political unit occupying the western half of southeast Missouri's "bootheel" until 1845, and a year later the present city of Kennett was laid out in the center of the county near a village of Delaware Indians. This community was first known as Chilletacaux, the name of a prominent Indian chief.

The early history of journalism in Dunklin County is rather vague, but the best sources seem to indicate that the first newspaper published in the county was the Dunklin County Herald printed at Clarkton in 1870. Clarkton was then the largest and most prosperous town in the county.

All authorities seem to agree that by 1872 this paper had moved to Kennett, but was published there only a short time.

Clarkton proved to be the spawning place for several more papers, the next being the Advertiser founded there in 1872 after the Herald had moved. Albert and Baldwin established this publication which shortly afterwards became the property of Charles Stokes who changed its name to the Enterprise. Apparently as his journalism predecessors had done, Stokes saw Kennett as a "greener pasture," and in 1876 the Enterprise moved to the county seat. Also like previous ventures, it was discontinued after a short time.

The early Dunklin County paper whose existence is most substantiated is the Dunklin County Advocate which was established at Clarkton in October of 1877 by W. R. McDaniel. Two different accounts of its existence are given, but both seem to have a common conclusion.

Goodspeed in his "History of Southeast Missouri," published in 1888, relates that the Advocate was taken to Kennett soon after its establishment and published there for several months.

Quoting Douglass' "History of Southeast Missouri": "It [the Advocate] shortly after its beginning in Clarkton came under the control of John W. Baldwin and was moved to Kennett.

"In 1879, the paper was purchased by Charles Stokes and moved to Malden. Here its name was changed to the Malden Clipper. It was then taken to Kennett in 1886 and its publication discontinued in 1887.

"The printing of the Kennett Clipper was begun in March 1888, by R. H. Jones."

In either case, it would seem there is a direct line of descent from the founding of the Dunklin County Advocate in 1887 at Clarkton to the beginning of the Kennett Clipper at the county seat in 1888.

Because of the numerous previous failures to make a newspaper a success in Kennett, little optimism was expressed by local residents when R. H. Jones, Will Mitchim, and Will A. Jones arrived on April 9, 1888, with the intention of printing the Kennett Clipper.

Mitchim soon left the firm, and Will A. Jones became the printer, with R. H. Jones the owner, proprietor, and editor.

In the early part of 1893, the entire operation was sold to a group of Kennett businessmen who formed the Dunklin County Publishing Co. This group, all stanch Democrats and prominent in the community, was anxious that Dunklin County have a successful Democratic newspaper which would be active for the party.

A search for a permanent editor was carried on for several weeks, and finally E. P. Caruthers was chosen. The journalist of several years experience assumed charge of the newspaper on June 22, 1893, with an editorial announcing the change of the paper's name to the Dunklin Democrat.

Other milestones in the history of the Daily Democrat include:

1903: First permanent home for the paper is built and a new press and paper folder is installed. (This building is the present home of the Daily Democrat);

October 1913: Caruthers dies, Will A. Jones returns to continue the paper;

1921: A Goss Comet webb press is installed;

January 1925: The first edition of the Twice-A-Week Dunklin Democrat makes its appearance;

January 1953: Will A. Jones & Sons announce the sale of the Dunklin Democrat to Stapleton Publications Co. of Albany, Mo. The former company was composed of U.S. Representative Paul C. Jones and Edgar Jones, who served as editors and publishers of the newspaper with distinction. Additional interests of the partnership brought about the sale to the Stapleton Publications Co., which is headed by Jack Stapleton, Sr., of Albany, Mo.

February 1, 1953: Stapleton Publications Co. assumes ownership and management of the Dunklin Democrat.

July 1, 1953: Jack Stapleton, Jr., of Stanberry, Mo., appointed publisher of the newspaper.

April 2, 1956: The first edition of the Daily Dunklin Democrat is published, signifying the changeover from semiweekly to daily publication.

March 15, 1960: Installation of the newspaper's 32-page Goss Straightline rotary press, with full color facilities, is completed.

November 1, 1960: The daily circulation of the newspaper exceeds 5,000 copies.

April 2, 1962: The Daily Democrat begins observance of 75 years of service of southeast Missouri and northeast Arkansas.

National Lottery of Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Guatemala. This country, although a small nation, has the financial wisdom to recognize and accept the worth of a national lottery.

In 1961, the gross receipts of the Guatemalan national lottery came to $2,883,580. The total net income to the Government in that year came to over half a million dollars which was used for the construction of a national theater and for the development of the art of music.

Mr. Speaker, there is really nothing special about the national lottery of Guatemala, for Guatemala is another of those countries where it is simply assumed that the Government will have the intelligence to supervise and control gambling rather than disregard it. Unfortunately, this wisdom has not yet dawned upon the Government of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, if we would only open our eyes and see beyond our noses, we would see that a national lottery in the United States could offer a great deal to our people. A national lottery in this country can easily and voluntarily pump into our Government coffers over $10 billion a year in needed additional revenue which can help provide a tax cut and reduce our national debt.

An Academy for Public Service on Ellis Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish a National Academy for Public Service to be located on Ellis Island in New York Harbor.

Ellis Island, which served for many decades as the path of entry for millions of immigrants coming to this country, is today unused. There is only the memory of its glorious past when it teemed with eager newcomers to our friendly shores who had obtained their first contact and glimpse of America through a few days sojourn on this island until their admission had been cleared. Ellis Island was a symbol of hope and the realization of that hope for several generations of new Americans.

I propose that we give this island a new lease on life and a new hope for present and future generations of Americans by establishing a National Academy for Public Service there. At this Academy young American men and women will be trained in the service of the Federal, State, and municipal governments as dedicated public servants. There they will have the opportunity to specialize in the various fields of government to enable them to assume positions of responsibility with national or local government agencies.

In other words, this institution of higher learning will emphasize education for public service. This is not intended as another liberal arts college to compete with other municipal and private educational institutions in New York, as has been suggested for Ellis Island, but rather as a school for qualified students who want to make a career of government service. We have some 2½ million people employed by the Federal Government and many hundreds of thousands by State and municipal governments, and yet we do not have a single higher educational institution that specializes in training and preparing public servants for these positions.

I believe that an Academy for Public Service at Ellis Island, set up on a similar basis as the academies of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, and merchant marine, could render a most useful purpose to the various branches of government just as the other academies serve our military and maritime needs. In addition, the Public Service Academy could provide refresher training for those now in public service.

My bill provides that the U.S. Government make available the use of Ellis Island for the establishment of the proposed Public Service Academy where it is estimated that about 1,000 to 1,200 students could be accommodated. After the Academy begins its operations, students between the ages of 17 and 25 may be admitted on the basis of nationwide competitive examinations prescribed by the Director of the Academy. Each of these "public service trainees" will be requested to sign an agreement that he will serve in the U.S. public service for a period of at least 3 years after graduation.

Each State will be entitled to appoint annually as many candidates to the Academy equal to its representation in both Houses of Congress, plus one additional appointment. Thus, the Governor of each State, each U.S. Senator, and each Member of the House of Representatives will be able to recommend someone for an appointment. In addition, the President will be entitled to make up to 10 appointments annually.

Tuition, room and board, books, and other necessities shall be provided free to all trainees in a similar manner as these emoluments are provided at the military academies. The curricula shall be established by the Director of the Academy, with emphasis on those studies which are best suited in his judgment for careers in public service. Upon graduation, the trainees will receive an undergraduate degree.

The Academy will also provide graduate training on a limited basis to not more than 100 persons chosen each year for specialized training in this field. They shall be persons who are career public servants, recommended by the head of their department or agency, or chosen by a special selection panel. The selection panel is to be appointed by the President and is to consist of 10 members, who are distinguished in the fields of Government, education, and other public service. They are to serve without compensation. The selection of persons for advanced training in public service may be made from among those employed in the Federal, State, and local governments, and is to include also those serving in the National and State legislatures, as well as members of the judiciary branch of Government.

Mr. Speaker, public service has long been described as a public trust. In the highly skilled times in which we live it has become a necessity to stress skill and specialization in every endeavor. Public service is no different. We must have the people who possess not only an education, but a special type of education and training, as well as the zeal to make public service their lifetime career. There is no doubt in my mind that such an educational institution would render a most useful service to our Nation.

And I can think of no better location than Ellis Island, only minutes away from the heart of our great metropolis of New York, with its many libraries, museums, and other institutions of higher learning. In this manner Ellis Island can once again perform a great service to the country, in other ways and in other generations, but still in the best interests of the American people.

The 125th Anniversary of Congregation Shaare Zedek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, 1962 is the 125th anniversary of the founding of Congregation Shaare Zedek, the third oldest Jewish congregation in New York City, which is located in the congressional district I am proud to represent. Founded in 1837, Congregation Shaare Zedek from generation to generation has served faithfully the community. On Sunday, April 8, the congregation held its 125th anniversary ceremonies. It was an inspiring occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to express my best wishes and congratulations to the members of the congregation: Dr. Arthur T. Buch, the rabbi; Rev. Moshe Taube, cantor; Dr. Samuel R. Levine, president of Congregation Shaare Zedek; Judge J. Daniel Fink, who presided at the proceedings; and the many others who contributed so much to this celebration.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, made a principal address which traced the history and accomplishments of Congregation Shaare Zedek. In his usual lucid style Chairman CELLER captured the spirit of the occasion, and his talk was received enthusiastically.

As Chairman CELLER said:

> The activities of the congregation have proven time and again that no man is an island unto himself.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the text of this excellent speech:

CONGREGATION SHAARE ZEDEK

(By Representative EMANUEL CELLER)

To one we love we say, "May he live to one hundred and twenty"—Biz ein hundret tsvunzig yuhr. But mere man is rarely thus blessed. One hundred and twenty-five years in the life of an institution is not a long time, as history measures time, but 125 years of existence of a synagogue in a nation only itself 186 years old, as a nation, is a memorable reminder of the life of the Jew in America and of his contributions as a Jew and an American to this country which fought its way through to religious acceptance for races and creeds.

If I have my facts straight, I believe that one of the most interesting characters in the United States was active in forming the Congregation Shaare Zedek in 1837. Solomon Henry Jackson was born in England and came to the United States about 1787, settled in Pike County, Pa., and married Helen Miller, daughter of a Presbyterian minister. He edited a magazine called the Jew and after the death of his wife, Jackson came to New York City as the first Jewish printer in the city. He raised his five children as Jews; four of whom married Jews, and the fifth daughter, Eliza, married Dr. Peter Donovan who embraced Judaism.

In addition to editing the Jew, Jackson translated and published an English and Hebrew prayer book in 1826 and issued the first American edition of the Passover "Hagada" in English and Hebrew.

I don't know if a biography has been written of Jackson. If it hasn't, it ought to be because in his story lies the drama, the dedication, the scholarship of the Jew in America.

As we all know, the synagogue for the Jew was in those days the center of his life. His status in his society was determined not only by the seat he held in the synagogue but by the office he occupied therein. All his social and spiritual forces were nourished from the stream of his faith. Be he peddler, merchant, or physician, his scholarship established his prestige. His birth, his marriage, his death were matters of deep personal concern to the synagogue. From the synagogue flowed the acts of charity; a system of social welfare so that the congregant was never without refuge or solace in times of need.

This unity reminds me of the anecdote told about the soldier in Napoleon's army who cried out, "shema yisorel" every time he fired his gun into the opposing troops, so that if his shot killed another Jew, that Jew at least would die with this profession of Jewish faith—if not on his lips, at least in the air about him.

Thus the establishment of a synagogue was no small moment in the lives of the Jews in New York in the first half of the 19th century. Congregation Shaare Zedek bears, of course, the proud heritage of being the third oldest Jewish congregation in the city of New York. Again, if I recall my history correctly, the establishment of a third synagogue symbolized a movement of the Jews in America from the South into the eastern port of New York, for it was in the South that the Jew in America had established himself most solidly in the earliest days of Jewish migration to the United States.

For many years now, as many of you must know, I associated myself first with the establishment of a homeland for the Jews in Palestine and later with the establishment of the independent State of Israel. But long before the problem gripped me, the Congregation Shaare Zedek understood and pursued the cause of the homeland. The activities of the congregation have proven time and again that no man is an island unto himself.

In fact, your congregation was among the first to contribute to the Jewish National Fund back in 1921, to support the united Palestine appeal and to extend to various individuals throughout the country, and in other lands, money for personal sustenance. It contributed to such institutions as the Shaare Zedek Hospital in Jerusalem, to passover funds for Jewish prisoners, the Jewish Students' House and other groups, certainly, more familiar to the congregant than to me. I make mention of this only because of my consciousness of the long and fruitful history of the congregation, of its growth with and within the march of time. The congregation fed the Jews of the 19th century as it now feeds the Jews of the 20th century. It began in the year of a great financial panic in the United States and withstood the storms and received the blessings of the Nation, of which it was a part, and together with the Nation, as givers and receivers, enriched the soil of this, our native land.

Think of the history of Shaare Zedek has seen: The Civil War, the Reconstruction era, the tremendous industrial growth of the United States, the mass immigration beginning with 1890, the First World War, the first postwar period, the rise and fall of Hitler, the cold war, from the uses of coal to the uses of atomic energy, from the horse and buggy to the jet-propelled plane, the rise and multiplication of city life, the massive shifts of populations. How inextricably is the congregation tied with the development of these United States. Much has it seen both in glory and in disaster and because of this, this congregation has a meaning that strikes the deepest notes in our hearts. These are the notes of tradition, of belief, of belonging. Thus, I am proud to have been honored to address you on the occasion of your 125th anniversary. Tradition and change have combined to produce your unique quality of endurance as a people together, passing on the accumulated wisdom to the new generations.

I speak to you with the respect you have earned and with the reverence of a faith sustained.

Is REA Really Reversing Policy of Secrecy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was announced in the afternoon papers yesterday that the Rural Electrification Administration was "reversing" a 26-year-old policy of secrecy surrounding pending loan applications. Many of my fellow members on the House Government Operations Committee, including my good colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], whose presence here is sorely missed by all of us, and many of my other colleagues in the House have worked for years to break the wall of secrecy which has surrounded REA's consideration of loan applications. One might think, therefore, that this announcement of a policy reversal would be met with universal applause and a feeling of accomplishment. This has not happened, however.

A careful reading of the REA bulletin announcing the information policy will reveal that, in substance, there is little more there than a possibility of reversal in some areas. The real nub of REA's announcement is that certain information heretofore made available only by loan applicants will now be made available by the REA upon request unless, and this could be a pretty big "unless," the applicant objects to disclosure of the information and is upheld by the Administrator. It appears from the announcement that the criteria for judging the applicant's objection will be left to the broad discretion of the Administrator.

As my able colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], has indicated, this could represent a small modicum of progress in the right direction, but, by that same token, it could represent little more than window dressing for an effort to maintain essentially the status quo. Only time will tell what the result will be. In any event, it does not provide for full discosure of essential information concerning loan applications.

So, I would merely point out to my colleagues that, although a small chink might have developed in the wall of secrecy down at REA, this is no time to relax. There is still a long way to go before the wall comes down.

My colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], has followed this matter very carefully for years and issued a statement to the press this past weekend evaluating REA's announcement. I am including my colleague's statement at this point and I commend his analysis to those who might be prone to accept REA's announced reversal at face value:

"The Rural Electrification Administration is planning to issue a policy bulletin soon which allegedly penetrates the iron curtain of secrecy which surrounds that agency's tremendous lending activities," according to Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, Republican, of Illinois, in a statement issued from his office today.

Mr. MICHEL, a member of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, which has jurisdiction over REA's appropriations, has been striving for several years to get that agency to eliminate its secrecy policy which he believes is contrary to the best interests of the farmers and other persons in rural America.

Mr. MICHEL also noted that rather than penetrating the iron curtain of secrecy, this proposed bulletin—with relatively minor exceptions—seems merely to put into writing the existing practices of the agency which have been coming under increasing criticism from many directions recently. "Apparently," he said, "the REA in putting out a bulletin like this must believe that Members of Congress follow the old axiom of P. T. Barnum that 'there's a sucker born every minute.' "

Mr. MICHEL indicated that he has read the bulletin carefully in an effort to determine whether or not something new was actually being added to REA's existing practices, but that he must conclude:

"1. REA lists five different statistical reports which will be published annually. But, every bit of information suggested is already being published annually and, therefore, nothing new has been added.

"2. REA will publish two different quarterly statistical bulletins summarizing national and State information of a very general nature, which again they already do today. Still, nothing new has been added.

"3. REA will publish monthly statistical bulletins summarizing national and State information in a very general way. Again, this is being done today, so nothing new is being added.

"4. REA will publish a magazine entitled 'Rural Lines,' which they have been doing for years, so nothing new has been added.

"5. REA will publish official bulletins on policies, procedures and practices. They have been doing this for years, so nothing new has been added.

"6. REA will issue a press release on every loan approval, stating the name of the borrower, the exact amount of the loan, its purpose or purposes, the area to benefit, and the approximate number of customers or subscribers to receive service. This information is being published today after the loan has been approved, so nothing new has been added."

Mr. MICHEL went on to say:

"When I got down to the section entitled 'Procedures and Criteria Relating to Loan Applications,' I thought that perhaps finally something new was being added. However, after a platitude about REA's recognizing its responsibility for treating as administratively confidential certain loan information, the bulletin says REA will make available certain other information—with one major proviso. This one proviso—that the information would be made available unless the loan applicant asks the Administrator not to disclose it—has the effect of virtually nullifying the effectiveness of the preceding expression of willingness to release certain basic information.

"Actually, this is almost the same procedure presently being followed by REA, so again for all intents and purposes relatively little of a substantial nature has been added."

Today Mr. MICHEL tested this new policy by calling the REA in an effort to obtain certain information on pending generation and transmission loans which he has been trying to get for Congress for several years. He was informed that a list of pending loans will be prepared for him except those still held to be confidential at the request of the borrower. Mr. MICHEL indicated that he considers this to be at least a small modicum of progress in the right direction, but it still falls far short of the complete disclosure of detailed information upon which Congress and the American people can evaluate the propriety of the REA loan program.

Mr. MICHEL then concluded:

"In the last analysis the REA Administrator, apparently feeling the pressure of public criticism of his iron curtain of secrecy, is now attempting to make the Congress and the American people believe the policy is being substantially changed. While admitting that progress is being made, I, for one, cannot accept this proposed new policy bulletin as being a conscientious effort to remove completely this restrictive practice of REA. I will continue to do everything in my power to get the Administrator to eliminate the secrecy restrictions entirely, because I believe that full disclosure of the information relative to governmental activities is imperative in our American system of government."

Live Music on Radio Versus Canned Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, for many years one of the leaders in the popular music field, WNEW, New York, has always been a pioneer in exploring new frontiers, and an innovator in broadcast techniques. In the field of music, WNEW can boast of a new achievement, involving live music programs on a regular basis. This new dimension of live music has been added to WNEW's established music stature, a stature that impelled Variety to write "probably the best sound coming out of radio in America today."

Today, there is almost no live music on any radio station throughout the country. The American Federation of Musicians has long been aware of the difficulties this situation poses to musicians everywhere, both in obtaining needed exposure and financial gain. About a year ago, WNEW initiated talks with Local 802 of the American Federation of Musicians in New York City, with an eye toward reviving live music as a part of its regular programing. Because live music today is so foreign to most of radio broadcasting, it took months of talking to evolve a workable plan.

Briefly, the WNEW concept was a monthly series of programs featuring live musicians—bands, small groups, solo artists, big names and little names—known and unknown. The series would be specially showcased in prime time—using personality Big Wilson, a musician himself—and heavily promoted. WNEW was looking for a way to reinterest the radio audience in live music as a vital component of community life.

The American Federation of Musicians heartily endorsed the idea, and it is only through its encouragement and cooperation that the project became viable. Since November 1961, WNEW has presented eight such spectacular programs:

Jonah Jones, November 17, 1961; Duke Ellington, December 8, 1961; Stan Rubin, December 31, 1961; Woody Herman, January 15, 1962; Erroll Garner, February 1, 1962; Dave Brubeck, February 19, 1962; Tony Bennett, March 7, 1962; and Marlowe Morris, March 29, 1962.

Future programs include: Si Zentner, April 24, 1962; Brook Benton, May 1962; Dukes of Dixieland, June 1962; and Count Basie, July 1962.

Reaction to the series has been so favorable, from the public, the press, and the union, that WNEW is far exceeding its "minimums," and is planning 20 such programs throughout the year, rather than the 12 promised. At the end of this first 12-month period, WNEW will have created 200 individual half-hours of employment. The income to the musicians will be approximately $10,000.

But of even more importance to the musicians and to the American Federation of Musicians is the all-out support WNEW gives this project, via extensive on-the-air promotion, as well as through local newspaper and magazine space. The power of radio to sell is legendary, and here WNEW is "selling" the concept of live music, and WNEW is "selling" the names of these musicians. The announcements about these special programs are saturated on the air for days preceding each performance.

I sincerely hope that other stations in other communities will do their utmost to revive interest in the musician, one of the natural resources of the country. What WNEW has learned, through trial and error, about the best way of producing and presenting these programs, is readily available to all stations.

Brooklyn Longshoremen's Medical Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention the published report of the Brooklyn Longshoremen's Medical Center, which deals with the 2-year period from October 1, 1959 to September 30, 1961. This medical center is located at 283 Union Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., and is maintained by the New York Shipping Association-International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO.

This medical center is only 4 years old, but in this short space of time it has made tremendous progress and continuous growth. In fact, right now it has under construction an additional wing at a cost of approximately a half million dollars which will double the size of the center, particularly its X-ray and laboratory facilities. Many other innovations and additional features have been added in recent years which make this center one of the most efficient and outstanding institutions of its kind.

Medical and dental care is provided by the medical center not only to the thousands of members of this particular union, but also to their dependents. The total number of patients served annually is close to 9,000, and the total number of visits is approximately 50,000 annually. The average number of patients per day was 345 in 1961. This is a record of accomplishments which is very gratifying and should be a source of great pride to those associated with the Brooklyn Longshoremen's Medical Center. The costs of maintaining this center in 1960 and 1961 were $658,541 and $826,072, respectively.

The officers of the medical center are: M. E. Knabe, chairman of the board of directors; Anthony Anastasio, president; D. J. Keogh, vice president; T. W. Gleason, vice president; P. J. Rowan, treasurer; and Anthony M. Scotto, secretary. Mr. Scotto is also the business administrator and Dr. Francis W. Mitchell is the medical director of the center.

I want to commend especially Mr. Anastasio and Mr. Scotto for their foresight in establishing this medical center and for making it a reality. Mr. Anastasio is associated with the longshore industry for more than 30 years and is an international vice president of the International Longshoremen's Association, AFL-CIO, as well as business manager of local 1814. Mr. Scotto is associated with the industry since 1951, working as

a longshoreman and studying at Brooklyn College from which he was graduated in 1956. He is a director of the Brooklyn Tuberculosis and Health Association and is president of the Maritime Port Council of Greater New York.

These men have done a commendable job in helping to safeguard the health of thousands of people employed in this very vital industry in the port of New York, of which Brooklyn is a very significant part. I am happy to congratulate them for these achievements and to extend to them my best wishes for even greater accomplishments in the future as the Brooklyn Longshoremen's Medical Center grows and expands its facilities.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Aubrey L. Burbank, pastor, the Centenary Methodist Church, Skowhegan, Maine, offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, our loving Father, we come to Thee this day in the name of Jesus Christ, Lord and Saviour of mankind.

As Thou, O God, hast given us this land for our heritage, we beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves worthy of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will.

With humility in the recognition of our imperfections and our failure to measure up to the teachings of the Master, we would humbly pray that Thou might bless our land with such spiritual understanding as will enable us to deal with all of life's problems, free of violence, discord, and confusion. Forbid that we should think of ourselves as Thy favorites, or that we, alone, are the object of Thy concern. Let not pride, prejudice, or arrogancy characterize our age; but grant us great sympathy with all the enslaved people of the earth, in their quest for life and liberty.

Endue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom we entrust the authority of government, that through obedience to Thy law we may show forth Thy praise, Thy power, and Thy glory among all the nations of the earth. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 10, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 10, 1962, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 899. An act for the relief of Liu Shui Chen; and

S. 2018. An act for the relief of Robert B. Kasparek, Robert M. Kearny, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 277)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10(b)4 of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12(1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 11, 1962.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate:

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Judiciary Committee.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO REGISTER OF NAMES IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE OF CERTAIN MOTOR VEHICLE DRIVERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act approved July 14, 1960, 74 Stat. 526, as amended, relating to the establishment of a register of names in the Department of Commerce of certain motor vehicle drivers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "STATISTICS OF ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1960, PUBLICLY OWNED"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1960, Publicly Owned" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

DIVISION OF TRIBAL ASSETS OF PONCA TRIBE OF NATIVE AMERICANS OF NEBRASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the division of the tribal assets of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska among the members of the tribe, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON BUSINESS TRANSACTED BY BANKRUPTCY COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, statistical tables reflecting the business transacted by the bankruptcy courts, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on the Revenue Act of 1962 (Rept. No. 1337);

S. Res. 321. Resolution to print additional copies of certain hearings entitled "Communist Threat to the United States Through the Caribbean" (Rept. No. 1338);

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a veterans' benefits calculator (Rept. No. 1329);

H. Con. Res. 405. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on civil defense for the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 1330);

H. Con. Res. 408. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the publication entitled "Our Flag" as a House document, and providing for additional copies (Rept. No. 1331);

H. Con. Res. 412. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1282, parts 1 and 2, 87th Congress, 1st session (Rept. No. 1332);

H. Con. Res. 414. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Hearings Relating to H.R. 4700, To Amend Section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as Amended (the Fund for Social Analysis), 87th Congress, 1st session (Rept. No. 1333);

H. Con. Res. 416. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the publication "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications" and to provide for the printing of additional copies (Rept. No. 1334);

H. Con. Res. 419. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of hearings on "Small Business Problems in the Poultry Industry," 87th Congress (Rept. No. 1335); and

H. Con. Res. 451. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 218, 87th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States" (Rept. No. 1336).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 11038. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1341).

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 327) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the "Election Law Guidebook," and submitted a report (No. 1339) thereon, which report was ordered to be printed, and the resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That a revised edition of Senate Document Numbered 102 of the Eighty-sixth Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook," be printed as a Senate document.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE 64TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 328) to print the 64th Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1961, as a Senate document, and submitted a report (No. 1340) thereon, which report was ordered to be printed, and the resolution was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sixty-fourth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1961, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

REPORT ENTITLED "CUBAN REFUGEE PROBLEM"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1328)

Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 50, 87th Congress, 1st session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "Cuban Refugee Problem," which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated March 26, 1962, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William B. Jones, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia;

George Templar, of Kansas, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Kansas:

George N. Beamer, of Indiana, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Indiana;

John Weld Peck, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Ohio; and

Robert Shaw, of New Jersey, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Jersey.

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Oscar H. Davis, of New York, to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I have an important announcement to make to the Senate. I am happy to report that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has unanimously endorsed the nomination of Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. I make this report now in behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 3148. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to eliminate discrimination against married female employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3149. A bill to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Marshall Division, holding court at Marshall, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3150. A bill to provide that any alien brother, sister, married son, or married daughter of a citizen of the United States, who is eligible for a quota immigrant status under the provisions of section 203(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act on the basis of a petition filed with the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1961, shall be held to be a nonquota immigrant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 3151. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust farm acreage allotments for wheat in order to correct inequities and to prevent hardships; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 3152. A bill to provide for the nutritional enrichment and sanitary packaging of rice prior to its distribution under certain Federal programs, including the national school lunch program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ANDERSON (by request):

S. 3153. A bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. Byrd of West Virginia):

S. 3154. A bill to amend Public Law 86-184, an act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 3155. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes J. Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S. 3156. A bill to amend section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with regard to furnishing court quarters and accommodations at places where regular terms of court are authorized to be held, and for other purposes; and

S. 3157. A bill to repeal subsection (a) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, limiting the area in the District of Columbia within which sites for public buildings may be acquired; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. Long of Missouri):

S. 3158. A bill authorizing construction of a bridge across the Missouri River in the vicinity of St. Joseph, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 3159. A bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor and Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands, for the transfer to the Government of the Virigin Islands of the assets and obligations of the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON "CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE MENTALLY ILL" AND "WIRETAPPING AND EAVESDROPPING LEGISLATION"

Mr. ERVIN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69);

which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary one thousand additional copies each of parts 1 and 2 of its hearings on "Constitutional Rights of the Mentally Ill," and one thousand copies of its hearings on "Wiretapping and Eavesdropping Legislation," held by its Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights during the Eighty-seventh Congress, First Session.

RESOLUTIONS

MRS. AGNES J. WONG—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. LONG of Hawaii submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 326); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 3155) entitled "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes J. Wong", now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the Court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK"

Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 327) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the "Election Law Guidebook," which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE 64TH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 328) to print the 64th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1961, as a Senate document, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

NONQUOTA IMMIGRANT STATUS FOR CERTAIN RELATIVES OF U.S. CITIZENS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing nonquota immigrant status, and consequent immediate admission to this country, for those brothers, sisters, married sons and married daughters of U.S. citizens who are eligible for immigration under the quota system on the basis of petitions filed with the Attorney General before July 1, 1961.

Under the present immigration law, the quota allotted to each country is divided into the following categories: 50 percent of the quota goes to those with urgently required skills; 30 percent goes to the parents and unmarried sons and daughters of American citizens; 20 percent goes to the spouses and unmarried sons and daughters of aliens residing in the United States. Finally, any visas not required for the first three groups go to a fourth class which consists of the brothers, sisters, and married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens.

Since the first three quota classes are almost invariably filled, an enormous backlog of prospective immigrants in the fourth class has built up in recent years.

We may say that this group of brothers and sisters and sons and daughters of American citizens are the forgotten persons of our immigration policy.

At this moment there are 137,000 Italian applicants, who have American families, waiting vainly for quota places that will never become available unless we change the law. In the same situation, there are almost 10,000 Poles; 6,300 Greeks; 2,000 Yugoslavs, and thousands of refugees from Iron Curtain countries who are desperately anxious to come to this country and join their families. Indeed, there are waiting lists of brothers, sisters, and married sons and daughters of American citizens waiting for immigration to this country in every quota area in the world. All of these who are otherwise qualified would be admitted under my bill.

There is a precedent for the policy of granting nonquota status to a large backlog of prospective immigrants. Under Public Law 87–301, which was signed by the President on September 26, 1961, nonquota status was granted to those in the second and third classes I described earlier, who were eligible for quota visas on the basis of petitions filed with the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1961. The present bill would in effect simply extend this nonquota status to the fourth class.

The incredible advances of the past generation in transportation and communications have removed many ancient barriers to the uniting of separated families. We must match these advances with an advance in our immigration policy which will remove this last barrier in uniting thousands of American families.

This is the third bill I have introduced in recent weeks to open the doors to increased immigration.

Underlying all of these bills are three convictions: We owe it to our origins as a nation and to our historic traditions to keep open "the golden door." We owe it to our own future to continue to encourage the transfusion from the Old World to the New of the talents, the insights, the skills, the creative energy, and the vigor of people of other lands; and we owe to our country the confidence and the faith that our expanding American society can continue to absorb and make a welcome place for those who seek to enjoy our blessings and carry our burdens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3150) to provide that any alien brother, sister, married son, or married daughter of a citizen of the United States, who is eligible for a quota immigrant status under the provisions of section 203(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act on the basis of a petition filed with the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1961, shall be held to be a nonquota immigrant, introduced by Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GUARANTEE TO ELECTRIC CONSUMERS IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST OF FIRST CALL ON ELECTRIC ENERGY GENERATED IN THAT REGION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, I introduce, for proper reference, a bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority and for other purposes.

The letter of transmittal of the Secretary describes the purposes of the bill in considerable detail, and I therefore request that it be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3153) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Anderson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. Anderson is as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1962.

Hon. Lyndon Johnson,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes." Enclosed also is a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

We request that this proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that it be enacted.

The purpose of the bill is to assure consumers of electricity in the Pacific Northwest permanent priority to the electric power and energy now or hereafter generated at Federal plants in that region. The bill also assures consumers in other regions electrically interconnected with the Pacific Northwest a reciprocal priority.

We do not regard the bill as inconsistent with the principle of preference and priority accorded by Federal power laws to public bodies and cooperatives. We strongly reaffirm our adherence to this principle as a cornerstone of Federal power policy. This bill recognizes the principle of preference for public bodies and cooperatives, and leaves it intact within each of the several regions to be interconnected with the Pacific Northwest. The bill does, however, meet unique problems which extra high voltage interties, capable of moving power 1,000 or more miles, pose to the Pacific Northwest's economy.

The President, in his February 23, 1961, message on natural resources, directed this Department to develop plans for electrical interconnections of regions served by our power marketing agencies. Pursuant to that directive, a task force was appointed on March 10, 1961, to conduct a study of the feasibility of an extra high voltage interconnection between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest which could make possible deliveries of surplus energy between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest.

The Department completed its study of the proposed interconnection and issued a report dated December 15, 1961, which finds and recommends that:

"Prudent national policy requires that immediate steps be taken to interconnect the electrical generating plants of the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest with extra high voltage common carrier transmission lines.

"It would be in the national interest and the interest of the electric consumers of both regions that all electric utilities participate fully in using such interconnections."

The benefits to be derived from this intertie are so large for each region that means must be found to attain these many advantages. From the outset, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the generating utilities involved, Governors of the affected States, a number of public power agencies, and others have recognized the special problem presented by this proposed interconnection. This comes about primarily because the Pacific Northwest is almost entirely dependent on hydroelectric power for its energy base whereas the Pacific Southwest is largely or substantially dependent on steam-electric power. Other factors unique to the Pacific Northwest are the dependence of many direct service electric process industries, representing hundreds of millions of dollars of capital investment, on a continued low-cost Federal power supply; the absence in the region of alternative low-cost energy sources such as oil, gas or large coal or lignite deposits; and the substantial cost differential between Columbia River hydropower and hydro or steam power generated in neighboring regions.

Pursuant to the President's directive above mentioned, the Department of Interior is also currently studying the need for extra high voltage interconnections between regions not involving the Pacific Northwest. The factors which impel the enclosed bill are not present in these other areas, and similar legislation would therefore not be needed.

This unique situation has led to general recognition that the desires of local interests to protect their long-range regional power needs should be met by appropriate legislation which would accommodate this interconnection to the unusual circumstances in this specific locality. The principle of legislative protection has been attested to and supported by resolutions of the American Public Power Association, Northwest Public Power Association, the California Municipal Utility Association, the State of California in a public hearing, State of Washington Governor's Power Advisory Committee, the Oregon-Washington Farmers Union, the industrial customers in the Pacific Northwest, and the Pacific Coast Power Coordinating Committee representing the principal public power agencies in the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest. All of these groups favor protective legislation safeguarding the power supply of both areas and many have advocated construction of a Federal intertie.

On June 21, 1960, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs adopted a resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to suspend negotiations looking to the sale and transfer of surplus power or energy from the Pacific Northwest to California. The committee further requested the Secretary to submit at the next session of the Congress a draft of proposed legislation designed to guarantee to the consumers in the Pacific Northwest States first call on power generated by Federal agencies in that region, as requested by the Governors of the Pacific Coast States.

A bill was drafted and widely circulated among the Governors of the affected States and the public and private utilities in both regions. It was discussed at a series of conferences with these groups, and a new draft, incorporating as many as possible of the suggestions which had been made, was prepared and circulated again for comment. A final draft, which is the bill herewith transmitted, was developed from that background.

We believe that the legislation, as herein proposed, meets the needs of the regions involved.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. CARLSON) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"GENERAL PROVISION

"No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any individual, corporation, or agency included in this or any other Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress, or to pay the salary of any officer or employee in the executive branch of the Government who appears before any public group for the purpose of explaining, interpreting, supporting, or opposing the administration's position on legislation pending before Congress; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business. For the purposes of this paragraph the term 'officer' or 'employee' shall not be construed to include (1) the President and Vice President of the United States; (2) persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the Office of the President; (3) heads and assistant heads of executive departments; (4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. CARLSON) also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 11038, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 19, after line 9, insert the following:

"CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

"For payment of claims as settled and determined by departments in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in Senate Document Numbered 84, Eighty-seventh Congress, $1,065,929, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of this Act."

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11038, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 17, after line 17, insert the following:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

"Joint Economic Committee

"For an additional amount for 'Joint Economic Committee', $20,000."

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11038, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 17, after line 3, insert the following:

"SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

"Office of the Vice President

"For an additional amount for 'Office of the Vice President', $1,185.

"Administrative and clerical assistance to Senators

"For an additional amount for 'Administrative and Clerical Assistance to Senators', $118,250: *Provided,* That the basic clerk hire allowance of each Senator is increased by $3,000."

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11038, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 16, after line 19, insert the following:

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

"Manpower development and training activities

"For expenses necessary to carry into effect the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (P.L. 87-415), $2,850,000 of which not less than $790,000 shall be available solely for carrying out part B of title II of the Act, to be transferred from the appropriation for 'Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen'."

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11038, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 10, after line 22, insert the following:

"CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

"For an additional amount for 'Construction of facilities', $71,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment of authorizing legislation into law to cover such amount."

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11038, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 7, after line 3, insert the following:

"GENERAL PROVISION

"The amounts made available for fiscal year 1962, for planning or construction of buildings or facilities under the headings 'Foreign quarantine activities', 'National Cancer Institute', 'National Heart Institute', and 'Allergy and infectious disease activities', shall remain available until June 30, 1963."

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11038, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 5, after line 18, insert the following:

"EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

"Bureau of the Budget

"The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is authorized to create a special review panel within the Bureau to carefully screen and evaluate all requests for additional personnel, and to make exhaustive and searching inquiries within the Departments and Agencies prior to approving any request for additional personnel."

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11038, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 3 line 20, following the comma, insert the following: "including compensation of a United States Commissioner, who shall be appointed by the President, at the rate of $19,500 per annum".

Mr. HOLLAND also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11038, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

PROMOTION OF FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS RELATING TO OUTDOOR RECREATION — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 4, 1962, the names of Senators Clark, Douglas, Humphrey, Smith of Massachusetts, Morse, Metcalf, Moss, Hart, Engle, Long of Missouri, Hartke, Long of Hawaii, Fulbright, Cooper, Carroll, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, and Aiken were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3117) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Anderson (for himself and other Senators) on April 4, 1962.

ESTABLISHMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION FUND—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 4, 1962, the names of Senators Clark, Douglas, Humphrey, Smith of Massachusetts, Morse, Metcalf, Moss, Hart, Engle, Long of Missouri, Magnuson, Mansfield, Long of Hawaii, Chavez, Bartlett, Cooper, Carroll, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, McGee, Hayden, Church, Burdick, Bible, and Aiken were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3118) to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Anderson (for himself and other Senators) on April 4, 1962.

ATROCITIES COMMITTED BY UNITED NATIONS TROOPS IN KATANGA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, during the past few months we have seen and heard sketchy accounts and subtle indications of atrocities committed by United Nations troops in their war against the Katanga Province. In the course of seeking to document these stories, I came upon a speech delivered on March 15, 1962, in the House of Lords, by Lord Colyton. The speech is entitled, "Alleged Atrocities by U.N. Troops in Katanga."

Mr. President, I respectfully submit that Lord Colyton's speech is substantial documentation of the most shameful and degrading chapter of United Nations history, and one of which the United States is guilty by association.

Lord Colyton is no novice observer of African affairs. He is a statesman of vast experience and great and proven integrity. He was Minister of State for Colonial Affairs, in Sir Winston Churchill's government. Under his direction, the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was successfully negotiated. He is now chairman of the Joint East and Central African Board, which represents a large number of British interests in that part of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Lord Colyton's speech printed in the Record following these remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Parliamentary Debates, House of Lords, Official Report, Mar. 15, 1962]

ALLEGED ATROCITIES BY U.N. TROOPS IN KATANGA

(Lord Colyton rose to ask Her Majesty's Government what steps are being taken to investigate the allegations of atrocities committed by United Nations troops in Katanga, having regard in particular to the alleged killing, wounding, or maltreatment of British subjects and the looting of property, and to punish those responsible.)

Lord Colyton. My Lords, a month ago I paid a visit to Katanga. It was a tragic and harrowing experience. I should like to make two things clear from the outset. First, I have absolutely no interest in Katanga, and I do not own a single copper share. Secondly I did not go to Elizabethville to collect horror stories; I went there to inform myself on the political and military situation in Katanga, and I hope to be able to make use of this material in our forthcoming foreign affairs debate. It was only when I and my wife, who accompanied me, met a number of people in Elizabethville and elsewhere, including clergymen, missionaries, Red Cross workers, and others, who gave us first-hand information of United Nations atrocities, and who begged us to get them investigated, that I decided to report the facts to your Lordships and to urge Her Majesty's Government to press for a formal investigation. I would add that our informants included Americans, British, Belgians, and Katangans.

I do not propose to go into details of the events of last September. Many incidents occurred then of violations of the rules of war of the Geneva Convention, some of which were reported in the British press. None of these so far as I am aware, has been investigated. Although deliberate shooting of civilians certainly occurred the incidents mainly related to the killing of prisoners of war, or attacks on Red Cross ambulances. I propose to devote my time this evening to actual cases of individual or mass atrocities committed by the United Nations forces in the December fighting. Under this heading I include not merely murder, but rape, assault, and looting of property. In a number of them British subjects were involved.

After the December fighting, and up to January 31, the medical officer of the legal department of the Katanga Government had examined 79 bodies, of which 27 were those of Europeans, including 4 women. Of these 27 Europeans, not one was a so-called mercenary. Of the 52 Africans, 23 were civilians, including 6 Northern Rhodesians who had long been residents in Katanga. In a debate on the adjournment in another place on March 7, considerable time was devoted to the case of Mrs. Van Damme, a British subject 72 years old, who was beaten up and had her house looted on December 18 by a party of Ethiopian soldiers of the United Nations. She escaped only in her bare feet, and has lost most of her possessions. Her Majesty's consul, Mr. Dunnett, to whom I should like to pay the highest tribute for his conduct of affairs throughout the series of crises in Katanga, has been looking after her and supplying her essential needs. I visited her house and can corroborate the statements of the condition in which it was left.

I should perhaps mention next the case of Mrs. Dyer, an elderly lady, a British subject, and the wife of the representative in Elisabethville of Messrs. Cooper Bros., the London-chartered accountants. She was killed by mortar fire while in bed at night in a residential area. I also visited her house and saw the destruction caused.

Then there is the case of Mr. James Biddulph, a British subject, and at the time the Federal Broadcasting Corp.'s representative in Elisabethville. Mr. Biddulph is now employed by the African News, and I spoke with him in Salisbury. He and an American colleague were in the hotel at Elisabethville on December 18, and when the fighting appeared to be dying down decided to leave by car for Northern Rhodesia. They took with them M. Favre, a Swiss accountant. Mr. Biddulph was driving a civilian car with Northern Rhodesian markings. At 10 a.m. they approached an apparently unmanned roadblock at the level crossing near Camp Massart, on the Munama Road. They slowed down to remove one of the empty tar barrels which constituted the roadblock, and were immediately fired upon by Swedish troops concealed off the road with a 15-millimeter cannon. M. Favre was killed, both journalists were wounded, and I understand that two Africans on bicycles were killed also. I asked Mr. Biddulph whether this could have been a mistake, and he assured me that this was impossible as three other civilian cars coming along the road later while he was waiting for transport to hospital were similarly attacked.

Then there was the case of Mr. de Deken, married to an English lady, who left the house of his cousin, Mr. Smith-Sheridan, during a lull in the fighting, taking some personal belongings with him. Eyewitnesses told us that they saw him shot in the back and killed by an Ethiopian soldier. Again, there was the case of two Katanga African policemen, who had United Nations passes to enable them to remove their families from the battle area. A clergyman and a missionary saw them fired upon in their car by troops using a United Nations bazooka and killed with their wives and seven children.

Then there is the case of Mr. Derriks, a civilian engineer 60 years old, who with his mother, aged 87, and his African cook were machinegunned in their house by Ethiopian troops as they were having coffee after lunch on December 16. These people, my Lords, could hardly be described as mercenaries. The kitchen boy, who hid under a table lived to tell the tale. I visited the house myself which was exactly as it was 2 months earlier when they died—sacked from top to bottom, every door and window broken, and the floor still covered with blood. Like many other houses I saw in Elizabethville, all sacked and pillaged, it was worse than anything I saw during the Italian campaign.

A number of cases of rape have been reported, including one of a middle-aged Frenchwoman by Ethiopian troops and one of a Belgian lady by an Indian officer with pistol in hand. My informant, a clergyman, saw that unfortunate lady immediately after the incident in a state of hysteria. Just a few days before our arrival in Elisabethville, the bodies of two young European building contractors, missing since December, were found in a shallow grave in the garden of their house in the United Nations area by Swedish police dogs and Red Cross investigators. They had been shot and mutilated, presumably by Ethiopians.

In addition to reckless and wholesale machinegunning of civilians in the streets, mortar attacks were carried out on the African hospital, on the church and mission of St. Jean and the Leopold Stadium. It is really impossible to understand, for example, how 22 mortar bombs could be lobbed into an enormous hospital covered with red crosses without the United Nations authorities knowing what they were doing. Indeed, one Red Cross worker told us that he had personally reported the attack to the United Nations Headquarters, but with no effect. In addition, there was the attack by Swedish jet fighters, using cannon, on the hospital of Shinkolobwe near Jadotville. This again was marked with a large red cross.

Then there were 14 cases of pillage of properties of British subjects, though not in all cases necessarily by United Nations troops. I understand that these, together with other cases of looting and occupation by the United Nations forces without payment of rent or compensation, are being investigated by a claims commission. In all these events, the only contingent of United Nations troops in Elisabethville to emerge with clean hands are the Malayans, to whom tribute was paid by all whom we met.

The only case of murder which is actually being investigated is that of M. Olivet, the Swiss head of the International Red Cross in the Congo, his lady assistant and his Dutch driver. M. Olivet was in an ambulance and, with his companions was kidnaped by Ethiopian troops. The ambulance was later shot up; M. Olivet, the lady and the driver were murdered and, I understand, were buried in a ditch. This case is being investigated because the International Red Cross insisted that this should be done. But no formal inquiry is being held into any one of the cases of murder and assault to which I have referred, or many others, involving Italians, French, Greeks, as well as Belgian and Katangan civilians.

In replying to an adjournment debate on March 2 in another place, the Joint Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs explained that the difficulty about such an inquiry was that the commander of the United Nations forces has military power but no power of court-martial, and consequently any question of discipline is a matter for inquiry by the senior officer of a particular contingent. On the other hand, Mr. Unden, the Swedish Foreign Minister, in an interview with the Stockholm representative of the paper, Le Soir, in February, said that accusations of attacks on civilians should be addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations. What then, is the real position? Or has it ever been determined?

Another reason given by the Under Secretary of State was that there was no use in holding such an inquiry without investigating similar allegations on the other side. I quite agree. But I should have thought that there was every advantage in holding an inquiry into these and all other allegations of atrocities by an impartial judicial commission, provided that it is under a judge of the International Court at The Hague, with two or four assessors. Such a commission would have to be absolutely nonpolitical, and personally I should hope that it might be actually selected by the International Court.

It may be argued that there is no advantage in raking over the ashes of the past, but although the situation is now easier, and there is, I believe, a real hope of a successful meeting today between President Tshombe and Mr. Adoula, I am convinced, from the condition which I saw myself in Elisabethville, that a further set of such incidents could occur at any time. The town itself is virtually an occupied city. When driving or walking about, you are constantly faced with United Nations roadblocks, with a tommygun pointed at your stomach. If you do not have a pass, I may say, you are told, pretty roughly, to "move on" or "clear off."

So long as United Nations troops are occupying Elisabethville, an incident could occur any time, whether deliberately provoked or otherwise. I have no doubt that, having regard to the lack of discipline of some United Nations troops and the mentality of the United Nations commanders, a series of further atrocities, and acts of pillage would then follow. I will give an example. When I was in Elisabethville, President Tshombe (who, incidentally, is one of the most outstanding African leaders I have ever met) received a demand for the dispatch of United Nations forces to the mining towns of Jadot- few dozen mercenaries remaining in those ville and Kolwezi, ostensibly to apprehend a districts. And this, in spite of the fact that President Tshombe had already agreed to set up mixed commissions of United Nations and Katangan officers and officials for the same purpose, which had already begun their work. These demands were later withdrawn but, having regard to the mood of the United Nations authorities in Elisabethville, such a situation could occur again.

The only real solution, I am convinced, is to withdraw the United Nations troops, first from Elisabethville and secondly from the whole of Katanga, when I believe complete peace and quiet could be soon restored. But unless there is any likelihood of this arising in the near future, I would most strongly urge Her Majesty's Government to press the United Nations authorities in New York to set up a judicial commission of inquiry, such as I have described.

In conclusion, my Lords, I would only add this. In July last year, a great and successful international fair was held in Elisabethville to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the founding of the city. A large sign on the central building proclaimed the slogan of the fair—"Toward a Better World." Today that sign is riddled with United Nations bullets. This is indeed a sad commentary on the activities of the United Nations in Katanga.

THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 11, 1962, W. W. Finlator, pastor of the Pullen Memorial Baptist Church of Raleigh, N.C., preached a remarkable sermon entitled "Christ in Congress," which deals in a most illuminating way with the respective roles of the church and the state—a matter of much concern to our country. I believe that Mr. Finlator's observations are of permanent value, and ought to be made available to all Members of Congress for consideration in connection with proposed legislation relating to Federal aid to education. Consequently, I ask unanimous consent that the sermon be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRIST IN CONGRESS

(By Rev. W. W. Finlator)

There is something undiscourageable in the manner with which the people of this church go about the educating of their minister. Hardly a week passes without his receiving from them a book, an article, an address, or the findings of some study committee, all of which he gladly accepts and carefully reads in the shared hope that such an educational process may eventually result in quality preaching. So keep them coming.

Last Sunday, however, there was a new wrinkle. Following the morning service he was handed at the door a copy of a joint resolution under the caption "87th Congress, 1st Session, H.J. Res. 103, in the House of Representatives, January 24, 1961." This of course is the resolution which has been before the Congress several times previously and is known as the Christian amendment resolution. Though the amendment has little chance of serious consideration, in spite of the fact that it has picked up more support among Congressmen than heretofore, it carries ominous overtones and dark suggestions to which we ought all to be alerted. For this reason the resolution forms the basis of our thinking today; and the moral of these opening remarks is: Be careful what you pass on to the pastor. It might turn into a sermon.

Now as every student of homiletics knows, the traditional sermon has an introduction, three points and a conclusion. Since this resolution has the built-in outline of an introduction and three succeeding sections, I shall follow it point by point, and then add my own conclusion.

First, the introduction which I quote:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by convention in three-fourths of the several States."

Now this certainly fulfills the injunction of the Apostle Paul to have all things done decently and in order as well as the spirit of the Founding Fathers who provided for deliberate and orderly change in the Constitution. There are always people who are unhappy with some provision of the Constitution and would welcome and agitate for certain changes in it. Much of the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church, for example, is increasingly restive about the first amendment which prohibits the use of Federal funds to support religious institutions. Investigating committees have frequently indicated their impatience with the fifth amendment which protects a citizen from being coerced to testify against himself. Many of our southern leaders have for years attacked the 14th amendment which makes it unconstitutional for any State to abridge the civil liberties of a citizen. And exponents of the extreme right have made no secret of their opopsition to the 16th amendment which authorizes the imposition of the income tax. Any of these amendments may be abrogated, or, as in the case of the Christian amendment, new ones added, if, as is stated above, a two-thirds majority can be mustered in both Houses of Congress and three-fourths of the States follow with ratification.

But it's a long, long way to Tipperary, and we can pause to thank God for the wisdom and farsightedness of those Founding Fathers who made change possible but slow. They thereby gave us a living and dynamic document which men can never freeze into idolatry and which will therefore remain not a god over the people but a servant to the people. Thus when Congress is called upon to exercise itself in theological matters—and specifically, as in this case, Christological matters—the people of the United States have a long time to think on and reject a proposal which is so obviously unconstitutional on its face.

But let us come to section I, and I quote: "This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of Nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God." Shocking, isn't it? One wonders if Congressman SILER, of Kentucky, who introduced the resolution, and the conservative Christian denominations who are sponsoring it, really understand the first amendment where Congress is specifically enjoined against making laws respecting the establishment of religion and which has consistently been interpreted as the principle of church-state separation.

Look at the adverb "devoutly." Plainly it is illegal here. Men can and should be devout, but not governments. Let's face it. What we have required of our Government, and written into its Constitution, is that it be neither devout or undevout, religious or antireligious, but that it remain religiously neutral, secular, if you please. The Constitution, which is very much the work of men of Christian persuasion, definitely excludes all religious considerations. And this wisdom has been abundantly justified. In no other land have the churches so prospered for 180 years as in the United States under its religiously neutral Government. Yet here is a resolution providing for the devout recognition by this Nation, not of God, mind you, not of the Creator who has endowed us with certain inalienable rights, but of "the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Ruler of the Nations through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God." In plain language the resolution officially escorts Christ into Congress and proclaims America officially Christian.

Briefly three comments: (1) After establishing for the first time in history a government in which religion and state were completely separated, thereby eliminating the scourge of religious wars that had devastated the church-state nations of Europe, we have now swung full circle. Thoughtful observers have told us that with the gradual absorption of the American churches into a cult of patriotism and respectability, we now have a national faith which is really more the established church we thought we had abandoned than some of the de facto state churches of Europe. This is what the Christian amendment would make final. (2) Once we declare our Nation officially Christian it follows that the decisions, the diplomacy and the foreign policy of the U.S. Government is undeviatingly Christian. This is the full-orbed national self-righteousness which we have been grooming for some time and which is so disastrous to the hard give-and-take encounters and the laborious conferences between nations out of which some hope and peaceful coexistence might come. Why bother with the U.N. if Jesus Christ is the authority of the United States?

The prophetic function of the churches is smothered in this national Messianism. There is simply no witness to the God who, as Karl Barth has told us, is over against our Nation and in judgment upon the deeds of men and nations. This was the problem the Hebrew prophets struggled with. Isaiah told the national and spiritual chauvinists of his day that the pagan Cyrus was actually called by God to become his instrument in chastising the chosen people who believed that God was so wrapped up in their national life that they could do no wrong and suffer no evil. One sympathizes with Martin Luther who in translating the Bible into his native tongue threw down his pen in exasperation when he came to the prophets, saying, "Ach, Gott! It is so difficult to make these Hebrew prophets speak German." It was never so difficult to make them speak American as today when our churches are being reduced to a department of religion in the supernationalistic cult represented by the Christian amendment. (3) It is a dismal commentary on the depth of our theological thinking that we can see no offense to the gospel in calling America "Christian." America with its growing crime rate, its flaunting of moral standards, its racial hostilities, its worship of money values and status symbols, "recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ."

What law and authority? The Sermon on the Mount? The injunction to lose life in order to find it? The invitation to leave all and follow him, seeking first the kingdom of God?

> "For frantic boast and foolish word,
> Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord."

More briefly, let us look at the next sections, and I quote section 2: "This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom, or freedom of speech and press, or of peaceful assemblage." This section is a dead giveaway. It protests too much. By its very denial it affirms. Naturally the Christian amendment will not set up the Catholic or the Lutheran or the Baptist Church or any other "particular ecclesiastical organization" as the established church. But the amendment names the name of Jesus Christ as authority and this is a fatal thing to do.

For this is a nation in which 40 percent of the remaining 12 million Jews live. Shall their constitution officially acknowledge as spiritual authority what their synagogues cannot? In this Nation there are growing numbers of Moslem and Hindu citizens. Shall their constitution acknowledge a spiritual authority which their Koran and Veda cannot? In this Nation there are millions of unchurched people and professing atheists. Shall their constitution acknowledge a spiritual authority which in conscience they have not and cannot?

It is no wonder that this section hastens to assure such people that there will be no abridgment of their freedom in religion, speech, press, and assembly. Heaven knows, and all who have read history know, that these freedoms are always imperiled when a majority of people decide that this shall be our way of life and that shall be our accepted faith and yonder shall be the direction in which our interests lie.

Finally the last section, and once more I quote: "Congress shall have power in such cases as it may deem proper, to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended." Now while I am intuitively allergic to all oath taking and disclaimer affidavits (preferring the simple New Testament "let your yea be yea and your nay be nay and whatsoever is more than these cometh from the Evil One"), I realize the propriety of requiring public officials to swear (affirm) to uphold the Constitution of the United States. But here again we see the self-exposure of the Christian amendment. There will be citizens, it bleakly acknowledges, who will have what it calls religious scruples against taking an oath to uphold a document that discriminates against their religion or, what is just as bad, against their freedom to choose no religion. So for them "in such cases" (note how each must come hat in hand), where Congress "deems proper" (note the condescension), "a suitable oath or affirmation" (note the all-competent spiritual know-how), will be provided. This I submit is a civil monstrosity and a spiritual blasphemy. How it could be affirmed either in the name of the democratic state or the Christian church is beyond my comprehension. It can only be explained on the basis that men are joining together in our day what our forefathers hoped in their day had been forever put asunder. Listen to these words from M. M. Thomas, an Indian Christian layman, speaking to the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches in New Delhi.

"The religious minorities tend to feel and often come to be treated as aliens; in any case, it leads to the division of citizens into first-class and second-class citizens. While it may appear to strengthen the unity of the country, in fact it may become a source of disaffection and divisiveness. Above all, since traditional religion and traditional static social order go together, the state sanction of traditional religion will mean in some sense a hindrance to radical changes in the direction of fundamental human rights and social justice."

Other fairy tales may have happy endings. but not this one. The advocates of the Christian amendment begin as forerunners of the millennium and end as apostles of discord. They set religion against religion and citizen against citizen. They revive the ancient blunder of the Emperor Constantine from which the church has never recovered. They envision an established Christianity with lofty tolerance for those who just can't go along. They invest this Nation with an aura of divine approval which makes crusades against atheistic and materialistic nations so easy. They give sanction to a static order in a time when creative change is desperately needed. They put Christ into the Constitution and hope thereby to end all theological struggle.

For centuries the best minds in the church have agonized over the nature and mission of Jesus Christ. At long last both Protestant and Orthodox communions have been able in the ecumenical movement of our day to accept as a basis of their unity in the World Council of Churches the simple statement: Jesus Christ is Lord. But here is a proposal for the Constitution of the United States to declare Him "Saviour and Ruler of Nations," One whom this Nation "devoutly" recognizes as possessing "authority and law," and through whom "are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God." And should there be any misunderstanding of this section of the Constitution it shall of course be the province of the Supreme Court to hand down the right—shall we say the infallible—decision on the nature and mission of Jesus Christ.

But enough. You see the point. Let us then direct our opposition not against those misguided, if sincere, men who in every age falsely believe that the Gospel may be enlarged by official recognition. Let us rather oppose with every fiber of our being that mentality which is afraid for the witness of our faith to stand upon its own feet in the free and open market of clashing ideologies and philosophies. Let us insist as did our forefathers that our Government support no religion and oppose no religion. Let us in short keep Christ officially out of the Halls of Congress in order that we might liberate Him in the hearts of men—including Congressmen.

DEATH OF JUDGE THOMAS C. HENNINGS, SR.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, today it is my sad duty to inform the Senate of the death of one of my State's foremost citizens, indeed, one of our Nation's foremost citizens, Judge Thomas C. Hennings, Sr., father of the late beloved Senator Tom Hennings.

Judge Hennings was one of the finest gentlemen I ever met. He always had the greatest concern for the well-being of others. He was never too busy but that he had time to share his wisdom with others. He had the greatest interest in government at every level. While always a leader in Democratic politics, he only ran for public office once in his life and that was his successful bid for the office of circuit judge. He was elected to this office shortly after the turn of the century. In recent years, he traveled east regularly and would never return to St. Louis without first visiting the United Nations General Assembly if it was in session.

At 70 years of age, he participated in what he termed "the most important activity of my career." In 1943–45, many of the outstanding leaders in Missouri assembled in a constitutional convention at Jefferson City, our State capital. Judge Hennings was an outstanding leader of this convention. Through his diligence and determined efforts, a number of very important changes were made in the constitution. One of these required that justices of the peace, now called magistrate judges, be members of the legal profession.

The U.S. Senate has directly felt the influence of this wonderful gentleman. His son was one of the greatest Senators Missouri has ever sent to Congress. The lessons Tom Hennings learned from his father in his formative years were never forgotten.

Our Nation has lost one of its greatest citizens. The death of Judge Hennings clearly demonstrates the basic truth of the words of John Donne when he said. "Never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

Mr. President, several years ago, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat printed an article concerning Judge Hennings as he neared his 85th birthday. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JUDGE HENNINGS NEAR 85—STILL ACTIVE IN LAW, HE HOPES HE NEVER HAS TO RETIRE

(By Sue Ann Wood)

Judge Thomas C. Hennings, Sr., can look out the window of his 15th-floor law office and see the dome of the old courthouse, where he served as a circuit judge nearly a half century ago.

Soon to reach his 85th birthday, on September 11, Judge Hennings is the oldest surviving former circuit judge of St. Louis and one of the most distinguished citizens of the city and State.

Still alert and active in his law firm, Green, Hennings, Henry & Evans—although now on something of an "emeritus basis," he explains—Judge Hennings waves off the title of "senior citizen."

"I hope I never have to retire completely," he told an interviewer this week. "Unless a man has a real hobby, he should continue working as long as he can."

"Ever since I was 13 years old, I've wanted to be a lawyer," he continued.

Even though a large part of his career was spent as an officer of the Mercantile Trust Co. of St. Louis, Judge Hennings remained in the legal end of banking, in charge of trusts and estates, during that period.

LIFELONG DEMOCRAT

Judge Hennings, a lifelong Democrat, always has been a leader in Democratic politics in the State but the only time he ran for office was in his successful bid for the circuit judgeship.

He passed on his successful campaigning ways to his son, now Missouri's senior Senator, Thomas C. Hennings, Jr.

"I always felt that I missed an experience in not running for the State legislature," Judge Hennings mused. "But I got my opportunity for legislative experience as a delegate to the State constitutional convention."

That experience is rated as "the most important activity of my career" by Judge Hennings.

"One of the greatest groups of men ever assembled in this State met in Jefferson City in 1943–44 to write that constitution," he said. "It was a privilege to be associated with them."

Judge Hennings was an outstanding leader of the convention, as observers and writers of State history have pointed out. He went to Jefferson City with firm convictions about reforms and changes which he believed were necessary in the State's legal and governmental structures.

HELPED WITH REFORMS

Some years before the convention, Judge Hennings had served as president of the Missouri Association for Criminal Justice, which prepared a State-wide "Crime Survey" of needed changes in the State's law enforcement system.

Its recommendations included the establishment of a State highway patrol, rulemaking powers for the State supreme court, limited parole power for the government and setting up a parole board. It also urged that justices of the peace—strongholds of political patronage—should be lawyers.

Judge Hennings believed strongly in these reforms and helped to write many of them into the State constitution. He chuckles as he recalls how a group of worried politicians tried to talk him out of his stand on requiring that justices of the peace (now called magistrate judges) must be lawyers.

"One of them was a union man," the Judge said. "I told him: 'You stand up for union people. Well, I belong to the lawyers' union.' They were startled, but I made my point."

The provision was adopted by the convention.

IN EVERY COUNTY

Judge Hennings' interest in progressive judicial and political ideas goes back to the early days of his career. He was one of the first juvenile judges in St. Louis, in 1913.

Back in those days, the Democrats were new to political power in St. Louis.

"The Democrats had been in the same position that the Republicans are now in St. Louis," Judge Hennings said. "The city had been a Republican stronghold, until Theodore Roosevelt bolted from the party in 1912 and all the Democrats won."

Judges were on the party tickets then, and had to run in primary and general elections.

"Usually, the party selected gray-bearded, distinguished men as candidates for judgeships," he said. "But the Democrats couldn't get any old fellows to run. All of us who were elected that year were young."

Judge Hennings has been "in every county of the State" campaigning. When he began his banking career, he gave up many of his political activities but maintained an active interest.

"I've known every Missouri Governor and St. Louis mayor for the past 50 years," he said. "Naturally, I've known the Democratic ones better than the Republicans."

His pride in his son is reflected in every remark Judge Hennings makes about him. He stresses that he has never attempted to influence his son's congressional actions or appointments in any way, but concedes that: "In our basic beliefs, we think alike."

CIVIL WAR LEADER

Besides his political and professional activities through the years, Judge Hennings has been a leader in numerous civic projects. He was one of six leading citizens who founded the Community Chest here in 1923 and led in "the real job of selling the idea to the people."

His interest in young people has never dimmed. On his desk daily are letters from the School of the Ozarks, which he served as board member for many years and still serves as legal adviser. He was honored as "Big Brother of the Year" in St. Louis 5 years ago, in recognition of his long service to teenagers.

Another of his favorite projects is the Thomas Dunn Memorial, which operates residential and recreational facilities for needy boys.

VISITS OFFICE DAILY

For 17 years, Judge Hennings was on the board of the city art museum—a position he gave up 3 years ago "to give a younger person a chance."

"I don't like modern art anyhow," he added, with a grin.

On the walls of his office in the Boatmen's Bank Building are prints of two paintings which rank higher in the Judge's favor—Franz Hals' "Laughing Cavalier" and Holbein's portrait of Erasmus, whom Judge Hennings calls the "greatest scholar who ever lived."

Judge Hennings comes to his office daily, after taking his morning walk near the Park Plaza Hotel, where he and his wife live.

Like fellow Democrat Harry Truman, he is a great believer in walking. He sometimes walks a quarter of a mile in the morning, usually through Forest Park.

Swimming is another of Judge Hennings' favorite activities. About once a week, he takes a morning swim in the Forest Park Highlands pool, where he has been a regular visitor for 40 years.

On occasional trips to the East, he makes a point of stopping by Washington, D.C., to visit his son. His daughter, Mrs. David Teasdale, lives in St. Louis County.

From his desk, Judge Hennings can look out on the Mississippi River, a scene of which he never tires. It flows past the site of many memories, like the old courthouse, where he worked as a title examiner in the recorder of deeds office while studying law at Washington University.

A portrait of Thomas Jefferson holds a place of honor on the wall opposite his office window.

LOOKS WITH PRIDE

Just as Jefferson considered his part in writing the U.S. Constitution one of his proudest achievements, so Judge Hennings looks back with pride on his role in shaping Missouri's present constitution.

On his 70th birthday, September 11, 1944, the State constitutional convention paused in its deliberations to pay tribute to one of its delegates.

A resolution was passed, honoring Thomas C. Hennings, Sr., for his "long experience as an outstanding lawyer and jurist * * * his daily diligent attendance and devotion to convention work * * * a courteous gentleman, and a fine companion."

"Therefore be it *Resolved,*" the motion continued, "That this convention extend its congratulations to Judge Hennings and wish him many, many more years of health and happiness in which he may contribute to the welfare of his city, his State, and his country."

That same wish will be in the hearts of the hundreds of friends and admirers of Judge Hennings on another milestone of his long and distinguished career—his 85th birthday—next month.

REDEVELOPMENT OF STORM-DAMAGED SHORE AREAS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on March 23 I suggested to the Secretary of the Interior that a study be made of the frequency of damaging storms and tides on the Eastern Shore and so that current reconstruction of the area from New York to Cape Hatteras can be planned to provide for tidal plain zoning and establishment of public access recreation areas where they are needed and advisable.

Secretary of the Interior Udall immediately undertook a study of the situation. Parties of the Interior Department experts and the State officials surveyed the coastline. A series of conferences has been held with each of the States involved. Gov. Richard J. Hughes of New Jersey has called a conference of State and Federal officials concerned in Newark, N.J., next Wednesday, April 18. I am extremely gratified at the prospects of sound redevelopment in much of the storm-damaged area, and that the situation is working out so well. There is now real hope that, instead of rushing in to restore works and buildings in areas repeatedly subject to damage, wiser plans will be followed, private investment will be protected against a repetition of this spring's losses, and greatly needed recreation areas will be provided.

The Engineering News-Record of March 29 has commented with approval on the effort. The editorial says: "When nature demonstrates time and again with her special and practically irresistible form of coastal urban redevelopment, it is time to take the hint—leave the beaches to the waves. Tide-hazard zoning, while preserving beaches for recreation, would also eliminate the high cost of high tides."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of the editorial in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Don't Go (Too) Near the Water

The damage caused this month by high tides and winds along the entire east coast (Engineering News-Record, Mar. 22, p. 59) should focus new and needed attention on beach protection measures. The first sign of this attention, and a welcome one, comes from Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico. Noting that after every major storm, Federal, State, and local agencies have to provide relief for citizens whose homes and businesses have been washed away or damaged, the Senator suggests that maybe the beauty of the surf can be observed better and more economically from a safe distance.

The suggestion was made in a letter to Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, recommending a study be made to see whether there should be zoning along the coast to prevent unwise reconstruction in shore areas likely to be hit by future high tides and coastal storms. And Secretary Udall passed the idea along to the Governors of three of the worst affected States, Delaware, New Jersey, and Virginia.

These little incidents have been pretty much overlooked amidst the hustle and bustle in Congress and the State legislatures to appropriate money for disaster relief. Nevertheless, they initiate a constructive line of thought. Not only should many coastal areas be zoned so that unwisely built homes and businesses don't go out with the tides, but the idea is also compatible with efforts to preserve large beach areas on all of our coastal fronts for public parks.

Too much of our beautiful coastline has already been desecrated with a hodgepodge of cottages and amusement parks. When nature demonstrates time and again with her special and practically irresistible form of coastal urban redevelopment, it's time to take the hint—leave the beaches to the waves. Tide-hazard zoning, while preserving beaches for recreation, would also eliminate the high cost of high tides.

SALINE WATER CONVERSION—FREEPORT, TEX., DEMONSTRATION PLANT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, because of the great and continuing interest displayed in the saline water conversion program I ask unanimous consent that the "Survey of the Freeport, Tex., Demonstration Plant," together with the letter of transmittal from Charles F. MacGowan, Director of the Office of Saline Water, be made a part of the RECORD.

The survey, one that I trust will establish a continuing method of analyzing all of the processes now being utilized in the presently authorized demonstration plants, indicates certain changes that should be incorporated to increase the efficiency of the Freeport installation. Experimentation is the mother of progress and only with continuing experiments and intelligent analyzing of the results of these experiments can we continue to advance toward our announced goal of the production of good economic water from the sea. I am sure that this is being done, and I would like to offer my congratulations to the Secretary and his very capable staff for their conscientious efforts in this field.

There being no objection, the report and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVEY OF THE FREEPORT, TEX., DEMONSTRATION PLANT

On February 28, 1962, the sea water conversion system at Freeport, Tex., was shut down according to plans for the purpose of an extensive examination and determination of the condition of most of the equipment and facilities. The plant had been in operation for more than 6 months operating daily between 90 percent and 100 percent of capacity. The last sustained run was for a period of 5 months.

On the whole and considering the experimental approach to the use of steel materials in certain areas, and the use of standardized machinery components as specified by the architect and engineer, although modified to some extent by the Office of Saline Water, the plant is in good condition and is meeting our expectations.

Some important design changes will be required for future distillation plants such as the following:

1. The necessity for the use of other than steel materials in the seawater intake lines ahead of the deaerator.

2. The discontinuance of the use of steel tubing in heat exchanger apparatus.

3. More confining and quality architectural and engineering specifications are necessary in the description of the required pumps, electrical apparatus other than motors and the heat exchanger design.

4. More automatic control and instrumentation must be provided.

There are some problems of water distribution to the evaporator tubes and some minor scaling problems as a result, but these problems can be corrected by proper design. Certain minor modifications are planned for the correction at Freeport. Some steel tubing will be replaced.

Our continuing efforts at Freeport is toward the demonstration of "the reliability, engineering, operating and economical potentials of * * * water conversion processes" as required by law. A sea or brackish water conversion process supplying water "for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses" must be regarded as a long life utility and our efforts must be directed to the selection and use of materials and machinery of a quality to provide for the lowest cost over the long-time amortization period.

U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1962.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: We recently performed an examination of the Freeport, Tex., conversion plant during a scheduled shutdown of the facilities. Until it was taken off the line, the plant operated successfully for 5 months. The plant was put on the line October 4 and taken off February 28 with shutdowns of very short durations (an hour or so). It was our purpose to inspect the plant, appraise its condition, and perform needed minor repairs.

Knowing of your interests in both this program and the first demonstration plant, I have asked for a special report. This report has been drafted, and I am presenting it herewith. In general, the plant is in excellent condition. Some design revisions appear to be indicated. Among these latter revisions seems to be the necessity for use of materials other than steel in nondeaerated sea water, as well as the use of alloys in some of the severe heat exchanger services.

I trust you will find this report of interest.

Best wishes and kindest personal regards,
Sincerely yours,
CHARLES F. MACGOWAN,
Director.

THE DESTRUCTIVE COMPETITION OF GOVERNMENT OWNED AND OPERATED NAVAL SHIPYARDS WITH PRIVATE SHIPYARDS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, every Member of the Congress demands that the muscle and fiber of our military posture must be strong and taut, but without fat or flabbiness. This is not a partisan proposition but an all-American attitude. Democrat, Republican, independent, liberal and conservative alike expect the most for every dollar appropriated for defense purposes. Urgently needed defense dollars must be saved without weakening our capacity to survive under all circumstances as a nation and to preserve our way of life.

I have therefore been disturbed, Mr. President, by the continuing evidences that higher costs for Navy shipwork in the naval shipyards are condoned in almost absolute disregard for the competitive enterprise system which is the backbone of our way of life.

The balance between receipts and expenditures in the budget proposed for fiscal 1963 is marginal to say the least, and a business decline in one or more segments of industry could easily cause a deficit. This is axiomatic. But, while private yards have been forced to shut down, the Government-owned naval shipyards have been operating at an optimum of capacity. By contrast, capacity in the privately owned, tax-producing sector of the Nation's shipbuilding and ship-repairing industry remains idle.

For some time, I have been trying to focus attention on this paradox, and my colleagues might therefore be interested in the full flavor of my recent correspondence with Budget Director David E. Bell, demonstrating the destructive manner in which public shipyards are competing with private shipyards.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this entire correspondence be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1962.

Hon. DAVID E. BELL,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BELL: Your letter of January 31 concerning the continued high-level operations of high-cost, tax-free Government-owned naval shipyards is acknowledged. In my years of public service, I have never before seen a more superficial treatment of a serious problem by an agency of the Government.

The arguments in your letter are the very same arguments which the Navy Department has advanced many times before. The similarity in the line of reasoning is unmistakable. Some very indefensible statements have thus been casually accepted. In my opinion, "an objective review" of the facts and circumstances behind those statements still has not been accomplished.

You say: "* * * the Navy believes that the cost of ship repairs performed at public yards are very close to those of private industry." Against the background of testimony by the Chief of the Bureau of Ships on May 9, 1961, before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, in which it was clearly asserted that costs in the naval shipyards were as much as 15 percent higher than in the private yards, this statement is irreconcilable, unless "very close" is intended to mean 15 percent. I am advised that this testimony has never been revised or revoked. It was the same House Committee on Appropriations that had this to say in House Report 574 (87th Cong., 1st sess.):

"The committee is not convinced that procurement officials of the several services are properly utilizing the production base available to them in the most economical and efficient manner. * * * Particularly is there a need for further studies of the policies relating to the awarding of contracts to private and naval shipyards. The committee is not convinced that the Department of the Navy is taking proper advantage of the strong element of competition which is available in the shipbuilding and repair field."

Fifteen percent (and I personally believe the ultimate difference to be even greater) of the $7 billion figure to which you refer is slightly more than $1 billion. This amount, for your information, would go far in replacing some of the obsolete ships which Navy officials are at this very moment decrying. This amount is also equal to the total appropriations requested for all Corps of Engineers civil works projects throughout the entire country in the coming fiscal year. In other words, critical funds that could otherwise be put to constructive use in the national welfare are being arbitrarily dissipated.

You say "there seems to be a misunderstanding" as to "the economic health of the private shipbuilding and repair industry."

I should like to suggest that the misunderstanding exists only in the minds and imaginations of those who seek to preserve for selfish reasons the myth of the unassailable functions of the naval shipyard complex. Here again, an erroneous appraisal has been accepted without consulting the true facts. It is a matter of positive record that more than 20 privately owned shipyards have gone out of business in the postwar years, and most of the remaining yards are operating at far less than full capacity. Strangely enough, since the close of World War II, not a single naval shipyard has been closed down, and unrealistic employment and work levels have been and are being maintained in these Government-owned, Government-operated facilities to the detriment of free enterprise, our tax-producing system, and the public treasury.

The availability of private shipyard facilities which are not now being utilized for naval ship procurements is ample refutation of the implication in your letter that: "Private industry, to accommodate increased and more complex shipwork, would probably require additional facilities duplicating those in naval shipyards." To the contrary, it seems to me, the naval shipyards have already duplicated—and improperly so—the facilities of private industry. And, it seems pertinent to add that practically all of this "more complex shipwork" represents the original efforts of private industry and private shipyards.

The employment statistics quoted in your letter are a "dead giveaway" of the manner in which self-serving Navy Department statements have been accepted without verification. There is only one yardstick for comparing employment, and that is in terms of naval shipwork only. The Secretary of the Navy has provided the Senate Committee on Armed Services with a tabulation indicating that, on this basis, employment in the naval shipyards has in most years since 1946 averaged twice, or more, that in the private yards. Also, on this basis, recent Federal statistics show that employment in the naval shipyards is increasing while employment in the private yards is decreasing. Surely this paradox is not in the national interest, particularly when the President of the United States has said that the Government should do nothing which private enterprise is able to do.

Even so, your letter labors the point that the shipbuilding and ship repair industry should be satisfied with the volume of naval ship procurements now being placed with private yards. Though faced with costly and destructive Federal competition, the private shipyard industry should placidly accept a preservation of the status quo. This line of argument surprisingly chooses to ignore President Kennedy's statement in 1960 that:

"* * * Private enterprise under our system of Government must remain the basis of our economic and political strength. It is the alternative we offer to communism. Government must do only those things which private enterprise cannot do."

If these words are interpreted literally, all Navy shipwork should go to the private yards—for there is nothing the naval yards are doing which the private yards cannot do. And, in the latter category, I certainly include support of the fleet. The naval shipyards have no monopoly on skills, facilities or capabilities.

In wartime, it was the private shipyard industry, not the naval shipyards, that gave the greatest measures of support to the naval fleet. Private yards can do the same now. Under modern-day concepts of warfare, when a time for preparation will probably not be possible, the underlying guide for naval ship construction and repair should be to insure the instant availability of vessels at the lowest possible cost to the Government—and that lowest possible cost, in spite of the many insupportable contentions in your letter, can be provided by the private shipyard industry. Under this concept, and in keeping with the precepts of free enterprise, the private yards should have first consideration on all naval shipwork.

Your citation of the 1961 Report of the Special Subcommittee on Utilization of Naval Shipyard Facilities of the House Committee on Armed Services recalls to mind this passage from an editorial in the Journal of Commerce on August 11, 1961:

"Of the six members of the subcommittee (four Democrats and two Republicans) five are from naval shipyard districts.

"There is no doubt about what has happened. The whole subject has been treated as a political football for years. The best way to correct the situation * * * is to broaden the base of the subcommittee. As matters stand, it is loaded."

Under these circumstances, I am sure you will agree that this report can hardly be characterized as an objective document, and the use of such a review as a benchmark is unworthy of the high standards which should prevail at the Bureau of the Budget. Of course, on any and every occasion, the Navy Department is using, and will continue to do so, the Special Subcommittee's Report for self-serving purposes.

The entire tenor of the justification for the naval shipyards—"industrial giants" as the Navy frequently likes to describe them—in your letter seems to be somewhat at variance with the facts as reported in the public press less than 6 months ago. In late August, the Nation's newspapers carried reports that the President had vetoed a Department of Defense recommendation calling for the "phasing out" of the San Francisco, Boston, and Philadelphia Naval Shipyards because of the Berlin crisis. The preparation of that recommendation, which has never been denied, must have substantiated the conviction of many, including those in high authority, that there is too much capacity in, and too much work going to, the naval shipyards.

More recently, on January 6, the Navy Times quotes an unidentified project 71 spokesman to the effect that: "at least three naval shipyards have already been declared 'in excess.' At least one of these will probably be ordered closed within the next 2 years, he said, declining to specify which were excess or which might be the first closed."

Admittedly, this is an unofficial publication, but these latter statements plus the earlier undenied recommendation persuade me to the point of view that there is a significant body of opinion elsewhere in the Government which wants to place greater reliance on the private shipyard industry for naval ship procurements.

May I respectfully suggest that this situation calls for a more objective study or review than is indicated by your letter of January 31.

Sincerely,

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
U.S. Senator.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1962.

Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: This is in further reply to your letter of October 26, 1961, recommending that in the formulation of the President's budget for 1963, the planned assignment of shipbuilding and ship repair work to public and private facilities be given an objective review.

During the formulation of the President's budget, the points raised in your letter were given careful consideration. Among the factors considered were the total shipyard capacity required to meet current and future needs; the difficulty of defining, for contract purposes, the repair work to be performed; fleet operational needs; the level of ship repair capability needed to meet emergency demands; and, of course, the cost of alternate methods. Among the cost factors involved in any substantial transfer of ship repair work to private yards are:

1. Increased administration and supervisory costs on the part of the Navy.

2. Increased technical services required, as private shipyards receive substantial assistance of this kind from the Navy when overhauling a Navy ship. These include design services, material procurements and assistance in specialized areas such as ordnance and electronics.

3. Private industry, to accommodate increased and more complex shipwork, would probably require additional facilities duplicating those in naval shipyards. Based on past experience, the likelihood is that such additional facilities would have to be financed by direct subsidy or as part of contract costs, with no assurance of the fleet receiving full and immediate responsiveness as provided by the naval shipyards.

While costs of repair and conversion work at public and private shipyards are not readily comparable because of the difficulty of reducing them to a common basis, the Navy believes that the cost of ship repairs performed at public yards are very close to those of private industry. Due to this lack of precise comparability, the Navy cannot estimate whether, on a long-range continuing basis, there would be any savings, or greater cost, resulting from the award of more ship repair work to private yards.

With regard to the economic health of the private shipbuilding and repair industry, there seems to be a misunderstanding. I am informed that private yards are now engaged in a Navy ship construction program having an overall value of approximately $5 billion, and that these yards have been receiving approximately $95 million in Navy ship repair work each year. The total dollar volume of Navy shipwork currently awarded is the largest ever obtained by private industry in peacetime. Navy records indicate that employment at private yards has increased from an average of 101,300 in fiscal 1955 to an average of 122,400 in fiscal 1961, while public shipyard employment during the same period decreased from 112,126 to 96,772. Average employment on Navy work at private yards during fiscal 1961 was the highest in 7 years. Although private yards may lack full utilization in merchant-type shipwork construction, the strong nucleus of private yard skills and facilities now being supported by Navy work is adequate to enable the industry to meet expected Navy tasks in wartime.

As a result of these and other considerations, it was determined that any substantial transfer of ship repair work from public to private shipyards would not be in the national interest. The outcome of this review, as incorporated in the 1963 budget, is a shipyard work program of about $7 billion, of which approximately 65 percent is allocated to private shipyards—about the same proportion as at present. About 70 percent of the new construction shipbuilding program will be accomplished in private yards, and approximately 20 percent ($88 million) of the ship repair and improvement work during 1963 will be awarded to private yards. It is believed that these planned assignments will maintain the levels of private and public shipyard capability necessary to meet current and emergency military purposes.

Extensive hearings on utilization of the naval shipyards were conducted during July and August 1961 by a Special Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. The special subcommittee reached the conclusion, in its report dated September 19, 1961, that any curtailment of the Navy shipyard support system would detract from the total capability of our naval forces and consequently impair national security.

Your letter of January 17, 1962, expressed an interest in the recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense. The discussion above is, I believe, a fair summary of the principal factors supporting the Secretary's recommendations.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Acting Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., November 21, 1961.

Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: This is in reply to your letter of October 26, 1961, recommending that in the formulation of the President's budget for 1963 the planned assignment of shipbuilding and similar work to public and private facilities be given an objective review. I am asking the Secretary of Defense for his recommendations in this regard and can assure you that in the formulation of the 1963 budget serious consideration will be given to the reasoning you have offered.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. BELL,
Director.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, November 3, 1961.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: I have read with interest your thoughtful letter of October 26 in which you discussed the operations of Government-owned naval shipyards.

I do indeed have a very real interest in the conservation of tax revenues generally. However, the activities and expenditures of the Department of the Navy are outside the scope of my responsibilities. I am forwarding your letter to David Bell for review and comment since the Bureau of the Budget does control the Defense Department's requests for appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., October 26, 1961.

Mr. DAVID E. BELL,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BELL: As you proceed in the development of the Federal budget for fiscal 1963, may I call your attention to an opportunity whereby the Government can reduce out-go while at the same time increase income. I refer to the continuing opportunities to save appropriated dollars for the construction, repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels through a greater utilization of private shipyard facilities—opportunities which are now being arbitrarily discarded.

I am prompted to write you only because officials of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy are unwilling to concede that the operation of Government-owned naval shipyards needlessly consume tax revenues and that the operation of these Federal facilities are undermining the mobilization and tax-producing capability of the Nation's privately owned shipyard industry. Perhaps you and your associates are disposed to give this matter a more objective review.

The following points might be helpful in placing this situation in sharp focus:

1. For the past 8 years, total employment in the 11 naval shipyards has been only slightly less than the total employment in all private shipyards throughout the United States.

2. More strikingly, there are today about 97,000 persons employed in the naval shipyards on naval shipwork—the private yards have 47,000 on the same work. As a matter of fact, in all of the years since World War II, employment on naval shipwork in the naval shipyards has been twice as great as that in the private yards.

3. During the last 8 years, for naval ship repairs, alterations and conversions, the Navy spent an average of $464 million annually in the Government-owned, Government-operated shipyards, and an average of $126 million in private yards. It is truly unrealistic from all viewpoints for the tax-free, higher cost naval shipyards to be doing better than 80 percent of this work, while the taxpaying, lower cost private yards are awarded the balance on a competitive bid basis.

4. Under peak circumstances in World War II, 11 naval shipyards supported a fleet of 10,000 vessels—today, the same 11 naval shipyards support a fleet of 817 ships. This means that during the war, the naval shipyards required 34 men per ship, but now, nearly 120 men per ship are needed.

5. The Navy admits that costs are as much as 15 percent higher in the naval shipyards than in the private yards, and the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, in a report during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, suggested that the Navy was awarding contracts to private and naval shipyards in an uneconomic and unrealistic manner. This report went on to say that the Appropriations Committee is "not convinced that the Department of the Navy is taking proper advantage of the strong element of competition which is available in the shipbuilding and repair field."

6. In times of emergency, it is the private yards which are expected to perform the majority of all naval vessel work—but in times of peace, these same private yards are neglected because of arbitrary governmental action. While the naval shipyards are flourishing and expanding, the private yards are declining and decreasing. In the last 15 years, more than 20 important private yards on all coasts have gone out of business because of a lack of work, and many of the remaining yards are operating at a perilously low level. In that period, all of the naval shipyards have remained open and predetermined employment levels in these shipyards are maintained through the assignment of work with little reference to the ultimate cost to the Government, effect upon our economic base or availability of privately owned, tax-producing facilities. Idle capacity in the private yards—and there is considerable today—is hardly contributing to economic health, let alone to national security.

7. In World War II, the private yard side of the shipyard complex to support the naval fleet expanded by 1,300 percent; the naval shipyard side expanded by 300 percent. Obviously, the outstanding performance of the private yards, in a time of extreme urgency, greatly enhanced the fleet's effectiveness.

8. Recently, while private shipyards have been forced to lay people off, the Government-owned, Government-operated shipyards have been advertising for more workers and swelling their rolls by some 5,000 people. Ironically, practically all of the additional persons will perform work which could and should be done in the private yards. All of this goes on in contradiction to our competitive enterprise system which has traditionally placed supreme reliance on privately owned, tax-producing facilities.

9. Naval shipyards, unlike private yards, are immune from all forms of taxation. In addition to paying no taxes, these Federal facilities pay no interest on borrowed capital, charge no depreciation, and the salaries of assigned enlisted and officer personnel are not included on their payrolls. Likewise, the "fringe benefits" of Government personnel are not included in their costs.

10. Naval shipyards are maintained, improved and sometimes expanded by public funds. In the years 1945–61, under the heading of "Military Construction" appropriations, the naval shipyards have received a total of approximately $180 million for these purposes, and the indications are that a modernization program for all of these Government-owned and operated facilities, costing approximately $200 million, will be instituted in fiscal 1963. These capital items are not reflected in naval shipyard costs. But, private shipyards are commercial enterprises and can only be maintained, improved and expanded by capital generated by the competitive enterprise system—without placing a further burden on an already burdened public Treasury and the taxpayer.

11. Over the years, thousands of naval vessels of all types and categories, from the simplest to the most complex, with all types of propulsion and armament, have been built and repaired by the privately owned shipyard industry of the United States. They obviously have the necessary facilities and know-how. There is nothing that the naval shipyards are doing which the private yards cannot do—if given the opportunity. The latest in electronics and atomic energy are no secrets to private industry, for in reality, these technological advances are the fruits of development and manufacture by private industries.

In summary, by every reasonable yardstick, the naval shipyards are overutilized and the private yards are underutilized. This imbalance destroys needed tax revenues and excessively drains the Federal Treasury. The naval shipyards retain for themselves work which should go to the private yards. No other major industry in the United States is confronted with the same intense form of Government competition. The effectiveness of the naval fleet would not be impaired by a reversal of this situation—to the contrary, the shipyard complex to support the fleet would be strengthened and improved. There would be just as much employment for skilled shipyard workers, and the local and national economy would improve. Defense dollars would stretch further, and this country will not fall deeper in the quicksand of nationalized industries.

As you may have observed, I have, in the last decade, devoted much time and energy to this problem. I continue to believe that the arguments of justification put forth by the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy are nothing more than self-serving pronouncements, completely contrary to our longstanding national objective that "the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial-industrial activity to provide a service or production for its own use, if such production or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels." To me, it is axiomatic that greater reliance on privately owned shipyard facilities will better serve the Nation's need for economic well-being, and thus strengthen the ability of our economic system to produce the funds to pay not only for military defense but for all of the many other varied activities of the Federal Government. If an assessment of the shipyard complex to support the naval fleet is made from the standpoint of insurance, it should be noted that greater coverage at lesser cost to the Federal Treasury can be obtained through more utilization of private shipyards for naval ship procurements.

In closing, let me emphasize that I do not advocate the elimination of naval shipyards. I do say, however, that employment and work levels in these Government-owned, Government-operated facilities can be realistically reduced at a great saving in badly needed tax dollars. There are efficient private shipyard facilities much more widely dispersed than the naval shipyards. And, with a transfer of work from naval to private shipyards, the defense capability of the Nation will be improved, our economy will be healthier, the private shipbuilding and repair industry will be saved from possible disaster, and at the same time, an appropriate nucleus of skills and facilities can be maintained in the Government yards.

With deep appreciation of any comments you might care to share with me, and with best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

John Marshall Butler,
U.S. Senator.

INTERNATIONAL BARBERSHOP HARMONY WEEK

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, this is International Barbership Harmony Week in North America. It is being observed by the largest organized all-male singing fraternity in the world today. I refer to the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., which has over 29,000 members in every State of the United States and most of the Provinces of Canada. These members are organized in nearly 700 chapters, sing in over 600 choruses and over 1,000 registered quartets and at least another 1,000 additional quartets which are not registered.

During the past 24 years, these happy harmonizers have been filling auditoriums across the continent with folks who love to sing and listen to the old songs. Community singing has been a part of every barbershop harmony show held since the organization was founded in Tulsa, Okla., on April 11, 1938. Most chapters stage at least one annual show and, in addition, frequently stage package shows for the benefit of local charities and community enterprises. It is a certainty, therefore, that more than 1,500 shows annually are staged by this organization.

Barbershoppers have no political, religious, or social axes to grind. The program is simple: To preserve and encourage the barbershop style of singing, to sing in harmony, and to live in harmony with their fellow men. The society has one goal toward which it is constantly striving, and that is to keep America singing. During 1962 it is stressing "Songs of Service;" that is, contributing to their communities through the use of their music and the wonderful songs of another era. One of the society's tenets is to render all possible altruistic service through the medium of barbership harmony, and in hundreds of cities, towns, and hamlets in the United States and Canada, local citizens are acutely aware of this society and the good it has done with its songs over the years.

Gone are the days when the barbershop quartet was associated in the public mind with the saloon, the corner lamppost and the tipsy warbler. Today's barbership quartet is composed of church choir members, substantial business and professional men, community leaders, and men who frequently are among the most musically knowledgeable in their area. Today's barbershop chorus is often conducted by a professional with a college degree in music, and the society's top quartets frequently equal and exceed the caliber of those who appear in the outstanding entertainment centers of our land.

Mr. President, I pay tribute to the members of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Singing in America, Inc. Long may they sing, and may their numbers increase, and their songs grow even more melodious.

ADDRESS BY DEPUTY POSTMASTER GENERAL H. W. BRAWLEY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on April 7, a Civil War commemorative stamp marking the Battle of Shiloh was dedicated at the Shiloh National Military Park in Tennessee.

The dedicatory address was given by our distinguished Deputy Postmaster General, the Honorable H. W. Brawley, who has been doing such a fine job in the Post Office Department.

To the historian, Shiloh may mean one thing; to the military tactician, another. But Mr. Brawley has discovered in the Battle of Shiloh a meaning of lasting importance to our generation.

His is such a thought-provoking speech that I think all readers of the Record should have an opportunity to study it. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Deputy Postmaster General H. W. Brawley at the Dedication of the Shiloh Commemorative Stamp, Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., April 7, 1962

A visit to Shiloh on this hallowed centennial is a particular pleasure to a South Carolinian like myself. The invitation of Congressman Tom Murray to participate today is a special satisfaction to one who has served for years on Capitol Hill where Mr. Murray is revered as one of the ablest and most effective of legislators.

And, as Deputy Postmaster General, I find the dedication of this second of five Civil War commemorative stamps a delightful duty and an opportune occasion.

Today we mark another in a series of major milestones in America's War Between the States. And we risk missing its significant. The battle which reached its climax in this peach orchard a century ago was staggering and memorable. The conflict of which it was a part was unparalleled in history. Still its real results, its lasting significance, often get buried in our awe for the courage and conviction of the men who fought here.

To a military historian, Shiloh was the first of the major battles in the western theater, the classic product of the brilliant strategic mind that was Albert Sidney Johnston, the first of the stubborn stands that were to characterize Grant and, most of all, the proof that the man in the ranks, North or South, was to be the decisive factor in this first of modern wars.

To a political historian, Shiloh marked the opening of a relentless Union campaign to sever the Confederacy along the line of the Mississippi and an instant response from the South in recognizing and meeting a crucial challenge.

But to a perceptive American Shiloh and the other bloody battles of the war a century ago should mean much more today. It has been said by many wiser than I that history is merely the prelude to today. If we in 20th century America cannot profitably draw on the experience of 19th century Americans epitomized in the Battle of Shiloh, then we are unworthy heirs of their heroism.

The War Between the States represented the resolution of conflict in a robust, but adolescent democracy.

Today we live in a mature democracy, but one no less vigorous.

The death and destruction that was Shiloh, and Bull Run, and Gettysburg, and Pea Ridge, and Cold Harbor, was but the expression of the ultimate in youthful, unabashed democracy—the honest, uninhibited knockdown, dragout settlement of differences between people who know today, in their maturity, that they have much more to unite them than to divide them.

But in 1861 today's fact was but a faint hope. And today, 1861's fatalistic factionalism has given place to a vigorous and responsive political system.

Some smugly point out that the South has matured. Realistically, one would have to admit instead that the Nation has matured. For growing up did not end politically in America with Appomatox. Reconstruction added its equally tragic, but tragically inevitable, postscript to the war years.

The post bellum careers of Wade Hampton, Robert E. Lee, James Longstreet—indeed, Andrew Johnson, James Garfield, William McKinley, and Woodrow Wilson—were irrevocably colored by not the bitterness but the bitterly learned lessons of the War Between the States.

Yet some today would celebrate this centennial only by recalling its glory, without taking into account its immutable effects. Others would refight its battles, without reflecting on its ultimate results.

Some, in other words, might remember the war, yet forget why it was fought.

We hope these Civil War commemorative stamps will remind millions of Americans of their real heritage—and in remembering we can all move ahead toward the America for which so many Americans died on this spot 100 years ago.

There are those who will say that little has changed. They tell us that the divisiveness, that ended in battle here, simmers today.

This I deny. To admit to this superficial appraisal would be to mock the deaths of thousands of Confederate and Union troops.

To accept that appraisal would be to say that war was fought in vain—and that Americans have stagnated for a century.

Let's abandon for a moment the nostalgic emotion of this occasion. Let's instead turn back the clock not to 1862, but to 1832—and keep an eye on today.

Abolition was not the cause of the war, but an accidental byproduct. A century and a quarter ago a dominant European economy, with which America was struggling to compete, raised a tariff issue which split America.

For 28 relentless years, this issue, compounded of shoddy economic theory, weak Federal leadership and uncertain appreciation of the real fruits of federation led our States down the shadowy road to war.

Today, the picture has changed—but the key issue then facing America has returned.

Tariffs—now their reduction, not their increase—is again the issue before America. It is not now a sectional issue but a national one and indeed an international one. It is an issue which in its resolution must involve every American, his job, his family, and his future. It is an issue which we can and should face today.

We fought a war on this field among ourselves primarily because we had no mechanism through which the economies of the several States could be meshed and coordinated in a national effort.

Each of our States and our sections looked for protection to its Congressmen, with an occasional look over its shoulder at the dominant competitive economy of Europe—

united through the seapower of the British Empire.

In those days, not so long ago, the executive branch of our Government did not lead, but observed. In those ante bellum days, the President and his Cabinet sought to avoid issues, not to face them.

The seeds of the War Between the States were planted, not by the farmers and artisans of both sides who gave their lives here, but by prewar politicians from all parts of the Nation who were unresponsive to their constituents and unaffected by Presidential leadership.

The result? When secession came both segmented nations turned in instinctive panic to strong executives—Lincoln and Davis—who simultaneously looked to the world trade markets as a decisive theater of war.

While Davis realized that the South's cotton crop could be its major economic weapon, Lincoln knew that the North's meager war potential must first be turned to countering that weapon through a blockade of southern ports.

And today, President Kennedy, with the wisdom born of a reverent appreciation of history, with the leadership developed in the hard school of war and the realism representative of a mature national economy, has offered America the exciting economic challenge only dimly understood in the days of our grandfathers.

The President's trade program has the same ingredients of breathtaking grandeur that have marked all major national motivations in history.

It places the American economy firmly in the main stream of world commerce.

It expresses a deep and abiding faith in the future and vigor of the free enterprise system.

It recognizes the fact of economic hegemony in a Europe whose 20th century recovery rivals that of the postwar South of the 19th century.

It hits the Communist empire where it hurts, in the world market where American ingenuity and inventiveness is at its best and the regimented thought of the Communist bloc is at its weakest.

It cushions the shock of effective competition with anticipatory reevaluation of both industrial resources and—more importantly—human resources.

It makes America—and for the first time all of America—an economic force in the world more than the equal of Europe, clearly the superior of the Communist bloc and potentially the world's strongest, most versatile economy.

How?

This breaktaking breakthrough can come to be because President Kennedy has brought to bear the leadership he promised—the force to "get America moving again"—and combined this genuine Executive leadership with legislative evaluation which seeks properly to meld local interest, national needs, and international realities.

The President's program is a positive one, and at the same time compassionate. It sacrifices nothing, but guarantees much. It concerns us all, but affects few. It protects those few, and burdens none.

It is, then, an exciting entree into a truly modern world whose economy is international and whose single greatest force is the yet unrealized potential of our Nation.

Basically, the President's trade program is revolutionary, but inevitable. And for each restraint we fear, it offers an unshackled opportunity.

In essence President Kennedy has presented us all with the essential factor missing in the tariff controversy which loomed tragically in the shadowy prelude of the War Between the States. He has presented every American with the ingredients of a truly great debate—one in which we are all concerned as Americans, as well as South Carolinians, Tennesseans, New Yorkers, or Californians.

It can really be jeopardized by only one jarring element—one that had no place at Shiloh.

Fear—under whatever guise it is expressed—is really the only thing that can keep our united Nation from finally making worthwhile the sacrifices we commemorate today.

Some would fear to face reality—that in the strength of our economy lies the best weapon to defeat communism, an ideology essentially economic in character. This fear lies deep in a suspicion of all persons a bit different, a bit differently oriented or originated than others.

Some would fear anything new or different—suspecting that they might have to adjust to the facts of today rather than memories of yesterday.

The American people are not frightened, though. Interested, yes. As yet not fully decided, perhaps. Honestly divided on some details, of course.

But where it counts—in support of programs at home and abroad which are the products of the first year of the leadership America craves in her President—in these things that count, the overwhelming majority of Americans stand with their President.

These are the symptoms of a mature nation—as the War Between the States a century ago evidenced the adolescent growing pains of a young nation.

The cause for which so many died from 1861 to 1865 was a single one—but the participants of North and South had not our advantage of hindsight to recognize it. We have, now, the opportunity to reap the fruits of their sacrifice.

In accepting the President's trade program and the essential measures which will make it effective, all Americans have the chance which comes but once to a nation—the chance to seize upon the role a century of growth has prepared it for.

It is this opportunity—not a lost cause—which we memorialize with the issue of this Shiloh commemorative stamp, which starkly depicts the only real hero of the war—the private soldier—against the peach blossom pink of this grove.

Each of these 120 million stamps, we hope, will serve to remind countless millions who see and use them, of our real American heritage—the right and responsibility to resolve in public debate and legislative processes the great issues of our time. Our predecessors at Shiloh had no recourse but combat.

At only the Shiloh post office today, but tomorrow at 35,000 more, we put on sale this adhesive reminder of Shiloh and its meaning. Our efforts will have been worthwhile if but a fraction of the people who see this stamp pause to think of its significance.

Now, it is my pleasure to present special albums of the Shiloh Civil War commemorative stamp to some of the people who have contributed to this event:

WHY MILITARY OFFICERS SHOULD NOT BE FRUSTRATED BY COLD WAR POLICIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, there appears in the April 1962 issue of the magazine Army, a very important article by Col. John E. Dwan II, entitled "Why They Are Frustrated." This magazine is the monthly publication of the Association of the United States Army, and although expressions of opinion in its articles do not represent official opinion of either the association or the Department of the Army, it is a highly regarded and widely read military publication.

Colonel Dwan's article is extremely timely. It recognizes that some in the military service are frustrated and dissatisfied about the cold war policies of the United States. Colonel Dwan discusses the false assumptions which underlie this feeling and shows that a realistic and informed military man should not be frustrated by the U.S. cold war strategy. Colonel Dwan is a distinguished combat veteran of World War II and a member of the faculty of the Army War College. His article is encouraging and stimulating because of his standing as a professional military man, but it would be regarded as a brilliant analysis of our foreign and military policies coming from any source. As Colonel Dwan points out, the notion that the world situation can be handled like a two-sided war game between "reds" and "blues" is a vast oversimplification. His article also shows the inaccuracy and deception of those who say we have a no-win policy. Although our objective cannot be a counterpart to the Communists and seek world domination by a political system run from Washington, a strategy of strengthening the free world to resist Communist encroachments and demonstrate democracy's superiority is nonetheless calculated to produce ultimate victory.

I hope everyone in uniform and everyone who is genuinely concerned with the role and attitudes of our career military officers will read this article. Colonel Dwan and the Army magazine are to be commended for making this valuable contribution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Colonel Dwan's article printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why They Are Frustrated—An Analysis of Some Unreal Assumptions About the Real World of Today

(By Col. John E. Dwan II)

There exists in the military services today a definite mood of frustration and dissatisfaction about how the United States is doing in the cold war. In my opinion a number of mature, professional officers appear convinced that the United States is losing the cold war to the Communist enemy, and that inadequate steps are being taken to reverse the trend. Their feeling is that the fortunes of the United States are in decline, and that if current trends continue, there is every prospect that eventually we will be defeated. Accompanying this pessimistic point of view is usually the clear implication that solutions are obvious if our people and their leaders only had the courage to act, or were not somehow unwittingly under insidious influences of the enemy and his accomplices.

If these attitudes are sincerely held by responsible officers in any appreciable numbers—as this writer thinks they are—then the consequences for the armed services and for the Nation are potentially serious indeed. Deeprooted frustrations on the part of responsible military officers about matters vital to the security of their country have aroused violent passions and intemperate action in more than one nation of the world in the very recent past. As one author writing in the January issue of this magazine has said:

"Most endemic and serious is the fact that there are deep motivations for the political factiousness of military groups in a democracy faced with the prospect of indefinite conflict with the Communist East. As the possibility of eliminating or softening the menace recedes into distant time, frustrations lead to the desire for some more direct form of action. * * * The world becomes split into a harsh dualism of good and evil. Why, it is finally asked, cannot civilian society be run by a mechanism of command and obedience like a well-trained military organization?"

This is not to suggest that extremist actions such as have been reported in the press from various parts of the world are remotely imaginable in an American context, given our long military tradition of loyalty to duly constituted authority and to constitutional processes. Still, deep-seated frustrations at the very least erode morale and impede the whole-hearted efforts that are needed in these perilous times.

The disquieting mood of frustration referred to here as characteristic of some segments of the military profession is, of course, not unique to that calling. It can also be observed within a portion of the citizenry at large. The point here is simply that the frustrations of the military professionals are probably due to some characteristic habits of military analysis and to the special experiences of military life.

This article proposes to look at some of the reasons why, in the writer's view, a sense of frustration is prevalent among some military professionals in this era of cold war. The purpose is not to pass judgment on the merits or shortcomings of national policy (which in any case would be inappropriate as a subject for public discussion by one in uniform), but to attempt to assess underlying attitudes and assumptions about today's world that appear to be held by those who are the most frustrated.

Three fundamental attitudes about the current world can be detected among those who feel a sense of frustration as they view current history. These attitudes are probably not consciously recognized as such by those who hold them. Rather, they appear to be unexamined assumptions about what today's world is really like—the lenses, so to speak, through which the observer looks out upon the world, and which shape his conception of reality. These premises are stated below in a fairly blunt and bald way. Chances are that very few people faced with them in these terms would subscribe to them completely without making exceptions and reservations. Nevertheless, the writer's contention is that these people talk about events of the cold war and take positions about what should or should not be done as if these were their assumptions about the real world today.

Assumption 1: "The single most important fact of today's world is that there is in progress a two-sided contest between the blues (United States and its allies) and the reds (Sino-Soviet bloc) in which ultimately one will win and the other will lose."

Military professionals quite naturally conceive of conflict situations in terms of a two-sided contest. This is the context of the war game, and the pattern within which thought is so effectively applied to problems at Benning, Knox, Sill, and Leavenworth. The real world of the 1960's seems to fit that design admirably, as indeed has the history of international affairs since the end of World War II. There is no doubt that our enemy is the Soviet Union, supported by the regimes of the captive nations of central Europe, and since 1949 joined by Communist China. Moreover, modern history reveals no more clear-cut, unambiguous hostile confrontation during a nominally peaceful period than that of the current East-West struggle.

The facts of the confrontation are irrefutable. Soviet missiles and aircraft presumably are able to devastate our continental homeland and present an imminent military danger unprecedented in our history. Our military forces themselves have engaged in limited yet large-scale operations with the principal enemy's North Korean and Red Chinese allies, the outcome of which was a stalemate that leaves the Chinese Communist adversary still powerful in his part of the world. The Soviets and Communist Chinese are constantly working for the weakening and downfall of non-Communist governments around the world whose demise would gradually enlarge the domain of Communist power and degrade our own. The Soviet Premier has announced his intention to assist so-called national wars of liberation, and has declared war on us in the economic field and in space achievement. Communist propaganda efforts around the world seek to capture the minds of men. The hostile confrontation thus involves far more on both sides than military power alone. It engages every major facet of the national lives of the opposing sides in a competition whose outcome will vitally affect the shape of the future world. Certainly, one might ask, how much more evidence do we need to be convinced that the East-West struggle is the single dominant fact of international life?

The answer must obviously be that the struggle between the Soviet bloc and the free nations is indeed a central fact in international affairs. Certainly very little that goes on is not in some way influenced by it. But to say this does not explain everything, nor can this vision of the world serve as the only guide for our national effort at home and abroad or for policy decisions about what the United States should or should not do in many perplexing concrete situations.

The point is that a view of the current world as a two-sided game between reds and blues, while true in many respects, is a vast oversimplification. Such a vision is entirely consistent with professional military experience in conflict situations, and as such it is understandable; but it is not a wholly accurate description of an incredibly complicated world of infinitely diverse and dynamic forces, some of which basically have nothing to do with the East-West contest.

The East-West struggle can indeed be made to look like the single driving force of current history in terms of which everything makes sense, if we choose to see it that way. In selecting, for example, events in the newspaper that strike us as relevant and important we use certain selection criteria, whether we are aware of them or not; and we organize the facts we read in relationships that give them meaning according to our own particular frame of reference. Using the red versus blue picture of the world as the central fact in terms of which events have real significance for us, we can see practically everything as stemming from it.

A few examples will suffice. We can view the political transformations taking place in Africa with unalloyed fear and dismay, as territories once parts of the empires of our stanchest Western European allies become independent states and announce policies of neutrality and nonalinement. We can interpret these events as losses to the West; and, since in a two-sided game one player's loss is the other's gain, as an unquestioned advantage to the Communist side.

When Latin American countries do not take vigorous, unequivocal public positions against Castro and refuse to stand up and be counted we can conclude that they are certainly turning toward the Communist bloc, and convince ourselves that the Western Hemisphere is falling apart around us. Hundreds of developments unfold each year that can be construed as undoubted gains for the East and losses for the West if viewed simplistically and uncritically in terms only of the East-West struggle.

The contention here is that world events are dangerous and troublesome enough without being made worse by interpretations that ignore the complexity of their causes, and distort their meaning and consequences for the United States.

Could one not also interpret the choice of the new African states for neutrality and nonalinement as a natural reaction against the colonial status from which they have just emerged, and as a reluctance to tie their newly won independence to either camp in the cold war? Whether or not we like such a choice or whether we consider it in the best interests of the African nations themselves, we have to recognize the possibility that most of the new African leaders in fact act from just such motivations and, right or wrong, have their own opinions about where the interests of their nations lie. If this interpretation is basically correct, then the fact that the new nations do not line up with the West takes on a different meaning, and does not need to raise blood pressures and feelings of frustration, because it does not mean that the African world in its choice of neutralism is by definition turning toward the Communist bloc. It can in fact be an encouragement; because at root our interest, like theirs, is in their continued independence, whereas the Soviet interest, quite incompatibly, is in their domination.

This does not mean that the road ahead is free from dangers, or that there is not much to be done to advance and encourage the political, social, and economic development of these countries. It does mean that emerging Africa is not necessarily "going down the drain" just because it opts for neutralism; and this view of things need not generate frustrations that one often encounters when the word "neutralism" comes up.

It is hardly necessary here to explore all the reasons why Indonesia is seeking to bring West New Guinea into its national boundaries. One may speculate that it is due to her strong anticolonial orientation; and, after Goa, to the possibility that there may be an element of competition among the world's neutralist leaders individually to assert their primacy in efforts to dig out the last vestiges of colonial rule in or adjacent to their territories, and thus fortify their images as nationalist leaders.

These are possible factors behind the recently renewed crisis over West New Guinea. But a person who views the world from the "reds versus the blues" perspective sees in the Dutch-Indonesian controversy still another example of an exasperating neutral placing pressure on a stanch Western ally of the United States; and he finds nothing effective being done to reverse what appears to be an inexorable trend around the world toward the gradual erosion of the oversea positions of European powers who are our best friends in the struggle with the Soviet bloc.

It is too simple and certainly not accurate to equate the historical trend of discolonization with the Communist conspiracy. While the Communist powers will inevitably try to fish the troubled waters of the developing areas, they are what W. W. Rostow has called the scavengers of modernization rather than the force behind the ferment of the emerging nations.

As for the reluctance of Latin American countries to take a firm stand against Castro, however much we may deplore their indecisiveness and however much this impedes collective action to rid the Western Hemisphere of Castro's tyranny over the Cuban people and subversive efforts against other Latin American countries, we would be deceiving ourselves if we ignored the domestic political difficulties that many Latin

American governments would create for themselves if they took strong anti-Castro actions at this time. Whatever frustrations this fact of life may cause us, and however much we think these countries should take the domestic risks necessary to achieve hemisphere solidarity, we need not automatically leap to the conclusion that these states are, by definition, against us and pro-Castro.

All this points to the probability that a lot of the anxiety on the part of the frustrated grows from a two-dimensional view of world events wherein everything not completely to the liking of the United States ipso facto advances the aims of the enemy. If we strike a balance sheet of "how we're doing in the cold war" in these terms we will inevitably come up with an unrealistically grim result, since we will be excluding the fact that, the world being what it is, there are a lot of things in it that are far from completely to the liking of the Soviets too.

Another premise in the thinking of these persons seems to be this:

Assumption 2: "Since the opponent's intention is to destroy us, it follows that ultimately it will be us or them, and the logic of the situation requires us to adopt as our objective his destruction, hopefully by means short of all-out war, but by that means if no other remains."

An additional source of frustration which the writer suspects seriously troubles many conscientious military men has to do with the ultimate objectives of the United States in our contest with the Soviet bloc. There are many who ask bluntly: Is our objective the destruction of the Soviet system, or is it not; and if not, aren't we fooling ourselves? These are fair questions, especially coming from men who have learned from the beginning of their careers the importance of having a clear understanding of the mission. What is the problem? What is the objective? are fundamental questions to military professionals.

There appears to be a general feeling among some military professionals that United States objectives in the cold war, because they do not apparently include the destruction of the Soviet system, are inconclusively defined, and this creates a mood of dissatisfaction and anxiety.

Reinforcing this mood is the fact that military professionals have a strong sense of the importance of knowing the enemy, his capabilities and intentions. It is precisely because there is plenty of evidence to support a strong conviction that the Soviet Union's objective is to destroy the United States and the capitalist West that our lack of a similar objective toward the Soviet system is so upsetting to many persons.

If there is anything that has been given a thorough airing in the past 10 years it is the threat presented to the West by the Communist powers. People who seem to make careers out of speaking and writing about the threat for the most part have rendered a valuable service, especially during the early years after World War II when the United States and the West were slow to understand the new world of changed power relationships in which the Soviet Union emerged as the dedicated and versatile enemy of everything we stand for. But as the years have gone by and every indication has pointed to a reasonably clear public appreciation of the nature of the struggle going on (witness the willingness of Americans to tolerate unprecedented levels of taxes and high government expenditures for security and foreign aid), there has developed in some quarters a pathological preoccupation with the threat to the extent that perspectives, both in domestic and international matters, have often become grossly distorted. Suffice it to say here that, important as it is to know the enemy and his methods, the extent to which some persons have become hypnotized by the threat has reinforced their tendency toward a red versus blue world view.

The question, nevertheless, arises: If you are confronted with a powerful and ruthless enemy whose announced intention is to destroy you by whatever means he can, what sensible ultimate objective can you yourself have other than the destruction of that enemy? There are those who take the view that indeed this must be our objective because eventually, given the character of Soviet leadership, it will be "us or them," and therefore we must consciously set out on a national program aimed explicitly to insure that it is "them." Yet, they ask, Where is the program that faces up to this logical objective? Containment of Soviet power within its present borders is all well and good as far as it goes, and efforts to strengthen the non-Communist world are fine, but can this course be conclusive as long as the Soviet Union and Communist China continue to exist with the unchanging objective of world domination?

In the same vein articulate spokesmen in the civilian sector of American life have publicly deplored the fact that nowhere in national policy does there apparently exist an objective to destroy the Soviet system and all it stands for; and, surprisingly, they say, no responsible public official seems to have stated that is in fact our aim. Such people come to the frustrating and, for them, irrefutable conclusion that, although it is vital to our survival that we adopt as our objectives the ultimate destruction of the Soviet system, this is not adequately recognized, nor are we taking action sufficient to achieve this objective.

Again, the source of frustration may lie in unexamined assumptions, in this case that the cold war will inevitably result in an "us or them" outcome, and that our objective must be identical in character with the Communists'.

What about the validity of these assumptions? There is little doubt that the Soviets and Chinese Communists see the conflict with the capitalist world in "us or them" terms, and if their apparent self-confidence in the future is not a complete facade, they eventually expect to triumph. Khrushchev and others have made this quite clear; and even though the current Soviet preference seems to be to lay us to rest by somewhat different means from those favored by Peiping, the result would be the same. But we would do well to recall that, according to the secular religion of communism, the thrust of history toward the inevitable defeat of capitalism is taken as predetermined, and is accepted as an article of faith. The destruction of our kind of society is an integral part of the Marxist faith, and is one of communism's built-in objectives. Thus, whether one thinks of Communist leaders as realistic, practical men motivated by nothing but the drive for power, who cynically use Communist ideology as a tool to manipulate the masses; or whether one considers them as truly committed to tenets of the Communist faith, there can be no doubt that Soviet intentions are to destroy the capitalist West as we know it—or, as they might put it, to facilitate the historical process.

The irony of the situation is that the frustrated fringe, although trained to plan against enemy capabilities, seems to insist that U.S. cold war objectives toward the Soviet Union be shaped by enemy intentions—and what is even more startling, that our ultimate objective be a mirror image of his. The result, in effect, is to let the enemy determine the ultimate character of one's own strategy.

A number of arguments can be raised against the conviction that our cold war objective must be the destruction of the Soviet system. First, however, it must be made clear that in speaking about our objective here we are not referring to something that we hope and wish would happen, but we are using the word in the sense of a specific condition in the world to be brought about by development of a national program of action by Government agencies, duly budgeted for, and purposefully implemented. If one does not accept the premise, as the Communists do, that the history of human societies follows a discoverable pattern leading to an inevitable result, then the way the future will unfold will not be determined by a grand design such as that revealed to the founders of communism and interpreted to the multitudes by the party elite, but will depend chiefly on the actions of men striving for goals of their own choice. If this is our view—and it is one that is consistent with our devotion to the idea that man has the inherent potential to shape his own destiny through democratic institutions—then we should not be bemused by the enemy's rhetoric about his intentions, and feel obliged to set the objectives of our strategy in his terms.

Our objective is not to dominate the world and to impose on it a foreign political system run from Washington. Hence, the fact that the Soviets must seek our destruction in order to impose their system on the world has an internal logic that does not apply for us. Destruction of the enemy is for us not a logical imperative imposed by the opponent's intentions or by our own goals in the world.

Nevertheless, Soviet power and intentions face us with great dangers and greater challenges. But the dangers lie less in the Soviet Union's intentions than in its capabilities, and we should not make the mistake of equating the two. Soviet intentions are unilateral in that there need be no external inhibitions on them. Many a man has intended to make a million before he reached 40, but this aspiration has often proved as visionary as we believe the Marxist dream of a communized world to be—not necessarily impossible, but certainly something that must be made real by more than mere intentions. It is up to us to see to it that the Communists' grandiose intentions are never matched by capabilities, since what they can do, unlike their intentions, depends in a crucial degree on our own actions.

Free world efforts and strategies must deal with the enemy's capabilities, and must insure that they fall short of intentions. The Communists' successes or failures in advancing their world goals will depend ultimately on whether the non-Communist world is able to confront the Soviet and Chinese systems on a long-term basis with the growing strength and prosperity of free societies, and thus to refute the Communist image of how the future will unfold. As one close student of these matters has expressed it:

"It has now become clear that the outcome of the so-called East-West struggle will be determined not so much by the military competition between the United States and the U.S.S.R.—although this is of great importance—but by the way in which the new states and the newly emerging states of the non-Western world organize themselves economically and politically in their efforts to modernize themselves and gain the benefits of an industrial civilization * * * the United States and the West must either lead in the process of modernizing the underdeveloped areas or, by default, contribute to a kind of world in which our institutions and values cannot survive." [1]

How long the Communist version of Utopia can be postponed without raising doubts among the faithful and semifaithful alike is uncertain, but continued deferment should not be without its disruptive effects. Less uncertain is that political societies undergo changes over time. There is no logical reason to believe that Soviet society is immune to the transformations which earlier societies have experienced. It is not a static entity. With the passing of the revolutionary generation, the emergence of new class structures including a middle bureaucracy and scientific elite, and with the acquisition of more of the fruits of industrialization, new concepts of what is in the national self-interest are bound to emerge, as indeed evidence now is beginning to reveal. Scientific and technological developments including those affecting weaponry modify power relationships. In the thermonuclear age, and under conditions when adversaries possess invulnerable retaliatory strategic forces, even Communists can be expected to see a large measure of self-interest in avoiding situations that carry serious risk of all-out war. Relations among the members of the Communist world are undergoing changes which cannot yet be fully assessed, but which point to greater diversity in outlook and policy than existed in the Stalin era. This is not to say that we can necessarily take comfort in these changes. It is to say the Communist states can be expected to act at least as much out of self-interest as out of implacable hostility to the West; and that, while the hostility may continue, estimates of self-interest will change in a changing world.

---

[1] Gabriel A. Almond, "The American People and Foreign Policy," 2d ed., Frederick A. Praeger, 1960, New York, pp. xii, xx.

The most useful and realistic course for us may well lie in the direction of continuing to shape a world in which Communist leaders and their followers over time cannot escape the conclusion that the world is not moving exorably in the direction predicted in the Communist myth of the future; that free societies can cope with their internal problems without weakening themselves, and can forge together an international community which, if not always without its stresses and strains, is still willing and able to reject the Communist system. Perhaps our basic task is to convince the Soviet and Chinese leaders through the facts of the world that confronts them that, in spite of their doctrine and dogma, it may be too hard and too dangerous to try to eliminate us, and that there are other threats and dangers in the world to prepare for. Secretary McNamara may have been thinking along these lines when he said recently:

"We are resolved to continue the struggle in all its forms until such a time as the Communist leaders, both Soviet and Chinese, are convinced that their aggressive policies, motivated by their drive to communize the world, endanger their security as well as ours."

We can take for granted that Communist intentions will remain unchanged for a long time to come; but in a world in which change is endemic, and in which the resources of free societies give us the capacity to thwart Communist world aims, we need not be frustrated by a cold war strategy that, whatever else its shortcomings, places its emphasis on strengthening the free world against Communist encroachments rather than more dramatically, but less realistically, contemplating the destruction of the enemy.

An additional assumption, closely allied to the two discussed above, also appears to underlie attitudes of the frustrated fringe:

Assumption 3: "All of the serious and dangerous problems the United States faces today have been created by the Communist adversary; these problems are susceptible to and require solution; and the United States can solve these problems if only our people and their leaders have the will and the courage to act resolutely."

The red versus blue image of events in the world tends to create the impression that all the problems we face are the work of the enemy, whether in the form of difficulties at home or abroad. There is danger in this perspective, for when our society attributes the source of all troubles to the Communists, problems not of Communist origin fail to get attacked at their roots, and useful efforts to cope with them are often stifled. Furthermore, the adversary gains advantage from the suspicion and dissension that begin to pervade our society and divide our citizenry.

The great challenges the Nation faces domestically have not been generated by the Communists, no matter how much the Communist apparatus may try to exploit troublesome situations for its own advantage. Whether communism existed or not we would still need to grapple as a nation with a number of major challenges of which the following are significant examples: a growing population, burgeoning urban centers, and the resulting social consequences in terms of housing, transportation, delinquency, and education; attitudes on racial matters with their political and social disruptions; tensions that arise in labor-management relations and their impact on our economy. These and other domestic challenges, each with its troublesome array of problems, have their roots in our own distinctive national experience, and their origins have nothing to do with the East-West struggle.

In the world at large in mid-20th century forces are at work that the Communist conspiracy did not create: nationalism among peoples who previously had never been actors on the international stage and the irrepressible urges of such peoples to assert a sense of cultural and political identity; the collapse after World War II of colonial systems based on Western Europe with the political vacuums and economic disruptions that ensued; the explosion in science and technology which has given man an unprecedented ability to reshape his environment and has heightened his expectations of a better life. These are merely suggestive of a range of historical forces of epic dimensions that are shaping our century. They form the background against which the East-West conflict is waged, and they raise problems that would be challenging enough in their own right even if our contest with the Soviet system did not inject even greater complexity into the picture.

Those of us who are temperamentally disposed to view problems of this kind as susceptible of solution are thus confronted with a world which cries out for solutions to all its disruptions and instabilities because the problems are believed to be enemy inspired. Seen in this light, when perplexing situations affecting U.S. interests arise from dynamic forces in the world such as those cited above and not stemming from Communist machinations, they become sources of frustration. The frustrated are unable to visualize a world in which there are conditions that nations can hope at best only to adjust to, and whose unstabilizing effects can only be moderated rather than solved. There are those who find it hard to accept the fact that even the United States faces limits beyond which it cannot influence—let alone control—people and events.

All this may account for the proposals one sometimes hears in heated discussions that call for the United States to take courses of action whose impracticability is obscured by the desirability of the ultimate objectives they seek—liberation, the toppling of unfriendly regimes, unleashing of certain allied forces, sending of U.S. troops as a sure way to straighten things out. Such proposed actions are invariably extremist since they are strongly motivated by exasperation; misdirected since they are based on faulty estimates of the situation; and infeasible because they attribute to the United States an inordinate ability to influence the world around it by a combination of its power and its will.

It is the great good fortune of the military services—and the Nation—that the numbers of its professionals whose points of view appear to be shaped by the assumptions discussed here are in fact a minority. The writer has the impression that, although those who feel frustrated are often articulate, they are probably far outnumbered by those who do not see the world in such oversimplified terms.

Difficult and dangerous as the current world is, and insoluble as its problems may seem to be, it is of vital importance to military morale and to the proper role of the services in the national effort that military professionals are not overcome by a sense of frustration which results more from an incomplete view of the world scene than from reality itself.

SUPPLEMENTAL AIRLINES

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, supplemental airlines cannot survive without a reasonable opportunity to participate equitably in civilian commercial air transportation. These small airlines depend upon flying charter groups to conventions and resort areas while also maintaining a fixed number of individually ticketed roundtrips each month between cities where there is a demand for low-fare air travel.

Currently, supplementals fly 10 roundtrips per month between such cities as New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Miami, Honolulu, and Las Vegas. In addition these air carriers have responded effectively as a supplement to the air transportation needs of the Department of Defense. Their history includes prompt and successful participation in such vital airlifts as the Korean, Hungarian, Berlin, and DEW line for the military. Their efforts in these areas—in meeting the challenge of our airlift capability—have been rightfully lauded by the Air Force.

I want to state at this time that the business people of my State, and especially the residents of Las Vegas, Reno, Hawthorne, Lake Tahoe, Elko, Searchlight, and Tonopah, rely heavily on the charter groups, many of whom come to our State for national conventions and are flown by these qualified air carriers or by aviation organizations which provide all-expense tours for resort areas.

Since Nevada depends heavily on tourism these services are a life-and-death matter for many a community and for more than a few businesses.

I hope the Members of Congress and particularly those giving specific consideration to the supplemental air carriers bill, S. 1969, will include all-expense tour authority and thus provide the supplementals with an avenue of revenue through low-cost packaged charters which include hotel, food, and other costs.

This type of air transportation is vital to resort areas which cannot attract regularly scheduled airlines or which are faced with too few low-cost carriers to meet the needs of resort areas.

I also believe individually ticketed authority for supplementals should be encouraged under the guidance of the CAB. The supplemental airlines do not cater to the expense-account traveler. The person who utilizes the supplementals saves for a vacation, travels on a budget, wants to see America, or is part of a fraternal or business charter group heading for a convention.

Indeed, the supplementals and charter groups cater to those 78 percent of all Americans who have never flown, oftentimes because they cannot afford to fly.

Unless the pending supplemental air carrier legislation includes both charter and individually ticketed civilian authority we will see the collapse of the whole industry. We will witness the prospect of many resort areas becoming depressed areas. And, certainly, we could not any longer count on the supplementals serving as a ready-made airlift for the military. Our failure to take proper and appropriate action would deprive the supplemental carrier industry of the opportunity to upgrade their equipment, depriving civilian and military interests from a vitally needed service. These carriers certainly deserve and need help.

They have a record of very high safety for the 16 years of their existence. They have served the Nation and are ready to do so now in the field of troop movements on an around-the-clock, day-today basis.

Certainly all of our experience in the domestic field and in the field of security demonstrate that we need to do everything we can to increase our airlift capability and expand our industries rather than harass and impede or eliminate a group which serve so useful and necessary functions.

The supplementals have demonstrated themselves to be unique in many different ways. They are unique in that they cater to people who seldom or never fly. As an industry they are unique because they do not harm or take business away from the larger commercial carriers; indeed, each year they introduce many thousands of new travelers into the field of air transportation. They are even more unique in that they have never been subsidized by the Federal Government nor do they seek a subsidy today. For these and many more reasons I believe that they strongly merit congressional authority to continue to serve the Nation.

WEST COAST SHIPPING STRIKE

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, until a few days ago when President Kennedy took the first steps toward invoking the injunctive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, few people on the mainland were aware of the threat which the west coast shipping strike was making to the life and economy of the State of Hawaii. The administration took early and vigorous steps to obtain a settlement, and when it appeared that a settlement would not be forthcoming in time to avert serious repercussions in Hawaii, the President very properly started procedures under the Taft-Hartley Act to obtain an 80-day cooling-off period. Everyone who has followed the course which the Kennedy administration has taken in labor disputes will have confidence the actions to be taken in this one will be based on consideration for the best interests of Hawaii and the Nation.

The circumstances of the strike and the necessity for resorting to the Taft-Hartley Act now draw national attention to the vexing problem of what the Nation should do in regard to a dispute which may victimize innocent bystanders—in this case, the people of the State of Hawaii.

An editorial in the Sunday Honolulu Advertiser of April 8, 1962, entitled "The Greater Right," emphasizes the need for a solution. Because of its national importance, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record, along with an article in the same edition of the Honolulu Advertiser including observations of the effects of the strike upon Hawaii.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Greater Right

Even if the shipping strike ends quickly its aftereffects will linger for some time.

Many individuals and small firms will suffer losses they may never be able to recoup.

Hawaii is the innocent victim, injured by the shipowners, and unions who are supposed to serve it. But the owners and unions have seemed not to care what their dispute has done to these islands.

At least one point on which we agree with the shipowners is that the dispute with the maritime unions should go to arbitration. And we further agree with the owners that it is vital to develop some means by which in the future shipping interruptions can be avoided, at least on the Hawaii run.

The Pacific Maritime Association calls for a compulsory arbitration law. Under such a measure any shipping dispute would automatically be submitted to an arbitration panel. In effect, strikes would be outlawed.

This is drastic medicine. It would restrict an important industry in its freedom to settle disputes in the traditional manner by injecting government into the picture in a big way. In a sense it would handcuff both labor and management.

Students of the problem tend to oppose compulsory arbitration as incompatible with democratic society. It is pointed out that if wage disputes are to be submitted to a Government arbitrator, it follows that Government must also have authority to determine prices.

It is also said that if compulsory arbitration is applied in shipping then it must be considered for other major industries imbued with public interest such as steel, chemicals, atomic energy. Where would the line be drawn?

These considerations have great weight. But opposed to them is at least one of greater weight, the consideration of the public health, welfare, and safety of 700,000 persons who depend almost entirely on ocean commerce for the necessities of life.

For Hawaii, at least, shipping is endowed with many of the characteristics of a public corporation or utility. West coast-Hawaii shipping is not just another private operation, and its public nature is heightened by the fact the Federal Government pays millions in subsidy to guarantee the existence of a merchant marine.

Consequently, any strike in west coast-Hawaii shipping is a strike against the public—and it could be argued with some force that in a sense it is also a strike against the Government.

The right of a relative handful of shipowners and maritime workers to settle disputes through unrestricted economic warfare must be modified. Neither labor nor management should have the power to cripple an entire State.

We do not know if compulsory arbitration is the best solution. But we do know the people of Hawaii are tired of being victimized, of being used as pawns in an economic chess game.

Some way must be found to insure an uninterrupted flow of shipping to these islands. If the right to strike is curtailed perhaps the unions involved must be given offsetting benefits.

The solution is not just a responsibility of the National Government. The shipowners and the maritime unions themselves can help in devising an effective and mutually acceptable means for avoiding strangulation of Hawaii in future disputes.

It is time for the Federal Government to show awareness and sympathy for Hawaii's peculiar dependence on the shipping lifeline.

And it is far past time for the west coast shippers and maritime unions to show responsibility and regard for their public trust as stewards of the pipeline by which the people of these islands exist.

When this strike is over a permanent solution should be the first order of business for the Federal Government, the shipowners, and the unions.

Isle Civic Leaders Rate Strike Effect

What effect will the shipping strike—already the longest on Hawaii's waterfront since the 6-month tieup of 1949—have on the islands' economy and on the mainland?

Here are opinions given by some leaders in the community:

Richard Holtzman, vice president of Sheraton Hotels:

"We're keenly concerned in our industry that the strike will have a long-range damaging effect. We have cancellations into June. The unfortunate thing is that headlines have given people on the mainland the impression that guests here have hardly anything to eat—but we have a 6 to 10 weeks supply of food.

"To the islands the strike is damaging psychologically because everyone wonders about the transportation. There is every good chance that Hawaii will get a reputation (for being a strikebound area).

"Governor Quinn has done a yeoman's job. It would appear that the Taft-Hartley law might be the only way to bring relief."

James Shoemaker, vice president of the Bank of Hawaii:

"The best indication of what will happen is to go back to the strike of 1949, when we had a large amount of unemployment, a recession and the largest number of business failures. We're now in a better position to bounce back than we were then.

"If we get a pretty quick settlement, there won't be much to worry about. But a strike is cumulative in its effects, and each week there are mounting losses.

"We're moving into a period when many losses will be irrevocable.

"A cooling-off period would give us an immediate respite and also time to find a plan to deal with the strike. Any place affected by strikes is not going to encourage people thinking of investment. A lot depends on how much, how often."

Thomas Hitch, vice president of First National Bank:

"I'm inclined to think that the long range effects are worse than the short range effects. Every businessman here, and every businessman on the mainland, has as one of his biggest worries the threat of a shipping strike—it really disrupts business.

"All that selling effort [of the Hawaii Visitors Bureau, the State government, etc.] is really undermined by one strike. Take sugar, for example. When C. & H. is unable to supply its big customers, some of them say, 'Why in the world don't we deal with that beet company down the road?' "

Walter F. Dillingham:

"I have been disturbed by the question of short rations of food, and the question of how long we can go on. The strike is a jolt to everybody.

"The Taft-Hartley Act offers the most encouragement. Within the time limit established by law, the situation could clear up. I wish I could settle this thing for you."

Charles Braden, general manager of the Hawaii Visitors Bureau:

"We are concerned that Hawaii's reputation as a visitor destination area will be clouded if strikes such as this one continue to happen periodically. But we are convinced that it is possible for visitors to keep on coming during the strike because of the ability of the hotels and restaurants to stockpile food.

"On Thursday we sent 200 cables to key travel agents and Saturday we sent 4,000 bulletins to explain that the strike need not affect plans of visitors.

"We were a little concerned that people would wonder why we were trying to get yet more visitors when food is scarce, but this [more visitors] will minimize the effect of the strike on the Hawaiian economy."

Malcolm MacNaughton, president of Castle & Cooke:

"This strike is the same as the other two or three we had last year, or the 1949 strike. They establish in the minds of mainland people that we are subject to this transportation isolation.

"This is the bad effect—one that is lasting. It definitely affects the investment of business capital. We succeed in spite of this disadvantage.

"The thing that does concern us is that everyone is interested in an immediate settlement, with no consideration of the consequences. The shipping companies could settle this in 15 minutes—but that produces an increase in the cost of operating vessels.

"The Taft-Hartley injunction in itself doesn't solve anything. I believe the shipowners are doubtful about Taft-Hartley because they don't think that anything new would be produced."

Hawaii Teamsters President Arthur Rutledge:

"We've had a number of strikes and this one hasn't even gotten started. I think it'll be over a lot sooner than is the belief of many politicians who are trying to make hay. The Governor went out of his jurisdiction. He should have done business through the elected Congressmen of the State * * *.

"The effect of the strike? Hawaii, an isolated area dependent almost entirely on shipping, hasn't done too badly in spite of strikes, and has done better than some mainland communities. Hawaii will continue to do so in spite of these temporary inconveniences."

Herbert Cornuelle, president of Dole Corp.:

"It is true that people considering investment might look at work stoppages here as a handicap, and a person who is undecided might have his opinion crystallized. An interruption in transportation is one of the factors investors have to take into consideration.

"A long strike is crippling to us (the pineapple industry). It has resulted so far in a severe dislocation in pineapple stocks on the mainland. But the effect of a Taft-Hartley injunction now might make for a more critical situation at the peak of the shipping season.

"I don't think there is a simple, legal answer (to how to prevent future shipping tieups)."

Malato Dol, city council chairman:

"The strike will have an adverse long-term effect, but recovery will eventually take place. I don't think there will be any permanent damage.

"In the future, I think it might be a good idea to look for alternative means of transportation before we get into another strike."

Lawson Riley, president of McInerny:

"You can't get back what you've already lost, and it will certainly be hard for the Hawaii economy to recover if the strike goes on for any period of time.

"The strike hasn't had much effect yet. Our sales are ahead of last year despite the strike.

"We ought to have some Federal legislation, absolutely. The President has the power to go to Congress and ask for legislation to settle the strike after the 80-day-cooling-off period. I think Governor Quinn has been very aggressive in this matter. I don't know what more he could do."

Robert Hasegawa, executive secretary of the Central Labor Council:

"I don't think the strike in any way is going to determine whether new industry will locate here. Land, water, and roads will determine much of any new industry.

"You see, there is a misconception. People think that because Hawaii is in the throes of a shipping strike, Hawaii is completely cut off. But there are other lines that could serve Hawaii if the people would utilize them.

"What we should have is wideopen competitive shipping. If we're wholly dependent on one service, it's just too bad. I see no avenue to treat Hawaii differently than other States.

"As far as enacting laws to prevent strikes from throttling Hawaii, I don't think such legislation is legally or constitutionally possible.

"In my belief, if the Taft-Hartley Act is invoked, an injunction won't help the situation, except for 80 days, unless the parties are closer to settlement."

Mayor Neal Blaisdell:

"There may be permanent injury to some small businessmen—but our major industry will recover fully, completely, and in a minimum of time.

"I suppose the fact that there is always the possibility of being completely cut off from the mainland, would have an effect on investment capital. But I don't have any doubt whatever that Hawaii will continue high-level progress.

"Governor Quinn has been doing an excellent job. A Taft-Hartley injunction won't really solve anything, but it will give us time to restock our shelves and the bargaining parties time to settle down to real negotiations."

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL GOLD PRODUCTION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, people of no less standing than officials charged with managing the Government's finances at various times are today more concerned about the outflow of gold than any other problem confronting the Nation.

There is one clear remedy to the gold shortage, that is to have more gold.

People who know nothing of the mining industry assume that gold is being produced because it pays to produce gold. Today it does not for ordinary mining conditions and ordinary management. I happen to have the honor of coming from a State where extraordinary managerial ability and experience of loyal and efficient workmen combine with an ordinary deposit to make possible the continued operation of the Homestake Gold Mine, the last of the great operating mines in this country.

But how long even the Homestake can continue to operate is problematical. The freezing of gold at $35 an ounce in 1934 and the maintenance of that fixed price coupled with the requirement that the gold from lode mines must be sold to the Government at that price in the face of mounting costs for drilling steel, chemicals, and all the other costs that go into deep underground mining have created the most adverse cost-price squeeze that can be imagined.

If the Government is going to persist in its monopoly and fixed price position, the least it can do, it seems to me is to adopt some such legislation as is proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 44, introduced jointly by Senators Engle and Kuchel, of California, and myself. It would help to keep alive the producing mine or two now left and would offer the encouragement needed if other mines are to reopen and to increase the domestic production of gold.

At this point I submit for careful reading and ask to have printed in the Record an article which appeared in the New York Times of last Friday, March 9, 1962, recording the worst outflow of gold in many months, bringing stocks down to a $16 billion figure, whereas a few years ago they totaled over $22 billion. That means a loss of over $6 billion in 5 years.

The situation is serious and merits immediate and favorable consideration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Gold Stock Dips $60 Million—1962 Loss Now $160 Million Against $394 Million in the Similar 1961 Period—Bank Reserves Decline—Net Free Rate Reaches Low of Year for the Nation's Reserve Institutions

The U.S. monetary gold stock sustained its biggest weekly loss of 1962 in the week ended Wednesday when a $60 million erosion occurred according to a report by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York yesterday.

This raised the total gold loss since January 1 to $160 million compared with a loss of $394 million during the 1961 period.

The monetary gold stock is reduced when foreign central banks purchase gold for dollars at the rate of $35 an ounce. The Treasury is committed to selling gold at this price to official foreign agencies.

Dollars are accumulated abroad by central banks when the total outflow of funds from the United States exceeds the total inflow, giving rise to a balance of payments deficit. The U.S. balance of payments has been in deficit chronically since World War II.

FIVE-YEAR LOSS $6 BILLION

The U.S. gold stock now totals $16,730 million. The loss over the last 5 years has exceeded $6 billion. The loss in 1961, however, was about half the $1,700 million loss in 1960, and Treasury officials are hopeful that the worst years of loss have passed.

The U.S. gold stock is vital to the Nation's economic health since gold is the ultimate international money with which nations settle their debts. It is a universally accepted medium of exchange and in effect measures a nation's ability to meet its debts.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York also reported yesterday that net free reserves of the Nation's member banks on an average daily basis had declines to a new low for the year during the week ending Wednesday.

Net free reserves reflect the lending capacity of the banking system. As the free reserve level declines, money conditions tend to become tighter. If declining reserves persist, credit costs—meaning interest rates—rise.

NET FREE RESERVES DIP

Average daily net free reserves of $350 million were down considerably from the $466 million level of the preceding week, as were actual free reserves as the week ended Wednesday of $491 million compared with $604 million on the preceding Wednesday.

Money market observers were not reading any special significance into yesterday's reported reserve declines, however. The Federal Reserve Open Market Committee usually buys or sells securities in order to keep the banks' free reserves at a desired level, but the results sometimes are off target.

Through January, for example, free reserves hovered above $500 million on weekly average. Beginning in February, however, the target level apparently had been reduced to about $400 million. But the latest weekly decline does not necessarily mean that the Federal Reserve authorities are moving more directly toward tighter money conditions.

Occasionally, substantial fluctuations in other factors that bear on the banks' reserve will take place. Last week, for example, there was a massive movement of cash out of the banks' vaults and into the hands of the public.

This development often takes place at the end of a month, when the Federal Reserve will attempt to compensate for the changing pressure on reserves by adjusting its open market operations. From time to time, the calculations are not exact and reserves rise or fall disproportionately with respect to the target level.

This seems to have happened a month ago. During the week ended January 31, average net free reserves were $470 million. On February 7, however, the level had declined to $384 million. By February 14, the reserve had gotten it back up to $427 million. In the next 2 weeks, some sharpshooting by the Open Market Committee returned levels of $421 million and $424 million.

If, of course, the next few weeks show free reserves persisting at levels substantially below $400 million, the inference then can be drawn that the lightening reflects policy rather than the vagaries of the open market.

The central bank in New York reported that business loans at major New York City banks fell by $14 million in the week ended on Wednesday, compared with a decline of $7 million a year earlier. At major Chicago banks there was no change last week; a year before there was a decline in business loans of $5 million.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED SERVICES, 1963

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK**. A bill (H.R. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the armed services, and for other purposes.

STEEL PRICE INCREASE

Mr. **GORE** obtained the floor.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield, if it is understood that, in doing so, he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. **GORE**. Yes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **GORE**. Mr. President, last evening the president of the United States Steel Corp. announced an increase in the price of steel. This news came as a great shock, surprise, and disappointment to me and, I am sure, to all those who have recently acclaimed what was thought to be a new attitude of economic statesmanship on the part of both management and labor in the steel industry.

This is a sorry end to an effort on the part of many, and particularly on the part of the President of the United States, to promote the national interest. United States Steel has pulled an end run before the ink is dry on a noninflationary wage contract.

During the past year we have enjoyed relative price stability. This is particularly significant in the light of the fact that we have been recovering from the 1960–61 recession. Unquestionably, this stability in retail prices is attributable in substantial degree to stability in the price of steel which is so basic to our economy.

Steel is one of the several large American industries dominated by the Big Threes or Big Fours on one hand and a powerful labor organization on the other. In such industries prices do not fluctuate in the classic response to supply and demand. They are arrived at by tacit agreement by the industry's leading companies and are known in modern economic parlance as administered prices.

In the post-World War II period generally steel price increases went into effect on an average of almost once a year. Steel wages and steel prices appeared almost to be engaged in a leap-frog operation. Each increase in labor cost was used by the steel companies as a justification for a further price increase, and the resulting profit increases were cited by labor as evidence of the steel industry's ability to pay higher wages. In any event the price of steel went up sharply and steadily and without any causal relationship whatever to the theoretical competitive influence of supply and demand. It has been estimated on the basis of studies that 40 percent of the rise in the wholesale price index of all manufactured goods from 1947 to 1958 was chiefly due to the fact that steel prices rose faster and farther than all other commodity prices.

President Kennedy, beginning late last summer, invoked the full prestige of his office in an effort to break this pattern. He sought, in the national interest, to promote orderly economic recovery under conditions of price stability. The action he took then to promote stabilization of steel prices and the action he took subsequently to promote restraint in demands for wage increases was, in my opinion, one of his most outstanding performances. Surely it was the most effective action ever taken by a President of the United States in the field of labor-management relations. United States Steel has this contract in the bag and now ups its prices, utterly disregarding the public interest.

You will recall, Mr. President, that an automatic wage increase was scheduled last fall under an existing labor contract in the steel industry. President Kennedy appealed directly to officials of the steel industry, urging them not to resort to a further increase in the price of steel, thus setting off an additional round of inflationary pressures. The fact that no general increase in the price of steel occurred was widely hailed as constituting assurance of continued price stability.

The degree to which the President's intervention may have influenced the steel companies in their decision not to raise prices cannot be precisely measured. Unquestionably, however, the President, serving as the focal point for an expression of the national interest, effectively brought to bear upon steel company officials the concern of the American people about another inflationary increase in the price of steel.

A similar objective was sought by a number of my colleagues and myself who discussed on the floor of the Senate in August last year the adverse impact upon our economy which would be brought about by another increase in steel prices. We endeavored to emphasize that the public interest—and the long-range interests of both the steel industry and its employees—would be best served by a hold-the-line policy with respect to steel prices and the negotiation of noninflationary labor-management contracts.

When the President appealed to steel industry officials last fall, he made it clear that he would urge restraint upon leaders of labor with respect to the contract provisions they might seek during negotiations for a contract to replace the one expiring on June 30, 1962. The steel industry accepted the President's promise. The President kept his pledge. His appeal, both to labor and to management last winter and, particularly, his intervention to bring about initiation of negotiations well in advance of contract expiration, culminated in agreement upon what is generally considered a noninflationary contract a full 3 months before the present contract terminates.

At this point, Mr. President, the American public had reason to believe that congratulations were in order all around. The modest increase in wage costs under the new contract was well within the margin of labor productivity increase that has prevailed in the steel industry in recent years. Thus, the new contract would not result in an increase in the unit production cost of steel and would, therefore, exert no upward pressure on steel prices. Indeed, there was every reason to believe that continued price stability was assured during the period covered by the contract. On the floor of the Senate on April 4, I described the negotiations which culminated in this contract as "a noteworthy example of effective collective bargaining" and stated further that "All who were involved in the negotiations merit commendation for demonstrated economic statesmanship in the public interest."

The illusion that this contract meant continued stability in steel prices was rudely shattered by yesterday's announcement by Big Steel.

The feeling that the officials of United States Steel had become responsible economic statesmen was wiped away by this irresponsible "end run" after they had the noninflationary wage contract safely in the bag.

I do not suggest that there was any contractual commitment on the part of the steel industry to refrain from price increases, conditioned upon obtaining a noninflationary wage agreement. Nevertheless, I am constrained to observe that, coming as it did on the heels of the announcement of successful conclusion of labor negotiations, this action is in sharp contrast to what the American people had reason to expect from responsible leaders of American industry. I do not charge breach of contract, Mr. President, but I charge breach of faith with the American people and action contrary to the national interest.

Mr. Leslie B. Worthington, the president of United States Steel, in whose name the announcement was made, went to great lengths to justify this action. Aside from stating the price increase in terms of so much per pound, there are other aspects of the announcement which appear somewhat unusual and which seem to be founded upon somewhat strained logic, to say the least.

For example, Mr. Worthington asserts that a price increase is made necessary by "competitive factors affecting the market for steel." Since there is no real competition within the domestic steel industry, Mr. Worthington presumably refers to competition from foreign producers or, perhaps, from other products which compete with steel. Whatever may be the type of competition referred to, Mr. President, this is the first time I have heard of the pressure of competition forcing a price increase. But then, I am reminded that we are dealing with an industry that employs administered prices, and one should not expect normal rules to apply.

Nowhere in the United States Steel announcement is there reference to the relationship between unit costs and utilization of capacity. Recently our domestic steel industry has been operating at approximately 80 percent of capacity. Production is expected to decline in the months immediately ahead as the inventory buildup resulting from fears of a strike is worked off.

Perhaps, as pointed out by the senior Senator from Illinois on the floor of the Senate last August, United States Steel may be able to break even when operating at a rate of only 38 to 40 percent of capacity. As long as prices can be arbitrarily set at any desired level profits can be made however limited to the tonnage produced. But the fact remains, Mr. President, that as utilization of production capacity goes up, unit costs tend to go down, and vice versa. Thus it seems strange that the steel industry would seek to stave off competition by foreign producers and competing products by raising prices, which will depress demand, reduce utilization of production capacity, and raise unit costs.

I noted in the press of yesterday—or perhaps it was today—that the president of Bethlehem Steel Corp. was quoted as having expressed sentiments similar to those I have stated.

Mr. President, the restraint apparently exercised by the steel industry last fall led me to conclude that its officials were in some degree cognizant of the public responsibility they bear as managers of so large a segment of the Nation's economy. Unfortunately, it now appears that they were merely awaiting a propitious time to spring the trap. They hardly waited for the ink to dry on the new wage contract to announce that competition was forcing another price increase.

In recent years, there has been considerable discussion about the cause of periodic sharp increases in the price of steel. Some have described this phenomenon as a wage-price spiral. Others have described it as a price-wage spiral. Well, to the extent this theory has validity, we now know which is the correct descriptive term to apply.

Mr. President, the unhappy sequence of events climaxed by the United States Steel announcement serves further to convince me that we must give thoughtful consideration to the impact of administered prices upon the Nation's economy. We must find some way short of rigid price and wage controls to preserve and protect our free competitive enterprise system, and some way to protect the public interest.

Mr. President, existing law provides machinery which could be effectively used in the existing situation. Among other things, the Government is empowered to preserve the national interest under the authority granted to the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice to proceed against monopolistic practices. I observe that at the present time there is sitting in New York a Federal grand jury now investigating alleged violations of the Sherman Act in connection with the marketing of steel castings. This investigation could quickly be expanded to cover the broader aspects of pricing and marketing practices in basic steel.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. At the present rate of consumption of steel, in a year's time what will be the increased cost of steel to the industry and to the economy of the United States at the increased price?

Mr. GORE. I do not have the answer to that question. Steel is so basic to our economy that an increase of $6 a ton in the price of steel means an increase in the price of automobiles, pots and pans, farm machinery, industrial machinery, roofing, nails, and fencing wire. Moreover, that increased cost is multiplied because, with our free enterprise mercantile system, the cost is pyramided since the manufacturer, the jobber, the wholesaler, and the retailer all have markups. So I am unable to calculate the cost. It will mean a rise in the cost of living. It will start another wage-price or price-wage inflationary spiral. The most basic business in our industrial economy is the steel industry. So the cost will be very great, though I cannot give an exact answer to the question.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. As the gross tonnage of steel production is manufactured into smaller items, such as knives, scissors, pots and pans, and automobiles, does not the cost of the manufacture of such items actually increase, too? Not only is the steel marked up, but by the time it is processed again, does it not cost more? We know there are losses through trimmings, and various materials are worked in with the steel for different purposes. It receives different treatment in the making of different objects. Does not the increased cost of the steel force an increase in the cost of such objects, when the base price of steel is raised a sizable number of dollars a ton?

Mr. GORE. The answer unquestionably is "Yes."

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee another question. I have been receiving protests from my part of the country for a number of years about American steel being driven out of the market, particularly items such as barbed wire, different kinds of wire netting, and nails. People have written me that such items are imported into the Gulf States, move into the States of Texas and Oklahoma, among others, and drive American steel products off the market. Will not a price increase make it more difficult for American steel to compete with imported steel, particularly products that come from Germany, Belgium, England, and Japan? Are we not disadvantaged and placed in a noncompetitive position with the Common Market countries by a sudden markup of price after the President has gone to great lengths to persuade labor to agree to scale down its wage demands so that we may hold the price line?

Will the increase hurt us in our worldwide competitive position?

Mr. GORE. To small minds, such as mine, the answer would obviously appear to be "Yes." But Mr. Worthington has said that he is raising prices because of competitive pressures. I wonder if the able senior Senator from Texas, with his great learning and wide experience, can explain that statement to me?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. My learning has been too limited and my experience too narrow to explain the statement of the spokesman of the steel industry that he is raising prices in order to meet competition, when steel from Western Europe shipped to my section of the country is cutting American steel out of the market in certain types of products such as nails, wire netting, and barbed wire. It seems to me that the increase will put us out of the market further at this time in competing with Common Market products.

Mr. GORE. As the Senator has said, many people are alarmed about international competition. Many have said that American business and industry was pricing itself out of foreign markets. The Senator has just said that the steel industry is pricing itself out of the U.S. market.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Government contracts are being let in our part of the country—and I am certain that in other parts of the country contracts likewise are being let—which would require American contractors in building projects to use American steel. I think we should. We spend the taxpayers' money to construct buildings; therefore, the Government ought to require the use of American steel and the employment of American labor. In our section of the country we have had difficulties with some contractors trying to slip foreign steel into the construction of buildings, because it is so much cheaper than domestic steel.

I cite that situation only as another problem growing out of the sudden, unexpected increase in the price of steel. It arises after the great work of the President in reaching some kind of understanding, as we thought, in prevailing upon labor to hold down its wage demands so that prices could be held steady.

If the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is not the most knowledgeable man in the Chamber on the question of steel prices, he is one of the three or four most knowledgeable. I have not heard anyone else who has shown the depth of learning on that subject that he has. He has kept up with the recent negotiations between management and labor. Does the distinguished Senator from Tennessee regard the increase in the price of steel as a breach of faith with the President of the United States?

Mr. GORE. I am not sure that I could say it is a breach of faith. I think it is very near that.

Let me state what has happened, as I see it. To begin with, the Senator will recall the great controversy that was finally settled in a conference between former Vice President Nixon and steel industry officials. At that time it was generally rumored that an agreement was reached for a price increase after the election. An increase in the price of steel was well advertised last fall as being imminent. As I stated before the Senator entered the Chamber, and as I know the distinguished Senator from Texas will recall, President Kennedy, in an earnest and intense effort to break the cycle or treadmill of price inflation, cast the full weight of the Presidency into an appeal to the steel industry not to go through with the price increase which had been so well advertised. The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], among other Senators, took the floor of the Senate and pleaded with the steel industry not to cause another wave of inflation in prices and in the cost of living.

In his letter petitioning and urging, in the national interest, that the steel industry officials refrain from raising prices, the President promised to use the influence of his office to bring about restraint on the part of leaders of organized labor in the negotiation of a management-labor wage contract. The President kept his promise. But before the ink was dry on the contract, United States Steel, having a noninflationary wage contract in the bag, pulled an end run on the public interest.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for his forceful statement and the great contribution he is making by his narration today of what has happened and what might happen to our economy as a result. I believe that the Senate and the country are indebted to him for his fine work. I know what has been happening to retail steel sales in my own State because of the great increase in the volume of imported steel by people who say, "We ought to use American steel, but we must buy it where we can get it the cheapest."

My concern is that we are pricing American steel out of the market, and consequently many American workers will be thrown out of employment.

It is actually putting American workers out of work when they go out of our domestic market, and involves also a potential loss in the oversea market. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Though I am unwilling to say that it is a breach of faith with the President—I do not know to what extent there was an understanding between the President and the leaders of the steel industry—I do say it is a breach of responsibility to the public. It is a violation of the public interest. The leaders of the United States Steel Corp. have abandoned the role of economic statesmanship for which they were being commended only a few days ago.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is true, is it not, that the price trend in the steel industry almost invariably follows the decision of the largest company, United States Steel?

Mr. GORE. Unquestionably the pattern has been that action by the United States Steel Corp., as the leader in the steel industry, in which there are only a few important producers, has quickly been followed, in the matter of raising prices, by similar action on the part of other steel companies. I would hope that this would not happen this time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If it does happen, then the guarantee of further inflation is just around the corner, is it not?

Mr. GORE. It is an inevitable consequence of a rise in the price of steel.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator who knows at least as much on this subject as any other Member of this body, and with whom I had the privilege of discussing this subject on the floor of the Senate several years ago, knows that if the rise in the price of steel goes through as an industry decision, the price of nearly everything else in the country can only increase. Is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. That is indisputable. Does the Senator know of any other commodity that is as basic to our industrial society as is steel?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No; I do not. I ask my able friend this question: Does he know whether, in the negotiations that were conducted by Secretary Goldberg and other representatives of the President, with the labor union involved, assurance was given, or opinion expressed, as to what the position with respect to prices would be if the labor request was acceded to?

Mr. GORE. I was not a party to these negotiations, and I am not informed in that regard, except that the wage contract was well within the limits of increased productivity. Therefore, the wage contract which has been negotiated, and which does not go into effect for another 3 months, even when effective will not exert an upward pressure on unit production cost because of increased productivity.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me remind the able Senator of what I am sure he remembers; namely, a dinner he and I had with Roger Blough and Conrad Cooper, who was close to Mr. Blough then. With earlier negotiations conducted over a period of weeks, even months, by the head of the union, and Mr. Cooper, as the representative of the steel corporation, it would be incredible for Mr. McDonald not to have asked something about the future of prices—and certainly it would have occurred to the Senator and to me—since he was talking to the man who represented the steel companies in the overall industrial negotiations.

Mr. GORE. I would be very much surprised to learn that no such conversation as the Senator has described was held.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have read the address of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and I commend him for it. He is making a distinct contribution to the past efforts he has made on this floor to avoid price increases and further inflation in the country.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his generous comments and for his encouragement. I should like to suggest that there may be some correlation between the issuance of restricted stock options and the price increase which was announced last night.

The Senator knows the market price for the stock of U.S. Steel. He will recall, I am sure, that it had been relatively stable for the past several weeks; in fact the price has been off a little. However, look what is happening to the stock market today. What is happening is an inevitable consequence of the announced increase in the price of steel, because this price increase means bigger profits, bigger dividends, more inflation. There are many consequences which are inevitable. I wished to call to the Senator's attention the fact that the top insiders of U.S. Steel were recently given more very handsome restricted stock options, and they are worth a great deal more on the market today than they were yesterday.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As the Senator from Tennessee will remember, despite the 100-day strike in 1959, the profits, overall, of the large steel corporations were greater after taxes in 1959 than in 1958. That is a figure which I will always remember. It would be interesting to compare in some detail the profits as against capacity incident to recent operations. I hope the Senator, with his usual perspicacity, will devote some attention to that fact; namely, as to why it was necessary to raise prices now.

Whether or not it is, in the Senator's opinion, a breach of faith, it would be interesting to get the economic facts as to profits as against sales and investment, in the past year as against previous years.

Mr. GORE. That would be worthwhile information, and I shall seek to develop it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in this connection, United States Steel was one of the early option grantors. The restricted stock option was authorized in 1950. By January, 1951, United States Steel had approved the setting aside of 1,300,000 shares for 300 of its top management people.

The Securities and Exchange Commission reports for the 5 months up to and including February 1961 showed that six officers of United States Steel purchased 32,300 shares of stock under option. This represents a possible gift of $1,291,000. Mr. Blough purchased 12,000 shares. He reportedly draws regular salary compensation of $275,000, which should put him in the 90-percent tax bracket. Considering the difference between the 90-percent and 25-percent rates, the tax gimmick associated with restricted stock options was worth, perhaps, $300,000 to Mr. Blough on this one block of stock alone in 1961.

In 1959, the recipients of stock options from United States Steel Corp. exercised options for 152,685 shares of stock at prices ranging from $18.50 to $55 a share. These options were granted in various years beginning in 1951. The aggregate purchase price of these shares amounted to $7.5 million. When the options were exercised in 1959, the market price ranged from $88.25 to $108.88 a share—or an aggregate market value of from $13.5 million to $16.6 million. In other words, during the year 1959, the executives of United States Steel Corp. exercised options at a time when they could have realized a profit of from $6 million to $9.1 million on their stock options after holding them for the requisite 6 months.

Recently, the price of shares of stock of United States Steel Corp. has been around $68 a share. Perhaps this is not high enough to suit Mr. Blough. But the action on the part of the officials of United States Steel last night will add to the value of Mr. Blough's restricted stock options, on which, under the present tax law, no tax is owed at the time the option is exercised.

I suggest that the President of the United States urge the Federal Trade Commission and direct the Attorney General of the United States to intensify and accelerate efforts to enforce existing applicable statutes.

Specifically, I would like to call to the attention to our enforcement agencies the fact that in 1951 the steel industry entered into a consent order with the Federal Trade Commission under which its members were ordered to cease and desist from entering into any "planned common course of action, understanding or agreement" to adopt, establish, fix, or maintain prices. It would appear to me to be at least prima facie evidence of a violation of this consent order of the other steel companies now follow United States Steel in raising prices about $6 per ton.

I suggest further, Mr. President, that Congress should promptly begin the consideration of legislation to provide additional machinery for the protection of the national welfare. In situations similar to that which pertains in the steel industry such legislation might follow one of the following approaches:

First. Congress should consider the establishment of a quasi-governmental organization that might be called a National Consumers Advisory Board. Such an agency should include representatives of the press, big and small business, labor organizations, academic institutions, religious groups, welfare organizations, service organizations, and the like. It should be a permanent organization, chartered by the Federal Government with a permanent staff and secretariat paid from Government funds.

Local or regional problems could best be considered by boards also set up at those levels. But when a national problem arises, such as the price of steel or the wage level for the whole industry, the National Board should operate with the advice of local and regional boards on anticipated local effects and sentiment. A major function of the boards at all levels would be, of course, to disseminate their views and findings in order to mobilize public support.

Since the activities of the National Board would cut across many departmental lines, it should report directly to the President. Upon its recommendations the President might—as he did last September—use his influence to persuade the steel companies that it is not in the national interest—or in their own narrow interest, in the long run—to raise steel prices. Or he might use conclusions of the Board to buttress an appeal for restraint, such as he urged upon labor leaders this year. The formal support of an alerted and informed public would, I believe, do much to enhance the success of such efforts in the future.

Second. Congress should consider applying to proposed price increases in monopoly-controlled basic industries a type of injunctive cooling-off period similar to that which is available under the Taft-Hartley law for application to strikes which threaten to imperil the national health and safety. The imposition of a waiting period of reasonable length would, I believe, focus national attention on the impact upon the economy resulting from such price increases and would permit the formulation of a consensus of the national opinion relative to the justification for such price increase, or the lack thereof.

Third. If measures of the type described above prove to be inadequate, Congress should consider application of utility type regulations to the pricing policies of monopoly-controlled basic industries similar to the manner in which various Government agencies now regulate prices in other fields characterized by monopoly control such as railroad, air, truck, and bus transportation rates, pipelines, communications, electricity, and other fields. I realize that this latter proposal may be considered by some as drastic, but in the final analysis the Government must not stand idly by permitting victimization of the national interest.

Mr. President, I am now preparing proposed legislation for early introduction in each of the above areas. I hope Congress will give immediate attention to those proposals.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. I commend the Senator for his able exposition of this subject, and express my deepest concern about the problem he is discussing.

When I opened my newspaper this morning and read that United States Steel Corp. had increased the price of steel $6 a ton, I was as shocked as I would have been had I read that the Nation had become engaged in an actual conflict, because I think the danger from a rise in steel prices is probably as great as if the country were engaged in some overt conflict.

Had not the assumption been all along during the recent negotiations that management and labor would both show restraint; and does it not appear now that the representatives of labor exercised restraint in negotiating the contract?

Mr. GORE. I think there was widespread belief that that restraint on the part of the industry, in response to the appeal last year of the President, and the restraint just recently on the part of labor—again in response to an appeal by the President, in the public interest—both having resulted in a stabilization of prices and wages in the steel industry—had brought us happily to a significant break in the treadmill of price and wage inflation. So, Mr. President, just as the Senator from Utah states that he was shocked when he read of it this morning, I believe the overwhelming proportion of the American people were shocked, and I daresay many of them were angry.

Mr. MOSS. The size of the increase is very considerable; and following, as it does, within a matter of days the conclusion of the negotiations, it casts great doubt, it seems to me, on the good faith of the industry's representatives in bargaining for the latest agreement.

Mr. GORE. Well, it is a 3½-percent price increase. Of course, if the wage contract had provided a significant increase in the wages of the steelworkers, perhaps an increase of $6 a ton in steel prices would have been considered permissible.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to join in the general commendation of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. It is most characteristic of him that, on such short notice and on the very day of the announcement of the increase in the steel prices, he is prepared to give so perceptive and so well analyzed a speech on this subject. I think it is a great contribution.

Let me say that no more damaging decision to the hopes for a stable economy has been made by any group in our society, than the decision made and disclosed last night by the United States Steel Corp.

I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if it is true that the real statesmanship demonstrated by the Steel Workers Union, and particularly by the steelworkers themselves—because, of course, they approved the agreement—in forgoing any wage increase and in taking a very, very modest fringe benefit increase, amounting to 2½ percent, and the whole sacrifice they made seems to have been in vain, in view of the decision which has been made by the United States Steel Corp.

Mr. GORE. In the common vernacular, the steelworkers might very well conclude that they have been "had"; and I should think the President of the United States might have a feeling not very dissimilar. It will certainly make wage negotiations more contentious and more difficult in the future.

I was genuinely encouraged—so encouraged that only last week I took the floor of the Senate to commend the leaders of the steel industry, the leaders of organized labor, and the President of the United States for having finally achieved a significant break in the treadmill of inflation. But now this price increase happens. I was shocked, as was also the Senator from Utah.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that an equal contribution to stability—that is to say, equal as compared with the very fine contribution made by the administration in persuading the steelworkers to accept stability in wages—was made by this new concept—which had been conceived of by the administration—of a wage policy tied to general productivity increases? I know that administration representatives testified in great detail before our Joint Economic Committee; and they had high hopes of this concept, and it seemed to be a magnificent contribution. Certainly it is most important for the steel industry, which is a bellwether to accept it—perhaps more so than any other industry in our society; and in the steel industry the plan seemed to be working.

But now this concept has been gravely damaged; and I ask the Senator from Tennessee if it is true that next year, when the contract will come up for renewal, will it not take the greatest restraint and the most amazing kind of statesmanship for the leaders of the steelworkers again to agree not to demand wage increases, instead of demanding whopping increases.

Mr. GORE. Certainly the burnt child dreads the fire. After having indulged in the assumption that a favorable response to such an appeal by the President of the United States to exercise restraint, in the public interest, would result in a stabilization of the price level, and then to see this "end run" before the ink of their signatures to the agreement had dried, would certainly raise doubt hereafter as to the intentions, if not the integrity, of the leaders of the United States Steel Corp.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does not the very dramatic experience we have now seen in the steel industry make it extremely difficult for the President, the Secretary of Labor, and others to extend to other industries this concept of restraint on the part of the workers and a recognition of their responsibility for price stabilization?

Mr. GORE. Yes, it is a most discouraging blackjacking of this concept. This concept—although some of the labor leaders did not endorse it—held out to the workers in the United States whose products are becoming subject to increasing competition from abroad, the hope that there was a sound way to obtain a wage increase; namely, by means of more efficient production and increased productivity; and the contract negotiated with the steelworkers was within the framework of increased productivity. But now the United States Steel Corp. has blackjacked the entire concept.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that despite substantial wage increases, it has been possible for the steel industry, because of vast increases in steel prices, to make a profit at a lower and lower capacity operation, so that whereas a few years ago it was necessary for the steel industry to operate at 70 percent of capacity in order to "break even," today it can operate—according to testimony given before the Joint Economic Committee, and not contested by the steel industry—at approximately 40 percent of capacity, and still make money? So today, when the steel industry is operating at perhaps 65 percent or 70 percent of capacity, it can make a great deal of money?

But when the steel workers agree to keep their total increases—in this case, fringe-benefit increases—below 3 percent, as they have, the annual 5-percent increase in productivity on the part of the steel workers, which has occurred regularly—as has been established, would automatically have given the steel companies higher profits, even if the steel industry had maintained their prices. So is it not true that there was a good case for having the steel companies cut their prices, this year, rather than increase them? Is not that correct?

Mr. GORE. Yes, I think there is a good case for it. However, the steel companies seem to operate on the basis of some strange economics. The United States Steel Corp. says this price increase is forced upon it by competitive pressures. I do not quite understand that statement.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I noticed that statement, too. It was one of the weirdest remarks I have heard. The corporation's officials said competitive pressures have compelled the steel price increase. But if that is so, and if steel produced in this country is thus priced far above steel produced abroad, that will mean decreased steel production in the United States, and will mean, in turn, decreased production in this country generally, and decreased employment in the United States, and in many areas it will mean a very sad situation for our economy.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his very sound statement.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his very generous remarks.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to join with my colleagues in commending the Senator from Tennessee. This is not the first occasion when he has directed the attention of the Nation to the steel problem and the central role that steel plays in the Nation's economy.

I too was shocked when I learned the news, and I think it might be helpful to read into the RECORD certain paragraphs from this morning's paper which disclosed to the Nation the fact that United States Steel had decided to raise its price $6 a ton. The article reads:

> The United States Steel Corp.—Big Steel—last night ignored President Kennedy's plea for price restraint and announced it would lift steel prices $6 a ton.
>
> The new price boost is one-third higher than the $4.50-a-ton increase that the industry last imposed in 1958. That one was the 12th round of price increases by steel since the end of World War II. The absence of a steel price rise since 1958 has helped hold the index of wholesale prices virtually stable in this period.

I should like to ask the Senator if it does not follow that, since steel figures in the cost of everything from hairpins to aircraft carriers, this rise will doubtless trigger off another round of inflation?

Mr. GORE. The experience which we have suffered—and I say "suffered"—from previous increases in the price of steel makes it unmistakably clear that an increase in the price of steel means an increase in the prices of millions of articles and items of service. In fact, it has been estimated, on the basis of competent studies, that 40 percent of the rise in the wholesale price index of all manufactured goods from 1947 to 1958 was chiefly due to the fact that steel prices rose faster and further than all other commodity prices.

Mr. CHURCH. Is it not also true that, although wages have increased very substantially in the steel industry since the war, on each occasion when a new wage contract has been entered into United States Steel has followed, within a few months, with price rises not only compensating for the wage increase, but going far beyond?

Mr. GORE. Oh, yes. A great deal of the expansion of steel facilities has been by what is called internal financing, by charging higher prices.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the Senator know of any data revealed in any of the exhaustive studies undertaken by the Senate and the House committees and other departments of Government which would indicate that current profits in the steel industry have fallen so low as to warrant this price increase?

Mr. GORE. I do not, indeed. As the Senator from Wisconsin said, a very good case could be made, by the rules of ordinary economics, for a price decrease.

Mr. CHURCH. I know of nothing in any of these studies which would justify the price increase that has been announced this morning. I put the question to the Senator from Tennessee because he is an expert in the field.

Mr. GORE. Well, I thank the Senator, but I do not claim to be an expert. I am a concerned student.

Mr. CHURCH. But I would make this comment in view of what we know about the fiscal condition of the steel industry in this country. It seems to me it is a very novel argument made by Mr. Blough when he says that United States Steel needs this increased price in order to strengthen its economic position by safeguarding its profits, in view of competition that it faces, and then he proceeds to admit, in the same announcement, that the price increase will make United States Steel less competitive with foreign steel and other substitute products.

It seems to me this is a non sequitur, which reveals that the primary motivation is to increase short-term profits for the ownership, and not to strengthen the long-term competitive position of American steel with respect to foreign steel or substitute products.

Would the Senator not agree with that statement?

Mr. GORE. I agree, and go further and say that in my view it is a contemptuous disregard of the public interest.

Mr. CHURCH. Let me ask one final question, because I concur wholeheartedly in what the Senator has said. In view of the fact that steel has such a far-flung impact upon all other industries in our modern economy, would the Senator not agree it is as much affected with the public interest as are private utilities and railroads?

Mr. GORE. I do, indeed. In fact, I do not think there is a factor in American economic life that is more basic to our industrialized society, or perhaps as basic as steel prices.

Mr. CHURCH. I think that proposition cannot be argued. Now we have imposed public regulation upon the railroads and upon private utility companies after long and sad experience demonstrated that they could not be relied upon to manage their own rates and conduct their own favored monopolistic position in our economy in such a way as to safeguard the public interest.

Because of what happened yesterday, and in view of the whole record of United States Steel in particular, and the steel industry in general, since the close of the war, I concur wholeheartedly with the Senator from Tennessee that the time may be on hand for us to examine the propriety of extending public regulation to the steel industry in such form as will insure the American public of the safeguards needed to protect the public interest.

I feel that the Senator from Tennessee has made a most significant address. I am only sorry that our friends from the opposite side of the aisle have not seen fit to join in the criticism the Senator from Tennessee has expressed today, because his arguments are incontrovertible on the facts. Unless we come to grips with the problem of inflation and of unjustified price increases, we will find ourselves priced out of the markets of the world, and all the people of America will be the victims of that process. It is the responsibility of the Government of the United States to move forward in whatever way is necessary to prevent that from happening.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his excellent address.

Mr. GORE. I wish to thank the distinguished and brilliant junior Senator from Idaho for his generous remarks and also to thank him for the encouragement of his support. The public interest must be protected. What is the reason for the U.S. Senate? For what better purpose are we here than to act in protection of the national interest, threatened as it is not only with inflation at home, but with an imperiled position in international economics, adverse balance of payments, flight of gold, increasing competition in international commerce? And yet we are faced with this contemptuous disregard of the public interest by extremely powerful vested interests.

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield briefly, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had intended to compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the outstanding job he did today on such short notice. As was true on yesterday in the field of foreign policy, today the Senator has performed a public service in the field of domestic policy. I am delighted he has taken the time and the energy—I know he put in long hours last night in drawing up his speech—to bring to the attention of the Senate and of the people of the country the situation which exists because of this unexpected, unanticipated and unwanted action by United States Steel Corp.

It is my hope that the United States Steel Corp., which is considered to be the bellwether for the steel industry, will not be followed in this respect this time by others in the steel industry, but that the others, unlike the United States Steel Corp., will show a degree of business statesmanship which we thought had been effectuated when the contract recently was signed between the steel producers and the steelworkers.

Again I recommend the Senator from Tennessee for a great job.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Georgia. I wish to join my colleagues in commending the Senator from Tennessee for his very workmanlike and thorough analysis of the unfortunate situation which has developed.

I read the Senator's article on how to meet the steel situation, in the current issue of Harper's magazine, and I had intended to have it reprinted in the RECORD. I think it should be printed in the RECORD, to show what a statesmanlike approach the Senator has to this important subject and how his knowledge has enabled him, only a few hours after the announcement of the steel price increase, to make such a thorough, scholarly, and comprehensive address.

It was a shock to all of us to hear the announcement that United States Steel Corp. was to raise the price of steel $6 a ton. It was a blow to the efforts of President Kennedy to maintain stability in the wage-price cycle, and to stop inflation. We had all hoped he had succeeded. It is rather shocking, after the agreement—in which there appeared to be an implicit or tacit understanding that if labor refrained from asking for wage increases the steel industry would not ask for price increases—to see what has now come about, and to what a degree. I think it is a very serious situation.

The Senator from Tennessee has proposed various remedies, for the future. I wonder whether the Senator has any suggestions as to how we can meet the immediate crisis—as to whether it might be possible, in view of the disastrous consequences which are very likely to ensue, to persuade the United States Steel Corp. to take another look, in terms of withdrawing the price increase; and likewise to work, as our majority leader has indicated, with the other steel companies, in the hope that they will not follow the example of the United States Steel Corp.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. First, I thank the Senator from Alaska for his very generous remarks. I also thank the distinguished majority leader.

In response to the Senator's question, the President of the United States is the only man in our Government who speaks for all the people, who was chosen by all the people, who is responsible directly to all the people. It is the Presidency, more than any other agency, in which the public interest is focused.

The President of the United States, more than anyone else, can bring the public interest to bear. Therefore, I would hope that President Kennedy would not let the sun set again before appealing once more to the steel industry to exercise restraint, to refrain from inflationary action in regard to steel prices.

I would hope that the President would ask the United States Steel Corp. to reconsider, and to rescind its action. I hope the President will ask other companies, in the event the action is not rescinded, to refrain from following it.

Unless there is compliance with both requests, it seems to me that the Congress will have no choice other than to act. The public interest is being thwarted, disregarded, threatened and challenged.

Mr. GRUENING. Has not the Senator from Tennessee noticed, throughout the last year or two, full-page advertisements by large industrial concerns pointing to the evils of inflation and repeating the theme, "Inflation is our enemy; inflation robs us of our savings"?

This is an example of the bellwether of American industry really taking a drastic step towards creating inflation.

Mr. GORE. It is a sad experience.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not also a fact that the steel industry has been complaining of foreign competition and pointing out that, with lower wage scales in foreign countries, it is expected to be increasingly difficult, if not impossible, to compete with imports. The action of raising the price of steel $6 a ton runs directly contrary to these complaints and arguments, which the industry has been advancing.

Mr. GORE. I know of no way to rationalize the actions.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator has read the justification published in the morning newspapers by the steel companies. Does that appeal to him in any degree as a logical presentation?

Mr. GORE. It surely does not.

Mr. GRUENING. That was my impression.

Again I congratulate the Senator from Tennessee for his masterful presentation of this subject and for bringing it before the country.

I thank the senior Senator from Georgia for his courtesy in yielding.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator also for yielding.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was glad to yield for such a worthy purpose.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, there has been a considerable lag in time between the presentation earlier this afternoon of the views on the steel price increase by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and now. Because the debate should appear in the RECORD as a unit, I now ask unanimous consent that my remarks—and perhaps other Senators will make a similar request—follow those of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is widely recognized, and, indeed, the statement of the President of the United States at his press conference so indicates, that the price increase in steel is a very serious matter. It came very suddenly, at least to those of us who had no notice of it; apparently the President did not know of it until yesterday.

Mr. President, it is not a development to be cheered. It is a development to be deplored. But, at the same time, it is a development in our economy. We pride ourselves on the fact that we have a private enterprise economy, and therefore we absorb the advantages with the disadvantages which such a system entails.

Up to the moment of the increase, all of us were very anxious to see a steel price increase avoided. We thought it could only lead to another inflationary spiral. We thought, when the contract was made with the employees some days ago, that it obviated the likelihood that there would be a need for a price increase, and that was all to the good. Nevertheless, the United States Steel Corp., which we all know to be the leader in the industry, has announced a 3½-percent price increase, and although we hope it may not, the price increase will probably be followed by other steel companies.

I think the big question which affects us now is: First, what will happen in the economy generally; and second, what will happen in the case of steel itself?

So I think it is important that Members of the Senate make themselves heard, and very early in the game. For one, there is absolutely no requirement that this rather small increase in the price of steel, 3½ percent, should necessarily extend throughout the whole price structure. Steel prices have not increased since 1958, but some increases have taken place in wholesale and consumer prices generally. It seems to me the increase is sufficient to leave some slack so that the steel price increase may not affect the total price structure. I think we have the right to express our expectation that, by and large, there will be no material effect on the total price structure of the increase in the steel price.

The president of the United States Steel Corp., Leslie B. Worthington, who gave a statement on the price increase, pitched the justification for the increase heavily on two points.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement may be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF UNITED STATES STEEL'S STATEMENT ON PRICES

Since our last overall adjustment in the summer of 1958, the level of steel prices has not been increased but, if anything, has declined somewhat. This situation, in the face of steadily mounting production costs which have included four increases in steelworker wages and benefits prior to the end of last year, has been due to the competitive pressures from domestic producers and from imports of foreign-made steel as well as from other materials which are used as substitutes for steel.

The severity of these competitive pressures has not diminished; and to their influence may be attributed the fact that the partial catch-up adjustment announced today is substantially less than the cost increases which have already occurred since 1958, without taking into consideration the additional costs which will result from the new labor agreements which become effective next July 1.

Nevertheless, taking into account all the competitive factors affecting the market for steel, we have reluctantly concluded that a modest price adjustment can no longer be avoided in the light of the production cost increases that have made it necessary.

MODERN PLANT NEEDED

If the products of United States Steel are to compete successfully in the marketplace, then the plants and facilities which make those products must be as modern and efficient as the low-cost mills which abound abroad and as the plants which turn out competing products here at home. Only by generating the funds necessary to keep these facilities fully competitive can our company continue to provide its customers with a dependable source of steel, and to provide its employes with dependable jobs. But the profits of the company—squeezed as they have been between rising costs and declining prices—are inadequate today to perform this vital function.

Our annual report, published last month, shows clearly the effect of this squeeze.

In the 3 years since the end of 1958, United States Steel has spent $1,185 million for modernization and replacement of facilities and for the development of new sources of raw materials. Internally, there were only two sources from which this money could come: depreciation and reinvested profit. Depreciation in these years amounted to $610 million; and reinvested profit, $187 million—or, together, only about two-thirds of the total sum required. So after using all the income available from operations, we had to make up the difference of $388 million out of borrowings from the public. In fact, during the period 1958–61, we have actually borrowed a total of $800 million to provide for present and future needs. And this must be repaid out of profits that have not yet been earned, and will not be earned for some years to come.

During these 3 years, moreover, United States Steel's profits have dropped to the lowest levels since 1952; while reinvested profit—which is all the profit there is to be plowed back in the business after payment of dividends—has declined from $115 million in 1958 to less than $3 million last year. Yet the dividend rate has not been increased in more than 5 years, although there have been seven general increases in employment costs during this interval.

RISING COSTS CITED

This squeeze, which has thus dried up a major source of the funds necessary to improve the competitive efficiency of our plants and facilities, has resulted inevitably from the continual rise in costs over a period of almost 4 years, with no offsetting improvement in prices.

Since the last general price adjustment in 1958, there have been a number of increases in the cost of products and services purchased by the corporation, in State and local taxes, and in other expenses, including interest on the money we have had to borrow—an item which has jumped from $11,500,000 in 1958 to nearly $30 million in 1961.

And from 1958 through 1961, there have been industrywide increases in steelworker wages and benefits on four occasions amounting to about 40 cents an hour, and also increases in employment costs for other employees. These persistent increases have added several hundred million dollars to the employment costs of United States Steel, without regard to future costs resulting from the new labor agreement just negotiated.

In all, we have experienced a net increase of about 6 percent in our costs over this period despite cost reductions which have been effected through the use of new, more efficient facilities, improved techniques, and better raw materials. Compared with this net increase of 6 percent, the price increase of 3½ percent announced today clearly falls considerably short of the amount needed to restore even the cost-price relationship in the low production year of 1958.

ADDS TO COMPETITION

In reaching this conclusion, we have given full consideration, of course, to the fact that any price increase which comes, as this does, at a time when foreign-made steels are already underselling ours in a number of product lines, will add—temporarily, at least—to the competitive difficulties which we are now experiencing. But the present price level cannot be maintained any longer when our problems are viewed in long-range perspective. For the long pull a strong,

> profitable company is the only insurance that formidable competition can be met and that the necessary lower costs to meet that competition will be assured.
>
> Only through profits can a company improve its competitive potential through better equipment and through expanded research. On this latter phase we are constantly developing lighter, stronger steels which—ton for ton—will do more work and go much further than the steels that were previously available on the market. They thus give the customer considerably more value per dollar of cost. As more and more of these new steels come from our laboratories, therefore, our ability to compete should steadily improve. But the development of new steels can only be supported by profits or the hope of profits.
>
> The financial resources supporting continuous research and resultant new products as well as those supporting new equipment, are therefore vital in this competitive situation—vital not alone to the company and its employees, but to our international balance of payments, the value of our dollar, and to the strength and security of the Nation as well.

Mr. JAVITS. One point is the allegation that the price increase is absolutely essential to allow the company to modernize and reequip and develop new sources of raw materials.

At the end of the statement, it is indicated that the avails are expected to be used in supporting continuous research. It states:

> The financial resources supporting continuous research and resultant new products as well as those supporting new equipment are therefore vital in this competitive situation—

And so on. These are desirable objectives—we expect they would be achieved, however, without a price increase. They are in contemplation in the new tax bill now being considered by the Finance Committee. It is emphasized that great efforts are being made to cut the weight of steel, and thereby to do with less steel a great many tasks which heretofore have taken more steel in weight—and steel is sold by weight.

In short, the steel industry by this type of action is very likely to get in hot water with the people of the United States, who did not look for such a development, who thought confidently that a price increase has been forestalled.

It seems to me that, if the industry wishes to restore itself in the public's eye, it can do so by utilizing and making available through the price increase effective research and modernization which will bring down the price of steel to the consumer—which is the acid test. It is my opinion that the industry will incur an adverse opinion and reception if it does not assure the public that that is precisely what it will do with the proceeds of the price increase, and do it effectively and be in a position, in the very reasonably near term, to go forward along those lines.

I heard the interesting presentation of the views of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I think he instructs us in what to do, in a sense, and what not to do in this situation.

I, too, deplore the price increase and feel that it represents a getting of the industry into "hot water" with the public, which is not a very good thing for American business generally.

Yet, I must say I cannot go along with a threat to business, to prosecute under the anti-trust laws, or through action by the Federal Trade Commission or by some other agency under the law, as contained in the Senator's presentation. It seems to me, speaking now as a lawyer, if a business is guilty of a violation of the antitrust laws, of the Federal Trade Commission Act, or of the Clayton Act, that business should be prosecuted whether or not it suddenly puts out a price increase. I think it depreciates our argument and writes it down somewhat if we take the position, "Well, since they have increased prices we are going to throw the book at them and go after them with respect to all the laws applicable to competition."

When the Senator suggests various alternatives which the country may have to adopt, if it faces serious problems of this character in respect to prices, that is another matter. One may differ with the Senator from Tennessee upon the particular ideas he presents. It so happens I like very much the idea of some consumer medium in the country, whether it be a Department of Consumers, or a Joint Committee of Consumers in the Congress. On the other hand, I may not agree with some other aspects of the possible legislative remedies.

Certainly every Senator is entirely within his rights, and I think proceeding quite constructively, when he lays out various alternatives he wishes to propose in a legislative sense for dealing with a situation of this character.

In summary, I deprecate and deplore the price increase. I think it is most unfortunate.

Second, I think the industry faces an acid test with the public. Indeed, I think this will have some reflection on the way in which the private economy and the private enterprise system operate generally. The price increase, which the company affirms it is seeking for constructive economic purposes—to wit, for modernization and for research—should be properly used. I think the industry undertakes a very material obligation to see that the increase is actually used for those purposes, which could translate themselves in lower real prices for steel. We will all be watching with the greatest of care and the greatest of interest how that eventuates. The steel company owes the public a full accounting on that score.

Third, and speaking now as a lawyer, I hope that we shall separate in our own minds any idea of "well, we are going to throw the book at them" in terms of all the involvements coming from the antitrust laws and other laws, from the possibility—which is a possibility—of the need in terms of legislation to effectively handle our economic processes in our country so as to keep abreast of a situation which might be caused in this way.

I think if we approach the problem in that way we shall be fair to the American people and to the American economy and, at the same time, we shall not be improvident in the remedies which we seek in a particularly serious situation.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DIRKSEN, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. AIKEN rose.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] for the splendid vote of support he received in the primary in the State of Illinois yesterday. It was certainly well merited. I know all of us are very much pleased by the overwhelming majority he received.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which was published in the Chicago Sun-Times of April 7, 1962, entitled "Leader of the Loyal Opposition."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADER OF THE LOYAL OPPOSITION

> Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the Republican leader in the Senate, distinguished himself in the final hours of debate on the bill to provide loans to the United Nations.
>
> He arose to the occasion as the leader of the loyal opposition should in a matter that ought to transcend party differences and political argument. He supported President Kennedy's desire to help bail out the U.N. with a $100 million loan or purchase of U.N. bonds. Some of his fellow Republicans, especially in the Middle West, regard the U.N. as not worth saving. Even among those that do there are some who are skeptical about allowing President Kennedy to use his own discretion whether to buy bonds or lend the money to the U.N., as the bill provides. DIRKSEN addressed himself to them.
>
> "I haven't forfeited my faith in John Fitzgerald Kennedy," he said emotionally, "I'm willing always to trust my President."
>
> The bill, a compromise worked out between Democrats and Republicans who agree in principle that the United States must advance money to the U.N., passed 70 to 22. It should do as well in the House.
>
> The issue of the U.N. financing is not the only one that should be beyond political rivalry and should be approached on a bipartisan basis. The fundamental principles of Mr. Kennedy's tariff-adjusting proposals to accommodate American business to the European Common Market and other overseas economic developments should be considered a nonpartisan matter. So should the general area of foreign aid.
>
> Mr. Kennedy is asking Congress to trust not him, personally, but the President of the United States in asking for more leeway and power with regard to tariffs. We hope Senator DIRKSEN will say in this matter, too, "I'm always willing to trust my President."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED SERVICES, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for Armed Services, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to direct the attention of the Senate to the pending legislative proposal (H.R. 9751), which is a bill authorizing appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the armed services in the amount of $12,969,300,000. This authorization is reported in compliance with a requirement enacted in 1959 as section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149. In brief, this requirement is that appropriations for procurement of major weapons systems must be authorized anew after December 31, 1960.

It is notable that the Constitution does not speak in terms of authorization. Instead, its pertinent provision in clause 7 of section 9, article I, is that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

The requirement that there must be an authorization act before there can be appropriations stems from the rules of the House and the Senate. If an appropriation for which there is no authorization is proposed and becomes law because no successful point of order was made against it, the appropriations act has been held to be sufficient in itself.

Under the specialization or division of labor that the Congress has prescribed for itself the so-called legislative committees consider authorizations and the Committees on Appropriations consider appropriations within the limits of the authorization.

Because of some some extremely broad authorizations of appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and vessels that were granted in the 1940's, the Committees on Armed Services came close to legislating away their major responsibilities in the shaping of defense legislation. While the Committees on Armed Services retained jurisdiction over manpower legislation, military pay measures, and military construction authorizations, only a very small part of what we have come to know as the defense program for a fiscal year came before these committees for legislative review. In the realization that a preponderant part of the defense program was based on major weapons, the committee proposed, and the Congress agreed, in 1959, that appropriations for procurement of major weapons should be subject to new authorizations. While I would not assert that the results under this procedure to date are earth shaking in their significance, I am convinced that this procedure affords a much broader base of information and understanding in the Congress. Moreover, it affords the appropriate legislative committees an opportunity to express their judgment in areas for which they have responsibility. This year the committee is proposing an expansion of this procedure that I shall discuss later in my remarks.

Not all the procurement proposed by the Armed Forces in 1963 is subject to annual authorization. The total procurement program of the Department of Defense for 1963 involves almost $18 billion. Available funding and expected reimbursements reduce the new obligational authority to about $16.5 billion. The difference between the new obligational authority and the amount of authorization contained in this bill represents the procurement not subject to annual authorization. For example, a substantial part of the appropriation accounts "Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army" and "Procurement, Marine Corps" is for items such as rifles, ammunition, tanks, combat vehicles, and communications equipment. Similarly, the entire amounts of the appropriation acounts "Other procurement, Navy" and "Other procurement, Air Force" are intended for items not requiring special authorization before appropriations are in order.

Under a literal construction of the pertinent provision of law, the authorization bill now before the Senate contains amounts for items that could not be defined as aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels. Because of definition problems incurred in attempting to separate directly related items from aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and to maintain some correspondence between authorization and appropriations for such purposes, the authorization includes amounts for such items as replenishment spares, modifications to aircraft already procured, conversion of naval vessels, and ground support equipment.

To facilitate meaningful comparisons for the purpose of making program decisions, the 1963 budget was developed under a new procedure within the Department of Defense. This procedure involved relating weapons and forces to missions or functions instead of to military departments or Armed Forces. The presentation of the Secretary of Defense to the committee was made on such a basis. Before identifying the weapons in this bill with the armed service that they will be used by I shall first group them on a mission basis.

STRATEGIC RETALIATORY FORCES

The 1963 program contemplates continued procurement of the Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman missiles of the intercontinental ballistic type and Polaris missile-firing submarines. No new manned bombers are proposed for procurement, but a limited development program on the B–70 is being pursued. Additional quantities of Hound Dog missiles will be procured to enhance the effectiveness of the existing bomber force. Development of the Skybolt air-to-surface ballistic missile will be continued.

Although I have some personal reservations of the wisdom of releasing information in this much detail—and I have expressed reservations time and again to representatives of the Department of Defense—the Department of Defense has announced that the 1963 program, together with the procurement programs of earlier years, will provide for over 1,000 Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles, 41 Polaris submarines with more than 650 missiles, and more than 700 B–52 and B–58 bombers, equipped with Hounddog and some Skybolt missiles. The destructive power of such a force is enough to cause horripilation in any rational being. This force should be an effective deterrent, but if it does not deter, it could unquestionably destroy any nation which might level an attack against us.

Over the past several months there have been some estimates and some so-called mathematical computations of the casualties that would result from a nuclear war under various assumptions, including a positive attempt by the adversaries to limit targeting to military installations and facilities.

It is unnecessary for me to state that the decision is that of the Commander in Chief, and is not mine. I have no hesitancy in saying, however, that to me these extrapolations or projections or hypotheses are exceedingly unrealistic. They presuppose a war being waged with rational restraint by both sides. I doubt that there could be anything rational in the awful eventuality of a nuclear attack.

This kind of reasoning, if carried to its logical extension, would lead one to believe that an international conflict could be settled under controlled combat or even by a game of some type in which the opponents were in agreement on the rules and abided by them.

The day of the tournament has long since passed into history. I am convinced that we would be deluding ourselves if we were to base any national policy on the assumption that any potential adversary would be restrained and rational and would abide by any such rules. In my opinion, if nuclear war begins, it will be a war of extermination, and I want to be sure that we have an adequate number of strategic weapons to completely destroy any enemy that first attacks us.

CONTINENTAL AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE FORCES

Relatively little of the authorization in this bill is for continental air and missile defense forces. The continued procurement of Nike-Hercules missiles as a defense against an air attack is the principal exception. The defense budget in its entirety, however, contemplates expenditures to, first, reduce the vulnerability of our bombers to ballistic missile attack; second, improve systems that warn of ballistic missile attack; third, attempt to perfect a defense against ballistic missile attack and submarine launched missiles; and, fourth, to provide reasonable fallout protection.

GENERAL-PURPOSE FORCES

We have heard of an increasing emphasis being placed upon our preparations to wage conventional wars. The pending bill provides more authorization for general-purpose forces than for any other category. In fact, if a one-sentence description could be applied to the 1963 program, I think it would be that previously announced strategic retaliatory force objectives are being continued, but a substantial addition is being made to our non-nuclear forces.

Requirements determinations in defense are difficult in general, but especially so for general-purpose forces. This is true because of the diversity of the forces involved, the many contingencies in which they might be needed, the multiplicity of weapons, the contributions of our allies, and the important role of the Reserve components.

The 1963 program involves 4 types of aircraft to improve the Army's mobility within the combat zone, 2 types of missiles to protect deployed Army and Marine Corps forces against air attack, new ballistic missiles to increase the Army's firepower, 37 new naval vessels, including a carrier; attack, fighter, and antisubmarine warfare aircraft for the Navy and Marine Corps, together with supporting missiles; antiaircraft missiles to protect vessels against air attack; and new aircraft with supporting missiles as tactical fighters for the Air Force.

AIRLIFT AND SEALIFT FORCES

The bill before the Senate contains authorization of appropriations for continued procurement of the C-130E aircraft and initial procurement of the C-141 jet transport aircraft. These types will increase our ability to deploy general-purpose forces overseas.

I might say that for a number of years the committee has been greatly concerned about the inadequacy of our airlift. We are delighted that the present administration and the present Secretary of Defense are proposing to increase our ability to deploy general purpose forces overseas. In addition, for the Military Sea Transport Service a roll-on-roll-off type vessel will be procured. This vessel substantially reduces loading and unloading time in the sea transportation of vehicles.

In my opinion, the additional emphasis that has been placed on our conventional warfare forces last year and this year will result in a measurable increase in our capability in this area. In a sense the strength of our Army is being increased by five divisions. This is true because three divisions that were used for training purposes are being made combat ready, and two additional divisions have been authorized, to, in effect, take the place of the Reserve divisions which were called up under the authority of Congress last year, when the Reserve divisions are demobilized.

Of equal importance, our ability to transport these forces overseas has been enhanced by the addition of transport aircraft. This increased capability should serve as a deterrent to conventional warfare as the strategic forces serve as a deterrent to nuclear war.

The committee report gives details of the part of this authorization that is earmarked for each military service and the types of aircraft, missiles, and vessels for which this authorization would support appropriations. I think it is unnecessary to enumerate each of these weapons at this time, but I shall summarize the procurement programs by department.

ARMY

The Army would be authorized $218.5 million for the procurement of aircraft and $558.3 million for the procurement of missiles. The total Army authorization in this bill of $776.8 million is but a part of the Army's entire procurement program for fiscal year 1963 of $2,674 million. The difference between the two figures is made up of those items in the Army modernization program that do not require special authorization.

The Secretary of Defense indicated to the committee that there has been a lack of balance among Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps elements of the general purpose forces. Each of the services has had a tendency to base its planning and force structures on unilateral views of how a future war might be fought. This imbalance extended to the inventory objectives for weapons and equipment. The Army and the Air Force, for instance, have had different assumptions on the length of a conflict. The procurement proposed in 1963 is part of a long-range plan to fill logistics objectives that have been established for the general purpose forces of all the military services on a common basis. The major items of procurement have been subject to a careful review and it is proposed to attain established objectives over a period of several years. The term "requirements" is a somewhat nebulous one at best and it becomes more so when each of the military services computes requirements on a different basis. Now that there has been established a common logistics objective for general purpose forces, I believe congressional consideration of steps to attain these requirements will be more meaningful.

The Army's aircraft procurement program involves purchase of the Iroquois, Chinook, and observation helicopters, and the Caribou type aircraft. These helicopters and aircraft will be used to transport troops and supplies rapidly to increase the Army's mobility within a combat zone.

The Army missile program contemplates continued procurement of the Nike-Hercules missiles for anti-air-defense of cities and military installations, Redeye and Hawk missiles to protect deployed Army forces against air attack, and Honest John, Little John, Pershing, and Sergeant missiles to add to the Army's firepower. The ENTAC missile will be procured as a defense against tanks.

NAVY

The Navy share of the authorization proposed in this bill is larger than that of the other military departments because of the inclusion of naval vessels in the authorization requirement.

The bill contains $2,979,200,000 in authorization of appropriations for naval vessels; $2,134,600,000 for the procurement of aircraft for the Navy and Marine Corps; $930,400,000 for the procurement of Navy missiles, and $22.3 million for the procurement of Marine Corps missiles.

The vessel authorization is intended to provide for the construction of 37 new ships and the conversion of 35 ships, in addition to the construction of 45 landing craft and the conversion of 1 floating drydock. It also includes money for long leadtime items for ships that will be in next year's program. The new construction includes a carrier, a guided missile frigate, eight attack submarines, six Polaris-type submarines, four amphibious transports, one amphibious assault ship, five escort ships, and three guided missile escort ships. A new submarine tender is proposed, along with a combat support vessel, two oceanographic research ships, one survey ship, and one cargo ship for the MSTS.

The Navy aircraft authorization is intended to finance the procurement of 887 new aircraft for the Navy and the Marine Corps. The aircraft to be procured include two types of fighters, three types of attack bombers, antisubmarine warfare aircraft and helicopters, early warning and interceptor control type, and a trainer.

The Navy missile procurement program includes Sparrow, Sidewinder, Bullpup, and Shrike for utilization by aircraft; Tartar, Terrier, and Talos for surface-to-air protection of Navy vessels; Polaris missiles for submarine installation; and an antisubmarine warfare missile Subroc.

The Marine Corps missile program includes two types that are also being procured by the Army. These are the Hawk and Redeye, both of which are used for the protection of field troops against aircraft.

AIR FORCE

The bill contains $3,626 million in authorization for aircraft procurement by the Air Force and $2,500 million for Air Force missile procurement. The aircraft authorization is $491 million more than the request of the Department of Defense. This item relates to the B-70, which I shall explain later in this statement.

Excluding the B-70 for the moment, the total Air Force aircraft procurement program for 1963 involves $4,030 million. The Department proposes to offset against this some of the anticipated reimbursements under the mutual security program, other available appropriations, and the authorization granted last year only for the procurement of long-range manned aircraft for the Strategic Air Command. That was for the wing of B-52's authorized by Congress but which the Department of Defense decided not to procure.

These setoffs reduce the amount of the new authorization requested to $3,135 million, to which the committee has added an amount for the B-70.

The aircraft types that will be procured by the Air Force include several different configurations of the KC-135 jet tanker, the F-105D fighter bomber, and the F-110, which is called the F-4H by the Navy.

I may interpolate that for years I have been urging the three services, when they use the same plane, to give it the same name or the same number; but to date I have not been successful. It is very confusing to me, when a particular plane is used by three branches of the armed services, as one particular plane is, to have a different name or number assigned by each of the services, although the planes are practically identical.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have experienced the same feeling of confusion as has the chairman of the committee, when we see the same type of plane bearing three different names, depending upon the field on which it is parked. I hope the chairman will persevere in his endeavor to have identical planes identically named.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had thought I had made an impression upon the present Secretary of Defense concerning this subject when he was before the committee; but up to now, despite the fact that he indicated he was in agreement, no action has been taken.

The plane we are discussing is designated by the Air Force as the F-110, and by the Navy as the F-4H. It is an excellent fighter bomber. It is confusing to hear the Air Force speak about the F-110 and then to hear the Navy say, "No, it is not the F-110; it is the F-4H," when they are identical planes.

Other aircraft types that will be procured by the Air Force include the C-130F and the C-141 transport types, the T-38 trainer, two light aircraft types, and two helicopter types for serving ICBM sites and remote areas.

The Air Force missile authorization is for continued procurement of Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles, the Bullpup tactical air-to-surface missile, the Skybolt air-launched ballistic missile, target drones, and the Sidewinder air-to-air rocket.

Mr. President, I shall now speak briefly of the B-70. The Senate will recall that last year the authorization request of the committee included an amount intended to be applied toward the development of the B-70 bomber. Since this item was in development, the committee did not change the amount requested because it was not required to be authorized. The amount was included in the authorization requested because of the manner in which the Air Force budgeted at that time. Since last year the Air Force has removed developmental items from the procurement authorization request and, under the limited B-70 development program that is being pursued, $171 million for this purpose is in the budget request under the caption of "Research, development, test, and evaluation."

The form of the bill as it was referred to the committee contained an addition of $491 million in authorization for the production planning and long leadtime procurement of an RS-70 weapon system. This addition was a manifestation of the view that a more ambitious developmental and production program on the RS-70 should be pursued. The $491 million figure represented a combination of the $171 million for deevlopment, which did not require authorization, plus $320 million more for production planning and long leadtime procurement.

Before the other body acted on the authorization, the Secretary of Defense announced that a new appraisal would be made of the RS-70. Language which had been contained in the bill directing the Secretary of the Air Force to use the additional authorization for the RS-70 was modified; but the additional aircraft authorization of $491 million was left in the bill.

The Senate committee has changed the authorizing language, so as to make sure that the availability of this $491 million authorization is restricted to the RS-70 program. A purist might insist that only $320 million in additional authorization should be provided, since $171 million of the $491 million does not require authorization.

At this time no one can predict what recommendations will emerge on the new RS-70 study. Because the latter stages of development and the early stages of production on advanced weapons systems are difficult to delineate sharply, the committee has left the $491 million figure unchanged, so as to provide the Committees on Appropriations and the Department of Defense with sufficient latitude to accommodate any accelerated development or production, or both, that may be found useful as a result of the new study.

In the past the Senate has supported appropriations for the B-70 above the level recommended by the executive branch of the Government. I have supported a more rapid development of this system for several reasons, including a deep-seated apprehension over the absence of any concrete plans for a manned bomber after the B-52 and the B-58. The RS-70 concept, however, is justified on somewhat different grounds from the old B-70 concept. The RS-70 involves not only the development of a new ballistic missile of the air-to-surface type, but, of more importance, the development of new radar display and communications systems. The Secretary of Defense and his scientific advisers believe that some of these subsystems may require such advanced technology that they cannot be attained within the time objective. In any event, the Secretary has asserted that the new look at this system will be made in depth and in good faith. If the study results in a decision to expedite the RS-70 program, this bill provides the basis on which the Committees on Appropriations might consider the necessary funding.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Merely for clarification and also for the legislative record, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question in regard to the change of the language in the House version. I refer to the language contained in the bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

I notice that the bill as passed by the House of Representatives provided as follows, in dealing with this $491 million authorization: "$3,626,000,000, of which the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to utilize authorization in an amount not less than $491,000,000 during fiscal year 1963 to proceed with production planning and long leadtime procurement for an RS-70 weapon system."

The corresponding language reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee is as follows: "$3,626,000,000, of which amount $491,000,000 is authorized only for the production planning and long leadtime procurement of an RS-70 weapon system."

Will the chairman of the committee agree with me that that means that under the language proposed by the Senate committee, the $491 million authorization may be used for the production planning and long leadtime procurement of an RS-70 weapon system, and for that only?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that is the purpose of the change. Of course, all of us are familiar, through reading the press, with some of the history of the change in the language. As originally reported by the Armed Services Committee of the other body, in line 1, on page 2—the language the Senator from South Dakota has read—the word "authorized" read "directed"; and the last minute change, when the word "directed" was stricken out, and the word "authorized" was substituted, left the picture somewhat confused.

So the Senate committee handled this matter in exactly the same way it handled the wing of B-52's that it authorized last year above the request of the Department of Defense. Last year we provided a total figure, and the language "of which $525 million may be used only for the procurement of long-range manned aircraft." This year we provide that this $491 million authorization, $320 million of which is above the estimate of the Department, can be used only on the RS-70 program. Of course, the reason for that is very evident; if we did not tie it down in that way, Congress would lose authorization control of that vast sum of money, and the Department could propose to apply it for other purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And is it the opinion of the chairman of the committee that the language proposed in the Senate committee version protects this $491 million authorization against any executive reprograming?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, it does; it cannot be utilized for any purpose other than that set forth in the language the Senator from South Dakota has read—which is for production planning and long leadtime procurement of an RS-70 weapon system.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. From the remarks previously made by the chairman of the committee and from the report of the committee on the bill, I knew the intent was clear. But I have made these queries largely for the purpose of emphasizing that and to draw attention to the fact that it is the intent of the committee that the money be preserved for the purpose set forth. In that connection, I point out that the use of the term "RS-70 weapon system" establishes a modification from the so-called original B-70 weapon system or program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, all parties concerned—the Air Force and the Department of Defense—have abandoned the B-70 concept, in favor of the RS-70, which is a reconnaissance plane.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the change in the language is a good one. It preserves the purse string powers of Congress, and preserves the option to use a word the Secretary of Defense has used many times, and the option of the Defense Department in its planning to go ahead with the RS-70 weapon system, and it assures that the authorization will be available without its being taken for some other, lesser or unintended purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department of Defense respected the language used last year, when we included identical language with respect to the B-52; and this year they asked us to lift the restriction, so that they could use it for other aircraft programs. And this bill does that. But for the coming fiscal year, the Senator from South Dakota is eminently correct when he indicates that no part of this $491 million authorization can be transferred to any objective which does not look to the acceleration of the RS-70 program.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the committee yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

I wish to say that I approve most heartily the bill as reported to the Senate from the Appropriations Committee.

Merely for clarification only I wish to propound a question.

In section 2, line 22, at the bottom of page 3, and from there on to the end of the bill, the committee has done what it tried to do a few years ago when such an authorization was first put into effect; namely, to require that funds be authorized "for the research, development, test, or evaluation of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels"—which was not done before, and which is not included in the House version of the bill this year, except as it applies to the RS-70.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the distinguished Senator that I intend to go now in some detail into the reasoning behind the change in the language in the bill. The Senator has stated in brief what has transpired. It is another undertaking on our part to carry out the authorizing authority of the Committees on Armed Services.

I now approach a discussion of the change in the language which was adverted to by the distinguished Senator.

AUTHORIZATION OF RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

The bill that was referred to the committee contained a provision that would have required authorization of appropriations for research and development and procurement of the RS-70 weapon system. This was section 2 of the bill that came to the committee.

The committee recommends that this provision be amended to require authorization of appropriations for the research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, instead of only the RS-70. The committee's recommendation would be prospective in effect and would apply only to the appropriations for fiscal year 1964.

As has just been pointed out by the distinguished Senator, the committee's recommendations on this subject are consistent with the original proposal approved by the Senate in 1959, for requiring special authorization of appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. At that time the committee recommended and the Senate agreed that development and procurement should be subject to special authorization. Unfortunately, the development feature was eliminated in conference.

Only a few days ago the characteristic pattern for procuring new weapons involved a relatively brief period of development and several years of production. As weapons have become more complex, this pattern has been reversed so that today development is relatively long and production is relatively short. Furthermore, as I have already indicated, it is difficult to distinguish between the latter stages of development and the early stages of production. Consequently, to consider procurement by itself, and not in its relationship to research and development, is to look at only a part of an almost inseparable subject. Because of the large sums involved in the development stage of a weapon, many of the crucial decisions occur at that stage. Reducing or eliminating procurement after full development would effect a relatively smaller expenditure. If a program is to be reduced or eliminated, the development period is the one that merits closer scrutiny.

This is not to suggest that the committee contemplates large scale reductions in authorization of research and development. Perhaps just the opposite course of action will result. But experience to date under the procedure for authorizing appropriations for procurement should allay any concern that arbitrary reductions are planned. It is undeniably true, though, that a more extensive congressional examination of any field of military activity causes a more thorough review and consideration in the executive branch. I strongly believe that an annual authorization of research and development on the major weapons will have constructive results.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Last year the Armed Services Committee under his guidance, recommended this be incorporated in the bill of last year. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. 1959.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I meant 1959.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and the Senate approved that unanimously, I may say.

Mr. SYMINGTON. But the other body decided it did not want that provision in the bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. They objected very strenuously, and to get any authorization authority at all, the Senate conferees found it necessary to yield on that one phase of our authorization proposal.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Would not the Chairman agree that the logic of his position and that of the committee and the Senate has been verified by the fact that now the other body wants to establish authorization for research and development in this particular field in which they are interested?

Mr. RUSSELL. It certainly has been. It shows beyond any peradventure that in many instances research and development are much more important than the authorization of procurement, and, I may say, sometimes involve greater expenditure.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I ask the senior Senator from Georgia, who, in my opinion, knows more about this subject than any Member of the Senate——

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very grateful for that remark. I would that I might deserve that encomium.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I mean it.

Is it not true that today research and development and production are tied so closely together that it is difficult to really separate them?

Mr. RUSSELL. In some cases it is well nigh impossible to determine where development ends and production begins. Production is a part of development. We change details from plane to plane and from vessel to vessel of the same type. Not only that, we spend so much money on development that we are committed and our power to authorize procurement is meaningless. So much money has been invested that the committee really has no option other than to authorize the procurement.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Whereas in the past production might run to hundreds of a complete unit a month, today there is no such production, primarily because of technological aspects that have revolutionized the armament business. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. There has never been anything more revolutionary in my lifetime than the change in the weaponry systems of the past 10 to 15 years.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Would the Senator not agree, from his experience, on the committee of which he is chairman, that the chief reason for the overage in the construction of missile bases, a form of production, was that the bases were being designed while they were being produced, and that this in effect is now characteristic of all research, development and production of airplanes or missiles, just as it would be in the case of bases?

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree completely.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment on what the Senator from Missouri has just said?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The other day a general of the Army testified on research and development. He said they kept it in that stage, as I recall his testimony, until they were ready to go fully into production on a large scale. In other words, the big expense, as the chairman of the committee has pointed out, now is in research and development, and they do not move into a production basis until they are ready to go on full-scale production.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator will permit there is no full-scale production as we understood it in the past. Often, after we decide on a unit to be made, relatively few are made. In the case of the RS-70, it is my understanding the Air Force is now asking for some 45 production units.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When we get in to the matter of construction of bases, however, the matter of change does contribute to the cost. What has bothered me somewhat is that I have had the feeling that contractors who bid on bases bid on them on the assumption that there would be change orders which would bail them out and give them profits, even if the original bid was a little close or thin so far as expected profits were concerned.

I mention this because it seems to me the Procurement Division and the construction agencies—whether it be the Corps of Engineers or other procurement agencies for the Department of Defense—should be on guard, and should write contracts as firmly as possible in the first instance. Change orders should be approved only when it is clearly in the interest of the Government. There should be protection against excessive change orders, because once a contractor has the base contract the change orders often afford him an opportunity to make exorbitant profits.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I could not agree more with the distinguished Senator, but the base construction people are only now getting into a field which has been utilized by other contractors for the Government for a century or more. In regard to Navy procurement, on bidding on naval vessels, and in regard to the Maritime Administration, on bidding on passenger vessels, it has been bruited about that sometimes contractors bid really below the actual cost on the original design, with a certain knowledge that there will be so many change orders or modifications of the original plans that they will be able to make themselves whole and, in addition, to earn a nice profit. Of course, the organization with the original contract is about the only group with whom the Department can deal for the change orders or the modifications.

That is a practice which any person who has had connection with contracts with the Government has seen over the years.

I think that at the present time the present Secretary of Defense is paying very close attention to the problem. I am hopeful he will be able to reach the point where realistic bids will be submitted and reasonable charges for changes and modifications set up.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Perhaps the most basic duty of any Member of the Senate today is to make certain that our country is secure. That means, of course, that we must exercise wisdom in voting on the defense proposals. Because of the complex nature of weapons systems today, we who are not members of the committee find it very difficult to know as much as we ought to know about the subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can assure the Senator that the difficulty is one which is common also for members of the committee. It is difficult for members of the committee to keep up with the many changes in our weapons systems.

Mr. COOPER. I wish to refer briefly to a question which has been covered in the newspapers very much lately. It has been raised in my mind and in the minds of other Members of the Senate. I remember that last year the Senator from Wisconsin spoke on the question at great length.

I am referring to the admonition of the Department of Defense, which I assume is a decision, that there should be no development at this time of other bombers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of manned bombers.

Mr. COOPER. Manned bombers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I notice that it is stated in the report that no manned aircraft will be procured. As I understand the proposal, the authorization of $491 million is intended for research and development, test and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, not the $491 million. The $491 million is limited to the development of RS-70 aircraft.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator, who is the chairman of the committee, for whom we all have great respect, a question which has been raised all over the country. People ask about it. People have asked me about it in my State.

Was it the judgment of the committee members that there is no need for further procurement of manned aircraft at this time?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not know that I can express the views of every member of the committee. I know what my own view is, and I think I am safe in saying it is shared by a majority of the committee. It is that we would have felt much better about our defense situation if the Department of Defense had procured the new wing of B-52's which we authorized last year. I personally feel that was a mistake. These matters change so rapidly that it is all a question of judgment of individuals. My judgment could well be wholly erroneous.

It has always been my view that if I make any error in the development of a defense system I want it to be on the side of having too much rather than of being caught with too little. For that reason I thought it was a mistake not to proceed with the procurement of that wing of B-52's which we authorized last year over and above the request. I still feel that way.

Mr. COOPER. I find myself in the same position. I do not know as much as members of the committee know, yet I feel I am charged, along with other Senators, with doing what ought to be done to provide defense for our country, and not being on the short side. Therefore, I am asking these questions.

Mr. RUSSELL. Both the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services of the Senate last year agreed on the opinion, I think the decision was unanimous, that we should proceed to procure another wing of long-range manned bombers, and that it would be a mistake to close the assembly line, as it will be closed, in October.

Only time can show who is correct. I hope those who have such confidence in the missiles are correct and that I am mistaken. I would have preferred to have had the new manned bombers procured. I think the B-52 bomber, equipped with the two Hound Dog missiles or four Sky Bolt missiles, which enable it to stand off from 300 to 1,000 miles from the target with comparative immunity, would be the greatest deterrent to war we could have. The Department, however, decided otherwise.

The Department did go along with us with respect to our increases for the Polaris submarines. For several years we have authorized and have appropriated for more Polaris submarines than the Department requested, but the Department has acquired them and is asking for additional Polaris submarines now.

It is a matter of opinion as to when it is wise to cut off production of manned bombers and to bring about a situation that will force us to rely upon missiles in a comparatively few years.

My own view was that we should not take the risk; but it has been done. There is nothing I can do about it. My committee authorized the procurement. I supported the appropriation for it. I went to the conference with it. It was in the bill which was signed. However, the money was not expended.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Senator believe that the development of missiles has reached such a stage that there is reasonable safety in believing the missiles will be properly developed, so that we can be safe without provision for more manned bombers?

Mr. RUSSELL. There have been some phenomenal developments in the accuracy and precision of some of the missiles particularly the Polaris solid propellant missiles.

For my part, I was not willing to place the security of this Nation and the freedom of our people altogether on missiles, since I have seen so many failures in the efforts to fire the missiles. We do not have many failures in getting bombers off the ground, yet we have seen a great many failures in firing missiles.

Of course, in good time we shall perfect the missiles, I am quite sure. I did not wish to have any interregnum whatever between the possession of a strong, overwhelming force of manned bombers capable of delivering the atomic and hydrogen warheads and the perfection of the missile system.

Mr. COOPER. I assume, then, the reason for not including funds in the bill for further procurement of manned bombers is based upon the fact that there is a belief the funds would not be utilized?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is based upon the fact that we were told definitely and clearly the funds would not be utilized.

In any case, I say to the Senator, the Department has stopped the procurement of parts. It would be necessary to reopen plants and assembly lines which have been closed.

Mr. COOPER. I assume that the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, a man whom we all respect, who has great knowledge of the subject, holds the same opinion today that he held 2 years ago?

Mr. RUSSELL. Last year.

Mr. COOPER. Yes, last year—that manned bombers should be procured to provide, as the Senator sees it, for the best security of our country.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed. That is my conclusion. But, as I stated, my errors have been on the side of seeking too much. I hope that the errors other members of the committee make will not be on the side of seeking too little. It is a matter of opinion or judgment.

Mr. COOPER. I know it is a matter of opinion. I have referred to the great difficulty which those of us have who are not members of the committee and who therefore cannot have the information possessed by members of the committee. Each of us is charged with doing what he thinks is best, and right, to secure our country. And yet we do not have the necessary information. We cannot obtain it except as we talk to members of the committee. On such occasions as the present one, when a bill is being considered, we are placed in a difficult position. The lack of information about which I have spoken makes it hard for each of us to express his views and, demonstrate, by his action, his determination to assure the complete safety of the country, as far as it is possible to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I again reassure the Senator to the extent that a majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are of the opinion that the proposed authorization is completely adequate to assure the security of our country and to prevent any act of aggression against it.

There was the dissenting voice of the Air Force, which was in favor of procuring some new manned aircraft. But the majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as well as the Secretary of Defense, for whose judgment I have great respect, were of the opinion that the authorization provided in the bill, together with the weapons that we have on hand, is sufficient to deter any attack against us.

Last year, and in 2 years before that I believed that the Department of Defense was not requesting sufficient funds for manned bombers. Therefore in the Appropriations Committee I fought with great zeal and, I believe I can say with some modesty, with some degree of success, for appropriations over and above the amount requested by the Department of Defense in 3 years to reinforce our efforts in that field. A few years ago we added much more than the Department of Defense requested. The then Secretary of Defense spent a great deal of that money and changed his views on the procurement program after the appropriations bill had been passed.

As I have said, Secretary of Defense McNamara is a man of unusual ability and inexhaustible energy. He has promised a complete review of the RS-70 program, and that he would act accordingly if the review indicated any justification for an acceleration.

Mr. COOPER. I concur in the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Georgia with regard to Secretary of Defense McNamara. I am glad to hear him say that there is no provision in the bill, or in the report, which would prohibit or inhibit the Secretary of Defense from proceeding at least to reexamine the program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only have we refused to prohibit or inhibit him, but also we provided $320 million which he said he did not want. In effect we said, "Here is the money. You can spend it for the purpose stated." Not only is there no prohibition, but also we are urging the Secretary of Defense to review the program, and if he decides favorably, the authorization will be at hand to implement the program without his having to request it. The authority will have been pressed upon him against his wishes.

I now advert to a subject that is not directly involved, but about which the committee asked a great many questions.

NUCLEAR TESTING

In the course of the hearings on this authorization bill many questions were propounded to the military witnesses and the civilian leaders of departments regarding their views on the wisdom of resuming nuclear testing in the atmosphere. Without exception these witnesses indicated that from a military standpoint resumption of such nuclear testing would be in the national interest.

All of us are aware of the negotiations now underway in Geneva. Speaking only for myself, I hope that a delay in initiating these tests will not be tolerated indefinitely. As a result of their preparations while the test moratorium was in effect, the Soviets have achieved an advantage through the tests conducted last fall.

As earnestly as I crave peace and as willing as I am to go the last mile to achieve it, I hope we shall not be deluded by talking while the Soviet Union profits from the results of the approximately 50 tests which it conducted last year in violation of the moratorium.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I associate myself, without any reservation, with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia on this vital subject of nuclear testing. Almost daily we read advertisements in newspapers signed by people who have had success under the capitalistic system.

The advertisements have consistently directed requests or threats at the President, in opposition to nuclear testing. Today I noticed a group of people, some bearing prominent names, picketing the White House. The people of the United States simply do not understand the full import of what the Russians apparently were trying to achieve in their approximately 40 air tests last fall, with respect to which we have now reached conclusions as a result of months of study of the atmosphere at that time. Therefore, I urge the able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services—the full committee would be most preferable, because it would be under his supervision—or in the Subcommittee on Military Preparedness, under the chairmanship of the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], give consideration to conducting hearings in order to answer once and for all the question, "What are the advantages incident to testing in the atmosphere and/or testing under the ground?"

I make that statement because persons of the highest degree of knowledge in the field have stated we may already be risking the future of our country in offers we have made to the Soviet Union in that field. This has nothing to do with the word "bomb." It has primarily to do with fusion in the low categories of explosion—say a kiloton or a half a kiloton. I would hope we could have hearings in the Committee on Armed Services. It is clear that such considerations as yield-to-weight ratio in weaponry are now vital as we plan our defenses against a possible enemy.

I notice in the Chamber my friend, the able senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Arms Control and Disarmament of the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope that he will consider as a sound and constructive proposal, the proposal to hold such hearings.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As a Senator and a citizen, I have fully concurred in the decision of the President as to the necessity of resuming atmospheric tests. I think we all wish that they were not necessary, but I do not think we can afford to close our eyes to the scientific realities and to the power struggle that is on in the world today.

Undue delay would serve no purpose. We have walked the extra mile. I believe all of us know that we have walked that extra mile in terms of negotiations, and we have done all this in good faith. We have done it even within the last 48 hours. The President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain have again offered to the Soviet Union an opportunity for negotiations. The Soviets have rejected this offer.

Therefore, I concur with what the Senator from Georgia has said on the matter of arriving at a decision and proceeding on the basis of that decision.

I believe that it would be desirable in all of these matters relating to our national security where arms are involved—and they are a very important factor in national security—if the Armed Services Committee could undertake its own inquiry into that subject. I recognize, of course, that when we speak of nuclear testing, we are in the field of foreign policy, or national policy, a matter which is of great importance. However, there is also the matter of weaponry. To date most of the hearings have been held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, because atomic energy is involved in this matter. However, it is involved also in the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee in terms of the total balance of the military structure.

We want these matters considered in the Foreign Relations Committee, because of the diplomatic considerations that are involved.

I regret that the subcommittee which once considered this matter, and had on it members of the Armed Services Committee and members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and also members of the Foreign Relations Committee, has been discontinued. It was a special subcommittee that looked into the subject of disarmament, which involves more than foreign policy, and is also a military matter and an economic matter. Surely it is also a scientific matter. I am sorry that that subcommittee could not continue to function. We lost our congressional authorization for it. As a result, the Armed Services Committee does not have a voice in the discussions of the subject of disarmament policy, nor has the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, except as it goes into this matter separately.

The Foreign Relations Committee, because of the manner in which it operates, cannot always give fullest consideration to the military aspects of this subject.

Therefore I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that his suggestion is welcomed by me. First of all, the Senator from Missouri is a member of both the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. That is a very happy circumstance.

Mr. RUSSELL. And he represented very ably the Armed Services Committee on that subcommittee. I share the Senator's regret that the subcommittee was discontinued. It was of great benefit to the American people. I have discussed the matter of its continuation with just about everyone who I thought had any influence on the subject.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate the able assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], for his fine statement and admire him for his position in this matter. It is true that when he was chairman of the Joint Arms Control Disarmament Committee, on which I had the honor of representing the Armed Services Committee, we had what might be called both sides consistently presented to us, and the record of the 1958 hearings are pertinent to that end.

Without interrupting any further the typically able presentation of the budget by the chairman of the committee, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Minnesota, and I hope the Senator from Georgia will give consideration to this suggestion. The decisions, which of course will be much molded by public opinion, should be based on publication of all truth that will not help a possible enemy.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have discussed this matter with the distinguished Senator from Missouri and with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee. We have a great deal of work to do in our committee. I doubt very much that the full committee would be able to conduct these hearings. However, I am sure that some hearings will be held in that area. Of course we have not been entirely without knowledge of the atomic bomb, from the standpoint of its power and methods of delivery, and matters of that kind. However, there are a great many scientific aspects, a discussion of which would be of profit to the committee. I hope the subcommittee will go into the matter before Congress recesses.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I brought this matter up because of the excellent statement of the Senator from Georgia under the subhead of nuclear testing.

Mr. RUSSELL. I too wish to express my delight that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has added his voice to this subject because many of us feel that patience has ceased to be a virtue in undertaking to deal with the Soviet Union, and that we must proceed in the interest of national security with a resumption of nuclear testing.

The Senator from Minnesota spoke about going the last mile. It seems to me we have gone far beyond the last mile, and have been overly generous in the proposals we have made to the Russians. Anyone who wanted peace would have accepted those proposals. I mean the proposals that were made long ago, not the ones that were made only recently, which are somewhat frightening to me. I know that all of us would like to avoid the resumption of nuclear testing, even though we would use the cleanest bombs that it is possible to make. We have learned a great deal about cleaning up our bombs and reducing the amount of radioactive fallout.

Our scientists have eliminated much of the fallout that resulted from the earlier testing of the bomb. The bombs are much less harmful in radioactivity now. However, even though some harm may result from the fallout, that harm is infinitesimal when compared to the consequences of a world dominated by the Communist tyranny that would result from a substantial lead in nuclear weapons by the Soviets.

What has kept us at peace over the past 15 years has been our predominance in the field of nuclear weapons. If we lose it, all is lost.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very much interested in the Senator's observations. Many people in the world try to equate our position on the resumption of nuclear testing with a decision relating strictly to our security as a nation. We have commitments to the whole world. As the Senator has said, the one thing that has preserved this tenuous peace of our time is our great strength, and our superiority and advanced technology in the field of nuclear power.

Sometimes we get ourselves involved in bad publicity and bad relations when it appears that our concern on this subject is based entirely on our own anxiety for our own Nation's security. That would be enough to motivate me to a proper decision. However, we must recognize that we have commitments to keep—commitments to NATO, CENTO, and SEATO, as well as to the Organization of American States. In fact, we also must keep in mind the security of the nonalined and neutral countries. The only way they can remain unalined and neutral is through the strength of the United States and its allies, which keeps them out of the jaws of the overly hungry and rapacious big bear that comes out of the Siberian steppes and woods.

I would suggest, when we talk about nuclear testing, that we talk about it not merely as being a great national decision but also an international responsibility and an international decision.

Mr. RUSSELL. I completely share the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I have been utterly amazed by the attitude of some of the so-called neutralist countries on this subject. There can be no question at all that if our Nation loses its predominance in this field, the light of liberty will be snuffed out not only in the United States, but wherever it burns anywhere on this globe today. If we let the Soviets get complete predominance in nuclear weapons, the original dreams of Lenin and Trotsky for world domination will surely come about, and they will come about with great speed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree with both the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from Georgia. Probably the greatest critic of statements incident to the actions of the United States in this field is Mr. Krishna Menon, of India. Shortly, the Senate will have an opportunity to decide whether it wishes to give hundreds of millions of dollars of aid to a country at least in part controlled by a man who, when the Soviets treacherously renewed their nuclear testing in the air last fall, stated that underground testing was much more damaging to the future of the human race than atmospheric testing. He defended without reservation the position of the Soviet Communists on this subject.

I hope the facts, figures, and thoughts presented to the Senate today by the assistant majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services will be given full consideration when the Senate is called upon to decide, in the not too distant future, whether we should grant some half a billion dollars of aid and loans to a country which opposes us in that manner and has opposed us so consistently on so many matters over the years.

Although Mr. Nehru is constantly portraying himself as a man of peace, and at times has stated that if necessary, India will remain the last large unarmed country in the world, the fact is that India has one of the large armies of the world, and also an air force more than three times larger than any other air force in that part of the globe.

Mr. RUSSELL. India has just dedicated one of the world's largest tank factories, which I understand is intended to produce a thousand Centurion tanks.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did not know that, and thank the Senator from Georgia for telling the Senate about it. We are reaching some kind of height in paradox when, at the same time we give substantial economic aid to India, India is buying heavy military units from Soviet Russia. Note that this goes on at the same time Mr. Nehru is saying he will not accept any military aid from us because he is a man of peace. So we continue to finance his great army indirectly, most of which faces, in belligerent fashion, one of the greatest friends this Nation has, Pakistan.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall not discuss that subject in detail now; but the neutralists who consider our foreign aid program so important, as it is, and those who are associated with us in one of the various pacts into which this country has entered, would do well to consider that, after all, the military might of the United States is the principal prop of freedom in the world today.

Therefore, as regretfully as we approach the facts, our knowledge of Soviet progress demands that we regain and overtake the lead which the Soviet has achieved in this field by reason of their violation of the moratorium.

It has been amazing to me that those who have criticized the United States for even presuming to test in the atmosphere do not mention the fact that the United States has not conducted any tests for about 40 months, with the understanding that Soviet Russia was not to conduct any either, but that without any notice whatever the Soviets violated the moratorium on nuclear testing.

CONCLUSION

I would not conclude this statement without a word of praise for the presentation made to the committee by the Secretary of Defense and his principal military and civilian assistants in the Department. The committee was furnished not a collection of conclusions but an impressive array of information, including alternatives to the courses of action recommended. One does not have to agree with every detail of the program presented to recognize that the Secretary is doing a tremendous job. He has abundant intellect and, perhaps more important, he works hard. He stays on the job until he concludes the work that is before him.

Often when a public official is the recipient of a great deal of favorable comment he becomes a target. I certainly have no desire to put Mr. McNamara in that position, but I must state that I think the Nation is fortunate to have a person of his ability occupying the important position of Secretary of Defense.

As is nearly always true, the authorization in this bill probably is not all that everyone connected with the defense effort would like. The procurement authorization that is proposed to the Senate for 1963, however, is substantial, it is balanced, and it is based on understandable objectives. I urge that the bill be approved.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS OF CHILE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia yield, provided he does not lose the floor?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask the indulgence of the Senate, while the Senator from Georgia retains the floor, because I know other Senators wish to ask him questions. However, I should like to have the privilege of presenting to the Senate a delegation from the Congress of Chile.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Iowa for that purpose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senate is honored today by the presence in the Chamber of a delegation of distinguished members of the Parliament of our sister Republic of Chile. They represent the various political parties of Chile and are here to observe, to get acquainted with, and to learn more about the United States of America. They are accompanied by the Ambassador from Chile to the United States.

First I wish to present the Ambassador from Chile, the Honorable Walter Müller. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Next I present the Honorable Gustavo Loyola, First Vice President of the Chamber of Deputies, Deputy from the Province of Cautin. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The Honorable Jose M. Huerta, Second Vice President of the Chamber of Deputies, Deputy from the Province of Malleco. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The Honorable Hernan Brucher, Deputy from the Province of Antofagasta. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The Honorable Luis Pareto, Deputy from the First District of Santiago. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The Honorable Tomas Reyes, Deputy from the Third District of Santiago. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. President, the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have enjoyed a very informative, discursive, and pleasant luncheon with these estimable gentlemen. We welcome them and are delighted to have them in the Chamber.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for his indulgence and kindness in yielding.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED SERVICES, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for armed services, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. First, I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for the fine work which the committee, under his leadership, has done, and which the committee, under his leadership, always does.

I wish to ask the Senator about a matter which does not appear in the bill, although I have badgered both the senior Senator from Georgia and some of the members of his committee about this item for the last year or two. The bill contains nothing which relates to the subject of Government rights with respect to the development of new inventions, patent rights, and proprietary rights. I have felt for some time that one of the worst things in Government is the enormous expenditure of Government funds for research and development, sums running to about $12 billion a year, under terms and conditions which permit contractors to have private patent rights on this vast amount of Government research.

It has sometimes seemed to me that we are spending a thousand times as much to create monopolies as we spend to break monopolies.

Can the Senator from Georgia suggest to me an appropriate bill to which I might offer an amendment which would seek to bring an end to the obtaining of private patents achieved at Government expense?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the discussions by the junior Senator from Louisiana in this field. I have not given the subject the attention and study which he has given to it, but I have looked into it to a certain degree, and I must say that I have found it to be one of the most complicated, complex subjects I have ever examined.

The same rule does not apply to all contracts or to all patents. It is a subject as to which I have not, up to now, felt qualified to initiate legislation. However, I have discussed it with some officials in the Department of Defense. I shall be glad to urge them to intensify any study which they may be making in order that we may have the benefit of their experience in the drafting of proposed legislation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield further——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I doubt that we are going to gain any cooperation from the Department of Defense. Those who are there seem to believe that a considerable portion of their pleasure in remaining there is related to the function of granting contracts which maintain this situation—on which they have consistently sought to maintain.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator from Louisiana is somewhat in error in that connection. There is a new interest in the matter—one which I have not heretofore observed in the Department of Defense. I think there was a time when those who served there apparently were not interested in the matter; but I think there is now some interest in it there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The General Accounting Office arrived at an inescapable conclusion in that connection that there is a strong incentive for one contractor to withhold from other contractors the information he obtains in the course of fulfilling his Government contract—on the theory that if he permitted the information he thus obtained to be had by other contractors, that might result in denying him an opportunity to have a virtual monopoly to such patent or other information. When that happens, the effect is to bar to many thousands of scientists and engineers an opportunity to advance to the next frontier of knowledge, although we may already have found an answer to a technical problem which constitutes a roadblock in that field. In fact, some have stated that a person must virtually reinvent the wheel. It is frequently cheaper to ascertain—at Government expense—what already is known. Of course, that process involves great additional expense for research. Various governmental agencies have made that statement, and I have not heard the Department of Defense deny it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the Senator from Louisiana had the Secretary of Defense appear before his committee?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, although I would have been glad to have him appear there. But my Monopoly Subcommittee of the Small Business Committee deals with only a small subdivision of this subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am surprised that the Secretary of Defense has not appeared before the Senator's committee, because it seems to me that he has testified before almost every committee on Capitol Hill. In the newspapers we read that he appears before a very great many of the congressional committees.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. He has been invited to appear before our committee, but he has not appeared there. I must say that I have found it extremely difficult to get Cabinet officers to appear before my Monopoly Subcommittee insofar as this subject matter is concerned.

But members of our committees before which the Secretary of Defense and similar officials have appeared have expressed the view that it is very difficult for the work to proceed under these conditions, particularly when the development is done at Government expense.

I can understand the situation when the work is done at private expense; but it seems to me that this is one of the most important matters which can be dealt with by us. So I wonder whether the Senator from Georgia would feel compelled to oppose an amendment to bring this problem to the attention of the Department of Defense. I have prepared such an amendment, which provides:.

> No funds authorized to be appropriated hereafter shall be expended pursuant to the authority of this act under contracts signed after the effective date of this act for research or development, unless those contracts contain provisions to assure that all patents and proprietary rights to information developed under the terms of those contracts under circumstances where the Government will have paid hereafter, under those contracts, for all or nearly all of the cost of developing such inventions, shall be the property of the United States.

I drafted this amendment in order to recognize the fact that after a contractor under a previous contract has done much research, there would likely be a problem if we were to provide that we are going to try to protect the interest of the Government to research done largely under such a prior contract. But when such work is done entirely under future contracts, it seems to me that the right to the inventions should belong to the Government. Furthermore, when the Government pays, under contracts signed hereafter, for all or nearly all the research, it seems to me that this amendment would protect the Government's interest.

I hope very much the Senator from Georgia will not object to Senate consideration of this proposal, because the President has this matter under consideration at the present time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is not that a very good reason why I should not accept the amendment—not until the President comes to some conclusion in regard to it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But the President is, I am sure, in considering this matter, somewhat impressed by the fact that the Daddario committee, in the House, is advocating exactly the opposite of what the Senate has voted when it has repeatedly been confronted with the same problem. The Senate has accepted, without objection, amendments to assure that such research work would be subject to the Government's rights, and that the Government would have the proprietary rights if the Government had paid for the work; and heretofore I have offered amendments to assure that result. On the other hand, on the House side, under the leadership of Representative DADDARIO, there is a determined fight to try to persuade the taking of just the opposite position. This matter has been resolved in both ways in the House, whereas in the Senate the answer has consistently been the same.

So I hope very much the Senator from Georgia will take this amendment to conference, and there will test the position of the House, or that at least he will not object to having debate and a vote on this matter in the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I believe that in times past I have supported the Senator from Louisiana in connection with amendments of similar intent.

Our committee has worked very hard and most diligently on the bill, and we entertain high hopes that the bill as passed by the Senate will be accepted by the House, without requiring a conference. So I hesitate to accept the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

However, I shall be glad to present the amendment to the Secretary of Defense and to obtain his views in regard to it. In that way we can get the response of the Secretary of Defense; and then I can give it to the Senator from Louisiana.

But I hope the Senator from Louisiana will not offer his amendment to this bill, because we have boiled it down to the point where I have high hopes that it will not be necessary to have a conference with the House.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia obtains that information from the Secretary of Defense, I wonder whether the Senator will also be so kind as to make such inquiries of other governmental departments and agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Aviation Authority, and various other agencies which do not agree with the attitude of the Department of Defense in its position about this matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Louisiana will introduce such a bill, I shall be glad to appoint a subcommittee to consider the bill, and to obtain information from anyone who, in the opinion of the subcommittee, might be able to cast any light on the matter. But I doubt whether the full Armed Services Committee would have time to go through with such hearings and, in the course of the hearings, obtain testimony from all persons who are concerned with this matter at this time. However, I shall be glad to have the Senator from Louisiana introduce such a bill, and then to appoint a subcommittee to hold hearings on it.

But I hope the Senator from Louisiana will not submit the amendment to the bill now pending, because the bill is of vital importance, and it must be enacted before the appropriations for the Department of Defense can be considered. Hearings on those appropriations are already underway; and if this bill becomes tied up, that situation might delay the making of those appropriations, which apply to the period beyond the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am sure the chairman of the committee knows of my great personal regard for him as perhaps the most responsible and completely able Member of this body.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am greatly flattered by what the Senator from Louisiana has said.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not care to increase the Senator's burdens. He has always been most considerate of me in connection with all matters.

Yet it does seem to me that this matter should be permitted to reach a vote in the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me we have had a vote on it in the Senate. Have we not voted on it here once or twice?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senate has, more or less by voice vote or unanimous consent, accepted such an amendment, to apply to other departments of the Government. But the Department of Defense is the agency which spends most of the money, and that is where the big problem arises.

I do not want to present the amendment under such circumstances that the Senator from Georgia will feel compelled to oppose the amendment, if there is some possibility of receiving support for the amendment or offering it on some other occasion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I frankly think that this matter is sufficiently important to have committee hearings on it. That is my own view of it. Perhaps the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary might be the place to consider it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Hearings have been held by the Subcommittee on Patents of the Judiciary Committee. No action has been taken. I doubt that there will be. Hearings have been held on the subject by the Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Small Business Committee. The Senator knows we have no legislative authority in that committee.

The only way the junior Senator from Louisiana sees to bring this matter to a vote in the Senate is by offering an amendment on the floor. Unless the chairman of the committee is willing to have it brought before the committee and voted on in committee, I shall feel compelled to offer the amendment on the floor, either to the pending bill or some other proposed legislation. If the Senator will assure me that it will be considered——

Mr. RUSSELL. I will assure the Senator from Louisiana that I will get the views of the present Secretary of Defense on the issue raised by the amendment. Frankly, it seems to me that legislation in that area would not be in the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, even though the subject relates to the Department of Defense. But if the measure is referred to my committee, we will give it consideration. In thinking of it and going over the matter of jurisdiction in my mind, I think legislation dealing with the subject would go to the Committee on the Judiciary. I will take the Senator's amendment and submit it to the Secretary of Defense and get a statement from him that I will submit to the Senator. I will be glad to do that.

The Senator from Louisiana knows this is a far-reaching amendment to put in the bill at this stage, without any hearings, or without an opinion of the Department of Defense.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The opinion of the Department of Defense is a matter of record before a number of subcommittees, including the Judiciary Committee, on one of the subcommittees of which I had the honor of acting as chairman. The Department is against the amendment; there is no doubt about that. Their spokesman, Mr. Bannerman, has testified against it. Other departments are in favor of the principle contained in the amendment.

So far as legislative jurisdiction is concerned, there are at least half a dozen places in Federal law where the law specifically excludes and forbids private patents at public expense. Invariably, such law has come out of the committee which had jurisdiction of the subject matter. For example, there is such a provision in the law pertaining to saline water, which came out of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which reported a bill containing that language. The Agriculture Department has had a similar prohibition. There is a provision in the law to that effect which was contained in the basic agricultural laws. The National Aeronautics and Space law has such limitations. That provision was contained in the basic act which established the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The coal research bill contains such a provision. That bill was reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Senate passed the so-called disarmament bill, which contained similar stipulations, and the bill was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

The Senator will find in half a dozen places that the law forbids private patents at public research expense, but invariably the legislation has not come out of the Judiciary Committee. It has come out of the committee handling legislation for the particular department of Government involved.

One reason for that, I suppose, is that it is sometimes difficult to get a controversial bill out of the Judiciary Committee. Things have a tendency to stay in that committee until the controversy is less at issue. Apparently committees handling legislation over a particular agency administering the matter appear more willing to let the subject come to a vote.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the first place, I wish to say that I think the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana is a good amendment, and should be adopted. I see no reason why, in research and development in defense matters, the public should not have the same protection it has in space matters and others the Senator has mentioned, where some protection is afforded to the public in the field of patents.

I do not know whether bills of this kind have gone to the Judiciary Committee or not. If so, they have not gone to the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of which I am chairman. They have gone to the Patents Subcommittee if they have gone to the Judiciary Committee.

I know the Senator from Louisiana is right. I am certain that in other fields such a restriction has been made as an amendment to the basic act by the committee which had original jurisdiction.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may well be, but I assume the question was raised in the committee. It was not raised in the Armed Services Committee, and the amendment was not submitted to the committee in time for us to have a hearing on it. While I have great respect for the views of the Senator from Tennessee, it seems to me our committee was entitled to have some hearings on the subject, and not to have this amendment brought up in shotgun manner on the floor of the Senate. I suppose the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry discussed the matter in those committees, but we had no opportunity to discuss it. This is the first time it has been brought up.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the Senator is correct in that regard.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I respect the right of others to disagree with me——

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not necessarily disagreeing with the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I know that.

Mr. RUSSELL. But no man's opinion is any better than his information. My information on this subject is rather limited. I have not had the opportunity of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Tennessee to have hearings on it. I heard the Senator from Louisiana discuss it in connection with a bill which I have forgotten, and to which he offered the amendment. That is the limit of my information on the subject.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not only on the floor, but in the cloakroom and elsewhere, the Senator from Louisiana has been waging something of a campaign to bring about an end to what he regards as a great abuse involving the issuance of private patents as a result of public expense on research and development.

Mr. RUSSELL. I might say that I approve of the Senator's objective. From what I do know about it, it seems entirely reasonable and logical to me; however, many things seem to be entirely reasonable and logical at first blush, but when we get into them further we find there are some arguments on the other side.

In addition, I do not wish to have to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I understand the Senator's position, but I should like to have the Senator make it clear that he understands my position, if he does.

My feeling about the matter is that if the Senator from Georgia felt as strongly about it as does the junior Senator from Louisiana, he would be seeking every method available to him to bring an end to what he believed to be a wrong practice.

Under those circumstances, if the Senator felt as strongly as I do about the matter, he would be seeking to get action of the Judiciary Committee, if he could; if he could not get action from the Judiciary Committee, he would probably seek action of the Armed Services Committee; if he could not get action out of the Armed Services Committee, then he might approach the Foreign Relations Committee; if not from that committee, from the Committee on Commerce; if not from that committee, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is an authorization bill. I heard the Senator's amendment read only once, but if it is not in the form of a limitation, it could be made a limitation. The Senator could offer it to the appropriation bill which would fulfill the authorization. However, if it is attached to this bill, it could delay the bill and could cause real problems.

The Senator can offer the amendment to the appropriation bill. I would suggest that the Senator go before the Appropriations Subcommittee and tell the subcommittee members his reasons, rather than catching them unaware on the floor of the Senate. The subcommittee is conducting hearings at the present time, under the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's assurance with respect to the Subcommittee on Armed Services of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of which is not in the Chamber at the present time. If the Senator will permit me to rely on the assurance he has given on the floor with respect to the Committee on Armed Services, I shall withhold offering the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am willing to send the amendment to the Secretary of Defense and get a full statement of the views of the Department of Defense. I think we could proceed more intelligently if we had that much.

Mr. BUSH and Mr. PROXMIRE addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Georgia. I shall be very brief.

The Senator made some very complimentary remarks in regard to Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense. I would not wish to see the RECORD closed this afternoon without a word from this side of the aisle in support of what the Senator said about the Secretary. He is a member of that oppressed minority group known as the Republican Party.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator astounds me. I thought he was a New Frontiersman of long standing.

Mr. BUSH. Certainly that is not the case—only of very short standing, anyway, if he were one. He is a member of our oppressed minority group, and he is out on the firing line with a very difficult job.

As the Senator from Georgia has said, Secretary McNamara conducts himself in a very statesmanlike fashion. He probably has the most responsible job that any Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force ever had, because today the problems are much more difficult and much more intricate, with so much more scientific knowledge involved.

Like my distinguished chairman, I am amazed by this man's ability to comprehend the detailed problems which come before him in connection with the new weapons systems, and the manifold other problems with which he must deal. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that his appearances before our committee this year have been truly remarkable. He has shown a grasp of detail which I have never before seen in a committee hearing by an official of this Government. It gives me a feeling of great confidence and security in connection with our whole defense picture to know that there is a man of such tremendous capacity, ability, and devotion to his duty.

I join with the Senator in his complimentary remarks. I fully agree with his high opinion of Secretary McNamara.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I assure him the fact that he has informed me the Secretary is a member of the Republican Party does not reduce the Secretary's stature by one jot or tittle. He is still an able man.

Mr. BUSH. I thought it would not.

Mr. RUSSELL. I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Before I ask the chairman a few questions, I should like to say that I find much to approve in his excellent statement. I particularly agree with the point made on page 24, when he said:

> I strongly believe that an annual authorization of research and development on the major weapons will have constructive results.

The process we are now going through on the floor of the Senate can be extremely useful.

Also I agree wholeheartedly that what has kept the peace has indeed been our predominance in the nuclear field. There is no question about that. It is essential that we continue this predominance in the future.

One of the reasons why I think the authorization bill is so important is that it involves such a fantastic expense. The amount involved is so great as to make one shudder. It is almost thirteen thousand million dollars.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is nearly thirteen thousand million. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On page 3 of the bill, lines 12 through 15, it is stated:

> *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1962, restrictions on the fund authorization contained in Public Law 87-53, approved June 21, 1961, for the procurement of aircraft, will no longer apply.

I have before me Public Law 87-53, which provides in part for aircraft for the Air Force, $3,841 million, of which amount $525 million is authorized only for the procurement of long-range manned aircraft for the Strategic Air Command.

I presume this section of the bill refers to that section of the act.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It eliminates that restriction?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does. It makes those funds available for the procurement of other aircraft.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is my second point.

Mr. RUSSELL. The $525 million was added to the bill in an amount over and above what the Department requested last year. There was a difference of opinion as to whether the United States should continue to procure manned long-range bombers.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. Congress said that the $525 million was available only for that purpose. In order to keep the books of the Department in better balance, and to eliminate that restriction, since it was manifest the Department was not going to spend money for the B-52's, we eliminated the language to permit the funds to be expended for any other aircraft.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is the point I wished to cover. I checked with the Parliamentarian, who referred me to the legislative counsel of the committee. There appears to be no authoritative certainty as to whether the funds would be restricted to aircraft alone, or whether there would be a carte blanche opportunity for the Defense Department to spend $525 million for missiles, and naval vessels as well as aircraft. What makes it particularly confusing is that, perhaps by misadventure, the House language, page 2, line 11, which is erased in the bill, has the same provision under "Naval vessels."

I have the impression that the money could be used by Defense for almost anything.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is one reason we rewrote the bill. The language was in the wrong place, under "Naval vessels." We put it where it belongs, under "Aircraft."

That amount was deducted from the total amount for procurement of aircraft, when the Department submitted the budget relying on obtaining the $525 million carryover.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I see.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is all to be used for the funding of aircraft, though.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We have established that, then.

The only reference in the committee report to this section of the bill is on page 4, where there is a paragraph which deals with "Eliminating Restrictions on Previous Authorization." The language simply eliminates it. It does not go on to specify any restriction.

The chairman has, I think, now made legislative history indicating that use of the funds would be restricted to aircraft.

Mr. RUSSELL. During the course of my statement I said:

> Excluding the B-70 for the moment, the total initial Air Force aircraft procurement program for 1963 involves $4,030 million. The Department proposes to offset against this some of the anticipated reimbursements under the mutual security program, other available appropriations, and the authorization granted last year only for the procurement of long-range manned aircraft for the Strategic Air Command.

I undertook to explain that. All the funds which were authorized last year and which were appropriated last year for the procurement of the wing of B-52's, the $525 million, will now be devoted for the procurement of other types of aircraft which have been approved by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In terms of authorizations available, if we go back to page 2 of the committee report, at which point there is a specification that it is a $12,969,000,000 bill, in effect what we can do is to add the additional $525 million and say that it becomes roughly a $13½ billion bill; and since the amount was not used last year, we would subtract it from what was used last year, and the authorization this year would therefore be several hundred million dollars higher than the authorization made available in 1962. Is that statement correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. At least one could add with safety $525 million to the almost $13 billion provided in the bill. In addition approximately $150 million or $200 million will come in from the mutual security program. The program is really nearer $14 billion than the almost $13 billion that would be authorized by the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have tried to establish the argument, because I wish to go into the next point, in which I think we might find ourselves involved again next year. On page 3, line 10, of the bill there is a provision to do this year with the RS-70 plane what we did last year with the B-52 and B-58 bombers.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, it is almost exactly the same thing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. An amount of $491 million would be authorized only for the production, planning, and long leadtime procurement of the RS-70 weapon system. The Senator from Georgia earlier indicated that if we did not specify the amount as available only for this purpose—if we did not have such a restriction—Congress would lose control of that money and the Department would be able to spend it in any way it might see fit.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. I am perfectly frank to tell the Senator that I do not believe the Department of Defense will spend the money on the RS-70 aircraft, and that next year I look for the Department to be back asking for authority to use the unexpended balance. They intend to spend some of the money. They have $171 million in the budget, and they may spend slightly more than that amount. But, in my opinion, they will be back asking for authority to spend the unexpended balance of that amount for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So in 1963 we would go through the same procedure as we have followed relative to 1962.

Mr. RUSSELL. Such action will keep the funds under the control of Congress. If we kept the authorization wide open, the Secretary could spend the money for anything he might wish.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to clarify a point in the committee report which seems to conflict with information I have received from the Department of Defense. On page 2, in the second paragraph, under the chart, the second sentence reads as follows:

> The executive branch had requested new obligational authority of $171 million to proceed with a limited development program on the B-70, but this amount was not subject to the authorization requirement, since it would have been applied to development, instead of procurement.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Hitch has said that the statement is not a fact, and that the Defense Department did not request additional new obligational authority of $171 million, or any other amount; that they already had it, and, in effect, the $491 million is in addition to the $180 million which they had, and it should be treated as such and understood as such by Congress. Is that statement correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not sure as to that point. I agree with the Senator that the statement in the committee report in respect to new obligational authority is imprecise usage. In its presentation to the Appropriations Committee, the Department stated that it intended to spend the $180 million this year, inasmuch as it had not expended it in the current fiscal year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the Department now has available $180 million——

Mr. RUSSELL. Plus $491 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Plus $491 million for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. I have no idea how much it will spend.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should say it will have that amount available if the bill is passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct—if the bill is passed in its present form.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe the Senator has made a series of very proper and helpful statements on the great importance of the development process and the subject of Congress very carefully approving or disapproving the development process, because we become so committed on the development process, and so many hundreds of millions or billions of dollars are involved, that it is often believed we might as well go ahead. Is that statement correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree completely with the Senator. Sometimes expenditures in the development of new weapons are almost fantastic. The amount runs into billions of dollars.

Mr. PROXMIRE. For the Senator's information, it is for that reason that, although I do not intend at this time to offer any amendments to reduce the provisions of the bill, I will probably do so when the appropriation measure comes before the Senate. But I think it would be redundant if we considered such an amendment at this time. However, for the RECORD, since I hope that we can get the best information possible in the RECORD now, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator for his comments on the remarks of the Secretary of Defense on the RS-70, because I believe they were devastating against the program, and it seems to me very devastating against the procedure of making what now appears to be approximately $670 million available for its development.

Let me read several statements. He said:

> A careful study of the earlier B-70 proposal led to the conclusion that it was really no more than a manned missile. Indeed, a book about it was published under just such a title. The old B-70 system offered none of the advantages of flexibility generally attributed to manned bombers. It could not look for new targets nor find and attack mobile targets or targets of uncertain location. It offered no option but preplanned attack against previously known targets—a mission that can be effectively performed by missiles.

I should like to ask the comment of the distinguished Senator on that quotation, in view of the fact that the statement was the basis of the objection of the Secretary of Defense against the proposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, the Senator was reading from the testimony of the Secretary of Defense before the committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe the testimony was in opposition to the mandatory provision, which would require the expenditure of more than $171 million on the B-70. The provision in the bill, of course, is a compromise, as most great issues that appeal to the emotions are compromises. Some members of the committee wanted to require such expenditures. Other members thought the Secretary had completely demolished any justification whatsoever for the B-70 and were wondering why he was agreeing to spend a large sum of money on the research and development of a plane that he had condemned with such scathing words. In effect, the provision would leave the decision up to the Department of Defense, though the Department cannot divert the funds to some other purpose.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the statement of the Senator will be very useful. I think it will be useful history for the Department to understand, because when Congress authorizes the expenditure of $491 million only for the production, planning, and long leadtime procurement for the RS-70 weapon system, it seems to me there is a clear intention that Congress wants to go ahead. I understand there is no direction to the Secretary to expend the amount. But if the Senator says that it is solely up to the Secretary of Defense, and if the Senator says that he can make the decision freely on the basis of his own judgment with respect to the moneys available, I consider this a reasonable position to take.

Mr. RUSSELL. I point out to the Senator that the identical language was used last year with respect to the $525 million for a wing of B-52 bombers. The Secretary did not buy the bombers. He did not spend one dime of the money. He is asking this year to have the money, but we are transferring it for other purposes. There is nothing in the provision that would make it mandatory for the Secretary to spend one dime more.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to go one step further. It seems to me that the Senator has said that we are affording an opportunity not only to the Secretary, but also to the Committee on Appropriations, when it takes up the measure, to consider the subject further, for they may decide on the basis of information available to them at that time not to go ahead.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing at all in the pending bill which could possibly require the Appropriations Committee to appropriate any of these funds. They will have to review the subject completely and decide what they will appropriate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let us suppose that the Secretary should decide to go ahead, but let us suppose that the Appropriations Committee previously decided not to make this money available. Is it not true that the Secretary of Defense would still be in a position, on the basis of these comments, to go ahead just as rapidly as he possibly could even if the Senate did not act until 1963 or if it acted before we adjourn in July? The Secretary took the position that this development is 2 or 3 years off, and in some cases even farther away than that. However, he is proceeding as rapidly as he possibly could if his money were unlimited.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would agree with the Senator, with one exception. I do not believe the Secretary would have any procurement authority if this review convinced him that he should reverse his position completely and push this program. I do not believe he would have any authority to launch a long leadtime procurement program if this were eliminated, and if the Appropriations Committee did not appropriate the funds.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Secretary pointed out that he would be at least 2 years away from the procurement program.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what he says. If he decided to change his position completely, I do not believe he could contract for any long leadtime procurement. This gives him the authority to do what he finally concludes is the wise thing to do with respect to this particular weapons system.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Secretary of Defense testified:

> But we are 2 or more years away from even a flight test of the reconnaissance subsystems in a form from which operational specifications can be drawn, let alone blueprints for the production of hardware.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; that is what the Secretary of Defense said, but that is under the present concept. Ways have been found to expedite these programs, although they have been extremely expensive. I do not believe he has any intention of doing it at this time, but it has been done in other cases, although it has been expensive.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not wish to delay the Senator too long. I have some questions on another phase. With the Senator's concurrence I should like to ask unanimous consent to put into the RECORD excerpts from the testimony of the Secretary of Defense, because I believe they should be made available in the RECORD at this stage of the debate so that they will be available to Senators who are interested in this subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to have them appear following my remarks. I would be glad to have them all go into the RECORD.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We have discussed several statements of the Secretary of Defense, and I have extracted most of the pertinent points from his testimony. If I could have these excerpts printed in the RECORD at this time I would not have to ask a series of questions on this subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have the Senator follow that course.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD certain remarks of the Secretary of Defense, which I have reproduced on the papers I have in my hand, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTILITY OF WEAPON AS BOMBER

1. A careful study of the earlier B–70 proposal led to the conclusion that it was really no more than a manned missile. Indeed, a book about it was published under just such a title. The old B–70 system offered none of the advantages of flexibility generally attributed to manned bombers. It could not look for new targets nor find and attack mobile targets or targets of uncertain location. It offered no option but preplanned attack against previously known targets—a mission that can be effectively performed by missiles.

2. Moreover, the B–70 had important disadvantages when compared with ballistic missiles. It would have been vulnerable on the ground to surprise missile attack. It would not have been hardened and dispersed like Minuteman, or continuously mobile and concealed like Polaris. Rather, it would have had to depend on warning and ground-alert response—a method of production far less reliable, in an era where large numbers of missiles exist, than hardening and dispersal or continuous peacetime mobility.

3. Further, the B–70 is far less suitable than the B–52 for airborne-alert measures.

4. Moreover, the B–70 was poorly designed from the point of view of penetration of enemy defenses. The B–70 would present a very large radar cross section, and the higher it flew the earlier it could be picked up by radar.

5. Furthermore, the B–70 had not been designed for the use of air-to-surface missiles such as Hound Dog or Skybolt, and therefore could not attack while standing off several hundred miles, but would actually have had to fly into the target area to drop its bombs. Finally, the B–70 would have been an extremely expensive aircraft, particularly so in relation to its capability in the straight bomber version.

AS A RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM STRIKE FORCE

1. The RS–70 would introduce, in addition, another new set of subsystems, including reconnaissance sensors, processing systems, display systems, communication systems, all requiring human interpretation and decision within very short times, and air-to-surface missiles. Many of these new subsystems, it should be recognized, have yet to be developed. Indeed, our technical review of this proposal, to date, indicates that some of the key elements may well lie beyond what can be done on the basis of present scientific knowledge.

2. At the present time we do not know how to specify a system which can gather, process, and display the data at the rates and with the resolution necessary for the RS–70 mission, which involves firing a missile from an aircraft flying at 30 miles a minute before it moves out of missile range. To achieve the capability which would be required to "recognize" or to analyze damage on some important types of targets is beyond any known technique.

We cannot state today with any assurance that satisfactory equipment to perform this processing and display function in an RS–70 can be made operational by 1970, let alone by 1967, on the basis of any known technology, or whether the human interpretation job required of the operator can ever be done.

3. The Air Force proposal would also require the development of new air-launched strike missiles. For use against hard targets, these missiles, because of their limited size and warhead yields, would have to be far more accurate than any strategic air-launched missile now in production or development.

4. Thus, it is clear that there are many very difficult technical problems yet to be solved—and, indeed, yet to be fully understood—before we can have any reasonable expectation that the reconnaissance capability required by the RS–70 can actually be developed and produced within the 1967–70 time period.

We have started work on these problems and over $50 million has been separately provided for this purpose in the 1963 budget, but we are 2 or more years away from even a flight test of the reconnaissance subsystems in a form from which the operational specifications can be drawn, let alone blueprints for the production of hardware.

5. The RS–70, as proposed by the Air Force, is also to have the capability of transmitting to home base processed radar data on important target areas. This capability, if obtainable, would be useful in retargeting followup strikes by other manned bombers or by ICBM's. However, the assured rate of transmission over intercontinental ranges in a wartime environment would be only a minute fraction of the rate at which the data are being acquired and processed by the RS–70 radar.

6. The RS–70, as proposed by the Air Force, is very far from being ready for production or even full weapon-system development. The new subsystems which could provide the RS–70 with its damage assessment capability have been started in development, but we are not sure now that we know how to develop successfully the extremely high data rate, sharp resolution radar system required. Our best estimates now are that we could not have such a system early enough to produce an operational RS–70 force capable of useful reconnaissance strike before 1970.

7. The RS–70, without these subsystems, would be nothing more than a B–70, the production of which it is now agreed would not be warranted.

8. Until we know much more about the proposed system—its technical feasibility, its military effectiveness, and its cost—we have no rational basis for committing this aircraft to weapon-system development or production.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would like to question the chairman now on another subject in which I am very much interested, and that is aircraft carrier production. I note that there is an authorization for a new aircraft carrier.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Three hundred and ten million dollars is the amount.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. It is $310 million for a new aircraft carrier. That is a conventional carrier, not a nuclear carrier.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is not a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. It is a conventional carrier.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The hearing at page 454 indicates a great deal of confusion and a difference from the facts as I understood them. Instead of the 14 attack carriers that we had in 1960, we now have 16 in the attack fleet. I am reading from near the bottom of the page, in the last four or five paragraphs. I read the appropriate statement, as follows:

> In fiscal 1962, this current year, as a result of the Berlin crisis, we went up to 16 attack carriers.

Then it goes on to state that the Navy recalled several squadrons from the Naval Reserve, and so forth.

Mr. RUSSELL. That means that they activated two carriers which previously had been in mothballs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I read further:

> As a result, our current forces require 7,672 aircraft, but now in fiscal 1963 we intend to reduce our force levels. We intend to return our recalled Reserves to inactive duty. Accordingly our requirements for operating aircraft total 7,329 operating aircraft.

Previously the testimony had shown:

> In fiscal 1961 we went up to 15 attack carriers, plus other forces, and we needed 7,300 aircraft.

I presume on the basis of the specified aircraft needs that they do not need 16 but only 15 attack aircraft carriers, and therefore they will retire one of the carriers. If the new carrier is added, they will retire two carriers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it will be 3 years before that ship is completed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. At any rate, they are in process of reducing the number of attack carriers.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had the opinion that this information was classified. However, the Senator has read it from the printed hearings, and that testimony was cleared by the Department of Defense. It was originally presented to us in classified form.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Well, the first point is that the carrier fleet is being reduced.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that means that one of the *Essex*-type carriers that was taken out of the mothball fleet will be put back in the mothball fleet.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The second point is that these carriers are primarily useful, not for all-out war, but for limited war. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is one of the most highly controversial questions that has arisen in the defense program. That is certainly the view of the Secretary of Defense. He says that they are useful only in limited war. However, there are some officers in the Navy, officers of great ability, who believe these carriers can protect themselves and that they would be useful in all-out war.

Mr. PROXMIRE. For at least many purposes in a limited war, the *Essex*-type carrier is just as useful as a *Forrestal*-type carrier. There may be advantages to a *Forrestal* carrier, but in terms of limited war, such as the situation which presented itself in 1959 in Lebanon when we used aircraft carriers—and this would be true of other countries and areas at other times—where we could use the *Essex*-type carrier, just as effectively as the new carriers. The *Essex* could be just as useful and just as impressive as the *Forrestal*-type carrier would have been.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be in a conflict of that size. However, if the trouble were larger, and there was necessity for the use of larger forces, I would think that the *Forrestal* type would be highly advantageous. However, in the type of case presented by the Senator from Wisconsin, the *Essex*-type carrier would be adequate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In a much larger kind of operation we are certain to be escalated into nuclear war, in which case the judgment of the Secretary of Defense is that the aircraft carrier's usefulness would be questionable.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Secretary of Defense is of the opinion that the carrier's principal value is in limited war, to provide air cover to ground forces that are carrying out a mission necessary to our own national security or to live up to some commitments that we have made in the many treaties we have entered into all over the world.

I must repeat that there are officers in the Navy who believe that the carrier has a very vital role in all-out nuclear war. They see it as a movable airfield. They feel that the enemy knows where every base we have in the world is located, and can drop a nuclear warhead on it. However, the carrier as a mobile base can move around, and these officers believe that it has great value in a strategic war.

However, that is a question on which I have had difficulty making up my own mind, much less deciding it as a matter of law. I have gone on the theory, in order to be prepared for any eventuality we could afford to take the risk, as expensive as these ships are, of continuing to build some of these carriers. Some of our carriers at the present time are almost 20 years old, and they have seen some hard usage.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to refer very briefly to the position which Admiral Burke took when he was Chief of Naval Operations. He felt that the aircraft carrier force, with its medium-range bombers equipped with atomic weapons—and the 6th Fleet is carrying such aircraft and such weapons in the Mediterranean—would be a particularly effective force if we were involved in an all-out war. I have had occasions to visit the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean.

I think he testified to that effect before our committee several years ago. Does the Senator from Georgia recall that?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes. All carriers have planes capable of carrying nuclear bombs a considerable distance.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that. Is it not also true that a carrier is about the size of three football fields end to end while a missile is about the size of a typewriter? It may soon be possible to knock missiles down when they are moving at 17,500 miles an hour. On the other hand, a carrier is more than a thousand feet long and travels 30 knots or 33 miles per hour. It seems to me a carrier would make a very inviting, remarkably easy target, as compared with almost anything else.

Mr. RUSSELL. The prevailing opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense seems to be that a carrier is primarily useful for limited war. But I must say there are those who occupy positions of responsibility in the Department of Defense who wholly disagree with the viewpoint that a carrier has only limited value.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I notice that at page 477 of the hearings it is said that the sustained speed of this carrier is figured as shockingly slow—30 knots. It is said that it might get up to 34 knots under pressure for short periods of time. But 30 knots seems like a slow speed as compared with the speed of the very newest nuclear-powered carrier, the *Enterprise*, which I have heard is 40 knots.

Mr. RUSSELL. I feel certain the Senator is in error about that. The speed of the nuclear carrier for a sustained period is somewhat greater than the speed of conventional carriers, but it is nothing like 40 knots.

Mr. PROXMIRE. At any rate, this is a 30-knot carrier.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has referred to the gigantic size of the vessels. They are of such tremendous size that they cannot go through the Panama Canal. It takes enormous power, enough to furnish the electricity for some of the largest cities in the country, to propel such a ship at 30 knots. It is a tremendous ship to be propelled at 30 knots. But it is mobile. At 30 knots, it can, within a few minutes, be out of the range of an intercontinental missile or a ballistic missile. However, in my opinion, such ships are targets for submarines.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is another difficulty with the carrier. I notice from the hearings that Admiral Moore does not discuss the carrier directly, but he discusses the frigate, and points out that one of the difficulties with this particular frigate—the DLG—is its refueling problem. He calls it a salient disadvantage. As the Senator from Georgia pointed out so well in the hearings, the conventionally powered aircraft carrier of the kind for which we are asked to authorize $310 million this afternoon uses five times the amount of fuel which is needed by the DLG frigate. But if refueling is a salient disadvantage for the frigate, certainly it is a salient disadvantage for the aircraft carrier.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin; I do not agree with Admiral Moore, as the hearings will show. In other words, I have not believed that when we get away from the submarine class with the tremendous extra cost of nuclear-powered ships is justified as compared with conventionally powered ships. It is simply that the submarine is able to make much greater speed underwater, and can remain underwater indefinitely.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand. A nuclear-powered aircraft carrier does not have to be refueled so often. As a matter of strategy, it has a great advantage over the conventionally fueled aircraft carrier, which we are now being asked to authorize and which is confronted with an extremely difficult refueling problem. Is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true; but they carry enormous quantities of fuel. I have forgotten the exact amount of fuel they can carry; but it is an enormous amount. I believe carriers can be refueled while they are at sea; in fact, I am certain they can be. They do not have to stop. A tanker can run alongside the carrier and refuel it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I so understand. That can also be done with a frigate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am also very much disturbed about the cost; $310 million is a fantastic amount of money, particularly in view of the fact that, as I understand, this amount does not include the cost of weaponry or airplanes, which is in addition.

Mr. RUSSELL. A carrier that is fully equipped, down to the last detail—weapons, aircraft, and protective forces—costs more than $1 billion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. More than $1 billion?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. To compare that cost with the cost of a few other programs, the appropriation for area redevelopment, for all of last year for the whole country was $44 million; Urban Renewal, $211 million; housing for the elderly, $100 million; National Institutes of Health, the total spending for research into cancer, heart disease, mental health, and so forth, $420 million.

This is not to mention some of the subsidiary military weapons, such as the M-14 rifles, which cost $68.75 to $114 apiece. We could procure from three to five million of them for the $300 million cost of a carrier. Five nuclear powered submarines cost the same as one aircraft carrier.

The information I have received—and I am sure the Senator from Georgia is a far better authority on this subject and on all other defense matters than I am—is that the appropriation has not been increased for the M-14 rifles. Complaints have been received from the Chief of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Army, that the Army is not getting the rifles in the numbers needed because funds have not been adequate to provide enough. I know from my own personal experience that at Fort Lewis our Wisconsin 32d National Guard is very short of M-14 rifles.

Mr. RUSSELL. There has been a lag in the equipping of the infantry and Marine Corps with M-14 rifles. Progress is being made in that direction. I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator from Wisconsin. There is no bargain counter for weapons, when it comes to today's complicated, complex system and the entirely new problems with which we are confronted in the waging of war. It so happens that there are several weapons systems today on which we are spending enormous sums, although we do not know whether they will have any great value in the event of war. But we cannot afford not to build them, because it might turn out that they will be of great value. There is no bargain counter for security today. I think the Senator will agree that the Military Establishment of this country today has been worth its cost considering what we seek to preserve.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator from Georgia. We cannot put a price on freedom; we cannot put a price on independence. If we cannot defend ourselves, then what we have in the country today is worthless.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was about to say that if we could not defend ourselves, we would lose our liberties and be overrun by the Soviets. We would not have urban renewal programs and projects of that kind. We would all be slaves, chained to the wheel of state, and the whole world would be plunged into darkness.

I agree with the Senator that there is great waste in the program, too. There is something about preparing for destruction that causes men to be more careless in spending money than they would be if they were building for constructive purposes. Why that is, I do not know; but I have observed, over a period of almost 30 years in the Senate, that there is something about buying arms with which to kill, to destroy, to wipe out cities, and to obliterate great transportation systems which causes men not to reckon the dollar cost as close as they do when they think about proper housing and the care of the health of human beings.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What the Senator has said is absolutely correct. We shall have to make these decisions. The Chief of the Air Force, the Chief of the Army, the Chief of the Navy can come to Congress and make fantastic requests for money. We must make the judgment. We can always say, as to any request, that the price of defense is high, and justify any expenditure on that basis. That is the easy way. But we must make these hard judgments. That is why I think the case which can be made against the aircraft carrier should be made and should be considered. Senators should stand ready, if they are convinced that there are better ways to spend the money, at least on defense, to delete the aircraft carrier, and not spend the money for it.

What disturbs me most is that the able Committee on Armed Services—and I do not think there is any more expert or, as other Senators have said, more responsible or more burdened committee than the Committee on Armed Services—in the table contained in its report shows that the amount requested for aircraft for the Army is $218,500,000; no change. The Committee on Armed Services apparently has left the amount just as it is, so far as H.R. 9751 is concerned.

For the Navy and Marine Corps, the amount requested for aircraft is $2,134,600,000; no change.

For the Air Force, the amount requested is $3,626 million, the increase of $491 million which I have discussed.

For missiles, the amount requested by the Army is $558,300,000; for the Navy, $930,400,000; for the Marine Corps, $22,300,000; for the Air Force, $2,500 million. There is not 1 cent of change by the Senate committee in any of those items.

Mr. RUSSELL. I point out that the Senate committee has reduced the amount as it came to us from the other body by nearly $100 million. We did not reduce it below the amounts recommended by the Secretary of Defense. We added to them when we included the $491 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What was that reduction?

Mr. RUSSELL. Army aircraft and missiles and a slight reduction in Air Force missiles.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So what actually happened was that the Senate Armed Services Committee voted to eliminate the increases the House voted in connection with the requests of the Department of Defense?

Mr. RUSSELL. Those over and above what the Department had requested.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the Senate committee accepted the request of the Secretary of Defense, in one type of weapon after another verbatim, did it?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I realize that it is difficult to expect any Senator to vote for a reduction in defense spending against the opinion of the Secretary of Defense——

Mr. RUSSELL. The action we take here is not the final action on this matter.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the experience last year and the year before is that we go ahead——

Mr. RUSSELL. We could include limitations, so as to prevent the Appropriations Committee from voting in favor of providing appropriations for the full requests made by the Secretary of Defense. But we know that the President reduced by approximately $3 billion the requests made by the Department of Defense, before they were sent to the Bureau of the Budget; and in the Bureau of the Budget, further reductions were made.

Of course any Senator has a right to propose to strike out any item of the bill. However, without these authorization items, the Appropriations Committees could not even consider the full amounts of the President's appropriation requests.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand. But of course in the past the Appropriations Committees have virtually accepted intact the full requests made by the Department of Defense.

Of course I admire very greatly the Senator from Georgia as one of the outstanding Members of the Senate; but certainly we must demonstrate a willingness to consider the making of such changes. If we do not demonstrate that, then it would seem that we have no alternative but to accept the Department's requests; and, in that event, no reductions in the Department's requests ever would be made.

Certainly we recognize that the Secretary of Defense has very great ability; but I think the outstanding service which Congress performs is, in many respects, in sifting and winnowing the departmental requests—in which process the Members of Congress use their own intelligence and their own sense of responsibility, however painful that may be.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the Senator. But I am frank to say that the errors I may make in connection with this matter will be made on the side of providing too much, rather than too little. When it comes to the question of providing arms, weapons, and men to assure the security of these United States—and that means the security of the entire free world, because the United States is the main prop, militarily, of the free world—if I made a mistake, I will make it on the side of extravagance and on the side of spending and providing too much, rather than on the side of spending or providing too little. I hope we shall never need any of these weapons; but I prefer to have them available, and not be needed, rather than to need them, and not to have them available, and not be needed, rather than available. If we ever needed them, but did not have them available, that would mean that the American way of life, as we have known it, would be gone.

But I agree that any Senator who believes this program is wrong in any detail, and who believes either that it provides too much—in which case he should move to reduce it—or believes we are placing the emphasis on the wrong spot, and believes that a transfer to another item should be made, should rise on the floor of the Senate and so state. Certainly I have never criticized any Senator for doing so.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I realize that. But I remember that last year, when I offered an amendment which had the support of the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense, and seemed to have a great deal of merit, on the basis of a letter the Secretary of Defense wrote, when the amendment was voted on by the Senate, it was rejected; the vote was 4 in favor of the amendment and 84 opposed to it. That shows the kind of realistic opportunity any Member of the Senate or any Member of the House has to exercise effective discrimination or judgment as regards accepting approximately 55 percent of our whole Federal budget, which defense spending represents.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was one of the Senators who opposed that amendment, and our side won in the Senate. However, the Senator from Wisconsin can correctly say that we then gained a Pyrrhic victory, because although the Senate defeated the amendment, in the long run the President and the Secretary of Defense did not spend the money, anyway. So in that way the Senator from Wisconsin gained his point.

However, I believe that the President and the Secretary of Defense were wrong; and I would feel much better if the B-52's were rolling off the assembly lines right now. I hope that time and events will prove that I was completely in error. However, as I have said, I prefer to provide too much, rather than too little.

But the Senator from Wisconsin won his fight in that way, even though in the Senate there were only four votes in favor of his amendment, because the overwhelming majority of votes in the Senate and in the House of Representatives were overruled in that way by the Secretary of Defense.

In that process we see in operation the system of checks and balances which makes our Government the greatest on earth.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is exactly the point we won when the Secretary agreed with us. If he disagreed on spending there would be no chance. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his great patience in replying to my questions.

I wish to say that although I am not offering any amendments at this time, I probably shall offer an amendment to reduce the amounts to those requested by the administration for the RS-70 program, when the appropriation bill comes before the Senate, and to eliminate the aircraft carrier. But I shall not offer such an amendment now, because then I would virtually repeat the process when the appropriation bill did come before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have listened, with much interest to the debate regarding the aircraft program and the programs for other implements of war for the Department of Defense.

I should like to ask whether the official spokesmen for the Department of Defense recommend the authorization of funds with which to construct another aircraft carrier.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, both the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy testified in favor of providing funds for an additional aircraft carrier. They pointed out that many of our carriers now in use are almost 20 years of age.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Wisconsin indicated, a while ago, that he was very eager to follow the recommendations of the Defense Department in regard to the B-70 bomber program. If he follows the same procedure, will not he now support the proposal for the appropriation of funds with which to construct an additional aircraft carrier?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will yield to me at this time——

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say that I followed the view of the Secretary of Defense in that instance, because of the very cogent basis of his reasoning. But I will never surrender the responsibility to use my own judgment; and I happen to think that the Secretary of Defense is wrong in his recommendation in regard to aircraft carriers, and that he is right in his recommendation in regard to the RS-70 program. That is why I take this position.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is also a very able member of the Appropriations Subcommittee which handles the appropriations for the Department of Defense. Is it not true that after holding many weeks of hearings on the various items for the Department of Defense requested by the Budget Bureau and the President, close scrutiny is given to every request made, a balance is struck as between the desirability of the several categories, and there is no inclination whatever on the part of the members of that Appropriations Subcommittee to follow blindly the Bureau of the Budget requests; but, instead, the committee members use their collective judgment in trying to allocate in the most effective manner the ceiling this year of approximately $50 billion?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly that is true; and it is manifest from the fact that last year, although we made some minor reductions in the budget, we added $525 million for a new wing of B-52's, which was not included in the requests.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What happened to that new wing?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I pointed out a moment ago, the President and the Secretary of Defense did not agree with the majority of the Congress; and the President and the Secretary of Defense closed down the assembly line, and the result is that soon we shall be out of production in this country of manned long-range bombers.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I also want to commend the distinguished chairman of the committee, who, as I have already said, is also a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee which handles the Defense budget, because of his long experience in the Senate in dealing with the very complex problems of national defense. He has rendered over the years outstanding service to his Nation. It has been my privilege to observe his work. He has been independent and courageous in doing those specific things which he considers vital to the Defense Department and to our national survival.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am deeply appreciative to the distinguished Senator for that compliment.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE B-70

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, in the past I have made a number of statements on the floor of the Senate urging the development of the B-70 as a complete weapons system. My colleagues are familiar with the arguments I have advanced to support my contention and I will not repeat them at this time.

Today the B-70 is known as the RS-70, and I am as strongly convinced as ever of the need to accelerate its development. I am happy that the House and Senate Armed Services Committees feel the same way.

I hope that the Senate will act favorably on the authorization of funds recommended by the House and Senate committees for this program. I hope also that the Secretary of Defense will lose no time in carrying out his promise to take another look at the program and to give full consideration not only to the size of the program recommended by the committees but the depth of the committees' conviction in approving the program.

It is in the interest of our country's security that we get moving as fast as possible on the RS-70.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 9751) was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF CHARLES EVANS HUGHES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that today is the 100th anniversary of the birth of Charles Evans Hughes.

In a most eloquent editorial today, the Washington Post and Times Herald cites the extraordinary achievements of this very gifted and important New Yorker.

Mr. President, I think we should all express gratitude and satisfaction that this is an American who, in the middle 1930's, held evenly the scales of justice and fought the "packing" of the Supreme Court in a very adroit way—and yet in a way completely compatible with his judicial duties. I think those who believe in the rule of law must be ever grateful to Charles Evans Hughes for this as well as other historic services.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUGHES CENTENNIAL

Today is the centennial of one of the best known figures among the great men who have presided over the Supreme Court. At the time of his birth in Glens Falls, N.Y., on April 11, 1862, the only son of a humble Baptist minister, Charles Evans Hughes would scarcely have been singled out as a prospect for an eminent place in the legal history of the country. As a young man, however, he found a consuming interest in the law, and that interest seemed to propel him into public life. His first momentous undertaking was the investigation of the life insurance business in New York; then he was twice elected Governor of New York State, appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States, nominated for the Presidency in 1916 against his wishes, defeated in a close race by Woodrow Wilson, gave up a lucrative practice of law in 1921 to become Secretary of State, served briefly as a member of the World Court and finally became Chief Justice of the United States at the age of 67.

Despite the wide range of his public service, Mr. Hughes' name is most prominently associated, on this centennial occasion, with his contributions to constitutional law upholding civil liberties and with his piloting of the Supreme Court through its darkest days of this century. No doubt the opinions of the Chief Justice in the New Deal cases of 1935-37, and his leadership of the Court through the difficult period when President Franklin D. Roosevelt sought to pack it, will always remain subjects of controversy. Nevertheless, the country will always remain grateful that, through the power of public opinion, the independence of the Senate and the skill of Chief Justice Hughes, the ignominy of court packing was avoided.

Mr. Hughes' steersmanship through this turbulent era compares most favorably with the conduct of his predecessors in previous crises. When the Supreme Court was under heavy pressure from the Jefferson administration, during the attempt to impeach Justice Chase, Chief Justice Marshall retreated to the extent of suggesting that Congress reverse decisions of the Court which it deemed unsound. In the Court's Civil War crisis, Chief Justice Taney allowed it to slip into open feuding with the Lincoln administration. Hughes avoided both these unfortunate precedents by maintaining a judicial attitude and by resisting both the extreme standpatism of the conservative wing of the Court and the more vulnerable of the New Deal recovery measures.

While controversy continues over specific decisions and over the precise role that Mr. Hughes played, the sweep of judicial history has confirmed the wisdom of his concept of a "marching Constitution" and appreciation for his skill in presiding over a court of nine eminent and independent-minded jurists has constantly grown. Whatever his mistakes of judgment, they were conscientiously made after soul-searching diligence. And if his concept of a "marching Constitution" did not always keep pace with the temper of the country, it helped to restrain some excesses, such as the NRA, that were incompatible with our system of limited government.

On the basis of his whole career, Charles Evans Hughes earned the lasting gratitude of a free people. His centennial is an occasion on which the country may well express appreciation for the strength of its judicial institutions.

THE ARAB-ISRAEL ISSUE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a strong editorial published in the New York Times of today entitled "Evading the Arab-Israel Issue," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVADING THE ARAB-ISRAEL ISSUE

In one of those actions that feed criticism of the United Nations, the Security Council has meted out something less than evenhanded justice in the Syrian-Israeli dispute.

The Council was right and bound by the precedent of its 1956 resolution to condemn Israel's latest escalation of a border incident into a major military action as a "flagrant violation" of the armistice agreement. It was equally right in calling on both Syria and Israel to comply with the armistice agreement and the United Nations Charter, in moving to strengthen the truce supervisory machinery and in requesting both sides to cooperate with it in maintaining peace.

But the council fell short of both impartiality and its own principles in two respects. It failed to condemn Syria for provocations which, according to the American delegate, included artillery fire that raised the Syrian action above a minor incident. Furthermore, and more important, it failed even to take cognizance of the basic cause of these recurrent incidents. This cause is the lack of an Arab-Israel peace settlement. The absence of such a settlement has put Israel under a blockade and constant threats of extermination that explain if they do not excuse, Israel's overaggressive reactions.

The Council's resolution can only encourage Syria and other Arab States to continue to harass Israel and to prevent its development through irrigation projects in which Israel's neighbors refuse to join, even for their own benefit. It is the first duty of the United Nations to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace. Neither Arab bellicosity nor Israeli reluctance to discuss concessions should keep the U.N. from fulfilling this task.

Mr. JAVITS. On tomorrow, if our work permits, I hope to undertake some debate upon U.S. policy in the Israel-Syrian dispute which was passed upon by the U.N. Security Council with a resolution, which I think is ill-advised in terms of American foreign policy as referred to in the editorial.

ANGOSTURA UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, because of a time limitation, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 2522.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2522) to defer the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "charges", to strike out "for the calendar year 1962 against the lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project, until the termination of the contract providing for the repayment of such charges" and insert "due in the calendar year 1962 as shown in the March 14, 1961, notice of 1962 water charges to the Angostura Irrrigation District: *Provided*, That the Secretary and the district enter into a contract prior to May 1, 1962, for the payment by the district of such deferred charges during the forty-year period commencing January 1, 1966."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to defer, without interest, the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges due in the calendar year 1962 as shown in the March 14, 1961, notice of 1962 water charges to the Angostura Irrigation District: *Provided*, That the Secretary and the district enter into a contract prior to May 1, 1962, for the payment by the district of such deferred charges during the forty-year period commencing January 1, 1966.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point excerpts from the report of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, showing the purposes of the bill, and its endorsement by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of the Budget, with the amendment.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT

The committee adopted the amendment recommended by the Department of the Interior to clarify the intent of S. 2522 and to provide repayment flexibility by making it possible to spread the deferred charges over the entire 40-year repayment period at the rate of $0.086 per acre annually.

PURPOSE

This bill would authorize the Department of the Interior to defer the collection of operation and maintenance charges due in 1962 from the Angostura Irrigation District. An extended drought has caused a critical water shortage with resultant decreases in crop production. Records indicate that the annual runoff within the basin has been decreasing for the past 3 years. In 1959 it was 42 percent of normal. In 1960 it was 29 percent while in 1961 only 25 percent of the annual average. Because of the shortage much of the land was not irrigated with low yields on the balance. Many of the district water users have loans on land, improvements, and equipment. As a result of a situation over which they had no control many of the landowners are in a critical financial condition and are unable to meet the 1962 charges now due.

The committee feels that temporary relief is urgently needed and justified under the circumstances.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS

The report of the Department of the Interior recommends enactment of S. 2522 if it is amended. The amendment by the Department was adopted by the committee. The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the enactment of S. 2522 if the amendment recommended by the Department of the Interior is adopted. The reports follow:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1962.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: This responds to your request for the views of this Department on S. 2522, a bill to defer the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project.

We recommend enactment of this bill if it is amended as suggested hereinafter.

Enactment of this legislation would authorize the Department to defer the collection of $42,000 of operation and maintenance charges due in 1962 from the Angostura Irrigation District. Such action is needed because an extended drought period has caused a critical water shortage with resultant decreases in crop production. According to the notice issued to the irrigation district on March 14, 1961, pursuant to the water service and repayment contract between the district and the United States, the 1962 charges are payable on or before April 15, 1962.

Irrigation facilities to serve substantially all of the 12,135 acres of irrigable land in the Angostura Irrigation District were completed in time to announce the beginning of the 10-year development period on January 1, 1956. The 40-year period for repayment of construction costs will commence in 1966 upon completion of the development period. The existing water service and repayment contract, executed May 29, 1951, requires the payment of all costs of operation and maintenance during the development period. While the cost of operating the distribution system in 1962 could be spread over the 3 remaining years of the development period, this procedure would increase the annual per acre payments to at least as much as those in the repayment period beginning in 1966. In effect, this would reduce the development period by 3 years.

Records for the drainage area of Angostura Reservoir show that during 1959 the amount of runoff was about 42 percent of the annual average for the period 1950 through 1960. In 1960, the runoff amounted to 29 percent of the average for the same period; and in the first 8 months of 1961 the runoff was only 25 percent of the average for the same months of the preceding 11 years. Consequently, carryover storage in the reservoir was not sufficient to meet normal irrigation requirements in 1960 and 1961, and is severely short of meeting 1962 crop needs.

Annual runoff from the Cheyenne River watershed above Angostura Reservoir and annual precipitation measured at Angostura Dam have varied since 1956 as follows:

Year	Runoff (acre-feet)	Precipitation (inches)
1956	51,680	13.43
1957	140,556	21.00
1958	102,829	13.59
1959	34,562	14.43
1960	24,010	8.12
1961	[1] 19,603	[2] 9.72

[1] Runoff from Oct. 1, 1960, through Aug. 20, 1961.
[2] Precipitation from Jan. 1 to Sept. 1.

Approximately 33,000 acre-feet of water delivered to farm turnouts are necessary to meet normal yearly irrigation requirements. This means that about 54,000 acre-feet of water must be available for diversions since the supply and delivery systems operate at an efficiency of only 60 percent. The necessary amount of water was available to project lands through the year 1959. By 1960, water supplies were so short that only 16,000 acre-feet were available to farm turnouts. In 1961, an estimated 6,400 acre-feet were delivered to farms. The extended drought has, therefore, so reduced the volume of water in the reservoir that carryover storage has been insufficient to meet irrigation requirements.

Careful and painstaking water management in 1960 enabled the water users to produce good crops on most of their land. Pastures and some hay land were neglected in order to use the available water on sugarbeets and corn. These practices seriously depleted soil moisture reserves and water has not become available to replenish them. In 1961, with natural precipitation at 80 percent of average and only 20 percent of the required irrigation water available, the acreage irrigated was reduced substantially. Many of the crops which were planted suffered badly due to a lack of moisture.

Many of the district water users have loans on land, improvements, and equipment. They have other loans to pay seasonal operating expenses. With failing crops, these landowners are in critical financial circumstances, and most of them will be unable to meet the 1962 charges required by existing contractual arrangements. We believe that relief from these payments is fully merited and sorely needed.

Our conclusion is that hardship conditions exist on the project. The Bureau of Reclamation has been doing everything possible to improve the critically short water supply. A substantial canal and lateral lining program is underway and will result in a significant saving of water currently being lost. In addition, preliminary studies show that limited amounts of water could be diverted from Fall River into Angostura Reservoir. These procedures will improve conditions but they cannot be fully accomplished for some time. Some benefits, however, should occur in 1963. Meanwhile, the water users urgently need the temporary relief which the proposed bill will provide.

To clarify the intent of S. 2522, we recommend that all of the language in the bill following the word "charges" on line 5 be stricken, and that there be inserted the following: "due in the calendar year 1962 as shown in the March 14, 1961, notice of 1962 water charges to the Angostura Irrigation district, provided that the Secretary and the district enter into a contract prior to May 1, 1962, for the payment by the district of such deferred charges during the forty- (40-) year period commencing January 1, 1966."

This procedure would provide flexibility by making it possible to spread the deferred charges over the entire 40-year repayment period at the rate of $0.086 per acre annually.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH HOLUM,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1962.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letters of August 25, 1961, and September 12, 1961, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 2462 and S. 2522, respectively, bills to defer the collection of irrigation, maintenance, and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project. We were informally advised by committee staff that S. 2522 supersedes S. 2462 and are, therefore, providing our views on S. 2522 only.

The purpose of the bill is clearly stated in its title.

The Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U.S.C. 485) requires that operation and maintenance costs be paid annually by the water users in advance of water delivery. The Department of the Interior, in a report being submitted to your committee on S. 2522, indicates that there are extenuating circumstances that appear to justify an exception in this case to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. The Department of the Interior, in its report, recommends enactment of S. 2522 if amended in certain respects.

On the basis of the information provided in the Interior report to your committee, the Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to enactment of S. 2522 if amended as recommended by the Department of the Interior.

Sincerely yours,
PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2522) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

STEEL PRICE INCREASE

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I shall be brief.

The action of United States Steel Corp. in raising steel prices $6 a ton is contrary to the public interest. It is inflationary. It is an affront to the President. It is an irritant to labor. It is economic arrogance. It is an additional burden on the consumer, and it can, and most likely will, set in motion a round of wage and price increases throughout vast areas of American industry.

Finally, it seriously weakens American capacity to compete in foreign markets. In the face of repeated statements by leaders of the steel industry that "we are pricing ourselves out of the world market," the United States Steel Corp. raises prices and admittedly weakens its competitive position in the international market.

Now, I understand, other steel companies are doing the same.

The action of United States Steel stands in sharp contrast to the self-restraint and responsibility of the United Steelworkers in their recent negotiations. The steelworkers heeded the call and the plea of the President to hold the line. The ink is scarcely dry on the contract between the companies and the union, when, with no advance notice to Government, public or labor, United States Steel raises its prices.

I noted that the New York Times of this morning indicated some of the attitude which existed in the steel industry. A statement was published to the effect that the steel executives were jubilant over the action taken last evening.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, the articles from the New York Times of April 11 may be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, the contract entered into between United States Steel Corp., and the United Steelworkers of America this past Friday gave our Government and all other objective observers confidence that steel prices would remain steady. The increased labor costs—as a result of the new agreement—do not exceed the 2½ to 3 percent increase in productivity in the industry. Production per man-hour will continue to increase at a rate adequate to cover the added labor costs. These are the cold, hard facts.

The nationwide concern over the inflationary effects of United States Steel Corp.'s price increases is shared by the United Steelworkers of America. I read the statement of David J. McDonald, the highly respected and responsible head of that great labor organization:

> I am surprised, troubled, and concerned by the announcement of United States Steel that steel prices are being increased by $6 per ton.
>
> The Steelworkers Union has never bargained with the steel companies about prices—and it would not do so this year—the decision of United States Steel is its own—not ours. We had no understanding or no discussion with the company on prices—I was surprised by the announcement, nevertheless, because the fact is that as the President of the United States has said, our settlement was entirely noninflationary and well within the current increases in steel productivity.
>
> I am troubled by United States Steel's attempt to place the blame for this price increase upon the settlements which have been made in the past by United Steelworkers. The fact is that since 1958, the date of the industries' last increase, the labor cost of producing a ton of steel has gone down, not up, despite the increases in wages and other benefits which have been negotiated in that period. I am concerned by the announcement because of the possible effect of the price increase on the Nation's economy and the Nation's position in the world.
>
> I remain pleased with our new labor agreement, nevertheless, and congratulate all those who helped bring it about.

I understand that Bethlehem Steel Corp. announced this noon that it, too, is increasing its prices. That action is most unfortunate.

It had been hoped—and I still hope—that one of the steel companies will hold the line. It is difficult to understand how the Bethlehem Steel Corp. could take this action in view of the statement only yesterday by the president of the company, Mr. Edmund F. Martin, as reported in today's issue of the New York Times. That statement was to the effect that there should not be any price rise even after the new labor contract goes into effect on July 1. Mr. Martin said:

> We should not do anything to increase our costs if we are to survive. We have more competition both domestically and from foreign firms. And we need to sell more steel.

The price rise flies squarely in the face of that statement. The price increase will make it ever more difficult for U.S. steel firms to compete in the highly competitive international markets, such as the Common Market of Western Europe, the Japanese steel market, and, indeed, the Sino-Soviet bloc market.

In view of Mr. Martin's remarks it would be interesting to know why Bethlehem has now decided to boost its prices too. Why did it switch signals? Is United States Steel's power so great in the industry that it can, in effect, dictate terms to its competitors? I am convinced that a thorough investigation of the price mechanisms in the steel industry is in order—both by the executive and legislative branches of our Government. I do hope and suggest that the two branches of our Government arrive at a common policy and agreed to upon procedure for any such inquiry. It would be well to have immediate consultation between the White House and the Congress.

The story in the New York Times fortifies what I said a moment ago about the competitive position of American steel in the world markets. The price increase will weaken America's economic position abroad. I repeat that the action of the steel companies does a disservice to our Nation. It does a disservice to our economy, and the effect of the steel price rise will be reflected in the price of automobiles and refrigerators, building construction, and durable goods.

Moreover, the increase will be reflected in the defense budget of our Nation. A few moments ago there occurred the third reading of a bill that would authorize the procurement of billions of dollars worth of military hardware. The $6 a ton increase in the price of steel will mean that the procurement of the planes, missiles, and naval ships that is to be authorized by the proposed legislation will be cut back. It will have the effect of unilateral disarmament by the steel industry. The taxpayer and the Nation are being hurt.

We were about to authorize—and we shall today authorize—the expenditure of many billions of dollars in military hardware based upon prices that were supposed to remain stable and steady. Today those prices go up. Therefore, authorization of today will not provide the number of planes, missiles, rockets, submarines, aircraft carriers, and the other items of military hardware that we had been contemplating. In other words, we have already taken a cut in the measure that was brought here by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], not by an action of the Congress, but by the action of some powerful corporations of our country.

I recognize that a corporation has a right to set the price of its commodity. But I also recognize that these same companies have a responsibility to enter into open competition. I am amazed to find that one company could announce only yesterday that it wants no rise in the steel price—that a rise in the steel price would be unnecessary, undesirable, and injurious to our Nation in the world markets—and only 24 hours later, after the United States Steel Corp. announces an increase of $6 per ton in the price of steel, that company—one of the so-called competitive companies—automatically announces another $6 increase.

Mr. **McGEE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. I yield.

Mr. **McGEE**. It is not unusual, is it, that the satellites of the Kremlin sometimes find themselves reversed overnight without any fair warning? Would the Senator from Minnesota see any parallels in this circumstance?

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. I do not want to do a disservice to any of our private companies. I wish only to say that it is very disturbing to the Senator from Minnesota to see companies that say they represent free and competitive enterprise follow the leader like sheep.

I appeal to one of the steel companies to demonstrate its independence and its concern for the well-being of our Nation by maintaining the old price. It was quite obvious that only yesterday one of the larger companies thought it was not necessary to increase the price. But the price was increased as soon as the steel companies had arrived at an agreement with the union and representatives of every local union had affixed their signatures, then, though there have been hearings on the tax bill, without warning to the Congress, the President, or anyone else, and without even any public discussion or, as far as that is concerned, any private discussion, the price was increased.

A few days ago I sat in my office with representatives of the largest steel corporation in the United States—the United States Steel Corp. There was no indication of the action announced today as we discussed the possibility of investment in large taconite plants in northern Minnesota, and in iron ore reducing plants.

The President of the United States had indicated to the American people—and he had a right to do so—that the recent agreement was noninflationary. If it was noninflationary, there was no reason for anyone to anticipate a price increase.

Mr. McGEE. Does not the assistant majority leader agree that the tasks of Senators on both sides of the aisle are really complicated when we are upbraided for Government's concern with relation to the operations of business?

Again and again we are told that business can regulate itself and that business has a new social responsibility. Then we are confronted with a development, without warning, of the magnitude of an increase in the price of steel of $6 per ton. We are rolled back, heaven knows how far, in our attempts to keep the self-regulatory strength of our private interprise system operating successfully in our country. It seems to me that United States Steel has done a disservice to the private enterprise economy of America in acting in the way it has, at a time when every effort is being made from the business consumer's and Government point of view to arrive at a stabilization of our economy.

I wish to join those who have expressed their dismay. If there is a strong four-syllable word to describe our being fed up with this kind of condition, it can be inserted at this point in the Record. It seems to me that if we are to make the system work, we must have from business itself a willingness to keep an obligation and a responsibility with respect to price holding and price stabilizing in our economy. The steel companies have failed us in that regard at this time. I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. My thoughts were expressed by the Senator from Minnesota in words that I should like to have used.

This morning's newspaper stated that the wage increase amounted to 2½ percent and the price increase amounted to 3½ percent. That would imply that every time the steel companies pay extra wages, they make more profits. We know that that will not be the case in the long run because of the law of diminishing returns.

I wish to agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] in his statement that this is a damaging blow to the free economy system. I think it is irresponsibility run wild. It is true that these corporations have an obligation to their stockholders, but they have an even greater and deeper obligation to the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HART. Those of us who have had the privilege of knowing the President of the United States during his period of service in the Senate know him to be a man of temperate judgment, discipline, and restraint, a man of eloquence and great courage.

I ask unanimous consent that the ticker tape summary of the President's statement on this subject at his press conference today, which has come over the news wires, be made a part of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington.—President Kennedy said today the steel price increase announced by major producers was "wholly unjustifiable" and "irresponsible defiance" of the Nation's interests.

Kennedy denounced price rises by United States Steel Corp. and the other firms at the opening of his televised news conference. He called attention to the fact that the price increases were "simultaneous and identical."

The Chief Executive appeared to be in a grim mood as he read his statement to newsmen. Speaking in deliberate, stern tones, he charged that "a tiny handful of steel executives" had acted "in pursuit of private power and profit" and had shown "utter contempt for the interests of 185 million other Americans."

He said they had done this at a time when the American people were being asked for "restraint and sacrifice."

The President said the steel price rise came in a "serious time in the Nation's history" when the United States faces "grave crises in Berlin and southeast Asia" and also is seeking recovery from economic instability.

He also said it came at a time when "we are asking reservists to leave their homes and families" and when "servicemen are risking their lives." He said that four Americans had been killed in the last 2 days in South Vietnam.

Kennedy said that if the steel price increase is "imitated by the industry instead of being rescinded," it would increase the cost of homes, automobiles, appliances, and other goods for every American family.

He said it also would increase the cost of machinery and tools for businessmen and farmers, would "handicap our efforts to prevent an inflationary spiral," and would "make it more difficult for American goods to compete in foreign markets."

Moreover, he said, Defense Secretary McNamara had informed him today the steel price rise would "add $1 billion to the cost of our defenses at a time when every dollar is needed for national security."

Within less than 24 hours after United States Steel Corp., the Nation's largest producer, announced a $6-a-ton increase, the other major firms followed suit. Bethlehem Steel, the No. 2 producer, was the first to fall in line. Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. and Republic Steel Corp. were next.

The President said that price and wage decisions in this country were made freely by the parties involved.

But, he added, the American people have a right to expect a higher sense of business responsibility for the Nation's welfare than some of the steel firms have displayed.

He recalled that he had told the Nation not to ask what its Government could do for it but rather how it could assist the national welfare.

"I asked the steel companies the same question and in the last 24 hours we had the answer," he said, in his prepared remarks on the steel price boost.

Mr. HART. I believe this should cause us all to think, including the United States Steel Corp. leadership.

I was privileged to sit as a member of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee some time ago when we heard Roger Blough testify in opposition to a bill then pending before the committee which would have required pre-price-rise notification whenever a basic industry intended to change prices.

I believe it would have required an industry to file this notice with the Federal Trade Commission about 30 to 40 days prior to the effective date of the price increase.

Would not Mr. Roger Blough be in a much stronger position if he had complied with a law such as the one that was proposed? He would not have dumped us over the cliff or run us down the path which we believe we have been treading. As a matter of fact, I had great reservation about the wisdom of enacting that bill.

Surely, in the light of events of the last 24 hours, I believe that somehow or other the Federal Government ought to be big enough to develop an instrument whereby the voice of the consumer in America can be heard, whether it is in the White House, in the form of a consumer council, or at the Cabinet level. Surely we ought to be able to turn to a reasonably objective source for that information.

We are reacting somewhat emotionally ourselves. Perhaps we are reflecting some of the frustration we feel because we have not been able to get this kind of information. If the Government of the United States is big enough to defend freedom, it ought to be wise enough to develop a device which will let the consumer be heard on this subject.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was very much interested in the very effective address made by the distinguished assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey]. I particularly agree with him in his statement that this was an example of grossly irresponsible management leadership, and that it is a great misfortune to this Nation, as we struggle to walk the path between the alternative cliffs of inflation and depression, to have an industry which is as basic as is steel, suddenly, without warning, and without justification, throw this bombshell into our very delicately poised economy.

At this time, certainly the protection of the stockholder is of vital importance, but the protection of this Nation, our economy, and our foreign markets, by stabilizing the prices of millions of items made from steel are also of great importance.

I have seen no justification, and the committees of Congress have found none, for the rise of $6 per ton in the price of steel.

During the war, when we had price control, when hundreds of billions of dollars were dumped into the war effort, the basic price line that had to be held was steel. On wages the formula was "little steel." The price line was held after we had acquired this firm control of the price of steel. As a result, the cost of living showed practically no escalation. It did not show any until prices were prematurely decontrolled.

I hope that the rest of the steel industry will not be misled or stampeded into imitating this very bad move on the part of United States Steel, a move which is dangerous to this Nation's economy, and follow, sheep-like, the example of a company that apparently has little respect for efforts to control inflation but, instead, is steaming full speed ahead into those very waters that endanger our economy.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1962]

INCREASE A BLOW FOR WHITE HOUSE—ADMINISTRATION HAD SOUGHT TO BAR RISE—UNION AID IS "SHOCKED AND SURPRISED"

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, April 10.—Administration officials were stunned by tonight's news that United States Steel was raising its prices.

They regarded the announcement from Pittsburgh as a frustrating end to a long and hard effort by President Kennedy and his principal lieutenants to get this key industry to hold the price line.

There was no immediate on-the-record statement about the increase from the White House or any other source. But one ranking official, hearing the news from a reporter, responded with an invective.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, who began an investigation of the industry by his Antitrust and Monopoly subcommittee 3 days after the last general price increase in 1958, likewise withheld comment tonight.

UNION SOURCE SHOCKED

In Pittsburgh, United Steelworkers Union sources indicated privately that they were "shocked and surprised" by the increase, but did not want to engage in a public quarrel with United States Steel.

Word had circulated within the administration in recent days that one of the smaller steel companies was preparing to raise its prices. Presumably the administration moved in as it has on the industry and the union for almost a year now—urging restraint.

The administration feels that steel prices and wages have been a major factor in general price and wage trends in recent years, a direct factor in the cost of the many things that are made of steel and an indirect factor setting a pattern for other industries and unions.

The administration started last spring to put pressure on the industry to hold the price line despite a wage increase that was scheduled to take effect in October.

Industry did hold the line, presumably as a result of the public pressure from the administration, combined with such other factors as foreign competition, slack business, and the President's open promise to help the industry resist excessive new wage demands when the union contract came up for renewal this year.

The administration's attention turned then to the wage negotiations. The President's Council of Economic Advisers published guideposts for noninflationary wage and price adjustments in January and the President personally asked the leaders of the industry and the union to sit down and arrange a new contract quickly without a strike.

The new contract was signed last Friday, 3 months before the old contract expires. The President, in a letter to David J. McDonald, the union president, called it "forward looking and responsible."

The new terms—no wage increase at all for 1 year and new fringe benefits costing about 10 cents an hour—were "obviously noninflationary and should provide a solid base for continued price stability," the President said.

SAID TO REFLECT PRODUCTIVITY

The administration, and labor authorities here, believed that the settlement was within the general rule set by the council's guideposts. That is, the increase in the industry's labor costs would not exceed the 2½ to 3 percent upward trend of productivity in the industry—the increasing output per man per hour.

In other words, they believed that a price increase would not be justified.

Assuming that the rest of the industry follows the lead of its biggest company, as it usually does, there is no certainty that the higher prices will, in themselves, set off a round of price increases in other industries, either steel-using industries or nonsteel industries.

Steel users may add the higher cost to the prices of their own products, as they have on past occasions, or they may absorb it. Nonsteel industries may or may not follow steel's example.

The disinclination of union sources to attack the price increase publicly—at least for the moment—stemmed from their hope that the recently negotiated labor contract would usher in a period of good feeling in industrial relations in the industry. They do not want to disrupt the harmony.

BAD JUDGMENT SEEN

Privately, highly placed union sources indicated that they felt the recent settlement provided no reason for the price increase and was "bad business judgment."

Last year, they said, there was a gain in output per man-hour in the steel industry of about 5 percent. That, they said, will more than offset the 2.5 percent increase in labor costs that will result July 1 when the new contract terms take effect. Thus, they said, to raise prices by 3.5 percent simply means that profit margins will go up.

If the steel industry's often expressed fear of foreign competition is rooted in fact, a price increase would seem to be the wrong move, the union sources believe.

There was no indication that the union leaders felt aggrieved by the increase. "It was a good settlement and a bad price increase," one union source said.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1962]

WALL STREET SURPRISED—SOME DOUBT RISE CAN RESIST COMPETITION FROM ABROAD

(By Robert Metz)

The United States Steel Corp.'s price increase caught some steel company executives by surprise last night, and Wall Street analysts expressed disbelief and questioned whether the company could make the rise stick.

A spokesman for one major company, who would not be identified, said, "Frankly, I was surprised."

William A. Steele, president of the Wheeling Steel Co., the country's 11th largest producer, said that the rise was long overdue. However, he said that the situation would require some study before he could say what his company might do.

Meanwhile, a metals market analyst in Wall Street said that he could not believe the news and was confident that the combined factors of administration pressure and foreign competition would force the price back to the previous level.

One steel company executive took the position that increased prices could be made to stick. "We have a reasonable market. It's not good, but the rising costs we face are faced by other competitive materials."

Unlike one other analyst who expected a shot in the arm for the ailing stock market, this analyst said the market would need much more than that for any significant recovery.

The other analyst in the nonferrous metals field said that he thought the market would rise as the price rise was inflationary. He added that the price differential was not sufficiently large in his opinion to cause metal users to shift to competitive metals such as aluminum.

The other companies could not be reached for comment. Bethlehem Steel Corp. executives were returning home after a stockholders' meeting in Wilmington, Del. At the meeting, the president, Edmund F. Martin, said there should not be any price rise even after the new labor contract goes into effect on July 1.

He went on: "We should not do anything to increase our costs if we are to survive. We have more competition both domestically and from foreign firms. And we need to sell more steel."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1962]

PITTSBURGH, April 10.—The United States Steel Corp. announced tonight an average increase of $6 a ton, effective at midnight. Five days ago it signed an administration-backed labor contract that by-passed a wage increase the first year and was termed noninflationary by President Kennedy.

The other members of the "Big 11" steel companies were expected to announce price increases soon.

United States Steel, the Nation's No. 1 producer, termed the increase a catch-up adjustment amounting to about three-tenths of a cent a pound. It was the first rise by the company since 1958.

The company was the first in basic steel to sign a new 2-year contract with the United Steelworkers of America. The other members of the "Big 11" quickly fell into line and signed.

THREE DIVISIONS AFFECTED

United States Steel said the increase would affect all its principal products, as well as those of its three operating divisions—American Steel & Wire, National Tube, and Tennessee Coal & Iron.

A company spokesman said semifinished forging quality carbon steel would be increased an average of $6 a ton to $104. Semifinished rerolling quality carbon would also be increased by that amount to $83.50, and carbon steel tube rounds to $127.50.

Leslie B. Worthington, company president, said that since 1958 "the level of steel prices has not been increased, but "if anything, has declined somewhat." He added:

"This situation, in the face of steadily mounting production costs, which have included four increases in steelworker wages and benefits prior to the end of last year, has been due to competitive pressures from domestic producers and from imports of foreign-made steel.

"Nevertheless, taking into account all the competitive factors affecting the market for steel, we have reluctantly concluded that a modest price adjustment can no longer be avoided in the light of the production cost increases that have made it necessary."

The increases affect the company's carbon-steel products, tin-mill products, wire and wire products, pipe and tubular products, and stainless steel.

The labor contract includes a wage-opener clause in the second year. It is estimated that it will cost the industry 10 cents an hour a man.

"If the products of United States Steel are to compete successfully in the marketplace, then the plants and facilities which make those products must be as modern and efficient as the low-cost mills which abound abroad, and as the plants which turn out competing products here at home," Mr. Worthington said.

"Only by generating the funds necessary to keep these facilities fully competitive can our company continue to provide its customers with a dependable source of steel and to provide its employees with dependable jobs.

"But the profits of the company, squeezed as they have been between rising costs and declining prices, are inadequate today to perform this vital function."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1962]

Industry Jubilant

Pittsburgh, April 10.—There was apparent jubilation among steel executives tonight over the unexpected announcement of United States Steel's price increase.

The action appeared to have taken other producers by surprise, although many had been reported considering such a step in view of the recent wage settlement.

Steel authorities estimated that the settlement would cost the industry $150 million, despite statements by President Kennedy and Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg that it was noninflationary and would not necessitate a price increase.

David J. McDonald, head of the United Steelworkers, was unavailable for comment. Other union officials declined to issue statements.

A spokesman for the Jones & Laughin Steel Corp., the Nation's fourth largest producer, said the company would have to study the new United States Steel price schedule before commenting.

The Pittsburgh Steel Co., one of the largest independents, said it would likely comment tomorrow. A company official observed that a price increase had been overdue, not necessarily because of the new settlement, he added, but because there had been no compensating increase to offset the 40 cents an hour cost of the 30-month labor contract arrived at in January 1960.

A spokesman for Allegheny-Ludlum, producer of specialty steel, declined to comment. He noted that the company would not start negotiating for a new union agreement until May 1.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1962]

Text of United States Steel's Statement on Prices

Since our last overall adjustment in the summer of 1958, the level of steel prices has not been increased but, if anything has declined somewhat. This situation, in the face of steadily mounting production costs which have included four increases in steelworker wages and benefits prior to the end of last year, has been due to the competitive pressures from domestic producers and from imports of foreign-made steel as well as from other materials which are used as substitutes for steel.

The severity of these competitive pressures has not diminished; and to their influence may be attributed the fact that the partial catch-up adjustment announced today is substantially less than the cost increases which have already occurred since 1958, without taking into consideration the additional costs which will result from the new labor agreements which become effective next July 1.

Nevertheless, taking into account all the competitive factors affecting the market for steel, we have reluctantly concluded that a modest price adjustment can no longer be avoided in the light of the production cost increases that have made it necessary.

MODERN PLANT NEEDED

If the products of United States Steel are to compete successfully in the marketplace, then the plants and facilities which make those products must be as modern and efficient as the low-cost mills which abound abroad and as the plants which turn out competing products here at home. Only by generating the funds necessary to keep these facilities fully competitive can our company continue to provide its customers with a dependable source of steel, and to provide its employees with dependable jobs. But the profits of the company—squeezed as they have been between rising costs and declining prices—are inadequate today to perform this vital function.

Our annual report, published last month, shows clearly the effect of this squeeze.

In 3 years since the end of 1958, United States Steel has spent $1,185 million for modernization and replacement of facilities and for the development of new sources of raw materials. Internally, there were only two sources from which this money could come: depreciation and reinvested profit. Depreciation in these years amounted to $610 million; and reinvested profit, $187 million—or, together, only about two-thirds of the total sum required. So after using all the income available from operations, we had to make up the difference of $388 million out of borrowings from the public. In fact, during the period 1958–61, we have actually borrowed a total of $800 million to provide for present and future needs. And this must be repaid out of profits that have not yet been earned, and will not be earned for some years to come.

During these 3 years, moreover, United States Steel's profits have dropped to the lowest levels since 1952; while reinvested profit—which is all the profit there is to be plowed back in the business after payment of dividends—has declined from $115 million in 1958 to less than $3 million last year. Yet the dividend rate has not been increased in more than 5 years, although there have been seven general increases in employment costs during this interval.

RISING COSTS CITED

This squeeze, which has thus dried up a major source of the funds necessary to improve the competitive efficiency of our plants and facilities, has resulted inevitably from the continual rise in costs over a period of almost 4 years, with no offsetting improvement in prices.

Since the last general price adjustment in 1958, there have been a number of increases in the cost of products and services purchased by the corporation, in State and local taxes, and in other expenses, including interest on the money we have had to borrow—an item which has jumped from $11,500,000 in 1958 to nearly $30 million in 1961.

And from 1958 through 1961, there have been industrywide increases in steelworker wages and benefits on four occasions amounting to about 40 cents an hour, and also increases in employment costs for other employees. These persistent increases have added several hundred million dollars to the employment costs of United States Steel, without regard to future costs resulting from the new labor agreement just negotiated.

In all, we have experienced a net increase of about 6 percent in our costs over this period despite cost reductions which have been effected through the use of new, more efficient facilities, improved techniques and better raw materials. Compared with this net increase of 6 percent, the price increase of 3½ percent announced today clearly falls considerably short of the amount needed to restore even the cost-price relationship in the low production year of 1958.

ADDS TO COMPETITION

In reaching this conclusion, we have given full consideration, of course, to the fact that any price increase which comes, as this does, at a time when foreign-made steels are already underselling ours in a number of product lines, will add—temporarily, at least—to the competitive difficulties which we are now experiencing. But the present price level cannot be maintained any longer when our problems are viewed in long-range perspective. For the long pull a strong, profitable company is the only insurance that formidable competition can be met and that the necessary lower costs to meet that competition will be assured.

Only through profits can a company improve its competitive potential through better equipment and through expanded research. On this latter phase we are constantly developing lighter, stronger steels which—ton for ton—will do more work and go much farther than the steels that were previously available on the market. They thus give the customer considerably more value per dollar of cost. As more and more of these new steels come from our laboratories, therefore, our ability to compete should steadily improve. But the development of new steels can only be supported by profits or the hope of profits.

The financial resources supporting continuous research and resultant new products as well as those supporting new equipment, are therefore vital in this competitive situation—vital not alone to the company and its employees, but to our international balance of payments, the value of our dollar, and to the strength and security of the Nation as well.

THE CRISIS IN CIVIL AIR TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to discuss the present crisis in civil air transportation. We are apparently coming to the threshold of total monopoly. What can be done is a matter for discussion, but first I should like to present the relevant facts relating to the plight of the supplemental air carriers. These are the carriers which can provide vital and stimulating competition to the major airlines at many points throughout the Nation.

The question of a proper place for the supplemental carriers has been one which has been before the Congress for a long time, and is now the subject of legislation in the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee under the able leadership of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney]. They have written a bill, S. 1969; the Senate version if retained in its entirety has considerable merit; the House version (H.R. 7318) would impose economic starvation on the independent airlines. As the Senate and House conferees resume their deliberations on this legislation it is devoutly to be hoped that the Senate version may be retained. But there is a much broader issue here than that covered by S. 1969. It is the issue of the elimination of competition and the concentration of economic power in the airline industry.

Mr. President, I want to make it amply clear that I am not making a case for those whose sole purpose is exploiting the public and those who have been characterized as "fly by night operators." We are not interested in them. We are interested and deeply concerned with those carriers who have made an earnest and conscientious effort to provide sound public service and who have established a record in safety and in service which in many ways excels that of the grandfather carriers.

It is not the purpose of the Senator from Oregon to speak for or against any particular carrier. I am not concerned with a particular aviation organization or corporation. I am concerned with the special role which the independents play and with the need for competitive factors.

We have the picture of the aviation industry arriving at a state of total monopoly, coming to this state through the machinations of the major trunk carriers. A pliant Civil Aeronautics Board has historically responded to their bidding, and has functioned as their protector and devout champion over the years. While this does not characterize the present Board, its predecessors hold a large measure of responsibility—the record is full of their mistakes of commission and omission. It seems that the present CAB majority must struggle with a series of problems which it has inherited, plus a lack of confidence which predecessors have transmitted to the present agency.

This is an industry which is less than 25 years old in its organized form—the Civil Aeronautics Act was only passed in 1938.

And it is this which most gravely concerns me—that we may be witnessing the last act in the closing of the sky to free enterprise, and the unconditional surrender of the airways to certain gigantic corporate combinations, who exert their economic power through the magnitude of loans to the airlines and through interlocking directorates between the lenders and the operating companies.

What are the stakes involved should these independents be banished, either by punitive legislation, or by economic regulations contrived to do what the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], once described as "strangulation by regulation?" See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 25, 1958.

Should these supplemental carriers be eliminated, or starved to death, damage will be done to five significant areas. First, to our military security; second, to the consumer, the traveling public; third, to the major airlines; fourth, to the small businessmen who own, operate and even sometimes fly these planes; and fifth, to our overall system of free enterprise and public morality.

On the question of national security; I wrote to Mr. Theodore Hardeen, Jr., the Administrator of the Defense Air Transportation Administration, asking him exactly what the role of the supplemental carriers was in relation to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet. I quote from Mr. Hardeen's reply:

> The supplemental air carriers, including former nonscheduled carriers now certificated as cargo airlines, have 96 cargo aircraft allocated to the current CRAF, or 62 percent of the total of 156 cargo aircraft in the allocation. In terms of airlift capability, these 96 aircraft represent 62 percent of the allocated cargo capability. The remaining 60 cargo aircraft allocated, representing 38 percent of the capability, are allocated from carriers which have always been in the scheduled category. The passenger requirements for CRAF are being currently met 100 percent by scheduled carriers. (Letter of Mar. 16, 1962, addressed by Theodore Hardeen, Jr., to Senator MORSE.)

It is one of the brightest memories in the history of all aviation to recall what these independent and nonsubsidized airlines did at the time of the Berlin and Korean airlifts. They were still a very young group at the time of the Berlin airlift. They borrowed money to acquire equipment, and carried over 25 percent of the commercial tonnage into that beleaguered city, flying right alongside the American and allied military craft. In Korea they carried over 50 percent of the commercial cargo. They not only comprised a potent airlift, they were ready to do the job and did it well.

These strategic situations, occurring in the postwar world, proved the necessity for a speedy means of delivering cargo and personnel to a great distance. John F. Kennedy, then a Congressman, introduced his air merchant marine bill in 1949 to authorize an adequate airlift and stimulate the development of aircraft suitable for heavy transport missions. His proposals and other plans to fill the logistical gap in air capacity were opposed by the major airlines on the grounds that such programs would constitute an unnecessary intrusion into the field of private enterprise.

Perhaps one of the private objections stemmed from the fact that the independent competitors had penetrated the military procurement field, providing one of the greatest bargains to the military at 2.7 cents per passenger mile, and bringing prices in line with costs.

Instead of an air merchant marine bill, Mr. James H. Douglas, an official of American Airlines, came up with the CRAF plan whereby carriers could qualify their commercial aircraft for emergency military service. It is of interest to note that at the present time, however, Mr. Douglas' own American Airlines has no planes at the disposal of CRAF, whereas the all-cargo and the supplemental carriers presently supply 62 percent of the CRAF capability for cargo airlift.

Eliminate these supplementals and you break the backbone of the CRAF cargo reserve. One wonders if equipment used on champagne flights would be ready and the pilots suitable should we need expanded airlift to Vietnam, or any other distant spot. The Lebanon experience was a poor one for airlift; and since then, and during the sheltered years following, the big airlines have put on a lot of weight that is not muscle.

The second consideration, is low-cost air transportation. During the fifties when the so-called nonskeds were flourishing in general passenger transportation, the major airlines were forced to provide coach service and reduce their fares. The consequence was astounding. The major carriers, instead of suffering financially, as they predicted, turned around and became healthy, and were weaned away from subsidy.

Then what happened? In 1957 the CAB finally grounded Trans-American Airlines, the largest and most successful of the pioneer independents. The charge was violation of the CAB's economic regulations. These regulations were an attempt to eliminate, very effectively, the independent competitors by a procedure which, according to the CAB's once-secret Goodkind memorandum, would "not lay the Board open to criticism of stamping out, without due process, these carriers."

The apparent reason for eliminating Trans-American was noted by Senator SPARKMAN at the time: they had flown too many people too economically, too frequently, with perfect safety, without any subsidy, and had made money at the time when the subsidized grandfathers were losing money. It had diverted no passengers, it had helped open new markets and pioneered profitable innovations for the industry, but it had committed the most unpardonable crime—it had embarrassed the autocrats of the sky. For this it had to be destroyed. This was the pattern which Senator SPARKMAN recounted to the Senate on June 25, 1958:

> As each of the new, veteran-owned postwar independent carriers grew and flourished in the new coach market which they pioneered, it was systematically grounded by CAB edict. The carriers were charged with violations of special regulations devised, as our committee revealed, as a checkrein on their existence. These economic regulations were so ingenious that compliance was economically unfeasible, and defiance legally impossible. Our committee repeatedly warned that this CAB policy of strangulation by regulation would ultimately have dire consequences. We felt that the industry, the traveling public, and the Government would ultimately pay dearly for the restrictive policies which had become CAB doctrine. The courts could not go into the economic doctrines, but merely the procedural questions, and here they found the CAB had used a clean knife.
>
> When the oldest and strongest of the large irregular carriers, Trans-American Airlines, was grounded on June 6, 1957, after an extended battle with the Board, and in the courts—manifestly guilty in the words of the CAB, of flying too frequently and too regularly—it was not hard to calculate the chain reaction which would ensue.

Of course, the grounding of Trans-American was followed by a general fare increase by the major carriers—up 30 percent since 1958.

I have always held the junior Senator from Alabama in high regard, but I never quite appreciated his gift for economic prophecy, bordering on second sight. In the same address, Senator SPARKMAN stated:

> As fares go up, public utilization will go down. Newly won air passengers attracted by genuine economy of time and money will revert to surface transportation, and in many instances there will be less travel. Thus the air carriers will soon be faced with a shrinking passenger market of their own making at the very time when they have bigger aircraft, more expensive aircraft, and more aircraft than ever before.

Here we have a very accurate portrayal of what the aviation industry is up against today, and I will demonstrate later in this analysis that the proportion of the public using the airways diminished at the time when the technology and economic feasibility of air transportation has greatly increased.

So, one must conclude that one of the most tangible values which is at stake is the need for some independent economic yardstick in aviation which will serve the interest of the consumer, the general public, which is a basic interest to be served by the entire system. It is the general public which loses most when you eliminate the critical competitive element, however small that element may be, and which provides the only yardstick in setting the rates.

As a third consideration, one of the values which has become obscured is the direct usefulness to the major airlines themselves of continued independent competition.

The lessening of this competition does not breed health. Air transportation must be sold. The independent competitor has helped to sell it, has helped to create the market. He has innovated, offered tours, opened up Miami for the off-season period, advertised the idea of traveling to places formerly too expensive to visit, introduced credit concepts in air transportation—"fly now, pay later." The independent has also drawn its customers from the 80 percent of the population which has never flown before. These are the passengers who, once started flying, become part of the permanent market for the grandfather carriers too. The record amply demonstrates that where you have had competition from the independent operator, things have been stirred up and made profitable—remove that competition and eliminate competition through mergers and exclusive franchises and you have stagnation.

A final service which the independents perform to the major carriers is that they have, until now, purchased the conventional piston equipment used by the big airlines which have converted to jets. If you eliminate the independent, the aviation industry will find itself surfeited with DC-6's and DC-7's, which normally should go into low-cost coach service. Being so much slower than the jet, they constitute no diversionary threat to the first-class market. They are in the nature of flying buses. But obviously the shortsighted plan is to remove these aircraft from service to the American traveling public. What irony. Were these planes available to the coach carriers, they would serve to stimulate new air travelers from that four-fifths of our population which has never before flown commercially.

The list of reasons is long. Suffice it to say that nobody will lose more and be more deprived by the elimination of the independent air carrier from passenger transportation than the monopoly-minded large carriers themselves.

A fourth consideration which is involved is clearly that of the operators of these supplementals. These men were invited into the air transport business by the U.S. Government. They, of course, wanted the opportunity to participate, but it was the Government which invited them, paved the way, and made available equipment at minimal cost after the war. Since then these men have enterprised and developed some of the most valuable economic innovations in air transport—notably aircoach and airfreight. Additionally, they have built up a reservoir of maintenance and pilot training, and they continue to give valuable, experience-generating employment to mechanics and pilots who would be readily available to this country in the event of a national emergency. And this type of experience, no matter how "crash" a program it might be, cannot be acquired overnight, at the time when it is most needed.

These independent operators have worked for more than 15 years. They have never received one cent of subsidy. Their lot has been made difficult by the constant campaign on the part of the major airlines to strangle them. They have been promised status by the Congress and by the Board, and they have risked everything on their faith that the sky is not permanently closed to all but a chosen few. Yet, not one of these enterprises has ever received a common carriage certificate on any domestic trunk route.

Now, what we must be careful of today is that if these pioneers are prevented from offering their services to the public, we are not only doing them an injustice, but we are establishing, across the board, the grave precedent, that no man will ever be able to enter the air transportation business—unless he should inherit or acquire the controlling interest in one of the super airlines. Does your son want to go into the airline business? Well, have him work his way up through a Wall Street syndicate. That is a fine conclusion to the American dream.

There is also a fifth consideration which is being tested here. It is an intangible, true, but perhaps the most important consideration of all. It is the question of whether wrongdoing is being ignored by the Government itself, in a way which is "all the more insidious because it has been mantled with the sanctity of legality"—quoted from annual report of Senate Committee on Small Business, 1952, at page 243.

What has happened to air transportation—and is about to happen—is no obscure secret. We have been watching the progress of creeping monopoly in the air; the economic schemers have proceeded with their long-range conspiracy in full view. It has been discussed, and exposed by several factfinding bodies as well as by impartial and objective academic studies. But the scheme proceeds and the legal and regulatory agencies of the Government interpose no objection. Is it because the scheme is too grandiose for anyone to take it seriously, any more than one would be alarmed over a tourist preparing to remove the Capitol dome?

The plan to exterminate the independent enterprisers in air transportation, has been revealed in Government documents. The Goodkind memorandum—the blueprint for what was to be "a final solution" for the independents—was discovered and denounced by Senator SPARKMAN before the Senate Small Business Committee in 1953—pages 128–129, hearings, Select Committee on Small Business, 83d Congress, May 4, 1953. Mr. Goodkind was not the man who made the policy. He was merely the technician, the CAB expert who designed the administrative trap whereby the small carriers would be knocked out for failure to comply with so-called technical economic regulations. To comply was virtually impossible economically. To defy was certain death for violation of the regulations.

No words of mine, Mr. President, can more adequately describe the carefully devised nature of the plan devised than do that memorandum's very own words. I quote:

> The staff is therefore generally agreed as to the desirability of finding means of bringing this phase of air transportation under more positive control within the near future.
>
> It is believed this could be effected by keying the duration of their authority, i.e., letters of registration, to Board action on either (1) the carriers' pending certificate applications under 401 or (2) their pending applications for special exemption under 416. Depending on which procedure was adopted, the appropriate application could be required to be filed within specified time limits. Either procedure has the advantage of affording a means for ultimately terminating the operations of this group of carriers.
>
> Our experience to date convinces us that, with few exceptions, it is necessary for carriers operating large aircraft to routinize their operations; that a fixed base operation of the type which we believe section 292.1 was originally intended to cover is not generally feasible for them, but they must more and more confine their operations between certain points to build up a clientele and insure themselves of adequate load factors and a balanced directional flow. The need for route operations by large carriers is further emphasized by purely operational factors—that is, considerations of maintenance, overhaul, fueling, crew change, etc. It is in the latter respect that the analogy between irregular carriers and tramp steamers breaks down, for it is necessary in the case of the former to make careful provision for their frequent overhauls and maintenance checks, crew changes, etc. Generally speaking, this cannot be successfully accomplished economically except on route operations.
>
> Once a carrier is involved in route operations it is encroaching on the field which the act is believed to have reserved to certificated carriers and is no longer providing the casual, unpredictable call and demand service which 292.1 was designed to accommodate and which the certificated carriers are not particularly well adapted to handle. It is instead catering to a more or less steady, predictable, and measurable public demand and should be subect to the requirements of section 401 of the act. Furthermore, we do not believe it necessary to enlarge on the fact that the determination of what constitutes regularity has been and undoubtedly always will be an extremely difficult

> problem and possibly not susceptible of satisfactory solution.
>
> It is conceded that there are certain limited and special services which can be conducted by large aircraft on a truly nonscheduled, irregular basis. These are the true fixed base operations such as conducted by Paul Nantz in carrying movie crews to and from location. It is believed unwise, however, to keep the door open to such few operators and thus provide entry for a host of undesirables.
>
> A second reason in favor of either proposal is that it should not lay the Board open to criticism of stamping out, without due process, these carriers which they have permitted to come into being. If, after consideration of either a 401 or a 416 application, the Board determines that it cannot make the statutory findings to permit authorization of the proposed service, it is difficult to see how the carrier or the public at large could expect the Board to perpetuate the service; accordingly, termination of such carriers' letters of registration would appear a natural and fair conclusion.

Mr. President, Congress intervened, and thanks to the vigorous leadership of the Senate Small Business Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator SPARKMAN and later of Senator Thye, the fair conclusion for the independent carriers was deferred. The House Antitrust Subcommittee was also disturbed and made its weight felt. The Board undertook a proceeding, known as docket No. 5132, to discover a proper role for these carriers, who were then flying on temporary authority which limited them drastically. This proceeding lasted for 7 years. It was trial by attrition—the application of the doctrine of exhaustion of litigants—during which time these carriers had only twilight status. They were obliged to obtain new equipment by borrowing at wild interest rates, because they were without tenure or permanent license.

At that time the major carriers were completely disdainful of the possibility of flying cargo commercially. Some of the independents were granted the right to fly freight, notably the Flying Tigers, Seaboard & Western, and Slick Airlines, but they were strictly prohibited from common carriage passenger service. Those independents who applied for certificates to fly transcontinental air coach, a type of service which at that time only they were providing, met bitter opposition. The CAB issued its negative decision in the Transcontinental Coach case, denying the applications on the ground that the major airlines had the right of first refusal, even though they were not providing this service themselves. It was at this time that Joseph P. Adams, then a CAB member, filed one of his most memorable dissents, arguing that the market should first go to those who had developed it. But General Adams was rebuffed by the doctrine that a sort of divine right to the sky belonged to the major carriers—a right to provide or to withhold service, depending on their pleasure rather than the public need and convenience.

The independents were obliged to eke out their existence largely on military contract service, where there were no fixed tariffs and carriers bid against one another sometimes for a single trip. Competition was so rough that the price for flying a military passenger across the Atlantic sometimes dropped below $70.

It is amazing, but about two dozen carriers survived during the 7 years that the CAB was considering docket 5132. What finally emerged was an awkward solution—the right to provide supplemental service on the basis of 10 trips monthly between 2 points and the right to fly charters of organized groups. One can imagine the difficulty involved in trying to advertise a 10-trip per month schedule, or trying to find a steady market among ethnic, religious, social, or economic groups who wanted to charter a large airplane. Nevertheless, the public hunger for economical service was such that these carriers managed to sustain themselves and hold their organizations together in the face of rising costs.

We are now at the closing phase of what was to be the "final solution" for the independent airline industry. Nobody was expected to survive the trials of endurance, administrative attrition, or strangulation by regulation. But some have survived, and their fate now rests with the Congress, since the courts found that the Civil Aeronautics Act did not authorize the limited supplemental certificates which the CAB granted. Therefore, we now have the legislation, S. 1969, which is presently in conference with the House. The importance of sustaining the Senate's version intact cannot be doubted. Any reduction in the strength of the independents at this time will accelerate the plans for a total monopoly in air transportation.

Today the major airlines are proclaiming that they are in financial trouble, or so they say. Does this trouble come from their having exhausted the market at too low a price? Have they been scraping the barrel and, therefore, been unable to make ends meet? The very opposite appears to be the case.

They have not been scraping the barrel, but rather skimming the cream, operating a high-priced luxury service for a limited market, a shrinking market. For instance, in U.S. News & World Report of February 19, there appears an interview with the president of American Airlines, Mr. C. R. Smith. He was asked about the present rate of growth of the number of people who fly. He replied:

> Growth was about 1 percent last year.

That is about half the rate of growth of the population. But now we come to a more significant and damaging revelation. The question was posed:

> What percentage of the population in this country travels by air?
>
> Answer. The number of people who have taken a trip in a year would be somewhere in the neighborhood of around 10 percent of the population. But the number of people who make up the bulk of the air-traveling population is much smaller than that.

Further Mr. Smith says

> Now, when you get through analyzing what they (the public) are really talking about, they're thinking of transportation at around 1½ to 2 cents a passenger-mile, which is about 65 percent of what it costs to go on a bus. If you can't sell air transportation competitively on the basis of 2 cents a passenger-mile, you don't have much chance of getting those people.
>
> Question. How much is air travel per mile, at present fares?
>
> Answer. It averaged to about 6 cents per mile last year. In general, the longer the distance the lower the price per mile.
>
> Question. Are businessmen your principal customers?
>
> Answer. Oh, yes, they always have been. In our own company, business travel is fairly close to two-thirds of our passenger travel.

In a recent study—"Airline Market Research Over a Decade"; excerpts from studies by Robert A. Peattie, Jr., director, marketing research and development, American Airlines, Inc.—Mr. Smith's salient facts were sharpened by these findings:

> Over half the U.S. population doesn't travel at all. Of the total U.S. population 78 percent has never flown in a commercial airline.

About 8 million people constitute the air traveling public. Of this number, only 15 percent, 1,200,000, fly with some frequency, providing the real base for the aviation market. They account for 64 percent of the air trips.

I quote from the Peattie report:

> The current air travel market is primarily a business market, with a high proportion of executives, professional and technical people in above-average income groups. Half of them have an income of over $10,000 per year. Eighty-six percent of their travel is expense-account travel.

In other words, we are apparently maintaining this air transportation system for the benefit of the traveling businessman who writes off 52 percent of ticket cost as a business expense. What Mr. Smith is describing is an elaborate and luxurious service being nourished by subsidy for the purpose of serving the elite, and it is losing money. It is as if the Department of Agriculture developed its entire program and disbursed its multimillion-dollar subsidies to promote the orchid industry.

This recalls the Senate Interstate Commerce Investigation into the airline industry in the 81st Congress when American Airlines testified:

> We do not believe we can presently engage in coach service * * * without consequent loss.

And United Airlines chimed in:

> We just cannot afford to take the chance in aircoach.

These carriers were then before Congress pleading for subsidy, and were fighting against the suggestion that they adopt aircoach to fill empty seats. The nonscheduled carriers, then running profitable operations, testified that what these carriers needed was not subsidy, but passengers.

One often hears the question, why do the big carriers deliberately price themselves out of the market? Why do they court deficits rather than profits? I do not know the answer, except that it seems to be one of the psychological quirks of the monopoly mind to obtain a scarcity, to seek a low-productivity situation, and to rely on spiraling prices and higher rates to save them. They may sincerely believe that each rate increase will dig them out of losses. I can no more explain this thinking than I can explain the lemmings' flight to the sea.

Last week, on March 23, under the able chairmanship of Representative Celler, Antitrust Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee published a staff study on the proposed merger of Eastern and American Airlines.

This study raises some very vital questions, not the least of which is the obvious one that "if a combination of such size and power to be approved, how can the Board refuse other airlines the right to consolidate in order to meet this vast proposed combine as best they can?"

How long before the 10 grandfather carriers will be reduced further? Is there truth to the rumor that ultimately we will have four surviving carriers, each dominating a special geographic preserve? Of course, should this come to pass they will all be serving the luxury market.

And to what extent is this merger and monopoly being promoted by the financial backers of the big airlines, since, in the words of the House study:

> The advent of the jet age has caused the airlines to become heavily indebted to a relatively small number of major lenders.
>
> The magnitude of the loans involved, the restrictions customarily contained in the loan agreements, and their holdings of convertible debentures combine to give these major lenders the power to influence the destinies of the airlines. Interlocking directorates and other close relationships between the lenders and the airlines provide an opportunity for the lenders to exercise their influence. Indeed, persons closely related to the lenders acted for American and Eastern in suggesting and negotiating the merger now proposed.

Mr. President, I shall not attempt to prove a conspiracy to establish a monopoly. All one can do, without a full investigation, is to relate the facts, the coincidences, the interlocking personalities and relationships. We know that there was a plan to exterminate the independent competitors. The great majority of these independents have been exterminated. We know that the Nation's second and fourth largest domestic route carriers, American and Eastern are seeking merger. There are also moves for further fare increases. Already we can hear what the columnist, Mr. William Shannon, calls the "oink and grunt of private hoggishness" emitting from the sky.

The neat sequence falls into place like a row of dominoes. The scheduled carriers first eliminate the independent competitor. Then they push for mergers. Without competition in their respective route areas, these carriers will operate in the classic monopoly pattern: high rates, few passengers, high unit costs. They will serve primarily the 1.2 million travelers who fly regardless of cost—86 percent of these travelers are businessmen on expense accounts, according to American Airlines' own survey, so the Government ends up paying 52 percent of their travel costs.

And now comes the little extra kicker, the bonus that goes to the winner above his winnings. This appears to be a plan to dispose of the propeller aircraft once the major airlines complete their jet conversion. Normally they have been disposing of much of this conventional valuable equipment by selling them to the supplementals. But with the supplementals virtually out of business the plan calls for the sale of this equipment abroad to the underdeveloped countries, with our own Government financing 90 percent of the cost. Thus, these planes will be taken to distant lands where they are no longer of potential use to our domestic passenger service within the United States, or for the airlift reserve fleet. Credit for these transactions will be supplied by the Treasury. And the monopoly carriers will congratulate themselves on their daring in taking such risks.

Somewhere in the GAO there must be an accountant who would relish in the exercise of figuring out how many times the Government has paid for the same aircraft, paid out to these rugged champions of free enterprise, who have always been true to the three S's of monopoly aviation: Subsidy, scarcity, and shelter — shelter from any competition, even shelter from any criticism, because these big airlines are sensitive to suggestions that they are motivated by anything but pure altruism.

I must mention subsidy, because, while the grandfather carriers are presently not on direct subsidy—unless you regard exaggerated mail pay and the fact that they cater so much to expense account travelers as subsidy—I predict they will be back before Congress, a year after the supplemental carriers are destroyed, crying for subsidy "in the national interest."

This is the story. It is not just the fate of the small business operator in aviation that is involved. There is the national security reason, the need for a consequential and reliable civilian air reserve—CRAF—there is the traveling public which must be protected from monopoly prices, there are the major air carriers who must be kept solvent in the interest of serving the general public which they presently ignore, and there is the question of our American system of laws and public morality.

What was once set out in a blueprint and what has been taking place before our eyes coincides. Only the appropriate committees of the Congress can piece together all of the steps, identify cause with effect, and determine if everything that has been happening to the small airlines is pure coincidence, innocent competition, or an ingenious, bold, and dangerous attempt to corner the sky.

I, therefore, hope that the appropriate congressional committees, and most particularly the Senate and House Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittees, will conduct a full probe of monopoly in air transportation, including, of course, a thorough examination of the role of all regulatory agencies involved, and the role of the military procurement agencies as well.

I also hope that such inquiry may begin without delay and, that in the meantime the Congress will make no final determination regarding the supplemental carriers and their future, other than steps to tighten safety. There is nothing deader than a dead small business, and we must be very certain that we in no way legislate in such a way as to foreclose future entry to the sky. The issue is not whether it be these 20-odd carriers specifically who fly, but whether we sustain or reject the principle and the values inherent in some measure of free enterprise in the American aviation industry.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ARMED SERVICES, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for armed services, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have the yeas and nays ordered on the passage of the pending bill?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez] would each vote "yea."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] is detained on official business.

Also, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senators from Maryland [Mr. Butler and Mr. Beall], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 42 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible

Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Case, S. Dak.
Church
Cooper
Curtis
Dodd
Douglas
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—15

Beall
Butler
Capehart
Carlson
Chavez
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Fulbright
Goldwater
Saltonstall
Johnston
Kuchel
Miller
Moss

So the bill (H.R. 9751) was passed.

CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I beg to advise the distinguished majority leader that the Appropriations Committee has today reported the second supplemental appropriation bill. I am sure a great many Senators have an active interest in one or more of the items contained in the bill, and that therefore they would appreciate a definite setting of the time for the consideration by the Senate of the bill. Has the majority leader set such a time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I may say to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida that, after contacting various interested parties, it has been decided to have the Senate consider the supplemental appropriation bill the coming Monday.

Let me also say, for the information of the Senate, that also today the Senate will consider some minor bills; and then the Peace Corps bill will be laid down and will be made the unfinished business.

On tomorrow, the Senate will proceed with the consideration of the Peace Corps bill. However, it is very likely that before the Senate begins the debate on that bill, Executive Calendar No. 5, Executive K, 87th Congress, 1st session, the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1960, will also be brought before the Senate. So the Senate will take a vote on that treaty.

There may be, on tomorrow, a vote on the Peace Corps bill, although I do not know about that as yet.

Also, on tomorrow, at approximately 12:17, the Senate will leave in a body to join the other body in the Hall of the House of Representatives, to hear an address by the Shah of Iran.

That is about the program, as I now understand it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Montana; and I hope that all Senators who are interested in items in the supplemental appropriation bill will take note of the announcement just now made by the majority leader.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this country has very few friends who have worked with us as partners in the struggle against communism as long and as definitely as has Iran. I hope as many Members of the Senate as possible will pay their respects to the Shah tomorrow.

I thank the majority leader.

HOM HONG HING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1227, House bill 3008.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 3008) for the relief of Hom Hong Hing, also known as Tommy Joe, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "fee.", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1258), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Hom Hong Hing, also known as Tommy Joe. The bill provides for the payment of the required visa fee. The bill has been amended to remove the requirement that an appropriate quota number be deducted, inasmuch as the beneficiary is married according to Chinese custom to a U.S. citizen.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 86-272

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1280, House bill 10043.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 10043) to amend Public Law 86-272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date, was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1316), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

Public Law 86-272 precludes a State from imposing an income tax upon a business where the only activity within the State is either (1) soliciting orders within the State, or (2) using an independent contractor to make sales in the State. This statute also provides that the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the U.S. Senate shall make full and complete studies of all matters pertaining to the taxation by the States of income derived within the States from the conduct of business activities in interstate commerce. The statute specifies that the committees shall report to their respective Houses on or before July 1, 1962.

After the enactment of Public Law 86-272, it was decided by the Committee on the Judiciary to delay commencement of the study until there had been an adequate opportunity to gain some experience with the operation of the substantive provisions of that statute. Consequently, the study was not begun until June 1961.

In the interim, problems arose relating to sales and use taxes similar to the State income tax problems which caused the enactment of Public Law 86-272. A number of bills were introduced, in both Houses, to impose restrictions on the power of the State to require the collection of use taxes. The complexity of the problems involved and the interrelationship of the various forms of State taxation led Congress to amend Public Law 86-272 in 1961, to broaden the scope of the study from State income taxation alone to taxation of interstate commerce by the States generally. However, although the study was thus greatly enlarged, the time allotted for its completion remained the same, July 1, 1962.

In view of the fact that work was not begun until June 1961, and in view of the broadened scope of the inquiry, the July 1, 1962, reporting date will not allow the committee adequate time for the thorough study which this matter requires. Accordingly, this bill would extend the time for the filing of the report from July 1, 1962, to July 1, 1963.

FREE ENTRY OF STEEL DONATED FOR CHIPPEWA COUNTY WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1282, House bill 9778.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 9778) to provide for the free entry of certain steel and steel products donated for an addition to the Chippewa County War Memorial Hospital, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, on page 1, after line 8, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 201 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1201), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"PAR. 1827. Records, diagrams, and other data with regard to any business, engineering, or exploration operation conducted outside the United States, whether on paper, cards, photographs, blue prints, tapes, other media."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to provide for the free entry of certain steel and steel products donated for an addition to the Chippewa County War Memorial Hospital, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan, and to provide for the free entry of records, diagrams, and other data with regard to business, engineering, or exploration operations conducted outside the United States."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I thank the leadership very much for calling up this bill. It is a singular demonstration of effective American-Canadian cooperation. The community affected, adjoining the Sault Ste. Marie locks, in Michigan, will be most grateful for the action of the Senate in passing the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1318), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 9778 is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of import duties any steel and any steel products donated by the Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd., Sault Ste. Marie, Canada, and imported for use in the construction of an addition to the Chippewa County War Memorial Hospital, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.

PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENT

The amendment is designed to facilitate the customs clearance of data with regard to business, engineering, or exploration operations conducted outside the United States.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Chippewa County War Memorial Hospital, located in Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., is a public, nonprofit hospital which serves the people of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada. This hospital is building an addition to its existing facilities, and the funds for such addition are being raised by public subscription.

The Algoma Steel Corp., Ltd., of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada, has undertaken to donate approximately 120 tons of high tensile strength structural steel for use in the construction of this addition to the hospital. Although this steel would be in the nature of a gift to the hospital and would be used in the same city, it would cross the border when delivered to the hospital site. The Finance Committee feels that, in this case, the steel should be entered free of duty and recommend that the bill as amended be passed.

The amendment would clarify a situation now causing extra work for the Bureau of the Customs and putting a burden on business firms with oversea branches. Data with regard to business, engineering, or exploration operations collected abroad and brought back to the United States for consideration by the executives of the firm may be subject to various rates of duty depending more on the type of material upon which the data are recorded than on the content or meaning. These records are not salable, their customs valuation is frequently in doubt, and delays and uncertainties are troublesome for business firms as well as for the Federal Government.

ALVIN R. BUSH DAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1283, House bill 6676.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 6676) to designate the Kettle Dam on Kettle Creek, Pa., as the Alvin R. Bush Dam was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1320), explaining the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 6676 is to change the name of the Kettle Creek Dam on Kettle Creek, Susquehanna River basin, Pa., to the Alvin R. Bush Dam, and any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such dam is referred to under any other name or designation shall be held to refer to such dam as the "Alvin R. Bush Dam."

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Kettle Creek Dam is under construction by the Corps of Engineers on Kettle Creek about 8.4 miles above its confluence with the West Branch of the Susquehanna River, and about 15 miles above Renovo, Clinton County, Pa. The project was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1954, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 29, 84th Congress, 1st session, as a unit of the comprehensive flood-control plan for the protection of communities in West Branch Susquehanna River Valley. Construction was initiated in May 1959 and is scheduled for completion in June 1962 at an estimated cost of $6,600,000.

The earth-fill dam will have a height of 165 feet above the streambed, a length of 1,350 feet, with controlled outlet works and uncontrolled spillway in the right abutment. The reservoir formed by construction of the dam will extend 8.8 miles upstream on Kettle Creek in Clinton County, have an area of 1,430 acres, and a storage capacity of 75,000 acre-feet at spillway crest. The reservoir will control the runoff from a drainage area of 226 square miles, or about 92 percent of the Kettle Creek watershed, with a storage capacity equal to 6.22 inches of runoff from the drainage area above the dam.

The project will reduce flood heights of Kettle Creek below the dam and of the West Branch below the mouth of Kettle Creek. Renovo, the first urban center downstream from the dam, will receive the major flood-control benefits from Kettle Creek Reservoir, but as a unit of the basin plan for West Branch of the Susquehanna River, the reservoir will aid materially in the reduction of the flood stages at all downstream points.

Hon. Alvin R. Bush ably served the State of Pennsylvania and the Nation in the U.S. House of Representatives from January 3, 1951, until his death on November 5, 1959, and as a member of the Committee on Public Works, was instrumental in securing the authorization of the project, and also in furthering the development of the water resources of the Nation.

It is understood that the bill has the support of interested groups and individuals in the area in which the dam is located.

PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1288, Senate bill 2935, the Peace Corps Act amendment, so that the bill will be laid before the Senate and will be made the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2935) to amend the Peace Corps Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 8, to insert a new subsection, as follows:

(c) At the end of the section add the following new subsection:

"(k) Not more than fifteen per centum of the total number of volunteers at the end of fiscal year 1963 and each fiscal year thereafter shall have been assigned to duty in any one country or area."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that Act, is amended by striking out "1962" and "$40,000,000" and substituting "1963" and "$63,750,000", respectively

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Peace Corps Act, which relates to Peace Corps volunteers, is amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (b), insert the following sentence immediately after the first sentence: "Supplies or equipment provided volunteers may be transferred to the government or other entities of the country or area in which they have been serving, when no longer necessary for their maintenance or to insure their health or capacity to serve effectively, and when such transfers would further the purposes of this Act.'

(b) In subsection (h), strike out "and for the purposes of" immediately after "tort liability statute," and insert in lieu thereof "the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 (5 U.S.C. 2171 et seq.), and".

(c) At the end of the section add the following new subsection:

"(k) Not more than fifteen per centum of the total number of volunteers at the end of fiscal year 1963 and each fiscal year thereafter shall have been assigned to duty in any one country or area."

SEC. 3. Section 7(b) of the Peace Corps Act, which relates to compensation of persons employed in the United States in activities authorized by that Act, is amended by striking out "so" in the first sentence thereof.

SEC. 4. Section 10(a) (2) of the Peace Corps Act, which relates to the assignment of volunteers to duty with international organizations and agencies, is amended by inserting "in fiscal year 1963, in addition to the number of assignments previously permitted," immediately after "shall be assigned" and by striking out "or volunteer leaders" immediately after "Peace Corps volunteers".

SEC. 5. Section 13(a) of the Peace Corps Act, which relates to the employment of experts and consultants, is amended by striking out "Peace Corps" and substituting "President".

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the nominations reported today from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be stated.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF U.S. SUPREME COURT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I was present at the committee meeting earlier today. I would say that with the exception of only one or two members of the committee, all the committee members were present at the hearing to consider the nomination of Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

I have spoken about the hearing to some of the senior members of the committee; and I would say that undoubtedly the hearing was a remarkable one. No one appeared there in opposition to the nomination.

Mr. White's nomination has the endorsement of the American Bar Association, and its representatives have stated that Mr. White is exceptionally well qualified to serve in this position.

The nomination of Mr. White also has the support of the Colorado bar and of the Denver bar. In fact, favorable reports on the nomination have come from all over the Nation.

This is one of President Kennedy's most outstanding appointments.

Of course, we in Colorado are specially proud today because Byron White is a native son. We Coloradans who have known him for 20 to 25 years feel he is an outstanding lawyer with all the necessary wisdom, temperament, and intellect to one day make him one of the great Justices of the Supreme Court.

Byron White is completely dedicated to the study and practice of the law. Nothing has deterred him from this goal. From his college days to this day his life has been shaped and directed with an all-consuming devotion toward practicing law. Now we will have the benefit of this consummate devotion applied to the questions of law brought before the highest tribunal of justice in the land. This devotion, this wisdom, this habit of calm, hard, fair appraisal will serve this country well, when, in these difficult times so many monumental questions of law are laid before the highest court. Byron White will acquit himself well in these tests of wisdom, as he has done in everything he has done before. He will be one of our great Justices, and I say that Colorado, in years to come, will be even prouder than she is today.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I join the Senator from Colorado in paying high tribute to the nomination of Byron White. I have long admired him and respected him as a student, as a lawyer, and as deputy assistant to the Attorney General.

Mr. Bernard Segal, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the American Bar Association, made a very strong statement in his favor.

I join the distinguished Senator from Colorado in predicting that Byron White will have an eminent career as a member of the Supreme Court. Those of us who have obserevd his duties in the past year and a half certainly wish him well in his new position.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his very kind and gracious remarks. I am sure Byron White would pay a similar compliment to the Senator if he were permitted to do so this evening.

The appointment was more than merely selecting a man who was Deputy Attorney General. It was pointed out in the committee that the appointment was a symbolic tribute to the youth of our Nation. He was not only a skilled athlete, but he was a cum laude student in his academic career. Through his service as Deputy Attorney General, we have had an opportunity for 15 months to examine his integrity of character and devotion to his duties in the high position which he now holds.

This nominee will be one of the finest appointments of President Kennedy.

SUPREME COURT APPOINTMENTS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the nomination of Mr. White. I understand his nomination has been unanimously reported by the Judiciary Committee, and knowing the diversity of views of the members of that committee, that fact in itself is a great tribute to the nominee.

I understand the American Bar Association, in its rating of his qualifications, accorded him the highly complimentary rating of especially well qualified. I shall, therefore, vote for his confirmation.

I wish to say just a few words about the composition of the Court in general. We have recently had a very momentous decision by the Supreme Court in the so-called Tennessee case. That case has brought to the fore the question of fair and equal representation as between freemen in this Republic.

Immediately after the so-called Tennessee decision was handed down, the President of the United States, at a press conference, said that the right to fair representation is basic. In my judgment, there is a very large segment of the population of this country that does not have any representation whatever on the Supreme Court of the United States at this time. I am speaking not only of geography, but of legal philosophy.

Millions of people in the United States—and they are not all residents of the section of the country from which I come—have found a great deal of fault with the trend of the Supreme Court in recent years toward expanding the Constitution, playing on it as if it were an accordion, and undertaking to rewrite the Constitution through judicial determination.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that one of the justices who hails from Louisiana, and who is coming to the District Court of Appeals in Washington, made a speech, after the confirmation of his appointment to a judgeship in the District, in which he spelled out that it was the clear duty on the part of the judiciary to legislate, a clear duty to make changes in our judicial and political way of life, which some of us never believed was the intention of the founders of this form of government.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what I am complaining about now—the tendency to make sociological rulings on legal matters. I am not complaining about this nominee. As I have said, I know very little of Mr. White, and all I have heard about him is good. I apprehend that, in the beginning at least, being human, his views will be somewhat colored by his associations in the Department of Justice, but he is undoubtedly a man of fine mental attainment; and I trust he will make as great a Justice as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] has indicated.

What I am talking about is appointing to the Supreme Court of the United States at least one conservative. It would not hurt in the least if he were a man who had had some judicial duty and experience. It might help if he had practiced law and had been before the courts, and if his experience had not been confined to merely holding political office.

There are at least 40 or 50 million conservatives in the United States. All I am asking for them is that, when there is another vacancy on that bench, the President give them a one-ninth representation on the Supreme Court of the United States.

We hear much talk about equalizing and equality, but it seems to me the only time we hear talk about equality is when it is going to benefit certain groups, certain individuals, and certain people who come up for election to public office from time to time.

I am speaking now of the basic question of the Constitution of the United States as it is written. It has been many years since a genuine conservative constitutionalist was appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States.

I think people who believe in the Constitution, who believe in such a thing as the doctrine of stare decisis, who believe that some attention should be paid to the precedents of law, who believe in following prior decisions of the Court, are entitled to have one man on that bench.

The Supreme Court is moving into the legislative field. As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, a judge has been appointed to the Court of Appeals in Washington who believes the courts should legislate. Those attitudes are gnawing at the very foundations of our Government and are destroying our system of checks and balances that have permitted us to enjoy this goodly life and our civilization.

Why should there not be an old-fashioned constitutionalist, a strict constructionist, on the Supreme Court? Is it because it is feared that his dissenting opinion would sweep the country like a prairie fire, when the people saw in the dissent how far afield the Court had gone in performing its constitutional functions? Is that the reason why there is no strict constructionist, no conservative constitutionalist, on the bench of the Supreme Court? Is it the purpose now to fill the whole judiciary with judges who believe it is their duty to legislate, rather than to decide impartially according to law and precedent?

Mr. President, I think it is a fair and a reasonable request that the next appointee to the Supreme Court of the United States be a strict constructionist and a conservative. I know it is considered something of which to be ashamed, to be a conservative. Conservatives are supposed to duck under a log somewhere. But there are a great many in this country yet who are proud of their conservatism. There are millions in the part of the world from which I come.

Mr. President, I say that those people are entitled to representation on the Supreme Court; and that is particularly true in view of its adventures from time to time in the field of legislation, and in view of the fact that the Court has undertaken to amend the Constitution by judicial decisions on several occasions. The Court has swept aside many laws which the States had enacted, as it did in respect to the Pennsylvania law against subversion in the State. The Court has stricken down laws which let States prescribe requirements for schoolteachers and practitioners of law, as well as other simple requirements of self-government.

I hope the President of the United States, whatever his own personal views may be on these sociological issues and however strongly he may believe it is the function of the Court to legislate, will, when the next appointment is made, let the tens of millions of people—at least 35 or 40 percent of the people of this country—have one-ninth of the representation on the Supreme Court of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as one who comes from the Rocky Mountain region, I want to be the first to extend congratulations, best wishes, and good luck to Mr. Justice White.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oscar H. Davis, of New York, to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. district judges.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

The nominations confirmed en bloc are as follows:

William B. Jones, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia;

George Templar, of Kansas, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Kansas;

George N. Beamer, of Indiana, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Indiana;

John Weld Peck, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Ohio; and

Robert Shaw, of New Jersey, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2935) to amend the Peace Corps Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is the proposed amendment to the Peace Corps Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be no further business tonight, and no voting. As soon as Senators who have remarks and speeches to make have completed them, it is planned to have the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT COOPERATIVENESS IMPROVES CLIMATE FOR INDUSTRY IN WEST VIRGINIA—STATE'S SELF-HELP EFFORTS APPLAUDED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is my privilege to report a significant event on March 24, 1962, at Parsons, the county seat of Tucker County, W. Va.

On that date, Local Union 1051 of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO-CLC, sponsored a recognition event in honor of Richard Rubin, chairman of the board of Dorman Mills, and Hugh Brown, international representative of the Textile Workers Union. The dinner, attended by 255 persons, was held at Parsons High School and was served by the High School Band Parents' Club.

The Dorman Mills plant is the Parsons community's principal source of direct employment. That it has been perpetuated in that status is a tribute to the validity of the program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of an earlier era and to the cooperation of the town's own Tucker County Bank and its persevering president, Hubert B. Lake.

I vividly remember that during my first two terms as a Member of the House of Representatives from the district which embraces Tucker County, the Dorman Mills, like many other businesses and industries in that depression period, faced near-bankruptcy. Working cooperatively with management and Mr. Lake, then cashier of the Tucker County Bank, we arranged in 1935 an RFC loan with local bank participation. Instead of being liquidated and closing, the Dorman Mills continued in business, overcame its financial problems, and grew to be a healthy industry.

Mr. Rubin came into the management of Dorman Mills prior to the death of one of its founders, Franklin Dorman, in 1957. After the death of the latter, Mr. Rubin acquired his prior holdings and became chairman of the board, with Mr. Lake assuming the presidency. Approximately $1 million has been invested in new equipment, machinery, and buildings since 1957. With product and market improvement, employment increased from 127 to 212 and Dorman Mills went on a 6-day week, operating around-the-clock with three shifts daily, as of April 2, 1962.

The purpose of the recent celebration, the local union sponsors said, was "to express thanks and appreciation to Mr. Rubin and Mr. Brown for their efforts and results as a consequence of management and union working together to provide nearly continuous work for the union members."

A spokesman for the union's officers said that "in these days of strikes and rumors of strike, it was appropriate to accord proper recognition to men able to cooperate together, and to change any fallacious outside image of labor conditions in West Virginia. The dinner was a demonstration that West Virginia labor unions are interested in working with management for mutual understanding and good relations."

Paul N. King, president of Textile Workers Union No. 1051, presided at the event. Joseph R. Gilmore, member of the house of delegates of the West Virginia Legislature and president of the Parsons Chamber of Commerce, presented framed copies of James Henry Leigh Hunt's poem, "Abou Ben Adhem." to Mr. Rubin and Mr. Brown. President J. Kenton Lambert of the Cheat Valley Development Corp., presented life honorary memberships in the Holly Meadows Country Club to the two honor guests, and noted that, as another mark of progress in the Parsons area, the country club is the only one in the Nation converted from a county poor farm.

The union president and the company president justifiably joined in commenting that "the ideal of the dinner and the splendid fellowship demonstrated serve as good omens of what prospective plant managers can find in labor relations in West Virginia."

Mr. President, I associate myself with those remarks, and I call attention again to a letter I received on November 9, 1959, from John P. Russo, then the plant manager of Metalab Labcraft Division of the Norbute Corp. at Elkins, W. Va.

Before I came to the U.S. Senate, I participated with other citizens in the founding of the Elkins Industrial Development Corp. Among our activities, with Phil Goldman as president, we sought new industries for the county and were successful in procuring the division of Norbute Corp., to utilize both West Virginia natural resources and our citizens' skills and labor. Our industrial development corporation procured a site near Beverly and erected a plant facility. This firm manufactures scientific laboratory furniture and equipment.

Two years after Metalab-Labcraft began operations, I received the communication from Mr. Russo in which he expressed his belief in the industriousness and adaptability of West Virginians.

He reminded me that his firm, at the time of the establishment of the plant in West Virginia, had a backlog of orders which amounted to several million dollars. But, he wrote, "we had no trained source of labor and were in reality engaged in fulfilling these contracts with no qualified personnel," and he then added:

> The most remarkable fact concerning this situation was that we employed immediately approximately 75 persons with no past experience or skills in our industry and within the period of 6 months we produced all of the items required for our backlog of work at that time * * *. To me, as the operating head of this division, it will always stand out as a tribute to the native intelligence and capabilities of the workers in our area. Primarily, our personnel had a background and experience in the mining industry and in timber production. Notwithstanding, we have developed our status in our industry from a new entrant in a very competitive field to a position commanding authority and respect by the leaders in our industry.

Mr. Russo pointed out that he had been in the industry 24 years and during that time had been located in eight different parts of the country where he had been "exposed" to the qualifications, capabilities, and aptitude of the labor pool in those areas. Then he noted this:

> I say without equivocation that I have never before seen a group of people who have combined their zealousness, attitude, cooperation and native capabilities, to achieve the measure of performance that we have here [in our West Virginia operation] * * * It was expected that the labor supply here would be of such a caliber that a training period would be necessary, and it was calculated that before we reached the competitive level in our industry, insofar as quality of production was concerned, that at least a year would be required. I am delighted to say that it took us just about half that time to arrive at a point in production which made us competitive with others in the industry.

Mr. President, the labor-management experiences relating both to the Dorman Mills at Parsons and the Metalab-Labcraft facility at Elkins, are excellent examples of harmonious relationships which exist within industry in West Virginia.

But these individual examples are buttressed by facts and statistics of a broader nature as disclosed by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg in a recent address in Fairmont, W. Va., where Melpar, a division of Westinghouse Air Brake, recently established a new plant.

Secretary Goldberg indicated that some industries might hesitate to locate in West Virginia because of a belief that some areas have been labeled as being "strike happy."

But the Secretary of Labor revealed that during the 8-year period from 1953 to 1960 industry in West Virginia lost an average of only 0.37 percent of total working time as a result of labor-management disputes, or about 1 day per year per employee, on the average. This loss ratio, his statistical report showed, was considerably less than most neighboring States and only slightly above the national average.

While that situation relates to the 8-year average up to 1960, Secretary Goldberg noted that "perhaps more significant in dispelling any notion of strike proneness was the record for the year 1960, the latest for which data are now available."

In 1960, he said, "the strike-loss ratio for West Virginia amounted to 0.10 percent, which was below the level of all neighboring States, and even significantly below the U.S. total of 0.17 percent."

Mr. President, we have suffered from chronic unemployment in severe degree in West Virginia and there has been a substantial attrition in our labor force. These conditions, however, have not been the result of any decline in worker-employer relations. The fact is that the contrary is true. Labor-management understanding and the strike-loss ratio have both improved substantially. Our problems stem principally from the necessarily rapid pace of mechanization in our basic coal mining industry and from automation generally.

To meet competition from other fuels—particularly from foreign residual fuel oil unfortunately permitted by policies of Government to be imported into our country in excessive quantities—our coal industry, not only in West Virginia but in other coal producing States as well, was forced to quicken the pace of mechanization. This accelerated the rate of unemployment in coal and coal-related business and industries in areas of the State where terrain and other factors mitigate against the establishment of replacement industries to provide payrolls and jobs equivalent to those displaced.

We are making progress, even though it is not at the rate necessary to overcome in a substantial degree the high level of unemployment induced by the impact of consistently increasing automation in recent years.

At the time of passage of S. 1991—the Manpower Development and Training Act—I suggested that it might well be a cornerstone of the administration's program for improvement of the economy and as a means to help solve the unemployment problem.

In West Virginia we are vocational training and retraining conscious because we recognize in these programs necessary means to the end of helping to overcome chronic joblessness. As we strive in our State to diversify the industrial complex and to stimulate the economy, we must develop our manpower resources in full measure. We realize this will require extensive retraining of many of our available workers.

I am again reminded of a pertinent editorial comment in the March 4, 1962, issue of the Charleston, W. Va., Sunday Gazette-Mail which pointed out that the problems and hardships of the automation era which have plagued West Virginia are likewise being experienced in some degree in other States—indeed, in some States only recently.

> The development of retraining programs—both for those displaced by mechanization and for youths who drop out of high school—is progressing, and this improves the prospects for attracting new processing and conversion type industries—

The editor wrote.

Mr. President, we need in West Virginia the benefits which accrue from Federal-State participation programs such as the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Area Redevelopment Act. We are also grateful for the Small Business Administration and its helpful loan programs, as well as the activities which stem from the Housing and Home Finance Agency and other agencies and departments of the Federal Government. And we are always hopeful that our industries, our businesses, and our people will be able to participate more equitably in the distribution of defense installation and defense procurement dollars. Some segments of the press malign us for our aspirations in these respects; others suggest that we are discouraged and somewhat unhappy that the administration has not moved faster to provide our State and her people with more of the fruits from the tree of Federal programs. On balance, we know that progress is being made.

Occasionally, however, the sturdiness, the fortitude, and the characteristics of self-reliance of the "Mountaineers" are duly recognized.

In this connection, I call attention to an editorial from the April 7, 1962, issue of the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times which comments on and quotes from interesting editorials from recent issues of the Palm Beach (Fla.) Times and the Annapolis (Md.) Evening Capital. I request unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE'S SELF-HELP EFFORTS GAIN RECOGNITION

West Virginians have been accustomed to reading unpleasant things about themselves and their State—and getting extremely upset about them—for so long that any favorable publicity borders on the realm of headline news.

When this comes from as widely separated communities as Palm Beach, Fla., and Annapolis, Md., such kind attention approaches the classification of sensational treatment. But such is the case, as editorials from those cities forwarded to the Times disclose.

There is sufficient similarity between the two pieces to suggest that the writers might have received identical information concerning West Virginia's efforts to get itself back on its feet. Nonetheless, both make interesting reading for those in this State who feel they have been more than necessarily subjected to the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune.

Here is last Tuesday's editorial from the Palm Beach Times in its entirety:

"During the 1960 presidential campaign, the State of West Virginia was a rather obviously depressed area, and a Senator, John F. Kennedy, made a lot of promises to do something about it if he was elected. He was. All West Virginia had to do was ask Washington for money to get it.

"But the 'Mountaineers' have done things for themselves.

"First came a $7.5 million crash public works program that made jobs for 9,000 persons. It was financed by a 1-cent increase in the State sales tax. It has resulted in improved roads, deepened stream channels, improved parks and recreational facilities, and community cleanup programs.

"Then there was created a division of individual development in the State department of commerce. So far, 46 new industries employing 5,000 persons have been brought in, and 45 industries already in the State have launched a massive expansion program to employ 2,500 more.

"A little more than a year ago, West Virginia had 96,000 jobless, mostly miners. Today the figure has dropped to 63,000—a reduction of 33 percent in a single year.

"The State legislature has established an industrial development authority, with a $2 million revolving fund to provide loans, when needed, to new or expanding industries where unemployment is serious.

"There is a statewide cleanup drive, people are beginning to take pride in the appearance of roadsides, parks and their communities. There are now 12 major regional development organizations, and 79 cities and towns have their own municipal development agencies.

"The State is being sold not only as an industrial center but as a tourist attraction.

"Says Gov. William W. Barron, who took office just 14 months ago, 'We have turned the tide of recession and made our economy more stable, while recovering a sense of purpose and restoring confidence in ourselves and in our State government. We have launched a movement in cooperative planning by self-reliant and very self-sufficient citizens.'

"If this be treason against the national welfare state, let them make the most of it.

"West Virginia deserves the congratulations and the thanks of all Americans."

An editorial in the Annapolis Evening Capital starts out: "Boy! Phone the florist shop and have them send a dozen red roses to the State of West Virginia as a token of our esteem for the way that sovereign State is staging an economic comeback without yelling for huge chunks of Federal money.

"In 14 months since Gov. William W. Barron took office there is, we are told, a new hope and grim determination, plus a lot of applied hard work taking place there in contrast to the despair and gloom that has existed."

Pointing out that West Virginia has not looked to Washington but has undertaken development programs on its own, the Annapolis paper recites the steps taken by this State in its own behalf and concludes: "There is a moral here which is inescapable. Note how little the State has relied on the 'great white father' in Washington. More power to the great State of West Virginia, and boy! better make that two dozen roses instead of one. Those people deserve congratulations. They've showing the rest of the country what backbone and self-help and self-pride really is."

This is the kind of publicity that West Virginia can use in ever-increasing quantities. It's good to know that proper recognition is finally being given us.

STEEL PRICE INCREASE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it was with a very heavy heart I heard the news of the steel price increase, especially in view of the fact that approximately 20 percent of the steel of the United States is produced in my home State of Indiana.

I believe the people of the United States basically were rather satisfied and felt relieved when the recent announcement was issued to the effect that the steel union and management had entered into a contract, and there was to be no increase in wages, except for some fringe benefits for certain employees. It was felt at the time that the agreement was ably arrived at under the direction and encouragement of the President of the United States, and I compliment him for so doing. The Secretary of Labor, Mr. Goldberg, was also one of the driving personalities who recognized that another steel strike similar to the last one could have only possibly disastrous results for the economic recovery we now have with us.

We observed that immediately after the previous steel strike, at least as a contributing factor to the steel strike, there was to some extent, possibly, an acceleration of the coming recession.

Everyone thought, this time, that the results would be fine and good for the country, and that we could go about the business of orderly planning. This feeling was shattered by the news of the steel companies coming forward with an announcement of an immediate increase in the price of steel, out of proportion to any concept of any individuals or groups as being necessary.

I hope that those who made this decision, on the part of steel management, will reconsider, realizing that they, too, have an obligation to their communities and to society.

Fearful that they may not reconsider, I urge them at least to give consideration as to what they are doing to America. They have complained about losing their competitive advantages and their competitive position with respect to oversea production. I know the sympathy of many people, which was with them when the settlement was agreed upon a few weeks ago, may now be lost at least temporarily, and perhaps, with regard to some, lost forever.

It is an unfortunate thing to happen to the United States, steel being a basic industry. It is an unfortunate thing for the people of the State of Indiana. I say to my friends in the steel industry, "Reexamine your position. Think back."

I am sure that they not alone would have the best wishes of the people of the United States, but also would serve the best interests of their own stockholders if they would reconsider and withdraw the intention to increase the price of steel.

NEED TO RESTORE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I hope the President's message on transportation, recently sent to the Congress, marks the beginning of the end of an era of neglect of our transportation system.

It is perhaps understandable, but nonetheless tragic, that the attention of past administrations and the public should have been diverted from this basic facet of our economic strength and military preparedness by the more dramatic new horizons of space travel and missile weaponry. Therefore, I commend the President who in his message has brought us back to the realities of surface and near-surface movements of men and materials. We have no tools which do more to congeal the various segments of our economy or the forces constituting our military might.

Our economy depends on the ship, the railroad, the truck, the barge, the plane, the bus, and the automobile. We should not neglect these realities in our understandable concern for the orbit and the moon. On the basis of the President's message, I am assured that this will not happen.

Moreover, I feel also that we cannot any longer afford, in the world struggle on basic ways of life, with the intricate role transportation plays therein, the time-consuming luxury of treating our total transportation system as an isolated part of our real strength or the concern entirely of the carriers.

Nothing in America's free enterprise system daily touches more people from Alaska to Florida, from Hawaii to Maine, than our workaday transportation media.

As the President has recognized, we must end the preoccupation of the past which has produced patch-quilt practices and neglected a real system. We must stop plugging this gap in this media one day and another gap in some other media the next, as we have been doing. The time has come to build anew on the basis of what we now have. There is a rich and proud tradition for all America in the pony express, the covered wagon, and ships of sail. Our tools and technology have changed dramatically but our transportation policy remains uncoordinated.

Within this framework I believe the President's message is perceptive and progressive. I endorse much of what he recommends.

Nevertheless, I am struck by the failure of the message to include specific recommendations in several critical areas in domestic shipping. I hope that the lack of concentration results from the pressure of time and is to be corrected and elaborated upon in the near future by a special message on these other maritime matters when the conclusions of governmental studies now underway are available.

Few would dispute that our merchant marine is a vital part of our transportation system, thus of our national strength and security. Yet today ours is an unbalanced fleet and an inadequate one. This deficiency is all the more obvious in this the most critical era of our Nation's history.

In terms of pure national survival, this shortcoming may be meaningless, but only so if we are convinced that we are on the precipice of a thermonuclear war. Although this route to human disaster is a possibility for which we must be prepared, our people and our President want U.S. military forces to be capable of taking action in any direction and form that international conflict may require, including a so-called limited war or a continuation of the already prolonged cold war. It was, my colleagues will recall, only recently that Mr. Khrushchev announced to the world that international communism's world victory would be economic and would take place through the medium of peaceful production and trade.

Thus, faced as we are with a broad range of types of conflict, America's survival depends on total preparedness against the inroads of Communist aggression.

Part of this preparation demands a more adequate American merchant marine in peaceful, domestic, and international trade, yet better ready to assume burdens that will be thrust upon it in an emergency.

We entered World War II with a grossly inadequate merchant marine for trade or defense, although less so than had the Congress not passed a Merchant Marine Act in 1936. During the war we spent $13 billion on merchant vessel construction, yielding some 5,000 ships. Even at the then low rate of interest on our national debt, it is now costing us some $300 million per year in interest alone on this cost, which could in part have been avoided were we better prepared.

None of my colleagues needs reminding about the valiant role played by merchant shipping and American sailors during that trying period. Perhaps no one was then in a better position to speak about this monumental undertaking than General Eisenhower, who in 1944, in London, said:

> When final victory is ours, there is no organization that will share its credit more deservedly than the American merchant marine.
>
> We were caught flat-footed in both world wars because we relied too much upon foreign-owned and operated shipping to carry our cargoes abroad and to bring critically needed supplies to this country.
>
> America's industrial prosperity and military security both demand that we maintain a privately operated merchant marine adequate in size and of modern design to insure that our lines of supply for either peace or war will be safe.

Quite naturally, when peace came, we sought to dispose of this abundance of vessels and assist in the rehabilitation of the merchant marines of many of the traditional maritime powers. This we did by the process of sale. Incidentally, these sales returned a greater proportion on investment than the disposal of any other wartime asset—843 vessels were sold for American registry and 1,113 abroad.

After World War II, with our fleet then in existence, we carried some 65 percent of our own foreign commerce. By 1950 this had fallen to 43 percent, and now it is down to approximately 10 percent. What further substantiation can I offer that we are yielding our rightful place on the seas?

It is, moreover, interesting to note that even the present participation of our ships in our own foreign trade is substantially prevented from plummeting still farther by the fact that Congress had the wisdom to provide in 1954 that no less than half of Government-generated cargoes be carried in U.S.-flag ships. It has been the single most important instrument in the last decade toward the maintenance of whatever semblance of an American merchant marine we now possess. That principle has been discussed on the floor of this body on many occasions, and the Congress has never failed to endorse it, in spite of opposition from limited segments both here and abroad.

But this principle, as enunciated by the Congress, is only slightly more than an indication of congressional intent. It is administered by each individual shipping agency of the United States Government without any overall guidelines and generally without dedication to more than minimum adherence. The President has stated that all executive agencies have been directed to comply fully with the purpose of the cargo preference laws. In my opinion, it is essential and I would urge the President to see to it that full compliance is actually given and potential benefit of this statute in the national interest is promptly realized.

Immediately prior to the outbreak of war in Korea, our merchant fleet consisted of 1,170 ships of 14 million deadweight tons and constituted 17.3 percent of the world's total. Today, just over a decade later, it totals 973 ships of about the same tonnage but is less than 9 percent of the world's total and it is older than foreign fleets as well.

And it is significant to note that during this same period of the last decade, total international seaborne trade has risen by some 83 percent, and our own waterborne foreign trade has risen by 126 percent. Thus it becomes obvious, as a result of fierce foreign competition and the necessity of maintaining American standards of living, that our fleet does not automatically improve in stature because of an increasing volume of seaborne trade. No small part of this resistance is caused by national policies abroad being pursued at almost any cost and aimed at developing large merchant fleets where none existed before, or to augment the fleets in the traditional maritime countries.

The responsibilities for the creation of an adequate American merchant marine are not exclusively those of the U.S. Government. American management, in partnership with American labor, must assume a large part of this responsibility and in fact play a greater role toward this end than has been the case to date. I am, however, sure that this enlargement of activities on the part of the private segments of the industry will take place when once the Government has publicly reconfirmed its national goals in this area and manifests, with consistency, its willingness and its desire to see these achieved. I can appreciate that unless Government policy affecting the well-being of the maritime industry turns less mercurial than has been the case in the past, that industry with its limited resources and long-term investment requirements is at a disadvantage in proceeding.

There are several specifics about our existing merchant marine that I must call attention to today. They appear paramount among many that must be taken into consideration if our fleet is to progress and be a real part of the Nation's transportation system.

First, our reliance on raw materials for our growing industrial economy depends overwhelmingly on ships. The Department of Defense estimates that there are approximately 75 raw materials essential to our economy and survival which must be imported, some in part, others completely. On the export side, rural America in particular, but actually the entire Nation, must appreciate the significance of sending abroad, in bulk, under established national programs, much of the surplus of our farm production. These import and export requirements along with others require a substantial increase in our almost nonexistent fleet of bulk carriers.

Second, I must address myself to the erosion of our coastal and intercoastal fleets, of which we were once so proud and with which we once were so well equipped, and which because of position were pressed so promptly into wartime emergency service in the past. Hearings were recently held on the decline of this strategic part of our shipping industry. It was reported that just before the outbreak of World War II there was a total of 350 dry-cargo ships in the coastwise and intercoastal trades. It is estimated that by the close of 1960 there remained a total of 70 ships in the same trade, but of that number only 15 vessels remained in the general cargo common carriage. The Interstate Commerce Commission which has regulatory jurisdiction over these carriers reports that early in 1961 another major line in the trade discontinued its service, thereby again substantially reducing the number of vessels in the trade.

This dislocation has contributed substantially to the lack of balance in our total transportation system. It is a wrong that must be righted. The painstaking inquiry into this problem, its cause and effect, referred to earlier was conducted by the Committee on Commerce under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and on which committee I have the honor of serving.

Six major recommendations were made, none of which in my opinion requires legislative effectuation. Far and away the primary point of the six dealt with ratemaking under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I urge the administration to consider effectuating all of these conclusions in consideration of bringing to our consuming public a more balanced transportation system. I feel, however, that we are grasping at straws in trying to build a sound system if we do not fairly and economically resolve ratemaking issues which are so fundamental to all domestic transportation media.

I also consider that a major consideration of our new look at transportation must include our waterborne domestic trade to the States of Hawaii and Alaska and our offshore territories and possessions, particularly the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and, likewise, Guam.

The loyal and dedicated Americans of these regions find their economies intricately linked with the continental States primarily but also the rest of the free world by shipping.

Alaska's trade is relatively small today in volume but is vital to its well-being and the realization of its vast potential. We are proud of the progress we have already made. Between 1955 and 1960 the tonnage of the waterborne commerce moving through the ports of Alaska increased over 65 percent, and the value of our trade with Japan has expanded most dramatically in the past few years. Between 1959 and 1960, Alaska imports from Japan increased from $200,000 to over $1.3 million, and exports grew from $2.8 million to $15 million. During these years and earlier, we have been blessed also by a period of labor peace in the maritime trade in Alaska.

Our trade with port cities in the continental States as domestic trade is confined to movements in U.S.-flag vessels. We would not have it otherwise. Perhaps from a very short-range point of view, economies might be realized by opening this movement to any low-cost foreign-flag ships. In short order, however, this would force American-flag vessels off these routes and we would find ourselves dependent on alien vessels and alien loyalties. Thus, we prefer to remain serviced by American-flag ships. But this is not without problems. The complications and costs of offshore U.S.-flag domestic service have resulted in numerous increases in freight rates. In the past 10 years in the Alaska trade alone, five general rate increases have been proposed. Last week for the first time a Federal maritime examiner decided that a proposed rate increase for Alaska was unreasonable at least for the future since the dominant carrier received in excess of 19 percent return on its capital invested in the Alaska trade in 1960. The Commission will now have an opportunity to review the examiner's decision and to determine if some measure of restitution is not due the shipping public for these past years. Similar rate increases have seriously affected the economies of Hawaii and Puerto Rico and Guam. Constantly increasing freight rates may well in the future limit, if not frustrate entirely, the realization of the full potential of these areas, particularly Alaska.

In all fairness, however, I cannot attribute this development entirely to any monopolistic position of an existing carrier in these trades. The water in the noncontiguous trade has been competitively open to all who possessed the initiative and capital to engage in the commerce. During the past 3 years, the Alaska trade has become increasingly modernized with more economical, efficient, and lower-cost barge and containerized service. Later this year train-barge and train-ship service will enter the Alaska trade promising even more efficient service and, it is hoped, lower transportation costs. One may well wonder if these developments would have come to pass without the healthy pressure of economic competition. We are proud that this has been achieved without the Federal Government being involved in the business decision of whether a new carrier or means of transportation should enter the Alaska trade. The Federal Government neither gives the carriers any protective operating rights nor requires the carriers to serve.

Although recent developments such as more effective regulation by the new Federal Maritime Commission and increased modernization of the Alaska trade have brightened our hopes for the future, my constituents are today still caught in a position of having to absorb extremely high freight rates into the economy. Now, this is not unique. The whole westward development of our country faced virtually identical problems except that the distances were not quite so vast and the surfaces involved less liquid. The Government, realizing this, stepped in to breach the gap. The gap is the difference between rates which will not be burdensome to Alaska but must be high enough to perpetuate adequate and dependable service by private U.S.-flag carriers. Again, in my opinion, the only intensely involved party that can play this role and breach this gap is the Federal Government. I have given long and serious thought to the mechanics for implementing this vital objective. The President has asked the Secretary of Commerce to review specifically the costs of service to our noncontiguous territories. I urge the Secretary, and I offer my full cooperation, to press forward in this matter with great speed and come forward with recommendations to accomplish this objective.

This must be done not only in fairness to the citizens of the State I represent, but truly in the interest of the people of the entire United States. There is precious little time to be lost.

We know of our President's concern, in part, because of the community of interest between the United States and the rest of the free world for increasing our export trade and avoiding the serious consequences of economic isolation. In my opinion, it would be a most serious mistake to strive to accelerate our foreign trade while at the same time allowing merchant ships to move farther and farther from American control and American national purpose.

THE ADMINISTRATION SHOULD REVERSE ITS POSITION ON TRADE VETO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in December 1961, anticipating the important debate over new trade legislation, I strongly urged that the administration include in its trade bill a provision allowing the Congress to veto trade agreements which exceed the authority granted to the President to negotiate trade agreements.

In a nutshell, my argument is that the Constitution gives the power to the Congress to regulate trade. The practicalities of administering trade policy in the complex postwar world in which we live have necessitated that broad authority to negotiate trade agreements had to be turned over to the President. However, this authority is turned over to the President only under certain conditions.

Under the proposed trade bill submitted to us, there is no way in which the Congress can determine whether the President exercises this authority with a proper regard for the conditions which the Congress has placed upon him. A congressional veto, by a two-thirds vote, exercised within 60 days of the submission of a new trade agreement to the Congress, is not an unreasonable request. It would give the Congress an opportunity, in an area which the Constitution clearly assigns to the Congress, to indicate its general approval or disapproval of what the President has done.

Mr. President, I have been watching with interest the hearings in the Ways and Means Committee of the other body where an excellent job has been done in making it possible for groups on all sides of the trade issue to have their day in court. I have noted in particular that many of the witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee have supported the general proposal of congressional oversight, of a trade veto. Support for this proposal has not simply come from those who might be called protectionists, it has also come from many who support the President's trade program in general, but who feel that certain changes need to be made in the specific legislation which the administration has proposed.

Mr. President, in January of this year I addressed a letter to Under Secretary of State, George Ball, the principal author of the President's trade program, requesting the administration's views on this recommendation. The Under Secretary's reply dated February 13 indicated opposition. He said in part:

> The negotiation of agreements that will preserve and expand market opportunities for American producers will undoubtedly prove complex and difficult. If they are to succeed it will be essential that our representatives be able to assure their negotiating partners that they are in position to conclude binding arrangements. I am afraid that the element of insecurity implicit in the possibility of a congressional veto could place our side under an almost impossible disability.

I replied to Secretary Ball on the Senate floor several weeks later and pointed out that his argument is a very limited one. The present structure of the Common Market retains a power roughly analogous to the congressional trade veto in the Council of Ministers of the EEC which has supervisory authority over the Commission which does the actual negotiating of trade agreements.

Furthermore, prior to the creation of the Common Market the Governments of West Germany and the United Kingdom retained to their Parliaments a similar power of oversight in trade negotiations. This is certainly a precedent to which we should give heed. In the cases of Sweden and Japan, both of which are parties to the new GATT agreement announced in March, they received prior authority from their Parliaments to enter into these negotiations. In this instance, the Parliaments granted advance approval for trade agreements under the terms of GATT.

My rebuttal, then, to the administration is on four counts:

First. The Common Market has an analogous power of oversight by a governmental agency other than that which is directly responsible for the negotiating of trade agreements.

Second. Other countries with which we do business retain to their parliaments a similar power of oversight on trade matters.

Third. Congress has a constitutional right to participate to a greater extent in the business of foreign trade. If we are going to give the President new tariff cutting authority, then surely we can take steps also to develop innovations in our trade legislation that will give the Congress some say over what is going on.

Fourth. A trade veto by a two-thirds vote of both bodies of the Congress could only be exercised under extreme conditions, wherein the administration had clearly exceeded the authority granted to it to negotiate trade agreements.

I would make one further point. On March 7 of this year, the administration announced a new tariff agreement with the EEC, the United Kingdom, and 24 other member nations of the GATT. Since it was announced and its terms were given to the press, I have heard little, very little, criticism of the specific terms or overall pattern of this agreement. As an illustration that a two-thirds trade veto would only be exercised under extreme conditions, I am quite certain that there is not sufficient congressional sentiment to veto this agreement—of March 7—by a two-thirds vote of both bodies.

I say this by way of showing that a two-thirds trade veto authority would and could only be exercised under the most extreme circumstances. The fact that the GATT agreement would not have been vetoed or have ever come close to being vetoed by a two-thirds vote is a good case in point.

The power which we are requesting for the Congress is not a power which would be disruptive or diversionary. It is a reasonable request. I am confident that the Congress has the wisdom and the ability in its technical committees to deal with this issue and to make intelligent decisions as to whether the President has adhered to or exceeded the power granted to him by the law to negotiate trade agreements. In a sense, he is negotiating for the Congress, because the Congress has the constitutional authority in this field.

Mr. President, I have made these remarks to bring the Congress up to date as to the controversy, if I may call it that, over the trade veto. While the administration is officially on record as opposed, there seems to be remarkably little opposition in other circles. I therefore want to take this opportunity today to strongly urge that the administration reverse its position now. If this is done, if the administration would promote and support a suitable trade veto provision, I feel certain that such a move would expand congressional support for the President's trade bill in its present form and would make its passage much less difficult. I support trade liberalization. In general, I support the administration's proposal to accomplish this purpose. I feel, however, that the trade veto is the one glaring omission which if included would greatly facilitate the process of passing effective new trade legislation and putting it on the books.

Mr. President, I have prepared appropriate legislative language on the trade veto patterned after the reorganization act which contains a very similar provision. I intend to offer this amendment on the floor of the Senate assuming, of course, that nothing is done on this point either in the other body or in the Senate Finance Committee. However, I would definitely prefer to have the administration reverse its position right away, because I believe that the acceptance of a congressional oversight amendment at this time would materially expand support in the Congress for new and effective trade legislation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 12, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 11, 1962:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Hortense C. Quarles, Tyler, Ala., in place of L. T. Minter, retired.

ARKANSAS

Robert E. Russell, Bentonville, Ark., in place of E. L. Williams, deceased.

John P. Lamb, Brookland, Ark., in place of R. H. Bridger, transferred.

Martha L. Rakes, Cave Springs, Ark., in place of B. H. Fagala, deceased.

Earl L. Pryor, Greenwood, Ark., in place of H. B. Stewart, retired.

Ray M. McCarty, Helena, Ark., in place of J. A. Leighton, retired.

Bert D. Johnson, Jonesboro, Ark., in place of Harry Craig, retired.

Ava D. White, Mount Ida, Ark., in place of W. J. White, deceased.

Corbit White, Strong, Ark., in place of W. H. Gorman, retired.

Fred L. Sullivan, Wickes, Ark., in place of S. M. Higginbottom, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Lorna J. Evovich, Hickman, Calif., in place of Alma Lynn, retired.

John T. Little, Mill Valley, Calif., in place of J. E. McSweeney, retired.

Donald V. Lee, Orosi, Calif., in place of T. S. Powell, retired.

F. Clay Fisher, San Bruno, Calif., in place of D. P. Morrison, deceased.

COLORADO

Floyd C. Bradfield, Cortez, Colo., in place of W. W. Winegar, resigned.

Wallace R. Thompson, Wiley, Colo., in place of B. N. Cramb, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Philip V. Rokosa, Bristol, Conn., in place of H. C. Polhill, retired.

B. Woodruff Clark, Litchfield, Conn., in place of S. A. Beckwith, retired.

John J. Slattery, Waterbury, Conn., in place of W. J. Phelan, retired.

DELAWARE

Jackie Hickman, Bethany Beach, Del., in place of S. A. Bennett, removed.

FLORIDA

Eugene R. Nelson, Bushnell, Fla., in place of W. T. Eddins, retired.

Allen F. Kendall, Jensen Beach, Fla., in place of W. C. Johnson, retired.

GEORGIA

Henry S. Dickson, Lilburn, Ga., in place of J. T. Jordan, retired.

Hazel J. Shellhouse, Willacoochee, Ga., in place of Lige Corbitt, retired.

IDAHO

Anna G. Bailey, Grand View, Idaho, in place of H. S. Bailey, deceased.

Roy B. Fields, McCall, Idaho, in place of C. L. Burdett, retired.

ILLINOIS

Dru A. Tighe, Aledo, Ill., in place of C. D. Lawson, retired.

Ralph E. Haffenden, Belvidere, Ill., in place of P. I. O'Brien, retired.

Carl W. Mattea, Caseyville, Ill., in place of J. R. Depper, removed.

Sereno Leoni, Highwood, Ill., in place of M. B. East, retired.

Cornelius L. DiPiotti, Taylorville, Ill., in place of S. W. Hershey, deceased.

INDIANA

Dale Hardeman, Lynn, Ind., in place of D. B. Mann, deceased.

IOWA

Herbert D. Wilson, Alden, Iowa, in place of S. G. Douglas, deceased.

Elsie D. Messamaker, Harvey, Iowa, in place of M. M. Bennett, retired.

Harry P. Healey, Victor, Iowa, in place of A. C. Soer, resigned.

KANSAS

Helen I. Ziegelmeir, Gem, Kans., in place of W. R. Riblett, retired.

Ted H. French, Jamestown, Kans., in place of S. E. Murray, retired.

Adolph H. Goetz, La Crosse, Kans., in place of A. E. Elias, retired.

David C. Tippet, Parsons, Kans., in place of R. J. Sharshel, retired.

George I. Althouse, Jr., Sabetha, Kans., in place of G. I. Althouse, retired.

KENTUCKY

Joe W. Treas, Fulton, Ky., in place of N. W. Carter, Jr., resigned.

Manville H. Fryman, Germantown, Ky., in place of F. E. Jordan, deceased.

Marguerite S. Crume, Mount Eden, Ky., in place of M. S. Catlett, retired.

LOUISIANA

Kermit M. Pinsonat, Livonia, La., in place of G. M. Johnson, deceased.

MAINE

Donald Hollister, Hartland, Maine, in place of L. W. Greene, deceased.

MARYLAND

Samuel U. Phillips, Hebron, Md., in place of S. T. Culver, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Reo E. Sievert, Ashley, Mich., in place of Charles Keck, Jr., resigned.

Arthur E. Fleetwood, Beulah, Mich., in place of R. B. Fair, retired.

Daniel J. Brosnan, Dowagiac, Mich., in place of G. A. Stahl, deceased.

Clifford B. Brown, Jr., Stephenson, Mich., in place of G. W. Beaudoin, retired.

John D. Wenzel, Sturgis, Mich., in place of J. E. Luttmann, deceased.

Oliver C. Ley, Williamston, Mich., in place of F. A. Brown, retired.

MINNESOTA

Dayle E. Ray, Barrett, Minn., in place of O. A. Jacobson, transferred.

Marie L. Moore, Castle Rock, Minn., in place of D. W. Burton, deceased.

Lawrence V. Niehoff, New Ulm, Minn., in place of Elmer Backer, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Lura A. Johnson, Glen Allan, Miss., in place of E. O. Johnson, retired.

Horace S. Polk, Greenville, Miss., in place of M. C. Johnson, retired.

MISSOURI

Stanley H. Crain, Boonville, Mo., in place of E. A. Williams, retired.

William R. Burk, Canton, Mo., in place of H. M. Ward, deceased.

William W. Evans, Center, Mo., in place of B. F. Coleman, retired.

Mildred B. Vick, Deering, Mo., in place of F. A. Brown, retired.

William C. Blair, Jefferson City, Mo., in place of C. A. Platt, deceased.

Lloyd E. McMullen, Slater, Mo., in place of H. B. Brown, retired.

NEBRASKA

Charles E. Churchill, Fairbury, Nebr., in place of J. B. Page, deceased.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Charles J. Beaudette, Alton, N.H., in place of A. P. Varney, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Carl A. Brueckner, Allenhurst, N.J., in place of A. G. King, deceased.

Kathryn E. Legg, Dorchester, N.J., in place of F. M. Champion, resigned.

Vincent T. Fagan, Jackson, N.J., in place of F. A. Asay, retired.

Dorothy E. Barth, Landisville, N.J., in place of G. A. Barth, retired.

Isabel B. Lowden, Leesburg, N.J., in place of F. G. Lowden, deceased.

NEW YORK

Erma B. Tenney, Alexander, N.Y., in place of E. R. Harrington, retired.

Marcella J. Lee, Crown Point, N.Y., in place of C. S. Kloos, deceased.

Raymond E. Skinner, Greenwood Lake, N.Y., in place of I. J. Posten, retired.

Robert J. Skebey, Horseheads, N.Y., in place of B. W. Playfoot, retired.

Albert J. Hart, Lynbrook, N.Y., in place of M. A. Cahill, retired.

Margaret M. Vaughan, Rush, N.Y., in place of E. L. Quinn, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Wilson L. Fisher, Elizabethtown, N.C., in place of J. K. Clark, retired.

G. Smith Shaw, Ivanhoe, N.C., in place of Fred Simpson, transferred.

J. Frank Smith, Lexington, N.C., in place of S. J. Smith, retired.

Edward L. Clayton, Tarboro, N.C., in place of T. T. Thomas, retired.

John A. Harrelson, Whiteville, N.C., in place of A. E. Powell, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Leo A. Roden, Casselton, N. Dak., in place of M. M. Roden, deceased.

OHIO

William F. Wetzel, Jr., Clayton, Ohio, in place of B. M. Lockwood, resigned.

William Lawson, Geneva, Ohio, in place of C. H. Humphrey, retired.

M. Kathryn Swank, Lewisburg, Ohio, in place of W. W. Farra, retired.

Mary L. Walker, Sugar Grove, Ohio, in place of Frankie Junkerman, retired.

Lewis E. Bales, Xenia, Ohio, in place of D. C. Bradfute, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Romaine S. McGuire, Crescent, Okla., in place of E. A. Blackmon, retired.

Frankie G. Morrow, Konawa, Okla., in place of R. D. Farish, retired.

Marvin F. Anderson, Moore, Okla., in place of D. F. Almack, retired.

Harris R. Underwood, Waukomis, Okla., in place of R. C. Grable, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Paul S. Weaver, Blain, Pa., in place of M. F. Woods, retired.

Erma I. Gibson, Bolivar, Pa., in place of H. N. Byers, retired.

Carl F. Englehart, Hunlock Creek, Pa., in place of S. C. Croop, deceased.

George M. Guswiler, Mechanicsburg, Pa., in place of G. C. Dietz, transferred.

Ernest S. Glatfelter, York, Pa., in place of E. A. Barnitz, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Charles P. Carroll, Kingston, Tenn., in place of B. W. Harvey, removed.

William R. Payne, Shelbyville, Tenn., in place of D. B. Shofner, retired.

Tom C. Morris, Waverly, Tenn., in place of R. H. McCrary, removed.

TEXAS

Carroll D. Brice, Bruni, Tex., in place of I. J. Brice, retired.

Joe F. Bennett, Coolidge, Tex., in place of G. N. Sellers, retired.

Thomas H. Finger, D'Hanis, Tex., in place of Alphonse Boog, retired.

Ulman Bruner, Mineola, Tex., in place of D. S. Lankford, retired.

Jacob E. Shoaf, Quitman, Tex., in place of J. T. Morse, transferred.

Billy D. Dockery, Trenton, Tex., in place of W. H. Summers, transferred.

Clifford E. Cummins, Windom, Tex., in place of G. C. Cooper, retired.

UTAH

Robert Q. Strong, Provo, Utah, in place of W. R. Green, retired.

VIRGINIA

Wilson L. Coleman, Bowling Green, Va., in place of F. G. Beale, retired.

Lillie M. Lowman, Iron Gate, Va., in place of L. M. Gertzen, retired.

Jimmie G. Orr, Sr., Pennington Gap, Va., in place of J. W. Newman, deceased.

Joseph T. Crosswhite, Jr., Virginia Beach, Va., in place of H. S. Myers, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Marvin J. Robbins, Burien, Wash., in place of A. C. Klotz, deceased.

Edward B. Pulice, Concrete, Wash., in place of C. M. P. St. John, retired.

Harold F. Evans, Coulee City, Wash., in place of A. J. Twining, retired.

James P. Daley, Zillah, Wash., in place of G. W. Schroeder, retired.

WISCONSIN

Clarence J. Mashak, Bangor, Wis., in place of L. F. Mashak, transferred.

Ralph G. Kadau, Big Bend, Wis., in place of I. W. Henze, Sr., retired.

Robert A. Ruben, Fountain City, Wis., in place of W. R. Hartley, retired.

Allen E. Houle, Wabeno, Wis., in place of F. F. Neider, transferred.

Carl H. Wolff, Wales, Wis., in place of H. B. Mason, deceased.

WYOMING

Thomas A. Sawyer, Sheridan, Wyo., in place of J. R. Gage, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 11, 1962:

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Byron R. White, of Colorado, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Oscar H. Davis, of New York, to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims, vice Joseph W. Madden, retired.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

William B. Jones, of Maryland, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia, vice F. Dickinson Letts, retired.

Robert Shaw, of New Jersey, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice William F. Smith, elevated.

George N. Beamer, of Indiana, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Indiana.

George Templar, of Kansas, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Kansas.

John Weld Peck, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Ohio.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

James 4: 8: *Draw nigh unto God, and He will draw nigh unto thee.*

Almighty God, grant that in the fellowship of prayer our minds and hearts may be cleansed of all sin and be ennobled and exalted by the purifying power of Thy holy spirit.

In these turbulent and troublous days may we learn the secret of a life that remains unmoved by the miseries and mutations of time and finds its strength and serenity in the sanctuary of the eternal.

We penitently acknowledge that we so frequently surrender cowardly to the epicurean ways of life and allow ourselves to become cushioned in complacency.

Inspire us to always take our stand on the side of that which is good and may we have the courage to follow faithfully the path of truth and righteousness regardless of circumstances and consequences.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 10, 1962, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Prischl Rogers;

H.R. 1492. An act for the relief of Ernest John Large;

H.R. 1671. An act for the relief of Edvige Cianciulli;

H.R. 2180. An act for the relief of Eugene C. Harter;

H.R. 2684. An act for the relief of Mohan Singh;

H.R. 3105. An act for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a minor;

H.R. 3376. An act for the relief of George A. McDermott;

H.R. 6082. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vartanus Uzar;

H.R. 6276. An act for the relief of Athanasia Dekazos;

H.R. 6343. An act for the relief of Mrs. Izabel A. Miguel;

H.R. 6740. An act for the relief of Teofilo Estoesta;

H.R. 8422. An act for the relief of Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll);

H.R. 8780. An act for the relief of Dr. Carl F. Romney;

H.R. 8781. An act for the relief of Walter Singlevich;

H.R. 8947. An act for the relief of Harry A. Sebert;

H.R. 9612. An act relating to the elections under section 333 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the shareholders of the G. L. Bernhardt Co., Inc., of Lenoir, N.C., and

H.R. 10573. An act to grant the American Numismatic Association perpetual succession.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4. An act to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 67]

Andrews
Barrett
Battin
Blitch
Boykin
Buckley
Cahill
Celler
Chelf
Coad
Derwinski
Dowdy
Fascell
Frazier
Glenn
Grant
Harrison, Va.
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Macdonald
Michel
Morrison
Norrell
Patman
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rostenkowski
Rousselot
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Shipley
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Van Pelt
Walter
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Ind.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 391 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 277)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10(b)4 of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12(1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 11, 1962.*

REGULATION OF TEXTILE IMPORTS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] to recommit the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FINDLEY moves to recommit the bill to the House Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the bill to the House forthwith with the following amendment: "On page 1, line 12, strike out the period and quotation marks, insert a colon, and add the following: '*Provided, however,* That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this section until such time as the President has negotiated agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the United States from foreign countries of the follownig commodities: Beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, and dairy products.' "

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 312, nays 81, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—312

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Alford
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Avery
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass, N.H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Brown
Broyhill
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Clancy
Clark
Cohelan
Colmer
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Daniels
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Dorn
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Durno
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fenton
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garland
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Hosmer
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kearns
Keith
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Lane
Lankford
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Loser
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
McSween
McVey
Macdonald
Mack
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Merrow
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Milliken
Mills
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Perkins
Peterson
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reece
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Spence
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vanik

Van Zandt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weis
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Winstead
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—81

Adair
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Becker
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bray
Bromwell
Bruce
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Church
Collier
Corbett
Curtis, Mo.
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Ellsworth
Findley
Fino
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Hall
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hiestand
Hoffman, Ill.
Johansen
Kastenmeier
Kilburn
Knox
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
MacGregor
Marshall
Mason
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Moore
Mosher
Nelsen
O'Konski
Pelly
Pillion
Ray
Robison
Roudebush
Rousselot
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer
Schneebeli
Smith, Calif.
Taber
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Utt
Westland
Wharton
Wilson, Calif.
Younger

NOT VOTING—43

Andrews
Barrett
Battin
Blitch
Boykin
Buckley
Cahill
Chelf
Coad
Daddario
Dowdy
Fascell
Frazier
Glenn
Grant
Harrison, Va.
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kelly
Michel
Morrison
Murphy
Patman
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Smith, Miss.
Stubblefield
Van Pelt
Walter
Whalley
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Michel.

Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Harrison of Virginia with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Frazier with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Whalley.

Mrs. BOLTON changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BONNER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE STEEL PRICE INCREASE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am certain the majority of the Members of the House regard with surprise and dismay the announcement that the steel trust had increased the price of steel by $6 a ton.

There was a general impression on the part of the President and the country that we had at least a tacit understanding with all concerned with the national economy that wages and prices were for the time being stabilized—industry, labor, transportation, agriculture, the consumer, and the producer—and we had expected teamwork.

And now ruthlessly, selfishly, arbitrarily, those who have most and receive most have snatched away from those who have least a disproportionate share of the national income without reason or justification.

Labor is a collateral beneficiary of the raid. The lowest, unskilled, common laborer in the steel mills draws $20 a day. The electricians work 25 hours a week—while the farmer with heavy investments works from dawn to dark 6 to 7 days a week for the smallest fraction of such pay.

And yet the farmer pays the larger part of the steel bill. More steel goes into farm machinery than into any other fabrication.

The farmer pays the larger part of the increase. He can no longer hire farm labor. It is practically nonexistent. Machinery is indispensable and every year the price of steel and other inflated costs of production therefore rise steadily. And the farmer's net income drops year by year.

The steel trust announces that the price of steel is $6 per ton more. And it is $6 per ton more. Labor announces that the wage of common labor is $20. And it is $20. The farmer has nothing whatever to say about his prices, his wages, or his income. He is producing food more efficiently and at lowest cost in hours of labor at union wage scales than any class in the Nation. And his standard of living—his compensation—steadily drops.

Now, the farmer believes in high wages and high prices. He believes the laborer is worthy of his hire. And I have through the years voted for every collective bargaining bill and every wage and hour bill that passed the House.

But the farmer does say—and I ask you humbly if it is not in the spirit of American fairplay—that if everybody else gets higher prices and higher wages and higher income the farmer also is entitled to higher wages and prices and income. If everybody in America gets higher pay and more money and a higher standard of living why leave out the farm stepchild of the family who does more work than anybody and who has increased productivity per hour of labor above that of any class in this or any other country on the globe?

And if it is proposed here to pass legislation pushing the farmer back down the ladder of progress why should they not push everybody else down with him? Let us work together and progress together and prosper together. For in the end no country can prosper permanently half rich and half bankrupt.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the present administration, business has frequently leveled unfounded charges that the administration has been antibusiness. The steel price increases just announced constitute grave hostility to the high purposes of the administration.

In the events leading up to the new steel contract, the administration made every effort to encourage a noninflationary settlement of the controversy in order to preserve the competitive position of the industry.

The selfish decision of the United States Steel Corp. to raise steel prices $6 per ton—obviously planned and decided upon all through the labor contract negotiation—constitutes a complete breach of faith with the members of the union and the American people.

The Steelworkers Union would be completely within their rights in an attempt to nullify the contract on the ground of fraud in the procurement of the contract.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that there is a profound sense of disappointment all over the country over the steel industry's news last night of a drastic price increase announced by the president of the United States Steel Corp.; and also the further news which I heard a few moments ago, but which I have not had the chance to verify as yet, that the Bethlehem Steel Corp. has joined in this raise.

I think this is a very depressing development in terms of the economic stability of the country. I believe also that it is particularly deplorable in view of the action taken by this House with the passage of the recent tax bill in which a genuine effort was made on behalf of the Members of this House to extend some tax benefits and tax incentives in the very field of expansion and improvement of industry which has been cited as the basic reason for the price increase.

With the tax bill just passed by this House, with the support which has been given to the tax incentive plan in this tax bill, it is unbecoming of Big Steel to move ahead without waiting to see the outcome of that tax measure, and to put into effect this drastic increase.

I earnestly hope that the management people who are responsible for this decision will reconsider it. I also hope that the responsible House committees, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Education and Labor—all concerned with the impact of this price decision — will immediately launch steps to investigate what was behind it and to look into the very weak justification that has thus far been cited for it.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I heartily join in what has been said about the steel price increase by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. The price increase could not have come at a worse time from the standpoint of the U.S. balance of payments.

We have, in this country, kept the cost of living and the wholesale price index steady for a period of around 15 months. We were making progress in new international monetary arrangements. The managers of big steel, by now announcing a large price increase do a great disservice to the attempt we have made to restore balance in our international relationships.

I hope the proper committees of Congress and the administration will bring the spotlight of publicity to bear on the justification, if any, for this steel price increase. I think when this is done, public opinion can be relied upon to play its part in securing a rescission of as much of the price increase as proves to be unjustified.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the Members of the House in highlighting the problem that faces this Nation with the announcement of the steel price increase of $6 a ton. As the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] pointed out, and it is so, Bethlehem Steel this morning made an announcement that it would increase its prices 3.5 percent. So the patternmaker for steel, United States Steel, has set the pattern. Now everyone will hop on the escalator.

I am sure we will find in this year of 1962 what we found in 1958. When United States Steel increased its price in 1958 the escalator started upward and all of the steel companies followed the pattern, and the automobile-making industry did likewise—all to the detriment of the consumer.

One of the reasons given by United States Steel as a basis for its decision was competitive needs. I ask the Members of this House if anyone has ever heard of any other instance where an industry has raised its prices in order to meet competition.

The action by United States Steel comes at the worst possible time. It is so disappointing to witness this decision in the face of its inflationary impact and against the expressed desires of the President of the United States. He expressed his opinion and hope, at the time of the wage negotiations a short while back that Big Steel would hold the price line. When agreement was reached by labor and management, everyone was led to believe a steel price hike had been arrested.

It is frustrating now to learn of this public-be-damned attitude.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] speaking on the subject of the increase in steel prices, and I was especially interested in his statement that there was some kind of agreement between the President of the United States and the steel companies that there would be no increase in steel prices.

I know nothing about the merits or demerits of the increase in steel prices, but I think it is incumbent upon the President of the United States or somebody representing the President of the United States, if there was an agreement, to submit that agreement to public scrutiny. In other words, to tell all of us the specifics of the agreement. We are entitled to that information.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I understand the President expects to speak on this subject this afternoon at 3:30 o'clock and I am sure he will give some light to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I hope he will submit the agreement that was made, if there was such an agreement, to public scrutiny.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EVERY KNOCK IS A BOOST

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I notice from news stories that my friends on the minority side of the aisle are planning a great spectacular for this evening using some 11 hours for a performance which will be unprecedented in the history of the House of Representatives. Apparently this will be an abortive effort to destroy the image of a great President and of a great administration which is leading this country on the road to recovery from a recession and to a position of world leadership. This image is based on real facts and will grow instead of diminish.

As they go about this grand spectacular this evening, I would like to advise my friends that the great objectors may make the news stories of tomorrow, but it is the great planners and men of vision and the men who bring about progress who fill the pages and the annals of history.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE STEEL PRICE SITUATION

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I wish it were within my power adequately to express my reactions to the announcement made by two of the major steel companies of this country, coming as it does, I think, at a most inopportune and unfortunate time, when the Congress is preparing to equip the executive branch of the Government with the authority to meet the forthcoming unification of the markets of Europe and to join in an economic partnership with our friends in Latin America and in Asia. For these companies to disturb the delicate balance that has been preserved with great distinction by this administration and virtually to perform an act, which in my opinion borders on bad faith, is most lamentable. I join with my colleagues in hoping that the appropriate committees of the Congress will certainly call upon these companies adequately and fully to justify their action.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE ADMINISTRATION SANCTIONS TRADE OF 1,179 CUBAN POLITICAL PRISONERS FOR TOTAL RANSOM OF $62 MILLION BY ITS ACTION OF ISSUING TRAVEL VISAS TO ALIENS FOR THE PURPOSE OF NEGOTIATING THE TRADE WITH CASTRO—CIRCUMVENTION AND/OR VIOLATIONS OF U.S. TRADE LAWS MAY BE INVOLVED—DESTRUCTION OF EFFECTS OF TRADE EMBARGO IS RESULT—HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 459 OPPOSING THIS TRADE INTRODUCED

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Concurrent Resolution 459 stating it to be the sense of the House of Representatives that the people of America as represented by the Members of this House oppose the trading of American dollars for Cuban prisoners.

In the first place, there is no question but what the administration is sanctioning this trade by issuing within 24 hours after the abortive proposal was made by a military tribunal appointed by Castro, who dictated the decree or the judgment of that kangaroo court—within which time they were attempting to exact a ransom, visitors' visas to those who are negotiating for the release. Now there is no doubt in my mind that this is a circumvention of the Logan Act which does not permit any person to negotiate on a matter of international significance with a foreign country, and that applies to any person in this country doing so.

In addition, in my opinion it is a violation of the Trading With the Enemy Act. This administration itself has already invoked that act for the purpose of preventing American dollars from going to Cuba to support the Castro Communist government, even to the extent of preventing friendly third nations from shipping to this Nation Cuban tobacco, which is used to make cigars by the third nation for importation into this country.

This policy of invoking the Trading With the Enemy Act to prevent the flow of dollars to Cuba was instituted a few weeks ago, and now we find a complete change with regard to this.

I say it is wrong, and I trust each Member will look into the resolution I have introduced. In addition, in my opinion, those who are participating are in violation of the Alien Anti-Sedition Act, which specifically requires the Attorney General to institute proceedings taking away the rights of an alien to be in this country if, in fact, he violates the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Mr. Speaker, I charge that such overt encouragement to the negotiators by the administration amounts to a purposeful design to circumvent the Logan Act and to violate the Trading With the Enemy and Alien Anti-Sedition Acts.

And thus, I had no choice but to introduce my resolution, because the Congress, speaking for the people of the United States, must stand in opposition to this blackmail proposal, to this exacting of ransom, to this demand for tribute.

Moreover, I was compelled to introduce this resolution because of newspaper accounts of statements attributed to the Kennedy administration, to the effect that the United States will place no bar in the way of the negotiations going on for ransom as demanded by Castro's handpicked kangaroo court—and thus, by not barring it, which I think is required by the Logan, Trading With the Enemy, and Alien Anti-Sedition Acts, is sanctioning the most diabolical plot conceived by the Communists in modern times to undermine the dignity and prestige of the United States.

And so, I was amazed and shocked at the thought that, by issuing visas to the negotiators and suggesting that the United States will not bar the flow of 62 million U.S. dollars to Castro, the President would, in the name of the United States, thus acknowledge this barbaric ransom verdict and thereby sanction the decision of Castro's kangaroo court and, further, sanction dealings with Castro himself.

The applicable section of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which incidentally was invoked less than 3 weeks ago to prevent the flow of dollars to Cuba through the purchase of tobacco by friendly third countries for import into the United States—50 United States Code, section 5—follows:

SEC. 5. (a) That the President, if he shall find it compatible with the safety of the United States and with the successful prosecution of the war, may, by proclamation suspend the provisions of this Act so far as they apply to an ally of enemy, and he may revoke or renew such suspension from time to time; and the President may grant licenses, special or general, temporary or otherwise, and for such period of time and containing such provisions and conditions as he shall prescribe, to any person or class of persons to do business as provided in subsection (a) of section 4 hereof, and to perform any act made unlawful without such license in section 3 hereof, and to file and prosecute applications under subsection (b) of section 10 hereof; and he may revoke or renew such licenses from time to time, if he shall be of opinion that such grant or revocation or renewal shall be compatible with the safety of the United States and with the successful prosecution of the war; and he may make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be necessary and proper to carry out the provisions of this Act; and the President may exercise any power or authority conferred by this Act through such officer or officers as he shall direct.

If the President shall have reasonable cause to believe that any act is about to be performed in violation of section 3 hereof he shall have authority to order the postponement of the performance of such act for a period not exceeding ninety days, pending investigation of the facts by him.

(b) (1) During the time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President, the President may, through any agency that he may designate, or otherwise, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of instructions, licenses, or otherwise—

(A) investigate, regulate, or prohibit, any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit or payments between, by, through, or to any banking institution, and the importing, exporting, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion, currency, or securities, and

(B) investigate, regulate, direct and compel, nullify, void, prevent or prohibit, any acquisition holding, withholding, use, transfer, withdrawal, transportation, importation or exportation of, or dealing in, or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to, or transactions involving, any property in which any foreign country or a national thereof has any interest,

by any person, or with respect to any property, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and any property or interest of any foreign country or national thereof shall vest, when, as, and upon the terms, directed by the President, in such agency or person as may be designated from time to time by the President, and upon such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe such interest or property shall be held, used, administered, liquidated, sold, or otherwise dealt with in the interest of and for the benefit of the United States, and such designated agency or person may perform any and all acts incident to the accomplishment or furtherance of these purposes; and the President shall, in the manner hereinabove provided, require any person to keep a full record of, and to furnish under oath, in the form of reports or otherwise, complete information relative to any act or transaction referred to in this subdivision either before, during, or after the completion thereof, or relative to any interest in foreign property, or relative to any property in which any foreign country or any national thereof has or has had any interest, or as may be otherwise necessary to enforce the provisions of this subdivision, and in any case in which a report could be required, the President may, in the manner hereinabove provided, require the production, or if necessary to the national security or defense, the seizure, of any books of account, records, contracts, letters, memorandums, or other papers, in the custody or control of such person; and the President may, in the manner hereinabove provided, take other and further measures not inconsistent herewith for the enforcement of this subdivision.

(2) Any payment, conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery of property or interest therein, made to or for the account of the United States, or as otherwise directed, pursuant to this subdivision or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder shall to the extent thereof be a full acquittance and discharge for all purposes of the obligation of the person making the same; and no person shall be held liable in any court for or in respect to anything done or omitted in good faith in connection with the administration of, or in pursuance of and in reliance on, this subdivision, or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder.

(3) As used in this subdivision the term "United States" means the United States and any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, including the Philippine Islands, and the several courts of first instance of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands shall have jurisdiction in all cases, civil or criminal, arising under this subdivision in the Philippine Islands and concurrent jurisdiction with the district courts of the United States of all cases, civil or criminal, arising upon the high seas: *Provided, however,* That the foregoing shall not be construed as a limitation upon the power of the President, which is hereby conferred, to prescribe from time to time, definitions, not inconsistent with the purposes of this subdivision, for any or all of the terms used in this subdivision. Whoever willfully violates any of the provisions of this subdivision or of any license, order, rule or regulation issued thereunder, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000, or, if a natural person, may be imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both; and any officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in such violation may be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both. As used in this subdivision the term "person" means an individual, partnership, association, or corporation."

Effective March 24 of this year, the Treasury Department amended the Cuban import regulations, title 31, sections 515.201–515.801, to strengthen the embargo on Cuba by barring third-country imports of Cuban tobacco. These sections—27 Federal Register No. 58, pages 2765–2766—follow:

TITLE 31. MONEY AND FINANCE: TREASURY—CHAPTER V—FOREIGN ASSETS CONTROL, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY—PART 515—CUBAN IMPORT REGULATIONS—MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS

The Cuban Import Regulations, 31 CFR 515.201–515.801 are being amended as follows:

Section 515.201 is being amended to prohibit the unlicensed importation or other transactions incidental to the importation of merchandise made or derived in whole or in part of Cuban articles.

Section 515.202 is being revoked.

The authority for the regulations is being amended to provide that they are additionally issued under the authority of section 5, 40 Stat. 415, as amended, 50 U.S.C. App. 5; E.O. 9193, July 6, 1942, 7 F.R. 5205, 3 CFR 1943 Cum. Supp; E.O. 9989, August 20, 1948, 13 F.R. 4891, 3 CFR 1948 Supp.

1. Section 515.201 of the Cuban Import Regulations (31 CFR 515.201) is hereby amended to read as follows:

§ 515.201 Prohibitions.

(a) The importation into the United States of all goods of Cuban origin and all goods imported from or through Cuba is prohibited except as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury .

(b) The effective date of paragraph (a) of this section is 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time, February 7, 1962.

(c) Except as specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury (or any person, agency, or instrumentality designated by him) by means of regulations, rulings, instructions, licenses, or otherwise, no person, partnership, organization, association, or corporation actually within the United States or organized or doing business under the laws of the United States or of any territory, possession, or district thereof, may import, or engage in any transaction in foreign exchange, transfer of credit or payment between, by, through or to any banking institution (as defined in § 500.314 of this chapter), incidental to the importation of, merchandise from outside of the United States made or derived in whole or in part of any article which is the growth, produce, or manufacture of Cuba.

(d) The effective date of paragraph (c) of this section is 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time, March 24, 1962.

§ 515.202 [Revocation]

2. § 515.202 is hereby revoked.

3. The authority for §§ 515.201 to 515.801 reads as follows:

AUTHORITY: §§ 515.201 to 515.801 issued under sec. 620(a) Public Law 87-195; Proclamation 3447; sec. 5, 40 Stat. 415, as amended, 50 U.S.C., App. 5; E.O. 9193, July 6, 1942, 7 F.R. 5205, 3 CFR 1943 Cum. Supp.; E.O. 9989, Aug. 20, 1948, 13 F.R. 4891, 3 CFR 1948 Supp.

[SEAL] DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

[F.R. Doc. 62-2928; Filed, Mar. 23, 1962; 9:52 a.m.]

Applicable sections of the Logan Act follow:

Title 18, United States Code, section 953—Private correspondence with foreign governments: "Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."

Title 18, United States Code, section 955—Financial transactions with foreign governments: "Whoever, within the United States, purchases or sells the bonds, securities, or other obligations of any foreign government or political subdivision thereof or any organization or association acting for or on behalf of a foreign government or political subdivision thereof, issued after April 13, 1934, or makes any loan to such foreign government, political subdivision, organization or association, except a renewal or adjustment of existing indebtedness, while such government, political subdivision, organization or association, is in default in the payment of its obligations, or any part thereof, to the United States, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both."

Applicable sections of the Alien Anti-Sedition Act follow:

Title 8, United States Code, section 1251 (a)(17): "The Attorney General finds to be an undesirable resident of the United States by reason of any of the following, to wit: has been or may hereafter be convicted of any violation or conspiracy to violate any of the following Acts or parts of Acts or any amendment thereto, the judgment on such conviction having become final, namely: an Act entitled 'An Act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 15, 1917, or the amendment thereof approved May 16, 1918; sections 791, 792, 793, 794, 2388 and 3241 of Title 18; * * * an Act entitled 'An Act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes,' approved October 6, 1917, or any amendment thereof; the Trading With the Enemy Act; section 6 of the Penal Code of the United States; section 2384 of title 18."

The President's proclamation cutting off trade with Cuba follows:

Hereby prohibit, effective 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time, February 7, 1962, the importation into the United States of all goods of Cuban origin and all goods imported from or through Cuba; and hereby authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out such prohibition, to make such exceptions thereto, by license or otherwise, as he determines to be consistent with the effective operation of the embargo hereby proclaimed, and to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to perform such functions.

Mr. Speaker, this embargo is now being ripped to shreds by permitting the flow of $62 million to flow to Cuba through the barter of human lives in a tribute deal—Castro having announced that he was demanding this as payment for injuries suffered because of the economic embargo of the United States. Again, I know that the Congress, speaking for the American people, will want to express itself as being opposed to such trafficking with Castro, and it is for its consideration that I have introduced my resolution, which hereafter follows:

H. CON. RES. 459

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House in opposition to dollars for Cuban prisoners

Whereas Castro's offer to ransom one thousand one hundred and seventy-nine Cuban prisoners for $62,000,000 can be interpreted only as indemnification by this Nation, or with its overt acts, consent to paying indemnity to a Communist country; and

Whereas this is blackmail; and

Whereas this is extortion; and

Whereas this is a demand for ransom reminiscent of the piracy on the high seas, and repugnant to every principle of decency and self-respect, and

Whereas this Nation, as a leading nation of the free nations of the world, would be kowtowing to the demands of a Communist dictator, as handed down by this kangaroo court and thus give recognition to the court itself and indirect recognition of Castro's Communist government; and

Whereas the dollars could build airstrips and missile launching sites to be used against the free nations of this hemisphere; and

Whereas dollars comprise moneys negotiable with Red China or some other Communist nation and could be traded for war materiel; and

Whereas this Nation's prestige would sink in the eyes of the world; and

Whereas this is appeasement to communism; and

Whereas there are thousands more prisoners rotting in Castro's rathole prisons who could be traded, hundreds at a time, for further indemnification from this country; and

Whereas thousands of Americans lost their lives in two World Wars and Korea fighting to uphold the dignity of America and dying to affirm their dedication to her freedom; and

Whereas, although there exists great sympathy for the Cuban freedom fighters, we must remember that soldiers of all nations have lost their lives willingly before bowing down to an enemy which raises question as to why the leaders of the Cuban freedom fighters would even agree to such a trade, knowing that it will only make stronger the enemy they are trying to defeat; and

Whereas, in reality, the one thousand one hundred and seventy-nine prisoners Castro speaks of are not one thousand one hundred and seventy-nine prisoners of Cuba, but one thousand one hundred and seventy-nine more Cuban prisoners for, in fact, every Cuban in Cuba today is a prisoner of the Communist conspiracy and it should, therefore, be this country's goal to free all the people of Cuba and not only those who recently returned to their homeland; and

Whereas, although it is being suggested that other nations of this hemisphere make token donations to this cause, it is this country, and not others, that is being forced to make this trade in the name of indemnity; and

Whereas negotiations by anyone in the United States with Castro appear to be a violation of the Logan Act and providing funds to the enemy is a violation of the Trading With the Enemy Act; and

Whereas the President of the United States has recently invoked this Trading With the Enemy Act against third-country imports of Cuban tobacco to the United States from Cuba; and

Whereas the administration, acting through its Post Office Department announced last month that postal money order exchanges between Cuba and this country were being banned; and

Whereas freemen have traditionally been willing to sacrifice both liberty and life in defense of principle; and

Whereas communism can never be defeated by governments or people too soft for sacrifice and who choose, instead, to pay or to condone payment of tribute to tyranny: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that this Government oppose the trading of dollars for humans as proposed by the Communist government of Cuba and request the President to withhold any further Executive approval of such commerce or trade with the enemy, to refuse to permit the issuance of visas to visitors to Cuba for purposes of negotiation, to refuse to permit shipment or payment of such dollars to Cuba from the United States, and to refuse to permit gifts and contributions made for such a trade to be deducted for income tax purposes.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11151) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11151, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate is limited to 2 hours. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this is the legislative appropriation bill for fiscal 1963. At the outset I wish to express my appreciation as chairman for the wonderful cooperation I received from the members of the subcommittee and from our most able staff assistants in bringing to you what we feel is the most complete and thorough record of the various phases of our own housekeeping that has been presented in some years. We have gone over this bill carefully. We have tried to make it the sort of bill that follows good sound commonsense, a bill that will be a credit to the House and one in which all Members can take pride.

As you know, the bill contains appropriations not only for the House of Representatives but also for the Architect of the Capitol, the Botanic Garden, the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, and certain joint activities of the two Houses such as the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Joint Committee on Defense Production, the Capitol Police, penalty mail, and the education of our pages.

The bill carries total appropriations of $113,733,890. This is a reduction of $344,535 below the budget estimate of $114,078,425 but is $8,442,355 above corresponding appropriations for the current fiscal year to date of $105,291,535.

Items pending consideration in the second supplemental appropriation bill, H.R. 11038, are not included in these figures.

The full details are set out in the committee report on the bill.

All items exclusively for the Senate are omitted from the bill in accord with longstanding practice. The total of the legislative appropriation bill in recent years has fluctuated somewhat, dependent largely on the requirements for construction and remodeling of projects that have terminated and for those initiated or accelerated. That is again the situation this year. Two such items in the bill more than account for the net increase of $8,442,355 over fiscal 1962, one of which is for an annex warehouse for the Government Printing Office, and the other for increased cash to meet the requirements of accruing obligations on the third office building project. There is no substantial change in the overall level of recurring types of expenditures. For all items under the House of Representatives section of the bill the total is $48,150,725, a net reduction of $79,325 from the requests and $271,390 above the 1962 appropriation.

The tables in the back of our report will disclose that the increases over last year are scattered in fairly minor amounts among the offices and committees and other housekeeping items.

The question comes up each year as to what the bill contains in the way of funds that directly affect the Members and their work. The amount of money allowed in this bill is in strict accordance with resolutions adopted by the House. We subscribe to the general proposition that any time the House and its membership need and want additional funds for specified purposes then they should be authorized by resolution.

For instance, one item that is probably going to become of some importance is the following: We have been allowing ourselves an annual amount for postage. Since the increase in postal rates is presently going through the Congress and will probably become law, unless something is done to change the amount the Members will have to look forward to the fact that they will be in a much more severe situation next year so far as postage is concerned than has been true up to now.

There are Members who have made a strong case for an additional stationery allowance; there have been other Members that have made a good case that the House has never been overgenerous in its travel allowance. These are items that deserve consideration. But again I would like to point out that we did not feel we should increase these amounts in the appropriation bill. So we have stayed within the House resolutions on these items and expect to continue to do so until and unless the House sees fit to change what is now existing.

Members will remember that last year a resolution was passed adding on an additional staff clerical worker for the Members. We hear a lot of criticism about how we run our affairs and especially our staffs. There is some information in the hearings that the Members will find of interest, and I would hope perhaps the critical press would take note of, in the fact that while there may be an occasional case where some abuse crops out, in the majority of cases the Members of this House use these privileges and these advantages with great care. You will be interested to know that about two-thirds of the Members have not seen fit to use all of the clerk allowance that they could use. Many Members do not use all of the telephone and telegraph allowance they could use. There are a great many ways in which Members have been careful in using the resources made available to them and many are reflected in returns to the Treasury of unused funds, this because of the wise and sensible way in which the Members operate their own offices.

Since there is such an overwhelming number of these cases as compared to the very few that might be subject to criticism, I think it is only fair that our record show and that the whole world be advised that the story, when you listen to all of it, is quite a very commendable one for the House of Representatives. And, I wanted to emphasize that here, because as we go through our work we have been very favorably impressed with the astute manner in which most of the Members handled their affairs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand, there is nothing in this bill for the other body except perhaps some additional funds for the east front of the Capitol and the penalty mail cost; is that correct?

Mr. STEED. Generally speaking, that is true. The practice has always been that those items of the architect that are strictly on the other side be left for them and all of the items that directly apply to the other body be left for them to put in the bill. In the case of joint committees, by a sort of gentleman's agreement, the House has always sponsored funds for some of the joint committees. It is kind of a division of it. We included in the bill those joint committees which traditionally have been assigned to the House sponsorship and the funds for other committees will be added in the other body.

Mr. GROSS. This is the only appropriation bill that comes to the Congress that is considered in this fashion; is that not about correct?

Mr. STEED. That is true. It is a long-time practice and it has worked out very well.

Mr. GROSS. So the only knowledge we will have of the appropriations that go into this bill or the requests that go into this bill from the other body will be when the bill comes back in conference; is that correct?

Mr. STEED. Well, they are shown in the budget, but they are not part of our hearings or in the bill at this point.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the budget is not binding on the Congress. What they put in the bill will be binding.

Mr. STEED. What they put in the bill on the other side is not binding on the House. The House has another opportunity to consider it. It is no different in some ways than any other bill that the other body sees fit to change. But the general custom is for one body not to interfere with the housekeeping of the other.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. With reference to the item for the acquisition of site and construction of an annex for the Printing Office in the amount of $6,450,000, is that a nonrecurring item?

Mr. STEED. That is a nonrecurring item. It not only provides for the acquisition of the site but for the construction of a four-story-and-basement structure. The evidence shows that as of now the Government Printing Office is compelled to store its paper stock in a warehouse at Franconia, Va., and the expense of transporting that supply is rather considerable. With this warehouse constructed, the saving, I think, will be sufficient to amortize the cost of the building in a little over 20 years. That is the evidence.

Mr. MONAGAN. There is another item I would like to ask about, with reference to acquisition of property, construction, and equipment, additional House Office Building. That shows an increase of $2.5 million over the 1962 appropriation. What is the situation there with reference to whether or not that is recurring or nonrecurring?

Mr. STEED. Well, the way that program operates is this: The building is going up under some 14 major prime contracts, and each year as the contractors perform their work the amount due them is made out to us and we merely appropriate an amount of money to cover that. The authorization has long since been made, and all this does is to reimburse the contractors for the work performed during that fiscal year.

It does vary from year to year, depending upon how much construction they are able to perform.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONAGAN. However, there will be further appropriations there until the contracts are completed?

Mr. STEED. That is right. I might say to the gentleman that a little later on I intend to go into some detail about that entire program, and about how much has been done and what remains to be done, because there is a lot of interest in that point.

Mr. MONAGAN. The general operating expenses with reference to the permanent items are pretty much the same?

Mr. STEED. In the main, most of them are identical, and in several instances they have been caused by some factor beyond our control.

We find that actually the housekeeping job here is very efficient. We were able to bring the heads of the departments in, and they were able to give us a very good account of their activities. I think the gentleman will be pleased when he reads the record. I do urge all Members to read the hearings so that they may know how many of these executives of ours were able to operate so efficiently, to the point that they actually returned some of the funds which were made available to them.

Mr. MONAGAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to compliment the gentleman and the committee for bringing in a bill in which this situation prevails.

Mr. STEED. It is not entirely unusual. I think it is fair to say that if all the Government operated in as efficient and austere way as the House of Representatives performs, certainly we could have a little better record all around. I think it is proper that the House of Representatives always tries to conduct itself in such a way as to set an example for the other departments of Government in this regard.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This is the bill that provides the pay for the Members of the House of Representatives, is it not?

Mr. STEED. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. And, there are not very many Members, apparently, interested in their paychecks? Would the gentleman agree that there are very few Members on the floor evidencing very little interest in their paychecks?

Mr. STEED. Well, perhaps one could say that the Members are so confident that the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Oklahoma and their associates here will do an effective job that their presence would not be needed.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield further.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think they would come over if the gentleman from Iowa offered a motion to cut their pay? Does the gentleman think they would be on the floor then?

Mr. STEED. I can only speak for myself, and say to the gentleman from Iowa that I would have to resist such a motion.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. May I take this time, Mr. Chairman, to compliment my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], for the fine job he has done for the House of Representatives. From the standpoint of efficiency of our operations there is no bill which comes to the floor of the House of Representatives that is as important as this bill. I do not think there is any bill any more important. It is not a job that redounds particularly to the credit of the gentleman from Oklahoma nationally because there is no particular glory in it. However, I know I speak the sentiments of every Member of the House of Representatives when I say we appreciate the thoroughness with which the gentleman has gone into this matter, and the constructive job which the gentleman has done.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, because of the interest and somewhat downright misinformation that persists in cropping up in the press about some of the construction programs that are going on here on Capitol Hill, I would like to call the attention of the Members to a few facts in connection therewith. As most of the Members know, we had a long period when there was very little capital investment on Capitol Hill. The last major construction was in 1933 when the present New House Office Building was completed. About the only other construction of major importance that was done on Capitol Hill until the late forties was the installation of air conditioning in the buildings during the late thirties. Then, in 1948, a long-delayed Senate Office Building project was started. It cost $26,579,550. Following that, in 1949, a long-range plan to convert and change over the Capitol Power Plant was inaugurated. That has been completed at a cost of $17,176,000. Then came, in 1955, the extension of the Capitol Building project, and the improvements related thereto, which is authorized at a total cost of $24 million. It is within $1 million of being completed, $22,500,000 having been already appropriated. There is $500,000 contained in the bill this year, and probably there will be another $1 million after this year for the final windup of that project.

The additional House Office Building project, including the remodeling of our two existing buildings, which started in 1955, is currently authorized at a total estimated cost of $115 million, $85,500,000 of which has already been appropriated and $8½ million is contained in the bill this year to cover current work.

In the remodeling of the Old Senate Office Building, starting in 1957, $250,000 was authorized and spent on that project.

The expansion of facilities of the Capitol Power Plant, authorized in 1958, $6½ million, of which $5,750,000 has been appropriated. That work is virtually completed.

The extension of the Senate Office Building site, started in 1958, with a total of $1,929,500 authorized and spent.

Preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional Library of Congress building were authorized in 1960 at $75,000 and $75,000 has been spent. No funds are contained for that building in this bill. A new heating and air-conditioning system for the main Library of Congress building was authorized in 1961 for $2½ million, which is currently underway. It appears that the completion of that project will cost about the amount authorized.

Another small item is the relocation of the greenhouses and improvement of the Botanic Garden, with an arrangement for a facility down on the river where we can have our greenhouses and raise trees and shrubs for landscaping of the Capitol Grounds, carried an authorization of $587,000. I think most of the Members are familiar with the fact that the old eyesore greenhouses down here below the Botanic Garden have now been removed and all that operation is now at this new nursery location.

These project authorizations total $194,597,050 of which up until this bill $162,847,050 has been appropriated. And there is contained in this bill $8½ million for this year's work on the third House Office Building and $500,000 for continuing work on the Capitol extension. And there is the $6,450,000 for this warehouse for the Government Printing Office.

I think it is very important that this be made clear because of the great amount of misinformation that has been circulated about construction on Capitol Hill.

I want to make a brief reference to the so-called west front extension of the Capitol. As far as I know there is no approved proposal to do that. It is something that is in the future. I do think that some day in the very nature of things Congress will be required to give some attention to that proposal because the architects and engineers advise that now that the east side of the Capitol dome is supported by a new, modern, and strong wall, and since the dome has a habit of traveling 3 or 4 inches a day as the metal expands in the hot sun, it is making an ever increasingly extra heavy load on that old Virginia sandstone west wall. As time goes on, since that wall has been exposed to the elements about 150 years, it is inevitable that some time in the future the weakness of that wall will require one of two things—either a new wall will be built to support the dome or the dome and the wall will come tumbling down. I do not expect to live to see that happen, but that certainly seems to be something that is not too far in the future.

I have talked to the committee and the Architect and others involved and, so far as I know, there is no immediate plan to start that project. I doubt if any of the proposals that some have seen fit to make will be given any serious consideration until at least the work now underway has been completed.

One more word in connection with the New House Office Building. It is making progress. It is a little behind schedule. We expect that part of the building will be to a point where it could be occupied by the middle of next year and that the entire project, including the tunnels, the elevators, and everything else connected therewith, will be all finished by August of 1964. That is the schedule the Architect has given us.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I should like to compliment the gentleman on the splendid statement he has made, and would like to ask him this question: In view of the mistaken information put out through the Nation, would the gentleman not agree with me that the operational cost of the entire Capitol Hill structure, including all salaries, the Congressional Library, and the Government Printing Office, and so forth, anything that can be ascribed to what can be called Capitol Hill, is approximately $150 million a year at the most?

Mr. STEED. It is something in that neighborhood. I hope the gentleman will note that includes not only the Government Printing Office, which prints for the Congress as well as the rest of the Government, it supports the Library of Congress, which serves not only the Congress but the other agencies of the Government. Also, there are many items in the Library operation, and in connection with the Superintendent of Documents, and even in the House, like the recording studio, where some of these funds are recouped to a considerable amount.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. We could possibly make the statement that not over $125 million could properly be charged to the operation of the Congress of the United States. I am speaking about the operational cost.

Mr. STEED. I think a detailed analysis might make it even smaller than that, though we have not done so.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. This is the point I am leading up to—$150 million, even if we ascribe it to the operations of the Congress, amounts to only 3 percent of the amount this Congress is being urged to appropriate for 1 year's foreign aid, an amount exceeding $5 billion. In other words, what we spend abroad this year under one appropriations measure would take care of the entire operations of the Congress of the United States for 33 years. Am I not correct in that statement?

Mr. STEED. That sounds right. Also note this, that this amount of money supports one of the three branches of this Government. The Congress of the United States is charged with the responsibility of providing the funds and the laws and with riding herd over all the other farflung Federal activities. I think that when you put it in comparison to the total cost of Government certainly the Congress does not have to be ashamed of the cost it has put on the people.

I think the criticisms that constantly come up are completely out of proportion and unjustified. That is why we brought in this year such a complete record of all the costs, so that anybody who honestly wants to know the facts, Members and everyone else, can have access thereto. I urge the Members to read the record this year and inform themselves firsthand of the many, many things about our everyday operation here that I think it would be helpful for them to know.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of information to the House and to the citizens of the area, and I did not have the opportunity to hear all of the gentleman's statement, I wonder if the gentleman is able to tell the House about any plans now either proposed or in more definite form relating to the approximately two-block area bounded by Independence Avenue, C Street, and First and Second Streets which is now in process of being cleared.

Mr. STEED. The only thing I know about that—of course, they have delayed the time of clearing the property, as you know—some time in the future, the Congress will have the problem of deciding what to do with that property. Until the Congress has passed on it, nothing will be done.

There are some proposals as to what could be done with it, but I assure the gentleman before any proposal is accepted, it will have to be brought before the House for its action. So your guess as to what might be done with it is as good as mine.

Mr. JOHANSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, and this is not directed in any sense as a criticism of the gentleman, but do I gather from this that it was the decision of the Congress or someone to acquire this property and to raze it and put these businesses out of operation before there was any firm plan or commitment or intention as to the use of the property?

Mr. STEED. All I can tell the gentleman is this: One time several years ago, the House in its wisdom and the Congress created a special committee and gave them very broad authority. Out of that came the acquisition of this property and the construction of the House Office Building. Now that committee and that authority still exists. It was done by the act of the House, and about all this committee can do, as a practical matter, is to provide the money to pay the bills as the result of the action of that committee which the House in its wisdom sees fit to take. I assume what the committee has done and is doing has met with the approval of the majority of the House.

Mr. JOHANSEN. If the gentleman will yield for just one more very quick observation, I hope when the House is called upon to make a decision as to the utilization of this property, it will not be done as a rider on an appropriation bill.

Mr. STEED. Well, that is something that some future session of the House will have to pass on, and of course I would not know what action will be taken.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. KYL. Simply for the purposes of clarification of the very fine and complete report, could the chairman advise us as to whether any definite action has been taken so far as the disposition or preservation of the files of joint committees is concerned?

Mr. STEED. We make reference to that in our report and it is an important point that the gentleman brings up. But I believe it is going to take some legislative remedy and all we can do is to call it to the attention of the House and urge that the proper committee do something to correct what we think is an omission. We are only trying to be helpful in calling the matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman for doing that. If the gentleman will yield further, the members of the House Administration Committee have been aware for some time that the wage scale for workers in the House cafeteria seems very, very low and that something should be done to bring that scale up to a more sensible and justifiable level. Is anything suggested in the appropriation this year which might remedy that situation?

Mr. STEED. No, there is not. This committee could not with any legal authority take any specific action in that regard. The wage rates are within the discretion of the Architect. I agree with the gentleman that the pay scale could well be given some consideration.

Mr. KYL. Does the responsibility for that particular item lie with the Architect of the Capitol?

Mr. STEED. That is correct. I believe the practice is for the Architect, subject to approval of the Speaker, to make any appropriate adjustments.

Mr. KYL. One final question, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. KYL. There is an item in the bill for reimbursement to the Metropolitan Police Department in connection with security and protection of the Congress. Could the gentleman explain a little further as to just exactly what duties are involved in that service?

Mr. STEED. There are several, and they have been increased. We find that by this working arrangement we have with the Metropolitan Police we achieve some very desirable results. I think the gentleman will notice in our hearings that we went into some of these questions in detail. We had a report that the incidence of criminal activity around Capitol Hill has shown a marked decline.

I think it has been a great contribution to an improvement of the entire police problem on Capitol Hill to have this arrangement. There are one or two factors that I do not think should properly be discussed here but I will discuss them with the gentleman privately as to some of the services they render of a somewhat confidential nature. I assure the gentleman, however, that there is no desire to keep it from the Members.

Mr. KYL. I am aware of those so-called confidential services, but I might ask the gentleman why it is necessary to utilize Metropolitan Police on a reimbursable basis. Is it because we do not have a sufficiently large or sufficiently trained Capitol Police force?

Mr. STEED. The gentleman knows the way the Capitol Police force is recruited and operated. It has been traditional for a long time that it does not lend itself to the career type of professional officer. Taking everything into account it seems to me that since we are part and parcel of the metropolitan area it makes for a closer dovetailing of both groups, and it certainly gives Congress some very needed professional leadership to have this arrangement. We get a degree of efficiency and effectiveness we could not get at anywhere near the cost by some other arrangement.

Mr. KYL. That was the response I wanted to have in the RECORD.

Mr. STEED. I think it is important to call some other matters to the attention of the House and the attention of the public generally. Not only is the Capitol the workshop for the legislative branch of Government, but it also happens to be the Mecca for more tourists and visitors than any other public building. Last year we had visitors totaling as high as 41,000 a day, and we had many days when the visitors exceeded 30,000. The number will continue to increase.

The Capitol dome is something that has an appeal, a magnetic appeal, to the American people, an appeal such as no other public edifice has. It is a shrine, it is a temple of liberty where people come to renew their faith and the things they believe in in connection with their Government. While we lawmakers are servants of the people I think we are also to some extent charged with the responsibility of being the keepers of this temple of the people. We, I feel, owe not only to the present generation, but also to generations yet unborn the duty of being the caretakers over these priceless heirlooms that are entrusted to our keeping. We must remember an increasing number of visitors will be coming to visit it and enjoy it. I know that no Member would want to do anything that would discourage or handicap this freedom of the American people who come here to be thrilled by the Capitol Building of the United States. I think all Members would feel as I do, that it is a privilege and something in which you can take great pride in knowing that you have had a part in helping preserve and to keep this great temple of freedom intact. I am sure everyone is happy to know that it does have this great appeal to the American people, and it does act as a magnetic attraction to those who make these pilgrimages to this Capitol.

I hope as these extensions are completed and some of the new, wonderful additions to this property are made available to the public, the Members will avail themselves of the opportunity to go and see them and take their constituents to see them. I really believe that most of you have had the same experience I have had. I have had no one from my district who came here who was not extremely pleased when they visited the Capitol of their country in which the laws are made. I think all of you are the same as I am. The first time you saw the Capitol dome it did something to you, it thrilled you, and it has continued to do that. I think we can all agree when any of us get to the point that our gazing upon the Capitol dome does not still give us a thrill our usefulness here has been ended.

So as we go into the matter of trying to keep this temple well, I know that the Members will be understanding and tolerant of the fact that some of this costs money and cannot be avoided. We do not want to be extravagant, but, on the other hand, we do not want to be neglectful when we approach our responsibilities in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, the Library of Congress is also contained in this bill, and while there is a reduction in the request they made, it still is somewhat larger than a year ago. Libraries are institutions which must grow or die. The Library of Congress, being the most literary institution on the face of the earth, is a great, throbbing institution, and of necessity it must increase if it is to continue to be the great institution that we want it to be. Demands upon the Library are constantly increasing. Many of the new positions allowed are in the Card Catalog Division, which is a section that makes a profit. All of the money required for the increased activities of that section will be recaptured to the Treasury of the United States. It is a service to the libraries of the country, which they are happy to pay for, and we are glad to know it is performing such a popular and such an important function.

We find in the Library an almost intolerable situation in reference to space. We realize that the only answer to the situation is a third building. In the meantime the committee has tried as best it could to make funds available so that the Library can obtain temporary space and relief from some of the very extreme problems with which they are faced.

Mr. Chairman, any questions that Members will want to ask about the bill and about its housekeeping activities are contained in the committee hearings and the committee report.

If we are able to advise ourselves more thoroughly with all these facts, we will, I am certain, all take more pride in the fact that in our own housekeeping, and in meeting our own responsibilities we have set a very good example for the entire Government.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman touched upon revenues derived from the card distribution functions of the Library. It is worthy of note along with that that the Superintendent of Documents more than pays for his appropriation. We also have in the Copyright Office a very considerable income. So the bill before us embraces those three parts of this appropriation for which revenues derived are either self-sufficient or produce a lot of revenue. We comment on that in the report.

Mr. STEED. The gentleman is entirely correct. And, I think perhaps we would perform a good service for the House if, in our work next year, we would make a tabulation of all these various items where funds are returned to the Treasury because of activities under this appropriation bill. It would certainly have the effect of making what I think is a very good picture somewhat even more effective. I think next year we will tabulate, in one place, the funds that are returned from these activities under this bill.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. So often we take the great work of this committee for granted, and I, as one member, certainly want to congratulate the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] and the committee for the very valuable service they are rendering to the House and the Nation. I want to associate myself with the very eloquent remarks that the subcommittee chairman has made to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, as Federal money goes—and it surely does—this is not a big bill. As it comes to you, shy of the items to be added by the other body, it barely tops $113 million—about one-tenth of a billion dollars. That is not so much in a spending budget of $92½ billion that the administration has sent us.

You are the House of Representatives and you and I, as Members, can, I believe, well pause here and take stock of our position. First, I want to say that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], the subcommittee chairman, is a solid American who has done a good job on the measure before you. He is an honest man and has done an honest job on your behalf on the bill you are presently considering. It has been my pleasure to work with him.

It has been said, somewhat facetiously, that this is "the most important appropriation bill of the session." It does cover one-third of the Government, or more correctly, one of the three branches of our Government, namely, the legislative branch. But it is important that we make reasonable provision for our operations—because the Congress as the legislative branch, is the board of directors and the chief auditor of the biggest business in the world.

Most of us appreciate the importance of having constitutional balances of power in this Government of ours. I am worried about the way our finances are going. Many others—but not a majority, I fear—are worried about them. The picture is anything but right. We had a rosy official prediction from the administration in last January's budget of a razor-thin budget surplus of one-half billion dollars, but any day you can pick up the paper and read informed predictions that there will be a substantial deficit—the only disagreement is the question of how much it will be. But all of them range in the billions of dollars. But the administration blithely continues the barrage of new proposals costing more and more.

The national debt limit is now at $300 billion. Everyone knows this and the administration is not through yet. The national obligations exceed $1 trillion. That is $1,000 billion. Our present budget of $92½ billion is the greatest in history of a peacetime budget. And even that figure closely understates the real situation as to the trend in spending. The administration's January budget requested new spending and obligating authority of $99.3 billion for fiscal 1963, actually $102.9 billion counting the highway program which they in former budgets used to add in the totals. So we are already over the $100 billion mark in the January budget. This, of course, does not include the billions coming in and going out through the so-called trust funds. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, clearly pointed this out in a remark on the budget of January 18 of this year.

Fresh evidence of the disturbing trend and the bleak outlook is the recent estimate of the expert staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. They have come out with a more up-to-date estimate of budget receipts and, using different assumptions as to the pending tax bill, have come up with a deficit prediction of from $3.8 to $4.9 billion for next year. And I want to emphasize that these figures assume that we would spend no more than the amount shown in the President's January budget; an updating of the export side of the budget from the administration would be helpful.

Maurice Stans, former Director of the Budget, and one who is qualified to speak on this subject, has recently predicted that the deficit for next year may go up to $6 billion or so.

There is reason for caution, I think, when we pass a tax bill that provides an order to a company or bank to withhold a certain percentage of interest on dividends, although there may not be an equivalent amount due in taxes. This is not soaking the rich—it is soaking the thrifty and those of low income for revenues to continue us further along this wide and questionable way. We know it, of course, as the "withholding clause."

Perhaps there is basis for serious misgivings about our "buy friendship" programs. These, I think, are often stymied and frustrated by clever, courteous, and politically resourceful politicians abroad. It is difficult, of course, to judge the political layout in some of these areas by the standards of the good folks back home. While in many of our districts the traditional attitude is "Let me, myself, pack my own freight," abroad there seems to be a disposition to let Uncle Sam be the "red cap" for many loads. I personally applaud all realistic programs into which we have entered internationally. I abhor the others. In some of its aspects our foreign trade is cozily nestled in the meshes of foreign aid. The uncertainty of the challenge of the Common Market is troublesome. And we are still voting spending bills, foreign and domestic, that I believe to be well beyond our present means. The precarious position and the dwindling supply of our gold holdings and the possible demise of the almighty dollar as the center of world currency are causes for great concern. Certainly if we are to stabilize the economy of our country and protect the good name of our currency, we need the best that is in every Member of this House of Representatives.

Our executive department, through its bureaus and agencies, has done much for the Nation. Let me be the last to decimate that good. They have to be supported—not by good wishes and messages of commendation and praise—but they have to be supported by the taxes of the industrious and the work of the faithful. To initially sort out the drones from the busy is the work of the Appropriations Committee, but it will fail if it does not have the support of the membership of this body.

The growth of executive personnel—bureaucracy, if you please—from less than 600,000 in 1930 to the neighborhood of 2½ million persons today is one statistic by which to grasp the sprawl of the Federal domain. Most of these 2½ million persons have some kind of civil service protection. It is part of the program that the Congress has created, because it takes money to hire them. It follows that these good people have sort of a vested right or interest in their jobs and they are not about to void that interest, even though the intent and purpose of their functions have, in some instances, become increasingly diluted and made less important by the changing times.

Well, where are we now? Our fiscal position is indeed precarious. The gold holding situation is something we should all view with alarm. We may be holding our own internationally, yet every crisis points to us to pick up the check. Many of our domestic problems call for revisions, yet provincial interests interfere with needed reforms. Unfortunately, the programs of the moment pay little attention to the facts of international economic life. That brings us to a new appreciation of this bill.

The bill before you is a simple measure. It merely appropriates funds to continue you and me in business. And it is a mere pittance in the context of $100 billion budgets for the board of directors of the biggest business man has ever witnessed. Many years ago, a famous president of Harvard University in a speech delivered in England, referred to our form of government as a raft, while those governments with high centralized controls, such as dictatorships, he referred to as a sleek yacht—agile, easily controlled and appearing much superior to our raft—with respect to balance of power in government. He continued that the raft was much more difficult to sink than the sleek yacht. In times of confusion such as now, there is a disposition on the part of too many people to accept the dangers of highly concentrated power in the name of expediency. I know that all of us are proud to be Members of the Congress and in solemn meditation we recognize our definite responsibilities as Members of Congress. This bill appropriates our salaries and the tools to do our provincial jobs. But, more important, it appropriates the funds to do our national duties. And now we have the added responsibilities of voting on matters of international and even space appropriations.

Perhaps I should apologize for taking this time on so small an appropriations bill. Yet, I plead for the continuation and the shoring up of our clear perspective of what is entailed in a true balance of power—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. It is in our hands. Within the last 30 years, with our help, dictatorships around the globe have been denied their ambitions. Dictatorships today around the globe have our earnest opposition. I believe that we should view the increasing of Executive powers here at home with great caution. Yet, the trend to increase Executive powers continues. Ever-increasing central rule cannot continue America. Probably what we see in experience and content within our national life is a natural phenomenon.

The time was when 80 percent of this Nation was rural and men in their freedoms often moved on when they could see the smoke from their neighbor's chimney or hear the sound of their neighbor's ax. They were a self-reliant breed and out of that great attribute comes some of the greatness of America. The times and our industrial growth have crowded our population into cities where the self-reliance of our rural populations is not so easy to achieve. It is perhaps but natural that more and more through the years, our people have surrendered to the search for security and have tragically, too often, accepted welfare as a way of life. They are apt to listen to the promises of any politician whose panacea is enticing but so impractical as to be economic poison. We all know that somewhere out of America's common purse must come the moneys to fund these proposals. No war is won by just tending to the wounded. We accept the curing and rehabilitation of those among us who have been hurt by the conflict of economics; but I submit that we should remember that the battles we face can only be won by the support of able men in the field who ask no subsidies, no benefits, no soft treatment, no minority preferment, no special attention other than the glory of working and fighting for so great a nation as America.

This bill becomes almost lost in the avalanche of fiscal demands descending upon us. It is, as I said before, a small bill. But it provides the tools for us as legislators to serve our districts in the ultimate best interests of our entire Nation as the legislative branch in this Government of checks and balances.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct a question or two to the chairman of the committee. I should like to ask if there is anything contained in this bill that would provide for the acquiring of properties east of the present annex of the Library of Congress to the Anacostia River.

Mr. STEED. There is nothing in this bill to provide for that. There was some comment in the hearings when the Architect was before the committee that deals with this whole subject. There is the problem of finding a site for the new building for the Library. But aside from the land for that, wherever it may be, wherever the Joint Committee on the Library may suggest, or the Public Works Committee may suggest, I know of no other pending proposals that would involve the acquisition of any additional property.

Mr. HALEY. I might say to the members of the committee and to this Congress that people on the Hill here have acquired this property. They have formed organizations, and they are putting their property in very fine shape, I think. Yet constantly before the Capitol Improvement Association and various other organizations we have people coming in representing the Government or some arm of the Government and telling them, "Do not buy property there because the Federal Government is going to take that property for its own use." I think the Architect of the Capitol or whoever is doing that should have a little consideration for the people who have acquired property on the Hill. They are trying to do a job. I think they have done a job in order to make Capitol Hill a more pleasant place to live. It is certainly unfair to the people who have acquired property up there or contemplate buying property on Capitol Hill to have speakers repeatedly come before their organizations, supposedly representing some arm of the Government, and keep them in a state of unrest as to what is going to happen.

I realize there are many ways that this property could be acquired. But, it is certainly doing a disservice to the people there who want to make their homes the kind of homes that the District of Columbia would be proud of. But they should not have this constant harassment by some of these so-called planners of this District who will not let these property owners rest in peace.

Mr. STEED. With the exception, of course, about the third Library building, I think the hearings will bear this out, the gentleman can be reassured that the remaining property owners in this area can have some assurance that there is nothing else pending. I believe there will be no additional acquisitions of property possible until the Congress first has had an opportunity to pass on it.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman for giving us that assurance for those of us who live on the Hill and who want to continue to live in this immediate area.

Mr. STEED. I agree with the gentleman. I am as anxious as he is to give the homeowners in this area all the reassurance that it is possible to give them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of the regular order.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

INCREASE IN STEEL PRICES

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to mention the fact that we were all shocked, I believe, last night by hearing of the increase in steel prices after we were led to believe that the cooperation of the unions had made it possible to try to give a boost to our economy and to make a contribution to price stabilization. However, this raise cannot be blamed upon high wages in the United States but rather upon low wages elsewhere. The industry itself has stated that the price rise is due to pressures between higher costs and lower prices. The only higher costs at this point are taxes and profits and the only lower prices posted in the United States are the prices of imported steel. Surplus steel production all over the world has reached such a magnitude that it is now endangering the economy not alone of this country, but of every other nation that has gone into steel production beyond its capacity to absorb.

Just within the past 2 weeks the first shipload of steel arrived from Chile to the United States. We have developed into a market as a dumping ground for all of the low-produced goods including and not exempting steel by any stretch of the imagination. I believe the time has come for all of us to consider and consider hard the facts that are involved in the question of world trade. Trade is a commercial venture. Its chief motivation is profit. There is not any other consideration given to the buying and selling of goods no matter how much our sophomoric economists would have us believe otherwise in a graduate society.

The Steelworkers Union has just made a great contribution to price stabilization by its willingness to cooperate in a move to give our productive economy a boost, all to no avail.

The fact that this price increase more than offset any tariff reductions by foreign countries both internally and externally makes this a prime example of unsoundness of any proposal urging a further reduction of protective covenants affecting American jobs and consumer markets.

In this kind of a squeeze play, labor loses the most. If we are content to level off our economy from now until eternity at the level we have gained to this moment in a free enterprise system all we have to do is continue our trade policies.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of the protectionists Geneva Pact agreement by the House this day shows vividly the end of our economic independence.

In simple terms what Congress is doing is to protect the 18 textile producing countries—90 percent of world production—from imports from, of all people, the underdeveloped emergency nations.

The sad part of the story is that the American people have poured billions into these countries to raise their standards and yet we are forced into a position to save our own textile industry of curtailing the insignificant exports of textiles—about 3 percent of world trade—from the struggling masses seeking their spot in the sun.

The nations that forced this agreement are all major producers, consumers, and indeed exporters of textiles.

To close the door by an international cartel and trade fixing deal on the little nations makes a mockery out of all the promises so often made to these nations.

Trade again proves itself to be a commercial venture with profit as its prime mover. Remember one important and discouraging point. We had to agree to this cartel agreement to protect the American market for the surplus of the Geneva Pact. There is nothing in this bill or the Geneva Pact that guarantees our textile industry any part of the world markets, on the contrary all we get is what we can earn, but our friends—17 nations—are guaranteed a certain percentage of the U.S. market for a period of 5 years.

Once this Nation gives a foreign country a stable percentage of our market, that country sets its economy upon this base. That this is true is shown in the action on the tariff increase for glass recommended by the Tariff Commission.

The Tariff Commission after years of turning a deaf ear to the pleas of the glass industry finally—1961—admitted serious injury because of imports.

It recommended increased tariffs. The Belgians protested with hints of reprisals and even worse, talked of reconsidering NATO commitments.

The President sent the recommendation back to the Tariff Commission after more months of delay, the Commission again recommended the tariff increase.

The President after full and complete study of the second recommendation approved the tariff increase.

Immediately three separate but related moves against the decision were started.

First. Protests by Belgium and Japanese Governments.

Second. Protests for Common Market backing up Belgian claims for compensation for the adverse decision.

Third. Protests from the United Kingdom based upon claims that the surplus glass from Belgium could be dumped into the U.S. domestic market thus injuring their job and industry and economy.

Result: Another delay for 60 days in the effective date of the increase for glass tariffs.

If we follow the established pattern, the importers will have a field day and our warehouses already filled will bulge with the added imports. The next move will be a barrage of propaganda showing that increased tariff did not put more men to work—how could it with surplus glass all over the place.

We cannot divorce our unemployment from the problem of trade free or otherwise. We cannot hide the economic facts of life: Production will flow to low cost areas and sales will flow to high income areas.

In regards to the promises of increased exports and more American jobs from world trade one would do well to remember a quote from Shakespeare:

> Oft expectations fail, and most oft where most it promises.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I think this is probably one of the cleanest legislative appropriation bills to come before the House in recent years.

First of all, I would like to ask the gentleman what use is to be made of the house that is being left where the demolition is now being carried out near the botanical gardens?

Mr. STEED. There is a discussion in the hearings in regard to it. It is a very good building and could be made useful without very much cost. The Architect indicated that he is going to recommend that he be permitted to keep the building and to use it at least on a temporary basis.

Mr. GROSS. What use will be made of the building, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. STEED. It is part of the activities under the Architect and part of the grounds. I am not in position at this time to tell the gentleman just exactly what will be done with it. The Joint Committee on the Library would have initial jurisdiction, since they have overall jurisdiction down there. And our committee has taken no position on it as yet.

Mr. GROSS. It is going to look a little queer without landscaping or shrubbery around it. It is going to cost something if it is to be preserved. I cannot help but ask what use is to be made of the structure.

Mr. STEED. When we get to the point of going down there with the Architect to see what his recommendation will be, I would like to invite the gentleman from Iowa to come along with us; maybe he can help us reach the right decision.

Mr. GROSS. There is no money in this bill for the purchase of more Cadillacs for some Members and employees of the House, is there? I understand they are being rented rather than purchased.

Mr. STEED. That is correct, we are still maintaining the rental system that was adopted a year ago.

Mr. GROSS. At about $500 a year. Is that about the way it runs

Mr. STEED. That is right. I believe it results in a saving of about $45,000 over a 2-year period.

Mr. GROSS. Who loses money on this deal? Is it the automobile manufacturers?

Mr. STEED. I think probably the same situation exists there as, for example, existed with reference to the painting of the legislative garage. The person who did the job wanted it for the sake of the prestige rather than the money he got out of it, and I believe the company that rents these cars considers that it is good advertising, or whatever you may call it, for them to have this arrangement with the Congress. Since it saves us a substantial amount of money we are glad they are satisfied with the prestige.

Mr. GROSS. I am intrigued by this interest in General Motors. There was a time a few years ago when a good many people on the gentleman's side of the aisle scoffed at the statement that what is good for General Motors is good for the country. I am glad to see this tremendous interest in General Motors products, especially on the part of some of those on the gentleman's side of the aisle.

Mr. STEED. If the gentleman will yield, I may say that anything that General Motors or anybody else does that helps the Congress save money in its expenses is good.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask about the $5,000 item for the House Foreign Affairs Committee for entertainment purposes. I would like to ask if there is any other committee in the House of Representatives that has such an entertainment fund.

Mr. STEED. I do not recall any as such, but this particular committee finds it necessary because of the nature of the legislation it deals with, to participate in some activities that involve visitors from foreign countries. I believe very little if any of the money has been used so far this year, probably a little bit for some coffee and doughnuts, but aside from that I know of no use that has been made of it.

Mr. GROSS. I do not see my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] on the floor, so I do not know whether this is considered to be an addition to the tools of the trade, as he calls it, or just what the story is, but do I understand the gentleman from Indiana to say he does not know of any other committee of the House of Representatives that has an entertainment fund.

Mr. STEED. That is true. I know of no other committee of the House that is called upon to participate in activities of this Government in relation to representatives of other governments in the way the Foreign Affairs Committee is.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that if the Appropriations Subcommittee on the foreign giveaway program of the Appropriations Committee of which the gentleman is a member, had $5,000 with which to entertain some visitors, that it might be able to find new avenues to give away the taxpayer's money? I doubt that it would be so inclined, but there is that possibility.

Mr. STEED. My answer to that is that the Appropriations Committee has not felt such need. Probably people coming before them are more interested in entertaining them than asking us to entertain them. We have no need of funds for that purpose.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman that so far the only money that has been spent out of this fund was for a luncheon given jointly by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for 24 parliamentarians, 5 Senators and 10 delegates from foreign countries. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has such a fund. The luncheon was given, and the expenses will be paid for jointly. This is a courtesy that is extended to American parliamentary groups abroad when they travel abroad. In the year previous to this the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs spent over $400 out of his own pocket in being courteous to visiting delegations of parliamentarians and members of congress from other countries, and I do not think he ought to have to stand that expense.

Mr. GROSS. There is the NATO setup, the Interparliamentary Union, and there are all kinds of funds in the State Department and elsewhere that are spent on foreigners. I question the establishment of this kind of precedent and I think the time has come to stop it. I know of no reason why the Committee on Foreign Affairs should have an entertainment fund to the exclusion of any other committee. At the proper time I will offer a motion to try to stop this now.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would like to come back to a domestic matter, and I apologize for intruding on the gentleman's time. I wonder if the gentleman from Oklahoma or the gentleman from Iowa can tell us with respect to this area bounded by First Street, Second Street, Independence Avenue, and C Street that I mentioned a while ago. Are there plans to landscape that area for whatever period of time before a decision is made as to its use?

Mr. STEED. I do not think a final decision has been made. Personally, I would like to see it made into a temporary parking lot until more facilities are made available in this congested area.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would there be some sowing of grass seed involved, or some pavement of a kind?

Mr. STEED. Gravel, or something of that sort. There would be a nominal cost. But until we get some of this construction finished, a decision cannot be made. In the meantime, to make it into a parking space would, I think, be very desirable. In the long run, it is intended under one plan that a large part of it will be landscaped and it will be made a part of the Capitol Grounds.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I want to confess to a possible conflict of interest, because I happen to live in an apartment adjoining this area. I know there are going to be serious problems for all residents of this area if something is not done to it. We will be hurt.

Mr. STEED. I think the gentleman can be assured if it is decided not to make a parking area of it, it will be put to grass and landscaped. At least that is a plan under consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the extension of the east front of the Capitol has cost $24 million or will reach that cost, with the money provided in this bill?

Mr. STEED. For the east front, the repairing of the dome, rewiring for the entire building, birdproofing, and so on, as set out in the hearings. About half of it is for the east front extension.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand correctly that the other body has 27 rooms in this east front addition to the Capitol?

Mr. STEED. I believe that is correct. There is a discussion on that in the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. They are all pretty plush, are they not, and I refer to the offices that have been established there.

I may say to the gentleman that I managed to find one door open the other day because repairmen were working on the clock in the new office. It was to me a very lavish setup, with wall-to-wall carpeting, drapes on the windows, beautiful new furniture, table lamps, and tables for them, and so forth. It looked more like a living room than an office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. STEED. We have some information in the hearings on that subject. But, as the gentleman knows, when it comes to furniture and that sort of thing for the Senate side of the Capitol, that is a matter that they have sole jurisdiction over and does not come under our discretion.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that they are pretty plush on the House side, too.

Mr. STEED. Well, I am no authority on what "plush" is. I do believe that in a facility of that sort—and we expect it to be here for a long, long time to come—it would be penny wise and pound foolish not to furnish it with substantial and durable furniture.

Mr. GROSS. With the country $300 billion in debt and the Treasury broke and borrowing money, I am sure this is not necessary to the conduct of Government.

Now, let us take the New House Office Building. How much have you in this bill for the New House Office Building?

Mr. STEED. The total cost of the building itself as it now appears by virtue of the contracts entered into is approximately $68 million. That is for the building itself and the sewer under it. The land cost is in a separate item of the total. Of course, there are other land acquisitions and improvements that go along with that but are not directly a part of the building. There will be a tunnel from that building over to the Capitol. Presently we are underpinning the southwest corner of the House wing. And, there are other tunnels to be built to connect that building with the other House Office Buildings.

Mr. GROSS. The land acquisition for that area, the whole thing, including the building, will run to at least $115 million, will it not?

Mr. STEED. That is the estimate, yes.

Mr. GROSS. But $68 million for the new, new building. If I remember correctly, this exceeds the recent sale price of the Empire Building in New York. And I ask the gentleman this question: That is without furniture, without wall-to-wall carpeting, without the equipment to go into the building; is that not about right, or am I wrong?

Mr. STEED. It is my understanding it includes everything except the actual furniture and furnishings itself. Except for that, for all practical purposes it will be a turnkey job, a completed building, ready to be occupied by the Members.

Mr. GROSS. The $68 million does not include rugs, furniture, drapes, or anything else by way of furnishings?

Mr. STEED. It is my clear understanding that that is a completed job except for furniture and furnishings.

Mr. GROSS. As I read the hearings, it is $68 million for the building, regardless of furnishings. I do not see anything to indicate anything else.

Mr. STEED. Let me read from page 318 of the hearings this comment by the Architect. That is the information we had on this point. He said:

> We have the following breakdown: Acquisition of property, protection and demolition of structures, grading, and miscellaneous incidental expenses, $14,100,000; construction and equipment of additional House Office Building, including construction of new sewer, $68 million; subway and subway transportation system, including underpinning of Capitol for terminal, $6,600,000; remodeling of Old House Office Building, including construction of garage in courtyard, $9 million; remodeling of New House Office Building, including construction and equipment of cafeteria in courtyard, $9,500,000—

And so on. The gentleman is correct. The $68 million includes everything for the building itself and the sewer except furniture and furnishings.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me whether the swimming pool is in or out?

Mr. STEED. There is no swimming pool in the building now under construction. I am not advised that there is provision.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the other body has 10 elevators operating for them?

Mr. STEED. Well, there is an actual figure in the hearings about the elevators.

Mr. GROSS. That is 10 elevators for 100 Members of the other body, while on the House side, with 438 Members, we have about 4 elevators.

Mr. STEED. I may say to the gentleman that part of the inequity there is due to the fact that we are delayed in the addition of some of the elevator facilities that are included in this program for the House side.

There will be five elevators in the southwest corner and two additional elevators on the front here when all of this work is finished, which is anticipated to be completed in the next 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] yield the gentleman from Iowa an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I remind the gentleman that apparently it is not going to make very much difference about time consumed this afternoon since it is indicated the House will be in session for a good many hours to come.

Now, let me ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], this question: Most of the new elevators that have been put in are automatic elevators, are they not?

Mr. STEED. Some of them are.

Mr. GROSS. Well, are not most of them automatic elevators, the new ones?

Mr. STEED. Well, the best observation I have had is that they are divided about half and half. Of course, it depends upon where they are located, and for what purpose they are used. In those areas where there is heavy use by the public involved, it is almost necessary to have operators.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but can the gentleman from Oklahoma tell me why having installed an automatic elevator, located out of the general line of traffic, it is necessary to have an elevator operator?

Mr. STEED. Well, the breakdown of the operators is also contained in the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. If I recall correctly, there is contained in this bill funds for 10 additional elevator operators. I do not know where they are going to be located. Why put operators on those automatic elevators, either serving the other body or the House of Representatives, where they are not in the line of heavy traffic? Are Members of Congress so feeble they cannot push a button?

Mr. STEED. Well, I am no authority on how an elevator is operated. But I do know this—that with the public traffic we have here there are hours of the day when signs and automatic facilities do not seem to do the job.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, let us be frank about this thing. This is political pap p-a-p; is it not?

Mr. STEED. Well, I think the gentleman will find most of these elevators where there is heavy public traffic.

Mr. GROSS. In any event, Congress buys and installs expensive automatic elevators and then hires individuals to operate them. It would make little difference whether some of these elevators carried a passenger per hour. There would still be operators aboard them. We, somehow or other, seem to be able to get up and down to our apartments on automatic elevators without operators. It seems to me we could get up and down here on such elevators if we had to.

Mr. STEED. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Oklahoma is not quarreling with the gentleman from Iowa. If the gentleman can arrange for automatic elevators to be unattended, it would be all right with the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. GROSS. Then, why not take the 10 additional operators out of this bill?

Mr. STEED. Well, we feel that what we have here is what we need.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman would agree, would he not, that there is very little patronage involved in automation?

Mr. GROSS. I would not agree to that on the basis of what is going on here. I would not agree that there is very little patronage involved in automation in this situation.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would the gentleman agree that normally automation would not yield new jobs?

Mr. GROSS. That is right; I do agree with that.

Mr. Chairman, on the subject of the House Folding Room, if I remember correctly there was a $14,000 deficit in that operation because the former superintendent had four people on the payroll that did not exist.

Has the $14,000 been paid, and by whom, and when?

Does the gentleman have any knowledge of that situation?

Mr. STEED. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa if that situation existed, it came up before I was connected with this committee. I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. GROSS. Well, it is my understanding that somehow or other there were four fictitious payrollers, payrollers that never existed, and that the former superintendent is now serving a sentence, or was serving a sentence, in prison for this payroll fraud.

Mr. STEED. All I know about that is that this is under the jurisdiction of the Doorkeeper, and the Doorkeeper was able to have a surplus left over in the money made available to him. The rates paid in the Folding Room are fixed in the bill. The people work on a piecework basis. The volume is handed on a rate basis. The volume, of course, is determined by the Members.

If there are any auditing shortcomings, that would come under the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Administration, and would not come under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee. We appropriate a lump sum for that activity.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that the House Administration Committee ought to look into a situation of this kind?

Mr. STEED. I think they ought to look into everything around here constantly that comes under their jurisdiction. We on the Appropriations Committee try to do what is assigned to us under the authority of the House. It is certainly a housekeeping duty that ought to be looked after and performed. I would not want to have anyone condone any activity at all that is not in accord with the law and spirit of the law.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think this situation has been cured, that it is not likely to occur again? Are better bookkeeping methods now being employed by the office of the Doorkeeper?

Does the gentleman know?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that now we have all of these studies under the General Accounting Office and I believe we will have much better surveillance than did exist at one time.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I shall take these few minutes to explain that when the legislative appropriation bill is read and when we come to the section pertaining to penalty mail, I shall offer an amendment which will be a limitation on the amount in the budget for this particular purpose. My amendment in essence will try to rescind what this House did last year, sometime around 3 o'clock in the morning, on the last day we were here before adjourning sine die; that is, it will rescind the right of Members of the House and the Senate to send mail all over the United States merely by marking the envelope "occupant," without the name and address of the individual recipient.

I have opposed this practice consistently since it was suggested in my Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Post Office and Treasury Department. I realize that I have not endeared myself to certain members of that committee but, Mr. Chairman, I think this practice is wrong. I think if it is allowed to continue we are going to endanger our franking privilege in which I believe and to which I fully subscribe.

The argument is going to be made here today that it will be cheaper to send this mail out as "occupant" mail rather than to include the name and address on the envelope. This is a lot of hogwash. It is just as if you were to tell me it is cheaper for me to have a dozen children instead of having four children. The argument is that the mailman does not have to sort such mail for individual distribution but that does not mean it will be cheaper, for the reason that the flow of mail will be much greater. Millions and millions of pieces of mail will go out of the House and the Senate addressed that way. Also each and every stop on the mailman's route will have to be made whether he has other mail or not. The result will be a greater cost due to additional time for stopping at each and every patron's home. And, if and when this privilege is abused, the press will pounce on the Members of the House and Senate to repeal altogether the franking privilege which, as I stated earlier, I feel is a rightful privilege and something to which we are entitled as long as it is not abused.

Mr. Chairman, when I offer this amendment I hope the Members will support it and restore the franking privilege to its intended use.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman from Massachusetts, I believe, has made a very good case. I have one question. As I understand it, last year we extended the so-called junk mail privilege only to the cities. Will the gentleman's amendment encompass the areas covered under so-called junk mail before last year's amendment or will it just rescind last year's amendment?

Mr. CONTE. I would rescind the entire "occupant, boxholder, and rural route" mailing privilege.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman and I am in complete favor of this amendment as it embodies the principal of legislation which I am preparing. Congress must set a good example in the face of the postal rate increase requested and I hope the gentleman's amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield.

Mr. ADDABBO. Does the gentleman send out a regular newsletter to his district?

Mr. CONTE. I certainly do. I make up my own mailing list at my own expense and address my own envelopes.

Mr. ADDABBO. And what percentage of that mail is returned because it has been undelivered?

Mr. CONTE. A very, very small percentage; maybe 20 or 30 letters come back. This is an expensive proposition and we check it very closely. We check the obituary columns in our district to eliminate the names of people who have become deceased during the year. As I say, it is an expensive proposition, but that is the way it should be. I think it would be wrong for me to have the privilege to send out a million pieces of mail through my district and merely mark the envelopes "occupant."

The general public does not have this privilege and I do not see why we should have it.

Mr. ADDABBO. How about just one mailing?

Mr. CONTE. I do not do that. I have a regular newsletter which I address and mail out that way.

Mr. ADDABBO. Is it not a fact that with respect to every letter the gentleman receives back that mail must be handled at least four times by the post office, creating a greater cost to the post office, rather than the patron mail, which is handled only once and put into a rack without any other expense?

Mr. CONTE. As I said, the percentage is very, very small that we receive back with "Address Unknown"; a very small percentage.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not a fact that most of the Congressmen use the occupant mail to send out notices of important bulletins that the Department of Agriculture furnishes for the benefit of the farmers throughout the country?

Mr. CONTE. I would not have any objection if the gentleman or anyone else wants to amend my amendment to allow farmers' bulletins. I do not see anything wrong with farmers' bulletins.

Mr. GARY. I do not see anything wrong with any of it. I do not see any reason for an amendment.

Mr. CONTE. That is a matter of personal opinion. I disagree with the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. It is not the first time the gentleman has disagreed with me.

Mr. CONTE. No, and it will not be the last time.

Mr. GARY. No, and it is not the last time I will disagree with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, despite the confusion or lack of understanding on the part of my friend from Virginia, I can judge from the mail I have received from my people and from the editorial comments in my district that the people of the Third District of Michigan very clearly recognize the difference between mail that is sent out to an address under a frank and the kind of bulk mailing to "Occupant" that was put through the House on the final night of the session last year.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, to call attention to an item that may be of interest to the Members. On pages 144 and 145 of the hearings there is some comment about this so-called patron mail. I think it is of interest to know that the records in the Folding Room show that in January 1958, before the occupant mail provision was enacted, they handled 10,979,706 pieces of mail. In January 1960, again before the occupant mail provision, they handled 10,018,536 pieces of mail. In January of this year, after—after—the occupant mail provision was adopted, there were 10,657,342 pieces. This indicates that the volume of mail through the Folding Room was about the same under both circumstances. I think that is clear evidence that there is no abuse of the occupant mail. I think that any facility we give, as long as the Members make it available to themselves, is going to be no more abused or no more wisely used than the individual Member of the House makes it.

What I try to do is conduct myself with these things in what I think is a proper manner. I hope my colleagues do the same.

I think that in the record you will find a very clear statement from the Post Office Department stating that it is cheaper to use the "occupant" method than the prior system.

It is obvious that the same number of pieces can be handled this way cheaper than mail that is addressed. I think all of us have a responsibility to try to keep in close touch with our constituents and that any and every reasonable facility we have of getting information to them is all in the interest of good government.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

For committee employees, including the Committee on Appropriations, $2,925,000.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. SCHWENGEL: On page 3, strike lines 2 and 3 and insert "For committee employees, $2,450,000: *Provided*, That at least $747,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the House rules shall be available only for the payment of salaries of employees appointed at the request of a majority of the minority members of the committee."; and on page 4, line 16, delete "$600,000" and insert "and for committee employees' salaries, $1,050,000."; and on page 6, line 8, change the period to a colon and add: "*Provided*, That $880,500 thereof shall be available only for payment of salaries of employees appointed at the request of a majority of the minority members of the committees."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but will reserve the point of order at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment because I feel the need to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of legislation considered in the House of Representatives. I have studied this question for several years and based upon recent experience in my own committee, I have felt the need for this more than ever. As a result, I have introduced a resolution which has come to be known as House Resolution 570. This amendment will carry out in part at least the provisions of that resolution. I believe that here is a good place to start a much needed reform and correction in the rules of the House.

On March 28 and April 4 of this year, Mr. Chairman, I took the floor to elaborate on House Resolution 570 and I discussed the imperative and obvious need for it. I would like at this point to review briefly my previous remarks in this regard. I began by suggesting that House Resolution 570 would amend the rules of the House relating to the appointment of professional clerical staffs to standing and select or special committees of the House so that the minority may have on its own motion more and better staff representation on the various committees of the House.

Specifically, my resolution would work in this manner. On the vote of the majority of the minority members of the committee, the minority could name 40 percent of the professional staff members of the standing committees. The minority members also could name 40 percent of the committee clerks.

In another section, the minority would be permitted to name half of the professional staff members as well as half of the other personnel of select and special committees.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the present situation with respect to some of the committees of the House is intolerable and it is my firm conviction that this situation in some of our committees is an indictment against representative government. More than that, I think it is not wrong to say that the committee system of Congress is on trial.

With allowances for revision upward or downward dependent upon when, who, or how the employees are counted, the figures show that of 538 committee employees only 20 are minority employees.

My resolution does not make it mandatory that any or all committees have a more equal division of staff employees where present conditions are satisfactory to the minority members of the committee. After all, the minority whose members' rights and prerogatives are at stake, is the best judge of whether present conditions are satisfactory or not.

Where a majority of the minority members of a standing committee are satisfied with the essential nonpartisan nature of the committee and its policy, as, for example, Foreign Affairs and Armed Services, there would probably be no need for change. Special and select committees must either be nonpartisan or bipartisan. Adoption of this resolution would make it possible for the minority to become a constructive opposition which would be prepared to present well-thought-out answers and alternatives based upon research and study, as well as to challenge more effectively the weaknesses and inadequacies of the propositions which are presented to the committee.

Mr. Chairman, there are many arguments that I could present but I will not take the time. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Ohio, which I gladly do at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I serve on two committees. I do not know the politics of a single member of the staff of either one. The question is, Did you include the staff of these committees in your census? And if you did, how did you determine whether they were minority or majority employees?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I said earlier in my remarks that it depends on who, when, and how they were engaged or counted so I make allowances for those situations the gentleman referred to.

Mr. HAYS. The same is true of the Committee on House Administration and likewise the Committee on Foreign Affairs, did you leave them out? I see the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] and the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Church] there. I doubt if they know the politics of any staff employee on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I assure the gentleman I do not.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I make allowances for that, and I am willing to grant that this may, in the gentleman's case that he refers to, be revised downward as far as the partisanship end of my statement is concerned.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I would like to say to the gentleman that in the case of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries I have practically the identical staff that I inherited when I became chairman; and this staff has been notified time and time again that any time a minority member desired their services they were to comply with the request and work with the minority members on reports or otherwise.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the grounds that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. While it appears to be a limitation it actually, in effect, is legislation. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the rules of the House set out how the committees and their staffs are to be organized and appointed. The effect of this amendment, it seems to me, would be to change that. It would have the effect of making a legislative change. I think it is obviously legislation on an appropriation bill and that the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel], desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I do not wish to concede at this point the point of order.

May I say, first of all, that my amendment reads as follows:

> At least $470,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out the rules of the House, shall be made available.

There are various sections in the rules that grant the minority certain rights and privileges. I hold that under present circumstances in many committees it is impossible for the minority to function, as I am sure the House rules when they were adopted originally intended it to function. And on that basis I resist the point of order.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's problem, and I am in sympathy with it. It is a situation that is susceptible to proper remedy, but it is not proper to try to secure it in this bill because it does take the form of being legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, is subject to a point of order. Under proper circumstances I would be happy to support the gentleman in what he is trying to do, because when the Congress refuses to give itself an ample staff to carry on its responsibilities, it is doing a very unwise thing.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. With the assurance of a distinguished Member on the other side, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Thompson of Texas). The Chair has studied the amendment and believes it would provide a new method of hiring personnel, and therefore would affect the Reorganization Act and the rules thereunder. It is legislation on an appropriation bill, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the Antitrust Subcommittee of which I am chairman is preparing for hearings to begin May 2, 1962, at 2 p.m. on the $6-per-ton increase in the price of steel announced yesterday by United States Steel. This increase is so plainly inflationary in its impact, setting off such a far-reaching chain reaction in the economy as a whole, that Congress cannot afford to ignore it.

United States Steel has long been the bellwether initiating price increases in the heavily concentrated steel industry. There is grave danger in such price leadership, which may itself evidence violations of the existing antitrust laws. I warn that if the other steel companies pursue their past follow-the-leader practices they may involve themselves in the toils of the antitrust laws, for an oligopoly must be suspect where it results in such conscious price parallelism.

Furthermore, the great concentration of economic power in the steel industry, with its attendant price parallelism, may well warrant amendment of the Celler-Kefauver Act to authorize divestiture in industries so heavily concentrated.

The steel industry has in the past loudly proclaimed its resistance to wage increases on the ground that they would be inflationary. Now that the steel industry has negotiated a noninflationary agreement with no increase in take-home pay, however, United States Steel has executed a sudden about face and now cites its desire to build up its industrial plant in an effort to justify this startling hike in prices.

Likewise, the steel industry has long voiced the fear of foreign competition. Yet, this extraordinary price increase seems calculated to lead to just such an influx of cheaper imported steel products.

These apparent anomalies deserve the most careful scrutiny, particularly in view of the manifest impact of this steel price increase upon our balance of payments and the economy as a whole.

The steel price increase affects carbon steel products, tin mill products, wire and wire products, pipe and tubular products, and stainless steel, as well as a host of other articles basic to the entire economy. If United States Steel's example is followed by the other steel companies, an inflationary chain reaction seems inevitable.

Congress has the patriotic duty to investigate this matter forthwith.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill how much was set aside or estimated would be the cost of printing the Congressional Record in this session of the Congress.

Mr. STEED. That is in a lump sum. It approximates, for all purposes, including printing of hearings and reports, some $15 million, the bulk of which is the printing of the Record.

I think if you will look at pages 226 and 227 of the hearings, you will see a breakdown there of the various items that come under this heading, and I note that the estimate for 1961 was $2,011,015.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. How much increase is that over the previous year?

Mr. STEED. Well, the previous year it was $2,218,540. That is for fiscal 1959. For fiscal 1958 it was $2,165,047. So, last year was a little under the 2 previous years.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Have you made any provision for an increase this year? The reason I am asking that question is that up until today we have had printed in the Record 923 more pages than were printed at the same period last year, and the trend seems to be to increase the number of pages. I think that you should make provision to take care of this expanded printing.

Mr. STEED. May I advise the gentleman that there is some small margin here for variations in the cost, but at best this is only an educated guess, and we try to judge the upcoming year by the Record of the past few years, and I think that perhaps in the total it would balance out somewhere.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman would permit me, I do not care to yield further, because I want to make one or two points. I have been trying to carry on an effort, with not much success, to reduce the volume of extraneous printing in the Congressional Record, though I have had at least some Members express the opinion that I might be on the right track. But, when you find Members extending their remarks, which in some instances have run more than $8,300 just during this present session of the Congress, and numerous instances of where the cost of just extraneous matter in the Record has run over $5,000 per Member, I think that is pretty much evidence that the privilege of extensions, particularly of extraneous matter, irrelevant matter, in the Appendix is costing us a rather substantial sum. The figures that I have compiled refer only to the extraneous material and not to the remarks of the Member. In one instance we find that one Member extended his remarks, including irrelevant material, to the extent of 92 pages at $90 per page, and that cost was over $8,000. In numerous cases there were more than 60 pages of that material, at $90 per page for a total cost of more than $5,400 for each Member who practiced this abuse of a privilege.

I do not know what the Record is going to cost for today, in light of what we have listened to on the floor and have seen in the press, but I am sure if the committee has not made provision for that, you better add something to your bill to take care of this additional cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of salaries unless specifically ordered by the House of Representatives, including the sum of $60,000 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 208 of the Act approved October 9, 1940 (Public Law 812); the exchange, operation, maintenance, and repair of the Clerk's motor vehicles; the exchange, operation, maintenance, and repair of the folding room motortruck; the exchange, maintenance, operation, and repair of the post office motor vehicles for carrying the mails; not to exceed $5,000 for the purposes authorized by section 1 of House Resolution 348, approved June 29, 1961; the sum of $600 for hire of automobile for the Sergeant at Arms; materials for folding; and for stationery for the use of committees, departments, and officers of the House; $2,600,000, of which such amount as may be necessary may be transferred to the appropriation under this heading for the fiscal year 1962.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 5, lines 16 and 17, strike out "not to exceed $5,000 for the purposes authorized by section 1 of House Resolution 348, approved June 29, 1961;".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there has already been some discussion of this $5,000 appropriation to the House Foreign Affairs Committee for purposes of entertainment, and it has been well established that this is the only committee of the House of Representatives that has an entertainment fund. I understand that the money expended thus far has been for coffee and doughnuts. I leave it to your arithmetic to tell you how many gallons of coffee and how many dozens of doughnuts you can buy for $5,000. Let me be frank and say that I am not ready yet to believe that this is the only reason why this fund has been established.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. Has the gentleman from Iowa checked with the Disbursing Officer to see how much of this money has been expended up until today?

Mr. GROSS. No; I have not. But the point I want to make is simply this, if the gentleman from Ohio will bear with me just a minute: This establishes a precedent. This is the well-known foot in the door, the camel's nose under the tent.

Mr. Chairman, there is no reason why any other committee of the House of Representatives should not ask for $5,000 for entertainment, if the House Foreign Affairs Committee has $5,000 for that purpose. This is the takeoff. We will soon be off and into orbit on this business of entertainment, and remember, it is coming right out of the taxpayers' pockets. That is the reason this appropriation ought to be stopped now and for all time to come.

Mr. Chairman, the Treasury of the United States is in no shape to be supporting this business of providing money for committees of Congress to entertain anybody, and I do not care whether they are Shahs or princesses or Ambassadors or who they may be—Senators from Timbuktu or Members of the House of Representatives from Timbuktu. Let us eliminate this $5,000. Let us stop this business before it goes any further.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one thing clear: this item is in this bill because the House of Representatives in its wisdom passed a resolution authorizing it, and the Committee on Appropriations, on matters of this sort, tries to abide by the will of the House. As to whether it is an advisable thing to do or not, it was not primarily up to the Committee on Appropriations to pass upon that, because the House had already worked its will when it passed the original resolution.

Mr. Chairman, the item, I think, has been well cared for. We were unable to find any evidence of abuse of it. So I just wanted to make clear that when a matter of this sort comes before the Committee on Appropriations the merits of why the House did or did not pass a resolution in the first place is not before that committee.

Mr. Chairman, the same Members of the House who permitted this resolution to be passed in the first instance have the full right to undo that, if they so choose. But I just wanted the Members to know that when they pass resolutions authorizing activities of this sort, as long as I am chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations, we are going to abide by its wishes, and that is what we have done here. So far as we know, this is what the House wanted done, this is what the House authorized to be done, and we have complied with the wishes of the House.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed] said, this money was authorized by the House of Representatives. As I stated a little while ago it is for the purpose of enabling the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to participate with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the occasion of a visit of distinguished members of legislative bodies from other countries. I have known the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. Morgan, a long time. He has spent a considerable amount of money of his own in doing this. The amount of money that has been spent out of this fund during this fiscal year stands at the moment at zero. There is a bill for a luncheon, as I said earlier, that is pending, and I should suspect that the House share of the bill might be in the neighborhood of $50; I do not know, I may be high on that; it is just a guess. I do not think we ought to penalize the chairman when he has shown that he does not abuse the privilege.

I would say that right at the moment there are four members of a legislature from a friendly country in Latin America in Washington and common courtesy dictates that somebody entertain them, perhaps at a luncheon or a dinner, and show a little bit of courtesy out of respect for the fact that they are here.

Mr. Chairman, it is with some trepidation that I get up to oppose an amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], because only last week he took me into the 5-H Club—"Hell, How He Hates Himself"—of which he is the president. I got taken in without any desire on my own part. As you know, I do not like to rush into this kind of thing but, if the gentleman really wants to save some money I will tell him how to do it.

There is nobody in this House who makes more unnecessary and useless quorum calls than he does. Every time he causes a quorum call it takes 40 minutes. If you multiply that by the number of Members and assume that they work 10 hours a day for 250 days at 40 minutes of their time, it costs $2,610 in wasted time of the Members alone. So, if he wants to save this $5,000 I would suggest that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] just refrain from a couple of quorum calls the rest of the week.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 9:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

"For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, $322,500."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to accommodate the gentleman; I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred and eleven Members are present, a quorum. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Thompson of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11151) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONTE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONTE moves to recommit H.R. 11151 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill forthwith to the House with the following amendment:

On page 25, immediately following line 22, insert the following:

"SEC. 105. (a) No part of any amount appropriated in this Act shall be available to finance, under authority of section 4167(a) of title 39, United States Code, the mailing and delivering of mail matter sent through the mails with a simplified form of address under the franking privilege by any Member or Member-elect of Congress to postal patrons, including those patrons on rural or star routes."

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion on the ground that the amendment embodied in the gentleman's motion would be legislation on an appropriation bill and would have the effect of repealing existing law.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CONTE. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel this is legislation on an appropriation bill. I have been very specific in my language. It is merely a limitation, and it only applies to this appropriation bill. It does not repeal any law that is in existence at the present time. It merely states that of this money provided in the bill under the penalty mail section, no money can be spent for mail marked in simplified form such as occupant mail. It is very clear and concise, and it certainly is not legislation on an appropriation bill but merely a limitation.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order and ask for a vote on the motion.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the recommittal motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] with whom I serve on the Appropriations Committee. His opposition to the junk mail privilege by Members of the Congress is a point well taken and should win solid support from all in the House.

I would like to make clear that this is a privilege no other citizen in the country has. The taxpayers cannot simply address their mass mailings "Patron, Local," and get it delivered. They at least have to put a street number on the outside. The newspapers and magazines which are so often accused of having a special mail privilege at least address their material before asking the mailman to deliver it.

The penalty mail privilege is reserved for the Government. This privilege is extended to the Congress, as one branch of the Government. But in our case, it goes even further. Any Member of Congress can, under the present law and with the appropriations contained in this bill, blanket every home in the Nation with his own personal point of view. It may be called a questionnaire or it may be a letter on a farmer's bulletin list, but it accomplishes the same purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I can hear now the loud cries of anguish from both sides of the aisle if one of the executive agencies should undertake, home by home throughout every city in America, to present its case. I can hear now the uproar from both sides of the aisle if, for instance, using a "patron, local" envelope, the Secretary of State sent into our communities a report on foreign aid or on reciprocal trade which left with the recipient the point of view of the administration. Rightfully, there would be mass indignation in the Congress and the sound and fury would be unequaled in all our history.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress are reserving this right for ourselves. Under this patron mail privilege we can blanket every community with a mail carrier system in the Nation. It is not confined to our own districts. Nor is it confined to our own States. If one Member opposes another Member's position on some bill, he could, under this privilege, flood every city with mail, outlining his position and critical of the position someone else may have taken.

When the Congress granted itself the franking right, it did so legitimately as a branch of the U.S. Government. When the rural, star, and boxholder type of mail was inaugurated, it was done because at that time there was no way of even knowing who the residents were in the rural areas. Few had telephones, there were no rural directories and you just could not reach them in any other way.

Today this situation no longer exists. In many areas—in fact, in most areas—the rural residents do have telephones; there are directories and their names and addresses can be found therein.

I have introduced legislation to repeal this junk-mail privilege. It is my understanding that similar legislation has been introduced in the other body, including the rural, star, and boxholder mail.

I plan to support such legislation if we ever get the chance to vote on it. We cannot expect the American taxpayers, faced with an ever-increasing deficit, to give us this type of luxury.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 192, nays 197, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—192

Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barry
Bates
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Boggs
Bolton
Bray
Brewster
Bromwell
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Brown
Broyhill
Bruce
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clancy
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Dominick
Dooley
Durno
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Feighan
Fenton
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Ford
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Garland
Gavin
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Hall
Halpern
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hosmer
Hull
Jennings
Joelson
Johansen
Jonas
Judd
Kearns
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kitchin
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McIntire
McVey
MacGregor
Mack
Mailliard
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Moeller
Moore
Morse
Mosher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Peterson
Pike
Poff
Pucinski
Quie
Ray
Reece
Reifel
Reuss
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Roush
Rousselot
Rutherford
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Sullivan
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Utt
Vanik
Van Zandt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Weaver
Weis
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Winstead
Wright
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—197

Abbitt
Addabbo
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Alford
Anderson, Ill.
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Avery
Bailey
Baring
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Beckworth
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Breeding
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Clark
Cohelan
Cook
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Finnegan
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Friedel
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.

Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Henderson
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kowalski
Landrum
Lane
Lesinski
Libonati
Loser
McDowell
McFall
McSween
Macdonald
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Mills
Monagan
Montoya
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nix
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill
Passman
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Price
Purcell
Randall
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Ullman
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watts
Westland
Wickersham
Willis
Yates
Young
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—47

Andrews
Bass, N.H.
Battin
Boykin
Buckley
Cahill
Chelf
Coad
Curtis, Mass.
Diggs
Dowdy
Fascell
Frazier
Glenn
Harrison, Va.
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kelly
McMillan
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Merrow
Michel
Minshall
Morrison
Moulder
Patman
Powell
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Scott
Selden
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Walter
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Minshall for, with Mrs. Kelly against.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Glenn for, with Mr. Harrison of Virginia against.

Mr. Cahill for, with Mr. Frazier against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Moulder with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. TOLLEFSON, Mr. KEARNS, and **Mr. MARTIN** of Nebraska changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. PHILBIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1963

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1963 and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD reserved all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute; and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] may extend his remarks immediately following my remarks; and I also ask unanimous consent that following the 1-minute rule today I may extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection the gentleman's several requests are granted.

There was no objection.

STEEL PRICE RISE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply shocked at the action of the United States Steel Corp., already followed by other companies, in raising its prices—and I think that all of my fellow citizens are of the same mind. It amounts to nothing more than a colossal insult to the national interest, a selfish rebuke to the common good.

Those may be strong words, but nothing more temperate will suffice to describe this action. It flies directly in the face of both fact and national purpose—of fact because it is not needed and of purpose because it runs contrary to our economic welfare. I, for one, do not think we should abide it.

How can anyone justify a raise in steel prices when the labor costs of the steel industry are the same today as they were in 1958 and when demand for steel products has fallen? How can that industry expect to achieve a needed increase in demand by raising prices? There is nothing in all of our economic and business history to suggest that a consumer is attracted by hitting him between the eyes.

The implications of this action are obvious—the total price level of the Nation is endangered; our competitive posture is weakened; the outlook for steel production has darkened; the recovery is harmed. And all needlessly.

The steel producers have in their hands a noninflationary contract that under no statistical guise or stretch of the imagination could lead to a price increase. They have a settlement hailed by the entire country as a symbol for genuine and stable progress. And with that in hand, the management of United States Steel tells the American people to go fly a kite.

I ask the Congress and the Government of the United States to begin an immediate inquiry into possible violation of the antitrust statutes in the steel industry, in which the president of one great steel company announces, on Wednesday, that "there shouldn't be a price rise" and follows on Thursday with the announcement of one. What happened to change his mind? Has United States Steel convinced its supposed and presumed competitors that the way to increase demand is to raise prices, all at the same time? What kind of competition is that, and what kind of business judgment is it that bases a price increase on a slack market?

The United States Steel management has provided the world with an example of industrial statesmanship at its worst and free enterprise at its most slavish and selfish level. I strongly suspect that what we have witnessed in this arrogant action is the beginning of a period when American steel will be unable to compete with other domestic products and with foreign steelmakers. This action is not only in the worst interest of the country but of the steel industry and its employees as well. I urge that we do everything we can to see that it does not take place.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's economy has enjoyed a vigorous recovery from the 1959–60 recession. We have seen personal income rise during the recovery period while prices have remained stable: we have not paid in inflation for this improvement.

The irrational action of the United States Steel Corp. in raising steel prices threatens the Nation with another inflationary price spiral which in effect takes dollars away from American consumers.

Clearly, United States Steel has deliberately chosen to ignore the interests of the consumer, the national interest and, in fact, its own best interests.

All informed estimates of the recent settlement between the steel industry and the United Steelworkers have universally held that it was noninflationary and should have no effect on prices. This settlement, moreover, will not even take effect until July 1, almost 3 months from now. Yet the United States Steel Corp. seems to be contemptuous of both expert judgment and national opinion.

The country as a whole, the industry and its shareholders, and the steelworkers all bear a full responsibility for preserving price stability, controlling inflation, protecting our balance of payments and remaining competitive, both at home and abroad.

Increased productivity, technological improvements and improved efficiency have all contributed to holding down the employment costs per ton of steel, despite the wage increases that have occurred since 1958.

Steel producers have persistently and in one voice maintained that they are being priced out of the market by foreign producers and by competing products at home.

Nevertheless, the United States Steel Corp. has elected to increase prices. This is a peculiar way to remain competitive unless the company anticipates a concurrent price boost among the other major steel producers.

We were given to understand by the president of the Bethlehem Steel Corp., just this week, that, "there shouldn't be any price rise."

Bethlehem announced today, however, following United States Steel's declaration, that it plans an increase in prices.

If the major steel producers throughout the industry slavishly follow these examples, the Executive and the Congress have a responsibility to determine why.

The country has a right to expect more than the irresponsible conduct displayed by yesterday's backward step. If we are to preserve the freedom of private decisionmaking in this critical area, we must press for sound price and wage policies.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the price increase announced yesterday by the United States Steel Corp.—several months before the new contract takes effect and in the face of a clearly noninflationary settlement—is not only contrary to the national interest but is a direct violation of responsibility. That action was taken with only one interest in mind, the shortrun gains of the shareholder. That is a legitimate and basic consideration of any management, but when it clearly works harm to the public interest, when it clearly makes us less capable of achieving essential national goals, when it jeopardizes our competitive position in the world and the level of consumer prices at home, then it must be marked down for what it is, a failure of industrial statesmanship and conscience.

The Nation is bitterly disappointed, as well it should be. It is not only disappointed, it is suspicious. Why is it, our people are asking, that the president of the great Bethlehem Steel Co. can say "There should not be any price rise," and then announce the following day, after United States Steel speaks, that he is raising his prices, too? What kind of free enterprise is it for companies to compete by raising prices? How can an industry which is operating well below capacity increase its business by reducing the demand for its products? Since when, in the history of American business, have profits come from raising prices when demand is weak?

I do not think the American people should or will swallow this one. If the United States Steel Corp. is unaware of the serious challenges we face today and the grave need to conduct ourselves responsibly, the American people are. If United States Steel does not care, we do. I urge that the Congress and the executive branch of our Government promptly inquire into this competition by inflation, this unusual dictatorship over the price level that apparently exists in one of our largest and most basic industries.

The simple facts of the matter are these:

Our balance-of-payments posture is tied directly to our price level, which has been holding steady.

A noninflationary agreement was arrived at in the steel industry, and of this there can be no dispute.

Labor costs to produce a ton of steel in 1961 were no greater than in 1958, because productivity rose by almost exactly the same amount as did labor costs.

The steel industry can easily afford the cost of the agreement without danger to its profits.

The basic challenge to our businessmen is to increase the demand for goods.

And, in the face of this, United States Steel raises its prices.

It may well be illegal. It is certainly an affront to the good character of American business and the good name of American enterprise—which with this action returns to the days of the "public be damned" philosophy.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House would like to know the reaction of the President of the United States to the decision of the United States Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin, and Republic Steel to raise their prices, as well as Bethlehem Steel, 3.5 percent.

He said that a new round of steel price hikes constitutes a chilling and irresponsible defiance of the Nation's interest. The price hike, he said, would increase the costs of homes, autos, appliances, and other items for every American family.

Furthermore, he said he had been advised by the Secretary of Defense that the increase would add $1 billion to the cost of national defense at a time when every dollar is needed.

The facts of the matter are, the President said, there is no justification for an increase in steel prices.

The facts, as indicated from the statistics given him by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, clearly show there was no reason for the increase in prices at this time.

President Kennedy said that when the country faces a crisis in Berlin and Asia and is seeking economic stability, is asking reservists to leave home and servicemen to risk their lives, and is asking union members to hold down their requests, the American people will find it hard to understand what he called the steel executives' utter contempt for the interests of all Americans.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the steel industry yesterday put the free enterprise system on trial.

The decision of the United States Steel Corp. to raise the price of steel by an average of $6 a ton was an irresponsible defiance of the public interest.

But it has deeper implications as well.

I note especially the statement of Mr. Homer of the Bethlehem Steel Corp., who said yesterday:

> There shouldn't be any price rise.

Just a few hours later United States Steel announced its increase.

Today Bethlehem followed the leader.

What kind of free enterprise is this?

It is a strange form of competition, to say the least, when companies within an industry compete by jacking up their prices.

The steel industry has said that in order to improve and modernize its plant, it needs higher profits to offset higher labor costs.

This is a strange argument indeed when you consider that since 1958, the date of the industry's last price increase, employment costs per ton have not risen, and when you consider that the contract just concluded was noninflationary and well within the ability of the industry to absorb with productivity gains and improved efficiency.

It will be interesting now to see what will be the actions of the other leading companies in the steel industries. If they all follow this example we will know that something is going on in the steel industry that is inconsistent with the free enterprise system on which our country is based.

The duty of Congress will then be clear. The public interest must be preserved and protected. No small group of men can be allowed to ignore the needs of American people.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that there is a big publicity operation going on this afternoon. I think this side of the aisle, the Republicans, would be very interested in having the Congress make an objective study into the steel price increase, because there are economic factors that lie behind it. I do not know what they are.

The spokesmen who have preceded me here do not know, either, I might submit, and certainly the only way to get into this is to make an objective study. I think the Joint Committee on Economics, of which I am a member, would be well suited for that purpose. I think before we have the facts, that we lay off the politics.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman think that the increase should take effect before the Joint Committee on Economics makes its study?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Certainly. That is in the private sector of our economy unless you want dictatorship.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand, there are a number of special orders that have heretofore been entered into. I have no objection to 1-minute speeches, certainly, at any time, but I am wondering whether or not, under the rules of the House, in view of the fact that earlier today we had 1-minute speeches, if requests by Members to speak ahead of the special orders that have heretofore been entered into is in line with the orderly procedure of the House.

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair has extended the same latitude to other Members without regard to party in the past. It just happens that there are a number of Members interested in speaking on this occasion, which is purely a very pleasant coincidence. The Chair feels that 1-minute speeches are not taking those who have previous special orders off their feet. The Chair will protect their rights.

STEEL PRICE RISE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] that we should take a long look at an action which I regard as being most cynical. About 10 days ago the Nation was heartened to learn of the very responsible and statesmanlike action of the United Steelworkers in agreeing, in the national interest, to a package settlement which was minimal in every respect and generally accepted as noninflationary. Now, before that package takes effect, we have a concerted move for price increases by the steel industry sparked yesterday by United States Steel and joined in a very orderly formation by other steel firms. This can only raise a very grave doubt as to the independent judgment exercised by each of the individual companies, in arriving at almost the precise, same formula for an increase; an action on the part of Steel in utter contempt of the policies of an administration attempting to stabilize the economy of this country in order that we better compete with the emerging competition from the nations of the Common Market. Certainly now the appropriate committees of this body and of the other body should undertake at the earliest possible moment appropriate inquiries. This Nation should not be subject to the whims of the few who control steel.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, about 10 years ago a tractor cost about $1,200 on an average Iowa farm. Today an average tractor costs about $5,000. During the same period of time, with the exception of the last year, farm prices have been going down and down and down. Corn was $1.50 per bushel in 1952 and is about $1 today. At the same time costs have been going up and up and up. This is an example of what we call the farm squeeze.

Mr. Speaker, now we find an increase in steel prices which is, of course, a principal element in farm costs. An increase in the price of steel set by producers is pyramided during processing and distributing into a much bigger increase in the cost of agricultural production.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious thing to the farmers, who have no way to set prices on what they sell, as do steel companies; but instead find prices have almost no relationship to costs. This steel price rise makes it all the more imperative that we at this time do as the administration has requested, and find some kind of formula whereby we can help to adjust the farm prices to offset rising costs of production.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, up to now our Nation has shied away from the controls recommended to the Congress by leading national experts on wage-price movements. Many of the Members of the Congress who in past years had come to the reluctant conclusion that limited controls might be essential put their proposals on the shelf. This was in the hope and expectation that we could rely on industrial and union statesmanship. Was our hope ill founded? Were our expectations empty?

United States Steel's price rises undermine these hopes and expectations in a tragic way. These price rises seem to say that those who forecast the inevitability of Government controls may have been right.

I, for one, am not so cynical. Nor do I think that the American public has lost its trust in the basic responsibility of American enterprise. But in view of United States Steel's action, that trust must be reinforced by something that has not yet appeared on the scene. The wrath of the American public, the self-interest of American enterprise, must bring home to the small group of men who control our steel prices that the path on which they have embarked is a dead end.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from California for the excellent remarks which he has made with reference to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are entitled to a full look at all the facts behind United States Steel's decision yesterday to raise the price of steel.

I wonder in my own mind whether they have not been betrayed by a small clique of irresponsible men.

I see no justification for the steel company's untimely action. Last month's contract agreement between the steel producers and the United Steelworkers Union was clearly noninflationary. The cost of the settlement was well within the limits of productivity gains that can be reasonably expected this year. The contract does not even go into effect until 3 months from now.

It appears now that even while the union was bargaining in good faith, and while the Congress, the President, and his administration and the union were given every reason to believe that the companies were doing the same, this unconscionable price increase was being plotted by management.

How else could the decision have been made so quickly?

The question which must now be considered by Congress and by the executive branch is whether this small, determined, and self-centered group can be allowed to defy the public interest at this critical time in our Nation's history, faced as we are with the threat of Communist expansionism and the increasing competition from foreign producers in world markets.

I urge you to consider the effects of a price rise in steel: American steel will become less competitive in world markets. Buyers will turn increasingly to foreign producers for their steel products. Moreover, the prices of American goods made from steel will go up correspondingly, upsetting America's competitive posture throughout much of our manufacturing industries. This will take place, I remind you, at a time when the administration, with the cooperation of thousands of American manufacturers, is seeking to improve our competitiveness in world markets.

In addition to that, there is every indication that the union leaders are aggrieved and that the unions can hardly be expected to stand still.

Steel management has said, "The public be damned."

I say the Government has an obligation not to let the public be damned.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the subject that is now under discussion, I wish to express my astonishment at the report this morning.

I was utterly surprised and sorely disappointed by the announcement that the four major steel companies of this Nation were raising the price of their steel mill products.

This sudden and unexpected action stuns our people and is a shock to the economy of this country.

It is said the increase is justified by rising costs. It may very well be so. If so, why was it not acknowledged and the people of the country informed of it when the settlement was reached a few days ago on the labor contract?

I was led to believe from all the reports and the announcements and I am persuaded that the people all over the Nation were led to believe that a satisfactory settlement had been reached which would make it unnecessary for an increase in price of steel. The people throughout the Nation accepted the announcement with gratification and commendation.

Inflation is a threat to the economy which rightfully disturbs the average individual. It is recognized that the pattern set in cost in the steel industry is the basis of the entire economy.

Had the steel companies announced very frankly at the time the labor contract was being settled that this would follow there may have been a different result and they would have been in a better position for such action today.

This raises the question, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not any major company or companies should be permitted to become so powerful as to jeopardize the free enterprise system in continually leading the economy to a dangerous state.

I believe that a thorough investigation should be made and, yes, objectively so, and the appropriate committee of this Congress should and I believe will investigate the entire situation leading up to this most unfortunate incident and most certainly the act itself. I shall certainly give consideration as to any action our committee might or should take.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of the steel price increase.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, the steel industry has today exhibited arrogant disregard for the national interest in raising prices.

We are faced with a big steal by big steel.

This event, coupled with the General Electric price-fixing conspiracy and disclosures in recent days about unconscionable profits in missile manufacture, show big business at its rapacious worst.

I applaud President John F. Kennedy's strong statement today and I will support him to the hilt.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, just 10 days after the settlement in the steel industry—a settlement held noninflationary by virtually all informed opinion—the United States Steel Corp. chooses to express its indifference to the American consumer and to the national interest by coolly announcing it will raise the price of steel by about $6 a ton.

I cannot help but view this action as irresponsible, and, since I do not believe it serves the best interest of the steel industry itself, it seems wholly irrational.

The industry has universally held that labor costs, foreign competition, and competition at home are pricing domestic steel out of its markets. Why, then, a price increase at this time?

I am informed that since 1958, the date of the industry's last price boost, the employment costs per ton of steel have not increased, despite wage increases that have occurred during this period. Increased productivity, technology, and greater efficiency have made this possible.

We must also note that the president of the Bethlehem Steel Corp. yesterday advised against a price increase in the industry. Today, however, Bethlehem announced that it would increase its prices also.

It is a unique kind of competition if producers compete by uniformly raising prices. The Justice Department and the Congress have a right to know more about it.

American consumers have enjoyed an increase in their personal incomes since the Nation began its vigorous recovery from the recent economic setback. This increase has not been jeopardized by inflation. Prices have remained relatively stable, and, in fact, the absence of a boost in steel prices since 1958 has contributed to price stability.

Now, the impending threat of another period of inflation must be attributed to the backward step taken by United States Steel.

United States Steel should immediately consider the impact its action will have on the rest of the Nation. The country, as a whole, the industry, and the steelworkers must share the responsibility for controlling inflation and securing price stability.

The steel industry's private decisions cannot ignore the public interest.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to know that the committees of the House with responsibility in the field are moving already to review the steel price situation and its effect upon substantial national interests.

The announcement by the gentleman from New York, Chairman CELLER, of hearings by the Judiciary Committee, to begin on May 2, is assurance that the antitrust aspects of the matter will be checked at once.

The gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman HARRIS, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who expressed astonishment over the price rise on the floor a few moments ago, has declared his staff is already at work on the question and he will be in conference at once with other committee chairmen who are concerned.

This concern is certain to be widespread among the committees of this House.

The estimate of the Secretary of Defense that the price rise will increase defense costs more than $1 billion a year is sure to interest the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations.

The effect upon our balance of payments is sure to lead to concern in the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and all Members of this body.

The impact upon the cost of our public works and highways will certainly concern the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

In short, this action by the giants of the steel industry will have its impact on many, many fronts and on many more programs and policies than most people realize.

The destinies of literally hundreds of industries outside the steel industry itself—the well-being of millions of farmers, working people, and small businessmen—the household budget of every family—all are sure to be affected by the price increase decision.

Congressional concern, and the concern of our great President, are both understandable and inevitable. Congressional investigation and factfinding are equally understandable and inevitable.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last night the United States Steel Corp. announced a $6-a-ton increase in steel prices. The other members of the Big 11 steel corporations are expected to join this "big steal." This action by the United States Steel Corp. is a shocking example of corporate indifference to the economic well-being of the Nation. Not only is the increase unjustified, but in the past increases in the price of steel have led to inflationary price increases in other industries. What makes this action even more deplorable is the fact that upon the urging of the administration the United Steelworkers of America 5 days ago signed a noninflationary labor contract with United States Steel. This contract provided for an increase in fringe benefits rather than wage increases. President Kennedy, in a letter to David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers, called the contract forward looking and responsible.

The irresponsibility of the increase is clear. Last year there was a gain in output per man-hour in the steel industry of about 5 percent. This will more than offset the 2.5 percent increase in labor costs which will result from the increase of fringe benefits in the new contract. In other words, United States Steel has increased prices to increase profits at the expense of the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the appropriate committees of the House immediately investigate this callous disregard of the Nation's welfare.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, today's news reports allege that the President of the United States is "hopping mad" over the announced $6-per-ton increase in steel prices.

It is not my purpose to discuss the Chief Executive's reaction to having bumped his head against the hard facts of economics.

I merely venture to suggest that a modest bit of righteous indignation might properly and profitably issue from the White House and might go far toward putting some iron in the spine of our national leadership in certain other areas of policy even more crucial than the price of steel.

For example, with respect to Moscow's scoffing rejection of our last-minute appeal for a nuclear test ban.

For example, with respect to Castro's latest use of the invasion prisoners for further brutal and vicious blackmail.

For example, the announced intention of Mrs. Cyrus Eaton to lead the White House picketing operations of the peace-at-any-price advocates of appeasement in this country.

For example, the persistent outgivings of supposedly responsible spokesmen of this administration who insist on telling Americans what they cannot do and telling the world what we will not do to protect our national interests and security.

I understand, of course, that even the President of the United States must carefully budget his indignation.

I respectfully suggest that there are some neglected targets of Executive anger which might properly rate even ahead of Mr. Blough.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that those steel companies in the United States, the president or duly authorized officials of which have yesterday and today announced a rise in their steel products prices per ton of $6, or thereabouts, have made a most seriously timed and economic error.

I now make this appraisement on the floor of this great legislative body because of what has recently transpired by steel management and organized labor in arriving at what appeared to be a happily negotiated, and soundly arrived at, settlement but which has not yet, by the terms thereof, been given initial effect. This settlement between management and labor in the steel industry manifestly struck a cordial response in the hearts and minds of the American people. I received a goodly number of expressions from folks in the great 23d District of California, which I represent, of deep satisfaction that there would not again this year be a strike in steel for higher wages.

With the early encouragement and request of the President of the United States, management in steel and labor in steel had averted the usual steel strike by labor against management in order to enforce a raise in wages. This time, Mr. Speaker, it seemed as though both steel management and organized labor in steel had seen the light of reason, and of public interest, and with the cordial aid of Government had averted a national situation of fear, worry, untold loss of millions upon millions of actual dollars, and of slowing down of our national production and of our national consumption.

Mr. Speaker, if there was any indication in the joint announcement by management and labor that management was anticipating shortly raising the price of ton steel by $6, or any other price, I failed to read it.

Mr. Speaker, if steel management gave notice to the American people at any time, directly or indirectly, that in making the agreement and arrangement management did with organized labor to avert a strike and other purposes, that steel intended and would within so short a time, or any time, after the agreement was reached, raise the price of steel nevertheless, I failed to see such declaration or hear it on radio or television by any responsible steel magnate or steel official.

But, Mr. Speaker, this shockingly high raise coming so suddenly cannot but leave in thousands of minds an inference that steel must have had in mind during the negotiations, and at the time of the close thereof, at least, that they would be declaring a ton raise in price nevertheless, and in spite of the fact of there being a nationwide applauded accord struck between steel and labor.

With the world as it is, with the price of living as it is in the United States, with the employment situation as it is, with the tragically complex problems presently facing us as a nation pressing in upon us for prompt, yet cooperative consideration and decision, always with the public interest necessarily in mind in all such decisions, I do not presently conceive of there having been taken into consideration by steel very much of the interests of the public.

Mr. Speaker, if American steel, which is raising the price of steel per ton, has what it believes to be clear-cut justification for this suddenly announced raise in price of $6 a ton, or any other price, then I respectfully suggest that steel has an immediate obligation to immediately fully submit their facts and figures and reasoning to the American people in every expeditious manner possible—by print, radio, television, telephone, and in every other manner available in such cases. It is up to steel to undertake if it can to make justification of this shocking, and to me, Mr. Speaker, I admit, a disgusting and keenly disappointing economic status which cannot help but result in tragic and unwanted and dangerous inflation and to set in motion a series of economic conditions which cannot help but be dangerous to American industry, to American homeowners, to wage earners, and even to the children in our schools.

And, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that as soon as possible this House of Representatives commence the most thoroughgoing and exhaustive—but fair and sound—hearings of this action by steel. If there is a violation of our antitrust laws, the quicker the American people know, the better. Whatever the findings are, let us have them as soon as possible.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the ignoble act of the United States Steel Corp. in lifting steel price $6 per ton came as a great shock to us and to the administration. This action is certainly irresponsible; the United States Steel Corp. and those companies which follow its lead can only be termed untrustworthy and unreliable.

Our Nation is in the throes of crises and a tremendous defense effort. It is imperative that our economy remain as stable as possible. In line with the President's plea, the United Steelworkers, after negotiations, and at great personal sacrifice of their own best interests, agreed to their least expensive contract in years; they showed their willingness to help their country by accepting a most modest contract which was noninflationary, and it has been indicated that no steel price rise was considered necessary at this time.

Now, after the workers are committed, Big Steel announces a price increase which will affect every facet of manufacturing and production, and which in itself forcefully creates another inflationary spiral. It makes a mockery of the generous and patriotic spirit of the steelworkers, and totally disregards our Nation's needs in these perilous days. If we are to permit the workers of our Nation to be hoodwinked in this instance, can we expect them to take any future pleas seriously when we ask their cooperation in connection with pay settlements?

Big Steel has no reasonable or acceptable explanation for its ruthless action.

I join with my colleagues in requesting that the Department of Justice and the appropriate congressional committees lose no time in bringing to a halt such unconscionable actions; to determine whether or not United States Steel and its followers have illegal monopoly power over steel prices, so that, if we and our Nation's economic safety are at their mercy at present, their stranglehold can be overpowered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, several of the giants of the steel industry within the past 24 hours have announced price increases averaging $6 per ton.

This cynical action has been taken in the face of several factors which had made the American people confident it would not occur.

The recently negotiated wage agreement with the United Steelworkers represented only a moderate increase in costs and dealt only with certain fringe benefits.

Those costs are well within the capacity of the steel industry to absorb.

President Kennedy had made a strong plea to the industry not to start another inflationary spiral by boosting prices on the pretext of the slightly higher costs to be generated by the new agreement.

President Kennedy's indignation and that of the American public, therefore, are fully justified, and the Congress should consider carefully what possible action is open to it to nullify the steel industry's move. Price controls certainly would not be an attractive solution, but I believe this great industry well might consider that continued unjustified inflationary pressures of this sort could lead the industry into that undemocratic trap.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the signal for a round of price increases has now been called by United States Steel, Bethlehem, and Jones & Laughlin. I hope that these sunshine patriots get sunburned and tanned by the Department of Justice, by the Steelworkers Union, and by the general public. The Steelworkers Union is now well within its rights to try to cancel the recently approved contract on the ground of fraud in the inducement to the contract which was premised on noninflationary considerations.

Roger Blough, Ben Morrell, and all the rest can now tell the widows of America how they contributed to the dwindling of their savings accounts. They are completely responsible for the consequences of the inflationary spiral they have now set in motion.

This type of profiteering is un-American. The greed manifested by these price increases places in peril the very security of our country.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I ask, How far has our country gone down the road toward socialism? We are supposed to be living under a free economy and a capitalistic system which has made the United States the most powerful Nation that the world has ever seen.

Today, my colleagues across the aisle challenged the right of the steel industry to raise the price of its products. Under a capitalistic system, this has always been their prerogative. The remarks made this afternoon demonstrate how socialistic this country has become, when threats are made against steel companies who feel that an increase in the price of steel is justified under present economic conditions.

The distinguished majority leader has made serious charges that a violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act might be involved and has called for an immediate investigation. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention that the interpretation of the Sherman Antitrust Act is a one-way street and has been applied only to industry. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9271, which would amend the Sherman Antitrust Act and related laws to make these acts applicable also to the labor unions. A monopoly exists in the field of labor and it should be specifically broken up in the same manner as these laws prohibit monopolies in industry. I defend the right of the steel companies and any other industry to set their own prices without interference from the Federal Government. Under our capitalistic system, this is one of the freedoms which they should and do enjoy in these United States.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by the United States Steel Corp. yesterday, swiftly followed by some other steel companies today, that steel prices are to be increased by $6 a ton is surprising in view of the moderate labor settlement recently concluded by the steel industry. Moreover, such a substantial price rise is deeply disturbing in view of its inevitable impact on our domestic economy at home and our balance of payments abroad.

It is difficult to see how such an increase can be justified, and I await with interest the explanations to be given by representatives of the steel industry at the hearings to be conducted by the gentleman from New York, Chairman CELLER, of the House Antitrust Subcommittee.

I am especially curious about the statement yesterday by President Martin, of Bethlehem Steel, at its annual stockholders meeting:

> There shouldn't be any price rise * * * we should be trying to reduce the price of steel if at all possible.

It is all the more startling therefore that today Bethlehem announced a substantial price increase. I will be interested to learn what caused Bethlehem's president to change his mind so radically in 24 hours.

I am also troubled by the fact that the big steel companies seem once again to be playing follow the leader in announcing price increases. The practice or price parallelism in the highly concentrated steel industry raises questions as to the legality of their conduct under the existing antitrust laws. If present laws prove inadequate, new antitrust legislation may be needed to assure price competition in this most basic industry.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this House joins with President Kennedy in his expressed agitation over the increase in the price of steel. At his news conference an hour ago, he expressed in no uncertain tone and phrase his alarm at the action taken by United States Steel yesterday and followed rapidly today by similar increases by Bethlehem, Republic, and Jones & Laughlin—the major producers of steel in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from the President's remarks as they appear in the Washington Evening Star's news story:

> President Kennedy today said the steel companies were "guilty of an irresponsible, unjustifiable defiance of the public interest" in increasing steel prices.
>
> In an almost unprecedented tongue lashing, Mr. Kennedy told his press conference that "a tiny handful of steel company executives" displayed "utter contempt" for the Nation's welfare. He said their "pursuit of power and profits" exceeded their concern for America's well-being.
>
> He said the $6-a-ton increase in steel prices announced last night by United States Steel and followed today by other companies would lead to price increases throughout the American economy.
>
> It would, he warned, "seriously hamper" Government efforts to prevent a new round of inflation.
>
> And it would also, he said, add $1 billion a year to the cost of the Nation's defense.
>
> ### NOTES SACRIFICES
>
> The President was plainly angered by the steel companies' action in what he termed a time of national crisis. He contrasted their action with the sacrifices being made by reservists called back to duty and the American servicemen who have lost their lives in the jungle fighting in Vietnam.
>
> Mr. Kennedy said the price boost would add to the problems of American industry in competing for foreign markets. This, in turn, he said, would adversely affect the balance of payments and endanger the U.S. gold stockpiles.
>
> It would also set a bad example for other industries, he declared.
>
> The President said there was "no justification" in the economics of the industry for the price increase.
>
> ### EXPECTS LABOR DROP
>
> Last week's 2-year labor agreement was noninflationary, he said. The productivity rise in the industry has been so great that labor costs per ton of steel can actually be expected to decline in the next 12 months.
>
> He quoted experts in the Bureau of Labor Statistics as saying today that per-unit costs in the steel plants was no higher in 1961 than they were in 1958.
>
> Cash dividends to stockholders of the steel companies, Mr. Kennedy said, have run over $600 million a year for the past 5 years. Estimates of first quarter earnings this year, he said, are among the highest in history.
>
> All this, he concluded, indicated that steel companies should have been able to hold the price line. For them to do otherwise, he said, is in "ruthless disregard of their public responsibilities."
>
> ### PROBES UNDERWAY
>
> The President said both the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission were looking into the matter. He encouraged congressional committees to see what they could learn about "how these price decisions are so quickly made" and whether legislation is needed to protect the public interest in these matters.

Mr. Speaker, this public-be-damned attitude ought not to go unchallenged by our Government. It will not. It is heartening to see that both Houses of the Congress have moved quickly to look into this crass action by Big Steel. All of us on this side of the Capitol applaud the announced promise of Congressman CELLER's Subcommittee on Antitrust to hold hearings at the earliest possible moment and find out who, why, and what prompted the ill-advised action of United States Steel Corp. The American public is entitled to know the answers. The people should be assured that the steel entity is not bigger than the U.S. Government itself.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is shocked by the irresponsible actions of the steel industry.

At a time when all efforts are being directed toward countering the inflationary trends in our society, the steel giants have announced a price increase of $6 a ton. Their action can only put another price spiral into orbit.

It is common knowledge that an increase in steel prices means an increase in prices all through the economy. Farm machinery, appliances, automobiles—these are just a few items which will be priced higher tomorrow, because of the steel increase today.

This action comes only hours after the steel industry had concluded negotiations with the steelworkers in which the industry conceded that a rise in the price of steel would be inflationary. This fact undeniably played a part in the contract which was signed. The country hailed it as noninflationary. Now, only a short time later, the companies have announced their increases. This, to my mind, is acting irresponsibly. They have not kept faith with the American people.

The Kennedy administration worked hard to insure that a steel wage settlement would not be inflationary and would be in the best interests of the Nation. In one stroke its best efforts have been negated. The increase is a severe blow to the Kennedy administration's hopes to preserve stable prices at home in a time of crisis abroad.

I am deeply disturbed by this day's events. But it is one thing to complain and another to take action. What action is possible in this situation? The only truly effective solution, if the men at the head of the steel industry persist in their selfish ways, is controls.

No one wants to see controls put on American business. But when Big Steel and other elements of big business act irresponsibly, and disregard the better method, voluntary self-restraint, they are risking controls. They invite them.

More immediately, I urge that this move by the steel industry and the reasons behind it be investigated and studied thoroughly by the Executive and by the Congress. Moreover, as I have done in the past, I urge the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Consumers' Interests to protect the consumer against inflation.

While it is the overall responsibility of the Congress and of the executive branch of our Government to look out for the interests of the consumer, the discharge of this responsibility would be facilitated by the creation of the type of committee I have proposed. We must safeguard the interests of the consumers—the American people—against the blight wrought by inflation.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has been shocked by the announcement by the United States Steel Corp. that it was raising the price of steel by $6 a ton effective immediately. Congress has been deeply stirred and, unlike the administration in 1958, this administration will take action. The action by United States Steel Corp. demonstrates a callous disregard for the welfare of the American people, the consumer, and the businessman. It is an act of deception upon the Steelworkers Union which only a few days ago negotiated a wage contract without any cash wage increase so as to prevent an inflationary spiral. This action by United States Steel Corp. seems to be an attempt to discredit and embarrass President John Kennedy and the administration.

I predict that the other 10 big steel companies will follow the lead of United States Steel Corp. This price rise by United States Steel is unnecessary, uneconomic, and unwise. The price increase is unnecessary because the amount of steel sold has not diminished but has been increasing. Great demand exists in the domestic and foreign markets for steel and steel products and new markets have been opening up for the sale of steel products. A price increase is uneconomic because competition from German, Japanese, and foreign mills may be in a position to undersell the Big 11 steel companies. The best way to meet competition is not to raise prices but to lower prices. The price rise is unwise because it jeopardizes our position in our relation with the European Common Market and threatens the purchasing power of the American dollar.

What does a price rise in steel products mean to our country? It means that appliances which every family buys, the stoves, refrigerators, TV, radios, the washing machines, the irons, the automobiles, the toys, will cost more and the dollar will purchase less. Our building construction, our commercial building, our schools with their equipment will cost much more, and our rents and school costs must increase. Farm equipment, tractors, and trucks will increase and farm products, our food supply, which machinery helps produce, will rise. The increased cost of food will hit every worker, every family, every home, and the dollar will purchase less. The cost of living will increase to the detriment of the American people and economy.

The United States Steel Corp. has rendered a great disservice. It has failed to hold the line; and the officers have acted irresponsibly. The American people do not want price controls but if the 11 steel companies follow the leader we may have to declare a national emergency to fix the price of steel. In the meantime I urge the Attorney General to investigate to determine whether a conspiracy to violate the antitrust laws has been entered into the legislative committees, and those committees having jurisdiction should immediately inquire into the impact of the price rise and make appropriate recommendations.

Billions are being spent for planes and defense missiles. We must purchase them because our Nation's survival is at stake. This price increase will add another billion dollars to our defense expenditures.

America, arise and protest this blow to our economic solvency and to our security.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the price rise announced by the United States Steel Corp. is a cold and deliberate affront to the entire Nation. And now, to turn insult into defiance, the remaining steel producers are submissively falling into line with price increases. This, of course, follows a respectable interval of a day or so in which the companies piously announced that they are studying the United States Steel boost.

I do not see how this rebuke can be termed anything but irresponsible, unless, of course, we agree that it is also illogical.

It is irresponsible because a clique of powerful men in the industry has chosen to ignore the interest of the American consumer and the national interest as well. It is illogical because, if we are to believe them, they are frustrating their own attempts to remain competitive.

The industry has argued that the cost of labor and foreign steel have created a price squeeze from which they cannot wrench loose. First, we know that the prospects of foreign competition have not lessened, and indeed are greater.

Second, since 1958, when steel prices were last increased, employment costs of steel have not increased. Furthermore, the recent settlement in the industry has been viewed by virtually all experts as noninflationary.

How, then, does the industry justify its declaration that it will summarily boost the price of steel and the public be damned?

The steel producers insist that they want to compete. I would ask whether a monolithic price increase throughout the industry represents competitive pricing?

These are questions the steel industry must be prepared to answer. Americans have a right to an explanation when the influence of one industry reaches into almost every facet of their lives.

They have a right to an explanation when the security of this Nation depends on our ability to compete abroad, not only in raw steel but in all other markets affected by steel.

I would caution the steel industry against the mere exercise of power, for the public interest and the national security are at stake. The Nation will demand an explanation for the threat posed by the steel industry's defiance.

EASTER RECESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to proceed for 1 minute in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the plans, if any, which he can announce now as to the Easter recess.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield——

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to advise the House that we plan, following close of business on Thursday next, April 19, to give the Members of the House a recess until the following Monday week, April 30.

Mr. HALLECK. Could I inquire further as to whether or not it is expected that that might be accomplished by a resolution to the other body?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, the decision as to the manner in which it might be done has not been made. But we will assure the Members of the House that we expect that they may have a 10-day recess during this period.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

PROPOSED AMENDENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of this week the House will consider H.R. 1159, a measure designed to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 by elimination of the 6-percent differential applied to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders on ships to be constructed under the Maritime Administration's replacement program.

Passage of this measure without appropriate amendment would be disastrous to the west coast shipbuilding industry, would largely defeat the intent of the parent act, and would alter dangerously our defense posture and our capacity to absorb attack.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD for the consideration of the House, a letter which I have received from Mr. J. A. Byington, of Seattle, president of the Western Shipbuilders Association, and collateral data from that association and from the Maritime Administration, which clearly substantiate the need for the continuation of a differential to Pacific coast shipyards:

APRIL 6, 1962.

The Honorable DON MAGNUSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MAGNUSON: After an express agreement by western interests—and what was assumed to be tacit agreement by the East—to abide by the results of a Maritime Administration audit, and let its findings resolve a 3-year controversy over the 6-percent shipbuilding differential—eastern interests, intent on full repeal, have now ignored Maritime's findings and succeeded yesterday in persuading the Rules Committee to report out H.R. 1159—a full repeal bill—which Rules had held up last year awaiting this very audit.

Under the law, the differential stands at 6 percent. A 7-month Maritime audit, just released on March 21, 1962, says the actual differential should be 4.2 percent—or "about 4 percent." Western House Members, shipbuilders, and practically the entire press on the west coast, repeatedly stated that the West should and would abide by what MARAD said. While no such public commitments were made by the East, there was full East-West cooperation with maritime in the study, and no effort was made to report the bill out of rules until after the audit was released.

Western shipbuilding, which has lived on the crumbs of the shipbuilding program (17 out of 78 ships) is stunned. The express purposes of MARAD's study was to determine where the differential should be pegged. Without the differential in the law, the West would have had only 12 ships, instead of 17. The East has built 61.

In the name of fairness, we ask you as a House Member to look over the enclosed facts on H.R. 1159, and vote for a floor amendment to change it from outright repeal to 4.2 percent.

Respectfully yours,

J. A. BYINGTON,
President.

FACTS ABOUT THE 6-PERCENT SHIPBUILDING DIFFERENTIAL

HOW THE DIFFERENTIAL WORKS

Under the 6-percent differential Pacific coast shipbuilders may be awarded contracts to build merchant ships subsidized by the Federal Government as long as the Pacific coast bid is not more than 6 percent higher than the lowest eastern bid. The differential applies only to certain limited ship construction defined in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

WHY THE DIFFERENTIAL EXISTS

One of the goals of national maritime policy is the dispersal of shipbuilding facilities on all coasts as a vital aid to national security. In 1936 it was found by investigation that shipbuilding costs were approximately 6 percent higher on the Pacific coast than in eastern yards. The differential was, and is now, due to the higher cost of labor and materials on the Pacific coast. Congress recognized this fact in pasing the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which has served the United States well for 25 years as an instrument of national policy.

LEGAL BASIS OF THE DIFFERENTIAL

The differential is provided for in section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which limits its application to Maritime Administration financed construction of merchant ships which (1) will be used on essential foreign trade routes designated by the Federal Maritime Board (2) will serve Pacific coast ports (3) will be operated by a steamship line headquartered on the Pacific coast.

WHO BENEFITS FROM THE DIFFERENTIAL?

The primary beneficiary of the construction differential is the Nation as a whole. The purpose of the differential is to strengthen national defense by maintaining a strong Pacific coast shipbuilding industry. Otherwise the facts of economic life would cause the Pacific coast yards to wither away and skilled personnel would scatter to other areas. In time of national emergency the Pacific coast would not have a readiness to build ships as it does now. The ready shipyards would be concentrated in the East.

Since 1958, the 6-percent differential has resulted in contracts for building five vessels on the Pacific coast, two in San Francisco for Pacific Far East Lines totaling about $20 million and three in Los Angeles for American Mail Lines totaling about $30 million. Of this $50 million, some $23 million was direct shipbuilders' wages in San Francisco and Los Angeles. Another $27 million went to material purchases in the East and on the Pacific coast and to local wages in related industries.

WHO THE OPPOSITION IS

In recent sessions of Congress there have been several attempts to repeal the differential both on the floor of Congress and in committee. These attempts originate with Congressmen representing shipbuilding areas on the Atlantic and gulf coasts. Up to now these eastern interests have been unsuccessful. On January 3 of this year, however, Representative GARMATZ introduced H.R. 1159, designed to completely eliminate the 6-percent differential.

THE MARAD STUDY

For the past several months the industry has been awaiting the Maritime Administration audit study on the actual Pacific coast differential. This was requested by Senator MAGNUSON, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee, after the House Rules Committee last August pigeonholed the House repeal bill (H.R. 1159) pending completion of an unbiased Government audit report.

The report was issued on March 21, 1962, and says that the actual cost differential between the east and west coasts should be 4.2 percent—or about 4 percent. Although both eastern and western interests had publicly and tacitly agreed to abide by the results of the study—eastern interests intent upon repeal of the entire 6 percent abruptly brought H.R. 1159 out of the Rules Committee on April 5, 1962, intent upon completely ignoring the long awaited Maritime audit.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the Members the conclusions of a survey conducted by the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce, as reported to the Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, under date of March 21, 1962:

CONCLUSIONS

1. The cost of shipbuilding on the west coast exceeds that of the east coast by about 4 percent.
2. The cost of shipbuilding on the gulf coast is less than that on the east coast by about 1 percent.
3. The cost of shipbuilding on the Great Lakes is less than that on the east coast by about 2 percent.

ONE-SIDED U.N. CENSURE

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the public reaction to the passage of the U.N. resolution in connection with the Syria-Israel matter was unfavorable to the resolution approval. The members of the Philadelphia Democratic congressional delegation, U.S. Representatives WILLIAM A. BARRETT, JAMES A. BYRNE, KATHRYN GRANAHAN, ROBERT N. C. NIX, WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., and HERMAN TOLL, sent telegrams to the White House prior to the presentation of the resolution by the U.S. delegation in the United Nations Security Council. The telegrams asked for the withdrawal of the proposed censure resolution. The message was acknowledged by the White House and our views were communicated to the State Department and to the U.S. delegation at the United Nations. The special assistant to the President stated:

> The long-range objective of the United States is to bring peace to the Middle East. Where this is jeopardized we shall seek to eliminate causes of friction.

The resolution was presented to the Security Council and passed despite our protests. The editorials in the Philadelphia Inquirer and the New York Times of April 11 show the unfavorable public reaction to the passage of the resolution.

I read the Inquirer editorial which calls the passage of the resolution a "One-Sided U.N. Censure":

ONE-SIDED U.N. CENSURE

The United Nations Security Council is not supporting the cause of peace along the Israeli borders by its one-sided resolution censuring Israel, while leaving Syria unrebuked, for the recent shootings on the Sea of Galilee shores.

In abstaining from a vote on the resolution, which found the United States and Britain on the same side with the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic, French Ambassador Arman Berard challenged it as neither "impartial nor objective," surely a fair appraisal. As the U.N. had failed to establish who triggered the exchange of shots, it could at least have had both sides sharing the blame.

The cease-fire should be honored equally by the Israelis and the Arabs. If a clash is set off by one side, it does not seem right to blame only the other side for retaliating.

In reaffirming the 1956 resolution that condemned reprisal raids by Israel, the Security Council is ignoring the reason for the

> reprisals, or the party that set them off by initiating the attack. Its heavyhanded partiality could give the Arabs the impression that they can violate the cease-fire with impunity.
>
> The United Nations has again missed the point in dealing with the continuing Arab-Israeli conflict. It deplores hostile exchanges between the two sides.
>
> But it still shirks the central issue of peacemaking. It seems satisfied to keep the Arabs and the Israelis at arms-length, hopeful that they won't shoot at each other too often. But it does nothing to promote a peaceful settlement.
>
> Instead of trying to "keep the peace" where there actually is no peace to keep, the U.N. should be pushing for concrete negotiations between Arabs and Israelis—something that Israel has consistently favored.

I also read the editorial of the Times which refers to the resolution as "Evading the Arab-Israel Issue":

> EVADING THE ARAB-ISRAEL ISSUE
>
> In one of those actions that feed criticism of the United Nations, the Security Council has meted out something less than evenhanded justice in the Syrian-Israeli dispute.
>
> The Council was right and bound by the precedent of its 1956 resolution to condemn Israel's latest escalation of a border incident into a major military action as a flagrant violation of the armistice agreement. It was equally right in calling on both Syria and Israel to comply with the armistice agreement and the United Nations Charter, in moving to strengthen the true supervisory machinery and in requesting both sides to cooperate with it in maintaining peace.
>
> But the Council fell short of both impartiality and its own principles in two respects. It failed to condemn Syria for provocations which, according to the American delegate, included artillery fire that raised the Syrian action above a minor incident. Furthermore, and more important, it failed even to take cognizance of the basic cause of these recurrent incidents. This cause is the lack of an Arab-Israel peace settlement. The absence of such a settlement has put Israel under a blockade and constant threats of extermination that explain, if they do not excuse, Israel's overaggressive reactions.
>
> The Council's resolution can only encourage Syria and other Arab States to continue to harass Israel and to prevent its development through irrigation projects in which Israel's neighbors refuse to join, even for their own benefit. It is the first duty of the United Nations to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace. Neither Arab bellicosity nor Israeli reluctance to discuss concessions should keep the U.N. from fulfilling this task.

We urge the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to encourage and push for immediate negotiations between the Arab nations and Israel in order to establish peace in that area as quickly as possible.

THE MOST REVEREND BISHOP JOSEPH M. GILMORE

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, western Montana mourns the death of the Most Reverend Bishop Joseph M. Gilmore, who was the chief shepherd of the Catholic flock for the diocese of Helena for the last 26 years. Bishop Gilmore died on April 2, in San Francisco, from an apparent heart attack which was later diagnosed as asphyxiation from food lodged in his throat. He was stricken while attending a dinner which honored the Most Reverend Joseph T. McGucken on the event of his enthronement as Archbishop of San Francisco.

Funeral services with solemn pontifical Mass of requiem in St. Helena's Cathedral will be held this morning, April 11, at 11 a.m. The Mass will be celebrated by the Most Reverend Edward D. Howard, archbishop of Portland. His Eminence James Francis Cardinal McIntyre, of Los Angeles, will represent the Holy Father at the services.

Bishop Joseph Michael Gilmore was a boy of five when his Irish immigrant parents, Mr. and Mrs. John J. Gilmore, moved to Anaconda, Mont. He was born on March 23, 1893, in New York City and was baptized in St. Patrick's Cathedral. The future Bishop Gilmore received his early education in Anaconda, attended St. Peter's grade school, at the age of 10 was confirmed by the Most Reverend John Brondel, the first bishop of Helena. Bishop Gilmore received his early religious training, as an altar boy, under the late Reverend John P. Pirnat, pastor of St. Peter's at Anaconda. Father Pirnat lived to see the day when his young altar boy was elevated to the head of the Helena diocese when he was consecrated in 1936.

At the suggestion of Most Reverend John P. Carroll, second bishop of Helena, he entered St. Joseph's College—formerly Loras College—Dubuque, Iowa, where he finished high school and college work and received a bachelor of arts degree summa cum laude in June 1911.

The late Bishop Carroll sent the promising young student to the University of Propaganda in Rome for theological training. He received his doctorate in sacred theology at the age of 22 and with a special dispensation was ordained to the priesthood the following year when 23.

He returned to his diocese immediately at Helena, and became professor of English and Latin at Mount St. Charles College, now Carroll College. He was appointed pastor of St. Teresa's Parish in Whitehall in 1920, and in 1925 was transferred to St. Helena's Parish at Meaderville, just outside the city of Butte. While pastor at St. Helena's Parish, he also served as chaplain at the St. James Hospital in Butte.

In 1927 Bishop Gilmore was appointed chancellor of the Helena diocese under Bishop George Finnegan, and continuing under Bishop Hayes. He was elected fifth bishop of Helena to succeed the Most Reverend Ralph L. Hayes when the latter became rector of North American College in Rome and who is now bishop of Davenport, Iowa. Bishop Gilmore was elevated to the hierarchy by Archbishop Amleto Cicognani, then apostolic delegate to the United States, in ceremonies in St. Helena Cathedral in Helena, Mont. He was the first Montana priest to become a bishop.

High regard of the Catholic Church was indicated in an April 17, 1959, ceremony in which privileges and honors of assistance to the papal throne were bestowed on Bishop Gilmore by Pope John XXIII.

The largest gathering of Catholic archbishops, bishops and abbots in the history of the Helena diocese attended a Mass marking his 25th anniversary in February of last year.

Bishop Gilmore has been spiritual leader of his vast Montana diocese for the past 26 years. When he took over as head of the Helena diocese, the Catholic population was slightly more than 41,000. Today that faithful number has more than doubled.

The shock over the death of Bishop Gilmore was comparable to conditions which prevailed on February 19, 1936, when he took over the reign as fifth bishop of Helena. At that time, the diocese was recovering from the effect of a devastating earthquake—a fact mentioned by Amleto Cardinal Cicognani, now Papal Secretary of State, but then apostolic delegate to the United States, who officiated at the consecration of Bishop Gilmore.

The words spoken by Cardinal Cicognani to the stunned faithful on that February day were recalled by some in the shocked diocese last week:

> Temporal misfortune has united all in the strong bond of charity, and this bond will become even stronger with the advent of your new bishop.

His first task as an administrator was to rebuild the cathedral in Helena, the parochial schools, the hospital, and other institutions destroyed and damaged by the hundreds of earthquakes felt in the Helena area in 1936. In adversity Bishop Gilmore met the challenge calmly, building his domain both spiritually and physically. His flock increased and his clergy, which currently numbers 110, is composed almost 80 percent of native sons. These young men are educated at Carroll College, whose enrollment increased from approximately 250 in 1936 to more than 700 in 1962. The diocese of Helena has continually increased in the number of young women entering the religious life during the past decade due to the inspiration of Bishop Gilmore and his devoted clergy. The diocese of Helena saw a tremendous increase in churches, hospitals, and schools under the watchful eye of the chief shepherd. Bishop Gilmore had just completed plans, before his death, to ordain the largest class of young priests in the history of the diocese—nine young men.

Bishop Gilmore enjoyed the unusual distinction of knowing or working with all of his predecessors. He first served as a train bearer, as an altar boy, to Bishop John Brondel in the dedication of the parish school early in his life in Anaconda. It was often said that "Bishop Gilmore knew each and every one of his priests as individuals."

I have been told here in Washington that Bishop Gilmore was a pioneer in the work of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and episcopal chairman of its immigration department at the time of his death. He played a key role in furthering the work of the confraternity of Christian doctrine and his diocesan program was adopted by many larger metropolitan dioceses in the United States. His wise counsel at the NCWC here in Washington will be sorely missed, according to the church directors.

We Montanans of all faiths offer our sincere condolences to all of the priests, sisters, and laity of the diocese of Helena. I, personally, was acquainted with and knew the beloved Bishop Gilmore as a learned religious leader, aggressive yet not brusque, but a kindly person and an effective administrator. I, also, offer my sincere sympathy to his brother, Timothy Gilmore, of Butte, and to his nieces and nephews.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the District of Columbia have permission to sit during general debate on Tuesday and Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the many Members of the House of Representatives who have, in recent days and weeks, addressed themselves to the problem of medical care for our senior citizens.

I understand that in this first sentence, I have committed a grave tactical error. I am told by supporters of the legislation in question—which, as you all know, is H.R. 4222, offered by my distinguished and forward-looking colleague from California [Mr. KING]—I am told by supporters of this bill that we must never use the term "medical care."

No, those are dangerous words. Instead, we must use the term "medical insurance." Or better yet, perhaps, "hospital insurance."

Now it is perfectly true that "insurance" is a proper and accurate description of the program contemplated by the bill in question, H.R. 4222. It is indeed a national insurance program—soundly conceived and broadly based, in the same manner as the social security system of which it would be a part.

Yet it is also true that the objective of this program, in the ordinary meaning of words, is better medical care for the aged. After all, just paying the bills is one way to improve anyone's medical care. If you doubt it, just show up at a hospital without having in your pocket either an ample supply of cash or a fully convertible insurance policy.

Then why have I been cautioned, by those who feel as I do about this legislation, to tread so cautiously along a semantic tightrope?

If a bill that insures against heavy hospital bills—or nursing-home bills—also results in medical care, as it does, what is wrong with saying so?

The answer does no credit to the intelligence of the American people, the perspicacity of the Congress or the integrity of the spokesmen for organized medicine.

The answer is simply this: The opponents of this program, led by the American Medical Association, describe it as a long step toward socialized medicine. To the average citizen—we are told—socialized medicine and medical care with Government participation mean exactly the same thing. Therefore, if we talk about medical care in connection with this program, we are pleading guilty to the AMA charges.

Mr. Speaker, I say this is nonsense—insulting nonsense. Insulting, because it assumes that both our constituents and we, their representatives, cannot identify a syllogism when we see or hear it. Insulting, too, because it assumes a depth of ignorance on the part of the American people and their representatives which would be terrifying if it were true.

Let us look at the facts without blinking.

Let us look at this program for assisting in the medical care—yes; I use the words again, and I will keep on using them—the medical care of our older citizens.

What does it do?

It pays their hospital bills—except for the first $10 a day during the first 9 days. There is a $90 gesture, a good-faith token, that ought to satisfy the critics, even if it is collected from an 85-year-old widow suffering from terminal cancer.

It provides for 6 months of post-hospital nursing home care. This bill does not set up any nursing homes or specify which ones shall be used; again, it just pays the costs.

It pays for home health services—visiting nurses and so on—that will allow a convalescent patient, or—let us face it—a dying one, to get needed treatment without cluttering up hospital space that could be better used for someone else.

And finally, it pays for outpatient services, like X-rays and laboratory tests, with the first $20 plucked from the patient.

That is a summary of H.R. 4222. That is the outline of socialized medicine in America.

Add it all up and what do you have? A device to pay the bills—the hospital bill, the nursing home bill, the visiting nurse bill, the outpatient bill.

There is not a word in all this about the doctor's bill—or about doctors at all.

Let us start from another point.

If you are sick, who decides whether you need hospital care?

Your doctor.

Who decides which hospital you will enter?

Your doctor—who picks one where he has staff privileges.

Who decides how long you stay in the hospital?

Your doctor, of course.

There is not a word in this legislation that will in the slightest degree affect the answer to any of these questions. The patient will still be under the care of his own doctor—and will still be wholly responsible for the doctor's bill. The doctor will still decide whether, where, and for how long the patient will be hospitalized, confined to a nursing home and so on.

This, they tell us, is socialized medicine.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed at the kind of attacks that have been leveled at this legislation. I do not argue that H.R. 4222 is a perfect document, immune from constructive amendment, and neither, as the record shows, does the gentleman from California.

But I ask in all candor by what standard does this proposal relate to socialized medicine?

What is there, in this simple bill-paying device, that—as one AMA advertisement put it—"brings the Government into every consultation" between doctor and patient?

I do not see where the consultation between doctor and patient is affected at all. The only thing involved is paying for the hospital.

Where the hospital is concerned, he should not even care.

Let us go to some experts for testimony that should lay the insubstantial ghost of socialized medicine to rest. First, let me quote a Republican Cabinet member and business leader, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and Under Secretary of the Treasury, Marion B. Folsom. I am sure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will agree that he may be considered above the suspicion of advocating socialism, creeping or otherwise. Mr. Folsom has said:

> There does not seem to be any sound basis for describing a plan financed through social security as socialized medicine.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, who also heads a large private insurance concern, says of the socialized medicine charge:

> This statement is as farfetched as were similar resounding slogans that the AMA used in fighting * * * disability insurance benefits legislation. Socialized medicine involves government ownership and control of hospitals, and other health facilities in the country. Under socialized medicine, physicians, nurses, and other health personnel are employed by or work under the control of the government. The health insurance program, on the other hand, would only be a program like Blue Cross for insuring against certain health costs—for the most part, hospital costs.

I would like to call your attention to one last quotation—this one from Mr. Irwin Saul, national secretary of the Socialist Party. Mr. Saul certainly should recognize socialism when he sees it, but in a letter to the New York Times last year he said as follows:

> Organizations behind the current (health insurance) legislation are not socialists and do not advocate socialized medicine. * * * But the AMA is demagogic and inaccurate when it describes President Kennedy's legislative proposal as a "vehicle with which to bring full-blown socialized medicine to this country."

I can only say to my fellow Members of the Congress, with a Republican Cabinet member, a Democratic insurance man, and an avowed Socialist insisting that H.R. 4222 is not socialized medicine, it leaves the AMA alone, unsupported, and certainly a dubious expert witness on what is socialized medicine.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, with just a word about where the money comes from.

This program is no handout, no attack upon the public purse. What it contemplates, as my cautious friends so correctly point out, is social insurance on a national scale against the catastrophic illnesses of old age. For roughly $1 a month, matched by his employer, a wage or salary earner could get this hospital, nursing home, and home care insurance in exactly the same way he now gets his old-age pension.

Is this a form of socialism? Then so is social security itself. This I just do not believe.

Mr. Speaker, let us listen to the people. Let us go into our own districts and ask honest questions. I am sure we will find, as I have found, that the people have recognized the bugaboo of socialized medicine for what it is—an unworthy effort to becloud an issue of genuine importance to every American.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT PROVISIONS

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, most Americans recognize the compelling necessity of expanding America's international trade. The President, realizing the importance of foreign trade, has recommended trade legislation to the Congress which should result in an increased amount of exports and imports for the United States. We must be concerned, however, with the probable injury to some of our industries which will be caused by increased imports. We must concern ourselves with the many wage earners who may become unemployed as a result of increased foreign competition with some American products.

Accordingly, I recently wrote the Secretary of Labor, Arthur J. Goldberg, asking him for his views on the trade adjustment provisions of the administration's proposed legislation. I believe the Secretary of Labor's reply to my inquiry is very constructive and helpful. I include herewith my correspondence together with the reply of the Secretary of Labor:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1962.

Hon. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the past year, I have served as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor that has been investigating the impact of exports and imports on employment in the United States. The investigations of the committee and experience in my own district have convinced me of the importance of this subject in regard to our foreign trade policy. It appears that the number of workers who have lost their jobs because of imports is a small percentage of the total labor force. Furthermore, I believe that higher tariffs or tighter restrictions on imports generally would neither be in the national interest nor in the longrun interests of the workers affected. However, I am convinced that the problems which face workers affected by imports are serious and call for action by the Federal Government. I believe that trade legislation must assure the American working man and woman adequate job opportunities. During any transition period, we must make certain that those dislocated because of the impact of imports will be assisted.

While our subcommittee has not focused its attention on the employment produced by our export trade, your recent testimony before the Ways and Means Committee pointed out the millions of jobs that we owe to exports and the danger those jobs would be placed in if we tried to shut off all competitive imports.

Because I am concerned for those who may lose their jobs as a result of foreign imports and because general import restrictions would be harmful to the labor force as a whole, I am especially interested in the trade adjustment assistance for workers that President Kennedy has proposed as part of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. I would appreciate your sending me your thoughts on this problem and also any material which discusses the program proposed and which would be helpful in answering inquiries from my constituents.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 10, 1962.

The Honorable ROBERT N. GIAIMO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GIAIMO: Thank you for your letter of April 4. I agree with your conclusions about foreign trade and employment and strongly believe that the trade adjustment assistance proposed by President Kennedy is the best answer to the problems of those workers who lose their jobs because of import competition. This assistance is a vital part of the President's trade program in my opinion.

As you point out, the number of workers displaced by imports is small, but their need is great and the Federal Government has a responsibility to meet their need. The trade adjustment program proposed will permit us to provide adequately for those workers displaced by increases in imports resulting from trade agreements, without restricting our foreign trade. In its operation, it will help our industry to become more competitive and our workers to become better qualified.

As you requested, I am enclosing a two-page explanatory statement on trade adjustment assistance for workers which we have prepared to assist us in answering inquiries concerning the details of the program. I hope that it will be helpful and that you will let me know if you have any further questions on this matter.

Sincerely,
ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

AN EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS IN H.R. 9900

1. The need for a trade adjustment assistance program: The United States has traditionally recognized that some protection should be given to American firms and workers who are faced with serious import competition. Until now that protection has been exclusively supplied by tariffs or other controls which had the effect of restricting imports.

Such protection is no longer adequate as the only or even the primary means of responding to import competition. It is inadequate because it does not provide sufficient flexibility in adjusting to changing patterns of international trade. We can no longer afford to shut off foreign trade. We need the means to assist American firms and workers to adjust to the competition they face. Only in this way can our trade continue to grow to the maximum advantage of ourselves and our trading partners. Only in this way can we adequately assist those Americans who find themselves unable to compete with imports.

2. The general nature of the adjustment assistance program in H.R. 9900: The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, H.R. 9900, provides the means to assist firms and workers in adjusting to import competition. The trade adjustment program it proposes would not create a permanent subsidy for inefficient firms and workers. Unlike the protection afforded by tariffs or import restrictions, assistance under this program would only be available to help firms become able to compete freely and fully and to help workers become better qualified. Clear and reasonable time limits are also provided for making assistance available to individual workers.

Under H.R. 9900, assistance would be available to workers who have lost their jobs or suffered reductions in pay and hours of work because of increased imports resulting from tariff action. Such workers would be indirectly aided by the assistance offered to their employers. In addition, direct assistance would be available to them in the form of weekly allowances, training, and financial assistance in relocation.

The assistance proposed for workers is somewhat greater than that now available as general unemployment or training benefits, but the additional assistance is necessary in order to provide adequately for the needs of the workers expected to qualify for such assistance. While the total number of these workers will be small, most of them will be in low-wage industries; many of them will have to acquire a new skill or change to another industry in order to find new employment, and a significant number will be older workers who will encounter special difficulties in trying to find another job.

The degree of assistance proposed is also fitting recognition of our special responsibility to these workers who will suffer hardship because of a positive trade policy undertaken in the national interest. These workers will not be casualties of supply and demand, technology, or any other impersonal force. In a very real sense their displacement will be the price of our decision to expand trade to improve conditions for our people as a whole.

3. Administration of the adjustment assistance program: The program would be administered by the Department of Labor through its existing bureaus and through the State employment security agencies. State and local vocational facilities would also be utilized as they are under current training programs. Thus personnel increases would be minimal.

4. Application and eligibility for assistance: Workers will apply for assistance at their local employment office.

A worker will be eligible for assistance (a) if the President determines that increased imports have caused unemployment or underemployment of a significant number of workers at the firm or division of a firm in which he works, (b) if the worker's unemployment or underemployment results from lack of work in his firm or division, and (c) if the worker had been employed in 78 of the preceding 156 weeks and had worked in 26 of the preceding 52 weeks in firms which were the subject of Presidential determinations concerning unemployment resulting from imports.

In order to be considered underemployed, a worker must be earning less than 75 percent of his average wages and be working less than 80 percent of his full-time hours.

5. Trade readjustment allowances.

(a) Amount: An eligible worker who is unemployed or underemployed will receive an allowance equal to 65 percent of his average weekly wage or 65 percent of the national average manufacturing wage, whichever is less. This allowance will be subject to three deductions: (1) The amount of any unemployment insurance to which the worker is entitled, (2) one-half of any remuneration he receives for services performed and (3) any amount by which the sum of his allowance, unemployment insurance entitlement and payment for services exceeds 75 percent of his average weekly wage.

(b) Duration: A worker can receive a maximum of 52 weeks of allowances with two exceptions: (1) If he is taking training he may receive up to 26 additional weeks to assist him in completing his training, (2) If he is at least 60 years old when he is separated and is not in a training program, he may receive 13 additional weeks of allowances.

(c) Disqualifications: The State requirements for availability and for disqualifications under the unemployment compensation laws will be generally applicable. In addition, workers will be disqualified from receiving trade readjustment allowances if they refuse suitable training without good cause.

6. Training: Eligible workers, including those threatened with unemployment or underemployment because of import competition, will receive the job testing, counseling, training and placement services available under Federal law, principally the Manpower Development and Training Act. To the extent practicable, workers will be retrained to fill the manpower needs of the firm for which they have been working.

If placed in training programs, workers will receive the trade readjustment allowances described above instead of the training allowances they would otherwise receive.

7. Relocation allowances: Eligible workers, who are heads of families, may receive financial assistance in relocating themselves and their families if they cannot reasonably be expected to secure suitable employment where they reside, and if they have received a suitable job or job offer in the area in which they wish to relocate. The assistance in relocating, available to a worker, would include the reasonable expenses for transporting his family and his household effects, as well as a lump sum equal to 2½ times the average manufacturing wage (equivalent to approximately $230 at current wage levels).

8. Estimate of number of eligible workers and cost of program. During the 5-year period of the operation of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, approximately 90,000 workers would qualify for assistance under that act. The total cost of providing such assistance would be about $45 million—some of which has already been provided for under other Federal laws.

SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE WHITE HOUSE LOBBY AND THE TRADE BILL

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, three separate items have appeared in the press recently that raise some serious questions about White House lobbying on the trade bill. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert these items from the March 22, 1962, edition of the Washington Daily News; the April 2, 1962, edition of the Washington Post, and the April 2, 1962, edition of Newsweek at this point in the Record.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 22, 1962]

White House Direction: Giant Behind-Scene Drive Is Pushing Trade Bill

(By Robert Dietsch)

Several hundred persons line up daily outside the House Ways and Means Committee room for seats at the hearings on the trade bill. The big room has been jammed since Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges began presenting the administration's case 10 days ago.

But eager and early as the spectators are, another group of interested persons probably scrambled to work on the trade bill hours before each day.

This group might include Cabinet officers, speech writers, public relations experts, assistant secretaries in executive departments, State Governors and—on occasion—President Kennedy himself.

THE REASON

The reason for such an impressive lineup is simply that Mr. Kennedy assigned a No. 1 priority to his trade ideas and subsequently organized an educational and lobbying campaign as big as Washington and the Nation will see this year.

Persons on all levels of Government, and volunteers from trade groups and State Democratic organizations have been recruited. They have made more than 1,000 speeches in the last 6 months and have wooed more than 250 business, labor, and consumer groups.

The whole campaign started last summer when a special lobbying office was set up in the White House, with Philadelphia banker (and Republican money raiser) Howard C. Peterson in charge.

LIAISON

Mr. Peterson's staff now numbers only a dozen, but it has served as the liaison between the executive branch and Congress, Cabinet departments, State political organizations, and public organizations. These staffers, for the most part, have been recruited as dollar-a-year volunteers from outside the Government.

They include Carl Levin, of Schenley Industries; John Hoving, of the Air Transport Association; and Lester G. Shapiro, of Englehard Industries. Thomas D. Finney, Jr., came over on loan from the staff of Senator A. S. Mike Monroney (Democrat, of Oklahoma).

Mr. Peterson, while here in Washington, presides over a 40-man trade bill steering committee which includes representatives from every Cabinet department, the Budget Bureau, and the Small Business Administration. On the road, Mr. Peterson has made at least 50 public speeches and as many off-the-record sales pitches to business and industrial groups.

TWO BROCHURES

An interdepartmental public relations commitee is headed by William Ruder, Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Under his guidance, Commerce put together two brochures on the trade issue—one 61 pages thick and the other 33 pages—and distributed them to every Congressman.

Only rarely have Mr. Kennedy's Cabinet officers failed to mention the advantages of freer trade in their speeches this year. Brooks Hays, the former Arkansas Congressman and now Special Presidential Assistant, has been sent on a solo selling job in the South—where the textile industry (thanks to the recent textile agreement on this week's tariff protection action on carpets) is said to be abandoning some opposition to the trade measure.

Almost a dozen Democratic Governors have been recruited and armed with another special Commerce study showing State-by-State dollar value of U.S. exports. Congressmen have been sent detailed reports purporting to show how many jobs in their districts are affected.

Whether this grand effort will pay off remains to be seen; the Ways and Means hearings are only the first of several gauntlets through which the trade bill must run, and the Ways and Means sessions themselves will run 2½ weeks more.

[From Newsweek, Apr. 2, 1962]

White House.—A cross-country net of private publicity firms has been enlisted by Presidential Aid Carl Levin for volunteer service promoting J.F.K.'s tariff-cut program. Levin (a Schenley Distillers vice president now on leave) can identify only one of them, Hal Phillips, of Los Angeles. The others—in New York, Chicago, and New Orleans—will stay anonymous, he says, because some may have clients who oppose the trade bill "and the fact that they are working with us might prove embarrassing to them."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1962]

Tariff-Cut Promotion Team Chosen

(By Frank Cormier)

The Kennedy administration has lined up, at little cost, an array of high-priced talent to help promote tariff-cutting legislation.

Three executives, borrowed from industry, are devoting full time to the enlistment of public support for the controversial trade expansion program. They are being paid by their private employers while working at the Executive Office Building, next to the White House.

In addition, four public relations firms are doing volunteer work, without pay from the Government. Some of these firms, located in New York, Chicago, New Orleans, and San Francisco, have client corporations which favor the measure.

Carl Levin, a vice president of Schenley Industries, Inc., is director of the operation. He said yesterday in an interview that his office has no official designation.

The trade bill is one of the most complex items awaiting action at the current session of Congress. It would authorize reciprocal 50-percent tariff cuts with the European Common Market. Also, it would allow the gradual elimination of tariffs on a limited number of industrial goods.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, these three articles I have noted, and there are probably more, for the first time begin to raise the "newsprint and airwaves curtain" that has surrounded the propaganda barrage to sell an incomplete, inadequate, and unresearched so-called trade bill. Lest there be any misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, I have supported good trade legislation in the past. I strongly believe in a policy for increasing our trade through a freeing up of the international marketplace. However, the administration has chosen to sell this bill, to what it hopes will be an uncritical public, by means of one of the most intensive propaganda barrages I have experienced in my 12 years in Congress. It has regarded the Ways and Means Committee hearings on the bill a farce. It has expected the members of this committee to accept the bill as delivered. Only now as our hearings end, but not the real work, my colleagues, are the facts about the White House lobby and the trade bill coming to light. This is unfortunate, for many of the editors, commentators, and reporters who have covered the public hearings might have been far more thorough and careful in reporting the issues instead of name calling if these facts had been known. In a legislative matter of such great import, the administration owes it to the public and Congress to keep its explanation clean—to avoid questionable lobbying techniques.

What, Mr. Speaker, are the provisions of the law? At least two sections of the United States Code place stringent limitations on the use of appropriated moneys for lobbying or publicity campaigns.

Title 18, United States Code, section 1913. Lobbying with appropriated moneys:

> No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation, but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.
>
> Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both, and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 792).

Title 5, United States Code, section 54. Publicity experts not to be employed without specific appropriation:

> No money appropriated by any act shall be used for the compensation of any publicity expert unless specifically appropriated for that purpose (Oct. 22, 1913, ch. 32, sec. 1, 38 Stat. 212).

In light of the recent press revelations and these laws I should like to raise a number of questions. I do not pretend to have the answers but I feel the press will certainly want to go after the facts. In fact I am surprised that there has not been more serious reporting on this subject to date.

Is the White House providing personnel, funds, or any other services to this promotion team of executives-on-loan and public relations firms? If the AP story is factually correct, does not the use of Government office space in the Executive Office Building by this team constitute a violation of the United States Code? Are these people receiving and placing telephone calls on the switchboard of the Executive Office of the President? If this is the case, does not this provide a so-called "private" or "nongovernmental" pressure group with enormous leverage in its efforts to sell the trade bill? Are we witnessing, without a protest, the informal integration of pressure groups into the machinery of Government at the higest policy levels? Does the trade promotion team have access to other services in the Executive offices? Stenographers? Typists? Stationery?

Who are the individuals and firms that constitute this promotion team? Why did the AP story in the Washington Post carry only the name of the director of the operation? Was their editing due to space or were the names of the other two executives omitted for other reasons? Why are the publicity firms involved cloaked in anonymity? The Ways and Means Committee for one would be interested in learning which firms are financing this great lobbying operation and how these contributions are being accounted for on the books of the companies involved. I daresay the directors, stockholders, and employees of the executives-on-loan, and the clients of the anonymous public relations firms might raise embarrassing questions of their representatives in Washington if the full facts of this story were known.

Mr. Speaker, I am also troubled by the ethical questions raised by the use of business executives without compensation in this matter. Although the intentions of these individuals may be completely honorable, how can such people divorce themselves completely from the interests of their companies and industries, especially when they anticipate returning to high-paying jobs with these firms? The Scripps-Howard article in the Washington Daily News cites some of their backgrounds. Is there a conflict of interest involved when a prominent Philadelphia banker who is still employed by a bank with important interests in international trade and finance presides over a 40-man trade bill steering committee? Is there a conflict of interest involved with the participation of an executive from Schenley industries in this project? As a member of the Ways and Means Committee I am acutely aware of the liquor interests in Government not just in the trade area. Does the participation of an executive of the Air Transport Association involve a conflict of interest, considering the extensive interrelation of Government and the air transport industry in such areas as air routes, fares, and so forth? Is there a conflict of interest involved with the participation of an executive from Englehard Industries which serves as the top American representative for the DeBeers international diamond cartel? Mr. Speaker, I do not condemn these individuals or their firms but I am deeply troubled by the potential impact of such recruitment on our representative form of government. What kinds of pressures are being brought and by whom upon private enterprise to contribute men and money to this trade lobby operating not merely under the shadow but apparently within the Executive Office Building? Will other firms have to lend their vice presidents on request of the White House lobby? Are we seeing established a new pattern of government by press agentry? Mr. Speaker, I raise these questions for the RECORD. I trust we shall have some answers forthcoming before this House is asked to approve a Trade Expansion Act.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RELEASE FROM ACTIVE DUTY OF RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD FORCES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I know I express the feelings of many Americans who greet with gratitude the announcement of the President that our Reserve and National Guard Forces mobilized last year will be released from active duty in August.

We respect the job these men have done and the personal sacrifice they have made in the service of their country.

We are thankful to them but our real gratitude and joy arises from the fact that their services no longer are necessary.

Our military forces are strong and prepared; our strength in the world is recognized.

We are pledged to maintain our state of preparation and we will do so.

To the men who now return to civilian life, we offer the tribute of a thankful Nation and wish them Godspeed.

The text of the President's announcement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

> Last summer we found it necessary to respond rapidly to a rapid increase in the level of international tension. Our response was twofold. First, we mobilized 2 National Guard divisions and associated Reserve units, 36 tactical fighter and troop carrier squadrons, and a number of ships and naval air squadrons. Reluctant as we were to disturb the lives and interrupt the careers of American citizens, we found it necessary to act as we did to protect the national security.
>
> An equally important part of our response to the heightened Soviet threat was our decision, supported by the Congress and the American people, to increase the pace and size of our permanent buildup of nuclear and nonnuclear forces. At that time, we requested and obtained from the Congress

an additional $3.5 billion to augment the two earlier supplements totaling $2.5 billion, which had previously been added to our military budget for fiscal 1962.

As soon as our $3.5 billion budget request was approved by the Congress, Secretary McNamara, at my direction, took steps to obtain the men and the arms required for the buildup, on an accelerated schedule. We set about organizing two additional regular divisions. These divisions will, by the end of the summer, bring the number of regular combat-ready Army divisions to 16, as against 11 such divisions in June of 1961. We retained 6 wings of B-47 bombers scheduled for inactivation, and we are increasing the number of tactical fighter wings from 16 to 21. We accelerated procurement of new equipment, both for nuclear and nonnuclear combat. We more than doubled the construction rate for Polaris submarines.

Our permanent buildup is, of course, still going on. But I can now report that we have reached the point where we can determine that in August of this year, unless there is a serious deterioration in the international situation in the meantime, we shall be able to release the National Guard divisions and the Reserves who were called to active duty last year.

We are, and will remain, prepared to do what is necessary to protect our own interests and the security of our friends and allies. The substantial increase in combat power that has been achieved in order to permit release of the guardsmen and reservists will be maintained. To the extent that Reserve units are now stationed in Europe (as in the case of tactical fighter squadrons), we are making detailed plans to replace them with equivalent regular units.

This release is not the result of any marked change in the international situation, which continues to have many dangers and tensions. It is the result, rather, of our successful buildup of permanent instead of emergency strength. The units we release will remain available, in a new and heightened state of combat readiness, if a new crisis should arise requiring further service.

I know that I speak for all Americans in paying tribute to all those whose emergency service in this year of growing national strength is doing so much for the national interest. Their ready response to our call to duty has been a most important element in the defense of freedom everywhere, in these last months.

ANNIVERSARY OF CHARLES EVANS HUGHES AND CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 570

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it crystal clear that I am not taking off on the much needed spring thaw. Credit for this should go to the gentleman from California, Congressman HOSMER, and others who have seen the need for this operation. I hope the thaw is successful. I hope that it will reveal not only some shortcomings but some positive answers to some very, very grave problems that not only plague us on the home front but maybe, more importantly, on the foreign front.

Mr. Speaker, what I have to say is not totally unrelated to the thaw, I believe, but part of what I will have to say is a part of the total problem.

First I want to speak on an important anniversary date, and then on my House resolution, which I think ought to come to our attention and to the attention of the Congress, and upon which I think we ought to act in a positive way at a very early date.

Mr. Speaker, because a number of people from New York have evidenced interest in this subject, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and work of a great American, Charles Evans Hughes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today our Goverment is issuing a postage stamp to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Charles Evans Hughes.

One hundred years ago this Nation was engaged in a great struggle to determine whether the Union could endure. It was into such a troubled environment that Charles Evans Hughes was born on April 11, 1862, in Glens Falls, N.Y. His father was David Charles Hughes, a Baptist minister, who had come to America from Wales in 1855. His mother was Mary Catherine Connelly, a seventh-generation American of Irish-English-Dutch descent.

The young boy received his early education from his parents under a plan that he himself had worked out. When he was 10 years old he entered public school at Newark, N.J., and at the age of 13 he graduated from high school in New York City. By this time he was writing essays on such subjects as "The Limitations of the Human Mind" and "The Evils of Light Literature."

At the age of 14 he enrolled at Colgate University, remaining there until 1878, when he transferred to Brown University. At the end of his junior year he received a prize for the highest standing in literature and at the termination of his senior year he was given an award for scholastic and general attainments. He delivered the commencement oration of his class and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa.

It is interesting to consider some similarities of Hughes and of the man who was Chief Executive at the time when Hughes was born. Although the future Chief Justice was more fortunate than Lincoln in securing a formal education, both were self-educated to a degree that is uncommon today. Although Hughes received help and encouragement from his parents in his quest for an education, the elder Hughes were not affluent, and the young boy was no stranger to pinched financial circumstances. In 1879, as he was beginning his junior year at Brown, he wrote to his father:

> I am going to the gymnasium as soon as I have the money to pay in advance—$3 (for the year). I went once but was respectfully informed that they must have pay in advance. My shoes are in very poor condition—my hair also needs cutting and my term's reading-room tax ($1) should be promptly paid.

Both Lincoln and Hughes were tall men and both wore beards. Both were lawyers by profession and numbered large corporations among their clients. Both were accomplished storytellers, although that facet of Hughes' personality was not so widely known. And both knew the disappointment of political defeat.

The fact that both Lincoln and Hughes were men and public servants of the highest integrity did not save either of them from ridicule and bitter criticism. The one was contemptuously referred to as a "backwoods railsplitter" while the other was called an "animated feather duster." Both were moderate, middle-of-the-road statesmen who did not please extremists at either end of the political spectrum. Both believed in the rights of the individual and in the correction of abuse and injustice within the framework of the Constitution, but neither could be classed as wild-eyed reformers. In balance, in wise restraint, and in their understandings of the process of change, both Hughes and Lincoln showed themselves to be statesmen of the first order.

Following his graduation from Brown, Hughes spent the years until 1905 in teaching at Delaware Academy in Delhi, N.Y., attending the Columbia University Law School, teaching at Cornell University, and practicing law in New York City. Such, in outline, is the foundation upon which in later years Hughes erected so imposing a superstructure.

In 1905 Hughes' political career began with his appointment as counsel for the Stevens committee of the New York Legislature which was about to start an investigation of gas rates. The inquiry resulted in a saving of $800,000 annually in the lighting of the city's streets and a reduction of the gas rate for consumers from $1 to 80 cents. All but one of the bills recommended by the committee were enacted into law, and Hughes overnight became a national figure. Impressed by his record the Armstrong committee invited him to direct its investigation of life insurance companies. The exposé continued through 57 public hearings over a period of 4 months. The resulting enactments have been declared by a competent authority to be the best insurance legislation the world has ever known.

His investigation completed, he accepted the Republican nomination for Governor of New York to campaign against William Randolph Hearst. His only asset in the contest was the confidence of the people. It was their confidence that led to his election over Hearst while all other Republican candidates for State executive offices were being defeated. His governorship was a continuous campaign of many battles for a long series of reform measures now almost universally accepted. In retrospect, at a much later date, John Lord O'Brian, one of his most loyal supporters, said of the Governor's efforts:

> It is impossible to reproduce for the present generation the aggressive personality,

> the seemingly inexhaustible energy, the unrelenting insistence of Governor Hughes.

Throughout his struggle with the political bosses he insisted that his retainer came from the people and that he regarded their interests as paramount. He pressed for laws regulating the public utilities of the State; he recommended the passage of a child labor law; he showed a friendly attitude toward organized labor and urged the passage of a workman's compensation act. He fought and lost a battle for a direct primary. At the same time he opposed a constitutional amendment to provide for an income tax. He established new standards of administration, and officeholders who appeared to be venal or unfaithful to their trusts were promptly removed from office.

The resignation of Hughes from the Governor's office in 1910 was followed by his service as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court until 1916 and his unsuccessful bid for the Presidency. Following his defeat, Hughes resumed the practice of law in New York. But it was not long before he was again called on to assume public duties. He was appointed head of the draft appeals board in New York City and later President Wilson made him head of a special commission to investigate charges of irregularities in the wartime aircraft industry. The findings of the commission exonerated those included in the charges of any willful wrongdoing but criticized the wastefulness of the program and the lack of accomplishment.

When Harding was inaugurated in 1921, Hughes became Secretary of State. Confronted by many problems left over from World War I, he became what Pearson and Allen, no great admirers of him, called "one of the most outstanding and forthright Secretaries of State in recent years." Under his direction, on August 25, 1921, a treaty was signed with Germany putting an end to the technical state of war that continued to exist because of our failure to ratify the Treaty of Versailles. He promoted and carried to a successful completion by his personal force the 1921–22 Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments. The Conference lessened the tension between the United States and Japan and postponed the naval armaments race for almost a decade. Hughes helped to straighten out the reparations tangle and brought about an agreement that gave the world a chance to recover economically. By the Four Power Treaty, he in effect detached Great Britain from an alliance with Japan and alined her with American policy. Finally, he initiated a policy of friendship with Latin America that developed into the good-neighbor policy of the Roosevelt administration.

Sumner Welles had this to say of Hughes:

> No chief could better inspire his subordinates to the best that was in them. * * * No Secretary has established so high a morale in the Foreign Service. Nor has any Secretary enjoyed such close relations with the foreign representatives in Washington. * * * The lucidity and frankness of his press conferences are a Washington tradition. * * * In this he was guided by his belief that in the Government's conduct of foreign policy the press should be, not an antagonist, but a partner in enlightening the American people. He often told me that he was convinced that the success of our democracy depended upon an informed public opinion.

Hughes retired as Secretary of State on March 4, 1925, at the beginning of Coolidge's elective term of office as President. He resumed his long-neglected law practice in New York and acted as counsel in many celebrated cases including some in which he represented the State of New York and the Government of the United States. In 1926 he served as chairman of a commission to draw up a plan for the reorganization of the New York State government in conformance with a constitutional amendment which had been ratified by the voters. He took time from his law practice to continue to work for pan-American friendship and in 1929 he served on the bench of the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague.

On February 3, 1930, upon the retirement of William Howard Taft, Hughes was named Chief Justice of the United States. As a judge, he was among the greatest in our history. He was a lifelong champion of liberty under law. During the critical period of New Deal legislation, the Chief Justice in some instances supported the New Deal; in others he found its measures unconstitutional. As a true servant of the law, he did not bear the mark of a factional branding iron. He was so devoted to the law that its strength became his strength. Attorney General Jackson said of him:

> Even more than by his judgments this man imparted strength to the Court during our time by his character. He presided over the Court through the most critical of its hours since the Civil War.

On March 4, 1939, the Chief Justice addressed a joint session of Congress in ceremonies commemorating the sesquicentennial of the meeting of the First Congress, as another Chief Justice, Melville Fuller, had done on a similar occasion 50 years earlier. Although he was so ill that he was almost unable to take part, Hughes compressed into a few ringing paragraphs his philosophy of the wise use of public power—a philosophy full of meaning for the modern world.

A series of illnesses led to his retirement from the Court in June of 1941 at the age of 79. He continued to devote time to such organizations as the Legal Aid Society and the World Council of Christians and Jews, but much of his time was spent with his family.

Chief Justice Hughes was unquestionably one of the great men of our time. His powerful personality, strong intellect, and high character made an enduring contribution to the Court and to our Nation.

THE STEEL PRICE RISE

Mr. Speaker, I was very, very interested in the colloquy that went on on the House floor and the reaction that was displayed by our colleagues about the steel price raise. Lest anybody might misunderstand, let me assure all of you on the Democratic side and all of America that the Republicans have great concern about the implications of this decision by the steel industry. However, I hope that we do not jump to conclusions quite as easily as some people do. I would like to admonish all of you who have firm convictions about this at this point that an ancient seer once said that jumping to conclusions is poor exercise. I think that this is true and those of you people who share this concern ought to be thinking about some other things that have been done in this country and in this Congress that affect the economy of our country. All of us in a measure share some of that guilt maybe, but I hold that those who sit across the aisle from us may be more guilty than we. I am concerned about inflation as much as anybody else is and I think the Republicans on this side indicated that concern the other day when we were considering the tax bill. We did not vote for what I think would, perhaps, prove to be a very inflationary bill, if it is passed as it passed the House here. We are voting tax credits for people who did not want them and did not need them and were not asking for them. Now it may be so that our answers are not the most perfect answers, but I hold that they are more perfect and should have been discussed and considered more seriously. I am aware of the fact that our friends across the aisle have been associated with programs that have been inflationary and have encouraged deficit spending. I think the record shows that every time we engage in deficit spending, we decrease the value of the dollar. I do not know what all the factors are that may be involved, but they concern more than the problems that are caused by the private sector of our economy, I am sure. Here again those who shape the destiny of government cannot go away with complete innocence because we have participated in programs that have affected adversely many, many people and we ought to be concerned about that every day that we legislate because I think it is true more people today are dependent upon money than ever before in history. We ought to be mightily concerned about what we do about the value of the dollar and about that person who is on relief and also about persons who are on pensions, and we have some 17 million of them now who have to depend on that dollar.

At this point I would like to recall a statement that was made by this great American that I just spoke about. I might say he is one of my favorites so far as political leadership is concerned. He is my guiding light in many ways. I am sorry he was not successful in getting elected President of the United States because he might have helped reshape our political party and avoid some of the problems that will plague our economy in future years. He was a fearless man. He was a man who kept uppermost in mind the public welfare. At this point I think I might suggest, if he were living today, he would along with all of us be very concerned about what is happening here, but he would not only be concerned about the steel price rise. I recall a statement he made at one time when he was addressing a group, which statement it might be appropriate for us to recall at this point. He was addressing the chamber of commerce at Buffalo. I think it was in 1907. He had been invited to speak and for good reasons, I think, as I have studied that period of time and the situation at that time, he threw away a prepared speech and tore into a group of businessmen who opposed reasonable reforms with a challenge and a spontaneous and castigating remark when, among other things, he said, and I quote:

> The people have no inclination to hamper industry but they are tired of financial jugglery and they demand proper service.

So I think he would not only point the finger at industry, but he would point the finger at the Congress who also had been very guilty. It may prove that an objective study would show that they were more guilty than anybody else, in participating in what he called financial jugglery.

So I want to add my word to what has been said on this side and say I hope a complete investigation is made of this problem and that we not only investigate the steel industry but that we investigate all the forces that come into play that have made this thing that we call inflation, which I think is a very terrible malady, and as I said, it is a malady more important for us to consider now than ever before.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 570

Now I come to the subject I have asked this special order for, which is a further discussion of House Resolution 570, and I begin by pointing out that a very distinguished Member of Congress who is a good friend of mine, a neighbor of mine, has done yeoman service in calling attention to this problem. He has spoken of this matter for years. I do not have to mention his name, TOM CURTIS, of Missouri, whom I consider one of the ablest Members of Congress and who from the standpoint of understanding this amendment and its import for our country is as qualified to speak on it as any man in the House. I am indeed grateful that he is here with us to call attention to the problems and that some of the answers being prepared and presented here are not sound answers and not presented in the public interest.

The whole problem of adequate staffing for Congress has been a matter of deep, dedicated, and personal concern to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, TOM CURTIS. For some years he has spoken on this matter, studied it carefully, and worried about what it was doing to harm the effectiveness of the Congress. He has felt that there were two serious problems: First, the staffing levels of congressional committees in general and, second, the imbalance between majority and minority staff.

First there is a lack of adequate staffing for all Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, so that all of us here were weaker in relation to the heavily staffed executive departments. TOM CURTIS has said that this was basically a problem of the Congress being able to get accurate and intelligent facts and independent staff work so that the various executive departments would be made more responsible to the thinking and study of Congress. As examples, he stated to us that the Ways and Means Committee of which he is a most respected and ranking member has no full-time all-year-around experts on foreign economic policy, and yet this committee has had to handle the complicated reciprocal trade hearings. One person part time has been working during the year on this problem. Last year he urged the Democratic leadership to obtain more help for all the committee, so that long before the hearings began study and interviews could be conducted to try to find out where the truth lay. Also in Ways and Means rests the responsibility for social security legislation. TOM CURTIS knows that if complicated and controversial pieces of legislation like medical care for the aged are to be studied by this group, adequate staff work is necessary. Yet no man is assigned full time all year around to work on social security. No wonder Congress is often at the mercy of executive departments' claims, pressures, charges, and programs. There are many more examples like this, but TOM CURTIS who has studied this problem for a long time knows that this is a basic problem which Congress itself must solve if it is to strengthen its hand and serve the public interest by careful analysis of what downtown proposes, especially as it involves the spending of millions and billions of dollars.

The second problem is that of minority staffing, regardless of which party is in power. Those constructive Republicans like TOM CURTIS want us to look good, to do well, and so to serve the public by achievement.

Only by pointing out the bad and pointing up the good will our side of the aisle do the type of job it is capable of doing. Men like the gentleman from Missouri, TOM CURTIS, have pointed out what a terrific group of newer and younger members we have now, and how their talents must be harnessed to the fullest so that Congress can do its best work with a maximum of Republican contribution.

There are two words about the two problems outlined previously which characterize the gentleman from Missouri, TOM CURTIS, inspiration to those of us who also worry about this problem and are trying to do something about it. These words are "outstanding scholarship" and "true political science concern" for Congress. In an age when true scholarship is all too rare, it is a pleasure to pay tribute to a man who has given so much thought to this problem and shared with us his constructive thoughts. It is always easy to criticize and I know that some who do not want Congress to really work and who do not care about the real welfare of our committees and the minority Republicans on them have criticized the gentleman from Missouri for even thinking and worrying about this problem. Many of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, salute the gentleman from Missouri, TOM CURTIS. We know that only men of courage and integrity can get before us and before the public the basic facts of the difficult role Congress must play. Our country needs it. Our districts demand it. Fairplay makes it obvious improvements in staffing must be made. I did want to add this personal note today as fairness demanded that those who had broken ground on the road we are now traveling be given the recognition of leadership and scholarship and integrity and courage that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, on March 28 and April 4, I took the floor to elaborate on House Resolution 570 and to discuss the imperative and obvious need for it. Let me review my previous remarks.

House Resolution 570 would amend the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the appointment of professional and clerical staffs to standing and select or special committees of the House so that the minority may have, on its own motion, more and better staff representation on the various committees of the House.

Specifically my resolution would work in this manner. On the vote of a majority of the minority members of a committee, the minority could name 40 percent of the professional staff members of the standing committees; the minority members also could name 40 percent of the committee clerks. In another section the minority would be permitted to name half of the professional staff members as well as half of the other personnel of select and special committees.

The present situation in some committees is intolerable. It is my firm conviction that this situation is an indictment against representative government.

More than that I think it is not wrong to say that the committee system of Congress is on trial. With allowances for revision upward or downward dependent upon when, who or how the employees are counted, the figures show that of 538 committee employees only 20 are minority employees.

My resolution, I point out, does not make it mandatory that any or all committees have a more equal division of staff employees where present conditions are satisfactory to the minority members on the committee.

Special and select committees must be either nonpartisan or bipartisan. One cannot have fair, honest, accurate investigations without such staffs. As I pointed out last Wednesday, the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, of which I am a member, is an example of what can, and does, happen when such bipartisanship is absent.

Adoption of this resolution would make it possible for the minority to become a constructive opposition which would be prepared to present well thought out answers and alternatives, based upon research and study, as well as to more effectively challenge the weaknesses and inadequacies of the propositions which are presented to the committee.

Specifically the minority could do, and do better, at least six things:

First. They could gather information on the history of the legislation before the committee. Often times this would be very helpful and a very reliable guide for us to use as we prepared other answers to the problem or amendments to the bill under consideration.

Second. They could have adequate time to counsel with authorities and with people who would be affected adversely and otherwise by the new legislation.

Third. They could help the minority to find competent authorities to testify on the pros and cons of the legislation before the committee.

Fourth. They could help prepare questions designed to bring out valuable and pertinent information necessary to consider the legislation.

Fifth. When and if a bill is voted out of the committee and opposed by the minority, the minority should have competent and adequate help as well as plenty of time to write the minority reports so that the minority views could be thoroughly and adequately understood by all the Members of the House when the bill comes to the House floor. Often times the minority is unable to use all of the time allotted to the minority because of inadequate staffs and research. Further, the minority staff could help members of the minority prepare the statements for the House floor——

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I am sorry I was called to the phone, but I heard the gentleman again mention the figure which he referred to earlier in the afternoon of 500-some majority employees and 20 minority employees.

Will the gentleman tell me what the figure is?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I will have it in the record. I think it is already in the record. I do not have the figures for the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Let me say to the gentleman I have discovered that in his committee the minority is very well satisfied.

Mr. HAYS. The question I am trying to get straight with the gentleman, and I do it in all friendliness, is how did he arrived at this figure he keeps quoting? Did he count the employees of the Committee on Foreign Affairs? And if he did, which way did he count them? And if he did not count them, how did he arrive at the figure? This applies to the Committee on House Administration too. How did the gentleman arrive at this figure?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. First, let me say we have been in contact with every committee, or some Members who were presumed to know something about the situation in that committee. In my statement I said, sir, that we allowed for revision upward or downward, depending on how, who, and when the employees were counted. The gentleman can imagine that I did not count all employees, because there are a lot of subcommittees that are not included. The situation is very much more in balance on some. There are two committees in controversy. In one committee we found there were 77 employees and admittedly only 3 Republican minority employees.

I point out to you also my bill provides that only upon a vote of the majority of the minority can this happen. So it cannot possibly disturb the gentleman's committee if the minority is satisfied, and I found this to be the case in other committees, at least one committee in which apparently they are completely satisfied. This would only affect a situation that prevails in my own committee, a special committee.

Mr. HAYS. Which committee is the gentleman complaining about?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am talking now about a special committee of the Public Works Committee investigating the interstate highway building program. All of us will admit that needs investigation of all phases of it.

Now, in my opinion, we have not done a thorough job, as near a complete job as we should. For 6 months we did not have a Republican counsel or any help of any kind.

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman would make a much stronger case if he would revise his figures and tell us whether he counted the Foreign Affairs Committee staff and, if he did, if he divided it 50–50 or gave them all under the major heading, because, I may say, I do not know the politics of a single one of them. They were there when I came on the committee; they were there under the Republican chairmanship of that committee. The same thing is true of the Committee on House Administration, of which I am a member. The same thing is true with the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] says. It is the same with the Joint Committee on Printing. So I think you really ought to make a census of the committee staffs about which you have laid the complaint and not lump all of the committees which have bipartisan staffs. As to the majority employees, I do not know; they are professional staff members, and I do not know their politics, and I do not think the chairman does.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to point out again I have allowed for revisions upward and downward, and I would be glad to talk to the gentleman privately about this. I do not have any detailed figures on the checks that were made, but I am convinced something is wrong, and whatever is wrong ought to be corrected, and this is what I propose to do with this resolution. Maybe the bill is not perfect, but it indicates the direction we ought to go. I think it will implement the Reorganization Act of 1946 and strengthen it and make it more operative, and I think it will give us better legislation and, as a result, the Congress will be more effective in its manifold duties and obligations to the people.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman made reference to the special subcommittee to investigate the Federal aid highway program headed by the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. BLATNIK, as an illustration of what he considers to be highly partisan committee staff. If the gentleman has any information about the politics of the members of the staff of that committee, he certainly has information that has not been shared with other members of that subcommittee. As a matter of fact, a great number of the staff of that particular subcommittee have a history that goes back to participation over on the Senate investigating committee, over in the other body, in which they saw service both under Republican leadership of the committee and under Democratic leadership of the committee in that body, and if anybody says that they have been partisan in their development of facts or that the members of that staff have not been fair, conscientious, and objective in the gathering of facts for that subcommittee, I certainly think that he does so without a solid basis, in view of the facts.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I serve on that committee with you, sir, and this is not the first time you have heard me complain about it. And, you have heard the minority Members complain often about that situation, and you know as well as I know when that committee was set up they had a 13 to 6 majority, and at that time I said it was precedent breaking. This was never done before with any special committee that was created. In many instances we had equal numbers on the investigating committee itself, and in most instances, in some instances, a one-vote majority, and you know as well as I do that the minority on the Special Committee of Public Works had no voice in selecting that staff. I had several people in mind that I thought should be on that committee staff.

Here is another thing, since you brought this question up. The investigation of this Federal highway road-building program is the greatest ever contemplated by any Government in history, and our investigating committee has no engineer on it. Now, I do not think we can do a complete investigation job without having a sufficient staff, and this is not casting any reflection on any member of the staff.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think they have done an outstanding professional job, and a job free from partisanship in every respect.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Sure, as far as they have gone, but in Massachusetts we came out without a complete investigation.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Not at this time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is counting.

(The SPEAKER resumed the chair.)

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordererd.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 70]

Addonizio
Andrews
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Battin
Bolling
Boykin
Breeding
Brewster
Buckley
Cahill
Cannon
Cederberg
Celler
Chelf
Chiperfield
Coad
Curtis, Mass.
Davis,
James C.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent
Dowdy
Doyle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Findley
Fogarty
Frazier
Friedel
Garland
Garmatz
Glenn
Granahan
Green, Oreg.
Hansen
Harrison, Va.
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Huddleston
Ichord, Mo.
Jensen
Joelson
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kearns
Kee
Kelly
Kilburn
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kyl
Loser
McDowell
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mason
Mathias
Michel
Miller,
George P.
Morrison
Moulder
Norrell
Patman
Peterson
Pilcher
Rains
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts, Ala.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
St. Germain
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Steed
Taber
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tuck
Udall, Morris K.
Van Pelt
Vinson
Walter
Wharton
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Ind.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 327 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 570

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I think someone suggested that a quorum call costs $2,600. I am sorry that a decision of mine apparently rankled some Member of the House to the extent that he felt the urge to make the point of no quorum. I apologize and say to the gentleman that he was talking about these figures and asking where I got the figures. I say to you, sir, I should be glad to adjust the figures as you see fit, and I think they should be adjusted to reflect what you think is the situation on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I have said to you of course, and I say again, that if every committee in the Congress were set up on a bipartisan or nonpartisan basis, as is the Committee on Foreign Affairs, this resolution would not be before the House. It is not for the purpose of disturbing any of the working arrangements that you have in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Just briefly.

Mr. HAYS. In the first place, let me say that I made the statement concerning a quorum call and how much it cost, and I called the quorum. If the gentleman's remarks are worth hearing at all, they are worth $2,600.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. If they are not, they are not worth anything. Now, about the number of committees. During this quorum call I talked to the following committee chairmen: Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Interior, Armed Services, House Administration, Post Office, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

They all tell me that their staffs are completely bipartisan and they do not know what are the politics of members of the staffs. If this is so then your figures must need rather radical revision. That is all I want the gentleman to do. I do not want to revise your figures; I did not make the census in the first place. But I do not want you to present a picture that because the staff of one or two committees may be out of balance—and this I would not challenge; but in the interest of fairness, I do not want the record to show that the staff of every committee is likewise out of balance.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. If a minority of the specific committees the gentleman has mentioned agrees to that appraisal, they would not be disturbed under my resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], who has been involved indirectly in this quorum cost business.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. All I want to say is this, that in view of the statement or rather the issue that was made here by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], only a couple of hours ago about quorum calls, I was astonished that he would put one on.

Mr. HAYS. Do not be surprised at anything I do.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the old saying is that consistency is a virtue and the gentleman is rich in consistency.

Mr. HAYS. I always thought consistency was a virtue of small minds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear that last statement repeated by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I say you have your definition of consistency. My definition is that consistency is a virtue of small minds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. HAYS. I say you have your definition of consistency. My definition is that consistency is a virtue of small minds.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, both Members were talking about a definition and each definition might apply to others outside the House. The Chair sees nothing about the words taken down that impugns the motives of any Member.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. In order that those who may read the record of these proceedings may know what this is about, and in view of the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] regarding the cost of quorum calls, I should think it would be in order for the record to show that a quorum call, even when deemed necessary and wise and advisable, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], is as costly, no more and no less, than one called by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I think I have yielded more to the gentleman's side of the aisle now than I have to this side. I prefer not to yield.

Mr. HAYS. You can have a quorum here now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, before we had this quorum call, I was referring to the sixth point.

I suggest that oftentimes when new legislation is introduced it is necessary to follow closely the effects of legislation that has been passed with a view of finding the shortcomings, omissions, and misapplications of the legislation in certain instances, with a view of being prepared through observation and continued study to present adequate and effective amendments in future sessions of the Congress to important legislation that has been passed.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say since I initiated this move and introduced legislation, I have received much correspondence from all over the United States and much of it in support of this legislation. I have found many, many editorialists who have supported me in my position and I have not yet found one in opposition.

Among these letters that I have received and that I have cherished most in support of this legislation is one from a fellow Member of this House, a man who served the Congress and the country with great distinction and who has as many personal friends on the left side of the aisle as he has on the right side and one whom we all respect very much. Most of you, of course, know I am speaking now of our beloved JOE MARTIN. He wrote me this letter which I would like to read into the RECORD.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. All I wanted to say is that I agree with Mr. JOHANSEN that one quorum call does not cost any more than another. But, in view of that, we will take a little census and see how many quorum calls the gentleman from Iowa made and how much the total is.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. MARTIN wrote to me as follows:

> CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
> HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
> *Washington, D.C., April 11, 1962.*
> Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR COLLEAGUE: This is in reference to House Resolution 570. I unhesitatingly approve the purpose of the resolution and would give it my support. My support is not based on partisanship but because I believe it is in the interest of efficient government and would be helpful to the welfare of the country and would improve the standing of Congress.
>
> Both parties should be adequately prepared to present their views to Congress. The majority can easily take care of themselves either through the staff or the several departments of the Government. The minority should be given an equal chance so that all Members of the House can have available all the facts when they make the decisions. With all the difficult problems, it is more important for adequate preparation of the minority now than at any other time in our history.
>
> This move is not new. England has long recognized this vital need of representative government and has carefully made sure the minority is adequately staffed. The United States is spending huge sums abroad to promote popular government and must not err here at home in failing to spend necessary money to maintain both parties in their work in Congress.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I think that sums up my argument about as well as anything I have said today. I would like to conclude at this point by asking unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the following is a brief statement prepared by Prof. Russell M. Ross, Department of Political Science, State University of Iowa. Dr. Ross is a capable college professor who is highly regarded within the political science profession. In addition, he has had considerable practical experience in government.

> The American system of government is based upon positive action by the legislative body. Both the majority and the minority elements of Congress must be in a position to have forward looking, affirmative, positive programs if the American system is to have the greatest benefits to the people of the country. The present system of virtually excluding the minority members of congressional committees from having staff assistants severely handicaps the minority party from positive action positions. It would seem imperative for the best interests of America to allow the minority members of congressional committees to have a competent staff to assist them with their part of the committee work. The ranking member of the minority should have the same authority in selecting the minority party's staff as the chairman of the committee exercises in selection and control of the majority party's staff members. Frequent criticism is launched at the minority party that it is merely against a program and never for anything. Adequate staff will enable the minority to avoid this position.

The following is a letter from Prof. John R. Kapp, Department of Political Science, Iowa Wesleyan College in Mount Pleasant, Iowa. Kapp is a capable professor of American government. His comments in support of House Resolution 570 are those of a student of American government. I think that they deserve some thought:

> IOWA WESLEYAN COLLEGE,
> *Mount Pleasant, Iowa, April 6, 1962.*
> Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR FRED: Your stand on the matter of fair and equitable representation of the two parties as to staffs of the respective committees is to be commended. It is my belief that House Resolution 570, if adopted, would accomplish the goal of a more just apportionment of committee staffs. The present topheavy appointment and control of such personnel by the majority members of committees is most clearly a perversion of the right of the minority to be fully represented. I especially favor the appointment of such personnel on the basis of fitness for the task, rather than mainly with regard to party affiliation.
>
> May I congratulate you on your statesmanlike activity in the House and wish you continued success in your efforts in behalf not only of the citizens of the First District of Iowa but of the entire Nation.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> JOHN R. KAPP.

I would like to refer to some comments which others have made on this subject.

Roscoe Drummond, the columnist, refers to the present situation as "the crippling anemic minority party representation of the congressional staffs." He continues:

> The fact is that the imbalance is extreme. It is harmful to the functioning of the two-party system. Unless the Democrats expect to control Congress forever, I should think they would be wise to accept staffing reforms.

Of my resolution, Drummond declared, it is a "simple, reasonable, and workable proposal." These comments are taken from an editorial by Drummond which appeared in the Washington Post of April 2, 1962. Mr. Drummond has long been interested in the minority staffing situation.

My distinguished colleague from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has stated:

> I do feel that the minority should have at least a modest supply of help available to inquire into matters perhaps considered too delicate for the majority to probe into. No person or group is overly energetic about exposing any weaknesses in its own system. Thus a majority party normally concentrates its efforts on promoting its philosophy.
>
> The majority is entitled to that preferred position by virtue of winning elections. And the responsibility of leadership goes with them. But minority rights deserve some protection, and that is where your resolution comes in.

The Honorable WILLIAM E. MILLER, chairman, Republican National Committee, has written:

> This is a matter of extreme urgency because the condition is so serious it can undermine the very effectiveness of even routine functions of Republican Members of the House.
>
> I am sure we all realize that under our two-party system this wide disparity between Republican and Democratic staff operations is not good for the Nation as a whole.

Director Arthur L. Pitman of the Ben A. Arneson Institute of Practical Politics, Ohio Wesleyan University, stated in a letter to me:

> Your resolution (H. Res. 570) would benefit both major parties because it would guarantee both of them an opportunity to search out the facts upon which a responsible program and a responsible opposition must be based. Your plan, indeed, will in truth benefit representative government itself because it will help safeguard the presentation of the multiplicity of views on any given issue which represent the American consensus.
>
> Pluralism has come to be regarded as one of the outstanding strengths of our way of life. But our pluralism depends on the expression of diverse views. Expression in the Congress, to be effective, must be based on sound research. And research, often, is only seriously attempted on the committee staff level. For all of these reasons it is my most earnest hope that the House of Representatives will give careful consideration to your thoughtful proposal as contained in House Resolution 570, and that this resolution will pass. We will all gain.

My colleague, Mr. MCVEY, has said:

> One of the great political strengths of America lies in the fact that we have a two-party system. It is not only desirable, but it is necessary to the maintenance of the two-party system that these parties oppose each other. If they were both in agreement, then the two-party system would be abolished and America would be the loser. Constructive and honest opposition is a healthy balance preventing one-sided rule and also preventing any tendency toward improprieties; however, this type of opposition is very difficult to maintain in the Congress where the rights of the minority party are not adequately protected in the committees, which are the workshops of this great body.
>
> Because our body operates on the committee system, I think it is imperative that this resolution be adopted so that minority rights may always be justly protected.

These are the statements of a few, and only a few, of the persons who are concerned about the minority staffing problem.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in rising to support Congressman SCHWENGEL's House Resolution 570, I believe I am unique in that I have acquired service both as a Member of this House and as a professional staff member of a congressional committee. During the 83d Congress I served as an attorney on the U.S. Senate Committee on Armed Services. Since January 1961 I have been a U.S. Representative and a member of two House committees.

This dual experience leaves me with the firm conviction that we must have genuinely bipartisan staffing if we are to enjoy truly representative government. The American taxpayers have voted for a bipartisan approach by sending to the House 174 Republicans out of a total of 437. The membership of the House is less than two to one in favor of the majority party. Yet situations exist on such important committees as Government Operations, on which I serve, where the 17 Democratic Congressmen who are members have a staff of 74 Democrats serving them and we 11 Republicans are provided with 3 workers of our political faith.

Total committee employees in the whole House number 538, of whom only 29 are minority employees.

Congressman SCHWENGEL's resolution would rectify this completely out-of-balance state of affairs by permitting the minority membership of a committee, by majority vote of the minority, to call for arrangements whereby they will be given 40 percent of the professional staff and 40 percent of the clerical staff.

If we of the minority are to live up to our obligation as the loyal opposition it is essential that we have access to the services of competent workers who understand and represent the viewpoint we have been elected to represent.

Mr. Roscoe Drummond's excellent series on the current committee's inequities has been quoted on this floor, but I would very much like to reiterate one comment by this thoughtful columnist which sums up the matter most succinctly:

> With such egregious imbalance as now prevails, the Republican teams of these committees are usually left on the bleacher seats in center field with the majority at bat all the time.

Mr. SCHWENGEL's resolution is demanding of the endorsement of Members from both sides of the aisle. As Mr. Drummond put it:

> The fact is that the imbalance is extreme. It is unjust and inequitable. It is harmful to the functioning of the two-party system. Unless the Democrats expect to control Congress forever, I should think they would be wise to accept staffing reform.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, some wise man in our distant past made the remark that Congress in session is Congress on exhibition, while Congress in committee is Congress at work.

All of us, I am sure, are aware of the need for competent, unbiased committee staff personnel. In committee is where the actual legislation as it will be presented to the floor of the House is considered, is drafted, is revised and amended. In committee is where the heart and soul of the legislative process works at its best.

If there is not give and take in committee, if only one side of a story is told, then no one suffers as much as our taxpayers, our consumers, our citizens, because the legislation which comes to the floor will be biased, warped out of shape by prejudice and distorted by a lack of objectivity.

Just as Representatives are most often at their best in committee, so we find that the importance of committee staff work is of the utmost importance to the orderly workings of the democratic process.

Yet, we find that while the majority party has all the committee staff personnel it needs, in fact so many that some committee employees do not even bother to come to Washington to pick up their paychecks, the minority party is bound hand and foot in its efforts to obtain facts, gather data, draft new legislation by lack of staff personnel.

The Members of Congress may be the architects of new legislation, but committee staffs are the carpenters, the technicians, the bricklayers, if you will, who build the foundation upon which legislation can rest. They do the digging, the research, the delving into the myriad facts which confront us. They give us a firm foundation upon which solid legislative accomplishment can be achieved.

Yet, we are told that there are 14 majority staff employees for every single minority employee. We find that some minority Members of Congress are hampered in their efforts to discover the raw, hard facts which confront us. We find that some 40 percent of the Members of the House of Representatives have difficulty in finding answers to their questions, other than the party line handed out by press release by the executive branch. We find that these Members have available to them only those facts which the Executive sees fit to part with.

All of us, I am sure, are aware of the excesses which go on in some House committees. We have some seven committees of the House which do not have a single minority staff member. We have some committees of the House which are so overloaded with majority staff employees that they do not have room to work in Washington and do not even come to Washington except on very rare occasions.

Rather than dwell upon these excesses and these shortcomings, I would like to point out to you one staff of a House committee which has done a job for Congress which can be classed nothing less than magnificent.

I am speaking of the staff of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, a committee on which I am privileged to serve.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has always followed both the letter and the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 in filling its staff positions. This act provides with respect to committee staffs that:

> Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives * * * is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office; and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has an experienced and highly qualified staff of specialists. One member of the staff has a Ph. D. in economics; another, a Ph. D. in political science. One is a lawyer and the committee employs two certified public accountants. All staff members had extensive oversea experience before joining the committee staff.

In selecting staff members the committee has taken precautions to assure that the best qualified persons are selected to fill vacancies and that political considerations are not the basis for appointment. All members of the regular professional staff were selected by bipartisan staffing subcommittees which reviewed long lists of applicants and agreed on the appointments to be recommended.

Professional staff members are available to serve both majority and minority members of the committee, and minority members are free to call for their services at any time. There has never been any indication that a staff member was less helpful or zealous because he was working on a job for a member of the minority.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has a staff of 15 members, all of them picked on a merit basis.

Boyd Crawford, the staff administrator, a native of Washington, D.C., came to the committee in November 1939, after holding a secretarial position with a Michigan Republican Congressman from 1932 through 1935, and serving from 1936 to 1939 as Secretary of the U.S. Sesquicentennial Commission. He also served as secretary to a Democratic Congressman from New York. Mr. Crawford is author of the Commission's report, included in "History of the Formation of the Union Under the Constitution." He was author of a number of booklets and articles published by that Commission. During his service as staff administrator of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he has served as a staff member of a number of congressional delegations, including the United Nations Conference at San Francisco, a number of General Assembly sessions, as well as parliamentary meetings and special study missions. He is listed in "American Men in Science" as an expert in international relations, American government, and international organizations. He is one of the few congressional staff members whose biography appears in "Who's Who in America."

Dr. Roy J. Bullock who joined the committee staff in 1951, serves as senior staff consultant. He was born in Crete, Nebr. Dr. Bullock received an A.B. degree from Doane College, a M.B.A. from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration and a Ph. D. in economics from Johns Hopkins University. He was associate professor of business administration at the University of Oregon and later served as director of the school of business economics in Johns Hopkins University. Subsequently he served in different capacities with the Office of Price Administration, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Department of State, and the Foreign Economic Administration. He also served as Chief of the Export-Import Section, Office of U.S. Military Government in Berlin and later became the U.S. Chairman of the Joint Export-Import Agency in Minden, Germany. Just prior to joining the Foreign Affairs Committee staff, Dr. Bullock was employed as an agent for the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation.

Dr. Albert C. F. Westphal, of New York City, joined the professional staff of the committee also in 1951. He received B.A., M.A., and Ph. D. degrees from Columbia University where he specialized in international relations and law. He was a Social Science Research Council Fellow, working on the role of the Foreign Affairs Committee in foreign affairs, and has the distinction of being the author of the only published history of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Dr. Westpahl also received a Carnegie grant for study of international law at The Hague. His experience includes service on the faculty of the College of the City of New York, the University of New Mexico, and for 2 years was director of studies at the National War College, in Washington, D.C. His teaching experience also included a lectureship in international affairs at Los Alamos, and a visiting professorship at Pennsylvania State University. Dr. Westpahl holds a reserve commission as captain in the Navy. During World War II he served for 3 years in naval intelligence and later in military government in the Pacific theater. He has also served as visiting lecturer at the Air War College, Army War College, U.S. Military Academy, and Foreign Service Institute.

Franklin J. Schupp joined the committee staff in June 1957. Mr. Schupp received a bachelor of science degree from the University of Alabama in business administration and commerce, and later a law degree from the same university. Mr. Schupp also received a bachelor of science degree in foreign trade and international affairs from Georgetown University. His experience background includes serving as secretary to a Member of Congress, counsel for a business firm, as attorney for the Veterans' Administration and as chief of the hearings section of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Mr. Schupp holds a lieutenant colonel's commission in the Air Force Reserve and during the Second World War served as special agent in charge of investigations, counterintelligence, and criminal division in South America, and later was officer in charge of psychiatric warfare-intelligence, U.S. Air Force, during the Korean war. Colonel Schupp is a member of the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, the Inter-American Bar Association and a number of other professional organizations.

Harry C. Cromer joined the committee staff in March 1960, as an investigator-consultant, but now serves in the capacity of staff consultant. Mr. Cromer was born in Detroit, Mich., is a graduate of the Strayer College of Accountancy where he received the degree of bachelor of commercial science in 1948 and later became a certified public accountant in 1952. Mr. Cromer served overseas in the U.S. Navy during World War II and after several years in private business, went to work for the General Accounting Office as a supervisory accountant and deputy director of the GAO Far East branch office in Tokyo, Japan. His experience also includes 2 years in Rome, Italy, as a supervisory accountant for the General Accounting Office.

Marian A. Czarnecki is the most recent addition to the staff of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, having joined in March 1962. Mr. Czarnecki was born an American citizen of American parents in Posen, Poland. Mr. Czarnecki holds a bachelor's degree in foreign service from Georgetown University, and has completed classroom work for a Ph. D. in economics at Georgetown University Graduate School. Prior to coming with the committee, Mr. Czarnecki served as administrative assistant to a Member of Congress, and also served as as adviser to the congressional delegation to the 14th General Assembly of the United Nations. Mr. Czarnecki's experience background includes a period as instructor in economics at the Georgetown University School of Business Administration.

Philip B. Billings, born in Rutland, Vt., joined the committee staff as a special assistant in January of 1961. He is a graduate of the University of Vermont where he received a bachelor of science degree in economics. He subsequently studied law at Columbia University and received a bachelor of laws degree. His experience includes serving as secretary to two Members of Congress, counsel to a special subcommittee of the House Administration Committee and administrative experience with NATO Parliamentarians Conferences.

Robert Fred Brandt, of Brooklyn, N.Y., was appointed investigator-consultant in October 1961. He received his bachelor of science degree—cum laude—from New York University and later a master of business administration from the same university. This academic training was supplemented by further doctoral studies at George Washington University. After experience in private business he joined the U.S. General Accounting Office in 1946 where his positions included: Chief, Planning Staff, Office of Comptroller General, Director, Far East Branch, Tokyo, and Director, European Branch, Paris. Mr. Brandt became a certified public accountant in 1948, and is a member of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and the Beta Gamma Sigma fraternity.

The ladies on the committee staff are all highly skilled research assistants with superior secretarial skills. They are headed by Miss Clara June Nigh of Falls Church, Va., who joined the staff as assistant clerk in 1943 and worked her way up to the post of senior staff assistant. She is a graduate of the Villa Maria Academy and has served as a staff member of the U.S. delegation to a Parliamentary Conference in Bermuda.

Miss Helen C. Mattas, of Gary, Ind., joined the staff in 1951. Miss Mattas received a Ph. B. degree from Northwestern University where she majored in international relations and public law. She also received an MA degree from the same university. Miss Mattas also studied at the Institute of Languages and Linguistics of Georgetown University. Her experience background includes secretarial work for several private firms, and during World War II she served as the WAC secretary to the Chief of Staff, and later was employed in the Office of Regional American Affairs in the Department of State.

Miss Helen L. Hashagen of Passaic, N.J., joined the staff in April 1952. She studied at New York University, and also studied Spanish at the Berlitz School in New York and the YWCA in Washington, D.C. Her experience background includes secretarial work for several business firms and administrative and secretarial work in the Defense Department where in the Office of the Under Secretary of the Air Force, she served as chief secretary to three consecutive Under Secretaries.

Mrs. Mary Louise O'Brien, of Buhl, Minn., joined the staff in April 1956. She is a graduate of St. Cloud Business College. Her experience includes secretarial positions with several business firms. Prior to her employment by the Foreign Affairs Committee she held several secretarial positions in the Department of State and later became special assistant to the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration.

Miss Mary E. Medsger, of Riverhead, N.Y., joined the staff in September 1961. Miss Medsger received her B.A. degree from Pembroke College in Brown University where she majored in history. She is a member of Phi Beta Kappa. Her experience background includes several secretarial positions and oversea service with the Department of State in an administrative capacity.

Mrs. Doris McCracken, of Little Rock, Ark., has a long background of congressional experience. She is a graduate of Draughon's Business College, and after coming to Washington, attended George Washington University. Her experience includes several secretarial posts in private business. She served as secretary to the U.S. High Commission to the Philippines, as secretary to the Presidential Adviser on Reparations and as secretary to two Senators and several Members of Congress over a period of years.

In my months as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have never had anything but the most complete cooperation from this committee staff. Answers have been forthcoming in detail, well documented, and well written. The committee staff has been, to borrow a phrase from the late Senator Vandenberg from my home State of Michigan, not only bipartisan, but nonpartisan.

Truth has been sought, no matter where it leads. Facts are actual facts, not opinions combined with doubtful or dubious statistics.

May I urge my colleagues to give their support to House Resolution 570, so that the excellent and efficient workings of this fine Foreign Affairs Committee staff will not be the exception, but the rule, in the House of Representatives.

ATHEISM BY LAW?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the Constitution which calls for atheism as the established religion of this country. And that is exactly what would be done if the Supreme Court upheld the demand to outlaw from the public schools of Pennsylvania the following prayer:

> Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessing upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country.

Even from the hearing of this nonsectarian prayer students are now excused upon request. Still extremists are insisting that its recitation by those who believe in it violates the constitutional declaration that—

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Obviously this prayer assails the views of nobody who has any religion. Still it meets the needs of children of all faiths. Those with no faith are not required to hear it. It would be paramounting and practically establishing complete faithlessness as the national religion to outlaw it.

The Constitution was designed to protect minorities in religion as in everything else. It was not designed to permit minorities to deny ruthlessly the rights and needs of others.

REPUBLICAN SPRING THAW

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Utt] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it might be appropriate at this time to make some explanatory remarks with respect to the special orders that the gentleman from California now in the well has taken together with others of his colleagues on this side of the aisle.

The idea was conceived just 8 days ago during a meeting of some dozen Congressmen who were discussing the blizzard of Kennedy administration propaganda blanketing the Nation. They have received increasing volumes of mail since President Kennedy's inauguration seeking information of what is being done in Washington aside from the Kennedy family and administration activities. These letters often express doubts, fears, and apprehension over the fate of our country.

Many questions are asked about the flood of proposals made continuously from the White House. Many of these letters express or imply the thoughts of the following telegram that I received just after the "thaw" was announced. This wire comes from Wichita, Kans., and reads as follows:

> Wichita and surrounding area has a population of approximately 500,000. We have one daily newspaper. It seems our news and entertainment consists of Kennedy administration publicity morning, noon, and night on television, radio, or newspaper. We have a steady diet of Kennedy, Kennedy, Kennedy. Who pays for all this propaganda? If you Republicans said anything, I don't know how we could hear about it.
>
> Everett DeHart.

Once this idea was expressed to other Members on our side of the aisle there seemed to be a general anxiousness to have this kind of opportunity to express what was on the minds of the Members and their constituents.

I want to emphasize that this specifically is not a Republican Party operation. It does not reflect GOP policies; it is a grassroots action, and the expressions made will be the viewpoints of various Members on the issues and the viewpoints they wish to express as elected Representatives on behalf of their people at home.

We are expecting among our side of the aisle a considerable diversity of opinion on the many issues that may be discussed, and we are justly proud of the diversity because, as the founder of our party, former President Abraham Lincoln stated, "in diversity there is strength."

Those who have the time today will yield to their Republican colleagues who may have different or the same views as their own. We will not hesitate to criticize the Kennedy administration where we believe it is mistaken, or to commend it when we believe it to be on the right track. Each man speaks for himself in this regard. But only by presenting all the points of view can either our party or our Nation select the wise courses and the wise actions we must select in order to endure against the dangers that face us in the world today.

I was very pleased to note earlier that the majority party indicated they would not cut off our opportunity to make these expressions of American viewpoint. I hope and trust that this may continue.

I think that perhaps the vast majority of the majority party might agree with an expression in a letter that was sent to one of the top majority leaders from a man in Los Angeles, who sent me a copy, and who appealed to him in these words:

> I am appealing to you to facilitate in every way possible the planned "Republican marathon" of 60 hours after the Wednesday closing of the House, so that your and my beloved country may hear or read the views of the minority party at this critical legislative session.
>
> Though I am a registered Democrat, I believe that when 50 percent of the 1960 votes were cast by Americans for the Republican presidential candidate, those 50 percent of Americans are entitled to considerable appreciation.
>
> Your help in permitting this marathon to be conducted properly will be appreciated by all reasonable Democrats and Republicans, and will prove to the world that free debate in the United States of America is practiced by us as we recommend it to other nations. May God bless you and our America.

That is signed "Edwin Kane."

Along the line of Mr. Kane's idea and thoughts are many, many telegrams that have been received by various Members on this side of the aisle asking that we discuss tonight the various issues that are before the country and give our viewpoint so that the people of America can at long last have an opportunity to see that there is more than one point of view, to note that in our course as a democratic republic we may choose those actions that are good and wise. I hope that in our action as a democratic republic we may choose those courses that are good and wise.

Inasmuch as the parliamentary maneuvers that have preceded us have delayed the start of these talks until about 6 o'clock, and conceivably no special orders could run until 8 o'clock in the morning, in fairness to the Members and to the staff of the House of Representatives, who are patient and able men and deserve consideration, among the group that plans to speak, we have decided and urged each other to keep the speeches as short as reasonably possible. I do not believe we will run until 8 o'clock tomorrow morning, but we do intend, if we are allowed to, to have our say.

We want to emphasize by this means that the important thing is that the people of America have a chance to hear both sides, and that is precisely why the Republican spring thaw has been programed, so they can hear both sides, instead of just the monotonous stream of intermixed fact and fancy proceeding from the mimeograph machines of the administration's gray-flannel-suited army of image makers.

Mr. UTT. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our colleague from California for explaining how this little operation got started. It is obvious that like Topsy it just growed. It does not spring from the leadership, it does not spring from the policy committee or from the campaign committee. Each Member who is going to participate tonight is speaking for himself and there will be some possible diversity of opinion. I think that is a healthy thing, because we Republicans have a diversity of opinion in our own party on many problems.

We, as Republicans, are united in our opposition to the New Frontier. First of all, we as Republicans feel that the New Frontier's legislative program is not good for the country. We Republicans, secondly, care about the people of our country. We care about the burden of taxes, and the inflation that may result from this program, and we care, too, about the freedoms that are going to be denied our people if the program of the New Frontier is put into effect.

We, as Republicans, resent the Madison Avenue techniques that have been brought into being by this administration, which is spending more money in propagandizing and brainwashing the American public than any administration in the history of this country.

This administration came into being on January 20, last year. It came in on the wings of one of the heaviest snowstorms we have had in the city of Washington. It snowed intermittently for several weeks afterward to such an extent that the new President was good naturedly and humorously referred to as the "Abominable Snowman."

In the blizzard of words that has come up to the House from the White House we have literally been snowed under by the New Frontier in the months that have passed since the first snowstorm on January 20, 1961.

This discussion may to some extent deal with the untruths and the half truths, and I might say even with the big lies that have been foisted on the American public. As the one practicing public relations man in Congress, I can tell you that I can see the very fine touches of the flack artists at work in this administration, the press agents trying to confuse the American public and convince them that all is well under the New Frontier.

I talked to a press agent not long ago who admitted his firm had a contract with the Peace Corps. That is one of the reasons we see the planted stories telling how wonderful the Peace Corps is. Whether you agree with the Peace Corps or not, to my way of thinking we do not need taxpayers' dollars being spent on press agents to tell the American public how well the administration is doing with a program of this type.

The White House conferences are going to be covered tonight by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER]. He is going to point out the expenses involved in this propaganda effort to confuse the American public. I would like to know how much these White House conferences cost. So far we have not been able to find out.

We, of course, all see today the staff at the White House selling ardently the tariff program. They have press agents at work across the country now pointing out the good points of that program, not pointing out the pitfalls. They are using the carrot and stick technique that is so successful in persuasion. They either coddle or punish those that do not follow their program.

The White House has had hundreds of publishers to dinner and to lunch, but always for a reason. The chairman of our Republican National Committee was out in Seattle and made a speech about foreign policy. The papers carried it very well. It was an antiadministration speech, of course. Within 2 weeks all of the publishers in the Seattle area had been invited to the White House and been told that what was said there was not true.

The same thing happened a few months ago in Minneapolis, right after a Republican meeting, when there was a good Republican press and very interesting reports in the newspapers about the sad state of foreign affairs of this country. Shortly thereafter all of the publishers from Minneapolis were invited to the White House and brainwashed again.

Who picks up the tab for this propaganda effort? Why the taxpayers do, of course.

There are even more sinister efforts to silence anyone in the press who opposes the New Frontier. The White House staff seems to go into sort of a frenzy if anybody attacks Mr. Kennedy or the New Frontier. So, one at a time they take these reporters or these columnists who are writing items that are critical of the administration, and either they try to woo them over by inviting them for lunch or else freeze them out and refuse to let them have interviews so necessary to the press.

I have on some occasions been told by leading writers and columnists that there have been attempts to offer jobs to reporters who were critical of the administration; very cozy and very attractive jobs. One columnist told me that he was offered a very exciting job in the State Department. He turned it down. Shortly thereafter his income tax returns were being checked.

This is a technique that has been used to good effect by our enemies. The Chinese in Korea used this brainwashing technique with the American prisoners. They first of all would bring the prisoners in from their cells, give them the best meals and cigarettes and try to get them to confess, and when they would not confess, of course, they were then put in solitary confinement on bread and water. They were alternately cajoled and beaten. This a known way to brainwash those who do not go along with your program.

I know of one instance where a publisher was invited to the White House. He was wined and dined at the White House. He was served no milk, although I notice in some of the press releases that it is served every day at the White House. He did not see any. He was treated very cordially at the White House, and then was asked to go down the street to the Department of Justice, where he had a conference with the President's brother. The conference had to do with a possible antitrust violation. So, the orders soon went out—and we have this on good authority—that the critical columnists and newspapermen on this particular paper were to let up on the criticism of the New Frontier.

So, you see, we on this side have reason to be concerned about this snow job that is going on. I know there were some crocodile tears shed on the other side yesterday about the cost of electric lights, about the cost of printing for taking down these words. It is rather ironic that those who were complaining the most are the ones that support every spending program that the New Frontier has brought out.

They are helping to build up the billion-dollar deficits that this administration is creating. Some of the critics are the very ones who were prattling not too long ago about free speech.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad we have free speech in this body. It is one of the last free things that we still have left in this country that is not taxed or controlled or eliminated completely.

Mr. Speaker, I say to those Members who are dedicating their evening tonight to express themselves in the free American way that we are with you, and many millions of Americans who believe in our philosophy also will be with you until the wee, small hours of the morning.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield at the present time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one single question?

Mr. UTT. I will yield for a question, but half of my time is gone already.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman may be good enough to advise the Members of the House whether he and the following speakers intend to yield for questions from this side of the aisle, or is this going to be one long presentation with no questions?

I ask this question only for this reason: Perhaps some of us may very well want to remain to hear some of these speeches, if we can participate in the discussion. On the other hand, if it is going to be a one-sided presentation there is really little value that can be obtained from this discussion.

Mr. UTT. I can say to the gentleman that insofar as I am concerned, I expect to yield to the majority side for questions, but not to take over my brief period of time during which I shall try to present a case. But as we go along it is intended that it shall be open for questions and discussion. But I do not want to interrupt what I have to say until I am finished. At that time if I have a colleague to whom to yield on this side of the aisle I shall yield to him, and then I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield for a question.

Mr. HAYS. Well, I have a question.

I notice the gentleman is complaining about being frozen out of the press. Is the gentleman complaining that he is being frozen out of the Los Angeles press?

Mr. UTT. I do not know what the gentleman is referring to. I just said that the general Republican Party as a whole had not been able to get the coverage that I thought it was entitled to.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. UTT. No; I refuse to yield any further. I must get on with my speech.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UTT. I have yielded once to the gentleman from Ohio already.

Mr. HAYS. Well, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The Chair will count.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, out of deference to the Speaker, whom I have known for 14 years as the majority leader previously, I will withdraw the point of order. But I will say I will make another one, if necessary.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. Utt] yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa for the purpose of making a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, does it require unanimous consent to withdraw a request for a quorum call?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It does not, the Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, this project might well be termed our 1 great hour of truth. In this world there are moral absolutes which are as immutable as the inexorable passage of time. One of these moral absolutes can be stated in very simple terms:

> If something is right, it is right, though all men believe it is wrong, and if it is wrong, it is wrong, even though all men believe it is right.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Lincoln expressed it in these words:

> If I am right, history will vindicate me, but if I am wrong, all of the angels in Heaven cannot justify me.

Mr. Speaker, I accept the challenge of that moral absolute in what I have to say to the House today.

It shall be my purpose to discuss the influence of the United Nations on our foreign policy, and to explore the management of the U.N., as well as the shift in the voting power of the General Assembly.

I should like to go back a couple of years and call your attention to a national strategy seminar, held at Asilomar Conference Grounds, Monterey Peninsula, Calif., under the sponsorship of the 6th U.S. Army, the Western Sea Frontier—U.S. Navy—and the 4th Air Force. At that seminar, Mr. Walt Rostow, among other things, made this statement:

> Those of us who live in the northern half of the globe * * * know that, in the century about to unfold, the technological monopoly we now hold will slip away and all the values and attitudes and policies that are rooted in this northern monopoly will have to be transformed.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Thornberry). Does the gentleman from California yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. UTT. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I ask the question, Is there any pending business of importance before the House this afternoon?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will say to the gentleman from North Carolina that we are proceeding under a special order granted by the House to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BONNER. So there is no business pending before the House this afternoon that would require that the gentleman from North Carolina remain in the Chamber?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has stated to the gentleman from North Carolina that the House is proceeding under a special order granted by it to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BONNER. So the gentleman from North Carolina may understand that there will be no votes on any important legislation this evening? So he and other Members can go home since it is now 6:45 p.m. and no further business will be conducted——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not aware of any at this time.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, may I say, that I am amazed at the naivete of the chairman of a committee who has been here this long who does not understand the calendar of the day.

Continuing with Mr. Walt Rostow's quotation:

> Specifically, we must count on a redistribution of power and influence on the face of the globe that will increase the relative authority of those who live in the South, whose influence on great events has hitherto been nonexistent or slight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is meant by "a redistribution of power and influence on the face of the globe"? Does that mean that we are to divide our powerful Military Establishment among all nations of the world, including the emerging African nations and the southeast Asian countries?

At the same conference, Mr. Paul Nitze made the following statement:

> In brief, my proposal is * * * that we accept the improbability that we can achieve a true class A nuclear capability * * * that * * * the aim of our foreign policy is to construct a world system compatible with the survival and development of nations with purposes like ours, and * * * that a possible route toward the aim is a series of unilateral actions designed to produce reciprocal action on the part of our allies and also on the part of our enemies.
>
> The actions I propose are the following: (1) that we concentrate on building a variety of secure, purely retaliatory systems, (2) that * * * we scrap the fixed-based vulnerable systems that have their principal utility as components of a class A capability, (3) that we multilateralize the command of our retaliatory systems by making SAC (the U.S. Strategic Air Command) a NATO command, and (4) that we inform the United Nations that NATO will turn over ultimate power of decision on the use of these systems to the General Assembly of the United Nations subject to the following conditions——

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I will not yield during my presentation.

Mr. JENNINGS. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. UTT. That is not a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. UTT. Not at the present time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. UTT. Subsection (a)—

> That we and our allies will assume continuing responsibility for manning, maintaining, and improving these systems.

Subsection (b)—

> That U.N. inspectors would be invited to inspect and satisfy themselves that these are the only nuclear systems we are maintaining.

Subsection (c)—

> That a U.N. order to use them will be honored only in the event some nation has initiated the use of nuclear weapons other than on or over its own territory in self-defense against military aggression.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from California yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JENNINGS. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the Chair understand the gentleman to say he will not yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. UTT. I will not yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. UTT. You will note that Mr. Nitze spoke about U.N. inspectors who would be invited to inspect and satisfy themselves that these are the only nuclear systems we are maintaining. Just why did Mr. Nitze invite the U.N. inspectors to satisfy themselves as to the nuclear systems which we are maintaining—why did he limit it to "we"?

He recommended that the Strategic Air Command be made a NATO command and that NATO would turn over the final power of decision on the use of these systems to the United Nations. I must point out that Great Britain is one of our NATO allies and has just discovered a gigantic Communist infiltration into its civil service system. Thus, Great Britain would become a stopping place for the transmission of military intelligence on its way to Moscow. Needless to say, these grave pronouncements by Rostow and Nitze created a deep concern on the part of the American public, and many letters were written to the Defense Department and others, inquiring as to whether such a program was contemplated. A classic reply, in true doubletalk and gobbledygook, dated November 30, 1961, reads as follows:

> Thank you for your recent letter enclosing a clipping from your local paper. The article is inaccurate in several respects, particularly inasmuch as the strategy seminar in which Mr. Nitze participated was held in April 1960, well before Mr. Nitze became a member of the administration. The proposal, portions of which were quoted in the clipping, was made in the context of an idea which he put forward informally for critical examination, indicating that it might well prove to be a grand fallacy. Consequently, the implication in the article that such a possibility is under consideration by Mr. Nitze or by the present administration is erroneous. With appreciation for bringing the article to our attention.

This letter was written on the letterhead of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs, and is signed by Timothy W. Stanley, Special Assistant.

There are several interesting statements in this letter. Mr. Stanley ignores the fact that the seminar referred to was under the sponsorship of the 6th U.S. Army and the 4th Air Force.

Even though Mr. Nitze at the time of his famous statement was not a member of the administration, he shortly thereafter became a top-ranking member of our Military Establishment. My simple question is, Was Mr. Nitze given this sensitive post because he made such a revolutionary statement and the administration wanted him to implement it, or was he made an Assistant Secretary of Defense in spite of his statement?

Mr. Stanley's letter was dated November 30, 1961, 3 months after the State Department issued its publication 7277, entitled "Freedom From War, the U.S. Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." This little 19-page booklet of disaster, defeat, and surrender is not in conflict with Mr. Nitze's statements, but rather supports them. This disarmament program as set forth by the State Department, among other things, proposes:

> The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations peace force and for maintaining internal order.
>
> As states relinquish their arms, the United Nations shall be progressively strengthened.
>
> Stage I: An International Disarmament Organization (IDO) shall be established within the framework of the United Nations. * * * Strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles in specified categories and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be reduced to agreed levels * * *. The reduction shall be accomplished * * * by transfers to depots supervised by the IDO.
>
> Production of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be discontinued or limited.
>
> Testing of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be limited or halted.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. UTT. I will not yield and the gentleman knows it. This is a matter of harassment and it is well recognized by me as such.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair will count. Seventy-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 71]

Addonizio
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Bass, N.H.
Battin
Berry
Bolling
Bolton
Boykin
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Buckley
Cahill
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chelf
Chiperfield
Coad
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, James C.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dorn
Dowdy
Ellsworth
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Findley
Fisher
Fogarty
Ford
Forrester
Frazier
Garland
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Glenn
Granahan
Hansen
Harrison, Va.
Harsha
Hébert
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Holland
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Kee
Kelly
Kilburn
Kowalski
Lankford
Lennon
Lesinski
Loser
McDowell
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Mason
Mathias
Merrow
Michel
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Mills
Moorehead, Ohio
Morrison
Morse
Multer
Nix
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
Patman
Peterson
Powell
Rains
Reece
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Colo.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
St. George
St. Germain
Schweiker
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Stafford
Steed
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Van Pelt
Vinson
Walter
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Zelenko

The **SPEAKER.** On this rollcall 275 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REPUBLICAN SPRING THAW

The **SPEAKER.** The gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] is recognized.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. UTT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, as this is a school night, I ask unanimous consent that the pages be permitted to leave at 7:15, which will permit any Member to get any request he wants, and permit them to return to their studies. The telephone people will be on just the same. This applies only to pages.

Mr. JENNINGS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and certainly I will not object, I would like to say that for the past 45 minutes or perhaps longer, an hour and a half, I have been trying to get the gentleman to yield for the same unanimous-consent request, that our page boys be excused. Especially in view of the colloquy which took place between the gentleman from North Carolina and the Chair which indicated that it is quite obvious that nothing of importance is going to take place tonight and that there will be no vote on legislative matters.

Further, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that very few Members were on the floor and they were not paying attention, I thought it unfair that the pages have to remain here and listen to a thaw that they were not interested in, either.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I was looking over the United Press——

(The regular order was demanded.)

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

The **SPEAKER.** The regular order was demanded, the Chair put the request, and there was no objection.

The gentleman from California.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the document of the State Department with reference to complete disarmament.

> Stage II: Further reductions in the stocks of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be carried out.
>
> During stage II, states shall develop further the peacekeeping processes of the United Nations, to the end that the United Nations can effectively in stage III deter or suppress any threat or use of force in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations. * * * The U.N. Peace Force shall be established and progressively strengthened.
>
> Stage III: In stage III, progressive controlled disarmament * * * would proceed to a point where no state would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened U.N. Peace Force.
>
> States would retain only those forces, nonnuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. Peace Force.
>
> The U.N. Peace Force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.
>
> The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. Peace Force and those required to maintain internal order.

Mr. Speaker, this is a frightening program of surrender. I have here a series of six Air Force recruiting posters which I wish to show to the Members of this House. You will note that the first one is entitled "Go U.S. Air Force." Six flags are displayed, the most prominent being the United Nations flag. There is no American flag on display. My question is, has our Air Force been turned over to the United Nations, or is the prominent display of the United Nations flag a bit of subtle propaganda? Of course it might be a trial balloon to see how the American public will react.

The other five posters which I display do not show the American flag.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the House is not in order. It is very obvious that nobody is paying the slightest attention to the speaker.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion we are exhibiting here one of the most shocking——

(The regular order was demanded.)

The SPEAKER. The regular order is that the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] has yielded to the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House for 10 years and I have never seen such an exhibition as we are seeing from the other side of the aisle. I think the House is unruly; it is not in order, and I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Chair maintain order in the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will advise the gentleman from California that the Chair is maintaining order.

The gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] will proceed.

Mr. UTT. Now, I am not one of those who are ashamed of the American flag and the respect which it should demand throughout the world, nor do I believe that the Star-Spangled Banner is a corny ditty for rightwing extremists.

In contrast to these recruiting posters of the Air Force, I shall show you six recruiting posters exhibited by the U.S. Navy, all of which display the American flag.

I was more than shocked to hear of the NBC special television show entitled "Regards to George M. Cohan," on March 4, 1962. You will remember that George M. Cohan wrote many patriotic songs, among them you will recall, was "It's a Grand Old Flag." In this NBC special one of the actors came on to the screen holding an American flag and said:

> I guess everybody knows that George M. Cohan wrote a lot of songs about this. The Cohan brand of patriotism is a little old fashioned and naive for these confused times.

What has happened to America to make the Cohan brand of patriotism "a little old fashioned and naive"? I am certain that the American people do not so believe, in spite of the so-called liberal movement.

Marcus Raskin, who was the mainspring of the liberal papers, is now employed in our highest level strategic planning agency, the National Security Council. What qualified him for this position? The liberal papers support the following recommendations: Recognition of Red China; sponsorship of Red Chinese membership in the United Nations; recognition of Red China's claim to Formosa and to the Pescadores; financial aid for Red China; demilitarization of the West German Republic; recognition of East Germany's puppet regime; expulsion of West Germany, Italy, Scandinavia, and France from NATO, shutdown of American missile bases in Europe; invitation to Russia to plug in on a bidirectional DEW line.

Is Mr. Raskin in his present position to implement these recommendations?

Was Walt Rostow appointed to his high position in the White House to implement his suggestion:

> We must count on a redistribution of power and influence on the face of the globe.

Is that redistribution of power going on at the Geneva Conference today?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us turn our attention to this organization to which some people in our State Department and some people in the Pentagon are suggesting that we turn over our Armed Forces.

The main structure of the United Nations was to consist of the General Assembly and the Security Council, which would have five permanent members. There also was created in the Secretariat an Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs. There was a secret agreement that a Russian national would hold this position of Under Secretary for this powerful committee. This was vigorously denied by the State Department for many years, until the first Secretary General, Trygve Lie, wrote his book entitled "In the Cause of Peace," after which there was nothing for the State Department to do but admit this agreement. Secretary Lie makes this statement on page 45 of his book:

> The choice of the Assistant Secretaries General, who would constitute my cabinet, was, of course, my first concern. It soon appeared that it was equally the concern of some of the great, and a number of the lesser, powers.
>
> Mr. Vyshinsky did not delay his approach. He was the first to inform me of an understanding which the Big Five had reached in London on the appointment of a Soviet national as Assistant Secretary General for Political and Security Council Affairs. Mr. Vyshinsky simply spoke of an agreement—he said nothing of its binding quality, of the right of the Big Five to arrive at it, or of the length of time it was meant to apply. Now, by the terms of the charter, the Secretary General has full authority in the disposition of the assistant secretary generalships, with respect both to their nationality and to their personality. The authority, in fact, was the point of a hard-won decision at San Francisco which rejected an attempt to prescribe that there should be four Deputy Secretaries General, appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council in the same manner as the Secretary General. Strictly speaking, therefore, the Big Five had no right to arrive at any understanding regarding the distribution of the offices of Assistant Secretary General which was binding upon the Secretary General.
>
> This is not to say, however, that it would have been politic of me to resist the great power accord.

And it is true that there have been seven consecutive Communists as Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs, all of them Russians with the exception of one from Yugoslavia.

This might not be so bad, while the United States had an effective veto power in the Security Council, but in 1950 Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in consort with some of the other powers, presented a program to the General Assembly entitled "United Action for Peace." I quote from page 75 of "Everyman's United Nations," a publication of the Office of Public Information of the United Nations:

> Resolution A included provision for: (1) emergency special sessions of the General Assembly on 24 hours' notice on the vote of any seven members of the Security Council or a majority of the members of the United Nations if the Security Council, because of a lack of unanimity among the permanent members, failed to act in any case where there appeared to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression; (2) establishment of a Peace Observation Commission composed of representatives of 14 members, including the 5 permanent members of the Security Council, to be utilized by the General Assembly, the Interim Committee or the Security Council to observe and report on the situation in any area where international tension threatened international peace and security; (3) maintenance by member states of elements of their national armed forces for prompt availability as United Nations units, and the appointment by the Secretary-General of a panel of military experts to give technical advice to member states on request; and (4) establishment of a Collective Measures Committee composed of representatives of 14 members to study and report on methods which might be used collectively to maintain and strengthen international peace and security.

The real purpose of this resolution, as you can readily see, was to bypass the Security Council with its veto powers, so that the control of the United Nations has shifted from the Security Council to the General Assembly, giving them full powers to do anything under the U.N. Charter. While Dean Acheson had in mind the circumvention of the Russian veto, he also circumvented the veto of the United States.

The shift in the voting power in the General Assembly is frightening. There are 104 member states of the General Assembly, 50 percent of which have a combined population of much less than the population of the United States. The smallest of these member states, Iceland, has but 200,000 population. Poor Mr. Stevenson sits as our Ambassador in the General Assembly representing 185 million people with a single vote to match the 52 votes representing a combined population of 165 million people. That is not only ridiculous, and stupid, but poses a catastrophic threat against the United States. On top of this situation, Russia started out with 3 votes and now has 10 under its control.

The real working force of the U.N. is not at the ambassadorial level. It is in the Secretariat and really revolves around three men: Secretary General U Thant, Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs Eugeny Kiselev, and Dr. Ralph Bunche, who is Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs.

I do not know too much about Secretary General U Thant except that he is from Burma, but judging from some of his past utterances I believe he has a strong pro-Communist bias. I would like to quote from one of his speeches.

On April 11, 1958, U Thant delivered a speech before the annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia. Here are some excerpts from that speech:

> It is not our business to pass judgment on the internal affairs of other countries. The recognition of this basic fact enables us to subscribe to the principle of peaceful coexistence. Our attitude should be governed solely by consideration of peace. We [Burmese] are convinced that it is not the path of wisdom to form military blocs, to enter into a hectic armament race and to rant hysterically at each other. These measures certainly do not make for peace; they only increase tensions. If the world's great religions like Islam and Christianity, after a prolonged and bloody war for centuries, flourish side by side in peace and amity, why should not Communist and non-Communist systems be permitted to coexist peacefully?
>
> Let me be candid. When American foreign policy did concern itself with what was happening in the rest of the world, it did so out of fear and suspicion—fear of communism and suspicion of Communist motives. Fear and suspicion are very undesirable states of mind. They breed hatred, and hatred in turn breeds cruelty and intolerance. Fear of Soviet communism has led the United States, and those who follow her lead, to take a distorted view of the world situation, and of the forces that are at work in modern society.
>
> When I say [this], I think I reflect the views of most thinking Asians. The weapons of the Soviet are in the first instance economic, social, and ideological: only secondarily military. If she relied primarily upon military action why has she not resorted to it before now?
>
> The U.S. policy toward China is unreal. It needs a thorough reexamination and reappraisal. The reason behind the U.S. attitude toward China is the contention that Communist China is bent on world domination. I find it difficult to understand this attitude when military force is neither in use nor immediately in prospect.
>
> The refusal of the United States to support the admission of China to the United Nations is based on two assumptions—that the Chinese Government's behavior unfits it for membership in the World Organization; that the Peiping government's grip on China may be broken at any moment. No one, however, believes this.
>
> [It is] unprofitable to ask who fired the first shot in a war between two countries. The relevant consideration is that, unlike Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union did not compel by actual military invasion any of its neighbors to become satellites. Eastern Germany and Austria are exceptions, but Soviet troops established in those territories were, like Western forces, legitimate armies of occupation.
>
> It can be argued, however, that though the Soviet Union has not as yet attempted to impose its will on any state outside the Communist cordon, the Soviet has had and still has the intention to do so whenever the circumstances are favorable. But it is very difficult to arrive at an objective appraisal of such suppositions. Suspicions are not proof, and it is doubtful whether any proof has been established to sustain this charge.

Nothing needs to be said about Eugeny Kiselev, as he is a well-known hard-core Communist, and is not only Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs, but he was also immediately made a top adviser for U Thant.

That brings us to the other powerhouse in the United Nations Secretariat, Dr. Ralph Bunche.

Anyone who does not speak in glowing terms of Dr. Bunche is considered to be a heretic or a segregationist. Let me state that I am not a segregationist, and we have millions of loyal, patriotic American Negroes, many of them capable of this assignment. All that I intend to say about Ralph Bunche is by pointing out some of his former connections and quoting from some of his speeches.

In an article written for the Journal of Negro Education in 1936, volume 5, No. 3, page 356, he wrote as follows:

> We are now witnessing an unusual era of academic repression, but the controls are always present, in good times or bad. The repressive measures, Red riders, gag laws, and oath clauses of the present period of hysteria are merely forceful reminders of the fundamental bias of our educational system.

In his pamphlet entitled "A World View of Race," pages 64–65, he makes this suggestion:

> If the oppressed racial groups, as a result of desperation and increasing understanding, should be attracted by the principles of equality and humanitarianism advocated by the Soviet Union [and it is both logical and likely that they will] then racial conflict will become intensified. In such case, however, racial conflict will be more directly identified with class conflict, and the oppressed racial groups may win the support of oppressed, though previously prejudiced, working-class groups within the dominant population.

He concludes this pamphlet by saying:

> And so class will some day supplant race in world affairs. Race war then will be merely a sideshow to the gigantic class war which will be waged in the big tent we call the world.

He continually refers to the imperialistic capital system indicating a complete disdain for the American capitalistic system.

Dr. Bunche was the main force in organizing the National Negro Congress. He not only takes credit for this but is given credit for it by none other than the Communist Party leader, William Z. Foster, in these words:

> Among those present were such notables as Ralph Bunche, W. E. B. DuBois, A. Philip Randolph, R. A. Carter, John P. Davis, James W. Ford, and others (book: "History of the Communist Party," by W. Z. Foster, International Publishers, 1952, p. 309).

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take a good look at the National Negro Congress.

NATIONAL NEGRO CONGRESS

First. Cited as subversive and Communist—Attorney General Tom Clark, letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

Second. A. Philip Randolph, president of the congress since its inception in 1936, refused to run again in April 1940 on the ground that it was deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists.

From the record of its activities and the composition of its governing bodies, there can be little doubt that it has served as what James W. Ford, Communist vice-presidential candidate elected to the executive committee in 1937, predicted "An important sector of the democratic front," sponsored and supported by the Communist Party—Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pages 7687 and 7688.

Third. "The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes is known as the National Negro Congress. The officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists"—Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, January 3, 1939, page 81; also cited, reports, January 3, 1940, page 9; June 25, 1942, page 20; and March 29, 1944, page 180.

Fourth. A "Communist-dominated mass organization"—California Committee on Un-American Activities, report, 1947, page 230.

Fifth. William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., stated that the role of his party was one of central importance in the organization of the great united front National Negro Congress in Chicago, February 1936—Massachusetts House Committee on Un-American Activities, report, 1938, page 298.

Those citations are certainly evidence of the pro-Communist bias exhibited by Dr. Bunche.

Dr. Bunche became a contributing editor of Science and Society, a Marxian quarterly. Among his fellow contributors were: Paul Langevin, a top level member of the French Communist Party who upon his death was publicly lauded for his dedication to communism; Joseph Needham, a British professor who has led in the Soviet charge accusing the United States of germ warfare in Korea; and W. P. Parry—he was managing editor of Science and Society when Bunche first appeared as contributing editor. Parry was director of the Communist Progressive Labor School in Boston. Appearing before the Un-American Activities Committee he refused to answer whether he was or has been a Communist.

The Communist publication entitled "The Communist," carried an article by V. J. Jerome, a top Communist writer. The January 1937 issue makes this statement:

> We have stated earlier, and we wish to reaffirm at the conclusion, the considerable achievements of the magazine [Science and Society], its auspicious beginnings, and the hopeful prospects for its realization of the purposes the editors have set for it. On the basis of its efforts and of its realizations to date, Science and Society is deserving of the fullest support of the Communist Party and of all progressives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bunche remained a contributing editor of this Marxian quarterly for 4 years and when he finally resigned he sent a letter to the editor of Science and Society explaining that other duties prevented him from further serving and wishing them success in their future endeavors. Does that sound like a dedicated American?

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY

First. Cited as a Communist publication—Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, March 29, 1944, page 96.

Second. Among publications which the committee found to be Communist initiated and controlled, or so strongly influenced as to be in the Stalin solar system—California Committee on Un-American Activities, report, 1948, page 225.

Third. Cited as a Marxian quarterly distributed by the Communists' Progressive Book Shop in Boston, Mass. William T. Parry, director of the Communist Progressive Labor School in Boston, is the managing editor—"Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," May 14, 1951, issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, page 149.

It is a matter of official record that Bunche sponsored a Communist to a key post in the U.N. In fact, this Communist had received an award of $40,000 in lieu of reinstatement from the U.N. after he had refused to answer as to whether or not he had been and was a Communist. This Communist who took the fifth amendment many times before the Senate Internal Security Committee was Mr. Harris.

Dr. Bunche was an active participant in the Institute of Pacific Relations—IPR.

The IPR was completely infiltrated with Communists and pro-Communists. Among those active in the IPR were: Alger Hiss, Soviet spy; Laughlin Currie, named by Elizabeth Bentley as connected with Soviet spy ring; Frederick Vanderbilt Field, convicted Communist agent; Harry Dexter White, spy exposed by the Attorney General of the United States and Edgar Hoover of FBI; Joseph Barnes, identified as a member of the Communist Party; and Benjamin Kizer, identified as a member of the Communist Party.

The Communist Daily Worker always comes to the defense of Dr. Bunche. If he is such an anti-Communist, why should he be receiving the constant praise of the Communist Daily Worker?

There, Mr. Speaker, is the blueprint for the full surrender of this great Republic. The implementation of this tragic program of the New Frontier can only be stopped by the American public, when the people are fully informed as to the truth, and demand that the administration take a firm stand.

It is no longer a question of "better Red than dead"—it is a question of being both Red and dead if we surrender or even try to coexist.

God forbid that this Nation shall ever fall into the hands of a foreign foe.

REPUBLICAN SPRING THAW

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pillion] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I want to compliment the previous speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. Utt], on his perspective and the erudite study he has presented. I think many of us could well take on board what he has said.

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that from the standpoint of the national interest of the United States, the usefulness of the United Nations is limited, though important. While it has rendered valuable services in the fighting of political flash fires which might have erupted into large conflicts, it cannot easily serve as an instrument in the fight against communism, since Communist nations are members and frequently exercise their veto power; nor can it become the principal agency for economic and technical aid to developing nations, as this is an internal matter. It is an ideological dream and I pray not born too soon in world history.

There are some issues in which the U.N. can render valuable service, especially when the conflict is limited in objectives, and where the United States and the Soviet Union are not allied on opposite sides; such as the Suez campaign and the Palestine war. But there are also issues in which it cannot render this service, and, in fact, some issues on which it can be a positive hindrance, such as the Algerian dispute. It now appears that the Franco-Algerian conflict may see a final settlement; but had this conflict been taken over by the United Nations, so many other interests would have entered the picture as to make quite impossible, the concessions to which both sides have now agreed. By these virtues plus the recognized quality of hindsight, would that the U.N. had avoided the Congo.

The U.N. is not our sole hope for peace, because such thinking assumes the normal diplomatic process to be nonexistent or paralyzed. Our three most explosive conflicts today, that of Algiers, Berlin, and Vietnam, are not handled by the U.N., but through other devices. If they were thrown into the U.N., the Soviet Union, through its veto power, could ease the way for accomplishment of its own purpose. The U.N. should be used as one of the devices within which our American policy may operate, but it should never become the sole or even the predominant outlet of our foreign policy. Our State Department and U.N. representatives should have this indelibly drilled into them by the Congress and the President.

One fundamental defect in the U.N. organizational structure should be pointed out, because it is a major contributor to some of our U.N. problems. That is on the question of U.N. representation:

In accepting the one-nation, one-vote doctrine we have abandoned a fundamental concept of our own Constitution which, through the House of Representatives, gives representation on the basis of population.

Under our Constitution each separate State as a geographic entity, is given two Senators; but recognizing that States would vary considerably in population, our Founding Fathers provided for a second legislative body based on population within those separate States.

The U.N. also has two parts: a General Assembly and a Security Council. In the latter, the major powers are represented although the term "major powers" is used instead of the term "separate states."

But in the General Assembly, a country with less than 175,000 people has the same vote, the same power, as the United States with 185 million people. When we further consider that many of these smaller states have yet to prove responsibility, it is readily apparent that we have been duped. The General Assembly, caught between two great power blocs, is reaching a position where those nations least equipped to sit in judgment hold the balance of power.

We even allowed the Soviet Union to cast three votes based on a reasoning that approaches insanity: that each of these three states is free to reach its own decision regardless of Kremlin policy. This has never happened yet, and I am not going out on a limb, if I predict it never will. Better let our new States of Hawaii and Alaska cast separate votes therein.

The United States last year paid 32.5 percent of the U.N. general budget. It pays 47.5 percent of the U.N. Congo costs. It now proposes to buy one-half of the bonds needed to underwrite the U.N. deficit for extracurricular activities. And yet it—the United States—has one vote equal to that of Afghanistan.

If the U.S. Supreme Court recently took objection to the underrepresentation of our cities, what would it think of our Nation's underrepresentation in the United Nations?

Unless this situation is corrected, the United States can never put any serious reliance in the United Nations, as a world policy organization.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman for his very fine presentation. I believe his comments are most valuable.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Constitution provides that the Congress shall have the sole power to tax, and to pay this Nation's debts. It further and specifically provides that all bills for raising revenue shall originate in this House of Representatives. Under this power, implied authority is also vested in this House to originate appropriation bills. The prime responsibility for currency stability, for fiscal solvency of this Nation, has been entrusted to this House.

Therefore, I consider it quite proper to review with you the continuing crises in the state of this Nation's fiscal affairs.

PUBLIC DEBT

Our national debt has reached the staggering and disgraceful figure of $296 billion. It is $100 billion more than the total debt of all other nations of the free world. The interest charges alone are $9.5 billion, annually.

There are a number of dangerous implications in these figures.

First of all, the management of the debt is becoming more and more difficult. There is a growing resistance in financial circles and among the public to the purchase of U.S. bonds.

The Treasury Department's program, over the last few years, to lengthen the maturity of this debt has not succeeded. The average maturities are dangerous—

too short in time. They approach the immediate convertibility of currency.

This huge debt continues to strain to the limit the credit of the United States. In the event of a depression, or in the event of war, we would lack a credit reserve to meet emergency fiscal demands.

I believe there should be a full disclosure to the investing public, and to the taxpaying public, that there is no policy or intent on the part of this Government to pay off or reduce any part of this public debt.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield or does he prefer that I not interrupt?

Mr. PILLION. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I think this is an appropriate time, if the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, to have the record show—and I ask the gentleman if he does not agree that this is the fact—that if we go on as we are now going and do not begin reducing the national debt we will pay out in interest charges alone an amount equal to the national debt in a little more than 30 years, and we will still owe every dime of the national debt.

Mr. PILLION. There is no question about it. It is a disgraceful situation, but I see no intent on the part of either this Congress or the administration to do very much about it.

I seriously suggest to this House that our budgetmaking process is in need of an immediate and drastic revision.

This Congress, and this House, particularly, has failed to fully discharge its responsibilities in this field. The transfer of this power to the executive branch, and to its Budget Bureau, has failed to meet the Nation's requirements for fiscal solvency and responsibility.

The present budget for fiscal 1962 was prepared by the Budget Bureau under President Eisenhower. It proposed receipts of $82.3 billion, and expenditures of $80 billion, with a surplus of $1.5 billion.

As of today, the cash deficit is $9.3 billion.

In January, less than 3 months ago, President Kennedy submitted his budget recommendations for fiscal 1963. They called for receipts of $93 billion, and expenditures of $92.5 billion, with a prospective surplus of $500 million.

This budget was predicated upon a gross national product of $570 billion for the calendar year 1962. These optimistic expectations are not being realized. Business activity has not picked up as anticipated. The staff of one of the Senate economic committees has now estimated that the 1963 budget will show a deficit of about $5 billion.

It is my opinion that the 1963 budget will show a deficit of about $10 billion or more.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place into the RECORD at this point a table listing the budget estimates since 1947, together with a comparison of the actual receipts and expenditures.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Comparative data on the Federal budget submitted and the final budget condition realized during the Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy administrations

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Estimated budget			Actual budget condition		
	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	Receipts	Expenditures	Surplus (+) or deficit (−)
Truman administration:						
1947	31,513	35,125	−3,612	39,677	38,923	+754
1948	37,730	37,528	+202	41,375	32,955	+8,419
1949	44,477	39,669	+4,808	37,663	39,474	−1,811
1950	40,985	41,856	−873	36,422	39,544	−3,122
1951	37,306	42,439	−5,133	47,480	43,970	+3,510
1952	55,138	71,594	−16,456	61,287	65,303	−4,017
1953 [1]	70,998	85,444	−14,446	64,671	74,120	−9,449
1954 [1]	68,665	78,587	−9,922	64,420	67,537	−3,117
Eisenhower administration:						
1955	62,642	65,570	−2,928	60,209	64,389	−4,180
1956	60,000	62,408	−2,408	67,850	66,224	+1,626
1957	66,300	65,865	+435	70,562	68,966	+1,596
1958	73,620	71,807	+1,813	68,550	71,369	−2,819
1959	74,400	73,934	+466	67,915	80,342	−12,427
1960	77,100	77,030	+70	77,763	76,539	+1,224
1961 [2]	84,000	79,816	+4,184	77,659	81,515	−3,856
1962 [2]	82,333	80,865	+1,468			
Kennedy administration: 1963	93,000	92,537	+463			

[1] The Federal budget for these fiscal years was submitted by President Truman, but the final condition realized was during President Eisenhower's administration.

[2] The Federal budget for these fiscal years was submitted by President Eisenhower, but the final condition realized was during the Kennedy administration.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Budget, "The Budget of the U.S. Government," annual volumes for the years 1947 through 1963; "The Federal Budget in Brief, Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1963," p. 63.

Mr. PILLION. This table will show that both receipts and expenditures vary as much as 10 percent each, producing a total swing imbalance of as much as 20 percent of the budget estimates as they are submitted to this Congress.

The 1963 budget, as in most budgets submitted by Presidents to Congress, overestimates revenues, and underestimates expenditures.

I recognize that the Budget Bureau performs a valuable service in reducing departmental requests.

However, I do want to emphasize that these budgets are unreliable. They are not fiscal budgets. They are budgets intended to attain political and sociological objectives.

It is a serious mistake for this Congress to rely upon the President's budget if it intends to fulfill its constitutional obligations.

The 1946 Reorganization Act directs the House to submit its own yearly fiscal budget. This provision has not been complied with.

I urge this House to give its immediate attention to formulate and enact a more accurate, fiscally sound method for estimating revenues and making appropriations.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, recently I conducted a poll or questionnaire survey of my district. I received some 6,700 replies up to now.

I should like to point out that the people are really concerned, because several hundred, oh, yes, thousands, of the people returning these questionnaires made additional comments about the excess spending of this administration and the Federal Government at this time without regard to income, which of course they point out, means higher deficits and a less value of the dollar.

In line with the gentleman's discussion, it is important to point out that for the first time in the history of our Federal Government we are spending over $100 billion in a single year. That is, in the fiscal year 1962, the year we are in right now. The total will be about $111 billion. Not even in World War II did we go over $100 billion spending totals, including, of course, trust funds. The total spending is $12 billion higher than last year and $17 billion higher than the last full year of the Eisenhower administration.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] is a member of the Appropriations Committee. He will recall that the fiscal 1963 budget estimates are about $92½ billion, with a phantom surplus of about $500 million. That is an estimate. Everyone knows this so-called surplus is a figment of fertile imagination. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue estimated just last week that there will be a $4 to $5 billion deficit. I would venture to predict it will be much, much higher than that.

For the first time in history Federal taxes are expected to take more than $100 billion from the American people, estimated at about $102½ billion. This, my good friends, is 25 percent of our total national income and it has gone to a point far beyond anything that is reasonable for the economic well-being of our Nation.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman for his most valuable comment.

In connection with his comment that he receives many communications of concern from his constituents, they should be concerned. When a nation reaches a point where it pays 36 percent of its income for the operation of Government, it has reached a dangerous and a saturation point.

I certainly agree with everything the gentleman has said.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from New York I wish it were possible for me to make the customary statement that I associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. PILLION. Perhaps the gentleman should wait until I have finished the whole of my statement.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. May I say that while we think differently, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from New York for the dignity of his presentation and to recall to this House that much as some of us may disagree with him, he did not hesitate to express these views when an administration of his own party was in the White House.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman. He has always been most kind.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. Surely.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure and the privilege of serving with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works. I know the intense scrutiny which the gentleman from New York undertakes of every proposal put before our subcommittee, and I admire the detailed way in which he extends his questioning.

Now, the gentleman stresses the need for a realistic budget, one we can depend upon. May I say that as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, we were informed by the administration that the gross income of the farmers of the Nation was up this last year $1.5 billion. In my subcommittee recently I questioned Dr. Cochrane, the adviser to Secretary Freeman. I asked him:

> Dr. Cochrane, does this increase of $1.5 billion include the payments made by the Government to farmers for not producing feed grains and such?

I quote his answer directly:

> The increase of $1.5 billion in terms of estimating the increase in farmers' incomes in the gross receipts of farmers was attributable about one-half to increased marketings and about one-half to payments under the feed grain program.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, we in this country are suffering from a chronic deficit, not only in our national budget, but also in our international budget. Our balance of payments continue to show an abnormal and dangerous increase in foreign demands for gold and dollars upon us.

The dollar is the prime currency of the free world. Its stability and convertibility is counted upon to support the world's trade and financial structure.

Its integrity must be maintained at all costs. If we are forced into a devaluation of our dollar, the economic, political, and military consequences would be most disastrous.

Yet, that is exactly what we are doing. We are engaged in a half-dozen plans and schemes to ward off a run upon our gold.

Our latest gold holdings as of today amount to $16.6 billion. Of this, $11.8 billion is reserved by law as a 25-percent backing for our Federal currencies and deposits. This leaves only $5 billion in gold available to redeem U.S. dollars and other short-term credits held by foreign interests.

The total foreign dollars and gold-redeemable holdings is $22.5 billion. If called upon to meet our obligations, we would have no choice except to default, or devalue our dollar.

We are resorting to borrowing foreign currencies, to asking other nations to lower interest rates, to insuring American exporters against losses, to asking other nations to support our currency through the International Monetary Fund.

None of these deal with, or will cure, the basic deficit. We simply refuse to take the necessary action to stop spending more abroad than we earn from abroad.

CURRENCY EROSION

The danger signals of an eroding currency are persistent and clear.

The United States has suspended the sale of silver. At the President's request, legislation is pending in the Senate to demonetize silver.

The $1 and $2 U.S. silver certificates will be replaced with Federal Reserve notes. They will no longer be redeemable in silver.

The President has asked for a repeal of the law that requires an $11.8 billion gold reserve for our currency.

I am reminded of a descriptive phrase prevalent many years ago: "There is something rotten in Denmark."

I would apply that to our condition by restating it in this way: "There is something fiscally rotten in the United States."

Mr. Speaker, although the fiscal picture is most disturbing, the Presidential proposals to Congress pose a much deeper and greater danger.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Is the gentleman saying that there has been something wrong with our fiscal policy in the last year or so, or does this go back into the 8 years of the Eisenhower deficit, or just how far does it go?

Mr. PILLION. I do not lay this on any one administration. It has been continuing and just keeps on getting worse. The pace at which our fiscal policy is deteriorating is getting greater. I do not say that it has existed only for the past 6 months or the past year.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. Surely, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it has been estimated that if the President's program—all that he has recommended— were to be enacted this year, it would increase spending, foreign and domestic, by $2,538 million in 1963, and by 1965 it would raise this spending by $9,076 million.

Mr. PILLION. Spending is just out of control, and let us face it. There is no control over it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. Surely.

That is the point, and that is what frightens people who have some knowledge of fiscal affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Is it not true that the recent tax bill which we put through will lead to another $1 billion shortage in revenue?

Mr. PILLION. At least. It is a giveaway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the economic report that was sent to Congress last January 20. This is a most amazing and terrifying document.

It purports to be a series of proposals to combat recession. As one analyzes his report and recommendations, one finds that it is much more than that.

We can readily see that we are not dealing with a theoretical discussion between the Harvard School and the Austrian School of Economics. The President's legislative requests are not merely a series of innocent steps to relieve unemployment.

This report, and his request for power, raises fundamental issues of the usurpation of legislative power by the Executive. They raise the issue of whether this country shall continue its free and private economy, or whether it shall proceed into a bureaucratic socialist planned economy.

It poses the question of whether we shall continue under a constitution that provides for the separation of legislative and Executive powers and responsibilities, or whether dictatorial powers shall be centered in the executive branch of our Government.

Permit me to cite and comment upon the powers the President asks for in his Economic Report:

I have already referred to his request to demonetize silver, and to substitute Federal Reserve notes for all $1 and $2 bills that are now redeemable in silver. This action would further weaken confidence in our dollar. It is evidence of an internal devaluation of our dollar. It would make about $2.2 billion of our silver available for international deficits, as a secondary currency, and thus allow the administration to further postpone the day of reckoning in our international payments.

The President's request to repeal the 25 percent backing of our money and Federal Reserve notes is another admission of fiscal failure. It is further notice to the world that our dollar is rapidly eroding in value.

But far more importantly, the repeal of the 25 percent backing of gold would eliminate any and all restrictions upon the Federal Reserve in the extension of credit and the creation of money. It is a signal of high speed on the Government's money printing presses.

The President seeks power to appoint all the Governors and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve. This means that the Federal Reserve Board would lose its semi-independent status. It would give complete political control to the President. It seeks to completely dominate the Federal Reserve System, and make it subject to the Executive in its most important functions of regulating the money and credit supply of our economy.

The President seeks to eliminate all ceilings upon public debt. This is a challenge to Congress. This plan seeks to avoid any congressional restrictions or limitations upon the Executive power to spend.

The President's request for a repeal of limitations upon Treasury bond interest rates is another step toward a complete centralization of economic and fiscal power in the Executive, and a delimitation of congressional powers and responsibilities.

The President asks for standby authority to reduce income tax rates by 5 percentage points. This power would allow him to reduce taxes by about $10 billion a year. Although he does not specifically ask for it, the power to reduce taxes must necessarily include the power to increase taxes.

Although it proposes to exercise that power for antirecession aims, it remains a brazen, naked, request for total Executive power. It violates the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. It is an insult to the intelligence of this Congress.

It proposes that this House and this Congress, in effect, abdicate the powers entrusted to it by that greatest of all political documents, the U.S. Constitution.

Let us not forget that tyranny is always achieved by promises of utopia on earth and a little bit of heaven above.

I have today introduced a bill which is offered as a substitute for the President's request for standby authority to reduce taxes by 5 percentage points.

This bill would increase personal income tax exemptions for taxpayers and all dependents by $200. It would more quickly and more effectively pump purchasing power into the economy. It has the added advantage of being constitutional.

This bill would give relief, mainly, to the low-income and middle-income groups, from the saturation point we have reached in our taxation. It is not a windfall to the $50,000 and up income groups.

The President claims he wants standby authority to act in an emergency. I would like to answer for myself. I am ready to come to Washington on 12 hours' notice to deal with any antirecession emergency matter. I am certain that every other Congressman would also give first priority to his congressional responsibilities.

I would like to refer to another request by the President for standby power.

The President is requesting power to spend $2 billion in public works programs.

This delegation of power would violate the constitutional provisions for annual appropriations by Congress. It seeks to open the door, to set a precedent for executive spending without congressional authority and appropriation.

Gentlemen, if this Congress delegates its supreme powers of taxation and appropriation to any President, no matter how benevolent or well-intentioned he may be, then it will have terminated its usefulness as a Congress. We will have betrayed ourselves and the citizenry of this Nation.

It is clear to me that the President's proposals embody a grand design on the part of his economic advisers. They have adopted and adapted the economic theories of Lord Keynes. More dangerous than that, they are transferring his theories into political reality. They propose to spend themselves into inflation, and to spend themselves out of depressions. They intend to spend and send their political patrons to political victories.

Their motto is: "To spend, borrow, inflate, promise, and elect."

Mr. Speaker, this country has reached the Rubicon. It is for this House to decide whether or not we should plunge this Nation into that river, toward the never-never land of economic chaos, socialistic planning, compulsive labor, governmental property ownership, and a totalitarian political structure.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman has mentioned the Economic Report of the President together with the annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers. There is some history about that which I think is worthy of noting at this time.

The Council of Economic Advisers which functions today includes members, including the Chairman, who were at one time, at the end of World War II, the counsel and advisers sent by the United States to the West German Government to give advice on how that Government could recover from its economic depression and overcome the devastation of war.

Among other things advised at that time was that a little inflation was necessary. This was something that was hard for the Finance Minister to follow because he had seen the wheelbarrows full of inflated money that were necessary to buy even a very small supply of groceries when the German Government had a terrible inflation.

They reported also to the German Government that the Government must dominate in many economic areas; as a matter of fact, they delineated very carefully those areas of enterprise in which the Government must dominate the economy.

The historic fact which is interesting to note is this: The West German Government turned down the advice of these people sent by the United States to tell them how to build an economy and by turning down the advice and following their own intelligence established one of the most prosperous economies the world has seen since the end of World War II.

The other side of this coin, the unfortunate side, is that these people now, even though their economic theories have been completely discredited, are the same people who now give economic advice to the United States.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman. If Dr. Erhardt had followed their advice instead of turning it down, West Germany probably would have been a second East Germany so far as its economy is concerned because most of them believe in the same socialist economy that exists in the Soviet—the grand design and the planned economy and the planned life for everyone. There is no question but that West Germany is enjoying its present great rate of growth and its prosperity because it did turn down the economic advice by the gentlemen who are today advising this Government and have been in our Government for a number of years.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOOLEY].

Mr. DOOLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to compliment and commend him on his very meticulous and trenchant speech. I think it shows very clearly our fiscal responsibility or irresponsibility.

Recently the President, through his intermediaries, asked for $2 billion in standby funds for public works, to be spent in areas of the country that have heavy unemployment and are threatened with an economic recession. These funds would come from unobligated moneys already authorized and appropriated for specific purposes.

While I am one who believes our President should have some authority and flexibility in alleviating the economic sore spots, I think $2 billion is entirely too much to be placed in the Chief Executive's hands for these purposes.

Currently it is obvious that the persistence of unemployment indicates our economy is not operating as satisfactorily as it might, and there is need for honest consideration of just why this situation exists and what corrective measures would be most feasible to improve it.

Most of the witnesses who appear before our Committee on Public Works have stated glibly that the nostrum or cure-all for unemployment and for economic recession is the expenditure of more Federal funds.

The gentleman from New York does not believe that legislation to provide for an expansion of expenditures for public works at this time, whether on a standby or immediate basis, is desirable or effective as a means of expanding employment, but rather that such action might have a longrun adverse effect on employment.

Our Federal expenditures have jumped from an average of $73.4 billion in 1942–46, which were war years, to $92.5 billion for fiscal 1963—source, Economic Report of the President.

These figures do not include nonbudgeted expenditures which are also increasing rapidly.

An increase in Federal budget spending of $16.4 billion a year between 1956–60 and 1962 has not reduced the number of unemployed persons. Apparently there is no reason whatever to suppose that a further increase in Federal spending will make any more impression on unemployment.

In the year 1960 total tax revenues of Federal, State, and local governments were 28.6 percent of net national product—the highest percentage in history. The percentage has been increasing steadily since World War II.

Nobody in his right mind questions or challenges essential expenditures for national defense, but expenditures for nondefense purposes are growing constantly and ever more rapidly. The 24.5 percent increase in Federal expenditures since the postwar years 1947–50 represents substantial increases in Federal responsibility for almost every public purpose.

If there are to be high defense expenditures—and certainly in these trying days there must be—these expenditures should be at least partially offset by reduced spending for less essential purposes.

The unrestrained tendency toward Federal spending for virtually everything must be controlled if the strength of our economy is not to be devitalized by excessive taxation. Governmental spending which necessitates taxation at levels which choke normal economic growth, stifle incentives, and restrict capital that might be invested in tools of production, will undermine our economic system.

Looking back over the years, it is apparent that we have lost our ability to balance tax revenues and expenditures. In the last 31 years there have been only 6 in which the Federal budget has been in the black. Constant deficit spending has resulted in a steady increase in the general price level. Brief periods of price stability do not in any way conceal what has taken place.

For no less than 78 consecutive months since 1955 the Consumer Price Index has moved upward over the same months in the preceding year, and with all this the value of our dollar has been declining for a sustained period of 78 months.

Tragically, there are no signs to indicate that this trend will come to an early end.

Along with this budgetary imbalance and the distortions and inequities of inflation, it is urgent that we recognize the drastic consequences of inflation on economic growth and job creation.

With inflation, the annual available capital, whether it is derived from profits or depreciation reserves, cannot buy the same facilities or finance the same number of jobs.

Mr. Matt Triggs, assistant legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation, pointed out recently that if a million-dollar asset is depreciated over a 10-year period, but due to inflation it costs $1.5 million to replace it, what really happens is that the owner pays taxes on a bookkeeping but fictional profit of $500,000. Thus, inflation destroys a part of the real worth of the invested capital and the capital recovered by depreciation reserves is not adequate to finance the same number of jobs and productive capacity.

One factor is sometimes regrettably overlooked, and that is that no portion of our population has a greater stake in a stable dollar than the unemployed.

The concern of many people with respect to the effect of inflation sometimes drives them to divert their capital into wasteful purposes. For instance, some of the steady increase in farmland prices over the past 15 years, unwarranted in terms of earnings, was caused by the purchase of farmland as a refuge from inflation.

During the 1960's the annual net increase in the Nation's work force will average about 1.35 million workers. Nearly as many workers will be replaced by automation and other technological changes. We cannot thus conceivably afford the adverse effect of inflation on investments which are needed for more job creation.

Sound economic growth depends on a number of factors, the natural resources of an area, its climate, the energy and morality of its people, education, economic organization, the political system, in fact the whole ball of wax, to put it in the vernacular.

Where investment is a small percentage of gross national product, unemployment is widespread and economic growth is sluggish. When investments are high in relation to the gross national product, unemployment evanesces and the rate of economic growth is high. The country that plows back the largest percentage of income into its economic system is the country with the fastest growing economy and full employment.

Germany and Japan may be cited as good illustrations of the relationship between investment and growth. Japan has an average annual increase in gross national product of 8.5 percent, based on constant prices between 1950 and 1960. Its average ratio of total fixed investment to gross national product in those same years was 23.1 percent. In Germany the situation is approximately the same.

Contrast that with the U.S. annual average increase in gross national product of 3 percent in the same years, and its average ratio of total fixed investment to gross national product of 17.6 percent.

Source, "Capital Investment and Economic Progress in Leading Industrial Countries, 1950–60," by George Terborgh, Machinery and Allied Products Institute.

All of which means one thing, that the persistence of unemployment in the United States in recent years is not due to inadequate Government spending but rather to inadequate private investment.

It is the expectation of profit that moves people to invest their money and create job opportunities. Unless our people have a reasonable expectation of making a profit there will be no expansion of employment. Obviously the effective way to approach increased employment is to find ways and means to encourage growth in the private sector where the key elements of such ways and means are profit incentives and sound money.

The quest for more jobs is defeated by concentrating our attention on Government spending and Government activity. It is defeated because Federal spending and inflationary fiscal practices reduce the ability of the private sector to grow and, through growth, provide jobs.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I wish to comment in connection with the gentleman's statement with regard to the administration's request for standby power with respect to projects to ease unemployment that just the other day the administration requested through the Budget Bureau of our Subcommittee on Appropriations to expend hundreds of thousands of dollars merely in an investigation to determine the feasibility of what? Of constructing the largest hydroelectric dam in continental United States 100 miles northwest of Fairbanks, Alaska.

I asked the Army Engineers just where they would secure a market for that project after spending $1,300 million on such a dam.

I also informed them that as far as I was concerned they would not get the several hundred thousands of dollars for investigation. That is an example, perhaps, of what the administration without screening by the proper Appropriation Subcommittee might commit the taxpayers of America to.

Mr. DOOLEY. Maybe they need that money in the light of what has happened in connection with the road program.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] for his remarks and his very careful analysis, and a very effective one. He touched slightly upon the gold outflow. I would like to put in the RECORD some thoughts on that matter if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. PILLION. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the outflow of our gold reserve is a knotty and serious problem but the Kennedy administration, rather than easing the problem, has done just the reverse. The New Frontier is in effect aiding and abetting our gold outflow.

The President, apparently, is puzzled by the gold picture. He has recently said, in press conferences and other pronouncements, that foreign aid is not a factor in the dwindling of this Nation's gold. This, of course, is completely incorrect.

But, noting the inconsistency of the New Frontier, we find that on February 5, 1961, when the President proposed several programs to "halt the gold outflow," one was the "restraint of the foreign aid program."

But the recent opinion of the New Frontiersmen, including Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, is that foreign aid is not a factor because "we are spending practically all of the dollars in the United States."

Mr. Speaker, these claims are not in accordance with economic facts. Regardless of where the dollars are spent, the goods and services are shipped overseas without a corresponding return of dollars into our economy, thus creating and stimulating severely a balance-of-payments deficit. This deficit, reaching gigantic proportions, more than closes the so-called dollar gap and causes a definite demand on our gold supply.

Let us go back to that February 5, 1961, speech. The President said:

> The United States has a quota in International Monetary Fund of $4,100,000,000. This can be called upon if necessary, and our access to the funds resources must be regarded as part of our international reserves.

In other words, we can, he said—if we need—draw upon the gold presently on deposit in the International Monetary Fund. Mr. Speaker, there are a few mistakes here. First, we do not own that gold. Second, we could not get it if we did. And, third, the gold is not there in the fund. We are being fed soothing sirup about a tragic situation.

Now the administration is asking for authority to cut tariffs on imports in the hope that foreign countries will do likewise, and we can thus increase our exports. There is no guarantee that other countries will do the same, however. History has shown that other countries do not do this—or, if they do, they impose import limitations or other restrictive measures. Result? This operation can open up a new source of deficits in our already unfavorable balance of payments.

The President, at his press conference of March 29, 1962, urged enactment of the administration's tax revision bill. He itemized several reasons why the bill should be passed, but particularly stressed that the bill would restrain the outflow of gold.

This is faulty reasoning. The bill, as recommended to us, would have created an added deficit of approximately a billion dollars. Yet, President Kennedy said:

> We need this bill to help close off our loss of gold in our balance of payments.

That is astonishing. A budget unbalancing bill is exactly what we do not need. Since foreign claims on our gold supply presently far exceed our uncommitted balance, much depends upon the confidence of foreign and international bankers in our ability to maintain and preserve the value and stability of the dollar. Deficit spending shakes the confidence of these financial institutions.

We are being handed a line, in my opinion directly contrary to the facts, and the gold supply continues to diminish. The administration had a break in bolstering Britain's currency with dollars. We received some $450 million in gold for these dollars, temporarily seeming to slow down the outflow. But the balance of gold has fallen to $16,609,694.91 as of April 5 and the end is not in sight.

Deficit spending continues to be a drain on our gold supply and nothing the administration is doing is alleviating the flight of gold. The administration's first order should be to assume a posture of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include at this point in the RECORD an editorial by Maurice Stans from the Washington Post of January 22, 1962, headed "Gold Outflow, Not Berlin or Congo, Is Nation's Greatest Threat."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The editorial is as follows:

GOLD OUTFLOW, NOT BERLIN OR CONGO, IS NATION'S GREATEST THREAT

(By Maurice Stans)

The greatest threat to our Nation today is not Berlin. Nor is it Vietnam or the Congo or Laos. It is the precarious situation of our balance of international payments and with it the potential erosion of world confidence in the dollar. President Kennedy's state of the Union message, by its emphasis on foreign trade, made this evident.

The balance-of-payments problem is not a complex matter to understand, as many people seem to believe. It is in fact quite elementary. Americans and the American Government spend a lot of money overseas every year to import goods, travel, investments, maintain troops, and give aid. We have not been able to induce the other countries to spend all of those dollars back with us. Instead, they hold the unspent difference in bank accounts and in claims against us that will have to be settled some day with goods or gold.

In the 3 years 1958 to 1960 our oversea spending and investing exceeded the inflow of our dollars at the average rate of $3.7 billion a year. Right now the net debt we owe to other countries on short-term demand is $18 billion. To pay this we have a little less than $17 billion in gold, but we already have pledged $12 billion of that to back up our money in circulation here at home. We could not pay all our current foreign debts if they were all demanded at once.

Khrushchev's pronouncements have regularly claimed that our capitalist system would go down under its own weaknesses. The most grave and chronic risk we now face is that we will not be able to extricate ourselves from our present predicament, which is of our own making. But the causes are easier to see than the cure.

The Kennedy administration is exerting strong efforts to fight a winning battle, as did Eisenhower. In this, it deserves support. But the unfavorable conditions are cumulative, and only titanic and unceasing work will reverse the trend and save us from a major setback.

Eisenhower fully recognized the seriousness of the problem. Treasury Secretary Anderson repeatedly urged that the strong nations of Europe should be required to contribute a larger share to their own and the free world's military defense, so as to permit a reduction in our foreign aid and our oversea costs. This plea was dramatized by the trip Anderson and Dillon made to Germany late in 1960, but the effort had been going on long before that behind the scenes.

In 1959 Commerce Department Secretary Mueller initiated a major program to increase American exports and to encourage foreign travel in the United States, but he was frustrated by the unwillingness of the Congress to appropriate the funds needed. The Defense Department laid down rules to reduce the number of dependents going to military posts abroad. Treasury proposed reducing the duty-free exemption to returning tourists from $500 to $100 and made other proposals to stem the outflow of gold. Above all Eisenhower recognized that the security of our position depended on maintaining confidence in our money, and he fought hard to keep the budget in balance and to demonstrate good fiscal housekeeping to our oversea creditors.

These efforts temporarily stopped the flow of gold, but they did not halt the growth of the unfavorable balance.

Since last January 20 President Kennedy and Secretary Dillon have carried on and enlarged the campaigns to encourage exports overseas and foreign travel in the United States. The Congress enacted the reduction in duty-free customs allowance to returning tourists. A new insurance plan has been announced by the Export-Import Bank to reduce the risks of loss on foreign export credits. West Germany and several other countries came through with $650 million of advance payments that Secretary Anderson had urged them to make on their postwar assistance loans.

The first 6 months of 1961 went well. Exports were up; imports decreased as a result of our slight recession, and the advance debt payments to the Treasury were enough to show almost an equilibrium for the period. But it is now apparent that this was only temporary improvement. The fundamental causes of imbalance had not been removed, and the actions to date were inadequate. Reducing the duty exemptions was more psychological than real, for example, as it helps to the extent of only $100 million or so a year.

Also, not all the administration's actions in the first 6 months of 1961 were toward tightening. The Defense Department withdrew the limitations on oversea dependents almost immediately to placate the military. Kennedy's proposals to increase the dollars paid out on foreign programs were defeated in the Congress, but heavy future commitments are involved in the Peace Corps and the mushrooming Alliance for Progress in Latin America. Since June imports have increased to record peaks. The deficit in the balance of payments for the second half of 1961 was again at the rate of $3 billion a year, and for all of 1961 would have been close to $2.5 billion except for the nonrecurring German debt payment. There are no present reasons to expect that 1962 will be better. The claims against our gold will grow.

In all of 1961 we lost $800 million in gold, and our reserve is at the lowest point since 1939. The claims against it are at the highest in history.

Secretary Dillon's job is to see that our oversea creditors increase their spending of dollars here. If he fails in this, he must persuade them to leave their money here, not to demand payment in gold. Decisive measures and continuing actions are required and can be expected. Some of them will be outlined in a later article.

President Kennedy's place in history will suffer badly if his administration doesn't solve this crisis of chronic imbalance. To miss or to default is to invite ruinous inflation and subsequent devaluation and their humiliating consequences. Khrushchev's experts are surely watching the outcome with eager anticipation. Everything depends on finding the answer while there is yet confidence in the future of the dollar. In the meantime, under this pressure, we are certain to see the decline of the early 1961 gospels of economic growthmanship and unlimited Federal spending, and that is all to the good.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman for his most worthy contribution to this very difficult problem.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PILLION. Surely.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from California [Mr. Hiestand] has made a very serious analysis of the gold outflow. I wonder if he would be willing to tell me whether or not he would agree that the $6 a ton increase on steel, which has been announced by the steel companies, is going to have as devastating an effect on our gold flow and our gold situation as any of the other points the gentleman mentioned in his remarks.

Mr. HIESTAND. I do not think that would have any effect either way.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman is saying, then, that the increase in the cost of steel would have no effect on the gold position and the gold outflow of our country?

Mr. HIESTAND. Precisely.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think the gentleman is incorrect. Of course, he is entitled to his opinion.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. PILLION. Surely.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There has been a great deal of discussion here now about fiscal responsibility, about a balanced budget. I am sure that we all agree that we want a balanced budget.

Mr. PILLION. I am sure we do.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But I was wondering if either the gentleman from California or the gentleman in the well would comment on what is going to happen to the budget when this $6 a ton increase goes into effect and, as the President stated today, our military, our defense budget, is going to be increased by a billion dollars as a result of this increase in the cost of steel. Where is this additional money going to come from if not from the taxpayers?

Mr. PILLION. I do not know, but I would assume that the profits that some of the steel companies were making probably have not been sufficient, because of the inflationary attitude of our Government. To create new jobs for new employees, and a steel company or a butcher shop or a shoestore all must have a profit if they are going to expand and create new jobs. It just happens that it takes anywhere from $10,000 to $60,000 of capital investment obtained either from savings or from profit to create one job. I am sure the gentleman is interested in seeing that our young people and our unemployed are given work.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his answer.

Mr. PILLION. Where are these capital funds coming from except from profit? Now, I do not know whether the profit may be too much or too little, but profit is a necessary factor. It is not evil per se; in itself.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his answer. I wonder if he would yield for one more question.

Mr. PILLION. Surely.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it not a fact, though, that the steel companies, despite their profits, have been able to decrease the cost of manpower in unit cost of production and have actually laid off an estimated 100,000 workers?

Mr. PILLION. I do not know why you gentlemen are suddenly so politically worried about the steel companies' increase in prices, when you were just advocating here last week the $1 billion giveaway to the 100 large corporations, which represents complete subsidy. You just got through advocating and begging this House to pass that bill, that giveaway of $1 billion.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman will yield further, the bill we passed last week will make jobs. The price increase of steel is going to cause a loss of jobs.

Mr. PILLION. I am sorry, but I cannot yield any further.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. However, I think the new Republican slogan we are getting now is "What is good for United States Steel is good for America." Would the gentleman agree?

Mr. PILLION. It is the gentleman's statement.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. The dissertation of the gentleman from California here a minute ago touched upon the subject of lowering tariffs here in the United States and letting foreign imports in, in the hope, perhaps, according to the administration, that we would thereby receive reciprocal reductions in tariffs in the European Economic Community and thereby increase our exports, which I am sure everyone is in favor of. But just a week or so ago the President announced in very glowing terms the results of the recent meeting over in Geneva, and the accomplishments that were made. In that area he told how they had obtained a reduction of from 29 percent to 22 percent in tax on automobiles—tariff on automobiles—going into the European Economic Community. The facts of the case are quite the opposite. The facts are that 75 percent of the automobiles that were exported from the United States to the European Economic Community went to the Benelux countries and Germany, which had an 18 percent tariff. That tariff has now been raised to 22 percent.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pillion] be allowed to proceed.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. Let me state to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Westland] that, under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Westland].

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding so that I might finish this statement.

As I was saying, the facts of the case are that 75 percent of the automobiles that are exported by this country to the European economic community went to West Germany and the Benelux countries. Those countries had an 18 percent tariff on our automobiles. Now, that has been raised to 22 percent. Now, sure, some of these countries did decrease their tariff from 29 to 22 percent. But let us see what happened: The fact is that in Italy which had an even higher tariff than 22 percent—some 35 percent—they will now go to 22 percent. But, still, they have what is known as a road tax, or a registration fee, that is based on horsepower. Any automobile that has 16 horsepower or more—and that certainly includes any American car—has this other sort of tax levied on it of some $240. That would apply, for example, on a six-cylinder Chevrolet. Then they have an annual road tax of $379.20, if you happen to own a Galaxie over in Italy. But if you own a Fiat the tax is $14. Now, the President, as I said, on the other hand, has tried to persuade the entire country that he has obtained great tariff reliefs through the Geneva agreements. I am not just citing figures here that I have dreamed up myself. These are statements that were made before the Ways and Means Committee. They are substantiated by the National Automobile Dealers' Association, which could not be a more interested party in trying to export automobiles.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to say that some of these statements that come out of the State Department or the White House as to some of the great accomplishments that are made in getting foreign tariffs reduced so that we can export more, require a little more examination.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, without any condoning the United States Steel price increase, I am curious as to just how anyone establishes the figure of $1 billion as it applies to the increase in our annual national defense costs. Presumably we are going to spend $51.9 billion on all phases of national defense this year. Assuming that we did nothing more than buy $51 billion worth of raw steel, at an increase of 3.5 percent, without any really close figuring, this comes to about $1.78 billion. How then can we arrive at a figure of $1 billion on a projection of an annual increase in the cost of national defense on this basis? This is just some figure taken out of the air on the basis of what someone assumes is going to happen, some broad pattern affecting not alone one industry, but any number of industries.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would imagine that the figure that was prepared by Secretary of Defense McNamara was based on programs of our expenditures for this fiscal year, what is in the pipeline now and what we anticipate for the immediate future. Of course, the fact is that when steel goes up, it is like an octopus—it affects every single American and every single industry. I am inclined to think that the Secretary's estimate of $1 billion is actually low. I think it is going to run a little higher than that, in my judgment.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. I am inclined to think that this is a guess or an estimate that cannot be predicated upon any fact other than a pattern that somebody has devised in order to arrive at a round figure. If there is some further substantiation of this figure in fact I would like to know what it is.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to serve notice on the House that I shall yield to the gentleman from Ohio and then the gentleman from New York and then I should like to proceed with my own statement. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the gentleman who just preceded me is worried about this figure being predicated on guesses. If that is so, he is really in bad shape because I would say that about 99 percent of what I have heard this evening is not predicated on much else than guesses, estimates, educated guesses, uneducated guesses, and statements that purport to be fact but are only the opinion of the speaker.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, let me make just one observation that is not predicated on conjecture and is not without basis of fact. That is that today there are 45 million families in this country. We have a national debt, as we all know, approximating $300 billion which means that whatever figures you use, each family in this country today has as its share of the national debt $6,300. And if the families of this generation do not pay it, you can bet your bottom dollar that it will be the heritage of the families in the next generation.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] makes a big statement about the national debt; and I guess everybody knows what the national debt is. I think it would be interesting to point out that during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration there was not a single year without a deficit. The fact of the matter is that the debt kept growing and growing and growing and I did not hear any talkathon about that.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am more particularly worried about the fact that for something like 25 years of the last 31 years we have been running a deficit every year. I am not interested in censuring anyone in particular.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I was not speaking about the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], but rather the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

I concur with the gentleman that the thing has been going on, but I just want to make the record a little clearer that it has not been during only the 15 or 16 months of the Kennedy administration.

Mr. PILLION. It has been through other administrations, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, in regard to spending, first of all, we must realize that intervention by Government in the economy does not meet more needs. It merely transfers the spending from free enterprise to government bureaus. Never forget that government is not able to give anything free. What government gives you, it must first take from someone else. Someone once said, "The welfare state is that great fiction where everyone tries to live at the expense of everyone else."

How far do we go in our efforts to spend away problems? Here is an example. During the past 4 years we have sent over $426 million to Communist Poland in loans, products, and credits. This year the Polish Communists want us to send $180 million more. What do the Polish Reds do with this money? Well, so far they have given $13 million to Cuba and promised more. Indirectly we are financing the military buildup in Cuba that may someday be used against us.

MORE SPENDING

When President Eisenhower left office a year ago, he estimated a $1.5 billion surplus for the current year. Here is what has happened to that surplus according to Democratic Senator HARRY F. BYRD, as brought out in a statement inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 19, 1962:

> 1. On March 27, 1961, the Kennedy administration revised the estimate to call for a $2.1 billion deficit.
>
> 2. On May 28, 1961, the budget deficit was revised to read $3.6 billion.
>
> 3. On July 25, 1961, the deficit estimate was revised to a new total of $5.3 billion.
>
> 4. On October 29, 1961, the deficit estimate was revised to $6.9 billion.
>
> 5. On January 18, 1962, the President in his budget message again revised the deficit estimate this time to $7 billion.
>
> 6. The latest monthly Treasury Department statement showed an actual deficit of $9.4 billion through the first 7 months of the fiscal year.

No matter how you look at it, the end result of this irresponsible frenzy is bankruptcy. Justice Robert H. Jackson said:

> It is not the function of our Government to keep citizens from falling into error; it is the function of the citizen to keep the Government from falling into error.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, let me wrap up this controversy with respect to the steel price increase and state my own views before going on to the subject that I had elected to discuss tonight. I for one do not at this time know the facts regarding the steel price increase. I would not venture a guess as to whether it was justified or not justified. But it does seem to me that the discussion and the concern here on the floor of the House seems to express a lack of confidence by this Congress in the free enterprise system which is the basis of this Republic.

If the antitrust law has been violated I am confident the Department of Justice will investigate first and then prosecute. Certainly we are not about to say that private enterprise does not have the right to raise or lower its prices in a free economy. Certainly we are not about to say that the law of the consumer would not apply and that perhaps the company could price itself out of the market, and that the checks and balances of the private enterprise system will not apply in this case just as they apply to pricing practices in all industry. So I beg you, let us let our economy work its will. Let us not try to legislate pricing morality, because this is still a free enterprise system.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman will agree that private enterprise has the right to fix prices as it sees fit, and the gentleman will also agree that the American workingman has the same right to seek the highest remuneration for his efforts.

Mr. GUBSER. I certainly will agree to that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The record will show, then, that the Steelworkers of America conducted themselves in a most responsible manner when they passed up any wage increase in the last negotiations in the hope that through this action they would create a period of wage stability that would help the economy. Is that right?

Mr. GUBSER. I know nothing of the facts regarding the Steelworkers' contract, but I venture to guess that there was not a clause in that contract under which the steel companies agreed not to raise prices.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. GUBSER. I understand the gentleman is a lawyer, and a good one. He will then agree that the face of the contract is what rules in this situation.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. While we seem to be on this steel business, I think I have seen on the ticker tape that this $6 a ton raise was supposed to cost the Defense Department an additional $600 million. I believe I have heard from the other side the figure of a billion dollars mentioned. This is a $6-a-ton raise. Now, just plain, simple mathematics would indicate that if it is going to cost $600 million for the Defense Department, and there is a $6 increase, the Defense Department would have to buy 100 million tons of steel. I think we have to agree to that.

Now the total production of the steel industry in the United States is somewhere in the neighborhood of 120 million tons, and I do not believe that the Defense Department is buying 99 percent of the steel production of the United States. I think that $600 million is as phony as a $3 bill.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks will require about 20 minutes, and I respectfully request the indulgence of the House in that I not yield during that time, but I will be pleased to yield to anyone at the conclusion of my prepared remarks.

Mr. Speaker, national defense, along with foreign policy, should be the least political of subjects. It would, therefore, seem that the national defense has no place in today's discussion.

But, in a two-party system the responsibility of a minority party is to intelligently and constructively criticize. And, this obligation must, if the best interests of humanity are to be served, be extended to every vital issue of the day. Certainly, nothing is more important to human survival than a strong national defense.

I take the floor today, not as a Republican criticizing the Democratic administration for the sake of criticizing, but as an American who is concerned about the "convulsions of our national defense policy."

As an American, I would like to see a policy of consistency rather than one which runs in fits, gasps and spurts of activity interspersed with delays, cutbacks, and hesitancy.

During the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, we saw an efficient, steady, and consistent buildup of our national defense. There were few spectacular steps which Press Secretary Jim Hagerty could dramatize on the front pages of the newspapers of the Nation, but the end result was a steady and marked improvement in our defense posture.

When President Eisenhower came to office in 1953, he could look back upon our recent military history with the experienced eye of a great military leader of World War II, which must have blinked hard following V–J Day as it witnessed the virtual dismantling of the greatest Army, Navy, and Air Force ever assembled. After World War II, in place of a large Military Establishment, the national policy for peace was anchored in the United Nations, in a system of economic and military alliances, and in the exclusive ownership of the atomic bomb. National defense spending went from its high of $81 billion in 1945 to a low of $11 billion in 1948 and an average of only slightly over $12 billion for fiscal years 1947 through 1950.

Then came Korea with an Army that was at minimum strength, a Navy that was largely decommissioned, and an Air Force that had been reduced to 48 wings. The United States was ill-prepared to face a tactical war situation created by the Soviet trained and Soviet-equipped soldiers of Communist China.

Our policy, necessarily, did an abrupt aboutface so that when Eisenhower came to office in 1953, our Air Force totaled 143 wings, we had a Navy of 508 combatant ships and a ground force consisting of 21 Army divisions and 3 Marine divisions. Defense budgets immediately climbed upward to $50.3 billion in 1953.

In surveying the defense policies of previous administrations, Eisenhower determined to substitute consistency and planning for preparedness in place of our practice of preparing in fits, gasps and spurts. The eras of feast and famine in defense spending were to stop.

President Eisenhower proposed a new doctrine which would keep defense expenditures and military forces at a high level over an extended period of time. By this method, the President, reasoned, the United States could fulfill its basic security objective of preventing Communist aggression while making progress toward fiscal stability.

President Eisenhower succeeded and built a steadily improving national defense through consistency in planning. Defense budgets rose to an average of about two-thirds of total budget expenditures and have remained there ever since.

During this period of steady and uninterrupted progress, we saw a major shift in emphasis as we entered the missile age. From the meager spending of $21 million in 1951 for missiles, we saw procurement spending spiral to more than $3.4 billion in 1961 for these newest in weapons.

In the years following World War II, the missile weapon concept struggled to keep alive, let alone move ahead. The first U.S. effort for an ICBM missile was the Convair project MX–774, a predecessor of the Atlas. President Truman cancelled the program when an economy binge swept the Nation. For the next 4 years, Convair carried on a reduced missile program, using its own funds plus small intermittent appropriations from the Air Force. It was not until 1951 that the missile program received new impetus when the Air Force awarded a second study contract known as MX–1539. And it was not until 1953 that the Air Force established a strategic missile program to accept the fact that the missile age had arrived after 5 long years of ignoring it.

Thus, under Republican stewardship, the United States got into the missile business and gained today's superiority over Russia. Under Eisenhower we overcame Russia's 6-year lead and took the lead in military missiles for ourselves. All of this was done, not through crash programs, not through press agentry and ruffles and flourishes, but through solid, substantial, businesslike techniques, and a consistent defense policy.

But this record of accomplishment was not acknowledged in the campaign of 1960. Senator Kennedy was quite sure that we were "second in missiles" during his campaign. He spoke positively and without equivocation as early as January 23, 1960, when he said "while America becomes second in space—second in missiles."

Speaking before the VFW convention candidate Kennedy said on August 26, 1960, "the missile gap looms larger and larger ahead."

On September 14, 1960, the candidate made certain recommendations "which," he said, "will eventually close the missile gap."

On various occasions, I personally heard Mr. Kennedy state that we were behind the Russians in missiles.

One columnist wrote an article on November 1, 1961, which stated that during the campaign Senator Kennedy said that by 1961 the Russians would have 500 to 1,000 ICBM's. Nineteen hundred and sixty-one is past and what is the count? Assistant Secretary of Defense Gilpatric said, in a speech given in late October 1961 that the Russians have only 50 to 70 ICBM's.

As early as the first week in February when the new administration was barely 3 weeks of age Secretary of Defense McNamara conducted a background briefing for the top military reporters in Washington. They unanimously reported him as admitting there was no missile gap. But Press Secretary Pierre Salinger issued a statement which carried Presidential approval. Salinger said in effect that the reporters had misinterpreted the briefing.

In an article written in February for the March issue of the Air Force Space Digest, the editor said:

> By the time this is read, the furor over the missile gap, so called, may be off the front pages and back with the goiter ads. That is probably where it belongs.

On January 23, 3 days after the inauguration, a national magazine quoted the Air Force Missile Chief, Lieutenant General Schriever as saying we were definitely ahead of the Russians.

Everyone knows the missile gap was not closed in 3 days. The present administration knew then and now admits that it did not exist in the first place. This in my opinion raises valid questions which should be answered in the future interest of this Nation: "Why did Candidate Kennedy insist that there was a missile gap? Did he have the facts?"

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee I sat in briefings which showed CIA, Air Force, Army, and composite intelligence estimates of each Russian capability. From those briefings I was convinced that a missile gap did not exist.

That same information was available to the Armed Services Committee of the other body of which Senator Kennedy was a Member. He was privileged to have it as I was. But 1960 was a busy year for Senator Kennedy. He may not have found time to attend his committee hearings.

It was still his responsibility to know the facts, which he could have easily obtained from one of his colleagues, before he spoke so positively to the Nation with the authenticity and the expertise that goes with the prestige of presidential candidacy.

But other information sources were available to Candidate Kennedy. President Eisenhower voluntarily directed Allen Dulles, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, to fully brief Senator Kennedy so that he would be on an equal footing with his opponent. Mr.

Kennedy had the information which conclusively showed that there was no missile gap and there can be no question that he had it.

White House sources have said, according to the press, that President Kennedy is now "standing on known facts while Mr. Eisenhower was standing on faith." What kind of facts was Mr. Kennedy standing on in the campaign of 1960? The known facts prove Mr. Eisenhower was right in 1960 and Mr. Kennedy was wrong.

It is regrettable that the man who made such an issue of our international prestige did much to damage it by inaccurately playing down our power. Even our allies became concerned and it is reported that most of our ambassadors in Europe were anxiously queried as to why Mr. Kennedy was striking down the world's image of America's peace preserving power vis-a-vis the Soviet aggressor.

But, if our allies were frightened by the irresponsible campaign talk of 1960, they have had additional reason to doubt the consistency of American defense policy after the Kennedy administration came to office.

Anyone knows that the finest gun in the world loaded with the most penetrating ammunition can never achieve its purpose until the trigger is pulled. And anyone knows that a human being must pull that trigger—a human being with the will to do so when it is necessary.

The most elaborate and the most powerful missile system is useless without the firing button and the human "will" to press it. Reluctance to use a weapon is understandably human and is shared by all decent people. But, if the masters of the Kremlin could be deluded into believing that the will to press the button does not exist, we are as effectively disarmed insofar as deterrent capability is concerned as if we were to equip our armies with bows and arrows. This is the danger in today's nuclear age—the danger that a potential enemy will miscalculate the intentions and the will of those who hold the power to unleash our strategic power.

Thus, human will is even more important than the budget figures this administration can show the Nation. It matters not that we estimate national defense expenditures in the neighborhood of $52 billion for each of fiscal years 1962 and 1963. The weapons this money will buy will not perform their function of preventing war if the Kremlin is falsely led into believing that our leaders do not have the will to use them.

The performance of the administration since its inauguration day certainly does not convey a sense of security to the world and a reassurance that the will of our leadership is a constant thing.

Thanks to the Eisenhower administration, we have a policy of consistency insofar as armed strength is concerned. The big thing missing today is a consistency of national will in our leaders and its recognition by the Kremlin.

Shortly after the Kennedy administration took office, it became obvious that certain members of its inner circle believed that they had the great intellectual ability required to outnegotiate the Communist bloc and thus end the cold war. Men like Rostow, Bowles, Stevenson, Galbraith, Sorenson, and others, reasoned that certain irritants to the Soviets must be removed to create the proper climate for negotiation. They sent up trial balloons, hinting that Red China's admission to the U.N. was inevitable. They lifted the ban on Communist propaganda in the U.S. mails. They released Red espionage agents and did not object to trade with Communist countries in strategic materials. Our military men were restrained from using terms like "the insidious ideology of world communism" lest the climate for negotiation be spoiled. Owen Lattimore traveled to Outer Mongolia.

The national will which we displayed to the world was a far cry from the words of Candidate Kennedy who bemoaned the fact that our Nation was "second in missiles." Little did we think that we would also appear as "second in national will."

Upon inauguration, defense policy as expressed by our leaders reflected a deemphasis of the nuclear deterrent policy which irritates the Soviets. The Polaris program was temporarily stopped short at 29 submarines, when the administration vigorously opposed my amendment to continue constructing this deterrent weapon at the rate of one per month. A vigorous stand in Laos never got beyond strong rhetoric, and it was the White House inner circle which apparently decided against the use of air support at Cuba's Bay of Pigs in a vain attempt to disassociate this Nation from military action against communism. The inner circle did not oppose the U.N. Congo policy which favored Russia at the expense of President Tshombe, friend of the West.

The most startling of the long list of alleged accommodations designed to produce a favorable climate for negotiation by the New Frontier braintrust was revealed in an article of March 30, 1961, by Washington correspondent Thomas B. Ross in the Chicago Sun-Times. Ross reported that the curtailment of the B-70 program had been called for by Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily V. Kuznetsov in a Moscow meeting following the election in November 1960, with Dr. Walt Rostow, now Chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Council. Ross said his information came from a source high in the administration and has not since been challenged by the New Frontier.

Both the Chicago Sun-Times and the Indianapolis News said that Kuznetsov objected to the ring of American air and missile bases built around the Soviet periphery during the Eisenhower administration, terming them "provocative" and stating that since they could be destroyed by Russian rockets, they actually were launching sites for "first strike" weapons. As a result of the conference, Rostow sent a "confidential" memorandum to President-elect Kennedy, advising abandonment "at whatever expense necessary" of our "first strike" capabilities and the development, instead, of a "second strike" force.

The Russians, Rostow is said to have written Mr. Kennedy, would "respect" us so long as our military policies do not tend to increase our "first strike" ability.

President Kennedy's 1961 defense message, the Indianapolis News said, "reverberated" with Rostow's advice and particularly stressed that this Nation was "not creating forces for a first strike against any other nation." President Kennedy also implied that our policy of not striking the first blow would be helpful in leading to eventual world disarmament.

Although he made no mention of the Moscow meeting or of any influence it may have had on White House policies, another newsman, Ray Cromley of Newspaper Enterprise Association, described in an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News on April 3, what he called the State Department-White House reluctance to make the Soviets "jittery" by developing "first strike" weapons.

Reasoning behind the policy, Cromley wrote, is that "some State Department and Defense officials say that a heavy U.S. dependence on first strike weapons systems could make the Russians think the United States intends a preventive war. Such weapons tend 'to keep everyone jittery,' according to one Pentagon official." The policy cut back oversea bases as well as the B-70 and the Atlas missile programs, Cromley wrote.

It is interesting to note that no major speeches early in the administration mentioned our powerful nuclear weapons. Every possible means of playing them down was utilized. The United States, it seems, was leaning over backward not to rattle its missiles while the braintrust accommodated Khrushchev in the hope that he could be cornered in a negotiation room.

With such an attitude, is it any wonder that Khrushchev determined that our leaders lack the will to back up their moral standards? Is it any wonder that international communism egged on the Communists in southeast Asia, the pro-Lumumba forces in the Congo, the Castro Communists in Cuba, and then finally brought the Berlin crisis to a head? Our record of strong talk with no action to back it up finally had to come to an end with the crisis in Berlin. It is not unreasonable to say that this miscalculation by Mr. Khrushchev could have started with the irresponsible campaign talk of 1960 that listed us as second in missiles.

Desperate action was required and the peace-at-any-price advocates in the State Department were forced to temporarily take seats in the second row. In the dramatic ruffles and flourishes so common to the Kennedy administration, reserves were called up from their private lives in what appears to those close to the situation as one of the greatest military "snafus" of the century. But it was necessary to strengthen the Presidential image and prove that our youthful President had the will and the vigor to back up his strong talk.

Secretary Gilpatric was unloosed to make a speech in late October in which, for the first time, an administration official pointed with pride to American strength. It must have brought shudders to Bowles, Sorensen, and Rostow when Gilpatric brazenly told the world that American nuclear weapons numbered in the "tens of thousands."

It was then that the administration swallowed its pride and decided to continue building Polaris submarines beyond boat No. 29. But even with this decision, the administration forecast of the eventual limit on our Polaris fleet is unrealistic. Even with our decision to build up our defenses and talk about them, the Army modernization program is this moment being cut to smithereens and the Army will operate with "substitute assets," as Secretary McNamara calls them, instead of the new modern weapons which everyone agrees they should have. As one editorial stated in one of the military magazines:

> One wonders how long the Army will be prepared to fight with a substantial proportion of substitute assets—in reality, the same old material they now have. Will such euphemisms fool the enemy? We think not.

It took Khrushchev's testing of nuclear deivces in the atmosphere to force this administration to heed the unanimous advice of its military experts that military security required continued testing. But even now, Rostow and Co. are moving back into the first row as we make one last foolhardy attempt to ignore reality.

So, in spite of the number of dollars spent, defense planning again goes in fits, gasps, and spurts. It is subject to the mental convulsions of whoever happens to hold the limelight of Presidential favor at the moment.

There is always the question of whose finger is on the button which could start world war III. Is it the vigorous speaking President Kennedy? Or, will it be the President Kennedy advised by Rostow and Sorensen? Naturally, Americans are curious but what is much more significant is which President Kennedy do the Russians think holds his finger over the button?

Political considerations created an artificial missile gap in 1960. Political considerations caused Candidate Kennedy to speak glowingly of the B-52 near the Boeing plant in Seattle, to draw applause with his ringing commendation of the B-58 at the Convair plant in Fort Worth, Tex., and to emphatically condemn the Eisenhower cutback of the B-70 program in San Diego.

Could it be that the employees who worked on the assembly lines of these three aircraft could have anticipated longer job tenure with the election of a President who favored the kind of airplane they happened to build? If so, how disappointed they must be today with the B-52 and B-58 production lines going out of existence and the B-70 probably destined for the same fate.

In light of such past tactics, how can we be sure that political conditions are not behind today's decisions? I, for one, fear that a sustained and consistent policy has been sacrificed to political considerations. If politics will make military decisions, I worry over whose politics it may be at the moment. If it is McNamara's business ability, perhaps I can be assured; but, if it is Rostow once again creating a favorable climate for negotiation, I am fearful.

Personally, I would gladly trade the dramatic ruffles and flourishes and the press agentry of the New Frontier with all its dollar tossing convulsions for the slower, steadier and more secure military buildup of the Eisenhower administration. Dollars and glamour will never be an acceptable substitute for consistency of national will.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment my astute, searching, and provocative colleague of California and senior of the Armed Services Committee. As a member thereof, within the past 24 hours I heard one of our top military leaders express the opinion that the country which first achieves an effective antimissile missile defense will hold the balance of military power. This being true we enter an era when the best defense is no longer a good offense. We know absolutely and without question that the Soviet Union is vigorously pursuing the development of such a defense and has made tangible progress. The nuclear bomb tests of last October had this capability as one of its prime objectives. The very height of some of the nuclear explosions tends to verify that they—the U.S.S.R.—have made considerable progress, even against reentry vehicles. In the face of this information—in the knowledge that the minimum leadtime for putting such a defense in the hands of our troops is 4 years—how can we neglect to act swiftly and decisively to procure the only, the only, anti-missile-missile defense which has reached the stage of attainability? Seldom in history has a weapon been perfected before it was placed "on the line." The Nike-Zeus has been put through a series of tests and for the most part has met the requirements of those tests. Would anyone in these Chambers gamble with our national survival by suggesting that we allow the Soviet Union to gain this balance of power? Did Soviet Russia fail to exert her entire directed, dictatorial and autocratic effort toward the development of nuclear weapons once we held a nuclear monopoly? The world knows they didn't, and the world also knows that if Russia had been the first nation to unlock the secret of the atom, the entire world would now be at her knees. Can we make any lesser assumption if she becomes the first country to develop an effective defense against ballistic missiles? We are gambling with years when we can ill afford to gamble with minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding and compliment him on his very effective presentation.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's nobudge policy on the RS-70 program is of grave concern to this House, for it threatens to put the United States on the short end of a bomber gap. Failure to follow through on this great program could damage the stability of U.S. defenses.

Unless we reactivate the RS-70, by 1964 we shall have no planned bomber program and will, in effect, be creating a bomber gap.

There is tremendous support for this program.—except with some of the members of the New Frontier palace guard. Are they trying to repeat the missile gap folly? You will remember we did not take action in that field, and in 1952 we found ourselves with practically no missile program. It required 5 or 6 years of concerted effort to close that gap.

The B-52 will be phased out this year; the B-58 program is scheduled for phasing out immediately thereafter. Where do we go from here? Do we forget completely about manned bombers? What happens when the B-52 and B-58 become obsolete? Should we not be planning for their replacement? Should we not be planning a giant step into the future? Does this sound like the much touted "moving forward"?

The RS-70 and its full development can answer all of these questions. The RS-70 is a plan for the future—and the future is what we must plan for now.

Last year the Congress added $525 million to the weapons authorization bill for the procurement of manned bombers. Only a token was spent. We added $180 million for B-70 development last year. Only token amounts of this was spent.

Now, this year, the Armed Services Committee unanimously agreed that $491 million should be made available for full-scale production of the RS-70 weapons system. Is this to be spent?

We certainly hope so. Somebody has the peculiar theory that we can wait until the time comes when we need this system, and then we shall go ahead with it. This idea just does not face the facts of aeronautical life. We have got to get this program moving now so it will be here when we need it. It needs and must have leadtime.

This is vital to the security of this Nation. The chairman of the House Armed Services Committee says:

> We've stopped building bombers and unless we take this action, it won't be many years before we will be out of the bomber business entirely. This is not safe.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is not safe.

Let us take the advice of the military experts in this field. Full development of the RS-70 is essential.

Let us also bear in mind that although the proposed RS-70 program will be expensive, the important thing is it will cost potential enemies 10 times as much to devise a defense against such an advanced weapons system. The RS-70 can keep the Soviets off balance another 10 years.

Let us also remember not to put all of our eggs in one basket—the missile basket. The missile remains an unproven weapon. We have seen the pictures of Soviet airshows. The Soviets are developing newer and faster bombers. We must not be caught on the short end of a bomber gap.

The Secretary of Defense says perhaps we should hold off development because a necessary breakthrough in radar and other electronic equipment could take 3 years.

Supposing it does take 3 years. Need we sit on our heels waiting for it to happen, thereby setting our defenses back another 3 years?

The RS–70 has immense capability. America's retaliatory power is presently based on the B–52 and B–58, along with missiles. The B–52 can fly at 600 miles per hour and fly at 50,000 feet. The B–58 can do 1,300 miles per hour and fly at 60,000 feet.

The RS–70 will be many jumps ahead of this space. The RS–70 will be capable of flying at 80,000 feet and cruising at better than 2,000 miles per hour.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many mysterious reports on why the Kennedy administration has refused to get moving on the B–70 bomber.

Could it be that one of the reasons is that the Soviet Union does not want us to have it—and we have merely acceded to the Kremlin's wishes? This sounds incredible, to be sure, but that is the essence of a newspaper article appearing in the Indianapolis News, April 9, 1962.

It was written by Allan Ryskind of Human Events, which discussed this subject in an article which appeared in Human Events last Saturday.

I ask unanimous consent to include this article and an editorial entitled "The Rostow Report" in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The articles referred to follow:

WHAT'S BEHIND PHASEOUTS OF U.S. BOMBERS

(By Allan H. Ryskind)

There seems to be far more than meets the eye in the administration's decision not to build the B–70 superbomber.

It is now alleged that the seed of the administration's thinking on this matter probably was sown in disarmament talks in November 1960 between Soviet Foreign Minister Vasily V. Kuznetsov and State Department official W. W. Rostow.

These hush-hush talks in the capital of the Soviet Union, it is strongly contended, actually shaped President Kennedy's defense messages in 1961 and 1962.

The startling notion that America's defense policies have been worked out in Moscow emerges from a story in the Chicago Sun-Times for March 30, 1961. It was written by the paper's able Washington reporter, Thomas B. Ross.

In this amazing story, which Ross assures me came from a top administration official, Kuznetsov is alleged to have complained to Rostow that the United States should get rid of certain "first strike" weapons; specifically manned bombers and their bases which ring the Soviet Union.

Kuznetsov, according to the Sun-Times story, told Rostow the bombers and their bases would be so vulnerable to a "sneak Russian rocket attack" they would be of little value to the United States unless it decided to launch a "first strike" against the Soviet Union. Kuznetsov, apparently, also declared certain American defensive weapons were considered "provocative" as well.

Rostow then wrote a confidential memorandum on these talks for President-elect Kennedy. He told him the United States should "at whatever expense might be necessary" develop a second strike force—composed largely of Polaris missiles—and a "limited war" deterrent of conventional, nonnuclear armies.

The Kremlin, Rostow said, will "respect" us for enlarging our defense efforts "so long as our moves are not designed to increase our first-strike capability."

President Kennedy's message, said Ross, reverberated with Rostow's advice. It was specifically written for Soviet consumption. It particularly stressed that the United States was not creating forces for a first strike against any other nation.

Moreover, Ross says that, on the recommendations of Charles Bohlen, a chief Presidential adviser on Soviet affairs, certain Communist phraseology was inserted in the message—words like dialectic—to assure the Russians the United States is genuinely prepared for disarmament and has no intention of inflicting injury on the Soviet Union.

The White House meetings, where the final defense message was thrashed out, says Ross, were directed by Theodore Sorensen, the President's personal adviser. Sorensen, writes Ross, repeatedly made it clear that the President wanted to avoid provocative, offensive weapons. Among the weapons deleted from the budget last year—and this year as well—were the B–70 superbomber and the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile. Each of these weapons was labeled as a first strike weapon for varying reasons. (Defense Secretary McNamara told the Senate Armed Services Committee January 15 that the United States would not produce the Nike-Zeus this year. He has also said that even if planned tests in the mid-Pacific show that the Nike-Zeus—lured by missile decoys—can kill a dummy ICBM launched 4,000 miles away in California, this will not be definite proof of its workability.)

Recent hearings before the House Armed Services Committee make it clear the administration is, in fact, deliberately phasing out manned bombers, the backbone of the Strategic Air Command.

The administration's plan to junk the manned bomber has been indicated by a number of items: It has allocated no new moneys in its defense message of either this year or last for new manned bombers; last year it impounded the $515 million appropriated by Congress to produce the B–52, the main bulwark of our nuclear striking force. The last of the B–52's, contracted for production under Eisenhower, will roll off the assembly lines at the end of this year. The B–58, a newer and faster bomber which would have replaced the B–52, is no longer being produced.

Defense Secretary McNamara has made it clear he plans to spend no money in the near future for a combat B–70 superbomber, equipped with Skybolt missiles, despite the so-called compromise between the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, and the President in their famous "rose garden" talks.

That these actions may have been taken because of the administration's determination to reach a disarmament agreement with the Soviets is suggested by the words of Dr. Hans Bethe, one of Kennedy's leading disarmament experts. Speaking before a Cornell University audience January 5, this year, Bethe suggested the United States might unilaterally abandon its long-range bombers since this act, said Bethe, might mean we could reach a disarmament agreement with the Soviets. Bethe also said the Nike-Zeus was of little value and indicated we shouldn't take the time to produce it.

Military officials feel Rostow was hoodwinked by Soviet propaganda. They point out, first of all, there is no such military term as "first strike" weapon.

Nathan Twining, a former Air Force Chief of Staff, was told the same thing by the Russians several years ago. Twining, however, was so sure it was Soviet propaganda he refused even to write up what the Russians had to say.

THE ROSTOW REPORT

Today the News presents one of the strangest stories ever to emanate from the Nation's Capital—a story concerning the abandonment of the B–70 bomber.

It suggests that the dropping of the B–70, together with the phasing out of our other long-range bombers, is, in essence, an effort to reassure the Soviet Union.

As stated in the story above, the administration is trying to tell the Soviets we will never strike first at them. Moscow sees our bombers as exclusively offensive weapons, and so feels uneasy about them. Thus the bombers have to go.

This fantastic doctrine, according to a dispatch in the Chicago Sun-Times, emerged from a report gotten up by a top Kennedy adviser, W. W. Rostow. In it, Rostow reportedly told the President that the Soviets would cotton to us more if we built up a "second strike" rather than a "first strike" force. The President took the hint and worked the idea into his defense message to Congress.

This episode comes to light, ironically, at the very time when the President is supposed to have stated (in an interview in the Saturday Evening Post), that, in certain instances, the United States will strike first with nuclear weapons. Just how we can strike first with our so-called "first strike" weapons eliminated has yet to be made clear.

In any event, thanks to the Rostow doctrine, our manned bombers are on the way out.

This conclusion, and the details canvassed by Allan Ryskind, are confirmed by a recent item reported by the Newspaper Enterprise Association, which reads as follows:

"There is a steadily growing attempt to reduce in the United States arsenal those weapon systems that are only good as 'first strike' weapons. These are weapons, such as the Atlas, so vulnerable that they could readily be knocked out in a Russian sneak attack. Forward strategic bombing bases overseas are in the same class. So is the B–70 bomber which can't carry enough fuel to be sent on air alert and still be able to reach the target and get back."

The NEA report adds:

"Some State Department and Defense officials say that a heavy U.S. dependence on first strike weapons systems could make the Russians think the United States intends a preventive war. Such weapons 'tend to keep everyone jittery,' says one high Pentagon official."

Moreover, the April 9 issue of Newsweek contains a summary of Rostow's views, saying he "rejects the strategy of preemptive attack. This, he argues, could create uncertainty in the mind of a prospective enemy and the risk that he might miscalculate U.S. aims."

Military officials, including Gen. Curtis LeMay and Gen. Nathan Twining, debunk the idea that our bombers are "vulnerable" and thus simply "first strike" weapons. But even if that thesis were valid, the idea of the United States abandoning a weapons system in order to make our enemies feel better is so incredible as to defy belief. Yet that appears to be just what the Kennedy administration has done.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. UTT. I wish also to compliment the gentleman on his presentation and call his attention to the fact that during the early part of the campaign the then Candidate Kennedy made constant references to Quemoy, Matsu, and the

Pescadores saying that we should withdraw our line or perimeter of defense back to Formosa. Now he has had 15 months to withdraw that perimeter to Formosa. But, I say that Candidate Kennedy knew then, and President Kennedy knows today the reasons why we have to protect Quemoy and Matsu—for the very simple reason that they are the islands which protect the only warm water harbors from which Red China could launch an air drive against Formosa. Those harbors are Amoy Harbor and Fuchow Harbor. And if we withdraw the perimeter of our defense to Formosa, there would be an air strike from Red China against Formosa and it would fall, and Formosa is the key to our Western defenses.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from California certainly made a worthwhile analysis of the problems of war by miscalculation. Certainly, I think every American would agree with him that this is a problem. However, I wonder if the gentleman will agree irrespective of all the advisers and the advices that the President gets from many sources including those sources that would want us to start raining bombs on Russia tomorrow, that the final decision under our Constitution rests with the President and it is his responsibility. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. GUBSER. There is no question but that the decision to press the button, using that as a figure of speech——

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am referring to the policymaking responsibility.

Mr. GUBSER. If the gentleman will permit me to answer him, I would say the decision to press the button, using that as a figure of speech, is exclusively the decision of the President. But there is also no question about the fact that a wrong decision by that one man is suffered by 185 million Americans.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But the gentleman will agree that the final decision on foreign policy is the President's; is that not correct?

Mr. GUBSER. No. It is with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Well, with the advice and consent of the Senate, formulating the foreign policies at the executive level.

Mr. GUBSER. No, I cannot agree with that. I think the Constitution will bear me out. You are in error.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In the executive branch at the executive level, the President despite his advisers and despite everything else he may see or hear or read, the decision and the responsibility rests with him obviously, with the advice and consent of the other body, in negotiations, in treaties and so forth; is that correct?

Mr. GUBSER. Of course, I will agree that in negotiations with foreign countries that is exclusively the province and the right of the executive department, but I think the gentleman will also agree that if any man, regardless of whoever he happened to be, tried to do all of this without advisers and without delegating some of the responsibility, he would not get it done.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The question I was leading up to is, Can the gentleman name me any other President in recent history or past history who has been as firm, and resolute, and decisive in serving notice on the Soviet Union that this country is not going to be pushed around?

Mr. GUBSER. I cite the Bay of Pigs; I cite Laos.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is right, let us cite them all. What is our position in Laos? What was our position in the Bay of Pigs?

Mr. GUBSER. I frankly think President Kennedy may have learned by this time, but I do not think his actions so far have matched his strong words.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The fact remains that his firmness in handling the Soviet has brought a significant increase in respect for this country.

Mr. GUBSER. Is the gentleman suggesting that the President has been practicing brinkmanship?

Mr. PUCINSKI. No, he has not been practicing brinkmanship; he has been giving this country the firm resolute leadership that the country has needed for a long time.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I was disturbed by a figure of speech the gentleman used, and I am sure he did not mean it, in reply to an interrogation by the gentleman from Illinois in making the statement that it was the President's responsibility to push the button. The Congress of the United States alone can declare war, and I think we all recognize the responsibility that is on our shoulders when the ultimate decisions are made.

Mr. GUBSER. But the decision to use nuclear weapons is exclusively the President's.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, nowhere is there a better example of the disconnected thinking of the administration vis-a-vis the powers and intent of Congress on defense problems, than on its handling of Reserve and National Guard reorganization. This applies to the current reorganization policy, as well as last year's beefing up for Berlin, approved by Congress on request of the administration, without a proclaimed Presidential emergency. The thesis advanced for the news release of the administration's proposals to cut back the National Guard is that "the announcement was being made to alleviate uncertainties." Just how, one might ask, does one alleviate uncertainties by announcing an uncertainty? The administration belatedly said these cutbacks were only tentative or realinements, subject to hearings in the House and Senate Armed Services Committees, when pressed by news media and the respective Governors of the various States. What does the guardsman or reservist think when he is told that a tentative decision has been made to eliminate his unit? Is he more uncertain or less uncertain? How would a military commander during war have reacted if his orders said an attack would take place on a certain date only if things go right, or, if the men do not mind, or if everyone else is in agreement with this plan.

The time to announce a decision is after it has been reached, after all the evidence has been sought, after coordination and staffing, after all other considerations have been given.

In fact, if the administration wanted its proposals to be rejected it could not have handled the guard cutback more adroitly.

The decision does not coincide with the Department of Defense's announced national policy to increase conventional warfare capability. The land forces are the very heart of conventional warfare capability, and the Reserve and National Guard divisions are the very strength of the land forces. Three times in this century they have literally saved our Nation in times of war.

Just what has happened to the decisionmaking processes in the New Frontier? Is this moot evidence of wrangling for powerplay and position; of administration versus Congress, or Department of Defense versus the duly and constitutionally contrived three armed services?

Mr. GUBSER. May I suggest to the gentleman that he get a special order after the others that have been entered into.

Mr. STRATTON. I am sure my colleague on the Armed Services Committee would not want the record to stand incorrectly. If I heard him correctly, he said he sat in on the confidential brief in 1960 which was presented to our committee, and the information presented to the committee indicated there was no missile gap. The gentleman does not want that to stand, because I am sure the gentleman knows, and the record will substantiate it, that the figures presented to the committee indicated clearly there was a missile gap.

Mr. GUBSER. What year is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. STRATTON. I am talking about 1960.

Mr. GUBSER. That is the one I am speaking of, too. I beg to differ with the gentleman. I think I sat a little closer to the front of the room than he did, and perhaps my hearing is a bit better.

Mr. STRATTON. As a matter of fact, the Member from New York sat a good deal closer to the speaker than did the gentleman from California. The gentleman will remember that the Secretary acknowledged that in terms of missiles there was a gap in favor of the Soviets on the basis of our intelligence; but the Secretary pointed out that in terms of destructive power there was no gap.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman will remember that in 1960 there was a big furor that was argued in the pages of the press, wherein you on your side condemned the administration of Secretary Gates for estimating the power of the

Russians insofar as their capability and their ability to produce were concerned. But even these estimates which were more pessimistic for our side showed no missile gap.

Mr. STRATTON. I am talking to the gentleman about the information presented to our committee, because the gentleman referred to that in his remarks. The fact of the matter is the information presented to our committee, based on intelligence estimates and was commented on before our committee by the Secretary of Defense, indicated in terms of long-range missiles the Soviets were ahead of us but not in terms of overall destructive power. I think the gentleman should correct the record. Of course the gentleman knows that intelligence information presented to the committee this year amounted to a reestimate of the situation, and it was on the basis of that information presented, not by political considerations, as the gentleman knows. There has been a difference of judgment on this matter of the missile gap. I am sure the gentleman would want to correct the record on that point.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman is in error. In the year 1960 and in the year 1961 our briefings showed that a missile gap did not exist.

LIE DOWN AND BE DEPRESSED, DAMN YOU

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. McDonough] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, here is an example of how the depressed-areas bill, which I voted against, is being administered which indicates that there are determined efforts being made to force areas in various parts of the United States into a depressed area against the will of the people in the area.

The people of Weaverville, Calif., have had a difficult time to preserve their dignity against Federal administrators who insist that Weaverville should be considered a depressed area when all indications are to the contrary.

This is an example of Federal control and proves that once a bill is passed and the criteria established, the Federal Government will impose its influence despite the objections of the people.

The following is the story of Weaverville, Calif., from the April 1962 issue of World:

Lie Down and Be Depressed, Damn You—But Weaverville, Calif., Citizens Aren't Taking any Federal Offerings

(By Lewis R. Nadle)

Sign of the times: "Welcome to Weaverville (Calif.). Elevation 2,170 Feet Above Sea Level. The Most Prosperous Little Depressed Area in the U.S.A."

Northern California's Route 299 meanders through the beautiful Salmon and Cascade Mountain Ranges, traversing, at a point between Eureka and Redding, the small town of Weaverville, seat of Trinity County, trouble spot for the New Frontier.

The trouble in Trinity County is easily explained. It has been proclaimed a depressed area. Its citizens say it is not a depressed area. The Government says it must be a depressed area—it has just got to be a depressed area. So Trinity County is trying desperately to overcome a depression it never made and probably would not have recognized had its nose not been pushed into it.

Behind the conflict are two points of view: one is new, the other dates back to the gold rush of 1849 and the old frontier.

The New Frontiersman living up to his billing as a voracious reader, would go by the book. To him Trinity County is a political subdivision embracing 3,191 square miles and 9,706 persons. The book says that when X number of people in such an area are reported unemployed, that area shall be decreed depressed.

TRINITY SEES IT DIFFERENTLY

Trinity Countians see the matter a little differently. Chronic unemployment, that much bantered phrase of welfare leaders, was introduced in Trinity County before the driving of the golden spike. Since time immemorial the county has existed on a one-crop economy: gold before the turn of the century, timber since.

In the faded recall of the county's oldest citizens there is not a shred of support for the theory that gold was panned or timber felled during the winter months. By late fall, coal bunkers are filled, firewood split, and larders filled with provisions. So it has always been—until the new New Deal pushed westward beyond the Cascades. More importantly, Trinity County has gradually prospered and grown under these "unfavorable" conditions, and the progeny of the 49'ers do not hold well with the notion of living in a depressed area.

All this happened last November. Among the first to hear the unwelcome news was William Asbury, editor of the Trinity Weekly Journal. He received three telegrams from State politicians in Washington. They were congratulatory in tone, informing him that Trinity County had been declared a depressed area. The cables stated rather graciously (as if to share some measure of credit for the noble deed) that Federal aid was available for the stricken country.

THE COUNTY THAT WOULDN'T LIE DOWN

Asbury blanched. He looked down Weaverville's main street, bustling with activity. Phoning several prominent businessmen and bankers in the county, the editor reinforced his own belief that the county's future looked brighter—not worse—than it had in several decades. Then, indignant and not a little provoked, the editor rolled a sheet of newsprint into his typewriter and rattled off a prizewinning editorial which he cynically headed: "Lie Down and Be Depressed, Damn You."

Today, despite the best efforts of Editor Asbury and the citizenry of Trinity County, the area remains officially depressed. The psychological reaction of the population, however, might be more accurately described as outrage than depression.

This resentment springs from many sources, but generally it is the tag that hurts. Many—like Editor Asbury—feel the uninspiring title has done a great deal to lessen the attractiveness of the county to the outside world, that the harsh label will not create a favorable image for industry and tourism. One must admit, after all, that there is precious little appeal in a "depressed area," a term easily interchangeable with "contaminated," "quarantined," or "polluted area."

STIGMATIC TITLE BLIGHTED PLANS

In the predepression days of 1961, the combined chambers of commerce of Trinity County polled $25,000 of privately raised funds to create a Trinity County Recreational and Development Association designed to attract more winter sportsmen, tourists, and industry. In this way the county hoped to ease its self-acknowledged problem of seasonal unemployment. Before the agency could make any real progress, the Government numerologists uncovered the magic unemployment figures and let the stigmatic title fall. The New Frontier has since dogmatically maintained that Trinity County is a depressed area and is likely to remain one until the boys go back into the woods.

The crusher, however, is the Federal aid program itself. According to Editor Asbury's scorecard, this is the fascinating way in which Federal aid has graced the community: To date no businessman or individual has requested or received funds, foods, or other assistance.

The county government has been puzzled by the uncertain benefits of being depressed. For instance, after three visits to Weaverville, regional program coordinator N. W. Clayton laid this first and only concrete proposal before county officials: The Government would provide matching funds of up to $15,000 to promote a survey of how economic conditions might be bettered for the community. Already possessing a lucid picture of its needs (and having a private investment of $25,000 working toward meeting them) the county decided it would be foolish to waste even Uncle Sam's money on such a redundant effort and refused the offer.

So, the score remains quite even—nothing to nothing in the last inning—though some give the Government a slight edge because it got to call the county a dirty name.

In his office, Editor Asbury sits quietly amidst thousands of sympathetic letters that have poured in from all over the Nation, shooting a sidelong glance to his window from time to time—doubtless hoping to see the first signs of spring and the last of depression.

[From the Weaverville (Calif.) Weekly Trinity Journal]

Lie Down and Be Depressed, Damn You

Last week this country's several representatives in Washington fell all over themselves trying to get the news to us first that we had been designated by John F. Kennedy as an economically depressed area. The Journal received three telegrams in as many hours from Congressman Johnson and from Senators Engle and Kuchel informing Trinity County that we were in dire economic distress. Each was apparently taking credit for personal intervention at the highest levels to qualify us for some kind of Federal help.

The Weaverville Chamber of Commerce met Monday of this week to ponder what all this meant. The chamber heard a report that about 3 months ago two men from the Department of Commerce and State Department of Economic Development came to Trinity County to say that we could apply for help as a depressed area. This would qualify us for low-interest loans, technical assistance (whatever that means), urban renewal money, relief to our blighted industries, specialized training, and other things. The State and Federal men, though, emphasized that Trinity County would have to apply for all these blessings.

But no one applied and we were still designated as a "depressed area." It gives one the impression that for his own political reasons someone back East is pointing a scornful finger our way and saying, "Lie down and be depressed, damn you."

Meanwhile, back at the ranch, Andy Vegel, manager of the Trinity County Branch of Bank of America, says with understandable enthusiasm that bank deposits are at an alltime high.

> To add to the confusing suggestion that this is a depressed area is a little survey that the Weaverville chamber has made about business opportunities. No fewer than 25 new businesses are found to be wanting and yet very likely would be profitable, the chamber concludes from its study. A new supermarket will open soon. A new garage opened recently. Throughout the county, in the last 6 months, several new subdivisions have been laid out, and more are planned. New businesses of many kinds, from a laundromat at Hayfork to a liquor store and bar at Lewiston, a new shopping center at Trinity Center, have been started this summer or will start soon.
>
> But someone has concluded that all this portends nothing, that the county should come to the Feds, with hat in hand and pencils for sale.
>
> Trinity County isn't enjoying the booms of Marin, San Mateo, Santa Clara and many other northern California counties that are becoming strip cities (thank goodness). At the same time, with timber, tourism, and tally ho, we aren't likely to fold up like the Dust Bowl areas of the thirties.
>
> Big brother is watching us, but he's myopic.

SMALL BUSINESS FAILURES ON THE NEW FRONTIER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I will be delighted to.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether it would be in order to make a unanimous-consent request that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 8 a.m. tomorrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not think that is a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. With respect to the suggestion the gentleman from California who just preceded the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] made that there is a tendency on the part of the administration to offer concessions for the purpose of negotiations with the Soviet Union, it is quite apparent that the Kennedy administration seems to be hypnotized by a fear Mr. Khrushchev may lose control of Soviet Russia and there might be somebody put in power very hard to deal with. I cannot imagine anybody any harder to deal with than Khrushchev. I can see advantages in involving the Soviet Union in a long power struggle which might take years to settle.

Now, I suggest that we stop worrying about Mr. Khrushchev. When he pleads for concessions to help overcome his domestic enemies, the President should either laugh in his face or look him in the eye and say, "You know, isn't it striking, we have the same problem. There is growing frustration in the United States. There is growing danger of dogmatic conservatives coming into power. The John Birchers are everywhere. We desperately need a major concession from you. Give us East Germany quickly—if you don't, the John Birchers will be in power in 1964."

That is the way I think he ought to talk.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman, my colleague from Ohio. He has done an excellent job, I might say, in keeping us on our toes this evening.

Mr. HAYS. Well, I am just a little curious. I understand this group had a press conference this afternoon, and that they said that the Republican Party had nothing to do with this show. They were all speaking for themselves. Now, I notice the only two Members I know of of the John Birch Society present. Is the John Birch Society running this show?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Well, Mr. HAYS, I will be delighted to answer that question. Why do you not go out and call Mr. Welch and see if he is. As far as I know, he is not.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman is a member of the society, is he not?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Yes, I am.

Mr. HAYS. And, as a member of the society, you have to put yourself at Mr. Welch's disposal under his direction, do you not?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Let me say this, I did not come here prepared tonight to talk about the John Birch Society.

Mr. HAYS. Well, if you are a member, you should be happy to. I would talk about any organization I am a member of.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Do you want to listen or talk?

Mr. HAYS. Well, both; a little of each.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I believe you have made that abundantly clear this evening. First of all, I am proud to be a member of the Birch Society. The Birch Society is not running this program tonight. The Congress is. Let me just say to the gentleman that your last remark is totally incorrect. There is no Member, including myself, who sits at the feet of Mr. Welch, as an individual Member of this Congress or as an individual citizen of this country. I sit at no one's feet, and I know that you did not intend to imply that. I thank you very much for your kindness in encouraging me to clarify that point.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak constructively about some of the areas where I think this administration has made mistakes that I think need correction. I am proud to be part of this activity this evening; to be part of the individual membership of the responsible minority. I know that this is not a minority party activity; it is an individual Member activity. I wish to make it abundantly clear that I speak only for myself as one Member of the Congress trying to do the job as he sees it.

I have the following observations to make.

SMALL BUSINESS FAILURES ON THE NEW FRONTIER

Mr. Speaker, this administration was elected on the following promise, and I quote Candidate Kennedy in 1960:

> We have the highest bankruptcy rates in small business last year than we have had since the end of World War II. Small business has been crushed. * * * Small businesses are failing at a record rate—from Candidate Kennedy's campaign speeches, 1960.

During his campaign for the Presidency, Candidate Kennedy held out glowing promises for small business firms. He said one of the great challenges of the 1960's will be to reverse the disastrous policies which are destroying this historic cornerstone of our free enterprise system.

Promises and performance are two different things—as many small business owners have since discovered. In fact, things got so tough during the first Kennedy year that 17,075 small firms went bankrupt, more than 10 percent above the 1960 level. This is a modern record, unmatched since the depression of the thirties. These firms racked up aggregate losses of $1.1 billion, an all-time record.

While the New Frontier propagandists are busily engaged in forecasting a brighter tomorrow, they have kept strangely silent about the accelerating rate of business failures. Many of our colleagues have been particularly quiet.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of housing, I make the following observations:

Last year this administration secured passage by this Congress of the legislative spending plan known as the Housing Act of 1961. It was the most liberal, largest, and economically unsound housing legislation ever enacted by the Congress. A writer in a financial publication appropriately characterized it as "Termites at work in FHA."

That bill was supposed to get housing moving. Well, it is moving, all right, but in the wrong direction. For the past 5 months housing production has been moving downward based on monthly housing starts which are projected on a seasonally adjusted annual basis. This is happening notwithstanding the fact that for the past 14 months we have been in the recovery phase of the feeble recovery following the mild recession of 1960. Massive rental housing is a drag rather than an assist to this modest recovery movement.

It must be disconcerting to this administration to find that, despite the ultraliberal provisions they have made, the housing picture has deteriorated. At the end of January 1962, the FHA held 27,375 houses which it acquired by default of federally insured mortgages. That represents about $400 million of housing. And, incidentally, it was 2,000 more defaulted houses than the Agency had held at the close of 1961.

Overall, lenders foreclosed 73,000 home loans in 1961, the highest number since 1940. The 1961 home foreclosures were up more than 44 percent from the 51,000 of such foreclosures in 1960. FHA holdings of foreclosed insured properties at the end of 1961 were up almost 100 percent over their holdings at the end of 1960.

The FHA, of course, simply cannot close its eyes to these economic facts of life. Conservatism is being forced on it. In a seven-county area in Florida under the Tampa and Miami offices of FHA the agency has banned mortgage insurance commitments on new construction unless the builder has lined up a buyer in advance. Similar bans have been placed on areas around Midland and Odessa, Tex.

The same housing agency which last year was extolling the virtues of the 40-year mortgage, under which incidentally the depreciation outruns the value of the property for the first 20 years, now has widely circulated a declaration of more than passing interest. It advises that homebuyers should be fully aware of the savings in interest costs which can result from higher downpayments and financing over a shorter period of time. Shades of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.

Another provision of last year's bill permitted the Administrator to make a full 100-percent loan on housing for the elderly. In this connection, I found of interest an article in the Washington Post for March 3, 1962, headed "Plan To Make Hotel 2400 Home for Aged Revealed."

According to this article a State Department official was disturbed by this news inasmuch as Hotel 2400 presently provided needed apartments to African diplomats without discrimination. The article recounts that the present owner apparently had agreed to sell the hotel to the manager of the establishment "at a previously agreed-upon price of $1.8 million." There was a reported mortgage of about $850,000 on the property. Then according to the article the owner apparently saw possibilities in a 100-percent loan from the Government if he could get "a nonprofit church group to sponsor the project" and convert it into a federally financed home for the elderly. Now here is the disturbing thing about this report. The owner withdrew the previously made sale offer of $1.8 million because he had found a group willing to buy the hotel for $2,250,000. I think our Housing Subcommittee ought to look into this on the basis of the newspaper article. To me it smacks of a $450,000 windfall milked out of a 100-percent Government loan. Either the Government would end up with a grossly overvalued loan or the tenants, elderly citizens, would be milked out of 25 percent more rent than they ought to pay. We ought to make sure there are no such improprieties in this program.

Last year's bill contained a provision increasing the urban renewal grant authorization from $2 billion to a total of $4 billion. Is it not about time Congress took a look at this program to see what it is accomplishing? I suggest to Members of this Congress that they go right down here in Washington to the Southwest urban renewal area, take a look at those luxury apartments, visit them inside, and then ask yourself if taxpayers' funds ought to be used to subsidize developments such as those. Or go down to the Bolling Field area which, as you know, is to be deactivated and the property made available for development.

I am sure there are dozens of private developers who would jump at the chance to acquire on a competitive bid basis that highly desirable location and develop it without a penny of Federal grant money. But is that to be done? No—the city fathers have declared it an urban renewal area on the nebulous grounds that there are subsoil deficiencies. I urge you Members to look at it yourself and see what your judgment is. Heaven knows there are plenty of slum areas in the cities of our country where it could be argued need Federal assistance in their eradication. We simply cannot afford to squander taxpayers' funds so needlessly as would be the case in that Bolling Field area. I will make another suggestion. I think our Housing Subcommittee ought to take a little time to look at what it has done instead of always devoting its energies to developing new and liberal spending programs to be saddled on the backs of taxpayers.

More and more, bigger and bigger Federal expenditures could well lead to the slow disintegration and future destruction of our private housing industry. This administration has failed to properly encourage the private sector of our housing industry because it imposes Federal big government on top of private industry to such an extent that our entrepreneurs are chased away from doing the job that can be done.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the grandiose programs of the New Frontier, particularly their vast spending programs, are the answer in housing. These plans are not the answer in stopping our gold flow outward, or are the answer for small business. These socialistic planning programs so extensively compete with private enterprise that they discourage and destroy the ability of our people back home in our districts to do the job which they can do as private entrepreneurs.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman made reference to termites in the Federal Housing Authority.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. That was a quotation from a newspaper.

Mr. CAREY. Does the gentleman endorse the quotation?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I believe there is an element of truth in this item, yes; that would be my judgment.

Mr. CAREY. Is the gentleman referring to the human beings, employees of the Government, when he refers to these termites?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am sure the gentleman does not think that that is what I meant. I did not refer to the employees. It was the shortsighted legislation and poor administrative-imposed socialistic policy to which I refer.

Mr. CAREY. I was just trying to clarify what the gentleman's statement was.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I believe the termites represent some of the spending activities of the New Frontier that many of us disapprove. Perhaps the gentleman encourages that kind of thing and he and I may disagree on that.

Mr. CAREY. As a colleague on the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask the gentleman this question. He sat and listened to testimony by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, did he not?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Yes, I did.

Mr. CAREY. In connection with the outflow of gold.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Yes.

Mr. CAREY. And the gentleman heard certain remedies proposed by the Secretary, including our membership in the International Monetary Fund?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Yes, I did.

Mr. CAREY. I am just trying to refresh the gentleman's recollection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I did hear that testimony. I heard it and read it very carefully.

Mr. CAREY. Did the gentleman endorse the testimony of the Secretary?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. No; I think I made that abundantly clear in my statement here on the floor. If the gentleman will recall, when that particular bill, the legislation to amend the Bretton Woods agreements was before the House on which Mr. Dillon was testifying, an additional authorization of $2 billion of our taxpayers' money to go to the International Monetary Fund, which in my judgment has proven to be an additional drag on our gold reserve position, I disagreed and made it clear that even though Mr. Dillon was a very able spokesman, I disagreed with his approach.

Mr. CAREY. And he is a member of the Republican Party, is that correct?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I made it abundantly clear that I am a Republican and proud to be. Mr. Dillon is a Republican. And I assume he is proud to be.

Mr. CAREY. And he is an able Secretary.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. This merely shows that Republicans may have honest disagreements on issues—facing our country. I thoroughly disagreed with Mr. Dillon on that bill and still do. An honest disagreement is a welcome thing in our form of government.

Mr. CAREY. I just wanted to make that point clear.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I think I made it very clear. And I wish to point out that Republicans can have differences of opinion, openly air them and not try to concede them in a phony atmosphere of unreal "unity."

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman know the conditions under which the 10 nations that agreed to the International Monetary Fund for the purpose of protecting currencies—the conditions that were laid down by the 9 countries before the United States could use any of the $4 billion that they had to put up?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I believe some of those points were brought out on the floor at the time the bill was debated.

Would the gentleman care to reiterate them?

Mr. PILLION. No, except to say that if the conditions that are laid down by those nine other countries are met the United States would not need the funds, because you would have a balance of international payments; so that particular agreement will be of very little use to the United States in balancing its budget. It is merely of psychological help. It does not basically balance our payments.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I could not agree more with the gentleman from New York. These were several of the points I tried to make during the debate on this issue. This was just one more area where this administration was seeking additional funds from the taxpayers for a fund that in my judgment no longer requires our full participation to purchase currencies in this so-called pooling system.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. WIDNALL, who has some remarks he wishes to make.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, 11 months have passed since the Area Development Act, more commonly known as the depressed-areas bill, became law. I have had a very keen interest in this because I had a substitute bill at the time it was originally submitted to the House and we fought over a $100 million boondoggle section that was put in there for political purposes.

In the 11 months of its history this new bureaucratic agency has a pathetic record of puny performance. With a $200 million authority for plant loans, only nine such loans in a total amount of only $3 million have been made.

You will remember the sense of urgency in connection with this. With a $100 million public facility loan authorization only seven such loans in the total amount of $538,000 have been made. The public facility grant authorization of $75 million has been utilized only to the extent of five such grants in the total amount of $628,300. According to the agency's report of March 26, 1962, these loans and grants made will provide only 4,588 new jobs. At the time the legislation was considered last year, it was estimated there were 2 million unemployed in the so-called depressed areas, industrial, and rural. The performance record, therefore, is about two-tenths of 1 percent and even that puny record is only achieved by statistical padding of the figures.

Of course, this new bureaucratic agency has not been completely inactive. As a matter of fact it has been quite busy designating areas as depressed areas. As of March 26, it has designated 924 such areas with a total population of 34.7 million. It would appear the agency has been so busy designating areas as depressed areas that it has had little time to do the job for which it was created; namely, provide jobs for the unemployed in the areas.

The agency has obligated almost a half million dollars, $495,600 to be exact, for technical, economic studies. But these funds do not provide jobs to unemployed people in depressed areas. The beneficiaries primarily are big-city consulting firms with even a sprinkling of other Government departments and agencies, such as Army Engineers, Bureau of the Census, and the Department of Agriculture.

The agency also takes credit for $4 million of expenditure to train 6,120 workers under 62 training subsistence programs. But it should be noted these are funds furnished by the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which were already conducting training programs before there was any depressed areas bill.

The information I have given you is from the Activity Summary Report dated Monday, March 26, 1962, of the Area Redevelopment Administration. I repeat, in the light of the stated need it is a pathetic record of puny performance. It is bearing out a prediction made in our minority views when this bill was reported by the Banking and Currency Committee over a year ago that "passage of this bill could only bring bitter disillusionment to most of the unemployed in most of the depressed areas."

I have here some recent releases, dated March 28, of the Area Redevelopment Administration. I am thinking now in connection with the campaign promises again, all the dramatization of West Virginia and eastern Pennsylvania and all those places where the heart of every American went out to those unfortunate people, where we wanted to alleviate the depressed conditions.

Here are the last releases:

"ARA Approves Timber Resource Study on Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont."

"University of Colorado To Study Tourist Areas Under ARA Contracts."

"ARA Approves Study of Tourism Potential on Three Indian Reservations."

"ARA Approves Study of Cement, Lime Plant Potential in Northwest Florida."

"ARA Joins in Feasibility Study of Ski Facility at Park City, Utah."

"ARA Approves Recreation, Tourism Study for Hot Springs, N. Dak."

"ARA Approves Tourist Study for Four-County West Virginia Area."

Actually, the only project now going on in West Virginia that involves employment is the one for employment of 200 people. There are some retraining programs going ahead, but where the jobs are going to be no one seems to know. Evidently the retraining program will be to retrain workers to move out of West Virginia into some other section.

According to the same Activities Summary Report of the Area Redevelopment Administration of March 26, 1962, only one industrial plant loan had been made in the State of West Virginia. This was a $572,000 loan for the National Sealing & Dimension Co. to provide 200 jobs. As of that date no public facility loans or grants had been made to any community in West Virginia. As of that date only one technical assistance contract in the amount of $7,000 had been granted to Johnson, Gray & Associates for an engineering site survey in Fairmont, W. Va.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman for finally yielding to me. I am proud to have voted for the legislation called area redevelopment legislation, and since that time we have arranged to put water and sewer facilities in two very fine communities. That is in keeping with the President's idea and I am just amazed at the gentleman trying to sabotage or sandbag this idea of helping the American people. I sat here for 4 years under the Eisenhower administration, and I never saw anything like the disregard of the rights and wishes of the people like the Eisenhower administration advocated. I am going to tell the gentleman that in my area we have used this legislation to help people go to work, and I am proud of that legislation. I salute the Area Redevelopment Administration people and staffs. I am sorry the gentleman does not want to have people to go to work, but I reckon that is just the Republican Party platform of kicking the little man and helping the big man—and I appreciate his views.

Mr. WIDNALL. I appreciate listening to your comment. When I read my remarks tomorrow I am sure I will find none of what you characterize as my remarks in the RECORD. We certainly want employment. I am pleased you have had a good experience in your own area. I am talking about the areas we talked about and that our hearts bled for on the floor of the House. Now, is the employment of the future just going to be in the recreational and tourist field?

Where are the jobs going to come from? Where is the money going to come from to provide the tourists for the facilities? Where is the employment going to come from that is real good steady employment?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I would like to comment on that further, and I will yield to the gentleman from South Carolina in just a moment. I would like to comment briefly on some of your remarks.

First of all, as you know full well, there was prior to the area redevelopment bill an institution known as the Community Facilities Administration which provided more than adequate funds, and several other agencies that had more than adequate funds, for this kind of activity which you spoke about. It was not necessary to establish the area redevelopment fund to make it possible to borrow this kind of money you are talking about for your area. Of course, I cannot speak for all other Republicans, but the gentleman knows full well that the Republican Party is not against the little man. As a matter of fact, we are more for him in many cases, we believe, in supporting the kind of legislation that truly does something for all people. Of course, it was our administration that put in the Small Business Administration which was for the little man in business, and you know this full well. You keep talking about the "little people" so much it seems to me as if our country were almost a race of pigmies. And you certainly did not mean to indicate that; did you?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. The gentleman's words sound very well, but the trouble was under the "Eisen-Hoover" administration, we never could get anything for the little man and we had to wait until we got the area redevelopment legislation to put people to work. And I will say to the gentleman who would not yield for so long a time, that these are not tourists—these are people in textile plants and in other industrial plants—and I will say to the gentleman, since he is yielding to me, and I thank him so very much, insofar as the gentleman's comments are concerned, I have not seen anything that your party has done in the 4 years that I have served under the "Eisen-Hoover" administration.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Is that a slip of the tongue? Mr. Hoover was not the Vice President, I am sure the gentleman is well aware of that.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I beg pardon? Hoover was not the Vice President.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I do not think the House fully understood. You said "Eisen-what"?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I said, "Eisen-Hoover," which is characteristic of the Republican Party because I remember the Hoover depression, you know.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Well, just a minute, please. I wish to speak to the issue. It was not the Hoover depression. There was a Democratic Congress starting in 1930, and you know that as well as I do. Frankly, there was very little legislation that went through this House during 1930–32, and it was a depression that was shared by the entire country. I know you did not mean to imply that it was Mr. Hoover's fault alone, did you?

Mr. HEMPHILL. No, I certainly did not mean to imply he was the only one to blame.

Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am delighted.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Of course, you know I suffered during the depression.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. We all suffered; did we not? You did not have an exclusive on that; did you? We all suffered in the depression; did we not? You did not certainly have an exclusive on the depression.

Mr. HEMPHILL. How old is the gentleman?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I am 34 years old and I was in the depression although I am not probably as old as the gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am delighted to know that the gentleman was an embryonic sufferer in the Hoover depression, but some of us who suffered realistically under the Hoover depression are not going to forget the "Eisen-Hoover" administration.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would just like to express my surprise, shock, and amazement to find the gentleman from South Carolina finding all the solutions for all of the problems in Washington. I thought he still had some adherence to the contributions that the States could make under the great principle of States rights.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan, and I want to point out further that the gentleman from South Carolina knows that the Community Facilities Administration had more than adequate funds, and as a matter of fact some left over, to adequately handle the various projects he was talking about.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I wish to make just two comments. The gentleman from South Carolina should be very proud of his representation of his district because there have been only seven loans made by the Community Facilities Administration, loans and grants, and he has obtained two. He is an outstanding Representative.

Now, a further comment: I would like to point out to the gentleman that he seems to think there were some hardhearted people in the Congress of the United States for the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration. The gentleman should remember that during the last 6 years the Congress was controlled by the Democrats, and they had every opportunity to pass legislation to try to correct the situations he complains of.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. He has made a very important contribution.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. HAYS). The gentleman has consumed 30 minutes. The gentleman asked the Chair to notify him when he had done so.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the Speaker for so notifying me. I would like to comment very briefly that I think the gentleman from New Jersey has pointed out very clearly that we had a Democratic Congress for 6 years. We also had a Democratic Congress, as I pointed out, from 1930 to 1932, and I know our colleague from South Carolina would not want to imply that the depression was all the fault of this Democratic Congress or Mr. Hoover alone.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, since I have been referred to?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Just a moment. I will be delighted to yield after I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER]. I have agreed to yield to him. He would like to comment on the extension of trade agreements and reduction of tariffs that are proposed at this time.

I now yield to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for yielding to me. I want to outline the form of my presentation, so that my colleagues will not be disappointed if I do not yield at first. If we are going to have argument over yielding let us have it now.

I want to outline briefly the salient characteristics of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 which the President has presented to us and on which we are holding hearings. I then will make some statements broadly analyzing the bill. Then I criticize the bill, and present a constructive trade program. Finally, I shall welcome questions. First of all, as to the bill, I do not intend to read it, for it is 60 pages long, but I do intend to make some comments that I think will give the Members plenty of reason to want to read it if they have not already.

The bill does these things: It gives the President blanket authority to reduce the present tariff to 50 percent of the rate of duty existing on July 1, this year; and the President may proclaim duty-free treatment for any article which is subject to a rate of duty existing on July 1, 1962, of not more than 5 percent ad valorem or to a rate of duty existing on that date the ad valorem equivalent of which is not more than 5 percent.

In case the President under this new authority we will grant him finds that any industry or employees of an industry are hurt by his reducing the tariffs then the President has the discretion to provide help for the industries and for the workers who are displaced.

To give you an idea of what he may do I will read from the bill itself:

> An industry shall be eligible to receive, as extraordinary relief, adjustment assistance under chapter 4 of this title if the President determines that—
>
> (a) as a result of continuance, reduction, or elimination of a duty or other import restriction, or continuance of duty-free or excise treatment under a trade agreement, an article like or directly competitive with an article produced by the industry is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause, or immediately threaten to cause, on a widespread basis in the industry, (1) significant idling of productive facilities of firms, (2) prolonged and persistent inability of firms to operate at a profit, and (3) unemployment or underemployment of workers; and
>
> (b) reasonable efforts in the industry to adjust have been made and have not substantially mitigated the conditions found to exist under subsection (a) of this section, and adjustment assistance under chapter 2 or 3 of this title to the firms or workers in the industry is or would be inadequate to mitigate substantially such conditions.

So we see joined the terms immediately threatened, then all of these three things that must have happened over years of suffering—in other words, when an industry is bankrupt, it can get help, if I understand the language. This bill has some of the most peculiar language I have ever read, and I am reading from pages 22 and 23 of the bill.

Now I want to present some of the basic criticisms. And after that I would like to present constructive solutions to the problem. Here are some basic criticisms of the President's Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

First. There is a constitutional abdication of power by the Congress and unconstitutional control by government of industry. If I were to paraphrase a title for this bill—let me say at this point that I speak only for myself. We have only today concluded hearings in the committee, so I cannot possibly be speaking for the Republican side. I am merely throwing out some facts, much of which has never been in the papers, and never will be, unless some of it gets there tonight. Instead, chiefly propaganda has been put out by the administration.

As to correct titles for this trade bill: This bill will result in government by man, not by law. It could be called destructive of U.S. industry if, as, and when the President decides, or it could be called a Government take-over of industry, since the Government can foreclose, take the assets and liquidate them, of any industry that does not repay the loan made by the Government. Next, there is, indeed, dictatorial power given the President. He can cut the tariffs, he can withhold aid to any particular industry he sees fit—give it or withhold it—after cutting the tariffs. Many of our industries are now up against the peril-point clause. It is dictatorial power.

Further, there is no court review.

If I were to summarize what this bill will do, I would say it will abandon the no-injury policy which has given us partial protection in the reciprocal trade bills in the past. We abandoned judicial review. We abandoned the Tariff Commission, the arm of the Congress, and the peril-point and escape clause. These are just some of the things that the bill will do.

The bill could be called an effort for planned injury of industry. The first 19 pages of the bill tell you how the President can injure industry as he sees fit, and the final 41 or 42 pages tell what aid and subsidies the President can give to overcome the damages which the first part of the bill creates.

This bill concentrates attention on tariffs as the one field of trade barriers, when there are others more restrictive—quotas, embargoes, license registration, road taxes, and a whole host of other restrictive practices that our foreign friends practice in order to keep our exports to them down to a minimum. This bill relates mainly to tariffs.

We have found in our hearings that the trouble is not indeed a need for more law, as the President proclaims, but better negotiating by our negotiators who have not received concessions in line with those that we have given.

Furthermore, this bill will ignore or violate these other things that are law today. First, it does not take into account deficit spending, or the inflationary influence of our Government by deficits when we devalue or weaken our currency. Second, it does not take into account foreign aid, gifts, and the balance of trade difficulties that stem from our outright giving away of money in the world today. Third, it does not take into account the unemployment compensation laws which we now have, since this bill will provide a separate program which involves 65 percent of the weekly wage of a worker for 52 weeks and 26 weeks more and some 13 more if he is over 60 years old, together with a lump-sum payment of 2½ times the weekly wage, plus other costs. That is what one worker can get. This bill does not take into account unemployment compensation. Fourth, it does not take into consideration the effects of the retraining bill which we passed or, fifth, the immigration laws that we have passed and immigration policies of the Common Market. It does not take into account the tremendous burden our industry is facing today at home and abroad in today's tax laws so that our industry cannot compete equally with other nations that have better tax laws than ours. It does not take into account the monopolistic position of labor today and collective bargaining of a dictatorial nature.

Let me tell you other laws we will now violate with this bill.

Let me get down to section 2 of the Unemployment Act of 1946, which declares it to be the policy of the United States to use all of its resources to create conditions under which there will be more useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

This bill will contradict this directly by causing immediately, to whatever extent the President makes it necessary, further unemployment than we now have.

This bill violates section 2 of the Small Business Act, which declares that the economic well-being and security of the Nation "cannot be realized unless the actual and potential capacity of small business is encouraged and developed."

Gentlemen, this bill will do away with small business, because the little companies cannot compete with lower imports. It is the little businesses that are going to be gutted. The big companies usually can look out for themselves.

Section 2 of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 declares it to be the policy of the Congress to overcome unemployment and underemployment in communities suffering substantial and persistent misfortune of this type by assisting in the establishment of stable and diversified local economies and by developing and expanding new and existing facilities "rather than by merely transferring jobs from one area of the United States to another."

This bill directly contradicts this. You are not going to take miners and make another industry out of them, the mine and the worker, as many of you have in your areas. They cannot be retrained overnight or even in 52 weeks in some other industry.

Further than that, this bill will permit the United States, rather than engaging in freer and fairer trade, to join cartels and antitrust practices existing in the world today. Nothing in this bill forces the President to do other than what he chooses to do. Indeed, 31 times in the first 19 pages there are specific grants of authority to the President alone, one man alone. I cannot believe for the life of me that any self-respecting Member of this body can, without studying this thing thoroughly, agree with that particular principle.

Furthermore, this is Government price control. Now, I asked Secretary Hodges and Secretary Ball about this, and they laughed at me. So, I did a little homework, and I think I hit on the right key to prove the point. The President said in New York City on October 12, 1960:

> Frequently imports may be only a relatively small percentage of our domestic market, 2 or 3 percent, but it breaks the price for the other 97 percent.

My colleagues, I appeal to you. Think of one man's dictatorial powers, empowered to do these various thngs, including breaking the market. In this bill he can. He said so himself in 1960.

Further than that, there are no guidelines of procedure in this bill as there are in the present Reciprocal Trade Act, much as you may disagree with the present trade bill, and I disagreed with it, because of the failure of our negotiators to succeed in negotiations.

There are many provisions which this bill lacks.

Further than that, the concessions we extend to the European Common Market actually do represent concessions that go to Japan and Asia, which, because of the most-favored-nation clause, will benefit. Now, whatever business you have in your respective districts, think about that. I am not making a political talk here; I am just warning you that this applies to each district, Japan and the Asian nations come under this bill. That is a fact. Now, this is what you will not know, nor any Member of the Congress, when you vote for this bill and pass it. You will not know what nations are included. It will not only include the six European Common Market, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, and others, but it will also include a number of other nations that will be brought into the bill. So, we do not know what nations will be involved, but they will be the ones that will be involved in computing the reducing of tariffs.

Furthermore, gentlemen, you do not know what the classifications will be. Do you realize that the broad categories covered in this bill are classifications laid out not by the United States but by the United Nations, and when they are classified, they will be classified according to what the United Nations wants.

Furthermore, their descriptions do not fit the descriptions of American commodities. Secretary Ball said so today. He said we have got to, for effectiveness, change over to meet the situation. But, it is not quite that simple.

For those of you who wonder what reclassifications are, let me mention several. You may not know what section 512 or section 651, which covers all textiles, actually covers. I think we have some Members in the Chamber interested in that.

First of all, section 512 covers all organic chemicals—the whole shooting match. The President can cut the tariff with a cleaver. Yet all organic chemicals are not alike. I do not know anyone who wants to argue that.

Second, group 651 covers all textiles, yarns, and threads, regardless of fiber. That includes manmade textile yarns and threads. With a broad meatax the

President will cut all tariffs on those businesses, and all such production in the Nation. They will be small losses in the overall picture, but will not be so to those who cannot compete.

Mr. Speaker, SITC—that is the standard international classification of the U.N. 653—covers a broad group, and does not say what country. It covers all clothing and wearing apparel, and all fiber content. The President, then, can cut the tariff on all of them.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say to the Members of the House is that the situation does not favor the United States. It is a U.N. classification and they can reclassify without taking the United States into account. I do not know how any Representative here of a textile community or other industry can go along with this, even though the President or one of his lieutenants may try to assure you that he has got a deal working of some kind, and not to worry. This will permit the final removal of those tariffs, or about 80 percent of them. How much of that is by gift? We were told only today that $2.8 billion is the amount in total export value.

Mr. Speaker, that comes about in this way: We give it to foreign nations and they buy back from us, and that is supposed to give us an export. But we do not know how much of this is through a gift.

Then, what is the period of time involved? The President can take any period since 1956—a shorter or longer period of time—to determine what is the right export value.

Mr. Speaker, now we come to the trading with Communists, and transshipping. I will address my attention to those whom I think are even more interested, even today, in order to give you just a little goody that we uncovered today before the committee when very few of the committee members were present, and the press had left, which is so often the case by the time the tail-end Charlies get to asking questions. But today we discovered a deal whereby Italy has made a deal with Russia for oil shipped from Russia. The pipes, the pumps, and the valves will be obtained by Italy from the United States. Yet certain precautions could be taken which could prevent this sort of thing. Secretary Ball said this bill cannot deal with this. I say it must be prohibited. Those who say we have got to go into the European market to permit them to transship these instruments into Russia should thoroughly consider this matter. The testimony we had before the Congress was that we will lose a year or 2 years of precious time in establishing the oil reserves needed in NATO in Western Europe to compete with the Russians from the standpoint of pipelines if they go through with this deal. This is working right now, gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, I have a list with me tonight of trade licenses with Russia on goods moving into Russia, and a full list of them will go into the Record by Secretary Ball, he said today. If I may, let me present a constructive program.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that many of us who are conservative are accused of putting forth things which are negative. But let me present a trade program which I hope will hit the nail on the head:

Recommendations to be considered as a unit:

First. Strike out everything after the enacting clause.

Second. Extend the present trade agreements law for a 4-year period.

Third. Within present law, give the President additional authority to reduce duties by 20 percent, to take effect 5 percent a year.

Fourth. Strengthen the existing peril-point and escape clause provisions by requiring a finding of actual or threatened injury by the Tariff Commission whenever there exists, or would be imminent, a combination of either (a) a decline in the share of the market supplied by domestic production and a decline in the domestic price level or in domestic industry earnings; or (b) a decline in the share of the market for domestic products and a decline in employment or wages paid in the domestic industry.

Fifth. Provide against the sappings by excessive imports of the rate of growth of industries, by adding to the peril point and escape clause, as alternate bases for action, circumstances characterized by an increase in imports, the continued expansion of the domestic market, but a decline in the established rate of growth, as shown by investment, earnings, sales, employment, or wage payments, of the industry producing like or competitive products.

Sixth. Direct the President to make a determined use of legislative tools already at hand designed to promote the expansion of U.S. exports without the necessity for new duty reductions. These include section 338 of the Tariff Act of 1930; section 350(a)(5) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; and the provisions of our trade agreements, such as article XXIII of GATT providing for action to prevent or correct nullification of concessions received.

Seventh. Establish a congressional commission, adequately staffed on nominations by the majority and the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, to make a comprehensive study of all the factors relating to our foreign trade position, including: (a) the development of the EEC; (b) our balance-of-payments situation; (c) the state of foreign reserves of dollars, and the extent to which these reserves could be urged to return in the form of payments for exports; (d) discrimination against U.S. exports; (e) the use by the President of statutory and trade agreement remedies to counteract same; (f) the effect of discriminations against exports of third countries on the volume of imports into the United States; (g) the practicability of further tariff concessions under most-favored-nation rules considering the situation of low-cost countries vis-a-vis EEC concessions; (h) the extent to which restrictions imposed by EEC countries against low-cost countries forces excessive volumes of imports from the latter into the United States; (i) an analysis of inflationary influences created by Government policies affecting the cost position of U.S. industries vis-a-vis their principal foreign competition; (j) an analysis of foreign and domestic costs and prices from the point of view of the adequacy of existing U.S. tariffs to make fair competition in the U.S. market possible; (k) a thorough analysis of the effect which elimination of industrial duties would have on domestic employment and on investment in plants and community facilities.

The report of this body should be made 3 years from the date of the bill's enactment, so that it will be before the Congress and the public for thorough study and consideration in any further extension of the trade agreements law 4 years hence.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman from California standing or sitting?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I believe it is obvious that I am standing.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman standing or sitting down? If he is sitting down, he would have lost the floor and that would have ended the colloquy, or the participation we are now having.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are talking about the transshipment of goods into Russia through a bill of this kind, we have that kind of comment on the floor of the House. I thought perhaps my remarks were deserving of something better; but perhaps not.

These are but some of the constructive suggestions I am passing on to you and obviously, whether you listen or not, you may read it in the Record, because this I think is food for thought. I hope that perhaps someone on the majority side will take this and give it the parentage that we need, so that we may have such a trade act, because we on our side cannot pass such an act.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. As I understand the gentleman from Texas, he says that he is going to be able to secure the export licenses and permits that are issued covering commodities shipped to the Soviet Union?

Mr. ALGER. Yes, I have some of it with me tonight, but Secretary Ball said today that he will give us a complete list for the Record, and I shall be glad to see that the gentleman is made familiar with it.

Mr. COLLIER. Will this list include simply the permits that are issued covering particular commodities or products, or will it reveal the names of the firms of the United States who are shipping directly to the Soviet Union?

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the gentleman that I do not think our colloquy should indicate in any way that there is necessarily anything wrong with this. I am not, by my remarks, saying that these export licenses, some of them as recent as March 5 of this year, are necessarily wrong. But I am calling attention to the fact obviously that in this trade bill we will not be perpetuating and accelerating the trade through an intermediate nation, as I pointed out in the case of the situation with Italy in the Common Market pipeline.

Mr. COLLIER. May I say that I have not suggested that there is anything wrong, either. I am simply asking the question to determine just what information may be available to the gentleman from Texas, which is not available to me.

Mr. ALGER. I assure the gentleman that I will put this information in the RECORD when it is made available to us.

Mr. Speaker, another little item that you might like to know about—and again very few members of the committee were present when we worked on this one—is this matter of Communist Czechoslovakian typewriters coming to us through Canada. They are made in Czechoslovakia, but they are put together in Canada, where they put a case on it and ship it down here. That is the sort of thing we have to combat, that our own industry is having to combat, importation of Communist-made material in that way.

This is something that we had at the time that we had Secretary Ball and Secretary Hodges before us yesterday and today; and I have here—and I stand tall enough for anybody to see and talk loud enough so anybody can hear me—a Common Market pamphlet which has in it safeguard clauses for the Common Market nations. It has also certain waivers mentioned in it where they are protecting one another, in addition to these cartels that are given grace periods.

This is what the Common Market has. They have got the safeguards, but our administration, President Kennedy and his associates, are asking us to give up the safeguards which they, the other nations themselves, will retain. Those of us in the textile areas and other areas of our country—pottery, and the rest of it—had better take a long look at this before we go into it.

As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] came before our committee and made a very fine presentation. I here and now commend him for it.

Material is being sent around the world about our trade program that our Under Secretary of State had never even seen. One of the things they say is that you cannot have automobiles in this country if you do not have oil from Kuwait. Before you get mad over whether you import oil or not, we have oil coming out of our ears in this country. But these State Department pamphlets, "Together We Grow Strong," and the "ABC's of Foreign Trade," are not only erroneous, they are false and misleading, filled with that kind of material. I suppose this, too, can be part of the propaganda material that the administration is putting out to support this trade bill. This is a recent publication. I think that is wrong. I do not think anybody here thinks that they ought to make misstatements on which we base our information.

Here I have a digest of this deal with Italy. Here is the deal between Italy and Russia. Italy is trading with the United States in the sense they are getting goods of which they will make prototypes to ship into Russia. There it is. I have some other things here.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas for bringing to the floor of the House the important matters that have come out in the public hearings in the Committee on Ways and Means in the past 4 weeks, when we have been trying to get to the bottom of this problem of reciprocal trade.

I call to your attention the fifth annual report of the President of the United States on the trade agreements program, dated August 6, 1961. The act requires that the President make this annual report to the Congress. I want to commend President Kennedy and his administration for the clarity of this report.

One of the chief questions that is involved in this foreign trade problem is things other than tariffs, trade barriers and restrictions other than tariffs. I invite your attention to, if I may use the word, the propaganda that has been going around the country for the past 3 months in behalf of this bill. It is directed toward the tariff aspects.

One of the lines of questioning that has been going on for 4 weeks has been, What about these other trade barriers? On page 4 of this report of the President is one section "Removal of Quantitative Import Restrictions in Europe." This is a very good section, and shows some achievement made in this area. But I also want to call attention to page 45, where we get into the real problem involved in foreign trade. On page 45, "Subsidies and State Trading Enterprises," the report states that "the present standstill agreement which was entered into on January 1, 1955" is still standing still. Right along that line is the item on "Restrictive Business Practices," which covers the waterfront, I might state. There are only one or two paragraphs and these further indicate the complete standstill. Here are the areas of real trade barriers, and the administration has devoted no attention to them in the 4 weeks of our hearings and in all of its propaganda, but that is what the Committee on Ways and Means is going to have to engage in, digging out the facts and trying to pay attention to them if we are going to write a good trade bill.

Mr. ALGER. I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri. He has been one of those who studiously questioned the witnesses. I certainly share his views on that. I have been very disturbed over the fact that some of the Cabinet officers come before us and do not understand too much of what is in the bill. For example, we had Secretary Hodges. He came in and admitted he did not know the tax features as they relate to the trade bill, and we just had a tax bill that all of you are aware of. I am sure the Secretary of Commerce should be and, yet, he did not know the tax implications as they relate to trade. Both of these bills, as we tried so hard at the time of the debate to point out to you, both the trade bill and the tax bill, limited the ability of U.S. industry to compete abroad.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for his very fine and clear remarks. I had agreed that I would yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, but before I do that let me point out one thing. He was complaining about the Eisenhower years. As the gentleman well knows, wages, that is real wages, went up more progressively in that period of time than during most other periods of our history. There were more homes built in that time than most of the other times in our history. There were more classrooms constructed. There was greater real prosperity. A great deal of this was done without Federal intervention. I am sure that the gentleman does not want to try to put the blame, as a partisan issue, for the depression on the Republican Party any more than we would want to blame on his party the three wars which occurred under the Democratic administration.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Before this tirade started on some tax bill or tariff bill, I had said that in my district we had been fortunate enough to get two of the seven loans from the ARA. Well, down where I come from, Democrats represent their constituents. They are on the ball. They are trying to get the loans and they are trying to help their people. Where I come from, Republicans always listen to the vested interests and taking orders and do not give a hoot about people. That is the reason I got the two loans. Now let me get to the gentleman's remarks I made about the "Eisen-Hoover" administration. May I answer the gentleman's tirade about the "Eisen-Hoover" administration.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. You certainly like that term; do you not?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I say, you certainly like that term; do you not? You know the man's name.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I do not know if I like the term, but I suffered under the administration and I do not like the administration, whether I like the term or not. I do not like what happened to my country.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. We all suffered under three wars. But you would not imply that the wars were the Democratic Party's fault.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I served in the war and I expect the gentleman did, too.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. We all suffered under the wars.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I hope the Republicans do not take the position today that they are scared to fight for their country. The Democrats never took that position.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Oh, no, the Republicans take no such position.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am proud that I fought for my country. But let me talk about the Eisenhower-Hoover administrations since the gentleman yielded to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYS). The Chair is happy to announce that the time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the Speaker pro tempore for his thoughtful remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYS). Under previous order of the House, the Chair reluctantly recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I object to the Speaker characterizing his recognition of the Member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is overruled. The gentleman will sit down.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman will not be seated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Well, the Chair did not ask for this job, but as long as he is in it, he is going to run the show and the gentleman had better be seated.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HOEVEN. The Chair is out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Well, the Chair is in the chair; what is he going to do about that?

The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I must ask the Chair whether I can yield or not. Mr. Speaker, can I yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may yield to whomsoever he likes and whenever he likes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. With no reluctance whatsoever I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would just like to make two observations. I think it comes with ill grace for the gentleman from South Carolina to refer to the remarks of his colleagues in this House as tirades. I should like also to suggest that it ill becomes any of the Members of this House, we who are the hired men of the sovereign people of this Nation, to refer to any of our masters as "little people." I just want to record my protest to this attempt to demean our sovereigns and our masters.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I have not said anything yet about which the gentleman could ask any questions.

Mr. ROONEY. The question pertains to the proceedings now going on this evening. I would like to know whether or not this is a revolt by the Neanderthals against the Ev and Charlie show. I just do not understand what is going on.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. I would like to inform the gentleman from New York that that was fully explained earlier. This effort this evening is a grassroots effort on the part of patriotic Americans who believe in America and believe America should take the right course, to point out that course and to compliment and commend the President where we feel he is on the right track, and to criticize him where we feel he is making a mistake. That was the purpose of this evening's proceedings, sir.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at the start that there are certain areas of operation of the New Deal, of the New Frontier I should say, that I cannot exactly agree with, but I certainly admire their ability.

I know that when I am watching a football game I do not like to see Ohio defeated by Iowa or Michigan, but I am frank to say that when I am one of a crowd of 80,000 people watching a game, and a Michigan quarterback throws a 60-yard pass and an end reaches out and grabs it and runs for a touchdown I admire the play and feel like cheering the player. In the same way there have been some good plays by this administration. One of their best has been in the field of public relations. I will ask you what could be more successful than the publicity they have received for the programs they have engaged in and without having to pay much for it. Contrast that with the old frontiersmen around Jamestown and Plymouth. Had we had the New Frontier in those days there would have been aid for stockade building, aid to corral Indians drunk on Saturday night, aid to trappers of muskrats. So I express my admiration of the President in his public relations, in his effort to sell the New Frontier, in his press-agentry.

We hear the various departments in their press releases applaud their own efforts, but we do not hear anything about the 17 million Americans going to bed hungry and the other problems that face us.

Despite the fact that we are improving education at the local level we hear this administration pointing out that we have a worsening education system. It does not seem possible, but in this field of aid to education, more than any other, suffering from Federal intrusion, the President points to this type of picture.

Last February he said, in launching the program, that we needed to build 600,000 classrooms in the next 10 years. That is rather interesting because in the last 5 years we have been building at the rate of 70,000 per year, all of this without Federal aid to education. I am not sure whether this means President Kennedy wants to cut down our State efforts, cut down 10,000 classrooms a year or what. Nevertheless, we are told unless we have Federal aid to education we will not be able to build the 600,000 classrooms.

I cannot understand in many ways, if we are going ahead with all of these programs, the chairman of my committee, the Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of New York, points out he was going to blow the whistle on further aid to education programs until he had a chance to look at them to see what the Government is doing. All of a sudden he was amazed by the fact we have 40 agencies in the field of aiding local education, both secondary and higher education. He quite frankly stated we do not know at this Federal level what is going on in these bureaucratic agencies. There is so much going on we cannot keep track, and until some effort was made to find out he is going to blow the whistle, and we have no further program. He has kept his word. They are studying these estimates.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen an unprecedented dose of public relations used to sell the New Frontier program to the American public. The press-agentry has on the one hand glorified and deified the marvels of the Frontiersmen while on the other deprecated the ability of the individual American to care for himself and provide local services. We have witnessed the chairman of the Democratic National Committee applaud the Colonel Glenn flight as an accomplishment of the foresight of the Kennedy administration, which it was not. We have heard the State Department applaud their own efforts and conclude that we are now winning the cold war which is at the very best questionable. On the other hand we do not hear about 17 million Americans going to bed hungry every night any more, nor about unemployment, nor about economic growth, nor about missile gaps. All of these problems are seemingly solved by the Frontiersmen and President Kennedy. He simply did it all.

On the other hand, a black picture is painted in the areas of medical care, education, unemployment compensation, agriculture and the various areas where the planners want to spread their programs. At a time when he has offered the most restrictive farm program in history, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman told Khrushchev that the way to succeed was to "let the farmers run their own farms." Speaking about medical care for the aged, President Kennedy stated that one of the best things about his program under social security would be that it would not be paid by taxpayers. No, it would not be paid by taxpayers—merely employees, employers, and self-employed persons but, to be sure, not American taxpayers.

We have seen more press-agentry in the field of Federal aid to education, in my judgment, than in any other sphere marked for Federal intrusion. While the President and the National Education Association have been painting a picture of a steadily worsening situation in local education, exactly the opposite is true. The facts show a steadily improved picture. Last February, President Kennedy stated that Federal aid to education was necessary so we could build the 600,000 classrooms we need in the decade of the sixties. The facts show that we have averaged almost 70,000 per year for the past 5 years. Is the President advocating that States and local school districts cut down their efforts by 10,000 classrooms per year? Where is this great need we are warned of? At the present rate of growth we will take care of our school classroom needs without Federal aid. Does this mean that it will be easy for local districts? No, it does not. By the same token, however, it would be even harder for the Federal Government which does not have the money. Federal indebtedness last year for present and accrued liability represented $800 billion while State and local indebtedness is less than $65 billion. Money, whether State or Federal, comes from local sources and there is no magic money supply no matter what the dope peddler of Federal aid might tell us.

Last January, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee seemed to be shocked by a revelation. United Press International carried the following story:

> WASHINGTON.—Chairman ADAM C. POWELL of the House Education and Labor Committee, advised that 40 Federal agencies are spending close to $2 billion yearly on education, said today he is blowing the whistle on further major school aid legislation until a study shows where all the money is going.
>
> It's unbelievable, the New York Democrat said of the estimate which he said was based on a preliminary check by Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, chairman of a Subcommittee on Higher Education.
>
> Pending the study—which he said should be completed by summer—POWELL said he got White House clearance today for a decision to delay action on President Kennedy's $900 million college scholarship bill.
>
> Also to be sidetracked until the survey is done will be any effort to revive the President's controversial program of Federal aid for construction of public primary and secondary schools, POWELL told a reporter. Not affected by the announced go-slow decision is a measure already en route to the House floor to put $1.5 billion over 5 years into loans and grants for construction of college classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.
>
> This bill is expected to come to a vote in the House shortly.
>
> POWELL and Mrs. GREEN outlined the study in a White House conference today with Theodore C. Sorensen, special counsel to President Kennedy. POWELL said Sorensen concurred in the decision to delay any further big push on schools until Mrs. GREEN's subcommittee has finished its survey.
>
> He said the object is to avoid fragmentation of the Government's education efforts, which he said now are so widely scattered that more Federal funds are being spent in this field outside the Health, Education, and Welfare Department than in it.
>
> Some congressional sources viewed POWELL's announcement as more of a justification than a basis for the decision by House education experts to abandon, at least temporarily, the President's scholarship bill.
>
> They contended the scholarships already have been sidetracked for fear there was not enough support yet to approve them. They said no real effort was planned, anyway, to emphasize the general construction bill.
>
> This measure foundered in the House last year on the rock of controversy over contentions that parochial schools also should be cut in on the Federal help.
>
> POWELL said Mrs. GREEN's preliminary check turned up Federal education outlays of $1.7 billion and that when the full story is told the figure "probably will run to $2 billion."

Only this month this House committee published a directory of federally financed student loans, fellowship and career training programs in the field of higher education in the United States and it took 51 pages to list them. The same proliferation of overlapping bureaucratic endeavor is present in the field of aid to secondary education and yet this administration would add billions of dollars on top of this spending which already aggregates so much that our Committee on Education and Labor has lost track of it.

Every scare technique is used. We hear that the Russians excel us and we must therefore accept the Kennedy proposals to close one more nonexistent gap. Our education is superior, our education is free, and our educational system is not ready for the junk heap. These professional educators at the Washington level, however, look at the school in terms of training rather than education. They speak in terms of developing the right attitudes and encouraging students to think rightly. A system of Federal control of education will ultimately lead to the indoctrination of the social, economic, political, and international views of the professional bureaucratic here in Washington.

Let me make it clear that the real question is not one of funds to run school districts. In my opinion, it is the basic target of these people to add fourth and fifth "r's" to the old three "r's." Those are regulation and regimentation. The Kennedy administration bill of 1961, wisely sidetracked by the House, contained controls. Of course, they called them criteria or standards—not controls.

Sterling M. McMurrin, U.S. Commissioner of Education has said:

> I see no reason why Federal aid to education must mean some kind of Federal dictation to local institutions * * * but without a strong centralized Government agency taking a firm hand in the educational direction of the Nation, we are likely to drift in such a way that our educational institutions will not satisfy the demands of the Nation.

Now this is a good example of bureaucratic jargon. He already has in operation the strong centralized Government agency he refers to and it has been reorganized only this month. The blueprint of this Federal takeover of our educational institutions is well documented in "A Federal Education Agency for the Future," which was published last April. This report contains 56 pages of findings and recommendations which call for more and more Federal participation and control and repeatedly stress the need for Federal activity in formulating educational policies. It recommends a review of teacher preparation, curriculum, and textbooks. It calls for an implementation of international educational projects in cooperation with UNESCO and other bodies. On page 6 the report boldly calls for an additional function for the Office of Education—"extensive involvement in the formulation of national policy."

Our educational system is unique because of its diversity. I think this is good even though Mr. MacMurrin and others may refer to this as drift. Freedom of the individual has been the hallmark, the guiding light of our society. Freemen as responsible individuals created this Republic and perpetuated it for our benefit. Those who want Federal control are typical of the other social reformers who have accepted and promoted the premise that central dictation is the only acceptable solution for the problems of the 20th century. I believe the opposite to be true.

In modern times, tyranny has commenced with regimentation in the classroom, with the removal of individual determination and with the substitution of mass or collectivist objectives. We cannot afford to have Federal dictation of our schools. They are able to provide adequate education at the local level and have been improving in every area—techniques, plant, teachers, curriculum, to name but a few. Certainly the facts do not make a good strong case for using vast Federal appropriations at the elementary and secondary school level. To a degree unequaled by any other nation in history, primary and secondary education has been provided in this country. Without bureaucratic dictation it will continue to expand and offer even better educational opportunities for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I compliment him on his statement on educational matters. It was a very sound and eloquent statement.

Some of the matters covered in our committee are also matters of labor, and I would like to inject as part of my remarks at this point that about 90 percent of the bills or proposals sent up to the House, up to Capitol Hill, for enactment by the White House have three basic ingredients: No. 1, a bigger Federal Government; No. 2, high, wide, and handsome spending; No. 3, increased Executive power, and this, I might say, particularly to build up the Department of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labor, under the New Frontier, is becoming the most powerful department in our Government. The bills coming before our committee have a built-in power for the Secretary of Labor. As could be expected, this power is being used in peculiar ways.

Take one example: In Texas, the Department of Labor is using the Davis-Bacon Act to sabotage U.S. space efforts.

Construction costs are being rocketed into scandalous orbits.

We are being hoodwinked into paying enormous costs on projects which should be performed 25 percent cheaper. The New Frontier wants to add fringe benefits in the Davis-Bacon law and this will jump the costs even more.

The Secretary of Labor's predetermination for the proposed manned spacecraft center at Houston, Tex., according to the Corps of Engineers' estimates, may increase the cost on the first phase alone by approximately $1 million, or about 25 percent. Increased costs are due to the use of wage rates, applied by the Labor Department under the Davis-Bacon Act, far above those normally used on similar work in the Houston area.

The Labor Department would require $3.90 an hour for operating engineers compared with about $2.75 for the same type of operators on heavy and highway work in the same vicinity. It would require $2.20 for laborers compared with about $1.40 for the same type of workman on heavy highway work. The wage decision was made without a public hearing and, in addition, the Labor Department's time in issuing a decision has already delayed the project.

The Davis-Bacon Act was originally enacted to protect local wage rates but under the New Frontier it is overriding them.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is one of the cases where the New Frontier is building big Government and big executive branch power far above reason and far above the Constitution.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. I should like to compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] for his remarks, and to say that I appreciate them. I am sure there are Members of the House who do appreciate them, and who do not share the view of the present occupant of the chair, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], that he reluctantly recognized the gentleman from Ohio.

I would like also, if the gentleman will yield further, to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT], who preceded him, and to say I do not share in the statement of pleasure that was expressed by the present occupant of the chair, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], upon the expiration of his time.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the recently expired gentleman.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I know that the gentleman from Ohio is probably very familiar with the figures on unemployment. Since several comments were made here this evening about the benefits that always come to the country when there is a Democrat administration, I think it should be pointed out that during the depression in 1933, when the Democrat administration came into power, there were approximately 15 million people unemployed. With all of the pump priming, with all of the vote buying, with all of the big taxing programs there were still 12 million people unemployed in 1939. It required a war to truly relieve us of unemployment. I say that the New Deal did not truly solve the problem of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the unemployment figures, I think it brings up appropriately at this time, perhaps, the weakest point in the administration's record thus far. A great deal was said during the campaign about unemployment, and the very acute problems that faced this country.

Mr. Speaker, just a day or two ago the Secretary of Labor announced that unemployment is now 5½ percent, or 4.4 million people still unemployed. More discouragingly, the very long-term unemployed—those who have been unemployed more than 6 months—have been increasing steadily for the past 3 months. The long-term—those who have been unemployed for more than 4 months—have been increasing steadily for the last 3 months.

Mr. Speaker, a good deal of talk was heard last year about the manpower retraining bill. The administration proposed this, and I pay tribute to Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Goldberg for bringing this to the Congress. They said it had a very high priority in attempting to solve this very serious problem of the long-term unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, we have an overwhelmingly Democratic-controlled Congress. While they talked about high priority on the manpower bill all last year, they put nothing through the Congress. We got no manpower bill enacted last year. We went through the entire session and came to this year with the substitute, as we all know, for the manpower bill, making about 30 major changes in the President's proposal which was enacted in the House of Representatives with 40 Democratic opposing votes and 22 Republican opposing votes.

This overwhelming bipartisan passage of the substitute bill I think makes it unmistakably clear that we should have and could have had this manpower retraining bill a year ago attacking this very problem of hard core unemployment.

There has been some discussion here of the manner in which the Democratic administrations in the past have solved unemployment or failed to solve unemployment. We have had four recessions since World War II. It is clear, unmistakably clear at this point, that our performance in the past 15 months under the Kennedy administration in recovering from the fourth recession has been the poorest of any recovery period since World War II.

I quote as an authority, which many of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle I think will accept, the AFL-CIO in this respect, when the executive council made this statement:

> The pickup from the recession in employment and unemployment have been the poorest of all recoveries from postwar recessions.

Mr. Speaker, the uniform prescription of the Kennedy administration to solve all problems appears to be massive injections of more Federal money into the economic patients. I will concede that in certain downturning periods of our economy the pouring of some Federal money into circulation can have an effect in moderating the recession. But I certainly do not concede that the Kennedy administration has been correct in trying to solve all of its problems by simply spending and spending and spending. This has been an approach to the problem that has actually stifled the rebound of our economy, the normal rebound of our economy. Even the Washington Post, which I cannot say is an unfriendly paper to the Kennedy administration, has criticized the conduct of its administration for its latest answer in trying to solve this unemployment problem. They said:

> Almost 30 years after the invention of that institution, the WPA, the administration should be able to think of something better." They seem to be obsessed with not the New Frontier but the Old Frontier, the reactionary, unimaginative, economic panaceas that failed during the 1930's to solve this very acute problem of unemployment.

I think that if the administration leaders would stop occupying themselves so much with the largely discredited weapons of the Old Frontier we could go ahead on a bipartisan basis and really begin to solve this problem of unemployment about which we are all deeply concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I include a Washington Post article comparing the past four recessions and recoveries:

ECONOMISTS SKEPTICAL ABOUT STRONG RECOVERY—CAPITAL, LABOR AGREE KENNEDY VIEW OF ECONOMY TOO ROSY

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Wall Street and organized labor, an unlikely pair of bedfellows, apparently agree on one point: President Kennedy's view of the economy is too rosy.

Outside of Government, economists are increasingly skeptical of the President's insistence that this is a strong recovery. In fact, a sampling of the major economic indicators shows that the current recovery could be labeled the weakest of the four postwar upturns.

This does not mean that a slump is on the horizon. As far ahead as economists can see with assurance—about 6 months—there is no sign of a downturn. But the pace of the advance in the last 6 months has been meager.

Wall Street reflects this in stock prices which haven't been rising; labor expresses it in more insistent demands for Federal action, partly appeased by the President's proposal on Monday for an extra $600 million in public works spending.

At the White House, Mr. Kennedy's experts single out the first 3 months of 1962 as the sore spot, acknowledge that they were disappointing but find the results mysterious.

Here, in schematic form, is a picture of how the first year of this recovery compares with the first year of the three earlier postwar recoveries.

All four began climbing at about the same rate. But after 6 months of advance, the three earlier recoveries rose at a faster pace; the current recovery continued rising too, but at a slower rate.

This shows up by comparing four important measurements of the economy in the four recoveries. The four indexes are jobs outside of farming, incomes of persons, industrial output and business investment in new plant and equipment.

Here is the percentage that each indicator gained in the first 6 months of the four recoveries:

	Recoveries			
	1949-50	1954-55	1958-59	1961-62
Jobs	3.4	1.7	1.2	1.6
Incomes	7.5	3.0	3.3	4.0
Output	13.8	7.5	10.2	10.7
Plant	8.0	−4.4	−1.2	2.5

In general, the 1961-62 advance (which began last March) is about in line with its predecessors for this 6-month segment.

But now look how it stacked up in the latest 6 months (through February) for the current recovery:

	Recoveries			
	1949-50	1954-55	1958-50	1961-62
Jobs	5.1	2.8	3.5	0.7
Incomes	7.4	5.0	4.3	3.2
Output	12.3	6.7	11.0	1.6
Plant	21.2	15.6	8.5	[1] 4.0

[1] Current quarter is estimated.

In the second 6 months of the first three recoveries, the gain in jobs was 4 to 7 times as great as in the current period; the gain in incomes, one-third to more than twice as large; in output, 4 to 8 times; in investment, 2 to 5 times.

Why is this recovery lagging? Many experts point to two factors:

1. Consumers are no longer buying autos, washing machines, and other durable goods with the same enthusiasm that they did in the earlier advances.

2. Home building has been declining.

As a result, business is investing less.

Why are hard goods and homebuilding no longer giving the economy a big lift? There are three major schools of thought.

The White House experts argue that there is no structural flaw in the economy, that consumers and corporate treasuries are loaded with cash and both should begin spending as soon as some economic spark is put to this money fuel. The cheap steel pact now in the making, the investment tax credit now before Congress or even spring weather might be the spark.

A conservative school would contend that there is a basic flaw, a lack of profits and incentive to invest. This could be cured by cutting labor costs and reducing business and top bracket taxes.

A liberal school would agree that there is a basic flaw but finds it in maldistributed income. Too much wealth in the top half and not enough in the bottom, with the top half's demand for housing and durables relatively satiated. This could be cured by cutting bottom bracket taxes, lifting wages of the submerged sector and increased Federal spending to reemploy the jobless.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire of the gentleman whether he supports Federal aid to education as it was pledged to the American people by the Republican Party in their 1960 platform.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I have introduced a bill, as the gentleman may know, to return 2 percent of the Federal individual income taxes to the States for that purpose; and I certainly think that would be an appropriate way to aid education.

Mr. CORMAN. As I read the Republican platform it indicates that there is a Federal responsibility in this field to some degree. It reads:

> One objective of such Federal assistance should be to help equalize educational opportunities.

Then it goes on to pledge:

> Federal aid for school construction.
>
> To update and strengthen vocational education for both youth and adults.
>
> To make adequate library facilities available to all our citizens.
>
> Support of programs to strengthen basic research in education; to discover the best methods for helping handicapped, retarded, and gifted children to realize their highest potential.

That is in the elementary and secondary field. Then it goes on to advocate:

> Construction of college housing.
>
> Student loan program and graduate fellowship program.

I should like to ask the gentleman whether he supports that kind of activity as pledged in the Republican platform.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I do. I speak for many of our Republicans when I say that I would support programs which are directed to this need. But it is very strange to me that the people who cry "need" with reference to the small number of the 40,000 school districts that are not able to meet these problems, nevertheless introduce bills which will help every single district in the country. I am not for that type of program. I am for helping districts which truly need help. I am not for the pork-barrel type of program which will ultimately bring control. They have always spoken for every school district in the country, not just the needy districts. If we did it on the basis of those which truly need it, we would not have an overall control education program which they want but most of us on our side are reluctant to accept.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from Ohio is a hardworking member of our committee. I have a great deal of pleasure in serving on the same committee with him. So is the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

There have been many statements here this evening that we have not taken the trouble to challenge. If the gentleman from New York will permit me to make a correction here, I perhaps either misunderstood him or perhaps he had spoken inadvertently regarding the manpower retraining bill.

I do not know of any Member of Congress who has worked harder for this legislation than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] and the majority of this House accepted amendments suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], and we accepted these in the most statesmanlike attitude to get this legislation through. One can hardly say today that we passed a Republican bill. The record will show conclusively and indisputably that the bill we got by this House was conceived, written, and pushed through this House through the untiring efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND]. I do not think anybody would want to take the credit away from that distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. GOODELL. I certainly do commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] and I commend the Members on that side of the aisle. They did accept the substitute which we presented. I think it was a clear statement from the floor that they were presenting Mr. HOLLAND's substitute, H.R. 10363 here on the floor. That was the bill I introduced. This was basically a different approach to the problem than the retraining part of the proposal of the administration, but it did make a great many changes in the approach of the administration, all of which were accepted. I commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for accepting the statements we Republicans proposed. They were an outgrowth of Operation Employment.

Some 60 Republican Congressmen last year working with university professors developed this program. They were very strongly interested in the idea of retraining. The purpose of my comment here was not to take away from the Democratic side their share of this bipartisan bill or to claim all the credit for the Republicans. It was to point out that we have a Democratic President and an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress, and it took us over a year to get a bipartisan bill on retraining. I think that delay was intolerable.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman agree that the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] and the rest of the Democrats did accept the suggestions and amendments offered by the gentleman from New York demonstrates statesmanship on our part in trying to get legislation through this Congress to help the American people? I am delighted to hear now that this bill, which we know is going to help the American people in the problem of automation, and which has been signed by a Democratic President and passed through the House by a Democratic majority, is being called Republican legislation, and that you are not fuss-budgeting about it.

Mr. GOODELL. If they had not been so free in passing massive artificial stimulant bills through the Congress, we would have had some retraining bills passed through the Congress and attacking this problem. The gentleman has not replied to this fact. You have an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress, which had control, but the Republicans were working last year for retraining but we could not get it out of here.

Mr. PUCINSKI. My distinguished colleague on the committee mentioned the artificial props we were discussing here. Would the gentleman say the extension of unemployment compensation was artificial? Would he say the payments to the children of unemployed parents were artificial? What are the artificial props he mentioned?

Mr. GOODELL. I will not go into all of them here.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Give me one.

Mr. GOODELL. We have spent over a $10-billion increase in the annual budget under the administration of President Kennedy. This increase in the budget was heralded by all the economic experts of the administration as the proposed solution to unemployment and to a lagging economy.

Mr. Kennedy, when he came into office, said: "Now we cannot blame the Democrats," in effect I paraphrase, "for this first 6-month period because we just began to put our prescriptions into operation." So when you compare the second 6 months of recovery, this is worse, far worse than the first 6 months.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Which of those bills did the gentleman not vote for which were for $10 billion, six of which were for defense. Which of those bills did the gentleman not vote for?

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I believe that point has been amply covered and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to get back to this matter of credit for the manpower training bill which, of course, I did not support. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from New York arguing the point whether this bill should be called the Holland bill or the Goodell bill. It is a refreshing thing and a new departure from having every bill called the Kennedy bill.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Ohio are talking about education. I would like to point out some of the things that have happened in education. After World War II there was a need for classrooms because during the depression we were not able to build classrooms fast enough and during the war we could not. By 1952 it is still true there was a great need for classrooms in this country. But what has happened to the Members of this House, I believe, is that they have not studied the figures of what happened in the last 2 years. Let us just cite a few. Remember last year we pointed out that local school districts were building classrooms at an unprecedented rate, but that it would not continue. An announcement came out this year that last year we constructed classrooms at the rate of 72,500, but it was simply added again that this would not continue. If we continue at the rate we have in the last 6 years, in just 5 years, we will completely eliminate all the backlog in the number of classrooms and the increases in enrollment and provide replacement of the obsolete classrooms. My big reason for not supporting a broad Federal aid classroom construction all over the country, divided equally among all parts of the country rather than equalization aid to areas that need it, is that this would actually slow down the construction of classrooms because now without Federal aid coming to the community, they go ahead and build classrooms, but if they know that Uncle Sam is going to send them a substantial portion of the cost of building their schools, they will wait.

We will not appropriate enough money for all of the 100,000 plus classrooms that need to be built. We will appropriate only a portion of it, and those who do not get the aid this year will wait another year to receive aid. I see no attempt on the part of this Congress to pass a true equalization aid only to areas that need it. This type of legislation does not seem to get anyplace because we cannot bring our share back to our own congressional districts. We have not seen any real acceptance of the principle of sending some of the tax money back to the States because then there could be no control because the Federal Government could not get their hands on it. But the Republican Party is not in opposition to all Federal assistance to education. I think under the National Aid to Education Act there was tremendous support on the part of the Republicans and we had a Republican President when this was enacted. We would like to change this act and improve it, but we have not been able to do so because we have not been able to pass aid for higher education which we could not accept. In fact, our Committee on Education which, as you know, is not dominated by arch conservatives would not accept the President's proposal for higher education this year. They turned it down. We passed, not too long ago, aid for governmental facilities. The gentleman from New York and I were instrumental, as well as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in seeing that this change was made because of this tremendous testimony before our committee from people in higher education saying, if we construct classrooms that are needed, we cannot use the President's program. We need the program that was passed by this House. Whereas, they have been building classrooms fulfilling the needs of the elementary and secondary schools, that has not been the case in higher education and there is a tremendous need, looking at what is happening in Federal Government activities, for some assistance in that area.

Last fall and through the first month of this session of Congress an advisory group met, worked, and studied with educators throughout the country. Our first recommendation was Federal assistance in technical education because of what appears to be the need for engineers and technicians. Due to Federal activities, however, the lunar project which we know is going to come about whether we like it or not, there is going to be a tremendous drain on this type of skill.

To date there has never been one hearing before our Committee on Education and Labor and this session of Congress is now getting on toward summer.

The same thing for handicapped children. I have been in the forefront of our committee supporting legislation which will further encourage assistance for handicapped children but to date this has not come out of our committee. We are lagging along. We have not had any hearings on that. There is great need in this area. The Federal Government must accept its responsibility in that field, but we have made no progress.

From our committee last year was reported a bill which provided Federal aid for academic facilities and student assistance. Later aid for academic facilities was reported and this was considered. I expressed my fears at that time that the House would never have a chance to vote and amend a student assistance provision, that the House would not be able to work its will under a program that looked like it would come before us. It looked as though the Senate would pass a bill with both academic facilities and students assistance in it, but this bill never came before the House. I objected to it when it went to the Rules Committee so we could find out one or two things about the scholarship provision, whether the House could work its will in the area of Government student aid.

There was great concern that the right approach was not in the scholarship field but in the strengthening of the loan program under NEA, but we have never been able to work our will. I feel that Federal assistance to education has got to be at this level also.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished and affable gentleman from Ohio yield very briefly?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York, but the debate having gone on for 7 hours, I believe he should know what it is about.

Mr. ROONEY. That is my trouble. I still do not understand it. I have in my hand an envelope of the National Republican Congressional Committee, Congresssional Hotel, Washington, D.C., bearing the statement "Personal and Confidential." It contains a mimeographed paper addressed by mistake to somebody on this side of the aisle. It is from Representative JAMES B. UTT and Representative CRAIG HOSMER, re Republican Spring Thaw, Wednesday, April 11, 1962.

> We have 15 hours reserved. We want everyone to get into the act.

Now, what show does this act succeed? That is my question.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The Kennedy circus, I might suggest.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the New Frontier advocates Federal aid with a vengeance. All we have to do is look to the House Education and Labor Committee, seeing the raft of bills before it which seek Federal aid.

Before the committee have come bills of broad and alarming range: Federal aid to the handicapped, Federal aid for scholarships, and construction, Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, Federal aid to exceptional children, Federal aid to illiterate adults, Federal aid to the performing arts; the list is almost endless.

Some of them would put the Federal Government into the permanent business of teacher training at all levels of education, both public, and private. That inevitably must result in specifications, standardized courses, and controls. This is Federal control with a vengeance.

Certainly, we have compassion for human needs, but there is folly in the belief that Washington is the only and final answer. And we must remember, too, that if Congress appropriates money, it is also Congress duty to control that money to see that it is well spent.

You can be certain that Federal aid to schools will result in Federal control. Federal aid, to any degree, cannot exist without Federal control. As I mentioned, it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to so supervise and control its allocations that waste and misuse are kept at a minimum.

If there is doubt that Federal aid to education bills now before Congress would mean eventual Federal control of education, read the booklet published in 1961 by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, titled "A Federal Education Agency for the Future." Carefully analyze what the Office of Education is planning for tomorrow's schools. Note how the report repeatedly stresses the necessity for Federal action in formulating education policies, how it recommends review of teacher preparation, curriculums, and textbooks. Note particularly how the report states that we must implement internal education projects in the United States, indicating future closer relationships with UNESCO, ministries of education abroad, and others.

This quietly circulated publication of the U.S. Office of Education, produced and printed at taxpayers' expense, shows that there has been no basic change in the plans of the professional political educationists who see the educational system as a means of remaking our society to fit their ideas of what is right and proper. It should emphatically and completely put at rest any doubts that the wheels are turning fast in the direction of Federal control over education.

The Commissioner of Education concluded a foreword to the report in this booklet by saying that the full evaluation and adoption of recommendations will require a period of review and that he anticipated that "much of this activity will take place through normal administrative processes within the Office and the Department." This means that the report will be largely implemented on the administrative level without congressional action and approval.

We can, therefore, expect that much of the attempt to create Federal control of education will take place quietly, without public notice, unless the spotlight of publicity is turned upon it.

If the atteempt succeeds, we will someday find Federal inspectors in our schools and on our campuses. We will find teachers afraid to speak against the official approved administration policy. We will find writers of textbooks forced to write only what is approved by high Government officials sitting in judgment in Washington.

This report, previously mentioned, has some startling items about our education future. In the report is revealed a proposal to create a U.S. Education Agency of three new bureaus, one of which would be International Education. The report talks of implementing international projects in the United States and goes on to say:

> The next decade will bring closer and multiple relationships with ministries of education abroad and international organizations such as UNESCO, the OAS, the International Bureau of Education, and others—as problems in education are attacked bilaterally and multilaterally on a worldwide basis.

Can we possibly want international controls and conventions directing, by agreement, American education methods and curriculums?

For example, the United States faces the threat of takeover by United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO—of its entire school system for purposes of socialization. This could be made possible by UNESCO's proposed new treaty, participated in by 10 Communist countries, known as the Convention Against Discrimination in Education. The UNESCO resolution was passed in Paris in December 1961, and is now in the State Department.

The treaty could hand our American education system over to international control. It could automatically remove education from under "domestic" law and control. It encompasses every phase and facet of education, including philosophy of subject matter taught our children.

A prominent religious leader in California is reported to have said that the proposed new treaty would substantially eliminate all local control of public education at State or local level, that it would place the direction and regulation of all American education under Federal control—control by the U.S. Department of Education and the National Education Association, and that the resolution would override this Federal control and make it subsidiary to UNESCO as a world court and final international arbiter of education.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a Socialist frontier.

Mr. Speaker, political payola which allowed more than $29,000 of the taxpayers' money to be poured into the Vice President's private airport on his Texas ranch.

Can you imagine any other private citizen receiving funds from the Federal Aviation Agency for navigational lights and radio instrumentation? Any other citizen, that is, except the second man on the New Frontier?

I have written to FAA Administrator Najeeb Hallaby, asking what the Agency's policy is in providing special services to ranking members of the national administration.

This certainly appears to have been a coverup job, the FAA has designated the airstrip as Johnson City Airport, but when I first called FAA to find out the story, they had not even heard of Johnson City.

There is little wonder nobody ever heard of it, except the bureaucrats who dealt out $29,265 for a private aviation facility. Johnson City has a population of 611 and a few longhorns.

Johnson City is 15 miles from the LBJ Airport.

Robert W. Richards, chief of the Copley Washington Bureau, has written a story saying that the airstrip would be manned by FAA experts. The FAA has informed me that $22,115 had been spent for a radio beacon homing device and $7,150 for identification lights at the runway.

The lights undoubtedly will distinguish the LBJ Airport from the other 12,500 acres on the Vice President's ranch.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a tabulation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the tabulation of the results of my sixth annual questionnaire and have today released these statistics to the press.

After an effort of trying to get this questionnaire into every home in Michigan's Sixth District, the response was most enthusiastic and I believe the results will be of interest to my colleagues. Therefore, I include in the RECORD the following tabulation.

Summary of questionnaire answers for 1962

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Not sure
1. Should a new Cabinet level Department of Urban Affairs be created?	19	63	18
2. Do you favor resuming nuclear tests in the atmosphere?	66	21	13
3. Should Congress delegate to the President its power to lower taxes?	22	70	8
4. Should Congress give the President broader authority to cut tariffs and negotiate trade agreements?	38	52	10
5. Should income tax be withheld on interest and dividends?	36	51	13
6. If our national security requires increased defense spending how should it be financed?			
(a) Increased taxes	23		
(b) Deficit spending	5		
(c) Cutting back or postponing other programs	72		
7. Should the principle of our antitrust laws be applied equally to big business and big labor?	87	5	8
8. Would you favor a gradual annual reduction of farm subsidies and controls to the end that the law of supply and demand will again control our agricultural economy?	84	8	8
9. With reference to medical care for the elderly, do you favor—			
(a) A compulsory program paid by increased employee-employer social security tax?	39		
(b) A voluntary program administered through private organizations with the Government providing assistance scaled to income of subscribers?	25		
(c) No Federal participation in this field?	36		
10. Should the United States purchase $100,000,000 in U.N. bonds to make up the defaulted assessments of other nations?	22	63	15
11. Should Red China be admitted to the United Nations?	14	75	11
12. Should we continue foreign aid to Tito's Yugoslavia?	16	61	23
13. In general is our foreign policy firm enough in meeting the Communist threat?	23	60	17
14. Do you think the Federal Government is taking over too many responsibilities from local and State governments?	67	26	7

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I would like to take just 1 minute to refer to this program that has been referred to as a start on the relief of unemployment, a start that will result in employment, even though it is admitted that there are in excess of 4,500,000 unemployed. That is the WPA $600 million proposal sent up by the administration as a sweetener to the $2,100 million proposal that is sent up as a public works system.

As this editorial in the Washington Post suggests, it is a program that fell into innocuous desuetude some 30 years ago, WPA going into new areas never participated in by the Federal Government, and providing for 100 percent Federal grants for such things as swimming pool construction, such things as ski slides—this is in the evidence, in the hearings before the Public Works Committee that were completed some few days ago—such things as skating rinks. This is not the answer to the problem of unemployment.

Let me quote the testimony of George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, when he said this total $600 million package when translated into employees means 90,000 new employees as a maximum over the 3-year period of the $600 million program. That is direct employees, and indirectly an additional 135,000, or a total maximum over the 3-year period involved of some 225,000 of the 4,500,000 unemployed at this time.

So that is proof positive that is not the answer to the problem, that pump priming is not the answer. The people who are unemployed are given the impression this is the answer to their problem, if Congress will only pass this bill which means $25 million for fiscal year 1962, $50 million for fiscal 1963, and $225 million for fiscal 1964. By some magic we who are unemployed will suddenly become employed through public works WPA-backed projects.

The President says this is a must bill. That this is the answer to unemployment. Why, the mayor of the city of Detroit came in the other day, and appearing before our committee testified this is going to provide matching funds for $117 million worth of municipal public works projects in the city of Detroit alone. I imagine some of those 235,000 unemployed in Detroit in this total were left with the impression that this bill is the answer to our prayer. I do not like to see this misrepresented. The administration, if it wants to do something about unemployment, if it thinks that public works is the way to do it, only has to issue a Presidential order accelerating presently authorized and properly programed through congressional approval of programs congressionally financed, such as urban renewal, which has $1,600 million not spent; community facilities, in which $500,000 has not been spent that could be spent immediately. Then there is the area redevelopment program of $300 million that has been withheld. VA loans for home construction, I submit, would create more jobs than the $600 million proposed.

Here is what disturbs me: First, the unemployed are being completely misled; and second, the President has the tools now he can use if he saw fit to do so; if the administration has the concern it says it has for the unemployed; if it would accelerate these programs, get the job done and put some people back to work; but not through a Madison Avenue approach instead.

The administration sounds off at the last minute with this $600 million sweetener in an effort to convince the unemployed that only the administration is concerned with the unemployed. I just quote as a reply George Meany.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his comments.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Florida, and I might say also all who have been participating in this act in reference to the employment problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add one other word of warning that the retraining bill is not an easy answer. Retraining has hard realities about it, and I am very pleased, I might say, to see Assistant Secretary of Labor Wolfbein in charge of this program. I think that anyone who talked with him will realize that this is just a beginning of digging into something that we should have dug into a long time ago. It is not going to produce immediate results, but it is on the right track.

Now, the second point I would like to make is that it is not the glamorous things, frequently, that go to the heart of our problem. Sometimes it is some little factor; it might be an impediment in our laws. But, frequently it is not that the Government can do more; it is the fact that the Government is standing in the way right now. That is particularly true in this field of unemployment or, as I like to put it, the problem of employment, because we actually have more jobs going begging than we have unemployed people for, if we got to work and identified them.

But, in three ways our Federal Government is impeding this process. One is under the unemployment insurance program, where the usual rule is that people are removed from the unemployment insurance program, which is a State and Federal program, if they retrain. It should be the other way around, almost, that if people who have obsolete skills or skills not in demand, they should be removed if they will not retrain for skills that are in demand. I am happy that my State of Missouri and the State of Illinois, largely as the result of a study that our group made last year, have changed their laws around. I think now 17 States have. But, we need to do something in our Federal unemployment insurance laws, and I am very sorry that this administration had not pushed forward at this time remedial legislation of that sort.

There are two other areas that I want to mention very quickly. These apply to tax laws. Incidentally, this is the way it goes: You are not going to train the unskilled for these highly skilled jobs available, but someone who has a job; if you upgrade that skill, then somewhere down the ladder the person of the semiskill comes on in; but the tax law says you do not get the deduction for going to school—as the schoolteachers did not formerly, going to summer school. It should be the reverse.

I have had bills in on these things, and I wish that the administration would pay attention to these things.

The third area is the tax bill. Now, when a worker has to follow his job, like when the Chrysler plant moved from Evansville, Ind., to St. Louis, the worker could not sell his home, and he was commuting back and forth, but the worker could not take his tax deduction. He should be able to.

The law is archaic. It says that the worker's home is where his job is. But, today 80 percent of our workers own their own homes.

Mr. Speaker, these three bills will do more than anything I can think of, and the Kennedy administration will not even look at these bills.

REPUBLICAN SPRING THAW

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. **BRUCE**. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I know that the hour is late. If there are any who will feel better, I do not intend to take the full hour.

Mr. Speaker, I have the very delicate subject and the highly controversial subject of discussing whether or not victory is possible in the cold war. Now, it is strange, indeed, that this should even be a subject of discussion and conflict. I have been heartened in recent months, in fact, over the last couple of years, to see an increase in the number of excellent writings on this very subject. Some of the writings come from the pens of comrades of the Kremlin, and others come from students on our side of the fence.

I think in order to thoroughly understand the nature of the enemy we face it is imperative that we thoroughly study and analyze both the writings going back many years, as well as currently, of the Communist theoreticians and practitioners as well as those on our side who have made it a career and a dedication to analyze the nature of the enemy we face. In passing, I shall refer to a couple of them which I think are essential. One is a new book called "Guerrilla Warfare," by the Communist, Che Guevara. Certainly, if one reads the book "Guerrilla Warfare" one sees laid out for all of us to read and understand the pattern of operation of the enemy in its attempt to lull us off the track as they carry out their program for the conquest of nations through internal military operations with the aid of psychological help from their allies within the target nations toward which their total program has a policy for destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I would also draw the attention of the Members of the House to another new book entitled "No Substitute for Victory," by Frank J. Johnson.

I think one of the most important books which has come out in recent years is a lengthy work, and it is tough reading. It is documentary reading all the way through, 2 inches thick. It is called "Cold War and Liberation," by John F. O'Conor. In this book Mr. O'Conor traces back the growth of the Communist power in the world and documents the techniques by which they seized control of the Soviet Union, utilizing many official documents from our men on the scene sent back to Washington at that time, warning of what would happen if certain steps were not taken. Tragically, these warnings were ignored, clear back in 1918, 1920, and right on through. The pattern repeats itself over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, certainly we cannot dwell in the past. Certainly we cannot live in the past. But I believe that it is certainly valid that we should study the past in order to learn where errors have been made, where successes have been obtained, in order to properly apply formulas for action today and in the future. Tragically, we are diverted by arguments both in this House of Representatives and elsewhere. We get in all kinds of arguments about who belongs to what. We get in all kinds of arguments about personalities, and this type of thing. Yet, I say that the question of whether or not we establish a policy aimed at victory in the cold war should and must transcend totally whether one is a Democrat or whether one is a Republican, because on the settlement of this issue and in trying to find a pattern of common understanding and policy that can work, the very survival of all mankind is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, one of the current arguments that rages back and forth, and it is a nonsensical argument from both sides, is whether or not the Communist threat is internal or external. Any student of the Communist operation, worldwide, can spot immediately the fallacy of an argument either way on that count, because it is neither internal nor external. It is both one and the same.

Mr. Speaker, the worldwide Communist movement is just that. It is not nationalistic in character. We hear so many denunciations of the Russian people. Our problem is not the Russian people. Our problem is the people who have captured them, and others in the so-called satellite states. I do not like the term. They are the "captive states of Europe" who have been enslaved by Communist forces that tyrannized them through treachery and violence. First the Communists captured a home base for their worldwide operation, the Government of Russia. This served as a launching pad for their expansion into other areas of the world.

We literally turn ourselves inside out trying to say that what they have done and what they say they are going to do is not true. Not too long ago Nikita Khrushchev said, "We shall bury you." As a newsman at that time I was literally astounded to see the amount of propaganda that came from non-Communist sources attempting to explain that Khrushchev did not really mean that at all; that he meant he wanted to compete with us, that he meant this, that he meant that. He meant exactly what he said, "We shall bury you." And it was not a new statement on his part. He was simply repeating, as he does every day, that "We believe in the Marxist-Leninist program."

What is the Marxist-Leninist program? Let me quote from it.

> We shall use every ruse, dodge, trick, cunning and unlawful method, concealment, veiling of the truth. As long as capitalism and socialism exist we cannot live in peace.
>
> In the end a funeral dirge will be sung over one or the other, but until that takes place our principal role is to dodge and maneuver.

The dialectics of this policy I think may be what is diverting us from understanding what it really is all about. They cry peace; they cry negotiate. They have said that negotiation at the conference table is but an extension of the instrument of war, from their point of view. They define the word "peace": "All wars, all evils in society stem from capitalism. There can be no peace in the world until capitalism is destroyed." You see? "We shall bury you."

It is amazing that there still should be any question about this. It is fantastically hard to understand how anyone in a position of authority could have any doubts at all or have the illusion that if we just are patient long enough the whole thing is going to disappear, that it is going to evolve out of communism into a mild form of "benevolent socialism," and at this point maybe somehow or other we can get together and have one happy community.

We can indulge in all kinds of these intellectual calisthenics, but it just is not going to happen. When they say, "We shall bury you," they mean just that. There have been plenty of hearings on this type of thing. It has been carried on for years by both the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the committee in the other body, the Committee on the Judiciary. I quote from a publication of theirs of last year. I quote their foreword to it:

> Words are only as good as their definitions. Our greatest disappointments and defeats in the last 15 years have come to a great extent—

Notice, this is a statement by a gentleman of the opposite party to mine—

> because the representatives of the free world have tended to define Communist words with a Western dictionary.
>
> For example, we in the free world have rightfully regarded the word "peace" as meaning a situation where nations exist side-by-side with mutual respect and without hostility. But representatives of the West have wrongfully assumed that the Communists accept our meaning of this

> and many other terms. As Dr. Stefan Possony points out in this study, the Communist definition of "peace" means the time when there will no longer be any opposition to the paramount aim of bringing the entire world under communism.

Then he goes on and the chairman suggests that the Members of the subcommittee and the Congress read this brief study but we continue on with the illusion that we are going to negotiate peace; we are going to negotiate peace with those who say, "We shall bury you." We are going to negotiate peace with those who say it is an instrument of war, that peace means the liquidation of all opposition societies.

I like another definition of peace, because I think it is much more valid, that of Thomas Aquinas: "Peace is the tranquillity of order."

You see, we get all mixed up here. We think peace is only an absence of war. That is not true, when we use "war" in the terms of military conflict. Do we have peace now? Well, they are dying in Vietnam now; they are dying in Laos; they are dying behind the Iron Curtain; they are dying in Cuba.

There is no worldwide order today because communism is planned disorder. There can be no peace as long as the disorder of communism continues to control any nation.

Peace is the tranquillity of order. As long as the Communist organization with its three-pronged operation continues to exist, peace is impossible.

Communism is three-phased in operation. It is a faith; it is a conspiracy, and it is a military operation. So often we try to deal with it in military terms almost exclusively. It is that. But to build the most gigantic defense system in the world in all history still will not bring victory if we ignore the other two phases. Communism is a faith. They say there is no God; there is no soul; there are no spiritual qualities. Man is an animal, nothing more. If he is nothing but an animal, you can then liquidate him in the name of peace and justice. You can kill off 6 to 10 million of your own people not because you hate them, as they did in the early thirties in the Soviet Union. You can liquidate the kulaks without a twinge of conscience if you accept the theory of the Communists, because they reduce man to the status of animal. Liquidate them. The end justifies the means.

They are diseased animals, diseased because they have religious icons on their walls, because they believe they have the right to the rewards of their own farms. Liquidate them. They are diseased with the germs of capitalism and with the germs of religion.

It is a faith; it is a conspiracy; it is a worldwide conspiracy. J. Edgar Hoover has described that well for us:

> It is appalling that some members of our society continue to deplore and criticize those who stress the Communist danger. What these misguided "authorities" fail to realize is that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is an integral part of the international communism. As the worldwide menace becomes more powerful, the various Communist parties assume a more dangerous and sinister role in the countries in which they are entrenched. Public indifference to this threat is tantamount to national suicide.
>
> Lethargy leads only to disaster. The Communists have a savage plan of liquidation for a vanquished America.

Let me tell you about this article which appeared in Presbyterian survey. This young man who is speaking is one of the conspirators, one of the missionaries of communism and irreligion. What does he say? I quote him:

> What seems of first importance to you is to me either not desirable or impossible of realization. But there is one thing about which I am in dead earnest—and that is the socialist cause. It is my life, my business, my religion, my hobby, my sweetheart, wife, and mistress, my bread and meat. I work at it in the daytime and dream of it at night. Its hold on me grows, not lessens, as time goes on. I'll be in it the rest of my life. It is my alter-ego. When you think of me, it is necessary to think of socialism as well, because I'm inseparably bound to it.
>
> Therefore, I can't carry on a friendship, a love affair, or even a conversation without relating it to this force which both drives and guides my life. I evaluate people, books, ideas, and notions according to how they affect the Socialist cause and by their attitude toward it.
>
> I have already been in jail because of my ideas, and if necessary I am ready to go before a firing squad. A certain percentage of us get killed or imprisoned. Even for those who escape these harsher ends, life is no bed of roses. A genuine radical lives in virtual poverty. He turns back to the party every penny he makes above what is absolutely necessary to keep him alive. We constantly look for places where the class struggle is the sharpest, exploiting these situations to the limit of their possibilities. We lead strikes. We organize demonstrations. We speak on street corners. We fight cops. We go through trying experiences many times each year which the ordinary man has to face only once or twice in a lifetime.
>
> And when we're not doing these more exciting things, all our spare time is taken up with dull routine chores, endless leg work, errands, and so forth, which are inescapably connected with running a live organization.
>
> Radicals don't have the time or the money for many movies or concerts or T-bone steaks or decent homes, and new cars. We've been described as fanatics. We are. Our lives are dominated by one great, overshadowing factor—the struggle for socialism. Well, that's what my life is going to be. That's the black side of it. Then there is the other side of it. We Communists have a philosophy of life which no amount of money could buy. We have a cause to fight for, a definite purpose in life. We subordinate our petty personal selves into a great movement of humanity. We have a morale, an esprit de corps such as no capitalist army ever had; we have a code of conduct, a way of life, a devotion to our cause that no religious order can touch. And we are guided not by blind, fanatical faith but by logic and reason, by a never-ending education of study and practice.
>
> And if our personal lives seem hard or our egos appear to suffer through subordination to the party, then we are adequately compensated by the thought that each of us is in his small way helping to contribute something new and true, something better to mankind.

I have taken the time to read that to point out what apparently some of us do not understand, the faith of the Communist. He really believes it. It is not an act. It is in his thought. It is in his soul. It is a way of life to him. He means it. He is dedicated to the burial, literally, of all other systems.

Still the argument rages: Should we try to attain victory? Or even is victory possible?

The gentleman from the other body from Arkansas says, "What would we do with victory once we had won it?" And I quote, "What would we do with victory?" I will tell you what we could do. We could start and build a world, but you will not build it as long as we try to make a deal with the enemy. This is just the beginning. But to me, dealing with the enemy closes the future; closes the door. Castro is in Cuba because—Mr. HAYS, you pointed this out on this floor and I read it as a newsman—we have a Castro in Cuba because too many were blind, regardless of political thought and party; he is there tonight and they just convicted men in a kangaroo court because we misunderstood the faith and the motivation and the passion of the Communists.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I have been listening with great interest to the gentleman's very learned dissertation. I cannot find a single thing in it to disagree with. But I would like to know what the gentleman proposes that we do or any new ideas that he may have to win this fight against communism short of all-out hydrogen war. I made some propositions. I am openminded and the Committee on Foreign Affairs is openminded to any thoughts that the gentleman may have on how to win this fight.

Mr. BRUCE. If the gentleman will be patient, I will try to satisfy his interest.

We are not alone in the warnings that we must establish a policy of victory.

Carlos Romulo, the great Philippine soldier and statesman, had an article in the Reader's Digest. He said:

> America wake up. Shake off the course of inaction that is giving the forces of evil the right-of-way in this world. Face up to the blunt fact that you are now engaged in a real war and that it must be fought and won. This is the only alternative to defeat by default.

The gentleman from Connecticut in the other body, a member of the other party, correctly says:

> We must find a foreign policy that will lead us to victory over the evil forces of communism because the alternative to this is a static defensive do-nothing foreign policy that led us from disaster to disaster since the close of the war.

Dr. Howard E. Kershner, editor, Christian Economics, said:

> The cold war will decide one of the most fateful issues in the history of mankind. It will determine whether Western-Christian civilization or atheistic, totalitarian communism will govern mankind for the next era.

> If we do not win the cold war the civilization which we have known will perish. To win we shall require the total commitment—time, loyalty, and resources—of every solid citizen in the Western World. It is total war for total stakes. If we do not destroy communism, it will destroy us.

I could go on. Here is Life magazine of June 2, 1961, with a long, magnificent editorial that says, we must win the cold war.

I was delighted when I saw that.

What can we do to win the cold war? First of all, we must stop doing the wrong things and stop giving aid to Communist nations.

I defy anybody to provide an answer to me for the young Polish refugee whose parents are still in Poland. He told me with tears running down his cheeks: "Why do you do these things to us? We resist in the only way we knew how. We do not plant the crops and we do not produce. It is part of our strategy to increase the tensions in Poland and what do you fellows do? You turn around and give aid to Gomulka to crush us and our resistance."

How do you answer a boy like that? Can you answer him? No, you cannot.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUCE. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There is no question in anybody's mind that Mr. Gomulka and his Communist henchmen are there, but nobody will ever deny the fact that these 30 million Polish people in Poland never have been Communists, never will be Communists, and will never adopt communism.

These people know where every single grain of this American help is coming from; they know it is coming from America. I will guarantee one thing: As long as we keep feeding those young starving children we demonstrate the complete bankruptcy of the Communist ideology and the Communist system; and, consequently, these people will prove to be our greatest allies, if, God forbid, we should ever get into conflict. Gomulka cannot count on these people for one second; and Khrushchev cannot count on these people. The instability of these people in Poland and Czechoslavakia as Communist allies is the greatest deterrent to war, because the Communists in the Kremlin and the Communists in Warsaw know they cannot count on these people. These are our greatest friends and would be our greatest allies in case of war. Of course, we do not agree with Gomulka, and of course we do not agree with Khrushchev, but the fact remains that by helping these 30 million people with this food we are binding them to our side.

Mr. BRUCE. Then, according to the gentleman's estimate we should continue to supply food to Communist China and Communist Russia to relieve them of the burden of supporting their enslaved peoples, take that burden off of them and by that much strengthen their hand against us.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUCE. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. I think one basic thing the gentleman from Illinois has missed thus far is that even assuming, if we might, that aid is necessary in these areas, there is a basic additional essential that must be given and that is a clear-cut knowledge that the American people and the American nations have irrevocably determined to win this contest and are proceeding to mobilize their manpower and their resources and their skills necessary for victory.

I have here a letter from the editor of the Reader's Digest. He is one of the Nation's experts in this field. I do not believe he would mind if I quote just a single short sentence from it. That is this:

> The mischief of the current situation is that we have not as a nation as yet decided that we want to win the cold war.

Therein lies the failure of Mr. Kennedy and his administration thus far to make it clearly the determination of this Nation to win and to announce that determination to the world so that freemen everywhere who have their doubts and fears and their apprehensions may be encouraged by knowing what to expect of us and that we are determined to win.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUCE. Wait until I finish what the gentleman from Ohio asked me to finish, then I will be glad to yield in the order in which the gentlemen rose. I yield first to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. I would like to contribute, if I may, to the answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS]. What would you do to win the cold war? I will leave the cold war which is primarily a contest between principles of government and principles of economic organization. The tradition and the principles of America are based upon the equal opportunity of every citizen to make his advances and to progress according to his ability in open competition with his fellows. The principles of the Soviet totalitarian communistic system is that the state orders its subjects and its citizens according to a plan decided on from above.

Now we have the opportunity of winning that cold war if our system is basically superior to theirs, if we not only advocate it as an evangelist but demonstrate it in our business operations abroad. I have consistently advocated that our Government efforts should be directed toward creating a climate in the underdeveloped areas of the world which is attractive to the investment of private capital. Very few people have spoken against it. But in this session the most progressive step was taken by punishing investment capital overseas in a tax bill this House passed a few days ago. In passing that bill this House reversed a decision that was made less than 2 years ago, on May 18, 1960, when it passed the Boggs bill, H.R. 5, a tax-incentive bill to encourage American private capital to go abroad and prove the superiority of the free enterprise system over the totalitarian planned state.

I say to the gentleman from Ohio that is one of the things we should do to win a victory in the cold war.

Mr. BRUCE. It was mentioned a few moments ago that we must reinvigorate the ideals that made America, the ideals and economic system upon which liberty has been built. I think from my observation I would reach the conclusion that the United States is attempting to substitute the economic formula of the enemy for its proved free enterprise formula of success. This is true, not only in our domestic affairs, but is equally or more true in our foreign policy. It would seem to me we have accepted the premise that man is the victim of his own economic environment and is incapable of rising above it except at the whim of government structure. This is technically termed "economic determinism." Its origin is found in the writings of Karl Marx, not in the writings of Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Payne, or the other Founding Fathers of our great Republic.

Our foreign aid program has accepted the Marxist premise of economic determinism. We view all problems apparently from economic factors alone. We apparently have accepted the belief that if we just change a man's economic condition, we automatically strengthen him and provide him with the tools of liberty.

Liberty is based upon a moral and spiritual foundation. Economic fruits flow from freedom; freedom does not flow from economic abundance. By accepting the Marxist premise of economic determinism, we play the game on the terms of the enemy. The crying need of America today is to provide an articulate leadership based upon the fundamental principles of freedom, recognizing that property rights and human rights are indelibly tied together, and one cannot exist without the other. We must reject a policy that seeks to find an answer in the development of a third force in the world which appears to be centered upon a non-Soviet Marxist economic development. The growth of this third force in the world can only lead to disaster. Our greatest sales point is truth, and truth can best be expressed in the terms of individual liberty and personal responsibility. Both at home and abroad, we must reject the false premise of economic determinism, and replace it with a dynamic belief in constitutional government that protects the inherent natural rights of man. If we analyze Soviet psychological warfare over a period of 30 years, we will find that basically they have been determined to prevent us from taking three fundamental steps. Two of them are not too controversial. The third brings the roof in when you even suggest it.

The first is military encirclement. They said you do not dare encircle us; it will mean war if you do. But, we did. That was Mr. Dulles' statesmanship.

But, we did it. With Polaris developed over the last 8 years, it is even better, and it has not led to war. It has led to great anguish in the Kremlin.

Second, analyze their psychological warfare, their writings, their speeches. It is aimed at keeping us from taking step No. 2: economically isolate the Communist bloc; quit doing business with the enemy; quit building up his economic structure; quit providing material benefits, the lack of which can bring the downfall of the Communist empire; quit pulling their fat out of the fire for them. As Dr. JUDD said in a speech that I heard, increase tension; do not decrease it. By increasing the pressures and tensions on the Communist bloc, you decrease the possibility of war. You strengthen them by gradually retreating and by appeasement you increase the chance of war. So, first there is military encirclement; second, quit building up the economic structure to the greatest extent possible.

Third—and this is the one that brings the roof in—ostracize them socially; quit doing business with them at the conference table until they live up to the agreements they have already made. They have agreed to free elections behind the Iron Curtain in the captive states. We have made over a thousand agreements with them, and they have broken almost every one of them. Consequently, we will be confronted with more agreements to be broken when it is to their advantage. How long does it take to get it through our heads? You cannot do business with the Communists. This is their plan, to trap us with this word "peace," and the false illusion that we can sit down and deal with them.

Dr. John R. Stambaugh, vice chancellor of Vanderbilt University, put it this way:

> The historical cycle of the body politic indicates that man progresses from bondage to spiritual faith, from spiritual faith to courage, from courage to freedom, from freedom to abundance, and then comes the waning, from abundance to selfishness, from selfishness to apathy, from apathy to dependency, and from dependency right back into bondage again.

The barbarian is at the door. He is moving forward. He is making gains. He is winning in this struggle only because we do not show the will to win ourselves. We can win. We can do it without a war. I hope that somewhere, somehow, along the line we can develop a policy, though it does entail risk, but there is a risk now, that gives us a chance for freedom for future generations, not just in America but throughout the entire world.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to an agreement heretofore made between the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] of which other Members are aware, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders heretofore agreed to for today may be put over until Thursday of this week following any special orders heretofore entered into.

Mr. HAYS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the speech of the gentleman from Indiana has been in my opinion worth while. The balance of the performance has been a rather dreary business, I thought, and I would like——

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if this means that this whole performance goes on again tomorrow night?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. All right; I object. We will do it tonight.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. All right.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, some of us may feel inclined to explain to our families how we spent this long, long day, and darkest night. In the mode of brevity and order now so clearly identified with the majority I offer the following as a plausible message to the folks at home:

> Listen, my children, and you shall hear of the midnight raid on the New Frontier
> The thrust was wide, the point not clear and at best produced a slide-sized smear
> For our plaintive friends we will shed a small tear
> Then rise on the morrow to move on from here.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this evening's proceedings I read a letter from a Democrat of Los Angeles, Calif., in which he said that he hoped this evening would be properly conducted and would prove to the world that free debate in the United States is practiced by us as we recommend it to other nations.

Mr. Speaker, I think that has happened tonight. I want to express my appreciation, and I am sure the appreciation of all Members of the House, to the Speaker for his fairness, sportsmanship, and conduct.

[Prolonged applause.]

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, lest silence on the part of the Democratic side of the House be construed as any kind of agreement with the remarks made by my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], concerning the address which was just delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE], I would like to make it clear that there are many on the Democratic side of the House, and I am sure many on the Republican side of the House as well, who do not subscribe in the slightest degree to the inference of that speech, that a great President of the United States, a great wartime hero who has proven under fire his willingness to bare his breast to enemy bullets, for one minute engages in any kind of a war, be it cold or hot, without the full intention and determination to win that war.

The determination of this administration to win the cold war is a determination which I am sure is shared by every patriotic Member of this House on both sides of the aisle; and that is something on which I think there can be agreement among most of us here this evening.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I withdrew the point of order of no quorum; but as I understand it, the Speaker did not understand that I did not withdraw my objection to the transfer of these special orders.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman did withdraw his objection.

Mr. HAYS. I did not; I withdrew the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood that the gentleman did withdraw his objection; and, of course, the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Oklahoma was granted.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, there was objection; I did object. I did not withdraw the objection. I withdrew the point of order.

I think I clearly said that and the RECORD will show it. Although I had planned to leave tomorrow to a NATO conference, I can tell the Chair that I will be here and available for points of order tomorrow, if that is the case.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman who spoke just a moment ago, I would like to say that no, I do not believe that the President of the United States has any intention of letting us be defeated. But I do say that I share the same concern that he expressed on February 21, 1949, when he said:

> What our young men have saved our diplomats and our President have frittered away—JOHN F. KENNEDY.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. OLSEN), for 1 hour, on Thursday, April 12, 1962.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. LINDSAY), for 10 minutes, on April 12.

Mr. CURTIN (at the request of Mr. LINDSAY), for 15 minutes, on April 12.

Mr. SANTANGELO, for 60 minutes, on Tuesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HORAN, his remarks today on the legislative appropriation bill, and to include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LINDSAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. DOOLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. INOUYE.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina.

Mr. DELANEY.

Mr. HEMPHILL.

Mr. BROYHILL.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODELL to include an article from the Washington Post in his remarks made earlier today.

Mr. MOSS.

TRADE WITH THE SINO-SOVIET BLOC

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am rising tonight to discusss our export control policy and to express extreme concern; yes, more than that, to express my alarm at what I conceive to be the policy of the administration with regard to trade and coexistence between the Communists and the free world. Later in my remarks I expect to deal in considerable detail with regard to trends and evidence as to this attitude of support for coexistence, but let me say at the start that coexistence is another name for a no-win cold war foreign policy. It follows a line of thinking that we can let down the bars, do away with export controls and thereby through trade—unrestricted sales—win the Soviets and their satellites over to a live-and-let-live policy.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that dedicated Communists could be treated so simply and that it were possible for us to placate and charm the leaders of the Kremlin and influence members of the international Communist conspiracy throughout the world into a frame of mind which would cause them to change their Marxist threat of international revolution. I wish that our "be kind to Khrushchev" dreamers and appeasers in the State Department and elsewhere were right and there was a basis for peaceful coexistence. I wish that I could support a program of winning over enemies from without and within this Nation so that they would cease their conspiracy to overthrow by peaceful means or by force, if necessary, the governments of free people.

But, Mr. Speaker, every Communist from Premier Khrushchev on down has no thought of peaceful coexistence. As long as these Communists exist they will plot and plan to achieve their goal. They intend to "bury us."

So, as I say, I think that the Members of this House and the American people have real cause for alarm at any foreign policy which looks toward unrestricted trade and peaceful coexistence because that policy is one of abandoning freedom of the individual and the dignity of man and accepting defeat in the cold war without a struggle.

Why do I say that there is reason to be alarmed?

First of all let me say that I have no fear that the American people themselves have been lulled into an attitude of "Better Red than dead." Nor do I think that the people of this country subscribe to any policy of coexistence. Certainly, I have never found a difference of opinion on this subject among the citizens of the various States or different geographical areas. I think that the people of Florida, the people of Maine, and the people of California and all the four corners of this Nation have much the same idea about this and may I say that the thinking of the people represented by my colleagues on my right of the Democratic Party does not differ in this respect from the thinking of the people who are represented by my colleagues on my side, the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, in other words, I am certain the feeling of my own constituents and the majority thinking of the people I represent of the First Congressional District of Washington is not dissimilar from the thinking in other congressional districts and as to what that thinking is I point up the statistics from a recent questionnaire I sent out in my district. This tabulation indicated a strong feeling against policies that would strengthen the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Later on in my remarks, as I said, I intend to go into the details with regard to my apprehension over the trend of our foreign policy but right now addressing myself to public opinion let me cite that in answer to a question, "Should the United States trade with the Soviet Union?" 5,711 questionnaires came back to me saying "no," we should not trade with the Soviet Union, whereas 2,467 persons answered "yes." I shall cite some further results of this questionnaire later, but now let me summarize this one thought, mainly that the majority of the American people, in my judgment, are strongly opposed to trade with the Communists and I have received mail from all sections of the United States supporting my bill to ban such trade.

Now let me say also that my apprehension is not fear as to any stand on this issue of my colleagues here in the House or of the other body. I believe that those of us who have made ourselves familiar with the objectives and tactics of the Communists strongly oppose any foreign trade policies which would strengthen communism and accept the premise of coexistence and unrestricted trade with bloc nations.

Why, then, should I express concern, you ask, if the majority of the American people and their elected representatives feel as they do, as I say they do, why be alarmed?

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I can show my colleagues why I am alarmed.

Certainly, one reason, Mr. Speaker, that I am alarmed is that for the past 60 years the legislative branch of our Government has been abrogating its constitutional responsibilities. Let us face it, more and more we have become a rubberstamp; more and more we are delegating our constitutional responsibilities.

The power of the purse, long the source of legislative control through a device called "back-door spending" is abrogated frequently. The Constitution provides that the Congress shall make laws and that the executive branch shall carry them out, but is that the way our domestic policy or foreign programs are carried out? Not at all. We have seen a case of President Truman sending troops into Korea. Was that in accord with the Constitution? And right down to date by reorganization plans and delegation of power this is becoming a nation of one-man rule.

Soon the matter of tariffs will be before this body. What have we been doing about our responsibilities as far as the provisions that the Congress is the branch of Government given the power over tariffs. Now we are asked to turn over full discretion to the President with sole power to cut tariffs; now we are asked to turn over to the President the power, under depressed economic conditions, to reduce income taxes. We are asked to turn over to the

President authority to make vast expenditures for public works when the economy is slack. So, as I say, we are making a rubber stamp out of ourselves.

Thus, and what I want to emphasize is, although the American people may oppose peaceful coexistence; although their representatives may oppose peaceful coexistence, if the Congress is going to give full discretion of our trade programs to the Chief Executive; if we are going to give him a free hand in determining what is best for the United States we have become a benevolent dictatorship and it would not make any difference what the American people or their elected representatives think. How about the bond issue or a loan to the United Nations? The Congress may turn the whole matter over to the President rather than face the decision itself.

I recognize, of course, that the Constitution gives the President responsibility of conducting foreign policy but that power, to me, is limited to a framework as established by the legislative branch of Government and I do not think that it is in the public interest for the legislative branch to sit idly by and allow internationalists and one-worlders in the State Department to maneuver this country into peaceful coexistence. But it appears that that is the direction in which we are traveling as I will explain. With those preliminary thoughts, Mr. Speaker, I would now like to address myself to the matter of our policy on trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc. From what I will say from now on it will be clear that I hold to the firm belief that trade in strategic and nonstrategic goods will strengthen the economy and military capability of the Communists. What I say will be based on the premise that letting the bars down on U.S. exports of one kind or another to the Communists allows the leadership of those Communist countries to keep their peoples from becoming too dissatisfied—from allowing an illusion that their systems provide higher standards of living than they do. In short, Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be based on the argument that by shipping food and fiber behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains we will be helping to make the Communist system work.

Now I will proceed to set forth the facts indicating strongly that the administration has in mind to establish a new foreign trade policy which will allow the free exchange of both strategic and nonstrategic goods between Communist bloc nations and ourselves.

Difficult as it is to do it, existing U.S. policy has attempted to draw a distinction between "strategic" and "nonstrategic" goods and materials.

Yet one may fairly wonder if there are any such items as "nonstrategic" goods as far as Soviet needs are concerned. The war of two ideologies, as everyone knows, is being waged on two fronts: First, on the one hand it is a contest of armament, missiles, and military strength; and second, it is one of economic competition. On this latter score, it is difficult to identify products that lack significant strategic value.

Congress established a policy under the Export Control Act of 1949 authorizing the President to use export controls to the extent necessary (a) to protect the domestic economy from a drain on strategic materials, (b) to use export controls to further the foreign policy of the United States, and (c) to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of national security.

Under the law, our policies of security export controls include embargoes to Communist China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and as of recent date, Cuba; and restrictive controls of exports to the U.S.S.R. and other Soviet bloc countries, limiting direct shipments of U.S. products for these latter destinations to nonstrategic exports. Controls over our shipments to the free world countries cover only a highly selected list of goods to prevent, if possible, their unauthorized diversion to the Soviet bloc.

All commercial exports from the United States, its territories and possessions are prohibited unless the Department of Commerce has either issued a validated license or established a general license permitting such shipments.

My fear, Mr. Speaker, is that this policy is in jeopardy and that the intent of Congress is being violated. In this connection it should be noted that following congressional adjournment last fall, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee had under study the operations and effectiveness of our export controls on shipments of strategic goods to the Sino-Soviet bloc; and the Select Committee of the House of Representatives on Export Policies also had hearings in connection with a study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act. This act expires June 30, 1962 and my remarks tonight are directed as to what the administration may have in mind as to an extension of this law. I have heard it said that weakening amendments will be proposed on both this and the Battle Act.

These House and Senate studies were the result of concern as to the Government's wisdom in allowing shipments of certain commodities, machines, and manufactured products to the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Public disclosure of various transactions such as United States sale of jet planes to Yugoslavia were the cause of indignant protests by the American people over existing policies. Subsequently certain Members of Congress have criticized the administration and in my case I introduce legislation to ban all strategic materials to the Communists. governments. Indeed, I have wanted to go further and restrict economic assistance of any kind to nations which sell strategic materials to the Communists.

Here I must point up again that the distinction between "strategic" and "nonstrategic" materials has posed a difficult problem and raised a strong difference of views in our Government. In administering the Export Act, the Secretary of Commerce consults with the Departments of State and Defense and other agencies of Government. To the distress of many Members of Congress, it has appeared that the administration's desire to increase industrial output and to increase foreign trade, even with the Soviet bloc, has resulted in the lifting of restrictions on strategic commodities; either this, or we seemed to have gone along submissively with our allies.

Exports from the Soviet bloc are based on political considerations, while as for Soviet purchases Khrushchev has been quoted as saying: "We want to buy products in which we are really interested." He has made it clear that the Soviets do not intend to open themselves as a market for goods just because the free world is seeking a consumer outlet for its surplus production.

Now, let me discuss the situation covering the sale of so-called "strategic" goods—items of military significance.

The Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, known as the Battle Act, supplements the Export Control Act. The Battle Act declares it to be the policy of the United States to embargo shipments of arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation and other materials of strategic value to nations threatening U.S. security, including the U.S.S.R. and nations under its domination.

This act, moreover, makes it mandatory to stop any kind of assistance to any nation which knowingly allows sale of arms to the Soviet bloc. Sale of strategic materials used in war production to Communist bloc countries calls for termination of U.S. aid, unless the President decided cessation of aid would be detrimental to our economy.

The provision calling for discontinuance of aid to a nation selling materials of strategic value to Soviet bloc countries has not been used. There is not one case of the Battle Act provision having been invoked. On the other hand, there have been 19 Presidential determinations to continue U.S. assistance in spite of other nations having sold strategic materials to the Soviet bloc. These were the following countries: Belgium, Denmark, West Germany, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. Fourteen determinations affecting eight countries have been classified, so there is no information available on these latter cases.

As to the free world system of controls, the United States consults with 14 other free world countries, Belgium, France, Norway, Denmark, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Luxembourg, West Germany, Portugal, Italy, France, Turkey, Japan, and Canada—a voluntary association of representatives of these nations known as Cocom—for Coordinating Committee—has been formed.

Cocom countries have one list of commodities under complete embargo on export to the Soviet bloc. This group of nations has as its basic purpose the denial to the Communists of materials, equipment and technical data—involving technical services which would aid the military-industrial mobilization base of unfriendly countries. Or at least that was its objective at the start.

Over the years since 1950 when Cocom was organized, through its members' eagerness to increase their foreign trade, many items on the international list of embargoed commodities have been removed, even though of obvious strategic importance.

In addition to the Cocom list, in the United States the Department of Commerce has a list known as the positive list. These are "presumption-for-denial" items against export to the Communists. Validated licenses must be obtained for export of these commodities to all destinations except Canada.

Our colleague, the chairman of the House Committee on Export Policy, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], has stated that evidence establishes that the Cocom list, the Battle Act list and the positive list have all been eroded, meaning that bit by bit their effectiveness has been lessened by deletions and yet it takes unanimous decision of all member nations to remove an item from the Cocom list. The excuse is that willingness on our part for the removal of items from the list was to prevent a breakdown in the whole setup, but I am far from sure those administering our controls themselves genuinely believe in the control program. U.S. decisions, we are told, in allowing licenses to be issued on export commodities of strategic goods to the Soviet bloc follow a policy of granting permission on the basis that if some other country will supply an item we will approve it, too. As an example, the Department of Defense strenuously objected to approval of an application for the issuance of a license to export to the U.S.S.R. certain machines capable of producing 360,000 V-8 engine motor blocks each year.

Due to diplomatic considerations, a restudy was requested. Secretary of Defense McNamara reversed the position of all the Department experts. The reason given was that similar machines could be obtained from alternative sources abroad. These machines had been internationally embargoed by the 14 Cocom countries—but for reasons unknown had been deleted from the list.

The application, however, is still pending because the Congress is interested. Someone is fearful of public reaction to this sale which would increase greatly the Soviet production of military trucks and tanks.

At the present time, also, in the Department of Commerce there are pending, I am told, export applications for many millions of dollars work of similar commodities, classified as strategic, to the Soviet-bloc countries. Since Congress has been studying export policy, there has been a marked slowdown in such approvals.

However, that does not alter the situation that prior to this study vast quantities of scrap copper, steel and iron scrap, borates, and hundreds of other strategic commodities were allowed to go to Communist Yugoslavia. Have we so soon forgotten the tragic lessons of history—Bataan, Pearl Harbor, Midway, Guadalcanal—to name only a few, when we were on the receiving end of our own scrap iron from Japan? And, by the way, before World War II, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, a younger man then, and perhaps wiser, picketed the loading of that scrap iron for Japan at San Francisco.

Speaking of Yugoslavia, the United States has had a less restrictive policy on exports to Poland and Yugoslavia than to the Soviet Union.

Our policy has been to encourage the development of free world economic ties with Yugoslavia. For example, under that policy, through various programs, we have supplied her Government with 683 planes. We have equipped and maintained her air force. Yet Tito's officers are said to have been in Cuba teaching Castro's flyers to use jet aircraft. With regard to Poland, we have permitted more liberal export policies so as to evidence our sympathy and support to the Polish people.

Interjecting as to public opinion on aid or trade to these two countries, I might refer again to the questionnaire sent to certain of my constituents, which I think is typical of American public opinion. I asked this question: Should the United States give military aid to Yugoslavia? This was the way the answers came back: 6,757, or 75.1 percent, said "No"; 1,068, or 11.9 percent, said "Yes"; 1,171, or 13 percent, had no opinion.

Now, as for Poland, I asked: Should the United States give economic aid to Poland? 5,742, or 63.8 percent of the replies, were in the negative; 1,879, or 20.9 percent, responded "Yes"; 1,375, or 15.3 percent, had no opinion.

The Foreign Assistance Act—or the so-called foreign aid bill—which is Public Law 87-195 of September 4, 1961, section 620(B), states:

"No assistance shall be furnished under this act to the government of any country unless the President determines that such country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement."

Let us keep that provision in mind.

The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], reviewing the findings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, stated:

> Because of the laxness of our export policy, we have been helping the Kremlin to overcome many of its most internal weaknesses in the field of military-industrial technology.

A colleague of Senator DODD, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], after a study of our Government agency policies, stated:

> The West has almost completely forfeited the opportunities it has to use trade as a positive weapon for winning substantial concessions from the Communists.

He added that we had been timid and unrealistic in invoking coordinated economic sanctions against Red aggression.

In discussing exports to Poland, Public Law 480 should be considered as well as the Foreign Assistance Act. Here under the so-called Latta amendment, which was added last year, the Congress has declared it to be the policy of Congress "to expand foreign trade in agricultural commodities with friendly nations, as defined in section 107 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, and in no manner either subsidize the export, sell or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nation other than such friendly nations and thus make full use of our agricultural abundance."

Back in 1956, and I am sure, on the basis of some wishful thinking at that time Poland was found eligible for sale under title 1 of Public Law 480 within terms of this agreement. Since that time in excess of one-half billion dollars of agricultural commodities have been shipped to Poland. The commodities had a value in excess of $500 million and in exchange for them the United States received Polish currency representing a theoretical value of $365 million. Thus, we have credits in Poland which are available under an agreement and providing eventually for them to be convertible into dollars. This eventually means 30 years and, of course, the truth is we will never get dollars nor anything of value. However, what I want to point out is that these so-called sales have been made on the finding that Poland is a friendly country. This executive department finding, I am informed, has been reviewed from time to time, yet Secretary of State Dean Rusk, himself, has testified that Poland's position on international issues is rarely distinguishable from that of the Soviet bloc and that Poland is formally bound to the U.S.S.R. by the Warsaw Pact, and is alined to Russia because of Poland's exposed geographic position and its economic dependence upon the Soviet Union.

As to her friendly attitude certainly a United Nations voting comparison of the United States and Poland would be a logical way of determining whether or not she is friendly. I obtained such a record from the Library of Congress and with it was this comment:

> Regardless of whether or not a rollcall is taken, however, it is safe to say that Poland always votes with the U.S.S.R. Poland is a member of the Soviet bloc and the bloc always votes as a unit, at the direction of the Soviet Government.

I will not take the time of the House to recite the comparative record but anyone who is interested can determine for himself that Poland and the U.S.S.R. vote together and almost always opposite to the United States. This does not indicate, to me, that she is a friendly nation. Indeed I submit Poland is controlled and dominated by the International Communist movement and her Government is decidedly unfriendly.

Nor do I believe Poland's transactions with North Vietnam and some other Communist countries including shipments of strategic materials indicates friendliness to the United States. Her participation in a loan to Cuba for facilities to repair Soviet submarines does not indicate she is a friendly nation.

Yet, the passage of the extension of Public Law 480 with the Latta amendment, and the will of Congress as expressed in the legislation passed last session governing foreign assistance spelling out that no assistance should go to any nation until the President had determined that such nation was not controlled or dominated by the international Communist movement had no effect. In spite of that last expression of the will of Congress, last December the administration approved a $43 million shipment of grain and barley to Poland for Polish currency.

The point I make here and wish to emphasize is that the executive branch of our Government, by its power of interpretation, or maybe I should say misinterpretation is able to make policy and ignore Congress. I warn the House that the State Department can get its way and further achieve coexistence by trade with the Communist bloc countries.

In his anxiety to increase such trade, did not Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, last June, lift the ban on the sale of subsidized agricultural commodities which heretofore had been denied to the Soviet bloc? Indeed, Secretary Hodges was blunt in telling the members of the House Select Committee on Export Policy that he might well lift the ban on shipment of strategic materials to Poland.

Mr. Speaker, I have addressed the House on previous occasions raising my voice in protest of appeasement and compromise. I have gone into detail as far as shipments to such countries as Yugoslavia. Tonight let me just reiterate that the President of the United States, through the advice of the Security Council determines export policy within the framework of the law. In this connection, it has been obvious that after his inauguration, President Kennedy embarked on a course of seeking to win Soviet good will through a change in trade policies.

One such generous impulse was an announcement in March 1961, whereby the ban was lifted on shipment to the Soviet bloc of surplus subsidized grain. Here, the idea of allowing Russians to buy food at considerably lower prices than American housewives can buy it resulted in many indignant American consumers. And then there arose the question: Is not food a strategic commodity? Does not an army still march on its stomach? Certainly our military experts believe this is true.

Secretary Rusk has argued that because of Soviet difficulties in their agricultural program, the Communists are forced to strain themselves to buy foodstuffs rather than use foreign exchange for supporting subversion and revolution abroad. The Secretary took the point of view it is safer for us if they use foreign exchange to acquire food rather than for other uses. But if this were true with Poland and Yugoslavia we are not using up their foreign exchange—we are taking their local currencies that are no good to them outside of their own borders.

Now, let us look at the other side of the argument. Agriculture is one of the really serious problems of the Communists, a problem wherein they suffered their most serious failure. Why not keep as many workers as possible in the fields meeting Communist-bloc food needs rather than in factories producing implements of war? Remember, the Soviet Union is capable of feeding its own people, provided it concentrates on production of food instead of building up its military potential.

The issue of selling grain for food is especially important in connection with Red China. Many Americans, of course, are softhearted and cannot support a policy of refusing food to people who are hungry. Other people were sharply critical of Canada when it negotiated a $365 million sale of surplus wheat to Red China. That was when the United States relented and approved of the United States supplying pumps to unload the grain in Red China. In my judgment, this entire issue is a matter of recognition that actually we are at war

I hold the view that after three bad crop years—and little prospect of being able to feed her exploding population—agriculture under Red China's Communist system has failed miserably. The food shortage is the one way of proving to the skeptical mainland Chinese that their system cannot compete with free enterprise. Signs have appeared in China: "We want food—not machines."

Apparently I am not the only one who feels this way. Under date of April 8, 1962 a Reuters dispatch from Sydney, Australia, stated that 16 officers and crew members walked off the British freighter *Hannington Court* a few hours before she was due to sail for Communist China with a cargo of wheat.

They were reported as saying they would rather go to prison than continue working on a ship while it was trading or visiting Communist countries.

George Meany has expressed himself on this subject. He said:

> Selling grain or goods to the dictators whose policies have brought misery and hunger will not help the people who are suffering. The menace of famine and the terrible shortage of goods will not stop these dictators from putting such imported supplies into reserves for their military forces geared to opposition at home and abroad.

Meany also said:

> The Chinese, Cuban, or Soviet dictatorships are known to have resold on the foreign market some of the very goods they imported for the ostensible purpose of alleviating the shortages and hunger confronting their own people.
>
> Trade with the oppressors is no way to aid the people who are the victims of oppression. On the contrary, such trade, as in the case of Communist China today would actually help bail the Mao Tse-tung regime out of the difficulties in which it now finds itself as a result of its false economic and inhuman political policies.

Meany proposes helping the starving people under the Communist yoke by organizing an American relief organization so that the U.S. representatives would distribute food and assure themselves the food reached actual famine victims. This food would be free and the suffering people would know who was giving it.

Here is what the China Club of Seattle writes me:

> We have definite, authentic information Red China has resold the grain she purchased from Canada and Australia. It did not and does not go to her starving millions. An escapee—a young chap who had been lured back to the mainland by propaganda and then sent to school to "unlearn capitalistic habits" and forced to labor on farms—wrote that the worst he experienced was the pain in the stomach from working at hard labor on an empty stomach. All they had in the mess hall was a diluted rice coulee and some nauseating mixture called vegetables. This latter probably the substitute food is produced in a converted cement factory—hay, grass roots, and plants ground up. This while Mao advertised to the world how much grain was being bought in other countries.

I have a clipping from the Hong Kong Tiger Standard of March 27, 1962, which has to do with food for Red China. It reads as follows:

> Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, wife of the President of the Republic of China, said today there is no objection here to food being sent to the Communist-held Chinese mainland provided every possible step is taken to insure it reaches the starving population. She said its delivery would have to be supervised by some responsible body such as the International Red Cross or an organization patterned after the Hoover Mission to Russia after World War I.
>
> Without ironclad guarantees, she declared, relief food would inevitably be used for the military and political purposes of the Chinese Communists and would in effect be food for war.
>
> "Unless the distribution of food is properly supervised," Madam Chiang said, "it will only prolong the Red regime and protract the agony of the people.
>
> "The effect would be much more damaging than beneficial.
>
> "The people of the mainland," Madam Chiang declared in an interview, "are suffering untold hardship. To get help to the starving people is certainly a praiseworthy project. But what guarantee do we have that it will get to them?"

Let me emphasize that we have an inconsistent policy covering export of food. If it is aid, it is banned to the Soviet bloc; if it is under a program of trade, it is permissible under general license.

This lack of a firm policy, which actually amounts to no policy at all, was pointed up not long ago when a little band of patriotic American citizens exercising their constitutional right of free speech picketed the *Titan*, a tanker being loaded at Seattle with grain for Communist Poland. The group carried placards saying, "Grain Is Ammunition," "U.S. Subsidizes International Communism," "Planes; Wheat; What Next?" "90 Million Loaves of Bread for Communism," and so forth.

These protests were lodged on the natural assumption that when Congress prohibited assistance to Communist-dominated countries, it made illegal this cargo of 26,800 tons of grain and 10,900 tons of barley.

So, Mr. Speaker, addressing myself to the policy of permitting grain shipments to the Soviet bloc, let me remind my colleagues of a news item not long ago. I refer to the speech before the central committee of the Communist Party by Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev warning that if current farm problems in the U.S.S.R. were not solved communism would be "seriously damaged." Khrushchev said if the Communists fail to solve this task they will confront the Soviet Union with great difficulties. Agriculture in Russia is throwing the Kremlin plan out of balance and causing discontent of Soviet citizens which could affect the outcome of the cold war.

Official Soviet reports on agricultural production lead Western authorities to the opinion that Kremlin planning and control are a failure so as to make it impossible for communism to win the battle of competitive coexistence with the outside world. The cause of building communism—so he frankly stated—would be seriously damaged.

This admission of failure of agricultural collectivism ties in with the recent free world predictions that Russia's economy is in serious trouble and the significant aspect of the problem is the comparison of collectivization with the system of privately owned farms so clearly pointed up in the Soviet bloc. The only European Communist country not collectivized, Poland, was the only member of the bloc to fulfill its agricultural plan; in fact, it doubled its planned increase. Elsewhere in East Germany, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, where collectivization is rampant, the programs were not successful.

Indeed, Edward Crankshaw of the London Observer News Service was quoted as saying:

> In food production, the Soviet Union, which should be the greatest agricultural country in the world, has a record which can only be called disastrous. With half the population on the land, it still cannot reliably feed the urban half. Whereas in the West agricultural production has grown at a rate far in excess of industrial production, where ever-diminishing numbers of field workers produce ever-increasing harvests, in the Soviet Union a monstrously swollen agricultural population can barely keep the country fed.

This article concluded that sooner or later the Soviet Union will have to abandon collectivization and in consequence much more besides. I suggest that those words "much more besides" are highly significant. If and when collectivism is destroyed, the entire structure of Marxist communism will inevitably collapse.

I have taken the position, Mr. Speaker, that the people under the yoke of communism must earn their freedom by hunger, hardship, and harsh sacrifice.

And, as for us, I hold that only if the United States reverses its policies of appeasement, compromise, and opportunism can we hope to win the cold war and thereby retain our free way of life.

Mr. Speaker, as an article in the March issue of Nation's Business points out, Russia's economy is headed for serious trouble, and industrial disorders building up in the Soviet Union and most of its satellites constitute potentially the greatest threat to international communism to arise since Hitler's armies stood in sight of Moscow.

Why should U.S. policy be such as to help the Communists solve their chronic inability to stabilize food production? Why, when the record indicates ultimate victory could lie in a decision to let the Soviets stew in the collectivist juices of their own making?

Now let me return to the matter of shipping grain to Red China. Not long ago the President in a press conference admitted that the administration had under consideration application for export licenses to allow sales of wheat and barley to the Red Chinese and North Koreans to the tune of $400 million. These applications were subsequently rejected.

The point I raise is, Why were they ever considered? Let us not forget that Public Law 480, section 3046, reads this way:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing transactions under title 1 or title 3 with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any Communist-dominated country including the Communist regime in China.

Of course, this is not a prohibition of our selling agricultural commodities for cash to Russia and other Communist countries but what I am alluding to is policy. If the administration under the so-called Battle Act decides commodities are not strategic they can permit shipment; if the administration determines that shipment of commodities under the Export Control Act are in the interest of foreign policy they can permit shipment. Under Public Law 480, it is only necessary to decide a nation is friendly. So it will be apparent, Mr. Speaker, that unless the Congress strengthens the law the administration, if it so desires, can go ahead and determine that nations are friendly or under one loophole or another accomplish their objective. Let us consider for a moment a grain deal with Red China. The Seattle Daily Times of April 3, 1962, has an article with this headline, "Big Grain Deal With Reds May Still Be On." Let me read from this article:

> Possibility that the Kennedy administration still may be considering permitting a proposed $400 million U.S. grain deal with Red China and North Korea was implied here last night by the mystery man whose application for an export permit was rejected last month by Secretary of Commerce Hodges.
>
> G. W. Nelson, president of the International Trading Corp., Seattle, key figure whose only comment on the widely publicized proposal had been "No comment," explained to the Times:
>
> "This deal has so much international repercussion that we cannot comment and still play square with the U.S. Government."
>
> Nelson, whose headquarters are in a two-room office in the 814 Second Avenue Building, said he has been working on the deal with representatives in Hong Kong for a year and a half. He said he has made two trips to Washington, D.C., in connection with it.
>
> "We have spent a lot of time and energy on it, and, of course, we hope to make some money," the white-haired trader said. "But there is more humanitarian interest in this for me than there is money.
>
> "I contend that shipment of this grain is humanitarian. There are 50 million Chinese actually starving over there.
>
> "There are," Nelson said, "five people who could talk (about the grain deal) but won't. It is inviolate in the Government."

Perhaps this is as good a time as any, Mr. Speaker, to recall to the Members of the House that on March 19, 1962, in order to prevent any such deal with Red China, I introduced a bill to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 2 additional years beyond June 30, 1962, when it expires. At that time I said: I desire to point out that my bill contains a new provision which would prohibit all exportation of agricultural commodities to any foreign country unless the President shall have determined that such country is not dominated or controlled by the international Communist movement.

Thereby, Mr. Speaker, the inconsistency in present law as between aid and trade would be removed so that indirect aid such as exports under Public Law 480 would be treated as they are under section 620(B) of Public Law 87–195 passed last September covering foreign assistance. The language of this latter foreign aid act expressed the will of Congress that no assistance should be furnished to the government of any Communist country.

My bill would terminate the policy of the administration which has been to permit the sale of agricultural products to Communist countries and especially the policy since Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges last June lifted the ban on shipment of surplus agricultural products to Communist-bloc countries. It would continue the complete embargo on trade with Red China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba, which rumor has it the administration wants ended.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the Government has been licensing shipments to other Communist-bloc nations and, as I said earlier, there has been much public concern that by so doing the United States has been actually helping the Communist system succeed where the Marxist program of collectivist farming has been failing.

Recently, the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, a United Nations regional body, has suggested that Red China's leaders may be endangering their own ambitions by this economic squeeze of government planning. Notwithstanding, our allies have seen fit to supply food to help these leaders out. The question is how about the United States? Will we stand firm in this respect and refuse to allow the sale of agricultural products to Red China and North Korea. I fear not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to me a possible change in foreign policy is pending, a change with ramifications that I view with the gravest of alarm, for once the gates of total embargo are breached, the dam will burst and the success of communism in Red China and no doubt eventually throughout the Far East will be virtually assured. Food is high on the list of strategic items in any struggle and if the decision is made to permit the shipment of wheat and agricultural products to the Chinese mainland, it will constitute the second and probably the final betrayal of the Chiang

Kai-shek government. It will also set the stage for the admission of this outlaw, atheist government into the United Nations by providing quasi-official recognition of Red China.

The very fact that it is even being considered and that the request for these export licenses was not summarily rejected is very disturbing. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to urge the President to reassure the American people by immediate rejection of any change in policy, so that they will know beyond doubt the administration has no intention of altering and weakening its foreign policy as it applies to the embargo on trade with Red China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba.

The American people must see that this issue is not one of feeding hungry mouths. My heart is filled with pity, too. But the harsh reality of this situation is either we win the cold war or we submit to our humanitarian instinct. The Chinese people under the yoke of Communist rule can win back their freedom from a form of government which disregards the dignity of man and fails in its responsibility by refusing the individual the right to provide for himself. As for those of us who are still free, we, too, must make sacrifices to retain our free way of life—sacrifices such as forgoing the profit of selling surplus grain.

We cannot win the cold war with a soft policy of supplying our enemies out of our own abundance. The United States must stand firm—otherwise the nonslave world is doomed.

Speaking of grain for Red China, perhaps at this point, I should mention that despite the shortage of food on the mainland of China increasing amounts of foodstuffs have been collected from the farmers for export. According to figures given by Food Minister Sha Chien-li, annual taxation and collection of food grain rose steadily between 1952 and 1959. The collection after 1959 must have been even greater. In 1960 the figures reveal that the rice exports to Hong Kong also increased. This grain flows out of China to earn foreign exchange and to pay for goods from Communist countries. Meanwhile, Peking imports foodstuffs from non-Communist countries. China has supplied Albania with grain and other principal foodstuffs. U.S. officials have stated that China has also shipped more than 200,000 tons of rice to Cuba and likewise has reported shipments to Guinea in north Africa and the equivalent of $20 million in foodstuffs, mainly rice to Ceylon.

Thus China is exporting food although its harvests have been short, yet the inference has been given out that if the government of Red China were to ask us we would ship them grain.

Incidentally, there have been reports of rebellion in Red China. On April 2 an Associated Press dispatch from Hong Kong stated that more than 1,000 rebellious troops in south China had taken to the hills to wage war on the Chinese Communists. The report said the troops had been joined by the militia and hungry villagers. In this connection President Kennedy has assured the Chinese Communist leaders by making it clear in his weekly news conference that the United States will not allow Chiang Kai-shek to invade the mainland. Privately discouraging Chiang is one thing, but publicly contributing to Peiping's security is quite another.

Mr. Speaker, now I come to the matter of rumored plans of those in the State Department and others who are convinced that peaceful coexistence is the answer. Let me go back to an original tipoff revealed by an article by Felix Belair, Jr., in the New York Times of January 18, 1961.

This article said a long secret report compiled by a task force proposed to President Kennedy the virtual scrapping of the existing embargo on exports of strategic materials to nations of the Communist bloc.

The present Under Secretary of State for Foreign Economic Affairs, George W. Ball, was chairman of this task force and so we know his views.

When the members of the House Select Committee on Export Policy last November interrogated Under Secretary George Ball as to the report of the task force, of which he was chairman, he declined to reveal anything about it. But I do not think that anyone who is familiar with the past activities of the Under Secretary and knows his views would not agree that in his capacity of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs he is working toward eliminating all bars of trade with the Sino-Soviet bloc. Furthermore, any one of us who takes time to read through the hearings of the House Select Committee on Export Policy and acquaint himself with the continual and continuing erosion of restrictions to trade with the Communists would conclude, as I have, that the administration is hopeful of getting their way.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, one hears recurrent rumors that the administration wants to emasculate the Battle Act and the Export Control Act. And as I said at the start, this has caused me great concern. All the clues point to such a proposition of emasculating them.

Of course, the Congress will not get a message stating frankly what their objection or even the means of achieving what is wanted. As it has been before, so it will be again, the executive branch will ask for more discretion, more delegation of authority, we will get the same old story that more power is needed to negotiate. Under a program of authorized negotiation and executive interpretation, we could expect to see trade with the Communists grow and expand just as the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Agriculture and other advisers of the President want it to expand. They want to have the barriers removed, they want to negotiate peaceful coexistence.

But, as I have said, the American people oppose a no-win cold war policy of coexistence and letting all bars down on trade with the Communists.

Listen to this telegram to me dated April 9, 1962, from American Legion Post 134, Burien, Wash.:

> Regular meeting our post over 300 members unanimously commissioned the undersigned to ask you to do all possible to stop direct or indirect shipment of food or other items to Communist nations believing this complete embargo is essential to our national sovereignty and security and to eventual world victory over communism.

And as to what may happen if the administration decides to go ahead in the face of previous expressions of the will of Congress and the American people, let me say commanders of Legion posts in my Seattle area have threatened to picket the waterfront if grain is shipped to Red China and North Korea through Seattle.

A wire to our senior Senator of the State of Washington from Legion Post No. 1 said:

> We vigorously protest and condemn as outrageous the possible shipment of wheat to Red China.

An organization dedicated to national security such as the American Legion is not the only one to protest trade with the Communists. Last February a 500-member union local—Lodge 893, International Association of Machinists, Stratas division of Fairchild Engine & Airplane Co.—invited their own loss of jobs by opposing the production of a strategic item for the U.S.S.R.

Union leaders had come to Washington, D.C., in December and following discussions with Government officials said they were shocked and dismayed to discover in their visit here that this administration has no set policy covering export of strategic equipment. Recently the 34th semiannual convention of the New York State Council of Machinists, representing 100,000 members, adopted a resolution opposing strategic trade with the Soviet bloc.

J. Edgar Hoover last year said this:

> We are at war with the Communists and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this the safer we will be.

He added:

> Those who follow the road of appeasement do not know the true meaning of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, some people, I think, have forgotten Mr. Chamberlain and his umbrella returning from Munich and saying, "It is peace."

These people say we should be realists and trade with Communist countries and scrap existing embargoes on exports of strategic materials to nations of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

The American people should be given the truth as to what their Government has in mind.

As I said at the start the word is that the Ball task force recommendations are in the mill and will be sought by asking Congress for more flexibility to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, I warn the American people that such a program is in the making.

In the name of commonsense I urge that the Congress reject in unmistakable terms any such ill conceived plan.

Let us stand firm and win the cold war.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4. An act to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon today.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), Thursday, April 12, 1962, the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86-472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86-628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency and dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, covering expenditures for the previous calendar year. The consolidated report is to be forwarded to the Committee on House Administration, which, in turn, shall print such report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 legislative days after receipt. There is submitted herewith the report from the House Committee on Education and Labor:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Powell, Adam C.:											
France			250.00		150.00		187.00		226.87		813.87
Italy [1]			308.00		168.00		483.30		502.23		1,461.53
Spain			280.00		140.00		100.00		380.00		900.00
Switzerland [2]			60.00		40.00				7.97		107.97
Green, Edith:											
Denmark	Kroner			110	17.00	35	5.00	119	17.00	273	80.00
Jamaica	Jamaican pound.	20	56.00	15	42.00	17.5	48.00	4	12.00	56.5	158.00
Zelenko, Herbert:											
England	Pound	22.17	64.00	17.2.8	48.00			8.11.4	24.00	48.11	136.00
France			119.00		77.00				45.50		241.50
Italy			150.00		120.00		19.22		60.00		349.22
Israel			102.00		72.00				36.00		210.00
Dent, John H.: [3]											
Italy			330.00		328.00		240.00		55.00		953.00
Costa Rica/Mexico			86.00		84.00		60.00		32.00		262.00
Spain			80.00		72.00		65.00		40.00		257.00
United Kingdom			21.50		26.00		15.00		11.00		73.50
Daniels, Dominick V.: [4]											
Italy			324.00		330.00		232.26		59.50		945.76
United Kingdom			21.30		33.60		11.20		12.10		78.40
Mexico			92.00		85.00		45.00		17.00		239.00
Brademas, John: Argentina			168.73		125.00		20.00		61.87		375.60
Giaimo, Robert N.:											
Argentina			168.73		125.00		20.00		61.87		375.60
Denmark-Germany			28.00		30.00		6.00		20.00		84.00
Russia					30.00		30.00		60.00		120.00
Denmark			26.00		36.00		12.00		52.00		126.00
Spain					54.00		20.00		31.00		105.00
Italy			50.00		75.00		30.00		50.00		205.00
England			45.00		67.00		22.00		34.00		168.00
Smith, Neal:											
Denmark					6.00				15.00		21.00
									54.50		54.50
Russia									51.00		51.00
Germany			20.15		29.00				15.25		64.40
England					4.00				3.85		7.85
Quie, Albert H.:											
Germany			43.40		54.01		2.50		6.90		106.90
Russia					31.00		29.43				60.43
Finland			22.24		23.00						45.24
Sweden			24.75		21.00				3.28		49.03
Norway			33.29		20.85				6.02		69.16
Denmark			12.45		14.77		4.10		5.60		36.92
Goodell, Charles E.:											
Germany			43.40		52.51		2.50		8.37		106.87
Denmark			35.00		25.71		15.00				85.71
Garland, Peter A.:											
Germany			50.00		41.00		2.50		13.50		107.00
Finland			21.00		23.00		20.00		12.00		76.00
Sweden			30.50		15.50						46.00
Norway			47.00		30.00				9.00		86.00
Denmark			13.00		12.00				12.00		37.00
Dargans, Louise Maxienne:											
United Kingdom					27.20		24.30		11.00		62.50
Brazil			110.00		97.50		55.25		84.75		347.50
Uruguay					27.00		15.00		4.50		46.50
Argentina			46.00		40.00		30.00		34.00		150.00
Derrickson, Russell C.:											
England			120.40		72.80		11.20		5.60		210.00
France			150.00		150.00		25.00		10.75		335.75
Italy			89.91		64.41		16.20		6.63		177.15
Denmark			60.00		36.17		5.12				101.29
Japan			100.00		75.00		15.00		5.00		195.00
Gamser, Howard G.:											
England			120.40		72.80		11.20		5.60		210.00
France			150.00		125.00		25.00		6.00		306.00
Italy			90.00		80.52		25.00		13.00		208.52
Denmark			60.00		26.00		11.00		5.72		102.72
Japan			83.34		50.00		25.00		8.33		166.67
Hong Kong			25.50		17.00		5.10		3.40		51.00

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Wingate, Livingston L.:											
Denmark			7.69		10.00		3.74				21.43
Greece			14.33		7.00				8.66		20.99
Ethiopia			25.32		32.00		5.00		17.68		80.00
France			85.00		40.00		45.00		45.00		215.00
Branigan, James E.: France			344.00		240.00		160.00		82.00		826.00
Fullmer, Marvin R.: France			357.00		260.00		189.00		94.00		900.00
Clark, Odell: France			340.00		240.00		160.00		80.00		820.00
Pryor, Betty R.:											
Jamaica			56.00		44.00		46.00		10.00		156.00
Denmark					20.00		6.10		18.90		45.00
Zumas, Nicholas H.: Denmark					17.60				24.20		41.80
Young, W. Wilson:											
France			108.00		72.00		30.00		100.00		310.00
Switzerland			56.00		45.00		15.00		58.00		174.00
Gerberding, William P.:											
Denmark			7.69		10.00		3.74				21.43
Greece			14.33		7.00				8.66		20.99
Ethiopia			25.32		32.00		5.00		17.68		80.00
United Kingdom			56.00		28.00		16.80		47.00		148.40
Teller, Ludwig:											
Sweden			651.50		364.00		294.00		147.00		1,456.50
Denmark			170.00		113.00		80.50		70.15		433.65
Young, John:											
Brazil			90.50		106.75		25.00		105.75		328.00
Venezuela			144.00		96.36		45.00				285.36
Jamaica			114.00		106.00		54.50		45.26		319.76
Mexico			279.20		186.50		180.30		209.00		855.00
Iorio, D. Thomas:											
Italy[5]			272.00		160.00		88.30		80.00		600.30
Sneed, Melvin:											
Germany			36.25		155.75		2.50		19.25		213.75
Denmark					6.10				2.62		8.72
Finland			8.63		11.13		13.68		3.44		36.88
Sweden			23.78		37.91		30.71		7.60		100.00
England			53.59		20.16		85.83		9.82		169.40
Total			7,772.50		6,226.61		3,632.17		3,641.73		21,272.99

[1] Traveled at the request of the President as a member of congressional committee to celebrate Italian centennial.

[2] Traveled at the request of the President representing the executive branch of our Government.

[3] Traveled to Italy as member of committee appointed by the President. Traveled to Costa Rica and Mexico studying labor, education, and trade. Traveled to Spain and the United Kingdom studying labor and trade.

[4] Traveled as member of President's mission to Italy.

[5] Member of special Presidential mission to celebration of Italian centennial.

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

APR. 10, 1962.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1924. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1960, Publicly Owned"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1925. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1926. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the division of the tribal assets of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska among the members of the tribe, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1927. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, relative to the court's opinion in the case of *Eugene C. Ottinger and Clyde L. Ottinger, a Copartnership Doing Business as Ottinger Brothers* v. *The United States* (No. Congressional 13–56), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and to House Resolution 531, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 10440. A bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10566. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and orderly disposition of mineral interests in certain public lands in Pima County, Ariz.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 10024. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9252. A bill to defer the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project; with amendment (Rept. No. 1591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 438. Concurrent resolution to provide for a joint committee of the Congress to represent the Congress at ceremonies celebrating the 375th anniversary of the landing of the Lost Colony and the birth of Virginia Dare; without amendment (Rept. No. 1592). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 596. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7596, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1593). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 597. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11131, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1594). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8134. A bill to authorize the sale of the mineral estate in certain lands; with amendment (Rept. No. 1587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2103. A bill for the relief of Antonio C. Ysrael; without amendment (Rept. No. 1595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2187. A bill for the relief of Augustin Ramirez-Trejo; with amendment (Rept. No. 1596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2198. A bill for the relief of Carlos Sepulveda Abarca, Rosario Perez Sepulveda, Carlos Perez Sepulveda, Jorge Perez Sepulveda, and Antonio Perez Sepulveda; with amendment (Rept. No. 1597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5916. A bill for the relief of Miss Susanna Moscato (Reverend Mother Charitas); with amendment (Rept. No. 1598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHRIVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8631. A bill for the relief of David B. Kilgore and Jimmie D. Rushing; without amendment (Rept. No. 1599). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 11215. A bill to amend section 501(c) (14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations organized to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.R. 11216. A bill to amend the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 11217. A bill to amend section 6112 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 11218. A bill authorizing construction of a bridge across the Missouri River in the vicinity of St. Joseph, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 11219. A bill to amend section 212 A(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 11220. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 11221. A bill to amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 252), to increase the basic allowance for quarters of members of the uniformed services and to make permanent the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 11222. A bill to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 11223. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 11224. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 11225. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1907, to provide that the 16-hour limitation upon continuous duty for certain railroad employees shall apply to employees installing, repairing, and maintaining signal systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 11226. A bill to provide for the nutritional enrichment and sanitary packaging of rice prior to its distribution under certain Federal programs, including the national school lunch program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 11227. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 11228. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide for additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 11229. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in certain cases because of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, or age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11230. To adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11231. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Philip Murray; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 11232. A bill to provide a right of ingress and egress across national forest lands to all persons owning property within the boundaries of such national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 11233. A bill to encourage the expansion and improvement of State programs of special education and related services for exceptional children through Federal financial participation in the cost of development and implementation of such programs and in the cost of colleges and universities in providing special courses of instruction and scholarships for persons preparing for professional participation in such programs, and for establishing research grants and special projects and by establishing and providing for consultation with a national training and research council and technical advisory committees on education of exceptional children in the administration of this act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 11234. A bill to provide for the nutritional enrichment and sanitary packaging of rice prior to its distribution under certain Federal programs, including the national school lunch program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 11235. A bill to assure the availability, after any nuclear attack upon the United States, of the scientific and technological information, instruments, and standards necessary for the rebuilding of the economy; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 11236. A bill to increase from $600 to $750 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 11237. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 11238. A bill to provide that certain survivor benefits received by a child under public retirement systems shall not be taken into account in determining whether the child is a dependent for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 11239. A bill to relieve ship operators of part of the cost of designing vessels as required under operating-differential subsidy agreements; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 11240. A bill to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, as amended, to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States, territories, and possessions receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 11241. A bill to direct the National Capital Planning Commission to develop forthwith a plan for the historic Capitol Hill area and vicinity in the District of Columbia which will protect the U.S. Capitol and the surrounding buildings of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 11242. A bill to provide that where the entitlement of a veteran, widow, or child to a pension from the Veterans' Administration is based upon the veteran's having served in World War I, the beneficiary shall, if otherwise eligible, have the right to elect payment of pension under either the provisions of title 38 as in effect on June 30, 1960, or as amended by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, whichever provides the greater benefit; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.J. Res. 687. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide the right of States to establish their own election districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.J. Res. 688. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the week commencing October 14, 1962, as "National Public Works Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.J. Res. 689. Joint resolution supporting the President of the United States denunciation of the steel companies price increase; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Con. Res. 459. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress in opposition to the proposed exchange of American dollars for Cuban prisoners; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 595. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962; to the Committee on Government Operations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 11243. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maisie Magdalene Lim Ketchens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H.R. 11244. A bill to supplement certain provisions of Federal law incorporating the Texas & Pacific Railway Co. in order to give certain additional authority to such company; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 11245. A bill for the relief of Verniere Catania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 11246. A bill for the relief of Jacob Tcherniavsky, also known as Jacob Golan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 11247. A bill for the relief of Chong Hai Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 11248. A bill for the relief of Valeriano T. Ebreo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 11249. A bill for the relief of Rosa Stefano Ratajczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 11250. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cocozza, his wife, Antonietta Cocozza, and their minor children, Maria Cocozza and Giovanni Cocozza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Best Is Yet To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago the Aloha Broadcasting System broadcast a program sponsored by the pineapple companies of Hawaii with a commentary by Joyce Roberts.

Mr. Roberts' subject was the future prosperity of America and what we had to look forward to as a nation. His material was inspired by an article he had read which had been printed by the Honolulu Advertiser and was authored by Samuel F. Pryor, who was then and now is vice president of Pan American World Airways.

In the article which caught Mr. Roberts' eye, Mr. Pryor spoke out against those who preach the gospel that America is finished. "These are the voices of false prophets," said Mr. Pryor. To substantiate his theory that the best is yet to come, Mr. Pryor quoted a group of economists who made conservative estimates on what we could expect 10 years hence. I think that it is extremely interesting to compare what Mr. Pryor's article predicted 10 years ago, with what is actually the case today.

"America will have a population of 175 million people—14 percent higher than in 1951," the article said. Today, the Council of Economic Advisers, in the Executive Office of the President, estimates our present population at 183 million people, a gain of 19 percent.

"There will be over 67 million people in our labor force—an increase of more than 3 million people over 1951." The Council of Economic Advisers reports that there are currently 74 million people in our labor force, an increase of more than eight million over 1951.

It goes without saying that Mr. Pryor's estimates for a prosperous future for America were on the conservative side and that his vision of good things to come for our country has more than been fulfilled. And keep in mind that all this progress occurred at a time when the cold war was at its peak and when the Communist-bloc nations were suggesting that our democracy was decadent, that our economy was on the road to ruin, and that they would "bury us" economically, if not militarily.

I know that Mr. Pryor, who has had a distinguished business and political career for more than 40 years, is looking toward retirement. I also know that he is looking toward Hawaii where he has purchased a parcel of property on the Island of Maui.

Growing and expanding Hawaii could certainly use more prophets. It is my earnest hope that Samuel F. Pryor's retirement will be pleasantly spent in the State with a future.

The President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution of disapproval of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962. The plan would provide for certain reorganizations in the field of science and technology.

My purpose in submitting this resolution of disapproval is purely technical and is not intended to express any position for or against the plan at this time. The resolution is introduced to set in motion the procedures of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, which will enable the House to vote on this matter of vital significance.

Under the act, a reorganization plan becomes law unless a resolution of disapproval is passed by either the House or the Senate within a prescribed 60-day period.

Government programs in science and technology are so closely affected with our national security and general welfare that any plan of reorganizing such programs should be thoroughly studied by the Congress before approving or disapproving them. It is hoped that the appropriate committee will study the plan in detail and report its findings to the House so that each Member may exercise an informed judgment in the vote or votes affecting this matter.

Questionnaire Results, First Congressional District, State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, early in February 1962, I sent a questionnaire to approximately 40,000 registered voters in my congressional district, for the purpose of seeking information as to the views of my constituents on a number of problems of national import facing this session of the 87th Congress. Many of these questions involved complex situations that I recognized were difficult to answer with a categoric "Yes" or "No", and for this reason I invited additional comments on the reverse side of the questionnaire, with the assurance that the views of my constituents would be included in the final tabulation of results and entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The interest generated by this questionnaire was truly amazing, resulting in a 22½ percent return. I am informed by the IBM statisticians who tabulated the returns that a 10 percent response is considered excellent.

According to many authorities on civil government, under a democratic process the American electorate is supposed to be apathetic. In my judgment, the results that I received completely reject this viewpoint, at least as far as my own district is concerned. Certainly the voters of my district have demonstrated beyond any doubt that they are vitally interested in their Government and in the records of their elected representatives.

In fact, a large percentage of those responding not only took advantage of my suggestion that they elaborate on their replies on the reverse side of the questionnaire, but they also expressed appreciation for this means of active participation in the legislative affairs of the Congress. Therefore, believing that the Members of the House will be as interested in the results of this poll as I am, I am including with these remarks the tabulation as prepared by IBM.

Results of 1962 questionnaire

	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	No opinion	Percent
FOREIGN POLICY						
1. Should the United States withdraw from the United Nations?	2,117	23.5	6,277	69.8	602	6.7
2. Should the United States extend foreign aid to British Guiana?	1,431	15.9	5,036	56.0	2,529	28.1
3. Should the United States sell surplus grain to Red China?	1,923	21.4	6,514	72.4	559	6.2
4. Should the United States give military aid to Yugoslavia?	1,068	11.9	6,757	75.1	1,171	13.0
5. Should the United States military forces occupy Cuba?	3,635	40.4	4,011	44.6	1,350	15.0
6. Should the United States trade with the Soviet Union?	2,467	27.4	5,711	63.5	818	9.1
7. Should the United States give economic aid to Poland?	1,879	20.9	5,742	63.8	1,375	15.3
8. Should the United States purchase $100,000,000 in United Nations bonds?	3,086	34.3	4,697	52.2	1,213	13.5
DOMESTIC PROGRAM						
9. Do you favor Federal aid for the arts?	1,318	14.6	6,680	74.3	998	11.1
10. Do you favor a cutback in nondefense spending?	5,401	61.0	2,724	30.3	781	8.7
11. Do you favor compulsory medical care for senior citizens under the social security program; financed by increased payroll deductions?	4,042	44.9	4,423	49.2	531	5.9
12. Do you favor giving the President increased power to negotiate across-the-board tariff cuts?	3,286	36.5	4,896	54.4	814	9.1
13. Do you favor Federal relief for individual industries and communities hurt by foreign imports?	2,713	30.1	5,107	56.8	1,176	13.1
14. Do you favor a congressional investigation of alleged subversive activities in the State and Defense Departments?	6,418	71.3	1,879	20.9	699	7.8
15. Do you favor extensive fallout shelters being built and supplied by the Federal Government?	1,582	17.6	6,621	73.6	793	8.8

South Carolina Does Its Part

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on the 9th of September of last year the Secretary of Defense suspended the movement of military dependents to Europe. Many Members of the Congress have been deeply disturbed over the possible effects of this edict on military families and the consequent motivation of our military men. It is deplorable that the wives and children of our servicemen are still restrained from joining their sponsors abroad. Military service is normally filled with sufficient family separations without imposing such added hardships on the military community alone. No similar restrictions have been placed on any other segment of our society.

I am most happy to report, however, that in at least one instance something grand and positive is being done for our military families. The great State of South Carolina, once more showing its traditional warmth of heart toward our service families, has taken a significant step toward relieving some of their burdens. And let me emphasize that this is no hollow gesture. It involves sacrifice by the people of South Carolina themselves. May I add that this action is gratuitous, is altogether admirable, and is certainly worthy of adoption by others.

I speak here of a recent act of the South Carolina General Assembly, approved by Governor Hollings on March 19 last. The military and I are deeply indebted to Representative F. Julian LeaMond for sponsoring this important, forward-looking legislation.

This act offers our service families within the State the same opportunities as State residents have for attending South Carolina's higher educational institutions. The language is simple and unqualified:

> It is hereby declared to be the intent of the General Assembly that the following sections shall constitute a part of the permanent laws of the State of South Carolina. * * * That the wives and children of members of the Armed Services and Federal employees stationed in South Carolina shall have the privilege of attending the States' educational institutions of higher learning for the fees charged to residents of this State; and where such military personnel or employees are ordered away from the State, their wives and/or children may continue to have this privilege while they attend these institutions.

Once again South Carolina has shown itself a leader in supporting our Armed Forces. Once again it has tangibly expressed its sympathetic understanding of a problem facing the uniformed guardians of our heritage and their civilian counterparts.

This generous act is due the highest praise. It is indeed in keeping with the finest traditions of this great State and its magnificent citizens. It is yet another entry on South Carolina's long and imposing scroll of illustrious deeds.

Barbershop Harmony Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is International Barbershop Harmony Week in North America. The 700 chapters of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., are joining together to celebrate the founding of this unique organization on April 11, 1938, in Tulsa, Okla.

In 1938 one man rebelled against a trend toward eliminating self-produced harmony which had been brought about by the increasing popularity of radio. In doing this, he subsequently changed the music patterns of North America. The man was the late Owen C. Cash, a tax attorney of Tulsa. He found a supporter in Rupert I. Hall, an investment man of the same city. Half seriously, half humorously, they invited a group of friends to meet with them to participate in some oldtime quartet singing, thus "encouraging the enjoyment of this last remaining vestige of human liberty."

The 26 men who responded were amazed and delighted when a story in the local paper, reporting on their meeting, was published across the Nation by the wire services, and in a matter of weeks, chapters were springing up all over the Middle West. The Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., was on its way. Today its international membership numbers over 29,000 men in the United States and Canada—men from every station of life who enjoy singing the old songs in four-part harmony.

The barbershoppers feel that a singing nation is a happy nation. This unique singing fraternity, the largest organized group of male singers in the world today, set out 24 years ago to keep America singing, and they have been doing a fine job, indeed. Barbership harmony is one of three original forms of native American vocal music, and these men feel a deep obligation to preserve and encourage this great American musical heritage. They accomplish this by participation—only a few of them are not active singers. They participate in over 700 choruses, ranging from 20 to 220 in number, and in over 1,000 registered quartets and about the same number of informal, nonregistered quartets.

I am pleased that Westchester County, N.Y., is represented by a very active group of part-time troubadours.

These choruses and quartets sing for their own enjoyment, but they also sing in and for their communities. They contribute their voices, not always trained but always expert through practice and expert instruction, to the welfare of their local charities, to the civic associations and the PTA's, to the town and county government organizations, and other local activities. During 1962 they have pledged themselves to songs of service by devoting their time and talents to increasing harmony in their communities. Proud of the part they play in preserving and encouraging this unique portion of American music culture, the barbershoppers remind us all that "if you're too busy to sing, you're too busy."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to this unique singing fraternity, the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc. They are making a grand contribution to our culture, to our communities throughout the length and breadth of the two Nations where they sing, and to the welfare of the citizenry at large. I hope that they may sing another 24 years and that all people may continue to look to them for the fine contribution which they are making to our national heritage.

Summary of Replies to a Questionnaire—Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 1962, I submitted to each family in the 42d District of New York a memorandum and questionnaire encompassing what I consider to be the most basic and critical issues presently confronting the Nation. In my memorandum, I attempted to present a balanced summary both for and against each issue.

I was most gratified with the response to this survey. The number of returns, and the many valuable and sound suggestions indicate a deep concern and sincere interest on the part of our citizens in both the national and international problems of our time.

The 42d District of New York consists of a small portion of the city of Buffalo, N.Y., and the suburban and rural areas surrounding it. The rural, the industrial, and suburban areas are in relatively the same proportion as those of the entire Nation. It is my opinion that the results of the questionnaire are fairly representative of the views of the country as a whole.

The tabulations of the answers to the questionnaire will be inserted in the Congressional Record in four parts. Part 1, appearing in today's Record, contains questions and replies on the subjects of United States versus Soviet-Communist relations, and United States-Soviet military power.

Part 2 relates to taxes and fiscal affairs; part 3 relates to budget expenditures, disarmament, nuclear tests, fallout shelters, and United Nations; and part 4 relates to reciprocal trade, education, medical care, postage rates, and Federal pay. These parts will be inserted in the Record on successive days.

The tabulated results for part 1 follow:

	Yes	No
UNITED STATES VERSUS SOVIET-COMMUNIST RELATIONS		
1. Do you believe that the international conferences of the world's Communist Parties, pronouncing and agreeing upon principles, policies, and actions is in fact a joint campaign to destroy all non-Communist nations and institutions?	6,180	461
2. Do you believe that the 98 Communist Parties acknowledge the leadership of Khrushchev and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in a war upon the free world, despite occasional interparty differences?	5,804	780
3. Do you believe that the Soviet-Communist forces are steadily winning their goals of weakening and destroying the free world?	5,401	1,179
4. Do you believe that United States and free world policies have been that of vacillation, conciliation, appeasement, and retreat?	5,098	1,346
5. Do you believe that the first step in reversing Communist gains is to recognize the Communist organization, its purposes, strategies, tactics, and weapons?	5,213	1,245
6. Do you believe that a United States-free world military superiority of at least 1.5 to 1 over the Communist forces is a necessary requisite to an effective political counteroffensive?	4,698	1,550
7. Would you support a unified free world effort to neutralize and destroy the international Communist conspiracy by nonmilitary political means?	5,426	386
UNITED STATES-SOVIET MILITARY POWER		
8. Would you favor increased draft inductions to avoid another callup of Reserves?	5,057	1,474
9. U.S. military costs are 10 percent of national production; Soviet is 22 percent; European average is 5 percent. Shall United States require a greater military effort by European NATO nations?	6,061	438
10. Admiral Rickover states our Navy is technologically obsolete. Do you favor equipping naval vessels with ICBM's for ICBM mobility and dispersal advantages?	5,594	538
11. Do you believe that total U.S. military firepower sufficiently exceeds that of the Soviet?	2,254	3,644

The National Lottery of Luxembourg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about another of those nations of our world that are short on size and population, but long on fiscal commonsense. I am referring to our smallest NATO partner, Luxembourg, and its national lottery.

In 1961, the national lottery of Luxembourg took in gross receipts of $1½ million from its lottery, and the net income of close to $400,000 was utilized for the benefit of numerous medical and charitable organizations.

Mr. Speaker, gambling in this Nation is a mammoth, multibillion-dollar industry, and what is more, it is the financial mainstay of organized crime. Why can we not establish a national lottery, and divert these many billions of dollars into the coffers of the Government where they may work for the public good? Why must we remain blind to the fact that gambling is part of human nature? Let us wake up to reality, and make gambling moneys work for good rather than evil.

Opposition to H.R. 9900

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous permission to do so, I include for printing in the Congressional Record my statement, supplementing the testimony of the Association of Pacific Fisheries, before the House Committee on Ways and Means in opposition to H.R. 9900:

Statement of Representative Thomas M. Pelly, First District, Washington, Before the Committee on Ways and Means on H.R. 9900 With Reference to the Pacific Northwest Salmon Industry, April 6, 1962

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to testify on H.R. 9900 and to supplement the testimony of the Association of Pacific Fisheries in opposition to this proposed legislation as drawn. This fishing industry is of great importance to the economy of the Pacific coast States and especially Alaska, Oregon, and my own State of Washington.

Under the Trade Agreements Act (from 1934), the United States has led the world in multilateral tariff reductions. As the members of the Committee on Ways and Means know full well, the United States now has the lowest tariffs of any industrial nation, but our reductions of tariffs have not achieved full reciprocity from other nations in tariff reductions or eliminations of other restrictions of trade.

Under the Kennedy proposal, the executive branch would fix the duties and commodity quotas—a power granted only under the Constitution to the Congress. The bill before the committee calls for Presidential determinations "which shall be final and conclusive and not be subject to court review."

I oppose the abdication of legislative power and responsibility to the executive branch and, likewise, I am against depriving the people of judicial review when victims of illegality under trade laws. I believe international agreements should be submitted for ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

In short, I urge that any new foreign trade policy follow the Constitution. As such, I favor a reorganization of the U.S. Tariff Commission as an independent creature of Congress and subject to it at all times. I would give it full responsibility for determining the effects of tariffs and tariff reductions on U.S. industry and employment.

If the Tariff Commission, by investigation, finds injury to domestic industry and employment, I urge legislation which would provide that such findings be reported to the President with recommendations to safeguard the disrupted industry.

Thereafter, I would have the law authorize the President to enter into negotiations to try and effect an international agreement with the countries concerned for the purpose of preventing, reducing, or eliminating disruption in the domestic market caused by the imports.

In this action, the Tariff Commission's recommendations to the President should be followed as closely as possible and, if an agreement were reached, the Congress under my plan should be informed as to any differences from the Commission's recommendations. I propose that the Congress then by a majority concurrent resolution could vote down the agreement. Otherwise, the President could proceed to consummate the agreement. A peril-point provision that would protect industries such as the Pacific Northwest fishing industry is absolutely essential.

Therefore, I propose that the law provide that if the President failed to obtain an international agreement, then the Tariff Commission would be required to issue an order of relief setting quotas or other restrictions which would be mandatory on the executive branch. This latter provision would give a so-called club to the President in his negotiations. In other words, it would be clear that American industry, one way or the other, was going to receive protection and a foreign nation obviously would prefer to make a voluntary arrangement after mutual discussion, rather than have import restrictions imposed by Government order.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, addressing myself to the specific example of salmon imports, I should frankly point out that this problem is largely one of American products being undersold by cheap Japanese imports of canned salmon.

I am told that the total Japanese pink salmon pack last year was 945,260 cases. Of these 496,000 cases remained unsold on March 1, 1962. As of that same date, 310,000 cases had been imported by the United States and the balance of 139,000 cases were either consumed in Japan, if any, or sold elsewhere. Meanwhile, the Japanese are said to have 1 million cases of red salmon unsold which may in time come on our market.

Of course, the Japanese are exercising great caution right now in order not to antagonize industries in the United States while a new tariff policy is pending. But we should not overlook what is going to happen after a new law is enacted. For example, the Japanese are dumping tuna in Europe now at less than our American cost of production. Once a new act is in effect, unless Congress provides safeguards, the Japanese if it were to their advantage would dump here too and undersell our fishing industry and put our fishermen out of business.

Congress must provide machinery that can effectively deal with such a situation. Our American standard of living and wage level must be protected.

At this point, I include a series of questions and answers which specifically refer to the Alaska red salmon industry and which provides supplementary information and background on the overall Japanese import problem and the need of remedial legislation.

Question. Do the Japanese catch salmon spawned in the American lakes and rivers?

Answer. Yes, they catch on the high seas a large proportion of salmon spawned in the rivers and lakes of the Bristol Bay area of Alaska. Our scientists estimate that in the years 1955–60 the Japanese caught more American-born red salmon than our own fishermen.

Question. Has this country spent any money to preserve these salmon runs?

Answer. This country annually spends large sums in the millions in research and in the enforcement of regulations in an endeavor to preserve these runs and imposes severe fishing restrictions on our own fishermen for these purposes.

Question. Where do the Japanese catch these red salmon?

Answer. Out on the high seas, where in 1961 they operated 12 large so-called mother ships or floating canneries, steamers of over 10,000 tons each, and 410 catcher boats.

Question. Why do not our fishermen fish out in the high seas for salmon?

Answer. They are prohibited from fishing salmon outside of territorial waters of 3 miles from shore because we consider it inconsistent with proper conservation. It is impossible to segregate the different races of salmon out on the high seas or open ocean.

Question. What difference in fishing gear is there between what we use and they use?

Answer. They have no restriction on the length of the nets used. One Japanese catcher boat may have from 5 to 7 miles out at one time, whereas our fishermen are restricted to gill nets not over 900 feet long. It is estimated that the Japanese fleet in 1961 used more than 2,500 miles of fishing nets every day they were fishing.

Question. Does this country import any canned salmon from Japan?

Answer. We do not have the latest figures, but in 1960 this country imported more than 18 million pounds of Japanese canned salmon.

Question. Then what happens is that we spend large sums to conserve the salmon runs, put severe restrictions on our own fishermen; then the Japanese catch more than half of the salmon we have preserved, can them in their floating canneries, and sell part of this pack back to us and put the rest in competition with us in the world market?

Answer. That is about it, and the American fishermen do not feel this is right.

In conclusion, again let me express thanks to the committee. I hope I have made my point in favor of a peril-point provision that means something and, likewise, I want to emphasize my support of such a protective safeguard provision being under the control and jurisdiction of the Congress and not abdicated to the free trade one-worlders in the State Department who seem to want to help humanity every place except right here in America.

The Social Security Program Should Be Expanded To Include Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to a subject of vital interest to America's forgotten men and women over 65 years of age.

Despite our abundance and prosperity, too little is being done to alleviate the burdens of our senior citizens. According to the Bureau of Census, there are 17½ million of our citizens 65 or older. Their average income is $1,300 a year, and 53 percent of them have a cash income of less than $1,000.

I need not tell anyone, Mr. Speaker, that an income of less than $1,000 is not a sign of abundance and prosperity. For too many of our senior citizens there is a constant struggle to makes ends meet—to purchase the bare necessities of life. Life on $1,000 a year is, at best, a small rented room in a substandard dwelling, cooking on a hotplate. For recreation, one is resigned to a seat in the city park and an occasional free band concert.

Although their incomes are at a lifetime low, older people have more sickness and more medical expenses. Survey after survey shows that men and women over 65 need two or even three times as much medical service as those under 65.

Older people go to the hospital more often and stay there almost three times as long as younger people. Their average hospital charges amount to $32.33 per day. Their average stay in the hospital is 15 days. The evidence clearly indicates that we in this land of prosperity and unparalleled medical know-how, have a large and ever-increasing number of older people with low incomes and high medical expenses.

Hospital bills may be alleviated by private hospital insurance, but in most cases, this is unlikely. Over half of those in the over-65 age bracket have no insurance at all. Those who do have some insurance are given only weak and inadequate protection. The latest estimates indicate that only 30 percent of our senior citizens have more than three-fourths of their hospital bills paid by private medical insurance. In too many cases, the costs of even modest medical-surgical policies are prohibitive for those who must exist on incomes of less than $1,000 a year.

The plight of our senior citizens is a disgrace and a scandal—a cause for national shame. We boast of our high standard of living and at the same time consign our old folks to a way of life that is little better than the alms houses and poor farms of a few generations ago.

I began, Mr. Speaker, by saying I was going to talk on a subject of vital interest to those over 65 years of age. But actually, the benefit of providing adequate health protection extends far beyond them. In families where the head of the household is between 35 and 54, there are children to support—to send to college. Can these mothers and fathers meet the dilemma of competing responsibilities to carry the burden of medical care for their parents and to provide for the future of their children? Usually they cannot do both.

This concern was reflected in the results of a Gallup poll conducted last year. A sampling of people in three age groups was asked if they favored an increase in the social security tax to pay for health insurance for the aged. In the group 21 to 29 years of age, 63 percent favored such an increase and 30 percent opposed it. The percentage was higher in the 30- to 49-year-old group—67 percent for, 26 percent against.

Certainly the social security approach to medical care for our old folks has widespread national support. My own heavy mail load indicates overwhelming support for this proposal among the people whom I represent.

The social security approach to providing medical care for the aged can make retirement a period of tranquil twilight instead of a season of economic peril.

This approach is embodied in the bill written by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. KING], now being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee. Workers and employers contribute only pennies a day. Spread out over an individual's working life the payment amounts to about $1 a month and that is certainly no sacrifice.

This piece of legislation provides aged patients with medical care according to their need and not according to their means. Illness requiring hospitalization is the most expensive, so up to 90 days in the hospital would be covered. Nursing home care costs less so the bill covers 180 days in such a home, allowing hospitals to discharge patients who are improved but still need treatment. Outpatient diagnostic services will encourage elderly patients to seek early diagnosis so they will not have to be admitted in a hospital for that purpose.

But most important of all, the aged patient becomes eligible for medical care under this bill as a matter of right. He does not have to go through the indignity of taking a pauper's oath and proving that he and his family are destitute.

Private insurance companies cannot adequately cover the health needs of the aged. The risk is too high to expect them to do so. Blue Cross has recommended that public funds be used to help pay for coverage of health costs for this age group. Simple arithmetic explains why. According to a Public Health Service survey 883 days of hospital care were required per thousand persons up to age 64. After age 65, 2,332 days of hospitalization per 1,000 persons were required. By spreading the risk over the entire working force, to young and old alike, the social security system can finance this system of health care for the aged and remain financially sound.

It is entirely proper that this program be a part of our Government's system of social security. The whole point of the system is to provide a measure of financial independence to people who have worked all their lives and who do not want to be a burden on their children or the recipients of charity with all its social stigma. Social security is a bitter mockery to an aged person who is reduced to poverty by medical expenses.

The King bill sets up a system of medical care that will help realize the original ideals of social security. When President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the act on August 14, 1935, he characterized it this way—

> The cornerstone in a structure which is being built, but is by no means complete.

It is up to us—the Members of this 87th Congress—to build further on that cornerstone. By enacting the King bill we can, for our aged fellow citizens, change fear into security, humiliation into dignity, and anxiety into serenity.

The Value of Registering and Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, registering and voting are truly valuable because they insure that our Government—be it local, State, or National—remains of us, and not against us.

But, day-to-day distractions often obscure the value of exercising these rights. It takes an unusual, crucial event like the last close presidential election to show that a single citizen's vote might decide who would be President, or who would be any other elected Government official.

Every citizen's ballot becomes especially important when a fateful question is decided by one vote. Many legends—some true, some false—have grown up, describing what happened or did not happen for the lack of a vote.

For example, a false legend has it that the War of 1812 was declared because New Hampshire's vote was not counted. It is untrue that Daniel Kelso was elected to the Indiana State Senate by a single vote. It is also untrue that Kelso's vote was crucial to the election of Edward A. Hannegan as U.S. Senator from Indiana. And, contrary to legend, it is not true that Senator Hannegan's vote was decisive when the United States declared war on Mexico in 1846. Senator Hannegan's vote, however, did play an important part in the annexation of Texas. On February 27, 1845, Hannegan voted for the resolution for annexation; since the resolution carried by a vote of 27 to 25, it would have been defeated had he voted "nay."

More pertinent examples on the importance of one vote and many votes are available both in our own history and in the history of other nations. One vote cost King Charles the First of England his head in 1649. The court that set his fate was made up of 135 judges; 67 voted for the King, 68 voted against him. Elizabeth the Second is Queen of the United Kingdom today because, some 250 years ago, the House of Commons voted in favor of the House of Hanover, 96 to 95. In France, in 1875, the nation vacillated between a republican and a monarchical form of government. By 1 vote, 353 to 352, the issue was decided for the Republic.

In our own history the change of a single vote could have changed the course of our destiny as early as 1774. In that year the First Continental Congress considered the so-called Galloway plan. In effect, the plan would have transformed the American Colonies into a British dominion ruled by an English-type of Parliament and a British governor. After an impassioned speech by Patrick Henry against the measure, the plan came to a vote on September 28. It was defeated by one vote.

In at least two instances a single vote carried the Presidency. In the election of 1824 neither John Quincy Adams nor Andrew Jackson was able to obtain a clear majority of votes in the electoral college, although Jackson led 99 to 84. The choice devolved upon the House of Representatives where, in accordance with the Constitution, the voting was by States. Adams was finally chosen when he received the vote of a clear majority of the States, 13 of the then 24. In the 13th State, New York, Adams originally had pledges from 17 members of the 34-man delegation. At the last moment, Gen. Stephen Van Rensselaer cast his vote for Adams, this 18th vote throwing New York and the election to Adams. Of course, the loss of any of the other 12 States that voted for him would have prevented Adams' election, and in 5 of those States Adams won the delegation by one vote.

Perhaps the most celebrated example of the power of a single vote occurred in 1876 when Rutherford B. Hayes and Samuel J. Tilden contended for the Presidency. In the electoral college Tilden received 184 undisputed votes to Hayes' 163. However, two sets of electoral ballots were received from South Carolina, Louisiana, Florida, and Oregon. For each of the three Southern States, one set was completely Democratic and for Tilden, the other completely Republican and for Hayes. For Oregon, one set gave Hayes all three of the State's votes; the others gave one of the votes to Tilden. Congress, on January 29, 1877, created an Electoral Commission, consisting of 5 Supreme Court Justices, 5 Senators, and 5 Representatives, to settle the question of the 22 disputed votes. The Commission voted on party lines, eight Republicans to seven Democrats, in favor of Hayes. The final results; Hayes, 185 electoral votes; Tilden, 184.

The failure of the Senate to convict President Andrew Johnson in 1868 is another notable instance in which a margin of one vote was crucial. On February 24, 1888, the House passed the "Covode Resolution" providing that Johnson be impeached. On May 16, when the first vote was taken in the Senate, 35 Senators—1 short of the required two-thirds majority—voted guilty, while 19 voted not guilty. Johnson's enemies, having failed in their attempt to secure conviction on the first count of the indictment, moved adjournment of the Senate until May 26. During the succeeding 10 days this group exerted strong pressure upon the 19, and particularly upon Senator Ross of Kansas, to obtain that one vote. Nevertheless, when the Senate reconvened on May 26 to vote on the next two counts, the outcome was the same, 35 to 19, 1 short of conviction.

A number of issues in Congress have been decided by a one vote majority. On August 12, 1941, the House of Representatives passed an administration bill to extend conscription for the duration of the emergency by a vote of 203 to 202.

A more recent example of the casting vote occurred on March 12, 1958, when the Senate was debating a housing bill, S. 3418. An amendment was proposed which would have kept interest rates on G.I. housing at a maximum of 4½ percent instead of 4¾ percent. The vote was 47 to 47, the amendment thus failing. On the motion to lay the request for reconsideration on the table, the vote was once more 47 to 47. Since this tie would have carried for the negative, former Vice President Nixon voted for the motion.

One final story, though not authenticated, deserves mention. A Member of Congress from California, it is said, seeking renomination on his party's ticket, had one opponent in the primary. The vote for each was exactly 10,429. In accordance with the State constitution, the contenders drew lots in the presence of the California Secretary of State. The incumbent Congressman lost the draw and the right to his party's nomination. He sank into political oblivion. And, the story ends, all because his secretary was too busy with office work to cast her ballot on primary day.

Secrecy, Power, and the FPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, a Federal Power Commission decision conceived in haste and nurtured in secrecy could well affect adversely the industrial future of the entire west coast of the United States.

The FPC orders in dockets E–7024 and E–7025 authorizing the Pacific Power & Light Co. to issue $54,900,000 worth of bonds and stock is a dangerous step toward the establishment of an inadequate and highly controversial substitute for the extra-high-voltage intertie between the Bonneville Power Administration in Washington and Oregon and the Central Valley project in California now being considered by Congress. The dangers of the FPC action are disclosed by a vigorous and able dissent filed by FPC Commissioner Howard Morgan, but the FPC has refused to make public Commissioner Morgan's minority dissent.

In a forthright and reasoned manner, Commissioner Morgan's dissent shows that the Commission's orders were the end product of hasty administrative action in which the true issues were never adequately called to public attention until Commissioner Morgan issued his dissent on April 3. The Commission's notice which was published in the Federal Register of March 8, 1962, treated the company's applications as routine and did not indicate the important and far-reaching issues which so vitally affect the people of California, Oregon, and Washington. Moreover, the time allowed for public response was unreasonably short. The notice was published in the Federal Register of March 8 and allowed only 12 days—to March 21—for comment by the public.

Such a proceeding, based on such short notice and without adequate indication of the issues involved, and without a hearing, is a perversion of sound administrative practice. The Congress did not intend the Commission to act in such an irresponsible manner. Section 204 of the Federal Power Act prohibits the issuance of securities by any public utility unless the Commission finds that such issuance is "compatible with the public interest" and "reasonably necessary or appropriate" in carrying out the utility's responsibilities. Commissioner Morgan's dissent points out that "there simply is no record on which to base either approval or rejection" of the Pacific Power & Light Co.'s applications for these large stock and bond issues.

The transmission line which the company proposes to build with these moneys from the public will have ultimate capacity of up to 500 kilovolts. Such capacity cannot be fully utilized without surplus Federal power from the Pacific Northwest. The Bonneville Power Administrator has already declared that the Bonneville surplus power will not be available for export out of the region until Congress enacts protective legislation that fairly protects the Pacific Northwest. His statement is in accord with the resolution by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee which requested suspension of any negotiations for transfer of surplus Bonneville power until such legislation is enacted to fairly protect the Pacific Northwest.

Thus, the Federal Power Commission, in a proceeding that violates the very essentials of responsible administrative principles, has approved financing for an expensive tansmission line without any assurance that there will be power available to justify it economically.

Who will pay for this overconstructed line which lacks economic justification? That wasteful cost will be a burden on the consumers who will have to pay the rates for power purchased from the company. This is, clearly, only a political gamble—a multimillion-dollar gamble—by the company to influence Congress in its decision on the Bonneville-California intertie which the Secretary of the Interior has so strongly recommended.

The Commission's action in a hasty manner which did not permit adequate public consideration is bad enough, but it is compounded by the FPC refusal to make public Commissioner Morgan's dissenting opinion. The Commission should rescind its orders of March 28 and, instead, issue a notice to the public that adequately delineates the issues and provides sufficient time for careful consideration of the economic justification of the proposed transmission line. Then the matter should be set for a full public hearing.

The Special Subcommittee on Government Information has initiated an inquiry into the FPC's withholding of Commissioner Morgan's most important dissenting opinion. Following is the subcommittee's letter of inquiry:

APRIL 11, 1962.

Hon. JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you are aware, members of the subcommittee staff and I have been in discussion with you and staff members of the Commission for the past 3 days attempting to ascertain whether the dissenting opinion filed on April 3, 1962, by Commissioner Morgan in Pacific Power and Light Co. (Dockets E–7024 and E–7025), is available to the public. The Commission's majority orders in these dockets were issued to the public on March 28, 1962. It is the subcommittee's understanding that as of this moment the Commission declines to make public Commissioner Morgan's filed opinion.

I firmly believe that the Commission's refusal to make the dissenting opinion available to the public demonstrates a callous disregard for the right and the need of the public to be informed about the activities of the Commission. Under the Commission's rules, only 30 days are available for interested persons to seek reconsideration of the decision. Already half the time allotted for public study and review of the Commission's action has expired with none of the opinions—neither majority nor minority—being made available to the public. Continued suppression of the minority opinion can only suggest that the Commission desires its orders to become final without the public becoming aware of the full ramifications of the Commission's decision.

It would be another matter if the Commission's orders were to be delayed until opinions could be issued simultaneously with it. In such an event, the public's right to seek reconsideration of the action would be protected in that the 30-day period would not begin running until issuance of the order. As matters now stand, however, the Commission is in the position of issuing an order, giving the public 30 days to question it, and meanwhile suppressing an official opinion severely criticizing the order. It is noteworthy that the dissenting opinion criticizes the Commission's orders on the very grounds that inadequate notice and insufficient time were given the public of the highly significant action contemplated in the decision, and that no record was developed by the Commission upon which a reasoned decision could be made.

Unless the Commission has specific statutory authority to order the withholding from the public of a dissenting Commissioner's filed opinion, I believe it is improper for the Commission to refuse to make public such dissenting opinion after the Commission's order in a case has been issued. If the Commission has statutory authority to withhold a dissenting Commissioner's opinion, please provide the citations to such specific statutory authority and any precedents in its application. Also provide two copies of the regulations and implementing instructions, if any, which have been made under such statutory authority.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Chairman.

Holiday Magazine Devotes Entire Issue to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House the April issue of Holiday magazine, a consistently excellent publication noted for its literary quality and range of subjects treated. This issue is devoted entirely to Washington, our Nation's Capital, and presents some of the finest articles on the city, past and present, that I have been privileged to read. It is unusual for a national magazine to devote a complete edition to one subject, but Holiday occasionally does so and in each instance the issue has become a collectors' item, to be kept and treasured.

In preparing this issue on Washington, which the editors term "The City of Our Time," Holiday has assembled an impressive array of today's finest authors and writers to treat different aspects of the city and its institutions.

The theme of the issue is set in an editorial on the meaning of democracy which in my opinion is a classic. I should like to quote one passage from that editorial:

> Baghdad, Constantinople, Athens, Rome, Madrid, London—in every age there has been one city which has seemed the center of the world, which the fates have chosen to be a guardian for the hopes of all men—to control their aspirations, to determine the possibility of their glory or their shame, their happiness or their misery, their freedom or their bondage. That city is now Washington.

Among the fine writers who appear in the issue are Aubrey Menen, who describes the awesome impact of the city on a visiting foreigner; Charlton Ogburn, Jr., who tells of the birth and growth of this world capital; William Manchester, who begins a fresh and revealing three-part study of John F. Kennedy; Stephen Birmingham, who writes of Washington society; and A. L. Todd, who scrutinizes the persuasive and enduring lobbyists.

There also is a fine article on the "lordly" press corps of Washington and its influence in shaping public opinion. Other noted writers deal with such subjects as politicians, civil servants, Herblock, Washington's famous cartoonist, the city's clubs, its former first ladies, and other topics.

The issue is lavishly illustrated with full-color photographs of Washington views and personalities.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I commend this excellent issue of Holiday to the Members of this body.

Senator Dodd on Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, no domestic problem is more vexing, or presents more danger to our country, than juvenile delinquency.

As you know, Senator Thomas J. Dodd is chairman of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Committee, and is a recognized authority on the subject.

On April 8, 1962, the Senator delivered an address in New York City on juvenile delinquency. I believe this is an important statement which should be read by every parent in the country. I consider it a privilege to insert it in the Record:

Remarks of Senator Thomas J. Dodd, of Connecticut, Before the New York City Police Department-Holy Name Society Breakfast, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, Sunday, April 8, 1962

Speaking before a group of New York City policemen on the question of crime and juvenile delinquency is a challenge which wiser men than I would doubtless forgo. For the policeman deals with the criminal face to face. He sees him with an immediacy and a constancy that the sociologist or the urban planner or the lawmaker does not.

Almost all of you have at one time or another had to drag a young criminal into the police station, a youth who has committed some hideous crime, who is unrepentant, who is filled with hatred and contempt for the police, for his victims, and for society in general.

After such an experience, you wonder what it took to produce such a man and you know that there is much more involved here than lack of wholesome recreation, or urban slums, or being underprivileged. You know that at the root of this man's behavior there is something sick and twisted, and when you see it happen so many times to so many men you must recognize that there is something sick and twisted about society.

One of the gravest indications of this sickness and distortion is a lack of self-discipline on the part of more and more Americans; and I see in this not merely a cause of crime but a threat to the very survival of free government.

The backbone of any free society is the self-discipline of its people. Self-control is the indispensable quality which makes it possible for people to get along together without authoritarian control.

No one at birth possesses this quality. Self-discipline arises out of discipline through a long formative period, and the three training grounds which instill the disciplines necessary to eventual self-control and self-reliance are the family, the school, and the church.

I am convinced that the basic cause of the breakdown in self-discipline and moral conduct which is sweeping across the Nation is the declining role of the three fundamental institutions of our society, the family, the school, and the church.

It is these institutions that must develop in the child those standards of conduct which will not only prevent a person from acting lawlessly but will prepare him to take his place as a responsible, productive, contributing member of society.

The basic unit is the family. The family provides the first training ground for moral instruction; it teaches the young to better distinguish right from wrong; it rewards good conduct and punishes bad; it provides models of behavior, the mother and father; it imparts an idea of the good life. It is the crucible wherein is forged the habit patterns of a lifetime.

There was a time when family life was a joint partnership and a joint adventure in the day-to-day struggle for survival. In this struggle for the necessities of life, the members of the family were dependent upon each other. Even the children had responsibilities ranging from the doing of chores to the actual support of the family. Thus they could feel a sense of partnership, a sense of unity, a sense of usefulness, and a sense of responsibility.

During the past 40 years, the family has become less and less of a collective unit and more and more a collection of individuals.

The home used to be the center of almost all activities, work, education, religious training, recreation. Now each family member pursues these activities away from home and apart from other family members.

It is the life away from home that now occupies most of the child's attention. The parents generally do not know their children's friends, and children in the same family have different sets of friends. The home has too often become merely a base for sleeping and eating.

The family, therefore, has become fractionalized and in the process perhaps its most important function has been gravely impaired; the early development of standards of behavior which children can use as a basis for dealing with the problems of a lifetime.

This breaking up of the family as a cohesive, interdependent unit at the very center of life has had a disastrous consequence.

The child of such a family has no one to look to for moral approval or disapproval. He is a lone agent. He is not restrained from evil through consideration of what the family will think, nor is he encouraged to good through anticipation of family approval. He is not influenced to sacrifice for the needs of his family and, therefore, never feels the satisfaction gained from selfless acts. There is a great void in his life, and too often he turns to crime and delinquency to fill that void.

The failure of the family is compounded by a corresponding failure in our Nation's schools. Outside of the home, the school is our first line of defense in preventing juvenile delinquency. Yet what do we find in many of our schools? Monsignor Joseph E. Schieder told the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee concerning our educational system: "Slowly but surely, we are reaping our just deserts from progressive education—that form of education which considers discipline as outmoded—where a child in a classroom is not to be reprimanded for fear that in later life he will be the victim of some inferiority complex. Where, if Johnny feels like leaving his lesson to cross the room and gaze out of the window, the teacher must accept his whim or fancy. Cradled in this sort of educational atmosphere, it is difficult for me to conceive how a youth in his leisure-time hours is going to curb his passions or thwart his inclinations to be dishonest."

Four of the hallmarks of the young criminal are that he is undisciplined, he is generally incompetent as far as useful skills are concerned, he has no sense of creative achievement, and he is completely lacking in the responsibilities of citizenship.

It is these very qualities, a disciplined mind, competence in a chosen field, a sense of achievement and a sense of citizenship which we expect the schools to instill during the many years they help shape the child's character.

It is obvious that the schools are failing to accomplish this. I do not say this in an attempt to belabor the school system; I know that many of the causes of this failure stem from outside the school and from lack of public understanding and support of the needs of our schools.

Yet the fact remains that an ever-increasing number of boys and girls are sliding easily through our school system, getting no real value out of it, dropping out before graduation, and appearing in the delinquency courts without any respect for authority, without any sense of responsibility to others, without any capacity for constructive achievement, and without any sense of loyalty to the community or to the country.

This is a terrible indictment of our school system. We have taken out of school life discipline, competition, hard work, reward for success, and punishment for failure. We have taken from the teachers the tools they need to properly preserve order and respect for authority in the classroom. We have not permitted our teachers to enjoy the economic status and social prestige which commands the respect of the students. We have permitted the poor student to pass on to the next grade year after year, along with the good student. We have encouraged the growth of easy subjects and permitted the students to avoid tough subjects. We have permitted an atmosphere to develop in which success in social life or in sports or other extra-curricular activities is more valued and respected than mastering the rigorous disciplines of academic life.

In the words of Jenken Lloyd, "We have sown the dragon's teeth of pseudoscientific sentimentality, and out of the ground has sprung the legion bearing switchblade knives and bicycle chains."

The motto of the hard-core delinquent is "only the suckers work," and there is a good deal about modern education that permits this belief to live on and flourish.

Only yesterday I read of a high-school student pulling a knife on his teacher to the applause of his fellow students. Lately it seems we hear about this sort of thing all the time. And it represents such a sickening outrage that it should shock the people of this country into throwing out the window all these sentimental, misguided notions which have been warping segments of our school system for more than 30 years, and have now led to this ultimate perversion of the proper relationship between student and the teacher.

It is time to stop pampering and coddling the worst traits of young people and start developing the best traits of young people through proper discipline, hard work and rigorous competition.

As the impact on the child's development by the family and the school is declining, so too is that of the church. The decline of relative influence of our churches on individual conduct is particularly distressing because it has come about despite the heroic, selfless, enlightened effort of those hundreds of thousands of dedicated religious men and women of all creeds.

Churches have made an enormous contribution in the form of philanthropic relief and rehabilitation activities of all kinds.

They have made a prodigious effort in the field of moral instruction from the Sunday school level to the full-time university.

They have, on the congregation or parish level, instituted programs and activities designed to meet every social need—from Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, to teen clubs, to athletic organizations to study groups, to young adult groups, to mothers' clubs, to fathers' clubs.

The clergyman, in an attempt to meet the enormous burdens placed upon him, has become more than a religious leader. He has become an administrator, a financier, a businessman, a social worker, a marriage counselor, an athletic director, an arbitrator between labor and management, a participant in public affairs. The physical expansion of our church system has been impressive. The growth of church newspapers and other information media has been enormous.

All of this has borne tremendous fruits. Yet, churchmen themselves would be the first to admit that the influence of religion as the molder of individual conduct is declining. It is declining because the voice of the church is being drowned out by a hundred contrasting voices and, therefore, the role of the third great foundation of free society is weakened.

The policeman on the corner is the first one to feel the full impact of this breakdown of conduct. Upon you, and upon your fellow officers across the Nation has fallen the burden of a million lawbreaking young people each year. Against you has been spent the initial fury of this legion of knife and chain wielders.

Anyone who knows anything about this problem can well appreciate the anger, the frustration, even the despair of good policemen who must defend against this tremendous criminal invasion without adequate numbers, without adequate laws, without adequate public support or even sympathy.

The attack of free society on this problem must be of two kinds. Against the criminal who is already on the streets we must intensify all of our police efforts. And to guard against the future tidal wave of crime and degeneracy toward which we are tending, free society must rebuild its faltering institutions.

We must stop handcuffing the police by forcing them to handle all young criminals as though they were merely juvenile delinquents. We must stop forcing the police to handle with kid gloves the vicious hoodlum who deliberately takes advantage of his juvenile status. We must, by beefing up the physical resources of our police department, and tightening the laws under which they operate, give our policemen the tools to make these criminals feel the full weight of restrictive law enforcement.

But more policemen and tighter laws are not the ultimate answer to our problem, as you would be the first to admit.

The long-range effort, upon which the survival of our freedom depends, really, is the effort of a free people to recast its basic institutions in order to preserve those human qualities without which freedom itself cannot survive.

The danger posed by the moral breakdown of our young people has far more significance than the personal tragedy it inevitably holds for the lives of millions of young Americans. For self-discipline is not only the foundation of a successful life, it is the backbone of a free society. Without it free society is threatened by two mortal enemies: the internal weakness of its people, which makes them unable to stand up to the fierce competition of tough, disciplined, Communist aggression; and the moral collapse of its people which forces the Government to assume the responsibilities of the family, the school, and the church.

The inevitable end product of a lack of self-discipline is flabbiness, physical, intellectual and moral. Thus we are fighting against a breakdown which could leave our people too weak and self-indulgent to fight for their freedom; too lazy to master the difficult intellectual disciplines of the present and future; too selfish to make the sacrifices necessary to strengthen the Nation; too self-centered, even, to recognize the mortal danger which threatens.

The other side of the coin is the fact that the failure of the individual to live as a responsible citizen forces Government intervention which leads in a thousand steps to a centralized totalitarian society.

When the family turns its problems over to the juvenile court; when the church boys' club yields to the police probation department; when the failure of the father to turn off the television dial forces the Government to regulate television in the interest of public morality; when failure on the part of artists and publishers and entertainers to observe standards of decency forces the Government to intervene with censorship; when widespread crime forces ever larger Government programs of social reform; when we have this trend going on in a hundred fields, we see the philosophic truth that freemen who refuse to control themselves must be controlled by others, and a free society which loses its cornerstone of self-control must inevitably succumb to control from without.

Already the failure of the family, the school, and the church has forced significant intervention by Government agencies. We must accept this reality and do all that Government reasonably can to combat the effects and origins of delinquency. But all the while we must recognize that in the end, the future of our society and the future of our civilization rests upon the outcome of the struggle to restore decency and self-discipline, a struggle which must primarily be fought and won in our homes, our schools, and our churches.

We trust, and grasping the larger hope, we believe that freedom has that inner strength and durability which will in the end lead us to the solutions.

We believe that the American family, realizing the growing emptiness of family life, will gradually realine itself so that the enforced family unity which the harsh necessities of life once compelled, will be replaced by a voluntary unity which seeks to satisfy not the material necessities but the higher needs of life.

We believe that our free educational system, seeing the bitter fruits of mistaken ideas and receiving the growing support of the American people, will reform itself and make each school in our land a training ground for the development of virtue and responsibility as well as of knowledge.

And we believe that once the current of regeneration begins to run through our whole society, the churches will achieve the triumph which their heroic sacrifice and prodigious efforts justify.

Deintermixture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, recently in the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce we have had to wrestle with a vexing problem of what is known as deintermixture which, in common terms, is the removal of VHF television production in certain areas and substituting UHF television therefor.

We found that many people would be deprived of the television opportunity and that the removal of the VHF channels in the areas proposed would work a terrific hardship on people, especially people in rural areas and small towns, who wanted to see and listen to news and production from their State capitals.

My good friend and my able colleague, KENNETH ROBERTS of the Fourth District of Alabama, and I were greatly concerned over the fact that so many people would be deprived of television in the rural areas. We vigorously opposed the deintermixture proposals, continuously pointing out that our people in Alabama and South Carolina wanted to have some voice and vision concerning happenings in the respective capitals of our respective States. I hurry to salute my good friend for his determined stand for his people.

Perhaps there are some people in Congress who do not know that KENNETH ROBERTS is chairman of the important Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. While I am not privileged to be on that subcommittee, I have been happy to follow his leadership in protecting the public of the United States on incidents and activities which would be injurious to the health and safety of our people. I am mindful, at this time, of his great fight against cancer, heart disease, death and injury from automobile accidents, and the many other campaigns he has so vigorously and ably spearheaded to help our generation and future generations enjoy the fullest American life and prosperity.

Mr. ROBERTS and I prepared for the committee report, which usually accompanies a bill, our views emphasizing our determination that our people should not suffer. Today, I would like to put that report in the RECORD, so that all may know how we feel and that others who have joined our fight may have the information we felt so necessary to the preservation of good television in our rural areas and small towns.

The report follows:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

As members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, we do not wish to file a minority report expressing any antagonism to the general purposes of all-channel receiver legislation. We hope, and expect, that the purposes of such legislation will result in the accomplishment of a wider television coverage, wider selection of channels, and, thus, the promotion of a greater UHF listening audience. However, we would not detract from the service, the investment, the pleasure or education resulting from VHF transmission in the television field. We must protect, preserve, and promote that effort also.

These views are additional views emphasizing the feeling of many of the committee on such subjects as (1) the desirability of having television sets with all-channel receivers, (2) the undesirability of regional deintermixture at this time when the impact in the future, as well as the result of experiments in programing are not known, and (3) the economic impact on any shift in television, on an area basis, on a local basis, or on a national basis to UHF. Thus, we discuss this legislation in the light of our feeling and our beliefs.

GENERAL PURPOSE

We of the committee share with the Federal Communications Commission its "firm conviction that the public interest requires use of all 82 channels allocated for television." The general purpose of the legislation is to foster the further development and expansion of commercial and educational television broadcasting in the public interest by requiring that all television receivers shipped in interstate commerce or imported into the United States be equipped to receive all 82 channels now allocated to television, including the present 12 VHF channels (channels 2-13) and the present 70 UHF channels (channels 14-83).[1] This requirement with respect to television receivers is designed to encourage and facilitate operation of UHF stations intermixed with VHF stations in the same communities and areas and to prevent the impairment of existing VHF and UHF commercial and educational television service to the public.

As of March 1962, television stations were operating on 500 of the 681 available VHF television channel allocations (73 percent) but on only 103 of the 1,544 available UHF television channel allocations (7 percent). Of 274 television channels reserved for education, only 60 (42 VHF and 18 UHF) were in operation. The extensive hearings conducted by the committee make clear that the single most important reason for the failure heretofore to utilize more of the available UHF channels to provide educational and commercial television service to the public is the fact that only a relatively small proportion of the television sets which have been produced since the 70 UHF channels were first allocated for television in 1952 have been capable of receiving the 70 UHF channels in addition to the 12 VHF channels. Of all sets produced in the period 1953 to 1961, inclusive, less than 13 percent have been equipped at the manufacturing plant to receive UHF. Although UHF set production was 20 percent of total production in 1953, by 1961 it had fallen sharply to only 6 percent of total production.

Unless the public has sets that can receive UHF as well as VHF, prospective commercial and educational UHF stations will not be able to reach the audiences necessary for effective operation and UHF stations will be deterred from coming into being. Yet, without UHF stations in operation, the public lacks incentive to buy sets to receive both UHF and VHF, especially when a 12-channel VHF set can be bought for a little less. Until this ring is broken and the public has sufficient numbers of all-channel sets, the ordinary development of commercial and educational UHF television will remain impeded. For 10 years the ring has not been broken by any technique. All other feasible approaches having been unproductive, it is apparent to us that the time has come for the Congress to enact appropriate all-channel set legislation to break the ring so that UHF can be developed in the public interest.

THE POLICY OF SHIFTING VHF STATIONS TO THE UHF

We are strongly of the view that it would be unsound and contrary to the public interest for operating VHF stations to be shifted to UHF channels. UHF channels are normally capable of providing television service over areas which are substantially smaller than the areas which can be served by VHF channels. In addition, even within the areas which UHF channels can serve, UHF signals are more variable and tend to be poorer than VHF signals, due in large part to the fact that foliage, hills, buildings, and other obstructions absorb or obstruct UHF signals. For reasons such as these, shifting VHF stations to UHF channels would result in losses of existing television service to the public. In large part these losses of service will occur in rural, farm, outlying, and sparsely settled areas where there is little or no prospect of economic support for new stations to replace the service which would be lost through shifts of existing VHF stations to UHF. We feel our entire committee is strongly opposed to any action that would take television service away from the public.

THE REPRESENTATIONS OF THE COMMISSION

We have closely followed the proposals of the Federal Communications Commission, issued in its dockets Nos. 14229 and 14239-14246 on July 27, 1961. A number of these proposals would involve, or be directly related to, the shift of VHF stations to UHF channels. In the Commission's notices in these proceedings these proposals were closely related to the Commission's request that the Congress enact all-channel receiver legislation. During the extensive hearings held by the committee there was widespread and vigorous opposition to the shifting of VHF stations to the UHF. Although we strongly support all-channel receiver legislation, we also firmly oppose the shift of VHF stations to UHF. Hence, we would be unwilling to recommend enactment of this legislation without satisfactory assurance that VHF television stations will not be shifted to UHF, in whole or in part.

Because of our deep concern with the Commission's proposals to shift VHF stations to UHF, and the relationship of all-channel receiver legislation to such proposals, our able committee chairman specifically inquired of the Commission whether it would proceed with proposals to shift VHF stations to UHF if all-channel receiver legislation were enacted. The Federal Communications Commission has represented to the committee, in a letter dated March 16, 1962, in which Commissioners Minow, Hyde, Bartley, Craven, Ford, and Cross concurred, that deintermixture is not a solution for the television allocations problem, that a combined VHF-UHF system is needed, that if all-channel receiver legislation is enacted by this Congress, the Commission would not proceed with the eight deintermixture proceedings initiated on July 27, 1961, and that, on the contrary, a sufficient period of time should be allowed to indicate whether the all-channel receiver authority would in fact achieve the Commission's overall allocations goal of a satisfactory system of intermixed UHF and VHF assignments. Further, the Commission represented that it would make periodic reports to the committee and that before undertaking the implementation of any policy concerning deintermixture, the Commission would advise the committee of its plans and give the committee an appropriate period of time to consider such plans.

This legislation is being recommended on the basis of our understanding of the Commission's representations as follows:

1. That the Commission would not even consider directly or indirectly requiring shifting any VHF station to a UHF channel without the licensee's consent before it is determined from experience how all-channel receiver authority is working out. Time will have to be allowed for the Commission to issue rules to implement the legislation and for manufacturers to convert to production of all-channel receivers. Substantial time will have to elapse thereafter before the vast majority of the public becomes equipped with all-channel receivers so that the effectiveness of the legislation can be determined. There are now some 55 million television sets in the United States and annual sales are at the rate of about 6 million. Thus, the committee understands the Commission's representation to mean that consideration will not even be given to shifting any VHF station to a UHF channel without its consent for a period of at least 9 years, and possibly longer, after the date of enactment of all-channel legislation.

2. That even after the passage of at least 9 years when a vast majority of the public has acquired all-channel receivers, the Commission would not undertake indirectly or directly to shift any VHF station to a UHF channel without the consent of the licensee (a) until the Commission has first advised this and other interested committees of the Congress of any such plan and its reasons therefor so that the committee may consider them, and (b) until each such committee has notified the Commission that it has had an appropriate period of time to consider the Commission's plan and is contemplating no action which, in its judgment, warrants further deferral of the plan.

It is in specific reliance upon these representations by the Commission that the committee is reporting favorably all-channel receiver legislation. We feel that the committee regards these representations as binding on the Commission as now constituted and as it may in the future be constituted

RECEIVER ALL-CHANNEL CAPABILITY

The legislation reported by the committee would require that all television sets "be capable of receiving" all television channels. The quoted language contemplates that all receivers shipped in interstate commerce or imported will be constructed with equipment inside its cabinet which will have performance characteristics sufficient to permit reasonably satisfactory and usable reception of each of the present 12 VHF and 70 UHF channels (in any location where, in the light of the normal state of receiver development at the time, such reception could be reasonably expected) without the necessity of adding further equipment other than an appropriate antenna.

---

[1] These channels occupy the frequencies 54-72 megacycles (channels 2-4), 76-88 megacycles (channels 5-6), 174-216 megacycles (channels 7-13), and 470-890 megacycles (channels 14-83).

We have very carefully considered the proposal that the Commission be authorized to prescribe minimum performance standards for all-channel television sets. The committee has declined to report favorably any such provision because it is not persuaded that it is recessary in the public interest to involve the Commission in the details of television set manufacturing. Nor is it our intention that the Commission could prescribe such standards through its existing power to issue rules or regulations or otherwise. We have made very clear in the preceding paragraph that by "all-channel television sets" we mean "all-channel television sets." We would regard any set which is not capable of performing in the manner described above as being a fraud on the public and we would regard its shipment as being in violation of section 2 of this bill and subject to all the sanctions and penalties of any other violation of the Communications Act.

DUAL UHF-VHF OPERATIONS

It has been suggested to the committee that each commercial VHF station be required to operate a parallel UHF station in the same community. A proposal for dual UHF-VHF operations by the same commercial licensee was made by the Commission in its notice of proposed rulemaking in docket No. 14229, adopted on July 27, 1961. We are convinced that such proposals are contrary to the public interest. It could not reasonably be expected that such operations by commercial licensees would provide the public with a significant amount of television programing on the UHF channel which was not available simultaneously, and throughout a larger area, on the VHF channel. Moreover, it would be expected that the more desirable UHF channels, and not infrequently all the UHF channels, in each community would be tied up in parallel commercial UHF-VHF operations if this approach were followed. This would hinder or block the introduction of new and different commercial television services and the full development of educational television facilities in these communities. In this latter connection it will be noted that witnesess of educational organizations testified that there is a need for a total of approximately 1,000 UHF channels to be reserved for education—825 in addition to the 184 now reserved. In other words, meeting educational needs alone would appear to require two-thirds of the total number of UHF frequencies assigned to television. We cannot afford to waste these frequencies by using them to duplicate VHF commercial service either in whole or in large part.

CONCLUSION

We have, in the statements above set forth, reduced to writing what we believe is the expressed intent of a majority of the members of the committee in accepting H.R. 8031 as all-channel receiver legislation without specific reference to our legislation emphasizing the undesirability of original deintermixture under the FCC dockets Nos. 14229 and 14239–14246. We felt that these additional views should be presented in order that there be no question but that the Commission's letter of March 16, 1962, was received in good faith by the committee and that we expect good faith from the Commission and its successors.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
Fourth District, Alabama.
ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
Fifth District, South Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 3: 5: *Trust in the Lord with all thine heart and lean not upon thine own understanding.*

O Thou who art the God and Father of all mankind, we pray that Thou wilt daily touch and transform our spirits and illumine them with the counsel and companionship of Thy divine spirit.

Kindle our life with the wonder and warmth of Thy presence, that in our hours of adversity we may be equal to the most arduous tasks and discharge them humbly and heroically, wisely and conscientiously.

Create within us those desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy and may we always be willing and eager to do what Thou dost command.

Grant that we may discern Thy ways more clearly and be workers with Thee in bringing to fulfillment Thy righteous and beneficent purposes for humanity.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6676. An act to designate the Kettle Creek Dam on Kettle Creek, Pa., as the Alvin R. Bush Dam; and

H.R. 10043. An act to amend Public Law 86–272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3008. An act for the relief of Hom Hong Hing, also known as Tommy Joe;

H.R. 9751. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vesels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9778. An act to provide for the free entry of certain steel and steel products donated for an addition to the Chippewa County War Memorial Hospital, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2522. An act to defer the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges for the calendar year 1962 for lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS IMPERIAL MAJESTY, MOHAMMAD REZA SHAH PAHLAVI, SHAHANSHAH OF IRAN

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The SPEAKER called the Members to order at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.

The Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the Shahanshah of Iran into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, the Senator from Florida, Mr. SMATHERS, the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SPARKMAN, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN, the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY, the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN.

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran.

The Shahanshah of Iran, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my great pleasure, and I deem

it a high privilege and a particular honor to present to you not only a distinguished visitor to our shores but also a friend, His Imperial Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS IMPERIAL MAJESTY THE SHAHANSHAH OF IRAN

The SHAHANSHAH of Iran. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, honorable Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, I consider it a great privilege to have the opportunity to address this august Assembly which has witnessed the birth of your Nation, and in which your great country's destiny has been forged. It is also for me a source of deep gratification to establish contact with the representatives of a Nation for whom my countrymen feel the deepest and most sincere friendship and respect, and whom they consider their ally and associate. [Applause.]

This brief moment in time—the last 50 years—has brought advance and cataclysmic change in the life of mankind. When future historians evaluate the 20th century, certain nations more than others will be honored for their works to better the life of man. And today, it is your Nation that has earned the greatest credit in the heart of mankind. Here, under this dome where we gather together today, man has found, at last, a light that shows the way. Those who love freedom have found true friends.

This credit has not come to you without great sacrifice, for here, in this building, are men of strong faith and clear will who realize that mankind is essentially one. You, the honorable gentlemen to whom I speak, realize that in this seemingly diverse world the destiny of every individual man is inextricably linked with the destiny of every other. Whether nations or men, we never stand alone. We are forever bound together.

I come to you from one of the oldest countries in the world. The ages-old history of Persia, which was once the greatest empire the world had seen, is not, like the chronicle of many vanished empires, an account of conquest, massacre, and injustice. It is the record of a civilization imbued with the spirit of equity and freedom. The text of the Holy Bible bears witness to my statement. In the only eulogy of its kind in so sacred a book, the Bible refers to the King of Kings and the land of Iran as the fount of justice, whence arose the spirit of liberty and respect for the individual.

The following text was written by order of Darius the King 25 centuries ago and is preserved on a bas-relief until this day. It says:

> By the will of Ahura Mazda I am King of Kings. I love justice, I hate iniquity. It is not my pleasure that the lower suffer injustice because of the higher.

No doubt, like all other great empires, our ancient land has had its days of decline as well as its hours of glory. But throughout these vicissitudes, it has never lost sight of the principles of freedom and respect for humanity, nor has it abandoned the spirit of democracy in which no class distinction has ever existed to prevent the individual from rising to the highest position according to his capacity and merit. Furthermore, it has always been ready to defend its political as well as its moral and spiritual independence. [Applause.]

During her long history, Iran has suffered a number of invasions each one of which would have been sufficient to obliterate a whole region. But on each occasion the conquerors were themselves conquered by falling under the spell of Iranian civilization and culture. Thus the torch, set alight many thousands of years ago, has outlasted the storms and stress of time and has been handed down intact to us, the heirs and trustees of that great civilization.

As I mentioned before, the alternate periods of rise and decline are inevitable in the life of empires. The last period of our decline coincided with the industrial revolution and its spectacular effects, as well as with the policy of conquest and imperialism in Europe, to which my country fell a prey. Owing to the absence of a strong central government, an organized administration, and a national army, and in particular owing to the country being split up into semi-independent entities, Iran became the happy hunting ground of foreign powers. In the First World War the central government declared its neutrality, but it was not strong enough to implement it, and our neutrality, as you know, was not respected and the country was invaded and devastated by foreign troops.

After the war, my father, who suffered deeply in witnessing the plight of his country, headed a national revolution in 1921 and took into his hands the reins of power. He realized the people's aspirations by putting an end to foreign interference and by stopping the tide of both imperialism and communism in Iran. He organized a strong central government and created a national army, not the least of whose achievements was the establishment of internal security and the unification of the country.

But if, during the First World War, Iran's plight was due to the absence of a strong and efficient administration and a national army, how was it that, during the Second World War, she was again to suffer invasion in spite of the fact she possessed a powerful government and declared her neutrality from the very start? The only conclusion to draw is that Iran's geographical situation is so important that, just as in the past, the destiny of that country has an immediate repercussion on the region as a whole. She is, in fact, the keystone to the arch that forms the structure of that part of the world.

During the Second World War, in spite of our bitter experiences, we stood by our time-honored tradition of defense of truth and freedom and the high ideal of human civilization, which had at all times been our guiding principle. We loyally helped the Allies in their struggle for victory, and entered into formal alliance against the Axis Powers and declared war on them. Our assistance was acknowledged by the leaders of the great powers at the historic Teheran Conference. The expression "bridge of victory" was not invented by us, but by the freedom-loving nations of the world in recognition of our share in the struggle to safeguard our common ideal. [Applause].

Nevertheless, immediately after the war, we had to face the mortifying experience of the Azerbaijan affair. In spite of all the guarantees and treaties, that Province was guilefully and forcibly occupied and cut away from the rest of our country. That was a new form of colonialism much worse than any kind of imperialism.

This, you will remember, was the first case of its kind to be brought before the Security Council of the United Nations. In conjunction with the Security Council's defense of our rights, we, ourselves, set out to liberate that Province. We decided that, with God's assistance, we would either succeed in our endeavor or perish with honor. The victorious outcome of that struggle was to prove that God was on our side, and that we had the support of the freedom-loving nations of the world, particularly of the United States of America. [Applause.]

What we suffered in the two World Wars, and, especially, the galling experience over Azerbaijan, proved to us that in the present state of the world no country, still less a country in our geographical position, can afford to remain neutral. We therefore decided to throw in our lot with the countries whose system of government, whose civilization and culture, whose way of life and manner of thinking resemble our own. [Applause.] We decided henceforth to associate ourselves with the free world whether it be for good or for ill. [Applause.]

As I mentioned before, we have already carried out our anti-imperialistic revolution successfully, and we no longer find any difficulty in associating and cooperating with other nations on an equal footing.

Our policy is that of positive nationalism, which is founded on the defense and protection of our rights, and interests and on alliance and cooperation with the West. Our nationalism is creative, not destructive. I have often repeated to my people that we can help the progress of our country through friendship and alliances with the West. In our past history we have exchanged whatever good things we may have had for the good things other nations had to give in return. We are willing to do so today. We are strong enough and confident enough not to be constantly inculcating in our people hatred against foreign nations. On the contrary we encourage friendship and association with foreign powers so long as our national interests are respected. [Applause.]

As an example of this policy of protection of our rights and cooperation with foreign powers, I can cite our struggle in connection with Persian oil with which you are already acquainted. The Iranian people, who had seen their interest jeopardized for years, rose in protest in 1950 and nationalized the oil industry. But our people refused to follow the policy of those who had only an eye for the negative and destructive aspect of the movement, which meant depriving both the country and the world of the benefit of oil. In accordance with the principle of positive nationalism, they saw fit, once they had put an end to the exploitative side of the problem, to set this industry going in a system of free cooperation with Western companies. This cooperation was based on equality of rights and honorable transaction, seeing that we had the oil and the companies concerned had the technical means of processing and marketing it. The result was that our oil took its place on the marekt once more as an essential product; and we, in turn, were able to use its revenues to move forward with the industrial and economic development of our country.

This wise policy of compromise and comprehension gave us the means for later activity, and opened the way for further success in this field. As an example, I can cite the 1956 and 1957 oil agreements, which no other country had been able to obtain up to that date.

I am glad to say that during that same period, and on many other occasions, America gave us generous and valuable financial and military assistance, thus greatly facilitating our task in the implementation of our vast economic and general development and security plans, for which I wish to express to you our deep gratitude and sincerest thanks. [Applause.]

I recognize that the United States is carrying a very heavy burden in the defense of freedom across the entire world, and that many of you must be feeling sick and tired of carrying this burden for so long a time. I sympathize with those who would like to lay this burden down. But however long you have so far borne this task it is not yet finished; the threat to freedom and security remains strong and aggressive. If America should weary of the struggle I can say to you that the Communists will not be weary and the race will then go to them.

My people do not like to take aid from another nation, and promise that the time will come when our resources develop we can support our own efforts and contribute also to the strengthening of others. For the present, however, we are absolutely certain that the freedom and security of the peoples around the world, as well as your own security, depends upon the will and the determination of the American people to continue with the struggle without flagging.

You must decide whether it is in the interest of the United States for the struggle to be successful. We hope you will decide, as you have in the past, that it is worthwhile; but I can assure you, whatever your decision may be the people of Iran have not maintained their freedom for 2,500 years in order to now surrender. [Applause.]

The governmental system of Iran is a parliamentary and constitutional monarchy. The spirit of our regime has existed in our country for many centuries. I do not wish to take your time in recounting our past history. Suffice it to say that the accounts given by the ancient historians of Europe bear testimony to the fact that, over 25 centuries ago, the essential requisites of democracy were the guiding principles of the Government of Iran. I refer to the rule of law, respect for the rights of the individual, and to the spirit of freedom, which today form the basis of the Charter of the United Nations. That is the main reason why the existing regime has persisted throughout the ages. The outstanding quality of this system of government has been to place no obstacle, whether of class or family or extraction, in the path of the advancement of the individual, which is exactly what has brought about your amazing progress.

We have thus safeguarded our ancient democratic traditions, and aspire to bring them into line with modern democratic procedure by trying to familiarize our people more and more with the control of their own destinies.

In the spheres of equity and social justice, great strides have been made. Our industrial laws for the protection of the workman are in line with modern practice. We have framed a law for the limitation of landownership and the regulation of the relationship between farmer and landowner which compares very favorably with those of the most progressive countries. The laws in favor of the farmers, who form the great majority of our population, the laws for the protection of the workingman and other social reforms undoubtedly place Iran among the enlightened countries of the world.

We are endeavoring to give a firm foundation to our reform activity by evolving a government of the people, by the people. We are building local self-government from the bottom up, through village, town, and provincial councils, culminating in the bicameral assemblies of the lower House and the Senate. We are doing this so that our national activity may have sound and firm roots in the country. Hand in hand with this program we are putting all our energy into spreading literacy and education, without which true democracy can never be attained.

Our industrial and economic development has been keeping pace with these reforms. Great public works are being undertaken throughout the country, such as the construction of railways, roads, ports, airfields, and large and small dams. We are building universities and schools, hospitals and clinics, health, welfare and sports centers, and we are forming institutions for agricultural guidance.

These are all included in the third plan which will start later this year, as soon as the second plan—which has been spread over 7 years—is completed. In order to encourage this plan, and industrial and economic growth, we favor in every way the investment of capital. At the same time we are taking steps to assure the success of this plan by the proper imposition of taxes and the fostering of individual initiative.

No doubt this vast program of reform requires time. But the basis of progress, which is social justice, is never lost sight of. The protection of the rights of the mass of our population is the objection of all our endeavors.

We are fortunate in enjoying vast natural resources and manpower. Our manpower is being employed, more and more, in conformity with modern methods. Our natural resources, which have hardly been tapped, must be exploited and distributed equitably among the people in proportion to each individual's merit and capacity.

However, like all other nations, we have no time to waste. Each minute counts. Perhaps, under ordinary circumstances, we could have reached our goal, without help, in three generations. But today, with the dangers that threaten us all, it is essential that the goal be reached in less than 20 years. To achieve this, the whole of our energy, unsupported, would not be sufficient.

In view of the importance of our position and our case, I firmly believe that we deserve that our friends should be as keen and anxious as ourselves that we should reach the desired end.

Take into consideration the fact that our present 20 million inhabitants will increase to 40 million in 20 years' time. Then imagine what a strong fortress of liberty Iran will be if she retains her alliance with the West and is able to raise her standard of living up to a level comparable with that of the progressive nations of Europe. On the other hand take our country, with the same manpower and natural resources, and her important geographical position, and imagine for yourselves the terrible consequences that would follow were she to depart from the principles which I have explained to you and which she upholds today.

It is due to this important position which we occupy that we experience every day the forces of international disruption doing their utmost to beguile and delude and divert us from the path we have adopted. They do this in order to seize this gateway to the Middle East, the Indian subcontinent, and Africa by means of falsehoods, threats, and subversion.

Just to give a single example of the importance of that region, where there are more than 150 million Muslims living, this year alone 280 million tons of oil were produced on which depend the life and industry of Western Europe.

Thus you can see that it is worth their while that the freedom-loving nations should consider their destiny and ours as one.

But, to my mind, there are only three factors on which we could rely for our protection:

To begin with, if the United Nations had the necessary executive power, immune from the right of veto, to uphold and enforce the provisions of the charter in all cases and with regard to all countries, we should feel that we had a sufficient guarantee. [Applause.]

Secondly, we would feel secure if there were sufficient controls in the implementation of disarmament, so that no country could openly or otherwise attack, or in other ways bringing about the destruction or loss of independence of any other country. [Applause.]

Thirdly, in a situation fraught with the danger of world conflict, and, in particular, of local wars, is it not the duty of every responsible and patriotic individual, so long as those guarantees do not exist, to have in the forefront of his mind the defense of his country's frontiers and its freedom and independence? [Applause.]

It is true that you are our allies and have promised to come to our aid under the bilateral agreement. Although this agreement does not provide the same guarantees as the NATO countries enjoy, it gives us a measure of security and encouragement. However, I am convinced that every independent country has a duty to see to its own defense. No nation wants to go to the aid of a country that does not have the will to defend itself. [Applause.] That is the meaning of collective defense.

We are well aware of this point and we are firmly determined to defend ourselves. I have no doubt that it is to your advantage that your allies should have this resolution. [Applause.]

Unfortunately, today the old-fashioned arms are no longer of use for defensive purposes, and an army would be helpless without the modern weapons of warfare, however high its morale and however firm its determination.

I trust that the day will dawn when all these obligations will have disappeared, and that we shall hear nothing but expressions of friendship and be able to live in peace in an atmosphere of security and amity. [Applause.]

I pray that you, the representatives of the great American Nation, who have the same ideal as we have, and have at all times struggled to make it a reality, will be successful in your endeavors, and that your Nation will be able to uphold, with steadfastness, the standard of freedom which is the most precious heritage of human civilization. As the responsibility of the leadership of the free world has devolved upon you, we all wish you ever-increasing prosperity, progress, and power; and in our hearts we pray that your great, justice-loving and benevolent Nation may succeed and prosper.

May God be with you and may He sustain your efforts. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m. the Shahanshah of Iran, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess of the House may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from South Carolina, Mrs. CORINNE B. RILEY, be permitted to take the oath of office today. Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. RILEY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1963 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

"AIRCRAFT

"For aircraft: For the Army, $218,500,000; for the Navy and Marine Corps, $2,134,600,000; for the Air Force, $3,626,000,000, of which amount $491,000,000 is authorized only for the production planning and long leadtime procurement of an RS-70 weapon system: *Provided*, That effective July 1, 1962, restrictions on the fund authorization contained in Public Law 87-53, approved June 21, 1961, for the procurement of aircraft, will no longer apply.

"MISSILES

"For missiles: For the Army, $558,300,000; for the Navy, $930,400,000; for the Marine Corps, $22,300,000; for the Air Force, $2,500,000,000.

"NAVAL VESSELS

"For naval vessels: For the Navy, $2,979,200,000.

"SEC. 2. Section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149 is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, or after December 31, 1962, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the research, development, test, or evaluation of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such dates.' "

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ARENDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is in keeping with the request of the members of the Committee on Armed Services, but I would appreciate it if the chairman would explain the amendment for the benefit of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to review for the House the amendments made by the Armed Services Committee and accepted by the House and indicate wherein the Senate has agreed or disagreed with these amendments.

I will deal with them in the order of Army and Air Force.

ARMY

First, the House added $55,290,000 for Army aircraft.

This addition represented authority requested by the Army but turned down by the Secretary of Defense.

For the most part, it represented authority to buy more of the kind of aircraft which are in the fiscal year 1963 program.

The committee's action in this respect was based on its strong belief that the Army is not being modernized rapidly enough.

As we know, the Soviet Army has been modernized twice since World War II while we have not even completed our first modernization of our Armed Forces.

I accept this amendment with some reluctance but with the thought in mind that the House has done its part of the job in adding this authority—a job that now appears will be left uncompleted since the Senate has not agreed with us.

The House also added $31,182,000 for Army missiles.

This addition was on exactly the same basis as the added authority for missiles. It is with the same reluctance that I accept this amendment.

I have referred to the modernization of the Soviet Army and I would also like to remind the House that at the time the Reserves and National Guard were called up last fall, it was found that not only were their weapons obsolescent—there also were not enough of them.

To a lesser extent, this same situation exists in our regular forces.

At least we have done our job.

With respect to both of these Army amendments we all realize that although the House has added authority and the Appropriations Committee might add sufficient funds for these aircraft and missiles, this would by no means assure that the modernization reflected in the additions would be accomplished.

It is highly probable that since Mr. McNamara has turned down these two requests when originally made by the Army, he would similarly refuse to spend funds for the aircraft and missiles were they given to him.

I feel, therefore, that we would have satisfied principle but not hastened the modernization of the Army.

This does not mean that I have modified my philosophy in any respect.

It means only that I am momentarily acquiescing in a situation which we can hope will change as time goes on.

AIR FORCE

The next area is the Air Force portion of the bill.

Here we find the most important amendments and I am happy to announce that the Senate and the House find themselves in very substantial agreement.

Indeed, the only area of disagreement is with respect to the $10 million added by the House for Minuteman missiles.

This was a step toward the procurement of 100 additional Minuteman missiles—additional to the number now planned.

The committee has given further thought to this matter and while the additional missiles may turn out to be necessary, there is actually no real requirement that their procurement be started at this time.

We are going to take another close look at this 1 year from now and form a more precise judgment at that time.

The language relating to the $491 million which the House inserted in the bill for the RS-70 has been modified by the Senate.

I might say, incidentally, that the Senate language is not only more precise from the standpoint of drafting but is also, I believe, more correct in its literary construction—a matter which was of particular concern to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

I believe even the most meticulous user of the English language can now be satisfied with the sentence structure of the new language.

It is important to note that the $491 million still remains in the bill for the RS-70.

It will be recalled also that the House version of the bill amended existing law so as to bring all aspects of the RS-70 under the requirement for specific authorization.

Previously only the procurement had been subject to specific authorization.

The Senate language has gone somewhat further than the House in this respect.

It will bring all research, development, test, or evaluation of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels under the requirement for specific authorization.

This means that after December 31, 1962, no funds can be appropriated for research, development, test, evaluation, or procurement for aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after that date.

This is a wise step since it permits the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate to begin study of these matters much earlier than has heretofore been the case.

We can hope that this will have some very good effects such as precluding duplication in weapons systems, the elimination of excessive spending, and the affording of an opportunity to provide guidance and counsel to the Department during the early stages of weapons research and development.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been advised as to the activities of the committee over there, but in view of the fact we have this important legislation on the floor of the House this afternoon, which I think demands the attention of the entire membership of the House, I trust that the gentleman will withdraw his request or I would be constrained to object.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

ELIMINATING PACIFIC COAST SHIPBUILDING COST DIFFERENTIAL

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 590) providing for the consideration of H.R. 1159, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1159) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6 per centum differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders, and all points of order against said committee amendments printed in the bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the minority, to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith]. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that this resolution makes in order has to do with the building of ships for our American merchant marine. The rule is an open rule providing for 3 hours of general debate. I hope, and I know that hope is shared by many of my colleagues, that the 3 hours will not all be taken up and that we can go ahead with the consideration of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, what does this bill do? Let us go back to 1936 when the west coast of our great common country was not engaged to any great extent in the shipbuilding industry. As you well know, the shipbuilding industry traditionally flourished in the eastern part of the country on the eastern coast. The authorities at that time who were interested in building up our merchant fleet and who were interested in expediting that work, no doubt looking to the possibility of hostilities, which later developed in World War II, desired to give the west coast some incentive to build ships. At that time the west coast had no steel mills. It was not industrialized. It was largely the great scenic part of our great common country. That picture has changed. But before I go into that let me explain what the Congress did in 1936. It enacted a provision of law that said simply that in the construction of these maritime ships under certain conditions the shipbuilding industry on the west coast would be entitled to a 6-percent differential. What did that mean? That simply meant, Mr. Speaker, that they were to receive a subsidy of 6 percent over their eastern competitors. In other words, contracts were going to be let for an *x* number of ships. We will say the cost was $10 million a ship. The west coast could bid 6 percent higher than the east coast and get the contract.

As I said a moment ago, the picture has changed. The west coast is no longer isolated industrially, it is no longer largely the mecca for tourists. It has become the fastest growing section of our great country. It has become highly industrialized. Steel mills have been built, the components of materials that go into the building of ships are produced in the West. There is no longer any necessity for this subsidy or differential.

Another great factor enters into this, of course, and that is in granting the 6-percent differential there was a question of transportation, freight rates, the hauling of the steel from the East and the Midwest to the west coast. This does not exist any longer, nor does the necessity for the subsidy exist for many other component parts that go into the building of ships.

As a matter of fact, the hearings disclosed that frequently east coast yards are outbid by the west coast yards on competitive bids without the benefit of the 6-percent differential. This happens, even though, as I stated, many of the ships built on the east coast buy materials that go into the construction of these ships from the west coast.

Now, I recognize that my friends here will be somewhat divided on this matter. I recognize the right of those of my friends from the west coast who will oppose this legislation. That is perfectly legitimate. But, I know of no other industry, I know of no other business where one section of the country is preferred over another section by the Government in granting subsidies.

There are many other arguments that can be and will be adduced on this occasion of a sectional nature. Of course, I would prefer that we could approach this without any question of geography, and to those of you who do not live on the east or the west coast, or the Great Lakes or the gulf coast for that matter, those of you who are in a position to approach this important matter objectively, without any axes to grind or bias, let me appeal to you to approach this question from the broad perspective of the interest of our great common country.

We are frequently told here "discrimination" is a bad word. It is pounded into us all the time. Well, why should we have discrimination here among people because of geographic locations?

Let me point out to you another area in which the situation has changed since this legislation was enacted. While it was enacted as an incentive to have more shipbuilding industries on the west coast, today the shipbuilding industry is in a highly competitive state. Your shipyards on the east coast are hungry for bids; they are hungry for work so that they can keep their yards going. There should not be any further use for this legislation. It was enacted for a specific purpose, as an emergency matter, and it should now be repealed.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to summarize in conclusion:

A quarter of a century has now passed. The west coast has grown in population and industry. Many shipbuilding components are built there. Steel mills now exist west of the Rockies. West coast shipbuilding is now an established industry. During the Second World War, west coast yards built 44 percent of all tonnage built in the great shipbuilding effort of the United States.

Also, the Maritime Administration's program for the replacement of subsidized ships under the Merchant Marine Act is now well underway. This program began in 1957, and since that time west coast yards have received their proportionate share of ships in the program. The record of hearings held last spring showed that of 61 ships then under construction in the program, 14 were in west coast yards and 47 in Atlantic, gulf, and Great Lakes yards—a fair share for the west coast in proportion to available capacity. There are 10 shipbuilding ways there, as compared with 74 in the rest of the country. The west coast yards have been highly competitive in bidding. Indeed, these shipyards have attained their share or better of naval shipbuilding contracts let under competitive bidding without any 6-percent perference, as well as their share of merchant marine contracts to which the 6 percent applies.

In these circumstances, it has seemed to the Rules Committee that the time has come to consider whether the 6-percent preference upon Merchant Marine Act ships should be continued. Since the west coast shipbuilding industry is no longer an infant industry, the House should consider carefully whether it should be given a handicap in competitive bidding with other sectors of the same industry. Statutory discrimination between sectors of an industry and sections of the country is unhealthy, and disappearance of the original justification should lead the House to reconsider existing law. Some 60 ships, of 300 remaining to be built in the Maritime Administration's replacement program, will be affected by the 6-percent preference if it remains in the law. This means additional costs, perhaps as much as $20 million, to taxpayers, through construction subsidies, as well as an additional $20 million to vessel operators whose rates paid by the public must cover these costs.

Mr. Speaker, we have been trying for several years to repeal this differential which is no longer needed.

As a matter of fact as a cosponsor of this bill we succeeded in finally getting my bill out of committee in the previous Congress but it was too late to get it considered at that session. Again in this Congress after many delaying actions by the opposition we finally succeeded in getting this bill to the floor. I hope it will be passed and this unnecessary and unfair differential to one section of our country removed.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], stated, House Resolution 590 does provide for 3 hours open rule for the consideration of H.R. 1159.

Mr. Speaker, on most issues I believe that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] and I, in connection with argumentative issues, would find ourselves on the same side. Today we are, of course, opposed on this particular matter, because the gentleman from Mississippi is representing his shipyards in his area and, in turn, I have the interest of the west coast to defend in bringing the rule before the House, as I see it, in connection with H.R. 1159.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan matter, even though there may be in support of the bill many Members from the right side of the aisle because of their coming from the South, predominantly Democratic, and there may be indications that it is partisan. But it is not a partisan matter in any way. It is a jurisdictional matter from the standpoint of location in the United States. In other words, the shipyards from the gulf coast and from the east coast, as against those on the west coast.

Mr. Speaker, by way of background permit me to tell the Members of the House how I understand this differential works. Under the 6-percent differential, Pacific coast shipbuilders may be awarded contracts to build merchant ships which are subsidized by the Federal Government, as long as the Pacific coast bid is not more than 6 percent higher than the lowest eastern bid. The differential applies only to certain limited ship construction as defined in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Why do we have this differential? One of the goals of the national maritime policy is the dispersal of shipbuilding facilities on all coasts as a vital aid to national security. In 1936 it was found by investigation that shipbuilding costs were approximately 6 percent higher on the Pacific coast than in eastern yards. The differential was, and is now, due to the higher cost of labor and materials on the Pacific coast. Congress recognized this fact in passing the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which has served the United States well for 25 years as an instrument of national policy.

Mr. Speaker, what is the legal basis for the differential? It is provided in section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which limits its application to Maritime Administration financed construction of merchant ships which first, will be used on essential foreign trade routes designated by the Federal Maritime Board; second, will serve Pacific coast ports; and third, will be operated by a steamship line headquartered on the Pacific coast.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this applies only to a few ships. It does not apply to every ship that is constructed. The primary beneficiary of the construction differential is the Nation as a whole. The purpose of the differential is to strengthen national defense by maintaining a Pacific coast shipbuilding industry. Otherwise, the facts of economic life would cause the Pacific coast yards to wither away, and skilled personnel would scatter to other areas. In time of national emergency the Pacific coast must have a readiness to build ships as it does now. The ready shipyards should not all be concentrated in the east.

Mr. Speaker, since 1958 the 6-percent differential has resulted in contracts for building only five vessels on the Pacific coast, two at San Francisco for Pacific Far East Lines, totaling about $20 million, and three in Los Angeles for the American Mail Lines, totaling about $30 million. Of this $50 million, some $23 million was direct shipbuilders' wages. The other $27 million was for materials, much of which was purchased on the east coast.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1159 is a bit of a battered bill, I would say, in some respects. It was introduced last year, and hearings were held in the Rules Committee on July 18, 1961. A motion was made to send the bill to the floor and it was defeated. In my opinion the main reason it was defeated was that we desired to have an investigation made by the Maritime Administration to determine whether or not there is a differential. We have stated—the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], on the Rules

Committee, and myself and other Members—openly stated that if there is no differential as shown by a report which we hoped would be made, or that we would try to have made, then we would accept that.

If there was a differential of 5 percent we would accept that, or 4 percent, or whatever particular differential was arrived at by an investigation made by the Maritime Commission, we would agree to accept their conclusions.

Following the action on July 18 of the Rules Committee it is my understanding a motion was made before the House Merchant Marine Committee to request this investigation. I believe it was denied. So the investigation was requested by the other body. At that time the Maritime Administration said that it anticipated that it would take about 6 months to complete the investigation, that they would try to have it completed, at the latest, by April 1 of 1962. In the latter part of March we were informed that they had completed their investigation. The report, however, was not printed at that time and it has been only a matter of a few days that I have actually had a chance to see the report. That is why I expressed the hope on April 5 when the bill was sent to the floor that possibly we could have another week or 10 days so that all of you could see this particular report.

You have probably not had a chance to see it, but there are some points that I believe should be called to your attention of the findings of the just completed report of the Maritime Administration. On page 6 they summarize the situation as follows:

> The bulk of the merchant shipbuilding activity, both private and subsidized, has been on the east coast. Of 307 vessels delivered since 1952 or under contract as of January 1, 1962, construction awards were 72 percent to the east coast, 12 percent to the gulf coast, 7 percent to the Great Lakes, and 9 percent to the west coast.
>
> A review of various economic indicators not directly related to the shipbuilding industry shows that costs, particularly labor costs, are higher on the west coast than on the east coast and are lower on the gulf coast than on the east coast. Data regarding the Great Lakes area are inconclusive.
>
> More than three-quarters of materials (excluding steel) used in shipbuilding is manufactured in the northeastern part of the United States.
>
> The cost of steel used in shipbuilding, delivered to the shipyards, is about 1 percent higher on the gulf coast, about 2 percent higher on the Great Lakes, and about 11 percent higher on the west coast than on the east coast.
>
> The cost of shipbuilding material (excluding steel) is about 2 percent higher on the west coast, about 1 percent higher on the gulf coast, and only slightly higher on the Great Lakes than on the east coast.
>
> The average cost of direct and indirect shipbuilding labor is about 7 percent higher on the west coast, about 3 percent lower on the gulf coast and, based on somewhat incomplete data, about 7 percent lower in the Great Lakes area than on the east coast.
>
> East coast and Great Lakes shipyards experience added shipbuilding costs due to higher cost of utilities and due to added costs of winter operations that are not experienced by west coast and gulf coast shipyards. These conditions increase costs by about 3 percent of the overhead cost.
>
> Conclusions:
>
> 1. The cost of shipbuilding on the west coast exceeds that of the east coast by about 4 percent.
> 2. The cost of shipbuilding on the gulf coast is less than that on the east coast by about 1 percent.
> 3. The cost of shipbuilding on the Great Lakes is less than that on the east coast by about 2 percent.

Then they went on for some 20 pages and took specific cases of some 15 yards, where I understand they received cooperation in the matter of data, and explain how they arrive at these conclusions, which they then summarize as follows:

> The east coast and Great Lakes areas experience added shipbuilding costs due to higher cost of utilities and due to added costs for winter operation that are not experienced by west coast and gulf coast shipyards. These conditions increase costs by about 3 percent of the overhead cost.
>
> Conclusions from study of shipyard cost comparison:
>
> As has been stated earlier, in order that a basis for comparison might be established, the cost data obtained from shipyards have been utilized in terms of a representative vessel of a type currently under construction. This vessel is estimated to currently cost $11 million on the east coast exclusive of profit on a multiple-vessel construction contract. Combining the individual geographical cost variations which have been developed from the data reviewed and as shown below, it is found that the construction cost on the west coast was about $460,000 (4.2 percent) higher than on the east coast, the cost on the gulf coast was about $92,000 (0.8 percent) lower than on the east coast, and the Great Lakes about $253,000 (2.3 percent) lower than the east coast.

So they concluded from this study that the differential existing as between the west coast and the east coast at this time is 4.2 percent. In considering this, I state to you that in accordance with the agreement that the Members from the west coast have made, as stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] before the Committee on Rules, we have prepared and will offer an amendment to reduce this 6-percent differential to 4 percent. It is true they have concluded that this differential should be 4.2 percent, but we are not quibbling about the 0.2 percent; it is easier to work with 4 percent. We think that is fair. We think if we have this differential the west coast can keep their shipyards in operation, which will be a benefit to the national defense in case of emergency. We are not asking for some unfair advantage over the others.

It is true, as the gentleman from Mississippi stated, that California and the west coast are growing rapidly. We have about a thousand people coming into the State of California every day. We have to have jobs and roads and schools for them. You notice the difference in the number of Representatives out there. The change now is eight. So if the shipbuilders have these jobs, it is a benefit to California, the entire west coast, and to our national defense, if we adopt this fair 4-percent differential which the Maritime Administration has stated in its recent detailed investigation is justified.

If, in turn, you in the areas not interested in shipbuilding will read this material and listen to the arguments I believe you will feel that those of us from the west coast are fair in our presentation, and it is a fair thing to do to allow this bill to be amended to 4 percent, which we will support, and send it to the other body.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from the Republican side [Mr. SMITH] in his comments with reference to this bill, H.R. 1159. It came before the Committee on Rules last year, at which time the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries requested a rule. At that time those of us from the West, including the west coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California, had requested the committee to ask the Maritime Commission to make a study of this situation. At that time my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], I, and others from the west coast agreed to be bound by whatever that study would show. If the study indicated that there was no longer any justification for any differential, then we would not any longer support a differential.

After some considerable time, a study was requested by a committee of the other body. As has already been indicated, that study has been completed and shows that a differential of some 4.2 percent exists at the present time. Therefore, even though our pledge was a unilateral one, not joined in, I might say, by my good friend from Mississippi and the east coast people, we at the same time feel that we are bound by our pledge at that time.

Let me say, it is 200 miles from my district in any direction to any shipbuilding operations. I do not have any personal or any direct concern and, yet, I think as a matter of fairness and in the best interests of our Nation that there still should be included at least a 4-percent differential in shipbuilding costs accorded the west coast. After all, in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 the whole point of providing any differential at that time was predicated on what was believed to be the best interests of our Nation, and that was that we needed shipbuilding facilities and ship repair facilities on all coasts. All we have to do is to look at what happened in 1941 to realize the importance of the decision at that time because had we been caught without facilities on the west coast at the beginning of the second great war, and this is particularly important to us in the Pacific, we would have been in an intolerable situation. The fact of the business is that we had to add greatly to those facilities. The costs at that time, of course, were such as to almost prohibit on an equal competitive bidding basis any shipbuilding going to the west coast without some differential. As I indicated today, that differential still exists to the extent of 4 percent.

Let me comment on just one further thing with reference to the request we are making. This provision requiring a differential applies, as my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith], has already indicated, to a very limited number of ships. In fact, by its terms the 6-percent advantage as now provided, and the 4 percent which we would be asking, is limited only to ships to be built for steamship lines with home offices on the Pacific coast who are desirous of building ships for use in the trade calling at Pacific coast ports. We are not seeking, and this is not, a differential which applies to all shipbuilding by any means. It is restricted entirely to ships run by operators on the Pacific coast calling at Pacific coast ports, and, of course, it is further limited to those lines with operating subsidies.

Now, to give you an idea in figures of what has happened in the last 10 years to shipbuilding, to the extent that some say the west coast has been favored, the total number of ships built on the east coast, and this was from 1952 to 1962, was 179 ships built in east coast yards; 25 ships in gulf coast yards; 22 ships in Great Lakes yards; and 19 ships built on the west coast. This then is indicative of the fact that we are not asking for a great deal here, but simply what we consider to be fair consideration.

ELIMINATING PACIFIC COAST SHIPBUILDING COST DIFFERENTIAL

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Tollefson].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, of course, there is no contest on the rule and I do not take the floor for the purpose of contesting the rule, but do so only to endeavor to keep the record straight.

My very distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer], in his presentation made some statements which I think require a little clarification. It is true that in 1936 the Merchant Marine Act became law and that act had as its basis the feeling on the part of the military that we needed shipyards on all coasts to meet any emergency that might arise based on our experiences in World War I when we were short of ships and had a terrible time meeting the requirements of the military.

In 1920, therefore, the Congress enacted a shipping act, but under it shipbuilding on the Pacific coast did not get underway. In 1936 the Congress enacted the Merchant Marine Act which had as its primary objective the activating of shipyards on all coasts. One of the provisions, as my friend from Mississippi indicated, was that in certain cases west coast shipyards would have a 6-percent differential over those on the east and gulf coasts. This because construction costs were higher, just as they are today.

One would assume that the west coast profited very well from that provision, but such was not the case. The 6-percent differential did not help the Pacific coast except to keep the yards barely alive. As indicated by one other speaker very few ships have been constructed outside of wartime on the west coast. As an illustration, out of 307 ships built during the years 1952 to 1961 only 27 were built on the Pacific coast.

Under the present and current replacement programs which require the building of 300 ships, out of the first 79 that have been constructed or contracted for, 62 were awarded to the east coast and gulf coast shipyards; only 17 were awarded to Pacific coast yards. Of those 17 only 5 ships were awarded under the 6-percent differential. Six of them were awarded under another provision of law which permits the Secretary of Commerce to allocate ship construction when he thinks it necessary in the interest of national defense.

The gentleman from Mississippi said the west coast could bid 10 percent higher than shipyards on the east and gulf coasts and still get the contract. I think he meant to say 6 percent.

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman will yield, I did mean 6 percent.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Yes. I wanted the record to be straight in that respect.

The gentleman further stated that this differential is no longer needed. That is not what the Department of Commerce believes. The Department of Commerce in its report recommends that the 6-percent differential be reduced to 4 percent. That is the position of the Department of Commerce as late as yesterday morning before the House committee when Mr. Hodges was there and we asked him about this very thing. He maintained that the position of the Department of Commerce as well as the Maritime Administration was the same as it was a year ago, May of 1961. He recommended that we maintain the differential but that it be reduced to 4 percent in accordance with the Maritime Administration study and survey.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I am sure he wants to be correct.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BONNER. The Secretary of Commerce in his report stated that the differential was about 4.2 percent; but I do not think the Secretary of Commerce yesterday recommended. He said, with respect to repeal of section 502 or its extension for vessels to be operated from Pacific coast ports by operators whose place of business is not on the Pacific coast, they considered it to be a matter of congressional policy. He goes on to say:

> We think, however, that, as an alternative to eliminating the differential, consideration might be given to reducing it to 4 percent, which we estimate is currently the difference in cost.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I had reference to one of the exact sentences which the chairman of the committee read; namely, that the Secretary of Commerce recommended as an alternative to this bill that we cut the 6-percent differential down to 4 percent.

That is the way I read his language, and it seems rather clear to me. When he was asked yesterday if his position was the same then as it was last May, he said "Yes," and he reiterated it again in a letter sent this morning, as I understand it, to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Downing]. He made exactly the same statement that as an alternative to this bill he recommends that consideration be given to reducing the 6-percent figure down to 4 percent.

There are one or two other items I want to mention to keep the record clear. The gentleman from Mississippi said that the differential is no longer required because there is a steel mill on the west coast and that machinery and component parts can be obtained in the West. That is not exactly so. The study just completed by the Maritime Administration indicates, as the gentleman from California stated, better than 75 percent of the machinery and equipment must be obtained on the east coast. Just exactly what percentage of steel is obtained on the east coast, I do not have the figures before me for, but during general debate I will supply them. Suffice it to say, the majority of the steel, machinery, and component parts for ships built on the west coast must be obtained in the East.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. At my request, Secretary Hodges did write me this morning reaffirming his position. In the letter he again states it is a matter of congressional policy, but that the Congress may want to give consideration to reducing it from 6 to 4 percent. It is still a matter of congressional policy.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. There is no question about that. The gentleman and I have no dispute there at all. The law is always a matter of congressional desire and policy. We discussed this throughout the hearings before our committee. But I interpret the Secretary's comment or his statement as a recommendation. It seems very clear to me when he says as an alternative to the bill he would suggest that we give consideration to reducing the 6-percent differential down to 4 percent. As one of the other speakers indicated during the reading of the bill, we shall offer an amendment to reduce the 6-percent figure to 4.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Congressional policy is really one of maintaining a mobilization base, so really what we are deciding here is whether they should have a mobilization base on the west coast as well as the east coast.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Some of our friends in the House have overlooked this fact. The No. 1 policy of this act, so far as ship construction is concerned, is the necessity for maintaining on all coasts shipyard facilities adequate to serve as a mobilization base. We should not overlook this. That is the important philosophy of the 1936 act. I am glad that the gentleman has made mention of it.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Is the gentleman aware of the March report of the Comptroller General in respect to the differential in the cost of steel and other component parts?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Yes, I am. I shall touch on that in debate on the bill. There are two reports to be taken into consideration: One, the more complete report by the Maritime Administration, and an earlier survey made by the General Accounting Office, which points up the difference in the cost of steel and other components.

Mr. COHELAN. As a matter of fact, there is a 13-percent difference?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Thirteen percent is the correct figure.

PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. George P. Miller].

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are proud of the recent strides our Nation has made in its outer space program. The vigorous and promising initiatives that we have taken to further international cooperation in this program should also be a source of national satisfaction.

Important progress has already been made in working with our allies, and there is good reason to hope that the reinvigorated United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space will prove a valuable forum for stimulation of what President Kennedy called substantive scientific cooperation in manned and unmanned space investigations.

On March 29 our representative on that committee invited the other members to visit the U.S. facilities at Cape Canaveral where they would have an opportunity to see and hear how our program for space exploration operates. They were to see the launching of a missile carrying a satellite designed and put together by the United Kingdom and the United States. Unfortunately, weather conditions did not allow for the launching of that satellite.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, however, that the members of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space enthusiastically responded to our invitation. I am confident that this demonstration of American sincerity will have a good effect on the prospects for future cooperation in space. Such cooperation clearly serves our national interests. Our own space program will be far more effective if other nations will cooperate with us on facilities and other needs that we must have.

Naturally, the visit included only those portions of the Cape Canaveral installation that are devoted to the peaceful uses of outer space or the NASA activities, and what is there is a matter of public knowledge. These are, of course, the only subjects relevant to the committee's work. Fortunately, the arrangement of the base makes it possible to do this and to arrange a worthwhile visit, while assuring the necessary security controls of the Department of Defense activities.

Outer space belongs to all the nations of the world, and it is only through the peaceful cooperation among the nations of the world that we can bring about the usages and the benefits to all the people that lie in the great space beyond the ionosphere.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'Neill].

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the rule will be adopted, and I hope that the legislation will be passed. In 1936, when the original act was written, it was indeed for the betterment of the entire Nation that the west coast shipbuilding industry have this differential.

But, let us look at what has happened. From 1950 to the year 1960, in New England, and particularly in Massachusetts, the economic growth of our area declined 0.05 percent.

Now, there are many reasons why New England went into a tailspin in that period. It was most because we lost our textiles, because we had inadequate buildings, because we were an old section of the Nation.

But, let us look at the economic development and growth of the other sections of the Nation. From Baltimore north to New England the economic growth of that area was 9.5 percent. Down on the coastal area where the gentleman from Mississippi comes from the economic growth was about 5 percent. But, let us look at the west coast, where the economic growth of the State of California during the period from 1950 to 1960 was 77 percent.

At the present time the State of Washington and the State of Oregon proudly wave the banner to the effect that they are the States growing the fastest, or are the States which have the fastest economic growth in the Nation at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, is it not kind of ridiculous, with the economic growth of the west coast the way it is, that the rest of the Nation should pay a subsidy to this section of the Nation that brags of its present economic growth?

Mr. Speaker, let us look at my home State of Massachusetts. We estimate—and you can only estimate—that we pay in taxes to the Federal Government about $3.4 billion a year. We anticipate that we receive back from the Federal Government through subsidies, through contracts or through governmental agencies, about $2.6 billion. Consequently, out of the coffers of little old Massachusetts, and into the Federal Government goes $800 million a year. I am not complaining about that because if it had not been for New England, if it had not been for Massachusetts, if it had not been for New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, what would have happened to the great growth of this Nation of ours?

Mr. Speaker, in the Rules Committee yesterday I voted for legislation for the Navajo Dam because it is one of the few remaining sections of this Nation that is undeveloped. The rest of the country must cooperate. We must look to the future. We must help to develop this great Nation of ours. If we had taken a selfish view, America would not be the great Nation that she is today. However, in my opinion it is ridiculous in this day and age that the people on the west coast, with their economic growth, should come before this Congress and ask for something that we gave them in 1936 from a willing and an honest heart because we thought it was in the best interest of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this legislation is passed.

Mr. DURNO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield; yes.

Mr. DURNO. I believe the gentleman mentioned the State of Oregon as being a State which was in the vanguard of industrial development?

Mr. O'NEILL. Yes; I did. I understand that Oregon and Washington at the present time, according to our Joint National Economic Council, says that the Northwest section of this country is the fastest growing economic section of the Nation at the present time.

Mr. DURNO. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to inform the gentleman that we are away in the background as far as industrial development is concerned. We have received virtually no money from defense expenditures. We have no Army camps. We are not the beneficiaries of this multi-billion-dollar defense program that we approve yearly on the floor of this House.

Mr. O'NEILL. I am not talking about the fact of any Government contracts that have been given out through the years. I say statistically that Oregon and the Northwest at the present time are the fastest growing States economically in comparison with the past, economically, that there is in the Nation. As a matter of fact, your chambers of commerce and your industrial agencies are boastfully advertising that in trying to take this business from other sections of the country.

Mr. DURNO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I can only say to the gentleman that I would suggest that he read the economic factors concerning my State of Oregon again.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. First, permit me, if I may, to congratulate the gentleman on a very splendid and forceful argument. Secondly, if I follow the gentleman's argument correctly, and if I follow the argument of my friend, the gentleman from California, what they are asking us is this: The opponents of this legislation are asking us to subsidize the already fastest-growing section of this Nation at the expense of the other sections of the Nation. While all we are asking for here by the repeal of this law is to be put on an equality and parity with the rest of the Nation; is that correct?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman has stated the question correctly.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the gulf coast area has a differential of 1 percent lower than the east coast, what assurance is there that any ships that are not built on the west coast will be built on the east coast? The probability would be that they would go to the gulf coast; is not that correct?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to answer that question?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The answer is, of course, that this report is a compilation of figures and studies that are not controlling, that have no bearing whatever upon the awarding of these ships and really has no place in it, because the original basic law provides for a differential for the west coast as against other sections of the country; and the Great Lakes and the gulf coast are considered in that as part of the east coast.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1159) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1159, with Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as the title to the bill indicates, its purpose is to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in order to eliminate a preferential differential of 6 percent enjoyed by shipbuilders on the Pacific coast with respect to bids on ships to be built with construction differential subsidy for Pacific coast ship operators. The bill as reported by the Merchant Marine Committee would accomplish this by repealing subsection (d) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and by repealing a portion of section 509 of that act.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks concerning this bill will be brief. The committee report speaks for itself. It is brief, clear, and concise. It reflects the views of the great majority of the committee.

The provision in question—section 502(d)—has been a part of the Merchant Marine Act since its enactment in 1936. It was apparently included therein in recognition of the fact that west coast shipyards at that time could not compete with eastern yards for ship construction on an equalized bidding basis. Inadequate manufacturing facilities for major ship components and transportation costs from eastern supply sources appear to have been major factors in the adoption of this system of encouraging the dispersal of shipbuilding activity.

Within 2 years after the enactment of the basic act, the problem of providing authority for development of a nationwide dispersed shipbuilding mobilization base was met by specific authority to allocate contracts throughout the country wherever and whenever needed. The amendments contained in this bill to sections 213 and 502(f) of the 1936 act which would strengthen and make the allocation authority more effective were overwhelmingly adopted by the committee members, including some of the members who voted against the bill as a whole and who submitted minority views thereon.

In the past 20 years there has been a tremendous expansion in the Western States. Manufacturing facilities for machinery and steel production have been developed to the point where shipbuilders on the west and gulf coasts procure major ship components at prices competitive with those of east coast suppliers. In addition, testimony developed that the delivered prices of many items, including such large and expensive ones as turbines and gears, are the same, irrespective of the distance from the point of manufacture. The transportation problem has become insignificant compared to the situation 25 years ago. The committee report states as follows:

> Thus, it appears that in view of industrial developments on the west coast, and the statutory allocation authority, the continuance of the 6-percent differential is simply discriminatory in that it gives one geographical region an automatic advantage over the other coastal areas. It is the view of the majority of the committee that the preferential differential of section 502(d) has outlived its purpose and should be repealed.

Some would have you believe that this legislation has not been thoroughly considered and that there should be various studies made to determine whether and how much regional differential actually exists.

First, let me say that this legislation has been as thoroughly considered as any bill that I can think of. Legislation to this effect was introduced first in May of 1955 by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] and others. Subsequently the committee held hearings on a similar bill in August 1959, April 1960, and June 1960, during the 86th Congress. In scheduling these hearings the committee made every effort to accommodate the various regional shipbuilding interests of the United States and finally, after review by the Comptroller General of the testimony and supporting data, further hearings were held in May 1961 on this bill, H.R. 1159. Generally speaking, the conclusions of the Comptroller General were that the testimony and underlying data presented by the shipbuilding interests during the 86th Congress were insufficient to afford a reliable basis for determining the soundness of the relative-cost arguments presented by the regional shipbuilders. This bill, including amendments strengthening the allocation authority applicable to all areas of the country on a nondiscriminatory basis, reflects the majority view that the 6-percent differential is unsound in principle and is not needed for the maintenance of an adequate dispersed shipbuilding mobilization base.

On this point I call attention to a recent report to the Committee on Commerce of the U.S. Senate entitled "A Study of Cost Factors Entering Into Bids for Ship Construction in Shipyards on the Four Coasts of the United States," prepared and submitted by the Federal Maritime Administration.

It concludes that the cost of shipbuilding on the west coast exceeds that of the east coast by about 4 percent, and that the cost of shipbuilding on the gulf coast and on the Great Lakes is less than that on the east coast by about 1 percent and 2 percent, respectively. The report consists of some 66 typewritten pages with charts and exhibits. But the report is woefully incomplete and furnishes support neither to the supporters nor the opponents of the bill we are considering. As it quite frankly states, and I read:

> It has been the judgment of this agency that overall yard efficiency, workmen productivity, backlog of work, facilities, plant depreciation costs, plant maintenance costs, work methods, and State and local taxes [except payroll taxes], should not be assessed in arriving at conclusions regarding cost differential.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that if consideration of certain geographic factors alone can show regional cost variations of only 4 percent, the factors of yard efficiency and worker productivity—and other items—if considered, could more than wipe out this minor variation and under these circumstances, the report is meaningless.

If I felt that favorable action on this bill would in any way impair our national shipbuilding mobilization potential, I would oppose it. But neither the testimony nor any studies considered by the committee give any convincing demonstration of national need for an automatic bid advantage to one area of the country. And, as stated in the committee report, even the east coast shipbuilding representatives who strongly favored repeal of the 6-percent differential preferential urged the use of the allocation authority as strengthened to keep our national shipbuilding mobilization base in balance wherever and whenever needed.

I shall vote for the bill.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1159

First. Conforming amendment: As reported, the bill repeals a section of 509 of the 1936 act. This is solely a conforming amendment. Under existing law Pacific coast applicants for Government-financed loans for vessels to be domiciled on and operated from the Pacific coast may receive such loans at three-fourths of 1 percent less than applicants elsewhere in the country, if the construction contract is awarded to a Pacific coast shipbuilder whose bid is not more than 6 percent higher than the lowest responsible shipbuilder from another region. Never been used and unlikely that it ever will be used.

Second. Strengthening amendments: The bill, as reported, contains amendments to two sections of the 1936 act designed to strengthen and make more effective the authority to allocate ship construction when the national interest so requires, as follows:

(a) Section 213 of the act requires that the Maritime Administrator shall make studies of and make a "report to Congress as soon as practicable" on "the relative cost of construction or reconditioning of comparable ocean vessels in shipyards of the various coastal districts of the United States, together with recommendations as to how such shipyards may compete for work on an equalized basis."

The committee amendment would require that such study and reporting should be done on a continuing basis, with annual reports to the Congress.

(b) Section 502(f) of the act provides for allocation of ship construction contracts to builders in areas other than that with lowest responsible bidder, if such allocation is determined to be necessary to "provide an adequate mobilization base at strategic points for purposes of national defense and national emergency." Under existing law such allocation must be "with the approval of the President," and studies are required to be made "periodically." The amendments to the bill would require studies to be made "at least once each year." The bill also eliminates the requirement that allocation must be approved by the President.

The amendments made mandatory the cost studies and surveys that are essential to any fair system of allocation and simplify the procedure by eliminating Presidential approval as a prerequisite. Thus, political pressures are minimized and the allocation system brought more in line with that used by the Navy.

THE 6-PERCENT PROVISION HAS NOT AND WILL NOT BE OF ANY GREAT VALUE EVEN TO ITS BENEFICIARIES

The record to date, as set forth in the minority report on this bill, demonstrates the insignificance of retention of the 6-percent differential provision.

It demonstrates the usefulness of allocation authority under section 502(f). It demonstrates that west coast shipyards are in fact capable of successfully bidding in national competition.

The opponents of this bill point out that of 17 ships in the maritime replacement program awarded to west coast shipyards, first, 6 were allocated under section 502(f); second, only 5 were awarded as the result of the automatic operation of the 6-percent provision; and, third, 6 were awarded to west coast shipyards by reason of lowest bids in national competition.

Between now and the completion of the current replacement program—312 ships—no more than 48 ships could be eligible under the 6-percent provision.

PASSAGE OF THIS BILL WILL NOT AFFECT IN ANY SENSE THE NATIONAL SECURITY OR THE MAINTENANCE OF A DISPERSED SHIPBUILDING MOBILIZATION BASE

Some Members have made dire predictions concerning the effect of passage of this bill. Yesterday a distinguished west coast Member of the House stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> Passage of this measure without appropriate amendment would be disastrous to the west coast shipbuilding industry, would largely defeat the intent of the parent act, and would alter dangerously our defense posture and our capacity to absorb attack.

The record to date completely refutes such extreme prognostication. First of all, allocation authority exists—by this bill is made more effective—and, in fact, has been used as a device to aid the western shipbuilding industry.

Second, as far as the question of effect on "our defense posture and our capacity to absorb attack," I will only call attention to the great miracle of shipbuilding in World War II in which western industry was preeminent without benefit of the small, discriminatory crutch of anything like the 6-percent differential.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina for the excellent presentation he has made here today on H.R. 1159, and wish to associate myself with his remarks in favor of this legislation.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman and appreciate what he said.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to hear the gentleman from North Carolina, the distinguished chairman of our committee, say that he believed shipyards should be maintained on all of our coasts. I know he believes that because he has said it on many occasions.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question if I may at this time: Is it not true that the representatives of the east coast and the gulf coast yards when they appeared before our committee to testify in behalf of the bill also supported the philosophy that shipyards ought to be maintained on all coasts in the interest of national defense?

Mr. BONNER. I think the gentleman is correct. Since the gentleman asked me this question I have had occasion and the pleasure to visit the west coast shipyards. I think the shipyard out there in California is one of the finest shipyards I have ever seen. Why they cannot compete with everybody else, I do not understand. They can build a ship right out in the open, not bothered by rain, snow, or sleet. You have nice shipyards out there.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I agree with the gentleman, we do have some very fine shipyards, but we need to maintain them in the future in the interest of our national defense.

I want the record to be clear that the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and I are in accord with respect to the necessity for maintaining shipyards on the Pacific coast as well as other coasts. I want the record to show further that the witnesses for the shipyards, the managers or superintendents for the shipyards, on the east coast and gulf coast came before our committee and, as I recall their testimony, they supported the philosophy embodied in the 1936 act, which provides that shipyards should be maintained on all coasts.

As I recall it, too, the members of our committee who voted for the bill also supported this philosophy. If I am incorrect in that respect, I trust those members of the committee who supported the bill will correct me at this point.

It is quite evident, in reading the bill that is now before us, the majority of the committee voting for it supported the allocation principle, because you will find in looking at the bill outside of the first few lines the balance of the bill has to do with the allocation principle, which is already in the law.

For the information of the Members, there are two sections of the Merchant Marine Act; one, section 502(d) and section 502(f). Section 502(d) has to do with the 6 percent differential. Section 502(f) gives the Secretary of Commerce authority, when he finds that a certain shipyard is depressed, to negotiate a contract with that yard, and he can under the law allocate ship construction to those yards. This has been done as a replacement program.

As I indicated earlier, we are in the midst of a ship replacement program involving some 300 ships which are in our active fleet. So far, some 79 of them have been allocated or have been awarded, I should say. Out of that 79 that have been awarded 62 went to the east and gulf coast yards, and the balance of 17 went to the west coast yards. Only five of them were allocated to the west coast by virtue of this 6-percent differential. The balance were allocated under section 502(f) or on low bids.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] made reference to the economy of the east coast and his area. He made reference also to the economy of the Pacific coast. Involved in those 17 ships were only 5 awarded under the 6-percent differential. I repeat, only five ships. This number would hardly affect greatly the economy of the east coast.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. In the history of the act since 1936, why does not the gentleman state only these five ships have been awarded under the 6-percent differential?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I shall be happy to do that.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. When they cry crocodile tears on how shipyards on the east coast cannot exist, it is hard for me to reconcile the fact that out of not 79 but some 142 ships built since

1951, only 5 were built under the 6-percent differential.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That is absolutely correct, with one slight exception. The number of ships built in the past 10 years, with the exception of these 79, were 307. There were 307, and only 5 ships out of that whole number have been awarded to the Pacific coast as a consequence of the 6-percent differential.

I think in our discussion and debate on this bill we should not move away from the basic purpose of the act, which is to keep the yards active by allocation of work. It is very easy to get away from that principle. The Federal Government has a stake here not only in connection with the national-defense aspects but the Federal Government contributes toward ship construction anywhere from 42 to 50 percent, and it has exceeded 50 percent in the last year or two. So, we are apt to become involved in the dollars and overlook the basic philosophy and policy of the Maritime Act of 1936. I trust that when the Members get ready to vote either on an amendment or the bill, they will vote not so much in their regional interests as they would vote in the interest of our national defense.

As indicated at the outset of my remarks, the chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee support the basic philosophy of the act. The shipyard operators themselves support the basic philosophy of the act, and all of them, without exception so far as I can recall, have said we need to maintain shipyards on the west coast, but we on the Pacific coast part company with the other members of the committee when it comes to the matter of the 6-percent differential. And, they say, while supporting the basic philosophy, we do not need the 6-percent differential; we can operate under section 502 (f). The Secretary of Commerce as of yesterday recommended that the 6-percent figure be reduced to 4 percent to be in keeping with the Maritime Administration study. The Maritime Administrator has for the past several years taken the position that it is much more difficult to allocate shipbuilding under section 502(f) than under 502(d). He would rather, as I understood him, allocate them under the section which provides the differential. So, it is our position that we ought to retain this differential, but at a reduced figure down to 4 percent, simply to comply with the study that was made.

There was mention earlier of a study made by the General Accounting Office. One was made last year at the request of our committee. However, the direction to the GAO was so limited that the study could not be completed, so that when they came before our committee and testified, they could not say they made a complete study and therefore they could not say as an average that it was 4 percent or 6 percent or any other figure. But, they did testify as to the cost difference concerning the cost of steel on the east coast as against the west coast, and, as the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] mentioned, that differential was 13 percent. They made a further finding in regard to component parts, and they testified there was a cost differential there.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. With respect to the study made by the General Accounting Office, the General Accounting Office was requested to make a study of the record presented to the committee, that is, the testimony pro and con. That was the directive. That was what the committee decided on.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I did not mean to be critical of the chairman of the committee with respect to the direction to the GAO, but I think the chairman will recall that the GAO did state that their survey was not sufficiently complete so that they could not fix a differential in cost between the east and the west coast shipyards.

They made one other statement which was disputed by some members of the committee and the industry. They said they were unable to obtain the full cooperation of some of the east coast yards; that they could not obtain all the information they asked for. Well, there was some justification for the attitude of the yards, I suppose. According to their testimony, they felt they did not want to give out business information. However, they did supply freely all the information that was requested by the Maritime Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to, in conclusion, just remind the committee that, as I read the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce yesterday, and as I read the report of the Commerce Department of last year, the Department of Commerce and the Maritime Administration today recommend that instead of enacting this bill we simply reduce the differential from 6 to 4 percent. And, I trust that is what the House will do.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, 25 years ago the Congress passed the Merchant Marine Act which has served as a blueprint for the operation of our American merchant marine for all these years. The framers of that act were sufficiently foresighted to realize that a fleet for defense and commerce was naturally dependent upon the existence of an adequate shipbuilding capacity to sustain it and to renew it as required. The effect of this approach has been amply demonstrated both in World War II and subsequent years.

It was realized that a shipbuilding potential must exist on all of the coasts of the United States, and in order to achieve that end, the act recognized the deficiency of the west coast in production potential. In 1936 there were no steel mills and relatively few manufacturing facilities west of the Rockies. As a result, all of the components of ships built in that area had to be transported from the eastern sources of supply. Naturally, that resulted in increased costs for additional freight. And equally naturally, the final cost of vessels so constructed reflected this increase. As a result, it was apparent that no west coast yard, which might thereafter undertake ship construction, was in a position to compete with the older established yards which were nearer sources of supply.

In order to encourage establishment of shipyards on the west coast and to minimize their disadvantage in this respect, the act provided that when ships were constructed for west coast operators with their principal offices on the west coast, that the bid of a west coast yard would be acceptable provided it was within 6 percent of the bid of a competing yard on another coast.

It does not appear that any particular science went into the establishment of this 6-percent differential, but the principle was sound as evidenced by the fact that yards were in fact established and during the war were able to turn out almost half of our war-built shipping.

Chiefly as a result of the war, the industrial potential of the west coast began to be realized and steel mills and manufacturing plants of various kinds were established.

The degree to which this program has been successful is illustrated by the fact that the Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., one of the oldest established shipbuilders in the United States, located in my city of Baltimore, recently purchased six cargo cranes in excess of $1 million from a manufacturer in Alameda, Calif., and also two main propulsion engines from Sunnyvale, Calif., for two ships they were building in Baltimore. I call your attention to the fact that the Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. is a private corporation in business to make money and the reason for these west coast purchases, with the resulting addition of freight charges, was simply and solely that the west coast suppliers were able to underbid those in the rest of the country.

The same experience has been repeated with most of the east coast and gulf coast shipbuilders and indicates quite definitely that this infant which required artificial stimulation 25 years ago in order to survive, has now become a giant that is able to compete on equal terms with older established organizations located elsewhere in the United States. In the same way, steel is available on the west coast from local sources, and of course, wood products, of which an amazingly large amount are consumed in the course of construction of ships, are available virtually in the shipyards' backyards, with the resultant lower cost to them.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote from Admiral Schultz, Assistant Chief, Bureau for Design, Shipbuilding, and Fleet Maintenance, at one of the hearings, where he said:

> In recent years, however, with the growth and diversification of west coast industry, private shipyards in that area have shown an increasing ability to compete successfully for Navy ship construction. The development of basic supporting industries, the application of improved techniques, and the achievement of greater efficiency in shipyard operations have helped to improve the competitive position of the west coast shipbuilding industry.

Also as previously outlined in his statement:

> **Several major awards on a competitive basis during the past year or so, offered convincing evidence that west coast yards have definitely overcome their former disadvantage in bidding on Navy ship construction.**

In 1936 only 3 percent of the Nation's steel-producing capacity was on the west coast, that is west of the Rockies. Today 9 percent is located there. Since only 1½ percent of steel production goes into shipbuilding, there is enough steel capacity west of the Rockies to supply the entire national needs many times over. Prices of steel sold by west coast plants are fully competitive with those of eastern plants.

East coast weather varies from extreme cold in Maine and Massachusetts to the excessively high temperatures and heavy precipitation in the gulf coast, both of which extremes result in lost time on outdoor work, and frequently additional expense for snow removal, necessitating substantial overtime to meet the schedules.

West coast climate is more temperate and there are a considerably larger number of good working days in the course of the year, reducing considerably the need for overtime work.

By reason of the fact that the prime source of lumber is British Columbia, Washington, and Oregon, the west coast enjoys a definite advantage in the cost of procuring it, in the range of 20 percent.

By reason of these facts, it appears that the handicaps imposed upon shipyards throughout the country in favor of the west coast no longer have any justification. The west coast yards have amply demonstrated their ability to compete on an equal basis and experience in the recent past has demonstrated that they are able to do so.

Of course, figures can be twisted to produce any conclusion that a speaker desires, but it is submitted that the recent records of the Maritime Administration, in the construction and conversion of vessels for the American merchant marine, have demonstrated that the west coast has been able to obtain more than its fair share, but that by reason of the existence of this differential, at the present time of some about 95 shipways in the United States, but 10 are located on the west coast, and an examination and analysis of the distribution of ship construction during recent years, will demonstrate that the west coast has received contracts out of proportion to the number of building ways.

It must be borne in mind that the fundamental purpose of maintaining and encouraging shipyards in the United States is national defense. The Merchant Marine Act wisely provides, in addition to the subsidy provisions involved in this bill, that the Secretary of Commerce with the approval of the President, may allocate ship construction to those areas where it is lacking in order to maintain our emergency potential for defense. This allocation provision has been used and has proven effective. While I and the other proponents of this measure believe that any advantage in the form of a bidding differential is not only unfair, but definitely harmful, to the established shipbuilding industry in the country, we recognize the necessity for maintenance of shipbuilding facilities not only on the east and gulf coasts but also the Great Lakes and west coast and for that reason emphasize that we are in favor of the retention and expansion of the allocation authority.

Under the 1936 act the Federal Maritime Board and its predecessor agency were required to make reports concerning shipyard potential. Unfortunately, the information available from this source is very sparse and I and the other members of the Merchant Marine Committee believe that proper utilization of the national shipbuilding capability is impossible without adequate information concerning the various yards available in the country for ship construction. As a result, we have inserted in the bill a requirement for annual surveys and reports to the Congress concerning shipyard capabilities, and it is our expectation that these reports will be the basis for adequate and fair allocations of ship construction, to maintain that very vital element of defense—shipbuilding capability. We believe, and our belief is embodied in the bill, that the proper way to see to it that the country is assured of adequate ships for war is to encourage and maintain shipyards during peacetime. This can be done much more effectively, by the device of allocating ship construction when such allocation is necessary, than by the wholly artificial and unscientific tariff, which is the effect of the present 6 percent west coast differential.

It is our belief that the elimination of the differential, as proposed in this bill, will encourage competitive bidding among shipyards on all coasts, thereby tending to reduce the price of new ship construction and by so doing reduce the burden on the taxpayers through construction subsidies.

The other sponsors of this legislation are: Congressmen Colmer, of Mississippi; Rivers of South Carolina; Downing, of Virginia; Brewster, of Maryland; Friedel, of Maryland; Garland, of Maine; and Tupper, of Maine.

We believe that the defense needs of the country can best be met by allocation of construction contracts where required to maintain the yards, based upon adequate knowledge of the needs of the shipyards.

I think we might mention here that this bill does not affect the fate of only the shipyards on the east coast, such as Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. It also affects the States that have facilities in the various cities and States that provide a tremendous amount of material for the various shipyards on the Great Lakes: Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. On the gulf we have the States of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the bill will pass.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1159, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The passage of this message would eliminate the 6-percent differential applicable to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held extensive hearings on similar legislation during the 86th Congress. We heard testimony from various Government departments and representatives of the great shipbuilding industry on all of our coasts. From the evidence I heard and the data presented by east coast, gulf coast, and Great Lakes shipbuilders, I cannot feel that our great west coast shipyards are at any significant disadvantage to entitle them to a preferential 6-percent differential in nationwide bidding.

In fairness to the shipbuilders I personally know on the east coast, and especially in our Free State of Maryland, I feel that the principal involved in the original enactment of preferential differential is no longer needed. In fact, to continue this differential I believe would discriminate against our east coast, gulf coast, and Great Lakes shipbuilders.

The economy of my State has been affected by this preferential differential. Our shipyards only ask to compete with others on an equalized basis.

There was a time when west coast shipbuilders had difficulty in obtaining major ship components at competitive prices with those east coast suppliers. In recent years manufacturing facilities for machinery and steel production has increased to a point on the west coast where the maintenance of the 6-percent differential would be highly discriminatory in giving one geographic region a marked advantage over other geographic areas in our Nation.

I sincerely hope that the Members, in their wisdom, will support this meritorious measure.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in favor of H.R. 1159, which amends the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders. As far back as 1959 I had introduced legislation designed to eliminate this anachronistic subsidy.

This west coast subsidy is obsolete, outmoded, and obviously unfair to our east coast shipyards. When the law was drawn up in the midthirties, there were good reasons for the 6-percent differential. At that time there were no shipbuilding or repair facilities on the west coast, and it was important for national defense to assure the continued existence of shipyards and skilled personnel on the Pacific coast. Because of the lack of steel production facilities in the West, costs were increased by a substantial freight bill on materials to be used in shipbuilding.

The situation is now completely different. Steel producing capacity on the west coast has been expanded so that practically all of the materials needed by the west coast shipbuilding industry is now obtained from west coast sources. Prices on the principal types of steel used in shipbuilding are slightly higher on the west coast than the east coast at some mills but at least one west coast mill quotes the same prices as the east coast suppliers. A great industrial development has been experienced in the West the past few years and manufacturing capacity built up which includes component parts necessary in shipbuilding in addition to steel. In addition, the shipbuilding industry has been built up during the years since the act of 1936, particularly during the World War II years, so that the differential is no longer required to secure shipbuilding facilities located on the west coast.

Considering the defense needs, there are also several large naval shipyards on the west coast in addition to the private yards. It is questionable whether defense considerations would justify continuing to grant preferential treatment to the west coast private shipyards, which apparently have higher costs of construction, in order to place them in competitive position with lower cost shipyards, keeping higher cost facilities in operation, thus perpetuating an uneconomic allocation of our resources. I am convinced that, on the basis of efficiency and other possible savings in operation of the west coast shipyards, including factors such as climatic conditions, the west coast yards are now able to compete successfully with the east coast yards without this 6-percent advantage they presently enjoy.

As a matter of record, some west coast shipyards have submitted the low bids, and others have been among the three lowest bidders on a nationwide competitive bid basis, for contracts. Between October 1957 and June 30, 1959, two west coast shipyards submitted highest bids and the two other west coast shipyards bidding were among the three lowest bidders on adjusted bids for ships for the Maritime Administration design C4–S–1q. During the same period 2 west coast shipyards were the lowest of 10 bidders for conversion of vessels of Maritime Administration design C4–S–1q.

Mr. Chairman, another factor which should not be overlooked is the added cost to the taxpayers where ships which are granted Federal subsidies for construction are built at a high-cost yard, adding to the amount of Federal contributions. Should the cost of the vessel be such that the construction subsidy allowed will not absorb the entire additional cost to build under the provisions for awarding the contract to a west coast yard at not more than 6 percent over the lowest bid from the east coast, then the cost to the shipping company of the new vessel is increased. It does not seem equitable to saddle the owner and operator of the merchant vessel with such an additional cost of construction, an added cost from which he receives no added benefit.

In view of the changes which have occurred since the enactment of these provisions, the 6-percent differential has become unnecessary and unduly preferential to west coast shipyards. With the announcement of price increases by the major steel companies, this will mean that the cost of this 6-percent subsidy will be even greater now. It is distressing enough to know that our defense costs will rise sharply as a result of the steel price increases. By keeping the 6-percent subsidy, taxpayers will now be paying more money out of their pockets and also will be adding to the spiraling effect on our economy of the steel price rises. The 6-percent handout goes to management on the west coast. Every tax dollar spent for this purpose means a dollar that directly injures the shipbuilding industry on the east coast.

Section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 should now be repealed, along with the portion of section 509 which grants preference to west coast construction in the matter of lower interest on construction for lines operating in domestic trade. This latter constitutes an undue preference granted to shipping companies on the west coast.

With the steel price rise, and the resultant added cost to the taxpayers for this obsolete Federal subsidy, the need for passage of H.R. 1159 is of the utmost urgency.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with my colleagues from Massachusetts who have supported this legislation. The elimination of the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders should take place forthwith.

Many of our shipyards along the eastern seacoast are now in financial difficulty. In fact some have already closed down. Unemployment in the shipbuilding areas of the east coast is very high at the present time. At the Fore River Shipyard in Quincy, Mass., over 6,000 men have lost their jobs during the past year. We are no longer in a position to subsidize the west coast in shipbuilding. The west coast is experiencing great economic growth at the present time. The east coast is having a difficult time trying to maintain a balanced economy. Surely it is unfair to continue this discrimination on the matter of shipbuilding.

Our shipyards are in dire need of work. Everyone should be placed on an equal footing.

I hope and trust that the Members of this House will favor H.R. 1159 and support the report of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to commend the gentleman from Maryland for the excellent job he has done here today.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] for the very fine statement he has made and wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Among the many fine shipyards in the State of New Jersey there is the great Camden shipyard where many of my constituents are employed.

The 6 percent differential in favor of the shipyards on the west coast is very unfair to shipyards in the East. The reason the 6 percent differential was granted in 1936 is that material had to be shipped from the East to the West. But today that is unnecessary because they now have their own sources of supply in that area.

In addition to the disadvantage of the 6 percent differential, the eastern shipyards must also compete with Canadian shipyards and other foreign shipyards that have lower wage rates.

We in the East are blessed with skilled shipyard workers who all their lives, and their families and their grandfathers before them have been employed in the shipbuilding industry. The shipbuilding industry is a vital and essential industry to the people of my State and to the people of my district. As the Bureau of Labor Statistics reveals, the unemployment situation although improved under this administration would be affected if the 6 percent differential prevails and would only add to the problems of unemployment among the people of my district and the environs of the city of Philadelphia generally.

Mr. Chairman, I endorse this bill 100 percent and hope that it meets with the overwhelming approval of the House.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS. I wish to commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] for his fine analytical treatment of this issue. I desire to be associated with him in his position on H.R. 1159.

There are several shipbuilding installations in the State of New Jersey, one of which is located in Hoboken, N.J., in my congressional district, which this legislation affects. The protective provision of this bill protects the operation of this industry against unfair competition—demanding advantages for distant areas competitive to its operation.

The 6-percent differential as contained in section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, created a preference in favor of west coast shipyards in bidding for construction contracts for certain ships in the Federal Maritime Board merchant marine replacement program. It was enacted to assure west coast private yards a fair opportunity to obtain Government ship construction.

The provision has outlived its usefulness. The material and transportation cost handicaps encountered by the west coast shipyards have been eliminated or substantially reduced. West coast shipyards have been in successful competition with yards in other sections for naval ship work. The Navy reports, "that there is no convincing evidence that west coast shipyards are now at a significant disadvantage."

The 6-percent preference has operated to the detriment of shipyards on the east coast, gulf coast, and the Great Lakes and has placed these shipyards at an unfortunate disadvantage. Therefore, I am pleased to vote for H.R. 1159, providing for the elimination of this unnecessary 6-percent differential.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland. I, myself, introduced legislation along this line last year. I am very much in favor of the passage of this bill, H.R. 1159.

Mr. Chairman, when the United States started to strengthen its defense posture prior to World War II one such progressive move was to stimulate shipbuilding on all coasts.

In 1936, a 6-percent differential was provided for west coast shipbuilders. Several conditions at that time made this move valid. Today, however, there is no doubt that this is just plain, gross discrimination. This differential allows builders on the west coast to underbid firms doing business on the east coast, the gulf coast, and the Great Lakes region.

Higher freight rates, lack of adjacent steel mills, and so forth, were the reasons to justify this 6-percent differential in 1936. Today these arguments are no longer valid.

Today, when the Congress has the opportunity to right this obvious wrong, proponents of maintaining the 6-percent differential have come up with what they hope will be considered unimpeachable justification for its continuance, a Maritime Administration study.

This cost survey, and I quote, "reveals that shipbuilding costs on the west coast are 4.2 percent higher than those on the east coast."

What are the factors involved in this 4.2-percent difference in construction costs?

John R. Newell, president of the Bath Iron Works Corp. in Bath, Maine, can speak more authoritatively than I. I quote from a telegram received today from him:

> We note that the Maritime Administration's latest study reports that a 4-percent cost differential now exists between east and west coast shipyards, but admits that almost three-quarters of this differential is because of higher wages paid to west coast shipworkers.

Mr. Newell then asks:

> Should the Government subsidize a high-wage area in awarding contracts? This seems to us to be a dangerous, inflationary principle for Congress to uphold.

Another matter that was not taken into consideration at all in this survey involves climate.

Due to winter conditions in Maine, the average annual heating cost to the Bath Iron Works Corp. during 1959 and 1960 was $549,000.

It is quite obvious that the shipyards on the west coast do not face this tremendous additional financial burden. The cost for fuel alone for Bath Iron Works came to $116,923 during this 2-year period. And this is the cost of a medium-sized concern, which Bath Iron Works is classified. You can imagine what the proportionate increase would be for larger companies, such as New York Ship and Quincy.

I sincerely believe that the 6-percent differential, enjoyed by the west coast today, is no longer justified. As was stated in last year's hearings, east coast shipbuilders could come up with justification for a 9-percent differential for themselves, if all factors are considered.

Members of Congress, let us be realistic. Let us be fair. Let us return this industry to the true competitive system on which a solid economy thrives. I urge favorable passage of H.R. 1159.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there is a principle involved in this matter of area differential that is basic to our whole system of free competition. The fact that some costs are higher on one coast than on another coast of the country would apply in some respect and to some degree to almost any major industry in any part of the country.

Is the Government going to try to iron out all the wrinkles in the industrial fabric of the Nation? If so, why should there not be special allowances, for instance, for the Great Lakes industries which suffer so many production disadvantages because of crippling storms during a good part of the year, while the west coast is blessed with weather the year around, if we believe their travel advertisements, that would bring out the best endeavors of workers in any line of production.

That the question of meeting unfavorable weather conditions and other minuses is not negligible is attested by the Administrator's calculations that—

> The east coast and Great Lakes areas experience added shipbuilding costs due to higher costs of utilities and due to added costs of winter operations, which increase cost of overhead by about 3 percent.

Of course, the Administrator in his report had to make it clear that it is impossible to set a firm figure as representing the overall differential in costs between the east coast and the west coast on items entering into the cost of shipbuilding. It is about 4 percent. It to me suggests that it might be more or it might be less than 4 percent.

If I recall correctly the report shows that the costs of materials—excluding steel—that go into ships while 2 percent higher on the west coast than on one coast, is only 1 percent higher than on another coast, and about the same as on the third coast. This is not a very persuasive argument for a 6-percent or even a 4-percent differential, I would say.

These are just random comments on the report findings but I go back to my original observations, that in trying to even out all the local wrinkles in the Nation's industrial pattern that Government could bring about an industrial hodgepodge that would do more harm over the long run than any temporary benefits that it might bring any one area.

The 6-percent preference now operates to the detriment of shipyards on the east coast, gulf coast, and the Great Lakes and adds to the cost of taxpayers everywhere. I earnestly urge every Member of the House today to vote for H.R. 1159 repealing this provision.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Does the gentleman not think that many other industrial activities and products have the same disadvantages due to weather conditions and material supplies and freight differentials, and does he not think they also should be given the same consideration if this 6-percent differential is going to prevail?

Mr. GARMATZ. Permit me to answer the gentleman in this way. In the testimony brought out in the hearings, it is shown that General Electric and Westinghouse, which both furnish a large amount of equipment charged the same price for their quipment whether it goes to the east coast or the west coast and there is no freight differential.

Mr. FALLON. In other words, the same consideration is not given to other industrial operations as is granted in shipbuilding; is that not correct?

Mr. GARMATZ. That is correct.

Mr. FALLON. So I ask the gentleman—does he not think that if this advantage prevails on the west coast for the west coast shipbuilders, should it not prevail in other industrial activities as well?

Mr. GARMATZ. I would think so, yes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. In connection with the remarks just made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], is it not true that shipyards are in a different category altogether than industrial plants, and that the 1936 act recognized it, and that is simply that this is a national defense feature? The reason for having shipyards on the west coast is to be able to build ships that ply the Pacific Ocean; is that not correct?

Mr. GARMATZ. That is correct.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman made a statement that he believed in the allocation principle and that shipyards can be maintained through the allocation feature of the statute, and a number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have concurred in what he said in that respect. I assume they also subscribe to the principle that ships should be allocated under the allocation section rather than under the 6-percent-differential section.

Mr. GARMATZ. That is true. Although recently Maryland lost two ships to the west coast, under the allocation section.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I recall the incident, but I think the gentleman, perhaps, made a little strong statement, if he will yield further, when he said that the Pacific coast yards are well able to bid competitively with east coast and gulf coast yards. The facts of the matter are that out of 79 of the replacement vessels, only 17 have gone to the Pacific coast. Out of 307 vessels theretofore constructed under the Maritime Administration only 27 went to the west coast. Those figures do not indicate the cost on the Pacific coast.

Mr. GARMATZ. I think the gentleman should bear in mind the number of shipways on the west coast and compare them with the shipways on the east coast. If he does so, he will find that the west coast got their share.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. If the gentleman will yield, as I recall the testimony and the charts in our hearing, they showed that on the east coast there were 21 shipyards; on the west coast there were 7 shipyards. So that while the west coast had 33⅓ percent of the shipyards it, at no time except during wartime, received more than 20 percent of the work. The same situation applies for ways as for yards.

Mr. GARMATZ. It is not the number of shipyards, it is the number of ways in the shipyards that count.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I was speaking of ways as well as shipyards.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1159 and intend to support the amendment which will be offered at the proper point to change the existing 6-percent differential to a 4-percent differential.

In 1936 Congress in its wisdom after considering all the factors in the situation thought it was for the best interest of the Nation to have a 6-percent shipbuilding differential applicable to ship construction on the west coast. That means that a majority of those Members of this body who were here at that time thought it was in the best interest of the Nation in 1936. It seems to me they should feel it is in the best interest of the Nation in 1962. We have assigned responsibility to the Department of Commerce and the Maritime Administration to handle the detailed problems of administering ship construction contracts. The Department of Commerce and the Maritime Administration have studied this situation and determined what should be the relative differential from the standpoint of costs at the present time, and have stated that according to their best estimates the present differential should be 4 percent. That is the reason for the amendment to be offered recommending that a 4-percent differential be applied to Pacific coast yards in accordance with the basic objective that the Congress felt was so important to achieve in 1936; and this is all that those of us who are in favor of the 4-percent amendment want. We feel that we should continue to support the principles of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, that it is for the best interests and for the defense of this country to continue a differential that would be in keeping with the actual difference in operating costs between the Pacific coast yards and the yards on other coasts.

The facts show that during the 10-year period from 1952 to 1961, of all ships constructed during that period 179 were constructed on the east coast, 25 on the gulf coast, 22 on the Great Lakes, and only 19 on the west coast. It shows fairly conclusively that there is a difference in cost applicable to the west coast.

If the proponents of H.R. 1159 should succeed in knocking out the differential they would succeed in putting the west coast yards at a disadvantage. That means they would not be able to play their part in fulfilling the defense needs of this country should they be suddenly called upon to do so.

Another factor that must be borne in mind is the matter of skilled labor. It does no good to have yards in mothballs if you do not have the skilled labor to operate the yards. Without that skilled labor they would no longer be available to the Nation in time of need. So that is the purpose for which the 4-percent amendment is going to be offered. It is consistent with the objectives of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, it is consistent with the recommendations of the Department of Commerce and the Maritime Administration. It seems to me this body should be guided by those figures and should support the 4-percent amendment which will be offered.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I think if the Members of the House will consider H.R. 1159 they will, on the basis of the facts and the public interest, see the justice and wisdom of supporting an amendment to the bill which will be made later to provide that west coast shipyards be given a 4-percent differential rather than a 6-percent differential that they now enjoy on Government-financed ships.

The bill as it comes to the floor of the House would eliminate any differential. I only hope that Members will keep their minds open and listen to the argument as to why this elimination of the entire differential is wrong and why a 4-percent differential is in the best interest of preserving a shipyard industry on the west coast.

These are the facts on which I submit my argument.

The Congress, in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, established as a matter of national policy that shipbuilding facilities and skills must be maintained on all coastal areas of the United States as a mobilization basis for national defense.

If a Member does not subscribe to that policy and to the need of an American merchant marine in the time of war then, of course, there is no need for multicoast shipyard facilities. But those military leaders who have studied the situation say that shipyard facilities on a dispersed basis are essential. Section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, seeks to assure such dispersed facilities by providing that if the amount of a bid of a shipbuilder on the west coast, in connection with Government-financed ships, for an applicant for construction differential subsidy, whose principal base of operation is on the Pacific coast is not more than 6 percent above the amount of the lowest responsible bid for a shipyard on the Atlantic coast, the Administrator shall approve the west coast bid.

This is in accord with national maritime policy of maintaining an adequate shipbuilding industry against possbile need of war or emergency.

Despite this so-called 6 percent provision of the law, to which non-west-coast shipyards have registered strong opposition a recent Maritime Administration study shows that the great bulk of merchant shipbuilding, both private and subsidized, has been on the east coast. Of 307 delivered since 1952, or under construction as of January 1, 1962, bid awards in spite of the 6 percent, bear in mind, were 72 percent to the east coast yards and only 9 percent to the west coast. The study shows the east coast has been awarded 179 vessels, the gulf coast 25 vessels, the Great Lakes 22 vessels, and the west coast only 19 vessels, and if I recall only 5 of these latter 19 vessels were awarded under the existing preference in favor of west coast yards.

Originally the 6 percent was established to offset the higher costs of materials and the building of a ship on the west coast. This higher cost was due in large measure to the fact that these materials had to be purchased on the east coast and there was a freight differential.

The Maritime Administration has testified in recent years that this 6 percent was too high and that 4 percent was a more reasonable figure. A review of the operations of 15 shipyards was made by the Maritime Administration to obtain basic cost information for a study which it was making for the Commerce Committee of the other body. The finding and conclusion of the study was that the cost of shipbuilding on the west coast exceeds that of the east coast by 4.2 percent.

Members of the House from the west coast who are on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, such as myself, had agreed to abide by the results of the maritime study. All we ask now is that our colleagues consider the facts as to why this 4.2 percent is needed.

To begin with we believe that if H.R. 1159 is passed and the 6 percent eliminated the west coast shipyards will be put out of business. We believe that it is essential to preserve those yards.

One reason a west coast shipyard industry is essential is to maintain competition. We fear that the trend otherwise will be toward the elimination of the smaller yards and toward the concentration of the ship construction business in one or two very large east coast shipyards. In this latter case many of us would feel all construction differential subsidy might just as well be eliminated. There would be no mobilization defense base unless there was dispersal, and as for me, Mr. Chairman, if all the shipbuilding is going to be concentrated in one or two localities I will not feel justified in supporting a merchant marine construction subsidy.

I think that I should show in the record that I have received a great many telegrams in support of the 4.2-percent differential as supported by the Maritime study and its agency and the Department of Commerce report. I will not take the time of the committee, but it is sufficient to say that they come from the Governor of our State, from responsible labor unions and chambers of commerce. All agree that repeal of the 6 percent will mean the loss of future payrolls in the western shipbuilding industry and a serious economic blow to that area. All feel that a continuation of the shipbuilding activity in the West is essential to defense and it cannot be maintained without the 4.2 percent as recommended by the study.

I urge, Mr. Chairman, Members to read the minority views on the report of H.R. 1159. They make it clear that the action of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee report on H.R. 1159 in June 1961 was premature.

Before Members of the House decide how they are going to vote I hope they will consider the facts and support the amendment at the appropriate time to substitute 4 percent for 6 percent.

Mr. Chairman, it will be a sad day for the American merchant marine and the maritime industry if this unjustified and ill-advised legislation is passed without amendment.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING].

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1159 repeals an outmoded discriminatory and unwarranted provision of our merchant marine law, which as now constituted affords Pacific coast shipyards a discriminatory advantage in bidding in competition with shipyards throughout the rest of the country. Existing law—section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936—provides that in bidding for shipbuilding contracts for certain ships—those built for ship operators headquartered on the Pacific coast and operating on routes to and from the Pacific coast—in the Federal Government's subsidized merchant marine replacement program, west coast shipyards must be awarded the contracts even though they bid higher than shipyards on the Atlantic, gulf, or Great Lakes coasts by as much as 6 percent. In other words, in supposedly competitive bidding, west coast shipyards are given a 6-percent headstart or preference over all other bidders.

Although this may seem to some Members of the House to be a narrow, technical measure, it has in fact important implications for every Member of the House and every section of the country, because existing law, which H.R. 1159 would repeal, embodies a statutory discrimination in favor of one section of an industry and one section of the country against other sections of the same industry and other sections of the country in dealings with the Government. I know of no other act of Congress containing such a discriminatory provision and I know of no other industry in which Congress or the Federal Government discriminates in favor of one section against others.

This discriminatory provision, moreover, causes direct losses not only to American-flag ship operators, who in these days of shipping depression and foreign competition can ill afford it, but also to the American taxpayer. The 6-percent preference provision which H.R. 1159 would repeal will be applicable in the next few years in connection with contracts for the replacement of more than 60 ships in our subsidized merchant fleet of more than 300 ships. These 60 ships will cost some $11 million each or a total of some $660 million—report No. 548 at page 6, 1961 hearings at page 222. If the 6-percent discriminatory preference operates in connection with all of these ships, their total cost could be increased by almost $40 million, of which one-half will be paid by the American taxpayer and one-half will be borne by American-flag steamship operators struggling to compete with low-wage foreign operators. In addition, the same situation will obtain with respect to an indeterminate number of ship conversion contracts.

Is there any justification for retaining this discriminatory provision? When the law was enacted 26 years ago, the west coast shipbuilding industry was practically dormant. The sponsors of the 6-percent provision justified the discrimination as a device for fostering shipbuilding on the west coast for national defense reasons. The west coast had little heavy industry and no steel production, so that shipbuilding components, material, and steel had to be transported from the East. The transportation cost made it difficult for west coast yards to compete with eastern yards, and the 6-percent preference was calculated as a measure to offset that transportation handicap.

Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of the act of 1936, my predecessor, Congressman Bland, made this statement on the floor:

> Mr. BLAND. I remember that when that question was up before the committee, during the framing of the act of 1936, that there was considerable opposition on the part of the Atlantic coast shipyards to the granting of this construction differential. I was personally approached by several of them and was told how bad it would be. I reminded them that we are facing an awfully hard fight in getting the Merchant Marine Act of 1935—it was passed in 1935, and it became the act of 1936—passed. I said: "If you want to abandon your fight in Washington, then, all right, do not furnish this differential. But if you want to give them an opportunity to construct ships, we have got to provide this differential." I said: "The result will be that there are about 24 votes from the west coast in Congress, and if you do not grant this, I think all of those votes are going to go against our legislation. If you do grant it, we may get them all."
>
> So they said: "If that is the case, you better grant the differential."

Mr. Chairman, now, a quarter of a century later, the preference is outmoded and unnecessary. Many shipbuilding components are now built and sold at competitive prices on the west coast; even east coast yards sometimes resort to west coast suppliers. Since the war two major steel mills have been constructed west of the rockies. The population of the west coast has grown far faster than that of the rest of the country, and industry likewise has grown fastest on the west coast. Some 24 percent of all existing prime defense contracts are in the hands of west coast contractors.

The west coast shipbuilding industry is now as strong as that in any other section, Atlantic, gulf, or Great Lakes. During the war some 44 percent of all of the vast tonnage of ships built in this country's great effort—17 million out of a total of 38,500,000 tons—was built in west coast yards—1960 hearings at page 67. At the time of the hearings on H.R. 1159 last spring, there were some 61 ships under construction in the Federal Maritime Administration's vessel replacement program. Of these, 14 were in west coast yards and 47 in Atlantic, gulf, and Great Lakes yards—1961 hearings at page 295. These figures are very favorable to the west coast when compared with the relative capacity of the yards: 10 available building ways on the west coast and 74 ways on the other coasts—1961 hearings at page 257. The west coast industry is therefore as vigorous as that in the rest of the country.

Time after time the west coast yards have proved their ability to compete without benefit of the 6 percent preference. On at least two occasions in the merchant marine program west coast yards have been the low bidder and have received the contract without benefit of the 6-percent preference—Marad comparison of bids received 1955–61. On numerous other occasions west coast yards have bid within a few percent of the lowest bid from other sections—far less than the 6 percent contained in the present law. Moreover, west coast shipyards have been most competitive in bidding for naval contracts, where no 6-percent preference applies. At the hearings last spring the representative of the Navy Department testified as follows—1961 hearings at page 199:

> In recent years, however, with the growth and diversification of west coast industry, private shipyards in that area have shown an increasing ability to compete successfully for Navy ship construction. The development of basic supporting industries, the application of improved techniques, and the achievement of greater efficiency in shipyard operations have helped to improve the competitive position of the west coast shipbuilding industry.
>
> As the previous witness outlined in his statement, several major awards on a competitive basis during the past year or so have offered convincing evidence that west coast yards have definitely overcome their former disadvantage in bidding on Navy ship construction.
>
> For example, in March 1960 a Puget Sound firm bidding on a nationwide competitive basis was the lowest bidder on three guided-missile destroyers (DDG) and received a contract for approximately $47 million. In November 1960 another Seattle firm was successful, in a nationwide bidding, in obtaining an award for two DDG's, at a price of approximately $29 million. Only a few days ago, a San Diego firm, again as a result of countrywide competition, submitted the lowest of 7 proposals received in response to invitations sent to 22 shipyards. This firm was awarded construction of a combat stores ship (AFS) at a price of approximately $18 million.

Mr. Jeremy Ets-Hokin, a former member of California's shipbuilding committee and president of Ets-Hokin & Galvan, one of the major opponents of H.R. 1159, wrote in an article in Iron Age magazine for April 28, 1960, that west coast yards can get along without the 6-percent discrimination and boasted that west coast yards had $100 million worth of work in progress—1960 hearings at page 291.

Thus, the justification for the discrimination has disappeared. Yet, the west coast continues to demand its benefits. Opponents of repeal say that further study is necessary. But many studies have been made and are complete, without any evidence justifying a regional discrimination. In 1960-61 the comptroller general made a study of comparative shipbuilding costs and was unable to reach conclusive results. In 1961-62 the Maritime Administration made a study of comparative shipbuilding costs. recently completed. That study concluded that west coast shipyards were at a 4 percent disadvantage as compared with east coast yards, but 2½ percent of the 4 percent is a reflection of higher wage rates on the west coast. In 1936 the sponsors of the 6 percent preference repeatedly made clear that wage rate differentials were not considered in fixing the 6 percent—a study setting forth their position is part of the record of the 1960 hearings at pages 100-107. The entire 6 percent basically was intended to offset the freight rate handicap involved in the transportation of materials and components. The Maritime administration's 1961-62 study reveals that this handicap has now been reduced to 1½ percent.

The Maritime Administration's study further shows that east coast yards are at a disadvantage in comparison with gulf and Great Lakes yards, yet no one has suggested giving the east coast a discriminatory preference in bidding. And certainly no one can validly urge that the now vigorous Pacific Coast shipbuilding industry should continue to benefit from a provision no longer needed to encourage its growth.

Supporters of this sectional discrimination also contend that the House may disregard its impact because it has applied to only five ships since 1936. These statements are misleading, because the merchant marine replacement program has been operative only during the past 5 years—in the first 20 years of its existence this part of the law was largely inoperative because of prewar, wartime, and postwar conditions. Since the program became operative in 1957, 13 ships have been subject to the 6 percent provision, and 5 of these have gone to west coast yards under the 6 percent preference at an additional expense to taxpayers and ship owners of some $3,700,000. Moreover, four others have gone to west coast yards under other provisions of the law, including two on which a west coast yard was low bidder—1961 hearings at pages 222 to 223. The heavy impact of the 6 percent preference will therefore occur in the future, and now is the time to repeal that provision.

For these reasons I urge the House to enact H.R. 1159.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNING. I certainly will.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I am sure the gentleman, because of the statements he has made previously, understands that the matter involved here is not a matter of economic hardship in one part of the country or the other. It is purely a matter of national defense, which is the basis for the act; is that not so?

Mr. DOWNING. That is certainly true, but the Defense Appropriation Act is certainly for the national defense of this country, and that act specifically provides that this money not be spent in the manner which the present law provides.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOWNING. I am delighted to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is because there is no other industry comparable to the shipbuilding industry. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNING. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, it may be true that this original law did not start out because of economic hardships as suggested by the Speaker, who is opposing this, who has pointed out what dire consequences would happen and what an economic hardship it would impose on the west coast if this unfair measure were repealed. By the same token, we have this situation on the east coast as well. We have hundreds of workers out of work in our shipyards on the east coast now, largely due to this piece of legislation which was passed in 1936.

Mr. DOWNING. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DOWNING. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with what the gentleman from Maryland said about the very fine representation which the gentleman from Virginia gives to his constituents. I can testify to it, but I would not want my good friend from Maryland to leave the impression that because in over 25 years, five ships, and only five ships, have been given to the Pacific coast because of this differential, that this can possibly be responsible for the lack of work in the shipyards on the east coast.

Mr. DOWNING. I shall attempt to answer that argument at a later time.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. As I understand the gentleman's position, he opposes the existence of the differential section of the act, but does support section 502(f) which is the allocation section of the act and that irrespective whether or not it would cost the Government any more or any less than allocation under the differential section.

Mr. DOWNING. The west coast is fully and completely protected by section 502(f) which provides for the allocation of ships to those shipyards and shipbuilding areas which are suffering from economic hardship and which will not be able to keep up their yards to a readiness standpoint so far as national defense is concerned. The west coast need not worry. You have that protection in the law.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNING. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to commend the gentleman for his views with respect to the manner in which shipyards had expanded on all coasts, as was apparent to the committee. We concurred in that view but differed only in respect to whether ships should be allocated. It was my view that they should be allocated under the 6-percent differential section. It is the gentleman's view that they should be allocated, if necessary, under what we called the allocation section. I commend the gentleman for his views in that respect, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOWNING. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNING. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1159. I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from Maryland, sponsor of this measure, Congressman GARMATZ.

The residents of my colleague's district, the Third Congressional District of Maryland, have been brilliantly served through the years by him. The bill today is one more outstanding example of his fine representation not only to his district, but to the entire State of Maryland.

The State of Maryland and the other east coast shipbuilding interests have a vital stake in the bill now under consideration. I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for a most straightforward presentation of the real issue before this body today. There have been many statements made containing dire predictions as to the effect on our Nation's defense effort in the shipbuilding area by opponents of this measure. I believe that the Department of the Navy is well qualified to speak in terms of our national defense effort in the field of shipbuilding. Adm. R. E. M. Ward, Chief of Legislative Affairs, in his letter to the chairman dated May 9, 1961, states:

> The Department of Defense has no convincing evidence that west coast shipyards are now at a significant disadvantage.

While the Department did not take an official position on this legislation, surely it is reasonable to assume that if the slightest danger existed of impairing our defense posture and our capacity to absorb attack, as opponents claim, then the Navy would have a clear responsibilty to oppose this legislation.

The issue then is pure and simple: Is there any longer a need for the present

6-percent differential now applied in favor of Pacific shipbuilders? The committee has adequately justified its recommendation that discrimination against east coast shipyards is no longer required because cost differentials existing 20 years ago are no longer in existence today.

Opponents of the repeal of the 6-percent differential are strangely silent on the committee's statements and recommendations concerning section 502(f) of the present act. The allocation authority contained in this section, in my judgment, is a far more effective and certainly more fair system for preserving shipbuilding facilities on either coast rather than retention of the present arbitrary and discriminatory differential system. The Navy Department has used a similar allocation authority successfully for many years. Much of the confusion concerning true cost is caused by the fact that the Maritime Administration and its predecessor agencies have never given effect to section 502(f) of the act that originally required extensive surveys by the agency of privately owned shipyards to determine capabilities. The recommendation by the committee to make it mandatory that such surveys be conducted at least once a year is clearly a much needed amendment and will enable us in the future to legislate constructively with detailed information readily available.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER].

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the preferential 6-percent differential presently enjoyed by shipbuilders on the Pacific coast in connection with bids is completely discriminatory and should be repealed.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 included this preferential treatment allegedly to compensate for the competitive disadvantages caused by higher shipping rates on the west coast and to build up the industry on the Pacific coast.

If this was the case at that time, it certainly is no longer a valid reason. It now works as a grossly unfair competitive advantage for west coast yards and hurts our east coast and Gulf States shipbuilders. The 6-percent west coast differential is particularly offensive to my State of Maine. The Bath Iron Works, Bath, Maine—one of the Nation's oldest shipbuilders and a substantial employer in our State—is placed at a serious disadvantage.

In the State of Maine the effect of climate in winter months increases the cost of shipbuilding operation each year considerably. The west coast, particularly California, does not have this expense to consider. In Maine, buildings have to be heated as well as ships. There is no legitimate reason to continue to subsidize west coast shipyards. To do so will injure yards in other parts of the country. Already Great Lakes Engineering Co. has gone out of business and several of the east coast yards are losing substantial sums of money.

The Maritime Administration has reported that a 4-percent differential now exists with three-fourths of this differential due to higher wages paid to west coast shipworkers.

Why should the Government subsidize a high wage area in awarding contracts? This is inflationary and is a dangerous principle for Congress to uphold.

I hope a majority will vote to repeal this outdated and unfair differential.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and take this opportunity to congratulate the committee that has sponsored it and associate myself with the views of those who hold that this differential is no longer necessary for the west coast shipbuilders.

However, I am going to take the time allotted to me to call to the attention of the Congress something that I think is more important than this differential and that is the inroads that are being made today on our shipbuilding all over the United States by foreign competitors. The district I represent in the Delaware Valley and along the Delaware River has historically been one of the great shipbuilding areas of these United States and during both World Wars served the Nation faithfully and well. I can say to the House that today shipbuilding in the Delaware Valley is drying up. It is drying up because of the inroads that have been made and are now being made by foreign shipbuilding.

I would like to relate for the Members of the House just one small incident in which I was personally involved. I found that a shipyard in my district was trying to get some subcontracting work from another shipbuilding company in the United States which company was the prime contractor on a U.S. naval contract to build a U.S. naval warship. I found that the prime contractor was subletting work on that naval ship, being paid for with American dollars, to a foreign shipyard. In this instance, it was a foreign shipyard of a friendly nation, but nevertheless it was a shipyard outside of the United States. At the same time not only the shipyard in my district, but I am sure shipyards in the districts of a great many Members of this House, could have done that work. When I asked the president of the shipyard in the United States that was building the ship under a prime naval contract why it was that he was permitting subletting to go outside the United States, his answer was frank and honest and very simply this, "the price is cheaper."

Members of the House, I think it is about time for all of us to recognize that the day of the ship is not over and that the safety and general welfare of the United States demands that we continue our shipbuilding industry. I would therefore particularly commend the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] for his amendment which requires that instead of periodic examinations to determine whether allocations of ships without competitive bidding are necessary, that these examinations be made at least once a year. In this way necessary shipbuilding facilities can be preserved.

Mr. Chairman, let me close by saying one of the most historic of the shipbuilding companies along the Delaware River is now shutting its doors because it has no work. I would suggest that if the periodic examinations had been made, it would have been determined that an allocated ship was in order. It seems to me we have come to a point in our development of shipbuilding where we must look to the preservation of American shipyards. Unless foreign competition is effectively met by this Nation we may find ourselves without warships or the facilities and skills to build them when this country is threatened by our enemies. I urge a full study and immediate remedial legislation.

I support the present bill and urge its passage.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from New Jersey who has made a vigorous fight in behalf of the shipbuilding industry in the Delaware Valley. I would also like to express my support of the bill, H.R. 1159. I believe that this differential is absolutely unnecessary and is costly and discriminatory. I strongly support this bill. I thank the gentleman for yielding and congratulate him.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to lend my strong support to passage of H.R. 1159, the bill designed to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in order to eliminate the 6 percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders.

There might have been a time when this 6 percent differential was justified, having as its objective the neutralization of certain economic advantages of the East over the West and, thereby, encouraging the development of a diversified shipbuilding industry in the interest of national security.

However, there certainly is no need for any such equalizer today, for enough years have elapsed since 1936—when this differential was instituted—to permit the shipbuilding industry of the West to adjust to certain economic facts of life. There is considerable evidence to suggest that such an economic adjustment has been effected and that any economic disadvantage that might have visited with the shipbuilders of the West has now been dissolved.

Mr. Chairman, it would be eminently unfair to keep this differential in effect, for it would operate to extend an economic advantage to one geographical section of our country over another.

this would be inconsistent with the theme of equal treatment that is basic to the purpose and the function of our American Government.

My State of Maine is known the world over for the ships it builds; however, shipbuilders at home are feeling, and felt, the economic pressures that always confront those engaged in a competitive effort in a free economy.

To keep this 6-percent differential in effect would be to extend a subsidy to west coast shipbuilders that is denied to makers of vessels in the East. This would result in comparatively higher costs for our eastern shipbuilders and absolutely higher expenses for the taxpayers of America.

The 6-percent differential is outlandishly outmoded and should be struck from the lawbooks by the Congress. H.R. 1159 would perform this correction, and I heartily urge that the House act forthrightly to approve this legislation.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I think this bill as it stands is a bad bill, an unfair bill and an unwise bill, and I further believe that the Members of this body will not approve it as it stands if they thoroughly understand what is proposed.

To do so possibly would destroy the west coast's shipbuilding industry, and I am sure no argument is required to convinence anyone that this not only would be contrary to the country's best interest, but potentially could threaten the Nation's security in some future crisis or cause defeat in some future war.

In 1936, the Congress decided in its wisdom that maintenance of a west coast shipbuilding capacity was sufficiently vital to grant that coast a 6-percent advantage in bidding on building contracts for certain ships in the Maritime Administration's program for replacement of vessels in the Merchant Marine. This program is subsidized to make it competitive with foreign shipbuilding costs.

The subsidy applies to construction activity on all coasts, of course. However, it was felt then that the Pacific coast could not compete without a small bidding advantage because of higher labor and materials costs. In my judgment, the facts show that this most emphatically still is true.

The differential—and it applies only to a small fraction of the ships in the program, as I shall explain later—was fixed at 6 percent and remains at that figure today.

H.R. 1159 would eliminate the differential entirely, and I warn you that if it should become law we likely are destroying a great industry and imperiling our country's security.

Last summer, when this bill was before the Committee on Rules, west coast Congressmen generally urged that it be allowed to proceed no further until a survey could be made of the actual present differences in costs of ship construction on the Pacific coast, the gulf coast, and the east coast, as well as the Great Lakes.

We said we would abide by the result of the survey. Such a survey just has been completed by the Commerce Department's Maritime Administration. It shows the Pacific coast's shipbuilding costs are 4.2 percent higher than on the Atlantic coast.

Honoring our commitment, we are willing to accept this figure, and an amendment will be offered later in these proceedings to make the subsidy 4 percent instead of the present 6 percent.

Now just how much of a proportion are we talking about here? From the fuss that is being made, one might conclude that the west coast has been monopolizing the construction contracts at issue.

Quite the reverse is true, as the following figures will substantiate.

The Maritime Administration's present replacement program calls for building 300 vessels. Seventy-eight contracts have been let to date. Of these 78, only 17 of the contracts went to the Pacific coast, and only 5 of the 17 were awarded on the basis of the 6-percent differential in bidding.

As the differential has helped the Pacific coast obtain only 5 ships of 78 contracted for on all coasts, I fail to understand how the other areas can plead they are being hurt. Must they have all of the work, and so eliminate shipbuilding on the west coast entirely, with resultant peril to the defense posture of the country?

The other side of this coin is to ask why a mere five contracts are so important to Pacific coast yards. In reply to this, let me point out that the five awards comprise almost one-third of the total work allocated to my coast in the period involved. Even so, the operation was marginal at best. Without this work, this industry could not survive on the west coast. It is the difference, to put the facts in simplest terms, between a shipbuilding industry and no shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast.

I wish to emphasize the importance of a differential to both the west coast and to the Nation. The 4 percent we shall propose constitutes a substantial amount in bidding upon construction and conversion contracts.

Let us look briefly at some of the statistics provided by the Maritime Administration in its report to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Overall, these reports firmly have established that the west coast suffers a 4.2-percent disadvantage, stemming principally from higher material and labor costs, in both construction and conversion contracts.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. In spite of the figures the gentleman has shown, is it not an undisputed fact that six ships were allocated to the west coast or awarded to the west coast by virtue of a low bid, regardless of the 6 percent?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Regardless of the 6 percent they outbid the east coast yards on those ships and got the contract?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let us straighten out what the gentleman is asking. What he is asking is, Did not the west coast yards get those ships without benefit of the differential?

Mr. COLMER. Right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. On a competitive bid?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is true. But that is explained by the yards in this way: They made a loss on the bids on these contracts to keep the yards alive. They were willing to take a loss on a contract so they could hold their crews together and keep their yards operating. This does not mean they are really competing with the east coast.

Mr. COLMER. Is it not a fact that because of the highly competitive bidding situation in ships in the last few years—in other words, they have all been in bad shape—the others bid below the cost of production of the ships?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I judge that is true, but it is not true on all bids. I do not know about these bids. It would depend on the situation in the various yards.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I think the record will show that the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. in 1961 had a very profitable year. It earned $7 plus per share, which is more than they had earned in previous years, which was $6 plus. I think it is generally known that some of our west coast shipyards have been operating at very substantial losses.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I know the situation ascribed to the west coast yards is accurate.

Of materials used in ship construction, by far the most significant single item is steel. In relation to the east coast, steel was found to be 10.6 percent higher to west coast yards, with the Great Lakes and the gulf coast 2 percent and 0.9 percent above the East, respectively.

That disposes of the statements that have been made in the last hour about the steel production we have on the west coast. The Maritime Commission found our steel cost out there was still more than 10 percent greater than it is in the case of an east coast yard.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I would also like to point out that in the Maritime Report the statement is made that more than three-quarters of the materials, excluding steel, used in shipbuilding is manufactured in the Northeast part of the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. That is in the Maritime Administration Report.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. We have heard a great deal about the lumber that goes into ships and the preferential position the west coast finds itself in because of the lumber that goes into ships. I was almost convinced this was right until I again rechecked to find out that less than one-half of 1 percent of the cost of building a ship goes into lumber. That is in the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The cost of the lumber that goes into modern ships is as the gentleman has stated.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. It is nothing but the scaffolding they use around the ship.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is very minor.

The major west coast product used in ship construction is lumber. One thousand board feet of lumber, suitable for merchant ship construction, is valued at $73 in Seattle, but brings $105 in Baltimore, $100.25 in Philadelphia and $108 in Boston. However, the proportionate costs of steel and lumber in a representative vessel show the availability of lumber to be a miniscule advantage. More than three-quarters of the materials—excluding steel—used in shipbuilding are manufactured in the northeastern part of the United States. Clearly the costs of shipment of materials and component parts is a major factor in computing the contractual disadvantages to west coast yards.

The Pacific coast is justifiably proud of the contributions made by the trade union movement to productivity. Technical skills have developed. Wages are high. The cost of living is 6.6 percent higher than on the east coast and 16.3 percent higher than on the gulf coast.

The report of the Maritime Administration shows that labor costs on the west coast place it at a serious competitive disadvantage. The report discloses:

> The average cost of direct and indirect shipbuilding labor is about 7 percent higher on the west coast, about 3 percent lower on the gulf coast, and based upon somewhat incomplete data about 7 percent lower in the Great Lakes area than on the east coast.

Our national defense posture demands that merchant shipbuilding and repair facilities be maintained on each coast. Defense considerations are several: first, the availability of repair and conversion centers in times of national emergency must be guaranteed; second, skilled technicians and craftsmen, trained in modern processes and in handling the latest equipment, must be available; third, American industry, including the shipbuilding industry, must be widely dispersed; fourth, an efficient and modern merchant marine fleet must be at all times available to meet U.S. demands for transoceanic hauling.

During the early 1900's, merchant ship construction in the United States fell far behind that of other leading powers, increasing amounts of American oversea shipping being hauled by foreign flag carriers. With the advent of World War I, British and German ships either were swept from the seas or were otherwise occupied. U.S. shippers were at a loss. The entry of the United States into the war brought even more extensive demands upon the then existing maritime industry. Construction was ordered to meet the demands of both war and peaceful service and to reinstate the United States in the ranks of major maritime powers.

The lesson of World War I was to serve America well. The United States suddenly found itself in need of a merchant fleet and naval vessels as well—but legislation was not sufficient to effect this. In large part because of the lack of ready facilities and skilled workmen, the ships were delivered after the war's end.

World War I was followed by a period of studies and stagnation. Skilled workmen, drawn to west coast yards from the East—the emergency over—lost their employment and in many cases were lost to the industry.

By 1935, the world was preparing for a new crisis; and the United States this time benefited from the experience of the earlier era. Calling for a comprehensive program of merchant marine development dispersed to all our shores, Congressman Wesley Lloyd, of Washington, looked sharply to the future, observing:

> If past history is any guide to future events it would be wise indeed—and I speak of this country generally—to provide adequate shipbuilding facilities upon the Pacific coast now.

Looking forward to the war in the Pacific, Congressman Lloyd continued:

> The time may come—I hope that such an eventuality will never occur—but if the time does come when it is necessary to repair ships in time of emergency, our Government yards will never suffice.

Congress passed and sent to President Roosevelt the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which included the 6-percent differential presently under discussion. During the war years which followed, labor and management combined to meet the challenge of despotism in Europe and in Asia.

As after the First World War, the shipbuilding industry cut back its work force and converted to peaceful endeavor. Again laborers were left jobless. In November of 1944, there were 493,000 people employed in Pacific coast yards. By 1959, only 13,600 remained. An industry subject to such fluctuation with concomitant periods of idleness is not calculated to attract bright, energetic young men. The maintenance of facilities and the development of skills, crafts, techniques and know-how, subject to rapid mobilization in time of emergency, requires more than sporadic economic stimulation in periods of crisis.

Workers with technical skills, trained for the shipbuilding industry, are absorbed during periods of cutback by other industries, the yards thus losing their training investment. Clearly the shipbuilding industry, especially on the Pacific coast, is unstable. Should Congress, ignoring the findings of both the Federal Maritime Administration and the General Accounting Office, abruptly and arbitrarily eliminate the west coast differential by approving this bill unamended, the results to the western shipbuilding industry would be disastrous. Such action would cause mass dislocation within the industry, disrupt the economic balance of the area, and prompt the dismissal of workers who lack the economic flexibility to migrate to other areas.

Let us face the situation before us as honestly as possible. The American maritime industry, in both operation and construction of cargo vessels, is basically artificial. If left alone in the unfettered economic marketplace, U.S. oceanic freight would be hauled in ships of Japanese or Polish construction, sailing under Liberian or Panamanian registry, and manned by Pakistani or Greek crews. It is political policy rather than economic law which governs the U.S. merchant marine.

Congress consistently has recognized the need for adequate, readily available shipbuilding facilities on all coasts for emergency use and a merchant fleet under the American flag and American control. For this reason, Congress has passed legislation to protect the standards of American merchant seamen. In effect, it has raised a tariff wall to protect American industry against the competition of foreign-made vessels—because it was in the national interest to sustain this vital industry. In the same fashion, Congress has established the Pacific coast differential to sustain this industry on that coast, because it is in the national interest.

Mayor Gordon S. Clinton of Seattle has noted:

> We have here (in Seattle) the facilities to build ships. We have a backlog of experience gained in two World Wars. We have a pool of trained and experienced manpower, which unfortunately is growing smaller each year through lack of shipyard jobs.

These are resources we cannot afford to waste. I respectfully urge the Members of the House to weigh carefully the deleterious effect upon the west coast shipbuilding industry and upon our national defense posture which would result from the passage of H.R. 1159 without amendment.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, there follows a rather detailed history of the 6-percent provision in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended.

THE 6-PERCENT PACIFIC COAST SHIP CONSTRUCTION DIFFERENTIAL; A HISTORY OF SECTION 502(d) OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

In 1936 the U.S. Congress recognized the need for establishing a comprehensive program of governmental assistance and regulation to secure for this country the strong merchant marine which is so vital to our economic welfare and national defense. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 has continued to this day as the foundation of our maritime policy. Although it has been amended to meet the demands of the postwar era, its objectives are even more important now than they were during the 1930's. The experience of World War II, the long-term cold war competition in which we have been engaged, and the increasing role of foreign trade in a world which has become more economically interdependent, have given American shipping and shipbuilding a stronger national priority.

In 1936 the shipbuilding industry of the United States was concentrated on the east coast, and earlier Government financial assistance had been given to eastern shipyards. Because of higher costs, Pacific coast facilities were unable to compete for ship construction, yet at the same time there was a significant volume of west coast trade, and furthermore national defense required a geographically dispersed shipbuilding facility. The importance of adequate facilities on each coast was dramatically proven some 6 years later when Japan attacked Pearl Harbor, and the Maritime Commission made its most extensive shipbuilding expenditures along the west coast.

Fortunately, Congress was aware of this problem and included in the 1936 act two provisions to encourage the expansion of Pacific coast shipyards. One of these was found in section 509 of the 1937 act, which provided for Government aid in the construction of certain vessels for domestic trade, whereby the applicant could make an initial payment of not less than 25 percent of the cost of the ship with the remainder to be paid within 20 years. The minimum interest rate on these deferred payments was to be three-fourths of 1 percent lower than the specified rate for those Pacific coast based ships which were owned by applicants whose principal place of business was located on the Pacific coast and for which the lowest Pacific coast bid did not exceed the lowest Atlantic coast bid by more than 6 percent of the Atlantic bid. According to testimony presented by the Maritime Administration last year in hearings before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, section 509 has never been used because of the Government's policy of using title XI mortgage insurance.

The second provision, section 502(d), is the one with which we are concerned today. Let me quote for you this section as it read in the original act:

> In case a construction subsidy is applied for under this title by an applicant who has as his principal place of business a place on the Pacific coast of the United States (but not including one who, having been in business on or before August 1, 1935, has changed his principal place of business to a place on the Pacific coast of the United States after such date) to aid in the construction or reconditioning of a vessel to be operated in foreign trade in a service, route, or line from ports on the Pacific coast of the United States, and the amount of the bid of the shipbuilder on the Pacific coast who is the lowest responsible bidder on such coast for such construction or reconditioning does not exceed the amount of the bid of the shipbuilder on the Atlantic coast of the United States who is the lowest responsible bidder therefor by more than 6 per centum of the amount of the bid of such Atlantic coast shipbuilder, the Commission shall, except as provided in subsection (e), approve such Pacific coast bid, and in such case no payment shall be made to aid in such construction or reconditioning unless the applicant accepts the bid of such Pacific coast shipbuilder and agrees to designate and continue as the home port of the vessel to be constructed or reconditioned a port on the Pacific coast.

Thus, the 6-percent differential applies only to ships operating from Pacific coast ports and owned by companies whose principal place of business is on the Pacific coast. There is the further restriction that if a company was in business before August 2, 1935, and later moves its principal place of business to the west coast, it may not benefit from section 502(d).

SUPPORTERS

There is not time to develop completely the legislative history of this 1936 provision. However, it is helpful to note the groups supporting it and the reasons used for its justification. During 1935 and 1936 a similar differential was being considered for naval ships, and it was in 1936 hearings regarding these vessels that Representative Richard J. Welch of California, stated:

> Congressman Carter (of California) and Congressman McGrath (of California), since they have been here, and I have been trying for years through a separate bill to get a differential provision in favor of Pacific coast ship construction.

It was Representative Welch, a harbormaster for the port of San Francisco from 1903 to 1907, who seems to have been the principal proponent of the Pacific coast shipbuilding differential. During the extensive hearings held by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the spring of 1935 on developing an American merchant marine, Mr. Welch, a member of the committee, introduced the following amendment:

> In the administration of the preceding paragraph of this subsection, the interest rate with respect to periods of construction, equipment, reconditioning, remodeling, or improvement of vessels on the Pacific Coast, and of operation of such vessels in the coastwise trade on the Pacific Coast, in the intercoastal trade, and/or in the foreign trade to and from Pacific Coast ports, shall, (1) in all cases provided for in the foregoing paragraph where (but for this paragraph) the minimum rate of 5¼ per cent per annum would be applicable, be not less than 4½ percent per annum, and (2) in all cases provided for in the foregoing paragraph where (but for this paragraph) the minimum rate of 3½ per cent per annum would be applicable, be not less than 2¾ per cent per annum. This paragraph shall not apply with respect to any period in which the vessel:
>
> (1) Does not continue as its home port a port on the Pacific Coast of the continental United States,
>
> (2) Is operated in coastwise trade other than on the Pacific Coast, and
>
> (3) Is operated in intercoastal or foreign trade except to and from ports on the Pacific Coast. This paragraph shall apply only to loans made after the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act, 1935.

It was on this amendment, which was similar to section 509 in that it granted an interest rate differential of three-fourths of 1 percent, that testimony was given during the House hearings on a Pacific coast differential. Appearing to testify in favor of the Welch amendment were the following Representatives: Frank H. Buck, Clarence F. Lea, Charles J. Colden, John J. McGrath, Florence P. Kahn, Thomas F. Ford, Albert E. Carter, John F. Dockweiler, George Burnham, John H. Tolan, and John M. Costello—represented by his secretary, Charles Kramer—all of California; William A. Ekwall, and James W. Mott, from Oregon; and Knute Hill, Marion A. Zioncheck, and Wesley Lloyd, from Washington. Both Representatives Carter and Lloyd stated that they had introduced bills calling for a differential.

In addition, there were supporters of a differential from other sections of the country. Cleveland A. Newton, speaking for the Mississippi Valley Association, stated:

> We are very much interested, I might say in sympathy, with the amendment of Mr. Welch. We think it is bad policy to have all the ships built in one section, or to have all the shipping lines owned in one section.

Representative William I. Sirovich, of New York, a member of the committee, commented:

> Mr. Chairman, I am in full sympathy with Mr. Welch, of California, that we ought to have a development of the merchant marine, of the docks and yards there on the Pacific coast, because in the event of war on the Pacific we would have nothing to protect ourselves.

Mr. H. Gerrish Smith, president of the National Council of American Shipbuilders, also supported a differential favoring the Pacific coast.

In hearings being held before the Senate Committee on Commerce during this same period, a differential was supported by Walter J. Petersen, representing the Pacific American Steamship Association and the Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast.

JUSTIFICATION

What reasons did its supporters give for establishing a differential? In the first place, they pointed to the existing state of shipbulding on the Pacific coast. In 1935, in addition to the Navy yards at Mare Island, Calif., and Bremerton, Wash., there were five shipbuilding and ship repairing companies on the Pacific coast: the Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. at Los Angeles; the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corp., at San Pedro and San Francisco, Calif.; the Moore Dry Dock Co., at San Francisco; the General Engineering Co., at San Francisco; and the Todd Seattle Dry Docks, at Seattle, Wash. However, only possibly one of these yards was capable of building a ship of any size, and it would have to build additional ways for this construction. According to Mr. Welch no ships had been built on the Pacific coast for foreign or intercoastal trade since World War I, although Mr. Smith, of the National Council of Shipbuilders, mentioned that the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corp. had built two ships for Hawaiian trade in 1921 or 1922. Mr. Welch also pointed out that none of the $150 million in Federal loans which had been made to shipbuilders had gone to Pacific coast yards. In addition, the extent to which major emergency repairs could be made at these shipyards was subject to question. Thus, the United States to all intents and purposes had no west coast shipbuilding industry.

It seems quite obvious in view of these conditions, resulting from the higher

Pacific coast costs which I shall mention later, that the Pacific shipbuilding industry could only be expanded if it were granted special concessions. In the free economic marketplace the west coast could not compete with the low bids of its eastern competitors. The introduction of a west coast differential would to an extent mean abandoning the allocation of shipbuilding on the basis of economic efficiency alone. The reasons most frequently advanced for this less economic allocation of resources was that of national defense. It was this reason which was repeatedly stressed by Representative Welch not only in the House hearings but also on the floor of Congress. Let me quote briefly from one of his statements on this subject:

> The purpose of our Navy is national defense; the purpose of our merchant marine is to act as an auxiliary navy for national defense. Neither of these purposes can be attained without adequate shipyards located on both our Atlantic and Pacific coasts capable of meeting any emergency when national security is endangered * * * If the Pacific coast is to have national security, now only given to the Atlantic coast, this differential must be allowed * * * These facilities (for ship construction and repair) should always be available for there is no sounder insurance for the security and protection of our west coast than the ability of our naval forces to cope with any emergency that might arise. Delay in providing these facilities may prove as costly as the Nation's experience in the World War.

If there were no adequate shipyard facilities on the west coast, the ships would have to go through the Panama Canal or, if that were cut off, around Cape Horn.

In addition to the use of national defense as the major justification for this preference, several persons pointed to the effect that expansion of the Pacific coast shipyards would have on employment. This, of course, was an especially important factor during the depression days of 1935. Two other important lines of argument were advanced by the witnesses. Shipping along the Pacific coast during peacetime required adequate shipyard facilities, as was pointed out by Representative Ekwall:

> But aside from the ever-present danger of war, it seems to me the Pacific coast is entitled to considerable recognition; because a great deal of the shipping of the future will be on the Pacific, and our ports will necessarily be involved in all of that shipping.

Another argument justified the differential on the grounds that although it favored one section of the country because of its higher costs, this was no different from the policy of granting subsidies to American shipping and shipbuilding, because its costs were higher than those of its foreign competitors. Representative Ford, of California, explained this reasoning, stating:

> But the thing that appeals to me the strongest is that the amendment is absolutely in harmony with the philosophy of the bill; because it attempts to do in America, between the different geographical divisions, what we are trying to accomplish with reference to other countries. The bill gives this country an even break with the others. Mr. Welch's amendment gives the west coast an even break with the east coast.

COST DIFFERENTIAL

What was the cause of the higher costs on the west coast? Several witnesses mentioned the higher interest rates that prevailed there. However, the primary factor was the higher transportation cost for Pacific coast ship construction. V. B. Bendix, a ship and freight broker from New York City, submitted for the record a statement in which he placed responsibility for most of the cost differential on the use of Pittsburgh-plus pricing by the steel manufacturers. Regardless of whether this type of pricing system was used, the fact remains that with the advent of the metal ship, the steel and most of the material used for ship production had to be procured from the eastern part of the country. The differential was intended to compensate for the higher freight rates paid by shipyards along the Pacific coast.

In the 1936 hearings on the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 the following exchange took place between Senator Nathan L. Bachman and Senator Royal S. Copeland, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce:

> The CHAIRMAN. It is necessary to carry steel and certain other products which are developed only in the East to the Pacific coast; therefore, they could not operate on a parity with an Atlantic seaboard shipbuilder, because of the added cost of materials which they would use. In our committee last year, you may recall that we argued rather extensively over the percentage. At first it seemed as if it might be 10 percent, but finally, after getting some figures from shipbuilders and others, it seemed to us that the 6-percent differential was the fair one, and that is the reason that figure crept into this bill.
>
> Senator BACHMAN. Did labor costs enter into that?
>
> The CHAIRMAN. No; I would not think labor costs entered into it so much as material costs.
>
> Senator BACHMAN. Transportation?
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Transportation.

On the other hand, H. Gerrish Smith, president of the National Council of American Shipbuilders, although feeling that there was hardly any difference in the wage rates on the east and Pacific coasts, in response to a request by Mr. Welch that the council prepare a recommendation for a differential, stated:

> I think it would be based, however, upon such differential as was necessary to cover differences in cost, and that would have to be analyzed. We would have to analyze the wage rates and the transportation charges.

When the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported a bill on June 20, 1935, it substituted for the Welch amendment, a section comparable to section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Mr. Welch later stated that Mr. Smith had prepared a table for him, showing that the three-fourths of 1 percent difference in interest rates on Government loans corresponded to a 6-percent differential.

AMENDMENT

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 became a public law on June 29, 1936. Since that time there has been only one amendment to section 502(d). Section 12 of Public Law 705 of June 23, 1938, provided the words "construction-differential subsidy" be subsituted for "construction subsidy" in section 502(d) and that this sentence be added to the end:

> Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Commission to approve a construction-differential in excess of 50 per centum of the construction cost of the vessel paid by the Commission.

The Senate Committee on Commerce explained the reason for this change as follows:

> The present section does not make it clear whether the Commission is limited to a differential of 50 percent in all cases or whether it can go above 50 percent by the 6 percent provided for Pacific coast ports. In line with the recommendation of the Maritime Commission, the committee believes that the differential should be limited to 50 percent, and the change is drawn to accomplish that purpose.

EFFECTIVENESS

In the 1935 House hearings, Representative Florence P. Kahn made the following prediction:

> I believe if Mr. Welch's amendment is put into law it won't be long before our shipbuilding yards on the Pacific coast will take their place in workmanship and in everything with the finest shipbuilding yards in the world.

This was one of the few statements made at that time which explicitly set forth what it was hoped the differential would accomplish. However, it seems apparent throughout the discussion of this subject that its supporters felt the differential would bring significant help to the Pacific coast shipbuilding industry.

During the next 19 years, however, their hopes proved to be ill-founded, for it was not until July 28, 1955, that the first award was made to a Pacific coast shipyard specifically as a result of section 502(d). The inability of the 6-percent differential to fulfill the hopes of its sponsors was recognized as early as January 8, 1938, when, in a radio address on the merchant marine and the Pacific coast, Joseph P. Kennedy, Chairman of the U.S. Maritime Commission, stated:

> I do not think that this differential is sufficient to assure you any substantial volume of construction under ordinary circumstances. With the volume of work in prospect today, however, there is a strong likelihood of considerable building coming to this section of the country.

In succeeding years there was indeed a great volume of shipbuilding on the west coast. In the war years of 1941 to 1945 the direct cost of west coast ships delivered for the Navy amounted to $2.4 billion and for the Maritime Commission to $6.3 billion. It might be noted here that the Maritime Commission spent a lower amount, $4 billion on east coast ship construction during the same period.

Following the shipbuilding boom of World War II, there was a decline in shipbuilding activity until in 1957 the Maritime Administration began its ship replacement program. I think it may be said that this nationwide decline in shipbuilding plus the limited scope of the 6-percent differential made section 502(d) inoperative during this period. In fact, even today only 5 of the 15 ship operators who hold operating subsidy contracts meet the section's requirements of operating their ships from Pacific coast ports and of having their principal place of business on that coast. These are American President Lines, Pacific Far East Lines, States Steamship Co., American Mail Line, and Oceanic Steamship Co. As of February 1, 1961, these operators owned 61 of the 312 ships in the American subsidized fleet, or about 20 percent. Of the 73 construction contracts which had been awarded by the Federal Maritime Board under the ship replacement program, 13 were for ships owned by these 5 lines and were thus subject to section 502(d).

A table showing the awards for these 13 ships as well as for reconversions to which section 502(d) was applicable was prepared by the Maritime Administration on April 26, 1961, and I would like to insert it in the RECORD at this point:

New ship construction and reconversion awards for west coast operators (Sec. 502(d) applicable)

NEW SHIP CONSTRUCTION

FMB contract No.	Contract date	Number ships	Design	Owner	Contractor	West coast contract price	East coast contract price	Basis of award
73	Feb. 28, 1958	2	C4-S-1q	American President Lines	Bethlehem Steel Co., San Francisco	$30,958,000		Sec. 502(f).
97	Aug. 5, 1959	3	C4-S-1s	American Mail Line	Todd Shipyards, San Pedro	36,016,784		Sec. 502(d).
100	Sept. 22, 1959	2	C4-S-1t	Pacific Far East Lines	Bethlehem Steel Co., San Francisco	27,346,000		Do.
106	Feb. 29, 1960	4	C4-S-1u	States Steamship Co.	Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., Newport News.		$44,841,000	More than 6 percent lower than west coast bid.
134	Feb. 28, 1961	2	C4-S-1u	do	National Steel & Shipbuilding Co., San Diego.	22,220,848		Low bidder without benefit of sec. 502(d).

RECONVERSIONS

FMB contract No.	Contract date	Number ships	Design	Owner	Contractor	West coast contract price	East coast contract price	Basis of award
35	Apr. 26, 1955	4	C4-S-1h	American President Lines	Bethlehem Steel Co., Baltimore		$6,964,440	More than 6 percent lower than west coast bid.
42	July 28, 1955	2	P2-S1-1k	Oceanic Steamship Co	Willamette Iron & Steel, Portland	$27,001,638		Sec. 502(d).
79	July 28, 1958	4	C4-S-1p	American President Lines	Todd Shipyards, Alameda, Calif	7,265,600		Low bidder without benefit of sec. 502(d).
136	Feb. 16, 1961	1	P2-S2-R14	do	Puget Sound Bridge & Drydock Co., Seattle.	8,193,300		Sec. 502(d).
				Total		159,002,170	51,805,440	

Apr. 26, 1961.

As you will see, contracts for 5 of these 13 ships were awarded to Pacific coast shipyards on the basis of section 502(d). Two other ships were awarded to the west coast under section 502(f), and on two other ships the west coast yard was the low bidder and did not need the benefit of section 502(d). The four remaining ships went to an eastern yard whose bid was more than 6 percent lower than the west coast bid. If we include the awards made for ship reconversions, it can be seen that out of the $210.8 million total of these contract prices, the west coast received contracts totaling $159 million; $98,557,922 of this amount was received by the west coast yards because of the differential granted in section 502(d).

I think the effect of the 6-percent differential can best be appreciated if we consider what it has meant to individual Pacific coast shipyards and see to what extent they have been building merchant ships of 5,000 tons or over since 1952. For this purpose, I would like to describe briefly activities at five west coast shipyards.

The National Steel & Shipbuilding Co., of San Diego, Calif., has delivered four merchant ships and has four more under contract, all built under the Maritime Administration replacement program. Section 502(d) was applicable for two of these ships, but by submitting the low bid of $22,220,848, the company did not need to invoke its provisions. Thus, the 6-percent differential has to date had no effect on this yard.

The Todd Shipyards Corp.—Los Angeles division—of San Pedro, Calif., has constructed or under contract five ships, all part of the current replacement program. In August 1959, it received the $36,016,784 contract for three of these ships under the provisions of section 502(d).

The shipbuilding division of the Bethlehem Steel Co. at San Francisco has delivered or under contract 13 merchant ships since 1952. Of the contracts for four ships awarded under the Maritime Administration replacement program, two ships were eligible for the 6-percent differential clause and were awarded on that basis. Thus, in September 1959, this company received a contract for $27,346,000 because of section 502(d).

The Puget Sound Bridge & Drydock Co., of Seattle, Wash., has constructed only one merchant ship, a passenger and auto ferry, since 1952. However, on February 16, 1961, it benefited from the provisions of section 502(d) by receiving a $8,193,300 contract for the reconversion of a ship for American President Lines.

Willamette Iron & Steel, of Portland, Oreg., was the first Pacific coast beneficiary of section 502(d) when on July 28, 1955, it received a contract for $27,001,638 for reconversion of two vessels for the Oceanic Steamship Co.

The 27 ships which these west coast yards have either delivered since 1952 or now have under contract amount to 9 percent of the construction awards made in the United States during this period. It should, however, also be mentioned that in addition to the merchant ships constructed by these yards, the first four yards have constructed since 1952 or now have under contract 14 naval vessels.

RECENT LEGISLATIVE ACTION

At the same time that section 502(d) has begun to bring ship construction to the Pacific coast, there has arisen a move to eliminate the differential. On three occasions, during the past 3 years the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has held hearings on the subject, "to eliminate Pacific coast shipbuilding cost differential."

Many bills have been introduced regarding section 502(d), and numerous articles have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this question.

The division of opinion on this issue seems to lie almost completely along sectional lines, with Pacific coast representatives urging retention of the differential and east and gulf coast interests advocating its repeal. This is an issue which has aroused considerable congressional attention, and many Congressmen from both the East and West have taken time to express their views before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. In addition, representatives of the Western Shipbuilding Association and the Atlantic, Gulf and Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association have presented their respective arguments, as have a number of shipbuilding companies and local interests such as chambers of commerce. In view of its role as a representative of the industry collectively, the Shipbuilders Council of America has not taken a stand on the differential issue.

In both 1960 and 1961, the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries favorably reported bills repealing section 502(d).

PRESENT COST DIFFERENTIAL

The position of those seeking to repeal the 6-percent differential is that conditions have changed markedly since 1936, and there is no longer a cost disadvantage for west coast shipyards. Many arguments have been raised supporting and attacking this contention, and I shall not attempt to deal with them here. I would, however, like to mention the conclusions reached in two recent governmental studies of the relative cost levels of east and west coast shipbuilding.

The first, dated March 1961, was an analysis by the Comptroller General of the 1960 House hearings on the 6-percent differential. I shall refer to this study as the General Accounting Office or GAO study. The second is a study prepared by the Maritime Administration for the Senate Committee on Commerce, entitled "A Study of Cost Factors Entering into Bids for Ship Construction in Shipyards on the Four Coasts of the United States." This report, which was released last month, I shall call the Maritime study. In presenting the conclusions of both of these studies to you, I shall not repeat the many qualifications and complexities which should be studied before a final decision is reached.

In comparing regional steel costs, the GAO study concludes that the cost of steel plates and shapes is about 13 percent higher on the Pacific coast than in other regions, while the Maritime study finds that steel costs are approximately 11 percent higher on the west than on the east coast. The GAO study concluded that costs of most other shipbuilding materials were "higher in varying degrees" on the Pacific Coast as compared with the Atlantic coast, while the Maritime study found these costs to be about 2 percent higher on the west coast. A comparison of the average straight time hourly wage rates on both coasts by the GAO study showed the Pacific coast rates to be approximately 6 percent higher. The Maritime study's comparison of the average cost of direct and indirect shipbuilding labor showed west coast costs to be about 7 percent higher than on the east coast. Because of the limitations of the data used, the GAO study was unable to reach any conclusion as to the overall relative costs of shipbuilding on the two coasts. On the other hand, the Maritime study concluded that, using the east coast costs as the standard, west coast costs were about 4 percent higher, gulf coast costs about 1 percent lower, and the costs along the Great Lakes about 2 percent lower than on the east coast.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the committee [Mr. Ashley].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1159. I think that the House will demonstrate its wisdom if it enacts this legislation today.

A great deal has been said with respect to the comparative costs of shipbuilding. It is the position of the opponents of this bill that it still costs more to construct ships on the west coast than on the east coast, and that therefore the west coast should continue to receive the benefit of the 6-percent differential which was written into the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

But the issue, as I see it, is not whether it costs more to build ships on the west coast. The issue is whether the differential preference is the proper mechanism by which to maintain our shipbuilding mobilization base, which all of us agree is essential.

When the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was written, it was clear that west coast shipyards could not compete with eastern yards on an equal basis. In order to develop a shipbuilding capacity on the west coast to meet defense requirements, it therefore became necessary to offset the advantage enjoyed by east coast builders. As we know, the device which Congress seized upon was the 6-percent differential.

Two years later, however, another mechanism was developed. This allowed direct allocation of shipbuilding contracts to any area of the country where it was found that our shipbuilding mobilization base needed support.

As a member of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, I have listened to testimony over a period of years on this subject and the one conclusion I have come to is that allocation provides the best means of maintaining our defense requirements as far as our shipbuilding capability is concerned.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that I object to the 6-percent bidding preference as a matter of principle because it results in one geographic area of the country being given preferred treatment over other areas. Congress has recognized the danger of such a policy because in no other instance, to the best of my knowledge, has it provided such preferential treatment to one section of the country.

I might add further that if this policy of preference is pursued, I will have no alternative—even though it would be with reluctance—but to request that a special preference be accorded to the Great Lakes shipbuilders, based upon higher costs resulting from severe winters and curtailed shipbuilding seasons. I would suppose, too, that Hawaii and Alaska might present a good case for favored treatment based on geographical factors which affect their costs of construction.

Clearly this is a foolish policy, particularly when precisely the same goal can be achieved far more simply and effectively by allocation.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge enactment of H.R. 1159.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I assume from what the gentleman has said that he supports the allocation principle as against allocating by the 6-percent differential.

Mr. ASHLEY. I am entirely in favor of the allocation system and I know that an amendment is going to be offered to drop it to 4 percent. If the gentleman by his question is indicating that he is in favor of allocation, I should think he would throw his support to the allocation system and not even consider the 4-percent preference amendment that is to be offered.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I would like to answer that, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. As I stated in my remarks previously the Maritime Administrator—I am not speaking of the present one, because I have not talked to him about it, but the people in the previous Maritime Administration informed us in more than one conversation that they preferred to make their allocations under the 6-percent preference allocation rather than the allocation section.

Mr. ASHLEY. I have read the record and I have read the report and I find no such statement on the part of the Administration officials.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Let me clarify what I have just said. I said "conversations." I did not mean to infer that these statements were made at hearings. They were not. But in private conversations before we ever had this struggle in our committee, the Maritime Administration, so far as my understanding is concerned clearly preferred to have it allocated under the 6-percent section because that did not subject them to so much pressure as under the other section. It is for that reason that I would like to see both sections continued in the law.

Mr. ASHLEY. I can understand the gentleman's position and I take his word implicitly. But I think it is unfortunate that the hearings do not reflect the statements he has just recited.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Eighty Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 72]

Alger
Andrews
Anfuso
Bailey
Bass, N.H.
Battin
Blitch
Boykin
Buckley
Celler
Chelf
Conte
Cramer
Curtis, Mass.
Dawson
Dowdy
Elliott
Fascell
Frazier
Hays
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Ichord, Mo.
Jones, Ala.
Kearns
Kee
Kelly
Lesinski
McMillan
Mason
Miller, N.Y.
Moulder
Patman
Pillion
Powell
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riley
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Rousselot
Schadeberg
Scott
Smith, Va.
Spence
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Vinson
Walter
Whitten
Wickersham
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Zelenko

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 1159, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 380 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment and congratulate the gentleman from Ohio, a member of this subcommittee, that has been studying this bill for the last 3 years. I want to associate myself with him in favoring passage of H.R. 1159, because I feel that this legislation is long overdue. I can recall that we gave to the west coast this benefit back in 1936 when they needed it. Of course, since that time they have prospered and now we feel it is only fair and just and right that it should be eliminated. We have the same problem as some of the other sections. We have to do our work with the problems of heating and lighting up in the Northeast.

So, Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman and his Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, much of what has been said today has been repeated, it has been said over and over. This is a subject about which I cannot help making this comment. One hundred years ago about this time this Nation was torn apart in a conflict between the North and the South. The gentleman from Mississippi has now started a new conflict between the East and the West. I guess things were just a little too quiet.

Some comments were made about the history of this act. It was adopted in 1936. It was proposed by the gentleman who immediately preceded me as a Member of this body, the late Richard Welch. Contrary to attempts to qualify the position of another gentleman on the committee, the late Judge Bland of Virginia supported the writing of this proposal in 1936. It was done after a detailed study of the entire merchant marine needs of this country.

In World War I we found ourselves deficient in our ability to give logistic support in a worldwide conflagration. Friendly nations' vessels had been destroyed. So we suddenly set up shipbuilding on both coasts. Immediately after the war we made the tragic error of letting shipbuilding go down and letting our shipyards deteriorate.

In 1933 there was a study instituted by the House and one by the Senate. The House looked into the needs for shipbuilding capacity and the Senate looked into the needs for ship operating and the need for operating subsidies. Out of these studies came the 1936 Merchant Marine Act.

It was hoped that the enactment of that law and the experiences of World War I would be a lasting lesson to the people of the United States and to those in Government. All this does is say that in view of the differences in the cost of steel and other materials that go into a vessel for building on the west coast a 6-percent differential in the bid price shall be allowed.

Why was this done? It was enacted in recognition of the very important need for maintaining shipbuilding capacity on all the coasts of the United States. This is a fact which has been subscribed to by every speaker today whether he is for the bill now pending before this body or against it. Even with the enactment of the act it meant nothing to the west coast. From 1936 until 1954 there were no ships awarded to any west coast yard under the 6-percent differential provision. Sad to relate, we did not learn a lesson as the result of our waste after World War I. We did the same thing after World War II. We found our merchant marine down in World War II. The Government took money and built shipyards on every coast, in every swamp area, in every bit of tideland they could find, on all four coasts and on the rivers throughout this country. If we had not done it the good Lord knows what the outcome of World War II, particularly in the Pacific, may have been. We had to have ships and we built them. Then we started on a program which came from a joint study made by civilians and by military personnel and by those in the old Maritime Commission as to the real needs of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that what I have to say may not be of much interest to a great many because evidently so many have made up their minds not on the facts that may be involved but on a geographical location from which they come.

I was raised in a school where you never assume that the other fellow has the votes or that you have yours; you fight till the last bell rings. I am sure there are some people here whose minds are open and who do not know all about this, so if I can just reach some of them I will be perfectly happy and perfectly pleased despite the slight disturbances by those who have made up their minds.

This study recommended the building of a merchant marine at the rate of about 30 vessels a year to replace the war-built vessels. It was recognized by all those who were involved that we were a major nation in world trade, that foreign countries who were shipping countries did not have ships, and that we were the only reliable factor for the world. We started a program which has never been carried out to its full fruition because we have never yet in a single year achieved the 30 ships per year.

For the first time in this building program, about 7 years ago, some ships were ordered on the 6-percent differential. Immediately thereafter bills were introduced to abolish the differential. Five ships have been awarded on this basis to the Pacific coast. Out of 294 ships conceived in the replacement program, 56 were awarded to Atlantic and gulf coast yards and 17 to the Pacific coast. Of that 17, 5 ships were under the section allowing the differential.

This is a low minimum—a low minimum carrying out that which was recognized after some years of study and restudy by those who administer the very act we are now trying to amend. At the request of the committee in the other body, a study was made because this has been argued back and forth in the committees now for 3 or 4 years. There were efforts to get the facts in the hearings on the House side and in the hearings in the other body, and in public expressions whenever it was mentioned. Those from the Pacific coast had said, if the 6-percent differential does not apply today, and if the facts show we are not entitled to it, we would be bound by the study and by the facts and the figures that are adduced therefrom. What fairer position could anybody take, I ask you? If we are not entitled to the 6 percent or to a differential, we are not entitled to it and we do not want it. And today we do not want the 6 percent. This is because the Maritime Administration study shows that the present difference in the cost of building a ship on the Pacific coast and building in the east coast yards is 4.2 percent.

Mr. Chairman, why do we think it is fair that we continue to get that differential on the same basis and for the same reasons that the differential was originally granted? It is on the same basis and for the same reasons that every speaker on this floor to this moment, whether he has been for or against the bill, has pointed out that it is in the interest of national defense that we should have shipbuilding facilities on every coast of our country. If you eliminate the differential, you are crippling the shipbuilding potential of the west coast where 44 percent of your ships were built in World War II.

There has been talk about there not being any work in the eastern yards. Let me make clear to those who may not be familiar with all of the ramifications of the shipbuilding program in this country that it is a complex, varied, and mixed program and has no application and no relationship whatsoever to the building of naval vessels. This only applies to the building of merchant vessels used in the foreign trade routes assigned by the Department of Commerce Maritime Administration. It applies to vessels built for the Pacific coast companies that have offices and operating headquarters on the Pacific coast and who operate in the Pacific trade.

If we had complete peace at this time, there might be some logic in casting the differential provisions aside at this time and saying, "Well, we do not need shipbuilding on the Pacific coast and the yards on the east coast and the gulf coast and possibly yards on the lakes can do the work." But we are not at peace today, we are at war. While I am standing here talking and while you are listening to me, we are at war in South Vietnam. Yet, some of you would destroy the capability of the shipyards on one great coast of our country to contribute to the defense of our country, and that in one of the most important elements of defense, namely, cargo- and personnel-carrying vessels.

Something else was said a while ago, and I am sure I must have misunderstood the colloquy between the two gentlemen, to the effect that the Secretary of Commerce did not support or did not recommend the 4.2-percent modification. I have before me a copy of a letter addressed to a member of the committee, which letter is signed by the Secretary of Commerce, in response to an inquiry by the member of the committee.

In the Secretary's letter he quotes a report from this Department dated May 17, 1961, referring to this bill:

> With respect to the repeal of section 502(d), or its extension to vessels to be operated from Pacific coast ports by operators

> whose principal place of business is not on the Pacific coast, we consider this to be peculiarly a matter of congressional policy. We think, however, that as an alternative to eliminating the differential, consideration might be given to reducing it to 4 percent.

The letter continues:

> There is no change in the position of the Department of Commerce on this point from that expressed in our letter of May 17, 1961, as quoted above.

A great many people, Members of this distinguished body, will vote because of their geographical location. I am sure everybody's desire is for getting all the work he can for his district and his constituents. I can appreciate more than many people what it means when some worker thinks he sees a job opportunity flying away. I know what it might mean to the owner of a plant, of a shipyard, or of an operation somewhere who thinks he sees the possibility of continuing in the occupation he has put his whole lifetime into and all his investments. But we are talking now about changing policy that was established not to give work to the Pacific coast, not to take work away from the east coast or the gulf, but to broaden the defense base of these United States so that we will have a shipbuilding capability on all sides of us. Today more than ever, in this age of hydrogen bombs, one coast might be wiped out with a couple of drops, and it behooves us to keep every bit of shipbuilding capacity and capability. Pray God we do not need any of it for defense, and please, Lord, let us use it for peaceful means, but please guide this House to keep everything we have, to keep this country strong and ready at all times. We can best do it by either defeating this bill or adopting the amendment inserting the 4-percent differential in its stead.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY AND BALANCE OF WEEK

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have been requested to advise the House as to the program for the balance of the day and for the balance of the week.

This is the last legislative business on the program for this week.

If this bill is finished at a reasonable hour this evening, it is the plans of the leadership to ask consent to go over until Monday. If it is not finished at a reasonable hour, and I must say there seems to be a little uncertainty about that, we will have to come back tomorrow.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. Is the gentleman in position to give us the program for next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Not at this time.

Mr. HOEVEN. Will he be before the House adjourns today?

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the gentleman I would like to announce the program after the disposition of this bill.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman says "if we finish it at a reasonable hour." Then I assume we could go over until Monday if that were done, and I am just impressed with the idea that the Members generally would prefer to stay here a little longer and finish this matter rather than have to come back tomorrow. I just throw out that hint for what it is worth.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1159 and urge my colleagues to vote for this bill. The repeal of section 502(d) and a portion of section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is long past due.

As most of you know, these provisions were made a part of the law during the war years when it was necessary to our national defense that we establish a shipbuilding industry on the west coast. We all realize that such an undertaking required that certain advantages be extended to the west coast operators until they could firmly establish an effective plant for construction of vessels for the defense effort. Therefore, the 6-percent cost differential was justified at that time, but it is not justified today. It is a well-known fact that the west coast now boasts a shipbuilding capacity almost equal to that on the east coast.

I think it is time we all recognized that legislation enacted for a specific purpose in time of war was never intended to be continued as a permanent drain on the Treasury. We must admit that the 6-percent cost differential granted west coast operators was an emergency measure—and the emergency is over. This law has served its purpose and it should be repealed now. It has already been in force too long—costing the taxpayers millions of dollars in subsidies.

It is well to remember that the west coast shipbuilding industry has the advantage of having an entirely new steel industry—also built at the taxpayers' expense. In fact, the entire west coast plant was financed by the Government.

Under the present law, the west coast shipbuilders can submit a bid 6 percent higher than the east coast builders and they will still be awarded the contract. I know of many instances during the past 10 years when the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co. was the low bidder on a Government contract but the contract was awarded to the west coast yards under section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act. I would like to ask my colleagues how we can justify this additional cost of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. Personally, I think it is a wasteful and unnecessary practice and should be abolished.

The city of Baltimore—with a great shipbuilding industry potential, one that has made its mark in history—has never asked for any particular favors. They have never received a subsidy from the taxpayers and they do not ask for one now. All we ask is that the industry be treated fairly and justly and be given an even break when bidding on Government contracts. They are not getting an even break when the Federal Government subsidizes the west coast shipbuilding industry.

I would like to ask my colleagues to carefully consider one simple question. What possible justification is there for adding millions of dollars to the taxpayers' bill each year, and throwing thousands of people on the east coast out of work, just so a ship can be built on the west coast? My answer is that we cannot justify such actions. It simply does not cost 6 percent more to build a ship on the west coast than it does on the east coast.

Therefore I urge the Members of this body to vote in favor of this bill, H.R. 1159, to stop this unfair competition fostered by the Government, stop this waste of the taxpayers' money, and stop this unreasonable contribution to our unemployment problems.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, H.R. 1159, which is designed to repeal the preferential differential for west coast shipbuilders. The present law, which this bill seeks to correct, provides that when a construction subsidy is applied for by a Pacific coast shipowner in aid of the construction or reconditioning of a vessel to be operated in foreign trade from ports on the Pacific coast, the lowest responsible bid by a shipbuilder on the Pacific coast shall be approved by the Government, if such bid is not more than 6 percent higher than the lowest responsible bid of shipbuilders on another coast. The home of a vessel so constructed or reconditioned must continue to be a port on the Pacific coast.

This provision has outlived its original purpose and has in fact become a plain discrimination. It is time it was repealed.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in vigorous support of H.R. 1159. Whatever may have been the justification for the inclusion of the discriminatory differential favoring the west coast ports, its continued existence is indefensible.

We have all witnessed the tremendous expansion of the west coast since the beginning of World War II. The development of its economy has given the West steel production facilities which permit Pacific coast shipbuilders to procure major ship components at competitive prices, thus eliminating the most frequently cited justification for the differential.

It cannot be reasonably argued that considerations of national security require the continuance of the differential. Indeed we must maintain a shipbuilding mobilization base on all coasts, but a price differential which discriminates against the majority of the Nation's shipyards is not the way to do it. There is a specific provision in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, section 502f, which gives the Secretary of Commerce power to preserve shipbuilding facilities on all our coasts. H.R. 1159, in fact, strengthens this provision by requiring annual rather than periodic survey.

Mr. Chairman, justice demands that we repeal this outrageous subsidy. I urge the passage of H.R. 1159.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER].

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, we have seen a great deal of froth here today on the glass of beer that means nothing. It is without substance. We have continuously heard the argument that the 6-percent differential is responsible for the lack of work in the east coast and gulf coast shipyards. This is a fallacy, and you may just as well lay it to rest now. The reason there is no work in the east coast or gulf coast shipyards is the same reason that there is no work in the west coast shipyards.

I want to assure the gentleman from Baltimore that the shipyard workers in San Francisco are just as enthusiastic as the workers in Baltimore in their demands to work.

Mr. Chairman, we have a number of factors that enter into this. We have not kept up with our merchant marine program. We have fallen for some siren songs that tell us that by appropriating more sums of money to the airplane industry, that the merchant marine is no longer necessary in time of war. We can send troops overseas in planes, but we cannot support them overseas with planes.

Now, let us take a look at our merchant marine today. In 1952 the prestige ship *United States* was built. She is now 10 years old. The life of a ship is 20 years. It takes 5 years to build a ship like the *United States*. A sister ship to the *United States* would provide lots of work in a shipyard, perhaps one of the great shipyards close to Washington, because it would have to be built on this coast.

Three years ago this committee and the Congress authorized the building of a sister ship to the *United States*, but Congress has never given us the money to build it. So, you people who are complaining about work for your shipyards come to the Committee on Appropriations and get the money to build this ship, and you will relieve some of the unemployment that you are concerned with.

The *Independence* and the *Constitution* are the next two biggest ships under the American flag. They were built and went into operation in 1953, and no plans are made to replace these ships. The *America* is now 20 years old and has to go into the reserve fleet, and it was to replace the *America* that we authorized the sister ship to the *United States*. This has gone on and on, and that is the reason there is no work in your shipyards today.

Instead of an interesting fight, if those of you who are interested in the welfare of your shipyard workers will join together with us, maybe we can get some work in the shipyards of America, but you are not going to get it by trying to pull one another down and saying there is no work.

There is no question but what there is a differential in the cost of doing business on the Pacific coast. This has been proven over and over again, but this is not the reason that we have not worked to produce or that you have not worked. It is because we have not provided the money for this work.

Let me point out to you that we are going into the Common Market. We are on our way into it whether we like it or not; we have to enter it. And, when we get into this Common Market, are we going to allow the merchant carriers of the world to dominate our trade? Are we going to be dependent on English shipping, on French shipping, on Italian shipping, or Japanese shipping? Are we going to be dependent on this type of shipping? Why, we would place our neck into a noose as far as our exports are concerned, as far as the goods reaching their destination is concerned.

Some time ago the secretary of one of the Scandinavian countries came before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and said that the United States is a wealthy country and that they should not have a merchant marine; they should let the small countries carry the goods of the world. Where would this leave us? Not only in the interest of national defense must we have integrated shipbuilding on every coast of the United States, but in the interest of our own peaceful economy we have got to have this type of operation.

Mr. Chairman, the quicker we realize this, and the quicker we forget the petty jealousy that has come up—because it is the apparent excuse that you can immediately point to in this 6 percent controversy and get down and realize what we are talking about the quicker you will forget this bill. The quicker those of you who are interested in defense and in protecting the commerce of the Nation will get down to seeing that the maritime industry of this country is modernized and operates efficiently, the better off we will be in America.

Mr. Chairman, the British have come out with three 40,000-ton ships that leave England and go into the Pacific. They touch our ports, they touch Canadian ports, and they go on back. These are the ships which keep the British flag flying. They well understand the situation in the far Pacific and give Britain an edge. Unless we take appropriate action we will rapidly lose the American position in the world marketplace.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1159 which would completely eliminate the 6-percent differential now applicable to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders.

Studies conducted in 1936, Mr. Chairman, revealed that shipbuilding costs on an across-the-board basis were approximately 6 percent higher on the Pacific coast than in eastern yards. Recognizing this fact, and also recognizing that a healthy, vigorous shipbuilding industry on all coasts is in the best interests of our country, Congress provided a 6-percent differential for west coast yards. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this was a wise policy decision at that time and that it has served our economic and security interests wisely and effectively for more than 25 years.

This 6-percent differential for the most part has not constituted a competitive advantage for west coast shipbuilders. Rather, because of the substantially higher wages and material costs that must be met by shipbuilders on the west coast, this differential has merely enabled them to compete on an equal basis with other shipbuilding regions.

I believe it is important to point out, Mr. Chairman, that these increased costs on the Pacific coast are not the figment of someone's imagination. The Comptroller General of the United States in March of last year reported, among other things, that wage rates at these yards were approximately 6 percent higher that comparable rates on the Atlantic coast, and that in the case of steel plates and shapes, the average was 13 percent higher.

Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware that cost figures can change and that a differential established in 1936 is not necessarily applicable today. Furthermore, if a differential for west coast shipbuilders was no longer justified, I would certainly not oppose its removal today.

The fact is, however, that after 7 months of intensive study the Maritime Administration reported only last month that the cost of shipbuilding on the west coast exceeds that of the east coast by 4.2 percent.

This is an authoritative study, Mr. Chairman, and I do not believe that its findings can or should be ignored. Rather, I believe that the House should weigh this report carefully in making its decision; that H.R. 1159 in its present form should be defeated; and that the amendment which will be offered at the appropriate time—an amendment to provide a 4-percent differential for Pacific coast shipbuilders—should be adopted.

Such action would be in the best security interests of our Nation by maintaining a strong Pacific coast shipbuilding industry—an industry which would be prepared in times of national emergency to build needed ships as it does now.

Such action would be in the best economic interests of our Nation by at least maintaining the present level of employment in these yards instead of further aggravating the already serious unemployment problem confronting the workers of this important industry.

Mr. Chairman, the report of the Maritime Administration makes it clear that shipbuilding costs on the west coast are 4.2 percent higher than those on the east coast. The Secretary of Commerce has recommended that a 4-percent differential be adopted, and I urge our colleagues to support an amendment which would provide a 4-percent differential for

Pacific coast shipbuilders as being in the best interest of our Nation.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. We have held hearings on this bill and have deliberated upon it for many months. It is right, it is timely, and it is just.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland, the cosponsor of the bill [Mr. Brewster].

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1159. I wish to compliment and commend my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Garmatz], for introducing this measure and also commend him for his vast knowledge of this subject. I am pleased to comment that I myself introduced a companion measure, H.R. 316.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues must surely agree that it is incumbent upon this Congress to approve only those laws which provide fair and equitable treatment and equal relief to all segments of our society and every geographic region in our Nation. There is certainly a corresponding duty and moral obligation to strike from the Federal statutes laws which do not meet this fair and equal treatment test.

We are today presented with a signal opportunity to meet this latter obligation by voting for passage of the bill now under consideration. The purpose of this bill is to repeal a section of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which confers a preferential bidding advantage on shipyards situated on our country's west coast.

The continued existence of this inequitable preference can no longer be justified. It results in one geographic area of the country being given a special advantage by legislative fiat. On this basis alone, this preference should be repealed, but there are other equally compelling reasons for changing the present law.

It is well recognized that the overriding consideration at the time of original enactment was the proper concern of the Congress for the maintenance of our national defense through the establishment of a two-ocean shipbuilding capacity. The hard fact is that the original reason for granting this competitive advantage to west coast concerns no longer exists. In fact, if the law were written today, a strong case could be made for granting an artificial competitive advantage to east coast yards for precisely the same reasons—the maintenance of a two-ocean shipbuilding capability.

A recent report submitted by the Maritime Administration concludes that the cost of shipbuilding on the west coast exceeds that of the east coast by approximately 4 percent. This same report shows that costs on the gulf coast are 1 percent lower than on the east coast, and that in the Great Lakes area these costs are 2 percent lower than those in the east. I question the conclusions contained in this report.

If the opponents of this bill honestly believe that west coast yards still need this artificial advantage when bidding for shipbuilding contracts, then I call on them to press their points to its illogical conclusion. Let them sponsor legislation which confers a 1 percent advantage to east coast yards when they are in competition with gulf coast yards and a 2 percent advantage when they compete with yards located on the Great Lakes.

Not long ago, Secretary of Labor Goldberg joined me and the Governor of my State on a tour of the industrial complex in the Baltimore metropolitan area. At the beginning of the tour we visited one of the principal shipbuilding and repair yards in Baltimore. In some of the shops the members of our official party greatly outnumbered the workmen still gainfully employed there.

If we give proper consideration to our overall defense requirements, it is absolutely essential that we maintain our pool of highly skilled and experienced shipyard workers, who serve our east coast yards. The collective know-how of these men is vital to our national security. The dissipation and eventual loss of these special skills would have serious effect on our country's ability to meet the demands of an emergency. Certainly they should be allowed to compete on a fair basis.

Passage of this bill will correct an injustice, strengthen our shipbuilding industry nationally, and effect substantial economies for both the Government and the shipowners.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, after an express agreement by western interest, and what was assumed to be tacit agreement by the East—to abide by the results of a Maritime Administration audit, and let its findings resolve a 3-year controversy over the 6-percent shipbuilding differential—eastern interests, intent on full repeal, have now ignored Maritime's findings and succeeded yesterday in persuading the Rules Committee to report out H.R. 1159, a full repeal bill, which Rules had held up last year awaiting this very audit.

Under the law, the differential stands at 6 percent. A 7-month Maritime audit, just released on March 21, 1962, says the actual differential should be 4.2 percent or "about 4 percent." Western House Members, shipbuilders, and practically the entire press on the west coast, repeatedly stated that the West should and would abide by what the Maritime Administration audit said. While no such public commitments were made by the East, there was full East-West cooperation with Maritime in the study, and no effort was made to report the bill out of Rules until after the audit was released.

Western shipbuilding, which has lived on the crumbs of the shipbuilding program—17 out of 78 ships—is stunned. The express purpose of the Maritime Administration study was to determine where the differential should be pegged. Without the differential in the law, the West would have had only 12 ships, instead of 17. The East has built 61.

In the name of fairness, I ask the House to vote for the amendment to change it from outright repeal to 4.2 percent which will be offered.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I strongly support the legislation now before the House. I urge the House to pass H.R. 1159, and I base my argument on grounds which are not tied to the geographic location of congressional districts.

In maintaining and extending a 6-percent differential in favor of Pacific coast shipyards, this House is sitting as a sort of court. It must determine that there is a national need, that Pacific coast shipyards, workers, and communities are making a unique contribution to that need and that such contribution is being made at a financial sacrifice which should be compensated from the National Treasury.

Before this determination can be made the House must have facts. The testimony on this bill is voluminous, but is not all factual. Such facts as have been submitted are complex and, in some instances, contradictory. In such a case, we must turn to the most qualified and least interested witnesses. Among these is George H. Staples, Associate Director, Civil Accounting and Auditing Division, General Accounting Office, whose testimony appears on page 46 of the hearings. On page 49 Mr. Staples said:

> Based on our analysis, our opinion is that the information on regional shipbuilding costs presented by the respective regional shipbuilding interests and the related testimony of these interests, all as contained in the record of the hearings, are not sufficiently complete, reliable, or accurate to support the contentions of the respective interests or to serve as a sound basis for determining relative shipbuilding costs.

What Mr. Staples has told the committee and the House is that there is no evidence upon which to grant a verdict against the entire country in favor of the west coast. And what a judgment would follow upon such a verdict. It would not only be a money verdict to be satisfied by tax dollars paid into the Treasury by all of us, but also in jobs, and paychecks and depressed areas created not by economic fluctuations, but by governmental preferences.

The opponents of this bill have been careful to employ the term "equity" in reference to the 6-percent west coast preference. They have been scrupulous to avoid using the term "subsidy," and the Members who have let the word creep into their vocabularies have been corrected or chastised by their colleagues. We do not have to spend time in debating a choice of words. The facts speak for themselves and the people of this country will know whether or not we have voted to continue a subsidy not supported by the facts.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House who desire to extend their own remarks at this point in the RECORD may do so on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation which repeals provisions of the Merchant Marine Act requiring certain approval of bids by Pacific coast shipbuilders.

The need for so-called construction-differential subsidy contract awards no longer prevails. In fact, I am convinced that under present conditions the west coast yards are receiving an unfair advantage over those on the east coast. These Pacific coast facilities have now developed economically to a point where they can directly and fairly compete with facilities in other parts of the Nation.

The U.S. Navy allows no differential, yet Pacific coast shipbuilders have been able to obtain awards of Navy ship contracts on a low-bid basis in competition with yards along the Atlantic and gulf coasts and the Great Lakes.

Section 502(f) of the Merchant Marine Act provides the machinery for allocating work to west coast yards in order to maintain mobilization capability, should it be in the national interest. This authority has been invoked in the recent past and can be invoked again should the need arise.

I strongly believe that the 6-percent differential, in effect, is subsidizing the west coast shipbuilding industry. This is an unfair situation, and I urge passage of H.R. 1159.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the biggest point at issue here is the fact that we are at war in South Vietnam right now and there is every reason for us to keep our west coast shipyards at least in some active status. It is my understanding that a compromise amendment of 4 percent will be offered. I think the amendment should be supported at least in the name of our national defense.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, the principle embodied in the law which H.R. 1159 seeks to repeal is as basic and vital to our Nation's security and strength as the day it was signed. That principle is this: That the best interests of our Nation are served by healthy shipbuilding industries on every coast.

The legislators of that period, when section 502 (d) and (f) were made into law, saw the need for a steady flow of shipping out of the west coast ports, where so many of our Far Eastern interests are centered. World War II and the Korean conflict demonstrated the wisdom of that vision.

Today, the west coast of the United States faces out toward a world in flux: Japan, China, southeast Asia. The day may come when west coast shipbuilding is not merely desirable, but vital to our Nation's survival, as it was in World War II. But it is not wise to wait for that moment before taking the necessary steps to revive west coast shipbuilding. It would be far better to maintain the gains made since the 1936 act.

The Maritime Administrator's findings do not call for the sort of action that H.R. 1159 would take: The repeal of any differential for west coast shipbuilders. The Administrator found that it costs these builders 4.2 percent more to construct a vessel on a west coast port. Should we, therefore, repeal all of the present 6-percent differential on the basis of this report?

I submit we cannot, if the interests of our Nation as a whole are to be served.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1159, to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders.

The effect of this bill is to repeal section 502(d) of the act which creates a discriminatory 6-percent preference in favor of west coast shipyards in bidding for construction contracts for certain ships in the Federal Maritime Board merchant marine replacement program.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this discriminatory provision has outlived its usefulness. Let us examine why it was included in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The purpose was to give a start to a dormant west coast shipbuilding industry in the fact of transportation and material cost handicaps then encountered by west coast shipyards. Now these materials and transportation cost handicaps have been eliminated or very substantially reduced. These west coast shipyards have been competitive with yards on the east coast and in other sections in bidding for both merchant marine construction and naval construction contracts. The Navy now reports that several major awards on a competitive basis during the past year or so offered convincing evidence that west coast yards have definitely overcome their former disadvantage in bidding on Navy ship construction. Therefore, I urge that this bill be passed to end this discrimination against east coast shipyards.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the proposal to place into statute content the 4-percent differential which was reported as equitable by the Maritime Commission study and audit.

We of California agreed before the Rules Committee to be bound by whatever their findings submitted as in the interests of our national defense at this period. If they had stated west coast yards should not have any continuing differential, we would have accepted that finding. We think it is fair for others to do likewise.

Our national defense best interests was the original basis of justification for the 6-percent differential. Our national defense must still be the permanent factor and consideration.

The decision today must not be made on geographical or sectional lines.

Our entire Nation must be kept in ready and fit condition to meet any national defense needs.

Every opponent of this 4-percent amendment frankly admits the west coast yards must also be kept active and ready, but argue that the eastern yards must be kept more so. This, Mr. Chairman, is purely a sectional viewpoint and dangerous to our national defense.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose H.R. 1159, which seeks to eliminate the west coast shipping differential. If the purpose of the bill is, as the Committee report maintains, to equalize the competitive position of various shipbuilding regions, this bill, without amendment, will defeat its own purpose, for, if enacted, it will discriminate against the West and western industry. West coast builders and interested western Members of Congress have accepted the principle of equalizing regional competition. Information as to the precise differential amount was sought and this lack has now been satisfied.

The Maritime Administration audit, completed and published on March 21, is as thorough and authoritative as can be performed on this complex subject. The conclusion of the study—that the cost of shipbuilding on the west coast exceeds that of the east coast by 4.2 percent—supports the need for adjustment recognized by the Committee, but shows clearly that the complete elimination of the differential would not be equitable.

The entire west coast is disturbed by the provisions of this bill, particularly at a time when employment is a grave problem. I may point out here that yesterday I received a wire from the Honorable Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of the great State of Washington, who also expressed his grave concern to the President of the United States and the Speaker of this House. In these wires he said:

> It has come to my attention that H.R. 1159, repealing the existing 6-percent differential for west coast shipbuilding, is scheduled for debate on the floor of the House of Representatives Thursday, April 12. This is a matter of grave concern to the State of Washington and the West. The implications of repeal can mean the loss of millions of dollars in future payrolls in the western shipbuilding industry and a consequent serious blow to the economy of our region. The industry in the West agreed in all good faith to abide by results of a maritime audit. The audit was published March 21 and set the differential for western shipbuilding at 4.2 percent. I am gravely concerned that this issue of such far-reaching importance be resolved fairly and consistent with well-established precedents and practices.

In closing, may I point out that shipbuilding has been an integral part of western industry almost since the first settlements there. Ships for the west coast trade were built and fitted by the Hudson's Bay Co. in the 1830's and 1840's. Trade and the development of trade is a major factor of western life and industry, and to this West the East sells materials. The East's economic health is bound up in the West's prosperity, and certainly in these times of national crises and a desire for all phases of national security, it would be folly to destroy the western shipyards' ability to share this national responsibility.

My own district has an outstanding record of shipbuilding for the war effort during World War II. Yards along the coast should be continually ready and able to build ships necessary for our national development and security.

I urge this House not to make this a nation of region against region, but to consider the total need of the Nation. To this end I strongly urge enactment of the amendment to be proposed which will provide the differential at 4 percent, in accord with the Maritime Administration study.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, one section of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is a clear illustration of how legislation, once necessary and beneficial, now contradicts its original purpose because of changing circumstances.

A quarter of a century ago, west coast shipyards could not compete with eastern yards for ship construction on an equalized bidding basis. Their manufacturing facilities were inadequate, and transportation costs from eastern supply centers made it impossible for them to compete for the major contracts which are the lifeblood of the industry.

Because of the worsening international situation that might eventually involve the United States in a global war, the Congress realized that the shipbuilding mobilization base on the west coast needed development.

Manufacturing facilities for machinery and steel production were insufficient, and there were serious shortcomings in the transportation system.

The west coast shipbuilders needed encouragement and help, so that we would have shipbuilding facilities in that vital area to strengthen our national defense.

It was decided to give them preferential treatment.

Section 502(d) of the 1936 act provided that, when a construction-differential subsidy is applied for by a Pacific coast shipowner to aid in the construction or reconditioning of a vessel to be operated in foreign trade from ports on the Pacific coast, the lowest responsible bid by a shipbuilder on the Pacific coast shall be approved by the Government, if such bid is not more than 6 percent higher than the lowest responsible bid of shipbuilders on another coast. It was specified that the home port of a vessel so constructed or reconditioned must continue to be a port on the Pacific coast.

This foresight and assistance paid off during World War II. The west coast shipbuilding industry expanded rapidly and played an important role in building the bottoms that transported and supplied our Armed Forces that won the war in the Pacific.

With the tremendous industrial development of the west coast that followed, the conditions that, in 1936, made preferential help mandatory, were eliminated.

In effect, the continuing 6-percent cost differential began to work the other way, placing lake, gulf and east coast shipbuilders in a position where they could not compete with the favored west coast shipbuilders.

For climatic and other reasons, it became apparent that lake and east coast shipbuilders had to meet extra costs that worsened their competitive position.

In the interests of strategic balance, it became evident that these shipbuilders now needed help.

The Bath Iron Works, of Bath, Maine, has been building ships since 1890. In spite of its experience and efficiency, in the early part of 1961 it had not had a contract in the previous 2½ years.

The president of that company pointed to the significant fact that the average annual cost due to the winter climate in Bath, Maine, in its shipbuilding operations, based on 1959 and 1960 costs, is $549,000. This covers the extra costs of snow removal, plant heating, fuel, labor, materials, depreciation on the heating system, and so forth. This is a cost that the west coast, and particularly California, does not have at all. Bath is a medium-sized shipbuilder. These costs would be proportionately higher for a big company like the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co. of Quincy, Mass., or the New York Shipbuilding Co.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, after hearing the testimony pro and con, has wisely decided that: "* * * the principle involved in the original enactment of the preferential differential is no longer needed."

The 6-percent cost differential for Pacific coast shipbuilders has outlived its usefulness. It operates against the strategic dispersal and support of the whole shipbuilding industry.

In the interests of national defense it is advisable to eliminate this artificial subsidy for the west coast, and thus make certain that shipyards are maintained on all coasts.

In its place, the allocation of ship construction contracts would serve to maintain a widespread mobilization base, and would be fair, just, and reasonable to all the shipyards.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCRANTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Chairman, however cogent the reasons may have been for orginally enacting the 6-percent differential in favor of the west coast, to the taxpayers, unjustifiable, and clearly discriminatory against the east coast shipyards, and their employees.

There is very substantial unemployment in the east coast shipyards, many men out of work in Pennsylvania and elsewhere who might now be working, so why, may I ask, should there be any such discrimination against them? The differential should be eliminated in good conscience and justice for all in this industry.

The situation today is far different than it was in 1936 when the differential was enacted. Inadequate manufacturing facilities and transportation costs from supply sources were the reasons given then justifying the differential.

Today the Western States have vast manufacturing facilities of all types and the transportation problem is insignificant if it exists at all.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 1159 and sincerely hope the House will support it.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am privileged to be a freshman member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries under the able and courteous chairmanship of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. I am also a member of the Committee on Agriculture. So I am now a member of two committees which deal with subsidies. If I stay here long enough, I might become an expert on subsidies. But let us look at this particular subsidy about which we are talking.

Back in 1936 the Congress in its wisdom decided that the United States needed a merchant marine fleet, built in the United States, for purposes of national defense, and that the only way that that could be accomplished was by providing a subsidy to U.S. shipyards in the form of the Government paying the difference between foreign and domestic shipbuilding prices. At the same time, I assume on good evidence, it was decided that these shipyards should exist on each of our sea frontiers, including the Pacific coast, and in order to have them on the Pacific coast a 6-percent differential subsidy was needed. Now, this brings us up to date.

Mr. Chairman, some people say that this 6-percent differential is no longer needed, but no concrete evidence has been brought forth to support that contention. The only official document of any substance in this area is a report of the Maritime Commission, which indicates that a 4.2-percent differential subsidy is needed. If we consider the original justification in this matter—this subsidy to the entire U.S. shipbuilding industry, and I will stipulate that they are all underemployed, even with the subsidy—we must recognize that there has to be a shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast when we look at the very vital Panama Canal and realize how easily it could be damaged. For that reason, we need shipbuilding on both our major sea frontiers.

The only authoritative report on this subject says that we have to have at least a 4.2-percent differential currently to support a shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast for the needs of the national defense.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. The allocation provision in this bill will make the allocation features of the American merchant marine by the Maritime Board identical with allocations of the Navy. It is my considered opinion that the west coast will be better off with this bill with allocations than they will by retaining the percentage.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I respect the gentleman's opinion. If that is the case and the issue here is to build ships in a given area or not to build them, why this desire to abolish the differential? If the west coast is going to get the same ships under allocation why abolish the differential? The Congress in its wisdom in 1938 added this allocation provision which is designed to bring equity to the totality of shipbuilding facilities. This is a separate proposition not related to the 6-percent differential proposition. I say that if you wish to forget your parochial interest and recognize the validity of the only official recommendation to date on the current need for a subsidy, you will support the Magnuson amendment which will be offered to reduce the subsidy to 4 percent, but leave it in existence.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman uses the word subsidy frequently in his statement. According to the report we have from the Maritime Administration the 4 percent is now designated as an equity in order to meet competition on the east coast—not a subsidy. Whatever may be said about the 6 percent in 1936 it was also for the purpose of creating an equitable situation to have equal bidding on both sides.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I thank the gentleman. When I say subsidy I refer to the subsidy that goes to every shipyard anywhere in the United States.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But you do not refer to the 6 percent as a subsidy.

Mr. HAGEN of California. No. The whole program for shipbulding in this country is a subsidized program based on the premise that it is necessary for the national defense. A corollary proposition is that we have to have shipbuilding on the Pacific coast to meet the needs of the national defense and it has been indicated by experts that some differential subsidy is required to maintain this position.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (49 Stat. 1985), is amended by striking out subsection (d) of section 502.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAGNUSON: Page 1, strike out all of lines 3 and 4 of the bill and insert in lieu thereof: "That section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (49 Stat. 1985), is amended by striking out the words '6 per centum,' as they appear in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the words '4 per centum' ".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is to amend section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act—the 6-percent differential section—to substitute the words "4 per centum", for the words "6 per centum" now in the law. The obvious result is to provide a 4-percent differential for west coast shipbuilding, rather than the 6 percent now existing. It makes no other changes whatsoever in existing law. It does not increase the application of the differential to any greater number of ships, nor does it reduce the number to which it applies. It still can apply to only a maximum of about 55 out of 300 ships—or 1 in 5.

The reasons for this amendment are as follows:

First. In the years of hearings before the Merchant Marine Committee, west coast shipbuilders and west coast House Members, when confronted with conflicting testimony of eastern and western yards as to comparative shipbuilding costs on the various coastal areas of the United States, repeatedly said, "Won't the committee please have an unbiased Government audit performed? If it will, we will abide by its findings, whether they are 6 percent or whether they are 0 percent."

Second. Such a study was commenced by the Maritime Administration last fall and was completed and released on March 21, 1962. It made a finding of 4.2 percent.

Third. All shipyards, east, gulf, west, and Great Lakes, cooperated fully with the Maritime Administration in that study, thus acquiescing in the conduct of such a study, though not in all cases expressly agreeing to abide by its results. Under these circumstances, however, a strong presumption of implied agreement with the study is raised.

Fourth. The Secretary of Commerce by letter dated May 17, 1961, which is contained in the report (H. Rept. No. 548) on this bill, and which states the administration's view, said, "We think, however, that as an alternative to eliminating the differential, consideration should be given to reducing it to 4 percent, which we estimate is currently the differential between the costs of east and west coast shipyards." The Honorable Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, in testimony yesterday, Wednesday, April 11, before the Merchant Marine Committee, stated that this is still the view of his Department.

Fifth. The differential is in the statute for the purpose of maintaining shipyards facilities on the west coast for defense purposes. There is no argument on this point—and all parties in interest agree that shipyards must be maintained there as well as on the east coast. Without this provision—and its companion, section 502(f)—the west coast cannot compete in the 300-ship program now in progress. The east and gulf have obtained 62 of the 79 contracts since 1957. The west has obtained 17, or some 21 percent. However, of those 17, 5 were awarded on the basis of the 6-percent differential, and 6 on the basis of 502(f)—the allocation statute.

Since this amendment meets the administration's view as expressed in the report on this bill last June 16; as expressed in its audit study of March 21, 1962; and as expressed by Secretary of Commerce Hodges just yesterday before the Merchant Marine Committee; and since it obviously will meet the national defense objectives of the statute, it should be adopted.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be allotted to the chairman of the committee, the time to be equally divided.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. May I inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina if he means an additional 10 minutes?

Mr. BONNER. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, it is understood in connection with that motion that the chairman of the committee is to control 5 minutes on this side and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] is to control 5 minutes on that side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not hear that.

Mr. BONNER. The last 5 minutes is to be allocated to the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. CHURCH, Mr. PELLY, and Mr. MAILLIARD objected.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Chair will control the time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, for you Members who came late to the meeting, we have had a lot of country talk today and we have heard several say, "What is this bill about?" Well, it is just a question of whether or not the fine gentlemen from the west coast get to keep a fair advantage—that is all they want—a fair advantage. And if they cannot keep a fair advantage, they would like to keep a middling fair advantage. So that is what the purpose of this 4-percent amendment is. Gentlemen, if you have ever seen a special survey made trying to walk a tightrope, it is this report that they have been talking about how they reached the so-called 4-percent differtial.

The Maritime Administration admits that they gave no consideration to such things as the efficiency of the plant or local taxes and gave no consideration to the productivity of the workmen and the work backlog, and the facilities. If those things were taken into consideration, then there would be no differential at all. Now you are not going to wipe out the shipyards on the west coast because they are still covered by the law which is not being touched, section 502(f). If they are needed for the defense of this country, they will still be there. So I say, let us wipe this thing out and let everybody bid on their own.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, no one is more surprised than I, myself, to find myself speaking on this legislation. I certainly had no intention of doing so when I came to the Chamber today. But I happen to be one of the Members of the House who has patiently sat through 4 long hours of general discussion on this bill, and I am shocked that any limitation has now been put on the discussion of this very important amendment. I rise in protest—and in so rising, feel constrained to express my sound support of the proposed 4-percent differential now under all-too-limited discussion.

Very briefly, because that is all that I am permitted to be, I would like to tell you that I am supporting this amendment because I think sectional interests should be laid aside. I also have shipyards in my territory that might profit from passage of this legislation. However, Mr. Chairman, the national interest merits prior consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and for 10 years have been a member of the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific. This is no moment in history—this is no time in the history of the United States—to take any chance whatsoever in limiting shipyard usage and construction of ships on the west coast. I would beg the House not to pass legislation that would do so, or that would offer any threat that it might do so. The Secretary of Commerce, in his letter of March 17, 1961, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, has stated that currently the differential between the costs of east and west shipyards is 4 percent. In view of the situation at the present moment, when this week we have had two Americans admittedly killed in guerrilla action in South Vietnam, and when we have extended our commitments in the Pacific area in ways not fully to be estimated now by this House, I would say again, take no chance—at least allow the shipyards on the Pacific coast the 4-percent differential proposed in this amendment and make sure that in so doing you keep in being the shipyards which may be needed to save this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will not use the 1½ minutes, for this is a repetition of the point I made in general debate. We on the west coast said 4 years ago that if a change in the amount of the differential less than 6 percent was found to be appropriate we would take it and be bound by it. We agreed that if the study showed that no differential should apply we would be bound by that.

We are keeping our position, we are keeping good faith. We simply ask for the Congress of the United States to keep faith with the defense needs of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, the study by the Maritime Administration is the best study we could have obtained from any organization in the United States. This is one agency that understands this problem. This agency after careful study of all the facts has said that the differential should be 4 percent. We who are most involved agree to this reduction from 6 percent to 4 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts for 1½ minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the afternoon I spoke about the economic situation of the Nation. During the past 10 years the average rate of economic growth has been approximately 3.8 percent per year. Over a 10-year period that means that the national growth should have been 38 percent. In Massachusetts for 10 years the average has been minus 0.05 percent. From Baltimore north to New England the average was 9.5.

The average in California over the past 10 years was 77 percent—over twice the national average.

I think this bill is tremendously unfair. I think that the Members from the western part of the country were fair back in 1936 when they came to Congress pleading for their cause—then the economic situation was different.

In New England the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co. has now about 5,400 employees where the normal complement should be 12,000.

Private industry let out a bid the other day on a $12 million job. Three shipyards came within $35,000 of each other in their bids.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is recognized.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. As I said, private industry let a job out to bid last week. It was a $12 million contract. Three different shipyards submitted bids and they came within $35,000 of the same figure. Do you know what 4 percent would mean on a job of that size? It would mean over $400,000.

In 1936, because they had no steel mill out in the West, because of the high cost of transportation, it was needed. But in this day and age there is no need for it whatsoever. The economy in California, Oregon, and Washington is the highest of any section of the Nation. It is the fastest growing part of the United States. California has just gained eight Congressmen, which shows what the growth of California has been.

I said earlier that we in the northeast industrial section of the Nation, we in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio are the ones who pay the taxes. We have spent these taxes to make America as great as she is today. I say in fairness to the east coast this amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Magnuson amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as Tellers Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. BONNER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 82, noes 147.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, following line 4, insert the following new sections:

"Sec. 2. Section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (40 U.S.C., sec. 1159), is amended by striking out ': *And provided,* That in case a vessel is to be constructed under this section for an applicant who has as his principal place of business a place on the Pacific coast of the United States' and all that follows in that section down through and including 'maintains his principal place of business at any place on the Pacific coast.' and insert in lieu thereof a period.

"Sec. 3. That section 213 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1123), is amended by striking out 'a report' and inserting in lieu thereof 'reports' and by striking out 'as soon as practicable'.

"Sec. 4. That paragraph (c) of said section 213 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding the following '; reports under this paragraph shall be made annually on the first day of July of each year.'.

"Sec. 5. The first sentence of subsection (f) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1152), is amended by striking out 'periodically' and inserting in lieu thereof 'at least once each year'.

"Sec. 6. The second sentence of subsection (f) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C., sec. 1152), is amended by striking out the words ', with the approval of the President,' ".

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHELLEY to the committee amendment:

"Section 502(f) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (40 U.S.C. 1159) is amended by adding at the end of that subsection, as a new sentence: '*Provided, however,* That in the event of a finding by the Secretary of Commerce, that the purposes of this subsection will be better served by calling for bids from qualified shipbuilders for the construction, reconstruction, reconditioning or remodeling of vessels as provided for herein, such bids to be limited exclusively to those from qualified shipbuilders in that area in which the Secretary of Commerce finds that the capabilities for merchant ship construction, including facilities and skilled personnel do not provide an adequate mobilization base at strategic points for purposes of national defense and national emergency, then the Secretary of Commerce may call for such regional bids, limited exclusively to those shipbuilders from such an area'."

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to maintain a Merchant Marine Act on the basis which is set forth in its preamble, that is, for defense purposes of the country, then this amendment to the committee amendment should be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, this will allow the Secretary of Commerce to do exactly what is now being done in letting bids for naval vessels where there is a greater capability. The need for defense purposes can be better served by taking the bids on a regional basis rather than on a nationwide, open-bid basis. This will empower the Secretary of Commerce to so do.

Mr. Chairman, this does not give aid to the west coast, the gulf coast, or the east coast, except where circumstances at any given moment of need may call for the application of this section.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be adopted as an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. As I understand existing law, section 502(f) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce under certain conditions to negotiate with a single yard and to grant that single yard a shipbuilding contract?

Mr. SHELLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. And the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], as I understand it, would give the Secretary of Commerce authority to ask for bids in the region?

Mr. SHELLEY. In the region and thereby he can save the Government money instead of entering into a straight negotiation deal with one yard.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHELLEY. I would be happy to.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. It seems to me that this is an amendment that should have been offered by the proponents of the committee amendment.

Mr. SHELLEY. Well, somebody did not think of it, I guess, or if they did, they did not offer it. So I am offering it, I hope, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina. I see the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is rising, and I hope he is doing so in order to accept this amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for the distinguished gentleman from California, and, of course, I have deep affection for the ranking member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the fine gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON]. Now, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] comes, after 5 years or more of consideration of this subject, with an amendment that, in accordance with the gentleman from Washington's own language—in his language—should have been considered in the committee or in the subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. So, therefore, in my opposition to this amendment I think that the subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries should have heard a suggestion of this kind and should have held hearings on the question. In the bill itself we broaden the allocation.

As I have said before, we place the allocation of merchant ships on the identical basis with the allocation of Navy ships and other ships of that type. Therefore, I hope the Committee will vote down this amendment. And if the gentleman will offer a bill to this effect I assure him that it will receive attention and there will be hearings by the subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHELLEY) there were—ayes 66, noes 153.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN to the committee amendment: Add the following new section to the committee amendment:

"SEC. 7. Section 502(a) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (49 Stat. 1985) is amended by adding the following proviso at the end of the subsection: '*Provided, however*, That no contract shall be entered into with a shipbuilder under this subsection until the Secretary of Commerce has certified that such shipbuilder does not engage in any discriminatory practices on the grounds of race, color, creed or nationality in the employment of individuals at the yard at which such vessel is to be constructed, or at any of the yards, plants, factories, offices or other establishments of business owned or operated by such shipbuilder.' "

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is an amendment that all Members on both sides of the aisle can agree to. It is in connection with the directives of the President's Commission to eliminate discrimination in employment involving Federal expenditures. It would be consistent with that. It is consistent with our directives in establishing the Civil Rights Commission some years ago.

This amendment simply states that if a bid is submitted by any shipbuilder to the Secretary of Commerce and it is the low bid, before the actual contract is issued the Secretary of Commerce will first certify that that bidder does not discriminate on the ground of race, color, and creed or nationality, and upon that certification the contract then will be awarded; but if the shipbuilder fails to meet that test, then that shipbuilder will be disqualified. Certainly it seems to me that all Members of this House can agree on this amendment.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is already the law and there is a commission that is looking into this matter at the present time. Therefore, I ask for a vote. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to take time, but the longer I listen to speaker after speaker talk about defense and subsidization of shipbuilding, the more I think I ought to say a few words. I am a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, although there is not a shipyard within many, many miles of my hometown in Iowa.

On the subject of subsidies, American taxpayers have been subsidizing the building, directly or indirectly, of foreign ships, including the foreign superliners you heard about a while ago. Do not forget that we made a loan to Great Britain of $4 billion shortly after the end of World War II, and all interest and principal payments on that debt are under suspension by act of Congress. Yes, we pumped money into Britain to prop up their economy, which helped them build new and modern ships against which our merchant marine is expected to compete. We pumped billions of dollars into France by way of foreign aid and the Government of that nation has just put into service a luxury liner, a speedy new uncompartmented superliner with no provision for rapid conversion to a troopship. Neither is there any provision for rapid conversion to troop-carrying capability in the new British passenger liners. But we build what new liners we have so that they can be converted almost overnight to troopships, and we compartment them so that they will at least have a chance to stay afloat under torpedo attack. We provide these safety features at heavy additional cost.

Someone introduced the subject of the European Common Market into this debate. I do not know how that was related to this bill, but let me say that we have been in the Common Market of subsidizing foreign ship construction for a long, long time, and we have been taken like a bunch of suckers. Let us face some of the facts of life. Let us stop subsidizing our competition by spewing out money to these foreign countries. Let us build our own merchant marine for a change and build these ships in our own shipyards, employing American workers who have always been the best consumers of the products of American farms.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], the able chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Mr. BONNER. I compliment the gentleman on what he is saying. He is a dedicated Member and an efficient and faithful member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I am glad to hear him speak as he speaks.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his generous remarks. I want these foreign countries, if we are going to continue to provide the money that backs up their economies so that they can build new vessels—I want to see them constructed so that they, too, can carry troops. I would like to have evidence from them, that if we get into another war, they will provide troops and provide their transportation to help in the fighting.

It is a sad state of affairs when, for instance, the west coast of the United States is unable to have available a new and modern liner because there is no money available while this Government ladles out billions in foreign aid, much of which is coming back to haunt us in the form of competition we cannot meet.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Baldwin].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Garmatz.

The Committee divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 99, noes 115.

So the amendment was rejected.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF APRIL 16

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week, if any, and as to the program for next week. I am doing this now because the membership is present. Later they might not be.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate the gentleman's taking this time. If this bill is disposed of today we will ask consent to go over until Monday next. There will be no further legislative business this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Pan American Day. Monday is also Consent Calendar Day, and there are seven suspensions, as follows:

S. 1057, portrait gallery for Smithsonian Institution.

House Joint Resolution 449, establishment of Alexander Hamilton Memorial.

H.R. 10786, Labor, Work Hours Act of 1962.

S. 1371, FCC renew station license.

S. 1668, FCC forfeitures.

S. 1589, Communications Act of 1934, radio operator licenses.

S. 683, FCC oath requirement.

These may not necessarily be called in the order listed.

The following bills will also be considered on Monday:

H.R. 11131, Armed Forces, authorization, military construction.

H.R. 10440, District of Columbia, acquisition of canines.

House Concurrent Resolution 438, provides for joint congressional committee, 375th anniversary, Lost Colony, Virginia Dare.

Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called.

Also beginning on Tuesday the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1963 will be taken up.

Any rollcall votes except on rules and procedural matters on Tuesday will go over until Wednesday because of the New Jersey primary.

I would like to advise the House that in order to make certain we may finish next week in time for the Easter recess, we may find it necessary to ask unanimous consent to come in earlier on Wednesday.

The Easter recess will begin on Thursday, April 19, at the close of business, and will continue until Monday noon, April 30.

This is subject to the usual reservation that conference reports will be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1159) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids on Pacific coast shipbuilders, pursuant to House Resolution 590, he reported the bill back to the House, with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Baldwin moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, with instructions to report the bill back to the House with the following amendment:

"Sec. 7. Section 502(a) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (49 Stat. 1985) is amended by adding the following proviso at the end of the subsection: '*Provided, however,* That no contract shall be entered into with a shipbuilder under this subsection until the Secretary of Commerce has certified that such shipbuilder does not engage in any discriminatory practices on the grounds of race, color, or creed in the employment of individuals at the yard at which such vessel is to be constructed, or at any of the yards, plants, factories, offices or other establishments of business owned or operated by such shipbuilder.' "

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the nays had it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

STEEL PRICE RISE

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, The United States Steel Corp. Wednesday cast a ballot for inflation and stock speculation.

Its decision to raise steel prices on an average of $6 a ton, effective today, is a conscious flouting of the welfare of our economy and a serious setback to efforts to achieve the reasonable price stability necessary to keep living costs from outdistancing the American wage earner. And, incidentally, I view it as a vestigal expression of the 19th-century outlook of the robber barons, an affront to the conservative economic theory that United States Steel professes to embrace, and an insult to the loyal steelworkers who agreed to a 2-year contract without a wage increase the first year.

Mr. Speaker, this is the beginning of the 13th round of price increases in the steel industry since 1950. The recently concluded collective bargaining contract with the Steelworkers Union would, according to estimates, cost the industry about $50 to $60 million. It will, according to these same estimates, be paid for several times over by productivity increases, the fast writeoff and the 7-percent investment credit contained in the tax bill that the House recently passed and which the Senate is now considering. And on top of this now comes the price boost.

The steel industry's break-even point on production, Mr. Speaker, is, I am told, now about 30 percent. The industry is now operating at a capacity of slightly over 80 percent, with indications that a drop in operating capacity is in the offering.

The price increase announced Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, will doubtlessly boost sagging steel shares on the stock market. And I read in the price-increase announcement an indication that there will be a stock dividend declared by United States Steel at some future time.

The price increase represents a hidden tax on the consumer in order purportedly to raise investment capital. The conservative economic theory would declare that United States Steel should go into the market and raise its own investment funds.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to read in the morning newspaper that the Justice Department will study the price increase with a view to bringing action against this citadel of administered prices.

And I will support legislation to require that in basic industries that there be ample advance notice of a price increase to enable the merits of such an action to be studied by the appropriate committees of the Congress and the President's economic advisers.

AFRICAN FREEDOM DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 598) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that April 15, 1962, be recognized as African Freedom Day; and that we extend to the independent countries of Africa our congratulations and assure them of our continued good will.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is merely a resolution of felicitations, is that correct, and that it will cost us nothing now or in the future?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE REPORTING ON CONGRESSIONAL STAFFS

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object, I wonder if anyone here can tell us what has happened to Operation Spring Thaw. I wonder if it has become frozen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the editors of the New York Herald Tribune for a fine job of reporting on the problem of committee staffing in the Congress. They deserve the thanks of Americans of both political parties and of all people interested in good government. Their distinguished Washington columnist and commentator, Roscoe Drummond, has been perceptive and persistent in alerting the country and Washington to the serious imbalance between majority and minority on committee staffs and the need for more committee staffing in general. It is not easy to start with a difficult idea early and stay with it as it slowly takes hold of the public imagination. It is therefore with special pleasure that I noted a thoughtful and constructive editorial in the Herald Tribune of Sunday, April 1, 1962, on this subject. I hope that deserved recognition will be given to the modest, dedicated, scholarly efforts of my good friend and valued colleague, TOM CURTIS, of Missouri, who in past years has kept alive interest and concern in this problem on the Hill. In the other body, Senator CARL T. CURTIS also deserves our gratitude. Both of these men have not had an easy time in their efforts to alert the Congress to this issue. I am proud to have been associated with them.

The editorial follows:

REPUBLICANS, LOOK TO YOUR STAFFS

In Congress, staffs are the bread of life. And though Republicans have been going mighty hungry, very few have been doing anything about it.

Increasing the size of minority staffs on House and Senate committees might seem a minor item of Federal housekeeping, but it cuts to the heart of the effective functioning of Congress.

What makes staffing important is the role committees play in legislation. This is where the real work of Congress is done, and it is on committee staffs that individual Congressmen have to place primary reliance for help in their legislative work. Not only are committee staff members specialists in their respective legislative fields, which the employees in a Congressman's own office are usually not, but the Congressman's office is largely tied up with the mechanics of representing his constituency. When it comes to working out the intricacies of, say, a trade or tax bill, the Congressman needs ready access to experts on trade or tax legislation.

As Roscoe Drummond has been pointing out repeatedly in his columns, the Republicans are grossly underrepresented on the committee staffs. Most staffs have only one, two, or three staff members—sometimes none—appointed by and responsible to the minority members.

The same committee may have 10 or 20, or more, appointed by and responsible to the majority. Much of their work is technical and nonpartisan in nature, but a lot of it is not. Some committee chairmen organize their staffs on a professional, nonpartisan basis—but others use them in a highly partisan manner, to the Republicans' distinct disadvantage.

To work as it should, two-party government needs two parties each equipped to develop its own independent legislative program. It is here that the need for a strong minority staff—with which minority members can enjoy a confidential relationship—is most urgent.

It wasn't so bad when one party controlled Congress and the other the White House, so that Republicans had access to the machinery of the executive departments. But now that the Democrats control both branches, the Republicans are not even out in right field. They're out of the park, beyond the fence.

The minority staff of two on the House Education and Labor Committee, for example, is hardly a match for the 40-odd answerable to Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, plus the combined bureaucracies of the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Democrats in Congress, liking the way their bread is buttered, have been understandably cool to pleas for bigger minority staffs. But the Republicans themselves have been apathetic. A few—notably Senator CARL CURTIS and Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS—have fought for fairer representation, and now a few more are joining in. But it's going to take a more concerted push than the Republicans have yet made to get the kind of minority staffs an opposition party needs—not only in its own interest, but in that of effective two-party government and sound legislative procedure.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the special orders today granted to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG], they may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

OPERATION BIG SNOW

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last night we witnessed installment No. 1 of the thawing of the "big snow job." We witnessed a great many other things, also. On the light side one refreshing point was the realization that we had a poet in our midst, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY]. In response to his poem, we dedicate the following to him and the hardy band of his colleagues on the other side of the aisle who were diligent in their task of stalling the deicers:

Listen my brethren and you shall hear
The squalls of pain from the New Frontier.
The moans and the sighs of our liberals crying
As sensitive nerves are basted for frying.
There is an old adage that they should remember:
The shoe may change feet on the sixth of November!

SMALL BEGINNING FOR EAST-WEST CENTER IS IN TRUE AMERICAN TRADITION

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. One of the increasingly encouraging examples of the cumulative benefits of some of the expenditures which the people of the United States, through their Government, have been making in a great variety of foreign aid during the past two decades, is the type of program for educational and cultural exchange between our country and many of the countries of the world. Under the Hays-Fulbright Act passed by this Congress, already programs of this kind are in operation with 40 other countries.

Even some of our people who were critical of the money expended for this purpose have changed their attitude, and are beginning to be convinced that such an exchange between peoples does pay off in benefits to both sides.

These programs began in a small way. There was not much that could be cited for several years, except to emphasize the potential of future development of the programs.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in the East-West Center which is being sponsored with Federal assistance at the University of Hawaii, and which was established primarily in support of the objectives of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, and title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and other acts promoting the international, educational, cultural, and related activities of the United States, we have an instrument for better understanding between East and West, which has made a small beginning but which has a tremendous potential for future influence about which I, for one, am most optimistic.

Recently, one of our widely circulated news magazines published a short article about the first year's activity of the East-West Center, under the caption, "Trouble in Hawaii," which I considered to be captious criticism.

Having had the opportunity, as a member of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to visit the East-West Center last December, I consider the article I have referred to as anything but objective reporting.

A number of the faults to which the reporter referred exist. This, however, is no more than might be expected during the first year of operation.

It should be noted that only since January 1, 1962, has the chancellor of the East-West center been installed in that important office. He is equipped by training and by capacity for leadership to put into action many of the things which the Congress visualized when we accepted the concept of such an institution, which led to the incorporation in the Mutual Security Act of 1959 of a Senate amendment providing an authorization for the Secretary of State to prepare and submit a plan and program for the establishment and operation in Hawaii "of an educational institution to be known as the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West." The purpose of such a center was spelled out as "to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study and research."

Further Congressional approval was given last year, in the Hays-Fulbright Act—Public Law 87-256—which authorizes the President to provide for "establishing and operating in the United States and abroad centers for cultural and technical interchanges to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and other nations through cooperative study, training, and research."

It was less than 18 months ago that the Federal Government signed a grant-in-aid agreement with the University of Hawaii to establish and operate the East-West Center.

The news magazine article to which I have referred called the East-West Center "an educational step-child of a second-rank State university." I might, as one who wishes well to the East-West Center and who believes that its objectives can be achieved, be somewhat aroused by such a statement, except for my knowledge that 25 years ago some people were saying the same things about the university of my own State. But the University of Connecticut did not stand still. Under dynamic leadership which inspired and stimulated citizen support, it went ahead, and today it is widely recognized as one of the best of the land-grant colleges, of which the University of Hawaii is one.

I should like to include at this point the text of a press release which was issued by my office at the beginning of this session of the Congress, because it presents in brief form my views about the present and the future of the East-West Center shortly after my return from an on-the-scene investigation:

> WASHINGTON, January 11.—Congressman HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., whose return to Washington preceded by 2 days the opening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress so that he could participate in further hearings by a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said today that the East-West Center being operated with Federal assistance in connection with the University of Hawaii at Honolulu, that the Center offers a remarkable opportunity for helping to make life better in every country of Asia, if its mission to educate Asians who will go back home and dedicate themselves to work among their own people, is faithfully fulfilled.
>
> The subcommittee heard Philip H. Coombs, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, here on Monday, after visiting last month the East-West Center in Hawaii, and further hearings will be held here if required.
>
> The East-West Center, now in its first year, has 231 students, and Congressman SEELY-BROWN said it is dealing essentially with three kinds of people: those requireing training at a very modest but practical level; second, with students who are taking systematic programs, and third, with distinguished scholars and experts. He said it should be noted that nearly 60,000 foreign students are studying in the United States today, of whom about 54,000 are here on their own, and of the total number about 40 percent are from Asia. They are about equally divided between graduates and undergraduate students, SEELY-BROWN said, and they are studying in a wide variety of American institutions, all of which have their unique strengths and weaknesses.
>
> Because there would be little point in the East-West Center merely adding a few hundred to the 25,000 or more Asian students now on the mainland, he said the East-West Center must go in not for numbers but for quality and specialization along certain lines in order to provide something worth while that is not being provided for Asian scholars and students elsewhere.
>
> Congressman SEELY-BROWN said he considers it most important for the East-West Center to follow up on its students, to see what they are doing when they finish there, because he is fearful that we may be developing, in all these programs, a group of "educational travelers" who are going to travel from one scholarship to another all over the world because the standard of living in the country they visit is normally better than the one from which they come.
>
> I want to make sure that the value of this East-West Center is that they have learned about us, we have learned about them, and then they have gone home and done something about it rather than just travel to some other place and spend 25 years doing it.

GOVERNMENT BY ANGER

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of this week's demonstration, I am not at all favorably impressed with government by Presidential anger. I trust that Mr. Kennedy's televised outburst over the steel price increase will not establish a precedent.

In the first place, I would scarcely expect that Executive indignation would be impartially applied. For example, against the steady and shocking increase in the already excessive price of big Government—continuing at a dizzy pace under this administration.

Or against the pay raise proposals for big bureaucracy—ranging from the President's own billion-dollar boost in annual pay of Federal employees to a $1,850 million increase proposed in Congress.

Or against present or future exorbitant demands of big unions—including those involved in the strike which has gravely threatened the State of Hawaii and against which the President invoked the Taft-Hartley provisions without an accompanying castigation in front of TV cameras.

No, I would scarcely expect impartial Executive indignation, even if a precedent was established this week. And I simply do not favor this sort of procedure in any instance, regardless of the target.

I cannot reconcile tantrum techniques with the objective set forth in the preamble of the Constitution, "to insure domestic Tranquility." The peril of such methods is well illustrated in the intemperate attack on the steel industry.

Mr. Kennedy's statement, involving the fearsome weight of Presidential words and anger, makes it obvious that he has already convicted the "tiny handful of steel executives" of a "pursuit of private power and profit" which "exceeds their sense of public responsibility" and which "shows utter contempt for the interests of 185 million Americans." And Mr. Kennedy made it equally clear that he expected the American people to render the same verdict of guilty without hearing.

Now the evident intention to press for Justice Department and/or Federal Trade Commission inquiries—and the plan for congressional investigations—suggests one of two alternative situations: Either not all of the facts are in, and there are admittedly two sides to the controversy over justification of the price increase—in which case the horrendous and publicly proclaimed conclusions of the President are indeed premature—or the purpose of these administrative and legislative investigations is to confirm and ratify a guilty verdict already reached and announced in obvious anger by the President.

By all means let there be investigation and full disclosure. But let there be equal and impartial appraisal of all factors involved in price policies, including higher costs imposed on industry. And let those who urge Government controls on prices and profits weigh the logical consequences in terms of potential wage controls. And then let the sequel—whether of criminal prosecutions in the judicial calm of a Federal courtroom or of orderly legislative deliberations and decisions in Congress—follow in due course.

But, meanwhile, let us be done with government by Presidential anger.

OKLAHOMA FARM YOUTH INSPIRE LAWMAKERS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, at noon today the Oklahoma congressional delegation had the great pleasure of lunching in the Capitol with an outstanding group of young Oklahomans, members of a tour sponsored by the Oklahoma Farmers Union headed by OFU President George W. Stone and Mrs. Stone.

As a feature of the luncheon, six of the young people spoke to the delegation and other guests on subjects of vital concern to the farmers of America.

Miss Jayne Floyd, 4-H Club speaking champion from Chelsea, delivered a stirring message on the vocational, patriotic, and character-building mission of the 4-H organizations in this country.

Miss Kendall Harrell, also of Chelsea and a Future Homemaker speech champion, spoke eloquently of the dramatic and constructive ways in which the Future Homemakers of America have strengthened the family and community foundations of the Nation.

Miss Janice Bradford, of Watonga, paid a stirring tribute to the great achievements of rural electric cooperatives in bringing the miracles of electricity to American farms and farm communities.

Three young men, each of them a speech contest winner also, addressed themselves to other major farm issues and questions.

Calvin Anthony, of Carney, spoke convincingly of the importance of constructive organizations in advancing farm interests, and warmly saluted the Farmers Union for the leadership it is building among young Americans.

Ladd Hudgins, of Clinton, FFA speech champion, eloquently summarized the great achievements of American agriculture, and demonstrated effectively the superiority of our farmers and our system over Communist competitors.

Gary Gray, of Waukomis, pointed dramatically to the lifeline of the earth—soil conservation—and the great job being done by Soil and Water Conservation districts in making the Nation a stronger and better place in which to live.

The confidence, enthusiasm and idealism of all six young Oklahomans were a genuine inspiration to all who heard them, and came as an emphatic rebuttal to all who lack faith in America's future and downgrade our country's youth today.

Joining in applauding the presentation were a splendid group of Oklahoma farm families and seven other young people who had distinguished themselves in Farmers Union speech contests in Oklahoma.

The other young speakers in attendance included Miss Pat McLaughlin of Gould, Roger Webb, W. L. Reed, and Coy Mathis of Poteau, Kenny Rodgers of Coyle, Larry Brantley of Sterling, and Mike LaMarr of Moore.

Miss Julane McManus and Miss Becky McCary, of Chattanooga, were also among the young Oklahomans being honored by the Farmers Union for leadership in their community.

Members of the Oklahoma delegation were so impressed by the speeches delivered at the luncheon that copies were requested, to be submitted for later editions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ANNUAL AUDIT OF BRIDGE COMMISSIONS AND AUTHORITIES

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8921) to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 8, strike out "shall" and insert "may".

Page 6, line 4, after "made." insert "The Secretary of Commerce shall review such annual reports and audit reports submitted under section 1(b) of this Act and shall make recommendations to the Congress based upon such review, or take such other action as he may consider necessary, to effectuate the intent of the Congress as established by this Act or by the Act under which the individual bridge commission or authority was created."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST. GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my support, energies and efforts to the need for a coordinated, comprehensive and national transportation policy. In any city in the Nation we can find the same problems arising in the field of transportation. The problems are not only in terms of passenger carriers, but involve the movement of farm products and manufactured goods as well.

It has become frighteningly apparent that it is almost financially impossible to supply the service needed and yet maintain the system on a commercially operative basis. The difficulty arises because so much that should have been planned in the past was neglected in the rush for the immediate and short-run gains. The short run in this field has ended and what was in the future is presently at the doorstep. The time for a reappraisal in this field has come and we must face up to the facts of the matter, we must lay the groundwork now so that the future of mass transportation in the Nation will be bright and prosperous rather than dark and bankrupt.

The fault, the blame, the mistakes of the past lie on many shoulders and in many places. There has been a lack of farsighted management, a lack of governmental interest, a lack of public concern, and a lack of planning. It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that the time for full consideration of this matter has come. I am in agreement with the recommendations of the President in this regard and I know that I speak the sentiments of the Nation when I say that he has done a service to the Nation in giving such consideration to the problem of transportation.

Before the end of this session of the Congress, a decision in this regard must be made. The Congress will be presented the opportunity to make the future of mass transportation in this country a bright one. If action is not taken the day will quickly come when there will be no need for the planning envisioned by the President and the legislation introduced in this Chamber, when there will be no need for Government action, when there will be no need for concern. These "whens" will quickly come because mass transportation will cease to exist, at least as private enterprise.

I urge hearings on the matter which will look carefully into all of the pertinent facts whether they be damaging to certain interests or not. We must be able to see the mistakes of the past in order to plan effectively for the future. Full consideration of the matter must be given and I seriously urge that it be done so that mass transportation will be able to meet effectively the challenges that are facing it.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is serious; the time for action has come. I again urge the Congress to give full and complete consideration to the factors involved and to plan for a coordinated attack on the problems of mass transportation throughout the Nation.

STEEL PRICE INCREASE

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon Roger Blough, the chairman of the board of United States Steel Corp., told a nationwide television audience that the effect of a price increase in steel would be negligible. He cited as an example the fact that the price increase for a standard size automobile would be $10.64, for an intermediate size car, $8.33, for a compact car, $6.83, for a gas range 70 cents, and for a toaster, 3 cents.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident from his statement that Mr. Blough naively believes that all the middlemen and all the other people who are associated in the production of these items he mentions will sit idly by and let United States Steel Corp. alone increase the price of its products. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Blough's figures are misleading. If the price of steel does go up by $6 per ton, it will touch off a chain reaction of price increases along the entire production line. Every single subcontractor, every supplier, in fact everyone who has anything to do with the production of these items will add a similar increase to their own cost of operation. What leads Mr. Blough to believe that everyone else is going to hold the price line while United States Steel alone recklessly raises its price on steel? If anything, it would appear that the President was most conservative yesterday in estimating the full impact of this tragedy on the American economy. The price on all of these items is going to go substantially higher than Mr. Blough in his naivete believes, and estimated today.

MONROE DOCTRINE OR KHRUSHCHEV DOCTRINE?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain documents and publication material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years I have made many statements in the Congress concerning various aspects of U.S. policies in the Caribbean area. These have included discussions of the world revolutionary program for conquest of that hemispheric crossroads in which the Panama Canal has long been a key target.

Certainly, a matter so charged with serious implications as the control of the approaches to the Panama Canal, which are essential for its successful operation and protection, cannot remain unchallenged. The perspective afforded by prolonged study and close observation has enabled me to predict important events in the Caribbean and to give timely warnings of them to the Congress and the executive branch, including the introduction of measures to reaffirm and make definite our policies. It is indeed regrettable that those warnings were not heeded and measures not adopted, but any satisfaction that might be derived by me from having been right is a barren one, for my foremost concern is the security of my country at this time of peril.

As much of what will follow relates to the Republic of Panama, I wish to stress at the outset that I am in no sense an enemy of that country, or of its people. On the contrary, I am devoted to the best interests of both and believe that those interests can be served only by the unhampered control of our Government of the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal in accordance with our historic and tested Isthmian policies as embodied in basic canal treaties.

To the task of clarification of what is an explosive situation in our own backyard, I now address myself.

PANAMA REACTS TO CUBAN INSULTS

In the crisis now mounting in the Caribbean, significant events requiring decisive measures have thronged upon us.

But, as so often happens in a storm, a rift in the clouds shows some blue sky. This appeared in Panama on December 14, 1961, when the Government of that country under the leadership of President Roberto F. Chiari reacted to studied insults from Fidel Castro and broke diplomatic relations with Soviet Cuba, retroactive to December 9. Thus, once again world attention, despite preoccupations with Berlin, the Congo, Goa, Indonesia, Laos, and other distant trouble spots, has focused on the crucial Caribbean, long ago recognized by Admiral Mahan as the Mediterranean of the Americas.

UNITED STATES—ULTIMATE OBJECTIVE

What is the nature of the sinister force which, through expertly conducted centralized direction, is exerting its pressures in so many strategic points in the world today? It is not a political party in the generally understood sense but pervasive action and intelligence arms of communistic revolutionary imperialism, which constitute conspiratorial fifth columns in every key spot, some government agencies, and influential sections of the mass news media. Its objective in warfare is destruction of the will to resist in advance of possible hostilities.

Emboldened by a long train of successes resulting from its calculated aggressiveness and encouraged by Western policies of placation and vacillation, this destructive force has taken over tremendous areas and great masses of population and imposed despotic governments of the most violent communistic character. These successes have indeed fed the fires of communistic revolutionary fanaticism and immeasurably strengthened the zeal and effort to bring the entire world under the yoke of despotism.

As has been aptly stated by an eminent theologian, "its cure for poverty is to increase it. Its cure for oppression is to universalize it. Its cure for injustice is to legalize it. Its cure for evil is to systematize it."

In every way, Mr. Speaker, Communist parties all over the world serve as Trojan horses, filled with trained and disciplined revolutionaries dedicated to the overthrow of all constitutional governments by force and violence, with the United States as its chief and ultimate objective.

For this aim, the conquest of the Caribbean is but the first stage in the long-range program for encirclement of our country—the bastion of constitutional liberty.

CRISIS IN THE CARIBBEAN

What is the record of the mounting crisis in the Caribbean? Some of its factors will be enumerated:

First. Failure and refusal by the Organization of American States to castigate Soviet Cuba for its lawless and violent actions against life and property.

Second. Display, under Executive order of September 17, 1960, by the United States, of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone territory, against the overwhelming opposition of the House of Representatives, formally expressed.

Third. Withdrawal by the United States of recognition of Communist Cuba.

Fourth. Issue in April 1961 by the Department of State of a white paper indicating U.S. support of "authentic and autonomous revolution" throughout the Americas, which action is certainly not a valid function of our Government.

Fifth. Failure on April 19, 1961, of the attempted liberation of Soviet Cuba under circumstances indicating subversive penetration of the U.S. security agencies.

Sixth. Declaration on May 1, 1961, by Premier Castro, following capture of the liberators, that Cuba is a Soviet satellite and his later admission that he has long been a secret Marxist-Leninist and that he had deliberately concealed this fact from the Cuban people during the course of the recent Cuban revolution.

Seventh. Establishment of a Communist beachhead in British Guiana by Cheddi Jagan, the newly elected Communist premier.

Eighth. Assent on November 2, 1961, to Communist-stimulated demands of Panama for new treaty negotiations, despite our generous concessions in 1936, 1942, and 1955.

From this cursory summary, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Caribbean is well on its way to becoming a Red lake, with Cuba and British Guiana, now admittedly Soviet satellites, covering both flanks of the Atlantic approaches to the Panama Canal, itself under bolshevist-inspired juridical attack.

PANAMA FLAG ENDANGERS CANAL ZONE SOVEREIGNTY

Of the long series of events contributing toward the present crisis in the Caribbean, the precedent set by Executive order on September 17, 1960, directing display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone territory, is transcendent.

In Panama, this action was taken as a complete reversal of the U.S. position on the question of sovereignty and as formal recognition of basic sovereignty of Panama over the Canal Zone, as well as a lever for wringing future concessions, including setting a time for the transfer by the United States to Panama of the canal as a gift, pure and simple. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the implications of this demand from a country whose very creation grew out of the movement to construct the Panama Canal.

In other countries, the action of the President made the United States a diplomatic laughing stock and it encouraged an extraordinary display of arrogance by Premier Castro in Cuba and alarmed shipping interests that have to pay tolls.

In our own country, it raised questions as to the identity of the influences in the Department of State that led to signing the ill-advised order and to constitutional issues of the highest importance for the future conduct of our foreign policy. Certainly, every realistic consideration demands that the order to raise the Panama flag over the Canal Zone must be disavowed.

For such disavowal, Mr. Speaker, recent studies by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—House Report No. 2218, 86th Congress, August 31, 1960—supply ample justification. Further reasons of more impelling character will be found in our diplomatic history in the period immediately following World War II, when Alger Hiss was in charge of the Office of Special Political Affairs, in the Department of State.

Transmitting a 1946 report of the Governor of the Panama Canal to the United Nations, this office, which is to say, Alger Hiss, erroneously described the Canal Zone as "occupied territory"—Senate Interior Section Subcommittee, hearings on "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments," part 19, March 25 and April 6, 1954, page 1365.

Enraging patriotic Panamanians, who oppose any move toward internationalization of the Panama Canal, this strange action gave the chairman of the Panamanian delegation to the United Nations an unexpected opportunity to declare in an address to the Political Commission of the General Assembly that Panama retains its sovereignty over the Canal Zone. More important, however, is the fact that the official listing of the zone by our Department of State as "occupied territory" played into the hands of the Communist revolutionaries whose ultimate aim since 1917 has been internationalization.

RADICAL DEMANDS ADVANCE COLOMBIAN OCCUPATION OR INTERNATIONALIZATION

If there is any force whatsoever in the argument for Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone, it must relate back to the parent country, Colombia, from which Panama seceded in the political developments preceding the actual building of the canal. It may be safely predicted that if the United States should ever be so unmindful and recreant of its solemn treaty obligations for the maintenance and operation of the canal for the entire world as to attempt to transfer the canal to Panama as a gift, Colombia will promptly follow such action with a reassertion of its complete sovereignty over the entire territory of Panama and claim the canal as its own. Nor should it be overlooked that Colombia has important treaty rights with respect to the Panama Canal and Railroad, as well as Panama.

As I have often stated and emphasized, Panama, in its ever-increasing effort to wrest control of the canal from the United States is not serving its own best interests but, on the contrary, strengthens Soviet policy and advances the movement for the internationalization of the canal. Even the advocates of these excessive Panamanian demands declare that it would be far better for Panama to deal with the United States as regards the operations of the canal than with an international organization. This undoubtedly is true.

It is strange indeed that, though our Government during recent years has made many important concessions to the Panamanian demands, it has never required any compensating Panamanian concessions. On the other hand, Panama has accepted the great benefits as signals for making new and greater demands. The latest are listed in a resolution of the Panamanian Assembly on November 16, 1961, which is quoted in documentation appended to my address.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, no revolutionary influence in our Government, determined on a piecemeal liquidation of our sovereign rights, power, and authority on the Isthmus, could have done a better job than has been accomplished over a long period of years.

CHARLES EVANS HUGHES AND ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY

In this general connection, Mr. Speaker, it is highly pertinent to consider what one of our country's ablest and most forthright Secretaries of State, Charles Evans Hughes, once stated.

In a conversation with the then Minister of Panama to the United States on December 15, 1923, in response to formal demands by Panama for increased sovereignty and increased sovereignty attributes over the Canal Zone, Mr. Hughes spoke with a refreshing degree of candor and vigor. He declared:

> Our country would never recede from the position which it had taken in the note of Secretary Hay in 1904. This Government could not, and would not, enter into any discussion affecting its full right to deal with the Canal Zone and to the entire exclusion of any sovereign rights or authority on the part of Panama (Foreign Relations, 1923, vol. III, p. 684.)

To this Secretary Hughes added:

> It was an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American administration, no matter what it was, any President or any Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part of these rights which the United States had acquired under the Treaty of 1903.

That is the type of statement that should be forthcoming from our statesmen today, especially from those in executive authority over the canal.

On another occasion, Mr. Speaker, when writing about the Monroe Doctrine, Mr. Hughes made this telling statement about Isthmian Canal policies:

> The construction of the Panama Canal has not only established a new and convenient highway of commerce but has created new exigencies and new conditions of strategy and defense. It is part of American policy not to yield to any foreign power the control of the Panama Canal, or the approaches to it, or the obtaining of any position which would interfere with the right of protection on the part of the United States or would menace the freedom of its communications (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1957, vol. 15, p. 738).

All the exigencies foreseen by former Secretary Hughes, in clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine and our solemn treaty obligations with respect to the canal have now come to pass. The questions that now face us are what steps should be taken to protect our country against the loss of its undoubted rights in the Caribbean and against the chaos that will inevitably follow if the United States ever abandons its operation and control of the Panama Canal.

JOHN F. STEVENS ALERTED US TO MARXIST DANGERS

At this point, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to examine some important historical antecedents of the world crisis, which show that current problems are not new, but old.

It was John F. Stevens, famed basic architect of the Panama Canal, who, while serving as head of our railroad missions in Russia and Siberia, 1917–23—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 7, page 9285—had a unique opportunity to observe the early years of the Russian Bolshevik revolution. He was thus able, in his reports and during periodic visits to Washington, to alert important leaders in our country, among them Ira E. Bennett, great editor of the Washington Post, to its internationally organized conspiratorial nature and the dangers thereby involved.

Ideas about communistic subversion that Stevens started through Editor Bennett still reverberate.

KARL MARX FORESAW SOVIET IMPERIALISM

Before Stevens there was Karl Marx, who, from 1853 to 1856, was European correspondent of the New York Daily Tribune. Among his perceptive writings are found these startling statements:

> Russian imperialism * * * is not a movement that strives for national independence, but a movement which, directed against Europe, would destroy all cultural values that history has created through thousands of years. This could not be achieved without eradicating Austria, Hungary, Turkey, and a major part of Germany from the [political] map.
>
> There is only one way of dealing with absolute power like Russia and that is by absolute fearlessness.

These telling words give the key to withstand aggressiveness: absolute fearlessness must confront absolute power.

COMMODORE PERRY FORESAW EAST-WEST CONFLICT

Mr. Speaker, by far the most revealing of all the prophetic statements on the question of East-West conflict is that of Commodore Matthew C. Perry, after return from his famous voyage to Japan.

Speaking before the American Geographical and Statistical Society on March 6, 1856, he expressed views that should ring through the centuries and I quote:

> It requires no sage to predict events so strongly foreshadowed to us all; still "westward" will "the course of empire take its way." But the last act of the drama is yet to be unfolded; and notwithstanding the reasoning of political empirics, westward, northward, and southward, to me it seems that the people of America will, in some form or other extend their dominion and their power, until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia. And I think too, that eastward and southward will her great rival in future aggrandizement (Russia) stretch forth her power to the coasts of China and Siam; and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, or another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest; for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—despotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought.

These words, Mr. Speaker, so meaningful today, were uttered more than a century ago. Surely no one who has studied world history should be surprised at what has happened in eastern Asia, the Southwest Pacific, Africa, or in Cuba.

The last, being closest to our shores and located near one of the historic invasion routes of North America, the valley of the Mississippi, and in a position to menace the communications of the Panama Canal, is of prime importance.

The domination of Cuba by a fanatical Communist power is a clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine and cannot be safely ignored or tolerated. Cuba can serve not only as a base from which to launch atomic missiles against vital points in the continental United States, but also as a beachhead from which to conduct further conquests through subversion. Such conquests would occur first in remaining Caribbean countries and later throughout Latin lands.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it should ever be borne in mind that Premier Khrushchev declared with exultation that the Monroe Doctrine is dead. The failure to make an adequate reaffirmation of this historic policy and the succession of recent Communist victories in the Caribbean can only mean that the transcendent issue on our fourth front has become the Monroe Doctrine versus the Khrushchev doctrine.

SUBVERSIVE PERSONNEL MUST BE REMOVED

What are the explanations for the collapse of our Caribbean policies? Of course, they are many but basic to any sustained deterioration in policy matters there is always the question of the character of the personnel conducting these policies.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, so long as men of this character are in positions of power or influence with respect to the conduct of our foreign policies, we may expect continued retrogression. The personnel situation presented is not one that can be corrected by a mere shifting of personnel or changing of official titles under procedures known as reorganizations. It is one that calls for the identification by investigating committees of the Congress, of the individuals in the Department of State, and the mass media who are responsible for our tragic failures in policy and their removal from positions of power.

Regardless of whether those responsible for these tragic failures in American foreign policy have been well meaning but stupid or definitely subversive, the results are the same and our Nation has suffered accordingly. Such individuals should be absolutely eliminated from any position of power in our Government and public opinion should prevent their employment in mass media operations.

PARALYSIS AND CONTRIVED CONFUSION MUST BE OVERCOME

In considering the ways to meet the challenge in the Caribbean, can we rely on the Organization of American States for remedial action? The answer is "No."

That agency, I regret to say, is nothing but an instrument for paralysis. Moreover, we should not delude our people by pretending to rely on an organization for the performance of tasks that we know are beyond its desires, intentions, or powers.

GUATEMALA OVERCOMES THREAT

Mr. Speaker, in viewing the problems now facing our country, it should be borne in mind that everywhere in Latin countries where, under a false notion of liberty, communism has been permitted to infiltrate, trained and disciplined Soviet agents have meddled in the affairs of those countries and plotted for the overthrow of all legally constituted authority.

In executing their designs for conquest, these agents have constantly resorted to bloody violences to attain their ends. The governments involved too often seem to have become unnerved and paralyzed when faced with the deadly peril.

A recent example of the Communist policy of violent overthrow of constitutional government was the effort on June 11, 1961, in Guatemala to drive the administration of President Miguel Ydigoras from power and to supplant it with one like that in Cuba, which is completely subservient to orders from its Kremlin overlords.

In contrast to what has taken place in some other Latin countries, the effective reaction of the Guatemalan Government to that threat was highly commendable and encouraging.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I voice the view of all patriotic Americans, North, Central, and South, when I publicly praise, on the floor of the House, President Ydigoras and his administration for their alertness to the danger and for their success in surmounting that threat. They contributed to the security of all the Americas.

OUR PEOPLE DEMAND ACTION

Subversive forces in Cuba are becoming consolidated in their beachhead and preparing for their next moves. The well-publicized moves of our Department of State in Dominican affairs and the Congo stand out in bold relief. What of Cuba, which is a storm center for American subversion? In this connection, the Organization of American States has been proved absolutely impotent.

Indeed it is fortunate that the people of our country are far ahead of our agencies of Government, both legislative and executive. They perceive the hazards and are demanding immediate remedial action. This I know, not only from observations and discussions during my travels, but also from numerous letters from thoughtful men and women in various parts of the Nation.

They are also demanding remedies in line with our historic policies and the inherent right of self-defense. They will not tolerate supplanting the Monroe Doctrine with the Khrushchev doctrine in any part of the Americas.

MONROE DOCTRINE MUST BE REAFFIRMED

World War II ended more than 15 years ago with the peoples of all lands, including the Soviet, yearning for a lasting peace. But instead of peace, the two strongest nations in the world today face each other in undisguised hostility. This makes it imperative that our country look first to its own vital interests, for it is the only hope of the free world to remain free.

In the first quarter of the 19th century, when our country was weak, it faced a crisis of the gravest character. Not only was the United States threatened by European imperialism from across the Atlantic, but also by Russian penetration from the Pacific Northwest, which had reached as far south as Fort Ross, just north of San Francisco.

American statesmen rose to the occasion and, on December 2, 1823, President Monroe, in a message to the Congress, issued a diplomatic warning to all nations that our country would resist any further conquests in the Western Hemisphere. Monroe did not wait until strategic spots in the Caribbean had been occupied, but, by a forthright declaration, made our position unmistakably and effectively clear. Such realistic treatment is sorely needed today.

To this end, I urge the Congress to take immediate steps to correct the dangerous legislative delinquencies which have diverted the conduct of our foreign policies from their destined course. In 1823 we were weak; today we are strong, but losing in relative strength. Why wait until the strength ratio is further reduced? Why wait for another Goa to demonstrate more dramatically the futility of relying for protection on nations which proclaim peace, but practice aggression, or on an international organization dominated by Soviet controlled vetoes or votes? We must act now.

FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION IS SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Speaker, underlying the Panama Canal sovereignty question is a fundamental principle. Our country is in the Canal Zone properly and lawfully, as of right, fully and explicitly defined in basic treaty agreements between two sovereign states, or else it is occupying territory to which it has no flawless title, territory upon which its armed forces and civil employees have been squatting since 1904, territory for which it pays a mere rental, so that it might be permitted to maintain, operate, and protect the interoceanic waterway.

If time permitted going into the early history of the negotiations which led to the acquisition of the Canal Zone, it could be shown that the United States could have rented the required strip across the isthmus from Colombia for construtcion of the canal, if mere leasing of the territory from another sovereign state was what our Government had intended nearly 60 years ago.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized, Mr. Speaker, that the idea of sovereign jurisdiction over the Canal Zone, subject to no limitation in time or substance, was the prime objective of our Government.

The reason for this is the basic fact that the United States could not afford, and was, therefore, unwilling to undertake the great obligation to build the Panama Canal at the expense of the American taxpayers and to maintain and operate it in a land of endemic revolution and political instability except on the basis of exclusive sovereignty in perpetuity. This consideration was fully recognized by both Panama and the United States in the formulation of the 1903 treaty and any other judgment is absolutely naive except to the extent that it may be influenced by communistic revolutionary forces.

Our obligations to the other countries involved and with which we had to deal in regard to the canal enterprise require that our country have untrammeled sovereignty and authority. A divided sovereignty would make fulfillment of our treaty obligations to operate the canal for world shipping on terms of equality utterly impossible. Our country is not a mere tenant on the isthmus nor a squatter, but a grantee of sovereignty in perpetuity for the perpetual maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal.

CANAL ZONE: TARGET OF REVOLUTIONARY AGGRESSION

In the perspective that is now possible, the argument of Alger Hiss that under article 73 of the United Nations Charter, the United States should file administrative reports with the Secretary General of that organization, because the Canal Zone is an "occupied area," was a monstrous aggression of communistic revolutionary conspiracy upon our valid and unblemished title to that part of the constitutionally acquired domain of the United States.

As was clearly foreseen by competent students, for more than 15 years our Nation and its Government have been harassed by those who aim to make the flag of the United States a symbol of imperialistic exploitation. Some of them, unfortunately, enjoy the status and heritage of citizenship in our Republic.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, many have wondered whether the 1960 Executive order to hoist the Panama flag over the Canal Zone was a cleverly planned move to validate the 1946 declaration by Alger Hiss of the zone as "occupied territory." To this question the only answer is that, regardless of the intent of its signer, the result was to that effect, and our sovereign status has been clouded.

At last, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for our country to settle once and for all how it intends that its tenure in the Canal Zone is to be regarded by our own people, by Panama, by our other American Republics, and by the world at large, including the Soviet Empire and its satellites. No bland generalities will suffice: a categorical and unequivocal reaffirmation that our exclusive sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal are not open to challenge, and nothing less, must be proclaimed. For the Congress to fail in this would be tantamount to adopting the Khrushchev doctrine by default.

PLAN FOR ACTION

Mr. Speaker, as previously stated to this body on many occasions, the conduct of our Caribbean and isthmian policies over a long period of time has been indecisive and lacking in consistency. Our innate courtesy and self-restraint have been mistaken for weakness and the forces of subversion have been advanced into the vacuum created by our own fumbling.

To meet this situation where we face absolute power, we must show absolute fearlessness as the only way to meet this power.

Accordingly, I urge the following program:

First. Make definite and reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine as applying to intervention through infiltration and subversion;

Second. Make definite and reaffirm our historic policies for exclusive sovereign control in perpetuity over the Panama Canal and Canal Zone;

Third. Liberate the people of Cuba from alien dictatorship and assist them in the restoration of constitutional government through free elections;

Fourth. Reactivate the Special Service Squadron on a permanent basis to serve as a symbol of liberty.

Mr. Speaker, only by such a forthright line of action by our Government—prompt, courageous, and effective—can the sadly impaired prestige of our great country and its leadership be restored and the cause of Western freedom be strengthened.

To these ends, I would appeal to the President of the United States when dealing with hemispheric crises to act in the spirit of Cleveland and Theodore Roosevelt, when they were faced with foreign attempts to destroy the authority and integrity of our Latin neighbors in disregard of the Monroe Doctrine.

A decision thus to act may be difficult to make; but it must be made if the cause of Western civilization is to be sustained. In no finer way can our President in his own right establish a profile of courage.

As partial documentation for this address and commended for study, resolutions on these matters previously introduced by me follow; also the recent exchange of letters between the Presidents of Panama and the United States with attendant publicity from the Isthmian press, which lists Panamanian aspirations:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 225

(In the House of Representatives, 87th Cong., 1st sess., April 26, 1961)

Whereas the subversive forces known as international communism, operating secretly and openly, directly and indirectly, threaten the sovereignty and political independence of all the Western Hemisphere nations; and

Whereas the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, are not subject to colonization or domination by any power; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, conflicts with the established policy of the American Republics for the protection of the sovereignty of the peoples of such states and the political independence of their governments; and

Whereas such a situation extended to any portions of the Western Hemisphere is dangerous to the peace and safety of the whole of it, including the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), (1) That any such subversive domination or threat of it violates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and of collective security as set forth in the acts and resolutions heretofore adopted by the American Republics; and

(2) That in any such situation any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, and in accordance with the declarations and principles above stated, take steps to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, and colonization in whatever form, by the subversive forces known as international communism and its agencies in the Western Hemisphere.

House Congressional Resolution 33

(In the House of Representatives, 86th Cong., 1st sess., January 9, 1959)

Whereas there is now being strongly urged in certain quarters of the world the surrender, by the United States, without reimbursement, of the Panama Canal, to the United Nations or to some other international organization for the ownership and operation of the canal; and

Whereas the United States, at the expense of its taxpayers and under, and fully relying on, treaty agreements, constructed the canal, and since its completion, at large expenditure, has maintained and operated it and provided for its protection and defense; and

Whereas the United States, following the construction of the canal, has since maintained, operated, and protected it in strict conformity with treaty requirements and agreements, and has thus made it free, without restriction or qualification, for the shipping of the entire world; and, in consequence of which, with respect to the canal and the Canal Zone, every just and equitable consideration favors the continuance of the United States in the exercise of all the rights and authority by treaty provided, and in the discharge of the duties by treaty imposed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) it is the sense and judgment of the Congress that the United States should not, in any wise, surrender to any other government or authority its jurisdiction over, and control of, the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal, in accordance with existing treaty provisions; and that (2) it is to the best interests—not only of the United States, but, as well, of all nations and peoples—that all the powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States in the premises be continued in accordance with existing treaty provisions.

House Concurrent Resolution 450

(In the House of Representatives, 86th Cong., January 11, 1960)

Whereas, the United States, under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in prepetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

Whereas all jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange of ratifications of the 1903 treaty on February 26, 1904; and

Whereas since that time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is one of reversionary character that can never become operative unless the United States should abandon the canal enterprises; and

Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an interoceanic canal "under American control," that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), (1) That the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired, and holds, in perpetuity, exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the canal; and

(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and would lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise.

[From the Star & Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama, Nov. 16, 1961]

Texts Of Letters

CHIARI'S

PANAMA, *September 8, 1961.*

To His Excellency, JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States of America,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: Relations between the Republic of Panama and the United States of America have been governed, basically, since 1903, by the Isthmian Canal Convention, signed in Washington on November 18 of that year, by the Secretary of State, Mr. John Hay, and the French citizen, Philippe Bunau-Varilla who was acting temporarily as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Panama.

The provisions of that convention have been, from the moment of its signature, and will continue to be, as long as they remain in force, a source of constant frictions, disagreements and conflicts between the two Governments and between the Panamanian people and the North American population residing in the Canal Zone.

In 1936, thanks to the dedicated efforts of the then President of Panama, Dr. Harmodio Arias, and his advisers, Drs. Ricardo J. Alfaro and Narciso Garay and thanks also to the clear understanding, ample spirit of fairness and the great kindness of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., Panama succeeded in abolishing three rights which the 1903 convention granted to the Government of the United States, namely: (a) The right of intervention in the internal affairs of the Republic of Panama when in the judgment of the United States this became necessary to maintain order; (b) the right to occupy and Panamanian lands or waters which in the judgment of the United States were necessary for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and defense of the canal; (c) the right of "construction" of a canal through the Isthmus of Panama.

In 1936, and after in 1942 and 1955, Panama obtained other amendments as to detail in the interpretation and implementation of certain provisions of the 1903 convention.

But there still remain in full force the provisions of that convention which in practice have had and still have the effect of having divided the Republic of Panama in two parts separated by the interpolation, between them, of a zone in which the Government of the United States considers that it has the right of exercising full sovereign authority and jurisdiction, notwithstanding that all of the rights which were granted it by Panama are limited to the purposes, expressly agreed upon, of the "maintenance, operation, sanitation and defense of the canal."

The real cause of all the vices and errors of the 1903 convention lies in that such convention was never negotiated. When immediately following the proclamation of Panama's independence, the Panamanian representatives who were sent to negotiate the treaty arrived in Washington they faced the tragic surprise that on the previous day, just as they landed in the port of New York Secretary of State John Hay and the Frenchman Bunau-Varilla had hurriedly signed the Isthmian Canal Convention, with no previous negotiation, but after a quick confabulation between them both, handing over the new Republic of Panama, bound hand and feet, to the mercy of the Government of the United States, in perpetuity, as if there could be perpetual human things.

For these reasons, the Isthmian Convention of 1903 carries within it the causes of its own extinction.

It is not necessary for me to go into details on the manner in which that wholly unfair convention was drafted and signed, because the turn of this century saw the peak of the colonialist expansion of strong states to the detriment of nations rendered weak by the ignorance and submission of the popular masses. At that time, no voice was raised in support of countries subjected by brute force or by unsurmountable causes to the domination of a powerful state.

After half a century and two world wars, the panorama is wholly different: Colonies are on their way out, respect for the personality of each state is now an axiom in international law, the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of another state has victoriously surged forward, and the structure of the world organization of nations is showing ever more effectively, the influence of united small nations on international problems and conflicts.

There is no place in the mentality of man in this second half of the 20th century for the proposition that a state, no matter how strong, can exert sovereign rights over any part of the territory of another state, no matter how small or week.

This does not mean, however, that two sovereign and independent states having common interests cannot reach understandings which, without being detrimental to the sovereignty and the dignity of either one, enable both to defend and protect their fair interest and rights without disregarding or damaging the fair interests and rights of the other.

It was for these reasons that, in the face of the indissoluble community of interests between Panama and the United States; in the face of the increasingly urgent need for establishing and maintaining reciprocal relations on a basis of sincere friendship, mutual respect, and well-reciprocated consideration; and in the face of the permanent source of discord which is the 1903 convention, that I took the liberty of forwarding to you, through your personal representative at the Conference of Foreign Ministers and Economy held in Tegucigalpa in July of this year, my personal message suggesting how convenient and necessary it is for Panama and the United States to converse without prejudice, without resentment, setting aside past problems and offenses, as nations sincerely friendly and sincerely determined to search for fair solutions, to analyze and discuss their present-day relations in the light of the doctrines which now govern the world, with a view to attaining permanent understandings, on just bases, which will assure to each party the attainment and enjoyment of what in justice and fairness is due each one, without a prior agenda, so that each may openly place the cards it wants on the table.

I have the deep personal conviction that if Panama and the United States were to cast aside the interminable and up to now almost fruitless discussions on what should be the correct interpretation of existing treaties, and disposed themselves to undertake the analysis of existing relations between both with a realistic approach and in the light of the principles and norms of international law, already universally recognized, they will find adequate formulae to resolve, once and for all and for all time, a stable and lasting association which will enable them to carry out harmoniously the common destiny set out for them by the Panama Canal. The bias—whether justified or unjustified—that such results are either difficult or impossible of attainment, should not be an obstacle for the attempt.

The Alliance for Progress you have so wisely proposed, which was set in motion in Montevideo with the cooperation of all the American nations, could find no better realization in the relations between Panama and the United States through a formula that will place these relations on a level of clear and just understandings permitting Panama a fuller use of its economic potential, without diminishing the consideration that is due to the interests of the United States by reason of the canal enterprise made possible by both countries and in whose operation both have a common interest.

It is a source of real pleasure for me to reiterate on this occasion the sentiments of my highest consideration and great appreciation.

ROBERTO F. CHIARI,
President of the Republic of Panama.

KENNEDY'S

THE WHITE HOUSE,
November 2, 1961.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have read with great interest your letter of September 8, 1961, which your brother delivered to me on September 15. I am also very pleased to have had a personal conversation with your brother at that time.

I agree with you that an unusual community of interests exists between the Republic of Panama and the United States. Our respective Governments and peoples have been closely associated since the very beginning of your nation. The Panama Canal has been an important element in the development and growth of the relationship between our two countries, and has also contributed to the bonds of unity which link all the American Republics.

The Government of the United States hopes to maintain and strengthen the relations between our two nations on the basis of mutual respect and sincere friendship. I feel sure that the Government of Panama shares this objective.

Once again on behalf of the Government of the United States, I reaffirm our willingness to cooperate wholeheartedly with the Government of Panama to insure the full enjoyment of the various benefits which the canal should afford to the two nations that made possible its construction. We also wish to make these benefits available to all nations interested in international trade.

As I pointed out to your brother on September 15, I realize that the historic friendship and cooperation between our two countries has sometimes been marred by differences concerning the interpretation of the rights granted to the United States by the Republic of Panama. In past years these problems have been resolved in various ways—sometimes through formal treaty negotiations and sometimes through friendly discussions and the subsequent implementation of specific measures agreed upon by representatives of the two Governments.

My Government recognizes that differences will inevitably arise between even the friendliest nations, and believes that these differences must be discussed thoroughly and frankly, in order to clarify the interests and attitudes of both parties. It seems clear, therefore, that when two friendly nations are bound by treaty provisions which are not fully satisfactory to one of the parties, arrangements should be made to permit qualified representatives of both nations to discuss these points of dissatisfaction with a view to their resolution.

I have instructed the various responsible departments and agencies of the U.S. Government to make a complete reexamination of our current and future needs with respect to Isthmian Canal facilities. I expect this study to be completed within a very few months, at which time my Government will communicate promptly with the Government of Panama. I am confident that representatives of our two Governments, after a frank exchange of views and a careful assessment of our mutual needs and interests, can reach fruitful conclusions which will promote the mutual welfare of both countries.

With cordial good wishes,

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

[From the Panama (Republic of Panama) Star & Herald, Nov. 16, 1961]

KENNEDY AGREES ON NEED FOR REPUBLIC OF PANAMA TALKS—NEGOTIATIONS APPEAR ASSURED DURING 1962

President John F. Kennedy has agreed with President Roberto F. Chiari that differences between their two nations must be discussed thoroughly and frankly. In a reply to the Panamanian Chief Executive, Kennedy announced he has called for a complete reexamination of U.S. current and future needs with respect to Isthmian Canal facilities prior to entering into negotiations with Panama.

"I expect this study to be completed within a very few months, at which time my Government will communicate promptly with the Government of Panama," Kennedy wrote Chiari. "I am confident that representatives of our two Governments after a frank exchange of views and a careful assessment of our mutual needs and interests, can reach fruitful conclusions which will promote the mutual welfare of both countries."

Thus, new negotiations over U.S. rights in the Canal Zone and Panamanian benefits from the isthmian waterway appeared assured for 1962.

President Kennedy answered the Panamanian President's letter of September 8, calling, in effect, for negotiations from scratch.

"I have the deep personal conviction," Chiari had written Kennedy, that if Panama and the United States were to cast aside the interminable and up-to-now almost fruitless discussions on what should be the correct interpretation of existing treaties, and disposed themselves to undertake the analysis of existing relations between both with a realistic approach and in the light of the principles and norms of international law, already universally recognized, they will find adequate formulae to resolve, once and for all for all time, a stable and lasting association which will enable them to carry out harmoniously the common destiny set out for them by the Panama Canal."

And he added: "The bias—wether justified or unjustified—that such results are either difficult or impossible of attainment, should not be an obstacle for the attempt."

Chiari's letter was hand delivered to President Kennedy at the White House on September 15 by his brother, Ricardo Chiari. Kennedy's letter was hand delivered to President Chiari at the Presidencia by Philip Clock, Acting Chargé d'Affairs of the United States in Panama, Tuesday afternoon.

Announcement of the text of the Presidential correspondence was made simultaneously yesterday afternoon in Washington and Panama City.

Press Secretary Fabian Velarde, Jr., distributed copies of both letters to newsmen at 4:30 p.m., at the Presidencia. In answer to a question, he said President Chiari is pleased by the answer he has received from President Kennedy. He declared that Panama most likely will continue the appraisal of its position during the time that the United States takes for the study of its current and future canal needs.

Velarde also said that the Panama Government will appoint its negotiators soon and they will work closely with the National Council of Foreign Relations in the presentation of Panama's claims.

When a newsman raised the point that the time mentioned in President Kennedy's letter for the U.S. study of its canal needs might be 1 or 2 years, Velarde pointed to the phrase "within a very few months" and added that while every one was entitled to his own interpretation, he thought this means less than 6 months.

Chiari's letter revealed that the Panamanian President made his first approach to Kennedy on the subject of new negotiations as far back as July. At that time an emissary of President Chiari met with the personal representative of President Kennedy at a meeting of Central American Foreign Ministers held in Tegucigalpa, Honduras. This was followed by the September letter.

The Panamanian Chief Executive made one major point in his personal letter to Kennedy—that the 1903 treaty, which has governed basically relations between the two countries since Panama became independent was not negotiated by Panamanian representatives, but was hurriedly signed "by a quick confabulation" between the Secretary of State of the United States John Hay, and Philippe Bunau-Varilla, a Frenchman temporarily acting as Panama's envoy. Chiari pointed out that this was done at the "peak of the colonialist expansion of strong states."

But times have changed, Chiari said, in effect.

"After a half century and two world wars," he wrote President Kennedy, "the panorama is wholly different: Colonies are on their way out, respect for the personality of each state is now an axiom in international law; the principle of nonintervention in the internal affairs of another state has victoriously surged forward, and the structure of the world organization of nations is showing, ever more effectively, the influence of united small nations on international problems and conflicts."

And with a pointed reference to the key question between Panama and the United States—sovereignty over the Canal Zone—the President of Panama added:

"There's no place in the mentality of man in this second half of the 20th century for the proposition that a state, no matter how strong, can exert sovereign rights over any part of the territory of another state, no matter how small or weak."

But, he went on, there is nothing to prevent two sovereign and independent states from reaching understandings providing acceptable arrangements for the fair interests and rights of each.

President Kennedy's letter matched the cordial tone of President Chiari's approach.

"Once again," Kennedy wrote, "on behalf of the Government of the United States, I reaffirm our willingness to cooperate wholeheartedly with the Government of Panama to insure the full enjoyment of the various benefits which the canal should afford to the two nations that made possible its construction. We also wish to make these benefits available to all nations interested in international trade."

He added: "My Government recognizes that differences will inevitably arise between even the friendliest nations and believes that these differences must be discussed thoroughly and frankly in order to clarify the interests and attitudes of both parties. It seems clear, therefore, that when two friendly nations are bound by treaty provisions which are not fully satisfactory to one of the parties, arrangements should be made to permit qualified representatives of both nations to discuss these points of dissatisfaction with a view to their resolution."

There has been no official announcement by Panama of what specific issues it proposes to raise when normal negotiations are undertaken. But an official listing of unfulfilled Panamanian demands in previous negotiations carried in the Foreign Office's 1961 report to the National Assembly included these major points:

1. The display of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone.
2. Implementation of the principle of equality of wages, of treatment, and of opportunity for employment among Panamanian and North American citizens in the Canal Zone.
3. Increase of the canal annuity to 20 percent of the gross revenue with a guaranteed minimum of $5 million. The present annuity is $1,930,000.
4. Cessation of grant in perpetuity.
5. Mixed courts in the Canal Zone.

[From the Panama (Republic of Panama) Star & Herald, Nov. 17, 1961]

Republic of Panama Assembly Calls for Brandnew Treaty—Deputies Favor Scrapping of Previous Pacts—Resolution, Approved Unanimously, Advocates Treaty Reaffirming Republic of Panama Sovereignty in Zone

The Panama National Assembly went on record yesterday for the scrapping of all previous treaties with the United States and for a new treaty reaffirming Panamanian sovereignty in the Canal Zone.

The resolution, introduced by nationalist leader, Aquilino Boyd, in behalf of himself and 11 other assembly deputies, was approved unanimously after a brief discussion.

In addition to the sovereignty demand, the Assembly listed 13 other points as minimum aspirations of the Panamanian people. These points are almost identical to the list of Panamanian demands not met by the United States in previous negotiations, issued earlier this month by the Foreign Office.

The Assembly acted within 24 hours of the release of the text of the correspondence between Presidents Roberto Chiari and John F. Kennedy on the subject of new treaty negotiations. President Chiari, in a letter dated September 8, told President Kennedy that the two countries should make another attempt at resolving their longstanding differences, starting this time from scratch. President Kennedy, in a letter dated November 2, agreed that such differences must be discussed thoroughly and frankly, and indicated that the United States will be ready to enter into talks in 1962 after a reexamination of its current and future needs with respect to Isthmian Canal facilities.

The Assembly said yesterday that Kennedy's letter "evidences the good will of his Government to arrive at satisfactory agreements on the questions deriving from the interoceanic canal embedded in our territory."

The resolution also pointed out: That the 1903, 1936 and 1955 treaties have not succeeded in "cementing the relations between the two countries in a satisfactory manner."

That the 1903 treaty is manifestly unfair and that the grant is made to the United States in perpetuity is not in keeping with the principles of international law.

That Panama is not deriving fair benefits from the Panama Canal.

The resolution provides as follows:

"*Be it resolved*—

"1. That (the Assembly) express its most fervent desire that the 1903 Treaty on the Interoceanic Canal and the treaties subsequently entered into in 1936 and 1955 be totally replaced and that a new treaty be drawn up which will reaffirm Panamanian sovereignty in the Canal Zone and satisfy the minimum aspirations of the Panamanian people.

"2. That the following are recognized as the minimum aspirations of the Panamanian people:

"(a) Elimination of the in-perpetuity clause and reversion to Panama of the canal installations on a fixed term.

"(b) Fair sharing of the canal revenues. (The Foreign Office had listed increasing the canal annuity from the present $1,930,000 to 20 percent of the gross revenue, with a guaranteed minimum of $5 million.)

"(c) Establishment of mixed courts and revision of the present legislation in the Canal Zone.

"(d) Recognition of Spanish as an official language in the Canal Zone.

"(e) Cooperation by Canal Zone authorities to enforce Panamanian laws in the Canal Zone.

"(f) Establishment of Panamanian jurisdiction over the ports of Balboa and Cristobal.

"(g) Raising of the Panamanian flag on all public buildings and on all ships transiting the canal.

"(h) Use of Panamanian postage stamps in the Canal Zone.

"(i) Elimination of the issuance of exequaturs (written official recognition) by the Canal Zone to foreign consuls.

"(j) Effective equality of opportunity and treatment for Panamanian and North American workers in the Canal Zone.

"(k) Inclusion of a clause on arbitration as the means of resolving controversies. (The Foreign Office has listed acceptance of the mandatory jurisdiction of the World Court over controversies between the two countries.)

"(l) Cooperation by the U.S. Government for the defense of the Panamanian civil population against possible nuclear attacks.

"(m) Regulation of commercial activities in the Canal Zone through a Treaty of Commerce, bearing in mind at all times the objective of insuring for Panama the full enjoyment of all types of benefits deriving from the operation of the canal."

Cosignators of the resolution with Boyd were Deputies Azael Vargas, Thelma King, José Agustin Arango, Enrique Jiménez, Jr., Jacinto Lopez y León, Jorge Fernández, Sidney Wise Arias, Rafael Grajales, Juan B. Arias, Raúl Arango, Jr., and Demetrio Oecerega.

Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments

U.S. Senate, Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws, of the Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1954.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 324, Senate Office Building, Senator William E. Jenner (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Jenner, Watkins, Welker, and Butler.

Also present: Charles P. Grimes, chief counsel; J. G. Sourwine, associate counsel; Benjamin Mandel, director of research; Dr. Edna R. Fluegel and Robert C. McManus, professional staff members.

The Chairman. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show this is a continuation of a hearing with Ambassador Braden that was started December 22, 1953, in New York, and I will ask Mr. Grimes to connect the two and to clarify the record.

Mr. Grimes. Thank you. I think that would make a more orderly record.

There will be some repetition, but simply by way of amplification.

The Chairman. Mr. Witness, do you swear the testimony you will give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Braden. So help me God, I do.

TESTIMONY OF SPRUILLE BRADEN, NEW YORK, N.Y.

The Chairman. State your full name.

Mr. Braden. Spruille Braden, and I live in New York, 320 East 72d Street.

The Chairman. What is your business or profession?

Mr. Braden. Presently as a consultant to various firms mostly on foreign investments and particularly in Latin America.

The Chairman. When were you with the Government of the United States?

Mr. Braden. I was with the Government of the United States more or less continuously—there were in the first couple of years a few intermissions—from the end of 1933 until June 28, 1947.

The Chairman. In what capacities did you serve?

Mr. Braden. I began first as a delegate in charge of all the economic and financial discussions at the Seventh International Conference.

* * * * *

Mr. Braden. Yes. Going back to 1941, when I was in Colombia, I began sounding warnings to the State Department about the menace of communism in this hemisphere and during the war—1943 and 1944—there were repeated dispatches in which I said that this is the gravest peril we face and that after the war it is going to be most serious.

The Chairman. That was in your written reports?

Mr. Braden. Written reports and telegrams, all kinds of things.

Mr. Grimes. What was the Russian Communist Party line at that time?

Mr. Braden. More or less simultaneously with that, we had the opening that fall of the first United Nations Assembly meeting in New York. They had a San Francisco meeting and a London meeting, but here the Assembly met in New York for the first time.

Mr. Grimes. They were about to meet at the time this took place?

Mr. Braden. This all took place after V–J Day, August 6 or August 7.

Mr. Grimes. The agitation began?

Mr. Braden. It began promptly and it grew rapidly in volume.

Mr. Grimes. You knew this through reports that reached you?

Mr. Braden. I had all kinds of reports and telegrams, everything coming in from Panama. The Army had the same thing. The newspapers carried it.

Mr. Grimes. But your knowledge is based on the official reports made to you as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin American Affairs; is that correct?

Mr. Braden. Exactly.

Mr. Grimes. That is the position you occupied then?

Mr. Braden. That is the position.

Mr. Grimes. Will you state, please, what the Russian Communist Party line was? I think I interrupted you.

Mr. Braden. I was going to say that for the first time the Russians at that time at that Assembly in New York, made the attack on us that we had aggressive intentions—that we were aggressive and the proof of the aggressive intentions we had was our establishing bases all over the world.

Mr. Grimes. Did they at that time mention Panama bases?

Mr. Braden. Subsequently during the discussions in the Assembly they did, not at the beginning, as I recall.

Mr. GRIMES. So they used the Panama bases as proof of our aggressive intentions?

Mr. BRADEN. Well, you say they used it. We gave them the ammunition.

Mr. GRIMES. Let's get to that later, but that was the party line?

Mr. BRADEN. Sure.

Mr. GRIMES. We were the aggressors. The proof is we have the bases, the military bases, all over the world, including Panama; is that right?

Mr. BRADEN. As I recall, the Russians made the point specifying Panama later.

The CHAIRMAN. They were not referring to the Canal Zone, they were referring to the Republic of Panama, 134 bases?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes, the 134 bases I am talking about. But the Canal Zone was brought in implicitly.

Mr. GRIMES. Did you have an experience in connection with the agitation in Panama and the Communist Party line with Alger Hiss?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes.

Mr. GRIMES. What was it?

Mr. BRADEN. There were two instances.

Mr. GRIMES. What was Hiss doing at that time?

Mr. BRADEN. Hiss was in charge of the Office of Special Political Affairs.

Mr. GRIMES. In the State Department?

Mr. BRADEN. In the State Department. That Office today is headed by an Assistant Secretary of State. It is the Office for United Nations Affairs. He was the head of that Office, although he did not have the rank of Assistant Secretary of State.

The first thing that happened was that, in the routine performance of his duties, the Governor of the Canal Zone submitted his annual report.

Mr. GRIMES. To whom?

Mr. BRADEN. On the operations of the Canal Zone. I think that is submitted to the War Department. I am not sure of that, but in any case, it was published, as it usually is.

Mr. GRIMES. You say routine operations. Would you describe it, briefly, please?

Mr. BRADEN. I can't do a good job of describing it. I don't think I read it.

Mr. GRIMES. What sort of report was it?

Mr. BRADEN. How many boats are going through the canal in different directions, the tonnage, et cetera; what were the operations of the stores in the canal, what was the labor operation, everything.

Mr. GRIMES. Population, matters of that sort?

Mr. BRADEN. I think population was probably in it. I don't recall.

Mr. GRIMES. This is a report by our Governor down there on operations in the Canal Zone and a report which he submits annually; is that correct?

Mr. BRADEN. Exactly.

Mr. GRIMES. He had been submitting it to the American Government; is that right?

Mr. BRADEN. Since 1903, I assume.

Mr. GRIMES. Go ahead, please. What happened in connection with that report?

Mr. BRADEN. My office, represented by Mr. Cochran, Mr. William Cochran, who was in charge of that whole area in the Caribbean, and Mr. Wise, who was on the Panama desk, became involved in an argument with the Office of Political Affairs, because the latter wished to submit this report by the Governor of the Canal Zone to the United Nations.

My officers immediately got in touch with the legal adviser's office where Miss Ann O'Neill, a very competent lawyer, and a very sturdy soul, I may say—I have a great admiration for her—supported the thesis of my officers that under no circumstances should this report of the Governor of the Canal Zone be submitted to the United Nations.

Finally, Mr. Hiss himself——

Mr. GRIMES. What was your reason for that?

Mr. BRADEN. I was going to say what Hiss' reason was first, because I think that makes it clearer.

Alger Hiss and his Office claimed under article 73(e) of the United Nations Charter, it was our obligation to submit that report. I don't know whether you would like to have article 73 reviewed now, or not.

The CHAIRMAN. Let it go into the record and become a part of the record, without reading.

(The material referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 357" and is as follows:)

"EXHIBIT NO. 357—CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS—CHAPTER XI, DECLARATION REGARDING NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES

"Article 73

"Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end:

"a. to insure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses:

"b. to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement;

"c. to further international peace and security;

"d. to promote constructive measures of development, to encourage research, and to cooperate with one another and, when and where appropriate, with specialized international bodies with a view to the practical achievement of the social, economic, and scientific purposes set forth in this article; and

"e. to transmit regularly to the Secretary General for information purposes, subject to such limitation as security and constitutional considerations may require, statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories for which they are respectively responsible other than those territories to which chapters XII and XIII apply."

Mr. BRADEN. My officers maintained that was perfectly ridiculous; that article 73(e) anticipated self-government. That was the phraseology used in it.

The Canal Zone, so far as the Republic of Panama is concerned, is self-governing.

We had a special agreement as to the operation of the Canal Zone. There was no rhyme or reason, in my opinion, nor in the opinion of my officers, why that should be presented to the United Nations.

Moreover, we knew that if it were presented that it was just going to enrage the Panamanians. It was going to play into the hands of the Russians with their allegations about our bases scattered all over the world, and particularly in Panama.

It was going to alienate a lot of the other Latin Americans, who would say, "See what the United States is doing in the Canal Zone?"

It was a thoroughly bad move to make and particularly with the Assembly starting up in New York.

I knew that Mr. Alfaro, the former President of Panama, and Minister of Foreign Relations, a leading politician, already faced this terrific problem about the bases outside of the zone, and would be terrifically annoyed by this report being presented.

Mr. GRIMES. In addition, would it complicate our relations insofar as operation is concerned by giving the United Nations a voice?

Mr. BRADEN. It would complicate us with the Republic of Panama. It brought the United Nations into something where they had no right to be.

Mr. GRIMES. It might give them a claim to some stake in the operation of the Panama Canal?

Mr. BRADEN. Exactly.

Mr. GRIMES. Was that part of the argument?

Mr. BRADEN. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Watkins.

Senator WATKINS. Is it not true we also made reports on Alaska?

Mr. BRADEN. That was not in my sphere, so I haven't any idea about that. I think we did. I don't know whether we did on Hawaii, or not, but I think we did, now that you mention it. But I wasn't concerned about that. I had enough troubles of my own with Panama.

Senator WATKINS. The reason I call your attention to it was the fact I entered a protest about reporting from Alaska.

Mr. BRADEN. I vaguely remember that was true.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Chairman, may I have a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Welker.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Ambassador, you were fortified by your counsel's opinion and the opinion of yourself and others, that you were permitted not to submit this information as requested by Mr. Hiss under the limitation of security; is that correct? That is subsection (e) of article 73.

Mr. BRADEN. That I can't give you an opinion on as a lawyer. I know that the procedure was totally out of order. There was no justification for that; aside from all of the issues that counsel has brought up in regard to our relations.

Senator WELKER. Not withstanding the fact that you did have the security defense in mind, it was still insisted by Mr. Hiss?

Mr. BRADEN. It was still insisted by Mr. Hiss that it had to be submitted to the United Nations.

Finally, Mr. Cochran and Mr. Murray Wise, my assistants on this matter, came to me and said, "You have got to enter this fight. We can't get any further on it."

At that point we got Mr. Hackworth, the legal adviser to the State Department, in on it.

My boys reported to me they were quite concerned. They feared Mr. Hackworth was veering over to the side of Alger Hiss, but I stormed around quite a bit on this problem and finally Mr. Hackworth would not give a decision.

At that point it was appealed to the Under Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was that?

Mr. BRADEN. Mr. Acheson.

I remember very vividly that I went in to see Mr. Acheson. I think Mr. Hiss had already been there for some time.

This was all 7 years ago, so my memory may be a bit off, but I think it is substantially accurate.

When I tried to state my case, Mr. Acheson, as a lawyer, agreed with Mr. Hiss, and I didn't even have a chance to state my case. I remember that I came out of that meeting boiling with rage at what happened.

Senator WELKER. Mr. Hiss was present there?

Mr. BRADEN. Oh, yes. The only thing we got out of Mr. Hiss' office was an expression which today I don't understand very clearly, and he said this—he put in a phrase that this was submitted to the United Nations, this report of the Governor, on a pragmatic basis for this year, for the year 1946. What that means, I don't know, but that was supposed to take care of our objections, which needless to say, it did not.

As we predicted, the Panamanian Foreign Minister made a speech in the United Nations. I have a copy of this if you wish to have it in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it should go into the record and become a part of the record.

(The material referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 358" and is as follows:)

"EXHIBIT NO. 358—PANAMA CANAL ZONE IS NOT LEASED TERRITORY

"(Dr. Ricardo J. Alfaro Explains Payment of $430,000 Annuity by the U.S. Government)

"(Speech by the president of the Panamanian delegation, Dr. Ricardo J. Alfaro, during the session of the Political Commission of the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 14, 1946, in respect to the international status of the Panama Canal Zone.)

"The Panamanian Delegation has been informed that by virtue of a resolution adopted on February 9, 1946, by the United Nations Assembly, the United States has presented a report concerning the territories under its administration and has included the Panama Canal Zone among those about which it had to report to the General Secretariat, in accordance with article 73(e) of the United Nations Charter."

* * * * *

Mr. GRIMES. Would you state what his points were?

Mr. BRADEN. The substance was that here we were talking about the canal as if we had it under lease, and we did not; that it was a special agreement beginning in 1903 between Panama and the United States; that Panama had given the United States certain facilities and we had in return made certain payments in regard to—I think it was $10 million to Panama, plus an annual rental of $250,000 a year.

Subsequently we went off gold, raised it to $430,000 a year.

There were the various quid pro quos back and forth that the submission of this to the United Nations was an outrage both to Panama and to the agreement.

Mr. GRIMES. In other words, it was none of the business of the United Nations that he came out very much on the side of the United States on this?

Mr. BRADEN. He came out very much on the side of my office, not of the United States, because we had submitted it.

Mr. GRIMES. That depends on what the U.S. interest is.

Mr. BRADEN. Of the true interest of the United States; yes.

Mr. GRIMES. The report was then submitted to the United Nations?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes.

Mr. GRIMES. Did another incident take place in regard to Panama?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes.

Mr. GRIMES. What was that?

Mr. BRADEN. At that time, and you have to get the picture of the United Nations, the Russians making their speeches about our being aggressors, and the proof being the bases, the Panama bases, 134 outside of Panama Canal Zone, being brought in as proof positive of our aggressive intentions, and I desperately trying and praying that I would be able to keep the lid on everything until the Assembly was over in New York.

And that we could get Mr. Alfaro down to Washington, and quietly and calmly, in luncheons, and in our offices, work out an agreement with him about these 134 bases which the military informed me were vitally necessary for the security of the Panama Canal—therefore, of the United States.

You can, therefore, imagine my utter astonishment when one morning I picked up the Washington Post at my apartment and here on the front page was an announcement that we had reported to the United Nations on the Canal Zone as an occupied territory. When I read that, I realized that was really putting the fat in the fire in our relations with Panama in the substantiation of the Russian allegations and in our relations with all of the American Republics; it was such a nasty situation.

Mr. GRIMES. In other words, our State Department had officially reported it to the United Nations, that Panama was one of our occupied territories?

Mr. BRADEN. Yes. The only thing, my memory is a little hazy on whether that came along at about the same time as the submission of the report by the Governor, or whether it came subsequently, but my best recollection is it came subsequently.

Mr. GRIMES. This was a matter under your jurisdiction as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs?

Mr. BRADEN. Exactly.

Mr. GRIMES. You learned about it for the first time in the newspapers?

Mr. BRADEN. I learned about it for the first time in the newspapers.

Mr. GRIMES What did you do?

Mr. BRADEN. I dropped the newspaper, and I tore down to the State Department. I called in the Director of the Office of American Republics Affairs, Mr. Briggs, who presently is our American Ambassador in Korea; and my first special assistant, Mr. Wright; and Mr. Murray Wise was then called in as the officer on the Panamanian desk.

I may say I was using some pretty strong language around the place at this outrage. None of them knew any more about it than I.

They also had read it in the newspapers.

We then tried to run it down, and we found that this report had been submitted and the employment of the words "occupied territory" by the Office of Special Political Affairs, that is to say, Mr. Alger Hiss.

THE NEW ONE-SIDED UNITED STATES NEAR EASTERN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today with a deep sense of concern over evidence that our foreign policy has embarked on a new and disastrous course in the Near East.

I read recent reports, Mr. Speaker, that the State Department had decided the time was ripe to try to improve relations with the Arab States, especially Nasser's Egypt and the new Syrian regime. I felt this was constructive thinking and that we must seek the best possible relations with all nations in these troubled times. You can imagine my dismay a few days thereafter when I learned that our Government had seized on the pretext of a minor armed clash between Syria and Israel to heap blame and censure on one side, Israel's side, on what was obviously a two-sided dispute.

The State Department said nothing for week after week when Soviet-trained Syrian troops fired Russian artillery shells into Israel and killed Israelis. But the moment Israel dared strike back in her own defense to silence those murderous guns, made in the Soviet Union, our diplomats rushed to the United Nations Security Council to cosponsor a resolution censuring Israel. This, of course, pleased the Arabs and even drew a vote of agreement from the Soviet delegation which is also bidding for Arab favor.

Mr. Speaker, this is a cynical way to pursue foreign policy objectives. It is not in the American tradition of impartiality in the troublesome Arab-Israel dispute nor of fairplay. We must not imitate the opportunistic diplomacy of the totalitarian states.

I am truly fearful that the emerging policy portends a willingness to sell the State of Israel down the Jordan.

Do our diplomats consider it somehow normal when Arabs kill Israelis but a grave threat to world peace when Israelis strike back?

This is particularly shocking when we observe that Israel is pro-American, anti-Communist, and does not resort to a self-serving pretense of neutralism.

Why were we so righteous about behavior of our proven friends and so oblivious to the misdeeds of our enemies?

Here we are, not only turning our backs on our friends but taking leadership in sponsoring a resolution against those friends. Are we thus entertaining an appeasement philosophy reminiscent of the loathsome Munich betrayal of a small beleaguered new democracy?

Was the Security Council intended to preserve the rights of small nations? Or as an Arabian bazaar in which we bid against Russia, at Israel's expense, for Arab favor?

I might note that the delegate of France abstained when the Security Council this week voted on the anti-Israel resolution we sponsored. The French delegate said the resolution failed to establish that both sides shared responsibility for the recent border clashes on the Israel-Syrian frontier. The Soviet delegate agreed with the U.S. delegate that all the blame and abuse would be heaped on Israel alone.

It might interest this House that the very same type of Soviet-made recoilless cannon used by the Syrians against Israel are being used by other Communist-supplied forces in South Vietnam. We have spent a fortune and almost a score of young American soldiers have died to prop up the questionable Diem regime of South Vietnam. But we condemn Israel for defending itself against other Soviet-equipped forces firing the weapons they have been trained to use by their Sino-Soviet instructors.

Israel is the only nation in the world menaced by Soviet arms that has turned to America and asked to participate with other free world states in our U.S. military assistance program to defend the free world and found itself rejected. The State Department felt it might embarrass our relations with the Arab States. We reject our friends and reward our enemies.

Could it be a question of trying to outdo the Soviets in currying Arab favor at the expense of Israel?

Must we appease enemies and potential enemies while punishing allies and potential allies? Must we condemn one side in a two-sided dispute to curry favor with the other side?

Is the disgusting fiasco of the Bay of Pigs in Cuba last year in which we abandoned freedom fighters to their fate to be followed by appeasement of Castro's Syrian friends at Israel's expense?

I will oppose such a policy because it is morally wrong and also negates the true interest of America. It tempts the Arabs to new adventures against Israel that could ignite a world catastrophe. I have urged the Secretary of State to make clear to the Syrians that their continued attacks on Israel will not be condoned by this Government and that this Government will impartially oppose aggression from whatever quarter. I have asked him to alert our diplomats to impress this on the Arabs before the Near Eastern situation deteriorates further.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks at this point in the Record the text of my telegram to Secretary Rusk.

I am convinced that the Department must maintain vigilance in the Near East and at once return to an objective policy vis-a-vis Israel and the Arabs lest we find ourselves with a new major crisis at a time when things are far from perfect in southeast Asia, Berlin, Latin America, and elsewhere.

The matter referred to follows:

April 11, 1962.

Hon. Dean Rusk,
The Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.:

I am dismayed that a new U.S. foreign policy appears to be emerging in the Near East which invites renewed Arab military transgressions against Israel while warning Israel not to fight back.

The American delegation at the United Nations, acting on instructions from Washington, cosponsored a resolution in the Security Council to condemn Israel just a few days after reports were published that the executive department was seeking to improve relations with the Arabs, especially Egypt's Nasser and the new Syrian regime.

Our diplomats apparently chose to ignore Syrian artillery attacks and murder of Israelis but considered it a threat to world peace when Israelis fought back in legitimate self-defense against the Soviet-equipped Syrian forces. The American delegation rushed to the Security Council with an anti-Israel resolution welcomed by the Arab States and, of course, endorsed by the Soviet Union—which is also bidding for Arab friendship.

Mr. Secretary, I wish to urge that the State Department, if it is at all responsive to public opinion and guided by fairplay toward all nations, alert our diplomats to impress on the Arabs that further attacks on Israel, guerrilla or open, will not again be condoned. If this is not done, the Soviet equipped forces of Syria and other Arab States may be tempted to continue aggressive warfare against Israel and ignite a catastrophic general war.

I respectfully request the Department's explanation, if any can be offered, for the apparent new tendency of our foreign policy to cynically court Arab favor at Israel's expense. I submit that we are also courting global disaster if we follow such a course.

Must we condemn one side in an obviously two-sided dispute to curry favor in the most opportunistic manner with the other side?

At a time when American soldiers are dying in South Vietnam and we are spending a fortune of our taxpayers' dollars there to prop up a virtually totalitarian regime, because it is under attack by Communist-equipped forces, why did we have to rush to the United Nations to condemn a truly free democracy for defending herself against the Russian artillery shells fired by Syria's Soviet-trained army?

Seymour Halpern,
Member of Congress.

SUPPLEMENTAL AIR CARRIERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Curtin] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session I introduced two bills, both of which are an outgrowth of a personal study concerning the circumstances surrounding the very tragic aircraft accident of Imperial Airlines on November 8, 1961, near Richmond, Va., in which 74 young Army recruits lost their lives. Six of these young men were from the congressional district that I have the privilege to represent.

The two bills which I introduced are designed to correct certain of the inequities and practices which have become evident as a consequence of this unfortunate incident.

The first of the two bills is H.R. 10690. This legislation would forestall insurance companies carrying a contract of insurance with an air carrier for the protection of persons and property transported by such air carrier from voiding such contract of insurance after an accident, on the defense that the aircraft was being operated in violation of its airworthiness certificate, or in violation of safety regulations, or some similar defense. The second bill, H.R. 10719, would, if enacted into law, provide the sum of $10,000 to each person certified as the living survivor of such Army recruit who lost his life in the said accident.

I have devoted considerable time seeking to get the facts relating to this very sad accident, and, as a result thereof, have been forced to conclusions which convince me that certain of our Government regulatory agencies have been shockingly negligent in their supervision of the operations of supplemental air carriers. My observations lead me to conclude that the Department of the Army has also been negligent in its preliminary investigations of these supplemental air carriers as to their reputation for safety and their financial responsibility, prior to entering into contracts with such nonskeds to transport its military personnel.

As is well known by this time, the Imperial Airlines was under contract to the Department of the Army to carry certain military personnel to Columbia, S.C. The aircraft involved in this particular transportation consisted of a Lockheed L-049, which crashed and burned in an attempted emergency landing at Byrd Field, Richmond, Va., on November 8, 1961. Seventy-four passengers, all young Army recruits, and three flight crew members died as a result of carbon monoxide poisoning. Two members of the flight crew escaped from the burning wreckage. The aircraft was totally destroyed. The young Army recruits who died in this crash were all members of the Army who had been members thereof for but a few hours. They were being transported to their first Army quarters.

The report on the accident, as adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board of February 2, 1962, and released on February 6, 1962, and known as file No. 10025, contains conclusions which are shocking almost beyond belief, in reference to the operation of this aircraft and the reasons for the crash. Among the said conclusions, I read the following from the said report:

> The Board, in its investigation, noted several company practices which were not in compliance with civil air regulations. First, making nonstandard repairs affecting the airworthiness of the aircraft. Second, operating an aircraft wherein repairs were made which were not in accordance with civil air regulations. Third, operating an aircraft in excess of the required maintenance inspection periods. Fourth, not reporting inflight discrepancies on aircraft flight logs and others. These and other actions describe a pattern of practice which indicates the type of substandard operation which Imperial conducted.
>
> From all of the foregoing, it is clear to the Board that the loss of power on engines Nos. 3 and 4 was not the result of a malfunction or mechanical failure of the engines. It is equally clear that fuel contamination was not a cause of the engine stoppage. It is the Board's conclusion that fuel exhaustion brought about by improper fuel management caused the stoppage of engines 3 and 4.
>
> As the aircraft was proceeding to Byrd Field the decision was made to land on runway 33. The tower was so notified and it must be assumed that both pilots were aware of this intention. It is clear that both captains were issuing orders and both were attempting to command the flight. Greenlee, although senior with the company, had elected to act as copilot. Yet, during the emergency he issued orders to the other crew members as captain. From all of the testimony the Board concludes that confusion prevailed in the cockpit due to lack of crew coordination and the issuing of conflicting orders. Greenlee's sudden turn to attempt a landing on runway 02 is a clear indication that a division of command and lack of coordination existed. His actuation of the landing gear selector handle was equally rash. Conway testified that when this turn had been made and the gear handle lowered he did not see any indication of the landing gear extending. He then recycled the landing gear up.
>
> From the location of the wreckage it is apparent that the landing pattern was poorly executed. It is believed that when the airplane was on its base leg the bank angle was steepened in an attempt to avoid overshooting the extended centerline of the runway. This increased angle of bank and increased rate of turn bled off airspeed and the aircraft began to sink. To try to arrest the sink rate Greenlee called for "all the power you got." By this time the No. 1 engine was destroying itself as a result of the over boosting during the emergency. It failed completely. With only one engine delivering power it was impossible to maintain flight and the aircraft stalled into the trees.
>
> From a study of all the information available to the Board it is concluded that this flight crew was not capable of performing the function or assuming the responsibility for the job they presumed to do. The Board further concludes that the management personnel of Imperial Airlines should have

> been aware of the manner in which company operations were being accomplished. It is believed that the substandard maintenance practices of Imperial's employees were condoned by management. The manner in which maintenance and personnel records were kept by the company confirms this conclusion.
>
> Estimates of the expected elapsed time from impact to loss of mobility of cabin occupants are from as little as 30 seconds to as long as 2 minutes, under such extreme conditions. It would be expected then, that with known available escape routes, time would have permitted at least a small number of occupants to escape.
>
> No positive evidence of impact injuries to the passengers was found. The cause of death in all cases was established as suffocation caused by carbon monoxide poisoning.
>
> The Board determines the probable cause of this accident was the lack of command coordination and decision, lack of judgment, and lack of knowledge of the equipment resulting in loss of power in three engines creating an emergency situation which the crew could not handle.

From the portions of the conclusions above mentioned, it must be apparent that something was radically wrong with the operation of this aircraft and the personnel having charge of the plane. It is also equally clear that these young men, in the prime of their lives, and through no fault of their own, were on an aircraft which was operated by at least some members who, by reason of wanton disregard for human values, gave them virtually no chance of survival. It is also quite evident that they had not been in the Army for a sufficient length of time to enable them to secure normal insurance, carried by most members of the armed services. This, then, is the reason for my introduction of H.R. 10719, a bill to provide the sum of $10,000 to the living survivor of each Army recruit. This is only fair and just, and I hope that the Congress will waste no time in enacting this bill into law.

While investigating this matter, I came upon another practice which, it seems to me, provides a loophole for an insurance company to evade responsibility which should be corrected. I have found that in the case of the aircraft mentioned herein, Imperial did in fact carry insurance for the aircraft and for the protection of its passengers. However, a history of such crashes where there was such insurance will show that the mere carrying of insurance does not mean that the insurance company will honor the claims arising therefrom. It appears that in some similar accidents to "nonskeds," the insurance company involved has successfully contended that the insurance policy was voided because of the fact that the aircraft was violating its airworthiness certificate, or that it was being operated otherwise than within the approved operating limitations contained in its air flight manual, or other documents issued with the airworthiness certificate, while in flight.

Whether or not such defense will be used in the current case is, of course, unknown to me. I do feel, however, that whenever an insurance company enters into a contract with an air carrier, it knows, or should investigate, the financial condition of the carrier and its reputation for safety, and when it accepts the aircraft for such insurance, it must accept all responsibility for insuring its flights. This is not to foreclose the legal rights of any insurance company to cancel its policy prior to such aircraft starting on a flight, should there be violations of the safety regulations being credited to the said air carrier. I do feel, however, that once such aircraft is in flight and an accident results, that it is then too late for an insurance company to say that it will not pay the insurance because of such violations. This savors uncomfortably much of the old adage of "having your cake and eating it, too."

For these reasons, I have introduced H.R. 10690, which says, in effect, that such defense shall not be available to an insurance company if the contract is in full force and effect as of the time the flight originates. It seems to me that such legislation is badly needed, and is also fair and equitable.

I earnestly hope that both of these bills will be acted upon by the Congress during this session. Great injustice has been done to the families of these young men by loose enforcement of safety rules. Nothing said or done on the floor of this House can restore these boys to their loved ones. But we have a clear duty to do all that is within our legislative power to remedy the demonstrated evils that this tragic incident has revealed. I bespeak your full support for these bills.

REPUBLICAN SPRING THAW

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. **HOSMER**. Mr. Speaker, late this month, if all goes according to schedule, the United States will begin a major series of nuclear tests in the Pacific—the first American atmospheric tests in nearly 4 years. These tests, as President Kennedy carefully explained to the Nation, are the necessary minimum answer to the alarming signs of nuclear progress shown in the Soviet series of last fall. "No single decision of this administration has been more thoroughly or thoughtfully weighed," said the President, and public reaction at home and abroad has generally indicated approval of both the deliberation and the decision. But it will be most remarkable if pressures on him do not build right to the last minute to try to get him to postpone or alter the decision, particularly from the members of his administration who have authored various of the liberal papers. We in Congress who believe the resumption of U.S. atmospheric tests is vital to the national security of the United States have a duty to speak out and urge the President not to engage in a last-minute reversal of his commendable decision to go ahead with the planned test series. The idea that tests, of themselves, are evil has developed surprising survival powers. And in the administration itself there is still talk about the need to take risks of loose inspection to halt the spiraling arms race. Therefore this seems the opportune time to note just how important new tests are to the United States in terms of risks to the national security.

Mr. Kennedy reported:

> In all candor that further Soviet series in the absence of further Western progress could well provide the Soviet Union with a nuclear attack and defense capability so powerful as to encourage aggressive designs.

Responsible journalists have dug out more concrete detail of the analyses of Soviet tests on which the President's finding rests, and those details grow more disturbing the more they are studied. I do not, by relating these estimates, intend to verify or not to verify them on the basis of what I may know by reason of my membership on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I offer them only as stated by the press for your own evaluation and consideration. These reporters state that the U.S.S.R. has far surpassed the United States in the development of supermegaton bombs, and appears to be quite capable of exploding the 100-megaton model that Khrushchev boasts about. They also state that the Russians also conducted extensive proof tests of existing weapons, probably including missiles subjected to the searing heat of atmospheric reentry. They have apparently tested intermediate-range missiles—700 to 1,100 miles—in salvos of as many as 10 to 20 per firing, according to Hanson Baldwin of the New York Times:

> Something—

He notes—

> the United States has never done and is not equipped to do.

On the defensive side the Russians apparently outdistanced the United States in their experimental work on an antimissile weapons system; the President emphasized one firing more than 100 miles in the atmosphere.

These tests, Mr. Kennedy said:

> In and by themselves, did not give the Soviet Union superiority in nuclear power.

But they did provide "a mass of data and experience" leading in that direction. Since U.S. strategy assumes that Soviet forces will be deterred from attack by threat of retaliation, Americans would do well to note that first, heavier Soviet warheads would decrease the need for accuracy in attacks upon the concrete emplacements of U.S. retaliatory missiles; second, Soviet intermediate-range missiles fired in Salvo could strike hard at U.S. bases overseas; and third, Soviet antimissile missiles, if perfected, could lessen the danger of counterattack from the West.

There is even an aspect of the Soviet tests that summons up memories of Pearl Harbor. This is the area of diplomatic deception, and it has much in common with the peace negotiations that the Japanese carried on in Washington while their fleets were moving eastward toward Hawaii. Our scientists believe now that the Russians were actively preparing for their test series for at least a year. During that period the Kremlin set out to weaken the arguments of Americans who thought it was high time for the United States to resume its own testing. Russians slipped the word to American scientists meeting in Moscow, just before Kennedy's inauguration, that they genuinely wanted a nuclear-test-ban treaty because of their worries over Communist China's nuclear progress. The same authoritative word was leaked all summer long through other Western channels and, for a while, it had considerable effect on the Kennedy administration—leading, among other things, to substantial concessions reportedly proffered by the United States at the interminable Geneva test-ban negotiations.

The Soviet pattern indicates now—as it did 2 years ago—that the prime Soviet goal is to overtake and surpass the United States in nuclear capability. The main features of the record needed to be kept in mind are first, the Soviet refusal of the American offer of 1946 to place the atom under international control; second, the intensive Soviet effort that produced the atom bomb in 1949, and a hydrogen bomb only 4 years later; third, the headstart on construction of giant rockets to which the United States has yet to catch up; fourth, the worldwide campaign exaggerating the effects of fallout, which prompted the U.S. moratorium on testing; fifth, the deliberately protracted negotiations on a test-ban treaty; and finally sixth, the Soviet test series last fall.

One seasoned American negotiator who has talked with Khrushchev about the realities of nuclear war returned to the White House not long ago with a pretty grim appraisal. Khrushchev talks a very great deal about the power of his new weapons, the American reported, and glories in his 100-megaton bomb "like a farmer with a new threshing machine." He talks as though he believed that his power was already superior to our power and that we must therefore ultimately bow to his will in such outstanding controversies as Berlin.

Soviet intentions are quite clear: to establish that power superiority and to make use of it in world politics. This is why it was remarkable, on the eve of the Geneva Conference, to hear William Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control Agency, acknowledge that the United States might be persuaded to stop or postpone its tests if Khrushchev indicated acceptance in principle of the U.S. draft treaty of last April.

> I think—

Said Foster in answer to a question on "Meet the Press"—

> that * * * if he would sign that kind of a treaty we would accept it hopefully because our real basic hope is that we can stop this test series here and now.

A little later Foster added, with considerable optimism, that Khrushchev would be likely to honor such a treaty because it was more formal than a moratorium.

Well, if Khrushchev follows past form, he might well appear to accept President Kennedy's offer to call off U.S. tests in return for a test-ban treaty, particularly if the offer is made in loose terms instead of the strict, tough terms outlined by the President. Khrushchev would have very little to lose by such a tactic. Even if he should accept the entire U.S. proposal for inspection and control, he could count on a substantial period of time before an inspection system could be set up. It probably would take Soviet scientists the best part of the next 2 years anyhow to analyze the findings of the 1961 tests and get hardware ready for the next major series of explosions. Such analysis and preparation meanwhile would be easy to conceal.

The national security demands full and complete U.S. nuclear tests. President Kennedy is quite right to leave the door open for negotiations on arms control and to work toward a test-ban agreement. But I believe he would be ill advised to cancel or modify U.S. tests on any grounds. They should, they must, go ahead on schedule.

NO NUCLEAR POWER PROGRAM

Now, to turn to peaceful applications of the atom, it is my view that the President can be justly criticized for lack of vigorous leadership and that there are certain things that should, and must, be done to get America's nuclear power progress moving again. These subjects are dealt with in the following letter I wrote to Mr. Kennedy under date of April 8, 1962:

APRIL 8, 1962.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The achievement of economic nuclear power in the United States on the quickest feasible time scale has long been one of our important national goals. Our present progress in civilian nuclear power reactors has been bought with a Government expenditure of some $882 million and private expenditures of some $271 million—in all, $1,153 million. At the present moment our goal is in clear sight. Yet, as of today, our nuclear power program is stalled on dead center.

The following figures indicate the totality of the freeze which has been placed on the cooperative power reactor demonstration program in which the AEC and public and private utilities are supposed to cooperate to achieve our goal. This is the budget history:

Fiscal year 1958, $149,915,000; fiscal year 1959, $25,198,000; fiscal year 1960, $45,500,000; fiscal year 1961, $45 million; fiscal year 1962, $12 million; fiscal year 1963, zero.

With respect to this sequence of events Chairman HOLIFIELD of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy wrote you on March 15 expressing his disappointment at the paralyzation of our atomic power program. His letter expresses belief that the power reactor demonstration program has been brought to a grinding halt "with the goal of economic nuclear power almost within reach." Mr. HOLIFIELD stated his belief that it is "incumbent upon this administration to continue efforts to foster atomic power development."

Subsequently your March 17 exchange of correspondence with Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg of the Atomic Energy Commission regarding another study of the nuclear power program received strong bipartisan criticism at a meeting of the JCAE on March 21. It was urgently pointed out that study papers do not produce nuclear kilowatts—only hardware will do it.

What needs to be done is already clear and requires no study. Further study only means further delay in reaching our goals. My purpose in writing this letter is to urge you and your administration to abandon the "no nuclear power program" and get on with the business of achieving economic nuclear power in this country. Toward this end I wish to suggest certain specific steps which are neither costly in relation to what already has been invested in the program nor difficult of vigorous pursuit.

It is evident that we require both short term and long term impetus for getting off dead center in the power program. Recommendations as to these follow, as well as semirelated recommendations with respect to our space nuclear efforts and for increased effectiveness in the organization of the Atomic Energy Commission.

SHORT TERM NUCLEAR POWER PROGRAM

The next logical step in our power demonstration program is the construction of nuclear powerplants in the 300-megawatt to 400-megawatt range. This will prove out our capabilities for large central power stations and is a vital necessary step to keep the Nation's nuclear industry alive.

Only a small extension of the power reactor demonstration program is needed to encourage U.S. public and private utilities to build such demonstration plants. Atomic Energy Commissioner Robert Wilson estimates only $10 million encouragement from the power demonstration program is needed to bring forth a $110 million non-Federal investment for a 400-megawatt nuclear power station. He suggests this encouragement take the form of research and development assistance, waiver of certain fuel charges and assistance in developing the plans and specifications for the plants.

Three reactor concepts are involved here: (1) pressurized water, (2) boiling water, and (3) either of the foregoing with nuclear superheat added.

It is my firm belief that should you decisively include the relatively small sum of $30 million in your request for AEC appropriations this year, work on these three powerplants could be underway within the next few months.

I use the terminology "relatively small sum" because that is exactly what it is in relation to the $146.2 million the Government already has put up for 10 smaller power demonstration plants which altogether total 526,473 kilowatts of installed capacity. That amount of Federal assistance has brought expenditures of $271 million by the non-Federal participants; i.e., financing in the ratio of 35 percent Federal and 65 percent non-Federal. The $30 million I have proposed would bring forth $300 million in non-Federal participation; i.e., a ratio of 9 to 91 percent. It would bring onto the Nations' powerlines up to 1,200,000 installed nuclear kilowatts of electrical generating capacity.

LONG-TERM NUCLEAR POWER PROGRAM

Prompt attention on your part to the above recommended short range nuclear power program will enable electric utilities, both public and private, on a competitive economic basis, to elect construction of large, nuclear-reactor-powered, central electricity stations in the 400- to 1,000-Mw. range by the year 1966. But, only if certain artificial impediments to nuclear power station reactor design, operation, and economics are removed promptly.

The most significant of these artificial impediments is the present requirement of law that all fissionable material be owned by the Federal Government. This necessitates Government leasing of slightly enriched uranium to utilities for reactor fuel. The lease charge necessarily includes the artificial high price the Government still pays for natural uranium due to the production incentives inaugurated many years ago. This runs up the cost of nuclear power artificially and leads to optimization of reactor designs to account for leasing fuel rather than owning it by purchase on a competitive market. This artificiality in both economics and technology can be eliminated by changing the law to permit private ownership of uranium and its enrichment in the fissionable isotope

U^{235} at Government facilities on a toll-charge basis. This would cut the cost of nuclear kilowatts and thus speed us toward the goal of economic nuclear power.

The AEC has drafted a proposed bill for private ownership and toll enrichment which has not yet been approved by various elements in your administration. This bill should be approved forthwith and sent to the Congress with a strong recommendation by you for its immediate enactment.

Only by this means can the "ground rules" under which the electric power industry can "go nuclear" with certainty be made known without delay. Eliminate this delay and the construction of truly economic nuclear power plants can be achieved on the quickest possible time scale.

If you fail to act on this recommendation the entire program will slip a year for each year's delay in enactment of the legislation. It is desired to reemphasize that this one important step vitally affects both the design and economics of nuclear power production. Utilities cannot be expected to decide to make the vast investments involved unless and until this particular item is made clear and certain.

Since the extent of enrichment in the isotope U^{235} for power production is different from that required for weapons production, the suggested legislation can, with ease, establish any desirable safeguards in this respect.

A related impediment to expansion of nuclear power in the United States on sound economics is the indefiniteness regarding the price at which the AEC will buy back plutonium made in private power reactors as an inescapable byproduct of power production. In contrast to enriched uranium, plutonium is a fissionable nuclear material for which substantial uses other than weapons fabrication have not yet been discovered.

As a consequence, private ownership of plutonium is at present impractical. The AEC has paid widely varying prices for plutonium. This presents a large variance factor in reactor designs. If the AEC's Pu price is high, the reactor will be designed for maximum Pu production and lower kilowatt production and vice-versa. Trying to guess this factor for the 30 to 40 years life of a reactor, is akin to playing economic Russian roulette.

We need badly to fix a Pu buy-back price which will remove these uncertainties in economics and reactor design—and one which will maximize design for power production and such byproducts as U^{233} for which there is a nonweapons use. To this end I recommend these two specific steps be taken without delay by your Administration:

1. Fix, set and state a plutonium buy-back price applicable for at least the next 10 years. In the recent "202" hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy several witnesses indicated an $8 per gram price might be appropriate. It is recommended the price be fixed somewhere in this range.

2. Meanwhile, work is being done at Hanford, Washington, and by AEC contracts on the possibility of using plutonium as a power reactor fuel. We are at a point where a small Pu experimental power reactor can be constructed at the Arco reservation at a total cost for construction and operation of about $16 million. This item should be included in the forthcoming AEC authorization bill. The information gained will permit ultimate adjustment of the $8 figure to reflect the actual value of Pu as a reactor fuel.

NATIONAL POWER REACTOR RESERVATIONS

The problem of locating large nuclear power reactor stations is a troublesome one and must be faced each time a power station is contemplated. With the Nation's growing demand for electric power, utilities must plan ahead in terms of not just one large addition to their systems, but the incremental addition of several large stations over a period of many years.

In the case of conventional plants, property can be acquired suitable for construction of the first large central power station and the incremental addition of others as power system demands enlarge. This is not true in the case of nuclear power stations. Each nuclear reactor must now be considered on its own merits from the health and safety standpoint. Even the siting of a single nuclear power station is, at the present time, a laborious, time-consuming process which constitutes a major obstacle to decisions to go nuclear.

The Federal Government has a unique opportunity to overcome in substantial degree this impediment to achieving our nuclear power goals. It is by the establishment of a reasonable number of nuclear power reactor reservations at suitable locations in various parts of the country.

These could be set aside either on presently owned Government land or private land might be acquired for this purpose where necessary. Each site should be open to public and private utilities for long term leases to install large size nuclear power stations. Careful determination of general health and safety factors pertaining to the sites prior to setting aside the reservations should cut to a minimum those to be resolved when a specific powerplant is decided upon. Each site should be adequate for the installation of at least a total of 5 million kilowatts generating capacity in plant sizes ranging from 350 to 1,000 Mw. In this manner the public and private power industry would be provided the opportunity to "grow nuclear" and would thus be encouraged to "go nuclear."

Where large areas of Government-owned land presently are devoted to other uses, including military uses, a resolution must be made as to the paramount use of the property in the national interest. If that use is for nuclear power, the dedication to such use should be made resolutely.

Example: The Marine Corps Camp Pendleton, near La Jolla, Calif., occupies many thousands of acres of land. It stretches along over 20 miles of coastline. A small portion of this coastline would be ideal for such a nuclear reservation because of the availability of ocean water for condenser cooling. It also is ideal from health and safety standpoints. It constitutes practically the only southern California location suitable for nuclear power reactors. It is close to heavy power load centers. Both the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, a public utility, and the Southern California Edison Co., a private utility, are anxious to go nuclear, but each have site problems. Both are severely restricted in the use of conventional fuels because of the Los Angeles basin's smog conditions. Other public and private electric utilities in the general area are comparable. The withdrawal of the small portion of the Marine Corps Base for such a 5,000 Mw nuclear power reactor reservation as I have described would be in the paramount national interest and can be accomplished without any serious hardship to Marine Corps amphibious training programs.

It is recommended that you issue a Presidential proclamation of policy with respect to the establishment of national power reactor reservations and initiate the program by setting aside a suitable area within the boundaries of Camp Pendleton for this purpose.

NUCLEAR SPACE PROGRAM—GOALS AND SINGLE MANAGEMENT

Development of the Polaris submarine and an idea to ships on station defending the Nation is a brilliant example of what Americans can accomplish when fixed goals are combined with the organization and management talents of our people.

Thus far we have failed either to set hard and fast goals or apply the Polaris single management concept to our space nuclear auxiliary power—SNAP—programs. We likewise have failed in these respects as to the achievement of nuclear powered space travel.

It becomes increasingly clear that if we are to get anyplace in space that is first, rather than second, place, it is going to be done by dependence on nuclear power for propulsion and nuclear power for auxiliary purposes in space.

The Polaris program's precedent should be applied without delay to the Snap program and the Rover nuclear rocket program in both their nuclear and nonnuclear phases. Definite goals and fixed dates to achieve them should be set and a single, dedicated management established to achieve them on schedule. The national defense implications of these programs warrant their handling in this manner.

REORGANIZATION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

It has been said that the camel is an animal designed by a commission and the general import of this statement is to some extent applicable to the present organization of the Atomic Energy Commission. It has been noted by serious students of government and good administrative practices that the organization of the AEC is far from ideal for the accomplishment of its present functions. It reflects the needs of the time of its creation—the demilitarization of the atom—rather than the needs of today.

The AEC should be reorganized so that there is a single head to act as administrator for all the executive functions and a three-man regulatory board be handed responsibilities for licensing and regulation. The present Commission could be retained to deal with policy matters as distinct and distinguished from administration of the agency and from licensing and regulation functions. Its chairman could function as the President's special assistant for atomic matters.

In addition to all the operations of the AEC, the single head should be responsible for inspection, for filing complaints with respect to licensed operations and for proposing new regulations and changes in existing regulations.

At the time this division takes place, there should be a conscious effort made to realine the duties, which at this time have been allowed to drift into the hands of higher echelons, thus the JCAE is doing work the Commission should be doing, the Commission is doing work the general manager should be doing and so forth on down the line.

These foregoing recommendations, suggestions and comments are respectfully made in a sincere effort to propose improvement in our various nuclear programs and their administration.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

LATIN AMERICA

Next I wish to turn to another area in which I believe the administration's programs are failing and to make certain constructive suggestions. That is in the problem area of keeping communism out of Latin America. I feel the $20 billion Alliance for Progress program, irrespective of its merits or demerits cannot do the job alone. It is only wishful thinking to believe it can. Long before the internal reforms and economic progress envisioned by the program could supply a bulwark against Communist takeovers, Communist arms and munitions in the Western Hemisphere could make such takeovers fait accompli.

Here is a country-by-country summary of the rapidly deteriorating situations in this part of the world:

ARGENTINA

Swept out of office for his blunder in allowing Peronists to run for office, Frondizi left a sea of troubles behind him. Exports are off, foreign reserves are down, the peso is shaky. There is a heavy budget deficit.

The Peronists, riding high and violently "anti-Yankee," are out to provoke new troubles. They control more than half of Argentina's labor movement and are heavily infiltrated by Communists. A wave of political strikes seems in the cards. Violence is likely.

BRAZIL

This ailing giant is crippled by headlong inflation, huge budget deficits, too much coffee that it can't sell. President João Goulart's government is weak and divided. He has been unable to get either land or tax reforms through congress.

Demagogs of all kinds are vying for office in this year's congressional elections. One of them is Goulart's brother-in-law, Gov. Leonel Brizola of Rio Grande do Sul, who recently seized a U.S.-owned telephone company, now plans to make an added grab of an American-owned light and power company. Another is Jânio Quadros, who quit as Brazil's President last August.

Brazil's Communist Party is a source of worry, but a more immediate threat is the anti-U.S. neutralism begun by Quadros and supported by both rightwing and leftwing extremists.

VENEZUELA

Caracas, capital of this oil-rich country, has seen more violence in recent years than any other Latin American city. President Rómulo Betancourt has come through 22 attempted rebellions in 3 years. His Communist foes now are preparing a Castro-type camp for training guerrillas.

Betancourt has taken the lead in many of the reforms called for by the Alliance for Progress. But Venezuela's economic and social problems still are enormous, and Cuba is making an all-out effort in Venezuela by pouring in money and propaganda. New violence seems certain.

COLOMBIA

Under President Alberto Lleras Camargo, Colombia has enjoyed much order and stability for almost 4 years. But a new President will be elected in May, and storm signals have now gone up. The reason is that a leftist bloc supported by Castro Communists scored big gains in the congressional elections just held.

CHILE

Leftist groups are blaming Chile's conservative Government for economic woes arising from the 1960 earthquakes and long strikes last year. And, with the Government lagging on land reform and tax reform because of heavy pressure from landowners, Red agitators are busy. Chile's 20,000 Communists are alined in a popular front with 3 other leftist parties. This front is given a good chance to win the Presidency in the 1964 elections.

PERU

This is a country ruled by 50 families while 6 million peasants live in squalor. Peru has barely begun to tackle social problems that could suddenly turn explosive. There is almost no land reform. In the cities, students are taking up the Communist cause. In rural areas, peasants are moving in on huge farms and fighting pitched battles with troops trying to keep them out.

BOLIVIA

President Víctor Paz Estenssoro is trying to avert collapse of his nearly bankrupt nation by reorganizing the nationalized tin mines with United States and West German aid. But the Communists are agitating among miners and other labor groups. There has been bloody rioting. Tension continues.

URUGUAY

Though it may be the stablest nation in South America, Uruguay is plagued by inflation, strikes, housing problems, and Communist activity. Just how long Uruguay can escape big trouble is anybody's guess. Castro's Cubans are pouring in propaganda by the ton.

PARAGUAY

Gen. Alfredo Stroessner runs Paraguay with an iron hand and a tough army. This country is a rural backwater where land reform is unheard of and where schools and taxes are, for the most part, ignored.

ECUADOR

Pressures are mounting here for an end to centuries of feudalism. Recently, 5,000 Indians demonstrated, demanding land reform.

President Carlos Arosemena's predecessor was forced out of office last November while trying to push reforms to implement the Alliance for Progress. The question is whether Arosemena can fare any better.

Late in March, Arosemena faced a revolt by army officers who demanded that he purge his government of Communist sympathizers and break relations with Cuba. Signs are that more trouble is brewing.

MEXICO

Mexico is stagnating economically and drifting politically because President Adolfo López Mateos fears to offend either rightwingers or leftwingers in his party. Hungry farmers rose in rebellion last September. More violence is not ruled out.

GUATEMALA

President Miguel Ydígoras Fuentes has just put down an uprising by both Communists and anti-Communists. Violence is almost certain to continue as all political factions bid for support of the army, key to control of the country.

EL SALVADOR

This country is on the eve of a presidential election. Opponents of Lt. Col. Julio Adalberto Rivera, who seems nearly certain of election, charge that he will be a military dictator. A big threat here: conspiratorial alliances between Communists and coffeegrowers who oppose land and tax reforms.

HONDURAS

President Ramón Villeda Morales is trying to push reforms, but danger threatens from Red plotters and politically ambitious army officers. An anti-Government plot said to have been inspired by Cuba was nipped on March 26.

COSTA RICA

Violence was narrowly averted as President Francisco Orlich was elected last February. Costa Rica has a new agrarian-reform law, but the prevailing low prices for coffee, bananas and cocoa are hurting the economy and creating unrest.

PANAMA

The Panama Canal is a constant target of anti-U.S. agitation. And, with many unemployed Panamanians impatient for land reform, there is always a possibility of Communist-led riots against the United States and the Government of President Roberto Chiari.

HAITI

Reports say the Government of President François Dulavier, which has Communist members, is allowing Haiti to be used as a staging area for sabotage against the budding democracy in the neighboring Dominican Republic.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Communists, backed by supporters of the slain dictator, Generalissimo Rafael Trujillo, are attempting to undermine the economy and the government. But, with U.S. support, the army appears to be in control.

BRITISH GUIANA

Headed for independence under Red-oriented Prime Minister Cheddi Jagan, British Guiana is the major area of racial conflict in the Americas. Riots erupting out of hostility between East Indians and Negroes took five lives in February, cost $30 million in property damage.

Summing up: Clearly, after 1 year of the Alliance for Progress, Latin America is in worse trouble than it was before the program started. Experts warn that the situation will get worse before it gets better. Looking ahead: There is a long, rough haul, with frequent setbacks.

Summing up: Clearly, after 1 year of the Alliance for Progress, Latin America is in worse trouble than it was before the program started.

DECLARATION OF CONTRABAND

It is evident that we must keep Communist arms and munitions out of the Western Hemisphere and that the way to do it is to declare them contraband and enforce the contraband according to international law.

Since the announcement of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823 onward, attempts on the part of European powers to extend their systems to the Western Hemisphere have been branded a threat to the peace and safety of the United States.

Presence of Communist arms and munitions in the Western Hemisphere is, in fact, a threat to the peace and safety of the United States.

Patriotic Americans have called upon President Kennedy for prompt moves ranging from a mere embargo on trade to a blockade of Cuba, to the dispatch of marines to excise the cancer of Castro communism and restore the island to its people as was done in 1898.

Without analyzing this spectrum of possible action in detail, or excluding any part of it from further consideration, I am today again calling for a move by the United States which I believe serves a major purpose not only in Cuba, but as well in the deteriorating situation in any other locations communism may seek to penetrate in the Western Hemisphere. It is formally stated in the resolution I introduced last year, House Joint Resolution 524.

Briefly, it is a formal declaration that Communist arms and munitions are contraband in the Western Hemisphere, a direction to the President to promulgate a specific list of contrabanded arms and munitions, including petroleum products, and an authorization for enforcement of the declaration by appropriate use of U.S. airpower and U.S. seapower.

This is the way it works:

On the declaration of contraband, international law recognizes the right of enforcement.

The procedure is peaceful.

A U.S. patrol aircraft spots a Communist bloc ship headed toward Cuba or elsewhere in the Americas.

It signals for a U.S. destroyer to intercept and search the ship.

If Communist arms or munitions are found aboard, the ship is warned to turn around.

If its captain refuses, or tries again to proceed toward a port in the Americas, Navy men can either reboard the merchantman and jettison its contraband cargo or bring it to a U.S. port to have confiscation adjudged.

The advantages of this unique approach, based on modernization of longstanding principles of international law, are many:

Only a few U.S. aircraft and ships would be required. These would operate on the high seas. There would be no interference with the integrity of any nation's territorial waters or domestic soil. In contrast, blockading Cuba would require a ring of vessels for many hundreds of miles around the large island, drawing U.S. naval forces from other world trouble spots where they are needed.

Once firmly established, the precedent would be applicable universally in the Western Hemisphere.

U.S. forces would be acting in a strong area of U.S. seapower and airpower almost 5,000 nautical miles from the U.S.S.R.'s nearest bases.

Moreover, it is highly unlikely the Soviets would attempt to escort their "merchant ships" with their own warships or otherwise engage in retaliatory mischief. It would be hard to imagine shrewd Kremlin realists risking the start of all-out war under the most disadvantageous conditions possible from both power and propaganda standpoints, that is, where their challenge would have to be made in an area of overwhelming U.S. strength and for the obvious warlike purpose of forcing arms and munitions into an otherwise peaceful hemisphere.

For over two centuries the Western Hemisphere has been a vast reservoir of physical and moral strength in the struggles of freedom against tyranny. Communist strategy obviously aims at eliminating this checkmate to Red goals, and the imposition of mischiefmaking arms and munitions upon the American nations is one of their major tactical moves to do so.

Equally obvious is the fact that the United States must act decisively to counter this deadly thrust. Failure, weakness, and lack of decision here, on our own doorstep, cannot but doom us to defeat from the broader challenge of worldwide domination thrust upon us by the international Communist conspiracy. Not only does it undermine our position as leader of the free world in crises such as Berlin and Laos; it rots away the entire foundation of free world security and survival.

I urge again that the President and his advisers in the administration consider the proposal and recommendation I have already made to them for the declaration of contraband.

COLD WAR

On the more general subject of the conflict between us and the international Communist conspiracy, I wish to reiterate my views expressed yesterday that the administration has not clearly evidenced a determination to win that conflict.

By this criticism I do not imply that the President or any of his administration desires to lose it, on the contrary, they and all good Americans want to win it. But that still does not mean they have exercised the leadership and sparked the necessary will and determination on the part of our Nation and our friends everywhere who cherish freedom to mount the effort on a vast scale that is required to achieve it. Herein lies my criticism of the administration. This will and determination must be made crystal clear to all the world on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Perhaps it is not being made clear because, as yet, there has been no real definition of what we mean by winning this conflict. Winning does not mean the physical destruction of the Soviet Union by the force of arms, nor does it mean the decimation of its population. It does mean the final, absolute, and unconditional abandonment of communism's announced goal of world domination and it does mean opportunity for free choice by all peoples behind the Iron Curtain to elect freedom or communism by secret ballots.

I have made these specific recommendations to the President which I believe are necessary in order to organize ourselves to win the conflict:

First. Establish a Strategic and Tactical Office of the Presidency—STOP—on the lines of a permanent cold war task force which will function to define our national cold war objectives, devise a series of operation plans for major functional and geographic areas according to sound strategy and tactics, and, under the President's authority direct cold war operations pursuant thereto.

Second. Establish a Command Control Information Center—CCIC—within the structure of STOP to assist in the continuing daily review and direction of cold war operations.

Just as the President alone has the broad power and control of activities necessary for cold war operations, so does he alone have the power to initiate the organization here suggested as fundamentally required to exercise that power and control effectively. He should act promptly and decisively.

The time in which he has to act grows shorter and shorter. Continued weakness in our cold war posture can only result in a progressive deterioration of our military posture. This ignominious defeat suffered by France in World War II sprang from her concentration on maginot line defenses. The Germans ignored them with a bypass move through the low countries. Similarly, in the struggle with communism we cannot safely concentrate only on its military aspects and our hot war defenses, leaving our cold war ramparts essentially disorganized and inadequately guarded.

The Congress, too, should give attention to its organization and procedures which need revising so that cold war responsibilities may be pinpointed rather than diffused. It is my intention to make legislative recommendations in this regard at a later time.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

For the latter purpose, on Tuesday of this week I introduced House Joint Resolution 685 to establish a congressional Joint Committee on National Security.

The establishment of the joint committee would bring the Congress in as a full and effective partner with the executive branch in the design and conduct of national strategy. Nowhere in Congress at the present time is national security being dealt with as a whole—only in fragments according to committee jurisdiction.

The Joint Committee on National Security would dovetail into this picture and provide the necessary congressional support and coordination needed if we are to stop losing the cold war and start winning it.

It will allow Congress to meet its responsibilities and obligations not only in cold war matters, but in the continuous study and coordination of all the various and complex matters that affect and shape our national strategy.

Thus far the administration has evidenced no interest in adopting the recommendation made for cold war organization. I hope the majority leadership in Congress will look more kindly on the suggestion to organizing Congress to act effectively in this area.

NEUTRON BOMB

In closing I have one further criticism to make and a suggestion by which an improvement in national security may be accomplished. It concerns development of the neutron bomb.

Development of the neutron bomb concept is probably as significant in world affairs today as was the original discovery of the atomic bomb and later development of the hydrogen bomb. Undoubtedly it is under research and development in U.S.S.R. laboratories. Undoubtedly, also, our scientists are, or should be, working on it. Only by possessing the weapon first—or at least simultaneous with the Soviet Union—can we prevent a radical shift against us in the balance of military power which could well prove fatal.

It cannot be expected that any efforts of ours in this regard will be carried on with a maximum of intensity—similar to that of the Manhattan project which developed the atomic bomb—unless the President of the United States forthrightly states it as a national goal, applies to its development the Polaris management principles and publicly encourages those engaged in the effort to give it their dedicated best.

Although the Manhattan project did not require such public support from President Roosevelt, it benefited from the hot war impetus of World War II. The cold war impetus of today is not enough. In my belief the President's action in this regard is required for the national safety. He should take a firm stand and act to achieve the neutron bomb with the same courage and wisdom ex-President Truman did when confronted.

FOREIGN TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means is presently considering H.R. 9900, the President's trade bill.

Last month, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a story by Mr. Felix Belair, of the New York Times, which gave excerpts of the secret foreign economic policy task force report of George W. Ball, now Under Secretary of State. These excerpts disturbed me to the extent that I asked Mr. Ball for a copy of the report at the time he appeared before my committee. He refused. Two committees of the House had also asked for this report, and it was not forthcoming.

This morning, at a press conference, I released this secret report which I now place in the RECORD for the whole country to see, together with a copy of my release, my letter to the President, and excerpts of testimony of Under Secretary of State George W. Ball and AFL–CIO President George Meany, given before the Committee on Ways and Means.

RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

Representative STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, Republican, of New York, a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, today released parts of the previously secret Ball task force report, which urges trade with Communist nations, and called on President Kennedy to tell the public whether he plans to follow the recommendation.

In a letter to the President, the New York Congressman noted that the foreign economic policy task force which drafted the report was headed by George W. Ball, now Under Secretary of State, who will help to administer the trade program Congress enacts.

Since many of the proposals contained in the President's foreign trade bill are based on the task force recommendations, DEROUNIAN said the report should be made public, and that Congress should have the President's views on it before finally acting upon the trade measure.

Ball had previously refused to release the report to the Congressman and to the Select House Committee on Export Control and the Dent Subcommittee on Education and Labor which had requested it, DEROUNIAN noted. He said he is releasing all of the document, except eight pages which contained sensitive reference to our allies, "to raise the Iron Curtain of secrecy that has permeated this administration since it took office."

Calling the Ball report "an eye opener for the American people," DEROUNIAN said, "Not only does Mr. Ball recommend the elimination of the viewpoint of Congress on foreign policy, for all practical purposes, but his report openly advocates the amendment of the Battle Act and the Export Control Act, along with increased trade with the Soviet bloc." He said Ball was extremely evasive when he was questioned on the report before the Ways and Means Committee.

In his letter to the President, the Congressman said:

"Of particular concern to me, and I believe all Americans, are the plain implications in the task force report that the United States abondon what the report calls our almost completely negative policy on trade with the Soviet bloc. Considering the vast powers which the trade bill would give the executive branch, I believe it is important that the Congress have your views on this vital point before finally acting upon the measure.

"I am also concerned with the report's recommendations to amend the Battle Act, the Export Control Act, and those portions of existing trade agreements law which deal with trade involving national security. I feel the Congress is not yet fully aware of the implications in these recommendations and has a right to know what your intentions are before voting on your bill.

"Obviously, a major question which can be answered only by yourself is: Will you go along with the report's recommendations to increase trade with Communist nations?"

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1962.
The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: After considerable effort, I have obtained a copy of the report on foreign economic policy prepared for you before your inauguration by a task force which was headed by George W. Ball, now your Under Secretary of State.

Inasmuch as Congress is now considering the proposals contained in your foreign trade bill (H.R. 9900)—many of which are based on the task force report—I sincerely believe there is every reason that the report be made public. I intend, therefore, to release it to the press.

Of particular concern to me, and I believe all Americans, are the plain implications in the task force report that the United States abandon what the report calls our almost completely negative policy on trade with the Soviet bloc. Considering the vast powers which the trade bill would give the executive branch, I believe it is important that the Congress have your views on this vital point before finally acting upon the measure.

I am also concerned with the report's recommendations to amend the Battle Act, the Export Control Act, and those portions of existing trade agreements law which deal with trade involving national security. I feel the Congress is not yet fully aware of the implications in these recommendations and has a right to know what your intentions are before voting on your bill.

Obviously, a major question which can be answered only by yourself is: Will you go along with the report's recommendations to increase trade with Communist nations? I would appreciate your views on this at your early convenience.

Respectfully,
STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN,
Member of Congress.

EXCERPT OF TESTIMONY OF UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE GEORGE W. BALL AND AFL–CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MARCH 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Ball, are you the general author of titles I and II of this bill?

Mr. BALL. No. The titles I and II of this bill were drafted by a committee. I had some responsibility for the discussions which led to an agreement on principle as to what should go into this proposed legislation.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. You were the author of the task force report on foreign economic policy, were you not?

Mr. BALL. I was the chairman of the task force prior to the inauguration, which prepared a report on foreign economic policy.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. In a story in the New York Times of January 7, 1962, by Felix Belair, Jr., it states, and I quote: "Although it was submitted to Mr. Kennedy as President-elect just before his inauguration, the report remains the basic rationale for the liberalized trade program he plans to ask Congress to approve at this session. The program would replace the expiring Trade Agreements Act." Is that a fair statement?

Mr. BALL. No; I do not think it is a fair statement, sir. Actually, most of the ideas which have gone into the development of this proposed legislation have been developed since then.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Ball, since there is such confusion about what the task force report said, would you mind, for the record, giving us a copy of that foreign economic policy report which you chairmaned before the inauguration of the President?

Mr. BALL. This report was a document prepared at the personal request of then President-elect Kennedy and was submitted to him for his private advice, and I do not feel that I would be at liberty to——

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Are you claiming a matter of executive privilege in this case?

Mr. BALL. I could not claim executive privilege until I had consulted with the President.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Is it not true that on January 12, 1961, neither you nor the President of the United States elected then had taken the oath of office?

Mr. BALL. That is right.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. And that is when you submitted the report?

Mr. BALL. That is right. This was a matter prepared by a private citizen, or a committee of private citizens, for the advice of the President-elect.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Now, Mr. Ball, would this bill result in further trade, or increased trade with the Communist bloc nations?

Mr. BALL. No; it would not.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Well, now, I read to you from parts of this report which were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in part, wherein it states that "our allies have refused to follow docilely the tariff discriminations and export limitations on Communist trade imposed by U.S. law"; and the report further called for "a positive response to Khrushchev's high-sounding trade overtures" that "the Soviet should be invited to trade with free world countries on the basis of a code of fair practices designed to remove the distortion and disruptions arising from monopolistic state commerce."

Do you state that that was not in the report?

Mr. Ball. No; I do not feel that I can say what was in or was not in the report, in view of the circumstances under which it was prepared.

Mr. Derounian. Do you believe that we should have increased trade with Communist bloc countries?

Mr. Ball. No; I have never advocated that.

Mr. Derounian. Well, now, if this report, which is quoted in the Congressional Record of March 8, put in by Representative Fisher, of Texas, is the same as you prepared, would you still say that you were not in favor of trading with Communist nations?

Mr. Ball. Well, my own position is perfectly clear.

I think to give a categorical answer to this question is difficult, because we have all shadings of the problem of regulations with Yugoslavia, with Poland, as well as with the Soviet Union. I am in agreement with the policies which the administration has followed since it came into power, and I may say that I have had some responsibility for those policies.

Mr. Derounian. A moment ago, Mr. Meany, in response to Mr. Alger's questions, you stated that you did not want to help the Communist cause in the world. I know you have been a fighter against communism, for which I commend you.

Do you feel that we should have a complete alteration of the U.S. policy on trade with the Soviet bloc countries?

Mr. Meany. A complete alteration?

Mr. Derounian. In other words, would you favor——

Mr. Meany. This has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. Derounian. I am asking you a question. Would you favor expanded trade with Soviet bloc countries over what we have today?

Mr. Meany. Under no circumstances.

Mr. Derounian. Do you know, Mr. Meany, that that recommendation, together with further recommendations, "The Soviet should be invited to trade with free world countries on the basis of a code of fair practices"—just get that, the Soviets going for a code of fair practices—"designed to remove the distortion and disruptions arising from a monopolistic state commerce," have already been made. Do you know where they came from?

Mr. Meany. Secretary Dillon?

Mr. Derounian. No; he does not go quite that far, but give him time. Under Secretary of State Ball was chairman of the secret task force that wrote this report and gave it to the President.

Mr. Meany. I completely disagree, not only with Assistant Secretary Ball; I completely disagree with the people in the State Department who have an idea that you can have cultural exchanges and in some way benefit from them with American groups and their counterparts in the Soviet Union.

I completely disagree with this whole idea of people exchanges, because there are no counterparts, for instance, in the Soviet Union to our organization, nor are there counterparts to any American organization.

I think the people who buy this idea are living in a fool's paradise. There are no cultural groups in the Soviet Union that are free, as our groups are. They are all agents of the state, just as the so-called unions are agents of the state.

So anyone who feels that you have something to gain by trading with the Soviet Union on any basis under the present world circumstances is living in a fool's paradise, in my opinion.

Mr. Derounian. I congratulate you.

Foreign Economic Policy

PART 1. MODERNIZING OUR FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

I. The objectives of foreign economic policy

A. In conducting an effective foreign policy in the 1960's the United States must employ all its available resources—political, social, cultural, and economic—to achieve its central objectives. This objective simply stated, is to preserve and develop the security, freedom, and prosperity of the United States within a strong free world.

B. The Task Force believes that foreign economic policy can be most effectively used to serve our foreign policy objective if it is directed at establishing an open and competitive free world economy in which the forces of economic growth will have full play. Only in such a world can we hope to bring about the most efficient use of our resources and maintain maximum rates of growth and development.

C. The United States should endeavor to lead the free world economy toward:

1. Strengthening, through internal growth and increased trade, the economies of the industrialized countries.
2. Providing the resources and markets required to sustain an adequate level of economic growth for the underdeveloped countries.
3. Supporting an adequate common defense against military and economic aggression on the part of the Communist bloc.

D. This formulation involves three sets of relationships for the United States:

1. With other free world industrialized nations.
2. With less-developed areas.
3. With the Communist bloc.

II. Problems and purposes in our economic relations

A. Relations With the Industrialized Countries

1. The U.S. balance of payments deficit

(a) The most pressing problem in our relations with the other industrialized countries arises from the persistence and magnitude of the U.S. balance of payments deficit. The task force on the balance of payments concluded that this deficit has resulted principally from the failure of other major industrialized powers to pursue adequate policies of growth.

(b) It is a matter of urgency, therefore, that we persuade the principal members of the free world industrial economy to concert their policies with ours in the interest of domestic economic growth and the expansion of world trade and investment. As part of this effort they must be persuaded to undertake larger contributions to the common defense, to assist in the economic development of the underdeveloped countries, and to develop a freer and more open system of international trade and finance.

2. Division in Europe

Another significant problem in our relations with the other industrialized countries of the free world is the divisive effect of two competing trade blocs in Europe—the European Economic Community (the Common Market) and the European Free Trade Association. Within the context of a common commitment to policies of growth, the United States must lead in countering the divisive forces in these alinements by bringing about a general liberalization of trade.

3. Liberalizing trade in the total free world industrial economy

Central to our relations with the other industrialized nations is the need to eliminate obstructions to the free flow of goods within the total industrial and agricultural economy. At the same time the Western countries must take steps to accommodate expanding exports from lower wage areas such as Japan. This, again, will require a cooperative effort if all the industrialized nations are to accept their share of such imports.

B. Relations With the Less-Developed Areas

1. Drive toward nationalism

(a) The intensive drive toward nationalism in the less-developed areas confronts us with a shift in the world balance of power.

(b) Most of the less developed countries lack the institutions and skills required to maintain even rudimentary governments or to meet the political, social, and economic aspirations of their people.

(c) The urgent task of the industrialized countries is to direct this drive toward nationalism into constructive channels by assisting in providing the less-developed countries with the necessary economic and technical resources. The obligation of Western leadership is to guide the less-developed countries toward sustained growth. We cannot succeed if we extend aid principally for maintenance of the status quo.

2. Providing markets for the underdeveloped areas

(a) Long-range programs for the development of these areas should not be limited to the furnishing of financial and technical assistance. The industrialized countries must also undertake to provide markets for the products of the underdeveloped countries.

(b) The commodities which the less-developed nations have to trade—primarily agricultural and mineral raw materials—are susceptible to violent price fluctuations in the world market; these nations are losing more in income as a result of cyclical movements of raw material prices than they receive through economic assistance. Therefore, along with increasing trading opportunities for the underdeveloped nations, arrangements must be developed to stabilize their export income.

3. The need for coordinated aid effort

These objectives cannot be achieved by the United States alone. Our policies must be directed increasingly toward obtaining commitments from the other industrialized nations to join with us in developing programs for the less-developed areas.

C. Relations With the Communist Bloc

1. Communist bloc trading capacity and objectives

(a) The character of our economic relations with the Communist bloc has been seriously altered in recent years. The bloc countries now have the ability to export surpluses, which they are beginning to use in furthering their external commercial and political objectives. Their economies also will require greater imports of raw materials.

(b) This trade, regardless of its motivation, has disruptive potentialities by virtue of its monopolistic state character. Communist trading patterns and, in particular, the use of bilateral treaties, barter, and blocked accounts tend to erode the multilateral trading patterns which are the objectives of U.S. trade policy.

(c) The task force believes that, in trade relations with the industrialized nations of the world, Communist objectives so far have been predominantly commercial rather than political in character. The reverse is true, however, in Communist bloc trade with underdeveloped areas, where political considerations dominate.

2. U.S. attitude toward Communist bloc trade

(a) In the past U.S. policy on trade with the bloc countries has been almost completely negative in character. It has failed to recognize that such trade is attractive and often necessary for many other industrialized countries. As a result of these U.S. policies, the expansion of East-West trade has taken place largely on Communist terms.

(b) There are clear signs that the problem of Communist bloc trade is likely to become far more acute in the 1960's than in the 1950's, particularly in the case of certain commodities such as oil. The emergence of bloc surpluses may have a highly disruptive effect on those markets of the free world which are already unstable.

3. Need for constructive action

The development, in collaboration with other free world industrial nations, of common measures for dealing with Communist bloc trade is a task of both complexity and urgency. Efforts should be concentrated on extracting trading advantages with the bloc while safeguarding world commerce from the threat of growing Communist penetration. This task must be accomplished while the West still has the overwhelming economic advantage.

III. The obsolescence of present policies, programs, and powers

A. Nature and Cause of Obsolescence

Economic policies and programs which the United States is following today are obsolete. Equally obsolete are the powers granted the President by the Congress for the conduct of foreign economic policy.

This obsolescence results from the fact that—

1. Present policies in trade, aid, and finance are based principally upon conditions prevalent a decade ago, when there was a dollar shortage and European nations lacked economic strength.

2. Europe was fragmented into individual countries, each with its own tariffs and commercial policies; there was no Common Market or Free Trade area to pose a collective threat to U.S. trade in the European area.

3. The United States generally earned rather than expended gold in its international transactions, and confidence in the dollar was high.

4. The primary concern of the United States was with reconstructing Europe and establishing military strength to deter Communist aggression.

5. The less-developed areas consisted principally of spheres of influence of European metropoles or independent nations where trade and private investment provided the bulk of economic development resources. U.S. foreign aid to the less-developed areas was small and directed principally toward defense objectives rather than toward fostering the viability of independent nations.

6. Commodity price fluctuations were treated as a reason for diversifying the less-developed economies rather than as an intrinsic economic problem.

7. The Communist bloc was economically weak and incapable of mounting large-scale trading forays into the markets of industrialized countries or extending significant assistance to the underdeveloped areas. The United States was concerned principally with the military importance of limiting, if not prohibiting, trade with the Communist bloc.

B. Changed Free World Relationships

In the last decade, conditions have materially changed but our policies have not been revised to reflect the following changed circumstances of free world relationships:

1. The United States is no longer economically independent

(a) Other industrial giants have arisen in the free world, and America is only the strongest of the strong. The disparity in strength is still so great that the United States alone can give effective leadership, and the potential division of Europe into two trading blocs has made it all the more imperative that we serve as a cohesive force.

(b) But we neither can nor should expect an unquestioning response to our demands for common policy. We must rely, instead, upon persuasion and negotiation. This, in turn, means that the President must have the power to take action and make concessions that will give him the leverage to bring about the concerting of policies. He does not have these powers under existing legislation.

2. We are losing the initiative in the drive toward trade liberalization

(a) Our commercial policy legislation, in particular, is obsolete. It does not provide sufficient authority to permit the United States to expand export markets rapidly to ameliorate its balance-of-payments problem.

(b) Today, the United States must conduct trade negotiations not with relatively weak trading countries, but with a strong trading bloc such as the European Economic Community.

(c) A measure of the inadequacy of our bargaining tools is that, in the current tariff negotiations in Geneva, the countries of the European Economic Community are offering 20-percent across-the-board tariff reductions. The U.S. negotiators, on the other hand, have no authority to make across-the-board reductions, and the total concessions that they can offer on a selective basis amount to little more than 5 percent when computed on an across-the-board basis.

(d) Moreover, the President is unable under the present law to make unilateral concessions to increase trade from the underdeveloped countries even though other industrialized countries may be prepared to join in such a program.

3. Failure of present program to respond to the problems of the underdeveloped nations

Our present aid program fails to satisfy the needs and aspirations of the emerging nations for a number of reasons:

(a) There is a tendency to regard it primarily as an instrument against communism rather than for the national development of these countries. All too often we permit ourselves to appear as seeking to purchase their support in the cold war rather than attempting to respond to their national needs.

(b) We have underestimated the social revolution fermenting in these areas and the need to assure that the benefits of economic assistance reach the masses rather than the governing oligarchy.

(c) Funds for the present program are inadequate and their efficient use is impaired by the requirement of annual authorizations and appropriations. Furthermore, the resources that are available are committed largely to short-term activities, such as defense support, thus leaving only limited funds for long-term economic growth purposes.

(d) The present program tends to look to private investment to carry the burden of development assistance. This fails to recognize the strength of nationalism in most underdeveloped areas and the unwillingness of private investment to move rapidly into areas needing such assistance.

(e) The program lacks the flexibility needed to meet the variety of development problems confronting the less-developed areas today. For instance, present procedures preclude extending loans at interest rates competitive with those offered by the Soviets.

(f) We have not succeeded in convincing most of the other industrialized countries that it is essential for them to make additional assistance available on satisfactory terms to the less-developed areas. We, in turn, have been reluctant to enter into multilateral arrangements for coordinating the various national programs.

(g) The present program has failed to assure that trade and aid policies are effectively coordinated and mutually support each other.

4. Communist bloc trade now threatens to become new disruptive force in commercial relationships

(a) We persist in regarding trade with the Communist bloc as immoral and we base our policies on the unrealistic assumptions that—

(i) The Soviets need Western trade items to build a military potential; and

(ii) We can induce, or force, our allies and the less-developed areas to concur in our views.

(b) Our policies do not provide for mobilizing free world countries to protect the free-enterprise trading system from Communist intrusions by establishing and enforcing mutually acceptable standards for expanded and advantageous Western trade with the Communist bloc.

IV. The need for new tools

A. The Conditions for Common Action

1. The solution of the major problems in almost every area requires a commitment to common action on the part of the industrialized countries. In order to create the conditions that are basic to such common action there must be a drastic revision of our foreign economic policies, programs, and powers.

2. At least two steps are essential to the achievement of common action:

(a) The development of clearly defined policies that express the consensus of all major industrialized nations of the free world.

(b) The negotiation of agreements where necessary to see that this new consensus is translated into common action.

3. To make such measures possible it will be necessary:

(a) To modernize and integrate the foreign economic powers delegated by Congress to the President. This is essential in order to give him the leverage to obtain agreement from our friends and allies and to carry out policies and programs effectively.

(b) To create a forum in which multilateral negotiations can be conducted looking toward the adoption of common policies.

B. Interrelationship of Policies

1. The interrelationship between our policies and those of the other major industrialized nations is seen clearly in our balance-of-payments situation. Unless we can persuade other major industrialized countries to adopt expansionist policies, we shall be forced to equilibrate our international payments by measures that restrict international trade and finance and retard domestic economic growth. For the United States to pursue growth policies effectively, it must obtain a commitment from the other major industrialized nations to follow such policies.

2. This means that all major industrialized nations must agree not only to pursue domestic policies of growth but also to adopt measures necessary to increase the level of trade with other free world countries.

3. Sustained economic growth within the industrial economy of the West is possible only if trade is not hampered by artificial restrictions or protectionist devices. Any elements that divert trade and retard its expansion will keep alive inefficient production and restrain economic growth.

4. Commitments to growth policies also require measures to control severe cyclical fluctuations in income, production, and prices. These cyclical movements deter growth and invite unilateral actions on the part of individual countries to insulate themselves. Actions of this kind tend to reduce trade and international investment.

5. Prosperity and a high rate of growth in the industrialized countries are, in turn, essential to the economic growth of the less-developed countries. Not only are the industrialized countries the major source of capital for development, but they are also the principal markets for the products of the less-developed countries.

6. It need hardly be pointed out that there is a relation between growth in the industralized countries and the ability to resist Communist aggression. If an adequate growth rate can be maintained, the free world should be able to:

(a) Finance adequate military defenses;

(b) Extend more aid to the less-developed countries; and

(c) Engage with confidence in advantageous economic relations with the Communist world while at the same time defending itself against disruptive bloc policies.

C. Strengthening the Forum for Negotiation—the OECD

1. The recently negotiated agreement for an Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation (OECD) provides a mechanism and a forum for accomplishing the coordination of the internal and foreign economic policies of free world industrialized nations. The Convention creating the Organization is general and permissive and provides an adequate framework for consultation.

2. It can be made an effective instrument for coordination if the new administration is prepared to submit its policies and programs for discussion on an equal basis with those of other member governments.

3. The problems involved in making the OECD effective are discussed in part 2 of this report.

D. The Need for an Integrated Approach

1. The need for a coordinated set of tools

(a) Just as there is a close interrelation between the foreign and domestic economic policies pursued by the major industrialized nations, so there is an interrelation among various aspects of the policy that the United States pursued in its dealings with the less-developed countries.

(b) Too often, however, we have not recognized that interrelation. We have helped underdeveloped countries increase the production of goods and have then denied a market to those goods. In other instances we have permitted the benefits of economic assistance to be canceled out by drastic cyclical fluctuations in the terms of trade. Finally, the lack of coherence in our own foreign economic policy has often made it difficult for us to persuade our friends and allies to agree with us on common policies.

2. The haphazard development of policy

(a) This lack of coherence results in part from the way in which our foreign economic policy has evolved. Today it consists of bits and pieces of policy developed at different times by different people to meet particular situations. It is embodied in a variety of statutes, Executive orders, and administrative decisions.

(b) The result is an incoherent body of policy which makes it difficult to have a clear view of the totality of U.S. foreign economic policy or of the strong interrelationship among its various aspects.

(c) The lack of total view impedes the ability of those responsible for administering the policy to recognize all of the considerations involved in deciding a specific question.

3. The need for comprehensive legislation

(a) Consistency in our foreign economic policy can be achieved best by incorporating all aspects of that policy in a comprehensive foreign economic policy bill. Such a bill might contain several titles concerning such subjects as trade policy, economic aid policy, commodity policy, and organizational provisions.

(b) Such a bill would offer a number of advantages:

I. It would be a means for providing the President with the broad and flexible powers he needs to conduct an effective foreign economic policy.

II. It would avoid the present practice under which the individual components of foreign economic legislation are handled within narrow, specialized contexts and by congressional committees frequently uninformed as to larger foreign policy considerations.

III. It would, for the first time, compel a consideration of our foreign economic policy as a whole. The interaction of trade, aid, and other elements of that policy would be evident. In addition, the Congress and the public would be able to assess the adequacy of these policy tools in meeting the objectives of our foreign economic policy.

IV. It could be made to appear to the people in the underdeveloped countries as an emphatic demonstration that the United States is determined to provide assistance to the emerging nations as a part of our long-range foreign policy.

V. It would give the President the tools he needs to induce the other industrialized nations to join us in adopting policies of economic expansion and growth in order that, by coordinated action, the industrialized nations may provide both markets and economic assistance to the less-developed countries.

VI. It would provide an opportunity to educate the American people in the relationships among various aspects of policy and furnish a fresh and ambitious proposal behind which the full resources of public opinion could be mobilized.

4. The desirability of a select committee

(a) The task force recommends that the President discuss with the congressional leadership the desirability of establishing a joint committee of both Houses, or a select committee in each House, with jurisdiction over the foreign economic policy bill.

(b) Such a committee or committees would be made up of selected members of the standing committees now having jurisdiction over the various components of foreign economic policy. The committee or committees should not only hold hearings but also report the legislation.

V. The political feasibility of a comprehensive bill in 1961

A. Probable Arguments Against Submission in 1961

The submission of a comprehensive bill and the creation of a committee to hold hearings can be expected to invite opposition. It would upset long-established congressional patterns and the proprietary interests of individual committees and Members of the Congress. Objections would undoubtedly be made that it is inadvisable for the Kennedy administration to endanger other programs by submitting such a revolutionary piece of legislation during the first session of the Congress. In specific terms, the arguments that might be advanced against the omnibus approach are:

1. Trade agreements legislation is not due to expire until 1962, and there is no need to take on a difficult fight prematurely.

2. It is undesirable to attempt trade liberalization or undertake greater foreign aid commitments at a time of economic recession. Larger foreign aid, or expanded imports resulting from tariff reductions may make a solution of our balance-of-payments problem more difficult.

3. It would be difficult to obtain favorable action on such a program in view of the growing protectionist sentiment arising out of the economic recession and of labor's fear that increased unemployment may result from automation and the growing tendency for industry to invest in sources of production overseas.

4. It would be unwise to seek new tariff-cutting powers this year since, with our present limited powers, we may be able to obtain substantial concessions from the European powers in the course of the present GATT negotiations on the basis of our past generosity and our present balance-of-payments difficulties without the need for reciprocal concessions on our part. This would make our position stronger in seeking trade legislation from Congress in 1962.

B. Arguments in Favor of Submitting Bill in 1961

1. Urgent need for action

(a) While recognizing the strength of these arguments, the task force believes that the overall position of the United States in the world and the pressing problems confronting us in the foreign economic policy field give a special urgency to the early submission to Congress of a comprehensive and integrated foreign economic program. The free world awaits assurance that the United States will adopt policies and programs related to the realities of the 1960's and assume again the leadership it has defaulted.

(b) A decision on whether or not to proceed this year with a comprehensive foreign economic program involves a careful weighing of foreign against domestic political risks. During the postwar period the executive branch has fought an increasingly difficult battle to obtain congressional authority and appropriations to enable the United States to meet its foreign policy obligations. The task force has reached the conclusion that a new approach is more than desirable; it is essential.

2. Effect on Congress and on foreign and domestic opinion

(a) The audacity of a fresh approach should appeal to many Americans who have felt and expressed the need for a vigorous foreign policy. At the same time it should disconcert the opposition which is accustomed to contest with the executive branch on terrain of its own choosing.

(b) By taking a fresh approach and by bringing together the related elements of foreign economic policy, the comprehensive bill should aid individual Congressmen to justify their support for the measure because of its contribution to the larger national security interests. The possibility of demonstrating that it expresses an overriding national interest should help legislators resist purely local or regional objections to individual provisions of the legislation.

(c) The presidential campaign of 1960, by emphasizing the importance of foreign policy and the weakness of the United States in world affairs, created expectations that the Kennedy administration would produce a new program. If the administration is to fulfill these expectations, it should be ready with a program to present to Congress this year in one of the most vital areas of foreign policy—our economic relations with the rest of the world.

(d) The submission of a comprehensive bill would also demonstrate to the free world our determination to reassert American leadership.

3. Need for U.S. initiative

(a) During 1961, decisions will be made on the direction that the free world's economy will take—either with us or without us. But decisions consistent with U.S. political and economic objectives will not and cannot be made in the absence of American initiative. While the United States does not stand dominant today as it did at the end of World War II, nonetheless we alone in the free world are capable of turning the enormous resources of the industrialized nations to the task of economic growth and the conversion of a portion of this growth to the requirements of the less developed countries.

(b) If the President can obtain the bargaining power through a comprehensive bill we can, during the course of this year, persuade the Common Market countries to adopt foreign economic policies that will result in a rapid lowering of tariff barriers not only among themselves but toward the free world as a whole. If the Continental Europeans move in this direction, then the British and their free trade area associates can be induced to adopt similar policies. The adoption of a comprehensive bill will demonstrate that we intend to pursue expansionist policies in dealing with our balance-of-payments difficulties. This itself could tip the scales of European decision toward a general lowering of economic barriers and lead the European nations to make greater contributions to the cause of economic development.

(c) The catalyst for the release of these Atlantic resources must be American. The present foreign economic policies of the United States are clearly inadequate to this mission. Only a major effort on the part of the new administration to secure new policies, the vital new tools, will coalesce the disorganized but potent resources of the industrialized nations for the common tasks that face us all.

4. It is the opinion of the task force that the comprehensive bill could be persuasively explained to the American people, along the following lines:

(a) In 1934 the United States embarked on the initiative of the reciprocal trade agreements program, which dispelled the chaos in world trade resulting from the great depression and led to the development of an orderly system of international trade.

(b) In 1947, faced with the wreckage of World War II, we created the Marshall plan, which led to the restoration of the European countries and created the present strong and prosperous Western World.

(c) Today, faced with the dual problem of the Soviet threat and the instability of the underdeveloped world, we need a major new American initiative. By the comprehensive program we would provide the means of coordinating our resources with those of other industrialized countries to solve the most pressing problem of the 1960's—that of raising the standard of living of the underdeveloped nations.

(d) By taking this initiative we can promote our own economic growth through the creation of new and expanding markets for our products, and we can increase the unity of the Western World and the cohesion of the less developed areas with the West.

PART 2. AN INTEGRATED FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY PROGRAM

I. Commercial policy

A. Principles

1. The bankruptcy of the trade agreements program

(a) The traditional tool of U.S. commercial policy is the trade agreements program, originally enacted in 1934. Through successive renewals it has served as an effective mechanism enabling the U.S. Government to lead a world movement toward the creation of a free, multilateral trading system.

(b) Today, however, the trade agreements program is bankrupt. The program has been slowed almost to a stop by its own doctrinal limitations. In addition, it has become encrusted with restrictive devices in repeated legislative struggles.

(c) Even if adequate additional authority for tariff reduction could be obtained through new extension legislation—which is doubtful—the trade agreements program in its present form would not meet the needs of the modern world. As a result, we are in danger of losing the lead in the fight for liberal trade to powerful European regional trading groups that are not inhibited by the heavy burdens of tradition and doctrine.

2. New principles of trade negotiation

Two new principles must be introduced into the machinery of multilateral trade reduction if we are to have an effective policy:

(a) The principle of across-the-board reductions:

(i) The authority provided by the traditional trade agreements program calls for negotiated, reciprocal reductions on a product-by-product basis. The approach of selective reduction leaves the United States with little bargaining power with those countries or trading blocs that have adopted an across-the-board approach to tariff reductions.

(ii) Even if an extension of trade agreements authority were substantially to increase the President's authority to reduce tariffs on a product-by-product basis, the United States would still be at a great disadvantage.

(iii) The technique of across-the-board reductions embodied in the provisions both of the European Economic Community treaty and the European Free Trade Association convention calls for the gradual elimination, over a period, of tariffs and other import restrictions on trade among members. This is to be accomplished by means of successive percentage reductions in the average of tariffs applicable within certain commodity groups.

(iv) If U.S. production is not to be at a serious disadvantage in the rapidly growing Common Market, the President must be armed wtih weapons enabling him to bargain effectively for the generalization to the United States of the internal tariff cuts within these markets—or, at least, for the substantial reduction of their external tariff, applicable to nonmembers, to minimize the disadvantage.

(b) The principle of accepting and cushioning adjustments to structural changes:

(i) The obsolescence of our trade agreements mechanism rests also in the no-injury doctrine, which is embedded in the present legislation. This is a dual policy: tariffs will not be reduced below the peril point if such reduction would cause serious injury to an American producer; higher tariffs or quotas will be imposed whenever imports cause or threaten serious injury. The peril point provision has become a severe limitation on tariff negotiating power, while the escape clause in its present form threatens the stability of our trade agreement commitments by permitting the unilateral reversal of reductions previously made.

(ii) The underlying philosophy represented by both the European Common Market and the free trade association is of a wholly different order. It recognizes quite explicitly that, at least within the area of the individual trading blocs, conditions should be achieved that would permit completely free movement of goods. It recognizes also that the transition from a system of individual, protected national markets to a system of free trade will necessarily require structural changes in the economies of the member countries. The Common Market Treaty proposes to cushion these structural changes by providing funds to pay the costs of economic dislocation, of retraining and relocating workers, housing, etc.

(iii) Our foreign economic policy objective of bringing about a high level of multilateral trade and the most efficient utilization of free world resources can be achieved only if we are prepared to provide Government mechanisms to cushion trade readjustments within our own economy.

(iv) The task force notes that the Kennedy administration has already recognized the need for assisting the rehabilitation of areas where chronic unemployment has been brought about by structural changes in the economy. The task force strongly recommends that the administrative machinery of the proposed area redevelopment legislation be adapted to provide for cushioning the consequences of structural changes resulting from tariff reduction. Such changes are an inevitable consequence of a major reduction in barriers to the normal flow of trade. In the opinion of the task force, the structural changes would be small in relation to the normal changes that take place in the economy each year as a result of technological change, change in consumer demand, depletion of resources, and other similar factors. The frank acceptance of such changes, however, and the provision of a mechanism to cushion the resulting hardship is indispensable if the United States is to continue to lead the free world in trade liberalization and to realize the economic benefits of this policy.

3. Consequences of a failure to adopt a modern trade liberalization program:

(a) The countries of the Common Market have already reduced their internal tariffs by 30 percent. The free trade association countries have reduced theirs by 20 percent. In another 5 years these countries, depending on the extent to which they accelerate these reductions, will have cut their internal tariffs by from 70 to 80 percent.

(b) The first 10 percent reduction in tariffs made by the two trade groups was generalized for the benefit of the rest of the world, including the United States. Given the fact that the United States does not have adequate bargaining authority for the 1961 negotiations under the general agreement on tariffs and trade, our negotiators can and should request that the second phase of reductions also be generalized without our offering substantial additional concessions. Such a request can be justified by our past record of generosity and by the hard realities of our balance-of-payments deficit.

(c) We cannot expect the two trading blocs to generalize their tariff reductions for our benefit beyond a certain point unless the President has authority to offer substantial reciprocal reductions in our own tariffs. If he is not given such authority, U.S. producers are likely to suffer a formidable competitive disadvantage in the markets of the Six and Seven. In the face of anxiety over the operation of the American cost-price mechanism, such discrimination could seriously reduce U.S. exports.

(d) Default in our leadership in trade liberalization is not, however, to be deplored merely because it might result in commercial disadvantage to American producers. It could also be a powerful force contributing to the disintegration of the free world economy into separate trading systems. Such a result could have not only economic but political consequences of a most serious order.

B. Provisions of the Comprehensive Bill

1. Tariff-cutting authority

(a) The new legislation should authorize reductions of American tariffs by an average of 50 percent of those existing in 1961 within commodity groups similar or identical to the commodity groups now being used for tariff negotiations by the European countries. The reduction would be effected in five equal annual stages through 1966.

(b) The reduction would be qualified by peril point and escape clause provisions (revised as recommended below) to slow the rate of reduction in cases of severe dislocation within the American economy. In order to offset those cases where it is impossible to reduce the tariff by the full 50 percent within the 5-year period, the new legislation should provide authority to make greater than 50 percent reductions on certain items on which there is now a high level of tariff protection.

(e) This tariff-cutting authority is necessary if we are to match the reductions to be made in the internal tariffs of the European Common Market and the free trade association. In that way we could receive the benefits of the generalization of these reductions of a most-favored-nation basis. Since those two trading groups will have reduced their tariffs by 50 percent across the board by 1966, the United States, armed with the authority we propose, would be able to prevent division of the industrial countries of the free world by widespread trade discrimination.

2. The concept of "no serious injury"

(a) The present trade agreements legislation is subject to the implicit doctrinal limitation that tariffs may not be cut below a point where such reduction results in serious injury to American producers or labor. The doctrine of "no injury" is given operational effect by the twin mechanisms of the peril point and the escape clause.

(b) The peril point mechanism serves as a limitation on the tariff-cutting authority of American negotiators in trade agreements negotiations. The escape clause mechanism comes into play after tariffs have been reduced if the Tariff Commission determines that increased imports following a reduction cause serious injury. Over the past decade, as Presidential authority to negotiate trade agreements has been extended periodically, the peril point and escape clause provisions have been increasingly tightened to make them more effective as devices for protecting domestic industry.

(c) The operation of the no-serious-injury principle is well illustrated by the peril point restrictions placed on the negotiating authority of the President in connection with the 1961 GATT negotiations now underway in Geneva. These negotiations were designed principally for the purpose of obtaining the generalization of the internal tariff cuts of the European Common Market. As a result of the recent peril point findings of the Tariff Commission, however, the authority of the American negotiators in Geneva has been so restricted that they will have difficulty in obtaining adequate matching concessions from the Europeans.

(d) The task force is of the strong opinion that the no-serious-injury doctrine should be substantially abandoned. The United States should recognize frankly that the liberalization of trade essential to a prosperous free world will require that tariffs be reduced to the point where it will be necessary to accept some temporary and local injury to certain American firms, industries, and communities. Trade adjustment provisions should be included in the comprehensive foreign economic bill to mitigate any possible hardship.

(e) The revision of this doctrinal limitation on tariff reductions implies the substantial revision of both the peril point and escape clause provisions of the present law. These provisions must be adapted to the proposed new technique of tariff cutting involving across-the-board reductions.

(f) The proposed system for cutting tariffs across the board contemplates that some tariffs on specific items will be reduced by more or less than the reductions in broad categories. In revising the peril point provision to embody this principle, it will be necessary to develop criteria to guide the adjustment of tariffs on individual items within categories to permit individual tariff adjustments that vary from the average reduction negotiated for the category.

(g) The task force recommends that the revised peril point procedure, which will determine the extent of variation in individual tariff adjustments from the negotiated average for the category, should come into effect only after the negotiation is completed and not before negotiations are undertaken as is presently the case.

(h) The criteria and standards applicable to peril point findings should also be applicable to the proposed revised escape clause.

(i) The present escape clause, which should be completely recast, has two major deficiencies: First, it is triggered not by the impact of imports on an entire multiproduct industry but by the effect on an individual product, even though the industry as a whole may be prosperous. Second, it is based on a static concept since it can result in a tariff increase even though the labor and capital resources of the industry concerned can easily be shifted to the production of other types of goods.

(j) The task force recommends that the escape clause provision be revised so that it will be operative (i) where there is a finding that an entire industry is adversely affected by increased imports resulting from a tariff cut, and (ii) where there is a finding that an adjustment to the impact of imports cannot readily be made.

3. Trade adjustment provisions

(a) Under the legislation recommended by the task force, the President would be empowered to employ optional mechanisms for dealing with hardships resulting from a tariff cut. Upon a finding of hardship he would not be requested to raise duties, as is presently the case. He could, as an alternative, provide measures to ease the adjustments made necessary by the tariff cut. These measures would include assistance to affected industries by providing loans to finance their relocation, accelerated tax writeoffs, etc. They would include measures for the retraining of workers, additional unemployment compensation, early retirement benefits, etc. They would be made available without regard to whether or not the affected industries or workers are located in areas of substantial labor surplus.

(b) To bring into play such measures of assistance, the task force recommends the following:

(i) Any industry claiming that it was being injured by a tariff reduction would be entitled to apply to the Tariff Commission for relief.

(ii) If the Commission found that the industry was being seriously injured by imports under the revised definition of "injury," it would recommend remedial action to the President.

(iii) If the President accepted this recommendation, he would certify to the agency responsible for administering the area redevelopment legislation that the industry in question was eligible for various measures of assistance provided in that legislation.

(c) Under certain circumstances the President might determine that, notwithstanding adjustment assistance, producers and workers in the industry were being displaced from their current activities faster than they could be absorbed in alternative employment. In that event—but only in that event—he would be required to grant relief by increasing tariffs.

(d) Such relief would, however, be of limited duration. The President would increase the tariff to the level necessary to eliminate hardship, taking into account the available adjustment assistance, but the increased tariff would not, in any event, exceed the 1930 tariff rate. Furthermore, it would be progressively scaled down over a prescribed period.

4. Unilateral tariff concessions to less-developed areas

(a) In order to increase the export opportunities of underdeveloped areas, the task force recommends that provisions be included in the comprehensive foreign economic policy bill authorizing the President to remove or reduce duties, import taxes, and quotas on articles which are produced principally by less-developed countries and which are of particular importance to the export trade of those countries. This action could be taken without requiring reciprocal tariff concessions from the less-developed countries. However, in principle it should be taken only on the following conditions:

(i) The United States would first obtain commitments that the other major industrialized countries would grant parallel concessions.

(ii) The less-developed countries benefited by such concessions would commit themselves to take actions to accelerate their own economic growth.

(b) The concessions contemplated by this provision might relate not only to sumptuary taxes on tropical products but also to tariffs and other import restrictions on an agreed common list of raw materials, materials in the early stages of processing, and certain light manufacturers.

(c) The recommended provision would have two purposes:

(i) It would promote an expansion of the export earnings of less-developed countries by facilitating access of their products to the markets of the industrialized nations.

(ii) It would tend to reduce the advantages enjoyed by underdeveloped areas that are members of a preferential trading system. These include not only the former British colonial possessions but also the associated oversea territories of the Common Market countries. At the present time the operation of the Common Market treaty threatens to extend the preferences accorded the oversea territories of individual member nations by giving them free access to the markets of all Common Market countries. This could result in a severe distortion in trade patterns and serious discrimination against underdeveloped areas having no special ties to a metropole—such as the nations of Latin America. The generalizing of such a preference is in accord with our political objective of promoting maximum access to these countries by all the Western nations. At the same time such a generalization proposal would be timely since the Commission of the Common Market is required by treaty to undertake a review of its commercial policies toward oversea territories of its members by the end of 1962.

5. Broad negotiating authority

The present trade agreements legislation requires that the President obtain reciprocal concessions equal in value to the concessions we make in the particular area covered by the negotiations. The present atomistic approach does not give sufficient recognition to the fact that we should seek to obtain commitments and concessions from foreign governments with respect to a number of aspects of their policy. The achievement of our objectives in foreign economic policy will be facilitated if the President has sufficient and diverse powers to negotiate an agreement in which he can either

(a) as the quid pro quo for U.S. trade concessions accept commitments which are not restricted or limited to the trade field; or

(b) offer commitments not strictly limited to trade in return for trade concessions.

Therefore the comprehensive bill should provide the President with a broad set of powers, involving a number of aspects of foreign economic policy, which he can employ in negotiating for reciprocal concessions from our friends and allies.

6. Other commercial policy questions

(a) Statement of purposes:

(i) The present preamble to the trade agreements legislation has remained practically unchanged since the legislation was first passed in 1934. It is an inadequate statement of policy under the conditions of 1961.

(ii) As a substitute for the preamble it is recommended that the comprehensive foreign economic policy bill include in its preamble a declaration that foreign trade policy is an instrument of U.S. total foreign policy and should be used as a means of accelerating the economic growth of the United States and the whole free world.

(b) National security provision:

(i) Under existing trade agreements legislation the President is empowered to limit imports of an article whenever the Director of the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization finds that such imports threaten to impair the national security of the United States.

(ii) The task force recommends that this provision be made more flexible. The President's power should not be limited merely to the restriction of imports. On a finding that the national security demands such action, he should be empowered to reduce import duties and expand quotas.

(iii) The President should also be empowered to employ such measures as tax concessions, subsidies, and special contracts when he finds that the national security requires the employment of such measures in order to insure the maintenance of supplies and facilities.

(iv) The criteria of the national security provision should be revised to make them consistent with the prevailing view of modern strategy in the field of military and economic mobilization, replacing the more outdated concept of the industrial mobilization base with the principle of forces in being.

(c) Japanese voluntary export restrictions:

(i) Under pressure from U.S. producers and fear of U.S. Government action, the Japanese Government has undertaken informally to restrict exports of Japanese textiles to the United States. This undertaking expires at the end of 1961.

(ii) The task force recommends that the administration indicate at that time that it will not continue the practice of bringing informal pressure on foreign governments to curtail exports to the United States. Such a practice is not consistent with sound policy since it makes it possible for American industry to obtain the benefit of governmental intervention without demonstrating hardship or injury by the use of normal administrative factfinding procedures.

(iii) In announcing the intention to discontinue this practice, the administration should make it clear that the change involves no prejudgment of the need to offer help to American business, whether through tariffs or adjustment assistance. The purpose of such action is to require industries to make use of established mechanisms for assistance rather than resort to informal and unofficial procedures.

(d) Tariff simplification:

(i) The task force recommends that the administration undertake to review the Tariff Commission proposals for a revision of the U.S. tariff classification system. These proposals were completed in November 1960 under legislation that imposed severe restraints on the discretion of the Tariff Commission. Among these restraints was the stipulation that no product should be reclassified so as to alter appreciably the rate of duty applicable to it.

(ii) Because of these restraints, it is believed that, upon review, the proposals may prove unsatisfactory. In that event it is recommended that the administration issue an amended directive to the Commission that does not contain such severe restraints. The new directive should instruct the Commission to propose revisions conforming as closely as possible to the international tariff nomenclature system already agreed upon by most major trading nations.

(e) Elimination of provisions:

The task force recommends that the following provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 be eliminated:

(i) The provision relating to cost-of-production criteria in the fixing and raising of duties.

(ii) The provision requiring the use of American selling price in fixing the valuation of certain products.

(iii) The provision directing customs officers to apply the highest rate of duty when alternatives exist.

7. Policy with respect to primary commodities

(a) In the past the U.S. Government has in principle opposed commodity agreements and arrangements for the stabilization of the export income of single commodity producing countries. It is the view of the task force that this principle has been too rigidly applied. The Kennedy administration should explicitly recognize the desirability of income stabilization and show hospitality to well-conceived proposals to attain that end. Two techniques for income stabilization are available:

(i) Commodity agreements to stabilize prices.

(ii) Loans to offset fluctuations in income.

(b) the task force emphasizes that commodity agreements are not a panacea and that effective agreements may be possible for only a limited number of widely traded commodities. Certainly the problem of developing and administering agreements will vary in difficulty, depending upon the commodity in question; e.g., its perishability, storability, the number and nature of producers, the geographic areas of production, etc. As a result the task force feels that no categorical statements can be made regarding the general utility of commodity agreement techniques.

(c) Not only are stabilization techniques vital to the economic development of less-developed areas, to which the United States is committed, but we have at least two additional interests in encouraging the employment of such techniques where they can be effective.

(i) The United States is either a principal producer or a principal consumer of every product likely to be the subject of commodity arrangements, and, hence, our participation in such arrangements is very often indispensable to their success;

(ii) The United States has a direct interest in the income stability of many raw materials producing areas since those areas in turn provide important markets for American production.

(d) While the United States should be hospital to proposals for commodity agreements where such agreements are practicable, it should not encourage efforts to employ commodity agreement techniques that support prices at artificially high levels. This would amount merely to ill-designed economic assistance paid for by the consumers of the commodity in question—ill-designed because it would tend to enrich a handful of individual producers without necessarily benefiting the total economies of the producing countries.

(e) In many instances income stabilization might be better achieved by techniques other than commodity agreements. The task force feels that much greater consideration should be given to the possibilities of using the resources of the International Monetary Fund for short-term loans to cushion income fluctuations resulting from cyclical variations in production conditions or the terms of trade of raw material producing countries.

C. Trade Policy Toward the Communist Bloc

1. The need for a policy

(a) Current U.S. trade policy offers no adequate response to the Communist bloc's worldwide trade and aid activities. The challenge of the Soviet economic offensive is no longer the narrow one of whether or not the United States should expand its commercial relations with Communist countries. It has begun to affect our economic and political relations with both industrialized and underdeveloped countries.

2. The inadequacy of present policy

(a) Since the Export Control Act of 1949, our approach has reflected the negative proposition that commerce with Communist countries is immoral, dangerous, and of doubtful economic benefit. While U.S. trade with the Soviet bloc is of only marginal interest, other Western countries have found such trade advantageous. As a result, our allies have refused to follow docilely the tariff discriminations and export limitations on Communist trade imposed by U.S. law.

(b) The Battle Act of 1951 sought to compel observance of U.S. trade policy toward the Soviet bloc by requiring the President to withhold economic assistance from countries that export certain types of strategic goods to bloc countries. In each instance of violation of this policy by a country receiving aid, however, the President has found it necessary to exercise his power of forgiveness. Meanwhile, multilateral coordinating machinery for the control of strategic exports, based on the voluntary participation of NATO countries and Japan, has all but broken down. The Soviet Union's demonstrated technological capacity to wage a nuclear war has led most Western countries to reject the proposition that the bloc's military potential can be affected by the type of export controls maintained by the United States.

3. The nature of Soviet trade

(a) The peculiar character of total state trading by the Communist bloc threatens a gradual deterioration in the open and multilateral patterns of international commerce. A crucial long-range problem is how to safeguard our general world trade against the increasingly disruptive commercial activities of total state-trading countries.

(b) The complete concentration of all industrial, commercial, and financial activity, both domestic and foreign, in the hands of the Communist state provides more suitable means for economic warfare than are available to a free economy such as ours, notwithstanding the vast superiority of our resources.

(c) A desire to maintain profitable economic relations with a preponderantly capitalist world has led the Soviet Union to adapt its commercial behavior to orthodox international requirements. So far, its trade with economically stronger nations has been dictated by commercial rather than political considerations: the need to import commodities in short supply, to acquire advanced foreign technology, to export surpluses, to earn foreign exchange.

4. The impact of bloc trade—Dangers and opportunities

(a) Nonetheless, ostensibly conventional business activities tend to produce serious dislocations in international markets when conducted by a total state trader. A dramatic example of this is the Soviet disruption of the world aluminum and tin markets in 1958 by organized price cutting without reference to the rules followed by traditional suppliers. More recently, international oil circles have become alarmed by the sale of large quantities of Soviet oil at substandard prices. Although the probable intention in each case was disposal of surplus commodities or the acquisition of scarce foreign exchange rather than deliberate dumping, the consequences have been no less disruptive than in the case of dumping in its most obnoxious form.

(b) The essential difference between this type of sporadic underselling and competitive practices in private commerce derives from the fact that Communist pricing policies have no relation to domestic costs, normal profit margins, or realistic rates of exchange. Moreover, losses incurred by a state trading monopoly are met from the national budget. The resulting propensity to unsettle established trading conditions and price patterns constitutes an intermittent threat to orderly commerce. The rapidly expanding capability of Communist economies, combined with a concentrated deployment of resources designed to exploit competitive pressures in the West, could make this an economic and political threat of dangerous proportions.

(c) In bloc relations with economically weaker countries, commerce is usually subordinated to political considerations. Here, increasing dependence on Communist markets, supplies, loans, grants, and technical assistance (as in the case of Egypt, Afghanistan, and Cuba) and subsequent manipulation of such dependence for political ends (as in the case of Yugoslavia, Finland, and Iceland) provide growing opportunities for the achievement of Communist objectives. Some 300 bilateral commercial treaties concluded by the Soviet bloc with free world countries since the end of the war have been particularly conducive to the expansion of economic relations with underprivileged areas. The Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany are showing an increasing willingness to offer currency-saving barters of capital equipment for unstably priced commodities, in a growing pattern of complementarity with underdeveloped economies. In addition, Communist enterprises are providing credits, price terms, and quasi-conscripted technical personnel (under noncommercial conditions) which private, profit-making companies cannot match.

(d) To blunt the dangers and exploit the opportunities inherent in the bloc's expanding economic commitments, we must persuade other free enterprise countries to take constructive and coordinated action. What is needed first of all is some measure of conviction on their part that we are genuinely prepared to recognize the potential economic advantages of expanded East-West trade. Only then will we be in a position to assert positive leadership in the formulation and enforcement of safeguards necessary for the protection of the common interest in stable world trade. These are the factors lying behind our recommendations for a change in policy under the Export Control Act, the Battle Act, and applicable provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act, and for a fresh approach in conjunction with our allies to the problem of Soviet bloc trade.

5. Proposed actions

(a) Within the framework of the OECD, the United States should seek a common strategy with regard to Soviet bloc trade. This strategy should proceed from the explicit recognition that East-West trade is likely to grow and that under suitable conditions such growth need not be against the interests of the free world.

(b) In a positive response to Khrushchev's high sounding trade overtures, the Soviet Union should be invited to trade with free world countries on the basis of a code of fair practices designed to remove the distortions and disruptions arising from monopolistic state commerce. The code should serve as a model for industrialized and underdeveloped countries in the negotiation of bilateral treaties or multilateral trade arrangements with the bloc. For example, detailed ground rules, coupled with an effective complaints procedure, would seek to regulate disruptive price undercutting and dumping by reference to comparative world price and cost criteria, rather than to the totally unrelated and unascertainable conditions prevalent in the Communist home market; to provide meaningful reciprocity in conditions governing access to Communist markets; to obtain Soviet commitments to purchase specified quotas of goods in lieu of an otherwise futile most-favored treatment undertaking; to end the wholesale pirating of Western patents, know-how, and technology; and, in general, to insure that trade and competition are conducted on the basis of commercial considerations.

Failing East-West agreement, the United States and its industrialized allies would still possess the economic advantage needed to secure observance of the rules, assuming that a uniform and coordinated policy toward bloc trade is established and enforced through consultation within OECD and the GATT.

(c) To provide added means for countering the bloc's use of trade for political penetration, the administration should seek an amendment to the national defense provisions of the Trade Agreements Act, authorizing temporary relaxations of U.S. import restrictions whenever such actions would provide alternative opportunities for exports of the country under Communist economic pressure. In urging this amendment, the President should make it clear that the power would normally be used only in concert with other members of the OECD.

(d) The administration should seek amendment of the Battle Act to extend its policy aim beyond control of strategic exports. The broader legislative policy should furnish means to safeguard normal trade patterns against politically inspired disruption or manipulation. Toward the same end, the Administrator of the Battle Act should be directed to recommend to the President supplemental action, within the scope of his Executive powers, to determine Government procurement policies, to allocate foreign aid, to enlist the organized participation of American business, and otherwise to draw on the plurality of means available in our economy, in order to cope with the politically and economically disruptive activities of Communist state trading.

(e) As a step in establishing a constructive policy image, the United States should confine Export Control Act prohibitions to exceptional products likely to contribute to the Soviet military potential in an important, direct, and immediate way.

(f) Under the Trade Agreements Act the President should seek discretionary authority to suspend provisions which embargo the import of certain furs from the Soviet bloc and which direct the United States to withhold most-favored-nation treatment from Communist-dominated countries. This discretion should be used as a bargaining chip in future bilateral or multilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union.

(g) The problem of trade with Cuba and mainland China should be dealt with as a political rather than as a trade matter. The scope and timing of trade policy changes should be determined by the political moves to be made in relation to these countries.

SPRING THAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, due to the lateness of the hour at which the House adjourned—12:09 a.m.—and not desiring to cause any inconvenience to my colleagues in the House, I did not insist upon having an opportunity to be heard. Therefore I am submitting the text of my remarks to be included in today's RECORD under the heading "Spring Thaw."

SPRING THAW PROJECT

The internal threat to the freedom of the people of this Nation is manifested in two broad areas, first, in the internal Communist Party, which is outside controlled and revolutionary in character; and, second, in the spread of socialism, which is evolutionary in character.

According to U.S. News & World Report, March 19, 1962, the Attorney General of the United States, who, I am sure all of us are aware, is quite close to the administration, is quoted as saying:

> In this country, the Communists have absolutely no following * * * they can't do anything to us * * *. Hysteria about the activities of Communists in the United States is misplaced apprehension.

According to a later report in the Washington Evening Star of March 25, 1962, the Attorney General is quoted as saying that the American Communist Party is a "political organization of no danger in the United States."

> The greatest danger is not from the Communist Party.

He continued—

> but from the espionage committed by representatives of the Communist bloc countries here.

This is another way of saying that the activities of the Communist Party and its followers in this Nation are not a threat to our security. While I personally have a great respect for the ability of the Attorney General I feel I must take issue with him on this matter. In so doing I want to make it abundantly clear that I in no way question his loyalty and dedication to the very important task that is his as the one who is responsible for the internal security of our country.

In recent hearings held by the committee on which I have the honor to serve, the Committee on Un-American Activities, the following points were brought out, and I quote in part from a speech delivered by the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER in Pennsylvania on December 6, 1961. Hon. FRANCIS WALTER is, as you know, the very able chairman of this House committee—

> The Mine, Mill, & Smelter Workers Union has been expelled from the CIO for 12 years because of Communist domination, and is still Communist dominated. In the summer of 1951, at the height of the Korean conflict where over 54,000 American boys died, this union went on strike. The effect of this strike was to pull 100,000 nonferrous metal workers out of the mines and mills and cut the Nations copper production by 95 percent. This happened at a time when copper was in the shortest supply of all strategic materials vital to the effort then being exerted in Korea. Only when President Truman invoked the national emergency clause of the Taft-Hartley law did the strike end.

Another case—hearings held from August 1960 to November 1961—is that of the American Communications Association. This union was expelled from the CIO in 1950 for being Communist dominated. It has a membership of about 8,000 today and is still under the domination of the Communist Party. This is the union which represents a great many of the engineering and technical personnel who work in our radio and television stations and networks. These people are in a position to completely upset the program of our civil defense Conelrad system. By leaving a transmitter on the air or identifying the location of the transmitter which they control, they could supply a missile guidance system with a homing signal—which is exactly the thing the Conelrad system attempts not to allow. In addition, members of the American Communications Association service the highly sensitive communications lines of the U.S. Government. These lines carry the messages of the Department of Defense and other critical Government agencies.

Another case in point—last hearings held in 1959: The infamous International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union was expelled from the CIO in 1950 because of its Communist domination. This is the union headed by Harry Bridges, a longtime member of the Communist Party, as are many of his union lieutenants. Through the union, Bridges controls shipping on the west coast from Alaska to the Gulf of Mexico. He holds a life-and-death grip on the economy of the State of Hawaii. Bridges not only has the longshoremen in Hawaii organized, but also the workers on sugar and pineapple plantations. In the past he has demonstrated the ability to injure this State by calling strikes which have completely tied up shipping between the mainland and the islands. In 1959, Bridges attended the so-called All Pacific and Asian Dockworkers' Trade Union Conference in Japan. The purpose of this gathering was to unite, under Communist control, all of the dockworkers' unions in the Asia-Pacific area. It should be obvious to all what this kind of alliance could do to the shipping lifelines of the East if we ever faced a world emergency and these unions could be controlled from the Kremlin. Imagine Russian-coordinated strikes, sabotage and other such activities under the conditions of war emergency?

In 1950 the United Packinghouse Workers of America barely escaped expulsion from the CIO because of the Communist Party influence in the union. Un-American Activities Committee hearings, held in 1959, indicated that there is still a high percentage of Communist Party infiltration in the leadership of this union. Let me read to you from the testimony of two witnesses who had broken with the party and had worked in the meatpacking industry. One, Carl Nelson, put it this way:

> Well, if this country was ever to go to war, an army has to travel on its stomach, and they [the Communists] would be in an excellent position to cut off food for the Armed Forces.

The other witness, one John Hackney said:

> Because the party felt that the meat industry was essential to the national economy and it was important that they [the Communists] build the party within the meat industry in the event that we had war with other nations, that we could control the meat industry and its various outlets.

Hackney continued:

> From my most current information and my experience in my activity in the party I would say that the party is stronger now in the meat industry than it ever has been.

Another large union which was expelled from the CIO because of Communist Party control was the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America—hearings held March 1959. This union has a membership of 160,000 and is still under the control of the Communist Party. This is the union which supplies the personnel to install and maintain the electrical equipment in industries such as steel. Imagine what would happen in the event of national war emergency if the power to the mills and foundries of the Nation were cut off, if all the electrical equipment in these plants were to be rendered inoperable. Our ability to produce the hardware necessary for our defense would be nil.

These are just a few cases in point. It is not my intent to leave you with the impression that all of the members of these unions are members of the Communist Party. Indeed, this is far from the case. However, the fact remains that many in control of the unions are. The workers have been reading and hearing the Communist line in union publications and meetings for many, many years. The danger is present, the danger is obvious. To say otherwise is to hide our heads in the sand.

The facts which I have just stated should be sufficient evidence for anyone to be aware that the Communist Party does pose a threat to our security. The Attorney General not only has these facts, he has many more facts than I. He has the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation at his disposal.

The effort to minimize or to declare practically nonexistent the dangers posed by the Communist Party membership in the United States is dangerous to our security. To discredit those who attempt to deal with the patriotic concerns of our people for the safety of their country by invective, slogans, and name calling is not in our Nation's best interests. If we are to deal effectively in this area of action which threatens our security we must use reasoned arguments and facts. The people must be given information so that they may see these matters in proper perspective. The Department of Justice has the facts. It has a most efficient investigative agency, namely, the FBI. The administration has the FBI at its disposal. Why does not the administration give the people the facts so that the people can act wisely instead of resorting to the use of invectives such as "extremists"? Do they fear giving the facts to the American people? Is not this an evidence of distrust of American opinion when the facts are available?

The appearance of these so-called extremist groups evidences a failure of leadership. I am not referring to such insignificant, contemptible organizations as Rockwell's Nazi Party, which has a membership of about 25 persons and is totally discredited by the American people. I am referring to the millions of American citizens who are honestly concerned about the safety of their Nation with respect to the world Communist conspiracy and the manifestations of this conspiracy within the United States through its tentacle, the Communist Party, U.S.A. Why should people, upon whom this administration has pinned the label of "extremism," be called extremists when they seek information from private sources which should have been made available to them by responsible Government agencies? Why should they be subjected to slanderous accusations when the only wrongdoing of which they are guilty is a patriotic concern for the security of their Nation which they love?

We cannot deny that there is a problem posed by the Communist Party in the United States and that this party poses a threat to our security. Do we accomplish anything by minimizing this threat—or attempting to make it appear as though it does not exist? I feel that our people can see this matter in proper perspective if they are given the information and if the executive branch properly led public opinion and explained its real nature and extent.

We do have crime in the United States, but certainly we are not panic stricken by that fact, and we do not feel that the criminals will overthrow the Government tomorrow. We have juvenile delinquency, but by recognizing this fact we do not mean to say that our youth are completely demoralized. We handle these matters in perspective. We are neither panicked by it nor are we defeatists. We deal with these matters as is necessary and by recognizing the problem. What is the purpose of the attempt to minimize the internal Communist threat and to pass it off as nonexistent?

We are told officially that the problem of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the danger it poses is being dealt with by the FBI. What is the FBI doing about it? Quite clearly the FBI has furnished evidence for the prosecution of a handful of Communists and quite clearly the FBI is operating as an extremely efficient organization to determine who are the Communists organizationally active in the United States. The identification by the FBI of organizational Communists are, on the other hand, confidential files of the executive branch, and rightly so. But who, outside the FBI, having facts available reveal them to the people? Does this knowledge possessed by the FBI eliminate Communists from leadership positions? We have evidence that there are several Communist infiltrated and dominated unions, many having been expelled by the AFL–CIO years ago, which are still in existence and still actively led by certain Communists. We know that they are engaging in propaganda activities and are laying the groundwork for espionage and sabotage in the event of a war emergency.

In what way is the FBI dealing with this? I would be the last to infer that the FBI is not doing all that it possibly can. The point I make is that it is wrong to infer that the threat to our security from Communists is being dealt with solely by the FBI. We all know that the FBI is the information-gathering arm of the Justice Department but it is up to the Attorney General to instigate prosecution.

Moreover, the American public is being misled by what appears to be minimizing actual Communist action and membership. The figure of 8,000 or 10,000 in Communist Party membership refers only to formal membership in the Party, or what may be described as members who are organizationally active. What happened to the 50,000 Communists who were formerly members just prior to the Mundt-Nixon bill and the Smith Act prosecutions of the late forties and early fifties? Have they ceased being Communists? Does not the extent of circulation of Communist magazines and journals indicate that the Communist party line is still being followed and read by tens of thousands of people, in addition to those indicated as members by the Attorney General? What are we trying to do? What is the purpose of this concerted effort to minimize the dangers of the Communist Party? Can we not be frank with the American people and trust their judgment?

The real difficulty seems to have been that in the past the executive branch has not communicated frankly and directly with the American people. There is no doubt in the minds of all of us that the people in Government and in the country are overwhelmingly loyal and patriotic. Does it accomplish anything but to give comfort to those who seek to destroy our Nation to say that no problem at all exists with respect to the Communist Party, U.S.A.? The people are asking for knowledge and assurance that this matter is seen in its true perspective. They expect their Government to keep them informed; to take them into its confidence so that there can be mutual constructive, effective action to combat communism. The classification of opinion within the country as either rightist or leftist is really an application of the "either-or" principle of dialectic materialism. If you are not one then you are the other. If you are actively anti-Communist, you are an extremist of the right and if you are not an anti-Communist, you are a leftist. What is the result of dichotomy? Simply this—if you want to avoid being tarred with that undesirable classification of "rightist" or "leftist," then you must be silent upon the important issues of the safety and welfare of our Nation. Why should we seek to silence the people? I merely ask. I would welcome an answer.

EVOLUTIONARY THREAT OF SOCIALISM

Communism, be it internal or external, is a threat to our security in terms of our national identity and sovereignty, since it emanates from a foreign power desiring to rule the world.

There is a more subtle threat to our security. It is not a threat to our national identity and sovereignty to the degree that communism poses that threat but it does weaken our internal security by chipping away at the individual freedoms that characterize this Nation and set it apart from most other nations of the world. This is the threat of limiting freedom through the evolutionary process of socialism. It seriously threatens our traditional constitutional form of government and seeks to make a change in our economy that can result only in weakening us in our position of leadership in the world.

Here again may I make it abundantly clear that in raising this issue that I do not question the loyalty or dedication to our country on the part of those who believe in the limitation of freedoms for what they believe to be the larger welfare of our Nation. I do not want to fall heir to the prevailing practice of name calling and invective with which criticism is met in some quarters of our Government today. I do feel, however, that the American people should be apprised of just what these programs are and from whence they emanate.

In 1947, here in Washington, an organization was formed which called itself the Americans for Democratic Action. In 1950 this organization, known as the ADA, adopted a constitution. This constitution contains the creed to which each member must pledge himself—to use the words of the ADA—"without reservation." Allow me to quote from that creed:

> We believe that rising living standards and lasting peace can be attained by democratic planning, enlargement of fundamental liberties, and international cooperation. We believe that all forms of totalitarianism, including communism, are incompatible with these objectives. In our crusade for an expanding democracy and against fascism and reaction we welcome as members of ADA only those whose devotion to freedom is unqualified.

Now, for the most part, this sounds like a listing of fairly noncontroversial and noble ideas which every American could support. However, the truth of the matter is that action speaks considerably louder than words and the actions of this organization make it obvious that the creed just quoted is nothing more than an exercise in semantics. The 1961 ADA policy statement spells out how these fine phrases are turned into action in the minds of the membership:

First. Total disarmament under U.N. control.

Second. Inclusion of Red China in nuclear talks.

Third. A U.N. army to keep the peace.

Fourth. Immediate U.S. initiation of talks on the recognition of Red China.

Fifth. Admission to the U.N. for Red China including the Security Council and veto.

Sixth. A plebiscite on Formosan independence or reunion with the mainland.

Seventh. Removal of all U.S. trade and passport barriers with Red China.

Eighth. Surplus food shipments to Red China.

Ninth. Less stress on military aid to free Asia.

Tenth. No atomic arms to U.S. allies.

Eleventh. A hands-off policy toward Cuba.

Twelfth. No resumption of U.S. atomic testing.

Thirteenth. Aid to all public schools.

Fourteenth. Broad changes in the McCarran-Walter Act.

Fifteenth. Liberalization of the Hatch Act.

Moreover, in reading ADA literature it becomes obvious that the term "democratic planning" is semantics for "control."

It might be wondered by many of what consequence is such an organization. Even according to their own claims, the ADA membership is only 50,000. In addition, the organization's annual expenditure is little over $200,000. It is rather amazing to note that this organization has supplied from its membership 3 members of the Cabinet, 3 Presidential aids, and 31 administrators in high positions in the executive branch in the fields of labor, foreign policy, civil rights, and others.

The philosophy of the ADA, which is evident in administration policies, has been spelled out by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. Schlesinger says: "Keynes, not Marx, is the prophet of the new radicalism." What does Keynesian dogma say? That government ownership and government control are the only ways to achieve what the ADA calls democracy.

The tremendous amount of influence exerted upon this administration by the ADA cult now in power has shown up in much of the legislation which the administration has sent to the Congress. It can be seen in the appeasement policies which the administration cannot seem to avoid in foreign affairs. It can be seen in the constant growth of the bureaucracy. It can be seen in the expanding role played by the agencies of the executive branch.

These things are dangerous to the freedoms of the people of our Nation. Socialism, and that is what Keynes proposes, is as destructive to free enterprise and the freedom of the individual as any other type of totalitarianism. There is no place within our constitutional Government for this usurpation of the people's rights. It is imperative that the people be apprised of the facts in this case. It is imperative that they know what it means to have the ADA, Fabian Socialists, in great influence over the executive branch.

There are further manifestations of this growing role of the socialistic, appeasement-oriented philosophy. One of these is the appearance of the now notorious "Liberal Papers." This book spells out in detail the program which is inherent in the above-quoted program of the ADA. Moreover, it has been described as a plan for surrender. Some of the more pointed, and I might say frightening, aspects of this document include:

First. Recognition of Red China.

Second. U.S. sponsorship of Red China to the U.N.

Third. Turn Formosa and the offshore islands over to the U.N. for 5 years and then hold a plebiscite to see if the people on the islands want to join Red China.

Fourth. Offer U.S. aid to Red China.

Fifth. Demilitarize West Germany.

Sixth. Recognize East Germany.

Seventh. United States would encourage West Germany, Italy, Scandinavia, and France to withdraw from NATO.

Eighth. United States should abandon its missile bases in Europe.

Ninth. Ask the U.S.S.R. to "plug in" to the DEW line warning system so they would know whether we are attacking them or not.

I believe that these matters speak for themselves. Of course, there is a lot more in the book than these few items which I have quoted. However, the tone here shown indicates the kind of "planning" that would be done for America if these planners had their way completely.

I firmly believe in the traditional American way which is firmly based upon the ideals of freedom for the individual and the economic philosophy of free enterprise. More important than what I believe is the fact that the great majority of Americans also believe in the individual and free enterprise. The American citizen is well aware that increased Federal control is a step on the road to totalitarianism. He knows that so many Americans have sacrificed so much, not for peace at any price, but for freedom. He knows that centralization of power is dangerous to him. He is aware that it is impossible for the Government to have anything which it does not first take from the people. He knows that which is spent by the party in power to influence his vote must first come from his pocket, be discounted in Washington to pay the salary of 2½ million bureaucrats, and then be sent back, badly devaluated. He knows that every time he is supposedly given something by the Government he must repay it with some of his freedom.

One of the most vital aspects of the drive to Keynesianize our Nation is dramatized in the recent appointment of new Federal judges. While President Eisenhower was in the White House, he time and again asked the Democrat Congress to give him authority to appoint sorely needed new Federal judges. All over the Nation, those aware of the situation in our courts, were clamoring for the passage of this legislation. President Eisenhower went so far as to promise that he would make sure the Federal judgeships were equally divided between the two parties. But no, Congress did not pass the legislation. Instead, it chose to wait until after the presidential election, gambling that the new Chief Executive would be of the proper political party. Last year the bill was passed. This administration has so far appointed some 85 Federal judgeships. Eighty-four of them are members of the Democratic Party. To those who may think that Democrats are just better qualified to sit on the Federal bench, I would refer him to the American Bar Association, which said that seven of these were "not qualified to serve."

When the judges of our Nation are appointed to office on the basis of political conviction and philosophy rather than reflect what must be bipartisan in their decisions if there is to be any sense of stability in our Government under law we are well on a way to a form of government that is in opposition to our historic traditions.

NEWSPAPER COVERAGE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **CORMAN**. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said on this floor concerning our national and international policies which demand examination and refutation. I am aware that my colleagues are as well or better able to make their own examinations and such refutations as they feel warranted. However, one accusation was made concerning which I am better informed than many of my colleagues.

The charge was made that the Republican Party had not been able to get the coverage it was entitled to in the Los Angeles press. Such a charge is a serious indictment, because with freedom of the press comes some obligation to report both accurately and completely the news and views of both major parties so that the American people may make sound decisions at the polls.

I submit that there is a wealth of evidence to refute the conclusion that the Los Angeles press has frozen out information regarding the Republican Party.

There are many daily, biweekly, and weekly papers circulated in part or all of the Los Angeles metropolitan area. The largest of these, both in size and circulation, is the Los Angeles Times. Last Sunday this edition, consisting of 410 pages, went to 1¼ million homes in the Los Angeles area. Because of expense, I hesitated to insert it in the Record at this point but I will be happy to obtain a copy for any of my colleagues who wish to examine it carefully. I feel certain they will agree with me the charge of a freezeout is not sustained by the facts as to either news coverage or editorial comment.

As to news of the Republican Party and its activities, the front page of this edition has a three-column picture and has a detailed report of the California meeting of the Young Republicans, a report which I am certain is accurate.

It includes some physical disturbance involving a young man terming himself a Goldwater-Tower-Rousselot Republican.

Additionally, there is a wealth of national and international political news.

The eight-page editorial section includes a broad area of syndicated local editorial comment, some critical—much complimentary of the Republican Party.

Among the best of the articles, and one that I especially commend to the attention of my colleagues is a penetrating analysis by respected Washington observer Robert T. Hartmann, Times' Washington bureau chief, entitled "Walker's No-Win Charge Does Not Fit the Facts." I call it to your attention not because of the political registration of the subject, General Walker, who I understand is a registered Democrat, but rather because it is an honest and perceptive treatment of a charge made by General Walker, but shared by some of last night's speakers.

Mr. Speaker, my parochial pride will not permit me to remain silent on this point.

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **CORMAN**. I yield.

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, what happened to the highly touted "spring thaw" which our Republican colleagues started last night? Yesterday we did not object, although we could have objected, to putting over until today the remainder of the special orders for the Republican-sponsored talkathon which allegedly was to have shown how the public had been misled by the present administration. We find today that the talkathon apparently has been postponed indefinitely. It appears, in reviewing many parts of Operation Spring Thaw, that one cannot help but get the feeling it turned out to be a monumental dud.

LYNN M. EWING

Mr. **CORMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Randall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RANDALL**. Mr. Speaker, it is our great privilege to be able to call attention to an honor received by one of our Missouri legislators, State Representative Lynn M. Ewing, of Nevada, Mo.

Mr. Ewing, the recipient of this outstanding honor was one of nine State legislators to receive a St. Louis Globe-Democrat award in recognition of their zeal, ability, and public-spirited service during the last General Assembly of Missouri.

On Monday evening, April 9, in Jefferson City, Mo., the coveted prizes were awarded at a dinner attended by a large number of State officials and even a larger group of distinguished guests.

While the awards were made in the name of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the dinner was cosponsored by the Jefferson City Chamber of Commerce and the Jefferson City Rotary Club.

For most of the winners it was their first award. Not so with Representative Ewing. Two years ago he won the St. Louis Globe-Democrat award as being the most effective first-term member in the general assembly. Now in his second term, Mr. Ewing becomes the winner of the award to the house member showing the greatest growth in leadership and ability. Richard H. Amberg, publisher of the paper, said of Representative Lynn Ewing, as the "scion of a distinguished Missouri family, Mr. Ewing has demonstrated during his first terms in the legislature the same ability and devotion to the public welfare that characterized his family predecessors in the public service." Mr. Amberg continued on to say that, "At 31 years of age, and with two distinguished terms in the house, he seems ready to assume a mantle of leadership in his party."

In further description of Mr. Ewing's growth in leadership and ability, Mr. Amberg pointed out that—

> Mr. Ewing personifies the type of young, able, and intelligent public servant which Missouri must attract to its government service.

Mr. Speaker, the recipient of this coveted award, Mr. Ewing, is an attorney and although he is young in years he has already a long background of unstinting contribution to civic organizations in his home city of Nevada, Mo. We know from our own personal knowledge that he has won the respect of all his colleagues in the Missouri Legislature and has demonstrated great courage in all that he does as a house member. He is a man who is admired by both sides of the political aisle and while he was elected to represent only Vernon County, Mo., he has developed a thorough understanding of the problems of the entire State of Missouri and not just the constituency of his own district. He has demonstrated again and again that he does not always seek to move into the spotlight but daily during the legislative session makes contribution by faithful attendance and is known in Jefferson City as a legislator who always does his homework and is well prepared upon the subject matter under consideration.

In allotting the award winners, Richard H. Amberg, publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, praised each of them for their spirit of sacrifice upon entering public service and expressed the hope that it would help spur others to seek public office. May we add as our own observation that a member of the Missouri General Assembly engages day after day like those in other legislative bodies in the performance of many seemingly thankless and unrewarding tasks.

But when a committee of private citizens has carefully considered the contribution made by the members of our general assembly to the legislative process and the general welfare of the State of Missouri and has decided upon winners to be singled out for special mention, it means that those selected have captured the respect and admiration of their fellow members and also the citizens of our State.

It is a privilege to salute State Representative Lynn M. Ewing.

AUFBAU COMMENTS ON WAR CLAIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. EDMONDSON]. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is incredible that 17 years after World War II there are a substantial number of U.S. citizens who have not been compensated for the terrible losses they suffered during the Nazi tyranny. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has estimated that there are at least 34,000 claimants for war loss compensation. A bill concerned with this situation has been reported and is on the Senate Calendar. This measure (S. 2618), however, incorporates a concept which is completely alien to American principles and traditions. The Senate bill would compensate only those citizens who were citizens at the time they lost the property for which they are claiming compensation. This is nothing more or less than the creation of two classes of citizenship. It is based on a misguided interpretation of international law and does not take into account the fact that the losses would be paid from assets which are the property of the U.S. Government. This is a matter of domestic legislation, and it is a violation of our concept of citizenship. To say in effect that the United States has a greater obligation to those who became citizens earlier than their fellow citizens is hardly consistent with American jurisprudence.

Mr. Speaker, in the first session of this Congress, after much study and investigation, I introduced H.R. 9694 to compensate U.S. nationals who were victims of the holocaust during World War II. H.R. 9694 treats all citizens alike and provides that any national, who is otherwise eligible, may make a claim if he was a national on the date of the enactment of the measure. I believe that H.R. 9694 is consistent with our abhorrence of discrimination against any group of U.S. citizens, and I urge the Members of this body to support the measure.

Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1962, Aufbau in a penetrating editorial analyzed the serious inequity of S. 2618 with its distinction between old and new citizens. Aufbau was founded in 1934 by a small group of refugees from Hitler's Germany. It has been published continuously ever since and is today the most widely circulated weekly in the German language appearing in the United States.

Dr. Manfred George, the editor, was well known as a German newspaperman before coming to the United States, and is regarded as one of the world's outstanding journalists.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the Aufbau editorial of April 6, 1962.

A WORD ABOUT AMERICAN VALUES

Secretary of State Dean Rusk convincingly formulated "our obligation to understand better the American system of government," a few months ago. "In a time of continuing conflict it is imperative that we Americans not merely recognize by name and by instinct the values which we are defending but that we thoroughly understand them," Rusk said. He listed values as having "developed from our revolutionary manifesto, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and many decisions in courts of law, so that we have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

No one will quarrel with the Secretary of State in presenting this challenging philosophy. We must, however, register disappointment when we find that these American values are not always evenly, justly, and fairly recognized and respected. The treatment of certain minority groups in this country comes to mind and we realize with regret and apprehension that too often fundamental ideas of American political philosophy—for instance, all citizens without distinction are entitled to the equal protection and benefit of the law—are violated. Let us examine one glaring example, the Johnston bill (S. 2618), which recently was reported to the floor of the Senate and deals with the settlement of war claims for American citizens.

Other nations have long since paid their own citizens for war losses. In the United States the necessary assets are available without any cost to the taxpayers; so is the agency for carrying out a program of such importance. The claimants, on the other hand, are aging and dying, and the difficulties of proof are increasing daily.

The Johnston bill will allow registration of such war claims before payment is decided, but fails to include from its final benefits and its present provisions those persons who have become citizens since World War II. This is indeed contrary to the very principles Dean Rusk has so eloquently underlined in the statement quoted above.

We refer in this connection to the American Journal of International Law (vol. 55, July 1961, No. 3), in which a draft convention on the international responsibility of states for injuries of aliens is published. A distinguished committee of the bar association—consisting of Prof. William W. Bishop, Jr., University of Michigan; Prof. Herbert W. Briggs, Cornell University; Arthur H. Dean, of the New York bar; Prof. Roger D. Fisher, Harvard Law School; Alwyn V. Freeman, Deputy Representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency, United Nations; Charles M. Spofford, of the New York bar; I. N. P. Stokes, of the New York bar; Prof. Quincy Wright, Emeritus, University of Chicago; the late Prof. Clyde Eagleton, New York University, as well as Prof. Philipp C. Jessup, Columbia University—has submitted a draft convention whose article 6 unequivocally states:

"A state has the right to present or maintain a claim on behalf of a person only while this person is a national of that state. A state shall not be precluded from presenting a claim on behalf of a person by reason of the fact that person became a national of that state subsequent to the injury."

The State Department and the Johnston draft, basing themselves on the accidental date of acquiring citizenship, negate equal recognition and equal treatment of U.S. citizens. These new citizens, whose duties and rights cannot be disputed, have lost all their belongings without having resources to any other government. The procedure applied to them creates injustice and is incompatible with the American values expounded by Dean Rusk. Besides, France, Greece, Denmark, Yugoslavia, and other European countries have excluded their former citizens from any such benefits, which causes more injustice.

Denying the claims of the new citizens, in favor of other groups of citizens, makes the discrimination still more unbearable. Compensation resulting from war losses must be shared by all, and certainly by the new citizens, who have suffered more than enough before reaching these shores.

Unfortunately, all efforts to convince the State Department, Senator JOHNSTON and his friends of the righteousness of these demands have consistently run into opposition. Secretary Rusk's own Department has taken the position that, where available funds are insufficient to permit a full recovery by all, those individuals who were American citizens at the date when the loss occurred should be given preference over those who became naturalized later—only 1 day later—which amounts to saying that these so-called junior citizens should not receive any compensation whatsoever.

Any distinction between junior citizens and senior citizens or, as Senator KEATING put it, the creation of a second-class citizenry, introduces into American Government practice an element of discrimination irreconcilable with our expressed basic rights and ideals. We still hope that the State Department and the majority of the lawmakers will realize that such discrimination among our citizens for purposes of domestic legislation or otherwise is indefensible.

MEDICAL PROGRAM FOR U.S. GOVERNMENT AGENCY PERSONNEL IN WEST AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, during the discussion of the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1962, a week ago—April 4—some questions were asked about an appropriation to the State Department for inauguration of a medical program for the personnel of all U.S. Government agencies in west Africa.

I said then, and I repeat now, that I have supported this program and will continue to support it.

The limitation of time did not permit a full exposition of the background of this matter, so for the benefit of the Members, I am making these additional remarks for the RECORD.

Over the years, men and women of the Foreign Service in all ranks and grades—from ambassadors to clerks—have willingly and uncomplainingly served in difficult tasks. In scores of posts throughout the world today they are displaying a strong sense of teamwork and devotion to duty, often under the most hazardous and trying conditions.

The hazards of service at difficult posts—at unhealthful posts—have always been a matter of deep concern to the Department, and to those of us in the Congress dealing with oversea personnel.

Beginning in the fall of 1960, with the rapid emergence of independent nations in west Africa, the Department of State quickened its pace in staffing new American posts there.

The Department sent scores of people—a great many of whom volunteered for the assignment—to man the American embassies and consulates throughout the area.

But the Department did not realize that a staff of one American doctor and eight American nurses in west Africa would prove wholly inadequate to safeguard the health of American personnel stationed there.

In retrospect, no one could foresee the urgent need for expanding facilities and medical care in west Africa. In addition to our own admittedly meager facilities there were European managed and operated hospitals, European doctors, and European nurses, many of whom had studied in the great medical centers of Europe and the United States.

But as independence came to these new countries of Africa, there was a rapid withdrawal of Europeans. In many cases, clinics, hospitals, and medical facilities have been taken over by the Africans. In all too many instances, the Africans have not had the long years of training, internship, residency, or practice required of their counterparts in Western Europe or in the United States. As a result, many of these medical facilities presently are simply not up to our standards.

A few of the European doctors desired and had planned to remain on in the various Republics. However, due to the confusion in the takeover, many of the new local ministers of health were relatively inexperienced and had inadequate facilities and untrained staffs at their command. As a consequence, many of the European doctors have left west Africa. This has left many large areas in west Africa almost completely with inadequate competent medical personnel and care.

Because of virtually nonexistent sanitation or pest control and the preponderance of all types of diseases in these areas of west Africa, our Government servants and their dependents serving at these posts are constantly exposed to the hazards of such endemic diseases as leishmaniasis, filaria, leprosy, dysentery, fevers, hepatitis, yaws, malaria, and some of the more exotic ones like onchocerciasis and kala-azar.

It is the stated policy of the Department of State to provide its employees and their families serving abroad with every possible medical benefit under the law. This policy extends to those serving in the most remote parts of the world, so that no employee need hesitate to accept an assignment to a post where health conditions are hazardous, medical service poor, or transportation facilities limited. Each employee should have the assurance that he and his family will be provided adequate medical care approximating American standards, if possible.

Unfortunately, the lack of medical care and facilities in that vast area of the world has caused a serious health problem for our personnel stationed there.

Perhaps "alarming" is a better word. For today in case of serious illness—a heart attack or contagious disease—an employee or dependent must be evacuated thousands, sometimes several thousands, of miles to Europe or the U.S. military bases in north Africa, relying on uncertain communication and transportation services.

In this vast area we have 787 American families. With dependents, that means some 2,500 people daily facing the hazards of diseases and lack of medical care.

Let me note that the one State Department doctor for all the posts in west Africa is doing a splendid job—but he has to cover an area comprising 18 countries; an area, in fact, that is one and one-half times the size of the United States excluding Alaska.

To serve all of these 2,500 Americans in west Africa, the Department has only eight American nurses scattered over thousands and thousands of miles.

They are stationed in such distant posts as Monrovia, Liberia—in Bamako, Mali—in Ouagadougou, Upper Volta—in Lagos, Nigeria—in Accra, Ghana—in Conakry, Guinea—Youande, Cameroons, and in Fort Lamy, Chad.

It is not necessary to dramatize this situation. The unpleasant facts speak for themselves. A number of our Foreign Service personnel or members of their families have been seriously stricken. A Foreign Service officer recently died, a victim of a disease he contacted while serving in this area. During 1961 it was necessary to evacuate over 40 people from posts of west Africa for emergency medical care, often hours—even days—away.

An Ambassador was stricken with a nearly fatal attack of polio. As no adequate local medical facilities were available, he had to be evacuated by air to the United States. Extraordinary effort was required to obtain a seat on the aircraft and he had to sit up for more than 14 hours before he could be placed in a bed.

In the case of another Ambassador suffering from malaria and general fatigue, it took 40 hours, including 4 by bus, to evacuate him from one of the interior west African posts to a U.S. Army hospital in Frankfurt. Much time could have been saved had the facilities of a west African medical center been available.

Another Ambassador was the victim of influenza coupled with a most uncomfortable and irritating body rash. No local diagnosis could be made, and it was not until the Ambassador reached the United States during the course of normal home leave that his malady was cleared up. This Ambassador's wife had to be evacuated to the United States for major surgery.

A nurse was recently evacuated to Europe for medical care. At one post, four of the nine people assigned simultaneously suffered from hepatitis and another suffered a heart attack. Another nurse had to be evacuated because of suspected malignancy. There have been several acute depression cases brought about by environment, debilitating climate, overwork, and pressure. At one post the nurse turned the Embassy residence into a makeshift hospital to take care of four severe cases of hepatitis and dysentery.

As a result of these deplorable health conditions in west Africa, the Department some months ago undertook to organize and lead a survey to study measures for safeguarding the health of Government personnel and their dependents and to maintain the effectiveness of posts in the area.

The survey team was headed by the then medical director, Dr. V. T. DeVault, now special medical consultant to the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, Department of State.

The purpose of the survey, I might point out, was to determine the practicability and feasibility of purchasing or leasing sufficient space in a modern hospital staffed with competent professional and ancillary employees to accommodate the medical needs for all U.S. Government personnel serving in west Africa. In addition, communications and transportation were studied to provide necessary facilities to support an adequate medical program.

The survey team studied the complex problem of safeguarding the health of all U.S. personnel stationed there. The survey team visited such countries as the Ivory Coast and Nigeria, the Cameroons, and the Republic of the Congo, the Central African Republic, Chad, Niger, Upper Volta, Mali, and Nigeria.

They talked with doctors in private clinics. They visited municipal hospitals. They discussed the problem with missionaries who had lived in the area for years. They inspected operating rooms. They reviewed existing equipment. They looked into the overcrowded facilities, the lack of personal care, the scarcity of housing for medical personnel, the inadequate plane service.

The study revealed that there was not just one west African medical problem. Each post presented its own particular medical difficulties and hazards, with its own local facility and evaluation problems.

Other complicating factors included the varying attitudes of the policy leaders of the local governments and the departure of foreign technicians, and the subsequent reduction of other medical assistance, since the achievement of independence. Medical facilities, equipment, supplies, and even stores of pharmaceuticals are severly limited and grossly inadequate for the preservation of health.

Until only a few years ago, for example, Liberia had only one Liberian physician serving a population of 2,750,000. As recently as 1961 there was not even one qualified dentist in all of Niger.

The survey team concluded that "evacuation to Europe, while indicated in certain cases, is not a sufficient answer to the total problem of medical care for this area." The west African medical plan would include:

First. A regional health and medical facility, such as a 15-20-bed hospital, for the west African area, staffed with a surgeon and a diagnostician-internist and 6 graduate nurses.

Second. Establishment as soon as possible of communications between this facility and surrounding posts, as the success of any medical evacuation will depend upon rapid, dependable communications.

Third. Use of charter aircraft in the area on a 24-hour standby basis as an air ambulance for the pickup and evacuation of emergency cases.

Fourth. Liaison with the various missionary hospitals, doctors, and nurses in the area.

Fifth. The assignment of two roving doctors with headquarters at Monrovia, Liberia, and at Leopoldville, Republic of the Congo.

Sixth. In addition to the nurses already at the posts in this area, the assignment of an additional nurse at Leopoldville to cover Brazzaville, Republic of the Congo, and Luanda, Angola. Extension of the services of the nurse in Accra to cover Lome, and a new nurse for Abidjan.

Seventh. Also establishment of a service center and medical warehouse.

It is essential that we give the people and their dependents representing our Government in these hazardous areas the assurance that we will do our best to maintain their health in order to carry out our national objectives in the new Africa. Therefore, it is imperative that the Department of State take immediate steps to establish a comprehensive and reliable medical facility in this area.

Last week the House of Representatives displayed great understanding of the problem and passed the supplemental appropriations bill providing $400,000 for the African medical program and the African administrative services center. Great credit is due to our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. Thomas], chairman of our Subcommittee on Deficiencies, and to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney], chairman of our Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of State and Related Agencies. I hope that our colleagues in the Senate will join in approving this program.

THE LINDSAY BILL FOR MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Edmondson). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, today we in the Congress are at an impasse on a major public issue—the Federal role in health care for older persons.

The need is real and immediate. No Member of this House of Representatives can fail to have experienced personally, or at least have observed, the crushing impact on family finances of an extended hospital or nursing home stay of an aged person. Multiplied across the country many thousands of times, this common experience adds up to hardship for countless families, and huge sums of money for the Nation.

The total cost of health care for persons over 65 is estimated at about $5 billion per year. Nearly half of this is represented by hospital and nursing home care, including custodial and mental hospital care.

The basic question we face as a nation is how best to pay these costs. A substantial portion is already being paid from Federal, State, and local tax revenues. Unfortunately, as the load increases, we must face the fact that an ever greater portion will have to come from public sources.

Once we concede the necessity of using the taxing powers of Government to do the job, the issue becomes one of "What kind of tax?"

The principal criteria by which any form of tax should be judged are adequacy, impact on economic growth, and fairness.

Applying these criteria, we are squarely faced with the unavoidable conclusion that no broad program of health care for the aged can be loaded onto the progressive income tax or the corporate income tax. Personal and corporate taxes based on income can absorb no further burden, in my opinion, without virtually destroying the forces which enable our economy to grow.

The sound and equitable way to finance a broad-scale health insurance program is through the payroll tax. The payroll tax, applicable to substantially the entire working force of the Nation today, has a wide base; is easily collectible; is more stable than an income tax; and is, in short, adequate for the job.

Secondly, the payroll tax will have a far lesser impact on economic growth than an income tax. The incentive to increase profits and income through growth is not blunted as in the case of a tax on profits.

Thirdly, the payroll tax is fair. It is shared by employers and employees, and is paid by the self-employed during their working years.

My deep conviction, based on these considerations, is that the social security approach to financing the costs of hospital and nursing home care for the aged is the sound and equitable approach.

In spite of this, I have two objections to the Kennedy administration's proposal, as embodied in the so-called King-Anderson bill. These objections are:

First. The bill is a compulsory health insurance bill, in that the benefits are offered only under a Government health insurance plan, without any freedom of choice for the individual; and

Second. The bill does nothing whatsoever for the aged who have not achieved protection under the social security system, either on their own or as dependents.

For these reasons I am today offering a bill which is not only a constructive alternative to the King-Anderson bill, but, I believe, can be the means for breaking our present legislative impasse.

The findings and declaration of purpose contained in the Lindsay bill are important. Section 2 of the bill emphasizes that any health insurance system financed by the contributory payroll tax system should preserve freedom of choice by the individual with respect to particular health insurance plans or policies, and should also encourage the further growth and development of private health insurance and voluntary prepayment plans. It is also declared to be a purpose of the Lindsay bill "to provide a supplementary system of health benefits available to the States under Federal-State agreements for older persons who are not otherwise protected under the Federal old age survivors and disability insurance program."

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the result of 2 years' research, study, and thought on my part on the problems of the aging and medical care. In drafting it I have drawn heavily on the program originally defined nearly 2 years ago by the distinguished Governor of my State of New York, Nelson A. Rockefeller. On June 29, 1960, Governor Rockefeller, speaking before the Governors' Conference in Glacier National Park, Mont., presented a comprehensive program for health care of the aged. In his talk, he listed among the deficiencies of the then Forand bill:

> 1. It lacks any element of choice and would therefore tend to stifle further development of voluntary health insurance for the aged in this country.
>
> 2. It would not provide health insurance coverage for any of the persons now over 65 who are not included in the social security system.

Governor Rockefeller suggested two sound and eminently feasible means by which these two serious shortcomings could be met.

First. He called for an option for the individual beneficiary, as follows:

> Each OASDI beneficiary eligible for the statutory health benefits should be given an

option to forego those benefits in favor of receiving a special monthly cash benefit added to his regular social security check, provided he presented proof that he carried a health insurance policy at least equivalent to the protection afforded by the statutory benefits.

This "Rockefeller option" provides an ideal mechanism for merging the payroll tax financing base with the principle of freedom of choice. The individual can decide whether he prefers the Government plan of protection to a private plan, and if he prefers a private plan he will have a wider range of choice as to the type of plan.

The bill I am introducing adds the Rockefeller option to the social security approach to medical care for the aged.

This single change gives the social security type of health program a distinctly new philosophical basis and should, I believe, make such a program acceptable to all those who insist on the right of the individual to choose his own form of health insurance protection.

Second. Governor Rockefeller called for a provision in the Federal law permitting payments into a separate health benefits trust fund for the purchase of the same health insurance protection for persons not eligible for social security as for those persons who are eligible for social security. He further suggested that the Federal Government make grants to the States to share in the costs of buying into the program by any State for its aged population.

The bill I am introducing would both permit the buying in and establish the Federal grant program. The Federal share of the grants would be the same as is provided in the Kerr-Mills law of 1960, with a 5-percent increase in the Federal percentage as an extra incentive to State action.

These, then, are the basic provisions. As can be seen, I have modeled my bill chiefly on Governor Rockefeller's original proposals. Many hours of work have gone into this bill to iron out the details of engrafting on the individual option and the State buying privilege and to create a separate trust fund for the medical care program. I am deeply indebted to my friend and constituent, Roswell B. Perkins, Esq., former Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower, for his tireless assistance to me in drafting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD, to be appended to my remarks, a summary of the bill I offer today. I urge every Member of the House to read that summary and to consider carefully whether my bill will not meet the needs of our older persons on a basis which is fiscally sound and yet not compulsory in its benefit system. It is a program, I submit, which meets the urgent needs of our elderly population but which preserves the principle of individual freedom of choice which is so fundamental to our way of life.

The summary is as follows:

SUMMARY OF LINDSAY BILL FOR MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The Lindsay bill utilizes the payroll tax for financing health benefits, and includes (in part 2) a "Government plan" which has the same benefit structure proposed by the King-Anderson bills supported by the administration (S. 909 and H.R. 4222). However, the Lindsay bill contains (in part 3) a so-called "private health benefits option," which makes the bill voluntary as to the benefit coverage.

1. The private health benefits option: The option available to the individual social security beneficiary is as follows: He may elect to receive cash in lieu of protection under the Government plan, so long as he is covered by a private health insurance policy or health benefits plan which has an actuarial value equal to that of the Government plan. The individual beneficiary who elects to take advantage of the cash option may assign his monthly cash payment to the carrier of his private health benefits plan.

2. "Buying in" by States: The second major new feature of the Lindsay bill is a provision permitting States to "buy in" to the Federal program for any class of persons not covered by social security.

A particular State would specify the eligible persons, issue cards or other evidence of eligibility to them, and when such persons enter a hospital or nursing home they will be treated as a social security beneficiary. The Federal Health Insurance Trust Fund would pay the hospital or nursing home in the same way as for a social security beneficiary.

The trust fund would then bill the particular State periodically for the aggregate amount paid out in respect of these non-social security beneficiaries. The State would be aided in reimbursing the trust fund by Federal grants from general revenues. These grants would be paid under the same formula as in the Kerr-Mills law enacted in 1960, except that the Federal percentage share of the grants would be 5 percent greater than under the Kerr-Mills formula. This would give the States an additional incentive to participate.

3. Separate trust fund: A third distinction between the Lindsay bill and the King-Anderson bills is that the Lindsay bill creates a separate health insurance trust fund, rather than merging the two existing funds and lumping the health insurance program with them. In this way the health insurance program would be made to stand "on its own feet" financially.

PART I

The Lindsay bill would add a new title 16 to the Social Security Act (which now has 15 titles). The following would be sections of the new title 16:

Section 1601: This section establishes eligibility for health insurance benefits for all social security beneficiaries. It also establishes the fundamental option for all beneficiaries; namely:

1. To be covered by the "Government plan" created by part 2; or

2. To receive a monthly cash payment if covered by a private health benefits plan, as permitted by part 3.

Section 1602: This section prohibits interference with the practice of medicine.

Section 1603: This section guarantees freedom of choice by the beneficiary as to providers of services.

PART II

Part II establishes a "Government plan" consisting of the same benefits as are provided under the King-Anderson bills. All the definitions and terms of the King-Anderson bills are incorporated without change.

PART III.—PRIVATE HEALTH BENEFITS PLAN OPTION

Section 1620: This section defines the key terms. A "private health benefits plan" may be any kind of private health insurance policy or membership plan. "Health benefits" include protection not only for the hospital and nursing home and related services offered by the Government plan, but also for substantially the full range of health services needed by an individual.

Section 1621: This section establishes the requirements for a "qualified private health benefits plan." For example, the plan must be "guaranteed renewable for life," as defined in subsection (b).

The most important requirement is that the plan have an actuarial value at least equal to the actuarial value of the Government plan. Furthermore, the plan must provide health benefits of the same type as the Government plan (hospital and skilled nursing home care and certain home care services) having an actuarial value not less than 60 percent of the actuarial value of the Government plan. Thus, a private health benefits plan may qualify even though it has a range of benefits different from the Government plan so long as (1) its benefits in the categories covered by the Government plan have a value of at least 60 percent of the Government plan, and (2) its benefits in all categories combined have an actuarial value at least equal to that of the Government plan.

The qualified plan may, in fact, be a combination of plans (for example, a "package" of Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and a "major medical" policy).

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is required to issue regulations (with the advice of the Advisory Council and after consultation with the National Association of Insurance Commissioners) prescribing standards for determining actuarial equivalence. The regulations might include detailed tables giving assigned values for different types and duration of benefits.

The private carrier would make application to the State Insurance Commissioner (of the State wherein the policy is to be issued) for a determination that a plan is a qualified plan. The carrier would present data showing the actuarial value of the plan as compared with the Government plan (subsec. (g)).

The State Insurance Commissioner would review the plan and make a determination as to whether it meets the requirements of a qualified plan. His determination would be conclusive (subsec. (e)).

The determinations by the State insurance commissioners would be made pursuant to agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as more fully spelled out in section 1625. The State insurance commissioners, in making their determinations, may enlist the aid of a special committee of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners if one is established. (There is precedent for such a professionally staffed committee of the NAIC today, in connection with the rating of securities for investment purposes.) If requested by the NAIC, the expenses of such a committee would be reimbursed by the Federal Government (subsecs. (h) and (i)).

Section 1622: This section provides for payment of the monthly cash payment to a social security beneficiary who exercises the private health benefits option. The beneficiary must submit evidence that he is covered by a qualified private health benefits plan (subsec. (a)).

The amount of the monthly cash payment would be the same as the actuarial value of the Government plan (rounded to the nearest dollar). This value would be determined annually by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. At the outset the monthly cash payment would be $8 per month (subsec. (b)).

The Secretary could, after 2 years of operation under the option, provide a variation in the monthly cash payment according to age, if the Secretary finds that there has been or will be an adverse selection of risks such as to increase the costs of the Government plan in an amount significant in relation to the overall cost of the Government plan. The variation could not be more than 20 percent up and 20 percent down, away from the actuarial value of the Government plan. This would permit the Secretary to provide a monthly cash payment of, for example, $7 for a beneficiary age 65 and $9 for a beneficiary age 75, more nearly reflecting the actual value of the benefits at the respective ages (subsec. (c)).

Section 1623: This section permits a beneficiary to assign his monthly cash payment to a carrier. It also creates certain rights in an employer or trustee of a welfare fund where the employer pays over half the cost of the qualified plan which is the basis of the monthly cash payments.

Section 1624: This section contains technical provisions as to the commencement and termination of monthly cash payments.

The Secretary would establish by regulation a month or months during the year when an individual could exercise the option or revoke such an exercise.

A beneficiary could not exercise the option a second time if he has exercised it once but subsequently accepted coverage under the Government plan.

Section 1625: This section provides for agreements between the Secretary and State insurance commissioners for making the determinations required by section 1621. If there is no such agreement with a particular State the Secretary would make the determination. Provision is made for reimbursement of the expenses of the State insurance commissioner in making the determinations.

PART IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Section 1630: This section provides for the same Health Insurance Benefits Advisory Council as in the King-Anderson bills, except that at least four members must be "persons who are outstanding in the fields of private health benefits plans."

Section 1631: This section provides for judicial review of the Secretary's determinations.

Section 1632: This section provides for issuance of regulations by the Secretary.

Section 1633: Technical provisions.

Section 102: This section provides for a separate Federal health insurance trust fund, and allocates a portion of the payroll tax to it.

Section 103: This increases the wage base to $5,000, as under the King-Anderson bills.

Section 104: Technical amendments.

TITLE II

This title provides for tax rate increases as under the King-Anderson bills.

TITLE III

This title provides for "buying-in" by States as described at the outset of this summary.

Section 301: This section makes the necessary changes in title I of the Social Security Act to provide for "State plans" for the buying in. The State plan requirements are similar to those in the Kerr-Mills program. Any eligibility tests, based on income or otherwise, would be established by the States.

Provision is made for a Federal grant program under which the Federal share for any State would be the same as under the Kerr-Mills program plus 5 percent.

Section 302: Comparable amendments are made for the programs of aid to the blind and disabled and aid to dependent children (for aged recipients in each case).

Section 303: This section provides for payments from the trust fund for services furnished to individuals eligible under the program of a State which has "bought-in" to the Federal program.

TITLE IV

This title amends the Railroad Retirement Act (as do the King-Anderson bills) to provide the same health insurance benefits program for railroad retirement beneficiaries as for social security beneficiaries.

AIR TRAVEL BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the House to the March 1962 report of the Comptroller General in "Review of Domestic Air Travel by Military and Civilian Personnel of the Department of Defense in First-Class Accommodations." The review discloses plush travel spending—first-class air tickets in 90 percent of all cases, which has wasted millions of tax dollars.

This disproportionate amount of first-class travel is in direct contradiction to various Government policy directives. Let me quote directly from the report:

> In a report dated July 7, 1959, on the Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1960, the Senate Committee on Appropriations stated that "The Department of Defense should immediately institute the policy of utilizing economy class * * * for all personnel, with exceptions only where justified" the Bureau of the Budget issued Transmittal Memorandum No. 15 of May 16, 1960, revising Circular A–7, the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, to encourage increased use by Government travelers of airplane accommodations designated "air coach," "air tourist," etc.; whenever practicable. On March 31, 1960 the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) advised the Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force concerned that "where adequate air coach accommodations are available, officials authorizing travel for civilian and military personnel shall take steps to see that such accommodations are used to the maximum extent consistent with successful accomplishment of the mission." These instructions were repeated in substance in a letter directed on November 30, 1960, by the same Deputy Assistant Secretary to the same addressees. However, the DOD directive on the subject of air accommodations has not been revised to incorporate these instructions or the requirements of the Bureau of the Budget memorandum.

The report estimated:

> On the average, for domestic flights on commercial airlines, first-class accommodations, less the Government (military departments) discount of 10 percent, cost about 20 percent more than cheaper accommodations.

The Department of Defense in 1961 spent $72.7 million for passenger transportation, exclusive of charter flights—$49.3 million for first-class accommodations and $23.4 million for lower than first-class accommodations.

We know this is a waste of money on fancy living; but we will not know—until all the records are checked and computations made—how great the damage to the taxpayers' pocketbook is.

It is true that some first-class flying cannot be avoided because cheaper accommodations either are not available or their schedules are impracticable. However, as the Comptroller General pointed out:

> An indeterminate but substantial proportion of the first-class nonjet flights could have been undertaken in lower than first-class accommodations so as to satisfy the legitimate requirements of the travelers and conserve travel funds. * * * However, generally, no attempt was made to secure the lower priced accommodations.

Moreover, since most jet flights offer both first and economy class accommodations, except in exceptional circumstances, personnel could not be inconvenienced by flying economy. Yet there are instances of first class purchase although economy space on the same flight was readily available. One of the more colorful examples in the report concerns a lieutenant colonel's flight from Washington, D.C., to Denver, Colo. The travel order authorized "extra fare aircraft jet"—first class—even though tourist class was available on the same flight, because of "the requirements of the mission which cannot be satisfied by use of regular fare aircraft." The lieutenant colonel's "mission" was to attend a planning meeting for the American Legion convention to be held in Denver.

The report indicates that millions of dollars can be saved if the Defense Department and the various services tighten their procedures. This is illustrated by the fact that two defense contractors, in one year alone, saved over $1 million through their efforts to economize on air travel.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Secretary of Defense to follow the recommendations of the Comptroller General and issue instructions requiring personnel to use "less than first class accommodations on commercial airlines, except when such accommodations are not obtainable to meet firm travel itineries effectively and economically." Although corrective actions already proposed by the Defense Department are to be commended, the proposed policy changes are restricted to first-class jet travel. This is not sufficient.

No longer should the Defense Department merely "encourage" personnel to economize, they must set up tough-line businesslike procedures to see that compliance takes place.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HAYS, for April 12–18, on account of attending a meeting of standing committee, NATO Parliamentarians, at The Hague.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. LINDSAY), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. LINDSAY), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MATHIAS (at the request of Mr. LINDSAY), for 30 minutes, on April 16.

Mr. CORMAN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York, today, for 10 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks and to include an editorial.

Mr. LINDSAY, for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MAGNUSON, his remarks on the bill H.R. 1159, and to include tables.

Mr. DOYLE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LINDSAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. SCHERER.

Mr. BRUCE.

Mr. BRAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KORNEGAY.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina.

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. SANTANGELO.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. PILLION.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6676. An act to designate the Kettle Creek Dam on Kettle Creek, Pa., as the Alvin R. Bush Dam; and

H.R. 10043. An act to amend Public Law 86-272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 16, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1928. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 961,061 pounds of silk waste now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1929. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition from the national stockpile of approximately 1,450,000 pounds of silk noils, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98b(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1930. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, relative to an application for a loan of $4,514,000 to the State of Hawaii for the completion of the Molokai project, pursuant to 71 Stat. 48; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1931. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain laws enacted by the Sixth Guam Legislature, 1961, pursuant to section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1932. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an initial review of the administration of construction of launch facilities for the Atlas and Titan intercontinental ballistic missiles at selected Air Force bases; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1933. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report by the Civil Service Commission entitled "Employee Development and Training in the Federal Civil Service, Fiscal Year 1961," pursuant to Public Law 85-507; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 2446. A bill to provide that hydraulic brake fluid sold or shipped in commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain specifications prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce; with amendment (Rept. No. 1604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8846. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of distributions of stock and dispositions of property made pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws; with amendment (Rept. No. 1605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on the Federal Pay Act of 1956 and the Classification Act of 1949 (Rept. No. 1606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1653. A bill for the relief of William Falby; without amendment (Rept. No. 1600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2672. A bill for the relief of Sonia Maria Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 1601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3714. A bill for the relief of Janina Maciejewska; with amendment (Rept. No. 1602). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9669. A bill for the relief of Molly Kwauk; without amendment (Rept. No. 1603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 11251. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to relinquish to the State of New Jersey jurisdiction over any lands within the Fort Hancock Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 11252. A bill to protect postal patrons from obnoxious mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 11253. A bill to provide health insurance benefits for aged individuals under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, either in the form of payment for hospital services, skilled nursing home services, and home health service or in the form of payment for private health insurance benefits at the option of such individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11254. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11255. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11256. A bill to amend section 5200 of the Revised Statutes to increase the amount of loans which a national bank may make to any one borrower to 15 percent of its capital stock and surplus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 11257. A bill to amend section 815 (art. 15) of title 10, United States Code, relating to nonjudicial punishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 11258. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.R. 11259. A bill to protect postal patrons from obnoxious mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 11260. A bill to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 11261. A bill to authorize an adequate White House Police force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 11262. A bill to amend section 220(h) of the National Housing Act to permit the insurance under that section or section 203(k) of a loan made to a homeowner for the purpose of paying the cost of public improvements for which (by assessment or otherwise) he is legally liable; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 11263. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to finance the testimony of expert witnesses before the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 11264. A bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 11265. A bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 11266. A bill to amend the act of March 8, 1922, as amended, to extend its provisions to the townsite laws applicable in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 11267. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to exempt certain officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives from the requirements of such act relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators when they can prove legal residence in some State; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 11268. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 11269. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 11270. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 11271. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 11272. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11273. A bill to provide for the use of foreign currencies accruing under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 for housing loans to veterans of service in the Armed Forces of the United States who are residing abroad; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 11274. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 11275. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to States in research programs to improve the conservation of fish in reservoirs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 11276. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 11277. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WESTLAND (by request):

H.R. 11278. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the popular election of the Governor and the government secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 11279. A bill to prohibit the reimbursement at Government expense under section 4167(a) of title 39, United States Code, of matter mailed by Members of Congress and certain other officials under the franking privilege without specific address, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 11280. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the popular election of the Governor and the government secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 11281. A bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor and government secretary of the Virgin Islands, for the transfer to the government of the Virgin Islands of the assets and obligations of the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 11282. A bill to amend Public Law 86–184, an act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 11283. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may become entitled to wife's insurance benefits or widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age if she is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.J. Res. 690. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as "Shut-In's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.J. Res. 691. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the U.S. World Trade Fair to be held in New York City, N.Y., from May 11 through May 22, 1962; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.J. Res. 692. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.J. Res. 693. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the District of Columbia to amend the Washington metropolitan area transit regulation compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.J. Res. 694. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the District of Columbia to amend the Washington metropolitan area transit regulation compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, endorsing President John F. Kennedy's medical care for the aged program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the construction of Hidden Dam and Reservoir on the Fresno River; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the passage of H.R. 5039; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to create the office of Delegate to Congress from Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11284. A bill for the relief of Lewis M. Greene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 11285. A bill for the relief of Toon-Ming Wong, also known as Hio-On Tom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 11286. A bill for the relief of Theophilos Bougias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 11287. A bill for the relief of Joe C. Oden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 11288. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gitel Fischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.J. Res. 695. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.J. Res. 696. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

305. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Don M. Berry, executive secretary, League of Alaskan Cities, Juneau, Alaska, relative to being opposed to any legislation which would subject the income from State and local bonds to a Federal tax, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. H. Dix Archer, B.D., pastor, Cave City Christian Church, Cave City, Ky., offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou who hast created us to live in both a terrifying and a wonderful time, we ask Thy blessing today upon our world, our Nation, and especially these Senators, their staffs, and the officers and assistants of this body.

May we be less impressed with our own importance, and more aware of Thy power. May we be less cowed by our enemies and more renewed by the strength of our convictions. May we seek less to curry the favor of our constituents, and more to lift to higher plateaus of enlightenment those who depend upon us. May we be less resigned to recognition of what cannot be done, and more motivated by a keen perception of what can be done within exceedingly limited alternatives upon our fields of action. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 11, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10788. An act to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956; and

H.R. 11151. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 10788. An act to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956; placed on the calendar.

H.R. 11151. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees or subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Committee on Public Works.

The Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the leadership on this side, objection is entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the minority leader has just walked into the Chamber. I do not know whether he heard the request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This has been cleared with the minority leader.

Mr. JAVITS. I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM IN CONNECTION WITH JOINT MEETING WITH THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that at 12:17 the Senate will move in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives, and it is the intention of the leadership to have a quorum call at 12:10.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield briefly to me, in order that I may make an announcement?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me state that when the Senator from New York concludes his statement, it is our intention to suggest the absence of a quorum, and have a quorum call, and then have the Senate take a temporary recess.

THE TEACHER STRIKE IN NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would not intrude at this point, except for the fact that I have a rather important matter to lay before the Senate.

I desire to make a statement about the tragic teachers' strike in New York, with its grave implications and its danger of wreaking serious damage to our educational system there and our progress in education.

This strike should be an object lesson for the teachers themselves, considering their professional careers and their pride. But, Mr. President, what happened in New York can happen in other large cities. Let us learn before it is too late. This is an area in which the Federal Government can help. Yet the very measures which can help are being bottled up in Congress. The aid to primary and secondary education bill is bottled up in the other Rules Committee. For New York City that would mean an amount of $50 million in the next 3 years. The bills cannot even go to conference.

An expanded National Defense Education Act measure is on the Senate Calendar. It is also blocked because its counterpart has not been reported out of the Rules Committee of the other body.

Hence, the Federal Government, which could help in what is becoming a grave national emergency, is itself inhibited from helping.

Here is the lesson for the President of the United States. The confluence of the teacher's strike and the "cold fury" of the President's "denunciation" of the steel price increase having occurred—I use quotation marks around both expressions—make me ask why has not the President shown the same indignation with respect to the failure of the Congress to pass any Federal aid-to-education bills?

Such indignation is long overdue. The problem has at least as high a priority as the problem of steel prices.

So I urge that what happened yesterday be the springboard for the President to show now that strong leadership with respect to the Congress, and that same type of indignation, so that the Federal aid-to-education bills can be acted upon, so that the bills will be unblocked from their present blocked position. The country has a right to expect no less of the President on this matter than he showed yesterday in expressing himself on steel prices—he has the capacity, that is clear.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PUBLICATION OF AMENDMENT OF NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN SILK NOILS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an amendment of a notice of the proposed disposition from the national stockpile of approximately 1,450,000 pounds of silk noils, which was transmitted to the Senate on August 18, 1960 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

APPLICATION FOR LOAN UNDER SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, an application for a loan of $4,514,000 to the State of Hawaii for the completion of the Molokai project, under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Laws Enacted by Legislature of Guam

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Sixth Guam Legislature, 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Medical Care for Certain Coast and Geodetic Survey Retired Ships' Officers and Crew Members and Their Dependents

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to Sacramento River bank protection

"Whereas a great urgency exists to protect the banks of the Sacramento River; and

"Whereas the heavy winter rains have heightened this severe problem; and

"Whereas the urgent need for action in this area is typified by the failure of the Merritt Island levee; and

"Whereas the act of Congress, Public Law 86-645, 86th Congress, approved July 14, 1960, contemplates Federal and State cooperation in carrying out the project for flood protection on the Sacramento River, with two-thirds of the cost to be borne by the United States and one-third by the State; and

"Whereas, in recognition of the urgent need for action, the California Legislature has included in the Budget Act of 1962 an appropriation of $270,000 for Sacramento River bank protection, which sum represents the State's share of the total cost for the 1962-63 fiscal year: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate the Federal share of the funds required in the 1962-63 fiscal year for the protection of the Sacramento River banks to meet the emergency situation which exists along those banks; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relative to a minimum wage law for agricultural workers

"Whereas agricultural workers and farmers have always formed a large part of the bedrock upon which our country rests; and

"Whereas our Nation is engaged in a great struggle against communism and the forces of despotism, ignorance and poverty, and without a strong, healthy farm economy, we cannot fulfill our obligations as the citadel of the free world in this great struggle; and

"Whereas the health and welfare of this country and the free world depends, therefore, in great part upon the products of our farms, and without adequate numbers of experienced and trained agricultural workers, these farm products cannot be grown, harvested and prepared for sale and consumption; and

"Whereas for many years agricultural workers in numerous areas of the United States have not received an adequate share of the results of their labors and, too often, have had to live out their lives on an extremely low annual wage as compared with other workers; and

"Whereas the farmers of California must compete in the sale of farm products with farmers of other States who pay less wages to their farmworkers than those paid in California and the West and in addition enjoy a more favorable freight rate, thus putting California and western agriculture at a tremendous disadvantage in the highly competitive national market for farm products; and

"Whereas legislation, such as Senate bill 2642, has been prepared which would enact a national minimum wage law to establish agricultural wages throughout the country and result in an incalculable benefit to our agricultural workers, our Nation and the world: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a national minimum wage law for the agricultural workers of the Nation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to the construction of Hidden Dam and Reservoir on the Fresno River

"Whereas severe winter rainstorms have once again caused a serious flood condition along the Fresno River, inundating thousands of acres of farmland; and

"Whereas these floods have caused damage to farmlands, crops, buildings, equipment, and livestock, and have endangered human life; and

"Whereas the flooding conditions caused by the Fresno River bursting its banks have resulted in a waste of water during a time when California is suffering from a critical water shortage; and

"Whereas in prior years the Chowchilla and Fresno Rivers have repeatedly caused extensive and increasing flood damage in Madera County, Calif., and it was estimated that over $2 million in damage to property was done in Madera County by floodwaters in December 1955; and

"Whereas the California Legislature in 1956 took cognizance of the urgent need for flood control projects along the Fresno River and requested the President and the Congress of the United States to enact the necessary legislation; and

"Whereas twice the Congress has passed bills authorizing the construction of the Hidden Dam project, only to be vetoed both times by President Eisenhower; and

"Whereas representatives of the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army have testified that these flood control projects have been carefully studied and that they are economically sound and feasible; and

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers has recently recommended the construction of a multiple-purpose dam and reservoir at the Hidden site on the Fresno River for flood control and other purposes; and

"Whereas the recent floods have once again demonstrated the urgent need for flood control facilities on the Fresno River: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation necessary to authorize and otherwise implement the immediate construction of Hidden Dam and Reservoir on the Fresno River for the control and conservation of the floodwaters of the river and its tributaries; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Public Works, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to the purchase of the United Nations bonds

"Whereas the United Nations maintains armed forces in the Gaza strip and in the Congo, the costs of which have caused a financial crisis for the world organization; and

"Whereas in an effort to solve this critical problem the 16th General Assembly of the United Nations has authorized the Secretary General to issue $200 million worth of bonds, which are to be payable in 25 years at 2 percent interest; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government proposes to buy half of these bonds; and

"Whereas it is to the self-interest of the American people to help the United Nations overcome its present financial difficulties for if the United Nations does not have the money to fulfill its emergency responsibilities in preventing war it will become simply a conference mechanism to secure coexistence between two ideological blocs rather than an independent organization capable of meeting the problems of the world; and

"Whereas further, as expressed by the President in his state of the Union message in 1962, the bond issue will not only keep the United Nations solvent, but will also require all voting members to pay their fair share of its activities; and since our share of special operations has long been much higher than our share of the annual assessment, the bond issue will in effect reduce our disproportionate obligation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to authorize the purchase by the Government of the United States of up to $100 million worth of said United Nations bonds; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to all Members of Congress from this State, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Vice President of the United States in his capacity as Presiding Officer of the Senate, and to the President of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Concurrent Resolution 21

"Whereas in this period of grave international tensions it is imperative that the people of Hawaii be protected against any eventuality; and

"Whereas in the event the Hawaii National Guard is federalized, the Hawaii State Guard, sometimes referred to as the 'State guard,' which is under the jurisdiction and command of the Governor, would be the only remaining statewide internal defense and security force; and

"Whereas in order to perform its security missions and duties efficiently and effectively, the Hawaii State Guard must have adequate arms and supplies to make maximum use of its experience and leadership; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill (H.R. 5039) which would give the President the authority to provide the Hawaii State Guard and the State militias of other States with uniforms, arms, ammunition, equipment, and supplies that are surplus to the needs of the armed services; and

"Whereas in the event of a major disaster the Hawaii State Guard, which is now being maintained at cadre strength, can be expanded to full strength of over 6,000 officers and men, trained and of military and combat experiences; and

"Whereas the Hawaii State Guard cannot effectively perform its important missions of maintaining law and order and internal security without adequate supplies and materials: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, budget session of 1962 (*the Senate concurring*), That the Legislature of the State of Hawaii respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to pass H.R. 5039; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States; the President of the Senate of the United States; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; the Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Oren E. Long and Hiram L. Fong, U.S. Senators from Hawaii; and the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, U.S. Representative from Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 22

"Whereas the highest wages in domestic sugar production are paid in the State of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the high wages were the result of the right of the sugarworkers, including fieldworkers, to organize and bargain collectively; and

"Whereas the foregoing has enabled the sugarworkers to enjoy a standard of living which is compatible with the American way of life; and

"Whereas all workers, including agricultural workers, should be paid reasonable wages so that they can enjoy a standard of living which is compatible with the American way of life; and

"Whereas the sugar industry in the State of Hawaii must compete with producers and processors of sugar in other areas whose employees labor for wages as low as 60 cents per hour and whose conditions of employment otherwise are, under American standards, substandard; and

"Whereas fairness and justice demand that sugarworkers in the United States be paid according to wage rates which are not less than the minimum established for nonagricultural workers under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; and

"Whereas fairness and justice to the people and sugar industry of Hawaii require that such a minium wage be set for sugarworkers all over the United States so that competition among the different domestic sugar producing areas shall be on fair and equitable terms: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First Legislature, State of Hawaii, budget session of 1962 (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, to provide:

"1. That payment to all persons employed on a sugar farm of wages not less than the minimum wage as set by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and as it may further be amended from time to time, shall be a condition for receiving a Federal payment by the producer: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of Agriculture shall be authorized to hold hearings to determine temporary exclusions and amounts of payments to be authorized for producers so excluded temporarily.

"2. That there shall be no reduction in the base rate of sugar compliance payments of 80 cents per 100 pounds of sugar for any sugar farm which pays to all persons employed thereon wages at rates not less than the minimum wage established by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and as may be further amended from time to time, irrespective of production; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Senators from the State of Hawaii, the Honorable Hiram L. Fong and the Honorable Oren E. Long, and to the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, Representative from the State of Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Whereas it is in the tradition of our Nation that all our peoples should have a voice in their Government, and there be no taxation without representation; and

"Whereas it is our national desire that the peoples of all nations shall look to the United States of America for hope of true democratic government; and

"Whereas our Nation's role in the Pacific area, and its relationship with Hawaii, has been a living demonstration to the peoples of Asia of American principles of democracy in action; and

"Whereas the citizens of Guam, who are also citizens of the United States of America, have shown their ability to participate in representative government, and whose sons serve in the Armed Forces of our country, are indeed worthy of a representative voice in the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First Legislature, State of Hawaii, budget session of 1962 (*the Senate concurring*), That the Congress of the United States be and it is respectfully requested to create the office of Delegate to Congress from Guam; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Honorable Senator Oren E. Long, the Honorable Senator Hiram L. Fong, the Honorable Representative Daniel K. Inouye, and the Honorable A. B. Won Pat, speaker, Sixth Guam Legislature, territory of Guam."

RESOLUTION OF NEVADA STATE WELFARE BOARD

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, for many years the Nevada State Welfare Board has expressed its concern over the inequities between aid to dependent children payments and those for the adult categories.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the board on March 26, 1962, be printed in the Record, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the Nevada State Welfare Board recognizes that the standards of assistance for all the public assistance categories are far too low in comparison with cost of living and average national income; and

Whereas the revised bill containing the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 (H.R. 10606) provides for an increase in Federal matching for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled; and

Whereas the aforementioned bill (H.R. 10606) retains the present Federal matching formula for aid to dependent children, only extends it to both parent caretakers if needy and in the home; and

Whereas the Federal matching limit for a needy parent is currently less than one-half that for a needy person over 65 years of age, and the proposed new formula further increases this inequity; and

Whereas, in aid to dependent children, more than in any other Federal-State public assistance program, the amount of the Federal matching base tends to establish the ceiling for recommendations by budgetary authorities and for legislative appropriations by this State; and

Whereas, while the emphasis on preventive and rehabilitative service is extremely important and necessary, the desired goal will not be achieved unless basic maintenance needs of aid to dependent children families are met more adequately: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal matching limit for aid to dependent children and the other three public assistance categories be brought closer together by providing a commensurate increase in the Federal matching formula for aid to dependent children as that proposed for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled under H.R. 10606.

THE POSITION OF THE PRESIDENT ON STEEL PRICE RISES IS PRO-BUSINESS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the implication in some of the press this morning was that the regret expressed by the President about the decision on the part of some of the large companies to raise prices was an "antibusiness" move.

Nothing could be farther from the truth.

The fact is that small-, medium-, and large-size businesses all over the country will now be faced with an increase in cost which can serve only to reduce their sales, lower their profits, and increase their problems with their customers.

Those of us who have had experience in business where the price of one of the necessary component materials or parts was controlled by a monopoly or cartel, know only too well what I am talking about. When handed, as too often was the case, an arbitrary price rise on such an item, it automatically increased the cost. In the past I have seen companies that simply could not survive such an arbitrary increase.

It is for this reason that, as one who spent a great many years in private, hard-line industry before coming into Government, I say with complete conviction that for the vast majority of businessmen in this country, the position of the President against this steel price rise is probusiness, instead of antibusiness.

What I hope can be developed next is the labor cost per ton of steel today, in comparison to what it has been in recent years.

Then, too, we should examine the profits against sales or/and investment in this industry over recent periods.

For myself, I shall never forget finding out that despite a 116-day strike in the steel industry in 1959, the profits after taxes for the industry for that year were greater than the profits for the year 1958, the latter a year in which there was no strike.

Considering all the efforts this administration has made to improve business, the American people will decide for themselves who is basically antibusiness—the President, or this little group of selfish men who are so shortsighted in grabbing a short-time profit at the expense of the overall economy and in a time of our greatest national peril.

Of all the cartel operations seen in the past, none can beat the action of Mr. Edmund F. Martin, president of Bethlehem Steel, who announced, day before yesterday, that his company, the second largest, would not raise prices. But when he got his word from his real boss, he humbly reversed himself.

This is a great tribute to the control Mr. Roger Blough and those behind him have over the steel industry. Because of the views some of us have heard him express previously, this action on his part should not be too surprising. But if he can continue to operate in such a unilaterally selfish fashion, it does not bode well for the future of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Bethlehem Steel Officer Expects Competition To Bar Price Rises." The article was published in the New York Times on April 11.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times of Apr. 11, 1962]

BETHLEHEM STEEL OFFICER EXPECTS COMPETITION TO BAR PRICE RISES

WILMINGTON, DEL., April 10.—The president of the Bethlehem Steel Corp. said today that competition in the industry probably would prevent any general increase in steel prices because of the new labor contract. Edmund F. Martin declined to say outright whether the cost of steel would go up after July 1, when the new 2-year agreement with the United Steelworkers goes into effect.

[Mr. Martin's comments on prices were made before the United States Steel Corp. late Tuesday announced a 3.5-percent increase in the general level of its steel prices, effective Wednesday.]

He told stockholders at the annual meeting that the 10-cents-an-hour increase in employment costs "comes at a time when we are trying to hold the line on prices. This is unfortunate. We should be trying to reduce the price of steel, if at all possible, because we have more competition, particularly from foreign sources."

At a press conference after the 75-minute meeting, Mr. Martin said that production for the first 3 months of this year nearly doubled that of 1961 quarter, which he said had been Bethlehem's worst first quarter ever.

The Nation's third largest steelmaker had a profit of nearly $8 million for the first quarter of last year. For all of 1961, its profits were $122,357,000.

Mr. Martin, presiding at the meeting in the absence of Arthur B. Homer, chairman, who had a cold, said that since the labor settlement early this month, business had been falling off. Thus, he predicted that production and profits for the second quarter probably would not be as good as for the first. He said that first-quarter earnings would be announced on April 26.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Bethlehem Does Quick Reverse on Steel Price." The article was published in the Washington Star of April 11.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of Apr. 11, 1962]

BETHLEHEM DOES QUICK REVERSE ON STEEL PRICE

United States Steel's decision last night to raise the price of its product apparently caused a quick change in the thinking of the rival Bethlehem Steel Corp.

Yesterday afternoon Bethlehem President Edmund F. Martin told stockholders, "There shouldn't be any price rise. We shouldn't do anything to increase our costs if we are to survive. We have more competition both domestically and from foreign firms. * * * We should be trying to reduce the price of steel if at all possible."

Today Bethlehem announced it was increasing its prices an average of 3.5 percent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Inflation in Steel." The editorial was published in the New York Times of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 12, 1962]

INFLATION IN STEEL

The decision of the United States Steel Corp. and other major producers to raise steel prices by $6 a ton is, as President Kennedy said yesterday, in "irresponsible defiance of the Nation's interests." It imperils the economic warfare of the country by inviting a new tidal wave of inflation after 4 years of general price stability. It aggravates steel's competitive difficulties in domestic and foreign markets, and puts a new curb on the economy's ability to make the sharp climb necessary for full production and full employment.

The underpinnings of our industrial society are so rooted in steel that any price increase tends to ripple out into manufacturing, construction, and dozens of allied industries. Everything from bobby pins to automobiles, from washing machines to locomotives, is affected. That is why the watchword after World War II became "as steel goes, so goes inflation."

What makes the companies' move especially disappointing is that it comes less than a week after the signing of the most moderate labor agreement in steel's postwar history—an agreement properly acclaimed by the President as "industrial statesmanship of the highest order." All the negotiations were conducted under the assumption by White House, union, and public that their successful outcome would serve as a guarantee against resumption of the inflationary spiral familiar in steel from 1946 through 1958.

The United Steelworkers of America agreed to a package settlement of 10 cents a hour, well within the guidelines laid down by the administration for an agreement that could be met out of rising productivity, without cutting profits or raising prices. The union's restraint evoked derision from labor leaders of the James R. Hoffa stripe. Now that the steelmakers have increased prices, the union leadership will be accused by militant elements in its own ranks of having been beguiled into a cheap settlement for enrichment of employers and stockholders. This can only discourage moves toward economic sanity in labor generally. The external evidence offers strong support for President Kennedy's statement yesterday that the labor cost of making a ton of steel has not gone up in the past 4 years and may even go down under the new agreement.

The real explanation for the profit squeeze of which the industry complains lies in prolonged operation at levels far below capacity. When the mills are running at 80 percent of capacity or better, as they did in the first quarter of this year, the companies' profits are substantial. Reports for the first quarter, which will be available in a few days, are expected to show near record earnings.

Raising prices represents the worst way to insure maintenance of the high demand essential if the first quarter operating rate is to be sustained for the rest of the year. Now the trend toward ordering from foreign producers or switching to aluminum, reinforced concrete, or other competitive materials can be expected to make it much harder to keep the steel mills in full operation.

The purchasing value of every American's dollar has been put in new danger and the price of survival through national defense has been forced up by an estimated billion dollars a year. When the adequacy of private decision making to cope with the challenges of automation and foreign competition is under question, the steel companies have given ammunition to those who feel much more authority for economic planning must be turned over to Government. All the principles of private initiative they profess to hold so dear have been undermined by their ill-considered action.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Mr. Blough's Great Mistake." The editorial was published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1962]

MR. BLOUGH'S GREAT MISTAKE

The justification of the price increase instituted by the United States Steel Corp. and followed by much of the industry may take some time to assess. The probable damage, if the increase should stick, is already plain. Whatever the steel companies have achieved, they have gained at great cost to the American people and to American business.

The steel price increase will be widely felt. Unless it is absorbed by the industries using steel, prices will go up for many products. An automobile executive has already predicted that prices will be raised on 1963 cars. The international competitiveness of American industry will be weakened as well as the U.S. dollar. To protect the dollar, a tightening of credit and of the budget may become necessary if the pressure becomes strong, with consequent restriction of output and loss of jobs.

For American business, Mr. Blough has brought closer the unhappy prospect that major price decisions will become subject to congressional scrutiny. The Department of Justice and the Kefauver subcommittee have already announced separate investigations. The President in his news conference hinted at collusion. If price hearings are now held for steel, they may follow for other products when their prices are raised. Hearings on price increases have long been resisted because it has been felt that they might be the entering wedge to price control. Now the wedge is beginning to enter. The President has hinted also at possible further action.

Finally, Mr. Blough has weakened, if not destroyed, what seemed a promising approach to the achievement of stable prices—the voluntary restraint on the part of business and labor in wage bargaining. In the recent negotiations, the union showed a high degree of cooperation by accepting what may be called a noninflationary increase, and by doing so well ahead of the contract deadline. Mr. Blough accepted the help of the administration in obtaining that settlement. The administration and the union had every reason to believe that the anti-inflationary purpose of the agreement would be realized and that the method of suasion and voluntary restraint would be validated. Mr. Blough seems to have gone out of his way to show them that they were mistaken. As a further consequence, the era of good feeling between Government and business that seemed to be at hand may yield to a very different climate. The President at his news conference used very strong language in denouncing the companies.

The administration must now see whether there remains some way of reversing the price increase, although the prospects seem poor. For the long run, the gloomy and intractable problem remains how to deal with the excess of power that has just been demonstrated. Traditionally, Americans have curbed great power either by regulating it or by breaking it up into its constituent parts. Regulation cuts deeply into freedom of enterprise. Breaking up a large company leaves wounds of another kind. Yet it is fundamental issues like these that may come to the fore in the wake of the steel price increase.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record editorials printed today on this subject, from the Baltimore Sun, the Washington Star, and the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 12, 1962]

STEEL

Any rise in steel prices at this time was sure to draw from the Kennedy administration a charge of bad faith. That charge the President, in the angriest terms yet to come from him on a domestic issue, has now delivered. His anger is justified.

When at the time of a mandatory wage increase last fall the steel industry refrained from raising prices, it did so in part because Mr. Kennedy promised to help resist excessive wage demands in this year's contract negotiations. He kept the promise.

Implicit in last week's settlement, as understood by the White House and as understood by the public, was price stability in steel. The steel industry as a whole, we now learn, privately understood it otherwise.

There was, and is, disagreement between the industry and the administration over some of the effects of the new contracts. According to Washington's calculations, the fringe benefits won by labor would fall within the limits of gains in productivity. According to steel's figures, they would exceed such gains. If steel had turned out to be right after the contract's becoming effective next July, pressure for price adjustments might have been expected, and might have been reasonable.

It is true that in raising its prices the industry, led by the bellwether United States Steel Corp., listed the new contract as but a minor factor. The main reasons given were a steady mounting of costs, including wages, since 1958, and a need for profits sufficient to keep its plants competitively strong.

These are good arguments. They would have been more persuasive if the price increase had not come immediately after the signing of the last contract. Under the circumstances, there is no way of reading the story except that the industry was lying low, waiting for the ink to dry, if that long.

The argument would be better, too, if certain other elements could be ignored. One of these is that the early signing of the contracts has forestalled heavy purchase of steel against a possible strike; that is, the immediate demand has fallen. Another is that even at the earlier prices steel is weak in some of its products. Another, by far the most important, is that foreign competition grows tougher. We buy more steel than we sell. A shared administration-labor-industry awareness of that serious fact—or what seemed for a brief moment to be a shared awareness—was thought to be the fundamental reason for last week's settlement.

The industry's acknowledgment now that a price increase will add to its difficulties in competition with foreign steels, and its contention that an increase is nevertheless necessary for the long pull, does not add up to much of a case. Everybody wants strong, profitable American steel companies. But everybody expects also that the steel industry, whose status as a basis of the economy gives it special responsibilities, will try to act in the public interest.

The public will doubt that in this instance it has done so. The public will worry, with the President, about the added costs in defense and about the inflationary effects throughout the economy. And the public will wonder, with the President, how it happens that so many companies, each presumably with its own particular financial condition, should suddenly happen to need almost exactly the same price increase.

These questions the steel industry has called squarely down on its own head.

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 12, 1962]

STEEL'S SHOCKER

If Big Steel's price hike was the opening gun in a planned war with the Kennedy administration, as some people believe, the battle now has been fully joined. And nothing could be more certain than the ultimate clobbering of the industry.

United States Steel attempts to justify its $6-per-ton price increase. It says that in the past 3 years it has spent $1,185 million to modernize and replace facilities and to develop new sources of raw materials. This was essential in order to remain competitive, the company says, and for this and other reasons it had to borrow $800 million during the 3-year period—a loan which must be repaid out of profits which have not yet been earned. During these years, the company adds, its profits have dropped to the lowest levels since 1952, it has had to meet four industrywide wage increases aggregating about 40 cents an hour, and, in all, it experienced a net increase of about 6 percent in costs prior to this new contract despite cost reductions resulting from improved facilities, better techniques, etc. In the face of this, the company concludes, its 3.5-percent price increase was fully justified.

The President's dissenting opinion came through loud and clear. The price boosts by United States Steel and the other companies, he declared, "constitute a wholly unjustifiable and irresponsible defiance of the public interest." A "tiny handful of steel executives" have shown "utter contempt for the interests of 185 million Americans." Steel costs do not justify a price increase. "Employment costs per unit of steel output in 1961 were essentially the same as they were in 1958." And the cost of the major raw materials, steel scrap and coal, has also been declining.

This seemingly irreconcilable conflict arises, we suppose, from the fact that United States Steel and the President were not talking about precisely the same things. But the President's highly emotional message will stick in the public mind long after steel's story has been forgotten.

This is so because the public interest almost surely will suffer from the steel price boost. It will add an estimated $1 billion to defense costs. If it spreads throughout industry, as steel hikes historically have done, it will mean higher prices to the consumer for all commodities in which steel is a significant element. It will adversely affect our ability to compete in foreign markets and to meet competition from abroad in our domestic markets. It will make it harder to stem the outflow of gold which is threatening the value of the dollar. Finally, it could well be a fatal blow to whatever hope there was of stabilizing our economy and holding the line on prices. For there is little prospect now of self-restraint on anyone's part. More probable is a renewal of the spiraling race between higher prices and higher wages, with an accompanying inflation which will deal harshly with most Americans.

In the face of all this, the manner and the timing of the steel increase are very hard to understand. Not only steel, but all industry, may suffer from the threatful implications of the President's remarks. Even if one accepts steel's arguments, the price boost still is a performance which brings to mind the old ditty about the man who was determined to maintain his right-of-way—the man who was right, quite right, as he drove along, but who's just as dead as if he'd been wrong.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 12 1962]

THE STEEL PRICE SHOCKER

Management of the steel industry is in President Kennedy's doghouse and, so far as the record now shows, got there by entering without knocking.

It will take some time to digest the figures management uses to justify its sudden $6-a-ton price increase—and there will never be a concurrence of opinion on whether it was justified.

But it can hardly be disputed that the timing of the price-boost announcement was a maladroit maneuver in public relations. Three days after the last steel company had signed the new union contract—a contract which the companies had permitted to be publicized as noninflationary and more than 2 months before it was to become effective—bellwether Big Steel announces higher prices, then tells the President. Next day several other companies play the business game of "follow the leader."

The President's angry reaction could have been foretold by any cub reporter who had followed the administration's soft-handed intervention in the recent contract negotiations with the steel union.

But the importance of the price increase depends on the ultimate economic effect. This is the real test, the political storm to the side.

Hiking the price of steel at this time looks bad because:

Competition from abroad, already keen, is rapidly becoming more intense. Price is a major factor in competition—and Leslie B. Worthington, United States Steel president, admits the price increase would hurt American sales, "temporarily, at least."

The competition from other products at home—aluminum, plastics, etc.—has been growing. Higher prices won't make it easier for steel.

All this, however, does not necessarily buttress the President's irate charge that there was no justification for the price increase. The question is whether there was "enough" justification. Obviously there was some—there had been no price rise through several wage and fringe-benefit raises—and obviously there would have been price rises before if it had not been for sharp competition in the market.

This raises another question: If steel makers were restrained before, why do they raise the price now, when competition if anything is keener than ever? Their explanation, in a phrase, is plant obsolescence. They claim profits, in recent years, have been squeezed to the point where they lack the capital to buy better equipment which can turn out improved products at less cost.

In any advancing industry, capital must be generated from earnings.

As Roger Blough, board chairman of United States Steel, said in early February: "Another thing which is quite necessary * * * is to have sufficient earnings to put in the new types of equipment that will permit us to sell some of the new type of products abroad and get some of that export market."

Expansion and modernization, as a means of competing in world markets, is exactly what the Kennedy administration has been preaching to industry for the last year. This takes money, but getting the money from higher prices is inflationary, unpopular and exceedingly risky in the competitive wars. Still, the money must come from somewhere—profits.

The steel managers have made their judgment. Their logic will be tested first by how much immediate psychological damage the price rises do to the economy, and by whether or not in the long run they get the earnings they seek and make them work to their competitive advantage—and the country's.

JUDGE THOMAS C. HENNINGS, SR.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, earlier this week, Missouri lost one of its most distinguished citizens, Judge Thomas C. Hennings, Sr.

Judge Hennings was a circuit judge in the city of St. Louis from 1913 to 1918, and was an attorney for 63 years.

He was a distinguished father of a distinguished son, the late Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr.

Judge Hennings practiced law until early this year, and was an outstanding political and civic leader during his entire career.

Born in St. Louis, he graduated from Washington University Law School in 1899. After 14 years in law practice, he was elected to the circuit bench. After leaving the bench, he served as president and director of the Mercantile-Commerce Bank & Trust Co. until 1938, when he resumed the practice of law.

One of Judge Hennings' outstanding contributions was his role as a delegate to the State constitutional conventions in 1943 and 1944. He was credited with writing many of the most important reforms in the State constitution, particularly those dealing with law enforcement.

He was a leader in many civic projects, being a founder of the Community Chest in 1923; a member of the board of the School of the Ozarks; president of the Thomas Dunn Memorial for Needy Boys; a member of the board of the city art museum; and an organizer of the Missouri Association for Criminal Justice.

Above all, Judge Hennings was a kind and gentle man, whose wise counsel will be missed by all of his friends. His contributions to his city, his State, and his country will long be remembered.

Mrs. Symington and I join in sending our deepest regrets to his wife, Mrs. Sarah Wilson Hennings, and their daughter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial regarding Judge Hennings, from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 11, 1962, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Apr. 11, 1962]

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, SR.

Not many persons can imagine at the age of 13 what destiny life holds for them. But Thomas C. Hennings, Sr., must have been influenced by a spark which led to his outstanding and devoted career when he chose at that early age to spend his lifetime in the law. His retirement 3 months ago at 87 years of age came only with a disabling hip injury.

As much as any member, Judge Hennings represented the Democratic Party in Missouri. He contributed some of his luster as a party stalwart to his son, the late U.S. Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr.

Judge Hennings' experienced legal hand extended back to a circuit judgeship from 1913 to 1918, through an extremely active leadership in rewriting the present State constitution in 1943–44, when important new State services and reforms were born.

He made many contributions to the varied threads of civic and legal life of his city. Judge Hennings' death emphasizes his unusual distinction—leaving the mark of a courteous gentleman and splendid citizen on St. Louis' past and its future.

RETIREMENT OF JUSTICE WHITTAKER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the announcement last month of the retirement of Mr. Justice Charles E. Whittaker from the U.S. Supreme Court brought a deep sense of regret to all of us.

Mr. Justice Whittaker's service on the Bench was marked by the high sense of public duty, the hard work, and the high level of legal ability which marked his entire career. His services will be greatly missed by his colleagues and by the Nation.

Mr. Justice Whittaker's appointment to the High Bench in 1957 was the culmination of a distinguished career, which began as a clerk and messenger in a law firm in Kansas City, Mo. He was a highly respected member of the bar in Missouri during his many years of practice in Kansas City; and his appointment to a series of positions on the Federal bench, beginning in 1954, was met with the unanimous approval of his colleagues.

He was the first Missourian to serve as a member of the Supreme Court, and we are proud of his fine record. I know I express the feelings of all those in our State in wishing Justice Whittaker a speedy recovery from the impairment to his health which forced his retirement from the Bench. We hope that in the years to come he will give us the benefit of his wise counsel and experience.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY MOHAMMAD REZA PAHLAVI, SHAH OF IRAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, with the proviso that when the Senate is again called into session, the morning hour will be resumed; and that the Senate proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives to participate in a joint meeting of the two Houses for the purpose of hearing an address to be delivered by His Imperial Majesty, the Shah of Iran.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint meeting to hear the address to be delivered by Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, Shah of Iran.

(For the address delivered by the Shah of Iran, see the House proceedings of today's Congressional Record.)

RESUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The joint session of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m., and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Metcalf in the chair).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. Gruening):

S. 3160. A bill to amend the act of March 8, 1922, as amended, to extend its provisions to the townsite laws applicable in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 3161. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDERSON (by request):

S. 3162. A bill to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Districts, and to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 (57 Stat. 14), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3163. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 with respect to the year of deduction of certain casualty losses sustained in areas designated by the President as disaster areas; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3164. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to increase, in the case of children attending school, from 18 to 21, the maximum age for receiving benefits under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Bush, Mr. Keating, and Mr. Scott):

S. 3165. A bill to amend section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 3166. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION STATING THE COMMERCIAL POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES TO RECOGNIZE APPELLATIONS OF ORIGIN APPLICABLE TO CERTAIN PRODUCTS

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 329); which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas it has been the commercial policy of the United States to recognize appellations of origin applicable to foreign and domestic products; and

Whereas the purposes of such policy are to—

(1) protect, by the establishment of rigid standards of identity which govern labeling and advertising of products and commodities—

(a) the consumers in the United States against deception;

(b) the foreign and domestic producers against imitators who would by the use of misnomae, deceive the public with substitute materials and inferior processing;

(2) serve as a factor which solidifies a friendly relationship over the world through recognition as property rights the names of countries, dominions, and provinces; and

Whereas recent events in world history have converted many former colonies into sovereign states or dominions; and

Whereas sharply increased travel has given United States citizens a true conception as to origin of native products and natural basic materials for products named for states or dominions; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to encourage every nation to become self-sufficient through the promotion of industry and gainful employment for its citizens and to take advantage of its natural resources and potential in international commerce; and

Whereas it is expressed desire of the President of the United States that the interests of consumers be fully protected from false labeling, and so forth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That commensurate with the present policy in commerce with long established nations, it shall henceforth be the policy of the United States to respect and recognize as property rights with respect to their products the names of new states, dominions, and provinces notwithstanding the extent of usage of their names without standards of identity during their years prior to independence and to the effective date of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That this declaration of policy be brought to the attention of the appropriate agencies of the United States Government toward the end that such agencies will take appropriate action in keeping with the policy as stated herein.

APPROVAL OF AMENDATORY REPAYMENT CONTRACT NEGOTIATED WITH THE COLUMBIA BASIN IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce by request for appropriate reference a bill to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin irrigation districts, and amend the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 (57 Stat. 14), as amended, and for other purposes.

The measure if adopted would furnish the basis for settlement of a longstanding controversy between the irrigation districts and the Bureau of Reclamation. This matter has been before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for several years without resolution. Last year after a series of meetings between representatives of the districts and the Bureau the agreements embodied in the bill were substantially agreed to and the proposed contract was approved by the Quincy District by a substantial vote of the electors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3162) to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin irrigation districts, and to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act of 1943 (57 Stat. 14), as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Anderson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for reference to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to increase, in the case of the children attending school, from 18 to 21, the maximum age for receiving survivors' annuities under the act. The bill is a substitute for S. 1337, which I introduced last session, and which was first introduced in February 1960, as the result of a constituent's inquiry. The purpose of the bill is to permit benefits to be continued between the ages of 18 and 21 when the recipient pursues regularly a full-time course of study.

I am introducing the substitute bill in order to incorporate certain technical changes which the U.S. Civil Service Commission recommended in its report supporting the objective of the measure.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the chairman of the Retirement Subcommittee, to which S. 1337 was referred, has called for hearings on this measure along with various others on May 10, 1962, and it is my expectation that the substitute bill will be taken up in place of S. 1337 at that time. I thank the chairman for his cooperation in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3164) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to increase, in the case of children attending school, from 18 to 21, the maximum age for receiving benefits under such act, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Bible, Mr. Bush, and Mr. Saltonstall) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 495) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COORDINATION OF MASS TRANSPORTATION AND HIGHWAY SYSTEMS OF THE URBAN AREAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 5, 1962, the names of Mr. Javits, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Scott were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3122) to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to encourage the formation of regional agencies to develop comprehensive plans for meeting, through balanced and integrated highway and commuter transportation systems, the transportation needs of metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Case of New Jersey on April 5, 1962.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON MASS TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce the beginning of hearings on bills relating to mass transportation including S. 2390, S. 3122, and S. 3126.

The hearings will begin on Tuesday, April 24, 1962, at 10 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on these bills are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, at the earliest possible date.

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THURGOOD MARSHALL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, SECOND CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing originally scheduled for Monday, April 16, 1962, on the nomination of Thurgood Marshall, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit, has been rescheduled for Tuesday, April 24, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH TO BE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, April 16, 1962, at 10 a.m. in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, of Illinois, to be Deputy Attorney General, vice Byron R. White.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE:

Address delivered by Senator DODD at the annual banquet of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, at Las Vegas, Nev., on March 17, 1962.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address on the subject of the Nation's program in the field of space and astronautical science by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, at Goddard Memorial Award dinner, Washington, D.C., Friday, March 16, 1962.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for the consideration of the treaty on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceed to the consideration of Executive K, 87th Congress, 1st session, the Fourth International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, which was read the second time, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA

ARTICLE I

(a) The Contracting Governments undertake to give effect to the provisions of the present Convention and of the Regulations annexed thereto, which shall be deemed to constitute an integral part of the present Convention. Every reference to the present Convention implies at the same time a reference to these Regulations.

(b) The Contracting Governments undertake to promulgate all laws, decrees, orders and regulations and to take all other steps which may be necessary to give the present Convention full and complete effect, so as to ensure that, from the point of view of safety of life, a ship is fit for the service for which it is intended.

ARTICLE II

The ships to which the present Convention applies are ships registered in countries the Governments of which are Contracting Governments, and ships registered in territories to which the present Convention is extended under Article XIII.

ARTICLE III

Laws, regulations

The Contracting Governments undertake to communicate to and deposit with the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (hereinafter called the Organization):

(a) a list of non-governmental agencies which are authorised to act in their behalf in the administration of measures for safety of life at sea for circulation to the Contracting Governments for the information of their officers;

(b) the text of laws, decrees, orders and regulations which shall have been promulgated on the various matters within the scope of the present Convention;

(c) a sufficient number of specimens of their Certificates issued under the provisions of the present Convention for circulation to the Contracting Governments for the information of their officers.

ARTICLE IV

Cases of force majeure

(a) No ship, which is not subject to the provisions of the present Convention at the time of its departure on any voyage, shall become subject to the provisions of the present Convention on account of any deviation from its intended voyage due to stress of weather or any other cause of *force majeure*.

(b) Persons who are on board a ship by reason of *force majeure* or in consequence of the obligation laid upon the master to carry shipwrecked or other persons shall not be taken into account for the purpose of ascertaining the application to a ship of any provisions of the present Convention.

ARTICLE V

Carriage of persons in emergency

(a) For the purpose of moving persons from any territory in order to avoid a threat to the security of their lives a Contracting Government may permit the carriage of a larger number of persons in its ships than is otherwise permissible under the present Convention.

(b) Such permission shall not deprive other Contracting Governments of any right of control under the present Convention over such ships which come within their ports.

(c) Notice of any such permission, together with a statement of the circumstances, shall be sent to the Organization by the Contracting Government granting such permission.

ARTICLE VI

Suspension in case of war

(a) In case of war or other hostilities, a Contracting Government which considers that it is affected, whether as a belligerent or as a neutral, may suspend the operation of the whole or any part of the Regulations annexed hereto. The suspending Government shall immediately give notice of any such suspension to the Organization.

(b) Such suspension shall not deprive other Contracting Governments of any right of control under the present Convention over the ships of the suspending Government when such ships are within their ports.

(c) The suspending Government may at any time terminate such suspension and shall immediately give notice of such termination to the Organization.

(d) The Organization shall notify all Contracting Governments of any suspension or termination of suspension under this Article.

ARTICLE VII

Prior treaties and conventions

(a) As between the Contracting Governments the present Convention replaces and abrogates the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea which was signed in London on 10 June 1948.

(b) All other treaties, conventions and arrangements relating to safety of life at sea, or matters appertaining thereto, at present in force between Governments parties to the present Convention, shall continue to have full and complete effect during the terms thereof as regards:

(i) ships to which the present Convention does not apply;

(ii) ships to which the present Convention applies, in respect of matters for which it has not expressly provided.

(c) To the extent, however, that such treaties, conventions or arrangements conflict with the provisions of the present Convention, the provisions of the present Convention shall prevail.

(d) All matters which are not expresly provided for in the present Convention remain subject to the legislation of the Contracting Governments.

ARTICLE VIII

Special rules drawn up by agreement

When in accordance with the present Convention special rules are drawn up by agreement between all or some of the Contracting Governments, such rules shall be communicated to the Organization for circulation to all Contracting Governments.

ARTICLE IX

Amendments

(a) (i) The present Convention may be amended by unanimous agreement between the Contracting Governments.

(ii) Upon the request of any Contracting Government a proposed amendment shall be communicated by the Organization to all Contracting Governments for consideration and acceptance under this paragraph.

(b) (i) An amendment to the present Convention may be proposed to the Organization at any time by any Contracting Government and such proposal if adopted by a two-thirds majority of the Assembly of the Organization (hereinafter called the Assembly), upon recommendation adopted by a two-thirds majority of the Maritime Safety Committee of the Organization (hereinafter called the Maritime Safety Committee), shall be communicated by the Organization to all Contracting Governments for their acceptance.

(ii) Any such recommendation by the Maritime Safety Committee shall be communicated by the Organization to all Contracting Governments for their consideration at least six months before it is considered by the Assembly.

(c) (i) A conference of Governments to consider amendments to the present Convention proposed by any Contracting Government shall at any time be convened by the Organization upon the request of one-third of the Contracting Governments.

(ii) Every amendment adopted by such conference by a two-thirds majority of the Contracting Governments shall be communicated by the Organization to all Contracting Governments for their acceptance.

(d) Any amendment communicated to Contracting Governments for their acceptance under paragraph (b) or (c) of this Article shall come into force for all Contracting Governments, except those which before it comes into force make a declaration that they do not accept the amendment, twelve months after the date on which the amendment is accepted by two-thirds of the Contracting Governments including two-thirds of the Governments represented on the Maritime Safety Committee.

(e) The Assembly, by a two-thirds majority vote, including two-thirds of the Governments represented on the Maritime Safety Committee, and subject to the concurrence of two-thirds of the Contracting Governments to the present Convention, or a conference convened under paragraph (c) of this Article by a two-thirds majority vote, may determine at the time of its adoption that the amendment is of such an important nature that any Contracting Government which makes a declaration under paragraph (d) of this Article and which does not accept the amendment within a period of twelve months after the amendment comes into force, shall, upon the expiry of this period, cease to be a party to the present Convention.

(f) Any amendment to the present Convention made under this Article which relates to the structure of a ship shall apply only to ships the keels of which are laid after the date on which the amendment comes into force.

(g) The Organization shall inform all Contracting Governments of any amendments which come into force under this Article, together with the date on which such amendments shall come into force.

(h) Any acceptance or declaration under this Article shall be made by a notification in writing to the Organization, which shall notify all Contracting Governments of the receipt of the acceptance or declaration.

ARTICLE X

Signature and acceptance

(a) The present Convention shall remain open for signature for one month from this day's date and shall thereafter remain open for acceptance. Governments of States may become parties to the Convention by:

(i) signature without reservation as to acceptance;

(ii) signature subject to acceptance followed by acceptance; or

(iii) acceptance.

(b) Acceptance shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument with the Organization, which shall inform all Governments that have already accepted the Convention of each acceptance received and of the date of its receipt.

ARTICLE XI

Coming into force

(a) The present Convention shall come into force twelve months after the date on which not less than fifteen acceptances, including seven by countries each with not less than one million gross tons of shipping, have been deposited in accordance with Article X. The Organization shall inform all Governments which have signed or accepted the present Convention of the date on which it comes into force.

(b) Acceptances deposited after the date on which the present Convention comes into force shall take effect three months after the date of their deposit.

ARTICLE XII

Denunciation

(a) The present Convention may be denounced by any Contracting Government at any time after the expiry of five years from the date on which the Convention comes into force for that Government.

(b) Denunciation shall be effected by a notification in writing addressed to the Organization which shall notify all the other Contracting Governments of any denunciation received and of the date of its receipt.

(c) A denunciation shall take effect one year, or such longer period as may be specified in the notification, after its receipt by the Organization.

ARTICLE XIII

Territories

(a) (i) The United Nations in cases where they are the administering authority for a territory or any Contracting Government responsible for the international relations of a territory shall as soon as possible consult with such territory in an endeavour to extend the present Convention to that territory and may at any time by notification in writing given to the Organization declare that the present Convention shall extend to such territory.

(ii) The present Convention shall from the date of the receipt of the notification or from such other date as may be specified in the notification extend to the territory named therein.

(b) (i) The United Nations or any Contracting Government which has made a declaration under paragraph (a) of this Article, at any time after the expiry of a period of five years from the date on which the Convention has been so extended to any territory, may by a notification in writing given to the Organization declare that the present Convention shall cease to extend to any such territory named in the notification.

(ii) The present Convention shall cease to extend to any territory mentioned in such notification one year, or such longer period as may be specified therein, after the date of receipt of the notification by the Organization.

(c) The Organization shall inform all the Contracting Governments of the extension of the present Convention to any territories under paragraph (a) of this Article, and of the termination of any such extension under the provisions of paragraph (b), stating in each case the date from which the present Convention has been or will cease to be so extended.

ARTICLE XIV

Registration

(a) The present Convention shall be deposited in the archives of the Organization and the Secretary-General of the Organization shall transmit certified true copies thereof to all Signatory Governments and to all other Governments which accept the present Convention.

(b) As soon as the present Convention comes into force it shall be registered by the Organization with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Executive K is the fourth International Convention of Safety of Life at Sea and the third one to come before the Senate of the United States. So, although the subject matter may appear highly technical and complex, the Senate has twice before approved conventions of this nature.

The new convention has resulted in the main from the sinking of the *Andrea Doria* after a collision with the *Stockholm.* Inasmuch as the *Andrea Doria* was presumably built to the specifications of the 1948 convention, worldwide concern developed over adequacy of the standards set forth in that convention. Accordingly, the 1960 convention was negotiated to advance maritime safety through improved technical regulations covering such subjects as construction, lifesaving appliances, radiotelegraphy and radiotelephony, safety of navigation, carriage of grain, carriage of dangerous goods, and nuclear ships. Admiral Richmond, the Commandant of the Coast Guard and the principal witness before the committee, summarized the new convention in these words:

> I would like to say that although in many ways the 1960 SOLAS Convention is not radically different from the 1948 convention, it does represent a very definite improvement in international maritime safety. The changes involved are in general agreement with the positions which were developed prior to the conference by our combined industry, labor, and Government committees and which were fought for at the conference by our delegation drafted from the same three sources.

I would like to call the attention of the Senate to the full text of the admiral's statement which is printed in the appendix to the committee's report and which summarized in greater detail the most important changes over the 1948 convention.

In urging that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of the 1960 Safety of Life at Sea Convention, the Committee on Foreign Relations took into account that the U.S. delegation consisted in part of representatives of shipbuilders, ship operators, labor unions, port authorities, professional societies, and trade associations and that there is no opposition to the treaty that the committee is aware of. The Department of State considers the treaty "an important step forward in international agreement on technical matters concerning maritime safety."

I hope that the Senate will give its approval to ratification of this treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the convention will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to the point of the consideration of the resolution of ratification.

The clerk will read the resolution of ratification.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein)*, That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea, 1960, dated at London June 17, 1960 (Executive K, 87th Congress, 1st session).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of active duty with the U.S. Navy.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 73, nays, 0, as follows:

[No. 43 Ex.]

YEAS—73

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carroll
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Church
Cooper
Curtis
Douglas
Dworshak
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hickey
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Smith, Mass.
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—27

Allott
Bennett
Burdick
Bush
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Capehart
Carlson
Case, N.J.
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Engle
Goldwater
Kerr
Kuchel
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Moss
Saltonstall
Scott
Smathers
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the action of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE FLAG AND CANNON CEREMONY AT TRYON PALACE IN NEW BERN, N.C.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of the most historic cities in America is New Bern, N.C. As capital of the colony of North Carolina during the years immediately preceding the Revolution, New Bern was the site of the original Tryon Palace, which served both as the capitol of the colony and as the habitation of the Governor, and which was probably the most magnificent building erected in America before the Revolution.

The original Tryon Palace was destroyed a few years after the Thirteen Colonies won their independence from the mother country. Fortunately, however, Tryon Palace has been reproduced in recent years in conformity to the original building, and is being visited in constantly increasing numbers by those who admire beautiful architecture or revere things symbolic of our historic past.

For the restoration of magnificent Tryon Palace we are chiefly indebted to Mrs. John A. Kellenberger, Miss Gertrude Carraway, and the other officers and members of the Tryon Palace Commission.

On September 27, 1961, the Tryon Palace Commission, the Marine Corps, and numerous citizens joined in an impressive flag and cannon ceremony upon the beautiful grounds surrounding Tryon Palace.

On that occasion Mrs. John A. Kellenberger, chairman of the Tryon Palace Commission, and Maj. Gen. Arthur F. Binney, of the Marine Corps, delivered appropriate addresses.

I ask unanimous consent that copies of these addresses be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREETINGS BY MRS. JOHN A. KELLENBERGER, CHAIRMAN, TRYON PALACE COMMISSION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE FLAG AND CANNON CEREMONY AT TRYON PALACE, SEPTEMBER 27, 1961

As chairman of the Tryon Palace Commission, it is my privilege and pleasure to bring greetings on this notable occasion. Every member of the commission joins me in welcoming all of you to this historic flag and cannon ceremony. We are highly honored by your presence and deeply grateful for your interest.

The Governor of North Carolina, the Honorable Terry Sanford, joins us in expressing his welcome to you also, and regrets his absence due to an important out-of-State meeting.

Especially are we proud and delighted to have with us so many distinguished personages, military officers and civil officials, who add so much luster and dignity to this colorful program.

On this occasion we pay special tribute to the marines stationed at the neighboring Marine Corps Base at Camp Lejeune, and Marine Air Station at Cherry Point, and to the Marine Corps in general. For almost two centuries these "soldiers of the sea" have formed a primary line of defense against enemies who would destroy our American way of life. The records of the marines are outstanding, in the air, on land, and sea. Their historic traditions, techniques, and ideals sustain us in the face of current cold war threats.

We are truly grateful for the splendid cooperation given us so generously by the commanding generals and their associates at Camp Lejeune and Cherry Point. The exercises this afternoon could not have been possible without their wholehearted aid and interest.

We are deeply grateful also to Mr. Ward and to Miss Carraway for arranging this colorful program which pays tribute to the marines, those intrepid "soldiers of the sea," who guard our shores and preserve our Republic.

Through appreciation of our country's rich heritage, as exemplified by the history of Tryon Palace, we hope that the marines and all of us may find renewed inspiration and zeal for even greater devotion to duty, and that our Nation may ever be kept free and independent.

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. ARTHUR F. BINNEY, U.S. MARINE CORPS, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT FLAG AND CANNON CEREMONY AT TRYON PALACE ON SEPTEMBER 27, 1961

We owe a debt of gratitude to Mrs. Latham who conceived and fostered the Tryon Palace restoration and to the members of the commission, and many others, who have worked so effectively for the fruition of the project.

This beautiful palace now stands as a visible and tangible example of our cultural heritage—rooted in European civilization, with contributions from many national cultures.

Of course, in that colonial decade of two centuries ago there were differences between the colonists and Governor Tryon and King George about the manner in which the Colonies should be governed.

But, I believe that we were fortunate to have had our beginnings as a part of the British colonial system. From them we derived our code of law and our ethical standards of fairplay, integrity, and fortitude. Perhaps our survival as a nation may be due to British support of the Monroe Doctrine. In two World Wars they bore the brunt in the beginning and were gallant allies in victory.

Now that the United States has achieved maturity as a nation and assumed new world responsibilities we and our NATO allies are following a British policy of long standing: To call a halt when any totalitarian power with aggressive intent seeks further to expand and impose its will, its form of government, its dominion upon the world. President Kennedy stated our position very well in his brilliant speech in the world forum of the United Nations on Monday.

We do not insist that our form of government is best for others. We do ask that there be freedom of choice. As President Kennedy said, "We cannot expect all nations to adopt like systems, for conformity is the jailer of freedom and the enemy of growth."

We do believe that when we achieve a universal system of representative government, responsive to the governed, only then can world peace be insured.

The Marine Corps is fortunate to have its two major air and ground bases of the Atlantic seaboard here in eastern North Carolina. We, too, take pride in your great State, which has been singularly fortunate in its leadership and its citizenry.

At the entrance to the National Archives Building in Washington there is an inscription on either side. One says, "The past is prolog"; the second: "Study the past." We might add a third. "And look to the future."

This historic palace is a door from the past to the future—a source of inspiration to all who visit it.

We of the Marine Corps are honored to be here today, and we appreciate the friendly spirit and community support that is evidenced by our joint participation in these ceremonies.

The Marine Corps has traditions of its own. And, if we are ever needed to protect and perpetuate our institutions, you will find us ready.

WILLIAM BRADLEY UMSTEAD

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of North Carolina's ablest and most beloved sons, William Bradley Umstead, served with distinction as a Member of this body before becoming Governor of my State. On April 1, 1962, East Carolina College at Greenville, N.C., dedicated one of its fine new buildings, Umstead Hall, to his memory. On that occasion Edwin Gill, the State treasurer of North Carolina, made a dedicatory address in which he paid appropriate tribute to Governor Umstead. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gill's address be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY EDWIN GILL, STATE TREASURER, AT THE DEDICATION OF UMSTEAD HALL, EAST CAROLINA COLLEGE, GREENVILLE, N.C., 3:30 P.M., APRIL 1, 1962

We are met here today to pay affectionate tribute to a distinguished North Carolinian. A man who served his day and generation with a rare brand of wisdom that continues to challenge all of us to better and more useful lives.

My pleasure in having the opportunity to speak on this occasion is enhanced by the presence here of Mrs. Umstead and her daughter, Merle Bradley, as well as other close relatives and friends who were intimately associated with the man whom we honor here this afternoon.

Often a tribute of this kind is delayed until there are none living who shared the companionship of the man who is honored. But, today we rejoice in the knowledge that William Umstead continues to be loved and respected by hundreds upon hundreds of men, women, and children throughout North Carolina who knew him in the various relations of life. It is for us, the living, to do what we can to preserve the record of his achievements and to see that his memory is kept green.

Let me say in the beginning that although I was honored with the trust of Governor Umstead, I realize that there are many here who knew him better than I. I only hope that as I speak in his memory my words will find a warm echo in their hearts.

This is neither the time nor the place to give the chronology of his life nor to catalog his achievements. It is also too soon to evaluate the importance of his administration. For this we must await the sanction of history. However, it is not too soon to say that Governor Umstead's administration was in the high tradition that has given North Carolina an unbroken record of good government for more than 60 years.

What I would like to do in the time allotted is to suggest, if I can, the essence of this man, the core of his character, the heartbeat of his life, his winning ways with people, the quality of his leadership which commanded the strong loyalty of those who knew him well.

I think I detect in the life of this man, running through it like a strand of finely tempered steel, a determination always, come what may, to do his best. Whether he was raising tobacco or working in a sawmill, teaching school, studying to be a lawyer, serving as a soldier overseas, prosecuting the criminal docket as solicitor, representing his State in the National Congress, or as Governor of North Carolina—we see him giving his all to the problem at hand, never sparing himself.

To be sure, there are some who have been critical of him because they say he was a perfectionist, that he set standards unreasonably high, that he was somewhat impatient of mistakes and human error, that he continued to believe in the attainment of the impossible. I dissent most heartily from any such deduction. In my opinion, there was never a man more modest or more conscious of his own fallibility.

Umstead knew that he and all mankind were fallible, and that if the human race did not strive for the best, if we did not keep our eyes on perfection as a goal, if we did not continue to experience a sort of divine discontent with things as they are, that we would inevitably fail to attain anything approaching excellence.

Human beings are never easy to analyze. There is always something about human personality that defies definition. For instance, Umstead was in many respects a puritan, serious of purpose with deep moral convictions. A man who could, in the presence of injustice, take on a grim aspect, giving vent to righteous indignation. And yet, to those who knew him well, he was witty, tolerant, and good humored, with a deep understanding of the limitations of human nature. And many a friend who had failed in some mission and who dreaded to face the judgment of Governor Umstead, was relieved to be welcomed with a dry wit and a generosity that overwhelmed them. Umstead fully understood the diversity of taste, mood, and ability among his friends, and never permitted intolerance or human frailty or such a thing as self-righteousness to enter his thinking and thus divide him from the brotherhood of those whose friendship he valued.

Yes, Bill Umstead was something of a puritan and yet he understood the world, and with all of its imperfections, he loved it. Among intimates, he was a gay companion, and through the magic of his fellowship bound hundreds of them to him with strong ties of friendship. Nothing pleased him more than to take advantage of a reunion of some kind, to engage in the good-humored give-and-take of such hilarious occasions. He loved a good story, even if the joke was on himself. He was often the life of the party, rendering a harmonica solo, quoting poetry which might be a stately verse from Shakespeare, or just a precious piece of doggerel. He loved the old old hymns and would often join in, singing lustily, "Ten Thousand Times Ten Thousand," and then more softly, "Blest Be the Tie That Binds." And then he would often shift to something as light as froth on the Milky Way. A favorite was:

"I was born about ten thousand years ago.
There ain't nothing ever happened I don't know
I pulled the lion's tail, and
I'll lick the man who says it ain't so!"

Umstead studied law at Trinity College under Samuel Fox Mordecai, and he frequently quoted some of the great teacher's colorful sayings. He once arose in the Halls of Congress to give Mordecai's definition of drunkenness:

"Not drunk is he who from the floor can rise again and drink once more,
But drunk is he who prostrate lies and can neither drink nor rise."

Subsequently, in a political campaign in which Umstead was involved, someone in the opposition seized upon this quotation from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to try to leave the impression that in some strange, fantastic way, Umstead was on the side of intoxicating liquors. Of course, this absurd attack brought only laughter from those who knew that Bill was a teetotaler and that he took a rare delight in the earthy, Rabelaisian wit of his famous law teacher.

My friends, the figure we have here is that of a man who loved both justice and his fellow man, and who was determined to season the hard decisions of life with the mellow wine of comradeship.

In a way, William Umstead was a lonely figure in the arena of politics. Not that he did not have friends, not that he did not have loyal supporters devoted to his cause, but because he seemed alone as he often differed with good men as to what was proper conduct in a political campaign. Time and again he worried his supporters by refusing to take advantage of facts which they thought could have legitimately been used and would have helped him, because his code of ethics would not allow him to take what he regarded as an unfair advantage.

Time and again it was William Umstead who held some of his more enthusiastic supporters in check because he desired above all things to be fair and just and to play the game according to the strict code that he had imposed upon himself. In his determination to be right, even though he might forfeit the prize, he was often the despair of political advisers. The truth of the matter was that William Umstead sought to apply to the rough-and-tumble, catch-as-catch-can domain of politics something of the ethics that he practiced in private life.

I do not wish for one moment to leave the impression that William Umstead was not a wise and accomplished politician. He was, in fact, a veteran of the political wars when he came to the Governorship. He had managed the successful campaign of the Honorable R. Gregg Cherry for Governor, and had served as chairman of the State Democratic executive committee. He was involved in two hard-fought, statewide campaigns, one for the senate in which he was in contest with the Honorable J. Melville Broughton, and the other for the Governorship, his opponent being the Honorable Hubert Olive. Both campaigns were conducted with mutual respect between the distinguished participants, leaving no legacy of bitterness thereafter.

We often learn much about the character of a man when we know the nature of those he most admired. While I do not presume to name those that he revered the most in private life, I do think it is well known that among the elder statesmen, there were none that he admired more than the Honorable Clyde R. Hoey and the Honorable Robert L. Doughton. Among Governor Umstead's letters and papers, we find touching tributes to each of them in whose honor he "dipped his colors" as they passed into the great beyond.

William Umstead came to the governorship well prepared for the heavy responsibilities of that high office. His experience in government had been broad and comprehensive. He climbed the ladder of public service, rung by rung, beginning on the county level and moving upward until he had reached the Halls of Congress. He knew what it meant to resolve opposing viewpoints in both the National House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, and he knew when it was his duty as solicitor to reach an agreement with the defendant's counsel and the court, all in the interest of sensible, humane solutions. It was as a solicitor that he learned that the administration of justice is not an exact science, that things are not always black or white, but that judges and juries must often make hard decisions in the gray area of compromise.

He knew how laws were made; he knew how laws were enforced. So, when he came to be the chief executive of North Carolina, he could look at the problems that faced him with the candid eyes of experience. The intensive apprenticeship that he had served in the science and art of government caused him to be one of the best prepared men for the governorship in the history of our State.

Undoubtedly Umstead had visions of a Utopia for the people of North Carolina, but he never permitted the bright light of this vision to blind him to the day-by-day, week-by-week, month-by-month necessities of the people that he served. His goal was perfection, but if he could not reach it in the short span of time assigned to him, he refused to be frustrated or discouraged, and bravely grasped such opportunities as offered themselves for the advancement of our people. Needless to say, in such realistic endeavors, his long and rich experience in the practical affairs of government was invaluable.

Although Governor Umstead served as chief executive for less than 2 years, and during that time was greatly handicapped by illness, it must not be forgotten that in this brief period he left a definite, concrete and, I think, lasting impression on the laws and policies of the State, giving impetus to important programs that were to mature and flower under succeeding administrations.

Umstead was a stanch friend of the University of North Carolina, the public schools, and of all phases of education. He was also a friend of good roads and of those humane institutions that minister to the sick and afflicted. At the same time, he was determined that the expansion and progress of all these services be accomplished well within the bounds of what he conceived to be the ability of the people to pay. Thus substantial progress was achieved and the fiscal integrity of the State maintained.

Umstead recommended and secured from the legislature of 1953 a 10-percent increase in the salaries of both teachers and State employees. It was at his insistence that the general assembly of 1953 authorized $14,250,000 of bonds for permanent improvements at the institutions and agencies of the State, as well as $22 million for mental institutions and $50 million for public school construction. He set in motion the reorganization of the State parole system and sponsored regional forums looking toward the industrial development of every section of North Carolina. It must be remembered also that it was during Umstead's administration, May 17, 1954, to be exact, that the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its controversial decision with respect to segregation in the public schools, thereby plunging our whole educational program into a sea of uncertainty. Umstead met the storm calmly, with a statesmanlike, judicial approach, naming a special advisory committee on education to study this problem. Later under Governor Hodges this committee was to sponsor the now famous "Pearsall plan."

Some of these policies came to fruition immediately, but most of them were moving forward with vigor when he died, and it remained for Governor Hodges and now Governor Sanford to carry on and implement many phases of the Umstead program. Considering the handicaps under which he labored, we can truthfully say of Bill Umstead's administration—never was so much achieved in so brief a time.

If I may be permitted a light diversion, I think it should be pointed out that while Governor Hodges has been called our "Hurricane" Governor, he in fact has no monopoly on disasters of this kind. One of the worst hurricanes—Hazel—occurred during the administration of Governor Umstead. And from what has recently happened under Governor Sanford on the coast of Dare, I feel that Governor Hodges has still less claim to this rather doubtful distinction.

When Umstead was first stricken with a heart attack shortly after his inauguration, the general assembly was in session. Historic conferences were held in a hospital room from which a frail Governor issued crisp, clear recommendations to lieutenants in the general assembly. Communications between the Governor and the legislature were kept open through the devoted services of the Governor's brother, Mr. John Umstead, his legislative counsel, Mr. Frank Taylor, and his private secretary, Mr. Ed Rankin. It was through the tactful and diplomatic action of these and a few other friends that Governor Umstead was able to maintain and make effective his position with respect to pending legislation.

Suffice it to say, that Umstead, under great handicaps, dealt with the problems that face all chief executives, but in this case, he did not have the time required for the full resolution of many issues, nor did he have left any period of comparative ease during which he could have enjoyed the fruits of his own achievements. Instead, fate abruptly terminated his administration and plunged the State into mourning. For the first time in 63 years, a Governor of North Carolina died in office. It seemed that almost all the activities of a great State ceased as over 4 million North Carolinians paused in tribute to this frail yet resolute man who had literally given his life in their service—the silver cord was loosed, the golden bowl was broken—William Umstead had received the final summons, and with bowed heads and heavy hearts we saw him go.

It seems to me that the greatest contribution made by William Umstead to his State was the emphasis that he placed upon duty, upon being faithful to one's trust, upon the absolute necessity for integrity in public life. As I have indicated, there were those who often felt that Umstead was too precise in his requirements, too exacting in his demands, too insistent that the shield of the State not only be spotless, but bright and shining—free from the slightest shadow of suspicion. The answer is that Umstead never asked of others more than he required of himself. To any who thought that he was a stern administrator, the answer is that he was stern with himself, and in the end, like the good soldier that he was, made the supreme sacrifice.

We live, my friends, in an age that has become all too cynical, all too self-satisfied. We live during years in which the brazen goddess of material success commands the loyalty of far too many of our citizens. We find all around us evidence of cutting corners, a revival of the philosophy that the end justifies the means, and a general flabbiness of thinking in the areas of ethics and morality. In such a time and period, the life of William Umstead is like the clear call of a trumpet summoning all of us back to the simple and yet basic virtues—to truth, to honesty and fair dealing.

Of course, William Umstead made his share of mistakes and his judgment as to people and as to policies was certainly not infallible, but no man ever seriously questioned his motives nor doubted his absolute integrity. His entire career was oriented toward unselfish service to his State and its people.

William Umstead as a young boy came to the altar of Mount Tabor Methodist Church and gave his life to Christ. He always felt that this was the greatest single act of his life. And I am informed that on occasions he returned to this same altar to rededicate himself on the eve of great decisions. No matter where he lived, no matter where he went, I have a feeling that the spirit of Mount Tabor remained with him.

William Umstead never made a fanfare or public display of his religion, but we do know of his deep loyalty to his church and to the Master in whose steps he sought to walk. I, for one, believe that, after he suffered the heart attack and during convalescence, he must have wondered where his duty lay. I know that there were sincere friends who felt that he owed it to himself to resign the burden of the governorship so that he might have a fair chance to regain his health. In my opinion, Umstead calmly weighed the consequences to himself against his inaugural commitment to the people, and in the spirit of Mount Tabor, decided to continue to serve as Governor. It was a decision quietly but firmly made by a man whose devotion to duty transcended all other considerations.

On entering the arena of politics, some of our public men have had their names shortened for political reasons. Oliver Maxwell Gardner became "Max"; Cameron Morrison became "Cam"; and after having been in the Governorship for some time, intimate friends began to call Governor Broughton, "Mel." The nearest Governor Ehringhaus came to informality was "Blucher," and Governor McLean, even to intimates, remained either "Angus" or "Wilton." Others received colorful titles. Governor Cherry was frequently called the Iron Major. Very few people assumed to call Governor Hoey, "Clyde," but there were many who affectionately dubbed him "the Presiding Elder." And more recently Hodges was termed "Luther, the Lion-hearted." With respect to Sanford, we must await the unfolding events of his administration. However, I doubt not that for him some equally colorful and appropriate title is now in preparation.

In the case of William Umstead, we find that he was sometimes called "Bill" and sometimes called "William." It is strange, however, that it was the general public that called him "Bill," while intimate friends, such as Mr. Jones Fuller, Mr. Percy Reade, and his brother, John, called him "William." This area between the familiar "Bill" and the more formal "William," symbolizes to me the delightful mixture of qualities that we have in Umstead, who could be both stern and tolerant, grim and gay, just and merciful—that delightful combination, a Christian gentleman in the hurly-burly of politics—a puritan, if you please, with a song in his heart.

So, my friends, as we take leave for the time being of both "Bill" and "William," I would like to think that we are really bringing to a close a reunion with an old and dear friend, with whom we have laughed, and with whom we have sung; whose modesty and reticence often tended to obscure his lovable and engaging qualities, whose companionship we shall seek again from time to time, and from whose exemplary life we shall derive inspiration and encouragement for the challenging days that lie ahead.

"His life was gentle, and the elements
So mixed in him, that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, this was a man."

THE EFFECT OF IMPORTS UPON THE TEXTILE AND GARMENT INDUSTRIES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Piedmont Associated Industries is an association of more than 100 companies operating in Greensboro, High Point, Thomasville, Jamestown, and Kernersville, N.C. On March 21, 1962, the association gave a dinner to the North Carolina congressional delegation at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel in Washington. On that occasion one of North Carolina's most enlightened citizens, John Harden, of Greensboro, N.C., spoke to the members of the association and their guests in illuminating fashion concerning the problems which imports pose to the textile and garment industries.

Mr. Harden's observations will be of much value to Senators and Representatives when Congress considers the foreign trade bill. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that such observation be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EFFECT OF IMPORTS UPON THE TEXTILE AND GARMENT INDUSTRIES

(By John Harden)

Thank you for your willingness to try this experiment with us here tonight. As George Eichhorn said, we're not here to tell you what kind of laws to enact—or to add anything to the tremendous pressures that go with your job.

Parenthetically, all of your friends in industry understand your position here in Washington because it parallels our own experience. When the North Carolinians we represent here were plant managers or department heads they specialized their attentions, and as they became presidents or division managers in their companies they had to widen their viewpoint and balance the needs of one unit against the whole. In a much broader sense, I assume this is the position today of Members of Congress. Just as we are responsible to our stockholders, employees, and customers, so are you responsible to all of North Carolina, to the Nation as a whole, and here lately it appears as if you're responsible to the entire world.

Originally we had planned to bring you some of our views only on the import situation. But it was quickly apparent that almost everything we assembled had either come from Washington or was just as available to you as to us.

Therefore we decided to enlarge our topic to what might best be described as "What North Carolina Industry Has on Its Mind," or as a Piedmont Associated Industries staff member irreverently called it, "What's Bugging Us." Since many of our companies have plants well scattered about North Carolina we feel that we represent a good cross-section of both large and small industries in the entire State. Obviously we will just touch some highlights here this evening. If anyone would like to go further into any subject mentioned, we can have a discussion at the end of this talk.

You gentlemen have probably noticed that while industrial production has gone up, corporate profits have not. Some of us recently took part in a survey made by a business publication to see why. Some of the findings might be of interest, as a means of setting the stage for this discussion here together:

There were several ways of describing the basic cause of low profits: "We can produce a helluva lot more than we can use," or, stated another way, "overcapacity." In brief, it's competition. In many industries it's not the big corporations that decide prices, it's the marginal operator—the man who will sell at a breakeven point or even slightly below that, when he gets hungry. In textiles and garments, foreign competition is a tremendous factor.

Another point is that many customers now depend on the manufacturer to keep his inventory for him. This is especially true in textiles, garments, chemicals, and steel. Customers keep inventories at a minimum, and expect the manufacturer to keep a sufficient inventory to ship the desired goods on a moment's notice. In some industries this means you have to set up regional credit offices, area warehouses, and use airfreight more often. It means distribution costs have gone up faster than manufacturing costs.

Electronic data processing has not reduced clerical costs, as many thought it would do. Properly planned and engineered, it has become an important means of conducting a complex business. To meet competition or satisfy a customer you have to get your answers fast and have them accurate. Today, some of the larger customers want the manufacturer to keep records they themselves formerly kept. You have to tell them what goods you've delivered, what they have on order, and what is scheduled to be delivered. Data processing equipment is, of course, invaluable here.

Pay rates as such are not as much of a problem as the growth of fringe or unearned benefits and the idea of working fewer hours for the same pay.

So much for what we found in the survey of our member companies.

Now for a problem that has given us much concern, not so much from our own viewpoint as that of our employees. It is Executive Order 10925. We have tried to approach this problem with the good commonsense that characterizes our State. We know some organized groups thrive on sensational incidents, which probably help their fund-raising efforts. We know, too, that there are many on both sides of the integration question whose reactions are explosive.

In at least one instance, a plant represented here tonight has hired Negro workers for traditionally white-held jobs, simply because no qualified white applicants were available. This was done without any pressure, other than economic or business necessity.

Several of our companies under Government contract met and discussed the problem. They agreed that the following procedure seems best: First, a frank and firm statement of company policy, explained to employees in small groups where possible. Second, careful screening of applicants, to avoid any likely to create incidents, and selection of two Negroes at a time—to provide moral support for one another and to broaden the focus of any reaction. Third, careful selection of the department to be integrated, and good personal communications well in advance of the hiring. Fourth, no public announcement at all.

The companies that have hired Negroes began with office girls, and they report no untoward reaction.

We know that Government inspectors will be around to see that these Negroes enjoy normal promotion opportunities, and that more are hired as time goes along. We hope we won't be in for too much administrative law at the hands of these inspectors.

Sometimes we find that pressure groups are more dedicated to putting on pressure than to ascertaining the facts in the case. I serve on the board of the Guilford Industrial Education Center at Jamestown. A few months ago a Negro delegation waited on our board and spent considerable time—half a day—talking about human rights and equal opportunities. They wanted to know why we didn't accept Negro students.

The delegation was surprised to learn at this meeting that we had already had a couple of Negro students to complete an air-conditioning course at the center. As of our board meeting 2 days ago, on Monday of this week, we had no applications from Negro students on hand. When we receive any such applications they will be processed just like any other.

Now to another thing Piedmont (North Carolina) industry has on its mind. We want to thank you for the recent improvement in depreciation allowances granted to the textile and garment industries. These industries are grateful indeed.

One subject that ranks almost with Government spending as a matter of concern to industry is the growing amount of paperwork companies must do for various Government agencies. This includes all kinds of reports, forms, and other data. It represents an increasing nonproductive cost to business. No one would hazard a guess as to the number of man-hours industry spends in preparing all these reports, but we did get one clue. Whenever Government reports were mentioned in our survey, the answering comment was always preceded by profanity.

Now we come back to our original agreed-upon topic for tonight, the effect of foreign imports on industry. After canvassing industry in our area, we found the effect of foreign competition is greatest in the textile and garment industries. We had to revise the import portion of this talk in February when the 5-year international agreement was reached in Geneva, and again on Monday of this week with announcement of the new limits placed on importation of goods from Hong Kong. We don't mind revising it again right now if need be, gentlemen, we think you're moving in the right direction.

One of the main problems facing the Piedmont's major industries is that of imports. You are probably aware that textile and garment manufacturing, combined, account for about 2,105,000 jobs in the United States, and make these two allied industries the Nation's No. 1 industrial employer. Even so there are now 400,000 fewer jobs in these two industries than there were 10 years ago. You also know that these two industries are dominant in North Carolina, especially in our Piedmont area.

The import problem facing these two industries can be simply stated. Other nations have just as good machinery as we have in our plants—and in many cases a whole lot better They have been able to buy American cotton 8½ cents a pound cheaper than our mills can buy it, and they pay their employees far less than we pay ours, not counting any of our many fringe benefits.

I have a copy of a letter from a Hong Kong exporter in which he offers for sale varying sizes and styles of men's cotton trousers, f.o.b. Hong Kong, for less than half the price at which a North Carolina manufacturer can make or sell a comparable garment. For instance, the Hong Kong price for a common and popular style trouser, sizes 6 to 16, is $9.69 per dozen, compared to $25 per dozen for an American company. The same trouser in larger sizes sells for $13.03 per dozen against $30.75. The freight charges which an importer would pay amount to very little.

Obviously, from the standpoint of the person who goes to the store to buy merchandise—you and your families—these cheaper garments represent a saving over what you must pay for American-made or North Carolina-made goods. We would be less than candid if we didn't point this out.

But the corollary is that this saving is at the expense of reducing the purchasing power of this Nation's largest group of industrial employees.

Let's put this in specific terms. The Southern Garment Manufacturers Association asked a firm of industrial engineers to compute the effect of imported garments on their industry.

Knowing the amount of work that goes into each garment and knowing the wage scales in the garment industry, these engineers translated statistics into terms of people, payrolls, and factories.

Let's look at 1960. This country imported 177,432,000 shirts, trousers, brassieres, and other garments from Japan and Hong Kong. If these had been made in the United States they would have kept 23,358 people at work for a total of 50,715,960 man-hours in the garment industry. In addition, these garments would have provided work for 8,452 people who make the thread, buttons, elastic, and other supplies used by the garment industry.

Payrolls lost to the 23,358 persons directly employed in the garment industry (and to the 8,452 people indirectly affected) came to a total of $94,667,176.

If produced in this country, these imported garments would have kept 127 factories, employing an average of 250 persons each, busy for a year. This is of special interest at a time when our State is making the development of industry and the location of plants a major project.

The loss doesn't stop here. It is shared by the merchants, doctors, druggists, automobile dealers, attorneys, and others whose goods or services would have been bought in part with the lost payrolls. And there is also a loss to Federal, State, and other taxes.

Nor have we even considered the loss to the American textile mills that did not weave the cloth from which these garments were made. And we have not mentioned the thousands of yards of piece goods imported into the United States, another great loss to our textile mills.

Once in a while you hear of a textile plant closing because it can no longer compete with coolie labor. You probably recall that a mill in High Point closed for that reason a year or so ago, and said so.

Not so spectacular, but just as tragic to the textile worker is the situation in which a company has to lay off employees or go on a short workweek because of imports. Going further, we might think of the lost jobs and lost promotion opportunities involved when a company must cancel plans to build a new plant or expand an existing one.

Obviously, foreign competition isn't the only factor involved in every mill closing, every loss of work or cancellation of expansion plans, but it is an important one.

Just recently, the Geneva agreement froze garment and textile imports at the 1961 level, giving these industries promise of some relief. However, there is no telling what developments face them in the future. The agreement provides a floor—not a ceiling.

I say this with good reason. You recall that the Japanese were supposed to be under a voluntary quota for export of cloth and garments into the United States. In 1960, while under this so-called voluntary restriction, as those of you in Washington well know, they exceeded their quota on trousers alone by 45 percent, or 272,000 dozen, and exceeded their quota on gingham cloth by 4 million yards. We believe the recent action of the Interagency Textile Administration was most helpful in dealing with this kind of willful disregard of a limitation agreement.

We have had antidumping laws, to control the sale of foreign goods at prices far lower than they are sold in their country of origin. Do you know that the Japanese blouse that sells for 98 cents in this country sells for $1.40 to $1.70 in Japan? That's dumping—but try to get the law enforced. These charges are not hearsay—we have eyewitness reports.

There have been some suggestions that we ought to try to sell American garments in Japan, since they are supposed to have a certain amount of status symbolism. Just try it. At least one of our member companies has. Japan has a lot of restrictions and gimmicks to discourage this. Recently the Japanese announced that they will remove these restrictions, effective next October.

There is just one little proviso: Anyone who wants to take textiles or garments into Japan must post a bond representing 35 percent of the total value of the goods. This simply means he must tie up his working capital, and makes it virtually certain that no textiles or garments will be taken to Japan for sale there.

Add to this situation the fact that the European Common Market will certainly call for some changes in our thinking about imports and exports. We will simply have to meet whatever comes, when it comes.

In the meanwhile, put yourselves in top management's position. The business is owned by stockholders, and you have to give them a good return on their investment—or they'll either put their money somewhere else, or find a new manager. You have to sell your products at competitive prices, or the public won't buy them. And you have to be right as far as style and packaging go. You have to pay your employees the going wage or you can't keep the good ones.

You know, it's gotten so lately that the fringe benefits and other extras are getting pretty important. Did you hear about the shrewd holdup man who appeared at the paymaster's window of a corporation?

He shoved out a gun and said, "Never mind the payroll, Mister, just hand over the welfare fund, the health insurance fund, the pension fund, and the withholding taxes."

You must constantly be alert to reduce costs by reducing waste, you must be planning months and even years ahead in terms of new products and market research * * * you must carry on research and development if your business is going to grow and prosper. You must select and train your company's future management, from supervisors to top executives.

You must keep your machinery and equipment modern, or your competitors will take your customers away from you because they'll produce goods a little better or be able to sell them a little cheaper.

Well, these are just a few of the problems management must handle every day.

My reason for reviewing some of these problems is to point up a further problem that foreign imports add to this load: The factor of uncertainty that makes it hard for management to make intelligent decisions.

Our textile and garment industries realize the Government is going to give up some of their American market to foreign competitors. What we need to know is how much of our market we must share with low-wage countries. Once we know, our executives will be able to make intelligently the decisions they are constantly being called on to make.

For example:

Do we expand our existing plants or open new ones to provide additional jobs in response to appeals from all sides?

Do we try to open up and operate abandoned plants that are being offered to us?

Do we buy a company that wants to sell or liquidate its business?

With the concentration of textiles and garments we have in North Carolina, I don't need to tell you that what affects these two industries affects all of us.

U.S. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION BUDGET—LETTERS TO PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States, from the Honorable Steve McNichols, Governor of the State of Colorado, enclosing a letter to the President, which may be of interest to those who come from water-short areas, for their perusal, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF COLORADO,
Denver, March 28, 1962.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Vice President of the United States, The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: With this letter I am forwarding two copies of a letter sent today to President Kennedy pertinent to the budget proposed for the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation for fiscal year 1963, and signed by the Governors of the 17 Western States.

I am sure that the letter will be of interest to you, and I hope it will be possible for you to consider placing the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the U.S. Senate.

Should you require additional information, I should be more than happy to provide it to you.

Sincerely,

STEVE MCNICHOLS.

Governors, Western
Reclamation States,
March 28, 1962.

Hon. John F. Kennedy,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. President: We in the reclamation west are deeply gratified by your recognition of the urgency of developing and conserving the natural resources of our Nation. The fact that we must proceed now with the development of water for beneficial purposes to conserve and make the best use of all of the natural resources of our States is expressed with force and clarity in these words from your recent message relative to "Our Conservation Program":

"This administration adheres to the policy enunciated in my natural resources message of last year that our available water supply will be used to provide maximum benefits for all purposes—hydroelectric power, irrigation and reclamation, navigation, recreation and wildlife, and municipal and industrial water supply. These diverse uses and our future needs require thoughtful preservation and full development of our national water resources.

"The leadtime is long in the development of water resources. Years are required to plan and build sound projects. Time should not be lost on those projects which have already been transmitted to the Congress for authorization.

"In the work of conservation, time should be made our friend, not our adversary. Actions deferred are frequently opportunities lost, and, in terms of financial outlay, dollars invested today will yield great benefits in the years to come."

We fully subscribe to your policy that our available water supply will be used to provide maximum benefits for all purposes. Such development of the water resources of the 17 Western States is essential if this region is to make the fullest possible contribution to the economy of the United States and the defense of the free world.

Reclamation is necessarily an integral part of such development. Down through the years reclamation has had the support of every Congress, both major political parties, and every President since 1902, when Theodore Roosevelt signed the original act. Projects conceived and planned under one administration have been authorized and constructed under another.

The reclamation program was authorized to develop the arid and semiarid lands of the Western States and to create homes and opportunities.

That program has been an outstanding success. It has created a self-supporting economy which will be an asset to the West and to the Nation for generations to come. It has created new wealth that otherwise would not exist, has broadened the tax base and has provided a dependable market for manufactured products from other areas, thus stimulating business and commerce. It has made the desert "blossom as the rose."

Except along the west coast, virtually every major population or industrial center west of the 100th meridian has as its foundation an irrigation or reclamation project. When reclamation projects are constructed, homes are built and thriving communities are soon established. First there are villages and then cities, which soon become highway and railroad junctions. Thus, metropolitan areas are developed, markets are created and the transportation, water and human resources which are needed to develop the timber, mineral, recreational, and other resources of the region are provided.

The reclamation program is oriented toward the full economic development of the West. It is not exclusively a food and fiber program. The Bureau of Reclamation program has evolved until today it includes every phase of multipurpose development including irrigation, flood control, municipal and industrial water, hydroelectric power, fish and wildlife propagation, recreation and other purposes. It is important that reclamation be included in current multipurpose, basinwide, development programs and not deferred for future development.

Reclamation is one of the few Federal programs that repays its costs. It pays through the repayments by water and power users. It pays through increased income taxes. On many projects the income taxes alone, over a few years' time, have exceeded the cost of the project.

There appears to be a popular misconception that reclamation contributes to the Nation's agricultural surplus. Actually, most of the sums appropriated for irrigation works are used to supply irrigation water to lands now in dry farming and lands under irrigation with an insufficient water supply. Reclamation projects produce only an insignificant percentage of the crops now in surplus. Reclamation project lands grow only 1.5 percent of all the wheat produced in the United States, less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the total corn crop, only about 1 percent of the grain sorghum, and no tobacco. Logic indicates that these very small percentages are not the source of our surplus problem. Furthermore, in many areas, and especially in wheatgrowing areas, when a reclamation project is developed, farmlands almost invariably are taken out of wheat and put into other crops that are not in surplus.

Western irrigation is largely responsible for improving the diet of the American people. Today, thanks to irrigation, we have an abundance of green vegetables and fresh fruits, not only during the summer but throughout the entire year. The 17 Western States provide 84 percent of the Nation's supply of broccoli, 63 percent of our asparagus, 82 percent of our cantaloupe, 60 percent of our celery, 79 percent of our carrots, 93 percent of our lettuce, and all of our olives, dates, figs, nectarines, and lemons. Without irrigation, our food consumption pattern would be vastly different and considerably less wholesome.

Population growth in the Western States is much higher than the national average, and all known forecasts indicate this trend will continue. This will require intensive development of the limited water resources of the West, to meet the many diversified requirements outlined in your own statement, quoted at the beginning of this letter. As you yourself have pointed out, such development entails a long leadtime and it is imperative that our multipurpose reclamation program keep moving ahead in order to be prepared for tomorrow's critical demands for water.

The 60-year-old reclamation program has contributed tremendously to the strength and the economy of the Nation. Without the 100 or more reclamation projects scattered throughout the 17 Western States, the arid and semiarid West would still be largely a desolate, barren waste and of little value to the Nation, either in times of peace or war.

We appreciate the splendid support which is being given to reclamation by you and your administration, as well as by the present Congress. We are especially gratified that you have again endorsed the reclamation program in your message in which you supported several projects now being considered by the Congress and in which you point out that, "Federal planning efforts have been intensified and studies and recommendations for authorization of additional water developments accelerated. These plans and recommendations will be submitted to the Congress as they are completed." We are hopeful, indeed, that these projects may continue to move forward in an orderly manner so that the West and the Nation may benefit by their development.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate, and to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, with the thought that its contents should be made available to the Members of the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

Paul Fannin, Governor of Arizona; Edmund G. Brown, Governor of California; Steve McNichols, Governor of Colorado; Robert E. Smylie, Governor of Idaho; John Anderson, Jr., Governor of Kansas; Tim Babcock, Governor of Montana; Frank B. Morrison, Governor of Nebraska; Grant Sawyer, Governor of Nevada; Edwin L. Mechem, Governor of New Mexico; William L. Guy, Governor of North Dakota; J. Howard Edmondson, Governor of Oklahoma; Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon; Archie Gubbrud, Governor of South Dakota; Price Daniel, Governor of Texas; George D. Clyde, Governor of Utah; Albert D. Rossellini, Governor of Washington; Jack R. Gage, Governor of Wyoming.[1]

EXERCISE GREAT BEAR AND THE FUTURE ARMY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, during February 1962 the U.S. Army conducted a major winter maneuver in a region of Alaska the size of Delaware and Rhode Island together.

In previous speeches I have reviewed the strategic importance of Alaska and the nature and scope of research and development activities in the State. Those remarks furnish the background for a closer look at the military training which is being conducted in Alaska today and the significance of that training for development of tomorrow's Army.

In today's strategic doctrine, the Polaris and Minuteman systems occupy primary positions. These systems have a high order of relative invulnerability and give the United States a powerful deterrent punch. But what is the strategic complement of Polaris and Minuteman for small wars? Of course we require and possess a wide range of limited war capabilities—a whole spectrum of ground, sea, and air power for less than total war. But what is the specific limited war or special situation weapon that equates with Polaris and Minuteman? I suggest that it may be the helicopter-portable combined-arms task force which is the goal of current U.S. Army, Alaska, development efforts.

This kind of force is not a new idea. What is new is the work that is being done to bring the idea into reality. The recently announced organization of Army sky cavalry units is a step in this direction but these units are only ancillary to ground-bound divisions. In the northern operations concept, complete fighting units are portable in Army aircraft—without loss of firepower and cross-country combat capability.

---

[1] Governor Gage signs this letter with the understanding that: (1) Feasibility of projects be based on irrefutable and real need, (2) self-liquidation be made a fact, not a contention made possible by amortization over illegal periods of time, and (3) urgency be tempered with logic.

Creation of forces of this kind is a big order. It calls for hardware that is not yet available, for new weapons which may not even be on the drawing boards. It calls chiefly for imagination and hard, practical thinking.

In Exercise Great Bear, U.S. Army, Alaska, made a long stride toward putting flesh on the bones of this idea. Great Bear was conducted in a maneuver area 160 miles long and 20 miles wide in central Alaska. This huge area was selected to meet the the particular requirements of the maneuver plan; other regions could have been chosen within Alaska's hundreds of thousands of square miles of unexploited land to meet any possible set of desired combat environment factors. The Army cannot exercise this freedom in the use of land for large-scale training anywhere else in U.S. territory.

The maneuver area offers a wide range of ground conditions. Generally covered with brush and low forest, it includes both lowland swamp and steep mountain ridges. The maneuver forces were organized to fight across this terrain. The maneuver elements were standard infantry task forces, reinforced with armor, artillery, engineers, and supporting supply and maintenance elements. A USARAL unit, 1st Battle Group, 9th Infantry, played the aggressor role, 2d Battle Group, 60th Infantry, from Fort Devens, represented the friendly force. Friendly force was augmented by A Company, 2d Battalion, of Princess Patricias Canadian Light Infantry, in a small combined operations test. Air Force fighter, reconnaissance and transport aircraft supported the exercise; the joint operations training was valuable to all concerned. Over 8,000 United States and Canadian Army and Army National Guard troops participated in the exercise. Alaska's Eskimo Scouts showed up well as guerrillas.

Combat mobility within the battlefield was based on foot movement, tracked cross-country vehicles, and Army air transport. We often hear that the Army is still moving at a rate of 2 miles per hour and we are supposed to contrast this with supersonic aircraft speeds and nuclear submarines. But ground combat deals with the individual enemy soldier, who must be defeated before the enemy is defeated; and foot movement is still important in dealing with the human enemy in his natural environment, particularly in offroad operations. Well-trained infantrymen can move very nearly as effectively as armored vehicles over broken ground where there are no roads. When moved by Army aircraft to the objective area, combat teams which make their final approach march on foot or on skiis can far outdistance armored vehicles. So foot mobility remains a very important element of combat mobility.

But a combat force must have a full range of weapons in addition to the infantryman's rifle. For offroad operations, heavier weapons must be tracked. Accordingly, the task forces in Exercise Great Bear were equipped with tanks, armored personnel carriers, and self-propelled artillery. Supply and maintenance support elements must be able to move with the combat vehicles. In Great Bear the opposing forces were equipped with lightweight cross-country 5-ton transporters which carried the ammunition basic loads and rations. POL was moved in rolling liquid transporters. With this offroad equipment, the combat vehicles which established the center of gravity for each task force had the capability to move independently across country for several days without resupply other than that which could be delivered by Army aircraft. This is a very critical factor. It makes the task force a weapons system which does not need to lay down the logistical tail which combat forces always before have required. It is the first step toward creating a ground fighting system with the flexibility of Polaris submarines.

Unfortunately, the Army does not yet have the equipment that is necessary to bring this system into complete reality. On the ground, for example, current tracked artillery can move well offroads—but when an Army air-mobile force is mounted, only mortars, 75-millimeter pack howitzers and similar light weapons can be moved by helicopter with the force. Helicopter-portable weapons with a bigger punch are needed.

While moving on the ground, the cross-country combat force employs tanks to support the Infantry advance and to provide shock power in the attack. When the force takes to the air, it must leave its tanks behind. The force needs air-mobile antitank weapons and offensive weapons systems that will provide the shock action of armor without the weight of armor.

The armed helicopters which are part of the sky cavalry organization may provide some of the needed mobile firepower but this is by no means a complete solution.

While the force is moving on the ground, armored personnel carriers not only provide protection against small arms and artillery fire in the assault but transport crew-served weapons, ammunition, rations, and survival equipment for the Infantry units. When the force moves by helicopter, armored carriers must be left behind. Therefore, a requirement exists for a helicopter-portable tracked vehicle to provide minimum essential transport for the air-mobile force in the objective area.

Some 50 Army- and industry-developed equipment items were tested under the realistic operating conditions presented by Exercise Great Bear, nearly all of them with the object of increasing the effective mobility of ground combat units in offroad operations. This extensive materiel testing program combined with the test of ideas to move the land fighting capabilities of the Army farther forward into the future. Alaska offered an ideal environment for both materiel and concept testing.

The controlling idea of Exercise Great Bear was the concept of a small, self-sustaining, cross-country, combined-arms task force, able to mount air-mobile elements with complete combat capabilities. This force is more than sky cavalry; it is the basic formation for an air-mobile Army. It could be the small war complement for Polaris and Minuteman.

TRIBUTE TO RAYMOND S. COLL

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, last Monday an outstanding citizen and an adopted son of Hawaii passed from the island scene. He was Raymond S. Coll, former editor of the Honolulu Advertiser. More than 40 of his 90 years were spent serving Hawaii and chronicling the many brilliant events of our island's history for posterity in the morning newspaper.

In March 1959, after 37 years as editor of the Advertiser, he retired and was named editor emeritus.

A native of Pittsburgh, Pa., he was born on January 22, 1872, 1 of 10 children of Hugh and Catherine Coll. His father, an Irish immigrant, was a noted mining engineer at the Frick Coke Co.

Ray Coll began his 67-year newspaper career as a young man of 20 at Connellsville, Pa.

In covering two disasters, he launched his lifetime work. On one he was assigned to cover the burning of a church at Connellsville for which he was paid, and on the other he got a coveted byline on a mine disaster. As he recalled a half century later, the byline was the incentive that set the objective for his life's work in newspaperdom.

He worked for Pennsylvania newspapers in and around Pittsburgh where he became an expert in labor disputes, strikes, riots, and attempted assassinations.

Early in his life, Ray Coll served as a delegate to the Democratic convention at Harrisburg and also was elected clerk of Connellsville three times. Later, however, he became a Republican.

Shortly after the turn of the century, Ray Coll with his beloved wife Nan moved west to Arizona for 3 years and to California for a brief 6 months. They returned to Pennsylvania for about 12 years when they decided on a trip around the world, planning to return to Pennsylvania where Ray Coll was to assume editorship of the Philadelphia Public Ledger.

On a stopover in Honolulu in 1921, he fell in love with the islands. After 2 weeks, he bought a home. His wife remarked to him, "You don't even have a job." But he said simply, "I'll get one." He did. He became editor of the Advertiser in July 1922, after a short time of reporting, his first love.

His staff affectionately called him "Boss," a name that stuck. He had the reputation of unwaveringly backing up his reporters whenever they covered a tough assignment.

During his 37 years with the Honolulu Advertiser, Ray Coll came to know many of the great and the near great. He was a distant relative of Ireland's Premier Eamon de Valera and the two met for a long talk when the latter visited Hawaii.

He also maintained a correspondence with Edgar Hoover, FBI Chief, the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, and former President Harry S. Truman.

While corresponding with the FBI's Hoover, "Boss" Coll joined the Naval Reserve and held the rank of lieutenant commander assigned to intelligence.

On December 7, 1941, Ray Coll was the first person to broadcast an account of the Pearl Harbor attack over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network. He revealed the story from the radio station KGU newsroom while information was telephoned to him from the scene by an Advertiser circulation man.

Ray Coll was more than a newspaperman; he was an outstanding member of the community. He served for many years with the Honolulu Liquor Commission and was chairman for a time. Many of the policies set down during his administration are still carried on.

Appointed a member of statehood commission, he rejoiced when Hawaii finally achieved its present status as a sovereign State in 1959.

Among the many awards that recognized his many contributions to the 50th State were an honorary doctor of letters degree conferred on him by the University of Hawaii, and the coveted Order of the Splintered Paddle awarded by the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce.

An avid baseball fan, he had a transistor radio at his bedside in the hospital ready to tune into the first broadcast of this year's major league baseball season. He did not hear it. He had passed on to his eternal reward.

All Hawaii mourns the passing of Ray Coll. His friends were legion, and I feel my life has been enriched for having known him as a personal friend. To his beloved wife Nan, his son, Raymond, and other members of his family, the people of Hawaii offer their sympathy and condolences. To Ray Coll we all say "Aloha oe," with deepest respect and affection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the eulogy to Raymond S. Coll, printed in the Honolulu Advertiser of Tuesday, April 10, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAYMOND S. COLL

Two-thirds of a century he spent in newspaper offices across the land, from a strenuous youth in the strike-torn Pennsylvania coal fields to the Arizona desert and the green islands of Hawaii.

His working life spanned the rise of organized labor in the United States, from the days of Eugene Debs and Samuel Gompers and John L. Lewis to the arrival of James R. Hoffa.

He watched Debs run for Congress, stumping with him on horseback through the rugged Alleghenies, sleeping nights with his head cradled on a saddle.

In those days he was a flaming liberal, and in later years delighted in recalling he had been considered a radical—the sharp term of opprobrium of the times.

He watched and reported Arizona's campaign for admission to the Union, and decades later he did the same in Hawaii, supporting both vigorously.

His life and work coincided with America's transition from a rural, isolated country concerned with its own social and physical growth pangs to its emergence into the 20th century and the struggle with world communism.

He saw Hawaii move from provincialism to internationalism, from a plantation-dominated territory to a bustling, forward-looking, multifaceted State, from feudalism to democracy.

He saw the islands go through the early militant years of unionization, a process which here as elsewhere sharply divided the community.

His newspapering took in four major wars—the Spanish-American, World Wars I and II, and the Korean.

In short, he saw a lot of history, the bulk of it from the editor's chair of the Honolulu Advertiser which he occupied from 1922 until 1959 when he was well past 80.

Although not a large man, he was physically rugged and gave the impression of size simply by the strength of his personality. The outstanding feature of his powerful face was the penetrating blue eyes which could be as cold as diamonds—and as cutting. Or they could twinkle with tolerance and amusement.

He was quick to anger—and as quick to cool off.

Until his last days as editor he came to the office daily, patiently plodding up the winding staircase to the second floor where he spent the entire time until 4 p.m. behind his desk.

Callers, no matter who they were, received the treatment their demeanor invited. The pugnacious, the intemperate soon felt the sharp edge of his tongue and the flash of his eyes. It was an office delight that an ancient leather blackjack still hung from the coattree behind his chair, a relic, perhaps, of his editing days on the Arizona frontier.

In conversation he was intolerant of extreme statement and of strong opinion unsupported by fact and logic. But he loved a good argument, and he emphasized his points by thumping on his desk with an iron paperweight or stabbing the desktop with the scissors he used to clip news items from the paper for editorial treatment.

In his younger days he had the voice and temper of a giant but as time passed he mellowed, and a wise and gentle irony replaced the thunder—but it was, in its own way, just as effective.

In a sense he had two careers—the one which began at Connellsville, Pa., in 1892, taking him later to Arizona and then back to Pittsburgh as editor of the Dispatch. In all, 30 years.

And then he came to Hawaii, starting anew in middle life and keeping on for 37 more years.

One of his strongest points was his respect for reportorial competence. The skilled and the dedicated on his staff knew they had his blessing, and he left them alone to work uninhibited.

Another strong point was his competitive spirit. To score on the opposition was his greatest delight, and he enjoyed taking a sharp editorial jab now and then at what he considered the foibles of the opposition.

In later years, he had here and there a critic who said the times had passed him by. It is a measure of his professionalism that he would have resented it if this went unnoted in his obituary editorial.

In the narrow sense it is perhaps true that events in the years after World War II moved more quickly than he.

But the important thing is not that his pace failed to quicken as rapidly as events when the atom and the rocket and the jet airplane transformed the Nation in a little more than a decade.

The important and impressive thing is that he remained eager, flexible, and excited about tomorrow throughout his seventies and eighties. Age may have slowed him physically and tempered him with an older man's conservatism, but mentally he remained strikingly young and vigorous.

In his middle seventies he coined the term "the new Pacific man" to describe the great future in human relations, the example to the rest of the Nation, he saw building in Hawaii's multiracial climate.

His life was as fruitful as it was long. For nearly four decades, more than one-third of the life of this newspaper, he guided its editorial destiny.

His imprint on Hawaii is probably beyond measure. Though proud of his craft, he was essentially a modest man. For his epitaph, he probably would want no more than this: Raymond S. Coll, editor, 1922–59, the Honolulu Advertiser.

NEEDED: STRONGER CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation—in a world of cold and threatened hot wars—needs to create:

A more realistic awareness of the scope of the threat;

A program to best prevent and/or protect us from attack;

A dynamic, not a passive, public attitude and confidence in our ability to meet and cope with the threats of the times.

In this fast-advancing nuclear age, there is, however, difficulty in getting broad understanding of the scope of the dangers, as well as defenses to protect us.

Over the years, the Nation has attempted to create a civil defense program. Unfortunately, a general inability to crystallize and evaluate the dangers, and understand protective measures—except for a relatively few vigorous, dynamic leaders—has made this program slow in getting "off the ground," or perhaps, I should say, in getting underground. Nevertheless, I strongly feel that there is a need for greater local-State-Federal action and cooperation to provide protection for our population, to the greatest degree possible, from the dangers of nuclear attack.

There are, of course, differing ideas as to just what should be done.

The effectiveness of the program, however, will depend not only upon top-level supervision and coordination, but also upon realistic leadership and action at the local level, where the people live.

Recently, I was privileged to receive from Mr. Richard C. Wilson, director of civil defense in Madison, Wis., an informative, constructive evaluation of the problems and challenges in civil defense. Believing this deserves the consideration of Congress, I request unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE,
Madison, Wis., March 30, 1962.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your kind letter of March 23. I, too, am very sorry that we were unable to meet while I was in Washington. I understand, however, that you were on the floor and that, of course, takes precedence.

Here are some thoughts on civil defense which I would like to bring to you for your consideration and comments:

Civil defense today is a far cry from the air raid warden of World War II with his white helmet and bucket of sand. Today civil defense is a Government responsibility whereby the resources of our political jurisdictions are used most effectively in an extension of normal Government service by those departments best able to carry out what is needed to meet the emergency. This concept, which is embodied in Federal and State laws and in many local ordinances, needs continuing clarification and evaluation in terms of national problems, the international situation, weapons capability, and other factors in order to be brought into proper focus at all levels of government.

There is no one answer to all of the problems which may confront us. It is necessary, therefore, for us to take a very close look at the many variables which we might face and to determine courses of action which might be used under different circumstances.

* * * * *

There is no one set pattern which can apply everywhere. It is necessary, accordingly, to tailor make the plans which would apply. Thus, there must be guidelines to assist those who are preparing and administering survival plans so they can take the best possible courses of action under varying circumstances.

You will note that I emphasize the importance of tailoring survival plans to specific needs of each jurisdiction.

You will also note that I emphasize the importance of having a variety of courses of action to select from to meet different circumstances as they arise. I think you will agree that an approach of this kind is much more workable, realistic, and capable of providing a better chance for survival than a single plan which does not necessarily apply to local needs and conditions.

In order to prepare a workable civil defense plan and to be able to carry it out, it is necessary that an acceptability be developed at all levels. The acceptability must be demonstrated and fostered by Government officials in Washington, in State capitols, in cities, with all of them understanding that all levels of government are involved. There must be a conditioning of the public to an acceptability, and this can be done only if our national, State, and local government leaders forcefully demonstrate to the public that civil defense is necessary. To have a workable civil defense there must be planning, training, and education. Those of us—local civil defense directors—who are on the firing line cannot do the job alone without assistance from political and governmental leaders at all levels. For many years we have been whistling alone in the wind. It is high time that we have a chorus of whistlers.

In order to have a thoroughly workable program of civil defense operations, as well as economic stabilization and resources management, there must be uniformity throughout the entire country with special tailoring to local needs. There should be a tie-in between the activities of OCD–DOD and OEP and the local governmental agency responsible for civil defense. This tie-in should be at the administrative level with the local civil defense director administering the total program in his jurisdiction.

The reorganization of civil defense is not a panacea. It has, in fact, presented a very grave problem. The separation of civil defense operations per se from resources management and economic stabilization may be a sound procedure at the Federal level. The placement of the operational aspect of civil defense in the Department of Defense is working out quite well. The retention of emergency planning, particularly resources management and economic stabilization in the Executive Office of the President seems to be workable at the Federal level. However, there is need for greater rapport between OCD–DOD and the Office of Emergency Planning and local civil defense.

We must recognize that civil defense in all of its aspects, both operations and emergency management, must be administered by the local civil defense director. At least in Madison our civil defense ordinance requires it. The organization of economic stabilization as a separate entity superimposed on the local level of government is an extremely unrealistic way of developing such emergency action at the local level. Anyway, the point I'm trying to make is that the organization of an economic stabilization unit which is divorced from and set off apart from the local civil defense agency is compounding the problem by presenting a Hydra, with each head looking in its own direction, paying little attention to the others.

It seems to me that OEP must be brought into much closer relationship with local civil defense. I do not want to infer that we should bypass the State, but certainly there must be close coordination at all levels of government in a unified approach to the problem. In this connection, perhaps it might be desirable to have discussion sessions, training courses, and localized conferences to fill the void between Federal-level and local-level emergency planners. I have written to Edward A. McDermott, Director of OEP, along this line. I discussed it at some length with him in Washington and also at a recent area emergency planning conference in Chicago. I have also discussed it with Charles Brewton, his very able assistant, and they both asked me to put my thoughts in writing to them.

We are faced with an extremely difficult problem as planning is developed by OCD–DOD. Following President Kennedy's injunction that top priority must be given to protection of the public from radioactive fallout, there has been such stress on the shelter program as to virtually eliminate consideration of all other aspects of civil defense. For us to have a workable and effective shelter program, other aspects of civil defense must be developed in conjunction with it. I am thinking specifically of such things as communications, the training of radiological monitors, the organization and training of auxiliary police, medical training, and various other programs which have a bearing upon getting people to shelters, caring for them while they are in shelters, and providing rapport between shelters and civil defense headquarters so that a total protective program can be administered. We cannot eliminate various service activities in civil defense and concentrate solely on shelters because the shelter program is much more embrasive in the total service to the people than just providing a physical facility.

As near as I can determine, there has been too limited an interpretation of the President's message to a point where national planning is having the woods obscured by the trees. Recently, however, there has been a noticeable reevaluation of civil defense by OCD–DOD wherein State and local civil defense directors are being consulted and asked to give their thinking on various matters. I hope this will lead to a more complete understanding of the problem by our Federal civil defense people. We must recognize that when civil defense was placed in the Department of Defense, it was necessary to completely orient the DOD people, and it has taken months to accomplish this. I do feel that they have a good understanding of the problem now and probably will begin to inject into overall planning and operations some of the things I have been discussing in this letter.

I am deeply impressed with the caliber of people at the top of OCD–DOD. In particular, I would like to mention William P. Durkee who seems to have a very good understanding of the relationship of various levels of government in this whole problem.

There is one other aspect of civil defense which would greatly facilitate effective emergency action. That is the establishment of a chain of command from Federal to State to local government. At the moment, each level of government operates independently of the others, and there is no real tie in or operational chain which is so vital to emergency action. No level of government has authority over any other in such a way as to effect directives. I am speaking primarily of emergency operations. There is some Federal control now, particularly since Federal administrative funds are available to State and local governmental units. The Federal can control action by manipulating the purse strings. But this is not the major problem.

The thing we are concerned about is having an operational chain of command so that each level of government knows exactly how it fits in and what its duties are and also what its responsibilities are to the next higher echelon.

For some reason or other, there has been a reluctance on the part of the Federal Government and, accordingly, on the part of State and local governments to be forthright in telling the public what we face. There has been an attitude of trying to avoid the unpleasant, or at least to soft-pedal information so as not to shock the public. A good example of this is the almost complete lack of reference to chemical and biological warfare. It is true that the public has been given a picture of what radioactive fallout is, but they have not been given an overall picture of what we face. I think it is high time that the government tells the public this very thing. It is also high time that all levels of government recognize what we face and take appropriate action. The key to doing this, however, rests with a demonstration by the Congress of the importance of preparedness.

From all of the foregoing, you will see that I consider civil defense as having been a stepchild for a long time. Only recently has it been accepted as part of the family of government. I certainly hope that, as it grows, it will be strengthened and be made an important part of our Government. There is no question but what emergency preparedness will be a part of our way of living for many, many years * * * as long as there is a Communist menace. Let's put things in the proper relationship. Let's focus public attention on what needs to be done. Let's demonstrate through our Congress, our legislators, and city councils that our public fathers recognize the importance of preparedness and that they are ready to make civil defense what the name implies.

You can help accomplish this by convincing your colleagues in Congress that, if our Nation is to continue being the champion of individual freedoms, hopes, and aspirations, a strong program for survival must be maintained.

Yours very truly,

Richard C. Wilson,
Director.

HAS THE CAB FORGOTTEN ITS RESPONSIBILITIES?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, according to the U.S. Government Organizational Manual, the Civil Aeronautics Board is an independent Federal agency charged with broad responsibilities for the encouragement and development of U.S. civil aviation. The manual further describes these responsibilities to be "vested with safety and economic rulemaking and adjudicatory powers."

The manual further states:

> In the interest of maintaining competition the Board regulates mergers, acquisitions of control, and interlocking relationships involving air carriers and passes on

contracts for cooperative working arrangements between air carriers.

Three key words from the manual definition invite our attention. Those words are: "Encouragement," "development," and "competition."

They ought not to be ignored, forgotten or misused.

It is reasonable to assume that throughout the world progress which aviation has prompted is appreciated and understood. Aviation has linked the most distant village with the largest cities. Aviation has enabled man to circle this globe and perhaps it soon will make it possible for him to step upon the surface of the Moon.

So it is proper that we have a Civil Aeronautics Board directed to encourage, to develop, and to spur competition. Progress is the principal benefit of such supervision when the supervision is properly used.

Keeping in mind the stated responsibilities of the Civil Aeronautics Board it is difficult to understand the cause of the Board's recent proposed order affecting air service to and in Alaska.

As I read the proposed order I am appalled. Its far-reaching effects can only harm a new State which needs every encouragement.

The order would abolish the service of Pan American World Airways to and from Alaska.

The order would curtail the routes of two carriers, Alaska Airlines and Pacific Northwest, unless they agree to merge. It would eliminate the connection between Portland, Oreg., and Alaska points now served by both Alaska Airlines and Pacific Northwest.

The order would permit Northwest Airlines to service Alaska only as an incident to its Orient service.

I can well understand the concern of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] who has termed the proposed order as "folly."

Not only is it folly, but injurious to the economy of more than one State.

I am concerned with the proposed order because it appears that it would substitute for competition of four excellent carriers a monopoly brought about by compulsion.

This sort of action is not a responsibility assigned the Civil Aeronautics Board, nor to any governmental agency.

I urge the Civil Aeronautics Board to consider carefully the air needs within Alaska. The vastness of Alaska is impressive. It stretches 2,700 miles from east to west and 1,400 miles from north to south.

The four States-Alaska carriers now operating in this area are Pan American World Airways, Northwest-Orient Airlines, Pacific Northern Airlines, and Alaska Airlines.

Those familiar with the transportation problems of Alaska inform me that these carriers compete to some extent but by no means duplicate service. They supply virtually the only transportation for people and airmail between the other States and Alaska. Other forms of transportation are limited or nonexistent.

Of the many needs in Alaska, monopoly is not one. The proposed action of the CAB would, if carried out, create a monopoly.

If the Civil Aeronautics Board has in mind the saving of subsidies paid to Pacific Northern and Alaska Airlines, then it should not bring the other carriers into the discussion. And if the matter of subsidies is to be considered, so, too, should be the billions of Federal dollars which over the years have been used to subsidize all American transportation, and indeed foreign transportation.

Pennywise and pound foolish action at this time will help no one.

The proposed order should, in the public interest, be withdrawn.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon on his realistic and enlightened appraisal of the situation as it would exist in Alaska if the Civil Aeronautics Board followed the wholly mistaken course which apparently it proposes to do.

I commend Senator MORSE, who, as usual, is on the right side of issues affecting the public interest, and join him in requesting that the proposed order of the CAB be withdrawn.

STEEL PRICE INCREASE

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I rise to express keen disappointment at the action of the steel industry in its unexpected and in my opinion unjustified increase in the price of steel.

United States Steel claims it needs a price increase to enlarge its profits to obtain funds for investment in more modern facilities.

I think there is a better solution to this need. I think there is a better avenue by which to increase its available funds for investment.

The investment credit provision of the tax bill now before the Senate Finance Committee and the administration's plan for revision of depreciable lives of productive equipment have precisely this objective in view—increasing the volume of funds available to all American industry.

Let us look at some figures.

United States Steel has announced a price increase which would give that company an estimated $63 million rise in aftertax profits this year. I base this estimate on the assumption that the company's sales increase by 15 percent this year over 1961 sales.

But how much can we assume would be added to the internal flow of funds in United States Steel as a result of the planned tax liberalization?

Based on the company's estimated investment in 1962, the reduction in tax liability—and thus the increased internal cash flow—from the investment credit would amount to $35 million.

On top of this, a shortening in the depreciable lives—and consequent higher depreciation charges—can be expected to add another $10 million to internally generated funds. I arrive at this figure by assuming that the steel industry will obtain a reduction in depreciable lives comparable to that already given the textile industry.

Thus from the two planned tax changes, United States Steel could assume that it would reap a total of $45 million in additional cash for investment.

This is more than 70 percent of the amount it is now seeking to obtain through its unwise and disruptive price increase.

For the steel industry as a whole, I estimate that the benefits in reduced tax liability from the investment credit will amount to $110 million in 1962 and from shorter depreciable lives to $24 million. This contrasts with the estimated $200 million rise in after-tax profits which would result from the price increase. The increased cash flow from tax liberalization would therefore amount to more than two-thirds of the total amount of increased cash obtainable from the announced price rise—if other companies follow the lead of United States Steel.

Or look at the figures another way: United States Steel complains that it has had to borrow funds to finance its expansion and modernization program, because its internally generated cash through retained earnings and depreciation charges has been inadequate.

I will not pause to comment on the peculiarity of the steel industry's view—almost unique among our great industries—that there is something wrong with borrowing or equity financing and that it must finance all of its capital spending from internal sources. But even if we accept this peculiar premise it is highly significant that United States Steel would not await the benefits it could obtain from the planned tax liberalization as a means of enlarging the proportion of its fixed investment that United States Steel could finance from internal sources, and chose instead a course contrary to the national interest which carries with it all of the unfortunate consequences outlined yesterday by President Kennedy.

And now let me turn to two other areas affected by the steel price rise:

TRADE AND BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS IMPACT

The impact of this price increase on our balance of payments and our gold stock is potentially quite serious.

The results are both direct and indirect. While iron and steel products represent only about 2 percent of our exports, their importance as components of other products is enormous. Even the less than $429 million this country earned by direct iron and steel exports last year is no trifle on our balance-of-payments books.

Machinery and vehicles, taken together, represent about one-third of our total exports—$6 billion in 1960—and manufacture of these products involves large quantities of steel, both in these products themselves and their components and in the machinery which is used to produce them. What is worse, these very products—our highly sophisticated American-made machinery, in particular—are the ones which offer the greatest hope for expansion of our exports.

World price competition on vehicles and machinery is strong. The steel price rise cannot have any effect other than to worsen our competitive position—not only on oversea sales but in sales in this country, too. Foreign penetration of the American market can be expected to increase. In 1960, about 10 percent of our total imports—$1.5 billion worth—represented machinery and vehicles.

What may be even worse from the point of view of the balance of payments is the psychology the steel price increase will generate.

The significant reduction in our balance-of-payments deficit and our gold outflow which has occurred since the Kennedy administration took office has been based in large measure on confidence in this country's ability to manage its economic affairs wisely. If foreign businessmen and foreign officials now believe there is reason to be fearful of another round of inflation in this country, will that not lessen their confidence that the value of the dollar will be maintained?

MILITARY PROCUREMENT COST

The price increase in steel, which we can expect to have ramifying consequences throughout the economy, will also have a seriously adverse effect on our Federal budget.

It will directly increase the costs of maintaining our Military Establishment, as the prices of military hardware containing steel and of other products in which steel is used, either in the end product or in the manufacturing process, go up.

Estimates of the additional burden on the Federal budget made by the President yesterday show that it could easily reach $1 billion—thereby adversely affecting the budget for the fiscal year 1963 by that amount.

Consider the magnitude of this cost increase. It amounts to the same thing as taking away from our Military Establishment nine fully equipped Polaris submarines—at $115 million each—or five squadrons of Atlas missiles—at $190 million each—or six squadrons of Titan missiles—at $158 million each.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the great components of our mighty steel industry will reconsider and reverse their recently announced unreasonable and unjustified price increase.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2935) to amend the Peace Corps Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2935) to amend the Peace Corps Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF VETERANS' BENEFIT CALCULATOR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily set aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1291, House Concurrent Resolution 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) authorizing the printing of additional copies of a Veterans' Benefit Calculator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the resolution (H. Con. Res. 25) was considered and agreed to.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions on the calendar from Calendar No. 1292 to Calendar No. 1302, be brought to the attention of the Senate in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the resolutions will be stated.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON CIVIL DEFENSE

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 405) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on civil defense for the Committee on Government Operations was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF "OUR FLAG" AS HOUSE DOCUMENT AND PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL COPIES

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 408) authorizing the printing of the publication entitled "Our Flag" as a House document and providing for additional copies was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT NO. 1282

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 412) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1282 (pts. 1 and 2, 87th Cong., 1st sess.) was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATING TO SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 414) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings relating to H.R. 4700 to amend section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as amended (the fund for social analysis), 87th Congress, 1st session, was considered, and agreed to.

PRINTING OF "GUIDE TO SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATIONS AND PUBLICATIONS" AS HOUSE DOCUMENT

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 416) to print as a House document the publication "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications" and to provide for the printing of additional copies was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS IN THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 419) providing for additional copies of the hearings on small business problems in the poultry industry, 87th Congress, was considered, and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "INAUGURAL ADDRESSES OF THE PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 541) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 218, 87th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States" was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON THE REVENUE ACT OF 1962

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) to print additional copies of hearings on the Revenue Act of 1962 was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Finance not to exceed one thousand additional copies each of part 1 and all subsequent parts of hearings on the Revenue Act of 1962, held by that committee during the Eighty-seventh Congress.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ENTITLED "COMMUNIST THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES THROUGH THE CARIBBEAN"

The resolution (S. Res. 321) to print additional copies of certain hearings entitled "Communist Threat to the United States through the Caribbean" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for use of the Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies each of parts 3 and 12 and three thousand additional copies each of parts 9 and 10 of hearings by the Internal Security Subcommittee during 1960 and 1961, entitled "Communist Threat to the United States Through the Caribbean".

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK"

The resolution (S. Res. 327) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the "Election Law Guidebook" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a revised edition of Senate Document Numbered 102 of the Eighty-sixth Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook," be printed as a Senate document.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF ANNUAL REPORT OF DAR FOR FISCAL YEAR 1961

The resolution (S. Res. 328) to print the 64th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1961, as a Senate document was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sixty-fourth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1961, be printed with an illustration, as a Senate document.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2935) to amend the Peace Corps Act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I understand that the Peace Corps bill is now the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Am I correct in assuming that the House bill is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill before the Senate is the Senate bill, S. 2935.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it in order to take up the House bill in lieu of the Senate bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House bill is in committee. The committee will first have to be discharged from the further consideration of the House bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from the further consideration of H.R. 10700, and to substitute it for the Senate bill, S. 2935.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed immediately to the consideration of H.R. 10700.

I also ask unanimous consent that further consideration of S. 2935 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Chair to state whether such action would preclude any Member of the Senate offering an amendment to the House bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My understanding is that the House bill, if it is taken up, will be open to amendment. The effect of it is this: The Senate amended the bill before us in two respects. The House passed it without those amendments. We are assured by the Peace Corps officials that it would be acceptable to them if we passed the House bill. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] will remember that one provision related to a matter that the Chairman had asked for, and that was a limitation of 15 percent of Peace Corps personnel in any one country. The Peace Corps is writing us a letter assuring us that under no conditions will they station more than 15 percent in any one country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Chair rule on the parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has inquired if the House bill were substituted for the Senate bill, whether the House bill would be open to amendment. The Chair states that it would be open to amendment.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the Committee on Foreign Relations is discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 10700), which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10700) to amend the Peace Corps Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10700).

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, last year the Congress approved the Peace Corps Act. We authorized the appropriation of $40 million for the first year of this program. Thirty million dollars was appropriated.

The bill now before the Senate is simply an authorization to appropriate funds to carry on the program we inaugurated last year. It authorizes the appropriation of $63,750,000.

If the Congress appropriates the amount authorized, the Peace Corps will have roughly 10,000 volunteers on duty by August 31, 1963.

Before going further into the details of the Peace Corps program, I take this occasion to say that this program has exceeded the expectations of a good many of the Members of the Senate. The first year of operations has quieted some of the critical voices raised against the original concept.

Indeed, I will go further. I suspect this program may well prove so successful that the Soviet bloc may in due course seek to establish a Peace Corps of its own.

There are several aspects of the program that deserve special comment.

For one thing, I believe the Peace Corps has tapped an asset we have always had but have never used, except in time of war. I speak of the drive and dedication of the young men and women of this Nation. Time after time during military hostilities we have drawn on our youth and they have served and died for their country.

Now, in time of relative peace, we have realized that the same qualities that have made our fighting men the world's best, also make them, and their companions of the opposite sex, the best exportable evidence of what this Nation is. The young man who has tinkered with a hotrod turns out to be a pretty good man with his mechanical hands. His ingenuity and ability can be put to constructive use in nations now moving into the mechanical age.

The young woman teacher is able to help her Nation in the conduct of its relations with foreign nations by the simple act of assisting illiterate peoples take their first step toward education, without which individual freedom and self-government are not possible.

In short, the infusion of well-qualified, energetic young Americans into educational and training activities in countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America is proving to be an effective adjunct to aid programs in many countries.

The committee, on the basis of frequent questioning of American ambassadors, finds that these young, person-to-person envoys are helping substantially in creating understanding of America, and at the same time giving substantial service to countries badly in need of assistance in the fields of sanitation, education, agriculture, and public health.

At the same time these volunteers are helping abroad, they are accumulating a fund of understanding of the problems of the countries to which they are assigned. By the very nature of their work they are required to learn foreign languages and culture. As a consequence, one of the collateral effects of the program will be to provide the United States over a period of years with a body of men and women experienced in foreign languages and cultures. This resource will be available not only to the Government, but to private American interests with oversea installations.

Some members of the committee have had doubt whether a 2-year tour of oversea duty is sufficient to enable volunteers to make helpful contributions to the countries to which they are assigned. Reports we have received, however, indicate that volunteers have been readily accepted and have usually been able to establish close working relationships with their foreign counterparts. And I am inclined to believe that the freshness of the Peace Corps program will be maintained in large part by the 2-year tour concept, thus providing every year an influx of 50 percent of new volunteers while those who have completed their service can return home and help this Nation better understand the nature of some of our foreign problems.

I now return to some of the details of the bill before us.

The appropriation last year of $30 million made it possible to bring into the Peace Corps its "freshman class"—individuals who will serve 2 years, and then return home. By July 1 of this year, 2,400 volunteers will be abroad or in training.

The appropriaton this year of the full amount requested—$63.7 million—will be used for the following purposes:

First, about one-fourth of the sum will carry the first-year class through its second year of duty;

Second, another one-fourth of the sum will cover the first year costs of an additional 2,710 volunteers; and

Finally, approximately one-half of the sum will be used to bring a new "freshman class" of about 5,000 volunteers into the Corps.

Thus, by the end of the summer of 1963, the Peace Corps expects its complement of volunteers to number about 10,000.

Except for the increased authorization of funds, the bill before the Senate makes only minor changes in the act we passed last year.

Last year when the Peace Corps was before the Senate for consideration some misgivings were expressed. Reservations were entertained that the tendency might be—as is often the case in new programs—to initiate projects too fast, without taking due account of knowledge to be gained from experience. But, on the whole, the Congress thought the Peace Corps, as an experiment in the foreign relations field, was worth embarking upon. We have been reassured to note that the Peace Corps has made a cautious start. Only some 900 volunteers are as of now overseas, and the percentage of volunteers returned to the United States because they failed in their tasks has been very minute, indeed.

The Peace Corps has made changes in its procedures in the past year on the basis of experience. Improvements have been made in the selection, training, and recruitment of volunteers. The Director of the Peace Corps has not said that the success of the Peace Corps as a long-range feature of our foreign policy is assured. Rather, all he is saying right now, and all the committee says, too, is that the results of the program thus far justify its continuation.

The committee believes the Peace Corps program has been well directed and well managed. Its Director and top personnel have lost none of their drive or their enthusiasm. They have been willing to discuss the program in detail and have not shown inclination to duck any issue. The approach of Peace Corps personnel toward Members of the legislative branch is refreshingly candid.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy said:

> Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country.

Many Americans, both young and old, have felt a deep desire to heed this call, and they have found in the Peace Corps opportunity to respond.

They have offered their talents, their skills, and 2 years of their lifetimes for the performance of national service abroad, in order that they might play a personal and individual role in the promotion of world peace and friendship through a Peace Corps. Those volunteers who are now overseas have given every indication that they are going to perform their tasks well and that their varied contributions are going to be worthwhile.

Mr. President, the committee has not changed its view that the success of the Peace Corps will depend upon the caliber of the volunteers and the Peace Corps employees. If the volunteers and other personnel continue to serve in a way which makes other countries realize important and tangible benefits from the tasks performed, and the people of the United States proud of the work of these citizens, then the Peace Corps can effectively contribute to helping make this a better world.

The committee recommends that the bill now before the Senate be approved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I fully associate myself with the statement made by the Senator from Alabama in presenting the bill on behalf of the committee. I hope that every Member of the Senate—and, indeed, the citizenry of the country—will be mindful of the projects which have been requested by other countries and which are programed. The point needs to be emphasized that the Peace Corps does not go out soliciting work; the Peace Corps answers the requests of countries which indicate their need and desire for this type of specialized assistance.

The Peace Corps places emphasis upon agricultural techniques; upon the needs of health protection or the improvement of health; upon teaching, to combat illiteracy; and upon the improvement and upgrading of teaching methods. All these and many other projects and proposals are, I think, most worthwhile.

The American people have taken justifiable pride in the accomplishments of the Peace Corps. I have yet to find a single program of the Government since the days of the Civilian Conservation Corps, which was designed to benefit the youth of the United States, that has met with such universal support and enthusiastic response as the Peace Corps.

I join with the Senator from Alabama in paying my respects to the Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Shriver, and to his staff, not only for the manner in which they have approached Members of Congress on this item of legislation, but more significantly for the capable procedures they have established for the training of recruits, for their contacts with the host countries, and for their general supervision of Peace Corps personnel.

As the Senator from Alabama knows full well, the average age of the Peace Corps personnel is between 24 and 25 years. These young men and women have carried to the world the real, true image of America, based on our character. The vitality, technical knowledge, youthful spirit, and maturity that they have demonstrated are typical of the American people and the American Nation.

I am pleased to know that the other body has acted so promptly on the Peace Corps measure. If my memory serves me correctly, there were 70 votes out of the entire House of Representatives which were cast in opposition to the Peace Corps. That demonstrates the overwhelming support of this organization on the part of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Minnesota; I agree with what he has said. I feel that the Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Shriver, is one of the most dedicated of men, and at the same time one of the most reasonable in his approach. It was he who led the way in saying that we would move into this project slowly and cautiously, and that he was not trying to build a new organization rapidly.

So far as dedication is concerned, the same statement applies to the staff members who have appeared before our committee. The same spirit seems to have permeated the whole Corps. It has been my pleasure to meet many Peace Corps volunteers both in this country and abroad. The Senator from Minnesota and I were together in Chile and saw Peace Corps volunteers at work. Not only did we see them; we heard what the people of Chile said about them.

This is a modest program. Unlike many other organizations, the Peace Corps is not seeking to grow and grow and grow. It is not seeking to attract personnel so as to retain them indefinitely. The Peace Corps program is a 2-year program. When a person enters the Peace Corps as a volunteer, he does so with the knowledge that he will remain in the organization for 2 years. So far as present plans are concerned, we have the indication that next year, when the personnel reaches 10,000, the program will level off. A class of 5,000 will be graduated every year, and a new contingent of 5,000 will be taken in every year. I think that is an excellent and a reasonable approach to the staffing of the Peace Corps.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That point needs to be emphasized, because the purpose of this particular authorization is to enable the Peace Corps to reach that level.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is to make it possible to lift the personnel to that level.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The bill now under consideration would enable the Peace Corps to sustain that level.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. After the number is at that level, at the end of next year, this year's group of 5,000 will graduate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Another 5,000 will then enter the Corps, and in the following year another group will graduate, and so on. Thus every year 5,000 will be going out and 5,000 new recruits will be coming in.

Mr. HUMPHREY. While the Peace Corps certainly extends benefits to the host countries, such as Chile—and a new contingent is going to Brazil; and contingents will be going to many other countries throughout the world, including those in the Middle East, Latin America, and Africa—I think that one of the great benefits of the program will be the knowledge of the world which the members of the Peace Corps will bring back to the United States. They will return trained in the use of the languages of a host of countries. When they return they will be fully matured, responsible, dedicated, enlightened citizens, in terms of the economic and the social problems of many parts of the world. This work is like a broad college graduate training course, but is conducted in the field where those who participate in it face the immediate responsibilities and difficulties of the areas to which they go.

The Peace Corps volunteers represent a reservoir of skills and experience that should not be lost to our country after the completion of their 2 years' training and service overseas. We should not reconcile ourselves to losing their talents when they return to private life. They are energetic, talented, and hardheaded in the cause of peace and human betterment. Today and throughout the future experience of the Peace Corps we ought to encourage these volunteers to put their gifts and their idealism to the continued service of their country and their fellow men.

I am confident that the greatest reward and dividend of the Peace Corps will be its strengthening of the United States of America in better political, economic, and social understanding of the world to which we seek to give leadership. We are really helping ourselves, as well as others.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Senator from Minnesota is correct.

Mr. President, yesterday I happened to have lunch with some members of the Chilean legislative body. The Chilean Ambassador was present. The subject of the Peace Corps was discussed during the luncheon; and I was particularly pleased with what one of those present said. The tribute he paid to the operation of the Peace Corps in Chile was most pleasing. I wish I could quote his exact words, and wish I had permission to use them, because it was an outstanding tribute to the American young people who have lived among the Chilean people themselves, have become more or less parts of their families, and have been able to carry on their work and also build up good will among the Chilean people.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Alabama understands that I have expressed the view that, in my opinion, an adequate experiment has not yet been made in order to put this program on the basis of what might be called a completed test, with final judgment as to whether it will work.

I should like to ask a few questions regarding the judgment I have just now expressed.

According to the chart which appears in the report, on page 14, as of March there were 1,057 volunteers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The program began in June 1961; and as of March 1962, there were included in the program 1,057 volunteers, either ready to be assigned to foreign countries or already assigned there. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the basis of the 9-month experience with the 1,057 who have been enrolled or who already have been assigned, some have reached the conclusion that the program is workable, that the test is complete, and that we should go ahead with it, not on the basis of a test still to be made, but on the basis of a test fully made and a program justified.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think there is a little more than that——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Very well, I should like to hear it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The proposed increase is based more or less upon requests which have come to strengthen or even to double the force in many countries, and also on requests of other countries to participate. In other words, the purpose is to be able to comply with the requests which have come and are coming from many countries.

Furthermore, Mr. Shriver explained to us that their recruitment more or less coincides with the end of the academic year. Therefore, in July, August, and September, there will be a very sharp increase in the number, so that by September 1 the total will be up to 5,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, the recruiting for them is now going on, and they will be included.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that if the proposed increase is authorized, a similar chart for the next year will show an additional 5,000, because of the fact that the recruitment coincides with the end of the academic or the school year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. But as of March 7, there were 1,057, I understand.

The program presented in connection with the bill contemplates having 10,000 by August 1963; does it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So by the middle of 1963, the number will jump from 1,057, as of March of this year, to 10,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; but I do not believe we should consider the case in just that way. I have stated that there will be an increase to 5,000 by September 1, 1962; and, in addition, 5,000 more will be added by September 1, 1963.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Very well.

I wish to direct the attention of the Senator from Alabama to the evidence and the figures shown on page 111 of the hearings. According to that part of the hearings, the sum of approximately $63 million will make possible the hiring of 9,970 volunteers. Does the Senator from Alabama agree?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct; that was the testimony which was given.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Alabama will recall that in the committee I offered an amendment to reduce the $63,750,000 to $43 million. Let me ask this question of the distinguished Senator from Alabama: If, instead of the amount being reduced to $43 million, it were to be reduced to $45,780,000, would not that make available 6,970 volunteers?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct; the Senator from Ohio is right. That is the figure which was given to us by Mr. Shriver.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. Of course, in the committee my amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. According to the testimony, Mr. Shriver was very much elated because many countries were requesting these volunteers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that the Philippines wanted 1,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe they requested 2,000—at any rate, a large number; the Senator from Ohio is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, they requested 1,000, to serve there as teachers——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Primarily as teachers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And also in other work?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, including agriculture.

The Filipinos probably are requesting more teachers than other countries have requested. I think that grows out of the experience in the Philippines following the Spanish-American War, when we sent teachers to the Philippines, and they became known as the American Teachers Corps. They constituted almost a Peace Corps at that time; and the Filipinos have remembered that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the Philippines there is a great reservoir of friendship for our country, and a great kinship in culture and language, in many of the areas, growing out of the influence which those American teachers had; and today the Filipinos want more American teachers. That is why they have requested so many teachers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So they want 1,000. Does it strike the Senator from Alabama as peculiar that they would not ask for 2,000 or for 3,000 if they could get them to serve as teachers in the schools in the Philippines?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it seems to me that the normal thing to do——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, if they can get American teachers, paid by the United States——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, under the conditions I have just described. In other words, the Peace Corps did not have to build up a reputation in the Philippines, for the group of American teachers who went there 55 or 60 years ago did that, and the Filipinos remember it. Many of those teachers remained there until the time of their retirement, and many of them retired only a few years ago. Their influence has continued; their image is still there.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not know whether the Senator from Alabama has studied the notations which appear on pages 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27 of the report, showing the countries which have requested such assignments, and indicating that in most cases they want them assigned as teachers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. That was the evidence brought before the committee. The report bears out the evidence presented in the committee that that is the greatest need. The Shah of Iran, in his very fine speech today, spoke about the great need for education. He said, in effect, that unless there is education and literacy we cannot hope to have the full benefits of freedom. I think that is true throughout the world. That is the reason why there is such a demand for teachers and others who can give technical training.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was the Senator present when I asked the question as to how much is paid in the Philippines to their own teachers, to which the answer was $78 a month?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure I was. I believe I was present during the entire time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the program, it will cost $9,000 a year for each assignee as the teachers are sent around the world. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the average across-the-board cost. The teacher does not get that amount, but the figure represents the total average cost.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The figure includes material, equipment, and everything else.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The probability is that our assignees will be of better quality than their own, who are paid $78 a month.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Even at $78 a month, those people cannot recruit teachers. They do not have enough teachers. There is a great void, in which we are seeking, in a relatively small way, to help them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not know whether the Senator from Alabama has formulated any opinion as to the proportions to which this agency will grow. If we use the Philippines as an example, in the second year of operation we are to have 1,000 assignees. What will the agency grow to when other nations of the world ask for similar numbers?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator will remember that Mr. Shriver explained the situation in the Philippines. I think it is a fair interpretation to say that it was more or less on a temporary basis and was developed primarily because of the entree which had been made there by American teachers in earlier times and the fact that a program was already established there. I think it is only fair to assume that there is no intention of building the organization into a very large one. As I recall, the testimony brought out the fact that we now have a great many more requests than we can hope to fill, and probably that will always be so. Many countries want the force doubled, and we cannot do it. Many countries want personnel for projects that we will have trouble filling because of the lack of numbers. It was suggested that the organization will never be very large.

I cannot tell what the future may bring, but as it looks now, we shall have to level off at the 10,000 level. Those are the terms in which the Director spoke—bring in 5,000 a year and graduate 5,000 a year, with a 2-year service.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I differ with the views of the Senator from Alabama concerning the interpretation that should be put upon the requests for increased assignments. To me, it is natural that each nation should take as many as we are willing to pay for. So when the Philippines Government asks for 1,000, that fact does not astound me. It does not give testimony to the virtue of the work; it merely means the Philippines are glad to have us spend $9 million for the provision of teachers in the Philippines.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator will recall that the committee was unanimous in believing that there ought not to be a concentration of Peace Corps volunteers in any one country. For that reason the chairman of the committee proposed the amendment limiting to 15 percent of the total the number in any one country. As I said a while ago, I am sure Mr. Shriver is writing a letter giving us assurance that at no time will the Peace Corps establish any more than 15 percent of its total number in any one country. It is my opinion that, at the beginning, the number will not be anywhere near that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am delighted to hear the Senator say that there should not be an expansion of the agency in such proportions that we shall be sending to such countries as Laos, Vietnam, Africa, and other places, numbers comparable to those sent to the Philippines, because, if we do that——

Mr. SPARKMAN. We could not do it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Ohio has made a good point. What he has said here, which reinforces what he said in the committee, ought to be brought to the attention of the Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Sargent Shriver, and his associates, so that they will know the intent of the committee and of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe that throughout the committee hearing Mr. Sargent Shriver was pretty well governed by that idea. I believe it is a fair interpretation of his testimony to say that the only thing we plan for now is the 10,000 level. I am sure that, in answer to the question I asked him, he said it would amount to a leveling off at 10,000. Repeatedly the term was used "5,000 recruits a year, graduate 5,000 a year," which, over a 2-year period, makes a total of 10,000.

As I said a few minutes ago, none of us can tell what the future will bring, but in this respect it is for us to decide. Certainly, so far as this legislation is concerned, the number will not exceed 10,000. In fact, I think the number is fixed at 9,970.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With respect to the bill, we placed a limitation in it of 15 percent of the total number that could be assigned to any one country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the maximum number.

Mr. LAUSCHE. A suggestion was made of 10 percent. That was done because we were disturbed about the large number being sent to the Philippines.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. We are in the process of receiving a letter from Mr. Sargent Shriver, which, as soon as it arrives, I will place in the RECORD.

Mr. SPARKMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I have now received the letter, to which I previously referred. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 12, 1962.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request for a statement of the policy the Peace Corps will follow with respect to the percentage of volunteers assigned to duty in any one country or area (dependancy), if H.R. 10700 is substituted for S. 2935 and voted upon by the Senate.

With regard to the Peace Corps project in the Philippines, we will respect the intent of the Committee on Foreign Relations and not increase the number of volunteers assigned to duty in that country to more than 15 percent of the total number of volunteers in service at any given time.

The Peace Corps also will follow a policy of not assigning more than 15 percent of the total number of volunteers to any one country or area. However, even now, when there are volunteers in only 12 countries, it is clear that major opportunities for the Peace Corps may develop rapidly at any time in certain countries whose continued political stability and economic growth are of vital importance to the United States.

The Peace Corps wishes to be in a position to take prompt advantage of such opportunities should, and when, they develop. Even in such cases, however, the Peace Corps will not as a matter of policy assign more than 15 percent of the total number of volunteers to any such country or area without first seeking the approval of the Secretary of State. Before seeking such approval, the Peace Corps will consult with the Committees on Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs.

Sincerely,

ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER, Jr.,
Director.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be brief, because my colleagues desire to vote on this measure. I favor the expansion of the Peace Corps, which is reflected in the bill. I am delighted that this great experiment in help, through the most able efforts of the younger people of this country, has achieved such success that the measure received the well-nigh unanimous approval of the other body, and promises to have unanimous approval in this body. It is gratifying that these inspired young people have engaged in this effort.

I had been working for the establishment of an organization of this character, a peace corps, for about 3 years when I made a speech at Case College in which I urged that our young people should go out into the world under these very auspices. So it is satisfying to me that we should have tried it, and that it has worked, and I hope very much it will be expanded again and again as its worth is recognized, because we are thinly dispersed in terms of technical assistance throughout the world, and there are no finer ambassadors than these young and dedicated people.

I understand that the quality of some is not the same as that of others, but, on the whole, they have done a remarkably fine job. I think great credit is due to Sargent Shriver and his associates, who have operated the program with such great credit to our country and to our country's youth.

Mr. President, I have received an account of the Peace Corps in action in Pakistan, which offers a clear demonstration of some of the reasons for its swift success. Bill Reder is a constituent of mine, who comes from Long Island City, N.Y. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 20, 1961.

Hello once again from East Pakistan. I hope this letter finds you all fine, healthy, and deep in the pursuit of your individual goals. I hope you all received my last mimeographed letter.

I finished my 3-week training at the Academy for Village Development and then went to Dacca to live with a Pakastani family. While at the academy in Comilla, we studied Bangla (Bengali language), history, economics, cultural patterns, cropping patterns, social stratification in villages, land fragmentation, cooperative farming, cooperative business, etc. We actually went out into the villages and met the people, sat with them and talked about their families, crops, livestock, problems, joys, etc. At each village we met the elders and then conducted our interviews and personal discussions, usually sitting inside their humble thatched bamboo huts. In all villages we were given the honor of smoking the village hookah (that meant we were accepted). After the hookah came the "bhan"—that's betel nuts and lime rolled up in a green leaf. You chew it and swallow the juices. Your whole mouth becomes red. Well, my dear friends, needless to mention we all smoked the hookah and chewed the "delicious" bhan—we had to. We all looked at one another and just chewed and smiled. Every eye in the village was on us; even the women were peeking from behind every nook and crook to watch our expressions. We passed all of the rituals of acceptance in all villages.

In one village we were invited to a song fest. When we arrived at the village, we were escorted into the village schoolhouse; a large bamboo and brick structure which was dimly lighted by kerosene storm lanterns. We all were seated and then the village leader made an opening welcome speech and declared a competition between his village music and our American music. He said, (in Bengali of course) "That we are ahead of them in all areas but he was not sure about music." Jack Jordon and I played our guitars and the rest of our group pitched in with some of our American favorites (folk music). (They played one, we played one.) "The Saints," "Oh Mary Don't You Weep," "You Are My Sunshine," "The Sloop John B," "Wimoee," "Good Old Mountain Dew," and "Midnight Special." We ended off with a Pakistani song, "Pakistan Zindabad." We tore the house down. All of the villagers spoke Bengali, but they loved our fast, loud, rhythmical songs. They played very beautiful songs also. One man played a belly drum (a clay pot with the opening on his bare belly), another played a two-string banjo, and another man (a university student) played a flute. As the evening drew on the songs became more melodious and beautiful for men would just start to sing spontaneously as they felt the urge. The song fest was called a draw and the village leader said "It was the first time that anyone had ever come to his village to share such a wonderful evening." Mick McGuire thanked the villagers (in Bengali) and we went home. (I failed to mention, everyone in the village turned out except the women.)

Our training in Comilla was very enlightening. We all left there for our new homes for 3 weeks in Dacca with the feeling that there's a lot of work to be done. And we could do our share. I am now living with a typical middle class, city-dwelling Pakistani family (Rahman family). The immediate family—all those living together under one roof—mother (ama), father (aba), and six children (chele-mee). Nehar is the oldest girl, 15, eighth year of school; Zillur is the oldest boy, 14, eighth year of school; Yousuf, middle son, 11, fifth year of school; Zenat, middle daughter, 9, third year of school; Samee, youngest boy, 7½, kindergarten; Ami (girl), 6 years old, not in school yet. One cook and servant (Baw ar chi), he lives in the servant's quarters in back of the house—that's where all the food is cooked and stored (he also purchases food.) One gardener and animal caretaker (Mali). He cares for garden and animals but does not live in our house. We also have 'a sweeper. He comes every day and sweeps and mops the floors, toilets, etc. Oh, I can't leave out the family's livestock; to do so, would be an insult to my family's prestige. We have ducks, chickens, a cat, a dog, a cow, and three goats. They all reside in our backyard, under thatched bamboo coverings. Every morning about 5 o'clock, I get shattered out of bed by the sounds of the crying goats, "maa," the cat and dog "meowing and barking," the ducks and chickens "quacking and clucking," the cow "mooing," and Ami crying "ama" (mother) because Samee teases her.

My first few days living with my new family were ones of detailed human character study. They were all studying me. I had 12 little peering eyes on me at all times. I found it hard to take a shower or take care of my personal needs without having two or three children watching and giggling.

My first step was to get to know the children. How does one do it, especially when you don't speak the language? Well, you try. So I did. Every time I said something in Bengali the children would laugh at me (especially the little ones). A few children's songs translated into Bengali to the tune of my guitar, a few warm caresses, a few tickles and you're a success—children are the same the world over.

Lieutenant Colonel Rahman (52 years old) is the director of physical education at Dacca University. He, like many Americans, is up early in the morning; he says his prayers, has breakfast, and scurries off to the university where he remains until 1–2 o'clock, returns home for a quick lunch and then off he goes again to the office where he remains until 8:30–9 and then returns home for prayers, dinner, and then goes to sleep. Next day the same schedule (7 days a week). He very rarely has time to spend with his family.

Mrs. Rahman (35 years old) remains at home nearly every day and sews the children's clothing, does knitting (which she sells) supervises the cooking, gardening, and occasionally goes to a ladies' social function at the university or club. At each meal she stands over Mr. Rahman and me and distributes the food to us. (Very rarely eating with us.) She usually eats with the children.

The children are all up bright and early. They study before going to school, they go to school, come home and play, study, take dinner, and then off to bed. For the children, their lives are mainly oriented around school. Through school they learn, meet friends, play ball, go to scouts, etc. Once they get home, it's study and remain home.

Nehar, the oldest girl, must be accompanied by her mother when she goes out (which is very rarely). She travels alone on transit to and from school. Her world, along with many other Pakistani girls, is the house, the road to and from school (and all she can peek at on the way), the family trips back to their original village once a year, what she reads in the newspapers and hears on the radio. She will be able to see the other aspects of her environment and the world when she goes to college. If her parents do not marry her off before (in that case she'll never be free).

So you see, my friends, just because the middle-class women in the Pakistani society don't have to cook, do marketing, wash floors, iron, etc. There are other drawbacks. You women in our country (United States of America) should be glad that we men allow you to do the cooking, washing, etc., and for doing it, we reward you with your freedom.

Many of the newly educated people are breaking away from the old traditions of Purdah (seclusion of the women). I even see university students (females) riding bicycles, talking and walking with men, etc. In many circles these young individuals are scorned at and are considered loose and immoral. The trend is toward more freedom for the women.

Last evening we were invited by one of the Peace Corps volunteer's host family for tea. I brought my guitar and the other volunteers brought their voices. After singing some songs, having some tea and sweets, and getting to know each other, one of the corpsmen made a suggestion to teach the Pakistanis an American square dance. There were about 8 women and 15 men present. After about 5 minutes of giggling and rejection of the idea we finally convinced four Pakistani girls (2 college girls and 2 wives) to give it a try. Mike called the "Virginia Reel," I played the music, they had a ball. Hence, they learned something new and a social barrier was torn down. (I have pictures of them square dancing in their saris.)

I will leave my Pakistani family on Monday. I am sure that I will miss the family's noises, peering eyes, little giggles, smiles, crying and delicious Pakistani cooked food along with the warm hospitality and friendship.

I officially start my work at the university on Monday. I've been coaching the athletes in track and field for about a week already. I'll be working with Marion Sidor from Chicago and Sherwood Tiernan from California. We have quite a team and we're all very anxious to get started.

I'll be sending photos home to my folks along with more up-to-date letters, so if you are interested just give them a call and they will be happy to fill you in on further details, and have you over to see the photos.

I would like to hear from you so please drop me a line when your jobs and pursuits permit. Happy holidays.

Regards to all,

BILL REDER.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the supporters of the bill are agreeable, I now am willing to yield for the purpose of having the bill passed.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of my friend from New York.

Before the debate is closed, I wish to join the Senator and to express my own gratification that the first year of the Peace Corps has been such a successful one, which has convinced the Congress of the soundness of the operation. I am especially happy about this, since I was one of the original Republican sponsors of the Peace Corps bill introduced more than a year ago.

I congratulate Mr. Shriver upon the splendid operation of his organization, and I express my renewed confidence in his management of the Peace Corps. I feel that this is a very sound approach to our problems with the lesser developed countries, perhaps a more sound approach than a lot of our economic programs. Certainly it is far less expensive.

The thing which appeals to me about the Peace Corps is the person-to-person contact at the street level, at the home level, and the fact that young Americans are willing to make sacrifices to go to various countries in a high spirit of devotion to our country and devotion to their work. This is one of the most inspiring things I have seen during my service in the Senate.

I join the Senator from New York and other Senators in pledging my continued support to the efforts of the Peace Corps. I think we have every reason to be quite proud of this budding organization and of its accomplishments in the first year of its existence.

I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for the purpose of having the bill read the third time, and passed, and that I may thereafter regain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also that I may yield for the proceedings incident to the consideration of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to reduce the monetary figure to $43,750,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, it is proposed to strike the numeral "$63,750,000" and to insert "$43,750,000".

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I can present my cause in 5 minutes. I think I have already developed my thoughts in the questions which I put to the Senator from Alabama.

In my opinion this program is still in its experimental stage. It began last year, and up to the present time 1,057 volunteers have been recruited.

Under a program involving $43,750,000 the number of 1,057 could be expanded to approximately 7,000.

I am greatly disturbed by the plan which was underway to send 1,000 workers to the Philippines. As I pointed out a moment ago, the request of the Philippines for 2,000 has been interpreted to be evidence of the great success of this program. To me that request is only normal. If we are willing to send 1,000 members of our society to the Philippines to act as teachers and advisers, at a cost to us of $9,000 apiece, it is fairly evident that the Philippines and other nations of the world will, on that gratuitous basis, be willing to accept whatever number we wish to send to them.

One full enlistment contemplates 2 years of service. Until now not a single one of the enlistees has served more than 7 months in a foreign country. I cannot interpret that to be an adequate trial from which to determine that the program is a success. I submit, since the term of enlistment is 2 years, that to determine whether the program is a success would require more than the 10 months of time which we have had to study it, and that the term should be at least 2 years.

Another reason why I urge caution is that while the program in its second year is estimated to cost $63 million, if the example set in the Philippines were to be followed in the other nations of the world, the ultimate cost could be of an amount far greater than we anticipate and far greater than I believe we can justify.

I wish to summarize.

First, the experiment has not been completed.

Second, if the Philippine example is one which is to be followed proportionately in Togo, in Senegal, in the Congo, in Laos, in Vietnam, in Cambodia, in Thailand, and in Indonesia, how many teachers will we have around the world? We cannot supply enough teachers for our own communities.

Third, the cost on that basis would be staggering.

For these reasons I suggest that in the second year of operation the amount of $45,780,000 would be adequate.

Mr. President, I wish to modify my amendment to make it provide for $45,780,000. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With this amount of money, the Peace Corps would be able to hire 6,970 volunteers instead of 9,970, as is contemplated in the bill.

That is my case, and I submit it to the Senate for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 10700) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2935 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Peace Corps bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADMINISTRATION TAX BILL HITS LITTLE PEOPLE AND FAVORS LOBBYISTS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Revenue Act of 1962 as passed by the House of Representatives contains certain provisions that will intimately affect the lives of millions of American taxpayers. Its provisions should be carefully scrutinized before we add additional burdens on taxpayers and institutions.

The bill requires that dividends and interest be withheld at the source at the rate of 20 percent. While the withholding by corporations of 20 percent of dividends does not disturb me greatly, I am gravely concerned regarding the withholding on savings accounts—particularly small accounts.

Millions of Americans including hundreds of thousands of children have small savings accounts in banks and savings and loan companies. For these banking institutions to withhold 20 percent of the total interest on their accounts is indeed a serious matter.

It is a fact that the bill provides that those who have no income tax liability will be able to file an exemption certificate to avoid the withholding tax and that those with minimal liability—less than 20 percent—will be entitled to quarterly refunds. The bill contains no requirement that the payer—the bank or savings and loan company—notify the depositor of the amount withheld.

Many people will be unaware that a deduction has been made. For others it will mean additional forms, paperwork, and red tape. Should these good thrifty people be caused great inconvenience and financial loss which they can ill afford? I assert financial loss because some of them undoubtedly would fail to file the necessary exemption certificates or for a refund out of ignorance of the law. They may not know the procedure to follow, would be hesitant to make a claim against the Government, and might not know how to go about making such a claim. Why burden men and women in ordinary circumstances with the necessity of consulting accountants and perhaps lawyers and later paying fees from the amount received as a refund?

The bill also provides that individuals under 18 may file an exemption certificate regardless of their income tax liability. The same inconveniences and objections arise here—in fact, more. Are we to expect 12- to 16-year-olds who are perhaps saving money for college to be aware of the intricacies of our income tax laws? Many of these young people are the children of working men and women who are too busy earning a living to be aware of exemption clauses in internal revenue statutes.

Also, what is to prevent a person from falsifying his age in order to exempt his account from the withholding tax? Are bank and corporate officials to be compelled to ascertain accurately all who are under 18 years of age?

If it is a fact that depositors in savings and loan associations and banks and stockholders in corporations do fleece our Government of $600 million a year by not reporting income from savings and securities, then why not set some examples to discourage this practice? Officials of the Internal Revenue Service and the Department of Justice should institute prosecution of some of these offenders in different parts of the country. When the penalty of the law has been meted out by our U.S. judges to those guilty of tax evasion, others inclined to evade their obligations will soon see the dangers inherent in making fraudulent tax returns. Why not try this procedure for the next 6 months rather than further inconveniencing millions of American taxpayers?

Furthermore, with automation and calculating machines doing the work of Internal Revenue Service agents, within the next 2 or 3 years it will be much more difficult for any fraudulent-minded person to fleece the Government by not reporting interest or dividends.

Regarding withholding 20 percent as a tax on dividends, it is likely that in most instances such tax is in reality owing to our Government and withholding the 20 percent of every dividend would work much like withholding the tax on wages.

My view is that such a tax would be a proper and enforceable one. It is more than likely that those who invest in securities are aware of their tax liabilities and the legal means of avoiding them. Little hardship would accrue to taxpayers from this provision of the bill.

I am fearful that withholding tax on interest will be oppressive as well as impractical, and in some instances will cause misery and, above all, distrust of our Government. Such a tax on interest might bear down needlessly on people with small incomes. They may feel that our Government assumes them to be dishonest unless proven honest.

Certainly, many thousands of taxpayers, including women, widows, and schoolchildren, would be entitled to refunds of the entire amount withheld, yet they would be forced to go through the additional paperwork, and in some instances perhaps employ acountants or attorneys to assist in filing applications for a refund. Then persons who desire or in fact need the interest at the time payable, would sustain the inconvenience of waiting for weeks, or months, until the Government made the refund.

Let us accelerate a system of spot checking of thousands and thousands more tax returns for the next couple years until electronic computer centers are geared to check everybody's tax return.

Personally, I would not find it so objectionable were savings institutions and corporations required to report to our Government the names and addresses of all persons earning $100 or more a year in interest or dividends, instead of the present minimum.

Let us stop, look, and listen before we pass a legislative proposal imposing cumbersome, burdensome, and expensive procedures on savings institutions and corporations.

I do not question the fact that additional revenue is needed for the investment tax credits provided for industry in the bill. However, why pick on the little fellow?

Too little recognition has been given to the billions of dollars of additional revenue which can be obtained by closing a series of tax-escape mechanisms and preferential treatment provisions in our present tax structure. These loopholes are those that give favored treatment to certain sectors of our economy.

If the staff of the enforcement section of the Internal Revenue Service were increased, a substantial increase in revenue could be expected. One recent estimate is that close auditing of business and professional returns might yield as much as $2.7 billion.

If we repeal the special tax credit and exclusion for dividend income, we would stand to gain some $400 million. At the same time, we would establish more equitable treatment between two classes of taxpayers. A wage earner netting $5,000 a year must pay at least $60 more income tax than a person receiving dividends of the same amount. There is no evidence to show that this special treatment afforded investors is in any way necessary for the continued growth of our economy.

If the 27½-percent depletion allowance for gas and oil producers were reduced to 15 percent, there would be almost half a billion dollars in increased revenue. It is an expensive anachronism for taxpayers to retain the percentage allowances established in 1926 in an entirely different economic atmosphere.

These are just a few of the numerous loopholes that would provide for more than the additional revenue required by this bill. It is my feeling that it would be better and wiser to eliminate them before putting an additional load of inconvenience and red tape on the shoulders of the average American taxpayer. The revenue lost by failure to report interest on savings can be obtained far less painfully by making examples of flagrant wrongdoers in this regard, by closer scrutiny of returns, by the new automatic processing machines, and by the reporting of interest over a certain amount by lending institutions to the Internal Revenue Service.

Also included in this bill as it passed in the other body was a little-noticed provision permitting income tax deductions by corporations and associations for most lobbying expenses.

This provision, permitting expenditures for lobbying to be deducted from income tax payments, is not a part of our President's tax reform program. I am wondering if this is a "sleeper" provision inserted somewhat surreptitiously, notwithstanding a contrary ruling of the Internal Revenue Service and decisions of our Supreme Court that lobbying expenses could not be credited as deductible.

This sleeper was inserted in the bill as it was passed in the House. I hope that in the Committeee on Finance or when this matter is debated on the floor of the Senate, this provision, which is not in the public interest, will be eliminated.

The fact is that here is an example of giving certain taxpayers a privilege, or, in other words, creating a loophole where none existed heretofore.

It is reported that officials of the Treasury Department are opposed to this provision in the revenue bill which would permit corporations an income tax deduction for lobbying expenses which they incur in trying to persuade Members of Congress to vote their wishes.

It is very unfortunate that this provision is now in the bill as it was passed in the other body. I will not vote for any such provision. Why should we enact such a provision into law in the absence of public hearings proving justification? I gravely doubt that even a long series of public hearings could justify the giving of income tax credit for lobbying expenses incurred by corporations and other special interest organizations.

Finally, Mr. President, I express the hope and voice the belief that the Committee on Finance of the Senate will retain the many good features of the tax bill as passed in the other body and will reject or amend those features which I feel lack justification and should not be enacted into law.

Money is a very personal matter. We should stop, look, and listen before we withhold taxes on the savings of the men, women, and children of this country, and require financial institutions to withhold such money, which may, in the final analysis, be found not to be due the Government.

There are millions of men, women and children who have deposits in savings and loan institutions and in banks. To be sure, many of them are small depositors. However, many of these people fled, or their mothers and fathers fled, from the old country to escape the tyranny of governments which constantly pried into their personal affairs and taxed them unjustly.

It is my fear that if we now withhold 20 percent in withholding taxes on these little savings and loan accounts, many of these people may distrust this Government and think that perhaps a tax on the principal of their money will be the next step. As a result they might even withdraw their money from these savings institutions and place it under the mattress at home. We should encourage and not discourage John Q. Citizen in saving and depositing his money in banking institutions.

Mr. President, tax reform is necessary. However, tax loopholes affording special privileges to some taxpayers should be removed before we further inconvenience and burden the average American taxpayer.

IRAN IN 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I had the privilege of placing in the daily Record an article describing the progress of land reform in Iran—page A2371. Today we have heard from the Shah himself that land reform is only one aspect—though a vastly important aspect—of Iran's emergence as a modern nation. Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi has an enormous task before him. Like Czar Alexander II of Russia 100 years ago, the Shah realizes that a revolution from above is the only alternative to a revolution from below. Czar Alexander subsequently forgot this lesson; he was slain by a revolutionary's bomb, and nearly 40 years later Russia underwent he most cataclysmic revolution in world history. That revolution could have been prevented by timely reforms.

Every one of the Shah's many friends in this country hopes that he will never compromise with the forces of reaction. His splendid speech before the joint session of the Congress gives all of us encouragement and confidence. It was a message of progress from a friend and ally. Social change is moving too rapidly to permit temporary and insubstantial accommodations with the past. Internal transformation is by far the most important task before the Shah today. It outweighs the country's need for military assistance, despite the menace of Soviet forces across the northern border. The fact is that the Soviet Union will hardly risk open aggression as long as it believes that Iran will fall into its grasp like a ripened plum. Khrushchev said as much to Walter Lippmann 1 year ago. The Shah must prove Khrushchev wrong, and our task is to encourage and help the Shah and his government in every way. Furthermore, our own determination to see Iran as a free and independent nation reminds Mr. Khrushchev not to engage in aggression.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record an editorial in the Washington Post of April 11, entitled "Monarch From Iran," and a remarkable series of articles on present-day Iran by Mr. Alfred Friendly, managing editor of the Post. These articles underscore both the dangers and the opportunities before the Shah. They confirm what I have always believed, namely that the Shah and his courageous Prime Minister, Ali Amini, are tackling the problem of reform with good will and courage. If our two friends, the Shah and the Prime Minister, continue to work together toward their goals, they will not fail. If they become divided, or if their vision narrows and their efforts slacken, then no amount of U.S. aid can save the throne of the Pahlavis. If the powerful undercurrents of social change are not channeled constructively, the result will be, as the Shah himself has said on numerous occasions, an unmitigated disaster to the non-Communist world. We must work together. Again, I wish to commend the Shah on his splendid address and the program of reform that he and his government have undertaken. Such courageous action deserves our generous and continued assistance.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 11, 1962]

Monarch From Iran

The Shah of Iran, who arrives today for a state visit, does not fit the stereotype of the reactionary and indolent royalist. He has applied himself energetically to the problems of his country and has set an example by taking a lead in land reform. The Shah is Iran's largest landowner and has distributed to his people about 3 million acres of his private estates and roughly half of the 1¼ million acres of crown lands.

To his credit, the Shah has also put aside personal feelings in appointing as Premier a member of the dynasty that was overthrown by the Shah's father after World War I. Ali Amini has been Premier for nearly a year, and the fact that he is heartily disliked by the wealthy landlords, the pro-Communists, and the cliques in the bazaar suggests that he is earnest in his campaign of reform.

It is no secret that relations are sometimes strained between the Shah and his Premier who rules by decree. Although each needs the other, there is inescapable friction because the Shah is not content to take a passive role and because some of Amini's worst enemies are close to the palace. The remarkable circumstance is not that tension exists, but that there has been sufficient flexibility to enable the two men to work together.

The Shah and his Empress will find a cordial welcome in Washington. There are disagreements, especially on the amount of military aid to Iran. But there is also a recognition that the Shah's intentions are creditable, that he has been a stanch friend, and that he is making an effort to avoid a revolution from below by encouraging needed changes from above.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1962]

Iran's Able Premier Lacks Friends at Home

(By Alfred Friendly)

(First of a series)

Teheran.—To mismanage Iranian affairs, a smart-cracking foreign diplomat here observed recently, takes a positive act of sheer genius.

His argument was that the nation has everything in its favor: intelligent and hard-working people, decent climate for the most part and fertile land. Two of the basic curses—indeed, the very definition—of an underdeveloped country are lacking: there is no pressure on the land, no land hunger, and there is no shortage of foreign exchange, for without lifting a finger Iran gets $300 million a year from its oil alone.

There is nothing wrong with Iran, the dipomat concluded, that could not be cured by 3 years of wise government.

The diplomat was indulging in some hyperbole, for it is not so easy to move a country 85 percent illiterate from the Middle Ages to the 20th century. But it is quite true that of all the nations in the Middle East, Iran has the best chance, the best natural advantages, the most hopeful horizon.

But, equally, it subsists under the most dangerous pressure from the Soviet Union. And for the past decade or more, it has been the victim of incredibly corrupt and incompetent governments, servants of an upper class mostly dedicated to the proposition that Iran was a cow to be milked, bled, and flayed for this elite's personal enrichment.

For the last 8 months, however, Iran has enjoyed a government of a different stripe which, at least in the minds of American observers here, is the nation's best hope. It is reformist, honest, courageous, and activist (all the terms must be taken relatively, by Middle East standards), but it is flatly undemocratic, a government of men and decree, not law. And, for the moment, it is almost without friends in its own country.

A FRIGHTENING BRINK

The dreary story of how Mr. Mohammed Mossadegh brought Iran to the brink of disaster in 1953, and how his successors nearly accomplished the same result by following the agreeably self-enriching doctrine of laissez aller, need not be rehearsed here. Suffice it to say that they squandered the nation's foreign reserves, brought it within 2 weeks of bankruptcy and left unchanged the power structure of quasi-feudal landlords, crooked bazaar moguls, inefficient and bribed civil servants and a sleazy elite and palace guard for whom corruption was a way of life.

Deeply frightened by the close call, Mossadegh gave up his throne in 1953, and, subsequently indecisive, the 42-year-old Shah was propelled into action by two election fiascos in 1960 and early 1961. Supposed to be "free," on the Shah's orders, the elections were so ludicrously rigged that the results were good for nothing but a universal laugh.

Among all classes was a feeling that nothing was going well, that bribery, corruption, and embezzlement had gone too far. The Parliament was dissolved; the Shah took a deep breath and appointed as Prime Minister the Government's principal opponent, an Independent, Dr. Ali Amini.

An intense, aquiline-featured economist and diplomat, former Ambassador to the United States, prince of the blood royal (of the dynasty which the Shah's father ousted), Amini has been in power since last May.

More accurately, he has been in semipower. The constitution of 1906 is in effect suspended; it requires that a Parliament be seated within 3 months of the last one's dissolution, but there is none and there are no plans for an election. Thus, there is the question of legal sanction for Amini's actions.

More important, the Shah has withheld from Amini control of the army, the police and the all-powerful secret police (SAVAK). The nature of the Shah's relation and attitude toward Amini today constitutes the principal rumor in a country where rumor, more than oil, is the top item of its gross national product.

In one sense, the Shah has come a long way in giving his backing to Amini, supporting him on the principal measure of land reform, his Spartan economic policy and even his anticorruption drive, which, almost for the first time in Persian history, has put a score or more of the elite in jail.

The most astonishing evidence of the Shah's support came a few weeks ago when, after fierce riots among university students January 21–23, Amini threatened to arrest Gen. Teymour Bakhtiar, formerly a mighty wheel in the Government, the army, the secret police and in the ruling clique. For some time Bakhtiar had let it be known that he was available for taking power when lesser men failed, and he was reliably reported to have connived, possibly with Communist elements, in the student riots.

The Shah accepted a less severe option offered by Amini and exiled the potential man on a white horse. His action was all the more remarkable since it was common gossip in Teheran that last November the Shah was on the verge of dropping all pretense to a constitutional government and taking for himself the absolute role of an Iranian Ayub Khan.

GOOD BUILDING BLOCKS

Amini came to office with one or two good inheritances from the past. Despite corruption and folly, and thanks to its oil earnings and American aid, Iran has made astounding economic progress in recent years and has produced, through education at home and abroad, a thin but able corps of Government administrators on the technical level.

With these to go on, Amini quickly reversed the squandering of funds, pushed for a third developmental program, soundly conceived, and restored a comfortable foreign exchange situation. He drove through a plan for land reform under which many big landlords must divest themselves of their holdings to the peasants.

By his statistics, which are guesses, he has reduced corruption by 60 percent. The active agent here is fear—fear by the swindlers of finding themselves, with some of their colleagues, behind bars.

Needless to say, by this process Amini has stepped on the toes of every element of power in a land where 95 percent of the people, as the phrase has it, "do not count" and have not yet built up something that could be called public opinion.

Amini's enemies:

The landlords.

The corrupt, whose numbers not only include most members of former Parliaments, generals, and big dealers in the bazaars, but reach deep into the palace itself.

The speculators and operators who were making killings when credit was flamboyantly loose.

The politicians, rendered temporarily powerless and unemployed.

The students and young idealists, some Communist influenced but surely for the most part simply young people who believe deeply in the democratic process.

The remnants of the outlawed Tudeh (Communist) Party, for whom Amini's reforms doom hopes that the nation will explode in corruption and stagnation.

But he has one powerful friend, the U.S. Government. It sees in his reforms, his unheard-of willingness to make decisions and accept responsibility, and his stanch anti-neutralist, anti-Communist stance, Iran's best hope.

Amini needs perhaps 12 or 18 months more, at his present pace of progress, before he can risk an election. Having alienated everyone else, he must produce results to win the confidence of the common people to the point where they can become a political force in his favor. They live now in dire poverty—one of the most powerful men in the Government describes their condition as "subhuman"—and as yet have no reason for anything but deep and angry dissatisfaction with any government, Amini's included.

Here is his greatest problem. Politically unsophisticated as they may be, the people are reported to feel deeply that this is not, and never can be, their government. If the army and the police are the Shah's, how can they look at Amini's government, whatever its good intentions—or even a government they elect—as theirs? There is a deep attachment to the Shah, but there is, by most reports, a feeling that the government is his, not the people's.

For the while, Amini depends on the continuing support of the Shah. Whereas His Majesty has backed him part way, he has still to quiet the whimpers and screams of the palace cronies who come running to him by the dozen with complaints.

In a recent interview, the Shah betrayed no little unhappiness at the publicity about the anticorruption campaign. The Shah declared that Amini must produce results, and fairly soon, or Iran might just as well have new elections and a Parliament.

That is to say, he is giving Amini a run for his money and keeping himself as detached as he can in case he later wishes to throw his energetic Prime Minister to the wolves. All of which illuminates the principal complaint to be heard in Iran, from friends as well as enemies of the Government: The Shah has not yet been willing to take the crucial step, a decision to reign and not to rule.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1962]

OPPOSITION VIEWS SUPPRESSED—IRAN, UNDER RULE OF SHAH AND AMINI, FEARS NEW ELECTION WOULD BE FARCE

(By Alfred Friendly)

(Second of a series)

TEHERAN.—An American, looking at the vigorous reformist government of Iran's Prime Minister Ali Amini, cannot help but feel that his program for governmental reorganization, economic stability and progress, land reform and anticorruption is on the right track.

Correctly executed, these are some of the measures that will make Iran a modern nation, strong and stable.

But to endorse Amini's government is to endorse a thoroughly nondemocratic regime in a country which once had some democratic aspects.

Contrary to the principle of constitutional monarchy, the Shah of Iran rules, as well as reigns, in military, police, and political police affairs.

His Prime Minister governs in the absence of a Parliament—an illegal absence under Iran's Constitution—by decree of a Council of Ministers. And the country as a whole operates under a system of fierce suppression of civil rights and civil liberties.

Repression may be less severe, and there may be more "democracy" in Iran than in any other country in the Middle East save Lebanon. Nevertheless, a Government censor sits in every newspaper office, papers are suppressed, speeches of opposition groups are not published, most demonstrations are forbidden, and the secret police (Savak) effectively prevents the formation of an operating opposition party.

It is, therefore, a simple matter for that opposition—it takes the form of a movement more than a political party and carries the name of National Front—to make an eloquent and irrefutable case as a matter of theory. Its practical case is just as good on the point that the Shah's and Amini's government, however well intentioned, is not a government of the people and does not command popular support.

MANY POLITICAL VIEWS

An umbrella covering many political views, the National Front has as its figurehead former Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadegh, now inactive and, in actual fact, not considered a real candidate or leader. The dominant conservative wing of the National Front quarrels with many of Amini's programs on important if technical points and is probably neutralist. The leftwing is avowed neutralist, and insists that the rightwing feels the same way but won't admit it.

The National Front is sharply critical of Iran's too-close links with the United States, and strongly opposes the Shah's program of army expansion. But its chief plank is the one of political liberty and constitutionality.

The National Front's rightwing insists that it is as well aware of Iran's danger from the Soviet Union as anyone else, Amini and the American Embassy included, and is not so mad or traitorous as to sabotage its country and its security. The leaders assert that they refuse under any circumstances to cooperate or deal with the remnants of the outlawed Tudeh (Communist) Party.

But the Shah's government insists that the National Front is more heavily infiltrated by the Communists than it dreams, and that if it ever came into power the young hotheads would throw out the older and more conservative leaders in a matter of months.

The National Front is indeed a movement of the youth. It has the support of the politically minded students, here and abroad, of many young technicians and city dwellers. Leaving aside the many corrupt members of the upper class, Muslim priesthood and merchant class, the National Front thus has a lock on most of the remainder of politically conscious Iranian elements. Food for its strength is resentment at the absence of democracy and civil rights.

STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE

The National Front's most recent bid to overthrow Amini came on January 21 when its student groups in the University of Teheran instigated a demonstration.

Police and police cadets tried to keep the young people from leaving the campus. After being bricked and spat upon for a time, they summoned reinforcements of army paratroops. These took their share of spittle and stones for a while and then went berserk. They pushed onto the university grounds, chased the students, broke doors, and beat the youngsters with ghastly brutality.

Curiously, the students could not at once prove that anyone was killed, though some have been or may have died later. Lacking this traditional reason for resigning—governments in Iran have always resigned when a student is killed in a riot—Amini took to the radio and declared that he would keep order.

Political jackals, waiting for a sign of weakness, found none. The markets, expected to join in the furor, kept quiet. Amini won.

He promptly jailed most of the executive committee of the National Front, and some other of his enemies in the bazaar besides.

The university remains closed and will not reopen until Amini puts through new regulations replacing its present administrative anarchy with rules that fix responsibility for discipline and performance on students, faculty and the university administration.

REASON FOR NO ELECTIONS

Meanwhile, the heat is on in Teheran. To get in touch with National Front leaders, those not in jail, entails acting like a character from an Eric Ambler novel. Even the conservative and respected Allahyar Saleh, Mossadegh's former Ambassador to the United States and nominal leader of the movement, does not take the risk of seeing an American newsman.

The Government's rationale for refusing to call an election that would create a new Parliament is as follows:

The last two elections, in 1960 and 1961, were farces, and a third one now, which would be equally farcical, cannot be risked. There can be no such thing as a free election in Iran because the illiterate, unsophisticated people, mostly rural, cannot escape being controlled by unrepresentative and undemocratic bosses—the feudal landlords who truck the peasants to the polls and have all the money to win an election anyhow; the mullahs, Muslim priests of a reactionary stripe; the Communists, supporting the National Front covertly, speaking coexistence, sweetness and light.

The resulting Majlis, the lower house of Parliament, would comprise, Amini's people feel, about 40 obstructionist National Fronters, and the remaining 160 seats would be held by the old landlords and bribetakers. The reforms, especially the land and anticorruption reforms, on which Iran's future is absolutely contingent, would be blocked again, as in the near-disastrous past.

The alternative is to have an election which the Government rigs.

The Shah-Amini-Savak argument, thus, is that to talk of free elections as a means to obtain democratic government is to play fast and loose with words, to perform a phony democratic pantomime to obtain a reactionary, crooked, obstructive and utterly nonrepresentative legislature.

Needless to say, the National Front denies each point in this argument.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1962]

Shah Would Like To Bolster Army—Iran and United States Differ on Defense Needs

(By Alfred Friendly)

(Third of a series)

Teheran.—Across Iran's border radio stations in the Soviet Union bombard the nation with 70 hours of broadcasting a week, denouncing the Shah's government and proposing its overthrow. Inside the border, Communist elements talk in honeyed words, preaching coexistence, proposing a paradise of aid and support and commerce, if only Iran would gain democratic rule, withdraw from CENTO, and declare independence from its American military alliance.

The logic is beguiling, the appeal to national pride is powerful, the prospects of increased trade and a surcease of tension are inviting.

WEAKEST LINK

Under these appeals, and harassed not only from the north but by rumblings from the eastern neighbor, Afghanistan, and the western neighbor, Iraq, and a further western one, Egypt, Iran stands as the weakest and most worried link in the northern tier of nations.

To defend against these threats, the Shah of Iran proposes an expansion and modernization of his already large, 200,000-man military force.

The United States, agreeing with his objective, does not, however, see eye to eye with him on method. It feels that already a disproportionate share of Iran's income goes into his army.

It feels that the military force is already strong enough to cope with any incursions that might come from east or west, and can never be strong enough to deal, singlehandedly, with those that could come from the north.

The Shah, a persuasive advocate, sees it otherwise. In a recent interview, he declared:

"What we have makes no sense. It is either too much or too little; too much for the needs of internal security, too little to cope with foreign dangers."

His appeal is not for the impossible goal of a force able to stop an all-out Russian attack. Rather, he wants sufficient strength to stop a limited border incursion before Soviet forces get well into his land.

UP TO UNITED STATES

He concedes that an all-out Soviet attack would be considered by the United States the equivalent of an all-out attack in Europe; he grants that in such an event Iran's only defense is the long arm of American nuclear weapons.

But the Soviet Union, he feels, is not likely to provoke world war III over Iran. Rather, any attack will be less clearly defined, much more limited. And, he fears, by the time the case is taken to the United Nations, a cease-fire agreed to, and an investigation begun, the Soviets will have a fixed position well inside his country, a line from which to make a second, and then a third incursion.

What is needed is a force to stop the first limited attack long enough for American or U.N. forces to be brought to bear.

Furthermore, says the Shah, the Soviet Union is supplying arms to Iraq and Afghanistan, better and more modern than those so far given to Iran by the United States.

His fear is that one or the other may end up as Soviet puppets and launch an attack at Moscow's behest. Again, Iran must have the strength to stop the attack long enough for the United States to determine whether the aggression is indeed a Soviet-backed move, and act accordingly.

CONCERN GROWING

A final gnawing concern is the future of Egypt. Having failed to effect pan-Arabism peacefully, losing Syria, and probably doomed to failure in the present plan for socializing the land, the Shah asks whether Nasser will turn in a few years as a last resort to military adventures, backed by Russian arms.

Bitter at criticism that he likes nothing better than to watch a military parade, the Shah says he is not such a young fool as that. But he is concerned about the morale of his own military forces. His officers know that the Soviet Union is supplying the uneasy neighbors on their flanks with planes vastly superior in performances to those Iran possesses.

Whether the United States will see it his way, and foot the added bill, is at this writing undecided.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1962]

Village Landlords a Major Problem in Iran

(By Alfred Friendly)

(Fourth of a series)

Teheran.—The presence of Americans in a mud-walled village south of Teheran was a matter of some comment, and in a few minutes the proprietor turned up to see what was going on. We asked him if he did, indeed, own the village.

His reply was that it belonged to Allah, not to him.

But as Allah's steward, pro tem, he collects three-fifths of what the 40 families in the little enclave produce. For this he supplies land, seed, a tractor, credit, a fair water supply (two artesian wells), a communal bath house, stables, a few animals, and the dwellings, mostly two-room, dirt-floor, adobe cubicles.

LANDLORD SHARES VARY

His village may be taken as typical of the 50,000 similar settlements in which three-fourths of Iran's 20 million people live. Conditions may vary—the landlord's share may be as high as four-fifths or as low as one-fifth, and in places affected by Government or American developmental projects the living circumstances can be considerably improved.

But the village, the landlord and the peasant, whose income may run from $150 to $300 a year, constitute one of Iran's greatest problems: the persistence of quasi-feudalism in the 20th century. Almost all elements in the nation agree it must be abolished.

Even the big landowners—and the big ones own scores or even hundreds of villages (the term includes the surrounding land appertaining to the settlement)—profess to concur with the principle of land reform. Some of them may even be sincere. But all of them shout, as an immediate second sentence, violent objections to the "method," which is to say that they will do their utmost to block actual progress.

Since the landowners are at the heart of Iran's power structure, their opposition is formidable indeed. The Shah and his Prime Minister, Dr. Ali Amini, are pushing the program, probably by unconstitutional methods, in the absence of a law ratified by Parliament. Parliament, at the moment, does not exist, and there are no plans for forming one. The major reason is that if one were elected, the landowners could, as they have done before, rig it to the point where their resulting majority would effectively stop the program.

The Shah himself is turning over to the peasants a major portion of his lands. But his government does not have the money in sight to pay other landowners for anything like a nationwide program of land distribution.

There are still other problems:

For hundreds of years the farmers have tilled their lands as the landlords instructed them. Put on their own, there is a question of whether they can handle their resulting little farms in an efficient way.

Under Muslim inheritance traditions, the little farms would be fragmented still further in the future among the farmers' sons and grandsons. Unless some preventive steps are taken, the tenants could end up with plots the size of postage stamps.

The program is planned as a gradual one, with a pilot project soon to begin near Marageh, in Azerbaijan in the north. But there can be little doubt that once it begins there, the demands of the rest of the peasants for like treatment will spread the length of the land. The political pressures could easily get out of hand and what ensued could be violent indeed.

Similarly, the law forsees, even ultimately, the distribution of only a minority of the villages. "Small landowners," holding only one village, would be exempted. If one village, now held by a big landowner, goes to the farmers, will the peasants in the next village, held by a small owner, be content to remain as sharecroppers?

The problems are enormous, the difficulties staggering. But the overwhelming consensus is clear: failure to effect land reform would have even worse consequences. On this point, the Shah, his government, and—as to principle—even the opposition parties are agreed, something that in Iran is as unique as it is hopeful.

Jailed Expert Adds to Iran's Embarrassment

(By Alfred Friendly)

(Fifth of a series)

Teheran.—In a capital where the favorite form of political athletics is entitled "Embarrass the Government," the Government itself has recently won the championship cup.

Its master stroke in embarrassing itself was accomplished last November when the Minister of Justice arrested A. H. Ebtehaj, Iran's top economist and, in a country where the category is small, a notorious nongrafter.

Despite an abundance of legal language, the charges against Ebtehaj remain close to unintelligible.

As near as one can make out, they seem to say that when he was chief of Iran's all-important plan organization, in charge of the massive American-aided economic development program for the country, he acted ultra vires, in disregard of regulations, and too handsomely rewarded foreign—mostly American—technical consultants and project operators.

To that extent, the embarrassment also runs to Iran's great friend, the United States. For the alleged beneficiaries of the largesse complained of are David E. Lilienthal and Gordon R. Clapp, both past Chairmen of the Tennessee Valley Authority and now proprietors of a consultative organization that guides one of Iran's most massive—and superbly operated—development projects.

What is unique in Iran is the utterly sensational fact that in neither the formal charges nor the universal gossip are there the slightest suggestions that Ebtehaj was in any way corrupt or committed any peculations himself.

This is foursquare with his reputation. Highly esteemed by Americans, he plays in their eyes the role of a Brutus: in economic affairs, the noblest Persian of them all.

He still languishes in the Teheran jail, deviled in small ways—he needs an operation for hernia and is denied the facilities of anything but the inadequate police hospital—but able to conduct a vigorous foreign correspondence.

PLIGHT REVEALED JANUARY 4

His plight was first revealed abroad by an article in the Washington Post of January 4.

His cause was promptly taken up, to the consternation and unhappiness of the Iranian Government, elsewhere in the United States.

Obviously, any lessening of American confidence in Iran, especially in its handling of economic affairs, could have the most disastrous consequences for it, and in this connection Ebtehaj was the worst possible choice for Iran to pick on.

The question thus arises, why then was Ebtehaj arrested? There is still no clear answer.

The affair began last April when a less than lovable politician named Ahmad Aramesh attacked Ebtehaj in Parliament, charging that he had made a failure of his planning job (from which Ebtehaj had long since resigned) and adding the embroidery about lavish payments to foreign consultants, violating regulations, etc.

Ebtehaj made vigorous denial, but the argument continued until the arrest on November 11.

Ebtehaj himself believes his arrest was due to a speech made some months before in San Francisco in which he proposed that future aid to Iran come not directly from the United States, but via an international organization. His implicit criticism of his own country was vigorous.

Another purported explanation is that the Shah himself was finally angered beyond bounds by Ebtehaj's public, strident, and continual criticisms of Iran and its sovereign. This may not be the whole story, but the fact remains that the Shah has not ordered Ebtehaj's release or put pressure on the Minister of Justice to effect it—something he could easily do.

The most far-fetched rumor of all is that Prime Minister Ali Amini himself ordered the arrest, presumably to get rid of a potential rival for power. But in an interview, Amini told how he tried, too late, to stop the arrest. And he has repeatedly stated in public that he believes Ebtehaj to be honest and guiltless; and by every account Amini is an honorable man.

Moreover, it is he who is caught deepest in the trap: If Ebtehaj is freed, Amini's critics can cry favoritism; if he is convicted, Amini can be charged with sanctioning a gross miscarriage of justice against one of the few top Iranians with a reputation for incorruptibility, while the known swindlers, by the hundreds, run loose.

SUSPECT EXPLANATION

The most plausible explanation is the simplest one. Running down Aramesh's charges, eager beavers in the Ministry of Justice, pursuing the Prime Minister's energetic anticorruption campaign, saw a chance to get a man who, by his constant criticism of Iranians and constant extolling of foreign economists, managers, and technicians, had not endeared himself to a naturally nation-proud people.

Although Ebtehaj insists that he can disprove every charge against him, it is perfectly possible that as a driving, energetic, no-nonsense, get-things-done administrator he shortcut some of the innumerable and impossible regulations devised by Iran's officious bureaucracy. Hence, the mahouts on the tiger hunt may have stabbed their own elephant on the ground that he once kicked the boards in his stall.

No date is set for a trial. The Minister of Justice refuses to make public two long documents Ebtehaj has prepared, which, he claims, answer in specific detail every charge made against him.

And the embarrassment continues.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9751) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 6676. An act to designate the Kettle Creek Dam on Kettle Creek, Pa., as the Alvin R. Bush Dam; and

H.R. 10043. An act to amend Public Law 86-272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to announce to the Senate what I plan to do in the next hour or so. I have a few requests to make, which will take not more than 10 minutes. Then I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. Following the quorum call I shall open a discussion of the policy of the United States in respect of the Syrian-Israel dispute, which resulted in a resolution of the Security Council. I understand several Members of the Senate wish to participate in the debate.

THE RISE IN STEEL PRICES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the President's comments on the rise in steel prices reflected an antibusiness attitude which is, to say the least, disturbing. His reaction to the steel price increase is inconsistent with his attitude toward wage increases.

The administration helped negotiate steelworkers fringe benefit increases of 10 to 11 cents an hour.

I should like to cite some figures on industry costs.

In 1958 the steel industry's employment costs per hour were $3.51. In January of 1962 they were $4.10. In July of this year they will be $4.20.

The increase in labor costs per hour since 1958 is 70 cents per hour. At 16 man-hours per ton of steel—that is what it takes to produce a ton of steel—the 70-cent wage hike increases production costs by $11.20 a ton.

The President's attack on the basis of increased steel costs to the consumer does not square with his demonstrated attitude toward Government costs to the consumer.

The record high budget of $92½ billion is one example. Other examples are his request for across-the-board wage increases for Government employees, which would result in the American consumer of Government services having to pay a higher price of approximately $350 million in fiscal 1963.

Furthermore, the President's attitude toward the successful demand of New York City's electrical workers for a 25-hour week and higher take-home pay does not seem to me to square with what he said about the steel industry. I thought he made some mild comments about that incident, but nothing as strong as what he said in connection with the steel industry.

If the 1,160,000 steel industry stockholders have shown, as President Kennedy said, "ruthless disregard of their public responsibilities," what about the 9,000 electrical workers and, for that matter, their employers, too?

I believe it was folly for the administration to negotiate the steelworkers fringe benefit increase, or any other wage increases, and then to announce that the increase would not be reflected in consumer costs.

Much was made of the fact that the recent contract settlement between steel and labor was a noninflationary settlement. Merely because the workingman did not get the increase in actual wages does not mean the settlement is noninflationary. It results in increased labor costs to the steel industry, and therefore, of necessity, is inflationary.

The President's remarks fail to take into consideration that in recent years there have been longer vacations, higher workmen's compensation costs, higher social security costs, and higher pension costs. All these increases figure in the cost of labor. They are a part of the statistical aspect of per-man productivity.

In his trade message, the President said he should be given the power to negotiate tariff reductions, to open the doors to greater trade between the United States and other countries, and in particular with the European Common Market, so that the discipline of the world market would operate to keep the wage-price spiral down in this country. The discipline of the world market cannot operate to keep the wage-price spiral down in this country if the Government does not cooperate.

I am convinced that the United States can compete on a favorable basis with any nation in the world if only we can get our production costs within shooting distance of competitive levels. We have the technology, the productive facilities, and the sales technique to compete with any nation.

Let us not criticize one segment of the economy for a price rise which was necessitated by increased production costs, when actually the blame should lie elsewhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent article entitled "Kennedy Rebuke to Steel Called His Worst Blunder," written by David Lawrence, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of today, April 12, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY REBUKE TO STEEL CALLED HIS WORST BLUNDER

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy has made perhaps the worst blunder of his political career. He has delivered a severe blow against the sound system of private capitalism in America.

The statement the President made to his press conference yesterday not only impugned the integrity and patriotism of the various executives who manage one of America's biggest industries—steel but, in effect, told other businessmen that, when their costs go up due to labor union extortions, they must absorb such costs without increasing their prices. If they attempt to follow the simple rules of sound economics, they are to be pilloried as in pursuit of private power and profit.

This is the most discouraging news event in many years—especially for investors. For it tells the businessmen of America that their fears of the Kennedy administration as a demagogic champion of labor unions and as the foe of business have been justified.

Without waiting to examine all the facts on both sides, Mr. Kennedy spoke impulsively and gave the impression that he had never read the statement issued on Tuesday night by the United States Steel Corp. in announcing its reasons for an increase in prices. Yet he called its action in raising prices "a wholly unjustifiable and irresponsible defiance of the public interest." With bitterness unbecoming a President, he threatened reprisals through the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice. No such words of intimidation have come from any American President in the last 50 years. The threat to use punitive powers will prove to be a psychological discouragement to industry leaders throughout the country.

IMPACT ON PRICES

Mr. Kennedy didn't reveal any knowledge either of just how prices are developed competitively in industry. He talked as if he didn't know that the largest company usually takes the lead and the others follow. This is the result of the antitrust laws of the day. He spoke of the suddenness of the decision of many companies—as if for several months now everyone in the industry hasn't known the approximate increase in labor costs to be expected from the labor-union settlement and the impact it would have upon prices.

Those present at the President's press conference did not interrogate him on the points made by the United States Steel Corp. in its statement. The so-called equal time privilege on television wasn't in operation at all. How, therefore, will the American people ever get both sides of the argument and be enabled to make up their minds whether the polemic statement issued by the President really rebutted the basic reasons given by the steel companies for their action?

It's only fair to present the other side. Businessmen will understand it, even if the President himself doesn't. Here is what the United States Steel Corp. said in part:

"Since our last overall adjustment in the summer of 1958, the level of steel prices has not been increased but, if anything, has declined somewhat. This situation, in the face of steadily mounting production costs which have included four increases in steelworker wages and benefits prior to the end of last year, has been due to the competitive pressures from domestic producers and from imports of foreign-made steel as well as from other materials which are used as substitutes for steel."

EFFECT OF PROFIT SQUEEZE

"The severity of these competitive pressures has not diminished; and to their influence may be attributed the fact that the partial catchup adjustment announced today is substantially less than the cost increases which have already occurred since 1958, without taking into consideration the additional costs which will result from the new labor agreements which become effective next July 1."

The steel corporation emphasized that its last annual report had shown clearly the effect of the profit squeeze, and then added:

"In the 3 years since the end of 1958, United States Steel has spent $1.185 billion for modernization and replacement of facilities and for the development of new sources of raw materials. Internally, there were only two sources from which this money could come: depreciation and reinvested profit.

"Depreciation in these years amounted to $610 million; and reinvested profit, $187 million, or, together, only about two-thirds of the total sum required.

"So after using all the income available from operations, we had to make up the difference of $388 million out of borrowing from the public. In fact, during the period 1958–61, we have actually borrowed a total of $800 million to provide for present and future needs. And this must be repaid out of profits that have not yet been earned, and will not be earned for some years to come.

REGARDED AS SIN

"During these 3 years, moreover, United States Steel's profits have dropped to the lowest levels since 1952, while reinvested profit—which is all the profit there is to be plowed back in the business after payment of dividends—has declined from $115 million in 1958 to less than $3 million last year."

Small wonder that steel shares in the stock market have been dropping in value recently, particularly since it became apparent that the new labor settlement would cost the industry an estimated $100 million a year.

Only a modest rise in prices is coming. It means 65 cents extra in the cost of a washing machine, or 51 cents more on a refrigerator, or an extra $8 to $10 on an automobile that is priced at $1,500 or more.

Yet this, under the Kennedy administration, is regarded as a sin.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have listened with attention to the remarks of the junior Senator from Texas. I take sharp exception to his comment that the action and the words of the President of the United States in commenting upon the price rise in the steel industry were antibusiness. Much to the contrary, this administration in its tax measure, which is now before Congress, has proposed tax adjustments which are probusiness, and which are subject to criticism by some in this country who feel that the tax measure is far too generous to business.

I think the best answer to the argument made by the junior Senator from Texas is in a New York Times editorial published this morning. The New York Times is not known to be antibusiness. It is one of the great newspapers of the country, and I believe its editorial comment is worthy of our serious consideration. I quote from one paragraph:

> The United Steel Workers of America agreed to a package settlement of 10 cents an hour—

I digress to point out that that is about the amount which the Senator from Texas called to our attention. I continue to read:

> well within the guidelines laid down by the administration for an agreement that could be met out of rising productivity, without cutting profits or raising prices.

It is a fact that the productivity increase, due to improved capital tools and improved productivity of the workers, more than compensates for the 10 cents an hour in fringe benefits provided in the agreement signed last Friday. Not a single responsible and objective economist has disputed this point. In other words, the increases which were provided under the agreement were to be made out of increased productivity; and the profit statements of the steel companies themselves show this to be the case. The unit costs of steel, so far as labor costs are concerned, have been going down rather than up. The steel companies are showing profit statements which indicate a generous return on investment, production, and sales.

The President of the United States had a right to be outraged yesterday when, after having come to an agreement with the workers, but without any notice to the Government, and without any notice to the workers, the United States Steel Corp. raised the price of steel $6 a ton. I remind Senators that the president of Bethlehem Steel Corp. said only the day before that a price increase was not warranted; that a price increase would be injurious to America's position in international markets. Yet within 24 hours a price increase of $6 a ton took place; and in another 12 hours, Bethlehem Steel Corp. raised its price $6 a ton.

The President of the United States has been a model of restraint. I only hope the President will again let the American people and the world know that this kind of economic arrogance, by which a powerful corporation thinks it can get by because ours is a free economy, will not be tolerated by public spirited citizens. The President has every right—and indeed should exercise that right—to remonstrate with and admonish those who have violated what I call sound economic sense and public spirited policy.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, is the distinguished Senator from Minnesota aware that the industry has been talking for some time about rising costs over the past few years? And is he also aware that there has been no substantial rise in steel prices since 1958 while costs have continued to mount? Is he aware that United States Steel Corp. had to borrow $800 million to improve its productive facilities and has to pay interest on that money, while right now the Government is in the money market, bidding up the costs, and that this adds to the steel corporation's cost of borrowing money?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am well aware of those observations. Of course, the United States Steel Corp. borrows money for plant expansion. It borrowed money to build facilities in Canada for taconite plants which could have been built in the State of Minnesota, which is where the largest taconite reserves in the world are to be found.

There is nothing wrong with a company borrowing money to expand its facilities. Only recently have companies talked about expanding their facilities out of current earnings; but when current earnings are so big that companies seek to earn them for major plant expansion, then they are too big. Stock distribution, which is another way of obtaining capital, is the normal procedure for the development of plants in the United States.

I wish to make it clear that I do not favor price controls; I do not favor all the loose talk in which some persons have engaged about looking upon the steel industry as a utility. I do not think we ought to lose our tempers in this situation. The Government ought to proceed cautiously and with a program. However, I think it is well for the Government of the United States, once it has decided upon a policy, to look into the pricing policies of the steel industry.

I want to know why, when Big Steel, United States Steel, barks "$6 a ton," all the other steel companies march like trained sheep and say, "$6 a ton." How can it be that on one night the president of a large steel company can say a price increase is not warranted, but 12 hours later can say, "We must have an increase of $6 a ton"? What kind of IBM minds do they have? What kind of computers run through those brain cells, whereby, all at once, a reason is found to increase the steel price $6 a ton?

The President of the United States is not antibusiness. That is an unfair comment about our President. He has exercised restraint. He tried to persuade both the companies and the union to hold down the price of steel and to hold down wage demands. I say now what I said yesterday; namely, that the action of the steel companies is economic arrogance. It will set off a wave of increases in prices and wages.

I say that it impairs our competitive position in world markets.

I say that it will cost the taxpayers of the United States hundreds of millions of dollars, because of the resultant increase in the prices of military goods in which vast amounts of steel are used.

I say it will be a burden on the consumers.

I say it will increase the cost of living.

I say it is an indefensible act of an economic nature.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to make one observation on the debate on the steel-price situation. Yesterday, I spoke on this subject.

It seems to me that the rest of business is yet to be heard from, and labor is yet to be heard from. I rather hope that the debate which has been engendered—and quite properly so, I believe—by the very precipitate act in raising the price of steel, and because of the way that was done, and because of its timing, may yet engender an even greater determination on the part of great segments of American business and on the part of American labor to maintain the degree of discipline which all of them thought would be maintained when the original negotiation between the steel companies and labor was so successfully contemplated; and I believe we have a right to suggest that this evidence first be obtained before we discuss, in connection with the debate on this subject, the position of great segments of American business outside the steel industry—segments which so far have not been heard from—and also the position of American labor, which has yet to be heard from on this very serious point.

I make this statement because, although Members of the Senate may express their own views as to the increase in the price of steel, I believe we should not take it for granted that other segments of American business will pursue the same course. Until they do, we should, instead, encourage them not to do so.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me. I did not wish to take so much of his time.

However, I should like to state that the President did not rise up in nearly as much righteous indignation against the electrical workers and their wage settlement as he did against the increase in the price of steel.

In connection with this matter, I should like to read part of a statement which was made on production costs from 1958 to 1961:

> In all, we have experienced a net increase of about 6 percent in our costs over this period despite cost reductions which have been effected through the use of new, more efficient facilities, improved techniques, and better raw materials. Compared with this net increase of 6 percent, the price increase of 3½ percent announced today clearly falls considerably short of the amount needed to restore even the cost-price relationship in the low production year of 1958.

Mr. President, I yield back the floor; and I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, Mr. President, I should like to add that I hope the admonition given by the Senator from New York to other areas of industry and to labor will be given very serious consideration and will be followed. Yesterday, I attempted to speak in that vein.

I hope this increase in the price of steel will not precipitate a round of price increases and wage increases.

Furthermore, I believe that the electrical workers agreement or settlement was far different from the steelworkers agreement with the steel companies. After all, the President of the United States knows that the steel industry is a bellwether industry, and that it undergirds the entire economy; and it is well recognized that when the price of steel is affected, such a change has ramifications throughout the total economy.

Furthermore, even if it be granted that the electrical workers' contract was too generous, nevertheless, the increase in the price of steel is not made any better by condemning the electrical workers contract and therefore supporting the increase in the price of steel. That is not my idea of cogent reasoning.

I call attention to the fact that last year—one of the worst years for the steel industry, when vast areas of the industry were operating at far below capacity—the corporate total net profits were as follows:

For United States Steel, $304 million.

For Bethlehem Steel, $121 million.

For Republic Steel, $53 million.

For Armco, $70 million.

For Jones & Laughlin, $33 million.

For the Inland Steel Corp., $47 million.

For the National Steel Corp., $42 million.

And for the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., $26 million.

Those were the corporate total net profits for the year 1960, which—I repeat—was a bad year, a recession year.

Furthermore, the percentage of profit is very interesting. In 1958, the year of the big wage increase in the steel industry, the net profit was 8.1 percent. Last year, 1960, when there was low production and when sales were down, and it was a recession year, the net profit was 7.8 percent—even in a bad year.

And in 1961 the profits were equal to that, or higher.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these figures and certain other ones, which have been taken from the evidence compiled by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. The figures relate to steel company net profits, in terms of percentages, for the last 10 years. I ask to have these figures printed at this point in the RECORD, along with an editorial expressing the view of the New York Times, which is surely my view, too.

There being no objection, the tabulations and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Corporate total net profit, 1960

	Million
United States Steel	$304
Bethlehem	121
Republic	53
Armco	70
Jones & Laughlin	33
Inland	47
National Steel	42
Youngstown	26

Percentage of profit of major steel companies, 1960

	Percent
1955	14.7
1956	13.2
1957	12.4
1958	8.1
1959	8.1
1960	7.8

	1960	1959	1958	1957
United States Steel	$304	$254	$302	$419
Bethlehem	121	117	138	191
Republic	53	54	62	85
Armco	70	77	57	55
Jones & Laughlin	33	29	48	45
Inland	47	48	23	50
National Steel	42	54	36	45
Youngstown	26	31	21	42

NOTE.—Profits in millions.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 12, 1962]

INFLATION IN STEEL

The decision of the United States Steel Corp. and other major producers to raise steel prices by $6 a ton is, as President Kennedy said yesterday, in "irresponsible defiance of the Nation's interests." It imperils the economic welfare of the country by inviting a new tidal wave of inflation after 4 years of general price stability. It aggravates steel's competitive difficulties in domestic and foreign markets, and puts a new curb on the economy's ability to make the sharp climb necessary for full production and full employment.

The underpinnings of our industrial society are so rooted in steel that any price increase tends to ripple out into manufacturing, construction, and dozens of allied industries. Everything from bobby pins to automobiles, from washing machines to locomotives, is affected. That is why the watchword after World War II became "as steel goes, so goes inflation."

What makes the companies' move especially disappointing is that it comes less than a week after the signing of the most moderate labor agreement in steel's postwar history—an agreement properly acclaimed by the President as "industrial statesmanship of the highest order." All the negotiations were conducted under the assumption by White House, union, and public, that their successful outcome would serve as a guarantee against resumption of the inflationary spiral familiar in steel from 1946 through 1958.

The United Steelworkers of America agreed to a package settlement of 10 cents an hour, well within the guidelines laid down by the administration for an agreement that could be met out of rising productivity, without cutting profits or raising prices. The union's restraint evoked derision from labor leaders of the James R. Hoffa stripe. Now that the steelmakers have increased prices, the union leadership will be accused by militant elements in its own ranks of having been beguiled into a cheap settlement for enrichment of employers and stockholders. This can only discourage moves toward economic sanity in labor generally. The external evidence offers strong support for President Kennedy's statement yesterday that the labor cost of making a ton of steel has not gone up in the past 4 years and may even go down under the new agreement.

The real explanation for the profit squeeze of which the industry complains lies in prolonged operation at levels far below capacity. When the mills are running at 80 percent of capacity or better, as they did in the first quarter of this year, the companies' profits are substantial. Reports for the first quarter, which will be available in a few days, are expected to show near-record earnings.

Raising prices represents the worst way to insure maintenance of the high demand essential if the first-quarter operating rate is to be sustained for the rest of the year. Now the trend toward ordering from foreign producers or switching to aluminum, reinforced concrete, or other competitive materials can be expected to make it much harder to keep the steel mills in full operation.

The purchasing value of every American's dollar has been put in new danger and the price of survival through national defense has been forced up by an estimated billion dollars a year. When the adequacy of private decision making to cope with the challenges of automation and foreign competition is under question, the steel companies have given ammunition to those who feel much more authority for economic planning must be turned over to Government. All the principles of private initiative they profess to hold so dear have been undermined by their ill-considered action.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for his typical generosity and accommodation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

JUDGE RALPH BUNCHE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first, I should like to address myself to some statements made yesterday in the other body about a fellow New Yorker whom I happen to know quite well. He is the Under Secretary on Special Political Affairs of the United Nations—Dr. Ralph Bunche. In the other body, a considerable number of references were made to Dr. Bunche. In the course of the debate last night in the other body, some questions were asked—such as:

> Does that sound like a dedicated American?
>
> If he is such an anti-Communist, why should he be supported by them?
>
> Why should he be receiving the constant praise of the Communist Daily Worker?

Mr. President, from my knowledge of Dr. Ralph Bunche, I can testify that he has been a loyal, dedicated servant of the United Nations, and he has acted in various capacities in our own country in a way which has tended to reflect credit upon our country, and he has done so as a person believing in our ideas of freedom.

Naturally, Mr. President, at this moment I am not in a position to give the answers to the individual details which have been cited for the RECORD. But I am asking Dr. Bunche to reply to them, himself, in detail; and I shall have the privilege of submitting for the RECORD his statement of his position on these various items.

But today I wish to affirm my knowledge of Dr. Bunche, my pride in the work he has done in the international fields and in our Nation, my knowledge of his fine reputation as a deep and convinced supporter of free institutions, and the fact that he is considered a most valued and important citizen of New York, and one of very great prestige.

As I have said, I do not now have the privilege of submitting for the RECORD his own replies on these particular items. However, I would be remiss in the performance of my duty if I did not, as quickly as possible, affirm my own knowledge of him and my own belief in his true Americanism.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague about Dr. Bunche. I have had the privilege of participating with Dr. Bunche at international meetings; and I know, of my own knowledge, of his firm adherence to free institutions and his fight for the basic principles on which our country stands.

He and I might disagree on this, that, or the other issue, individually; but I would resent deeply any reference which might impugn his integrity or his loyalty or his dedication to the cause of freedom.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague; and when I receive Dr. Bunche's specific replies, I shall consider it an honor to join with my colleague in offering them to the Senate. Both of us, in representing our State, will consider that a real honor and privilege.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5(a) OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have appropriately referred a bill which I introduce on behalf of myself and Senators BUSH, KEATING, and SCOTT, to amend the Area Redevelopment Act—Public Law 87-27—in order to correct a statistical inequity which now deprives a handful of communities hard hit by unemployment from becoming eligible for Federal assistance under the act.

This amendment would remove the requirement that in order to qualify for Federal assistance, areas of substantial labor surplus must have a rate of unemployment 50 percent or 75 percent above the national average for each of three out of the last four or two out of the last three years, respectively. Instead, it would permit an area of substantial labor surplus to qualify if it had an average unemployment rate of 50 percent or 75 percent above the national average for three out of the last four or two out of the last three calendar years, respectively.

Affected by the bill would be: Buffalo-Niagara, N.Y.; Talladega, Ala.; Norwich, Conn.; Torrington, Conn.; Oil City-Franklin-Titusville, Pa.; and several very small areas of substantial labor surplus.

All of these areas come painfully close to qualifying under present law. They have been substantial labor surplus areas for at least four consecutive years. And all of them have suffered a severe increase in joblessness during the last year, an increase larger than the national average. Their situation is just as serious as any of those communities now eligible for assistance, and only a statistical accident prevents them from becoming eligible.

The Buffalo-Niagara area provides a good illustration of this inequity. This area has not qualified because a temporary improvement in its unemployment situation dropped the rate to less than 50 percent above the national average in 1960 and 1961. But the average rate for three of the last four years persisted at 55 percent above the national average. In addition, it should be noted that the latest statistics show the unemployment rate for Buffalo-Niagara has climbed to more than 50 percent above the national average during the first 2 months of 1962. Clearly, this area has been suffering from the kind of persistent and substantial unemployment which is the target of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a memorandum and two statistical tables with respect to the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection the memorandum and tables will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3165) to amend section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The memorandum and tables presented by Mr. JAVITS are as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT (PUBLIC LAW 87-27)

Proposed amendment: Section 5(a)(2): strike the word "annual."

Deletion of the word "annual" is intended to remove the requirement that areas of substantial labor surplus must have a rate of unemployment 50 or 75 percent above the national average for each of 3 out of the last 4 or 2 out of the last 3 calendar years, respectively, in order to qualify as a "redevelopment area." It would make an average rate of 50 or 75 percent above the national average for 3 out of the last 4 or 2 out of the last 3 calendar years, respectively, sufficient for qualification.

Effect of proposed amendment: As of March 1962, 20 major and 105 smaller areas of substantial labor surplus qualify as redevelopment areas. Also, 366 very small areas so qualify.

The proposed amendment would enable one major and four smaller areas of substantial labor surplus to qualify as "redevelopment areas" in addition to the ones now qualifying. Also, a limited number of additional very small areas may qualify—on the basis of the proportionate increase of major and smaller areas, less than 20 very small areas would benefit.

Reason for proposed amendment: As can be seen from the following tables, the one major and the four smaller areas which would qualify as "redevelopment areas" have been areas of substantial labor surplus for at least 4 consecutive calendar years. All of them have come painfully close to qualifying under present law and all of them suffered a severe increase in joblessness during the last year—an increase larger than the national increase.

Furthermore, a wide gap of continuing unemployment separates these 5 areas from the other 62 major and 199 smaller areas of substantial labor surplus now listed as not qualifying as "redevelopment areas." Only a handful of the latter (7 major and 16 smaller) have had 2 or more calendar years of substantial labor surplus since 1958.

Need to enact amendment this year: As can be seen from the table I, the general drop in unemployment during 1960 (and in one case 1959) would probably exclude all of these five areas, with the possible exception of Oil City-Franklin-Titusville, from qualification even under this proposed amendment—unless joblessness grows much worse during 1962.

TABLE I.—*Major and smaller areas of substantial labor surplus affected by proposed amendment*

Area	1958		1959		1960		1961		Unemployment above national average during 3 of last 4 years
	Unemployment rate	Above national	Unemployment rate	Above national	Unemployment rate	Above national	Unemployment rate	Above national	
MAJOR		*Percent*		*Percent*		*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*
Buffalo-Niagara, N.Y.	10.8	59	9.3	69	7.1	[1] 27	9.2	37	55
SMALLER									
Talladega, Ala.	12.5	84	7.8	42	7.4	[1] 32	9.4	40	55
Norwich, Conn.	11.1	63	8.2	49	8.0	[1] 43	10.0	49	54
Torrington, Conn.	12.5	84	7.5	36	7.6	[1] 36	10.7	60	60
Oil City-Franklin-Titusville, Pa.	10.3	51	9.4	71	7.8	[1] 30	9.8	46	56
National rate	6.8		5.5		5.6		6.7		

[1] Percentage not used in computing 3-year average. However, exchange of this percentage with previous year's percentage in computing the average would still have given an average of above 50 percent.

TABLE II.—*Unemployment rates in other nonredevelopment areas classified as major and smaller areas of substantial unemployment, 2 years or more, 1958–61*

State and area	1958		1959		1960		1961		Unemployment above national average during 3 of last 4 years
	Unemployment rate	Above national	Unemployment rate	Above national	Unemployment rate	Above national	Unemployment rate	Above national	
MAJOR AREAS		*Percent*		*Percent*		*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*
Indiana: Terre Haute	8.5	25	7.4	35	7.2	29	7.9	[1] 18	30
Massachusetts:									
Brockton	10.4	53	7.1	29	7.3	30	7.7	[1] 15	37
Lawrence-Haverhill	10.1	49	6.8	24	6.7	20	7.6	[1] 13	31
Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke	8.0	18	6.6	20	6.6	18	7.1	[1] 6	19
New York: Utica-Rome	9.7	43	8.2	49	7.1	27	7.3	[1] 9	40
Tennessee: Chattanooga	7.9	16	6.6	20	6.4	[1] 14	7.7	15	17
Texas: Beaumont-Port Arthur	8.1	19	9.3	69	8.4	50	7.7	[1] 15	46
SMALLER AREAS									
Connecticut:									
Meriden	11.9	75	6.8	[1] 24	7.8	39	8.9	33	49
Middletown	9.0	32	7.3	33	6.6	[1] 18	8.4	25	30
Indiana:									
Connersville	10.9	60	7.9	44	7.0	25	8.1	[1] 21	43
Vincennes	9.3	37	7.3	33	6.8	[1] 21	9.1	36	35
Kansas: Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons	8.3	22	7.3	33	7.7	38	8.2	[1] 22	31
Mississippi: Biloxi-Gulfport	[2] 8.1	19	[2] 8.5	55	[2] 7.1	27	[2] 7.3	[1] 9	34
New York:									
Elmira	10.7	57	7.7	40	5.7	[1] 4	7.8	16	38
Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon	9.4	38	7.9	44	8.2	46	6.7	[1] 0	43
Wellsville	9.5	40	7.2	31	7.4	32	7.2	[1] 7	34
North Carolina:									
Fayetteville	7.8	15	5.0	9	5.5	[1] −2	7.4	10	14
Hendersonville	9.0	32	8.1	47	5.8	4	6.1	[1] −9	28
Mount Airy	9.3	37	6.1	[1] 11	6.4	14	8.2	22	24
Pennsylvania: Williamsport	10.2	50	8.4	53	7.0	25	8.4	[1] 25	43
Texas: Texarkana	9.5	40	7.2	31	7.6	36	7.9	[1] 18	36
Washington: Bellingham	8.3	[1] 22	7.4	35	8.1	45	8.8	31	37
West Virginia: Martinsburg	8.5	[1] 25	8.1	47	8.2	46	10.3	54	49
National rate	6.8		5.5		5.6		6.7		

[1] Percentage not used in computing 3-year average.
[2] Rough estimate.

Source: Rates of unemployment from U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Employment Service, Washington, D.C., Apr. 2, 1962.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me and also for giving me the opportunity to join with him in the sponsorship of the amendment to the act.

I wish to ask the Senator one question. I do not believe our amendment is in conflict with the original purposes of the act, but, rather, is designed to implement the original purposes of the act. Does the Senator not agree with that statement?

Mr. JAVITS. I thoroughly agree. I point out the fact that all the proposal does is strike out the qualifying word "annual," which defeats the very purpose of the act for the very areas which are hard hit.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator. I am very glad his interpretation is the same as mine. I hope we can convince the committee which will consider the bill. I think we are both members of the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. I am interested because two important industrial areas in my State are affected by this problem, and, very unfortunately, the two towns of Norwich and Torrington have serious unemployment problems. Unemployment is one of the serious problems of our day. As I said on the floor last week, I believe the administration, with all its good intentions, has not really come to grips with the basic problem of solving the long-term unemployment problem.

I hope that as time goes on the administration may see that temporary palliatives that are proposed from time to time in the way of Government spending do not come to grips with the causes of unemployment, and that the causes are deep and must be met squarely.

Members of the Joint Economic Committee on our side, including the able Senator from New York, have joined me and other House Members of the Joint Economic Committee in proposing an eight-point program proposing what ought to be done in order to come to grips with the causes of the unemployment problem.

The one thing that was done this year was passage of the retraining act, which, I am proud to say, had Republican authorship and sponsorship in both the House and the Senate.

I again thank the Senator from New York for permitting me to join in this proposal. I agree with him that this measure will not come to grips with the basic long-term problem, which is the very large amount of unemployment. There are people who have been unemployed in this country for more than 15 months. The number is not shrinking. It has actually been increasing, despite the fact that the labor force has been expanding.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his remarks.

PERSECUTION OF JEWS IN RUSSIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, information continues to be published in our press with respect to executions and sentences of executions of Jews in the Soviet Union for alleged offenses against laws regarding black marketing and currency speculation. We have not heard anything officially from the Soviet Union or its representatives on this subject, notwithstanding the constant publication of this information.

Today, in the New York Herald Tribune, there is a list of 20 of these doomed people, identified by name and with the name of the courts which allegedly had sentenced them. The article also refers to the fact that intercession has been made with the Russian authorities by distinguished citizens throughout the world, pointing out to them, that, in some cases, as the newspaper states, they were tried under ex post facto laws, that the punishment which was meted out is unusually severe, considering the penalty, and in comparison with the jurisprudence of civilized countries of the free world.

I have on previous occasions pointed out that a very special point has been made of singling out Jews as the culprits who are allegedly committing these criminal acts in synagogues, and so forth. This has been disseminated in such a way as to incite what we know to be endemic and longstanding anti-Semitic feeling in Russia, which existed long before the Communists came to power in czarist days.

I ask unanimous consent that the news story to which I have referred, together with the tragic list of the condemned persons, be made a part of my remarks and printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 12, 1962]

Soviet Juggles Law To Doom 16 Jews

(By Martin G. Berck)

United Nations, N.Y.—In violation of its own laws, Russia has condemned at least 24 Soviet citizens to die before firing squads for so-called economic offenses.

At least 16 of the doomed, previously believed to number 20, are Jews. They were punished under a law passed after the commission of their crimes—in other words, it was ex post facto punishment.

As disclosed in the New York Herald Tribune, the Soviet regime has carried out at least five executions. Some sources believe many or all the others have already been shot.

A clear ban against ex post facto punishment, or increase in punishment, is specifically set forth in article 6 of the principles of criminal legislation of the U.S.S.R. and the union republics, which was ratified by the Supreme Soviet on December 25, 1958. These principles establish that:

1. "A crime and punishability for an act are determined by the law operating at the time the crime was committed."
2. "A law that eliminates punishability for an act or reduces punishment is retroactive, that is, it applies to acts committed before it was promulgated."
3. "A law that establishes punishability for an act or increases punishment is not retroactive." (That is, shall have no retroactive effect.)

PUBLICITY IN PRESS

Trials of the economic offenders, for the most part, took place last fall and winter and were given unusually wide publicity in the Russian provincial press.

Specialists in Soviet affairs noted that it was not until May 5, 1961, that the Supreme Soviet, Russia's nominally highest governing body, decreed the death sentence for pilfering state and public property.

Currency speculation was designated as a capital crime on July 1, 1961, and bribery on February 27, 1962.

LENIENCY APPEALS

The firing squads did their grisly work despite leniency appeals to Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev from such widely known personalities as Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Norman Thomas, Martin Buber, Francois Mauriac and Bertrand Russell.

It was learned that a joint appeal signed by Lord Russell, Mr. Buber and Mr. Mauriac was cabled to the Kremlin early last month. Mrs. Roosevelt sent a personal letter to the Soviet Prime Minister.

WHY DID THEY DO IT?

Other public expressions of condemnation over the imposition of capital punishment for alleged crimes treated far more leniently in other countries have come from Episcopal Bishop James Pike and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Soviet experts here believe that Russia has chosen to run afoul of world public opinion and compromise its own laws against retroactive court proceedings for two main reasons:

1. By singling out Jews as the prime culprits, the Communist regime seeks to exploit endemic Russian anti-Semitism as an educative device to combat widespread practices among the Soviet masses—dealing in currency speculation, black marketing, selling goods on a private basis, and trading in gold and jewelry.
2. An atmosphere of isolation and terror for Russia's 3 million Jews is thereby engendered, intensifying Russia's campaign to atomize its Jewish community, which it regards with suspicion because of communal ties to Israel and the West.

RED DEATH LIST: MOSTLY JEWS

The following have been sentenced to death in the Soviet Union for currency and economic offenses. All are known to be Jews, with the possible exception of those whose names are starred.

Begelman, D.; sentenced to death by shooting—Moscow.

Biller, Shmuel Leib; sentenced to death by shooting for currency speculation.

Faibishenko, Vladislav Petrovich; charged with currency speculation. Sentenced to death by shooting, without right to appeal, by Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Court on August 18, 1961.

Kakiashvili, Morderh Abramovich; charged with currency speculation. Sentenced to death by shooting, without right to appeal, by Georgian S.S.R. Supreme Court.

Kaminer, Fedor; charged with currency speculation. Sentenced to death by shooting, without right to appeal, by Lithuanian S.S.R. Supreme Court. Sentence carried out.

*Kapanov, S.; charged with embezzlement of state property. Sentenced to death by the East Kazakhstan Regional Court.

Kaplun, A. T.; charged with currency speculation. Sentenced to death by shooting by court commission for criminal affairs of the Leningrad Town Court.

*Katbaev, B.; charged with embezzlement of foodstuffs. Sentenced to death by Kazakh S.S.R. Supreme Court in Kazalinsk on October 3, 1961.

Kleimanov, A. F.; charged with embezzlement of state property. Sentenced to death by shooting by Georgian S.S.R. Supreme Court. Sentence executed.

*Kobelitsin, Aleksander; charged with embezzlement of state property. Sentenced to death by Nikolaevo Regional Court.

*Kotlyar, Nikolai; sentenced to death by shooting—Moscow.

Kraizman, Abram Lazarevich; charged with speculation and embezzlement of state property. Sentenced to death by shooting by RSFSR Supreme Court.

Maly, Mikhail Isakovich; charged with embezzlement of state property. Sentenced to death by shooting by RSFSR Supreme Court in Piatigorsk on February 14.

Oizerman, V. S.; charged with currency speculation. Sentenced to death by shooting by court commission for criminal affairs of the Leningrad Town Court.

Palei; sentenced to death by shooting either for currency speculation or traffic accident.

Rabinovich, Mikhail; charged with currency speculation. Sentenced to death by shooting, without right to appeal, by Lithuanian SSR Supreme Court. Sentence carried out.

Reznitskaia, Basya; charged with currency speculation. Sentenced to death by shooting, without right to appeal, by Lithuanian SSR Supreme Court.

Reznitski, Aron; charged with currency speculation. Sentenced to death by shooting, without right to appeal, by Lithuanian SSR Supreme Court. Sentence carried out.

*Rokotov, Yan Timofeevich; charged with currency speculation. Sentenced to death by shooting, without right of appeal, by RSFSR Supreme Court on July 18, 1961.

*Safarov; charged with embezzlement. Sentenced to death by shooting.

*Tomaev, Rashid Medzhidovich; charged with embezzlement. Sentenced to death by shooting by the Moldavian SSR Supreme Court in Benderi. Sentence carried out.

*Tushpar, Aleksander Ivanovich; charged with embezzlement of state property. Sentenced to death by shooting by Kazakh SSR Supreme Court.

Shapiro, S. I.; charged with currency speculation. Sentenced to death by shooting by court commission for criminal affairs.

Suvorov, F. G.; coin counterfeiter. Sentenced to death by shooting by Ivanovo Regional Court. Sentence executed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Russian authorities question these facts, they certainly owe the world an explanation, as they are so insistently put forward. It is no explanation that the Jews of Russia will not speak. I have been there, myself. I know too well, personally, the reason why. It is true not only of them, but of other Russian citizens. It is a closed society in which it is very perilous to speak of this sort of thing.

The world is entitled to an explanation, and the protest cannot be downed or muted until there is an explanation, because the facts are too dangerous and damaging, considering the dreadful experience of Nazi Germany and the horrible scourge of anti-Semitism which took place in the Hitler era.

The Soviets pride themselves on having a society in which it is a criminal offense to have such an attitude, and they pride themselves—at least in their propaganda—on a society which does not permit or tolerate anti-Semitism.

Mr. President, that is all the more reason for giving the world an explanation, in view of the insistent and continuous reports, the most dramatic of which has come this very day.

I hope that at least a small amount of deference to the conscience of mankind will not now be long deferred by the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, with the permission of the majority leader, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum and then regain the floor to discuss the United Nations Security Council resolution on the Syrian-Israel dispute, and I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so that Senators may know what are the plans, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1303, H.R. 11038, be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when the Senate completes its business today, it is the intention of the leadership that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at noon. At that time the unfinished business will be, as has been announced, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1962. There will be no session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Minnesota asking for an order for adjournment until Monday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the Senate's business today it stand in adjournment until Monday at noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION ON ISRAEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we are all very well acquainted with the resolution adopted by the United Nations Security Council, with the concurrence of the United States—indeed, the United States and Britain sponsored the resolution jointly—which was widely and quite properly interpreted as a resolution of censure on Israel for the retaliatory military action which it took on its Syrian border.

This U.N. action is a matter of very deep concern to me and to many others in this country, because it seems to us that by censuring Israel, without giving any recognition to the acts that brought on this attack and to the situation in the Middle East generally, we are putting Israel's national survival in very grave jeopardy, and we are loading the cards against her in her own committed efforts to be a faithful and devoted member—indeed, a servant—of the community of the free world and of the United Nations. Survival is the first law of nature, and a country as small as Israel—many of us have been there, and have seen the area—literally cannot live in the face of shooting across its border which makes its own area untenable. This is precisely what has taken place on the Syrian border.

In addition, I feel, and many others in this country feel, that a failure to deal with the provocations by Syria will, by implication, encourage the Arab States in their announced position that a state of war persists between them and Israel, notwithstanding the armistice agreements, and that they continue to await the day when they will be sufficiently prepared militarily, in their judgment, to obliterate Israel and drive her into the sea. Obviously there cannot be a peaceful situation under those circumstances.

Mr. President, at the very least the United Nations should have been evenhanded in the action it took in this situation and should have been at least as condemnatory of the provocations of Syria as it was of the action taken by Israel, not only in self-defense but also over a matter of sheer survival. That was not done, of course.

Hence there are grave concerns, which I entertain and which others entertain, about the policy of our country. We are not without knowledge on this subject. There is a long history in respect to the area. It is inconceivable that the United States should have proposed the resolution with the United Kingdom except in the light of some considered policy. Our Government officials know, only too well, the extent of the interest in this country on this subject.

Mr. President, if this action indicates some new commitment of policy which is to be further damaging to the possibilities of peace in the Middle East, and is to be further damaging to Israel's very hope for survival, we must know about it, and we must protest it very early and very often, because there is not a better or more dependable friend for freedom in that whole area than Israel. If we needed any tangible evidence of that, it was very apparent when the United States sent its troops into Lebanon. All our military authorities were the first to agree that action would have been inconceivable unless our flank had been secured by Israel and our opportunity for access to our own forces in Lebanon had been absolutely assured through Israel territory. This is an indispensable element in an area as incendiary and dangerous as this area, because of the constant agitation of President Nasser of the United Arab Republic, who would like nothing better than to lead all the Arabs in an unified way, in the same position he himself occupies, working very closely with the Communists.

Great stakes are involved. This is a most alarming development which has occurred. It has aroused widespread protest, and even more than protest. It has aroused very deep concern by many of us who are thoroughly committed to the foreign policy of our Nation.

That concern is intensified because of the very clear statements made in the platforms of both political parties, which seem to go precisely the other way from what has been reflected as American policy in the U.N. Security Council resolution which we initiated, and by President Kennedy's own statements made during the 1960 campaign, in which he laid out in detail his own specific six-point formula for Middle East peace. It seems to me implicit that every line of the resolution which the United States proposed is a contradiction of the policy which the President laid out as the policy he would follow.

For example, his six-point policy calls for security treaties guaranteeing the boundaries, preventing their alteration by force, renouncing the use of threat or force, and providing for progressive limitation of armaments in respect of the Arab States and Israel.

The Security Council resolution is precisely to the contrary. No contemplation is taken whatever of the sanctity of boundaries or of preventing their alteration by force. In adopting the resolution which we sponsored, the United Nations Security Council has reflected what is apparently an American policy of putting on blinkers and says, "There has been military action in this area. Therefore we must condemn it. Therefore we must censure the party who took it, without regard to the fact that that party was acting in self-defense." Such action was taken in order to save their own lives.

I think the time has come when we must call upon the Government of the United States to reevaluate its policy in that area and to state it in just so many terms. Otherwise people like myself will have the right to assume that our Government has taken a new tack in its policy, that it has made a change in its policy with respect to the Arab States and Israel, and is now ready to blink its eyes at the actions of the Arab States in endeavoring to make untenable the State of Israel as a state, while censuring Israel and holding it strictly to account for every measure which it may take in its own defense. Such action would represent a complete reversal of the policy our Government has pursued since the time of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. If such is the case, we ought to know it. Yet that is the implication which, it seems to me, must be drawn from the support of the Security Council resolution. It is very important that the Government again state our policy, and state it very clearly, so that we may determine whether it has changed. The last authoritative statement on the subject was made by the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on August 26, 1955, in a speech before the Council on Foreign Relations in New York. At that time he said:

> I speak in this matter with the authority of President Eisenhower.

We made his statement the governmental policy of our Nation. The policy enunciated by Secretary of State Dulles is 180 degrees from the policy which we have just incorporated in the resolution which we supported before the Security Council of the United Nations.

Secretary of State Dulles pointed out that the three great problems in the area were as follows:

First, the tragic plight of the refugees who had lived in the territory now occupied by Israel. Incidentally, he said that their number was 900,000; since that time the figure commonly used is 1 million.

Second, he said that a pall of fear hangs over the Arab and Israel people alike, and that it must be dispelled.

Third, another element of the problem was the lack of fixed boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

He said also—and it should be a very important object lesson for the present administration:

> This may be a situation where mutual friends could serve the common good.

That statement is particularly true since the area may not itself possess all of the ingredients needed for the early and full building of a condition of security and well being.

He then went on to say that he was speaking with the direct authority of the President.

Secretary of State Dulles made some very practical suggestions, suggestions which are as good today as they were at that time. For example, he recommended that the United States participate in loans which could be used to resettle and, "to such extent as may be feasible"—I use his words—repatriate the Palestine Arab refugees.

Second, he said that President Eisenhower had authorized him to say that he would recommend that the United States join in formal treaty arrangements to prevent or thwart any effort by either side to alter by force the boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors. That is a different attitude from the one reflected by the United States in the resolution to which I have referred.

Third, he said that the United States would be willing to help in the search for a solution if the parties to the dispute should desire any, thus reflecting a need for fixed and final boundaries between Israel and the Arab States.

How very different that assertion is from the refusal of the United States to support a resolution recently proposed by a Latin American country and supported by important elements in the so-called African-Asian bloc calling for direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. The suggestion was echoed by my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] in a most eloquent and timely speech delivered in New York last Sunday night. Yet we have turned away from that policy. Indeed, it is widely felt that American opposition resulted in the defeat of that highly desirable resolution, which, though advanced by 16 nations, nonetheless went down to defeat. How important would that resolution have been had it been on the books when the Arab-Israel incident had taken place. How helpful it would be at a time like the present. Instead, the resolution was defeated.

I earnestly draw the attention of the Senate and the administration to the fact that whether we mean to do so or not, by our acts we are demonstrating a very sharp change in what has been the considered policy of the United States under three Presidents. We would not condemn the Syrians for making life absolutely intolerable for the Israelis across the border and jeopardizing their national existence, while at the same time we censure and condemn Israel for acts of self-defense which are absolutely essential if it is to continue as a nation. Such action represents a direct reversal of the policy of the United States, which we understand has been consistently pursued. Therefore, a considered declaration of policy by authority of the President is called for, just as Secretary of State Dulles declared our policy which, as far as any of us knows, remains our policy to this day, in order that the whole world may know whether American foreign policy remains consistent in its even-handed friendship with Israel and Arabia, or whether we are loading the dice against the Israelis because they have the temerity, at the risk of their lives and national existence, to try to defend themselves and to preserve their national existence.

I make this statement as a friend of the foreign policy of our Nation. Nothing will ever be won by that kind of fuzziness or by wearing blinkers in so dangerous an area of the world as the Middle East. The only way we shall ever get anywhere there is by fighting for what we know to be right.

It has been said in the Senate that the United Nations should be downgraded, that it is too important in our foreign policy, and that we pay too much attention to its votes. I have answered—and what I am about to say is an excellent illustration—that that situation will be so unless we fight for what we believe in the United Nations, and what is best for the peace of the world, whether we win or lose.

What I have stated is a prime example of the principle. Whether the resolution before the Security Council was defeated or not, whether or not it received a majority of votes, is not the material question. The material question is, What is U.S. policy? Is it consistent? Will we fight for it in and out of the United Nations? It will not be necessary to downgrade the United Nations if the United States will stand up to what it believes in and is consistent in its policy, instead of drafting a resolution which was designed to win 10 votes in the Security Council, and not encounter a Russian veto—which I suspect was the reason for the presentation of this ill-advised resolution. I hope that the administration will take heed of what has been said today and will declare its policy on the Near East so that we may know whether it is or is not the same as the policy which was consistently pursued by Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I commend my distinguished colleague from New York for the very forceful statement he has made today on this regrettable problem.

Mr. President, the initiative which the United States took in the censure of Israel is very disturbing to me. Only last Thursday, I received a letter from the Department of State in which I was assured that the United States was pursuing a "general policy of even-handedness with the Israelis and the Arabs." I was very much disturbed then by that terminology for it was evident from the rest of the letter that "even-handedness" entailed doing exactly what the Arab States wanted and ignoring Israel's legitimate search for security. For example, the State Department followed the Arab line by first, denying the value of direct negotiations—a standard Arab position; second, by emphasizing the refugee issue, which the Arab States have consistently ignored; third, by ignoring the Arab boycott, and even continuing U.S. aid to the countries responsible; and fourth, by looking the other way at Arab closing of the Suez Canal to Israel, which is a clear violation of U.N. principles. This latest motion of censure is, I presume, another example of the policy of "even-handedness." It entirely backs the Arab position without any consideration whatever of Israeli rights.

Frankly, Mr. President, this "even-handedness" seems to mean the palm of the hand for the Arabs and the back of the hand to the Israelis.

Let us consider for a moment what would happen in the United States under similar conditions. It will not happen here because we have friendly neighbors, with whom we enjoy mutual respect for boundaries and other rights.

However, let us suppose that in Minnesota a farmer was plowing his land, or a U.S. citizen was fishing on the St. Lawrence River, and there was a snipers' nest across in Canada, and the snipers started shooting at the U.S. citizen and continued shooting for 8 days.

Or, let us suppose the situation occurred in Texas, where a farmer was plowing his field. Our colleagues from Texas claim, of course, that it is not necessary to plow the land down there, because it is so fertile to begin with. However, let us suppose that a Mexican snipers' nest was set up across the boundary, or an American citizen was fishing in the Rio Grande, and that the snipers across the river started shooting at the American, and continued to do so for 6 or 8 days.

We would go to the United Nations and say, "Put a stop to this. We are not going to stand for it. These people are playing with fire. They should not ignore us or the United Nations."

What would the United States do? I am pretty sure what we would do. I am certainly sure of what the people down in Texas would do. They would undoubtedly send in a sufficient force to wipe out that snipers' nest.

That is exactly what occurred in Israel.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I have the floor. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator wish me to yield on this point?

Mr. GRUENING. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's train of thought, but I wish to speak on the same subject.

Mr. KEATING. My colleague from New York has yielded to me to speak on this subject. I am happy to yield on this specific point. However, I would like to complete my remarks, and then I am sure my colleague from New York will be very happy to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

What would the American people say should be done in a case like that? Any poll taken anywhere in the country, in any city or town or village or in any rural area, would, I am confident, yield the response, "Do exactly what Israel did. We will not stand for that kind of attack on our citizens." That is what Israel did.

The resolution which Britain and the United States initiated was based on a Western-sponsored resolution of 1956 which declared in part that Israel was in "flagrant violation of Israel's obligations under the United Nations Charter."

In spite of our so-called evenhandedness, I have yet to see the United States introduce a resolution condemning the Arab States for their "flagrant violation" of "obligations under the U.N. Charter" in their economic warfare against Israel and in their continuing refusal to permit Israel ships to use the Suez Canal.

The policy of evenhandedness should certainly be carried to its logical conclusion. The United States should make a similar effort to censure Arab States for their violation of the charter.

I agree with the distinguished senior Senator from New York that the United States should stand up for principle. If we are defeated, or if there is a veto, let it come, but the United States must stand up for principle, not expediency.

I reiterate that I do not want to be partisan about this matter, for I am well aware that the 1956 resolution condemning Israel was also initiated by the West—by Britain, France, and the United States in concert.

My colleague from New York has referred to campaign statements of the President. I point out that the Democratic platform on which this administration was ostensibly elected to office, laid down the following principles for Mideast policy:

> In the Middle East we will work for guarantees to insure independence for all states. We will encourage direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations, the resettlement of Arab refugees in lands, where there is room and opportunity for them, an end to boycotts and blockades, and unrestricted use of the Suez Canal by all nations.

Direct negotiations are a prominent part of that program and now they are directly repudiated. There is no mention of "evenhandedness" in that statement, no hint of censure of Israel, no suggestion that we would shortly be appeasing the Arab States as fast as we could.

Frankly, I think it is a serious error to censure Israel for alleged violations and to refrain from censuring Syria, merely because of fear of a Soviet veto.

It is unfortunately further evidence of the dangers that can result from too great reliance on the United Nations and not enough reliance on our own tools of policy and power. To censure Israel because the Soviets are willing to go along in the Security Council while at the same time stepping up our foreign aid program to those very countries which have continually mocked U.N. efforts to bring peace in the Middle East is self-defeating. To my mind it is wholly in conflict with long-term American objectives in the Middle East.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his observations. Even in the 1956 situation, to which my colleague from New York has so properly referred, the President of the United States made a promise with respect to the efforts to work for freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal. This administration has not even given recognition to the provocations of Syria or indicated whether it will do anything at all on that subject; there has been complete silence.

I agree with my colleague. I am not handing any bouquets to the Eisenhower administration, either. I do not think that that administration effectively followed through in its dealing with Mr. Nasser. We are paying for that negligence now; perhaps we shall never be through paying for it. At least, let us not make the same mistake with respect to the present rulers of Syria, by letting them go scot free, so that they will feel they have immunity, just as Nasser thought he had immunity after we saved his very life, speaking in national and political terms, in 1956. Nasser has done nothing since that time but thumb his nose at us and at the whole free world. Let us not make the same mistake again.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I desire to express agreement with the remarks of the distinguished Senators from New York. Two years ago, I took the floor of the Senate to criticize the loan made by the World Bank to Egypt's President Nasser. It was a $50 million loan and was made without exacting any conditions, or even attempting to exact any conditions, with respect to free passage through the Suez Canal. The U.S. representatives all voted for the loan. It was a loan made directly for the purpose of clearing up and improving navigation through the canal. But the vital principle involved was never raised—although the United

States had repeatedly declared our policy for free passage—and the World Bank money was largely our money.

I was critical of the policy of the administration when in 1956 we turned against our traditional allies—France, and England, as well as Israel—and were on the same side as Soviet Russia at the time of Nasser's completely unwarranted and illegal seizure of the Suez Canal. Now we are confronted with a situation which shows that apparently our policy has not changed. I consider it deplorable.

I did not know this subject would come up for debate today; but 2 days ago, when I read what had happened in the United Nations, I wrote the following letter to Adlai Stevenson, our representative there:

> DEAR ADLAI: I am most concerned with and disappointed at the U.S. position and vote in the Security Council on the resolution censuring Israel and its actions in resisting continued Syrian provocations.
>
> We seem to be excessively concerned with being on the winning side in a United Nations vote rather than in establishing basic principles for which the United States stands.
>
> The least we could have done was to propose an amendment censuring Syria and the Arab States for their continued provocation. We might have lost the amendment, but there would have been no doubt where the United States stood.
>
> How do we reconcile our condemning the only true democracy in the Middle East—Israel—economically boycotted and perpetually menaced with annihilation by its far more numerous encircling unremittingly hostile neighbors, with our inaction with respect to India's seizure of miniscule, unoffending and peaceful Goa, where there had been no provocation.
>
> In a world as troubled as ours, if we continue the old double standard and establish and adhere to no principles to which the freedom loving nations can rally, we shall do both ourselves and those nations a real disservice.
>
> I appreciate that your task is not an easy one and I appreciate your statement at the time of pacifist Nehru's armed seizure of Goa. I feel strongly, however, that in the long run the task will be made far easier if we stand up and are counted on the side of right and justice. Surely not if we side with dictatorships because we do not have the votes in the Security Council or the General Assembly. If we seek constantly to win votes, then ultimately we will find ourselves forced to compromise with principle to gain votes. The U.S. position will then sink to that of the least common denominator among all the positions of those nations whose votes we seek.
>
> With all best wishes, I am,
>
> Cordially yours,
>
> ERNEST GRUENING.

I did not intend to read the letter, because I had hoped to receive a reply from my good friend, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson. However, since the subject was being discussed on the floor of the Senate, I thought it appropriate to read the letter into the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS. I am most grateful to the Senator from Alaska for his contribution to the debate. I know that what he has said will be of great interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I associate myself with the views of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] which are expressed in his letter to Ambassador Stevenson, and I associate myself with the observations made by the two Senators from New York.

I feel that what is needed is an official report with regard to what the U.S. delegation at the United Nations considered to be the operative facts concerning the Syrian-Israel incident, which resulted in the resolution of censure. What I know about the resolution, I know unofficially; therefore, my information may prove not to be accurate. Nevertheless, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I am making a formal request for a briefing on the subject by the appropriate officials of the State Department and by the Ambassador to the United Nations.

I think we are entitled to know, and we should know, what the facts are, at least as our responsible officials considered them to be at the time the action was taken by the United States in respect to its vote on the resolution.

I have been led to believe that the gun entrenchments have been of long standing and were fired upon Israel shipping where Israel shipping had the right to be. There is no doubt about what would have happened had the shells landed on land territory of Israel. But if the firing was aimed at Israeli shipping, and if Israel shipping had the right to be where it was—of course, that is a question for international determination, if anyone raises a question about it—then I think, as the Senators from New York pointed out, it is quite understandable that Israel should have exercised what it considered to be its right of self-defense.

However, two questions ought to be raised: Where was the United Nations buffer force? Where were the United Nations military officials who were assigned to the Middle East to maintain peace? It is my understanding that this activity did not occur overnight; that the United Nations military officials knew that the situation was a threat to the Middle East; and that we have been seeking, through the United Nations, to prevent incidents which would result in such direct action as occurred in this instance.

I quite agree with the position taken by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. I am somewhat at a loss to understand why we have taken action against Israel without, apparently, taking action against the provocations of Syria. Before I say more on the subject, I wish to get the facts and to be absolutely certain of them. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I think I owe it to the Senators from New York, the Senator from Alaska, and other Senators to make the request I am making, that this question be the subject of official briefing before the Committee on Foreign Relations by officials of the administration.

In 1959, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] joined with me as we offered, and the Senate adopted, the Morse-Javits amendment to the mutual security bill, an amendment which had to do with the problem of discrimination in the Middle East. We must face the fact that the Israel-Arab situation continues to be a threat to the peace.

There is no question about the fact that for years the Israel Government has sought to get the Arab Government to negotiate a peace, but it will not negotiate.

I have taken the position that if they cannot do that themselves, the negotiations should be conducted under the auspices and procedures of the United Nations.

The Senator will recall that last year, when the bill was before the Foreign Relations Committee, and ultimately was before the Senate, the question was whether there should be eliminated from the statement of objectives and purposes, at the beginning of the bill, any language possibly pertaining to our concern about the threat to the peace in the Middle East. In the conference, it was suggested that when two nations friendly to the United States found themselves in controversy, then the position of the United States should be one of neutralism in regard to the controversy.

But within the framework of the mutual security bill, it was perfectly obvious what the intent of that language was: It amounted, in effect, to a pro-Arab position.

So I proposed, as a substitute, what became known in the conference as the Morse amendment. At first, a good many persons were quite puzzled about it, because they did not understand its implications. I took the position that we should have, as a substitute, language about as follows:

> That when two nations friendly to the United States engage in a controversy, it will be the policy and the position of the United States to urge each and both of them to resort to the peaceful procedures of international law available to them for the settlement of their dispute.

There is nothing neutral about that. Yet that would not put us in the position of being partisan, either. I say frankly that I think the Arab countries have the duty to proceed, either directly or through the United Nations, to negotiate a peace in the Middle East. Until they do that, so far as I am concerned I cannot assume that they are acting in good faith when there are incidents such as the recent Syrian incident. Rather, I would assume that then they are acting as provocateurs; and when we know that some of their leaders in some parts of the Middle East still indicate that when they become strong enough to drive Israel into the sea, that is what they plan to do, that certainly indicates that they are not good protagonists of peace in the Middle East.

I say the time has come to get the participants in this dispute to resolve their dispute through the peaceful procedures of the United Nations. That was my position, and it continues to be my position; and I believe it to be a much better procedure than that indicated by the facts, as I believe them to be, in connection with the resolution of censure for which the U.S. representatives to the United Nations voted.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Oregon. I hope he follows through with his demand for a briefing and an accounting; and I deeply feel that the issue the Senator from Oregon, my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] have raised is very important.

No one assumes for a moment that if we joined in the resolution asking for direct negotiation, the Arabs would negotiate. But it is one thing to serve notice on them that the present situation is an intolerable one and that we will not go along with nations which are not performing their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. It is one thing to do that. It is quite another thing, as soon as the Israelis get precisely what they deserve, to adopt the censure resolution which in effect, tells the Arab countries that everything is just dandy insofar as their actions are concerned, and just to go on doing what they have been doing—which is jeopardizing the peace in the Middle East.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon for his remarks.

I find it extremely difficult to understand U.S. policy in the Middle East. Certainly as a nation we are dedicated to peace. That is the essence of our foreign policy. Yet in the Middle East we are supporting nations whose avowed and declared purpose is to make war and to destroy a small neighbor, a country which is ringed about with great powers, and is only about one-fiftieth of their size in population and area—a country whose only purpose is to live and to let live.

It seems to me that the policy of our country would be far sounder if we withdrew our aid to nations which wish to destroy a peaceful people, and a truly democratic and enlightened people, and if, instead, we said to such nations, "Follow the example of Israel and proceed to educate, to sanitate, and to irrigate, and develop your own lands."

Certainly our policy would be far wiser if we adopted such a course.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it was a great mistake for the United States and Great Britain to propose to have the Security Council of the United Nations approve the resolution which, in clauses 2 and 3, virtually throws the entire burden of responsibility upon the State of Israel. There is little doubt that Israel retaliated for acts of aggression previously committed against her by the Syrians; but it seems to me that to condemn retaliation without giving an adequate condemnation of the acts of provocation is extremely one sided. For how long are a people or an armed force to be expected in practice to accept aggression without carrying out either self-defense or a counterattack?

It so happens that in Algeria, much the same process is underway. The OAS—the secret army of the European settlers in Algeria—is carrying out an organized program of the murder of innocent Arabs. What is their purpose? It is to so provoke the Mohammedan population of Algeria that there will be reprisals, which, the secret army—the OAS—believes, will get public opinion in France and the combined European opinion in Algeria to favor making war upon the Algerian and Mohammedan population.

Thus far, the Mohammedans and Algerians have shown themselves to be better Christians in practice than has the European population in Algeria, for the Mohammedans and Algerians have refrained from retaliation. But it is not at all certain how long they can so refrain.

It seems to me that just as the OAS is placing an almost impossible burden upon the Mohammedan people of Algeria, so the Syrians placed an almost impossible burden—not quite as great, but still an impossible burden—upon the Israelis, in what seemed to be confirmed provocatory attacks.

But now, after the Israelis have responded, the United Nations Security Council condemns the response and the retaliation, but is silent about the provocation.

I think the resolution is one sided. I take it that the Senator from New York has submitted the U.N. resolution for printing in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope this action of the U.N. does not represent the opinion of the Senate. I am quite sure it does not represent the opinion of the country. Although I have great respect for the members of U.S. delegation to the United Nations, and believe that, on the whole, they are doing an extremely good job, I also believe it was a great mistake for them to criticize the effect without mentioning the cause, and I think that works a disservice to the cause of peace.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Illinois for his typically eloquent statement, which I am sure will be very helpful in connection with this matter.

To complete the RECORD at this point, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD—I make the request on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]—two statements recently made by him on this subject. One of the statements is dated April 5; the other is dated March 27. In the statements, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] also calls for direct Arab-Israel talks for peace, and comments upon the State Department rejection of that proposal.

He is absent today on necessary duty as an officer of the Navy. He wished me to introduce both of these statements as indicating his sympathetic affiliation with the sentiments which have been voiced today on this subject.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR SCOTT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, LABELS STATE DEPARTMENT REPLY AS PRO-ARAB

WASHINGTON.—The State Department rejected a proposal by 10 U.S. Senators that it encourage direct peace talks between Israel and the Arab States, and U.S. Senator HUGH SCOTT called the State Department's answer "the most pro-Arab statement I have read in years."

Senator SCOTT said:

"On March 27 I sent to Secretary of State Rusk, for myself and nine other Senators, a telegram proposing that the United States announce its position in favor of direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States.

"I have received a reply which says that the United States will not make such a proposal and that the Department of State does not believe that direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States is a 'realizable objective.'

"This letter constitutes the most pro-Arab statement I have seen from the State Department in all my years in Congress, because it's precisely the Arab position. It says that while the Department agrees in principle, it does not intend to follow its principles.

"This indicates a major change in U.S. foreign policy. I disagree emphatically with the view expressed in this statement and I believe that the statement is a blow to the hopes of the world to obtain peace in the Middle East."

Following is the text of Secretary's Rusk's letter:

"DEAR SENATOR SCOTT: On behalf of Secretary Rusk, I am replying to your telegram of March 27, 1962, in which you urge that during the current consideration by the United Nations Security Council of the Lake Tiberias incidents between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic, the United States 'announces its position in favor of direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States.'

"In principle, the Department fully agrees with the doctrine in article 33 of the United Nations Charter that parties to a dispute should, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation or other conciliatory means. But if negotiations are to be fruitful they must be appropriately timed and there must be some common ground between the parties, even if only in the definition of the dispute. In fact, ill-timed negotiations forced on reluctant parties may exacerbate differences rather than mitigate them. In such circumstances we must seek other means for settlement of issue.

"Our doubts about the practicality of direct negotiation are particularly strong at the present time, when serious tension exists between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic, as a result of violations by both parties of the General Armistice Agreement. In the absence of mutual and full compliance by Israel and its Arab neighbors with the provisions of their respective General Armistice Agreements, and given the presently inadequate degree of cooperation by the parties with the United Nations peacekeeping machinery in the area, the Department cannot agree that this would be an auspicious time to try to achieve progress through direct confrontation.

"The Department is convinced that before direct negotiations can become politically feasible, and in order to enhance the prospects for a fundamental improvement in Arab-Israeli relations, considerable progress can and should be made on the most serious differences which divide the parties. One such dispute is that relating to the fate of the approximately 1 million Palestine Arab refugees. As is the case in other aspects of the Palestine question, we think that progress on refugees can best be achieved by the enlightened exercise of quiet diplomacy. That is why the United States is actively supporting Dr. Joseph E. Johnson, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, in his efforts to persuade the governments directly concerned to cooperate in a realistic implementation of the basic United Nations resolution on the subject. Dr. Johnson is about to undertake during April his second trip to the Near East as the Special Representative of the Palestine Conciliation Commission, of which the United States is a member together with France and Turkey. Public espousal in the United States of the concept of direct negotiations at this time would be taken to indicate weakening of our support of the Johnson mission.

"In supporting the Johnson mission and in other important ways, such as our frequent diplomatic representations, our political and financial support of the United Nations Emergency Force and our determination to strengthen the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization and our general policy of evenhandedness with the Israelis and the Arabs, we are contributing to the enhancement of the relative tranquillity in the Near East. The Department believes that our influence can now be exercised more constructively through such means than by urging direct negotiations, which do not appear to be a realizable objective at this juncture.

"From the above it is clear that the U.S. decision not to support various proposals put forward in the Special Political Committee of the 16th United Nations General Assembly on the Palestine refugee item was not taken merely for reasons of parliamentary tactics, as suggested in your telegram. The U.S. resolution on the Palestine Conciliation Commission was indeed overwhelmingly approved, but the delicate, constructive diplomatic initiative goes on.

"The Department agrees completely that the United States should actively pursue the goal of peace in the Middle East, as well as in other areas. The Department is, in fact, pursuing this goal with vigor based on our best judgment of the ways in which our national interest and peace can most effectively be served."

"Sincerely yours,

"Frederick G. Dutton,
"Assistant Secretary."

Senator Scott, of Pennsylvania, and Other Senators Urge Arab-Israel Peace Talks at U.N.

Washington.—U.S. Senator Hugh Scott (Republican of Pennsylvania), today led a group of 10 Senators in urging that the United States announce its position "in favor of direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States" at the U.N. Security Council.

In a letter to Secretary of State Rusk, Senator Scott and the other Senators pointed out that Israel has always been ready to talk peace, but that the Arabs refuse to sit down around the peace table.

The letter said:

"When the United Nations Security Council considers on Wednesday the recent border incidents between Israel and Syria, we respectfully urge that the United States announce its position in favor of direct peace negotiations between Israel and the Arab States.

"Since the United Nations was founded, the unresolved Arab-Israel conflict has been on the U.N. agenda in one form or another. Each year some specific problem has been considered. Often, as in the case of the recent Israel-Syria border actions—the matter under consideration has involved the loss of human life and the destruction of property.

"But the discussions have never been able to bring the disputing parties together around a peace table to settle finally the 14-year-old dispute that has sapped the vitality of the Middle East.

"During the past session of the United Nations General Assembly, 16 nations proposed a resolution which called on Israel and the Arab States to settle questions in dispute by direct negotiations.

"The United States voted against this resolution, which was defeated. In explaining the U.S. vote, U.S. Ambassador Francis T. P. Plimpton said, in part:

" 'The United States has made clear from the outset its opposition to anything that might tend to divert attention from that simple, direct, and constructive initiative. This, of course, means that we shall be obliged, regretfully, to oppose such other proposals whether in the form of other resolutions or amendments to our draft, as would tend in any way to obscure or cut across that initiative.'

"Since the U.S. resolution on the Palestine Conciliation Commission passed, there is no longer any tactical reason for avoiding a motion to encourage direct negotiations.

"Israel has repeatedly offered to negotiate directly with the Arab States. The Arab leaders consistently oppose this plan because they refuse to take any action that would seem to recognize the State of Israel.

"The U.S. position is clear in the matter. An Arab-Israel peace has been stated often as a fundamental goal of American foreign policy.

"As recently as 1960, this objective received the endorsement of both major political parties.

"The Democratic platform said, 'We will encourage direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations.'

"The Republican platform said, 'With specific reference to Israel and the Arab nations, we urge them to undertake negotiations for a mutually acceptable settlement of the causes of tension between them.'

"This Nation has every reason to implement its stated goal of peace in the Middle East. It is clearly in the interest of all people in that important part of the world.

"We hope that the U.S. delegation in the U.N. will be able to assert this position during the Security Council debate."

In addition to Senator Scott, it was signed by Senators Keating, Javits, Morton, Saltonstall, Case, Kuchel, Prouty, Bush, and Harrison A. Williams.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the conference of presidents of major American Jewish organizations the day before yesterday in New York may be made a part of my remarks and printed in the Record, together with a list of the organizations whose presidents participated in this action, in which they strongly take the same position which we have taken here on the floor today.

There being no objection, the resolution and list were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations

At an emergency meeting of the conference of presidents of major American Jewish organizations, held today, the following statement was unanimously adopted:

"We express our disappointment and concern at the resolution of the United Nations Security Council of April 9, censuring Israel for self-defensive measures against Syria. This resolution, regrettably sponsored by our Government, failed to reflect the facts of persistent Syrian provocations, the declared Arab objective of liquidating Israel, and continuous threats to the citizens of Israel and to its territorial integrity. We find almost incomprehensible this failure to distinguish between acts of aggression and self-defense.

"Peace in the Middle East, as elsewhere in the world, has long been a declared objective of U.S. policy. Pursuant to that policy, our Government has maintained long-standing and firm friendship with Israel and with the Arab States. In our view, the Security Council resolution may very well encourage further acts of aggression by the Arab States instead of promoting peace.

"The role of the United Nations is to help achieve the goal of peace everywhere in the world. To attain that goal, we express the hope that our Government will use its power and prestige, and its position of moral and political leadership in the free world, to make it indisputably clear that continued acts of Arab belligerency will not be tolerated in the community of nations."

Associated with these views are the following organizations: American Israel Public Affairs Committee, American Jewish Congress, American Zionist Council, American Trade Union Council for Labor Israel, B'nai B'rith, Hadassah, Jewish Agency for Israel, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Labor Zionist Movement, Mizrachi-Hapoel Mizrachi, National Community Relations Advisory Council, National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Young Israel, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, United Synagogue of America, Zionist Organization of America.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record as a part of my remarks an article entitled "U.N. Justice Against Israel," written by William S. White, and published in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday, April 11, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.N. Justice Against Israel

(By William S. White)

With the support of most of the West, the United Nations has again applied one-sided justice against a pro-Western power.

In U.N. lore this extraordinary doctrine has been laid down: If retaliation against provocative attack is tough and candid, retaliation is more evil than the attack itself. The provocation becomes so unimportant, in this case, as not even to be mentioned.

This is the meaning of the recent Security Council resolution censuring Israel for sending troops into Syria to destroy gun positions which had been harassing Israel boats on the Sea of Galilee.

The United States and Britain took the lead in this denunciation. They were joined by, among others, the Soviet Union and Egypt. Egypt, though a mortal enemy of Israel and also a Soviet stooge, had the happy fortune to be a member of the bench of judges of Israel, as a member of the Security Council. It is from such a bench that world opinion is now expressed.

The closest thing to any criticism of Syria was in a vague phrase "deploring hostile exchanges" with Israel. Israel, however, was found to be in "flagrant violation" of U.N. peace directives. This was in the face of the obvious fact that the Israelis, plainly unable to counter Syrian artillery fire from small boats in the Sea of Galilee, obviously had a pretty strong reason to go in after those Syrian cannon firing on them.

What the U.N. has again done, therefore, is to try to repeal or at least qualify the basic right of self-defense on the general conclusion that peace and quiet might best be served that way. Israel, of course, had a "right" to go to the U.N. for help when attacked. But that theory is remindful of the old, sardonic phrase that the rich and poor have equal right to sleep in the public parks.

For the Soviet Union, sitting with veto power in the Security Council, long has openly been backing the Arabs. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that Israel will get no help in that quarter, whatever its case may be.

Now, the West is sincerely motivated by a desire to keep down trouble in the Middle East. Understandably, too, it does not wish to become involved in all the ancient Israel-Arab quarrels.

But this central fact remains: Israel, if she is to fend off attacks, simply must do it alone. There never will be any real U.N. help so long as the U.N. is so largely under the influence of Soviet and allied Communists, and Asian and African neutralists.

For Israel is openly anti-Communist, strictly not neutral and strictly pro-West.

So, once again, a pro-West country gets the short end of the stick from U.N. "justice." Once again we take the course not only of refusing to stand up for friends but of joining our own declared enemies in repudiating those friends.

Why must we condemn a friendly power on the say-so of others, including Communists and neutralists? And if we feel we simply must, in fear that any other course might bring open Soviet stirring of war in the Middle East, cannot we at least condemn Syria, too?

Why must we be so "objective" in searching with a magnifying glass for the shortcomings of our friends, and so broadminded about the shortcomings of others?

Questions of this kind must continue to be asked—asked not by enemies of the U.N. but by friends who believe it is being so perverted as to risk self-destruction.

Mr. JAVITS. Also, Madam President, so the background of this subject may be completely before the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the clauses of the Syrian-Israel armistice agreement adopted in 1949, which bear upon the establishment of a demilitarized zone and the absolute prohibition against fortifying that zone or taking other military action across it may be made a part of my remarks, as well as the Security Council's resolution on the previous Israel-Syrian situation, dated January 19, 1956, and the Security Council resolution adopted on April 9, 1962, which we have been discussing on the floor today.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Clauses of the Syrian-Israel Armistice Agreement Adopted in 1949

Article V

1. It is emphasized that the following arrangements for the armistice demarcation line between the Israel and Syrian armed forces and for the demilitarized zone are not to be interpreted as having any relation whatsoever to ultimate territorial arrangements affecting the two parties to this agreement.

2. In pursuance of the spirit of the Security Council resolution of November 16, 1948, the armistice demarcation line and the demilitarized zone have been defined with a view toward separating the armed forces of the two parties in such manner as to minimize the possibility of friction and incident, while providing for the gradual restoration of normal civilian life in the area of the demilitarized zone, without prejudice to the ultimate settlement.

3. The armistice demarcation line shall be as delineated on the map attached to this agreement as annex I. The armistice demarcation line shall follow a line midway between the existing truce lines, as certified by the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization for the Israel and Syrian forces. Where the existing truce lines run along the international boundary between Syria and Palestine, the armistice demarcation line shall follow the boundary line.

4. The armed forces of the two parties shall nowhere advance beyond the armistice demarcation line.

5. (a) Where the armistice demarcation line does not correspond to the international boundary betwen Syria and Palestine, the area between the armistice demarcation line and the boundary, pending final territorial settlement between the parties, shall be established as a demilitarized zone from which the armed forces of both parties shall be totally excluded, and in which no activities by military or paramilitary forces shall be permitted. This provision applies to the Ein Gev and Dardara sectors which shall form part of the demilitarized zone.

(b) Any advance by the armed forces, military or paramilitary, of either party into any part of the demilitarized zone, when confirmed by the United Nations representatives referred to in the following subparagraph, shall constitute a flagrant violation of this agreement.

(c) The Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission established in article VII of this agreement and United Nations observers attached to the Commission shall be responsible for ensuring the full implemention of this article.

(d) The withdrawal of such armed forces as are now found in the demilitarized zone shall be in accordance with the schedule of withdrawal annexed to this agreement (annex II).

(e) The Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission shall be empowered to authorize the return of civilians to villages and settlements in the demilitarized zone and the employment of limited numbers of locally recruited civilian police in the zone for internal security purposes, and shall be guided in this regard by the schedule of withdrawal referred to in subparagraph (d) of this article.

6. On each side of the demilitarized zone there shall be areas, as defined in annex III to this agreement, in which defensive forces only shall be maintained, in accordance with the definition of defensive forces set forth in annex IV to this agreement.

U.N. Resolution on Israel

(Note.—Following is the text of a resolution unanimously adopted by the United Nations Security Council.)

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions of July 15, 1948, August 11, 1949, May 18, 1951, November 24, 1953, and March 29, 1955;

Taking into consideration the statements of the representatives of Syria and Israel and the reports of the Chief of Staff [Maj. Gen. E. L. M. Burns] of the Truce Supervision Organization on the Syrian complaint that an attack was committed by Israeli regular Army forces against Syrian regular Army forces on Syrian territory on December 11, 1955;

Noting the report of the Chief of Staff that this Israeli action was a deliberate violation of the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement including those relating to the demilitarized zone, which was crossed by the Israeli forces which entered Syria;

Noting also without prejudice to the ultimate rights, claims, and positions of the parties that, according to the reports of the Chief of Staff, there has been interference by the Syrian authorities with Israeli activities on Lake Tiberias [Sea of Galilee], in contravention of the terms of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria;

1. Holds that this interference in no way justifies the Israeli action;

2. Reminds the Government of Israel that the Council has already condemned military action in breach of the General Armistice Agreements, whether or not undertaken by way of retaliation, and has called upon Israel to take effective measures to prevent such actions;

3. Condemns the attack of December 11 as a flagrant violation of the cease-fire provisions of its resolution of July 15, 1948, of the terms of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria, and of Israel's obligations under the Charter;

4. Expresses its grave concern at the failure of the Government of Israel to comply with its obligations;

5. Calls upon the Government of Israel to do so in the future, in default of which the Council will have to consider what further measures under the Charter are required to maintain or restore the peace;

6. Calls upon the parties to comply with their obligations under Article 5 of the General Armistice Agreement to respect the armistice demarcation line and the demilitarized zone;

7. Requests the Chief of Staff to pursue his suggestions for improving the situation in the area of Lake Tiberias without prejudice to the rights, claims, and positions of the parties and to report to the Council as appropriate on the success of his efforts;

8. Calls upon the parties to arrange with the Chief of Staff in this and all other respects, to carry out the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement in good faith, and in particular to make full use of the Mixed Armistice Commission's machinery in the interpretation and application of the provisions.

The Text of Security Council Resolution

(Note.—Following is the text of a United States-British resolution on the Palestine question that was adopted by the Security Council.)

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions of July 15, 1948, and May 18, 1951,

Having considered the report of the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization on the military activities in the Lake Tiberias area and in the demilitarized zone,

Having heard the statements of the representatives of the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel,

Being deeply concerned over developments in the area which have taken place in violation of the Charter and of the armistice agreement,

Recalling in particular the provisions of article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter, and article 1 of the Syrian-Israel general armistice agreement,

Noting with satisfaction that a cease-fire has been achieved,

1. Deplores the hostile exchanges between the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel starting on March 8, 1962, and calls upon the two governments concerned to comply with their obligations under article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter by refraining from the threat as well as the use of force;

2. Reaffirms the Security Council resolution of January 19, 1956, which condemned Israeli military action in breach of the General Armistice Agreement, whether or not undertaken by way of retaliation;

3. Determines that the Israeli attack of March 16–17, 1962, constitutes a flagrant violation of that resolution and calls upon Israel scrupulously to refrain from such action in the future;

4. Endorses the measures recommended by the Chief of Staff for the strengthening of the Truce Supervisory Organization in its

tasks of maintaining and restoring the peace and of protecting and deterring future incidents, and calls upon the Israeli and Syrian authorities to assist the Chief of Staff in their early implementation;

5. Calls upon both parties to abide scrupulously by the cease-fire arranged by the Chief of Staff on March 17, 1962;

6. Calls for strict observance of article 5 of the General Armistice Agreement, which provides for the exclusion of armed forces from the demilitarized zone, and annex 4 of that agreement, which sets limits on forces in the defensive area, and calls upon the Governments of Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic to cooperate with the Chief of Staff in eliminating any violations thereof;

7. Calls upon the Governments of Israel and of the Syrian Arab Republic to cooperate with the Chief of Staff and the Truce Supervisory Organization in carrying out his responsibilities under the General Armistice Agreement and the pertinent resolutions of the Security Council and urges that all steps necessary for reactivating the Mixed Armistice Commission and for making full use of the mixed armistice machinery be promptly taken;

8. Requests the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervisory Organization to report as appropriate concerning the situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First I commend the Senator on his statements this afternoon. I apologize to the Senator for having left the Chamber for a little while. I wanted to hear all of his remarks; but I am familiar with the general thesis of them.

As I have said to the Senator privately, I say now for the RECORD, that I am concerned, over the resolution introduced by our Government in the Security Council relating to the Israel-Syrian dispute. I had been in touch with representatives of our Government in the State Department concerning the matter prior to the introduction of the resolution and the action of the Security Council.

I visited this very area last fall. I was at Lake Tiberias. I saw the demilitarized zone whence came the gunfire that hit the Israel gunboat. At the time of the armistice agreement the area which is now the so-called demilitarized area was considered to be in Israel territory insofar as the actual occupation by armed forces was concerned. That area was to have no military equipment in it. It is quite obvious that there were Syrian gun emplacements there; and from those guns firing took place into Israel territory.

My view is that we were right in seeking to restrain both the Syrians and Israelis from carrying out any kind of attack. It seems to me that the resolution would have expressed more properly the position that relates to the facts had it directed equal condemnation or equal chastisement to both countries. It is very important that our action in this area be predicated on the facts, and that we not rely upon trying to guess what may be happening a year from now.

I felt that the resolution as it was finally adopted did not lend itself to restraining the Arab countries from further provocation. I am sure it angered the Israeli officials considerably, and that fact was indicated by the speech of Premier Ben-Gurion and the action of the Knesset, Israel's parliament.

I hope that our policy in the Middle East will be one of trying to prevent any provocation, of encouraging regional economic development, and of being mindful of the value of a trusted friend such as Israel.

I do not know whether the Senator pointed out—possibly he did—that at the time we had to land forces in Lebanon, when there was a violent revolution, we could be sure of one thing—that our flank on the side of Israel was well guarded.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator pointed that fact out specifically.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And that there was no provocation coming from that flank which would cause embarrassment to us. These are valuable considerations in our national foreign policy.

I want to do what I can as a Senator to encourage reason, fair play, and, I hope, prudent judgment to the consideration of the difficulties in the Middle East. It is one of the most highly volatile and explosive areas of the world.

While for the moment our mind is fixed on Berlin, we ought not to forget that the Middle East has been looked upon by the Soviet Union as a prize and as a major strategic area for penetration by the Communists. It was even looked upon by the old Russian czars as a very vital area for Russian imperialistic ambitions. Therefore, whatever we do in that area ought to be done in the knowledge that stability is of the utmost importance.

We have made many commitments in the area—for example, in connection with the Suez Canal and freedom of navigation. We have talked about regional economic development.

We ought to make it our national policy to fulfill those commitments, particularly as they relate to unfettered navigation through the international waterways.

It is in the interest of peace to carefully and persistently seek a better understanding between the nation states in the Middle East.

I believe that such an understanding can be brought about if the policy of our country and of other countries is one of approaching the area on a functional basis; on the basis of economics, of water resources development, of a proper utilization of land, and the building of lines of communication. Ultimately this will have a tendency to wear away the irritating factor of Israel-Arab tension or conflict.

I join with the Senator from New York and other Senators in expressing my concern over the nature of that resolution of the Security Council. I would not be fair to myself, nor could I really say I would be fair to my Government, if I did not express publicly what I have stated privately.

I wish to have the record quite clear. I sent a message to the State Department. I do not think it is necessary to put the message in a public record, but in it I pointed out what I know to be the geographical and jurisdictional facts, such as the location of guns in the demilitarized zones, agreements reached at the time of the armistice, and the fact that there was provocation and reprisals.

There is no doubt that the Israel reaction was a severe one. The response was quick and devastating, but there would not have been any response if there had been no attack.

I hope the respective governments in that area of the world will recognize they are not merely engaging in hostilities among themselves. That would be bad enough; but every time one of those guns goes off, every time a reprisal takes place, every time a provocation occurs, the world peace is threatened. Struggles which start out sometimes as border skirmishes have a way of spreading into a much broader area of the world. The Middle East is like a tinderbox. Any spark can cause terrible destruction.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to our colleague, who not only speaks well but also speaks from such an important position as the deputy leader of his party in this Chamber. His expression reflects his typical frankness and integrity of thinking on the subject.

I join my colleague in the strong feeling he has already expressed, that if we are to be successful in continuing to keep the sworn enemies of freedom out of this highly incendiary part of the world we should be very grateful to little Israel for giving to us an absolutely dependable anchor point, which will not be alienated, I assure the Senator, through any feeling of unfairness over what has happened. That is quite apart from the point. We can thank Israel for being the central core of what will prevent real losses in that area of the world, which, when we faced the serious situation in Lebanon, seemed almost inevitable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This area of the world includes countries like Turkey and Iran. I realize that Iran is a considerable distance away from the shores of the Mediterranean, but it is in the great bridge which brings together the European, Asian, and the African continents.

Senators should recognize that there are serious governmental difficulties in Turkey today. I do not stand here as a judge of who is right or wrong, but the press reports we receive and the other information we receive as Members of the Senate indicate that the whole area requires the most statesmanlike and careful diplomacy on our part and on the part of our allies.

We are deeply indebted to Turkey as a loyal ally. Surely we wish for Turkey the very best. We rely upon Turkey as one of the pillars of the great NATO alliance.

Iran also must be considered. This noon we attended the joint meeting of the two Houses of the Congress, to listen to His Majesty the Shahanshah of Iran give us a very fine and thoughtful message—a statement from a friend and ally. His country has been going through a very difficult period. It is harassed from the outside by Soviet pressures. It is harassed on the inside by tremendous economic and social problems. Despite this, it is making progress. It is very important not only that our relationships with that country be maintained on a friendly basis but also that greater cooperation be extended. Iran is a stabilizing force, despite its difficulties, in the Middle East.

What I am trying to say is that all the Middle East is tied together. When any one of the areas breaks out into open hostility or violence, it has a tendency to affect the others. Had the Israel-Syrian incident flamed into a major struggle between those two countries, it is quite obvious that the conflict might have spread all along the Mediterranean. It could have involved a country like Iraq. Iraq is close to Iran. Therefore, it seems to me, that whatever action our Government takes in the United Nations or any place else should be thought out with meticulous care.

In this particular instance, since the United States felt compelled to admonish the nations involved, that admonishment should have been one of equal force. By admonishing equally, it seems to me, we would have better served the cause of international peace.

In addition, by so doing we should have demonstrated a worthy attribute in either public or private life, namely, a regard for a friend. Israel does not proclaim that she is a neutral in the world struggle. She does not say she is nonalined. She has put herself squarely on the side of democracy, on the side of the West. She has had to pay a penalty for it in many areas of the world. The Soviet Union now brings incredible pressure upon that country and harasses Israel and her people. I think we ought to be mindful of that fact.

I do not wish to have my remarks misinterpreted. I feel that the Middle East could again be the garden spot of civilization. The Arab people have a marvelous culture. They have a great history and they will have a great future, if ever once in this area they will lay down their swords and beat them into plowshares.

I have thought, sometimes, in regard to extending our foreign aid in areas such as this, that we ought to insist, before a country gets foreign aid in these highly volatile areas—particularly when a country says it is nonalined—that there be absolutely no military assistance along with the economic aid.

What I have stated here may be subject to some misinterpretation. I am a friend of this administration. I believe my record of support of the administration will stand careful scrutiny. However, when one feels strongly about a subject and has already discussed the subject privately with the appropriate authorities it might help a little to speak up publicly, so that the words will not be lost in the filing cabinets of the State Department.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I say to my colleague from Minnesota that the Senator from New York will in no way misinterpret or misuse his expressions of sentiment. The Senator from New York understands the Senator's fidelity to the administration. The Senator from New York understands that what the Senator from Minnesota has said today is the kind of thing only a friend can tell a friend.

It is in that spirit I know he has uttered his words with respect to the administration.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

UNITY FOR RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT ON THE COLUMBIA AND MISSOURI

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, on Tuesday the White House announced agreement between the Departments of Army and Interior on several important water resource projects.

I was pleased that among the projects cleared for authorization was Knowles Dam on the Flathead River in western Montana, which was proposed for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Knowles project, according to the December 1959 report of the Corps of Engineers, Seattle district, would have an initial installed capacity of 256,000 kilowatts, an ultimate capacity of 512,000 kilowatts. Cost was estimated at $235 million. Usable storage would be 3,080,000 acre-feet.

Construction of Knowles Dam will preclude alternative development of Paradise Dam on the Clark Fork, or Buffalo Rapids sites Nos. 2 and 4 on the Flathead.

Hearings on water resource developments in the Clark Fork-Flathead Basin were conducted by the Corps of Engineers in Hot Springs, Mont., in 1948, in Missoula, Mont., in 1957, by the Senate and House Interior Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittees in 1960.

I am gratified that the recommendations announced yesterday did not include construction of the Flathead Lake outlet. Senator MANSFIELD and I, and a majority of the persons in the Flathead area, concur in the administration's decision against this channel improvement project.

The White House also announced yesterday agreement between the two agencies on a joint study and report on the upper Missouri Basin between Fort Peck and Fort Benton. This area offers varied possibilities for development of water, recreation, grazing, and fish and wildlife resources.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, immediately following these remarks, the text of the April 10 White House announcement to which I have referred, and the March 14 "Memorandum of Agreement" between Secretary Udall and Secretary Stahr on which the announcement was based.

There being no objection, the announcement and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENTS OF ARMY AND INTERIOR

Major water resources developments in the Columbia River Basin and Alaska are being recommended in two executive branch reports being submitted to the Congress by the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior in conformity with a recent agreement between the two Departments. This action clears the way for early authorization of a number of important projects.

The Department of the Army is recommending construction of eight water resource projects based on a comprehensive review of the plan for the Columbia River Basin authorized by the Congress in 1955. The recommended projects are expected to cost $559 million and will provide important power, flood control, and related benefits. The Asotin project on the Idaho-Washington border, the China Garden project on the Idaho-Oregon border and the Bruces Eddy project in Idaho are proposed for construction by the Corps of Engineers, and the Knowles Dam project in Montana is proposed for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation. In addition, four projects in the Willamette River Basin in Oregon—Strube Reregulating Reservoir, Gate Creek Reservoir, Cascadia Reservoir, and modification of the existing Fern Ridge Reservoir are recommended for construction by the Corps of Engineers. Four projects—the proposed Flathead Lake outlet, High Mountain Sheep Dam (or any alternative), Penny Cliffs Dam and Garden Valley division are not recommended for authorization pending the results of additional studies of fish and wildlife, and other conservation measures by the Department of the Interior. If proposed for authorization when these studies are completed, the High Mountain Sheep Dam (or alternative) and the Garden Valley division will be proposed for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Penny Cliffs Dam and the Flathead Lake outlet improvement will be proposed for construction by the Corps of Engineers.

The Department of the Interior is recommending legislation to authorize construction of the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project in Alaska by the Corps of Engineers, and operation, maintenance and the marketing of power by the Department of the Interior. This project, located near Juneau, is expected to be constructed in three stages at an estimated total cost of about $42 million. It will contain an ultimate hydroelectric power installation of about 60,000 kilowatts.

These projects are recommended in conformity with a joint agreement recently concluded between the two Departments. The agreement provides for a division of responsibility between the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army in water resource development activities in Alaska, the upper Missouri River Basin and the previously mentioned projects in the Columbia River Basin. The division of responsibility agreed to is intended to assure the most effective utilization of the capabilities of the two Departments in the planning, construction, and operation of water resources projects, and these agreements will serve as a basis for administration recommendations for water resources development in these areas.

In the case of Alaskan activities, the two Departments have agreed that because of its longstanding interest in all natural resource development matters in Alaska, the Department of the Interior shall provide leadership in undertaking comprehensive studies for natural resources development, including water resources and power. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, because of its civil and military planning and construction responsibilities in Alaska, will design and construct all water resource projects. The Department of the Interior will operate and maintain completed hydroelectric power projects.

A report on the Rampart project, now in preparation by the Corps of Engineers, will proceed without interruption. This project, expected to be the largest single power project in the United States, would have a major impact on the development of natural resources in Alaska. Accordingly, the Department of the Interior will undertake a broad study at an early date on the relationship of the project to the development of Alaskan resources.

In the Missouri River Basin, the two Departments have agreed to make a joint study and report on the feasibility of multiple-purpose reservoir development on the main stem of the Missouri River, between Fort Peck and Fort Benton, Mont. Except for single-purpose flood control problems, planning and construction of multiple-purpose water resources development of the James River and tributaries of the Missouri River above Gavins Point on the South Dakota and Nebraska State line shall be the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation.

A copy of the "Memorandum of Agreement" is attached.

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

The undersigned have carefully considered the complex problems of water resources development in Alaska, the Columbia River Basin and the Missouri River Basin, and have concluded that a division of responsibility between the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army is both necessary and desirable. The division of responsibility agreed to is intended to assure the most effective utilization of the capabilities of the two Departments in the planning, construction and operation of water resources projects, and these agreements will serve as a basis for administration recommendations for water resources development in these areas.

1. ALASKA

It is agreed that, because of its longstanding interest in all natural resources development matters in Alaska, the Department of the Interior shall provide leadership in undertaking comprehensive studies for natural resources development in Alaska, including water and power development. Consistent with its responsibility for marketing of power produced at Federal hydroelectric projects, it is also agreed that the Department of the Interior shall be responsible for the operation and maintenance of completed hydroelectric power projects in Alaska.

It is agreed that, because it must maintain an organization engaged in civil and military planning and construction in Alaska, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers shall have responsibility for engineering design and construction of all water resources projects, including hydroelectric power projects, in Alaska. It is also agreed that the Corps shall continue its studies of the Rampart Canyon project and shall complete its report.

It is agreed that the Department of the Interior shall make the necessary power marketing studies in connection with the Rampart Dam project and shall initiate, in cooperation with the State of Alaska and interested Federal agencies, broad comprehensive studies of the effect of this project on all natural resources. This study shall be completed prior to any recommendations for authorization of the Rampart Dam project. The Department of the Interior shall also report as soon as possible on markets for power to be generated at any other major hydroelectric project in Alaska recommended for authorization.

This agreement will avoid the establishment of a duplicate construction organization in the State of Alaska and, at the same time, it will stimulate the broadest participation in comprehensive water resources planning.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS ON THE REVIEW REPORT ON COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

It is agreed that the projects proposed for authorization in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 31, 1961, on Columbia River and tributaries shall be recommended for authorization of construction by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, except that (a) Knowles Dam shall be recommended for authorization of construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, and (b) because further study is needed of major fish and wildlife problems and other conservation problems, the proposed Flathead Lake outlet improvement, high Mountain Sheep Dam, Penny Cliffs Dam, and Garden Valley division shall not be recommended for authorization at this time. It is also agreed that, because of the close relationship to major program interests of the Department of the Interior, that Department shall undertake detailed studies of the fish and wildlife problems associated with the four projects mentioned in (b) above. In addition, it is agreed that the Department of the Interior shall undertake any further engineering and economic studies leading to a recommendation for authorization of high Mountain Sheep Dam (or any alternatives) and Garden Valley division, and that these projects shall be recommended for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation; further, that the Corps of Engineers shall undertake any additional needed engineering and economic studies leading to a recommendation for authorization of Flathead Lake outlet improvement and Penny Cliffs Dam, and that these two projects shall be recommended for construction by the Corps of Engineers.

3. MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

It is agreed that because both departments have major program interests, a joint study and report should be made on the feasibility of multiple-purpose reservoir development on the main stem of the Missouri River between Fort Peck and Fort Benton, Mont. It is also agreed that, except for single-purpose flood protection problems, planning and construction of multiple-purpose water resources development of the James River and the tributaries of the Missouri River above Gavins Point shall be the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.
ELVIS J. STAHR, JR.
Secretary of the Army.

MARCH 14, 1962.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 16, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

New Frontier Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the imminence of a fateful April 16—income tax day—reminds us anew that "the power to tax is the power to destroy." And our recently abortive efforts to write an omnibus tax bill in the House is still being met by reverberations from my constituency, despite the fact that I voted against the measure in the belief that it should have been defeated on all counts.

At the time we debated the administration's tax reform plan my mail clearly reflected that there was precious little insistence on the part of industry for tax credits for certain investments in plant and machinery. Indeed one of the leading newspapers in my congressional district, the Lancaster, Pa., New Era, editorializes an industrial apathy towards this proviso in these words:

> For instance, on the matter of growth, with its promise of new jobs, the bill offers a doubtful program of credits to companies making certain kinds of investments. This would amount to direct subsidies and simply would increase Washington's meddling in a free market.
>
> We have more than enough tinkering with enterprise now. Why not promote growth by freeing business and industry from numerous unnecessary Federal restrictions and liberalize antiquated depreciation allowances?

That portion of my mail which refers to the Kennedy tax bill centers, however, on the proposal whereby taxes will be withheld on dividend and interest income by the bank or business with whom such income has accrued. In reviewing the letters which continue to reach me on that subject I do not find a single person who seeks to avoid paying what has been determined to be a just tax on his earnings. What he does object to is the heavy and unfair burden that will be imposed upon him as an honest taxpayer.

Here again, my New Era editor makes some telling comments on this objectionable proviso:

> Not only is there no effort to adjust the amount withheld to the amount due, but there is not even any provision for notifying individual taxpayers how much has been withheld. Banks and corporations would simply ship a flat 20 percent to Uncle Sam; individuals, if they owed less, and if they were aware that they are being cheated, and if they understood the redtape, would then have to petition Washington for refunds—not once but regularly. Meanwhile they would be deprived of the use of income rightfully theirs, and business firms would have to absorb the cost of the huge additional load of governmental bookkeeping.

This burdensome proviso has also had the attention of my favorite columnist, David Lawrence, in his article entitled "The Bank Withholding Proposal" in which he cites the complaint of one of his correspondents in regards to this measure:

> Our taxable income is approximately $4,200 a year, all of it derived from dividends and stocks. My husband and I are past 65 years of age and therefore have double exemptions of $1,200 each—a total of $2,400. We also have a retirement exemption, a 4-percent credit on dividends, as well as other deductible items. Our taxes amount to something like $50 a year or less. Yet the administration proposes to withhold from our modest income the sum of $840.
>
> What moral or legal right does it have to do such a thing? Except for the taxes we owe, that money is ours. It does not belong to the Government, nor to anyone else. If the Government withholds from us money we do not owe, that is confiscation. Promise of refund does not alter this fact.

Finally, to return to my Lancaster, Pa., New Era article, I find the editor making this pronouncement which may prove prophetic:

> If this trend toward centralization keeps up, we may some day find the Federal Government withholding everything we make and giving each of us an allowance to live on.
>
> That's an exaggeration, of course, but is it any more startling than the idea of a withholding tax on dividend and interest income would have been 30 years ago?

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is about as bad a piece of legislation as anyone has ever attempted to ram through the Congress and I predict that its supporters will have a difficult time as they attempt to justify it to their constituents. As for myself, I shall continue to believe that I did the right thing in opposing this New Frontier monstrosity.

Explanatory Statement to Accompany H.R. 11216

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, section 504 of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 provides that no person who has been a member of the Communist Party may serve as an officer or business agent of a labor union or as a labor relations consultant, for a period of 5 years after termination of his membership in the Communist Party. This section also provides criminal penalties for violation of this prohibition.

A major difficulty in determining whether any violation of this prohibition has occurred arises from the fact that membership in the Communist Party is a secret usually known only to party members or officials. Rank-and-file labor union members and law enforcement authorities are without access to such information. Even in those instances where an individual has been a known Communist but asserts that he has discontinued his party affiliation there is no clear way of determining whether such assertions are true, and the actual date of such disaffiliation.

The amendment here proposed would, at least to some extent, remedy these deficiencies. It would require that any individual who has been a member of the Communist Party must, before he can serve as an officer or representative of a labor organization, file an affidavit with the Subversive Activities Control Board setting forth the dates of his party membership and the date of final termination of such membership. As can be seen, this requirement will place a further legal obligation upon the Communist and cripto-Communist and will thereby increase the legal sanctions which may be applied in cases of violation of the prohibition now set forth in the statute. It is considered that this amendment will be of definite aid to rank-and-file union members in keeping their unions out of the hands of Communist agents, and will aid law enforcement authorities in the accomplishment of this same objective.

You will note that this is not an affidavit required of all union officials as was the case under Taft-Hartley. This affidavit will be required only of those union officials who have in the past been members of the Communist Party.

Victor Wickersham—Man of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, 21 years ago, my good friend and esteemed colleague from the State of Oklahoma, VICTOR WICKERSHAM, entered upon his career in this great legislative Chamber. It is my personal pleasure and privilege today to congratulate him upon his splendid record of service both to the people of Oklahoma and to the Nation, and to convey to him the warm personal regards and best wishes of his friends and colleagues.

If I were to name a particular characteristic which has distinguished VICTOR WICKERSHAM's legislative career, a quality which all men do not possess to such an abundant degree, I would say that VICTOR WICKERSHAM is truly a man of the people and a man for the people, and that he has never lost the common touch. He likes people and remembers them; and they remember him. This human quality, this ability to understand and sense the hopes and aspirations of his fellow men, is surely a fundamental prerequisite of the successful public servant.

VICTOR WICKERSHAM has, in addition, the advantage that he is a self-made man. He came up by his own efforts. He was born on a farm in Baxter County, Ark., and was reared on farms, both in Kansas and Oklahoma; he was educated in the rural public schools. At the age of 18 he began his public service as an employee of a county clerk's office. He was appointed court clerk in Greer County and elected to that post three times. From 1935–36 he was chief clerk of the board of affairs of the State of Oklahoma. For a few years he tried his hand in private business and was a success at that also.

When the people of the Seventh District first elected him to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1941 to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Representative Massingale, VICTOR WICKERSHAM came to Washington with an intimate firsthand knowledge and understanding of the problems of the farmer as well as the businessman. He came to the Congress confident that he could represent the interests of the people of Oklahoma, and he admirably fulfilled their expectations. He knows how to get things done.

Since 1941, VICTOR WICKERSHAM has been reelected to serve in the 78th, 79th, 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, and 87th Congresses. He has been a member of the Committee on Agriculture, Veterans' Affairs, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the Armed Services Committees.

On November 2, 1954, Representative WICKERSHAM had an opportunity to look into agricultural conditions in the Iron Curtain countries, the Soviet Union, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia.

It was most impressive that VICTOR WICKERSHAM availed himself of an invitation to the Kremlin the day after his arrival in Moscow to attend a reception given by M. Molotov on the occasion of the 37th anniversary of the Russian revolution. Mr. Molotov singled out VICTOR WICKERSHAM, shook his hand and led him up to Mr. Malenkov, then Premier, for an exchange of greetings and for an unprecedented conversation. VICTOR WICKERSHAM did not hesitate to take the opportunity on this historic occasion to serve his country as an ambassador of good will. He spoke very sincerely to Mr. Malenkov, impressing upon him America's desire for peace.

VICTOR WICKERSHAM was permitted to travel inside the Soviet Union for some weeks. He visited Stalingrad, Kiev, Odessa, Rostov, Kharkov and Stalino. He could not have helped impressing the Russian people with his sincere, warm, and friendly interest.

Shortly after his return to the United States, VICTOR WICKERSHAM received the Loyalty Day Award from the District Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The citation reads, "exhibiting those qualities in private and public life that make for a greater America."

Just last fall, VICTOR WICKERSHAM was in Berlin during the height of the crisis. He flew the Berlin wall. He tirelessly devoted himself to visiting the young enlisted men and the officers from Oklahoma who were in Berlin serving in the U.S. Armed Forces. Upon his return to the United States, he personally visited 79 towns in Oklahoma, making personal calls on the parents and relatives of the men he had talked with in Berlin, reporting firsthand on their welfare. VICTOR WICKERSHAM knows that the success or failure of the United States abroad often rests significantly upon the morale of our men in uniform.

Oklahomans know that in VICTOR WICKERSHAM they have a real friend in

Washington. His warm, sincere counsel, his friendly handshake, his encouragement to the folks back home to "phone, wire, or write," all constitute the hallmark of a true public servant.

Victor Wickersham is blessed with other great assets, his attractive wife and four fine children. He is an elder of the National City Christian Church here in Washington and when he is home in Oklahoma, he worships at the Christian Church in Mangum.

I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues in expressing our admiration for our fellow Member and in wishing him many more years of service to Oklahoma and the Nation.

The Agricultural Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I am hereby submitting a statement made by me before the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the House Appropriations Committee, on March 29, 1962, in behalf of the agricultural conservation program in the 1963 appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

Although my remarks were mainly confined to the accomplishments of this program in my State and in my congressional district, I am sure the ACP program is meaningful to every section of our country, and I include my statement in the Record in the hope that my colleagues in the House will be interested in the full appropriation for this important conservation plan which has been so helpful to the preservation of our natural resources.

The statement follows:

THE AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman and members of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I appreciate your giving me time to appear before you this afternoon in behalf of the full appropriation of $250 million for the agricultural conservation program in the appropriation measure for the Department of Agriculture, and to protest vigorously the $100 million cut recommended by the Budget Bureau for this program.

This program has been very meaningful to the agricultural sections of the entire country, but I should like to focus my remarks today on the benefits of the ACP to my own State of North Carolina. Despite the great industrialization of our State, and particularly of my own district with its concentration of tobacco manufactures, textile and furniture plants, and electronic installations, North Carolina is still an agricultural State and has the largest number of family farms of any State in the Union. We in North Carolina wish to retain, encourage, and make provision for our farmers in the interest of a wholesome and diversified economy, and I know of no better means of accomplishing this than by the full implementation of the ACP.

North Carolina has been receiving an ACP State allocation annually of a little more that $6½ million, which farmers match, thus enabling about $13 million worth of conservation work to be carried out each year. If the budget recommendation of $150 million is approved instead of the current $250 million authorized, the State allocation will be cut to about $3½ million, or almost half the previous amount.

The number of North Carolina farmers participating in the program has been growing each year until they now number more than 100,000, the largest number of any State in the Union. Many types of soil, water, forestry, and wildlife conservation practices are carried out to meet the manifold needs of the State.

About 87 percent of the ACP cost-sharing funds went for conservation practices with enduring benefits. But although operators of North Carolina farms representing 10½ million acres of farmland utilized the program to carry out many needed practices during 1960, more farmers would like to undertake more conservation work than they are able to do with the resources now available to them.

This is a voluntary program, whereby the Federal Government helps the farmer to help himself in carrying out conservation practices which individual farmers cannot finance completely on their own. Thus the money appropriated by the Federal Government for this program is in my opinion not an expenditure but rather an investment in an adequate future supply of water and food and fiber. I cannot give you nor, I suppose, can anyone, the return on this investment in terms of dollars, but I can only say that without an adequate supply of water, food, and fiber, the United States could become another Sahara Desert, and surely to keep our country green, to save our soil, to conserve and increase our water supply, and to preserve our forests is incentive enough and return enough on the mere dollar investment.

This program is not limited to the benefit of the agricultural population of our Nation, it serves directly the public interest. While our population is rapidly increasing, our farmland is being taken out of production by the steady and relentless encroachments of new roads, housing areas, airports, and any number of developments which indicate progress which we must make as a nation, but which shrink our farm potential. This is all the more reason why conservation practices are tremendously important for our farmland and why this problem is a universal responsibility and should be of concern to all segments of our population. Everyone benefits from conserving our soil and water, for this has direct implications for our standard of living and for that of future generations.

Also, the chain of interest and of business activity generated by the food and fiber produced by the farmer is an amazing and wonderful progression.

For example, the farmer's productivity and his conservation practices affect the vendors of seed, feed, fertilizer, insecticides, machinery, gasoline, credit, and other goods or services, who receive over two-thirds of the farmers' cash receipts from farm marketings. The livelihood of warehousemen, transporters, processors, salesmen, and others who handle farm products after they leave the farm depends on agricultural production, and it is estimated that about two-thirds of the price consumers pay for farm products as a whole goes to pay for these services. Manufacturers who depend on farm production for their raw materials are also a link in this chain, as 70 percent of the dollar value of all raw materials flowing into American industry and commerce stems from agricultural resources. And another link is the millions of consumers not engaged in production themselves but in professional walks of life to whom the farmer's welfare and agricultural practices are very meaningful although seemingly far removed. If only from a standpoint of self-interest, then, we must or should be vitally concerned with a continuing stable agricultural production.

I want to say a word about the watershed conservation program, in view of the fact that water is one of our natural resources which is and has been in crying need of conservation and expansion. The anticipated future water needs for this country are alarming and we are going to have to bend every effort to meet them. Under the 1961 ACP program in North Carolina, $301,983 of ACP cost-sharing assistance and additional amounts of ACP funds for bearing a part of the cost of technical assistance were utilized on 4,057 farms in 23 organized small watersheds. Since farmers match the ACP assistance from their own resources, this investment through the 1961 ACP in these 23 North Carolina small watersheds amounted to more than $600,000.

I cannot trespass further on the valuable time of this subcommittee, but I should like to offer for the record of hearings a tabulation showing the participation in the 1961 ACP program of the four counties comprising my congressional district, which indicates that 2,729 farms participated and received cost-share assistance to the extent of $253,251 in establishing conservation practices on those farms. Data on some of the outstanding practices performed are included. For the record, I should like also to include a separate tabulation for each of my four counties, showing the 1961 ACP accomplishments. It would be impossible for me to estimate and convey to you the ultimate value of all these conservation practices applied on the rolling lands of these Piedmont (North Carolina) farms.

And now let me apologize for dwelling on this program principally as it applies to the State of North Carolina and to my congressional district. As all of you know, this is an incentive, cost sharing, democratic program involving the best possible pattern of teamwork operation between Federal, State, and local governments and individual citizens, and it is important to all areas of our country. Feeling that what is good for North Carolina is good for the Nation, I have here presented the fine results of the ACP program in my State, and again, I wish to enter a strong plea for the full apppropriation of $250 million for this program.

The National Lottery of Malta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House about the national lottery of Malta. Indeed, the Maltese lottery is a new lottery, it being only recently established, but it has well proven its worth.

Malta, a small and poor Mediterranean island, last year took in gross receipts of more than a million and a half dollars from its national lottery. The income from the lottery was applied to the general revenue funds of the Maltese Government.

Mr. Speaker, if tiny Malta can operate a successful national lottery, why can't the United States also do so? In this country, where gambling is a $50-billion-a-year business, the revenue potentialities of a national lottery are stunning. We could bring at the minimum $10 billion a year into the coffers of our Treasury, and at the same time strike a deadly blow at the financial roots of the crime syndicates.

Mr. Speaker, how long must the hard-pressed taxpayers of America wait for financial and sociological reality to prevail over entrenched hypocrisy?

Summary of Replies to a Questionnaire—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the second part of the tabulated results of the replies to my questionnaire. This part consists of the questions and replies for the section entitled, "Taxes and Fiscal Affairs."

The tabulated results follow:

	Yes	No
TAXES—FISCAL AFFAIRS		
To achieve a balance of international payments which general combination of methods would you choose?		
12. Reduce desirable but unnecessary U.S. personnel abroad	4,775	1,034
13. Reduce desirable but unnecessary foreign aid and military aid abroad	5,116	915
14. Restrict U.S. currencies for our tourists	3,323	2,188
15. Restrict U.S. corporate foreign investments	3,597	1,950
16. Make U.S. goods competitive by stabilizing taxes, labor costs, and corporate profits	4,490	1,071
17. Increase U.S. duties to protect U.S. markets and probably decrease both imports and exports	1,784	3,657
18. Do you favor repealing the 25-percent gold reserve for U.S. currency and Federal Reserve bank deposits?	763	4,824
19. Do you favor substituting Federal Reserve notes for U.S. $1 silver redeemable dollars?	1,003	4,368
20. Would you favor a House of Representatives budget submitted by its revenue and appropriating committees in conjunction with Presidential budget?	4,202	1,293
21. Do you believe in a balanced budget except in an abnormal depression economy?	5,762	547
Would you favor these currently considered tax changes?		
22. Doubling depreciation rates for new machinery at a loss of about $1.8 billion a year in corporate revenues	2,571	3,528
23. Withholding tax of 20 percent on dividends and interest	2,834	3,582
24. Limit club dues and entertainment expenses to 50 percent where substantiated and connected with business	5,001	1,374
25. Increase taxes of mutual savings banks, loan associations, insurance companies, and cooperative businesses	4,094	3,332
26. Give President authority to reduce personal income tax percentages by 5 percent subject to congressional veto	4,283	2,077
27. Increase taxes upon U.S. corporate foreign profits	5,183	1,107
28. Increase taxes on U.S. individual foreign earnings	5,213	1,065
29. Increase taxes on corporate official stock option plans to buy at lower than market price and also permitting capital gain tax treatment instead of direct income	4,334	1,356
30. A $200 increase in tax exemptions for taxpayer and dependents	5,156	1,295

Vice President Lyndon Johnson Makes Vital Contributions to a Better Understanding of Our Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, admittedly there is too little understanding on the part of many of us who have a responsibility to know and to acquire comprehension of our country's programs in the field of space and astronautical science.

Our periodicals, television, and radio have been helpful in substantial degree and they have performed admirable services for our citizens in providing detailed articles and live coverage of some of the remarkable achievements of our astronauts.

The clearest understanding of the scope, the performance, and the future of space programs and developments seem to me, however, to reach us through the speeches on the subject by the statesman who was a legislative pioneer in this vital field and who serves so diligently and effectively as Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

On March 16, 1962, Vice President JOHNSON spoke here in the Nation's Capital at the Goddard Memorial Award dinner when tribute was paid to the late Robert H. Goddard whose pioneering in rocketry in New Mexico during the early 1920's provided much scientific knowledge as a foundation for the space technology of this era.

The Vice President's message on that occasion was a masterful and concise evaluation of our commitment to space; of what we expect; of the realistic purpose of the space program; of satellites at work; of developments in the interest of peace; of the tangible gains through the space investment; and of the unlimited reaches of space which today constitute the new world of freedom.

Mr. President, for authoritative answers to the questions in the minds and on the lips of many Americans as to what we are doing in space and what our efforts will mean in tangible terms for all Americans, I recommend a careful reading of the Vice President's Goddard Memorial Award dinner address. I ask unanimous consent that pertinent excerpts from that message be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTIAL REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, GODDARD MEMORIAL AWARD DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., FRIDAY, MARCH 16, 1962

I think the man we honor tonight would be pleased indeed to know how much a part of the American scene his great dream has become.

And tonight, it is a great privilege for me to join with you in this dinner which pays tribute to Robert H. Goddard. All who knew the story of his life and work, know how richly this honor is deserved.

He wasn't a Texan, but I hasten to add that he came from the next best place—Massachusetts.

It is fitting that we meet for this purpose at this time. This is a season of success for our Nation's space effort.

We are reaping a bountiful harvest from the vision and the courage of those who urged that America move forward with vigor in the exploration of space.

To all those men of faith and zeal, our Nation owes a very great debt for their leadership and their labors. Because of them, we shall live in a new and wondrous world.

OUR COMMITMENT TO SPACE

Today the exploration of space is firmly fixed as a part of our national policy and purpose.

Three years ago we began the space program with $900 million. In the current fiscal year, new obligational authority will reach $3.1 billion.

For the next fiscal year, beginning in July, the request is for new obligational authority of $5.5 billion.

Never before in history has any nation made so great a commitment of its resources and talents to a program of science research and exploration for purely peaceful purposes.

WHAT DO WE EXPECT?

With the space program at this level, with space activities absorbing our national resources at this rate, I believe we are obligated to ask ourselves, every step of the way:

Why are we doing this?

What do we expect to attain?

What will this mean, in tangible terms, for our people who bear the burdens of this great endeavor?

It is not enough to answer that, like the mountain climbers, we must climb into space simply because it is there. Nor is it enough to answer that we must explore space because others are engaged in such exploration.

OUR PURPOSE IS REALISTIC

Our purpose is not merely to peek into the windows of heaven or to preen our national pride. Our purpose in space is both realistic and responsible, just as it is also peaceful.

It is important that the world understand this, and it is equally important that we understand this about ourselves.

That is why tonight, as chairman of the National Space Council, I would like to address my remarks to these questions I have listed.

Why are we doing what we are doing in space? What do we expect to attain? What will our efforts mean, in tangible terms, for Americans?

"The real and legitimate goal of science is the endowment of human life with new inventions and riches."

That is the goal of our own space effort today, to endow all of human life, in all lands, with new inventions and new riches.

It is peculiar to the nature of peaceful space achievements that their benefits flow not to a single nation or a single people, but to all nations and all peoples.

Let me itemize and illustrate what I mean.

Thus far, space science and research is focused in five principal areas: communications, weather, navigation, mapping and medicine.

In each area, the gains of our progress will benefit not only ourselves but free nations in both hemispheres.

SATELLITES AT WORK

Our weather satellites already are doing this. Last year Tiros satellites watched over five hurricanes and one tropical storm in the Atlantic.

These same satellites provided invaluable information on nine Pacific typhoons to Japan, the Philippines, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Mexico, as well as Hawaii, Guam, and Okinawa.

Our navigation satellites ultimately will—in every kind of weather—guide ships at sea, regardless of their national registry. Our research in space medicine is being shared in by our allies in the cause of freedom.

We anticipate in the not distant future that mapping and measuring satellites will be in cooperative use with our neighbors in Latin America and elsewhere to permit for the first time accurate mapping of their nations.

COMMUNICATION SATELLITES

One of the most dramatic advances in human history will come from the communications satellite program proposed by President Kennedy.

That one program will eliminate the need—and the cost—of laying 50 additional cables across the oceans in the next 20 years.

Intercontinental communication between people will be made far easier, far less expensive.

More than that, this system will permit face-to-face television communication at any hour between heads of state.

Major conferences can be held without the principal participants ever leaving their own country.

Furthermore, advances in the realm of rapid data transmission will permit the transmission in 2 weeks' time of every page in every book in the Library of Congress anywhere in the world.

That means that scholars in the new nations of Africa and Asia no longer need yearn for libraries or source materials. They will have access to the world's greatest stores of knowledge within a matter of seconds.

OUR EXPECTATION: PEACE

I cite these examples for one reason. From the beginning, our national policy toward space has been guided by the faith that the avenues of space offer man's best hope for bringing nearer the day of peace on earth.

All that we have learned, all that we have achieved, fortifies that faith.

In these realms, there is no cause for nations to war against one another. On the contrary, there is every cause for nations to cooperate together, and out of such cooperation will grow the basis for understanding and peace.

It is our policy, and will continue to be our policy, to work for such joint exploration and use of space for peaceful purposes by all nations.

If any ask, why do we do what we are doing in space—what do we expect to attain—the first answer of America is a one-word answer: peace.

THE TANGIBLE GAINS

But, as this answer is given, we acknowledge the right of every American to ask and to be answered on what this space effort will mean to him in tangible terms.

Here, again, the answer is exciting.

Twice within the lifetime of many here, and more often in the lifetime of our Nation, we have experienced our greatest bursts of economic growth and social advance on the impetus of new inventions and innovations. At the turn of the century, such impetus came from inventions of the automobile, the airplane, the electric light, and many others.

Again, at the end of World War II, we experienced the phenomenon of the consumer markets with the application of many war-born inventions.

Out of today's space research another such wave of growth and business prosperity is developing now. Let me cite a few examples:

The transistor radio, now one of the most popular consumer products in America, is basically the outgrowth of space technology.

What we have learned in miniaturization techniques will make possible, ahead, wristwatch radios, pocket television receivers, new hearing aids for the deaf, whole new families of home appliances.

Out of space research the powerplants of tomorrow's automobiles may be no bigger than a coffee can, burning new fuels with much greater efficiency.

The automobiles themselves as well as our homes, our office buildings, even the clothes we wear, could be made of materials which are not known or named today.

Within the next 10 years, at most, our economy will begin to feel the impact of major new revolutions: a revolution in materials, in methods, in marketing, in medicine.

It is important to see our space program in this perspective. We are substituting space research dedicated to peaceful purposes for war itself as the source and stimulus of new invention and technological progress.

We are strengthening our defense capabilities and we shall keep them strong; but the funds going into space research are investments which will yield dividends to our lives, our businesses, our professions, many times greater than the initial costs.

THE SPACE INVESTMENT

Let me underscore this. Our entire space program, even at the peak planned for next year, is costing annually less than the $7.5 billion we spend on cigars and cigarettes, less than the $5 billion we spend on face powder, lipstick and nail polish.

It could be tripled and it would still be less than the $19.4 billion we spent in 1961 for what we call recreation.

And it is estimated conservatively that our space outlays will yield $2 return for every $1 invested. For every nickel we put into it, we get a dime back.

This is tangible, proved fact. Already the Weather Bureau estimates that the savings from our space advances in weather forecasting will soon run into billions annually.

Just last year, a Tiros weather satellite gave 3 days advance warning of Hurricane Carla.

The early knowledge permitted thousands of cars, bumper to bumper, to evacuate the people inland 300 miles, and this most powerful hurricane in a generation was one of the least costly in terms of human life or property damage.

From all our space programs, we may anticipate such measurable, tangible benefits enriching human life in our own land and in our own times and in all lands, for all time to come.

It may be 10 generations, or it may be much sooner, before space science will enable man to reach the milky way. But it will not be 10 years, it may be very much sooner, before space science reaches into every home, every business, the life of every family on Main Street, U.S.A.

A LOOK AT THE FUTURE

As we attempt to look 25 years into the future we catch visions of breathtaking journeys in large manmade planets around the Sun to Mars and Venus, of a new freedom of movement of man across millions of miles of space, of a permanent colony on the Moon and of large space stations or spaceports at key locations for the conduct of space research, for aids to space navigation, and for rescue operations.

The cosmic space waves may well become as familiar to us as our present global airways.

THE NEW WORLD

As we strive to see or to explain the "practical" aspects of space, let us not forget the broad perspective.

From the beginning of time until about five centuries ago, men lived out their lives on earth without hope of rising above the station of their birth.

They had no expectation of freedom, no expectation of justice, no thought of individual rights, no conception of a voice in governing themselves.

Then came the discovery of the new world, the world of the Americas. Since that day, man has climbed steadily to his noblest heights.

His status, economically and socially, has risen through every century. Most importantly, since the opening of the new world, no crown has rested securely on the head of any tyrant.

Discovery, exploration, and a floodtide of invention for five ceturies have brought the liberation of the human spirit and the elevation of human dignity and worth.

Freedom as we know it would not have come into existence, and certainly would not have survived, without the opening of this great new frontier on earth.

Today the unlimited reaches of space constitute the new world of freedom.

This is no labored comparison. Of what meaning, of what worth to their builders can walls long be in an age when men can leap from the earth and presume to reach toward the moon and the stars?

Of what value are the jail keys of the totalitarian societies when God has permitted man to unlock the doors to the universe itself?

The scientific value is only a part of the impelling motives for our space exploration.

Improved weather forecasting, the communication and navigational advances, and the industrial improvements also represent gains in our defense structure.

A nation that could control the weather and communications could control the world.

Final results in space science and space explorations, our intense support of the program, could well be the determining factor between defeat and victory.

The Big Steal by Big Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the boost in steel prices by the United States Steel Corp. and other leading steel producers by $6 a ton effective immediately is the "big steal" from the hard-pressed American taxpayer, the wage earner, and the American farmer. Such action is unjustifiable, uneconomic, and unwise. The action demonstrates a callous disregard for the American economy and raises the flag of profits above the flag of the United States. The action will extract from the pocketbooks of the American people billions of additional dollars which they cannot afford to spend.

The American people in all walks of life have been deeply disturbed—disturbed by the knowledge of a wrong perpetrated by indifferent economic barons who have disregarded the American people.

The ramifications of this action extend to every part of our economic fabric. The cost of living will increase and the purchasing power of the wage earner will shrink.

Steel is basic to the American way of life. The farmer uses steel machinery to plant his crops and to harvest his wheat, corn, and cotton. The increase in steel prices will cost the farmer more to produce the food and fiber and the farmer's increased cost will be passed on to the consumer in the cities and across the Nation. What does this price boost mean in our everyday life? It means that our stoves, our frigidaires, our freezers, our television sets, our cooking utensils, our washing machines, and the manifestations of our advanced civilization will cost the housewife and the breadwinner much more to purchase. Our American dollar will buy less goods. Automobiles, trucks, and trailers, which presently are in great supply, will cost our people more money to purchase, to repair, and to operate. Our clothing, suits, and dress wear, will see rising prices. Our machinery equipment, our satellites, our missiles will mount to an additional billion dollars. The cost of projecting astronauts to explore the universe will soar higher than the astronauts themselves. Our whole economic structure has been shaken to its foundation by this price boost in steel and allied products.

Our administration, our President, and the Congress have been called upon by me and my colleagues and the American people to see what they will do. Action has been promised and will be taken. Every one who believes in our free economic society disapproves of price controls except in times of extreme emergency. When a group of powerful economic interests can jeopardize our American economy by a concerted drive, an emergency has arisen. We must, therefore, seriously consider economic price controls in steel products to prevent inflationary disaster. We trust that the leader of the 11 big steel companies, the United States Steel Corp., and those steel producers who followed quickly the price boost parade will reconsider their ill-advised action and demonstrate their responsibility to the American people as well as to their stockholders and rescind their action.

Archbishop John J. Swint Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week the West Virginia University bestowed an honorary doctor of laws degree upon Archbishop John J. Swint of the Wheeling diocese of the Roman Catholic Church. The degree was conferred at ceremonies in connection with the installation of Dr. Paul A. Miller as president of the university.

Bishop Swint is a native West Virginian, and was ordained a priest in 1904. Prior to that he had received degrees from St. Charles College, Ellicott City, Md., and St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore. For many years he was head of the diocesan apostolate in Wheeling, before going to Weston as a pastor.

In 1922, he was recalled to Wheeling as administrator of the diocese and later that year was named bishop. In 1929, in recognition of his outstanding service in the diocese he was appointed by Pope Pius XI as an assistant to the pontifical throne. Later he was honored with the additional title of archbishop.

The honors and responsibilities given him by the Roman Catholic Church bear testimony to his service as a religious leader. Others of us in West Virginia know of his great service to his community and his State as a civic leader. Our paths first crossed in 1923 when I was a member of the Clarksburg City Council and a matter in which Bishop Swint was interested came up for consideration.

The honor is well deserved. I congratulate both the university and Archbishop Swint.

Go Slowly, Carefully on Free Trade Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, as the debate concerning our tariff program nears, a great many Americans believe we should proceed very cautiously in any further tariff reductions because of the threat to our workers and industry.

This cautious attitude was ably expressed in an article by Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, which appeared in the March issue of the International Teamster.

The article follows:

GO SLOWLY, CAREFULLY ON FREE TRADE PROPOSALS

(By Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana)

President Kennedy's admission and that of the AFL-CIO's George Meany that the President's foreign trade program will increase unemployment at least temporarily is reason enough for me, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, officials and members of all unions, and every citizen of the United States to consider carefully, and in the light of all the facts, whether it deserves support or opposition.

President Kennedy recognized the unemployment possibilities in his proposals when he said in his message to the Congress:

"Any worker or group of workers unemployed or underemployed as a result of increased imports would * * * be eligible for (certain) forms of assistance."

Mr. Meany and Mr. Walter Reuther, who heads the UAW, have made it plain that the Congress must provide even more adequate protection than that which is provided in the President's bill for workers who lose their jobs because of increased imports as a result of the trade legislation.

There is far too much unemployment now. What we need is legislation to create jobs. Will President Kennedy's program do that? On the basis of the facts now available, I don't know. If it will, let's support it. If it won't create jobs or if it will reduce jobs, let's oppose it.

I am not opposed to foreign trade. One of my basic theories as a Senator for 18 years has been that trade, including foreign trade, makes jobs, and jobs make trade. Will the Kennedy proposal accomplish that? That's the test.

It is the responsibility of each and every trade union official and every American worker to obtain informative, factual answers to many unanswered questions raised by the President's so-called free trade program.

It is also the responsibility of every Member of Congress to do so. As the senior Senator representing the citizens of Indiana, including approximately 100,000 Teamster members, I will live up to my responsibility.

At least seven basic questions must be answered before Members of Congress can vote intelligently on this new program, and before labor officials take a definite position. After reading the following questions, I believe you will agree:

1. How many American working people will be forced into the ranks of an already excessive number of unemployed workers—1 million, 5 million, or more?

2. How many industries will be forced out of business, how many will be seriously affected, and what will become of them?

3. What American towns and cities might be reduced to ghost towns by forced shutdown of their businesses?

4. What effect will the proposal have on the American farm community—not just farmowners, but farmworkers?

5. How long will the American workman be unemployed before he can be retrained or provided gainful employment in another industry?

6. What kind of jobs will the Government provide for those American working people forced into the unemployment ranks?

7. Will our working people, forced into the ranks of the unemployed because of the lowly paid worker in foreign countries, be forced to live on a government dole, and will such a dole become a permanent fixture in the American economy?

It should be obvious to all of us that these questions must be answered in precise terms by the Kennedy administration. They have not been.

There are those, including the President and some of my colleagues, who insist that we rush into this matter immediately and uninformed. We just must not do so, because the consequences might be as serious as those of many other mistakes we have made in the past. Let's take a year, or two, or three if necessary, to be sure we don't make a mistake. We can't afford a mistake on this one.

Where are new jobs to come from? Equally important is what happens to the employer driven out of business by unfair foreign competition. It doesn't stand to reason that an employer, providing wages and working conditions demanded by Teamster officials and other unions, should be penalized by foreign competitors providing wages and working conditions 50 to 75 percent lower.

Businessmen or employers, be they small, medium, or large, are wise. Whether President Kennedy likes it, they have devoted the best part of the lives, financially and physically, to their enterprises. I speak from experience, and you will find that even my critics will concede that I was successful in building a small business into a fairly large business. Moreover, I did it without capitalizing on or exploring low-cost labor.

Industry cannot compete with foreign imports produced by low-cost labor.

The establishment of new and expansion of existing businesses is one of our great hopes for correcting the serious unemployment picture.

The President has said that in 1962 we need 25,000 new jobs each week if we are to reduce unemployment to 4 percent of our working force. Even reduced to the 4-percent figure there would still be approximately 4 million unemployed. Interestingly enough, at the same time the President made his statement, Under Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz told a midwest audience we need 35,000 new jobs each week to reach the 4-percent figure. This is one reason why we must have informative, factual answers to the questions I have raised.

Businessmen are genuinely concerned with President Kennedy's request for arbitrary power to revise and abolish tariffs as the price of entering into free trade. Justifiably, they are reluctant to support his proposal.

Many employers feel they must delay plant expansion or the opening of new plants for fear these new plant facilities would be noncompetitive by the time they were ready to go into operation because of the trade program.

They feel they may be forced to invest in foreign countries the money they would normally use for growth and expansion in the United States, thus substituting foreign investments for national investment in plant facilities.

Many of them are considering remodeling of existing plant facilities, converting them to totally automated plants, with the hope that completely new industries will spring up to provide the new jobs for a greatly increased number of unemployed.

When the President's free trade program comes up on the Senate floor, I am going to propose amendments that will provide an equalization of labor costs through tariffs.

For example, let us assume the labor cost for making a pair of shoes imported from Italy is $1, and the labor cost for making a similar pair of shoes in the United States is $2. My amendments will make it mandatory that a $1 tariff be added to the Italian-made shoes. This tariff will equalize the labor cost so the American shoe manufacturer is not driven out of business, and it will also assure the American worker in the shoe factory his standard of living will not be reduced.

I recognize, as do Teamsters members I am sure, that the nations of the world are closer to each other today because of modern transportation and communication facilities. But, that doesn't mean the American businessman and American wage earner must sacrifice our free enterprise system to the low-wage-scale program of other nations. That can result only in the inevitable reduction of our standard of living to their lower standard.

Great Lakes Shipbuilding: The Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the American shipbuilding industry at this date is a buyer's market. So few contracts are available that the competition for them is high pitched. Contracts have frequently gone to companies bidding below costs. Clearly, such practice is impossible over the long run. Particularly acute is the condition of the Great Lakes shipyards. They have received no contracts for commercial oceangoing vessels and have lost contracts for lake carriers to the coast yards. The seaway, allowing Great Lakes builders to bid for ocean ships, has allowed the coast builders to bid on lake carriers.

The pattern on Great Lakes commerce has been disrupted by the operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the decreased demand for domestic ores resulting both from the depletion of Lake Superior ores and the recession. New trends are appearing: The Great Lakes fleet is being reduced in the face of low-cost foreign competition; importation of foreign ores will increase; new vessels will be larger because of additional channel depths and the need for economical operation against foreign competition; general cargo traffic and the export of grain will increase.

A U.S. vessel cannot compete economically with an identical foreign-built vessel operated in an identical manner. Besides the lower construction costs, the labor costs average from 35 to 65 percent less. Canada countered the threat of low-cost competition through two moves: first, depreciation allowances were liberalized to permit increased vessel construction funds to be set aside before taxes; second, the Government also recently authorized construction subsidies up to 40 percent for vessels built during the next 3 years. These actions figure in the Canadian construction program: five large bulk carriers were built in 1960 and three more are scheduled for 1961 delivery. Five others are contracted or on the way. American operators must have bigger ships to compete with the 20,000- to 22,000-ton Canadian carriers in the hauling of grain and iron ore.

Great Lakes shipping and Great Lakes shipbuilding cannot be considered apart. The health of the two is complementary, and neither one is healthy. The security of the United States requires that there be enough ships to handle the traffic load in case of an emergency. At the present rate of decommissioning of the Great Lakes fleet, an emergency would overtax the carrying capacity. Forty-one of the 77 ships in the independent American fleet alone have been sold or scrapped since January 1. The Shipbuilders Council indicated in their memorandum that some domestic Great Lakes ore carrier replacements are under consideration. Also, there is some prospect of overseas industrial ore carriers under the U.S. flag. Marring both these projections is the question of financing. Under present law, the Government cannot subsidize domestic shipping nor Canadian-United States shipping.

As most commercial building is done with the aid of a Federal Maritime Board subsidy, the Great Lakes must show interest in maritime contracts. Shipbuilders must be willing to bid; the initiative can come only from them. Some coast builders bid deliberately high on a bid because they do not wish to spend $10,000 to $15,000 to make an exact bid but do wish to remain on the bidder's list. Government's role, specifically that of the Maritime Administration, certainly cannot be obviated. A regional group of shipbuilders should be organized to serve as a spokesman for the shipbuilders and for liaison with Maritime. The problem is a joint one and must be met jointly.

The engineering report of 1958 states that Great Lakes shipyards "perhaps are not as extensively equipped nor as well manned as are some of the larger U.S. coast yards." Competition in costs is therefore problematical. Because of their limited facilities, one yard in the Great Lakes cannot build simultaneously the usual Federal Maritime Board allotment of from four to six ships. Chairman Thomas Stakem of the Maritime Board has suggested that two shipyards might bid on a Maritime allotment as a joint venture.

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

To encourage the development and maintenance of an American merchant marine adequate to meet the commercial and defense needs of this country is the policy of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Title 50, United States Code, section 1735, further elaborates this policy:

> (a) It is necessary for the national security and development and maintenance of the domestic and the export and import foreign commerce of the United States that the United States have an efficient and adequate American-owned merchant marine: (1) Sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of its waterborne export and import foreign commerce and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times, * * * (4) composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States, and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personel; and (5) supplemented by efficient American-owned facilities for shipbuilding and ship repair, marine insurance, and other auxiliary services.

Following this policy, the Maritime Board began a replacement program of 294 ships to be built by 1972. The fiscal year 1961 program included:

> East coast: 19 ships at $181 million; 66 percent of dollar value; west coast: 3 ships at $30.4 million; 11 percent of dollar value; gulf coast: 6 ships at $62.7 million; 23 percent of dollar value; Great Lakes: nothing.

For fiscal year 1962, Maritime had asked for $170 million for 19 ships; only $85 million for 14 ships was approved. Added to this will be $85 million carried over for 5 ships. To July 1, 1961, 77 ships in the replacement program had been contracted, but fewer than 15 had been completed. Of these, 14 freighters and 2 passenger ships were awarded to gulf coast yards; 39 freighters, 3 combinations, and 2 passenger ships to east coast yards; and 17 freighters to west coast yards.

In administering this program, the Maritime Board was directed to consider national defense needs as to the existence of "vigorous and dispersed shipbuilding and ship repair facilities in the United States." Mr. Unander, a member of the Federal Maritime Board, in the same speech, added that this policy pertains to facilities on all coasts. The allotment of contracts, however, has been almost strictly on the basis of low bid. Exceptions were five ships allotted to the west coast under section 502(d) of the 1936 act and six ships allotted to the same coast under section 502(f). Great Lakes yards have received no contracts under the replacement program; in fact, only one, Manitowoc, has bid on a contract, and this was several years ago. Even if the Board saw fit to allocate contracts under 502(f), they feel that a region should at least show interest in Maritime contracts.

It is plain that the Great Lakes position has declined relative to the other maritime regions. Under section 502(f) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 the Secretary of Commerce may allot work to a shipyard if such work "will remedy an existing inadequacy in such mobilization base as to the capabilities and capacities of a shipyard or shipyards at a strategic point." Admiral Schultz, of the Bureau of Ships, remarking on the national defense value of the Great Lakes in hearings on the 6-percent differential before the Merchant Marine Committee this year, said that "it has expanded in recent years because of the St. Lawrence Seaway." However, it does not appear as if Maritime will allocate any ships. For one thing, all shipyards are experiencing difficulty in obtaining work, so the competition is keen. Award of a contract to other than the low bidder can also cause political repercussions.

Public Law 84-805 provides for a periodic survey of shipbuilding capacity to determine the mobilization potential on all coasts. Of prime consideration in this survey, and therefore of first importance in 502(f) allocation, is the status of employment and of the ways with respect to the mobilization base. The last survey, in 1959, showed the Great Lakes poorest in line next to the west coast. At that time, there were five bulk carriers in the yards on the lakes; now there are none. Continued operation and improvement of the St. Lawrence Seaway will mean increased importance for the Great Lakes in the national defense picture. Thus, there is a situation in which the defense value is increasing while the mobilization base is shrinking.

Other agencies of the Government build ships, and the Maritime Administration usually administers the contracts. Lately, the contracts have been let out to the low bidder. In the latest bidding for Coast and Geodetic Survey ships, four Great Lakes companies were invited to enter bids but failed to do so. These contracts may be allocated under certain conditions similar to those for 502(f) allocations.

The economic position of the Great Lakes yards and, therefore, their ability to bid, is difficult to ascertain. The General Accounting Office did study cost sheets of yards on the four coasts in connection with hearings of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on the Pacific coast 6-percent differential. Material prices are certainly not appreciably more than the other coasts, and, in some cases, may be less because of the proximity to sources of supply. The labor cost differential was found to be 18.7 percent less than the west coast. Weather conditions on the lakes, according to E. Q. Sylvester, president of the American Ship Building Co., "operate against Great Lakes yards to the extent of approximately 2½ percent per ship because of the fact that recent Maritime Board contracts have contained provisions for delays in delivery amounting to a $2,200 penalty a day." Delivery of the contracted vessels can be made from, roughly, the first week of April to the first week of December. The Board, on its part, has altered requirements for the delivery of completed vessels to salt water, accepting delivery at the builder's yard, provided the vessel can be steamed out to salt water. The Board has also provided a longer building period, up to 27 months. Further, they have said they would conclude the awarding of a contract within a specified 30-day period after the opening of the bids if a Great Lakes shipyard were low bidder. These procedures would enable a Great Lakes shipyard to arrange its construction schedule in a manner that would permit avoidance of delivery during periods of ice conditions. Aside from delay in delivery, weather has adverse effects of raised overhead—for heating, snow removal, work delays, and so forth. Since efficiency increases and overhead costs proportionately decrease the greater the amount of building in a yard, the lakes' shipyards are again at a disadvantage because little work is being done.

Another possibility for their inability to bid are the built-in limitations of the seaway. Dimensional limitations of the St. Lawrence Seaway as fixed by the Canadian locks are: 730 feet in length by 75 feet in width by 25.5 feet in draft for minimum safe clearance. The usable dimensions of the locks are 768 feet by 80 feet by 27 feet. Ships over the minimum safe clearance, yet under the maximum usable clearance, could go through the locks on a special basis. In this manner, 75 percent of the replacement fleet could go through the seaway. The C-4 ships—28 proposed in the program—for example, could go through without a cargo to meet the draft restriction. In addition, the St. Marys River and Detroit River passages to the upper lakes impose draft restrictions of 23 feet 10 inches and 24 feet. These are scheduled to be deepened to the seaway's 27-foot controlling draft by 1962. Additional restrictions may be imposed by local port facilities.

Aside from the navigational facilities and their limitations, the Great Lakes yards have berths large enough to handle and build oceangoing ships. The "Engineering Study of the Effects of the Opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway on the Shipping Industry, 1958" lists the building berths of the Great Lakes yards. There are also 13 drydocks at 8 different ports, some of which may be used for shipbuilding.

Shipyards and shipways in the United States as of Jan. 1, 1960

	Gulf	West	East	Great Lakes
Yards	5	7	9	7
Ways	19	29	40	15

Building berths in the Great Lakes

	Berths	
	Number	For ships to—
American Shipbuilding Co.:		
Lorain, Ohio	2	735 by 75 feet.
	2	550 by 75 feet.
Toledo, Ohio	3	680 by 75 feet.
Defoe Shipbuilding Co.:		
Bay City, Mich	1	800 by 75 feet.
Great Lakes Engineering Works:[1]		
River Rouge, Mich	3	800 by 75 feet.
Ashtabula, Ohio	1	800 by 75 feet.
Manitowoc Shipbuilding Co.: Manitowoc, Wis.	3	700 by 75 feet.
Christy Corp.: Sturgeon Bay, Wis.	1	700 by 40 feet that can be expanded to 700 by 75 feet.

[1] Now in the process of liquidation.

There are also 24 general repair facilities in 13 ports; their average winter repair force is 4,750 men, and the average summer repair force is 1,200. Assuming that 500 men are needed to build the modern lakes bulk carrier (12- to 18-month construction period), a much larger force would be needed if the yards received several contracts. The 1958 engineering study estimated that the approximate number of skilled ship workers in the Great Lakes yards is at the most 1,500 men, the others being for repair work. Available work will attract the necessary workers, as a pool of unused, trained manpower exists because of the depressed conditions in U.S. shipyards.

Employment in private shipyards of the United States

[In thousands]

Date	Private yards	Great Lakes	Percent
March 1960	107.4	6.1	5.6
April 1960	110.1	5.1	4.6
March 1961	122.0	4.4	3.6
April 1961	120.5	3.8	3.1

The trend of employment in the Great Lakes yards is cause for worry. In case of a national defense emergency, the coast yards that are privately owned can be joined with the naval shipyards to produce ships. No naval yard is on the Great Lakes coastline. It is important, then, that the private yards on the lakes, the only ones available, be maintained in condition as a mobilization base.

COMMERCIAL SHIPBUILDING

As of June 1, 1961, no major contract for the construction of commercial cargo, combination passenger cargo, or tanker type vessels were listed for shipyards on the Great Lakes. This was in contrast with the 49 vessels being built on the east coast, 13 on the west coast, and 7 on the gulf coast. Of the 69 vessels under construction or on order for merchant shipping, 58 of them are being built under construction-differential contracts. These contracts are limited to operators in foreign commerce. Two operators, Moore-McCormack and Grace Lines, can operate on the Great Lakes. Other applications for subsidized service on the lakes are pending. Major repair and reconstruction activities have fallen off; one self-unloader conversion has been ordered and one existing bulk carrier has been lengthened and repowered. Four ships not in Great Lakes yards are being converted to Great Lakes ore carriers, using foreign-built midbodies. Public Law 86–583 forbids this use of foreign-built midbodies for any future construction of ships engaged in coastwise trade.

From 1946 to 1959 inclusive, the Great Lakes built 26 commercial ships and 15 Navy ships; the west coast, 12 commercial ships and 32 Navy ships; the gulf coast, 31 commercial ships and 49 Navy ships; the east coast, 235 commercial ships and 156 Navy ships. The overall figures do not show the deterioration of the Great Lakes position in the last few years.

Commercial shipbuilding: Dollar value and percent

Coast	1951–60		1960 (underway)	
	Value	Percent	Value	Percent
Gulf	$263.9	13	$58.8	12
East	1,734.5	76	230.0	48
West	110.8	5	182.4	38
Lakes	138.5	6	8.0	2

Statistics supplied by the Shipbuilders' Council of America show that, although the dollar volume of ship repair, alteration, and conversion of the Great Lakes shipyards has remained fairly constant, even improved slightly in proportion to the Nation, the dollar volume of shipbuilding business, both naval and commercial, has fallen off sharply, both in percentage and in actual dollar value. See appended tables.

FINANCING

Mr. Harrie S. Taylor, president of Oglebay, Norton Co., said that the basic need of the Great Lakes industry is a better means of financing modern bulk-cargo vessels which can meet foreign-flag competition. This, he said, is the area where legislation is essential. He suggested that such legislation should: First, establish a shorter or more realistic period for depreciating lake vessels; second, liberalize statutory provisions pertaining to reserve funds for construction of new vessels and for reconstruction of older vessels; third, provide increased allowances on vessels turned in to the Federal Government in exchange for credit to be applied on the construction of new vessels; fourth, make greater use of present provisions providing mortgage aid in financing new vessel construction.

First. Bulletin F of the Internal Revenue Service, revised in 1942 and published unchanged since then, is a guide for the depreciation life of various capital investments. Fresh water carriers are given: a 45-year life if built prior to 1905; a 60-year life if built after 1905; a 40-year life if they are self-unloaders. This is not a formula that the owners must rigidly adhere to; the taxpayers may determine the useful life. If they disagree with the guide, they should show that the ships are worn out or obsolete previous to that period. This is the Internal Revenue Service's explanation.

The U.S. Great Lakes ore fleet, for example, consists of 229 ships at present, and a projected tabulation foresees 180 ships in the 1964 fleet.

Great Lakes ore fleet: Age and fraction of total capacity

	Fleet	50 years or more		20 years or less	
		Number	Fraction	Number	Fraction
1961	229	100	⅕	46	¼
1964	180	81	¼	26	⅕

The Canadians have a depreciation policy at the rate of 15 percent a year, so that the capital investment in a ship may be depreciated in 7 and sometimes even in 3 years. Depreciation of U.S. lakes vessels over a shorter period would take ships out of the fleet sooner and would bring a tax advantage to the owners. In part, increased depreciation would act as a construction-differential subsidy. As it is, any lakes ship which operates in seaway traffic shortens its useful life because of the corrosive action of salt water. The powerplants of older vessels are obsolete. Many otherwise inefficient small carriers have been kept in operation because of restricted dock facilities. With the dock and harbor improvements to come, these carriers should be scrapped in favor of larger, more economical vessels.

Second. One Great Lakes ship, the *Shenango II*, was converted with the aid of a construction reserve fund several years ago. Another, a large bulk carrier for the Pioneer Ship Co., is being converted under such a fund at Maryland shipbuilding. Net proceeds from the sale of vessels, net indemnities from the loss of any vessel, and interest or other earnings upon amounts deposited in the fund are in the construction reserve fund. The deposits are exempt from income tax at the time of deposit, provided that they are used to build a new vessel within a limited period of time—2 years. However, the deposits must be used to reduce the tax basis of the new vessel, and, therefore, this assistance amounts only to a limited tax deferment. Shipowners have little to gain from this fund because the tax basis of the replacement vessel is reduced by the capital gain realized, and the depreciation allowance for tax purposes is accordingly reduced. Twelve percent of the ship's cost to be constructed with the fund must be paid at once, and the specifications must be approved by the Secretary of Commerce. The provisions of this section include any ship construction, reconstruction, or remodernization which the Secretary of Commerce believes will promote the objectives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so far as the Great Lakes are concerned.

Third. Section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 authorizes the Maritime Administration to acquire any obsolete vessel—over 1,350 gross tons and not less than 17 years in age—engaged in either foreign or domestic trade, in exchange for an allowance of credit. The amount allowed is to be based upon consideration which approximates the circumstances under which a vessel would be sold on the open market: scrap value, depreciated value based on a 20-year life, and market value for operations. These agreements cannot be finalized without the express knowledge of the Congress and without specifically authorized grants. The allowance is applied upon the purchase price of a new vessel. If a lakes ship were turned in under these conditions, it would have a value based upon a 20-year life; for tax purposes, the same ship is considered to have a 60-year life. The most sound reason for this that I find seems to be that the two conditions are administered by different agencies.

Fourth. Any citizen may apply to the Secretary of Commerce for aid in the construction of a new vessel, either for foreign or domestic trade. Dependent on the size and speed of the vessel, the applicant shall pay the Secretary from at least 12½ to 25 percent of the ship's cost. The balance is to be paid over 20 years at an annual interest charge of 3½ percent. Any mortgage requires individual congressional appropriation.

Congress also provides for a Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance Fund to encourage private financing of shipbuilding. The act was aimed at encouraging the private financing of vessels for domestic trade. However, most of the insurance contracts have gone for ships engaged in oversea commerce. The mortgages are insured for either construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning. Few have gone to the Great Lakes although no applications from the Great Lakes have been turned down nor is allocation a consideration in the awarding of contracts. The awards are definitely given to strengthen the commerce-carrying ability of the Merchant Marine. Therefore, the Board has set the useful life of a ship to be not over 25 years; the Board will advance the age another 5 years in some cases. A Government-insured mortgage definitely encourages lenders, and for this reason, shipowners have been willing to pay the additional three-fourths of 1 percent yearly interest charge for Government insurance.

Vice Chairman Sigfrid Unander of the Federal Maritime Board, in a speech of a year ago, said that "to protect the interest of * * * the entire country, examination of changing costs should be made. We use the adjustment principle for construction differential subsidy and operating differential subsidy. There is no reason why this sound principle might not apply in this economic and geographic barrier." The statement leads, ultimately, to a method of procedure that would go far in aiding the Great Lakes by allowing for the adverse weather conditions.

Domestic American shipping is collapsing. Rates, imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, place waterborne carriers at a disadvantage. Subsidies are refused by law to domestic carriers as well as U.S. carriers engaged in the United States-Canadian trade. No single force could revitalize Great Lakes shipbuilding so much as a prosperous U.S. shipping trade on the lakes.

NAVY PROGRAM

The Bureau of Ships is responsible for the contracting of ship awards for the Department of the Navy. Naval shipbuilding programs are awarded to maintain the mobilization potential of all sections of the country if the natural forces of competition do not take care of this.

Evidently, the Bureau is quite confident that competition does insure the dispersal necessary. Rear Admiral James, Chief of the Bureau, wrote me that dispersal ordinarily has not been a factor in the award of ship construction.

There have been, however, instances when the Bureau limited the bidding to a geographical area. Although this limiting has been mainly for the west coast, 5 years ago competition was limited on some DE's in order to insure that the Great Lakes shipyards got a portion of the business.

The actual Navy shipbuilding program for fiscal year 1962 is $3,077,900. Included in this are 35 new ships, 16 miscellaneous and landing craft, and 22 conversions and modernizations. As over 70 percent of the 381 ships in the Active Fleet are of World War II age or older, a constant replacement program at the level of 40 to 50 new ships a year is needed to insure a modern fleet of the present size. About 70 percent of the new construction is let out to private yards, but only 20 percent of the maintenance work goes to them. Most conversion projects go to Government yards.

As of May 1, 1961, a progress report of the Bureau of Ships showed 12 naval vessels under construction at Great Lakes shipyards.

Defoe Shipbuilding, two guided missile destroyers; Marinette Marine Corp., four motor gunboats; Peterson Builders, Inc., two coastal minesweepers, four motor gunboats; Christy Corp.,[1] two oceanographic research ships.

In the 1962 program, the Great Lakes are qualified to build the conventionally powered guided-missile frigates, guided-missile escort ships, escort ships, and the smaller vessels and craft. Although they cannot construct nuclear-powered ships, Great Lakes area shipyards are qualified to build all Navy ships capable of navigating the St. Lawrence Seaway.

All the vessels and craft of the inland category in the following table are not being built on the lakes. The number of contracts on the lakes is 4; 12 ships were being constructed on the lakes.

CURRENT CONSTRUCTION AND CONVERSION, JANUARY 1, 1961

East: 13 private contractors, constructing 107 vessels and craft, representing 51.1 percent of the total dollar value; 5 naval shipyards, constructing 30 vessels and craft, representing 21 percent of the total dollar value.

Gulf: 4 private contractors, constructing 18 vessels and craft, representing 5.7 percent of the total dollar value.

West: 7 private contractors, constructing 18 vessels and craft, representing 5.9 percent of the total dollar value; 4 naval shipyards, constructing 21 vessels and craft, representing 14.4 percent of the total dollar value.

Inland: 7 private contractors, constructing 31 vessels and craft, representing 1.9 percent of the total dollar value.

This current construction included ship awards from previous years. The following are Navy ship awards to private shipyards for fiscal years 1958 through 1961—to June 13. Excluded from the listing are aircraft carrier and submarine construction awards, in thousands of dollars.

Year	East	Great Lakes	West	Gulf
1958	$33,563	$36,250	$21,790	----------
1959	127,387	----------	50,807	$11,379
1960	72,022	3,625	46,940	52,379
1961	58,659	10,429	44,468	----------
Total	291,621	50,313	164,004	63,758

N.B.—Six submarines for a total of $355 million were awarded to the gulf coast in this period. The rest of the submarines and the aircraft carriers went to the east coast.

Rear Admiral James, in his letter, expressed the consideration that the Great Lakes yards would seem to be in a more favorable competitive position for naval work with the operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Actually, this competitive position is often one of bidding below cost because shipbuilders are hard put for business.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

It can be, as I hope it has been, shown that the Great Lakes shipyards are in a difficult position that is hardening into a more difficult one. In shipbuilding, as in other industries which do not use assembly line techniques, a fairly constant level of work is necessary to maintain efficiency. The trend of employment of the Great Lakes facilities is therefore even more disturbing than the actual figures. The downward trend means that the Great Lakes yards do not have a constant level of work; employment is dropping; one company is liquidating. Consequently, their competitive standing for major ship contracts deteriorates; and so moves the cycle. The inability to bid on Maritime contracts substantiates this.

Allocation, dependent on classified mobilization plans, as it is, can be only partly an answer to the Great Lakes problem, and a tenuous one at that. Seen in the previous few year's policies, the probability of allocations to the Great Lakes becomes small indeed. The invisible hand theory, that the workings of competition will guarantee dispersal, reigns. A restriction of bidding by Maritime to a specific maritime area such as the Navy has done does not seem either in the books or in existing statutes.

The answer is to make the Great Lakes shipyards competitive on all levels. Whether this has to be done with the administrative and promotional aid of Government, by cutting costs, or by a combination of the two, it must be done. Officials of the Maritime Administration, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Defense Department repeatedly have stated the need for dispersal of shipyards for national security. The stature of the Great Lakes as a fourth seacoast, its proven shipbuilding performance in World War II, and the national defense needs require that shipbuilding facilities not only be maintained, but improved, in this region.

TABLE I.—*Approximate value of unfinished shipbuilding business underway in U.S. private shipyards*

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

ON THE LAKES AND RIVERS

Date	Commercial vessels	Naval vessels	Total	Percent
Jan. 1, 1957	$55,000	$28,000	$83,000	5.1
Jan. 1, 1958	45,000	49,000	94,000	5.1
Jan. 1, 1959	36,000	59,000	95,000	5.5
Jan. 1, 1960	20,285	25,436	45,721	3.1

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

ON THE SEABOARD

Date	Commercial vessels	Naval vessels	Total
Jan. 1, 1957	$894,000	$676,000	$1,570,000
Jan. 1, 1958	829,000	903,000	1,732,000
Jan. 1, 1959	623,000	1,001,000	1,624,000
Jan. 1, 1960	471,680	948,286	1,419,966

TABLE II.—*Dollar volume of ship repair, alteration, and conversion in private shipyards of the United States*

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Yards	Total	Great Lakes	Percent
1957	53	$435,470	$23,404	5.4
1958	54	316,808	14,963	4.7
1959	53	240,645	17,338	7.2
1960	(1)	(1)	18,085	----------

[1] No figures.

Source: The Shipbuilders Council of America.

TABLE III.—*The Maritime Board's ship replacement program, by years, 1958–79*

Ship type	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979
Freighter	19	15	22	40	21	31	26	26	30	20	9	10	2	6	4	2	2	------	------	------	------	------
Combination	------	------	5	3	------	5	------	------	------	3	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Passenger	------	------	1	------	------	------	------	2	------	------	------	2	------	------	------	------	------	------	1	------	------	------

NOTE.—Two passenger ships not specified as to date of contract.

---

[1] Contracted, but not yet begun.

"Every Citizen Holds Office," From a Speech by President John F. Kennedy While a U.S. Senator in 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present to the attention of your own distinguished self, and all the other Members of this great legislative body, portions of a speech delivered by President Kennedy when he was a Member of the U.S. Senate in 1957.

In answer to my inquiry to the President of the United States I have received back his express permission dated April 9, 1962, to have this inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The speech was printed, by permission, in the NEA Journal October 1961:

EVERY CITIZEN HOLDS OFFICE

(By John F. Kennedy)

(NOTE.—This article has been adapted by special permission of the President from a speech he delivered, while a U.S. Senator in 1957, before a convention of the American Association of School Administrators in Atlantic City.)

It is disheartening to me and I think alarming for our Republic to realize how poorly the political profession is regarded in America. Mothers may still want their favorite sons to grow up to be President, but according to a famous Gallup poll of some years ago, they do not want them to become politicians in the process.

Unfortunately, this disdain for the political profession is shared by the educational profession. Educators find it difficult, I believe, to accept the differences between the laboratory and the legislature. In the former, the goal is truth, pure and simple, without regard to changing currents of public opinion; in the latter, compromises and majorities and procedural customs and rights affect the ultimate decision as to what is right or good, or more accurately, what is possible.

And even when they realize the difference, many educators and other intellectuals consider their chief function to be that of the critic—and politicians are sensitive to critics (possibily because we have so many of them).

Disdain for the political profession in our schools and communities did not matter quite as much in the days when active participation in the political affairs of the Nation was limited to a select few.

But today, the implications of national policy necessarily make politicians of all of us. Today, every citizen, regardless of his interest in politics, "holds office"; every one of us is in a position of responsibility; and, in the final analysis, the kind of government we get depends upon how we fulfill those responsibilities. We, the people, are the boss, and we will get the kind of political leadership, be it good or bad, that we demand and deserve.

Thus, the American political education with which I am concerned is that of each and every American citizen. His opinions, his votes, and his efforts define the limits of our policy, provide its guideposts, and authorize its implementation.

In Lincoln's words, that man on the street, the average citizen, the educated voter, "makes statutes possible or impossible to execute." His attitude toward taxation and selective service, foreign aid and alliances, the United Nations, imports, immigration, even his attitude toward members of minority groups in his own country—all of these have an impact upon foreign policy far beyond his knowledge. Without his indispensable support and loyalty, no American foreign policy in times such as these can possible succeed.

There are, of course, dangers in this increased participation of the public in the policymaking process. Public opinion in a democracy has on many occasions, in this Nation and others, been too slow, too selfish, too shortsighted, too provincial, too rigid, or too impractical. But in these times, in facing these issues which deeply touch the lives and fortunes of every citizen, in making these hard decisions which require overwhelming public support, we as a nation cannot—we dare not—exclude the people or ignore their opinions, whether right or wrong. Instead, in the words of Thomas Jefferson: "If we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them—but to inform their discretion (by education)."

"To inform their discretion (by education)"—that is the task of every teacher in every city and village in America: to educate all, or nearly all, Americans to serve as politicians in making public policy. But what kind of education is necessary to prepare young Americans for a more active and enlightened role in the political affairs of their Nation? Permit me to offer a few suggestions.

First, I would emphasize that we need not an overconcentration upon civic and political affairs, but the development of a broad range of talents. We do not need men like Lord John Russell, of whom Queen Victoria once said that he would be a better man if he knew a third subject—but he was interested in nothing but the Constitution of 1688 and himself.

We need instead men with the education of Thomas Jefferson, described by a contemporary as "a gentleman of 32, who could calculate an eclipse, survey an estate, tie an artery, plan an edifice, try a cause, break a horse, dance a minuet, and play the violin."

We need men like Daniel Webster, who could throw thunderbolts at Hayne on the Senate floor and then stroll a few steps down the corridor and dominate the Supreme Court as the foremost lawyer of his time; men like John Quincy Adams, who, after being summarily dismissed from the Senate for a notable display of independence, could become Boylston professor of rhetoric and oratory at Harvard and then become a great Secretary of State.

Second, I would emphasize that we need scholarship fitted for practical action, for something more than merely discussing political issues and deploring their solutions with learned phrases. We need intellectual achievements fitted for more than the delights of abstract discourse.

It is not enough that our schools merely be great centers of learning, without concerning themselves with the uses to which that learning is put in the years that follow graduation. Indeed, care must be taken to see that it is not left behind upon graduation.

Third, I would emphasize the importance, in teaching students about public affairs, of avoiding the confusion of political idealism with political fantasy or rigidity. We need idealism in our public life—we need young men and women who will stand for the right regardless of their personal ambitions or welfare.

But let us not permit them to carry that idealism to the point of fantasy—to the point where any compromise or concession is regarded as immoral. For politics and legislation are not matters for inflexible principles or unattainable ideals. Rather, the democratic way of life and the Federal system of government require compromise between the desires of each individual and group and those around them.

Fourth, I would emphasize the importance, in teaching students about public affairs, of avoiding the confusion of national patriotism with national mythology. Instillation of a sense of patriotism, of national pride, of awareness and gratitude for the liberties and opportunities that are ours as Americans—these are precepts which, of course, it is hoped every student shall grasp.

But at the same time let us recognize the necessity of clearing away these false axioms and myths which, however comforting to our sense of security or appealing to our sense of patriotism, impair a realistic view of our Nation's role in the world. I refer to those myths, among others, that are based upon the untouchability of national sovereignty; the existence of inherently good, bad, or backward nations; or the emphasis of governmental economy over national security.

Many Americans persist in the myth that a democratic way of life, inasmuch as it is the best way, will inevitably be the victor in any struggle with an alien power; that the United States can never lose a war. Many still hold to the belief that our allies owe homage and gratitude to the United States and to all of its views at all times.

There are those who oppose assistance to or cooperation with our allies, those who reject bargaining or diplomatic pressure as a method of dealing with international disputes. Education for citizenship, for increased participation in American political life, must dispel these myths.

Fifth and finally, I would emphasize that this kind of education requires quality as well as quantity. I realize that education cannot fulfill its responsibilities when nearly a million boys and girls are deprived by the classroom shortage of full-time schooling, when millions more are held back in unwieldy classes of 40 or more, and when the Nation is short 135,000 qualified teachers.

But more and better classrooms are not enough. Even an increase in the number of teachers is not enough. Better trained, better paid teachers, using better techniques and textbooks, are necessary if we are to improve still further the education of our citizens for the responsibilities of citizenship.

Of one thing we can be sure—the graduates of our schools and of our universities will be expected to play an increasingly important role in American political affairs. The effort and expenditure by which society has made their education possible have not been undertaken merely to give them an economic advantage in the life struggle. They are expected to offer leadership and guidance for all.

"Don't teach my boy poetry," an English mother once wrote the provost of Harrow. "Don't teach my boy poetry; he is going to stand for Parliament." Well, perhaps she was right—but if more politicians knew poetry, and more poets knew politics, I am convinced the world would be a little better place in which to live.

Unique Literary Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today the Washington Post included a full report of the Presidential press conference of April 11, 1962. It contained the following unique literary style:

Question: "Do you think there was an element of political discrimination in the behavior of the industry this year?"

Answer: "I would not—and if there was, it doesn't really—if it was, if that was the purpose, that is comparatively unimportant to the damage that—the country is the one that suffers. If they do it in order to spite me, it really isn't so important."

St. Patrick's Day Address by Senator Dodd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Las Vegas, Nev., were addressed on March 17 by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut. It was my pleasure to introduce Senator DODD to his Las Vegas audience, and his reception was both warm and enthusiastic.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Senator DODD's eloquent address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD, OF CONNECTICUT, AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE SOCIETY OF THE FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK COUNTRY CLUB, DESERT INN HOTEL, LAS VEGAS, NEV., SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1962

I have participated in many St. Patrick's Day observances in my time. I have attended them in homes, in church basements, in fraternal halls, and in civic auditoriums. There have been parades, concerts, dinners, dances and parties. But celebrating St. Patrick's Day at the Desert Inn Country Club in Las Vegas is something new to me, and I am very happy to be here tonight and to find so many genial Irishmen in this part of the world.

The observance of St. Patrick's Day in America has many dimensions.

First, we honor St. Patrick himself. We honor his faith, his zeal, his courage, his simplicity. We stand somewhat in awe of this great Saint whose voice echoes down across the centuries and whose life left an imprint on the Irish character which survives to this day. He gave to Ireland a creed and a tradition around which a people formed and upon which a nation was built.

Virtually all other names of that unknown, murky period 1,500 years ago are lifeless and forgotten, but the name and image and example of St. Patrick remain vibrant and alive. We pay testimony to that by our presence here, as do countless gatherings all over the world tonight, where those of Irish blood are gathered together in his honor and in his name.

On this day we traditionally pay tribute, as well, to the Irish people, to their trials and their triumphs, to their struggle for freedom and independence in Ireland and to their achievements here in America.

The plush surroundings in which we meet tonight form about the sharpest contrast imaginable to the rude and humble beginnings of the Irish in America.

For our ancestors came here as refugees from persecution and misfortune. They arrived on these shores penniless, hungry, homeless, uneducated, without skills, without trades, without tools.

Their reception by the citizens here was not a very friendly one; they were crowded into terrible slum areas; they were excluded from "good society"; they were the traditional object of ridicule and the butt of venal jokes; prejudice often barred their way to advancement. They were offered only the jobs that no one else wanted. And they took them.

Yet, they endured. And they endured with an indomitable humor, a certain picturesque heartiness which slowly won over those around them. The jokes they told about themselves were funnier than the jokes told about them by others.

As we reflect upon the progress of the Irish in America, it is easy to see how St. Patrick's Day here has become more than a saint's day, more than an Irish day. It has become a day of tribute to America, a day of patriotic observance.

For it is here in our own country that the Irish, and so many other peoples, have been able to realize their hopes and aspirations more fully than in the land of their origin.

When our forebears came here from Ireland, they sought many things that were denied them in their own country.

They sought work and here they found it. They sought land of their own, and here a combination of God's bounty and enlightened laws made that land available to them. They sought freedom to openly practice their religion and here it was safeguarded to them. They sought education for their children and here it was provided. They sought opportunity for advancement and here they received it. They sought a voice in their government and here their voice has been heard.

This is true not just in the case of the Irish. It is true of all groups which came here and it causes us to ask a question: Why have all nationalities been able to more fully realize their hopes and aspirations here in America than in the land of their origin?

Part of the answer lies in the fact that our continent was so richly endowed by nature. Part of it arises from the fact that for a century and a half the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans protected this country from foreign wars and allowed it to grow and flourish.

But I think a more basic answer is that the laws and institutions of this country have been built upon certain central ideas which were right morally and which therefore have proved to be right practically.

These central ideas were spun off a basic belief in freedom, equality, and fair play. In a dark world beset with tyranny, privilege, injustice, and persecution, America shone like a beacon in the night, and carried a new message to oppressed millions.

Government exists to serve man and man's liberty, his property, his family, and his individual rights are above and beyond the reach of the state, America said.

Every man deserves a fair chance to succeed or to fail on his own merits; every man should be able to speak freely, without fear or reprisal; every man should have an equal voice in choosing those who govern him; every man is innocent until proved guilty; every man should be free to worship as he pleases; every man has the right and should have the opportunity to own property and capital and to use these, within reasonable limits, as he chooses, free from tribute to any baron or monopoly, and secure from confiscation by government.

To a world riddled with artificial distinctions and entrenched oppressions, America said that the normal relationship between men was not one of artificial division, by class or by trade or by race or by religion, or by education, but one of democratic equality, of cooperation, of equal opportunity for all, of working together to tame a continent and build a nation; in this land the habitual attitude of men need not be fear and foreboding but confidence and optimism.

This was the message that brought millions to our shores; this was the charter upon which this Nation was founded. And the Irish immigrants took to it as though it were a natural inheritance, as indeed it should be the natural inheritance of all men.

True enough, as the decades passed, the native Americans in practice all too often failed to measure up to the standards of the Founding Fathers. All too often they refused to apply these principles to the immigrants. But whatever the prejudices and failures of individuals might have been, the laws and the institutions of this country did reflect these central ideas. And thus in the end they have prevailed.

I think we may be pardoned for taking pride in the fact that a man of Irish descent today sits in the chair of the President of the United States, in the chair of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and in that of the majority leader of the Senate.

It is traditional at St. Patrick's Day celebrations to cite long lists of Irishmen who have achieved distinction in this country—in government, in the professions, in finance, in the arts, in the military, in the church.

I shall not give you such a rollcall tonight but the significance of these lists is not only to demonstrate the contributions the Irish people have made to American life but also to clinch the fact that as a group, the Irish in America have "arrived."

Other minority groups are today struggling to achieve their rightful place in our society. Surely the Irish-American whose father and grandfather fought this same struggle should be in the forefront of the effort to secure equal rights and equal opportunities for all Americans.

And in a larger sense we who have enjoyed the blessings of freedom must feel a special devotion to the cause of freedom for all men which is at the heart of the struggle between communism and Western civilization.

Our country today is carrying the greatest and most awesome burden that any nation has ever carried. For upon us has fallen the principal task of defending freedom, not just our own liberty but the freedom of all who are not yet enslaved and beyond that, we represent the hope of eventual freedom for all those who are today bound in chains.

It will perhaps prove a significant factor in history that millions of displaced Irishmen and their descendants, who but for chance circumstance would have lived out their lives in a small land, far from the storm center of world events, today are a prominent and influential force in America at a time when the actions of our country may well determine the outcome of 30 centuries of recorded struggle between tyranny and freedom.

What an opportunity to repay the kind treatment of history.

It is here in America that whatever is of worth in our race has been given a chance to develop and flower. It is here that the ancient Irish yearning for liberty and religious freedom was first satisfied. It is here that the hope and the fate of man is centered. And it is here that Irishmen can best justify their heritage by strengthening America in its determination to do the painful things that must be done if we are to gain and preserve for all men what we have here.

We have a great inheritance to uphold and to fulfill. To us has been given the faith of St. Patrick, the qualities and the insights of the Irish race, and the priceless bounty of the American experiment in human freedom. Tonight we honor all three and in so doing we make ourselves and our country the better and the stronger for the struggle that lies ahead.

Perilous Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1962

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech delivered by me to the Allied Construction Industries in Cincinnati on March 28, 1962:

It has given me considerable concern as to what I should say to you leaders of Cincinnati business and industry in what perhaps will be my last major speech in my own district before I leave the Congress after 10 years of service. There is so much happening these days that affects us all that I have changed my mind a half-dozen times as to what I should talk about tonight.

Originally I decided to get off my chest some of my deep-seated convictions about the harm that will eventually come to this country as the result of the new, astronomical spending programs on which we have recently embarked. We continue to pile up deficits in spite of the fact that we must pay interest alone on our national debt $26 million a day, day in and day out, year in and year out. And this interest is increasing by the hour.

I then thought that this appearance might give me an opportunity to point out how this administration was accelerating the trend toward Government's participation in and competition with private industry in this country. Just one glaring example of this is the sundry and subtle moves by Government-subsidized agencies such as TVA and REA to eventually take over and control the production of all electric power in the United States.

Then again, as the ranking Republican on the Roads Subcommittee, I thought that your meeting here tonight might be a forum in which to expose the callous and blatant maneuver to pay off a political debt for what West Virginia did in a presidential primary, by building in that State an unneeded superhighway at tremendous cost to the taxpayers and to the detriment of the road program.

In fact, I actually started to write a speech which dealt with the plans of this administration to further strip the Congress, the States, and the local governments of their basic constitutional powers and prerogatives and transfer them to the ever-growing, all-powerful, executive bureaucracy on the Potomac.

If I had given that speech I intended to substantiate this charge by pointing out among other things the demand by the President that he be granted the authority to raise and lower taxes and that he be given a free hand to negotiate trade agreements in which he could for all practical purposes eliminate industry-protecting tariffs.

At this moment, in fact today, the Public Works Committee on which I serve is considering the demand of the President that he be given a free hand in times of recession to spend as he sees fit without further authorizations or appropriations by Congress $2,000 million on public works programs in those sections of the country where unemployment is high. Just think what a President could do with this pork barrel money for the 6-month period before an election.

Furthermore, experience has taught us that Government pump-priming spending, resulting in more borrowing and greater deficits, has never helped get us out of a recession.

We know that the only way to create jobs is to allow industry to retain more money to invest in plant expansion. This is what creates jobs and sound employment.

These powers which the President would arrogate unto himself are basic rights vested by the people in the House of Representatives, which the President is asking that it surrender.

Frankly, gentlemen, I got halfway through a speech dealing with these and other unconscionable grabs for power when I tossed all of these subjects into the wastebasket. It came to me, as it has many times before, that all of these problems of our day, serious and important as they are, fade into insignificance and are of little moment when compared to the real issue of our time, namely, our fight for survival with the international Communist conspiracy.

America at the grassroots is at last becoming alive—is becoming aware that we are engaged in a life and death struggle with international communism.

During the past year people all over this country have been getting together in forums, conferences, and seminars to learn more about the nature, strategy and objectives of the enemy we face in our time.

They are heeding the warning issued just last week in New York by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Army Research and Development. Trudeau said the defensive strength of this country was being undermined by "appalling ignorance of Communist intentions and capabilities." Trudeau continued: "We must not allow ourselves to be perverted by those who would try to lull us to sleep—who would try to make us lie down as the lamb with the wolf—and expect to wake up in the morning."

Heretofore, wars have been waged principally by fighting forces on the battlefield and by the destruction of people and industrial centers. Today war has changed its form. In fact, at this moment we are engaged in a comparatively new type of conflict. In the past the women, the children and the elderly were usually behind the lines. Today our fighting men, armed to the teeth, are poised and ready for a shooting war that most likely will never come.

However, at this moment—in this present so-called cold war struggle for survival with the sinister and diabolical forces of international communism—every man, woman, and child is in the frontline trenches. As the soldiers in this current conflict, we cannot hope to survive, much less, win, unless we know our enemy and the nature of the various weapons he is using against us—unless we then develop some weapons of our own and counterattack.

Of course, the Communists want us to continue to believe that the only threat is aggression from without. Therefore, diversionary tactics are used. They rattle swords in Berlin. Today, while they talk peace in Geneva, they even harass our planes in the Berlin air corridor.

They agitate guerrilla attacks in Vietnam. Occasionally they hurl a few more shells at Matsu and Quemoy and blast off atomic weapons in the arctic. As a result, we are then compelled to further weaken the financial and economic stability of our country by spending additional billions for defense. We throw more men into the Armed Forces. At home we start to build fallout shelters. I am not saying these steps are not necessary. We must do these things—we simply cannot afford to take a chance—because the Communists are engaged in total war. The threat is both from without and from within.

The Communist Party in the United States is part and parcel of their international Communist movement which is waging this total war. The Communists within the United States and many of their apologists are ready, willing and able to perform their allotted tasks when the time is ripe. They, just like the Cuban Communist termites, will come out of the woodwork when the moment of takeover arrives.

In the meantime many people, some in high places in this Government, fall into the Communist trap. They ignore and even pooh-pooh the threat from within. Actually it is within the free countries of the world that the Communists are at this moment attacking. We leave ourselves wide open and almost defenseless against the new weapons of modern warfare, principally infiltration and subversion. We completely ignore the findings of men like Edward Hunter, who is one of the world's outstanding authorities on Communist psychological warfare. Hunter is a newspaperman, a journalist, a former officer in Office of Strategic Services, a man who for more than 30 years lived abroad in countries that have been under Communist pressure and attack.

Hunter told the Committee on Un-American Activities 4 years ago that the Communists have abandoned the centuries-old concept of war. They believe that a man killed by a bullet is useless—he can mine no coal; that a city destroyed is useless because its mills produce no cloth.

Hunter testified that the Communists seek to take intact people and their possessions so they can be put to use. Other experts in this field have given the same warning.

If we had only the opinion of these experts, there might be some question about the validity of their conclusions. But the Bible warns, "by their acts ye shall know them." Today the Communists dominate approximately one-third of the land mass of the earth and one-third of its people. How did they do it? Not so much by outward aggression but by indirect aggression and subversion.

I ask the doubting Thomases to look at Cuba as the most recent and cogent example of the effective use of this new weapon of war. If the Soviets had attempted to take Cuba by direct military aggression on their part, they would have failed miserably because we would have moved in with everything we had. Yet today, less than 100 miles from our shores, we have a country that has been taken into the Soviet orbit. Havana is as much Communist dominated as are Peiping and Moscow.

And, as Hunter said, the Cuban people and their possessions have not been destroyed by a shooting war. They have been taken intact from within and put to use by the conspirators in the Kremlin. At this moment the Communists are driving for similar takeovers in Central and South America, using Cuba as a base for their operations.

Having been so successful in Cuba and other places throughout the world by the use of indirect aggression, by the use of subversion and infiltration, does anyone think that the Communists are so dumb that they will risk the almost total destruction of their own cities by starting an all-out nuclear war?

And so, while we are spending—and, as I have said, we cannot do otherwise—$50,000 million each year to protect us from military aggression which may never come, we have fallen for the Communist line and have done little or nothing to understand or combat the weapons being used against us at this very moment in the war in which we are now engaged.

In fact, the FBI and investigating committees of the Congress, the only agencies dealing with this internal threat, are continually under attack. The Communists and the leftwing crowd try to discredit Hoover, weaken the FBI, and our security laws, and abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities.

It is unbelievable—but it is true—that over the years those persons and anti-Communist organizations which have tried to alert the American people to these new weapons and to expose those within our shores who have aided the Communist cause of subversion, have been scurrilously and in some cases unmercifully attacked and pilloried for their effotrs.

Now it is only normal that such an attack should come from the Communist apparatus, our sworn enemy. The astonishing and often disheartening fact is that some of the most unfair and vicious assaults upon the anti-Communist have come from the leftwing crowd in this country, from some people in high places in Government, from some leaders in the clergy, and in the field of education who should know better.

I am going to tell you briefly about this sustained vendetta over the years simply so that if any of you decide to get into this fight you will know what to expect; so that you will understand why you will become the target of villification and slander.

As I said, we are in a war and, when you get in the frontline trenches, as the anti-Communists now are doing, you are bound to get hurt. There will of necessity be some casualties. This we expect from the enemy we are facing. But it is difficult, especially for the new anti-Communist recruit, to understand why he is constantly clobbered and attacked from the rear by the leftwing eggheads. To help those of you who may have recently come into the kitchen stand the heat, let me tell you about some of the pitched battles that have been waged with the Communists and their apologists in this country.

Ten years ago I was a novice—a new recruit. Soon after my election to Congress in 1952, I accepted a place on the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

I had neither misgivings nor forebodings. Our boys had been dying under Communist fire in Korea. The mischief wrought by Soviet agents in this country and within our Government was no longer a matter of surmise. Enough of it had been exposed in detail to alarm the American people. To help dislodge these internal enemies seemed to me a task any patriotic American could undertake proudly, earnestly, and with a clear conscience.

Alas for my innocence, what I failed to foresee was that the mere act of joining this committee would make me a target for organized slander, regardless of how I might conduct myself. I was not unfamiliar with the rugged give-and-take of political life but not until I joined the struggle against Red sedition had anyone impugned my patriotism, honesty, and decency. Thereafter I had to accustom myself to being called to my face, in print, and on the air, a witch hunter, a character assassin, an inquisitor, and a Fascist. Suddenly I had become an enemy of the Bill of Rights—a vigilante.

One would be surprised at the people in high places who have joined in the drive to discredit and abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities. Jimmy Roosevelt has been the darling of the leftwing crowd ever since his early days. Using the immunity of the floor of the House of Representatives, he delivered, in violation of the rules, the most vitriolic attack ever made against the committee or its members. No Communist ever made a more scurrilous, vicious, and untrue attack. You would be shocked to know who wrote that speech. Do you know what Roosevelt did with that speech?

He personally sent thousands of copies of it to Ralph Izard, one of the chief agitators of the San Francisco riots against the committee. Izard is a top Communist agent. Those of you who viewed the film of the San Francisco riots saw him with the five other Communists leading the demonstration in the hearing room. Izard had Roosevelt's speeches distributed to students and others at the scene of the rioting. Excerpts from Roosevelt's speech appeared on the banners of those picketing the hearing.

The great Senator from South Carolina, the Honorable Strom Thurmond, put in the Congressional Record an editorial which said in effect that Roosevelt helped create the climate for the San Francisco riots.

Now, if anyone thinks that the drive against anti-Communist organizations in this country has died down, he is sadly mistaken. Just a few months ago the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security issued a report entitled "The New Drive Against the Anti-Communist Program."

It started in December 1960. The 81 Communist parties of the world met in Moscow. At that meeting it was decided that, if the Communist drive was to continue to go forward on schedule, the anti-Communist organizations and programs, particularly in the United States, had to be discredited and destroyed.

Believe it or not, within a few weeks after the Moscow meeting the attack began in the Communist Daily Worker. The attack was repeated and stepped up in the leftwing newspapers and magazines in this country.

Grassroots, anti-Communist seminars and organizations were held up to scorn and ridicule. As an example, Dr. Fred Schwarz' Christian Crusade, which had been in existence for more than 5 years, doing an excellent job of alerting people to the Communist menace, had been practically unnoticed by the leftwing crowd. All of a sudden, almost simultaneously, from all sections of the country, Dr. Schwarz and his organization were denounced and ridiculed.

This treatment was given to anti-Communist organization after organization. Volumes of material spewed forth from every quarter. "The Un-Americans" by Frank Donner suddenly appeared on the shelves of bookstands throughout the Nation. Leftwing writers like Gore Vidal, who did a smear job on Barry Goldwater, and who more recently was a White House party guest, wrote glowing book reviews on "The Un-Americans."

Vidal and his claque were overjoyed to repeat the book's slanderous and libelous charges against the Committee on Un-American Activities and its members. Vidal, in particular, in order to add prestige and salability to the book, paid glowing tributes to its author, Frank Donner. He called Donner a "brilliant constitutional lawyer."

Vidal and his ilk deliberately concealed from the public the fact that Frank Donner had been an identified Communist; that he had a long record of service to Communist causes; that, as a trusted Government employee in the early days of the National Labor Relations Board, he participated with other Communists who were employees of that agency in Communist cell meetings where the policies of the NLRB were discussed in the light of Communist Party directives. Perhaps here is the answer to some of those unbelievable decisions in the early days of the NLRB.

In 1958 Eisenhower and the National Security Council, after long and careful deliberation, decided that, while our men in the Armed Forces were trained and familiar with military weapons, they, like the general public, were unaware of the new, sinister and diabolical weapons of modern psychological warfare; that they knew little of the techniques, strategy, and objectives of international communism's indirect aggression.

The military was, therefore, directed to acquaint its men and the American people, through anti-Communist seminars, with the various facets of this new, dangerous, and effective weapon which was being used so successfully against us. In these seminars all of the ugly and heinous tactics and objectives of the amoral, atheistic Communist apparatus were exposed to the cold light of common day. Almost simultaneously, with the smearing of the anti-Communist movement in the United States, an all-out attack was begun against the military seminars and the generals who conducted them.

Eventually military installations were ordered by the Pentagon to stop these seminars; to stop showing the film of the Communist-inspired San Francisco riot. As Senator Strom Thurmond said, "a namby-pamby, gutless film" produced by Ed Murrow was substituted.

As we all know, speeches by our military leaders dealing with the Communist conspiracy were decimated until those speeches became namby-pamby, gutless dissertations on the Communist society. The generals are now being compelled to fight the current cold war with both arms tied behind them, just as MacArthur, Van Fleet, and others were compelled to fight the Chinese Communists in the Korean war.

The muzzling of the military demonstrates that the new and current drive against the anti-Communist program was successful. Furthermore, this muzzling of the military fits in perfectly with the plan of the Stevensons, the Bowleses, the Schlesingers, the Galbraiths, and the rest of the Americans for Democratic Action crowd, to help create a favorable climate or atmosphere in which they foolishly believe they can negotiate a settlement of the cold war tensions with the butchers of the Kremlin.

Now in order to create and maintain this favorable climate or atmosphere, the generals were ordered to delete from their speeches unfavorable references to the Communist brass. their policies and programs. The generals were denied the right to tell their men and the American people about the hypocrisy and treachery of the Communist conspiracy. This is the reason why speeches were censored—the military muzzled—the anti-Communist seminars stopped and the film "Operation Abolition" banned.

The charge that the generals were engaging in political activities; that they were backing certain candidates; that they were making statements directly contrary to basic American foreign policy, was a smokescreen, a subterfuge, an excuse for the muzzling.

I wish I had time in this speech to read you statements that have been stricken from speeches by the censors in the State Department.

I will give you just a few examples of those eliminated from the speeches of men like Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, the Army's Chief of Research and Development. Here's one:

"I, for one, do not believe that the Soviets have relented in the slightest in their determination to dominate the world and to destroy our way of life. At the present time, the Soviet Union presumably wants to relax tensions, but only those they themselves created, such as Berlin. Remember this: If Russia relaxes, it will only be in her own interest. She will tighten the tensions, when it is again to her interest. Such is the nature of communism. We must not be lulled into a false sense of security, no matter what the tactic."

What General Trudeau said is the truth. What's wrong with it? Why delete it if it wasn't for the reasons I have stated. From another speech the following was removed.

"The Soviet threat is as great as ever. Nothing has happened to indicate that the goals of international communism have changed.

"Let's take a moment to look around. Has the clenched fist been relaxed? Five years after the armistice was signed in Korea, our troops still man their battle positions. Quemoy and Matsu remain under siege. The most flagrant infiltration plagues South Vietnam. Whose troops are committing recognized aggression in Laos? What is behind the takeover in Tibet and the incursions into Indian territory? Who foments unrest in the Middle East? Why is not the threat to free Berlin lifted? The answers to these questions point squarely at the Communist bloc. Surely we want peace, but at the same time, until the fist is unfolded, we must remain prepared for the worst."

I ask you, Why should such statements of a general who knows the facts be censored, unless it is part of the plan not to irritate Mr. Khrushchev and create this favorable climate in which they foolishly hope to negotiate a settlement of the cold war?

Let's take a look at one or two other deletions which are typical of the hundreds that have been stricken. Here's one from a proposed speech by General Trudeau to the Royal Canadian Military Institute.

"Beyond a shadow of a doubt, your country and mine are the prime targets of the worldwide, allout offensive of world communism.

"Since the days of their bloody, Red revolution, the Soviets ceaselessly have increased their weapon capabilities against the day when, in Khrushchev's words, they 'will bury us.'"

Let me ask you, Why did they strike the following from a speech by Gen. Herbert B. Powell? Was it because it points out the threat from within? Was it because it points out the danger from the so-called American Communists? General Powell wanted to say but was prohibited from saying this:

"The world Communist movement today is but a single conspiracy by a small organized minority against humanity as a whole. They plot to impose on all humanity a self-confessed dictatorship operating through individual parties centrally controlled and coordinated under the leadership of the Communist Party of Soviet Russia."

Then, from Gen. T. C. Darcy's speech, this was taken out:

"That is why we have been eager to believe that Khrushchev's smiling face and outstretched hands were indications of a new attitude on the part of the Soviets. We have wanted to believe that he was coming to us in friendship and to establish peaceful relationships."

The General then goes on in his speech to point out how we have been deceived by this approach of the Communists time and time again.

Do you know what the censor's note said about this language that he ordered stricken? Here's what it said: "Let's stay away from Khrushchev for the time being." In other words, as I have said, the boys in the State Department didn't want to make the butcher of the Ukraine angry. They want to maintain a favorable climate in which to negotiate. These censored statements and hundreds of others make no mention of politics whatsoever. General Walker, of course, did but, as I have said, they used a few of his remarks as an excuse for the whole muzzling program.

It was because of the stopping of the anti-Communist seminars and this type of censoring that Senator STROM THURMOND made his demand for an investigation of the muzzling of the military. THURMOND would have never succeeded in getting his investigation had not the grassroots of America risen up and told the Senate in unmistakable terms that it wanted such an investigation.

Let me tell you that the Thurmond investigation is not wanted by some people in high places. Some are doing everything possible to throw roadblocks in Senator THURMOND's path, and attempt to apply a liberal coat of whitewash over the whole matter.

The success of congressional investigations depends largely upon the staff which does the actual work. THURMOND has complained, and rightly so, that he had no word in the selection of the chief counsel.

Day in and day out this investigation avoids the real issue as I have discussed it here. No one contends that the military has a right to participate in political campaigns; to urge the support of certain candidates and attack others. Nobody contends that the military has a right to lobby for legislation not wanted by the administration.

These charges are being thrown up as a smokescreen to hide the type of censoring I have pointed out and to cover up the reason for this soft attitude toward the top brass in the Kremlin and their current policies.

There is another facet and perhaps the most important to this current nationwide attack of the so-called rightwing or extremists.

During the last 18 months the anti-Communist and conservative movement in this country started to grow by leaps and bounds. Not only its voice but its political power was being felt. The liberals, the leftwing crowd, the ADA'ers, the advocates of welfare-statism, big government, one-worldism and the soft on communism contingent became worried and concerned. It became necessary for them to turn back this tide of conservatism and anti-communism which was interfering with their drive toward the welfare state and the abortive attempts to negotiate by appeasement and surrender a settlement of Soviet demands in the cold war.

How did they attempt to do it? An old but effective technique was used. They started a campaign to discredit the conservative and anti-Communist movement by smear and ridicule. I must admit a clever job was done. The leftwing which has always condemned and pretended to abhor guilt by association used it effectively. In fact, they have played it to the hilt in the current campaign. They divided and threw fear into the conservatives and sound anti-Communists in the United States by ridicule—by tarring and feathering it with some of the foolish and asinine statements and activities of a few so-called extremists and crackpots. The leftwing press joined in this guilt by association attack.

Many stanch conservatives and sound anti-Communists couldn't stand the heat and ran for cover under the barrage of smear and invective from the left. Meanwhile, the Communists and their apologists sat by enjoying the show as others did their work. Conservatives and anti-Communists retreated instead of counterattacking. They should have pointed out how some in the highest places in Government who were leading this attack had, over the years, remained strangely silent about the extreme left. They should have shouted from the rooftops how these self-righteous liberals have coddled and slept in the same bed with the extreme left—how they even supported Communist-front organizations and vilified those who sought to expose the machinations of the Communist apparatus operating within the United States.

This guilt by association attack upon the conservatives and sound anti-Communists resulted from the fact that the conservatives were becoming more successful in convincing the American people that our destruction from within can result from policies that we are following just as well as from active, hard-core Communists within the American community.

One of the great men of our day, the distinguished Democratic Senator from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD, brought into focus this possibility during the recent debate in the Senate over raising the debt ceiling. Senator BYRD said: "Is it possible for us to destroy ourselves from within? Every American should ask himself that question. Nothing could serve Khrushchev better. Survival of free nations, including our own, depends upon the financial soundness of this Government."

Senator BYRD continued: "Nothing now before the Congress or any other branch of Government is more important than protection of the Nation's fiscal structure."

Senator BYRD in that debate went on to point out the threat to this Nation by the spending programs of the liberals and leftwingers by saying:

"We have been the policeman, the banker, and the Santa Claus for the free world more than 15 years. Recent figures showed U.S. foreign aid has totaled more than $100,000 million and is continuing.

"Meanwhile," he said, "we are faced with a menacing deficit in the balance of international payments between the United States and nations we have assisted. It has run as high as $4 billion a year.

"This situation, in combination with domestic deficits which threaten or cause inflation, has resulted in a drain on our gold supply. We have lost 30 percent of our gold in relatively a few years. Mr. President," the Senator said, "I emphasize: We have lost 30 percent of our gold reserves.

"Neither our form of Government nor our system of enterprise can survive insolvency. All of us know that we cannot continue much longer to spend and spend, and tax and tax, and borrow and borrow.

"We are already laboring under a terrible tax burden. It is confiscatory in some areas. Deficits are continuing; and the debt is at a peak never reached even for 4 years of global shooting war.

"In addition to $300 billion in direct debt, we have assumed contingent liabilities at home and abroad amounting to untold billions more. Now we propose to underwrite the debts of the United Nations."

It was at this point in the debate that HARRY BYRD asked the question whether it was not possible for us to destroy ourselves from within.

Daily, my congressional mail bristles with condemnation for refusing to vote for certain spending measures. Just last week an irate constituent wrote: "SCHERER, why do you consistently vote against measures that have merit?" The answer is simple. Because we can't afford it. We're broke. Gentlemen, I did not go to Washington to be a party to the destruction of the fiscal stability of the United States.

But the attack on the rightwing and the anti-Communists continues, spearheaded by the very top echelons of this Government. Those of the so-called rightwing, which Edward Murrow and Bobby Kennedy derisively call "mock patriots," are pro-Americans vitally interested in the preservation of constitutional Government, and opposed to the Communist ideology which would destroy us.

They are opposed to those programs and policies which Senator BYRD condemned and which they genuinely feel will weaken this Nation so that it will not be able to withstand the aggression of international communism either from without or from within.

In the field of policy, reasonable men should be able to disagree vigorously without being called "mock patriots," "lunatic fringe," and charged with being "tremendously harmful to the country."

In case Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Murrow don't know what is making Americans angrier by the minute, I will close with telling just one of dozens of cases I could mention.

The National Security Council is the top security agency in this country. It is composed of the Cabinet officers, etc., etc.

Mr. Attorney General, you are a member of that Council. You are not only the law enforcement officer of the United States, but also a member of the Security Council. Will you tell me why this highest level strategic planning agency employs Marcus Raskin?

Marcus Raskin, in case you don't know it, was intimately associated with the preparation of a just-published collection of foreign policy essays which not only follow the Communist line but go beyond it.

The book, entitled "The Liberal Papers," is the result of a project involving 35, let us say, of the most liberal Democratic Members of Congress. Edited by Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, it states that Marcus Raskin played "a leading role in the development of the project" which spawned the book.

In case you haven't seen the book, here are a few of the foreign policy recommendations advanced by the authors of "The Liberal Papers" for the guidance and enlightenment of the American people.

Recognition of Red China, sponsorship of Red Chinese membership in the United Nations, recognition of Red China's claim to Formosa and to the Pescadores, financial aid for Red China, demilitarization of the West German Republic, recognition of East Germany's puppet regime, expulsion of West Germany, Italy, Scandinavia, and France from NATO, shutdown of American missile bases in Europe, invitation to Russia to plug in on a bidirectional DEW line.

Mr. Attorney General, the Communists in their wildest dreams never hoped for such concessions. But the choicest quote of all from this book reads: "As the cold war continues, it becomes increasingly difficult for decent Americans, humane enough to prefer peace to an egocentric national honor, to be outspokenly and genuinely anti-Communist." In plain English this means it's better to be Red than dead.

The rightwing, Mr. Attorney General and Mr. President, want to know if this is the philosophy that has infiltrated the National Security Council even at staff level.

How often do we have to be tricked and deceived before we are willing to recognize the true nature and objectives of world communism?

Like Hitler, the Communists have given us a blueprint of their strategy and objectives. They have said and they have written that there can no more be sincere diplomacy than there can be dry water. It is also written so that all who read may know that to accomplish Communist objectives any and every conceivable type of promise, treachery, deceit, espionage, sabotage, abduction, and murder is to be used.

The Soviets in their drive for world domination have entered into more than 1,000 treaties, agreements, and nonaggression pacts with other countries of the world. They have flagrantly broken and violated all of these except a handful which it has suited their purpose to keep.

The spirit of Camp David which the world hailed has become the ghost of calumny. At Paris, Eisenhower and the United States were insulted, humiliated and vilified as never before. In Vienna, Kennedy was ignominiously spanked and given his orders. In the United Nations, Khrushchev threw his weight around like a bully and got away with it. The Kremlin's pipsqueak stooge, Fidel Castro, has kicked us around and humiliated us as never before in our long history. The so-called neutral nations at their Belgrade Conference, nations to whom we have poured out billions in aid to buy their friendship, licked Khrushchev's boots and gave the United States an insulting cold shoulder.

For 2 years at the disarmament and nuclear test ban talks at Geneva, we negotiated like suckers while the Soviets never had any intention of arriving at agreements. They continued these fraudulent negotiations solely for the purpose of enabling them to obtain a nuclear advantage. At this moment, we are engaged in further test ban talks. There will be no agreement unless the United States backs down on its demand for adequate inspection and controls so the Communists can't cheat. Read between the lines and see who is backing down. The current Geneva talks are only propaganda forums for the Soviets. They now, as in the past, have no intention of keeping an agreement even if one should be reached.

I won't even talk about Berlin.

Haven't we had enough? Haven't we learned that you cannot appease or negotiate with the Communists? Don't we know that the Soviets practice the salami type of aggression? They take slice after slice, but each one so thin that it is not worth fighting for and then all that is left is the string and, of course, who would fight for a string?

I can hear the leftwing scream: "SCHERER is a warmonger." No, but the only way to prevent war and to avoid eventual domination by international communism is to call the Soviets' bluff—to draw the line and say: "This far and no farther," and mean it and by our actions and deeds let the Soviets know we mean it. They will not start an all-out nuclear war. They will not risk the almost total destruction of their cities when they have come so far in the short space of 40 years by internal subversion or indirect aggression.

If they had not learned the lesson of success by subversion or indirect aggression before, they certainly learned it in Cuba. As I have said, if the Soviets had sought to take Cuba by outward aggression, by force of arms, in the air, on land, or by sea, they would have failed miserably because we would have moved in with everything we had. Yet today Havana—90 miles from shore—is as Communist dominated and controlled as are Moscow and Peiping. The Soviets did it without the loss of a man. They took Cuba intact. They did not need to destroy physically the Cubans or their possessions. They have taken their people and their possessions and have put them to use.

Not many people any longer deny that we are engaged in a life or death struggle for survival with the international Communist apparatus.

We cannot hope to prevail in this struggle unless all Americans in every field of endeavor are absolutely convinced beyond any peradventure of a doubt that we are not engaged in a popularity contest with a competing economic system; that we are not faced merely with certain annoying adjustments which should be made so that we may coexist with a different system of government; but that we are now in a death grip with an enemy the like of which for debasement and inhumanity the world has never before experienced—an enemy we can ignore, appease, negotiate with, only at the expense of our survival.

This is the challenge of our day to all patriots of this Republic. We must accept this challenge. We shall either dedicate ourselves to it or, like the countries already behind the Iron Curtain, face slavery and eventual destruction.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in a world so embittered by hatred and suspicion, create in us, we pray, the splendor that dawns when hearts are kind.

At this high altar of the Nation's life, may those who sit in the exalted seats of this historic Chamber, scorning all expediency, match these dangerous days with daring deeds, as with cheerful courage, sustained by an unwavering faith, they bear the weight of vast concerns, the sting of criticism, and the drudgery of unapplauded toil.

May those who here, by the will of the people, are servants of the Republic, speak always with due caution and humility, knowing that their words are not just their own, but that they are heard in all the earth.

In these days of destiny, may we merit the shining crown of the divine approbation, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 12, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 1159) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6 percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 1159) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CALL OF THE LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Finance Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent the Subcommittee on Stockpiling of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING IN THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on employee development and training in the Federal Civil Service, fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS ON ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, TEST AND RESEARCH CONTRACTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on Army, Navy, and Air Force experimental, developmental, test, and research contracts, for the period July 1, through December 31, 1961 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TEMPORARY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1958, TO ENCOURAGE EARLY RESTORATION OF MONEYS MADE AVAILABLE TO THE STATES

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, to encourage early restoration of moneys made available to the States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT ON TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Tennessee Valley Authority, fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL ACTIVITIES UNDER ADMINISTRATION OF THE PHILADELPHIA REGIONAL OFFICE, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected slum clearance and urban renewal activities under the administration of the Philadelphia regional office, Housing and Home Finance Agency, March 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIM OF NEZ PERCE TRIBE *v.* THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of Charles E. Williams, Joseph Redthunder, and Harry Owhi as representatives of the *Nez Perce Tribe, petitioners* v. *The United States of America, defendant,* Docket No. 180-A (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUDIT REPORT OF NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL

A letter from the president, National Safety Council, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the audit of the financial transactions of that Council, for the year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 6303(c), TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6303(c) of title 39, United States Code (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO APPORTIONMENT OF FEDERAL-AID PRIMARY AND SECONDARY FUNDS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the mileage of rural delivery and star routes used as a factor in apportionment of Federal-aid primary and secondary funds (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Joint resolution relative to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp for Father Junipero Serra

"Whereas civilization was planted in California in 1769 in the coming of Father Junipero Serra who established a system of Christian missions, and who is universally regarded by the people of California, of all denominations, as the father and founder of this great State; and

"Whereas in 1749 Father Serra sought and received the permission of his Franciscan superiors to journey to the New World and to work there as a plain and simple missionary among the Indians; and

"Whereas Father Serra served 18 years in Mexico engaging in frontier missionary work before he received orders to proceed to Alta or Upper California for the purpose of founding a mission system in a hitherto uncolonized area where there were no roads, factories, stores, farms and schools; and

"Whereas within 15 years of his coming to California, and under primitive conditions, he was responsible for 10 missions for Alta California, stretching from San Diego in the south to San Francisco in the north; and

"Whereas as father president of the mission system of Alta California he established himself as a great leader, a man of rare ability and vision, a great administrator and teacher, and exemplified the sanctity and spirituality of St. Francis; and

"Whereas the entire career of Father Junipero Serra in California, which covered a period of 15 years, was characterized by faith and dedication which gave him the courage to continue his work in this wilderness area; and

"Whereas Father Serra was truly one of the original pioneers of California who sowed the first seed of civilization and established the first permanent settlements in Alta California in the Franciscan missions; and

"Whereas in 1913 Michael Williams characterized him as 'a man among men as well as a gentleman and a scholar; a worker in the world as well as a seeker after the sanctity of the spirit; a generous, humorous, product as only the mystic mind may be, such was Serra—the first Californian; the founder of the civilization of the West'; and

"Whereas, the year 1963 will mark the 250th anniversary of the birth of Father Junipero Serra: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California memorializes the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in 1963 in honor of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Father Junipero Serra; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES NOT TO REPEAL THE SILVER PURCHASE ACT OF 1934

"Whereas the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 would be detrimental to the economic welfare of the people of the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States not to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1962.

"WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
"*Clerk.*

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, April 3, 1962.

"THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Requiring That Automobiles Be Manufactured so as To Provide Maximum Safety for the Public

"Whereas thousands of persons are killed annually by automobiles; and

"Whereas the preservation of the lives of our citizens is of prime importance to the welfare of the Nation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation requiring that automobiles be manufactured so as to provide maximum safety for the public; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1962.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, April 3, 1962.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

Three resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation To Provide Medical Care for the Aged Under the Provisions of the Social Security Law

"Whereas there are millions of citizens of the United States of advanced age who are unable to pay for adequate medical care; and

"Whereas it is of prime importance that the needs of such aged persons be provided for: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide medical care for the aged under the social security law; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 26, 1962.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, March 28, 1962.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation To Allow Deductions To Be Made Under the Social Security Law for Any Service Rendered in the National Guard in Any Quarter of the Year

"Whereas members of the National Guard are covered under the social security law only for service rendered during the annual active duty training period: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to allow deductions to be made under the social security law for any service rendered in the National Guard in any quarter of the year; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1962.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, April 3, 1962.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Removing All Tariff or Other Restrictions on the Importation of Residual Fuel Oil

"Whereas it is important to the economy of this Nation that the importation of residual fuel oil to this country be continued: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation removing all tariffs and restrictions on the importation of residual fuel oil; and be it further

"'*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, March 30, 1962.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, April 3, 1962.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Expanding Federal Aid to Education

"Whereas the welfare of our country depends on an educated citizenry; and

"Whereas many school districts in the Nation are in need of additional funds for education of their pupils: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation expanding Federal aid to education; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1962.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, April 5, 1962.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation To Prevent Interference With the Registration of Prospective Voters

"Whereas it is the duty of a democratic government to permit every citizen to exercise his right of suffrage; and

"Whereas many citizens are denied the privilege to register as voters by unlawful intimidation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to prevent interference with the registration of prospective voters by intimidation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, adopted, March 30, 1962.

"William C. Maiers,
"*Clerk*.

"Adopted by the senate, in concurrence, April 4, 1962.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"*Clerk*.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to ask for a further study of the problem of foreign beef importation

"Whereas the increased importation of foreign frozen beef has been causing undue hardships to cattlemen in Hawaii who must compete with foreign beef not measured or regulated according to U.S. standards; and

"Whereas Honolulu, Hawaii, the closest and highest priced American port, is the favorite market for 'down-under' beef; and

"Whereas in 1960, 24 percent of Hawaii's market supply came from 'down-under,' compared to only 1.7 percent for the entire United States; and

"Whereas a certain limited amount of foreign beef in the Hawaiian market is welcomed, but sale of such beef within the past 5 years has increased from slightly less than 5 percent to approximately 25 percent, and if this trend is allowed to continue, the cattle industry in Hawaii will soon be thoroughly ruined; and

"Whereas Hawaii's cattle industry is an important part of the island economy, it is of vital necessity that it be preserved, not only to help stabilize the general economy, but to insure local self-sufficiency of beef as well: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate of the first State legislature, budget session of 1962* (the house of representatives concurring). That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to ask an appropriate department of the Federal Government to give further study to the importation of foreign beef to the U.S. ports and to consider the advisability of imposing a quota on the importation of beef, equal in total to the present importation level, with periodic adjustments therein to be determined; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the Honorable Hiram L. Fong and the Honorable Oren E. Long, Senators to Congress from Hawaii, and to Congressman Daniel K. Inouye, Representative to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 2

"Resolution to memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to oppose any amendment of the Constitution of the United States or any other action of the Congress, or the executive branch thereof which would subject income from State and local bonds to a Federal tax or cause the tax to be increased in any manner.

"Whereas the State of Maryland and the political subdivisions thereof have in the past and are now currently engaged in financing, through the issuance of bonds, needed public improvements such as the building of schools, highways, water and sewer distribution systems and other projects for the promotion of the health, safety, and welfare of the people; and

"Whereas the interest income which the owner derives from such bonds has in the past and is now currently exempt from the imposition of any Federal income tax; and

"Whereas the Federal taxation of the interest of such bonds, as income, would result in the curtailment of construction of needed public improvements, and would result in either an increase of taxes imposed by the State of Maryland and any political subdivision thereof in order to pay higher interest costs, or the assumption by the Federal Government of the responsibility of financing such improvements; and

"Whereas there is currently a national movement to permit the imposition of the Federal income tax on the interest income from the bonds issued or to be issued by the several States and their political subdivisions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland,* That we respectfully memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose any amendment of the Constitution of the United States, or any other action by the Congress of the United States, or the executive branch thereof, which would have the effect of subjecting the income from State and local bonds to a Federal tax or causing the tax to be increased because of such bond holdings by a taxpayer whether or not the increase is in fact titled a tax; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the house of delegates is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Maryland in the Congress of the United States.

"Read and adopted by the house of delegates, March 9, 1962.

"By order:

"James P. Mause,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Delegates.*
"Perry O. Wilkinson,
"*Speaker of the House of Delegates.*"

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the State board of control, Austin, Tex., signed by William J. Burke, executive director, favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding advertised and negotiated disposals of surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Oakdale, Calif., protesting against the imposition of a Federal income tax on income derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, a certified copy of a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would release and convey to the State of Rhode Island unused land and/or buildings, located within the State of Rhode Island and held by the Federal Government and its agencies, where said land and/or buildings are not necessary to the public defense.

This resolution was adopted by the General Assembly, State of Rhode Island, at the January session, A.D. 1962, and approved by the Governor on the 22d day of March 1962.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Resolution 1177

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would release and convey to the State of Rhode Island unused land and/or buildings, located within the State of Rhode Island and held by the Federal Government and its agencies, where said land and/or buildings are not necessary to the public defense

Whereas the State of Rhode Island is desirous of developing and utilizing all unused real estate and buildings presently held by the Federal Government and its agencies to their fullest potential; and

Whereas the Department of the Navy, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, and the General Services Administration, all within the Federal Government of the United States, have within their jurisdiction, land and/or buildings which are not being used and are not necessary to the public defense; and

Whereas the State of Rhode Island has requested the Federal Government and the said agencies to make a study of all unused land and/or buildings located within the State of Rhode Island and not necessary to the public defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island earnestly urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would release and transfer to the State of Rhode Island all unused land and/or buildings held by the Federal Government and its agencies, and not necessary to the public defense; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of State to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to enact legislation which would carry out the purposes of this resolution.

THE PRESIDENT'S PUBLIC WELFARE PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the President's public welfare program (H.R. 10032), passed by the General Assembly in the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations be appropriately referred and printed in the Record.

Mr. President, a number of leaders in the welfare field in my State of Rhode Island have expressed considerable interest in H.R. 10032 and I am hopeful that favorable action will soon be taken on this bill.

There being no objections, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Resolution 1440

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the President's public welfare program (H.R. 10032)

Whereas the President of the United States has submitted legislation to the Congress designed to strengthen and to render more realistic the Nation's public welfare program; and

Whereas H.R. 10032, incorporating the provisions of the President's public welfare legislative program, is of vital import to the welfare and well-being of more than 7 million Americans whose lives are intimately touched by public welfare assistance; and

Whereas H.R. 10032, if enacted, shall revitalize the administration and philosophy of public welfare by enabling and assisting the individual States in administering public assistance and child welfare programs geared toward prevention, rehabilitation, and intensive casework service; and

Whereas the sound and progressive concepts underlining H.R. 10032—concepts calling for increased Federal financial participation in services and administrative costs; expansion and improvement of child welfare services; incentives aimed at the gradual elimination of public assistance residency requirements in each of the States and toward the establishment of community work and training programs within public assistance; authorization of protective payments; increase in adequately trained public assistance personnel; extension of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents; extension of increase in Federal share of public assistance payments; and the option to States of combining, under a single plan, adult programs for aid to the aged, blind, and disabled—offer a promising opportunity to Rhode Island and to each of its sister States to more fully meet the challenges of public welfare of the sixties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned to enact H.R. 10032; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of State to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Wilbur Mills, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House; the Honorable John F. Fogarty, Congressman from Rhode Island; the Honorable Fernand J. St. Germain, Congressman from Rhode Island; the Honorable John O. Pastore, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island; and the Honorable Claiborne Pell, U.S. Senator from Rhode Island, earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to secure passage of H.R. 10032.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H.R. 7477. An act to repeal section 409 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949, requiring the submission of a report to the Congress concerning eligible public building projects (Rept. No. 1342).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Earl F. Haffey, of Colorado, to be assayer of the mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Brig. Gen. Ellsworth Ingalls Davis, U.S. Army, to be a member and President of the Mississippi River Commission.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GORE:

S. 3167. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to limit the conduct of business in interstate or foreign commerce by corporations which have the economic power substantially to lessen competition, or which tend to create monopolies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3168. A bill to amend the National Emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to extend certain of the procedures under such provisions to emergencies arising out of general price increases in certain industries; and

S. 3169. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Consumers Advisory Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gore when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. Saltonstall) (by request):

S. 3170. A bil to amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 252), to increase the basic allowance for quarters of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Russell when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3171. A bill to provide for the conveyance under certain conditions of the phosphate rights in certain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 3172. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Hartwell Dam project, South Carolina and Georgia, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3173. A bill for the relief of Robert T. Barnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH (by request):

S. 3174. A bill to provide for the division of the tribal assets of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska among the members of the tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3175. A bill for the relief of Llewellan B. Griffith; and

S. 3176. A bill for the relief of Bernard W. Flynn, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 3177. A bill for the relief of Michael (Mike) Bessler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. Church):

S. 3178. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to finance the testimony of expert witnesses before the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3179. A bill for the relief of Lee Ah Foo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 3180. A bill to establish the Capitol Hill National Historical Park and to provide for the protection and preservation of its historic character, dignity, and environment; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3181. A bill to permit applications for entry under the public land agricultural laws to be filed only for lands designated as open to such application, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 3182. A bill to provide for the establishment of National Board of Cancer Control; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A REPORT ENTITLED "STUDY MISSION TO SOUTH AMERICA"

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 330); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document a report entitled "Study Mission to South America", submitted by Senators Gale W. McGee, Frank E. Moss, Clair Engle, and Stephen M. Young to the Senate Committees on Appropriations, Interior and Insular Affairs, Agriculture and Forestry, and Armed Services on February 13, 1962; and that five thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

STEEL PRICES AND STEEL COMPANY ORGANIZATION

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am sure all my colleagues share the gratification expressed by President Kennedy on behalf of the whole country over the decision of the managers of our large steel-producing corporations to hold the price line, at least temporarily.

But, while we can share in this general gratification, we must not allow the lessons learned during the past week to go unheeded, for the country surely learned two great lessons from big steel's march up the hill and down again.

First, we have learned that public opinion, aroused, mobilized, and voiced by a determined President, can exert great moral pressure upon those who are tempted to move contrary to the public interest.

Second, we have had brought home to us most forcefully the dependence of the health of our whole economy upon the arbitrary decisions of a few men in key positions in industry and labor. Specifically, we have had a classic demonstration of the way prices are fixed in our modern big corporate economic structure, not by classical economics, but by the fiat of a few financiers.

We must now move to correct those conditions which exist in our economic structure, which would allow this near tragedy, and other similar ones, so barely averted—a rise in the price of a basic commodity which would surely set off the fourth round of post-World War II inflation. Now, while this incident is fresh in our minds is the time to act to bring about a betterment in our economic machinery.

Let us then view our problem, not with hostility or revenge in our hearts, but in full realization of the waiting threat to the stability of our economy. Conditions and procedures similar to those in the steel industry exist in other industries and economic areas.

But, while the steel incident is fresh, I want to illustrate the problem by referring briefly to steel, and specifically to United States Steel.

The steel industry—and United States Steel as a company—has long constituted a national problem. The plain fact of the matter is that United States Steel sets the price pattern for the whole steel industry, and United States Steel is an inefficient company. This means that prices are set high enough for United States Steel to make a good profit. Other more efficient steel companies, of course, make a better profit.

Less harm would be done to the economy, assuming that for some reason we had to have price fixing and price leadership in steel, if the price leader and price fixer were a more efficient company.

United States Steel is not now, and hardly ever has been, operated by real steel men. The top officers of United States Steel do not generally come up through steelmaking ranks. The company was put together by financiers in 1901, and has generally ever since been run by money-market manipulators, not steel manufacturers. United States Steel has rarely been known for innovation or rationalization. United States Steel's costs have always been high, and its rate of return on investment somewhat lower than Bethlehem and other more efficient producers operated by steel men who have grown up in the steelmaking business.

In some ways the problems of United States Steel typify the problems of other large corporations which set price patterns throughout much of the industrial sector of our economy. Many of these industrial giants were put together around the turn of the century, not with the idea, purpose, or result of increasing efficiency in production and distribution, but to insure against competition and, therefore, to achieve a guaranteed profit.

Here are some things which appear to me to be wrong with our corporate giants, and I shall use United States Steel merely as an illustration:

First. While fewer man-hours are utilized year by year in production activities, the ranks of the corporate bureaucracy are swollen. Although soaring labor costs are blamed for United States Steel's troubles, that corporation's employment costs were lower in 1961 than in 1960. Despite this lowering of employment costs, profits fell 37 percent on a drop in total sales of only 4 percent.

Second. Vertical integration has been carried so far that cost control, and even the determination of cost of various steps in production, is most difficult, if not impossible.

Third. The company is engaged in so many outside activities—such as mining, coking, transportation, cement production, zinc mining, zinc smelting, the production and servicing of oil field machinery, natural gas, and prefabricated housing—that one wonders how adequate attention is given to any particular phase of the business. The record seems clearly to indicate this.

Fourth. Too much debt has been floated, and there have been no new public issues of common stock. The company has more than $700 million of long-term debt outstanding, and must currently repay $30 million each year, in addition to interest. While borrowing heavily, the stock has been split 6 for 1 since 1949; but no new stock has been sold to the public.

Fifth. In light of the need for plant expansion and modernization, the step-up in dividends seems to me unjustified. In 1947 and 1948, the dividend was $5 per share. The present dividend is $3 per share, which is the equivalent of $18 on the pre-1949 share of stock. The dividend has thus more than tripled—almost quadrupled; and this same high dividend was paid in 1961, despite the fact that bookkeeping earnings were only $3.05 per share.

Sixth. A somewhat less than candid compensation pattern for top executives has been established. United States Steel has leaned heavily on restricted stock options, in lieu of higher salaries. As of December 31, 1960, options were held by a few key employees on 518,705 shares of stock, at prices ranging as low as $18.50 per share. This amount of stock could have been sold, during the past year or two, for more than $50 million. The top executives, in turn, could have been paid salaries in honest dollars, thus giving the company a greater deduction from taxes, and thus a higher real profit for the stockholders.

These are just a few of the things which are wrong with United States Steel, although United States Steel is not alone in suffering from these maladies. Many of our large conglomerate corporations suffer from the bloat of bigness without underlying strength, and the leukemia of steadily watered stock.

Many of these difficulties, under which some of our corporate giants labor, would, I am convinced, be corrected, or at least alleviated, if the companies were broken up both vertically and horizontally. Such a breakup would stand a good chance of restoring price competition. Or, if we must have price fixing, price administration, or price leadership, for some reason which escapes me, a breakup of United States Steel would offer the opportunity of placing leadership of the steel industry in the hands of steelmen, rather than financiers.

With these thoughts in mind, I am now introducing three bills. One of these fits into the antitrust pattern, and amends the Sherman Act. The other two are designed to reinforce and make more certain the voice of public opinion which we have seen at work during the past week.

The first bill would place in the Sherman Act criteria which would make it easier for the courts to order a breakup of existing monopolies. I think these monopolies can be broken up under existing law, given sufficient vigor on the part of the Justice Department; but this bill should make the job easier.

There is some question as to the adequacy of existing law in laying down standards and criteria under which the courts can find that monopolistic conditions in restraint of trade exist. This bill applies to existing concentrations substantially the same criteria, now found in the Clayton Act, which have been successfully used in the courts to prevent certain mergers. It seems reasonable to me that if a certain type of merger should be prevented in the public interest, the type of situation which would be brought about by such a merger, if it already exists because of past mergers and acquisitions, ought to be corrected.

This bill, then, gives the courts the same yardstick to apply to break up existing large concentrations, that they can already apply to prevent proposed mergers and acquisitions.

The other two bills cover an essentially nongovernmental approach. On April 4, prior to the galling gambit of Big Steel, I discussed on the floor of the Senate a plan for a National Consumers Advisory Board. One of these bills would establish such a board. I shall not repeat what I said on April 4.

Briefly, this bill sets up a quasi-public national board, together with regional boards, which have factfinding and information-disseminating functions on matters of interest to consumers. Through such machinery, I hope the public can be informed and alerted, and that the force of public opinion thus formulated can do much to keep down inequities in prices, wages, and other costs.

As a supplement to the activities of this Board, I have also proposed, in the third bill, to apply Taft-Hartley procedures to proposed general price increases.

Under this bill, which would amend the Taft-Hartley Act, if a general price increase in steel or other similar products or services appears imminent, the President may convene a factfinding board and, through the same procedures now followed to halt certain threatened strikes, may seek a court injunction which would delay for 80 days the price increase. I hope that during this 80-day period the force of public opinion can be brought into play, so as to prevent actions of administered-price industries inimical to the public welfare.

I hope the appropriate committees of the Senate will begin hearings on these bills before the month is out.

Mr. President, I introduce the three bills, for appropriate reference.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. GORE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 3167. A bill to amend the Sherman Act to limit the conduct of business in interstate or foreign commerce by corporations which have the economic power substantially to lessen competition, or which tend to create monopolies, and for other purposes.

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 3168. A bill to amend the National Emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to extend certain of the procedures under such provisions to emergencies arising out of general price increases in certain industries; and

S. 3169. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Consumers Advisory Board, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 302 OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, for myself, and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to the Armed Services.

This bill is requested by the Department of Defense and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal explaining the purpose of the bill. I ask that the letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3170) to amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 252), to increase the basic allowance for quarters of members of the uniformed services, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter presented by Mr. RUSSELL is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, March 19, 1962.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of proposed legislation "To amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 252), to increase the basic allowance for quarters of members of the uniformed services."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the 87th Congress and the Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 252), to provide an increase in the basic allowance for quarters (BAQ) for members of the uniformed services in order to meet the increased costs of housing in the civilian market.

Basic allowances for quarters at the present time are essentially those established by the act of May 19, 1952. The Military Pay Act of 1958 added two new pay grades in both the officer and enlisted ranks and authorized for these pay grades the quarters allowances payable to the most senior officer and enlisted grades at that time. However, no adjustment was made in the 1952 basic allowance for quarters schedule. The 1952 scale represented an increase of 14 percent over allowances authorized by section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and approximated the rise in housing costs since 1949. This is the only increase granted in the case of officer personnel. Most enlisted personnel benefited substantially from the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, which increased allowances authorized by section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and extended entitlement to allowances to virtually all enlisted personnel with dependents.

The proposed increases in the basic allowance for quarters are based in large part upon those recommended by the Advisory Panel on Military Family Housing Policies and Practices in its report of November 15, 1961.

This Panel consisted of civilian experts in financing, marketing, construction, and management of real property and was appointed by the Secretary of Defense to study the overall problem of military family housing. The report of the Panel disclosed that the rates established in 1949, based on the Hook Commission study, were intended to reflect the current housing costs but were actually based on 1947 source data. Therefore, while the 14-percent increase of 1952 was appropriate for the rise in cost of living between 1949 and 1952, the established rates did not adequately reflect 1952 housing costs.

The allowances for each grade in the proposed legislation are based on housing expenses of civilians at comparable income levels. While the methodology followed in the 1961 study differed somewhat from that employed by the Hook Commission, the basic principles accepted by the two studies are essentially similar. In construction of the proposed rate structure, data from numerous Government agencies have been utilized, including Census, Federal Housing Administration, and Bureau of Labor Statistics. Very significantly, the same procedures followed and the same data used for this study can be effectively utilized for future BAQ adjustment studies.

The proposed rate structure incorporates certain principles proposed by the Housing Panel:

1. Differential by grade in the enlisted rate structure, as is currently the case in the officer structure;

2. Two separate allowances in pay grade E-4, intended as a reenlistment incentive at the end of the first 4 years of service.

The fact that no appreciable increase is recommended for the lower enlisted pay grades is based on a comparison of current allowances with housing expenditures by comparable civilian income groups, and housing expenditures actually reported by a sampling of enlisted personnel of those grades in a survey conducted for the Housing Panel study. The allowances currently authorized enlisted personnel in their first enlistment are believed to be reasonable.

Section 9 of the act of June 18, 1878 (20 Stat. 151), provided commutation of quarters for Army officers when they were stationed at places where no public quarters were available. Section 13 of the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1007), authorized similar provision for the Navy. The Congress thus recognized at that time that it was neither practicable nor desirable to provide Government housing for all military personnel. This practice continues to be necessary due to fluctuating personnel strength, the opening and closing of bases, and the probable adverse effect on the civilian economy which would result from providing public quarters for all military personnel. It is Department of Defense policy to utilize community support to the greatest extent practicable. Actually, as of June 30, 1961, 61 percent of married members eligible for public quarters (E-4 with 7 years of service and all grades above) in the United States were living offpost on the local economy.

A long-range family housing construction program is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program. However; within the foreseeable future, there will always be military personnel for whom Government housing is not available, and it is strongly recommended that an adequate BAQ be provided for these personnel.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal would result in estimated increased budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense as follows:

[Fiscal years. In thousands]

	1963 [1]	1964	1965	1966	1967
Army	51, 714	103, 074	103, 074	103, 074	103, 074
Navy	30, 791	62, 323	61, 812	61, 174	61, 174
Marine Corps	7, 794	15, 610	15, 610	15, 610	15, 610
Air Force	59, 182	118, 364	118, 364	118, 364	118, 364
Total	149, 481	299, 371	298, 860	298, 222	298, 222

[1] One-half year.

Sincerely,

ROSWELL GILPATRIC,
Deputy.

DIVISION OF TRIBAL ASSETS OF PONCA TRIBE OF NATIVE AMERICANS OF NEBRASKA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the division of the tribal assets of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska among the members of the tribe, and for other purposes. This bill was submitted by the Department of the Interior, and I am introducing it at the request of the Department.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal, signed by Assistant Secretary of the Interior John Carver, and the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3174) to provide for the division of the tribal assets of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska among the members of the tribe, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the membership roll of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska shall be closed at midnight of the date of enactment of this Act, and no child born thereafter shall be eligible for enrollment. The Secretary of the Interior with advice and assistance of the tribe is authorized and directed, pursuant to such regulations as may be issued by him, to prepare a final roll for the purposes of this Act of the members of the tribe consisting of the persons whose names appear on the census roll of April 1, 1934, with the supplement thereto of January 1, 1935, and their descendants of not less than one-fourth degree Indian blood of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska, regardless of place of residence, who are living at the time the roll is closed, and in so doing shall provide a reasonable opportunity for any person to protest against the inclusion or omission of any name on or from the roll. The Secretary's decision on all protests shall be final and conclusive. After all protests are disposed of, the final roll shall be published in the Federal Register. Upon publication of the roll in the Federal Register, the Secretary shall give the adult members an opportunity to indicate their agreement to the division of tribal assets in accordance with the provisions of this Act and when a majority of the adult members have indicated their agreement, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of that fact.

SEC. 2. Each member whose name appears on the final roll of the tribe as published in the Federal Register shall be entitled to receive in accordance with the provisions of this Act an equal share of the tribe's assets that are held in trust by the United States. This right shall constitute personal property which may be inherited or bequeathed, but it shall not otherwise be subject to alienation or encumbrance.

SEC. 3. (a) All property of the United States used for the benefit of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska is hereby declared to be a part of the assets of the tribe, and all of the tribe's assets shall be distributed in accordance with the provisions of this section. The distribution shall be completed within three years from the date of this Act, or as soon thereafter as practicable.

(b) The tribe shall designate any part of the tribe's property that is to be set aside for church, park, playground, or cemetery purposes, and the Secretary is authorized to convey such property to trustees or agencies designated by the tribe for that purpose and approved by the Secretary.

(c) Each member may select for homesite purposes and receive title to not to exceed five acres of tribal land that is being used for homesite purposes by such member, or that is not used and selected by some other member. The member shall pay the current market value of the homesite selection, excluding any improvements or repairs constructed by such member, his wife, children, or ancestor, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

(d) All assets of the tribe that are not selected and conveyed to members shall be sold by competitive bid at not less than the current market value, and any member shall have the right to purchase property offered for sale for a price not less than the highest acceptable bid therefor. If more than one member exercises such right, the property shall be sold to the member exercising the right who offers the highest price.

(e) The net proceeds of all sales of tribal property, and all other tribal funds, shall be used to pay, as authorized by the Secretary, any debts of the tribe. The remainder of such proceeds and funds shall be divided equally among the members whose names are on the final roll, or their heirs or legatees. Any debt owed by a member, heir or legatee to the tribe or to the United States may be set off as authorized by the Secretary against the distributive share of such person. Any member of the tribe who purchases tribal property in accordance with this section may apply on the purchase price his share of the proceeds of all sales of tribal property, and the Secretary of the Interior shall adopt sales procedures that permit such action.

Sec. 4. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to partition or to sell the complete interest (including any unrestricted interest) in any land in which an undivided interest is owned by a member of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska in a trust or restricted status, provided the partition or sale is requested by the owners of a 25 per centum interest in the land, and the partition or sale is made within three years from the date of this Act. Any such sale shall be by competitive bid, except that with the concurrence of the owners of a 25 per centum interest in the land any owner of an interest in the land shall have the right to purchase the land within a reasonable time fixed by the Secretary of the Interior prior to a competitive sale at not less than its current market value. If more than one preference right is exercised, the sale shall be by competitive bid limited to the persons entitled to a preference. If the owners of a 25 per centum interest in the land so request, mineral rights may be reserved to the owners in an unrestricted status. The Secretary of the Interior may represent for the purposes of this section any Indian owner who is a minor, or who is non compos mentis, and, after giving reasonable notice of the proposed partition or sale by publication, he may represent an Indian owner who cannot be located.

(b) All restrictions on the alienation or taxation of interests in land that are owned by members of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska three years after the date of this Act shall be deemed removed by operation of law, and an unrestricted title shall be vested in each such member.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make such land surveys and to execute such conveyancing instruments as he deems necessary to convey marketable and recordable title to the individual and tribal assets disposed of pursuant to this Act. Each grantee shall receive an unrestricted title to the property conveyed.

Sec. 6. Nothing in this Act shall affect any claims heretofore filed against the United States by the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska.

Sec. 7. Nothing in this Act shall affect the rights, privileges, or obligations of the tribe and its members under the laws of Nebraska.

Sec. 8. No property distributed under the provisions of this Act shall at the time of distribution be subject to any Federal or State income tax. Following any distribution of property made under the provisions of this Act, such property and income derived therefrom by the distributee shall be subject to the same taxes, State and Federal, as in the case of non-Indians: *Provided*, That for the purpose of capital gains or losses the base value of the property shall be the value of the property when distributed to the grantee.

Sec. 9. Such amounts of tribal funds as may be needed to meet the expenses of the tribe under this Act, as approved by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be available for expenditure. There is authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the tribe for such expenditures, and carry out the responsibilities of the Secretary under the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 10. When the distribution of tribal assets in accordance with the provisions of this Act has been completed, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a proclamation declaring that the Federal trust relationship to such tribe and its members has terminated. Thereafter, the tribe and its members shall not be entitled to any of the special services performed by the United States for Indians or Indian tribes because of their Indian status, all statutes of the United States that affect Indians or Indian tribes because of their Indian status shall be inapplicable to them, and the laws of the several States shall apply to them in the same manner they apply to other persons or citizens within their jurisdiction. Nothing in this Act, however, shall affect the status of any Indian as a citizen of the United States.

The letter presented by Mr. Church is as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1962.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "to provide for the division of the tribal assets of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska among the members of the tribe, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and that it be enacted.

The title of the bill indicates its purpose.

The tribe has asked for the enactment of the bill, and the county board of supervisors has recommended the enactment of legislation of this kind. We believe that the enactment of the bill will be in the best interests of the Indians.

The bill was developed in cooperation with the tribe in the following way. The tribal government had ceased to function by about 1950. On April 11, 1956, a general meeting of the membership was called for the purpose of reorganizing the tribal government. At that meeting the members decided that instead of reorganizing the tribal government, arrangements should be made to close out the affairs of the tribe.

Another tribal meeting was held on January 4, 1957, and Indian Bureau representatives were requested to attend for the purpose of discussing procedures and legislation for dividing the tribal assets among the members and dissolving the tribal government.

On September 23, 1958, a general meeting of the tribe was called to consider a petition bearing 12 signatures and calling for a dissolution of the tribe. The petition was approved by those present at the meeting and a three-member negotiating committee was elected by popular vote to represent the tribe in developing a program and the necessary draft legislation.

On March 11, 1959, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs advised the three-member negotiating committee that the Bureau would cooperate with the tribe, and instructions for that purpose were issued to the field personnel.

On June 29, 1959, another tribal meeting was held for the purpose of getting the reaction of the tribal members to specific items in the proposed legislation. This meeting was also attended by representatives of the county, including the chairman of the board of county supervisors, the county attorney, and the county welfare director. On the basis of this discussion, a legislative proposal was drafted and submitted to a tribal meeting on September 17, 1959. The draft was explained and discussed in detail and those present voted unanimously to approve it.

On the same day the draft proposal was discussed with the board of county supervisors of Knox County and with a representative of the State of Nebraska. After a section-by-section explanation, the board of county supervisors adopted a resolution favoring introduction and passage of the bill.

Copies of the draft bill and a questionnaire were mailed to 78 Indians who, to the best of our knowledge, are members of the tribe and for whom an address of some sort was available. Forty-seven questionnaires were returned, of which 29 expressed a preference for the bill, 5 expressed a preference against the bill, and 13 questionnaires were unclaimed.

There has been no material change in the situation or attitude of the Ponca Indians since 1958 and 1959, except that there is an increased desire on the part of the Indians for a division of the tribal assets among the members of the tribe at the earliest time possible. Some resident members have already indicated that they have personal plans to leave the area as soon as the program is completed.

On August 9, 1961, a general meeting of the tribal members was held at which a resolution, reaffirming the petition of September 23, 1958, for the termination of Federal trusteeship, was unanimously adopted.

The provisions of the bill are identical to the draft bill considered by the tribe and other interested parties as above noted except for the provision in section 1 requiring acceptance of the division of the tribal assets in accordance with the provisions of this bill by the adult members of the tribe. This procedure is in accordance with the precedent set by the Congress in the enactment of the act of September 21, 1959 (73 State. 592), providing for the division of the tribal assets of the Catawba Indian Tribe of South Carolina among the members of the tribe.

The principal provisions of the bill are:

1. The membership roll would be closed at midnight of the date the bill is enacted and the Secretary of the Interior would be directed to prepare a final membership roll with the advice and assistance of the tribe. The adult members would be given an opportunity to accept the division of tribal assets as provided in the bill.

2. Those eligible for enrollment would include all persons on the basic membership roll prepared in 1934 and 1935, and the descendants of those persons, provided the person possesses not less than one-fourth degree Indian blood of this tribe, and was living on the date the roll was closed.

These membership requirements differ from those in the tribal constitution. Over a period of several years, the tribe has been unable to hold an election to select a board of governors, which is necessary to the operation of the constitutional provisions. Membership provisions in the bill were requested by the members of the tribe who were present at meetings with Bureau personnel. They provide an equitable basis for developing a final roll.

3. Each member on the final roll would be entitled to an equal share of the tribal assets.

4. Federal property used for the administration of the reservation is made a part of the tribal assets. The Federal property has a value of about $7,400.

5. All tribal property would be disposed of within 3 years or as soon thereafter as practicable, as follows: The property consists of land worth about $70,080; trust funds amounting to about $28,155; and the Federal property, if it is given to the tribe, worth about $7,400, which is a total of $105,635. The number of members to share in the property is unknown, of course, but is estimated to be about 525. Approximately 134 of these are living on or near the reservation.

a. Land desired by the tribe for church, park, playground, or cemetery purposes would be conveyed to a trustee or agency designated for that purpose.

b. Each member of the tribe would be entitled to select not to exceed 5 acres of tribal land for a homesite, but he would be required to pay the tribe its current market value. Any improvements previously made by the member or his family would not be included in the valuation because by tribal custom the improvements belong to the individual rather than to the tribe. Several families are dependent on the tribal land for a homesite, and their share of the funds realized from the sale of and distribution of tribal assets will be of considerable assistance to them in improving their homes and living conditions.

c. The rest of the tribal land would be sold on the basis of competitive bids, subject to a right of any member to meet a high bid.

d. The proceeds from all sales, and all other tribal funds, would be divided equally among the members and would be subject to setoffs for debts due the tribe or the United States as authorized by the Secretary. Each member would have the right to apply his distributive share to the purchase price of any tribal property which he elects to buy.

6. All restrictions on interests in land owned by individual members of the tribe would be removed by operation of law 3 years after the enactment of the bill. During the 3-year interval, the Secretary would be authorized to sell allotted land upon the application of the owners of a 25 percent interest. This provision is important to the individual Indians because the heirship problem is a serious one, and any sales conducted by the Secretary would be without expense to the Indians. After restrictions are removed, sales and partition proceedings under State law would be at the expense of the owners. There are 13 allotments on the reservation in which restricted interests are owned by 387 heirs. The total value is about $100,500.

7. The tribal constitution and charter would be revoked when the distribution of tribal assets has been completed, and thereafter the tribe and its members would have the same status as any other group of citizens.

A statement showing more detailed data about the tribe is enclosed for your information.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Carver, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

LOANS TO FINANCE TESTIMONY OF EXPERT WITNESSES BEFORE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to finance the testimony of expert witnesses before the Indian Claims Commission.

Mr. President, the problem to which this proposed legislation is directed arose from a recent decision of the Indian Claims Commission in the Crow case, relating to the payment of expert witnesses under contingent-fee contracts.

The Chief Commissioner, former Senator Arthur Watkins, of Utah, pointed out that when tribes do not have sufficient funds to hire their expert witnesses, the witnesses are retained under contingent-fee contracts, and that such an arrangement results in a temptation toward colored testimony, since the experts have a direct financial interest in the outcome of the case. Clearly, such a situation is not in the public interest.

The legislation Senator Church and I are sponsoring would authorize loans, to be made to tribes, bands, or groups of Indians who have a claim before the Commission, to be used in obtaining expert witnesses needed in the preparation and trial of their claim before the Commission, when the Indians do not have funds available, and cannot obtain a loan from any other source.

The loans would bear interest, and would be repayable out of proceeds of any judgment recovered. If no judgment is recovered, the loan would be repaid from future revenues of the tribe, under reasonable terms prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. All repayments and interest would be credited to the revolving funds.

Mr. President, on February 17, the Washington Post, and on February 28, the Washington Evening Star, published editorials entitled "Hitch in Indian Claims" and "Red Man's Day in Court," which point out the problem we are seeking to resolve. I ask consent that the two editorials be printed in the Record following my remarks, together with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and editorials will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3178) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to finance the testimony of expert witnesses before the Indian Claims Commission, introduced by Mr. Anderson (for himself and Mr. Church), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make a loan out of any funds available in the revolving fund created pursuant to section 10 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), to any Indian tribe, band, or other identifiable group of American Indians residing within the territorial limits of the United States for use by it in obtaining expert witnesses which it needs in the preparation and trial of its claim pending before the Indian Claims Commission, if the Secretary finds that such tribe, band, or group does not have funds available in an amount that is adequate to obtain such witnesses and is unable to obtain a loan from any other source.

(b) Any loan made by the Secretary pursuant to this Act shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary and shall, together with such interest, be repayable out of the proceeds of any judgment recovered by any such tribe, band, or group on such claim against the United States. If no judgment is recovered, such loan shall constitute a debt of the tribe, band, or group payable upon such reasonable terms as the Secretary may provide from future revenues or assets of the said tribe, band, or group.

(c) Repayments of loans made pursuant to this Act (together with all interest thereon) shall be credited to the revolving fund referred to in subsection (a).

The editorials presented by Mr. Anderson are as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 17, 1962]

Hitch in Indian Claims

In denying additional compensation to two expert witnesses who appeared before it, the Indian Claims Commission has brought to light a serious deficiency in the presentation of Indian claims cases. The Commission concluded that the fees already paid to the two witnesses were adequate, but it also objected to the proposed additions on the ground that, in part, the fees had been made contingent upon the success of the litigation. "The witnesses' financial interest in the outcome of the case still existed at the time they testified," the Commission said in its opinion. "* * * inherent in contingent contracts is the temptation to color one's testimony, or worse still, to commit perjury."

No extensive argument is needed to emphasize the dangers of making exceptions to the general rule that witnesses may not be paid on a contingent basis. But this does not dispose of the matter. Chief Commissioner Arthur V. Watkins' opinion pointed out that a large majority of the more than 400 Indian claims before the Commission have been filed by tribes which do not have funds to pay expert witnesses. In some instances the expert witnesses have been paid by the attorneys handling the cases, but this has put an unreasonable burden upon the lawyers. Under present conditions, witnesses have to be hired on a contingent basis, in many cases, if they are to be hired at all.

This is obviously a serious impediment to the Commission's work, as it has a mandate from Congress to adjudicate all Indian claims against the Government which came into existence prior to 1946. Many of these claims are a century old. Their presentation entails an enormous amount of work on the part of historians, anthropologists, archeologists and other professional men.

Noting that the administration has included in the current budget for Indians a $34,417,000 item for resources management, the Commission suggests that some of this might be made available in loans or advances to pay expert witnesses. Experience has proved that the Indians' claims against the Government are one of their principal resources. Certainly some means should be found to enable the tribes to press their claims with expert assistance, without resort to contingent fees that encourage coloring of the facts.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 28, 1962]

Red Man's Day in Court

The Indian Claims Commission was created 15 years ago to afford the Indian tribes of America at long last an expeditious prosecution of their ancient claims against the Government. Now it appears that this worthy goal is being thwarted by the inability of most tribes to pay the historians, anthropologists, land appraisers and other expert witnesses whose testimony is essential to support their cases.

Except for those few instances where tribes have adequate resources, attorneys handle such cases on a contingent-fee basis, relying on a successful award for their payment. For the most part, the attorneys have advanced the costs and expenses of the necessary consultant services. But now, according to the Indian Claims Commission, "the burden has proven to be too heavy for the Indian attorneys to carry. Immediate relief is needed if the adjudication of all eligible Indian claims is to be completed as planned, or at all."

Nor is this a problem of small dimensions. More than 400 claims now are pending before the Commission, most of them seeking adequate compensation, after many years of neglect, for Indian land which was seized by the Government, often for a pittance, and at times for nothing at all. Of these 400 cases, the Claims Commission estimates, a large majority involve tribes which are too insolvent to hire expert witnesses and consultants. As a result, trials in a number of cases recently, some of them scheduled for as long as a year, have had to be postponed.

The Commission has refused to sanction contingent-fee arrangements in any form for the consultants, on the valid ground that the testimony of expert witnesses must be free from any taint of financial interest in the outcome of the litigation. Such arrangements, as the Commission said in a recent opinion, are fair neither to the parties to the suit nor to the experts themselves. Nor, on much the same basis, would it be desirable for the Commission to use its own investigative powers in behalf of the Indian claims.

In the same opinion, however, the Commission proposed a simple and workable solution: that Congress, in its annual appropriations for Indian affairs, advance or lend funds to enable Indian tribes in need to hire and properly compensate "such expert witnesses as they reasonably need to prosecute their claims." Where claims are successful, these advances could be deducted from awards. Where unsuccessful, if the loan should not be repaid the relatively small amounts involved would not be too great a price to guarantee the Indians their day in court. This is a suggestion to which the appropriate committees of Congress should give immediate and careful consideration.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL BOARD OF CANCER CONTROL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a Board of Cancer Control intended to strengthen, expedite, and promote more effective progress in the search for effective means of treating and curing cancer.

The month of April is, as you know, National Cancer Month. This is a time when we become even more than usually aware of the menace of cancer and of the attempts being made to conquer this dread disease. On January 23, 1962, I introduced S. 2725, a bill to provide special additional appropriations for the purpose of accelerating research with respect to the causes, prevention, and cure of cancer, heart disease, and mental illness. The bill I am introducing now goes one step further in the fight against cancer.

Here are the facts: About 45 million Americans living today will eventually have cancer, this is 1 out of every 4 persons. This year approximately 800,000 Americans will receive medical treatment for cancer and 520,000 new cancer cases will be diagnosed. It is estimated that 87,000 people will die from cancer in 1962. Each year cancer costs the national economy nearly 50,000 man-years of productivity; about $215 million in services and salaries; almost $189 million in estimated spending and earnings; at least $426 million in income taxes; plus loss of other tax moneys at least equal to that.

Clearly, then, we are faced with a national health emergency. We must mobilize American energy and skill into a coordinated and powerful effort to develop cures for cancer and to rid our people of its scourge.

Cancer research is being carried on by a number of divergent groups at this time. However, in order to avoid a duplication of effort and to avoid a lack of coordination and communications, this bill I offer today will, I believe, provide the framework which is necessary to initiate a really concentrated and coordinated effort to deal a smashing and final blow to the pain and destruction of cancer.

Generally, the bill—

First. Replaces the nonpaid National Advisory Cancer Council which has only advisory powers and meets only intermittently during the year, with a full-time Board of Cancer Control vested with essential powers to furnish effective leadership and to promote and coordinate all cancer research operations.

Second. Protects the public from worthless and sometimes dangerous nostrums and purported cancer "remedies" peddled by fakers, and irresponsible and unscrupulous persons by vesting in the Board the authority to examine and approve or disapprove all compounds, drugs, or preparations purported to be beneficial in the treatment of cancer.

Third. Requires that each individual, manufacturer, chemist, laboratory, or other establishment engaged in cancer research shall register with and report to the Board of Cancer Control, the general details of such research and that each individual, manufacturer, chemist, laboratory, or other establishment shall, upon registering, become entitled to receive periodically from the Board informative data and other pertinent material with respect to progress made in the field of cancer research.

Fourth. Requires that those engaged in cancer research shall report to the Board any new discoveries, experimental or test results, or research progress made or conducted by them and that the Board will collate, consolidate, and coordinate, in confidential proceedings, the reported findings, tests, results, and experiment progress of every cancer research project within the Nation to the end that in the centralized material in the hands of the Board successful anticancer agents may more quickly be found.

Fifth. Encourages, through Federal reimbursement of audited research costs, cancer researchers to expand their efficient research facilities further into the field of cancer research.

Sixth. Provides that in the event that any cancer researcher, who is registered with and approved by the Board under this section, develops completely a successful anticancer agent, such researcher shall be entitled to usual rights with respect to, and patent protection of, his discovery, except that the Board shall have purchase rights for official needs with respect to such anticancer agent, and without payment of royalty therefor.

Seventh. Allows certain universities and colleges who, for financial reasons, are not able to construct special facilities essential for cancer research projects to waive the requirement for matching of Federal funds.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3182) to provide for the establishment of a national Board of Cancer Control, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 495) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO REGISTRATION AND PROTECTION OF TRADEMARKS USED IN COMMERCE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. HART) submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1396) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMS RELATING TO OUTDOOR RECREATION — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] desires to join as a coauthor of S. 3117, a bill to define the authorities of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and establish a program of aid to States for recreation planning. I request unanimous consent that when the bill is next printed, his name be included as a coauthor.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] be added as an additional cosponsor of S. 3117, a bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, and for other purposes, and also of S. 3118, a bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, and for other purposes, and that his name be listed among the sponsors of these bills at the next printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INJUSTICE OF RETIREMENT PAY PROVISIONS IN MILITARY PAY ACT IN NEED OF CORRECTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the injustice of provisions in the Military Pay Act of May 20, 1958, providing two classes of retirement pay, and making second-class retirees of most of the combat officers who fought in World War II and were retired at its close or shortly thereafter, has been reemphasized in a resolution recently passed by Gragg-Sherrill Post No. 248 of the American Legion, at Corpus Christi, Tex.

I am coauthor of Senate bill 626, which would correct the situation in which personnel of the Regular and Reserve elements of military services retired prior to June 1, 1958, are deprived of pay to which they are obviously justly entitled. Those retired after that date receive higher retirement pay than that received by those who were retired prior to June 1, 1958.

Senate bill 626 would equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services, an act of justice which is long overdue and deserving of earliest favorable consideration.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution adopted by Gragg-Sherrill Post No. 248 of Corpus Christi, Tex.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION TO CORRECT THE INEQUITIES OF THE MILITARY PAY ACT OF MAY 20, 1958, FOR CERTAIN RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

Whereas the inequities in the computation of the retired or retainer pay of certain classes of personnel of the military services retired prior to June 1, 1938, as provided for by an act of Congress (military pay), dated May 20, 1958, is discriminatory and ought to be corrected; and

Whereas the injustice of certain provisions of the Military Pay Act of May 20, 1958, which deprive certain personnel of both the Regular and the Reserve elements of the military services retired prior to June 1, 1958, of an increase in retired or retainer pay to which clearly and of right they are justly entitled is well known and obvious to all persons familiar with this act; and

Whereas there now are pending in both branches of the Congress certain bills which will correct the inequities cited: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Gragg-Sherrill Post No. 248, the American Legion, Department of Texas, in regular meeting assembled, at Corpus Christi, Tex., April 10, 1962, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned to enact, during the current session, pending legislation designed to correct the inequities of the Military Pay Act of May 20, 1958, which deprive certain personnel of the military services retired prior to June 1, 1958, of increases in retired or retainer pay equal to that provided for personnel of the military services retired subsequent to or on June 1, 1958; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States; the Vice President of the United States; the chairmen of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives; the Secretary of Defense; the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; appropriate Members of Congress from Texas; the Department of Texas and the National Commander, the American Legion, for submission to the 1962 conventions; and to the chairman of the National Security Commission, the American Legion, Washington, D.C.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

List showing number of Anchorage, Alaska, teachers from each of the other States.

RIGHT OF ASTRONAUTS TO THEIR PRIVATE LIVES DESERVES RECOGNITION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, our American astronauts and their families, unlike most of us, are pursuing a way of life for which no pattern has been drawn. No history books for their guidance are at hand.

In learning, our astronauts and their families have only their own unique experiences from which to draw, and all indications are that they learn with a rapidity and a thoroughness in which all America can take pride.

Early in the stages of the American move to conquer outer space, a decision was made that many of the efforts would be open to the eyes of the world, in vivid contrast to the secrecy of the space program in Communist Russia.

This decision, unquestionably a wise one, immediately hurtled a few astronauts and their families into a way of life involving close and almost constant public scrutiny.

It is one thing to turn the powerful beam of the Nation's news media on an astronaut going into space on a mission for his country. It is quite another to meddle in private lives and to probe at private thoughts.

If there has been any parallel to the courage of the American astronauts, it has been in the courage shown by their families, who share in all the dangers to an extent that defies the imagination.

But we should never let our public pride in these few outstanding Americans be turned into an abuse of their rights to private lives.

Public scrutiny can be kind, or it can be harsh. It can be thoughtful and responsible; or it can be heedless and irresponsible. There has been some unwarranted tendency, I think, toward the heedless and the harsh, where the astronauts and their families are concerned.

By and large, our news media display a sense of responsibility. But occasionally there will be incidents in which actions of the press will be as "out of this world" as anything in outer space, and it is likely that the astronauts will have to adjust to this fact. Due to the fact that they are such great heroes and the fact that they have the adulation of all of us, there is a tendency to probe their innermost thoughts, and even to probe the innermost thoughts of their families.

The public has shared, by invitation, in the space missions and the parades. It is our responsibility to respond with understanding and sympathetic hearts to the very human desire of our fellow Americans for a right to their private lives.

Their greatest adventures, their toughest tests, lie ahead. The public also faces a test—in depth of understanding.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Interpretive Report: Space Heroes Feel Letdown." The article was published in the Washington Star of April 9, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 9, 1962]

SPACE HEROES FEEL LETDOWN

(By William Hines)

The Mercury astronauts are beginning to wonder whether the hero business is all it has been cracked up to be.

Distressed by public reaction to an offer of seven free houses in Houston, Tex., some of the astronauts fear they may be entering the downhill side of the buildup-letdown cycle to which American heroes are often subjected. The feeling is probably felt most acutely by Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., by virtue of his current preeminence in the public eye.

But others of the astronauts are known to be concerned about what seems to them the inordinately bright glare of publicity. One such is Maj. Donald K. Slayton, grounded recently because of idiopathic atrial fibrillation, a minor heart aberration. Major Slayton recently wrote a stinging letter to his hometown of Sparta, Wis., castigating timid souls in the Space Agency for unseating him as pilot of the next orbital shot.

FLIER PERTURBED

Major Slayton's discomfiture is typical of that felt by the Mercury men. Everything they do, or that happens to them, seems to end up being bigger than life. They are finding it difficult to adapt to all the ramifications of this new situation.

In the Slayton case, for example, had a test pilot been grounded in the flight schedule for a hot new experimental plane—even the X-15—the fact would have been scarcely noted outside the trade papers. But when Major Slayton was forced to step down, it became national, even world news and the whole space program came under public scrutiny.

Capt. Virgil I. (Gus) Grissom has long been known to be unhappy over the publicity which followed his suborbital Mercury flight last July. His "Liberty Bell-7" capsule was lost at sea and, at least by implication, many persons involved in the Mercury program tended to "blame it on Gus." The quiet little Hoosier pilot was unhappy about this and (the story again being magnified) his unhappiness was translated by some newsmen into a reported desire for a transfer out of the program. This had to be denied officially and specifically.

SOME ARE CHAFING

So far, the astronauts have taken their personal prominence pretty much in stride, and with good grace, but some of them are beginning to chafe at what they regard as an invasion of privacy. Colonel Glenn, for instance, had his telephone number changed not long ago and the new number kept on an unlisted basis. But now the new number has leaked out and it is understood he is contemplating another change.

Some of the privacy invasion was the astronauts' own doing, of course—at least, insofar as they opened their front doors to Life magazine under a $500,000 contract signed in 1959. The spacemen's attitude is that the contract was not only sanctioned by the space agency, but was actually arranged for largely through the good offices of agency officials. Hence, the astronauts wonder, why should they be criticized now for signing up with Life?

But some publications have gone far beyond what Life has done in the way of personal reporting of the astronauts' lives. Indeed, some have stepped over the bounds of journalistic ethics in their "reportage." One such is a movie magazine now on the stands which includes an article purporting to be an inside peek at the Glenn family.

Colonel Glenn remarked, after the magazine was called to his attention, that he would be angry "if it wasn't so corny."

The Glenns are known to their acquaintances as people of taste, and it is inconceivable that they would either publicly utter or authorize for quotation some of the remarks attributed to them in the article. Colonel Glenn has stated that neither the magazine nor the man who signed the article ever approached him or his wife for an interview.

AUCTION ARRANGED

Another symptom which has disturbed the globe-girdling astronaut is the presentation by a "Manhattan Gentleman" (so identified in an auction catalog) of Glenn documents to be auctioned off at the fashionable Parke-Bernet Galleries in New York tomorrow. This lot of "documents," offered in strict alphabetical order between letters by the Mahatma Gandhi and Ulysses S. Grant, had to do with a car Colonel Glenn bought some time ago. A canceled check signed by Colonel and Mrs. Glenn is included.

The astronaut has stated he does not know how the letters ever got into the hands of the "Manhattan Gentleman," nor who the gentleman is. Colonel Glenn's lawyer and the space agency have similarly pleaded ignorance.

But the development which seems to disturb the astronauts most is general reaction to the "Houston house deal." The Mercury seven are genuinely convinced of the importance of the space program, and are as deeply concerned as anyone else over the astronaut "image."

"This thing was very carefully checked," one of the spacemen said. "Leo (the astronaut's attorney, Leo DeOrsey) has turned down much more than he has ever told you about, simply because it did not seem proper."

GROUNDS FOR CONFUSION

The record appears clear that the astronauts have grounds for confusion, regardless of what anyone may think about the Houston house deal itself.

Mr. DeOrsey seems to have received at least tacit clearance from one high official of the Space Agency before agreeing tentatively in the astronauts' name to acceptance of the Houston houses. The turnaround he received from another official on the same level of authority a few days later only served to surprise and shock the astronauts—and apparently the attorney whose services had been negotiated for them by another, former, high official of the Agency.

The house deal apparently had its genesis in a chance remark passed between a high Government official and legislators, all from the wheeling-and-dealing Southwest. At a congressional hearing where three of the astronauts appeared, Space Administrator James E. Webb, of Oklahoma, expressed the hope to representatives from Texas that good care would be taken of the Mercury "boys" when they moved to Houston this summer along with the rest of the Space Agency's manned spacecraft center, currently headquartered at Langley Air Force Base, near Norfolk.

Persons familiar with the mores of the big-spending Southwest have said that the offer of houses and furniture of possibly $30,000 to each of the astronauts was the most natural reaction in the world to this admonition from the Space Administrator.

OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is obvious to almost everyone that the American oil industry has a tough fight on its hands in meeting competition from abroad.

Even in the best of competitive conditions this industry is a high-risk operation. I am, therefore, concerned with recent appeals to reduce the oil depletion allowance. At a time when our oilmen are faced with serious and increasing competition, it would be extremely unwise to tamper with the depletion allowance, particularly in the State of Wyoming, where the costs of exploration are mounting rapidly because of the depths to which they have to drill in order to bring in new oil—which new oil would be added to our reserves in the national interest. It is imperative that we not impinge upon exploratory efforts to discover new oil for our country's needs.

In my view, the consequence of tampering with the oil depletion allowance would seriously weaken one of our most important industries, one vital to the defense effort. It would bring economic chaos to many Western States, including our own. In the State of Wyoming, oil is the largest single factor in our State's economy.

I am confident that the Congress will ignore this invitation to cripple the oil industry and to add to the heavy burden already being borne by American oilmen. And I pledge my best efforts to forestall any attempt to hog-tie an essential industry.

ACTIVITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CRUSADE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there are still many persons in this country who determinedly fan the flames of extremism in the advancement of pet causes. And thus we find that the prophets of catastrophe, who see a Red in whichever direction they look, are also training their scatterguns on a variety of religious, economic, and racial enemies whom they link together in a massive plot against our democracy.

An apt illustration of this type of blanket accusation tactic is found in the activities of the Christian Crusade, founded and led by the Reverend Dr. Billy James Hargis, of Tulsa, Okla.

An excellent series of three articles published recently in the Oklahoma Courier, the Catholic diocesan weekly for Oklahoma City and Tulsa, illustrates the great variety of social malcontents who have gathered under the Rev. Mr. Hargis' banner.

These articles, written by Donald Quinn, point out that Dr. Hargis' operation, which has a budget of $1¼ million, gives platform space, and presumably its blessing, to racists, book burners, and a rather curious lot of determined people who find communism behind every idea of which they disapprove. It is quite distressing that these people are quick to deny sincerity of thought and ideals to anyone but themselves, and equate every political attitude except that of extreme conservatism with communism. Their tar brush is broad and wielded with vigor, if not with discrimination.

It is also interesting to note that this operation is plotted on strict Madison Avenue lines by a professional public relations man who gets 15 percent of the take for putting the crusade on a businesslike basis.

To me there is a real danger that the extremists in our country will trample under the rights of freemen in their misguided zeal to adjust the Nation to their way of thinking. This excellent series of articles presents a thoughtful, enlightening—and I might add frightening—picture of zealots at work, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report on the "Super-Patriots"—Hargis Mixes Evangelism and Anticommunism

(By Donald Quinn)

Tulsa.—A Bible-belt evangelist who leads what he insists is the most effective of the anti-Communist movements in the United States will make a second try next month to group the Nation's hard-right organizations into a single force.

The Reverend Dr. Billy James Hargis of the Christian Crusade, which has its headquarters here, admits the chance of success is doubtful. But it is necessary, says the Disciples of Christ minister who preaches anticommunism because "it is part of my ordination vows * * * part of my creed * * * God demands it." Hargis says that "almost frantic opposition to my suggestions of a coalition, by Communists and liberals, points out graphically to me the necessity of the project, for it is obvious that such concerted action by conservatives is what our opposition fears the most."

RUGGED INDIVIDUALISTS

The major difficulty Hargis sees to such a unification is that ultraconservatives "are all rugged individualists." But those who have studied the methods and operations of the many ultraright groups that have achieved prominence in the past year or so—the Christian Crusade of Dr. Hargis, the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade of Dr. Frederick Schwarz, the John Birch Society, the National Indignation Committees, and as many as 2,000 other separate organizations—contend that "rugged individualism" is another way of saying that anticommunism these days is big business, profiting by millions of dollars in contributions, donations, freewill meeting offerings, speaking fees, and book and film sales.

The meeting on March 20, as planned by Hargis' high-powered organization and publicity staff, is supposed to bring together in the Washington Hotel in the Nation's Capital more than 100 conservative Senators and Representatives—Republicans and Democrats. Hargis is inviting leaders and members of the top rightwing groups to the session, in the hopes that a sort of coalition called the Conference for the Coordination of Conservative Efforts will be formed.

A preliminary to the Washington meeting was staged when Hargis gathered 179 people from 23 States and Canada here for a "National Anti-Communist Leadership School" early this month. The 179 paid $100 to attend 5 days of morning, afternoon, and night sessions behind closed doors.

The school's faculty numbered 14, and included two Congressmen, 2 ex-Communists, some accredited and some self-styled experts on communism and internal subversion and "the conspiracy." Honored Americans such as Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker and Gen. A. C. Willoughby spoke. The students heard an out-and-out racist declare that the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision was based on "the bogus American creed that all men are created equal."

Over and over the participants heard that the enemy is not just international communism as dictated from the Kremlin and practiced in Belgrade or Havana. The enemy also is the liberals and the softies in the present and past U.S. executive administrations, in the Pentagon, the State Department, the White House. The enemy is a multitude of organizations: Some are fronts, others have been subverted, and they include such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the Jewish Anti-Defamation League (ADL), the National Council of Churches (NCC). The enemy influences through newspapers like the New York Times, the Atlanta Constitution, and the Washington Post. The enemy has taken over the university and all education. The enemy mans a good number of pulpits in the United States.

BOMB RUSSIA

Those attending the school, needed little convincing that the Nation is in peril. The solutions given them range from the simple and practical (elect a conservative Congressman, demand the school board to exorcize a selected list of books from the school library) to the easy (do away with the income tax, thus making it impossible to finance foreign aid and welfare programs—or, do away with foreign aid and welfare programs, thus making the income tax unnecessary) to those that take a bit of determination (invade Cuba again, knock down the wall, bomb Russia). All of these proposals were made once or more, and usually to applause, at Hargis' anti-Communist leadership school.

Typical of the comments given by those attending the sessions were:

"I wanted to know how to contact more people about the menace of communism * * * how to refute a lot of this liberal philosophy I expect to hear while I'm in the Army," said a 23-year-old Illinois farmer who will be drafted next month.

"If Americans aren't awakened soon to the danger of communism, they stand to lose everything," a South Dakota man said. He retired from the oil business 4 months ago and plans to devote his full time now to anticommunism.

HOUSEWIFE WANTS FACTS

"An individual can help educate people he knows if he really has some facts about communism and how to fight it," said a Tulsa housewife.

"I came to distribute information about Communist writings in textbooks," said a Texas minister as he handed anyone interested a list of obscene quotations culled from books in his town's school library. Out of 42 books "pulled at random for review," 10 "are totally unfit for consumption at any age level," he said. His list included some Steinbeck, "Andersonville," "Brave New World," "Nineteen Eighty-Four," and "Marjorie Morningstar."

"My group is more or less resigned to a Communist takeover," said the Missouri pharmaceutical firm owner who is the national coordinator for the Minutemen. Robert B. DePugh said he "just came to see what the school had to offer." His only criticism of the school was that "these people think they can talk their way to victory. I don't think they can." DePugh's Minutemen organization claims that 25,000 people have gone though the 60-hour course in guerrilla warfare and underground tactics and that each group now has a weapons cache ready for action. Because of his notoriety as the Minutemen's leader, DePugh is certain that "if the Communists take over, I'm a dead duck."

"I came to get some objective information which I can't get from newspapers," said a 24-year-old California college student who was one of several Young Americans for Freedom members attending. "I've liked what I've heard."

W. H. Rutledge, the executive secretary of the White Citizens Council of Louisiana, said he thought "the school was valuable." We know that communism is furthered by class division as ordered by Stalin in 1947," he said in explaining the mutual interest his organization has with the ultraright groups.

In all, the 179 included students and ministers, businessmen, and housewives. Some were elderly, but most were middle aged. There were young people. One Colorado couple even brought two school-aged daughters, but their interest was divided between anticommunism and the geography and history lessons they had brought along with them.

GAINED SOMETHING

To a person, all who attended the meeting thought they had gained something.

Among the registrants, there were a good number who represented, as the Minutemen's coordinator and the Citizens Council executive did, other hard-right organizations. A good number of them admitted membership in the John Birch Society, the National Indignation Committees, and other groups. At least 4 of the 14 faculty members were Birch national councilors or Birch endorsers. Nearly half of Hargis' Christian Crusade advisory board members are closely connected with the John Birch Society.

One of those in Tulsa for the week was L. F. Reardon, the vice president and the executive director of the Manion Forum, of South Bend, Ind. Reardon said that in a private capacity, he had been working for the Hargis Crusade on a part-time basis.

Though the Manion Forum's head, Clarence Manion is a Birch national councilor and one of the Christian Crusade's advisers, Reardon explained that the two organizations had different roles. While Hargis' outfit is concerned with "Christian anticommunism," the Forum is concerned "only with constitutional issues," said the director. He said the Manion Forum makes no attempt to relate its program to religion, or Catholicism, in spite of Manion's wide reputation as a former Notre Dame University dean.

NOT PARTISAN

The Forum concentrates, he said, on issues such as States rights, in favor of right-to-work laws, against foreign aid, and against the income tax. "We're not partisan, but we're very conservative," said Reardon. "We're proud that no liberal or so-called liberal has ever spoken over our microphone."

With its radio broadcasts over 235 stations and a mailing list of 80,000 names, Reardon says that some 11,000 regular contributors donate annually to the Manion Forum.

But that list is only one-tenth the number of contributors who regularly support Billy James Hargis' Christian Crusade.

As a nonprofit "religious" organization, with tax-exempt status, the Christian Crusade has a regular contributor list of some 110,000 names. Some 5 to 10 percent of these, according to Hargis, are Catholic and Jewish people. Catholic involvement on Hargis' board of advisers is higher, the minister says—nearly one-third of the 46 board members, including a priest, are Catholic. (On his board is "Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, Frederick, Md." Kenedy's Official Catholic Directory shows that Father Joseph F. Thorning is a priest of the Baltimore Archdiocese, pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Buckeystown, Md.)

ONE-MILLION-DOLLAR BUDGET

Spectator growth came to the Hargis crusade in the past 2 years, and in that time donations, and the organization's budget, have grown from less than $500,000 to about $1,250,000.

The main source of contributions is mail, but about $200,000 a year comes in the form of book and record royalties. All of the more than 200 radio and TV programs "offer a free tract, which is to promote mail," says Hargis' public relations director, L. E. (Pete) White.

Income, and spreading of the Christian Crusade, also is advanced by personal appearances of the Hargis team. In following evangelistic patter, the Christian Crusade leader averages 20 appearances a month, traveling in a specially converted Greyhound bus that provides working, sleeping, living and eating quarters for up to five people.

Hargis, who contends he receives only his $12,000-a-year salary and expenses, made appearances in 36 States last year by using the landcruiser. Because of his wider travels, White says the strength of the Christian Crusade has spread far beyond the South and Southwest States where evangelism best takes hold.

Important, too, is White's estimation of the effect of the Christian Crusade. Because it uses mass appeal—radio, TV, personal appearances, and printed matter—White claims that the Hargis organization packs more wallop than other hard-right goups. "By its nature, John Birch is secret," says White, "and therefore limited in how far it can spread the word." Frederick Schwarz' Christian Anti-Communist Crusade, so far, hasn't pushed its west coast movement eastward.

As evidence, White claims that mainly through the efforts of the Christian Crusade, some 140,000 pieces of mail was dumped on Congress recently demanding an investigation of Gen. Edwin A. Walker's muzzling.

HARGIS LAYS PECULIAR EMPHASIS ON RELIGION

(By Donald Quinn)

TULSA.—In the liturgy of anticommunism as practiced and taught in the fundamentalist Christian Crusade of the Reverend Dr. Billy James Hargis, there is a peculiar emphasis on religion.

On the one hand, the name of God is implored often by Hargis, and at the Anti-Communist Leadership School he sponsored here early this month every session was opened with a devotional service that included an "oldtime religion" song, a Bible reading, and an invocation by a minister.

But on the other, religion and the churches came in for a good share of hard knocks from Hargis and the 13 other speakers who served as the "faculty" for the school. In their attacks on any form of liberalism—which they equate to socialism, procommunism, or even communism itself—they were clear that the pulpit was one of the main carriers of this message.

It became evident, hearing the speakers at some 15 sessions spread over a week's time, that they believe that the United States is going down the road to socialism or communism at the hands of three professional groups—journalism, education, and the ministry.

People in these three fields of work, explained one speaker, are in the business of telling people what to think and how to live. The speaker, Revilo P. Oliver, is himself an educator, professor of classical literature, at the University of Illinois. Oliver's theory was that since these fields are influential, they have been targets of Communist infiltration; another factor is that people in these professions are intellectuals, and so he said, "nincompoops," apparently suceptible to the liberal line.

This obvious paradox of a crusade that calls itself Christian, which has an ordained minister as its head, and which follows the trade practices of evangelism to get its message across, crossing swords with all religion except that part of it that follows the belief of the superpatriots was most surprising when it attacked ecumenicism.

Unity of belief, and all steps toward unity, are suspect in the eyes of the hard right because of a fear of a "one-world Church."

This fear was expressed by some of the 179 participants who paid $100 to attend Hargis' week-long school, when they were interviewed in the corridors. It also was stressed by some of the speakers, notably Mrs. Harry Artz Alexander of Grenada, Miss., who spoke on "Socialist and Pro-Communist Propaganda in Textbooks," which she and a Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) group claim they cleared out of Mississippi schools.

Many faults were found in the objectionable texts, among them favorable mentions of the United Nations; suggestions that the *Mayflower* Pilgrims came to America to seek "material gain"; hints that environment is an important factor in developing persons and leading to the conclusion that "there are no superior races or nationalities, although there are superior individuals"; discussion in home economics books of steady dating, "how far is too far," and other topics directed at the teenager.

But one of the most important flaws were references to churches, unity, and brotherhood ideas, said Mrs. Alexander.

She scored "public education that advances ecumenicism," saying it is the "duty of the schools to teach moral training without propagandizing in behalf of particular ideas." Such propagandizing, she related, are favorable mentions of a "brotherhood movement (that) would set up a kind of world community church—that is, a church to which all religious people throughout the world might belong."

Such teaching in Mississippi has been stopped, the pretty lady said, with the help of Gov. Ross Barnett and a new State law governing textbooks, put into effect after what she called a "bloody" battle.

Given credit for his help in the Mississippi campaign was another of the leadership school's faculty members, Myers Lowman, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Lowman, said Mrs. Alexander, came to her State to make 136 speeches in support of the DAR's cleanup of the textbooks.

Lowman founded and heads another superpatriot group called the Circuit Riders—whose speciality in the anti-Communist battle is cataloging and documenting the liberal associations of teachers and ministers, which are then published in book form and sold in the public under such titles as: "42 percent of Unitarian Clergymen and 450 Rabbis"; "614 Presbyterian Church of the U.S.A. Clergymen"; "2,109 Methodist Ministers"; "20.5 percent Episcopalian Ministers"; "660 Baptist Clergymen."

The books, of course, list those numbers or percentages of the specific denomination's clergy found by the Circuit Riders to be—at best—soft on Communist ideas and—at worst—outright traitors. Lowman's books were on sale at the Hargis school's bookstore, along with other publications from the Christian Crusade, the John Birch Society, and other ultraright publishers.

An entry in "660 Baptist Clergymen" lists the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., with eight citations—five of them charging him with signing statements concerning nuclear weapons testing. Other prominent churchmen listed in Lowman's books include the Reverend Dr. Harold A. Bosley, who became pastor of Christ Church (Methodist), New York City, early this year, and the Reverend Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, the Baptist clergyman whose association as president of the National Council of Churches, a favorite target of the ultraright, earns him Lowman's most dim view.

Although other speakers zeroed in on other targets as the most dangerous practitioners of subversion, Lowman had his own candidate: the Reverend Harry F. Ward, former professor at Union Theological Seminary in New York, is in Lowman's eye, "the living American who did the most to damage America" since 600 seminarians who passed under his teaching, have, as clergymen, citations in the Circuit Riders' blacklists.

A place in the Circuit Riders documents is found for any person who has three or more connections with an organization or a cause "founded by or taken over by the Communist apparatus or its agents," according to Lowman. Such organizations as the Foreign Policy Association, the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, or the Fellowship of Reconciliation fit such a description, Lowman said in an interview.

The Circuit Riders head seemed pleased to report that "of 20,900 clergymen" in the United States who have endorsed dangerous causes, such activities have engaged only "some 60" Catholic priests. Lowman later hedged his Catholic figure to "less than 100 to our knowledge."

For this record, Lowman credited the fact that "the Catholic Church has a publicly announced policy and program of militant anticommunism which it practices 7 days a week." However, in discussing specific examples of anticommunism in relation to Catholic teaching of such matters as social justice, Lowman revealed both a lack of acquaintance and a failure to understand generally accepted church instruction.

The clergywatcher became somewhat specific about Catholic priests who might fit into his group of 60, or 100, by naming one priest he said started his "record of activity" while in the seminary, and a vague reference to a single geographical group of a named religious community. (EDITOR'S NOTE.—These identifications, made by Lowman are not published because they are considered libelous.)

To other direct questions, such as one relating the acceptance by an American cardinal of life membership in the NAACP, Lowman would make no comment.

Lowman made two speeches before the Hargis School, one directed at "infiltration" of education, and the second the clergy. Both received warm applause, especially when Lowman would take off on a wide-swinging statement such as: "One time to get suspicious is when you see the course, 'religious ethics.'" Attacks on organizations also were will received, even when Lowman referred to such community-accepted groups as the National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ) in derogatory fashion.

The National Council of Churches, too, was even more severely hit and Lowman announced the forthcoming publication of a new Circuit Riders book listing 607 NCC officers and denominational representatives.

Urging his listeners to action, Lowman reminded them of their duties to do all they could to refuse support for people in his lists and the institutions that hire them.

"If you are a heavy contributor to a liberal school, college, or church," he said, "you are most stupid * * *" He recalled that there was a time "when all the action in churches was at the foot of the Cross, but now we are going to have to take action with dollar signs."

Myers Lowman of Circuit Riders was not an unusual speaker; he did not voice a message that was rare at Hargis' leadership school. Hargis himself repeated references made by Lowman or others, as the ultraconservatives often do, by quoting each other as authorities.

Oliver made references to the same arguments against the liberal clergy, when he summed up their philosophy in mimic tones, fairly spitting out the words "humanitarianism," and "social gospel."

As religion-connected organizations form a target for these ultraright extremists, they also receive blame as being the main opponents of Billy James Hargis and his Christian Crusade. L. E. (Pete) White, public relations director of the Hargis organization, says that local councils of churches form the main opposition to Hargis' appearances around the country. Another group, the Jewish B'nai B'rith organization's Anti-Defamation League, according to White, is "in every town in the country" and "has us at the top of its list." He said, "We don't fear ADL," but he admitted that the Christian Crusade could widen its appeal if "we are not branded as anti-Semitic"—a brand which he and Hargis both deny as fitting.

White, also apparently as proud as was Lowman that a good number of Catholics are on the side of the ultraright, cited a recent publication of a tabloid section in several Catholic weekly newspapers. The four-page section, entitled "Our Moral Obligation To Oppose Communism," was written by a Jesuit priest.

"Take the author's name off of that and put on the name of Billy James Hargis, and you couldn't tell the difference," said White of the article.

Whether it is Hargis' ministerial background, and his confessed desire to retire to radio preaching of the Bible once more, or some other reason that causes the Christian Crusade to dwell on religion as a major factor in its anticommunism can't be sorted out. But the paradox is there.

HARGIS GROUP HAS ONE CALM, DELIBERATE SIDE: ITS APPROACH TO BUSINESS

(By Donald Quinn)

It is surprising to discover at a gathering of the ultrarightwing, where free-swinging and sometimes fanatical charges are thrown about, that there is a calm and deliberate side to all of this.

At least the Christian Crusade, holding a week-long "anti-Communist leadership school" here a few weeks ago, revealed this trait. Christian Crusade is an ultraconservative operation based in Tulsa. It uses mass appeal, through radio and television, books, pamphlets, and weekly publications, and personal appearances of its leaders.

ALL BUSINESS

Christian Crusade is all business. The crusade is run by its founder, the Reverend Dr. Billy James Hargis, and its public relations man, L. E. (Pete) White, in a smooth and businesslike way.

Hargis is quite conscious of the crusade's public image. He's quick to spot what the press clippings have to say about him.

The measures of success for the crusade are the headcounts in the auditoriums and at rallies wherever Hargis speaks and a close eye on the letters and the dollars in the incoming mail.

Good public relations helps this, of course. Public relations also serves to protect one of the organization's most valuable assets, its tax-exempt status as a nonprofit and religious group.

ANNUAL BUDGET

Christian Crusade, with a regular contributor list (that is, people who repeatedly donate to the cause) of 110,000 names and an annual budget of $1¼ million, claims more mass support than any of the other superpatriotic organizations—though the John Birch Society and the Schwarz Christian

Anti-Communist Crusade and others have received more national notoriety.

Such a wide following is nurtured by the work of the crusade's 52 employees and a separate advertising agency headed by White. Talking to White reveals the business flavor.

"Just like a lot of businesses," he says, the White firm watches the mail and spots the peaks and the slumps. Radio and TV time is bought on the basis of its pull. Printed appeals are analyzed against their results.

The mail brings in the regular donations. Ones and fives, which he estimated would average between $2 and $4 per letter. These, and major contributions, account for the bulk of the income. Another $145,000 was earned last year in speaking fees and $50,000 in book and record royalties came in. All the money goes into the Christian Crusade treasury, according to White and Hargis.

It isn't peculiar that the system uses the techniques of radio evangelists, because Hargis, an ordained minister of the Disciples of Christ, is an evangelist. But more to the point in White's connection.

White took on faith-healer Oral Roberts in 1947, when the minister had $25 in his pocket—"all he had in the world," says White. Through coaching Roberts for radio and later more involved as friend and business adviser, White sent the Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association on its way to the multimillion-dollar operation it is today. The relationship lasted until 1954, when, according to the adman, the two men fell out over money.

A few months passed before Hargis called on Promoter White, who says "I was pretty disillusioned with preachers then." But, impressed with Billy's sincerity and drive White stepped in. Hargis at the time was a minister in a small Oklahoma town, was broadcasting on two Mexican and one Tulsa radio stations, had some mailing equipment and an outdated mailing list.

"We set up Hargis along the same pattern as Roberts," White says. From $40,000 worth of billings (commissionable radio and TV time bought and advertising purchased) in the first year, Hargis' Christian Crusade now has billings of between $400,000 and $500,000 a year—on which White's agency receives the standard 15 percent commission.

White says he devotes half of his time to the Hargis account. Others in his office work full or part time for the crusade. The agency has other accounts too, mostly business and industrial firms, but no other evangelists and no account is as big as Hargis.

The 36-year-old Hargis, a native of Texarkana, Tex., who entered the ministry after a year and a half at Ozark Bible College in Bentonville, Ark., draws a salary of $12,000 and expenses from the Christian Crusade. The evangelist's degrees are from a mail-order college in Colorado, a seminary in Puerto Rico, and an honorary title from Bob Jones University in North Carolina.

HOME WORTH $35,000

The crusade supplies Hargis with a "parsonage," a $43,000 home in Tulsa—domestic help, a station wagon and a sedan, and business expenses. One major business item is Hargis' "headquarters on wheels"—a converted Greyhound bus that is equipped as an office and living quarters for five persons. This landcruiser bus, converted at a cost of $50,000, is home for Hargis some 20 days a month when he is on the road. Last year he traveled to 36 States.

Hargis claims to dislike the hoopla of the Christian Crusade. "I'd like to go about making my own converts," he says, but he sees publicity and planning and a big staff as necessities to get the anti-Communist message to the most people in the quickest way.

"I couldn't build a movement sitting in an office," the 6-foot, 270-pound evangelist says.

The movement Billy James Hargis has built, he hopes, is a popular one. He'd like to see it join with other conservative organizations to parlay enough strength to elect the President of the United States in 1964.

With relish, Hargis talks of politics and political action; he would like to see a realinement of the "already existing conservative coalition" to form a Conservative Party and a Liberal Party; he holds no hope for a third party movement, estimating that it would cost at least $20 million to get off the ground.

POLITICAL OUTLET

Before long, Politician Hargis retreats and Bible-Evangelist Hargis comes forward in conversation.

Going too far into political waters could threaten the tax-exempt status of the Christian Crusade, and Hargis admits that his public support of Candidate Eisenhower in 1952 "was a mistake."

He has, however, a political outlet. He is in his third term as president of "We, The People" of Chicago, which is a conservative political action organization. In his We, The People capacity he can serve his political motives without hazard.

Typical of what Hargis does say in his Christian Crusade speeches would be an attack on liberals he delivered here as a finale to the "leadership school." The evangelist puts all of his big force into his subject, building up in tempo and pitch.

He'll start out quietly, showing a clipping or a letter to his audiences, as he did in his major appearance at the leadership school. This time it was a news report of President Kennedy's November speech against the ultra rightwing movements. The President's words, said Hargis, are "a shame, and the President should apologize to every patriotic association in this country." Building up, the minister said, "Liberals need not be Communists, but some liberals are Communists; [a little louder] but brother, no conservative is a Communist." Bringing his audience a little further, Hargis will say:

"Liberals may be innocent; they may be ignorant; but they're wrong. Liberals in religion will damn the church. Liberals in education will destroy the country." And, then with another clipping citing American aid to Yugoslavia, Hargis will tear into his subject. His hand and pointed finger raised high, and his face reddening from the exertion, he'll scream:

"You can't justify foreign aid to Communist Yugoslavia, you cannot justify this, no matter how liberal you are." And now the voice lowers, and the audience is taken into confidence with a little aside:

"To be a real good liberal, you've got to be 100 percent stupid."

Hargis is touchy about the political aspects of the Christian Crusade. In conversation he'll tell you that he thinks the conservatives, by working together, could put Senator BARRY GOLDWATER in the White House in 1965. He also urges Gov. Orval Faubus of Arkansas to run against Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT. But the three primary objectives of the Christan Crusade, now, are to:

Reorganize the United Nations to exclude Communist nations and make it a "friendly alliance"; eliminate foreign aid to all nonfriendly nations and restrict aid to friends to a loan basis rather than grants; abolish the Communist Party in the United States, and arrest and deport all Communists.

These are religious motives, explains Hargis, who stresses the "prophet" (as opposed to the "priest") aspect of his ministry. "I have accepted the leadership of the Holy Ghost who directs me to fulfill my ordination vows of opposing the No. 1 enemy of the Church of Jesus Christ * * * communism * * * and anything or anybody who will contribute to the success of communism."

STEERING CLEAR

Steering through the narrow course of a political ideology by using a religious presentation is almost as tough for Hargis and the crusade as is the problem of avoiding a racist or anti-Semitic tag.

At the recent "Leadership School," where 179 participants paid $100 each to attend 15 sessions of speeches and films, the official program carried a statement of policy that said:

"Christian Crusade does not encourage our speakers to make extreme, generalized statements which are shocking to the average citizen. However we do not censor speeches. We are against shocking generalities because the Communists and leftwing radicals have frequently quoted the shocking generalities from anti-Communist speeches.

"From time to time we are attacked as being anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, and antichurch. All of these charges are without foundation."

But the Christian Crusade hired the "faculty" of the school, and Hargis was in complete control of the program for the full week. Hargis announced, on occasion, "I have rearranged the schedule," or "I wanted you to hear * * *."

The most embarrassing program of the week was a speech delivered by R. Carter Pittman, a Dalton, Ga., attorney, who—although he stated in opening remarks that "You can't accuse me of racism"—delivered an out-and-out racist speech.

Curious was the way the Hargis organization handled Pittman's appearance, because it was the only session which Hargis himself did not attend, the time for the program was cut, and the press corps was informed by the public relations people that there were regrets all around.

Yet, Hargis himself had whetted the appetite of the participants by telling them that the subject for the coming session would be on the "race question." Advance texts were available.

Newsmen covering the sessions were unanimous in concluding that Hargis was trying to have it both ways.

BOGUS CREED

Pittman, in his talk, denounced the idea that environment, rather than heredity, was a major factor in developing a Negro culture. He claimed the Supreme Court school integration decision was based on a Communist-inspired notion of equalitarianism, when actually, the social scientists have advanced "the bogus American creed to the effect that all men are created equal."

The Georgian conceded that the Negro has some "superior attributes" that make him a good "athlete, singer or dancer."

"But in culture," he went on, "we know him to be inferior."

Pittman's documentation was a biographical book, "Who's Who in Colored America," which used photographs as well as text matter for the entries. Holding up the book, the lawyer said that one could tell by the pictures that "9 out of 10 of the people in this book are mulatto or near white," proving to his satisfaction that "it takes white blood to make a Negro notable or aristocratic."

Calling the equalitarian idea of the "scientific hoax of the century," Pittman said: "The only difference between the African Negro and the U.S. Negro is that the African Negro eats more white people."

RACIAL AGITATOR

Hargis himself indulged in only one racist statement during the week, when he was trying to urge his audience to boycott the sponsors of suspected radio and TV programs—"We will buy only those products which are for America"—by saying: "If that stinking racial agitator, Martin Luther King, can use the [boycott] technique, so can we."

He later confirmed that he was correctly understood by newsmen.

Regardless of the official posture of the Hargis organization, on race, or Jews, or politics, the people who attended these sessions—undistinguishable by age, or dress, or outward appearance, from any other group of Americans attending a meeting—were delighted by each speaker who drew blood.

Pittman was particularly popular. Others who alleged subversion or conspiracy in government, or in schools, or in the pulpit, others who hit responsive emotional appeals of one kind or another got cheers and applause and drew the crowds to the rostrum.

So the appeal of this nature appears popular, likely to gain further support and more contributions to the Christian Crusade or any like organization.

If the people who pay the way, lead; the Hargises will find a place at the head of the column. Billy James Hargis told it well in selling one of his platforms:

"We must demand the abolition of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in this session of Congress. And this is not political talk.

"This is a popular issue that will get the support of millions of people to the conservative cause."

CREATION OF A PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION TO STUDY STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there can be no doubt that the Nation won a great victory on Friday when the United States Steel Corp. and others rescinded their price boost of $6 a ton.

Events of this past week demonstrate that a strong, firm President can exercise effective power on behalf of the Nation in combating inflation through unjustified price increases. To say that the President has no business to interest himself in bargaining agreements between business and labor and in the pricing practices of powerful corporations, is to say that the country should be content to sit back, an idle spectator oblivious to the effects on the national interest of wage and pricing practices.

The overwhelmingly favorable reaction to the President's firm and determined stand clearly demonstrates that the American people believe that their Government should play a positive role in regard to the conduct of the great private economic power blocs.

This, of course, does not suggest a controlled economy. No one suggests this. Our free enterprise system has served the Nation well. It has given us the highest standard of living in the world's history. It has proven itself far superior to regimented, State controlled and owned industrial production as exists in the Soviet Union.

The public, as represented by the President of the United States, does, however, have a right to see to it that concern is shown for the Nation's needs, for the total welfare. And this is what President Kennedy has done.

That is the significance of the struggle which took place this past week between the Government of the United States, as represented by the President, and the powerful steel corporations.

Although the steel price increase has been rescinded, it is still essential that an inquiry be made into the competitive and pricing practices of the steel industry. Such an inquiry should not be conducted in a partisan spirit or as a vendetta. It should be objective, fair, and comprehensive. It should be removed from all possible party or partisan considerations. The inquiry should be an economic study, not a political exercise.

Therefore, it would be my suggestion—and I offer this merely as a personal suggestion—that the President appoint a top-level, blue-ribbon commission of persons representing management and labor, as well as prominent economists and financiers and the general public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Yarborough in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This commission should be authorized to utilize the services, facilities, and personnel of any Federal agency, including law enforcement agencies, as well as to utilize private and independent sources for the purposes of the study. The commission should be asked to report to the President and to the Congress not later than 1 year after its formation. Its report would be in the form of an analysis of the position of the steel industry in our country in terms of the domestic and world economic situation.

This commission should be asked to study conditions of our steel plants, the need for modernization and automation, requirements of expanded investment, productivity increases per worker per hour, and the financing requirements in order to keep American steel competitive in the world markets.

A commission study would serve a most useful purpose in bringing to light the objective facts so that we may act intelligently in matters involving the steel industry. Such a study would be in the best interest of our country. I think it would be in the best interest of the industry. I think it would be in the best interest of the steelworkers and of the consumers.

This is a propitious time for a thorough study by a high-level Presidential Commission. I hope favorable consideration will be given to this suggestion.

I ask unanimous consent that a series of editorials and articles which have appeared over the weekend, relating to the problem in the steel industry, its pricing, the proposed price increase, as well as the order to rescind the price increase, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

Victory on Steel Expected To Spur Kennedy Policies

Washington, April 14.—Steel's surrender to President Kennedy appeared today to have bolstered acceptance of the administration's economic policy in and out of Congress.

This morning Wheeling Steel Corp. announced the rescinding of price increases posted 3 days ago. Wheeling was the last of eight major steel makers to bow to administration pressure against the $6-a-ton increases set off by the United States Steel Corp. Tuesday night.

President Kennedy, after denouncing the price increases as inflationary at his news conference Wednesday, opened a concerted counterattack to force the companies to back down. With United States Steel's cancellation last night, the President's victory was assured.

AID TO TAX BILL SEEN

Despite the steel companies' capitulation plans for antimonopoly investigations by the Justice Department and congressional Democrats continued today.

Meanwhile, ranking Democrats on Capitol Hill and within the administration predicted that the President's victory would have these effects:

Dampen some of the bipatrisan opposition to the investment-credit provisions of the administration's tax bill, which has passed the House and is now in the Senate Finance Committee.

Reduce rank-and-file pressure on union leaders for bigger, possibly inflationary, wage settlements during forthcoming negotiations in the aluminum, canning, and missiles-and-aircraft industries.

Enhance the political stock of both President Kennedy and congressional Democrats who are running for election this fall.

LIKE MONEY IN THE BANK

Give the Kennedy administration itself a new sense of confidence.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, assistant Democratic leader, commented:

"The President converted his political popularity into political power. That's what popularity is for. It's like money in the bank. It's to be used."

He said "there isn't any doubt" that the tax bill's provision for a 7-percent credit for industry investment in new plant and equipment would now encounter less Senate opposition.

Opponents of the credit provision had cited steel's price rise as a reason for not granting additional relief to the industry, especially because United States Steel had said price increases were needed to provide new equipment.

It was understood that Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg believed that the administration's victory would "take the heat off" union leaders for wage increases that would break through administration guidelines for wage increases that would not exceed productivity. Psychologically, Mr. Goldberg believes, the steel backdown will help hold the line on inflationary wage-price rises.

KEY NEGOTIATIONS DUE

Forthcoming negotiations will involve 400,000 workers in the construction industry this month and next; 143,000 aircraft and missile workers in June, July, and November, and 31,000 workers in can manufacturing in September. The wage contract for 32,000 aluminum workers expires in July.

George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, was extremely pleased by the President's success, according to a federation spokesman.

However, some labor officials expressed doubt that the steel companies' action would have any effect on negotiations in other industries. Had the steel companies their prices, however, it was said the can companies, which are major steel customers, might have been forced to fight harder against wage increases for their workers.

Some Republican leaders disputed the contentions of administration officials that the steel settlement would help Democrats running for Congress this fall. The issue, these Republicans maintained, will fade well before autumn.

MILLER CONCEDES A GAIN

However, Representative William E. Miller, of upstate New York, chairman of the Republican National Committee, agreed with Democrats that "probably, at first blush, President Kennedy has gained politically over the short run."

However, Mr. Miller said, if the steel companies "lose their competitive position and become a depressed industry" as a result of the price-raise cancellation, the longrun effect could hurt the administration.

Several Republican leaders, including former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, declined to comment. Representative Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana, the Republican leader, said this afternoon that "I haven't quite yet decided what I'm going to say about it." A spokesman for Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, the Senate minority leader, noted that the Illinois Republican had turned aside questions with "no comment" yesterday and would probably not comment today.

Representative Bob Wilson, of California, chairman of the Republican congressional campaign committee, asked for "a full and frank disclosure of the threats or pressures brought to bear" against the steel companies by the administration to reverse their price-rise decisions.

[From the Washington Post]

Steel's Sensible Decision

Decisions of the major steel companies to rescind their price increases will be greeted everywhere with relief.

There are problems to which the attention of Government and industry can be more profitably directed than the instant determination, on an emergency basis, in an emotion-charged atmosphere of the basic methods by which we wish prices in our society to be governed. If the decision to advance prices had stood, it certainly would have compelled an immediate reexamination of the whole apparatus of price and wage regulation under circumstances least likely to develop a sound solution.

Perhaps there should be some such reexamination, but at least, it can now proceed with less interruption to the economy if the existing system is allowed to continue in the interim. The steel industry has drawn back from a Government-business collision that would have been hurtful to all and it deserves credit for having had the good sense to avoid the conflict.

The administration has not found the permanent solution to industrial pricing. Neither has the steel industry. It is clear that basic commodity prices cannot be altered at will, when that alteration conflicts with national economic interest. It is equally clear that the prices of a given instant in history cannot be maintained forever at a fixed point in disregard of cost changes up or down. In a functioning economic system there must be price changes. It is clear that they ought to be made with regard for the interests of consumers, stockholders, workers, and Government. How they ought to be made is not so clear.

It may be argued that the best price regulator is competition and that the most fruitful role of Government is the restoration of that competition by stricter enforcement of antitrust regulations. It may be contended that, in limited areas, prices ought to be a matter of Government regulation, as they often are in public utilities. These are proper areas of debate and discussion. They are areas of such difficulty that the country justly may heave a high of relief that it has escaped the necessity of settling such issues in a climate of controversy and in an atmosphere of political conflict.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 16, 1962]

A New Economic Balance

The clearest moral of President Kennedy's swift triumph in the steel price battle is that there has been a fundamental shift in the power relationships governing our industrial society. The steel union's acceptance of a noninflationary wage contract geared to higher productivity, followed by the surrender of the major companies in their abortive attempt to raise prices, indicates that the public interest has ceased to be an abstraction in regulating the conduct of the great economic power blocs of management and labor.

It is now plain that a strong President, marshaling the pressures of Government and public opinion, can successfully lay down guidelines to give national needs primacy over the special claims of employers or unions. This does not mean we have moved into a controlled economy, but it does mean a new weight of concern for the total welfare. To insure that the revised balance will promote freedom, as well as responsibility, immediate steps should be taken to improve machinery for the cooperation of industry, labor and the Government.

The White House National Economic Conference, now being planned, offers an excellent instrument for creating such machinery on a permanent basis. The Conference will permit a three-way interchange of ideas on how to achieve maximum progress in modernizing our aging industrial facilities, speeding national economic growth, improving our competitive position in world trade, combating inflation and reducing long-term unemployment. Government has no monopoly of wisdom in these matters. Neither has industry or labor.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 14, 1962]

New Turn in Steel

The decision of the United States Steel Corp. to rescind its ill-considered price increase avoids a destructive new war between industry and Government at a time when national unity is badly needed. The day's developments on the steel price front have done much to reinforce faith in the independence of corporate decisionmaking and the free play of market forces in basic industries.

The refusal of two relatively small companies—Inland and Kaiser—to join the parade started by United States Steel forced a collapse of the industry front in support of higher prices. Inland took the view that the national interest, as well as competitive pressure, made a price increase "untimely." When Kaiser joined in this display of economic good citizenship and good sense, Bethlehem decided that sound business judgment required it to rescind its increase "in order to remain competitive."

United States Steel's surrender guarantees a general cancellation of the price advance. Maintenance of the old price line will guard the country against a new inflationary spiral, foster sanity in collective bargaining and help the steel companies preserve the high-level demand for steel that is their best insurance of improved profits.

The whole episode has provided powerful support for President Kennedy's theory that the White House has a duty to define the public interest in prices and wages while leaving the ultimate decision to management and labor. The recent steel wage agreement provided no excuse for higher steel prices, and the President served the Nation well by rebuking the major companies for shattering 4 years of price stability.

Automation, hard-core unemployment and the emergence of efficient oversea competitors have created urgent new problems in the relationship of big government, big business, and big labor in this country. These need solution in an atmosphere of cooperation, free of vengefulness or class distrust.

Now that the marketplace has supplied its own constructive answer to the conflict over increased steel prices, the consideration of what new policies are necessary to promote wage-price restraint, plant modernization and faster economic growth ought to be undertaken without the overtones of rancor so pronounced in the President's first reaction and the subsequent initiation of punitive moves against the steel producers. A vendetta will contribute nothing to the Nation's industrial strength.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 13, 1962]

The Underlying Debate in the Steel Crisis

(By James Reston)

Washington, April 12.—Roger Blough, of United States Steel has revived in Washington a question President Kennedy asked in his first state of the Union message.

Could a nation, the President asked, organized and governed such as ours, deal effectively with the problems of unemployment, foreign economic competition and national defense in a protracted state of cold war?

Nothing that has been said since then has raised this issue so dramatically as the steel price rise and Mr. Blough's remarks on television today. His view was that United States Steel had to think solely about its own cost-price problem, that prices were not made in Washington, and that these other questions of the Nation's costs and prices were not his concern.

"I do not know anything about politics," Mr. Blough said in what must be the understatement of the year, but he is now up to his eyes in politics, and the paradox of it is that he is encouraging precisely the things big business fears the most—more Government intervention in the bargaining process, sharper administration of the antitrust laws, and more Government spending to increase the Nation's economic rate of growth.

THE INSIDE DEBATE

Ever since President Kennedy came to power, his principal economic and financial advisers have been engaged in a debate about how to produce more jobs, and increase the rate of growth and investment.

Particularly in the Department of Labor and the Council of Economic Advisers the President has been under constant pressure to increase the rate of Government spending to achieve this end through far greater demand, but the President has compromised the issue.

He has counted on tax revision, particularly more liberal tax depreciation allowances on obsolete equipment; on public appeals for cost-price restraint, and on some increased Government spending to "get the country moving again."

His view was that both business and labor could be persuaded to hold wages and prices in line and that the Roger Bloughs would think not only of their own cost-price problems but of the Nation's cost-price and balance-of-payments problems in an increasingly competitive world market.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

What United States Steel has done, apparently much to Mr. Blough's surprise, is to make the President question his own compromise approach and wonder whether a nation organized as Mr. Blough thinks it should be organized, and governed as the Kennedy administration has governed it, will really create a modern, fast-growing economy that can employ its people and compete with the new industries overseas.

Mr. Blough is not the cause but merely the symbol of Mr. Kennedy's problem. United States Steel is not the only company running into trouble because of obsolescent equipment, high costs, and savage competition from new foreign factories and new products. This is a widespread problem in an America that has been able to sell what its factories produced even if many of those factories were increasingly out of date.

That is now changing. The question is where the money is to come from to modernize industry. Mr. Blough says from increased profits. The administration says from tax relief for plant modernization. But there is another view—now getting a much more sympathetic hearing since Mr. Blough dropped his bomb—that the Government's growth, investment, and full-employment goals will not be achieved without the addition of substantial new Government spending, even at the risk of substantial deficits.

EUROPE'S VIEW

This idea not only has support at the Department of Labor and in the Council of Economic Advisers, but also in Europe, where Government spending and increased demand have made spectacular progress despite the introduction of new automatic machinery and a rising labor force.

Edwin L. Dale, Jr., the able European economic correspondent of the New York Times, emphasizes this point in the current issue of the New Republic. "Europe," he writes, "is automating faster than the United States and some countries (West Germany for example) have had a far faster growth in the labor force; but the trouble in Europe is lack of labor. There is no unemployment. The simple and single reason is high demand."

To create high demand by Government spending and Government deficits is, of course, precisely what the business community does not want, and President Kennedy has in the past been restrained by this view. He may continue to be restrained if the other steel companies break the price rise, but for the moment he is not in a very moderate mood.

The Kennedys do not like to lose. They do not like to be crossed. And when they think they have been doublecrossed, brother, hand me down my steel shillelagh.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 13, 1962]

CONSTRUCTIVE PLANS CAUGHT IN THE CROSS-FIRE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—The political war of industry with President Kennedy and the Democratic Party that was precipitated by the timing and other provocative aspects of Big Steel's price increase may be of short duration. The potential of the damage which could be wrought by protracted hostilities—on the economy at home, the standing of the dollar abroad and the prospect of sounder policies raised by Mr. Kennedy's transportation message—is so enormous that the business community should take immediate steps to halt this ruinous chain reaction started by one of its principal units.

If one of the important segments of the steel industry that has not yet joined what the President called the parade of almost identical price raising should keep out of the procession a while, the pressure of competition on the paraders conceivably could force them to break ranks. This was significantly conceded by Roger Blough, chairman of United States Steel, in his news conference today. And there are still such companies.

The point of Mr. Kennedy's cutting observation yesterday—that the last contract between the union and a steel company (Great Lakes) was signed last Saturday—was to emphasize that United States Steel waited until the nationwide union was tightly bound for a year before taking the step that might have put the settlement in jeopardy. But if all the companies which absorb almost all of the steel market join the parade without much delay by any of them, the political war between industry and the party in power, plus some Republicans, will soon produce casualties of constructive proposals now pending.

Among the beneficiaries in view are an economy freed from existing statutory restraints on trade with the non-Communist world, and from the inequitable consequences of the superior political power of certain special-interest groups. In this casualty list, if industry makes no move to dispel the punitive attitude of the administration that the steel price rise, and particularly the timing and manner of it, has created, could be these:

1. Any tax relief for industry that would enable it to enlarge the modernization of its production facilities that foreign competition and the steadily rising cost spiral have made imperative.

2. Legislation to effect a loose partnership between the United States and the Common Market.

3. The trend toward economic realism, and away from political favoritism of special economic groups, that the President and his congressional forces have lately been revealing.

LABOR'S POLITICAL REACTION

This last factor, in which the public interest is foremost, depends greatly for development on the President's influence with organized labor and the internal union influence of those labor leaders who have done at least something to cooperate with him. But development is threatened by what happened in the steel industry. There, under the President's pressure, the union agreed to a moderate settlement for which its leaders were criticized within the union movement even before United States Steel lent aid to the critics by waiting to announce the price rise only until the signing of the last contract that committed all workers in the industry.

This experience is bound to stiffen the wage demands of other union bargainers in the interest of protecting their threatened leadership. And efforts now in progress to persuade Congress to salvage the Landrum-Griffin law from the mounting sabotage of the National Labor Relations Board will be even less likely to succeed.

That move was made in the House this week by the authors of the law, who cited numerous Board decisions in support of their contention that "the policies laid down by Congress in the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts are being distorted and frustrated. * * *" The Board, they said, has assumed the role of a policymaking body, contrary to a restriction "underscored in the law." In this assumption, they charged, the Board, whose decisions the courts are "reluctant to upset," is eroding the specific bans of Congress on secondary boycott abuses and blackmail picketing.

In the atmosphere of the hot political war between the party in power and industry's price bellwether, this constructive effort is only one of the probable casualties in the same important area of the public interest.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 13, 1962]

MR. BLOUGH'S EXPLANATION

The reasons given by Roger M. Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., for the steel price increase of $6 a ton fail to convince us of either the wisdom of the increase or the industry's sense of responsibility in thus setting off what may well be a chain of inflationary price rises. The essence of Mr. Blough's position is that higher profits are necessary to permit the company to modernize more rapidly and thus keep it competitive against highly efficient foreign steel producers.

The difficulty with the device the steel industry—which is the foundation of America's industrial strength—has employed in pursuit of its objective is that raising prices will quite likely lower demand and aggravate competitive difficulties. If steel is being priced out of its domestic and oversea markets, as the companies have repeatedly warned, the worst possible remedy would appear to be to price it still higher.

The 4 years since the last increase in steel prices have all been poor years on which to base any long-term judgment about relations between costs, prices, and profits. The period started with 1958, a year of recession, followed by 1959, when the mills were shut down by a 116-day strike, 1960, when the strike's aftermath was dragging the economy into a new slump, and 1961, when another recession kept the mills operating at half of capacity for many weeks. Despite these factors, United States Steel's profits on each dollar of sales were 8.7 percent in 1958, 7 percent in 1959, 8.2 percent in 1960, and 5.7 percent last year. The amount of profit plowed back into the business for plant improvement in the 4-year period was $302 million.

Profits are the lifeblood of business. They must be adequate to assure a reasonable return for investors and to provide the enormous sums necessary to keep our plants abreast of the swift forward movement of industrial technology. But profits are self-canceling if price increases instituted to make them bigger result in stifling the high-level demand for steel which prevailed in the first quarter of this year.

Mr. Blough reports that foreign competition has reduced the market for American steel by 5 or 6 million tons, or the equivalent of 40,000 jobs. This loss will never be recaptured by making our steel less competitive. The real need is for tax incentives to spur new plant construction, of the type proposed in the administration's tax bill, and for more generous depreciation allowances, of the type the Treasury Department reportedly has under consideration. With such tax aids and a renewed upsurge in the economy, steel could do much more to improve its profit position than it can by raising its prices.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1962]

STEEL'S WEAK DEFENSE

Roger Blough, the chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp., spoke with commendable tact and proper restraint in his reply to President Kennedy's criticism of steel price increases. It is too bad the actions of steel were not equally restrained.

The emphasis Mr. Blough places on the need for more rapid equipment modernization in the industry is sound enough, but his case for effecting that modernization through higher prices is not so sound. The investment tax credits which the administration has proposed to allow for equipment modernization (in the tax bill) would make funds available for this purpose, and would have the added virtue of directing the savings in taxes specifically to this purpose. There is no way of earmarking a portion of the price rise for this end, however plausibly the industry may argue that general increases in profits will allow more modernization.

The chairman's statement that there was no commitment to retain existing prices is no doubt literally true, but it is essentially false. The Government, labor, and the public, during the negotiations, had drawn an inference that the quid pro quo for restraint by labor would be restraint by industry. It would have been honest, candid, and prudent of the steel industry to have made it plain that this was not the case before the contracts were signed. The Blough argument on this head is just not convincing.

It is to be hoped that the chairman is correct when he argues that higher steel prices furnish no just occasion for large increases by steel users in the prices of their finished commodities. How persuasive his figures will be for the customers of steel remains to be seen. The figures used are impressive. They are not users' figures, however. And even if they are correct, other manufacturers can make the same argument that Mr. Blough makes for higher prices that will permit them to modernize their equipment. Nor do his cost figures take account of the psychological impetus to rising prices that the steel industry has provided.

United States Steel management, like every other management in a market economy, has obligations to stockholders which Mr. Blough very properly emphasizes. But stockholders are not the only citizens who have a concern about steel prices or the only citizens to whom management is beholden. Modern industrial management, concerned in the long-term profits of enterprise, have a responsibility to their customers, too. Mr. Blough has not stated that obligation very well. His policy decisions and actions have not exhibited much awareness of that obligation.

The President has not argued and the country does not believe that profits are reprehensible in a market economy. They are essential to industrial productivity, growth and prosperity. It is not profits as such to which there is objection. The steel industry and other industries should be profitable. They must be profitable if there is going to be a satisfactory rate of reinvestment and economic growth. Raising prices, however, is not the only means of increasing profits; it is simply the readiest and easiest and the quickest method of doing it. The least that Big Steel owed the Government and the country was a demonstration that it had considered every other means before pursuing a policy so at war with other needs of the national economy, and so indifferent to the desirability of holding the price line, the necessity of maintaining a price structure competitive in world markets and the importance of holding down the financial burdens of Government.

The careful statement that Mr. Blough made Thursday would not convince many people that the industry had thoughtfully, prayerfully and soberly considered every alternative to higher prices before taking an action so filled with bad consequences for steel in particular, for business in general and for the country.

It is especially unfortunate that the steel industry's action has alienated so many people who are so much in agreement with its larger views of industry's important role. No doubt an overwhelming majority of citizens are convinced that it is by keeping industry profitable and successful that we have the best hope of maintaining prosperity and growth. A functioning industrial society makes jobs by wholesale while Government struggles to make them by retail with public works and Federal spending. It is to this purpose and end that we should be turning managerial genius. Now we seem likely to have a sterile and rancorous argument over Government's proper role in wage-price policymaking in basic industries, such as steel. Despite Mr. Blough's argument, most Americans will remain convinced that the steel industry has taken the wrong action, at the wrong time in the wrong way.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1962]

Steel Drama—Kennedy the Victor

A few minutes before 6 last Tuesday evening a caller was shown into President Kennedy's office, his purpose unannounced. The caller was Roger M. Blough, board chairman of United States Steel. What he had to say left Mr. Kennedy in what was described as state of "controlled fury." United States Steel, said Mr. Blough, was raising its prices.

A few minutes past 5 last Friday, reporters in the New York offices of United States Steel were handed a statement. It was a statement of surrender. The price rise had been canceled.

In the 72 hours between these two events the Nation had witnessed a great drama—a struggle of will between the White House and a pivotal industry. The price rise—in which most major steel concerns had joined—would have torpedoed a major part of Mr. Kennedy's strategy for promoting economic growth while restraining the forces of inflation. To forestall it, the President did battle with a whole arsenal of weapons—public denunciation, pressure to split industry ranks, the threat of loss of Government contracts, moves toward criminal prosecution under the antitrust laws.

The outcome was a clear-cut Kennedy victory and, by all indications, a popular one. Nevertheless, three large questions remained. They were:

First, how would relations between business and the Kennedy administration be affected?

Second, could the President continue to hold the line against inflation?

Third, what should be done about a basic problem involved in the steel battle—the rising competition U.S. industry has been encountering from other industrial powers, including Russia?

THE BACKGROUND

Steel is the principal underpinning of the American economy. The steel industry is a colossus in its own right, providing jobs for 569,000 workers and accounting for $14 billion in annual sales. Its output of 100 million tons a year is a quarter of the world's production.

Moreover, steel's products are the starting point for hundreds of other industries, from the manufacture of bobby pins to the construction of ocean liners. An ordinary house may contain as much as four tons of steel in its construction and equipment.

The giant of the industry is United States Steel Corp. This is how it compares with other major steel companies for 1961:

Company	Output (million tons)	Employees
United States Steel	25.1	199,000
Bethlehem	14.9	126,000
Republic	7.2	48,000
Jones & Laughlin	5.6	41,000
National	6.1	26,000
Armco	5.4	36,000
Youngstown	4.3	27,000
Inland	5.2	29,000
Kaiser	2.2	11,000

Steel's pivotal role has made the industry a major focusing point for President Kennedy's economic policies. Mr. Kennedy has had two separate but related key objectives—the avoidance of inflation at home as the economy has emerged from the recession, and the achievement of a growth rate that would keep the economy flourishing at home and competitive abroad.

For several years after World War II, steel seemed to be the handmaiden of inflation. Steel prices went up regularly and other prices followed. The wholesale price of steel rose 66 percent between 1945 and 1950; consumer prices rose 37 percent in the same period. Thereafter steel rose even faster than other prices. Since 1950 steel prices have risen 61 percent, consumer prices 20 percent.

PROBLEM OF PRICES

The tendency of steel price increases to push other prices upward has made Washington keep a sharp eye on the industry. Steel increased prices in 1958, but thereafter held the line under strong pressure from both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

The problem of economic growth, arises from the rising economic challenge of such areas as Japan and the six nation European Common Market. In the United States, economic growth—as measured by the rise in the gross national product—has averaged 3 percent a year over the last decade. That compares with annual increases averaging 8.5 percent in Japan, 7.5 percent in Germany and 5.8 percent in Italy.

One result is persistent unemployment in the United States, contrasted with labor shortages in the boom countries. The growth of foreign output, together with increased productive efficiency, is making it increasingly difficult for U.S. products to compete in foreign markets.

Steel is a prime example. U.S. steel production in 1960 was 10 percent higher than in 1954; in the same period the six nations of the European Common Market increased their steel production 66 percent. In 10 years, the U.S. share of world steel trade has dropped from 17 percent to about 7 percent; American imports of steel have risen to a point where in some months they exceed exports.

The United States confronts this problem at the very time President Kennedy has been trying to increase exports as a means of coping with the persistent deficit in the balance of payments. The United States makes money in trade—exports exceeded imports by $5 billion last year—but that surplus is more than wiped out by the dollars the Nation sends abroad for defense, foreign aid and other purposes.

Mr. Kennedy has made strenuous efforts to win business support in his approach to these economic problems. He put two business leaders in his Cabinet—Douglas Dillon as Treasury Secretary and Luther Hodges as Commerce Secretary. He has emphasized his concern with balancing the Federal budget; and, aware that businessmen have tended to regard Democratic administrations as hostile ever since the New Deal, he has taken frequent occasion to assert "how really untrue" it is that "we are antibusiness."

It was against this background that the President embarked upon his special appeal for restraint by management in steel.

THE CONFLICT

The administration for many months has been heavily engaged in the effort to hold the line on steel prices. President Kennedy committed his own prestige to the attempt.

Last September, when there was talk of a steel price increase, Mr. Kennedy wrote the heads of the 12 major steel companies that an increase "could shatter the price stability which the country has now enjoyed for some time." Steel prices range roughly from $100 to $175 per ton depending on the type and quality. The President added that "if the industry were to forego a price increase * * * it would clearly then be the turn of labor representatives to limit wage demands to a level consistent with continued price stability."

Steelmen grumbled about Government meddling, but they held the price line. With steel's 3-year labor contracts due to expire June 30, the President then went to work on the United Steelworkers for a noninflationary wage agreement. His guidepost for all industries—that wage increases should stay within the average annual rise of 3 percent in U.S. productivity—would have meant for steel a boost limited to about 12 cents an hour in the first year. Mr. Kennedy declared that the steel negotiations would "be regarded symbolically as a test of our ability to manage our economy in a competitive world."

Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, who had been chief negotiator for the steelworkers prior to coming into the Cabinet, played an active role in trying to get the union to hold down its demands. Although no formal commitment was sought from the companies not to raise prices, the administration made plain to them that its efforts to restrain the union demands were based on the assumption that if it were successful, there would be no price increase. As Mr. Kennedy put it last week:

> That was the thread that ran through every discussion which I had, or Secretary Goldberg [had].

Mr. Blough said on that point last week: "No assurances were asked and none were given regarding price action."

SIGN CONTRACT

Late last month the union and the steel industry agreed on a 2-year contract that provided fringe benefit increases amounting to about 10 cents an hour for the first year and left wage questions for next year. The new contracts were signed the week before last, to the accompaniment of praise from the President for "industrial statesmanship of the highest order." The administration's apparent success in obtaining a noninflationary agreement was widely regarded as one of its major domestic achievements since taking office, and one that might have important political repercussions in the elections next fall.

That was the situation last Tuesday afternoon when the White House received a telephone call that Mr. Blough (rhymes with how) was on his way to Washington and wanted to see the President. Mr. Blough was ushered into the President's office at about 6 p.m. Mr. Kennedy had no idea in advance of the purpose of the visit.

Mr. Blough's news shocked and deeply angered the President. Mr. Blough informed Mr. Kennedy that United States Steel was raising the price of steel by $6 per ton and that an announcement to that effect had already been sent to the press.

On orders from the President, White House aids immediately began telephoning the heads of the other steel companies. They hoped to persuade them not to follow United States Steel's lead, hoping Big Steel might then be forced to rescind the price increase.

OTHERS FOLLOW

That hope waned Wednesday morning as the President conferred with members of his Cabinet on the steel situation. The White House ticker flashed the news that, one by one, five other major steel companies had increased their prices $6 a ton.

There was an air of tense expectancy in the State Department auditorium Wednesday afternoon as the newsmen waited for the President to make his entrance. He strode in a minute late, mounted the rostrum and in slow, measured tones that served to emphasize his anger, delivered a slashing indictment of the major steel corporations.

President Kennedy accused the steel companies of "irresponsible defiance" of the public interest and "ruthless disregard" of their duty. He said that at a time of grave crisis in Berlin and southeast Asia, when reservists were being asked to leave their families and servicemen to risk their lives, he found it hard "to accept a situation in which a tiny handful of steel executives" could show "such utter contempt for the interest of 185 million Americans." The President wound up his statement by saying:

"Some time ago, I asked each American to consider what he would do for his country, and I asked the steel companies. In the last 24 hours we had their answer."

Apart from the question of economic consequences, it was evident the President felt the steel companies had been guilty of bad faith. He clearly regarded their tactics as a deliberate mousetrapping of the steel union and a slap in the face to his administration.

Counteraction came fast. Attorney General Robert Kennedy announced a grand jury investigation of the steel price increases. The implication was that the Government was seeking evidence of collusive price fixing—a criminal offense—in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. The Federal Trade Commission was also reported looking into the price increase, and both the House Antitrust Subcommitee and the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee announced that they planned investigations.

BLOUGH'S VIEW

Thursday afternoon, Mr. Blough held a news conference to present the steel industry's case. He said the price increase was necessary to enable the industry to invest in new plant and equipment in order to meet competition both at home and abroad. When asked what United States Steel would do if some of the steel companies did not raise prices, Mr. Blough said that would create a "very difficult" situation.

Friday was a day of dramatic, rapid-fire developments. The President wheeled up virtually every big gun at his command. White House pressure on the steel companies that still had not announced a price increase was intense, with the President making some of the phone calls himself. Inland Steel Co., eighth largest producer, was a major target. From the Attorney General's Office, subpenas flew out to the heads of other steel companies. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara announced that defense orders would be shifted to companies that did not raise prices.

Midmorning Friday came the first crack in the steel industry line. Inland announced that it would not raise its prices. The retreat began to turn into a rout when Bethlehem Steel, second largest producer, ordered its $6 increase rescinded. But all eyes were still on United States Steel which 72 hours earlier had precipitated the price-increase parade. At 5:15 p.m. came the capitulation. A statement by the company said:

"United States Steel Corp. today announced that it rescinded the 3½ percent price increase. * * * The price decision was made in the light of competitive developments today, and all other current circumstances."

The other steel companies quickly fell into line. In Norfolk, Va., where he was aboard a cruiser observing naval maneuvers, President Kennedy issued a statement saying:

"The people of the United States are most gratified. * * * In taking the action at this time, the steel companies are serving the public interest."

THE QUESTIONS

John Kennedy's victory last week seems certain to have wide political and economic repercussions.

Politically, the President has entered the lists on behalf of the little man—the consumer who would been hit by rising prices—and triumphed. That feat promises to increase his already high popularity as he heads toward the first public referendum on his administration in the congressional and gubernatorial elections this fall.

Mr. Kennedy's deed also promises to give his party a big campaign issue. The Democrats can now depict themselves as the champions of the consumer. They can be expected to go further and trumpet anew the assertion that the Republicans are the party of big business. The argument would be that big steel went along with a Republican president for 2 years when he was trying to hold the price line but sought to override a Democratic President who pressed the same objective.

A closely related political question is what the relationship will now be between the President and the business community. Mr. Kennedy has made plain his belief that the effort to raise steel prices was a betrayal of an implicit agreement arising from the noninflationary wage contract signed by the United Steelworkers. He may therefore reappraise his attitude toward business.

MAY BE TOUGH

That reappraisal could result in a tougher line by the administration. Mr. Kennedy seems less likely to heed business cries about unbalanced budgets, especially if he deems deficit spending necessary to the realization of his economic objectives. Similarly, the President may be less inclined to heed business objections to legislative proposals that would give increased protection to consumers.

It is also possible, however, that having demonstrated his power, the President will decide to forgive and forget. He still has an important economic stake in maintaining good relations with the business community.

One clear economic outcome of last week's encounter is that the President is in a much stronger position to present and defend the national interest in price and wage disputes. He made plain long ago his belief that the Government has a duty to do so, and now he has emerged victorious in a major showdown on the issue.

ISSUE OF INFLATION

Mr. Kennedy has also won a round in his battle to curb inflation. But that will remain a pressing issue for the future. Many businessmen believe that steel had a case for a price increase—whatever may be said against the timing and the method of the effort.

Still unanswered, but in much sharper focus as a result of last week's events, is the question of what the United States is to do to improve its economic growth rate. Even before the clash over steel prices, the President was receiving conflicting advice over the role the Government should take in the economy.

From the Labor Department and Council of Economic Advisers came pressure for a stronger Government direction of the economy if the Nation was to cope with problems of unemployment, a lagging growth rate and rising international competition. These advisers urged the President to advance public works programs to provide jobs and increase demand; tax policies to spur business investment in new productive facilities; possibly even price and wage controls to make certain that growth occurs without inflation.

THE OTHER VIEW

Other advisers, notably in the Commerce and Treasury Departments, urged the President to rely primarily on guidance and selective Government spending to accelerate the strong forces of a free, competitive economy. This was the advice Mr. Kennedy had tended to follow.

Now the President may conclude that he must take a stronger hand. Few observers think he would go so far as to impose price and wage controls. But short of that several avenues are open to him.

The principal one is toward sharp increases in Federal spending to stimulate the economy, even at the risk of deficits. Mr. Kennedy may now also press for more legislation to control the economy.

Underlying all these economic considerations is the fundamental issue of how the United States is to solve its problems of domestic unemployment and foreign competition. It was essentially that issue to which the steelmen were addressing themselves. Mr. Blough presented an argument that has a considerable following. It was that U.S. business cannot compete without constant modernization of plant; that the money for modernization must come from profits (either those that are reinvested in the business or those that attract further public investment), and that profit margins have been shrinking.

The counterargument—that raising prices is not the way to make products more competitive and that shrinking profits are attributable to low volume—does not do away with the fundamental question. If the events of last week do nothing else, therefore, they seem certain to focus the attention of both Government and business on the basic issue of how to keep the U.S. economy flourishing at home and competitive abroad.

RETURN OF "YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW" TO CAPITAL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Sunday, March 11, I had the privilege to be the first guest on Theodore Granik's award-winning, "Youth Wants To Know" program in its return to our Nation's Capital. This time-honored program was presented by American Security & Trust Co. over WTTG, Channel 5.

The American Security & Trust Co. is to be commended for bringing the "Youth Wants To Know" program back to our Nation's Capital and a special word of praise should go to Robert W. Baker, president of American Security & Trust Co., for his tremendous spirit of public service in making this kind of outstanding programing possible.

It is another example of what has made American Security & Trust Co. become one of the 100 largest banks in the Nation, and reflects superbly the American Security & Trust Co.'s unerring insight into what interests and concerns the people who live in and near our Nation's Capital.

As a personal note, I repeat what I said at the conclusion of the "Youth Wants To Know" broadcast, "Well, coming back on the show is like a salute to an old friend, Ted Granik."

I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks a copy of the transcript of the program be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

Announcer. American Security & Trust Co., one of the 100 largest banks in the Nation, presents "Youth Wants To Know."

Question. Senator Dirksen, has the U.S. decision to resume nuclear testing frozen the thaw of the cold war?

Question. Senator Dirksen, has the Republican Party become a party of personalities rather than policies?

Question. Senator Dirksen, why should we even consider negotiating with the Communists?

Barber. In just a moment, Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen, of Illinois, will answer these and other penetrating questions on "Youth Wants To Know."

Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to "Youth Wants To Know." Our guest, Senator Everett Dirksen, of Illinois, is one of the busiest men in the U.S. Senate. In addition to his duties as minority leader, Senator Dirksen is enjoying a second season of what is known in Washington as the "Ev and Charlie" show. This is a weekly news conference conducted jointly by Senator Dirksen and House Republican Leader Charles Halleck. Senator Dirksen, it's a pleasure to welcome you again to "Youth Wants To Know."

Senator Dirksen. Well, it develops some nostalgia with me, because I was one of Theodore Granik's first patrons, I think, on a TV show long ago. And so it's good to come back and to see this very sharp panel.

Barber. Thank you, sir. Now let's begin our questioning with Bob.

Question. Senator Dirksen, hasn't the recent amity created by the Powers-Abel swap been destroyed by the recent resumption of nuclear testing—or the decision to resume?

Senator Dirksen. Oh, I doubt it very much. I rather fancy the firmness on the part of this country in undertaking to resume nuclear testing has brought our so-called friends across the sea to their senses. And maybe something good and objective and constructive will come out of it before we get through.

Question. Senator Dirksen, do you feel that the resumption of these tests will cause the Afro-Asian voting bloc to vote against the United States in the U.N.

Senator Dirksen. I know of no reason why it should. It's our own security that's involved, and they should be as much interested in our security as they are in that of anybody else.

Question. Senator Dirksen, do you consider that there are other criteria other than preventing war, of going to the summit?

Senator Dirksen. Well, that's a pretty broad question and I'm not sure that I can give you a responsive answer. There are so many factors, of course, that are involved in the business of making or conducting war, whether war is declared or not. And you'd have to evaluate a great many factors in order to answer that question properly.

Question. Well, should we first achieve something at the Prime Minister level before the President should?

Senator Dirksen. Oh, definitely so, because I think we've had our lesson in that respect. Too often the agenda was not firmed up and as a result, whatever our hopes were for achievement at the summit, just fell apart. And we ought to be positive and quite sure that we know what the agenda is going to be and that the agenda is going to be followed, even though in other times, it hasn't been followed, because that's the only assurance, I think, we can have that something conclusive can come out of it.

Question. Senator, Khrushchev has pointed out a discrepancy in the U.S. confidence in its military prowess in its decision to resume testing. Is he right? Is the missile gap back with us?

Senator Dirksen. I doubt whether the missile gap is back with us. I thought we had settled that issue quite a long time ago. And I think we're pretty confident about our power in the missile field. Now, Khrushchev may make most any kind of an observation that his rather vagarious mind will suggest, but that doesn't mean that it is a fact or he is uttering what is the truth.

Question. Senator Dirksen, in view of the results of past negotiations, why should we even bother to negotiate with the Communists?

Senator Dirksen. Well, there are probably a hundred million people who have asked that same question. In view of the fact that these other adventures have failed, and that so often we could have no confidence in the oral or written word of the people who conduct the affairs of the Soviet Union. I have had some doubts on that score myself.

Question. Senator Dirksen, do you feel that a fear of Communist China is forcing Mr. Khrushchev to negotiate more with the West?

Senator Dirksen. That, of course, is a speculation. I do not know what's in the mind of Chou En-lai or Mao Tse-tung in Red China, who seem to be the directors of the policy. I can only evaluate it as best I can from the things I read in the press from time to time. There may be a schism between these two countries—who shall say?—but this much we know, that the Red Chinese are pretty well wedded to a rigid Marxist line, and in view of what happened to Stalin in the Soviet Union, perhaps they're not so hard bitten there on that same thing.

Question. Senator Dirksen, on a recent television program Senator Goldwater expressed his approval of the ideals of the John Birch Society, but disavowed its leadership. Do you care to comment on his——

Senator Dirksen. I have no comment on the John Birch Society. First, I know nothing about him. I have never seen a John Bircher in my life. I have no idea what they're achieving. I've seen some of these things in the press. That's as far as it gets. I doubt whether we have any John Birch factions to speak of back in my home State. And so I have given no attention, and since I have no knowledge, obviously, I could make no reasoned or durable or sustained comment.

Barber. Would you agree with former Vice President Nixon, Senator Dirksen, that he would not support a Republican candidate who is a member of the Birch Society?

Senator Dirksen. Well, I don't know what the exact situation was in California. I speak only for myself. Because I know what my own politics, my own policies are, and I never get off the trail because some of these rather strange and extreme phenomena should develop in the political scene. That's not new. That's been going on since the days of Abraham Lincoln.

Question. Senator Dirksen, do you know how far the John Birch Society has penetrated into the Republican Party?

Senator Dirksen. Well, I would have any doubt that it's penetrated at all insofar as I know.

Question. Senator Dirksen, do you believe that General Walker's running for the governorship in Texas will aid the Republican Party?

Senator Dirksen. I couldn't tell you.

Question. Senator, George Romney has recently been hurdled into the spotlight, bringing the number of personalities in the Republican Party to four. Isn't that too many for a minority party?

Senator Dirksen. Oh, I doubt it very much. I think our history will show that we've had a lot more personalities that far ahead of a Presidential election. But, of course, time has a way of dealing with them.

Question. Senator Dirksen, do you agree with Senator Javits' recent comment that the current debate between the progressives and the conservative wing of the Republican Party is the most critical crisis it has faced since 1932?

Senator Dirksen. You mean the party has faced?

Question. Yes.

Senator Dirksen. Oh, I doubt it very much. I didn't know that we had a crisis in the Republican Party.

Question. How are you going to bring the conservatives and the more progressive wings of the Republican Party back together again?

Senator Dirksen. You don't always do it, and never have you. I've always said that the Republican umbrella is a large one that admits of all shades of opinion. Don't forget that the Republican Party started as an amalgam of a half a dozen parties in 1856. But they had one objective and one great ideal—that was the preservation of the union, and ultimately freeing the country of slavery. They didn't agree on a great many other things, and so you never expect in the vagarious times for all Republicans to agree on all things. My hope as a leader always is that on the fundamental issues, and at the top of it I'd put freedom and individual liberty, that there we can use it as a measuring rod when we evaluate all the policy matters and all the programs that are advanced upon the Congress for attention.

Question. Senator, recent polls show that President Kennedy's popularity is very high. Do you think this indicates that the Democrats will increase their majority in the Senate and House in next fall's election?

Senator Dirksen. No, I don't, because you have to dissociate, I think, the leader from the policies that are a part of the New Frontier. And I think you'll discover in the country that the popularity of those items is quite a different thing from the personal popularity of the President.

Question, Senator Dirksen, do you feel that Illinois will be a safe Republican State in 1962?

Senator Dirksen. Well, I try not to be overly prophetic, but I hope so.

Question. In view of recent party setbacks, of your party, on the State and National level, what do you think will be the fate of the Republican Party if the Democrats sweep the Nation in 1962 and 1964?

Senator Dirksen. Well, first you'll have to tell me what these setbacks were.

Question. Well, the Republicans have had a President in only two out of eight terms. Also only 19 State Governors.

Senator Dirksen. Oh, but you spoke about recent setbacks.

Question. Well, I'm sorry——

Senator Dirksen. We had done quite well, I thought. Obviously, there was a defeat in 1960, but when you talk about recent setbacks, I think of two Republican members who were elected to the legislature in the Carolinas. I wouldn't call that a setback. I think the advances we made in that congressional district in Michigan, even though we didn't win, but cut the majority from some 25,000 to around 700 or 800, was anything but a setback. So you see life is swiftly moving and in the political field there's a great acceleration of events, and to be timely, we've always got to bring it up to date. And I think if you use the word "recently," we have been doing all right.

Barber. I think, Senator Dirksen, Douglas was referring to two recent special congressional elections—one in New York and one in Texas—in which Democrats won both.

Senator Dirksen. Oh, well, of course, you must set Texas to one side. After all we've never felt that that's a State where we are strongest, by any means.

Question. Senator Dirksen, it has been said that the Republican Party needs to strengthen itself in the city. What is the Republican Party doing in Illinois to lure voters in Chicago and other cities?

Senator Dirksen. It's doing a great job of organizing, because the great problem of a political party is to get its voters to the polls.

Question. Senator Dirksen, what are the Republican Party's expectations for former Vice President Nixon and the State of California as far as governorship is concerned?

Senator Dirksen. Well, are you speaking now of the hope of a victory?

Question. Yes, sir.

Senator Dirksen. Well obviously we hope for a victory.

Question. What is your belief in the situation?

Senator Dirksen. Well, I not only hope so, but I believe he's going to win.

Question. Senator Dirksen, speaking of getting the people out to the polls in the city, why, if the Republican Party wants the city support, didn't you back President Kennedy's Department for Urban Affairs?

Senator Dirksen. It had nothing to do with it. The whole question involved there was whether or not a Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs could do the job and achieve the things that were set out in the Presidential message. Don't forget that we had that under consideration in the Eisenhower administration. We thought it ought to be set up as an office in the executive branch, and not as a Cabinet department. So, we're aware of the problem, and the question is how do you do it more efficiently.

Question. But you do back an urban affairs, and you feel that this would.

Senator Dirksen. Oh, not a Cabinet department.

Question. But some type.

Senator Dirksen. A kind of executive agency, and as a matter of fact, I have drafted a bill along that line. Whether I'll introduce it or not remains to be seen.

Question. Did the Republicans in their decision to vote against the urban affairs proposal, did they consider that this would relegate the States to a rather minor position with regard to cities, and, therefore, strengthen the Democratic margin in these cities?

Senator Dirksen. It was a factor, and I think probably the best statement I can make on this is that in the Senate, where we didn't actually vote on the merits of the plan, but rather on discharging a Senate committee, that you found those who had served as Governors of their State quite hard bitten in their opposition to this reorganization proposal.

Question. Senator, President Kennedy in preappointing Robert Weaver as Secretary of Urban Affairs was accused of exploiting the racial issue for partisan purposes. In a recent press conference, you stated that should he be nominated to take Abraham Ribicoff's place, not a single Republican would vote against him. Isn't this essentially the same thing?

Senator Dirksen. No. We've had experiences with Mr. Weaver. He served on a commission of human relations in Chicago for about a year, and everybody who was associated with him thought he was a fine type of person with great capabilities, and so if the whole hope here and the problem was to find a Cabinet spot for Dr. Weaver, then we believe that if Mr. Ribicoff goes to the State of Connecticut to run for the Senate, there'll be a vacancy, and I think I could assure the appointive powers that every Republican would vote for his confirmation.

Question. Can you safely and with full confidence guarantee all those Republican votes?

Senator Dirksen. I guarantee nothing, but on my own honor and responsibility, I think I could deliver every Republican vote.

Question. Senator Dirksen, do you agree with Secretary Goldberg's recent statement that the Government should be a third party at the bargaining table?

Senator Dirksen. I doubt it very much. I'm afraid that if Government becomes a third party, that it no longer remains collective bargaining, because if you're going to bargain, the principals, parties at interest, have to do the bargaining. But if you have a third party as an intervener, can you say that it's collective bargaining?

Question. Then you do not feel that the national interest should have an equal hand?

Senator Dirksen. Oh, yes, but you're talking about a matter of procedure, not the national interest.

Question. Senator Dirksen, do you look with optimism at the forthcoming Geneva Conference?

Senator Dirksen. Well, I haven't been too optimistic heretofore, I must say. I always utter my hopes, and I hope, of course, that something good will come out of it. But on the basis of past experience, those hopes may be just a little high. And yet it's in the nature of humankind always to advance and to nurse their hopes.

Question. Senator Dirksen, how do you feel about the U.S. plan of trade assistance to underdeveloped foreign nations under Kennedy's trade expansion bill?

Senator Dirksen. Are you limiting your question now to trade with underdeveloped nations?

Question. No. Assisting these underdeveloped nations?

Senator Dirksen. Oh, well, we've been in that program for a long time. And we hope that insofar as we assist, it can become an efficient program and that it will add up finally to a better relationship and even a trade relationship between the United States and those nations that we assist.

Question. To return to disarmament negotiations, France has decided to boycott the conference. Can the West really hope to negotiate accurately without one of its most principal allies?

Senator Dirksen. Well, who shall say when President de Gaulle may come into the picture? If it has an element of success in it, if it goes forward, and if France finally discovers that it's in its own interest to do so, I would rather gather that sooner or later she would come into the picture.

Question. Speaking with cold realism, has the whole affair become just a meaningless gesture, kept up for the gesture's sake?

Senator Dirksen. You don't dare believe that it's a gesture just for a gesture's sake. Because, if that were the case, where would the hopes of mankind finally end?

Question. Senator should we ignore France's refusal to attend the conference?

Senator Dirksen. You can't entirely ignore France. Look at the strategic position that she occupies, and look at the troops and the people and the instrumentality that we have in France at the present time. She can't be ignored.

Question. How would our foreign policy be affected if we resume nuclear testing?

Senator Dirksen. You say how would it be affected?

Question. Yes, sir.

Senator Dirksen. Well, I think it will be affected in a sense that there will be more confidence in the capacity of this country to deal with any situation that might arise, and when all is said and done, it is not so much love and affection as respect and confidence that finally makes the world go forward and brings them into a cooperative status.

Barber. Senator Dirksen, speaking of respect, some critics are rather hard on you and Mr. Halleck at your weekly news conferences, and in the introduction to this program I made reference to the "Ev and Charlie" show. I asked you this a year ago and you were not offended by this tag. I would like to restate that question. After another year of the "Ev and Charlie" show and reporters reactions to it, are you offended when it's referred to as such?

Senator Dirksen. Oh goodness no. And I was assailed way out on the west coast, then I knew that the "Ev and Charlie" show had really penetrated the country.

Question. Senator Dirksen, I would like to change the subject. Mr. Powers is said to have said as he was brought into a Russian courtroom: "I have committed a grave crime and I realize that I must be punished for it." In view of the fact that he voluntarily accepted this well-paying job, why would he say this? Doesn't it seem a little unpatriotic?

Senator Dirksen. Well, my dear, I must make you a confession. I try to keep abreast of nearly everything that goes on, but I'm afraid the days that I've been away from Washington doing a little campaigning incidentally, why that sort of got out of mind and out of eye with me, and I would have to refresh myself a little more on that story before I could give you a proper answer.

Question. Was the depression, Senator, in American prestige caused by Francis Gary Powers' U-2 incident?

Senator Dirksen. I didn't get the first of your question?

Question. Oh, was American prestige—the depression that was caused by Francis Gary Powers' U-2 incident—was this made up for by John Glenn's flight around the earth?

Senator Dirksen. Well, I think it has helped to rehabilitate our prestige in that field.

Question. Senator, do you know when Mr. Powers will be brought before the Senate and House?

Senator Dirksen. Well, he has testified at various places already, and how much more testimony he will give I do not know.

Question. Is South Vietnam, Senator, becoming another hot spot in the world?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, it is a hot spot to say the least. And I can speak with some authority because I have been there three times and had a chance to evaluate the situation all the way from the Red River Delta up into Hanoi down to Saigon and south of Saigon. And to say the least, it is a hot spot.

Question. What can the United States do to alleviate some of the hotness of this spot?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, of course, we are privileged to send equipment in there, and we are privileged to give them some training up to a point because we did subscribe, I think, in a general way, to the Geneva undertaking that was subscribed to in 1954. And so we hoped that means of the coaching and the instruction and such equipment as we can give them, that they can at long last hold their own and maintain the integrity and the sovereignty of South Vietnam.

BARBER. Would you favor committing American troops, Senator DIRKSEN, in order to save South Vietnam?

Senator DIRKSEN. I do not believe there is any desire to commit American troops there, and you have to rationalize that against what was written in that undertaking in Geneva 8 years ago.

Question. Senator, in toughening our defense stands from all-out nuclear war to the twilight zone as Secretary McNamara called it, are we in danger of crossing the line from a defensive policy to an aggressively defensive one?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, that's one of those amorphous and vague lines that you never can tell until you're confronted with it. I suppose you mean whether we go from limited conventional war into nuclear war. Obviously, you can't tell until you're confronted with the realities of a condition. And then those best versed and schooled in that field have to come up with the answer.

Question. Senator, to get back to legislation problems, would you support a Federal aid to education bill if it provided aid for parochial schools specifically?

Senator DIRKSEN. I doubt it very much because I've been congenitally against aid to education from the Federal level as was envisioned in the omnibus aid to education bill, on the grounds that I believe it will inevitably result in Federal control of school curriculums.

Question. Senator, has Congress found it a necessity for the Federal Government to step into education in Congress?

Senator DIRKSEN. In what respect?

Question. Has Congress seen a necessity that warrants President Kennedy's bill which is not up?

Senator DIRKSEN. No, I don't believe the viewpoint of Congress has materially changed since last year.

Question. Can the Russians use a threat of war as a gambit to force us into conditions which we will not—we do not exactly approve of?

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, that question is too vague and I just can't give you an answer to it unless you particularize.

Question. In other words, if Russia would threaten a war and demand certain terms concerning Berlin—the divided city—the removal of Western troops from Berlin—and as a threat uses threat of war against us, would we take up their gambit, or would we withdraw?

Senator DIRKSEN. It depends on how far they go. They've been threatening for the last 20 years, and we've become more or less accustomed to their threats. That's part of their propaganda stock in trade. The question is do they implement it with some kind of action that makes it a real threat that would require some definite action on our part. And you see that's a rather undefined line and obviously no one could give you an answer to it unless he knows what the conditions are.

BARBER. Senator DIRKSEN and panel, I'm afraid our time has run out for our answers but we'll be back with a final word from our guest in just a moment.

Senator DIRKSEN, it's been a pleasure having you on "Youth Wants To Know."

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, coming back on the show is like a salute to an old friend, Ted Granik, and I'm delighted to see you all.

BARBER. Thank you, sir. And our thanks to our panel members and thank you, ladies and gentlemen for joining us. Now this is Julian Barber inviting you to be with us again next week when our guest will be another well-known figure of prominence in the news.

ANNOUNCER. Tune in again next Sunday at 6:30 for "Youth Wants To Know," presented by American Security and Trust Company where Greater Washington banks.

AMERICAN REVOLUTIONISTS OF 1776 AS CONSERVATIVES

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in these days when there is so much discussion of the extreme left and the extreme right, as well as a search for proper definitions and descriptions of such terms as "liberal" and "conservative," it is refreshing to have the very clearly thought-out analysis of a longtime student of government, such as Lt. Gov. Dwight Burney of Nebraska.

When the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] spoke at a University of Nebraska convocation in Lincoln recently, a student asked, "You say Americans are fundamentally conservative. Was the American Revolution a conservative movement?"

In the informal give and take of a question and answer session with a college audience, the Senator's answer was that the Founding Fathers were part liberal, part conservative. The questioning then moved on to another subject. But the student's query remained with Governor Burney and he has developed a thoughtful expression in its response.

He points out that the American Revolution was fought because an oppressive King, by simple edict, imposed heavy taxes and dictated many of the phases of people's lives. Hence the Revolution was a revolt against a powerful central government. It was fought by people seeking liberty for themselves and their posterity. Those revolutionists and the framers of our Constitution went to great lengths to stress the point of liberty, states Governor Burney. They may have been liberal with their lives, but conservative with the liberty of their future generations.

Then his statement goes on to outline some of the trends and the programs which we have before us today and it is observed that we are handing to posterity "a Central Government that is growing in size and power until in the conceivable future, this Central Government will be as powerful over individual lives as that from which our forefathers fought so valiantly to break away."

Thereupon Governor Burney concludes his statement by these words:

> The liberal would increase this Federal growth and power. The conservative would try to curb this growth. The people of the Revolution fought to get away from a powerful central government; hence, it is my conclusion that they were fundamentally conservative.

Any extended consideration of the question posed at the student convocation would certainly take into consideration that the leaders of the Revolution were men of substance. They were wealthy landowners in large part. The professional men and the businessmen of the Nation compose the rank and file of those who took their lives, their fortunes, as well as their sacred honor, into that hazardous venture against the powerful king of a great empire. They were men who had a great deal to lose, but it cannot be said that they were visionaries in the sense of engaging in unstable, unbalanced, impracticable schemes of something for everybody but no cost to anyone. The Constitution which they wrote in 1787 proved this. A reading of George Washington's "Farewell Address" proves it also.

Mr. President, Governor Burney, who served as Governor of Nebraska for a short time in 1960 following the death of Gov. Ralph Brooks, is a serious and perceptive student of government. He served 12 years in Nebraska's unicameral legislature. Three times he has been elected as Lieutenant Governor. He served as speaker of the legislature. He has served on many committees which have enabled him to become well acquainted with governmental processes, local, State, and National.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of his statement entitled "In Answer," be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on this same subject of whether American revolutionaries of 1776 were conservative or liberal, the very distinguished political writer, William L. White, also spoke recently. He did so in his article in Harper's magazine entitled, "How To Tell a Real Conservative From All Those Other Conservatives."

In his conclusion on this subject, Mr. White points out that the liberal is hotly compassionate toward people in the abstract and in the mass; his essential respect goes to "The Common People" in the collective sense.

Mr. White goes on to say in his conclusion that the conservative is warmly and unalterably compassionate toward the individual; his essential respect goes not so much to mankind as to man. Then Mr. White's concluding sentences read:

> The 18th century French revolutionary was liberal. The 18th century American revolutionary was, and remains, the type of the modern conservative. Or so, at least, it seems to me.

The Omaha World-Herald in an April 9 editorial, "Conservative Founders," concerned itself with Governor Burney's statement as well as with the Honorable William L. White's article in Harper's.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of that editorial be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATIVE FOUNDERS

Were the Founding Fathers "conservatives"? Senator GOLDWATER answered the question at Lincoln with what some considered a facetious reply. He said they were part liberal, part conservative.

Lt. Gov. Dwight Burney disagrees. He said that since Washington, Jefferson and company were trying to get away from a powerful central government, it is his conclusion they were "fundamentally conservative."

This view is shared by political writer William L. White in a current article in Harper's magazine, "How To Tell a Real Conservative From All Those Other Conservatives." Says Mr. White in his conclusion:

"The liberal is hotly (though sometimes fitfully) compassionate toward people in the abstract and in the mass; his essential respect goes to the common people in the collective sense. The conservative is warmly, and unalterably, compassionate to the individual; his essential respect goes not so much to mankind as to man. The 18th-century French revolutionary was liberal. The 18th-century American revolutionary was, and remains, the type figure of the modern conservative. Or so, at least, it seems to me."

EXHIBIT 1

IN ANSWER

The item that induced me to write this statement was taken from the Lincoln Journal, about a speech by Senator GOLDWATER given in the university coliseum. According to the story, someone asked the question, "You say Americans are fundamentally conservative. Was the American Revolution a conservative movement?" It seems that the Senator may have considered the question to be of a facetious nature as he passed it off lightly. I feel, however, that it should be answered fully and that is what I propose to do.

Naturally the question arises, "What brought on the American Revolution?" It was, according to my recollection of history, because of an oppressive king who by simple edict could impose heavy taxes and dictate many of the phases of people's lives such as imposing certain religious affiliations. In other words, it was a revolt against a powerful central government. The war was fought by people seeking liberty for themselves and their posterity. They were willing to give their all for the cause of liberty. Just so with the framers of our Constitution. They went to great lengths to stress the point of liberty. They, of the Revolution, may have been liberal with their lives but conservative with the liberty of their future generations.

Just what are we doing today to preserve for our posterity, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? We are endeavoring to keep everyone of the present generation well fed, well clothed, and well housed in a standard of living far above that of 40 years ago and far above most other people of the world. This would seem very desirable and I believe no one would object, if we did not try to consider and understand the cost someone must pay.

Just what are we preserving for our posterity? This we know. We are teaching them to expect this standard of living, inflated materially by Federal pump priming. We handed to them a Federal Government whose budget is approaching $100 billion a year. It, too, is highly inflated by Federal pump priming. We are handing to them a Federal debt of nearly $300 billion that has been growing by several billion nearly every year and the end is not yet. This, too, is highly inflated because of Federal pump priming. These things we are doing to our posterity during times of high productivity and relatively high prosperity. We are handing to them a Central Government that is growing in size and power until in the conceivable future this Central Government will be as powerful over individual lives as that from which our forefathers fought so valiently to break away.

The liberal would increase this Federal growth and power. The conservative would try to curb this growth. The people of the Revolution fought to get away from a powerful central government, hence it is my conclusion that they were fundamentally conservative.

JOSEPH KENNEDY'S CHICAGO MART TO RAISE RENTS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a news dispatch from Chicago, published in the Wall Street Journal of April 16, 1962, announcing that the Merchandise Mart, owned by President Kennedy's father, Mr. Joseph Kennedy, is boosting rents from 3 percent to 5 percent on renewals of expiring leases.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOSEPH KENNEDY'S CHICAGO MART TO RAISE SOME RENTS

CHICAGO.—The Merchandise Mart, owned by President Kennedy's father, is boosting some rents 3 percent to 5 percent on renewals of expiring leases.

"The raises are necessitated by increased operating costs, principally labor and taxes," Wallace O. Ollman, general manager, commented.

Mr. Ollman said not all expiring leases would be affected this year but he declined to estimate the percentage involved. The expiring leases have been in effect a minimum of 3 years.

The 18-story building, containing 92 acres of floor space and 7.5 miles of corridors, is devoted mainly to showrooms for the home furnishings and appliance industries.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 more minute.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. Wallace O. Ollman, general manager, commented:

> The raises are necessitated by increased operating costs, principally labor and taxes.

This 18-story building, containing 92 acres of floor space and 7½ miles of corridors, is devoted mainly to showrooms for the home furnishings and appliance industries.

I imagine this article will be of great interest to consumers, particularly those who pay rent. It is not the thought of the Senator from Nebraska to ask for any commission to be appointed, or for any law to be passed which would require notices of rent raises like this to be filed in advance, but nonetheless the buyers of washing machines, of draperies, of deep freezes and of furniture and those who pay rent will be interested, as consumers. They are, after all, that class of the people for which the President expressed such great concern in his recent message to the Congress on that subject.

WARSAW GHETTO DAY

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, Governor Rockefeller has issued a proclamation proclaiming April 19, 1962, Warsaw Ghetto Day in New York State. On April 19, 1943, the strong-spirited Jewish inhabitants of the Warsaw Ghetto revolted against Nazi tyranny. The struggle of these people in their fight for freedom will be honored with great dignity in New York State.

On April 3, 1962, I introduced, for appropriate reference, and in conjunction with the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, a joint resolution to mark the first day of May 1962 in recognition of that heroic battle.

The difference in dates depends upon whether one uses the Gregorian calendar, in which case the day would be April 19, or the Hebraic Judiac calendar, in which case the date would be May 1.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, to which the resolution was referred, I shall follow with close interest efforts to win national observance of this heroic but hopeless fight for freedom.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of Governor Rockefeller's proclamation in the RECORD following my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair.) Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK

On April 19, 1943 the world witnessed a scene of incredible valor in the revolt of the Jewish inhabitants of the Warsaw Ghetto. Hopelessly outnumbered from the start, knowing they would fail and without moderns arms, they rose in rebellion against the might of the Nazi military war machine.

Faith and spirit were greater than material things, for at first their hopeless rebellion was successful. With the bravery of desperation they threw back the first attack of the storm troopers who had been sent to liquidate them. It took the full fury of the then irresistible German Army to crush them.

These unforgettable patriots fought to death as martyrs in the cause of freedom. On this day we honor them as God-fearing men and women who preferred to die fighting rather than to live on bended knees in humiliation and slavery.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim April 19, 1962, as Warsaw Ghetto Day in New York State.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 29th day of March in the year of our Lord 1962.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. ROMAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

SENATOR SCOTT ON "YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW"

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, on Sunday, March 25, I had the pleasure of watching Theodore Granik's "Youth Wants To Know" program on which our distinguished friend and colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], appeared. The questions put to him were penetrating and provocative, and demonstrated the deep interest of youth in their Government and in international affairs.

Madam President, this is a fine and important public service, and I ask unanimous consent that following these remarks the transcript of this excellent program with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Youth Wants To Know

Question. Senator Scott, what can be done to save the Republican Party?

Question. Senator Scott, won't President Kennedy's trade program injure American business?

Question. Senator Scott, isn't President Kennedy failing to give us the dynamic leadership we desperately need?

Mr. Barber. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to "Youth Wants To Know." Our guest is Republican Senator Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania. Prior to his election to the Senate in 1958, Senator Scott served eight terms in the House of Representatives. A former Republican national chairman, he has the reputation of being quite outspoken and hard hitting in his criticism of his rival party. Senator Scott is a member of the Public Works Committee and the Committee on Commerce. Senator Scott, it's a pleasure to welcome you once again to "Youth Wants To Know." Now let's begin our questioning with Al.

Question. Senator, why has the Congress failed to cooperate with President Kennedy's legislative proposals?

Senator Scott. Because the Congress is one of the three coordinate bodies and the people elected the Congress to exercise their own judgment. That's why they are the Congress. And obviously we must examine these proposals. Several matters which have been deemed to be good and worthwhile, have been approved by the Congress.

Question. Well, the Congress has passed no major legislative action of the administration. Would you say that the President has failed to lead the country effectively?

Senator Scott. Well, the President has received the manpower retraining bill. It was, as you remember, in the House of Representatives, a Republican bill which the Democratic Party accepted. It was a little tighter bill, provided a little more orderly rules for its operation. So the President will get just about whatever he asks for in national defense measures. He may be disappointed in other areas. I would say that the President hasn't failed in sending messages. They say for every mess there's a message. But he has not been very successful in getting legislation just as he experienced as a Senator—almost none of his bills got through. He's entitled to a little better treatment, I think, than he's gotten.

Question. But Senator, can the Nation afford a period in which there is no dynamic leadership in which the Congress refuses to pass the President's bills and no other leader does emerge?

Senator Scott. Well, the Congress has said—and it always says with every President—we know that when you send a message up you want to please everybody. We know that there's going to be another election and you're looking at the various pressure groups and the voters. But we have the responsibility as a body to decide whether it's good legislation, and that is why, in the House of Representatives, no education bill has come out because they haven't been able to agree on what they think is a good one. That is why we are delayed in other legislation. I think the President will get some of the things he asks in modified form before this session ends.

Question. Senator Scott, as an example of this, it's been said that the White House has created an atmosphere of misinformation concerning their trade extension bill. Have you found this to be so?

Senator Scott. Well, I think perhaps the President gives the country the impression that there's an easy answer to these bills like the trade bill. It is a very difficult thing. We've got to do something about competing with the European Common Market and the rest of the world. But what the President has to convince the Congress of is that in his bill there will be sufficient protection for the so-called injured or distressed industries so that they cannot be forced to bear the burden for all the prosperous industries of the inevitable change in our tariff and other trade legislation. I would have to be convinced, as most Senators, I think, that our textile industry, ceramics, glass, leather, and other industries were not going to be driven to the walls. But if we can get some kind of protection we all face the fact that there must be new trade legislation of some kind.

Question. Senator, it's been charged about this tariff bill that it's pushing aside domestic economic interests for foreign prestige and a betterment of foreign relations. Would you agree with this?

Senator Scott. I don't entirely agree with that, no. I think some of the wording in the message is designed to appeal to foreign countries. I do think that we have not yet seen whether the bill is sufficiently realistic in meeting the competition of West Germany, Japan, Hong Kong, and so on. I would say that the President should address his concern to our national problem, fully as much as he should to the problem of getting a good headline or goodwill in foreign countries. In fact, if I were to be critical of the President tonight, it would be along the area where I think he has failed to retain the goodwill of some of our own allies, like Great Britain, Portugal, France. I wish when some of the Kennedy family travel abroad, they would go to see Lisbon, which was the country aggressed against rather than spending all their time courting old man Nehru, the principal aggressor of this period.

Question. Would you then say that President Kennedy has gained the United States new friends abroad?

Senator Scott. Well, I think he's lost us some of the old ones. He seems to be devoting so much time to India that we ought to have a friend in India, but I don't find that the Indians reciprocate that way. The more we try to woo them, the more they lean toward pacifying and placating Russia. We have some new friends, yes, in the emerging African countries. I think there's hope that some of them are going to be friends of ours; others are neutrals for profit.

Question. Well, how can you hope the new nations—especially the new African nations—to be friendly to us if we keep courting Portugal, as you suggested before?

Senator Scott. I don't suggest that we court Portugal. I suggest that we be fair to an old ally—to Portugal. When Goa was taken from Portugal, we allowed our action in the United Nations in the Security Council to be vetoed without even taking it to the General Assembly where we had a chance to plead the cause of a nation who was being victimized by aggressive India. India was plenty aggressive in dealing with Goa, because Portugal was too far away to protect it. And yet they are weak kneed when they're dealing with Red China and with Russia. I think we ought to be fair in these things, and instead of being guided entirely by colonial or anticolonialist policies, we ought to consider we also owe an obligation to our old allies as well as to our new friends. And I don't think we're doing that in our treatment of the Netherlands or of Portugal. I'm not saying we have to woo them, but let somebody at least stop off in Lisbon and say a kind word sometimes.

Question. You mentioned India. Do you think the First Lady is making any significant contribution to American prestige?

Senator Scott. I think the First Lady of the United States makes a contribution wherever she goes. She's beautiful; she has winning ways; and there's a tremendous outpouring of enthusiasm. After all, we Republicans can't compete against Mrs. Kennedy or Caroline. But we get a little bit fed up with Teddy and Bobby and the whole dynasty and the total entourage. There are just too doggoned many Kennedys to make sense in an American government where you ought to have one President and the rest of the people working for him, instead of all being part of one family—one big happy family.

Mr. Barber. Senator, do you think you're going to be welcoming another Kennedy to the U.S. Senate soon?

Senator Scott. That's up to the voters of Massachusetts, whose discretion and judgment, I hope, will give us a Republican Senator.

Question. Senator, are you suggesting, then, that the United States and India should get together—should become a little bit more friendly?

Senator Scott. We've tried everything—food, money, gifts, military assistance. And I have nothing against India. I've been there as a delegate. I have many Indian friends, and I have them here and in India. I simply think that this particular administration has gone overboard in treating India as if it were the most important ally we could have, and you're not going to get them as an ally at all. They're going to be neutral, and the more you try to be nice to them, the more neutral they're going to be. And, unlike the Irish—an Irishman always knows who he's neutral against, you see. But the Indians are resolutely neutral, in a way which never helps us in the United Nations, and doesn't help us in Asia. And, therefore, we have to look to countries like Thailand, Vietnam, and the Philippines to find our true friends. And if I had my way about it, I would form an alliance for liberty in the world, an alliance which would consist of every nation which was willing to say it takes its affirmative side with the free nations of the world for liberty, rather than merely to be a neutralist for profit.

Question. Senator Scott, you mentioned the Kennedy family in Washington. Do you think President Kennedy could be accused of nepotism in Government affairs?

Senator Scott. The very definition of the word "nepotism" is to prefer or to appoint or to advance one's relatives to public office. And if President Kennedy hasn't done that, no man alive was ever guilty of nepotism.

Question. Senator, you mentioned an alliance for liberty. Would our present allies, Portugal and Spain, who are now controlled by two men, would they be included in this alliance for liberty?

Senator Scott. I would say any nation—and I realize there are some small nations who can't afford to be anything but neutral. They live too close to the enemy. But any nation which is willing to assert affirmatively and to vote accordingly in favor of the general program of freedom against Soviet slavery and communism, ought to be included, whatever that nation is. And you would have among them, nations which are not following necessarily the republican form of government. They aren't all federated republics like we are.

Question. Well, I don't think we're talking about republican form of government. I mean democratic form of government.

Senator Scott. This is a federated Republic. It's only a democracy when a Democratic President or Democratic orator is talking. It's still a federated Republic. That's what the Constitution says. That's why I use the correct term. I realize it's a losing game, but I still use the phrase.

Question. Using the term loosely, "democratic," would you say that Spain and Portugal—which I would say are dictatorships—would you say they fit into this loose term of democratic countries?

Senator Scott. Well, in every major war we've been in we have had allies who could be classed as being ruled by one man or as being dictatorships. We are awfully busy helping dictatorships in South American countries. And we don't question whether they are not. We do not interfere in the internal affairs of any other country. I have heard people say you shouldn't help Spain because it's a dictatorship, but you should help Portugal because it's a modern revolutionary country. Well Tito is fully as much a dictator as Franco. You should help your friends. You should stand your enemies off, and you should treat the neutrals to the degree to which you believe that treatment is advancing the cause of freedom and the security of the United States.

Question. Are you suggesting, sir, that in the case of Belgian activities in the Congo that we would have had to support Tshombe or the Belgian stand?

Senator Scott. Well I don't know if you can equate the Belgian stand with Tshombe. It was Belgium which gave the Congo freedom—perhaps prematurely—which led to much of this trouble. I am not one who assumes that Tshombe is necessarily all good or Adula is necessarily all bad. I do say that when O'Brien, who was the commander of the Congo forces of the U.N., was there, he favored the Communists in the Congo and he opposed Katanga and Tshombe who were anti-Communists and it's interesting that O'Brien has now become a member of the faculty of the University of Ghana—a Communist allied country. So, we had a clear pro-Communist as the leader of the U.N. forces in the Congo, and I was sure against that.

Question. Senator, what dictatorships are we now supporting in South America?

Senator Scott. Well, I would say—I don't want to give offense to any of them—but I would say that Ecuador is pretty much of a dictatorship. Bolivia is regarded as pretty much of a dictatorship. Uruguay is a democracy with a small d. Brazil changes from one form to the other. Argentina appears to be heading toward a dictatorship this week.

Question. Speaking of Argentina, was it unwise of President Kennedy to give $150 million worth of Alliance for Progress aid several weeks before their rather controversial election?

Senator Scott. Well, it seems we never do know what's going to happen in these countries. I don't know whether that's the fault of our intelligence or not. President Kennedy used to say as a candidate that we ought to know more about these countries before we get into these messes. And he's getting into the same old messes that other administrations have gotten in, only, I think, worse. And the extension of the money to Argentina may have been good or it may have been bad. But it seems to have been based on information indicating Frondizi would survive. And now it appears he can only survive with the support of the army and a dictatorial form of government. I don't know whether the particular money is wisely spent. I know the Alliance for Progress is having rough going, and conditions in South America are worse now than they were at the period when Candidate Kennedy was criticizing them.

Question. Senator Scott, do you believe that it would be possible for certain Latin American countries to effectuate needed social and economic reforms? And do you think the Alliance for Progress will furnish necessary incentive to accomplish this goal?

Senator Scott. Well, I hope it will. That's why I voted for the program. I also voted for an amendment which would cut the interest rate to 8 percent, which these countries would be allowed to charge their people. I don't know whether it is generally known or not, but the money we give down there which we pay about 4 percent for or less, they can charge up to 20 percent interest in some of these countries, and the bankers and the rich families charge this money, and the rich get richer and the poor get poorer in some of these Latin American countries. Now I think that we should insist that our money go to housing projects, for irrigation, to ending malaria and other tropical disease, that it should go to teaching the teachers how to teach, to improving the school system, to raising the standard of living. When it merely goes to bankers to lend 20 percent to a corporation that builds houses, and has to charge a higher rate than it ought to charge, I don't think that is the purpose of the Alliance for Progress.

Question. Well, since you have this criticism of the program, Senator, do you think it has failed completely?

Senator Scott. No, I do not. I think the program undoubtedly is helpful in some countries, but we have no report on it yet to show that in any given country the standard of living has been raised. Personally, I think we are going to find that the standard of living probably has been improved in Peru, for example. We are going to find, I think, the standard of living may have been improved in Chile, which has had a terrible inflation. And, undoubtedly, in other Latin American countries. But we are wasting some of the money by letting the grabbers, the usurers, charge too much interest.

Question. Senator, how would you suggest that we insure that our money that we send to these countries be spent for the things we wish it to be spent for?

Senator Scott. Well, I think that is an administrative problem, which rests squarely on the President and the Secretary of State, and also we could have raised the standard of living, as I say, by adopting the amendment I favored to cut the interest rate down—not to the 6-percent level here in Washington—but to 8 percent. We could have done that, and we could insist, and I hope we will in the future insist more strongly, on safeguards for the program. But we will have to wait for the first anniversary report before we can comment further.

Question. Do you think that these weakened social-economic conditions in Latin America will lead to the spread of Castro's communism?

Senator Scott. I think Castro's communism is spreading very definitely in Latin America today. And I do not see that our State Department or our Government has done much effectively to stop it, in spite of the Punta del Este Conference.

Mr. Barber. Isn't the Alliance for Progress, Senator, a deterrent to communism—to the spread of communism?

Senator Scott. It's intended to be, and I'm sorry to say, as I view it—and I'm not on the Foreign Relations Committee, I'm not an expert, just from what you can see and read, and what I have been told in certain briefings—in my judgment it is not stopping the spread of communism. It has, to some degree, deterred the spread of Castroism in Mexico and in a few limited areas. But communism is certainly spreading in Latin America today.

Question. Specifically, how can we stop communism if the present administration isn't doing it?

Senator Scott. I'm not sure we can stop it entirely. We weren't able to stop it elsewhere in the world. But we have held it back successfully in places like Siam and Thailand with military aid, with treaties, and with economic aid. And I think that economic aid to South America is warranted if we can have these safeguards applied. I just think the Democratic Party is not doing a very good housekeeping job; when you hand them a lot of money, they just don't seem to know what to do with it, unless it gets near election time in the United States, and then they have some very definite ideas.

Question. Senator, what about the use of actual force in connection with Castro and communism?

Senator Scott. Well, I thought we should have used more force at the time. That's crying over spilled milk. I believe that we should continue to press for Organization of American States action to extend to actual boycott and further economic restrictions than we are now getting.

Question. What about more military force now—I mean now and in the future?

Senator Scott. Well, I don't think an invasion of Cuba would be warranted now because they have had a chance to build their forces up so greatly than an invasion of Cuba would be a tremendously expensive thing in the casualties—it might be as bad as Korea. I think we ought to try to strangle the dictatorship of Cuba economically. And I would be in favor of boycott. I would even be in favor, under certain circumstances, of military blockades. I would not favor an invasion at this time.

Question. Senator, doesn't the present Cuban problem stem largely from the fact that President Eisenhower did not act while the Cuban revolution was in its formative stages?

Senator Scott. No, that has nothing to do with it. It's a good democratic question, but it doesn't have any fact behind it. President Eisenhower authorized training of Cuban refugees but, as he has told me himself, he did not authorize any invasion plan, and he has indicated to others, and I might say without quoting him, he has indicated to me that as the Commander in Chief of the United States he would never have gone about the invasion the way it was done by an inexperienced young ex-lieutenant commander or lieutenant.

Question. Senator Scott, you seem to think the economic blockade is working effectively—or starting to work effectively. Would you suggest then that we stop selling materials to the countries who are selling goods to Cuba as a more effective economic blockade of Cuba?

Senator Scott. Well, that gets you into secondary boycotts and also gets you into a great deal of trouble with our very best friend and neighbor, Canada. I don't think it's feasible. I think if we start messing around with Canada and Britain on these matters, we'll do more harm than good. We ought diplomatically to try to persuade them to decrease their trade to Cuba, yes. But we shouldn't try to invoke any penalties on them. I don't think it would be wise.

Question. Senator, do you think the Government should permit the exporting firm in Seattle to sell to Communist China?

Senator SCOTT. I am against any American sales to Communist China of any kind or description whatever.

Question. Senator, there are hundreds of thousands of people starving in Communist China. Does this mean that we are not humane enough to put aside our political——

Senator SCOTT. No, it does not. It means that Communist China, while its people are starving, is shipping the same wheat to Albania, in order to maintain Albania on the Mediterranean as a socialist enemy of Russia to provoke a war between them. I would say this—if the Red Chinese would permit American free gifts of wheat and other foods to Red China, with distribution supervised by the Red Cross from Geneva, I would favor it. Anywhere we can meet human suffering by American contribution, individually or Government, I'm for doing it. But I'm not for selling them wheat so that they can starve their own people and turn around and sell the wheat to Albania.

Question. Senator, what can the Government do to prevent the new Government of Algeria from going to the Communists as certain signs indicate that it might?

Senator SCOTT. I don't know that there's very much that we can do to prevent it except what we're doing in other countries—that is, by offer of economic as distinguished from military aid, and I certainly wouldn't favor any military aid to Algeria under any circumstances. The situation is bad enough now, and beyond the representations which friends of Algeria might make to her, there's very little we can do. But we have to hold the line wherever we can against communism. Algeria may be a very bad place to hold it.

Mr. BARBER. Senator Scott, I'm sorry but on that note we must stop for a moment. However, we'll be back in just a moment with a final question for Senator Scott.

John, do you have a final question?

Question. Senator SCOTT, was your reason for withdrawing from the Pennsylvania gubernatorial race just a political maneuvering to eliminate some people from the race?

Senator SCOTT. No, my purpose in withdrawing was to secure the strongest possible ticket and to give Pennsylvania Republicanism the chance to go in with the best we had to bring Pennsylvania back into the Republican fold. And in declaring for Governor, and withdrawing when we got the man I wanted all along, BILL SCRANTON, we have a good ticket, and such a ticket ought to win if we work hard enough.

Question. Senator, former President Eisenhower said he favored youth and experience in the Republican slate in the upcoming elections. Mr. SCRANTON has youth, but does he really have experience?

Senator SCOTT. We have both youth and experience on the ticket. Mr. SCRANTON has been a very successful member of his community. He knows the industry and industrial problems of Pennsylvania and its labor problems. He is a Congressman, and he has youth and experience. And Representative VAN ZANDT has had the maturity of some 20 years' experience in Congress and in the Federal Government. And it's a very well balanced ticket.

Mr. BARBER. Senator SCOTT, I'm sorry, we are just out of time. Thank you for being our guest. It's been a pleasure having you on "Youth Wants To Know." Thanks to our panel, and thanks to you ladies and gentlemen for joining us.

"MIKE" MICHAELIS—A GREAT SOLDIER

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, since August 21, 1959, Maj. Gen. J. H. Michaelis has commanded the U.S. Army, Alaska. It was with regret, mixed with satisfaction, that Alaskans learned recently that this outstanding officer, who has become a real part of the northern community, is being promoted to the rank of lieutenant general, and will soon leave the 49th State to assume command of the V Corps, U.S. Army, in Frankfort. The regret is natural and spontaneous because Alaskans know that they will lose—at least for the time being—a true and trusted friend, as well as an outstanding citizen. The satisfaction lies in their knowledge that Gen. John Michaelis is moving on with higher rank and greater responsibilities to an area of the world demanding the superior judgment and strength with which his 31-year Army career has been distinguished.

John Michaelis is a native son of California who spent many of his younger years in the East. He began his military career in 1931 as an Army enlistee. He served as a private with the 29th Infantry for 1 year when he gained admission to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

December 7, 1941, found Michaelis a captain in the U.S. Army, and at 28 years of age he joined the original 501st Parachute Battalion. Following a brief tour in the Canal Zone as commander of Company B of the Parachute Battalion, Michaelis returned to the United States to attend the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. By June 1943, Michaelis held the rank of lieutenant colonel and shipped over to Europe with the 502d Parachute Infantry as regimental executive officer.

With the launching of the Normandy invasion of June 6, 1944, he assumed command of the 502d Parachute Infantry, 101st Airborne Division. His first battlefield promotion—to colonel—followed in July.

The history of the regiment under Michaelis' command is one of unbelievable valor and achievement. The regiment was awarded the Distinguished Unit Citation for its action in the initial invasion. For a later assault in Holland, the unit was awarded the Netherlands Orange Lanyard, equivalent to the U.S. citation. Michaelis was twice wounded in 3 days during the Holland operation. After battlefield surgery he was evacuated to a field hospital, but only after 8 days' delay due to enemy action covering the evacuation route.

Seriously injured in September, Michaelis was back on duty in December 1944 as chief of staff for the 101st Airborne Division during the storied stand at Bastogne—famous for General McAuliffe's reply, "Nuts," to the commander of the German corps surrounding his division. The entire division was awarded the Distinguished Unit Citation for the Bastogne action.

Michaelis was finally returned to the United States in March 1945. The wounds he received in the assault on Holland had reopened and hospitalization was required.

In July 1945 Michaelis was ready to assume new duties. Until 1949, he served in the United States, reverting to the rank of lieutenant colonel in 1947 under departmental policies necessitated by demobilization. During this period of relative military peace he served as Chief of the Officers' Division and later Chief of Manpower Procurement Division, War Department General Staff, and then as senior aide to General of the Army Dwight Eisenhower. For a time Michaelis was sent to do battle on a field far different from that to which he had become accustomed, when he was assigned as the Department of the Army liaison officer with the House Armed Services Committee. Six months later, in September 1948, he entered the Armed Forces Staff College at Norfolk, Va., from which he graduated in February 1949.

In March 1949, General Michaelis became assistant chief of staff for operations of the 8th U.S. Army in Japan. In the desperate days at the outbreak of the Korean conflict, his immediate reassignment was ordered by the Army commander in Japan assigning him the command of the 27th Infantry—Wolfhound—Regiment.

Under the brilliant leadership of General, then Colonel, Michaelis, the Wolfhound Regiment became the first unit to stop the rampaging North Koreans when they tore into the South Korean 2d Division in the mountainous terrain around Hwanggan during the latter part of July 1950. After this action the 27th Infantry became General Walker's fire brigade and General Michaelis became known as the "fire chief." Wherever the fighting was thickest and the pressure the greatest there would be the magnificent Wolfhounds.

In September 1950 General Michaelis showed that his own courage matched the valor of his regiment. When the enemy threatened to break through his position and perhaps penetrate the U.N. lines, General Michaelis crawled more than 500 yards under heavy fire to restore communications and call for an air strike which saved the situation. For this heroic action General Michaelis was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

During his 8-month command of the Wolfhounds in Korea, he received two battlefield promotions—from lieutenant colonel to brigadier general—and was awarded many decorations including the Distinguished Service Cross. Under his leadership, the regiment received two U.S. Distinguished Unit Citations and Korean Presidential Unit Citations.

In February 1951, General Michaelis became the assistant division commander of the 25th Infantry Division in Korea, and in June of that year he was transferred to General Eisenhower's headquarters in Paris, SHAPE, where he became a deputy for training of the 15 allied nations banded together under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—NATO. There he was given an additional assignment by General Eisenhower as his personal representative to the European Defense Force Conference—an effort that led to the entry of the German Army into the NATO forces and formed the basis of the European Coal and Steel Community, and the European Defense Community.

He was returned to the United States in August 1952 to become the Commandant of Cadets, U.S. Military Academy. In August 1954, the general was reassigned to headquarters, southern Europe—the supreme NATO headquarters for Italy, Turkey, and Greece, and in September 1955 was named as the first commanding general of the Southern European Task Force, the U.S. Army Atomic Command. This command was located in northern Italy.

Reminiscent of his earlier assignment to a House legislative committee, Michaelis returned from this command in October 1956 to the Office of the Secretary of the Army as the Chief of Army Legislative Liaison, the office responsible for the Army's congressional affairs. He was promoted to major general on December 1, 1956.

General Michaelis served as Chief of Army Legislative Liaison until his assignment to Alaska on August 21, 1959.

As commanding general, U.S. Army, Alaska, General Michaelis has made untiring efforts to improve our northern defense position. He recognized from the beginning of his assignment, as he has written, that Alaska is, in fact, "at the heart of the geopolitical picture." In a recent article published in the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register he wrote:

> Alaska provides a complete range of environments of the kinds in which future wars must be fought. Realistic research, training, and testing areas of practically unlimited size are available.
>
> Many agencies are now conducting aggressive development programs in Alaska. Here, Active Army forces are currently executing tactical missions. No other area available to the United States affords a comparable grouping of the means for defining and solving the problems of future war.
>
> The many mutually supporting activities which are bringing the concept of fast-moving, hard-hitting combat forces into reality in Alaska today are laying the groundwork for greater mobility and combat effectiveness for the entire Army tomorrow.

Madam President, as an Alaskan I regret that General Michaelis is leaving his command at Elmendorf Air Force Base. He will be missed by his many Alaskan friends. But, I and my fellow Alaskans recognize that such a man as he cannot be withheld when duty calls. He will assume his new command with the highest honors his country can offer. In addition to the Distinguished Service Cross, he holds the Silver Star with Oak Leaf Cluster—for valor—the Legion of Merit with three Oak Leaf Clusters—exceptional meritorious service—the Bronze Star with "V" Device and two Oak Leaf Clusters—valor—the Air Medal; and the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster.

Among his foreign decorations are the French Croix de Guerre with Palm; the Belgian Fourragers and Croix de Guerre with Palm; the Netherlands Bronze Lion; the Order of Merit of Italian Republic, Grade of Commander; the Korean Ulchi Distinguished Service Medal with Gold Star; and the Chilean Army Military Medal, first class.

But, above all else, John Hersey Michaelis holds the trust and confidence of his countrymen whom he has served with consistent excellence and valor over the past three turbulent decades.

NOMINATION OF EARL F. HAFFEY TO BE ASSAYER OF THE MINT AT DENVER, COLO.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, the Banking and Currency Committee has reported the nomination of Mr. Earl F. Haffey, of Colorado, to be assayer of the mint of the United States at Denver, Colo., with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief biography of Mr. Haffey, which the Treasury Department supplied to the committee, together with a letter from Senator Carroll endorsing the nomination, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the biography and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Earl F. Haffey

Born: June 3, 1900, at Durango, Colo.

Marital status: Married.

Education: B.A. degree, University of Colorado, 1925.

Employment: 1925–28, research chemist, Complex Ores Recoveries Co.; 1928–36, various positions as chemist, assayer, etc.; 1936–41, assayer, chemist with American Smelting & Refining Co.; 1941–43, assayer, American Smelting & Refining Co.; 1943–45, chemist and ore testing, Denver Equipment Co.; 1945 to date, owner and operator, Durango Assaying Co.

Memberships: Alpha Chi Sigma, Professional Chemical Society.

Other activities: Copatentee, flotation of oxide ores; developed Xanthate method for quantitative determination of copper.

Home address: 252 Third Avenue, Box 1202, Durango, Colo.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
March 28, 1962.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I write you to endorse President Kennedy's nomination of Mr. Earl F. Haffey, of Durango, Colo., to be assayer of the U.S. Mint at Denver, Colo.

Mr. Haffey is a graduate of the University of Colorado, having majored in chemistry and geology. His entire career—more than three decades—has been in the metallurgical, chemical, and assaying professions.

From 1925 until 1947 he worked in various metallurgical positions, largely performing research. He has had considerable experience as an assayer and chemist for the American Smelting & Refining Co., one of the leading companies in the field of metals.

In 1947 Mr. Haffey went into business for himself as owner and operator of the Durango Assaying Co. in his hometown. Durango is the heart of a huge area famed for many years for its rich metal resources.

Mr. Haffey has made a success of the assaying business there. In addition, he is very strongly endorsed by leading citizens of the area as a man of the highest character, intelligence, and diligence.

I endorse Mr. Haffey's nomination wholeheartedly and urge most respectfully that the committee do likewise.

Sincerely,

John A. Carroll.

DEVELOPMENT OF OIL SHALE RESERVES IN BRAZIL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a statement prepared by him on the subject of the development of oil shale reserves in Brazil, together with a letter and statement in that connection.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Allott

For a considerable length of time, I have been urging our Government to negotiate with our neighbors in Brazil regarding development of its oil shale. I made several speeches on the floor of the Senate last year calling attention to the opportunity which presented itself for us to implement our good neighbor policy and at the same time realize a benefit ourselves. The proposal, of mutual benefit, to which I call the Senate's attention once again, concerns itself with a loan to the Brazilian Government of $3.5 to $7 million for the purpose of constructing a research-prototype oil shale plant. There has been interest on the part of both Governments manifested but, to date, nothing concrete has developed. Of course, negotiations, in order to bear fruition, must ultimately result in a formal application from Brazil for such a loan, and as yet none has been received. Nevertheless, the recent visit of President Goulart brings this entire subject to the fore and I am hopeful that the talks which took place between President Kennedy and President Goulart included this all-important matter.

Brazil is dependent upon imports of oil to the extent of 165 million barrels annually in order to satisfy its needs. This figure will rise to 490 million barrels annually by 1970. On the other hand, it has deposits of oil shale which, if subjected to the extraction process, would materially alter that situation. Moreover, the United States should also be watching Soviet efforts to penetrate Latin America, and oil is one of the vehicles by which it intends to make this penetration. There is considerable urgency involved which is best illustrated by an article in the New York Times of March 18, 1962, written by Senor Juan de Onis. This article states quite clearly the reasons for such urgency. I submit for printing at the conclusion of this statement the very perceptive and comprehensive article by Senor de Onis.

The article points out that there is a shortage of foreign exchange in Brazil. Unless this sum is provided by the United States, there is every reason to believe that Brazil may be forced to turn to the Soviet Union for equipment, technicians, and money. The Soviets already have a shale oil plant in operation.

I earlier characterized this as a mutually advantageous proposal, and the reason for it is the fact that we, in this country, have substantial oil shale deposits in northwestern Colorado and surrounding States. The known reserves in this area amount to 1½ trillion barrels of oil. This represents more than double the known liquid petroleum reserves in the world today. Experimental work has been carried forward at the Rifle, Colo., plant, but we have now extracted all the useful data which this modest plant can supply, and we now need the technological information and data which can only be supplied by a plant of substantially greater capacity. The Brazilian proposal could furnish just that. Any agreement entered into by the United States and Brazil would undoubtedly carry with it the right to inspect the operation, obtain resulting data, as well as furnish American equipment.

I understand that President Goulart came to this country with a request for some $500 million in aid. Just this past week, an approved loan to Brazil was announced for the further development of its depressed areas in the northeast part of the country. While it may be difficult to assess priorities,

nevertheless, I am hopeful that the oil shale situation will be at the forefront in further considerations of assistance.

Last week, I wrote President Kennedy pointing up this entire situation with the hope that oil shale played a prominent part in the discussions recently concluded. A similar letter, which I submit for printing in the Record, was dispatched to Secretary Rusk.

It appears to me that in the projected expenditures under the Alliance for Progress, which total approximately $20 billion, there should be a place for the $7 million required to launch Brazil into this area of independence from outside oil sources. I am certain, too, that the information and know-how which we can secure from the studies of an operating oil shale industry will repay our investment manifold. Such a loan is in the national interest and I am hopeful that it will be realized promptly.

April 12, 1962.

The Honorable John F. Kennedy,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I would assume that the recent conference with President Goulart precipitated new discussions about the possibility of our participation with Brazil in the development of the oil shale reserves there. Such discussions seem to be indicated after my proposal of last March that we participate in such a program by loaning Brazil some $3.5 million to $7 million for construction of a research-prototype plant.

The United States has already indicated its willingness to cooperate with Petrobras to undertake this development. It is my continuing hope that everything will be done to make this assistance available. Information and knowledge derived from participation with Brazil would be of untold economic value to both Brazil and the United States. It is understood, of course, that we would share in the benefits from all data, reports, and recommendations resulting from the operation of this prototype.

I am interested in the matter because my own State of Colorado has mountains of just such oil shale as exists in Brazil. The known reserves in this area alone amount to some 1½ trillion barrels of oil. This is more than double the entire known liquid petroleum reserves in the world today.

The attached article from the New York Times of March 18 makes the urgency of this matter common knowledge. The Soviet Union is endeavoring in every way possible to offer its money, technicians and resources.

Because of the points outlined here, and particularly the urgency of the matter, I would appreciate any information you can give me relative to any discussions or negotiations that have recently transpired, or are contemplated.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

Gordon Allott.

U.S. AND SOVIET VIE ON HELP TO BRAZIL—BOTH WANT TO AID HER WITH SHALE OIL EXTRACTION

(By Juan de Onis)

Rio de Janeiro, March 17.—A belt of gray shale stretching across three Brazilian states has become a focal point of competition here between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The shale may solve one of Brazil's most serious economic problems. Impregnated with oil, the shale belt running from southern São Paulo through Parana to Rio Grande do Sul may provide the petroleum needed for Brazil's increasingly industrialized economy.

The production of oil in Brazil is a monopoly held by the state oil company, Petrobras S. A. The U.S. aid agency here has offered $7 million in long-term credit to the company to finance the installation of an industrial pilot plant at São Mateus do Sul in the State of Parana.

This would determine whether the shale can be processed to produce crude oil at a cost that would be competitive with imported oil and oil produced in the State of Bahia, Brazil's only domestic source.

GORDON HOPEFUL

Ambassador Lincoln Gordon of the United States said in a speech yesterday in Curitiba, capital of Parana: "If this great resource could be exploited economically, it would revolutionize the power supply situation in Brazil. It would provide foreign exchange and at the same time give great impulse to industrial development of the entire southern region" of Brazil.

The Communist weekly Novos Rumbos said in a front-page editorial, coinciding with Mr. Gordon's speech, that the "Alliance for Progress is making a grab for Brazil's shale." It said the American credit offer was really motivated by a plan of U.S. companies that now supply Brazil with oil to block production here.

Observers linked this editorial with the offer of the Soviet Union to provide the pilot plant and the technique to develop the shale oil on an industrial basis. In the middle of this politically charged issue was Petrobras, a federal corporation highly sensitive to criticism from Brazil's leftists.

A Petrobras engineer has studied the U.S. offer and has reported that the setting up of an industrial pilot plant and an experimental mine in the shale belt require only half the credit offered by the United States.

TECHNIQUE IS MAJOR ISSUE

His report favored acceptance of the offer, but the technique to be employed in working on the shale is a major issue. Involved are a laboratory formula developed by Petrobras technicians, a Soviet method and a U.S. plan based on experiences of the U.S. Navy experimental station with shale in Colorado.

The Petrobras annual report for 1961 issued this week said that the state company had drawn up specifications for a pilot plant and completed the mapping of the most promising area of the shale belt around São Mateus do Sul. The technical and political decision to put the shale program into motion now remains.

The importance of the shale project can be measured by the fact that last year Petrobras pumped 34 million barrels of oil from the Bahia fields. This amounted to only 30 percent of Brazil's petroleum requirements.

Brazil spent $209 million to import products last year. Her oil needs are growing as her automotive industry increases production and as more power sources are required.

Brazilian oil reserves in Bahia are now estimated at 633 million barrels. In one area of 50 square miles in the shale belt the oil-bearing potential has been estimated at more than 600 million barrels.

The oil content of the shale that can be recovered is estimated at between 8 and 12 percent of the shale's total weight. Sulfur, hydrocarbon gases and other byproducts are also avilable, according to technical reports.

The decision taken by Petrobras and the Brazilian Government, which holds 62 percent of the company's stock, will provide a test for the Alliance for Progress here. Nationalists are campaigning to block cooperation between Petrobras and the U.S. Government.

The weekly newspaper of the Metropolitan University and Second Students Federation here launched a sharp attack on the Minister of Mines, Gabriel Passos, and on Francisco Mangabeira, president of Petrobras, for not being "nationalist enough." Both men are considered to be militant nationalists, but not Communists.

The student group is affiliated with the National University Student Federation and both are considered Communist-influenced.

PROBLEMS AND POLICIES FOR GUAM

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, on Thursday of last week, Senator Long of Hawaii, and I, who are both members of the Subcommittee on Territories of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were hosts at a luncheon to give the Honorable A. Wong-Pat, speaker of the Guam Legislature, an opportunity to present some of the problems which this westernmost possession of the United States in the Pacific faces.

We were happy to have present on this occasion Members of both the Senate and House, as well as staff members from the appropriate subcommittees of the Interior Committees of both Houses, as well as of the House Appropriations Committee, the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Fred Korth, the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, representing the State Department, and Mr. Spurgeon Keeny, representing the White House.

It is my own view, which I expressed at this luncheon, that we should proceed in the case of our remaining outlying possessions—the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Samoa—to accord them the maximum amount of self-government compatible with our Nation's responsibilities and compatible with their desires and their capabilities. A similar approach is indicated for the trust territories in the Pacific.

Obviously these areas, because of their small population and terrain, and limited economic resources, cannot become States, but they should be as little disadvantaged by that fact as it is possible for our Government to make them.

How rapidly the process will proceed depends, of course, on local conditions in each of these three areas—the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Samoa. Obviously, the ultimate objective should be to make them as nearly economically self-sufficient and self-sustaining as possible, to accord them at the appropriate time an elective governorship, a Delegate in the House of Representatives, and I hope, an opportunity to vote for President and Vice President. Every American citizen should have that right. None of these results can be achieved overnight, but they should represent our national purpose and direction. We should eliminate every vestige of colonialism in the areas under U.S. control as rapidly as it can properly be done.

Guam, long the site of an important naval station, faces certain problems. The Navy has been of great assistance to Guam economically, and the importance of the Navy from the standpoint of national defense in that far western Pacific outpost is unquestionable. It is the Nation's traditional first line of defense and Americans rightly cherish it. Nevertheless, the presence of the Navy and certain of its established practices there have raised some problems which require congressional and Executive attention, which I am hopeful they will soon have.

This situation was reviewed in some detail in a scholarly article in the California Law Review of March 1960, entitled: "Peacetime Martial Law in Guam," by W. Scott Barrett and Walter

S. Ferenz. In order that the problems involved may come to the attention of Congress and the appropriate Federal authorities, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Peacetime Martial Law in Guam

(By W. Scott Barrett and Walter S. Ferenz, members of the California and Guam bars)

According to the U.S. Navy, Guam is under martial law and has been for many years. In February 1941 President Roosevelt issued Executive Order No. 8683[1] establishing the Guam Island Naval Defensive Sea Area and the Guam Island Naval Airspace Reservation. Administrative authority was vested in the U.S. Navy. To assist the Navy in enforcing the security clearance a number of regulations have been issued.[2] One section, which is not in the Instruction (naval directive, or regulation) issued to the general public, provides as follows:

"Compliance with laws and regulations. All persons, vessels, and aircraft entering the Guam Island Naval Defensive Sea Area or the Guam Island Naval Airspace Reservation, whether or not in violation of Executive Order 8683 * * * shall be governed by such regulations and restrictions upon their conduct and movements as may be established by the commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Marianas, whether by general regulation or by special instructions in any case."[3]

The foregoing regulation clearly purports to establish martial law in Guam. Civilians are under martial law whenever an Executive order authorizes a military commander to prescribe rules of action—make laws—governing civilians in military areas set up in domestic territories upon the sole standard of military necessity.[4]

One well might ask how the Navy derived authority from Executive Order No. 8683 to govern the conduct and movement of all persons on the island of Guam regardless of whether or not they had violated the order. If the Navy has that authority, then Guam is under martial law. It is the argument of this article that the foregoing regulation is illegal, and, further, that all of the regulations issued by the Navy under the ostensible authority of the Executive order are illegal and the power exercised by the Navy in administering the security clearance program is unauthorized and unconstitutional.

HISTORY OF THE NAVAL SECURITY CLEARANCE PROGRAM IN GUAM

The unincorporated territory of Guam is an insular possession of the United States located in the Pacific Ocean about 5,200 miles southwest of San Francisco and 1,350 miles southeast of Tokyo. Guam is the largest and most southern island of the archipelago known as the Mariana Islands. It is 32 miles in length and varies from 4 to 10 miles in width. Its 206 square miles give it an area nearly 10 times that of Manhattan Island.[4a]

The United States acquired Guam from Spain in 1898. By Presidential Executive order of December 23, 1898, the Secretary of the Navy was designated by the President to administer Guam. Except for Japanese occupation during World War II this administration continued until August 1, 1950. The island was therefore directly administered by a naval governor who was a naval officer assigned to the post for a tour of duty. Civil government was organized but only for the carrying out of such naval policies as might be established by the governor or the Secretary of the Navy.

For some years prior to the beginning of World War II it had been obvious that Japan had been building up military forces in the Pacific islands. Saipan and Tinian are approximately 120 miles from Guam and Rota only 40 miles from Guam. All these islands were known by 1940 to be strongholds of Japanese military forces, both air and naval.

To preserve the security of the defense efforts in Guam and other Pacific islands such as Wake, Johnston, and Midway, President Franklin D. Roosevelt promulgated Executive Order No. 8683.[5] Insofar as Guam was concerned the Executive order established two defensive areas known as the Guam Island Naval Defensive Sea Area and the Guam Island Airspace Reservation. The Secretary of the Navy was delegated the power to authorize entry at his discretion and to prescribe such regulations as were necessary for carrying out the provisions of the order.[6]

When Guam was recaptured by the United States in July 1944, Executive Order No. 8683 was not immediately reinstated.[7] In May 1946 the naval government was reestablished and the Navy resumed administration of civil affairs in Guam. Following resumption of the naval government, the civilian economy of the island began to expand, and labor, goods, and services were in great demand. The Navy adopted the policy of preventing non-Guamanians from entering the island in order to enter business, unless there were no local people qualified or financially able to supply the particular service or handle the merchandise in question.[8]

This exclusion policy was enforced mainly through the business license provisions of the Government Code of Guam, as it existed at that time, and through regulations and orders issued by the naval governor. As a matter of fact the policy did not completely succeed because a considerable number of employees brought in by contractors eventually went into business for themselves.

In 1947 the Navy was confronted with an additional problem concerning business competition with local residents. Naval officers or personnel who had reached the age of retirement were attempting to return to Guam to enter business. To prevent this the Chief of Naval Operations issued a directive to the naval governor of Guam stating that former Navy officers or personnel who were retiring from active duty were not to be allowed to enter Guam for the purpose of engaging in private enterprise.[9]

---

[1] 6 Fed. Reg. 1015 (1941). The Executive order reads:

"By virtue of the authority vested in me by the provisions of section 44 of the Criminal Code, as amended (U.S.C., title 18, sec. 96), and section 4 of the Air Commerce Act approved May 20, 1946 (44 Stat. 570, U.S.C., title 49, sec. 174) the territorial waters between the extreme highwater marks and the 3-mile marine boundaries surrounding the islands of Rose, Tutuila, and Guam, in the Pacific Ocean, are hereby established and reserved as naval defensive sea areas for purposes of national defense, such areas to be known, respectively, as Rose Island Naval Defensive Sea Area, Tutuila Island Naval Defensive Sea Area, and Guam Island Naval Defensive Sea Area; and the airspaces over the said territorial waters and islands are hereby set apart and reserved as naval airspace reservations for purposes of national defense, such reservations to be known, respectively, as Rose Island Naval Airspace Reservation, Tutuila Island Naval Airspace Reservation, and Guam Island Naval Airspace Reservation.

"At no time shall any person, other than persons on public vessels of the United States, enter any of the naval defensive sea areas herein set apart and reserved, nor shall any vessel or other craft, other than public vessels of the United States, be navigated into any of said areas, unless authorized by the Secretary of the Navy.

"At no time shall any aircraft, other than public aircraft of the United States, be navigated into any of the naval airspace reservations herein set apart and reserved, unless authorized by the Secretary of the Navy.

"The provisions of the preceding paragraphs shall be enforced by the Secretary of the Navy, with the cooperation of the local law enforcement offcers of the United States; and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out such provisions.

"Any person violating any of the provisions of this order relating to the above-named naval defensive sea areas shall be subject to the penalties provided by section 44 of the Criminal Code as amended (U.S.C., title 18, sec. 96), and any person violating any of the provisions of this order relating to the above-named naval airspace reservations shall be subject to the penalties prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 973)."

[2] For the latest version of these regulations, see 32 C.F.R. §§ 761.1–.24 (Supp. 1959). Some have been printed in pamphlet form as OPNAV Instruction 5500.11B, Nov. 27, 1957. This pamphlet is made available to those requesting information on clearance regulations. No mention is made in the pamphlet of the other applicable regulations.

[3] 32 C.F.R. § 761.21 (Supp. 1959).

[4] *Ochikubo* v. *Bonesteel,* 60 F. Supp. 916, 929 (S.D. Cal. 1945).

[4a] See map, App. C. For a general survey of the history of Guam, see Stevens, "Guam, U.S.A., Birth of a Territory" (1953). For a concise review of current social, political and economic conditions in Guam, see 1958 Gov. Guam Ann. Rep.

[5] 6 Fed. Reg. 1015 (1941); see note 1 supra. For a case illustrating the scope accorded Executive orders validly promulgated, see *Perko* v. *United States,* 204 F. 2d 446 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 346 U.S. 832 (1953).

[6] Executive Order No. 8683 expressly refers only to aircraft entering the airspace reservation and to vessels and persons entering the defensive sea area. In practice, the Navy enforces the order in reverse, being apparently more concerned about "persons" entering Guam by aircraft than by vessel.

[7] "Guam is a naval base under naval government and the Harbor of Apra is a closed port, and shall not be visited by any commercial or privately owned vessel of foreign registry; nor by any foreign national vessel, except by special authority of the United States Navy Department in each case. (Executive Order 26 September 1912.) United States Navy Regulations, 1920, Article 78, paragraph 1: Certain military districts on the island are closed to visitors." "Civil Regulations With the Force and Effect of Law in Guam," ch. 34, at 73 (U.S. Government Printing Office ed. 1947) (hereinafter Civil Regulations). Though first promulgated in 1936, the "Civil Regulations" were reprinted in 1947 and no reference was made to Exec. Order No. 8683 in the 1947 edition. ("Civil Regulations with the Force and Effect of Law in Guam" were issued originally on March 1, 1936, by order of G. A. Alexander, Governor of Guam, and replaced the theretofore existing "Orders and Regulations With the Force and Effect of Law in Guam." The "Regulations" were suspended during Japanese occupation and were reestablished July 21, 1944, by order of Admiral Nimitz. For a brief discussion of the origin and development of "Civil Regulations," as well as of other pre-Organic Act Guam laws, see *United States* v. *Johnson,* 181 F. 2d 577, 580 (9th Cir. 1950).)

[8] Enlisted men were not allowed to engage in business if it "interfered with the customary employment * * * of local civilians * * *." Civil Regulations, ch. 2, par. 17, at 4.

[9] None of the specific orders or regulations are available to the writers, but this infor-

Since the Navy had complete control of the island and all of the inhabitants, no effort was made to enforce actively the provisions of Executive Order No. 8683 or to enact regulations thereunder.

A. Background and legislative history of the Organic Act

In July 1950 the U.S. Congress passed the Organic Act at Guam[10] which transferred administration of governmental affairs from the Navy to the Department of the Interior. The act provided a bill of rights, established civilian courts, and in other ways took away control of governmental affairs from the Navy. A district court of Guam was created and patterned after the Federal district courts. The legislature was given authority to create inferior courts and transfer causes from the district court to those inferior courts.[11]

The clear congressional intent of the Organic Act, as revealed by committee hearings and numerous exchanges of correspondence among Senators and others,[12] was to give U.S. citizens residing in Guam full civil rights.[13] The indications are that Executive Order No. 8683 was then dead and forgotten. However, the Navy resurrected the order on December 4, 1950, thus enabling it to retain its long-enjoyed power over the civilian community.[14]

B. The "security clearance" program after the Organic Act

Although the Navy officially stated that it was strongly in favor of the passage of the Organic Act,[15] the Chief of Naval Operations reinstituted the security clearance entry program for Guam less than 3 months after the act became effective.[16]

Since that time the regulations have been vigorously enforced by the Navy. All persons desiring to come to Guam [17] who are not within certain excluded categories [18] are required to obtain a security clearance from the Secretary of the Navy or his subordinates before they are permitted to enter. A person coming to Guam for the first time files the application directly or indirectly with the Chief of Naval Operations. In the case of a citizen of the United States who is a resident of Guam and who desires to leave Guam temporarily with intent to return, an application for a reentry permit must be made to the Commander, Naval Forces Mariana Islands.[19]

Enforcement of the naval security program is not difficult inasmuch as the only two permissible ways to enter Guam are through naval reservations. Apra Harbor is the only seaport, and it is within the confines of the naval station.[20] All port operations are under the direction of the commander, Naval Forces Marianas. This includes piloting, tug boats, ship repair, and to a lesser extent, cargo operations. Persons entering Guam by way of air carrier are required to land at the naval air station. There are no civilian airport facilities in Guam.

To insure that persons entering Guam have the required entry-clearance documents, the Navy has ordered civilian transportation agencies to require these documents before allowing prospective passengers to purchase a ticket. This is true of the airlines and the steamship lines.[21]

After the reinstitution of the security clearance requirement, many U.S. citizens were faced with the necessity of obtaining a security clearance from the Navy to come to a U.S. territory. Many persons, citizen and alien alike, objected to the requirement, and some were refused entry for various reasons. In answer to the many complaints, letters were written by naval officers, the Chief of Naval Operations, and even the Secretaries of Navy and Interior. The reasons given for the continued enforcement of the security clearance requirement were many and included the following:

1. The clearance is necessary so long as the Korean war continues to exist.[22]

2. Because of the huge expenditure of appropriated funds on defense projects, Guam draws from nearly every walk of life civilians whose purpose is making as much money as possible, directly or indirectly, from the salaries of military and Government employees.[23]

3. Many aliens are excluded because their long-term presence would be detrimental to the effective use of Guam for its primary mission of defense.[24] (This reason did not prevent entry of aliens married to citizens if the citizen-spouses worked for the Government.)

4. The island of Guam is an important U.S. naval and military base, and its protection fully warrants those measures authorized by Executive Order No. 8688.[25]

---

mation is well verified by statements of reputable former naval officers now in business in Guam.

[10] 64 Stat. 384 (1950), as amended, 48 U.S.C. §§ 1421–25 (1958).

[11] Organic Act of Guam § 22, 64 Stat. 389 (1950), as amended, 48 U.S.C. § 1424 (1958).

[12] S. Rep. No. 2109, 81st Cong., 2d Sess. (1950). See, e.g., Letter From Harry S. Truman to J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, May 14, 1949, in id. at 3; Letter from J. A. Krug to Alben W. Barkley, May 3, 1949, in id. at 6–9. The report stated that "given a period of peace, the growth of Guam as a transportation and commercial center for American interests in the Far East seems almost a foregone conclusion. American business enterprise in the area will want, and need, a center in which it can have the full protection of American laws and legal procedure." Id. at 4. The business community on Guam is generally agreed that the security clearance requirement has seriously hampered Guam's economic development, particularly as to tourist business. There are no public hotels on Guam though thousands of tourists transit the island annually. Navy red tape discourages stopovers.

[13] "All American tradition and history dictates that government shall rest upon law, rather than upon executive decree. By international treaty also, the Congress has a direct responsibility for the government of Guam. The second paragraph of Article IX of the treaty ceding Guam to the United States provides: 'The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the Territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress (30 Stat. 1759).' In addition to the obligation under the Treaty of Paris, the United States has additional treaty obligations with respect to Guam as a non-self-governing Territory. Under Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations, ratified by the Senate June 26, 1945 (59 Stat. at p. 1048), we undertook, with respect to the peoples of such Territories, to insure political advancement, to develop self-government, and taking 'due account of the political aspirations of the peoples' to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions" (S. Rep. No. 2109, 81st Cong., 2d Sess. 2 (1950)).

[14] See note 16 infra. What was perhaps the prime initiating cause of the resurrection of the order, and the reinstitution of the entry-clearance program, i.e., the Korean conflict, of course no longer justifies the Navy's conduct, even assuming it justified it then. See text at note 22 infra. See also text at note 56 infra.

[15] S. Rep. No. 2109, op. cit. supra note 12, at 9.

[16] Entry clearance requirements were reinstituted by Letter [Directive] From Chief of Naval Operations, serial no. 5235P21, Dec. 4, 1950. This directive was superseded by subsequent regulations.

[17] Prior to the passage of the Organic Act, Guam law provided: "Residents of Guam shall not be permitted to leave Guam without a passport issued by the Governor or a certificate of identification issued by the Department of Records and Accounts." Civil Regulations, ch. 21, para. 1, at 45. After passage of the Organic Act the Department of Immigration required United States citizens coming to Guam to have a passport until Nov. 7, 1958.

[18] 32 C.F.R. § 761.10 (Supp. 1959). See text at note 65 infra.

[19] So-called multiple-enty clearances are difficult for nonresidents to obtain and are usually limited to 1 or 2 years. Although residents are treated more liberally, those not favored with a multiple-entry clearance are required to fill out the forms and reapply for re-entry each time they leave or be excluded when they try to return to their homes. A sample multiple-entry clearance reads as follows:

DATE: ———.

U.S. PACIFIC FLEET,
Commander Naval Forces Marianas.

MY DEAR ———: Your application has been reviewed and authorization is hereby granted for -------- to enter and re-enter the Guam Defensive Sea Area for a period of 2 years beginning ---------- for the purpose of making repeated business trips off the island. This letter * * * must be in your possession when traveling in the above areas.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———,
Island Government Officer.

(Note that the administrator of the clearance program is called, significantly, "The Island Government Officer.")

[20] The Commercial Port of Guam is operated by the Government of Guam, but it is within the Apra Harbor area and access from the sea is controlled by the Navy. Both air and sea access to Guam in civilian areas could be arranged, however, if the Navy ceased requiring entry clearance to the entire island.

[21] The carriers comply with Navy orders, and except for occasional oversights they will not sell a ticket to Guam passengers not holding a security clearance. The Navy contends that the carriers are "fully responsible for restricting the activities of the passengers in their custody so as not to permit violation of entry clearance requirements." Letter From Rear Adm. W. B. Ammon, Commander, U.S. Navy Forces, Marianas, to G. Selwyn, Manager, Pan American World Airways, September 6, 1956, on file with the authors. Unless otherwise noted, personal letters cited are on file with the authors.

[22] Letter From Ira H. Nunn, Navy Judge Adv. Gen., to Rear Adm. H. A. Houser, June 3, 1953.

[23] Letter from Comdr. Edward L. Beach, Naval Aide to the President, to F. L. Moylan, Guam Businessman, September 20, 1956, citing a certain report from the Secretary of the Navy. In a recent letter, answering a request for a copy of the full report, Commander C. E. Herrick stated that it could not be found. Letter From Comdr. C. E. Herrick, Office of Chief of Naval Operations, to W. Scott Barrett, July 31, 1959.

[24] "The very presence of large numbers of aliens owing allegiance elsewhere would constitute an obvious threat to security." Letter From Charles S. Thomas, then Secretary of the Navy, to Gayle Shelton, then President, Guam Chamber of Commerce, September 21, 1956.

[25] Ibid. This view was also expressed by Douglas MacKay, Secretary of the Interior. Letter From Douglas MacKay to G. M. O'Keefe, Guam Businessman, June 8, 1953 (during the Korean War). Pearl Harbor is also a naval defensive sea area, but no clearance is necessary to enter the island of Oahu, which is no more than twice the size of Guam. Also, almost as great a percentage of Oahu is occupied by military reservations.

5. The Navy is required by Executive Order No. 8683 to enforce the order.[26]

6. The clearance is necessary to enable the Navy to assist the local government in keeping the "riffraff" out of Guam.[27]

7. Entry into Guam is limited to persons who contribute to its "strategic development." [28]

The validity of the foregoing reasons will hereinafter be discussed. Many of them are obviously invalid; keeping the "riffraff" out of Guam and being concerned about whether civilians come to Guam to make money are simply not the concern of the U.S. Navy.

Officially, the Navy has set forth a number of grounds on which clearance can be denied,[29] although the regulations specifically state that the reason for a denial may not be given to any person.

II

THE LEGAL EFFECT OF THE ORGANIC ACT ON THE SECURITY CLEARANCE PROGRAM

Following the reinstitution of the security clearance program on December 4, 1950, the attorney general of Guam wrote an opinion [30] which concluded that the Organic Act had repealed Executive Order No. 8683 by implication. The opinion relied heavily upon the wording of section 33 of the Organic Act,[31] which authorized the President to designate parts of Guam as naval or military reservations.

By Executive Order No. 10178 [32] the President expressly reserved to the United States parts of Guam for military bases. Those parts of Guam reserved to the military constitute less than one-third of the land area of the island. There is no indication that the Senate intended the whole island to be under military control. The Organic Act also gave the President power to treat Guam as a closed port with respect to the vessels and aircraft of foreign nations. Had Congress been aware of Executive Order No. 8683 and intended to perpetuate it, the language of section 33 was surplusage. By saying in section 33 that "nothing contained herein shall be construed as limiting the authority of the President * * * to treat Guam as a closed port with respect to the vessels and aircraft of foreign nations," Congress expressed an intent that the President has no authority to treat Guam as a closed port to U.S. citizens on domestic vessels and aircraft.[33] Thus, the Organic Act does supersede and overrule Executive Order No. 8683.

Subsequent to the Guam Attorney General's opinion, the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the United States Navy issued a contrary opinion.[34] Unfortunately, the opinion is classified and therefore not available to the general public.[35]

III

UNCONSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATION OF A VOID EXECUTIVE ORDER

Beyond the determination of the effect of the enactment of the Organic Act upon the present validity of Executive Order No. 8683, the question remains whether the administration of that order denies certain fundamental personal rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. For example, if the United States Navy has failed to provide an adequate administrative hearing to persons denied a security clearance, such persons may be deprived of liberty or property without procedural due process of law. Likewise, if the regulations promulgated by the United States Navy exceed the authority of the order, or if Navy practices exceed the authority of its own regulations, persons denied a security clearance may be deprived of liberty or property without substantive due process of law.

A. Constitutional guarantees in an unincorporated territory

The question arises as to what extent U.S. citizens residing in Guam or attempting to visit Guam for any purpose are protected by guarantees extended by the Federal Constitution to U.S. citizens. The constitutional guarantees extended to a citizen residing within continental United States or in an incorporated territory are not always extended to U.S. citizens residing in unincorporated territories.[36] The status of Guam is similar to that of Puerto Rico at the time of the Balzac case.[37] In the Balzac case the U.S. Supreme Court held that a Puerto Rican cannot insist upon the right of trial by jury except to the extent it is conferred upon him by his own representatives in his own legislature.[38] In Guam, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit held that a U.S. citizen residing in Guam had no constitutional right to a grand jury indictment,[39] but that such citizen did have that right pursuant to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.[40] Congress subsequently amended the Organic Act so as to require grand jury indictment only if made available by local law.[41]

Regardless, however, of whether or not all procedural constitutional guarantees are reserved to U.S. citizens residing in an unincorporated territory, there are certain fundamental rights that are reserved to all U.S. citizens. In the Balzac case, the Court stated:

"The guarantees of certain fundamental personal rights declared in the Constitution, as for instance that no person could be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, had from the beginning, full application in the Philippines and Porto (former sp.) Rico." [42]

B. Substantive due process of law denied

In a very real sense exclusion from Guam by reason of denial or revocation of a security clearance is a deprivation of liberty and in some instances possibly of property. The only justification for depriving a citizen of liberty and the free choice of residing wherever he pleases within the confines of the United States, including its possessions, and in traveling freely throughout such areas, lies in the war power. However, the extent to which the war power can be used to deprive private citizens of their life, liberty, or property without due process of law has been carefully limited,[43] the courts often quoting Mr. Justice Holmes' language in *Chastleton Corp.* v. *Sinclair:*

"A law depending upon the existence of an emergency or other certain state of facts to uphold it may cease to operate if the emergency ceases or the facts change even though valid when passed." [44]

1. Liberty—The right to travel and work where one pleases:

"There is more absoluteness about the more directly personal aspects of freedom. However strong the reaction to interference with rights of property or trade, it does and ought to take second place to the reaction against interference with the legal safeguards of personal liberty. Vigilance against the temporary removal of such safeguards * * * is therefore more universally supported than protests against governmental powers over property." [45]

The right to travel, unrestricted by unreasonable regulations, is one of the rights guaranteed to U.S. citizens by the fifth amendment of the U.S. Constitution. The right to work and to reside in any area, State, territory, or possession of the United States is also a constitutionally guaranteed right, and no restraints may be imposed upon such rights except by reasonable regulations under law. While during World War II the rights of U.S. citizens were infringed upon to a greater extent than ever before, the courts nevertheless made it quite clear that only an extreme emergency such as the danger of invasion could justify restrictions on the movement of citizens. In recent passport cases the courts have held that the right to travel, to go from place to place as the means of transportation permit, is a natural right subject to the rights of others and to reasonable regulation under law, and that any restraint upon this liberty must conform with the provisions of the fifth amendment.

---

[26] Letter From Ira H. Nunn, supra note 22: "The existence of this Defensive Sea Area is not inconsistent with the newly acquired status of Guam, nor is there any legal authority to discontinue security clearance as long as the Executive Order is in effect."

[27] Remarks of a naval officer, quoted in Bauer, "American Guam Off-Limits to Americans," Portland Oregonian, Aug. 4, 1957, p. 42, cols. 3–4.

[28] "Because of the strategic importance of Guam, entry into this area has been limited to persons who contribute to the strategic development of this area . . . . Inasmuch as Mr. McCready does not work for the United States Government, you do not qualify * * * (to enter Guam)." Letter From Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, to Mrs. Gordon McCready, July 25, 1956. Mrs. McCready is the Japanese-national wife of many years of a local businessman. Mrs. McCready had asked why she could not join her husband when aliens married to government employees were allowed to enter. Subsequently Mrs. McCready entered without a clearance and promptly was granted one! Several other persons who have entered without a clearance are presently "at large" on the island and have never been prosecuted.

[29] 32 C.F.R. § 761.6 (Supp. 1959). The grounds listed include: (1) prior non-compliance with entry-control regulations; (2) wilfully furnishing false or misleading information in application for entry; (3) advocacy of the overthrow of the United States; (4) sabotage, espionage and sedition; (5) acting so as to serve the interests of another government detrimental to that of the United States; (6) deliberate unauthorized disclosure of classified defense information; (7) membership in subversive organizations; (8) serious mental irresponsibility or chronic alcoholism; (9) conviction of certain felonies; (10) illegal presence in the United States or being the subject of deportation proceedings.

[30] Dec. 13, 1951, in "Statutes and Amendments to the Codes of the Territory of Guam," First Guam Legislature, 1951–1952, at A–14 (1952).

[31] 64 Stat. 393 (1950), 48 U.S.C. § 1421k (1958).

[32] 15 Fed. Reg. 7313–15 (1950).

[33] See note 12 supra.

[34] The opinion is cited in Letter, supra note 22.

[35] "I regret that the classification of this opinion makes it impossible to comply with your request." Letter From Capt. Wilfred Hearn, Asst. Navy Judge Adv. Gen., to W. Scott Barrett, July 30, 1959.

[36] *Balzac* v. *Porto Rico*, 258 U.S. 298 (1933).

[37] Compare the Organic Act of Guam § 3, 64 Stat. 384 (1950), 48 U.S.C. § 1421a (1958), with the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (Jones Act), ch. 145, 39 Stat. 951 (1917) codified in scattered sections of 48 U.S.C. relating to Puerto Rico), as construed in *Balzac* v. *Porto Rico*, supra note 36, at 305–14.

[38] *Balzac* v. *Porto Rico*, 258 U.S. 298, 309 (1922).

[39] *Pugh* v. *United States*, 212 F. 2d 761, 762 (9th Cir. 1954).

[40] Id. at 763 (Fed. R. Crim., p. 7(a)).

[41] Act of Aug. 27, 1954, § 1, 68 Stat. 882, amending the Organic Act of Guam § 22(b), 64 Stat. 390, as amended, 48 U.S.C. § 1424(b) (1958). To this date the local legislature has not provided for a grand jury.

[42] *Balzac* v. *Porto Rico*, 258 U.S. 298, 312–13 (1922).

[43] See e.g., *Korematsu* v. *United States*, 323 U.S. 214 (1944); *Hirabayashi* v. *United States*, 320 U.S. 81 (1943); *Scherzberg* v. *Maderia*, 57 F. Supp. 42 (E.D. Pa. 1944); *Ebel* v. *Drum*, 52 F. Supp. 189 (D. Mass. 1943); *Schueller* v. *Drum*, 51 F. Supp. 383 (E.D. Pa. 1943).

[44] *Chastleton Corp.* v. *Sinclair*, 264 U.S. 543, 547–48 (1924).

[45] Friedmann, "Legal Theory," 446 (2d ed. 1949).

(a) The "security clearance" and "exclusion" cases: During World War II U.S. citizens of Japanese ancestry were uprooted from their homes and relocated away from the western coast. This exercise of the war power was ratified by the Supreme Court in *Korematsu* v. *United States.*[46] The Court said:

"We uphold the exclusion order as of the time it was made and when the petitioner violated it. In doing so, we are not unmindful of the hardships imposed by it upon a large group of American citizens. * * * But hardships are part of war, and war is an aggregation of hardships. All citizens alike, both in and out of uniform, feel the impact of war in greater or lesser measure. Citizenship has its responsibilities as well as its privileges, and in time of war the burden is always heavier. Compulsory exclusion of large groups of citizens from their homes, except under circumstances of direct emergency and peril, is inconsistent with our basic governmental institutions. But when under conditions of modern warfare our shores are threatened by hostile forces, the power to protect must be commensurate with the threatened danger."[47]

Also during World War II, the Supreme Court upheld a curfew restriction requiring all persons of Japanese ancestry to be within their place of residence daily between the hours of 8 p.m. and 6 a.m.[48] Both the exclusion order and the curfew restriction had been imposed pursuant to Executive order.[49] In upholding the validity of the curfew, the Supreme Court stated:

"Our investigation here does not go beyond the inquiry whether, in the light of all the relevant circumstances preceding and attending their promulgation, the challenged orders and statute afforded a reasonable basis for the action taken in imposing the curfew. We decide only that the curfew order as applied, and at the time it was applied, was within the boundaries of the war power."[50]

It should be noted that the Supreme Court in both the Korematsu and Hirabayashi cases recognized that individual liberties were being restricted and that under ordinary circumstances the restriction would be unconstitutional. Nevertheless the admittedly discriminatory treatment of U.S. citizens was justified solely on the ground that the President and Congress could restrict the liberty of citizens by exercise of the war power at a time of great emergency.

Subsequent to the Hirabayashi and Korematsu cases several cases arose in the U.S. district courts involving U.S. citizens of German ancestry.[51] The plaintiffs in these cases had been excluded by military order from a coastal strip along the eastern seaboard of the United States. Authority to exclude certain persons from such areas had been given to military commanders by an Executive order[52] which had been ratified and confirmed by Congress.[53]

In *Schueller* v. *Drum*[54] the district court acknowledged that from the evidence produced the plaintiff appeared to be a German sympathizer. Nevertheless the court held that there was not shown such danger as would warrant denial to the petitioner of her right to due process of law. In regard to the situation existing on the eastern seaboard at the time Mrs. Schueller was excluded, the court stated:

"The normal civilian life of the area was being pursued; commercial and industrial activities, their tempo heightened by a demand for greater production, were in private ownership; the courts both Federal and State were open and functioning as well as all the administrative and executive departments of government, and it could not be honestly said that ordinary law did not adequately secure public safety and private rights. Accordingly, it would seem to me that Congress 'cannot authorize the executive to establish by conclusive proclamation the very thing which, upon familiar principle, would have been the subject of judicial scrutiny.' (Citing Fairman, *Law of Martial Rule,* 55 Harv. L. Rev. 1253, 1272 (1942).)

"While I am not unmindful that the issuance of the proclamation by the Commander of the area is some evidence of the finding of the necessity for his assuming control of the functions of civil government, yet where there is a direct interference as here with one's liberty and property, conduct normally beyond the scope of governmental power, such action could only be justified, a constitutional guarantee of freedom can only be abridged, when the danger to the Government is real, impending and imminent.[55]

Under present world conditions it cannot be said that the danger of sabotage to Guam is real, impending, and imminent. Certainly it cannot be said that there is any impending danger of invasion, nor is the danger of attack greater to Guam than it is to the entire State of Hawaii or to any city in the United States. Whether or not present conditions justify the Navy in continuing to require a security clearance from U.S. citizens is subject to judicial review.[56] The consistent conduct of the Navy in immediately granting a clearance in cases of entry without a clearance rather than allowing the matter to be heard by a court of competent jurisdiction indicates that even the Navy is convinced that judicial review would not be favorable to the continuation of the clearance requirement. U.S. citizens have been prevented from coming to Guam to engage in a legitimate occupation or to live in the place of their choice. This deprivation of those rights under present circumstances is in clear violation of the due process clause of the U.S. Constitution.[57]

(b) The passport cases: More recently the U.S. courts have been confronted with the right of U.S. citizens to travel as affected by regulations issued by the Department of State.[58] The two cases reaching the Supreme Court did not raise the constitutional issue,[59] but the Secretary of State was held not to have authority to deny a passport to citizen applicants solely because of their refusal to be subjected to inquiry into their beliefs and associations.

In the Shachtman case[60] the plaintiff sued in the district court to enjoin the Secretary of State from denying application for a passport to visit Europe. His complaint was dismissed and he appealed. The plaintiff had been granted "a hearing of a sort." The court did not decide whether the hearing complied with all procedural requirements, but held that the action of the Secretary of State in denying the passport was arbitrary and thus denied plaintiff substantive due process of law. The principal ground for the denial appeared to be that the Secretary of State alleged that the plaintiff was a member of an organization listed by the Attorney General as subversive. The correctness of this characterization was denied by the plaintiff.[61]

"What is involved at the present stage is a question of substantive due process—whether the refusal for the reason given, as alleged in the complaint and undisputed thus far by the Secretary, was arbitrary. If so, it is not a valid foundation for the denial, for the Government may not arbitrarily restrain the liberty of a citizen to travel to Europe. Discretionary power does not carry with it the right to its arbitrary exercise. Otherwise the existence of the power itself would encounter grave constitutional doubts."[62]

When one compares the language of the Shachtman case with that of the Naval Guam regulations[63] it immediately becomes apparent that the regulations deny substantive due process of law to any applicant who is denied a security clearance to enter Guam. The regulations arbitrarily provide that "under no circumstances will a notice of disapproval include a statement of the reason therefor."[64] Clearly, if the regulations are followed, any denial of a security clearance to any U.S. citizen is a denial of substantive due process under the fifth amendment of the Constitution. Unexplained denial of a security clearance is abritrary administrative action outside the authority of law in view of the circumstances existing on the island of Guam at the present time.

2. Equal protection of the laws:

In its Guam regulations the U.S. Navy has chosen to discriminate against certain "types" of U.S. citizens.[65] Those born on Guam or those who became citizens of the United States under the Guam Organic Act of 1950[66] may enter the Guam Island Naval Defensive Sea Area and the Guam Island Airspace Reservation without a clearance. Approximately 35,000 U.S. citizens are in that category, and a security clearance is not required of them, while a clearance is required of other U.S. citizens who were not fortunate enough to be born on Guam.

---

[46] 323 U.S. 214 (1944).

[47] Id. at 219–220.

[48] *Hirabayashi* v. *United States,* 320 U.S. 81 (1943).

[49] Exec. Order No. 9066, 7 Fed. Reg. 1407 (1942).

[50] *Hirabayashi* v. *United States,* 320 U.S. 81, 101–02 (1943).

[51] *Scherzberg* v. *Maderia,* 57 F. Supp. 42 (E.D. Pa. 1944); *Ebel* v. *Drum,* 52 F. Supp. 189 (D. Mass. 1943); *Schueller* v. *Drum,* 51 F. Supp. 383 (E.D. Pa. 1943).

[52] Exec. Order No. 9066, 7 Fed. Reg. 1407 (1942).

[53] Act of Mar. 21, 1942, ch. 191, 56 Stat. 173 (now, as amended, 18 U.S.C. § 1383 (1958)).

[54] 51 F. Supp. 383 (E.D. Pa. 1943).

[55] Id. at 387.

[56] *Cf. Sterling* v. *Constantin,* 287 U.S. 378, 400–01 (1932); *Ebel* v. *Drum,* 52 F. Supp. 189, 195–96 (D. Mass. 1943).

[57] Even a military order placing a civilian establishment "off-limits" is subject to review. If not well-founded it is unconstitutional as being a deprival of a property right without due process of law. *Barn Ballroom Co.* v. *Ainsworth,* 67 F. Supp. 299, (E.D. Va. 1946); cf. 32 C.F.R. § 761.18 (Supp. 1959). Apparently the Navy places the burden upon the United States citizen to prove he has "legitimate cause" to enter Guam. What is "legitimate" is committed to the Navy's sole discretion.

[58] *Kent* v. *Dulles,* 357 U.S. 116 (1958); *Dayton* v. *Dulles,* 357 U.S. 144 (1958); *Boudin* v. *Dulles,* 235 F.2d 532 (D.C. Cir. 1956); *Kraus* v. *Dulles,* 235 F.2d 840 (D.C. Cir. 1956); *Shachtman* v. *Dulles,* 235 F. 2d 938 (D.C. Cir. 1955).

[59] *Kent* v. *Dulles,* supra note 58; *Dayton* v. *Dulles,* supra note 58. Although the constitutional issue was not reached, the language of the Court was extremely strong. See *Kent* v. *Dulles,* supra at 125.

[60] *Shachtman* v. *Dulles,* 225 F. 2d 938 (D.C. Cir. 1955).

[61] *Shachtman* v. *Dulles,* 225 F. 2d 938, 943 (D.C. Cir. 1955).

[62] Id. at 941.

[63] 32 C.F.R. §§ 761.1–.24 (Supp. 1959).

[64] 32 C.F.R. § 761.16 (Supp. 1959).

[65] See 32 C.F.R. sec. 761.10 (Supp. 1959).

[66] 64 Stat. 384, as amended, 48 U.S.C. secs. 1421–26 (1958).

The regulations also discriminate against citizens who do not work for the Government—for that reason alone. Civil service employees and military dependents and many other groups are not required to be cleared, nor does the Navy claim that they have been checked for security purposes.

It would seem that few would venture to vouch for the undivided loyalty of all persons belonging to any of the Navy's favored groups solely because of membership in that group. Yet the Navy arbitrarily requires no clearance of such persons. Clearly the exclusion of such large groups from the clearance requirement is for the purpose of naval convenience and has no relation to security.

Were they to be enacted by a State the naval Guam regulations would undoubtedly be in violation of the 14th amendment, which extends equal protection of the laws to all U.S. citizens. While the 14th amendment does not extend to authority exercised by the United States,[67] the Supreme Court has tested the validity of Federal legislation under the due process clause of the 5th amendment by the same rules of equality that are employed to test the validity of State legislation under the 14th amendment.[68] The equal protection of the laws afforded by the due process clause of the 5th amendment has been spoken of as "that mere minimum of equal protection secured both by the due process clause and by the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment."[69] Furthermore, the statute or regulation may be so discriminating or so arbitrary and injurious in denying equal protection of the law that it may be said to violate the due process clause of the 5th amendment even though the 5th amendment contains no equal protection clause and provides no guarantee against discriminatory legislation by Congress.[70]

The Supreme Court has held that discrimination against U.S. citizens of Japanese ancestry was unconstitutional as being in violation of the fifth amendment where the circumstances were such as to make racial distinctions relevant.[71] During the time United States was at war with Japan racial distinctions were relevant, as it was then possible that some U.S. citizens of Japanese ancestry might have loyalties toward their mother country. No such distinction is relevant at the present time in respect of Guam.[72] Discrimination against U.S. citizens on the sole ground they were not born on Guam is arbitrary and unjustifiable. The regulation appears clearly to be so objectionable on its face that it violates the due process clause of the fifth amendment.

3. Power exercised by U.S. Navy exceeds the authority of the Executive order:

Assuming Executive Order No. 8683 is valid today, it is submitted that the practical power exercised by the Navy exceeds the authority of the Executive order, and as a result substantial rights have been denied both U.S. citizens and aliens.

(a) Enforcement of exclusions:

"Wherever law ends tyranny begins, if the law be transgressed to another's harm. And whosoever in authority exceeds the power given him by the law, and makes use of the force he has under his command to compass that upon the subject which the law allows not * * * may be opposed, as any other man who by force invades the right of another."[73]

The Navy has acknowledged that it has no power whatsoever to exclude anyone from the island of Guam.[74] In spite of that acknowledgment, however, the Navy has as a practical matter excluded numerous persons from Guam by the simple expedient of revoking their security clearance and notifying their employers that they must be repatriated.[75] A prevalent reason for the revocation of an alien's security clearance is that he has placed himself "out of status" for having had the temerity to marry a U.S. citizen. Employers invariably cooperate, knowing well that future importation of labor depends upon favorable Navy action on security-clearance applications. Though such action is admittedly contrary to law,[76] the Navy continues to revoke clearances, thereby arbitrarily exercising a power it does not have. The rights of aliens under the fifth amendment are also protected if they are permanent residents. In *Kwong Hai Chew* v. *Colding*[77] the Supreme Court so ruled, saying:

"It is well established that if an alien is a lawful permanent resident of the United States and remains physically present there, he is a person within the protection of the fifth amendment."[78]

Aliens who have been admitted though not with "permanent resident" status do not have constitutional protection.[79] When the language used in Kwong Hai Chew is applied to the Guam situation, however, it would appear that even nonresident aliens should have some rights. The Court there said:

"This preservation of petitioner's right to due process does not leave an unprotected spot in the Nation's armor. Before receiving clearance for his foreign cruise, he was screened and approved by the Coast Guard. Before acceptance of his petition for naturalization, as well as before final action thereon, assurance is necessary that he is not a security risk."[80]

Before he enters Guam for any purpose an alien presumably is screened to determine whether he is a security risk. Therefore, an alien subsequently excluded by the Navy without explanation should be given some opportunity to be heard and to show that he has not become a security risk in the interim.

The Navy has exercised considerable arbitrary power in forcing repatriation of aliens, particularly to the Philippines, without lawful authority. A very much-needed and well-qualified nurse employed at the Guam Memorial Hospital was separated from her job due to the fact that her security clearance was revoked shortly after she married a U.S. citizen.[81] In justification of the policy of revoking an alien's clearance for marrying a citizen a naval spokesman said that the Navy favors keeping "Guam for the Guamanians."[82] The only other justifica-

---

[67] *Truax* v. *Corrigan*, 257 U.S. 312, 340 (1921).

[68] *NLRB* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.*, 301 U.S. 1, 43 (1937); *District of Columbia* v. *Brooke*, 214 U.S. 138 (1909).

[69] *Lewis* v. *Brautigam*, 227 F. 2d 124, 128 (5th Cir. 1955).

[70] *Detroit Bank* v. *United States*, 317 U.S. 329 (1943); *Hirabayashi* v. *United States*, 320 U.S. 81, 100 (1943).

[71] *Hirabayshi* v. *United States*, supra note 70. The Court also said, "Distinctions between citizens solely because of their ancestry are by their very nature odious to a free people." Id. at 100.

[72] It should be noted that by far the greater number of "locally born citizens" are natives of Guam whose ancestry is principally Spanish, Filipino, and Chamorro.

[73] Locke, "Second Treatise of Civil Government," sec. 202 (1690).

[74] Letter From J. H. Smith, Jr., then Ass't Secretary of the Navy for Air, to Senator William Langer, in Guam Daily News, Dec. 8, 1954, p. 1, cols. 2–4.

[75] A typical exchange of letters will be found in App. A.

[76] In *Wilcox* v. *Emmons*, 67 F. Supp. 339 (S.D. Cal. 1946), the plaintiff had been excluded from a military area in continental United States. The military commander who had excluded the plaintiff acted under color of law in an honest belief that he was empowered lawfully to direct the acts of expulsion and exclusion by physical force. The court held that the exclusion order was not self-executing and that defendant did not have lawful power to expel or exclude plaintiff from such area, the statute being a limitation on the power of the military and providing for criminal penalties only. *Cf. Ochikubo* v. *Bonesteel*, 57 F. Supp. 513 (S.D. Cal. 1944), 60 F. Supp. 916 (S.D. Cal. 1945).

[77] 344 U.S. 590 (1953).

[78] Id. at 596.

[79] *United States ex rel. Knauff* v. *Shaughnessy*, 338 U.S. 537, 545 (1950). Even here the majority of the Court justified denial of procedural due process to an alien on the ground that a state of war still technically existed. The Court admitted that in peacetime Congress had provided aliens with a hearing.

[80] *Kwong Hai Chew* v. *Colding*, 344 U.S. 590, 602 (1953). The language of Mr. Justice Jackson in *Shaughnessy* v. *United States ex rel, Mezei*, 345 U.S. 206, 224–27 (1953) is of interest also, though in a dissenting opinion.

[81] The Government of Guam terminated Mrs. Delfina A. Cataluna's contract for the reason that the Navy had revoked her authority "to remain within, or reenter the Guam naval defensive sea area as per letter from commander naval forces Marianas dated Apr. 22, 1957." Termination notice, Apr. 30, 1957, signed by Peter C. Siguenza, director of personnel. Mrs. Cataluna had been hired in August 1956 on a 2-year contract.

[82] "The U.S. Navy 'does not favor the entry' of Filipinos to Guam 'for the purpose of settling permanently' because U.S. Navy policy is 'to keep Guam for Guamanians,' Rear Admiral William B. Ammon, commander of the U.S. Naval Forces in the Marianas said. Ammon's 'Guam for the Guamanians' statement was in reply to a question as to why the Navy frowns upon any effort of Filipinos to settle permanently on Guam. 'Navy policy is to keep Guam for Guamanians, therefore, it does not look with favor on the entry of any foreigner to Guam for the purpose of settling permanently,' he said." Abcede, "Guam Policy Explained," the Manila Times, Oct. 12, 1956, p. 2, col. 1.

More recently Mr. Abcede wrote a long article in a Manili newspaper commenting on the life of the Filipino on Guam. He said in part: "Despite the enactment of the Organic Act of Guam, establishing the supremacy of of civilian authority, the U.S. Navy paper curtain remains to this day. Naval intelligence has been intensifying efforts to fend off foreigners and unwanted Americans. * * * The clearance requirement has worked hardships on both Americans, Guamanians and Filipinos. The economic life of Guam has also been adversely affected. An estimated 200 Filipino-Guamanian families have been broken up because of this stringent requirement. Filipinos married to Guamanian women and who have been forced by circumstances to visit the Philippines found themselves unable to go back to Guam. In many instances, a breakdown of family ties resulted. The writer presented this problem to Rear Admiral W. B. Ammon, commander of the U.S. Naval Forces in the Marianas in 1956. The Navy was asked whether it discouraged the intermarriage of the two peoples and whether it frowns on any effort of the Filipinos to settle permanently in Guam. Admiral Ammon's reply is quoted: 'The Navy does not encourage or discourage intermarriages and endeavors not to become involved in domestic affairs except as necessary to administer entry clearance regulations. Navy policy is to keep Guam for Guamanians, therefore, it does not look with favor on the entry of any foreigner to Guam for the purtion ever given by the Navy for revocation of an alien's clearance because of marriage to a citizen is that the Navy feels it is not in the best interests of the United States to build up in Guam an alien colony whose members are qualified to become permanent residents.[83]

Just why an alien colony in Guam is detrimental to the interests of national defense has never been fully explained, particularly in view of the fact that there are presently only about 6,500 aliens on the island of Guam, and by far the greater portion of those aliens are working for the U.S. Government or for contractors of the Government The fallacy of the "alien colony" argument advanced by the Navy is particularly revealed by the fact that although the United States as far more extensive operations on the island of Okinawa than in Guam, Okinawa has an "alien colony" residing thereon, numbering almost 800,000. This is more than one-hundred times the number of aliens on Guam, although the land area of Okinawa is little more than twice that of Guam. Nor has the Navy given any reason why Filipino aliens should be more detrimental to national defense because they happen to reside in Guam, than Okinawans loyal to the Japanese are detrimental to defense because they reside in the small land area of Okinawa.[83a]

(b) Penalties for violators: Navy Guam regulations set forth no less than five sections of the United States Code as providing penalties for violations of Executive Order No. 8683.[84] One of the sections cited[85] is really not applicable to the security clearance program inasmuch as it provides a penalty for entering military reservations. The entire island of Guam is not a military reservation and the code section therefore applies to Guam only to the same extent that it applies to a U.S. military reservation, post, or camp anywhere in the United States.

Another section cited provides a penalty for violating any regulation or order promulgated pursuant to law by military authority.[86]

A third section cited provides a punishment for knowingly making any false or fraudulent statement or representation.[87] The rather obvious reason for citing that section is seen when one considers the voluminous paperwork applicants are required to execute in order to obtain a security clearance.[88]

Another section cited provides a penalty for anyone who knowingly or wilfully violates any Executive order.[89] It is this section that has been "violated" a number of times in Guam by persons who have been denied a security clearance but who nevertheless have entered the island. In their case the Navy has without fail issued them a security clearance forthwith and has not held them long enough to enable their counsel to obtain a writ of habeas corpus.[90]

The fifth penalty provision cited by the regulations related to the naval airspace reservations [91] and has been repealed, subject to a savings clause which provided that all orders made by the President under any provision of law repealed or amended by the act, which were in effect at the time the section takes effect, should continue in effect according to their terms until modified, or terminated, superseded, set aside, or repealed by the administrator or the board or by any court of competent jurisdiction or by operation of law.[92]

C. Procedural due process of law denied

The constitutional right to a hearing has been defined in *Morgan* v. *United States*,[93] as follows:

"The right to a hearing embraces not only the right to present evidence but also a reasonable opportunity to know the claims of the opposing party and to meet them. The right to submit argument implies that opportunity; otherwise the right may be but a barren one. Those who are brought into contest with the Government in a quasi-judicial proceeding aimed at the control of their activities are entitled to be fairly advised of what the Government proposes and to be heard upon its proposals before it issues its final command." [94]

Prior to the fourth day of September 1956, the Navy had administered the security clearance program for some 13 years,[95] excluding the time Guam had been occupied by the Japanese, without giving persons to whom it denied a clearance any reason or right to appeal.

As Kelsen has pointed out, the liberties granted under a bill of rights are rights only if there is the right to appeal:

"The liberties it (the Bill of Rights) states are rights in a juristic sense only if the subjects have an opportunity to appeal against acts of state by which the provisions of the constitution are violated in order to get them annulled."[96]

1. The Feraru case—appeal procedure supplied:

In 1953 Arthur N. Feraru was hired by United Seamen's Service to come to Guam in their employ. Subsequently the Navy informed Mr. Feraru that his application for a security clearance had been denied. Mr. Feraru then lost his job since the employer apparently required his services only on Guam. Subsequently, in December 1955 Mr. Feraru filed suit against the Secretary of the Navy in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.[97] The Government filed an answer admitting substantially all of the factual allegations in the complaint but denying that plaintiffs were entitled to relief and denying on information and belief that plaintiffs were loyal to the United States.

Within 9 months of the filing of the Feraru suit the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations issued a new directive providing a procedure, though grossly inadequate, whereby a U.S. citizen denied entry to Guam might appeal and receive an administrative hearing.[98] This was the first attempt on the part of the Navy to establish an administrative board to hear appeals. The directive is very brief. It places the burden upon the petitioner to justify his entry into Guam. The petitioner is also required to show that his entry would serve the best interests of the United States. The directive applies only to U.S. citizens. The board it establishes is composed of three naval officers or employees who are not empowered to make a final decision. That decision is made by the Chief of Naval Operations to whom the board only makes a recommendation.[99]

---

pose of settling permanently.'" Abcede, "Filipinos in Guam," the Manila Sunday Chronicle, July 26, 1959 (Magazine) p. 16, col. 3.

The Department of Justice maintains an Immigration and Naturalization Office in Guam, and the entry of aliens is controlled by that office. Under the ostensible authority of Executive Order 8683, however, the Navy excludes numerous aliens who have been admitted by Immigration authorities for announced reasons no better than "Guam for the Guamanians."

[83] "The long term presence on Guam of aliens in large numbers would be a detriment to the effective use of Guam for its primary mission of defense, while heavy population of the island by aliens could not fail to adversely affect the people of Guam and their own economy." Letter From Comdr. Edward L. Beach, Naval Aide to the President, to F. L. Moylan, Guam Businessman, September 20, 1956. The latter reason hardly seems a proper concern of the Navy even if true.

[83a] As a further justification for the imposition of the security clearance, the Navy has insisted on its duty to enforce Executive Order No. 8683. See Letter From Ira H. Nunn, Navy Judge Adv. Gen., to Rear Adm. H. A. Houser, June 3, 1953. However, although current Navy regulations list all Naval Defensive Sea Areas and Naval Airspace Reservations set aside by Executive order, the Navy has suspended operation of entry controls in no less than nine of these areas. 32 C.F.R. §§ 761.3–.4 (Supp. 1959). Entry control with respect to Tutuila and Rose Islands was revoked by Executive Order No. 10341, 17 Fed. Reg. 3143 (1952). With respect to the other areas, "suspension of the operation of certain entry controls * * * has been accomplished administratively and is subject to reinstatement without notice at any time." Letter From Comdr. C. E. Herrick, Office of Chief of Naval Operations, to W. Scott Barrett, July 31, 1959. It is difficult, to say the least, to reconcile this administrative suspension of entry controls with respect to selected areas with a compelling duty of obeying Executive Order No. 8683 with respect to entry controls for Guam. Unfortunately, the opinion of the Judge Advocate General's department which concluded that the Navy had such a duty is unavailable. It is, as has been noted before, a classified document. See text at note 35 supra.

[84] OPNAV Instruction 5500.11B, Nov. 27, 1957, p. 7, 32 C.F.R. § 761.3(f) (Supp. 1959).

[85] 18 U.S.C. § 1382 (1958).

[86] 64 Stat. 1005 (1950), 50 U.S.C. § 797 (1958).

[87] 18 U.S.C. § 1001 (1958).

[88] Applicants are required to itemize in detail all places of residence and employment for the past 10 years. OPNAV Instruction 5500.11B, Nov. 27, 1957, p. 22, 32 C.F.R. 761.8(b)(3)(iv)–(v) (Supp. 1959).

[89] 18 U.S.C. § 2152 (1958).

[90] One petition for a writ of habeas corpus was actually filed, but the Navy issued a clearance thus rendering the case moot before the court made any decision. *Bolosan* v. *Johnson*, Civil No. 29-55, D. Guam, Apr. 20, 1955.

[91] Act of May 20, 1926, ch. 344, § 4, 44 Stat. 570 (repealed by The Federal Aviation Act of 1958, § 1401, 72 Stat. 806).

[92] Federal Aviation Act of 1958, § 1504, 72 Stat. 811, 49 U.S.C. § 1301 (1958).

[93] 304 U.S. 1 (1938).

[94] Id. at 18–19.

[95] During the period between the time of the reoccupation of Guam and Dec. 4, 1950, the Navy did not actually enforce the security clearance; until the passage of the Organic Act in July 1950 it had unquestioned power to exclude anyone from the island. See text at notes 7–9 supra.

[96] Kelsen, "General Theory of Law and State," 236 (1949).

[97] *Feraru* v. *Thomas*, Civil No. 3603–55, D.D.C., Dec. 27, 1955.

[98] OPNAV Instruction 5420.18, Sept. 4, 1956 (reproduced in App. B). The Navy originally contended no hearing of any kind was required. "The Navy has at no time made any charges against Mr. and Mrs. Feraru. There is no statutory or legal requirement for a hearing in this case, and there has been no change in Navy Department procedures for handling requests for entry into the Island of Guam. Under the terms of Executive Order 8683 . . . no hearing is provided for and none is contemplated where refusal of entry occurs." Letter From Rear Adm. L. L. Russell to David I. Shapiro, of Deickstein, Shapiro & Friedman, New York, Counsel for Mr. and Mrs. Feraru, November 10, 1955.

[99] Compare the appellate procedure reported in Parker v. Lester, 227 F. 2d 708, 712 (9th Cir. 1955). In the Parker case, too, the Commandant made the final decision and the burden was on petitioners to show they were good security risks.

In January 1957 the Feraru suit was continued by stipulation until the Navy could complete the procedure offered the Ferarus under the new directive. Thereafter, the Feraru family, because of personal problems, were forced to delay the hearing offered them by the Secretary of the Navy pursuant to the directive. Their counsel thereafter agreed to dismiss the suit without prejudice rather than let it remain endlessly on the docket.[1]

Regardless of the merits of his case, there is no doubt that Mr. Feraru was denied procedural due process of law. Only after suit was filed did the Navy provide for appeal. Still more time passed before the appeal machinery was actually set up. The Navy is notoriously slow in these matters. Nor do the regulations providing for appeal take cognizance of the fact that when one desires to travel, it is usually a desire which must be acted on immediately or it is frustrated entirely. By the time the appeal procedure had been provided, Mr. Feraru had lost his job. Few persons would have the time and money and inclination to carry a court case forward under such circumstances.

2. The Parker and Greene cases—appeal procedure inadequate:

Unquestionably the Navy directive offering a limited administrative hearing does not provide the procedural due process of law required by the Constitution. In *Parker* v. *Lester*[2] petitioners were denied security clearances by the Commandant of the Coast Guard and were thereby deprived of their employment as merchant seamen. The Commandant's order had been made pursuant to an Executive order[3] authorized by statute.[4] The principal contention of petitioners was that they were subjected to procedures that deprived them of due process of law in violation of the fifth amendment. The district court judge defined procedural due process of law as "the maximum procedural safeguards which can be afforded petitioners without jeopardizing the security program,"[5] but nevertheless held against petitioners. On appeal the court of appeals reversed,[6] holding that the regulations fell short of furnishing the minimum requirements of due process in respect to notice and opportunity to be heard.[7] In so holding the appellate court discussed the regulations provided by the Coast Guard, which were strikingly similar to the Navy directive establishing the review board.[8] The Coast Guard board in Parker had before it the complete record on which the Commandant's initial determination to deny clearance was made, but none of this was disclosed to the seamen, although they could appear in person and by counsel and could submit testimony and documentary evidence. The burden of showing that they were good security risks was on the seamen, notwithstanding the fact that they knew neither the names nor the identities of, nor anything else about their accusers. The Commandant had final authority to grant or deny the security clearance. The board only had power to recommend.[9] The court of appeals apparently placed great weight upon the fact that the accused seamen were not furnished with a bill of particulars setting forth the source of the data upon which their security clearances were denied.[10]

The Navy directive providing for a limited hearing makes no provision whatsoever for informing the person whose application for entry clearance has been denied as to the source of information upon which the determination was based. Another directive sets forth a form letter which is sent to all persons whose requests for entry authorization are denied.[11] That letter merely states that their entry has been denied because it is not considered in the interests of national defense. The person is then advised that he may appeal the decision by submitting a letter to the Chief of Naval Operations, setting forth in full why the granting of the application would be in the best interests of national defense. Officers are expressly instructed to give no reason whatsoever when they deny a clearance.[12]

In *Greene* v. *McElroy*[13] an employee of an aircraft factory having access to classified information had his security clearance revoked, thereby causing him to lose his job. The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held that one having access to classified matter may be deprived of his employment without any procedural safeguards. That decision was discussed and criticized in the California Law Review,[14] the author concluding that Greene should have been given one or more of the following rights: (1) The right to know the evidence used against him; (2) the right to know the identity of his accusers and to cross-examine them; and (3) the right to inspect reports made by his accusers to the Government.

The Supreme Court granted certiorari and decided the case on June 29, 1959.[15] The Court, Mr. Chief Justice Warren writing the opinion, reversed the court of appeals. The constitutional question was not reached. Rather, the Court apparently preferred to decide the case on the ground that the type of hearing given the petitioner "was the product of administrative decision not explicitly authorized by either Congress or the President."[16] In that connection the Court said:

"Before we are asked to judge whether, in the context of security clearance cases, a person may be deprived of the right to follow his chosen profession without full hearings where accusers may be confronted, it must be made clear that the President and Congress, within their constitutional powers, specifically have decided that the imposed procedures are necessary and warranted and have authorized their use. Such decisions cannot be assumed by acquiescence or nonaction. They must be made explicitly not only to assure that individuals are not deprived of cherished rights under procedures not actually authorized * * * but also because explicit action, especially in areas of doubtful constitutionality, requires careful and purposeful consideration by those responsible for enacting and implementing our laws. Without explicit action by lawmakers, decisions of great constitutional import and effect would be relegated by default to administrators who, under our system of government, are not endowed with authority to decide them."[17]

Significantly, the U.S. Navy cites as its only authority for enforcing the security clearance entry requirement in Guam the Executive order issued by President Roosevelt in 1941. Congress did not ratify that order although the President was authorized by Congress to make it.[18] It is by no means clear that either the President or Congress within their constitutional powers have specifically decided that the procedures imposed by the U.S. Navy are necessary and warranted. Citizens and aliens alike have been deprived of liberty and property,[19] and the procedures used have afforded less due process than that given to Greene. It must therefore be assumed that Congress and the President intended to afford those affected by the Guam naval security clearance entry requirement the traditional safeguards of due process.

The issue in the Greene case was whether the Department of Defense had been authorized to create an industrial security clearance program under which persons having access to classified information may lose their jobs on the basis of facts determined in proceedings in which they are denied the traditional procedural safeguards of confrontation and cross-examination. It is at once apparent that the authorization given to the Defense Department to administer its clearance program was much more complex and granted greater authority than has been given to the Navy by virtue of Executive Order No. 8683. The appellate procedure offered to Greene appeared to give him an opportunity for a fair hearing which was considerably better than that given by the appellate procedure offered to those denied a security clearance to enter Guam.[20]

CONCLUSION

If naval officials were convinced that their security clearance program was legally unassailable it would seem that some of the many violators would have been prosecuted. On the contrary, as has been pointed out, no one has been prosecuted, and violators who enter the island without a clearance are immediately issued one or are permitted to stay without a clearance rather than allow the entire program to be tested in the civil courts.[31]

---

[1] Letter From James H. Heller, Counsel for Mr. Feraru, to W. Scott Barrett, May 26, 1959.

[2] 227 F.2d 708 (9th Cir. 1955), reversing 112 F. Supp. 433 (N.D. Cal. 1953).

[3] Exec. Order No. 10173, 15 Fed. Reg. 7005–08 (1950).

[4] Magnuson Act § 1, 64 Stat. 427 (1950), as amended, 50 U.S.C. § 191 (1958).

[5] *Parker* v. *Lester*, 112 F. Supp. 433, 443 (N.D. Cal. 1953).

[6] *Parker* v. *Lester*, 227 F.2d 708 (9th Cir. 1955).

[7] Id. at 724.

[8] Discussed note 98 supra; see App. B.

[9] Cf. OPNAV Instruction 5420.16 (see App. B).

[10] *Parker* v. *Lester*, 227 F.2d 708, 716 (9th Cir. 1955): "Thus if the Commandant's information is that at a certain time and place the accused seaman in a conversation with an acquaintance spoke disparagingly of the American flag, the seaman will have no information that this incident is being considered, for to mention the charge would be to disclose the informer."

[11] OPNAV Instruction 5500.11B, Nov. 27, 1957, p. 31; see note 2 supra. The form letter is not printed in the Code of Federal Regulations.

[12] OPNAV Instruction 5500.11B, Nov. 27, 1957, p. 28, 32 C.F.R. § 761.16 (Supp. 1959).

[13] 254 F. 2d 944 (D.C. Cir. 1958).

[14] 46 Calif. L. Rev. 838 (1958).

[15] *Greene* v. *McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474 (1959).

[16] Id. at 508.

[17] *Greene* v. *McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474, 507 (1959).

[18] By virtue of the act of Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 321, § 44, 35 Stat. 1097, as amended, ch. 180, 39 Stat. 1194 (1917), added by ch. 20, § 19, 40 Stat. 89 (1917) (now, as amended, 18 U.S.C. § 2152 (1958)).

[19] Joseph Siciliano, a local businessman, somehow incurred the enmity of the Navy and has been excluded from Guam and told never to return. The actual reasons are known to no one but the Navy. Siciliano's substantial business interests in Guam have diminished or vanished due to his prolonged absence.

[20] The Board made the final decision. Greene was informed of charges against him but not of the identity of the informers. Greene had access to three appeal boards, the Personnel Security Board (PSB), the Industrial Employment Review Board (IERB), and the Eastern Industrial Personnel Security Board (EIPSB). Greene had been cleared in 1952 by the IERB, which reversed the PSB. On March 27, 1953, the PSB and the IERB were abolished. On April 17, 1953, the Secretary of the Navy arbitrarily and without further hearing revoked Greene's clearance. More than one year later Greene was granted a hearing before the EIPSB which affirmed the Navy's decision.

If there is some doubt in the minds of naval officials as to the legality of the clearance, why do they insist on continuing to enforce it? The answer hardly can be found in the official reasons given by the Navy as set forth in the introduction to this article. Many of the reasons given are not valid at the present time due to change in circumstances, and many others have no justification in law. Although one can only speculate, the real reason seems to be that the Navy hesitates to relinquish power which it has exercised for many years over the entire populace of Guam. The Navy once ruled Guam with an iron hand, and the enforcement of Executive Order No. 8683 may be an attempt to retain as much of that rule as possible.

In Hawaii during World War II martial law was in existence. J. Gardner Anthony, who was for a time attorney general of Hawaii during World War II, summed up the reasons why martial law in Hawaii was allowed to continue for years after it was necessary. His words are equally applicable to Guam at the present time:

"Perhaps one of the reasons why martial law in Hawaii was allowed to continue for years without correction from the War Department in Washington lies in the application to the situation in Hawaii of the precept that judgment of the military commander in the field should not be disturbed, a principle valid enough at or near the battlefield, but dangerous when applied generally. No one likes to admit error. It is only human to defend a position once it is publicly asserted. However, in the face of convincing proof most people will give way. In the military system this would be looked upon as a sign of weakness. Once a decision is reached by a military commander, change will be resisted even in the face of almost conclusive evidence of error."[32]

Others have also spoken out against the Navy security clearance requirement in Guam. In a speech before the Multnomah County Bar Association in Portland, Oreg., in August 1957, Judge J. Frank McLaughlin of the U.S. District Court of Hawaii spoke out against the legality of the Guam security clearance.[33] His speech was commented upon in an editorial in the Portland Oregonian.[34] The editorial referred to an incident involving Ford Q. Elvidge, Governor of Guam from 1953 to 1956. Governor Elvidge wrote after leaving his post that he had been surprised by the number of prostitutes in Guam whose origins were in other countries. He asked a Navy officer why these girls, whose vocation was apparent, were admitted in such numbers whereas a casual tourist would be turned down. "Governor," said the officer, "our clearance is for security, and we haven't any reason to think these girls are subversive."

The editorial comment continued:

"There were probably few lawyers in Judge McLaughlin's audience who would want to undertake to justify legally the U.S. administration's high hand in Guam. The security regulations are, according to the Navy, based on an order issued by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Actually the Navy is not in charge of civil administration in Guam. This, since 1950, has been the responsibility of the Department of Interior operating through a Governor appointed by the President. The Government has limited the veto power over the locally elected unicameral legislature. It is not clear why Guam should be the most stringently guarded of all U.S. territories * * * [for] the scars of war have disappeared from Guam. Its beaches rival in beauty any in the Pacific. Its climate is near perfection. But U.S. tourists are not likely soon to explore its charms. The U.S. Navy doesn't want to be bothered. In fact, a naval spokesman has been heard to take credit for keeping all sorts of "riffraff" out of Guam under cover of the security program.[35]

One can only conclude that the U.S. Navy is intentionally enforcing the naval security clearance while realizing at the same time that it is unsupported by statute and is unconstitutional. The words of Judge McLaughlin are again appropriate, though he was commenting upon the fact that the Army continued martial law on Hawaii long after it was necessary. He said:

"Yes, they did it. They did it intentionally. They did it with design aforethought. They did it in knowing disregard of the Constitution. They did it because Hawaii is not a State. They did it because they did not have faith that Americanism transcends race, class and creed." [36]

APPENDIX A

(1) Denial of clearance by Commander Naval Forces Marianas:

U.S. PACIFIC FLEET,
COMMANDER NAVAL FORCES MARIANAS,
Fleet Post Office, San Francisco, Calif.

From: Commander Naval Forces Marianas.
To: Commander 3d Air Division (SAC) Andersen Air Force Base, Attn: Provost Marshal.
Subject: Guam entry clearances; denial of.

1. In view of information obtained by Commander Naval Forces Marianas during the processing of the following Filipino contract laborers for regular Guam entry clearances, the authorization of these men to remain within, or reenter the Guam Naval Defensive Sea Area is hereby denied:

* * * * *

Palican, Feliciano (clerk), laundry.

* * * * *

2. It is requested that these Filipino contract laborers be repatriated to the Philippines as soon as possible. It is further requested that the Commander Naval Forces Marianas be notified when the repatriation of the above men has been accomplished.

By direction.

G. W. ROBERTS.

---

(2) Letter canceling employment:

CENTRAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL OFFICE,
3960TH AIR BASE GROUP (SAC),
U.S. AIR FORCE,
APO 334, San Francisco, Calif.,
March 29, 1957.

BPCP
Subject: Notice of proposed separation (disqualification).
To: Mr. Feliciano Palican, 3960th Supply Squadron.
Attention: Base laundry.
APO 334.

1. This notice is issued in accordance with the provisions of Civil Service Regulation 9.102(a) and chapter AFS1 of AFM 40-1. You are hereby given 30 days notice of proposed action to separate you from your position for disqualification not earlier than May 1, 1957, for the following reason:

(a) Your separation was requested by the Department of Navy, letter dated March 9, 1957, which indicated that your Guam entry clearance had been revoked. Since you are no longer in possession of the necessary clearance, it is therefore necessary to separate you from the service.

2. You are hereby informed of your right to reply personally and in writing to this notice of proposed separation and to show cause why the action should not be taken. You may submit affidavits and evidence in support of your answer. Your reply must be within 7 calendar days of receipt of this notice. A written reply should be made to the Civilian Personnel Office.

3. No decision to separate you has been made or will be made until after the time allowed you for reply. Your reply will be given full and careful consideration before final decision is made. Whether you reply or not, a written notice of final decision will be given you.

4. You will be continued in a work status during the notice period in your present position until you are instructed to clear the base for transportation to the Philippine Islands on or about May 1, 1957.

By order of the commander:

WILLIAM L. PUETT,
Civilian Personnel Officer.

APPENDIX B

ESTABLISHMENT OF NAVAL DEFENSIVE SEA AREA REVIEW BOARD

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

OPNAV instruction 5420.18.
From: Chief of Naval Operations.
To: Distribution list.
Subject: Naval Defensive Sea Area Review Board; establishment of.
Reference:
- (a) General Order No. 13.
- (b) OPNAV instruction 5500.11A (security clearance procedure for entrance of individuals to Guam, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Bonin-Volcano Islands and Marcus Island, Midway, Wake and Johnston Island).

1. Purpose: This instruction establishes the OPNAV Naval Defensive Sea Area Review Board and sets forth the policies and procedures governing operations of the board.

2. Composition of the board: The OPNAV Naval Defensive Sea Area Review Board is hereby established in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations and will be composed as follows:

(a) One (1) rear admiral USN who will act as Chairman and will be designated by the DCNO (Administration).

(b) One (1) civilian member GS-14, or above, designated by the DCNO (Administration).

(c) One (1) captain USN or one civilian GS-14, member, who will be appointed by the DCNO (Administration).

(d) There will be a recorder to provide staff assistance to the board who will be appointed by the DCNO (Administration).

3. Duties and responsibilities of the board: The board will act only in the case of U.S. citizens who make application for entry into a defensive sea area and who are denied entry. Such individual whose entry is denied under the provisions of reference (b) may petition the board for further consideration of the case, by submitted a request in writing to the Chief of Naval Operations. The petitioner may appear at his own expense or be represented by counsel, and may present a reasonable number of witnesses who have intimate knowledge of the circumstances. In this connection, the board has the right to restrict the number of witnesses

---

[31] Numerous individuals have entered through the Air Force base in Guam without a naval clearance, though they are not included in the Navy's exempt groups. See note 28 supra and text at note 89 supra.

[32] Anthony, "Hawaii Under Army Rule," 122 (1947).

[33] Judge McLaughlin has visited Guam as Judge of the Guam District Court, Appellate Division.

[34] Bauer, "American Guam Off-Limits to Americans," Portland Oregonian, Aug. 4, 1957, p. 42, cols. 4-5.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Anthony, "Hawaii Under Army Rule," 118 (1947), quoting from the Honolulu Advertizer, Feb. 28, 1946.

insofar as contribution of additional information is concerned. After fair and reasonable effort to ascertain facts has been made, the board will commend to the Chief of Naval Operations the final disposition in the case.

4. Policy: It is incumbent upon the petitioner to provide full justification for his entry and to show that the interests of the United States are served by such entry.

5. Procedures: In order to execute its mission the board may take the following action as appropriate:

(a) Request testimony (not under oath) from interested parties as deemed necessary, except that the petitioner may at his option testify under oath or submit sworn statements. The board does not have the power of subpena.

(b) Request services of technical specialist who are able to assist the board in the establishment of fact.

(c) Obtain from other sources information which will enable the board to render its determination without prejudice or bias.

(d) The board will prepare a brief of the significant issues and facts in presenting its recommendation to the Chief of Naval Operations for his final decision.

(e) The board may establish such other procedures as it deems necessary.

Arleigh Burke.

BILLIE SOL ESTES AND GRAIN STORAGE TRANSACTIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, under date of April 5, 1962, I directed an inquiry to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, requesting information as to the status of any financial arrangements or storage agreements between his Department and Mr. Billie Sol Estes, of Texas. I have asked for a complete report concerning all of his operations with the Government, which I now understand may extend beyond storage agreements.

Under date of April 13 I received an acknowledgment of the April 5 letter, signed by Mr. B. S. Soleau, Director, Inventory Management Division, stating that the information was being assembled and within a few days I would get a report.

I was interested to note an article which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 14, under the headline "U.S. Aid Quits in Payola From Fertilizer King."

The article states that a U.S. Agriculture Department official was said to have received $1,433 worth of luxurious gift clothes from this same indicted Billie Sol Estes.

I must say that this news article, to the effect that Mr. Jacobs has been removed from the Department pending inquiry, only further arouses my interest. I am awaiting a full report from the Department of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that the two letters and the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

April 5, 1962.

Hon. Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Secretary: It is my understanding that Mr. Billie Sol Estes, of the El Paso, Tex., area, who recently was mentioned as being involved in a questionable transaction concerning the financing of storage bins, was also storing substantial quantities of Government grain. Allegedly his storage interests were in the United Elevators, Plainview, Tex.; Allied Elevators, Hereford, Tex.; and South Plains Grain Co., South Plains, Tex.; as well as certain others of which I do not have the names.

In this connection I would appreciate the following information:

1. A list of all elevators owned or controlled by Mr. Estes in which any Government grain is stored.

(a) The amount and kind of grain stored in each as of the most recent date readily available.

(b) The amount of storage which has been paid by the Government to each of these companies during the past calendar year.

2. Has the Department experienced any difficulty in prior years from the standpoint of either shortage or downgrading of grain that was stored for the Govenment?

3. Since the recent adverse publicity of Mr. Estes has there been any reexamination of the inventories in these warehouses as well as the condition of the Government grain? If so, please advise the results of such examination.

Your sincerely,

John J. Williams.

U.S Department of Agriculture,
Agriculture Stabilization and
Conservation Service,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1962.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Williams: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 5, 1962, addressed to Secretary Freeman, in which you request certain information concerning grain elevators owned or controlled by Mr. Billie Sol Estes of Texas.

A reply to your letter will be sent to you within a few days.

Sincerely yours,

B. S. Soleau,
Director, Inventory Management Division.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Apr. 14, 1962]

U.S. Aid Quits in Payola From Fertilizer King

Dallas, Tex., April 13.—A U.S. Agriculture Department official said to have received $1,433 worth of luxurious gift clothes from indicted Texas fertilizer king Billie Sol Estes resigned in Washington Friday.

The official, Emery E. Jacobs, Deputy Administrator of the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service, said he was ready to come to Texas and tell his story under oath.

He said there has been no "blemish or implication of misusing the public's trust" in his long years as a public servant.

HE IS GUILTY

Texas Attorney General Will Wilson, who charged Thursday that Estes took two Agriculture Department men shopping for $245 suits and $65 slacks in the Neiman-Marcus Co. men's store at Dallas, said, "In my opinion, he is guilty."

"We want him to testify to all his relationships with Billie Sol Estes, especially as to how Billie Sol Estes managed to secure the storage of U.S. Commodity Credit Corporation grain," Wilson added.

Estes, 37, was until recently regarded as a Texas financial genius. He now is under Federal indictment with three associates on charges of committing 57 acts of fraud in an anhydrous ammonia fertilizer scheme.

His interests, once unofficially estimated to be worth a gross of $150 million, now are run by a court-appointed receiver. He admits he is $20 million in debt.

FORTY-SIX MILLION DOLLARS IN GRAIN

The basis of his prostrate empire was an interlocking fertilizer and Federal grain storage business. An estimated $46 million worth of grain is in elevators he wholly or partly owns.

Jacobs, an Oklahoman, has spent more than 30 years in Government agriculture work. He is a friend of Democratic Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, and headed the Farmers for Kennedy organization in Oklahoma in 1960.

Wilson seeks to prove that Estes showered gifts on Agriculture Department officials to get them to put grain in his elevators. The Government paid him $8 million in 3 years for storage.

AN EDITOR'S CHALLENGE TO OUR AMERICAN PRESS

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, a week ago, it was my privilege to attend the annual meeting of the South Dakota Press Association in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. The annual banquet was addressed by one of neighboring Minnesota's most distinguished editors who has held numerous national offices in the press and editorial associations of our country—Mr. Alan C. McIntosh, editor and publisher of the Rock County Star Herald of Luverne, Minn.

In blunt, picturesque, dramatic language, Alan McIntosh challenged his fellow editors and publishers in this Republic to climb down out of their ivory towers and to revive the type of fearless, unintimidated, unshackled journalism which during the golden era of journalism in America enabled the press of this country to provide a responsible and respected leadership that did more than any other factor to determine the direction of our country's destiny.

So that others in the country and the Congress may have an opportunity to read and analyze Mr. McIntosh's penetrating presentation, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An Editor's Challenge to Our American Press

This is not going to be a Dale Carnegie type of talk. Instead, I'll probably make a number of people angry, but there are some things that I feel should be said.

Most of us got into the newspaper business the easy way. If we could scrape up a downpayment we were in business. We didn't have to tote a sack of type and a handpress by river boat or prairie schooner and risk our lives in a raw frontier town.

And we don't have to keep in our office desk a piece of equipment that was as necessary as a font of type in pioneer days—a shooting iron.

I think it does good to think back what our pioneer journalistic forefathers went through—Goodhue, Minnesota's first newspaperman had to fight a pistol-bowie knife duel on the streets of Pigs Eye Landing, which is now St. Paul, because a subscriber objected to one of his political editorials.

Down in New Mexico there were about 13 pioneer newspapermen that met violent death—one editor being shot as he entered his church for a Christmas Eve service.

In making talks to the Minnesota audience and the New Mexico newspapermen, I had plenty of data because their historical societies furnished me a wealth of material.

It was a little different preparing for this talk. Your State historical society couldn't furnish me any material of value, and didn't even reply to my second letter renewing my query as to whether history shows whether or not any South Dakota editor was ever killed or wounded. The historian told me he was too busy.

Thanks to Marv Gilbertson, who sent me the book "Tramp Printer," by John Hicks, I did catch one chapter that gave a hint of the color that surrounded the early days of newspapering in hell-roaring western South Dakota.

The author tells of his trip by stagecoach from Sidney, Nebr., to Deadwood, where he secured a job.

He says the "terrain was not difficult until we reached Custer. As we drove into the wide and only street of the town, the usual crowd of miners and others greeted us. A young woman was riding with the driver on the front seat and impetuously removed a part of her more intimate apparel and stood up waving them in friendly fashion to the cheering crowd."

Charles Collins of the Sioux City Times had started for the Black Hills with type and presses for his new paper which he planned to establish at Gayville but the equipment was all lost when the steamboat burned.

Did you know that the original Black Hills gold was figuratively discovered in the hellbox of the Sioux City Times? Deadwood then was made up mostly of red-light houses, gambling joints, saloons, and Chinese opium dens, and Hicks tells of the flood that hit Deadwood. The printers heroically rescued the entire stock of a saloon, carrying it to safety in the composing room of the paper. When the printers disposed of what they had rescued, the owner couldn't get the paper out for 2 days.

Another thing that Hicks tells is that the Sioux City Journal could have scooped the world on Custer's massacre but the telegraph editor looked at the skeletonized story about the massacre and said, "Just another Indian killing" and gave it about four lines of type.

I wonder if we are going to be just as blind about the import of some of the stories that are taking place before our eyes—I wonder if we will be able to face up to tomorrow's challenges like these pioneers.

A newspaper without an editorial page is a sterile thing—not a newspaper—it means that the editor either has no opinion or is too timid to voice them. Have some of us substituted pink tea editorials for the fire and brimstone editorials of a century ago, because it makes for "good public relations," are we working overtime to avoid controversy?

If we are, we are betraying a precious heritage, bought with us in blood, because we are the living trustees of freedom of the press.

The dictator fears our typewriter more than he fears a plastic bomb.

There were plenty of heroes in those days—men with a lot of raw courage and high principles—and I want to make it plain that no State had a monopoly on personal courage, 75 years ago, or today for that matter.

Those pioneers were a strange breed of cats. Some were uncouth, some came from exclusive Eastern schools, but they all had one thing in common—they wanted to print the news and they wanted freedom and they were willing to fight for it and to put conscience above pocketbook.

These people had one burning desire—to blaze a trail—and they had heard of the old Indian who said, "Every man has to leave a track to show that he passed this way in life"—A track that no farmer can ever plow under.

Some of us aren't going to leave much of a track, which is a tragedy, because a newspaper that does nothing but paddle along downstream with public opinion is of no value whatsoever—to itself, to its readers, or its community.

Even the fourth graders know that we are living in a fantastic era of science where there seems to be no boundaries on what we can achieve.

The New York Times now transmits 60,000 words in an hour for its overseas edition.

Louis Janssen has a new electronic printer tube which will produce a picture—not in the present 7 minutes, but in one third of a second.

IBM has a scanner that does 20,000 numbers a minute—that's 1,200,000 numbers an hour.

Sterling Hoff showed me a new teletype kind of linotype keyboard that could produce type at the rate of 32 lines a minute.

Last summer the three McIntosh's went back to Europe on Pan American's jets. You fly 40,000 feet high at 600 miles an hour—you say "we're racing the sun."

But how fast?

Hopelessly slow compared to our electronic devices that give you the answer in a millionth of a second.

What is a millionth of a second? It is the time it takes for a Pan Am jet to fly from one side of this pin to the other.

IBM now has developed an experimental film memory unit for computers that can feed back stored data in one-hundred billionths of a second.

We have new cameras that take pictures at 5 billionths of a second, three pictures exposed fifty billionths of a second apart.

Control Data in Minneapolis has a computer that will transmit 160,000 characters a minute.

Why are we at a disadvantage in keeping up with what Russia is doing in the field of science—they put it all in their scientific journals.

But translation by humans is slow. Humans can do only 2,600 words an hour, so 97 percent of all Russian scientific journals go untranslated.

But IBM is marketing a machine that will translate Russian into English at the rate of 108,000 words, or a 300 page book, every hour.

But America isn't built by electronics; America was not built by machines; our fourth estate may be on the verge of sensational mechanical improvements, but great papers, whether small or large in circulation, weren't built by machines—they are the creation of dedicated men and women.

There is not—and never will be—any substitute for a human mind, a human heart, a human soul.

But not one of you, no matter how small your circulation or how small your main street is unimportant * * * to your community (and a town can do without a railroad but not without a newspaper if it is to live) your State or to your Nation.

When I say no newspaper is unimportant to our body politics let me illustrate what I mean.

Your heart beats about 70 times a minute. That's 36,720,000 heart beats a year—and 2,391,480,000 in your lifetime. Every day it pumps 51,840 quarts of blood; that's 19 million quarts a year.

No matter how big you are, that little heart is pumping away without time out for repair or replacement is hopelessly dependent on an artery. Let one artery, no thicker than the lead in your pencil, blow up then that magnificent heart is all through. There is no unimportant artery in the human body. There is no unimportant newspaper in the body politic.

We have more at stake in this matter of the vitality of a free press than our own lives; we hold the future of our children's children.

How much courage have we? Madame Yvonne Hakin, editor of Madame, in Haiti had courage. This just happened a few weeks ago. She was kidnapped, brutally beaten, raped, and mutilated because she dared to speak up against a cruel dictator.

Do we have that courage or do we worry that we might offend somebody and lose a 4-inch ad or a subscriber?

There used to be 150 million buffalo roaming these Plains States a hundred years ago. Now all that are left are a few in the zoo. The buffalo hunters are gone and a buffalo hunting rifle is obsolete.

But even the hot metal may someday become obsolete in newspaper production, there never will be an obsolescence editorial integrity and courage. And the Nation needs us more now than at any time in our history.

It's high time some of us faced up to the challenge of whether we are editors—or just printers.

And more than ever before we need an awakening of social conscience. If we had lived in the time of Christ, would we have passed by the injured man lying beside the road, would we have been the good Samaritan who gave comfort and aid?

So many of us quit so near to the top.

In 1959 we went abroad. We went abroad again in 1961 because I have been more than a bit terror stricken the way the lights of freedom are dying out around the world. It is so easy to let our light, in our own community, go out. But we must not falter; we must not be a modern Esau trading our precious birthright of freedom of the press for a mess of pottage. If we haven't the courage to stand up and dare to be willing to be unpopular, then we should sell out and go in the popcorn business.

We were in Paris when De Gaulle's secret police were staging dawn raids and arresting prominent newspaper journalists and attorneys—and closing down newspapers.

We were trailed in Portugal and we saw the troops at the airport censoring incoming copies of newspapers and magazines. We saw the great uneasiness in Spain and we could almost feel and touch the great silence—of censorship.

We've seen how the people in East Germany hungrily read and listen to every scrap of legitimate news from the West. All this and much more we have seen.

When freedom of the press dies rigor mortis of a nation sets in, too. When freedom of the press fades so does the effectiveness of advertising as a media.

And how much freedom is left in the world?

I could call the roll of the nations but there isn't that much time. I could mention Russia where after 43 years the Government doesn't dare give its citizens a free press, a free radio, or television. You remember what happened first in Cuba: the newspapers were reeducated. Or China—and I could mention all the other nations—Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Egypt, and all the rest.

But here's the score: Countries with a slave press, 15; countries with a restricted or censored press, 81; countries with a free press, 44. Ninety-six with a slave, or restricted press, and only 44 with a free press.

No use puffing out our chests with arrogant pride about our free press tonight.

Our free press is not so free as we'd like to think.

One out of every 180 persons in the United States tonight wields the censor's stamps, 1 million people are deciding what you should hear or read. These are not McIntosh's figures; those are from Congressman Moss' committee.

There are 5,000 Federal agencies living off your taxpayer dollars who do not even make their meeting minutes available to the public or the press.

Ninety-eight percent of our censorship in America is either damn foolish or unnecessary, mostly to cover up ghastly blundering or waste or stupid bureaucracy.

These are the things that menace our security in America as a free people. Under every administration, Republican or Democratic, are the pinheads that have a contempt for the ability of an American citizen to hear the truth and face unpleasant fact.

Try to find out tonight how 80 billion in foreign aid was spent—and how.

Up until a couple of years ago try and find out the official shape of the first atom bomb, although Stalin knew all about it when the bomb was dropped.

(Information sought: Pentagon couldn't answer; man called Russian Embassy in Washington and got it.)

A couple years ago Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant wanted to revise and update a book written in 1879 about a Confederate Civil War general, Gen. Richard Taylor. He wanted some additional information but the Department of Defense turned him down and refused access to the records. They said the information was still "classified." What security is endangered 100 years after the Civil War?

Try to find out if General Custer had a "bab" with him at the battle of the Big Horn. That's still classified as to whether it is truth or malicious rumor.

In Indiana you couldn't find out the names of persons leasing post office buildings or the names of the lessees or the amounts paid.

Here's a shocker. In 1960 the operations research office of Johns Hopkins University completed an unclassified research project.

The report recommended that our conelrad warning system be junked as senseless and useless in this missile age.

Immediately the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization went to work to suppress that unclassified report. Why, if that became known the people would not have the feeling of complete security, the big spending would be ended, and a lot of people would lose their jobs, and because the report would embarrass some political appointees in Washington.

The congressional committee brought proof of the suppression forced release of the report—2 years late—that Conelrad is senseless and worthless.

Which makes us wonder: How many other vital facts are buried deep by the censor—facts that affect our future welfare, security, and prosperity.

If all the secret documents in the Department of Defense, alone, were put in one filing drawer—that filing cabinet would be 575 miles long.

We are beginning to see a new restraint on newspapers, a subtle but complete censorship of newspapers through the business side by the agencies of Government.

Who are the battle scarred veterans who are going to fight censorship in America? They will be the 8,500 hometown editors and publishers of America, for we are the watchdogs of America.

There will be no help from those loathsome malignancies, the shopping guide throwaways, who skim the cream and who ride free. There will be no help from the advertising agencies and public relations firms, that deluge you with tons of publicity but never a dime in advertising.

I'm sick of a lot of things—sick of columnists, cartoonists, and big city editors who preach the line that if you're not marching shoulder to shoulder ideologically with Hubert Humphrey then you're a hopeless reactionary or a John Bircher.

I'm sick, too, of the big city editors who sneer at the country and small towns—and who gloat over the supreme decision of redistricting.

They are in the last stages of metropolitanitis, where you believe that the outstate people should support the cities.

No need of any of us having an inferiority complex because we only have one linotype, or two—we are the little Davids—and if we only knew our strength we would go out and show up a lot of these so called Goliaths as cardboard phonies, particularly the glamor magazines.

I'll bet you $10 what the circulation is for some of these magazines—in Luverne—a city of 4,500: Saturday Evening Post, not over 200; Time magazine, not over 50; Reader's Digest, 300; Life magazine, 135.

We have lived with ourselves so long we overlook the fact that we have something that no other media can touch, provided we publish a good paper, a paper with a full quota of local news.

For we are the scrapbook fillers of America.

Let us take the Twin Cities paper and our citizens of Rock County. Some mighty fine, prominent citizens in Luverne will be born, live, and die and never once will their names ever be found in a metropolitan daily.

If he was real prominent he might get a two paragraph obituary. If he committed a particularly vicious crime or murder or had a cow that gave birth to a three-headed calf he might get more space. But chances are he'll be born, live, and die without ever having his name in a metropolitan paper.

Since it is the names that make the news, they are what give vitality to South Dakota newspapermen's desire to build a greater State.

Occasionally we will count the number of names that appear in a Star-Herald issue. One time not too long ago we counted over 2,240 names and each one of those names meant something to somebody—the individual, his friends, his family, and his neighbors.

We don't have a reading life expectancy of about 12 minutes as for the average city daily but we have a life of at least 7 days.

One of my grocers was complaining about the low rate of coupon redemption from his ads and he started asking customers why—and he found the answer. Woman after woman said, "I don't want to cut up my Star-Herald." She thought more of the paper than she did a coupon giveaway.

Using Minnesota again, it has been estimated that if the Minneapolis Tribune printed a half column cut and brief writeup of every Minnesota bride it would take eight pages in the Sunday edition.

If the paper printed a two paragraph obituary of every Minnesotan who died, it would take three solid pages a week.

If it printed the local city council proceedings it would take 20 pages, solid.

We are the scrapbook fillers of America, because here is where our people find their names and the names of their loved ones.

For we record the births, the deaths, the joys and the sorrows, the graduations and the golden weddings, the honor rolls and the civic awards, the achievements, and the heartbreaks, yes, even the drunken driving arrests.

We, out here away from the metropolitanitis are the last frontier of personal journalism.

It does take courage but as Herbert Bayard Swope said, "I cannot give you the formula of success, but I can give you the formula for failure, which is, try to please everybody."

The New York electricians now have a 25-hour workweek while there are still a lot of dedicated newspapermen working a 25-hour day, once a week.

But we haven't time for any bragging, because there is no time for smug complacency. We are getting a hatchet job on us. NBC carved up the American press but good with its recent so-called documentary on the death of the two Los Angeles papers.

However, despite the distortion of the TV scripters there were a few painful truths that did stand out.

The downfall and decay started when the papers broke their trust with the public.

The people felt that their newspapers had abdicated their traditional role of champions and defenders of the rights of the common people.

We need closer touch with our readers because we are the mainsprings that make a community and a State tick.

Who puts over the bond issues for civic improvements, the new schools, the new city halls, the disposal plants, the roadways? It isn't the sterile, opinionless TV and radio commentators.

It's to the newspapers that falls the burden of working for betterment.

Never, never underestimate the power of the smalltown newspapers.

THE SECONDARY BOYCOTT LAW

Right now it's open season for the trigger happy, shoot-from-the-hip critics who have crawled out from under the rocks to discredit the press.

People cheer Jack Paar's screaming, weeping abuse of newspapers—tearing them all down to get even with a half dozen columnists.

I say we newspapermen are up to par, but I still am not going to sit still for criticism by a public figure who thinks he should be immune from press scrutiny or criticism, who interprets everything less than superlatives as insults.

I am willing to be judged as a newspaperman by my peers but not by a self-confessed neurotic, egotistical hypochondriac and psycho.

I am not willing to have this jerk who thrives on vulgarity set himself as the supreme arbiter of good taste. morals and accuracy.

I resent, too, the overnight, sudden patriots who recklessly charge the American press with a lack of concern for the welfare of America.

We will be here long after Mr. Paar has sung his swansong in an orgy of tears, and we will be here long after the so-called patriots, selling their own peculiar brand of Americanism, have been discredited by printing of the truth.

To those people who question the American press we can ask these questions:

1. What other watchdogs of liberty do you have?
2. Where else do you learn of the doings of your Government, your Government agencies, and your public servants who too many times think they are our masters?
3. Where else would you find the warnings that power-hungry men were trying to hoodwink you out of your liberties and rights and put you under subjugation?
4. How long would the United States last as a free nation if every newspaper, every radio and TV station were exterminated or forced to print identical party-line policy stories and propaganda?

Newspapermen are perfectly able to fight their own battles without begging sympathy or volunteers. All we want is to print the truth and the truth will prevail.

And we can say "Thank God" for the spirit of the courageous pioneer newspapermen is not dead. It still lives. I could spend my entire time tonight talking about some of the present-day heroes—heroines.

Like Hazel Brannan Smith, of Mississippi, who knows what it is to tie into a corrupt political machine, who had the courage to print the fact that a crookedly coward sheriff shot a Negro in the back at 10-foot range and then claimed he was trying to escape. She knows what it is to have her newspaper bombed and to be physically threatened.

Or Horace Wells, of Clinton, Tenn., who stood up and said to a gang of unemployed hoodlum segragationists and said, "You are not going to destroy this town."

Or William Bell, of West Covina, Calif., who cleaned up Irvingdale where the town was owned by an ex-Communist, where gamblers and ex-cons, hoods and Communists sliced up the town and pocketed a million dollars of the people's money, and every member of his staff had to carry a gun and they were guarded day and night by special deputies.

Or you can talk about Samuel Woodring, of North Augusta, S.C., who tried to clean up his community and was beaten up by a police sergeant, who was vilified as a dirty Rumanian Jew, a Yankee, and a Communist. They started another paper against him, they boycotted him, but he didn't quit.

Or Gene Wirges, of Arkansas, who was shot at, beaten up, boycotted, who had to send his wife and children to another city for safety. His friends stood armed guard at night around his home.

Why? Because he was a rapist of little children or a hoodlum? No; he was just trying to clean up his hometown.

This wasn't 60 years ago or 20 years ago—this is now.

This is not a fight for the New York Times or the Chicago Daily News—this is a challenge that publishers must meet on their own Main Street and the fight for freedom of the press will not be won by the far-off metropolitan dailies but by the hometown newspapers of America, the papers that serve the small towns that, as George Sokolsky, the columnist, said the other day, "The small towns are the real strength of the United States."

Sometimes I get terribly downhearted about the future of America. I keep remembering that Fraser Tyler may have been partially right when he said no democracy can last over 200 years. He said that 102 years ago—and it seems to me that some people in America are trying their damndest to make that prophecy come true, ahead of schedule.

I keep remembering, too, that 16 out of the 21 great civilizations that have fallen since the beginning of time have crashed to nothingness not from assault from without but from decay within.

I am concerned about the image of America that is being projected throughout the world. Our relentless enemy, Russia, tells the word that we are a decadent nation on the toboggan slide of moral decay and rottenness.

Unfortunately we do show, too many times, an ugly American type of face that is not the true image of a real America.

The truth of the matter is that we squares who still believe in some basic fundamentals of decency, in personal and public morality, are being intimidated by the sneer and smear brigades into abject silence by those who are perverting the face of America.

As Lloyd Jones, of the Tulsa Tribune, so eloquently said, we are now in the 30th year of the national insanity of progressive education, where everybody wins and nobody loses. Children are promoted every year for fear of creating a mental bloc in the mind of that child that he has failed—and having his feelings hurt.

We are in an era today where we worship the false gods of the average and the norm, where we worship conformity. If a youngster in kindergarten doesn't want to spend his time playing in the sandbox—"quick Doctor, get the psychologist; there's something wrong with him."

We worship conformity. We saw the article in Fortune magazine a few months ago describing how to reach an executive post no junior executive dare be different. I remember the article said that in the business big leagues if a prospect wore a bow tie, or argyle patterned sox, that would be an automatic ticket for being dropped. We must wear gray flannel suits and a button down oxford shirt.

We forget that the men who made America better and different were the oddballs, the freaks, the nonconformists, the Borglum feller, the Crazy Horse sculptor, Edison, Ford, Dooley, Schweitzer, and all the scientists.

What's been the result of our progressive education?

A survey by a leading research corporation in a big eastern high school found this: 61 percent of the students didn't believe in profits; 83 percent think business profits are at least 50 percent; 62 percent think workers should not produce all they are capable of doing; 53 percent favor Government ownership of banks, railroads, and steel companies; 55 percent approve the idea "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." That last one is pure Marxism Communist doctrine.

Our decay is reflected in the national essay contest on the subject of which entrant was to discuss what he wanted most from life.

All of the essay winners in the top bracket had security as to what the youngster wanted most in life. Not one of them mentioned that he wanted opportunity. What a contradiction of the pioneer days of those hardy folks who fought their way west, giving of their blood to wage the fight for new opportunity and new way of living.

We have seen juvenile delinquency mushroom to nightmarish proportions, wherein certain sections of New York police won't go on certain streets unless they have a patrol of six men. We have seen the most vicious killings and fearful crimes perpetrated by teenagers; and the sob sisters are working overtime to weep for these "poor misunderstood children" with their smoking pistols.

The worst of it is that we have allowed the law to throw a blanket of secrecy about these poor little misunderstood killers.

Yes, we have worshiped too at the altar of mediocrity—and the honor student today is jeered at as a freak or an apple polisher.

I'd like to throw a verbal bouquet to that new high school in Baltimore where they are going to hand out letters every year for scholarship achievements, just as they do for athletic progress. Its about time we started recognizing the accomplishments of the mind as well as the musclebound.

We squares are being intimidated in the field of art by the corduroy-jacketed and tight-panted freaks of both sexes who are uncouth and ignorant, but it took an outsider to find something in the Metropolitan Museum that none of the caretakers, the curators, or the experts had noticed—that for months a painting had been hanging upside down, and nobody had known the difference. It's a sad commentary on art.

What does constitute art nowadays? A Remington or a Charlie Russell painting of the old West—no, no, no.

In Paris today there is a group of young artists who refer to themselves as the nouveaux realistes.

They say that painting at an easel is decadent and they are pursuing—quote "passionate adventure of the real seen in itself and not through the prism of conceptual or imaginative transcription"—end quote. How many understand that? If so, hold up your hands.

These were the canvasses covered flatly and completely and exclusively with several layers of a pigment called international Klein blue.

But that now is old stuff. Klein has advanced to painting with "living models." He gets a bunch of bare naked models who cover themselves with this blue paint and then press their nude bodies against blank canvasses under the direction of the artist.

Then you've got Nikki de Saint Phalle who extends a cordial invitation to all visitors to toss darts at her plaster encrusted collages, or to shoot them with a .22 rifle.

I'm a square. I think you have a lot of mentally disturbed people at Yankton, but none that crazy.

I think today we squares are being sold down the river on the idea that sin is the normal thing, and that decency, personal or public, is old hat and out of date.

We have lapsed into the paralysis of mind where our consciences are dull and no longer shockable, and we justify our actions saying, "Everybody else is getting theirs, why not me?"

Think of the Negro porter on the west coast who found a fortune in bills lost by Brinks and he returned the money. And he was subjected to a torrent of filth and abusive criticism because he was such a fool as to return the money instead of keeping it and his mouth shut.

We have been sold the idea that sin is mostly imaginary and we call it behavioristic psychology—that we are the product of our environment and that we mustn't try to rise above it—which makes a mockery out of Abraham Lincoln and all our other former national heroes.

We speak of slum clearance and social service, and I think of the hundreds of fine new apartments we have built in the East for the underprivileged. They move out of their cold-water flats into fine, modern dwellings and those splendid apartments have broken windows, garbage piled in the halls, the smell of human filth in the elevators and the hallways.

Congress voted $283 million for "retraining the unemployed." How can you retrain a chap that can't even read, write, or figure? This is superficial thinking. There are 6 million unemployed, but there are also 6 million jobs that are begging for qualified men.

We have the black-jacketed hoods with their ducktail haircuts and their switchblades, bicycle chains, and brass knuckles.

Relief is now becoming honorable, and we now have the third generation on relief who never knew what it was to draw a paycheck from anybody. But the money always came from Uncle Sam, never an honest dollar for an honest day's work.

We reward the broad who spawns a big brood of illegitimate offspring like a brood sow—the more she has, the more money she gets—and if you protest, then the sobsisters protest. Why, we are keeping that floozy and her boyfriend living high on gin.

The violence in TV is giving a postgraduate course master cum laude in crime, murder, ugly senseless brutal violence to our 9-year-olds. My, my, didn't the networks sob and cry before Commissioner Minow on how much they lost on their news departments. Well, if they are going to be in the communications business who doesn't expect to lose on his news department?

It's getting so that I don't dare take my 13-year-old daughter to a movie any more without careful checking. She's been in the Copacabana in New York and at the Follies Bergere and the Lido when she was 10 and 12, and it was a lot cleaner than most of the movies you are seeing nowadays.

Frankly, I'm getting sick of sitting in the dark, squirming in discomfort and embarrassment at the spoken smut and double meaning dialog and suggestive situations in too many movies. There are too many Tennessee Williams' and not enough Walt Disneys.

I'm far from a prude. Nobody has been a bigger sinner than I have been, but I was only an amateur.

I think it's high time we stood up on our two feet as newspapermen and quit glorifying the screen tramps who are box office headliners—who otherwise would be cheap street floozies with the morals of a "mink" whose only claim to fame is the size of their mammary glands. I think it's about time that our columnists stopped glorifying Sinatra and all the rest of the beatniks who make up the ratpack even though they do have access to the Presidential yacht and the White House.

What are we seeing in the movies nowadays? What are the big pictures? Lesbianism; incest; homosexuality; rapist; Lolita; a middle-aged professor has a transcontinental affair with a 12-year-old; the adventures of a nymphomaniac.

The Hollywood code of decency has been thrown in the ashcan. The quick buck boys are beating down the last bastions of decency.

What kind of image do you think we show abroad with this kind of export? Small wonder that Khrushchev finds willing listeners when he says we're a morally decadent nation.

We sent a Tennessee Williams play to Rio de Janeiro. Because of its filth the audience walked out and across the street the Russian ballet was packing the crowds in with their famous ballet.

Are we ugly Americans, or am I just a hopeless square when I mention literature? "Lady Chatterley's Lover" and "Tropic of Cancer" are now on sale, having been given the green light as being art, but no barroom lout would have used the words in "Tropic of Cancer," any madam or any bagnio in Deadwood would have booted out the door anybody using that language for fear of having her girls contaminated.

But it's "art."

Yet you can find the same thing in your public libraries. Kids can check out books, recognized as bestsellers today, which have all the four-letter words in them, explicitly used, that you only used to see chalked on a fence or a building wall.

It's time some of you led the fight against this avalanche of filth and corruption, foisted on us by the maffia gangsters and the morally corrupt.

Some of you should lead the fight to restore the old fashioned morality of living by the dictates of a conscience than by a pocketbook.

Let us squares quit being intimidated by the freaks and the morally bankrupt who are the high priests of arts and literature, the TV, and the movies today. Let us not be afraid to speak up against those artistic bums who claim a string of paint daubed chamber pots hung on the wall is art.

Let's not worship at the box office and those who have the morals of the barnyard. Let's quit glorifying the cesspools and start planting a few roses.

A tramp is a tramp is a tramp, whether he or she is working in a waterfront dive, or whether he or she has access to the top echelons of society or playing the role of a modern Cleopatra.

There is still time. We can carve the moral decay from America. You have the weapon—your type, printer, and your Linotype. For God's and America's sake, let us have the courage to speak up.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 1303, H.R. 11038.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1962 which is now before the Senate recommends appropriations in the amount of $487,802,980. Reference to the committee report No. 1341 will inform the Senate with respect to all the items covered in this bill, as well as eight amendments, which I am authorized, by the committee, to offer later after consideration of the amendments proposed in the bill.

H.R. 11038, the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1962, was passed by the other body on April 4; referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on April 5; hearings were held covering all items in the bill on April 4, 5, and 6 before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals; and the bill was reported on April 11. I am reciting this chronology for the purpose of pointing out that the bill was being handled expeditiously in view of the fact that there are included funds for the disaster areas along the Atlantic coast and it was the committee's aim to secure the earliest possible passage of this bill. Supplemental estimates transmitted to the Senate on April 3, after House committee consideration of the bill, include a number of items for emergency repair and rehabilitation of coastal areas suffering storm damage.

The major emergency items in this bill are as follows:

Twenty-five million dollars for the Office of Emergency Planning for Disaster Relief. This amount, recommended in the House bill and by the Senate committee, is needed to provide immediate relief to the coastal areas of the eastern seaboard devastated by recent storms. It also includes amounts to cover flood damage in West Virginia, Kentucky, and Idaho.

Fifteen million dollars is earmarked by the committee for disaster loans in a $90 million recommended appropriation, being the entire budgeted amount for the Small Business Administration's revolving fund. The House bill proposed $85 million and the House report instructions left to the discretion of the Administrator the application of a $5 million reduction as between the regular loan and disaster loan programs.

In addition, emergency items considered by this committee and recommended herein, but not considered by the House committee, include:

Four hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars for the Coast and Geodetic Survey for work in the field of oceanography, geodesy, photogrammetry, and navigational chart production necessitated by storm damage along many stretches of the coast between Cape Fear, N.C., and Montauk Point, Long Island.

Two million dollars for the Corps of Engineers for repair of navigation structures and dredging of shoaled navigation channels at 12 authorized projects being maintained by the corps on the Atlantic coast between North Carolina and New York.

Two hundred thousand dollars for the Bureau of Land Management to construct employee housing rendered uninhabitable because of a flood which occurred on February 11, 1962, at Battle Mountain, Nev.

One million eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the National Park Service to repair storm damage at Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, N.C., at Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and to repair damage caused by flash floods in Zion National Park, Utah, in September, 1961.

One million six hundred and eight thousand dollars for the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife for the rehabilitation of wildlife refuges damaged by storm and floods. The installations involved are at Bombay Hook, Del.; Brigantine, N.J.; Pea Island, N.C.; Cape Romain, S.C.; Back Bay, Va.; and Chincoteague, Va.

These disaster items total $46,083,000.

A résumé of other major items in the bill follows:

Eighty-five million dollars for research and development, National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The House bill proposed $80 million and the committee recommendation is in the amount of the budget request. The committee was advised that the full amount is required to meet target schedules of the advanced Saturn program, the Centaur development program, and the liquid-propulsion program.

Eighty million dollars, as proposed in the House bill, for the Social Security Administration grants to States for public assistance. These funds are used for grants to States for five programs: Old-age assistance, medical assistance for the aged, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

The $80 million will be needed to finish their calendar year in our social security program and to get the various States up to date.

Fifty-million-dollar loan authorization for the Farmers Home Administration for farm operating loans. The House bill made no provision for this; the committee recommends the increased loan authorization to meet the minimum requirements this spring on loan applications which have already been received and docketed in the county offices of the Farmers Home Administration.

Thirty-seven million dollars for the Forest Service in reimbursement of other Forest Service funds used to fight forest fires during the 1961 fire season and estimated requirements for the balance of this fiscal year. The amount recommended is identical with the House bill allowance.

I may state that this will be no news to the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], because a part of this fire history has been in the State of Oregon. This year has been peculiarly disastrous because of the drought in many portions of the West. The Forest Service had to draw upon other funds heavily, as had other agencies as well, for smaller funds, in order to combat the fire menace up to this time. The $37 million mentioned in this item is needed to reimburse the Forest Service for the expenditures it has already made and to supply sufficient funds to carry it along to June 30.

Another item is $20 million for operating-differential subsidies — liquidation of contract authorization — Maritime Administration, for making final payments back to calendar year 1958 for operators on essential trade routes. The committee recommendation is in the amount of the House bill allowance and $5 million below the budget estimate. The House reduction was not appealed by the agency. The next three items relate to the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Sixteen million one hundred-fifty-five thousand dollars for defense educational activities as proposed in the House bill. These funds will be used to make advances to schools for commitment for the school term beginning in September 1962.

Fifteen million seven hundred and seven thousand dollars for payments to school districts, as recommended in the House bill, to provide sufficient funds to pay full entitlements under Public Law 874 to school districts in federally impacted areas for maintenance and operation.

Seven million and ninety-two thousand dollars for assistance for school construction is recommended by the committee to finance all eligible projects under Public Law 815 for the Federal contribution for school construction in school districts in federally impacted areas. This item added to the bill as a committee amendment.

Fifteen million dollars for participation in the New York World's Fair is recommended by the committee in lieu of the $17 million proposed in the House bill. The supplemental budget request was in the amount of $25 million. The committee recommendation of $15 million, at this time, is without prejudice for later consideration of such additional sums as may be deemed necessary for this purpose.

In addition to the amendments in the reported bill, I am authorized by the committee to offer eight additional amendments. These latter eight amendments, which would add $72,205,364 to the reported bill as a principal item, include $71 million, contingent upon enactment of authorizing legislation, for construction of facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, principally for land acquisition at the Atlantic missile range at Cape Canaveral, Fla., and at the Mississippi test facility, near New Orleans, La., and $1,065,929 for claims and judgments.

Madam President, I especially call this item to the attention of my distinguished friends the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Delaware, and the Senator from New York.

I ask unanimous consent at this time that the committee amendments, exclusive of the amendment on page 3, lines 22 and 23, relating to participation in the New York World's Fair, be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 2, line 6, after the word "control", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$3,000,000".

On page 2, after line 16, to insert:

"FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

"Direct loan account

"Direct loans and advances not to exceed $50,000,000 may be made from funds available in the Farmers Home Administration direct loan account for operating loans under subtitle B and section 335(a), for which funds are not otherwise available, of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961."

On page 3, line 9, to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$625,000".

On page 4, line 6, after the word "general", to strike "$1,500,000" and insert "$3,900,000".

On page 4, line 20, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$63,000" and insert "$77,500".

On page 6, after line 10, to insert:

"Assistance for school construction

"For an additional amount for 'Assistance for school construction', $7,092,000."

On page 6, after line 14, to insert:

"Grants for waste treatment works construction

"For an additional amount for 'Grants for waste treatment works, construction', fiscal year 1961, $5,000,000."

On page 6, after line 17, to insert:

"Hospitals and medical care

"For an additional amount for 'Hospitals and medical care', for payments for medical care of dependents and retired personnel under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (35 U.S.C. ch. 7), $174,000."

On page 8, after line 5, to insert:

"Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission

"For payment of the United States share of the current expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), $20,000."

On page 8, after line 10, to insert:

"Federal Maritime Commission

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $175,000."

On page 8, after line 13, to insert:

"FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $150,000: *Provided*, That the funds provided for special counsel and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), shall be available at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem."

On page 9, after line 14, to insert:

"Acquisition of land and building, Chicago, Illinois

"For an additional amount for 'Acquisition of land and building, Chicago, Illinois', $2,703,000."

On page 10, line 4, after "(5 U.S.C. 630g)", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000".

On page 10, line 7, after the word "distribution", to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$488,000".

On page 10, after line 7, to insert:

"HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

"Office of the Administrator

"Public Works Planning Fund

"For an additional amount for the revolving fund established pursuant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 462), $2,000,000."

On page 10, line 17, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$125,000".

On page 10, line 21, after the word "development", to strike out "$80,000,000" and insert "$85,000,000".

On page 12, line 5, after the word "limitations", to strike out "$85,000,000" and insert "$90,000,000, of which not less than $15,000,000 shall be available for disaster loans".

On page 12, line 26, after the word "resources", to strike out "$1,250,000" and insert "$1,760,000".

At the top of page 13, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION

"For an additional amount of 'Construction', $200,000."

On page 13, line 7, after the word "protection", to strike out "$775,000" and insert "$875,000".

On page 13, line 11, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$455,000".

On page 13, after line 11, to insert:

"Construction

"For an additional amount for 'Construction', $1,850,000."

On page 13, line 18, to strike out "$720,000" and insert "$820,000".

On page 13, after line 18, to insert:

"Menominee educational grants

"For grants to the State of Wisconsin or the County or Town of Menominee for school district costs, as authorized by the Act of April 4, 1962 (P.L. 87–432), $220,000."

On page 14, line 17, after the word "Construction", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$1,990,000".

On page 15, after line 5, to insert:

"Fees of jurors and commissioners

"For an additional amount for 'Fees of jurors and commissioners', $300,000."

On page 15, after line 13, to insert:

"Administrative Office of the United States Courts

"For an additional amount for 'Administrative Office of the United States Courts', $11,250."

On page 16, after line 1, to insert:

"LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals', $200,000."

On page 16, after line 6, to insert:

"Fees and expenses of witnesses

"For an additional amount for 'Fees and expenses of Witnesses', $400,000."

On page 16, after line 13, to insert:

"*Buildings and facilities*

"For an additional amount for 'Buildings and facilities', $300,000."

On page 16, line 19, after the word "prisoners", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$800,000".

On page 16, after line 20, to insert:

"SENATE"

On page 16, after line 21, to insert:

"For payment to Doloris T. Bridges, widow of Henry Styles Bridges, late a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, $22,500."

On page 16, after line 24, to insert:

For payment to Marie T. Schoeppel, widow of Andrew F. Schoeppel, late a Senator from the State of Kansas, $22,500.

On page 17, after line 2, to insert:

"SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

"*Administrative and clerical assistance to Senators*

"For an additional amount for 'Administrative and Clerical Assistance to Senators', $4,730: *Provided*, That the clerk hire allowances of the Senators from the States of New York and Virginia are hereby increased so that the allowances of Senators from the State of New York will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of over seventeen million, the population of said State having exceeded seventeen million inhabitants, and so that the allowances of Senators from the State of Virginia will be equal to that allowed Senators from States having a population of four million, the population of said State having exceeded four million inhabitants."

On page 17, after line 16, to insert:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

"*Miscellaneous items*

"For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous Items", $286,000."

On page 18, after line 10, to insert:

"*Senate office building*

"For an additional amount for 'Senate office buildings', $15,000."

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, the reason why I have asked that the item for the New York World's Fair be suspended from the unanimous consent just given is that I have been advised that the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will not be in the Chamber until later; and I have consented to hold this item, along with another item relating to the same subject, to be considered at the same time, when both Senators from New York are available to take part in the action on the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. On behalf of my senior colleague from New York, I wish to express appreciation for the kindness and courtesy of the distinguished Senator from Florida, who has shown that kindness unfailingly throughout the entire controversy. As has been stated, it is entirely agreeable that that item should not be included as a part of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York. I am always happy to accord a full measure of courtesy to every Senator, because I have never been denied that kind of treatment from either of the Senators from New York or from any other Senator.

Madam President, I believe that all the committee amendments have been disposed of except the one to which I have just referred.

I shall now call up the specially reported committee amendments which contain matter that might be regarded as legislative. I shall call them up separately, believing, however, that as to most of them there could be no objection. The first is designated as "4–11–62—C." I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Bureau of the Budget

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is authorized to create a special review panel within the Bureau to carefully screen and evaluate all requests for additional personnel, and to make exhaustive and searching inquiries within the departments and agencies prior to approving any request for additional personnel.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, the Committee on Appropriations has for some time desired to establish and organize a budget group for Congress, to keep us advised, but we have not been able to see eye to eye with the other body on this question. As the next best course, this amendment is suggested for the purpose of allowing the Bureau of the Budget more adequately to screen and consider requests for additional personnel before they are required to act on such requests.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am in agreement with the objectives of the amendment and shall support it. However, I understand that first it will be necessary to move to suspend the rules, and I shall support that motion. Following the action on such a motion I shall support the amendment even though it is legislation on an appropriation bill. Nevertheless, it is proper to offer it at this time, and I shall support the Senator from Florida both in the motion to suspend the rules and on the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I deeply appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Delaware. Unless a point of order be raised, there will be no need for a motion to suspend the rules. I do not believe a point of order will be made on this particular amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I did not object to the amendment, and later I expect to offer an amendment of my own, which will likewise constitute legislation. I merely desired to have the record show that it is not unusual to move to suspend the rules.

This particular amendment is likewise subject to a point of order, just as will be the amendment to be offered later by the Senator from Kansas and me. Therefore, if a point of order is made with respect to my amendment, I hope the Senator from Florida will support my motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the forbearance of the Senator from Delaware. I wish the situation were such that I could grant the Senator from Delaware exactly the same treatment later. However, I have instructions from my committee with respect to the Senator's amendment, which will come before the Senate in due order.

Madam President, do I correctly understand that the amendment offered by me has been acted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been agreed to; the Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I call up the amendment designated as "4–11–62—A" and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

GENERAL PROVISION

The amounts made available for fiscal year 1962, for planning or construction of buildings or facilities under the hearings "Foreign quarantine activities", "National Cancer Institute", "National Heart Institute", and "Allergy and infectious disease activities", shall remain available until June 30, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, I favor this amendment also; but I again call attention to the fact that this amendment—and I believe the Senator from Florida will concur—is legislation and that to adopt it would require a motion to suspend the rules. I shall support such a motion to suspend the rules and shall support the amendment. However, I merely wish to emphasize further the fact that there is nothing sacred about an appropriation bill so far as offering an amendment which constitutes legislation is concerned. It is done frequently.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator from Delaware is correct in his statement that amendments of this nature are frequently offered to appropriation bills and are adopted. I am simply acting for the committee in offering such amendments as have been approved by the full Committee on Appropriations, comprised of 27 members.

I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Delaware agrees with the committee that this particular amendment, which extends the time for the use of certain important appropriations, particularly relative to the National Institutes of Health, is an appropriate one.

Madam President, has the amendment been acted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, again I am in full agreement with the Senator from Florida. Both of us recognize that this amendment constitutes legislation, as does the amendment previously agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is no question about that. That is the reason why the amendments are offered.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement concerning the reason for the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Holland

Amendment 4-11-62—A. This language was approved by the committee and will extend the availability of funds through June 30, 1963, for the following projects:

1. Pier facilities at the Rosebank Quarantine Station, Staten Island, N.Y.;
2. Additional facilities at the Rocky Mountain Laboratory, Hamilton, Mont.;
3. A gerontological research facility, Baltimore, Md.; and
4. A cancer research building at the National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md.

The construction of the pier facilities at the quarantine station and the additional facilities at the Rocky Mountain Laboratory will be completed on schedule in the coming fiscal year and funds for the construction work have been obligated. Certain supervisory obligations cannot be made until the performance of the work, however, and the continuance of the availability of funds is necessary.

Planning for the gerontology research facility is in its early stages. The program of requirements is now in preparation and completion of design is scheduled for April 1963. Obligational authority will be needed to provide for reservations, change orders, late charges, and Public Building Service, GSA, administrative and supervisory costs.

Diagrammatic drawings have been completed on the cancer research facility and are being reviewed. The amount necessary for the production of working drawings will be obligated by June 30, 1962, and funds required for obligation in 1963 will be for costs of the PBS for supervision, design changes, and contingencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the report on the second supplemental appropriation bill, which is now before the Senate and is being discussed by the Senator from Florida, is a unanimous report of both the majority and minority members of the committee. The only question that arose was with respect to the amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Delaware. The committee placed in its report some language concerning the amendment. I hope that before final action is taken on the second supplemental bill, the language with which the Senator from Delaware is concerned will be worked out through an understanding with the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. I join with the Senator from Massachusetts in expressing that hope. In the meantime, I shall expect to discuss briefly the question raised by the Senator from Massachusetts. I shall be glad to discuss it not only with him, but also with the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Madam President, I now call up the amendment designated "4-11-62—D" and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 10, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Construction of facilities", $71,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment of authorizing legislation into law to cover such amount.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, this amendment provides for a large amount—$71 million. The occasion for it is that the Senate passed an authorization bill last year under which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was directed to proceed with the development of additional facilities, two of which, and perhaps others, required the procurement of large amounts of land and the construction thereon of expensive installations. One of those areas was in my own State, near or adjoining the Canaveral base. The development of that installation has had to be delayed.

Likewise, one was close to New Orleans, but was located in the State of Mississippi, near enough to the great Michoud Base, which has been taken over by the Space Agency for its use. I regret to say that the difficulty with the authorization last year, was occasioned by the death of one of our distinguished colleagues, the chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, Hon. Overton Brooks, of Louisiana. Therefore, the action upon that authorization has come over into this year.

Because of the speed at which space activities are moving, this item was joined with additional authorizations which are now pending, and, according to my understanding, are about to be passed by the House. In the meantime, the situation, both at Canaveral and in the Mississippi area, is that the program has been slowed down. The Agency has used all the funds it has had in other years in order to move forward. For instance, at Canaveral, it has acquired areas where new launching pads have to be built, but it has not been able to acquire buffer areas and other areas needed for homes, warehouses, and other activities.

I understand that the situation in the Mississippi area is very bad. The area taken there consists mostly of small farmsteads. The owners of those farmsteads having been advised that they must move because of the necessity of the Government to take over that area, have looked elsewhere and in many cases have bargained to buy other homes for themselves and their families, but since that time have been held up in such a way as to make their situation increasingly difficult.

The committee felt that although there was tied to this amendment a condition which might not be satisfied at once—that is to say, the passage of such an authorization—yet by all means this amount should be added to the bill, subject, of course to the condition that the appropriation item would not be available until the authorization was completed.

I believe that is a full description of this rather large item.

I yield now to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, once again I find myself in agreement with the objective of the Senator from Florida, but for the sake of the Record—and I am sure the Senator from Florida will concur—I call attention to the fact that we are dealing with legislative amendments which, if objection is made, require suspension of the rule in connection with our consideration of an appropriation bill. Certainly I shall not object; but again I call attention to the fact that what is suggested is the normal procedure in connection with the passage of an appropriation bill, even though in these instances no objection is made inasmuch as all of us are in favor of these proposals and support them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator from Delaware is correct in pointing out that, by this means, such amendments frequently are offered and adopted. In this instance, at the direction of the full committee I have offered this amendment; and I appreciate the forbearance of the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I now call up the amendment identified as "4-11-62—E," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 16, after line 19, it is proposed to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower development and training activities

For expenses necessary to carry into effect the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (P.L. 87-415), $2,850,000, of which not less than $790,000 shall be available solely for carrying out part B of title II of the Act, to be transferred from the appropriation for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen".

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, a brief description of the amendment, which has been approved by the full committee, is that the occasion for it is that recently Congress passed the Manpower Development and Training Act; but no funds for commencing its administration are available, unless such funds are provided in this supplemental appropriation bill—which applies, of course, to expenditures to be made during the remainder of the fiscal year 1962.

I believe the provisions of the amendment are self-explanatory. They will permit the setting up of this program, which a majority of both Houses of Congress has found to be in the public interest; and the act has been signed by the President, but it will languish for some months unless this particular appropriation is made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I now call up the amendment identified as 4-11-62—F," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, after line 3, it is proposed to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Vice President

For an additional amount for "Office of the Vice President", $1,185.

Administrative and Clerical Assistance to Senators

For an additional amount for "Administrative and Clerical Assistance to Senators", $118,250: *Provided,* That the basic clerk hire allowance of each Senator is increased by $3,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I think Senators will recall the events of the last night of the first session of the 87th Congress. The Senate had added to the last supplemental appropriation bill acted upon then—I believe it was the first supplemental bill for the fiscal year 1962—an item which would have allowed this small increase in the basic compensation allowed each Senator, and also allowed the Vice President, for the employment of administrative and clerical assistance. For the first time during my service in the Senate—and in the conference held at that time I learned that the same comment could be made by senior Senators whose service has covered much longer periods of time than mine—the other body interposed some objection, through an effort to add an item which had not been considered by either House. Rather than permit such handling of the conference report, the Senate conferees declined to push our amendment; instead, we withdrew it.

So it comes up at this time.

I believe that is a full explanation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Does the amendment provide compensation for two additional clerks in each office?

Mr. HOLLAND. That will depend on the standard of pay in each office. The addition of $3,000 to the basic salary allowance would, at the very lowest salary level, allow for such additional staff members.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Is this the amendment of last year?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Then, Mr. President, I strongly commend the Senator from Florida for offering the amendment; certainly it is particularly needed.

The increase in the amount of mail being received by Senators' offices is really staggering; for instance, one day last week my office received 476 letters—in that one day; and it is impossible to answer such vast amounts of mail by using the very small staff we have.

So I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Florida for offering the amendment; on behalf of all Senators, I offer him my sincere commendation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Texas, and I wish I could claim credit for the amendment. However, it is a committee amendment, and is offered on behalf of those who are in direct touch with the operations of the Senate and the personal staff allowance of each Senator. Of course I was glad to support the amendment, and I do now support it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Then, Mr. President, I congratulate the entire committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment identified as "4-11-62—G," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, after line 17, it is proposed to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Joint Economic Committee

For an additional amount for "Joint Economic Committee", $20,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think a brief description of the amendment will suffice:

Recently, it has been developed on the floor, by the press, and otherwise, that the minority have not had adequate staffs on various Senate committees and joint committees. This amendment will allow for the employment of additional staff for the minority on the Joint Economic Committee and will permit continuation of major studies. The Appropriations Committee unanimously favor this provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, again I agree with the Senator from Florida, but again I call attention to the fact that both this amendment and the preceding ones are all dealing with legislative matters. I point this out since I will later offer a legislative proposal on this same bill. I appreciate the reason for all these amendments, and I support the Senator from Florida. I hope in turn I shall have his support when I later ask for a suspension of the rules.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the statement the Senator from Delaware has made. Again I call attention to the fact that all of these are committee amendments, approved by all 27 of the members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I now call up my amendment 4-11-62—H.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 19, after line 9, to insert the following:

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims as settled and determined by departments in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in Senate Document Numbered 84, Eighty-seventh Congress, $1,065,929, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided,* That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further,* That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest whenever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of this Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this item covers miscellaneous judgments and claims that have been allowed against the United States. It is quite customary for such as have already accrued to be recognized in a supplemental appropriation bill, in order to avert the running of interest on these items.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand now that all of the committee amendments that were in the bill, excepting one, relating to the New York World's Fair, and excepting one in the group of eight which we have been considering, which also relates to the New York World's Fair, have been passed upon.

I renew the statement I made in the beginning, that I had agreed to withhold until the last, action on the New York World's Fair items. It would appear, therefore, if the Senator from Delaware wishes to take up his item, this might be an appropriate time to do so.

I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am always delighted to call an amendment when the Senator from Florida thinks this is an opportune time to do so and when I may have his support. Therefore, on behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and myself, I call up amendment "4-11-62—I," which is at the desk.

I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment may be dispensed with, and that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment proposed by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, for himself and Mr. CARLSON, is as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"GENERAL PROVISION

"No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any individual, corporation, or agency included in this or any other Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress, or to pay the salary of any officer or employee in the executive branch of the Government who appears before any public group for the purpose of explaining, interpreting, supporting, or opposing the administration's position on legislation pending before Congress; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business. For the purposes of this paragraph the term 'officer' or 'employee' shall not be construed to include (1) the President and Vice President of the United States; (2) persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the Office of the President; (3) heads and assistant heads of executive departments; (4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws."

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. The committee in its report stated:

> The committee is in sympathy with the objectives sought to be accomplished by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware.

I appreciate the sympathy of the committee, but I am not asking for sympathy; I merely want their votes. If they are all for the amendment let us vote for it.

I offered a similar amendment on a preceding appropriation bill—the Treasury-Post Office bill. At that time it was argued in the Senate that the committee had not had a chance to consider this proposal. I was requested to withhold offering it to that particular appropriation bill and to go before the committee and offer it as an amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill which is now before the Senate. It was then argued that it would be a more appropriate procedure.

One other convincing argument that was advanced then as to why it would be more appropriate to offer the amendment to this bill rather than to a regular appropriation bill for one of the respective departments was that after the regular appropriation bills are passed in Congress and signed by the President, they do not become effective until July 1st, the first day of the new fiscal year, whereas this bill becomes effective on whatever date the bill is signed by the President. Therefore, it was pointed out that if the amendment were incorporated in this supplemental bill it would become effective on the day the President signed the bill. Also, if approved this amendment would be applicable to all other appropriation acts approved during this calendar year.

It is for these reasons that the amendment is offered at this time.

The need for the amendment resulted from a ruling which was issued by the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Macy, under date of January 10. I have previously incorporated the entire ruling in the RECORD and will incorporate it again today. I wish to say I found no fault with the ruling except for one sentence, which appears at the end of the paragraph marked 2, wherein it is stated:

> Aware of these implications, however, the career official may explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation before interested public groups.

The purpose of this amendment is to repeal or nullify this sentence. The language preceding that sentence is very significant. It reads:

> A more difficult decision is faced when new or changed programs are pending before Congress in the form of proposed legislation. Definitive statutory language prohibits the use of appropriated funds for "publicity or propaganda designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress."

In other words, the Commission has recognized that the language of the existing law specifically "prohibits"—that is the word he uses—prohibits the use of appropriated funds for political use or propaganda either to support or to oppose the administration's pending legislative programs.

I recognized that this ruling raised a serious question as to the propriety of the use of civil service employees, and I directed a letter to the Attorney General asking for a clarification of the ruling.

The Attorney General's reply raised an even more serious question as to the propriety of this ruling. In the Attorney General's interpretation he went so far as to say that these civil service employees can and are expected to speak before interested public groups on behalf of the administration's program, but, in effect, he dares them to say one word against the administration's program. It is a one-way ticket so far as the administration's program is concerned.

If they can speak for the program, then the question was asked, If one of these employees disagreed with the proposed legislation could he speak against it and point out the objectionable features of the proposed legislation?

I quote his reply:

> The legal considerations pertinent to your question concerning a career employee's publicly expressed opposition to an administration's legislative recommendation are to a large extent the same as those discussed above. But—

This is a very significant "but."

> But, granting the legality of such public action in a particular instance, I believe it would nevertheless constitute a serious impropriety.

Thus the Administration is saying that it would be "a serious impropriety" for any civil service employee before any public group to express one word of opposition to the administration's program.

He goes on to say he thinks the employees have a responsibility to support the administration's legislative program and that the administration has a right to expect them to fulfill this responsibility.

He goes on to say—and "they" meaning the administration in this instance—

> and they are entitled to that cooperation and support from him even though he may not agree with the policy.

Even though the civil service employee does not agree with the administration, all the civil service employees are supposed to become overnight New Frontiersmen and to go out to advocate the New Frontier policies.

In Russia perhaps Mr. Khrushchev may be able to dictate and to rule the minds of his employees, but we have not yet adopted such a procedure in America. I am confident that there is no one on the floor of the Senate who wishes to see this ruling remain in effect.

It must be either withdrawn or repealed by congressional action.

I quote further from the Attorney General's opinion:

> Whatever may be proper for such an official acting in a clearly private capacity, I think it would be a distinct breach of his duty as a career official to use his official position publicly to oppose the policies of the administration he serves.

I agree with the statement that the career officials should not use their positions as career employees to oppose the administration's legislative program pending before the Congress; by the same token, the civil service employees should not be ordered to go out to support the administration's program.

The career civil service employee, by no stretch of the imagination—nor was it ever so intended—is to be used as a pawn by any administration in power to advocate its pending legislative programs.

Earlier today I talked with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission in connection with this problem. He admitted that he was disturbed as to the interpretations which had been put upon the ruling, and on that basis I suggested that an easy way to correct this problem would be for him to agree to eliminate or rescind the language in paragraph 2 of his ruling, wherein he said:

> Aware of these implications, however, the career official may explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation before interested public groups.

If he will strike that language out of the ruling we shall be back to where we were before. The career employees then would still have a perfect right, under the ruling, to go before any interested public groups only to explain the law, once it was passed by the Congress and signed by the President. No one quarrels with that point, but he should not be used either to support or defeat pending legislation. It makes no difference whether the civil service employee is in favor of a law or not. Once Congress enacts a law and it is signed by the President of the United States it becomes the law of the land, and the career civil service employees have a right—I would go further and say they have a responsibility—to go before public groups to explain the law in order that the people who are affected by it may understand it and may carry out the purpose of the law.

I think that at this point it would be well to quote the two basic laws upon which this ruling was based:

> Section 509 of the "General Government Matters, Department of Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1962," approved August 3, 1961 (Public Law 87-126):
>
> "No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any individual, corporation, or agency included in this or any other act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress."
>
> Section 1913: Lobbying With Appropriated Moneys, from title 18 of the United States Code:
>
> "No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal services, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation ar appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.
>
> "Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment" (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 792).

No one questions the propriety of civil service employees, when requested by the Congress, coming before legislative committees and explaining a proposed program. Very often these career employees are more familiar with the programs than many other officials. They can render a constructive service for Government and for the Congress. I do not quarrel with that point at all.

I do take strong exception to the fact that any administration can delegate to itself an arbitrary power over one million and more civil service employees, that the administration can overnight tell those employees, "You have to close your minds to all your own personal opinions and now go out before the interested public groups and become advocates of this administration's program."

If we do not override that decision or if it is not rescinded then the career civil service employees will become involved in the controversial questions of pending legislation because the Attorney General of the United States has gone further in his broad interpretation. The Attorney General has, in effect, told the civil service employees that they are expected under the Kennedy administration to go out before the public groups and to speak for and to advocate the administration's legislative program. On the other hand, the employees are warned that it would be considered "a serious impropriety" if they dare to say one word or to utter any explanation that would be against the administration's program.

The Congress has no alternative other than to ovrride this ruling. I invite attention to a recent letter of instruction that was sent last week to the employees of the Agriculture Department instructing them to support the administration's agriculture program. This will show Senators the broad interpretation being put upon this ruling now by the various departments.

The Attorney General's broad interpretation of the ruling came out on March 22, I think it was, and I put it in the RECORD on March 28.

Under date of April 13, only a few days ago, the Department of Agriculture issued Notice PM-164, and enclosed a copy of this ruling to all its employees. I shall read from the statement of purpose for which it was sent out.

It is entitled "Action By: All Divisions and Offices—Role of the Career Official in Support of Federal Programs."

This is signed by R. P. Beach, Deputy Administrator for Management.

I quote from the bulletin:

> To transmit as Exhibit 1 a statement by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission describing the appropriate role of career officials in supporting administration programs. This statement should be circulated or reproduced and brought to the attention of the employees of the ASCS.

Here is a notice being sent out, Mr. President, by the Department of Agriculture to the career employees advising those employees that they are expected to become advocates and supporters of the administration's proposed farm program. They are asked to familiarize themselves with this proposed program—to go out and generate some heat on the Congress supposedly in order that the administration can get the new program through.

These instructions are a clear violation of the law as it was passed by the Congress.

The President of the United States, after this ruling had been made, went even further in his press release of April 4, 1962, when addressing a group of A.S.C. committeemen. He made a very significant statement. I quote:

> We are attempting to meet a problem which is difficult, which is challenging, but nevertheless a problem which I think we can meet.

I quote further from the President:

> And as I say, while you are prohibited by custom and law, quite rightly, from involving yourselves in any particular agricultural program, or recommending it, or lobbying it, nevertheless—

He says "nevertheless" and then he goes on, in substance, and says, "Go ahead and do it anyway."

He ends his remarks with this comment:

> We hope you will also see the Members of Congress and acquaint them and the Senators. We don't want them to be, as the Secretary said, lonesome.

We have a challenge to meet here today in the Congress. I am asking that this amendment be considered on its merits. I hope that no point of order will be made, but if a point of order is made I shall promptly move to suspend the rules. I recognize the amendment would be legislation on an appropriation bill, but the same was true with regard to the seven preceding amendments which were offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and which have been approved. Those amendments were likewise legislation on an appropriation bill. We voted for those amendments because we are in favor of them. I want the same consideration in reference to this amendment.

When the vote is taken on my amendment or on the motion to suspend the rules I do not want any Senator to vote to suspend the rules if he is against the amendment and in favor of the Civil Service Commission's ruling. I am not asking for sympathy as is mentioned in the committee report. But if Senators are against the ruling of the Commission and are in favor of this amendment then vote for it.

Let us not duck the issue behind a procedural maneuver. I do not care to have a single vote in favor of suspending the rules from any Member of this Senate who is in favor of Mr. Macy's ruling and the interpretation given to it by the Attorney General of the United States.

On the other hand, if any Senator is against the ruling because he feels that the Civil Service Commission and the Attorney General were wrong when they ruled that the administration has the authority to use at its own discretion the 1 million and more civil service employees to promote the administration's legislative program, I hope that Senator will support me.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion, so that I may make a brief statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum. I say to the Senator from Florida, I hope he will not see fit to make a point of order. However, if he is to do so, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum before the point of order is made.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield so that the Senator may suggest the absence of a quorum, because I shall have to make a point of order eventually. I thought this would be a good time to make a general statement as to the position of the committee, which of course the Senator from Florida is in the Chamber to state.

Then I shall yield to the Senator from Delaware to suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask the Senator whether he wishes me to yield before I make the point of order or after I make the point of order, so that a goodly number of Senators may be present to hear his statement in opposition.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I had promised certain Senators that before consideration of the amendment proceeded to a point of order, I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall observe the commitment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittee spent a great deal of time on the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Delaware. Speaking for myself, I have a great deal of sympathy with his amendment. I have been approached twice within recent days by groups of Federal employees who are very decidedly not supporting the program of the administration. They were within their rights in doing so, and I uphold such right. One of them was a group of Post Office employees who were opposed to the so-called administration bill relating to the general subject of salary increases. Another was a group of agricultural employees from my State who were opposed to some, though not all, of the provisions of the so-called omnibus agricultural bill presented by the administration. One of the good sources of information for citizens and for Members of the Congress on any point, but particularly on a complex issue, is the statement, opinions, and convictions of those who are administering the particular program.

So I go a long way in sympathizing with the Senator from Delaware. I hope to have an opportunity to support his proposal in more tangible fashion.

However, our full committee felt that the proposal was not timely as applied to the bill now before the Senate, which contains many emergency items. I am instructed to raise a point of order, which I shall do, only after having yielded so that the Senator from Delaware may suggest the absence of a quorum.

As to discussions by our subcommittee, the full committee and individual Senators, the subcommittee was glad to extend an invitation to the Senator from Delaware to be heard on this subject. We heard the Senator from Delaware at some length, as the printed record of the hearings will show. I was very glad to discuss the question personally in detail with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who, as the ranking minority member of the full committee espoused the amendment of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Delaware, and subjected it to very searching analysis.

After the full committee had discussed the subject at some length, two courses of action were followed. One of them was that the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], approached his counterpart in the other body, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Representative from Missouri, Mr. CANNON, and asked if he would accede to the placing of the amendment on the particular bill now before the Senate, or, if not the amendment in full form, in some amended or modified form.

The Senator from Arizona reported to our full committee that the chairman of the House committee felt that the present bill was not an appropriate place for the question to be considered, and he gave the chairman of our committee a statement of his position. On this point I ask the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and also the distinguished ranking minority member, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

As I understand, the chairman of the House committee felt that to accept the amendment, either in the form submitted or in some rewritten form, would incur antagonism in the form of opposition of the legislative committee of the other body which handles this type of legislation, and would subject the bill to long delay and uncertainties, and that he, Mr. CANNON, would not agree to the acceptance of such an amendment upon the proposed legislation.

Furthermore, we studied the history of the question. We found that beginning in 1952 an amendment on this subject had been included in various appropriation bills which originated in the House and finally reached this body.

The history of this subject is as follows:

Since fiscal year 1952 this provision was contained in the independent offices bill. It was also in the Department of Agriculture bill from 1952 to 1961. It was in the Department of the Interior bill from 1956 to 1961. It is in the Departments of State, Justice, and judiciary bill for 1962. When these 1963 bills are being considered, the consideration of this matter on the floor of the Senate without the giving of any notice and without the raising of any point of order will be proper, because then the customary language provision which has been coming over to this body from the House since 1952 in connection with various appropriation bills will be before us.

Likewise we explored the question from the standpoint of how soon the provision might be made effective if it were placed in any of the annual appropriation bills for 1963. We found that, by appropriate wording, it would be made effective at once, even though the bill as a whole applies to appropriations for the fiscal year 1963. We found that provisions similar to the one before us have been included in the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and judiciary continuously since the act of 1953. Such a provision was placed in the Department of Labor-HEW appropriation bill continuously from 1953 to 1961, in the Department of Commerce appropriation bills from 1956 to 1959, and in the foreign aid bills for 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1962.

The legislative history on this subject goes back to May 17, 1951, when Representative Smith of Wisconsin offered an amendment to the agricultural bill. I do not believe it is necessary to go into the details as shown by that record, but they are all available if any Senator wishes to study them.

The point I make is that this is not new matter. It is a matter which has come over annually. There has not been a period recently when no such provision came over from the House to this body. We are told that it is definitely in the next appropriation bill for 1963. The bill will very shortly come before the Senate for consideration. No waiver of the rule will be required, but the bill will be subject to amendment at that time, and in the meantime there will be opportunity for discussion in our committee and with the appropriate authorities to see if we cannot draft wording which will be acceptable to all concerned.

Our distinguished chairman, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], appointed the distinguished ranking minority member, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Florida to try to arrive at some agreement. Eventually the Senator from Massachusetts found, as we had previously discovered, that there would be adamant opposition in the other body. We finally arrived at certain wording friendly to the proposed action of the Senator from Delaware, as shown on page 21 of the committee report. Without reading the paragraphs into the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the three paragraphs appearing after the heading "Civil Service Employees Appearing Before Public Groups," on page 21 of the printed committee report, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The committee considered an amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Delaware with reference to the appearance of civil service employees before public groups for the purpose of explaining, interpreting, supporting, or opposing the administration's position on legislation pending before Congress. His amendment is designed to deal with a recent ruling of the Civil Service Commission which it is contended nullified in part the restrictions of previous legislation on this subject.
>
> For many years a provision has been carried in one of the appropriation acts prohibiting the use of any funds appropriated in any of the acts for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress. During fiscal year 1962 this provision was contained in the General Government Matters, Department of Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act. In the fiscal year 1963 there will be no such appropriation bill. However the general provision on this subject will be included in one act for the fiscal year 1963 by the House, and the language will be made applicable to the funds contained in all of the acts.
>
> The committee is in sympathy with the objectives sought to be accomplished by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware. The committee, however, does not believe that this is the proper bill in which to place this amendment. The committee proposes that this matter be studied further by the staff in cooperation with the Civil Service Commission and it is proposed to consider the amendment further when the bill arrives from the House which deals with this subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope we can work out something on this subject. I have volunteered to try to work out something on it. However, I do not believe that this is the time or the place to try to work anything out, because the pending bill involves $48 million of disaster relief, and contains appropriations for other emergency situations. They are of such an emergency nature that even the seven items reported here, which contain legislation, have been approved without any objection by all the Senators present, because they obviously are matters which are equitable and which require immediate action.

To show my own attitude on this matter, all I can say is that I will try with the Senator from Delaware and with the Senator from Massachusetts, who are certainly in earnest in this matter, to work out amended wording to be added to the House bill when that bill comes to us from the House in the near future. That kind of provision is now 11 years old. We will attach it to the House bill when it comes to us.

That is about all I can say in candor. I believe it shows a friendly and fair disposition. I repeat what I believe the Senator from Delaware did not hear me say a little while ago, namely, that I have recently conferred with two groups of Federal employees from my own State, one of them containing as many as 42 employees, who have come all the way up to Washington to object to proposed administrative legislation sponsored by the executive branch of the Government. I not only talked to them, but I told them that they have a right to express their disapproval on any proposed legislation, and I want to preserve and defend that right.

Therefore I shall be glad to join as a volunteer in trying to work out something in this field. I hope the Senator from Delaware will not insist on pressing his proposal, because if he does so I will be forced to raise a point of order, because I am under instructions from my committee to do so.

We have gone to great lengths to work with the Senator from Delaware and with those who are sponsors with him in support of such an amendment while the matter was before our committee, and have finally joined together in the statement which is included in the report. This obviously does not solve the problem, but I believe it points the way to the road along which this problem may be solved.

Before raising the point of order, I yield to the Senator from Delaware, as I stated I would, unless he wishes to address some questions to me, and in that case I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Florida. I wish to point out two additional reasons why I still think the matter should be pushed at this time.

First, in response to the suggestion about the employees who came to Washington from Florida to talk to the Senator about certain legislation, I am sure the proposed legislation affected them as individuals, perhaps from the standpoint of a pay raise in which they would be interested. Our amendment would not affect their right to contact you on that subject. It would not restrict the right of civil service employees, or any other Federal employees, from presenting their views to the Members of Congress with respect to the merits of the legislation which would affect them.

The amendment I propose does not in any way restrict that right, nor has the Commissioner of the Civil Service Commission so interpreted it; but it would prevent the administration from using these career employees to support its pending legislative programs. That is not their job.

I cannot go along with the Senator in his suggestion that it be incorporated in a later appropriation bill. If we were to add the amendment to the Interior Department appropriations bill or the Commerce Department appropriation bill or to any other regular appropriation bill for fiscal 1963 it would then not become effective until July 1 or the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. We have explored the matter and have found that an amendment appropriately worded on an annual appropriation bill can be made effective at an earlier date than the date on which the annual appropriation measure itself becomes effective. If the Senator will explore that matter, he will find that to be the case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; that can be done, but when it was suggested before, the committee strenuously objected. I raised the point when we were debating the Treasury Department appropriation bill, and I was advised that it would be contrary to the precedents and rules relating to the appropriations bill, and objection was then made that they did not want to break a precedent.

Therefore, I have tried to work out an amendment which will take care of the situation and which will make it possible to get action now. It is before us here today. All that we have to do is vote for it.

I shall not delay action on the pending bill. I am ready to vote. I recognize the importance of the bill before us, I told the Senator from Florida that I would not delay the pending bill. All that I want is a vote on its merits. It is important that we get this matter settled at this time. I was hopeful that the Commissioner, Mr. Macy, would agree to rescind that ruling and thereby remove the necessity of this action. It would be a simple matter to delete that one sentence which has raised all the controversy. It is a simple matter to rescind this ruling. All that is required is the deletion of that one controversial sentence.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish the Senator to know also that the legislative committee which would handle this type of legislation also objects, through its chairman, who has asked to be called to the floor in time in the event that our committee did not raise the point of order, so that he could raise the point of order himself. I refer to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

I hope the Senator realizes that this is an evidence of the kind of situation into which we run when we get on a subject of this kind and it is raised in an untimely fashion. I have offered to enlist in the army of the Senator from Delaware in trying to work out this matter, because there is merit in his amendment. However, I hope the Senator will not insist upon calling up his amendment at this time. If he does insist on doing so, I shall be forced to raise a point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand the Senator's position. I appreciate his position and also the position of the Senator from Rhode Island. Nevertheless, this amendment is just as much in order as the preceding seven amendments which were offered and which were adopted this afternoon, and I shall insist upon a vote. Those other amendments also constitute legislation. My proposal is just another legislative proposal. I told the committee last week that unless the Civil Service Commission withdraws the ruling which has created all this misunderstanding and controversy I would feel obliged to press for a vote. The Civil Service Commissioner, Mr. Macy, has affirmed the fact that never in the history of the Civil Service Commission has a similar ruling been issued. I shall insist upon a vote on my amendment. This Civil Service ruling establishes an entirely new precedent. Congress might just as well throw up the red flag now to alert not only this administration but others as well, to the fact that they have no right to use 1 million civil service employees as pawns to promote their legislative programs.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum following which I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, while the quorum call was in progress I received a telephone call from the Commissioner of the Civil Service Commission, John W. Macy, Jr., and I understand that he has also talked to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Mr. Macy said that in view of the controversy which has arisen in connection with his recent ruling he is withdrawing or rescinding effective immediately this phrase of his recent ruling which my amendment proposed to repeal. The language in the ruling which is being rescinded is as follows:

> Aware of these implications, however, the career official may explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation before interested public groups.

The Commissioner said that in view of what he thinks developed from a misunderstanding, he is today rescinding this part of the recent ruling. The withdrawal or rescinding of this controversial provision automatically nullifies the interpretations placed upon it by the Attorney General.

I am delighted with Mr. Macy's decision. Since he is withdrawing the controversial part of the ruling effective immediately it eliminates controversy.

I quote the controversial paragraph of his ruling:

> Pending legislation: A more difficult decision is faced when new or changed programs are pending before Congress in the form of proposed legislation. Definitive statutory language prohibits the use of appropriated funds for "publicity or propaganda designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress." Such language clearly limits the career official's position of possible support of or opposition to new or amendatory legislation. Aware of these implications, however, the career official may explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation before interested public groups.

The last sentence is the language about which all this controversy arose.

Mr. Macy has just advised that effective immediately he is rescinding this part of the ruling.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. First, Mr. President, I should like to yield to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], who also talked to the Commissioner.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I can confirm what the Senator from Delaware has said. I have talked to the Commissioner, and he told me just what the Senator has stated he told him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware read into the Record the words to which he objected, which the Commissioner has now withdrawn—so as to show what has been withdrawn?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; the language stricken from the ruling is that last sentence which reads as follows:

> Aware of these implications, however, the career official may explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation before interested public groups.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the quotation the part he has now withdrawn?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. It is the language to which I objected and under which there was given the order that civil service employees could be expected and required to speak for the administration's program. Under this language, it was ruled that they could speak either for or against the administration's program, but it was pointed out by the Attorney General that if they spoke against it that would be a serious impropriety.

Here is the language to which we objected:

> Aware of these implications, however, the career official may explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation before interested public groups.

It was this ruling and the broad interpretation which was placed on it by the Attorney General that the amendment proposed by the Senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] and myself proposed to repeal.

Since the controversial language is being withdrawn by the Commissioner, there is nothing left to vote on.

Our amendment is no longer needed. I think that Mr. Macy's action of simply rescinding the ruling is by far the better solution. I am glad his decision came before the vote was taken.

So I repeat—the language I have just now read is being stricken in its entirety from the recent ruling. The Commissioner has said that that will be done immediately and that appropriate notice will be sent out to all the agencies.

I wish to thank the Commissioner for his cooperation in this connection.

In view of this announcement, naturally the amendment I now have at the desk—which was offered for the purpose of overriding the ruling—is no longer necessary and will be withdrawn. So, Mr. President, I now withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware is withdrawn.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I was unable to be present in the Chamber this afternoon during the discussion of what has been known as the Williams amendment, affecting Federal civil service employees. I am delighted by the action that has been taken by the Civil Service Commission, and commend Mr. John Macy, distinguished Chairman, for the action taken.

The language greatly disturbed me when it appeared under the heading: "Ruling: Role of the Career Official in Support of Federal Programs," dated January 10, 1962.

I have a great interest in the welfare of our Federal employees, and have discussed this subject with the Chairman and other members of the Civil Service Commission. I am, therefore, greatly pleased that they have rescinded these words, which action I think has some bearing on the future welfare of our civil service employees.

I read from the ruling of January 10, 1962, these words: "aware of these implications, however—."

This is the language that disturbed me greatly—

> The career official may explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation before interested public groups.

I have no doubt that it was not the intention of the Civil Service Commission that Federal employees should enter into political campaigns, but there was an implication and a threat that might have been misunderstood. Therefore I am very much pleased by the action which was taken to rescind that language. I think it settled an issue that was of concern to every Member of Congress, and particularly every Member of the Senate.

RESCISSION OF RULING BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER MACY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware subsequently said: Mr. President, I submitted an amendment the purpose of which was to override the ruling of January 10 as it had been issued by Civil Service Commissioner Macy, wherein he had instructed the departments and agencies that they could pass down to civil service employees the ruling that career officials "may explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation before interested public groups."

I had taken exception to this ruling on the basis that it would unquestionably break down the civil service system and that it would allow the administration to mobilize 1 million-odd civil service employees as agents who could be used to support and defend the administration's pending legislative program.

I pointed out that this interpretation was in direct violation of the law which specifically prohibited such activities by career employees.

The opinion rendered on this ruling of Commissioner Macy by Attorney General Kennedy went even further and said that these civil service employees could be expected to support the administration's legislative program but that it would be considered a "serious impropriety" if they opposed it.

The purpose of the amendment which I was offering was to override this ruling and its interpretation.

During the course of the debate we received a telephone call from Mr. Macy to the effect that he would agree to withdraw this ruling. Therefore, with that assurance, I withdrew my amendment. I have here a letter dated April 23, signed by Mr. Macy, confirming the fact that he has withdrawn this controversial ruling. With this letter he enclosed a copy of a memorandum which he sent out on April 17 to all department and agency heads calling their attention to the fact that he was officially deleting the controversial language from the previous ruling and requesting them to call this deletion to the attention of all civil service employees in their organizations who had received the original guidance memorandum.

I wish to thank Mr. Macy for his cooperation in rescinding this ruling, and congratulate him for the prompt manner in which he carried out his part of the agreement, notifying all agency and department heads that he was rescinding the controversial part of the earlier ruling.

I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the Record the letter of Mr. Macy dated April 23, 1962, along with a copy of his memorandum dated April 17, 1962, as sent out to all departments and agencies instructing them that his ruling of January 10 had been rescinded.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1962.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: In accordance with the agreement we reached over the telephone on April 16, I distributed the attached memorandum to all department and agency heads who received my memorandum of guidance dated January 10. You will note that I have informed all recipients that the cited sentence should be deleted from the original memorandum and all those who received that memorandum so advised.

Sincerely yours,
John W. Macy, Jr.,
Chairman.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1962.

Memorandum to Department and Agency Heads:

On January 10 I forwarded to you a memorandum of guidance on the "Role of the Career Official in Support of Federal Programs." The following sentence in that memorandum has been subject to misunderstanding and controversy: "Aware of these implications, however, the career official may explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation before interested public groups."

I have advised Members of Congress who have raised questions concerning this sentence that in the interest of eliminating extended misunderstanding and controversy I would inform all officials who received the original memorandum that this sentence should be deleted. I would appreciate action on your part to convey information concerning this deletion to those in your organization who received the original guidance memorandum.

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, immediately following these letters there be printed a copy of the two laws which apply to the subject as they will now stand and have effect.

There being no objection, the laws were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are two laws dealing with this subject:

Section 509 of the General Government Matters, Department of Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1962, approved August 3, 1961 (Public Law 87–126):

"No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any individual, corporation, or agency included in this or any other act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

Section 1913, Lobbying With Appropriated Moneys, from Title 18 of the United States Code:

"No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment." (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 792.)

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has placed in the RECORD a copy of a memorandum to departmental and agency heads, from the U.S. Civil Service Commission. The memorandum was signed by John W. Macy, Jr., and was dated April 17, 1962.

The memorandum deleted from the order of January 10 the sentence which has caused concern and misunderstanding on the part of many who are interested in the welfare of the Federal civil service employees.

This action on the part of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission not only has my approval, but also has my commendation. I felt that the Commission erred in the use of the language which now has been deleted; and I expressed my disapproval of the language.

I do not believe for a moment that the Chairman of the Commission or any other member of the Commission would advocate that civil service employees become active in partisan politics or in connection with controversial issues affecting the administration.

Regardless of that, Mr. President, the sentence which now has been deleted, had some implications which caused concern among Federal workers and among many of us who are greatly interested in the welfare of the civil service employees.

I desire to commend the Chairman of the Commission and the other members of the Commission for the action they have taken. I think the action taken was appropriate under the situation with which we were confronted. Although I was critical at the time when the memorandum was issued, at this time I wish to commend the Chairman for the action subsequently taken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the committee, the Senate, the entire Congress, and all other parties concerned owe a debt of gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Delaware for the persistence and the tenacity with which he has pursued this matter and finally has prevailed upon the Commissioner to withdraw what we have regarded as an offensive ruling.

It is always most difficult to get at such matters, if it is necessary to introduce separate legislation. An appropriation bill is often a convenient vehicle for getting such things done.

Now that the Commissioner has taken the initiative in correcting the fault, there is no point in pressing for adoption of the amendment; and I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Delaware for his further outstanding public service.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I may say that—as the Senator from Illinois has pointed out—there is now no reason to press for adoption of the amendment, because it was offered for the purpose of overcoming the objectionable part of the ruling, but now that part is withdrawn.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the situation now is as it was before the ruling was issued—namely, that the language now in the law, which has been in the law for 5 or 6 years, still prevails, and that with this ruling withdrawn, the language of the act is satisfactory, and sufficiently covers the purposes. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. The existing law will still remain unchanged on the statute books, and the interpretation of it will go back to that which we all understood prior to the recent ruling.

I quote the exact language of the law which was approved under date of August 3, 1961. It is a part of Public Law 87–126:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any individual, corporation, or agency included in this or any other act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

From reading this law it can readily be seen that Congress has never had any intention other than that civil service employees would be barred from taking an active part in either supporting or defeating pending legislation. There has never been any basis for the Commissioner's ruling, wherein he interpreted the above law to permit these employees to be used to support the administration's programs.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was the law which we approved. The intent of Congress was very clear. However, the Commissioner's ruling on January 10 went beyond any previous interpretation. In his ruling he states that although he is "aware of all these implications" mentioned in the act, nevertheless, "career officials may explain the position of the administration" before interested groups. Following the Commission's ruling the Attorney General expanded the interpretation even further and stated that civil service employees could explain and support the position of the administration before interested public groups, but that it would be considered a "serious impropriety" to oppose the position of the administration, even though they disagreed with the legislative program.

The Commissioner's action in withdrawing the ruling is an excellent solution. As I told the Senator from Florida, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Commissioner, it is difficult to write language to override an interpretation or ruling. There is always the danger that the new language we write can be misunderstood. I think the best solution has been arrived at; namely, the withdrawal of the ruling by the Commissioner.

My only regret is that his decision did not come earlier in the day, but in any event it came before it was too late.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator will refer to page 21 of the committee report, he will see a section entitled "Civil Service Employees Appearing Before Public Groups." In that section it is suggested that the committee staff and the Civil Service Commission study the subject further.

Is it the opinion of the Senator that this study now becomes unnecessary because the provision in the law, which has already been enacted for this year, and presumably will be enacted next year, is sufficient to cover what the Senator has in mind, in view of the fact that the ruling has been withdrawn?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. With the ruling withdrawn as far as I am concerned the matter is settled. All I wanted to do was to make sure no administration, whether it is the present one or a succeeding one, regardless of party, can ever use civil service employees as pawns in order to promote its legislative programs before Congress.

With the legislative background we now have established and with the withdrawal of the objectionable part of the ruling the problem will be solved so far as this issue is concerned.

Naturally, with the ruling rescinded there is no need for our legislative amendment. There is now nothing to repeal.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator recognizes that this inhibition is in effect until the end of the fiscal year 1962, and with that understanding, under the assurance given by the Senator from Florida, the Senator from Delaware will insist on the inclusion of the same inhibition, effective July 1, 1962, for the next fiscal year. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. I shall insist upon the same restrictions being included in the appropriations for the next fiscal year just as we have always done in preceding years.

That law has always been considered adequate. It was only the recent broad, and in my opinion erroneous, interpretation that was placed upon it to which I objected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, so there may be no misunderstanding, I believe I should repeat what I have already said. This is a uniform provision. It has been in the law since 1952. We are told by the other body that it will be in one of the bills coming over a little later. My understanding is that everybody is happy and will live happily together ever after, and that there is cause for mutual rejoicing. So far as the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Arizona, the Senator from South Carolina, and other interested Senators are concerned, this is a solution of a difficult situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Commissioner Macy ought to be congratulated for seeing the light.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have already done so. I join the Senator from Illinois in expressing appreciation to the Commissioner for recognizing the problem and rescinding his ruling.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for withdrawing his amendment.

I yield now to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Delaware for withdrawing his amendment. I do so for the simple reason that I think it is bad to be legislating upon appropriation bills in connection with matters which, in a great many instances, can have a far-reaching effect. This issue involves the Hatch Act. We usually hold hearings on proposals of this kind. Whether I would be for or against it, I think some aspects of the amendment might have created some problems.

To illustrate, in the field of agriculture, votes are taken from year to year on crop programs and other programs. I fear the amendment as drawn would prevent the Agriculture Department or its agencies from telling the people what the program was to be. So we must be very careful when we legislate in that field.

I thank the Senator from Delaware for withdrawing his amendment. I understood him to say that he had information from the Civil Service Commission to the effect that it had canceled the order which had been issued.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from South Carolina for his statement. However, I point out, in all fairness, that the amendment was not withdrawn because I do not think that this appropriation bill was the appropriate place for it to be offered. I would have insisted on action. The amendment was withdrawn only because it is no longer necessary in view of the rescission by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission of his recent ruling. Had that not been done I would have insisted on final action on the amendment. I think it is very important that no administration be permitted to enlist any civil service employee, regardless of which administration is in power, to go out and advocate its programs. Sure, such employees have not only a right, but a responsibility, to go before interested public groups when they are called upon to explain a law which has already been enacted.

Whether the Senator from South Carolina and I happen to be for the law is immaterial. Once a law is passed it becomes the law of the land. All Government officials then have a right and a responsibility to help to explain the law and to make it work.

But no administration has a right to force the civil service employees, under a directive, to support its pending legislative programs.

Unless that ruling had been rescinded or overruled by congressional action, our entire civil service system could have been destroyed.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. First, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Delaware for having scored another great victory for the American taxpayer on the floor of the Senate. The Senator has developed quite a list of notches in the totem pole in his tent by utilizing the proposed amendment device to stop unsavory practices which he finds rampant in the American Government. I salute him for his efforts.

Now that the amendment has been withdrawn because of a commitment made by the Civil Service Commission, I ask the Senator whether the situation is the same as before—whether, under the terms of the commitment and under the terms of the understanding acquired by the Senator from Delaware, the directive urging civil service employees to inject themselves into the political situation has been withdrawn; whether the civil service employees still have the permission of the Civil Service Commission to engage in such activity; or whether, by the removal of the directive, we have arrived at a situation in which the civil service employees are prohibited, as they were in the past, from injecting themselves into political discussions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. With the withdrawal of the ruling by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, we are now back to where we were before the ruling of last January.

Mr. MUNDT. What is the Senator's understanding as to where we were before?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That all career civil service employees are prohibited from injecting themselves in the controversial question of supporting or opposing legislation pending before the Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is fine.

I do not wish to associate myself, by direction or indirection, with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] since he sort of deplored resort to an amendment to an appropriation bill to achieve a salutary end.

This is the place for action, Madam President, and that is the way to get the job done. If I correctly understand the unfolding of Anglo-Saxon history, it has been through the control of the purse strings that the people and their representatives historically have been able to keep excessive grabs for power from being committeed by overzealous administrators. This is in keeping with what happened in the meadow of Runnymed in 1215. This is in keeping with petitions of rights and with the Bill of Rights. This is the place in which the representatives of the people are supposed to have an impact, in dealing with appropriations.

I hope the Senator from Delaware will continue to keep his eyes close to the keyhole, watching for these little political peccadilloes, and that when he sees them he will continue to use the power of the purse of the people to stop them, because when we stop the spending of money we have them completely and permanently stopped.

Again I congratulate the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I agree with him fully. This was one of the most appropriate places to push for the enactment of the legislation. The best evidence that I did not select the wrong vehicle is that we were successful in getting the ruling withdrawn prior to the vote.

Mr. MILLER subsequently said: Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that my comments may be printed in the Record following the statement by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to point out that during a recent controversy on this same subject I proposed an amendment which would have included not only the civil servants but also the members of the ASC committees and employees of the Extension Service.

I have in my hand a statement from the Deputy Administrator for Management of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, calling attention to the recent ruling of the Civil Service Commission and pointing out that the statement should be circulated or reproduced and brought to the attention of the employees in ASCS.

I wish to emphasize that in this statement there is included the recent ruling by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, to wit,

> Aware of these implications, however, the career official may explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation before interested public groups.

Madam President, in view of the assurances given the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, this should no longer be the policy of the Department of Agriculture, and the Department can be expected to follow the assurances given the foregoing Senators.

The only suggestion I might offer is that this changed policy be extended to the Extension Service as well as the ASCS.

I thank my friend from Florida for yielding.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have this statement, to which I have referred, printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ROLE OF THE CAREER OFFICIAL IN SUPPORT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

1. Purpose: To transmit as Exhibit 1 a statement by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission describing the appropriate role of career officials in supporting administration programs. This statement should be circulated or reproduced and brought to the attention of the employees in ASCS.

2. Disposal Authority: July 1, 1962.

The extent to which Federal career officials should publicly support current and discuss proposed programs of their departments and agencies requires thoughtful judgment by all concerned. The role of the career official is still evolving within our system of government with the consequence that the precedent of longstanding tradition is not available. It is understandable, therefore, that uncertainty exists regarding the role the career official should play in program advocacy. This uncertainty has prompted requests from career officials, particularly in the field service, and from department and agency heads for guidance.

No definitive standard can be enunciated to define this role. Discretion and judgment must be applied by both Presidential appointees and career officials within the context of each problem as it arises. With this in mind it may be helpful, nevertheless, to consider the following guidelines:

1. Programs already authorized by law or Executive order: When a Federal program is based on law or Executive order, every career official has a positive obligation to make it function as efficiently and economically as possible and to support it as long as it is a part of recognized public policy. This means that a career official may properly make speeches explaining and interpreting a current program, identifying its public purposes, citing its achievements, defending it against uninformed or unjust criticisms, pointing out need for possible corrective action or soliciting views for improving it. The fact that the program was the subject of partisan controversy during the stages of enactment or development would in no sense lessen this obligation although the career official should exercise care in divorcing his remarks from a strictly political context.

2. Pending legislation: A more difficult decision is faced when new or changed programs are pending before Congress in the form of proposed legislation. Definitive statutory language prohibits the use of appropriated funds for "publicity or propaganda designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress." Such language clearly limits the career official's position of possible support of or opposition to new or amendatory legislation.

Aware of these implications, however, the career official may explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation before interested public groups. Frequently, career officials are requested to testify on pending legislative proposals before congressional committees. Presidential appointees should recognize potential political involvement in assigning responsibility for legislative testimony to career officials. In most instances, the career officials should be used to present factual or technical testimony with policy advocacy reserved for presentation by the Presidential appointee.

A special circumstance arises when congressional committees request the technical services of career officials to assist in drafting bills or reports. Even in politically controversial areas such an assignment is appropriate if it is understood that the career official is serving as a technical expert to assist in committee work under the direction of committee leadership.

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,
Chairman,
U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, as Senators will recall, we passed by the items relative to the New York World's Fair at the time of earlier action. I stated that I had agreed to withhold them until later, so that the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] would have an opportunity to get to the Chamber. I told the Senator that in the event the bill was ready for final action except as to those items it would be necessary to proceed. I now find myself in that position.

I note the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] is in the Chamber. It seems to me we must take up the items relative to the New York World's Fair. Perhaps the senior Senator from New York will arrive during the course of our discussion.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator has been very gracious. I know my senior colleague would not wish in any way to delay consideration of the bill. The Senator from Florida certainly has done all he could to defer consideration until the last moment. It may be that before the debate is concluded my colleague will arrive in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, before the clerk reads the amendment I wish to say that there are two amendments to be considered. I give notice of both, so that Senators will not be surprised.

The first relates to an amount. The House granted $17 million out of the $25 million requested in the budget estimates. The Senate committee action cut that figure of $17 million to $15 million. Senators will find that on line 22, page 3, of the printed bill.

In addition there is an amendment on which the committee has instructed me to endeavor to have action taken, which would allow for a U.S. Commissioner to represent the Federal Government in connection with the carrying out of the fair, since so much Federal money will be involved. That amendment will be considered later than the money amendment, to which I have referred.

Madam President, I ask that first the amendment which relates to the money amount be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 3, line 22, after the word "diem", it is proposed to strike out "$17,000,000" and to insert "$15,000,000."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, a point of order, for clarification. Will the Senator from Florida yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to make sure that it will be possible for the junior Senator from Wisconsin to offer an amendment relating to this section also. My amendment would strike out the section providing for the New York World's Fair, covered in lines 15 to 23 on page 3 of the bill.

I wish to make certain of that. The Senator from Florida has reassured me I would be in a proper parliamentary position to offer my amendment. I am sure the Senator is correct, but I should like to have it stated on the record. There will be a whole series of parliamentary bear traps in the course of this discussion, as will be revealed. I wish to be sure with respect to this item.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida of course is not the one to rule, but the Senator from Florida understands that the bill, as agreed to so far, was agreed to with the full understanding that no such action as that to be attempted to be taken by the Senator from Wisconsin would be barred or banned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to strike out would be in order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, have the amendments offered by the Senator from Florida been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, line 22.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, a point of order. Would it not make the task of the Senator from Wisconsin more simple if the Senate proceeded to adopt the amendment relating to the Commissioner? Would the Senator prefer to bring that up separately?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Go right ahead. So far as I know, that amendment is noncontroversial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 3, line 20, following the comma, it is proposed to insert the following: "including compensation of a United States Commissioner, who shall be appointed by the President, at the rate of $19,500 per annum."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, the amendment speaks for itself. Under the bill as it now stands, the Federal Government is committed to spend $15 million. Therefore, of course, it is reasonable that the Federal Government should have a representative in charge of its important building and exhibits. I have before me a statement which shows the precedents in such matters with reference to the Century 21 Exposition at Seattle, the 1939 World's Fair at New York, and the 1933 World's Fair in Chicago, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> This amendment, 4–11–62—B, provides for a U.S. Commissioner for the New York World's Fair at a salary of $19,500 per annum. The House committee bill, as reported, contained provision for this position at a rate not to exceed $19,500 per annum; on a point of order, this matter was stricken from the bill on the floor of the House. I am informed that there are ample precedents for such positions in connection with Federal participation in past world fairs and expositions. Public Law 85–880, approved September 2, 1958, authorized a commissioner at a salary of $17,500 for the Century 21 Exposition at Seattle, Wash.; Public Law 860, 84th Congress authorized for the Brussels Exhibition a commissioner at a salary not in excess of that of a chief of mission at a class 2 post; authority for a commissioner for the 1939 World's Fair in New York at a salary of $10,000 was approved by 50 Stat. 493; authority for a commissioner for the 1933 World's Fair in Chicago at a salary not to exceed $10,000 per annum was approved in 47 Stat. 40; H.R. 7763 which was to provide for planning the participation of the United States in the New York World's Fair to be held in 1964 and 1965 contains a provision for a U.S. Commissioner at a salary rate applicable to an Assistant Secretary. This bill passed the House August 22, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, for fear that there may be a misunderstanding, I have offered the amendment and it has been adopted subject to the clear understanding that it becomes a part of the entire section to which I understand the Senator from Wisconsin is about to address his amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I thank the committee for inserting in the bill now before the Senate the item of $7,092,000 for the assistance of the school construction program. I think it is very important that we make the appropriation at this time. I am glad that the committee saw fit to include the item.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter I wrote to the chairman of the subcommittee, which appears on page 557 of the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations, calling the attention of the committee to this subject when the hearings were being conducted.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> U.S. Senate,
> Committee on Post Office
> and Civil Service,
> *April 6, 1962.*
>
> Hon. Spessard L. Holland,
> *Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Senator Holland: The House of Representatives passed the supplemental appropriation bill Wednesday, and it is now in your Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations.
>
> In the supplemental appropriation bill the House added $15.7 million to the program for Federal aid for impacted school districts. This will make it possible to pay 100 percent of the entitlements under Public Law 874. However, this supplemental appropriation did not include the $7,092,000 needed to meet the 100 percent of the entitlements for construction purposes under Public Law 815. The omission of this $7,092,000 by the House in this supplemental appropriation poses a critical problem for a number of school districts in the United States, and South Carolina in particular.
>
> I have been informed that in one particular district, school district No. 2 of Richland County, S.C., we have had an increase of 139 percent in student enrollment in the past 10 years, and we are currently running under the double session every day, and will continue to do so for the next school year, unless we are able to get the $137,270 that the Office of Education has notified my State that it is now eligible for under section 5, Public Law 815.
>
> Senator, I urge that you respectfully include in the supplemental appropriation bill the $7,092,000 needed for Public Law 815. My request is that your committee look into this matter thoroughly and I believe that you will agree with me on this matter.
>
> With kind regards and best wishes, I am,
> Sincerely yours,
> Olin D. Johnston.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I offer an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 3 of the bill, as amended, it is proposed to strike out all the language pertaining to the New York World's Fair beginning with line 15 through the period on line 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, the amendment would eliminate the language in the bill which provides $15 million for participation in the New York World's Fair. There are a number of reasons why I am offering the amendment. In the first place, I have tried very hard, as has the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] also to determine how we could raise a point of order on the amendment.

APPROPRIATION IS NOT AUTHORIZED

I have done so because I am convinced that there is no basic authorization for the appropriation for the New York World Fair. The appropriation is based upon authority contained in Public Law 87–256, the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act which was authored by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] and which was approved by the Congress on September 21, 1961.

This appropriation represents a classic example of the need for authorization legislation under these circumstances. The authority for the proposed legislation is based on the omission of language in previous exchange acts.

The author of the act, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], in his testimony observed that there was no significance attached to the elimination of the word "abroad," and that his committee considered it obvious that projects under the particular act would be "abroad." Public Law 87–256 authorizes grants for cultural exchanges, and perhaps it may be argued that the World's Fair in New York is a cultural exchange between New York and the rest of the United States.

That seems to be about the only ground on which the appropriation could be justified.

This point is made clear in the hearing on this appropriation, as follows:

> Senator Holland. I thought I understood that point, but I was trying to get it completely clear. In the case of Seattle, as I recall it, we had authorizing legislation.
>
> Senator Fulbright. Yes. This bill which I sponsored in the Senate and which Congressman Hays sponsored in the House, was a combination of existing legislation in many fields, including the old act, the bill I sponsored, and several other bills, and among those was a provision regarding fairs. As I stated here, the previous language had limited this to participation in fairs abroad. This language was not carried over and it does, apparently, on its face, authorize participation in domestic fairs.

So I assume as to domestic fairs there is legislative authority for participating although, like it is stated, in the case of Seattle they sought specific authority and got it with the reservation that I mentioned about it being on land which is deeded to the Federal Government and accepted.

Senator **HOLLAND**. The Senators from New York depend then for their authorization upon legislation sponsored for passage by the Senator from Arkansas, is that correct?

Senator **FULBRIGHT**. That was a very unusual circumstance, but it is true. I can assure the Senator that was not in the minds of the committee when that particular bill was passed.

TECHNICALITY BARS POINT OF ORDER

Madam President, a bill (H.R. 7763) passed the House and is pending in the Senate which would authorize planning for a U.S. project at the New York Fair. Since that bill has not been enacted, I thought a point of order could be made against the appropriation to the effect that neither the project nor the planning have been authorized.

I have just checked with the parliamentarian and I have been informed that there is a technical reason why such a point of order would not be well taken, and that is the fact that the House has already adopted all of the language in this apropriation bill pertaining to the New York Fair except the particular figures. The House having acted, of course, the Senate is not in a position to invalidate by point of order a prior action by the House.

As I have said, the New York World's Fair appropriations proposal is a classic example of what is wrong with passing proposed legislation that has not been through the authorization process, because there is an almost total lack of justification for the appropriation, of a kind that I have not heretofore seen in my experience in the Senate.

The House-passed bill, H.R. 7763, would only authorize planning for U.S. participation in the fair. According to the presentation before the House committee, the President's support was for that bill, that is, for planning and thinking about possible participation, not more. The presentation of the Department of Commerce to the House committee on March 19, 1962, included the statement that "if the Federal Government is to participate in the fair, it is necessary to authorize the participation at once so that the project would be carried on in the allotted time."

I emphasize the word "authorize."

This is a statement regarding an appropriation which, according to their own testimony, had yet to be authorized.

In the course of the hearings there were additional references to the fact that authorization was needed.

The authorization point which I am making is not a technicality. A quick review of the justification for total requirements shows among other things that no plan for a building exists at the present time. Not even the design or detailed concept of the building is known. Yet for this purpose we are asked to provide a cool $10 million for the building.

Incidentally, as I said, H.R. 7763 would have authorized $300,000 for planning and, of course, that has not been passed.

WHAT SIZE IS BUILDING?

The difficulty in the situation is made obvious from one clear contradiction. In the course of the testimony, it was developed on page 60 of the House hearings, and on page 466 of the Senate hearings, that the gross floorspace for the building would be 220,000 square feet. But on page 73 of the House hearings it is stated that the gross floorspace would be 286,000 square feet. There is no reconciliation of that contradictory testimony. On the basis of the facts as presented, we cannot determine within 30 percent what size building we are appropriating money for. There is no way of telling what happened to the extra 66,000 square feet.

What size will the building be? Will it be a building containing 220,000 square feet or one containing 286,000 square feet? How much will it cost per square foot? Will it cost $44 per square foot or far more? It is very difficult to tell.

ONE MILLION, EIGHTY-SEVEN THOUSAND DOLLARS TO DECIDE "WHAT TO DO"

Another reason why it seems to me the project is a classic example of Congress appropriating money without having any real idea of what the appropriation is for is that there is no authorization providing guidelines and providing a clear description of where the money would go. One million, eighty-seven thousand dollars is requested for "development of concepts" and "design and engineering." This indicates that there is no idea here at all as to what they are going to do as yet with the money, and have set aside a part of it to think about how to spend the rest.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BEARS TOTAL COST

There is no indication of industry or regional or private or museum or other contributions to the U.S. pavilion. Apparently every last item, including many which relate to local or special private interests—such as oil or steel, and others—will be bought and paid for in full by the U.S. Government, if such an item appears in the U.S. pavilion.

In this connection, we should note that Great Britain, France, and several other countries are doing their exhibits on a commercial basis. The Government is not paying for their representation. Of course as pointed out previously, many of them will charge admission.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR "ANYONE'S" TRAVEL

Then there is also an item for travel. It is stated in the House hearings, at page 60:

> During the 5 years of planning and operation of the fair there will be considerable need for travel.

For that purpose $250,000 will be required.

Madam President, there is no definition or description of what is meant by travel, and for what purpose it would be done, or how it would be authorized. There are no limitations.

If the funds become available on May 1, 1962, there are 3 years and 5 months until the fair is over. The question naturally arises: Will there be an additional 1 year and 7 months spent in traveling to close and clean up the fair, or is there included all the time since about October 1960? This is not very clear, Madam President.

At page 61 of the House hearing under the title "Transportation of Things," it is indicated that a large volume of equipment, including "electronic equipment and scientific devices" will have to be shipped to the fair, at a cost of $500,000.

Is all this equipment to be bought from manufacturers? Are they not going to be asked to contribute the many items which relate to public relations and prestige? Will not the manufacturers even carry the cost of getting their products from their factories to New York City? What is going to happen to the items, such as a big computer, or a modern crane, for example, after the fair is over?

UTILITY COST JUSTIFICATION LOSES 540 DAYS

Under "Utilities" is stated that the cost of water, gas, and electricity for the fair will be $550 a day, and that "For an estimated period of 900 days, this will amount to $500,000." Madam President, since the fair will be open only for 300 days—180 days in 1964 and 180 days in 1965—why do they need $550 per day for the other 540 days?

There is no explanation for it. The $550 per day figure is computed on the basis of 900 days. It is perfectly clear that the need for utilities will not be significant during the period when the fair is closed.

These justifications are of the kind that hitherto only the Defense Department has been able to get away with. In this case we would be handing these people a blank check.

PROFITS TO NEW YORK

The New York Fair Corp. will charge a $2 fee for admission to the fair, with a $1 fee for children. The estimated attendance will be 70 million. At $2 for adults by way of an admission charge, and $1 for children, the revenue should be at least $100 million.

In addition to that, of course, there will be a charge made to the exhibitors who will have exhibits at the fair, and to many concessions at the fair from which the people in New York expect to have an income.

Does the Federal Government share in any profit New York makes? Certainly not. All profits revert to New York City and New York State.

PARLIAMENTARY SITUATION BARS REPAYMENT TO UNITED STATES

I also wanted to offer an amendment to provide that there will be a repayment to the Government of the $15 million that would be appropriated. I was told by the Parliamentarian, however, that such an amedment would be subject to a point of order because it would represent legislation on an appropriation bill. As I indicated, I feel that the whole appropriation is subject to a point of order because there is no authorization for it. I cannot make that latter point of order because the House has already acted, and I cannot offer any modification to it, as would be possible on an authorization bill. In this case it would be legislation on an appropriation bill, and therefore subject to a point of order, which could be immediately sustained.

COST OF BUILDING EXCESSIVE

The Federal pavilion is to cost at least $44 per square foot, which is an extraordinarily high cost, particularly for a temporary building. The fair will last 2 years only, and it is mandatory, on the basis of all the testimony that I have read, that the building must be torn down. It will not remain as a permanent building. It is to be torn down after 2 years. Forty-four dollars a square foot is a great deal of money even for a permanent building. It is an excessive amount of money for a temporary building.

UNITED STATES HOLDS TITLE IN SEATTLE BUILDING

With respect to the Seattle World's Fair which is taking place this year, I have already indicated that an authorization is provided. The authorization was developed on the basis of "give and take" between the Federal Government and the city officials in Seattle who are in charge of the fair. In that case the title to the Federal building will remain in the Federal Government. It will not be turned over to the city of Seattle. It will remain in the possession of the Federal Government, and will be used as a Federal office building. The Federal Government, therefore, will not be giving the money away. The Federal Government will remain in possession, and will therefore have an asset of real value after the fair has concluded operations.

Because there was no authorization legislation provided in connection with the pending bill, there is no such provision in the bill, and no opportunity for negotiation has been provided.

In the case of the New York fair, it is required that the building be demolished at the end of the fair. New York City is getting back the $24 million that it is investing in improvements at the fair site. New York City is providing a loan, not a grant, of $24 million. New York gets that $24 million back.

In addition to that, it also, of course, gets the advantage from any profits that will ensue. There have been substantial profits realized in the past from this kind of fair. These are profits from admissions, and a large part of those profits will go to New York City and to New York State, with not a nickel of those profits going to the Federal Government.

These profits that go to New York City and New York State will be used for a very laudable purpose, namely, to defray educational expenses. Of course what this really means is a reduction in the taxes for the people of New York City and New York State at the expense of the Federal Government.

Part of the New York contribution was stated in the hearings to be the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, which is located in midtown New York City. This can be likened to a contribution by the Federal Government of the value of the Capitol or the value of the Library of Congress. Obviously, the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts in midtown New York is not available at the site of the fair.

FAT $1,809,000 CONTINGENCY

Madam President, the justification for the cost for a $10 million building, as I have already indicated, is extremely slight. There is a contradiction in the size of the building, with respect to the number of square feet. The cost justification at page 73 adds up to $8,291,000. At the bottom there is a note—and it is a very expensive note—showing that $1,809,000 is for contingencies. There is no further explanation than that. That brings the total figure to $10 million. This is the kind of fat, unjustified spending a private business contract would never embody. Imagine nearly $2 million for something as vague as "contingency."

Madam President, the $10 million building will be used only from April 1964 to September 1965, omitting the period October 1964 to March 1965, when the fair will be closed for the winter. The building is to be razed at the end of this period, at a cost of $100,000, having had a useful life of 12 months, spread over an 18-month period.

I hope this section will be stricken from the bill, because it is perfectly obvious that an authorization bill should be passed to cover some of these contradictory points and, at least, to cover the possibility of the Federal Government being repaid, if not to have some kind of title in its investment, so as to preserve the asset on which Congress is being asked to spend so substantial an amount of money.

UNITED STATES PAYS—NEW YORK GETS

The reasons why I feel this section of the bill should be stricken particularly so that we may consider the possibility of reimbursement of the U.S. Government, are as follows:

First, New York City will receive back a $24 million investment in improvements at the fairgrounds.

Second, New York will receive the improvements themselves.

Third, New York will receive an estimated $23 million from the proceeds for educational purposes.

Fourth, there will be no Federal tax on admissions or any other aspect of the fair. That is a further advantage which the fair will be getting. The Federal Government will not collect a cent of admissions tax, which is usually charged for a recreation of this kind. However, the New York City sales tax will apply at the fair.

Fifth, if the $10 million building is not demolished, it will also revert to New York City. So, under the proposed legislation, even if for some reason the building is not demolished, New York City will have the building, while the Federal Government, which supplied the money for it, will have nothing.

Sixth, every service and utility at the fair will be paid for by the fair, which is a further benefit to New York.

ENORMOUSLY EXPENSIVE PRECEDENT

On the basis of this clear and emphatic case against $15 million of appropriations; in view of the fact that it is only a technical accident, really, that there is no opportunity to make a point of order from the standpoint that there is no authorizing legislation; in view of the fact that the Federal interest is virtually abandoned; in view of the fact that it will be an extremely dangerous precedent if New York City can do this, since in the future Chicago, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, and every other city in the country which might have a World's Fair could, on the basis of this precedent, ask for a complete, direct handout from the Federal Government, I think the amendment is unwarranted.

Instead of the people of the locality determining whether there exist the local willingness, the local resources, and the local ability to sacrifice to secure a fair, they would be able to look to Uncle Sam, in Washington. On the basis of the New York City precedent, they would be able to say that Uncle Sam paid this enormous sum, with no reimbursement, with no chance of repayment of any kind, with no opportunity, even to collect the Federal Government's normal taxes; whereas the locality was collecting all of its taxes.

Anyone who has had experience in or around Congress knows that if the proposed action is taken, it will likely become a precedent for future fairs. So, while the proposal to appropriate $15 million is a serious mistake, I think the precedent could be far more serious in the future.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I am disappointed that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has attacked this item. It is opposition from an entirely unexpected source. We were prepared to meet advances of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who have shown a reluctance to accept this proposal for participation in the New York World's Fair. Apparently they have been satisfied.

Now from whom do we have opposition? From the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. Rather than attacking this amendment, I wish he would direct his great influence and abilities toward convincing the State of Wisconsin, which is one of the States which have not yet indicated they will exhibit at the fair, to display at the fair some of the wonderful dairy products produced in Wisconsin. Wisconsin is already trying very hard to send its milk into the great markets of New York.

Obviously, this attempt is opposed by the dairymen of the State of New York. That is a natural reaction on their part. However, it is possible that if the Senator from Wisconsin could induce the dairymen of his State to exhibit at the New York World's Fair, he might be able, and Wisconsin might be able, to convince the people of New York who visit the fair of the quality of Wisconsin's milk. I doubt this is possible, that the people of New York might be convinced of the superiority of Wisconsin's milk, but I would prefer this approach to the opposition now expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin.

In answer to the Senator's argument, I appeal to him to reconsider his opposition and try instead to have Wisconsin enter an exhibit in that great fair.

Second, I point out that it is something of a paradox that it devolves largely upon the junior Senator from New York to defend the President and the administration in asking for this important appropriation.

Before going any further, I express my deep appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for his patience and courtesy during the rather lengthy hearings which were held by the Committee on Appropriations on this bill. Parenthetically, the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin did not appear at those hearings, although the World's Fair funds were opposed at this hearing by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. The Senator from Florida and all the other members of the subcommittee could not have been more courteous or more considerate in hearing all who were interested in this issue, or more patient in listening to the rather sharp points of difference which developed in the hearings.

The President of the United States asked an appropriation of $25 million for this purpose. After the House had allowed $17 million, Secretary of Commerce Hodges wrote the Senate Committee on Appropriations and asked for the restoration of the entire $25 million. The committee decided not to restore that sum, but to reduce the House figure by $2 million, to $15 million, saying in its report that this sum would be sufficient to permit the fair authorities to begin their work.

Despite the fact that H.R. 11038 does not contain the full amount requested by the President for the Federal exhibit at the New York World's Fair, I am of the opinion that in one important respect it is favorable to those involved in the planning and management of the fair. The key word on which I base this opinion is contained in the report of the Senate committee. On page 4 of the report, the committee states that these funds, $15 million, will enable the agency involved to "begin" necessary planning, design, and construction of the Federal pavilion. The key word is "begin."

This appropriation looks only to the beginning of this work. It is my impression, and I want to make this very clear, that it does not preclude the corporation of the World's Fair from coming in and requesting additional funds, if it develops that such additional funds are required.

I would say this: I do not think that the fair or that the Federal officials involved, will seek, or should seek to exceed the $25 million ceiling placed on this item by the President in his letter to the Congress urging the enactment of this appropriation. Fifteen million dollars may be sufficient to do the whole job. But if it is not, I would interpret the language of this report to mean that the appropriate Federal officials could request additional supplemental funds to complete—and I use the word "complete" as contrasted to the word "begin" contained in the report—work on the U.S. pavilion.

The first point which the Senator from Wisconsin makes is that there is no basic authorization for this appropriation. I disagree. The Cultural Exchange Act of 1958, as amended in September of 1961, provides clear authority for cultural exchanges, including international expositions. I think it is quite generally accepted that this is sufficient authority for the appropriation of $15 million before us today.

It was impossible to have an authorization bill for planning passed, largely because of the opposition of the two distinguished Senators to whom I have referred, who are members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Last year and this year, we made Herculean efforts to do this, but were not successful.

The President and the Secretary of Commerce this year concluded that there was no necessity for a separate authorization for this project, although I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that a separate authorization would have been desirable. I would have preferred a separate authorization; nevertheless, I think there is clear authority under the provision of existing law to which I just referred for this appropriation.

As to the figures the Senator from Wisconsin has cited—and he has selected specific items—I am in no position to say that $250,000 or $230,000 or $190,000, or any other figure, is the proper one for travel or any of the other projects. The total of those items comes to $25 million. All of these items are covered in the careful statement of justification presented by the Department of Commerce—adding up to $25 million. Obviously these figures will be and have been scrutinized by both the Department of Commerce and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses. I know plans for all these expenditures will be carefully scrutinized. I certainly agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that this should be done, and I believe it will be done.

The effect of the amendment the Senator from Wisconsin has submitted would be to strike out this entire appropriation, and to provide that the United States will not participate in any way in this fair. This would be despite the fact that the Soviet Union will have an exhibit which will cover 78,000 square feet, the cost of which undoubtedly will be in excess of the amount the United States is going to spend; and also in face of the fact that other countries which already have signed contracts to participate are the following:

Republic of China, Christian Science pavilion, Guinea, Haiti, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Sudan, Thailand, United Arab Republic, and U.S.S.R.

And the following additional countries have selected and reserved sites at the fair, and have completed the negotiations, although they have not yet entered into contracts:

Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Colombia, Ireland, Japan, Lebanon, Liberia, Malaya, Mali, Pakistan, Philippines, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Korea.

And the following additional countries reserved sites:

Afghanistan, Ecuador, France, Germany, Islam mosque, Jordan, League of Arab States, Nigeria, Panama, Poland, OAS, Senegal, Sierra Leone, UNICEF, Vatican City, Italy, Yugoslavia, and Singapore.

And the following have declared their intent to participate, but have not yet selected a site:

Cameroun, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Republic of Dahomey, Gabon, Greece, Kuwait, Malagasy Republic, Mauritania, Netherlands, Niger, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Trinidad and Tobago, and Upper Volta.

All these countries—or, at least, the vast majority of them—will have exhibits at this fair.

Madam President, it is unthinkable that with this fair being held in the United States and with all these nations exhibiting that our own great Government would not participate by having an exhibit at the fair.

The New York World's Fair will be a dynamic, sweeping expression of our national heritage. Millions of people will visit it. It will be a great expression of the achievements of our country, and will provide an excellent opportunity to bring people from all over the world to the United States. They will see our cities and will visit other parts of our country. They will see its mountains and its countryside, and will meet our people; and it is hoped they will absorb some of the essence of our fundamental belief in individual freedom and justice.

This expenditure of $15 million—or, indeed, if it reached $25 million for a U.S. pavilion—is not for the benefit of the State of New York or for the benefit of any one group of people. It is a part of this broad gesture toward unity and cooperation. In its own way, the New York World's Fair will seek to bring together, rather than to divide, the nations of the world.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, at this point will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator from New York assume that the Senator from Wisconsin feels that the U.S. Government should not participate in this fair? I wish to state that I feel it is undoubtedly a project in which our country should participate; but I say it should be done in an orderly way, and on the basis of an authorization, so that we shall know what we are doing; and there should be safeguards for the Federal taxpayers.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I wish to state to the Senator from Wisconsin that I did think this was his position on his amendment. I am very happy to hear him state that he does think the United States should participate in this fair.

I point out to him something which he may not have realized—because of the fact that, naturally, he has not lived as close to this problem as have the Senators from New York—namely, that even if a start were to be made today, when this appropriation bill goes through, there will be only 2 years in which to make all the plans and have this pavilion ready.

When the fair opens in 1964, the United States would not want its pavilion still to be under construction. Our pavilion must be in working order and open for visitors. Two years may be a long time for many kinds of undertakings; but for the planning, design, and construction of such a building, which is for the purpose of expressing the vigor and strength of our great country, I am informed that this is not enough time. Great efforts will be required in order to get the planning done and the pavilion erected by the time the fair opens.

So the difficulty with the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin is that even if a start were to be made now—all over again—to pass a separate authorization bill, obviously, even if such a bill were reported at all by the Foreign Relations Committee, it would be some time hence before it would become law. Then, assuming that we were able to get the necessary appropriation bill passed in the Senate and have it go through the legislative mill, it would still be late in this session of Congress. For this reason, it is imperative that the Senator's amendment be rejected.

I accept completely the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin that he is not trying to prevent U.S. participation in the fair; but I must say to him, in all candor, that if his amendment were adopted, that would be its effect. It would be impossible to do the necessary work within the time available between, let us say, even the end of this session and the opening of the fair.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As shown on page 490 of the hearings, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], in questioning Mr. Imhoff, Budget Director of the Department of Commerce, made the following statement:

> Even if the money were appropriated in the regular bill that, of course, would become available only with the new fiscal year, July 1. That is the best guess, as I understand it, with reference to the time it can be made at this time.

The reply was as follows:

> Mr. IMHOFF. That is true, Mr. Chairman, and our present estimated schedule of obligation calls for an amount of $92,900 to be obligated during this fiscal year which is the reason for our requesting the money in this supplemental appropriation.
>
> Senator SMITH. It is not to keep pace with time, but to get your money obligated?
>
> Mr. IMHOFF. Both reasons are valid. The money needs to be available during this fiscal year, Senator SMITH.

It seems to me to be clear, on the basis of the antecedent of the money, that what Mr. Imhoff was talking about was only the money to which he referred—namely, the $92,900.

So I ask the Senator from New York if he would be satisfied if, instead of this amendment, I submitted an amendment to provide for—instead of the $15 million—$92,900, because the Budget Director of the Department of Commerce said that is all that is needed during the remainder of this year, in the fiscal 1962 supplemental, which we are now considering.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I am sure it will not surprise the Senator from Wisconsin when I say I would not find that acceptable. Such a drop—from $15 million to $92,900—would be a drastic one. All that meant was that that is the immediate actual expenditure. More than this must be done now if contracts are to be let and work completed by 1964.

The expenditure, of course, will be on a vast, graduated scale. They will start with the planning and the drawings. I think some steps have already been taken in that direction.

In all frankness, I think they have taken the chance that this item will be approved, and have started their work. But we have this issue before us now. Certainly, it would not be satisfactory to start all over again with an authorization, with which we have had very much difficulty in the Foreign Relations Committee; and I simply cannot let my President down to this extent when my President thinks these funds are needed and his feelings happen to coincide with mine. I simply do not feel he ought to be let down, because he has taken a constructive attitude. He says this is the way to do it. I agree with him, and shall oppose any effort to substitute $92,900 for $15 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The President has not committed himself to the 1962 supplemental. I am sure he would not object to considering the item in the Commerce Department appropriation for fiscal 1963, which would be normal, orderly procedure.

In the House hearings, Mr. Bow said:

> For instance, in 1963 you have travel, $79,000. And, then 1964, $107,000. You have transportation of things into 1964 of $326,000. These are large items here in future fiscal years that certainly deserve more investigation and more study by the Appropriations Committee than we have been able to give it today.

That sentiment runs all the way through the hearings. Members of the Appropriations Committee seemed to be concerned about it. They did not have an opportunity to study it. We have the unfortunate circumstance of no authorization bill, and this approach would give the Foreign Relations Committee or the Commerce Committee an opportunity to come in with an authorization bill, with details and on the basis of which the Federal Government would have an opportunity to get back its investment or protect its investment, and not set a precedent for the future.

Mr. KEATING. On the contrary, I must say the Senator's attacks upon the Appropriations Committee are not well founded, because I sat there for 2 out of the 3 or more hours when they considered this one item. They questioned the representatives of the Commerce Department and the GSA, who were presenting the item, most thoroughly. I do not know for sure, but, so far as I know, the members of the subcommittee, after that very thorough study, were unanimous in their feeling. Regrettably, from my point of view, they cut the appropriation $2 million, but they were unanimous that World's Fair funds should be included in the appropriation bill, as requested by the President of the United States.

Of course, the President probably would have no objection to having the rest of the money included in the next appropriation bill for the next fiscal year, but the President has been very successful in getting across to the Appropriations Committee that he would like to have this done now. This is the time to act. We have the issue before us, and we should face up to it at this time.

I cannot overstress the tragedy which would result if the United States of America were not represented at the fair where there will be exhibits by Soviet Russia, many satellite countries, several neutral countries, and many countries with which we have endeavored to make progress, either in assuaging their enmity or bringing them around to our way of thinking on some of the great fundamental principles of freedom and justice. If we were not represented at the World's Fair, it would be inexplicable to them and would be a tragedy for us.

The effect of adopting such an amendment would be to kill the participation of the U.S. Government in the fair. We all know from our experience in foreign aid that all the dams, harbors, roads, and so forth, and frequently not as valuable, in various lands as is an appearance by an American musician or an American artist in a country in which music or art is understood and appreciated.

The tremendous impact which American musicians and other entertainers have had in cementing our relationships with other countries is an excellent illustration of the point that our friendship with other nations is not based on cement or steel beams, but is based on understanding which comes from within, an understanding which comes out of social and cultural exchanges. The New York World's Fair presents the best opportunity I can think of for us to cement and solidify our relationships with other nations which will have exhibits at the World's Fair.

In that connection, I wish to refer to the wonderful news that Michelangelo's "Pietà" will be one of the major exhibits at the World's Fair. It is an excellent indication of the high purpose of the World's Fair. His Eminence Cardinal Spellman, of New York, is largely responsible for bringing the "Pietà" to the World's Fair.

I ask unanimous consent, because I shall probably not speak on it, to have printed at this point in the RECORD a news article which extolls Cardinal Spellman's efforts in this respect.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fair Sees "Pietà" as Top Feature—Statue by Michelangelo Is Expected To Draw Millions at World Exposition—Spellman's Aid Hailed—Cardinal Credits Pope and Bids Opponents of Move Be More Generous

(By Gay Talese)

Michelangelo's marble masterpiece, the "Pietà," which he completed in 1499 and is the only statue bearing his genuine signature, will be the greatest single attraction at the New York World's Fair of 1964–65, fair officials predicted yesterday.

Cardinal Spellman was credited with 18 months of "tireless efforts" that were instrumental in the decision by Pope John XXIII to permit the 3,000-pound sculpture to leave St. Peter's Basilica and be displayed for 2 years at the fair. The work depicts a limp figure of Christ held by the Madonna.

However, Cardinal Spellman gave complete credit to the Pope, saying the Holy Father was "delighted to do it" because, first, it would give millions of people who might never get to Rome an opportunity to see the rare work; and, second, it was the Pope's way of showing gratitude "for all that America has done for the poor people of the world."

SOME FEAR DAMAGE

The cardinal agreed that public interest in the statue would be "extraordinary." He said he could not understand why Italians, anyone else, would object to its leaving the Vatican for 2 years.

There have been some protests in the Italian press and in some New York art circles on the ground that the priceless work might be damaged in shipping it here.

The editor of Art News magazine, Dr. Alfred M. Frankfurter, is preparing an editorial denouncing the shipment of the statue, which he says might command $10 million at auction. He points out that when the "Pietà" was placed in the Basilica in 1749, four fingers of the Madonna's left hand were broken.

The newspaper Il Messaggero also criticized Pope John for agreeing to the suggestion of Cardinal Spellman. It contended he had "shown the weakness of a father who cannot say no to his children who ask him to entrust things to them that cannot be entrusted to them."

Yesterday Cardinal Spellman said he hoped that these dissenting groups would be "more intelligent than to protest." He urged the Italian groups opposing the move to be "more generous and let us have it 2 years out of 400." He added that the "Pietà" "is just as safe here as anywhere else."

According to the chairman of the fair's executive committee, Thomas J. Deegan, Jr., the idea for getting the "Pietà" to New York was first suggested by Roland Redmond, president of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and director of the fair. Mr. Redmond dropped a note to Robert Moses, president of the World's Fair Corp., and Mr. Moses and Mr. Deegan then broached the suggestion to Cardinal Spellman. The cardinal took it up with the Pope.

Through arrangements made by Cardinal Spellman, Mr. Deegan presented a formal invitation on September 4, 1960, for the Holy See to participate in the international exposition.

The Pope was immediately responsive, Mr. Deegan said, and felt a world exposition would be good for the brotherhood of man.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not pass, because it would sound the death knell of the participation of the U.S. Government in the World's Fair, and would be a disaster for the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I rise to support the position just taken by the able junior Senator from New York, and in opposition to the motion to strike taken by the able junior Senator from Wisconsin.

It is true that we had no specific authorization measure here. Our committee went into that question and were advised completely on it, we think, in two directions: First, the fact that the House had acted prevented any approach to the matter by way of a technical point of order; second, that the bill passed last year, after the authorization bill on this subject had passed the House, was broad enough to include this item.

If the Senator from Wisconsin will read again the words of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I think he will find that even he admitted that the wording of it was broad enough to include this part in the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I read the testimony of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. He did seem to concede that perhaps, technically, it would do so, but he indicated this was not in his mind and, so far as he knew, not in the minds of the authors of the legislation. This appropriation would contradict the intent of the author that the authorization act was for fairs abroad and for U.S. participation in fairs of other countries. On the basis of the legislative history made by the author of the bill, the proposal did not seem to comply with what one would expect under the circumstances.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is of course correct, yet the Senator from Florida is also correct in his statement that the Senator from Arkansas made it very clear that not only technically, as the Senator from Wisconsin has put it, but actually and really, the wording of the bill is broad enough to cover this fair or a foreign fair.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the Senator from Arkansas was anxious to see that there would be a separate authorization bill for the Seattle Fair, because he thought that the Seattle Fair should not be included in the broad category of foreign fairs, which is the technical basis under which the New York people are able to get away with not having an authorization bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in answer to the statement of the Senator I wish to say I do not know what part, if any, the Senator from Arkansas had with respect to the Seattle Fair. The Senator from Florida was very actively engaged, in the committee and on the floor, in support of the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in respect to passage of the authorization measure and negotiating an arrangement for certain lands.

That fair, by the way, is close in to the highly developed portion of Seattle.

Mr. President, I wish to make a few points and then I shall be through.

First, our committee was greatly impressed not only by the distinguished Senators from New York, who appeared with respect to the bill, but also by the other fine witnesses, one of whom I wish to mention in particular, Maj. Gen. W. E. Potter, retired. He was regarded so highly as an executive by our country that he was made Governor of the Canal Zone for several years, during which period of time the Senator from Florida happened to serve as chairman of the subcommittee dealing with funds for that particular subject. The distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who is in the Chamber now, was ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

In visits to Panama, in the hearing of testimony by General Potter and his associates, in the examination of reports of activities, in every phase of our contact with General Potter I was very highly impressed by his outstanding ability as an executive. I want the RECORD to show that he is the executive vice president of the New York World's Fair Corp. The fact that he is in that position is a confidence-inspiring factor in this regard.

Furthermore, Major General Potter, retired, testified to several things which I think need to be stated for the RECORD.

First, he stated that 63 nations have already taken active steps to participate in this fair, as the record will show.

Secondly, he stated that Russia is spending $20 million to put in what will probably be, other than our own, the major exhibit at that fair.

He also stated, and the other witnesses stated, that prospective attendance is something like 70 million people to see the fair in the 2 years of its operation. For 70 million people, in the largest and most cosmopolitan city in our country, wherein is located the headquarters of the United Nations, where representatives of all nations on the earth will be, and, in addition to those, for many who will participate, it seemed to the committee—and I think I speak for the committee as a whole—that this was an opportunity and a real responsibility for our Government which we could not properly pass up. The idea of our turning over that vast crowd, that immense opportunity for publicity, to our major competitor in world affairs on the scale that it would be done was something we could not consider as reasonable at all.

Mr. President, I have served on the Appropriations Committee for a good many years, and on other committees which have had to deal with these fairs. I recall the United States contributed substantial amounts for participation in the Brussels Exhibition and the Moscow Fair, and also has contributed sizable amounts for participation in various trade fairs, which on a smaller scale but which nevertheless represent an opportunity for contact with friendly and sometimes not-so-friendly people all over the world.

The very idea of our not participating as a nation and putting our best foot foremost in an affair of this size, in our principal city, at the site of the United Nations, with more than 60 other nations participating, was something which our committee was not willing to consider.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, what I did was not for the city of New York or for my good friends the Senators from New York, fond as I am of them, but instead was done because of my feeling that this was both an opportunity and a responsibility for our Nation which could not be overlooked, and as to which our committee, because of the shortness of time, was the final agency to determine whether or not, in time to make a real showing there, our Nation should participate in the fair.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the Senator regard this as a precedent? Suppose that in the future Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, or some other great city of our country should face this kind of a circumstance and the appropriate authorization committee should decide against an authorization, or should decide not to act. Would the Senator then also look with favor upon proponents, Representatives in Congress or Senators who might come before his committee to ask for an appropriation, when there was no authorization? Is this to be a precedent on which we can rely for the future? Will there be no authorizations for fairs in the future, when the Government is to spend great amounts of money?

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as I am concerned, I much prefer a specific authorization. I would prefer to do what we did in the case of the Seattle Exposition. I would attempt to get that kind of action. I understand that attempt was made at some length, and rather tirelessly.

On the failure of such attempt, I would try to place the matter in its proper perspective, on its merits, as I believe our committee has done, based on the importance of the fair to our country.

I doubt if one could find another occasion as important to our country, or a time more important for us, to show what we have to the world, including that part of the world which likes us and that part of the world which does not like us, compared to what will be afforded at this particular fair during the 2 years when it will operate, I believe 1964 and 1965.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Florida is the chairman of the Commerce Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, if I correctly understand the situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida used to serve as chairman of that subcommittee, and this year we found, to our astonishment, when we came back—and when I say "we" I am speaking for the able Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and myself, if not for other Senators—that in the judgment of the leaders of the House of Representatives it was unnecessary to have a separate subcommittee for the Commerce Department and its related agencies, such as the Panama Canal and the St. Lawrence Seaway and many others of which the Senator knows. Therefore, there is not any separate subcommittee on that subject now. The Senator from Florida has been either promoted or demoted, depending upon one's point of view, to handle the supplemental appropriation bills and the deficiency appropriation bills in this session; I am also chairman of the sub-subcommittee which will continue to handle appropriation matters for the Commerce Department and related agencies.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The point which the Senator from Wisconsin wished to make in asking the question is that the attitude of the Senator from Florida is absolutely crucial in these circumstances, because the Senator will be in a position to pass upon such questions. There could well be an occasion when the authorizing committee will not act. Think of the great difficulties involved.

I have the greatest admiration for the strength and the integrity of the Senator from Florida. I have seen him resist pressures very often. Undoubtedly he can do so in the future.

However, I ask the Senator to think of the painful difficulty which will arise when a Senator from another State comes before him and says, "You did this for New York. We are just as important as New York is. Times are just as pressing and just as crucial." The question will be asked, "If we did it for New York, why should we not do it for others?"

From everything that I have seen in the Senate, it will be pretty hard to say, "No."

Mr. HOLLAND. The able Senator from Wisconsin certainly has a point, but the Senator from Florida, in 16 years of service in the Senate, has found that service to be crowded with many difficulties, and he expects to find that that situation will continue.

I state again that I would much prefer to have specific authorization for appropriations. I shall urge that that course be followed in every case in which it can be followed. I believe I understand the difficulty under which the proponents have labored. They had a fixed time schedule, and with a delay of more than a year in their effort to obtain specific authorization, the sponsors of this particular fair had to rely upon general legislation. The Senator from Florida would not have relied upon such general legislation unless he had been advised by those who he thought knew best that it was broad enough to cover the kind of situation which we are considering.

I close by saying that the Senator is completely correct that specific authorization would be preferable. The Senator from Florida agrees with him. But as to anything not specifically authorized, I believe he will have to look at the question on its merits, as we did in the case of the Brussels Exhibition, the Moscow Fair, and perhaps others.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Belgium and Russia have no Senators sitting in the Senate. There is quite a difference.

Mr. HOLLAND. However, there was general authorization.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is now general authorization, too.

Mr. HOLLAND. That was prior to the 1961 law, under which we are now proceeding. But I do not recall that there was specific authorization. If my able friend the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] recalls the situation differently, I hope she will correct me. But I do not think we had specific authorization for those other fairs. We had general authorization. The Department of Commerce authorized to take the leadership in directing us toward representation in fairs of great international importance in which the Department felt that our national needs required us to participate. We did not participate in every instance and in everything that was recommended, but as I recall, we participated heavily at Brussels and Moscow.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Why not strike the amount of $15 million and insert "$92,900," the amount requested by the GSA for this year? That is the amount the GSA said was necessary for the fiscal year 1962. Let the New York people make their case for the fiscal year 1963. There will be somewhat more time, as I indicated, for the Committee on Foreign Relations to act.

I agree with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] that a strong case should be presented, but we could be provided with some kind of guidelines and with some kind of notion as to whether we would insure protection of the Federal money that would be invested in the project under those circumstances. The case as to how New York took care of itself is devastating. On the other hand——

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to address myself to that point. I think the Senator has been misinformed as to how New York has taken care of itself. I have before me a letter from the counsel of the fair to the effect that the city of New York will not be repaid any of its expense for its own building and exhibits, which will be about $2 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. For how much? Will the Senator repeat the amount?

Mr. HOLLAND. Two million dollars. The State of New York will not be reimbursed in any respect for its building and exhibits, which will represent a cost of $5 million. At least, it has already appropriated $5 million. No other State, no other agency, none of the fine eleemosynary agencies, such as Christian Science, the Islamic Council, the Organization of American States, and the Vatican, will be reimbursed for their very large investment in the fair. The reimbursement of $24 million, to which the Senator has adverted, to the city of New York has nothing to do with the building or the exhibits.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that point; but the fact is that New York is loaning $24 million and will receive that $24 million back. Furthermore, New York will have the benefit of the asset, which will be left when the fair is finished in 1965. Is that not true? On the other hand, under the mandate it is clear that the Federal Government's building will be destroyed, and the Federal Government will have nothing left.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to read a part of the letter, dated April 9, from Whitman, Ransome & Coulson, a very able and highly respected law firm of the city of New York, general counsel for the fair:

> Inasmuch as the city will be reimbursed by the World's Fair Corp., at the conclusion of the fair, for this $24 million—

Which is for the permanent improvements out in Flushing that have nothing to do with the building or the actual exhibits—

> a suggestion was made by some persons at the hearings that the United States should be reimbursed by the World's Fair Corp., at the conclusion of the fair, for the funds the United States expends on the construction and operation of the U.S. exhibit.
>
> This suggestion stems, we believe, from lack of familiarity, with the facts surrounding the city's expenditures of the $24 million in question. There is no analogy between this $24 million and the funds the United States will expend to construct and operate its exhibit.
>
> The $24 million is not being spent for the exhibit of the city of New York, but for roads, bridges, a pedestrian overpass, a botanical garden, a marina, and utility facilities and other similar permanent improvements. The city's exhibit, like the exhibit of every exhibitor, will be constructed and operated entirely at the city's expense, and no reimbursement will be made to the city by the World's Fair Corp. for the cost of such exhibit.

I shall not read the letter at great length, but it continues:

> The city's exhibit will consist of a large scale model of the city, an ice show, and other features which will be housed, entirely at the city's expense, in the New York City building, an existing structure which was constructed at the city's expense for the 1939–40 fair and is being renovated for the 1964–65 fair, likewise solely at the city's expense. The city's exhibit will cost, in all, approximately $2 million, for which, as previously pointed out, the city will not be reimbursed by the fair corporation. Similarly, the State of New York will not be reimbursed by the fair corporation for the $5 million it has appropriated.

So that $24 million is a part of the capital cost of the fair. A large part of that $24 million of developments will be left there, as the Senator has suggested, in the form of paving, sidewalks. I do not know that all the paving will be left, but any that is needed in the park will be.

Certainly much of the expenditure for utilities will be lost, because such utilities as gas, water, electric light wires, transformers, and the like will have to be withdrawn. The equivalent of a great city is being built. So the $24 million has to do not at all with the building or the operation of the exhibits that will be in that building for the State of New York or the city of New York. The failure to understand that point caused some at the hearing to be misled into putting the $24 million on the same basis as the item requested of the Federal Government for the construction and operation of its building and exhibit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But is it not true that in a precisely similar situation, in almost the same year—2 years apart, but the action was taken in the same year—in Seattle we drove a bargain by which we insisted that title to the building should remain in the hands of the Federal Government? It is true, as the Senator from Florida has properly pointed out, that in Seattle the situation was a little different, because the fair is located much closer to the downtown section of Seattle. In New York the fair will be much farther from the downtown section. But that situation seems to me to provide a much stronger case for Seattle to retain title to the building, if it is located closer to downtown Seattle; it would be much more important to the city of Seattle, it seems to me, to be able to retain that property.

Mr. HOLLAND. The only comment the Senator from Florida would make on that point is that in every contact that he has had with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]—and he has had many in connection with this subject and others—he has found the senior Senator from Washington well able to state the interest of his own people, and the advantages which would be realized by them. We found him willing to concede that of the nearly 200 acres that was being contributed temporarily by the city in a downtown area for the location of the park, 6½ acres of that land which was still closer than much of the rest should be deeded to the Federal Government and used in connection with the building which would be permanently built and which should furnish much needed housing facilities.

I can see that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has read the record.

The Senator from Florida explored with the GSA the question of whether or not a similar situation could be created in the case of the New York fair.

We found, and I believe we already knew it, that the fair would be located in Flushing, some miles from the city, on low-lying land, but very attractive and picturesque land which is now being used as a park, and not a place where any installation such as is spoken of in Seattle would be located. It is specified in the contract by the park authorities of the city of New York that the land would be cleared off and left again as a park near that great metropolis of around 10 million people for enjoyment of its recreational opportunities.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield again to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that if the decision is made not to destroy this pavilion, then the title will not remain in the hands of the U.S. Government?

Mr. HOLLAND. The decision is made to destroy whatever is built. If the Senator will check, he will see that that is the provision in the contract. A specific amount is provided for that purpose.

Mr. PROXMIRE. One hundred thousand dollars is provided.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is provided for the demolition of the building and clearing the site after the fair is over.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But that kind of provision may well be repealed, depending on the kind of building there is a decision to build. It is likely to be destroyed, as the Senator from Florida says, and the money is appropriated for that purpose. However, the decision may be reversed. If that should occur, there would be no title the Federal Government would have in it, and there would be no opportunity to sell it. The people of New York would have it in their possession. It seems that this is a most advantageous circumstance so far as the people of New York are concerned, and certainly is not like what was done in the case of the Seattle Fair. Furthermore, it provides a very bad precedent.

Mr. HOLLAND. For the agreement to be reversed would require a breach of contract entered into ahead of time between the Fair Corp., and the U.S. Government. The Senator from Wisconsin is reminded that in the event of such a breach of contract it would be a breach of faith. Furthermore, in that case the Federal Government would always have the power to condemn. I do not believe that we would stand idly by and see the Federal Government imposed upon in such a manner. The Senator from Florida does not believe there is any intent at all for that kind of imposition, because the total amount of the building and improvements, we are told by General Potter, would be in the neighborhood of $500 million.

All the other buildings are subject to the same arrangement as is the Federal Government's pavilion. All of them will have to be demolished, and the site will have to be cleared. This will have to be done so that the people of New York may again have access to that huge area for much needed recreational purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. All that would be needed would be to pass through the House and the Senate a bill voiding the previous contract which requires demolition. Is that not correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. If the Senator thinks that the city of New York is popular enough to get that kind of arrangement through Congress, all I can say is that, popular as New York City is, its popularity just does not go that far.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator yield for one more point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to make one point. Mr. THOMAS in the House, who is the floor manager of the bill over there, said, in connection with this problem:

> Mr. THOMAS. You are going to build this building for us and then you want to charge $100,000 to destroy it and, of course, at the end of the period you don't want to destroy it, so you give us another $100,000 and we will let it stay there.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. THOMAS was arguing out of the keenness of his business experience as to what might possibly happen. The Senator from Florida, who has not had as much business experience as has Mr. THOMAS from Texas, does not feel that that kind of situation will come to pass, because he believes that the Representatives of the other 49 States would have something to say about this. If the building were to remain there, and if the plans were changed so that the building were to remain, I believe the United States is amply able to take care of any such contingency.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Not only does the area not lend itself to permanent structures being erected on it, because the entire plan foresees a park area there, but also, this is not be to a permanent building. The cost of a permanent building would be 70 percent more than the building it is proposed to erect there. Therefore, we would have to make a much larger request if this were to be an office building or other type of permanent building, or a building similar to the kind that is being erected in Seattle.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true, however, that although the present plans are to clear the whole site, at the same time it is planned to keep the paving, as the Senator has implied, and the streets and other parts of the improvements that would make the park very attractive and very useful and certainly of very substantial value?

Mr. KEATING. But not the structures. They would be demolished.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida in his statement attempted to say, and believes did say, that any paving and sidewalks which could be utilized—perhaps all of them, or a great deal less than all of them—would be permanent assets.

The clerk has just brought me some figures with respect to what was appropriated for our participation in the Brussels Exhibition. Thirteen and one-half million dollars was appropriated. That was a 1-year fair. It was held on foreign soil, and with much less obligation on our part to what I have called putting our best foot forward, than is the case in New York City, the site of the United Nations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me that the comparison is not very clear, because the entire fair in New York is to be held in New York City. As the Senator from Florida and the Senator from New York have said, there will be exhibits from many of the 50 States in the Union, and there will be many industrial exhibits. This is a fair that will be an American fair, in America. Therefore, any demonstration by the Federal Government will not be comparable to what we would do at the Brussels Fair or, in the future, perhaps, at a Rome fair or at a Paris fair, where the entire demonstration of America would be embodied in what our Government did, in cooperation with certain commercial groups.

In this case it is going to be a fair that will be held in our country. It seems to me that while the Senator from Florida and the Senator from New York made a strong point in saying that we probably should have governmental representation, I believe it is not overwhelming, and I think it is not unthinkable, as has been said, that our Government be not represented there, because there will be many cultural exhibits of many kinds. I believe we can justify an exhibit at the fair, but I would argue that the justification should be made in an orderly way. It should be passed on in connection with an authorization. There should be an argument on the amount involved, and it should not set a precedent that can be very damaging and expensive to us in the future.

Mr. HOLLAND. I come back to the point made by the Senator from Wisconsin as to why we are not content with appropriating $92,000 and then wait for next year's appropriation to go further. That would amount to nothing at all, because no one would be justified in planning a specific building and the things that would go into it, or in organizing the many exhibits to be placed in that building, if all that they were given now was to be $92,000, which would be used for that building and for the series of exhibits to be housed in it. The $15 million to be appropriated enables them to move just as though they have the $15 million by authorization. Likewise, they have the knowledge that the committee has not closed the door with reference to future hearings if they can make their point properly for a larger amount. I am not inviting them to come in for a larger amount. I want to make it clear that I am not suggesting that any amount beyond the budgeted amount suggested by the administration would ever be seriously considered.

I am making it clear that in the absence of an authorization, we must do something which is more or less permanent, permanent enough to enable the authorities to proceed. That is something which they could not do if we simply provided a small appropriation of $92,000 in the bill and said, "Now you can get ready for the fair. We are giving you this much money to enable you to plan for something which we may follow with an appropriation, or we may not. We are not obligated. We are not recognizing any obligation. We are simply furnishing $92,000 to enable you to plan, but are not telling you for what you must plan." I think that would be a completely unsatisfactory course of action. I believe that upon reconsideration, the Senator from Wisconsin, practical and distinguished as he is, will have to come to the same conclusion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think that would be an eminently practical action. First, it would commit the U.S. Government. I think it should satisfy the Senators from New York, who are involved, that we do not want to throw $92,000 away. Second, it would mean that the fair authorities would have to return to Congress and submit a real justification for some kind of plan or program.

As I understand, the authorization legislation provided for only $300,000, and it was only to be used for planning.

Would the Senator from Florida accept an amendment on page 3, line 23, to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

> except that in no event shall any amount, in addition to that herein appropriated, be hereafter appropriated to provide for such participation, unless hereafter specifically authorized.

Mr. HOLLAND. No, I do not think I would, because we are not proceeding by the authorization route; we are proceeding by the appropriation route.

The Senator mentioned justifications. Very detailed, lengthy justifications were filed with and examined by our committee. If the Senator has before him a copy of the hearings, he will find that they begin near the bottom of page 461 and continue through page 469. So the justifications comprise about 9 pages of closely printed matter, which certainly commit the recipients of the appropriation, if they receive it, to a course of action which is acted upon implicitly by Congress in the making of the proposed appropriation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. With all due respect to the Senator from Florida, I think this affords a wide open, blank check, on one item after another. For example, the item for "Travel" provides $250,000. As I have pointed out, there is no real indication of a limitation on travel, such as who is to travel and under what circumstances.

For "Transportation of things," $500,000 is provided.

This could include transportation of items provided by industry, on which they would not even have to pay the transportation.

For "Utilities," $500,000, or $550 a day for 900 days. The World's Fair will be open 360 days, so over half the days of utility cost fall in periods during which the fair would not be open.

It seems to me that throughout the so-called detailed justifications are vague, only the general purpose is indicated, and a very large amount of money provided, in item after item, with no effective breakdown of how the money will be spent.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Wisconsin will turn to page 466 of the hearings, beginning with the heading "Justification of Total Requirements by Type of Expense," he will find a detailed description of, first, the item for the pavilion. It will cost $10,100,000. The item states the square footage; and various other large items of information, such as design specifications and supervision, and demolition, which are all provided for.

Without being wearying, I suggest to the Senator that he will find much more specific information, even to a breakdown of positions required. On page 469, the salaried positions which are involved are shown.

I cannot agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that there are no real justifications or planning shown; to the contrary, I think there are sufficient justifications and planning so that the Nation and the people, particularly our representative, the General Accounting Office, will have something to tie to and rely upon as they check upon the amount of the expenditure.

Also, in connection with the amendment, we have authorized the naming of a high-level executive, to be known as the U.S. Commissioner, to have charge of the interest of the United States in the fair.

I do not think action has been carelessly taken in this matter. I only wish the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin had been present for the entire hearings. I think he would have been impressed by their thoroughness and by the character and quality of the persons who testified before us.

Mr. President, I am glad to observe that the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has arrived. I assure him that I was not filibustering; I was simply trying to reply in a kindly way to the Senator from Wisconsin. But I am glad the plane of the Senator from New York arrived in time, and I yield the floor to him.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, before the Senator from Florida yields to the Senator from New York, will he yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Do I correctly understand that this is a proposal to appropriate $15 million for a temporary building?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is a proposal to appropriate $15 million, of which $10,100,000 will be used to build the exhibitions pavilion, so-called, which will be the building in which, for 2 years, the U.S. exhibit will be housed. It is not to be a temporary building in the sense that it will be insecure or unsafe, or anything like that; but temporary in the sense that it is not fitted or suited for any other kind of operation.

Mr. McNAMARA. It will be a one-purpose building?

Mr. HOLLAND. It will be a one-purpose building. A part of the contract provides for its demolition and the removal of all traces of its presence there, in order to make the space again available for park purposes when the exhibition is over.

Mr. McNAMARA. Can the Senator state the size of the building, in square feet?

Mr. HOLLAND. That information is set forth in the justifications. The total Federal space is shown.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is shown as 220,000 feet at one point, and 226,000 feet at another point. Without an authorization, there is no clear idea of how big the building will be.

Mr. HOLLAND. At page 466 of the hearings, the facts are stated as follows:

> The pavilion, $10,100,000. Of that amount, $9,200,000 will be for the site development and construction.

The entire space to be made available by the World's Fair Corp., which means ground space, will be 196,349 square feet.

The ground cover of the building is to be limited to 60 percent of the assigned area, or approximately 118,000 square feet.

Then the justification speaks of an exhibit space, overall, of 220,000 square feet of floor space, one of which 150,000 square feet will be available for exhibits.

These items were discussed at some length between the witnesses and the members of the committee.

Mr. McNAMARA. These figures add to the cost of construction. They indicate that actually the cost of the temporary building will be somewhat more than the Government generally pays for this type of construction at today's market price. The General Services Administration uses a figure below what this amount would be for 118,000 square feet. I think the GSA figures the cost at about $12 a square foot. The pavilion will be a temporary building, and will cost, according to these figures, much more than permanent construction costs these days would amount to. It seems to me that a large sum of money is involved while, at the same time, we will not get anything for it.

Mr. HOLLAND. The GSA official who testified, who is Assistant Commissioner for Design and Construction, Public Buildings Service, said that the pavilion would be an ornate structure, and had to be, because of the type of building it was to be. But he also said that it would not be available for any permanent use of the GSA.

He further stated, when the committee was considering the Federal building at the Seattle Fair, that the Seattle building would be considerably more expensive—about a 60-percent added expense—to make it a permanent-type building; that in that case the additional expense would be required of the Federal Government before the building in Seattle could be made available for its full use.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Government retains title to the building in Seattle.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The building in Seattle is in the downtown area, and at a location which, the GSA states in great detail in the hearings, will accommodate such a permanent building. But he believes the Government will not need such a permanent building in Flushing, Long Island, which is several miles from the main part of New York City. Such a building there would be unappropriate.

Mr. McNAMARA. Inappropriate today; but perhaps 20 years from today the city will have built out to that area.

Mr. HOLLAND. All I can say is that the committee, which I believe is reasonably chary in the spending of Federal funds—I frequently hear Senators complain that we are not economy minded—felt otherwise.

The committee feels—and I think that I state this for all members of the committee—that for the United States not to exhibit on a par with any nation which is to exhibit there—for instance, the Soviet Union is spending $20 million at this particular fair—in view of the tremendous attendance which is promised, and in view of the particular location, would be almost a criminal act; and I think the Senator from Michigan will agree.

Mr. McNAMARA. I agreed the first time the Senator from Florida said it.

Mr. HOLLAND. And it is still true.

Mr. McNAMARA. But I still say the proposed building is a tremendously expensive one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that the Government of the United Kingdom will not exhibit there, because it is not really a world's fair, but is a New York State trade fair? Is not that the case?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Arkansas has put his finger on a matter which I think perhaps needs to be stated for the RECORD. There is a Bureau of International Expositions, which passes upon the question of whether any particular fair will be ruled to be an international fair. Great Britain is one of the 28 members of that Bureau; and because that Bureau has not seen fit to give its approval—despite the tremendously large acceptance of this fair, by 63 nations already, and with others to come in—of this fair as a world's fair, because of the pendency of other fairs elsewhere, the United Kingdom has not officially decided to take part. But I am told by General Potter and others that the United Kingdom, through various commercial exhibitors and others, will be heavily represented there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But is it not equally true that United States concerns will exhibit there, even if the building now proposed is not built?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So there is no reason why the U.S. Government should build such an extravagant building there, to last only 2 years.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think it is quite a challenge to us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. You do?

Mr. HOLLAND. I notice that when the Soviet Union exhibited at the Brussels Fair, our country felt that it had some obligation to exhibit there, also; and the United States did exhibit there—in a free, foreign country—to the tune of $13,500,000. I cannot believe that it is less important for our country to make a good showing at the New York City Fair than it was for our country to make a good showing at the Brussels Fair.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But those are to be exhibits by Russian industrial concerns, which correspond to Union Carbide, General Motors, and so forth. In other words, the Russian exhibits at this fair will be exhibits by Russian industrial concerns; but the Russian Government will not have a governmental extravaganza, such as this one is intended to be on the part of the United States.

Some of us saw the exhibits at Brussels; I was among those who saw them. But the one now proposed is not comparable to that one, or for the same purpose at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. All I can say is that the Appropriations Committee did not agree with the position so ably taken by the Senator from Arkansas. The Appropriations Committee felt that the United States should exhibit at this place, and is moving to do so. So far as I am concerned, I am merely appearing as chairman of the subcommittee. I think I heard all the testimony taken; and later I examined it carefully, and I also talked at length with General Potter, in whom we have confidence—in my case, particularly, because he was Governor of the Canal Zone at the time when I was supervising that operation for the Senate. Everything I have learned about this matter causes me to feel intensely—after all, why should I be interested in it otherwise?—that our Nation should have strong representation at this fair.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I desire to ask the Senator from Florida about what appears to be a very important conflict of statistics.

In the Senate committee hearings to which the Senator has referred, I notice on page 466 the following:

> First estimates indicate that we would require a mezzanine-type or two-story building to provide corridors, restrooms, etc., in addition to the desired exhibit space, for a total of 220,000 square feet of floor space.

Yet when Representative THOMAS, in the House committee, asked for a more firm estimate than the one given before, he said:

> You had better strengthen your entire case on your other objects, too, as well as your building cost, and strengthen it on your exhibition costs.

And then they came in with an estimate of 286,000 square feet. It is from the estimate of 286,000 square feet—not from the estimated 220,000 square feet, as stated at the Senate committee hearings—that the square foot estimate of $43.21 is arrived at. If the estimate is reduced to 220,000 square feet, the estimated square-foot cost is even higher.

Furthermore, on the basis of the usable exhibition space, we find that the cost would not be $12 per square foot, as the Senator has indicated is the usual standard relied on by the General Services, but would be $66 per square foot—or more than five times as great, and more than four times as great on the basis of 286,000 square feet as the estimate of the exhibit space.

It seems to me either one of those would be an extraordinary allowance, and I believe there is no proper basis for it; and certainly there was no opportunity to submit details in that connection.

I realize that the burdens of the distinguished Senator from Florida are very heavy, and certainly he has done a marvelous job under the circumstances.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my friend.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But I think this proposal would, if adopted, constitute a very dangerous precedent for future heavy governmental expenditures in connection with fairs intended to be domestic fairs, not world's fairs. Under this loophole Congress would be helpless to resist such requests, because we know how politics works in the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. When the Senator talks about a completed operation costing $25 million, all I can say is that so far as the committee which acted on this matter is concerned, it felt justified in reducing it to $15 million. The committee has not closed the door to a showing in favor of an additional amount—whether in connection with an authorization—and we understand that the authorization bill is well under consideration before the committee so ably headed by the Senator from Arkansas—or whether by a showing before the Appropriations Committee, or however the matter may be handled. We favor going into the matter now to the extent of $15 million; and I believe that those involved will realize that perfectly well, and also will know and will realize that they will have to "sell" both the Senate and the House and the entire Government on a larger amount if they ever expect to get it. But they are not proceeding on the basis of the larger figure in connection with this recommended appropriation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I simply wish to request that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of agreeing to this amendment. Will the Senator from Florida yield, so that I may make that request?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then, Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to this amendment, I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. A little later, when we get through, we can suggest the absence of a quorum; and I shall assist the Senator in getting the yeas and nays ordered on this question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe it was in 1959 that there was brought before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a bill providing that a World's Fair be held in Seattle, Wash. Testimony on that bill was submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee. At the hearings on the bill, the committee required the promoters of the Seattle, Wash., World's Fair to accept to the bill an amendment containing language which would order the city of Seattle to convey to the United States title to the land on which a $10 million structure would be built.

In other words, we said: "We will put into the World's Fair at Seattle $10 million, provided that the land becomes the property of the United States and the building is constructed so that after the fair it will be usable by the Federal Government."

The Seattle Exposition has the sponsorship of the World's Fairs Organization situated in Paris. As I recall, there are 20 or 22 members of that organization in Paris, which determines where world's fairs shall be held.

One might ask: "Why do we need a World's Fairs Organization?" The purpose of the organization is to stop whimsical ideas of having different nations declare that, within their boundries, they will hold a World's Fair. The members of that organization believe it is wrong to allow a State or a country, at any time it sees fit, to declare, "We shall hold a World's Fair." They believe it is wrong because they do not think a country ought to be subjected to the financial burden of exhibiting each year in different places around the world.

When we approved the legislation for the Seattle Exposition, it was understood that would be the World's Fair of this decade held in the United States. In that same year New York made the announcement that it will hold a World's Fair.

I shall not get into a discussion of the exchange of words that we had in our committee on the subject. In effect, they were: "We have a World's Fair in Seattle. The U.S. Government ought not to be participating in two of them in the period of half a decade."

At any rate, it was decided that the New York Exposition would be held. That was to be for $30 million originally. The Commerce Department said it would cost $40 million. I opposed the proposal because I did not believe we were justified in saying to the nations of the world, "In 1962 we will hold a World's Fair in Seattle, in 1964 we will hold one in New York, and we expect you to come to those expositions."

The World's Fairs Organization has announced that none of its members will participate in the New York Exposition, because it is not a World's Fair.

My position on this matter is generally known. I have opposed our participation in the New York Exposition from the beginning. I tried to get the committee to write into the bill an amendment that would make possible the reimbursement of the United States if the fair building was constructed, but I did not succeed in that effort.

Let me recite to the Senate the figures as they have developed. Forty million dollars was the estimate by the Department of Commerce of the expense that would be entailed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator recall that, before the committee, Mr. Gudeman, a representative of the Commerce Department, told him personally that their first request was $40 million?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is right. They estimated $40 million would be the lowest amount needed to construct the building and get it into operation.

Mr. HOLLAND. The present appropriation is now down to $15 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the point I was about to reach.

The Commerce Department said it would request $40 million. The promoters of the fair, in a brochure, said it would require $30 million. After the fight was made against the authorization of $30 million, I believe the President requested that the amount to be assigned should be $25 million. The House fixed the allocation at $17 million. The Appropriations Committee fixed it at $15 million.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator think that is making considerable progress?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, I think so, with the exception that if the sponsors of the exposition come in next year asking for a supplemental appropriation bringing the amount to $25 million, I will be led to believe that was a plan and a part of the proposal.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator mean, by his recent statement, that he thinks the committee has made any such agreement under the table and is withholding it from the Senator?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, I do not, but it may be that the promoters are willing to take $15 million now and will come in and ask for a supplemental appropriation at a later date.

Getting to an aspect of the subject mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, when the bill on the exchange of students and culture was passed by our committee, in my opinion it was not contemplated to give the President the power to include, as international matters, domestic expositions. However, such an item is in the bill, and I think the language of the bill probably authorizes the exposition. It ought not to be in the bill as it now is: Seattle in 1962; New York in 1964; California is contemplating a world's fair in 1965 or 1966. The question naturally arises, how many world's fairs are we to have?

In whatever form this matter comes before us for a vote, I will remain steadfast to the position I took at the very beginning. The World's Fair of this decade is being held in Seattle. We should not participate in the New York World's Fair. I shall vote against this Government's participation, recognizing, however, that cutting the amount from $40 million to $15 million is a rather conspicuous achievement.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first I wish to extend my thanks to the U.S. aircraft, for getting me here on time to participate in this debate, and to state to the Senate that the only reason for my absence was a longstanding engagement, in which I replaced the Vice President of the United States as a speaker before the Pan American Society in New York. It proved to be impossible to disappoint those in attendance, so I relied upon my distinguished and valued friend and colleague [Mr. KEATING] who today proved to be, as he has before, Horatius at the bridge so far as the New York World's Fair is concerned. I am very grateful to him.

I express my thanks to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for scheduling consideration of this item as the last among the various items on the second supplemental appropriation bill. I wish to tell the Senator from Florida, if he will be kind enough to give me his attention, that New Yorkers will be forever grateful to him for his patience and for his wisdom in steering a potentially troublesome appropriation to what I hope will be successful consummation, both in the committee and before the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will give me their attention, because I should like for Senators to hear what I have to say.

I was born in New York City 57 years ago. I have represented New York in the Congress of the United States since 1947. I live in New York City. My whole life is tied up with the city.

New York is a great city. I think it is the greatest city in the world, without any disrespect to any other. It has a tremendous heart and tremendous dynamism.

What I cannot understand, I say to my colleagues in all solemnity and seriousness, is why every American is not as bursting with pride about New York as every Frenchman about Paris, as every Englishman about London, as every Japanese about Tokyo, and as every Italian about Rome. New York certainly rates it.

We say, "Come and see us." Whether some Senator moves to strike the appropriation or not, we in New York can take it. All will be very welcome at the World's Fair. Then all can give us an appraisal, when it is over, about New York and its performance.

Mr. President, our State—that of my colleague [Mr. KEATING] and myself—contributes almost 20 percent of the national revenue, and receives back about 6 percent in Federal aid of various kinds.

New York City is the greatest port in our country, for both air and sea travel.

When soldiers are needed to serve in the U.S. Army, does the city of New York or a city of some other State produce the most people?

Mr. President, at the latest count 67 nations are to participate. Were the 67 nations dragged squealing into participation in the World's Fair? They could have said "No." There was no compulsion involved.

The organization in Paris, presided over by a lady, I understand, in an upstairs office, which has 20-odd countries as members, was well known not to desire the fair in New York City, for whatever reasons there were. Did that stop 67 nations from entering the fair, including the Soviet Union? Of course not. We are not living in a dream world.

New York is the cynosure of the world.

I should be interested to hear what Senators would have to say if some Senators were successful in preventing the United States from participating in the fair with a pavilion and then had to watch the Soviet Union and other countries erect magnificent pavilions in New York, to show not only to New Yorkers but also to 70 million people from every corner of the earth what they have to offer. Seventy million people are expected to attend the fair. Judging from the record set in the previous fair in the 1930's, they will come. They will come to see New York and they will come to see the fair.

We should remember that every one of those people pays every kind of indirect tax there is when he comes to New York. He will pay a tax when he goes to a hotel or to a restaurant. Everyone pays a U.S. income tax, and lots of other taxes in addition, direct and indirect.

This will be a very profitable investment for the United States.

Perhaps I should be grateful for the fact that my colleagues are not more intense about this than they are. I shall not be intense about it. There is no reason why, at this late stage of the proceedings, after the Senator from Florida has handled it so very well, with such wisdom and judgment and taste, I should stir up the water. I intend to do no such thing.

I have been talking about New York City as a city, and about our reason for pride in it. I do not see anybody in New York looking down his nose at the other cities of the other States or at other States. We are very proud of them. We travel to them. We, as New Yorkers, are probably the most ardent travelers and the most spending travelers there are in this Nation.

When reclamation or something else comes up, for some other place, no one finds my colleague [Mr. KEATING] or myself saying, "This does not concern New York City or New York State, so we shall vote against it, because every time New York pays out $4, it gets only $1 back." No one sees us doing that. On the contrary, New York State has a tradition for liberal Senators, whether they are Republicans or Democrats. Why? It is because the people of New York State feel that way. They are Americans in the truest sense of the word, of whom we have every reason to be very proud.

That is all I have to say. Everything else goes down the drain. All the points made about the square footage, about this, about that, and the other thing really are not important. What is important is whether we do or do not admit that New York City is the greatest city in our country and, so far as we are concerned, in the world.

I should like to give one example of what some of these practical arguments equate to. My distinguished colleague from Ohio, whom I respect and admire, for whom I have great affection, asked if the sponsors of the fair will come in and ask for more money.

Who is asking for the money? Is it the sponsors of the fair? Not at all. It is the United States, in order not to be left behind, which is asking for the money. If more money is requested, it will be requested by the United States. The sponsors of the fair have raised their money in New York City, out of bonds and some exhibits, and so forth. They are not asking money from the United States.

Surely, we in New York are extremely anxious and extremely interested that our country shall exhibit. Who would not be?

We are not getting this money. We are not asking for this money. We are not asking for more money. That will be up to the governmental authorities and up to the very hard-headed Appropriations Committee members, and the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The Seattle World's Fair is a fine thing. We are all for it. I hope to go out there, with my wife and children, this summer, as I hope other Senators will come to see our fair.

In this great Nation of ours, its boundaries separated by 3,000 miles of magnificent land, one side facing all of Asia and the Orient, one side facing all of Europe and the Atlantic community, north and south, with great access to Latin America, there is more than enough room for these fairs and, yes, for a California fair, too. It is all very good business and magnificent public relations on the part of the United States.

Let us remember there were two very successful world's fairs held before World War II, one in San Francisco and one in

New York City. They took place practically at the same time, not even separated by 2 years, and they were both great successes and a great credit to our country.

It seems to me that as a Nation we are growing up, and the fairs are perhaps an indication of our growth. It is not that world's fairs are anything new; but what will be shown in Seattle, what will be shown in New York, and what I hope and pray will be shown in California, because we can stand this kind of exposure, will be a vindication of our system, of our method of operation, of our way of life.

We are spending billions upon billions of dollars to protect our way of life, yet we always haggle about a few paltry million dollars to sell it.

It is not inappropriate now to point out that the U.S. Information Agency gets appropriations of about $140 million a year, yet we make demands on it which could not be filled with a budget of a billion and half dollars a year. Despite this we complain, Mr. President, that nobody understands us.

I recently attended a meeting in New York of the Pan American Society. Surely no one understands the Alliance for Progress. Why? The reason is that if we wish to sell something, money, people, time, energy, and organization are required to do so. It cannot be done on air, conversation, and speeches. The Russians know that. Hence they are leading us a merry chase in the world, as we so very well know.

Mr. President, rather than expressing any controversial feeling or antagonism on the subject, I prefer to let it stand upon the solid base, again expressing my deep appreciation to my colleague, who has been a magnificent partner and friend on this question and has handled it so admirably, to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], who has led the defense, as it were, of this project on the floor so very ably, and to Senators who have opposed the project as well. They are very sincere. They have as much right to their views as I have to my own.

When it is all over—and I hope it will be over successfully and the Senate will follow its subcommittee and its Committee on Appropriations—I will tell them that the heart of New York is big enough for us all. The Senators are generous and able, and if we do the job of which I know we are capable and will do, they will be the first to say, "Now that we see it, it was worth it."

It is for that day and toward that day that I would rather turn my eyes than to any other.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the statement was made that the sponsors of the fair are not asking for anything. Technically that argument can be made. But the fact is that the sponsors of the fair want the United States in it and are avidly seeking the participation of the United States.

I do not wish to enter into an argument about many aspects of the problem, which would entail considerable time. Those aspects would include the question of why the appropriation is asked to go to New York and at least the understanding of the Committee on Foreign Relations, although that understanding might not have been the understanding of the promoters of the fair. The question might be asked as to why I have opposed the project. Primarily I have opposed it because I think the time is at hand when we had better start worrying about millions, because if we worry about millions and try to save them, the billions will take care of themselves. I think it was Ben Franklin who made the statement:

> Worry about your pennies, and the dollars will eventually take care of themselves.

Within the next 3 months we shall be asking for an increase in the debt ceiling to $308 billion. We have had deficit operations in 25 out of the last 31 years. The purchasing power of the dollar has dropped from 100 cents in 1941 to 45 cents in 1962. Our gold reserves are in flight. They are being demanded, or at least in 1959 they were demanded on the basis that our currency was not acceptable and that our short-term foreign creditors wanted our gold. One of the major problems confronting the country today is the fear that the gold reserves will keep on dwindling to the point where the thought might arise in the minds of some that the 25-percent support of gold required for our Federal banking notes may be removed.

I shall not contribute in any way, if I can avoid doing so, to a further decrease in the value of our currency. I shall not contribute to a policy of spending and passing the obligation of paying the debt over to future generations. $15 million might be said not to be much, but every day in the Senate and in the House similar arguments are made with relation to $25 million and $50 million, and when those appropriations are added, they amount to a large sum.

I wish to state one final thought. What will be our position when, as I understand they will, California announces that it intends to hold a World's Fair and wishes the United States to contribute to it? It will be said, "This is to be a World's Fair."

At that time we shall recall that we participated in the Seattle fair and in the New York fair. Would we then go into California and build a $15 million or $20 million building on a temporary basis and then have it torn down within a year or two?

Are there not other uses to which the money could be put? Instead of the New York exposition, are there not colleges which could be aided with the amount of money that we propose to appropriate for a fair, supposedly to let the world know what we are doing.

If Khrushchev wishes to come into New York and spend huge sums of money, let him do so. I sometimes think that he glories in the thought that we might spend ourselves to destruction. I do not wish to see our country follow a course of that type. Let us begin to be more frugal in our operations.

I do not blame New York people for wanting a fair. It will mean much to them. I think it will be a huge success. But in spite of that fact, I think the United States ought not to participate. When the question comes before the Senate, as I have previously said, I shall vote against participation by the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the yeas and nays are requested on this question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer state the precise question upon which we are voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will vote on the motion to strike out lines 15 to 23 in the supplemental appropriation bill, as amended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does that particular item relate to the $15 million appropriation for the fair in New York?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are voting on the question to strike out the committee recommendation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A "yea" vote is a vote to strike out the committee recommendation. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hickey] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Massachusetts

[Mr. Smith], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from Iowa, [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is absent because of active duty with the U.S. Navy.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Case] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 44 Leg.]

YEAS—13

Church
Fulbright
Hart
Lausche
McGee
McNamara
Miller
Moss
Neuberger
Proxmire
Talmadge
Thurmond
Young, Ohio

NAYS—60

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Bush
Byrd, W. Va.
Capehart
Carlson
Carroll
Case, N.J.
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Douglas
Dworshak
Engle
Fong
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan
Keating
Kefauver
Kerr
Kuchel
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Saltonstall
Smith, Maine
Stennis
Symington
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—27

Allott
Burdick
Butler
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Case, S. Dak.
Chavez
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Goldwater
Gore
Hickenlooper
Hickey
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
Morton
Robertson
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Sparkman
Wiley
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. Proxmire's motion to strike was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion to strike was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while a large number of Senators are in the Chamber, I should like to ask the distinguished acting majority leader if he will state the program for the remainder of the week.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is planned to have the Senate meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. At that time the Senate will consider a noncontroversial bill, Calendar No. 1290, H.R. 11027, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. As I recall, the bill relates to flooded acres.

Following that measure, we shall take up Calendar No. 1281, House bill 10607, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and certain related laws, to provide for restatement of the tariff classification provision. I wish to notify the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], both of whom have expressed interest in that measure.

That will be the business for tomorrow.

In addition, there is a possibility that the Senate will consider Calendar No. 1043, Senate bill 495, amending the Trading With the Enemy Act.

In addition, an address is to be made by our illustrious friend, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel]. I shall be present to hear it, and I hope other Senators will be present.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And from Tuesday, we shall go over until Thursday.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is the distinguished Senator from California to talk about New York State?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California, in order that he may clarify this situation.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have the honor to inform my beloved brother from New York that in any comments I shall make tomorrow, I shall not mention his great, imposing Commonwealth.

Mr. KEATING. Nevertheless, I shall be present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is very reassuring.

Mr. President, in order that Senators may know about the program for the remainder of the week, let me state that from tomorrow, Tuesday, the Senate will go over until Thursday; on Thursday there will be a very short session; and it is the intention of the leadership to move, on Thursday, that the Senate go over until Monday. I understand that on Monday there will not be any votes. Therefore, Senators can make their plans accordingly for the period of the Easter weekend.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will there be any votes on Thursday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There will be no yea-and-nay votes on Thursday.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the filibuster begin the following Monday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope not.

Mr. ANDERSON. If not then, will it begin a week later?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico should wait until the distinguished majority leader returns. I can deal only with the situation between now and next Monday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have heard rumors that the majority leader will not return for 2 weeks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator from Illinois that the majority leader will not be away that long. He will be back before that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Minnesota state whether the so-called literacy test bill will be brought up next Tuesday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There will be a session on Monday, and the majority leader will be here then. So I prefer that he make whatever announcements are to be made concerning the program for the following days.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Senators who are "in the know" are able to make their plans accordingly; and I understand that a considerable number have been "tipped off" that nothing of importance will be done next week, and that therefore they are planning to be away on various matters political. But those of us who are not "in the know" are subject to the disadvantage of not knowing just what will happen. We do not like to be kept dangling and in a state of innocuous desuetude.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Whatever may be the situation or state to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, I wish to assure him that he will not be kept dangling or in a state of uncertainty; all Senators should be able to plan their programs at least to next Monday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is not what I am worried about.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may we have the third reading of the supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was attempting to clarify the situation.

Before the distinguished majority leader left, I had an understanding with him that on Tuesday, April 24, the so-called literacy test bill would be called up. I have not been advised otherwise, since then; and, therefore, I dare presume that that is still the understanding, and that that bill is set for Tuesday, April 24.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall not attempt to be as precise as that, although surely I accept the word of the minority leader. However, under my responsibility in connection with the matter, I announce that on Monday there will be no votes, and Senators can make their plans accordingly. If I had any doubt as to that, I would check on the arrangement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Minnesota check in person or by telephone?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of the rapid means of communication available, the Senator from Illinois can do so in either way. But if I were in Illinois, I would check by telephone.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 683. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission;

S. 1371. An act to amend subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit the Commission to renew a station license in the safety and special radio services more than 30 days prior to expiration of the original license;

S. 1589. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the issuance of radio operator licenses to nationals of the United States;

S. 2522. An act to defer the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project; and

S.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8921) to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 8921. An act to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9751. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10700. An act that section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that act, is amended by striking out "1962" and "$40,000,000" and substituting "1963" and "$63,750,000", respectively.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, included in the second supplemental appropriation bill is an item for a large sum of money for the State of New York, to enable it to conduct a fine exhibition and fair. I am very pleased that that is so. I am glad we were able to do what we did, with the result that considerable time is saved.

I say to my friends the Senators from New York that I realize the importance of saving time in that connection, because for several months I have been involved in an indirect way in the planning of a great World's Fair and a great exhibition and exposition at Seattle, Wash.; and I know how much time that takes. So I realize how important it is, in the case of New York, particularly in view of the 1964 date, to make a start now, for literally a multitude of things must be done.

I am sure there will be a fine Federal exhibit at the New York fair. I am glad provision has been made in the bill for a Federal Commissioner, because I am sure that those in New York wish to see the Federal Government expend its funds wisely and well for the great show that New York will have.

I announce to the Senate that the New York World's Fair has planned an exhibit at the Seattle World's Fair. The Seattle World's Fair opens next Saturday. So I am very glad of the announcement which has been made by the acting majority leader and by the minority leader in regard to the program, in order that I may be able to remain in Seattle a little longer next week.

At Seattle we have a fine exposition. It is beyond our expectations; and I say that only in order to report to the Senate that the money the Federal Government has given to the Seattle World's Fair has been well spent. I think we shall get a great deal out of it.

Many countries will exhibit at the New York fair; and 35 countries—approximately the same as the group which will exhibit at the New York fair—are exhibiting at the Seattle World's Fair.

In terms of building good will for our country, in addition to the number of persons who will attend this fair and will see what America has been doing in the modern age—which is the theme of the great exposition at Seattle—it is apparent that the great Seattle exposition is well worth the confidence of the Senate and of the House of Representatives and of the then President, Mr. Eisenhower, who signed that bill. I am sure the same will be true of the New York exposition.

At Seattle we have spent a great deal of money; and no one knows that better than does the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Commerce appropriations, always has been most helpful in connection with these matters, not only in connection with this fair, but also in connection with trade fairs and other fairs held in other countries, such as the one held at Brussels. We participate in those fairs in hopes of being able to spread to many persons information about what we call the American way of life.

Both the Seattle Exposition and the New York Exposition will do not only that, for the benefit of a great number of visitors, but also will fit in with the visits which many persons from abroad will make to our country.

In such terms, the cost involved is very little—in fact, really nothing, when we realize the full value.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me state, on behalf of myself and also on behalf of my colleague [Mr. KEATING]—even though he will speak for himself, I know—that, as my colleague said a few minutes ago, we want nothing but the best for Seattle. We think the Seattle fair is a great one. I and my family will visit it; and that will be a great privilege. Three thousand miles separate the State of Washington from the State of New York. Washington State faces the Pacific world and New York State faces the Atlantic world. So I am glad and honored that our authorities have had the wisdom to participate in this fashion, because the Seattle fair will be very helpful in developing an atmosphere which will be of great value to all, including the New York fair.

I wish to express my appreciation for the attitude taken by Senators. Again, I express to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] our appreciation of the wisdom and generosity he has demonstrated. All of us understand how hardheaded he has been about the amount of money to be spent, and we understand why he takes such a position. But we very much appreciate his understanding of New York's problem, and we are most grateful.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to add a word of appreciation for the support of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the chairman of the Commerce Committee. The stand he has taken has been most helpful. Furthermore, I wish to say to him that, as he knows, with his generous assistance for which I am extremely grateful, I have already started one member of my family on the way to Seattle; and I shall certainly try to be there myself.

I wish Seattle every success. I know that both these fairs will make a great contribution toward a better understanding of our country, among our friends abroad.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 11038) was read the third time.

EXPEDITION OF UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION TRANSMISSION FACILITIES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1609)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

" 'PART IV—GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION BROADCASTING FACILITIES

" 'Declaration of purpose

" 'SEC. 390. The purpose of this part is to assist (through matching grants) in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

" 'Authorization of appropriations

" 'SEC. 391. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding $32,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available for payment of grants for projects for which applications, approved under section 392, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1968.

" 'Grants for construction

" 'SEC. 392. (a) For each project for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities there shall be submitted to the Secretary an application for a grant containing such information with respect to such project as the Secretary may by regulation require, including the total cost of such project and the amount of the Federal grant requested for such project, and providing assurance satisfactory to the Secretary—

" '(1) that the applicant is (A) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof, (B) the State educational television agency, (C) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues, or (D) a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting and is eligible to receive a license from the Federal Communications Commission for a noncommercial educational television broadcasting station pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Commission in effect on April 12, 1962;

" '(2) that the operation of such educational television broadcasting facilities will be under the control of the applicant or a person qualified under paragraph (1) to be such an applicant;

" '(3) that necessary funds to construct, operate, and maintain such educational television broadcasting facilities will be available when needed; and

" '(4) that such television broadcasting facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

" '(b) The total amount of grants under this part for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities to be situated in any State shall not exceed $1,000,000.

" '(c) In order to assure proper coordination of construction of educational television broadcasting facilities within each State which has established a State educational television agency, each applicant for a grant under this section for a project for construction of such facilities in such State, other than such agency, shall notify such agency of each application for such a grant which is submitted by it to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall advise such agency with respect to the disposition of each such application.

" '(d) The Secretary shall base his determinations of whether to approve applications for grants under this section and the amount of such grants on criteria set forth in regulations and designed to achieve (1) prompt and effective use of all educational television channels remaining available, (2) equitable geographical distribution of educational television broadcasting facilities throughout the States, and (3) provision of educational television broadcasting facilities which will serve the greatest number of persons and serve them in as many areas as possible, and which are adaptable to the broadest educational uses.

" '(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Secretary shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding (1) 50 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project, plus (2) 25 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of any educational television broadcasting facilities owned by the applicant on the date on which it files such application; except that (A) the total amount of any grant made under this section with respect to any project may not exceed 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Secretary to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project; and (B) not more than 15 per centum of any such grant may be used for the acquisition and installation of microwave equipment, boosters, translators, and repeaters which are to be used to connect two or more broadcasting stations. The Secretary shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine.

" '(f) If, within ten years after completion of any project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities with respect to which a grant has been made under this section—

" '(1) the applicant or other owner of such facilities ceases to be an agency, officer, institution, foundation, corporation, or association described in subsection (a) (1), or

" '(2) such facilities cease to be used for educational television purposes (unless the Secretary determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation so to do),

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of such facilities the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facilities are situated) of such facilities, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facilities.

" 'Records

" 'SEC. 393. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this part shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out his functions under this part, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

" '(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this part.

" 'Definitions

" 'SEC. 394. For the purposes of this part—

" '(1) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

" '(2) The term "construction," as applied to educational television broadcasting facilities, means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus (including towers, microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, mobile equipment, and video-recording equipment) necessary for television broadcasting, including apparatus which may incidentally be used for transmitting closed circuit television programs, but does not include the construction or repair of structures to house such apparatus.

" '(3) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

" '(4) The term "State educational television agency" means (A) a board or commission established by State law for the purpose of promoting educational television within a State, (B) a board or commission appointed by the Governor of a State for such purpose if such appointment is not inconsistent with State law, or (C) a State officer or agency responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within the State which has been designated by the Governor to assume responsibility for the promotion of educational television; and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the term "Governor" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

" '(5) The term "nonprofit" as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association, means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

" 'Provision of assistance by Federal Communications Commission

" 'SEC. 395. The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this part as may be requested by the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide for consultation and close cooperation with the Federal Communications Commission in the administration of his functions under this part which are of interest to or affect the functions of the Commission.

" 'Rules and regulations

" 'SEC. 396. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part, including regulations relating to the order of priority in approving applications for projects under section 392 or to determining the amounts of grants for such projects.

" 'Federal interference or control prohibited

" 'SEC. 397. Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed (1) to amend any other provision of, or requirement under this Act; or (2) to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system.' "

And the House agree to the same.

That the title of the bill be amended to read as follows: "An Act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes."

Warren G. Magnuson,
John Pastore,
M. Monroney,
Norris Cotton,
Clifford Case,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Kenneth A. Roberts,
Morgan M. Moulder,
John E. Moss,
W. L. Springer,
J. Arthur Younger,
Paul F. Schenck,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, unless there is some objection, I wish to have action taken on the conference report on the so-called TV education bill. As Senators well know this is a piece of legislation on which we have been working for 7 long years. The Senate passed it unanimously three times. The House finally passed a bill several weeks ago. We had a very successful conference. I want to get the bill on its way to the White House as fast as possible, in order to get this very important work underway.

Mr. President, I am submitting for the Record at this time the statement on the part of the conferees which was prepared jointly by the House and Senate and sets forth in detail the areas of agreement, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of the Managers on the Part of the House

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as agreed to in conference is in form and for the most part in substance the same as the amendment of the House to the Senate bill. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are set forth in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and minor or clarifying changes.

The several important changes which have been made in the House amendment have the common objective of expediting as much as possible the construction of additional educational television broadcasting facilities. The construction of such additional facilities has been long overdue. At present the Federal Communications Commission has reserved 273 educational television channels of which only 62 are in use. Only through the establishment of additional educational television broadcasting facilities and the activation of noncommercial educational television broadcasting stations can the goal of creating an adequate television system to serve the needs of all the people in the United States be accomplished. The conference agreement, thus, must be considered an integral part of a broader legislative program now under consideration in the Congress which is aimed at expanding and improving television service in the United States.

Grants for surveys: In order to accomplish this objective, the conference agreement omits all provisions for the preparation of State surveys of educational television needs which were contained in the House amendment. Educational television legislation was first considered during the 85th Congress when it was passed by the Senate and was reported favorably to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Between that time and the present, extensive national studies have been undertaken by educational television organizations of educational television broadcasting needs. These studies show a minimum need of 1,197 television channels for educational broadcasting stations. Therefore, the time for additional surveys has long since passed and the time has arrived to take prompt action to get the needed additional educational television stations on the air as promptly as possible.

Authorization of appropriations for construction grants: In recognition of the urgent need for the construction of additional educational television broadcasting facilities the conference agreement authorizes the appropriation for fiscal year 1963 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years of not to exceed $32 million, in the aggregate, for construction grants. The House amendment had authorized the appropriation of not to exceed $25 million while the Senate bill authorized the appropriation of not to exceed $51 million for the making of such grants.

If sufficient applications are submitted and approved to utilize available funds authorized by the conference agreement, numerous additional educational television broadcasting facilities will be constructed because of the requirement that these Federal grants must be matched.

Thus, it is expected that the Federal funds authorized by the conference agreement will be effective in providing a much-needed initial momentum to get this large and badly needed expansion program underway at the earliest possible date.

In order to assure proper coordination of construction of educational television broadcasting facilities within States which have established State educational television agencies, applicants for construction grants within such States are required to notify the agency of each application for a grant which is submitted by them and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in turn, is required to advise the agency of the disposition of each such application.

Administration: The conference agreement places the administration of the program in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The House amendment placed the administration of the program in the Commissioner of Education.

The conferees placed the responsibility for the execution of this program in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare rather than in an office or bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, because of the realization that, if the relatively small program provided for by this legislation is to be carried out speedily and effectively, it must be given proper priority among the many other important and far-reaching programs which are now administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Under no circumstances should this program be subordinated to or tied in with other Federal programs in the field of education. This could only result in unavoidable delays which would prevent the achievement of goals which the conferees seek to accomplish by this legislation.

The execution of this new program will quite likely involve the establishment of policies and the rendering of decisions for which ready precedents may not be available. By placing the responsibility for the execution of this program in the Secretary himself, the Secretary is placed in a position where he may designate a person responsible immediately to him who will be in a position to expedite the formulation of such policies and the making of such decisions. However, the full responsibility for the administration of the program remains with the Secretary, with whom it has been placed under the conference agreement.

The conferees anticipate that the Secretary will keep the committees of the Congress responsible for this legislation advised at regular intervals of the operation of this program.

The decision of the conferees to enact this legislation in the form of an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 likewise lends emphasis to their view that this program is a program aimed at promoting particular broadcast services within the general framework of broadcasting in the United States. Attention is called by the conferees to the provision contained in the legislation that the Federal Communications Commission is authorized to give to the Secretary all assistance requested by the Secretary to carry out the program. The conferees are gratified that the Federal Communications Commission has recently established in its Broadcast Bureau an Office of Research and Education for the specific purpose of assisting educational broadcasters in their efforts directed at expanding and improving educational broadcasting. The conferees are confident that the Federal Communications Commission will put forth its best efforts to promote the educational television program provided for in this legislation. If the Secretary will avail himself of the expert services which can be rendered by the Federal Communications Commission he will be in a position to minimize the administrative expenses incurred in connection with the execution of this program.

Entities eligible for construction grants: Under the House amendment nonprofit community educational television organizations would not have been eligible to receive construction grants. The Senate bill would have permitted any nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association, which was organized to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting, to receive construction grant funds.

The conference agreement makes eligible to receive construction grants any nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association, which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting and which is eligible according to the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in effect on April 12, 1962, to receive a license from the Commission for a noncommercial educational broadcasting station.

The conferees adopted this language in the light of the following representation made by the Federal Communications Commission in its memorandum relating to the provisions of the Senate-passed bill and the House amendment thereto:

"In this connection, you are advised that under the Commission's rules and policies, qualified applicants for the reserved noncommercial educational stations have been limited to the following:

"(a) One or more duly accredited public or private educational institutions, organizations, or bodies;

"(b) A municipality or other political subdivision which has no independently constituted educational organization;

"(c) One or more tax-supported cultural organization (e.g., public libraries); and

"(d) An association of nonprofit community organizations chartered by a State to engage in noncommercial educational broadcasting. Such groups have been broadly representative of the educational, cultural, and civic groups in the community and have included public or private educational organizations or representatives.

"Thus, a single nonprofit organization, unless it were an accredited educational organization or a tax-supported cultural organization, would not be considered eligible to receive a license for a noncommercial educational television reservation."

Interconnecting apparatus: The conference agreement limits to 15 percent of any grant, the amount that the recipient may utilize for the acquisition and installation of microwave equipment, boosters, translators, and repeaters which are to be used to connect two or more broadcasting stations. The purpose of this change is to assure that most of the available funds will be used for putting new educational television broadcasting stations on the air. Expenditures made to interconnect stations with each other should be incidental to this primary purpose.

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico: The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House amendment making the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico eligible to participate in the educational television construction grant program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the proposed legislation has as a common objective the expediting, as much as possible, of the construction of additional educational television broadcasting facilities throughout the United States. The construction of such facilities has been long overdue. At present, the Federal Communications Commission has reserved 273 educational television channels of which only 62 are in use. Only through the establishment of additional educational television broadcasting facilities and the activation of noncommercial educational television stations, can the goal of creating an educational television system to serve the needs of all the people in the United States be accomplished. I firmly believe that this legislative program will achieve this objective.

I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Was the action on the part of the conference committee unanimous?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was unanimous on the part of both the Senate and House conferees.

I think at long last we shall be able to get an important piece of educational television legislation enacted. Long ago the Federal Communications Commission reserved 273 educational channels, all of them valuable. Only 62 are now in use, after almost 9 years. The bill ought to go a long way toward taking care of the needs of schools and colleges in this vast new field of education.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator, the committee, and the conferees, for coming to a successful conclusion on the television education bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11038) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, now pending before the Senate for final passage is the amendment to the present supplemental appropriation bill that was reported by the full Appropriations Committee. The distinguished chairman of the Supplemental Appropriations Subcommittee introduced it. It calls for the establishment of what I feel to be one of the most needed tools Congress must have in order to cope with an ever-growing problem: that of the constant increase in the numbers of Federal employees. The amendment is very simple. It reads as follows:

> The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is authorized to create a special review panel within the Bureau to carefully screen and evaluate all requests for additional personnel, and to make exhaustive and searching inquiries within the departments and agencies prior to approving any request for additional personnel.

This is not a new search for such tools on behalf of the Senate. The Legislative Reorganization Act, which I had the pleasure of cosponsoring with the late great Senator La Follette, has as one of its principal purposes, the establishment of fiscal controls by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress. We provided for a legislative budget, for a joint staff on appropriations in the budget, and for the elimination of nonessential, wasteful, and inefficient expenditures. It was particularly aimed at decreasing the overpopulation of Government agencies.

Following this there was much activity in this realm by the Senate.

In 1951 I sponsored S. 206, to provide for an investigation of personnel needs and practices of Government departments and agencies. In 1952 I sponsored S. 2484, to improve the efficiency of the U.S. Civil Service.

In 1957, along with the then Senator Kennedy, who took the lead at that time, I and many other Senators cosponsored a Senate bill to provide for improved methods of stating and examining budget requests for all deficiency and supplemental appropriations.

We were seeking a way to control the ever-growing numbers of Government employees in all departments. Later, in the sessions of the 82d, 83d, 85th, and 87th Congresses, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] sponsored a bill to establish a Joint Committee on the Budget, and to provide for a more effective evaluation of fiscal requirements of executive agencies of the Federal Government. This would have highlighted the question of personnel needs. The Senate passed the bills in 1952, 1953, 1957, and 1961, but the House of Representatives has consistently refused to act on them.

S. 529, the bill now pending in the 87th Congress, was passed by the Senate last May. It is now being held in the House Committee on Rules.

I give Senators this background to indicate the lengths to which the Senate has gone to recognize the existing deficiency in our tools for coping with ever-growing Government employment. Without proper fiscal supervision and control, without the necessary staff to inquire searchingly into the needs for additional employment in various Government agencies, we have seen the Federal employee population continue to grow.

I was shocked when I totaled up the increases in personnel requested in the budget for the coming year. We are asked to add 46,147 new employees to the already crowded Federal payrolls. The Department of Defense, which, because of the threat to this country, would be in a position to ask for and justify greatly increased employment, expects to decrease its military employment by 7,949. There has been a reduction of 97 in the Executive Office of the President. The foreign assistance program is to be decreased by 160. Even with these reductions, the total number of additional personnel requested is 46,147. The employee population continues to grow. I think it requires specialized attention.

We have repeatedly sought to give the problem special attention with additional staffing for a Joint Committee on the Budget, and with better practices in staffing in the Senate and House. Each time we have been rebuffed by the House of Representatives, which claims it is not the Senate's business what is done with the appropriations; and if more staff is required it will be given to the House, and the Senate can shift for itself. The House does not recognize the concurrent jurisdiction of the two bodies in the appropriations field. If the House would join us with respect to a Joint Committee on the Budget it would give us a better tool.

Lacking this opportunity, we must seek some means to fill the very urgent requirement that every single request for an additional Federal job is inspected by X-ray, and put through several tests. We must determine, first, whether the job is absolutely necessary and indispensable for the continued work of the Department.

Second, if it is necessary, we must determine whether personnel now in the Department can be transferred, so that new employees will not be required to carry on the new duties which, perhaps, the Congress authorized.

The Senate Appropriations Committee is amazed each year to find that the slightest added duty for a Government department, as a result of a rather minor change in the law, always brings from the personnel office a demand for 100 or 200 or 500 more employees for the department. This is known as Parkinson's law. The more employees one has under him, the "bigger shot" he is in Washington, D.C.

I fear this is being done by many of the men who draw good salaries as personnel managers, but who are not managers at all. For that reason, I think we must move toward a better overall supervision of personnel managers. Men who have talent and authority and skill must look into every single department. They must be able to knock on the doors and say, "Who are you? Whom do you have working here? What are you doing? How many more men will you need to do this work? Can you not find some employee, from the thousands you employ, who can be moved over to assume these new duties?"

If we do not follow such a course, we shall see a continued increase of Government employees in all departments. This will result in increased appropriations, not for 1 year alone. We all are realistic enough to know that if 46,000 or more people are added to the payrolls this year, they will be continued from now on. It is almost impossible to find ways and means to reduce payrolls on a reasonable basis, without destroying or damaging the essential work of a department, once people are put on the payroll.

Talking about trying to eliminate personnel by large scale percentage points is good for headlines in newspapers and looks good in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but it does not get results. If we are to achieve true economy we shall have to achieve it with good personnel practices such as the great corporations have applied. We must know the subject and be properly advised, and then must take firm and vigorous action to be sure that no people are employed who are not absolutely required.

I found a great sentiment in the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, in support of this purpose. I was very pleased to have the support of many Senators, who realize the deficiency of tools to meet the ever-growing problem of the increase in the Federal employee population.

Some bureaus and agencies will have to be provided with additional personnel, when the population of the country grows or more service is required. No one can doubt that. Certainly there should be a "needs" test applied to all the requests. The departments should prove beyond a shadow of doubt that the employment of additional people is justified.

For that reason we have turned to the Bureau of the Budget, which is recognized as one of the high level, businesslike management groups in the Government. That is the group which formulates the President's budget.

One may ask why the Bureau of the Budget is not already doing so. I presume the Bureau of the Budget is doing so to a certain extent. However, it is necessary for them to examine appropriations totaling some $60 billion or $70 billion. Many requests are made for installations, military equipment, hardware, buildings and a myriad of things. It is very difficult for any group, working with such a large departmental budget, to be able to bore in, to X-ray, to carefully examine and to diagnose personnel needs. That is why we are directing, in the amendment to the bill, which has been read the third time:

> The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is authorized to create a special review panel within the Bureau to carefully screen and evaluate all requests for additional personnel, and to make exhaustive and searching inquiries within the departments and agencies prior to approving any request for additional personnel.

I hope the men who will be appointed will be topflight men in the Bureau of the Budget, who will be hard-boiled but who will be understanding of Government needs. If a request with respect to additional personnel in the departments can be justified beyond a shadow of a doubt, it certainly will be the point of wisdom and good business judgment to provide them.

We must have specialists, men who make it their principal duty to be sure, when the budget is finally approved with respect to personnel requests, that the requests have been screened in a searching way and will not result in any great padding or packing of employment in the various agencies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, who was extremely helpful in preparing the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator from Oklahoma, not only on the amendment, but also on the documentation and explanation he is giving as to the purpose of the amendment.

So that there may be no doubt in anyone's mind, the Committee on Appropriations adopted the amendment which the Senator from Oklahoma sponsored, so that we could put up a caution and go-slow sign to the Bureau of the Budget in terms of Federal employees. The Senator has explained that the Bureau of the Budget has many duties and is an outstanding office in our Government. However, those duties sometimes make it difficult for the Budget Bureau to go into any particular facet of the budget preparation unless the Congress itself specifies that we want this part looked into carefully. I for one feel that it is the proper approach to cutting back on Federal employment or holding down the increases in Federal employment. Frequently, amendments are before the Senate to cut back 5 percent or to cut back 10 percent in each department. Such action is unfair and regrettable, because in some departments there has been closer management and tighter controls than in other departments. It works a disservice upon a department head who has been doing a good job in personnel control and management and budget management to say that he must cut 10 percent or 5 percent when another department, which has not been doing as good a job in terms of personnel and management and budget control, is called upon to cut back 10 percent or 5 percent.

The purpose of the proposal is to put the responsibility where it belongs—in the executive office of the Presidential office; namely, the Bureau of the Budget—to see to it that when department heads and agencies of Government ask for additional personnel, the burden of proof is on the department head to prove the absolutely essential need for that personnel.

I think the Senator is correct. I wish to associate myself with the request and, in fact, the order of the Congress, that the Bureau of the Budget establish the proposed board, unit, or panel within the Bureau to examine every personnel request with meticulous care, because I for one feel that many of those assignments could be absorbed by existing personnel.

As I recall, the Senator said that the Department of Defense did not ask for additional personnel.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Department of Defense is reducing personnel to the extent of 7,949 employees in the budget request now before us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And the Executive Office of the President——

Mr. MONRONEY. There was a decrease of 97 in that Office.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What was the third department?

Mr. MONRONEY. Foreign aid, a decrease of 160.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Those departments did not ask for additional personnel but, in fact, asked for fewer.

We can well ask ourselves where the increase of 46,147 arises. I shall not ask for a listing of the departments and their requests.

Mr. MONRONEY. I intend to put such a list in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, so that the Senator will see the number that the various agencies are requesting. One department, the Post Office Department, has requested as high as 15,464 additional employees. The Department of the Treasury is asking for 6,881 additional employees, many of whom would be revenue collectors. The space agency is requesting 4,300. Perhaps that additional personnel is necessary. We wish to know the facts through experts. So far, the Senate has passed only one appropriation bill. The quicker we can get on with the job proposed, the more we shall be able to save in appropriations for this year. At least that is my hope. By next year, with a competent panel of men putting a spotlight on the personnel needs, they will be able to give the Congress advice and testimony that we have not had in the past concerning justification for the overall expenses of Government. This includes expenses for personnel, as one of the portions of the overall budget.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not wish my remarks to be interpreted as meaning, for example, that the Treasury Department should not have more personnel. We have directed the Treasury Department to hire more revenue agents. That statement applies to other departments. I do not know whether the Post Office Department needs the additional number specified.

Mr. MONRONEY. Some additional lettercarriers undoubtedly will be required to service our towns as the towns continue to grow. For that reason, the skill of a man with a surgeon's scalpel instead of a meat-axe approach is needed in order to remedy this situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that the Senator's amendment is indicative of responsible Government and reveals a great sense of understanding of the needs of the executive branch of the Government. No one is in a better position to offer that kind of advice than the author of the Reorganization Act for the Congress, and one who has interested himself for years in governmental efficiency. I am happy to say that over the years I have associated myself with the bills the Senator recited a while ago for the joint budget program of which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and other Senators were sponsors.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe that President Kennedy introduced one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Those efforts reveal the sensible and responsible way to get at the problems of a growing Federal civil service and Federal employment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I feel that they are true. For example, we authorized a large increase in personnel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue because the number of tax returns was growing larger, and we were able to audit too small a percentage of them.

That was fine. But I would like to follow through and see if there is truth in some of the rumors I have heard that many of the supposed revenue agents that were employed were winding up as satchel carriers for the brass, the subbrass, or the sub-sub brass in order to make them feel more important; and that many of the 3,000 employees, that we thought were going to be auditing, are merely flunkies to some subdepartment chief or regional chief out in the field. I want a searching inquiry both before and after in order to know what is happening to those people.

Let us not leave ourselves out. Let us consider the Senate. It is proposed that the Senate add 102 employees. Those employees would be stenographers. Every Senator knows of the millions of letters we are receiving asking for more economy in Government, which require additional stenographers to answer. We all know that we have a great backlog because of the letter-writing campaigns, which have been larger this year than before.

If we must have 102 additional employees to write letters, I ask whether we can find them already here in the Senate. We must determine whether we can run our elevators a shorter number of hours, perhaps have fewer people standing around the corridors of the Capitol, and pinch down in some of the less necessary work that goes on in the Senate.

While the Budget Bureau might not feel inclined to help us squeeze our personnel loads down, I believe that the amendment will enable us to demand better performance and better advice on the personnel in the service of the Senate.

I appreciate the cooperation of the great chairman of the committee and the fine help he has given to secure its inclusion in the bill.

I feel sure that the House conferees, with many of whom I have sat in the Congress, would approve such an idea. They are unwilling that Members of the Congress overstaff themselves with people, and they will approve of the Budget Bureau's taking the responsibility for surveying and certifying as to the essentiality of the personnel requested, or to deny the jobs for which essentially is not demonstrated. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his great cooperation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his contribution. It is a fine amendment. I hope it will stick. I have supported him heretofore in his more ambitious efforts that have run into opposition from the other body. I hope this time we will make the progress suggested. If so, I predict that it will be followed by a successful saving.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list showing the increases and decreases in requested personnel.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	1962	1963	Increase or decrease
Increases in requested personnel:			
Department of Agriculture	110,934	116,388	5,454
Department of Commerce	30,793	32,773	1,980
Department of Defense: Civil	31,445	31,562	117
Department of HEW	78,028	82,669	4,641
Department of Interior	64,762	70,157	5,395
Department of Justice	31,997	32,671	674
Department of Labor	8,642	8,956	314
Post Office Department	593,265	608,729	15,464
Department of State	24,038	24,221	183
Peace Corps	547	1,093	546
Treasury Department	82,995	89,876	6,881
Atomic Energy Commission	6,923	7,035	112
Federal Aviation Agency	45,118	48,959	3,841
Increases in requested personnel—Continued			
General Services Administration	32,844	34,521	1,677
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,607	14,981	1,374
NASA	22,000	26,300	4,300
Veterans' Administration	177,860	178,975	1,115
Other agencies	81,649	81,832	183
Legislative: U.S. Senate			102
Decreases in requested personnel:			
Executive Office of the President	1,661	1,564	−97
Department of Defense (military)	1,037,018	1,029,069	−7,949
Department of State (AID)	16,219	16,059	−160
Total increase			46,147

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may we have the vote on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 11038) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to thank every subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, because the work in connection with the development of this supplemental bill was divided among all the chairmen of the subcommittees. I wish the RECORD to show that I am very much obligated to each of them for the good work that he has done, and, also, to the ranking minority members.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Florida leaves the Chamber, I wish to express, on behalf of the distinguished chairman of the committee and on behalf of the majority leader and myself, appreciation for the fine manner in which the Senator from Florida has handled the bill and the work he did in committee to bring the bill to the floor for debate and action. It was a tedious job. As usual he handled it in a most able and commendable manner.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the acting majority leader. I hope we can get the bill speedily out of conference and signed by the President, because it contains nearly $50 million for disaster relief, funds which are very badly needed under conditions with which all of us are familiar.

MRS. CHOW CHUI HA—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 87)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1934, "For the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha."

The provision of law which would have been made applicable by the bill to Mrs. Chow and would have granted her and her family nonquota immigrant status was expressly repealed as of March 25, 1962. Accordingly, the intended relief is no longer available and approval of the bill would serve no useful purpose.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 16, 1962.*

ELIZABETH TAYLOR

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the glories of American journalism became even more glorious as of last Saturday. On that day, in a front-page article, the New Haven Register subtly, differently, and with dexterity—and perhaps with a bit of cruelty—dealt with a situation about which all of us have read too much already. Without attempting in my own words to give a demonstration of why American journalism was elevated on that day, I quote from the article to which I have referred. The headline reads: "Liz Squeezed Out."

There followed these words:

> EDITOR'S NOTE.—Due to an abundance of legitimate news, there is no Elizabeth Taylor-Richard Burton story in today's Saturday special.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1938

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1290, H.R. 11027.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11027) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it is my opinion that the most important legislation facing this session of Congress is legislation affecting increased international trade.

International trade is mutually advantageous in the interest of a strong economy in the United States and in order to maintain our leadership in the pursuit of lasting peace. I have a strong conviction that trade is a key to the maintenance of peace and freedom in the noncommunistic world. In this struggle, two principal elements emerge—free world strength and free world unity.

Of course, we must be militantly strong if we are to contain the armed might of the Soviet Union. But of equal importance is free world economic strength. The ability and opportunity of nations to trade, to buy, to sell, to earn, bring a vitality and vigor to a nation's economy that can be obtained in no other manner.

At the same time, such trade can contribute substantially to free world unity. Indeed, throughout history it is clear that trade relations have been and are requisite to political alliances. In simple terms, customers and suppliers are usually friends. Expanding markets, expanding sources of supply, should be the keystone in the free world's struggle for peace with freedom.

In discussing an expanded foreign trade at a meeting in Topeka, Kans., Wednesday, April 11, I made the above statement.

This meeting was sponsored by the League of Women Voters of Kansas, whose president is Mrs. Paul Peterman of Hutchinson, Kans. The Kansas League of Women Voters is taking an active part in promoting an expansion of international trade in our State.

Mrs. Peterman stated that the organization favored the tariff legislation since it would pave the way for political harmony, stimulate economic growth, and expand opportunities for consumer choice of products.

The chairman of the meeting was former Gov. Alf M. Landon. Governor Landon is taking an active interest in an expanded trade program because of its benefits to our Nation through economic, political, and social gains.

Representatives of agriculture, industry, and labor participated in the meeting.

Walter C. Pierce, president of the Kansas Farm Bureau, stated that the proposed trade agreement authority, while agreeable, should allow for all U.S. products to be negotiated at the same time.

In discussing the matter further, Mr. Pierce stated:

> The Common Market wants to be as nearly self-sufficient as possible on agricultural products. We farmers would have no bargaining advantage if concessions on industrial products had already been made.
>
> We do not believe it is consistent with this act for the Department of Agriculture to push for a farm bill that curtails production in an effort to raise farm income.
>
> This leads to less efficient production, raises our costs and sets an artificial price for our products when we are trying to compete in the world markets.

Mr. Harry C. Colglazier, of Larned, Kans., master of the Kansas Grange, endorsed the proposed legislation as a means of expanding trade among nations of the free world.

The Kansas Farmers Union was represented by Mr. Martin Byrne, of Topeka, Kans., who emphasized the need for expanded trade in behalf of agriculture. He also stated the program should be given "a seasoned approach," but that the President should be given the authority to make trade agreements.

Mr. Merle Worman, Topeka, vice president of the Kansas Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, expressed the views of the organization and stated that labor definitely favors the President's request because it will create new markets, industry, and job opportunities. Mr. Worman further stated that the members of his organization want protection on adjustment assistance for unemployed workers and the necessary retraining and relocation resulting from foreign imports.

Mr. Robert A. Finney, Humboldt, director for a six-State Midwest area for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, stated that his organization had for the past 28 years favored broader trade policy on the part of our Nation and urged that the new tariff program should be approved, but it should take effect gradually in order to allow industry ample time to make adjustments that may be required.

Frank A. Lombard, Enterprise, president of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, spoke in favor of an expanded trade program, but cautioned that any assistance to business suffering a hardship under new tariffs should not be on a cash or subsidy basis.

It was encouraging to note the active support of these agricultural, industrial, and labor leaders in behalf of a program that means so much, not only to the State of Kansas, but to the Nation.

It has been estimated that our State's share of the total exports of agricultural products amounted to $204 million. Wheat and feed grains, which Kansas produces heavily, accounted for $181 million, and livestock products more than $22 million. The total represents nearly one-fifth of the market for the State's agricultural sales and about two-fifths of the market for the grains.

It has been estimated that it took slightly over 21,000 farmworkers to produce these exports, or about 13 percent of the total number on Kansas farms.

In return for these important agricultural exports, Kansas' share of the competitive imports totaled $71 million, $40 million worth of field crops, and $31 million worth of livestock and livestock products. The balance of trade was about 3 to 1 in favor of our exports.

Of course, agricultural products are not the only ones for which the State has an interest in export markets. It is estimated that about $97 million worth of manufactured goods were exported from Kansas in 1960. The exports were comprised of transportation equipment, nonelectrical machinery, rubber and plastic products, and chemicals and allied products. There are 48 manufacturing establishments producing for export in the State, where a total of nearly 31,000 workers are employed out of a total for the State of 118,000.

These figures for agriculture and industry illustrate clearly how important an expanding export market is to the nearly 2,200,000 people living in our fair State. We cannot afford to be satisfied with our accomplishments to date in this regard. We must continue to work for even larger foreign outlets for our producers. Our agriculture and industry are the most efficient in the world, and given an opportunity, given access to the market, I am confident they can deliver the goods on a competitive basis.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech that I delivered before the League of Women Voters and other organizations on April 11 in Topeka be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON BEFORE THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS, TOPEKA, KANS., APRIL 11, 1962

Governor Landon, it is a real pleasure to have an opportunity to meet with the League of Women Voters, representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, and other civic organizations to discuss our stake in expanding foreign trade

I should like at the outset to emphasize that the Trade Expansion Act is the culmination of a series of major initiatives which the United States has taken since the war with a special bearing on our economic relations with Europe, the other major free world economic power center.

At the close of World War II, it was imperative that the United States assume the responsibility of leadership in world affairs, if our freedoms and private enterprise system were to be preserved and the spread of communism checked.

The United States was strong while most of the rest of the free world was weak and unable to meet the bare necessities of life. We had to move in first with aid, then economic and military assistance, and later with commercial trade.

Fortunately, we had gained some experience in the art of negotiating for trade during the prewar years. Thus, it was possible, through the grant of authority by the Congress to the Executive, to negotiate with friendly countries the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This was done in 1947 and we have continued to enlarge upon it. Now we have a well established organization where we can discuss all of the intricate problems of trade and negotiate for expanding markets for our goods. These negotiations not only involve changes in tariff rates, but include the removal of all sorts of barriers to the movement of goods.

As a consequence, our total trade—both exports and imports—has expanded greatly. In 1961 U.S. merchandise exports totaled slightly more than $20 billion and imports about $14.5 billion. On balance this looks very good. It would appear that we had a favorable balance of trade of about $5.6 billion. It really was not that large, because about $2.4 billion of our exports were sales for foreign currencies, donations, et cetera, and did not bring in dollars. Thus the favorable balance in dollars was only $3.2 billion, not enough to cover all of our military, economic, investment and tourist requirements abroad. Thus, we had a net balance-of-payments deficit of about $2.4 billion.

An expanded foreign trade is most important in preserving our balance of payments. Our present total gold stock is $16.9 billion, and according to the laws of the U.S. currency system, there must be $11.8 billion minimum in gold reserve.

Our balance of payments is not only dangerously low, but it is threatened with further reductions that could be disastrous.

Here are a few facts about our balance of payments:

We ship $5½ billion more in goods and services abroad annually than we purchase.

The U.S. Government spends $5 billion abroad each year.

There are $2 billion sent abroad in Government loans each year.

Our own people are sending abroad $2 billion more annually in gifts and investments.

Corporations are investing abroad $3.75 billion annually.

These items result in our balance of payments.

I bring this out in order to illustrate one of the important reasons for the need to further expand our exports. It also illustrates how important trade is in our foreign relations and our posture in world affairs.

International trade is mutually advantageous in the interest of a strong economy in the United States and in order to maintain our leadership in the pursuit of lasting peace. I have a strong conviction that trade is a key to the maintenance of peace and freedom in the noncommunistic world. In this struggle, two principle elements emerge—free world strength and free world unity.

Of course we must be militantly strong if we are to contain the armed might of the Soviet Union. But of equal importance is free world economic strength. The ability and opportunity of nations to trade—to buy, to sell, to earn—brings a vitality and vigor to a nation's economy that can be obtained in no other manner.

At the same time, such trade can contribute substantially to free world unity. Indeed, throughout history it is clear that trade relations have been and are requisite to political alliances. In simple terms—customers and suppliers are usually friends. Expanding markets—expanding sources of supply should be the keystone in the free world's struggle for peace with freedom.

Some people would say, let's control imports. We cannot afford to do this because a large share of the imported goods are raw materials for our factories, or foods which we cannot produce here. About three-fifths of the imported goods are noncompetitive and the balance are goods that Americans like to have because they are different. Also, our imports earn foreign exchange for our foreign friends who buy from us. So far we have been able to gain expanded markets for our goods by taking some of our customers' goods. Imports stimulate the development of new inventions and encourage efficiency of production here. American agriculture and industry have thrived on trade with the rest of the world.

Of the $20 billion of exports, our agriculture supplied one-fourth, or $5 billion worth, an alltime record high in both value and volume in 1961. About $3.5 billion worth were commercial dollar sales and contributed directly to improving our balance-of-payments position. The remainder, about $1.5 billion worth, was exported under special Government programs (mostly Public Law 480) such as sales for foreign currencies, barter and donations.

The potential for expanded foreign trade is of vital importance in years ahead. It is especially apparent in Western Europe, particularly in the six countries of the Common Market. We have had a taste of what prosperity can do to our export sales to that area, and we would like more of it.

During the past 5 years, our sales of farm products to EEC countries have increased 29 percent. In fiscal year 1961, our agricultural exports to EEC came to $1.1 billion, which was about one-third of our total dollar exports.

Our agricultural exports have risen to record high levels—$5 billion worth last year. Seventy percent of our agricultural exports are being sold for dollars to the more prosperous countries, such as those of the Common Market. Thirty percent are moving to the less prosperous countries under the concessional programs of food for peace.

As time goes on, we hope that this 70-30 ratio will change in the direction of more exports for dollars in proportion to exports under concessional programs.

Our domestic market for farm products will expand very little more than at a rate resulting from population growth. Foreign markets can expand at a far greater rate. Between 1950 and 1960 our domestic consumption increased 14 percent, our agricultural exports increased 84 percent. We can do better, as economic development creates new purchasing power all over the world.

Our exports represent very important markets for our farmers. The production from 60 million acres—1 out of every 6 harvested—moves abroad. Every farmer has a stake in these markets, even those who produce only for the domestic market.

If those who do produce export products cannot export them, they will either sell them here, or shift to a product that can be marketed at home.

American agriculture is the most efficient in the world and our capacity to produce is growing all the time. Our main problem is to gain access to foreign markets and have the opportunity to produce and market at prices that are competitive.

Our annual exports account for about one-half the output of wheat, cotton, rice and dry peas—about two-fifths of soybeans, tallow and hops—about one-third of raisins, tobacco and nonfat dry milk and one-fourth of dried prunes, rye and flaxseed. Other important export commodities are lard, hides and skins, variety meats, poultry, feed grains and fruits and vegetables.

In calendar 1961 we exported an unprecedented volume of wheat, 740 million bushels. This quantity almost equaled the world total international movement of wheat of a few years ago. Wheat farmers depend on export markets for more than half of their production. At the same time our exports of corn totaled nearly 300 million bushels.

These are important commodities produced in Kansas. It has been estimated that our State's share of the total exports of agricultural products amounted to $204 million. Wheat and feed grains, which Kansas produces heavily, accounted for $181 million and livestock products more than $22 million. The total represents nearly one-fifth of the market for the State's agricultural sales and about two-fifths of the market for the grains.

It has been estimated that it took slightly over 21,000 farmworkers to produce these exports or about 13 percent of the total number on Kansas farms.

In return for these important agricultural exports, Kansas' share of the competitive imports totaled $71 million—$40 million worth of field crops, and $31 million worth of livestock and livestock products. The balance of trade was about 3 to 1 in favor of our exports.

Of course, agricultural products are not the only ones for which the State has an interest in export markets. It is estimated that about $97 million worth of manufactured goods was exported from Kansas in 1960. The exports were comprised of transportation equipment, nonelectrical machinery, rubber and plastic products and chemicals and allied products. There are 48 manufacturing establishments producing for export in the State where a total of nearly 31,000 workers are employed out of a total for the State of 118,000.

These figures for agriculture and industry illustrate clearly how important an expanding export market is to the nearly 2,200,000 people living in our fair State. We cannot afford to be satisfied with our accomplishments to date in this regard. We must continue to work for even larger foreign outlets for our producers. Our agriculture and industry are the most efficient in the world and given an opportunity—given access to the market—I am confident they can deliver the goods on a competitive basis.

There is still another factor that makes expanded world trade especially important to U.S. farmers. Many supplies necessary for agriculture production can be and are imported. This helps to alleviate the serious price-cost squeeze which farmers presently are undergoing.

The squeeze on net farm income has been more from increased costs than from reduced farm receipts. In 1947, the high net farm income year, farm operators received a gross income of $34 billion, had operating expenses of $17 billion and realized an alltime high net income of $17 billion.

In 1960, by comparison, realized gross farm income was estimated at a record high of $38.1 billion. Production expenses, however, totaled $26.4 billion so that realized net farm income was $11.7 billion.

This clearly indicates that one of the major economic problems faced by farmers has been, and is, the rising cost of farm operations.

Imports can play a vital role in the solution of this problem.

There are problems, however. We face new conditions in the future and we must be prepared to meet them. One of the important new elements in the trade picture is the European Economic Community, which is known as the Common Market.

Six countries, West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg, have agreed to band together into one economic unit. Over a period of years they plan to remove all trade barriers between them—develop common external tariffs—permit a free flow of capital and labor and have a common agricultural policy. Much progress has been made in these areas since the enabling treaty was signed in 1957.

Uncle Sam must get his trading clothes on to hold his own on farm exports—especially wheat, feed grains, and poultry—to the six countries now in the European Common Market, to say nothing of others due to go into it.

It is our greatest challenge as we enter into negotiations with these countries on expanded trade.

Ever since World War II Europe has striven for self-sufficiency in agriculture. The European Common Market further encourages this.

The United States is faced with a European economic bloc as big as we are and soon to become half again as large as to population. It is one of the most highly industrialized areas in the world. Technological skills of its workers are high. It has a superb transportation system. Trade barriers between the six-member countries are in the process of erasure, as between States here. A single policy on imports from outside the ECM is being developed—as the United States has.

ECM aim is greater economic strength, higher standards of living, and greater prosperity through free trade and free movement of capital and workers among its members and a united trade front to outsiders.

Their agriculture is generally less efficient than American. Of 9 million farms in the six countries, over 5 million have 12 acres or less. Many are scattered, limiting the use of machinery. Livestock products make up 70 percent of output, compared to about 60 percent here. But in Europe, as in the United States, farm output is increasing faster than population.

On July 1, variable import levies will be made by each country, the preference for trade between European Common Market countries. These import levies threaten free movement of agricultural products.

The fear in farm circles is that agriculture may get sold down the river in favor of industry in the coming trading and that fear is justified. The fear is that the State Department—which doesn't understand agriculture and has quaint and contradictory notions about farmers—will not press for a trade program in behalf of agriculture.

What is the significance of these developments to the United States? In 1960–61 the United States exported $1.1 billion worth of agricultural products and $2.4 billion worth of nonagricultural products to these six countries. Practically all of these exports were for dollars and as a unit constitutes our largest dollar market. It is a very important market for wheat, feed grains, soybeans, cotton, tobacco, fruits, livestock products, and many different kinds of industrial goods.

While we exported $3.5 billion worth of goods to the "Six"—we imported only $2.1 billion worth from them. Thus the balance of trade was in our favor in the magnitude of $1.4 billion or nearly one-half of our total net dollar trade.

In 1961 the United Kingdom, Norway, Denmark, Ireland, and Greece indicated interest in joining the Common Market and others are considering some kind of association in order to obtain the advantage of free trade. Thus, it is obvious that the community can become one of the strongest economic units in the world. It could embrace a population of over 300 million and a tremendous market for our goods.

This is not to overlook the opportunities for trade with such important markets as Canada, Japan, and Latin America. Then there are the emerging nations which we are helping through our foreign aid program to get started on economic development and we hope become good dollar markets eventually.

With these great opportunities open to us in the future, we must be prepared to make the most of them. To do this, we must be able to negotiate for lower trade barriers and a freer flow of trade. Since the Common Market countries will eventually have no trade barriers between them, we shall have to be tough negotiators, with ample flexibility to get the external barriers down if we wish to compete in that growing market.

We shall have an especially difficult negotiating problem in the field of agriculture. There are indications that the European Economic Community will eventually have a common agricultural policy which provides for price supports on grains and livestock products. In order to protect these price supports, the plan calls for variable fees on imports. The idea is to set the fees equal to the difference between the support price and the world price. Such fees will make it very difficult for our products to get in.

To counteract this, the Executive will need authority to negotiate for limitations on these fees. If we can keep the fees relatively low, their price support will have to be at reasonable levels and there will be less tendency for them to expand domestic production.

In addition to this, we need to give the President the power which he is asking to adjust tariff rates to a substantial degree in return for tariff concessions by other countries on our commodities. I think this is particularly essential in the case of agricultural commodities like wheat and feed grains, where there will apparently be some reluctance on the part of Common Market countries to adjust import restrictions.

It has been suggested, and I agree, that in passing legislation giving the President tariff powers, that provisions be included which will direct him to use these powers in reducing trade restrictions on agricultural commodities in Common Market countries.

I think it is apparent from what we know of the Common Market situation that this program can be either a shield or a sword, depending on how we use it, as far as the expansion of our agricultural trade in Western Europe is concerned. If we go at the matter constructively and effectively, there is a good chance to maintain, or even increase, our exports into the Common Market countries. If we fail to do this, however, there exists the possibility of losing a considerable part of one of the best export outlets which we have for agricultural commodities now in surplus.

What is inspiring about the Common Market is its power to move men's preoccupation away from narrow nationalism. If we choose to sit on the sidelines and do nothing, we could watch the Common Market—as enlarged—further divide the free world. If, on the other hand, we seize its logic and apply it broadly, we can play our part in the creation of a community of free nations that can grow beyond our dreams. Only such a strong community is capable of meeting the requirements of the underdeveloped countries—of offering a magnet to the peoples back of the Iron Curtain. The adventure could be what the West needs to recover its spirit over the next two decades.

In conclusion, let me say I think we should push forward for an expanding foreign trade program. The Congress is considering such a program and, although there are many complex problems to consider, I am confident that we shall provide the Executive with a sound and workable authority. It is one of the most important pieces of legislation before the Congress this session.

I trust that all of you will study it and give it your full support. It is important to Kansas agriculture and industry and to the Nation.

ABOLISHMENT OF RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD DIVISIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the President's proposal that four Reserve and four National Guard divisions be abolished came as a shock to the members of the organizations and our citizens generally.

The 35th Division was organized in World War I and has a great record of service in World War I and World War II. It seems most unfortunate that a division with this background should have been selected for deactivation.

The 35th Division, based on the rating by the Army itself, is in a group of 9 ahead of 12 other divisions.

Gen. George S. Patton in World War II called the 35th Division the best infantry division in that war.

When this matter is before the Senate, it is my hope that we will be able not only to retain the 35th Division, but take a good look at the proposed reductions in our military strength at this uncertain time in our Nation's history.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial, entitled "A Dubious Plan To Slash the National Guard," which appeared in the April 6 issue of the Kansas City Times, be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DUBIOUS PLAN TO SLASH NATIONAL GUARD

The Pentagon plan to break up four Reserve and four National Guard divisions—including the famous 35th Guard Division of Missouri and Kansas—leaves a great deal to be explained. As outlined by the Army so far, the proposed "realinement" would abolish units with fine service traditions and outstanding record in both World Wars. This would be done in the name of "streamlining" and "modernization."

This area's particular concern is the intended slashing of the 35th Division. But disturbing questions are suggested about the plan in general as well as about the 35th in particular. Thus:

Why was the 35th one of the four Guard divisions named for dismantling? Last year the Missouri-Kansas outfit was rated in the first 10 or the 27 Guard divisions for efficiency and general merit.

Why is the Army disregarding its own rating system for combat readiness? The present priority places the 35th in a group of 9 ahead of 12 other divisions.

Was sufficient thought given to the outstanding records of the divisions marked for extinction? The 35th fought brilliantly through five World War II campaigns in Europe. Gen. George S. Patton called it the best infantry division in this Third Army.

What about the morale problem that scrapping these divisions would create? Members of separate State brigades would have no idea of their divisional command setup in a future war. They would have to start from scratch in building brigade traditions and esprit de corps. Moreover, fewer guardsmen would be available for State duty in the event of natural disasters or riots.

Does this latest approach not simply reflect a longtime Pentagon ambition to reduce the size of the Army Reserve and National Guard? There have been rumors that complaints by some of the 156,000 reservists called up last fall would be cited as cause for a sweeping reorganization. But the basic fault here lies not in the Reserve-Guard structure but in a patchwork manpower system based on the draft. Virtually all of the complainers were young men who were ordered back into uniform as individual replacements. They were not active members of civilian military units.

Congress repeatedly has rebuffed Pentagon attempts to reduce the size of the Guard and the Army Reserve. We trust that Congress will take a highly skeptical look at this new attempt to cut the overall strength of the civilian components by some 58,000. It is a broadax approach which has yet to be justified.

RAILROAD MERGERS

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I support Senate bill 3097, which recently was introduced by my good friend, Senator Estes Kefauver. This proposed legislation would defer decisions by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to large rail mergers until 1964, so that Congress may investigate and determine whether such vast mergers should go forward as presently proposed, and what additional standards and criteria should be effectuated in order to assure the American people that such railroad mergers are, in fact, in the public interest.

Mr. President, the introduction of Senate bill 3097, which would amend the Clayton Antitrust Act, was a wise decision on the part of the chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. Senator Kefauver has developed a persuasive record, in his statements on the Senate floor, that there is need for deferral of action by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to these vital economic and social issues, in order to insure that they will be settled according to the best interests of the public.

I am not opposed to rail mergers, as such. Certain kinds of mergers may well result in improved financial conditions and better service. What I am concerned with is this apparent "crash program" by the country's largest railroads to combine themselves in the direction of regional monopoly, by eliminating competition, reducing trackage, schedules, and facilities, and laying off many workers who have dedicated their lives to transportation. I am not sure that these directions of mergers which are being proposed by the railroads are best for the stimulation of our economic growth, the protection of our national defense, and the maintenance of our competitive free-enterprise system. I know that many of my colleagues are beginning to share this apprehension, and to note the vital need for time in which appropriate committees of Congress can make a thorough investigation into the economic feasibility of these giant mergers and their possible anticompetitive and monopolistic effect upon American industry.

I am informed that the Interstate Commerce Commission, through a staff study by its economic experts, has in effect questioned whether it presently has sufficient criteria and adequate tests in order to determine that these large railroad mergers are, in fact, in the public interest. Furthermore, in his recent challenging transportation message to the Congress, the President specifically recognized the administration's responsibility to recommend more specific guidelines and procedures to be followed with respect to these mergers, and indicated that he had formed a special group, with representatives of a number of agencies, including the Department of Justice, to formulate new administration policies on mergers and to develop a "Government position" before the regulatory agencies. In addition, the President proposed far-reaching changes with respect to rate regulation, subsidization of carriers, tax-depreciation schedules, and other actions which he believes will stimulate a healthier and more competitive national transportation network. Certainly the Congress should have the time to study the President's recommendations, as well as to analyze the need for new policy in the Interstate Commerce Commission before any final decisions are reached with respect to the gigantic consolidations which are being proposed.

Mr. President, one of the most crucial aspects of this rail and airlines merger movement is the fact that it, in one way or another, will affect substantially every State, every community, and every region of the country. I have already begun to receive expressions of grave concern from persons in my own State.

Just recently, the very able Governor of Colorado, Stephen L. R. McNichols, wrote to Senator Kefauver and myself, urging that mergers and consolidations should not be considered as a panacea for solving railroad problems, and that care should be exercised in assuring that no mergers will result in a weakening or deterioration of service to a territory, such as Colorado, which vitally depends upon such service. Governor McNichols expressed the hope that Congress will devote careful attention to the merger problem and will effectuate a national transportation policy which will not allow the "cannibalization of railroads" for the sake of more profits, and to the disadvantage to public service. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter of Governor McNichols printed in full in the Record, following my remarks.

I have also received an excellent letter from R. E. Carroll, chairman of the general grievance committee, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Denver, Colo., which strongly supports the proposition that Congress should move to stop action on railroad mergers until it can develop a new national policy with respect to them. Mr. Carroll particularly expresses his concern with respect to weakening of our national defense which may be caused by the mergers presently proposed. Again, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Carroll's letter be printed in the Record, following these remarks.

A third most thoughtful letter, written by Mr. J. T. Weber, chairman, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Lodge No. 32, Pueblo, Colo., will also be of interest to Senators. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full in the Record, following my remarks.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I recommend that my colleagues give thought to joining me in cosponsoring this important bill, and that the Congress move with utmost speed to obtain a deferral of these important merger plans, and begin a thorough study of the effects of rail and airline mergers and the development of a national transportation merger policy.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Denver, Colo.,
March 28, 1962.

Hon. Estes Kefauver,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kefauver: It was with a great deal of interest that I read your remarks in the Congressional Record of January 17, 1962, regarding the proposed merger of the New York Central Railroad and the Pennsylvania Railroad.

As the Governor of a State that depends entirely upon land surface transportation, and upon air, with no navigable waterways, the problems of railroads of America—and especially in the West—are of grave concern.

By virtue of the fact that our rail system is a somewhat integrated system nationally, and most certainly is integrated in the eastern, western, and southern areas of our country, the policy of the Federal Government on national transportation—and especially concerning rails—does vitally affect this State.

Not only is it important to us from the point of view of transportation of commodities, both into and out of Colorado, but the general condition of railroads is also vital to us, insofar as the well-being of the railroads rendering local service in Colorado is concerned.

Although we do not have a blanket objection to mergers as such, neither do we believe that blind adulation for mergers or consolidations provide a panacea that will solve all of the railroads problems. Undoubtedly there are instances where some consolidation, merger, or elimination of wasteful duplication of facilities may afford some relief in specific instances. We are convinced, however, that care must be exercised in assuring that mergers or consolidations, for mergers sake, should not be accomplished, which may result in a weakening or deterioration of service to a territory that vitally needs the service. It must be remembered that historically railroads are considered as utilities, and that their primary function is the public service. The public interest is of at least equal importance with the balance sheet.

We sincerely trust that Members of the Congress who have a deep concern over the public interest will devote careful attention to this problem of mergers or consolidations of railroads, and assure that a national transportation policy will evolve that does not allow the cannibalization of railroads, simply for the sake of more profits, to the redounding disadvantage to the public requiring the service.

I am pleased to add my hearty support to you to assure that this end will be accomplished.

Kindest personal regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

STEVE MCNICHOLS.

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Denver, Colo., March 22, 1962.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARROLL: We are quite concerned and alarmed over the number of proposed railroad mergers now pending and those being contemplated; and we agree completely with the position of Senator KEFAUVER as stated in his recent letter to the President.

He pointed out that the ICC, which now has complete authority to grant mergers, has not only encouraged, but actually has invited them, indicating that the carriers themselves should have the authority to determine the directions such mergers should go.

We are especially concerned about the effect of mergers on our national defense. You know, as do we railroaders, that the present condition of the Nation's railroads has weakened our defensive position. We have no reserve passenger or freight equipment, nor power, with which to move our Armed Forces and materials in the event of war. Other facilities and trackage have been eliminated to such a degree as to impair our position. The threat of war exists today very strongly, so why should we agree to make further consolidations, eliminate facilities and service at a time when, in the interest of national safety, we should be doing just the opposite?

At the present we have no established or coordinated policy, no standards established for the purpose of setting up a strong and efficent railroad transportation system. It is necessary to preserve competition on the rails, also, alternate and adequate routes over which to move our servicemen and supplies in case of war; and just as important to fully service our rapidly growing economy in time of peace.

We sincerely agree with the proposition that Congress should intervene by taking the proper action to stop all mergers and hearings in connection thereof, until such time as a national policy can be adopted, together with the establishment of a proper tribunal, which can evaluate merger petitions in an unbiased manner for the good and safety of our Nation as a whole instead of the monopolistic-minded Wall Street dealers.

We feel confident that you are fully aware of this danger, that you feel as we do and that you will do everything possible to subjugate proposed mergers and consolidations to our national interests.

Best wishes.

Very truly yours,

R. E. CARROLL,
General Chairman.

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Pueblo, Colo.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Nation's newspapers along with our own paper the Trainsmen's News is full of mergers of railroads. We all know that any of these mergers will not help the community in which the railroads involved serves. Not to mention the number of railroad workers that would be placed on the unemployment roles. It is the opinion of this writer, that the Interstate Commerce Commission is more than ready, willing, and able to give favorable consideration to any and all merger proposals.

I have read that Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has complained to the President of the United States, the immediate danger of mergers to the American economy.

The recent announcement of the proposed New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroad merger would create a huge monopolistic combination of financial power which would only result in a snowballing of other large consolidations.

I urge and will appreciate your taking the necessary action to stop all railroad mergers immediately for a period of at least 2 years, or until such time as they can enact remedial legislation or establish a national transportation policy.

You have never let us down in the past so I know that you will do your best to stop this slaughter of railroaders' jobs.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES T. WEBER,
Local Chairman, B. of R.T. Lodge No. 32.

ED C. JOHNSON REPORTS ON MEDICARE

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, one of Colorado's most respected elder statesmen is Edwin Carl Johnson. "Big Ed," as he is known to tens of thousands of Coloradans, has twice served his State as Governor, and was a distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate for three terms, ending in 1954. He is personally known and highly regarded by people in every mountain town and city neighborhood and crossroads community across the State.

If there is anything that the people of Colorado know about "Big Ed" Johnson, it is that he has no use for socialism in any way, shape, or form. He is a hardy, rugged individualist, a truly independent thinker. He has always detested the idea of socialized medicine, and has always said so.

Recently, I was privileged to meet with "Big Ed" and the President of the United States, to discuss the question of medical care for the aged.

President Kennedy was delighted to see his old friend and colleague of the Senate, and expressed in warm and glowing terms his sincere thanks to Ed Johnson for his willingness to lead a grassroots educational campaign within Colorado on medical care for the elderly.

The President stated that no one was more qualified by experience and background to make a fair and objective appraisal of this subject. And of course this is entirely true.

"Big Ed" is superbly qualified, because he was one of the earliest proponents of Colorado's pioneering old-age assistance program, begun in the 1930's, and recognized as one of the Nation's finest. During his last term as Governor, in 1956, he sparked the successful campaign to amend the State constitution, so as to provide a nonsocialistic program of medical care for the needy aged—one of the first and most effective programs of its kind to be developed by the States.

The Rocky Mountain News of Denver, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, published an unusual document on March 30. It was a letter written by Ed C. Johnson to his nephew, a Colorado physician, discussing the President's medicare program.

Mr. President, I have repeatedly declared my own strong opposition to socialized medicine. I have never had any use for the idea, and never have hesitated to say so. I urge that every Member of the Senate and the House read this letter carefully for Ed Johnson's nonpartisan, independent views, independently arrived at. He has no ax to grind, except as a proven friend of the elderly. He will be working on his own time and at his own expense to inform the Colorado public on this vitally important program.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter by Ed C. Johnson, published under the title "Medicare Not Socialization," in the Rocky Mountain News of March 30.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICARE NOT SOCIALIZATION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Former Senator and Governor, Ed C. Johnson, in his capacity as President Kennedy's Colorado medicare adviser, sent the following clarifying note to his nephew, Dr. William A. Hines of Denver. The News publishes the letter because of its definitive and analytical value in weighing merits of the controversial program.)

(By Ed C. Johnson)

As you know my pet peeve has been and is socialized medicine.

I want no part of it now or ever. From current gossip, I had been led to believe that S. 909 is merely a new version of that black art.

To my surprise I find that it is nothing of the kind. It deals only with hospitalization and nursing and has absolutely nothing to do with medical practice or medical treatment as such. It leaves the doctors alone and does nothing to them or for them.

It is a compulsory hospitalization plan for persons covered by social security and is made available to them after the age of 65.

The facts of life prove that persons over the age of 65 are exceedingly vulnerable to the need of hospital care and that very few of them have funds to meet this grave risk. Human beings are notorious for their failure to make provisions for hospital care in their old age. If there is one area where compulsion is necessary this is it.

GREAT VIRTUE

All insurance has great virtue. It stabilizes communities and makes it possible for life to go on. We owe it to ourselves to insure against every kind of disaster. Sensible people insure against fire, theft, accidents and death.

Banks have the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which costs the taxpayers nothing. Very prudently some States compel automobile insurance.

However, only a few human beings voluntarily insure against the greatest and most humiliating risk of all—diseases. Consequently we are caught short financially when suddenly, out of a clear blue sky, hospitalization is necessary to save our lives.

In recent years hospitalization costs have soared into the stratosphere and we are told they will go higher. Good dependable nursing is the physicians' and surgeons' right hand.

It enables them to treat more effectively 10 times as many patients as they could without it. Limitations on hospital care due to the financial capacity of their patients places a serious limitation on them and their services.

Hospital care does not dominate them or their services. Doctors dominate the hospital care instead and the supporters of the King-Anderson bill want that domination over the hospitals to continue unabated and without Federal or State interference.

END OF LINE

By 1968 under the gradual rising scale of social security taxes already levied by Congress, social security taxes including the one-half of 1 percent proposed tax levied on the employers and the employee by the King-Anderson bill will reach a total of 10 percent of the payroll.

I do not believe the people would go for more payroll taxes than 10 percent. That fact effectively closes the door on social security expansion.

I favor enthusiastically the insurance plan now under study by the American Medical Association and Blue Shield to cover the cost of doctors for retired persons.

The Kerr-Mills Act is another splendid venture in this field. It authorizes the States to provide medical care programs for their aging indigent people. Under this act the Government contributes 50 to 80 percent of its total cost. The States and the Government finance such expenditures out of compulsory taxation.

SPLENDID PROTECTION

In 1956 under my administration as Governor of Colorado a $10 million-a-year medical program was developed. It led all States in this new field.

However, due to a technicality in the Federal law the $4.5 million available to Colorado was not added to Colorado's $10 million medical program. That grievous error should be corrected. Colorado senior citizens need this additional medical care the Kerr-Mills Act intended they have.

The Kerr-Mills Act plus the King-Anderson insurance plan for social security members should give Colorado splendid protection. Both programs are needed. They complement each other.

In this State 20,000 recipients of old age pensions also receive some benefits under social security but the total received from both programs is held to the payments which Colorado would provide if there were no social security contributions.

PROBLEMS OF THE STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Nation, our citizenry, was just as stunned as was our President when steel industry management decided to increase the price of steel by $6 on the ton.

As our President said in his news conference, the increase constituted a wholly unjustifiable and irresponsible defiance of the public interest.

Since almost 20 percent of the Nation's steel is produced in the great State of Indiana, I personally am vitally interested in the steel industry and its problems. These problems were aggravated by steel management after it was generally understood, when the steel contract was signed just a few days ago, that this action was a giant step forward to prevent another inflationary spiral. Then the giant of the basic industries, steel, decided to forego all of this for a possible increase in profit.

I should like to point out that in the Senate, and before the decision was made to rescind the price increase, I asked my friends in the steel industry to "reexamine their position." I asked them to think back.

Today, I am pleased to see that they did "reexamine their position," and that the price increase was rescinded.

Let us not be too harsh on anyone—management, labor, or whomever—on this vital problem. Perhaps the fault lies partly within the Halls of Congress for our not having recognized a need of the steel industry—and other industries—to have the opportunity to reinvest their capital in new equipment enabling them to keep pace with—or move ahead of—their oversea competitors.

Perhaps the renowned columnist Walter Lippmann has the answer, as he said so eloquently last week in his column, copyrighted for the New York Herald Tribune, Inc. He said that if he read the situation correctly, this problem "has become so acute that the company management felt itself driven to its rude and arbitrary rush for relief."

Mr. Lippmann suggested that perhaps we should address ourselves not only to the bad manners of the company management, but also to the "grinding reality of our declining industrial supremacy, which is at the root of the whole affair."

Assuming that Mr. Lippmann may be right, I should like to remind the Senate that on January 31, 1961, I introduced proposed legislation calling for reinvestment depreciation to alleviate a problem such as this. S. 720, which has since been introduced as of April 10, 1962, as an amendment to H.R. 10650, calls for business to be able to reinvest its capital into its business—by actually spending the capital—and thus to remove outmoded and obsolete equipment.

We in this country seem to have taken the attitude that so long as a wheel will turn, let it turn. But turning wheels, if they are old and tired, soon give out, and the only alternative to alleviating the problem is to gear our industries to new methods and new ways, if we are to maintain our industrial supremacy throughout the world.

Mr. Lippmann pointed out, just as I have been doing, that while Europe and Japan were rebuilding their ruined industries, we rested on a comparatively low rate of capital investment and enjoyed an enormous production of consumer goods.

Now, along with the British, who have a similar problem, we find ourselves with a comparatively low rate of growth due mainly to our low rate of capital investment—and in most cases a comparatively obsolescent plant.

Permit me to point out once again, just as was done here last week by so many Senators, that this action cannot and must not go unnoticed. However, let us also reexamine the statement of United States Steel, in which it was said:

> If the products of United States Steel are to compete successfully in the marketplace, then the plants and facilities which make those products must be as modern and efficient as the low-cost mills which abound abroad and as the plants which turn out competing products here at home. Only by generating the funds necessary to keep these facilities fully competitive can our company continue to provide its customers with a dependable source of steel, and to provide its employees with dependable jobs.

Perhaps the position of United States Steel along this line is justifiable. But I say to the management of United States Steel that the proposed increase in price per ton of $6 was not the answer to competition. It is not the answer to gaining more money for investment. The answer lies in a realistic depreciation allowance—long overdue in this Nation.

Congress has not recognized the need for a realistic depreciation allowance since the 1930's. Japan has. West Germany has. Our good and wonderful neighbor to the north, Canada, has.

Canada again has recognized the need for giving her industries an opportunity to expand. In his message of the budget, the Canadian Minister of Finance, the Honorable Donald M. Fleming, called for a further reduction in corporate tax rates to the extent of 50 percent of the increase in sales on the first $50,000 of taxable income and to the extent of 25 percent of the increase in sales on all over that amount.

Already the corporate tax rates in Canada are 21 percent on the first $35,000 and 50 percent on the excess. In the United States, our corporate tax rates are 30 percent on the first $25,000 and 52 percent on all over that amount.

Since we are not in a position to revise downward our corporate income tax structure, it is imperative we have a realistic stimulus for the expansion of industry, for the purchase of new machinery and equipment, such as reinvestment depreciation.

Therefore, I merely say that not only am I glad that steel management reexamined its position of April 10, which was to increase the price of steel. They did think back. I am asking that Members of Congress also reexamine their position on depreciation allowances. I am asking that we also do some reflecting—and think back.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE FUTURE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently, I read an article about the U.N., written by the Honorable Chester Bowles, and published in Yale Political for February 1962. As usual, I was most impressed with Ambassador Bowles' stimulating thoughts.

It is my belief that sometimes, both the friends and foes of the U.N. make the same mistake by expecting too much from the U.N. In his challenging article, Mr. Bowles very correctly points out:

> The new world with which we must deal is one of infinite complexity in which instant solutions are rarely available. We represent only 6 percent of mankind and even with all our great industries and military power, there are strict limitations on what we can do.

Mr. President, the U.N. may be imperfect, but it is the best we have and absolutely necessary, not only for our own national interest and welfare, but for the world as a whole. The world is far less Red and less dead with its United Nations than it would be without it.

I share Ambassador Bowles' view that:

> Despite its aching conflicts, the real world of 1962 is no place for a Cassandra. Although the future is exceedingly dangerous, its hopeful possibilities are infinite. If we are to understand the prospects and problems of the U.N. in this world of conflicting danger and hope, we must understand the forces at work in it.

Mr. President, in view of the debate concerning U.N. bonds which recently took place in the Chamber, I believe that this article, entitled "The Future of the U.N." is especially timely and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE OF THE U.N.

(By Hon. Chester Bowles)

This has been the most critical year in the history of the United Nations.

The institution has been the target of two great assaults, each of which alone could have wrecked it for all time.

The first of these assaults was the deliberate attempt of the Soviet Union to take advantage of the death of Dag Hammerskjold by imposing the troika on the new Secretary General.

The second assault derived from the tragic situation in the Congo where a bold and daring U.N. effort to avoid the injection of the cold war into the heart of Africa appeared likely, at one point, to fail through lack of support.

Yet the Soviet attempt at international sabotage did not succeed. Nor has the U.N. disintegrated in the African jungle.

On the contrary, the central fact about both these crises, with their vast implications for the future, is that the U.N. has emerged from them not only alive, but more vigorous than ever.

Yet the world it faces has never appeared so overwhelmingly complex, so agonizingly insecure, and so desperately at odds.

Despite its aching conflicts, I believe that the real world of 1962 is no place for a Cassandra. Although the future is exceedingly dangerous, its hopeful possibilities are infinite. If we are to understand the prospects and problems of the United Nations in this world of conflicting danger and hope, we must understand the forces at work in it.

We are contending with two mighty rival tides, running at cross current. At times these two tides seem so contradictory that we are tempted to conclude that one is the reality and the other an illusion.

On the one hand, we have the massive tide of cold war conflict. This is the world of barbed wire and stone walls, of sneak raids in the jungle and threats of nuclear destruction, the world of violence, distrust and fear, of standoff and fallout.

This rampaging tide of cold war conflict has dominated the headlines since Stalin first threatened Greece and Turkey in 1946.

And yet, parallel to the arms race, coexistent with tension, and largely obscured from public understanding, another tide has been running toward freedom, toward hope, toward increased understanding and justice among nations and men.

What are the components of this less dramatic but perhaps decisive tide of human effort?

First is the movement toward national independence through which 900 million Asians and Africans have thrown off the rule of the old European trading empires to create 42 new countries within 15 years. This wave of liberation may earn more pages in the history of our time than the cold war itself.

The second aspect of this hopeful tide is the worldwide determination to attack the hunger, disease, and despair which for centuries have been the lot of the vast majority of the people of the underdeveloped world.

Until recently, the United States was one of a handful of noncolonial nations engaged in oversea aid. Now some 15 industrialized nations are offering their capital and technical skills to help speed the progress of economic and social development in the less developed areas. Much of this assistance is now being coordinated through regional and international institutions.

A third hopeful phenomenon has been the rapid emergence of new international communities of sovereign states which are learning to work in free association for common purposes.

Since the end of World War II there has been a great reaching out across national frontiers, a groping for new forms of international cooperation, and the sudden appearance of new institutions in what remains an unplanned and still embryonic world community.

Now let us consider the United Nations. How does it relate to these twin tides of conflict and hope?

In our frustration with the complex and largely unfamiliar world around us there is a temptation even among the most thoughtful and informed observers to see the possibilities only in terms of the black and white contrasts.

The task of dealing with varying shades of gray is unfamiliar, uncomfortable, and unsatisfactory to many Americans. Our experience in building this great Nation has conditioned us to believe that there are only two sides to every question, one right and one wrong; that if there are problems, there must be solutions; that if there is struggle, there must be total victory for one and total defeat for the other.

This "all or nothing" attitude is a vital part of the American character and one which has given us much of the special energy and determination which have typified our country since its earliest days.

However, the new world with which we must deal is one of infinite complexity in which simple solutions are rarely available. We represent only 6 percent of mankind, and even with all our great industries and military power there are strict limitations on what we can do.

It is inevitable that Americans who fail to understand the complexities with which the United Nations must deal should charge that this great world organization has failed to do what it was set up to do.

At the same time, however, another aspect of the American character is helping to move us toward the mature understanding of possibilities and limitations which is basic to an effective foreign policy. I refer to our traditional appreciation of variety, to our acceptance of the give-and-take of honest differences, to our belief that a healthy society thrives not on conformity but on diversity.

This is the spirit which we must bring to all we attempt to accomplish in our troubled world. To behave otherwise by creating our own rigid doctrinaire orthodoxy, as do the apostles of modern-day Marxism, would be gravely to weaken our capacity to bring our great influence effectively to bear on the agonizing questions which confront us all.

As President Kennedy said last September in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly, "We cannot expect that all nations will adopt like systems, for conformity is the jailer of freedom and the enemy of growth."

An added dimension to the sheer complexity of the challenge is the often overlooked fact that there are not one but many threats to the peace.

In the Middle East, in south Asia, in the Caribbean, even in Africa, there are stubborn and dangerous conflicts and belligerent confrontations which have nothing to do with the cold war.

If the super powers were by some magic to settle their differences tomorrow, some half dozen conflicts would remain which could produce a very sizable war at any moment. And while missiles which carry thermonuclear warheads are incredibly more destructive than World War II field artillery, their aggressive use to promote national ambitions is no easier to justify. A man is just as dead when killed by a bullet as by a bomb.

The new nations of Africa and Asia are properly alarmed by the dangerous implications of the big-power nuclear arms race. But they should not forget that they, too, may have contributions to make to the peace of the world in their own backyards.

Now what is the record of the United Nations judged against this complex and difficult background? Certainly its development has not followed the lines laid down in 1945. The hopes for unity among the world's great powers, so tenuously constructed during World War II, failed even to survive the first years of the postwar world.

But in considering the changes of function and emphasis which grew out of the cold war situation, let us be frank.

If it had not been assumed that the United Nations would be dominated by the Security Council in which we have the veto, the U.S. Senate never would have voted to join. Yet within a few years the United States and a majority of the members found ways around the veto power, and it was this that made it possible for the United Nations to develop its capacity for executive action.

The Soviet response to this movement to transform the United Nations into a functioning world organization, capable of united action in an emergency, is recorded in its 95 vetoes, in its efforts to cripple the Secretariat, and in Mr. Khrushchev's belligerent statement of last spring in which he said he would use armed force to prevent the U.N. from carrying out any decision with which the Soviet Union did not agree.

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that much of what the U.N. has accomplished has been accomplished without the participation and frequently over the opposition of the Soviet Union.

And yet in spite of the determined opposition of one of its most powerful members, the U.N., and its family of specialized agencies, has acted with increasing vigor and imagination. Let us briefly consider the remarkable accomplishments of some of these new agencies.

The World Health Organization, for example, is now conducting a worldwide campaign to eliminate malaria, a disease which has caused more deaths and more loss of work than any other in history. It also has launched a campaign to help bring clean water to every village on the globe.

Last year the United Nations Children's Fund with 9 governments participating, brought better care to 55 million expectant and nursing mothers. It also examined 75 million children for yaws, at an average cost of 15 cents a head.

The World Meteorological Organization is planning a worldwide weather reporting system. The International Telecommunications Union now allocates radio frequencies for the whole world.

In addition there is the equally effective work of the other specialized agencies of the technical assistance program, of the special fund, and the new and promising program for recruiting expert personnel for the developing countries. Each of these U.N. agencies is handling tasks which were barely conceivable a generation ago.

Moreover, in every field regional economic and social cooperation through binational and multinational agreements is matched by the development of vigorously creative U.N. regional agencies such as ECAFE—the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East—and ECLA—the Economic Commission for Latin America.

The capacity of the United Nations itself for positive political and economic action has been demonstrated in the Congo during the past year.

When the Congo threatened to fall apart in the summer of 1960, many of the 9,000 European experts who had been managing the productive facilities, the public services, and the technical branches of the economy packed up and went home.

A tiny corps of some 200 United Nations experts, most of them drawn hurriedly from the U.N. Secretariat and the Specialized Agencies, was organized to fill the gap. These international public servants faced a situation in which starvation was claiming scores of people every day, unemployment was rampant, government revenues and exports and reserves were falling, inflation was mounting, and public services were disrupted.

By late 1960 a semblance of order had begun to emerge from the chaos; epidemics were checked, and starvation ended. Somehow, under incredibly difficult circumstances, this United Nations team of technicians and advisers managed to get the wheels turning again.

Then began an even more important task: the long-range job of helping the Congolese to train their own administrative and technical personnel and to create their own institutions. The results appear promising.

The Congo also illustrates the U.N. capacity to act politically to create a more solid base for peace and security. There is no need to remind Yale Political readers of the remarkable performance of the United Nations in throwing together under the most difficult and urgent circumstances an emergency force of nearly 20,000 men drawn from 28 countries.

The ability of this organization to mobilize, transport, supply, and command a major peace-keeping force on short notice exceeded almost everyone's expectations. I believe events will show the tough decisions required by the Congo effort were correctly taken.

Finally, in addition to promoting economic and social progress and keeping the peace, the United Nations has served with considerable effectiveness as an international forum for the airing of disputes.

Although its detractors refer to this function as a debating society, the debates which take place there, in spite of the bitterness and demagogery with which they are often conducted, are of the utmost importance.

The issues that come before the United Nations are the oldest and most intractable issues of history which cannot be effectively aired in any other arena.

The annual agenda therefore is no less than the agenda of mankind's most pressing problems in the second half of the 20th century. To mention only a few:

How can we create machinery for keeping the peace?

How can we strengthen the concept of international law?

How can we secure outer space for peaceful use?

How can we wipe out the poverty that breeds hatred and upheaval?

How can we better protect human rights and promote a greater measure of justice?

It is true that answers so far have been few and far between. But isn't it a long step toward international sanity to be able to debate them in a worldwide forum in which every viewpoint is represented, and where world opinion can be brought to bear?

Cynics deny even the existence of world opinion, and cynical nations do not hesitate to flaunt it. Yet whatever leader or nation consistently disregards the opinion of mankind will eventually pay, and as time goes on, I believe that the price he pays will become higher.

How then can we assess the United Nations record and potential?

Clearly we cannot say that it has abolished the threat of war or even that it has narrowed the gap of disagreement among the world's great powers.

Yet the record is in many ways extraordinary. Although sorely hampered by the vast ideological struggle which commands the unflagging energies of freemen everywhere, the United Nations has somehow grown and developed by associating itself ever more effectively with the powerful currents of hope.

Where great issues of justice have been raised, it has served as a meetinghouse for the opinion of all humanity.

Where violence has threatened, it has time and again proved its growing capacity to divert the pressures and to preserve the peace.

Where peoples have been striving for an end to the tyranny of poverty, it has opened new paths for the indispensable cooperation in the battle against human misery.

We live in a raucous, restless, ill-mannered world in which a community of hope exists side by side with a community of fear. The cold war conflict is paralleled by a growing partnership between the United States and the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It is this evolving world which helps shape the United Nations and which, increasingly, may be shaped by it.

Indeed, I believe there is solid basis for a measured optimism about the future of this great world organization.

The new and growing nations, which now form the majority of the United Nations, most urgently need its protection and its help. Why should these nations act to weaken or destroy the international institutional arrangements which are providing them security, economic aid and the opportunity to make their views heard?

For them the United Nations Charter is the best guarantee of their right to develop their own nations in their own way.

No, the United Nations is not likely to be destroyed by the majority of its members, however recklessly determined they may sometimes appear to do precisely that. Nor are we likely to destroy or weaken it by our failure to provide the necessary support and the leadership.

President Kennedy put it very simply and directly when he declared to the General Assembly: "Today of all days our dedication to the charter must be maintained."

The record has shown that from one crisis to another the United Nations has steadily developed an ever greater capacity for action.

As future crises appear, I believe this capacity to act will continue to grow. For in a world polarized by two great military giants, conciliation, mediation, or intervention by the U.N. represents the principal alternative to direct East-West confrontations at almost every crisis point.

For this reason alone, it is very much in the interest of the United States, as well as the smaller nations, to support the U.N. as an instrument of peace.

By the same token, the Soviets, who unfortunately believe they can best achieve their totalitarian goals by fomenting trouble, will continue in the future to oppose an effective U.N.

In this contest we have the advantage. For unlike the Communists what we want for the rest of the world is what they want for themselves—individual dignity, self-government, and material welfare.

The U.N. is reaching for these same goals through three principal channels.

It has become an effective instrument of political action in many difficult military situations.

It has become an incomparable forum for discussion of regional and worldwide problems, for educating the newly emerging countries of the world, and for demonstrating to Americans the complex global situations that confront us.

And lastly, through its technical and developmental programs it has become an organization through which the economic and social revolution now sweeping the world can be peacefully channeled.

This is not to say the U.N. has not had its disappointments. It has and it will undoubtedly have more. But in the words of President Eisenhower: "It is clear that without the United Nations the failures would still have been written as failures into history. And certainly, without this organization the victories could not have been achieved."

Let us therefore rededicate ourselves to maintaining the vision to which the United Nations has always aspired—of a world at peace in which nations great and small will settle their differences in harmony.

Only by so doing can we make the United Nations the instrument of a worldwide community of hope that its founders intended it should be.

FOREIGN TRADE AND THE COMMON MARKET

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at the present time, there is much debate on the subject of foreign trade. In particular, the relationship of the new trade policy that has been proposed by our administration to the Common Market has resulted in much discussion.

The Providence Sunday Journal Business Weekly of February 4, 1962, published an article about a textile firm in my State of Rhode Island which exports pile fabric to many points of the globe, including Hong Kong. I know and admire the president of this corporation, Mr. Bernard K. Symonds. He is an extremely brilliant man with initiative and imagination, which he has put to good use in exploring the world market. I ask unanimous consent to insert this interesting article in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVIDENCE PILE FABRIC LINKS SUCCESS TO EXPORT BUSINESS

(By Joseph L. Goodrich)

A Rhode Island textile firm has developed its own version of carrying coals to Newcastle and is thriving on it. The company is exporting textiles to Hong Kong.

This is just one phase of the growing export activity of the Providence Pile Fabric Corp. and its subsidiary companies which together employ about 400 Rhode Islanders. The company began exporting pile fabric for the upholstery trade 2 years ago. Today it is shipping its product to 49 foreign countries.

Providence Pile Fabric, located on Dunnell Lane in Pawtucket, was founded by Bernard K. Symonds, its president, and his father, the late Louis J. I. Symonds, 16 years ago.

Today its operations include the Quincy Dye Works, Inc., Woonsocket, and the Fisherville Fabric Corp., Fisherville, Mass., which like the Pawtucket plant, does pile fabric weaving.

Last year, while the rest of the Nation's pile fabric industry was suffering from a recession, Providence Pile Fabric and its affiliated companies operated at peak capacity, around the clock, and increased employment by 20 percent, the company president said.

He attributed this 1961 success to the export business generated by the firm.

Exports also have given the firm diversified markets which have helped to offset seasonal declines in domestic business and thereby even out the production cycle, Mr. Symonds said. In a world market, he explained, a seasonal decline in one part of the world is offset by a seasonal upswing in another.

Among the 49 countries in which Providence Pile Fabric does business are such diverse geographical locations as England, Australia, South Africa, Pakistan, South America, and Canada.

In 1960, the first year Providence Pile Fabric entered the field of foreign trade, about 7 percent of its production was exported. Last year, that ratio jumped to 18 percent. Mr. Symonds predicted exports would amount to about 25 or 30 percent of production this year.

"And," said Mr. Symonds, "the market is still in its infancy and is developing with great rapidity."

Because of this expanding export business and aggressive development by the company of its domestic markets, Providence Pile Fabric has plans in the works for expanding its plant facilities both in Pawtucket and Woonsocket.

In Pawtucket, Providence Pile Fabric already has acquired 20,000 square feet of floor space in an existing mill building which it will occupy about June 1. Mr. Symonds said this expansion will eventually provide an additional 50 jobs.

In Woonsocket the dyeing and finishing operations at 719 River Street will be expanded into a 10,000 square foot plant addition to be constructed there.

Mr. Symonds credits the success of the firm's exporting activity to a team effort on the part of management and the employees and the realization by the company that it had something to offer to the rest of the world.

"Technologically," Mr. Symonds said, "we can do things that they can't do. The whole pile fabric industry in the United States is more developed, more complex than anywhere else in the world."

In the past decade, he said, the American pile fabric industry has adopted new techniques while the industry in other parts of the world remained unchanged. Providence Pile Fabric, which, Mr. Symonds said, is one of the Nation's largest producers of pile fabric for upholstery, kept in the vanguard of those technological changes.

Mr. Symonds said the domestic industry made a significant advance as the result of techniques developed during the Korean war for the manufacture of fabrics designed to protect pilots and soldiers from frigid temperatures. These techniques were adapted to the manufactures of pile fabric, he said.

Another important advantage favoring the American producer has been the research and development efforts of large U.S. corporations such as E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Mr. Symonds asserted.

NEW FIBERS AVAILABLE

Du Pont has developed new fibers, such as its Antron Nylon, a trilobal multifilament, which has more durability and beauty than other natural or synthetic fibers. These new fibers are not available to foreign producers, Mr. Symonds explained. "In our export business we sell Du Pont as much as we sell our own product."

All this convinced Providence Pile Fabric there was a good foreign market for its product. Mr. Symonds gives credit to his brother, Alan E. Symonds, vice president in charge of sales, for organizing and setting in motion the export program.

As explained by Alan Symonds, the initial step involved foreign market surveys to evaluate potential demand, styling requirements and color tastes. Then agencies were set up with the help of the U.S. State Department and chambers of commerce in the different countries or through contacts made by advertising in foreign trade journals.

Once a relationship was established in a foreign country, the tie was further strengthened by an on-the-spot visit from Alan Symonds or some other Providence Pile Fabric executive.

HAS THREE SELLING UNITS

Foreign sales are handled by the company's foreign and domestic sales subsidiary, Quaker Pile Fabric Corp. of New York City. The company also operates two other selling organizations, Pilgrim Fabric Corp., and the Roger Penn Co. which was set up 2 years ago as its Western Hemisphere trading operation.

Counting the sales organizations, the Providence Pile Fabric Cos. employ about 600 persons. The company said about two-thirds of the 55 persons employed at the Fisherville, Mass., plant are Rhode Islanders.

Fundamental to the company's foreign trading philosophy, the Symonds brothers said, is the treatment of the world as an economic and political unit in which the customer from Africa is entitled to the same courtesy and satisfaction as the customer from Syracuse, N.Y.

The company makes it a point to conduct all communications and print all sales literature in the language of the country in which the selling is done. The company caters to the styles and fashions in vogue in the customer country.

CATERS TO VARYING DEMANDS

"We are not trying to cram U.S. goods down somebody's throat," said Bernard Symonds. "We don't presume our ideas are the only valid ideas."

In order to meet the challenge of this highly diversified world market, the company has adapted its production facilities to meet widely varying demands.

OFFICERS, POLITICS, AND IDEOLOGY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently, I had the pleasure of reviewing a most stimulating article entitled "Officers, Politics, and Ideology," written by Mr. George A. Kelly, and published in the January 1962 issue of Army magazine. Mr. Kelly, who is a research fellow at the Center of International Affairs and the defense studies program at Harvard University, has produced a most penetrating discussion of a subject which has very fundamental implications for our form of government.

Mr. Kelly very correctly points out that one of the principal reasons for increased discussion of the military and foreign policy is that the comprehensive struggle which we are engaged in with the Communists demands a comprehensive response. He adds:

> The military hierarchy and the civilian Government and its auxiliaries have become more closely interlocked at all stages. At the wide end of the spectrum, technical questions relating to the incredibly complex and destructive weapons systems now available have required the intimate association of scientists, policymakers, and strategists. It is no longer an affair of the politicians asking the military: "Are you ready?"

Another central question which Mr. Kelly deals with involves public statements by the military critical of civilian established policy, which Mr. Kelly terms "independent political action."

As a former Foreign Service officer, I have always believed that it is the right and duty of a civil servant be he military or civilian, to argue for a particular point of view within the executive branch of the Government. However, once a decision is arrived at, the civil servant—be he civilian or military—has a duty not to attack such a decision in public. If he feels that he must disagree publicly, he should resign and state his objections as a private individual.

Therefore, I particularly agree with Mr. Kelly's observation:

> Independent political action by serving officers * * * tends to shatter the solidarity of the military organization to call primary criteria of obedience into question, and to lead toward the fragmentation of discipline which saps a force's capability as a fit fighting instrument.

Mr. Kelly emphasizes the danger of oversimplifying many of the challenges which face us in the world today and stresses that while an individual military leader may know a great deal about his particular specialty, he often lacks a thorough understanding of the overall complexities involved. I was most impressed by Mr. Kelly's balanced approach and on the positive side, he points out that military officers are becoming more politically sophisticated and that more and more officers are participating in programs where they enjoy close contact with civilian colleagues.

Mr. President, we all know that the vast majority of our military officers behave like the fine civil servants they are; and, therefore, I particularly want to stress my agreement with Mr. Kelly's observation that:

> In spite of hints of frustration, most officers will not need to be told that professionalism, obedience and honor are the highest criteria of their service. They will deplore any political detours that could

threaten their solidarity or weaken their ability to insure the national defense.

I commend Mr. Kelly's fine article to Congress and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Officers—Politics—Ideology

(The controversy over what limits should be placed on the free expression of political opinion by military officers is rarely debated publicly by the persons most intimately concerned: military men themselves. This is understandable, but unfortunate; for reasoned exposition of military views on the subject is essential to public understanding of the issue. In this thoughtful article we present the views of a civilian who, as a research fellow of the Center for International Affairs and the defense studies program at Harvard University, is more than superficially acquainted with the great problems of war and peace and national survival that face us today. We welcome the views of our readers, con or pro.)

(By George A. Kelly)

The subject of the political affinities of an officer corps is particularly hazardous to treat in the pages of a military journal. But this is precisely one of the places where there should be mention of the question. I shall be anxious to avoid conveying the idea that military personnel should not be politically informed or prepared to defend certain political beliefs. However, it is also true that some tendencies implicit in military thinking and military groups can, under stress, develop abusive political consequences.

A man's conscience is his temple. His opinions blossom there unfettered by law or command, conditioning his mechanics of obedience or refusal. This can be taken away from no one, unless his personality is to be erased. When the man is a component of a group that places special demands on his allegiance, he must train his convictions to satisfy the minimal consensus of that group or resign in protest from it. Obviously what we are considering when we speak of officers and politics is the possibility that public professions of conviction may collide with the patterns of disciplined neutrality that regulate the group, or that through the mechanism of command a superior officer may attempt to impose questionable political ideals on subordinates.

As military readers will recognize, this is not merely an academic subject. Controversy has arisen in the United States in recent months concerning the extent to which commanders may bring political problems to the attention of their troops and the manner in which they should "inoculate" them against inimical political views. It is not my purpose here to cast particular criticisms against individuals, but to examine in depth the fundamental nature of the problem, and to evoke in passing some examples where elements of an army have proceeded dangerously far along this path.

THE TRADITION OF POLITICAL ASCETICISM

The traditional army in democratic countries is in no sense a political one. The law normally imposes certain restraints upon the soldier's political connections, in some cases going so far as to deprive him of the right to vote and hold office—as in the Third Republic of France. More wisely, in the United States—where we have no history of political intervention by the military—the proviso has been that the officer must take off his uniform and reenter the civilian community if he wishes to undertake political controversy.

Complementary to an army's abstinence from politics has been the notion that it is the military arm of the legitimate government, an instrument of force committed to the service of the national interest as defined by the civilian leadership. The rule has been obedience and performance; and, by accepted codes of conduct, political sabotage and subterfuge are harshly dealt with. Patriotism and professional honor have been at the core of this commitment.

Furthermore, in the United States when a military figure has been called on to assume high civilian responsibility, he has customarily "put his uniform in mothballs" and avoided any implication that his conduct of policy was motivated by the military reflex. The Presidency of General Eisenhower can serve as a model of this deeply ingrained habit of thinking. Generals Marshall and Smith are other notable examples of military leaders who have known how to resist all taint of "militarism" in the exercise of civilian responsibility.

Opposed to this ideal pattern, however, other currents have been flowing. The composition and mission of the traditional army have been incessantly evolving, and the nature of the conflict itself has changed. We cannot trace the course of this complex development within the scope of these remarks. Let it be said simply that the matter of national defense can no longer be artificially isolated from other political concerns of a government in the conduct of its foreign strategy; by the same token, neither can the military men, who insure the defense of the nation be so isolated.

THE INTERLOCK OF TOTAL POLITICS IN TOTAL WAR

International conflict which is total and by no means exclusively military (at intervals, scarcely so at all) demands a full and integrated response by any nation that does not care to cast away lightly its chances of survival. This requires, among other things, that the military leaders have both a deep awareness of the entire range of factors dictating national policy and the intelligence to execute orders against this background. Political training cannot be shunned. If the political training provided for American officers does not and should not amount to a national ideology, it at least stresses the fact that ideology is a component of conflict and that political conviction may have immense military repercussions. Briefly stated, something which we might describe as a total politics has evolved as the logical complement of the total war that unceasingly threatens our security.

Meanwhile, the military hierarchy and the civilian government and its auxiliaries have become more closely interlocked at all stages. At the wide end of the spectrum, technical questions relating to the incredibly complex and destructive weapons systems now available have required the intimate association of scientists, policymakers, and strategists. It is no longer an affair of the politicians asking the military: "Are you ready?"

In a more restricted sense, the conditions of modern conflict have raised the specter of psychological and propaganda warfare, of troop indoctrination, of understanding the political aims of the enemy, of national goals, and of the "why" as well as the "how" of combat. This has quite naturally led all informed military leaders to speculate deeply themselves on factors of international politics—affairs that are now of entire relevance to their profession.

Traditional armies under democratic systems have never been at home with politics, and even where circumstances have dictated otherwise, they have been reluctant to intervene in the political process. Today, the pressures and the temptations are more vast and more subtle. It is no longer a question of arbitrating between the national political parties, but one of seeking to inflect a national regime in the way that seems best suited to frustrate, check, and perhaps defeat the Nation's enemies. But when a decision of this kind is made by a military group or by specific individuals within it, the implication is clear that the regime is no longer trusted to serve the best interests of the Nation and that the ideal mechanism of obedience has broken down. A role in politics has been staked out.

THE SPLINTERING EDGE OF POLITICS

When this Rubicon is crossed, a military group will begin to lose its solidarity. For the specific and quasi-monolithic value of national loyalty as expressed in obedience to the freely elected government, a host of divisive loyalties to conflicting political principles is substituted. Once the nation's politics has been cast in doubt there is no alternative source of allegiance to rally to; one rallies instead to his own opinion and interpretation of events.

Another element that looms large in the mechanism of military effectiveness may simultaneously be sacrificed: the quality that we call "honor." Regarding the intricate relations between honor and other stimuli, the American military sociologist, Morris Janowitz, has written in "The American Professional Soldier":

"Traditionally, officers have fought primarily because of an explicit political ideology. Only in the higher ranks (of the military) and among its elite members is there a more sustained concern with the political purpose of the Military Establishment. Honor is the basis of its belief system."

Honor, for the military man, is both a personal and a contractual conception. The defiant sacrifice of one's commitment of obedience can decisively abolish the standard of honor: at this point the disciplined officer becomes a freebooter. On the other hand, the sense of honor (whether true or false) may be intensified if, in justifying an act of insubordination, the military conceives of some higher standard of national ideals to which both it and the civilian government must refer equally, and which it believes the Government to have violated. This is one of the dangers of the mystique of a "national ideology," and it is within this spectrum that numerous tragedies of military disobedience have occurred.

THE DANGERS OF MYSTIQUE

A single example will illustrate how the notion of honor may lead to the questioning of national policy. Jean-Yves Alquier, a former S.A.S. ("Sections Administratives Spécialisées") officer in the French Army in Algeria, relates:

"I knew a paratroop captain who was obsessed by the thought that he had lost his honor in Indochina by persuading hundreds of young Vietnamese Catholics to enlist in his auxiliaries. Because he believed it himself, he had repeated to them: 'You can always count on us.' And when we pulled out, the Viet Minh shot them for having trusted him."

The widespread feeling in the professional French Army that they might eventually have to abandon some of their Algerian Muslim allies in like fashion to the F.L.N. ("Front de Libération Nationale") has led them to oppose the honor of personal commitment to that of obedient discipline. And this has been one of the many factors that have provoked today's deepening crisis in the French military society.

The observer who perceives events clearly while losing sight of their pattern may feel that a few isolated distortions of the U.S. military establishment's troop information program or contention over the showing of films like "Operation Abolition" do not raise any consequential threat to our traditions of an apolitical military force. Clearly, the vast majority of commanders are disposed to accept the political directives of the Department of Defense without excessive personal interpretation. It is a very few who create the uproar.

BEYOND THE GUIDELINES: CHAOS

Again, it may be asked: What is dangerously political about anticommunism? Are we not agreed that the doctrine of communism menaces our society and political order? Why, indeed, should officers be censured for going beyond the guidelines set by the Government in this respect, when we know that our present conflict is complex and multiform and that no single individual or entity is ipso facto in possession of the exclusive counterstrategy?

These questions need to be answered now, before military groups in the West feel free to take on themselves the luxury of political interpretation, before such a trend becomes irreversible and its permission seems ambiguous. It is not that a serving military leader might not possess vision superior to that of his civilian colleagues. It is, in part, that his uniform disqualifies him professionally from implicating his service in the criticism of civilian policy. This much is clear if we refer to the standards of ultimate civilian decision in a democracy. Here, military forces have come to accept a circumscribed role in the political community.

A second qualification on independent political action by serving officers, evoked earlier, is that it tends to shatter the solidarity of the military organization, to call the primary criteria of obedience into question, and to lead toward that fragmentation of discipline which saps a force's capability as a fit fighting instrument. Political opinions and complaints may, of course, in good conscience be rendered through proper channels in the performance of duty; but they should only in exceptional circumstances become public knowledge and never the miraculous assets of self-interested political forces which oppose the same regime that the military presumably serves.

Thirdly, while no one will care to dispute the reality of the Communist threat or the necessity for taking firm and unambiguous national measures to meet the emergency, individual oracles—especially if they are out of tune with what the Government is trying to achieve—can hamstring our unified efforts to meet the menace. This may help to pervert our grand strategy or lead military or civilian groups to misconstrue the nature of the danger and the best ways of confronting it. While refraining from directly entering the well-known controversy that engendered these remarks, one can scarcely avoid approving the wise statement of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT: "A truly 'tough' approach * * * is one which accepts the challenge of communism with the courage and determination to meet it with every instrumentality of foreign policy * * * and with willingness to see the struggle as far into the future as may be necessary."

THE DANGER OF OVERSIMPLIFICATION

It is unfortunately even truer today than when it was written that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing." Military leaders who have made personal studies of the Communist danger may know quite a bit about their chosen topic, but not enough. They may fall prey to simplistic ideas of counterstrategy and becomes converts to doctrines that filter out much of the requisite complexity of the challenges we face. Being men of action, they may be too ardent to pledge the "truths" they have learned to the service of action without stopping to reflect on some of the global factors that might render their techniques dangerous or desultory. Finally, they may tumble into ambiguous alliances with civilian groups that intrinsically detest liberal democracy and manipulate the many deceptions in our struggle against communism to sap the bases of political strength to which the vast majority of the Nation is dedicated.

It is not the clever or scholarly officer that plays into the hands of the antidemocratic groups; it is the inept officer who imagines himself an oracular political pundit. His conviction and patriotism may not be in question. His intelligence surely is.

BEYOND THE DEEP

Most endemic and serious is the fact that there are deep motivations for the political factiousness of military groups in a democracy faced with the prospect of indefinite conflict with the Communist East. As the possibility of eliminating or softening the menace recedes into distant time, frustrations lead to the desire for some more direct form of action. An increasing feeling takes hold that the employment of some of the harsh methods of the enemy—brainwashing, psychological war, rigidification of liberal institutions—might beat that enemy at his own game. The hatred of one "intoxication" produces the encouragement of a "counter-intoxication." The world becomes split into a harsh dualism of good and evil. Why, it is finally asked, cannot civilian society be run by a mechanism of command and obedience like a well-trained military organization? This attitude leads finally to an ultimate question: Why should an army be in the submissive service of an ephemeral government in an evolving state when there are fixed and perpetual values of a historic nation or civilization to which it would be more correct to refer? The difficulty here is, of course, that nations are made for men and not vice versa, even if the men should be unworthy of the construction, and that men take orders necessarily from their superiors, not from some abstract and deified notion of an ideal political solution.

THE END PRODUCT OF DISCONTENT

Besides the grave danger that a military organization may suffer lethal fragmentation if its individuals seize the privilege of public political self-expression, there is the concern that a military force may want to transform its own nature and mission in a political sense. This threat is not imaginary; it has occurred at least once in the history of contemporary Western armies. We may reflect on the following graphic illustration from the pages of the semiofficial French military journal, Revue de Défense Nationale:

"The army fulfills four functions, separated here in the interest of clarity but obviously interpenetrating each other and in practice closely linked.

"It is first a training school for the young people.

"It is an extraordinary effective vehicle of propaganda.

"It is a means of coercion against all troublemakers and those who oppose the regime.

"Finally, it is a military force, and instrument of combat.

"Giving last place in this enumeration to the seemingly most important function may be surprising. But in Communist doctrine this function is not ipso factor the most important."

This is not a surprising statement to find in any of the leading French military reviews during the past 6 years. The author is a well-balanced and highly intelligent military critic (now a general) with distinguished combat service behind him. But the passage would seem shocking if we read it in the United Kingdom or the United States. And most readers are aware that French military society has been long on the point of crisis, encouraged in part by deep suspicion of the Government's policy and motives, in part by lingering and deepening frustration at the empty balance sheet of 14 years, almost continuous conflict against Communist and nationalist adversaries. We need not go theatrically far in affirming that the elements of the French military discontent exist in embryo in the United States. But we should take caution from the anguishes of our ally, and concede that her experiences are not totally irrelevant to the psychology of the West as a whole.

THE NEED FOR STANCH PATIENCE

Senator FULBRIGHT's suggestion about patience and pace is a good one. One lesson that we can well learn from Lenin and his revolutionary progeny is that success is not created by some instantaneous and miraculous formula. Salvation—and most probably not in the sense of military deliverance—can come only if we are stanch and bide our time, meanwhile preserving that which is worth preserving.

The Government, with its unparalleled means of viewing every corner of the situation and synthesizing its findings, can be the only arbiter in such a complex sphere. The officer—even the general—who discovers the essence of Lenin and Mao Tse-tung cannot. His contributions can count, but they must be submitted as becomes his position in the command structure and not be made above the head of the referee. Nor should he abuse the confidence his Government—which is the political reflection of his society—has placed in him by distorting its directives in educating the officers and troops of his command.

On a final note of optimism, it is possible to add that as our military officers become more politically aware and are being yearly rejuvenated by returning to command and staff posts from schools and programs where they have enjoyed close contact with civilian colleagues, a balanced political perspective is the rule and not the exception. The present writer has had a personal opportunity to witness this gratifying experience and is sanguine about its results.

This does not mean, however, that the U.S. Military Establishment should not prudently survey and penalize the political indulgences of certain of its members, for they could vitiate its solidarity and play a malignant role in civilian politics. In this respect, Senator FULBRIGHT's analysis does not go far enough. It is not just a question of the radicalization of a certain political tendency; it is also the frustration that many men of action feel when faced with a situation that promises no immediate resolution. In spite of hints of frustration, most officers will not need to be told that professionalism, obedience, and honor are the highest criteria of their service. They will deplore any political detours that could threaten their solidarity or weaken their ability to insure the national defense.

RETRAINING THE UNEMPLOYED

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on March 26, the Pawtucket Times published an article entitled "Retraining the Unemployed," written by Nelson H. Cruickshank of the AFL-CIO. In his article, Mr. Cruickshank cited the program at the Vocational Technical School in my own State of Rhode Island as one example of the kind of activity the Congress seeks to promote under the area redevelopment program and the Manpower Retraining Act.

Mr. Cruickshank's description of the retraining work being done in Rhode Island is as follows:

At the Vocational Technical School in Providence a group of unemployed men are being trained to operate turret lathes and machine tools. In nearby high school shops and over in Woonsocket, more trainees—90 in all—are training as auto mechanics.

He adds:

> The Federal-State employment service is being called on to take a major role in the retraining. As part of the Rhode Island Department of Employment Security, the employment service selected the trainees after aptitude tests and counsel-interviews. When the trainees have finished, the employment service will try to place the graduates in appropriate jobs.

Mr. President, it is this kind of activity which I hope will be multiplied many times, in the months to come, throughout this country. Nelson Cruickshank points out that in several of the European countries—France, Belgium, The Netherlands, and the United Kingdom—the term "readaptation" has been invented to indicate the spirit with which a wide range of retraining activities are carried on. Rhode Island's "readaptation" services, he says, are a first step in the right direction toward the enactment of a nationwide effort to meet the problem of unemployment in a changing economy.

It is with a great deal of pride that I bring to the attention of the Senate Mr. Cruickshank's description of the fine program underway in my State. I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in full in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Retraining the Unemployed

(By Nelson H. Cruickshank)

At the Vocational Technical School in Providence a group of unemployed men are being trained to operate turret lathes and machine tools. In nearby high school shops and over in Woonsocket, more trainees—90 in all—are training as auto mechanics.

This program and others like it in Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Maryland, and West Virginia are multiplying around the country as the new Area Redevelopment Agency gets underway.

The Federal-State employment service is being called on to take a major role in the retraining. As part of the Rhode Island Department of Employment Security, the employment service selected the trainees after aptitude tests and counseling interviews. When the trainees have finished, the employment service will try to place the graduates in appropriate jobs.

Both in the area redevelopment program—one of the first economic measures of the New Frontier—and in the manpower and training bill now awaiting final approval by Congress, the employment service—an old organization—will have a multitude of new duties thrust upon it.

To prepare workers for the technology of the sixties, the employment service must be retooled.

From its beginnings, the employment service was designed to match men and jobs. Actually, the earliest employment agency was the local union; later Government employment services were established but over the heated objections of private agencies that charged a fee for job placing. The present U.S. Employment Service was created in 1933 by the enactment of the Wagner-Peyser Act. Under the urgency of World War II, the employment service as the operating arm of the War Manpower Commission had the major responsibility for manpower mobilization and allocation.

IDEA IS A NEW ONE

But the idea of mobilization against recession is a new one. When unemployment benefits were established in the mid-thirties, paying claims began to eclipse the finding of jobs. As the agency for administering the "work test," the employment office was subordinated to paying benefits. From a job placement service it became a routine registration center.

The private employment agencies have contributed to this image of the employment service by picturing it as a last resort for the rundown unemployed. They have asked Congress to limit the public employment service to taking the unemployed only, leaving the lucrative market of job changes and upgrading to their private profit-making.

Instead, Congress has voted a large staff expansion so the service can work on nationally significant employment problems and beef up its activity, particularly in metropolitan areas.

EFFICIENCY IMPERATIVE

The economic cancer of persistent unemployment, the new problems created by automation and technological change, excessive unemployment among youth, older workers and minority group—these problems call for the most highly efficient employment service operation.

What is needed is a new concept of the employment service as more than an employment exchange and one that recognizes that our manpower problems are caused by major changes in the national economy—relocations of whole industries, complete shifts in market demand.

A provincial or parochial view of the job market is inappropriate today. To get employment offices up to the times they have to be reorganized and modernized; unencumbered by unemployment compensation claims taking; free to find jobs and interview and test applicants and to clear job placements on a national as well as local basis.

Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg puts it this way: "If the Employment Service is to serve as a major force in resolving problems of labor supply and labor requirements, of bringing about a more orderly functioning of local labor markets and of speeding up return of unemployed workers to jobs, then it must become a far more active and aggressive force than it has been in the last 10 years."

CHANGE IS CONSISTENT

With this in view, the Federal Bureau of Employment Security has just been reorganized to help the Employment Service meet its widening responsibilities. Research and evaluative functions will be integrated with the Service's work for continuous assessment of national and local labor market conditions. At the local level, similar efforts are being made to restore the employment offices to their main job.

This change is consistent with the recommendations of a resolution by the AFL–CIO Executive Council in June of 1961 calling for an effective national headquarters organization. The council further stated that if the Employment Service is not completely returned to the Federal Government, a minimum requirement should be the establishment and enforcement of adequate Federal standards of performance for the State agencies.

Whether the Employment Service can successfully perform its new role in manpower retraining and placement will depend on more than additional staff and better headquarters organization. It will depend on whether the Federal Government can effectively lead the State agencies in the directions called for by national public policy.

For example, about 20 local offices in 4 States still practice some form of racial discrimination either through separate buildings, waiting rooms, facilities or files for Negro job applicants. The Department of Labor does not condone the practice but in these remaining cases seems powerless to abolish it.

Actually, the practice could be ended by shutting off the administrative funds for the State program, but Federal officials have as yet been reluctant to take such a drastic step.

NEW SCALE OF VALUES

A project to train tractor operators on the Yazoo-Mississippi Delta has just been delayed and possibly killed by political pressures that feared "unionization" and the Federal Government's nondiscrimination policies. According to some officials, this plan was one of the best conceived to date.

It is doubtful that high morale and competent performance will characterize the employment service until the outmoded and stultifying measures of performance—the tallying of placements—is replaced by measures that show how well the employment service is doing relative to the potentialities in the community.

We can set our sights today by the performance of several European countries—France, Belgium, West Germany, The Netherlands, and the United Kingdom—where retraining is part of broad governmental programs to provide assistance to unemployed workers. The range of services is so wide that they have even invented a new word—"readaptation." This includes unemployment benefits, training allowances, travel and moving expenses and a family allowance while the jobseeker is away from his family.

We are cautiously taking the first steps in this direction. But even now we are faced with the question whether a decentralized institution like the Federal-State employment service can play an effective role in our "readaptation."

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, the Senate will adjourn, under the order previously entered, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 17, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 16, 1962:

U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals

J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., of Virginia, to be judge of the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, vice Ambrose O'Connell, retired.

In the Air Force

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of sections 8351, 8363, 8376, and 8392, title 10 of the United States Code.

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Earnest H. Briscoe, AO291638, Ohio Air National Guard.

To be brigadier general

Col. Albert L. Pearl, AO350203, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Robert D. Campbell, AO663481, California Air National Guard.

Col. John R. Dolny, AO672579, Minnesota Air National Guard.

Col. Arthur F. Fite, Jr., AO411954, Alabama Air National Guard.

Col. Erick W. Kyro, AO661335, Michigan Air National Guard.

Col. James K. McLaughlin, AO789398, West Virginia Air National Guard.

Col. Charles F. Riggle, Jr., AO403611, Florida Air National Guard.

Col. Dale E. Shafer, Jr., AO433414, Ohio Air National Guard.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Major to lieutenant colonel

Aagaard, Emmert M., 13574A.
Aamodt, Duane A., 13643A.
Abbott, Hershell L., 33555A.
Abbott, Woodrow A., 12763A.
Abels, Erich T., 13624A.
Adams, Charles J., 22656A.
Adams, James A., 12893A.
Aderholt, Harry C., 13592A.
Agnew, Jack D., 33812A.
Ainsworth, Jess W., 13238A.
Alexander, Ernest W., Jr., 33838A.
Allen, Donald W., 12715A.
Amundson, Floyd A., 13127A.
Amundson, Lowell O., 13561A.
Andersen, Leslie E., 33615A.
Anderson, Bernard I., 33739A.
Anderson, Curtis A., 13136A.
Anderson, Edgar H., Jr., 12752A.
Anderson, John B., 12964A.
Anderson, John G. M., 33497A.
Anderson, John R., 13762A.
Anderson, Richard K., 13201A.
Andrae, Paul H., 2d, 13309A.
Andress, Crystal L., 33770A.
Andrew, James W., 12795A.
Angevine, Frank W., 11618A.
Apgar, Paul D., 12832A.
Arents, Bertrand J., 33677A.
Arey, Warren F., 13029A.
Armstead, Seth A., Jr., 12947A.
Arnold, William R., 48718A.
Ashcraft, Archie B., Jr., 33614A.
Ashman, Robert E., 48721A.
Assimotos, Samuel A., 13335A.
Atchley, Kenneth L., 33813A.
Atteberry, Billy N., 33681A.
Atterbury, Logan C., 13197A.
Aumer, Thurman D., 13857A.
Aust, Abner M., Jr., 20631A.
Avery, Charles M., 13399A.
Ayres, Frank L., 18173A.
Babinec, Albert S., 33580A.
Back, John V., 12953A.
Bailey, Gordon A., 12918A.
Bailey, James M., Jr., 13906A.
Bailey, Joseph A., 13505A.
Bailey, William D., 13522A.
Baillie, Irwin L., 12937A.
Bair, Joe C., 11786A.
Baker, Ellsworth A., 11862A.
Baker, Harold S., 51779A.
Baldwin, Joseph L., 33695A.
Balliet, Byron F., 13367A.
Bankard, Harry V., 33859A.
Barbati, Patrick A., 33767A.
Bare, Harold F., 12841A.
Barker, Havelock W., 13530A.
Barnett, James W., 13924A.
Barnidge, William H., 12915A.
Barns, William F., 20630A.
Barouch, Robert, 13628A.
Barr, Richard E., 13657A.
Barrett, Harry W., 33694A.
Barry, Michael A., 33588A.
Barter, John W., 18208A.
Barton, Roger D., 12904A.
Bass, Robert A., 20632A.
Beal, Henry E., Jr., 33653A.
Beall, Max T., 13814A.
Beaty, Albert R., 33705A.
Beauregard, Frank R., 13758A.
Beck, Howard G., 13020A.
Becker, Robert H., 24318A.
Beighley, Joe W., 12977A.
Beitzel, James E., 33537A.
Belchyk, Paul P., 33870A.
Beldowicz, Leonard F., 33593A.
Bell, David H., 13598A.
Bell, John A., 12627A.
Bell, Walter W., Jr., 33611A.
Bellows, Clyde L., 13088A.
Bennett, Frenchy D., 13538A.
Benson, Cameron B., 51775A.
Benton, Robert I., 33754A.
Berg, Howard L., 13503A.
Berger, Joseph A., 33879A.
Berschel, Donald F., 33900A.
Bevard, Franklin B., 13041A.
Bicher, Robert F. B., Jr., 33891A.
Biedul, Chester A., 13799A.
Bigum, Alfred C., 12796A.
Billings, Donald E., 33522A.
Bilson, John G., 13310A.
Bingham, Henry T., 33798A.
Black, Jim, 12717A.
Black, William T., Jr., 12744A.
Blake, Clifford H., 13261A.
Blanchard, Jerome L., 13164A.
Blanton, Franklin D., 21458A.
Blitch, Norman H., 13423A.
Blount, Buford C., 17699A.
Boarman, William O., Jr., 51790A.
Boaz, Reynolds O., 13024A.
Bockelman, Frederick, Jr., 13396A.
Boelter, Herbert O., 33689A.
Boggs, Wallace M., 13606A.
Bohannon, James R., Jr., 18146A.
Bohart, Chester H., 13091A.
Bohling, Charles F., 13289A.
Bollard, Donald W., 13512A.
Booher, Henry D., 33871A.
Borders, Charles W., 18149A.
Bormann, Frederick E., 12842A.
Boswell, Benedict A., 11895A.
Boulineau, Donald H., 13842A.
Bowlan, Kent G., 33518A.
Boyce, Kenneth C., 33696A.
Boyd, Earl W., 33889A.
Boyd, Robert R., 13075A.
Boyles, Dixon R., 13874A.
Bradbury, Jack E., 13665A.
Bradley, Clyde W., Jr., 13856A.
Brake, William J., 13707A.
Brasser, Bernard B., 49137A.
Briggs, Gifford M., 33733A.
Brindley, E. V., Jr., 33646A.
Britt, Daniel T., Jr., 13061A.
Broach, William G., Jr., 11820A.
Brookie, Donald W., 33569A.
Brooks, James B., 12742A.
Brooks, James G., 13497A.
Brose, Herbert E., 13878A.
Brouillard, Rex L., 33539A.
Brown, Chester L., 33511A.
Brown, David R., 33763A.
Brown, John W., 13350A.
Brown, Milton M., 33656A.
Brown, Walter J., 13179A.
Browning, George A., 3d, 33934A.
Buck, Robert E., 13748A.
Buckley, Robert S., 33964A.
Buehler, Lloyd P., 13553A.
Buersmeyer, Wilfred C., 13745A.
Bumm, William C., 33941A.
Bumpas, Eugene F., 51748A.
Burke, Leonard F., 33525A.
Burkett, William H., 33623A.
Burns, Raymond, Jr., 33787A.
Burton, Ernest L., 13389A.
Bush, Russell L., 22654A.
Bussells, Chatham P., 13738A.
Buzard, Frank S., 33814A.
Bynum, Jess L., 33674A.
Bynum, Willis A., 13425A.
Byrn, Milton W., Jr., 33861A.
Cadwallader, John S., 13351A.
Caldwell, Joel B., Jr., 13263A.
Caliendo, Lorenzo, 33948A.
Camarena, Alfonso, 33576A.
Canestrari, Gisto, 13495A.
Carah, John P., 33907A.
Carey, George F., Jr., 13104A.
Carlson, Donald C., 13339A.
Carlson, Roy D., 13447A.
Carlyle, James H., 13373A.
Carmack, Harold H., 12998A.
Carmichael, Charles C., 33829A.
Carpenter, Claude S., 13054A.
Carpenter, Dustin E., 12974A.
Carr, William F., 13749A.
Carraway, Wilbur C., 33658A.
Carrington, Wallace J., 33782A.
Carson, Kenneth R., 33888A.
Carter, Harold W., 33678A.
Casagrande, Jeo J., 33711A.
Casale, Richard S., 28159A.
Cashman, William J., 13464A.
Caudill, Orley B., 13074A.
Caulfield, John J., 33725A.
Cavanaugh, William D., 12938A.
Cecil, Walter M., Jr., 13621A.
Cesky, Charles J., 33532A.
Chandley, Sherley S., 12775A.
Chapman, Gerald S., 33866A.
Chapman, John M., Jr., 17700A.
Charbonneaux, Dorwin D., 12731A.
Chardi, Merlin L., 33734A.
Chasteen, John R., 33505A.
Cheatham, Richard B., 12777A.
Cherrington, Henry W., 33962A.
Cherry, Clyde S., 12952A.
Cherry, Merdy E., 33887A.
Chesser, Alvin J., 12996A.
Chinnock, Earl H., 13158A.
Chisholm, Steward J., 33669A.
Cho, Summer, 33083A.
Christiansen, Kenneth P., 11409A.
Christopher, Albert M., 13278A.
Christy, Clayton E., 33661A.
Churchville, Louis J., 12635A.
Clark, James K., 13673A.
Clark, Waymon D., 12749A.
Clark, Wayne E., 12783A.
Clark, William T., Jr., 13611A.
Clary, Galloway H., 33635A.
Clayton, Benjamin H., 33777A.
Clements, Lawson W., 12707A.
Clisham, Winston H., 22618A.
Cloninger, Charles R., 13587A.
Coberly, Theodore S., 33954A.
Coble, Walter M., 12979A.
Coggin, Roy J., 33697A.
Colby, Eldon N., 33832A.
Cole, Eugene E., 12330A.
Coleman, Alphonse J., 33834A.
Coleman, Thomas P., 13283A.
Colley, George L., 33807A.
Collier, Milton, 13620A.
Collier, Robert E., 12770A.
Collins, Perry V., 18156A.
Collver, Robert C., 13221A.
Colson, Carl C., 13731A.
Colthorpe, Sidney E., 33728A.
Combe, John 3d, 12170A.
Combs, John H., Jr., 13368A.
Conger, William R., 33788A.
Conklin, William D., 13873A.
Connolly, Lawrence D., 33810A.
Conti, James F., 33757A.
Cook, Charles E., Jr., 13481A.
Coons, Merle M., 33581A.
Cooper, Harold M., 12894A.
Corcoran, Joseph B., 13126A.
Corn, Cecil P., 13016A.
Corsalini, August D., 33718A.
Coursey, Robert J., 12971A.
Coventry, James A., 33774A.
Cox, Claude W., 13212A.
Cox, Jack R., 33709A.
Crabtree, Robert O., 33512A.
Craig, Charles D., Jr., 33510A.
Crandall, Fred, 13129A.
Craven, Paul R., 51780A.
Crenshaw, David L., 33717A.
Crepeau, Lawrence T., 33831A.
Crepeau, Victor J., 33909A.
Crisman, Harry B., 13306A.
Crites, Doyle L., 10882A.
Crone, Douglas A., 13072A.
Crozier, Roswell L., Jr., 13521A.
Culbertson, William R., 13308A.
Culp, Charles H., 13822A.
Cunningham, Donald B., 13761A.
Cunningham, John J., 33939A.
Curd, James L., 13327A.
Curtis, Ralph R., 13573A.
Dahlberg, Arvid E., 33565A.
Dalton, William L., 33551A.
Daly, William J., Jr., 33780A.

Danforth, George L., Jr., 12863A.
Daniel, Garland S., 13591A.
Dargue, Donald S., 13727A.
Dauteuil, Donat F., 13809A.
Davidson, B. H., 22575A.
Davis, Claude C., 33927A.
Davis, Montie A., Jr., 13108A.
Davis, Vincent E., 13650A.
Davis, Wilbert E., 13381A.
Davis, Woodard E., Jr., 33914A.
Dawson, Albert E., 12757A.
Dayton, Earl R., 33956A.
Dayton, Steward R., 13300A.
Dean, Frank R., 33846A.
Dean, Hubert N., 33753A.
Dean, Ivan E., 33919A.
Dean, Preston M., 12703A.
Dearing, Charles G., Jr., 33627A.
Degennaro, Carlo N., 20570A.
Degroat, Russell E., 13064A.
Delbeccaro, Vincent J., 19779A.
Dellamonico, Anthony S., 33803A.
Deloughary, Robert D., 12989A.
Deluca, Joseph R., 33749A.
Derrick, Daniel F., 48720A.
Dessert, Donald M., 13359A.
Deutshendorf, Henry J., 33922A.
Devasto, Pasquale L., 33622A.
Dickey, Thomas P., 33806A.
Dietrich, Fred H., 13671A.
Dietrich, Leroy S., 12785A.
Dill, Glenn E., Jr., 22615A.
Dineen, Richard C., 33570A.
Doe, Irving C., 18155A.
Dorman, Reynold C., 49139A.
Dorow, Alfred A., 33797A.
Dossey, Don E., 33513A.
Doughman, Carl E., 33541A.
Dover, Joseph H., 12850A.
Dowell, Ralph H., Jr., 13818A.
Dressler, Arthur L., 33786A.
Duff, David J., 33858A.
Duffus, John D., 13563A.
Dumontier, Louis D., 18171A.
Duncan, Bruce G., 33687A.
Duncan, Joseph A., 33693A.
Dunlap, Ronald E., 33744A.
Dunn, Buel A., 23701A.
Dunn, William E., 13764A.
Dusenberry, Robert K., 13429A.
Dyas, David D., 12840A.
Dye, Thomas E., 33895A.
Easley, Charles D., 13666A.
Ebelke, William H., 13235A.
Egan, James C., Jr., 13638A.
Eilar, Norman W., 13342A.
Elder, Clarence P., 51787A.
Elias, William, 33514A.
Ellett, Darwin E., 51757A.
Elliott, Charles M., 33930A.
Ellis, Frederick D., 33868A.
Engel, Gardner W., 51753A.
Erickson, Donald H., 33960A.
Erickson, Orin H., 12772A.
Ertler, John T., 33912A.
Esterl, Edward H., 33857A.
Estes, Melvin A., 13746A.
Ethridge, Floyd C., 13448A.
Eve, Arthur, Jr., 33746A.
Ezell, William O., 22649A.
Fairbanks, Gerald D., 13600A.
Falk, David M., 13841A.
Fantone, William H., Jr., 13472A.
Farr, John W., 20660A.
Faulk, William, Jr., 33835A.
Fazlollah, Maurice J., 13247A.
Feldman, Albert, 33657A.
Fender, Francis W., 33824A.
Ferrari, Victor J., 33507A.
Fess, Kenneth B., 33574A.
Fielder, Benton, Jr., 13803A.
Fikes, Charles W., 12791A.
Finnerty, William J., 12957A.
Fisher, Gene E., 33500A.
Fisher, Gerald B., 43719A.
Fisher, James R., 13612A.
Fisher, Orville L., Jr., 13193A.
Fisher, Roger L., 12861A.
Fisher, Thurman D., 12836A.
Fjeseth, Harold E., 13338A.
Flaherty, Donald F., 33938A.
Flannigan, William C., 13457A.
Fletcher, Henry M., Jr., 13693A.
Forbragd, Maurice H., 13583A.
Ford, Walter V., 33946A.
Forehand, William W., 33523A.
Foss, Robert J., 13243A.
Foster, John P., 13237A.
Fountain, Ross M., 33556A.
Fowle, Herbert L., Jr., 13575A.
Fowler, James F., 13483A.
Franco, John A., 33598A.
Frazier, Max E., 21456A.
Freas, Luther W., 12821A.
Frederick, Paul A., 3d, 13062A.
Freeman, Elmer C., 13915A.
Fremouw, Gerrit D., 33710A.
French, George E., Jr., 13063A.
French, Reginald W., 33692A.
French, Russell A., 13174A.
Frey, George J., 13494A.
Friedli, Robert K., 33738A.
Friedrich, Roy E., Sr., 13154A.
Frisbie, Norman H., 13722A.
Fristoe, James P., 12887A.
Fritsch, Edward M., 12790A.
Frost, Edwin C., 51741A.
Fry, Wallace, J., Jr., 13743A.
Fuessel, Aloys W., Jr., 33771A.
Fulmer, James H., 33818A.
Fultz, Kenneth H., 33624A.
Furrie, Frank G., 33852A.
Gaither, John M., 13892A.
Galas, David E., 13695A.
Gallagher, James, 13582A.
Gallagher, John J., 13318A.
Gallerami, Alterio, 12746A.
Gallien, Carson R., 12310A.
Gamelin, Aime J., 13376A.
Gardner, Herbert G., 12053A.
Garino, Charles V., 33528A.
Garlitz, William B., Jr., 13837A.
Garner, Harold C., 33885A.
Garvin, John T., 13674A.
Gascoigne, Joseph A., 33582A.
Gasiewicz, Sigmund I., 22994A.
Gaspard, Richard E., 11478A.
Gassler, John, 13274A.
Gauvin, Francis R., 13208A.
Geary, Paul X., Jr., 33592A.
Gehri, Donald H., 22717A.
Geller, Ulrich A., 13670A.
Geniesse, Eugene W., Jr., 33910A.
Gentry, James E., 12706A.
Gerdes, Donald R., 12834A.
Gettelfinger, Robert J., 13066A.
Gifford, William E., 13918A.
Gillespie, Keith L., 22576A.
Gillingham, Rowley E., 22616A.
Godbey, Donald E., 12705A.
Goforth, Pat E., 33649A.
Good, Marvin H., 13162A.
Good, William H., 33963A.
Goodfellow, Alford J., 13514A.
Goppert, Jean G., 18167A.
Gorelangton, Eaton A., 13715A.
Gorton, Kenneth B., 33610A.
Govednik, Martin J., 13927A.
Gradel, George A., 12991A.
Grant, Bayard V., 33566A.
Grant, Richard A., 33519A.
Grashoff, Robert A., 12325A.
Gray, William E., 33833A.
Green, Dexter M., 33651A.
Green, James A., 13754A.
Green, Jimmie L., 13392A.
Green, Joseph, 12921A.
Green, Milton C., 33920A.
Green, Robert V., 12967A.
Greene, Clarence R., 12745A.
Greene, Melvin L., 13364A.
Greenwood, William, 33873A.
Greer, Walker B., 33550A.
Gregory, Benjamin F., 13334A.
Gregory, Fountain L., Jr., 13122A.
Gregory, Milton F., 51759A.
Grey, Richard E., 33691A.
Griffin, Claude K., 33616A.
Grinnell, George G., Jr., 51788A.
Grottle, George T., 12776A.
Grubb, Royal H., 12835A.
Gruber, Donald C., 33755A.
Gullion, Allen W., 13726A.
Haan, Carl J., 13320A.
Hagemann, Joseph A., 22657A.
Haggerty, Frank R., 13058A.
Hagle, Carl M., 51796A.
Hakola, Allan A., 33878A.
Hale, Morris A., 21795A.
Hall, Harvey P., 20674A.
Hall, Zane G., 13824A.
Halliday, Robert W., 13098A.
Halpin, Edward V., 12940A.
Hambrick, George O., 13866A.
Hamilton, Calvin L., 18139A.
Hamilton, Richard E., Jr., 13776A.
Hammack, Charles R., 13669A.
Hammond, Walter S., 33723A.
Hancock, Quentin L., 33947A.
Hand, Stanley I., 33816A.
Handy, Paul, 13031A.
Hanner, Charles K., Jr., 13079A.
Harden, Paul E., 33594A.
Hargraves, John F., 33707A.
Harris, Lloyd M., 33722A.
Harris, Robert W., 12704A.
Harris, Willie M., 12907A.
Harrold, Paul C., 13431A.
Hart, Francis J., 13432A.
Hartley, Frank W., Jr., 13169A.
Hartnett, Bernard F., 33851A.
Harwell, Albert S., Jr., 33883A.
Haughom, Andrew, 33600A.
Hawes, Warren H., 18160A.
Heath, Robert H., 13881A.
Heaviside, Robert W., 13390A.
Heberling, Raymond L., 13417A.
Heintzelman, H. L., 3d, 13700A.
Helmick, Richard H., 33830A.
Helms, Willard B., 12949A.
Hemingway, Norman B., 33643A.
Henderson, William T., Jr., 33747A.
Hendrick, Andrew J., 33820A.
Henke, Arnold W., 13217A.
Henley, Robert M., 13033A.
Henry, David W., Jr., 20590A.
Henry, Mervin L., 20604A.
Henry, Russell F., 13391A.
Herberg, John A., 51784A.
Herbert, Dilver B., 51782A.
Herdzina, Raymond J., 33261A.
Herrera, Alfred C., 20608A.
Herrmann, Harry H., 33966A.
Heslep, Alvin R., 12931A.
Hester, Benjamin F., 12011A.
Hester, James A., 12625A.
Hewitt, George, 33638A.
Hicks, Charles K., 12130A.
Hill, David M., 33671A.
Hill, Kennedy D., 13766A.
Hill, Louis D., 33716A.
Hillen, John W., Jr., 13537A.
Hinckley, Frank O., 33493A.
Hinnant, Robert E., 13329A.
Hoban, Richard M., 23658A.
Hodge, Russell E., 33953A.
Hodges, Edward F., 33654A.
Hodges, Millard U., 13025A.
Hodgins, Lawrence J., Jr., 13558A.
Hoerler, Walter, 13418A.
Hojnacki, Joseph, 13855A.
Holcomb, Robert J., 13496A.
Holder, Glendi C., 13138A.
Holland, Clark O., 13911A.
Holland, Mark F., 33801A.
Holley, Roy L., 12773A.
Holt, Garland E., 20607A.
Hooper, William D., 13151A.
Hopkins, Charles, Jr., 11962A.
Horn, Willard L., 13416A.
Horrigan, Robert J., 13071A.
Horrocks, John T., 33560A.
Howard, Pat N., 13420A.
Howe, Charles E., Jr., 11479A.
Howell, James R., 12933A.
Howell, John C., 51769A.
Hubbard, Thomas P., 22590A.
Hughes, John F., 12766A.
Hughes, Jonathan S., 33949A.
Hughes, Paul A., 13663A.
Hullar, Robert J., 33849A.
Hume, Truman F., 33712A.
Humphrey, Lee J., 13900A.

Hunter, Jack C., 33793A.
Hutchinson, Paul E., 18158A.
Imhoff, Harold L., 13544A.
Immel, Harry D., Jr., 33751A.
Ingram, Vernon J., 13570A.
Iverson, Robert W., 33869A.
Jackson, Arthur J. W., 33896A.
Jackson, Thomas T., 13716A.
Jacobs, Dan J., 13760A.
Jacobs, Eugene W., 13860A.
Jacobs, Michael C., 13518A.
Jacobs, William P., 13052A.
Jahnke, Ernst E., 33601A.
James, Ben E., 51783A.
James, Clifton E., 13374A.
James, William W., 33719A.
Jane, Edwin G., Jr., 13085A.
Janek, Lewis F., 12872A.
Janovitz, George W., 12213A.
Jarrett, David D., 13636A.
Jehl, Roland R., 33881A.
Jelley, James D., 33817A.
Jenkins, Russell H., 33495A.
Jenson, Harris L., 13121A.
Jerman, Charles E., 12897A.
Jessop, Paul D., 33826A.
Johnson, Clayton J., 33952A.
Johnson, Earl L., 33837A.
Johnson, Francis E., 33595A.
Johnson, George L., 11870A.
Johnson, George W. S., 13165A.
Johnson, Howard C., 13219A.
Johnson, John R., Jr., 13656A.
Johnson, Kenneth L., 33553A.
Johnson, Lionel F., 33844A.
Johnson, Louis M., 33967A.
Johnson, Raymond F., 33673A.
Johnston, Ben D., Jr., 12792A.
Jonas, Gordon E., 12812A.
Jones, Albert W., 13603A.
Jones, Charles C., 33795A.
Jones, David A., 33498A.
Jones, Donald A., 18157A.
Jones, Frank C., 33802A.
Jones, Henry L., 12891A.
Jones, James S., Jr., 11400A.
Jones, Joseph W., Jr., 18094A.
Jones, Melbern R., 12965A.
Jones, Robert L., 13251A.
Jones, Warren H., 11608A.
Kahn, Leroy, 21787A.
Kangas, John F., 13893A.
Karnezis, Demetrios, 12740A.
Katz, Theodore, 33561A.
Kaufman, Richard H., 13471A.
Kava, Stanley F., 59990A.
Keator, John E., 12830A.
Keeling, David W., 13898A.
Keely, George J., 33535A.
Keish, Frederick C., 12738A.
Kelley, John B., 33640A.
Kelly, James D., 12728A.
Kelly, James W., 21462A.
Kelso, William R., 12822A.
Kemp, Ridgely D., 33775A.
Kennedy, Jerome M., 13260A.
Kennedy, Joseph J., 33632A.
Kennedy, Robert L., 33562A.
Kennedy, Thomas B., 12723A.
Kerr, Robert A., 12804A.
Kessler, Donald L., 12750A.
Kester, Clifford D., 18163A.
Kienle, Frederick J., 33552A.
Kiick, Richard D., 33729A.
Kile, Roddie L., 33543A.
Kille, Wesley G., 13001A.
Killian, Melvin J., 33568A.
King, Frederick M., 12852A.
King, Paul S., 13534A.
King, William H., Jr., 13484A.
Kinny, Archer W., Jr., 13607A.
Kirby, Julian B., 13017A.
Kleine, James D., Jr., 13301A.
Klonowski, Joseph J., 12926A.
Knott, Clarence W., 13552A.
Knowles, Edward, Jr., 13365A.
Knowles, Harold F., 13678A.
Kocel, Edward P., 13216A.
Koelbl, Henry C., 33538A.
Kohl, Don R., 22635A.
Koles, Robert L., 51776A.
Komlenich, Peter, 51781A.
Korbol, Clifford O., 12929A.
Kougias, George C., 23682A.
Kouts, Alexander, 33544A.
Krause, Francis R., 12983A.
Krug, Valentine W., 51772A.
Krysakowski, Joseph E., 19791A.
Kuertz, Robert R., 13765A.
Kuldau, Parker C., 13069A.
Kurtz, Howard F., 33819A.
Lackens, Edwin B., 13912A.
Ladd, Roy E., 33961A.
Laedtke, Elmer C., 13890A.
Lahargoue, Joseph J., 33862A.
Lakin, Robert K., 33951A.
Lambert, Raymond E., 33628A.
Lane, Edward E., Jr., 13394A.
Lane, Joseph A., 13597A.
Lane, Ralph H., Jr., 13279A.
Langworthy, Everett W., 13253A.
Lannon, James J., 13653A.
Larson, Jack A., 33715A.
Lassandro, James L., 33563A.
Lawson, Delbert R., 13820A.
Lawyer, John E., 12638A.
Leary, Dodge E., 13089A.
Leaser, Earl R., 13036A.
Ledbetter, Lamar E., 13312A.
Ledig, Richard G., 2d, 33633A.
Lee, Richard D., 13414A.
Leeds, John C., Jr., 13103A.
Legrand, George, 33714A.
Lehner, Albert M., 13554A.
Lemak, Frank, 13919A.
Lenihan, John J., 33700A.
Lepski, Walter P., 51789A.
Levy, Richard A., 33684A.
Lewis, Frank L., 33736A.
Lewis, Howard J., 13851A.
Lewis, Melford W., 13882A.
Lien, Arthur M., 22574A.
Ligon, Vernon P., Jr., 33825A.
Lindberg, Carl A., 13826A.
Lindgren, John R., 13403A.
Lindsay, Robert A., 13533A.
Linn, Howard A., 12862A.
Lipcsak, Mike, Jr., 33545A.
Liptak, James S., 13143A.
Littleton, Franklin W., Jr., 12896A.
Littlewood, Theodore P., 20642A.
Lockwood, Harold K., 13173A.
Logan, Douglas H., 12925A.
Lonczak, Walter J., 33913A.
Long, Clifford G., 12756A.
Long, Lewis F., 13234A.
Long, Raymond W., 13541A.
Longren, Carl W., 33957A.
Looney, John P., 13186A.
Love, David E., 33617A.
Love, Edwin L., 48717A.
Lovelady, Albert P., 33867A.
Loveless, Philip M., Jr., 33742A.
Lowe, Jerome G., 33965A.
Lowman, Raymond P., 13049A.
Luber, Vernon N., 18127A.
Lucterhand, Fred W., 33874A.
Lumovich, Victor, 33926A.
Lupa, Henry J., 13299A.
Lutrey, Theodore T., 12865A.
Lutz, George W., 13388A.
Lux, Frank O., 13004A.
Lyle, Vernon J., 12759A.
Lyman, Edward M., 13256A.
MacCauley, Hugh B., 13819A.
MacDonald, Douglas L., 13660A.
MacDougall, Joseph E., 13775A.
Mack, Matthew M., 33928A.
MacKenzie, Robert F., 13779A.
Macks, Charles W., 33546A.
Maitland, William W., 13341A.
Makowski, Bernard A., 33959A.
Mallard, Thurston N., 13467A.
Malnassy, Ernest, 33554A.
Mandros, William J., 20692A.
Mann, William L., 13777A.
Mansfield, Cliff D., 13849A.
Margison, Robert L., 13332A.
Markham, Vernon C., 13633A.
Marohl, Hugh P., 13584A.
Marr, James A., 33686A.
Marsh, Franklin C., 13877A.
Marsio, James W., 51795A.
Marston, Arthur A., 12854A.
Martell, Donald J., 13444A.
Martin, Herbert W., 13426A.
Martin, Jack T., 13634A.
Martin, Richard R., 11413A.
Martin, Thomas S., Jr., 13504A.
Martin, William W., 13682A.
Mason, James E., 33925A.
Mason, John J., 13482A.
Mason, John R., 33917A.
Masters, Edgar J., 12886A.
Masterson, Robert J., 12901A.
Mathews, James E., 20021A.
Mathias, Albert C., 11411A.
Mattatall, Marsden W., 33923A.
Mattingly, Richard T., 33655A.
Maxwell, Earl P., 33766A.
Mayfield, Darrell W., 13358A.
Mayo, William E., 13876A.
Mays, John B., Jr., 10544A.
McAdam, Richard C., 13679A.
McAuliffe, Richard G., 33892A.
McBride, Elmer T., 12799A.
McCabe, John J., Jr., 33558A.
McCain, Earl S., 13510A.
McCann, James J., 12924A.
McCarthy, John F., 33783A.
McClain, Charles J., 33815A.
McClement, Robert L., 13236A.
McClure, Samuel S., 13336A.
McClure, William C., 13640A.
McCooe, Christopher T., 51751A.
McDermott, Robert W., 33672A.
McDonald, Allen K., 33586A.
McDonell, Charles E., 13475A.
McFadden, Robert W., 51764A.
McFann, H. Miles, 13499A.
McFarland, Kenneth T., Jr., 13023A.
McGee, Charles E., 51799A.
McGregor, Jack K., 13717A.
McGrew, Kenneth G., 12813A.
McIntyre, Brandt, 13767A.
McIntyre, Donald E., 13757A.
McIntyre, Harry D., 33886A.
McIver, Claud L., Jr., 33950A.
McKenzie, Byron E., 13184A.
McKinney, Russell M., 13622A.
McKinney, Walter A., 13816A.
McKinzie, William M., 13661A.
McKittrick, Richard G., 33499A.
McKown, Robert E., 12939A.
McLaren, John P., 13741A.
McLeod, Billy A., 33520A.
McMahon, James J., Jr., 12805A.
McMinn, Truman L., 13400A.
McMullen, Frank M., 13681A.
McNabb, Maurice E., 33641A.
McNulty, Gerald M., 33970A.
Meade, Elmer C., 13577A.
Meador, Thomas R., Jr., 33890A.
Meeks, John R., 33724A.
Meibohm, Winfred H., 13083A.
Meline, Ralph E., 13848A.
Melvin, Robert T., Jr., 13735A.
Merrill, Robert T., 3d, 13413A.
Meyer, Gilbert E., 12930A.
Mickish, William J., 12819A.
Middledorf, William F., 33609A.
Mikkelsen, Albert H., 13250A.
Miles, Wilson A., 33940A.
Millar, John R., 51771A.
Miller, John F., 33660A.
Miller, Louie, Jr., 33564A.
Miller, Nathan W., 13511A.
Miller, Richard F., 13542A.
Miller, Richmond L., Jr., 12718A.
Miller, Robert T., 12810A.
Mills, Clarence H., 22650A.
Mish, Charles C., 13828A.
Moelich, William E., Jr., 12725A.
Mohr, Homer H., 13455A.
Moll, Frank, Jr., 33516A.
Molloy, Paul F., 12882A.
Montgomery, Beverly O., 33908A.
Moon, Bryden E., 13378A.
Moon, Jack F., 13176A.
Moore, Herbert W., Jr., 12779A.
Moore, Jack K., 18135A.
Moore, John T., 33937A.

Moore, Robert B., 13781A.
Morefield, Luther W., Jr., 33850A.
Morel, Raymond E., 13026A.
Moreland, Arthur L., 33918A.
Morey, John B., 59989A.
Morfit, Charles B., 13896A.
Morgan, Joseph P., 13218A.
Morgan, Noland J., 13303A.
Morgan, Thomas E., Jr., 13840A.
Morphew, Marion C., Jr., 33776A.
Morrison, Harold C., 33571A.
Morse, Elmer M., 33855A.
Moses, Larrie E., 13280A.
Moss, George H., 3d, 33894A.
Mouat, John C., 13045A.
Muehleisen, Jacob D., 33864A.
Mulanax, Robert V., 13286A.
Mullen, John T., 13925A.
Muller, Frank J., 33809A.
Mullin, Robert E., 13130A.
Murray, Charles B., 13377A.
Murray, Francis W., 33906A.
Murray, John E., 23656A.
Murray, Loren P., Jr., 13055A.
Murray, Richard E., 13161A.
Murray, William M., 12758A.
Musgrave, Howard J., 13178A.
Musick, Bill C., 51747A.
Nawrocki, Joseph C., 12041A.
Naylor, William E., Jr., 13690A.
Neal, Arthur M., 22617A.
Neal, Harold L., Jr., 12802A.
Neal, Jack S., 33597A.
Neal, Robert E., 12987A.
Neeley, Robert F., 33785A.
Neff, James M., 33827A.
Neie, Reuben W., 11439A.
Neil, John G., 13183A.
Nelson, James E., 33596A.
Ness, Patrick J., 13227A.
Netherwood, Douglas B., 12857A.
Neville, Elmer M., 33491A.
Newell, Jamieson H. B., 13501A.
Newton, James H., 13084A.
Nicholls, Ben H., 33612A.
Nichols, Horace C., Jr., 51770A.
Nichols, William H., 33778A.
Nicholson, Clifton L., 13452A.
Nielsen, Victor L., 33789A.
Niersbach, Norman G., 12760A.
Noble, Jerry W., 33811A.
Nolte, Ursel C., 33735A.
Norman, Harry E., 13580A.
Norton, William R., 13140A.
Norwood, Howard L., Jr., 33898A.
Novak, Jack C., 13708A.
O'Brien, Lawrence G., 13784A.
Ogburn, Henly M., Jr., 33605A.
O'Grady, Harold J., 33521A.
O'Hara, David B., 24319A.
O'Hearn, Daniel R., 12978A.
O'Keefe, Truman, 33621A.
Oldfield, Charles S., 13901A.
O'Leary, John D., 13010A.
Oliver, Thomas K., 13677A.
Olsen, Frank W., 33759A.
Opper, Leroy C., 13817A.
Orr, Wayne P., 33526A.
Orsi, Victor, 48722A.
Osborn, Carlos R., 13844A.
Osburn, John A., 33533A.
Ostrem, Roy E., 13233A.
Oswald, Garth B., 12876A.
Otier, Richard E., 49144A.
O'Toole, Jerome T., 13732A.
Ottaway, Harold E., 13065A.
Overton, William W., 13555A.
Owens, Melvin O., 13100A.
Pachl, Ruel J., 13742A.
Page, Jack C., 13032A.
Pahutka, Raymond W., 49138A.
Palmer, Carl G., 13531A.
Pamperien, Roka D., 13752A.
Pandolfo, Andrew R., 33665A.
Paradise, Charles H., 13515A.
Park, Paul L., 13662A.
Parker, Harold A., 33496A.
Parker, Jack, 26430A.
Parker, Richard H., 13687A.
Parramore, William W., Jr., 33863A.
Partridge, Charles H., 13508A.
Partridge, James A., 33494A.
Pascoe, Harry J., 13266A.
Patterson, Edward H., 13845A.
Patterson, John V., Jr., 13788A.
Patton, Roderick R., 13625A.
Paulman, John R., 33750A.
Paulsel, Donald Q., 13288A.
Payne, George N., 33589A.
Peattie, Harry A., Jr., 12801A.
Peck, Warren K., 13916A.
Peebles, Farley E., 13756A.
Peightel, James L., 12784A.
Pelter, Joseph M., 33517A.
Pennstrom, John H., Jr., 13751A.
Percival, Jay V., 49140A.
Perkins, Donald F., 12711A.
Perry, Marshall F., 33647A.
Perry, William W., 33902A.
Petersen, Richard E., 33792A.
Petersen, Roy, 51763A.
Petersen, Warren J., 13436A.
Petree, William L., 13386A.
Petrus, Tom P., 49134A.
Pettit, Roy F., 13382A.
Phillips, Charles S., Jr., 33968A.
Phillips, William L., 13478A.
Phillips, William T., 33931A.
Philpott, Jammie M., 13694A.
Pietrucha, Joseph J., 33703A.
Pitchford, Joel F., 33741A.
Pitts, Morris B., 25502A.
Pollen, Milton T., 12875A.
Pope, Kermit R., 13433A.
Porter, Ernest J., 13141A.
Porter, Fletcher S., 22672A.
Porter, Frederick S., Jr., 12848A.
Porter, George E., 13904A.
Porter, Jack V., 13846A.
Ports, Robert A., 13277A.
Prahler, Robert H., 13806A.
Price, Ernest C., 13701A.
Price, Robert D., 12736A.
Prochoroff, George, 12984A.
Pugh, James R., Jr., 13711A.
Pullen, Howard V., 12884A.
Purdy, Douglas C., 13322A.
Quisenberry, George B., 13926A.
Raggio, Frank S., 33572A.
Rainier, Robert C., 33897A.
Randels, James B., 13258A.
Ratterree, James G., 12274A.
Rausch, George R., 33701A.
Rawls, Don M., 13487A.
Ray, Arthur G., Jr., 51773A.
Raynor, Walter J., 33527A.
Reagle, Robert C., 13668A.
Reap, Cyril J., 33690A.
Reavis, Cecil L., Jr., 12909A.
Recher, John H., 13059A.
Reed, Charles W., 12722A.
Reed, Emile L., Jr., 33880A.
Reeder, William D., 18161A.
Rees, Ernest W., 33679A.
Reid, Alva R., 13571A.
Reid, Richard S., 33903A.
Reilly, Alvin E., 13118A.
Reiss, Leonard, 21439A.
Remick, John H., 12838A.
Renegar, Charles Z., Jr., 33899A.
Renken, Fred P., 13123A.
Rennie, David, 33808A.
Renth, Edward J., Jr., 13724A.
Rentmeester, Lester F., 13352A.
Reuteler, Bruce E., 18168A.
Reynolds, Walker R., Jr., 13614A.
Rhoades, Franklin G., 33762A.
Rhodes, Charles W., 51766A.
Richards, Donald W., 13362A.
Richardson, Bill M., 13435A.
Richardson, Sidney K., 13333A.
Richie, Frank G., 13353A.
Ridenour, Paul W., 13019A.
Riggs, Francis H., 13489A.
Rigney, Harold D., 33534A.
Riser, William W., Jr., 13894A.
Ritter, Henry W., 13847A.
Roberts, Charles A., 12948A.
Roberts, Harry W., 12818A.
Roberts, Ray O., 13248A.
Robertson, Edward D., 49135A.
Robertson, Hugh B., Jr., 33779A.
Robertson, Thomas D., 12751A.
Robinson, James D., 33618A.
Rochlin, Arthur W., 13361A.
Rockey, Carlton G., Jr., 12708A.
Roeder, Richard O., 33630A.
Rollman, Robert O., 22823A.
Romo, Peter E., 13157A.
Rorrer, Marvin T., 13070A.
Ross, Richard H., 13163A.
Rountree, Malcolm S., 12774A.
Rozner, Morris, 33893A.
Russell, Walter J., Jr., 33760A.
Ryan, Charles W., 33606A.
Ryan, John A., Jr., 33884A.
Ryan, Neil B., 12885A.
Rybos, Karol F., 33822A.
Sage, Joseph P., 33677A.
Saltzman, Ernest C., Jr., 13675A.
Sams, Richard H., Jr., 13267A.
Samson, George D., 33530A.
Sandbach, John O., 13437A.
Sander, Frank R., 33971A.
Sanders, Ardeene E., 33730A.
Sanderson, Duncan M., 12970A.
Sarchet, Kenneth J., 33732A.
Sargent, Jack S., 33921A.
Sarrett, Dale T., 13734A.
Satterfield, George W., Jr., 33659A.
Savage, Robert B., 13156A.
Savuto, Joseph A., 13897A.
Schacherbauer, Carl J., 49145A.
Schapira, Calvin D., 33842A.
Schatzley, Byron L., 33708A.
Schindler, Joe T., 13434A.
Schlueter, Edward A., 13543A.
Schmidt, Robert C., 12962A.
Schmucker, Daniel L., 33629A.
Schnabel, Robert E., 13532A.
Schneck, Ralph H., 33916A.
Schneider, Jack J., 33515A.
Schooley, Jim C., 13302A.
Schramm, Ned, Jr., 13697A.
Schuering, Alvin G., 18166A.
Scott, Frank P., 33791A.
Scott, Robert I., Jr., 12905A.
Scudder, Robert K., 13345A.
Scurzi, Joseph R., 13547A.
Secor, Ralph A., 33828A.
Segura, Wiltz P., 23681A.
Seith, William F., 33619A.
Seliga, Edward J., 13397A.
Sert, Louis R., 12657A.
Shaber, Bert, Jr., 13021A.
Shackelford, George W., 33667A.
Shafer, Guy L., Jr., 13344A.
Sharp, Stuart M., 20629A.
Shepard, Frank H., 33865A.
Sheppard, Brooks L., 33840A.
Sherman, Fred P., 11653A.
Sherman, Ocea D., Jr., 13062A.
Sherrill, Estes B., 13859A.
Shively, George K., 13839A.
Shook, Fredric W., 13175A.
Shuler, Leroy T., 33531A.
Shultz, Charles Y., Jr., 13476A.
Simmons, Harlan G., 11551A.
Simmons, Malcolm C., 13013A.
Simon, John J., 13535A.
Singleton, Floyd E., 12748A.
Sipes, Arnold, 33702A.
Sisson, Jack H., 33584A.
Sitler, Fred H., 13124A.
Skubal, Otis O., 33853A.
Slater, Hugh C., 33573A.
Smith, Clark S., 33509A.
Smith, Eben J., 11963A.
Smith, Garland J., 33650A.
Smith, Hubert, Jr., 13710A.
Smith, Jack A., 13078A.
Smith, James C., 51786A.
Smith, Justus W., 33752A.
Smith, Lewis C., 13462A.
Smith, Ralph L., 13285A.
Smith, Robert E., 13507A.
Smith, Robert L., 12850A.
Smith, Robert W., 13454A.
Smith, Vander L., 13615A.
Smith, Wayne E., Jr., 13524A.
Smith, William L., 33942A.
Smitherman, Julian E., 13276A.
Smoak, Andrew W., 22652A.
Smolenski, Joseph B., 33933A.

Snead, James W., 33670A.
Sneed, William O., 13468A.
Snyder, Richard C., 13684A.
Snyder, Wallace S., 33720A.
Sohrweide, Harold W., 33843A.
Sommers, Harold L., 12999A.
Sorenson, Bernard R., 13383A.
Sparks, Earl E., 13449A.
Sparrow, Harry I., 13787A.
Speer, Marvin L., 51792A.
Spence, Aubrey A., 11522A.
Spencer, Robert V., 13230A.
Spiva, Thurman, 13527A.
Spofford, James R., 13371A.
Sporer, Albert B., Jr., 33536A.
Sporer, Fred, Jr., 13564A.
Sprague, Robert L., 13142A.
Stabler, Tarlton B., 12820A.
Stanfield, Donald N., 13870A.
Stanley, Marvin M., 13109A.
Starmer, Glenn A., 13356A.
Staten, William H., 51758A.
Steen, Clarence H., 12823A.
Steiger, George J., 33929A.
Stein, Winfield M., 13813A.
Stephens, Robert L., 13581A.
Sterr, Roger J., 33769A.
Stevens, Charles A., Jr., 13117A.
Stewart, Dale F., 13255A.
Stewart, Dana W., Jr., 13895A.
Stewart, Thomas E., 12945A.
Stillens, Homer L., 49133A.
Stoeber, Leslie R., 51754A.
Stoll, Albert E., 12860A.
Stonis, Peter C., 13307A.
Stout, Robert A., 13588A.
Stovall, Collins C., 51793A.
Street, James C., 51774A.
Strickland, Robert M., 33972A.
Stroff, Michael J., Jr., 20648A.
Struble, Raymond H., 13763A.
Stull, Grafton W., 13627A.
Stuyvesant, Ernest D., 13586A.
Sullivan, Charles L., 13000A.
Sullivan, Cornelius D., 33731A.
Sullivan, John H., Jr., 33823A.
Sullivan, Robert, 13081A.
Summers, Victor F., 33904A.
Sunde, Robert J., 33698A.
Sutton, Robert C., 12985A.
Swaim, Harold L., 13812A.
Swap, Arthur M., 13214A.
Sweeney, David M., 33969A.
Swope, Jerome M., 33668A.
Sylvester, Frank V., 33699A.
Symmes, Roderick O., 12710A.
Tammenga, Henry L., 12811A.
Tarr, Milton F., 13658A.
Taylor, David M., 13618A.
Taylor, Franklin W., 13689A.
Taylor, Jimmie, 22572A.
Taylor, Joseph T., 20611A.
Taylor, Roland H., 13282A.
Taylor, Vernon J., 13868A.
Terrell, James H., Jr., 13134A.
Territo, Vincent A., 13314A.
Thaler, Melvin S., 12870A.
Thom, George J., 51768A.
Thomas, Allen, 33607A.
Thomas, Harold P. G. H., 33547A.
Thompson, Allen W., 12789A.
Thompson, Walter R., 13792A.
Thompson, William M., 13412A.
Thornton, Charles H., 13346A.
Thuma, Richard R., Jr., 33626A.
Tiddy, Eugene, 33860A.
Tiller, Frank R., Jr., 33662A.
Tilley, Douglas G., 12415A.
Tilson, William F., 3d, 33599A.
Timmermans, Henry L., 12817A.
Tisdale, James W., Jr., 13778A.
Todd, Raymond V., 13112A.
Trabb, Ralph, 19792A.
Trail, Reo C., 13768A.
Traylor, Horace C., Jr., 18165A.
Trost, Victor J., 51798A.
Troutman, Baldwin L., Jr., 12346A.
Trudeau, Carvil A., 33973A.
Tucker, Claude J., 12903A.
Tucker, Hugh O., 33905A.
Tulin, Shale L., 33856A.
Tull, Levin P., 33548A.
Turnquist, Roy H., 13195A.
Tyndall, Elmer N., 33713A.
Tyson, Houston C., 13210A.
Ulriksen, Arnold C., 33764A.
Underwood, William S., 13651A.
Vacanti, Charles L., 13116A.
Vanbruggen, Richard, 12713A.
Vanbuskirk, Robert C., 33644A.
Vance, Lewis I., 13811A.
Vancleef, Paul L., 13647A.
Vanderbeek, Louis M., 13099A.
Vansickle, Philip H., 13043A.
Vantrease, Hubert C., 13422A.
Vaughan, John W., Jr., 33587A.
Vincent, Arnold W., 51785A.
Vocke, Robert D., 13102A.
Voight, Robert O., 33578A.
Voigtmann, Frank L., 13469A.
Voss, Kenneth W., 12976A.
Waage, Amos E., 13887A.
Wacht, Thomas A., 51755A.
Wagasky, Sylvester J., 33567A.
Wagner, James, 33911A.
Wagnon, Harry T., 13520A.
Waid, Elwood J., 13579A.
Wakefield, Harry A., 12825A.
Walls, L. E., 13905A.
Walsh, Edward J., Jr., 13712A.
Walsh, James, Jr., 13419A.
Walsh, Roy M., 13903A.
Warren, Keith L., 33768A.
Waterman, Leroy R., 13415A.
Wathen, Roy D., 13439A.
Wear, Thomas O., 13438A.
Weaver, Allen T., Jr., 51791A.
Weaver, Carl T., Jr., 13011A.
Webb, Richard L., 13446A.
Weber, Charles G., 33854A.
Weed, John B., 12765A.
Weeks, John A., Jr., 33740A.
Weigle, Vincent J., 12793A.
Weigner, Leonard N., 33706A.
Weinmeister, Carl J., 3d, 13655A.
Weitzler, Donald L., 13404A.
Welch, Norman E., 12824A.
Welch, Robert G., 33620A.
Wells, Charles B., Jr., 12919A.
Wells, Harold E., 12943A.
Wells, John H., Jr., 33756A.
Welsh, Thomas G. A., 33579A.
Wesley, James R., 13488A.
Wewer, Gene B., 51765A.
Weyant, Jack A., 13424A.
Whalen, Daniel J., 13265A.
Wheeler, Richard V., 13702A.
White, Edwin J., Jr., 33779A.
White, James H., 13861A.
White, Richard J., 33804A.
Wildman, Carol E., 33875A.
Wiley, Edward R., 33765A.
Wiley, James F., 33666A.
Wilkerson, Sam C., Jr., 13652A.
Williams, Burl R., 13646A.
Williams, Cyril E., 13363A.
Williams, Donald E., 12958A.
Williams, Earl T., 33631A.
Williams, Herndon F., 13619A.
Williams, James A., 13605A.
William, James B., Jr., 13473A.
Williams, Lewis H., 12963A.
Williamson, Arthur, 33737A.
Willis, W. B., 12982A.
Wilson, Henry T., Jr., 51752A.
Wilson, James B., 33613A.
Wilson, Mathew R., 13785A.
Wilson, Morris F., 13144A.
Wilson, Stephen C., 13883A.
Wilson, Theodore A., 13888A.
Wimberly, Wesley F., 13270A.
Winchester, Jackson L., 33915A.
Wines, Daniel C., Jr., 33876A.
Wink, Eugene A., Jr., 12871A.
Winslow, Douglas E., 51777A.
Wisdom, Joe K., 33506A.
Wise, Billie R., 12798A.
Withers, Raymond R., 13015A.
Wolfe, Lawrence J., 13073A.
Wolfe, Roland L., 12771A.
Wood, Herman C., 33805A.
Wood, Horace D., 13076A.
Wood, Thomas W., 13044A.
Wood, William D., 13215A.
Woodyard, Jean K., Jr., 13676A.
Worley, William H., 33664A.
Wywal, Felix B., 13028A.
Yarbrough, Leonard H., 13172A.
Yeoman, Bill L., 13146A.
Yochim, Frederick A., 12720A.
Yockey, Donald J., 13921A.
Yoder, Richard A., 13922A.
Young, Woodrow W., 51794A.
Ziegelgruber, Lee R., 13791A.
Zimmer, Adolph E., 33836A.
Zimmerman, Max G., 13087A.
Zuber, Richard S., 13593A.
Zukerberg, Harry, 13869A.

WAF's

Gary, Virginia S., 21296W.
Kubli, Lorna V., 21327W.
Odell, Shirley T., 21283W.
Rice, Charlotte T., 21378W.
Walls, Kathryne M., 21384W.

CHAPLAINS

Albert, John F., 48575A.
Barringer, John D., 20857A.
Brenner, Arthur E. K., 20858A.
Clark, William L., 48578A.
Evans, John T., Jr., 18807A.
Glaize, Charles H., 20854A.
Mattheson, Raymond T., 20861A.
Taylor, James D., 48579A.
Terry, Roy M., 21429A.
Wilson, George S., 55103A.
Woods, Ransom B., Jr., 48577A.

DENTAL CORPS

Ayres, William E., 22976A.
Baldwin, Kenneth H., 24205A.
Bowman, Robert G., 25465A.
Chapman, John A., 19618A.
Cox, John, 25664A.
Dunham, David R., 18970A.
Gillespie, Carroll C., Jr., 22984A.
Hannon, Harrison J., 26359A.
Jackson, James T., 24117A.
Jaslow, Charles, 20553A.
Kienholz, Richard L., 29649A.
Kreutzer, Joseph J., 24204A.
McCully, Albert C., 20524A.
Morgan, Howard H., 20835A.
O'Leary, Timothy J., 18966A.
Reilly, Robert L., Jr., 20833A.
Rogers, Joseph C., 18965A.
Schulte, William C., 18947A.
Stebbins, Harcourt M., 55925A.
Stumpf, Arthur J., Jr., 23058A.
Thompson, Robert L., Jr., 20523A.
Townsend, Lewis F., Jr., 18960A.
Turk, Roy S., 22988A.
Walker, Fredrick E., 19823A.
Williams, Marion R., 21727A.

MEDICAL CORPS

Barnum, Ferdinand, 22544A.
Bear, Stanley H., 20826A.
Bowling, Franklin L., 19621A.
Clarke, James S., 55850A.
Culver, Warren T., 19346A.
Dewey, Walter W., 22958A.
Fenno, Richard M., 21848A.
Ferris, Curzon C., Jr., 25729A.
Flinn, Don E., 23562A.
Freedman, Martin J., 21690A.
Gibbs, Charles E., 24111A.
Goggans, Walter H., 20628A.
Hansen, Carl L., Jr., 19353A.
Hessberg, Rufus R., Jr., 24647A.
Hood, Oliver C., 19325A.
Ketring, Eldon G., 19347A.
Kurth, Robert J., 22401A.
Leeper, Claude K., 55851A.
Levine, Robert, 22559A.
Lutz, Stanley, Jr., 19958A.
Marriott, William R. V., 24648A.
Marshall, Charles B., Jr., 19962A.
Myers, Paul W., 21761A.
Nauert, Nicholas H., Jr., 19606A.
Osborne, Horace H., 19605A.
Patterson, Roy R., 19826A.
Peterson, William F., 19913A.
Powell, George W., 32359A.

Quinnell, Robert K., 19323A.
Randel, Hugh W., 19357A.
Reynolds, George E., 22955A.
Rosen, Irwin E., 19326A.
Schafer, George E., 19345A.
Schear, Evan W., 19352A.
Shirer, Ralph F., Jr., 19351A.
Simons, David G., 19331A.
Smith, Dasil C., 20542A.
Stein, Ignatius J., 19963A.
Swindell, Herbert V., 25328A.
Talley, Thomas P., 22962A.
Turner, William R., 20011A.
Vivian, Donald N., 19988A.
Watts, Charles C., Jr., 20010A.
Whitehouse, Wesley C., Jr., 22545A.
Wright, Walter D., 23063A.

NURSE CORPS

Albert, Janice A., 22037W.
Ball, Adele M., 21091W.
Deegan, Florence I., 21014W.
Dupont, Aileen A., 21958W.
Graham, Viola, 22019W.
Grinevich, Matilda D., 21996W.
Hierstein, Martha J., 21984W.
Hodgson, Maralee R., 21120W.
Hogdahl, Willie H., 21109W.
Laucks, Colatine D., 21098W.
Nordstrom, Norma B., 21002W.
Palm, Jamie F., 20927W.
Ragsdale, Lula M., 20998W.
Rydzewski, Helen A., 21171W.
Sutton, Mary L., 21128W.
Thompson, Catherine M., 21048W.
Wendt, Irene M., 21058W.
Zibell, Mabel M., 21982W.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Beck, William S., 21612A.
Burnie, Harrison G., 48902A.
Delahunt, John C., 19509A.
Doidge, William T., 19493A.
Donneson, Arthur J., 55320A.
Foley, Frank R., 21870A.
Force, Ronald C., 19492A.
Gaines, Robert L., 19496A.
Geary, John M., 19489A.
Holihan, Francis L., 21607A.
Horton, Russell E., 19501A.
Howell, Louis G., 19500A.
Kelley, John R., 48901A.
Manrow, William E., 19504A.
Marolf, Kenneth L., 21613A.
Nicholson, Guy C., 19506A.
Powell, Dudley F., 19507A.
Rohles, Frederick H., Jr., 19505A.
Rossi, Joseph P., 19498A.
VanHorn, Robert M., 19494A.
Westerdoll, Gale A., 55318A.

VETERINARY CORPS

Armstrong, James, 21603A.
Kuhn, Ulysses S. G., 3d, 19012A.
Neurauter, Lloyd J., 19011A.

In the Navy

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Warren R. Abel
Michael G. Abercrombie
Charles T. Acreback
James N. Agamaite
Donald W. Allee
Michael K. Andrews
Edward C. Archer
John T. Argo, Jr.
Charles S. Arnest
David P. Arnold
John R. Arthur
Frederick H. Badger
John G. Baehr, Jr.
James L. Bagby, Jr.
John L. Baker
John S. Baker
Ronald C. Baker
Alfred J. Banford, Jr.
Edward P. Barker
James H. Barnes
Walter E. Bateman
Robert C. Bates
Charles J. Batts
Thomas H. Bayless
William E. Bealle
Errol D. Beard
Fenn C. Beasley
Ralph E. Beedle
Ronald I. Bell
David C. Belton
William C. Benton III
Joseph C. Benzing
John S. Berg
James S. Bewick
Bryce G. Billings
Richard K. Bishop
Gary C. Blegstad
Jerry M. Blesch
William C. Bond
James P. Borsic
Ronald A. Boss
Stephen H. Bostwick
David L. Bourland
Charles H. Bowers
Leonard D. Bradt, Jr.
Herman T. Brandon
Dale E. Brandt
Richard A. Brems
William J. Brennan
William A. Brockett, Jr.
Richard B. Brodehl
Philip D. Brodeur
Lynn A. Brooks
David C. Brown
George E. Brown, Jr.
Jay S. Brown
Joseph R. Brown
Noel W. Brown
Joseph P. Broz
William T. Brunelle
Brian R. Buchholz
Rufus T. Burges, Jr.
Hugh A. Burkons
James B. Burrow, Jr.
John H. Butler
Paul L. Callahan
Gordon H. Carter
William M. Carter
Alden B. Chace, Jr.
Stephen K. Chadwick
Robert H. Chambers
Robert H. Champion
Melvyn H. Chang
Robert W. Chasteen
Gregory A. Chauncey
Geoffrey L. Chesbrough
Ralph R. Chesson, Jr.
Robert S. Clancy
David G. Clark
Jerry A. Clark
Vady R. Clark
Edward J. Clarke
Allan J. Claypool
Francis P. Cleary
John F. Cleater
William R. Cliff
Joe E. Clugston
Robert H. Coleman
Daniel J. Condon III
Thomas R. Conrey
James M. Coopersmith
David R. Copley
Joseph F. Corcoran
Clarence M. Cornforth
Douglas L. Cotton
Robert W. Covey
William E. Covington III
John H. Cox
Charles B. Creighton
Stephen C. Crooks
William D. Cross
Jerry M. Crumly
Daniel A. Curran
Harvey J. Cybul
Dennis K. Dahl
Alton T. Davis
Edward A. Davis
George B. Davis
James D. Davis
James C. Delesie
Carl W. Demshar
Stephen L. Denson
Robert W. Deputy
Dennis J. Desmond, Jr.
John W. Diedenhofen, Jr.
Donald L. Diget
Emil C. DiMotta, Jr.
Robert L. Ditchey
Richard W. Dommers
James W. Donahue
Wells B. Doty
Thomas F. Doyle, Jr.
David A. Drain
James B. Droste
Theodore B. Dubs
Stephen M. Duckworth
Gary R. Dukes
Calvin R. Dunlap III
David V. Dupee
Thomas I. Eastwood III
Alfred J. Egerton
William A. Eldred
John C. Eller
Ronnie R. Elliott
John R. Ellis
Norman P. Emerson
James F. Engelking
David C. English
Joseph L. Epstein
Jon K. Ericson
William A. Estell, Jr.
Robert F. Everett
Lawrence E. Ewert
Cornelius J. Fagan
Martin J. Farber
Edward R. Farrell
Gerard D. Farrell
Harry J. Feeney III
Nicholas M. Ferriter
Carl M. Fink
Ernest C. Fischer
Arthur W. Fisher III
Stuart J. Fitrell
George M. Fitzgerald, Jr.
Richard N. Fitzgerald
Myron T. Fleming, Jr.
Michael L. Foster
Robert C. Foyle
Wayne H. Francis
Ronald E. Frederick
Thomas P. French, Jr.
Jerome C. Fritz
Charles W. Fryer
James D. Fuller
John P. Fuller
William J. Fulton
William L. Fulton II
John M. Fultz III
George W. Futch
Frank J. Gaffney, Jr.
Paul E. Galanti
Jose C. Gamboa
Gerald S. Garmon
Stephen A. Garrison
James H. Gaul
William A. Gauvin
Lawrence F. Ghirardi
Robert E. Giles
Peter S. Gingras
Richard F. Ginieczki
Peter K. Glasier
Walter L. Glenn, Jr.
William F. H. Glover III
John M. Gluck
David M. Goebel
Martin W. Goldsborough
Peter G. Golwas, Jr.
Bruce R. Googins
Donald P. Gordon
Richard S. Gordon
Karl R. Graf
Patrick S. Grafton
Walter H. Graham
Louis R. Grant II
Victor S. Gray, Jr.
Norman R. Green, Jr.
Robert P. Greenman
Charles D. Griffin, Jr.
Stanley D. Griggs
Thomas C. Grzymala
Thomas R. Gunlock
Robert J. Guyon
John R. Haddick
Jack E. Hamilton
Frederick N. Hamly
John L. Hammer III
John J. Hanley, Jr.
Joseph A. Hanzel, Jr.
Richard E. Hardy
Raymond J. Harms
Leigh Harris
Larry M. Hart
Patrick V. Hart
Robert C. Hartman
Paul R. Harvey
Richard W. Hastings
Arthur L. Hatheway
Ronald G. Haugen
Brian J. Havey
Richard J. Hayes
Edmon L. Hayhurst
Thomas J. Heffernan
Phillip C. Henderson
Richardson L. Henley, Jr.
Russell J. Henry
Kermyn J. Hermann
Jack A. Herriott
Daniel R. Hertzfeldt
John F. Hewitt
Aubrey W. Hickam
Oscar J. Hickox, Jr.
Robert L. Hicks
John C. Hinkle
James B. Hitchborn
Thomas K. Hitchcock
David W. Hoffman
William St. Clair Hoffman
James J. Homer
Frank J. Horvath
Henry F. Howe
Peter A. Huchthausen
Faust F. Hughes, Jr.
Frank W. Hughes
James Hughes
Michael B. Hughes
William A. Hughes
John M. Huling, Jr.
Paul D. Hunt, Jr.
Edwin K. Hurst II
Paul D. Hurst
David V. Hutchinson
Albert R. Hyde
John J. Hyland III
Charles R. Ingram
Isom I. Ingram
George W. Inskeep
William H. Ise
James B. Jackson
Donald W. James
Paul R. Jeffers
Joseph R. John
Philip H. Johnson
Thomas F. Johnston
Wayne G. Johnston
David F. Jones
James F. Jordan
Charles V. Judge II
Ernest R. Kallus
Roger N. Kammerdeiner
Charles R. Kane
Walter B. Kasberg
Thomas D. Keenan
Stephen L. Kehl
Charles L. Keithley, Jr.
Douglas G. Keller
John P. Kelly
James R. Kendrigan
Robert S. Kennedy
Robert J. Kennelly, Jr.
John J. Kenny, Jr.
Barry R. Ketner
Thomas J. Kile
Donald M. King
John B. King
Joseph M. Kinger
William H. Kirvan, Jr.
Roger W. Kisiel
Charles A. Knochel
Stanley R. Knotts, Jr.
John A. Knubel, Jr.
Michael L. Kobar
James P. Koch
Robert W. Koch
Charles J. Koeber
Jerry A. Kotchka
Robert P. Kuntz
Peter S. Labyak
Larry B. LaGrandeur
John B. LaPlante
Jerome E. Larsen
Ronald S. LaStaiti
Richard L. Laws
Charles R. Lee
Richard C. Lee
Richard N. Lee
Lawrence C. LeGrande
David B. Lencses
Lawrence K. Letteney
James C. LeVangie
William H. Levings III
Ernest L. Lewis
Frederick L. Lewis
Robert J. Lewis
Richard A. Life
James H. Lindsay, Jr.
Gordon S. Lingley
Edwards S. Little
Oliver G. Locher
Boley A. Lojko
Mylan W. Lorenzen
William J. Lorino
Rodolfo Losoya
James D. Lucas, Jr.
Richard A. Luker
Donald G. Lundquist
Peter L. McCammon
John J. McCarthy, Jr.
James S. McCasland
Donald McCray
John M. McGrath
Thomas W. McKechnie
Robert McLean
Corbin A. McNeill, Jr.
Donald R. McNeill
Eugene B. McPhail
David A. McRae
Robert T. McWhinney, Jr.
Peter B. McWhite
John A. MacGregor
Peter C. MacIsaac
Russell L. Madison
Peyton M. Magruder, Jr.
John C. Maheu
Robert A. Majeski
Pedro M. Malave
Michael D. Maley
Frank H. Mallen
Anthony R. Maness
Edward B. Mann, Jr.
Samuel F. Manno
Anthony R. Marrical
Frank G. Marshall III
James A. Marshall
Walter P. Martin
Richard G. Martineau
John H. Maurer, Jr.
David M. Mayfield
Edward I. Mears
Jacob M. Meckler
Thomas A. Mercer
James S. Messer
James H. Mettler
Victor A. Meyer
Gerald C. Milkowski
William C. Miller
Brian D. Monaghan
Harry Monroe III
Alan R. More
Carl A. Moritz, Jr.
David L. Mullins
Jerry W. Munger
Thomas F. Murphy
Thomas E. Murray
William L. Murray
Thomas M. Mustin
Sterling E. Nair, Jr.
Carl F. Nardone
Michael A. Nash
John T. Natter
Denton "J" C. Nelson
Geoffrey A. Nelson
Peter J. Nelson
Robert K. Nerup
Michael T. Newell
Frank H. Newton III
Roy I. Newton
Richard E. Nichols, Jr.

Guy D. Nickerson
Charles Nicklas
Charles K. Norton, Jr.
Herbert T. Nowell
Stephen C. Nystrom
Joseph R. O'Brien
Martin J. O'Brien
Robert L. O'Connell
Kip O'Connor
Michael B. O'Connor, Jr.
Peter G. Odell
Francis X. O'Donnell
Harvey D. Olson
Phillip R. Olson
David A. Orriss
Geoffrey H. Osborn
Edward J. O'Sullivan
John W. Overstreet, Jr.
Robert H. Owen
Thomas J. Owen
William A. Owens
James "M" Palmer
James E. Paquin
Robert E. Partrick
Michael J. Patten
James W. Pearce
Dale Q. Pearson
Douglas C. Penny
Ernest D. Perkins
David A. Peterson, Jr.
William C. Pfingstag
William C. Pfister
George B. Phillips, Jr.
John B. Phillips
Charles R. Phoebus
Ronald T. Pitzer
Richard N. Plath
John R. Poe
James E. Pooser
Arvel J. Popp
Robert J. Pozzi
Thomas R. Pratt
Joseph G. Procopio
Michael M. Raggett
Roger C. Ramsey
Hugh M. Rawls, Jr.
Gary A. Reed
John T. Regan
Victor G. Reiling, Jr.
John R. Reilly
Thomas M. Reilly
Emery A. Reistetter
Donald W. Rhodes
Henry M. Richarde, Jr.
Richard A. Riddell
Philip J. Ridgely
Dayton W. Ritt
Edward Rogas, Jr.
Bernard H. Rosenbach
Theodore N. Rosser, Jr.
Joseph L. Rossi
Thomas A. Rue
John C. Ruff
Robert P. Rupprecht
Paul F. Rutherford
Gregory M. Salyards
James C. Sand
Ralph L. Santi
Neil C. Sapp
Phillip G. Saunders
Jerry B. Schreiber
Kermit W. Schroller, Jr.
John W. Schropp
Henry W. Schwartz
George W. Schweizer
Millard J. Searcy, Jr.
Martin A. Seelig
Laurence E. Senn
Clay L. Sharp, Jr.
Joseph W. Shaw, Jr.
Edward D. Sheafer, Jr.
William G. Sheldon
Linn T. Shoup
Richard L. Simmons
Stephen T. Simpson
Raymond M. Sisk, Jr.
James W. Sloat, Jr.
Bradford D. Smith
Franklin J. Smith III
Leighton W. Smith, Jr.
Michael O. Smith
Roger W. Smith
William R. H. Smith
James E. Soderberg
Robert M. Sontheimer
Robert J. Spane
Barry A. Spofford
Herbert O. Sprague
Charles H. T. Springer
Lawrence R. Stackhouse
Billie O. Steele
William W. Stephenson II
William C. Stilwell
William C. Stolgitis
Thomas E. Stone
William F. Story
Craig A. Stratton
William O. Stubbs, Jr.
Michael E. Sullivan
Andrew P. Sundberg
Peter W. Sushka, Jr.
Dustin C. Sykes
Richard A. Szekely, Jr.
Hugh A. Tabb
Michael A. Tamny
Richard G. Tanger
Philip M. Tansey
Irvin C. Teasdale
William W. Teeple
John P. Teller
David R. Thaxton
John H. Theis, Jr.
Simon Theriot, Jr.
Edward C. Thomas, Jr.
Peter W. Thomas
Louis E. Thomassy, Jr.
Robert N. Tidball
Michael C. Tiernan
John E. Tipton
Donald M. Tobolski
Terrence S. Todd
Clarence O. Tolbert
Paul S. Tompkins
Jerry B. Torbit
Arthur H. Toreson, Jr.
Carmine Tortora
James T. Townsend
David T. Travis
Lindsay J. Trax
Richard W. Tripp, Jr.
Cecil L. Tune, Jr.
Thomas E. Uber
Gordon E. Valentine
Vernon L. VanBrackle, Jr.
Arthur VanSaun
Trotter Vaughan
Dennis A. Veith
William L. Vincent
Clyde R. Vinson
Raymond W. Vogel III
John S. Volk II
Richard J. Vopelak
Roy A. Vreeland
Frank Wagner
George F. A. Wagner
James E. Walker
Roy N. Wallace
Steven R. Wallin
Bernard Walsh
Jonathan C. Warthin
George R. Waterman
Donald E. Watkins
Joseph L. Wehner
Walter F. Welham, Jr.
James P. Werlock
John E. Wertin III
Ross C. Wesner
Richard E. Westbrook
Kenneth B. Wheeler
Sidney E. Wheeler
John D. White II
Joseph A. White, Jr.
Robin J. White
Richard K. Whitney
James M. Wilhoit
David D. Williams
William S. Williamson
Harold D. Wilson
Joseph J. Winkler
Ward L. Winter
John T. Wolfe
John G. Wood
Thomas K. Woodka
Peter B. Woodruff
James R. Woods, Jr.
George P. Woodworth, Jr.
William L. Wunderly, Jr.
Edward V. Wurts III
Lawrence A. Yandell
Ronald M. Yandrofski
Thomas R. Yeatts
Robert R. Yohanan
Kenneth L. Yufer
Anthony J. Zaccagninc
Andrew R. Zagayko
Raymond P. Zimmerman, Jr.

Lawrence L. Laine, midshipman (Naval Academy) to be a permanent ensign in the restricted line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Joseph R. Baker
Ronald D. Beasley
Robert O. Beer, Jr.
James B. Birindelli
Jack M. Brown
William E. Burk
John P. Carroll
William J. Condon, Jr.
John N. Costello
Fred Y. Fellows III
James A. Fleming, Jr.
Richard L. Foley
Robert E. Fulghum
Harold C. Green, Jr.
George W. Greer III
Phillip H. Harrington
Charles A. Kosch
Donald E. Krehely
Gregory A. Mather
Thomas J. McDonough, Jr.
Joseph A. O'Connor
Frederick E. Perrill
Howard S. Pinskey
John T. Quinn
Jack D. Renfro
Thomas C. Roberts III
Jon Rueckert
George S. Steen, Jr.
John K. Tomcheck
Richard C. Treanor
Albert P. Tully, Jr.
Richard Waite IV
Evans W. Webb

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Paul A. Chapla
William A. Heine III
Kenneth B. MacKenzie
Salvatore A. Martinelli
Dennis F. McCahill
Neil T. Monney
Stephen R. Stokes
Donald C. Sturmer
Donald L. Woodford

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James W. Alexander
Robert J. Barton
Carl H. Bender, Jr.
Robert F. Bennett
Randolph C. Boggess
Charles R. Boyer
Edward L. Cantrall
Robert L. Carter
James A. Cloar
Phillip C. Cota
Richard E. Garlick
Lawrence "H" Garoutte
Verne E. Griffith, Jr.
Ross M. Hamilton
Jon K. Hanlein
Dennis R. Hiatt
Charles A. Hodapp
Russell S. Koss
David F. LaRocque
Urbie A. Lawson
Charles L. McCallum
Dan S. McCrosky
James H. McElroy
Keith A. McKinley
Ranald R. MacKinnon
Frederick C. Meyer, Jr.
Albert H. Mitchell, Jr.
Boyd D. Obermeyer
Robert I. Packman
William L. Parker
John E. Reichwein
Leslie L. Schmeling
James M. Stewart
Antoni A. Thelen
Roger H. Toler
Robert H. Wiggins
Forrest K. Wood

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Paul R. Alwine, Jr.
Robert J. Barton
Robert H. Bestor, Jr.
Erwin W. Boehmler, Jr.
Peter A. Bondi
Stephen H. Braver
Earnie R. Breeding
Edward L. Cantrall
Richard B. Chapman
Richard T. Cleary III
William K. Cooper
James T. Corbet
Ronald L. Daley
Quin A. Denvir
Richard M. Hamm
Frank E. Hanscom
Charles A. Hodapp
Leonard Keller, Jr.
Thomas M. Kittredge
Russell S. Koss
Thomas K. McCraw
Hoke P. Martin
Carl M. Mitchell
Brian J. Murray
Myron P. Mustaine, Jr.
Fay M. Piester
Michael J. Popik
Gerald D. Prager
Joseph L. Pressley
Terry A. Rhodes
Alan C. Rosebery
George N. Saito
James M. Schwartz
Lawrence A. Soletti
Richard A. Steiner
Michael J. Sullivan III
Roger H. Toler
David J. Ullius
John D. Wagoner
Richard A. Welch
Robert R. Young
Sherrod B. Zumbro

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Wilbert L. Argus, Jr.
Peter S. Bordas
Stuart L. Carter
James A. Cloar
Rufus H. Cofer, Jr.
Robert N. Endebrock
Thomas N. Gardner
Verne E. Griffith, Jr.
Carl P. Houck
Wilfred E. Lehder, Jr.
Stephen M. Thrasher, Jr.
Nathaniel A. Towle

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific educational program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Ernest L. Abbott, Jr.
Alton L. Adams
Kenneth E. Andersen
John H. Bartol, Jr.
Jerry N. Begley
Gilbert C. Blank
George J. Boone
James A. Brink
Gary R. Burdick
Lester F. Canham, Jr.
Harry R. Charles, Jr.
John R. Cochran, Jr.
Chandler L. Cook
Virgil G. Cox
Charles R. Crawford
Carson H. Creecy, Jr.
Allen H. Dick
Stephen A. Elrod
Shirley L. Felkins
David D. Fields
Joseph H. Freeman, Jr.
Ronald C. Funk
Keith M. Garns
David J. Griffiths
John B. Haskins
Harold M. Heggestad
Robert G. Hoff
Donald W. Horner
Jerry D. Horton
Jerry P. Hucks
Walter R. Jackson
Kenneth L. Janssen
Jack N. Jenks
Robert J. Jones
Laurie P. Keiski
Darrell H. Kimball
Windall R. Knight
Doyle R. Lemons
James R. Meyer
Robert C. Miley, Jr.
Richard J. Mysliwiec
"E" James Oertel
Loren H. Otto
David P. Parrett
Donald H. Puariea
John C. Reiche
Frank W. Roeckner
Roland W. Samuelson
Marvin C. Schiffman
Ronald K. Seiberling
Dan H. Smith
Robert J. Smith
Chester T. Spangler
William E. Sprague
Russell M. Stender
Richard H. Stoltman
Arthur J. Sweat
Lennart A. Swenson
William A. Tate
Terry E. Trisel
Albert L. Tucker
Walter J. Underwood
Melvin E. Walker
Howard A. Wilkin
Gary O. Williams
Allen L. Wright
John P. Zaretki

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific educational program to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Herbert E. Black
Robert L. Davies
Kenneth M. Foster
"J" "V" Hood
Richard O. Johnstone
Francis J. Lawlor
Toivo W. Makela
William E. Mullins
James F. Nale
Marlin E. Rechterman
Cyrus W. Roton
Robert J. Seufert
Herbert W. Taylor, Jr.
Donald K. Thomas

Henry E. Fenner (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Norman C. Lyster, Jr.
Alvin C. Rolen, Jr.
Frank J. Schmetz, Jr.
Norman K. Takaki

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald O. Alford
Robert L. Altman
Marshall E. Atwell
George E. Byers, Jr.
William E. Carson, Jr.
Ronald L. Christ
Thomas A. Farrell
Robert A. Feeney
Darrell E. Fisher
Charles D. Fogg
Sigvard T. Hansen, Jr.
Dan W. Hibner
Hilmon D. Holley, Jr.
Clyde W. Jones
Frederic R. Keifer
"L" "B" McDaniels
Lawrence J. Macatee
Pablo P. Prietto III
Donald K. Roeder
Richard M. Ryan
Edward M. Spencer
Gary M. Tolley
Kenneth W. Travis
Wood G. vanValkenburgh

Paul B. Menges (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and a temporary lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert D. Balcerak
George E. Clark
Jack E. Groat
William F. Hohlt
William C. Johnston
Joseph P. Kelty
Benjamin F. Kepley
John P. Kulas
Patrick A. Parrino
William F. Pierce III
Harold H. Reed, Jr.
Claude L. Rowley, Jr.
Donald L. Scoralle
Richard H. Sewell
Donald F. Sheller
Melvin W. Walters
Donald A. Zenas

The following-named Naval Reserve officers, selected as alternates to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert L. Smith
Alan J. Cills
Norman H. Daily
Vangel R. Zissi
William G. Jackson

Charles H. McKenzie, U.S. Navy officer, to be a permanent chief warrant officer, W–4, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named warrant officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classifications indicated, in lieu of ensigns as previously nominated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

DECK

Douglas S. Milne
Richard T. Fellis

ORDNANCE SURFACE

Joseph R. Sleeper

ADMINISTRATION

Howard L. Bailey
Doyle W. Fortney
John J. Pursel
Donald L. Terry

BANDMASTER

Dexter H. Reynolds, Jr.

ENGINEER

Frank Graham
Billie R. Hardin
Phillip B. Kinnie, Jr.
Edgar A. Schardein

ELECTRICIAN

Jack A. Davis
Raymond G. Kazebee
Richard E. Marlin
Richard N. Peterson

ELECTRONICS

Walter J. Cislo
Paul K. McKimens
Robert N. McKinley

METEOROLOGY

Thomas L. Megill

AVIONICS

Dale Kitch

SUPPLY CORPS

Howard F. Gohrband, Jr.
Allen R. Hooten
Stewart N. Landon

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Yung H. Ketels

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abbott, Peter D.
Abdalla, Peter G.
Aber, John W., Jr.
Abercrombie, Gordon E.
Abernathy, William K.
Abrams, Neal E.
Abramsky, Alan L.
Ackerman, Jack J.
Ackley, Frederick R., Jr.
Adam, Richard W.
Adams, Douglas F.
Adams, Lloyd H.
Adamson, Frank M., Jr.
Adkins, Lawrence R., Jr.
Akens, Jerry D.
Albert, Harrison B.
Albrecht, Carl J.
Alden, Michael G.
Alexander, Edward E., Jr.
Allen, Bobby D.
Allen, Robert C., Jr.
Allgood, Dempsey E.
Allum, Kenneth M., Jr.
Altmiller, John C.
Ambrose, Michael J.
Amesse, Arthur P.
Amidon, David M.
Amis, William B.
Anckonie, Alex, III
Anderson, Carl E.
Anderson, Donald R.
Anglin, James M.
Armstrong, Roger W.
Armstrong, Larry G.
Arnold, James J., Jr.
Art, Raymond J.
Asafaylo, Richard J.
Ascher, David C.
Asher, William M. L.
Assell, William L.
Atkins, Donald S.
Auchy, George B.
Austin, Jack B.
Babcock, Donald D.
Bacon, Roger F.
Bahler, Adrian A.
Bailey, Harold W., Jr.
Bainbridge, John K.
Baker, Edward B., Jr.
Baker, Herbert D.
Baker, Robert E., Jr.
Baldwin, Richard R.
Baldwin, Richard L.
Ball, Ronald F.
Ball, Stuart F.
Bannan, Edward K.
Barber, Hugh P., Jr.
Barkman, William D.
Barksdale, Thomas G.
Barnum, Gary L.
Barrett, David M.
Bartlow, Basil B.
Baskin, Walter H.
Bast, James L.
Bast, William H.
Batchelor, Jon D.
Bates, Wilmer I.
Battaglini, Arnold R.
Battenburg, John A.
Batts, William H., Jr.
Bauer, Lawrence D.
Baute, Robert E.
Beachy, Lloyd H.
Beam, James L.
Bearden, William F.
Beasley, Robert H., Jr.
Beaton, Robert R.
Beattie, Stanley A.
Beaumont, Geoffrey C.
Bednarek, Norbert H.
Beecher, Norton J.
Beggs, Richard K.
Bell, Emerson H., Jr.
Bell, Joe L.
Benson, Lyle N.
Berkowitz, Howard V.
Bernett, William A.
Berniklau, Vladimir V.
Berryman, Glenn E., Jr.
Bessire, Robert P.
Biddle, Maxwell D., Jr.
Bingler, John H., Jr.
Bird, Francis M., Jr.
Bishop, David K.
Black, Donald L.
Black, Leroy G., II
Blair, John E.
Blake, Richard L.
Blasi, Donald T.
Bleakley, James B.
Blish, John H.
Bloch, Vernon C.
Blose, Larry E.
Blount, Charles W.
Boatwright, Samuel C.
Bogar, Norman J.
Bohen, Frederick M.
Boissenin, William C.
Bonar, Challen O., III
Bond, Douglas E.
Bond, Thomas H.
Booher, Timothy
Booth, Robert M.
Borlick, Robert L.
Borlik, Robert E.
Borrell, Robert F.
Boshoven, Robert L.
Bostick, Ronald E.
Boswell, Lexie B.
Bothwell, Robert O.
Bothwell, Michael P.
Boufford, Joseph F.
Bouril, Paul F.
Bovey, Robert L.
Bowley, George A.
Boyd, David H.
Boyd, Roy H.
Boyer, Donald C.
Boyle, Alonzo R.
Bozzo, Peter R.
Brady, John R.
Brady, Thomas A., Jr.
Brainerd, George E.
Branch, Daniel B., Jr.
Brandt, Hans E., Jr.
Brandt, Karl E.
Brantuas, Joseph A.
Bregman, Peter R.
Bremer, Brian F.
Brenner, Louis
Brewer, Richard D.
Brezina, Dennis W.
Brier, Charles J.
Brinkley, Otis H., Jr.
Brolin, Edson C.
Bromwell, Kent S.
Brons, John C.
Brooks, Linton F.
Brooks, William T. J.
Brown, Alan R.
Brown, Larry J.
Brown, Michael J.
Brown, William L.
Bruce, Malvin D.
Bruemmer, Jerry L.
Bryan, Edward L. G.
Buchanan, John C.
Budinger, Richard W.
Buell, Bryon "W"
Bugg, William A., Jr.
Bundarin, John P., Jr.
Burchett, Jerome V.
Burgess, William S.
Burke, Nolan R.
Burmester, Alan F.
Burns, John M., Jr.
Burns, Thomas M., Jr.
Butterfield, John A.
Buxton, Richard L.
Bybee, Jimmy L.
Byng, Robert H.
Bynum, Joe H., Jr.
Cade, John C.
Cadow, William S., Jr.
Cahill, Michael J.
Cain, William T.
Calhoon, Theodore H.
Callsen, Christian E.
Camilleri, Terrence J.
Campbell, Wayne R.
Campbell, Donald R.
Campbell, William W.
Campbell, Colin C.
Canavan, James M., Jr.
Cant, Geoffrey D.
Capper, John R.
Caprio, Gabriel P.
Carlson, William C.
Carmosky, John M.
Carnes, Billy R.
Carpenter, Robert N.
Carter, Clyde A. L.
Carter, Frederick W., Jr.
Carter, George C.
Carter, Phillip R.
Cartwright, James P.
Carwin, James P.
Casciato, Anthony C.
Castro, Alexander, Jr.
Cate, John D.
Cather, Edward W., II
Caton, Robert L.
Cauvet, Kenneth B.
Ceres, Robert L.
Cerini, Donald J. A.
Chadwick, William H.
Chamberlin, Philip R.
Chambers, James A., Jr.
Chandler, Thomas R.
Chapman, Michael K.
Chappelear, Claude K.
Chase, Donald A.
Cheston, Daniel M., IV
Chidlow, Douglas O.
Chidsey, John W.
Christensen, Peter C.
Christensen, Gary S.
Christensen, Keith L.
Christian, Richard A.
Christy, Ralph W.
Chulick, Joseph, Jr.
Churchill, Gerald J.
Ciboci, John W.
Claflin, Warren E.
Clapper, Gean P.
Clark, Donald H.
Clark, Jackson S.
Clark, Kent R.
Clark, Maurice E.
Clark, Newton T., Jr.
Clark, Roger M.
Clark, Robert L.
Clark, William S.
Clautice, William G.
Clegg, William L.
Clement, Russell L.
Clements, Wilton R.
Clift, Thomas A.
Coates, Dannie R.
Coats, Jack T.
Coats, Richard L.
Cobb, Stanley M., Jr.
Cockley, Richard M.
Code, Ronald B.
Coffin, Robert H., Jr.
Cohen, Michael M.
Cole, John S.
Coleman, John B., Jr.
Colias, George C.
Collins, James E.
Collins, John F.
Collins, Donald S.
Commons, Patrick M.
Conger, William L.
Conley, Charles F., Jr.
Connolly, Raymond T.
Connors, James J., III
Converse, Paul T.
Cooke, John B., III
Cooke, Nicholas J.
Cooper, Michael B.
Copeland, Edgar W., III
Coppedge, Davis A.
Corcoran, William R.
Corey, James W., Jr.
Cormack, James P.
Corse, Carl D., Jr.
Cosky, Charles E.
Cossey, James D.
Costello, William G.
Cox, David L.
Cox, John J.
Cradit, Raymond H.
Craft, Thomas T.
Crandall, Joel L., Jr.
Crawford, Lewis A.
Crooker, Peter P.
Crumpacker, John P.
Culliton, James J.
Cunningham, Robert S.
Curran, Thomas E.
Currie, Robert E.
Curtin, James M.
Curtis, Charles D.
Curtis, Guy H., III
Curtis, Ronald R.
Cushing, Robert D.
Cutler, Lee M.
Cyr, Philip A.
Dachos, John
Daidone, Henry F.
Dailey, John L.
Dakin, Robert A.
Daley, William A.
Dalgliesh, William J. M.
Dalton, Dick N.
Daly, Bruce D.
Damm, Thomas P.
Damoose, George L.
Danitschek, Carl N.
Darby, Robert M.
Datemasch, Edward C.
Dau, Ralph W.
Davidson, Allen R., Jr.
Davis, Alden A.
Davis, Carl E.
Davis, Hartwell, Jr.
Davis, Homer L.
Davis, Hugh M., Jr.
Davis, Joseph F.
Davis, Lawrence D.
Davis, Richard S.
Davis, Wade L.
Dawdy, John R.
Day, Jerome J., Jr.
Deblois, Richard W.
Debuhr, Milton D.
Decesare, Armand G.

Deck, Robert E., Jr.
Defrancesco, John B., Jr.
Deniston, David A.
Denotter, Clifford R.
Denton, Marc F., Jr.
Depaul, Anthony W., Jr.
Derickson, Richard B., III
Desmond, Richard L.
Dickey, Glen L.
Dickinson, Joshua C., III
Diefenbacher, Robert H.
Dietsch, Marvin D.
Dirvianskis, Arunas
Dobbs, Charles P.
Dodge, Robert I., III
Doelger, David P.
Donald, Henry F., Jr.
Donovan, David A.
Donovan, Daniel R., Jr.
Donovan, Francis R.
Dorwart, Frederic G., Jr.
Dougharty, James R.
Dovre, Howard A.
Downing, Robert E.
Doyle, Ronald J.
Drake, Terry C.
Drake, William B., Jr.
Drotleff, William C., Jr.
Dugan, John F.
Duke, William L.
Dunn, Donald R.
Dunn, James V.
Dupler, Larry N.
Dyke, David W.
Dziedzic, Walter T., Jr.
Ealick, Perry L.
Edgar, Richard B.
Edgerton, Everett W., Jr.
Edic, Richard E.
Edwards, Oliver J., Jr.
Egan, Gerald E.
Ehlers, Ernest J.
Ekleberry, William D.
Ekstrom, John S.
Eldredge, Howard S.
Elliott, George M.
Ellis, Gary H.
Ellis, John C.
Ellis, Robert P.
Elson, Donald E.
Embry, John H.
Emmons, George H.
Engel, Richard L.
Ericksen, Grover G.
Erickson, George E., Jr.
Ertel, Allen E.
Estes, Clifford D.
Estes, John A.
Euclide, James F.
Evans, Lucian C.
Evans, Stuart D.
Evans, Thomas W.
Everett, William H., III
Everette, Oliver G.
Everitt, Perc A.
Fagan, Christopher B.
Faith, Larry E.
Fallone, Paul R., Jr.
Fant, Albert E., III
Farley, Harold C., Jr.
Farrar, William T.
Farrell, James H., Jr.
Faulk, Edmund E.
Featherstone, James F.
Fendorf, Dale N.
Fernow, William F.
Ferraro, David B.
Ferris, Charles L.
Fiddaman, Robert A.
Field, Tylor, II
Fiene, James R.
Finch, Jerry L.
Finerty, Martin J., Jr.
Finlen, James R.
Firmin, John P.
Fischer, George J.
Fitch, William T. S.
Fitzgerald, Michael E.
Fitzpatrick, Eugene E.
Fitzpatrick, Thomas J., Jr.
Flikeid, Jack R.
Flood, Wayne M.
Florence, Scott A.
Flynn, Martin R.
Flynn, Noel S.
Fogarty, Eugene P.
Folsom, Robert B.
Foltz, Peter C.
Fondren, William E.
Forbes, Raymond L., Jr.
Ford, Joseph P. P.
Forde, Jerome B.
Foster, James W., Jr.
Fowler, Charles B., Jr.
Fox, Jonathan M.
Foxworth, Thomas G.
Franck, Homer L.
Frank, Donald S.
Frankhauser, Charles G.
Franklin, Larry B.
Fraser, John A., Jr.
Freckmann, Fred H.
Freeborn, Guy H.
Freymann, David G.
Fry, Donald K., Jr.
Fuller, Edward M., III
Fuqua, James R., Jr.
Furtado, Donald A.
Gabrielson, Robert L.
Gainer, Thomas H., Jr.
Gaither, John L.
Galamaga, Donald P.
Garand, Bruce
Garrett, Donald F.
Garrett, William B.
Garrity, William F.
Garton, George B., Jr.
Garverick, Charles M.
Gary, Perry E., Jr.
Gaudet, John F.
Geanopulos, Thomas G.
Geiger, Bernard R.
Geist, Gary Q.
George, Henry P.
Gerboth, Don M.
Gersbacher, Frank P.
Gibbs, David L.
Giles, Thomas V.
Gill, David A.
Gillen, James R.
Gillies, Donald C.
Gilmer, David S.
Giss, Robert K.
Gladieux, Bernard L., Jr.
Glaeser, John S.
Glaser, Francis E.
Gleeksman, Harvey W.
Gleixner, Barrett J.
Glenn, Richard T.
Glenn, Robert L.
Glenn, William D., Jr.
Godshall, Douglas R.
Goggin, Ronald L.
Goldsmith, Albert L., Jr.
Golt, Ralph S.
Goodman, Jess T.
Goodman, Thomas F., Jr.
Goodman, James C., Jr.
Goorjian, Paul M.
Gordon, Barry L.
Gordon, Robert C.
Gordon, Samuel J.
Gorham, Milton R., Jr.
Gosen, Lawrence D.
Graham, Francis W., II
Graham, James B.
Graham, Thomas S.
Gray, Henry F.
Gray, John R., Jr.
Gray, Willie F.
Green, David L.
Green, John G.
Green, Patrick T.
Griffin, William A.
Griffith, Richard K.
Griffith, John G.
Grigsby, James S., Jr.
Grise, James E.
Grisso, John R.
Gross, Paul E.
Guay, Paul E.
Guilbault, Roland G.
Gunn, Curtis C., Jr.
Guthrie, David G.
Habermas, Thomas W.
Haffey, James M.
Hafford, David A.
Hager, Raymond D., Jr.
Haines, Robert N.
Haley, Wayne J.
Hall, Arthur E.
Hall, Dale G.
Hall, Kenneth T., Jr.
Hallahan, Richard A.
Halpin, Michael J.
Halton, Nicholas H.
Hamilton, Griffin F.
Hamilton, Allan J.
Hammond, Warren G. F. X.
Hancock, William J.
Hanford, James M.
Hansen, Lyle F.
Hansen, Ronald L.
Hanson, Martin P.
Hardie, James S.
Hardy, Brenton P.
Hardy, Earl L.
Harmuth, Robert K.
Harrell, David M.
Harris, Raymond P., Jr.
Harrison, Robert G.
Harry, Leonard W., III
Hart, Ronnie R.
Hartfeldt, Will H.
Hartman, Michael L.
Hartwig, Richard C.
Hassler, Thomas A.
Hatzel, Henry J.
Hauxwell, Gerald D.
Hawthorne, John W.
Hayward, John F.
Healey, Matthew B.
Hearn, James J.
Heavey, James L.
Hedges, Lyle H.
Hedstrom, John R.
Heiges, John M.
Heinberg, John D.
Held, William E., Jr.
Helliwell, Charles H., Jr.
Helmer, John B.
Henderson, Joseph C.
Henderson, Tomas G.
Henderson, George D.
Henderson, Harvey H.
Hendrickson, Daniel L.
Hendry, David M.
Henry, James E.
Herman, John M., Jr.
Hernon, Donald M.
Herrs, Walter E.
Herzing, Henry G.
Hewett, Marle D.
Heyden, Hanley E.
Hickey, James C.
Hicks, William F.
Higginbotham, John D.
Higman, Darrell E.
Hildebrand, Wayne T.
Hill, "A" Jackson
Hill, Charles E.
Hill, Edward R.
Hill, Hassel, Jr.
Hill, Malcolm T., Jr.
Hill, Robert M., Jr.
Hilt, John W.
Hines, Robin H.
Hirl, Joseph P.
Hoberg, Thomas J.
Hoever, Milton H.
Hoey, John H.
Hoff, Richard W.
Hogan, Joseph M.
Holcomb, Stanley R.
Holds, James H.
Holloway, Charles A.
Holmes, Donald D.
Holmes, James F.
Holmlund, James R.
Holt, Ben F., Jr.
Holts, Philip P.
Holtzschue, Karl B.
Homburg, Tracey G.
Honadle, William J.
Honsa, William M., Jr.
Hopkins, Granville J.
Hopkins, John D.
Horacek, Jerry L.
Hougland, Charles A.
Houley, William P.
Howard, Peter B.
Howbert, Edgar C.
Howe, Robert R.
Hubbard, Russell S., Jr.
Hudacko, Charles T.
Hudalla, Anthony E.
Hudgens, Thomas K.
Hudgins, Christopher L.
Hudspeth, Richard B.
Huebner, Richard F.
Huetter, Harvey P.
Huffman, William H.
Hughes, Charles L., Jr.
Hull, James C., Jr.
Humes, Charles B.
Humphrey, John W.
Hunt, John W.
Hunt, George B., Jr.
Hunter, Richard W.
Huntington, Charles R.
Hurd, Robert C.
Hurley, Francis P.
Hurley, Michael J., Jr.
Huskamp, George C.
Hutchison, Allie A.
Hutchison, Charles H.
Hydinger, Robert M.
Ihly, Richard L.
Iler, Jack L.
Jackmond, Arnold D.
Jackson, James N.
Jackson, John P.
Jacoby, Clifton G.
Jaffe, Frank M.
James, David W., Jr.
James, Jon G.
James, Thomas M.
Jarvis, Thomas C.
Jaseph, Robert L.
Jaycox, Edward V., Jr.
Jenik, Allan R.
Jenner, Robert F.
Jesberg, Ronald H.
Jessen, Warren A.
Jessen, Werner H.
Jockel, Joseph A., Jr.
Johanson, Ronald J.
Johnson, Raymond L.
Johnson, Charles O.
Johnson, Charles L.
Johnson, Willoughby C.
Johnson, Roland R.
Johnson, Arlo J.
Johnson, Ralph H.
Johnson, Robert D.
Johnson, Dennis L.
Johnson, Robert A.
Johnson, Richard W.
Johnson, Peter A.
Johnson, Alvie M.
Johnston, Abner C., Jr.
Johnston, Rodney K.
Jones, Sheldon A.
Jones, Thomas C.
Jones, Wilbert C.
Joynt, Patrick D.
Junker, Delvin W.
Kambeitz, Raymond A.
Kanuch, John S.
Kartvedt, Maynard O.
Kass, Matthew A.
Katz, Donald L.
Kearney, David W.
Kearns, Daniel W.
Keats, Lawrence R.
Keay, Karl L.
Keeley, Joseph
Kehl, William W.
Kelly, David S.
Kelly, Edward J., Jr.
Kelly, Michael A.
Kelly, Robert J.
Kelly, Thomas
Kelly, William H.
Kemmer, Alva E.
Kenworthy, Larry D.
Keske, Carl D.
Ketts, Harry C., III
Keyes, Bradley N.
Kieweg, James D.
Kight, James R.
Kihune, Robert K. U.
Kiland, Ingolf N., Jr.
Kimble, Charles D.
Kinch, Judson M.
King, James R.
King, John J.
King, Joseph F.
King, Maclellan E., Jr.
King, Philip M.
King, Richard J.
King, Robert R.
Kinnier, John W.
Kirchner, Robert A., Jr.
Kirk, Robert G.
Kislingbury, Terry B.
Kjerland, John R.
Klapp, Anthony J.
Klein, Donald G.
Klein, Martin B.
Klementz, Robert W.
Kling, Edwin R., Jr.
Kloepfer, Ronald M.
Klorig, William N.
Klosky, Lowell H.
Knachel, Robert E.
Knoblock, Keith R.
Knox, Samuel J., Jr.
Koch, Arthur H., Jr.
Kocian, Ralph B.
Koke, Herbert E.
Koor, Robert S.
Kopp, Walter H. O.
Korrell, Harry J. F., Jr.
Kribel, Robert E.
Krieger, Charles B.
Krischker, Allen L. J.
Kroeter, James J.
Krol, John A.
Krol, Richard M.
Krug, Charles D.
Krumm, Theodore G., Jr.
Kruzic, Victor C.
Kubik, Bruce W.
Kuebler, Richard J.
Kuenzli, Joseph R.
Kuhlman, John H., IV
Kuhn, Edward R.
Kyle, Alan M.
Lacagnina, David H.
Lackey, James B.
Laferty, John D.
Lagrand, William L.
Lamar, Robert O., III
Lamb, Charles E.
Langemo, James C.
Langenbach, Ross K., III
Langford, John A., Jr.
Langland, Jay E.
Laning, Clifford L.
Larkin, Robert L., Jr.
Larsen, Darrell W.
Larsen, John T.
Larson, Arvid G.
Larson, Robert L.
Lasala, Anthony J.
Laschenski, John P.
Lathrop, Mitchell L.
Lau, Robert C., Jr.
Laub, Jack R.
Lauer, Dudley S.
Law, Wilburn P.
Lawler, John T.
Lazarchick, Frank T.
Leder, John F.
Leeds, John M.
Lehmberg, George R., Jr.
Leinbach, William H.
Lekebusch, Adolph O.
Lekstrom, Lennart C.
Leon, Hayden L., Jr.
Leonard, James F.
Lester, Robert F.
Levin, Mark D.
Lewis, Harry E.
Lewis, John T.
Lewis, Michael H.
Lewis, William F.
Leyerle, James D.
Libert, John J.
Liebmann, John E.
Lind, Thomas O.
Lindau, Jules W., IV
Linderman, David R.
Link, Kent "A"
Littlefield, Gordon M.
Lloyd, Charles H.
Lockwood, Wayne P.
Loew, Donald E.
Lofdahl, Clyde A.
Logalbo, Salvatore E.
Logan, Wallis "M"
Logie, Robert W.
London, "J" Phillip
Long, Norman E.
Long, Thomas A., Jr.
Longfellow, William J., Jr.
Lovejoy, John E.
Loveless, Jerry M.
Lovell, Jack W.
Lovitt, Ronald
Lowe, James R.
Ludwig, Peter W.
Luebke, Robert W.
Luesing, William H., Jr.
Lukish, Thomas J.
Lynch, John A., Jr.
Lyon, Fred M.
Mabry, John B., Jr.
MacDonald, Bridgman A.
MacEwen, Richard A.
MacFarlane, Bryon N.
MacGillivray, Kenneth A.
MacVean, Charles R.
Male, John
Mann, Timothy J.
Maragides, Steve A.

Maran, Anthony J.
Mardigian, Richard
Maris, Alan H.
Markowski, David "L"
Marron, Charles F.
Marsh, William B., Jr.
Marshall, Bruce C.
Marshall, Walter W.
Martens, Walter F.
Martin, Johnny N., Jr.
Martin, James E.
Martin, Richard L.
Martin, Robert L.
Marvin, Timothy H.
Mascali, John H.
Mason, Albert T.
Mason, Joseph D.
Masterbone, Joseph A., Jr.
Masters, David R.
Mauz, Henry H., Jr.
Mawhinney, Robert C.
Maxwell, Jasper M.
Mayer, Charles R.
Maynard, Michael D.
Mayo, Norman A.
Mays, Albert T.
McAnulty, John F.
McAree, William B., II
McCabe, John J.
McCabe, William D., Jr.
McCall, Edward P.
McCann, William E., Jr.
McCarthy, David D.
McCarty, Walter B.
McClendon, James F., Jr.
McCloskey, David J.
McCone, Alan I., Jr.
McCord, Howard E., Jr.
McCracken, Dwight M., Jr.
McDaniel, Jerry P.
McDowell, Richard R.
McElhenny, James P., Jr.
McGanka, Steven W.
McGann, Robert G.
McGowen, William R.
McGuire, Robert J.
McIntosh, William D., Jr.
McIntyre, Fred P.
McKenna, Peter D.
McKenney, Peter W.
McKinney, Henry C.
McKittrick, Lawrence
McLeod, Robert H.
McMurry, Jerry C.
McNamara, John R.
McNemar, Arlis J., Jr.
McReynolds, Thomas P.
McVey, Charles J.
Meadows, Donald C.
Medaglia, Anthony J., Jr.
Medcalf, William A.
Meeks, Harman T., Jr.
Menzies, Lawrence R.
Meredith, Francis M., II
Merrell, Richard S.
Mertens, John R.
Mertz, Robert M.
Merz, Arthur
Meslow, Edwin C.
Messegee, James A.
Meyers, Robert O.
Michael, Robert D.
Miller, Alan C.
Miller, Charles P., III
Miller, Harlan B.
Miller, John H., II
Miller, Lee E.
Milligan, Richard D.
Milner, Robert L.
Milwee, William I., Jr.
Minard, Bernard F.
Mischler, James E.
Mitchell, Herbert W.
Mitchell, John S., Jr.
Mitchell, Howard D.
Moeller, Karl A.
Mogol, Louis M.
Moncilovich, Milan
Montgomery, Michael D.
Montgomery, Seth D.
Moody, James R.
Moore, John "L" "A"
Moore, Richard J.
Moore, Temple C., Jr.
Morgan, Harry E., Jr.
Morgan, Henry A., Jr.
Morgan, Hubert A., Jr.
Morgan, John P.
Morgan, Robert V.
Morrison, Alan B.
Morse, Raymond M.
Moynahan, Dennis M.
Mulkern, Kevin M.
Mullin, Robert J.
Mulrooney, Robert M.
Murphy, John R.
Murphy, James E.
Murphy, Terrence R.
Murray, John F.
Muth, Daniel G.
Naef, Frederick E., Jr.
Nash, John E.
Nazro, Arthur P., Jr.
Neese, John F.
Neish, John F.
Nelis, Patrick J.
Nelson, Charles T.
Nelson, George A.
Nelson, John P.
Nelson, Paul C.
Nelson, Robert A.
Newby, James A.
Newland, Kenneth T.
Newman, Errett D.
Newquist, William A.
Nichol, William L., Jr.
Nicholson, Daniel A.
Nicholson, John W.
Nield, Van K.
Nissler, Charles L.
Noble, Richard A.
Noel, Francis J., III
Nolan, Charles G.
Nolan, Michael H. V.
Nolan, Thomas E.
Nordwall, Bruce D.
Noreika, Richard J.
Noren, Robert C.
Norwood, David F.
Nourie, John E.
Nunn, Silas O., III
Oakes, Robert O.
Obsitnik, Vincent
Ocker, Jerold R.
O'Connell, Philip J., Jr.
Ogburn, James E.
Oistad, Bryon J.
O'Keeffe, Thomas A.
Olds, Frederick A.
Olita, Julius A.
Oliver, Robert G.
Olson, Gerald D.
O'Neil, Rickard T.
O'Neill, Edward J., Jr.
Oneto, John C.
Onuska, John T.
Orr, Francis A.
Osborn, Delbert M.
Osburn, David L.
Osburn, Marvin R.
Osgood, Franklin B.
Osswald, William C.
Oswald, Thomas H., Jr.
Overman, Everett F., Jr.
Ovrom, Allan A., Jr.
Owen, Ernest E.
Owen, William E.
Page, David A.
Pagnillo, Richard J.
Paine, John A., Jr.
Palas, Fritz R.
Palmer, Leslie N.
Palmer, Michael W.
Parker, Harold W.
Parks, Robert M.
Parks, Tom H., Jr.
Parrillo, Joseph L.
Parsons, Guy C., Jr.
Passerini, Edward M.
Patten, John R.
Paulsen, Paul H.
Payne, James W., III
Pease, Charles C.
Pechauer, John N.
Peck, Roger L.
Pedler, William F.
Pemberton, Robert B.
Penman, Paul D.
Penny, Donald M.
Penny, Joe R.
Perkins, Robert C., Jr.
Permenter, Lawrence F.
Perry, Leroy F.
Person, James S., Jr.
Peterson, Gerald L.
Peterson, Loren R.
Peterson, Charles E.
Petitt, Robert A.
Pfannkuche, Frederick T.
Pfeifer, Eugene "M," III
Pheris, William E., IV
Pierce, Lawrence C.
Pinkerton, James D.
Pitcher, Gerald K.
Pizinger, Lawrence C.
Pollock, Preston G., Jr.
Poole, James K.
Popernik, Michael H.
Porter, Oliver W., Jr.
Porter, Robert P.
Porter, Russell J.
Posner, Ernest G.
Pound, Don P.
Powell, Richard A.
Powers, Philip H.
Powers, Robert E.
Praetorius, Hugh M.
Pratt, David W.
Prendergast, Robert L.
Preston, Terry L.
Prevost, Stephen M.
Price, Henry T.
Price, Waldo E.
Priest, John T.
Pringle, Stuart H., Jr.
Printup, Lloyd E.
Putnam, Tom C.
Quarles, Clifford E.
Quint, Peter A.
Radecki, Richard A.
Radeke, Harold J.
Rager, Richard R.
Rahming, John C.
Raines, William A.
Ramsey, James E.
Rand, Robert S.
Randolph, David E.
Rappolt, James F.
Raunig, Donald J.
Read, Dennis S.
Ready, Thomas J., III
Redd, Albert M., Jr.
Redden, Edward G.
Redman, Jerry L.
Reed, David A.
Reed, James F.
Reed, John H.
Reed, Travis B.
Reeder, John A.
Rees, Elbert G.
Rees, Gayle "H"
Reeves, Roy M.
Regan, James D.
Reilly, Charles P., Jr.
Reilly, Robert R.
Reimann, Lyle F.
Render, Ronald W.
Rennard, Robert S.
Renner, Ernest A.
Resare, Ronald A.
Reynolds, James G.
Reynolds, James A.
Reynolds, Philip W.
Rhodes, Hugh W.
Rice, Roy J.
Richard, Joseph E.
Richardson, William E.
Richardson, Daniel C.
Richards, Grahame P., Jr.
Richter, Herbert B.
Rickman, Wayne E.
Rickson, David O.
Rickwald, Ronald R.
Riddell, Robert A.
Ridings, Ted L.
Riess, Daniel M.
Riley, Larry M.
Riley, Michael W.
Rine, Charles A.
Ringer, George W.
Robens, William J., Jr.
Robert, James R.
Roberts, Paul J.
Roberts, John R.
Roberts, James N.
Roberts, Thomas M.
Roberts, William E.
Roberts, James L.
Robertson, John S.
Robertson, Armand J., II
Robertson, James
Robinson, Wayne
Robinson, Robert H.
Robinson, Richard E.
Rodgers, Joel E.
Rodriguez, Ronald J.
Roeder, Richard A.
Roensch, Hans M., Jr.
Rogers, David N.
Rogers, Leslie L., Jr.
Rogers, Will, Jr.
Roper, John D.
Roscoe, David R.
Rose, Clifford A., Jr.
Rosenberger, Glenn C.
Rosenthal, Alan G.
Rossi, Louis F.
Rossiter, Frank R.
Rothermel, Kenneth W.
Rowe, Charles R., II
Rowland, Gilford G., Jr.
Royalty, Reed L.
Rucker, James B., Jr.
Rudegeair, Leo C.
Russell, Richard D.
Ruth, Allen R.
Ryan, Reade H., Jr.
Ryan, Richard J.
Ryan, William J., III
Sakuda, Paul S.
Salem, Edward R.
Santos, Alfred J., Jr.
Saunders, Frederick W.
Savage, Robert L.
Savel, John J., Jr.
Sawhook, James L.
Saxton, Harold E.
Saylor, Mark
Scanlan, John W.
Schaper, Darwin E.
Scheck, Timothy R.
Schernecker, James G.
Schexnayder, Bodin R.
Schick, Bruce J.
Schiffner, Robert C.
Schmidt, William R.
Schnauffer, Patrick M., Jr.
Schnoor, Frederic J.
Schoen, Gordon S.
Schoneman, Elmer C.
Schrag, Larry P.
Schulte, Francis L.
Schultz, John J.
Schultz, Philip D.
Schuyler, Paul G.
Schwartz, William G.
Scollard, Patrick J., Jr.
Scoones, Gerald F.
Scott, Albert T.
Scott, Douglas R.
Scott, Lawrence S.
Scott, William M., Jr.
Seagren, Malvern K.
Sears, David F.
Seeley, James R.
Seessel, Thomas V.
Seibold, Charles F.
Sells, John E.
Seltzer, James L.
Seykowski, Donald W.
Shafer, Clark B.
Shafer, Lee E.
Sharp, James E.
Shaw, Harry A., III
Shelton, Donald
Shenton, Scott S.
Sheppard, Furman L., Jr.
Sheya, Lawrence J.
Shinn, Allen M., Jr.
Shiverdecker, David K.
Shopbell, Phillip W.
Siders, Ronald A.
Siembieda, John
Sigmund, Samuel W.
Simich, Stevan
Simmons, Dean M.
Simmons, George T.
Simon, James W.
Sinnott, Joseph F., Jr.
Skelton, Luther W., III
Skroski, James C.
Slaven, John K.
Slocum, "L" Wilson
Small, Fenwick R.
Smalley, Larry L.
Smith, Arthur K., Jr.
Smith, Archie D.
Smith, Bradley N.
Smith, Charles A.
Smith, David R.
Smith, Douglas W.
Smith, Eurie H., III
Smith, Gary T.
Smith, George M., Jr.
Smith, Gibson P.
Smith, Harvey D., Jr.
Smith, James A., Jr.
Smith, James F.
Smith, John S.
Smith, Lee M., Jr.
Smith, Mark W.
Smith, Philip G.
Smith, Rayburn R.
Smoot, William T.
Snyder, Stephen V.
Soderholm, Robert "V"
Solberg, Warren R.
Sole, James W.
Somes, Timothy E.
Sopko, John R.
Sparks, Roger C.
Sparrow, William W.
Springer, Nelson C.
Spruell, Alfred H., Jr.
Stabel, Lawrence G.
Stahel, Rudolf S.
Stanford, Bruce E.
Sanford, David L.
Stanton, Courtney W.
Starck, Robin L.
Stebbins, Herbert M.
Steckler, Charles T.
Steffenson, Michael R.
Stein, Gilbert D.
Steinman, Joseph B.
Stephens, Daniel P.
Stern, Alvin L.
Stewart, Francis J.
Stiehm, Bruce G.
Stillwell, William H.
Stitzel, David H., II
Stoessl, Leslie
Stout, Peter C.
Strachwitz, Hubert J.
Stratton, Sylvan D.
Strauch, Ralph E.
Street, Robert W.
Strohsahl, George H., Jr.
Strommer, Frederick A.
Stubbs, Robert E.
Stutzer, William T.
Sullivan, John L.
Sullivan, David D.
Summey, James W., III
Susag, Gary R.
Swanner, Roy S.
Swanson, Norman F.
Swift, Douglas M., Jr.
Szczypinski, Walter S., Jr.
Talbert, Lee R.
Tamony, Joseph M.
Tanner, David K.
Tarpgaard, Peter T., Jr.
Tassone, Lenny J.
Taylor, William S., III
Temple, Jim J.
Temple, John W.
Templeton, Felix E.
Tenkhoff, Philip A.
Theisz, Gordon F., Jr.
Thelen, Larry A.
Thompson, David R.
Thompson, Stanley P.
Thompson, James A., Jr.
Thresher, Alfred A., II
Throop, Gerald J.
Tibbetts, John W.
Tidd, James F.
Tiedemann, Hollie J., Jr.
Tilton, Allan P.
Tindall, Samuel J., Jr.
Tobin, Wallace E., III
Todd, Bennett E., Jr.
Tomajczyk, Charles F., Jr.
Tomlinson, Rodney G.
Touchstone, Frederick F., Jr.
Touhey, Robert J.
Tremblay, Victor J.
Trimbach, Charles G.
Trinley, Thomas L.
Trippe, Richard M., Jr.
Troidle, Thomas N.
Trollope, Richard G.
Trossbach, Ronald C.
Troyer, David D.
Truax, Daniel M.
Trull, Donald A.
Truly, Richard H.
Tschida, Robert M.
Tucker, Henry C., III
Tuggle, Ralph E.
Tull, Robert W.
Turner, Gale N.
Turner, John W.
Turner, Tom D.
Tuthill, Donald L.
Udebrock, Jack H.
Ullrich, Peter F.
Ulrich, Peter B.
Umsted, Truxtun
Underhill, Hurshel G.
Valenti, Patrick C.
Valenti, Joseph P.

Vandemar, Charles H.
Vandervoort, George W.
Van Gemert, Richard J.
Van Heuit, Robert E.
Van Nort, Peter S.
Varni, Gerard F.
Vasey, Robert C., III
Vaughan, Joseph S.
Vaughan, John S.
Veazey, Sidney E.
Ventura, Melvin C. A.
Vincent, Charles D.
Vogt, Larry G.
Volgenau, Douglas
Von Dreele, Carl W., Jr.
Voogd, Anthonie M.
Waddell, Lee W., Jr.
Wadsworth, Richard I.
Wagner, Nicholas
Wainwright, Jonathan M.
Wainwright, Howard E.
Waldman, Roger L.
Waldrup, James C.
Walker, David R.
Walker, George M., Jr.
Walker, Harry C.
Walker, John W.
Walker, Lee H.
Walker, Ralph C.
Walker, William L.
Wallace, Michael W.
Wallace, Donald J. H.
Walls, Harold D.
Walls, Robert G.
Walters, Arthur K., Jr.
Wamser, Richard T.
Ward, John P.
Ward, Randall W.
Ward, Richard F.
Ward, Samuel R.
Wardlow, Louis B.
Warson, Toby G.
Wasmund, Thomas L.
Waterman, Thomas C.
Watjen, Kenneth D.
Wayland, Henry P., Jr.
Weaver, Larry S.
Weber, Roger K.
Weber, Waldemar C.
Webster, Edward C.
Weigel, Thomas E.
Weikert, John P.
Weil, Robert
Welch, Thomas A.
Weldon, Thomas J.
Wellborn, Raymond B.
Welles, Christopher J.
Wermecke, John D.
West, Carl R.
West, Terence H.
Westfahl, Richard K.
Weston, Robert M., Jr.
Weyhing, Edward J.
Whalen, William J.
Wheatley, Gary F.
Wheaton, William C.
Wheeler, Robert B.
Wheeler, James R.
Wheeler, Tilman E., Jr.
Whipps, Russell E.
White, Wallace I., Jr.
Whitehead, Verne B.
Whitt, Darnell M., II
Wieczorek, Robert A.
Wiggin, Charles C.
Wightman, Hal, II
Wilderman, Alvin L.
Wiley, Robert C.
Wilkins, Perry
Williams, James D.
Williams, Wayne N.
Williams, John R.
Williams, James M.
Williams, Douglas D., Jr.
Williams, Robert A.
Williams, John H., Jr.
Williamson, Mark H.
Willihnganz, Paul W.
Willingham, Robert J., Jr.
Wilson, Alger L.
Wilson, Charles M., Jr.
Wilson, Frank R.
Wilson, James P.
Wilson, Paul L.
Winter, Jerrold C.
Winter, Richard F.
Wirth, William T.
Witke, David R.
Witsmeer, Arthur J.
Witt, Allan E.
Witt, Charles D.
Witt, John R.
Wolfe, Don C.
Woll, Steven A.
Wolynies, Jon G.
Wommack, Roland R.
Woodaman, Ronald E. H.
Woolley, William J.
Worley, Kenneth C., Jr.
Worrall, James D.
Wright, John J.
Wright, Robert R.
Wu, Theodore W., Jr.
Wynn, Walter P., Jr.
Yarborough, John M., Jr.
Yaworsky, William J.
Yeaple, Donald S.
Yenchko, Raymond A.
Yerkes, George M.
Yoder, Max N.
York, Milton W.
Young, Howard L., Jr.
Young, James T.
Young, Peter T.
Young, Vernon O.
Zacharias, Thomas C.
Zangwill, Willard I.
Zanzot, Warren L.
Zatyko, Donald R.
Zimels, Robert F.
Zimmerman, Frank
Zink, Charles T.
Zitzewitz, Walter C.
Hallett, Sue C.
Hamil, Martha M.
Hankey, Joan R.
Hayes, Roxie L.
Hayward, Ellen M.
Holway, Nancy H.
Kent, Ruth W.
Larsen, Carol M.
Naidl, Rowena
Palleria, Edith M.
Parsons, Clara D.
Pond, Linda A.
Pool, Naomie E.
Potter, Ann M.
Sherman, Jean C.
Smith, Elizabeth
Sowersby, Twila J.
Weber, Joyce A.
Yeoman, Marjorie A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Allan, Ronald C.
Anderson, Charles L.
Armour, Robert C.
Arndt, Ronald C.
Bailer, Carl A.
Ballard, William H., Jr.
Bell, Ronald M.
Bender, James L.
Billings, Thomas H.
Biren, David R.
Blakely, Robert F.
Bloom, Jardine C.
Bogdon, Bernard D.
Boltz, Jacob
Branson, William H.
Bray, John J., Jr.
Brock, Harry J., Jr.
Brown, Alan G.
Burnett, Chester I., Jr.
Cady, Carl M.
Casasanto, Joseph
Christensen, Thomas W.
Chrysler, Scott G.
Clemente, Vincent F.
Coenen, Walter D. E.
Cole, Peter S.
Connelly, Francis X., Jr.
Cooper, Donald R.
Crawford, Thomas, Jr.
Crosby, Alexander C.
Crosswy, Frank L., III
Cummings, Samuel R., III
Cunningham, John J., Jr.
Dare, Joseph C.
Davis, James M.
Dean, Claire T., Jr.
Dempsey, Edward J.
Denney, Jay R.
Desmarais, Normand D.
Dorough, Donald E.
Drinnon, James W., Jr.
Ellermeier, Joel D.
Ellison, David H.
Erickson, Roger C.
Facciani, Ralph J., Jr.
Farley, Arthur G.
Felt, John D.
Flammger, Jerome T.
Forsberg, Roy W.
Foster, Thomas L.
Fournier, Alexander F., III
Franchi, Paul J.
Frommelt, Roger H.
Fruin, Jeremiah E.
Gantt, Lynn M.
Goetz, John W.
Goodell, Robert F.
Granger, Sylvester R.
Gregorich, Kenneth J.
Grettenberger, John O.
Groom, Robert W.
Grossman, Stephen Z.
Hadbavny, John W.
Hamlin, Rudolph B.
Hardin, Jonathon J., Jr.
Harris, Neal L.
Hay, Vernon M.
Hazelton, Walter A., III
Hendershot, Gerry E.
Heubaum, William L.
Hockenberger, William A.
Hollender, John W., Jr.
Hollingshead, Richard "A"
Hulan, Milton T.
Inman, James E.
Jacoppi, Kenneth A.
Jacroux, Paul E.
Jones, Bobby J.
Jordan, James C., Jr.
Kelly, James A.
Kenney, Thomas R.
Knapp, Emmett J.
Koczur, Eugene
Koncar, William R.
Kopp, Roland A.
Krieg, William C.
Krummel, John C.
Kubasch, Donley D.
Kwolek, John R.
Lamphear, Steven C.
Leisenring, Richard P.
Leonard, James B.
Ligon, Samuel J., Jr.
Login, Gerald
Love, Richard S.
Machesky, John M.
Mandeville, Earl K.
Manly, Robert L.
Mann, Ronald L.
Marble, Alfred C., Jr.
March, Frederick W.
Marshall, Solomon W., Jr.
McCumber, Harvey T.
McGee, Bernard J.
Meany, John P., Jr.
Meier, John D.
Mezzio, George H.
Moore, John A.
Morehouse, Stephen H.
Morrison, Roger T.
Neelon, Paul R.
Newton, William A., Jr.
Noble, Francis E.
Norby, Karl G.
Oates, Wallace E.
O'Brien, Daniel A.
Parker, Donald W.
Parsons, Stanley S.
Payne, Jerry E.
Peck, Leo J.
Peters, Donald T.
Petrick, Nancy A.
Powell, William E., Jr.
Poxon, Howard W., Jr.
Putnam, Frederick M.
Ralston, Daniel E.
Ransdell, Maurice G.
Ray, Harold P.
Renfer, Ronald G.
Rike, Harry B., III
Robie, Ralph L., Jr.
Rogers, Ted
Rosen, Lawrence R.
Roth, Jon B.
Salmon, Robert C.
Schleck, Peter J.
Schneider, Richard D.
Seeburger, John E., Jr.
Serafin, John R.
Sharp, Robert L.
Sheill, Gordon W.
Shiels, John M.
Sleeth, Sterlen S., Jr.
Smith, Harley J.
Smithson, Wayne B.
Spage, Basil A.
Spearman, Wayne C.
Staats, Charles T.
Steidle, Robert E.
Stewart, John J.
Sturges, Michael S.
Sturhahn, David P.
Surr, John V.
Sutterfield, Richard A.
Thompson, Donald D.
Thorpe, Thomas E.
VanHorn, Lloyd D.
Villella, Conrad L.
Wadsworth, William T.
Walker, Samuel J.
Waller, Billy G.
Weader, Joseph A.
Welsh, Gerald H.
Willen, Michael D.
Williams, Augustus J., Jr.
Williams, John P.
Willis, Gerald W.
Wright, Joe B.
Yeager, Howard B.
Young, Emmett N.
Zembrzuski, Richard S.
Zscheile, Richard E.
Zuntag, Alexander E.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Annable, Weldon G., II
Austin, Donald R.
Barker, Walter R.
Bawden, Gordon W.
Bonham, Paul W., Jr.
Boothe, Allen P.
Bottger, George C.
Bottorff, David E.
Brabston, William N.
Brosky, Donald L.
Campbell, Robert S.
Clower, George E., Jr.
Coward, Clauson R.
Croneberger, Don K.
Davis, Harry P., Jr.
Dettbarn, John L.
Emsley, Thomas H.
Fogle, Fredric D.
Fraunces, George D.
Gabbard, William D.
Gilbert, Roy Herbert R.
Gunther, John A.
Hayes, Robert C.
Hogan, Brian R.
Ives, Jon R.
Kaiser, Richard B.
Kau, Julian M. F.
Kelly, Clinton W., III
Kolar, Ronald E.
Lafond, John A.
Larson, Phillip G.
Laton, Richard W.
Lewis, Quentin E. D.
Martin, Roger G.
Matthews, William G.
McCorvey, Donald L., Jr.
Metz, Theodore D.
Mintun, James H., Jr.
Monarch, Delmont J., Jr.
Osborn, James H.
Pankow, Kenneth O.
Patterson, Joe T., Jr.
Poole, Arthur S., Jr.
Preston, Robert L.
Reidenbach, William F.
Rivkin, Maxcy C.
Short, Roy E.
Sifferman, Donald J.
Smith, Theodore A.
Tack, Curtis A.
Thornton, Paul A.
Wells, Howard A., Jr.
Westdyke, Robert G.
Wilson, David J.
Wisenbaker, Richard Y.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Anderson, Francis G., Jr.
Auton, William J.
Bagnall, Donald L.
Bleh, Harry W.
Boyle, John A., Jr.
Bristow, Bertram W.
Butler, Robert C.
Cole, Charles C.
Conover, Fredric G.
Darr, Kenneth L.
Delaney, Thomas J.
Dewey, William A.
Faherty, Francis X.
Ferguson, Donald R.
Fitts, Marvin L.
Geiger, Robert E.
Godfrey, Walter A., Jr.
Graves, Joseph L.
Hammett, Gene L.
Harris, George S.
Hassey, Jasper T.
Hensle, Harold R.
Hinds, Robert B.
Hines, Kenneth F.
Johnson, Ralph W.
Jones, Bob A., Jr.
Laliberty, George W.
Lawson, Charles W.
Liming, John W., Jr.
McCullagh, Robert F.
Menges, Robert P.
Mountain, Charles R.
Mulrennan, John A., Jr.
Nelson, Jack A.
Pavlick, John E.
Pritchard, Glenn E.
Reeves, Donald E.
Reynolds, Joseph L.
Richardson, Fredric M.
Richardson, Langston E., Jr.
Roper, Charles A.
Schroeder, William H.
Steil, James J.
Teague, Francis A., Jr.
Weidner, Wilfred L.
Wentworth, Richard L.
Wire, George W.
Wright, Donald N.
Zimmerman, Lonnie V.

NURSE CORPS

Arthur, Margaret J.
Zatzariny, Tanya

William M. Bristow, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lt. Helen R. Levin for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Supply Corps of the U.S. Navy subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

In the Marine Corps

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Randy "J" Collins
Gary E. Foltz
Richard V. Greene
Jimmy K. Jacoby
Edward V. Kuzela
William A. Lindstrom

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Ronald J. Drez
Carl R. Fye
James W. McCarter, Jr.

The following-named (U.S. Air Force Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Sheridan A. Davis
Roy N. Emanual
Robert F. Gibson

The following-named (U.S. Military Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas C. Abbott
Marshall N. Carter
James R. Furleigh
Gerald G. Garwick
James Gorman
Lewis Higinbotham
Stephen J. Kott
James Lau
Thomas H. Merrell, Jr.
Frank S. Reasoner
Christopher W. J. Stanat
Douglas J. Wauchope

The following-named (reverted limited duty officer) for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–2, in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald P. Hill
Charles A. Markello

The following-named (Naval Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas S. Althouse
William L. Arbogast
John C. Arick
Wayne A. Barner
Malcolm K. Beyer, Jr.
Robert W. Bolster
Robert A. Burgin
Thomas L. Carter
Henry B. Chamberlin III
John A. Chambers
John W. Chesson
Donald E. Christy
Donald A. Clement
Everett E. Cossaboon
William E. Cullen, Jr.
Robert G. Dawson
Robert H. De Groot
Chadwick H. Dennis
Thomas V. Draude
Peter A. Duffy
Thomas J. Dumont, Jr.
Francis X. Egan
Robert W. Falkenbach
William R. Gage
Thomas D. Gallagher
Arnold N. Hafner
Mark T. Hehnen
John M. Hennessy
William A. Hesser
James A. Honeywell
Kenneth R. Jacobson
John N. Jolley, Jr.
Patrick J. Jones
Philip T. Jones
William M. Krulak
John E. Kszystyniak, Jr.
Donald J. Kunkel
Nicholas J. La Duca, Jr.
John A. La Voo
Michael Madalo
Raymond C. Madonna
Robert J. McNeal
Donald G. Miller
Sigurd E. Nelson
Leonard Nissenson
Fred Palka
John W. Ripley
Joseph T. Roberts III
William R. Roll
Patrick H. Rupertus
Henry J. Sage
Patrick J. Sarsfield
Steven A. Soechtig
Alfred E. Sommers, Jr.
John S. Sramek, Jr.
John P. T. Sullivan
Kenneth R. Updegrove
Dale D. M. Windham
Michael D. Wyly

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David G. Cadiz

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Paul G. Davenport
Thomas E. Hemingway
Orville E. James, Jr.
Glen R. Kirk
Otto J. Lehrack III
Joseph R. Phaneuf
John W. Pratt
Kenneth L. Rider
John A. Ryan, Jr.
Robert E. Salisbury
Troy T. Shirley
William C. Stroup

The following-named (meritorious noncommissioned officer) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas C. McAllister

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., pastor of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, author of light and of love, look down with favor upon the Speaker of this House and let the radiance of Thy countenance shine brightly upon all the Members of the Congress of the United States of America.

Grant a special blessing, dear Saviour, to the President of our beloved country and to the chief executives of the other American Republics who, conscientiously, strive to uphold God-inspired ideals of human freedom, religious brotherhood, and genuine socioeconomic program.

Bestow upon freedom fighters, everywhere, the vision, bravery, and perseverance to maintain their crusade for the liberation of captive nations, especially the good neighbor republic near our own homeland where, on an island endowed with a wealth of natural resources, economic disasters combine with religious persecution to render democratic, God-loving citizens the helpless victims of tyranny.

Enlighten our minds, beloved Father of Nations, and fortify our wills that we may find victorious solutions and constructive programs for our needs at home and abroad.

Vouchsafe to our good neighbors in the other American Republics, whether they be property owners, managers, or workers, the willingness to embrace sacrifices and changes essential to the brilliant success of a fruitful Alliance for Progress so that the farmers, miners, proprietors, employees, and all other groups in the population may recognize that they have a share in the new benefits to be made available and, in this way, achieve a more abundant life, according to the Bible, without the loss of human dignity and the priceless liberties flowing from the just administration of representative government.

We implore these divine gifts and graces in the name of our Most Holy Redeemer, the Christ of the Andes. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 12, 1962, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10700. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act;

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a Veterans' Benefits Calculator;

H. Con. Res. 405. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on civil defense for the Committee on Government Operations;

H. Con. Res. 408. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the publication entitled "Our Flag" as a House document, and providing for additional copies;

H. Con. Res. 412. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 1282, parts 1 and 2, 87th Congress, 1st session;

H. Con. Res. 414. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "Hearings Relating to H.R. 4700, To Amend Section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, as Amended (the Fund for Social Analysis)," 87th Congress, 1st session;

H. Con. Res. 416. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the publication "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications" and to provide for the printing of additional copies;

H. Con. Res. 419. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of Hearings on Small Business Problems in the Poultry Industry, 87th Congress; and

H. Con. Res. 451. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 218, 87th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on the Revenue Act of 1962.

PAN AMERICAN DAY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 583 this day has been designated as Pan American Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 599) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas April 14 marks the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, from which the present Organization of American States has evolved; and

Whereas the Organization of American States seeks to promote understanding and cordiality among the Republics of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas understanding and cordiality among the American Republics is a foundation for the peace and economic and social progress of the Americas; and

Whereas the Organization of American States is playing an important role in the success of the Alliance for Progress, in which the United States is banded together with the other American Republics to create a better way of life for all the peoples of the hemisphere: Therefore be it

Resolved, That on this seventy-second anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union the House of Representatives of the United States extends to the legislative bodies of each of the other Republics of the Western Hemisphere its warm greetings and expresses a sincere hope for the continuance and intensification of the cooperation of the Americas in the Organization of American States and in other feasible ways.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today on our observation of Pan American Day I can no better epitomize the sentiment of a hemisphere than by repeating what often we have said: "I am proud and privileged to be an American."

We who by the circumstances of birth or adoption are citizens of the United States are Americans. Our friends to the north, citizens of the great Dominion of Canada, are Americans. Our friends to the south, citizens of the great Republic of Mexico, are Americans. Our friends in Central America, in South America and in the islands of the Caribbean are Americans. We have a common heritage. We have a mutual pride. We share the responsibilities of keeping ours a harmonious family, a happy family, a family in which each member will sit in contentment, in dignity, equality, and in affection at the family table.

I am an American whether I live in the United States, in Canada, in Mexico, in Central America, in South America, or in the islands of the Caribbean. I am an American, holding high my head in pride and recipient of the respect of the world, when all is well in every land and in every home on the American Hemisphere. Hemispheric solidarity rests upon a foundation of hemispheric sharing of all the good things that united efforts can bring.

It is a troubled and a changing world. Poverty, disease, educational neglect too long have been the instrumentalities of an unnatural enslavement by adversity in a world of plenty. It has been given to America—and by that I mean the American Hemisphere, all of us—in unity of purpose and in cooperation of dedicated effort to work out in the perfect functioning of a team our destiny to lead all mankind to higher plateaus of economic well-being, spiritual contentment and human dignity. May God give to us in every nation and in every nook and corner of our hemisphere a continuing sense of our interdependence and the wisdom and the strength to perform our mission.

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in the unavoidable absence of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, the Honorable ARMISTEAD SELDEN, it was my pleasure to introduce House Resolution 583, designating April 16, 1962, for the celebration of Pan American Day here in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. The unanimity with which the resolution was adopted and the priority given the observance of Pan American Day as the first order of legislative business bespeak the depth of our interest and the sincerity of our every good wish for our neighbors and our fellow Americans in Latin America.

The United States and the republics to the South were pioneer coadventurers in the escape from colonialism and in the crusade for independence. The Fourth of July and the 15th of September, the former the Independence Day of our own country, the latter that of a number of our Latin American neighbors, are reminders of a past in which we shared the same aspirations and each in our respective areas struggled and sacrificed that in the American hemisphere, our hemisphere, all nations should be free and sovereign, independent of foreign meddling. It was our hemisphere, the American hemisphere, that started colonialism on the road of its decline. The peoples and the republics of North, Central, and South America won for themselves the precious and priceless right of self-determination when in other parts of the world recognition of that right was far in the future. The American hemisphere accomplished this and set the pattern of progress by hemispheric unity.

It is appropriate on this anniversary of pan-American collaboration to recall, however, that the road to hemisphere unity has never been devoid of difficulties and problems.

Simon Bolivar, the great South American liberator, envisioned a union of democracies of the Western Hemisphere as far back as 1826. At that time the newly independent nations of Latin America were menaced by the Holy Alliance of Austria, Russia, and Prussia. Bolivar believed that by union, the fledgling states could protect themselves against the threat from Europe.

Bolivar sounded a call for a conference in Panama. His draft for the conference contains these prophetic words:

> This Congress seems destined to form the vastest league, the most extraordinary and the strongest which has ever appeared on earth. No one of [the Nations] will be weak in respect to any other; no one will be stronger. A perfect equilibrium would be established in this truly new order of things. The strength of all would come to the aid of any one which might suffer from the aggression of a foreign enemy.

Despite Bolivar's brilliant concept and personal prestige, the Panama Conference was a failure. When the conference met, only Mexico, Central America, Colombia, and Peru were represented. Those in power in Buenos Aires, because of the leading part played by Colombia, declined the invitation. Paraguay, then a principal state, also remained aloof. Owing to factional opposition in the U.S. Congress, there was much delay in appointing the American delegates; one of two that were finally appointed died on the way to Panama, and the other arrived too late. Under the circumstances, this first attempt to create a union of American nations collapsed.

Several other attempts were made to get joint action later in the century including one gathering in Peru in 1847. But all the early efforts at some kind of confederation for the purpose of preserving independence, territorial integrity, and sovereignty came to naught.

Meanwhile, some of the South American nations fell to battling with each other. In the 1860's the population of Paraguay was decimated in the disastrous war against an alliance consisting of Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. In 1879, Chile went to war against Peru and Bolivia. As late as 1932, Paraguay and Bolivia engaged in the Chaco War which killed about 60,000 Bolivians and Paraguayans. But before presuming to express regret that the course of hemispheric unity was retarded by these martial events it is well that we remember that in this same general period our country also was engaged in a bloody civil war on a much greater scale and with vastly larger casualties.

Progress toward a desired and worthwhile goal never is easy. Roadblocks are the tests of dedication and the challenges to greater effort. Despite the setbacks and the disappointments, despite occasional misunderstandings, there has been in all the years since independence came to this hemisphere a realization that the welfare, the security and the advancement of all the peoples living on this hemisphere depended on hemispheric unity and solidarity.

In the early years the Monroe Doctrine was a shield that gave protection to all nations on this hemisphere. In the dying years of the 19th century, when indirect violation of the Monroe Doctrine was threatened, President Grover Cleveland called the Congress into extraordinary session and an ultimatum resulted that saved most of Venezuela and the eastern coast of Central America from enforced return to colonialism.

In 1898 the United States went to war with Spain, then rated fourth among the great world powers, to free Cuba from the yoke of colonialism.

In the two world wars, when the United States was in need of strategic materials and of fighting forces, her Latin American neighbors were not found wanting.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a real and abiding spirit of hemispheric unity and when the chips are down that spirit has never failed to manifest itself.

When delegates from 18 of the then 19 American Republics gathered in Washington, D.C., in 1889 to discuss commercial matters, none could possibly have conceived that they were laying the foundation for a mighty regional organization. The invitation from the United States spoke only of discussions relating to commercial matters.

Many of the delegates held sincere doubts as to the possibility of achieving any permanent cooperation, even in a most limited sense. History certainly afforded them little encouragement. The earlier attempts to create hemisphere leagues had failed. Besides, since independence almost every section of the continent had been troubled by serious boundary disputes. Even armed conflict, as I mentioned earlier, was no stranger to the New World. Moreover, the smaller states distrusted the more powerful, and all jealously guarded their sovereignty. None wanted an international organization which they believed might deprive them of their sovereign rights.

That first Pan American Conference which we commemorate today went only so far as to establish a little commercial bureau, empowered merely to distribute trade information. One contemporary U.S. newspaper, reflecting the prevailing opinion, declared:

> The Pan American Conference is pronounced a failure by those most concerned.

The rough road to hemisphere unity in the 19th century became even rockier after the turn of the century.

That was the period when the United States took it upon itself to police the Caribbean area.

With the vantage of hindsight, we can understand the circumstances that led President Theodore Roosevelt to formulate his famous policy of preventative intervention, known as the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine.

When Roosevelt became President the world situation had altered considerably. The United States had obtained sole rights to build an isthmian canal. Our naval power was growing and so was Germany's.

The 1902 British-German blockage of Venezuela to coerce respect for the rights of their nationals sparked intense reaction in the United States where it was feared that such use of force was a step toward European control, and hence a menace to the projected canal and to the future of all the American Republics.

Roosevelt faced a dilemma. On the one hand, instability and political turmoil in Latin America could be expected to occasion grievances which European nations would seek to redress by coercion, a time-honored international custom. On the other hand, American public opinion was in no mood to brook European interventions in the Western Hemisphere.

President Roosevelt concluded that, if the United States would not permit others to intervene, we ought to intervene ourselves to guarantee general principles of international conduct. After 1905, the United States sought to set in order the chaotic finances of such states as the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Guatemala in order to obviate European intervention. Latin American bitterness and distrust of the United States permeated inter-American relations during this period.

The tide of resentment against U.S. tutelage erupted in 1928 at the Pan-American Conference in Havana. Attacks on the U.S. policy of unilateral intervention were biting. It became apparent that harmony and cooperation could not blossom in such a charged atmosphere.

Finally, in 1933, the United States reversed its policy of three decades. That year, at the Montevideo Conference, we pledged nonintervention. The way was cleared for the development of a dynamic concept of pan-American cooperation. The good-neighbor policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt won the hearts and the minds of the peoples of all the American Republics and built a hemispheric solidarity upon the enduring foundations of mutual respect and confidence.

The good-neighbor policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt lives in the Alliance for Progress. It is an alliance of men and women of good hearts and of far-surveying vision in our country and in the nations of Latin America, operating through the governments of their own choosing, to pool resources, spiritual and material, in combating poverty, disease, ignorance, lack of opportunity in even the remotest corner of this, our hemispheric home. Distress in any sister Republic of the American hemisphere has repercussions in all other member nations of the hemispheric family. It is our hemispheric duty, the duty of one family member to another, to relieve that distress as much as wise planning and the giving of a helping hand will accomplish a worthy purpose.

As necessary as are land and tax reforms, I would stress also the urgency of some serious effort to affect as quickly as possible a stabilization of the markets for the products of Latin American countries largely subsisting on one-crop economies with prices determined by the demand among consumers in the United States. As the programs of the Alliance for Progress are carried on, permanent solution doubtless will be found in developing diversified economies, but that will take time, and time is fast running out on us.

Whatever the problems of the Alliance at this initial stage, it holds untold promise for the future peace and security of the hemisphere. With good will, perseverance, and unwavering devotion to pan-American ideals, I am confident that the American Republics, working together, can win the battle against economic stagnation and poverty.

On this, the 72d anniversary of our great hemispheric regional organization, we send fraternal greetings to our fellow Americans south of the Rio Grande. With faith in God, and in one another, with humility and with courage, we shall not fail in our mission to give to the humblest his place in the sun and to hold this, our American hemisphere, fortress of democracy and of free governments of, for, and by, the people.

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, among the good things we are apt to take for granted are such commemorations as Pan American Day and Pan American Week.

Pan American Day is an affirmation by the Republics of this hemisphere of their mutual objectives and their cooperation. Seventy-two years ago, on April 14, 1890, the First International Conference of American States meeting here in Washington on invitation of the U.S. Government to consider common problems, agreed to establish the International Union of American Republics. It created as its central office here the Commercial Bureau of American Republics.

The stated purpose of the new organization was the promotion of peace, friendship, and commerce in this hemisphere. It was, in fact, more than three score and ten years ago, a very definite Alliance for Progress, to use a phrase which has become famous in the Americas during the past year. From that modest objective concerning commerce, the International Union has developed into the present Organization of American States, which integrates into treaty form the principles, purposes and policies which the American Republics have been developing in common since 1890.

The Organization of American States is a regional group functioning within the framework of the United Nations. As a matter of fact, it afforded in many ways both an organizational and a functional pattern for the United Nations and for other regional organizations in various areas of the world. Officially the Organization of American States is founded upon the Charter of Bogotá signed in 1948. However, the root from which it has developed in continuous and vigorous growth is that first meeting in this capital, and establishment of the International Union of American Republics on April 14, 1890.

In 1930 the Governing Board of the Pan American Union unanimously adopted a resolution to dedicate a day to inter-American unity. April 14 was so designated because of its significance in the history of hemisphere cooperation.

Pan American Day, first proclaimed officially by President Hoover in 1931, has been proclaimed similarly by every succeeding President. Over the years the proclamation traditionally has come to include not only April 14 as the day itself, but the full period of Pan American Week. Pan American Day is now hemispherewide commemoration on the part of American Republics. It is in fact the only day of special hemisphere significance which is officially recognized by the governments of all the American Republics.

In our commemoration today we can look at the long record of achievements through collective action and take renewed confidence in the solidarity of the inter-American system.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, since the early days of the 19th century, statesmen of North America and Latin America have dreamed of establishing an American way of life based on liberty and freedom from intervention by European powers.

When the colonies of Latin America revolted against Spanish authority, President Monroe annunciated the doctrine which has since borne his name and stood for the opposition of the United States to foreign interference in the internal affairs of her sister Republics. Although scholars have been quick to point out that the United States was not always able to back up the Monroe Doctrine with force, nevertheless it stood as an ideal.

In the land to the south, development of a way of life free from foreign interference was advanced in detail by Simon Bolivar. It was he who was responsible for calling the first inter-American Congress which established in principle the concept of mutual security among the American Republics.

It was not until the 20th century, however, that the principle of mutual security became a reality in the face of imminent threat from abroad. In the dark days of the thirties Nazi and Facist aggression overseas and fifth column subversion throughout the Western Hemisphere were real threats to the security of the United States and her neighbors to the south. It was fortunate that at successive conferences bgeinning with that at Montevideo in 1939 the American Republics moved closer to the ideal of mutual cooperation for the common defense.

As the Axis menace grew in force, so the bonds among the American Republics grew stronger. At the Eighth International Conference of American Republics held in Lima in 1938 the technique of consultation for the common defense was articulated as the policy of the American Republics.

In large measure the credit for drawing closer to the ideal of mutual consultation belongs to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The patient give-and-take negotiation which underlay the good-neighbor policies of Roosevelt and Cordell Hull proved an effective antidote to Latin American distrust and bitterness engendered by U.S. policies of economic, political, and military interventions following the Spanish-American War. The good faith of the new Democratic administration was demonstrated in action. The good-neighbor policy ceased to be a phrase and became a program. The Roosevelt administration applied with steadfast earnestness the principles of respect for the political integrity of her sister Republics and negotiation to lower tariff barriers to provide for a mutually beneficial flow of goods.

The cooperation of the thirties became active collaboration in the forties. When the United States was attacked at Pearl Harbor, a conference of foreign ministers was called at Rio de Janeiro in January 1942. A general resolution was passed which recommended severing all diplomatic relations with the Axis Powers. In addition, measures were adopted to provide for hemispheric defense. Under the leadership of the United States, the Latin American nations contributed vital war materials, naval and airbases, and fighting men to the Allied war effort.

And now in the sixties we are entering a new and even more dynamic phase of inter-American relations. The problems of economic development have been faced squarely with a new program—the Alliance for Progress. Although little over a year old, the impact of the Alliance for Progress has been felt throughout Latin America. The appeal of communism as a solution to the difficult tasks of social and economic reform can be weakened by the programs of the Alliance.

Once again the American Republics are closing ranks against an alien intruder that threatens hemisphere security. Castro's Cuba with its attendant communism has been expelled from the Organization of American States by a vote of its members. The expulsion of Cuba is a reflection of the degree to which the American Republics have achieved solidarity in their determination to solve the difficult problems of social and economic progress through democratic institutions.

And so we salute the new Alliance for Progress this Pan American Day in 1962 and look forward to years of dramatic achievement in the quest for fulfillment of the ideals of human liberty.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the 20 nations of the Organization of the American States are diverse in population, area, and natural resources; and yet they have been able to gradually form an effective, working international organization.

This relationship did not come about suddenly. Throughout the 19th century tentative approaches to inter-American unity were made by Latin American nations and our own. In 1826 Simon Bolivar called the Congress of Panama; and a Treaty of Union, League, and Perpetual Confederation was signed. Although the treaty was ratified by only one nation, it set a significant precedent, for its principles embodied the concept of mutual security now a permanent fixture of inter-American relations. In the 1880's a number of bills were introduced in Congress to authorize the President to call a Congress of the American Republics to promote trade and peace.

Finally, in April 1890, at the instigation of Secretary of State Blaine such an inter-American conference took place. The Conference adopted a plan of arbitration to abolish the use of war and establish a permanent bureau of commerce. The Commercial Bureau became the Pan American Union, now the secretariat of the Organization of American States; and in 1910 moved into its present headquarters in the "House of Americas." Another important specialized organization which dates from the early days is the Pan American Sanitary Bureau. It started as an international effort to wipe out yellow fever and malaria and today is a part of the World Health Organization.

The present regional structure was devised at the Ninth Conference of the American States held in Bogotá, Colombia, in 1948. The name Organization of the American States was chosen, and the multitudinous treaties and conventions which had grown up since 1890 were incorporated into a single body as the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement. A third significant outcome of the Bogotá Conference was the signing of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. Once again the American Republics formed a new concept in international relations, for the American declaration was the first international document of its kind.

And now in our time the exciting vistas of the Alliance for Progress have opened up. In his inaugural address of January 20, 1961, President Kennedy hailed the paramount nature of the program with these words: "To our sister Republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds—in a new Alliance for Progress—to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty."

The goals of the Alliance for Progress were formalized in Uruguay in August 1961. In the declaration to the peoples of America the main objectives of the Alliance were spelled out as follows: To improve and strengthen democratic institutions; to accelerate economic and social development; to carry out urban and rural housing programs, thus providing decent homes for all Americans; to encourage programs of agrarian reform to correct unjust systems of land tenure and use; to assure fair wages and satisfactory working conditions to all; to wipe out illiteracy; to press forward with programs of health and sanitation; to reform tax laws and punish tax evasion severely; to maintain fiscal policies which will protect purchasing power; to stimulate private enterprise in order to encourage economic development; to solve the problems created by excessive price fluctuations in basic exports; to accelerate the economic integration of Latin America.

Today the principles of the Alliance for Progress are being carried out in programs of action. Throughout Latin America there is the desire to make the Alliance work. The governments of our sister nations are undertaking to improve the real and social position of their citizens, and to stimulate their domestic economies. We in America are giving of our own resources to assist them in their undertaking.

On March 28, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, president of Johns Hopkins University, speaking up the street in the Pan American Union, hailed the document of Punta del Este as the "modern Magna Carta of the Americas."

We can indeed be proud of America's part in making this a living document. And on this Pan American Day, let us salute the progress that has been made and pray for the progress that will be made.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Pan American Day, which the House observes today, is traditionally celebrated on April 14. President Herbert Hoover, issued the first Presidential proclamation to give "expression to the spirit of continental solidarity and to the sentiments of cordiality and friendly feeling which the Government and people of the United States entertain toward the people and governments of other Republics of the American Continent."

It is singularly appropriate that the House observance of Pan American Day should commence with prayer by the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning. Dr. Thorning is the pastor of St. Joseph's Church-on-Carrollton Manor in the Sixth District of Maryland. While his pastoral role is obviously close to his heart and his affection, he has much wider responsibilities and an international reputation.

Only last week, the Baltimore News-Post quoted Mrs. Harold B. Chait, president of the Baltimore Woman's Committee for Cuban Freedom who said Dr. Thorning was selected as the group's honorary chaplain because of his long standing leadership in upholding freedom and decency:

> Dr. Thorning has served God and country as a pioneer in emphasizing the vital role which can be played by the people of the Western Hemisphere in building up the socioeconomic foundations of representative government and in cooperating in the effort to liberate the captive nations.

Dr. Thorning is professor of Latin American history at Marymount College, Arlington, Va., associate editor of World Affairs, advisory editor of the Americas, and Latin American editor of the Diplomat.

He has served as acting dean of Georgetown University Graduate School and was elected as the one honorary fellow from the United States to membership in the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today is Pan American Day. In observing this day we pay tribute to an adventure in international community living. Hemispheric unity, conceived 136 years ago by Simon Bolivar, was formally established 72 years ago by the founding of the Pan American Union. From that modest beginning has grown the present Organization of American States.

The importance of the Organization of American States cannot be overstated. It is unique as the world's oldest extant community of nations whose continued vitality can only be a force of good in the world and essential to the promotion of economic and political stability in the Western Hemisphere.

During the past year developments were such in regional affairs that this year's observances should take on an additional implication—a clear recognition of the need for an inter-American alliance to attack as a team, with increased vigor, the immense social, economic, and political problems of the area. If we do not all join in this attack there are tyrants who will tell the people that a totalitarian system will solve the problems.

This hemisphere must have progress, but without tyranny. The American Republics must work together to demonstrate the superiority, in every sphere of life's activities of free social systems for which this hemisphere has fought so many times over, during the past century and a half. We have proposed an Alliance—an Alliance for Progress—which will work to do away with tyranny. The success of this Alliance will rest largely with the Organization of American States, the agency for collective action in all areas of mutual hemispheric interest.

I have every confidence that the Organization of American States will be responsive to the challenges generated by the conditions existing in its member nations and the urgent need for social and economic changes. In fact it has already made great strides in assisting member nations to improve development planning and provide technical assistance so these nations may participate in the Alliance.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, almost three-fourths of a century has transpired since the American Republics established their first permanent cooperative venture, a little commercial bureau here in Washington.

After that first gathering in 1890, delegates from the American nations began to acquire the novel habit of getting together in peacetime to discuss matters of common interest. Almost imperceptibly, with each conference the agenda grew.

At the second Pan American Conference, held in Montevideo in 1901, the question of the peaceful settlement of disputes was considered. At Rio in 1906, resolutions were adopted recommending that each nation instruct its delegates to the next Hague Conference to work for a general treaty of arbitration. Two years later the American Republics called a pan-American scientific conference in Chile, the first of a long line of special conferences dealing with such varied matters as labor, journalism, taxation, and the rights of women. The fourth Pan American Conference in Buenos Aires in 1910 considered trademarks, copyrights, and patents, pecuniary claims, and introduced a new element in international relations with a resolution favoring the interchange of students and professors.

Some ringing oratory resounded at these first meetings. Speaker after speaker extolled pan-American brotherhood and evoked the name of Simon Bolivar, the great liberator, who decades before had urged hemisphere unity and cooperation.

The oratory soon soured, however, as the United States embarked on an era of "dollar diplomacy." Some of Latin America's most brilliant writers denounced "Yankee imperialism." The famed poet, Ruben Dario, summed up Latin American bitterness in his ode to Theodore Roosevelt:

> You would need, Roosevelt, to be appointed
> by God himself,
> The terrible Marksman and mighty Hunter,
> In order to hold us in your iron claws.

After World War I the Latin American nations hurried to join the League of Nations, hoping to find in it a countervailing force against what they had come to regard as the "colossus of the north."

When the American Republics resumed their conferences after World War I, first in Chile in 1923, then in Havana in 1928, the U.S. representatives encountered a barrage of criticism and recriminations. Bolivar's starry ideal may have been in the background, but it cast a pale glow.

The foundations of a policy of true hemisphere solidarity and collaboration were not laid until 1933. Not until the United States signed a treaty obligating itself to a hands-off policy in Latin America could we begin to establish the friendly attitudes essential to hemisphere unity.

The great Franklin Delano Roosevelt's good-neighbor policy erased Latin American fears and antagonisms which impaired effective cooperation. One astute observer of the inter-American scene, the scholar Bryce Wood, points out some of the factors which contributed to Roosevelt's extraordinary success in reversing the Latin American tidal wave of hatred for the United States. Writes Dr. Wood:

> These men (of the Department of State in Roosevelt's administration) were not associated, in the minds of Latin Americans, with the Nicaraguan intervention, with governmental support for U.S. business enterprise in Latin America, or with the policies of U.S. bankers and investment houses. Consequently, there existed a willingness to believe in the sincerity of Roosevelt and his colleagues that could not be erased, but recriminations became stale as hope grew in a fresh start with a spirit exuberantly expressed by new men who were untrammeled by the past.

Furthermore, the Latin American people, who themselves yearned for a new deal in life, admired and appreciated a U.S. President who sought to help the little man in his own country.

There is an extraordinary parallel between events today and those of 30 years ago. It has been widely commented that President Kennedy's election was greeted throughout Latin America with profuse joy. Our colleagues, Mr. SELDEN and Mr. FASCELL, on their return from a study mission to the region on behalf of the Foreign Affairs Committee shortly after the 1960 elections, reported:

> We found almost unanimous support for President Kennedy and great expectations of what his administration might mean for Latin America. When pressed for an explanation for their enthusiastic reaction to Senator Kennedy's victory, Venezuelan, Brazilian, Argentine, Chilean, Bolivian, and Panamanian uniformly replied that it meant "a return to the good-neighbor policy" or a "new era in inter-American relations."

Other commentators have remarked the frequency with which our Latin American friends linked the names of Kennedy and Roosevelt. Apparently, our neighbors believed that the new President of the United States shared Roosevelt's concern for the humble, be they nations or individuals.

What Dr. Wood has said about the Roosevelt administration is a peculiarly apt description of the present administration in its relations with Latin America. Changing only the verbs to the present tense, it reads:

> Recriminations become stale as hope grows in a fresh start with a spirit exuberantly expressed by new men who are untrammeled by the past.

As the good-neighbor policy opened a new and fruitful era of inter-American friendship and cooperation, so the Alliance for Progress can be the beginning of an epoch in which man's imagination, energies, and sense of social responsibility create the prosperous and free hemisphere which all Americans so deeply desire.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am constantly studying the grave crises which crop up from Berlin to Katanga to Vietnam. But no area of the world gives more cause for concern today than does Latin America.

A rundown of conditions in the 20 Latin American Republics is disheartening. The Argentine military have ousted the constitutional president and the future political stability of that nation is in balance.

Brazil, with over half its 70 million people living just above starvation level, stumbles along with huge budget deficits, a runaway inflation, and at the helm an experimental parliamentary-type government which we sincerely hope will prove satisfactory.

Peru, where the disinherited Indians are moving on to vast estates and fighting the troops sent to keep them out, holds elections in June, with the army already threatening to frustrate the popular will if the candidate for the non-Communist left wins.

Venezuela's moderate reform government under Betancourt is constantly harassed by the radical left and right, complicating an already monumental task of instituting democratic reforms.

The Dominican Republic, that sad little country where 30 years of tyranny has only recently come to an end, walks a slender tightrope of domestic peace as gory tales of the Trujillo regime emerge into the light, public indignation demands justice, and the interim government fears to move against possible culprits who still occupy positions of strength in the armed forces.

I could go on country-by-country with a recital that leaves little room for optimism. Despite the baffling task ahead to bring a measure of peace and social justice to a continent wracked by ancient social inequities, modern demands for readjustments, and Communist fishing in troubled waters, we cannot throw up our hands in horror and resign from the race.

On this, the 72d anniversary of the establishment of a system of inter-American cooperation, we should take renewed vigor and determination in recalling the satisfying history of inter-American solidarity in meeting challenges in the past. We should keep our heads when isolated incidents occur which try our patience—as the state-government's expropriations in Brazil—always remembering that a few trees do not make a forest. Above all, we should redouble our faith and determination to prove that freemen, working together for the common good, can achieve their goals, that we North Americans as close friend and neighbor shall do all we can by whatever means to assist in the flowering of all the good existent in South America.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we have designated today for the celebration of the 72d anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union. The Union, which is the oldest organization of its kind in the world, throughout its 72 years has worked stanchly for the ideals which freemen everywhere live by.

Operating from a firm foundation based on the principles of nonintervention, disapproval of territorial conquest by forceful means, legal equality, and collective defense, the Pan American Union—in its present form as the Organization of American States—stands as the uniting force in the American Republics for common progress and defense.

Long a leader in the field of economic and social development in Latin America, the OAS stands as the first bulwark against international communism in the Western Hemisphere. This Organization, through the years, has been the mediator of many disputes arising from the problems of starvation, lack of land, the population explosion, and political turmoil. Today, the cooperation of all the American Republics is vital to the success of the Alliance for Progress, which will enable free people of this hemisphere to know an environment composed of homes, work and land, health, and schools.

The successes of the OAS during the turbulent years since its foundation in 1890 deserve the highest note and can serve well as the guidelines and vehicles of the future for peace, freedom, and the objectives of the Alliance for Progress in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, no domestic or foreign question engenders more widespread support among the American people than the desire for friendly, cooperative relations with our Latin American neighbors. Year after year Congress has reflected this public sentiment with overwhelming bipartisan support for programs designed to strengthen inter-American ties.

It is indeed a pleasure to join in commemoration of the 72d anniversary of the inter-American system. The development of the Organization of American States from the fledgling commercial bureau established in 1898 is a great saga in the annals of mankind's struggle for international peace.

The Organization of American States has piled up an impressive record. Its success in the peaceful settlement of disputes, for which it has evolved original procedures, is unmatched anywhere in the world. The OAS also provides a framework through which differing views on economic and other matters can be debated and harmonized, thus increasing the chances for amicable relations.

We are grateful to the precursors of inter-American unity; to those, like Simón Bolívar, who first envisioned the benefits to be derived from peaceful collaboration, and to the many in later years who, without benefit of blueprint or precedent, built a living instrument from Bolívar's dream.

It is now our turn to demonstrate the ingenuity and devotion necessary to meet new challenges to hemisphere peace and security.

The social injustice and human despair prevalent in much of Latin America promises to erupt into revolutionary chaos unless solutions to Latin America's staggering problems are forthcoming. Meanwhile, the emergence of a Communist government in Cuba, dedicated to the disruption of the pan-American system, possess a severe threat to the well-being of all the Americas. We must devise new avenues of cooperation to safeguard Latin America for the free world.

On this anniversary of the founding of the oldest, most successful international arrangement in the world, let us join with our fellow Americans throughout the Western Hemisphere in renewed dedication to the principles of freedom and justice upon which our pan-American system is founded.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, in celebration of this 72d anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, now known as the Organization of the American States, I wish to speak of the commmon bonds which unite us with the peoples of Latin America.

All our countries are melting pots of peoples and cultures. Our countries were once colonies; and in their desire to rule their own destinies our forefathers fought for their independence, won it, and established representative constitutional democracies founded on the high regard for the dignity and freedom of man.

Because of this similarity of backgrounds, we are a family of nations whose cooperative efforts are based on mutually high regard and affection for each other. These bonds led inevitably to the establishment of the system of inter-American cooperation that has become an outstanding example of a successful international community of nations.

The Organization of American States is founded upon the solid bases achieved by many years of collective effort. Its charter gathers together the basic principles embodied in numerous pan-American agreements which many years of trial had shown to be best. We should all take time to review and remind ourselves what the charter means to our welfare, and how the OAS assures that the precepts contained in the charter remain alike and responsive to the aspirations of the peoples of the Americas.

Special note should also be taken of the work of three of its dependent organizations: the Inter-American Social and Economic Council, which coordinates all official inter-American social and economic activities; the Inter-American Council of Jurists, which foments interest in the progressive development of international law; and the Inter-American Cultural Council, which promotes understanding through educational, scientific, and cultural exchange.

The observance of this day in tribute to the Organization of American States and its accomplishment is more important today than ever before. In recalling the common traditions and ideals of the American Republics, it is important to note that these very ties will provide the necessary understanding of our common goals to insure the success of needed social and economic reforms.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD following the remarks I have just made; and also, Mr. Speaker, that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Pan American Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE PEARL PEDEN OLDFIELD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of a former Representative of the Second District of Arkansas, Hon. Pearl Peden Oldfield, widow of the late Honorable William A. Oldfield. Mrs. Oldfield departed this life Thursday, having been stricken with a heart attack at her home here in Washington.

Mrs. Oldfield won a special election for the Second District of Arkansas, the district which I now have the honor to represent, on January 9, 1929, to succeed her husband who had represented that district from March 4, 1909, until his death. Mrs. Oldfield served during the balance of the 70th Congress and until March 3, 1931. She was not a candidate for renomination in 1930.

Mrs. Oldfield was born at Cotton Plant, Woodruff County, Ark., on December 2, 1876. She attended the public schools and Arkansas College at Batesville, Ark. She married the late Honorable William A. Oldfield in 1901. Mrs. Oldfield remained in Washington after her retirement from Congress in March 1931, and continued active in the Congressional Club and other social and charitable organizations. However, she retained her ties to the Second District of Arkansas through her many friends and relatives, and maintained her Methodist Church membership in Batesville.

Mrs. Oldfield leaves a nephew, retired Navy Capt. Robert C. Peden, and a niece, Mrs. Ellsworth T. Kauffman, of Kansas City.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Oldfield served as a Member of this House with great distinction. She was one of the first women to succeed her husband in Congress. Her husband, in turn, had served with great distinction as a Representative until his death. While her term of service was short, it was characterized by loyal and conscientious devotion to duty as a Representative of the Second District of Arkansas.

Mrs. Oldfield was a remarkable woman, who had courage, straightforwardness, and commonsense, together with tolerance and understanding. She had the characteristics which we associate with the finest pioneer woman.

To her intimates, Mrs. Oldfield was known as "Miss Pearl." Her serenity and strength were an inspiration to many individuals much younger.

Mrs. Oldfield served during a period of great economic change—in the great depression. She worked hard to see to it that appropriate steps were taken looking toward recovery

Mrs. Oldfield was a distinguished and able citizen of her district, her State, and her Nation. I know all who had the privilege of knowing her will grieve her passing. I extend to her nephew and niece and her many friends my deepest sympathy and condolences.

POSTPONEMENT OF RECORD VOTES TODAY UNTIL WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any record votes, other than those on the adoption of rules and procedural matters, that develop on Tuesday, April 17, be postponed until Wednesday, April 18.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

"THE LIBERAL PAPERS"

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I regret that a most important engagement prevents me from being in the House at the time the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Stafford] and his nine Republican colleagues intend to discuss "The Liberal Papers," for I would like to be present in view of my previous comments in the Record regarding this book. Nevertheless, I shall read the Record, and in a couple of days comment on their remarks. I appreciate the courtesy of my colleagues in advising me that my name will be mentioned in connection with their remarks, and I will certainly reciprocate their generosity.

PENSIONS FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, today I filed Discharge Petition No. 4, which would discharge House Resolution 585, which makes in order the consideration of a bill (H.R. 3745) providing for paying pensions to veterans of World War I. World War I has been over for 43½ years. No veterans of any other war have waited that long a period before receiving a pension.

I happen to be a veteran of both World War I and World War II. I cannot help contrasting the difference in the treatment the veterans of World War II received as compared with those of World War I. The veterans of World War II received greater mustering-out pay, and in addition they received terminal leave, and unemployment insurance benefits, they had the GI bill of rights, giving them GI loans with the right to buy a home or go into business and have educational advantages such as a college education and on-the-job training.

I would like to remind Members on my right that the Democratic platform recognizes the fact that the veterans of World War I have not been treated the same as the veterans of other wars and says that that would be corrected. I hope enough Members will sign this discharge petition so we can bring this matter before Congress.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

METRIC SYSTEM OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2049) to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD., SCHOOL BOARD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6759) for the relief of the Prince Georges County School Board, Maryland.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8962) to revise the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PARAPLEGIC HOUSING PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4012) to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BURIAL EXPENSES OF CERTAIN DECEASED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4901) to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 904, title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "If the burial allowance was not payable at the death of the veteran because of the nature of his discharge from the service, but after his death his discharge has been corrected by competent authority so as to reflect a discharge from the service under conditions other than dishonorable, then the burial allowance may be paid if a claim is filed within two years from whichever last occurs, the date of correction of the discharge or the effective date of this sentence."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be effective from the date of approval.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING OFFICES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IN EUROPE, AUTHORIZING FURNISHING ABROAD OF HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9561) to amend section 624 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing abroad of hospital care and medical services for wartime service-connected disabilities.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

STATUTORY AWARD FOR APHONIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10066) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF THE COSTS OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AT UNIVERSITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6984) to provide for a method of payment of indirect costs of research and development contracted by the Federal Government at universities, colleges, and other educational institutions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That hereafter provision may be made in cost-type research and development contracts (including grants) with universities, colleges, or other educational institutions for payment of reimbursable indirect costs on the basis of predetermined fixed-percentage rates applied to the total, or an element thereof, of the reimbursable direct costs incurred.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VALIDATION OF SPECIAL STATION PER DIEM ALLOWANCES AND BASIC ALLOWANCES FOR QUARTERS MADE TO CERTAIN COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10195) to validate payments of certain special station per diem allowances and certain basic allowances for quarters made in good faith to commissioned officers of the Public Health Service.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THIRD PARTY LIABILITY FOR THE COST OF HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE AND TREATMENT FURNISHED BY THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 298) to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the cost of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in any case in which the United States is authorized or required by law to furnish hospital, medical, surgical, or dental care and treatment (including prostheses and medical appliances) to a person who is injured or suffers a disease, after the effective date of this Act, under circumstances creating a tort liability upon some third person (other than or in addition to the United States) to pay damages therefor, the United States shall be subrogated to any right or claim that the injured or diseased person, his guardian, personal representative, estate, dependents, or survivors has against such third person with respect to the care and treatment so furnished or to be furnished. The head of the department or agency of the United States furnishing such care or treatment may also require the injured or diseased person, his guardian, personal representative, estate, dependents, or survivors, as appropriate, to assign his claim or cause of action against the third person to the extent of that right or claim.

(b) The United States may, to enforce such right of subrogation or assignment, or both (1) institute and prosecute legal proceedings, in a State or Federal court, either alone (in its own name or in the name of the injured person, his guardian, personal representative, estate, dependents, or survivors) or in conjunction with the injured or diseased person, his guardian, personal representative, estate, dependents, or survivors; or (2) intervene or join in any action or proceeding brought by the injured or diseased person, his guardian, personal representative, estate, dependents, or survivors, against the third person who is liable for the injury or disease.

SEC. 2. (a) The President may prescribe regulations to carry out this Act, including regulations with respect to the determination and establishment of the reasonable value of the hospital, medical, surgical, or dental care and treatment (including prostheses and medical appliances) furnished or to be furnished.

(b) To the extent prescribed by regulations under subsection (a), the head of the department or agency of the United States concerned may (1) compromise, or settle and execute a release of, any claim which the United States has by virtue of subrogation or assignment under section 1; or (2) waive any such claim, in whole or in part, for the convenience of the Government, or if he determines that collection would result in undue hardship upon the person who suffered the injury or disease resulting in care or treatment described in section 1.

SEC. 3. This Act does not limit or repeal any other provision of law providing for recovery by the United States of the cost of care and treatment described in section 1.

SEC. 4. This Act becomes effective on the first day of the fourth month following the month in which enacted.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "States" insert "and except employers of seamen treated under the provisions of section 322 of the Act of July 1, 1944, 58 Stat. 696, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 249".

Page 1, line 10, after the word "shall" insert "have a right to recover from said third person the reasonable value of the care and treatment so furnished or to be furnished and shall, as to this right,".

Page 2, line 3, strike out "with respect".

Page 2, line 3, after the word "the" insert "extent of the reasonable value of the".

Page 2, lines 11–22, strike out all after "right" in subsection "b" and insert: ", (1) intervene or join in any action or proceeding brought by the injured or diseased person, his guardian, personal representative, estate, dependents, or survivors, against the third person who is liable for the injury or disease; or (2) if such action or proceeding is not commenced within six months after the first day in which care and treatment is furnished by the United States in connection with the injury or disease involved, institute and prosecute legal proceedings, against the third person who is liable for the injury or disease, in a State or Federal court, either alone (in its own name or in the name of the injured person, his guardian, personal representative, estate, dependents, or survivors) or in conjunction with the injured or diseased person, his guardian, personal representative, estate, dependents, or survivors."

Page 2, following line 22, insert a new subsection (c) as follows:

"The provisions of this section shall not apply with respect to hospital, medical, surgical, or dental care and treatment (including prostheses and medical appliances) furnished by the Veterans' Administration to an eligible veteran for a service-connected disability under the provisions of chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code."

Page 3, line 8, strike out "subrogation or assignment under" and insert "the right established by".

Page 3, line 13, at the end of section 2 insert a new subsection as follows:

(c) No action taken by the United States in connection with the right afforded under this legislation shall operate to deny to the injured person the recovery for that portion of his damage not covered hereunder."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTH CAROLINA TERCENTENARY CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The Clerk called the resolution (S.J. Res. 147) providing for the establishment of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question or two about this resolution. Do I understand that this is a 6-day celebration?

Mr. WHITENER. This is a celebration commemorating the 300th anniversary of the State of North Carolina. It does not involve any expenditure of the funds of the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. I was under the impression that this would cost the Federal Government $10,000.

Mr. WHITENER. No, there is no such provision. The resolution passed the other body and it has been stated by the Senator from North Carolina who introduced this resolution that there would be no cost to the Federal Government. I might say to the gentleman, I introduced an identical resolution. It was unanimously approved by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House. The pending resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 147, was substituted for the resolution which I introduced.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the year 1963 will mark the tercentenary of the charter by which King Charles II of England conveyed to Edward, Earl of Clarendon; George, Duke of Albemarle; William, Lord Craven; John, Lord Berkeley; Anthony, Lord Ashley; Sir George Carteret, knight and baronet; Sir William Berkeley, knight; and Sir John Colleton, knight and baronet "all that territory or tract of ground situate, lying and being within our dominions in America extending from the north end of * * * Luck Island which lies * * * within six and thirty degrees of the northern latitude, and to the west as far as the South Seas, and so southerly as far as the River St. Matthias, which borders upon the coast of Florida and within one and thirty degrees of northern latitude, and west in a direct line as far as the South Seas aforesaid * * * to have, use, exercise and enjoy * * * as * * * true and absolute Lords and Proprietories * * * (with authority to make and) enact under their seals * * * any laws whatsoever, either pertaining to the public state of the said province or to the private utility of particular persons, according to their best discretion, of and with the advice, assent and approbation of the freemen of the said province, or the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies * * *;" and

Whereas the foregoing event constitutes a major landmark in the early history of North Carolina and of the United States as an English Colony; and

Whereas it is fitting and desirable that we commemorate the beginnings of the State of North Carolina, together with its subsequent history and future role in the family of the United States, for the benefit of all the people of our Nation; and

Whereas a commemoration, with careful planning, can be of enduring, rather than transitory, worth to our people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission (hereafter referred to in this joint resolution as the "Commission") which shall be composed of fifteen members as follows:

(1) Four members who shall be Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(2) Four members who shall be Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(3) Seven members to be appointed by the President.

(b) The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as Chairman. The members of the Commission shall receive no salary.

SEC. 2. (a) The functions of the Commission shall be to develop and to execute suitable plans for the celebration of a series of anniversaries occurring during 1963, commemorating the three hundredth anniversary of the Carolina charter of 1663, together with significant events in the history of North Carolina from 1663 to 1763, both years inclusive.

(b) In carrying out its functions the Commission is authorized to cooperate with and to assist the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission and any other agency created or designated by the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina for the purpose of planning and promoting the Carolina charter tercentenary celebration. If the participation of other nations in the celebration is deemed advisable, the Commission may communicate to that end with the governments of such nations through the Department of State.

SEC. 3. The Commission may employ, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions. Service of an individual as a member of the Commission, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U.S.C. 99).

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with patriotic and historical societies and with institutions of learning; and to call upon other Federal departments or agencies for their advice and assistance in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution. The Commission, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may, without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure supplies, services, and property and make contracts, and may exercise those powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this joint resolution.

(b) Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid by the executive office of the Commission, who shall keep complete records of such expenditures and who shall account also for all funds received by the Commission. A report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be furnished by the Commission to the Congress within three months following the celebrations as prescribed by this joint resolution.

(c) Any property acquired by the Commission remaining upon termination of the celebration may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the national park system or may be disposed of as surplus property. The net revenues, after payment of Commission expenses, derived from Commission activities, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall expire upon the completion of its duties, but in no event later than April 1, 1964.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILING CLAIMS IN CHAPTER XI BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4856) to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this is the first of two bills on the Consent Calendar dealing with the bankruptcy laws. Is it made necessary by the accelerated rate of bankruptcies?

Mr. FORRESTER. No, sir. This is merely for the purpose of doing something that ought to have been done at the time the law was placed upon the books. As the law stands, the person who goes into this form of bankruptcy can list his creditors and the moneys will be distributed according to the list that this bankrupt sets up. What we want to do is to change that so that anyone who has a valid claim can come in and file his claim within a period of 6 months.

Mr. GROSS. Does this extend or restrict the time of filing?

Mr. FORRESTER. It restricts.

Mr. GROSS. What is the present period for filing?

Mr. FORRESTER. The present time is just the time the petition is filed by the bankrupt.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORD. Either the public address system is not operating correctly or it is not being manned properly. I think we ought to have the public address system looked into. For some reason or other it has not been working well all afternoon. I make the point of order that something ought to be done about it.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the gentleman from Michigan can hear me now or not. I might call attention to the fact that this particular bill passed this House last year as H.R. 7727. I know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] was acquainted with it at that time. Of course, I realize that after the lapse of time one cannot keep all matters of this kind in mind, but I assure the gentleman it has already passed muster in this House once before.

Mr. GROSS. I am greatly interested in the increase in bankruptcy legislation in view of the tremendous increases in business failures, foreclosures and bankruptcies in the field of housing. I recall, Mr. Speaker, that last year and again this year the House passed deficiency appropriation bills, in both of which additional funds were provided for the bankruptcy courts of the country.

The point I want to make is that it is very interesting that we resort to deficiency appropriations to beef up the bankruptcy courts in view of the accelerated rate of bankruptcies. I hope the Members will keep this in mind when they vote some of the spending bills that come before us.

Mr. FORRESTER. As I said before, the reason for this legislation is not the number of bankruptcies, but the need to correct a grievous error that should never have been made.

I can say to the gentleman that a few days ago in some of the hearings on bankruptcy matters not related to this we were informed as a matter of fact that the bills or costs paid into the bankruptcy courts paid the expenses of those courts with a surplus being left over. You may be called upon to pass deficiency items for the bankruptcy courts; nevertheless, the moneys paid in to the Treasury through the courts as fees, amount to more than the expenses of the bankruptcy courts.

Mr. GROSS. Will not the gentleman agree with me that it is a strange paradox that bankruptcies are increasing, business bankruptcies and individual bankruptcies, at this time when we are told we are wallowing in affluence; when we have such wonderful, alleged prosperity? Does the gentleman think this is a very strange paradox?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am not aware of these sayings, but if they are saying that I agree with the gentleman 100 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Of course the gentleman knows that bankruptcies have greatly increased, both corporate and individual bankruptcies.

Mr. FORRESTER. There is no doubt about that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 334 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 334. Within ten days after the petition is filed the court shall give notice by mail to the debtors, the creditors, and other parties in interest of a first meeting of creditors to be held not less than fifteen days nor more than thirty days after the date of the mailing of such notice. The last date for filing claims shall be set forth in such notice."

SEC. 2. That after section 354 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 754) a new section is added to read as follows:

"SEC. 355. Where a petition is filed under section 322 of this Act, subdivision n of section 57 of this Act shall apply."

SEC. 3. That paragraph 3 of section 367 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 767) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) the consideration deposited, if any, shall be distributed and the rights provided by the arrangement shall inure to the creditors affected by the arrangement whose claims (a) have been filled prior to the date of confirmation but within the time prescribed by section 355 of this chapter and are allowed or (b) have been filed after the date of confirmation but within the time prescribed by section 355 of this chapter and are allowed; and".

SEC. 4. Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 769) are amended to read as follows:

"(2) are disputed and unliquidated, have been scheduled by the debtor, and are filed within the time prescribed by section 355 of this chapter; or

"(3) arise from the rejection of executory contracts by the debtor and are filed within the time prescribed by section 355 of this chapter."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE BANKRUPTCY ACT AS IT RELATES TO THE EXAMINATION OF ATTORNEYS' FEES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5149) to amend subdivision of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) is amended to read as follows:

"d. If a debtor shall, directly or indirectly, in contemplation of the filing of a petition by or against him, pay money or transfer property to an attorney at law, for services rendered or to be rendered, the transaction may be examined by the court on its own motion or shall be examined by the court on petition of the trustee or any creditor and shall be held valid only to the extent of a reasonable amount to be determined by the court, and the excess may be recovered by the trustee for the benefit of the estate.

"If, whether before or after filing, a debtor shall agree orally or in writing to pay money or transfer property to an attorney at law after the filing, the transaction may be examined by the court on its own motion or shall be examined by the court on petition of the bankrupt made prior to discharge and shall be held valid only to the extent of a reasonable amount to be determined by the court, and any excess obligation shall be canceled, or if excess payment or transfer has been made, returned to the bankrupt."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN GLENN DAY

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 641.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the flight of Colonel John Glenn is a triumph for the human spirit of achievement, for the many scientists, engineers, and technologists who have worked on this program, and for the courage, ability, and perseverance of Colonel Glenn himself; and

Whereas the flight of Colonel John Glenn has extended the frontiers of American experience and of human knowledge on outer space and revealed to the world new vistas of study and exploration; and

Whereas the entire American Nation offers congratulations to the brave men who have undertaken this program and offers its prayers to Almighty God for the success of these efforts in the future; and

Whereas a token of recognition for this achievement is offered by an enthusiastic and grateful Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February 20 of each year is hereby designated as John Glenn Day, and the President of the United States is requested and authorized to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING MILITARY SUPPORT TO THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA IN CONNECTION WITH THE WORLD JAMBOREE TO BE HELD IN GREECE IN 1963

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9752) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in Greece in 1963.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, for the use and accommodation of the approximately five hundred Scouts, Scouters, and officials who are to attend the World Jamboree, Boy Scouts, to be held in Greece in July and August 1963, such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and other equipment and services as may be necessary or useful to the extent that items are in stock and available and their issue will not jeopardize the national defense program.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such jamboree, and to be returned at such time after the close of such jamboree, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States Government for the delivery, return, rehabilitation, or replacement of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the

National Council, Boy Scouts of America, good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to provide, without expense to the United States Government, transportation from the United States or military commands overseas, and return, on vessels of the Military Sea Transportation Service or aircraft of the Military Air Transportation Service for (1) those Boy Scouts, Scouters, and officials certified by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, as representing the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, at the jamboree referred to in the first section of this Act, and (2) the equipment and property of such Boys Scouts, Scouters, and officials and the property loaned to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to this Act to the extent that such transportation will not interfere with the requirements of military operations.

(b) Before furnishing any transportation under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall take from the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, a good and sufficient bond for the reimbursement to the United States by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, of the actual costs of transportation furnished under this section.

SEC. 3. Amounts paid to the United States to reimburse it for expenses incurred under the first section and for the actual cost of transportation furnished under section 2 shall be credited to the current applicable appropriations or funds to which such expenses and costs were charged and shall be available for the same purposes as such appropriations or funds.

SEC. 4. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of State, no fee shall be collected for the application for a passport by or the issuance of a passport to, any Boy Scout, Scouter, or official who is certified by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, as representing the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, at the jamboree referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 23, strike "or aircraft of the Military Air Transportation Service".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGOSTURA UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2522) to defer the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to defer, without interest, the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges due to the calendar year 1962 as shown in the March 14, 1961, notice of 1962 water charges to the Angostura Irrigation District: *Provided,* That the Secretary and the district enter into a contract prior to May 1, 1962, for the payment by the district of such deferred charges during the forty-year period commencing January 1, 1966.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H.R. 9252) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member interested may have permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD concerning the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR A NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1057) to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Portrait Gallery Act".

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "Board" means the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

(b) The term "Commission" means the National Portrait Gallery Commission as provided for in this Act.

(c) The term "Gallery" means the National Portrait Gallery established by this Act.

(d) The term "gift" includes a gift, bequest, or devise, whether outright or in trust, and any legal instrument by which the gift is effected.

(e) The term "portraiture" for purposes of this Act shall mean painted or sculptured likenesses.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Smithsonian Institution a bureau which shall be known as the National Portrait Gallery. The functions of such bureau shall be those authorized by this Act. The use for the purposes of the Gallery of any part of the building transferred to the Smithsonian Institution pursuant to the Act of March 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 68), is hereby authorized.

(b) The Gallery shall function as a free public museum for the exhibition and study of portraiture and statuary depicting men and women who have made significant contributions to the history, development, and culture of the people of the United States and of the artists who created such portraiture and statuary.

SEC. 4. There is hereby created the National Portrait Gallery Commission. The number, manner of appointment and tenure of the members of the Commission shall be such as the Board may from time to time prescribe. The Board may delegate to the Commission any function of the Gallery or any function of the Board with respect to the Gallery. The Board may make rules and regulations for the conduct of the affairs of the Commission and the operation of the Gallery, and to the extent and under such limitations as the Board deems advisable, the Board may delegate to the Commission the power to make such rules and regulations.

SEC. 5. (a) The Board is authorized to accept for the Smithsonian Institution gifts of any property for the benefit of the Gallery.

(b) Legal title to all property (except property of the United States) held for the use or benefit of the Gallery shall be vested in the Smithsonian Institution. Subject to any limitations otherwise expressly provided by law, and, in the case of any gift, subject to any applicable restrictions under the terms of such gift, the Board is authorized to sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of any property of whatsoever nature held by it, and to invest in, reinvest in, or purchase any property of whatsoever nature for the benefit of the National Portrait Gallery.

SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out any function authorized by section 3 of this Act, the Board may—

(1) purchase, accept, borrow, or otherwise acquire portraiture, statuary, and other items for preservation, exhibition, or study. The Board may acquire any such item on the basis of its general historical interest, its artistic merit, or the historical significance of the individual to which it relates, or any combination of any such factors. The Board may acquire period furniture and other items to enhance its displays of portraiture and statuary.

(2) preserve or restore any item acquired pursuant to paragraph (1).

(3) display, loan, store, or otherwise hold any such item.

(4) sell, exchange, donate, return, or otherwise dispose of any such item.

SEC. 7. (a) The Board may appoint and fix the compensation and duties of a director of the Gallery, and his appointment and salary shall not be subject to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Board may employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for the efficient administration, operation, and maintenance of the Gallery.

(b) The Board may delegate to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, as well as to the Commission, any of its functions pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1057.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, is there to be no discussion on this bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no control over that. The Chair has put the motion.

Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] desire to make a statement?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I did not think there was any controversy over this bill. I was going to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, which give a brief explanation of the bill. It cleared both sides of the aisle, and for that reason I did not go into an explanation at this time.

The basic law establishing the Smithsonian Institution 116 years ago provides that the Institution should, among other functions, receive and arrange for public exhibition and study, objects of art. At this time the Smithsonian Institution has jurisdiction over the National Gallery of Art, the National Collection of Fine Arts, and the Freer Gallery of Art.

Through the years the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Gallery of Art have received portraits of noteworthy character which cannot be publicly exhibited due to lack of appropriate exhibition space, as well as a specific organization responsible for the proper display of portraits.

S. 1057 passed the Senate on July 31, 1961, and was referred to the Committee on House Administration. The proposal was carefully considered by the Subcommittee on Enrolled Bills and Library and favorably recommended. The full Committee on House Administration has recommended enactment of the proposal. The committee reported H.R. 8446 which is identical to S. 1057 with the exception that the Senate bill on page 2, line 10, contains the words "the whole or." There is an amendment to the Senate bill which we are considering which will remove these three words. The proposal has the endorsement of the Director of the National Gallery of Art and the Librarian of Congress, the Fine Arts Commission as well as other interested agencies. Care has been taken in the language of the bill to avoid duplication of collections and overlapping of functions which might occur in connection with the activities of the Library of Congress or other agencies.

The amendment to S. 1057 is contained on page 2, line 10, and would eliminate the words "the whole or." The purpose of the amendment stems from the fact that the building is intended to house both the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts. By eliminating the words "the whole or" specific assurance can be obtained that neither the National Collection of Fine Arts nor the National Portrait Gallery will usurp the entire building for its use.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has asked me to yield to him for a unanimous-consent request to extend his remarks after my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the other gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for a question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have an explanation of this bill, particularly with respect to the establishment of a new commission, as I understand this bill does. Then I note on page 4 of the bill that the Board may appoint and fix the compensation and duties of a director of the gallery, and his appointment and salary shall not be subject to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Board may employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for the efficient administration, operation, and maintenance of the gallery.

Then on page 5 there is a blank check as follows:

> There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Can the gentleman give the House any idea of the amount of the unlimited salary to be paid to the new director and how many other employees it entails?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I will be glad to answer the gentleman's question.

In the first place, the Smithsonian Board has the authority to do practically everything that we are asking for under this legislation. I had hoped that it would not be necessary to read the statement that I have prepared, but I think if I read from the statement, I will satisfy the gentleman.

The establishment of a National Portrait Gallery has been under consideration for 50 years. Portraits which would have been given to such a gallery have been disposed of elsewhere while the portrait galleries of other nations, including England, Ireland, and Scotland have become more valuable and important.

Because of the recognized need for exhibition space Public Law 85-357, approved March 28, 1958, provided for the transfer of the existing Civil Service Commission Building—formerly known as the Patent Office Building—which is located at F and Seventh Streets NW., to the Smithsonian Institution and authorized the remodeling of the building to make it suitable as an art gallery to house the National Collection of Fine Arts. In the consideration of that legislation specific attention was given for the use of a portion of the building as a portrait gallery. The building will be available for transfer to the Smithsonian Institution in fiscal year 1963.

The gallery shall function as a free public museum for the exhibition and study of portraiture and statuary depicting men and women who have made significant contributions to the history, development, and culture of the United States and of the artists who created such portraits and statues. The bill creates a National Portrait Gallery Commission to be appointed by and to serve under the general jurisdiction of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

While it has been generally agreed that the old Civil Service Commission building would house a National Portrait Gallery, the provisions of S. 1057 are needed for the following reasons:

First. To provide statutory establishment of a National Portrait Gallery Commission.

That would be appointed by the Smithsonian Board, which presumably has the authority to do the things that the Commission would do.

Second. To establish specific identity to the National Portrait Gallery in order to encourage donations.

Third. To set standards of acceptance of portraits and other objects, and to emphasize individuals who have made significant contributions to the history, development, and culture of our Nation.

Fourth. Specific legislative authorization is important to avoid questions as to authority for appropriation of funds for the support of the gallery.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will pardon me.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thought that you wanted the cost.

Mr. GROSS. I do not want to take too much time of the House. I know what this proposal is; I have read the report, but your bill and the report are completely silent as to the cost.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. All right. I will give you the estimate of cost.

The cost of the National Portrait Gallery will be included in the budget estimates in "Salaries and Expenses—Smithsonian Institution," and is estimated as follows:

Fiscal year 1963, $55,000 of which $40,000 will be expended for personal services and $15,000 for other expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I might emphasize here that I think money could be expended by the Smithsonian Board, rather than to have it expended by the National Portrait Commission which would be appointed by the Board. I do not think it is going to add anything to the cost. However, when we open up this portrait gallery, there will be additional cost. In fiscal year 1964, it is estimated that the cost of this new gallery would be $140,000, of which $105,000 will be expended for personal services and $35,000 for other expenses.

It is estimated that in fiscal year 1965 this cost will increase to $250,000, of which $187,000 will be expended for personal services and $63,000 for other expenses. It is believed that the expenses of the National Portrait Gallery will not exceed this figure. That is the basis upon which the subcommittee and the full committee approached and approved this project.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me, after reading all that he has what is planned to be paid by the Director?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think that, of course, would be determined by the Commission. But, again, I want to emphasize that without this legislation the authority for hiring this person would rest with the Smithsonian Institution Board. I think as far as the expense is concerned you have to approach it in this way if you want a portrait gallery. I think there is plenty of support for that, and that this affords the best way of handling it. It will lend substantially to the Commission and will enable the Smithsonian Institution to have it operated in the best manner.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Did you hold hearings on this bill? Did anyone come in and testify as to what they were going to pay the Director and what they were going to pay the additional employees that will be put on the payroll?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The Board of Regents of the Institution has that authority now. They did not indicate what the salary of this Director would be. I am afraid that the hearings did not reveal that.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. CANNON, a member of the Board of Regents.

Mr. CANNON. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that this will be handled with the usual economy and efficiency, as the administration of the Smithsonian Institution has always been administered.

Mr. GROSS. I am not too well acquainted with the economy of the Smithsonian Institution, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. It may be a very economical operation. However, if it is, it is one of the very few in the city of Washington.

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to see that the gentleman has expressed it exactly. It is one of them, and it is in that class.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to see bills come before the House in this fashion. We are finding out in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee that some 80,000 people will be added—additional employees—to the payroll this year. And there will be an increase to 140,000 or 150,000 by the end of the next fiscal year.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I might again remind the gentleman that I do not think by creating this Commission it will add any employees. Just the opening of the gallery will increase the number of employees, and there is no question about that. But I do not think the passage of this bill will offer any employment opportunity for an increase in employees other than the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution has at the present time. For that reason, the committee did not feel that it was adding anything unduly.

Mr. Speaker, it is a question—"Do you want this portrait gallery?"

Mr. GROSS. I am not necessarily opposed to a portrait gallery, but I am interested in what all these things are going to cost. It is not a question of "Do you want this" or "Do you want that"? There is also the question of the cost. I think we are entitled to have that information, and I am sorry to see that we have not gotten the information as to what the cost is going to be. I cannot support the bill under these conditions.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have given the gentleman an estimate of the additional cost of the portrait gallery. I am saying we are not going to add anything to the cost by passing this bill because we have already provided for the building in which to house the gallery.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW]. The gentleman from Ohio is also a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have an identical bill pending in the House to this Senate bill which has passed. I might say to my friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that the provision to which he has referred is a similar provision in all of the acts that have created the various departments and branches of the Smithsonian Institution; that the Board always stays within civil service requirements in the hiring of employees. The Director of the Zoo and all other such directors of museums come under those amendments.

The Smithsonian Regents of the House, with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and my colleague from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and myself, I think, in representing the Appropriations Committee on the Board try to keep the expenses down.

The Smithsonian Institution has large funds of its own that are invested and used to pay much of the expense of the Smithsonian Institution. I can assure the gentleman from Iowa that we shall watch these figures very carefully and keep them down as much as we can.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1057 would provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution.

The need for a national portrait gallery was carefully considered by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. A committee of the Board of Regents, chaired by Dr. John Nicholas Brown, of Providence, R.I., reviewed proposed legislation to establish such a gallery. As a Regent, I had the honor of serving on that committee. As the result of the work of our committee and the review of proposed legislation by the full Board of Regents on January 13, 1961, the Board approved the wording of proposed legislation. The provisions of this proposed legislation as approved by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution are incorporated in H.R. 5739, which I introduced on March 21, 1961, a similar bill to S. 1057.

The House of Representatives has recognized the need for a national portrait gallery as indicated in House Report No. 1533—85th Congress, 2d session—supporting enactment of Public Law 85-357, approved on March 28, 1958, providing for the transfer of the present Civil Service Commission Building to the Smithsonian Institution. This building will house the proposed National Portrait Gallery as well as the National Collection of Fine Arts of the Smithsonian Institution.

The other body passed S. 1057 on July 27, 1961, which was sponsored by two members of the Smithsonian Board of Regents, Senator ANDERSON and Senator SALTONSTALL. S. 1057 is identical to H.R. 5739, except for modifications suggested by the Library of Congress. I am agreeable to the modifications as adopted in S. 1057.

I urge that the House adopt the wording of the Regents' approved bill (S. 1057) for the following reasons:

First. There is no disagreement on the allocation of space. The Regents and the Secretary of the Smithsonian favor equal sharing of space by the proposed National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts. However, the wording of S. 1057 insures administrative flexibility in the utilization of space.

Second. It seems to me that the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, which is composed of the Vice President, the Chief Justice, Members of both the House and the Senate, and distinguished citizen members, should be assigned the responsibility for appointing the members of the proposed National Portrait Gallery Commission as provided in S. 1057. The Board of Regents is intimately acquainted with the administration of the Smithsonian Institution, the problems that will face the new gallery, and the type of membership the Commission will need. In my judgment, the Board of Regents has the prestige necessary to assure appointments of the highest quality.

This is important legislation, legislation which will show over the years a far-reaching influence on the cultural and historical life of our Nation. There is need for a national portrait gallery in which distinguished men and women who have made significant contributions to our country may be honored. So memorialized, they will continue as an inspiration to all Americans through generations to come.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record in support of S. 1057 with the amendment recommended by the Committee on House Administration.

The Subcommittee on Enrolled Bills and Library of the Committee on House Administration held a hearing on my similar bill, H.R. 5748, on August 1, 1961, under the able direction of our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, told the members of the subcommittee:

> The basic law establishing the Smithsonian Institution 115 years ago provided that the Institution should, among other functions, receive and arrange for public examination and study, objects of art.
>
> From the first such an art gallery was maintained. Down through the years both the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Gallery of Art have received portraits of outstanding American men and women and portraits painted by eminent artists. These collections, for the most part, are not on public exhibition due to lack of appropriate exhibit space as well as the lack of a specific organization responsible for the proper display of portraits.
>
> The National Portrait Gallery in London has served as a focal point for portraits of eminent men and women of Great Britain and now has several thousand individual portraits. Other large nations have similar galleries.
>
> There has been general agreement for many years that a comparable National Portrait Gallery is needed in Washington. For example, in 1921 the National Art Committee, endorsed by the Smithsonian Institution, sponsored the presentation of an exhibition of war portraits in the Smithsonian Art Gallery. Arrangements for the gift to the Smithsonian of this portrait collection required fundraising and the commissioning of qualified painters to portray in oil the distinguished leaders of America and the Allies.

This collection was circulated to other museums. The brochure describing the exhibition pointed out the need for additional gallery space, not only for then-existing collections but "to make possible the acceptance in a large way of such additions as will undoubtedly be contributed by public-spirited citizens." The brochure also stated that the war portraits were regarded as the "nucleus of a National Portrait Gallery."

Because of the recognized need for exhibition space for the National Collection of Fine Arts (many of whose important works are in storage or incongruously displayed in the Natural History Building of the Smithsonian Institution) and for the display of portraits Senator Anderson sponsored Public Law 85–357, approved on March 28, 1958, which provided for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building to the Smithsonian Institution and authorized such action as is necessary to remodel the building to make it suitable to house certain art galleries.

It should be pointed out that in the consideration of that legislation specific attention was given by the Congress to the use of a portion of this building for a portrait gallery. Senate Report No. 1354 (85th Cong., 2d sess.) stated that the building was urgently needed for the National Collection of Fine Arts and also 'to display portraits of eminent American men and women'.

House Report No. 1533 (85th Cong., 2d sess.) quotes the Honorable Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey, as follows:

"The building is well-suited for use as the home of the century-old National Collection of Fine Arts and a National Portrait Gallery."

Construction of the new Civil Service Commission Building has begun and it is expected that the present building will be available for transfer to the Smithsonian in fiscal year 1963. This transfer, as I say, is provided in legislation. This leaves relatively little time for planning and organizing the new portrait gallery.

National Portrait Gallery legislation is needed for the following reasons:

1. There is a need for setting standards for acceptance of portraits and other objects to emphasize individuals who have made significant contributions to the history, development, and culture of the people of the United States rather than to depend on the artistic merit of the painting, as implied in the act of May 17, 1938.

2. The establishment of a National Portrait Gallery Commission with statutory basis can be accomplished only through legislation.

3. Establishing a specific identity of the gallery through legislation is considered important to encourage donations.

4. Specific legislative authorization is important to avoid any question as to authority for appropriation of funds for the support of the gallery.

Dr. Carmichael also commented on proposals that certain ex officio members be placed on the National Portrait Gallery and specifying that the appointment of others should be in the hands of the President. He noted that the regents, ex officio, of the Smithsonian Institution at that time were:

Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States; Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States; Senators Clinton B. Anderson, J. William Fulbright, and Leverett Saltonstall; and our distinguished colleagues, Mr. Bow, Mr. Brooks, and Mr. Cannon.

Dr. Carmichael explained to the subcommittee members:

The feeling can be expressed that the proposed ex officio members are busy people and this additional duty is extraneous to their central mission, and that the appointment of members of the Commission should be left to the distinguished Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

He added:

The regents would appoint members on the basis of qualifications needed on the Commission, such as competence in U.S. history, technical knowledge of American biography, as well as appreciation and knowledge in the arts. Such appointments should be of a stature that would command confidence and attract contributions to the collection.

It may be doubted that the regents of the Smithsonian Institution should make these important appointments to the National Portrait Gallery Commission rather than the President of the United States. Also, it may be doubted that Members of Congress are too busy to serve on the new National Portrait Gallery Commission but are not too busy to serve as regents of the Smithsonian Institution, or as members of the governing bodies of such other bureaus of the Smithsonian Institution as the National Gallery of Art, and the National Cultural Center.

Surely the Members of this House, and the members of the Committee on House Administration will be most interested in seeing how well the particular type of Commission recommended for the National Portrait Gallery actually works out in practice. The success of the National Portrait Gallery will depend, in a very large degree, on the ability of the members of this new Commission and they must indeed be men of great ability in whom the country will have confidence.

The Congress will want to stand by and be ready to help this new Federal bureau and to take whatever steps are necessary to assure that it does not fail.

The Committee on House Administration favorably reported on August 14, 1961, my revised bill, H.R. 8446, which I introduced for the committee, without amendment and recommended that this bill do pass.

House Report No. 902, 87th Congress, 1st session, stated, in part, with regard to my H.R. 8446, which is the basis of the amendment to S. 1057 which is being offered today:

H.R. 8446, introduced by Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania, has the full endorsement of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and is identical to S. 1057, which passed the Senate on July 27, 1961, with the exception that the use of the whole building transferred to the Smithsonian Institution pursuant to the act of March 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 68), is not authorized. H.R. 8446 provides that any part of the building so transferred may be used. It is the intention of the Smithsonian Institution for both the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts to share occupancy of the building and the language of H.R. 8446 does not permit the use of the whole building for the National Portrait Gallery.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1057 as amended by the Committee on House Administration.

I wish especially to commend the members of the Committee on House Administration for their work on this legislation, for they have protected the national interests most effectively.

A National Portrait Gallery is needed, but it should not be established at the expense of the National Collection of Fine Arts.

Under this legislation, as amended by the Committee on House Administration, both the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts will share equally the historic old Patent Office Building, at Seventh and F and G Streets in the Nation's Capital.

As explained by the Committee on House Administration, in its report on H.R. 8446 which it favorably reported to this House, the purpose of this legislation is to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a bureau to be known as the National Portrait Gallery. The Gallery would operate under the direction of the National Portrait Gallery Commission and within the jurisdiction of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. The Gallery would be aided by gifts and loans.

The historic Patent Office Building, which was designed by Robert Mills, the internationally famous American architect who designed those other landmarks in the Nation's Capital, the Washington Monument and the U.S. Treasury Building, will be a splendid home for those two great bureaus of the Smithsonian Institution: the National Collection of Fine Arts, and the National Portrait Gallery.

The Patent Office Building has been occupied by the Civil Service Commission as its headquarters building for many years, but the Civil Service Commission has outgrown the building and a new building is being constructed for the Commission just west of the Interior Department Building, and all of its employees will be brought together there.

On January 13, 1961, the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution adopted a resolution to request the introduction of legislation in the Congress to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rhodes] and I joined in introducing legislation to establish the National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution.

The measure, H.R. 8446, which the Committee on House Administration has reported has the full endorsement of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and is identical to S. 1057, which passed the Senate on July 27, 1961, with the exception that the use of the whole building transferred to the Smithsonian Institution pursuant to the act of March 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 68), is not authorized.

Instead, H.R. 8446, and the amendment offered by the House Administration Committee today to S. 1057, provides that any part of the building so transferred may be used.

Under this legislation it is the intention of the Smithsonian Institution for both the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts to share occupancy of the building, and the language of the House amendment does not permit the use of the whole building for the National Portrait Gallery.

The Congress directed more than a century ago that the Smithsonian Institution, which was established as the result of a gift by an Englishman, James

Smithson, form a gallery of art for the Nation. This was begun in 1849, and the gallery was formally established in 1862 under President Abraham Lincoln.

It is interesting to note that this was the same year which saw the establishment of the land-grant colleges and universities, and that we are this year celebrating the centennial of the great Morrill Act which made these educational institutions possible.

It is most fitting that we here in 1962 provide finally, in the face of many vicissitudes, a permanent home for the National Collection of Fine Arts and for a National Portrait Gallery, since the basic purpose of the Smithsonian Institution is "the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men."

So the act of Congress creating the Smithsonian Institution, and the act of Congress authorizing the establishment of land-grant colleges and universities, such as the University of Delaware, have the same basic purpose.

It is especially fitting, then, here in 1962, to note that both of these educational organizations received great impetus under President Abraham Lincoln during the darkest days of the War Between the States.

Abraham Lincoln came from the heartland of America and was part of a frontier society, yet his education was shaped and largely based on the Bible and on Shakespeare. The arts, education, and culture were held in great reverence by this man of the people.

Certainly a people which could build for the future in the midst of war, and express such faith in its own cultural values, was worthy of its great destiny.

But this is an unfolding process, and we here today are engaged in building and adding to this great tradition.

Certainly in this period of cold war, and revolutionary and national aspirations of people everywhere, it behooves us to take those steps which will aid in the proper development of our own culture.

You will recall that President Eisenhower told the Congress in 1955, in his message on the state of the Union, that the Federal Government should do more to aid the arts and other cultural endeavors which "make our civilization endure and flourish."

It is a fact that what we do about our own arts will be widely observed by the peoples of other nations, and that as a leader of the free world, and of freedom-loving peoples everywhere, we must provide leadership in the cultural field as well as in other areas.

The National Portrait Gallery in London, England, operates on the basis of rules which should prove helpful to us in this present endeavor. The London Gallery looks to history, and to the celebrity of the person represented by a portrait rather than to the celebrity of the artist.

In the National Portrait Galley its trustees must attempt to estimate celebrity without any reference to the color, or the political party, or religious institution of those whose portraits are selected.

We are starting at a very late date in our history to establish such a National Portrait Gallery in our own country.

In the small gallery in Philadelphia's famed Independence National Historical Park may be seen the portraits of our Founding Fathers. These portraits are carefully preserved, and they are seen by millions of people.

It may be argued that a National Portrait Gallery is no longer necessary, in view of the high development of photography, to record the likeness of our great statesmen. However, I would certainly think that one section of the gallery should be devoted to photography, an art which has reached a high state of development in our own country.

With such an institution, a further important part of our history will be available to all of our people. It will quickly become a major tourist attraction, and will be seen by many of the visitors to our Nation's Capital from this country and from overseas.

In view of the importance of the National Portrait Gallery in our national life, it is of the highest importance that the National Portrait Gallery Commission established pursuant to S. 1057 be made up of distinguished Americans, without regard to race or to political or religious affiliation, who will be able to make this gallery a successful institution, and one which will be a credit both to the Nation's Capital and to the Nation at large.

As far as the National Collection of Fine Arts is concerned, it is widely recognized that many of the paintings in this collection are disintegrating and are not being cared for as they should be. In addition, many of them are not exhibited where they are easily accessible to the public.

The paintings by George Catlin of American Indians were displayed in Europe a few years ago and were internationally acclaimed.

Yet they have never been displayed in their entirety in the Nation's Capital.

The need for a permanent home for the National Collection of Fine Arts was ably stated by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, the author of the bill, S. 1057, we are considering today, in a letter published in 1958 in a leading art publication.

Senator ANDERSON declared at that time:

> I realize that the paintings in the National Art Collection are disintegrating, and many of them are not being exhibited and cared for as they should be. Therefore, I think it is possible to say to you that we will soon be able to take care of the art collection about which you were worried, and do it many years quicker than the building of a new art museum.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support S. 1057 with the amendments recommended by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the proposal set forth in S. 1057 is one in which I am deeply interested.

It would provide, if amended, as the House Administration Committee recommends, for a permanent home for the century-old National Collection of Fine Arts, and for the National Portrait Gallery.

The historic Patent Office Building between Seventh and Ninth Streets, and F and G Streets NW., would be used for this purpose.

When I came to the Congress in 1955 the Eisenhower administration proposed to tear this building down to provide a parking lot on the site.

There were slum buildings in the next block, but the Eisenhower administration did not propose to raze those buildings.

No, they were particularly interested in the Patent Office Building which was one of the great architectural monuments in our Nation, a building which was designed by Robert Mills—one of the country's greatest architects, and a man who designed the Washington Monument and the U.S. Treasury Building.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and I set about trying to save this building, and I might say that it has been estimated that it would cost between $30 and $40 million to replace this great structure.

Also, of course, the history connected with this particular building runs deep in the American consciousness.

So, that many leading American organizations, among them the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Society of Architectural Historians, the Committee for Preservation of Historic Buildings of the American Institute of Architects, and the Commission of Fine Arts were in the vanguard of those fighting for the preservation of this great structure.

It took about 4 years before this historic building was finally saved, but this figures out at about $10 million a year at the going rate for replacing this structure.

How else can one make $10 million a year for our country?

I do want to publicly commend those organizations which are so deeply concerned with our Nation's history that they are willing to fight to save its great historic structures.

Americans spend nearly $3 billion a year to travel to other nations to see the architectural monuments which, like the pyramids in Egypt, and the temples of India, go back thousands of years.

If we take care of our own historic structures they will draw people of other countries to our shores.

It is with a real sense of personal accomplishment, then, that I support this legislation to make the historic Patent Office Building the permanent home of the National Collection of Fine Arts, and the National Portrait Gallery.

The Patent Office Building will make a fitting home for American art in years to come, and will be able to continue its service to our people.

The Congress directed the Smithsonian Institution, in 1846, to form a gallery of art for the Nation. In 1849 the Smithsonian Institution began the collection of painting and sculpture, and art objects in general.

The Smithsonian, because of its congressional sponsorship in 1846 under the terms of the will of James Smithson, of London, England, and because of the high caliber of its administration down through the years and at present, has always been the organizational center and keystone of the Federal outlook on American art.

It is built into the American tradition and it has built into it executive, legislative and judicial authority. Its head is the President of the United States. Its membership includes the President's Cabinet, the Vice President, and the Chief Justice of the United States. It is governed by a board of regents which includes representatives of the three branches of Government and six private citizens. Policy is carried out by an executive officer who is the Secretary of the Institution.

Thus the seed for the National Collection of Fine Arts and a National Portrait Gallery took root a full century and more before our day. In time the Institution's art collections—as they grew—began to earn recognition. Names like Mrs. Harriet Lane Johnston, niece of President Buchanan; Charles L. Freer, William T. Evans, Henry Ward Ranger, Alfred Duane Pell, Ralph Cross Johnson, George Catlin, and others, are identified with bequests that won the Smithsonian national and international fame.

Here, even before the beginning of the Mellon Gallery, was one of the signs that Federal guardianship of American art and other art had come of age. I cannot find in the history of the relationship of Congress to American art that Congress has been penurious, or limited, or narrow in its horizons. On the whole, I incline to the feeling that in this area, at least, Congress has even been ahead of the public consciousness.

In 1930 the Smithsonian struggled and failed to get funds to house its collections, greatly increased by the $5 million Gallatly bequest of the year before. This failure had the effect of turning the only space the Smithsonian had into a monumentally cluttered attic and an overcrowded curiosity shop.

The housing of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery in the historic Patent Office Building will in no way provide competitive galleries. Rather, they will supplement each other, and will provide a continuous picture of art from early times to the present.

The 75th Congress on May 17, 1938, authorized an appropriation of $40,000 to secure, preferably by competition, designs for a Smithsonian Gallery building on public ground on the Mall. This legislation provided, also, that private funds be accepted for the purchase of works of art by living artists. The legislation also made possible the right to acquire private funds for the financing of exhibitions everywhere in the country both of current and of past works of art.

Consequently the Alice Pike Barney Memorial Fund was given to the Smithsonian Institution to encourage American painting, sculpture, and design through exhibition and purchase. In 1951 a traveling exhibition service was established. This is today cooperating with the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency to present American art, historical and contemporary, abroad.

Here is but one phase of the free world's struggle for the minds of men.

The President is not without consciousness of this project and, on the basis of his entire record, is certainly sympathetic to it.

I am convinced that the enactment of this bill, S. 1057, if amended as proposed by the Committee on House Administration, will work for the good of America and the free world, and for the prestige and dignity of the Capital of the United States.

Our country, in the arts as in other fields of human endeavor, must live up to the great destiny that is now hers.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1057 with an amendment?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 449) providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial, with committee amendments printed in the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary to provide for the establishment of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton (commonly known as the Grange), situated in New York, New York, as a national memorial. However, the Secretary shall not establish the national memorial until he has satisfied himself that the lands which have been donated are sufficient to assure the relocation of the Grange and administration and interpretation of the national memorial.
>
> SEC. 2. (a) The national memorial established by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to this joint resolution shall be designated as the Hamilton Grange National Memorial and shall be set aside as a public national memorial to commemorate the historic role played by Alexander Hamilton in the establishment of this Nation.
>
> (b) The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop such memorial, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935, as amended.
>
> SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $460,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 449, Congressman ZELENKO's bill to provide that the Alexander Hamilton home in New York City shall be a national memorial. In doing so, I want to commend not only the gentleman from New York, Congressman ZELENKO, for introducing his bill on this subject but also the gentlemen from New York, Congressman LINDSAY and Congressman POWELL, for introducing companion measures.

We are all familiar with Alexander Hamilton's services to this Nation during its formative years. We know of him as an officer in Washington's army. We know of the part he played in the Constitutional Convention in 1787. We are familiar with his writings in the Federalist Papers. We know of his work as the first Secretary of the Treasury—particularly his great report on manufactures in the United States.

The strange thing is that, despite all the good he did, despite all the history books and biographies say about him, the Nation has never seen fit to honor him with a public memorial. I said "honor him"—I should have said "honor itself."

Now we have an opportunity to overcome this neglect. The American Scenic & Historic Preservation Society has offered to donate his home, the Grange, to the United States, and New York City has offered to donate a site on the campus of its City College for its relocation. The cost of moving the building and refurbishing it will be borne by the Government or, as we have reason to hope and believe will be the case, by private contributors. Even if none of the private contributions we hope for materialize, the cost to the Government will be less than $500,000.

When this is done, we will have, indeed, a suitable memorial to Alexander Hamilton: his own home, the only home he ever owned, on land which he once owned. We will have a memorial that all Americans can visit and be proud of. As it is at present, this home is more of a disgrace to the man and the Nation than it is an honor. I visited it within the last 2 months with four of my colleagues from the Interior Committee. I can assure you that the way it has been allowed to run down, the place on which it stands, the lack of protection against thievery and vandalism that it has, are shameful. I do not by any means criticize the American Scenic & Historic Preservation Society for this situation. That fine organization has done all it could, and we owe it to the society to say that, but for its efforts, we would not have even the little left that is left. The society is simply inadequately endowed to do its great work. But I do criticize the American people and the American Congress for having allowed this to happen.

I, therefore, urge the House to take this opportunity to do itself proud. None of us will live to regret this slight tribute to a great man.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Zelenko] may extend his remarks as this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 449, which I introduced on June 13, 1961, providing for the Secretary of the Interior to take such action as may be necessary to establish the Grange, the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton in New York City, as a national memorial and designate it as the Hamilton Grange National Memorial.

The Grange, built in 1801, was the only home ever owned by Alexander Hamilton, who was a major draftsman and proponent of the Federal Constitution and the foremost architect of American financial policy in the first critical years of the Federal Union. The design of the structure is simple but dignified and is one of the few houses of the Federal period still standing in New York City.

The new proposed site is on the campus of the College of the City of New York. This will bring the structure into an appropriate situs; that is, within the grounds of an institution of learning. At the new site it will also overlook a fine public park.

We must preserve the memory of the men who founded this country. They were a truly remarkable group—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, the Adamses and many others—and Hamilton was in the very first rank. These men, and their successors, have made the country what it is. To know them is to understand our origin and our growth. Our young men and young women, our boys and girls, can draw understanding and inspiration from their lives.

The preservation of living memorials to these men can do much to keep their memory alive. This is particularly true of their houses—Washington at Mount Vernon, Jefferson at Monticello, the Adamses at their house in Quincy, Robert E. Lee at Arlington, colonial and revolutionary Virginians at Williamsburg. We can understand these men and their times far better when we see the surroundings in which they lived.

Hamilton's principal contributions to the Nation were his participation in the adoption of the Constitution and his services as the first Secretary of the Treasury from 1789 to 1795.

We also think of Hamilton's long and close association with George Washington. When President Washington chose Hamilton as his Secretary of the Treasury in 1789, he was not choosing an unknown. Hamilton had already served General Washington as aide-de-camp from 1777—a lieutenant colonel at the age of 20—to 1781, when he left to take part in the siege of Yorktown, where he personally led the attacking party which stormed the first British redoubt to be taken.

Hamilton was associated with James Madison in the preparation of the Federalist Papers. It was indeed a high compliment for Hamilton to be asked to join with the father of the Constitution and with John Jay in this series of papers which was so important in the ratification of the Constitution and in the interpretation of the Constitution in later years.

Despite Alexander Hamilton's great and well-known services to the Nation as an officer in the Revolutionary Army, in the calling of the Annapolis Convention, in the formulation of the Constitution at the Philadelphia Convention, as an author of the Federalist Papers, and as the first Secretary of the Treasury, he is the one outstanding patriot of his time to whom no suitable public memorial exists. The Grange, built by him in 1801 and now owned by the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society, is the closest that we come to such a memorial. But the society is inadequately endowed to carry on its work and the present location and condition of the Grange are more of a disgrace than an honor to the man and to the country which he served during the greater part of his short life.

The consequence is that the Grange fails to serve its memorial purpose, since few visitors of New York, and few New Yorkers themselves, are aware of its existence and fewer still visit it and share in the intimations of this great man. Enactment of House Joint Resolution 449 will permit this to be corrected.

Hamilton was a New Yorker, an alumnus of Columbia University, active in law and in politics and a representative of this area as a Member of the Continental Congress. His memory and tradition are ingrained in the hearts and minds of all citizens and particularly those who make New York their home.

I wish to take this opportunity to extend my personal thanks, and that of my constituents, to the great chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Honorable Wayne Aspinall, and to his entire committee. My special thanks also go to the Honorable J. T. Rutherford, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, for his magnificent effort in perfecting the legislation.

I am proud to submit legislation over my name saluting Alexander Hamilton as one of the great founders of this Nation. The proposal to make the Grange a national memorial for Alexander Hamilton deserves the support of the entire country.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, 158 years have passed since Alexander Hamilton and Aaron Burr fought their duel. In all that time, his fame has not diminished. But, though the American people have long learned to respect his name, we have never taken any steps to erect a public national memorial to him. His portrait on our $10 bills is the furthest we have gone.

Alexander Hamilton's name goes along with the names of Washington, Jefferson and Madison in the list of the founders of our Government. Without the work that he did in the Constitutional Convention, in the writing of the Federalist Papers, and as Secretary of the Treasury, the new Government might well have foundered. We owe it to him, we owe it to ourselves, we owe it to our children to perpetuate his name in some tangible fashion.

His home in New York City, the Grange, is now being offered to the Government free of charge and with a small endowment fund to go with it. The plan is to move the Grange to a new and more suitable location, about 10 blocks away, on the campus of the College of the City of New York. This new site is also being offered to the Government free of charge.

The moving and rehabilitation expenses will be sizable—about $500,000—but it will be well worth incurring them, if funds to cover them cannot be procured from other sources, for the sake of preserving this structure and the memories that go with it.

I congratulate our colleagues from New York, Congressmen Zelenko, Lindsay, and Powell, for their interest in this matter and for the diligence with which they have pursued it.

They deserve great credit. I also congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] for the assiduity with which he has pursued his quest for private funds to cover the moving and rehabilitation expenses which enactment of this measure will entail. Finally, I commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks for the interest he has shown and particularly for his unwillingness to move the bill until he had personally inspected the site. He came back from New York, after having viewed it with four of our colleagues on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, convinced, as he had not been before, that the Grange is well worth preserving.

Mr. Speaker, I express my personal hope and that of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the House will pass this bill enthusiastically.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand, it will cost close to half a million dollars for the moving of the structure and then apparently a minimum of $45,000 annually in perpetuity for maintenance and custodial services.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I correct my colleague to this extent, that moving, remodeling, and refurnishing the Grange is supposed to cost in the neighborhood of $500,000. As far as the annual cost is concerned, the gentleman is correct, but it is intended that we will charge fees to the people who intend to visit this particular facility of the National Park Service.

Mr. GROSS. It is proposed to recapture some of these expenditures for the Federal Government?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes; just the same as in connection with the legislation which we passed for the memorial to former President Roosevelt a short time ago.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of my full committee and to express the hope that when this bill goes to the other body there will be no crippling amendments attached, as I understand happened to a similar bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I express the hope that when we get this bill over there they will be considerate of our position.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the suspension of the rules and the passage of this bill. As the chairman of the full committee stated, I have endeavored to have the cost of this project underwritten by private sources. Those private sources include the American Bankers Association. This association has been very free on occasion to criticize the expenditure of public funds, and I feel as a matter of personal pride to that organization, they should pay for the cost of establishing this shrine.

Alexander Hamilton is the father of our Federal banking system. Through his efforts our bankers today have an excellent foundation upon which to build. It is altogether fitting and proper for the bankers today to honor their founder. It would be an excellent example of public relations. An opportunity rarely found in our modern world.

I sent a letter with such a request to the present president of the American Bankers Association and was turned down by him on the basis that they had no funds available and undertook no such projects.

It is interesting to note that at the same time I sent the letter to the president of the American Bankers Association I sent a copy of that letter to the mutual savings banks of the country and to the savings and loan associations of the United States. Both of the latter organizations were most anxious to express their delight that our committee had seen fit to recognize Alexander Hamilton and to preserve his home, "The Grange," and stated that they would be only too happy to cooperate with the American Bankers Association in raising funds to underwrite this project. I certainly hope that the American Bankers Association will reconsider and raise the funds to underwrite the cost of this very worthy project.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I should like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as did my chairman, the gentleman from Colorado, for supporting this idea and requesting the cooperation of the three financial organizations in recognizing Alexander Hamilton as one of the greatest financial geniuses in this Nation.

I think it is reasonable to assume because of his efforts that while we are authorizing the expenditure, and I might say this is a closed-in appropriation request, that is the $460,000, that when the time comes for the appropriation, less than this amount will be necessary to be appropriated due to the gentleman's interest and activity in this behalf.

I commend the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the work he has put in on this bill and also the chairman of the subcommittee for the attention he has given this extremely important matter. It may not seem of great significance to other parts of the country at this moment, but I imagine that other parts of the country will find it significant as they come to know the importance of Alexander Hamilton's "Grange." The beauty of this building, and the quality of the architecture is worth knowing. Indeed, it is one of the few remaining examples of federalist architecture of the period, and it is one of the best examples of all. One must also appreciate the owner of the building.

It was from this building that Hamilton went out to meet Aaron Burr in that historic fatal encounter. This was the only home he ever owned. If you visit it at the present time, you will see that it is in a state of half collapse. The surrounding neighborhood completely blocks out any view you might have of the structure. It is nothing short of a crime that it has been allowed to deteriorate in this fashion. Therefore I thank the committee for its attention to this matter, for seeing to it that one very important treasure that we have is not allowed to deteriorate any further, for making it a national memorial. As a cosponsor of the legislation and as one who testified before the committee, I strongly support this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Rather than move this building, it is too bad we cannot reincarnate Alexander Hamilton, the financial genius, to tell us how to handle critical problems today of deficit, debt, and inflation—we do not seem to have anybody else who can do it.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in support of the resolution offered by my colleague from New York, to have the house which was built and occupied by Alexander Hamilton established as a national memorial.

Alexander Hamilton, as we all know, was one of the great patriots during the early days of our country's formation. We New Yorkers are very proud that he came from our State. He served during the Revolutionary War as an officer in the Continental Army, and after the war as the New York delegate to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787; he played a most important part in drafting the Constitution. He was one of the authors of the Federalist papers, which presented a defense of the Constitution, and which certainly facilitated its ratification by the various States. And he climaxed his outstanding career of service to his country by becoming our first Secretary of the Treasury and the proponent of the basic financial policy of the United States.

In 1801 he had his home built in New York, and called it The Grange. At that time, of course, it was a place in the country surrounded by acres of open land. It was beautifully designed by John McComb, one of the leading architects of the day, and the designer of New York City Hall, and has been called one of the outstanding examples of early 19th century architecture. Its location at the present time—crowded between two buildings, unprotected and inadequately maintained—leaves much to be desired. Much of the furniture which had been in the house when Hamilton lived there has been stolen, and minor alterations in the structure have been made over the years, caused by its forced removal from its original site as a result of the urban development of the great city of New York.

Hamilton unfortunately had a short life, brought to a tragic end as a result of his duel with Aaron Burr, but during his career he certainly contributed much to the founding and establishment of this Republic, and directed his talents and energies toward perfecting the operating and functioning of the new Government to which he was so dedicated.

At the present time there is no memorial established by the Federal Government which pays tribute to Alexander Hamilton. The passage of the resolution before us, calling for the removal of the house to another location—on the campus of the College of the City of New York, on land Hamilton himself once owned—where it would be renovated and restored, would certainly be a worthy gesture on the part of this House in recognizing and perpetuating the memory of one of the founders of our country.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I support the establishment of a national memorial to Alexander Hamilton. The other body, under the leadership of Senator JAVITS, has already passed a bill which would allow the United States to accept title to and preserve the home of Alexander Hamilton as a national monument.

The Hamilton Grange built in 1801 is one of the few remaining structures from the Federal period in New York City. It still contains some of the furniture and other items which belonged to Alexander Hamilton. It is now owned by the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society, which is inadequately endowed and cannot maintain this historic structure. As Senator JAVITS pointed out, the home is "in a state of terrible disrepair and it would be only a matter of a very short time before it might very well collapse and be irremediably ruined." Mr. Speaker, the City College of New York has generously offered to make available a site for the Grange.

It is surprising that among our Founding Fathers Alexander Hamilton is one of the few who have not had a memorial established in his honor. Officer in the Revolutionary Army, major contributor to the drafting of the Constitution, author of the Federalist Papers and first Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton is one of our great patriots, and for the benefit of future generations a suitable memorial should be established in his name.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RULES AND REGULATIONS OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION IN COMMON CARRIER AND SAFETY AND SPECIAL FIELDS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1668) to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields, with certain amendments.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title V of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"FORFEITURE IN CASES OF VIOLATIONS OF CERTAIN RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 510. (a) Where any radio station other than licensed radio stations in the broadcast service or stations governed by the provisions of parts II and III of title III and section 507 of this Act—

"(1) is operated by any person not holding a valid radio operator license or permit of the class prescribed in the rules and regulations of the Commission for the operation of such station;

"(2) fails to identify himself at the times and in the manner prescribed in the rules and regulations of the Commission;

"(3) transmits any false call contrary to regulations of the Commission;

"(4) is operated on a frequency not authorized by the Commission for use by such station;

"(5) transmits unauthorized communications on any frequency designated as a distress or calling frequency in the rules and regulations of the Commission;

"(6) interferes with any distress call or distress communication contrary to the regulations of the Commission;

"(7) fails to attenuate spurious emissions to the extent required by the rules and regulations of the Commission;

"(8) is operated with power in excess of that authorized by the Commission;

"(9) renders a communications service not authorized by the Commission for the particular station;

"(10) is operated with a type of emission not authorized by the Commission;

"(11) is operated with transmitting equipment other than that authorized by the Commission; or

"(12) fails to respond to official communications from the Commission;

the licensee of the station shall, in addition to any other penalty prescribed by law, forfeit to the United States a sum not to exceed $100. In the case of a violation of clause (2), (3), (5), or (6) of this subsection, the person operating such station shall, in addition to any other penalty prescribed by law, forfeit to the United States a sum not to exceed $100. The violation of the provisions of each numbered clause of this subsection shall constitute a separate offense: *Provided,* That $100 shall be the maximum amount of forfeiture liability for which the licensee or person operating such station shall be liable under this section for the violation of the provisions of any one of the numbered clauses of this subsection, irrespective of the number of violations thereof, occurring within ninety days prior to the date the notice of apparent liability is issued or sent as provided in subsection (c) of this section: *And provided further,* That $500 shall be the maximum amount of forfeiture liability for which the licensee or person operating such station shall be liable under this section for all violations of the provisions of this section, irrespective of the total number thereof, occurring within ninety days prior to the date such notice of apparent liability is issued or sent as provided in subsection (c) of this section.

"(b) The forfeiture liability provided for in this section shall attach only for a willful or repeated violation of the provisions of this section by any licensee or person operating a station.

"(c) No forfeiture liability under this section shall attach after the lapse of ninety days from the date of the violation unless within such time a written notice of apparent liability, setting forth the facts which indicate apparent liability, shall have been issued by the Commission and received by such person, or the Commission has sent him such notice by registered mail or by certified mail at his last known address. The person so notified of apparent liability shall have the opportunity to show cause in writing why he should not be held liable and, upon his request, he shall be afforded an opportunity for a personal interview with an official of the Commission at the field office of the Commission nearest to the person's place of residence."

SEC. 2. Section 504(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 504(b)) is amended by striking out "sections 503(b) and 507" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 503(b), section 507, and section 510".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the thirtieth day after the date of its enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the bill S. 1668 has been a matter before the Congress for several years. It has the recommendation of the Federal Communications Commission. Some time ago when the Commission asked us for the amendment dealing with small fines, objection was raised by certain groups, particularly the forestry or timber industry. They were fearful that their operations would be materially affected, and I think there was some substance to that fear. Over a period of time the difficulty was worked out and that particular question has been resolved. There was an understanding between those groups and the Federal Communications Commission, and the amendment that we present here today includes the understanding that was reached in the consideration of this proposal.

The committee held hearings on the bill, considered it in executive session, and reported it unanimously. There is no objection that I know of on the part of anyone.

The purpose of the legislation is to add a new section to the Communications Act of 1934 so as to grant authority to the Commission to impose monetary forfeitures for violations of the Commission's rules and regulations in common carrier safety and special fields. It would also provide for the remission or mediation by the Commission of such forfeitures if warranted by the circumstances.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Would the passage of this bill have any effect on this discussion that has been underway as to the small radio stations, daylight stations, coming on the air before daylight during the winter months?

Mr. HARRIS. No, it has nothing to do with that.

Hearings are underway and we contemplate that they will be finished by tomorrow. That is on the daytime broadcasting bill.

Mr. BROWN. This bill would in no way affect that.

Mr. HARRIS. It would not affect that at all. This bill has to do with certain operations which under present law, should penalties be necessary, perhaps they might be so severe in some instances as to work extreme hardship. The committee report very clearly explains the effects of the bill and its importance. I urge passage of the bill as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1668, as amended?

The question was taken: and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF RADIO OPERATOR LICENSES TO NATIONALS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1589) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the issuance of radio operator licenses to nationals of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 303(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1082) as amended (47 U.S.C. 303(1)), is hereby amended by inserting the words "or nationals" immediately following the word "citizens".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously passed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The bill has passed the Senate.

The legislation has been urged by the Department of the Interior so as to give the Commission authority to issue radio operator licenses to foreign nationals engaged in navigation.

The committee held hearings at which representatives of the Department of the Interior and the Federal Communications Commission testified in support of this legislation.

Under the bill the Federal Communications Commission would be empowered to issue radio operator licenses to natives of American Samoa who are nationals of the United States and owe allegiance to it, but to whom full citizenship has not been extended.

The bill is approved by the Department of the Interior and the Federal Communications Commission. It materially affects the fishing industry of Samoa.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been considered by the committee and reported unanimously. I know of no objection, either in the House or from anybody else concerned.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 1589.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT TO ELIMINATE 30-DAY RESTRICTION ON SPECIAL AND SAFETY SERVICE LEGISLATION

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1371) to amend subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit the Commission to renew a station license in the safety and special radio services more than 30 days prior to expiration of the original license.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1084; 47 U.S.C. 307 (e)), is amended by striking out all after "(e)" and adding in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "No renewal of an existing station license in the broadcast or the common carrier services shall be granted more than thirty days prior to the expiration of the original license."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which this bill was referred to amend section (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, would permit the Commission to renew a station license in the safety and special radio services more than 30 days prior to expiration of the original license.

This provides authority for the Commission to issue the license prior to the 30-day expiration, not so provided at the present time. It applies only to safety and special radio services. For example, during the fiscal year 1959 there were 10,500 modified licenses issued. Eventually, each of these 10,500 licenses must be processed again on renewal.

The bill as reported would permit the Commission to consider such applications for modification as applications for modification and renewal. The Commission could then issue such modified licenses for a regular license term, thus eliminating most of the duplicate effort that the Commission is now burdened with.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOULDER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has done a very commendable and outstanding job on these bills, in the way of allowing hearings and developing them before the subcommittee and getting them reported by the full committee. These are very important bills.

I may say to the gentleman from Missouri probably it might be advisable to comment on the fact that the legislation maintains the present restriction insofar as broadcasting and common carrier licenses are concerned, and to state that it is in this area that the restrictions of 307(e) are more appropriately applied.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes. I thank our outstanding chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for his complimentary statement and cooperation. This bill applies to safety and special radio services only. It is a step in the direction of making available to the FCC a flexibility which will permit more efficiency and a reduction of its backlog of cases.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the important thing to keep in mind is that we have here applications, and where they are competitive they must pursue the regular course in the competitive field.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOULDER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this require any fee or additional fee, if there is a fee charged?

Mr. MOULDER. None whatsoever.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this applies only to safety and special licenses and is not applicable to the broadcasting or common carrier licenses insofar as they are concerned. The present rule is retained for them. In view of the fact there were over 10,000 of these last year, there is no objection, insofar as I know, from anybody, and it seems to me it is in the public interest that this be passed without further ado.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1371.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATION OF OATH ON CERTAIN FCC DOCUMENTS

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 683) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That subsection (a) of section 219 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 219(a)), is amended by striking out from the first sentence thereof the words "under oath".
>
> SEC. 2. That subsection (b) of section 219 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 219(b)), is amended by striking out from the penultimate sentence thereof after the word "Act" the semicolon, adding a period thereafter and striking out the following: "and such periodical or special reports shall be under oath whenever the Commission so requires".
>
> SEC. 3. That subsection (b) of section 308 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 308(a)), is amended by striking out from the last sentence thereof the words "under oath or affirmation".
>
> SEC. 4. That subsection (a) of section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 319(a)), is amended by striking out from the last sentence thereof the words "under oath or affirmation".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, this bill or legislation would eliminate duplication and unnecessary voluminous work on the part of the Federal Communications Commission. It would eliminate the necessity of requiring an oath or affirmation to certain papers or documents. For example, where the FCC calls upon an applicant for additional information, and, as the present law stands, an oath is required on every additional piece of paper filed. The committee has been advised by the Department of Justice that the enactment of this legislation would not adversely affect the enforcement activities of that department.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 683.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TELEVISION TRANSMISSION FACILITIES IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Mr. HARRIS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs.

WORK HOURS ACT OF 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10786) to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Work Hours Act of 1962" and title I may be cited as the "Contract Work Hours Standards Act".

SEC. 2. As used in this Act, the term "this Act" means the Work Hours Act of 1962 except in title I, where it means the Contract Work Hours Standards Act.

TITLE I—CONTRACT WORK HOURS STANDARDS ACT

SEC. 101. As used herein, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor, United States Department of Labor.

SEC. 102. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the wages of every laborer and mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in his performance of work on any contract of the character specified in section 103 shall be computed on the basis of a standard workday of eight hours and a standard workweek of forty hours, and work in excess of such standard workday or workweek shall be permitted subject to the provisions of this section. For each workweek in which any such laborer or mechanic is so employed, such wages shall include compensation, at a rate not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay, for all hours worked in excess of eight hours in any calendar day or in excess of forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be.

(b) The following provisions shall be a condition of every contract of the character specified in section 103 and of any obligation of the United States, any territory, or the District of Columbia in connection therewith:

(1) No contractor or subcontractor contracting for any part of the contract work which may require or involve the employment of laborers or mechanics shall require or permit any laborer or mechanic, in any workweek in which he is employed on such work, to work in excess of eight hours in any calendar day or in excess of forty hours in such workweek except in accordance with the provisions of this Act; and

(2) In the event of violation of the provisions of paragraph (1), the contractor and any subcontractor responsible therefor shall be liable to such affected employee for his unpaid wages and shall, in addition, be liable to the United States (or, in the case of work done under contract for the District of Columbia or a territory, to such District or to such territory) for liquidated damages as provided therein. Such liquidated damages shall be computed, with respect to each individual employed as a laborer or mechanic in violation of any provision of this Act, in the sum of $10 for each calendar day on which such individual was required or permitted to work in excess of eight hours or in excess of the standard workweek of forty hours without payment of the overtime wages required by this Act. The governmental agency for which the contract work is done or by which financial assistance for the work is provided may withhold, or cause to be withheld, subject to the provisions of section 104, from any moneys payable on account of work performed by a contractor or subcontractor, such sums as may administratively be determined to be necessary to satisfy any liabilities of such contractor or subcontractor for unpaid wages and liquidated damages as herein provided.

SEC. 103. (a) The provisions of this Act shall apply, except as otherwise provided, to any contract which may require or involve the employment of laborers or mechanics upon a public work of the United States, of any territory, or of the District of Columbia, and to any other contract which may require or involve the employment of laborers or mechanics if such contract is one (1) to which the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, any territory, or the District of Columbia is a party, or (2) which is made for or on behalf of the United States, any agency or instrumentality thereof, any territory, or the District of Columbia, or (3) which is a contract for work financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from, or loans insured or guaranteed by, the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof under any statute of the United States providing wage standards for such work: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 102 shall not apply to work where the assistance from the United States or any agency or instrumentality as set forth above is only in that nature of a loan guarantee or insurance.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, the provisions of the Act shall apply to all laborers and mechanics, including watchmen and guards, employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of any part of the work contemplated by any such contract, and for purposes of this Act, laborers and mechanics shall include workmen performing services in connection with dredging or rock excavation in any river or harbor of the United States or of any territory or of the District of Columbia, but shall not include any employee employed as a seaman.

(b) This Act shall not apply to contracts for transportation by land, air, or water, or for the transmission of intelligence, or for the purchase of supplies or materials or articles ordinarily available in the open market. This Act shall not apply with respect to any work required to be done in accordance with the provisions of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act (49 Stat. 2036; 41 U.S.C. 35–45).

SEC. 104. (a) Any officer or person designated as inspector of the work to be performed under any contract of the character specified in section 103, or to aid in the enforcement or fulfillment thereof shall, upon observation or investigation, forthwith report to the proper officer of the United States, of any territory or possession, or of the District of Columbia, all violations of the provisions of this Act occurring in the performance of such work, together with the name of each laborer or mechanic who was required or permitted to work in violation of such provisions and the day or days of such violation. The amount of unpaid wages and liquidated damages owing under the provisions of this Act shall be administratively determined and the officer or person whose duty it is to approve the payment of moneys by the United States, the territory, or the District of Columbia in connection with the performance of the contract work shall direct the amount of such liquidated damages to be withheld for the use and benefit of the United States, said territory, or said District, and shall direct the amount of such unpaid wages to be withheld for the use and benefit of the laborers and mechanics who were not compensated as required under the provisions of this Act. The Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to pay directly to such laborers and mechanics, from the sums withheld on account of underpayments of wages, the respective amounts administratively determined to be due, if the funds withheld are adequate, and, if not, an equitable proportion of such amounts.

(b) If the accrued payments withheld under the terms of the contracts, as aforesaid, are insufficient to reimburse all the laborers and mechanics with respect to whom there has been a failure to pay the wages required pursuant to this Act, such laborers and mechanics shall, in the case of a department or agency of the Federal Government, have the rights of action and/or of intervention against the contractor and his sureties conferred by law upon persons furnishing labor or materials, and in such proceedings it shall be no defense that such laborers and mechanics accepted or agreed to accept less than the required rate of wages or voluntarily made refunds.

(c) Any contractor or subcontractor aggrieved by the withholding of a sum as liquidated damages as provided in this Act shall have the right, within sixty days thereafter, to appeal to the head of the agency of the United States or of the territory for which the contract work is done or by which financial assistance for the work is provided, or to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in the case of liquidated damages withheld for the use and benefit of said District. Such agency head or Commissioners, as the case may be, shall have authority to review the administrative determination of liquidated damages and to issue a final order affirming such determination; or, if it is found that the sum determined is incorrect or that the contractor or subcontrator violated the provisions of this Act inadvertently notwithstanding the exercise of due care on his part and that of his agents recommendations may be made to the Secretary that an appropriate adjustment in liquidated damages be made, or that the contractor or subcontractor be relieved of liability for such liquidated damages. The Secretary shall review all pertinent facts in the matter and may conduct such investigations as he deems necessary, so as to affirm or reject the recommendation. The decision of the Secretary shall be final. In all such cases in which a contractor or subcontractor may be aggrieved by a final order for the withholding of liquidated damages as hereinbefore provided, such contractor or subcontractor may, within sixty days after such final order, file a claim in the Court of Claims: *Provided however,* That final orders of the agency head, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or the Secretary, as the case may be, shall be conclusive with respect to findings of fact if such findings are supported by substantial evidence.

(d) Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3175; 64 Stat. 1267) shall be applicable with respect to the provisions of this Act, and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, 54 Stat. 1236, 63 Stat. 108; 40 U.S.C. 276c), shall be applicable with respect to those contractors and subcontractors referred to therein who are engaged in the performance of contracts subject to the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 105. The Secretary may provide such reasonable limitations and may make such rules and regulations allowing reasonable variations, tolerances, and exemptions to and from any or all provisions of this Act as he may find necessary and proper in the public interest to prevent injustice or undue hardship or to avoid serious impairment of the conduct of Government business.

SEC. 106. Any contractor or subcontractor whose duty it shall be to employ, direct, or control any laborer or mechanic employed in the performance of any work contemplated by any contract to which this Act applies, who shall intentionally violate any provision of this Act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and for each and every such offense shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not to exceed $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court having jurisdiction thereof.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS AND EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 201. The proviso of section 23 of the Act of March 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 509, 522), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided,* That the regular hours of labor are hereby established at not more than eight per day or forty per week, but work in excess of such hours shall be permitted when administratively determined to be in the public interest: *Provided further,* That overtime work in excess of eight hours per day or in excess of forty hours per week shall be compensated for at not less than time and one-half the basic rate of compensation, except that employees subject to this section who are regularly required to remain at or within the confines of their post of duty in excess of eight hours per day in a standby or on-call status shall be paid overtime rates only for hours of duty, exclusive of eating and sleeping time, in excess of forty per week."

SEC. 202. (a) Section 1499 of title 28, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

§ 1499. Liquidated damages withheld from contractors under Contract Work Hours Standards Act

"The Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to render judgment upon any claim for liquidated damages withheld from a contractor or subcontractor under section 104 of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act."

(b) The Court of Claims shall continue to have jurisdiction to render judgment upon any claim for a penalty withheld from a contractor or subcontractor under section 324 of title 40, United States Code, in connection with any contract subject to said section existing on the effective date of this Act, or thereafter entered into pursuant to invitations for bids that are outstanding at the time of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203 The following statutes are hereby repealed: Sections 1 and 2 of the Act of August 1, 1892 (27 Stat. 340; 40 U.S.C. 321, 322), as amended by the Act of March 3, 1913 (37 Stat. 726); sections 892 and 893 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1334; D.C. Code, 1961 edition, secs. 22–3407, 3408); the Act of June 18, 1912 (37 Stat. 137; 40 U.S.C. 324, 325), as amended by the Act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 989); that portion of the Naval Service Appropriation Act, 1918 (Act of March 4, 1917, 39 Stat. 1192), which is codified as section 326 of title 40 of the United States Code (1952 edition); and section 303 of the Second Supplemental Defense Appropriations Act, 1941 (54 Stat. 884; 40 U.S.C. 325a). The provisions of such statutes shall, notwithstanding, continue to apply with respect to contracts existing on the effective date of this Act or entered into pursuant to invitations for bids that are outstanding at the time of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 204. This Act shall take effect sixty days after its enactment, but shall not affect any contract then existing or any contract that may thereafter be entered into pursuant to invitations for bids that are outstanding at the time of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 73]

Addonizio
Alexander
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Andrews
Ashley
Bailey
Barry
Bass, N.H.
Battin
Bonner
Boykin
Brademas
Brewster
Brooks
Celler
Chelf
Coad
Cramer
Curtis, Mass.
Daniels
Dawson
Dominick
Dowdy
Dulski
Elliott
Ellsworth
Fascell
Fino
Fogarty
Fountain
Friedel
Gallagher
Glenn
Grant
Harrison, Va.
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Hoffman, Mich.
Horan
Huddleston
Jensen
Johnson, Md.
Jones, Ala.
Kearns
Kee
Kitchin
Kornegay
Lennon
McDonough
McSween
McVey
Macdonald
Miller, George P.
Moorehead, Ohio
Morse
Murray
O'Neill
Patman
Powell
Rains
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Saund
Scott
Scranton
Selden
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Ullman
Utt
Walter
Westland
Whitener
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.
Zelenko

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WORK HOURS ACT OF 1962

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I move to suspend the rules and to pass H.R. 10786 with the amendment at the desk. Mr. Speaker, Federal legislation establishing the principle that 8 hours should constitute the regular working day for laborers and mechanics on Government work was first passed in the 1860's—act of June 25, 1868, Revised Statute 3738. This principle was later embodied in the 8-hour laws and extended to work on Government contracts.

H.R. 10786 would provide a uniform Work Hours Act for establishing standards for hours of work and overtime pay for laborers and mechanics employed under U.S. Government contracts or under federally assisted programs.

This bill meets a great need in the field of labor standards legislation for a single general hours act to revise and replace the group of complicated and overlapping statutes dating as far back as 1892 which are known as the 8-hour laws. Former President Eisenhower, in his 1960 economic report to the Congress, recommended the enactment of "legislation to revise the ambiguous and outmoded provisions of the 8-hour laws applying to Federal and federally assisted construction projects." A similar recommendation was contained in his 1960 budget message.

The present bill is substantially similar to the draft bill sent to the late, revered Speaker, Say Rayburn, by the then Secretary of Labor, James Mitchell. The present administration has supported this bill both in testimony before the subcommittee by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, and by a report filed with the committee.

H.R. 10786 would improve the present 8-hour laws in three major respects: First, by replacing the uncoordinated and confusing series of laws enacted at different times with a single statute simplifying and clarifying the present provisions; second, by modernizing its hour standards through addition of a provision for a standard workweek of 40 hours with not less than time and one-half pay for work in excess of 40 per week; and third, by making the laws' standards applicable to those federally financed and assisted contracts with respect to which Federal legislation provides for the payment of prevailing or minimum wages.

I am at this point inserting in the RECORD a compilation prepared by the Department of Labor indicating the various Federal laws that contain wage standards and which provide various kinds of financing for construction. Only those statutes that provide grants or loans of Federal funds would be included in the bill under the amendment.

Federally assisted construction programs with wage standards

Program	No overtime	8-hour provision	40-hour provision	8- and 40-hour provision	Type of financing
Hospital survey and construction (2 U.S.C. 291(h)(5))	X				Grants ⅓ to ⅔ of cost.
Federal airport (49 U.S.C. 1114(b))	X				Grants to 50 percent of cost.
School (impacted areas) (20 U.S.C. 636b(1)(E))	X				Formula grants.
Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 (42 U.S.C. 1592i(b)).		X			Loans and grants.
Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2281(l))				X	50 percent grants.
Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 (sec. 21, Public Law 87-27; 75 Stat. 47)				X	Loans to 65 percent of cost of project grants necessary to complete project.
Delaware River Basin compact (art. 15.1(l), Public Law 87-328; 75 Stat. 688).				X	Commission authorized to negotiate for available financing.
Federal-aid highway (23 U.S.C. 113)	X				50- to 90-percent grants.
Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466e(f))	X				30-percent grants.
National Housing Act:					
1. Sec. 207, rental housing (12 U.S.C. 1713); wage standards (12 U.S.C. 1715c).	X				Mortgage guarantee up to 90 percent.
2. Sec. 608, veterans rental (12 U.S.C. 1743)	X				Do.
3. Nonprofit co-op housing (12 U.S.C. 1715e)	X				Do.
4. Moderate income rental housing (12 U.S.C. 1747)	X				Do.
5. Family housing, military bases (12 U.S.C. 1748a); labor standards (12 U.S.C. 1748b(k)).				X	Mortgage guarantee with construction on Government property. After completion of project armed services manage the project and guarantee FHA against loss.
6. Housing for military and civilian employees (12 U.S.C. 1748H-2).	X				Mortgage insurance to 90 percent.
7. Defense rental housing (12 U.S.C. 1750g)	X				Do.
8. Rehabilitation housing for 12 or more families (12 U.S.C. 1715k)	X				Do.
9. Experimental housing for 12 or more families (12 U.S.C. 1715x)	X				Mortgage insurance up to replacement cost by conventional methods.
10. Rental housing for moderate income families (12 U.S.C. 1715l(d)(3)(4)).	X				Mortgage insurance up to 90 percent.
11. Housing for elderly (12 U.S.C. 1715v)	X				Do.
12. Nursing homes (12 U.S.C. 1715w)	X				Do.
Housing Act of 1949, slum clearance and urban renewal (42 U.S.C. 1459)	X				Loans of 100 percent of cost; grants up to ⅔ of cost.
Housing Act of 1950, college housing (12 U.S.C. 1749a(f))			X		Loans of 100 percent of cost.
Housing Act of 1959, housing for elderly (12 U.S.C. 1701q(c)(3))	X				Loans of 98 percent of cost.
U.S. Housing Act of 1937, low-rent public housing (42 U.S.C. 1416c)	X				Loans of not more than 90 percent of cost.

Numerous inconsistent provisions were called to the attention of the subcommittee: First, present 8-hour laws permit the employment of workers on Government construction up to 56 hours a week—seven 8-hour days—without overtime compensation; second, under the existing laws no overtime protection, either daily or weekly, is provided for a substantial part of the vast federally assisted construction programs even though the Federal share of the cost of construction may amount to as much as 90 percent; third, under existing law no laborers or mechanics employed by the Federal Government may work more than 8 hours a day "except in cases of extraordinary emergencies"; and fourth, some laws provide criminal sanctions whereas others provide civil fines for violations of their provisions. It was indicated before the subcommittee that because of these and other inconsistencies and inequities in the present 8-hour laws, businessmen and others have a difficult time in determining what hours they may employ laborers and mechanics.

In concluding my opening remarks, I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this bill has been a bipartisan measure. I urge its adoption now.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. First, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee why the decision was made against seeking a rule and bringing the bill up in the regular order instead of under suspension of the rules?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Because of the fact there is such bipartisan support for the measure. Also, it was thought that with the difficulty of getting a rule, in view of the large legislative jam coming up, it would be easier and proper to do it under this method. The leadership agreed to this.

Mr. LANDRUM. I would like to ask the gentleman if the amendment being proposed here, or the bill being proposed, would extend the 8-hour law and the 40-hour week to highway construction in States where any part of the funds had in the construction of that highway or road consisted of special funds?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If Federal funds are actually employed, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. LANDRUM. If a public housing project is under construction, then the terms of this bill would apply?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The answer to that is "No."

Mr. LANDRUM. Why?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In that instance most of the funds are federally guaranteed or it has an insurance provision in it. We have by this amendment eliminated that from this proposed bill.

Mr. LANDRUM. The amendment which you propose to the bill eliminates from its provisions all coverage which comes about because the interest of the Government is only in the nature of a loan or guarantee of a loan or in the nature of insurance?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is generally correct. The bill does not apply where Government participation is only by way of guaranteeing or insuring a loan.

Mr. LANDRUM. If there is a direct grant for work under the Area Redevelopment Act, for example, do the terms of this bill apply?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If there is construction involved, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. LANDRUM. In other words, if a community any place in the United States receives from the Federal Government a direct grant, or a combination grant and loan under the Area Redevelopment Act, and uses that money in the expansion of its sewerage system or in the expansion of its water system or in the laying out of streets in any form, then this bill applies as to wages?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If there is a grant involved, counsel assures me that they would be subject to this act.

Mr. LANDRUM. What about the case of a loan under the Area Redevelopment Act?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the loan was only guaranteed, the act as amended would not apply.

Mr. LANDRUM. I mean if it makes the loan.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If it makes the loan, at that point, then the act would apply.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the author of the amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, during the deliberations of the Committee on Education and Labor, I was greatly concerned because the bill, as reported, would extend rigid Federal 8-hour coverage into areas of the housing program where the Federal Government has no connection whatsoever other than guaranteeing the loan. It seems to me that we would be going too far to impress not only Davis-Bacon prevailing rates, but 8-hour and 40-hour restrictions as well, upon construction projects as to which the Federal Government provides no funds, and does not, itself, even lend any money. In fact, I submit that if Congress should actually go that far, we would discourage construction in the very areas where our purpose is to encourage construction with private financing.

If the Federal Government, itself, provides funds, I think the situation is somewhat different. Dating back to the 1800's, there has been an 8-hour-a-day provision in effect where the Federal Government, itself, constructs a building. In other words, for a long time there has been the requirement in those situations that work over 8 hours in a day be paid for at time and a half rates. However, in those areas of Federal construction, the 40-hour-a-week provision has not applied; or at least it has not applied generally. Situations have come to light where some contractors work their employees 8 hours a day but 6 or 7 days a week without paying time and one-half. In view of the general wage-hour law that applies to other industries in our country setting a 40-hour week, I believe that a 40-hour-a-week limitation can be justified in the construction industry. However, where the Federal Government merely guarantees a loan, I do not think that both the 40-hour week and the 8-hour day should be imposed by law. I say that because bad weather can close down a job for 1 or 2 days in a week. If the employees want to work 9 or 10 hours a day at straight time on the remaining days to make up a 40-hour week, I do not think we should say, by law, that they cannot do it.

While I shall support this bill in view of the acceptance by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] of my amendment, I want to make it clear that I do not necessarily approve of the procedure under which this bill is being considered.

I would have preferred to have it come up under a regular rule permitting more time for debate and permitting other amendments to be offered. However, I shall state that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has remedied my principal objection to this bill by accepting my amendment, and I thank the gentleman for accepting it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I ask our chairman, Is it not true that under provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act both the 8-hour-per-day and the 40-hour-per-week provisions apply; that this is not being changed by this particular bill?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is correct. I drew the attention of the gentleman from Georgia to the statement that the 8-hour day and the 40-hour week are now applicable by act of the Congress under the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. GOODELL. I think it should be pointed out so that the membership understands what is being done by this act, however, and I ask it in the form of a question of the chairman to confirm it, that this does for the first time extend the 8-hour day and the 40-hour week to hospital construction, Federal airport construction, impacted areas construction, educational aid construction, community facilities type construction, with the exception that the 8 hours a day in that instance already applies, Highway Act construction, Water Pollution Control Act, National Housing Act construction, housing for military and civilian employees, defense rental housing, rehabilitation housing, 12 or more families, housing for the elderly. This is not a complete list, but I believe in each instance this is extending the 8-hour day and the 40-hour week to those constructions.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is correct, with one exception, that is, where there is only a guarantee, they would not be covered, particularly with reference to the housing for the elderly.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. It does apply where there is a loan involved?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is correct; where there is a loan involved.

Mr. GOODELL. If the gentleman will yield further, the distinction, apparently, is if there is Federal money involved, either as a loan or grant, then the standards apply—the 8-hour day and the 40-hour week?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. However, if there is a guarantee of insurance or some other private loan involved, it does not apply?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is correct. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. I would like the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], so I can propound this question:

In the case of housing being built under FHA specifications where only the guarantee of the loan or insurance is involved, the terms of this bill with the amendment will not apply; is that correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct.

Mr. LANDRUM. If the gentleman will yield further, in the case of veterans housing where the money is a direct loan, it will apply; is that correct? Where the money furnished for the construction comes from the Government in the nature of a direct loan?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If under the circumstances which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] has outlined, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. LANDRUM. If the gentleman will yield further, what we would have here is the terms of this bill applying to wages being paid in the construction of homes for veterans, but not applying in the construction of homes where the only interest of the Government was in the nature of an insured or a guaranteed loan?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so I can clarify that point?

Mr. HIESTAND. Yes, I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from California for that purpose.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want to point out that this has nothing to do with wages.

Mr. LANDRUM. If the gentleman will yield further, I have reference to hours. Hours have something to do with wages.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. There are two types of veterans' loans. One is the direct loan which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] spoke of, and the other is the GI guaranteed loan. I might say that unless the administration releases the $300 million it is sitting on, we do not have to worry about it because there are not any direct loans being made.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to us under a suspension of the rules. I object most emphatically to its coming to us under suspension of the rules, limiting debate to 20 minutes for and 20 minutes against it.

Mr. Speaker, we did not get out any minority report because this bill was put through under the cloak of another bill, the fringe benefit bill. The hearings were held concurrently, or together, and were almost identical. Most of the objection to the fringe benefit bill was also applied to this bill, and the only minority report we got out was to the fringe benefit bill. We had no warning that this bill was going to be brought up, and especially was going to be brought up first. In fact, there were practically no hearings on this bill as such, and there are no printed hearings.

Mr. Speaker, there is much objection to this bill on the part of the Associated General Contractors, the Associated Builders and many chambers of commerce, and so forth. There was opposition within the subcommittee and within the full committee. Lack of opposition is usually a requirement for the consideration of a bill under suspension of the rules. I believe the bill should have gone to the Rules Committee for proper consideration and should come up under proper rule, because it involves not only the extension of these two laws—the 8-hour-law and the 40-hour-week measure—but it also provides a large extension in scope.

Mr. Speaker, we are now told that an amendment has been presented at the last minute, which we have not had an opportunity to study, and has been accepted by the majority side to take out some of the objectionable features, namely, the vast extension of scope of coverage.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the gentleman and to the House that at the time the bill was before the full committee the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] said that he was going to offer this amendment. He said this was all he was interested in and that is why the amendment was offered in this manner. May I say further, as the report will show, that there was no minority report of any kind against the bill.

Mr. HIESTAND. No; there was not, but I stated why.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to state that I regret very much there are no printed hearings available on this bill. Even though I am in favor of the bill it does seem to me advisable, before we bring in a bill of this character which does have some controversial characteristics, that we have hearings available.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HIESTAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AYRES. The ratio of staff members on the Committee on Labor is about 35 to 1. If we had on the minority as many as four or five members of the staff, we would be able to get these reports out.

Mr. HIESTAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress the point which seemingly has been little understood: that there is a wide and a national demand for a complete overhaul of the Davis-Bacon Act. Many Members have had correspondence on this subject and requests that this act be overhauled. There are a lot of other bills that have been introduced to correct weaknesses in it to clarify conflicts and bring it up to date.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that this act was originally passed to protect local communities from being undercut on labor projects. I have a bill, H.R. 225, which would consolidate the Davis-Bacon, the Walsh-Healey, the 8-hour law, and the Federal Labor Standards Act, which would clarify many of these overlappings and much of the confusion.

There has been much testimony against this bill. Increased costs are inevitable and the "fringe" bill will come up next. The increased scope in this bill will then apply under that bill. Later there will be requests for double time on Saturday and Sunday.

I have had a complaint from a district in which there is a project for elderly housing where they want the costs kept down so that the old folks can rent at a low figure. FHA rules would apply, and if this bill were passed costs would go up as high as $85 per month for most of the elderly involved in that project. The vast extension of coverage is most distressing.

Generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to regard this as an inflationary bill. It would increase the costs of these projects, making some of them difficult to finance. There would be just no way of avoiding it.

Increasing costs without increasing productivity means inflation.

Also the authority of the Secretary of Labor would be increased, which is another important point.

I oppose the bill and I oppose it as it has been amended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I favor this bill and think it should be passed. But I think we in Congress should look to our own employees. For example, what are we doing in the Folding Room? We pay people there at an hourly rate. They do not get overtime; they do not get time-and-a-half after 8 hours; they do not get double time for Saturday afternoon; they do not get triple time for Sunday. Also, some of those rate employees have been there for 14 to 18 years. They get no vacation pay whatever. Did you gentlemen know that? If they work in the evening they get paid at the regular rate. They get no sick leave, either. If they do not work they do not get paid. Likewise, they have no social security. These are employees that are working for Congress, the House, with no overtime, double time, triple time, and no sick leave or vacation pay, no social security and no retirement. What do you think of that?

Mr. AYRES. How did they get the jobs?

Mr. FULTON. These are not the patronage employees, I might say.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to section 103 on page 4 of the bill, line 14, part (3), which provides that the provisions of this act shall apply "to a contract for work financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from, or loans insured or guaranteed by the United States."

I am well aware that this amendment, which has been accepted by the gentleman from California, will exclude the section that relates to guarantee of loans through FHA and VA housing, but as pointed out on the floor, I would like to call your attention to the fact that direct loans by the VA will still come under this act.

I also want to make the point that many of our homes built in the rural areas of the United States under direct loans from the Veterans' Administration would be vitally affected by this section of the bill.

I would venture a guess that it would raise the cost of construction in these areas by from $200 to $300 a home. In these rural areas we do not have unionized labor. The men who build these homes many times are a force of one or two carpenters that contract to build these homes on an hourly basis. They work as long as they see fit. They work when the weather is good. They try to get the house built as economically and as quickly as possible. This provision would increase the cost of homes in such areas.

The second point I want to make is that this act would apply to the construction of all highways in the United States, that is, not only Federal and State highways but also county roads which are built with assistance in funds from the Federal Government. Again you are hitting the rural areas of the United States where we do not have unionized employees, where these men go out and work on these county roads when the weather is good, whether they are working 40 or 50 hours a week or whatever it may be. Again, you are going to increase the cost of road construction in the various counties.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am afraid the gentleman does not appreciate the fact that this law applies only to those areas where the Federal Government sets minimum wages under a statute that provides for a grant or loan of Federal funds. It does not do that under the veterans' law of which the gentleman spoke. Therefore, this would not affect the rural situation in any way.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Where a direct loan is made by the Veterans Administration, according to the way I read this language, I believe it would apply.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, the gentleman is wrong. This affects only those situations which are covered by minimum wage standards set by the Federal Government under a statute providing loans or grants of Federal funds.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I think many of these rural homes now are being constructed under direct loans from the Farmers Home Administration. I should like to ask whether those homes so constructed would be constructed under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. According to the way I read this bill, they would come under this provision.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The Building and Construction Workers Guide, put out by the U.S. Department of Labor, James P. Mitchell, Secretary, on page 16 specifically states:

> Construction does not cover any individual house built for sale regardless of the number of houses in any one development, when each house is subject to its own mortgage.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. The gentleman from California has just quoted from a directive from a former Secretary of Labor.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If the gentleman will yield to me to answer the gentleman's question—it is not a directive. It is simply an explanation of the law.

Mr. LANDRUM. Is there anything to prevent a new explanation of the law coming out? We have a few of those coming out.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, there is. If the statute which grants or loans Federal funds does not contain wage standards, then this bill would not apply.

Mr. LANDRUM. The hour provision will apply.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have one more point I would like to make. The Labor Committee has been promised by the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California, that our committee will have extensive hearings in regard to Davis-Bacon in all facets of this act. This act was passed in 1931 and, as you know, allows the Secretary of Labor to determine wages on all projects in which Federal funds are involved. This investigation would cover a complete facet of the construction industry. In view of that fact and in view of the fact that this bill goes into this field, I think this is piecemeal legislation and should be deferred at this time until the committee has had an opportunity completely to go into the operation of the Davis-Bacon Act and how it has affected our economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Work Hours Act of 1962 is intended to gather up all the loose ends of labor standards laws covering Federal and federally assisted construction projects that have been passed over the years, into a coherent and consistent law.

Specifically, it will clarify standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any territory, or for the District of Columbia.

The 8-hour-day laws go back to 1892, and have not been revised or unified since 1940. We must bear in mind two important changes that have occurred in the American economy within our time. The first is the improvement in labor standards, and the second is the increasing participation by the Federal Government in construction programs where the Federal share of assistance goes as high as 90 percent. The confusion resulting from complicated and overlapping statutes opens the door to the lowering of these standards on work done with financial assistance of the Federal Government.

We are advised by the Committee on Education and Labor after extensive study of the problem, as follows:

> H.R. 10786 would improve the present 8-hour laws in three major respects: (1) By replacing the uncoordinated and confusing series of laws enacted at different times with a single statute simplifying and clarifying the present provisions; (2) by modernizing its hour standards through addition of a provision for a standard workweek of 40 hours with not less than time-and-one-half pay for work in excess of 40 per week; and (3) by making the laws' standards applicable to those federally financed and assisted contracts with respect to which Federal legislation provides for the payment of prevailing or minimum wages.

The laws on this subject are often contradictory. The courts and the Comptroller General are in disagreement as to whether one statute gives employees who work overtime the right to collect, by administrative or judicial action, the time-and-one-half compensation if the employer fails to pay it. This bill would make clear the liability of the contractor to reimburse laborers and mechanics to whom he has failed to pay time and one-half for overtime as required by the bill.

Responsible contractors who perform Government contract work covered by the 8-hour laws have adopted the 40-hour standard. However, there are other contractors performing Federal work who require laborers and mechanics to work up to 56 hours a week—seven 8-hour days—without paying them overtime compensation. The bill would modernize the hour standards of the 8-hour laws by adding a requirement for the payment of time and one-half for work in excess of a 40-hour week.

Another needed improvement in the 8-hour laws is an extension of their scope to include work financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government under statutes which require the payment of prevailing or minimum wages. This bill, therefore, provides that its hour standards shall apply to all contracts for work financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from, or loans insured or guaranteed by, the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof under any statute of the United States providing wage standards for such work.

The Wage Hours Act of 1962 will bring order out of confusion and will help everyone concerned to comply with the standards set forth.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk here, it seems to me, about some exceptions to this bill that we are trying to pass. We are not dealing with or amending the Davis-Bacon Act at all. We are dealing with wage-hour legislation. The amendments just offered by the gentleman from California clearly state that all of the provisions of former acts in projects that are financed by loans or guarantees by the Government will not be covered by this act. In this particular type of project you have the individual house for sale carrying an individual mortgage. You have the apartment-type project built to house families forced to move from slum clearance areas. You have the agencies affected under this particular amendment, which will not be required to comply with the 40-hour coverage, or the Federal Housing Administration, Community Facilities Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and military branches responsible for housing under section 1748. In other words, this does not increase the cost for so-called public housing and so-called veterans' housing and so-called apartment buildings for slum clearance unless it is a direct grant, and under those provisions we naturally expect to cover.

In addition to a need for revising the language of the 8-hour laws to eliminate complicated and overlapping provisions, the present overtime provisions need amendment. Congress has established a straight-time workweek of 40 hours for Federal employment, for work connected with interstate commerce under the wage and hour law, and for work on Federal supply contracts under the Walsh-Healey Act. Many responsible contractors who perform Government contract work covered by the 8-hour laws have adopted this 40-hour standard. However, there are other contractors performing Federal work who require laborers and mechanics to work up to 56 hours a week—seven 8-hour days—without paying them overtime compensation. The bill would modernize the hour standards of the 8-hour laws by adding a requirement for the payment of time and one-half for work in excess of a 40-hour week.

This would make the 8-hour laws consistent with the Walsh-Healey Act and the wage and hour laws.

The present bill would make another needed improvement by making applicable the work and overtime standards to laborers and mechanics working under federally financed construction programs wherein Congress has provided the labor standards in their enactment. Therefore, I believe that the bill merits your support.

The question may arise regarding the bill as to what particular areas would be covered under the wording of the bill on page 4, line 14:

> Which is a contract for work financed in whole or in part by loans or grants from, or loans insured or guaranteed by, the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof under any statute of the United States providing wage standards for such work.

The bill would be applicable to the following Federal laws:

First. Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and Highway Act of 1958.

Second. National Housing Act, as amended.

Under this act housing covered would be civilian housing projects, military housing projects, housing for the elderly, nursing homes, cooperative groups of individual houses of eight or more when under a single mortgage, and college housing. Excluded would be individual houses built for sale regardless of the number of houses in any one development when each house is subject to its own mortgage. Also excluded would be any apartment-type project built to house families forced to move from a slum clearance area.

Third. Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

Fourth. Federal Airport Act.

Fifth. School Survey and Construction Act of 1950.

Sixth. Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951.

Seventh. Area Redevelopment Act of 1961.

Eighth. Water Pollution Control Act of 1961.

Ninth. Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950.

Tenth. Housing Act of 1949.

This would include low-rent public housing, slums clearance, and urban renewal.

All the preceding laws were passed at different times by the Congress and each of them provide minimum or prevailing wage standards. Some of the acts; namely, college housing, area redevelopment, Federal civil defense, and military housing, provide some hours standards; that is, an 8-hour day or 40-hour week. But most do not have any such hours standards and hence the present bill would apply the 8-hour and 40-hour laws provisions to them along with making both applicable to those laws where there is only an 8-hour or 40-hour standard.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] asked the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] why this legislation was being brought up under the harsh procedure of suspension of the rules, the reply of the gentleman from California was that it was necessary because of a legislative logjam. Now, if there is a legislative logjam this is the first I have heard of it, and I do not believe the leadership of the House will corroborate the statement that there is a legislative logjam. If there is, we have no business taking an Easter recess.

Where is this logjam that the gentleman from California talks about that makes it necessary to bring this legislation up under suspension of the rules with no opportunity to amend the bill, with only 40 minutes of debate, and no printed hearings?

I protest this kind of legislative procedure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the various 8-hour laws enacted at different times go back as far as 1892 and have not been revised or unified since 1940. Testimony indicated that because of the various conflicting, overlapping, inconsistent, and ambiguous provisions in the present 8-hour laws, businessmen, the Government, and unions have a most difficult time in following these laws.

As my distinguished colleague mentioned, this bill is substantially similar to the draft bill sent to the House by the previous administration. Like some of the other speakers, I think we should also review the operation of the Davis-Bacon Act but this bill has nothing to do with the Davis-Bacon Act which concerns prevailing wage rates in local communities. This bill applies to hours of work performed and helps reduce the conflicts, ambiguity, overlapping and inconsistent interpretations possible under existing laws.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have only one more request for time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Under suspension of the rules it is not necessary to rotate time. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The proponents of the measure are entitled to close the debate.

Mr. GROSS. A further parliamentary inquiry: All rules are suspended under a suspension of the rules. Is that not correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is a matter under the control of the House caucus.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] is recognized.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I want at this time to propound a question to my friend from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. It is the understanding on this side of the aisle that there is an amendment to be proposed. It is my further understanding that the amendment is acceptable to the gentleman from California and the Members on the Democratic side. My inquiry is whether an amendment can be offered to a bill under suspension of the rules. Will the gentleman express himself on that?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be happy to. During the committee deliberations I agreed to accept an amendment that was to be prepared by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN]. He prepared it, and it was agreed to by the leadership. The bill was called up under suspension of the rules and at that time the amendment was read and included in the bill.

Mr. AVERY. It was the gentleman's motion to suspend the rules and further to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. Is that correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It was offered as a committee amendment. I have told the House that while it was a committee amendment it was proposed by the gentleman from Michigan. I wanted to give the gentleman all the credit to which he was entitled.

Mr. AVERY. I only wanted to make it abundantly clear that the amendment was in order.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from California yield for a question?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Is it my understanding that the provisions of this act will not apply unless the act specifies that the wage and hours law applies?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Further, then, under the amendment proposed we are correct in assuming that it will not apply to any construction where the only Government participation is in the way of a loan guarantee or insurance?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. If I understood the gentleman correctly, it does not apply under those provisions that he mentions.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then, specifically, this act does not apply to multiple housing, standard projects, or private housing?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In the case of private housing the gentleman is correct because that is a guarantee status.

Mr. WAGGONNER. But it does apply to area redevelopment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The answer is, "Yes," it does apply to area development.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Do we have the gentleman's word that he will stand by this amendment in conference?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman has my word that I will stand by it in conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Might the Chair inquire of the gentleman from California how many more speakers he has?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman from California has no more speakers, but wishes to yield briefly to several Members to submit consent requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the gentleman from California a question with respect to the amendment which is being considered in the form of additional language to the language on page 4. I wonder why any additional language is needed—in the form of this proviso, instead of striking language in lines 15 and 16 which says "for loans insured or guaranteed by"—why we are restricting the effect of the language and not simply striking all reference to guarantees and loans?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am sure there are several ways it could be done. But this language was prepared by the gentleman from Michigan, in order to make sure we had that language rather than striking anything. This was deemed the proper way to do it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. This language simply negates the language "insured or guaranteed by"? Or does it have some different significance?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is all it does.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this short time to rise in favor of this legislation as it will be amended, as proposed by the gentleman from California. The bill brings together all of the various disjointed Federal laws that apply to 8-hour and 40-hour standards. We have today most of these provisions written individually and in separate acts that have different impacts and have to be interpreted in each case somewhat differently. I think it is worth while to put them all in one coordinated act. I would emphasize, however, that this bill will extend the 8-hour Federal standard and the 40-hour week Federal standard to a number of Federal programs to which it does not apply today. These include hospital construction, airport construction, impacted areas school aid construction, Highway and Water Pollution Control Act construction, urban renewal and slum clearance, college housing, housing for the elderly, low rent public housing and others. I favor this extension and am happy to support it, particularly in view of the acceptance by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] of the amendment which makes it clear that Federal work standards should not be applied merely because the Federal Government is guaranteeing or insuring a private loan.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks that have been made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

I believe this is a step in the right direction and, with the majority accepting the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, I will support the bill.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. I want to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], or the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], either of whom may answer, if to loans made by the Small Business Administration the provisions of this act would apply in the construction of any facilities built with funds from those loans?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The answer to that is "No."

Mr. LANDRUM. Why?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Because the Small Business Administration law does not encompass wages or hours under loans made under the Small Business Act.

Mr. LANDRUM. This does not apply?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Not, to my knowledge, under the Small Business Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California a question. In the 1956 Highway Act, when the Congress passed the interstate program 90–10 provision, 90 Federal and 10 State, the Davis-Bacon provision was included in that act, and has never been extended to what is known as the A–B–C program, which is financed on a 50–50 basis. That is known as the secondary farm to market program. Does this legislation before us today extend the Davis-Bacon Act to the A–B–C program?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The answer is, No, it does not extend it to the program which the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. FALLON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

The present bill would rectify a situation which exists today in the construction industry. That is, it would provide a 40-hour week for laborers and mechanics working on Federal construction. Presently unfair contractors and subcontractors have taken advantage of this situation and have worked their laborers and mechanics up to 56 hours a week without any overtime pay. The device to avoid overtime consists of scheduling a 7-day week of 8 hours per day.

The present 8-hour laws require only payment of overtime for any work beyond 8 hours in a given day. The present bill would require the payment of any overtime for work in excess of 40 hours per week on any contract into which the Federal Government actually puts up the money. The bill before us as amended would continue to exclude those construction projects on which the Federal Government has merely guaranteed—or underwritten payment in case of default—but has not put up any funds in the first instance. It would also continue to exclude hour standards on veterans housing and other federally insured projects on which the Government does not now set minimum wage standards. This 40-hour-week language is provided for in the existing Walsh-Healey Act which covers Government procurement of supplies and in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Therefore, I urge your support to pass this bill and relieve the intolerable situation which I made reference to previously.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes, briefly.

Mr. LANDRUM. The gentleman, in reply to a question a few minutes ago, said that on construction being built with funds derived from a Small Business Administration loan, the terms of this act would not apply. Can the gentleman cite me the section of the Small Business Act which makes that exemption?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman will have to state that if the gentleman from Georgia will look at the Small Business Act, he will find that there is no extension in that act by the Congress of authority to the Secretary of Labor to set any wage standards of any kind, hours or otherwise. This bill only extends to those areas where the Congress has already set that authority

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Briefly.

Mr. GOODELL. I take it you are referring in this bill to page 4, lines 17 and 18, where one of the requirements for this act to apply to a given contract is that under any statute of the United States providing wage standards for such work this shall apply, and your answer is that the Small Business Administration Act does not provide wage standards for that work.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I think that we have pretty well cleared up whatever misunderstanding might have arisen. I think we have taken care of the principle which the gentleman from Michigan raised. That was that where there is no Federal money actually being spent or being loaned under the laws already set down by the Congress, the bill would not extend its provisions to this area.

Therefore, it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that without question, because of the bipartisan measure which we have before us, that this bill be passed. It is forward-looking legislation, necessary legislation, and I consequently urge its adoption.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, there is a great need in labor standards legislation for a single general Hours Act to revise and replace the group of complicated and overlapping statutes. Those colleagues on the right side of the aisle should be interested in knowing that President Eisenhower in his 1960 Economic Report to Congress recommended the enactment of legislation to revise ambiguous and outmoded provisions of the 8-hour laws applying to Federal and federally assisted construction projects. This bill, H.R. 10786, as it is now amended is certainly a bipartisan measure which will eliminate discrimination against the worker. I think we have all come to realize that a 40-hour week is standard procedure and certainly during these times of great unemployment to work an individual under the terms of the 8-hour laws as they now apply is unconstitutional when so many others are overworked. As has been pointed out, contractors under existing laws require laborers and mechanics to work up to 56 hours a week by working them 8 hours a day, 7 days a week. Yet they do not pay them any overtime for work in excess of the 40 hours. Congress has recognized a 40-hour workweek for Federal employees, for work connected with interstate commerce, and for work contracts under the Walsh-Healey Act. It is only fair that this existing inequity in the present law be abolished. Many responsible contractors who perform contract work covered by the 8-hour laws have adopted this universally recognized 40-hour standard. However, there are unscrupulous contractors performing Federal work who require laborers and mechanics to work up to 56 hours a week. So this corrective legislation as urged by former President Eisenhower should be adopted. I hope my colleagues on the right side of the aisle will give this bill their bipartisan support.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10786.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HIESTAND) there were—ayes 163, noes 46.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the bill just passed prior to its passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 597 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11131) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 597 provides for the consideration of H.R. 11131, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 11131 is to provide construction and other related authority for the military departments, within and outside the United States, and authority for construction of facilities for the Reserve components.

The bill would provide the military departments and the Department of Defense with new construction authority in the amount of $1,518,287,000 and deficiency authorization in the amount of $5,910,000, a total of $1,524,197,000 in construction authority.

The deficiency authorization request in this bill is very modest. Total amount requested is approximately $6 million. Practically the entire amount of this total is the result of unanticipated rehabilitation costs experienced by the Navy in remodeling Bancroft Hall at the Naval Academy.

Despite the large amount of new construction authorization requested for fiscal year 1963, there are no new major installations in the bill with the exception of one item of a classified nature, and the Armed Services Committee found it to be justified.

Land acquisitions in the bill involve relatively little acreage when compared with previous years. The total land acquisition authority requested amounts to less than 700 acres and includes land for certain classified requirements. This contrasts very favorably with the fact that the Committee on Armed Services was advised that departments have reduced their inventory of landholdings by almost 2 million acres during the past year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 597.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 11131, comes to us from the Committee on Armed Services, a committee in which we have the utmost confidence and a committee that always prepares its legislation thoroughly and completely. It is a big bill; that is to say, it is a big bill in point of dollars and cents. How can we quarrel with it? How can we go into all the details? As a matter of fact, it is rather impossible. We cannot set ourselves up as knowing all these details. Many of them are top secret, and they should be. For that reason I think the House of Representatives will as usual repose the utmost confidence and trust in this great committee and in its chairman, who has given up most of his life to the furthering of the defenses of our country.

There is only one point I would like to bring up. I brought it up once before in the Committee on Rules and I think it is still worthy of consideration, although I was told at that time that the matter had been carefully gone into and that there was no reason for alarm. I am disturbed by the amount of money that is being set aside to be spent in Okinawa. I understand that there is every reason to believe that Okinawa is gradually being evacuated. I also understand that Okinawa is gradually being given back to Japan; that is, a little more power is being given to Japan all the time. I think this should be very carefully considered. It has come out recently in the public press; and while it is a small amount when we compare it to the total of the bill, I still think that we should be a little more careful about spending money if it is not necessary.

There are a great many reasons why it seems to me that Okinawa probably should not be held completely very much longer. It is not being held. I see my friend, the lady from Illinois, Mrs. CHURCH, shaking her head in agony. But I would like to point out to her that what I am saying is merely a statement of fact. We already have given away a great deal there. Now it is a question whether we want to strengthen our position, which I am sure would be highly desirable. We have either got to fish or cut bait.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from New York yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, since the gentlewoman has described my agony in no uncertain terms, I would say that it arises from my shock at hearing her say that she felt that we should in any sense retire from or weaken our position in Okinawa. I realize that there are some trusting souls or hopeful souls within the administration who have given some evidence of feeling that we can accommodate ourselves to what appear to be substantial changes in our policy toward Okinawa.

However, I have never heard the situation stated so baldly as by the gentlewoman just now. I would like to go on record as saying that, even though it does appear that we may seem to be willing to undermine our defenses in the Pacific and elsewhere in the world, perhaps beyond hope of repair, we should permit no further weakening as regards any determination to hold Okinawa as the bastion of our own defense in the Pacific. And if I am emphatic, my emphasis is not directed at the gentlewoman from New York, I would say. It arises from my conviction that we should not weaken our position one iota, anyplace in this world.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentlewoman that I am strongly inclined to agree with her. I am also delighted that my baldness has elicited this statement from her because I think it is something that needs to be said. I do think that we have not faced up to the situation across the Pacific. I think we ought to go into it very closely. I think it is no good simply saying, "Oh, no, everything is all right," and brushing it under the rug. Everything is not all right and the rug is not quite big enough to hold all the things that we want to brush under it.

So, for that reason, I would like to call the attention of the House to this matter. Maybe I am overworried, maybe I appear as a timid soul; but I can assure my colleague that I am not a timid soul nor afraid. But I think we have to face up to the facts. I think we ought to try to find them out. I do not feel we have found them out quite yet.

Mr. Speaker, apart from this one little item—and it is a small item—I think this bill is eminently well prepared. I am sure everything in it is necessary and I am sure that the committee has looked into every possibility of restraining themselves and not being too extravagant.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the question raised by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] I think it is highly important that the House be informed about correspondence that has taken place between the Committee on Armed Services and the Department of Defense with reference to Okinawa.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be directed to read a letter that I addressed to the Secretary on April 3 and the Secretary's letter in reply of April 11, shedding light on the Okinawa situation, with reference to the jurisdiction of the High Commission and the military necessity of keeping Okinawa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

APRIL 3, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During current consideration of the Department's annual military construction requests, various members of the committee raised questions concerning the implications of a recently issued Executive order reducing the authority of the U.S. High Commissioner over Okinawa.

Briefly stated, the committee is aware that many political and economic considerations have prompted the issuance of this Executive order. However, the committee is not aware of the extent to which military and defense considerations may have entered into the final decision to reduce our control over Okinawa.

Therefore, with a view toward satisfying the committee's interest in this most important matter, I would appreciate a precise but comprehensive reply to the following questions:

1. What military purpose has been served by our forces in Okinawa over the past 3 years, and what resources have we allocated to support this purpose?

2. Has there been any change in the importance of Okinawa from a military strategic standpoint?

3. What recommendations, if any, were made by military officials in connection with this policy decision?

4. Did the commander in chief, Pacific Forces, concur in the action taken?

5. Did the Joint Chiefs of Staff approve this action?

Inasmuch as your reply will have a bearing on final committee action on current authorizations being requested by the departments for Okinawa, I would appreciate an early response to this inquiry.

Sincerely,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1962.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of April 3, to Secretary McNamara, concerning the recently issued Executive Order 11010, which amends certain provisions of Executive Order 10713, providing for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands.

At the outset, I wish to assure you that the basic military and strategic implications, which made it necessary to retain these islands under our administration when the United States concluded the treaty of peace with Japan, were fully considered in developing this amendment. The provisions of the new Executive order do not reduce any essential element of U.S. control over this area, but merely carry out our established objectives in administering these islands.

Below are answers to your specific questions:

1. As to the military purpose which has been served by our forces in Okinawa over the past 3 years, I quote what the President said on this point, in the statement made by him on March 19, upon signing the new Executive order:

"The armed strength deployed at these bases is of the greatest importance in maintaining our deterrent power in the face of threats to the peace in the Far East. Our bases in the Ryukyu Islands help us assure our allies in the great arc from Japan through southeast Asia not only of our willingness but also of our ability to come to their assistance in case of need."

As to what resources we have allocated to support this purpose, the United States has put approximately $1 billion in military construction and equipment into the Ryukyu Islands. The expenditures of all U.S. forces for operation and maintenance of these facilities has averaged about $180 million annually during the past 3 years. Additionally, the United States, since 1945, has appropriated close to $200 million for relief and economic development of the Ryukyus, which also serves to support our position in the islands.

2. There has been no reduction in the importance of Okinawa, from a military-strategic standpoint, as is indicated by the statement of the President which I have quoted above.

3. Military officials were consulted and gave recommendations regarding the policies implemented by the Executive order, and their recommendations were taken fully into account in Department of Defense actions on this subject. In general, military officials were in agreement on those points in the Executive order amendment which they addressed, with the following qualifications:

The Joint Chiefs of Staff saw no advantage to the appointment of a civilian as the Civil Administrator but recognized the reasons therefor and emphasized the qualifications which such an appointee should meet and that he should be responsive to the authority of the High Commissioner.

The High Commissioner, while likewise stating that he saw no advantage to changing to a civilian Civil Administrator, stated that a suitable civilian appointee responsive to the High Commissioner's authority would be acceptable.

The High Commissioner was also consulted regarding all details of the Executive order amendment itself. In general, aside from the matter of the Civil Administrator, discussed above, the amendment is in consonance with the High Commissioner's views.

4. As you know, although our military forces on Okinawa are under the command of Admiral Felt, commander in chief of the Pacific theater, the civil administration of these islands is directly supervised by the Department of Defense, with the Department of the Army acting as executive agency. However, as in all significant matters affecting the civil administration, CINCPAC was informed of recommendations incorporated in the amendment, and was thus given an opportunity of expressing his views, should he have felt that his military responsibilities or requirements were being affected.

5. As indicated in (3) above, the Joint Chiefs were consulted as to their views on the report and recommendations of the task force on the Ryukyus, and, with the qualification previously noted, they gave their concurrence to those recommendations which were subsequently incorporated in the recent Executive order.

I trust that the foregoing information will clarify the situation and will serve to allay concern as to whether the recent changes in our policy for Okinawa derogate from the U.S. strategic position in this area. In my opinion, this decision of the President should serve to enhance our military position in the Ryukyu Islands.

Sincerely,

ROSWELL GILPATRIC.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I know it seems presumptuous for any Member of the House to take any time on the rule when the bill will be so ably handled, as this one will be, by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON. I would like to point out just two provisions to the Members of the House, if I could, and I think they will be of interest to most Members who have military installations within their district.

No. 1 is that under this authorization bill, the method of financing housing on military bases known as the Capehart housing authority is terminated—it is ended. From this time on, all military housing built on military bases will be built by direct appropriations and not by the procedure that we have known in the past and more recently as Capehart. Before the Capehart authority, we constructed a considerable amount of housing known as Wherry housing authority.

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, neither authority will be employed in the future and it is anticipated it will be done under the direct appropriation method.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct. We have abandoned the method of building under what is known as the Wherry and Capehart housing and put it on the basis of direct appropriations.

Mr. AVERY. I think that is one of the significant policy changes that is contained in this authorization bill. I would further point out, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government, not only the Department of Defense, but all agencies of the Federal Government, are being criticized continually in the press and in the other news media for acquiring an increasing amount of property and thereby removing it from the tax roll. In other words, the Federal Government is becoming too much of a landlord and is removing too much property from private ownership. I would like to point out to the House this afternoon that the Committee on Armed Services has made a commendable record here whereby only 700 acres are authorized to be procured, and I further point out that as much as 2 million acres have been reduced from the land holdings. The report is not very clear. It says, "from the departments"; I assume that means from the Department of Defense.

Mr. VINSON. As to the Department of Defense, some 2 million acres in the last year have been disposed of or are in the process of being disposed of, and in this bill we are only acquiring 700 acres.

Mr. AVERY. That is probably one of the most remarkable records achieved by the Department of Defense since 1940 and the committee is to be commended for that.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, not all the bouquets should be given to the Department of Defense. It was the close scrutiny of these matters by the Committee on Armed Services that enables us to achieve these results.

Mr. AVERY. I am sure that it was at the admonition of the committee and more particularly of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia that the Department of Defense was able to review their landholdings and reduce it by 2 million acres. Certainly, I enthusiastically support the gentleman in that regard.

The only other thing I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, is for the distinguished chairman and other members using time under general debate on the bill, to explain further the authorization for the Defense Supply Center. There seems to be a lot of interest in this authorization at the local level. Frankly, I do not understand it. I would not want to impose on the chairman's time, but I would hope that he would go into that authorization more in detail during general debate.

If I have any time remaining, Mr. Speaker, I yield it back.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the

State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11131) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11131, with Mr. MAHON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to provide construction for the support of the military departments within the United States, and certain bases outside the United States.

The bill would provide the military departments and the Department of Defense with new construction authority in the amount of $1,524,197,000.

The Department requested $1,596,697,000. The committee reduced it by $72,500,000, so the total amount in this bill, as I have just said, is $1,524,197,000.

When the bill was first submitted by the individual services to the Department of Defense, it called for a construction program in the neighborhood of $2 billion. After screening by the Department and the Bureau of the Budget, it was reduced $800 million. Later on, as a result of a month's hearings by the Armed Services Committee, we reduced it, as I have said, by $72,500,000.

INSTALLATIONS AND ITEMS IN BILL

There are 322 named installations in the bill; 144 installations not specifically designated—making a grand total of 466 installations covered by the bill. The bill contains approximately 1,035 individual line items.

With reference to land acquisition, the bill only calls for the purchase of approximately 700 acres of land.

The bill is more than that of last year by some $700 million. This is brought about mainly by an increased cost in the Atlas-Titan ICBM installations. Some $225 million more than was anticipated—and by $312 million for the construction of some 16,500 units of family housing.

The committee was very much disturbed by this $225 million additional authorization request for Atlas and Titan ICBM installations. As a consequence, the committee spent considerable time on this matter and, finally, concluded that the additional authorization was justified.

Ballistic missile site construction has posed problems of great difficulty. Some of the difficulties stem directly from the lack of previous experience by all concerned with construction of this type. The sheer magnitude of the effort certainly has added to the difficulties. Finally, the urgency, and I wish to emphasize this most strongly, to attain an ICBM operational capability has made it necessary to do facility design before the missile itself and its associated general equipment had emerged from complete development and testing.

For example, because of the immediate national requirement to expedite attainment of a strategic missile capability, all of the silos for Titan II were being constructed before that missile had even been test flown. These circumstances have made the design and construction jobs more difficult and, thus, have contributed substantially to costs.

The current total cost estimate for the Atlas and Titan construction program is $1,273 million. This will provide 13 Atlas and 12 Titan squadrons. To date, $1,048 million has been authorized for this purpose. The additional authorization of $225 million is necessary to complete these programs.

The other item that helped bring about this increased authorization above that of last year is the requirement for direct appropriations for 16,503 units of family housing representing approximately $312 million. As Members will recall, the Congress in the past few years has attempted to satisfy the military family housing requirements through the so-called Wherry and Capehart programs. Those programs basically represented military family housing construction financed through private sources. Thus, although previous military public works bills included substantial numbers of those housing units, the actual cost of construction of these units was not reflected in the bills.

Many Members of the House questioned the utilization of these programs to satisfy military family housing needs. Criticism of these programs basically revolved around the fact that, in the final analysis, the program was more costly to the Government than the direct appropriation method because of the interest payment involved for the use of private capital.

During my appearance before the House last year on this very subject, I conceded that these programs were slightly more expensive. However, I pointed out that this method of financing military family housing had proven successful in providing our military families with critically required housing.

Later during debate on this particular portion of the military construction bill, I stated that the fiscal year 1963 military construction authorization would, in view of the mounting criticism of the Capehart program, return to the concept of financing military housing construction by direct appropriations.

The bill reflects this change in congressional policy and provides, as I said, nearly $312 million for the construction of 16,503 units. You will see on pages 34 to 38 of the bill a list of line items of the location of the proposed housing. You will see on page 41 of the bill the cost limitations. You will see on page 42, section 406, of the bill wherein, in the future all items related to these houses must be authorized before appropriations may be made. This applies particularly to the operation and maintenance costs required to support these houses.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The money authorized in this bill is broken down in the following manner:

For the Army	$187,353,000
For the Navy	227,129,000
For the Air Force	745,854,000
For military family housing	311,451,000
For Reserve Forces	46,500,000
For deficiency authorizations	5,910,000
Grand total	1,524,197,000

BASIS OF THE BILL

The military construction requirements in this bill were developed on the same basis as were the departments' requirements just recently presented to the Congress for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

As members of the House will recall, this involves the "package program concept" of identifying our military force structure with their primary missions and then assigning to these forces the weapons, equipment, and facilities required to discharge, most effectively, these assigned mission responsibilities.

All budget planning for fiscal year 1963 was initiated by the departments with a 5-year projection of the missions and forces to be supported through fiscal year 1967. Such projects are particularly important in planning military construction in view of the leadtime required for many construction projects. This 5-year projection of mission and forces was, therefore, the basis upon which the military construction requirements for fiscal year 1963 are based.

In order to provide the House with a summary picture of the proposed utilization of the construction authorization in this bill, I will briefly outline the amount of authorization allocated to the Department of Defense and the military departments on the basis of military missions.

These mission categories are as follows:

First. Strategic retaliatory forces: The bill provides $549 million for this mission. The mission accounts for the largest part of new operational facility needs, and includes Polaris, Minuteman, Atlas-Titan facilities, SAC base improvements, and other miscellaneous projects.

Second. Continental air and missile defense forces: The bill provides $31 million for this mission, which includes Nike-Hercules facilities, submarine detection facilities, fighter-interceptor squadrons facilities, and DEW line and aircraft and early warning stations.

Third. General purpose forces: The bill provides $147 million for this allocation which, generally, relate to various operational Army and Marine Corps facilities, both in the continental United States and overseas, various communication facilities, and Tactical Air Command facilities in the continental United States.

Fourth. Airlift and sealift forces: The bill provides $5 million to authorize construction to support facilities for troop carriers, cargo aircraft, and MATS.

Fifth. Reserve Forces: The bill provides $46½ million for additional Reserve Forces facilities.

Sixth. Research and development: These facilities account for $115 million of new construction authorization. This includes facilities for the space surveillance system, missile range improvements, and Nike-Zeus facilities.

Seventh. General support: This category includes all other facilities of a nonoperational nature essential to support service departments. The authorization provided for this category amounts to $283 million and includes troop housing, training facilities, medical facilities, communication facilities, and various other administrative and security facilities.

Eighth. Emergency construction authorization: The committee provided the services with a total of $30 million to meet unforeseen requirements for military construction during firsal year 1963. See sections 103, 203, 303, pages 9, 20, 33.

The total of these authorizations represents $1,206 million. In addition, as I previously mentioned, the committee included approximately $312 million for military family housing and, finally, approved deficiency authorizations for construction previously authorized by law in the amount of approximately $6 million. These amounts total $1,524,197,000 as provided in this bill.

At this point, I wish to call the attention of Members of the House who desire a more detailed breakdown of this bill to the table on page 8 of the committee report. That table identifies the types and categories of facilities which make up the authorization provided each service to support it in carrying out its assigned mission responsibilities.

MEDICAL FACILITIES

Among the categories of facilities included in this bill is that involving medical facilities.

The bill provides authorization for the construction of medical facilities amounting to approximately $45 million. Included in this figure is $32,637,000 for the construction of eight new or replacement hospital facilities. Thus, the cost of the new or replacement hospital facilities represents 73 percent of the authorization provided for medical facilities.

These eight hospitals, the number of beds, and total construction costs are as follows:

	Beds	Cost
ARMY		
Fort Hood, Tex	285	$7,084,000
White Sands, N. Mex	50	1,878,000
NAVY		
Long Beach, Calif	500	9,196,000
AIR FORCE		
Langley Air Force Base, Va	125	3,078,000
Nellis Air Force Base, Nev	50	2,230,000
Hill Air Force Base, Utah	50	2,136,000
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr	125	4,170,000
Patrick Air Force Base, Fla	75	2,865,000
Total	1,250	32,637,000

MILITARY VERSUS CIVILIAN HOSPITAL COST-PER-BED

The average cost per bed for civilian Hill-Burton hospitals for 1961 is $18,290. The average cost per bed for the comparable portions of the military hospitals proposed for fiscal year 1963 is $18,131. With the addition of the flight surgeon clinics, dental clinics, and outpatient clinics which must be provided in combination with the hospitals on military bases, the cost of this total medical complex per bed advances to $25,902 for the hospitals in this year's program. This latter cost is not comparable with civilian hospital costs, however, since it includes medical services which are provided in the civilian community by independent doctors' offices, dental offices, laboratories, and pharmacies.

On the basis of bed patient support, therefore, the civilian cost of $18,290 to the military cost of $18,131 per bed is completely comparable.

MAJOR COMMITTEE CHANGES IN THE BILL

H.R. 11131 is, of course, a clean bill. The departmental request as submitted was embodied in H.R. 10202. On reviewing the Department's request, the committee modified and amended the bill in many particulars and, consequently, directed that these changes be reflected in a clean bill.

A detailed breakdown of the respective titles of the clean bill, H.R. 11131, appears in the committee report. However, for purposes of providing a summary of committee changes to the bill, the following general information is provided:

REDUCTION IN AUTHORIZATION

As I previously stated, the committee reduced the Department's request for new construction authorizations from $1,596,697,000 to $1,524,197,000, a net reduction of $72,500,000.

DEFENSE AGENCIES

The committee deleted a Department of Defense request for separate authority to construct facilities for defense agencies in the amount of $33,915,000. This committee action was based on its longstanding belief that the Defense Department should confine its activities to policymaking and not attempt to duplicate the operating functions of the military departments.

Construction authority to provide support for defense agencies has heretofore been provided through the individual military departments. The committee intends to continue this procedure. Accordingly, the committee directed that this construction authority be distributed among the military departments which are responsible for providing direct support to these agencies.

DEFENSE EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION

The committee deleted a Department of Defense request for the creation of a separate emergency construction fund for Department of Defense use. The committee has annually provided each of the military departments with approximately $10 million in this type of authorization. This provision has proven adequate to meet the service requirements in the past. Therefore, the committee was not persuaded that a change in this policy was necessary or justified.

DEFENSE FACILITIES REPLACEMENT FUND

The committee deleted a Department of Defense request for authority to establish a defense facilities replacement fund. This authority would have permitted the Defense Department to utilize the proceeds of its disposal of surplus properties for the purpose of relocating facilities which are of marginal utility to the departments in their present locations. Under the departmental proposal, these disposal proceeds would be segregated in a separate fund rather than permit them to go into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. The committee rejected this proposal since it was of the opinion that this procedure, in the last analysis, represented back-door financing which would, for practical purposes, conflict with the regular appropriation process.

The committee believes that the relocation and replacement of marginal facilities should be authorized and funded in the normal legislative and appropriation process.

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING FUND

The committee rejected a Department of Defense request for authority to establish a revolving fund which would provide the financial support necessary to defray the cost of military family housing. As proposed by the Department, the principal annual source of income to the fund would result from the forfeiture of the basic allowance for quarters—BAQ—of personnel who occupy public quarters.

The committee believes that military family housing is a critical requirement in our construction program. However, notwithstanding this fact, it is not willing to authorize the creation of a "revolving fund" which will distort the appropriation process. Military family housing requirements, like all other military construction, should be subject to the same careful Congressional scrutiny that is now provided by the responsible legislative and appropriating committees. Accordingly, the committee directed that all family housing proposed by the departments be subject to direct appropriations by the Congress.

LIMITATIONS ON COST OF FAMILY HOUSING

The family housing as proposed by the departments would not, for practical purposes, have been subject to any specific cost limitation in the authorization act. As a consequence, the committee incorporated, in section 405, the limitation currently contained in the appropriation act—section 109 of Public Law 87–302—and also included an overall limitation that "no project in excess of 50 units at a specific location, other than those constructed outside the continental United States or in Alaska, shall be constructed at an average unit cost exceeding $17,500, including the costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities."

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF FAMILY HOUSING

Among the numerous remaining changes to the bill, one is particularly noteworthy. This change relates to the problem of the cost of operating and maintaining military family housing.

The Committee on Armed Services has, over the past few years, attempted to develop this information so as to enable it to measure the total actual cost of providing our military families with housing.

I am happy to say that the Department of Defense has now instituted management changes in the area of family housing which will, in the future, make it possible to develop this information.

The committee concurs in this departmental action and, therefore, has included a provision in this bill—section 406—which will require the Department of Defense to obtain annual authorization for the appropriations required to support family housing.

This new provision included in this legislation will require that after December 31, 1962, appropriations for the construction, acquisition, leasing, additions, extensions, expansions, alterations, or operation and maintenance of military family housing must be authorized by legislation enacted after that date.

This provision will occasion no change in either the legislative processes or the appropriation process with relation to the construction or acquisition of new family housing units. However, it will require that the departments obtain an annual authorization for the amount of operation and maintenance funds required to provide support to maintain family housing.

The sole purpose, therefore, for the enactment of this requirement is to insure that complete data on family housing costs is available, as a package, to the Congress. There is no intent on the part of the committee to adversely affect either the appropriation structure or the capability of the Department of Defense to discharge its many responsibilities.

SUMMARY

Now, this represents the work of the Committee on Armed Services. We have worked long and diligently on this bill. As reflected in the printed hearings, our full committee spent more than a month in studying every item and provision in the bill.

The committee unanimously approved H.R. 11131. I therefore urge the Members of the House to also approve this bill without a dissenting vote.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL. I notice on page 35 that in the total number of houses or units authorized there is included 200 units for Fort Belvoir and 525 units for Fort Myer. It is my understanding that there are sufficient housing units in that area, that approximately 1,500 vacant units are now available and several hundred rental units available. We just do not feel it is necessary to construct additional military houses over there at this time.

Mr. VINSON. My answer to the gentleman is, I hope that is a fact, and I share his concern. The committee received a letter from our distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and we invited interested people from that community to appear before our committee. They sent a very brilliant representative, a Mrs. Robbins, and if you will examine the hearings on page 4725 you will see where Mrs. Robbins made a statement on behalf of the realtors. It developed there were 1,500 units for sale; it developed there were 2,500 units being built.

We were looking for rental quarters, not sale housing. Of course if an officer or one of the personnel had assurance that he was going to be kept at his station for some time, it would be economically sound for him to buy a home. But oftentimes they are assigned for 2 years, not over 4 years, and they have to depend on rental. So there are not sufficient rental facilities over there to take care of the personnel assigned to those stations.

Now, let me read the record. Here is what Mrs. Robbins said:

> Presently, on the multiple listing service with the real estate bord there are more than 1,500 single family residences owned by Government employees, civilians, and military personnel. We believe that if these two projects are approved our military owners in northern Virginia will suffer undue harm.

Then she said this:

> Private industry has and is supplying the need for adequate rental houses in these areas. Presently under construction at the corner of Seminary Road and Shirley Highway 2,500 rental units are presently being built. These units are conveniently located to serve the needs of both Fort Belvoir and Fort Myer.

Now, listen to this:

> Recognizing, sirs, that the housing allowance for military personnel is considered inadequate for renting and maintenance in the northern Virginia area

Then she goes on and says—and she is very wise, and it is certainly what we are doing—she said the proper way to do it is to increase the quarters allowances.

Now, there will be a bill presented in the next 2 or 3 days increasing the quarters allowances $225 million, which means that the private who gets anywhere from $70 to $90 will ultimately get under that bill $105, and therefore they may be able to rent some of these quarters, but they cannot do it until that becomes law.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for one further question, on page 34 the committee did include language that "no construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations."

Mr. VINSON. Let me say this: Before we determine whether any units are going to be built in a location, a study is made by the departments and the FHA Director to determine the availability of adequate housing in the area. Available community assets are then assessed against total military requirements to determine what the local deficiency in available housing may be. In other words, a most careful survey is made before any houses are authorized.

The committee also has been assured that in the four localities which presently have Wherry housing and at which locations, new appropriated fund housing is proposed—that such Wherry units will be acquired before construction is initiated on the appropriated fund housing.

Mr. BROYHILL. Then, if the Housing and Home Finance Administrator determines that there are sufficient houses available, then the Secretary of the Army will not commence construction?

Mr. VINSON. We went over these items line by line. We have the information on how many civilian units are for rent and how many Government quarters they have there, and then the committee determines whether or not the Federal Government is warranted to build these homes.

Now, since we are talking about houses, let me give you this information: There are 381,027 housing units owned by the military; 115,000 are Capehart houses, 71,000 are Wherry houses; 140,000 public quarters, and 55,000 inadequate quarters. That makes a total of approximately 381,000 units.

There are 978,598 military families eligible for public quarters. Listen to this: Approximately 50 percent of all males on active duty with the armed services are married today whereas in 1954 only 37 percent were married.

Only 39 percent of eligible military personnel now occupy military-owned housing. Of the 16,503 units contained in this bill, 80 percent, or 13,200 units, are for enlisted personnel, approximately 3,300 are for officers.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand from the statement that the gentleman has made that unless there is a Wherry or Capehart housing project now on the base, you do not propose to have any constructed under that setup?

Mr. VINSON. If there is a Wherry house that has not been acquired, we will not build new housing unless the Wherry is acquired. If there is a Capehart house there, we will take into consideration as public quarters in order to determine whether any more houses should be built.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Could the gentleman tell me the situation with reference to Lowry Air Force Base?

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will ask the clerk of the Committee on Armed Services, he has the information on where the Capehart houses are. I do not think Lowry is one of the bases, but he will give the gentleman the information. We have it broken down.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. KYL. When the distinguished committee of which the gentleman is chairman was receiving testimony on the Reserve and National Guard components was there any evidence that the

Department planned an alteration of the operation of those components?

Mr. VINSON. Does the gentleman mean by operation the strength of those components?

Mr. KYL. Anything regarding the operation of the Reserve and National Guard.

Mr. VINSON. I am glad the gentleman brought that subject up. The whole subject of the strength, the operation, the mission and everything relating to the National Guard and the Reserve was taken up this morning by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

In that connection I read in the paper that former President Truman has written a letter, being much disturbed about some rearrangements affecting the Missouri National Guard. We are going into it further and find out all about it. We are going to see what is going to take place. We are going to see why it is that the National Guard and the reservists are being cut down, and why should we not have a strong, virile, well-qualified, well-trained National Guard and Reserve force.

When they called up this 155,000 men they had to borrow equipment from some of their Regular forces. That should not have been necessary. We have to look into it, so the proper way to do it was to appoint a subcommittee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], and ably assisted by 10 members of the committee. I think when they finish and make their report to Congress the Congress will be satisfied with the conclusions they recommend.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have a few questions for the gentleman. I am glad he mentioned the name of former President Truman.

Mr. VINSON. I knew what that would bring forth, and I have the information for the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I know there is $158,000 in the bill for Mr. Truman's airbase at Kansas City or Grandview, that is it—but what I wanted to ask is has the Continental Air Command ever been moved to the Truman airbase?

Mr. VINSON. No, everything out there is going along just about as it should be. We provided only $158,000 for some 15 hospital beds for military men stationed out there.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman remember that was the reason given when the first appropriation went through for Mr. Truman's airbase?

Mr. VINSON. I am quite familiar with it.

Mr. GROSS. We were told then that the Continental Air Command would be moved there. That was the reason for the airbase.

How does the figure of $1,524 million in this bill compare with the actual expenditure for this purpose last year?

Mr. VINSON. I am sorry the distinguished gentleman was not here. I pointed out that this bill was $700 million more than the bill last year, and I enumerated where it came in. There is $225 million on account of the increased cost of building the silos, the hardened sites for the Atlas and the Titan ICBM's. Then there is $312 million for building houses.

Mr. GROSS. I want to ask the gentleman about the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot. Do I understand they are having a little trouble down there?

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman is wise in following that up, because I was about to forget it. A few years ago we authorized the abandonment of a great ammunition depot at San Jacinto, off the canal that goes into Houston, Tex. It was valued around $35 million for the land, a chemical plant, a fertilizer plant, and a short-line railroad. We moved that out, and we turned it over to the General Services Administration. In the law when we did so we gave authority to the Engineers to select this area in keeping the channel open. We had to keep the Houston Channel open. We had to put pumps in there to pump out silt, and they had to have some place to put it. The most valuable place down there is that fronting on the canal.

Mr. GROSS. So control of the spoilage area has been turned over to the General Services Administration?

Mr. VINSON. They are responsible for selling it and under the change, they will select the area. They will figure out the best way to bring about a sale.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman this question. Is there money in this bill for any new ordnance depots?

Mr. VINSON. No, there is no money in this bill for any new ordnance depots. There may be some money in the bill for repairs in some depots but not for new depots.

Mr. GROSS. There is no money for new depots to replace any closed depot or in any other way?

Mr. VINSON. You mean as to the establishment of a depot?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. Well, to be absolutely accurate about it, there is only one new installation in this bill and it is not in the United States and it is not an ordnance depot. It is a very highly classified installation being established outside the continental United States. But there is no new installation provided for in the continental United States.

Mr. GROSS. That is the question I wanted answered. Now then can the gentleman tell me, since apparently there will be 3,890 additional employees at Columbus—is this Columbus, Ohio, or Columbus, Ga.?

Mr. VINSON. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. GROSS. The bill apparently provides funds for 3,890 employees at the Engineering Maintenance Center at Columbus General Depot. Is that Columbus, Ga., or Columbus, Ohio?

Mr. VINSON. Well, that is Columbus, Ohio. I regret to say that it is not in Georgia. I regret to say there is not one item in this $1,500 million bill for the district that I have the honor to serve in this House.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I cannot see a dime in the bill for the State of Iowa.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman and I are in the same position then.

Now, I particularly invite the gentleman's attention to this information concerning the eight new hospitals in the bill. The average cost per bed for civilian-built hospitals in 1961 was $18,290. The average cost per bed for the comparable portion of military hospitals proposed for the fiscal year 1963 is $18,131 per bed.

When we add the flight surgeon's clinic, the dental clinic, the outpatient clinic, and put these in the hospitals, which are outside of the Hill-Burton hospitals, it raises the cost to $25,902 per bed. Without those facilities which the doctors and the community provide themselves, we are building these beds at less than they can be built under the Hill-Burton Hospital Act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How about the Air Force hospital over in France? Has that ever been used?

Mr. VINSON. Since there has been so much criticism of Members going abroad I have not had any recent report on it. We may have to wait until the next session of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman is referring to me, I have not complained about Members going abroad on business but I want the Members to detail their "miscellaneous" expenses. That is what I am particularly concerned about right now.

You have authorized a new building in Maryland to cost $12,900,000 for the National Security Agency. The east coast is supposed to be vulnerable. Should not this be spread out rather than put the National Security Agency in new quarters on the eastern seaboard?

Mr. VINSON. I think we reached the right decision.

Let me say to the gentleman that as far as I know never have I had the honor and privilege to present a bill as tightly written as this bill. We have done a magnificent job. The record of each item is in the hearings. We read these line items, some 1,035. They are here in this book; and in the case of some 466 different installations we go right down the line. These books next year will be sent out as early as possible to the 37 members of our committee, so they will be conversant with these items before we open our hearings.

Therefore, all I can say is that our review of the facts justified the authorization for the Security Agency at that location.

Mr. GROSS. I am not quarreling primarily with the authorization of funds for a new building, but I am asking, Would it not be better to put some of these sensitive agencies out in the State of Iowa or the Middle West?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, it would be good because it is one of the great States of the Union.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course, it is.

I am willing to go along with the gentleman on that, but try to give our State of Iowa a little consideration.

Mr. VINSON. I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution.

I think in connection with the National Security Agency, it might be pointed out that this Agency is already in this location, and I have already said there is no new item anywhere in the bill.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I notice on page 24 of the report an item for fleet base facilities at Charleston, S.C.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. With particular reference to the Polaris. Does that indicate any shift in emphasis from New London, Conn.?

Mr. VINSON. No, for New London is one of the most important Atlantic coast bases. The mere fact we are doing something for Polaris down in Charleston does not indicate anything detrimental to New London.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, under permission to extend my remarks I include the following statistical information in regard to the "Military construction program, Reserve facilities":

Reserve forces facilities—State totals from tentative fiscal year 1963 program

State	Army National Guard	Army Reserve	Naval and Marine Corps Reserves	Air National Guard	Air Force Reserve	Total
Alabama	237			858	63	1,158
Alaska				1,156		1,156
Arizona	441					441
Arkansas	176			183		359
California	808	1,055	497	328		2,688
Colorado	136					136
Connecticut						
Delaware	125					125
District of Columbia		731				731
Florida						
Georgia				620		620
Hawaii	312	406		570		1,288
Idaho	370	279	92			741
Illinois		557	662	230	220	1,669
Indiana	464					464
Iowa	106	459				565
Kansas	90		145			235
Kentucky	374	221				595
Louisiana	585	50	157		158	950
Maine	125			276		401
Maryland			135		266	401
Massachusetts	200	182	1,176		256	1,814
Michigan	560		178	1,007		1,745
Minnesota			396			396
Mississippi	276			381		657
Missouri	231	368		2,044	270	2,913
Montana	145			110		255
Nebraska	82					82
Nevada						
New Hampshire	148					148
New Jersey	610	402	100		760	1,872
New Mexico	75	158	65			298
New York	276	841	455		980	2,552
North Carolina	190	145				335
North Dakota	130					130
Ohio		1,298		509		1,807
Oklahoma	206	169	64		170	609
Oregon	395					395
Pennsylvania	414	767	1,531	350	359	3,421
Puerto Rico	305					305
Rhode Island	145					145
South Carolina	275			408		683
South Dakota	281	119				400
Tennessee		436				436
Texas	268	162	782	2,059	390	3,661
Utah		57		723		780
Vermont	129					129
Virginia	413		897			1,310
Washington	184	241	801		100	1,326
West Virginia						
Wisconsin	495			714	362	1,571
Wyoming	275					275
Various locations					315	315
Land acquisition		764				764
Total	11,057	9,867	8,133	12,526	4,669	46,252
Amounts in H.R. 11131	11,000	9,900	8,200	12,700	4,700	46,500

Army National Guard

CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

[Fiscal year 1963 authorization program]

State and location:	*Estimated Federal cost*
Alabama:	
Birmingham	$147,000
Montgomery	90,000
Arizona: Phoenix	276,000
Arkansas:	
De Queen	57,000
Harrisburg	62,000
Crossett	57,000
California:	
Santa Monica	342,000
Gilroy	120,000
Porterville	130,000
Colorado: Alamosa-Monte Vista	136,000
Delaware: Milton	125,000
Idaho: Weiser	90,000
Indiana:	
Winchester	205,000
South Bend	259,000
Iowa: Jefferson	106,000
Kansas: Holton	90,000
Kentucky:	
Lexington	230,000
Bowling Green	144,000
Louisiana: Jonesboro	88,000
Maine:	
Newport	53,000
South Brewer	72,000
Massachusetts: Ayer	200,000
Michigan: Lansing	560,000
Mississippi:	
Moorhead	90,000
Baldwyn	96,000
Poplarville	90,000
Missouri:	
De Soto	133,000
Webb City	98,000
Nebraska: Ogallala	82,000

Army National Guard—Continued

CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS—continued

State and location:	*Estimated Federal cost*
New Hampshire: Franklin	$148,000
New Jersey: Bridgeton	172,000
New Mexico: Lovington	75,000
New York: Walton	276,000
North Carolina:	
Sylva	95,000
Elkin	95,000
North Dakota: Wishek	130,000
Oklahoma: Oklahoma City	206,000
Oregon: Portland No. 2	395,000
Pennsylvania:	
Phoenixville	222,000
Chambersburg	192,000
Puerto Rico:	
Mayaguez	195,000
Guayama	110,000
Rhode Island: Middletown	145,000
South Carolina:	
Clemson	111,000
Greenwood	164,000
South Dakota: Rapid City	281,000
Texas:	
Brownwood	125,000
Tulia	69,000
Fredericksburg	74,000
Virginia:	
Danville	238,000
Martinsville	175,000
Vermont: Brattleboro	129,000
Washington: Bellingham	184,000
Wisconsin:	
Reedsburg	165,000
Black River Falls	165,000
Stoughton	165,000
Wyoming: Cheyenne	275,000
Total	9,004,000

Army National Guard—Continued

NONARMORY PROJECTS

State and location:	*Estimated Federal cost*
Arizona: Phoenix	$165,000
California:	
Oxnard	126,000
Stockton	90,000
Hawaii: Honolulu	312,000
Idaho: Boise	280,000
Louisiana:	
Camp Beauregard	415,000
Jackson Barracks	82,000
Montana: Helena	145,000
New Jersey:	
Camp Drum	131,000
Camp Drum	307,000
Total	2,053,000

Summary—Army National Guard:	
Armory projects (57)	9,004,000
Nonarmory projects (10)	2,053,000
Total	11,057,000

Army Reserve program

Location:	*Cost*
California:	
Bell-Cheli AF Station	$482,000
Santa Ana-Anaheim	573,000
District of Columbia: Washington, D.C. No. 4	731,000
Hawaii: Hilo	406,000
Idaho:	
Idaho Falls	174,000
Pocatello	105,000
Illinois:	
Chicago No. 1	56,000
Chicago No. 5	501,000
Iowa: Cedar Rapids	459,000
Kentucky: Bowling Green	221,000

Army Reserve program—Continued

Location:	*Cost*
Louisiana: Baton Rouge	$50,000
Massachusetts: Brockton	182,000
Missouri: Columbia	368,000
New Jersey: Caven Point	402,000
New Mexico: Santa Fe	158,000
New York: New York	841,000
North Carolina: Asheboro	145,000
Ohio:	
Columbus No. 2	603,000
Columbus No. 3	603,000
Youngstown	92,000
Oklahoma: Enid	169,000
Pennsylvania: Philadelphia No. 3	767,000
South Dakota: Rapid City	119,000
Tennessee: Nashville No. 2	436,000
Texas: Wichita Falls	162,000
Utah: Logan	57,000
Washington:	
Bellingham	164,000
Tacoma	77,000
Total Army Reserve (28 projects)	9,867,000

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve

Installation and line item:	*Cost*
Naval air facility, Andrews AFB	$135,000
Naval Air Station, Dallas, Tex	342,000
Naval Air Station, Glenview, Ill	662,000
Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Mich	178,000
Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, Calif	151,000
Naval Air Station, Minneapolis, Minn	396,000
Naval Air Station, New Orleans, La	157,000
Naval Air Station, New York, N.Y	355,000
Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kans	145,000
Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Mass	371,000
Naval Reserve electronics facility, Berkeley Heights, N.J	100,000
Naval Reserve electronics facility, Enid, Okla	64,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Harrisburg, Pa	434,000
Naval Reserve Training Center, Houston, Tex	440,000
Naval Reserve electronics facility, Idaho Falls, Idaho	69,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Little Creek, Va	652,000
Naval Reserve electronics facility, Middletown, N.Y	100,000
Armed Forces Reserve Training Center, Philadelphia, Pa	604,000
Naval Reserve electronics facility, Pocatello, Idaho	23,000
Naval Reserve Training Center, Santa Ana, Calif	346,000
Naval Reserve electronics facility, Santa Fe, N. Mex	65,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tacoma, Wash	573,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Worcester, Mass	601,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Harrisburg, Pa	108,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Little Creek, Va	245,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Philadelphia, Pa	385,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tacoma, Wash	228,000

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve—Continued

Installation and line item:	*Cost*
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Worcester, Mass	$204,000
Total Marine Corps Reserve	1,170,000
Total Naval Reserve	6,963,000
Grand Total	8,133,000

Air National Guard

Location and project:	*Amount*
Alpena County Airport, Alpena, Mich	$527,000
Dannelly Field, Montgomery, Ala	858,000
Detroit Wayne County Airport, Inkster, Mich	480,000
Dow AFB, Bangor, Maine	276,000
Ellington AFB, Genoa, Tex	2,059,000
Gore Field, Great Falls, Mont	110,000
Greater Peoria, Peoria, Ill	230,000
Gulfport, Gulfport, Miss	381,000
Kulis ANG Base, Anchorage, Alaska	1,156,000
Hawaiian Island complex	570,000
Little Rock AFB, Little Rock, Ark	183,000
McEntire ANG Base, Columbia, S.C	408,000
Rosecrans Memorial Airport, St. Joseph, Mo	2,044,000
Salt Lake, Salt Lake City, Utah	723,000
Santa Ana Reserve Facility, Santa Ana, Calif	328,000
Springfield, Springfield, Ohio	509,000
Travis Field, Savannah, Ga	620,000
Volk Field, Camp Williams, Wis	714,000
Willow Grove NAS, Philadelphia, Pa	350,000
Total	12,526,000

Air Force Reserve

Location and project:	*Amount*
Andrews AFB, Prince Georges County, Md	$266,000
Bates Field, Mobile, Ala	63,000
Davis Field, Muskogee, Okla	170,000
Ellington AFB, Houston, Tex	390,000
General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wis	362,000
L. G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass	256,000
McGuire AFB, Burlington, N.J	760,000
New Orleans NAS, New Orleans, La	158,000
O'Hare IAP, Chicago, Ill	220,000
Paine AFB, Everett, Wash	100,000
Richards-Gebaur AFB, Belton, Mo	270,000
Stewart AFB, Orange, N.Y	960,000
Willow Grove NAS, Willow Grove, Pa	359,000
Various locations	315,000
Total	4,669,000

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to speak briefly in favor of enactment of the military construction authorization bill, H.R. 11131. The chairman of our committee has done his usual splendid job on this bill. With the help of his wise counsel and able leadership, the committee has produced a very tight program for each of the services. The program for each of the military departments this year gives clear evidence of intelligent and forward-looking planning. I believe each program merits your approval.

For a reason which I shall develop in a moment, I invite your particular attention to the Navy's program, title II of the bill. It is for the amount of $232,405,000 which is divided as follows: $120,846,000 inside the United States, $96,283,000 outside the United States, and $15,276,000 for emergency construction and amendments to prior years authorizations. Before commenting on my point at issue, I should like first to highlight a few significant facts about this program.

As you well know, our Navy has, for a number of years, been engaged in a vigorous fleet modernization program. The greatest effectiveness of a modern fleet cannot be realized however, unless, at the same time, the supporting shore establishment can be kept abreast of the fleet improvements. This is due to the rapidly changing operational concepts and the increasing technical complexities of the new ships, aircraft and weapons systems being developed and introduced into the fleet today. The Navy's mobile combat ready operating forces must be assured adequate, up-to-date shore facilities to back them up. These facilities must be capable of providing the logistic support necessary for the fleet to be instantly responsive to any situation which may arise in hot, cold, or limited warfare.

Each individual line item in this Navy program supports one or more of several military force objectives to achieve this ultimate purpose. This year's program has been divided into functional packages in support of these objectives as follows:

Package I—Strategic retaliatory forces: This includes $21,842,000 for Polaris and command support facilities. This will increase the capability of the Navy's Polaris weapons system and increase the ability of our deterrent force to prepare for and wage undersea warfare in ocean areas generally far removed from our shorelines.

Package II—Continental air and missile defense forces: This includes a total of $1,139,000 for an oceanographic system and associated communications in support of our antisubmarine defense effort which is now confronted with the largest submarine force ever assembled by a potential enemy.

Package III—General purpose forces: This includes a total of $93,574,000 for ships, aircraft, and weapons systems support. These line items support operations of the fleet in projecting their fighting strength to control the seas. This package also contains those projects required for training and effective utilization of the Marine Corps in support of national objectives, including readiness for quick deployment to any area of unrest where they may be needed.

Package VI—Research and development: This includes a total of $22,870,000 for new and expanded facilities to implement our technological progress.

Package VII—General support: This package includes a total of $77,704,000 for alterations, expansion or replacement of many old facilities that are nearing the end of their useful life and for a few new facilities. These facilities supply overall logistic support to the operating forces.

In concluding my remarks, I wish to assure you that it is my firm conviction that the Navy's military construction program has been soundly conceived, is well balanced, and represents the minimal facilities which will insure the essential supporting needs of the Navy's operating forces. I recommend that you approve, not only title II, but the entire bill.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to have the opportunity to speak briefly in favor of enactment of the military construction authorization bill, H.R. 11131.

As usual, the chairman of our committee has done a thorough job of analyzing and explaining this bill and I do not propose to duplicate his efforts. However, I do wish to stress that the programs represented by this bill have received a most careful scrutiny.

These construction programs are, of course, not an end in themselves but are only a means of supporting broader military programs which are dependent for their effectiveness on the facilities which this bill will authorize.

This year, for the first time, the Department of Defense has presented to the Congress programs based on budget planning which projects for a period of 5 years the missions and forces to be supported. This approach to programing is in consonance with previous recommendations of the Congress with respect to the necessity for the Department of Defense to develop a more realistic planning and programing system based on a coordinated review and analysis of requirements. This objective has been attained to a very marked degree, and its continued use and refinement should lead to substantial economies, particularly in those areas related to our major weapons systems.

This long-range view is especially significant as it affects construction, where the end product of our expenditures cannot be shifted to meet revised plans or changes of concept—this in contrast to the manner in which troops, tanks, and planes can be shifted from one location to another.

In this regard, it is pertinent and somewhat comforting to note that almost 90 percent of the authorization contained in the bill is for construction within the United States where the facilities are much less subject to abandonment, or disposal at a small fraction of their original cost, than when they are built in oversea areas.

In connection with construction at oversea installations, I was very much disturbed as a result of a recently issued Executive order reducing the authority of our High Commissioner in Okinawa. This was particularly pertinent since the military construction bill provides authorization for military projects in Okinawa amounting to more than $13 million. As a consequence, the committee requested information as to the military implications of this Executive order.

I invite the attention of the Members to the letter addressed to Secretary McNamara that appears on page 4731 of the printed committee hearings. The Department's reply to this inquiry is not produced in the hearings because it was received subsequent to their printing. However, I have received a copy of this reply and, in effect, it reassured the committee that the Executive order in no way implied any intention to downgrade the strategic military importance of Okinawa or discontinue use of this area in our overall defense program.

Okinawa is a military strategic defense outpost. Except for a few thousand natives, there is really nothing there of value except our military installations of various kinds. Indeed, we have approximately $1 billion in military construction and equipment in this chain of islands. The operation and maintenance of these facilities cost around $180 million a year. And we now propose by the terms of this bill to authorize over $13 million more for military construction.

Obviously, what is done with respect to Okinawa is basically a military question. Military considerations are paramount. And that is why I am so desirous of knowing the basis for this recent Executive order, diluting the authority of the High Commissioner and setting up a civilian Civil Administrator.

I must frankly say that we have in the last year or so had altogether too much of this substituting of inexperienced civil judgment for the military judgment of our Joint Chiefs of Staff and those responsible for our defense. We asked if the Joint Chiefs of Staff took a position on this Executive order to establish a Civil Administrator.

The answer we received is inconclusive, but it is clear from the answer that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are against the new office being established. This is how the answer from the Department of Defense reads:

> The Joint Chiefs of Staff saw no advantage to the appointment of a civilian as the Civil Administrator—

And then went on to explain that if one was appointed certain qualifications should be met.

I ask, why is it so necessary to name a Civil Administrator at all? You may answer that Japan wants this done. My answer is that because Japan wants it is no reason why we should do it. Our national security is at stake. This is another of those typical State Department retreats—yielding to demands of other countries. This is another example of lack of firmness.

The High Commissioner saw no advantage in establishing an office of Civil Administrator.

Admiral Felt, Commander in Chief of the Pacific Theater, was simply advised that this was being done.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will tentatively accept the assurances given the committee by the Secretary of Defense that this action in no way implies any intention to abandon, in due course, our military outpost abroad. I will tentatively accept assurances that this Civil Administrator will in no way and at no time interfere with our military operations.

But I intend to continue to scrutinize everything that is done in connection with this vital bastion. And I should like to say here and now, with all the emphasis I can command, that I shall insist that we allow our military men to make these decisions and that their recommendations be followed. There has been too much of this civil interference, and we are in the international mess we are in simply because we are everlastingly worrying about other countries and not concerning ourselves enough with our own needs.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize my belief that the authorizations contained in the bill will provide for military construction programs that are well balanced, soundly conceived, and vital to the support of our military forces.

I recommend your approval of the entire bill as presented to you by our Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gavin].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates], relative to Okinawa. We fought our way in, we are dug in, and we ought to stay in. It is one of the most strategic points in the Far East, and under all circumstances we must maintain the position we now occupy for the future defense of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add only a few comments to what has already been said about the military construction authorization bill as proposed in H.R. 11131.

As you know, I have had a continuing interest in seeing the combat capabilities of our ground forces maintained, particularly their capability for engaging in conventional and limited scale actions—the types of overt warfare which are most probable under conditions of nuclear parity. Accordingly, I wish to address my remarks principally to the requirements of the active forces of the Army.

Mr. Vinson has commented that 17 percent or $261 million of the total amount in the bill is for Army requirements; $161 million of this amount is included in title I, which also includes $26 million for certain defense agency requirements. The title IV contains an additional $79 million, for family housing at Army installations. The method by which the Secretary of Defense proposed to defray the cost of building these houses was unacceptable to the committee. The balance of the $287 million is $21 million which appears in title VI for construction in support of readiness training of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve; $108 million of the authorization for direct Army requirements in title I is for construction in the United States and an additional $17 million is for construction at our permanent bases within the Caribbean area and on Okinawa; $26 million is for construction at foreign bases, principally for support of our forces deployed in Korea, France, and Germany.

The remainder is accounted for by the $10 million included in section 103 of the bill. As in previous years this section contains language authorizing construction to meet unforeseen and urgent requirements arising from new weapons development, research and development requirements, and improved production schedules related to changes in Army missions. However, in order to prevent any possible abuses of this authority, the committee has reworded the language of similar such sections for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, to more clearly indicate its intention that the use of this authority be reserved for unexpected and unforeseen changes in missions dictated by circumstances outside the control of the Department of Defense.

This year for the first time the Department of Defense presented its programs not only in terms of the usual appropriation structure breakout but also in terms of program packages which aline requirements according to basic missions. The great bulk of military construction authorization for fiscal year 1963, 36 percent or $549 million, is devoted to strategic retaliatory forces. This category does not encompass any Army requirements. Requirements for the Army fall within four other of these program packages, or mission groupings.

Nine and eight-tenths million dollars in new authorization is provided for the package entitled, "Continental Air and Missile Defense Forces." Continental Air and Missile Defense Forces are those elements and units involved in defense for the contiguous 48 States. The $8.9 million of authorization is for continuing a program of improvements to the existing Nike-Hercules air defense system and to provide greater tactical effectiveness. Major projects are for installation of improvement kits and high power acquisition radar at additional sites and for collocation of certain of the regional headquarters of the Army Air Defense Command with corresponding regional headquarters elements of the Continental Air Defense Command.

Approximately $30 million is provided for a second package entitled, "General Purpose Forces," which are those combat units and their direct combat support elements either deployed overseas or stationed in the United States, that have the capability to participate in combat operations ranging from a general worldwide nuclear war to a small, limited locale, conventional weapons action. This grouping includes the Army's combat readiness forces, and the authorizations which are provided in the bill are for facilities for housing, training, and logistic support of these operational units. Major items are for Army airfield runways, maintenance hangars and parking aprons at Forts Bragg, Lewis, and Riley; unit facilities and improvement posture in Korea and Okinawa; improved storage for the ammunition requirements of our combat forces in Europe; and surface-to-surface unit missile facilities in Germany.

For research and development, the third package, the bill contains over $10 million. Among the larger projects are $1.5 million for a nuclear effects laboratory at White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex., and a $4.6 million facility also at White Sands, to test an advanced concept in more rugged radars. This latter project is associated with the Nike-Zeus research and development program.

The fourth and final package in which the Army has requirements is entitled, "General Support," which is the broad base for training, supply, maintenance, medical services, headquarters, communication networks and Army Security Agency requirements. Since many bases and facilities necessarily have highly diversified support capabilities this package covers requirements at the greatest number of stations, and thus there is in this category, $101 million in new authorization. Some of the larger items included in this category are a special warfare center headquarters and school buildings at Fort Bragg, N.C., a 285-bed hospital at Fort Hood, Tex., and a 50-bed hospital at White Sands; a $3 million central powerplant and transmission system at an oversea security and communications station, $3.7 million for completion of the European Tropospheric Scatter Communication System, the first increment of which was authorized in last year's program, and a limited increment of troop housing ancillary structures at our long-range permanent training stations of the Army. This last item is part of a phased program started by the Army in 1954 for replacement of aging World War II wood frame buildings which have served their best years and today are wasteful of maintenance funds and man-hours. Within the bill are items for the replacement of troop housing at Fort Dix, N.J., and Fort Leonard Wood, Mo. Also included are projects for bachelor officers quarters at a number of stations where the deficiency is acute.

I assure you these are all valid requirements which represent the minimum essential facilities necessary to provide a proper working and living environment and a high combat capability for our Army forces. Although I have not dwelt on programs of the Navy and Air Force, these programs also have been reviewed thoroughly and in detail and have a similar degree of urgency. I wish to emphasize that in my opinion, the committee has developed a soundly conceived bill. I recommend you approve it in its entirety.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the chairman of the Armed Services Committee on the splendid explanation he has given of this bill. This is, of course, only in keeping with his usual high standards.

This bill has my wholehearted support and I want only to amplify slightly comments regarding the troop housing facilities contained in title I. I am sure that you are all aware of the serious problems that have been confronting the Army and to a lesser extent, perhaps, the other services in seeking to provide adequate housing for our troops. This country is now maintaining the largest peacetime Army in its history and in the light of international tensions any significant reduction in its force appears most improbable within the foreseeable future.

About one-half of the Army troops stationed in the United States are presently living in mobilization-type structures, hastily erected during World War II. I am sure many of you recall the kinds of material and workmanship which went into these buildings; they were designed against a requirement estimated at 5 years' use. And, indeed, many have deteriorated and been demolished since 1945. But the buildup forces which occurred during the Korean war and which have been maintained since, have caused many of these buildings to be retained in use. In efforts to provide barracks of minimum acceptable standards, the Army has rehabilitated or improved many of these structures at major installations—but only so much can be done with these old wood-frame buildings. Maintenance and repair costs continue to be high while deterioration continues at an accelerated rate.

As a result of complaints alleging serious inadequacies in troop housing facilities at Fort Dix, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, last year appointed a subcommittee of which I was chairman to investigate this situation. Following its investigation, the subcommittee recommended that the Army include in its fiscal year 1963 authorization request, provisions for the construction of at least 8 new 326-man barracks. I am happy to report that title I of this bill contains such a request but I wish to stress that this situation is not confined to Fort Dix, nor is it a problem that can be overcome in 1 year, or even 2 or 3 years. To properly accommodate the long-range assigned strength of enlisted personnel of Fort Dix in permanent barracks will require construction of 19,347 barracks spaces. Similar large deficits exist at other of our training installations, those to which our young men are brought for their initial period of orientation and training upon enlistment or induction into the Army.

Nor is the situation confined to training centers; there are also significant shortages at the installations which house our tactical divisions. In brief, the Army is faced with the problem of replacing approximately 200,000 of these inadequate barracks spaces in the near future. Such a program, totaling many millions of dollars obviously must be undertaken on a phased basis—not only because of the total sum involved, but because the construction must be phased in such a manner at each installation that the troops assigned there will not be without housing during the construction period.

This bill provides for a total of 7,279 permanent barracks spaces, a larger number than has appeared in an annual program in recent years. This indicates the increased emphasis very properly being given by the Army to the vital matter of providing a living and working environment which will induce highly qualified and skilled personnel to continue their service careers. Such a reduction of personnel turnover contributes materially to the reduction of costs, increased operating efficiencies and most importantly, a higher combat capability.

I strongly endorse this accelerated program of replacement of obsolescent barracks and trust that the Army will continue to program new barracks in future years at a rate which will rid our installations of these old mobilization barracks within a reasonable period.

I wish to lend my assurances that this entire military construction authorization bill has received a most careful scrutiny by the Armed Services Committee and that it represents a minimum essential program in support of our Defense Establishment.

I strongly endorse its approval.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly in support of the military construction authorization bill as proposed in H.R. 11131. It is my sincere belief that our committee, with the wise counsel and able leadership of our chairman, has produced a sound, well-balanced although tight program for each of our military services.

I should like to address my remarks particularly to the program for the Navy contained in title II. This program totals $227,192,000 of new authorization, representing 15 percent of the total bill. This sum will insure that the supporting shore establishment of the Navy retain its capability to back up our fleet and Marine forces. As you well know, our Navy has for a number of years been engaged in a vigorous fleet modernization program. In addition, rapidly changing operational concepts and increasingly complicated new ships, aircraft, and weapons systems have been developed and introduced into the operating forces. The Navy's shore establishment must keep pace if our mobile, combat ready naval forces are to have the vitally needed logistic support.

Each individual line item in the Navy's program supports one or more of the military objectives required to achieve our ultimate purpose of control of the seas sufficient to meet any challenge from any foe. The program in total provides for the most urgent requirements in shipyards, air stations, marine bases, naval bases, training centers, and in the field of research and development. Of particularly vital concern to us all is the support provided for our Polaris forces. For the past several years I have followed with special interest the evolution of this new weapons system. The mating of the Polaris missile with the nuclear powered submarine has produced a most powerful deterrent force against an unwise or unscrupulous foe.

Less than $21 million is included in title II for facilities to support this new and revolutionary missile system, upon which the defense of our Nation so heavily depends. This small amount belies the importance of our Polaris forces. It does, however, speak well for the adaptability of the Navy's existing facilities which continue, in large measure, to support this vital arm of the fleet.

An item added to the bill by the committee authorizes the sum of $1,275,000 to add to the submarine base at the naval shipyard in Philadelphia the capabilities of maintenance and overhaul facilities for our nuclear submarine fleet. The number of nuclear submarines is increasing rapidly, while on the other hand conventional submarines are rapidly being phased out. It takes 3 to 4 years to provide a conventional naval shipyard with the capability for overhauling nuclear submarines, considering the requirements for new public works, procurement and installation of modern equipment, and the training of the personnel. Consequently the committee believed it necessary to add this project to the Navy program at this time.

From the standpoint of my State of Pennsylvania the following eight projects are included in the bill at a cost of $2,904,000:

State	Department or component	Name of installation	Type of construction	Cost	State total
Pennsylvania					$4,292,000
	Army	Carlisle Barracks	I, M (36 units)	$490,000	
	Navy	Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville	H	585,000	
		Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg	M (45 units)		
		Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia	G	482,000	
		Navy Regional Accounts Office, Philadelphia	G	250,000	
		Naval Hospital, Philadelphia	J	190,000	
		Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia	C	1,275,000	
		Military Industrial Supply Agency, Philadelphia	G	1,020,000	

In connection with military Reserve units in Pennsylvania, the bill authorizes the following projects:

First. A 1,000-man Army Reserve center in Philadelphia, to be used jointly by Army and Navy units, $767,000.

Second. Armed Forces Reserve Training Center, Philadelphia, Pa., $604,000.

Third. Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Philadelphia, Pa., $385,000.

Fourth. Maintenance dock for medium aircraft, Willow Grove Naval Air Station, near Philadelphia, Pa., $350,000.

Fifth. National Guard Armory, Phoenixville, Pa., $222,000.

Sixth. National Guard Armory, Chambersburg, Pa., $192,000.

These six projects total $2,520,000.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks have been brief. I commend most sincerely the military construction program now before you for consideration. It has been soundly conceived, well balanced, and, I can assure you, represents the minimum support necessary for our Armed Forces.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make inquiry of the committee as to a matter in which I have been very much interested over the years, that is, What has happened to the $5 million that was in the President's budget for the purchase by the Navy of 20 Grosvenor Square?

Mr. VINSON. I am happy to advise the gentleman from Ohio that that was one of the items that was very carefully considered, and we struck it out.

Mr. BOW. I hope it is permanent, Mr. Chairman.

For the sake of the record, if the committee will permit me to review that item, back in the 83d Congress I had the privilege of being the chairman of a small subcommittee of which our former distinguished colleague from Georgia, the late Mr. Preston, and Mr. Coons, of Oregon, were members. We were in London, and they were wanting a new chancellery there. We worked out an understanding with them that they would sell all the property on Grosvenor Square except where they built the new chancellery, and the proceeds of the sale would be paid into the Treasury of the United States, which would have been more money than was to be spent for the new chancellery. Everything went along in good shape until the Navy decided they wanted to stay at 20 Grosvenor Square, instead of keeping their agreement with the committee and with this House. When we returned and put the bill through to build the new chancellery we promised the House that 20 Grosvenor Square would be sold and the money go into the Treasury. It was held up in the last administration by the Navy and they have tried to hold it up now. In order to keep faith with the House and to keep the word of my subcommittee that made the promise at that time, this property should be sold and the $5 million should go into the Treasury. There is no need for this building at 20 Grosvenor Square for the Navy. There are some plush apartments in it. They used to have a supermarket there. That has been moved, I am told. But the Navy can find other space just as good and not as valuable or expensive to the taxpayer. We can ask the Department of State to keep faith with us, and sell this property and put the money in the Treasury. We can keep faith with what we promised the

House. The Armed Services Committee and its distinguished chairman should be congratulated for the action they have taken.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] as he may desire.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I am gratified that the House Armed Services Committee has provided facilities to give the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash., a capability for overhauling conventional and nuclear submarines.

I have long expressed the view that our fleet on the west coast should be dispersed and naval units based at different geographical locations. In particular I have favored basing of these naval units in the Puget Sound area.

The Chief of Naval Operations has always pointed out that this dispersal, or deployment, as he called it, is only possible where facilities are available. Of course the newly authorized repair facilities for submarines will constitute a step toward the basing of submarines at some future date, so I hope, Mr. Chairman, the facilities authorized in this bill are a step toward eventual basing of the submarines at Bremerton.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, my visit to Okinawa this year revealed many serious problems, but one of particular concern to me was that of public health. I would like to take this opportunity to urge that sufficient funds be made available to the Administrator, whoever he ultimately may be, so that he may cope with problems in this general area. Among other things, I believe a sewage treatment plant is sorely needed, and the matter of improving an inadequate water supply must be given careful attention.

It was also clear to me that notwithstanding the administrative arrangements which are presently being reviewed, the general operating budget of the island's civilian administration should be substantially increased. I understand that the high commissioner and the task force have asked that the present budget limitation be repealed and the annual Federal allowance increased. I urge early action on this matter which is so crucial to our smooth operation of a most critical and important forward base.

Finally, I would like to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee on his typically thoughtful and conscientious job in preparing and presenting this very important legislation.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, it is desired to clarify the bed requirements for the proposed Long Beach Naval Hospital, joint service facility, as follows:

First. Navy and Marine Corps—active duty: 36,000, beds 310; BuM&S records show 94 per 10,000 servicemen are hospitalized daily. Thus of 36,000 servicemen, 338 will be hospitalized daily. This figure is reduced to 310 to account for an average of 28 men estimated to be on leave from the hospital during final recovery stages.

Second. Air Force—active duty: 5,900, beds 50; DOD has directed Navy to provide 50 beds in this hospital for March Air Force Base patients in need of specialized care for orthopedics, urology, and major surgery. This is to obviate necessity to provide such facilities and staffing at March Air Force Base itself.

Third. Army—active duty: 3,380, beds 50; an obsolete 85-bed Army station hospital at Fort MacArthur can be disestablished on the availability of these 50 beds, effecting a net saving to the Government.

Fourth. Gross capacity required to maintain average daily patient load of 410, 90; U.S. hospital standards indicate a gross capacity in excess of 500 beds is required in order to maintain the average daily patient load of 410 which this hospital must support. Such service as may be rendered to dependents of the three service branches will come out of this necessary difference between average daily patient load and gross number of beds required to meet it.

Total active duty, 45,280; total beds, 500.

At the present time, the Navy operates 300 beds in this area aboard the hospital ship *Haven* at an exorbitant expense. The hospital will replace these 300 beds, replace the 50 Fort MacArthur beds, provide the 50 beds which must be provided someplace for March Air Force Base and the figure of 500 beds gross is the minimum size of this hospital if it is to maintain its required average daily patient load of 410 patients.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, there being no further requests for time, I ask the Clerk to read the bill:

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Continental Army Command

(First Army)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Supply facilities and troop housing, $1,619,000.

Fort Dix, New Jersey: Operational and training facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $11,095,000.

(Second Army)

Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Community facilities, $490,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and community facilities, $5,240,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Maintenance facilities and troop housing, $1,473,000.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Medical facilities, troop housing and community facilities, $2,032,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, $3,764,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities and utilities, $4,343,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Supply facilities and utilities, $1,989,000.

Fort McClellan, Alabama: Training facilities and troop housing, $1,352,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, $3,772,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Ground improvements, $231,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities and troop housing, $2,503,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and ground improvements, $7,657,000.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas: Utilities, $426,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities and troop housing, $6,847,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Troop housing, $1,260,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Utilities, $103,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Operational facilities, $444,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $8,567,000.

(Sixth Army)

Hunter-Liggett Military Reservation, California: Troop housing, $159,000.

Fort Irwin, California: Community facilities and utilities, $653,000.

Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $4,627,000.

Fort Ord, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, utilities and ground improvements. $3,108,000.

Technical services facilities

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $920,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Hospital and medical facilities, and utilities, $1,109,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $2,000,000.

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, $318,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Administrative facilities, $272,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Research, development and test facilities, and hospital and medical facilities, $7,934,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Fort Lee, Virginia: Community facilities and utilities, $199,000.

Utah General Depot, Utah: Maintenance facilities, $145,000.

(Signal Corps)

Army Radio Receiving Station, La Plata, Maryland: Utilities, $175,000.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Research, development and test facilities, $452,000.

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey: Troop housing facilities, $920,000.

West Coast Relay Transmitter Station, California: Troop housing, $203,000.

(Medical Service)

William Beaumont General Hospital, Texas: Troop housing, $202,000.

Brooke Army Medical Center, Texas: Hospital and medical facilities, $834,000.

Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado: Hospital and medical facilities and troop housing, $1,177,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Medical facilities and troop housing, $653,000.

United States Military Academy

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Maintenance facilities and community facilities, $657,000.

Defense Atomic Support Agency

Various locations: Utilities, $193,000.

Defense Intelligence Agency

Metropolitan Washington, D.C., area: Administrative facilities and utilities, $2,800,000.

Defense Supply Agency

Cameron Station, Alexandria, Virginia: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $3,700,000.

Columbus General Depot, Columbus, Ohio: Administrative facilities and utilities, $3,346,000.

National Security Agency

Fort Meade, Maryland: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $12,870,000.

Army Component Commands

(United States Army Air Defense Command)

Various locations: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and utilities, $8,891,000.

(Alaska Command Area)

Wildwood Station, Alaska: Utilities, $55,000.

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Operational facilities, $289,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Fort DeRussy, Hawaii: Community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $4,251,000.

Various locations, Hawaii: Operational facilities and utilities, $270,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Operational facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and utilities, $4,684,000.

Army component commands

(Pacific Command Area)

Korea: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements, $11,932,000.

Fort Buckner, Okinawa: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities and utilities, $2,775,000.

Various locations: Troop housing and utilities, $558,000.

(European Command Area)

France: Operational facilities, supply facilities and utilities, $4,655,000.

Germany: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities and ground improvements, $1,176,000.

Classified locations: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and utilities, $3,705,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Allen, Puerto Rico: Medical facilities and troop housing, $171,000.

Fort Clayton, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, $411,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $18,697,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1963, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 85-685, as amended, is amended under heading "Inside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "technical services facilities (Corps of Engineers)" with respect to Army Map Service, Maryland, strike out "$1,913,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,200,000".

(b) Public Law 85-685, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502, "$110,797,000" and "$310,707,000" and inserting in place thereof "$111,084,000" and "$310,994,000", respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 86-500, as amended, is amended under heading "Inside the United States" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "technical services facilities (Chemical Corps)", with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out "$87,000" and insert in place thereof "$123,000".

(2) Under the subheading "technical services facilities (Quartermaster Corps)", with respect to Sharpe General Depot, California, strike out "$218,000" and insert in place thereof "$248,000".

(b) Public Law 86-500, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502, "$79,275,000" and "$146,205,000" and inserting in place thereof "$79,341,000" and "$146,271,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Shipyard facilities

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Troop housing, $80,000.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $651,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, and utilities, $499,000.

Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, California: Maintenance facilities, $702,000.

Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,139,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $2,618,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $2,304,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $462,000.

Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $1,275,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $899,000.

Naval Repair Facility, San Diego, California: Maintenance facilities, $477,000.

Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory, San Francisco, California: Research, development and test facilities, $2,534,000.

Fleet base facilities

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $4,320,000.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Troop housing, $563,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida: Troop housing, $765,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, and real estate, $3,333,000.

Naval weapons facilities

(Naval Air Training Stations)

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Maintenance facilities, $70,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee: Training facilities, $1,975,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi: Community facilities, $274,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Administrative facilities, $130,000.

(Field Support Stations)

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Troop housing, $1,999,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Operational facilities, $667,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Utilities, $490,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Administrative facilities, $130,000.

Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Troop housing, $2,516,000.

Naval Station, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $91,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Community facilities, $1,021,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $261,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California: Operational and training facilities, $1,112,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $262,000.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Administrative facilities, $132,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Troop housing and community facilities, $1,898,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,180,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $562,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Training facilities, $243,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational facilities, and utilities, $2,013,000.

(Fleet Readiness Stations)

Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California: Community facilities, $189,000.

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $537,000.

(Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Stations)

Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Virginia: Research, development and test facilities, $2,042,000.

Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania: Troop housing, $585,000.

Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $482,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and research development and test facilities, $3,647,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, $3,280,000.

Supply facilities

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $218,000.

Naval Regional Accounts Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $250,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,874,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing, $5,027,000.

Naval Weapons Plant, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, $128,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training facilities, $1,592,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia: Training facilities, and troop housing, $1,773,000.

Officer Candidate School, Newport, Rhode Island: Troop housing, $2,772,000.

Fleet Antisubmarine Warfare School, San Diego, California: Training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,537,000.

Medical Facilities

Naval Hospital, Long Beach, California: Hospital and medical facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $9,196,000.

Naval Aviation Medical Center, Pensacola, Florida: Training facilities, and research, development and test facilities, $5,200,000.

Naval Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Utilities, $190,000.

Communication Facilities

Naval Radio Station, Kodiak, Alaska: Utilities, $117,000.

Office of naval research facilities

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Research, development and test facilities, $5,582,000.

Naval Training Device Center, Port Washington, Long Island, New York: Research, development and test facilities, $265,000.

Yards and docks facilities

Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, and utilities, $572,000.

Defense atomic support agency

Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, $968,000.

Defense supply agency

Military Industrial Supply Agency, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $1,020,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Naval weapons facilities

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam: Real estate, $133,000.

Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland, Canada: Operational facilities, $71,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Futema, Okinawa: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $1,976,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Iwakuni, Japan: Troop housing, $679,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Operational facilities, $495,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Maintenance facilities, $57,000.

Naval Station, Rota, Spain: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and troop housing, $4,044,000.

Fleet Activities, Okinawa: Utilities, $144,000.

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $935,000.

Marine Corps facilities

Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $7,679,000.

Medical facilities

Naval Hospital, Yokosuka, Japan: Hospital facilities, $118,000.

Communication facilities

Naval Communication Station, Asmara, Eritrea: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $4,346,000.

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam: Utilities, $166,000.

Yards and docks facilities

Public Works Center, Guam: Utilities, $5,688,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, resettlement, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $96,908,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop naval installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1963, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended in section 201 under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)", with respect to the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey, by striking out "$17,911,000" and inserting in place thereof "$18,263,000".

(b) Public Law 161, Eighty-fourth Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502, the amounts "$309,134,600" and "$579,301,300" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$309,486,600" and "$579,653,300".

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 86–500, as amended, is amended in section 201 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, by striking out "$6,000,000", and inserting in place thereof "$8,605,000".

(b) Public Law 86–500, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502, the amounts "$87,075,000" and "$130,666,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$89,680,000" and "$133,271,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 87–57 is amended in section 201 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, by striking out "$9,687,000", and inserting in place thereof "$12,006,000".

(b) Public Law 87–57 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602, the amounts "$79,239,000" and "$138,344,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$81,558,000" and "$140,663,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Air Defense Command

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minnesota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and real estate, $2,812,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,310,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $352,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, $1,477,000.

Kincheloe Air Force Base Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Training facilities, and troop housing, $648,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $464,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,745,000.

Paine Field, Everett, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and real estate, $2,698,000.

Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Kansas City, Missouri: Medical facilities, $158,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Operational facilities and real estate, $179,000.

Spokane International Airport, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities, $80,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Operational facilities, medical facilities, and real estate, $867,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $241,000.

Air Force Logistics Command

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities, $206,000.

Health Maintenance Annex, Newark, Ohio: Maintenance facilities, $1,676,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $5,116,000.

Hill Air Force Range, Lakeside, Utah: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $7,581,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, $2,976,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $389,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $6,700,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $15,305,000.

Air Force Systems Command

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, $2,462,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities, $2,934,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Research, development, and test facilities, $282,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, $619,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, utilities, and real estate, $1,540,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Hospital facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,335,000.

Sacramento Peak Upper Air Research Site, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, $45,000.

Various locations, Atlantic Missile Range: Research, development, and test facilities, and administrative facilities, $7,934,000.

Air Training Command

Amarillo Air Force Base, Amarillo, Texas: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $351,000.

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,731,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $297,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Utilities, $129,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, $1,288,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, troop housing, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $5,088,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational facilities, $123,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $2,566,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, $37,000.

Air University

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Utilities, $245,000.

Alaskan Air Command

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Operational facilities, $809,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $2,939,000.

Galena Airport, Galena, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $135,000.

King Salmon Airport, Naknek, Alaska: Operational facilities, $494,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and community facilities, $1,607,000.

Headquarters Command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,270,000.

Military Air Transport Service

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, $269,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational facilities, and medical facilities, $730,000.

Strategic Air Command

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, $120,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Community facilities, $350,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational facilities, and medical facilities, $694,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, $210,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Community facilities, $230,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Maintenance facilities, $229,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $170,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, $71,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $473,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Operational facilities, $6,027,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $416,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $120,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Training facilities, $276,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $160,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $415,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $614,000.

Loving Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $255,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, $96,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Maintenance facilities, $380,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $8,350,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $449,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Maintenance facilities, $60,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, $394,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $276,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and medical facilities, $601,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $502,000.

Tactical Air Command

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Operational facilities, $300,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, $140,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $392,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Operational facilities, and hospital facilities, $3,157,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $401,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, $3,136,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $4,753,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tennessee: Operational facilities, $418,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $655,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $733,000.

Special Facilities

Various locations: Operational facilities, $3,176,000.

Defense Communications Agency

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, $1,446,000.

Defense Supply Agency

Gentile Air Force Station, Dayton, Ohio: Administrative facilities, $1,296,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Caribbean Air Command

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operation facilities, $1,747,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Various locations: Operational facilities, $112,000.

Pacific Air Force

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $11,116,000.

Strategic Air Command

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, $50,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, $221,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,921,000.

United States Air Force Security Service

Various locations: Operational facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $8,386,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $2,642,000.

Special Facilities

Various locations: Operational facilities, $2,314,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $567,165,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1963, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

Sec. 304. (a) Public Law 86–500, as amended, is amended in section 301 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "HEADQUARTERS COMMAND", with respect to Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland, by striking out "$3,109,000" and inserting in place thereof "$3,294,000".

(b) Public Law 86–500, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts of "$206,035,000" and "$728,605,000" and inserting in place thereof "$206,220,000" and "$728,790,000", respectively.

TITLE IV—MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

Sec. 401. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units, in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. The authority to construct housing under this title shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

(1) For Department of the Army: Inside the United States and Caribbean, 3,952 units, $72,159,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, 150 units.

Fort McClellan, Alabama, 19 units.

Petroleum distribution pipeline, Alaska, 19 units.

Fort Richardson, Alaska, 100 units.

Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, 33 units.

Sharpe General Depot, California, 40 units.

Fitzsimons General Hospital, Colorado, 100 units.

Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colorado, 18 units.

Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colorado, 44 units.

Fort Stewart, Georgia, 132 units.

United States Army, Hawaii, 500 units.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, 100 units.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 100 units.

Fort Riley, Kansas, 300 units.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland, 179 units.

Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, 40 units.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, 280 units.

Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, 36 units.

Charleston Transportation Depot, South Carolina, 10 units.

Fort Sam Houston, Texas, 204 units.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, 67 units.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 200 units.

Fort Lee, Virginia, 100 units.

Fort Myer, Virginia, 525 units.

Pacific Side, Canal Zone, 500 units.

Quarry Heights, Canal Zone, 20 units.

Fort Allen, Puerto Rico, 53 units.

Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico, 83 units.

Outside the United States and Caribbean, 364 units, $6,485,000.

Army Security Agency, location 04, 60 units, $900,000.

Army Security Agency, location 12, 157 units, $2,723,000.

Fort Buckner, Okinawa, 147 units, $2,862,000.

(2) Department of the Navy: Inside the United States and Caribbean, 4,426 units, $83,580,000.

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, 250 units.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, 500 units.

Naval Radio Station, Dixon, California, 7 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, 400 units.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California, 500 units.

Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, California, 400 units.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, 400 units.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, 200 units.

Naval Station, San Diego, California, 500 units.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, 200 units.

Naval Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida, 40 units.

Naval Air Station, Sanford, Florida, 10 units.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, 325 units.

Naval Research Laboratory, Chesapeake Bay Annex, Maryland, 6 units.

Naval Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, 150 units.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, New Jersey, 48 units.

Naval Air Station, New York, New York, 8 units.

Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, 45 units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas, 9 units.

Naval Supply Center, Cheatham Annex, Virginia, 50 units.

Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia, 15 units.

Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia, 125 units.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, 25 units.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia, 100 units.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, 9 units.

Naval Radio Station, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico, 104 units.

Outside the United States and Caribbean, 208 units, $7,330,000.

Naval Station, Argentina, Canada, 200 units, $7,000,000.

United Nations Command, Korea, 8 units, $330,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force: Inside the United States, 6,773 units, $126,017,000.

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, 160 units.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, 290 units.

Mather Air Force Base, California, 200 units.

Norton Air Force Base, California, 14 units.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, 200 units.

Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 200 units.

Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, 300 units.

Bellows Air Force Base, Hawaii, 8 units.

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, 190 units.

Dow Air Force Base, Maine, 200 units.

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, 500 units.

K. I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, 400 units.

Kincheloe Air Force Base, Michigan, 400 units.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, 300 units.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Montana, 200 units.

Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, 135 units.

Hancock Field, New York, 100 units.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, New York, 100 units.

Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, 300 units.

Grand Forks Air Base, North Dakota, 300 units.

Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, 430 units.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Oklahoma, 100 units.

Kingsley Field, Oregon, 200 units.

Hill Air Force Base, Utah, 200 units.

Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, 300 units.

Paine Field, Washington, 100 units.

Various locations: 946 relocatable units.

Outside the United States, 780 units, $15,880,000.

Kadena Air Base, Okinawa, 500 units, $9,900,000.

Peshawar Air Station, Pakistan, 200 units, $4,540,000.

Wakkanai Air Station, Japan, 80 units, $1,440,000.

Sec. 402. (a) The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions not otherwise authorized by law of family housing units at various locations under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense which, on the effective date of this Act, have not been designated as public quarters. Units so improved shall be designated public quarters.

(b) No family housing unit may be improved at a total cost of more than 50 per centum of the maximum cost of construction prescribed by this Act for an equivalent unit of new family housing.

Sec. 403. (a) Sections 4774(f) and 9774(f) of title 10, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(f) If the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines, on the basis of a survey of the family housing needs at any installation where the construction of family housing is authorized, that the construction of four-bedroom units for enlisted men is required, such units may be constructed with a net floor area of one thousand two hundred and fifty square feet or less."

(b) Section 7574(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) If the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines, on the basis of a survey of the family housing needs at any installation where the construction of family housing is authorized, that the construction of four-bedroom units for enlisted men is required, such units may be constructed with a net floor area of one thousand two hundred and fifty square feet or less."

(c) Sections 4774(g) and 9774(g) of title 10, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(g) If the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines, on the basis of a survey of the family housing needs at an installation where the construction of family housing is authorized, that the construction of four-bedroom units for officers holding grades below major is required, such units may be constructed with a net floor area of one thousand four hundred square feet or less."

(d) Section 7574(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) If the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines, on the basis of a survey of the family housing needs at an installation where the construction of family housing is authorized, that the construction of four-bedroom units for officers holding grades below lieutenant commander or equivalent is required, such units may be constructed with a net floor area of one thousand four hundred square feet or less."

Sec. 404. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended (75 Stat. 96, 111), is further amended by deleting the word "tactical" in the third line of the section.

Sec. 405. Authorizations for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject to the following limitations:

(a) the cost per family unit shall not exceed—

$22,000 for generals or equivalent;

$19,800 for colonels or equivalent;

$17,600 for major and/or lieutenant colonel or equivalent;

$15,400 for all other commissioned or warrant officer personnel or equivalent;

$13,200 for enlisted personnel;

except that when such units are constructed outside the Continental United States or in Alaska, the average cost per unit of all such units shall not exceed $32,000, and in no event shall the individual cost exceed $40,000.

The cost limitations provided in this subsection shall be applied to the five-foot line.

(b) no project in excess of fifty units at a specific location, other than those constructed outside the Continental United States or in Alaska, shall be constructed at an average unit cost exceeding $17,500, including the costs of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

Sec. 406. No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1962, for the construction, acquisition, leasing, addition, extension, expansion, alteration, or operation and maintenance of family housing under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date.

TITLE V

General provisions

Sec. 501. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529, 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for military construction projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $128,589,000; outside the United States, $30,067,000; section 102, $18,697,000; section 103, $10,000,000; or a total of $187,353,000;

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $93,690,000; outside the United States, $26,531,000; section 202, $96,908,000; section 203, $10,000,000; or a total of $227,129,000;

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $137,180,000; outside the United States, $31,509,000; section 302, $567,165,000; section 303, $10,000,000; or a total of $745,854,000.

(4) for title IV: For housing units to be constructed under section 401 for Department of the Army, $78,644,000; Department of the Navy, $90,910,000; Department of the Air Force, $141,897,000; or a total of $311,451,000.

Sec. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines in the case of any particular project that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variation in cost arising in connection with that project, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. However, the total costs of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriate for projects in that title.

Sec. 504. Whenever—

(1) The President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) The Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

Sec. 505. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States, and its possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

Sec. 506. As of July 1, 1963, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before June 9, 1960, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1963, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) notwithstanding the provisions of section 606 of the Act of June 27, 1961 (75 Stat. 96, 110), the authorization for—

(a) utilities in the amount of $2,300,000 at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Third Army Area)" of the Act of August 10, 1959 (73 Stat. 302, 303);

(b) maintenance facilities in the amount of $330,000 at the Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (Special Purpose Air Stations)" in the Act of August 10, 1959 (73 Stat. 302, 307); and

(c) maintenance facilities, medical facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements in the amount of $3,957,000 for Naval Radio Research Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, that is contained in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" of the Act of August 10, 1959 (73 Stat. 308).

Sec. 507. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 2677 of title 10, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

(a) The Secretary of a military department may acquire an option on a parcel of real property before or after its acquisition is authorized by law, if he considers it suitable and likely to be needed for a military project of his department.

(b) As consideration for an option acquired under subsection (a), the Secretary may pay, from funds available to his department for real property activities, an amount that is not more than 5 per centum of the appraised fair market value of the property. However, such amount must be credited to the purchase price of the property if the acquisition is completed.

Sec. 508. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project inside the United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $8 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters; unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

Sec. 509. Section 109(a) of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 641), as amended by section 413 of the Act of August 10, 1959 (73 Stat. 322), is further amended by striking the preceding comma and the following: "and four hundred acres for a temporary spoil disposal area for a period of ten years," and by inserting at the end of the said section 109(a), "The Administrator of General Services shall, incident to this sale, reserve (for the benefit of the Chief of Engineers) a spoil disposal easement expiring August 20, 1968, on four hundred acres to be selected by the Administrator."

TITLE VI

Reserve forces facilities

Sec. 601. Section 2233a of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2233a. Limitation

"(1) No expenditure or contribution that is more than $50,000 may be made under section 2233 of this title for any facility until after the expiration of thirty days from the date upon which the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives of the location, nature, and estimated cost of such facility. This requirement does not apply to the following:

"(a) Facilities acquired by lease.

"(b) Facilities acquired, constructed, expanded, rehabilitated, converted, or equipped to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed, where the Senate and the House of Representatives have been notified of that action.

"(2) Under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, any project authorized pursuant to section 2233(a) which does not cost more than $25,000 may be accomplished from appropriations available for maintenance and operations."

Sec. 602. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, $11,000,000; and

(b) Army Reserve, $9,900,000;

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $8,200,000;

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, $12,700,000; and

(b) Air Force Reserve, $4,700,000.

Sec. 603. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Sec. 604. As of July 1, 1963, all authorizations for specific facilities for reserve forces to be accomplished by the Secretary of Defense, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in the Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1960, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization, are repealed, except the authorizations for facilities for the reserve forces as to which appropriated funds have been obligated in whole or in part before July 1, 1963, and authorizations for appropriations therefor.

Mr. VINSON (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 51, after line 17, add the following new section:

"Sec. 605. (a) Public Law 87–57 is amended under the heading 'Army National Guard of the United States (Armory)' in clause (1) of Section 701 with respect to Stockton, California, strike out '$254,000' and insert in place thereof '$350,000'.

"(b) Public Law 87–57 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of Section 704, '$22,682,750' and inserting in place thereof '$22,778,750'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will only take a moment. I read this bill, this $1,500 million bill, quite carefully and I do not find any representation allowances in it anywhere. Can it be possible that the House is authorizing the spending of $1,500 million without any representation allowances or entertainment money in it? This would be most unusual.

Mr. VINSON. I will state to the distinguished gentleman that we do not handle the money. We merely handle the authorization. That question probably should be addressed tomorrow to the distinguished gentleman from Texas who is now presiding.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I am glad to know where I should go to get the information.

Mr. VINSON. I would suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that he hold his question until tomorrow when the distinguished gentleman who is now presiding as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union will present his bill for $40 and some odd billion, and I hope that that little item might be imbedded in that bill somewhere.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Mahon, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11131) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 603) to provide for certain new positions and to increase the compensation of certain employees of the House of Representatives, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby created in the Office of the Speaker the new position of Messenger the basic compensation of which shall be at the rate of $2,100 per annum, and

(b) There is hereby created in the Office of the Parliamentarian the new position of Clerk-Messenger the basic compensation of which shall be at the rate of $3,300 per annum.

Sec. 2. The basic compensation of each of the two positions of Telephone Clerk (one minority) in the Office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $3,000 per annum.

Sec. 3. The additional amounts necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives until otherwise provided by law.

Sec. 4. This resolution shall take effect May 1, 1962.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, in addition to the gentleman from California [Mr. Saund], Chairman, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States interparliamentary group for the meeting to be held in Washington, D.C., from May 14 to May 17, 1962, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Rutherford, of Texas; Mr. Montoya, of New Mexico; Mr. Nix, of Pennsylvania; Mr. McDowell, of Delaware; Mr. Inouye, of Hawaii; Mr. Rivers, of South Carolina; Mr. Chiperfield, of Illinois; Mr. Whalley, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Springer, of Illinois; Mr. Derwinski, of Illinois; Mr. Reifel, of South Dakota.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have permission to sit during general debate in the House on Tuesday and Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

"THE LIBERAL PAPERS"

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Stafford] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, today nine of my colleagues and I will proceed, under special orders, to acquaint the American public with a systematic analysis of the so-called "Liberal Papers." This collection of essays, recently published in paperbacked form by Doubleday Press, is the unquestioned result of a liberal project of Democratic Congressmen formed 3 years ago by a dozen Members with the sympathetic assistance of approximately 23 like-minded individuals.

Now the fruits of their labor are at hand. "The Liberal Papers," edited and with an introduction by Congressman James Roosevelt, were published last month in paperback form by Doubleday, and ever since Democrat Congressmen of the liberal project have been running like rabbits away from this synthesis of their deliberations. Letters to the editor; speeches on the floor of the House; frantic press releases, all these have been flowing in great number to the effect that apparently these appeasement essays somehow just appeared "out of nowhere." The Kennedy administration, we are told, is of course far aloof from such pronouncements as these. At least 10 of the founding dozen of Democrat liberals, we are also told, never were members of the project, knew nothing about "The Liberal Papers" until they were published, and somehow got the notion that their original meeting was just an informal group for social purposes. In order to show graphically to the American people the true facts of the situation, let me just stress a few points:

First. According to Representative Kastenmeier's own statements in announcing the founding of this project:

> Twelve liberal Congressmen and scientists, scholars and writers would meet, exchange letters, study papers, and try to reach some agreement * * * to complete a coherent and comprehensive program for the Nation.

He also declared that the final objective of this project would be publication of "a paperbound book, tentatively entitled 'The Liberal Papers'." This hardly sounds like an informal group. It hardly sounds as though the "Liberal Papers" came along from out of nowhere.

Second. On June 9, 1960, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Johnson] read into the Congressional Record a rough draft of "The Liberal Papers" and identified them as "a working statement" prepared at the request of a group of U.S. Congressmen—the liberal project. Some feel that the act of reading it into the Congressional Record constitutes an official endorsement of its content by Kastenmeier and his colleagues.

Third. The author of the "working statement" is identified in the Record of June 9, 1960, as James P. Warburg. If, indeed, the Democrat Congressmen wish to repudiate any connection with authors of study papers or final drafts of this projects, it is interesting to note that one James P. Warburg was the largest individual contributor to Representative Kastenmeier's 1960 campaign.

Fourth. One Marcus Raskin, one of the consultants for "The Liberal Papers," has turned up at Geneva as an adviser to the U.S. disarmament delegation in its talks with Soviet Russia. Mr. Raskin, who had been on Representative Kastenmeier's staff and about whom "The Liberal Papers" states—"he took a leading role in the development of this project," has an amazing record of illogical statements in the past which infer that the United States could not win a war today and that those who once were willing to give their life for their country would be foolish to offer the same sacrifice under the conditions of a nuclear age. Raskin is on the special staff of the National Security Council—which is inside the administration and inside one of the more vital areas of our defense organization today.

Fifth. Three of five members of the original "liberal project" who were defeated in the wisdom of their electorates during the 1960 campaign are currently in the administration as well. Representative Wolf is with the Agency for International Development, as is Representative Johnson, while a former Member from my own State, Representative Meyer, serves as a consultant to the Department of the Interior.

Sixth. Two authors of study papers, in addition to Mr. Raskin, have had close Government ties as well. Mr. Allen Whiting is on the staff of the Rand Corp., while Prof. Charles Osgood has served in various capacities for the institute working on project Vulcan for the State Department's Disarmament Administration.

There have been reports from reliable sources that he had been under consideration as a consultant for the Arms Control Agency but perhaps the publication of "The Liberal Papers" has changed all that.

Seventh. This participation by leading congressional and administrative figures has now spread as far as the White House. On Sunday, April 8, the New York Times Book Review—which has rarely reviewed paperback publications other than in a special column—reviewed "The Liberal Papers" in a fairly favorable light. The author of the review? None other than Mr. August Hacksher, the cultural coordinator for the White House. There may be muzzling of the military and muzzling of other Government officials, but there surely is a lack of muzzling here—perhaps an indication that the White House is not wholeheartedly in opposition to the proposals made in this publication.

In short, Mr. Speaker, "The Liberal Papers" contain views held by persons to whom an influential segment of the Democratic Party looks for guidance. The views, which will be summarized by several of my colleagues this afternoon, appear most naive and dangerous to our security to most thinking Americans. While many may deny implication, and while Representative Kastenmeier may state as he recently did that "the others are perfectly free to say that they have not been members, although I issued the original membership list in good faith," the facts are now spread on the Record.

As you hear some of the numerous "accommodations" "The Liberal Papers" would demand, such as recognition of Red China; aid to Red China; demilitarization of West Germany; expulsion of West Germany, Italy, and France from NATO; and allowing Russia to "plug in" on our DEW line to warn Reds of surprise attacks by the United States, think of what it would mean to America if those holding these views came even more into power in our administrative or legislative branches of government. I think that when you analyze these "Liberal Papers" you will feel, as do I, that the liberal Democrats who have set up as strawmen the so-called "thunder on the right"—all by private organizations—might first set their own house in order and look to Democrat defeatism on the left which is best typified by the wild extremism shown by the apostles of appeasement and the disciples of defeat found in these extremist papers.

Now, further evidence is available which sets in more accurate perspective the relationship between the authors of "The Liberal Papers" and the Congressmen involved in the liberal project.

For example, we have on the one hand Congressmen denying any association with the authors of accommodation but on the other the fact that Marcus Raskin, staff director of "The Liberal Papers" study, received money from the Government payrolls of eight Democratic Congressmen during 1960 and six during 1961. Official vouchers in the House Disbursing Office indicate that Mr. Raskin was paid as follows during 1960: Representative Coad, $264; Representative Johnson of Colorado, $609; Representative Kasem, $207; Representative Kastenmeier, $4,514; Representative McGinley, $195—not mentioned in New York Times, of May 23, 1960—Representative Roosevelt, $414; Representative Toll, $467—not mentioned in New York Times of May 23, 1960—Representative Wolf, $609.

The same records for 1961 indicate the following payments: Representative Johnson of Colorado, $5, through opening of session; Representative Kasem, $5, through opening of session; Representative Kastenmeier, $1,293; Representative Moorhead, $221; Representative Wolf, $5 through opening of session; Representative Roosevelt, $69.

It would appear to me that the fact that Mr. Raskin was on the payroll of nine different Members of Congress—five still in Congress—would seem to imply a link between the authors of "The Liberal Papers" and some of the participants in the liberal project. In addition, a "Liberal Papers" essayist, Arthur Waskow, was also on the payroll of Representative Kastenmeier for $215 during January 1961, as was Professor Waskow in the amount of $2,052 during all of 1960. A "Barbara Raskin" joined Marcus Raskin on Representative Wolf's payroll for the months of January and February of 1960.

Another instance coming to light involves a mimeographed study on "Deterrence and Reality," by Marcus Raskin and Arthur Waskow, which was mimeographed by the Library of Congress with the notation that "this study originated in a staff report on defense policy to Congressman Robert Kastenmeier, copyright 1961 by Marcus Raskin and Arthur Waskow."

This year Doubleday published a hardcover book called "Limits of Defense," supposedly written by Arthur Waskow and David Reisman. No mention is made of Raskin in the entire book, while a cursory check of the first 50 pages reveals not one difference in the wording or punctuation of even one sentence from the Raskin and Waskow book. I would like to ask: Was the name changed from Raskin to Reisman in view of Mr. Raskin's service on the sensitive National Security Council? Does Mr. Raskin still hold astounding views similar to his view that "Patrick Henry's willingness to purchase liberty with his life no longer applies in an H-bomb age" and "until recently in our national history, Americans believed that when wars were thrust upon us, the United States could win them"? Will the real Marcus Raskin please do us a favor and stand up?

We know of the recent activities of Mr. Waskow, who penned a booklet, "Civil Defense—Both Red and Dead," which was published under the auspices of the peace education service division of the American Friends Service Committee. We would, however, like to tie together the loose ends involving present views and activities of some of the other "Liberal Paper" authors, many of whom now serve in the administration or related agencies and corporations.

In conclusion, I would like to bring out three facts: First, "The Liberal Papers" were written by essayists with a very close connection with the Congressmen of the liberal project. Second, the papers represent a design for defeat to any thinking American. Third, any divorce of these Congressmen from these views is not going to impress the American people in view of the facts brought out today and heretofore.

Now, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in criticizing Professor Riesman's and Dr. Maccoby's essay, "The American Crisis," I risk encouraging what the authors describe as "the characteristic attitude of American scholars and intellectuals toward Congressmen—and toward politicians in general—whom they tend to regard either as cynical opportunists or as stupid windbags." This comment, like many in the Riesman-Maccoby paper, demonstrates their deep-seated contempt for many aspects of American life, for many honorable people on the American scene. Presidents, military leaders, scientists are among the targets of their angry polemic.

I have long respected Dr. Riesman for his scholarship. He is a brilliant social scientist. But I fear that those who joined the Riesman cult after reading "The Lonely Crowd" will be sorely disappointed in "The American Crisis."

This is not to say that I do not agree with some of the things the authors have to say: I subscribe to their major thesis—"the improvement of the American political climate" and certainly I defend their right to advance their formula for the improvement of the fabric of American society so as to permit greater political understanding and participation.

I was vaguely reassured by their statement that "we are, of course, not opposed to rationality," but their treatment demonstrates a disdain for rationality, and an indifference to or an ignorance of the nature of communism's ideology and its clearly stated goals.

Equally disturbing is the authors' lack of real understanding of the high purposes of our own Republic. I am fully aware of the dialog that has occupied many great American minds in recent years with regard to national purpose, but I would hope that I could offer at least a brief restatement of what the vast majority of Americans deem to be the rationale of the United States of America. I hope that the authors will agree with me that the United States is in business as a nation to provide an environment in which men may live in liberty and dignity with an opportunity to pursue their highest spiritual, social, cultural, economic, and political aspirations. I would agree with Doctors Reisman and Maccoby that perhaps our Nation is not fully achieving its purposes, but these, nonetheless, are, I think, the noble goals to which our national existence is directed.

I speak today as one as deeply concerned with the achievement of a rational peace as are the noted authors of "The American Crisis." I speak as one who spent a number of years on the faculty of one of our great American universities. I speak as a cosponsor of the bill to create the Arms Control Agency, enacted by this Congress last year. I speak as one who testified in favor of the bill before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, anticipating the need for greater public understanding of the terrible problems that the prospect of nuclear war creates. But I say to Dr. Reisman and Dr. Maccoby that in order to create the political milieu in which alternatives may be effectively discussed they must first gain the confidence of the American people. This cannot be done by completely ignoring the essential fact of the cold war and of the nuclear age: the dedication of the Communist world to enslave freemen.

On the one hand, the authors, to whom is available the entire history of the Communist movement, insist that the Communist leaders, from Marx and Engels to Khrushchev and Mao, are not to be believed when they proclaim as their goal the total victory of communism; on the other hand, they contend that somehow they are men to be credited with the same standards of decency, integrity, and justice that govern freemen.

They say, "it is wrong to insist that one must choose between slavery or freedom," but they ignore the fact that that is exactly the choice world communism offers.

They say that some Americans put "full blame on the Russians," but they refuse to remember that every tension, every crisis, has come about because of the belligerence of Communist leaders.

I was troubled, too, by the statement that "as the cold war continues, it becomes increasingly difficult for decent Americans, humane enough to prefer peace to an egocentric national honor, to be outspoken and genuinely anti-Communist." I honestly believe that the overwhelming majority of decent and humane Americans are anti-Communist, and will remain so, proudly and confidently, so long as communism remains a threat to the peace, freedom, and justice of the world. They will remain so, in spite of their preference for peace, until it has been demonstrated that the Communist world has given up its imperialistic ambitions.

But, let me return to the authors' main thesis. I find it difficult to understand their political paranoia. Without taking anything away from the British, I think it is no more difficult for a man, fired with honesty and conviction, to discuss alternatives to nuclear war in the United States than it is in the United Kingdom. I do not believe that the American people are less interested, less aware, less intelligent, less objective, or less concerned than are their British cousins. If the words of the left are not heeded, perhaps the fault lies with them. Perhaps the contempt which some spokesmen of the left have for many aspects of American life and for many personalities on the American scene has caused an erosion of public confidence in their pronouncements. Perhaps the failure of the left fully to understand the basic ingredients of the cold war equation has cast doubt on the validity of their conclusions.

The United States has, again and again, demonstrated its disposition to negotiate, its willingness to work toward a program for meaningful arms control. I, for one, hope that these efforts will continue, but I hope, too, that those Americans whose intellectual achievements guarantee their words wide circulation, will take a second look at the history of the last 20 years. It was Bernard Baruch who said:

> Every man has a right to his own opinion, but no man has a right to be wrong in his facts.

As the authors said:

> Human reason, slender threat though it be, is the thread on which our hopes hang.

But let them know that reason, no matter how perfect, applied to faulty facts can but lead to error.

Let us hope that the Democrats who control this administration and this Congress will not be seduced. The road of error is not the road to peace.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I read with much interest, and, I might add, concern, the essay by James Warburg on "A Reexamination of American Foreign Policy," chapter 2 in "The Liberal Papers." For those of you who have swallowed the line that the authors of these essays and their views bear no relation to the sponsoring liberal project Congressmen or to their philosophy, I would like to present this fact:

On page 12294, Congressional Record, volume 106, part 9, a rough deal of "The Liberal Papers" was read into the Record by Representative Johnson, of Colorado, a member of the project. It was identified as "a working statement prepared at the request of a group of

U.S. Congressmen—the liberal project." The author of the "working statement" is identified as one James P. Warburg, long known for his internationalist and world federation views.

The recent attempt to "divorce" the liberal project from the appeasement proposals in its "Liberal Papers" cannot be accomplished that easily. The Democrat "Liberal Papers" are the first documented example of wild extremism to come from either major political party, as Chairman Miller of the Republican National Committee has well expressed it.

Let me first of all summarize some of the recommendations made by Mr. Warburg, who is an author of "The West in Crisis." This is ironical, since the proposals he makes would bring the crisis to a head and ultimately to a disastrous surrender of the principles the free world holds dear. I wonder how many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree with a majority of the following:

First. The alliance with Chiang Kai-shek serves more to provoke than to ward off attack.

Second. From the Western point of view, West Berlin is of no particular value.

Third. A revision of U.S. policy should take place with respect to those nations which are not now members of the U.N.—notably the People's Republic of China, Outer Mongolia, and the presently divided nations of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam.

Fourth. We must expect and accept "the more or less permanent partition of Germany, which implies the recognition of the East German state and acceptance of the status quo in Eastern Europe." This presents an alternative, to forgo Germany's participation in Western Europe's defense.

Fifth. Withdrawal of Soviet coercive power from East Germany and a countervailing withdrawal of Anglo-American-French forces perhaps no farther than to the west bank of the Rhine.

Sixth. The Polish Rapacki plan is advocated for reunifying Germany at the price of its military neutralization.

Seventh. "Obviously the United States cannot, in the present circumstances, withdraw altogether from the Continent. Nor can it, overnight, liquidate its bases. But the United States could, we think, recognize that this is what it eventually wants to do, when and if peace in Europe and elsewhere is assured."

Eighth. Liberalization of our "restrictive trade policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union."

Ninth. "The United States should begin by recognizing Peiping's unquestionably valid claim to the offshore islands—Quemoy and Matsu."

Tenth. "The native population of Taiwan and the Pescadores be permitted to decide by plebiscite whether they wish to become part of mainland China."

Mr. Speaker, we once more have 10 commandments of so-called accommodation penned under the auspices of the apostles of appeasement and the disciples of defeat. I disagree vigorously with each of the 10 points above as well as with many other ideas and suggestions and statements of supposed fact contained in Mr. Warburg's article. In light of this disagreement, I was most interested in the author's conclusion on page 95 that "this document represents a general consensus of those who offer it for the consideration of their colleagues and constituents without binding any individual to every specific recommendation therein contained." This is proof positive that some Congressmen agreed generally in a consensus of views on this paper if not others. The author has ipso facto wrecked the claim of certain Members of this body that the leftwing extremist proposals for appeasing Red China and Communist Russia are the ideas of the essay authors alone.

Mr. Speaker, as long as I am a Member of this body I will oppose the policies advanced by this author and many other authors of essays in "The Liberal Papers" series. I will certainly oppose allowing Europe to be handed over to the enemy on a platter of platitudes. I will resist the efforts to have the United States disarm unilaterally without regard for the cold war which has been thrust upon us. I would resist policies which would allow Communist China to become the masters of Asia by our own inactions. I will vigorously oppose allowing communism to be rewarded by favorable policies of trade and aid. And I would be most interested in hearing at this point from any colleague who would.

It has been said that "he that diggeth a pit shall fall into it." The Democrats who have attacked conservative Republicans and who have tried to draw a link between the Republican Party and some ultraconservative groups are now finding out that guilt by association works both ways. I might add parenthetically that it has not been conservatives who have worked overtime on plans to disarm the United States and then surrender it piecemeal to the Communist conspiracy. I regret sincerely that a project sponsored by Members of the U.S. Congress should culminate in suggestions of this nature in a publication of this type, much as I have to regret spreading upon the RECORD the suggestions of James Warburg in this regard.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL].

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am especially intrigued by the title of Walter Millis' paper. It is called a "Liberal Military Defense Policy."

Frankly, I never considered defense a partisan issue nor one which could be described as liberal or conservative or as anything but American.

Surely, it is not a quality of a military policy to be liberal or anything else except efficient and capable of carrying out the mission for which it is designed.

What is a liberal defense policy supposed to mean? One to which only liberals would be drawn? One which would defend only liberals? A more liberal use of arms? One which would comprise only liberals? Would military commanders have to certify to their belief in specified social philosophies before being given commands? How silly can we get?

The military is a tool of policy. It is a means of achieving and enforcing policy. The political concepts of liberal and conservative or anything else have no place in a discussion of military policy.

Even Mr. Millis admits the pointlessness of discussing a liberal defense policy. He does this, in fact, with the opening sentence of his article, which reads:

> It is difficult to speak in terms of a specifically "liberal" defense policy.

It is not only difficult, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible.

That sentence would have been a good place to end the article but it does not. Instead, Mr. Millis labors through many words to arrive at the conclusion:

> A rational military establishment would not differ very greatly—from what has, in fact, been hammered out through the compromises and controversies of the Eisenhower administration.

By the time he has reached this conclusion, he is no longer talking about a liberal policy anyway but is referring to a "rational" policy. This makes more sense. As a matter of fact, "rational" would have been a good standard for the writers of all these papers.

To be fair, Mr. Millis' paper does not really belong in this curious collection. The wonder is that he wrote it at all or allowed its publication in this form.

This exercise in stating the obvious would have value only if it brought a fresh and enlightening view but it does not do even that. By introducing the thought of a liberal defense policy, the issue is muddied and we really do not know what to conclude from it.

The fact that the attempt is made to label a military policy as liberal—and I stress that it is the sponsors of this project who do so and not Mr. Millis—reveals an alarming fuzziness of thought. It says nothing useful about military policy but it says a great deal about the sponsors themselves.

By ascribing a political attribute to military policy, these self-described liberals seem to be upgrading the role of the military in national policy. I submit that this is a dangerous line.

It is, in fact, a line about which General Eisenhower himself warned in his farewell message to the Nation at the end of his term as President. An extension of this line would lead to the dominance of national policy by the industrial-military complex in this country and the tool would then become the designer; the servant would become the master.

I cannot believe this is what the "Liberal Paper" sponsors of anyone else in the country really want to happen.

Mr. Millis discusses the horrible prospect of a continued, competitive build-up of two colossal time bombs, the Soviets and ourselves, bound, he says, to set each other off sooner or later and destroy mankind in an atomic holocaust. The continuance of a balance of terror is a horrible prospect, Mr. Speaker. The only worse prospect would be the lack of any balance at all.

Mr. Millis presents no alternative, however.

Several times, this year, various groups and individuals called at my office to talk about peace and the "peace race." Like Mr. Millis they feared the present balance of terror and the time-bomb situation. The latest suggestion I heard was that we should take the initiative in disarmament to show the Soviets we really mean no harm. The suggestion was that we abandon one of our overseas military bases, just one, to show the Soviets we can be trusted and that we really mean peace.

Mr. Speaker, this would be the quickest way I know of to encourage aggression. And if this represents so-called liberal thinking on how to use the military, it should be condemned out of hand.

Arms are a symptom and not in themselves a basic cause of tension. Throwing arms away will not remove the causes of tension any more than throwing out the medicine chest will cure disease. And, until the basic causes are removed, it would be folly to proceed in the world without protection.

The basic cause of world tension today is the Communist subjugation of more than a third of mankind. Khrushchev can relieve these tensions by freeing his colonial empire from Soviet domination.

Until he does, the policy of deterrence through strength is our only hope of keeping peace. And this fact makes it not only a hope but a sacred obligation.

We know it works although it has been condemned as "brinkmanship." In 1958, the Communists gave us a 6 months' ultimatum on Berlin. President Eisenhower refused to comply. Toward the end of the 6-month period a reporter asked him at a press conference:

> What will happen next week when the ultimatum expires and the Communists move with force against Berlin?

And the President prevented a war with seven words:

> It would not be a ground war.

The Soviets got the message and the expiration date came and went. There are many other examples.

I have observed that many of the self-described liberals consistently express greater concern over the totalitarianism of the right than they do of the left—communism. The rational man recognizes both as evils and does not seek to draw fine distinctions between Khrushchevs and the Hitlers of this world.

Both kinds have total victory for their goals—goals that many of the self-described liberals refuse to recognize in spite of the constantly repeated statements of the despots themselves. "We will bury you," says Khrushchev, directly and in hundreds of other ways, fortified by the deeds and words of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and all the principal Communist gods. Yet, the fuzzy minded refuse to believe them.

If "The Liberal Papers" purport the objective of the United States, militarily, to be total disarmament at this time I submit that their sponsors and authors are naive and most ignorant of the true nature of communism and its goals in the cold war.

In the context of "The Liberal Papers" it is only fair to ask if the notion of a liberal defense policy suggests more of this attitude and does it suggest further concessions to the Soviets.

Insofar as it may have influence on our present administration, this notion is a dangerous one. It suggests that we maneuver with the Soviets not on the basis of reality but on the basis of the Soviet conception of reality. It is a view that we cannot allow to prevail.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Several times this afternoon a colleague of my congressional delegation from Wisconsin has been mentioned. In the interest of fairplay, I would like to find out whether he was notified that this series of speeches was to be given today on the floor of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am pleased to be able to inform the gentleman that notification of the reservation of time for this emposium was sent in writing to all Members of the House who at any time had been associated in any way with the liberal project, including the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative KASTENMEIER.

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to have that assurance.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, another in the series of "The Liberal Papers" was written by Mr. Arthur Waskow, former assistant to the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman KASTENMEIER, and entitled "The Theory and Practice of Deterrence." While chapter 3 of the collection of essays, dealt with some lucid examinations into the military and defense policies of our Nation, chapter 4 reveals a complete disregard of this Nation's experiences since 1945 and, if its suggestions were followed, would lead us to surrender on the installment plan to a nation and a philosophy which is atheistic by definition and sworn to destroy us and bury us—to hang us from our capitalistic lampposts.

The staff director of these papers was Mr. Marcus Raskin, who now serves on the National Security Council, and more recently at Geneva in the disarmament conferences; also served on the same congressional staff as did Mr. Waskow. I hope that this is not an indication that the ideas and suggestions of these authors also represents the feelings of their former congressional employer, or of the other 11 men who originally founded the liberal project, or of the others in the House who were close to them in political philosophy.

This paper, written by Mr. Waskow, disclaims the defensive theorists of every administration since World War II. It ridicules the idea of civil defense, and once more sets up strawmen and tears them down. This time by claiming that three theories of defense exist—first, counterforce; second, combined deterrence; and, third, a mixture of the first two. Each of these theories is dismissed with a wave of the hand.

In a few hundred ill-chosen words, Mr. Waskow ridicules any notion that there can be an effective deterrent and offers instead only the hope that we can substitute in its place international arrangements for effective arms reductions and control leading to disarmament.

Now everyone in America and in the world is all for arms control, on proper and meaningful terms. But most Americans have been following the recent talks at Geneva, and have pondered the fate of previous pacts with the Soviet Union. Not so this author. He feels that Soviet disarmament proposals have accepted the idea of careful inspection and enforcement. If this were the proper conclusion we would have concluded arms control agreements with the Soviets years ago. But General Eisenhower, who has dealt with the Soviets both as President and as supreme military leader, concludes that the Soviets have no intention of making any agreement of any kind where effective inspection in appropriate areas must be accepted by them as a necessary condition.

The author suggests the creation of a National Peace Agency. We now have an Arms Control Agency, formed after this article was written, but which accomplished little in concrete results, either in atomic test bans or in general arms control, nor will it, until world communism by some magic transforms its goal of world conquest, which, according to its present leader, will happen "when shrimp learn to whistle."

The author also wants the President to sign a treaty for an atomic test ban, stating "that atomic testing is not vital to American military security because it involves only a marginal addition to firepower, and no addition to all to delivery capability."

He conveniently overlooks the fact, that leaders of both parties now are aware that Russia made major strides toward nullifying our nuclear supremacy last fall; and that it is essential for us to resume our own atmospheric testing, if we are not to be caught in a nuclear weapons gap.

He conveniently overlooks the fact that the Soviet Union apparently made important strides in the all-important development of an antimissile missile, with implications that far exceed in vital security any marginal addition to firepower.

Mr. Waskow apparently has gone to some lengths to probe the motives and minds of America's military planners, but he has failed completely to probe the motives and minds of our Soviet counterparts. And here is where he misses the point entirely.

For he assumes that the Communists and the non-Communists think alike; that what is rational to us, is also rational to the Communist leaders. He expects the Communists to react as Judaeo-Christians and to exercise the same judgment, passions, and sensibilities of the Christian world. He expects to bargain on the basis of what is theirs is theirs, and that what is ours is for negotiation.

In effect, he says that what makes sense to us, should also make sense to the Communists; forgetting all the time that from its very inception, communism has had world domination, spelled out as its ultimate goal by every leader since Karl Marx. Its status must be accepted as more than just another political belief, or party.

Thus, while disarmament to us represents a worthy goal of mankind, to the Communist it represents only another means toward their goal of world domination, to be ignored at the first opportunity when it is in their best interest.

Looked at in this light, it becomes obvious that America must not agree to disarmament; without absolute assurance that such disarmament will be accompanied by bilaterally agreed to—and thoroughly enforceable—inspection controls, which cannot be circumvented.

It is much easier to understand the Communists refusal to accept international inspection; when we realize that such inspections would remove the possibility for abruptly breaking the agreement, when the time and circumstances are right—for them.

If Mr. Waskow had explored the Communist mind, if he had delved into the objectives of the Soviet bloc, he would find that his assumptions are based on footings of sand.

The author states:

> An international police force does not have to be all-powerful to be effective; it is the probability of discovery and punishment that restrains criminal action.

Mr. Speaker, American prisons are filled with criminals who, lacking responsibility, were not restrained by the probability of discovery and punishment. Why, then, should we expect dedicated Communists to be restrained?

Were they "restrained" in Hungary by the probability of discovery? Were they "restrained" in Tibet? Were they "restrained" in Korea? Were they "restrained" in Berlin?

If Mr. Waskow would come down from his ivory tower and face the hard reality of Communist goals, he would know that communism will only be restrained by the absolute knowledge that this country possesses the power and the will to meet aggression with force.

Once convinced of our determination, the best we can hope for is that communism will still seek its goal of world domination; but at least it will confine its efforts to economic and political pressures, short of war.

It is our considered and sincere belief that the United States must sustain a credible margin of superiority in military strength. This is far to be preferred over fancies and reveries aimed at launching a phantom world, which is—to all intents and purpose—what these split-level intellectuals propose in their design for defeat.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the premise of chapter 4 is wrong in that the writer assumes that ultimate peace is a true goal of both sides. To us it is. To them it is a device only.

Secondly, this article is one more example of an attempt to imbue our leaders with the disarmament—we have got to have it or we all die agitations—none of us wish agitation for impossible disarmament proposals to weaken our will to resist.

Finally, in deriding deterrents or adequate arms, he reflects the lack of realism based on facts so often exhibited by the social elite and planners.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Iowa [Mr. BROMWELL].

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the implications of Prof. Charles Osgood's paper on "Reciprocal Initiative," one of the more naive approaches to the cold war and our policies to combat it. In effect, Professor Osgood seems to feel that the cold war is the result of a titanic misunderstanding between East and West, and that to relax existing tensions we should and must take unilateral action which would appease the Communist aggressor.

At great length and with great technical sophistication, he has put the old proposition "if you give a little you receive a little," and amplified it to "if you give a lot you may receive a lot."

In my opinion his basic error is in misjudging the motive of the dictators who dominate the Communist world and seek to control us all.

The United States has tried since 1945 to preserve the peace by any and all feasible actions, unilaterial, bilateral and multilateral. Yet the Soviet Union has rejected any of these actions which failed to advance the goals of world communism. How now can Professor Osgood be certain that the unilateral acts he suggests will induce reciprocation by an enemy sworn to destroy us? Even he admits that one side may try to take advantage of the other's unilateral actions, and that this, of course, is the risk we take. It is indeed ironical that the same forces who accused us of bringing the United States to the brink of war by sound defense policies under President Eisenhower would take the risks of disillusion, defeat, and disaster by encouraging us to abandon any semblance of free world supremacy as we know it today.

As Americans we all know that the stated aims of communism are the destruction of capitalism, the subversion of the free societies, and ultimate world domination. Premier Khrushchev has said that he intends to bury us and that our grandchildren will live under communism. Lenin warned that ultimately, one or the other—side—must conquer. We believe that it will be the side with the steadiest nerves, the most flexible strategy, the greatest resources, the most balanced forces, and the will to prevail, not in destruction but in liberation.

This Professor Osgood has denied us by agreeing that a Communist victory would certainly not be so great a disaster as the extinction of human life. This Professor Osgood further denies us by insisting that we would ultimately lose an arms race. This Professor Osgood further questions by reasoning that the totalitarian system seems better able to wage a conflict on these terms than a democratic system.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what is the use of filling our arms with weapons if we let the enemy disarm our brains? The unilateral actions Professor Osgood would have us take would parrot almost exactly the desires of the Soviet Union and, in fact, would reach far beyond their wildest dreams of hoped-for American actions of appeasement. These actions would demoralize and disrupt our system of alliances, destroy our military might, and finally subvert any will remaining among our citizenry to resist the onslaught of atheistic world communism.

The truth of the matter is simply this—Osgood feels that the Soviet Union and world communism are not our enemy. He refuses to accept the goals of communism to be those stated by the leaders of the movement or to raise one finger of defense against them. He feels that, as far as summit conferences and arms control are concerned, our media people jumped on the blame-it-all-on-Khrushchev bandwagon in the face of evidence of a good share of culpability on our own side and at the expense of healthy self-criticism. He admittedly feels that we are treating Khrushchev, Soviet Russia, Red China, world communism, Soviet aggression, and similar factors as a gigantic bogey man. For example, he feels there is probably nothing more Communist about Castro Cuba than there is democratic about Franco Spain.

It is dangerous for the American people and for the free world to feel that such preposterous whitewashing of communism can represent the thoughts and views of a portion of the Democratic membership of the House to say nothing of actual members of this administration, as some of the study paper authors have become. However, Professor Osgood has been a consultant to the Institute for the Defense Analysis when it was doing work for the State Department on arms control studies under Project Vulcan and Marcus Raskin has appeared at Geneva as an adviser to the U.S. disarmament delegation in its talks with Soviet Russia. The use of purveyors of logic such as contained in this paper on American agencies for arms control points the question of whether the Liberal Papers are in operative fact a primer for policy making on the New Frontier.

Let me list for you just what unilateral steps Professor Osgood suggests hypothetically be taken in order to achieve a better understanding with the Soviet Union so that relaxation of tensions might result; asking you to identify or not identify these steps with currently discussed national policy as the facts direct you.

First. Making public all medical information concerning man in space.

Second. Lifting all discriminatory trade and travel restrictions with respect to Communist China.

Third. A unilateral test ban which will be continued indefinitely.

Fourth. Move the seating of Red China in the U.N.

Fifth. Denuclearization of one of our oversea bases in Japan.

Sixth. Inviting the Soviet Union to plug in on our DEW—early warning system—line.

Seventh. Supervision of all launchings of flights into outer space by the U.N.

Eighth. Demilitarization of the islands of Quemoy and Matsu—turning them over to proper authorities on the mainland.

Ninth. Substitution of Communist China for Nationalist China on the U.N. Security Council.

Tenth. Opening of the United States unilaterally to inspection and monitoring by authorized U.N. teams.

Professor Osgood asks if this reads like something out of fantasy and science fiction. In reality, it reads like something out of the hopes and aspirations of the Communist Party and of the Soviet Union's leaders. It is not sense, it is suicide. It is not advantageous, it is appeasement. These 10 commandments by the "12 disciples of defeat" are a sorry chapter on the record of America when compared with a statement like "I have only one life to give for my country." The American people must realize that "The Liberal Papers" threaten to place "Better Red than dead" in the annals of American history with the anemic delicacy which indicates unwillingness to oppose communism and reluctance to stand up for the values and goals of American freedom.

It is the same tired, old, tragically unsuccessful formula of conciliation, appeasement, and defeat.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, previous speakers have discussed some of the designs for disaster which the authors of "The Liberal Papers" have suggested. I want to concentrate my comments on chapter 7—an essay called "Southeast Asia and Japan," written by Vera Micheles Dean. Professor Dean is not currently a member of the administration, and for that I am very thankful. What she advocates in this essay can be put very simply—first, foreign aid to all Communist countries, including Communist China; second, continuation of our present foreign aid to Poland and Yugoslavia; and third, the admission of Communist China in the United Nations. In this regard, I quote the following paragraph from Professor Dean's essay on pages 261 and 262:

> Nor should we refuse aid to Communist countries, if aid is requested. We are already giving aid to Communist countries in Eastern Europe—Poland and Yugoslavia. The eventuality of undiluted Communist regimes is not at present anticipated in southeast Asia. However, the United States might make a powerful impression on countries in this area by declaring that it would be ready to give aid to Communist China, which now relies almost exclusively on financial and technological aid from the Soviet bloc, once Peiping has been admitted to represent China in the United Nations.

If we follow Professor Dean's theory to its logical conclusion, we might as well throw in the sponge and towel and give up now. She not only suggests that we recognize Communist China in the United Nations, but goes considerably further and recommends that we give aid to this country because of the powerful impression we would make. I might say that conspicuous by its absence in Professor Dean's essay is the fact that the United Nations, itself, has labeled Communist China as an aggressor nation, and we know that since the time that label was applied, the Peiping regime has been guilty of further aggression in both Tibet and India. It can scarcely qualify as a peace-loving nation. Also noticeably not mentioned are some of the numerous reports which have been made in the United Nations—the one, for example, of General Hammarskjold, himself, to the 21st session. It has been clearly demonstrated by these reports that millions of people in that country—farmers, educators, ministers, and priests—have been liquidated and that millions more have been forced into slave labor. It has been thoroughly documented that this same Communist regime is the major source of the worldwide narcotics traffic which has had a direct bearing on the increase in crime and juvenile delinquency throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, we should ask ourselves: Is this the kind of tyranny that we should encourage by our foreign aid? Rather than the powerful impression that Professor Dean would have us create, I believe we would be making permanent an oppressive dictatorship which does not purport to be based upon self-determination of the people and which, in fact, has destroyed the last hope of freedom in China. This is exactly what we have already done by more than $2.5 billion of foreign aid to Yugoslavia. Poland is another good example. In neither case have we aided the cause of freedom and self-determination, but rather made permanent Communist regimes.

I will grant that we should try to make a powerful impression, not by conceding defeat but by deciding here and now that we must win the cold war which has been thrust upon us. Both our program of foreign aid and our policy of trade with Communist countries are examples of two powerful weapons in the cold war which to date have been used least effectively.

The American people should be aware of our policy of trade and the application of the Export Control Act under the Kennedy administration. Last year I personally protested the shipment to Yugoslavia of 6,250 tons of scrap iron from my hometown of Saginaw, Mich. I do not criticize the scrap dealers for this, but I do criticize the Commerce Department and the officials who issued the export licenses. I point out also that before World War II, no less a person than Secretary of State Dean Rusk, himself, picketed the loading of scrap iron for Japan in the San Francisco area. Public sentiment has not changed, although apparently Mr. Rusk's views have.

The Department of Commerce has, in my opinion, shown great laxity in permitting the export of both strategic and nonstrategic materials. For example, last year the Commerce Department reissued an export license authorizing shipment of precision ball-bearing manufacturing grinding machines to the Soviet Union, and then had to withdraw it—after the exertion of the strongest possible protest from Congress and the American people. Another bewildering action by the Commerce Department was the announcement by Secretary Hodges on June 22, 1961, reversing the long-standing policy of the Eisenhower administration and stating that henceforth, the Commerce Department would issue export licenses to ship U.S. surplus agricultural commodities to Soviet Russia and the eastern European Communist countries. Under Mr. Hodges' plan, we would have paid export subsidies on food shipped to Communist Russia and her satellites. The House was keenly aware of the popular sentiment against this action of the Kennedy administration and adopted the Latta amendment to the omnibus farm bill, and declared that as a matter of policy Congress opposed this. But even after this declaration of policy, Commerce officials have said they were considering it.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], chairman of the Select Import-Export Committee, summed up the situation very well when he said the following:

> While we are maintaining the peace we may be losing the cold war. As our military posture and that of the Soviet bloc approach a stalemate, the economic phase attains the status of a prime and strategic operation. A strong and affirmative policy on foods and fibers to the [Communist] bloc must encompass a philosophy of peace for food as well as food for peace.

I agree wholeheartedly with this statement. It is time we realize that trade and economic sanctions should be used as a powerful persuader at the bargaining table. Western productivity, technical know-how, and trade can be strong weapons for us to use in the cold war—but only if the administration realizes that the Communist world badly needs our trade and is dependent upon it. I point out also that it is inconsistent for our Government, while striving to impress our citizens with the urgency of the hour, to call for the largest military budget in peacetime history and to call up 100,000 reservists, but at the same time pour in foodstuffs and materials to the Communist countries, and thereby make life easier for the Communist dictators.

This is but one of my complaints with Professor Dean's essay. She feels that Sukarno has a guided democracy in Indonesia. She downgrades the importance of Japan to the free world, hinting that Communism may make great gains there and that Japan might develop close economic ties with Communist

China. While she feels our military assistance program is more of a burden than a boon for underdeveloped countries, she goes all out in her insistence on vast quantities of economic aid for southeast Asia. I think she goes a bit out of her realm to suggest that we protect our allies by long-range missiles rather than a build-up of local forces as in Laos and South Vietnam.

I totally disagree with her conclusion on page 253 that we should prepare them—non-Western areas—as rapidly as possible for effective participation in the world community of the 20th century, irrespective of whether these countries have strong Communist elements or, of their own free choice, political and economic relations with members of the Communist bloc. This statement, along with others in the article, make Professor Dean's essay a suitable companion for the other essays in the liberal project which, if adopted by this administration would cripple the U.S. defensive position with numerous major and unilateral concessions to accommodate Khrushchev and the Kremlin.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, continuing an analysis of "The Liberal Papers," a project initiated by a dozen Members of this body, I would like to give some impressions of the article on "Communist China" as written by Prof. Allen Whiting, who has taught courses in the Far East at several universities. It is by no means an uninteresting article, but I surely wish it had not been written under circumstances which leave Members of this body somewhat suspect of endorsing Professor Whiting's dangerous views on this subject.

First of all, while he admits that there has been some provocation from the Chinese Communists—such as Korea—he obviously feels that much of the warlike cries emanating today from Peiping have been a result of our policies toward them. Why? We were cruel and unsporting to the Red Chinese.

> We prohibited Americans from entering China and took legal action against those who did. We banned the importing of publications from China, except to academic and governmental institutions. We fostered an image of a fragmented China, with 10 million persons in Taiwan administered by Chiang Kai-shek, supposedly united in spirit with their 600 million fellow countrymen on the mainland. Somehow the fragments would unite to overthrow the non-Chinese or Soviet-imposed regime in Peiping.

Well, that is surely a crying shame. Professor Whiting obviously would have us ignore the fact that Chinese Communists are as determined to destroy us as are Russian Communists. According to him we obviously must start free trade and exchange of citizens with Red China. We must tell Chiang Kai-shek that he is through and somehow admit to the Chinese people that their oppressive, oligarchical, tyrannical regime must be recognized and admitted into the United Nations because the world will never be emancipated from them. We must face reality and endorse for all time the right of the Chinese Government to commit wholesale murder and make slaves of their own people, as they intend to do to the whole world. When this has been accomplished, we can pin on our merit badge, pat ourselves on the back for relaxing tensions, and slowly sink into our grave.

The truth of the matter is simply this—Communist China is no less a threat to the free world than the Soviet Union. Russia and China remind one of the two cannibals who caught a plump missionary, with one advocating killing him outright by a blow on the neck and the other favoring breaking his bones gently and leaving him to expire in the nearby river, thoroughly tenderized. After all, there are all kinds of murderers. Some rob grocery stores and knife the proprietors. Others kill a wife or a husband in a jealous rage. Still others become raging maniacs and indiscriminately gun down all those in their path. Yet every victim is still just as dead—regardless of the state of mind of their killer.

Perhaps China and Russia are ultimately destined to fall out with one another. A future struggle may occur between these Communist states, but it is far less likely to occur while both are progressing toward a common goal of global victory differing only in degree and in timing. Many feel that there has been an actual division of roles between Mao and Khrushchev.

Two things are certain. First, the international commitment of communism is to destroy the free world. Second, any desired changes in Red China are not going to be brought about by relaxing pressure upon her or by including her in the company of peace-loving nations.

I shall not spend much further time on the author's view of Chinese history or of American foreign relations in the Far East. Some of his statements, however, are shocking. First, Professor Whiting blames a so-called United States-Japanese hegemony in 1949–50 for a breakdown of Sino-American relations:

> [Since] Peiping's expressed concern * * * was not entirely fantastic, given the rapprochement between Tokyo and Washington already evident in 1949–50. The historic invasion path up the peninsula through Manchuria made such a rapprochement of genuine concern, should it be accompanied by an anti-Communist, MacArthur-Rhee conquest of North Korea.

Second, Whiting states that the October 1950 invasion of South Korea by Mao's armies swarming across the Yalu gave U.S. troops one of the most stunning defeats this Nation has suffered in modern times. Third, Whiting traces the killing of Indian border guards and occupation of portions of the Burmese frontiers and says, in effect, so sorry please—mere accident, when he states that "qualitatively as well as quantitatively, these deserve the classical term of incidents."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that any invasion of the territory of another state and the killing of border guards is more than an incident. Surely we cannot blame the whole matter on the revolt in Tibet, as the author so conveniently does on page 298. I also believe that had we been devoted to a win policy in the Korean war as we should now be devoting our energies, what Whiting calls our most stunning defeat would have been a final and unequivocal victory. As it is, it surely was not a stunning defeat. Finally, I cannot see how Japanese-American friendship in 1949 and 1950 was a legitimate cause for concern in Peiping as compared especially to Sino-Soviet alliances which were more than mere rapproachements.

The thoughts and suggestions of Vera Dean and Allen Whiting on southeast Asia are surprisingly similar. They would each downgrade Japan. Both would defend China in that Peiping appears to have observed strict rules designed to minimize the risks of war with the United States. Both would accuse our policies of friendship for Chiang Kai-shek and protection of the offshore islands for the creation of tensions in the Far East. At the very least Whiting would criticize our moving in the space of 3 years from noninvolvement to open support for one side in the prolonged Chinese civil war.

Actually, we moved too little and too late in the Chinese civil war. We did too little toward positive victory in Korea. While I agree with Professor Whiting's view that we must expect to remain in constant struggle with the People's Republic of China over the destiny of Asia, and, I might add, of the world, I disagree with his means in this struggle. I feel we must use our strength and not lead from weakness. I feel we must go forward and not backward. And I finally feel that we must realize the true nature of world communism whether it be in Peiping or in Moscow and not help it attain its ultimate ends by recognizing Red China, by admitting Red China to the U.N., by trading with Red China, or by scrapping our entire SEATO alliance system in an effort to appease a foe sworn to destroy us.

Mr. STAFFORD. I appreciate the contribution made to this discussion by my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may desire to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Vermont for yielding to me. My particular interest is in chapter 10 of "The Liberal Papers," the chapter entitled "Disengagement and NATO."

In 1938 British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain picked up his umbrella, flew to Munich, sold out a helpless Czechoslovakia, and announced that free nations could coexist with Hitler. One year later this dream world collapsed under the boots of the storm troopers. Chamberlain's umbrella became a symbol of the wishful thinking of decent men that aggressive dictatorships negotiate and deal motivated by peaceful intention.

Now, in 1962, we find 12 liberal Democrat Congressmen associating themselves in the liberal project which produces an astonishing and extremist plan for attempting to coexist with world communism by crippling non-Communist defensive positions and by making numerous major consessions to accommodate Mr. Khrushchev.

The names, documents, and slogans are different, but the principle of appeasement is the same. "The Liberal Papers" call it accommodation and make dream world statements based on an imagined wish of communism to end its aggressive economic, political, military, and propagandistic efforts of the cold war.

In a short but dangerous article, Harvard Prof. H. Stuart Hughes has written a summary of an extremist plan for central Europe. It represents the wishful world of persons who evidently believe that Communist behavior is based on Western, not Communist, definitions of morality.

Professor Hughes first criticizes our overall policy which he says is based on assumptions that have long outlived their usefulness "and that have acquired a false air of permanence through the power and prestige of three elderly statesmen—Konrad Adenaur, Charles de Gaulle, and Harold Macmillan." Mr. Speaker, I resent this attack against three great men of our age, and three stanch friends of America. Each of them has made major contributions to the attainment of the goals proclaimed by true liberals everywhere. Ideas advanced by Professor Hughes would divide us from our NATO allies, and would create the very schism which is the fondest Soviet hope. Do the liberal Democrats really want to play the Russian game of divide and conquer so as to enable communism to rule the world?

This author, who currently is a candidate for election to the U.S. Senate from Massachusetts, presents as his main goal to keep Europe out of the nuclear race by progressively enlarging a central European area of military disengagement. In this way we could, according to Hughes, decrease cold war tensions by drastically reducing the military emphasis of our policy, by curtailing the nuclear aspirations of our allies, and by encouraging the creation of disengagement in central Europe.

History is full of the blood of citizens of disengaged zones like Danzig and the Saar, set up by those who no longer cared for them. Political freedoms lost were regained only after new outbreaks of warfare. And history is full of tragic examples of the folly of reducing military emphasis and discouraging allies in the fond hope that relaxations of tension would result. But Professor Hughes is eager to take that chance on the strength that if we take the initiative in such proposals, then there would be a good chance that the Soviet Union would respond in similar fashion by recognizing that disengagement and a nuclear true are in its interests also. He avoids any mention of the Soviet response which closely followed the American initiative toward disengagement and relaxation of tensions in Korea in 1950.

Where does the author get his faith in Soviet intentions of the future, in view of evidence which shows the opposite trend? Why does he suppose that if the United States would close down NATO missile bases right now the Soviet Union would suddenly become reasonable and trustworthy? How can he claim that disengagement in central Europe would really produce relaxation of tensions, even if we could expect the Communists to express agreement with the idea? Why does he not explain his implication that a skeleton alliance of the United States, Britain, and Canada would somehow be better than the present NATO alinement?

Professor Hughes has a simple solution for our foreign policy problems. It reflects the kind of oversimplification favored by extremists of the left. He favors the Rapacki plan for central Europe as an alternative to the liberation which Republican politicians have talked so much about and done so little about.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree. Should we support the Rapacki plan we would be turning our backs on the lessons learned in Neville Chamberlain's day as well as those learned in Korea in 1950. The disaffected population of Communist-dominated countries in Europe cannot be ignored. We must identify ourselves with their hopes rather than with the machinations of their political masters. Their welfare and ours depends on a stout defense of the principles of freedom, not on acquiescence to the expansionist efforts of a Communist military dictatorship.

Views represented by Professor Hughes have had a substantial influence on certain members of this Congress, and on the administration. Why else so much opposition to creation of a Select Committee on the Captive Nations, and to establishment of a Freedom Academy to train Americans and selected specialists from all non-Communist countries so that we might more effectively defend ourselves against Communist agitation, propaganda, and economic offensives? Why the opposition to setting up a strategy board to run our combined international programs?

The Hughes philosophy would reject that portion of the U.N. Charter which states it is to be the joint obligation of all peoples to protect and promote the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms wherever they may be denied or threatened. He weakens this basic idea of the U.N., and in fact, rejects the true meaning of the "liberal" philosophy he proclaims.

Mr. Speaker, the members of our group oppose a reduction in NATO's scope. We do not feel that the defense of Western Europe can be reduced to conventional weapons without inviting disaster. We reject the author's contention that NATO is falling apart and, on the contrary, we believe NATO is strong and that the lasting peace and freedom of the world will be served by making NATO stronger.

Many of our colleagues have fallen all over themselves in a rush to avoid any association with the group that issued this book. However, from most of them and from the President, we have heard no repudiation of the policies and principles the book expresses. We invite such a repudiation now.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. What would lead to the President of the United States issuing a repudiation of a book of this type? Has anyone asked him for his comments on it or sought his opinions on it, to the gentleman's knowledge?

Mr. MacGREGOR. There have been a number of leaders of this body who have expressed themselves with respect to this book before today. The published fact of this feeling on the part of many Members of this body and the other body to the effect that the philosophy in "The Liberal Papers" is an expression of an extremist view, an extremism of the left, should in and of itself invite a comment by the President of the United States.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Without being asked by anybody?

Mr. MacGREGOR. He has felt free to bitterly criticize extremism of the right. I think it would be helpful in encouraging the application of a moderate philosophy in both parties, if you will, toward the solution of problems that this country faces, if he would voluntarily also criticize extremism of the left as expressed in this document.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman will find that the President's comments regarding extremism of the right have been in response to questions at his press conference concerning them, and that he has not been charging across the landscape throwing rocks in the direction of any Members of the Congress of the United States that I know of; certainly I am not aware of any charges that he has led in this direction without being questioned about the matter. I think the gentleman, by inferring that the President, by not speaking, has associated himself with any particular viewpoint is guilty of an approach to intellectual honesty that the gentleman would not want to be guilty of when this debate is over. I hope the gentleman will correct his remarks challenging the President of the United States for not having commented upon this particular paper.

Mr. MacGREGOR. The gentleman has read into my remarks, apparently from a feeling of having suffered a deep wound, an implication that was not intended. What I said was, and I repeat it, we invite such a repudiation now.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I would merely like to point out in connection with the colloquy that has just occurred between my friend from Oklahoma and the gentleman who now has the floor that, as I recall it, the President traveled out to the University of Washington, I believe, spoke at a university convocation on the west coast, at which time he saw fit to discuss in rather scathing terms the ideas and the activities of some of those who are commonly labeled as being on the far right.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Did he do this without a specific invitation at a press conference to comment?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am not aware of any specific invitation to discuss that topic that was issued.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the President of the United States has made some of the most devastating attacks upon extremism of the left that have been made from any quarter that I know of. I do not know of a man in the United States who has spoken out more vigorously against communism and against the extreme leftwing socialism in the United States than the President of the United States. And furthermore, I do not know of a man in any circle who has done more to fight them or who has done more to launch constructive programs to halt the corrosive and destructive effects of communism than has the President of the United States.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I assume, of course, the gentleman wishes us to forget some of the things that run contrary to what the gentleman has just expressed; and I am talking about Cuba, I am talking about Laos, I am talking about no plan to effectively confront the wall in Berlin.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think the gentleman has already stated that it should be remembered that some of the people who have written "The Liberal Papers" have held positions of rather high esteem in the administration. These attacks, as the gentleman from Oklahoma characterizes them, do not come without some reason. We should believe a person means what he says when he writes a book or a paper. We did not believe what an Austrian housepainter once said and we had to fight a war because of it. I do not think anybody in the United States wants to repeat that mistake. So when people write papers about how they feel about philosophy, disarmament, and such things as that, when those people are closely associated with an administration which is charged with governing this country, it seems to me the request that the President either associate himself or disassociate himself with persons who have taken upon themselves this responsibility in the administration comes with good grace. I do not think there should be any resentment whatsoever on the part of anybody for asking the President as to how he feels about how any member of his administration would react to a particular problem.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. I feel very strongly—that must be obvious to the gentleman from Oklahoma—about the dangers that are presented by an essay which gives support to the Communist Rapacki plan. I feel deeply, and I would guess that the gentleman from Oklahoma does too, about a philosophy which says that disengagement, that accommodation, that concessions are the most effective way to deal with the threat of militant international communism.

Speaking for myself, I believe that not disengagement but confrontation is the proven way to keep the peace. I think the history of the world and our own experiences with disengagement and with confrontation relative to the forces of international communism since the end of World War II demonstrate the truth of that statement.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If the gentleman will yield further, I have found nothing in the remarks just made by the gentleman from Minnesota with which I have any quarrel at all.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I was sure the gentleman from Oklahoma had no quarrel with them.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I heartily endorse practically everything that has been said by the gentleman on the line of pursuing a hard, rough and ready policy against communism. But what does disturb me about the gentleman's remarks is the inference that still remains that if you do not speak out personally and objectively when a paper of this kind is being printed you become associated with it.

I have a very good friend and associate in the Congress who has offices over across the hall from me in the Old House Building. There has been a lot of attack upon him because of his affiliation with an organization that has been subject to a lot of comment in the columns and in the papers, and so on. I have walked over to the House with him several times. We continue to have friendly conversations in the hall. It disturbs me that my failure to attack him and to disagree vigorously and publicly with what he says or what he believes would be the occasion, apparently, for somebody to conclude that I feel the same way he does.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I am sorry that the gentleman takes it that way, because nothing personal is intended at all. I expect to continue to be friendly with the gentlemen who have the sponsors of this liberal project. I disagree with them very, very much. I hope the day will never come when a voice in this country in opposition to a particular line of thought is smothered because there is an inference in somebody's mind that a spirited controversy implies a personal attack on this group or on the President of the United States. We would welcome, however, and we invite a repudiation of the philosophy expressed in essay No. 10, "Disengagement and NATO," because we think it is seriously wrong.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If the gentleman wants to, he can address a letter to the President and ask for an answer. I think he will get a speedy answer to it.

Mr. MACGREGOR. May I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that since my election to the Congress and my qualification as a Member here, I have sent a number of letters to the President. I do not yet have a personal reply, but I have received responses from members of his staff. I will do as the gentleman suggests on this particular occasion, and I hope to get a response from the President.

While the Democrats have recently denounced ultraconservatives as rightwing extremists and have talked about the thunder on the right, these "Liberal Papers" are the first documented example of extremism attached to a major political party. The 10 Democrat Congressmen and former Congressmen associated with the project have effectively added to the free discussion of ideas mentioned in the book's introduction. I hope to hear from some of my colleagues and from the administration that the ideas of Professor Hughes are repudiated as unacceptable and dangerously unrealistic as part of the U.S. foreign policy.

And I want to express my agreement with the book's stated purpose of adding to the communication of ideas in the political forum. I welcome publication of the views of these Democrat officeholders and I welcome the opportunity to participate in this added free exchange of ideas on important issues.

And particularly do I welcome this interchange with the gentleman from Oklahoma.

It is especially important today that all Americans consider the philosophy expressed in this essay because of the negotiations or subnegotiations, as they have been called in the newspapers, taking place between our Secretary of State and the new Soviet Ambassador. The reports circulated over the weekend contained in various publications have caused many Americans, I am sure, to be concerned about the issue of whether or not the philosophy expressed in this essay is manifested in some of the present attitudes of our State Department toward international communism.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include additional comments on the four points reportedly offered in the documents currently circulated by the United States with our allies as a basis for a purported accommodation or agreement with Russia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the following four points were reportedly leaked to newsmen in Bonn last Friday—April 13—according to the Washington Post of Saturday, April 14.

First. An exchange of nonagression declarations between NATO and Warsaw Pact nations. These declarations would pledge not to violate existing lines of demarcation or borders. This would be implicit recognition of the Oder-Neisse line, and the partition of Germany.

Second. United States-Soviet agreement to rule out spread of atomic armament. This means United States guarantee that Germany will not be so armed without specifying that country.

Third. Establishment of mixed East and West German committees designed to advance trade, cultural exchange, travel, and communication between the two Germanys. This was a part of the 1959 U.S. proposal to reunite Germany.

Fourth. Establishment of an international authority over traffic between West Germany and West Berlin. This authority would include East Germans. Any difficulties encountered in the administration of this authority would be referred to a committee including the United States and U.S.S.R. for negotiation. A portion of this point was also included in the 1959 U.S. proposal, that part dealing with the high authority which would include the United States and U.S.S.R.

The greatest concession immediately obvious is the omission of any mention of East Berlin. This is a tacit recognition of Russia's position that East Berlin and the wall are not negotiable. In other words: "What's mine is mine, what's yours is negotiable." A position which we have never recognized as valid.

Points 1, 2, and 4 can be found outlined in "The Liberal Papers." At least in essence.

Point 1, compare to chapter 11, "Liberal Papers," Quincy Wright:

> Recognition by the United States * * * of Communist China, both Germanys, both Koreas, and both Vietnams * * * for stabilization of international relations in central Europe and the Far East.

Point 2, compare to chapter 10, "Liberal Papers," H. Stuart Hughes:

> The prime goal should be to keep Europe out of the nuclear race by progressively enlarging a central European area of military disengagement.
>
> But there are certain things that can be negotiated right away. Among them the most important are the establishment of an initial zone of disengagement and the denial of nuclear weapons to further powers. The logical place to start negotiation on disengagement is some version of the Rapacki plan * * * which has usually had as its central feature the nuclear demilitarization of East and West Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

The Rapacki plan was advanced by Polish Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki in 1957. It is aimed at guaranteeing no nuclear armament in Poland if East and West Germany agree not to nuclearly arm also.

Point 4, this requires at least de facto recognition of East Germany by the United States. This has already been shown in "The Liberal Papers" above—chapter 11.

Point 3 is an obvious attempt to gain bipartisan support for this program, as is the latter part of point 4. If heartily criticized, Kennedy will undoubtedly refer to these two matters which the Eisenhower administration proposed.

It is reported that this plan has Adenauer furious. In addition, De Gaulle has agreed with Adenauer that this program is unacceptable. Great Britain has been pushing the United States toward this kind of program for some time. Therefore President Kennedy has precipitated a very major split in the NATO Alliance.

Adenauer has long been toying with the idea of announcing himself "neutral" and making a deal with the Russians. This is due to the soft approach of the Kennedy administration. He feels he can do better for his country by himself. In addition, morale has been badly dropping in West Berlin since the wall. If he could get a "deal" with the Russians he could perhaps take the pressure off that city. See New York Herald Tribune, April 16.

De Gaulle has always been of the opinion that the "crisis" in Germany was created by the Russians. Therefore there is nothing to negotiate with them. He believes negotiation is a sign of weakness in this case. His people are tired of war—Algeria—and the preparations for war. He could well find himself in the position of leaving NATO and taking a more nationalistic approach to foreign affairs. "Liberal Papers," chapter 10, H. Stuart Hughes:

> France might be left to follow its own nationalistic course: the policy recommendations I have made obviously imply a loosening of American ties with De Gaulle.

On the floor of the House Mr. Kennedy's firmness in foreign affairs was warmly praised last week during the "spring thaw." This gives some indication with whom he is firm—our allies who want a more vigorous policy toward the Russians.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield as much time as he may require to my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER].

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding to me to briefly discuss chapter 11 of "The Liberal Papers" entitled "Policies for Strengthening the United Nations."

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most Americans want peace in our world. Most Americans also feel that the United Nations has a usefulness as one of the means through which peace may be preserved. Under present circumstances, despite glaring weaknesses in some areas of United Nations' structure and organization, we realize that mankind's hope for peace is too tender a reed that we may easily afford to disregard it as one of our feasible instruments for peace. But after reading Prof. Quincy Wright's analysis of the United Nations and its future needs, I disagree sharply with his kind of U.N., and with his premise that to save itself the United States must subordinate its own immediate interests. The dreamworld of Mr. Wright, also titled "Policies for Strengthening the United Nations," forms the basis for chapter 11 of "The Liberal Papers" about which my colleagues have been speaking this afternoon.

After a historical introduction, Professor Wright first traces some of the mistakes and favorable steps in the development of the United Nations. I cannot agree that the so-called uniting-for-peace resolution of November 1950, remedied the lack of function by the Security Council in the absence of unity among the great powers. On the contrary, it resulted in the shifting of power to the General Assembly, as intended, but also in the evil of meaningless and sundry majorities of ill-assorted nations voting decisions which they have neither the will nor the power to carry out.

Nor do I agree that in principle the United Nations has committed itself to the proposition that all sovereign states should be members. The concept of peace-loving states was incorporated into the United Nations Charter and still remains today. If this were not so, how could the United Nations ever serve as an instrument in the fight against world communism or in the fighting of political flash fires which could otherwise erupt into large conflicts? If a practice is made of admitting non-peace-loving nations to U.N. membership, how can the United Nations be anything more than a debating society or a collector of census figures around the world?

Later in this essay the United States is in essence blamed for the start of the cold war, due to aggravation by, according to the writer and I quote—

> the policy of the Western states in building the NATO alliance, inevitably countered by the policy of the Communist states in building the Warsaw alliance. These policies resulted in a polarization of the military power of the world and extreme instability of the balance of power. While these destructive alliances could theoretically be brought under the conception of "collective self-defense," recognized in the charter, they were contrary to the spirit of the United Nations and frustrated its political effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, the formation of NATO was a move of self-defense, caused by the threat of world communism already manifest throughout the world. Its formation probably saved the West and led to free world supremacy which has existed to this day.

Apparently, Professor Wright is pleased that such quarrels as Vietnam, 1954; Suez, 1956; and Algeria, 1955, have led to differences of power among the leading powers of NATO. In fact, he openly hopes that "policies looking toward decentralization of power" may continue in order that errors of great power policy can be rectified. I am sure that recent disputes with Belgium, the Dutch, and the Portuguese over colonialism and votes in the U.N. have brought more genuine joy to Professor Wright. However, I submit that such quarrels and disputes weaken the free world, the U.N. and every other institution devoted to the cause of world peace.

I would like here to list some of the suggestions Professor Wright makes for American foreign policy which would, to his way of thinking, strengthen the United Nations. I only wish it were possible to gain a consensus of the American public as to whether they agree with my contention that in most cases to follow Professor Wright would mean a weakening of the United States and of the free world. These are his suggestions:

First. Recognition by the United States and admission to the United Nations of Communist China, both Germanys, both Koreas, and both Vietnams.

Second. Incorporation in mainland China of the offshore islands of Matsu and Quemoy.

Third. The U.N. should be made universal by admitting all de facto states—Mongolia.

Fourth. Give permanent Security Council membership to India.

Fifth. Repeal of the Connally reservation and manifestation by the United States of confidence in the World Court.

Sixth. Economic aid should be given in the main through the U.N. without discrimination as to political ideology. In other words, Professor Wright would have the United States give aid to all Communist governments.

Seventh. Breaking down nationalistic and ideological barriers to trade and facilitating the development of the world through the pacifying influence of international commerce.

Eighth. Cultural exchanges by promoting understanding, stimulating fruitful borrowing from one culture to another, and so forth, should be increased through the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.

Professor Wright claims that these steps and others are major interests of the United States for the security of its territory and its democratic institutions and for the further advance of its high economic level. I, for one, disagree. Like many other authors in this series, Professor Wright completely negates the influence of world communism and the cold war. We should remember that the cold war is not merely a misunderstanding between two friendly groups of nations, but mainly a part of a plan for world conquest drawn up by a nation and an ideology which have declared war upon us—not a hot war fought with guns or nuclear weapons but a war waged with ideas, propaganda, economic aid, trade, culture, and espionage.

Let us face it. Each time we recognize a de facto nation not genuinely representative of the population, or admit such a nation into the United Nations, we help to bury ourselves. Each time we give economic aid or cultural advancement to a Communist nation we assist their hold on their peoples and on the war for ideas in the world. Each time we smilingly say to the Communists, "You were right—East Germany belongs in the U.N." or, in the words of Professor Wright, "China should be represented by the Peiping government which alone can meet the United Nations responsibilities of that vast state," we drive another nail into the coffin wherein rests freemen and free ideas and dedication to principles rather than to expediency.

In return for all these concessions, what would we receive? Promises by Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung to behave themselves? And why should we accept such promises and start trusting Communists who have refused to keep a single major promise made by them since the time we started doing business with Russia in 1933?

I would seriously like to ask any of the Democratic liberals who were responsible for the formation of this liberal project and ultimately the publishing of this book I question. What would the United States or the free world gain by following the policy suggestions made in this handbook of surrender? I submit that the vast majority of American citizens sincerely believe, we would thus lose our freedom.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to compliment the gentleman from Vermont and the other gentlemen on this side of the aisle who have taken part in this very scholarly, dispassionate dissection of "The Liberal Papers." I am sure they have done a great service to the country, and I congratulate them on the work which they have performed so ably and capably.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, these are the views of authors sponsored by the "Liberal Project." However shocking their words, they no longer appear as a mere platform of academic discussion or merely a group of liberal Congressmen and authors airing their views. Some of the authors are in the administration. Some sponsoring Congressmen are still in this body, they were notified of this special order, others are now with our Arms Control Agency. The gentleman from California, Representative ROOSEVELT, states that "in broad scope the relevance and importance of these essays still stand." I trust that the Members of this body here today who agree with views expressed in these essays we have discussed will now take part in a debate as to the worth of these views. It would help to clear the air. It would help the American people realize just which Members take these positions, so that if the positions are especially valid the electorate can give them a vote of confidence this November. I, for one, would be willing to place my record on the line here and now in opposition to the direction in which these policies would lead us.

We have been necessarily negative today in the face of the naive views thrust upon us in these essays. Later this session, a task force which has been formed by the subcommittee on special projects of the House Republican policy committee will issue a report on positive steps for free world supremacy. While study papers will be inserted in the RECORD in this regard, the members of the task force will be willing to stand by their views and recommendations and will not hide behind the writings of split-level intellectuals in order to get their views across.

It is fairly obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the American presence in the world must be more determined than what these "Liberal Papers" suggest. We must examine with a steely eye the jagged truths of interest and power and struggle. Unless we do so, the United States will commit suicide on the installment plan, having lost understanding of what is needed for survival and victory—power, and not words or empty formulas.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the gentleman for leading this very fine discussion today on the question of liberal papers. I have read those "Liberal Papers" with a great deal of interest, and I am forced to admit they are not liberal papers in the same sense that many liberal papers in our early history were liberal.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say further that I believe a discussion of ideas is good, and it is important to note, too, that the preservation of ideals is better. All of us are for a complete and fair discussion of all issues and problems and have it in the public domain. Free debate and discussion of ideas gives us an opportunity to sift the chaff from the wheat; to help us find the right answers, the truth; to discover again the ideals of our heritage that must be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, this discussion is in the public domain and will add to our better understanding, I believe, of what should be our foreign policy in this very, very difficult time. "The Liberal Papers" have provoked an interesting discussion in that they have made their greatest contribution. Even though I cannot agree with all that has been written by them, they have given us an opportunity to further discuss all of these matters that relate to the preservation of ideals and the promotion of ideals that must be established in all parts of the world if we are going to have a peaceful world and if we are going to realize the kind of a situation we all want so that all of us can have a more abundant life.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I would like to thank the gentleman for a very interesting late afternoon seminar, and perhaps I am oversimplifying the situation, but would not the country perhaps be better off if we would take these "Liberal Papers" that you have discussed at great length and the pronouncements of the John Birch Society and throw them simultaneously in the same ashcan?

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today several Members of this House are introducing legislation to restore home rule to the District of Columbia, something they enjoyed until the late 1870's.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important, as late as the hour is, to discuss the subject matter of local government for the District of Columbia. In popular language, the legislation which a number of Members have introduced today is identified as home rule for the District. As a matter of exactness, these bills would not provide home rule, because in true home rule legislation, in whatever jurisdiction, it is generally meant that some inferior area within a larger governmental body is cut loose, both governmentally and from the standpoint of revenue and allowed to govern itself. As is well known, under the Constitution the Congress will always remain the principal legislative body for the District of Columbia. I have not myself today introduced a bill providing this measure of self-government for the District, but I do welcome the opportunity, in concert with my colleagues, to discuss this most important subject. I shall not presume to tell you what is wrong with Washington or what is wrong with the District of Columbia. I could spend a great deal of time telling you the things that are right about the District.

I would like at this time to try in advance of the discussion of the specific legislation to put into perspective the government of the District of Columbia as it is in relation to the Government of the United States, to the Congress and to its own people.

Washington is unique as a city. But the city is unique as an institution, so we should not be surprised that a particular city is unique in itself. The unique nature of Washington is probably a very great advantage, which, if understood and accepted, rather than resisted and resented, could be this District's principle asset. In the case of most American cities the very nature of a municipal corporation makes administration difficult, because the city itself as a government is a foreign concept to ancient Anglo-American law. In this country it is true we have named the “realm” the “State”; we have named the “shire” the “county,” but it is in classical English manner that we have set up local governments. Upon that logical, if unwieldly, system we have engrafted the city as a government.

We call local governments in some instances “political subdivisions of the State,” but in most instances we don't really mean it. Since the merchants and craftsmen forced Edward II of England 700 years ago to charter the cities and seat their representatives in Parliament, we lawyers have devised fiction after contrivance to make cities fit into a logical place in the governmental structure, and this is not true of Washington. State constitutions are full of legislation, which they should not contain, defining and limiting the powers of cities. County governments planned to serve 19th-century rural America, twist and torture their very fabric in an effort to accommodate the cities which lie within their jurisdictions; or they try to act like city governments, which they are not, in an effort to render city-type services which no one ever dreamed they would be called upon to do.

I call these things to your mind for the purpose of reminding you that the very nature of Washington as a city without a county or State containing it has some advantages which no other major American city enjoys.

“Well,” you say, “so it is. But Washington, the city, is called upon to render services which are elsewhere rendered by counties or States.” Of course it is. But the problems thereby created are financial ones almost entirely, and to finance, I think we should say a word now, because in dealing with cities in the United States—and I speak not only of Washington—we have all of this in American government in something of a lemming-like procession moved from Ebenezer Howard's “Garden City” into Sir Patrick Geddes' regional plan through Lewis Mumford and others into a sort of national frenzy which pretends to rebuild and renew our cities by applying pseudoscience, which, if carefully considered, is intended to destroy them.

I pause to note that city planning, urban renewal, urban redevelopment and related activities are in themselves good, but we need to see where they are, what they have done, and where they are going. The problems are deep and simple; they are philosophical as well as socioscientific.

Now, to observe some of the things about the District of Columbia as a government, and I hope all will understand that it is in the spirit of common interest and common effort, and to pursue discussion of how these can be solved that we talk about what is wrong with the Washington government.

In common with all other American cities, Washington has problems raising enough money to pay for the services which it is called upon to render. There is a sort of local folklore that this major difficulty results from the fact that thousands of acres of land and billions of dollars in potentially taxable property—real and personal—are kept off the tax rolls because it all belongs to the United States. Furthermore, if Congress would appropriate more money measured by this nontaxed property everything would be all right. Like most folklore there is some basis of fact in that; but once again let us be realistic. There are 19 States which have within them more urban acres owned by the Federal Government than does the District of Columbia. There are 24 States which have within them more dollar value of land, buildings, structures, and facilities owned by the United States than does the District of Columbia. There are numerous counties in the United States where upward of 80 percent of the total area is owned by the Federal Government.

I hasten to agree that in these States other bases exist to support the economy, but nowhere do the expenditures of the Federal Government support the economy to the degree that they do in Washington.

It is not the ownership of land by the United States within the District of Columbia that creates the problems. It is the local government services which the District of Columbia government must render because of the nonlocal operations of the Federal Government that create the problem.

On balance, no one unquestionably has as yet paid sufficient attention to what the problems of this city are; to understand them. In common with every other American city, Washington has been subjected to a sort of mass municipal schizophrenia. Half of the personality basks in a dreamworld murmuring, “Would it not be nice to live in a beautiful park?” while the other half stitches patches on a motley garment of municipal finance and administration which quite obviously does not fit the public body.

And I think that it is to answer some of these questions that a thoughtful, hard-working group of people in this House on both sides of the aisle have today introduced a number of so-called home rule bills for the District of Columbia. Many of the people who introduced the bills have serious reservations about their details. Many of us, for example, have serious reservations about the size of the Council proposed, about the power of the Council, for example, to change its own numbers, about the need for a nonvoting Delegate in the House of Representatives, and the relationship between such a Delegate and the administrative head of the proposed District government, whether he be a mayor or a Governor.

Be these things as they may, and be it as they may be concerned in the catalog of plans to transfer power, unquestionably these things need to be discussed. These bills which have been introduced are as good a vehicle for plain discussion as can be found. There needs to be decided what kind of government is best for the District of Columbia. There needs to be decided what are local matters and what are not. There needs to be decided what it is that presents these continuing financial problems. And I submit that it is not the ownership of Government real estate in the District.

I do, however, commend the gentlewoman from Oregon for taking this time. Those who will discuss the problems deserve the attention that will be paid them, because it is a matter long neglected by the Congress generally and one which needs to be paid attention to.

The last half of the 20th century no doubt is the age of the city. This is truly one of the great cities in the world and it is time that we who are charged by the Constitution with governing it pay attention to giving it a government which fits its needs.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his very excellent statement and his very persuasive arguments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL].

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be here tonight, even at this late hour, to discuss a subject that is of importance to all of us.

First, I would like to commend the spirit that has existed between the approximately 10 Members in the Republican Party in the House and about 10 of us on the Democratic side who through the last few weeks through mutual consultation have reached an agreement on the bipartisan bills that have been introduced today. I am proud and happy to be one of the sponsors, and I am proud to have been associated with this group.

There is not much mileage in home rule as far as the folks back home are concerned. There are not many votes involved. I believe most of us who believe in this think that this is simply an exercise in democracy. We cannot very well go around the world telling people in other countries that they ought to extend home rule and self-rule to the people of emerging nations and others while the people in our Nation's Capital say they do not believe in it here.

It is easy to let some wise man or commissioner or appointed individual run a city or run a State or run a government, but in the long run this will not work out. Many of those who oppose this kind of legislation are the same people who talk in favor of States rights, and I am in favor of States rights, in keeping government close to the people and letting local people handle local problems. Yet here in our National Legislature we have continued to waste the time of 437 Members of this body on things such as dog licenses and dog leashing laws, whether or not the fire station needs a new roof, and things of purely local concern. The Congress, according to my calculation, or at least the House, spends about 500 hours per year in deliberation. You take out the time for special orders and not actually debating measures before us, and Congress really does not work on legislation more than about 500 hours a year. I would make a rough estimate that at least 5 percent or perhaps 10 percent of this time is directed to matters purely local or to the District of Columbia in its local affairs. Just today we had a bill for the purchase of some additional canines to be used by the District of Columbia for some particular purpose.

I think there are more important things for the Congress; I think there are more important things abroad and at home that need our attention in the limited amount of time we have available during the course of a session here.

I hope that out of this bipartisan move will come some frank and honest discussion of this whole problem. I hope that out of it will come some debate and a bill that will represent the best feeling of the House of Representatives for some measure of local government.

Many people who have been against this proposal in the past say this is a Federal city, that the District of Columbia is not like any of the other cities in the country, it is the seat of government and the Federal Government must control it in the smallest detail. I think this argument is wrong, it is fallacious. Because there are some things that have a national interest, because there are some things in which the national interest is paramount, does not mean that is cause for them to be controlled by the Congress. I think we can separate out those things that are purely local, the schools, the control and licensing of dogs, that I referred to earlier, the question of stand-up drinking, whether or not it is proper for patrons of cabarets and restaurants to stand up and take a drink while they are waiting to be served. These are not burning national issues that should take the time of the Congress. I think we can separate out the things that are local and let a local, democratically elected council or government run these things, and let the Congress pay attention to the major problems that affect the national interest.

Someone said recently we are all part-time mayors of the great city of Washington, 537 of us, that we all are part-time mayors. We do not live here the year round. We do not have the interests of the people here at heart in the same sense that the permanent residents do. I think we would have a lot less crime and juvenile delinquency and a lot less of the type of local problems they have in this city if the city leaders and the residents knew they had their own local officials they could go to and work out their own solutions. They could handle them the way other cities around the country do.

So I hope that the Congress will act on this measure this year. I hope the year 1962 will be the year we stop talking about home rule for the District of Columbia and do something about it.

Some of those who were opposed to this measure say that it was always intended that Congress control the District of Columbia when the country was founded, yet they had home rule here for over 100 years or for 75 or 100 years—I have forgotten the exact number of years. They had locally elected people to govern the District of Columbia.

When the Republic was founded, it was not contemplated that one of the Nation's major cities would arise here. It was supposed to be a small city, a seat of government which was populated heavily when the Legislature was in session but not at other times. If the principle is that the National Legislature must control every commercial factor and all civic life in every detail, then I think in consistency those who take this position ought to claim that the Legislature of New York would act as city council for Albany and the Legislature of South Carolina will act as city council for Columbia and the Legislature of Arizona will act as city council for Phoenix, and we could dismantle city government in any place where the State seat of government happens to be.

We have here, I think, a good bill. It is limited. It does not go so far as some of my colleagues would like it to go, but it gives basically the 800,000 people in the District of Columbia a status similar to what Alaska and Hawaii had before they joined us in the Union and similar to what Guam and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have today. So I am happy to be here today and say a few words in behalf of this measure and to express the hope that hearings will be held shortly by the Committee on the District of Columbia on this measure, and that the House will have a chance to vote this measure up or down on the question of District of Columbia home rule.

Mr. Speaker, some of the members of our group because of prior commitments and the lateness of the hour have been unable to appear with us today. However, they have prepared statements and two of our colleagues have authorized me to present them for the record.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN] and the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, residents of the District of Columbia are perfectly capable of speaking for themselves in support of home rule. They have been doing so in and around Congress for a good many years, and one cannot help but admire the tenacity of purpose with which they go on pursuing a goal that has eluded them for so long.

While they have expressed their own desire for self-government often and well, I wish to take this time to attempt to look at the problem through the eyes of a full-time District resident. We in the Congress are, after all, visitors—in a sense visiting firemen—whose basic concern is with major public policy issues.

Remember, it has been over 80 years since residents of the District had any voice in their local government. Thus, few Washingtonians know what it is like to help decide on a school bond question, on a master street plan or on the building of a new sewage treatment plant.

It is frustrating enough to have to deal with such perplexing needs as a citizen; think how frustrating it must be to live in the center of a city with ever-increasing urban problems—and yet be unable to help find solutions to them.

By refusing District residents a voice in their own affairs, we make them wards of the Federal Government. They are taxed without being represented. They are given somewhat the same rights, or lack of them, as are given to inmates of a Federal prison. All the rules come from on high. They must depend on the Federal Government for much of their support, but have nothing whatever to say about how much is needed or where it shall be spent.

This is not a healthy situation. The residents of Washington can be and should be entrusted with the same kind of control over their affairs as is entrusted to citizens of other major cities. No one questions that the District has a unique relationship to the Federal Government, but there is no reason to anticipate any greater difficulties arising from this relationship than is the case in other cities with large Federal installations.

Local elections, the solving of local problems, the raising of local taxes—these areas of city administration make up one of democracy's most important training grounds. It is a training ground forbidden to wards of the Government.

It is, however, a training ground where the exercise of good citizenship always flourishes.

It is to provide for the exercise of good citizenship that I have joined my colleagues today in introducing the 1962 bipartisan home rule bill. It is my earnest hope that it will be enacted into law this session, that District residents will this year be rewarded for the time and effort they have spent seeking not special privileges but only restoration of their right to govern themselves.

HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, ever since I came to Congress I have been an ardent supporter of home rule for the District of Columbia. It was obvious then, and more obvious now, that Washington should have home rule. We can no longer justify—to ourselves or to the rest of the world—the failure to grant the right to govern themselves to the residents of Washington.

We talk a good deal about the fact that our Government is based upon consent; we are always reminding others that freedom is the right to choose. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we have denied the right to choose for too long, to a substantial number of people, living in the Nation's Capital City where everyone from everywhere can see them. How much longer can we allow this to continue?

Recently we passed a constitutional amendment to allow the residents of Washington to vote for President and Vice President—a most noteworthy achievement.

This, however, is less than half a loaf. Now we must find a bill that will pass both bodies of the Congress so that the principle of home rule survives intact in the legislation. The specifics are not too important at this stage; what we must do is enact this most important principle. Any defects can be remedied and needed improvements can be supplied as administration develops the need.

I have not only been a supporter of home rule these many years, but I have also been in the forefront of the fight therefor. During the last Congress, I was privileged to place on the Speaker's desk a discharge petition which would have brought a home rule bill to the floor for action by this House.

Consequently, I am proud to join with so many of our colleagues today in cosponsoring a bill which will grant a measure of home rule to Washington. This bill has bipartisan support and would provide an appointed Governor and an elected legislative council of nine members and give the District a nonvoting Delegate in the House.

I am for it, or any other bill that can pass both Houses in order to grant the long-delayed right to District citizens to govern themselves. That is little enough to ask for the citizens of the city that is the showplace of the world.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona. At this time I also want to commend him for the great leadership he has shown on this particular legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as I sat here listening to the gentleman from Arizona, I also recalled some of the earth-shaking pieces of District legislation that the 537 Members of Congress have had to concern themselves with.

For example, amid the brush-fire war in Vietnam, the Soviet pressures in Berlin, and the disarmament negotiations in Geneva, the House of Representatives on March 26 of this year took up a bill to grant the American Numismatists Association "perpetual succession" because its 50-year-old charter would have expired next month.

Now should this not have provided sufficient opportunity to exercise the best talents of the House, a perusal of the House and Senate District Committees calendars shows that shortly we shall be able to engage in a great dialog and debate on measures:

To permit the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America to issue life insurance to its members; to authorize construction of railroad sidings over First Street NW.; to name the new stadium as Walter Johnson Stadium; to authorize the sale of Cherry Hill; to require as the gentleman from Arizona suggested that dogs be kept on leash in public places; to increase cost of learner driver permits; and to incorporate the President's Trophy Bowl Game.

Take a look at the calendar, Mr. Speaker, and you will find many more such momentous pieces of legislation that we are being asked to discuss and pass upon.

One of my favorites, Mr. Speaker, is a piece of legislation that came before us a few years ago—a momentous piece of legislation indeed—that would authorize the District Commissioners to issue the city code in looseleaf form instead of bound form. I was most pleased and proud, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress of the United States refused to dodge this legislation and resolutely met it head on, discussed it in a statesmanlike way, and had the courage of stouthearted legislators to pass it.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the District bills that Congress must concern itself with, as the city council for the District, during this most critical time in our history.

We might have more time, I would suggest, for national and international issues if we could grant some form of local self-government to the disenfranchised residents of Washington, D.C. I believe philosophically that Washington residents should be permitted to govern themselves. We talk about self-determination for other countries of the world, and certainly we can do no less for the residents of this area. I would think all of my colleagues would feel that they could better serve the constituents of their own districts and their own State if a city council made decisions on purely local matters for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons—many philosophical reasons—why I am pleased to be among those supporting restoration of self-government to the 763,000 residents of the District of Columbia.

I support home rule, because the present administered form of government is inconsistent with both the ideals and practice of our democracy.

You will note that I have said that local self-government should be restored—not granted—to the District.

Those of us who support home rule are not proposing anything revolutionary. We do not want to break with tradition; we want to return to it. Home rule existed here when the District was established in 1800. Congress fostered and extended it until the mid-1870's, when the self-government franchise was removed by Congress. Now what brought on this change?

Opponents of home rule have over the years made much of the fact that it was a city public works improvement program which involved enormous expenditures that led to this revocation. But two items should be noted in this context.

First, this was the Capital City's era of greatest improvement; prior to the start of the program, there was not a single sewer in the District, the streets were choked with mud and foreign diplomats were indignant about the inconveniences. Second, all home rule proposals with which I am familiar provide adequate safeguards against financial mismanagement.

I should also like to point out that Congress has long recognized the need for reform of the District's undemocratic governmental system. Modern efforts to bring this about go back to 1933 in the Senate. In that body, I might add, home rule legislation has been approved five times in the past 10 years. Also in recent years, several Members of the House have made memorable attempts to put responsibility for District affairs back where it belongs—in the hands of local residents.

Some progress has been made. Ratification of the 23d amendment gives Washingtonians a share in the national electoral process; the enfranchised District will have three votes in the electoral college in the next presidential election. They will be sent there by residents voting—at long last—for the President and Vice President of their choice.

But we must not stop here. Whatever the obstacles, and I am well aware that there are some, I believe that we should make every effort to overcome them. I believe that we should restore—now, not later—the kind of self-government in Washington that is in accord with the self-respect of inhabitants eager to assume the full rights and obligations of full-time citizenship.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield to me first?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. The gentleman from Wisconsin was unable to stay, in view of the lateness of the hour. He prepared a statement which I would like to ask permission at this time to include in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY S. REUSS, OF WISCONSIN

I am sponsoring one of the identical Home Rule Bills introduced today because I believe that the people of Washington should have home rule, and that the Congress should concentrate its energies on the Nation's business.

All of us are aware of the demands on the time of the Congress, of the difficulty most of us have in keeping abreast of important developments in our home districts, in our States and in our Nation. It simply is too much to ask that we consider the detailed problems of local, District of Columbia government as well.

And it is an unfortunate truth that we are not keeping in touch with the problems of this city. Congress actually has neither the time nor the structure to do the job of running a city well.

To be sure, Congress cannot give up its responsibility for the Nation's Capital. But I do fail to see any reason why the Congress should maintain itself as a kind of 537-member city council, each with a share in the responsibility for day-to-day city administration.

Yet we continue to burden ourselves with such details as decisions on street lights, school lunches, police dog patrols, even on what to do about a leak in a ceiling at the morgue.

The result of having such details brought to our attention, if only dimly, is all too clear. We get in the habit of ignoring all district problems, simply because we don't have the time to consider them.

I suggest that the proper role of Congress in this regard is outlined in our bipartisan home rule bills.

Let local government be conducted by those who are closest to it, the local residents who have the biggest stake in the administration of their city's affairs. Let Congress then do the job for which it is best suited, the job of general policy supervision required in the protection of the substantial Federal interest here.

This is the way it is done in the capital of every State; it is the way it is done in most of the world's major capitals. Other legislative bodies have provided for home rule at the seat of government. I believe that we also can do so successfully—and I believe that the best time to do it is now.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], also had a statement prepared on this subject, but because of the lateness of the hour he has asked me to have it included in the RECORD at this point, and I make such request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ, OF TEXAS

In previous discussions of home rule for the District of Columbia apprehension has been expressed over the prospect of partisan political conflict in our Nation's Capital. At one point it was proposed that District elections be conducted on a nonpartisan basis. Subsequently both Republican and Democratic Party organizations in the District have gone on record as strongly opposed to nonpartisan elections and favoring party primaries. I am happy that the bills being introduced today provide for party primaries, not only because the District political organizations are unanimous in favoring them, but because this is a pattern of the electoral process in keeping with the rest of our Nation.

So far as local political pressures and conflicts are concerned, I would point out that both major political parties are already organized and active in the District. The District is not, and will not be, immune to political conflict, regardless of whether or not there are party primaries.

Anyone residing in Washington knows that debate can and does, become heated and, on occasion, acrimonious over purely local issues. In fact, I would say that, as in my own State of Texas, local issues are the ones that generate the most heat.

Every community has problems about which opinions will differ. This is the way a free society works. With or without home rule, the people of the District of Columbia are going to make themselves heard on these problems, just as the people of Texas or Massachusetts or Montana make themselves heard when they have strong views on public questions.

Would home rule increase these conflicts? I think the evidence is persuasive that, if anything, the conflicts would be lessened by home rule.

In the first place, let's be frank and admit that we have partisan government in the District of Columbia now. The Commissioners are appointed by the administration in power and are clearly identified with that party. Behind the Commissioners is the Congress, which spends countless hours every year debating District matters. Is anyone going to suggest that the Congress is free from partisanship?

Realistically, the biggest source of political pressure is the local community. What we have now is a multitude of local political pressures being exerted directly on Congress and the administration because together they constitute the District government. Every interest in Washington takes its problems directly to the Federal Government. Instead of providing a sanctuary, the District provides the Congress with a perennial burden of no small magnitude.

Obviously, a responsible local government is the only proper agency to resolve such local matters as the qualifications of plumbers and the price of school lunches.

A responsible local government would be a lightning rod to divert trivia from the Federal Government. Such matters as these are the proper subject of local politics and should not take the time and energy of the Federal Government. By doing its own job, local government thus can provide a sanctuary never previously enjoyed by the Government of the United States.

I say this is the time to provide that sanctuary.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentlewoman from Oregon would be so kind as to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon, and I thank my colleague from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL]. I shall not talk long. It is 6:30 in the evening. I think those who have remained on the floor know exactly how we who are here feel on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition to home rule for the District of Columbia, in the last analysis, reflects a basic lack of confidence in the free democratic process. Those who argue against home rule very often will deny this and will translate their opposition in terms of practicalities. They point to problems confronting the District and they say: "Well, I have more confidence in the Federal Establishment running the District of Columbia than I do in my neighbors running the District of Columbia."

Mr. Speaker, I have never yet seen a housewife who could not run her household better than her landlord. Any time the landlord starts trying to run her household, takes over the housewife's responsibility for cutting the lawn, keeping the place painted and tidied up, having the garbage taken care of, and all the rest, there is trouble, and it does not work.

I come from the city of New York which, I can assure you, has trouble with its government. I have seen a great many other city governments across the country in operation. I will say right now for the record that the garbage collection in the District of Columbia is the worst of any city in the United States. Thank our present system for that. Let us change it then. Turn over the responsibility for housekeeping to the good people of the District of Columbia who have had to suffer under this present system and whose garbage is not being collected.

This is just an example. I can talk about other practical problems that exist in the District of Columbia which would be improved if we turned over the day-to-day operation to the folks who live here.

In the 86th Congress we had a great disappointment because we came close to getting a bill to the floor of the House of Representatives on the subject of home rule. There are a lot of people who exhausted themselves pretty thoroughly in that effort; some who are Members or former Members of the House, some who are good citizens of the District of Columbia. I do not blame any of them if they were exhausted from that effort. But they are not. And they are supporting this measure again. I think we might even have a better approach than we did in the 86th Congress. This bill keeps the best of the old Eisenhower bill; in fact most of it is the Eisenhower bill. It would seem to me this might result in limited Republican objection. It has engrafted on it some of the good features of this administration's proposed legislation. So how can Democrats object? It is a good bill.

The gentleman from Kentucky was absolutely correct when he said anybody can find some dissent or disagreement with parts of the proposed legislation. But on the whole, this is extremely carefully, thoughtfully worked out legislation which I should think would have the support of the vast majority of the Members of the House of Representatives if they were only given the chance to vote on it.

So I join with our colleagues who have spoken before me on the floor tonight, and I extend my congratulations to them for the work they have done on this subject, particularly the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], and the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

I urge the Members of the House of Representatives to keep faith with the free democratic process at least to the extent of urging the committee to permit the bill to come to the floor of the House so that we will have a chance to vote it up or down.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his very excellent statement. I should also like to mention the work which his colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. WEIS], a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, has done in reference to this legislation.

I also join my friend from New York in paying special tribute to the gentleman from Iowa, whom I will yield to in just a moment, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], on that side of the aisle, for the time and effort they have spent trying to bring forth legislation that will indeed have bipartisan support of the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon and wish to add my commendations to her and others with whom I have had the pleasure of working both last year and this year on this very, very important legislation.

To begin with, I would suggest that I am a part of a coalition, a coalition that desires more freedom and more opportunity for more people; for people who have a right to govern themselves and people who want to accept their full responsibility as citizens of a great country.

Mr. Speaker, I think it might be well to point out that this is a historic day, for it was just 100 years ago today that Abraham Lincoln signed a bill that was passed by the Congress which became the first official act of the Government to lead to the emancipation of the slaves. It was a bill that provided for the freeing of the slaves within the District of Columbia. It was a bill that was designed to give freedom to people. So, it is fortunate, I think, that we are kicking off on this proposition today.

The gentleman from New York talked about the collection of garbage. I had not known about that problem here in the District, maybe because I live across the river in Arlington, but I do read the local papers and I note that there is some crime in the District of Columbia. Many people think it is almost the worst place in the United States. Now, that is a feeling that the people of the District are appalled at, about the crime that they see, and yet they cannot do anything about that problem here in the District like the people can in any other city of comparable size or any other city anywhere in the United States. I think crime is at an alltime low, and that problem will be resolved. I think it would be dealt with better if people had home rule.

Now, I suggested it was 100 years ago that Abraham Lincoln signed this bill freeing the slaves. And, people ask me sometimes, knowing my interest in Lincoln, how would Lincoln stand on this home rule question. Well, maybe it might be interesting to find out, so I did a little research, and I can say to you that I believe Lincoln would not be against this proposition we have under consideration today. He might be against some details of it, but he would not be against giving more freedom to more people. He had some deep feelings about this, and they were revealed to the then mayor of Washington in February of 1861, when Lincoln came to Washington and before he took over as President. In response to a call by the mayor and some of his friends, some of the councilmen, among other things he said this to them. They had come to him to discuss some problems that they had with the Congress that the Government could grant relief on. He said:

> I have not now nor never have had any disposition to treat you in any respect otherwise than as my neighbors. I have not now any purpose to withhold from you any of the benefits of the Constitution under any circumstances that I would not feel myself constrained to withhold from my neighbors.

Then, in response to a serenade by the Republican Association a few days later, and knowing also that some of their leaders had some worries about some problems and wanted the same relief that the mayor had talked about, said to them:

> I hope that, if things shall go on as prosperously as I believe we all desire they may, I may have it in my power to remove something of this misunderstanding, that I may be enabled to convince you, and the people of your section of the country, that we regard you in all things our equals and in all things entitled to the same respect and the same treatment that we claim for ourselves: that we are in nowise disposed, if it were in our power, to oppress you, to deprive you of any of your rights under the Constitution of the United States, or even to split hairs with you in regard to those rights, but are determined to give you, as far as is in our hands all your rights under the Constitution—not grudgingly, but fully and fairly.

So, here is some pretty persuasive arguments from a man whom I think was pretty wise. I am glad to have this opportunity to put them into the public domain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that tomorrow I will introduce a bill which will be substantially the same as the bills that have already been introduced by my colleagues. The principal difference of my bill will be that it will provide for 34 Members of the legislative body rather than 9 that the bill, as I understand it, now calls for. I have a feeling that the salary provided here in the bill is high and that it might set a bad precedent for some of our State legislatures which might argue that if in the District of Columbia they are entitled to this kind of money for governing 800,000 people that, perhaps, where they have 2 million or 4 million or 8 million people, they would be entitled to that kind of salary. So, my bill will provide that the members of the legislature will receive $1,800 or $2,000. I have not decided for sure yet. The chairman would receive $2,000 or $2,500.

Mr. Speaker, there are other small amendments that I will present which I think might be worthy of consideration. I hope that the committee will give consideration to these items when this matter comes before them for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, because of the lateness of the hour and because there are other colleagues on this side of the House who have some strong feelings about it and who would like to talk on it today, but it was necessary for them, because of previous commitments, to leave, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point statements by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCRANTON], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The statements referred to follow:

Mrs. DWYER. It is a privilege today to join with a number of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle in sponsoring the District of Columbia home rule bill. With each year that the people of the District are denied the right to govern themselves with respect to purely local matters, the need for this self-government becomes greater.

As the seat of the National Government, the District of Columbia ought to be the showcase of the Nation, a symbol of democracy and representative self-government. It ought to be the best governed area in the country. In fact, however, it is none of these things.

Washington belongs to all the people of our country but, paradoxically, experience proves beyond a doubt that it cannot adequately be governed by all the people, either directly or through their elected representatives in the Congress. Much of what is wrong with the District is the direct result of the present unworkable system of government. As the New York Herald Tribune expressed it in an editorial this morning, Congress has been "niggardly" toward the District. Despite the fact that 43 percent of the land is federally owned, Congress has failed to appropriate sufficient funds to enable the District to meet satisfactorily its many municipal responsibilities in such basic fields as transportation, education, and welfare.

Home rule for the District of Columbia will not solve all its problems. There will continue to be a need for a fair Federal contribution to District revenues. And, under the terms of the legislation we are introducing, Congress will retain both ultimate legislative power in the District and the right to legislate independently for the District or repeal or modify legislation adopted by the District Council. In addition, the President may veto Council actions which he considers adversely affect the Federal interest.

Home rule will, however, redeem our sworn belief in democracy, in representative government, in the right of freemen to govern themselves. It will relieve Congress of a burden which Congress itself has refused to carry in any fully responsible fashion. And it will release the latent talents, energies, and determination of District people themselves who want to make this city one in which the whole Nation can take pride.

Throughout my three terms in the House, Mr. Speaker, I have strongly supported home rule legislation for the District of Columbia. I have investigated the arguments pro and con as thoroughly as I know how. The position of those who oppose home rule—and I believe they are in a distinct minority—is simply not convincing. On the other hand, it seems irrefutable that history, experience, and commonsense are clearly on the side of those who favor it.

I hope the House this year will do what it should have done long ago, and what the platforms of both political parties have long promised to do—permit the residents of the District of Columbia to behave as though they were American citizens.

Mr. Scranton. I am pleased to be able to add my remarks to those of my colleagues who are supporting home rule for the District of Columbia. I believe that most Members of the House of Representatives recognize that we should restore Democratic institutions to the Nation's Capital—the place of all places where they should be a proud exhibit—and that the residents of Washington have a right to govern themselves.

I believe that most of us recognize, too, that the Federal interest in the District of Columbia is a vital one, which must be protected.

It is my conviction that the bipartisan home rule bill we are introducing today would serve the interests of both the Federal Government and the 880,000 people whose right to self-government has been too long denied. Our proposal should also establish clearly the fact that in America there ought not be any bars to full participation in government because of race, creed, or color.

To be sure, there will be some—who are at best lukewarm on home rule for the District—who will say that our bill goes too far. On the other hand, there will be those highly competent and sincere advocates of home rule who maintain that our bill is unnecessarily limited, that it doesn't go far enough toward complete local autonomy.

With all due respect to these views, I believe that our bill represents a sound approach. It represents, in the best sense of the word, a compromise—an attempt to harmonize all of the various interests and points of view without sacrificing any of the essentials. It is an attempt to find common ground, a point where reasonable men, regardless of their differences on specifics, can arrive at a reasonable agreement on a general good—full citizenship and the rights that go with it for the residents of the city of Washington.

Finally, as another alternative approach, there are some who have suggested that Congress turn away from specific legislation at this time and that we devote our efforts instead to further study of the problem. Undoubtedly this proposal has merits; I am all for further study and I think improvements in the District's government will always be desirable.

Yet I cannot help feeling that our bipartisan home rule bill is in fact a product of years of study. For more than a quarter of a century, some of the best minds of Congress have considered the problem of returning self-government to the District while protecting legitimate Federal interests in the city.

In my opinion, their efforts have produced ample guidelines for the Members of this Congress, and I believe that we should pass this legislation this session, and start getting some practical experience with limited self-government in the Federal city. Then we will have something on which to base suggestions for improvement, if experience proves that changes are in fact desirable.

Mr. MacGregor. I wish to speak—in the name of our leadership of the free world—for the bill which I have introduced today, a bill which would restore some of the essential freedoms temporarily taken away from the residents of the District of Columbia in the 1870's.

Speaking in the name of our free world leadership is, I realize, a rather large order. But I am stressing this aspect of the home rule situation, because I am acutely aware of the way in which our treatment of the District of Columbia can be used against us elsewhere in the world. Especially is this true in those developing nations where we are attempting to maintain the vitality of democratic principles.

We quite correctly deride the Communist election system as a false front, having no substance and making a mockery of the democratic processes. Unfortunately, it is also true that we deny access to these same processes to the large number of Americans who just happen to live in the Nation's Capital.

For as things now stand the residents of Washington are without so much as the right to elect their own school board, to say nothing of electing a delegate to Congress. To me it is a great irony that the right of a people to govern themselves is so fundamentally violated right here at the seat of American democracy.

This gives the Communist propagandist a ready tool. After all, he can argue, any election is better than none at all—and the citizens of Moscow at least have their ballot. No matter how invalid this argument is, it serves to undercut our own arguments for freedom. We fail to provide some of the essential features of freedom in the very city from which freedom's principles are being enunciated.

We as a nation have assisted wherever possible the efforts of peoples toward self-government. We can take great pride in our role in one of recent history's greatest dramas—the breaking up of the colonial system in Asia and Africa.

Yet, despite our efforts elsewhere in the world, we maintain this enclave—in many respects the heart and mind of our Nation—in which Americans are denied even the rudiments of self-government.

It is time to look to our own shores. It is time to think not only of what is decent and just but to think of what is in the best interest of this Nation as the leader of the free world. It is time, in short, for Congress to restore the right of self-government to the District of Columbia.

Mr. Conte. In discussing the home rule question with various interested persons, I have often been asked: Do District of Columbia residents really want self-government? Do District of Columbia residents really know what kind of system they want to replace direct congressional control?

On the first point, all the evidence suggests that Washingtonians are overwhelmingly in favor of a return to self-governing status. For instance, in the 1960 presidential preference primary, over 75 percent of both the Republican and Democratic voters marked their ballots for home rule.

Furthermore, strong arguments for local control over local affairs were developed during the recent Senate District Committee hearings. As I recall, more than 20 Washington organizations sent representatives to speak out strongly in support of home rule; many other groups and individuals sent written statements for inclusion in the hearing record. Five or six organizations spoke against the restoration of District self-government.

On the second point, there also appears to be a broad consensus—all of the proponent organizations testifying in the Senate hearings indicated they would gladly accept any practical and workable form of home rule that would give the District a reasonable amount of local autonomy. The same organizations that endorsed the so-called territorial government also endorsed the mayor-city council proposals. In short, District residents apparently are more than willing to leave the decision up to Congress.

And this is necessarily so. Washington is the Nation's capital and it must be administered in accordance with the interests of the entire Nation. This does not mean, however, that we must run roughshod over the purely local interests of local residents; on the contrary, in my opinion the national interest would be far better served if the day-to-day details of Washington's municipal administration were placed under local control.

Let me repeat: The residents of the District of Columbia have gone more than halfway; they have indicated clearly that they are willing to accept the type of institutions of self-government that Congress believes are workable in the Federal city. It is now up to us to go the rest of the way, to offer the inhabitants of Washington a form of home rule and to ask for their approval—or rejection—of it through a popular referendum. Such a referendum is provided for in this bill.

That is precisely what the bipartisan home rule bill I introduced today is designed to do. That is why I urge my colleagues in this House to help us enact this bill into law.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Congressman Tollefson, of the State of Washington, may be inserted in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The remarks referred to follow:

Mr. Tollefson. Only recently the Post Office Department issued one of its handsome series of credo stamps bearing a quotation by Abraham Lincoln. It read: "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves." If we believe in this principle, I do not see how we can any longer justify the continued denial of freedom to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Firmly believing in this principle, I gladly join today in the effort to put an end, once and for all, to the denial of freedom that has continued in the very shadow of the Capitol dome.

The effort commencing today to achieve home rule for the District is a bipartisan effort, and this is as it should be, for both parties share responsibility for the failures of the past in restoring to the residents of the Nation's Capital the rights enjoyed by all other American citizens to govern their own local affairs.

I come from a State that bears the same name as this city. It is a proud name—one of the great names in our history. In the State of Washington we make our own decisions about taxes and roads and schools—all of the thousand and one things that make up our State government. In our cities we decide how many policemen we need, how many judges, how streets are to be financed, and under what circumstances liquor will be dispensed. We don't have to ask the Congress of the United States to make these decisions for us, and we can't imagine how we could justify asking the Nation's lawmakers to devote their time to such matters. And yet this is precisely the way laws for the other Washington—this Washington, in which the movement for self-determination of peoples finds its greatest voice—are enacted.

So long as this continues we are ignoring the very fine principle laid down by President Lincoln. It is ironic that at the very time that we are paying new respect to Lincoln's

> words we are under an attack we cannot fully answer for the hypocrisy of our pronouncements. The world is well aware that we violate our own principles when we deny self-government to the residents of our Capital.
>
> The situation in the District of Columbia is the exception and not the rule in our society. We have the greatest system of representative government in the world today. Our Nation is justly proud of its electoral processes. Our people truly have a voice in their government, at all levels—Federal, State, and local. The District of Columbia is the one exception. That this should still obtain in the latter half of the 20th century is hard to believe, and yet it does. It is time we put an end to this anachronism and thereby prove to the world and ourselves that we truly mean what we say.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in the introduction of this District of Columbia home rule legislation. I am particularly pleased because from the outset this has been a truly bipartisan effort to secure badly needed changes in the governmental structure of the District of Columbia.

The bill which is being introduced today represents a compromise, and as such it will not be agreeable to everyone. I myself am not in full agreement with all of the provisions of the bill and there are still other things which I would like to see included which do not appear in the bill at all. But as a compromise, as a basis for going forward with our efforts to provide limited home rule for the residents of the District of Columbia, it merits the attention and careful consideration of every Member of the House.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to have been associated with efforts to return self-government to Washington residents since 1950. During these years there have been some disappointments and some setbacks for the home rule cause. But there have also been some areas of substantial progress, along with a good many developments that have been personally gratifying to me.

One of the most gratifying experiences that I recall in this connection is the response and the interest in this problem expressed by people who live far away from—indeed, people who perhaps have never even had the opportunity to see their Nation's Capital.

When I first became involved in this effort I assumed that few beyond the immediate locality either knew anything about the District residents' status or cared whether it was improved. I was wrong. American citizens elsewhere do know, and care, about the plight of the 880,000 people here who are being denied the right to a voice in the affairs of their own city.

For example, one letter that I received in the 1959 home rule campaign contained some particularly memorable language. I found it in my files the other day and ask your indulgence as I quote a few sentences from it. Signed by Mrs. John W. Thomas, president of the League of Women Voters of Hunterdon County, N.J., the relevant parts of the letter state:

> The League of Women Voters of Hunterdon County wishes to congratulate you on having taken what we consider an enlightened and courageous stand during the floor debate April 20. I refer, of course, to your support of the franchise for the District of Columbia.
>
> With new States as far away as Alaska and Hawaii being admitted to the Union, it becomes doubly absurd to deny the vote to people living within the shadow of the Capitol. Not only is it unfair to our own citizens; it looks to the rest of the world like a denial of the democracy we profess.

And the writer goes on to say that her organization will appreciate our further efforts to get our practices into line with our pronouncements on democracy where the District of Columbia is concerned.

This letter does not represent an isolated response. Newspaper editorial writers all across the Nation attest to the general nature of the interest and concern regarding the inequity of the situation that has prevailed here too many years.

A moment ago I mentioned that there had been some disappointments during a decade of experience with this vital issue. I am not going to talk about these disappointments here today, however, if for no other reason than the end of our quest—in my opinion—is not far off. I express optimism at this point in the full realization that a rough road lies ahead, that there are many detours leading to dead end roads along the way to local autonomy for the inhabitants of the Nation's Capital.

My optimism stems from the fact that, for the first time in my experience with the home rule question, the bipartisan approach has been followed throughout—from the selection of a steering committee to the drafting of legislation. The identical home rule bills that we are introducing today have no single author. They were not prepared by any single individual, nor were they prepared from any single party point of view. The 1962 bipartisan home rule bill represents an attempt to take the good things from a number of bills—including the Eisenhower-backed bill of the 86th Congress and the Kennedy-backed proposal of the current Congress—to take the best features of both and to combine them in a single bill.

I believe that the product of our thoroughgoing, two-party consultation is a sound piece of legislation, one which I can heartily recommend for enactment by the Members of this House.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House are alined in opposing ranks and I would like to make known my firm position on the side of medical care for the aged under social security.

Down through the ages, since the dawn of civilization, mankind has demonstrated great concern for the security and welfare of their senior citizens. That is true, not merely in the West but also in the Far East, and in the countries and among the peoples in and about the Holy Land. Love of parents is inculcated in every child and as the child grows into adulthood he develops a deep reverence and respect for the elderly. Amongst all people, we notice this same ingrained trait of love and respect for the aged. Throughout our beloved country there are countless homes designed primarily to care for those too old to help themselves. But not all our old folks, even in this modern day, are given the love and attention they need, or given the care they merit.

More than 16 million of our citizens are 65 years of age and older. Most of this group require medical care of one kind or another; not many of them, because of meager earnings or even of little and sometimes no income, can afford to pay for such care, particularly in this era of sky-high medical costs.

Yet we, a rich and powerful nation, with virtually unlimited resources and with the finest medical skill in all the world, find ourselves quibbling over the question of carrying out our moral duty.

Actually, this question of medical care for the aged is economic. It is tied up with the individual's economy and with the economy of the Nation. We, as individuals and as a Nation, are quite dependent entities, dependent one upon the other.

My colleagues in this House are well-informed about the purposes of this bill, just as they are informed concerning all the facets of current or impending legislation dealing with this program of medical care for the aged. You are aware that the Kerr-Mills legislation can provide only very limited care for our senior citizens. You know, too, that the President's proposal is more far-reaching and that it contains many proposals so essential to full and proper care of all persons over 65 years of age.

Let us be realistic. Most citizens—by far the great majority of our people—will welcome legislation such as that contained in the Anderson-King bill which has the support of the President. The strongly organized opposition represents but a small minority of citizens.

There is nothing in the President's recommendation urging support of this bill that is repugnant to American principles of government. Contrary to certain false allegations made, there is nothing socialistic in this program; nothing un-American; nothing which might in any way bring discredit or harm to our Nation or its people.

With approximately 70 percent of our citizens in favor of legislation along the lines of the Anderson-King Kennedy-supported measure on medical care for the aged, it is good to realize that the people of Philadelphia have taken definite steps to provide free care for persons over 65 which is designed to help the most needy. Obviously neither this program, nor any other local program, can care for the medical needs of all our senior citizens. This is a function that quite properly belongs with the Federal Government. The Philadelphia project, under the direction of Mayor James H. J. Tate, is about to be launched and will be the first of its kind in a large urban center. Its service is intended to include all needy persons living in Philadelphia. At first, the clinic will be restricted to free physical examinations for the most common ailments of the elderly. It is intended that this program will be expanded to include all needy city residents. But at best this service falls far short of the present needs. There is, and can be, only one program to ease the worries and the ills of the aged, and that is one such as the President recommends.

The Anderson-King bill provides no coverage for either physician's or surgeon's care, thereby squelching the familiar argument that "the individual cannot select his own doctor and the personal physician-patient relationship is lost." This bill does provide hospitalization, nursing home care, home visits by nurses, and diagnostic care, but there are certain limitations.

For hospital care: A patient must pay $10 a day for the first 9 days, and for the remaining 81 days of care the cost would be paid by the social security system. Ninety days of hospitalization are permitted for any one illness.

For nursing home care: A patient could receive 180 days.

For home health care: A patient would be entitled to this type of assistance for 240 home visits during a calendar year. This can be administered by a visiting nurse or, in some communities, by a physical therapist.

For diagnostic services: A patient could secure this service in the outpatient clinic of the hospitals, but he would pay the first $20 of the costs and the social security system would cover the balance, if any.

The Anderson-King bill takes care of those retired individuals who are under the social security system and railroad retirement.

The cost of this program would be covered by one-fourth of 1 percent payment by employee and one-fourth of 1 percent by employer on earnings of those who are covered by the old age and survivors insurance plan—our social security program.

I think it is important for us, at this time, to recall that the majority of the Members of this House are members of a great organization, which, from its inception, under Jefferson, has been undeniably the party of the people.

Virtually every piece of liberal legislation enacted for the security and the welfare of all the people has been due to the foresight and the tenacity of the Democratic administrations. And I urge my colleagues, in this time of urgency, to remain true to our basic principles of a fair deal for all our people, by giving all-out support to this desirable bill to help a large segment of our population. If we are to keep our Nation strong and great, we must stand ready to protect our senior citizens as well as our young citizens, and we must at all times be ready to give the fullness to devotion to the basic principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness intended for old and young alike.

PTA REVOLT AGAINST FEDERAL AID

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT] may insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the April 14, 1962, issue of Human Events an article by Steve Stahl entitled "PTA Revolt Against Federal Aid," which I believe will be of interest to many Members of Congress. Mr. Stahl discusses the disenchantment of many individual members of the Parent-Teacher Association and local PTA groups with the pro-Federal aid objectives of the National Education Association. The text of the article follows:

OKLAHOMA LEADS THE WAY—PTA REVOLT AGAINST FEDERAL AID

(By Steve Stahl)

A long and cozy romance between the Congress of Parents and Teachers and the National Education Association is beginning to disintegrate. While the two national organizations are still continuing to live in wedded bliss, individual members, many local and some State units are no longer willing to serve merely as handmaidens for the parent organizations.

Evidence of this revolt has continued to build up ever since Oklahoma parents said "No" to Federal school aid at the State Congress of Parents and Teachers convention in Enid on October 19–20, 1961. (See Human Events, Nov. 24, 1961.)

Letters from individual Parent-Teacher Association members, supported by newspaper clippings covering PTA conventions, indicate that this grassroots rebellion is spreading and growing. And, it may well develop into a real brawl at the national convention in Portland, Oreg., on May 20–23 of this year.

However, it would be naive to predict a divorce between the national organizations since the PTA boards of managers, tightly knit policy groups dominated by State education associations, control the selection of delegates to national conventions in most States.

It is this high-handed manner of democratic management from the top which has sparked the rebellion and caused many dedicated parents to begin studying State and national bylaws and directing some rather embarrassing questions to the national PTA office.

The following are some excellent examples of this ruthless control in operation:

On the Kansas front, a delegate to the State PTA convention of last fall reports: "The chairman, without previous notice, called for a vote on the resolution for Federal aid when two-thirds of delegates were out for lunch, and the measure was passed by voice vote over the courageous protest of one local PTA president. Kansas thus became one of the 30 States needed to bind the Nation's 12 million members."

Another delegate to the Kansas convention recommended dissolving the national PTA and described the organization's legislative program for 1961–62 as "red-raw liberalism all the way—a blueprint for socialism's regimentation."

In Montana, the home of Democratic Senator LEE METCALF, an ardent advocate of Federal aid, it took 2 years for members to find out that their State PTA was on record with the National Congress as favoring Federal aid to education without the knowledge or consent of its members.

When proof of this fact was presented on the convention floor, delegates voted 10 to 1 against Federal aid. Much credit for this action undoubtedly belongs to Dr. Gordon L. Doering, a member of the Montana State Board of Education, who has effectively debated the question all over the State. (Correspondence between Dr. Doering and Senator METCALF was published in the June 16, 1961, issue of Human Events.)

Another excellent example of rigging by PTA top brass, under the influence if not direct control of the National Education Association, occurred last November in Colorado. The State PTA scheduled a "Legislatice Institute" in Denver. Members from all over the State were invited and urged to attend.

The main event on the institute program, which was well publicized by Colorado papers, was billed as a pro-and-con discussion of the Federal aid to education question. Members interested in hearing both sides of the controversy attended from all over the State. They heard only two speakers, and both were stanch advocates of Federal aid.

Most of those present were disappointed; many were downright resentful. District Judge Hilbert Schauer of Fort Morgan, who drove 160 miles to attend the meeting, voiced the sentiments of many Colorado parents in a statement to the press in which he said:

"The Legislative Institute, sponsored by the State PTA and billed as a debate on Federal aid, was an insult to the intelligence of those present. Americans have the right to full debate of any subject no matter what the PTA says."

Although the Texas PTA has been on record as opposed to Federal aid for several years, a recent action by the Fort Worth PTA Council is significant. This Texas group, composed of representatives from 123 local units with a total membership of approximately 50,000 men and women, adopted a resolution opposing Federal aid and special agencies of the U.N. which are approved in the National Congress' legislative program.

From Hobbs, N. Mex., comes the report that the PTA of Houston Junior High has severed connections with both State and National PTA organizations. Undoubtedly there are many other similar instances over the Nation which have not reached this writer's attention.

The Oklahoma story actually began last August when the Oklahoma City PTA Council notified local units that the question of Federal aid would be voted on at the Enid convention. "Therefore," said the August bulletin, "it is important that your unit sends instructed delegates to the convention showing whether or not they approve such legislation."

Following receipt of this bulletin, Mrs. Don W. Boulton, a soft-spoken, red-haired, conservative PTA mother, wrote a letter to the forum page editor of the Oklahoma City Times. Mrs. Boulton's letter read, in part, as follows:

"This is an appeal to all PTA members who are opposed to Federal aid.

"This past year the national PTA has vigorously supported Federal aid to education. It has brought a great deal of pressure to bear on Members of Congress to vote for this legislation, in the name of all PTA members.

"I do not believe the majority of the members wants to support such legislation. The national PTA has been able to get this legislation approved by State PTA congresses simply because those of us who oppose it have not been instructed how to withhold State approval.

"If you want the national PTA to oppose Federal aid it is up to you to see that delegates favoring such action are sent to the State convention. It is time for those of us who believe in local control of our schools to speak up."

This bombshell, coupled with the fact that 18 of Oklahoma City's 98 locals had voted on the question with only 1 in favor of Federal aid, caused such consternation in the professional promoters' camp that a second bulletin was rushed to local unit presidents stating:

"The voting delegates to the State convention do not have to be instructed on how to vote. They will be instructed at the convention for a better understanding of their vote."

This switch, together with the announcement that Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, roving representative of the NEA and former U.S. Commissioner of Education, would be the principal speaker prior to consideration of the national legislative program, sparked another wave of protest.

However, all requests that the program include a speaker opposed to Federal aid were rejected by Dr. W. R. Fulton, State PTA president and professor of education at Oklahoma University.

The convention was described by four Edmond mothers "as rigged as a Russian election." The best available report on the entire convention was prepared by Mrs. Jack Short, a mother and former teacher, who was an official delegate from Duncan. Mrs. Short writes:

"The day began ominously. Mrs. Roger Rensvold and I arrived sometime between 9:30 and 10 a.m. After registering at the desk we attempted to enter the auditorium only to be told that we couldn't go in until the current item on the agenda was completed. So we waited out in the lobby along with about a hundred others. There was no chair so we were forced to stand on the concrete.

"This was the first closed convention I had ever attended. It disturbed me to think that all of us left outside might be missing an opportunity to vote upon some important issue. We were not sent information about the order of the program in advance, and consequently had no idea what was on the agenda.

"After we finally got in, our State legislature program was discussed and voted upon. The delegates inserted an amendment to the following proposition: Section IIA, 'We believe in a program of education adequately financed, which will offer the best educational opportunities to all children and youth.'

"The amendment changed the statement to read: 'We believe in a program of education, adequately financed at the State and local level, which will offer the best educational opportunities to all children and youth.'

"It was evident from the insertion of these words that those voting were for State and local financing, rather than Federal financing.

"The following morning Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, representative of the National Education Association and former Commissioner of Education of the U.S. Government, gave a speech entitled 'Our Schools—What of Tomorrow?'

"To the uninitiated parents or newspaper reporters who have not made a thorough study of Federal aid to education, what Dr. Derthick said would appear, on the surface, merely a plea for better schools due to changes in technology in this supersonic age. And anyone finding fault with what he said would be branded as unprogressive.

"However, before he was finished, it was apparent to those who have made a study of Federal aid to education, that he was merely making a sales pitch for people to fall right into line with plans mapped out by members of the National Education Association and U.S. Office of Education.

"This was further evidenced by the legislative program of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers which members of the Oklahoma congress were asked to adopt.

"Unfortunately, this legislative program was not given out in advance to delegates before they came to the convention, and its phraseology was of such cunning, and so ambiguous, that only another career educator could see the traps built into it—either that or an alert parent with time to study it.

"Time makes it impossible for me to go into each and every detail of this legislative octopus, but in general the wording was such that, if a person refused to go along with it, it made him appear opposed to all educational progress, poor little crippled children, motherhood, and God.

"Certain members of the convention delegation requested that motions be made amending this bit of legislative chicanery. They were informed by Dr. Fulton that amendments were not possible.

"Someone else made a motion to the effect that we simply go on record as opposed to Federal aid. Again Dr. Fulton said that this was against the rules, and could not be done, and that no amendments could be made to the proposed national legislative program.

"Warren Morris, of Oklahoma City, proposed that we suspend the rules of the convention and that five delegates be allowed to yield their 2 minutes of time to Steve Stahl, executive vice president of the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council, to speak against Federal aid, since Dr. Derthick's speech was clearly in favor of Federal aid.

"The convention parliamentarian ruled that in order to suspend the rules, the vote must carry by a two-thirds majority. This proposition lost by only three votes.

"Thus the morning passed. On every hand, opponents of Federal aid were given no real chance to present their side.

"It was proposed by Mrs. Claud Paul, of Duncan, that the national legislative program be sent home to the local units to study, and that action be taken on national legislation at a later date. Again Dr. Fulton ruled 'no.'

"Furthermore, delegates tried to get a motion passed which would have continued the legislative session after lunch, because time was passing, and very little had been accomplished. The legislative program had 15 sections and innumerable items under most of these sections. To have had full debate and discussion on each of the items separately would possibly have kept delegates there until late Friday night.

"Yet, Dr. Fulton insisted that there was only so much time allotted on the program for national legislative action, and that the program would not be changed regardless of the wishes of the delegates. This was against the rules. Whose rules, I still don't know. This action was grossly unfair and unjust and unreasonable, because to discuss them fully was the only fair and democratic way to handle them.

"As the noon hour approached, item 4–B was discussed. This item stated that Federal funds should be appropriated for the purpose of increasing educational opportunity among the States, with provisions insuring maximum local control and encouragement to the States to put forth their best efforts to equalize opportunities within their own boundaries.

"This item, according to Dr. Fulton, would be the one to vote on, if members wished to vote against Federal aid. This one opponents of Federal aid voted down in an overwhelming standing vote.

"Unfortunately, they did not vote down the whole program, which item by item supports Federal aid or Federal action of some kind. The reason this is so is the way in which the items are worded. In each one of them, there is the assumption or implication that there is Federal action of some kind to be taken on each item. This means that when the final vote was cast the majority of items accepted tended to nullify the intentions of those opposed to Federal aid.

"A perfect example of this was item 3–C which says: 'The U.S. Office of Education should be established as an independent agency of government under the general direction of a Federal board of education. This board should be composed of laymen appointed to long overlapping terms and should have the authority to appoint, and be advisory to, the U.S. Commissioner of Education.'

"Now what this particular section is asking for is the creation of a giant Government bureaucracy. The plans for this bureaucracy are spelled out in full in a pamphlet published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, in April 1961. The Committee, which consisted of several distinguished members of the career staff of the Office of Education, were charged by none other than Dr. Derthick—U.S. Commissioner of Education at that time and our speaker at the convention—with developing 'clear-cut and balanced statement of the mission proper of the Office of Education, over the next decade, and a reasonably detailed outline of an organizational structure that would be most conducive to the effective accomplishment of that mission.'

"It is absolutely impossible for me to review the contents of that little pamphlet in the time allotted, but, believe me, it is a blueprint for controlling our schools. I base this on several facts, one of which is that rules and regulations set up by any Government bureau are regarded as law, as much as if they are passed by Congress.

"I would also call attention to a statement from a book by Prof. Theodore Brameld, School of Education, New York University, who said: 'We need a National Education Authority and eventually an International Education Authority financed largely by U.S. dollars which would exercise control over newspapers, radio and television stations, as well as education. Certainly religion is much too fundamental an aspect of social realities to be left to the casual or doctrinaire treatment outside public education.

"The National Education Authority and the International Education Authority which Dr. Brameld spoke of are outlined in the pamphlet already discussed—and refer to item 3–C on the national legislative agenda presented to us at Enid.

"As you can see, I could spend hours on that one little item which wasn't even discussed at the convention, but was on the program. That should give you an idea of what I was trying to say about the whole national legislative program that was given less than 2 hours on their schedule.

"The upshot of the whole thing was that eventually weary of long debate and given no break to take care of natural functions, people were forced to leave.

"Dr. Fulton, by using every delaying tactic in the book, finally called for a vote on all the rest of the items on the agenda. About half of the delegates had already left, and when the vote was called for, those in favor of Federal aid and further bureaucratic controls won the day. And many, including the press, were deceived as to the final outcome.

"As an American and as a parent, I urge you to study this issue. Work actively in your PTA, and every other organization with which you are affiliated, to make certain that you are well represented by people who believe as you do, at any convention. I do not think that the travesty of justice which occurred in Enid would occur again if all of us were aware of the issues—social, economic, political and moral—which are voted upon by organizations every day."

Although an official delegate to the Enid convention, Mrs. Short was not permitted to present this report to the Emerson School PTA which she represented. Fortunately, she reached a much larger audience through the courtesy of Duncan radio station KRHD, which permitted her to broadcast the report as a public service feature.

The story in Oklahoma, as told by Mrs. Short in her letter, did not end with the convention. Early in November, Oklahoma City delegates who were disgusted with the total disregard of freedom of expression at this convention started a series of meetings to study local, State, and National bylaws; to alert other units in the State and Nation to the fact that they had been "taken for a ride down a dangerous path" by the National Education Association; and to determine the number of State PTA's on record for Federal aid. After considerable effort, it was learned that the national PTA office was claiming 34 States.

Perhaps some of these States, like Montana, are on record without their knowledge or consent. For that reason it is suggested that PTA members in these States check the records to find out if and when they voted approval of the Federal aid resolution.

As a result of the activity of the Oklahoma City committee, program chairmen of many local units attempted to schedule pro-and-con discussions of the question. Several were prohibited from discussing the question by either the president or school principal.

In four instances, scheduled programs on which the writer was to appear were canceled. In another, Willis J. Wheat, dean of the School of Business Administration at Oklahoma City University and an opponent of Federal aid, was asked to speak. His audience consisted of two parents, a few guests and no teachers.

When it became apparent that the Oklahoma Education Association was determined to deny PTA members the opportunity to discuss and become informed on the question of Federal aid, Ferman Phillips, executive secretary of the association, was invited to debate the question on a half-hour television program. He declined.

In the meantime, the Oklahoma City PTA Council, in an effort to pour oil on troubled water, scheduled a series of meetings. The first was a discussion of the Federal aid question with Dr. Garland Godfrey, a member of the board of directors of the National Education Association and president of Central State College, third largest tax-supported institution of higher education in Oklahoma, and the writer.

Each speaker was allotted 20 minutes with a question-and-answer session to follow. Ignoring the rules, Godfrey spoke for 48 minutes during which he questioned the accuracy and source of the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council's reports on school finance.

The following day, January 17, a full packet of council information on school finance and related problems was sent to Dr. Godfrey with a covering letter which stated: "If you can find any errors in fact in this material, they will be corrected immediately with a public apology for any and all such errors." The council has not yet heard from the NEA board member.

The final meeting was held on Tuesday, March 6, with Mrs. Fred L. Bull, chairman of the national PTA committee on legislation, as the speaker. Mrs. Bull emphasized two points: (1) the tremendous power of the PTA in legislative matters; and (2) that there was no partnership between the national PTA and the National Education Association.

Insofar as a partnership between the two organizations is concerned, Mrs. Bull should read the speech by the national PTA president, Mrs. Clifford Jenkins, to the 1961 NEA convention in which Mrs. Jenkins said:

"Your professional organization and the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, in which you are valued partners, move side by side toward shared goals. Through years of cooperation we have learned to adjust the size of our steps and the length of our strides to each other's."

However, neither she nor anyone else explained why there were six NEA pamphlets promoting Federal aid to education in the folders handed to delegates at the Enid convention.

Dr. Derthick, who spent a bundle of the taxpayers' money as a traveling salesman for Federal aid when he was U.S. Commissioner of Education, came up with a pat explanation for this nationwide rebellion during a visit to Great Falls, Mont., last November.

When asked what happened in Oklahoma, he blamed "damned Republican infiltration" and intimated that more such "infiltration" is expected at national." Whether the good doctor, who was appointed U.S. Commissioner by a Republican President, is seeking to exclude Republicans from membership in the PTA and the NEA, only he can answer.

Meanwhile, one thing is certain: A substantial number, perhaps a majority, of the Nation's PTA members are no longer willing to make draperies for school cafeterias while waiting a call to action in State and National legislative chambers when the National Education Association rings the gong.

PORTSMOUTH, OHIO, TOPS FOR INDUSTRY

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks and include therein extraneous material I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the results of a recent survey conducted by the Fantus Area Research Corp. in Scioto County, Ohio.

The results of this survey prove without a doubt that the people of this area are willing industrious folks pulling together to encourage new industry to locate there. As pointed out by the survey this area has all the attributes for many new industries. The people are willing to make the necessary sacrifices to bring industry into the locality. And in the minds of these experts the Portsmouth area is tops. I include in my remarks the following story that appeared recently in the Portsmouth Times:

Rosette From Fantus—Area Praised in Industry Survey

(By L. W. Burns)

The Portsmouth area today is wearing a rosette pinned on by the Fantus Area Research Corp. of New York.

Fantus was employed by the Norfolk & Western Railway to make an industrial development survey of the area. Details of the survey were revealed Tuesday night by Jack Adams of the N. & W. industrial department.

To those interested in industrial development, the Fantus rosette is more cherished than the mythical All America City Award the city sought earlier this year.

The Portsmouth area ranks tops among the communities of the Ohio Valley extending from Fort Gay, W. Va., to Columbus and Cincinnati, Adams said.

"The Portsmouth area made a good first impression," Adams said. "Fantus found the people are progressive, community spirit is high and the general appearance of the homes and buildings is good. Fantus was impressed with the public interest in keeping homes neat and attractive.

Adams predicted that the current decade will see great industrial growth in the area, although present inquiries for plant sites are low compared with the same period last year. He said industry was enthused by the New Frontier last year, but now has adopted a wait-and-see attitude.

Adams said the report is just another tool for use of those working toward industrial development.

"Industries are landed as the result of teamwork," he said. "No individual or single group ever landed an industry. It takes the cooperative efforts of many groups."

Fantus recommended that the Portsmouth area seek industries for which the area is suited rather than make a shotgun approach to all industry.

It found the area is suitable for the chemical processing industry, concrete materials such as concrete pipe, prefab houses, notions, garments, athletic uniforms and medicine cabinets and similar products.

It found that Ohio Valley section is suitable for the chemical industry while the Scioto Valley has many sites for other smaller industries.

"Fantus was much impressed by the Scioto Valley and the number of 100-acre sites available," he said. He pointed to the Teays River valley as a source of underground water for industry.

Fantus found the main highways of the area good, while work needs to be done on secondary roads leading to potential plant sites.

Industry moves or locates a plant for three reasons, Adams said, to make a profit, for closeness to raw materials and markets and transportation.

He said Fantus reported Portsmouth area has an adequate supply of skilled labor. He said the Ohio tax structure is good and comparable to other States.

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the House has today taken a step long anticipated and much desired in approving the bill to establish a National Portrait Gallery within the Smithsonian Institution. This is an event of such significance to the historical, cultural, and artistic life of the Capital and the Nation that I think it merits a word of special mention.

Those of us who have been privileged to visit a national portrait gallery know what a special interest and charm they may have. Pictures of great historical interest which may or may not have sufficient artistic merit to find a place in art galleries can become favorites in a museum of portraiture. The features and characters of national leaders and famous figures can be fascinating and well worth the study of the discerning citizen as well as the professional historian.

I welcome the National Portrait Gallery of Washington. I wish it a long and constructive career in serving the people of America to better understand the vigor and strength of our traditions by more personal acquaintance with our leaders and heroes.

EDUCATIONAL TAX RELIEF

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, our current tax laws as they relate to the rearing and education of children are as archaic as the brass spittoon, the jeweled toothpick, and the lavaliere. In fact, a study program or demonstration grant vitally needed is for some agency to illustrate how to shelter, feed, clothe, medicate and educate a dependent on $600 per year. Even if a child were turned out to pasture on Federal grazing land or fed out of surplus crop storage I doubt that the bureau could make ends meet.

About the only group which can take any balm or comfort from the $600 deduction for dependents is probably the planned parenthood association. At $50 per month many who want children cannot afford them and many who have children cannot meet the cost of educating them. The expanded incentive of 7 percent in the tax reform bill now before Congress is a pretty good deal for business but it does not do much for father. It is about time that the House recognized that the money spent for the education of children should be as eligible for tax relief as the cost of a new store front, a geodesic dome, or an automatic pretzel bender. All of these will make more jobs and that is good. But only the dedication of parents to the education of children to their maximum capacities will enable us to meet the real challenge of automation and competition in the decade ahead. We need to encourage such dedication.

That is why I have this day introduced legislation under the appropriate reference number to revise the system of deductions for dependents on an escalated basis tied to educational expenses. The present $600 deduction would be the floor and apply to infants of preschool age. It would step up to $700 for school children between ages 6 and 12, move to $1,000 for secondary school students in the over-12 age bracket and reach a top of $1,400 for dependents pursuing education beyond high school. One feature would discourage dropouts after elementary school by tolling the increase in present deductions for children over 12 who are not students after the eighth grade.

The increase of $400 to $800 over the present basic deduction would be a maximum limitation and apply only to actual expenses incurred in the education of dependents. I confess that the author of this bill would probably qualify for more relief than any other Member of the Congress but I am also in a position to offer special knowledge of the impact of a dozen dependents on the $12.50 per week per child deduction. Let me add that I am thoroughly sympathetic to the childless individual or couple who face an individually severe burden with the single deduction. A true tax reform bill would do something for both of us.

I am well aware that it is awkward at this time to suggest a reduction in Federal revenue while we are exploring every avenue to find ways to meet the cost of our spending for survival. I have supported survival spending measures because I recognize the dimension of the challenge and the impossible alternative of weakness. I submit, however, that we will be the stronger Nation in the long run if we can give some relief to those who are bearing the burden of educating the new generation to prepare to meet the crises beyond the present and to endure stresses now unknown.

WILLIAM L. MITCHELL, COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, William L. Mitchell, Commissioner of Social Security and one of the architects of the American social security system, today retired after 40 years in the Federal career service.

Through the years, I have gotten to know Bill Mitchell well. He has appeared many times before our Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee to justify needed appropriations and to answer the many difficult questions that arose. He has always exemplified honesty, integrity, and devotion to duty and has exhibited the finest traits of the career Government servant. His personal dignity and warmth have been used in helping to advance the programs for which he has been responsible and to stress the dignity of the individual human being and of the American family.

He has well earned the privilege of retiring, and I wish him every satisfaction in the years ahead.

His successor is Robert M. Ball, 48, former Deputy Director, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, whose nomination was submitted to the Senate by President Kennedy on March 20, and was confirmed there on April 3.

In accepting Mitchell's request for retirement, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff declared:

> You can be very proud of your splendid record in the Federal service and especially in the several capacities in which you have worked during the past 25 years in the Social Security Administration. Through the length and breadth of this land there will be people who are receiving social security and public welfare whose security and well-being will be due, in part, to the contribution that you have made.
>
> It has been a real joy for me to have been associated with you as Commissioner of Social Security. Your loyalty and commonsense have been great assets to this Department and myself.

President John F. Kennedy said:

> It is with great reluctance that I accept your request to retire after 40 years of distinguished and valuable Federal service.
>
> Your complete dedication to the national interest and the public welfare during your tenure of duty helped make possible the great progress that has been made in advancing social security for the American people.
>
> Being a career employee has many satisfactions and compensations, but it also requires sacrifice. I hope that new and interesting avenues of life will open before you in the years ahead and I know that you will continue an active interest in the public service.

The praise voiced by these two high officials symbolized the regard in which Mr. Mitchell is widely held as a distinguished careerman in Government. He began Federal work in the Department of Public Buildings and Grounds in 1922. In the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce he started in 1923 as a commercial agent in Washington, D.C., and New York City and closed 10 years of work there in 1933 as district manager in Atlanta, Ga. With the arrival of the New Deal he joined the National Recovery Administration in Georgia. In 1936 he joined the newly created Social Security Board as the Director of the Bureau of Personnel and Business Management. By 1946, he had worked up to the post of Deputy Commissioner of Social Security. In December 1958, after 13 years of such service under three Commissioners, he was named Commissioner of Social Security by President Eisenhower. He continued as Commissioner under President Kennedy.

During his more than 3 years as Commissioner, Mr. Mitchell testified on Capitol Hill in behalf of many amendments to broaden the social security system and to strengthen family life. He led the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Social Security Act on August 14, 1960. By that time more than 14 million beneficiaries were drawing monthly checks and 5.9 million needy persons were on public assistance programs.

Under Secretary Ribicoff's direction, Mr. Mitchell set up the programs for assisting the Cuban refugees, who have escaped the Castro regime.

During the last year, he has been implementing Secretary Ribicoff's reform in public welfare in which the aim is to reduce dependency by retraining and rehabilitating as many as possible of the people on relief to the point where they become contributing members of society.

Mr. Mitchell has been a notable international leader in the social security field. In 1948, he was assigned to study and advise on reorganization of the social security system of Greece. He has attended many international conferences. He has personally studied the social service systems in Russia, the Scandinavian countries, southern Europe, Latin America, and the Far East. Just before his retirement, he made a trip to Florence, Italy, to plan for the 1964 triennial convention of the International Social Security Association.

Full text of the letters from President Kennedy and Secretary Ribicoff follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM L. MITCHELL,
Commissioner of Social Security,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER MITCHELL: It is with great reluctance that I accept your request to retire after 40 years of distinguished and valuable Federal service.

Your complete dedication to the national interest and the public welfare during your tenure of duty helped make possible the great progress that has been made in advancing social security for the American people. Those endeavors resulted in your being entrusted with vast and complex responsibilities as Commissioner of Social Security in 1959. Your appointment culminated a distinguished career of Federal service and association with the Social Security Administration from its inception.

Being a career employee has many satisfactions and compensations, but it also requires sacrifice. I hope that new and interesting avenues of life will open before you in the years ahead and I know that you will continue an active interest in the public service.

Personally and on behalf of all the men and women of the Federal service, I wish you every happiness and future success.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1962.

Mr. W. L. MITCHELL,
Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington D.C.

DEAR BILL: This will acknowledge your letter requesting retirement as Commissioner of Social Security. It is with great reluctance that I concur in your request.

You have performed in an outstanding manner in your position of trust and responsibility. I have great respect for your integrity and conscientiousness and the way in which you have handled a very difficult assignment.

You can be very proud of your splendid record in the Federal service and especially in the several capacities in which you have worked during the past 25 years in the Social Security Administration. Through the length and breadth of this land there will be people who are receiving social security and public welfare whose security and well-being will be due in part to the contribution that you have made.

I must add a personal note, Bill. You are really a great guy. It has been a real joy for me to have been associated with you as Commissioner of Social Security. Your loyalty and commonsense have been great assets to this Department and myself.

You are still a vigorous and alert man. I know that there are many useful years ahead for you. I do hope our paths cross many times in the days ahead. If, at any time, I can be of help to you, please do not hesitate to call on me.

With all my best wishes for a happy and fruitful future, I am,

Sincerely,

ABE.

HOLDING OF THE LINE IN STEEL

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have taken the floor during the past week to speak on the subject of the recent price increase in steel. Subsequently, this increase has been reversed. There is still one phase of this controversy that has not been touched upon.

The President did not see fit to take most of the Members of Congress into his confidence when he originally met with representatives of both business and labor to ask for a "holding of the line." Most of us have had to learn what little we could from unconfirmed news reports and there is confusion in what has appeared in print. I, for one, cannot say for certain what steel pledged nor what labor pledged, if, indeed, any pledges were exchanged. And so I cannot say whether steel broke its word or not.

I am left to wonder—and I am afraid the people are left to wonder—whether or not the President and the Attorney General have used the power and prestige of their offices to intimidate both labor and business into doing the bidding of the Government. If such is the case, this country, founded on free enterprise and grown strong because of it, has come to a sad state when open covenants, openly arrived at, may now be replaced by Federal dictation to both labor and business. I am too much a believer in open negotiations to be happy with such an eventuality.

And finally, I am left with one other impression from what I have read of last week's events. That is that the Attorney General has leaped to the opportunity to investigate steel with more vigor and more zeal than he has shown so far toward an investigation and prosecution of the Communist agents and subversives the FBI indicates are in this country today.

I would hope that he would divert some of this energy and enthusiasm into an anti-Communist channel. If he would do so, I feel this country would be the better off for it.

The law requires this prosecution and I would like to see his office going about it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mrs. RILEY), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. STEED, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, April 17, 1962.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, for 20 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROBISON.
Mr. FOGARTY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHWENGEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEARNS.
Mr. HALL.
Mrs. DWYER.

Mr. VINSON, his remarks in Committee of the Whole on H.R. 11131, and to include extraneous matter and tables.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FASCELL.
Mr. BAILEY.
Mr. LANKFORD.
Mr. MADDEN.
Mr. SHELLEY.
Mr. ROOSEVELT.
Mr. KOWALSKI.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of hearings on the Revenue Act of 1962; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9751. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8921. An act to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10700. An act that section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that act, is amended by striking out "1962" and "$40,000,000" and substituting "1963" and "$63,750,000", respectively.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 12, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the follow titles:

H.R. 6676. An act to designate the Kettle Creek Dam on Kettle Creek, Pa., as the Alvin R. Bush Dam; and

H.R. 10043. An act to amend Public Law 86-272, as amended, with respect to the reporting date.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 17, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1934. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting reports submitted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the period July 1 through December 31, 1961, listing contracts negotiated under the authority of sections 2304(a)(11) and 2304(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, 2304(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1935. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for the period July 1, 1959, through December 31, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 389); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1936. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 390); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1937. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the administration of forest management activities by the Portland area office, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1938. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crewmembers and their dependents, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1939. A letter from the president, National Safety Council, transmitting a report of the audit of the financial transactions of the National Safety Council for the year 1961, pursuant to Public Law 259, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1940. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1941. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1963 involving a net decrease in the amount of $2,400,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 388); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1942. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the report of the Post Office Department pursuant to section 2304 of title 39, United States Code (sec. 105 of the Postal Policy Act of 1958) (H. Doc. No. 391); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1943. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 6303 (c) of title 39, United States Code"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1944. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected slum clearance and urban renewal activities under the administration of the Philadelphia regional office of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, March 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1945. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a report relative to the provisions of section 451(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to the use of funds under this section; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1946. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the following claim: *Charles E. Williams, Joseph Redthunder, and Harry Owhi as representatives of the Nez Perce Tribe, Petitioners,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* Docket No. 180-A, pursuant to 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1947. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, relative to inviting the House of Representatives to a proposed reopening and dedication of the House of Representatives Chamber of Congress Hall at Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia; to the Committee on Rules.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 11, 1962, the following bill was reported on April 13, 1962:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 11289. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted April 16, 1962*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11221. A bill to amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 252), to increase the basic allowance for quarters of members of the uniformed services and to make permanent the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee of conference. S. 205. An act to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs (Rept. No. 1609). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ADDABBO: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 8564. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to provide for escheat of amounts of insurance to the insurance fund under such act in the absence of any claim for payment, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 11145. A bill to repeal subsection (a) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, limiting the area in the District of Columbia within which sites for public buildings may be acquired; with amendment (Rept. No. 1611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 11, 1962, the following bill was introduced April 13, 1962:

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 11289. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

[*Introduced and referred April 16, 1962*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 11290. A bill to provide for the nutritional enrichment and sanitary packaging of rice prior to its distribution under certain Federal programs, including the national school lunch program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 11291. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11292. A bill relating to the refund to the States of any unexpended balance of taxes collected under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 11293. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources to timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local public service programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H.R. 11294. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of the domestic gold mining industry and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 11295. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 11296. A bill to provide a charitable contribution deduction of up to 30 percent for contributions to nonprofit museums, libraries, and other facilities in support of the arts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 11297. A bill to provide for an elective Governor and an elective Lieutenant Governor of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 11298. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 11299. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to relinquish to the State of Delaware jurisdiction over any lands within the Fort Miles Military Reservation located near Lewes, Del.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 11300. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 11301. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to prohibit the use of foreign lumber or other wood products in any construction or rehabilitation covered by FHA-insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 11302. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 11303. A bill to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ annually, on a temporary basis, a student congressional interne; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 11304. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the payment of benefits to adopted children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 11305. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 11306. A bill relating to the refund to the States of any unexpended balance of taxes collected under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 11307. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to eliminate discrimination against married female employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCRANTON:

H.R. 10308. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 11309. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11310. A bill to amend section 3515 of the Revised Statutes to eliminate tin in the alloy of the 1-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 11311. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to provide criminal penalties for violations of civil aeronautics safety provisions and regulations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 11312. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Virgin Islands National Park, St. John, Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 11313. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Virgin Islands National Park, St. John, Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 11314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide more realistic amounts for the personal exemptions allowed a taxpayer for his children, and to provide a deduction from gross income for certain educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 11315. A bill to provide for the establishment of a permanent program of additional unemployment compensation, to provide for equalization grants, to extend coverage for the unemployment compensation program, to establish Federal requirements with respect to the weekly benefit amount and limit the tax credits available to employers in a State which does not meet such requirements, to establish a Federal requirement prohibiting States from denying compensation to workers undergoing occupational training or retraining and deny tax credits to employers in a State which does not meet such requirement, to increase the wage base for the Federal unemployment tax, to increase the rate of the Federal unemployment tax, to establish a Federal additional compensation and equalization account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 11316. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 11317. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 11318. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make it clear that disaster loans in cases of flood or other catastrophe may be made with respect to property of any type (including summer homes as well as other residential property); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 11319. A bill to provide for the nutritional enrichment and sanitary packaging or rice prior to its distribution under certain Federal programs, including the national school lunch program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER (by request):

H.R. 11320. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to permit national banks to make loans on unimproved real estate in certain circumstances; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 11321. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 11322. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 11323. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 11324. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 11325. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 11326. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11327. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 11328. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 11329. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.R. 11330. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 11331. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 11332. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. Con. Res. 460. Concurrent resolution expressing sense of Congress on Project Hope; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

H. Res. 600. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H. Res. 601. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the production, distribution, and exhibition of objectionable motion pictures and related advertising; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H. Res. 602. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the production, distribution, and exhibition of objectionable motion pictures and related advertising; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to prevent interference with the registration of prospective voters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to allow deductions to be made under the social security law for any service rendered in the National Guard in any quarter of the year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to amending the 16th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp for Father Junipero Serra; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to imports of livestock and livestock products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting a further study of the problem of foreign beef importation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to opposing Federal taxation of income derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation expanding Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation requiring that automobiles be manufactured so as to provide maximum safety for the public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to prevent interference with the registration of prospective voters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to allow deductions to be made under the social security law for any service rendered in the National Guard in any quarter of the year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation removing all tariff or other restrictions on the importation of residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide medical care for the aged under the provisions of the social security law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 11333. A bill for the relief of Kamejiro Ikeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 11334. A bill for the relief of Mary J. Papwroth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 11335. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bruschi, his wife, Maria M. Carrera Bruschi, and their son, Giovanni Bruschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 11336. A bill for the relief of Ntina P. Galoris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 11337. A bill for the relief of Bohdan Lubaczewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11338. A bill for the relief of Frances Kastelic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

306. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Eleanor S. Wendell, Society of Daughters of Holland Dames, New York, N.Y., relative to supporting legislation to establish Alexander Hamilton's home, the Grange, in New York City as a national memorial; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

307. Also, petition of Arthur E. Hird, city clerk, Hanford, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of interest derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

308. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, New York, N.Y., relative to appropriating funds to provide for a biographical directory of the American Federal Judiciary from 1789 to date; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Pan American Day, April 16, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1962

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, 72 years ago Simon Bolivar's dream of pan-American unity came true. In April 1890 an international conference of representatives of the American Republics created a permanent international organization which has evolved in our own time into the Organization of American States. Since 1931 this event has been celebrated throughout the hemisphere as the day of inter-American unity, which we note here today in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States we tend, I believe, to emphasize the contribution of the English and neglect the elements brought to the New World by the Spanish. Although the Spanish contribution to most areas of our Nation is great, I believe the most significant contribution of the Spanish culture to the New World is most evident in the State of California and in my own city, San Francisco.

Two great Spaniards were primarily responsible for the settling of California. The first was a priest, Father Junipero Serra. The second was a soldier, Don Gaspar de Portola. Together they advanced into northern California in 1769. On this expedition Don Portola discovered the beautiful Bay of San Francisco. In the same year that the American colonists revolted against Great Britain, the military outpost of the Presidio and the Mission Dolores were established in San Francisco.

In language, architecture, farming methods, and the law the Spanish made lasting contributions to California. The use of Spanish place names is common for cities and streets; many words of Spanish origin have been incorporated into American speech. The simple and striking style of the Spanish missions has molded the shape of public and private buildings throughout California and continues to be a strong influence in modern architecture.

Mr. Speaker, the productiveness and variety of California crops is a direct heritage from the Spanish missionary farmers. Father Serra on his first expedition carried with him seeds of the flowers and vegetables of both the Old World and New World. The missions were famous for their gardens and direct inspiration for planting fruits orchards. The sheep raising industry also derives from the Spanish days. Finally, the effect of Spanish law upon land grants and water rights remains to this day. The Spanish community property laws were retained when California became a State.

Prof. William Q. DeFuniak, of the University of San Francisco Law School, has written the definitive work in the field of community property. His scholarly investigation entitled "Principles of Community Property" makes clear the Spanish contribution in this area of California law.

Both the English and the Spanish, long rivals in the politics of Europe, contributed the best elements of their culture to the making of the New World. The mingling of these two different and unique cultures has resulted in the growth of an entirely new civilization, which we call American. Mr. Speaker, it is in recognition of our common dedication to the hemispheric way of life based on liberty that we celebrate Pan American Day.

Student Congressional Interns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1962

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, in the past 5 to 10 years there has been an ever-increasing interest in the legislative process and the Congress itself among our college and graduate students. One result of this interest is that many college graduates and those with advanced degrees have sought to enter the field of congressional staff work as a career or as a preparation for other phases of public service. Certainly the educational background level of staff personnel has risen markedly in the past decade. This healthy interest has also manifested itself in a huge increase in the number of college and graduate students who have sought summer positions on the staffs of the Members of Congress. Some of these come under the aegis of various associations or of their university, such as the program which Yale University has organized which screens the students to meet certain academic and motivational criteria and provides a standard résumé sheet to prospective congressional employees. Others use the individual approach of contacting their own Congressman, or the Member representing the area in which the college or university is located.

During the past three summers I have employed students from St. Lawrence and Syracuse Universities in my office and they made a worthwhile contribution to the staff workload. More important perhaps, is the knowledge of the workings of the Congress and the various facets of the legislative process which are rarely taught in political science courses, which these students took with them when they returned to their classes, and which will spark their interest in public affairs the rest of their lives.

In recent years, however, the supply of interested students has far exceeded the availability of summer positions in the Members' offices. In the summer of 1961, the U.S. Employment Service Office here on Capitol Hill had several hundred students registered which it could not place in offices. In several cases, Members have had to restrict their consideration to constituents only, but still have half a dozen well-qualified students both male and female standing in line waiting for possible employment this summer. Many of us who have previously employed students for the summer cannot do so this year because the increasing workload has brought about enlargement of our permanent staffs so that there is no room for a summer employee. No room in the office, no room in the maximum number of people we can employ under law, or no funds in our clerk-hire allowance to compensate such employees.

The third House Office Building should ease the space problem. To solve the other facets of the summer staff problem, I have introduced H.R. 11303 to authorize each Member of the House to employ annually, during the period June 1 to August 31, a student congressional intern in his office. It requires that each student appointed have on file with the Clerk of the House a certificate from an official of the college or graduate school that the student was in good standing at his institution of learning during the academic year preceding his employment.

The compensation for these student interns would be less than that now paid to members of the Capitol Page School, and it would be paid of course only during the 3 months of employment.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that my bill will be given serious consideration by the Committee on House Administration It would encourage many Members to utilize student employees during the summer months which I believe is helpful to the Member and of lasting value to the student and the Nation. Additionally, it would permit many who have previously hired students in the summer but who now cannot do so to continue the practice.

WTVJ's Well-Deserved Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1962

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in these days when television has been designated "a vast wasteland," it is indeed a pleasure to recognize a television station that is aware of its public responsibility and the standards of broadcasting in the public interest. Such an outstanding television station as this is WTVJ, channel 4, in Miami, Fla.

WTVJ recently has been named by the National Headliners Club as winner of the 28th annual award for "Consistently Outstanding TV Editorials."

Mr. Lee Ruwitch, WTVJ executive vice president and general manager, will accept a plaque and a silver medallion on behalf of WTVJ at the National Headliners Club annual award program at Atlantic City on May 5.

WTVJ was selected for this honor on the basis of its daily editorials throughout 1961, which were broadcast by Ralph Renick, WTVJ vice president in charge of news. The award made special mention of the station's 7-day campaign during the summer of 1961 protesting the firing of Miami City Manager Melvin Reese, without notice and without stated charges. Reese was subsequently retained as city manager.

It is a signal honor for WTVJ that this editorial campaign was cited by the man who gave us the term, television "wasteland," Newton Minow, FCC Chairman, in a speech before the National Association of Broadcasters in March of this year. Congratulations must be extended to WTVJ and its parent, Wometco Enterprises, Inc., for their continued activity in the field of public service programing.

Alaskan Teachers From the Other States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 16, 1962

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, information released in a recent edition of the newsletter of the Anchorage Independent School District at Anchorage, Alaska, reveals just how generous have been the sister States of Alaska in sharing human resources with their new and northerly partner. According to Education News, published by the school district, no State has been so generous in this regard as has been the State of Wisconsin.

Wisconsin has provided Anchorage with 39 of her sons and daughters who are now Alaska teachers.

But Wisconsin is not alone among the States who have provided educators for the children of Alaska's largest city. In fact, Anchorage teachers are representative of all States in the Union with the exception of Delaware, and I would certainly add that it is more than just probable that there are teachers from Delaware in other Alaska communities.

In addition to the interstate representation among Anchorage teachers, it must be added that the school system is given an international character by teachers who claim Canada, England, and China as their former homes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD immediately following these remarks a list I have prepared which shows the number of Anchorage teachers from each of the other States.

We Alaskans are proud of all our teachers and we are grateful to those States from which many traveled to join us in our effort to educate our children. We could not do the job alone and we cannot help but be proud to have attracted the high caliber individuals who have joined us from points far distant.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wisconsin, 39; Washington, 35; Minnesota, 32; Texas, 29; Oklahoma, 27; California, 25; Kansas, 24; Illinois, 24; Ohio, 23; Colorado, 21; Pennsylvania, 21; Michigan, 19; Oregon, 18; North Dakota, 16; Iowa, 15; Montana, 14; Nebraska, 13; Idaho, 13; South Dakota, 12; Massachusetts, 11; New Jersey, 9; Indiana, 9; Tennessee, 9; Alabama, 8; Florida, 7; Missouri, 7; Arkansas, 7; Alaska, 6; Arizona, 6; North Carolina, 6; New Mexico, 6; Utah, 5; Mississippi, 5; West Virginia, 4; Georgia, 4; Canada, 4; New Hampshire, 4; Maine, 3; Kentucky 3; Connecticut, 3; Vermont, 3; Virginia, 2; Rhode Island, 2; Hawaii, 1; Nevada, 1; South Carolina, 1; Louisiana, 1; Maryland, 1; Wyoming, 1; Washington, D.C., 1; England, 1; China, 1.

Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1962

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry of the Select Committee on Small Business, I have a great and continuing interest in the problems of the small business segment of the dairy industry. A great mass of information has been assembled by the subcommittee under the chairmanship of our distinquished colleague from Oklahoma, the Honorable TOM STEED, and we of the subcommittee continue to get serious complaints from small businessmen who are rapidly being eliminated by the monopolistic practices of the large, multiple-market concerns. On April 10, 1962, at the Mayflower Hotel, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, majority leader of the House of Representatives, addressed the fifth annual convention of the National Independent Dairies Association and pointed up the problems and the needs of this important group of small businessmen. In his usual masterful way our colleague from Oklahoma explains the problems and supports the findings of the Small Business Committee. The speech was of such interest to me that I wish to share the message with all Members of the Congress and under leave to extend my remarks I include this address.

The address follows:

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE CARL ALBERT, OF OKLAHOMA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL INDEPENDENT DAIRIES ASSOCIATION, APRIL 10, 1962

Mr. Daniel, ladies and gentlemen, to my mind, no group is more important to the welfare of this country than you and the millions of small businessmen like you. No single force has had a greater impact on the growth of America than the independent businessmen.

Small business always has been the backbone of our economy. It symbolizes the traditional American spirit; independence personally, independence socially, and independence economically. You represent this spirit in the business world; you are men and women who prefer taking the risks in return for the compensations of self-employment. Yours is a personal incentive for accomplishment.

Show me the man who does not labor willingly when his return is self-satisfaction as well as financial gain. Show me the man who takes no pride in the product of his skill and industry. Show me such a man and I guarantee he will not be an independent businessman.

Small business thrives in free competition.

The independent producer makes the most of his materials, man-hours, and facilities. He is efficient, he is industrious. He knows his market and his product. In most cases, he has the advantage of low distribution costs and little advertising or general retailing expense. The small businessman runs a more efficient shop than his large competitor. Give him a fair opportunity and he can hold his own against a large firm.

The giant monopoly has the power to destroy this free competition. Congress recognized this economic fact-of-life and enacted antitrust legislation. The war years brought new economic concentration and new problems for the small business community. In 1941, Congress created a select committee to investigate these problems, chaired by the able, distinguished WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas.

I doubt any man in the Congress of the United States is better qualified to hold this post. Since he coauthored the Robinson-Patman Act a quarter of a century ago, WRIGHT PATMAN has been a stanch and effective friend to small business.

No segment of American small business contributes more to the health and welfare of the public than those who are engaged in the processing and distribution of dairy products. I can assure this group the Congress is aware of the many problems that face the independent dairyman.

The Congress is aware of the special nature of those problems and their ramifications for the consuming public. The Congress recognizes the need to insure a climate in which small business can compete. Protected from unfair practices and illegal trade restraints, you can hold your own. Protected from monopolies and mergers, you can thrive, strengthening the economic fiber of America. Small business asks only a fair chance; Congress has acted, and will continue to act, to guarantee this chance.

I would like to take this occasion to discuss with you some of the proposals receiving consideration in the House of Representatives to meet and resolve the problems that you, as independent dairymen, must face, particularly in the area of unfair practices.

Members of Congress have received many complaints from small businessmen located in various parts of the country.

Most of these complaints are to the effect that small business concerns are being eliminated as a result of alleged unfair policies and practices utilized by large competitors.

Reports of the House Select Committee on Small Business in the 86th Congress contain accounts of large distributors utilizing unfair trade practices such as the sale of milk in some areas at unreasonably low prices while subsidizing those sales by much higher prices charged in other areas.

Reports of the committees of Congress stress the fact that for over 25 years the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have endeavored to prevent monopolistic and unfair trade practices in the dairy industry but that these efforts have been certainly less than fully effective. The work of the Special Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business regarding problems in the dairy industry is well known to you.

In 1957, Congressman PATMAN presided over hearings in Dallas, Tex., about a milk price war then in progress. Subsequently, my own good friend and distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, Representative TOM STEED, led his subcommittee through hearings in Kansas City, Mo.; Washington, D.C.; Nashville, Tenn.; South Bend, Ind.; and Denver, Colo.; gleaning the story from every section of the Nation.

In addition, Congressman STEED directed staff investigations in those and many other areas of the United States, as is shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1960.

I am referring to the speech made to the House of Representatives on that date by our present esteemed Speaker, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK. In his speech he referred to the chaotic and deplorable conditions found in the dairy industry. He inserted in the RECORD a transcript of the detailed testimony which has been presented to the Select Committee on Small Business by Mr. Brooks Robertson of the committee staff, giving the results of field investigations which he had made of small business problems in the dairy industry.

Most of those investigations were initiated at the request of Members of Congress.

Recommendations by congressional committees that the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission provide more effective enforcement of Federal laws to give relief from some of these problems brought the response that these agencies are doing all they can under existing law. Congressman STEED introduced a bill designed to assist the Federal Trade Commission in its effort to provide more expeditious and effective action to meet these problems.

That bill, H.R. 8830, would empower the Federal Trade Commission to issue temporary cease and desist orders pending the conclusion of long and protracted litigation directed against unfair practices allegedly having the effect of destroying small business firms.

On August 28, 1961, the President of the United States in a letter to Congressman OREN HARRIS, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, endorsed the proposal to empower the Federal Trade Commission to enter temporary cease and desist orders. In his message on consumer protection, the President again renewed his call for favorable consideration of these legislative proposals to extend the powers of the Federal Trade Commission in this area vital to the welfare of small business.

The President's statement brought into sharp focus the interests of the consuming public in having effective enforcement of our laws for fair competitive practices.

The public has a big stake in our effort to maintain competition. Without effective and fair competitive practices, the public will be denied the benefits of enterprises vying to provide quality products and services. Many Members of Congress, myself included, find ourselves allied with the interest of your small business firms in the dairy industry.

Ours is a common effort to secure full and effective enforcement of existing laws and additional legislation where necessary to strengthen the hand of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice to maintain competition on an effective and fair basis.

I have always felt a special kinship for you in the dairy industry, born perhaps of many early morning bouts with a stubborn cow. In my lifetime, I have watched your industry grow from infancy to maturity. I saw the birth of your relationship with Congress when the national interest dictated legislative action to protect small business against large monopolies.

I have seen the Congress act to preserve the atmosphere in which industries like yours can continue to thrive, insuring your freedom to grow and to serve.

This is one of the many facets of our obligation to you and every American. Congress is nothing more, nothing less, than a mirror of America, reflecting our people's needs, hopes, and desires. Most important, it symbolizes our national goal, the highest aspirations of a people, often great, sometimes greedy, always willing to try. From the taciturn New Englanders to the hardy midwesterner to the colorful Californian, this is America.

Men are sent to Congress from every corner of this great land, sometimes to lead and shape the views of their neighbors and sometimes to be directed by existing public opinion. To these men you entrust the fate of this Nation and your own futures. To these men you entrust the great decision of our age, the preservation of peace and the fulfillment of our ideals of human dignity and individual liberty.

Tonight I bring you a message as the elected spokesman of the majority of these men.

We will err for we are human. We will disagree for we are freemen. But we will remain true to the oath we have taken and the grave responsibilities we have assumed. We will, to the best of our abilities, be the mirror of America.

The image we reflect is yours to create. It can be one of apathy and despair, disillusion and defeat, or it can reflect the bright promise of America, that symbol which for generations has drawn freemen in search of fulfillment to our shores. It can reflect the hope and the determination which will make reality of our dream. It can reflect the stuff which made America great and will lead us on to new pinnacles of progress.

The image is yours to create.

Think on it and I believe you will join me in this affirmation; together—you independent businessmen, the backbone of our Nation and we, your elected Representatives, who mirror this image you create, let us pledge ourselves to give our best to this land which has given us so much.

Together let us pledge to move America forward to the realization of your dreams and mine.

Dr. Paul Miller Installed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 11, Dr. Paul A. Miller was installed as the president of West Virginia University in ceremonies at Morgantown.

Dr. Miller, who was born in Hancock County, in the new First Congressional District, returns to his native State following a distinguished academic career. Immediately prior to assuming his duties as the head of our great State university, he was provost at Michigan State University. His appointment has been hailed by all friends of West Virginia, including President John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, West Virginia has many problems, and we are taking many steps to help ourselves. One of our greatest needs is for improved educational opportunities at all levels. In selecting Dr. Paul Miller to administer our university, the board of governors has chosen a highly qualified man to direct its further development to better meet the needs of our State.

West Virginia is fortunate to obtain the services of such an outstanding man. The board of governors is to be congratulated for its wisdom and good judgment.

As a part of my remarks, I include a congratulatory telegram from President Kennedy.

The telegram follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C. April 11, 1962.

Dr. FOREST H. KIRKPATRICK,
Board of Governors, West Virginia University,
Morgantown, W. Va.:

I extend congratulations and good wishes to West Virginia University and to the new president, Dr. Paul A. Miller, whose distinguished record as provost at Michigan State University indicates that he has the ability, energy, and vision to give West Virginia University the strong and wise leadership it merits.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

District of Columbia Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1962

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which I believe will provide a useful vehicle for discussion as we seek to bring order out of chaos in the redevelopment program for the District of Columbia. I have selected today for the introduction of the bill for I believe that on District Day it is well to be reminded of the responsibilities each and every one of us has toward our Nation's Capital as its Legislature.

Many of the suggested changes made in my bill are, beyond doubt, controversial in nature. While I do not claim to be an expert on the subject of urban renewal, my proposals are made without regard to special interest groups but are entirely motivated in the public interest. It is my hope that because of the controversial nature of some of the proposals, that spirited debate will take place before public groups, in committees and ultimately here on the floor of the House. From such debate, undoubtedly, perfecting amendments can and should be made to my bill. If such discussions are stimulating, it is my feeling that all of the Members of this body will become informed on a matter of crucial importance; namely, redevelopment of our Nation's Capital.

As I have stated before, it is the responsibility of each of us to be concerned over the future development of the District of Columbia. As the Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland bordering Washington, I feel that I have an even greater responsibility than many of my colleagues, for my constituents are vitally concerned over a program of this magnitude. Its effects, good or bad, will not be confined entirely to the boundaries of the District of Columbia. During my tenure of office, I have been confronted with many problems involving displaced businessmen, some of whom are residents of the State of Maryland, and other Marylanders who have supplied these businesses. Unfortunately, many of these successful businessmen have not been given an opportunity to relocate adequately within the District of Columbia. I have experienced numerous examples of arbitrary and secret actions by those now charged with the administration of the present law. I have detected a complete lack of confidence on the part of the general public in many instances over the administration of the present program. Although special-interest groups widely differ on the correct solution, there appears to be virtually unanimous agreement that the present program is not successful and that drastic reorientation is essential. One only has to read the Washington newspapers, particularly in the last 2 weeks, to come to the conclusion that drastic action is essential if we are to have a redevelopment program that is not only a model for the Nation, but, indeed, for the entire world.

In addition to the problem of relocation of private businesses, one of the most disturbing facts is the complete lack thus far of housing construction providing for family units in the middle income bracket. The present program apparently is quite able to commence projects but is experiencing considerable difficulty in completing these projects. It is significant that in the 5 projects now under urban renewal in the District of Columbia, approximately 7,000 families have been displaced, yet not 1 family unit to rent for less than $115 a month has been completed. There is clear evidence that transferring a large number of displacees from one section of the city to another is merely eliminating slums in one area and creating them elsewhere in the city. There are, of course, many reasons submitted justifying the fact that not one single project has been completed, but this does not explain in my mind why, after 11 years of operation, not one—I repeat not one—project is 50-percent completed. General Clark, the Engineering Commissioner for the District of Columbia, stated last fall that approximately 20,000 families will be displaced either as a result of urban renewal, highway construction, or as a result of other Government activities.

I feel that amendments to the existing law proposed by my bill will provide the means for a drastic reorientation of the present program and ultimately will assist in the creation of a Nation's Capital of which we can all be proud.

Results of a Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1962

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to determine the attitude of the citizens of southwest Missouri on major national issues, I recently distributed a questionnaire throughout my district. An effort was made to send one of these questionnaires to every household in the Missouri Seventh Congressional District, which I represent. More than 12,000 replies were received. Considering that no preconceived mailing list was used, I believe these results are an accurate reflection of the views of the people in the Missouri Seventh Congressional District. They certainly represent a larger sampling than do many of the professional polls whose results have caused considerable wonderment.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, the results of this poll are as follows:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Uncertain
1. Do you favor admission of Red China to the U.N.?	6.8	82.8	11.4
2. Do you believe the United States should purchase $100 million worth of U.N. bonds?	23.3	62.2	34.5
3. Do you believe the President should be given more authority to lower tariffs without congressional approval?	13.2	79.6	7.2
4. Do you favor a decrease in foreign aid spending?	72.4	17.9	9.7
5. Would you favor an increase in Federal taxes to support Federal aid to education to include—			
(a) School construction?	23.5	68.9	7.6
(b) Teacher's salaries?	20.1	70.4	9.5
(c) Grants for college students?	17.3	71.5	11.2
(d) Loans for college students?	37.0	53.0	10.0
6. In the field of medical care, do you favor—			
(a) A higher social security tax rate to provide Federal medical care for persons eligible for social security benefits?	17.9	72.4	9.7
(b) Missouri participation in the Kerr-Mills program whereby matching funds are used to defray medical costs for all needy persons?	32.2	41.4	26.4
(c) Any Federal program?	19.2	47.7	33.1
7. If greater Federal expenditures in defense and mutual security are needed, should the necessary revenue—			
(a) Be raised by increased taxes?	25.2	48.8	26.0
(b) Be financed through deficit spending?	13.3	53.7	33.0
(c) Come through a postponement of domestic programs?	44.0	28.5	27.5
8. Should mutual security funds for defense be considered separately from foreign aid?	67.9	10.2	21.9
9. Do you favor general tax reform based on the theory that our present tax burden discourages incentive, economic growth, and plant modernization?	56.0	17.1	26.9
10. Do you favor—			
(a) Balancing the Federal budget?	82.9	4.9	12.2
(b) Paying off part of the Federal debt in time of growth and prosperity?	88.6	3.4	8.0
11. Do you favor creation of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing?	12.4	77.0	10.6
12. Should our antitrust laws be applied equally to both business and labor?	80.7	7.3	12.0
13. Do you favor the administration's feed grain program as presently constituted?			
(a) Farmers	16.8	65.1	18.1
(b) Nonfarmers	8.2	52.4	39.4
14. Do you favor greater Federal regulation of agriculture to include—			
(a) Higher price supports?			
Farmers	18.1	70.8	11.1
Nonfarmers	8.5	73.3	18.2
(b) Production controls?			
Farmers	20.3	69.2	10.5
Nonfarmers	16.5	65.4	18.1

Lest We Forget: The Day of Martyrs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1962

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, very shortly, the people of the Jewish faith throughout the world will celebrate the Day of Martyrs which falls on May 1. It is a solemn day, commemorating the 6 million Jews who died in Europe during the Nazi reign of terror. Many of those who participated in the slaughter of these innocent millions have met their just deserts. Many have escaped.

The Jews do not consider these affairs closed. Questions persist that remain unanswered. One such question is raised by a case that I present for your consideration.

There is presently living in the United States a Mr. Nicolae Malaxa. This man, a Rumanian, is living in this country solely because of the activities of several top-level personages in our Government. The reason for my concern is that evidence recently published by the Department of State, "Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918–45," reprinted German war documents, clearly shows that Mr. Malaxa was the "financial mainstay" of the Iron Guard—the legionnaires—in Rumania which, during the tragic days of early 1941, was responsible for the murder of some 7,000 Jews. I refer specifically to page 1051, document No. 623, a communication from the German Minister in Rumania to the Foreign Ministry in Berlin, January 8, 1941, which I quote in part:

> In this fight between the general and the legionnaire command, a man plays a role who even earlier played a secret part in Rumanian politics: Carol's former friend and the present financial mainstay of the legionnaires, N. Malaxa. The legionnaires let this clever big industrialist finance them. He has in his plants the leader of the legionnaire labor organization, Gana, and there the green flags of Sima flutter everywhere. Sima and his (group missing) have let themselves be roped in and want to come to an agreement with Malaxa on a settlement, while the general, as the exponent of order and purity, demands that Malaxa hand over all the "property stolen" from the state. Malaxa therefore considers the general his mortal enemy and makes common cause with the legionnaires against him. Malaxa has even again supplied with arms the legionnaire police, who had already been disarmed. Yesterday, while the scene between the general and Sima occurred in the office of the Minister President, they established themselves in the prefecture of police with machineguns.
>
> The general, whose entourage kept this information from him last evening, is now extremely angry. He would like best to send Malaxa and his family off to Germany in order to get rid of them for a while. In reply to a question from him, I told him that, if he wished it, we would be glad to oblige him by taking Malaxa in, since German industry had always been on the best of terms with him. The general considers this his only chance of getting rid of this troublesome schemer.
>
> General Antonescu described the events to me in detail. He asked me to treat the information in strict confidence.
>
> FABRICIUS,
> *German Minister in Rumania.*

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Malaxa not only was connected with the dread Iron Guard during the early war years, but allegedly was an active collaborator with the Hitler government and was associated in business with Albert Goering, brother of Field Marshal Herman Goering. Following the war he became actively associated with the Communist Government of Rumania and was sent to the United States by that Government on a trade mission. He took advantage of this and despite his background, he was permitted to remain in the United States by a ruling of the Immigration Appeals Board and the Justice Department in 1958.

While this ruling may have been made without the benefit of the new evidence found in the recently published documents I cited, it was made contrary to the findings made by a special inquiry officer of the Immigration Service in December 1957. This officer determined that Malaxa was inadmissible partly because he would not submit to oral examination under oath. Another basis for exclusion was the finding that this individual was attempting to organize a private corporation with funds to be borrowed from the U.S. Government, and then have the corporation request he be admitted as an essential executive of this corporation.

My purpose in bringing this matter to the attention of Congress is not because I wish to prosecute an individual. Rather my concern is that any individual with such a background of questionable activities, can seek refuge in the United States when so many deserving persons are denied admittance.

That any person could be admitted against the findings of the Immigration Service's special inquiry officer, and essentially because of the efforts of influential friends in high official positions, is to me reprehensible.

I can understand that mistakes can be made, that occasionally persons who are unqualified for admission may slip by. But any individual who has a documented history of affiliation and collaboration with Nazis and Communists has no right to residence in this country. We extend this privilege to far too few as it is. To extend it to the breaking point, as was done in this case, flies in the face of justice. Mockery is made of the day of martyrs.

I would like to advise my colleagues that I have called this matter to the attention of the Attorney General of the United States and have asked for a complete review of this case.

Work and Watch Your Library Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address which I delivered at a meeting of the Rhode Island Trustees, Providence Public Library Auditorium, April 9, 1962.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY AT MEETING OF RHODE ISLAND LIBRARY TRUSTEES, PROVIDENCE PUBLIC LIBRARY AUDITORIUM, MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1962

It is a real pleasure for me to join my fellow Rhode Island library trustees at this first statewide meeting of our trustees' committee. It seems particularly appropriate for us to come together during National Library Week to consider the role of the library trustee in working toward better library service for all of the people in our State and Nation.

The National Library Week theme for 1962 is "Read and Watch Your World Grow." I would like to suggest that we library trustees might use as our theme tonight, "Work and Watch Your Library Grow." As each of you in this room has already learned, it is library trustees, working closely with their librarian, who determine to a large extent the quality and quantity of library service which their community receives.

This newly formed committee reflects the present resurgence of statewide interest in Rhode Island library development. In planning its future activities, this group will want to define its goals clearly and to become thoroughly familiar with the tools now at hand which will help reach these goals. The national standards for public library service as adopted by the American Library Association can serve the trustee committee well as a point of departure in defining good library service for the people of our State. I'm sure you will agree that the basic objective of both this committee and of the individual trustee is to secure for our citizens the kind of library service which will effectively meet their needs.

This is a big and important job. We in Rhode Island are fortunate, however, in that we are not facing this task without assistance. For the next few moments, let's look at some of the tools we have to work with and how some of them can best be used.

One such tool which, properly used, can be of great value to library development is the event which we are observing tonight—National Library Week. This effort to focus public attention on the values of reading is now a year-round program helping to build the use and improvement of libraries of all kinds. We believe that libraries are an important means for developing an informed, creative citizenry, willing and able to make the decisions required of free men and women in a complex, troubled world. The alert trustee can help his library demonstrate that belief by relating both the services and the needs of his own library to this national effort.

I know you are all familiar with another important source of aid to those public libraries in communities of under 10,000 population. The Library Services Act (Public Law 597), first passed in 1956 and subsequently extended through 1966 by the 86th Congress, allocates funds to the States for the promotion and further development of public library services in rural areas. Rhode Island began participation in the act in 1958 and since that time this program has been ably administered by Miss Elizabeth Gallup Myer. Forty-three rural community libraries have participated in the Rhode Island State plan receiving book grants, advisory services, centralized book ordering and processing, and inservice training opportunities. Miss Myer has reported that the number of books loaned from these libraries nearly doubled between 1956–61, and that the local financial support increased 95 percent over the same period. This substantial increase in the use of books is heartening evidence of the improved ability of these libraries to meet the needs of their users. Of equal significance to us is the continued financial effort which the local communities are making to support these services. This fact demonstrates the success of the Library Services Act as a partnership program in which State and local governments share with the Federal Government the responsibility of financing good library service. Funds under the act are allotted to the States in proportion to their rural population and are matched by the States according to their per capita income. This matching provision is reminiscent of a donation made in 1847 by Francis Wayland who was then president of Brown University. Mr. Wayland offered the town of Wayland, Mass., $500 for a public library provided the town matched this amount. The community then levied an assessment, optional with the individual taxpayer, and the Wayland Public Library began operation in 1850. This early partnership of public and private funds became formalized in Massachusetts 1 year later when the State legislature passed a law permitting towns to tax their inhabitants for the support of free libraries.

In addition to the matching concept, the Library Services Act also contains a floor provision. This means that State and local expenditures for public library service cannot fall below the amount spent in 1956 if the State is to be eligible for the Federal grant. These provisions are consonant with the intent of the act which is to stimulate and to promote statewide library development and not to relieve State and local governments of their responsibility to provide their fair share of the total cost of library service. The success of the act as a stimulant can be seen in the fact that, since 1956, appropriations by the States for rural public library service have increased 92 percent and appropriations by local units of government have increased 74 percent. The Library Services Act has in fact been so successful in developing rural libraries that I believe its benefits should be extended to all areas including urban and metropolitan areas.

At the present time 27 States, including Rhode Island, have cash grants-in-aid programs to local libraries and three other States have grant programs consisting of books and other library materials. Many of these, however, are quite inadequate, amounting to very small grants of only a few cents per person in each community. I don't believe Rhode Island trustees will be content with the status quo. I suggest that one important job to which this committee can address itself is the careful evaluation of the role of the Rhode Island State government in public library financing.

A third important tool with which this committee can work is the report of the Brown University Study of Library Service in Rhode Island. I know that the information we have been given at this meeting stimulated your thinking and I hope that every library in the State gives high priority to a careful study of these findings and recommendations. It may be noted in this connection that similar comprehensive studies have been implemented with outstanding success in such States as New York, Pennsylvania, and New Mexico. In each case the efforts of library trustees were a vital factor in the progress library development has made in those States.

Closely related to this study and its implications for every library in the State is the legislative commission which was created on January 30 by the State legislature. As you know, the task of this commission will be to study existing library laws as well as to review the survey report. Then, based on all available information, this commission will recommend legislation which will be appropriate to the organization of modern public library services. All Rhode Island library boards will want to follow closely the deliberations of this commission and to take advantage of any opportunity to make their needs and opinions known to this group.

Turning again to the national level, I might call your attention to the small libraries project of the American Library Association. This project is designed to assist the small library by publishing a comprehensive series of 16 handbooks and guides to good public library practice. The handbooks will be devoted to the basic principles of librarianship as they apply to the small public library. The guides, which will accompany the handbooks, will be specific aids in handling the day-to-day operational problems which small libraries face. The entire series will be distributed free to libraries in communities of less than 10,000 population. One of the handbooks will deal specifically with the role of the trustee of the small public library and several others in the series will be of value to library boards in working to improve their library. It is my understanding that these will be available very soon through the State library extension agency and your trustees committee may want to consider ways in which the effective use of this series can be promoted.

Thus far we have looked at some broad library goals and we have discussed some of the tools which librarians and trustees can use in reaching those objectives. It might be well at this point to give some thought to specific library needs and to identify those which require a high priority.

The stimulus provided by the Library Services Act, the increased use of library facilities by people of all ages, and the increasing national emphasis on excellence in both formal and informal education, have been accompanied by a change in the ways the library is used. Modern readers are in a hurry; the majority come on specific missions and they expect prompt and complete service. To meet this demand more and more librarians, many with special skills, must be secured. Even today there are four or five job openings for every library school graduate and it has been estimated that by 1970 twice the present number of full-time professional librarians will be required.

Facing critical situations realistically will take courage by every segment of the library profession, but especially by library administrators and their governing authorities. An aggressive, imaginative, and continuing recruitment program is essential, but it must be backed up by a number of elements. Professional responsibilities must be clearly defined and adhered to, status and working conditions of both professional and nonprofessional staff members improved, and salaries must be maintained at attractive levels. Scholarship, fellowship, and inservice training programs must be increased at all levels of government if our libraries are to cope with both the increasing flow of recorded information and the increasing quantity and quality of public demand for convenient access to these resources.

Library service as we have known it in the past will not meet the needs of our citizens in the years that lie ahead. Bold and imaginative planning, and action on an unprecedented scale will be required of both librarians and trustees.

The changes now taking place and those which can be foreseen will call for important adjustments in the present pattern of library organization and distribution. Many of these changes have already been felt by Rhode Island because we are a small, heavily urbanized State. Tomorrow we can expect even more people, particularly more young people and older people, who will be more highly educated and who will have more leisure time. Future increases in the labor force will take place most rapidly among the professional and technical workers whose demands for research information and resources will strain the facilities of all our libraries.

In addition to the increased number of people and their changing characteristics, we should also be aware of the amazing mobility of the modern American family. They may choose to live in one community, earn their living in another, and send their children to school in a third. Already they shop, go to church, and seek their recreation on this basis, crossing city, town, county, and even State lines almost daily, often without being aware that they are doing so. The vast majority of Americans have little patience for arbitrary political boundaries which, to them, complicate rather than simplify their daily lives. They also have little tolerance for public officials who try to maintain such barriers for the benefit of a few, rather than eliminating them for the benefit of all.

Library users are as diverse and as mobile as the general population. They expect to use whatever library facility happens to be the most convenient for taking out and returning library materials. Under these circumstances, every library trustee must study carefully the kinds of library administrative structures which will give the user convenient access to all library resources. The kind of partnership I am now suggesting is that libraries at all levels should form a network of resources which will make available the widest possible range of services and materials.

The national library standards which I mentioned earlier conceive of this kind of network in a way which is not projected downward from the Federal or State level, but rather is built up from the individual needs of the single reader in the local community.

As the network is formed the barriers now caused by various governmental jurisdictions will be easier to cross. A bill now before Congress would grant the consent of Congress to interstate compacts between two or more States for the development or operation of library facilities and services. Several States already have State legislation permitting interstate library arrangements and at least five more States are now considering similar laws.

The attempts to erase artificial barriers to convenient library services include the possibility of statewide registration and one borrower library card which can be used anywhere within a State. In 1960, Ohio began plans for the development of a special library card to be issued by the State. This card would be honored by any community library in Ohio under certain mutually agreeable conditions. Massachusetts as part of its new State aid law, has incorporated some features of reciprocal borrowers' privileges among the libraries qualifying for State funds. Arkansas, California, and Michigan officials are also studying the feasibility and probable costs of providing this service. The point is that the particular need of the individual, and not his place of residence, will be the major consideration. This concept merits study by librarians and trustees in order to determine what legislative, administrative, and financial arrangements may be necessary.

Other efforts to provide easier access to greater resources are now achieving considerable success. The pattern of library systems in New York State, the tri-State film service in Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire, the development of regional library resource centers in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts all illustrate methods of improved accessibility to library materials.

Here, then, for your consideration, are two serious problems with which Rhode Island trustees ought to be deeply concerned. We must find patterns of library organization which will function efficiently and economically to meet present and future demands. In addition, we must attract and retain skilled and experienced librarians who can put into action an adequate public library program. I believe that the library trustee has a vital role in helping to solve both of these problems. Two elements are needed and both relate to the job of being a good library trustee. One important factor is adequate financing. Good libraries staffed by good librarians cost money, and much of the responsibility for sound fiscal planning and obtaining the needed funds from appropriating bodies rests with the library board.

In the early days of publicly supported libraries, real property accounted for 75 percent of our wealth; today, real property accounts for only 25 percent. Yet local governments still rely primarily on the property tax for the support of schools and public libraries. To provide the funds needed for adequate library support new sources of revenue must be found and the size and distribution of existing library service areas must be reevaluated.

Greater flexibility in fiscal resources must be obtained in order to provide a sound financial foundation for library services. Library trustees have an important obligation to the people they represent for striving to establish equitable means of library support. Private endowments and gifts should be encouraged. Trustees should work for maximum local support which will, of course, vary with the ability of a community to pay for all public services. The extent and type of State and Federal support should be carefully studied by both trustees and governmental officials.

The second way in which library trustees are intimately involved in working to solve these problems is through alert and vigorous leadership. Every trustee has a detailed knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of his own library. Armed with this knowledge, the trustee should begin an exploration of outer space, the space beyond the service area of his own library. He may well find that these regions are inhabitable and that the creatures there are friendly. What productive relationships can be established with your neighboring public libraries? What forms of cooperation among different types of libraries will help to improve the services from each? What role can be played by our largest urban library in Providence? What responsibility has our State government for the development of good local libraries? Every library board and each individual trustee should come to grips with these and related questions. Then, acting through the Rhode Island Library Association, and through your own trustee committee, and local boards, the steps necessary to a systematic, statewide program of library development can be undertaken.

It is only as we lift our eyes to the horizon that we begin to develop a sense of true perspective on our daily concerns. Any plans we make for our own local libraries will be realistic and effective only if they are based on a clear view of the relationships between each library and the other library facilities and services existing throughout the State and region.

I have urged you to "work and watch your library grow" and our work may indeed be difficult. I'm sure we agree however that this work is highly important and that the rewards are great. You know of my deep commitment to the improvement of all our educational facilities. You know of my belief that the public library has a major role to play in providing the necessary educational opportunities to every citizen. If we work together as trustees, if we build effective relations with our librarians, with officials of government, and with other libraries we will accomplish our goals. If we can provide public library service of high quality, we will contribute significantly to the educational excellence of our country. To this end, let us all pledge our best efforts to work and watch our libraries grow.

The Letter Carriers in Erie, Pa., Believe the Administration's Pay Reform Bill Is Discriminatory and Unjustified, and Favors the Few Over the Many

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1962

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the letter carriers of Erie, the third largest city in Pennsylvania, strongly urge the passage of H.R. 9531, the Morrison postal pay bill—Postal Employees' Salary Act of 1962. While they appreciate the present administration's acknowledgment of the postal employees' need for an increase in salaries, they believe the administration's Federal pay reform of 3.5 percent for level 4 and the proposed increases of up to 34 percent for other higher levels is unfair and unjustified. This proposed 3.5 percent is but a bone to letter carriers, while the meaty part of the "reform" would benefit those already drawing high salaries.

The starting salary for letter carriers is at present $4,345. Recently the daily newspapers in my 24th district have been running articles recruiting applications from interested men to contact the Pennsylvania State Employment Service in regard to applying for jobs as policemen for the city of New York. These positions would have a starting salary of $6,300, and after 3 years' service this salary would be raised to $7,600. After 12 years in the postal service, a letter carrier's salary is $5,305. The Bureau of Labor Statistics study of 1959, reporting the amount of money needed by a city worker for his family budget, was averaged at $6,083. This 1959 study was of 20 cities of various sizes across the Nation. And no provision was made in this worker's budget for savings of any kind. A recent Labor Department release shows the average weekly gross pay of factory workers in December was $104. The weekly gross pay of the average letter carrier is $96.25, and he must pay out of this substantially more than the factory worker does for retirement benefits, hospitalization, and insurance. In most union contracts, management pays for all or nearly all these fringe benefits.

The administration's pay proposals cite the need for higher salaries for those in higher levels so they will not leave Government positions for better paying jobs outside the Government. These proposed increases up to 34 percent will encourage them to stay in the Federal Service. The Post Office Department knows that the same holds true for the letter carriers and other postal employees. Many trained employees do leave the Postal Service each year. In fact, last year, 87,440 employees left the Post Office Department for one reason or another. About 35,000 left to go to work in better paying private industry jobs.

And over 30 percent of the letter carriers are holding down two jobs working anywhere from part-time to holding down another full-time job. Some are working two part-time jobs. This is called "moonlighting." And the letter carrier is not proud that he has to seek a second job to be able to buy the necessary things in life and to be able to enjoy life. Nor is he proud that over 40 percent of the wives of letter carriers have to work to make ends meet. I wonder how many higher level government employees are holding down two jobs or their wives work to make income match outgo.

The Department knows the requirements to enter the Postal Service and many men, sometimes college men, fail to pass the entrance examination. And the unique complex business of handling and delivering efficiently the Nation's mail is not an easy task. The volume of mail has increased 128 percent since 1940 while the number of employees has increased only 59 percent. The preponderance of this increase is due to new mail delivery routes and to an increase in supervisory positions. Therefore, the record clearly shows that the caliber and the efficiency of the postal employee has steadily improved.

We also question the administration's proposal to set a goal of 27 years before a letter carrier can reach his top salary. In what other line of endeavor must a man work so long to reach the top? This is at variance with all other walks of life, not just in highly organized industry where unions have led the way to a richer life for so many.

Why must a letter carrier wait until 1963 to receive an increase which the administration admits he needs now? The Bureau of Labor Statistics report of 1959 showed he was behind considerably then; it would follow that he is that much further behind now in 1962. An increase of $150, which is about what the administration's proposal amounts to for level 4, to become effective January 1, 1963, means the letter carrier will have a little more than $2 per week to spend in 1963. By then, wage increases to other workers and rising costs to themselves will cut this spending power even lower.

Letter carriers are patriotic and hardworking Americans. They ask to be put on a par with their neighbors—no more. And while they feel some foreign aid is necessary, they would like Uncle Sam to take care of his own folks, too.

Pay raises do not come every year to postal employees and they feel justified in seeking more than 3.5 percent this year, or 7 percent to be spread over 3 years. The Morrison bill calling for 19 percent may be too high; and the administration bill of 3.5 percent too low. Compromises can be made on both proposals giving the letter carriers a decent raise.

Hardship Cases Among Reservists Deserve Priority in Release to Inactive Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter, dated April 14, in which I urged the Secretary of Defense to adjust the standards governing consideration of hardship discharge applications so that reservists whose active duty in recent months has involved real hardship will receive immediate reconsideration and the earliest possible release to inactive duty:

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I share the satisfaction of virtually everyone that the President has found it possible to announce the beginning of preparations to release on schedule in August the approximately 150,000 Reserves and National Guardsmen who were called to active duty last year.

Nevertheless, I am concerned at the absence of any reference in the President's statement or in subsequent announcements from the Departments of the Army and the Air Force to the possibility of expediting the release of reservists whose personal, family, and business circumstances constitute genuine hardship cases. As you of course know, since the emergency international situation last year which led to the callup of the reserves, the armed services have followed a rigidly restrictive policy with respect to the consideration of applications for hardship discharges received from reservists—a policy much more prohibitive than that in effect previously. Whether or not one accepts the contention that the international danger justified the retention of those reservists for whom recall was a positive hardship, there is no question that for many the hardship was real, demonstrable and severe.

The purpose of my letter, therefore, is to propose that the Defense Department immediately instruct the armed services and their appropriate subordinate commands to return to preemergency standards for consideration of hardship discharge applications. I further suggest that priority be given to those reservists who have previously submitted applications and that responsible commands be instructed to review such applications with a minimum of delay.

I base my request on the following factors:

1. The number of reservists who would be affected by such a liberalization of hardship discharge criteria would be relatively small.

2. The early release of reservists determined to qualify for hardship discharges would not significantly interfere with the ability of the units to which they are attached to accomplish assignments involving the security of the United States, since, to the best of my knowledge, most such units are presently engaged in training activities.

3. Although the President pointed out that his decision to release all recalled reservists in August was not the result of any lessening of international dangers and tensions, it is undeniable that the emergency nature of the international situation which existed last year has diminished.

4. As the President emphasized, the buildup of the Nation's Regular Armed Forces has been extensive. Whereas there were only 11 combat ready divisions in the Army a year ago, there are 16 today. In such a condition of readiness, the role of reservists during the last 3 or 4 months of their active duty cannot possibly be such as to maintain hardship discharge standards resulting from a past emergency.

5. So far as I can determine, a principal reason for announcing in April that reservists will be released in August is to provide sufficient time for developing procedures, determining transportation and processing requirements, and otherwise arranging for the orderly movement and release of nearly 150,000 reservists in the space of 1 month. In other words, a national security requirement for retaining all these men for the additional 4 months does not seem to exist.

6. In order to release reservists determined to be hardship cases as a result of relaxed standards, there would be no necessity to establish new procedures. Procedures exist currently, and the number of men entitled to early release would not be so great as to impose such administrative or logistical burdens on the services that their release could not be effected expeditiously enough to make it worthwhile.

7. The 3 months or so which reservists deserving of early discharges would gain would be of inestimable value to them, to children who need their fathers, to wives expecting new children during this period, to families with heavy burdens of debt and in danger of losing their homes, to small businesses requiring skills without which they cannot operate successfully.

In common with every Member of Congress, I have received hundreds of letters in recent months from reservists, their wives, business associates, parents, in-laws, pastors, friends, and doctors attesting to the disruption of lives and families and careers resulting from the emergency calling-up of reservists. Undoubtedly, some of these appeals have had much less justification than others, but I am personally familiar with a number of cases about which there can be no question of the seriousness. Yet, none of their applications for hardship discharges have been approved. And in conversations with colleagues from other congressional districts, I find that this is true generally.

As a case in point, I would refer to a situation brought to my attention at Fort Benning. For a number of reservists, the financial strain involved in being recalled to active duty was so intense that they were forced to hire themselves out to their fellow reservists. In exchange for money, these men undertook in their own off-duty hours the officially assigned duties of others, including such galley assignments as potato peeling.

In another case, the young wife of a reservist, the mother of three children, was forced to return to work to support the family. The strain of separation from her husband, the dual burden of being mother and breadwinner at the same time, and her concern for the health of her husband's parents who were trying to help care for the children despite their own difficult situation, has resulted in turn in her own illness. This has meant long absences from work, with greatly diminished income, and added burdens and expenses for the family. According to the doctor, the employer and others, the breaking point is near.

Another instance involves a young man who took over his father's business in mid-1961 following the father's serious heart attack. At that time he applied for and received a hardship discharge from the Army Reserve. He was recalled for the emergency, nevertheless, and subsequently denied a hardship discharge. The family is in immediate danger of losing the business, their home, car and truck, since it has been impossible to keep the business going. An uncle also suffered a heart attack after trying to keep the business open on weekends. The reservist's sister, who recently underwent a heart operation, is not well and his mother is showing signs of severe strain. He, himself, has been forced to take extensive leave and pass time, which has involved inordinate travel time and expense. He also was injured in a bad fall in the course of duty, which now requires him to go to a hospital for regular treatment.

Several cases involved reservists who had considerable previous active duty service. One such man and his wife were both working in order to support themselves, his parents and younger brother. Shortly after he was recalled, which meant a sharp reduction in income, his wife was also required to stop work because of pregnancy. This sudden and doubly serious financial setback has plunged the family into debt and has threatened its future stability.

These are representative cases, selected from a much larger total. Some have been more serious, others less. Several of the more critical concern so-called fillers among reservists, men who were not members of Reserve units in active training status, older men in some cases who had served in World War II and the Korean war and who had received little or no subsequent military training. Many reservists, who themselves are members of organized units, have written me about the special hardships encountered by those selected to fill vacancies in the units.

I am sure I speak for many of my colleagues in Congress when I say that we have been reluctant to do anything which might interfere with the effective recall and employment of reservists during the recent emergency, whatever our individual doubts or questions about the procedures used during the mobilization. We have recognized that reservists recalled to active duty were being asked to make great personal sacrifices on behalf of the Nation and that the distribution of this burden was oftentimes discriminatory. But we understood that sacrifice and unequal treatment are sometimes inevitable in an emergency.

The time has come, however, when we should take immediate steps to reduce the sacrifice and the burden to a minimum. The time has come when this can be done without the slightest jeopardy to the national security. Now that the emergency is over, now that our regular armed strength has been built up to satisfactory levels, we owe it to those who have sacrificed most, whose lives and careers and families have suffered the greatest disruptions, to provide a means for the earliest possible return to inactive duty.

I hope you will give this important question your immediate and sympathetic attention.

With highest regards and best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely,

FLORENCE P. DWYER,

Member of Congress.

Hearings Opened on Quality Stabilization Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1962

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of last week the Special Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce, under the chairmanship of Senator MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, opened hearings on the quality stabilization legislation.

Hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 159, dealing with quality products in our retail economy, was considered. This is a companion bill to H.R. 10335, introduced by me in the House of Representatives.

The following are excerpts from my testimony before the subcommittee:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN, FIRST DISTRICT OF INDIANA, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE RELATIVE TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 159—QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL, MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1962

Mr. Chairman and members of the special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, I am grateful to the chairman and members of this committee for your decision to hold hearings this week on the quality stabilization bill, Senate Joint Resolution 159. Your cooperation demonstrates that you are much concerned over the devastating methods of merchandising in recent years that is causing a great damage to the manufacturers, retailers, and consumers throughout the country.

Basically, the quality stabilization bill offers a major step in curbing dishonest practices that are misleading the consumer in merchandise values. It spells out bait advertising, deceptive pricing, and published misrepresentations of the product as reasons why a manufacturer may protect the property rights in his brand name or trademark.

The public will be helped by the enactment of the quality stabilization law, since the established price and quality symbolized by the brand name will be a standard from which it may judge the competitive values of products. The consumer will be guarded against the loss-leader operator who uses the honored brand name or trademark to build store traffic at the expense of his more honest competitors, while recouping his loss at the same time on overpriced, inferior, and "blind" merchandise.

OPERATION

If the owner of the trademark elects to come under quality stabilization, the retailers and distributors must cooperate with the owner or manufacturer in maintaining the stabilized price of that trademarked product. This enables the manufacturer to continue to build quality into his stabilized brand name product. If the retailer violates the provisions of the quality stabilization law, the brand name owner can revoke the retailer's right to use the brand name. If the distributor violates the revocation order, the brand name owner (the manufacturer) can then institute a Federal civil suit for damage. This legislation will call for no Government bureaucracy or department to supervise or enforce the quality stabilization law. The law is 100-percent optional and the manufacturer, retailer, wholesaler, or consumer can choose to come under or stay out of quality stabilization. It provides a wholly meritorious and worthwhile opportunity for quality products to be distributed through quality-conserving resellers.

NOT FAIR TRADE

Since its introduction last January 1961, the merits of this proposed legislation have come to the attention of thousands upon thousands of manufacturers, distributors, retailers, and consumers. This bill is not fair trade legislation and is not a price fixing measure.

The quality stabilization bill has now become one of the most widely publicized and acclaimed measures that await action in this session of Congress. In our long and critical struggle against communism, the American system of free enterprise must be our major weapon. Business failures in recent years and the growing lack of protection for consumer purchases must be given consideration by this Congress. The market place is rapidly becoming infested with the so-called fast buck merchandisers.

OPTIONAL

In giving the manufacturer the optional right to control his trademark, safeguards are also established for the distributor, the retailer and, most important of all, the consumer. It is imperative in considering the bill, that you fully realize that its use by the manufacturer, retailer and consumer is optional. No product can be stabilized under the proposed quality stabilization law unless competitive products are available to the consumer. And sale or purchase of a product stabilized under the proposed law is also completely voluntary on the part of the distributor, the retailer, and the consumer. It is of fundamental importance that this bill be recognized as one not aimed at harming any legitimate business, but as a measure of economic benefit to all.

BUSINESS FAILURES

The Senate Small Business Committee has reported that small business failures (bankruptcies—businessmen giving up the struggle for survival) climbed in 1960 to the highest point since 1933 and the great depression. The House Small Business Committee, in its December 16, 1960, report entitled "Status of Small Business—1948–58," 86th Congress, 2d session, made this frightening statement:

"Most small retailers discontinue businesses without going through bankruptcy. This explains why, of the 139,000 who discontinued business in 1959, only 6,873 showed up among the business failures."

There are about 2 million retailers in America; 88 percent of them operate in only one location from one store—70 percent individually own their own businesses. These are not huge outfits—over 75 percent have annual sales under $100,000.

There are 165,000 merchant wholesalers in the United States; 91 percent of them are active owners of unincorporated businesses—71 percent operate from only 1 building.

It is the well-known brand names—brands with a reputation for a reliability—that are taking it on the chin. If these brands did not have such an excellent reputation, do you suppose they would be of interest even for 1 minute to the discounter who needs a traffic builder for his kind of selling?

We cannot permit the further degeneration of the brand-name system of distribution. We must arrest the growing rate of failure of small business in this country. We must give the incentive to the manufacturer in this country to build toward excellence, and we must protect the consumer from junk merchandise.

Quality stabilization covers specific areas in which a manufacturer can control, that is, prevent the unfair use of his own property—his trademark—by the reseller. These areas are: (1) Intentional misrepresentation as to make, model, size, age, etc.; (2) bait and switch merchandising tactics; or (3) price.

To repeat, it is not compulsory that the brand-name owner use the law.

MECHANICS OF USING THE LAW

The manufacturer who does elect to use the quality stabilization law will publish a specific retail price at which his trademarked product must be sold. He has this right so that he may protect the quality of the product, the goodwill of his brand name, the ethical reseller, and the consumer. This is not to say that the manufacturer cannot change his specific price. Not at all. Competition is promoted—not restricted—by the quality stabilization bill, and the interaction of competitive forces will insure that the manufacturer's price represents fair value or else that manufacturer will be forced out of his business. Any price established under this law will be at the manufacturer's peril. This is the way the free enterprise system should function.

If a retailer knowingly violates the published policy of the manufacturer by engaging in any one or all of the three specific practices named in the bill—price deviation, bait and switch tactics, misrepresentation—then the manufacturer may revoke the right of that offending retailer to make any further use of the manufacturer's name, brand, or trademark.

The quality stabilization bill is not a one-way street. It imposes an obligation on the manufacturer as well. The bill states that lack of due diligence in revoking the rights of competing resellers known to the trademark owner to be committing similar acts of unfair competition will constitute a valid defense against any action brought under this law.

With the enactment of the quality stabilization bill, the reseller and the public will know where each manufacturer stands as to policy and quality consistency. The manufacturer no longer will have the convenient excuse that he cannot protect good resellers against unfair competition.

FOUNDATION ESTABLISHED BY SUPREME COURT

The quality stabilization bill contains none of the usual fair trade language. There is no provision for contracts, as the bill is wholly predicated on the owner's property rights in his good name; there is no dependence on a nonsigner clause as is the case with fair trade. The essential difference is that fair trade enforcement is to compel a dealer to raise his prices for a product, while under the quality stabilization bill, the action is one akin to trespass—to stop a reseller from abusing a manufacturer's property right in his trademark.

The quality stabilization bill simply provides that when a trademark is abused, the trademark owner may deny that unfair reseller further use of the brand name or trademark. Essentially, it is a confirmation by Congress of the unanimous decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Old Dearborn Distributing Co.* v. *Seagram-Distiller's Corp.*, 299 U.S. 183 (1936), that the manufacturer possesses property rights in the goodwill symbolized by his trademark. The bill describes how the manufacturer may protect his trademark as it moves along the channels of distribution.

CONSTRUCTIVE COMPETITION INSURED

The quality stabilization bill leaves the Sherman Act intact. Any group of manufacturers or wholesalers or retailers who abuse the quality stabilization bill to effect illegal collusive price fixing between themselves would be courting the same prosecution as the heavy electrical firms and their executives experienced not long ago in Philadelphia.

To underscore that the quality stabilization bill will promote competition, it must be emphasized repeatedly that the manufacturer alone must make the basic marketing decision—whether to stabilize his price, as a means of restoring and improving quality, or to rely primarily on price alone to attract customers. It is, after all, his brand and his reputation which is at stake. Only he can make the decision.

Wholesalers and retailers will be free, too, to determine whether they wish to handle products of stabilized quality or a competitive unstabilized one. They may elect to handle top brand lines which are stabilized and others on which they can vary the price. It is their decision. If they elect to handle the quality stabilized brand, they must respect the law and the manufacturer's established policy. This means that the reseller may not abuse the brand name by misrepresentation as to make, model, size, age or other details of the quality-stabilized brand, by bait and switch merchandising techniques, or by selling that brand name product at other than the manufacturer's specific price.

THE CONSUMER'S INTEREST

This legislation safeguards the consumer. This committee is not unmindful of the situation that results when an unprincipled retailer can take advantage of a product by running a loss-leader ad. For every dollar spent by the misguided customer who is brought in on account of this ad, sacrificing a brand name or a trademark of some producer, that customer spends an estimated $9 for inferior products at the regular or higher price. Now, what happens? It does not take long until that honored product loses customers. Soon the loss-leader advertiser drops the brand name product and picks up another quality product to temporarily pack his store with unsuspecting customers. It is operations of this kind that the quality stabilization bill will control by protecting the customer, the producer, and the small retail man.

We need protection for the small retailer, the consumer, labor, and for the man who invents a product or spends his adult life and great sums of money to establish a brand name or trademark.

Enactment of the quality stabilization bill will result in availability of products in which the public can have confidence—confidence in their stabilized price and in their quality. Customers can buy that which they seek: quality and price, or price alone. The retailer, by offering both quality stabilized and unstabilized brands, can give the consumer an excellent mix of durable, high-quality products and products of lesser quality whose prices fit his pocketbook or his limited needs.

I feel confident that there will be many brands, made by reputable manufacturers, which will not be stabilized even though some of their brands are stabilized. The quality stabilization bill will affect discount merchants only as to the products the manufacturers place under quality stabilization and then, only as to the brand name thereof. On those products the manufacturer will have the legal and equitable right to protect his property. But the discounter is optionally free to handle quality stabilized products along with merchandise that he does not elect to come under quality stabilization.

It is not the purpose of the quality stabilization bill to put anyone out of business. Indeed, it is my conviction that it will reduce the number of small businesses whose owners find it necessary to liquidate. I predict that enactment of the quality stabilization bill will result in a drastic drop in the number of small business failures.

Obviously, the buying public will benefit from this bill. For the first time in a number of years, the consumer will have a standard against which to measure quality. The quality stabilization law will also give protection to the consumer against entrapment and unwise purchase of the loss-leader merchant specializing in bait and switch tactics.

HELP RESTORE EMPLOYMENT

In urging speedy consideration of this bill by this committee, I direct your attention to the fact that unrestrained price slashing is rapidly disabling labor, industry, resellers, and the public. Our entire economy will continue to deteriorate at a time when leading economists and statesmen agree we need instead economic growth to strengthen our Nation for survival.

I represent the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana. In recent years purchasers and small retailers have been asking me what can be done to reestablish confidence in retail marketing. Unemployment in my area is critical.

Enactment of this quality stabilization legislation will contribute more toward restoring employment than any other legislation that can be enacted by Congress. When a manufacturer is forced to make 15 men do the work of 20, and is forced to employ cheaper and less-skilled labor as well as inferior materials, both American labor and the American consumer are injured where it hurts most. Small manufacturers of trademarked products have been forced to close their factories or downgrade the quality of their products to suit the high pressure, falsely advertising retailers, as a means of staying in business. This type of retailer may be few in number but they are powerful and heavily financed, and growing in size and number every day.

Enactment of the quality stabilization bill will give manufacturers the confidence to build better products instead of cheaper products with poor quality. This bill will give the bargain seeker an opportunity of knowing what is a bargain by placing a standard of value as a gage.

NONPARTISAN

This is strictly nonpartisan legislation. Ten U.S. Senators of both parties have cosponsored quality stabilization, and seven Members—from both parties—have introduced the bills in the House of Representatives.

I am hereby submitting with my statement the list of more than 50 national trade and professional organizations that have endorsed this quality stabilization bill: Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc.; National Retail Hardware Association; National Retail Furniture Association; National Association of Retail Clothiers and Furnishers; National Appliance & Radio-TV Dealers Association; National Sporting Goods Association; National Office Machine Dealers Association; Retail Jewelers of America; Master Photo Dealers & Finishers Association; Independent Garage Owners of America; Toy

Wholesalers' Association of America; Wholesale Stationers' Association; National Stationery & Office Equipment Association; National Wholesale Jewelers Association; American Fishing Tackle Manufacturers Association; Archery Manufacturers & Dealers Association; National Association of House to House Installment Companies, Inc., Marine Manufacturers Safety Equipment Association; Gift & Decorative Accessories Association of America; Sporting Goods Jobbers Association; Billiard & Bowling Institute of America; American Watch Association, Inc.; Automotive Service Industry Association; Fountain Pen & Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers' Association, Inc.; National Wholesale Hardware Association; Watch Material Distributors of America; National Association of Bedding Manufacturers; the National Association of Shirt, Pajama and Sportswear Manufacturers.

National Industrial Distributors Association; Christian Booksellers Association; National Small Business Men's Association; National Congress of Petroleum Retailers; National Shoe Manufacturers Association; Wallcovering Wholesalers Association; American Reseach Merchandising Institute; American Retailers Association; National Art Materials Trade Association; Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association; National Shoe Retailers Association; Northamerican Heating & Airconditioning Wholesalers, Inc.; American Watch Manufacturers Association; National Association of Women's & Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.; National Audio-Visual Association, Inc.; National Bicycle Dealers Association, Inc.; National Office Furniture Association, Inc.; National Outerwear & Sportswear Association; the Automotive Warehouse Distributors Association, Inc.; National Frozen Food Association, Inc.; American Association of Small Business; National Association of Glove Manufacturers; National Association of Retail Druggists; Paint & Wallpaper Association of America, Inc.; National Marine Products Association; Retail Tobacco Dealers of America; National Association of Tobacco Distributors; National Retail Farm Equipment Association; Conference of State Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries; American Pharmaceutical Association.

I thank you.

SENATE

Tuesday, April 17, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and glory, in these days of the earth's awakening, thrilling and throbbing with the loveliness of springtide, we thank Thee for every sacrament of beauty of which our enraptured senses drink as we bend in wonder at the petaled cups held up by bushes aflame with Thee.

As we lift to Thee our gratitude for this dear land of our love and prayer, our thought of her is glad with hope. Under Thee, her way is down no fatal slope, but up to freer sun and air—

Tried as by furnace fires and yet
By God's grace only stronger made
In future tasks before her set
She shall not lack the oldtime aid.

So runs our loyal dream of her. God of our fathers, make it true, as we rededicate ourselves anew to the preservation of the precious things we hold nearest our hearts, and won for us at so great a cost. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 16, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Saund, of California; Mr. Rutherford, of Texas; Mr. Montoya, of New Mexico; Mr. Nix, of Pennsylvania; Mr. McDowell, of Delaware; Mr. Inouye, of Hawaii; Mr. Rivers, of South Carolina; Mr. Chiperfield, of Illinois; Mr. Whalley, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Springer, of Illinois; Mr. Derwinski, of Illinois; and Mr. Reifel, of South Dakota as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1057. An act to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S. 1668. An act to authorize the imposition of forfeitures for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in the common carrier and safety and special fields.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 298. An act to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the cost of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States;

H.R. 4856. An act to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n);

H.R. 4901. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable;

H.R. 5149. An act to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding;

H.R. 6984. An act to provide for a method of payment of indirect costs of research and development contracted by the Federal Government at universities, colleges, and other educational institutions;

H.R. 9752. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in Greece in 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10786. An act to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11131. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 449. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial; and

H.J. Res. 641. Joint resolution designating February 20 of each year as John Glenn Day.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 683. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirements of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with Federal Communications Commission;

S. 1371. An act to amend subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit the Commission to renew a station license in the safety and special radio services more than 30 days prior to expiration of the original license;

S. 1589. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the issuance of radio operator licenses to nationals of the United States;

S. 2522. An act to defer the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project; and

S.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 298. An act to provide for the recovery from tortiously liable third persons of the cost of hospital and medical care and treatment furnished by the United States;

H.R. 4856. An act to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n);

H.R. 5149. An act to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding; and

H.J. Res. 641. Joint resolution designating February 20 of each year as John Glenn Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4901. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 6984. An act to provide for a method of payment of indirect costs of research and development contracted by the Federal Government at universities, colleges, and other educational institutions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9752. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide transportation and other services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in Greece in 1963, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11131. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 10786. An act to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum has been suggested; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Amendment of Federal Reserve Act, Relating to Adjustment of Certain Salaries

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Reserve Act to adjust the terms of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to increase the salaries of members of such Board, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Overobligation of an Appropriation

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation within that Department, for the fiscal year 1961; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Amendment of Title III of Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Notice of Proposed Disposition of Certain Silk Waste

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 961,061 pounds of silk waste now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Review of Administration of Construction of Launch Facilities for the Atlas and Titan Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, reviewing, for the information of the Senate, the administration of construction of launch facilities for the Atlas and Titan intercontinental ballistic missiles at selected Air Force bases; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Audit Report on Virgin Islands Corporation

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Virgin Islands Corporation, fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Occupational Safety Act

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for assistance to States in the promotion, establishment, and maintenance of safe workplaces and work practices, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Cost Ascertainment Report of Post Office Department

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Cost Ascertainment Report of the Post Office Department, for the fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Report on Survey of Postal Rates

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a survey of postal rates, dated April 15, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to west coast shipbuilding

"Whereas the Congress of the United States in its wisdom has provided in subsection (d) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act 1936 (49 Stat. 1985), for a 6-percent differential for bids of West coast shipyards for the construction of ships to be operated by steamship companies whose home office is located at Pacific coast ports; and

"Whereas the shipbuilders of the eastern and gulf coasts, without the aid of a comparison of ship construction costs, are presently seeking in the Congress of the United States to repeal this 6-percent differential; and

"Whereas the Western Shipbuilding Association has proposed an impartial study of comparative construction costs on the Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific coasts; and

"Whereas the retention of the 6-percent differential is vital for the preservation of the west coast shipbuilding industry because of the higher construction costs of this area; and

"Whereas the security of the United States requires a healthy and vigorous shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast as well as on the Atlantic and Gulf seaboards; and

"Whereas not only California but the other 12 Western States including Alaska and Hawaii will be affected by the proposed repeal of the 6-percent differential, since they furnish both raw materials and manpower to the shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly. That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the proposed study, to retain the 6-percent differential allowed for bids of West Coast shipyards for the construction of ships, and to take any further action indicated as appropriate by the results of the study; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California, and the other 12 Western States, in the Congress of the United States, and to Thomas Crowley, Jr., chairman of the California Governor's Committee for Ship Construction and Repair, Thomas A. Rotell, executive secretary of the Pacific Coast Metal Trades District Council, Hugh Gallagher, chairman of the San Francisco Mayor's Committee for Shipping, Shipbuilding, and Ship Repair, and J. A. Byington, president of the Western Shipbuilding Association."

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution relative to supplemental air carriers

"Whereas official accident statistics of the Civil Aeronautics Board, as set forth at page VII–29 of the 1961 edition of the Board's Handbook of Airline Statistics, show that for the entire 12-year period 1949 through 1960 the accident rate of the supplemental air carriers has been consistently and substantially higher than that of the certified route carriers, whether measured by total accidents or by fatal accidents per million miles flown; and

"Whereas in recent months the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and other responsible and knowledgeable public officials are reported to have testified and admitted publicly that the inadequate financial resources of many supplemental air carriers are conducive to substandard maintenance and operating practices and to inadequate safety measures, to the danger of the public; and

"Whereas the adverse consequences to the public of operations by financially irresponsible supplemental air carriers are not limited to death and physical injury, but often encompass financial loss and severe personal hardship, as witness the stranding of 103 members of the Erin's Own Club of Chicago, Ill. for 6 days at the Shannon, Ireland, Airport in October 1961, because the supplemental air carrier was unable to meet its bills and pay for gasoline for the return flight to Chicago; and the stranding in London of 88 members of the British American Club of Los Angeles in October 1961, who chartered an airplane from a supplemental air carrier; and

"Whereas for the past 15 years the Civil Aeronautics Board, in repeated enforcement proceedings, has proved to be incapable of enforcing the frequency limitations and regulations of supplemental air carriers as evidenced by those decisions and by the testimony of the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board before the Hardy House Subcommittee investigations; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States of America legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the licensing of supplemental air carriers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States of America to incorporate into said pending legislation, or otherwise to provide by any necessary and appropriate legislation, such stringent standards of fitness, and such powers for and directives to the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency, as will insure that no supplemental air carrier will hereafter be authorized to operate unless it has adequate financial resources, adequately skilled personnel, and competent management, so that its operations will be conducted lawfully and with the highest standards of operations, engineering and maintenance and of responsibility to the public; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency to utilize all their lawful powers to eradicate from the supplemental air carrier industry companies and managerial personnel who lack the financial resources, fitness, willingness, ability, or other qualifications, to conduct their business lawfully and with the highest standards of operations, engineering, maintenance, and responsibility to the public; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Civil Aeronautics Board, and to the Federal Aviation Agency."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relating to imports of livestock and livestock products

"Whereas the sheep and cattle industry of the United States has for the 3 years past sought adequate protection from excessive imports from low-wage foreign countries; and

"Whereas livestock production, employment and related business in the producing communities have been seriously curtailed and are threatened with further curtailment; and

"Whereas definite relief for the livestock industry was unanimously recommended by the National Wool Growers Association and American National Cattlemen's Association, which recommendation was preceded by a thorough investigation made by the U.S. Department of Agriculture upon the request of the industry, the Congress, and administration officials; and

"Whereas the Wool Act was provided for the sheep industry by the President and the Congress in lieu of the recommended tariff relief; and

"Whereas the effectiveness of the Wool Act has been seriously hampered by excessive importations of wool fabrics and lambs selling at prices below our costs of production, which has resulted in a progressive decline in sheep production in many areas: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to provide immediate relief under the terms of the escape or peril-point clause of the Trade Agreements Act or by establishing import quotas or any other appropriate action to relieve the stock-raising industry of the United States from the vast and ever-increasing quantities of meat and meat products, hides, wool, woolens, and other related products flooding our domestic markets; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit a copy of the resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution relating to the illegal traffic in narcotics

"Whereas illegal traffic in, and use of, narcotics has increased from year to year, particularly in California; and

"Whereas narcotics are a serious menace to the health and well-being of the citizens of California and of the United States; and

"Whereas illegal traffic in, and use of, narcotics is a primary cause of crime in California and the United States; and

"Whereas illegal traffic in, and use of, narcotics is a cause of much juvenile delinquency in California and the United States; and

"Whereas illegal traffic in, and use of, narcotics weakens the moral fiber of our children and threatens the future of our State and nation; and

"Whereas the primary sources of the illegal narcotics traffic are outside of California and the United States; and

"Whereas this illegal traffic in depravity must be stopped: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes and urges the President and the Congress of the United States, and the U.S. Department of State, to take whatever steps are necessary to induce nations, which are the source of the illegal traffic in narcotics, to increase their efforts and to stop such flow of narcotics from their nation to ours; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President, the Vice President, the U.S. Secretary of State, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to amending the 16th amendment

"Whereas amendment 10 of the Constitution of the United States provides that powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people; and

"Whereas amendment 16 of the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration; and

"Whereas all interest upon bonds and other obligations of States, territories, and possessions of the United States and of political subdivisions thereof is, under present statutes, regulations, and court decisions, exempt from Federal income taxes and, as a consequence of such exemption, such obligations sell at substantially lower interest rates than if such exemption were not available, thereby effecting substantial savings in interest costs to the respective issuers of such obligations and to the taxpayers of such issuers; and

"Whereas frequent attacks on the tax immunity of bonds and other obligations of States, territories, and possessions of the United States and of political subdivisions thereof endangers their essential governmental functions and threatens an untenable increase in the cost of financing needed public works projects, including vitally needed public schools and other State and local governmental needs; and

"Whereas it is imperative to the continued financial well-being of all such issuers that such exemption be permanently established and continued as to all such obligations now outstanding or hereafter issued, so that needed public improvements of said respective issuers may be financed at the lowest possible cost to said issuers and their taxpayers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to adopt an amendment to amendment 16 of the Constitution of the United States to exempt from taxes on income, on which the Congress has power to lay and collect taxes, all interest upon the obligations of any State, territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision of any thereof which is a municipal corporation or to which has been delegated the right to exercise part of the sovereign power of such State, territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to each Governor of these United States."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 819. A bill to provide for suitable works of art in Federal buildings (Rept. No. 1343).

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY METHODS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 332) to investigate certain aspects of national security methods, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from the date of approval of this resolution to January 31, 1963, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of means to improve these methods and processes.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from date of approval of this resolution to January 31, 1963, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $70,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ENTITLED "FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATIONS" (PT. 6 OF REPT. NO. 994)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on September 13, 1961, I had leave of the Senate to file Senate Report No. 994 in six parts. This report was authorized by the Senate in Senate Resolution 305, 2d session of the 86th Congress. Part I was filed on September 13, 1961; part II was filed November 28, 1961; part III was filed December 11, 1961; part IV was filed December 12, 1961; part V was filed January 9, 1962.

I ask unanimous consent for leave to file part VI, that final part of the report.

This recommendation part of the report of the Freedom of Communications Subcommittee—a subcommittee of the Communications Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee — presents the final results of a study begun in 1960. The conclusions and recommendations it contains have neither been approved, disapproved, nor considered by the Communications Subcommittee or by the Commerce Committee.

I think the recommendations are provocative and timely. It is from such studies as this that the Senate will garner the information it needs to be able to legislate intelligently in the field of Government-licensed media.

In the marketplace of ideas, there is always room for the fresh approach—a new look at our traditional ways of thinking about things. The thrust of these recommendations is toward more discussion of controversial issues on Government-licensed media. Responsible controversy is good for the body politic. If the recommendations provoke discussion, and I hope they do, that will be good. It is out of the give and take of recommendation and alternative that we achieve sound judgment for public policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). The report will be received and printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 3183. A bill for the relief of Erman-Howell Division, Luria Steel & Trading Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 3184. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a salmon and steelhead development program in California; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 3185. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to approve a bridge on Interstate Highway 29 at Sioux City, Iowa, as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 3186. A bill for the relief of Ejnar Christian Pedersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 3187. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 with respect to the ratemaking elements in the transportation of mail; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 3188. A bill to authorize the improvement for navigation of Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3189. A bill for the relief of Miss Mamie H. Winstead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (by request):

S. 3190. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the mileage of rural delivery and star routes used as a factor in apportionment of Federal-aid primary and secondary funds; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 3191. A bill to amend section 202(b)(4) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 and section 103(a)(2) of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Hawaii when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 3192. A bill authorizing improvements along the Mississippi River below New Orleans for prevention of hurricane tidal damages;

S. 3193. A bill authorizing modification of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Louisiana and Texas, in the interest of navigation;

S. 3194. A bill authorizing modification of the existing project from the Intracoastal Waterway to Bayou Dulac, La. (Bayous Grand Caillou and Le Carpe), and maintenance of the Houma Navigation Canal; and

S. 3195. A bill authorizing modification of the existing project for the Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, La., in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 3196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat wholesale distributors of automobile glass as manfacturers for purposes of the tax on automobile parts and accessories; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

INVESTIGATION OF IRREGULARITIES IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted a resolution (S. Res. 331) to investigate irregularities in the activities of the various branches of the Department of Agriculture, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, which appears under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY METHODS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 332) to investigate certain aspects of national security methods, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JACKSON, which appears under the heading "Report of a Committee.")

SALMON AND STEELHEAD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize an anadromous fish development program for California. This is an administration measure, based on joint recommendations of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Department of Fish and Game. Although the construction and maintenance work proposed to be authorized is on rivers in California, the program would benefit the declining salmon and migratory trout fishery of the entire Pacific coast. Washington and Oregon also are conerned with the welfare of the salmon and trout resources of California.

Existing facilities of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries of the Fish and Wildlife Service and those of the California Department of Fish and Game would be utilized to the fullest extent. Every dollar invested will be returned manyfold. The California Fish and Game Commission approved the program at a special meeting in Sacramento last week. I hope the Congress will approve it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3184) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a salmon and steelhead development program in California, introduced by Mr. ENGLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AIRLINE SERVICE FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE AND NORTHERN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 with respect to the ratemaking elements in the transportation of mail.

This bill is one more element in my efforts to meet the critical need for more and better airline service to New Hampshire and northern New England.

Public transportation facilities are essential for manufacturing and recreation, two of the most important industries of New Hampshire. Furthermore, the State's need for good transportation is magnified by our geographic location in one corner of the Nation; at the end of the line, as it were.

Despite our needs, public surface transportation has steadily withered. Railroad passenger service has been obliterated in many areas of the State, and all hopes for its improvement were extinguished long ago. Airline service is, thus, the principal form of speedy public transportation still available in northern New England.

One of the obstacles which has tripped our efforts to get better service is the fact that airline service in and to New Hampshire and northern New England is local service. The realities of our geography prevent it from being the long-haul traffic most desired by the airlines. The distances between our principal cities simply is not great. It is not, by nationwide standards, a long flight from New Hampshire to Boston, Albany, New York, or even Washington.

The airline serving the three States of northern New England has made, in my opinion, earnest efforts to provide effective and adequate service, but the short-haul, multistop operations are as much a problem to them as they are to the citizens of the region. These problems are clearly evidenced by the recent requests for curtailment of service. While the airline service is vital to these communities, it can only be provided at a loss to the carrier.

Ordinarily, the local service nature of the airline operation would not be a significant stumbling block. Adequate airline service is now being provided many areas of the country by local service carriers under the direction of the Civil Aeronautics Board. But New Hampshire's problem is compounded by the fact that its airline service is provided by a long-haul, trunkline carrier, Northeast Airlines, instead of by a local service airline.

The purpose of my bill is to give the Civil Aeronautics Board discretionary authority to treat one part of a carrier's operation as a local service operation. It will permit the CAB, in determining subsidy, to recognize that a part of a carrier's operations are of a local service nature, even though its total operations are not. It will permit the Board, in its discretion, to give adequate consideration to the special characteristics and special needs of airline service to New Hampshire and northern New England. If enacted, it will give us an improved opportunity to get the better airline service we so desperately need.

Mr. President, it is my intention to seek the speediest action possible on this bill so that the course of action it provides will be available at an early date in case the airline situation in New England should worsen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3187) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 with respect to the ratemaking elements in the transportation of mail, introduced by Mr. COTTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

IMPROVEMENT FOR NAVIGATION OF BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IND.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it is the good fortune of the State of Indiana to have a precious few miles on the southern tip of Lake Michigan along the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Since these miles are precious, encompassing industry and industrial potential as well as the raw beauty of virgin sand dunes, the best use to which all can be put has been in controversy for some time. One of America's most powerful industrial complexes has grown on these shores. One of Indiana's finest State parks preserves virgin dunes. Some of America's finest beaches grace the shoreline.

Nowhere in the 22 miles of shore is there a public port, open to all deep-draft shipping and controlled by an agency of the State government or any municipality. The Army Corps of Engineers recently completed a study of a site that has been selected by the Indiana Port Commission to determine the wisdom and feasibility of constructing such a deep-draft public port. The Engineers' report states that such a port, under certain conditions, is indeed feasible.

The State of Indiana has begun acquiring land at the port site, which is adjacent to the site of a rolling mill now being operated by Midwest Steel Co., a subsidiary of National Steel. It is flanked on the other side by a site owned by Bethlehem Steel Corp., acquired some 10 years ago, and upon which Bethlehem has stated it intends to build a mill. To the South are railroad lines and highways.

Construction of a port at this site would leave several miles of lakeshore for continued recreational and scenic development. Some 5,000 acres of dunes would remain for conservation by the Federal and State Governments.

In view of the fact that the site of the Burns Waterway Harbor lies within an area already developed by industry, it is my feeling and the feeling of my colleague that it is entirely consistent to continue such development while reserving land to the east for conservation and recreation purposes in a national seashore.

The two developments should not be confused.

The operation by a State-affiliated commission of a public port on the seaway has long been a dream of Hoosiers. It has been endorsed and promoted by Governors and legislators of both parties in Indiana.

Last week Governor Welsh and representatives of his administration met in Washington with me and two ranking members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. We informed our colleagues then that we anticipated introduction of an authorization bill for the construction of the Burns Waterway Harbor.

My senior colleague from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is in the Chamber. As soon as he has made his statement, I will send to the desk my bill to accomplish this purpose. It is introduced on behalf of myself and my senior colleague. We understand that companion measures are being introduced today in the House of Representatives by the minority leader and by Representative ROUSH.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the introduction of the authorization bill for deep sea harbor on the shore of Lake Michigan in northern Indiana represents an important stepping stone in a long-range effort of which I am proud to have been an advocate as a private citizen or an active participant as a U.S. Senator for more than a quarter of a century.

I am happy to say that in this effort has been the full force of Indiana's government, State and local, and it has been carried forward in the Congress with the complete cooperation at all times of the members of Indiana's congressional delegation.

When the project is completed it will open to world sea traffic the boundless products of Indiana's industry and agriculture and, in turn, will facilitate the movement of incoming commerce to Indiana's northern door.

The bill represents one of the most important pieces of legislation from Indiana's standpoint in which it has been my privilege to join in the nearly 18 years I have represented the Hoosier State in the Senate of the United States.

It is a fortunate thing, Mr. President, that there can be little controversy or fault-finding with this bill because it simply authorizes that which has been recommended by the Corps of Army Engineers after many, many years of careful and expert study.

It is a fortunate thing also that the project which this bill anticipates has the added advantage of affording not only commercial but recreational advantages in an area already nationally famous for its land of dunes.

Happily, the recreational and scenic natural advantages afforded by our dunes area will not in any way be impaired by the construction of the deep sea port.

In addition to its transportation and recreation advantages, the project envisioned in this bill likewise will bring—indeed has already brought—vast new industries to Indiana which will provide thousands upon thousands of new jobs.

This bill, Mr. President, is all "pluses."

I wish to add that the Corps of Army Engineers have authorized the construction of a deep sea harbor for the State of Indiana. We have been working on this matter for 25 years. We are the only State that borders on the Great Lakes which does not have a deep sea harbor, or at least one in preparation or being constructed. It is very much needed.

There has been some controversy over the question as to whether the land on which the harbor is to be built should be used for a harbor or a park.

My position today, as it has been for 25 years, is that there is plenty of space on the Michigan Lake shore for both a harbor and the expansion of industry, and for recreation facilities. This a good piece of legislation. It has been considered for years. It is nothing new. It is not something that people have rushed into without consideration. I am happy to join my colleague from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] in introducing the proposed legislation.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I now send forward my bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3188) to authorize the improvement for navigation of Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind., introduced by Mr. Hartke (for himself and Mr. Capehart), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO MILEAGE OF RURAL DELIVERY AND STAR ROUTES

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the mileage of rural delivery and star routes used as a factor in apportionment of Federal-aid primary and secondary funds. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of Commerce requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3190) to amend title 23, United State Code, with respect to the mileage of rural delivery and star routes used as a factor in apportionment of Federal-aid primary and secondary funds, introduced by Mr. Chavez, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letter presented by Mr. Chavez is as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., April 16, 1962.

The Honorable President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The Department of Commerce has prepared and submits herewith as a part of its legislative program for the 87th Congress, 2d session, a draft of a proposed bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the mileage of rural delivery and star routes used as a factor in apportionment of Federal-aid primary and secondary funds.

Existing law stipulates that Federal-aid primary and secondary funds be apportioned partially on the basis of the ratio which the mileage of rural delivery routes and star routes in each State bears to the total mileage of rural delivery and star routes in all the States at the close of the next preceding fiscal year, as shown by a certificate of the Postmaster General, which he is directed to make and furnish annually to the Secretary of Commerce, 23 U.S.C. 104(b) (1), (2).

Federal-aid highway funds are normally apportioned during the midsummer or early fall for the next following fiscal year, but in any event apportionments are required, by the provisions of 23 U.S.C. section 104(b), to be made on or before January 1 next preceding the commencement of the fiscal year for which authorized. For example, the apportionment of fiscal year 1963 funds for the ABC program was made on October 10, 1961, and the latest such apportionment could have been made was January 1, 1962. This leaves a maximum of 6 months between the controlling date for mileage statistics and the date apportionments are made. Considerable difficulty has been experienced in obtaining the required mileage data for use in these apportionments, particularly when Federal-aid highway funds are apportioned during midsummer, as is most frequently the case. It is proposed, therefore, that the provisions of 23 U.S.C. section 104 be amended to allow the use of mileage statistics, for primary and secondary fund apportionment purposes, as of a date 6 months earlier than is now provided.

The enclosed draft bill would provide for an amendment to existing law as herein proposed. The Department of Commerce believes that enactment of this legislation would facilitate apportionment of Federal-aid primary and secondary funds computed on mileage data which may be obtained reasonably in advance of such apportionment without affecting the rationale upon which such funds are apportioned.

The Department of Commerce recommends the proposed legislation for the favorable consideration of the Congress.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

Edward Gudeman,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

S. 3190

A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the mileage of rural delivery and star routes used as a factor in apportionment of Federal-aid primary and secondary funds

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) (1) of section 104 of title 23, United States Code, is hereby amended by striking the phrase "at the close of the next preceding fiscal year" and by inserting in lieu thereof "at the close of the next preceding calendar year".

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1955 AND HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to correct the inadvertent restrictions placed by certain provisions of the Housing Act of 1961—Public Law 87–70—upon full participation by 22 States, including Hawaii, in the Federal urban renewal and community facilities programs.

The effect of my bill would be to—

First. Qualify, for Federal community facilities credit assistance, those counties which have populations more than 50,000 but less than 100,000 and which do not include, and are not included by, any municipalities. At present, only those municipalities and other political subdivisions having populations less than 50,000 are eligible for credit assistance under this program.

Second. Qualify, for Federal urban renewal capital grants of up to three-fourths of the aggregate net project costs of eligible projects, those counties which have populations less than 100,000 and which do not include, and are not included by, any municipalities. At present, only municipalities having populations less than 50,000 are eligible for this favorable Federal-local ratio.

According to the 1960 census, the populations of Hawaii's counties and urban areas, outside the city and county of Honolulu, are as follows:

County of Hawaii	61,332
Hilo	25,966
County of Kalawao	279
County of Kauai	28,176
Kapaa	3,430
Lihue	3,908
County of Maui	42,576
Kahului	4,223
Lahaina	3,423
Puunene	3,054
Wailuku	6,969

Hawaii finds that its share in the Federal programs mentioned is circumscribed because it has organized its local government not according to the traditional mainland pattern, but into a unique system comprised of only five units. All five units are counties with jurisdiction over all of one or more islands—except the county of Kalawao, the famed Hansen Disease Settlement at Kalaupapa. As a result, the application of the term "municipality" is not always clear when Hawaii's urban areas are in question, as none of them is incorporated. We have not incorporated any of our urban areas because we have found our simple county system both efficient and effective.

I have attempted—see exhibits I–A and II—to obtain a Housing and Home Finance Administration ruling to include Hawaii's urban areas within the meaning of the term "municipality," but without success. That agency strictly adheres to the following definition: "A public corporation created for political purposes and having subordinate and local powers of legislation."

The disqualification of Hawaii's urban areas resulting from the HHFA's strict interpretation of sections 301(a) and 501(e) of Public Law 87–70 is indeed unfortunate, especially for the city of Hilo.

Hilo is like most any other American city of 30,000 people and experiences the same sorts of urban problems. But Hilo was devastated by the tidal wave of May 1960, suffering the loss of 57 lives and $50 million in damages. The county of Hawaii, of which Hilo is the seat, has been declared a depressed area by the Department of Commerce. What more appropriate an urban area is there for Federal assistance? But because Hilo is not incorporated and although it has a population less than 50,000, it was not allowed a 3-to-1, Federal-local urban renewal capital grant for its $6.7 million project to restore an area damaged by the 1960 tidal wave. If my proposed bill is approved, all counties of the State of Hawaii, except the city and county of Honolulu, will be eligible for urban renewal capital grants for qualified projects at the 3-to-1 ratio. Also eligible for the first time would be 82 other counties in the following States: California, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin—see exhibit II.

The county of Hawaii may also be ineligible for community facilities credit assistance for the sewer and water projects already planned for Hilo and Kailua-Kona. This is because the county has a population over 50,000, although the areas to benefit have populations of far less. The proposed bill would enable the hard-pressed county to apply for the necessary credit to undertake these projects satisfactorily. Other counties which would be similarly affected are: Massachusetts—Barnstable and Franklin Counties; Virginia—Chesterfield, Norfolk, and Princess Anne Counties.

I ask unanimous consent that exhibits I–A and II, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the exhibits will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3191) to amend section 202 (b)(4) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 and section 103(a)(2) of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The exhibits presented by Mr. LONG of Hawaii are as follows:

EXHIBIT I–A

SEPTEMBER 11, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WEAVER: Thank you for your letter of August 31 concerning the definition of municipalities under 50,000, with specific reference to the city of Hilo, Hawaii.

I cannot, of course, quarrel with the legalistic definition of a municipality, as I have been aware of the facts you cite for many years. The fact remains, however, that communities such as Hilo are clearly intended to be the beneficiaries of the special Federal assistance provisions of the Housing Act of 1961, and the fact further is that for some purposes Hilo is considered a municipality. Even without being a public corporation created for political purposes and having subordinate and local powers of legislation, Hilo is a municipality in the eyes of the Census Bureau.

Further, Hilo has defined and identifiable boundaries that exist in law, which distinguishes it from the unincorporated fringe areas that lie on the outskirts of many cities. Finally, Hilo is already served by a redevelopment agency that has, in the past, received assistance through your agency.

I therefore suggest that you inquire more fully into the conditions that prevail in Hilo, with a view to determining whether or not the accepted definition of "municipality" is indeed controlling in the exceptional circumstances that exist.

In addition, I would appreciate your comments as to whether Hawaii County, being a unit of local government with less than 150,000 population and having been designated as a depressed area by the Department of Commerce would or would not qualify for a 75-percent loan for urban renewal purposes. The county of Hawaii might meet your definition of a municipality, but it may not be urban enough to qualify.

As you can see from the above comments, and from our previous correspondence, it appears that an overly rigorous adherence to any of the terms in the statute may result in disqualification of the city of Hilo and the county of Hawaii. It is not for me to advise your legal staff in their interpretation of the act, but I feel strongly that if any community in the Nation meets the standards that the Congress had in mind when it enacted the Housing Act of 1961, Hilo is it. I repeat that I would consider it sheer discrimination if Hilo were barred from the benefits of the program solely because the people of Hawaii have not organized their local government according to the stereotype of the 48 mainland States.

I am fully aware of the arguments that have been put forth for creating metropolitan government where none exists today. I further am aware of the possibilities that a more general approach to local government provides. Finally, I am aware of, and am a cosponsor of the bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing which would have the salutary effect of permitting the Federal Government to take a more comprehensive and less parochial view of local problems. Yet your letter seems to indicate that in Hilo, where the people of Hawaii have avoided many of the problems with which we are wrestling elsewhere, the very fact that a rational local governmental organization exists bars its participation in one of your programs. I cannot agree with this concept and I earnestly request your review of the whole matter.

Sincerely yours,

OREN E. LONG.

EXHIBIT I–B

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., October 2, 1961.

Hon. OREN E. LONG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: This will acknowledge your letter of September 11, 1961, with further reference to the eligibility of the city of Hilo, Hawaii, for a three-fourths capital grant as a small municipality within the meaning of section 301(a)(2)(B) of the Housing Act of 1961.

You renew the contention that Hilo should be regarded as a municipality even though it is not a public corporation, has no governing body and no legislative authority, and is in fact governed by the county of Hawaii. As I pointed out in my letter of August 31, 1961, and as you apparently recognize, acceptance of that view would do violence to elementary definitions of municipal law. Although you state that it was congressional intent to make communities like Hilo eligible for a three-fourths grant, I find no language in the Housing Act of 1961 and no legislative history to warrant a departure from the customary definition of the term "municipality." Moreover, the fact that the Bureau of the Census compiles population statistics for Hilo does not establish its status as a municipality. The Bureau of the Census, under present operating procedures, furnishes population statistics for any area with definable boundaries, whether incorporated or unincorporated. It is true that, in furnishing figures for Hilo, the Bureau adds a note to the effect that Hilo has legally established limits and is treated as an incorporated place (U.S. Census of Population 1960, Number of Inhabitants, Hawaii, PC(1) 13A), but the explanatory note does not purport to affect or define the legal form of organization of the city of Hilo.

On the question of whether the county of Hawaii can qualify for a three-fourths capital grant under the provision relating to redevelopment areas, I am obliged to reply in the negative since the only designation that has been made for the county of Hawaii is under section 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act and our statute is explicit on the point that a three-fourths grant may be made to a municipality having a population of between 50,000 and 150,000 if it is in a redevelopment area so designated under section 5(a) of that act.

I fully appreciate your distress in learning that Hilo cannot qualify for assistance as a small municipality, but after reviewing the entire situation, I am fully persuaded that under the present statutory authorization, an unincorporated area such as Hilo does not qualify for the benefits conferred upon a small municipality by the Housing Act of 1961. Of course, we are prepared to provide continuing assistance to the Hawaii Redevelopment Agency under the customary two-thirds formula for the purpose of undertaking renewal projects in the city of Hilo.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator.

EXHIBIT II

Counties having a population of less than 100,000 (according to the 1960 census) where there does not exist any municipality which is included within, or inclusive of, such counties (according to the 1957 Census of Governments)

California:	
Alpine	397
Mariposa	5, 064
Mono	2, 213
Trinity	9, 706
Florida:	
Liberty	3, 138
Wakulla	5, 257
Georgia: Echols	1, 876
Hawaii:	
Hawaii [1]	61, 332
Kalawao	279
Kauai	28, 176
Maui	42, 576
Kentucky:	
Elliott	6, 330
Knott	17, 362
Martin	10, 201

See footnote at end of table.

Counties having a population, etc.—Con.

Kentucky—Continued	
McCreary	12,463
Menifee	4,276
Wolfe	6,534
Louisiana:	
Cameron	6,909
Plaquemines	22,545
St. Bernard	32,186
St. Charles	21,219
St. John the Baptist	18,439
Maine:	
Franklin	20,069
Piscataquis	17,379
Somerset	39,749
Maryland: Howard	36,152
Massachusetts:	
Barnstable [1]	70,286
Dukes	5,829
Franklin [1]	54,864
Michigan: Oscoda	3,447
Mississippi: Issaquena	3,576
Nebraska:	
Banner	1,269
McPherson	735
Nevada:	
Douglas	3,481
Esmeralda	619
Eureka	767
Lander	1,566
Mineral	6,329
Storey	568
New Hampshire:	
Carroll	15,829
Grafton	48,857
New Mexico:	
Catron	2,773
Los Alamos	13,037
North Carolina:	
Camden	5,598
Currituck	6,601
Hyde	5,765
South Dakota: Buffalo	1,547
Tennessee: Union	8,498
Texas:	
Bandera	3,892
Borden	1,076
Crockett	4,209
Glasscock	1,118
Hartley	2,171
Hudspeth	3,343
Jim Hogg	5,022
Kenedy	884
King	640
Loving	226
McMullen	1,116
San Jacinto	6,153
Terrell	2,600
Zapata	4,393
Utah: Daggett	1,164
Virginia:	
Amelia	7,815
Augusta	37,363
Bath	5,335
Bland	5,982
Charles City	4,492
Chesterfield [1]	71,197
Cumberland	6,360
Gloucester	11,919
Goochland	9,206
James City	11,539
King and Queen	5,889
King George	7,243
Mathews	7,121
Nelson	12,752
New Kent	4,504
Norfolk [1]	51,612
Northumberland	10,185
Powhatan	6,747
Prince George	20,270
Princess Anne [1]	76,124
Spotsylvania	13,819
Stafford	16,876
Wisconsin: Florence	3,437

[1] Designates those counties which will become eligible for community facilities loan assistance. All counties listed will become eligible for Federal urban renewal and planning grants of up to three-fourths the aggregate net project costs of qualified projects.

IMPROVEMENTS ALONG THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER BELOW NEW ORLEANS, LA., FOR PREVENTION OF HURRICANE TIDAL DAMAGES

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which has for its purpose the authorization of a project for improvements along the Mississippi River below New Orleans, La., for the prevention of hurricane tidal damages. This bill is being introduced after a study conducted by the Corps of Engineers and the receipt of reports which indicate that justification exists to accomplish this work. The study and reports in this instance were made pursuant to Public Law 71 of the 84th Congress, 1st session, which authorizes a study of the eastern and southern seaboards of the United States to secure data on the behavior and frequency of hurricanes, and to determine possible means of preventing loss of human life and damage to property, with due consideration of the economics of proposed protective structures or other measures which might be required. My colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] joins me as a sponsor of this measure.

The bill I am introducing would provide for an increase in the height of the back levee protection on the Mississippi River below New Orleans, with modification of drainage facilities for four reaches of the river, at an estimated Federal cost of $7,502,000, subject of course to certain conditions of local cooperation.

In the past, hurricanes approaching the coastline of Louisiana from the southeast, south, and southwest, within the limits of the study area have caused widespread flooding of developed sections on both banks of the Mississippi River. The inundation creates hazards to life and health, damages public and private property, disrupts business and community life, and requires expenditure of public and private funds for evacuation and rehabilitation of local residents. Since 1893, the area has experienced 12 hurricanes in which major damage was inflicted, 9 which caused minor damage, and 17 others which were potentially dangerous for which actual damages were not assessed.

It is my belief that the project covered by this bill is urgently needed, and I recommend its adoption at the earliest possible time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3192) authorizing improvements along the Mississippi River below New Orleans for prevention of hurricane tidal damages, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

DEEPENING AND WIDENING THE GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY IN LOUISIANA AND TEXAS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, for a number of years it has been apparent to anyone who had occasion to observe the movement of commerce in the waterways of this Nation that additional depth and width were required in the Intracoastal Canal that traverses the States of Louisiana and Texas if this artery of commerce was to be utilized to its fullest. The study in connection with deepening the authorized 12- by 125-foot channel has been under way since the adoption of a study resolution in 1952, but many problems were encountered along the way and only recently has this study been brought to a conclusion with a recommendation by the Chief of Engineers that this channel be increased to a depth of 16 feet and a general width of 150 feet.

At this time, I introduce a bill to provide for this channel deepening and widening and other appurtenant works substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated Federal cost of $25,540,000, subject to the necessary conditions of local cooperation. My colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] joins me in submitting this bill.

Since the early 1920's the Intracoastal Canal has done a big job for American industry. It has provided an urgently needed source of transportation of petroleum and many other products, and it gives every indication of furnishing just as valuable a contribution to our missile program. During World War II the service rendered by this channel was invaluable in supplying badly needed fuel to the eastern coast of the United States when normal shipping lanes in the Gulf of Mexico were obstructed by enemy forces.

The service rendered by the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway has been so outstanding that for many years it has enjoyed one of the highest benefit-cost ratios of any project in the Nation.

Progress in our inland shipping has been just as evident as progress in other fields of American industry and invention. Our barges are being built larger and wider, and they require greater depth and more width if they are to traverse without difficulty the protected waterway that the Gulf Intracoastal Canal affords. This bill proposes to furnish that needed width and depth, and I strongly recommend its adoption at the earliest possible time as a further adjunct to the progress of our economy and our defenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3193) authorizing modification of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, La. and Tex., in the interest of navigation, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

MODIFICATION OF THE EXISTING PROJECT OF THE INTRACOASTAL CANAL TO BAYOU DULAC, LA., AND TO AUTHORIZE THE UNITED STATES TO MAINTAIN THE HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for necessary navigation work in the waterways of the State of Louisiana. This bill would modify the existing project for the Intracoastal Waterway to Bayou Dulac, La., to provide for a 10-foot-deep by 45-foot-wide channel in Bayou Le Carpe, at an estimated Federal cost of $45,500. It would also provide for the maintenance of the new Houma Navigation Canal by the United States. Both of these measures have been recommended by the Chief of Engineers of the U.S. Army and by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

The portion of the intracoastal system that would be affected by this improvement is one of the channels that is part of an interconnected network of small waterways, which provide the principal means of transportation through a large area of marshland in Terrebonne Parish, La., lying between Houma, La., and the Gulf of Mexico. The area includes numerous active oil and gas fields, and sulfur is mined at two locations. The marshlands are among the best hunting and trapping sections of the State of Louisiana; and the lakes, streams, and adjoining section of the Gulf of Mexico produce large quantities of fish, oysters, crabs, and shrimp.

The existing Federal project provides for a 5-foot by 40-foot channel from Houma to Bayou Dulac via Bayous Le Carpe, Pelton and Grand Caillou. Portions of Bayous Le Carpe and Pelton are being improved to 15 feet by 150 feet as part of the Houma Navigation Canal, which is being constructed by local interests. The Corps of Engineers, as a result of its study, has come to the conclusion that it is practicable to enlarge the short section of Bayou Le Carpe between the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the Houma Navigation Canal to the dimensions proposed by this bill.

For many years the need for a navigation canal at Houma, La., has been evident. This canal is now being constructed by local interests to dimensions of 15 feet deep by 150 feet wide. It is considered to be in the best interests of navigation to have the United States take over maintenance of this canal when it has been completed, and this is a second purpose of the bill here introduced.

In the interest of the orderly development of our waterways, I recommend the earliest possible adoption of this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3194) authorizing modification of the existing project from the Intracoastal Waterway to Bayou Dulac, La. (Bayous Grand Caillou and Le Carpe), and maintenance of the Houma Navigation Canal, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

INCREASE THE CHANNEL OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN BATON ROUGE, LA., AND NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the modification of the existing project for the Mississippi River, Baton Rouge, La., to the Gulf of Mexico, by providing for a channel 40 feet deep and 500 feet wide between the city of Baton Rouge, La., and the port of New Orleans.

For some time the Corps of Engineers has maintained a 36-foot channel on the Mississippi River between Baton Rouge, La., and the Gulf of Mexico. This channel proceeds down the Mississippi River to the southwest pass of that river and through the southwest pass to the Gulf of Mexico. Improvements in modern shipping have for some time required greater depth to avoid costly groundings and to permit fully laden ships of the world to enter the Mississippi River and proceed all of the way to the port of Baton Rouge.

During the past 25 years the progress that has been made by the city of Baton Rouge has been phenomenal. Many industries, particularly those of the petrochemical variety, have been attracted to the city of Baton Rouge and the intervening area between Baton Rouge and New Orleans, by the unlimited supply of fresh water that the Mississippi River affords and by the fact that the work of the Federal Government during the past 30 years has assured such industries that their plants and equipment will not be subject to recurring floods. This increase in industrial activity has increased the need for full 40-foot navigation on this stretch of the Mississippi River at all stages.

The Mississippi River carries such a tremendous quantity of water when it passes the cities of Baton Rouge and New Orleans that its channel nearly throughout this entire area is sufficiently deep and no work will be required to obtain the 40-foot depth. As a matter of fact, there are only three crossings in this reach of the river that will require work and the entire cost of this project will amount to only $357,000.

In view of the need that already exists, I recommend the adoption of this measure at the earliest possible time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3195) authorizing modification of the existing project for the Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, La., in the interest of navigation, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

DEFERRAL OF EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILE REPLACEMENT GLASS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat wholesale distributors of automobile glass as manufacturers for purposes of the tax on automobile parts and accessories. This bill has been prepared and is being introduced to carry out the third of 10 recommendations contained in Senate Report No. 1015 of the 86th Congress, a report of the Senate Small Business Committee entitled "Studies of Dual Distribution: The Flat-Glass Industry."

During the last half of 1958 and throughout 1959, the Small Business Committee's Subcommittee on Monopoly, which it is my privilege to chair, conducted an intensive study of competitive problems of independent flat-glass dealers and distributors. We were especially—but not conclusively—concerned with dual distribution, that is, with competition by manufacturers, through their own stores, with independent customers in the distributive trades.

One of the several respects in which we concluded that the manufacturer-owned distribution outlet enjoys a competitive advantage over the independent distributor, often a customer of the same manufacturer, was in the area of taxation. The situation was briefly but clearly explained at page 86 of a staff report which was appended to the committee's report, as follows:

> The 8-percent Federal excise tax on automobile replacement parts, including auto-glass replacement parts, is payable at the time of the first sale by a manufacturer. The result, in dollars and cents, is that an independent distributor or dealer who buys from a glass factory and maintains a normal auto-glass inventory of $100,000 always has $8,000 of his working capital tied up in the Federal tax. (The tax is not reassessed in subsequent sales and is passed on to the second and subsequent buyers below the factory as a part of the first buyer's costs.) A PPG warehouse or service branch, on the other hand, competing with the independent distributor or dealer and maintaining the same $100,000 inventory, has no comparable tie-up of working capital, because the auto glass in that case is still in the ownership of the manufacturer and the tax is not payable until sold by the manufacturer. Independent distributors for Shatterproof, holding glass on consignment, have the same advantage. The independent distributor who pays for his inventory when it is stocked argues, very cogently, that his competitive position with relation to the PPG warehouse and the Shatterproof distributor could be equalized, as to this one point, by amending the law to change the time of payment of the tax from the time the glass is stocked and paid for to the time that it is sold. This would have no effect whatever on the second (dealer) purchaser, for the distributor would still pay the tax and pass it on as an unspecified cost; the principal effect would be upon the Federal revenue, which, in the case of some slow-moving glass parts, might wait a year or more for an item to move out of a distributor's inventory and the tax thereon to become payable.
>
> CONCLUSION
>
> The only major public-policy question involved in this proposal is whether the distributor taxpayer or the Government should have the use of the tax money during the period (which is an average of about 4 months) that auto glass parts are in the distributor's inventory. The writer believes this question should be resolved in the distributor's favor and the law amended. In

> 1958 the Congress amended the Internal Revenue Code to give PPG (and other manufacturers engaged in dual distribution) greater equality of excise tax treatment with manufacturer competitors that sell only to factory buyers, by providing that the constructive price at which goods sold by a manufacturer at wholesale or retail shall be regarded, for excise tax purposes, as the factory price.[1] In 1959 the Congress moved to give gasoline wholesalers relief from a complaint almost on all fours with that of the glass distributors. By section 201(e) of Public Law 86-342, 86th Congress, enacted September 21, 1959, gasoline wholesale distributors who agree to bond their stocks are permitted to defer payment of the Federal special tax on gasoline from the time the gasoline is purchased until the time it is sold; further, losses in inventory due to evaporation and spillage are relieved from the tax.[2]
>
> In 1960, it is strongly suggested, the tax-writing committees of the House and Senate should carefully consider the urgent request of independent auto parts distributors, particularly auto glass distributors, for similar treatment—that is, deferral of the time of payment of the 8-percent excise tax from the time the parts are purchased to the time they are resold, with an exemption for losses due to breakage. The latter, of course, is a considerable factor in the glass jobbing business.

The individual companies referred to in this quotation, Mr. President, are the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. and Shatterproof Glass Corp. Pittsburgh Plate Glass is, of course, the largest flat glass manufacturer in the country and a prime example of dual distribution. Shatterproof Glass Corp., a relatively small manufacturer of automobile glass, was mentioned only because of its practice of placing consigned stocks with distributors, a practice which has also been adopted by the Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co.

For the reasons set forth in the foregoing excerpt from the staff report, the Senate Small Business Committee, at page 9 of Senate Report No. 1015, made the following recommendation:

> 3. The tax-writing committees of the House and Senate should give early and sympathetic consideration to the request of independent flat glass distributors for an amendment of the 8-percent manufacturers' excise tax on replacement auto glass, to change the time of payment of the tax from the time the glass is stocked to the time it is sold by the first purchaser from the manufacturer. Such an amendment would not reduce the revenues nor shift the tax burden from one level of distribution to another. It would simply equalize the tax treatment of Pittsburgh Plate Glass warehouses and of independent distributors who receive glass on consignment, on the one hand, with the treatment of independent distributors who pay for their glass when it is stocked, on the other.

The bill I am introducing today, if favorably considered by the appropriate committees of the House and Senate, would, I believe, carry out this recommendation of the Senate Small Business Committee in full. I do not believe that anyone can or will be hurt by this proposed legislation and I anticipate no serious or concerted objection to it. It is a matter of simple justice and equity and I hope that it will be favorably reported and enacted during this session.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I might add that I am familiar with the somewhat different approach to the same sort of problem that is represented by H.R. 221, a bill that passed the House last September and is now pending in the Senate Finance Committee. That bill deals with the manufacturer's excise tax on tires and inner tubes. The problem is the same in that industry; the inequity is the same. The integrated manufacturer does not pay the excise tax on the tires and tubes it transfers to its own stores until the store sells them. The independent, on the other hand, must pay the tax when he takes the tires into his inventory. H.R. 221 would remedy the situation, bring parity of treatment, by requiring the integrated manufacturer to pay the tax when he transfers the tires from factory to store.

I acknowledge that this equalizes the tax treatment of integrated and nonintegrated distribution as effectively as deferring the time of payment of the independents' taxes. However, the chief benefit desired by the independent is to avoid having his own working capital tied up in onerous taxes on inventory, not just to achieve some sort of hypothetical parity with his integrated competitor. For that reason, I believe the approach taken by the 1958 gasoline legislation, and by my bill, is to be preferred, even though it admittedly represents collection costs and proolems that are avoided by the approach of H.R. 221.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3196) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat wholesale distributors of automobile glass as manufacturers for purposes of the tax on automobile parts and accessories, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AUTHORIZATION OF STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND ITS AGENCIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I am submitting a resolution the purpose of which is to authorize a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters relating to the administration by the Department of Agriculture and any of its agencies of, first, acreage allotment programs for cotton and other agricultural commodities, and, second, storage programs for grain and other agricultural commodities, with a view to determining, in the case of each such program, the manner in which officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture have discharged their duties and obligations in dealing with persons affected by or receiving benefits under such programs.

This investigation is particularly pointed at the financial transactions which have taken place between the Department of Agriculture and Mr. Billie Sol Estes, of Texas. Since a preliminary inquiry was started into the amazing financial arrangements of Mr. Estes it is significant that certain high officials of the Department of Agriculture have been either fired or suspended by the Department under charges that there is strong evidence of a conflict of interest.

In view of the tremendous investment which the U.S. Government has in its grain storage operations and in view of the importance of acreage allotments always being administered in the best interests of the farmer, the Congress cannot overlook its responsibility to investigate thoroughly any suggestion that there may have been unnecessary expenditures, improper allotments, or possible conflicts of interest.

Although the activities of Mr. Billie Sol Estes might well be the focal point for an initial investigation the problem is undoubtedly much broader, and therefore the resolution has been drawn in a manner to provide the committee adequate authority to explore any weaknesses in the system.

Proper administration of these multibillion-dollar programs goes to the heart of the integrity of our whole agriculture system.

Unquestionably a thorough investigation is in order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 331) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters relating to the administration, by the Department of Agriculture and any of its agencies, of (1) acreage allotment programs for cotton and other agricultural commodities, and (2) storage programs for grains and other agricultural commodities, with a view to determining, in the case of each such program, the manner in which officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture have discharged their duties and obligations in dealing with persons affected by or receiving benefits under such programs.
>
> SEC. 2. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1963.
>
> SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, through January 31, 1963, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed

---

[1] Public Law 85-859, title I, sec. 115, Sept. 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1279 (26 U.S.C., sec. 4216(b) [1952]).

[2] In addition to the cited public law, see the House and Senate committee reports covering the cited section: Senate Finance Committee, S. Rept. 903, 86th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 10; and House Public Works Committee, H. Rept. 1120, 86th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 23.

and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD two articles from today's Washington Post and Times Herald; one entitled "Cotton Controls Under Scrutiny" and the other entitled "Agriculture Official Fired in Estes Case Inquiry."

From these articles it can be seen that grave questions have been raised concerning the operations of some of these programs.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTON CONTROLS UNDER SCRUTINY

(By Julius Duscha)

The Government's cotton allotment program is being called into question in the investigation of west Texas land dealings by financier Billie Sol Estes.

A basic element underlying this issue is the fact that the right to grow cotton is more valuable than cotton land.

The Agriculture Department establishes cotton quotas based on legislation approved by Congress. A cotton farmer without an allotment cannot market his crop unless he pays a severe cash penalty.

With an allotment a farmer is guaranteed a minimum price by the Government for his cotton.

AS IMPORTANT AS LAND

Throughout the South and Southwest cotton allotments are as great a prize as good homesteading land was a century ago in the Midwest and West.

When a farm is sold, the cotton allotment goes with it. Farmers can also transfer allotments from one piece of land they own to another tract of their land.

An allotment cannot be sold by itself, however, or transferred to land not owned by the farmer who was given the original allotment.

Many allotments become available when land is taken by eminent domain for highways, dams or other projects. These allotments are then placed in a pool from which they can be taken by their original owners and transferred to other lands owned or purchased by them.

AGENTS FROM TEXAS

Agents for Estes and other west Texas landowners have traveled throughout the South and Southwest seeking out cotton farmers who have allotments that they are not using.

The agents offer to sell to the farmers irrigated land in west Texas where cotton can be grown profitably. Under these arrangements the holders of the allotments generally must agree to lease back the land for cotton production to the sellers of the land.

Such lease-back arrangements are legal as long as the land sales are genuine.

In the case of Estes' dealings the Agriculture Department held that the arrangements were not legal because no downpayments were required and because, in the words of a Department statement issued yesterday, the first payment "was so large that it appeared unlikely that any of the displaced owners would be in a position to make the payment."

"The contract provided an escape clause whereby the displaced owner could reconvey title to the land if he failed to make the first payment," the statement added, "and he could thereby escape all personal liability under the contract.

"He would, however, be entitled to keep the first year's rental payment which in effect amounted to the purchase price for the cotton allotment."

ALLOTMENTS TRANSFERED

John C. Bagwell, Agriculture Department General Counsel, held last December that cotton allotments were transferred to land owned by Estes under arrangements that did not constitute bona fide sales of the land.

Estes and his lawyers have argued that the land deals constituted genuine transfers of ownership. They can appeal Bagwell's findings, and Bagwell said yesterday that he expects the question to be decided eventually by the courts.

West Texas land became valuable for cotton acreage after the Pecos River was dammed and water was provided for irrigating previously arid tracts.

The land is sold for from $150 to $200 an acre. Individual cotton allotments obtained from other States range from 10 to 200 acres.

The first-year payments demanded by Estes of the purchasers of the land generally amounted to several thousand dollars. The land was supposed to be paid for within 4 years.

The owners of the cotton allotments were usually guaranteed about $50 an acre as their share of the cotton grown on the irrigated land.

AGRICULTURE OFFICIAL FIRED IN ESTES CASE INQUIRY

(By Julius Duscha)

An Agriculture Department official was fired yesterday for failing to make himself available for questioning about his relationship with Texas financier Billie Sol Estes.

The man, William E. Morris, is the second official who has been linked with Estes to leave the Department in 4 days.

A third official, James T. Ralph, is scheduled to testify on Friday before a Texas court of inquiry in Dallas on his relations with Estes.

TWO UNDER INVESTIGATION

Two other Department employees who received commissions from associates of Estes are under investigation by the Department. They are Russell E. Dill and Harvey E. White of Clinton, Okla.

Morris was an assistant to Ralph, who was fired as an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture 2 months ago and was slated to become an agricultural attaché in Manila. Morris was brought into the Department a year ago by Emery E. "Red" Jacobs, who resigned on Friday as a Deputy Administrator of the Department's Stabilization and Conservation Service.

The Texas court of inquiry into Estes' activities heard testimony that Estes took Jacobs shopping for $245 suits and other expensive clothing in the fashionable Nieman-Marcus store in Dallas.

Ralph's name has also figured in the court of inquiry's testimony. Estes, once named as a young man of the year by the junior chamber of commerce, has been indicted for fraud in connection with the sale of fertilizer tanks.

ANNOUNCED AT CONFERENCE

The dismissal of Morris was announced at a stormy press conference by Thomas R. Hughes, Executive Assistant to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

Hughes said that "Mr. Morris has been dismissed * * * principally because he has not made himself available" for questioning.

Morris was questioned last Thursday afternoon, Hughes said, and on Friday, "took a day of annual leave." Friday night Morris was sent a registered letter, Hughes added, "asking that he keep himself available for possible questioning Saturday and Sunday" and report to the Department at 9 a.m. yesterday.

When a Department investigator went to Morris' home at 3806 Basil Road, McLean, Saturday night Morris' wife told the investigator that Morris was not at home and that she did not know where he was.

The investigator, Hughes continued, stayed "in the vicinity of his home" (Morris') until about midnight Saturday and returned Sunday morning, remaining until 7 p.m. Morris did not show up at the Department yesterday, Hughes added.

ALLOTMENT CONTROVERSY

Estes was a member of the Department's cotton advisory committee. He has been engaged in a controversy with the Department over cotton allotments and has 45,843,000 bushels of Government wheat, milo, barley, and soybeans in Texas warehouses that he owns.

The Justice Department is also looking into the relationships between Estes and Morris and Jacobs.

On Capitol Hill, Representative BOB DOLE, Republican, of Kansas, demanded that the House Agriculture Committee investigate Estes' relationships with the Department.

But Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, committee chairman, said that a House inquiry was not needed at this time because it would "tend to confuse and frustrate the efforts of those conducting investigations."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware for suggesting an investigation in reference to the operations of the Department of Agriculture. I hope that investigation not only will go into the question of whether or not there has been wrongdoing but also whether or not the Department of Agriculture is attempting to change the economic pattern of the country by transferring activities from one section of the country to other sections.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submit amendments intended to be proposed to H.R. 10904, the appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the coming fiscal year. I am privileged to have as cosponsors of the amendments the distinguished Senators from New York [Messrs. JAVITS and KEATING], the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may lie at the desk until the close of business today in order that other Senators may joint as cosponsors if they so desire; and that the amendments then be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in explanation of the amendments may be printed at this point in the RECORD together with the text of S. 2980.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and bill will be printed in the RECORD, and the amendments will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendments were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The statement and bill presented by Mr. BUSH are as follows:

STATEMENT OF U.S. SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH

I have introduced today amendments to H.R. 10904, the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, which are intended to prohibit Federal payments to school districts unless they are proceeding in good faith toward full compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public schools.

The appropriations bill would provide approximately $346 million in Federal funds for payments to school districts under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, the so-called impacted areas legislation.

All citizens, regardless of race, creed or color, are taxed to provide these funds. Yet a substantial amount of these funds will be distributed to segregated public schools unless Congress acts to prevent it.

I regard it as immoral to tax millions of our fellow citizens for the support of schools from which their children are barred solely by reason of their race. I regard it as contrary to the principles of good government to encourage by Federal grants continued defiance of the Supreme Court's decree that segregation must be ended with all deliberate speed.

One set of my amendments would withhold funds from a local educational agency "unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall have determined that such agency is proceeding in good faith toward full compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public schools."

It is difficult to understand the attitude of the administration on this problem, particularly in view of the President's repeated statements during the 1960 campaign that discrimination could be ended "by a stroke of the Presidential pen" on an Executive order.

Mr. Kennedy's specific reference was to discrimination in housing, but his authority to take executive action against discrimination in the public schools is even more firmly established in view of the Supreme Court's decision that segregated schools are unconstitutional.

Yet the administration has not acted in either field. There has been lipservice to the constitutional doctrine. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recently made this statement before a House subcommittee:

"The Constitution of the United States forbids governmental action that discriminates against any person by reason of his race, creed, or color. This is a rule of law. More than that, it is a principle of morality."

Those are noble words, and I agree heartily with them. But the Secretary has, in effect, nullified them by contending he is bound by statutory law rather than by the Constitution. He has testified that executive authority will be exhausted by his proposal to withhold Public Laws 815 and 874 funds from segregated schools only in those limited cases where such schools serve children living on Federal bases. He intends to postpone such action until 1963.

The Secretary has challenged Congress to act. "Within the limited authority we have," he said, "I believe we are discharging our responsibilities. I hope the Members of the Congress will face up to the responsibility which is theirs."

Despite his call upon Congress to act, the Secretary has opposed antidiscrimination riders to new Federal programs and has labeled as negative, efforts to amend existing programs to bar all forms of discrimination on penalty of losing Federal financial support.

I cannot accept the Secretary's argument that the executive branch cannot do more and that Congress should not act in any way open to it to prevent the use of Federal funds to promote segregation. And I find his recommendations glaringly inconsistent with his declaration on legal and moral grounds that the Constitution forbids governmental action that discriminates against any person by reason of his race, creed, or color.

As the supreme law of the land, the Constitution is part of every one of our statutes. For a Government official to say that he must obey a statute which is inconsistent with the Constitution is to ignore the law, not enforce it.

So, my first set of amendments is intended to require a determination by the executive branch that a school district is proceeding in good faith toward desegregation before it becomes eligible to receive Federal funds. Such amendments are essential, in my view, because of the Secretary's statements that he lacks discretion under existing law.

I am advised by the Senate Parliamentarian that amendments in this form are subject to a point of order, as being legislation on an appropriation bill. In the Parliamentarian's view, they impose an additional duty upon the Secretary.

With that, I disagree. As I have previously stated, it is my firm belief that the Constitution of the United States already imposes that duty.

The second set of amendments I have introduced would impose a flat prohibition against the disbursement of Federal funds to any local educational agency "which operates and maintains segregated public schools." Under the Senate rules, I am advised by the Parliamentarian, this may well be construed as a limitation, rather than legislation, and thus not subject to a point of order. It is my intention to call up these amendments only if the first set of amendments is held subject to a point of order.

I would prefer to proceed by affirmative legislation. I am privileged to be a cosponsor with the distinguished Senators from New York [Messrs. JAVITS and KEATING] and other Senators of S. 2980, which is intended to implement recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for progress in the desegregation of public schools. This bill, introduced with bipartisan support, would provide financial and technical assistance to facilitate desegregation of public schools and would restrict Federal financial aid for segregated public schools and institutions of higher learning.

However, because I am highly doubtful that this bill will be reported to the Senate floor in the present session, the proposed amendments to H.R. 10904 appear to be the only practical way in which to bring this issue to a decision.

S. 2980

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Equality of Education Act of 1962".

TITLE I—DESEGREGATION PLANS

SEC. 101. For purposes of this title and titles II, III, and IV of this Act—

(a) The term "desegregation" means the assignment of all students to public schools irrespective of their race or color. No assignment system in which race or color is a factor in the initial assignment of students to particular public schools shall be deemed to have achieved desegregation even though placement or other tests or transfers or other options may be available to change such assignment.

(b) The term "public school" means any elementary or secondary educational institution operated by a State, subdivision of a State, or governmental agency within a State, or operated principally or substantially from or through the use of governmental funds, or funds derived from a governmental source.

(c) The term "school board" means any agency or agencies, the members, agents, and employees thereof, and any other person or persons, authorized to determine, control, or direct the institutions, structures, or places at which particular students are assigned to or attend public school.

(d) The term "first-step compliance" means the affording of desegregated education to a substantial number of students at each public school within the jurisdiction of a school board.

(e) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SEC. 102. Every school board which, on the date of the enactment of this Act, has failed to achieve desegregation of all public schools within its jurisdiction, shall adopt a desegregation plan as provided in section 103 and shall file such plan, within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, with the Secretary.

SEC. 103. Every desegregation plan required under section 102 shall—

(1) provide for achieving desegregation of all public schools within the jurisdiction of the school board with all deliberate speed, pursuant to a schedule setting forth the time when and the manner in which desegregation is to be achieved for each class, grade, school, and district within the jurisdiction of the school board involved; and

(2) provide for at least first-step compliance not later than the commencement of the first school year which begins after the submission of such plan.

SEC. 104. Every school board required to adopt a desegregation plan pursuant to section 102 shall forthwith implement the same in accordance with its terms immediately upon its adoption and thereafter continue its implementation in good faith and with all deliberate speed until desegregation is fully achieved in all pubic schools within its jurisdiction.

SEC. 105. Whenever any school board subject to the requirements of this title loses or relinquishes any of its authority over public schools formerly within its jurisdiction or its authority to assign students to schools within its jurisdiction, the duties prescribed in this title shall immediately devolve upon the person or persons to whom such authority has been transferred or relinquished.

SEC. 106. Wherever, because of overlapping or complementary jurisdiction, more than one school board is subject to the requirements of this title with respect to the same schools or students, the boards concerned shall exercise their obligations hereunder jointly.

SEC. 107. The requirements of this title shall not apply with respect to any public school which, on the date of enactment of this Act, is subject to a court order providing for or approving a desegregation plan for such public school.

SEC. 108. (a) In the event that a school board, or its successor as provided in section 105, subject to the requirements of this title has violated any of the obligations prescribed herein, the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States in the U.S. district court for the district wherein such school board or its successor is located or meets, a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief including an application for an injunction or other order, against such school board or its successor. The court in which such action is instituted is authorized, upon finding that there has been a violation of this title, without limitation upon the grant of such other relief as may be appropriate under the circumstances, to require the school board or its successor, (1) to adopt and implement a plan of school desegregation pursuant to the requirements of this title, (2) to implement any other school desegregation plan which the court may find appropriate and consistent with the requirements of this title, or (3) to issue such other orders and grant such other relief as will most expeditiously achieve first-step compliance and desegregation with all deliberate speed in the public schools under the jurisdiction of the school board or its successor.

(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over proceedings instituted under subsection (a), and shall exercise the same without regard to whether any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law shall have been exhausted, and in a manner calculated to achieve desegregation in accordance with the requirements of this title.

TITLE II—GRANTS TO SCHOOL BOARDS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

SEC. 201. Whenever the Secretary determines that a desegregation plan submitted to him by a school board pursuant to section 102 meets the requirements of title I he is authorized, for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of any such desegregation plan and upon receipt of application therefor, to make grants to such school board, or to the local government having authority to provide funds for such school board, to assist in meeting the costs he determines to be reasonably necessary for—

(1) employing specialists in problems incident to desegregation, and providing other assistance to develop understanding by parents, schoolchildren, and the general public of desegregation in order to reduce the possibility of community hostility or resistance to desegregation;

(2) providing in-service training to teachers, guidance counselors, and other school personnel for dealing with problems incident to desegregation; and

(3) establishing programs designed to identify and assist teachers who are handicapped in their professional endeavors as a result of inferior training or educational opportunity, and to identify and assist talented and able students who are handicapped in their scholastic efforts as a result of inferior educational opportunity.

SEC. 202. The Secretary is further authorized, for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of desegregation in accordance with any desegregation plan provided or approved by a court, or of carrying out desegregation by any other school board not subject to the requirements of title I, to make grants to school boards, and local governments, to assist in meeting costs he determines to be reasonably necessary for the purposes enumerated in section 201.

SEC. 203. Each application made for a grant under this title shall provide such detailed breakdown of the measures for which financial assistance is sought as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe. Each grant under this title shall be made in such amounts and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, except that a grant may be made only on condition that the applicant will, during the period for which the grant is made, expend for the same purpose or purposes for which the grant is made an amount of its own funds equal to the amount of the grant. In determining whether to make a grant, and in fixing the amount thereof and the terms and conditions on which it will be made, the Secretary shall take into consideration the amount available for grants under this title and the other applications which are pending before him; the financial condition of the applicant and the other resources available to it; the nature, extent, and gravity of its problems incident to desegregation; and such other factors as he finds relevant.

SEC. 204. Payments of grants under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals as the Secretary may determine. No payment of a grant shall be made to any school board, or to the local government having authority to provide funds for such school board, after the expiration of five years from the date on which a desegregation plan was submitted by such school board under section 102, or, in the case of a school board subject to a desegregation plan provided or approved by a court, after the expiration of five years from the date on which the court provided or approved such desegregation plan, or, in the case of any other school board not subject to the requirements of title I, after the expiration of five years from the date on which a program of desegregation was begun by such school board.

SEC. 205. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year in process on the date of the enactment of this Act and for each succeeding fiscal year, such sums, not exceeding $40,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary for making grants under the provisions of this title.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE WITH RESPECT TO DESEGREGATION PROBLEMS

SEC. 301. The Secretary is authorized, upon receipt of application therefor, to give technical assistance to school board eligible for assistance under title II, and to local nonprofit organizations in the communities served by such school boards, in training school personnel and community leaders in techniques useful in solving desegregation problems, including training and other assistance in establishing home study programs for academically and culturally handicapped students. Such technical assistance may be given to any such school board, or local nonprofit organization, whether or not such school board or the local government having authority to provide funds for such school board has applied for or received a grant under title II.

SEC. 302. Technical assistance authorized by section 301 may be given by the Secretary by such means as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of such section. No technical assistance shall be given to any school board, or to any local nonprofit organization in the community served by such school board, after the expiration of five years from the date on which a desegregation plan was submitted by such school board under section 102, or, in the case of a school board subject to a desegregation plan provided or approved by a court, after the expiration of five years from the date on which the court provided or approved such desegregation plan, or, in the case of any other school board not subject to the requirements of title I, after the expiration of five years from the date on which a program of desegregation was begun by such school board.

TITLE IV—LOANS TO SCHOOL BOARDS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

SEC. 401. The Secretary is authorized, upon receipt of application therefor, to make loans—

(1) to any school board, if he finds that—

(A) part or all of the funds which would otherwise be available to such school board have been withheld or withdrawn by action of the State or local government because of the desegregation, in whole or in part, of one or more schools under the jurisdiction of such school board; and

(B) such school board has authority to receive and expend the proceeds of such loan; or

(2) to any local government within the jurisdiction of which any school board operates, if he finds that—

(A) part or all of the funds of such local government which would otherwise be available to such school board have been withheld or withdrawn by action of the State because of the desegregation, in whole or in part, of one or more schools under the jurisdiction of such school board; and

(B) such local government has authority to receive such loan and to make the proceeds thereof available for the use of such school board.

SEC. 402. (a) Loans may be made by the Secretary under section 401 to any school board or local government only if he is satisfied that the proceeds of such loans will be used for the same purposes for which the funds withheld or withdrawn would otherwise be used, and that such purposes are necessary for the operation and maintenance of the school system under the jurisdiction of such school board.

(b) Loans may be made by the Secretary under section 401 to any school board or local government only if he is satisfied that funds cannot be borrowed by such school board or local government, as the case may be, from private financial institutions.

SEC. 403. Any loan under section 401 shall be made upon such terms and conditions, not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, as the Secretary deems appropriate. Any such loan shall be repaid within such time as the Secretary prescribes after the funds withheld or withdrawn are restored to the school board or local government concerned, or after funds are available to such school board or local government by borrowing from private financial institutions.

SEC. 404. There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary for making loans under the provisions of this title.

TITLE V—ASSISTANCE BY COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

SEC. 501. Part I of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is amended by inserting after section 104 the following new section:

"Additional duties of the Commission

"SEC. 104A. In addition to the duties imposed by section 104(a), the Commission is authorized—

"(1) to collect and disseminate information concerning programs and procedures used by school districts in the various States to achieve an organization and operation of their schools in accordance with constitutional requirements, including data as to the known effects of such programs and procedures on the quality of education and to the costs of such programs and procedures; and

"(2) to establish an advisory and conciliation service to assist local school officials in developing desegregation plans designed to meet constitutional requirements and local conditions, and to attempt to mediate and conciliate disputes between school officials and school patrons, upon the request of either, relating to desegregation of schools, including proposed plans for desegregation and the implementation of desegregation plans already in operation."

TITLE VI—RESTRICTIONS ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID FOR SEGREGATED PUBLIC SCHOOLS, COLLEGES, AND UNIVERSITIES

SEC. 601. (a) In the case of any program providing Federal grants-in-aid to the States for elementary or secondary education in public schools, the amount of such grant-in-aid for any fiscal year to any State shall be reduced in accordance with the provisions of this section if the head of the Federal department or agency administering such program determines, at the time of determining the amount of such grant-in-aid for such year, that the public elementary or secondary schools of any local educational agency in such State are operated in such a manner as to segregate pupils of any race or color. If the head of such department or agency determines at such time that all local educational agencies in such State practice such segregation in the operation of such schools, then such grant-in-aid shall only be 50 per centum of the amount it would have been but for the provisions of this section. If the head of such department or agency determines at such time that one or more local educational agencies in such State have initiated a program of desegregation, or do not practice segregation, in the operation of such schools, then such grant-in-aid shall be 50 per centum of the amount it would have been but for the provisions of this section, plus such proportion of the remaining 50 per centum as the number of pupils enrolled in the public elementary and secondary schools of all the local educational agencies which have initiated a program of desegregation, or do not practice segregation, bears to the number of pupils enrolled in all the public elementary and secondary schools in such State.

(b) For the purposes of this section—

(1) the term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State; and

(2) enrollments shall be determined on the basis of the latest reliable figures available to the department or agency head concerned.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

SEC. 602. (a) No Federal department or agency shall make any grant or loan to any publicly controlled college or university unless satisfactory proof is submitted to the head of such department or agency that such college or university does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in accepting students for enrollment.

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

TITLE VII—PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS FROM BODILY HARM

SEC. 701. The Attorney General is authorized to take such action as may be necessary to protect—

(1) the members of any school board having under its jurisdiction one or more public schools which are desegregated or in which desegregation has been commenced;

(2) the officials, teachers, and other employees of any public school which is desegregated or in which desegregation has been commenced, or of any public school system of which any such public school is a part;

(3) children attending any such public school and the parents of such children; and

(4) any other individual assisting any such member, any such official, teacher, or other employee, or any such child or parent, from physical injury and from harassment, intimidation, or reprisal by any person or group of persons.

TITLE VIII—ANNUAL SCHOOL SURVEYS

SEC. 801. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall conduct an annual survey to determine the number and ethnic classification of students enrolled in all public educational institutions in the United States. The Secretary shall prepare and publish each year data obtained from each annual survey setting forth the number and ethnic classification of students enrolled—

(1) in all public educational institutions in each State,

(2) in each elementary and secondary public educational institution in each school district, and the totals for each school district, and

(3) in each public institution of higher education in each State.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair any remedies already existing for the protection or enforcement of rights guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States, nor to prevent any individual or private organization from acting to enforce or safeguard any constitutional right in any manner now or hereafter permitted by law.

SEC. 902. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 903. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, for printing under the rules, to H.R. 10904, the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the result of which will be to bar the use of Federal funds to hospitals which maintain segregated facilities or discrimination on the ground of race, creed, or color.

The cosponsors of the amendment are my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], who this morning is submitting another amendment of the same kind to the same bill, relating to impacted school areas.

Mr. President, this is a rather unique situation. The Hill-Burton Act, which this proposal is intended to aid, and which deals with construction of hospitals, still has within it the old separate-but-equal-facilities formula, which was ruled out by the Supreme Court in the Brown case in 1954 with respect to school desegregation.

Here we must have an affirmative act by Congress in order to cancel out a situation where segregation is permitted by our law. It is an anomaly, and therefore unthinkable. Although normally I am not favorable to having riders on appropriation bills, I feel justified in acting in this way, because it is the best and most direct way to deal with this anachronism.

There is no question about the fact that this type of segregation and discrimination exists and is vicious, because my own office made a survey which indicates it is widespread in many areas of the South. There is litigation pending in Orangeburg, S.C., in which allegations are made of segregation of Negro patients and discrimination against them. The suit relates to doctors as well as patients.

I very much hope, therefore, Congress will take the earliest opportunity to correct the anomaly in the Hill-Burton Act by barring use of funds for segregated hospital facilities. The Supreme Court has certainly given us the law very clearly on that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am glad to join as a cosponsor of the amendments offered earlier today by my colleagues, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to prohibit the use of Federal funds for racially segregated school and hospital facilities.

Such amendments should not be necessary to put an end to vast outlays of public revenues to promote or maintain unconstitutional practices. Federal grants for segregated facilities are no more lawful than State grants for such facilities. In my opinion, it is untenable to suggest that the President is powerless to order a termination of such grants.

The President has expressed in many ways his deep personal interest in securing equal justice for all Americans. He has failed, however, to use his broad executive powers to halt Federal investments of billions of tax dollars in segregated schools, hospitals, and other programs.

There are many precedents for executive action. The Department of Interior requires nondiscrimination agreements in sales of Federal lands for recreational purposes. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board prohibits member banks from discriminating in the making of loans. Discrimination in the Armed Forces and in employment under Government contracts is prohibited by Executive order. Only the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare continues to insist that the Constitution is not a part of its enabling legislation.

The Constitution makes no exception for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or any other Federal agency. If it prohibits discriminatory governmental action—as it surely does—these agencies have no choice but to obey its commands, no matter what action Congress eventually takes on the amendments offered today.

The requirements of the Constitution could not be more plain, but this appears to be one of those cases in which there is a legal wrong without a legal remedy. The Department of Justice or an aggrieved citizen can protest in the courts against the use of tax moneys by the States to violate the law of the land, but neither can hail Secretary Ribicoff before the courts for a redress of rights. Last year I introduced proposed legislation which would have authorized recourse to the Federal courts in such cases. I continue to believe that such general legislation is preferable to attempts to attach limited riders to specific bills. But the Department of

Health, Education, and Welfare objected to my proposal, and it was defeated in the Senate. If the President continues to refuse to direct a change in policy by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, amendments such as those offered today are the only alternative.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has shown little desire to conform its programs to the requirements of equal protection. Whatever measures it has adopted reflecting such requirements have been adopted reluctantly and enforced halfheartedly.

We should give up trying to deal with this problem through the Department and assign to the reorganized Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity the responsibility for assuring that Federal grant-in-aid programs respect constitutional guarantees. This Committee now has jurisdiction over Federal employment and employment under Government contracts. Giving it authority over Federal grant-in-aid programs would be a logical and useful extension of its jurisdiction.

If the President uses his powers effectively, there will be no need ever to confront Congress with the amendments offered today. If the President fails to act, then the obligation will devolve upon Congress to make certain that the Federal Treasury is not used to finance violations of the fundamental law.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I had been informed that there was to be consideration today of S. 495, a bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act. It had been the intention of the junior Senator from Louisiana to offer amendments to that legislation, and one has been printed and is presently at the desk.

It is my feeling that, before any legislation is enacted to dispose of funds presently being held under the Trading With the Enemy Act, American citizens whose property was taken by Germany or Japan, or who suffered injuries from Germany or Japan, should be entitled to have their claims satisfied. Certainly, before the assets of enemy nationals seized by this Government is returned to those nationals, those who have claims against the foreign governments should have them fully satisfied.

Accordingly, it seemed to me that the approach of trying to pass legislation to care for those who were enemy nationals at the time of the last war was a matter of placing the cart before the horse. The first obligation of this Government is to look after those citizens of the United States, who suffered very great injuries or whose property was taken from them by enemy action during the last war, who have claims which probably should be recognized.

The proper procedure is for the Congress to pass proposed legislation such as S. 2618, which is presently on the calendar—but which I might say, lacks the payment provisions—in order to see that the funds will be made available for the paying of of claims of American citizens.

Accordingly, I have drawn up an amendment, which is at the desk, as a substitute for S. 495, as amended in committee, and which was to be called up today. In the event that the amendment in the form of a substitute failed, I had in mind offering the same amendment as an addition to S. 495, as amended by committee and reported to the Senate. In either case, my amendment assures that those who are entitled to have their claims adjudicated and paid might have a fund toward which they could look, in view of the fact that they are the Americans who should first be cared for, before the United States undertakes to restore property to people who were enemy nationals at the time, and to whom this Government has no obligation, but to whom the German Government, by treaty, has well acknowledged its obligation.

So I shall offer the proposed amendment to S. 495 if it is called up, and I ask that the amendment I offer today be printed and lie at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie at the desk.

RAILROAD MERGER MORATORIUM—ADDITIONAL SPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on April 3, 1962, I introduced S. 3097, which is legislation designed to defer decisions by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to major rail merger applications until December 31, 1963, in order that Congress may have time to develop a national transportation merger policy.

I am very pleased to note the support for this bill by the majority floor leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], and Senators METCALF, GRUENING, MCCARTHY, BURDICK, DOUGLAS, BARTLETT, MORSE, and SMITH of Maine, all of whom joined as cosponsors during the 5 days in which the bill lay on the table. I appreciate very sincerely their interest and support with respect to this matter.

In addition, Mr. President, since the first printing of S. 3097, I have been informed by Senators CHURCH, PASTORE, and CARROLL that they also wish to support this proposed legislation and desire to be joined as cosponsors. Again, I am indeed appreciative of their interest and cooperation, and accordingly I ask unanimous consent that Senators CHURCH, PASTORE, and CARROLL be listed as cosponsors of S. 3097 when that bill is next printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AWARD OF MEDAL TO DR. GORDON SEAGRAVE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on September 18, 1961, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 139, authorizing the President to award a medal to Dr. Gordon Seagrave. On March 21, 1962, I introduced for myself and other Senators S. 3043, amending the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] be added as a cosponsor to Senate Joint Resolution 139 and S. 3043 and printed on the same at their next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXXIV TO PROHIBIT THE SERVING OF HARD LIQUOR IN SENATE WING OF CAPITOL OR SENATE OFFICE BUILDING — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 325, to amend rule XXXIV to prohibit the serving of hard liquor in Senate wing of Capitol or Senate Office Building, submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for himself and other Senators on April 5, 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc. were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Correspondence on the Mourning Dove.

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE REQUESTS HIGH-LEVEL ATTENTION BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO INFORMATION PROBLEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was gratifying to note in last Friday's report by the House Appropriations Committee on the Department of Defense bill for the 1963 fiscal year, an important statement on a subject which I had been pleased to take up with the committee.

On March 26, 1962, I had written to Chairman GEORGE MAHON, of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, pointing out that a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has made a comprehensive analysis of what I regard as serious weaknesses in the handling of scientific and technical information by the Defense Department.

RESULTS OF INFORMATION WEAKNESS

The subcommittee has received indication that because administrators and scientists are not getting the up-to-the-minute research information which they need, the following alarming results are occurring:

First. The equivalent of 300,000 man-years and a $1 to $2 billion equivalent in funds are being wasted.

Second. The already long "cycle" for weapons development is being stretched by 1 year to 5 years. This time loss is critical, in view of Soviet adeptness in speeding new weapons from conception to drafting board to operational reality.

COMMITTEE URGED HIGH-LEVEL ATTENTION

In response to my message, the House committee noted the information which I had furnished, as follows:

> It was called to the attention of the committee that improvements in the management and dissemination of scientific and technical information could save not only money but the time of scientific and technical personnel.

The committee then reiterated, in House Report No. 1607, a position which it had expressed, following my similar recommendation to it last year:

> The committee once again states its desire for the Department of Defense to give careful, high-level attention to this point.

EFFICIENCY IN $6.8 BILLION INVOLVED

The 1963 fiscal year appropriation bill allocates $6.8 billion for Department of Defense research, development, testing, and evaluation. This is the greatest single amount of such expenditures by any source within or outside the U.S. Government in the United States as a whole, or in the world.

A mass of evidence which our subcommittee has compiled attests to the fact that the yield from this vast scientific effort will remain seriously handicapped until what is, in my judgment, an appalling information mess in the Defense Establishment is straightened out.

Regrettably, the Defense Department has neither the streamlined, coordinated organization, the policy, the plans, nor the programs to do justice to the hundreds of thousands of scientific and technical reports—classified and unclassified—which it is using taxpayers' funds to support.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara would and could, in my judgment, straighten out this situation in a relatively brief amount of time, if he would find time, amidst his busy days, to devote his personal attention to the problem.

He has straightened out situations infinitely more complex than this.

OUR GOAL: A REVOLUTION IN INFORMATION THROUGHOUT THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The information gap in the Pentagon is but a symptom of a deeper seated situation throughout the executive branch. The situation is characterized by "horse and buggy" information systems, totally unsuited to the space age.

In my judgment, what is necessary is nothing less than a peaceful but profound information revolution throughout the executive branch. This revolution in the handling of scientific and technical information is necessary for national survival, for the progress of civilian science and technology, and for conserving the resources of America's taxpayers.

COMMUNICATING TO APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEES

One of my personal aims has been to bring to the attention of as many Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees as possible the findings on information pertinent to their particular interests and jurisdictions.

For this reason, I have communicated concerning weaknesses in the handling of medical research information to the House Appropriations Subcommittee, and I intend to do so with the Senate subcommittee.

Similarly, I have developed a series of pertinent findings for strengthening of the management of agricultural research information, of NASA research information, as well as of information supported by other major Federal agencies.

ARCHAIC METHODS OF HANDLING ALL TYPES OF INFORMATION

Thus far, I have referred only to scientific and technical information which is locked up in $9 billion of federally supported research and development expenditures.

The fact is that all types of Federal information should now be handled through modern-type systems. This includes administrative, legal, foreign policy, and other types of information.

The files of Federal agencies are groaning with mounds and mounds of unassimilated, unidentified, unused information.

OTHER EXAMPLES OF WEAKNESS: IN REGULATORY AGENCIES AND FOREIGN POLICY

For example, Federal regulatory agencies are decades behind in handling the information buried in tens of thousands of backlogged cases. The most archaic methods are being used by Federal commissions, and innumerable American businesses are suffering because justice delayed is justice denied.

In still another field, foreign policy, the State Department and the Agency for International Development are likewise decades behind in central management of information which is buried in tens of thousands of Federal, United Nations, and nongovernmental reports.

For these and other reasons, I intend to continue to urge every single Federal agency to put its information house in order and to cooperate with other agencies and the Bureau of the Budget in doing so.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I have worked on this problem for 10 years. I intend to persist until the vast amount of research funds which are allocated by the Government and are paid for by the taxpayers are used in a way that brings results. Far too many research findings are lost in the confusion of inadequate information systems.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from House Report No. 1607, page 48, entitled "Management of Scientific Information"; and a writeup in the April 9, 1962 issue of Missiles and Rockets, describing my memorandum to Congressman MAHON. The full text of the memorandum was reprinted in the House committee's hearings, pages 310–326.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM REPORT NO. 1607

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Management of scientific information

A major problem in the administration of a research program of the size and scope of that prosecuted by the Defense Department is the control of excessive duplication in programs. The problem is complicated by the essentiality of following more than one approach to the solution of scientific enigmas. Even so, funds are wasted when independent researchers do not have access to information on the progress made by others working in the same area. It was called to the attention of the committee that improvements in the management and dissemination of scientific and technical information could save not only money but the time of scientific and technical personnel. The committee once again states its desire for the Department of Defense to give careful, high-level attention to this point.

[From Missiles and Rockets, Apr. 9, 1962]

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT ATTACKED BY HUMPHREY

Hidden waste within the Department of Defense may be costing taxpayers between $1 and $2 billion a year in the development of weapons systems and, in terms of time, may be adding 1 year to the 5-year development cycle of a weapon system.

Responsible for these conditions is the "unsatisfactory management of scientific and technical information by the Department of Defense."

These charges were made by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, in a letter to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on DOD Appropriations, GEORGE H. MAHON, Democrat, of Texas.

"No matter how much the contractors spend, or how able or diligently they go about the task," the Humphrey memorandum continued, "they cannot possibly find all the Federal report-type information which they need when they need it.

"As a result, contractor scientists and engineers needlessly repeat work which has been done before, or which is being unknowingly done at the same time, in other locations, or on which there might have been a shortcut if ideas had been properly cross fertilized."

Noting that the House Appropriations Committee had urged DOD to give this matter close attention, HUMPHREY characterized subsequent defense efforts as "too little, too late, at too low a policy level, with too little followthrough and too few results—present or prospective."

Problem studied in depth: For the past 3½ years, the Humphrey subcommittee has been studying the problem of the documentation, coordination, indexing, and retrieval of scientific information stemming from Government-supported R. & D. projects.

The results of these studies which included the comments of scientists and engineers both within Government and industry have been published in a series of four Senate reports. The fifth report—"The Crisis and Opportunity in Scientific and Technical Information"—is now in preparation and is the basis for Senator HUMPHREY's memorandum.

Solution: upgrade Armed Services Technical Intelligence Agency? Asserting that the efforts of triservice information coordination will remain severely frustrated unless fundamental reforms are instituted, HUMPHREY advocates an expansion of the overall role of the Armed Services Technical Intelligence Agency.

A 19-point program—designed to remedy the inherent limitations in Armed Services Technical Intelligence Agency services today—has been developed by the Agency, according to the subcommittee chairman, and, with the proper support of higher authorities, would do much to correct existing deficiencies.

At present, the Armed Services Technical Intelligence Agency has a store of 650,000 documents and processes some 750,000 requests a year. However, since the Agency receives only 19 percent of the total technical reports of DOD prime and associated contractors, its inventory of reports is both quickly outdated and almost totally incomplete.

For example, until recently, the Polaris program has generated only 323 reports to the Armed Services Technical Intelligence Agency while the Minuteman project has contributed only 128 documents.

Another limitation of Armed Services Technical Intelligence Agency service, at present, is its inadequate staff. This means that currently, the Armed Services Technical Intelligence Agency requires 18 working days to process a technical request. The Agency's goal is to eventually reduce this processing time to 1 day and, on an emergency basis, to 1 hour.

DOD-level agency needed: Asserting that there is at present inadequate organization, interest, or responsibility for management of scientific and technical information at the DOD level, Senator HUMPHREY recommends that a small information unit be established in the Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

This Office, the Senator said, would evaluate, coordinate, and monitor the information activities of the services, advise the Secretary of Defense on the Department's future information role and provide liaison with other Government agencies involved in Federal information activities.

Decrying any intention to establish another bureaucratic layer at DOD level, HUMPHREY asserts that departmental-level responsibility for management of scientific and technical information is inescapable.

Additional recommendations for solving the information retrieval problem include: a specific line item in the R.D.T. & E. budget for intramural scientific and technical information and, as part of the report of the Committee on Appropriations, observations and requests for reports on DOD's future management of information.

ABORTIVE STEEL PRICE INCREASE AND GOVERNMENT POWER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the events of last week, involving the abortive steel price increase, have left a mark on the history of our Nation. I do not believe that it is presumptuous to say that this mark will not be soon erased.

The President found himself in a position where his protest was good and was backed by the overwhelming majority of the people, but the other steps taken by the President, using the Department of Justice and the FBI to get after business without necessary relation to violations of law, could, if it ever becomes regular procedure in such situations, threaten the foundations of our institutions based on the freedom of economic decisions and on the many-sided deliberation of Government policy.

Mr. President, the experience we must learn from the events of last week cannot be applied in the national interest by the drafting, with punitive and selective intent, of specialized antitrust or price control legislation. It cannot be applied by vesting additional emergency power in the President, when he already disposes of such vast powers and when we are faced, not with an emergency, but with a permanent fact of life today. It can, however, be dealt with by setting up a mechanism in keeping with the free institutions which must continue to serve as the framework of our national policies while serving the overriding national interest in a time of such challenge as this.

Mr. President, I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial from the New York Times of April 16, calling for "immediate steps to improve the cooperation of industry, labor and the Government." I believe that we should proceed to consider such steps and would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a bill for this purpose to establish a Peace Production Board, S. 2204, which I introduced in the Senate last year. Also, I shall insert in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 15 and from the Wall Street Journal of April 16.

The importance of a mechanism to achieve cooperative action among labor, management, and Government at all levels, resides not only in what it would do, but also in its ability to establish a procedure which will be deliberate and which would preserve traditional areas of responsibility for all participants. The White House Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy does not have the authority or the staffing to initiate economic policy as between Government and business. It is the job of the Congress to establish a mechanism which will be able to deal with the economic challenges of our time through the application of public policies conforming to our traditions and to exigency.

I am pleased to say that some small start has been made on the solution of this problem at the grassroots level through the provisions in section 205 of the Manpower Development and Training Act, which are designed to encourage the formation of local and industrywide labor-management-public committees. The value of such committees was demonstrated in the steel labor settlement, where the preparatory work of the industrywide committee was instrumental in taking several vital issues out of the conflict of bargaining negotiations.

I ask unanimous consent for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Furthermore, I am informed that many communities have already been in touch with the Department of Labor, requesting assistance in forming such local committees. This is indeed an encouraging response.

But, these local committees are only a part of the purpose of the Peace Production Act, S. 2204. They form essential bases for, but they do not solve, the broad national policy questions in the operation of the economy in the public interest. Grassroots responsiveness to this idea must be carried to the top levels of management, labor leadership, and Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the text of S. 2204, so that the Members of the Congress and other readers may examine it in the context of these remarks and of the debate which has been taking place during the past week.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2204

A bill to increase United States productivity in the national interest and for the benefit of the individual worker and businessman, by promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between labor and management, encouragement of public responsibility in the private economy, and maximization of technical and managerial progress, through the establishment of a Peace Production Board and the support of local and industrywide boards

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Peace Production Act of 1961".

CONGRESSIONAL FINDING

SEC. 2. Congress hereby finds and declares that the national interest requires a productivity drive in order to meet the continuing responsibilities of the United States for the development of its own domestic economic strength and that of the free world; and in order to meet the threat of the growing and aggressive Communist bloc economic power. The Congress further finds that the major problems facing such a national productivity drive are an unacceptable rate of chronic unemployment, the underutilization of production facilities, a too frequent incidence of recessions, and the inadequacy of means for resolving labor-management disputes resulting in the loss of production vital to the national economy. The Congress declares that efforts to achieve success in a national productivity drive will be advanced through the acceleration of automation, the elimination of featherbedding in both management and labor, the reduction of absenteeism, the establishment of better procedures to avoid national emergency work stoppages, and the promotion of higher morale, which can best be achieved through cooperative action among labor, management, farmers, voluntary organizations, consumers, and all levels of government, while preserving the traditional areas of responsibility and interest of each. The Congress also declares that it is the responsibility of the United States under present international conditions to require the most effective mobilization and the maximum utilization of all elements of the Nation's productive forces.

PEACE PRODUCTION BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the executive branch an independent agency to be known as the "Peace Production Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed of twenty-five members as follows:

(1) The Vice President of the United States who shall be the Chairman of the Board;

(2) The Secretary of the Treasury; the Attorney General; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Secretary of Commerce; the Secretary of Labor; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration;

(3) Four members who shall be representative of management in large and small businesses (as defined by the Small Business Administration) in manufacturing and service industries (including transportation);

(4) Four members who shall be representative of labor organizations in such industries;

(5) Two members who shall be representative of management in extractive and agricultural industries;

(6) Two members who shall be representative of labor organizations in such industries;

(7) Two members who are recognized experts in labor-management relations, at least one of whom shall be from the academic field; and

(8) Three members who shall be representative of the general public, and who shall be selected without regard to any interest or connection they may have with any of the foregoing areas.

(b) Members of the Board referred to in paragraphs (3) to (8) of subsection (a) shall be appointed by the President for terms of six years, except that of the members first appointed six shall be appointed for terms of two years, six shall be appointed for terms of four years, and six shall be appointed for terms of six years. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments except that a member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of such term.

(c) The Board shall meet at least four times each year at such times as it shall determine or at the call of the President. A quorum shall consist of thirteen members.

(d) Members of the Board referred to in paragraphs (3) to (8) of subsection (a) shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem while performing services for the Board, and while away from their homes in connection with attendance at meetings of the Board shall be entitled to transportation expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence at the rate prescribed by, or established pursuant to, section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).

(e) The President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Executive Director of the Board. The Executive Director shall be the principal executive officer of the Board and shall be paid compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum. The Board is authorized to appoint, in accordance with the civil service laws and regulations, and fix the compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of such other officers and employees as may be necessary.

(f) With the consent of the heads of other departments and agencies of the Government, the Board is authorized to utilize the personnel, services, and facilities of such departments and agencies in carrying out its functions under this Act. Such departments and agencies shall cooperate with the Board to the greatest extent practicable for such purpose.

(g) The Board shall transmit to the President and to the Congress an annual report of its activities under this Act.

OBJECTIVES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 4. It shall be the objective of the Board—

(1) to enlist the cooperation of labor, management, and State and local governments, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, toward the implementation of the national policy declared in the Employment Act of 1946 to create and maintain "conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment activities, including self-employment, for those willing and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power";

(2) to promote peaceful labor-management relations;

(3) to promote free and responsible collective bargaining;

(4) to promote sound wage and price policies;

(5) to promote a climate of cooperation and understanding between labor and management and the community, and the recognition by labor and management of the public interest in harmonious labor-management relations;

(6) to promote the maintenance and improvement of worker morale and to enlist community interest in increasing productivity and reducing waste and absenteeism;

(7) to promote the more effective use of labor and management personnel in the interest of increased productivity;

(8) to stimulate programs through which the social and economic problems of individual workers and management personnel adversely affected by automation or other technological change or the relocation of industries may be ameliorated; and

(9) to promote policies designed to insure that American products are competitive in world markets.

FUNCTIONS OF BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) In order to achieve the objectives set forth in section 4, the Board shall encourage and assist in the organization of labor-management-public boards and similar groups designed to further such objectives, on a plant, community, regional, or industry basis, and to provide assistance to such groups, as well as existing groups organized for similar purposes, in attaining such objectives. Such assistance shall include—

(1) aid in the development of apprenticeship, training, and other programs for employee and management education for development of greater and more diversified skills;

(2) aid in the formulation of programs designed to reduce waste and absenteeism;

(3) aid in the revision of building codes, zoning regulations, and other local ordinances and laws, in order to keep them continuously responsive to changing economic conditions;

(4) aid in planning for the provision of adequate transportation for the labor force and the promotion of employees safety and health;

(5) the encouragement of attendance by members of such groups at courses in industrial relations at institutions of higher education, and the fostering of close cooperation between such groups and such institutions for the purpose of developing such courses and for other purposes;

(6) the encouragement of studies of techniques and programs similar to those in paragraphs (1) to (5) of this subsection, as they are applied in foreign countries;

(7) aid in the development and initiation of production incentive programs;

(8) the dissemination of technical information and other material to publicize its work and objectives; and

(9) the dissemination of information and analyses concerning the economic opportunities and outlook in various regions and communities, and of information on industrial techniques designed for the increase of productivity.

(b) The Board is authorized to make recommendations to the President regarding legislation for price, wage, commodity, and materiel control, and commodity and materiel allocation, authorized to be exercised during periods of emergency, as it may deem necessary from time to time.

(c) The Board shall perform such other functions, consistent with the foregoing, as it determines to be appropriate and necessary to achieve the objectives set forth in section 4.

POWERS OF BOARD

SEC. 6. (a) The Board shall carry out the functions referred to in section 5 through—

(1) the utilization of the services and facilities of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and of such other governmental agencies, private groups, and professional experts as it deems necessary;

(2) the coordination of such services and facilities in order to supply technical and administrative assistance to labor-management-public groups designed to further the objectives set forth in section 4;

(3) grants to groups or individuals for financing up to 50 per centum of the cost of carrying out any project or program, including the setting up of local, regional, or industrywide labor-management-public boards, in furtherance of the objectives of the Board, but financial assistance shall not be provided under this paragraph in connection with any one project or program for a period in excess of three years, and not more than a total of $ shall be expended in any year for such purposes; and

(4) establishment of regional or industrywide advisory committees to advise the Board on ways and means to best fulfill its functions and to convene regional and industrywide conferences to formulate ideas and programs for the fulfillment of the objectives set forth in section 4.

(b) The Board may accept gifts or bequests, either for carrying out specific programs which it deems desirable or for its general activities.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that editorials on the subject from the New York Times, the Herald Tribune, and the Wall Street Journal may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 10, 1962]

A NEW ECONOMIC BALANCE

The clearest moral of President Kennedy's swift triumph in the steel price battle is that there has been a fundamental shift in the power relationships governing our industrial society. The steel union's acceptance of a noninflationary wage contract geared to higher productivity, followed by the surrender of the major companies in their abortive attempt to raise prices, indicates that the public interest has ceased to be an abstraction in regulating the conduct of the great economic power blocs of management and labor.

It is now plain that a strong President, marshaling the pressures of Government and public opinion, can successfully lay down guidelines to give national needs primacy over the special claims of employers or unions. This does not mean we have moved into a controlled economy, but it does mean a new weight of concern for the total welfare. To insure that the revised balance will promote freedom, as well as responsibility, immediate steps should be taken to improve machinery for the cooperation of industry, labor and the Government.

The White House National Economic Conference, now being planned, offers an excellent instrument for creating such machinery on a permanent basis. The conference will permit a three-way interchange of ideas on how to achieve maximum progress in modernizing our aging industrial facilities, speeding national economic growth, improving our competitive position in world trade, combating inflation and reducing long-term unemployment. Government has no monopoly of wisdom in these matters. Neither has industry nor labor.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 15, 1962]

IN THE WAKE OF THE STEEL ROW

There are some concrete advantages to the country in general in the maintenance of the old steel prices. A new inflationary wave has been checked. It will, presumably, be easier to settle wage disputes in other industries on the basis of national interest. So far as prices go, American steel will not increase the competitive advantage of foreign producers. A long and bitter struggle between the Government and a major industry has been averted. The obvious disarray of the steel companies on the issue contradicts the theory of the monolithic structure of that industry on which some of the Government's punitive measures were based.

These are on the plus side of the ledger. The disadvantages of the enforced rescinding of the price increase may be less apparent to the public at large, but they are no less real and may, in the long run, be much more important.

In the first place, it was the considered judgment of most steel executives that the 3½-percent price rise was necessary to keep their companies healthy, in the light of increased costs during the past 4 years. This has been disputed, in general terms, but who except the responsible officials of the steel companies can really appraise this problem at this time? It is no service to the national economy to weaken one of its basic industries.

This is especially true in view of the generally conceded need of American steel to replace its obsolescent plant. Competition from abroad is keen, and growing keener; much of the foreign product is made in new, highly efficient mills and the original advantage which the United States possessed while these facilities were being constructed after the devastation of war overseas has been whittled down. Perhaps an increase in the price of steel is not the answer, or the sole answer, to this growing problem. But some recognition by the administration of the fact that the problem exists would have been in order.

The most troublesome legacy of the steel dispute, however, lies in the political, rather than in the economic field. Mr. Kennedy's successes in Congress, where he has the constitutional and traditional powers appertaining to the President and to the leader of the majority party, have been meager. On the very day that the steel companies succumbed to his threats, he was defeated in Senate and House committees on a key portion of his farm program, and the House Appropriations Committee rebuffed the President on two significant military items—the pace of RS-70 development and the size of the National Guard and Reserves. Most of the Kennedy domestic program has been stalled ever since he took office.

Yet the President has won a sweeping and undeniable victory in an area where he has no direct legal authority whatever. He has exerted pressures upon an American industry that he would never dare use upon a recalcitrant Congress; he has used language about industry leaders that, if applied to Congressmen, would create a major revolt.

The combination of Executive frustrations on Capitol Hill and successes against business is dangerous. There will be obvious temptations to seek administration laurels in easier fields than a stubborn Congress affords and the President's willingness to stretch his own prerogatives has now been demonstrated. The precedent of the steel case, whatever its immediate and practical effect, could easily rise to plague the Nation.

An Incredible Week

In a long life not without its share of amazement, we never saw anything like it.

On Tuesday one of the country's steel companies announced it was going to try to get more money for its product. And promptly all hell busted loose.

We wouldn't have been surprised ourselves if some people had shaken their heads in puzzlement at the new price list. Although after 20 years of inflation a price rise in anything is hardly unusual, there was some reason for wondering if the company officials had made the right decision in today's market.

But what happened was no mere headshaking. The President of the United States went into what can only be described as a tirade. Not only had the company changed its price list without consulting him but it had also set a price which, in his opinion, was wholly unjustified. With a long preamble in which he rang in the Berlin crisis, the soldiers killed the other day in Vietnam, the wives and mothers separated from their husbands by the Reserve callup—all of which he cast at the feet of these "irresponsible" steel officials—he wound up by crying that these men had shown their utter contempt for the welfare of the country.

The response in Washington was instantaneous. The Justice Department, the Federal Trade Commission, the congressional inquisitors, all leaped to arms.

Then came the night riders. At 3 a.m. Thursday morning a reporter for the Associated Press was awakened by Government agents unable to wait even for regular office hours in their driven haste to find out what testimony he could give about the criminal conduct of these steel officials. At 5 a.m. it was the turn of our own reporter in Philadelphia. At 6:30 a.m. the scene was repeated in Wilmington, Del., for a reporter on the Evening Journal. All this without any warrants, only orders from the Attorney General of the United States.

By mid-Thursday morning the United States Steel Corp. had been subpenaed for all documents bearing on the crime and had learned that a Federal grand jury would move swiftly to see what laws had been violated by asking three-tenths of a cent a pound more for a piece of steel.

This brought us to Thursday afternoon. Then Mr. Roger Blough, the chairman of this company, felt forced to stand up to an assembly of microphones and television cameras and defend himself before the country for the wickedness of his deeds. And to be treated by the reporters at that gathering as if they were a part of the prosecution and he was, indeed, a malefactor in the dock.

And that leads to what is probably the most amazing thing of all about last week. Across the country—on the radio, in newspapers and at street corners the necessity of the defenders to justify themselves before the righteous accusers was simply accepted as a premise from which the trial should begin. There were few to say otherwise.

In such a climate it was not at all surprising what the mailed fist could do. All day Friday steel company offices were awash with Government agents, while the threats of punishment were mingled with promises of reward for doing the rulers' bidding. It is a technique of government not unknown elsewhere in the world, and it is a combination almost irresistible. So by Friday night Mr. Kennedy had his victory.

Finally the jubilation. The President himself said all the people of the United States should be gratified. Around him there was joy unrestrained at this proof positive of how naked political power, ruthlessly used, could smash any private citizen who got in its way. So far as we could tell, the people did seem relieved that it was all over and that the malefactors had been brought to heel.

Yet what, in all truth, is this crime with which these men stood charged by a wrathful President?

It had nothing to do with arguments about whether this particular asking price was economically justified, or fair to the steel stockholders, or somehow responsible for dead soldiers in Vietnam. This last is sheer demagoguery, and the others are questions no man can answer—neither Mr. Blough nor Mr. Kennedy.

What was really at issue here, and still is, is whether the price of steel is to be determined by the constant bargaining in the marketplace between the makers and buyers of steel; you may be sure that if the makers guessed wrong the market would promptly change their decision. Or whether the price of steel is to be decided and then enforced by the Government. In short, the issue is whether we have a free market system or whether we do not. That, and nothing more.

Thus the true "crime" of this company was that it did not get permission from the Government and that its attempted asking price did not suit the ideas of a tiny handful of men around the White House.

It was for this that last week we saw the President of the United States in a fury, a public pillorying of an industry, threatened reprisals against all business, the spectacle of a private citizen helplessly trying to defend himself against unnamed accusations, the knock of policemen on the midnight door. And there was hardly a voice heard rising above the clamor to ask what it was all about.

If we had not seen it with our eyes and heard it with our own ears, we would not have been able to believe that in America it actually happened.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I again point out it is difficult to make the distinction, because people are inclined to lump everything together, but it must be done, and I hope the American people will give attention to this matter. It is one thing to approve a denunciation of a price increase—it is a very different thing to countenance the use of the punitive force of the United States, in the Department of Justice or the FBI, to coerce anybody who is making an economic decision when there is no reasonable evidence as yet that there has been a violation of law.

SUBPENAS BY ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE FOR UNIT MANUFACTURING COSTS OF MAJOR STEEL COMPANIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in the Washington Post, Tuesday, April 17, there appears on page A2 an article by Robert C. Albright, relating to steel industry studies and investigations. During the course of that article, it was reported that the Senate minority leader, Senator Dirksen, "complained of the action of the Kefauver subcommittee in subpenaing records of the big steel companies, saying it was done without a formal meeting of the subcommittee."

So that the Record may be full and complete with respect to the action taken by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I should like to state that I canvassed each member of the subcommittee relative to the issuance of subpenas for unit cost information from the major steel companies, and obtained the approval of such issuance from the majority of the subcommittee in writing.

LOBBYING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, information about the extent of lobbying, and who pays for it, is vitally important to the proper functioning of a democratic system of government. That individuals and groups should be able to make their views known to their elected representatives is a cornerstone of our representative system of Government. It is equally important, however, to make detailed, accurate information about lobbying available to Congress and the public, as well as to State and local legislative bodies.

Information about the money that is spent to influence legislation, who provides it, its tax deductibility, how much is spent for various purposes, should also be available to the public.

An editorial in this morning's New York Times makes two points about lobbying that are worth noting in this connection. The editorial points out that the amount reported spent for lobbying in 1961 is the smallest for any year since the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act was passed in 1946—in spite of what the Times described as "abundant evidence that Washington's 'Third House' has waxed fatter and richer with each passing biennium." It documents this interesting discrepancy by referring to the National Association of Manufacturers, which has not filed a lobbying spending report since 1950.

Secondly, the editorial relates this interesting phenomenon to the proposal in the pending tax bill to permit businesses and trade associations to deduct expenses in connection with lobbying.

On this point, as I made clear in my statement to the Senate Finance Committee recently, I completely agree with the New York Time's conclusion that "the Senate would be well advised to reject the provision for deducting lobbying expenses."

I intend to introduce an amendment to accomplish that if the committee does not do it in marking up the bill.

I estimate that less than 25 percent of all lobbyists in Washington comply with the registration requirements Congress has set up. I base this estimate on a study of oil and gas industry representatives during the 1960 session of Congress:

> of the 41 lobbyists who did file reports, 36 violated the law by failing to give their specific legislative interests, 21 failed to comply with the law by stating whether they had received contributions of more than $500, 20 illegally refused to list the parties they had paid money to, and 17 did not state the nature of their employers' businesses as the law requires.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times to which I have referred be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Light on Lobbying

> The fact that 312 groups registered under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act have reported spending a total of $3,770,109 in 1961 to influence legislation before Congress is noteworthy on two counts.
>
> First, the amount reported is the smallest for any year since the act was passed in 1946, although there is abundant evidence that Washington's "Third House" has waxed fatter and richer with each passing biennium. Second, the figures appear at a moment when the Senate Finance Committee is considering a tax bill that would permit businessmen, for the first time, to deduct certain lobbying expenditures.
>
> As passed by the House, the bill would permit taxpayers to deduct two types of expenses now disallowed: those incurred in appearing before or communicating with Members of Congress and congressional committees or their counterparts at State and local levels, and those incurred in channeling information between lobby organizations and their members regarding matters of direct legislative interest. In justifying this provision (on which no hearings were held), the Ways and Means Committee argued that it would encourage taxpayers to keep legislators informed as to the effects of proposed laws and give the same tax treatment to "legislative" expenses as to those incurred in dealings with executive agencies and the courts.
>
> The amount of lobby spending reported—if any—is wholly within the discretion of a registrant. The National Association of Manufacturers, for example, has not filed a spending report since 1950. No one is charged with administering the act; prosecution for violation of its terms is all but unknown. It is high time that Congress set about the business of rewriting the statute to conform with an overriding public interest in securing the fullest possible disclosure of lobbying activities, year in and year out. Meanwhile, the Senate would be well advised to reject the provision for deducting lobby expenses, as an effort to put the cart before the horse.

BASIS FOR OPPOSITION TO ADMINISTRATION FARM PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been repeatedly asked and today I wish to say exactly why I voted in the Senate Agriculture Committee to modify very substantially the farm proposals offered by the Department of Agriculture. What persuaded me to take this course was the very substantial probability that both the Department's mandatory feed grains and dairy proposals would be rejected by farmers voting in the nationwide referendums that would be necessary to put these programs into operation.

The result of such an outcome would be utter disaster. There would be huge overproduction of feed grains, resulting in an immense surplus over what could be consumed, whether this was bought and stored by the Government or not, and would have caused the most serious farm depression that this country has suffered in many years.

This would result even if a majority of farm producers, in the main feed grains and dairy areas, supported the mandatory program, because of the great and obvious likelihood that producers in other parts of the country would vote no in such a referendum. The crucial point is that just one-third plus one of producers voting in such a referendum can prevent approval of a program. In the case of both milk and feed grains, the evidence indicated that not one-third, but some two-thirds of farmers would vote no in such referendums.

I want to make clear that I have the greatest admiration and respect for Secretary Freeman and his staff. They have been doing an excellent job under very difficult circumstances. But I simply cannot bring myself to vote for a farm program which I am convinced, on the basis of all evidence and logic, will result in income devastation for farmers.

I also want to state that I accept the principle of supply management in agriculture. The only effective way to enhance the sadly deficient market power of farmers is by making it possible for them to limit output to what can be sold at fair prices.

THE DILEMMA OF THE MIDWEST

There is no doubt that dairy and feed grain producers in the Midwest are in serious trouble. Very proper concern has been expressed about the Government cost of current dairy and feed grain price supports. It is argued that if price supports are to be continued on these two major groups of farm products, producers must adopt mandatory supply management programs patterned on the successful wheat and cotton programs.

Yet many farm leaders outside the Midwest who make these statements report feed grain and dairy producers in their districts do not want controls. They say there is no overproduction of these products in their districts; they represent deficit areas. And herein lies the dilemma for Midwest producers.

Feed grains are grown on more farms and have a far higher value than any other farm crop. The value of feed grain production is greater than the combined value of the two next most important crops—cotton and wheat. In 1961 the value of the feed grains produced totaled $5.4 billion as compared with $6.6 billion for all other basic commodities—cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts.

Dairy products also are produced in every State in the Union, and in almost every county. Cash receipts from the sale of dairy products totaled $4.9 billion in 1961—almost equal to the value of the combined production of cotton and wheat.

GOVERNMENT LOSSES ON DAIRY PROGRAM RELATIVELY LOW

I am in complete agreement with those who say we must reduce the Government cost of farm programs. We also must adopt supply management measures to the extent feasible and avoid the production of unneeded and unwanted food supplies. But I would point out Commodity Credit Corporation losses on price supports for feed grains and dairy products in the three most recent fiscal years—1959–61—were lower in relation to the value of production or marketings than for wheat and cotton. The data are as follows:

Cost of Government price-support operations for cotton, dairy products, feed grains, and wheat, fiscal years 1959–61

	Average annual losses or costs	Losses as percentage of value of marketings [1]
	Millions	
Cotton	$315	12
Wheat	250	12
Feed grains	439	8
Dairy products	252	5

[1] Value of crops produced in case of feed grains.

I realize that the costs projected for this fiscal year and next for both feed grains and dairy products are higher than in recent years. But even though mandatory supply management programs are not adopted, they are unlikely to equal 12 percent of the value of the production or marketings.

On the other hand, if we attempt to require mandatory supply management programs as a condition for price supports for feed grains and dairy products, Midwest producers, even though they vote overwhelmingly for them, are likely to be deprived of price supports by the adverse votes of the producers in other sections of the country.

Cotton and tobacco growers who receive a substantial part of their cash income from these price-supported crops, I am told, tend to oppose mandatory supply management programs for feed grains and milk produced on their farms. Wheat producers in the deficit feed-grain producing sections of the Northern Plains and the Northwest are less than enthusiastic in endorsing a mandatory supply management program for feed grains which would result in acreage cutbacks on their farms. I doubt that they could be counted on to support the Midwest farmers by voting favorably on such a program in 1962.

Rough estimates based on the 1959 census indicate that approximately 30 percent of the producers having 25 or more acres of feed grains are in Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, and the States of the Southeast. Most of the feed grains are fed to dairy herds and other livestock on these farms and the producers believe they have little to gain from feed grain price supports Another 12 percent located in the central Corn Belt and Western States have acreages of 25 to 50 acres. Again, most of these small farmers are diversified livestock men with little direct interest in the sale price of feed grains.

Not more than 50 to 55 percent of the feed grain producers are located in the Corn Belt, the Southwest, or Western States and have 50 acres or more of feed grains. These are the producers who have a direct interest in price supports comparable to that of the cotton and wheatgrowers.

In the case of dairy price supports, producers of milk for the fluid market under State or Federal milk marketing orders receive relatively stable prices of from $1 to $3 per hundred pounds above the market price for manufacturing milk for most of their supplies. Many of these dairymen are less than enthusiastic about joining with the midwestern producers in a nationwide mandatory supply management program.

MIDWEST INCOMES THREATENED BY VOTES OF OTHERS

It is one thing to say that price supports without production controls cannot be justified. But it is quite another thing to say that midwestern producers whose incomes depend entirely on feed grains and milk for manufacturing should be denied reasonable price supports because oteher producers of these products, whose incomes are partially protected by other price support and Federal order programs, vote unfavorably on proposed mandatory supply management programs.

Furthermore, if there were any indication the producers of feed grains as a whole would vote "yes" in a referendum on the mandatory program, the situation would be entirely different. But the fact is that there has been no such indication.

Without exception every poll and study has shown that feed grain producers overwhelmingly oppose production limitations. Yet if merely one-third plus one vote "no," the program is rejected, and prices will plummet.

And there is ample reason for this. Feed grains differ from all other commodities under supply limitation programs in that a very large part of our output is neither bought or sold in a marketplace, but is fed directly to livestock or dairy cattle on the farm. Far from being sellers of feed grains for cash, and thus amenable to the discipline of the marketplace, these feed grain producers often buy feed to supplement what they produce themselves. They think they have every reason to vote against the kind of mandatory program that has been proposed, unless an extensive and persuasive educational campaign has convinced them otherwise.

Right now there is absolutely no evidence to indicate that two-thirds or more of feed grains producers will vote for a mandatory program in a referendum. All the evidence—and it includes the opinions of practically every farm writer, reporter, economist, and pollster in the country—indicates the opposite.

Consequently, offering a mandatory program at this time will have precisely the opposite result. As certain as night follows the day, it will mean a "no" vote in the referendum and then a disastrous, precipitous drop in prices, with all the unfortunate side effects that we know will result. Rather than offer such a probability, I believe the Congress should continue the present feed grains program for an additional period, preferably with the addition of strengthening amendments, as I shall suggest.

I am not convinced that either the administration or the producers of these two most important farm products have exhausted the possibilities of developing supply management programs tailored directly to the complex economic interests of the producers located in the different sections of our diverse country.

I believe we should endorse the principle of extending mandatory supply management programs to feed grains and dairy products if and when the administration and the producer organizations are agreed they have developed mutually satisfactory and acceptable programs.

In the meantime, I am confident that with modifications the current voluntary feed grain adjustment program, if continued, will reduce surplus stocks to desirable levels at a much lower annual cost than was incurred for the 1961 program.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF EXTENDING THE CURRENT FEED GRAINS ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

Although the current voluntary feed grains adjustment program cannot be continued indefinitely, with modifications it can be continued as long as surplus Government stocks are available for payments-in-kind with a reasonable expectation that Government costs will be substantially lower than in 1961. It also offers promise of reducing feed grain carryover stocks to desirable levels within a reasonable period. A continuation of the 1961–62 program with modifications could be expected to achieve these results while maintaining market prices for feed grains at current or slightly higher levels, with less Government interference in commercial marketings of grain than in 1961. These expected accomplishments appear to meet the essential criteria for future programs established by President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman.

If the 1961–62 feed grains program were to be continued until stocks are reduced to desirable levels, increased participation could be obtained and Government costs for the program could be reduced by adopting several or all of the following modifications.

First. Offer price support on other crops not under marketing quotas, such as soybeans, flaxseed, dry beans and oats, only to farmers who participate in the feed grains program if they also produced feed grains.

Second. Limit ACP cost sharing payments to farmers who participate in the feed grains program if they produce feed grains.

Third. Limit SCS technical assistance in designing drainage or irrigation systems and land use plans to farmers who participate in the program if they produce feed grains.

Fourth. Limit USDA storage facility loans to farmers who participate in the program if they produce feed grains.

Fifth. Permit pasturing on the diverted acreage on small farms or on all farms if the producer accepts substantially lower per-acre diversion payments.

If several or all of these modifications were made in the 1961–62 feed grains program, it could be reasonably anticipated that participation in the program would be higher, excess stocks would be reduced more rapidly and Government costs would be lower as compared with the 1961 experience.

I regret that the Senate committee did not accept these amendments, which in my opinion would greatly strengthen the current voluntary feed grains program. The first four have in common a very simple principle, one which on the basis of my own experience I know many farmers understand and would accept. That is: Farmers who choose not to comply with a voluntary production reduction program should not be permitted to benefit from Federal subsidy programs in other areas. This would add a sensible incentive to back up the generous inducement offered farmers to win compliance. Those farmers who want the freedom to continue to plant all they want could do so. But they could not at the same time continue to receive lucrative subsidies of various kinds also offered by the Department of Agriculture.

make their views known to their elected representatives is a cornerstone of our representative system of Government. It is equally important, however, to make detailed, accurate information about lobbying available to Congress and the public, as well as to State and local legislative bodies.

Information about the money that is spent to influence legislation, who provides it, its tax deductibility, how much is spent for various purposes, should also be available to the public.

An editorial in this morning's New York Times makes two points about lobbying that are worth noting in this connection. The editorial points out that the amount reported spent for lobbying in 1961 is the smallest for any year since the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act was passed in 1946—in spite of what the Times described as "abundant evidence that Washington's 'Third House' has waxed fatter and richer with each passing biennium." It documents this interesting discrepancy by referring to the National Association of Manufacturers, which has not filed a lobbying spending report since 1950.

Secondly, the editorial relates this interesting phenomenon to the proposal in the pending tax bill to permit businesses and trade associations to deduct expenses in connection with lobbying.

On this point, as I made clear in my statement to the Senate Finance Committee recently, I completely agree with the New York Time's conclusion that "the Senate would be well advised to reject the provision for deducting lobbying expenses."

I intend to introduce an amendment to accomplish that if the committee does not do it in marking up the bill.

I estimate that less than 25 percent of all lobbyists in Washington comply with the registration requirements Congress has set up. I base this estimate on a study of oil and gas industry representatives during the 1960 session of Congress:

> of the 41 lobbyists who did file reports, 36 violated the law by failing to give their specific legislative interests, 21 failed to comply with the law by stating whether they had received contributions of more than $500, 20 illegally refused to list the parties they had paid money to, and 17 did not state the nature of their employers' businesses as the law requires.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIGHT ON LOBBYING

The fact that 312 groups registered under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act have reported spending a total of $3,770,109 in 1961 to influence legislation before Congress is noteworthy on two counts.

First, the amount reported is the smallest for any year since the act was passed in 1946, although there is abundant evidence that Washington's "Third House" has waxed fatter and richer with each passing biennium. Second, the figures appear at a moment when the Senate Finance Committee is considering a tax bill that would permit businessmen, for the first time, to deduct certain lobbying expenditures.

As passed by the House, the bill would permit taxpayers to deduct two types of expenses now disallowed: those incurred in appearing before or communicating with Members of Congress and congressional committees or their counterparts at State and local levels, and those incurred in channeling information between lobby organizations and their members regarding matters of direct legislative interest. In justifying this provision (on which no hearings were held), the Ways and Means Committee argued that it would encourage taxpayers to keep legislators informed as to the effects of proposed laws and give the same tax treatment to "legislative" expenses as to those incurred in dealings with executive agencies and the courts.

The amount of lobby spending reported—if any—is wholly within the discretion of a registrant. The National Association of Manufacturers, for example, has not filed a spending report since 1950. No one is charged with administering the act; prosecution for violation of its terms is all but unknown. It is high time that Congress set about the business of rewriting the statute to conform with an overriding public interest in securing the fullest possible disclosure of lobbying activities, year in and year out. Meanwhile, the Senate would be well advised to reject the provision for deducting lobby expenses, as an effort to put the cart before the horse.

BASIS FOR OPPOSITION TO ADMINISTRATION FARM PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been repeatedly asked and today I wish to say exactly why I voted in the Senate Agriculture Committee to modify very substantially the farm proposals offered by the Department of Agriculture. What persuaded me to take this course was the very substantial probability that both the Department's mandatory feed grains and dairy proposals would be rejected by farmers voting in the nationwide referendums that would be necessary to put these programs into operation.

The result of such an outcome would be utter disaster. There would be huge overproduction of feed grains, resulting in an immense surplus over what could be consumed, whether this was bought and stored by the Government or not, and would have caused the most serious farm depression that this country has suffered in many years.

This would result even if a majority of farm producers, in the main feed grains and dairy areas, supported the mandatory program, because of the great and obvious likelihood that producers in other parts of the country would vote no in such a referendum. The crucial point is that just one-third plus one of producers voting in such a referendum can prevent approval of a program. In the case of both milk and feed grains, the evidence indicated that not one-third, but some two-thirds of farmers would vote no in such referendums.

I want to make clear that I have the greatest admiration and respect for Secretary Freeman and his staff. They have been doing an excellent job under very difficult circumstances. But I simply cannot bring myself to vote for a farm program which I am convinced, on the basis of all evidence and logic, will result in income devastation for farmers.

I also want to state that I accept the principle of supply management in agriculture. The only effective way to enhance the sadly deficient market power of farmers is by making it possible for them to limit output to what can be sold at fair prices.

THE DILEMMA OF THE MIDWEST

There is no doubt that dairy and feed grain producers in the Midwest are in serious trouble. Very proper concern has been expressed about the Government cost of current dairy and feed grain price supports. It is argued that if price supports are to be continued on these two major groups of farm products, producers must adopt mandatory supply management programs patterned on the successful wheat and cotton programs.

Yet many farm leaders outside the Midwest who make these statements report feed grain and dairy producers in their districts do not want controls. They say there is no overproduction of these products in their districts; they represent deficit areas. And herein lies the dilemma for Midwest producers.

Feed grains are grown on more farms and have a far higher value than any other farm crop. The value of feed grain production is greater than the combined value of the two next most important crops—cotton and wheat. In 1961 the value of the feed grains produced totaled $5.4 billion as compared with $6.6 billion for all other basic commodities—cotton, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts.

Dairy products also are produced in every State in the Union, and in almost every county. Cash receipts from the sale of dairy products totaled $4.9 billion in 1961—almost equal to the value of the combined production of cotton and wheat.

GOVERNMENT LOSSES ON DAIRY PROGRAM RELATIVELY LOW

I am in complete agreement with those who say we must reduce the Government cost of farm programs. We also must adopt supply management measures to the extent feasible and avoid the production of unneeded and unwanted food supplies. But I would point out Commodity Credit Corporation losses on price supports for feed grains and dairy products in the three most recent fiscal years—1959–61—were lower in relation to the value of production or marketings than for wheat and cotton. The data are as follows:

Cost of Government price-support operations for cotton, dairy products, feed grains, and wheat, fiscal years 1959–61

	Average annual losses or costs	Losses as percentage of value of marketings [1]
	Millions	
Cotton	$315	12
Wheat	250	12
Feed grains	439	8
Dairy products	252	5

[1] Value of crops produced in case of feed grains.

I realize that the costs projected for this fiscal year and next for both feed grains and dairy products are higher than in recent years. But even though mandatory supply management programs are not adopted, they are unlikely to equal 12 percent of the value of the production or marketings.

On the other hand, if we attempt to require mandatory supply management programs as a condition for price supports for feed grains and dairy products, Midwest producers, even though they vote overwhelmingly for them, are likely to be deprived of price supports by the adverse votes of the producers in other sections of the country.

Cotton and tobacco growers who receive a substantial part of their cash income from these price-supported crops, I am told, tend to oppose mandatory supply management programs for feed grains and milk produced on their farms. Wheat producers in the deficit feed-grain producing sections of the Northern Plains and the Northwest are less than enthusiastic in endorsing a mandatory supply management program for feed grains which would result in acreage cutbacks on their farms. I doubt that they could be counted on to support the Midwest farmers by voting favorably on such a program in 1962.

Rough estimates based on the 1959 census indicate that approximately 30 percent of the producers having 25 or more acres of feed grains are in Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, and the States of the Southeast. Most of the feed grains are fed to dairy herds and other livestock on these farms and the producers believe they have little to gain from feed grain price supports Another 12 percent located in the central Corn Belt and Western States have acreages of 25 to 50 acres. Again, most of these small farmers are diversified livestock men with little direct interest in the sale price of feed grains.

Not more than 50 to 55 percent of the feed grain producers are located in the Corn Belt, the Southwest, or Western States and have 50 acres or more of feed grains. These are the producers who have a direct interest in price supports comparable to that of the cotton and wheatgrowers.

In the case of dairy price supports, producers of milk for the fluid market under State or Federal milk marketing orders receive relatively stable prices of from $1 to $3 per hundred pounds above the market price for manufacturing milk for most of their supplies. Many of these dairymen are less than enthusiastic about joining with the midwestern producers in a nationwide mandatory supply management program.

MIDWEST INCOMES THREATENED BY VOTES OF OTHERS

It is one thing to say that price supports without production controls cannot be justified. But it is quite another thing to say that midwestern producers whose incomes depend entirely on feed grains and milk for manufacturing should be denied reasonable price supports because oteher producers of these products, whose incomes are partially protected by other price support and Federal order programs, vote unfavorably on proposed mandatory supply management programs.

Furthermore, if there were any indication the producers of feed grains as a whole would vote "yes" in a referendum on the mandatory program, the situation would be entirely different. But the fact is that there has been no such indication.

Without exception every poll and study has shown that feed grain producers overwhelmingly oppose production limitations. Yet if merely one-third plus one vote "no," the program is rejected, and prices will plummet.

And there is ample reason for this. Feed grains differ from all other commodities under supply limitation programs in that a very large part of our output is neither bought or sold in a marketplace, but is fed directly to livestock or dairy cattle on the farm. Far from being sellers of feed grains for cash, and thus amenable to the discipline of the marketplace, these feed grain producers often buy feed to supplement what they produce themselves. They think they have every reason to vote against the kind of mandatory program that has been proposed, unless an extensive and persuasive educational campaign has convinced them otherwise.

Right now there is absolutely no evidence to indicate that two-thirds or more of feed grains producers will vote for a mandatory program in a referendum. All the evidence—and it includes the opinions of practically every farm writer, reporter, economist, and pollster in the country—indicates the opposite.

Consequently, offering a mandatory program at this time will have precisely the opposite result. As certain as night follows the day, it will mean a "no" vote in the referendum and then a disastrous, precipitous drop in prices, with all the unfortunate side effects that we know will result. Rather than offer such a probability, I believe the Congress should continue the present feed grains program for an additional period, preferably with the addition of strengthening amendments, as I shall suggest.

I am not convinced that either the administration or the producers of these two most important farm products have exhausted the possibilities of developing supply management programs tailored directly to the complex economic interests of the producers located in the different sections of our diverse country.

I believe we should endorse the principle of extending mandatory supply management programs to feed grains and dairy products if and when the administration and the producer organizations are agreed they have developed mutually satisfactory and acceptable programs.

In the meantime, I am confident that with modifications the current voluntary feed grain adjustment program, if continued, will reduce surplus stocks to desirable levels at a much lower annual cost than was incurred for the 1961 program.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF EXTENDING THE CURRENT FEED GRAINS ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

Although the current voluntary feed grains adjustment program cannot be continued indefinitely, with modifications it can be continued as long as surplus Government stocks are available for payments-in-kind with a reasonable expectation that Government costs will be substantially lower than in 1961. It also offers promise of reducing feed grain carryover stocks to desirable levels within a reasonable period. A continuation of the 1961–62 program with modifications could be expected to achieve these results while maintaining market prices for feed grains at current or slightly higher levels, with less Government interference in commercial marketings of grain than in 1961. These expected accomplishments appear to meet the essential criteria for future programs established by President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman.

If the 1961–62 feed grains program were to be continued until stocks are reduced to desirable levels, increased participation could be obtained and Government costs for the program could be reduced by adopting several or all of the following modifications.

First. Offer price support on other crops not under marketing quotas, such as soybeans, flaxseed, dry beans and oats, only to farmers who participate in the feed grains program if they also produced feed grains.

Second. Limit ACP cost sharing payments to farmers who participate in the feed grains program if they produce feed grains.

Third. Limit SCS technical assistance in designing drainage or irrigation systems and land use plans to farmers who participate in the program if they produce feed grains.

Fourth. Limit USDA storage facility loans to farmers who participate in the program if they produce feed grains.

Fifth. Permit pasturing on the diverted acreage on small farms or on all farms if the producer accepts substantially lower per-acre diversion payments.

If several or all of these modifications were made in the 1961–62 feed grains program, it could be reasonably anticipated that participation in the program would be higher, excess stocks would be reduced more rapidly and Government costs would be lower as compared with the 1961 experience.

I regret that the Senate committee did not accept these amendments, which in my opinion would greatly strengthen the current voluntary feed grains program. The first four have in common a very simple principle, one which on the basis of my own experience I know many farmers understand and would accept. That is: Farmers who choose not to comply with a voluntary production reduction program should not be permitted to benefit from Federal subsidy programs in other areas. This would add a sensible incentive to back up the generous inducement offered farmers to win compliance. Those farmers who want the freedom to continue to plant all they want could do so. But they could not at the same time continue to receive lucrative subsidies of various kinds also offered by the Department of Agriculture.

UNCERTAINTY IN GRAIN MARKETS COULD BE REDUCED

A common criticism of the 1961 feed grains program has been the uncertainty introduced into commercial grain marketings resulting from the Secretary of Agriculture's unlimited authority to sell Government held grains equal to the cash value of the payment-in-kind certificates.

If the program were extended until stocks are reduced to desirable levels, this uncertainty could be reduced without adverse effects on program accomplishments. A provision might also be added that the Secretary could not sell grain to redeem the payment-in-kind certificates at more than 15 cents a bushel below the support level, that is, if the support level were retained at $1.20 a bushel for corn, no "certificate" corn could be sold for less than $1.05 a bushel.

In order to assure that the noncooperator benefits would not exceed those of the cooperators in case of unfavorable weather and a short crop, the Secretary of Agriculture might be granted authority to sell additional CCC stocks at not more than 5 to 10 cents a bushel below the price support level. Operating within the limits of these authorities, the Government could stabilize market prices within a range of $1.05 to $1.15 a bushel, or 5 to 15 cents below the loan level until surplus stocks are reduced to desirable levels.

THE 1961 RESULTS MINIMIZED BY UNUSUALLY FAVORABLE WEATHER

Louis M. Thompson, associate dean of agriculture and professor of agronomy at Iowa State University, after an exhaustive statistical analysis of factors affecting corn yields, 1935–61, concludes that 7 percent more corn was produced in the five major Corn Belt States—Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, and Ohio—in 1958–60 than would have been produced had we experienced average weather in those years.

Moreover, in these five States which produce about half the corn in the United States, corn yields were 8.9 bushels or 15 percent higher in 1961 than in 1960. Dean Thompson estimates that two-thirds of this increase was the result of more favorable weather in 1961 than in 1960.

Other studies attribute a greater part of recent yield increases to heavier fertilizer use and improved technology but confirm Thompson's conclusions that favorable weather was an important factor in the 7.3-bushel-per-acre national average increase in corn yields in 1961. In spite of the most favorable corn-producing weather in the Corn Belt on record, it is estimated that feed grains utilization in the current marketing year will exceed 1961 production by 7 million tons, the equivalent of 250 million bushels of corn. Carryover stocks next October are expected to decline for the first time in 10 years.

With a part or all of the modifications suggested above, a voluntary adjustment program can be expected to reduce surplus stocks with less Government cost even though corn-growing weather continues to be unusually favorable. If the weather is only average in the next few growing seasons, sharp reductions in surplus stocks would be expected.

REAL GOVERNMENT COSTS REDUCED BY PAYMENT IN KIND

The face value of the payment-in-kind certificates, paid to cooperators for diverting their feed grain base acres to conservation uses in 1961 totaled $782 million. Since the Commodity Credit Corporation is realizing about $1 a bushel from its sales of corn and grain sorghums, it will be forced to sell about 782 million bushels of these grains to realize the cash value of the payment-in-kind certificates.

Preliminary estimates indicate that with CCC sales of this magnitude, about 550 million bushels of 1961 corn will be placed under price support loans and delivered to the CCC.

Although there are many ways of estimating the cost of the 1961 feed grains program, one realistic way is to assume that the corn sold out of Government inventories otherwise would have been kept in storage until storage costs equaled or exceeded its current market value. Looked at in this way, the real cost to the Government is the cost of acquiring the 1961 corn—about 550 million bushels at $1.20 per bushel, or $660 million—plus Government acquisitions of other 1961 feed grains.

Had the weather in 1961 been no more favorable than average, feed grain production would have been several hundred million bushels smaller, and fewer 1961 feed grains would have been acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under price support operations. Had we experienced only average weather this past growing season the real cost to the Government of the 1961 feed grains program would have been very low indeed.

If the current feed grains program were to be continued until stocks are reduced to desirable levels, with a part or all of the changes as indicated, including pasturing a part of the diverted acres; per acre diversion payments might be expected to average 15 to 20 percent less than in 1961. Fewer payment-in-kind certificates would be issued and less CCC grain would have to be sold in the market. If the weather during future feed grain growing seasons should be only average, very little new feed grains from the current year's production would be acquired by CCC under price support operations. Over the period of years required to reduce stocks to desirable levels the real costs to the Government might well average little more than half of those experienced in 1961. The reduction in costs would be achieved by avoiding placing such large quantities of the current crops under Government loans as in 1961.

THE 1961–62 EXPERIENCE WILL BE REVEALED MORE FULLY IN JULY

At the present time the amount of the 1961 crop which will be acquired by the CCC under price support operations can be estimated only roughly. Also, the amount of participation in the 1962 program is uncertain and the extent to which nonparticipators may increase their feed grain plantings is unknown.

The July crop report is the first report which will show the acreage of feed grains planted under the 1962 program. By that time more will be known also about the extent of the price support operations for the 1961 feed grains.

If extension of the feed grains program were delayed until July, any desired modifications could be considered in the light of the facts shown at that time.

USDA STUDY NEEDED OF IMPLICATIONS OF PASTURING DIVERTED ACRES

Preliminary and informal studies indicate that the increased pasturage resulting from allowing producers the option of pasturing their inverted acres would not seriously affect the livestock industry. This added pasturage would be used primarily to increase beef and dairy breeding herds leading to increased market supplies, for the most part, 2 to 4 years later. Taking into account the total feed used by beef and dairy cattle at the present time, informed technicians estimate in a preliminary approximation that additional pasturage on the diverted acreage resulting from such a change in the program would increase the total feed supplies for beef and dairy cattle by not more than 1 percent annually.

In evaluating the possible adverse effects on the beef and dairy producers of pasturing diverted acres it is important to note that changes are required in the current dairy price support program in any event. Also, the indirect benefits of a feed grains program in reducing excessive competitive supplies of hogs and poultry probably more than offsets the potential increase in beef cattle feeds resulting from pasturing diverted acreages. To the extent that permission to pasture the diverted acres should result in increased participation and increased reductions in feed grain production, there would appear to be a net gain to beef cattle producers as well as to all livestock producers.

In order that better informed judgments can be made regarding the desirability of allowing pasturing on the diverted acreage—with reduced diversion payments—the Secretary of Agriculture might well be requested to have his technical staff make a special study of the economic implications of pasturing diverted acres.

TESTIMONY BY SENATOR PROXMIRE BEFORE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning I appeared before the Select Committee on Small Business to discuss the small business investment company program. The select committee has been holding a series of open hearings as part of its present review and investigation of the SBIC program.

Because I have been concerned about some features of recent operations by SBIC's, I presented a statement to the select committee. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, U.S. SENATE, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 17, 1962

The generous capital privileges and rich tax benefits available to small business investment companies were established for one purpose: to assist small businesses needing loanable funds. I am concerned about the tendency of some SBIC's to use these advantages to make very large commitments in large business operations, often of the multiple-unit type. In my view this is a perversion of the intent of the SBIC program.

It was the stated purpose of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, establishing this program, "to improve and stimulate the national economy in general and the small business segment thereof in particular."

I firmly believe that it should continue to be our primary concern to assist small businesses by providing access to loans and equity capital which are more readily available to larger firms. The welfare of SBIC's must be closely related to how well they serve small businesses.

My concern about the very large number of smaller small businesses needing loans and capital leads me to urge this Committee to direct its questions not so much to the SBIC's, but to the small business community they were created to serve.

The comments by your many SBIC witnesses have, I am sure, provided much useful information. However, asking such interested witnesses about the program is not necessarily the best way to find out how small businessmen feel about it.

While I note that SBIC's were asked to describe their aids to small business, and to cite cases which especially exemplify the value of the SBIC program to small business and the Nation, this may not provide an accurate or meaningful appraisal. Such a survey is rather like publicly asking a general about the welfare of his troops. Sometimes the answer merely reflects the welfare of the general.

I raise this point because I know from personal contact with many small businessmen that they have objections and reservations about the SBIC program, among them these:

1. Small businessmen feel that the main goal of many SBIC's often is dominant ownership of their company. This they object to strongly.

2. Small businesses in need of loanable funds who come to SBIC's for loans frequently find they must give up significant shares of ownership to get any money.

3. Small businesses feel that SBIC's drive hard bargains, with very high interest rates and heavy surrender of equity.

4. SBIC's have shunned some kinds of business entirely. One of these, the men's retail clothing field, passed a resolution to this effect at a recent national convention.

Whether these and other criticisms coming from large numbers of small businessmen are justified or valid or even avoidable, I do not wish to judge at this time. But I do think that a fair appraisal of the SBIC program should include a thorough investigation at the grassroots level of how small businessmen feel about it.

The field hearings by this committee could well have served the additional useful purpose of asking small businesses generally how they feel about the SBIC program. I regret that this opportunity has apparently been missed.

In the opinion of many small business owners, another aspect of the SBIC program as it has developed to which they object is the rising trend toward large loans and investments, particularly by some of the big SBIC's. I share this view.

The purpose of the $500,000 limit is to keep the obviously attractive and profitable SBIC program to its proper function of aiding small business. In the occasional instances where commitments above half a million dollars may still be warranted for small business purposes, the law permits up to five SBIC's to join in a commitment of up to $2.5 million. Limiting the commitment of a single SBIC removes some of the obvious incentive to make exclusively large loans.

The questionnaire sent by the committee to all SBIC's is designed primarily to gather information relating to the welfare of SBIC's, not small business. I believe it would be of at least equal importance similarly to survey the financial position and opinions of small business firms, both those who have had dealings (successful or unsuccessful) with SBIC's and a sample of those who have not.

Undoubtedly much valuable information will be ascertained by means of this questionnaire. The questions which it asks relate significantly to the SBIC program. However, I would observe that for the purpose of getting an accurate statistical appraisal of SBIC's, the questionnaire has certain weaknesses. Specifically, nearly all the questions are open ended. This means that any answer which the SBIC considers suitable can be given.

Questions asking respondents to give data on operations without guidelines, categories, or brackets in which to structure the information are of little use for overall statistical purposes. Census Bureau experts, who can be of great assistance in statistical inquiries of this kind, strongly emphasize the key importance of such "precoding." Without it the result of a survey is a difficult-to-digest mass of data; with it a survey lends itself readily to significant and useful analysis.

The specific points that I think could be usefully surveyed with the aid of such techniques include:

(a) How many small business firms seek SBIC financing, compared to how many get it? What are the reasons for the turndowns? Are there categories of small business which do not get SBIC money? If so, why?

(b) Are any SBIC's functioning in effect as personal holding companies?

(c) Do some SBIC's limit their activities to financing a small circle of enterprises? Were some SBIC's formed for this purpose? How many SBIC's actively seek new situations, and how do they do it?

(d) What specific factors in a small business firm's operations influence the SBIC's decision to make a commitment? (Such information would be especially useful to small business firms.)

(e) Are SBIC's tending to concentrate their operations in and around large cities?

These are questions that could well be asked of SBIC's. As I stated above, I consider it of equal importance to ask small business firms their views on these and other points.

I would emphasize that the importance of getting data in a form that can be dealt with readily is made all the greater by the fact that the specific responses must, of necessity, as stated in the chairman's letter, be kept confidential. I fully recognize the need for this requirement. But it does underline the need for accurate and significant statistical analyses.

I am distressed by what appears to be a recent tendency to limit entry into the SBIC program. At least one recent regulation has had the effect of fencing out potential new SBIC's, some of whom I know from firsthand information would be among the most worthwhile type of SBIC.

The regulation I have in mind is the requirement for a personal financial statement from the directors and principal stockholders of new SBIC's. It is interesting to chart the progress of this regulation. As first promulgated, it applied to all existing SBIC's. The uproar that arose in the SBIC community caused this order to be withdrawn. But it was retained to apply only to new proposed SBIC's.

It has had the effect of discouraging a number of individuals, some on the verge of forming SBIC's, from going into the program. Some of these people have not previously been active in the field. But they were attracted by the possibility of making a useful contribution to the development of small business in their communities. In several cases, these were prominent and successful men in small towns.

When the requirement of a personal financial statement was added, with conflicting overtones, many of these potential investors became discouraged and withdrew. It is my understanding that the number of new SBIC's formed since this regulation went into effect has fallen sharply.

The "fencing in" of SBIC's is also the result of the view, several times expressed by officials of SBA, that minimum SBIC's are less satisfactory than bigger ones, because they can't afford the staff to carry on an extensive operation. On the basis of my present knowledge many of these smaller SBIC's appear to be doing a fine job, particularly in making the small loans and investments which I feel must be encouraged. I see no reason why a considerable expansion in the number of small SBIC's should not continue. This would bring new talent into the field. The additional competition would cause existing SBIC's to range farther afield in search of investment opportunities—and thus would benefit small business generally.

I can see no justification whatsoever for limiting SBIC's to a few in each area. While this might establish a protected situation for the favored few, it would eliminate the all-important spur of competition, which here as elsewhere can be relied upon to bring the benefits of investment capital and loans to an increasing number of small businesses.

Let me just add in conclusion that more than one small business has told me wryly that SBIC's offer a mighty hard bargain. Continued free entry into the SBIC program would permit small businesses to "shop around" for better deals.

WASHINGTON POST WRITERS CRITICIZE INVESTMENT CREDIT, LOBBYING DEDUCTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I testified before the Finance Committee on two provisions of the impending tax bill which I consider unwise, the proposed investment credit and the proposal for the deduction of business lobbying expenses.

Two articles in the Washington Post and Times Herald during the past few days discussed these tax changes. The first, by staff reporter James E. Clayton, is headed "Revived 'Lobbyists Aid Act' Stirs Controversy." The second, by J. A. Livingston, bears the title "Investment Credit is One More Tax Loophole."

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles, as well as a copy of my prepared statement to the Finance Committee, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUCKED IN TAX REFORM BILL—REVIVED LOBBYISTS AID ACT STIRS CONTROVERSY

(By James E. Clayton)

Tucked away in the middle of that massive tax bill which the Senate Finance Committee is considering is a section headed

"Appearances, etc., with respect to legislation."

The section is a little one as such sections go, but it has a long history and a big potential.

One name that has been proposed for it is the Lobbyists Aid Act. The reason is that the section would permit business firms to deduct from their taxable income many of the expenses of their lobbyists.

Another proposed name is the Legislators Aid Act. The reason is, the House Ways and Means Committee said, in approving the section, that it might bring legislators information that lobbyists might not otherwise present.

PURCHASE LEGISLATURES

One lobbyist, who prefers to remain anonymous, says it ought to be called the bill to authorize the purchase of State legislatures. He thinks the major effect of the section will be to increase lobbying at State capitols.

But another lobbyist says the section only gives businessmen a fair chance to get their views heard by lawmaking bodies. Lobbying is just as important to businesses now, he claims, as many other expenses that can be deducted from taxable income.

No one seems to be exactly sure what the section means. It was dropped into the tax bill, without hearings, during a closed session of the House Ways and Means Committee. It passed the House without debate.

Nor is anyone who knows saying how it got into the bill. One administration official said, "The Congressmen who pushed this thing through were simply trying to do a favor for their friends."

Since the full implications of the section are somewhat unclear, its opponents interpret it to show how much mischief it contains and its proponents demonstrate that it is drawn narrowly to meet specific problems.

Senator William Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, says it would give "a thoroughly unjustified tax advantage to special business interests." Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, has indicated much the same view.

RACETRACKS CITED

One example cited is that the section would let a racetrack deduct many of its expenses in lobbying before a State legislature in favor of on-track betting, but would not permit a Presbyterian minister to deduct his expenses for opposing the same legislation on moral grounds.

Another example is that a corporation could deduct some of its dues to a trade organization that lobbied against a tax bill, but a member of the League of Women Voters could not deduct dues to her organization for favoring the same bill.

What the section does is to say that business firms may deduct the following as expenses in figuring their income tax:

Any money they spend to present their views on legislation of direct interest to them to any committee or individual member of any legislative body in the Nation.

Any money they spend in transmitting information on similar subjects between their firms and trade associations.

The part of their membership dues in a trade association that is spent by that association on either kind of activity outlined in the other two provisions.

There are two specific prohibitions. Deductions would not be allowed for expenses in a political campaign or in a general propaganda campaign aimed at the public.

TWO BASIC ARGUMENTS

The Ways and Means Committee, in its report, makes two basic arguments for the section.

It says that expenses incurred by business firms in appearing before administrative and judicial bodies are already deductible and that this merely puts appearances before legislative bodies on the same footing.

It also says that business firms should not be discouraged in making information available to Members of Congress or of State legislatures. Apparently, the committee thinks that businesses have been discouraged from lobbying because they cannot now deduct lobbying expenses.

To this one Congressman said, "I'll be swamped if this passes. Every businessman in my district who comes to Washington on vacation will demand to see me so he can write off the costs of his trip as a lobbying expense."

The proposal had its origins in 1959. In that year, the Supreme Court upheld the Internal Revenue Service ruling that lobbying expenses are not ordinary expenses that a business can deduct. Soon afterward, IRS issued new regulations and started to crack down on such deductions.

BILLS WERE PROMPT

Almost immediately, a number of bills appeared in Congress. Representative Hale Boggs, Democrat, of Louisiana, introduced one to make deductible all lobbying expenses on matters directly related to the taxpayer's business. Representative Wilbur Mills, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, introduced one drafted by the American Bar Association to limit such deductions to direct appearances before legislative committees. The Treasury Department, in the Eisenhower administration, backed the ABA approach while the Commerce Department argued for the Boggs bill.

The Ways and Means Committee reported out the Boggs bill in 1960 but it died in the House. In January and February of this year, the committee voted down that approach and settled for the narrower one, which has since passed the House.

The chamber of commerce has already let it be known that it thinks the House bill is too narrow. It wants the Senate to replace the measure with one sponsored by Senators Vance Hartke, Democrat, of Indiana, and Robert S. Kerr, Democrat, of Oklahoma, which would permit deductions for any lobbying expenses, even those on subjects unrelated to the taxpayer's business.

Last week, Secretary of the Treasury C. Douglas Dillon said the Treasury is now opposed to even the version that passed the House.

Investment Credit Is One More Tax Loophole

(By J. A. Livingston)

When businessmen refuse tax concessions, it's like children rejecting candy.

When the President of the United States tries to push on businessmen an 8-percent investment tax credit and they react to it as children to castor oil, that's also news.

But there's a difference between castor oil and the investment credit. Medical evidence indicates that castor oil works.

The supposed beneficiaries of the tax credit are certain that (a) it won't work and (b) it's not their medicine.

The National Association of Manufacturers is against it. So is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Furthermore, the AFL–CIO objects to the proposal as a windfall.

Opposition has driven the administration to redoubled defense of what only it seems to want.

Here's how the administration puts its case: International competition is increasing. U.S. industry needs to be lean, hearty, and modern. The credit will stimulate investment in new facilities.

So far, no argument. Who's going to kick modernization or Santa Claus?

Businessmen say the proper cure for investment anemia is revision of Treasury Bulletin F, long deferred and long promised. This bulletin, which sets forth allowable depreciation rates on machinery, plant, and equipment, hasn't been revised adequately since 1942, though more liberal rates—shorter life—were granted to the textile industry on machinery and the administration has promised revision in other major industries.

Senator William Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, usually an administration faithful, condemned the credit proposal before the Senate Finance Committee because it would grant tax benefits to business firms even if they do not change their investment decisions one iota.

I think Treasury experts are victims of analogy. They found that investment credits often supplemented depreciation rates on business equipment in Europe. They noted that production in recent years has expanded more rapidly in West Germany, Italy, France, Belgium, and other continental countries than here.

Ergo: If investment tax credits imported a lift in Europe, why not a similar incentive here.

But is that logical?

When the war ended, European businessmen had to rebuild and reequip. Shortages existed. Demand was greater than supply. Profits were promising. Consumers wanted the comforts and conveniences they had so long forgone. But business firms were short of capital. So governments helped with special tax credits.

Moreover, growth here was rapid in early postwar years simply because consumers and businessmen quickly went about making up for wartime austerities. But since our deficiencies were less than those of Europe, the U.S. growth rate ultimately slowed down comparatively.

Growth in the Soviet Union has also been more rapid than that of the United States. Nevertheless, the U.S.S.R. has no investment credit to spur on its industrial commissars. Production in Europe and the U.S.S.R. during the war was catastrophically disrupted and diminished by war. Naturally, the catch-up process would last longer there.

For me, the investment credit is one more loophole in a tax structure full of loopholes. Tax rates—both individual and corporate—are too high; exemptions and exclusions too numerous.

Businessmen's decisions are based—not necessarily on what's good for business—on how to save taxes. High personal tax rates set up a tug of war each year between a man's conscience and what he thinks he can get away with.

The sooner tax rates in general come down the better it will be for the tone of society and the economic tone of business. And the investment credit, if enacted will be one more loophole to get rid of in a general overhaul and simplification of the tax structure.

The Senate will perform a public service by burying the proposal under an avalanche of "nays." One more patch in a patchwork quilt is the last thing we need.

Statement by Senator William Proxmire Before the Senate Finance Committee, April 6, 1962

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to discuss two parts of the tax bill. These are: Section 2 dealing with a proposed credit for investment in certain depreciable property, and section 3, dealing with appearance and other costs with respect to legislation.

INVESTMENT CREDIT

Regarding the investment credit, I oppose it because it would not work, it is unfair to other taxpayers, it is hypercyclical, and it would result in a huge revenue loss to the Treasury.

1. One principal disadvantage of the investment credit is its unfortunate equity concept. It will give a business firm tax benefits which are more than 100 percent of costs. For a corporation in the 52-percent bracket, the investment credit is equivalent to depreciation of 114 to 116 percent of the cost of newly acquired assets. Other taxpayers—excepting those who receive percentage depletion—are limited to deductions of 100 percent of costs. Granting such an exceptional privilege raises a serious question of tax equity.

I am concerned, therefore, as I am sure you must be, about the potentially dangerous precedent set by the investment credit. It is not unlikely that other groups will request similar tax treatment. Retailers may request more than 100-percent deductions for the costs of carrying inventory. Construction firms may request more than 100-percent deductions for buildings they own. Teachers could request deductions for more than 100 percent of the costs of advanced courses. Individuals who borrow money to invest in homes may request more than 100-percent deductions of their interest costs incurred in the purchase of homes.

2. The investment credit is also undesirable because it will tend to accentuate the business cycle. Far from contributing to business stability, it is in fact hypercyclical. It aggravates the business cycle by encouraging investment during a period of inflation and discouraging it relatively in a recession, when businesses have less income against which to write off new investment.

If the proposed credit stimulates investment—which I doubt—the stimulus will be greater in those periods when investment is likely to be high in any case. Thus, investment will be stimulated exactly in those periods when there is little or no need for an investment stimulus. Contrariwise, the investment credit will have its least stimulative effect when investment prospects are dim. Hence, the credit will tend to accentuate present fluctuations in investment. If there is any single goal sought by administration economic policy, it is to increase growth by stabilizing the economy and ironing out fluctuations. This proposal will have exactly the opposite effect. It will be inflationary in boom times. It will increase unemployment in recession periods.

The investment credit is also undesirable from a cyclical standpoint because it serves to reduce Government revenues exactly at those times when Government revenues should be raised to curb private demands for goods and services; namely, in inflationary periods. If the Federal budget were otherwise in balance during a prosperous period, the effect of the investment credit would be to create budget deficits in the prosperous periods. Certainly this is fiscal irresponsibility in its purest form. Moreover, it is bad economics. Almost all economists, regardless of their political persuasion, feel that the Government should run surpluses during periods of high employment. The investment credit will serve to reduce those surpluses, or throw the budget into a deficit position, exactly in those periods when surpluses would be most appropriate.

3. One basic criticism of the investment credit is that the goals which are sought by this device are inappropriate. Specifically, the credit is designed to stimulate artificially the rate of physical investment in the United States. Why do we need an artificial stimulus to obtain more investment than the free market deems appropriate? A fundamental tenet of our economic system is that, wherever possible and to the greatest possible extent, we will permit free-market forces to determine the amounts and types of goods to be produced. The investment credit attempts to interfere with the free-market decisions of consumers and producers.

It is also argued that the investment credit is needed to stimulate physical investment to compete with foreign countries. Such competition takes many forms. If standard of living is the area of competition, then we have managed well to date without the investment credit, and no credit seems appropriate simply to obtain additional quantities of products described above.

If "competition with foreign countries" refers to our balance-of-payments position, then it seems ridiculous to support the investment credit for all industries in the United States simply to aid the relatively few firms that actually compete overseas.

Moreover, there has been remarkably little evidence provided indicating that lack of investment is holding back U.S. firms in foreign competition. First, it is not clear that U.S. firms are suffering significantly in their competition with foreign industry. Second, it is not clear that, if such suffering is occurring, it is due to lack of investment. It could just as easily be due to lack of initiative, weakness of new designs, excessive labor costs, insufficient mobility, or many other reasons which would not be affected by the investment credit. Surely, the burden of proof is on those who support the investment credit to indicate that the problems of foreign competition—which were so heavily stressed by Secretary Dillon on Monday—in fact exist and would be significantly reduced by adoption of the investment credit.

4. What grounds do we have for doubting the efficacy of the investment credit?

First, the credit will be given to business firms even if they do not change their investment decisions by one iota. Obviously, business firms are always engaged in making investments. On all of these investments, they will obtain the proposed credit. But the only justification for the credit is that new investment, over and above what would normally be made by a business firm, will be encouraged as a result of the credit. Nonetheless, business firms receive the cake-credit, and can eat it, without taking any new and additional actions to earn it.

Secondly, businessmen themselves are not responding favorably to the proposed credit. A responsible survey by the Wall Street Journal indicates that virtually all the businessmen interviewed would consider the proposed investment credit as a windfall and did not plan to change their investment plans if the investment credit were enacted. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit a copy of this Wall Street Journal article for the record.

It is rare in the area of tax policy to have advance laboratory tests of the potential effectiveness of policy proposals. Such laboratory tests, when available, should certainly be examined closely. In this case we have the example of the accelerated depreciation methods which were introduced in the 1954 Internal Revenue Code. One of the primary purposes of these accelerated methods was to encourage greater business investment in plant and equipment.

Yet, look what happened. Before the enactment of these new methods, the growth in capital stock per worker was roughly 3.5 percent per year. After the adoption of the accelerated depreciation methods, capital stock per worker grew by only 1.9 percent per year from 1954 to 1960. In other words, instead of acceleration of business investment as a result of the new depreciation methods, there was a very substantial dropoff, so that the rate of increase was only about one-half what it had been in the earlier period. The effect of this on output per worker was significant. Output per worker in the period from 1947 to 1954 increased by 3.3 percent per year. After the accelerated depreciation methods were enacted, the rate through 1960 was only 2.1 percent.

How can we explain this lack of effectiveness of a tax stimulus to investment so analogous to the investment credit? It seems to me there are several available explanations.

One, while the tax benefits were being given, there was still no corresponding increase in aggregate demand for the goods and services which additional investment could produce. Therefore, while there were cost savings through tax reductions, there was no particular stimulus to obtain more investment to produce more goods and services. The tax stimulus, as I am sure will be the case with the investment credit, was simply reflected in increased profits, rather than increased production.

Two, the period since 1954 has been generally one of excess capacity due to inadequacy of consumer demand. Given this excess capacity, there are relatively few marginal investment decisions which will be encouraged by an investment tax stimulus such as accelerated depreciation or the proposed credit.

Three, there is ample indication that prices of products are sometimes administered prices. When this is the case, prices are less subject to market forces. Such prices tend to stay up under circumstances in which they could be reduced. Returns from increased investment for a business firm come only if the firm reduces its prices to sell the increased quantities that can be produced with the additional investment. Rather than expanding plant and equipment to produce more goods and then lowering prices in order to sell the additional goods, some firms have been content to maintain prices and sell lesser quantities that require lesser amounts of plant and equipment. The tax stimuli to investment, therefore, reflect themselves merely in higher aftertax profits at constant price levels, rather than in greater production at lower price levels.

A principal argument for the investment credit is that business firms need additional cash for additional investments. The facts refute this justification. There is no evidence that the major firms, which do the great amount of investing in the United States, need additional cash flows to finance further investment. Take General Motors, for example. G.M. set aside depreciation reserves of $1,637 million during the years 1957 to 1960, while it invested only $1,589 million in plant and equipment combined. During those same years, it retained profits after payments of dividends in the amount of $1,017 million, out of which it added $965 million to its cash and security holdings—rather than in physical investment—so that the total of its financial holdings at the end of 1960 was $1,637 million—ironically, the same amount as its depreciation reserves. Surely General Motors has not been in need of an artificial tax advantage to support further physical investment.

The G.M. case is typical of many large firms and reflects the situation in industry generally. Table 1, drawn from the recent report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, indicates that, in the period from 1959 to 1961, funds available from internal sources alone exceeded total plant and equipment outlays for industry generally. This is completely aside from the additional funds that would be available through new debt financing or new equity issues.

Table 1.—*Relationship of plant and equipment outlays to internal funds*

[Billions of dollars]

Period	(1) Plant and equipment outlays	(2) Funds available from internal sources [1]	(3) Col. (2) as percent of col. (1)
1950–54	$107.2	$97.1	90.6
1955–58	113.2	108.4	95.8
1959–61	88.9	93.0	104.6

[1] Retained profits and depletion allowances, and depreciation and amortization allowances.

It has been alleged that the low level of investment in recent years has been due to a squeeze on corporate profits. Two sets of facts indicate that this reasoning is fallacious. The first set of facts involves the history of the last few years. This history indicates quite clearly that corporate profits are quite sensitive to the rate at which capacity is being utilized. Corporate profits have been low only when capacity is not being fully utilized. Since the rate of utilization was higher in the early period of this decade, it follows that the ratio of profits to GNP would be higher in the earlier period. This in turn, suggests that the lack of investment has been due to an inadequacy of final demand, rather than a lack of corporate profits. Lack of investment is a symptom, not a cause.

The second set of facts concerns the relationship between corporate profits and that part of the national income which originates in corporations. If the corporate share of economic activity falls, corporate profits decline as a percentage of GNP, even when corporate profits are a stable percentage of the income flow through corporations. Table 2 indicates this relationship quite clearly. If a comparison is made simply between corporate profits and GNP, as indicated in line 2 of table 2, this percentage has gone down. However, if corporate profits plus capital consumption allowances are related to national income originating in corporations—which is the more relevant comparison—it is clear that the ratio in recent years has been higher than at the beginning of the decade—even though unemployment rose from 3.7 to 6.1 percent during the same period.

Table 2.—*Comparative corporate income rates, 1950–53, 1954–57, and 1958–61*

[Percent]

Item	1950–53	1954–57	1958–61
Corporate profits after taxes:			
Percent of gross national product	5.9	5.3	4.5
Percent of national income originating in corporations	12.6	11.4	10.1
Corporate profits after taxes plus capital consumption allowances:			
Percent of gross national product	9.4	10.0	9.7
Percent of national income originating in corporations plus capital consumption allowances	18.8	19.5	19.3
Unemployment as percent of civilian labor force	3.7	4.6	6.1

Source: U.S. Departments of Commerce and Labor.

The investment credit, by providing a windfall tax break for businesses, would cost the Treasury $1.8 billion the first year. At a time when the Federal budget is in precarious balance, such a revenue loss, which will accomplish so little, should not be incurred.

LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

I oppose the tax deduction for lobbying expenses because it would give a thoroughly unjustified tax advantage to special business interests over the public interest.

Contributions to lobbying organizations that fight for their ideals—be they left, right, or center—are not tax deductible. Contributions to groups like the American Civil Liberties Union, the Americans for Constitutional Action, and the League of Women Voters are prohibited by law from tax exemption.

But if this provision is enacted, special interest business groups, whose financial interests may run counter to the public interest, will get a juicy tax break.

This proposed new tax deduction is the one part of the bill that is flatly opposed by the Treasury.

This is one of the very few significant changes made in the law in years on which the House Ways and Means Committee conducted no hearings.

Section 3 of the bill would allow businesses and trade associations, but not the ordinary citizen nor the individual specialist, to deduct costs incurred in connection with promoting or opposing particular legislation. The bill as presently written would allow deductions for not only the expenses of appearances before congressional committees, but also expenses involved in personal contacts with individual Members of the Congress, personal contacts with State and local officials, and all expenses incurred by trade associations in propagandizing a particular point of view with their individual Members.

I consider this provision of the bill wholly indefensible on several different grounds. First, from a legislative standpoint, the Ways and Means Committee has held no hearings on this particular measure. Certainly there should be an opportunity for the general public to be heard by the Ways and Means Committee on this subject before the legislation is enacted.

Second, from a legal standpoint, section 3 of the bill represents a change in a longstanding principle which has been supported on several occasions by Federal courts, including the Supreme Court. The Internal Revenue Code provides for deductions only for ordinary and necessary expenses. It is far outside the ordinary and necessary income-producing procedures of business to attempt to influence legislative decisions. While the Treasury Department has apparently not attempted to enforce fully its present regulations, dereliction of duty should not be a justification for legislative change.

Third, the proposed change can be criticized on equity grounds. It clearly and explicitly discriminates in favor of business lobbying and against lobbying by private citizens or individual specialists. Thus the provision serves to rig the odds against legislation for the general well-being, and in favor of specialized legislation for the few. It is difficult enough at present for the individual legislator to obtain information on both sides of the question upon which we must legislate. In effect, the new provision means that some tax funds now coming to Uncle Sam will be returned to businesses and trade associations in order that they can present their case more effectively, while at the same time discouraging individuals, who presumably have less capacity to meet lobbying costs, from incurring those costs. Thus the flow of information to legislators is diverted so that it comes more freely from certain sources and is less available from other sources.

Fourth, the proposed section can be criticized on economic grounds. The Federal Government, through this measure, will be subsidizing the diversion of resources away from productive output for the benefit of the national economy into specialized propagandizing purposes designed solely to benefit the few. These proposed deductions are not equivalent to deductions for advertising. Advertising is intended to disseminate knowledge to the many about products which are available in the market. The proposed deductions are for expenses designed to influence the few for the special benefit of a few.

The proposed provision on lobbying expenses will only discriminate against certain nonprofit lobbying organizations, such as the League of Women Voters. These organizations, like industry trade associations, are usually nonprofit and are generally not subject to tax on their own activities. However, contributions to these organizations, like contributions to industry trade associations, are only deductible by the contributors to the extent that the contributions are not used by the associations to support lobbying activities. Section 3, of H.R. 10650, would permit contributions to trade associations to be deductible even though the contributions were used by the trade associations for lobbying purposes. This change would be made on the grounds that the contributions were "ordinary and necessary" business expenses. However, contributions to organizations such as the League of Women Voters would not be deductible to the extent that the league engaged in lobbying activities because the contributions in that case—under the proposed bill—would not be considered as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses. Therefore, the bill tends to discriminate in favor of lobbying activities by industry trade associations and against lobbying activities by certain other groups which have been of great assistance to legislators in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I stated at the beginning of this statement that I believed there were two sections of the bill before you which were inimical to the best interests of the general public. I believe the case against both these provisions is clear cut and overwhelming.

BLOSSOMS ON THE KYLE PALMER TREE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, a great journalist passed from the scene early this month. He was Kyle Palmer, the political editor of the Los Angeles Times. Bob Hartmann, Washington bureau chief for the paper, has written an article about his old friend that should warm the hearts of Kyle's many friends and admirers.

Sometime ago Kyle Palmer sent Bob Hartmann a pink dogwood tree. It has just burst into bloom. On this nostalgic note, Bob Hartmann recalls the many memorials that Kyle Palmer left him. In winding up his article he touches on the credo that dominated the career of Kyle Palmer and distinguished him as a newspaperman: the belief that a reporter's most powerful weapon is truth, that his most dangerous trap is cynicism.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the April 6 issue of the Los Angeles Times be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Blossoms on the Kyle Palmer Tree

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

The pink dogwood tree in our front yard has just burst into glorious bloom, as it does every spring. But this year it has more buds than ever before.

What has this to do with Washington, D.C.—a city famed for its delicate cherry blossoms and indelicate politicians? Why write a column about a dogwood tree?

Ours is not just any old dogwood tree. It is, and always will be, the Kyle Palmer tree.

There seems a special symbolism in the fact that its annual rebirth occurred just as Kyle laid aside his burdens by the Pacific.

Kyle, my predecessor here in the Times Washington Bureau when I was a 2-year-old toddler, never liked the weather much on the shores of the steamy Potomac. But he genuinely liked politicians and this is their apogee. So he used to make pilgrimages to check up on the young statesmen he had launched into national orbit and, sometimes, waited out their reentry as well.

On one of these visits, about this time of the year, my wife and I took our friend and mentor for a Sunday afternoon ride through the Maryland countryside. It was just coming to life after a long winter, and the dogwoods were especially lovely.

Kyle Palmer was born in Tennessee, and although he shifted his adult allegiance to California and Hawaii he never lost the hickory ruggedness of his native State and the courtliness of its southern tradition. Nor could he forget the dogwoods, he told us.

Later, a little pink dogwood was delivered with his compliments.

The last time Kyle revisited his old haunts in the Capital (where doors swung open as his footsteps sounded) he inspected his tree. Already it was as tall as he.

But its fragile petals had given way to green leaves and he said sadly he probably would not see them next year.

I pooh-poohed this, of course, for Kyle Palmer seemed indestructible to any Times man, and still seemed so a few months later at the national conventions in Los Angeles and Chicago.

But a little over a year ago the fatal illness struck, and I could only send him a color snapshot of the pink blossoms which failed to do them justice.

My camera was all loaded to catch this year's brief flowering at its peak.

We knew the dogwood would surely blossom, though foreknowledge did not lessen our delight when it did. And we know the finest and fullest lives will surely end but it does not decrease our sadness.

Kyle Palmer left me, among many others, continuing memorials less tangible than a dogwood tree. For many decades, he gave the Times a tradition of political action and intimate association with the great, near-great and would-be greats of government.

He fought hard, but fairly, not only for the principles but for the people he believed in. I know of no one in this cruel and cutthroat business of politics who bore him any ill will.

It was Kyle who pointed me on my way in Washington 8 years ago on the raw March day when Puerto Rican gunmen sprayed the House of Representatives with hot lead. We were quietly eating luncheon while this sensational shooting took place, but I can't think of any news story I have more profitably missed.

For Kyle Palmer was telling me some of the things he understood about politicians that few reporters do: that they are human beings, more often than not honorable, and probably put a higher premium on trust than men in more secure jobs. That a reporter's most powerful weapon is truth, that his most dangerous trap is cynicism, and that above all else politics is about people.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to associate myself with the comments of my colleague with respect to the passing of the late Kyle Palmer, one of the truly great political editors in all the history of American journalism and also with the statement he has made respecting the eloquent and moving tribute paid to our late friend by Mr. Robert Hartmann, the chief of the Washington bureau of the Los Angeles Times and a longtime intimate associate of Kyle on that great newspaper. Like my colleague, I cherish the memory of Kyle Palmer for practically my lifetime. All of us, in and out of politics in our State, grieve at his passing, and extend our profound sympathies to his dear wife and family.

TRADE-FAIR SHIPS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, events in the past few years have demonstrated beyond any doubt that the United States must substantially increase its exports in order to maintain a healthy domestic economy. We likewise realize that our economic welfare remains the bellwether for the free world in its struggle with the Communist ideology. Thus it behooves us to make every possible effort to promote and expand our exports, and this effort should and must embrace all segments of this Nation—Government, management, and labor.

The reasons for this have been well documented by the studies and reports of private and Government economists. I refer Senators to the special staff study made by the Committee on Commerce during the last Congress, as well as to reports made on this subject by the Select Committee on Small Business and the Joint Economic Committee.

In truth, while there have been some differences voiced as to the means to be employed, there has been an unprecedented unanimity as to the necessity for taking steps toward increasing the flow of capital goods from our shores, and thereby stemming the unfavorable tide of our balance of payments.

Last year our balance of payments improved considerably, and much credit for this is due to the terrific job the Department of Commerce has done under the able direction of Secretary Hodges. It has been most gratifying to see the Commerce Department rapidly implement into its programs suggestions made by the Congress, sometimes even before they have taken the form of legislation.

During the first session of this Congress, the Senate passed and sent on to the House S. 1729, a bill which I introduced, and on which I presided during the hearings held by the Committee on Commerce. This bill contains a number of means by which the Commerce Department can aid in the promotion of exports. Although S. 1729 is still in committee in the other body, I have recently learned that most of its provisions concerning the Department of Commerce have already been implemented, so far as is possible under existing legislation.

Among the improvements which the Department has already put into effect are: greater emphasis at trade fairs on selling American goods, rather than the old practice of demonstrating products which were beyond the means or needs of the countries involved; the establishment of permanent trade centers overseas—there is now such a center in London, one will open soon in Bangkok, and two more are planned for Frankfurt and Tokyo; more efficient and expanded use of trade missions; and an increase in the services offered to American businessmen in the export field by Commerce Department representatives both here and overseas.

There is, however, at least one further means of increasing exports which the Commerce Department has not adopted to date. This is in the use of trade-fair ships, which would provide a means for exhibiting our products in port cities throughout the world. Basically, this ship would carry the products of small businesses, which cannot afford to set up their own agencies overseas, but for whom great markets remain untapped. Last year, 20 Senators, myself included, joined in sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 73, a bill to provide for the establishment and use of such trade-fair ships. My own bill, S. 1729, was amended to include enabling legislation for such an enterprise, in hope of earlier action.

Regrettably, however, our hopes did not reach fruition, and the trade-fair ship has remained on the drawing board so far as the United States is concerned. I repeat, we do not have any trade ships, but that is not to say that other nations have failed to make use of this valuable means of increasing exports.

An article in the New York Times of April 1 describes the activities of Japan in this field. The Japanese are now building a new 12,000-ton vessel to be used as a trade-fair ship, having already sent three other ships on similar missions in alternate years since 1956. If we need proof of the practical value of traveling trade fairs, Japan, one of the greatest trading nations of the world, has offered it to us by its own example. I feel that the Times article is of interest to all of us, and I shall ask that it be included as part of my remarks.

I have requested the Department of Commerce to look into this matter and, by checking with their personnel overseas, determine how efficient and practical this venture by Japan has been. I hope that from the evidence so obtained we will have a basis for going forward with plans of our own.

The United States cannot leave unexplored any avenue for increasing our exports, and it is my intention to pursue this question of the value of trade-fair ships until I am satisfied as to its worth to the United States. If, as I now am inclined to believe, it is a practical and efficient means of demonstrating and selling American goods, then there is no reason why we, the world's greatest trading nation, should not launch our own fleet of trade-fair ships to open new ports to American products.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD in connection with these remarks the article from the New York Times of April 1, 1962, in regard to the Japanese development of trade-fair ships.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN DEVELOPS TRADE-FAIR SHIP—NEW "SAKURA MARU" WILL BE READY FOR FALL CRUISE

A sleek new funnelless Japanese liner, the 12,000-ton *Sakura* (Cherry Blossom) *Maru*, will go on cruise next fall and winter as a showcase for the promotion of Japan's oversea trade.

The 515-foot motor vessel is being built for the Japan Industry Floating Fair Association. On her first voyage she will visit 12 ports in the Near East and in Africa.

Her trip, which will last from November 12 to March 6, when she is due to return to Kobe, Japan, has been officially designated the Fourth Japan Industry Fair. The tour will be made under the auspices of Japan's Ministries of International Trade and Industry, Foreign Affairs and Transportation.

EXTENSIVE DISPLAY FACILITIES

Display facilities aboard ship include 430 booths, each of 355 square feet, in three exhibition halls. About 10,000 items of machinery, durable consumer goods and textiles will be displayed. A trade mission of 100 persons will accompany the ship.

Japan's newest seagoing trade fair—Tokyo has sent three other ships on similar missions in alternate years since 1956—will visit Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Turkey, Greece, Morocco, Tunisia, Libya, the United Arab Republic, Sudan, Tanganyika, and Kenya.

The *Sakura Maru*, which is costing about $5,850,000 to build, is now being completed at the Kobe yard of the Mitsubishe Heavy Industries, Reorganized, Ltd. She will have a 17.6-knot speed.

By present plans, the ship, after completing other trade promotion voyages through 1964, will be used as a passenger liner on a Japan-Brazilian run. In this service she will be operated by OSK (Osaka Shosen Kaisha) Line, primarily as an immigrant carrier.

The *Sakura Maru* will have air conditioned accommodations for about 1,000 passengers, the majority of whom will be carried in dormitory spaces. She will also have a small cabin and tourist class.

U.S. MEASURE IN CONGRESS

In contrast to Japan's use of floating fairs for the promotion of export trade, U.S. moves in this direction have been rare.

One ship line, the Isbrandtsen Co., Inc., has been sponsoring privately a program under which a limited number of display containers have been transported aboard its 'round-the-world cargo ships for showing at port of calls en route.

Legislation is pending in Congress that would make available one or more ocean-going Government-owned vessels that could be converted to display the products of American industry and agriculture.

The measure, introduced in January by Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois Democrat, has been indorsed by maritime industry and maritime labor spokesmen. It has been referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but no action has been taken on the bill so far.

PLATFORM OF ILLINOIS YOUNG REPUBLICAN COLLEGE FEDERATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Young Republican College Federation of Illinois met in convention at Peoria, Ill., on February 17, 1962, and there adopted a platform. This document merits wide currency and I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that it be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLATFORM OF ILLINOIS YOUNG REPUBLICAN COLLEGE FEDERATION PASSED IN CONVENTION AT PEORIA, ILL., FEBRUARY 17, 1962

PREAMBLE

We, the members of the Illinois Young Republican College Federation, do herein declare the basic fundamental principles of the Republican Party to be:

That in accordance with the natural rights and dignity of the individual, he should be free of all unduly restrictive governmental forces;

That the natural rights of man are embodied in the Constitution of the United States and that the role of Government is to uphold and perpetuate these constitutional rights;

That international communism represents the most immediate and dangerous threat to these fundamental rights and must be defeated and supplanted by Western democratic ideals; and

That the safest repository for these rights lies in a public, well-educated, operating in a free economy, and protected by powerful defenses and a vigorous foreign policy.

To implement these principles, we offer the following platform:

AGRICULTURE

We believe that the farm crisis, caused by excessive Government intervention, calls for a realistic settlement. Our goal is an agricultural economy governed by the natural laws of supply and demand. Believing that this plan and only this plan can relieve the burden on the American taxpayer, and solve the problems of low farm commodity prices, overproduction, and an equitable share of the nation's net income for the farmer, we propose:

To continue to favor policies which will provide an orderly adjustment of agricultural production to fit our needs. We will support programs designed to bring about an orderly and definite liquidation of Commodity Credit Corporation surplus stocks. Such programs should provide only limited government control and direction and should allow the farmer to make his own operating decisions.

To support programs and policies to further expand our domestic and foreign markets for agricultural products. We support Public Law 480 and the broadening of its scope. We emphasize that these efforts be tied to the long-range development of dollar markets for our products.

To support continued emphasis on research. This includes research on new crops, new products, consumer demand, and new processing, packaging and promotion methods that will assist in enlarging our markets.

To recognize farm production needs and to liquidate the Commodity Credit Corporation. We support a practical land retirement program which will recognize the right of the farmer to make a choice in the acceptance of such a program as to the most effective way to eliminate this excess on total cropland and not just submarginal lands.

To support a plan for voluntary resettlement for farmers and their families who wish to seek employment in other fields.

To oppose all measures of rigid production quotas and rigid price supports. We believe these seriously hamper foreign trade advantages for this country and tend to add to the gravity of the internal crisis.

To commend Illinois' 20th District Congressman, PAUL FINDLEY, and to vigorously support his plan to utilize the principle of payment-in-kind to reduce our staggering farm surplus. We endorse the Republican Party's plan for creating a strategic food reserve for national emergencies and the strengthening of the food-for-peace program. We laud the valuable work done by the American Farm Bureau Federation in preserving conservative principles in American agriculture.

ECONOMIC POLICY

We believe that the free market economy is a sound and growing economy, that a free economy is necessary for preserving individual liberty, and that only this freedom can be ultimately successful in waging the cold war against communism.

We favor the growth of private enterprise. To this end we encourage corporate expansion by an increase of depreciation allowances. Also, we favor holding the limit on capital gains taxes with an effort toward eventual reduction of this tax.

We favor constant effort toward devising a more incentive-encouraging tax structure.

We oppose any increase in the present national debt limit of $300 billion.

We favor taking positive steps to improve the dollar's value abroad by fighting inflation at home.

We favor the continued independence of the Federal Reserve Board.

We favor the removal of the ceiling on long-term Federal Treasury bonds to shift investment emphasis from the short-term to the long-term bonds.

We favor relating wages in production to productivity in order to maintain our competitive position at home and abroad.

We favor across the board tariff reductions as proposed originally by the European Common Market rather than selective tariff cuts. However, we deplore the proposed usurpation by the executive branch of the constitutional function of Congress to determine national foreign trade policy.

We favor keeping expenditures less than revenues except in times of war or economic adversity.

We favor maintaining the current depletion allowance rates on national resources.

EDUCATION

We affirm that the success of a workable and effective government is in direct proportion to the extent of the education of its people. Realizing further the increased demands being placed on American education by the increased complexity of modern society, we recommend the following, with respect to education in America:

We believe that the financing and responsibility for education is primarily a local concern, and as such, should be handled on the local level rather than on the Federal level.

We feel that the present aid to private schools should not be increased in scope.

We recommend that the individual should be allowed a deduction from Federal income tax equal to the amount paid for local school taxes, and that the individual be allowed a deduction from his Federal taxable income equal to the amount paid for college tuition.

We demand that American education be subjected to a critical evaluation with the express objective of modification in such a manner as to raise intellectual achievement at all levels.

We favor the desegregation of public schools. However, we object to attempts by the Federal Government to circumvent the 10th amendment to the Constution of the United States by interfering with the right of State and local governments to determine educational policies within their jurisdictions.

We affirm that as students attending the February 1962 Seventh Annual Convention of the Illinois Young Republican College Federation, by a vote of 122 to 9, with 9 abstentions, declare that the National Student Association (NSA) does not speak for us.

We urge that the students of all colleges and universites in Illinois seriously consider the value of continued membership in NSA.

In the light of our own evaluation, we further recommend that all colleges and universities in Illinois withdraw from NSA.

FOREIGN POLICY

We believe that the purpose of American foreign policy must be to maintain freedom for the American people, to hearten and fortify the love of freedom everywhere, and above all, to work for a just peace among nations of freemen.

We maintain that the United States is engaged in a war with the international forces of communism and that we must take the offensive toward winning that war. We assert that the sole criterion for judging foreign policy is whether or not that proposed policy will further the just interests of the United States. To implement this policy, we state the following:

Realizing that no nation can purchase friendship and respect on the world market, we advocate limiting foreign aid to those anti-Communist nations which will use the funds and military assistance for the furthering of freedom and strengthening of the free world alliance; not to those countries which use it to build a Socialist superstate.

We oppose U.S. participation in any form of summit conference with Communist rulers unless there are preliminary negotiations which lead to sound progress toward the goal of freedom and peace.

We support U.S. membership in the United Nations.

We urge that the Congress of the United States conduct a thorough investigation, with public hearings, to determine the facts about the U.N. operations in the Congo, Cuba and Goa, and the bearing of the U.N. conduct in general on the security and interests of the United States.

Since the U.N. has proved ineffective in keeping peace in the world and has used aggressive force in the domestic affairs of the Congo in opposition to the anti-Communist government of Katanga; and since the U.N., in its inconsistency, made no attempt to save the Portuguese colony of Goa from Indian aggression; and since the United States already pays more than one-third of the costs of the U.N., which is now in dire financial straits, we urge that the U.S. Congress reject the Democratic administration's proposal to buy U.N. bonds.

We favor the retention of the Connally reservation to U.S. membership in the world court, maintaining that it is the sovereign right of any nation to determine the nature of its own domestic concerns.

We reaffirm our belief in the cause of those peoples of Eastern Europe, Asia and Latin America who have been subjugated to the godless force of communism. We advocate the use of every peaceful and practical means toward regaining their independence from Communist domination. We favor the use of such instruments as U.N. observers whenever revolutions, such as that in Hungary during 1956, break out.

An overpopulation threat jeopardizes the stability of certain pro-Western countries. Therefore, we recommend that research data regarding this problem be given to friendly nations requesting it.

We advocate the strengthening of and continued participation in such collective security alliances as SEATO, NATO and CENTO.

We reaffirm our belief in and the defense of the Monroe Doctrine, and will oppose, with force if necessary, the undesired intrusion of any non-Western Hemisphere nation into the internal affairs of any American nation. To implement this, we support participation in the Organization of American States.

Since Fidel Castro and the government of Cuba is admittedly Communist, and since there is visual proof of the Communist jet and missile buildup in Cuba, and because the United States is the leader of the freedom-loving nations in the Western Hemisphere, we believe that the United States should actively support by all means—economic, political and/or military—the overthrow of that regime.

We unalterably oppose the admission to the United Nations or the diplomatic recognition of Red China. We recognize the government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek as the only lawful government of the Chinese people. We emphatically deny that the American people accept or ever intend to accept the status quo in China.

We propose to meet any infringement of the sovereignty or freedom of West Berlin with military force and reaffirm our support for the reunification of Germany under a free, democratic government. We emphatically deny that the American people accept or ever intend to accept the status quo in Germany.

We believe that the United States should "knock down" the Berlin wall.

We hereby support all programs for counterguerrilla action in North Vietnam in order to defend Laos and South Vietnam.

In the war of words with the Communist empire, we advocate taking the offensive, using such Communist crimes as the downing of American fliers to their fullest American propaganda value, and exchanging verbal attack for verbal attack.

We call upon the Congress to submit a constitutional amendment to the States to protect the constitutional rights of the people and the sovereign States from abuses by treaties and other international agreements.

LABOR

We affirm that the Republican Party has fought for laws which would help labor unions become more representative and responsible institutions, and we feel that the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts are a step in the direction of establishing labor-management on a sounder basis.

But we are of the opinion that further action is needed to protect American workers in their rights.

Therefore, we recommend that all union elections be conducted by secret ballot, and that free disclosure of union finances for the benefit of dues-paying members be required.

We demand protection of union members from any compulsory individual political assessments by the union. This does not include donations from the general fund voted upon in secret ballot by the membership.

We support the right of any individual to choose his own bargaining agent without compulsion by public law or private agreement to belong to any association in order to earn a living.

We favor the outlawing of all secondary boycotts and coercive blackmail picketing not covered by the Landrum-Griffin Act.

We believe that management should have the sole prerogative to lay off workers where technological advances make the workers unnecessary.

We favor the joint responsibility of labor and management to provide for the retraining of the individual worker.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

It is not only appropriate that Americans assert their unswerving devotion to the cause of honor and liberty, but that they be prepared to rally to the defense of liberty in a world threatened by the ever-marching forces of Communist imperialism.

Since our mutual security alliances (such as SEATO, NATO, etc.) are the keystones to America's worldwide defense network, we advocate the intensified participation and contribution of the United States, both economically and militarily, in these mutual security alliances in order that those nations willing to defend the cause of freedom be given the means to do so. We advocate the divergence of U.S. funds from support of U.N. military activities to the task of beefing up the military power of those nations definitely committed to defending our mutual interests.

We assert that America must have a defense posture second to none. America must increase her military capability, both in conventional as well as nuclear weapons, in order that we may successfully wage brushfire wars as well as retain nuclear capacity to retaliate instantly and annihilate any potential aggressor anywhere on the face of the globe.

We believe that the testing and development of nuclear weapons is vital to the national security interests of the United States. We advocate taking all necessary steps toward maintaining America's nuclear superiority over the Communist bloc. We favor the immediate resumption of atmospheric testing. We call for America's continued exploration of outer space.

We very strongly commend the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for their vital work in exposing Communist infiltration and subversion of American institutions. We maintain that America's greatest bulwark against foreign tyranny and oppression is the love of individual liberty indelibly rooted in the hearts of the American people.

JOSEPH KENNEDY'S CHICAGO MART TO RAISE RENTS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, in yesterday's Wall Street Journal there appeared an article under the heading "Joseph Kennedy's Chicago Mart To Raise Some Rents."

The article states, in part:

> The Merchandise Mart, owned by President Kennedy's father, is boosting some rents 3 percent to 5 percent on renewals of expiring leases.

I should like to inquire of the acting majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], whether he has called this development to the attention of the Department of Justice for appropriate action.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Excuse me?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like to ask the acting majority leader whether he has called this development to the attention of the Department of Justice for appropriate action.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to my colleague from Idaho, most respectfully, I am sure both the President and the Attorney General, who are avid newspaper readers, have undoubtedly read that story and have made appropriate referral and comment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. They have not made any public statements yet, have they?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to my friend that the time will come—and I hope the Senator will tune in to the President's press conference. In case the Senator did not know it, there may be a few other places to rent space besides the Merchandise Mart.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Of course, this development has a profound effect upon inflation in the great city of Chicago. Knowing of the keen interest of the Department of Justice in taking remedial action, I certainly shall hopefully anticipate that something will be done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that every officer of this Government will read the Senator's words with great care and attention, and that all possible remedial action will be taken.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If they pay as little attention in the future as they have in the past, I can assure my good friend from Minnesota that no cognizance will be taken of the words, and no action, likewise.

RESOLUTIONS SET FORTH RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION VIEWS ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, within recent days the Reserve Officers Association of the United States met in Washington, D.C., and considered various issues relating to national defense. Their findings I believe to be of considerable interest to the Congress.

The ROA has been in existence since 1922; its principal objective is "to support a military policy for the United States that will provide adequate national security and to promote the development and execution thereof." The contributions by ROA to the national defense have been so significant over the years that in 1950 the Congress issued a charter to the association, and today it remains as one of the outstanding, highly motivating patriotic organizations, with special knowledge, experience, and industry. We are aware that our congressional committees always welcome the views of ROA on matters relating to national defense, of which ROA's representatives have particular knowledge.

As national legislative chairman of the Reserve Officers Association, I believe the findings expressed in resolutions by the organization will be of assistance to Members of the Congress in considering legislation bearing on national defense.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a number of resolutions adopted at the midwinter conference in 1962 of the Reserve Officers Association.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL MIDWINTER MEETING, MARCH 2, 1962, WASHINGTON, D.C.

(Adopted by the national council and attested by John E. Harlin, national president and John J. Carlton, executive director)

STATEMENT OF POLICY

It is the policy of the national resolutions committee that in this critical hour in our country's history, when we are beset by enemies from without and cannot but observe their insidious boring from within, your resolutions committee feels it is time to weigh with infinite care and thoughtful consideration what expressions emanate from this annual meeting of the national council of this association. Let us bear in mind in all our deliberations that the objective of this association is, above all, the support for and provision of an adequate national security for these United States. Keeping this objective always before us, let us devote ourselves to those things which directly and undeniably contribute to the effectiveness of that security, and let us not permit considerations of personal interest, of minor annoyance, or of inconsequential merit, to divert us from the requisite devotion to the association's true and indeed sole objective.

Proposed by resolutions committee.

CONTINUED SUPPORT OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

Whereas there has become evident in recent months a tendency to downgrade and reduce the role and effectiveness of the Reserve Forces; and

Whereas despite our appreciation and strenuous support of the Regular components of our Armed Forces, the urgent necessity for whose continuance in strength and effectiveness we do not question, we still urge that such strength and effectiveness can and should be maintained without detriment to the strength and effectivness of the Reserve components: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That it urge upon the Congress the continued full-scale support of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

Proposed by department of Washington.

STABILIZATION OF THIS NATION'S MILITARY PROGRAMS

Whereas there have been during the past several years frequent fluctuations in strength, goals, programs and organizational policies in the military services, including the Reserve Forces; and

Whereas these developments have created uncertainties, instability, and consequent loss of effectiveness in the Nation's military structure; and

Whereas many of these proposed changes and reorganizations appear to ignore sound personnel policies, realistic military needs and sound principles of military leadership, where confidence, loyalty, and assurance of good faith produce highest morale, and hence maximum effectiveness; and

Whereas many of these fluctuating policies which allegedly have been designed to save money, in practice have proven to be extravagant and demonstrably wasteful, not only in money but in manpower, morale, facilities and equipment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That it urge that steps be taken without delay by the Congress, the Department of Defense and the military services to stabilize the Nation's military programs, as to both Regulars and Reserves, as one of the essential requirements of a sound national defense policy.

Proposed by resolutions committee.

EXPENDITURE OF RESERVE FORCES TRAINING FUNDS

Whereas moneys appropriated by the Congress for the training of Reserve components of the Armed Forces have not always been expended in the amounts and for the purposes stated in the appropriations but have in some instances been withheld and in others reallocated by or under the authority of the Department of Defense for other purposes; and

Whereas funds appropriated by the Congress for the training of the Reserve Forces have been diverted to maintain the Regular military establishments by charging against said funds the cost of certain training facilities and equipment supplied by said establishments; and

Whereas the effect of nonexpenditure of the entire amount of such appropriated funds for the purposes specified in the congressional appropriations has been to reduce the training activities within the Reserve Forces and to weaken the said forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That every means be taken to correct such practices and that the association urge Congress to provide, by law:

1. That all of the funds appropriated for the Reserve Forces shall be expended for the purposes specified in such appropriations and for no other purpose;

2. That the military departments be expressly prohibited from making any charge against funds appropriated for the support of the Reserve Forces for use by the said forces of facilities of any kind or type that is in use in their training other than items procured for the exclusive use of the Reserve Forces or direct costs incurred in the utilization of these facilities by the Reserve Forces; and

3. That the authority of the Secretary of Defense to reallocate funds be restricted to deny him the power to expend, for other objects, any funds appropriated for the support and training of the Reserve Forces.

Proposed by department of California.

SUPPORT OF DOD CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Whereas the nations of the world are confronted with a nuclear war stalemate; and

Whereas to be credible our defense posture must insure the will and the ability to survive an aggressor's attack; and

Whereas the President of the United States has directed that the civil defense of our Nation be the responsibility of the Department of Defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That it support the Department of Defense in their program to conduct a national shelter survey.

Proposed by Navy affairs section.

RECALL DEFERMENTS

Whereas a trained, callable and answerable Reserve is an essential weapon in the stockpile of any nation seeking to exist without reliance on vast standing armies; and

Whereas to insure the training of this Reserve, the Congress of the United States has, upon the urging of the Reserve Officers Association and other dedicated groups, enacted over the years a vast body of preparedness legislation, including pay and retirement privileges for the personnel composing this Reserve; and

Whereas it is a basic principle that men and women so trained and so paid shall, at whatever personal sacrifice, stand ready to serve when exigencies dictate their call to active military duty; and

Whereas any failure to answer such call, or effort to evade it, casts grave doubt on the integrity and reliability of the Reserve for whose training the national has paid: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That each Member of Congress be made aware of this association's intolerance of anything but the firmest policy, both legislative and regulatory, in dealing with any efforts by Reserve personnel, their employers, their families or their representatives in Congress, to evade, in time of national crisis, the call to active service for which the Reserve has been organized, trained and paid in peacetime years.

Proposed by Navy affairs section.

OGLA EQUALIZATION

Whereas the Armed Forces are faced by a situation under the OGLA (Officer Grade Limitation Act) which results in seriously unequal career opportunity for active duty officers of the services; and

Whereas the Department of Defense has sponsored a review including this matter by an ad hoc committee to study and revise the Officer Personnel Act of 1947; and

Whereas the committee has made recommendations which would provide substantially equal career opportunities to all active duty officers of the military services; and

Whereas the Congress has recognized the need and desirability of legislation in this regard in the passage of temporary relief measures; and

Whereas, unless permanent legislation embodying the full tables of authorization recommended by the committee is passed in the next session of the Congress, the promotions of officers on active duty in the Armed Forces will be impeded or, in the case of Active Reserve officers, prevented after 1 July, 1962: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Reserve Officers Association recommends approval by the Department of Defense of the revised table of authorization in the report of the ad hoc committee, and that the Congress enact legislation to revise or replace the Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954 as recommended by the committee.

Proposed by Air Force affairs section.

ALLOWANCES FOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Whereas the Reserve Officers Association of the United States is deeply concerned with the state of morale among the enlisted personnel in the Armed Forces; and

Whereas we are convinced that the present scale of pay and allowances for enlisted personnel with family responsibilities is such as often to cause actual privation to the family and to be a disturbing concern to the enlisted man concerned; and

Whereas a study of the pay and allowances of the Armed Forces has been ordered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That the association commend and encourage this effort to establish an adequate and equitable scale of enlisted pay and allowances.

Proposed by department of California.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RESPONSIBILITY PAY

Whereas the Congress has enacted legislation authorizing a special pay for certain military personnel in positions of unusual responsibility, which special pay is known as responsibility pay; and

Whereas the retention of officers in certain specialties in some of the services is inadequate; and

Whereas proposals have been advanced for special pays for officer personnel in positions of various degrees of unusual responsibility or of a critical nature; and

Whereas it would appear unlikely that the Congress will give serious consideration to new pay proposals for positions of a critical nature until existing authority has been utilized and found inadequate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That it recommend that the Department of Defense implement in the most practicable manner the authority contained in the Military Pay Act of 1958 to pay responsibility pay to officers in positions of unusual responsibility or of a critical nature.

Proposed by Air Force affairs section.

INCREASED TRAVEL ALLOWANCES FOR MILITARY MEMBERS

Whereas the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, authorizes members of the uniformed services to receive a per diem, in lieu of subsistence, of not to exceed $12; and

Whereas recent studies by Government agencies have revealed that the total average cost of the subsistence items on which the per diem is based is well above $12; and

Whereas the Department of Defense has sponsored a proposal to increase the maximum per diem allowance to an amount equal to that enacted for civilian employees of Government; and

Whereas the House of Representatives has passed a bill, H.R. 7723, which would accomplish this object: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Reserve Officers Association recommend the enactment of this legislation.

Proposed by Air Force affairs section.

PRESS RELEASES AFFECTING UNITS ALERTED FOR MOBILIZATION

Whereas the immediate release of information to the press, by the Department of Defense, concerning the alerting of USAR units to extended active duty, has caused much embarrassment, confusion, and misunderstanding by all concerned, including the general public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army are petitioned to delay public release of all information concerning units, their designations, mobilization stations, and other pertinent facts affecting such units until such time as the Army, corps, and unit commanders have been informed.

Proposed by the Army affairs section.

DISABILITY RETIREMENT PROCEDURES

Whereas AR 40-501, December 1960, entitled "Standards of Medical Fitness," is now used by Army physical evaluation boards as the basis for evaluation of physical condition for physical disability retirements, and is proposed to be similarly used by the other armed services; and

Whereas in the manner in which it is being applied, the minimum requirements for disability retirement are separate and not cumulative, and no overall evaluation is considered to be disabling, even though a whole series of disabilities may be involved, so long as disability retirement is not achieved under one particular diagnosis; and

Whereas this procedure is contrary to the dictates of sound medical practice, under which a man's total physical condition must be considered in order to evaluate his capacity for military service; and

Whereas the effect of this procedure is not only to frustrate meritorious cases deserving disability retirement, but also to load the Army rolls with personnel arbitrarily removed from the normal MOS for which qualified, and thus to make inevitable their early separation by reason of assignment to sedentary tasks for which they are unfitted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That it urge a critical review both of the provisions of AR 40-501, and of the manner in which they are being applied, with a view to the correction of inequities; and be it further

Resolved, That the Departments of Navy and Air Force be asked to refrain from adopting similar regulations in this area pending the review above suggested.

Proposed by committee on retirement.

MINIMUM ACTIVE ARMY STRENGTH

Whereas the President of the United States and other national leaders have indicated that the current cold war may last for a generation; and

Whereas our military stature must be based on long range needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That this association strongly support the continued maintenance of an Active Army of not less than 1 million officers and men.

Proposed by Army affairs section.

DELAYED EFFECTUATION OF PENDING ARMY RESERVE REORGANIZATION DURING STUDY THEREOF BY CONGRESS

Whereas the Secretary of Defense has announced a forthcoming drastic reorganization of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard; and

Whereas this program was not prepared by the Army's General Staff Committees on Army Reserve Policy and Army National Guard Policy, as required by law; and

Whereas after complaint by the Chairman of the General Staff Committee on Army Reserve Policy, the Secretary of Defense belatedly presented this program to the General Staff Committees on Army Reserve and Army National Guard Policy, and set a 30-day deadline for final recommendations from these bodies; and

Whereas the House Armed Services Committee chairman, the Honorable CARL VINSON, has assigned to subcommittee No. 3, under the chairmanship of the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, the task of a study of the Army Reserve program, which study cannot be completed for some months, and which study is clearly doomed to be abortive if the program announced by the Secretary of Defense is carried out without consultation with the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That we urge upon the Congress and upon the Secretary of Defense, that effectuation of any such plan of Reserve reorganization as announced be deferred until such time as the Armed Services Committees of Senate and House shall have examined that program, and shall have had an opportunity to exercise their constitutional authority thereon.

Proposed by resolutions committee.

RETENTION OF USAR DIVISIONS

Whereas the present crisis, necessitating a current buildup of military strength, has clearly demonstrated the need for organized, manned, trained and equipped USAR divisions and the dependence of our military posture on such USAR units; and

Whereas the elimination of any USAR divisions would significantly impair the combat effectiveness of our Nation's defense forces; and

Whereas a general mobilization or war would require an increase in the number of divisions available for deployment; and

Whereas the Department of the Army has indicated intentions to eliminate or reduce in stature a number of USAR divisions from the troop program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army be urged to abandon any plans for the reorganization or realinement of the Army Reserve component troop unit basis, which would reduce the number of USAR divisions available for the defense of this country; and be it further

Resolved, That the Department of Defense and Department of the Army be also urged to discard any plans for the reduction of any USAR division for deployment as command headquarters for nondivisional units.

Proposed by Army affairs section.

REQUEST THAT CALL TO ACTIVE DUTY NOT DETER ACTIONS FOR PROMOTION OF RESERVIST

Whereas message (unclassified) DA 576132, AGPR-AP, DA October 9, 1961, provides for officers assigned to USAR units alerted for active duty who have been considered by a Reserve Selection Board prior to the effective date of the order to active duty of the unit and have been recommended for promotion to fill unit vacancies will be promoted to the recommended grades and will enter on active duty with their units in such grades; and

Whereas above-mentioned message does not provide for recommendations for promotion of officers to fill unit vacancies on which selection board action has not been completed prior to the effective date of the order to active duty of the unit (in such cases, the officers concerned will be ordered to active duty in the grade in which serving on the effective date of the order to active duty of the unit): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That action be taken to prevent penalizing the unit and nonunit officers who are eligible for recommendation for promotion and selection board action not completed and those officers who will become eligible for promotion while serving on active duty, to be eligible for consideration for promotion and selection.

Proposed by department of Indiana.

FLEET AUGMENTATION COMPONENT (SURFACE)

Whereas the current mobilization order eliminates the ASW component of the selected Reserve; and

Whereas by this action the fleet augmentation component will be deprived of the use of these ships in the active duty for training phase of their training. Fleet ships will have to provide these services. Experience has indicated that the availability of fleet ships is such that most of the training they provide takes place alongside the dock; and

Whereas the fleet augmentation component is the most important element of the selected Reserve in the event of an outbreak of hostilities. Active duty for training is the most important phase of their training for the maintenance of the skills they have acquired while on active duty; and

Whereas the group I ships of the selected Reserve are operational and have an excellent state of readiness in ASW. They are immediately available to the fleet with their reduced crews and can be made available promptly with their full crews: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That it be recommended to the Navy Department that the DD's of the group I ships be returned in their reduced status to the Naval Reserve program, or that similar ships be provided for use primarily for the training of the Naval Reserve.

Proposed by Navy affairs section.

INITIAL ASSIGNMENTS OF NEWLY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS TO SEA DUTY

Whereas the fleet augmentation component of the selected Reserve must provide qualified officers and men for the fleet without postmobilization training; and

Whereas only those officers who are professionally qualified as line officers are eligible for assignment to the fleet augmentation component; and

Whereas many young officers return from active duty without having been to sea and are consequently not eligible for assignment to the fleet augmentation component; and

Whereas the NROTC and ROC programs are specifically designed to meet the requirements of the Naval Reserve program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That it urge the Chief of Naval Personnel to require all NROTC and ROC officers to perform their initial active duty assignments in ships of the fleet.

Proposed by Navy affairs section.

ADEQUATE MODERN AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS

Whereas many of our weaker, more distant, and less stable allies which are threatened with conquest through Communist-led guerrillas, insurgents and subversion are located in areas of the world where we have no fixed bases or adequate airfields; and

Whereas in those cases it is most necessary that our capability to wage conventional war be strengthened; and

Whereas the heaviest responsibility for carrying out U.S. policy in those limited war situations rests upon the U.S. fleet and its amphibious force; and

Whereas the Marine Corps and the U.S. Army have developed new and modern techniques in projecting power ashore which require newer, faster and especially equipped shipping to accommodate the vertical assault concept with its helicopters, special equipment and weapons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That the U.S. Navy be provided sufficient additional funds to procure more and modern amphibious ships.

Proposed by Navy affairs section.

INCREASE U.S. SEALIFT CAPACITY

Whereas a nuclear stalemate will lead to great probability of localized aggression by Communist forces, of limited wars and of Communist fomented unrest in allied nations overseas, as in Laos and South Vietnam today; and

Whereas such limited military conflicts may suddenly erupt in any part of the world without warning; and

Whereas sealift in adequate volume is the prime necessity for the movement and support of limited war forces overseas, either of the United States or of our allies; and

Whereas it will become a race against time to quickly deploy relatively large numbers of troops and equipment to threatened areas overseas; and

Whereas it is necessary that we have in existence at the commencement of any war of whatever nature an adequate fleet of ships for the task of lifting troops and supplies to our farflung bases and allies overseas, without which support those bases and allies would be endangered; and

Whereas the Military Sea Transportation Service existing capability even when augmented by ships reactivated from the National Reserve Fleet and commercial sources does not suffice to meet military sealift requirements in certain critical categories of shipping; and

Whereas the Military Sea Transportation Service nuclear fleet ships are becoming progressively obsolescent because of insufficient funds appropriated for replacing outdated ships: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association, That it urge the Department of Defense to give priority consideration to increasing the capability of the Military Sea Transportation Service to provide vitally needed sealift by the construction of modern, high speed transports.

Proposed by Navy affairs section.

SUPPORT OF NAVY'S OCEANOGRAPHY PROGRAM

Whereas we are largely devoid of scientific knowledge on underwater currents, temperature gradients, and bottom sediment of the oceans of the world; and

Whereas the advent of nuclear-powered submarines has made ASW even more complex; and

Whereas the oceans of the world may well become the battle area of the future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That the association in national conference vigorously supports the Navy's plan to conduct increased activity in the field of oceanography.

Proposed by Navy affairs section.

AFRO-ASIAN OCEAN FLEET

Whereas international communism, as exemplified by aggression in Laos and South Vietnam, is threatening the very existence of the free and democratic nations of southeast Asia and east Africa; and

Whereas it is the demonstrated tactic of international communism to attack these smaller and weaker countries by political subversion, infiltration of arms, and fifth column elements leading to direct internal armed aggression by Communist forces; and

Whereas there is a very real need to effectively support our free world allies in the South East Asia Treaty Organization and the Control Treaty Organization; and

Whereas those weaker countries most directly threatened by Communist forces are readily accessible from the adjoining oceans; and

Whereas the eviction of the United States from oversea bases will greatly reduce our ability to quickly respond to aggression in the newly developed nations; and

Whereas this weakness can be effectively offset by a U.S. Navy task force operating in these ocean areas; and

Whereas a United States-Afro-Asian fleet would provide the capacity to intervene favorably for the protection of U.S. interests and support of friendly governments in this critical area of growing Communist infiltration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That—

(a) A United States-Afro-Asian fleet be established as a means of carrying out U.S. national policy and preventing Communist conquests in that area; and

(b) That the U.S. Navy be provided sufficient additional funds to procure the ships, aircraft, personnel, and logistic support for an Afro-Asian fleet.

Proposed by Navy affairs section.

WOMEN ON SELECTION BOARDS

Whereas considerable discontent has been expressed by women officers of the Naval Reserve concerning the practice of allowing only one woman Reserve officer on selection boards; and

Whereas it would be desirable and more equitable to increase the number of women officers on selection boards which consider them for promotions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That it request the Secretary of the Navy to increase to at least three the number of women Reserve Officers ordered to serve on Naval Reserve selection boards which consider women officers for selection for promotion.

Proposed by Navy affairs section.

ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. COAST GUARD

Whereas the current world situation has required a very positive increase in all military establishments, both regular and reserve; and

Whereas the mobilization requirement of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve (USCGR) has been established by appropriate authority at 39,600 Ready Reserve; and

Whereas this condition of readiness is over 10,000 short of its goal, due solely to a shortage of appropriated funds; and

Whereas the continued rising cost of operating the USCGR has not been balanced by adequate appropriations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That it urge the Secretary of Treasury to increase its Reserve training appropriations in sums adequate to build and sustain the USCGR program so as to meet the mobilization requirements of its Reserve and the Reserve Officers Association will support these additional requirements in the Congress.

Proposed by Navy affairs section.

FULL UTILIZATION OF AUTHORIZED RESERVE FUNDS

Whereas the Department of Defense has withheld, to date, authority to expend the $4 million appropriation provided by Congress for support of the Air Force Reserve recovery program for this fiscal year; and

Whereas the Department of Defense has undertaken a critical review of the Air Force Reserve recovery program, including the base support program, to determine whether there is a military requirement for the program; and

Whereas it is reported that part I positions in the Air Force Reserve may be discontinued in order to provide funds for support of the recovery and base support units: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That it fully supports the concept of the Air Force Reserve program, including the base support program; that approval by the Department of Defense for expenditure of appropriated funds to provide 48 paid drills annually for recovery units be urgently supported; and, that part I positions in the Air Force Reserve be maintained in sufficient numbers to support the war requirement of active units.

Proposed by Air Force affairs section.

PILOTS FOR RESERVE TROOP CARRIER WINGS

Whereas the requirement to maintain Ready Reserve flying units in being has been amply demonstrated by the recent order to active duty of such units by the President of the United States; and

Whereas the requirement to maintain the Ready Reserve is further substantiated by the inclusion of this force in Air Force emergency war plans; and

Whereas the rated officers required to properly man those units have in the past been obtained as volunteers from rated Reserve officers released from active duty; and

Whereas the actual future potential of such volunteer rated officers is represented by the less than 1,400 second lieutenant rated officers on active duty in the Air Force in May 1961, which figure also includes Regular Air Force officers and career Reserve officers, a figure woefully inadequate to meet the attrition and promotion losses in the Ready Reserve program; and

Whereas the Air Force has, in the past, recognized the requirement for pilot manning in the other Ready Reserve Force element, the Air National Guard, by providing this force with a quota for training 1,000 pilots exclusively for assignment to that Ready Reserve Force: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That the Department of the Air Force immediately make provision for the future pilot manning of Air Force Reserve flying units on a basis commensurate with what has already been provided for the Air National Guard, the other Ready Reserve Force flying element.

Proposed by Air Force affairs section.

COMMENDATION OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL GLENN AND THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the orbital flight of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, a Reserve officer now integrated into the regular establishment of the U.S. Marine Corps, has by the manner of its conduct and excellence of its performance brought great credit, not only to Colonel Glenn and all of his associates, but has also, with rare and dramatic simplicity, demonstrated to the whole world the vast vitality of the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Reserve Officers Association formally voices to Colonel Glenn and to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration a sincere "well done."

Proposed by fourth dimensional warfare committee.

COMMENDING RESERVE COMPONENTS FOR EXCELLENT PERFORMANCE IN 1961 CALLUP

Whereas the national president and staff of this association on December 22, 1961, published a white paper relating to the callup of Army, Navy, and Air Force Reserves in the autumn of 1961; and

Whereas this white paper was produced and distributed with a view to clarifying in the public mind the character and performance of the Nation's reservists, and the vital importance of their services, and was a factual and fully documented report on morale and patriotic spirit in which this peacetime callup was accepted and carried out by members of the Reserve components of our Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, That it endorse and commend the content and design of the white paper issued by this association on December 22, 1961, and be it further

Resolved, That the Reserve Officers Association commend the prompt, spirited and competent performance of the units and individual members of the Reserve Forces of the Army, Navy and Air Force in their response to a considered call to active duty by the President of the United States as an effective and necessary means to preservation of the peace.

Proposed by resolutions committee.

FOREST PRODUCTS ARE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, H.R. 10788, which is on the Senate Calendar, is identical to S. 3006, reported by the Agriculture Committee on April 4. I should like to call the Senate's attention to the Senate Report on S. 3006 which contains a discussion of forest products as "agricultural commodities."

Mr. President, Oregon is an agricultural State and lumber is Oregon's principal agricultural product. Oregonians are naturally disturbed when, on occasion, the right of lumber to be regarded or treated as an agricultural commodity is challenged. Yet, the Department of Agriculture has never before put this challenge to rest.

I therefore took the opportunity during the Agriculture Committee's consideration of S. 3006, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, to request the chairman to determine whether the phrase "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom" includes forest products.

I am most gratified to report that the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture has concluded that forestry is a part of agriculture and that forest products are agricultural commodities.

This conclusion was the product of an exhaustive review of the historic use of the terms "agriculture" and "agricultural commodities," both in Congress and in the courts, to apply to forestry and forest products. The General Counsel's opinion represents the first definitive attempt by the Department to formulate a general rule for the treatment of forest products within the scope of legislation affecting agriculture, and should foreclose any future suggestion that the term "agriculture" or "agricultural product" does not include forest products.

The committee report of S. 3006 endorses the General Counsel's opinion, expressly recognizing that "the committee has generally considered lumber as a product of an agricultural commodity."

I ask unanimous consent to have the opinion of the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1962.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: Mr. Stanton, counsel for your committee, has informed us that in considering S. 3006, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1854), the question has been raised as to whether the phrase "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom" includes timber and its products.

Section 204 is as follows:

"The President may, whenever he determines such action appropriate, negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products, and the President is authorized to issue regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of any such commodity, product, textiles, or textile products to carry out any such agreement. Nothing herein shall affect the authority provided under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933) as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854)."

Although we have not had time to examine the legislative history of this provision exhaustively, our study thus far indicates that such history does not give clear evidence of the intention of the Congress in this respect. In examining this question, therefore, we believe we must first determine the meaning of this phrase as the words therein have been generally construed.

Webster's New International Dictionary, second edition, defines agriculture as "The art or science of cultivating the ground, and raising and harvesting crops, often including also feeding, breeding and management of livestock; tillage; husbandry; farming; in a broader sense, the science and art of the production of plants and animals useful to man, including to a variable extent the preparation of these products for man's use and their disposal by marketing or otherwise. In the broad use it includes farming, horticulture, forestry, dairying, sugarmaking, etc."

Court decisions have adopted the foregoing definition of "agriculture" in defining agricultural commodities and products. *United States* v. *Turner Turpentine Co.* (111 F. 2d 400 (5th Cir. 1940)) involved the issue of whether labor performed in the production of gum from oleoresin by scarification of living pine trees and its processing into gum spirits of turpentine and gum resin was "agricultural labor" as used in the Social Security Act. The Social Security Act of 1935, as it read before the 1939 amendments, was the law before the court in this case and the term "agricultural labor" was not defined. In holding that Congress intended the term to have a comprehensive meaning so as to include tree products, the court said at page 404:

"When then, Congress in passing an act like the Social Security Act uses, in laying down a broad general policy of exclusion, a term of as general import as 'agricultural labor,' it must be considered that it used the term in a sense and intended it to have a meaning wide enough and broad enough to cover and embrace agricultural labor of any and every kind, as that term is understood in the various sections of the United States where the act operates. This does not mean, of course, that a mere local custom, which is in the face of the meaning of a general term used in an act, may be read into the act to vary its terms. It does mean, however, that when a word or term intended to have general application in an activity as broad as agriculture, has a wide meaning, it must be interpreted broadly enough to embrace in it all the kinds and forms of agriculture practiced where it operates, that its generality reasonably extends to. Definitions of 'agriculture' in standard texts and treatises and in decisions in these latter years have had the widest content. Funk & Wagnalls defines 'agriculture' as including horticulture, fruit raising, etc., 'because agriculture is the science that treats of the cultivation of the soil.' Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, 1935, declares that in a broader sense agriculture includes farming, horticulture, forestry, dairying, sugarmaking, etc. The Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th edition, 'Forestry as a Science,' declares: 'the science underlying the growing of timber crops is therefore nothing but a branch of general plant science,' while the Cyclopedia of American Agriculture says of forests, 'if agriculture is the raising of products from the land, then forestry is a part of agriculture' (vol. 2, p. 312). From the Encyclopedia Britannica article, on rosin production, we quote the following significant passage: 'The chief region of rosin production is the South Atlantic and Eastern Gulf States of the United States. American rosin is obtained from the turpentine of the swamp pine and of the loblolly pine. The main source of supply in Europe is the lands of the departments of Gironde and Landes in France, where the cluster pine is extensively cultivated.' An examination of the cases cited in 'Words and Phrases,' fifth series, volume 1, page 339 et seq., under agriculture and in 3 C.J.S., 'Agriculture,' pages 361, 365, and 366, section 1, under 'agricultural' and 'agriculture,' convinces that in modern usage this is a wide and comprehensive term and that statutes using it without qualification must be given an equally comprehensive meaning."

The *Turner Turpentine Co.* case was followed in *Stuart* v. *Kleck* (129 F. 2d 400 (9th Cir. 1942)), which also involved the definition of "agricultural labor" as used in the Social Security Act. In the following cases the courts adopted definitions of "products of the land," "agriculture," "agricultural purposes," "agricultural commodities," "agricultural products," or "agricultural labor," some as used in statutes, in the broad sense of things which are the result of husbandry and the cultivation of the soil (*Sancho* v. *Bowne*, 93 F. 2d 323 (1st Cir. 1937); *Lowe* v. *North Dakota Workman's Compensation Bureau*, 220 Wis. 701, 264 N.W. 837 (1936); *Forsythe* v. *Village of Cooksville*, 356 Ill. 289, 190 N.E. 421 (1934); In Re Rogers, 134 Neb. 832, 279 N.W. 800 (1938); *Getty* v. *C. R. Barnes Milling Co.*, 40 Kan. 281, 19 Pac. 617 (1888); *Florida Industrial Comm'n* v. *Growers Equipment Co.*, 152 Fla. 595, 12 So. 2d 889 (1943)).

Congress has recognized that the term "agricultural commodities" may include forest products. Section 207 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1091; 7 U.S.C. 1626) defines "agricultural products" to include "agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, and dairy products, livestock and poultry, bees, forest products, fish and shellfish, and any products thereof, including processed and manufactured products, and any and all products raised or produced on farms and any processed and manufactured products thereof."

Section 518 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (55 Stat. 256; amended, 7 U.S.C. 1518), defines "agricultural commodity" as "wheat, cotton, flax, corn, dry beans, oats, barley, rye, tobacco, rice, peanuts, soybeans, sugarbeets, sugarcane, timber and forests, potatoes and other vegetables, citrus and other fruits, tame hay."

Section 2 of the act of May 9, 1956 (70 Stat. 133; 12 U.S.C. 1841(g)), concerning bank holding companies, defines "agriculture" to include "farming in all its branches including fruitgrowing, dairying, the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, forestry or lumbering operations, and the production of naval stores, and operations directly related thereto."

Section 1 of the act of March 4, 1927 (44 Stat. 1423; as amended, 15 U.S.C. 431), concerning discrimination against farmers' cooperative associations by boards of trade, states that "agricultural products" "means agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, and dairy products, food products of livestock, the products of poultry and bee raising, the edible products of forestry, and any and all products raised or produced on farms and processed or manufactured products thereof, transported or intended to be transported in interstate and/or foreign commerce."

Section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1060; as amended, 29 U.S.C. 203(f)), defines "agriculture" to include "farming in all its branches and among other things includes the cultivation and tillage of the soil, dairying, the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodities (including commodities defined as agricultural commodities in section 1141j(g) of title 12), the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, and any practices (including any forestry or lumbering operations) performed by a farmer or on a farm as an incident to or in conjunction with such farming operations, including preparation for market, delivery to storage or to market or to carriers for transportation to market."

The present social security tax law, now known as the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, has an extensive definition of "agricultural labor," which includes expressly only some forest products such as naval stores (68A Stat. 447; 26 U.S.C. 3306(k)).

As may be seen, some of the definitions, for the immediate purposes involved in the legislation, include forestry products only in part. However, we believe even in these instances, this serves as an indication that where the terms "agricultural commodities" or "products thereof" are used without qualification it is reasonable to include timber in the concept.

We believe that in the historical development of public attention to the timber resources of this Nation the concept has long been that the growing of trees and the work of forestation and reforestation is a part of agriculture. It also appears to be a necessary corollary that timber is an agricultural commodity and that lumber is a product of such commodity. We have found a number of instances both past and present where this concept is expressed. We will quote a few of these.

In an annual report of the Secretary of the Interior (Ethan Allen Hitchcock) in 1901 the following is stated: [1]

"The keynote of the administration of the forest reserves should be to increase the value of the reserves to the public and to perpetuate their forests by wise use * * *. Forestry, dealing as it does with a source of wealth produced by the soil, is properly an agricultural subject."

Gifford Pinchot, Chief of the Bureau of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture in 1902, in a statement before the Agricultural Committee of the House, declared:

"Forestry is a component part of agriculture. Every source of wealth grown from the soil is in the sphere of the Department of Agriculture; hence the forestwork rightly belongs to it. The production of timber is as naturally within the scope of the Department of Agriculture as is the production of field crops."

Secretary of Agriculture D. F. Houston, in a letter to the chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the Senate, June 24, 1918, stated:

"This Department is charged with the task of stimulating and improving the production of all forms of wealth grown from the soil. A forest is a crop and forestry is primarily a problem of production from the soil."

Secretary of Agriculture E. T. Meredith, in an annual report to the President dated November 15, 1921, stated:

"The Bureau of Crop Estimates secures information on the needs of stockmen and farmers for public and national forest ranges which aids the national forest administration, and collects also data on the products of farm woodlots which is of value in the development of farm forestry. In short, having largely exhausted the forest crop grown in advance, the problem now is to use more widely what remains and to grow other crops to meet our needs. That is to say, forestry is a distinctly agricultural business. The function of the Department as a whole includes efforts for the production of the most effective manufacture, distribution, and utilization of the products of both farm and forest for the benefit of the country at large."

President Franklin D. Roosevelt in a letter to the Joint Committee on Forestry of the Congress declared: [2]

"Forests are intimately tied into our whole social and economic life. They grow on more than one-third the land area of the continental United States. Wages from forest industries support 5 to 6 million people each year. Forests give us building materials and thousands of other things in everyday use. Forest lands furnish food and shelter for much of our remaining game, and healthful recreation for millions of our people. Forests help prevent erosion and floods. They conserve water and regulate its use for navigation, for power, for domestic use, and for irrigation. Woodlands occupy more acreage than any other crop on American farms, and help support 2½ million families.

"Our forest problem is essentially one of land use. It is a part of the broad problem of modern agriculture that is common to every part of the country. Forest lands total some 615 million acres."

In testifying in 1951 on S. 1149, a bill to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, Lyle F. Watts, Chief of the Forest Service, stated: [3]

"Forestry and grazing are agricultural functions: Trees and grass are crops. Like corn, wheat, and cotton they start from seed. They respond to the same kind of care given other crops. They are harvested—or at least they should be harvested—so that one crop follows another. Their culture is based on the biological sciences, which are chiefly and in many cases exclusively the concern of the Department of Agriculture. Insect and plant-disease control, genetics, soil science, and other agricultural sciences are as important to growing crops of trees and grass as they are to field crops.

* * * * *

"Forestry and grazing are inseparable parts of agriculture. It takes the same know-how to grow timber in the farmer's woods as it does in forests owned by anyone else. Farm woodlands are indispensable to the Nation's timber supply. Farmers own one-third of all our commercial forest land—139 million acres.

"Turning it around, woodlands are indispensable to the farmer. Forest lands make up half the total farm acreage in New England and about 40 percent of all farm acreage in the South. Forest products provide farmers in many regions with a valuable source of cash income. When forest land is properly managed, the timber harvest can be as regular and dependable as any other crop.

"Farm forestry is an integral part of the Department's farm program. Farmers look to the Department of Agriculture for help on farm forestry just as they do in animal husbandry, fruitgrowing, or other crop problems. The small nonfarm forest properties of 125 million acres, almost as extensive as the farm forests and often intermingled with them, face exactly the same problems and should be served by the same agency.

* * * * *

"Nor can any sharp line be drawn between forestry and grazing. In much of the South and West the same land is used to grow both trees and grass. Thus all such lands are interrelated parts of the Nation's agricultural enterprise.

---

[1] Some of the following quotations have been derived from a collected document which is authentic. Time has not permitted review of the original sources.

[2] Mar. 14, 1938, Report of the Joint Committee on Forestry, S. Doc. 32, 77th Cong., 1st sess.

[3] Hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, U.S. Senate, 82d Cong., 1st sess., p. 442.

"And from the watershed angle, forest and grazing lands are inseparably linked with field-crop lands. In every watershed, we must have a unified approach covering all lands to effectively control erosion, floods, and water supply. Soil conservation and watershed management are agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture, under the Flood Control Act of 1936, is responsible for watershed surveys on all lands. Within the Department, the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service work together closely to reduce damage from floods and sedimentation on forest, grazing, and other crop lands.

"Adding it all up, any way you look at it, the answer is the same: Forestry and grazing are agriculture."

It is, therefore, our opinion that forestry is a part of agriculture and that timber is an agricultural commodity. It follows, therefore, that the products thereof, such as lumber, are products within the definition in section 204. We have attempted to analyze the problem from the standpoint of general precedent and authority. If the foregoing analysis is not consistent with the present intent and purposes of the Congress, you may wish to reexamine the question for greater clarification.

Sincerely yours,

John C. Bagwell,
General Counsel.

COMMENDATION ON PASSAGE OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION BILL, S. 205

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am indeed pleased that at long last the Federal Government has moved ahead to assist in the development of educational television. Both in the 85th and 86th Congresses under the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senate passed a Federal aid to educational television bill. This desirable legislation has now been approved by the Congress and is awaiting Presidential approval.

Educational television promises the most fundamental advance in educational methods since the invention of the printing press 500 years ago. There is today a serious educational gap, and educational television can do much to alleviate this problem.

In 1952 the Federal Communications Commission set aside 242 assignments for noncommercial television use. By 1961 the number of reserved educational television channels had increased to 268. Ten years have passed since the FCC reserved educational channels, and in that period only 62 educational stations have come on the air.

Oregon has pioneered in educational television with two educational stations. KOAC–TV at Corvallis commenced broadcasting in October 1957, and KOAP–TV in Portland commenced programing January 30, 1961.

While my State has accomplished a great deal in this field much remains to be done. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a letter from Dr. Leon P. Minear, superintendent of public instruction for the State of Oregon, outlining the important needs of educational television in Oregon and the benefits which S. 205 offers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State of Oregon,
State Board of Education,
Salem, Oreg., May 31, 1961.

Hon. Maurine Neuberger,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Oregon State Department of Education is interested in the passage of Senate bill 205. After a decade of developments in the field of educational television, the schoolchildren of this State are not yet being provided with any widespread access to this new communication medium. As yet, there has not been a single educational television channel activated in this State by a local school district or combination of school districts, by a local community organization or association of private schools or colleges, or by any other combination of educational and cultural interests. The only access to educational television, and especially inschool viewing of planned educational broadcasts, has been provided in 1957 to a limited area of western Oregon by KOAC–TV, channel 7, Corvallis, and since January 1961 by KOAP–TV, channel 10, Portland, both stations being operated as an educational television network by the General Extension Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. So far as programs for in-school viewing for elementary and secondary schools of the State are concerned, the nearly 400,000 Oregon schoolchildren have had only 2 hours per week of programing during the past year and almost nothing prior to that time.

Lest this seem a reflection upon the concern of Oregon citizens for their children's educational opportunities, it should be pointed out that there has been no dearth of interest in educational television on the part of many groups both in professional education and among lay people. The simple truth is that Oregon's pattern of population distribution and geographical conformation does not now and will not in the foreseeable future provide the concentrated density which can afford educational television facilities on the basis of local areas. For example, outside of the Portland area there is not a single metropolitan region which can boast of more than 100,000 persons and not a single incorporated city of more than 60,000. The largest of these—Eugene and Salem—count their populations somewhere in the 40,000's. Thus, it is not within the realm of possibility for these limited population complexes, whether they work through local school districts, other official agencies, or voluntary organizations representing cultural groups of the community, to support educational television facilities. The school districts of each of these areas have an attendance of less than 13,000 pupils daily, which indicates how frail the base is for local educational television installation.

Only the Portland School District of Multnomah County with its approximately 75,000-pupil enrollment could hope to do so, and then apparently only with some outside assistance.

For the rest of Oregon, the population is widely distributed and Oregon's elementary and secondary school pupils are to be found in numerous small cities, towns, villages, and the rural countryside. In eastern Oregon particularly, there are many sparsely settled and somewhat inaccessible regions for which there is no present prospect to provide educational television opportunities through local action.

It is the considered opinion of the Oregon State Department of Education that not only the best, but the only avenue for providing educational television for inschool viewing programs is through strengthening and extending the educational television network now operated by the State system of higher education. This network as it now exists, comprising stations in Corvallis and Portland tied together with a microwave relay, is able to reach approximately 70 percent of the people of Oregon. However, for reasonable effectiveness it needs funds such as Senate bill 205 provides for extensive improvement of broadcasting installations and equipment. Chief among these are the relocation of channel 7 transmission facilities on Mary's Peak at Corvallis in order to vastly increase the range and power, and the construction of a broadcast studio in Portland where at the present time there are no studio facilities.

Also, funds from Senate bill 205 would permit the installation of a series of microwave relays connecting with satellite stations or translators which could extend the present network into corners of the State not now reached, including all of eastern Oregon. These pockets of population which need to be reached in order to create a complete State network include northern and southern regions of the coast, southern Oregon, and the several population concentrations of Oregon east of the mountains. This situation, of course, is a direct result of our population distribution and geographic problems. Once these facilities are installed, it would be entirely feasible for local communities, school districts, and cultural agencies to combine in providing the operating funds which, when utilized through the one network, could support a very rich educational program with a number of strategically located studios permitting regionally if not locally originated programs, and bring the benefits of cooperatively created effort as well as stimulating instructional and enrichment materials to school districts and localities of all sizes.

Therefore, the educational television network in Oregon, extended as indicated through the assistance of funds provided by Senate bill 205, becomes the key to providing educational television opportunities both for adult education and cultural needs and for daytime inschool viewing by the elementary and secondary school children.

In addition, funds made available by Senate bill 205 for closed-circuit installations could be provided to a number of larger school districts which are ready to utilize this kind of ETV for improvement of instruction and in-service education for teachers within their own district boundaries. Experimentation is indicating the values of closed-circuit ETV to medium-sized school districts for accomplishing some educational goals now beyond their grasp. No Oregon school district at the present time has installed closed-circuit television, but many school districts are interested—costs being the dampering factor. Assistance through this bill would undoubtedly bring many such installations into operation and provide the opportunity to utilize and extend a number of new methods and media of instruction in Oregon public schools.

The evidence now is that it will take substantial funds to place this program into operation. The department hopes that the time will not be unduly delayed when this can be realized. The State of Oregon has already contributed what it has felt it could to the development of educational television in this State. The additional funds through Senate bill 205 would make constructive use of educational television in Oregon a reality.

Leon P. Minear,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the compromise worked out by Senate and House conferees is a good one—$32 million is made available for assistance to educational television, with up to $1 million available for each State. The matching fund requirement as provided for in the House version is retained, but the Senate provision for assistance to nonprofit organizations operating educational television stations is retained.

PASSING OF JOHN BUDD LONG, AMERICAN NEWSPAPERMAN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the free press of California—indeed, the free press of America—lost a devoted servant last month. John B. Long, the secretary-manager of the California Newspaper Publishers Association, came to the end of a very long, active, and vigorous life in my State. For over a third of a century John Long represented the newspapers of California before the State legislature, the executive branch of the State government, and before bodies, public and private, all over our State and Nation.

John Long devoted his life to the people's "right to know." That was his creed. That was his motto. He gave of himself to the free press without stint, and with great courage. As a boy, I worked on the country newspaper of my late beloved father. I remember first meeting John Long in the 1920's, when he would call on my father. Later on, after I finished college and law school, I became a member of the legislature. I remember the indefatigable devotion to duty which John Long constantly displayed in carrying the banner of the free press in his appearance before appropriate legislative committees. I remember and I cherish his friendship.

After the war I saw him from time to time when I was first a member of the State government and later a U.S. Senator. Like all his friends, I enjoyed his company, his wit, his drive, his humor.

Along with the rich and poor, high and low, big and little, who knew him and his undeviating record of constructive accomplishment, I grieve at his passing, and send heartfelt condolences to his family which survives.

On the occasion of John's funeral, a moving eulogy was given by Mr. Carroll W. Parcher, publisher of the Glendale (Calif.) News Press and John Long's dear friend. I ask unanimous consent that an article containing a eulogy entitled "Death of 'Johnny' Long Saddens Newspaperdom," published in the California Publisher, April 1962, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEATH OF "JOHNNY" LONG SADDENS NEWSPAPERDOM

The renown "Little Giant" of California newspaperdom is dead.

John Budd Long, whose sole interest in life was the advancement of his beloved newspaper fraternity, has passed into the Great Beyond—and a veritable army of publishers, editors, friends and associates through the length and breadth of California were stunned.

"Johnny," whose exploits in behalf of newspaperdom during his 34 years as the general manager of the California Newspaper Publishers Association had become legendary, died in his sleep at his San Marino home during the night of March 15.

"Johnny" as he was affectionately known to tens of thousands of Californians, ranging from Governors, editors and publishers of the great dailies, down to attachés of the smallest weekly, was buried with simple, but impressive services at the Church of the Recessional in the Forest Lawn Memorial Park, Glendale.

The services for "Johnny" who had retired barely a month earlier, were attended by almost 300 persons—the officers and past officers of the CNPA, leaders of the newspaper industry, from the metropolitan areas to the remote towns in the hinterland, leaders of business, industry, the sciences, labor, leaders of government, plus many friends of another day.

The eulogy, which properly extolled the many accomplishments of the champion of the people's "right to know," the "little merchant" and the founder of National Newspaper Week, was delivered, quite eloquently, by Carroll W. Parcher, publisher of the Glendale News-Press, a former president of CNPA, and a close friend and confidant of many years standing.

Hundreds of floral tributes banked the church as the formal services were conducted by the Reverend James Whitcomb Brougher, Jr., pastor of the First Baptist Church of Glendale.

Tributes came from many of the men high in government and industry—from Chief Justice Earl Warren, from Senator Thomas Kuchel, State Senator Hugh M. Burns, and Gov. Edmund G. Brown, to mention but a few.

In Sacramento, the assembly and the senate, where "Johnny" was a familiar figure, adopted laudatory resolutions and adjourned in memory of Mr. Long.

CNPA President Ralph H. Turner, Temple City Times, expressed the sentiment of the publishers of California, when he declared:

"Our hearts are full of sorrow by the passing of our beloved John B. Long.

"The newspaper industry in California and generally has lost one of the most dedicated men in the profession.

"He was a tireless worker in the defense of newsmen and in the advancement of the profession generally.

"His death is a tragic loss to all of us."

Mr. Long leaves his widow, Berthe Long, the "mommy," whom—no matter where he was or what he was doing he would go to his hotel room at a certain hour every day to telephone Mrs. Long, to whom his devotion was complete.

Long also leaves a son, Dair Long, a naval architect who has won fame in his own right as the designer of the powerful P–T boats of World War II. A sister, Hazel G. Long, of San Marino, also survives.

But John Budd Long himself had never failed to point out that he was the "hired man" of California's newspapers. And therein lies one of his greatest strengths. That, and the fact that he was frankly and openly in love with all of California's newspapers.

Born in Iowa some 68 years ago, educated at Denison University in Ohio (which honored him as one of its most distinguished alumni), and tempered in the forge of World War I—in which he won a battlefield commission—"Johnny" Long has been away from newspapers seldom and briefly during his life.

John Budd Long was "tapped" by the late Harry Webster, San Bernardino Sun-Telegram, to become executive secretary of the then Southern California Editorial Association.

Subsequently, under his guidance, the organization became statewide, and grew into the California Newspaper Publishers Association. He became the general manager, and the CNPA now boasts a membership of almost 600 daily and weekly newspapers in every section of California.

JOHN BUDD LONG—1894–1962

(Note.—The eulogy in honor of John Budd Long, printed herewith, was delivered by Carroll W. Parcher, a friend and confidant.)

The star that swung low last Thursday night, March 15, to lift Johnny Long from the life he had lived in fullest measure carried away on its beams one of the most remarkable men it ever has been the privilege of most of us in this church to know.

John Budd Long came to California 34 years ago, when he was 33, perhaps as one answer to California's call for "men to match her mountains." Not in physical stature, perhaps, did this little giant of journalism match the mountains of which he became so fond.

But, in courage, in devotion, in loyalty, in love and in his great heart which encompassed all these attributes, he was as the highest peak of the Sierra.

Loyalty and love—probably these are the terms that come quickest to mind when friends talk of Johnny Long, a man who became a legend in his own time and who, in everything he did, demonstrated loyalty and love.

His fiercest loyalty—and his tenderest love, next to that he held for his God and his family—was to the newspapers and the newspaper men and women in his State and in the Nation.

All of his adult life was devoted to newspapers—a major portion of it to California newspapers. For it was here, in 1928, that John Long came to take over the management of the somewhat less than sturdy Southern California Editorial Association.

Before that, dating back to the time he had started a neighborhood weekly as a boy and going on through the time he became editor and publisher of the weekly Council Bluffs Enterprise in Iowa following his graduation from Denison University, and then a staff member of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, and then city editor of the Omaha Bee, he had been a newspaperman.

But, it was here that he labored mightily, and successfully to weld the newspapers, large and small, in both ends of his adopted State, into the great California Newspaper Publishers Association. It was here that he conceived the plan of a National Newspaper Week, which he lived to see brought to the status of a truly national event.

The association from which John retired as general manager only last month, stands, with its nearly 600 members, as a living monument to his energy, his tenacity, his determination, and to his loyalty and his love. John Budd Long, always the perfectionist, always the "old city editor," as he liked to call himself, neatly wrapped up his life story before the final edition.

His great heart assailed by recurring strictures, his eyesight faded to the point that he recognized friends and associates by the tone of a familiar voice or the warm clasp of a friendly hand rather than by vision, he determined last year that the time had come to turn over the affairs of his beloved association to other hands.

Retirement is never easy—not when a man devotes himself wholeheartedly to a job over most of a lifetime. It was doubly hard for Johnny Long, whose whole life was in his work and who said a good many times, perhaps prophetically, that when his work was over his life would be over, too.

But, having determined the necessity of bringing the story to a close, Johnny set about preparing the final paragraphs with characteristic neatness and dispatch.

He arranged that at his passing his retirement income would go to his wife, Berthe, the mamma of whom he spoke so affectionately and whose welfare and comfort were always in his mind. He spent extra time with his assistants, getting the business affairs of the association in good order. And he prepared a final general manager's report for presentation to the annual convention of the CNPA in Coronado last month—a report which he announced with pride was "the best report I have ever made to this association."

Then John Long retired to his San Marino home, surrounded by the flowers whose fragrance he loved but whose beauty he could no longer see. He was surrounded, too, by the memories of an active and intensely interesting life—memories which he hoped to put into book form.

The great heart gave out, finally, before the book could be written. But in his comparatively few days of attempting to adjust activity into inactivity, work into rest, Johnny had the sweet sounds of his friends' sincere praise and fervent good wishes ringing in his ears.

As more tangible evidence of their regard he had plaques and scrolls and letters and telegrams, all attesting to the high regard in which he was held by men in high places and those in less exalted positions. By newspaper editors and publishers of the largest dailies and the smallest weeklies in the State and Nation.

Johnny Long, thank God, lived to savor the sweet aroma of the flowers which all too often are proffered too late to be enjoyed.

As do all of us, if we are honest enough to admit it, Johnny was pleased at the good reports of his friends. And he never hesitated to convey his appreciation. In his last letter, dictated to his secretary in Sacramento but sent out unsigned to the past presidents of the CNPA, Johnny wrote:

"I have no facility for writing flowery, fancy-pants letters like the one in my portfolio bearing your name. But give me time. I just ordered some new letterheads and I am now searching for a stenographer in San Marino—then you will really be hearing from me. I couldn't think of any nicer tribute than to have so many past presidents at my party."

He was particularly gracious in his appreciation of a column I wrote at his retirement and which read, in part:

"Things aren't going to be quite the same in the long corridors of the State Capitol in Sacramento, which knew the patient tread of his feet. Nor in the legislative committee hearing rooms, which echoed to his ringing denunciations of any attempt to subvert freedom of speech or of the press. Nor in countless newspaper offices in the big cities and little towns up and down the State where his warm personality and intense interest made him a welcome visitor. Nor in numberless bistros in the same big cities and little towns where his conviviality was legend.

"Because John Budd Long, for the past 34 years the energetic and effective general manager of the California Newspaper Publishers Association, has retired.

"As is the pleasant custom when a popular figure in any field retires, resolutions are being adopted and plaques are being prepared and gifts presented and luncheons are being given in honor of Johnny Long. One of the luncheons was held by the Advertising Club of Los Angeles, members of which have adopted as a theme, 'The House That John Built.'

"It's quite a house they will have to talk about, too. A house built upon the firm foundation of an abiding belief in the first amendment to the Constitution. A house big enough and sturdy enough to hold the representatives of nearly 600 newspapers throughout the State, with widely divergent interests and viewpoints. A house whose doors were open to all men of good will, no matter what their party or their creed or their color.

"A newspaperman by training, experience and temperament, Johnny first welded the newspapermen of the entire State into an effective organization and then led their battles to maintain a free press worthy of a free people. He battled with the weapons of logic and justice and without regard to partisanship. His friends in the State legislature and in city councils and boards of supervisors and school boards were Democrats and Republicans, conservatives and liberals, righteous and uprighteous.

"But he strove mightily, and usually successfully, to bring them to see the light as he saw it. Which was to say as it affected his beloved newspapers and their readers.

"I have had the good fortune to know Johnny Long during all the years he has devoted to newspapers and those who make them their life work. I have seen him become a national figure in his chosen field. I have worked, played, traveled and, upon occasion, quaffed a beverage with him. So I know whereof I speak.

"John Budd Long is a great man, the kind that passes our way only occasionally."

The legends that will be told of John Budd Long in the years to come—wherever newspapermen and lawmakers gather—will be legion. But they will never surpass the reality of the man who inspired them—truly a great man.

WARSAW GHETTO DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the 19th of April marks the anniversary of Warsaw Ghetto Day, which, on April 19, 1943, held up to the world a mirror of the heroism of oppressed, downtrodden and ground-under-the-heel minority of inhabitants of Warsaw, and also a mirror to the world, in a most dramatic way, of the terrible moral wrong which had been inflicted upon all of mankind by the Nazis in the incredible slaughter of 6 million Jews in Europe in connection with the Nazi holocaust beginning in 1933.

Every anniversary of this character is a cause for contemplation of our own hearts as to whether we are doing enough to prevent the world from again undergoing this terrible trial in winning the world's struggle for freedom, and to get a new inspiration, in the heroism of these heroes of freedom, to continue on with the struggle which is critical to the survival and life and moral future of mankind.

To signalize the occasion, Governor Rockefeller has declared April 19, 1962, as Warsaw Ghetto Day for the State of New York.

I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation may be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARSAW GHETTO DAY

On April 19, 1943, the world witnessed a scene of incredible valor in the revolt of the Jewish inhabitants of the Warsaw Ghetto. Hopelessly outnumbered from the start, knowing they would fail and without modern arms, they rose in rebellion against the might of the Nazi military war machine.

Faith and spirit were greater than material things, for at first their hopeless rebellion was successful. With the bravery of desperation they threw back the first attack of the storm troopers who had been sent to liquidate them. It took the full fury of the then irresistible German Army to crush them.

These unforgettable patriots fought to death as martyrs in the cause of freedom. On this day we honor them as God-fearing men and women who preferred to die fighting rather than to live on bended knees in humiliation and slavery.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim April 19, 1962, as Warsaw Ghetto Day in New York State.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 29th day of March 1962.

By the Governor:

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.
WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on Commerce:

J. Herbert Hollomon, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Jalmer O. Brown, and sundry other persons, for appointment to the U.S. Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. MINT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Earl F. Haffey to be Assayer of the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Ellsworth Ingalls Davis to be a member and president of the Mississippi River Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CARLSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I notice in the Chamber the distinguished

Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson]. I wish to take this opportunity to express a word of commendation and appreciation to him on the splendid message he placed in the Record yesterday, along with his own comments. I refer particularly to the speech the Senator made to the League of Women Voters and other organizations at Topeka, Kans., on April 11, on the subject of our international trade.

I believe the speech demonstrates the bipartisan support that the subject of our foreign trade has brought about. As a Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle, the Democratic side, I wish to express thanks to the Senator for his fine statement.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished acting majority leader. He has referred to a very interesting meeting in which I had the pleasure of participating. Present at the meeting and participating also in the program, which dealt with the subject of international trade, particularly with the Common Market, was the president of the State farm bureau, the president of the State farmers union, the master of the State grange, a vice president of AFL–CIO, the president of the League of Women Voters, the director for a six-State Midwest area for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the president of the State chamber of commerce. They all participated in the program, thus proving the great importance of this program.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I was particularly impressed by the Senator's remarks on the impact of foreign trade upon agricultural exports, which, of course, mean a great deal to us in the Midwest. I wish every Senator could express himself on the subject of international trade, because we will need a broad community of understanding of the subject.

AFRICA FREEDOM DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, festivities marking the fourth annual observance of Africa Freedom Day will take place in many parts of the world on or about April 15. This decision, to designate April 15 of each year as African Freedom Day, was made at the first conference of African independent States at Accra, Ghana, in April of 1958. Then many of the now independent nations of Africa still remained under the control of colonial powers. Since that time, however, events on the continent have rapidly outdistanced the expectations of many of the African states.

Since the last Africa Freedom Day alone, events in Africa have moved briskly forward and some new states have entered the family of nations: Tanganyika and Sierra Leone have been granted independence from Great Britain, France has reached an amicable settlement with the Algerian nationalists, which augurs well for continued friendly cooperation between her and an independent Algeria; the British territories of Uganda and Kenya have moved steadily on the road to independence, the former recently receiving internal self-government with independence promised for October this year, and the latter soon to embark upon self-government with independence not far away; progress in the Belgian trust territory of Ruanda-Urundi in Central Africa indicates that this territory will soon emerge as either one or two independent states before the next Africa Freedom Day takes place.

The areas of Africa still under colonial control, however, present far greater problems than have already been experienced.

In mineral-rich northern Rhodesia, Africans have recently managed to extract more favorable franchise conditions than before. In southern Rhodesia, however, settlers retain a tight hold on the destiny of all inhabitants. Even so, South Africa's policy of apartheid surpasses in severity any measures taken by the colonial regimes in central Africa. There, race relations are so tense that the government has just increased defense spending—for internal use—five times more than in the previous year. Only the pressure of world opinion could prevent tragic bloodshed.

Africa Freedom Day is thus both a celebration and a protest. In New York, a rally will be held with Kenneth Kaunda of northern Rhodesia, Oliver Tambo of South Africa, A. Chanderli, of Algeria, and Eduordo Mondlane, of Mozambique. The theme of this meeting will be: "Freedom for Southern Africa." In keeping with our traditions, the sponsors of the observance, the American Committee on Africa, urges all Americans of good will to support the struggle for political freedom, civil liberties, and nonracial democracy throughout Africa.

ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last night in Washington's historic Constitution Hall, Adm. Arleigh Burke delivered a memorable and highly significant address to the 71st Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. It is an address which every alert American should study carefully and ponder thoughtfully.

Admiral Burke in this patriotic presentation raises some fundamental questions about our American foreign policy and the utilization of our American resources in the cold war. He calls attention to some basic weaknesses in our prevailing policy approach. He argues for abandonment of programs and policies which are designed simply to defer disaster and challenges our country to adopt policies and programs designed to win the controversy rather than simply to postpone the day of judgment.

Proudly calling attention to the power which this Republic presently possesses, Admiral Burke suggests we lead from strength and that we advocate actions we are equipped to implement rather than to hide our light under a bushel and fearfully fail to exercise the world leadership we are prepared to demonstrate.

Pulling no punches in his courageous address, Admiral Burke particularizes the problem which we confront, identifies imperialistic communism as the source of our troubles, and proposes that we develop policies and programs designed to solve the problem rather than to dissipate our American resources by simply relying upon the expenditure of more money without having clearly in mind how such expenditures will specifically strengthen our position, weaken the Communist conspiracy, and harness our present and potential power in a successful effort to lead the world into a new era of progress free from the specter of encroaching communism.

I seriously recommend that all leaders of public opinion, all officials of Government, and all citizens concerned about changing a no-win policy into one assuring victory for the concepts of freedom read Admiral Burke's brilliant address and then dedicate themselves to revising and revamping our foreign policies and our defense activities toward the attainable goals set out in his thoughtful and refreshing presentation.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of Admiral Burke's address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE, U.S. NAVY (RETIRED) TO THE 71ST CONTINENTAL CONGRESS OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 16, 1962

President general and distinguished ladies, before I joined the Navy many years ago, one assumption was that a sailor had "a girl in every port." This never happened to me—but looking around me now, I feel I have found compensation at least.

There is every reason why the opportunity of talking to you is more than just a passing one for me. Too many people, these days, appear to have become embarrassed about patriotism. Some of our citizens scoff at and heckle the patriot who adheres to the principles, the dedication, the sense of honor and integrity which made this wonderful country of ours the leader of the world.

I deeply appreciate the honor of addressing an organization whose charter states its goal to "afford to young and old such advantages as shall develop in them the largest capacity for performing the duties of American citizens; to cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom; to foster true patriotism and love of country; and to aid in securing for mankind all the blessings of freedom."

It must be abundantly clear by now to even the most ardent pacifist that our great Nation is engaged in a struggle whose outcome will determine whether the peoples of the world will live in freedom or in abject slavery. This is the struggle of freedom against international communism.

Let there be no mistake about it. We are engaged in a titanic conflict with an enemy which has sworn to impose its order over the entire world. It is war just as surely as any combat is; but far more is at stake than in previous wars.

The very existence of the human race—the dignity of the individual, the morality of nations, freedom in all its aspects, depend upon the outcome.

It is manifestly clear, then, that in all of our efforts our sights must be fixed on unmistakable victory.

But there is misunderstanding and confusion about the struggle we are in. All people want the benefits and privileges that go with freedom, but some people do not wish to shoulder the responsibilities which are the other side of freedom's coin. What is worse, some people won't even see the other side of the coin.

Some of the confusion about the nature of the conflict, and our responsibilities in it, is self-induced. Those whom we might describe as culpably ignorant seem determined to hang on to their "do-it-yourself" ignorance "if it takes all summer."

Overwhelming and compelling evidence which time and again demonstrates the absurdity of their convictions about the nature of the Communist conspiracy fails to shake them from their determined ignorance.

Some of the confusion is a result of a sincere misunderstanding of the present struggle as compared with previous concepts of conflict.

During the days of our Revolution our forefathers were faced with what must have seemed incredible problems as they entered the transition from colony to sovereign nation. In light of our present day confrontation with world communism, we might well review some of Washington's admonitions which are summed up so well in his Farewell Address.

In this lucid and deceptively simple speech, Washington enunciated his policy of self-reliance.

The wisdom of that policy has been tested and proved by the experience of over 150 years. With such an example, it would ill behoove us to discard Washington's advice and thoughts on national policy. Instead, our goal should be to formulate a policy as well suited to our present circumstances as his was for young America.

Washington's carefully defined isolationism was not rooted in morbid fear. He simply recognized that a newly born nation had no business contending with the mature, established nations of the world. (The new nations of today would do well to ponder this address.)

Since 1918 when we achieved our status as a world power, we have been debating the question of our place in the world, and debating the foreign policy appropriate for it.

The debate, although occasionally inventive, with glimmers of high vision, has more often been tedious, cliche ridden, and largely irrelevant to the true issues confronting the country. The weary protagonists first appear after World War I.

There was first the Wilsonian position with its idealism about international self-determination in a world where reason would displace power in a League of Nations.

Against this, a new isolationism appeared whose basic position consisted in an unexamined repetition of the no-foreign-entanglements policy of Washington's day.

Both positions were proven incorrect.

The first assumed a utopian world of men of perfection that has never existed.

The second assumed an America that had not grown for 150 years.

What the country really needed was a foreign policy that could see men as they are—and the Nation as it had become.

When, in 1940, the idealistic position ultimately won, it was not because of any intrinsic merit in itself, but because of the obvious fallacy of isolation at that time in history. With the rise of Hitler and the appearance of ideological dreams of empire in both Nazi and Communist camps, it became obvious beyond discussion that American power was necessarily involved in the mainstream of world affairs.

As we look back along the road since then, we appear to have been groping our way from one unrealistic position to another, with expediency and Pollyannaism as guideposts. Witness the terms of surrender in Germany, Soviet intervention in the Far East, frantic postwar disarmament, equally frantic rearmament, withdrawal, containment, massive retaliation, massive foreign aid, diplomacy through a U.N. that can only be a forum. In this welter of frenetic human endeavor, only one strand of direction can be found: We are again at war.

First, we have a desperate need to recognize the basic character of our problem. We are currently spending about $50 billion a year on armaments. We spend additional billions in foreign aid. We levy upon our youth a tax of 2 important years of their developing lives. All of this is good—but all of this we do because of a single fact—the fact of communism. If this vast, ideological monster did not exist, we would not need these vast expenditures and levies.

Yet we seem—year after year, decade after decade—reluctant to admit this. Too often our policy has been to talk softly about communism, refusing to recognize the intensity with which the Soviet Union abhors America, the free world, and all we stand for. Our policy continues to be "negotiation" with the Soviet Union—as though the issues between us were ones that could be settled by the traditional diplomacy of limited interests. The first and greatest of our errors lies in this myopic view of reality.

The question today is not, as it was in Washington's time, whether to accept a revolutionary ideology. The question is one of recognition and understanding of fact—of recognizing what Communist ideology is, and understanding what the Soviet Union is doing with it.

On much less evidence than the evidence which assails us, Washington and the American people were quite able to identify the ideology in the France of their day. We need a like ability to identify in its true dimensions the ideology in the Soviet Union now. This is not some phantasm that will disappear if we pay no attention to it. This is the basic fact in our current situation.

The second fundamental unreality in our policy is the desire to have peace without the use of power. In a schizoid manner we have balanced a Department of Defense with a Committee on Disarmament. Ballistic missiles with the position that war is unthinkable. Basically, we oscillate between an unpalatable reality and an act of faith. Consequently we have become dangerous to the world. No one really knows what we will do, because we ourselves do not know. The simple fact is that America and the West in general have a guilt complex about power. It frustrates our every use of power. In Cuba, in Suez, in Korea, currently in Laos, we half use it in a compromise between dream and reality.

Contrast this with the sturdy acceptance of the fact of power by Washington. One would have expected that a weak, ineffectual collection of former colonies would have made a great to-do about moral principles and the principle of persuasion.

One might have expected Washington to speak like some of the leaders of modern day neutral states. But there, in 1796, in the context of a concern with morals and virtue, we had a quiet acceptance of the fact of experience. Power relations are basic in international affairs. Therefore our young nation had to withdraw from the stage and sit quietly in the audience. It had no power. There is no complaint here, no querulous objection to the realities. There is realistic acceptance. There is the unshakeable confidence that some day we would have power, that some day we might "choose peace or war, as our interests, guided by justice, shall counsel." This grasp of reality promised predictability. Peace or war were envisaged as a matter of choice, and the clear standard is "our interests, guided by justice. * * *"

Will there ever be peace in the world unless the powerful use their power for peace? This always involves the position that there is an alternative to peace, and, at the margin, that the alternative will be invoked against the lawless nation.

America, in its youth, was wise. Our wisdom, perhaps, has faltered in our transition from preoccupation with our own affairs to status of world leader.

The first signs of a refurbished wisdom will be found in a frank, conscious, and determined use of our power—in all its forms—to determine the course of international events in the modern world.

Lest I be charged with mongering for war, I would like to make it clear that I mean all forms of national power—not only military power. I mean diplomatic power, spiritual power, economic power, psychological power, and all other forms of power which, with military power, make a nation great. Military power is important, but in these days of cold war, it is the use of other forms of national power which must concern us. In some instances military power may have to be used and in those instances it must be used. But in the main it is the other forms of national power which must be used to create stability in a disordered world. So I would like to repeat—there is a need for frank, conscious and determined use of our power—in all forms—to influence the course of world events. That way lies sanity. That is reality in a realistic world.

But there is another unreality in our policy. The absurdity of the desire to have policy without national interest. Deeply involved in our approach to foreign affairs is the suspicion that justice and national interest are incompatible principles of action.

This suspicion is articulate in the idea that the Government of the United States has certain altruistic obligations that require a continuous sacrifice of the economic and political interests of the people of the United States. Thus we engage in a policy of do-goodism and sometimes work against our own interests before an assemblage of nations that can find us at most amusing and at worst irresponsible. A paradoxical consequence of this avoidance of national interests is that it leads to a new isolation. But it is a subtle isolationism, hidden behind a mask of the U.N. Our avoidance of national interests leads to a deeper and deeper involvement in the United Nations. And so it is the U.N. and not the United States that engages in foreign affairs.

Let us be clear about it. In proportion to our refusal to accept the responsibility of our power in all its various forms, we in fact withdraw from the real world. We operate in a shadowland where nothing is called by its right name and ghostly memories of a former imperialism obscure the terrible reality of Communist expansion.

What a contrast to Washington. He clearly thought that the objective of any foreign policy is the implementation of national interest. Justice operates to insure that those interests will be accurately defined and temperately sought.

Justice is the mode of foreign policy, not an abstraction that defines its substantial goal. It was still clear in those earlier days that the first and the basic obligation of a government is to the governed. From this it follows that governments have only indirect obligations, defined by natural equity, toward other peoples.

There is a tragic element in the loss of this clear insight. The real interests of the United States coincide with the real interests of the human race. These can be summarized in the single word "peace." Our rise to power was marked by no international adventures. We never coveted our neighbors' territory or wealth. Now that we have the power, our history assures us that we could use it effectively for peace. The powerful must act powerful—for they cannot act at all, except they act effectively. We are confused by fears—the fear of gaining some advantage, the fear of seeming imperialistic, the fear of being unpopular. The massive power providentially given to us is frustrated by an abstract idealism that is apart from reality and does not recognize the basic conditions for the effective use of power.

The final unreality in our policy is our refusal to permit the economic order to function normally in international affairs. The consequence is confusion between economic and political orders. Our policy on economic aid has attempted to do, by political decisions, the things that the inventiveness of economic man achieves almost unconsciously. Instead of permitting trade to find its own channels, capital to move freely wherever advantage may call it, we have reduced the basic flow of wealth to the paltry trickle of a few billions, extracted by taxes from the American economy and too often inserted into backward economies on the basis of shortsighted political expediency rather than economic rationality. In doing this we foster the illusions of the underdeveloped countries themselves, who think they will solve their economic and social problems by fiat rather than by works.

Economic aid can be good as the concept of the Marshall plan was good, but it can also be bad. More money to a spendthrift son will not solve his problem. Character, hard work, and a realization of his responsibilities will solve a prodigal son's problem. And character, hard work, and a realization of responsibilities in the building of economic strength within a nation's competence, and within its willingness to meet its obligations, will solve many of the new nations' problems. We can help them, but fundamentally economic growth is possible only when people are willing to work and meet the obligations and responsibilities of that growth. We can open a door, and even hold it open for a while, but they have to walk through it.

Against the chaos of thought in our country and in countries receiving aid Washington has left us a neglected heritage of wisdom in lines whose very rhythms convey the quiet sense of contact with reality:

> "It is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another * * * it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character. * * * There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard."

And that, too, is reality. Reality in the past. Reality for the present.

The enduring elements of the realities that Washington sensed or saw in all things are the very elements that challenge us today: the motivations of states, the real ends of foreign policy, the relations between power and peace, the functions of ideology, the character of people.

As we misjudge or confuse or obscure these elements we diminish profoundly the possibilities of peace and even the possibilities of survival, at last of survival in freedom.

To our Nation today falls no social worker's chore of improving the world's hygiene Our challenge is not that of the carnival barker called upon to extol the excellence of his show so that every passerby will at least want to peek inside. Our challenge is not that of the marathon runner who, if only his breath holds out, will find his competitor gasping and falling by the wayside.

Our chore and challenge is simply the dedicated, wise, timely use of every element of our national power to secure the peace of the world by reducing to impotence the opposing power that threatens it.

This is not work for a young nation. It is work for a mature nation in a real world.

We will write, with the pen of our morality and the sword of our responsibility, a great testament to man's triumph over tyranny and terror—a great testament to man's dignity and his determination to live, not as animals cowering in pens of authoritarianism, but as men cast in the image of God and knowing no fear but of Him.

Our lives would be meanly led and, finally, ignobly lost if we accept any lesser dedication.

TRIBUTE TO PIONEERS IN HEAVIER-THAN-AIR CRAFT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, yesterday, April 16, at the Smithsonian Institution a presentation was made of an "Early Bird" plaque to the Smithsonian Institution's National Air Museum honoring pilots who flew solo prior to December 17, 1916.

The plaque presented lists the names of the members of the "Early Birds" organization, both living and deceased, including many renowned pioneers of flight. A living member of the "Early Birds" organization is Mr. Reinhardt N. Ausmus of Sandusky in Erie County, Ohio. He built and flew his own airplane in 1912, 9 years after the Wright brothers first flew.

It is needless for me to say that Ohio is proud of the Wright brothers in Dayton, Ohio, Reinhardt N. Ausmus, and others who were the "Early Birds" of our State in building and piloting heavier-than-air craft.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. MILDRED K. GEARE

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, it is a real pleasure to call the attention of this body to an action by the Republican Party which, I am certain, will receive the most enthusiastic bipartisan support. The event to which I refer is the honoring last night of Mrs. Mildred K. Geare, who is Woman's Club editor and a political writer for the Baltimore News-Post and Sunday American, at a banquet of the Republican Women's Conference at the Statler-Hilton Hotel here in Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Geare was 1 of 3 newspaperwomen who received scrolls in recognition of their attendance at 10 consecutive national conferences of GOP ladies, and I would be terribly remiss if I failed to point out that this unbroken record which she has compiled represents a very real and important service to all of our citizens, Republicans and Democrats alike. The reason, of course, lies in the honest and objective manner in which she has handled her assignments. Acting in accordance with the very highest traditions of the newspaper business, Mrs. Geare has reported the news from a decade of Republican Women's Conferences with an accuracy, a professional detachment and an insight which have won her the respect and admiration of members of both of our major political parties, and I feel I can speak for the citizens of the great Free State of Maryland when I thank her publicly for her enormous contribution to the cause of a free, truthful press. I sincerely hope that our Nation will always continue to have men and women of the ability of Mrs. Geare reporting the political activities which are so important to our continued growth and welfare.

THE STEEL PRICE CONTROVERSY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the recent settlement of the steel price controversy has given the American public an explosive display of Government by Presidential anger and I suggest this is a most dangerous precedent. This Executive action should erase any doubts previously existing about the crushing powers at the command of the President and that these powers were unleashed at our free enterprise system is most unfortunate.

President Kennedy has proved the power of Government to fix prices. He has also proved that the administration's so-called guidelines for wage and price actions are in the nature of mandatory directives. If they are not followed—at least by business—those who digress can expect the full power of Government intimidation to be directed against them.

In effect, the Government's performance was to replace the supply-and-demand operation of the marketplace with an arbitrary bureaucratic decision. It completely overlooked the steel industry's right to appraise its own price requirements in the light of many diverse factors, not the least of which is the actuality and the threat of foreign competition.

The administration offered this naked display of Government power to the public as a move to offset inflation. Such interest in national welfare is laudable but I suggest it is inconsistent with the administration's continuing disinterest in the root cause of inflation—deficit Government spending now estimated at $9 billion.

Mr. President, I wonder why the administration wore blinders while the most inflationary of all labor contracts was recently signed in New York giving the electrical workers a 25-hour week.

And I wonder also, if price fixing is to be the practice of the administration, whether the Attorney General will marshal his forces against his father for the announced increase of prices on expiring leases at the Joseph P. Kennedy-owned Merchandise Mart in Chicago? I doubt that any such action will be forthcoming, but I suggest the administration give its attention to the reasons offered by the Mart's general manager as necessitating the boost—increased operating costs, principally labor and taxes.

Mr. President, if these are valid reasons for a price increase in one segment of our economy—and I believe they are—are they not valid for other segments, including the steel industry?

In its assault on steel, the administration ignored the industry's right to make a decision affecting its own stockholders, its own interests, and its own workers. The possibility that the decision may have been wrong is no excuse for Government pressure and coercion to reverse that decision. One of the prerogatives of a free enterprise system is the right to make decisions, even wrong decisions.

The President has set a bad and dangerous precedent in forcing the steel companies to knuckle under. At the very least, it will make the business community gun shy at a time when an aura of confidence is needed to spur investment and expansion. And this will aggravate seriously the already difficult unemployment problem in the United States.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further morning business, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11027) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED INCREASES IN SECOND- AND THIRD-CLASS MAIL RATES

ARE WE DIGGING GRAVES FOR OUR NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, under normal conditions, it is not my general practice to comment on proposed legislation while it is still under consideration by a committee of the Senate. Today, however, I intend to violate that rule in order to commend the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for its wise and thoroughgoing examination of the postage rate increase bill as passed by the House of Representatives.

This measure, in substance, follows the recommendations of the policymaking officials of the Post Office Department, who seem determined to make prohibitive jumps in second- and third-class mail rates regardless of the consequences to the general welfare or to these hard-pressed mail users. In its present form, the evidence at hand indicates that this bill, if enacted, could be the most harmful legislation in recent years because of its adverse effects upon the free press of the United States. For that reason, I am relieved and delighted that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, under its able chairman, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and with the full cooperation of its ranking minority member, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is exploring every facet of the proposed legislation. They are concerned not only with the relation of this legislation to revenue raising and postal policy, but also with its probable influence upon the economic health of the publishing industry. Perhaps the best service rendered by the committee is to put the general public on notice that something more is involved here than mere Government bookkeeping.

I am sure that every Member of the Senate would like to see a balanced budget for the Post Office Department. I am equally sure that every Senator would be appalled at the idea of achieving a balanced budget by bankrupting some of the Nation's finest publications and by driving the $20 billion mail-order business out of the mails. These results would certainly follow if the Senate adopted the House bill.

The postage rate bill sponsored by this administration and the Post Office Department is ill advised as a revenue measure because it may yield less revenue, not more. As a matter of public policy this result is most unfortunate.

By this time, I assume that most Senators, like myself, have been hearing from many constituents who will be placed in an economic straitjacket by an exorbitant increase in mail costs if the postal authorities get what they want. In the course of these brief remarks, I propose to read some of these communications into the RECORD. But my chief purpose in speaking is something else.

I wish to protest the policy of the Post Office Department in dragging the publishers of the United States onto the economic scaffold every time the subject of increased postal revenue comes before Congress. Over the past decade, Congress has increased second-class mail rates by 89 percent, and third-class rates by 150 percent, a terrific cost increase for publishers, many of whom spend nearly as much on third-class mail as they do on second class.

Then in the spring of 1961, just 1 year ago, the present administration sponsored a new rate schedule so big that it would mean extreme financial hardship for thousands of small dailies and country weeklies. In addition, it would actually force dozens of magazines, big and little, into liquidation. The net effect is that publishers and editors have been worrying for 1 whole year about the exact day of their extermination by Congress. Is this fair or even good sense?

It seems to me that it is about time for the political bureaucrats of the Post Office Department to become a little more realistic about postal costs and postal charges. Five years ago, under congressional impetus, an advisory committee of distinguished citizens was appointed to study this whole problem. The report of this committee is still the finest study ever made on the complex business of ratemaking in relation to public policy. I think I may make that statement without equivocation. I know many of the men who served on that committee and have spoken with them on this subject. This committee strongly upheld the theory that the Post Office Department is primarily a public service institution and not a business, and that it has been so considered since our Nation was founded. The committee said that service functions performed by the postal system apart from mail carrying amounted to $392 million for the fiscal year of 1955, and as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the majority whip, noted in the Senate last year, by now the public service cost is probably in excess of $400 million.

How well I recall the words of the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], early last year, in a letter addressed to the new Postmaster General when he stated:

> Without a clear resolution of this controversy involving public services, the setting of future postal rates is impossible because we wind up with nothing but confusion confounded insofar as basic costs and the rate formula in the 1958 law are concerned.

The chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is still pursuing this intelligent course of action in his committee work. Without this diligent effort and attempt to determine public service costs, we may well be digging graves for our newspapers and magazines in the maze of all this confusion. I, too, am very much confused. The Post Office has variously indicated public services amounting to $49 million, $342 million, and now it is supporting $248 million. What is the true figure? They now tell us that thousands of small post offices are not public services as envisioned by the 1958 Postal Policy Act.

Recently I noted that the Postmaster General carried a statement in the U.S. News & World Report which I quote:

> The cost-accounting system is a convenient target for attack, when the actual tarket is not the system but the inescapable conclusion from its findings.

What kind of a system produces such variety of results? The administration is seeking a $450 million hike in first-class mail, and yet its advance cost ascertainment sheets for 1961 show a profit in first class and airmail. Does the system operate in this manner to penalize second-class and third-class mail with enormous losses for propaganda purposes? I say to you, Mr. President, that resolving these questions is a major undertaking—a real challenge to our distinguished Post Office Committee. I am glad the problem is in competent hands.

However, the chief service performed in 1957 by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee was to establish the principle that in postal matters the general welfare must always take precedence over the need for revenue.

The Post Office Department simply ignored the report of the Citizens Advisory Committee in recommending a new rate schedule to Congress. And it did something else, which may be even worse: It disregarded the economic facts of life about the publishing industry, by sponsoring rates far above bearable levels. Let us consider some individual cases.

The Curtis Publishing Co. is facing the cost-price squeeze which is raising such havoc in the publishing business, and as a result of which nearly 40 percent of the Nation's magazines failed to make money last year. The Curtis Co. publishes, among others, the magazines Saturday Evening Post and Ladies Home Journal, which for the past several decades have been household words from coast to coast. Recently, the Post decided to reduce its number of issues, in order to save money.

Last year the Curtis Publishing Co. paid nearly $15 million in postal charges; and the current bill would increase this amount by another $6½ million.

This huge increase would mean that Curtis would have just two alternatives: further drastic cutbacks, or suspension. The company has about 12,000 employees, enough to form a good-sized city. Most of them are high-wage employees, and Curtis' payroll means the difference between hard times and good times in many communities. I cannot see what public good is accomplished by giving such publications the financial hotfoot.

This is not an isolated case. The publishers of Grit, a nationwide weekly published in Williamsport, Pa., have told me of their plight. Grit is one of the oldest weekly journals in the United States; and for many, many years it has been a welcome visitor in hundreds of thousands of homes. The publisher told me that postal charges are now their third largest budget item. Currently Grit pays $880,000 yearly for postage charges. The 1-cent surcharge on the so-called Murray bill would jump this annual cost to $1.5 million.

Mr. W. B. McGrew, the circulation director of the Sunset magazine, a noted western periodical, published by the Lane Magazine Co., in Menlo Park, Calif., has told me the effect of the House-passed bill on his firm. Virtually all of Sunset's circulation is mail delivered. The increase in second-class and third-class rates would amount to $150,000 in additional annual costs. This, plus the effect of the first-class rate increase, would eliminate Sunset's profit.

The administration-sponsored House bill, if enacted, would go far toward eliminating the magazines of serious thought which have been the nurturing ground of American literature and which have enormously enriched our cultural life.

Mr. John Fischer, editor of Harper's magazine, summed it up this way in a letter to Postmaster General Day:

> Probably the administration has not fully realized that this blow will probably exterminate most of the country's serious magazines—which are largely delivered to subscribers by mail—while it would not touch the sex, crime, and comic book publications, which are sold almost entirely through newsstands.
>
> I find it hard to believe that the Kennedy administration really means to destroy such publications as the Atlantic Monthly, Harper's, the Reporter, Saturday Review, and Commonweal—leaving American culture to be represented in the eyes of the world largely by comic books and TV.

The strain of such large postal cost charges would be severe on the small daily newspapers and the country newspapers. In the long run, they, too, would suffer economic injury. The National Editorial Association, serving as spokesman for these papers, has told the committees of Congress that the new tolls will mean increased mailing charges ranging from 200 to 400 percent, or to put it plainly, far more than these publications can bear. Here again, I wonder what purpose is served by putting the continuance of these small papers in jeopardy. At the conclusion of my remarks, I shall include several letters from California publishers detailing the effect of the proposed rates on their business.

All impartial witnesses that I know of agree that the rate on third-class bulk mail in the House-passed bill will just about exterminate the mail-order business. While the Post Office Department may claim in defense that it recommended a rate somewhat lower than that in the House bill, it was that Department that set the pace and started the trend towards unrealistic rates.

I wish to read to my colleagues the comment of William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, in testifying before Senator Johnston's committee:

> The organization I represent is wholeheartedly in favor of a postage rate increase. We want the record to so state. However, I think it should be shown here that if we price this product [third-class mail] out of the market there is going to be serious difficulty insofar as our postal substitute letter carriers are concerned and there will probably be considerable difficulty among some of the junior regulars.

There is no more loyal body of workers on earth than our fine postal employees; and why Congress should be threatening them with job insecurity is beyond me. Congress set up the bulk-mail class in 1928, to provide employment for postal employees during their slack hours. Thousands of business enterprises accepted the invitation by Uncle Sam to base their selling on mail orders. With characteristic American ingenuity, these men have developed their businesses into a $20 billion industry. But now we propose to put them out of business by exorbitant postage rates, and at the same time deprive private workers in the industry of their means of employment. The Government will lose large sums of revenue, and perhaps thousands of postal employees will find themselves out of jobs, and will join the unemployed of America.

Mr. President, I shall end these observations, as I began, by praising the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee for its excellent work on the postage rate measure. I am convinced the committee will act wisely, and not in haste. I am sure the Senate will follow.

The measure which passed the House would mean nothing less than calamity for the free press of the United States. I feel that the Senate committee will come up with a far more sensible solution to the postal rate problem.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter by Mr. John Gunther to the editor of the New York Times, which appeared in the issue of March 14, 1962.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Postage Rise Protested—Hardship for Periodicals Seen in Increased Rate

> To the Editor of the New York Times:
>
> The House of Representatives has recently passed a bill (H.R. 7927) which, if it is also passed by the Senate, will almost certainly destroy serious periodical literature in the United States.
>
> What H.R. 7927 proposes is, in short, a fantastically unjust and excessively steep increase in the second- and third-class postage rates which affect printed matter like magazines, including those of superior literary status.
>
> Meantime, the grisly mulligatawny of sex, crime, joke books, and comic books which are a standing disgrace to the United States will remain untouched, since serious magazines are largely delivered to subscribers by mail, whereas those in the first category are sold almost exclusively at newsstands.
>
> If H.R. 7927 is not drastically modified by the Senate the postal charges paid by magazines will rise 40 percent in a single year. This represents a sum greater than the total net earnings of several distinguished periodicals. I know one magazine, long established, worthy, vital, and of prime national value, which will have to spend more than $100,000 a year in extra postal charges. This was around twice the total profit of this publication in 1960, and more than the combined profit of several previous years.
>
> #### SHIFT FROM MAIL SYSTEM
>
> Some publications might avoid a small part of the proposed added costs by an attempt to shift away from the postal system, turning to railroads and trucking.
>
> But the great bulk of the postal costs of magazines cannot be avoided. No other means except mail exists to send out renewal notices, for example, or to get magazines into the homes of subscribers.
>
> In the last decade third-class rates have gone up 150 percent, second-class rates 89 percent. This is a much faster increase than other magazine costs—for paper, printing, etc.—which have been rising about 5 percent a year.
>
> There is a widespread impression that magazines are getting a subsidy from the Government under the present rate scale, but this is certainly not the case.
>
> Surely it is unnecessary to stress the point that American magazines of the better class are a national cultural and educational asset—particularly during the present period of international tension when we need all the education and culture that we can get.
>
> The Soviet Union does not destroy literary and cultural outlets which it considers to be useful. On the contrary, Soviet periodical literature (such as it is) flourishes and proliferates under Government protection.
>
> By way of contrast, the total profits for the 35 biggest magazine publishing firms in the United States in 1960—a relatively good year—were only 1.7 percent. In the last 10 years 32 of the 250 largest American magazines either merged or died. Some of the remaining giants are now struggling for their lives; one magazine which was highly profitable for generations lost more than $15 million last year.
>
> The plight of most small American magazines is even more difficult.
>
> Finally, writers have an intimate involvement with the whole issue. It would be a

grievous thing for authors to have to adjust themselves to the somber fact that dozens of our best publications, including many experimental magazines which are wombs for creative activity, should cease to exist. I would like to hear the Authors' League make its voice heard on this aspect of the problem.

JOHN GUNTHER.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I make the same request in regard to an interesting article entitled "Publishers Versus Postal Hike." The article was published recently in the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLISHERS VERSUS POSTAL HIKE

WASHINGTON.—All kinds of publishers, ranging from those who put out smalltown newspapers to those who publish big opinion magazines, are protesting the proposed cent-a-copy surcharge in the pending postal bill.

This penny surcharge, contained in the $691 million postal rate increase bill passed by the House and endorsed by President Kennedy, would be levied on each copy of a newspaper mailed as second-class mail outside the county in which the paper is published.

Magazines (their publishers testify next week) would be similarly affected. But rates for nonprofit publications are untouched by the pending measure.

Smalltown publishers warned in their testimony before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee March 22 that enactment of the measure would sound the knell for a number of weekly and small daily newspapers.

For instance, Maurice K. Henry, publisher of the Middleboro, Ky., Daily News, said his paper's monthly postal bill would increase from $307 to $921 and would be "approximately 50 percent of our net profit."

Faced with these protests, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, committee chairman, has hinted strongly that the House-passed 1-cent surcharge would either be scaled down or eliminated by his committee.

MAGAZINE MEN

Bernard E. Esters, publisher of the Houlton, Maine, Pioneer-Times, said newspapers already have absorbed six increases in the last 10 years, raising their postal costs an average of 89 percent. Speaking in behalf of the more than 6,000 weeklies and small dailies affiliated with the National Editorial Association (NEA), Mr. Esters said the pending bill would hike rates an additional 114 percent.

First witnesses next week before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee will include Edward Weeks, of the Atlantic Monthly magazine, and Payson Hall, of Meredith Publishing Co., which publishes McCall's magazine, and the president of the Magazine Publishers Association.

There is sharp apprehension among the magazines making marginal profits, such as Harper's and the Reporter, that added total costs would shove their budgets dangerously into the red.

OTHER BOOSTS

A big weekly with 2 million subscribers would find the penny surcharge adding $3,640,000 extra expense each year.

The proposed surcharge, if not eliminated by the Senate, would take effect in two steps—half a cent on July 1 this year and another half a cent on July 1, 1963.

The House bill would also raise rates on other categories of mail, boosting first-class letter postage from 4 to 5 cents. Airmail would rise from 7 to 8 cents an ounce.

Magazine publishers point to the tremendous challenge of television, which lures away their most lucrative advertisers and adds to the casualty lists among magazines. They go so far as to suggest that since television is subsidized by having free use of that public domain known as the air waves, publications should continue to enjoy some sort of assistance in reaching readers via general delivery.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed seriatim in the RECORD several representative letters from small newspaper and periodical publishers in my State, from those engaged in direct mailing, and from those employed in the printing industry; which show the effect the House-passed bill would have, if it were enacted, on their livelihood.

One of the letters, which is addressed to me, is from Jack Craemer, secretary of the North Bay unit of the California Newspaper Publishers' Association, and also an executive of the San Rafael, Marin County, Independent Journal.

One is from Mr. Herb Brin, editor and publisher of Heritage, the Southwest Jewish Press, of Los Angeles, Calif.

Another is from Mr. Eli Isenberg, editor and publisher of the Monterey Park Progress.

Another is from Mr. Sol O. Bender, president of Bender Publications, Inc.

Another is from J. S. Hines, publisher of Western Machinery World & Steel.

Another is from a constituent, Mrs. Mary F. Laderoot, of Bellflower, Calif., whose husband is employed by a printing firm.

Another which I received last year is from Jack T. Pickett, editor of the California Farmer, a farm newspaper.

Another is from Mrs. Fritz Thornburg, of Markleeville, Calif., a very small community in the State from which I come. In her letter she demonstrates the effect of this proposed legislation on people who live in small communities in the United States.

Another letter is from George Murphy, Jr., publisher of the Manteca Bulletin in Manteca, Calif.

Another is from Newton Wallace, publisher of the Winters Express in Winters, Calif.

Also a letter regarding direct mail advertising from Mrs. Esther Harvey, a constituent, of Burbank, Calif.

And a letter from Maurice Forley, executive director of Toastmasters International, which does splendid work in our State and the entire Nation.

Also a letter from James W. Wilson, manager of the mail order division of the Ferry-Morse Seed Co., of Mountain View, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters submitted by Mr. KUCHEL are as follows:

INDEPENDENT JOURNAL,
San Rafael, Calif., April 9, 1962.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Please be advised that the North Bay unit of the California Newspaper Publishers Association is opposed to those portions of the postal rate bill, H.R. 7927, which would impose oppressive postal rate increases for newspapers.

It is our understanding that H.R. 7927 is scheduled for hearing by the Senate Post Office Committee within the next 2 weeks.

It is our further understanding that some newspaper publishers in other States have suggested a compromise that would trade away present free-in-county privileges for a so-called fair rate structure and minimal increases.

The publishers of the smallest papers in our six-county area, embracing Lake, Marin, Napa, Solano, Sonoma, and Yolo Counties, were most outspoken in their opposition to giving up free-in-county privileges.

They pointed out that a majority of the Nation's newspapers are weeklies with fewer than 1,000 paid subscribers. Postal rate increases of any kind would seriously cut into—if not cut out entirely—their slim net profit.

A resolution setting forth these views for presentation to you was passed without dissent at our most recent meeting, April 6 at Petaluma.

We hope that you will make every effort to see that postal rate increases endangering the very existence of our smallest newspapers are not adopted.

Very truly yours,

JACK CRAEMER,
Secretary, North Bay Unit, CNPA.

HERITAGE,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 5, 1962.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The purpose of this note is to suggest the possibility that you might consider helping a few broken-down weekly publishers, such as Herb Brin, who really face disaster should the Post Office get away with its cent-a-copy surcharge in the pending postal bill.

This surcharge is explained in the enclosed story from the Christian Science Monitor. While major magazines might be affected with great or lesser impact, this surcharge spells disaster for me, since we publish three papers in Los Angeles County, mailing two of the papers to areas totally out of Los Angeles County.

In explanation: We distribute our San Diego paper to every Jewish family in San Diego County and down into Imperial Valley. Thus, since we print that paper in Los Angeles (out of necessity, since I live in Los Angeles) I would be paying 1 cent a copy additional to mail it, while the Post Office would have no extra work in processing the San Diego paper, putting me in a precarious competitive position.

Similarly, our paper which circulates in Central Valley and goes to every Jewish family in this large region covering many counties, will also be hit hard.

I am sure that interest will be generated to help the plight of small publishers, because I can't believe that the Post Office Department would want to make more difficult the difficult-enough problems of economic survival for the small, independent weekly newspapers in the Nation.

Forgive me for making this a plea to you at this time because I know in my heart you already are aware of the situation. Yet, I feel better in writing to you.

Best wishes, and—what can I say?

Cordially,

HERB.

SAN GABRIEL VALLEY PUBLICATIONS,
Monterey Park, Calif., April 6, 1962.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: The Senate will act soon on the postal increase bill.

It is my feeling that the Monterey Park Progress and its affiliated newspapers using the mails receive no subsidy from the Federal Government.

We pay $15,000 a year for postal deliveries in this community. All of our mailings are prepared the way the postman covers his route. If we are priced out of postal service, the post office would not be able to reduce by one employee.

During the last decade, second- and third-class rates have gone up more than 100 percent. The causes of postal deficit are beyond me; but they are not caused by me.

If Post Office is to have balanced budget, I will expect that the Park Service and Agriculture operate on the same equitable basis.

Sincerely yours,

ELI ISENBERG,
Editor and Publisher, Monterey Park Progress.

BENDER PUBLICATIONS, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 9, 1962.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: As president of Bender Publications, Inc., publishers of Southern California Industrial News, Northern California Industrial News, Pacific-Southwest Industrial News, and General Aviation News, H.R. 7927 would work an extreme hardship on us.

I personally do not disagree with the need for an increase in postal rates to cover increased costs. Everything is going up in price, why not postal rates? However, the rate of increase in H.R. 7927 and the planned increase for the coming year would make it almost prohibitive to operate profitably.

We feel the second-class and third-class publications like our own give little work to the post office as compared to a first-class letter. After all, Senator, our mailer delivers to the post office all our papers bundled by zone or city, ready for delivery to its destination. There is no need for postal pickup at a street corner, or individual sort.

It seems to us that the main cost should be borne by the first-class letter which does demand the greatest time and expense in handling.

The higher rates for second- and third-class publications if passed would result in the demise of many worthwhile publications regardless of their marginal character.

Yours truly,

SOL O. BENDER,
President.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
April 2, 1962.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

If the Senate passes H.R. 7927 it will work an almost impossible hardship on all regional publications in the West. We have published Western Machinery & Steel World for the last 40 years in California. With present business I'm just about able to take care of third-class postal rates as they are today. The 40-percent increase will sink us and will probably mean the folding up of many important trade publications.

J. S. HINES,
Publisher, Western Machinery & Steel World.

MARCH 30, 1962.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: My husband is employed by a printing firm now, but if the proposed postal increase is passed, he may no longer be.

I do not feel that it is fair to increase the second- and third-class mail when it brings in its wake the loss of so many jobs. It is such losses of work that start the ball in motion for other businesses to be hurt because of a reduced buying public. Let's keep America producing and buying and keep our economy progressive not regressive.

Sincerely,

MRS. MARY F. LADEROOT,
Bellflower, Calif.

CALIFORNIA FARMER,
May 16, 1961.

Senator T. H. KUCHEL: I have just returned from a national meeting of the Agricultural Editors' Association. The assembled editors represented the readership of 20 million families. When we were told of the suggested postal rate increase we thought somebody was kidding. I, personally, cannot conceive of anyone who is politically responsible to the electorate voting for a bill which would sound the death knell for a large number of publications.

Every responsible newspaper is eager and willing to do their part and we feel like we have done our part when we have accepted postal rate increases over the past 3 years totaling 30 percent, but then when we turn around and are faced with a 79-percent increase, put into effect by a man who is a newcomer to his Cabinet post and has, admittedly, no past experience in this field, we are so shocked that we find it difficult to even entertain the idea.

In the case of our own farm paper, which goes to most of the occupied farms in the State, we would suffer a rate increase amounting to something over $38,000 per year. If this incredible rate increase was proposed as a bargaining point, it was certainly a suggestion in bad taste. There are at least two ways to solve most problems. One way that is the easy way out is to pour a bucket of money on it and this has been the Federal Government approach to many of the problems. The other, more intelligent, approach is to make a complete study of the problem, increase the efficiency, modernize, mechanize and cut down waste. It would be my feeling that if the elected representatives would be so careless as to let this suggested postal rate increase go through that they would suffer a tremendous personal reaction from the press of the Nation. In all decency we ask that you reject this catastrophic rate increase and let's make a more intelligent approach to the problem.

JACK T. PICKETT,
Editor.

MARKLEEVILLE, CALIF., *April 10, 1962.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: It isn't very often that I write to my Senator, but I wish to express my opinion regarding the bill now under consideration concerning the increase of postal rates—H.R. 7927.

At first I was opposed to the raise in first-class rates from 4 to 5 cents, but having read several articles and editorials concerning this bill, I am much more opposed to the raising of third- and fourth-class rates. We take the Reporter, Farm Journal, Saturday Evening Post, as well as several other magazines which will be severely in jeopardy if these rates are raised.

We live in a tiny rural town and the only contact we have with current events and matters of national importance are our daily paper and the magazines we subscribe to. It is so vital in this type of government that the electorate be well informed on current issues and problems, and I fear that we would be much less well informed if we were to lose these better magazines.

Please, if it is necessary even raise first-class rates to 6 cents. But don't tax our magazines out of existence. Instead, please try to do something about these tons of unsolicited junk mail we receive every day.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

MRS. FRITZ THORNBURG.

THE MANTECA BULLETIN,
Manteca, Calif., April 10, 1962.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: While not unalterably opposed to any postal increases of any type, I think it would be difficult, if not impossible, for smaller publishers to live with the provisions of H.R. 7927.

We have, of course, had an 89-percent increase in second-class rates since 1945 and, if I understand the provisions correctly, this would go to 189 percent of the 1945 base.

I think, too, that some consideration should be given the proposed increases in third class. This class has already risen 150 percent and it would jump 250 percent over 1945 under the bill as presently set up.

As you probably know, the publication of companion shoppers has been necessary by most small newspapers. We simply could not hold or attract sufficient display advertising in today's market without offering saturation coverage of our trade area since, as you realize, the trading area and circulation area of small newspapers is not always the same. This is certainly the case in our community.

The Bulletin's postal bill in 1961, for shopper and newspaper combined, was a little more than $10,000. As near as I can figure it, this would jump to at least $15,000 and perhaps considerably more.

Unfortunately, as is often the case, such increases will hit the smaller paper in the more scattered rural-type area the hardest. In our own case, for example, we cover a rather large geographical area with scattered population. In this type of situation, we have no alternative for distribution, other than the mail, as the area is not suitable for carrier-boy distribution. Some indication of the inefficiency of the postal system can be gathered, I think, by the fact that newspapers in solidly urban areas can distribute copies much cheaper by carrier boy than by mail. And this applies to existing rates and not to the proposed rates. We, of course, have no choice but to continue the mail distribution.

I understand that you are very interested in this postal matter, and please accept my thanks in advance for anything you can do to assist the small publishers in this problem.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MURPHY Jr.,
Publisher.

THE WINTERS EXPRESS,
Winters, Calif., April 10, 1962.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Regarding the proposed postal rate increases, it seems to me that both the 1-cent surcharge and the proposal to eliminate the historic free-in-county provision are grossly unfair to the extremely small weekly papers (those of under 1,000 circulation).

The 1-cent-per-paper surcharge is unfair in that it charges the same surcharge to a 64-page paper that it does to an 8-page paper, and yet, obviously, the larger paper costs more for the post office to handle, and a 64-page paper crammed with advertising is in a better position to absorb postage than an 8-page paper.

The proposal to eliminate the free-in-county provision sounds to me like an attempt on the part of the large newspapers to sell their smaller brothers down the river, and pass most of the load of a postage increase onto the marginal country newspapers, that exist in communities without home delivery of mail.

These small weeklies, most of which came into being after the free-in-county policy was adopted, are usually man-and-wife operations, and these publishers haven't the time to carry their fight in person to the Nation's Capital.

The small weekly, which serves as historian, news agency, conscious and focal point of a small community, is just as important to the people of the area as is the large metropolitan daily to its community. I made a rough check with the post office this morning and the elimination of free-in-county would increase my mailing costs to six times the present rate. I'm sure this figure would hold true to all other papers with under 1,000 circulation.

I have no objection to an increase in second-class rates, provided it is reasonable and equitable. A percentage increase in the present well-established formula based on weight and advertising percentages seems to me to be the only fair way to increase postage rates.

Sincerely yours,

NEWTON WALLACE, *Publisher.*

APRIL 9, 1962.

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: There are thousands of workers in California who depend on direct mail advertising for their livelihood. The increase on the third-class postal mail would mean the loss of these jobs.

Of the $2 billion spent on direct mail advertising, much of it is by the small company who also depends on this type of advertising for his living. It sells billions of dollars' worth of merchandise every year. Many thousands of workers are required to manufacture these articles. It takes many more workers to produce the cartons, string, wrapping paper, transportation, and other items used directly and indirectly in the making of these articles.

The unemployment that would result from the increase in third-class mail rates would not only mean hardship for the workers but a loss in revenue for the Government. Will you please vote against this increase in postal rates.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. ESTHER HARVEY,
Burbank, Calif.

TOASTMASTERS INTERNATIONAL,
Santa Ana, Calif., April 10, 1962.

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
The U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: As the largest mailer in Orange County, we are extremely concerned with the proposed increase in third-class mail rates which would be brought on by the passage of H.R. 7927.

As a nonprofit, educational organization, we strive to conduct our financial affairs on a modest basis to enable the greatest number of men to participate in our speech and self-improvement programs.

We have hundreds of clubs active throughout the State of California, as well as in every other State, Canada, and 44 foreign countries. An increase in third-class rates would badly cripple our ability to continue service to our 80,000 members on the financial basis which we now operate.

The postal increase undoubtedly would necessitate an increase in the price of our educational materials to members, as well as a rise in dues. Any increase would materially affect the ability of many of our low-income workers to continue their activities.

We sincerely urge you to vote against H.R. 7927. Passage of the bill would serve only to legislate against our people who least could afford an increase.

Sincerely,

MAURICE FORLEY,
Executive Director.

FERRY-MORSE SEED CO.,
Mountain View, Calif., April 11, 1962.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: A substantial number of employees at Ferry-Morse Seed Co. depend on mail order for their livelihood. Garden seeds and supplies by mail is one of the oldest, direct to consumer, services.

We are greatly concerned about the proposed rate increase for third-class mail. In spite of highly automated mailing and order processing within our company, net profit is thin.

We have a mailing list of 250,000 home gardeners. Each gardener receives three mailings a year, the minimum number of letters which will keep him coming back to us as a regular customer. If we have to pay a 1 cent per piece increase for these three mailings, this means $7,500 increased expenses each year. Year in and year out we might expect to realize a 3 percent net profit on mail order sales. In order to make $7,500 profit we would have to sell an additional 1 million seed packets at 25 cents each. To get this additional volume would be a costly process.

In another envelope you are being sent a copy of our 1962 Ferry-Morse Garden Catalog. This catalog ordinarily goes out only to people who ask for it, yet it is now being denounced as junk mail. We are mailing the catalog by third-class mail on the same day this letter leaves our office. You will be very fortunate if you receive it within 2 weeks because third-class mail is handled as the last order of the day.

Internally, third-class mail costs us three times as much to handle as first-class mail because of the special zoning and bundling required by the post office. It is our sincere belief that third-class mail is already bearing its share of the postal burden. We urge you to give serious consideration to the inevitable destructive effect that an increase in third-class mail would have on businesses such as ours.

Sincerely,

JAMES W. WILSON,
Manager, Mail Order.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to commend the Senator from California for the very excellent statement he has made in regard to proposed postal rate increases in second- and third-class mail.

As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which is holding hearings on a bill which came to us from the House of Representatives, I share his views with regard to the danger of such a piece of legislation if it should be approved as we have it before us in the committee.

I make the statement because the 1-cent surcharge in second-class mail is an unusual and a new method of placing additional charges on second-class mail use.

Before I go further, I want to state that I am in favor of some increase in second-class mail rates. Few persons realize that if that legislation should become law, small newspapers out in the country, weekly newspapers, where we have free-in-county service, would have to pay an added 1 cent per issue outside the county. In other words, a small county daily published near a county border line would have to add $3.12 to the subscription price of their paper to have that paper carried. On the other hand, a great national publication published in New York City monthly or weekly, covering the entire Nation, would have only 1 cent added to its cost.

It seems to me that is a rate which cannot be justified, and I am hopeful our committee will take proper action in regard to that particular section, as we deal with it, and before the bill comes to the Senate.

Second, I want to comment on third-class mail. The Senator from California has well suggested that this is a business-builder mail. There are small corporations and businesses in this Nation that cannot afford to pay for advertisements in national magazines at the rate of $20,000 or $40,000 or $60,000 a page, but they can send advertising literature regarding their products through the third-class mails.

I have received letters from many persons suggesting we should eliminate third-class mail. There are two reasons why it should not be eliminated, in addition to its being a business-builder mail. First, it raises $517 million a year in revenues for the Post Office Department. I venture the guess that if we were to eliminate third-class mail, it would not reduce the cost of operating the Post Office Department one iota. There would be the same number of employees and operational expenses. Second, it is not preferred-handling mail. In other words, first-class mail receives preferred handling, and there should be an increased rate for it. Third-class mail is handled after hours, when employees have no other work to do.

In addition to the reason that a great amount of business is generated as the result of third-class mail, I sincerely hope that the committee, when it considers that question, and before it reports the bill to the Senate, will give additional thought to what the Senator from California has stated today.

I thank him for his fine speech. I did not want to make a speech, but I could not let the opportunity pass without mentioning the fact that he has rendered a real service, not only to publishers, small businesses, and third-class users, but to the citizens of this Nation as well.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the Senator from Kansas for his fine remarks. I also express my thanks for the succinct way in which he has demonstrated why the bill, as it came to us from the House of Representatives, is not in the public interest. When the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which the Senator is the ranking Republican member, works its will on it, I am sure the Senate will have a far better and vastly improved piece of legislation than one which, if it were to become law, would, I think, in truth, take the constitutional guarantee of a free press and make a mockery of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the distinguished Senator who is the acting majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The points the Senator from California has raised with respect to certain aspects of the postal rate bill are surely worthy of very, very careful consideration. I believe a rate increase must come, and I think most of us would join in that general conclusion. The question is as to the degree of the increase and the rapidity with which it is applied.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has a real obligation to examine the proposed rate increases with meticulous care, because there is no Member of this body in the first place, who does not want the Post Office Department to have more revenues in order to carry out its responsibilities. Also, we would like to make sure that in obtaining that revenue we would not do an injustice to free enterprise and the free press that means so much to the educational and commercial life of our Nation.

I make no bones about it—I have never felt that the Post Office Department was a business institution as such. We must provide revenues for the Department, as far as possible, from its services, but so many public services that mean so much to the educational and commercial life of this country are performed by the Post Office Department that I think it is foolish to assume that the Post Office Department should be operated as a balanced-budget department of the Government on the basis of what one would call a corporate business structure.

If that were to be done, rural free delivery would go out the window, and surely we would not want that to happen. If the Department were to be operated as a corporate business structure, there would not be favorable rates on the mailing of books which mean so much to the life of this country. If the Department is going to be operated as a business structure, we would have to take an entirely different attitude with reference to our weekly newspapers. I think, surely, we ought to arrive at some degree of balance, in accordance with what I think the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from South Carolina, and most of the other members of the committee have tried to say, namely, and include in the overall budget of the Post Office Department those public service features which should be paid out of general revenues, and then make proper increases in first-, second-, third-, and fourth-class mail to meet a good deal of the cost of the operation of the Department.

The speech of the Senator from California was thoughtful, and while it was critical of certain administration proposals, there is no law against that. Further, as a result of this debate and discussion, we may very well improve the bill and make it possible to pass it, so there may be additional revenues for the Post Office Department.

By the way, I think the Department itself is amenable to these suggestions. Obviously, the Department would like more revenues. I would like to help them get more revenues.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has an obligation to fulfill in reporting a bill. I hope it will do so quickly. In the process of doing it, I think we should take into consideration the observations made by the Senator from California, the Senator from Kansas, and other Senators on this side of the aisle, in an effort to get an equitable rate structure.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend for the excellent and constructive comments he has made.

I think basically, in this whole dispute, perhaps there is a growing agreement and a growing awareness in the Senate that it is bad for the United States at any time when a publication, big or little, suspends and goes out of business. I know I have shed a tear in the last several months when some distinguished newspapers in California have folded up, because one of the great bulwarks of strength of the American people is a free press.

Congress must not and will not do that which would add to the burdens of any segment of the free press in America, to the point that it would push or prod them along the road to bankruptcy and to decay. I believe the comments of my able friend from Minnesota demonstrate that fact quite well. Whatever action we do take with respect to postal rates, we need to be constructive in so doing and we need to recognize the public service of the Post Office Department as well as the crucial and overwhelming importance of continuing and, indeed, strengthening the free press of this country.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able friend from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to comment further on the remarks made by the distinguished acting majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I think the remarks were very timely. We should take a second look at the postal operations.

Unfortunately, many people in our Nation believe, when they go to a post office and buy some stamps, that the revenue from the sale applies to the postal operations of our Nation. It does not. That revenue goes into the U.S. Treasury the same as excise tax payments and income tax payments. The Post Office Department is operated under a direct appropriation by the Congress of the United States. It is important, I think, for us to keep that in mind when we deal with this splendid public service organization of ours, which is what the Post Office Department is.

I have wrestled with this problem for many years. I am glad the Senator from Minnesota has mentioned it. In my opinion, we should provide at least $342 million for public service. I think perhaps we could justify more. Certainly, no one believes, as was mentioned, that a rural route can justify on a business basis the carrying of a letter 25 or 30 miles for the cost of the stamp. Many second-class, third-class and fourth-class post offices certainly cannot be justified on the basis of their actual costs of operation compared to the revenue derived from them.

If we can, as Members of the Senate, finally reach an agreement with the Department, we can work out postal rates which will be accepted by the people. This would continue the splendid public service of the Post Office Department.

I shall be one who will cooperate and assist in so doing.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The second-class and third-class post offices are the Government of the United States to many thousands and thousands of people. That is the only symbol of the Government, outside of the Stars and Stripes, in these small communities.

Those post offices serve many functions other than merely the distribution of mail. I think the Senator from Kansas has made a very much needed point today; namely, that the Post Office Department offers great service for the people of this country.

Without a post office, our industry and commerce could not possibly be what it is today. Without a post office, our whole educational achievement could not possibly be what it is.

The Post Office Department should not be accused always of operating at a deficit, as if it were a catalog house or a seed house or a corporation. It should be looked upon as one of the vital services for enlightenment, for health and welfare, for security, and for the commercial development of this country. It is one of the finest institutions we have. A good deal of that is due to the kind of cooperation which has been extended by the Congress over the years in expanding such services.

I pay my respects to the chairman of the committee [Mr. JOHNSTON] and to the ranking Republican member of the committee [Mr. CARLSON], because I have never known very much partisanship to exist on that committee, and I have served on it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Minnesota again has made a valuable statement.

The post office is the one spot an individual citizen of a community goes to where the flag is flown above the building. It is the citizen's first contact, and his closest contact, with the Government of the United States. We should keep it operating in a way so that the citizen will recognize it is his first contact, in a way so that he will be proud to be a citizen of this great Nation, represented by that Department.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from California yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the able Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I commend the Senator for his discussion of the postal rate bill. It needs much discussion and study.

Under the bill which has been sent to us by the House of Representatives the surcharge for mailing a little newspaper which weighs 3 or 4 ounces from one county seat in Nebraska to another county seat in Nebraska would be 1 cent, yet the surcharge for sending the Sunday issue of the New York Times from New York City to San Francisco would be 1 cent. I do not know how such a difference can be justified.

What I am saying is that the bill needs a lot of study.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is to be commended for the work he has put in, as well as the other members of the committee and the chairman of the committee. Our distinguished whip has contributed much today by discussing the problems before a final Senate bill is formalized.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, not only for his kind words, but also for demonstrating very clearly one of the specific inequities involved in the proposed legislation now before the committee, under the example he gave. There is no reasonable or rational justification for that kind of a result.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying my respects to the Senator from California for his very timely remarks on the important proposal of postal rates which will be before the Senate later this year. His remarks deserve study by every Member of the Senate.

ARE DIRECT INVESTMENTS IN OVERSEA SUBSIDIARIES BENEFICIAL TO THE U.S. ECONOMY?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee is confronted with the problem of reconciling two completely divergent points of view with respect to America's foreign economic policy.

There is bipartisan agreement that a two-way flow of trade and a person-to-person contact between Americans and the citizens of other countries will promote a better understanding of our national objectives, including the advantages of our free, private enterprise economy. At a time when we are spending billions of dollars on economic assistance programs and the Peace Corps, it would be foolish not to realize the contributions that our businessmen abroad can make to the attainment of our overall foreign policy objectives. Every Senator, I am sure, concedes that we are experiencing difficulties because of our unfavorable overall international accounts which have resulted in a continuous pressure on our gold reserves.

The problem that confronts the Senate is how to achieve our aims and maintain our solvency and the strength of the dollar.

The administration is proposing that we reduce our already low tariff barriers in an attempt to persuade other countries to lower theirs. This is particularly directed to those in the European Economic Community. It is their belief that we could greatly increase our exports in relation to the imports that we are receiving from other countries if we adopt their course. If the reduction of tariffs with an expected increase in imports is a wise move for us to make, many citizens will wonder why the Congress found it necessary to reduce the duty-free tourist imports from $500 to $100. It is difficult in view of the magnitude of the dollars involved in the various items which constitute our total balance of accounts to see how this minute reduction in imports is justified when at the same time we propose far more sweeping incentives to increase them by authorizing the President to negotiate large reductions in our tariff barriers.

The administration further proposes that the Congress correct our unfavorable dollar balance by imposing new restrictions on oversea investments by American business.

In explaining the theory underlying the administration's tax proposals, they use the phrase "tax neutrality." They state that they have no quarrel with any firm establishing a plant overseas but that the decision to establish such a plant should not be influenced by any tax considerations. They concede that at the present time foreign investments, particularly in the European Economic Community, have been necessary in order to avoid having to scale a high tariff wall. The administration believes that with tax neutrality, there will be no incentive for American firms to export jobs; they will only build plants overseas where the economics of the situation would justify such a decision. They further state that this course is a logical one providing that the Congress grant the President the power to eliminate any tariff barriers which may impede American exports.

Because these issues are so fundamental, it is my intention to discuss them with my colleagues at some length. The economic destiny of too many Americans is at stake in the decisions that this Congress may make involving the administration's tax and tariff programs.

First, it is necessary to recognize that oversea investments have contributed greatly to America's exports of capital goods and components. They constitute a significant plus factor in our overall international monetary position. Furthermore, there is the mistaken notion that the establishment of American-oriented firms overseas tends to export jobs. Nothing could be further from the truth. Those who advocate such a theory apparently presume that if American firms did not establish subsidiaries in oversea countries that the products which such firms produce abroad would be replaced by exports from the United States. This theory overlooks the fundamental fact that other developed nations are making every effort to assist their enterprises to improve their market position in every country—developed and underdeveloped. If the United States were to withdraw from oversea investment, it is a certainty that leading firms in the other developed countries would establish foreign operations to take their place. Should this occur, within a short time our export markets would shrink and our overall financial position would deteriorate.

There have been many debates on the Senate floor with regard to the taxation of foreign income. Invariably reference is made to the abuses of our internal revenue laws by a few individuals or closely held corporations whereby an oversea operation is established for the sole purpose of evading a portion of the financial obligation which every taxpayer has to the U.S. Treasury. Certainly no Senator has the desire to assist such individuals who are improperly using oversea subsidiaries or so-called tax havens.

Legislation has been enacted to require detailed reporting by corporations with respect to their oversea operations. In addition, for many years the statutes have provided for the taxation of incorporated pocketbooks through legislation dealing specifically with the taxation of foreign personal holding companies.

However, it would be a great mistake to apply such treatment to the taxation of oversea investments by widely held American firms which have ventured overseas for good sound business reasons. From the standpoint of our foreign policy, these oversea operations constitute a working model of our free enterprise system for all to see. The issues presented by the administration's original proposals before the House Committee on Ways and Means last spring are involved and, it is our obligation, before enacting any legislation, to make sure that all the implications of the Treasury's recommendations are perceived by every American.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I believe, supports the administration's trade expansion program. He has stated the need for tax neutrality to equalize the position of American workers and employers with their competition overseas. To this end, he is convinced that the Congress should enact the Treasury's proposals with respect to the taxation of foreign income. It is essential that the points which he has raised be widely discussed. The testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee provides evidence which either supports or refutes his contentions. The Senate Finance Committee is currently receiving additional testimony. All these views should be given consideration by not only the Finance Committee but all Members of this body.

The junior Senator from Tennessee, since early in the 1st session of the 87th Congress, has been proposing drastic changes in U.S. taxation of income earned by oversea subsidiaries even though no funds have been remitted as dividends to the parent domestic corporation.

On Thursday, March 29, 1962, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 10650. This act will change the present tax code with respect to the taxation of foreign-source income.

Mr. President, it is my firm belief that amendments to the 1954 code included in that act will damage the economic position of the United States.

The administration in its presentation to the Finance Committee already has requested that the original proposals presented by the Secretary of the Treasury a year ago be incorporated in the House bill by amendment before it is reported by the Finance Committee.

Mr. President, a careful examination of the statements by the junior Senator from Tennessee clearly shows the areas of misunderstanding which must be given further consideration by the Senate. I shall state them for the benefit of my colleagues:

First. Is it true that our present treatment of income earned abroad by American direct investments has an adverse effect on our balance of payments?

Second. Does the present revenue code with provisions for so-called tax deferrals and the tax credit tend to export jobs?

Third. Do Americans invest abroad rather than in the United States because of the tax advantages they may secure?

Fourth. Is it true that it is no longer desirable to encourage American investment in developed countries and thus alter the policies the United States followed since the end of World War II when there was a dollar shortage in Western Europe?

Fifth. Does the encouragement of American investment overseas have an adverse effect on our exports?

Sixth. Are tax-haven operations used to evade U.S. income taxes by the great majority of American firms with direct foreign investments?

Seventh. Does equity require that American taxpayers with equal amounts of income pay the same tax regardless of the source of such income?

These contentions would demand a revision of our tax structure if they are substantiated by factual evidence. However, the preponderance of the testimony received by the Committee on Ways and Means clearly shows that foreign direct investments have made a major contribution to our balance-of-payments position, have increased our exports, and provided jobs for American workers. Rather than mitigate the problems which have been cited by the junior Senator from Tennessee, the administration program would compound our difficulties.

Mr. President, it is my intention in the coming days to review with my colleagues in the Senate each of these seven major questions which have been raised with respect to the effect of foreign direct investment on our domestic economy in the field of employment and in the field of increasing exports.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGISTRATION OF STATE CERTIFICATES IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 320) to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by striking out the last two sentences and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Pending the determination of any such application the continuance of such operation shall be lawful."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 206 of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(6) On and after the date of the enactment of this paragraph no certificate of public convenience and necessity under this part shall be required for operations in interstate or foreign commerce by a common carrier by motor vehicle operating solely within a single State and not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with any carrier engaged in operations outside such State, if such carrier has obtained from the commission of such State authorized to issue such certificates, a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing motor vehicle common carrier operations in intrastate commerce and such certificate recites that it was issued after notice to interested persons through publication in the Federal Register of the filing of the application and of the desire of the applicant also to engage in transportation in interstate and foreign commerce within the limits of the intrastate authority granted, that reasonable opportunity was afforded interested persons to be heard, that the State commission has duly considered the question of the proposed interstate and foreign operations and has found that public convenience and necessity require that the carrier authorized to engage in intrastate operations also be authorized to engage in operations in interstate and foreign commerce within limits which do not exceed the scope of the intrastate operations authorized to be conducted. Such operations in interstate and foreign commerce shall, however, be subject to all other applicable requirements of this Act and the regulations prescribed hereunder. Such rights to engage in operations in interstate or foreign commerce shall be evidenced by appropriate certificates of registration issued by the Commission which shall be valid only so long as the holder is a carrier engaged in operations solely within a single State, not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with a carrier engaged in operation outside such State, and except as provided in section 5 and in the conditions and limitations stated herein, may be transferred pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Commission, but may not be transferred apart from the transfer of the corresponding intrastate certificate, and the transfer of the intrastate certificate without the interstate or foreign rights shall terminate the right to engage in interstate or foreign commerce. The termination, restriction in scope, or suspension of the intrastate certificate shall on the 180th day thereafter terminate or similarly restrict the right to engage in interstate or foreign commerce unless the intrastate certificate shall have been renewed, reissued, or reinstated or the restrictions removed within said one hundred eighty-day period. If, however, during the six months period of termination, restriction in scope or suspension of the State certificate the holder of the corresponding certificate of registration has continuously performed the interstate operations authorized thereunder such certificate of registration can only be suspended, revoked, or terminated by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Act governing such suspensions, revocations, or terminations of certificates issued by the Commission: *Provided, however,* That under all other circumstances such certificates of registration * * *. Such rights shall be subject to suspension or termination by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of this Act governing the suspension and termination of certificates issued by the Commission. The Commission may impose reasonable requirements with respect to the filing with it of certified copies of such State certificates and other appropriate statements and data, and compliance with applicable requirements established by and under the authority of statutes applicable to interstate and foreign operations administered by the Commission, as conditions precedent to engaging in interstate and foreign operations under the authority of such State certificate. In accordance with such reasonable rules as may be prescribed by the Commission, any party in interest, who or which opposed in the State commission proceeding the authorization of operations in interstate or foreign commerce, may petition the Commission for reconsideration of the decision of the State commission authorizing operations in interstate or foreign commerce, and upon such reconsideration upon the record made before the State commission, the Commission may affirm, reverse, or modify the decision of the State commission, but only with respect to the authorization of operations in interstate and foreign commerce.

"(7)(A) In the case of any person who or which on the date of the enactment of this paragraph was in operation solely within a single State as a common carrier by motor vehicle in intrastate commerce (excluding persons controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with, a carrier engaged in operations outside such State), and who or which was also lawfully engaged in such operations in interstate or foreign commerce under the certificate exemption provisions of the second proviso of paragraph (1) of this subsection, as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of this paragraph or who or which would have been so lawfully engaged in such operations but for the pendency of litigation to determine the validity of such person's intrastate operations to the extent such litigation is resolved in favor of such person, and has continued to so operate since that date (or if engaged in furnishing seasonal service only, was lawfully engaged in such operations in the year 1961 during the season ordinarily covered by its operations, and such operations have not been discontinued), except in either instance as to interruptions of service over which such person had no control, the Commission shall issue to such person a certificate of registration authorizing the continuance of such transportation in interstate and foreign commerce if application and proof of operations are submitted as provided in this subsection. Such certificate of registration shall not exceed in scope the services authorized by the State certificate to be conducted in intrastate commerce, and shall be subject to the same terms, conditions, and limitations as are contained in or attached to the State certificate except to the extent that such terms, conditions, or limitations are inconsistent with the requirements established by or under this Act. If the effectiveness of the State certificate is limited to a specified period of time, the certificate of registration issued under this paragraph (7) shall be similarly limited. Operations in interstate and foreign commerce under such certificates of registration shall be subject to all other applicable requirements of this Act and the regulations prescribed hereunder. Certificates of registration shall be valid only so long as the holder is a carrier engaged in operation solely within a single State, not controlled by, controlling, or under a common control with a carrier engaged in operation outside such State, and except as provided in section 5 and in the conditions and limitations stated herein, may be transferred pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Commission, but may not be transferred apart from the transfer of the corresponding intrastate certificate, and the transfer of the intrastate certificate without the interstate or foreign rights shall terminate the right to engage in interstate or foreign commerce. The termination, restriction in scope, or suspension of the intrastate certificate shall on the 180th day thereafter terminate or similarly restrict the right to engage in interstate or foreign commerce unless the intrastate certificate shall have been renewed, reissued, or reinstated or the restrictions removed within said one hundred and eighty-day period. If, however, during the six-month period of termination, restriction in scope or suspension of the State certificate the holder of the corresponding certificate of registration has continuously performed the interstate operations authorized thereunder such certificate of registration can only be suspended, revoked, or terminated by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Act governing such suspensions, revocations, or terminations of certificates issued by the Commission: *Provided, however,* That under all other circumstances * * *. Such certificates of registration shall be subject to suspension or termination by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of this Act governing the suspension and termination of certificates of public convenience and necessity issued by the Commission.

"(B) All rights to engage in operations in interstate and foreign commerce under the provisions of the second proviso of paragraph (1) of this subsection, as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of this paragraph, shall cease and terminate, but any carrier lawfully engaged in interstate and foreign operations on the date of the enactment of this paragraph or any carrier who would have been so lawfully engaged in such operations but for the pendency of litigation to determine the validity of such person's intrastate operations to the extent such litigation is resolved in favor of such person, pursuant to such provisions, may continue such operations for 120 days after such date and, if an appropriate application for a certificate of registration is filed within such period, such operations may be continued pending the determination of such application. The Commission shall prescribe the form of such application, the information and documents to be furnished, the manner of filing, and the persons to whom or the manner of giving notice to interested persons of such filings. Issues arising in the determination of such applications shall be determined in the most expeditious manner and, so far as practicable and legally permissible, without formal hearings or other proceedings. A notice of intent to engage in interstate and foreign operations accompanied by certified copies of effective, lawfully issued or acquired State certificates filed with the Commission as evidence of authority to operate in interstate or foreign commerce under the provisions of the second proviso of paragraph (1) of this subsection, as in effect immediately before the date of the enactment of this paragraph, shall be conclusive proof that the applicant is lawfully engaged in interstate and foreign operations and the scope thereof."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Smathers, Mr. Hartke, Mr. McGee, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Case of New Jersey conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11027) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, as reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], is to deal with a situation which exists in several areas of the Midsouth, where floodwaters are now overrunning cotton land and preventing the planting of cotton. Even when the floodwaters recede, the land in many instances will be unfit for planting for several weeks.

This year flood conditions have already occurred in Kentucky and Tennessee and are expected to occur in Missouri, Mississippi, and other Southern States. The bill would change the date on the act to permit farmers in areas flooded in 1962 to take the same kind of action which has proved helpful in similar circumstances in the 2 previous years.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit 1962 cotton acreage allotments which cannot be planted because of natural disaster to be transferred to any farm in the same or an adjoining county in which the producer will be engaged in the production of cotton and will share in the proceeds thereof.

As has been stated, the bill has been passed by the House.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator confirm my understanding that the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and with no objection having been raised from this side of the aisle?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. It is a unanimous report, a noncontroversial report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 11027) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TARIFF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1281, H.R. 10607.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 10607) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and certain related laws to provide for the restatement of the tariff classification provisions, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, I have received from a constituent of mine a memorandum objecting to the passage of the bill. Based on the memorandum, I wrote a letter to the Chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission, asking for his comments on the bill, particularly with respect to whether judicial review would be afforded under the proposed legislation in exactly the same fashion as it is afforded under existing law.

In his reply, the Chairman referred to language both in the Senate report and in the House report, which reads, in part:

> This bill does not in any way detract from or remove any of the existing provisions of law concerning judicial review of executive or administrative action. The present judicial review procedures will continue in force before and after the new tariff schedules are made effective.

Simply for the purpose of the Record, since I interpose no objection to the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter to Chairman Dorfman, his reply to me, and the memorandum of objection from one of my constituents, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letters and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

April 6, 1962.

Honorable Ben D. Dorfman,
Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Several of my constituents have expressed their concern regarding certain provisions of H.R. 10607, the Tariff Classification Act of 1962, which has passed the House of Representatives and is now pending on the Senate Calendar.

Their principal concern is that they believe the present procedures providing for judicial review of classification and rates will not apply to the new tariff schedules and merchandise imported after these new schedules have taken effect. I would be grateful for your comments on this matter. I believe judicial review should be afforded under the same conditions as presently exists. Judicial review of administrative determinations is an essential ingredient of American justice and should be preserved.

My constituents have also noted the following sentence which appears on page 4 of the report of the Senate Committee on Finance (S. Rept. No. 1317): "The only changes which can be made in the tariff schedules, after the enactment of the bill, will be those which the Tariff Commission finds are required to be made by virtue of legislation, court decisions, or authoritative administrative decisions, all of which necessarily must be reflected in the new tariff schedules."

They would point out that authoritative administrative decisions are blanketed into the new tariff schedules as law without a final court determination having been made. I would be grateful for your comments on this point as well as on the three-page brief which they have sent me and which I enclose for your review.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,
Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senator.

OBJECTIONS TO H.R. 10607 AS PASSED BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

H.R. 10607 is an act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and certain related laws to provide for the restatement of the tariff classification provisions and for other purposes.

The bill was introduced in the House of Representatives on or about March 8 or 9, 1962. It was favorably reported by the House Committee on Ways and Means (H. Rept. No. 1415) on March 10, 1962, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 12, 1962. A resolution limiting debate to 3 hours and the right of amendment to members of the committee was adopted on March 13, 1962. The bill was briefly debated and passed by the House of Representatives on March 14, 1962, and was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance on March 15, 1962.

H.R. 10607 replaces H.R. 9189, which was introduced in the 1st session of the 87th Congress. No action was taken on that bill, to which objections were made by both importers and domestic interests.

H.R. 10607 provides for the adoption of the revised tariff schedules prepared by the U.S. Tariff Commission pursuant to authorization contained in the Customs Simplification Act of 1954. The purposes of the revision were, among others, to rearrange in more logical form and terminology the schedules of tariff classifications which set out the import duty rates applicable to imported merchandise, and to adapt the tariff classification schedules to changes which have occurred since 1930 in the character and importance of articles imported into the United States. The congressional directive to the Tariff Commission called for the revisions to be made without changing rates of duty other than those incidental rate changes deemed necessary by the Commission in accomplishing the objective sought.

In November of 1960, the Tariff Commission transmitted to the Congress the results of its study, in the form of a 10-volume report entitled "Tariff Classification Study—Proposed Revised Tariff Schedules of the United States." A supplemental report was submitted to the Congress by the Tariff Commission in January of 1962, incorporating certain changes in its original proposals necessary to reflect inadvertencies called to the Commission's attention during its reexamination, as well as certain changes made because of additional information supplied to the Tariff Commission after publication of its initial report.

It is noted that the report of the House Committee on Ways and Means indicates that the proposed schedules do involve some rate changes (H. Rept. No. 1415, p. 3). Aside from the fact that this would seem to warrant congressional review or consideration, there are other aspects of the bill which have serious implications, depriving importers of the right to judicial review of administrative decisions as to the rate and amount of customs duty payable on imported merchandise.

It is noted that the House Report No. 1415 states (at p. 5):

"This bill does not in any way detract from or remove any of the existing provisions of law concerning judicial review of executive or administrative action. The present judicial review procedures will continue in force before and after the new tariff schedules are made effective."

However, the saving clause of title II of H.R. 10607 set out in section 202(a) thereof does not appear to have the effect stated above, since it does not appear to preserve such rights with respect to merchandise entered (imported) after the effective date of the tariff schedules.

Section 202(a) of H.R. 10607 provides:

"SEC. 202. (a) This Act shall not divest the courts of their jurisdiction over a protest filed under section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1514), or by an American manufacturer, producer, or wholesaler under section 516(b) of such Act (19 U.S.C. 1516(b)), against a liquidation covering articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption before the effective date of the Tariff Schedules of the United States."

Section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 provides for the filing of protests against decisions of customs administrative officers fixing rates of duty applicable to imported merchandise. Thousands of such protests are filed annually by persons engaged in importing, at all ports of the United States.

While section 202(a) of H.R. 10607 specifically preserves the right to judicial review as to merchandise entered (imported) before the effective date of the tariff schedules proposed by the Tariff Commission, no such provision is made with respect to judicial review of assessments on merchandise imported after the adoption of such revised tariff schedules.

The bill accordingly warrants further study to insure that it does not deprive a substantial segment of our citizens of the right to judicial review of administrative decisions as to the rate and amount of customs duties chargeable on imported merchandise, a fundamental principle of our American way of life.

It is suggested that language such as was used by Congress in the Tariff Act of 1930 in the saving clause would be more appropriate:

"Nothing herein shall be construed to limit or restrict the jurisdiction of the United States Customs Court or the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals."

APRIL 9, 1962.

The Honorable THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: I have your letter of April 6, 1962, regarding concern expressed by several of your constituents in connection with H.R. 10607, the Tariff Classification Act of 1962, which has passed the House of Representatives and is now pending on the Senate Calendar.

As you state, their principal concern is the belief that the present procedures providing for judicial review of classification and rates will not apply to the new tariff schedules and to merchandise imported after the new schedules have taken effect. I wish to allay the fears of your constituents on this point. Report No. 1317 of the Senate Finance Committee and Report No. 1415 of the House Ways and Means Committee both clearly state (p. 5) that—

"This bill does not in any way detract from or remove any of the existing provisions of law concerning judicial review of executive or administrative action. The present judicial review procedures will continue in force before and after the new tariff schedules are made effective."

Section 101(a) of the bill provides for the substitution of the new tariff schedules for the existing schedules of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. Thus, being bodily incorporated into the existing Tariff Act, the administrative and special provisions of such act, including sections 514, 515, 516, and other provisions relating to the jurisdiction of the customs courts to review administrative determinations of customs officers, will perforce continue unabated with respect to issues arising after the new schedules have taken effect. No saving provision is needed for the reason that no provision in the bill specifically or impliedly divests the court of any of its existing jurisdiction.

In actuality, the jurisdiction of the court is extended rather than curtailed. As stated in Report No. 1317 of the Senate Finance Committee (p. 9), section 202(b) of the bill prevents domestic manufacturers' protests which may be pending before the courts under section 516(b), Tariff Act of 1930, from becoming moot at the time the tariff schedules go into effect.

Your constituents also express concern about the fact that the new schedules include some incidental changes in rates of duty. This fact they suggest would seem to warrant a congressional review or consideration of the schedules. On this point, I wish to point out that this feature of the new schedules was thoroughly discussed and considered by the Committee on Ways and Means in executive sessions held at the end of the 1st session and at the beginning of the 2d session of the 87th Congress. That committee issued a press release on August 15, 1961, to all interested parties inviting their comments on the proposed revised schedules and on the bill introduced providing for their implementation. Very few objections were received, and all those which were received were the subject of public hearings by the Tariff Commission in November 1961. The results of this further review were reported to the President and the Congress in January 1962 in the First Supplemental Report to the Tariff Classification Study.

The enclosure of your letter is herewith returned.

Sincerely yours,
BEN DORFMAN, *Chairman.*

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Calendar No. 1281, the act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930.

Mr. KERR. Is that H.R. 10607?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, H.R. 10607 is designated the Tariff Classification Act of 1962.

The Tariff Act of 1930 is now about 32 years old. Since it was adopted, numerous trade agreements have been entered into and literally hundreds of new items have come into being and have found their way into the channels of commerce.

When a new item is imported, the Treasury Department uses various logical and legal methods of ascertaining what is the duty, and as the number of these items increases the workload becomes greater; the free flow of trade is impeded and both importers and domestic producers have problems ascertaining what rate of duty would be assessed on an item when imported.

A few years ago the Congress took cognizance of this growing problem and asked the Tariff Commission to prepare a revision of our import classification system, to modernize it, to streamline it, and to simplify it wherever practical. The suggestion was made that, to the extent feasible, rates of duty be left unchanged, although it was recognized that in any consolidation process some incidental rate changes would be required.

The Tariff Commission has done an unprecedented job. Many, many hearings were held; and the conferences with importers, domestic producers, and other interested parties ran into the hundreds. Now we have the proposed revised tariff schedules submitted by the Commission which, with full explanatory notes and background material, fill 11 large volumes, which I have on the desk before me, including a supplemental report of over 1,100 pages.

Out of the many problems that have been taken up and the hundreds of individuals, companies, and associations that have been involved, only a very small number have raised questions that seem at this point to defy compromise or solution to the full satisfaction of all concerned. Even so, this is an amazing record, and the Finance Committee recommends that the bill be passed, so that the long process of arranging to put it into full force and effect may be started by the Treasury, State, and Commerce Departments as well as the other agencies which are awaiting the opportunity to make effective this much-needed modernization of our import classification system.

I want to say just a word about these few remaining problems which we believe can be satisfactorily resolved under procedures established in the bill. Further consideration of these items is taking place, and it would appear to be in the best interests of the country as a whole for the implementing legislation to be enacted without delay so that the President and the interested agencies of the Government can begin the tedious process of putting these revised schedules into operation.

I want also to make it clear that the bill provides for further consultation and consideration of a few matters about which questions still exist. Best estimates are that implementation will take 12 to 18 months—in other words, it will be that long before the new classifications are actually put into practice. At any time during this period corrections, alterations, compromises, or other changes may be recommended by the Commission, and these will be included in a supplemental report which the bill requires to be submitted to the Congress.

In plain language, this means that those few who may yet feel that the present Tariff Commission recommendations are not entirely equitable are not at this time being foreclosed, but their problems may be reveiwed and further adjustments made before the new classifications actually begin to regulate imports. On this basis, the committee has the strong hope that the bill may be adopted by the Senate without amendments to these classifications so that this long-needed legislation can be adopted without further delay.

I have assurance that further consideration can be given to pending complaints. In several cases the Tariff Commission has already promised further full-scale hearings and consideration.

We have had a question about the possible effect of this bill on the rights of importers and domestic manufacturers to obtain full judicial review. This doubt has possibly been raised because of the provisions of section 202 of the bill, the so-called "saving clause." This section saves the jurisdiction of the courts over protests filed by importers or domestic producers under the Tariff Act of 1930 before the new classifications replace the ones in effect when the protests were made. The report of the Ways and Means Committee, statements on the floor of the House, and the report of the Finance Committee establish the fact that the passage of the bill would not impair or affect existing judicial review. I call attention to page 5 and to page 9 of the Finance Committee report where it is made clear that nothing in the bill will affect in any way the existing full and complete review in the courts. The full review will continue in force with respect to all importations under present law as well as those under the new tariff schedules.

In conclusion, I want to thank the Tariff Commission for this painstaking and thorough job. The Commissioners, the staff, and the various agencies which have given help when needed should have the appreciation of the Congress and of the businessmen of the country. Mr. Russell Shewmaker, assistant legal counsel of the Tariff Commission, has spearheaded the project and to my knowledge has been most patient and has worked untiringly many extra hours because of the urgency of this project.

Madam President, I urge the adoption of the bill; and in connection therewith I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, which is in the nature of a technical amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed to strike out lines 12 through 19 on page 4.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, the Tariff Commission, after long and careful study, sent to the Congress the package before me containing recommendations for changes in our tariff classifications. The Ways and Means Committee amended that package by inserting a paragraph providing that in certain cases, when the Tariff Commissioners were equally divided in a matter, the Commission should make changes to insure that the existing law would apply to the articles in question.

This sounds innocuous, and it has been called a technical amendment. It was not until after the bill had been reported by the Finance Committee that it was learned the amendment which had been adopted would cover only one case and that that case had already been worked out by the Commission in a compromise effected by the Commission. The Ways and Means Committee, by adopting the amendment, actually killed the compromise and therefore altered the proposal by the Tariff Commission.

The amendment would put into effect what the Commission itself had done, and with reference to which, on review, the Commission was divided three to three in passing on a change of the previous action by the Commission.

Under the bill as it came to the Senate, because of what had been regarded as a technical amendment, that three-to-three division of the Commission would kill the action previously taken by the Commission.

The effect of the amendment which I have offered, which applies to only one item, would be to restore the effectiveness of the action of the Commission, without permitting it to be nullified by the three-to-three decision on action of the Commission at a later date.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator spoke of one item. Would the Senator give us a statement as to what is that item?

Mr. KERR. I shall do that.

Mr. JAVITS. Very well.

Mr. KERR. As I stated before, if we should not adopt the amendment I have offered to strike the language, the law would be certain, by reason of the technical amendment added by the Ways and Means Committee. The supplemental studies by the Tariff Commission which I have just explained would not apply, and it would be too late to correct what I think would be an injustice to a new and budding domestic industry.

I believe that what I am about to say relates to the question of the Senator from New York.

Our watchmaking industry has been diligently working out plans for a new type of watch, called the electronic watch. I do not know just how it will operate, but I do know that much research has been done and much money spent to perfect this new timepiece. Just where in our tariff classification this item should be placed was the cause of the one and only division among members of the Tariff Commission.

A compromise was arrived at with respect to the electronic watch and that compromise would be made effective by the amendment I have sent to the desk. Therefore I ask for its adoption.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I merely wanted to make sure that the item to which the Senator referred was not the item in which we were interested. If the Senator wishes the amendment to be acted upon at this time, that is agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. My colleague [Mr. Keating] and I are interested in an item technically described as face-finished hardboard. Its more normal description is tempered and painted hardboard. I believe we have satisfied ourselves with respect to that subject through discussion with the Senator in charge of the bill. However, I should like to place in the Record the necessary answers to the questions asked by my colleague and myself. In order to save time, my colleague has kindly consented to let me ask the questions.

The main problem we raised was that a compromise rate of duty which would apply to both face-finished and non-face-finished hardboard would, for practical purposes, bring about an increase in the ad valorem duty on face-finished or oil-treated hardboard of a certain type. Hence those who employ that kind of material felt they would be adversely affected.

In a letter dated April 13, 1962, we were informed by the Chairman of the Tariff Commission that, in view of the way in which the bill would operate—it is prospective in its operation—there would be, first, consideration of any problems such as the one raised with the Tariff Commission, which again may make reports; and the final schedules would not be published by the President until there had been an opportunity to consider questions of the kind that my colleague [Mr. Keating] and I have raised. We have also been assured by the Commissioner in the letter as follows:

> The Commission is most anxious that the proposed tariff schedules carry out the purposes of the tariff classification study without adversely affecting any of the interested parties, whether they be domestic producers or importers. In the interest of assuring the accomplishment of this result for the proposals with respect to face-finished hardboard, the Commission will be pleased to review such proposals under the procedure set forth in section 101(b)(4), and you may be assured that steps will be taken to effect such a review as soon as practicable after enactment of H.R. 10607.

Mr. KERR. With reference to the item which the Senator has mentioned, the committee went to the extent of asking the Tariff Commission for such assurance with reference to further consideration of the particular item as the Commission gave to the Senator in the letter from which he has just read.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the Senator. We have been advised by the Chairman of the Commission that—

> The Commissioner proposes to hold a full scale review of the hardboard situation, including hearings at which all interested parties will be heard; and that following these further studies, the Commission will issue a supplemental report, and the Congress will then have an opportunity again to take up any differences that remain.

The two questions that I wished to ask the Senator are as follows:

First, is the Senator satisfied that the method of procedure described is entirely within the compass of the bill as the Senate is expected to pass it today?

Mr. KERR. Yes. That is the situation, not only because of the difference of opinion with reference to the classification of the particular kind of hardboard to which the Senator has referred but also because of a similar situation existing with respect to a limited number of other products.

Mr. JAVITS. The second question is as follows: The Senator has stated that the committee is prepared to undertake the necessary action based upon the report of the Tariff Commission, should it have any different view after the proposed hearing.

Mr. KERR. Both the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee are committed; and the bill provides that an additional report shall be made to the Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. I express my appreciation to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Kerr] for their typical graciousness and consideration. It was upon that ground and those assurances that my colleague [Mr. Keating] and I were satisfied to go along with the bill today. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 10607) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KERR. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN MISSIONARIES IN AFRICA

Mr. PELL. Madam President, I rise at this time to pay a public tribute to the debt that is owed by the Western World to our Christian missionaries and the education they have offered in Africa and to say, "God bless our missionaries." Until I had made a recent trip to Tanganyika, I had always given a very long look at the activities of missionaries since I was under the impression that they were often disliked by the people of the emerging nations and regarded by them with great suspicion.

However, my trip to Africa deeply impressed me with the great educational and medical contribution made by missionaries there. In Tanganyika alone, I found that there were 400 American Christian missionaries, or 20 times the number of American Government personnel in that country. In fact, in tropical Africa as a whole, there are close to 10,000 American missionaries. This is a number more than a thousand percent higher than the 778 American Government personnel there.

Or, another way of looking at it, and an even more impressive figure, is the realization that there are 23,000 missionaries of all nationalities, including Americans, in tropical Africa, approximately 6,440 Catholic and 15,970 Protestant.

These dedicated men and women may handle very high caliber education as is the case with the Angelican St. Andrew's School outside Dar-es-Salaam, Tanganyika, where the graduates are able to compete on an equal basis with youngsters finishing the best English schools at home. Or, as is the case with the majority of missionary schools, the education may be more simple and elementary, giving the students a basic knowledge of reading and writing. But, no matter what may be the particular level of missionary education in Africa, without it that continent would be undergoing far greater turmoil and internal strife than is now the case.

In this connection, it is interesting to notice that 16 heads of state and prime ministers of the newly emergent nations of tropical Africa received their education in full or in part in missionary schools. In fact, with only a single exception, every head of state or prime minister in tropical Africa who is not a Moslem was educated to some degree in a Christian missionary school.

This is, indeed, a startling fact and is highlighted by a report prepared for me by the Library of Congress, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Education of Heads of State and Prime Ministers in Tropical African Countries

Cameroon: President Amadou Ahidjo, Moslem and secular schooling.

Central African Republic: President David Dacko, Catholic mission school in Congo.

Chad: President Francois Tombalbaye, born to Protestant parents in Moslem area. Some Protestant schooling assumed.

Congo Republic (Brazzaville): President Abbe Fulbert Youlou, ordained and defrocked Roman Catholic priest.

Republic of the Congo (Léopoldville): President Joseph Kasavubu, Catholic mission education to seminary. Premier Cyrille Adoula, Catholic mission educated.

Ethiopia: Emperor Haile Selassie, educated by private European tutors, and in Catholic mission school. Titular head of the Ethiopian Coptic Church.

Dahomey: President Hubert Maga, Catholic mission education.

Gabon: President Leon M'ba, Catholic mission education.

Ghana: President Kwame Nkrumah, Catholic mission education.

Guinea: Premier Sekou Toure, Koranic and secular education.

Ivory Coast: President Felix Houphouet-Boigny, presumably elementary Catholic mission education followed by extensive secular education in France.

Liberia: President William V S. Hubman, Protestant (Methodist) education.

Malagasy (Madagascar): President Philibert Tsiranana, possible elementary Catholic education followed by secular schooling.

Mali: President Mobido Keita, secular and probably Koranic schools.

Mauritania: Premier Moktar Ould Daddah, Koranic and secular schools.

Niger: President Hamani Diori, Koranic and secular schools.

Nigeria: Governor General Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, Protestant mission schools. Prime Minister Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa, Koranic and secular schooling.

Senegal: President Leopold Senghor, Catholic mission and secular schooling.

Sierra Leone: Sir Milton Margai (President), Protestant mission schooling.

Somalia: President Adan Abdulla Osman, Koranic and secular schooling. Premier Abdirashid Ali Sharmarkay, Koranic and secular schooling.

Tanganyika: Prime Minister Rashidi Kawawa, apparently Koranic and then secular schooling. (Julius Nyerere who resigned in early 1962 was educated in Catholic mission schools. Nyerere remains the strongest political figure in Tanganyika.)

Togo: President Sylvanus Olympio, Catholic mission school.

Upper Volta: President Maurice Yameogo, Catholic mission schooling.

Mr. PELL. Madam President, in fact, of the 27 men listed in this report dealing with the heads of state and prime ministers for 23 countries, 17 received Christian missionary education at one stage of their career. Of the 23 heads of state alone, 16 received Christian missionary training. The remaining men, it is to be noted, are in all cases Moslems. Put the other way, every single man listed in the report other than the Moslems was educated to some degree in Christian missionary schools.

Among the total educated in mission schools, 14 attended Catholic mission schools, and 4 Protestant mission schools. Among the heads of state alone, 12 received Catholic schooling and 4 Protestant.

Moreover, in those countries not yet independent, we find the leaders equally owe their education to missionaries as is shown by the attached list, which I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF LEADERS IN EMERGING AFRICAN STATES

Angola: Holden Roberto, chairman of the rebel UPA, was educated in Protestant mission schools. Mario de Andrade, president of the rival MPLA, educated in Catholic mission schools.

Kenya: Jomo Kenyatta, probably the President of independent Kenya, was educated in Protestant (Church of Scotland) schools. Tom M'boya was educated in Catholic mission schools.

Nyassaland: Dr. Hastings Banda, president of the Malawi Congress Party and the leading African figures, was educated in Protestant mission schools.

North Rhodesia. Kenneth Kaunda, president of the United National Independence Party, and apparently the strongest African figure, was educated in Protestant (Church of Scotland) schools.

South Rhodesia: Joshua Nkomo, president general of the National Democratic Party and in a sense the "elder" African politician, received a secular education.

Uganda: Benedicto Kiwanuka, chief minister of provisional government to receive internal autonomy in March 1962. Educated in Catholic missions through secondary level.

Mr. PELL. Madam President, among the eight men in six territories included in the table of emerging African States seven were educated in Christian missionary schools. Three of these attended Catholic schools and four attended Protestant schools. The remaining individual, Mr. Nkomo of South Rhodesia, was educated in South Africa where secular schools have been more widely established.

Putting the tables together, a total of 35 men are included. Of these 35, Christian missionaries educated 25; Catholic missionaries educated 17; and Protestant missionaries educated 8.

It is obvious, Madam President, that we owe a great debt to the missionaries. These figures to my mind are highly significant and they mean that, without our missionaries, the nations of Africa would have been much more poorly equipped to join the family of nations and conditions would be far less stable in Africa than they are.

JAMES M. NORMAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1233, H.R. 1361.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 1361) for the relief of James M. Norman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, the Farmers Home Administration—originally the Farm Security Administration—was established in the thirties to help farm families buried under the distresses of the great depression again find a place in the sun.

It looked upon the people it served as living, breathing, thinking, working contributors to the general welfare—not as byproducts of a crop surplus.

Its basic tools were concern, credit, and a system of supervision that respected personal dignity. The results of its efforts are reflected, even now, in thousands of farm families who recognize they could not have survived on the land without the cooperation of this agency of Government.

Nearly three decades have passed since the depression put its greatest weight upon our society. Yet, in the face of comparative general prosperity, a financial blight afflicts much of the agricultural sector—due largely to our failure to equitably manage the Nation's food abundance and failure to keep the social and economic advances in step with rapid technological progress.

Unfortunately, for 8 long years the tools of the Farmers Home Administration, largely because of misuse and misdirection, were allowed to rust. There was a day, during those 8 years, when a statement of official satisfaction came out of the Department of Agriculture accompanying statistics showing the disappearance of a million and a half farms. This disappearance was described as good because it brought physical resources into balance. There was no mention of human resources. It is that phase we must consider now.

It would be indeed tragic if we put ourselves into the position many other nations find themselves in—where a redistribution of the rewards of production must have its start in a redistribution of the land itself.

So I am proposing that we take a fresh look at the Farmers Home Administration and make it a well-financed tool for the fight on human misery and for the maintenance of family farms that make maximum contributions to the physical, social, economic and spiritual welfare of the whole of the society.

During the past year this Agency has begun to come back into its own.

In connection with the second supplemental appropriation bill I requested that at least $100 million in additional funds be made available. That request was made by letter to the Committee on Appropriations. I am happy to say that we appropriated $50 million in the second supplemental appropriation bill. I am hopeful that in conference between the two Houses that sum of money will be maintained. These are not appropriations which are expended. These are amounts of money that are made available by loans, with interest, and upon which the Government earns a profit and a fair return.

Armed with new authorities, some additional funds and a leadership that is bound and determined to serve those who are most in need—the agency is beginning to make its mark.

And the people it serves are once more gaining spirit for the struggle at hand and hope for a brighter future.

The response from the people has been overwhelming.

Even though the new authorities given to the Farmers Home Administration by the 87th Congress were only placed in effect a few months ago—mid-October to be exact—the applications for services are running about 70 percent ahead of last year. And this is only the beginning. There are thousands of farmers who are not aware that this service exists. There are even larger numbers who were pushed aside by the administration in power for so many years in the past that they are convinced that the Government—their Government—is against them.

Congress showed commendable foresight in rearming the Farmers Home Administration last year with modern, up-to-date authorities. Practically all of the strings that had been hampering its actions have been cut. The agency can now serve the full range of family farmers instead of a narrow band of this group of farm people so essential to our national welfare. But unfortunately the funds for the Farmers Home Administration are still too limited.

What are the problems, the needs our people are bringing to the Farmers Home Administration in 1962 that require additional funds?

Many have bought farms on contracts with terms and conditions they cannot meet because of an economic situation not anticipated at the time of the purchase. Others have been caught in the cost-price squeeze and have accumulated operating debts that are forcing them to the wall.

Others need additional acreage to make their farms go, or need land or building improvements to achieve maximum efficiency.

Still others—and these are of major importance to all of us—are young farmers who have an opportunity to buy a family farm to take over the operations of a retiring farmer but lack the equity required for a conventional loan.

For families with these problems, I propose that Congress authorize the

Farmers Home Administration to lend $200 million during fiscal 1963.

There are other farm families who need financial help in the development of water resources. These include irrigation facilities that will eliminate major growing season risks and farmstead water supplies for livestock production and home sanitation.

Some water resources can be developed on an individual basis; others require cooperative action by farmers and rural residents in a neighborhood. For this assistance, I propose that the agency be authorized to lend $100 million during the coming year.

In the third—and probably the largest—category of farmers who must turn to the Farmers Home Administration for credit they cannot obtain from other sources, are those who would achieve financial stability through the purchase of additional livestock or by replacing wornout machines or spreading fertilizer or by acquiring other essentials for modern farming operations. For these farm-operating loans I propose that Congress authorize $500 million.

With almost 3 months remaining in this fiscal year, FHA operating loan funds are nearly gone. The Senate Appropriations Committee is reporting the second supplemental appropriations bill, as I said before, included a $50 million appropriation for FHA operating loans to meet the critical credit needs of farm families during the next few months. I am extremely hopeful that the conferees will leave this item in the bill.

In total, this is three times as much as was available to the agency during the current year. But it still represents but a small part of the credit that will be used by farmers; and it demonstrates that we have lifted our eyes from the ground and are facing up to a significant phase of the total farm problem.

Along with increased funds, Congress should expand the Farmers Home Administration's manpower. There are several reasons for this.

Perhaps the most basic reason lies in the function the agency performs. Because it is primarily concerned with people the credit function is secondary to its main activity, which is advising and counseling the farm families it serves in all the matters that affect their economic well-being. This supervision, this guidance, this personalized service encompass all the families' major economic problems.

The field service officers of the Farmers Home Administration help with farm management and with money management; they advise as to debt problems, give help with medical care, work with the families on education, marketing, community participation, and all the allied matters that go with rural farm life.

They bring to these discussions the specialized knowledge and experience of 28 years of working with families who have had, for one reason or another, problems of such a magnitude that the ordinary avenues for overcoming these problems are closed to them.

As a result, the advice and guidance given is as important as the loan funds provided. One could not serve its purpose without the other.

To give the agency more funds to lend, without giving it additional personnel, would be to filter out the full effect of the funds.

There is another basic reason for expanding the agency's staff. Through the years, the staff has been diminished until now it has personnel in less than half of the agricultural counties. Where it once had rather sizable staffs in counties where the need was greatest, rarely does one now find more than one trained specialist in an office.

In a way, it is a rather bitter comment on the distorted attitude of recent years to note that the Farmers Home Administration is practically the only agency of the Department of Agriculture that has shrunk in size.

As a result of this pulling back, large segments of the country are without any service coverage.

To restore this program to nationwide coverage and to give it the strength in depth that it needs in the areas of greatest concern, I suggest that Congress appropriate for fiscal year 1963 $70 million, or approximately two times the amount available for 1962.

In addition to the services mentioned a moment ago, the Farmers Home Administration is involved in a number of other services which have the same basic objective.

The rural part of the housing program is handled by this agency.

I see great things in store for rural people with the housing program being administered under an enlightened leadership. The Housing Act of 1961 expanded the benefits to anyone residing in a rural area. This is a great step forward. We are beginning to see people instead of bureaucratic lines.

A total of $430 million was authorized by the Housing Act of 1961 for the rural housing loan program, to be expended over a 4-year period. The FHA was given $75 million for fiscal 1962, and these funds already have been used in making approximately 9,000 loans. Secretary Freeman recently announced that the FHA has now received an additional $20 million in rural housing loan funds for the remainder of fiscal 1962. I commend the Secretary for his action in releasing these badly needed funds.

The agency is also tied directly into the rural areas development program. In fact, it is the heart of the program—at least in depressed areas. For how else can low-income farm families make the most of what they have, and acquire the additional resources they need?

I mentioned earlier that the 87th Congress has greatly improved the services of the Farmers Home Administration. But I can see new programs that will further strengthen and develop the assistance this agency can render to the underdog in agriculture.

For example, it is necessary to have some additional methods of making available to small farmers the resources they need most—land. This could be done by helping them to establish associations, like grazing associations, that would lease or buy land for the use of groups of small farmers, or we could authorize the Farmers Home Administration to purchase large tracts as they come on the market and return these tracts in family size sections to individual farmers.

The President, in his farm message, spoke of a rural renewal program that might encompass loans and technical assistance to local and rural renewal groups. These groups might be one method of getting land resources in the hands of family farmers. For they would acquire land and then resell it to family farmers in a manner that would both conserve the soil and meet the needs of the people.

I am also most enthusiastic about the emphasis the President has placed on developing recreational and other facilities in rural areas.

I note that in proposed legislation that has been already introduced at this session the Farmers Home Administration would be empowered to make loans to individual farmers and to associations for the development of recreational facilities.

We need also a freer use of grant funds. They are already authorized in emergency situations in farm housing. We should also have them available in support of all of the lending activities of the Farmers Home Administration. In some instances they would serve as a means of exploring certain possible solutions, as in the test drilling of wells in the West. In other instances they would bridge the narrow gap between what a family could repay, and what they needed, in the way of financial aid.

We also need to give the Farmers Home Administration more freedom in exploring any road that opens up and appears to lead to a successful way of helping a group or even an individual farm family make a decent living.

I am not thinking of anything grandiose in this field. But I cannot help thinking of the millions we have placed into other types of research—and with good results. But on the same basis why can we not allocate a much smaller amount to this living laboratory in human endeavor so far as the small farmers, the poor farmers, the farmers who have come up with the short end of the stick in agriculture, are concerned.

Backing up this research in human endeavors to solve rural poverty we need to authorize the actual development, on a limited scale, of any feasible ideas that evolve from the drawing tables. We need to be able to develop prototypes, so to speak, of any institutions, services, or other devices that might help low-income farm families. We do this in our probing of outer space, why not also do it in our probing of inner space problems?

We also need to authorize the Farmers Home Administration to explore the possibilities for helping elderly rural people work out a satisfactory solution to a means of livelihood in the final years of their lives.

Within its present authorities the agency can do a great deal in helping its borrowers so plan their farming activities that they have access to as many resources as they choose to handle in their declining years. But there is a big field here for further assistance if it can be attacked with imagination and vigor and a reasonable amount of funds.

There are numerous alternatives that must be explored. There are certain advantages to enabling the aging to have access to a loose knit rural community—loose knit in the sense that it still has enough open land and even cultivated land to give them a feeling of continuity with that which they have known all their life, but enough of a community so that medical care facilities could be close at hand. On the other hand, with visiting nurses it might be possible to devise ways and means to enable many farmers and their wives to spend the last, and the best, years of their lives on their own farms, near their children, with a large degree of independence, but still protected by ready access to the community facilities they need.

All these possibilities need to be explored.

The programs of land tenure, of research, of aid to the aging, are all areas that need to be explored. The Farmers Home Administration is ideally suited to the job.

The benefits of an expansion of the activities of this agency along the lines I have described are many:

First. First and basic is the fact that any move the Farmers Home Administration makes, by the very position of the people it works with, is an attack on underemployment and rural poverty.

Second. The skills and tools held by and available to the Farmers Home Administration are admirably suited to helping young farmers get started on their own.

Third. The program of the Farmers Home Administration builds communities. Many rural communities are dying. Hundreds have already disappeared. Each time a community shrinks, the people suffer. The work of the Farmers Home Administration gains in significance when you note that it helps not only farm people but by increasing their incomes enables them to support their towns and the people within those towns.

Fourth. The program of the Farmers Home Administration helps to hold down the size of the ranks of the unemployed in urban areas. When it does this, it helps to hold down the rate of delinquency, and misery, and all the other evils that come from the poverty-stricken groups in our metropolitan areas.

Fifth. The program of the Farmers Home Administration helps to guarantee that we will be able to feed the millions of additional mouths that will be a part of the world population in the year 2000. For the agency's program brings stability and strength to our farming economy.

Sixth. The program of the Farmers Home Administration is a wonderful demonstration for underdeveloped countries of the world to see and examine, not only as a demonstration of ways and means that they may be able to adapt to their own uses and benefit, but also as a demonstration of how a democratic country feels about its people and their problems—of how people come first.

Seventh. The program of the Farmers Home Administration is an aid to production control. The agency builds family farms. Family farms are flexible in their operations and can shift from one farming system to another in accordance with the needs of the times. Corporation farming with its heavy investment in a specialized farming system is inflexible.

Eighth. The program of the Farmers Home Administration perpetuates the family farm—the ideal type of relationship between man and the soil. This ideal is a part of the American heritage. The family farm is the foundation of rural American economic, social, and political institutions.

Ninth. The loan program of the Farmers Home Administration is self-liquidating. The money the agency lends is repaid with interest. Losses are negligible. Even the cost of administration is offset, so far as the national economy is concerned, by the substantial gains made by the families it assists. These families contribute to the national economy in a threefold manner: As producers, as consumers, and as taxpayers. In each of these three respects their contributions are substantially heightened by the progress made with the aid of supervised credit assistance.

Tenth. The contributions the Farmers Home Administration is making to welfare of farm families and the far greater contribution the agency could make—given the means to do it—are functions no other agency can perform.

Conventional credit agencies are unable to serve the farm families reached by the Farmers Home Administration. Agencies with educational programs can be extremely helpful in many ways, but they lack the ingredient that brings paper plans into reality—the financial assistance that is an integral part of the Farmers Home Administration's system.

In summary, let me point out that in the form of this agency we have an extremely powerful force that can help hundreds of thousands of our rural people move up to a status that is rightfully theirs. In this agency we have an approach that places the emphasis where it belongs—on people.

Measured in the true sense, our family farmers are the most efficient and the most needed, and they make a major contribution to our Nation.

They must be given an opportunity to overcome the risk and forces beyond their control if we are to maintain our greatest national heritage. And this must be done today; tomorrow would be too late.

So many of our rural people have been pushed off the land, gobbled up, and discouraged, that I raise the question, Have we already passed the point that should never be passed if we are to preserve our agricultural strength?

Are there in the United States today areas where there are not enough farm people to properly maintain a sound diversified agricultural economy?

Madam President, these are thoughts I think we should ponder. Let us not delay. We need to move now, if we are to keep rural America alive.

Madam President, I want the record clear, as I submit statistical tables which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD. They relate to the operating loans of this program.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Actual number of signed applications for initial operating loans on hand Jan. 31, 1962, estimated number of such applications to be received Feb. 1 through June 30, 1962, and estimated amount of applications, selected States

State	On hand Jan. 31, 1962		To be received Feb. 1–June 30, 1962		Total	
	Actual number	Estimated amount needed	Estimated number	Estimated amount needed	Actual and estimated number	Estimated amount needed
Alabama	769	$2,083,221	1,279	$3,464,811	2,048	$5,548,032
Arkansas	597	2,936,046	1,222	6,009,796	1,819	8,945,842
Colorado	247	2,829,632	286	3,276,416	533	6,106,048
Georgia	574	3,326,330	745	4,317,275	1,319	7,643,605
Idaho	384	3,315,456	517	4,463,778	901	7,779,234
Indiana	175	1,487,150	599	5,090,302	774	6,577,452
Iowa	622	5,764,696	1,051	9,740,668	1,673	15,505,364
Louisiana	501	2,443,878	664	3,238,992	1,165	5,682,870
Minnesota	453	3,952,878	1,798	15,689,348	2,251	19,642,226
Mississippi	794	2,885,396	1,844	6,701,096	2,638	9,586,492
Montana	242	2,807,926	360	4,177,080	602	6,985,006
Nevada	48	447,360	65	605,800	113	1,053,160
New York	317	$3,558,008	785	$8,810,840	1,102	$12,368,848
North Carolina	800	2,656,800	1,313	4,360,473	2,113	7,017,273
North Dakota	424	4,108,136	1,090	10,561,010	1,514	14,669,146
South Carolina	465	1,024,860	1,166	2,569,864	1,631	3,594,724
South Dakota	218	2,444,652	464	5,203,296	682	7,647,948
Texas	1,051	7,754,278	1,422	10,491,516	2,473	18,245,794
Utah	163	1,324,538	267	2,169,642	430	3,494,180
Washington	234	2,222,298	445	4,226,165	679	6,448,463
Wyoming	80	830,400	161	1,671,180	241	2,501,580
Total	9,158	60,203,939	17,543	116,839,348	26,701	177,043,287
Total, all States	13,691	90,772,825	30,000	199,635,079	43,691	290,407,904

NOTE.—This table reflects the estimated need for operating loan funds in excess of the present appropriation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I wish to note for the RECORD that the program of the Farmers Home Administration is not a giveaway program. Although it offers many services to the farm people, in terms of supervised credit, education, health, and better land use, the Farmers Home Administration is essentially a businesslike operation by the Government. So, for the life of me, I cannot understand why the Government in its budgetmaking insists on treating such loans as if they were expenditures. As a matter of fact, any banker who did that would undoubtedly be dismissed for utter incompetence or would be assigned to a mental institution. The truth of the matter is that loans help put capital to work, and they put it to work at interest; and these are interest-bearing loans which have been repaid and are being repaid. Not only do they return a profit to the Government, but they also make great profits for the communities.

The Farmers Home Administration has literally saved hundreds of communities throughout the Nation, by making available long-term credit, medium-range credit, and short-term credit for farm operators and farm producers, thereby making it possible for them to be consumers as well as producers in a growing economy.

So, Madam President, from their point of view, the Farmers Home Administration, like the Small Business Administration or like the Federal Housing Administration, these great loan programs of our Government—makes money for the Government. Of course, that should not be its primary purpose. But, in addition, and most importantly, it contributes to the health, the strength, and the prosperity of the American economy.

However, for some peculiar reason, because of some old-fashioned notion, whenever money is made available for loans from the U.S. Treasury, it is called an expenditure, and is so listed, for the American public to see. Yet, when one borrows money from a bank—thus making loans available from the resources of the bank—the bank calls it a credit, not a debit, and says that is doing business. After all, that is the way bankers get rich and that is the way the bank depositors are paid interest on their deposits. Yet the Government completely negates that theory, when handling Government financing.

Certainly it is time for Government financing to be brought out of the 18th century and into the 20th century. When that is done, we shall find that these loan programs make major contributions to the health, the well-being, and the prosperity of the Nation, and at the same time they are not any drain whatever upon the Federal Treasury or the taxpayers.

FINAL SETTLEMENT OF WAR CLAIMS PROBLEM URGED

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, there are on the Senate calendar two bills which are a reminder that Congress has not yet completed action on a program for disposing of some $600 million in enemy assets vested in 1942 as a war measure. It was anticipated that one of these bills might be brought up today; but I understand it is not now the intention of the leadership to call it up.

However, Senate bill 495, as proposed by its sponsors to be amended, would terminate the vesting program insofar as copyrights, future interests in estates, trusts, and similar property rights are concerned. But it would by no means settle the long neglected war claims problem.

The guidelines for a final settlement were long ago determined by treaties, statutes, and other precedents. In brief, we agreed with our wartime allies, except Russia and Poland, and with the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan that the vested assets of our former enemies would be retained and used to pay compensation to Americans who suffered property losses in the European and Pacific war theaters. At the same time, the allies renounced claims for reparations from the Axis Powers, which could have amounted to many billions of dollars; and Germany and Japan agreed to pay compensation to their own nationals, for the vested property.

In 1948, a war claims bill was enacted. It expressly prohibited the return of vested property to the former German and Japanese owners, and established a number of programs under which payment would be made out of these assets to American wartime internees, prisoners, and certain religious organizations. Later—in 1949—we enacted an International Claims Settlement Act, which has since been amended several times. Under this act we have used the liquidated assets to pay for wartime losses attributable to Italy which occurred in Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia, Albania, France, North Africa, and on the seas. The same act also provided for payment out of vested assets for nationalization claims of Americans against Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Poland In all, under these different programs, more than $200 million has been paid to Americans, out of the assets vested during World War II.

These acts go part of the way toward compensating Americans for the losses they suffered as a result of World War II. They reflect the agreements we made not only with our allies, but also with our former enemies, with regard to the use of the vested assets. But they have one glaring shortcoming: They make no provision whatever for losses which Americans suffered as a result of military operations in Germany and Japan and contiguous areas.

There is no difference whatever between a program for compensation for such losses and any of the other programs which have been enacted. A powerful lobby and the determined opposition of a few men—not any matter of principle—are all that distinguish a settlement of claims against Germany from the settlement of claims against Italy, Bulgaria, Rumania, and other countries.

Attempts to enact a German and Japanese war-claims program have been stymied for more than a decade. It is now 16 years since the end of World War II. This is too long to ask any American to wait for fair treatment from his Government. Every day's delay prolongs the period of injustice and compounds the administrative and legal problems involved. If more people were aware of the situation, there would be a national outcry in protest against the failure of Congress to act. The situation is intolerable; and, in my opinion, any further delay in settling this issue would be shocking.

Unfortunately, the prospective beneficiaries of a German war claims bill are not organized into powerful lobbies. They are, in the main, too old and poor and discouraged to give voice to the disappointment and despair which they feel. We are doing them a grave injustice by not giving attention to their cause and expression to their rights.

I have heard from many of these poor souls—men who served in our Armed Forces, widows who have been forced on relief, children whose inheritances were destroyed—a small army of beleagured Americans who have been made to suffer a wholly unfair burden because of our failure to act. Their letters would stir the conscience of every Member of this body and spur the same determination which I feel to relieve their plight.

The other pertinent bill pending on the Senate Calendar (S. 2618) would allow the filing and adjudication of claims against Germany and Japan, but makes no provision for their payment. It has been pending on the calendar since the last session of Congress, but no assurance has been given that it will ever be called up for consideration. Apparently, some of those who supported even this halfhearted approach reluctantly are so fearful that desirable amendments would be accepted by a majority of the Senate that they refuse to allow the bill to be debated.

I believe a majority of the Senate would support the amendments needed to make S. 2618 meaningful and equitable. But it is wrong to deny the Senate an opportunity to work its will on this issue. I hope that before this session is much older, the opposition will relent or be overcome, and this problem will be openly considered.

When S. 2618 was reported to the Senate, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and I joined in individual views in which we outlined the amendments which would be needed to make this an adequate bill. These amendments are now in legislative form, and we have asked other interested Senators to join in their cosponsorship. This is a wholly bipartisan effort, and there are many Senators on both sides of the aisle who are deeply concerned. We are ready to act whenever S. 2618 is called up for consideration.

The first of these amendments would provide for the payment out of vested assets of adjudicated claims. Let us face the issue squarely. Either the vested assets will be used to pay these war damage claims, as they have under other programs, or they will have to be paid for out of tax revenues. The attempt in S. 2618 to defer this question of payment is not a solution to the problem, but a tactic designed ultimately to cast upon the shoulders of U.S. taxpayers the cost of the program. This violates every agreement, treaty, and precedent for dealing with World War II claims. Really it would mean that the American taxpayer would pay for these losses twice, first when the United States agreed to waive all reparations in exchange for the vested assets, and second, when tax moneys are appropriated to pay for the damage done by our wartime enemies. This is a preposterous proposal which will have few supporters in this chamber. Provision for payment out of the war claims fund is the only possible alternative.

Our second amendment would permit the sale to private enterprise of the General Aniline & Film Corp., a large company vested during the war because of its secret ownership by I. G. Farben. Because of interminable litigation affecting this property, it is still being run by the U.S. Government through the Department of Justice. It has been suggested that there has been favoritism and other abuses in the awarding of contracts by the corporation. But in fairness, it must be said that Attorney General Kennedy, like his predecessors in the Department of Justice, has given strong endorsement to the proposal to allow the Government to get out of this business. Every interested organization except those representing the plaintiffs in the litigation and a small group which favors the return of all vested property, supports this same objective. The management of the company, the chamber of commerce, the AFL–CIO, the Supervisory Association of the General Aniline Corp., the International Chemical Workers Union, which represents most of the company's rank and file employees, the minority stockholders, and many veterans groups have all joined in the effort to rid this company of the dead hand of Federal management and control. If there have been abuses, if the company has not realized its full potential of growth and prosperity, Congress must certainly share the blame.

There are recurring rumors of an impending settlement of the GAF litigation. There is strong suspicion that some of these rumors are deliberately spread by interests speculating in the stock of the company, although one such report was traceable to some unfortunate press conference remarks of a new U.S. Ambassador. Of course, there have been some negotiations for settlement in the almost 14 years during which the GAF litigation has been pending. However, I can report authoritatively that these negotiations have failed and there is no prospect for a settlement of this suit. There is no possibility of our Government ever agreeing to a return of this property to I. G. Farben or any other foreign interests. Delaying this matter of sale, therefore, does not do anyone any good and is causing tremendous harm to the company and its thousands of employees, which could do much better under free enterprise than under Government ownership.

Our third amendment would permit a lump-sum settlement in the amount of $500,000 of all claims of so-called successor organizations for the return of heirless property vested during the war. This is property that could not be returned to German nationals who had been subjected to persecution on grounds of race, religion, or political belief during the Hitler regime. Since many of these persons perished in concentration camps and gas chambers without any heirs, Congress enacted legislation in 1954 allowing this property to be used for the relief and rehabilitation of needy surviving persecutees in the United States. Originally a ceiling of $3 million was established. A bulk settlement of $500,000, such as is proposed, is eminently fair and is urgently required if this relief and rehabilitation program is to continue.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. JAVITS. I am pleased to hear my colleague make this plea for action in this matter, with which I have been associated for a long time. I know how urgent is the need, and I interrupt only long enough to join with my colleague in his urgent request that action is long overdue, and that it represents very elemental—and I think most limited, in terms of money—justice to people who have been sadly put upon. I am indebted to my colleague for raising the question.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the comments of my distinguished colleague, and I know of his great interest in the amendment and the problem, about which he has been concerned for a long time. It is a problem which really appeals to the fairness and the human instincts of everyone.

The fourth amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and myself would simply make the war claims bill applicable to Americans who suffered losses in Hungary. Such claims have been omitted from earlier war claims bills only because of the assumption that compensation would be provided under the International Claims Settlement Act. In actual fact, the Hungarian vested assets were insufficient to pay more than 1 percent of awards over $1,000, which no one would consider fair compensation. The amendment we will offer would allow additional compensation to be paid on these claims, but the total amount could not exceed the percentage paid under the Rumanian claims program, the area for which the next lowest recovery has been realized.

These four amendments have the strong endorsement of the administration. Similar proposals considered in the 86th Congress had the equally strong endorsement of the prior administration. All four amendments are reflected in bills already approved during this session by a subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. From advice I have received, I would expect the full committee to act favorably on these bills in the very near future. It is apparent that those who have given this matter objective and thorough study recognize the merit in our amendments. I know that the complicated and technical nature of this subject has handicapped a wider understanding of their significance and that is why I emphasize the uniform support they have received from men in Government in both administrations who are expert on the subject. But let me emphasize also that when the technicalities are removed it is evident that what is involved is simply whether we are going to carry out agreements and commitments long ago made to pay Americans the losses they suffered during the last world war.

The only one of our proposed amendments which does not have the backing of the interested Government departments is the amendment to permit all Americans on the date of enactment of a war claims program to participate in its benefits. The arguments against this proposal are grounded on considerations of international law. These considerations, in my opinion, are of dubious validity. But apart from that, this is not a matter which should be decided on the basis of international law but rather on the basis of our own laws and policies. Our laws have never sanctioned a distinction between Americans based on the date of their naturalization. As Americans, we instinctively reject any such division of our fellow citizens as discriminatory and indefensible. There may be first- and second-generation Americans, but there are no first- and second-class Americans. The concept of junior citizenship may be recognized in international law, although I doubt it; but this is no justification for recognizing any such concept under whatever domestic legislation we enact to carry out a war claims program.

The point I am making is well illustrated by the background of S. 495. The principal purpose of this bill, as it is proposed to be amended, is to divest all rights and interests of individuals in copyrights and estates, trusts, insurance policies, annuities, remainders, pensions, workmen's compensation and veterans benefits which have not become payable or deliverable prior to the effective date of enactment. There is no distinction made in this bill between later citizens and earlier citizens or indeed between citizens and aliens. This is not an oversight. Former Deputy Attorney General, now Associate Justice White, in recommending this amendment in March of this year stated, "it would, in addition, benefit all beneficiaries of these interests, regardless of whether they are citizens of the United States or whether the estates or trusts were created by a citizen or national of the United States." Nothing is plainer than the recognition this gives to the power of Congress to treat all Americans alike under war claims legislation.

One thing we certainly must not do is enact legislation such as S. 495 to divest property interests not only where Americans are concerned, but former enemy nationals as well, and then fail to enact a converse measure to allow claims to be filed by all Americans. I cannot believe that we would follow such an inconsistent and unconscionable course when the war claims bill is before us. If we are going to set any precedents, let it be for equal treatment of all Americans.

Mr. President, I hope we shall have an opportunity in the not too distant future to discuss these principles again when the war claims bill is before us. S. 2618 has been languishing on the Senate calendar for many months. It has been resting quietly but it has not been forgotten. Let it be called up soon so that it can be strengthened and humanized and become the basis at long last of a final settlement of this long neglected subject.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 505. An act for the relief of Seymour Robertson;

S. 508. An act for the relief of John E. Beaman and Adelaide K. Beaman;

S. 704. An act for the relief of Marlys E. Tedin and Elizabeth O. Reynolds;

S. 2151. An act for the relief of Harvey Burstein;

S. 2319. An act for the relief of Harry E. Ellison, captain, U.S. Army, retired; and

S. 2549. An act for the relief of Edward L. Wertheim.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, after discussing the matter with the acting majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY], with the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], with the chairman of the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who has in turn conferred with the chairman of that committee [Mr. ANDERSON], and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], it is my intention to suggest the absence of a quorum and then to ask the Senate to consider a resolution which has come to us from the other body, almost identical in form to Senate Joint Resolution 171, to provide for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial. The resolution is House Joint Resolution 449, as reported by the committee in the other body and passed yesterday.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum so that Members may be informed as to the business of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he suggests the absence of a quorum?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield, and withhold my suggestion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] wishes to make some remarks this afternoon. I suggest we might have a brief call of the roll and then yield to the Senator from Oregon, until other Senators who may be interested in the proposal can return to the Chamber.

Mr. JAVITS. That will be fine. I suggest that it is unnecessary to have a quorum call until the Senate is ready to consider the resolution. I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

COMMUNITY VISITOR SERVICES PROGRAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Department of Commerce has embarked upon what is called a travel program, under the very able direction of Voit Gilmore, pursuant to a bill reported by my committee and passed by the Senate and House of Representatives last year.

The other day the Department issued a guide for a community's visitor services program, for guidance when visitors come to the United States. I think some very pertinent points are made in this publication, in respect to being good hosts and hostesses, so I ask unanimous consent that the publication may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY VISITOR SERVICES PROGRAM

When communities hear of the new "Visit U.S.A. Program," generally their first question is: "Does this program really mean anything for us?" Definitely "Yes." Oversea surveys by the U.S. Travel Service show that our prospective visitors want to see all of America—our scenic wonders, our villages, our prairies, our industrial centers, and all the other attractions of this land that beckon them. Every community has the right to expect international visitors, depending upon its interest in receiving them and its willingness to get ready for them.

Oversea travel-promotion offices of the U.S. Travel Service are distributing literature, movies, and newspaper, television and radio features about every part of the United States. Travel agents and carriers are busy promoting tours to every part of the country.

International visitors to a community mean not only a great opportunity for increased international understanding and good will, but increased dollar income as well. Attracting and taking care of international visitors is good business.

As part of its program to encourage America to be a better host to the increasing tide of visitors from overseas, the U.S. Travel Service is glad to send its representatives to any community that wishes to discuss a "visitor services" program. The Travel Service will assist communities in planning a program to attract and take care of international visitors. Where there is no such program established, one effective way to start is for the mayor to summon a meeting of all interested in tourism to organize an active committee.

Following is a checklist of activities which communities have found helpful in starting or strengthening their program to care for the international visitor. Some ideas listed below may not be applicable to your community, owing to size or location:

1. Creation of an international visitors commission or council.
2. A survey of all present services available to foreign visitors.
3. Coordination through some central organization or committee of all civic, industrial, governmental, and professional resources interested in international travel.
4. Courtesy schools sponsored by industry for all personnel who come in contact with the general public—courtesy, service, and welcome are three musts.
5. Cooperation of travel agents, transportation officials, hotel and motel and restaurant managers, and others who provide services for international travelers.
6. Improve and promote community-area and State tourist attractions.
7. Expansion of services of organizations which already meet the needs of particular types of foreign visitors.
8. An inventory of multilingual people of the community willing to serve as translators, guides, hosts.
9. Sponsorship of international tours for foreign travel agents, travel writers, newspapermen, industrial leaders, and civic groups.
10. A program to provide opportunities to meet U.S. citizens in their homes.
11. Tours of churches, museums, art galleries, industrial plants, supermarkets, subdivisions, homes and gardens, and other points of interest to international visitors.
12. Development of group tours to ease language and cost problems.
13. Wider use of bilingual personnel by restaurants, hotels, transportation, sightseeing, and other businesses which serve international visitors.
14. An inventory of multilingual policemen. Identify their language ability by armbands and make use of their language facility by assigning them to areas with a concentration of foreign travelers.
15. Encourage restaurants and retail establishments to place signs in windows indicating languages spoken. Encourage multilingual menus.
16. Educational programs in schools, radio and TV, and newspapers to stimulate a general awareness of, and interest in, the foreign visitor.
17. Multilingual directional and informational signs in airports, piers, other transportation terminals, and at important tourist attractions.
18. Visit communities that have established successful programs for foreign travelers.
19. Sponsorship of workshops devoted to the foreign traveler.
20. Cooperate with the activities of the National Association of Travel Organizations, the National Council for Community Services to International Visitors, Travelers Aid, and similar organizations.
21. Prepare a list of interesting industrial plants which welcome visitor tours.
22. Provide convenient currency-exchange facilities.
23. Establish visitor information centers, with material in appropriate languages.
24. Obtain NATO Community Book (source: National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.) and encourage hotels and motels to use "Serving the International Visitor," published by the People-to-People Committee of the American Hotel Association (source: American Hotel Association, 14th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.).

SEATTLE WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the April 7 issue of the Nation carried an excellent article on our Seattle World's Fair which will open April 21.

The author is Lincoln Kirstein.

I believe the article will be of wide interest, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER FROM SEATTLE

(By Lincoln Kirstein)

In the coming months, Century 21 Exposition, the Seattle World's Fair which opens on April 21, will get its just and lavish due in the press. But before the massive weight of an indicated and seemingly inevitable success swamps any hint of the trials of its inception and organization, it may be useful to indicate some of the realities behind this exemplary project. The pressures which urged its birth are not unique to our Pacific Northwest, although the physical plant which these pressures have finally determined is unique in this Nation at the present. The normal human obstructions of conservatism, apathy, and the frictions of greed and envy, which made much of the early going difficult, are universal, but the success with which they have been overcome, and fairly rapidly, are unusual anywhere. We now have many projects for culture centers all over the country, from Lincoln Center in New York, which is already partly built, to those projected for Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, and Washington, D.C. Again, however, Manhattan is an island, and its costs in land and labor are the Nation's peaks. Social, economic, and geographic insularity predicate extremely conservative possibilities. For one thing, it might have been possible in any European autocratic or socialist state to condemn the expensive block of real estate leading from Central Park West to Broadway. This would have provided an axis for Lincoln Center, a planted parade approach which is the normal setting for its key building, the Metropolitan Opera House. But the razing of property involved would be unthinkable here and now. Manhattan has not been a frontier town for two centuries; in many ways, Seattle still is. And Seattle is more homogeneous and focused than Los Angeles, less rich and complacent than San Francisco.

The more one studies the organization of the Seattle plan, the more one doubts it could have been effected on such a scale in any other part of the country. There may be more money in Texas, but Texas suffers from a self-perpetuating parochialism which prefers to spend its energy in the inbred competition of three towns, and tends to exclude the rest of world, except as it applies to Texas. New York may be the cultural capital of the country and port to the globe entire, but its costs and pressures in nerves and property preclude much breadth or daring. Washington, as a National Capital, has a symbolic prestige of some urgency and a captive audience of tourists and Government workers, but it is at root inchoate and faceless.

There is a very strong face to the Seattle Fair which is most immediately apparent in the impulse and ability to control its overall visual aspects. From the outset, there has been a determined effort to maintain a unit which contains an elastic interior vitality and variety, presenting a unified, light, elegant stylistic whole. Unlike many previous fairs, one's first impression is not of any startling eccentricity in a few arrogant and insistent profiles, but rather of a more or less delicate fantasy within a compact plan. It sacrifices no gaiety or playfulness, but it is designed as an integrated precinct, rather than as a loose collection of temporary structures.

And unlike other world fairs, past and future, there was a root necessity for the Seattle exposition, beyond the compulsive exuberance of an energetic park commissioner, or the usual enthusiasm of a chamber of commerce. This necessity was the many sided and long acknowledged demand for a center for industrial shows, cultural activities, sports events and entertainment, serving not alone a large city but a whole region that embraced Seattle, Tacoma, Spokane and up to Vancouver.

It is difficult to understand the economic logic of self-styled hardheaded businessmen, bankers, actuaries and real estate operators who backed the "Century of Progress" in 1933, the New York World Fair of 1939 (as of 1964) and the Brussels Fair of 1958, wherein the greater part of their investment in planning and construction was wiped out at the conclusion of each shown. In New York, which is typical, the fair site is too far removed from the urban center to have much continuous value except as a summer park. A concept of permanence and continuous use was paramount from inception in Seattle, and hence its integration, the ordering of its facilities, its accessibility to the heart of the city as well as the adjacent growing outskirts were always considered.

In 1956, the city of Seattle authorized a modest bond issue of $7.5 million, to initiate a civic center whose rather vague conditions then included a 6,000-seat opera house as a multipurpose auditorium. The scope of the present center was hardly indicated, and the interest of national or international factors not even suspected. To be sure, there was the useful reminder that in 1909, Seattle had held the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition for 137 days. In spite of the lack of mass transport at the time, 4 million people visited Seattle.

In 1957, Gov. Albert D. Rosellini invited some 70 business, labor and community leaders to form a trusteeship for Century 21 Exposition, Inc. However, any major underwriting was a considerable struggle until as late as 1960. Then, with substantial aid from Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, help was promised in Washington for a very ambitious Science Pavilion, for which the Federal Government granted $9 million, the largest sum for such a purpose that has ever been made. (The New York 1964 Fair will probably receive $25 million from the same source.) Having grown from its first notions of a State fair, to a regional exposition, Century 21 then sent Joseph Gandy, the energetic president of the fair and a local Ford dealer, to Paris, where he obtained from the Bureau of International Expositions an authorization as a legitimate world's fair. This recognition automatically allied 30 member nations with the project. Such authorization has been ignored by the New York World's Fair of 1964.

In order to encourage those who follow in the footsteps of Seattle's planners, it should be said that the early going was the reverse of simple or easy. Not only doubt, but possibly well-intentioned opposition was a powerful deterrent. Whenever public lands or facilities are in hazard, either to rehabilitate or replace, whenever there is a question of condemnation, reconversion or improvement, one must expect every legal hindrance due process can muster. Seattle had its full share. For example, an individual who owned some $1,000 worth of the original $7.5 million city bond issue brought suit. He stated that the proposed new multipurpose concert hall was merely a conversion and not the new facility which had been voted by the people; in June 1959, the court ruled in his favor. A general referendum was scheduled for September so that the entire local electorate could be heard. And the Seattle voters sustained the conversion program. Had they denied the plan, the cost would have been almost double. To build an opera house-concert hall from scratch would have entailed many millions more than the original $4 million proposed for that building; no additional facilities could have been afforded. What finally resulted was the completion of an excellent opera house within the walls of an older structure (the former vast civic auditorium) at a cost of $2.5 million; the remaining funds were allocated to the small theater and further permanent exhibition space. In addition, $1.5 million was authorized from the city's general funds to assure completion of the whole culture center in more than a minimal fashion. This included the realistic decision to purchase first-rate equipment and furnishings which will mean long-range economies of maintenance.

At the start, apart from suspicion and envy, there was considerable doubt that sufficient energy and funds could be found to justify an appreciable local displacement of habitual investment and passive planning. Besides, there was not even a skeleton staff to direct strategy for such an exercise. But beginning 5 years ago, a small key group of the busiest men in the Northwest met on fair business weekly, later twice a week, from 7 o'clock in the morning until their own offices opened. It took 3 years of tactical maneuvering to clear the way for actual construction. But the fact remains that for the last 3 years, the fair has enjoyed the strongest volunteer program both in quality of leadership and dollars of underwriting, for any public purpose in the history of the Seattle region. One cannot pretend that it was a mass movement; a very few men did a very great deal of work. That so large a program was undertaken in peacetime, rather than under the whips of war, is also heartening.

Paul Thiry, a local architect of taste and capacity and a member of the City Planning Commission, was retained as governing architect for the whole exposition, and for the residual permanent civic center. He has insured a unity of style in a manner which has been more editorial than censorious. In order to accommodate diversity within a unified whole, a repetitive module was established for much of the shelter skirting the fair walls. Tall, delicate, square, black-steel columns at regular intervals support a more or less continuous colonnade, facing the interior of the fairgrounds; these hold up large square precast concrete vaults which form a solid roofing. The spaces between the columns may be plugged in any way the exhibitors desire, to avoid monotony, although all plans have been under the close observation of Mr. Thiry and his staff. The use of very thin precast concrete slab walls on the perimeters of the grounds is most impressive. The construction workers took considerable pride in the great project; it was a mark of some prestige to be chosen to work at the fair. As a result, the broad walls have a surface, their edges a crispness, hardness and apparent solidity, unusual to an often graceless and impermanent material.

B. Marcus Priteca and James Chiarelli, local architects, have inserted a very handsome and capacious opera house seating 3,100 persons, with a huge and well-equipped stage and a luxurious lobby in rose marble, within the shell of the old civic auditorium. Apart from serving the Seattle Symphony annually, it can accommodate the San Francisco and Metropolitan operas, on tour, in facilities as good as, or even better than, their own homes. The fair has taken similar advantage of other existing and adjacent structures. The sports arena, seating 5,500, has been handsomely refaced in brick; the large State stadium, seating 12,000, has been beautifully replanted.

A courageous and dramatic move was made during the fair's earliest planning in the retention of Minoru Yamasaki of Detroit as a member of the fair's design standard advisory board. This Nisei architect had lived in Seattle and graduated from the University of Washington, but had left because of the anti-Japanese feeling engendered by the Second World War. His parents had been interned as enemy aliens, and his return to Seattle was not undertaken without emotion. The Federal science pavilion, the single most ambitious complex at the fair, is entirely of his design. Although Yamasaki was actually no longer advising the fair when he, with the local Seattle Architects Naramore, Bain, Brady, and Johansen, was selected by the U.S. Government to design this building, his interest stemmed from a very close involvement in the original embryonic ideas. Yamasaki has placed three large rectilinear structures around a water court; very tall precast concrete columns in the center form an airy skeletal pavilion, capped with a lacy articulation of tracery and concrete spider-webbing which is almost late Gothic in feeling, and also recalls the construction of crystals. It is a masterpiece. When the fair closes, it may revert to the University of Washington.

The theme building of London's 1851 International Exhibition was Paxton's Crystal Palace. The Fourth International French Fair was adorned by Eiffel's tower which, until the present has surpassed all other theme structures, including the trylon and perisphere of New York in 1939, and the atomic globes of Brussels in 1958. John Graham, a Seattle architect-engineer, had recently placed a revolving restaurant on a large office building in Hawaii. He was asked by a group of private financiers to design what has now become the fair's theme building, and promptly produced the space tower. It is far handsomer in reality than early models or the renderings issued by the management. In certain lights, it seems entirely improbable, for its central service shaft disappears, and one sees only the slim profiles of the bundle of steel and concrete rods, which support its diadem, 600 feet in the air. The rods are pinched together at a height of 375 feet, and then gently flare out to 550 feet, to hold a restaurant seating 600 people, which turns imperceptibly once an hour, to give an incomparable view of bay and mountain ranges. It is proof against earthquake and even suicide; it is so perfectly balanced that a 1 horsepower motor is all that is required to swing the restaurant.

"The World of Tomorrow," the theme show of the fair, is housed in perhaps the most radical engineering among many very advanced designs. Paul Thiry has designed a coliseum which can house large conventions and sports events after the fair closes. Four massively sculptured concrete tripods act as abutments for the four steel compression trusses of the roof envelope, and are connected by a hollow prestressed concrete edge beam. Steel cables laced between the trusses form a hyperbolic paraboloid network on which aluminum panels are secured to form the completed roof. This encloses 3 acres of uninterrupted space and can seat 18,000 persons when cleared of exhibits and converted to civic center use.

In what will be the civic center's main complex, connecting the small theater designed by Paul Kirk with the opera house, stands the exhibit hall. It is a very high and well-lit concrete shell, enclosing some 40,000 square feet of space. During the fair, this will contain at various times, an ambitious exhibition of masterpieces of painting from international collections, chosen by Dr. William Milliken, director emeritus of the Cleveland Museum; a large show of American and international art since 1950, selected by Dr. Sam Hunter of Brandeis University and Dr. William Sandberg of the Stedlijk Museum, Amsterdam; and the arts and crafts of the Pacific Northwest. By no means least, there will be shown the best of the brilliant collection of the Seattle Museum itself which, under the able direction of Dr. Richard Fuller, has made itself famous among American galleries of middle size since the last war, particularly in its Chinese and Japanese departments. There will also be a one-man show of pictures by Mark Tobey, perhaps the most widely appreciated of northwestern modern painters. The opera house, the small theater, the sports arena and the large stadium, owned by the Seattle school system, will be continuously occupied by performing arts events, under the direction of Harold Shaw, an associate of S. Hurok.

In an operation of such magnitude, many people have been responsible, and a wealth of medals and bouquets have already begun to be handed around. But, as is often the case, a very few have been in key positions, and of these some have seldom been mentioned at all. In the central operations office of the fair corporation there is mounted a terrifying robot, the count down machine. This proclaims visually the weeks, days, indeed the hours to high noon, April 21, 1962, when President Kennedy will declare the fair open. No one watches this relentless reminder with more fascination, alarm and hope than Ewen C. Dingwall, since 1957 the vice president and general manager of Century 21 Exposition, Inc. Mr. Dingwall, an affably anonymous dynamo, is one of our unsung culture heroes. He served an invaluable apprenticeship as the former executive director of the Washington State Research Council; he has been executive assistant to a mayor of Seattle and is no innocent in Washington, D.C., nor in Athens or Tokyo. He has been chief administrative officer of the entire fair, charged with carrying out the plans and construction of the whole scheme. Under 50, Dingwall is a concentrated man who seems first of all to have conquered any apparent restlessness or apprehensiveness of his own, to have found a formula which saves time, money and nerves, with at the same time a just insight into the personal interests of diverse people. Mr. Dingwall has something more than administrative gifts and long experience. By supporting the choice of individuals whose best judgments were sometimes quite at variance with the atmosphere of commercial success, he has imposed a high degree of elegance on this exposition. With the small key group of strong-willed leaders in close agreement, Dingwall recognized from the start the importance of the philosophical or esthetic basis to so popular, so loose, and in the best sense, so democratic a proposition. The fair has not so much good taste, nor any one man's taste; it is the creation and presence of an ambience in which logic, gaiety, a homogeneous lightness and variety interlock with compactness and practicality, with no watering of a central aristocratic integrity, and nothing vulgar.

Is there nothing wrong, at all? Are there no errors? Had it to be done again, could anything be done better? These questions are scarcely relevant at this juncture, particularly since there is so much of excellence and the fair is not yet finished or open. It might be carping to find some fault with the brutal and graceless precast concrete supports of the first monorail train in the United States; it will transport visitors from downtown Seattle to the fairgrounds, more than a mile in 96 seconds. But they point to the fact that the Seattle Fair designers had nothing to do with the visual aspects of the monorail; it was planned and executed (and financed) by a West German concern. When one compares it with the delicate concave and convex domes sheltering many of the national and industrial exhibits, one sees the wisdom of controlling design with a firm yet delicate central hand and eye. One might, as a professional theater man, question the size of the small theater. To provide for only 800 people in so beautiful, so luxurious, a house is luxury indeed; the economics of present-day theater being what they are, future managers may moan for another 400 seats for which there can never be room.

And naturally one wonders what use will be found for the opera house, the small theatre, the sports arena and coliseum, and all the other fine facilities after the end of next October, when the fair is closed. It would be a tremendous pity if their reversion to the city of Seattle resulted in a perfunctory cityhall operation. To fill such premises, to maintain them in a city the size of Seattle, 52 weeks in a year, year in and year out, will take money for loss and for development. But is it too much to expect that the men and minds which called these structures into being in response to a real need (even though you can't have a world's fair every year) will be unable to determine their future uses? There is already much discussion of a public-service corporation which will manage or lease the spaces from the city on a basis of planned quality.

It would be good to think that what Seattle has been able to do about getting a culture center as the residual endowment from a world's fair, could be done in half a dozen other American communities in the next 30 years. Boston, Atlanta, Chicago and Los Angeles naturally spring to mind. All have large and growing urban and suburban areas, and are regional centers as well. The manner in which Seattle has responded to its necessity, its combination of salvage and courage, is certainly a model and an incitement.

"THE CITIZEN AND NATIONAL SECURITY"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACKSON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an address by my colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], entitled "The Citizen and National Security," delivered as the opening address to the National Security Seminar in Spokane, Wash., on Monday, April 9. This seminar is one of a series of meetings being held for citizens in different parts of the country under the auspices of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

I hope my colleague's address will receive a wide reading. I find it a very constructive and helpful statement of attitudes and actions for Americans who wish to make a greater effort for peace and freedom.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITIZEN AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington)

I am honored to have this chance to speak to you this morning.

I have great respect for the effort represented by this seminar. Your discussions and your study should encourage a more realistic understanding of the task we face in providing for the safety of the Nation and the preservation of individual liberty.

The enemies of freedom are on the march. Their emblem is the hammer and sickle. Their weapon is the totalitarian state. Their battlefield is the world. Their aim is to bury us.

This Nation now faces a time of testing as decisive as any in its history. Lincoln's words to Congress in 1862 apply equally to us: "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

Lincoln knew, as we must know, that the struggle is not won by words. His eloquent expressions spoke for powerful deeds. Our deeds must be powerful now.

America and the free world are mortally threatened and we will lose unless we make a supreme effort.

Can we do that kind of job now—without the stimulus of a shooting war? This is the central challenge of our time. Can a free society generate the sustained national effort required to outperform and outlast the Communist adversary?

Henry L. Stimson wrote in 1915:

"History is not often changed by speeches. The course of history is made up by a long patient series of humble acts which gradually form the opinion and character of a Nation and not by dramatic utterances."

You and I and 180 million Americans share the responsibility of creating the opinion and character of this Nation. Our humble deeds, our attitudes, our understanding set the limits, or open the way, for national action.

This is what I want to talk about today. How can our attitudes and actions help make a greater effort possible?

I want to make a few suggestions.

First, we should be skeptical about simple solutions to the complex problems of the cold war.

Some people claim a stepped-up defense program is all we need to contain the Soviet threat. It is not. We face a total threat—extending over a worldwide military, political, economic and cultural front.

Others claim there is some gimmick which can dramatically halt the Soviet threat or some trumpet we can blow to tumble down the walls of the Kremlin. There is no such easy answer. The problem cannot be outlawed by act of Congress or even talked to death on the Senate floor. Soviet power has risen for over 30 years; it will not be suddenly reversed in 30 weeks or 30 months.

The problems we confront cannot be met by action in any one field. The challenge is total, the response must be total, or it will not be enough.

Second, we must be again the aroused and purposeful people which, at our best, we are.

When a Hitler strikes for world domination, freemen spring to arms in defense of their liberties. They fight and work with an irresistible will to victory.

Think back to what we accomplished in World War II. Between 1940–44, we increased the real value of our gross national product by 55 percent, and while putting 11 million men into uniform and sending them all over the world, we were still able to increase the real consumption of goods and services by about 11 percent during that period.

And this Nation has proved its ability to make the great effort in more than wartime. The determination of an American people who discovered and tamed the western frontier, who built and maintained a great democratic society, who mastered the challenge of the industrial age and developed the highest standard of living in the world—such a determination must be applied to the present struggle.

Our grandfathers lived with danger. The homesteader had a rifle by the hearth. Like the pioneer before us, we have to carry the burden of weapons while not laying aside the tools of freemen. We too must live with the sword, but not by it.

Third, we should recognize that the conference table is no escape from the conflict.

Some people say: "As long as we keep the Soviets talking, they aren't fighting." Nothing could be more untrue. Khrushchev is fighting. He is practicing the classic Communist tactic—manipulating the crisis to demoralize and weaken the opponent.

Traditionally, we tend to look upon international discussions and conferences as a means for resolving disputes and stopping conflicts. Many people cannot see that in the hands of Moscow they may be a means to continue conflict. To the Kremlin negotiation can be a weapon and the peace conference a field of battle.

Some people say: "There is no alternative to negotiations with the Russians." This kind of statement is not really helpful. There obviously is an alternative, which is by wise action to modify the attitude of the adversary. Negotiation is not talk apart from action—negotiation and action are parts of one whole.

Action may well be the wisest method of negotiation. It influences the environment which in large part is likely to determine the outcome of any discussions.

The Marshal plan was a powerful move in negotiation. So, on the other side, was the first sputnik.

I am personally confident that there is but one way to make progress toward the reduction and control of arms. That is, to prove that the free world will not let Moscow excel it in any major weapons field. The only way to bargain successfully with Moscow is to have strength to bargain with.

Fourth, ours must be the steady spirit in an unsteady world.

We live in a time when every tomorrow brings another crisis. From Berlin to Brazzaville, from Bangkok to the Bay of Pigs, our nervous systems are plugged into every distressed area of the world. No matter how distant the dateline we feel the strain, for we are all under the gun.

This is, perhaps, the toughest test of all. Is our mettle strong enough to take it? Khrushchev is betting against us. He thinks our will is brittle and will break. He thinks we are not in the struggle to stay.

It is a very personal challenge to us all. There may be some among us who, dreading the dangers of the nuclear age, will seek relief at any price. There may be others who, in great impatience from fear or frustration, will advocate a brutal end to uncertainty. But our survival depends on the stable, sensible majority who believe we must preserve both ourselves and our free institutions.

These institutions we defend make room for the doubters and the detractors. We hear them out. But our tradition has been that though we tolerate extremists of many kinds, we do not follow them. We have kept our heads in tight spots before and I am betting we will do so again.

In conclusion, let me say this:

Many people wonder where all this is coming out—they ask: "Is there a light at the end of the tunnel?"

In answer to that question, I would reply: The problems of war and peace are not amenable to any once-for-all solution. Something like eternal vigilance and determination will be required to keep peace secure and individual liberty safe. But if we outperform the Soviets, I believe we will outlive them.

If we respond to the Soviet challenge on all fronts, we will accomplish things we would never accomplish otherwise. We will have to cooperate with friends and allies on a scale far surpassing the past. We will see a stronger and better America and a stronger and better free world.

Maybe the Soviets do not realize this, but forcing this competition upon us as they are, they give us the historic chance to prove the advantages and power of freedom.

The words spoken by Robert Lovett are the right words:

"I see no reason for black despair or for defeatist doubts as to what our system of government or this country can do. We can do whatever we have to do in order to survive and to meet any form of economic or political competition we are likely to face. All this we can do with one proviso: we must be willing to do our best."

ESTABLISHING OF THE FORMER DWELLING HOUSE OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON AS A NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 449, which the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] has discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 449) providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (H.J. Res. 449) providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the joint resolution which we are now considering comes over from the other body, having been passed there. It is precisely, as to the operative text, the same as Senate Joint Resolution 171, sponsored by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. Keating] and myself, which was passed in the Senate on March 28, 1962, roughly 2 weeks ago.

The purpose of both resolutions is to establish the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial. The record in the Senate is complete as to the discussion on that subject.

The difference between the joint resolution we have received from the other body and the joint resolution which was passed in the Senate is solely in the addition of one section, which provides a ceiling upon the authorization for appropriation of $460,000, thereby differing from the Senate joint resolution, which carried an authorization for appropriation in the same section, section 3.

I point out that the other change is that the preambles have been stricken from both the joint resolution adopted by the Senate and the joint resolution from the other body. Aside from the changes I have described, the text is exactly the same.

It is to be noted that the ceiling on appropriations applies only to section 1 of the joint resolution, which concerns itself with the removal of the present structure from where it is now located in the city of New York to a new site.

The feeling to which I have referred has nothing to do with the other section of the joint resolution, section 2, which relates to the administration, protection, and other operation of the proposed memorial.

The Senate report made clear that the estimated cost was $460,000. That statement is contained at page 2 of the Senate report, Calendar No. 1274. The report states:

> The Federal Government would bear 'the cost of removing and restoring the house

and developing the new site for visitor use. Such costs are estimated to be $460,000.

That is the ceiling which has been placed in the joint resolution by the other body.

The report continues as follows:

Annual maintenance and operation expenses thereafter would be approximately $45,000.

I have consulted with the acting majority leader, the minority leader, and the chairman of the subcommittee that had this subject in charge, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], who has in turn advised me that he has consulted with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson]. I have also consulted the Republican member, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Dworshak], and it seems generally satisfactory to all to accept the House joint resolution.

My colleague from New York [Mr. Keating] and I have discussed the subject. We have no pride of authorship in our joint resolution, as opposed to the House measure. The project is long overdue. The structure is going into terrible disrepair. It would be a shocking national loss if it were not immediately preserved. So we very much hope that the Senate will approve the House measure, and that it may proceed on its way to the White House for the signature of the President. The memorial will then become a reality.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to join in the suggestion of my distinguished colleague that the limitation which was put on the project in the other body be accepted. According to the engineers' estimates, the amount represents the anticipated cost for the relocation of the Grange. As my colleague has pointed out, the amount does not expressly apply to the anticipated administration and operation cost of the house as a national memorial, which is estimated to be about $45,000 annually.

The American Scenic and Historic Society, the present owners of the Grange, have indicated their intention to donate about $75,000 for the future upkeep and management of the memorial. The willingness of that group, the State, and the city of New York to provide the site and the other necessary legislation is additional reason for prompt action in the Senate to approve the measure in its present form. I am happy to join my colleague in asking that the Senate take the requested action.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to my colleague. I point out that we have consulted also with the principal technician of the Committee on the Interior, who feels that the ceiling amount is adequate to achieve the purpose of establishing the memorial, so long as it does not affect the question of maintenance and operation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 449) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the joint resolution was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the junior Senator from New York.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY AS BUREAU OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1057) to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution, which was, on page 2, line 10, strike out "the whole or".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

JAMES M. NORMAN

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H.R. 1361) for the relief of James M. Norman.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the bill (H.R. 1361) for the relief of James M. Norman.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

"YOU CAN FIGHT COMMUNISM"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the February 1962 issue of the VFW magazine contains an excellent article "You Can Fight Communism," by Mark Clutter.

I commend this article to the attention of all thinking Americans. The formula that Mr. Clutter sets forth is for each of us to fight for justice, good social order and the principles of Americanism. As the article points out these are the causes for which all decent men should stand.

The VFW stresses a positive approach to our responsibilities to be good citizens in contrast to those who urge that we flail out at communism.

The best way to beat communism at home is to make democracy work and work well. The best way to defeat communism abroad is to set the good example here for others to follow.

I salute the VFW for the positive and constructive stand they are taking. Through daily deed and act members of the VFW, their families and their friends are serving to strengthen the cause of freedom everywhere.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

YOU CAN FIGHT COMMUNISM

(By Mark Clutter)

(Editor's Note.—If you need to be convinced that you are doing your bit to help fight communism—when you belong to the VFW—this article rates your careful reading. It was written by a newspaperman with more than 20 years of experience as a reporter and editorial writer. He was in charge of the editorial page of the Wichita, Kans., Beacon, until that newspaper was recently purchased by the publishers of the Wichita Eagle.

(As a member of post 112, Wichita, since 1953, Mark Clutter became acquainted with the aims and activities of the organization. "I would have joined earlier if I had understood the purposes of the VFW," he explains.

(Author Clutter's understanding of the VFW from the viewpoint of an objective newspaperman—one who has taken the trouble to truly know the organization as a dues-paying member—is most inspiring. He backs up his appraisal with a most significant observation when he says:

("I think it extremely important for eligible newspapermen and others in communications to belong to the VFW. The understanding they gain makes it possible for them to serve the public fairly and truthfully."

(Comrade Clutter is a Navy veteran of World War II. His several assignments in Asiatic-Pacific areas included service as an enlisted correspondent, attached to Pacific Advanced Headquarters Detachment. He also served a brief tour of duty aboard the destroyer, U.S.S. *Stoddard*.)

There isn't any way that you, a plain citizen trying to make a living and rear a family and get a little pleasure out of life, can fight communism directly.

That negative statement appears to contradict the title of this article. Actually it does not. It merely sets limits which must be recognized by anyone who wishes to do his part in defeating the Communist conspiracy.

HERE'S HOW YOU CAN FIGHT REDS YOU CAN'T IDENTIFY

You can't fight communism directly because the enemy is mostly invisible. He seldom presents a target, and when he does, it may not be a real target. The Communists are a secret, criminal, highly disciplined gang. They know how to work underground, how to use the gullible, how to infiltrate and pervert worthwhile institutions. To catch them and break up their plots is a job for skilled operatives, such as agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Communists are, as J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, pointed out, "masters of deceit."

The chances are that you, a VFW member, don't know any Communists or deep pink fellow travelers. You just don't move in those social circles. How can you fight people you can't identify?

How does a military commander act when the position and plans of the enemy are unknown? He makes his forces as strong and battle-ready as possible. He tautens discipline. He prepares for attack from any possible quarter. He knows his own position thoroughly.

Such strategy is the basis for an effective anti-Communist campaign. Since we, as citizens and veterans, cannot seek out and destroy the enemy, we must make ourselves so strong that he cannot prevail against us.

Any positive and effective anti-Communist campaign must be essentially a pro-American campaign. The conflict is, in its present phase, a war of ideas. Two opposing ways of life are struggling for world supremacy. It is important to know what communism means, but it is far more important to know what Americanism means.

How good an American are you?

There can be no doubt of your emotional loyalty to flag and Nation. If you were less than loyal in your feelings, you would not belong to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. But do you truly understand what Americanism means? Do you know your own position?

VFW members generally are better informed about Americanism than the average citizen, but one would not have to look far to find a comrade who had only the sketchiest ideas of the laws and traditions that define our freedom.

The lack of understanding of Americanism in the general population is shocking. A survey conducted in some eastern high schools not long ago showed that many young people did not understand or believe in the basic freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. Such boys and girls would be pushovers for wily Communist recruiters.

VFW posts are in an admirable position to educate their members and the communities in basic Americanism. Such programs can be both direct and indirect in method. Posts can sponsor lecture series, courses and essays contests. They can make it quite clear to school boards that they favor strong courses in American history and government.

Patriotism is a virtue somewhat out of style in our apathetic era. To revive it, many Americans must learn why they should be proud of their Republic. By teaching and example, VFW posts can help bring about renewed patriotism.

VFW work that seems to have no direct bearing on either Americanism or communism can contribute directly to the preservation of our Nation. Consider, for example, the children's and youth programs which so many posts emphasize. All studies of delinquency show that children who participate in organized sport and recreation are much less likely to end up in the hands of the police. In many communities, the police are so aware of this fact that they organize baseball leagues and other activities, knowing that it is better to prevent trouble than to have to deal with it.

Wherever veterans are engaged in intensive youth work, they are fighting both crime and communism. The doctrines of the Reds have no appeal to healthy, happy people. Communism attracts the confused, the despairing, the unwanted, the emotionally sick.

Wherever VFW members, acting as groups or as individuals, effectively carry out the patriotic, fraternal, historical, and educational ideals of their organization, they are fighting communism. This is true in small matters as well as great. The musketry over the grave of a fallen comrade is, in one sense, a volley against communism, for the ritual proclaims that the man, obscure though he may have been, had served the true and enduring cause. Any activity that makes the post an example of Americanism in action has an effect on the entire community.

It is impossible to fight communism passively. Communism feeds and flourishes on passivity. The nonactive VFW member may feel that he is as much against communism as anybody, but he is creating, by default, those conditions under which communism spreads. Only through active, personal commitment is it possible to build the good society that is invulnerable to the lures and snares of the enemy.

The typical VFW post today has too few workers who recognize their patriotic obligations. Some members are overworked. For a while they try to do everything. Then fatigue and discouragement, together with business and personal obligations, force them to quit. They leave a vacuum that can't be filled because so many members give only lipservice.

The nonactive members have good alibis which usually contain a bit of truth. The typical World War II veteran has reached the busiest time of his life. He has a wife and a houseful of youngsters. He has more business or job responsibilities than he had 10 years ago. "I can't do everything," he says lamely.

That is true. No one asked him to do everything. But he can do something. He can devote himself to some worthwhile post project for a few hours a week. It is quite likely that, once he becomes active, he will find considerable personal gratification in being useful beyond the confines of home and shop.

Try to imagine a post in which every member did something. Such a post, large or small, would rank as the most dynamic and worthwhile in the world. Its influence would extend throughout the community. Its example would inspire other posts and other community service organizations.

And wouldn't it be fun to belong to such an effective post.

Communism is a militant movement. Its leaders, like all clever generals, prefer to attack the weak, the disorganized, the undisciplined. The Communists frankly state that this is their strategy. They always move into areas of weakness. They do not—in fact, they cannot—infiltrate a strong and healthy society.

The Communists are quick to exploit conditions of injustice and social disorder. They have, from time to time, played their evil roles in racial conflict, in labor unrest, in governmental corruption, and in organized crime. But they are also quick to recognize intellectual confusion, a weakness of a different kind. Their infiltration into education, the communications media, entertainment, government and even religion has been possible because some leaders in these fields have lost their intellectual integrity. They no longer know what they think or what they represent.

The Communists always work against just and sensible solutions of social problems. They seek to turn racial tensions into bloody riots. They do not want unions to gain their goals through peaceful bargaining; they want bitter strikes. They seek to turn any infiltrated institution from its true goals. The Communists always fight for more and more injustice, strife, confusion and hatred. This is frankly stated party policy and is always true, although their propaganda seems to say the exact opposite.

This should make the work of the dedicated anti-Communist quite simple. To fight communism, he must fight for justice, good social order, and the principles of Americanism. Communism or no communism, those are the causes for which a decent man should fight.

Nikita Khrushchev predicted, "Your grandchildren will be Communists." In the context of his remarks it was clear that he believed this would happen in America, not as a result of war or external pressure, but through apathy and decadence. Communism would move into one area of weakness after another until it had everything.

Few Americans share Khrushchev's view. There is magnificent strength in the American people. The Nation that lifted itself out of the depression to arm the free world while fighting on every front, and that has since maintained world peace, albeit a hair-trigger peace, is not decadent. Our grandchildren will not be Communists.

The important thing is to increase our strength. On the military front it is necessary to maintain constant alertness and a ready battle force. But communism is both an external threat and an internal conspiracy. This world war of ideas must be won on the civilian front. Americans must continue to create the good society of freemen. Through our way of life, we must show that the Communist promises are a lie. Dynamic Americanism is the answer to the Communist conspiracy.

In this great struggle, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has the opportunity to play a magnificent role.

FINANCIAL AID FOR EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION FACILITIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the RECORD a letter dated February 7, 1962, from members of the Oregon State Advisory Committee on Educational Television, urging support of H.R. 132, which provides financial aid to States in connection with educational television facilities.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Salem, Oreg., February 7, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The members of the Oregon State Advisory Committee on Educational Television urge you to support the passage of H.R. 132 which provides financial aid to States for establishing or improving educational television facilities.

In the last 18 months, there has been a rapidly growing interest in Oregon in television for classroom instruction and for teacher education. Research and experience in other parts of the Nation have shown Oregon educators the potentials of this medium for improving instruction at all levels. Through the use of programs of direct instruction and enrichment presently being broadcast on the State-owned network both teachers and parents are becoming more and more appreciative of the values of this new medium. For instance, more than 5,000 elementary school children are receiving direct instruction this year in French and Spanish—instruction which might not otherwise be possible due to the shortage of elementary teachers with foreign language training.

Oregon public school educators have indicated their interest in this instructional medium by producing television programs locally, by obtaining funds for the purchase of receivers, and by using available televised programs in their classrooms. Developments uncovered by a recent survey made by the committee and the department of education disclose:

"Five school districts, Eugene, Bethel (a large suburban district adjacent to Eugene), Springfield, Portland, and Salem; and Jackson and Multnomah County schools have produced programs during the current school year. Actually these indicate three areas where there is activity in program production: Lane County, Multnomah County, and Jackson County.

"The commercial television stations in Eugene—KEZI and KVAL—have made available to Lane County schools 5 hours a week for educational programing of which 1 hour is for public relations programs during evening hours. The Eugene schools have provided programs for 3½ hours of this time a week and for 1 hour per week on the State network. They have produced local program series in mathematics, health, art, and Spanish—all at the elementary school level—and language arts at the junior high school level. They have also produced an inservice course in mathematics for teachers, and the county schools have produced a physical education series.

"Bethel and Springfield districts have cooperated with the Eugene schools in production of the Spanish series and with each other in production of series in local government, literature, and Canada for elementary grades.

"Lane County schools are rapidly completing plans for areawide educational television programing for next year. Some of the participating districts will probably be from outside Lane County.

"This past summer, personnel in the Multnomah County school superintendent's office initiated plans for a series of Spanish lessons for sixth-grade pupils, and Salem public schools cooperated in the project. The series is being broadcast over channels 7 and 10 all this present school year. Portland public schools this fall produced an hour-long teacher inservice program which was telecast on the State educational television network. The Jackson County school superintendent's office is also producing an experimental series in Spanish for elementary school pupils.

"A survey of Oregon's first- and second-class districts conducted by the committee in November 1961, indicated there were at that time 296 receivers in the schools or three times as many as in January 1961. This does not include 100 receivers being purchased by Portland and 30 receivers by Salem schools, or an estimated 75 receivers in Multnomah County. The committee is certain many school districts are including funds in their 1962–63 budgets for the purchase of receivers. Two hundred and fifty-eight of the reported receivers were in schools receiving the State educational television network—station KOAC, Corvallis (channel 7) and station KOAP, Portland (channel 10).

"The survey also showed there were more than 11,000 pupils viewing in-school television programs. This is slightly less than 3 percent of the total elementary school population of some 300,000. While it is not an amazing figure, it is gratifying since this is the first year that there has been any extensive programing in Oregon for elementary classroom pupils. Some 6,700 of the 11,000 pupils were viewing programs on the State network; the remainder were viewing programs offered by commercial stations in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

"While the survey indicated that school districts are making use of the available facilities, the lack of complete coverage by the State network seriously limits utilization of the medium for instruction. One of the most significant findings of the survey was that so many of the districts were unable to get an adequate signal from either State-owned station and were therefore unable to profit from the resource. One hundred and nine administrators out of 221 who replied to our questionnaire said no community reception was possible of either channel 7 or 10. Thirty-nine said special antennas were needed, and 10 said cable connections were required.

This lack of reception is due to the terrain of our State. With certain key installations, which would be possible through H.R. 132, we could cope with Oregon's topographical problems and educational television could be brought to all parts of the State—to the isolated coastal regions, to far eastern Oregon, to southern and central Oregon.

The financial assistance for facilities construction which the passage of H.R. 132 would provide could extend educational opportunities for Oregon public school children by increasing the viewing area for in-school lessons offered by the two State-owned television stations. This would be possible through the installation of a series of microwave relays, translators, and other equipment to extend the signal of KOAC and KOAP to the most distant parts of the State. Passage of the bill would also help local school districts interested in establishing their own television facilities for either broadcast or closed-circuit purposes. In December, the Eugene schools were granted the rights to channel 20, a UHF channel.

Since Oregon school districts are producing programs for televising even without adequate broadcast facilities, we are confident more programs will be produced, more schools will be equipped for utilizing the programs, and the quality of instruction generally increased if better facilities become available.

We strongly urge you to support H.R. 132 so that with the additional funds which it will make available, the use of this new teaching medium can be extended and strengthened throughout the State.

Sincerely yours,

OREGON STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION,
MISS KENAR CHARKOUDIAN,
Chairman, Radio and Television Coordinator, Eugene Public Schools.
DR. GEORGE HENDERSON,
Assistant Superintendent, Lebanon Public Schools.
WILLSON MAYNARD,
Director Public Relations, Oregon Education Association.
CHARLES D. SCHMIDT,
Superintendent, Salem Public Schools.
DR. PATRICIA SWENSON,
Supervisor, Radio Station KBPS, Portland Public Schools.
MRS. E. BERNICE TUCKER,
Assistant Superintendent, Multnomah County Schools.
DR. GERALD WALLACE,
Superintendent, Corvallis Public Schools.

THE SERVING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN THE CAPITOL OR SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on April 5 there was sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration Senate Resolution 325, which I submitted for myself and in behalf of the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to regulation of the Senate wing of the Capitol) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"3. The serving of alcoholic beverages shall not be permitted within any portion of the Senate wing of the Capitol, or any portion of any office building set aside for the use of the Senate, other than a room or suite which is assigned for occupancy by a Member or officer of the Senate for the transaction of the business of his office. As used in this paragraph, the term 'alcoholic beverage' means any alcoholic beverage containing more than 24 per centum of alcohol by volume."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the resolution, is very brief. I first spoke on this subject matter on the floor of the Senate on April 2, when just across the hall the Senate was—shall I say dedicating, as well as desecrating?—the new reception and conference room that was opened on that day. Two bars were placed in the conference room, and I understand that liquor flowed freely.

I have not submitted the resolution to have it forgotten. I shall from time to time with increasing frequency speak on this subject matter between now and the end of the session, if I am unable to have the resolution brought to the floor for a vote.

After I have waited for a fair period of time, I shall, if I find it appropriate in connection with any matter pending before the Senate, start adding it as an amendment to the pending business. I feel that if the Members of the Senate are going to serve hard liquor at Senate functions or make available offices of the Senate for use by public organizations or other groups, about which I shall speak shortly, they ought to be willing to stand up and go on record in support of what I consider to be an unjustifiable course of action.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly about this matter, because I do not believe it is a very good example for the Senate to be giving to the youth of this country.

Furthermore, I do not believe it is fair to what I am satisfied are millions of taxpayers in this country who do not believe that so much as one cent of tax money should be used in connection with any such function. I believe these taxpayers have some rights in these premises. We cannot countenance such functions and say that in no way does the serving of hard liquor cost the taxpayers any money. There is the matter of maintenance and the matter of personnel. There is the matter of the people behind the bar. Anything that can be directly related to the use of personnel of the Government costs the taxpayers money.

I protest this as a matter of social policy. It is a social policy which in my judgment the Senate cannot justify and should not countenance. The people of this country should not permit it.

I do not like to be the source of pain to my colleagues in the Senate. It always grieves me when I am. However, if they follow a public course of action which in my judgment cannot be justified as a matter of public policy, I will not hesitate to pain them. I believe this is a practice that must be stopped.

There is a certain function being held on Capitol Hill this afternoon, within Senate precincts, to which I was invited. It is an affair, I understand, that is being held in one of the public rooms under the jurisdiction of the Senate Permission was obtained for the use of the room. When I asked whether hard liquor was going to be served at the affair, I was told that in all probability it would be.

On April 2d I told the Senate that if I knew in advance that that was going to be the case in connection with any affair under the auspices of the Senate, or any affair being held within the premises of the Senate through a courtesy extended to any organization by a Senator in obtaining official permission for the use of such a room, I would not go to such an affair, and that if I got there and found that hard liquor was being served I would absent myself from the affair.

I intend to do more than that. I intend to do my best, with all my parliamentary rights, in behalf of my cosponsors to get a vote on the resolution. I want a vote on it. I want a record vote on it. If the Committee on Rules and Administration finds itself in disapproval of my resolution, I ask the Rules Committee to send my resolution to the Senate with an unfavorable report.

I take the position that the resolution, which I submitted in good faith, justifies the Committee on Rules and Administration to bring it to the floor of the Senate. It will not take the committee very long to study the resolution. It is pretty clear. It will not require a great deal of research on the part of the committee staff with respect to the merits of the resolution. In fact, let us be perfectly frank and honest with ourselves. There is not a Member of the Senate who would not be prepared to vote his conviction on the resolution within the next 5 minutes.

I will do the best I can to get a vote on it. I have not been here for 17 years not to have some familiarity with my parliamentary rights in the Senate, and with the parliamentary steps that may be necessary for me to take to at least to encourage action on my resolution on the floor of the Senate.

I hope it will not be necessary, but I will get this matter handled on its merits.

I wish to say that I have been highly amused with regard to the snide journalistic tactics of the Washington News since I have submitted the resolution, in trying to persuade its readers that WAYNE MORSE does not know when he is in a saloon, or did not know when he was in a saloon, and thereby seeks in some way to engage in some duplicity in regard to this matter.

I wish to say to the Washington News that when I see a sign on a window saying "Breakfast being served," I am entering what I have every reason to believe is a restaurant.

When I saw the breakfast prepared behind a counter in the establishment, I had every reason to believe I was in a breakfast shop; although anyone having eyes, as I have already said, knew that in another part of that room, at other times of the day, liquor was served. Perhaps liquor might have been served there for breakfast if someone had come in and asked for it. However, I say to the Washington Daily News that the fact is that I went in for breakfast. I ate my breakfast. I was courteous and polite to the owner of the establishment. He recognized me and asked me to have my picture taken. I went behind the counter to have my picture taken behind what I then thought—and I believe I was correct—was a soda jerk, but which it is now claimed was a beer jerk.

I do not have to apologize to anyone for my lifetime as a teetotaler and as one who deplores the fact that the high consumption of hard liquor in this country is one of the great menaces to the Nation. When I think of the terrible cost to the taxpayers of the country in the administration of government services by way of the burden upon the courts, the welfare agencies, the jails, and the prisons, caused by alcoholism, I apologize to no one for the position I have always taken against the consumption of hard liquor.

So I repeat the point of view I have been heard to express before. If Senators wish to give parties at which hard liquor is to be served, let them rent a reception room in the Congressional Hotel or the Carroll Arms, or in any other hotel in the city; but I do not think we should desecrate a public room in the Senate wing of the Capitol or in one of the Senate Office Buildings by having any function at which hard liquor is served. I do not believe any Senator should be put in the position of having to make the choice I have made—and I am proud to have made it—that if there is to be that kind of function, I shall absent myself from it.

I intend to discuss this subject further. I hope that in the very near future this resolution can be put behind us with a yea-and-nay vote. I am confident that such a vote would result in a substantial majority in support of the adoption of the resolution, for I continue daily to hear from my Senate colleagues, as I said the last time I discussed this question on the floor of the Senate, who says: "There is no question about how I shall vote if your resolution can be brought up for a vote, because I cannot quarrel with the soundness of the public policy you are advocating."

Mr. President, I say most respectfully that we have surrendered to a social practice which has developed, particularly in this city. The time has come to stand up against it. There is no reason in the world why an official function cannot be held by the Senate, in connection with our so-called extracurricular activities, without putting any Senator or any observer in the position of being somewhat ashamed of a policy which permits the serving of hard liquor at such a function.

I have been interested in and have chuckled a bit about a few criticisms I have received as to why I have not protested before. It is asked, Why did I wait until now, seeking to give the impression, perhaps, that I protested because I am a candidate for reelection? I merely say that April 2 was the first time I was aware that a stamp of official policy would be placed upon the serving of hard liquor at a Senate function. That was the occasion when, for the first time, I learned that an official reception or conference room was being opened in the Senate wing of the Capitol, and that at that so-called initiation or dedication session liquor would be served. I felt that the time to hit the policy was when an attempt was being made to make the policy official. As I indicated on that day, on some occasions, both surreptitiously and sometimes not surreptitiously, there had been affairs in the Senate at which liquor had been served; but never had it been served as an official policy. I had been so advised, and that was my understanding.

If the function on April 2 had gone by without any protest, it certainly would have been a function at which it could have been said that for the first time the stamp of approval had been placed upon the serving of hard liquor at what was unquestionably an official Senate affair. That was why I took the floor while the function was being held; I wanted to express my disapproval of the policy.

I have every confidence that the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration will deal fairly with those of us who believe that we are entitled to a vote on the resolution. If there are those who think the policy of serving liquor is a sound policy, they should not hesitate to go on public record and say so, giving to us who deplore such a policy the privilege and the right to go on record against it. Then we can let the American people pass judgment on the record.

I believe in direct action. I do not believe in surreptitious policy, or indirection, or subterfuge. This question calls for a forthright, open, frank statement of policy; but I believe the Senate should formally decide the policy; it should not permit Senators to decide the policy for us by their acts. Yet that is what is happening. All of us, in my judgment, are implicated in this policy, a policy that has never been formally and officially determined in the Senate, by some Senators acting of their own volition to carry out this very unfortunate social practice, and then inviting the rest of us to attend. If we go, we allow ourselves to become implicated in a practice of which we do not approve, so far as official policy is concerned. If we refuse to go, we place ourselves in the position of hurting the feelings of some of our colleagues.

Some persons have asked me, "Senator, don't you go to cocktail parties?"

Of course, I go to cocktail parties when I feel that in carrying out the official work of the Senate, in representing the people of my State, it is necessary that they be represented at some affair conducted by industry or by some organization, at which liquor is served. But that does not require me to participate in such refreshments, and I do not. But that is quite a different thing, just as it is quite a different thing when I go to the homes of people where liquor is served. That is quite different from putting my stamp of approval on such activity as an official policy of the Senate at a Senate affair. That is the line of distinction which I think is so crystal clear that it should not require an explanation. But some people always like to have some basis on which they think they can cause embarrassment, in seeking to draw that kind of non sequitur distinction.

So I repeat to the leadership on both sides of the aisle that the senior Senator from Oregon will continue to press for action on Senate Resolution 235, until it can be disposed of.

PROGRAM OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate Small Business Committee is presently engaged in a study of small business investment companies and their contribution to the economic growth of the country. As a part of this study, the Financing Subcommittee, on which I have the privilege to serve as chairman, recently conducted a hearing in my State, at Portland. This hearing was the first in a series of five such hearings being held in various sections of the country.

As Senator SPARKMAN, chairman of the Small Business Committee, pointed out, in announcing these hearings, the SBIC program has grown remarkably since its establishment in 1958. There are presently more than 500 companies—6 of them in Oregon—operating under the 1958 act, with combined capital of almost one-half billion dollars. Two-thirds of these companies have been chartered within the last year.

Since over 90 percent of the business firms in my section of the country are small businesses, the recent increase in the activities of the Small Business Administration is particularly important to Oregon.

A salient example of increased SBA help to small businessmen is the direct loan program, which, in 1961, made within the State of Oregon 111 loans, totaling $9,376,000. The comparable figure for 1960—when the agency was under other management—is 44 loans, totaling $2,060,000. About 65 percent of these Oregon loans are made in cooperation with local banks, which further generate local economic activity.

Pursuant to the SBA's "State and local development company program," which will provide a community with up to 80 percent of the costs of modernizing or establishing an enterprise, the city of McMinnville has received loans, for development purposes, of $23,000 and $239,000.

Other SBA programs which have been of benefit to my State include the procurement contract set-aside program under which 373 awards, totaling $10,982,000, were made last year in Oregon, as against 224 contracts for $4,984,000 in 1960; and the management training program under which nearly 700 persons have enrolled in 25 specially designed business courses.

I was, therefore, most pleased by the decision of the Small Business Committee to hold this first of its current hearings in Portland, to which we proudly refer as the "City of Roses." I should like very much to express my gratitude and that of the people of my State to my good friends and colleagues, the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], who on that occasion joined me and so ably and so effectively aided the subcommittee's inquiry into the SBIC program in the West. I know that these two able and distinguished members of the Senate Small Business Committee feel as I do about the results accomplished by the committee at its Portland hearing. We heard testimony from representatives of some of the small business investment companies, from small businessmen who had received financial assistance from SBIC's, from SBA personnel, and from a representative of the Oregon Independent Retail Grocers Association.

I was most impressed by the testimony of these witnesses, both as it related to the assistance being provided to small firms, and as it related to the need for certain changes in the laws under which the SBIC's operate.

I came away from the Portland hearing with renewed confidence in the soundness of this program and its value to the small businesses of Oregon and the western section of the country.

Mr. President, later I participated in a hearing at Chicago, under the leadership of the chairman of the Small Business Committee, on which I am privileged to serve as a member—the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]; and today we have been conducting, here in Washington, a hearing at which we have had some very able witnesses testify regarding the operation of the Small Business Investment Corporation program.

We learned of example after example of small firms, faced with a lack of adequate capital and having no place to which they could turn for assistance, about to become just another addition to the ever-rising number of business failures, who solved their problems through a loan or an investment from a small business investment company. Take, for example, the case of Tempera Corp. of Portland, Oreg.

This company was founded in 1958 and manufactures an automatic pressure-compensating valve designed to maintain a selected water temperature to within 1 degree, regardless of changes in supply line pressure. The initial capital of this company was obtained from the individual organizers and from their families, but this money was used up in the initial promotion of their product. By January 1961 the actual sales of the company were only 71 valves per month, and, according to its president, the company was about to collapse for lack of adequate capital. Due to the company's brief experience and the fact that it had no past record of earnings nor any substantial collateral, the necessary funds were not available through normal financial channels.

To make a long story short, the company applied for assistance to an SBIC, Preferred Growth Capital, Inc., of Portland; the application was approved and a loan of $50,000 was made in late January 1961. By April of 1961 additional capital was needed, and the further sum of $10,000 was provided by Preferred Growth Capital. The company continued to grow, and by September 1961 the need for more funds arose. In this instance, another SBIC was brought into the picture, and the further sum of $20,000 was provided by the Oregon Small Business Investment Co., of Salem, Oreg. This made a total investment by the SBIC's in a struggling small manufacturer of $80,000. The results of this capital injection have been rather remarkable. Sales have grown from 71 valves per month in January 1961 to 900 valves per month by November 1961 and to 1,080 valves in January of 1962. The president of the company estimated that within a matter of 4 or 5 years the company will be making and selling 1½ or 2 million valves per year.

I am frank to say that I felt a deep sense of pride in knowing that this truly remarkable success story was made possible through the small business investment company program. And let us remember—there is much more involved here than simply the success of one small business and a profitable investment for an SBIC. The growth of this company will be felt by the economy of the city of Portland, and eventually by the economy of my whole State. The benefits in terms of jobs and payroll that this success story includes will contribute significantly in the years to come to the welfare of the people of Oregon.

As I have said, Mr. President, this is only one of a number of examples recited before the committee of small concerns rescued from the brink of collapse by the SBIC's. We heard praise for this program from four small electronics firms and a small manufacturer of pressure-sensitive adhesives, all located in the State of California, from an electronics firm in Texas, and from the owner of a small rental service in Salem, Oreg. Each of these witnesses, Mr. President, provided solid evidence of the results being achieved through this great program.

Mr. President, the economy of the State of Oregon has been dominated for many years by the timber industry. The contribution made by timber interests and related enterprises to the growth and development of my State has been truly significant, and no one recognizes and appreciates this more than the senior Senator from Oregon. Yet, I have also recognized for many years that only through industrial diversification could Oregon continue to grow and prosper. No State can long endure the overconcentration of economic resources. One has but to study the history of the southern region of this country, and the events which followed the days when "cotton was king" in the region, to learn this lesson in elementary economics.

The need for a diversification of industry in Oregon played a significant role in my decision to support this small business investment program from the beginning. In this program, I saw a great potential for financing new business enterprises and for strengthening and assuring the success and growth of existing small concerns. I saw in this legislation the vehicle by which new jobs and new payrolls might be provided, and economic growth through diversification of economic resources might be accomplished. One of the most gratifying experiences of my career in the U.S. Senate was to learn at the hearing we had in Portland that this program has worked in this way and has done much toward accomplishing these very ends in my home State.

Let me hasten to add, Mr. President, that there is much yet to be done. There were indications in the testimony presented to us that the flow of private capital into the SBIC program has slowed significantly in recent months, and that the American investing public may be "taking a second look" at the stock offerings of SBIC's. Recommendations were made for additional incentives to be written into the law and for existing restrictions to be relaxed, and frankly I was somewhat impressed by these recommendations. I refer particularly to the arguments offered in support of providing a statutory loss and bad debt reserve for SBIC's, and liberalizing the dollar limit upon loans and investments.

You will recall, Mr. President, that last year the Congress enacted several amendments to the Small Business Investment Act. These amendments were designed to improve the program, and I supported and voted for them. Included among the 1961 amendments was a provision which limited to $500,000 the maximum amount which any single SBIC might loan to or invest in a small business concern. I also voted for this provision, but I did not do so, Mr. President, with the same degree of confidence and assurance of its soundness as I felt about the other amendments. There was the possibility that this restriction might preclude assistance to worthy small firms having a real need for funds exceeding the limitation. I went along with this amendment because it included a provision allowing SBIC's, with the permission of the SBA, to make loans and investments of more than $500,000. I felt that, with this qualification, the amendment would not substantially impede the flow of needed funds to small firms.

My judgment in this regard was strengthened when the SBA issued its regulations implementing the new amendments. In implementing the dollar limitation amendments, and its qualifying clause allowing transactions exceeding the limitation, SBA provided a blanket approval whereby SBIC's could make loans or investments exceeding the limitation only when they maintained at least 50 percent of their portfolio in transactions of less than $500,000. In this way, the administrative burden of reviewing these transactions on a case-by-case basis was avoided, and of more importance, assistance to small firms having a need for larger amounts was not to become bogged down in the needless redtape that was certain to arise under any other methods. As I said, Mr. President, I was satisfied that this dollar limitation was workable under the approach taken in the SBA regulation, though some doubt remained as to its soundness.

The testimony presented to Senator BARTLETT, Senator Moss, and me in Portland has made me somewhat more doubtful of the wisdom of writing this limitation into the law. I still have not reached any conclusion because the hearings are still in progress.

But in our Portland hearing, for example, some of the representatives of the electronics industry testified. They pointed out how difficult it is for new businesses in the electronics field to get loans from commercial banks and sources. Yet they also pointed out that $500,000 very often does not amount to much in an electronics business, and that the limitation of $500,000 is quite a handicap to the electronics industry, both from the standpoint of the work it does for defense and for the nondefense segments of the economy. Many other businesses could make the same comments.

The substance of the testimony presented to us in Portland, and in Chicago too, by representatives of the SBIC industry was that this limitation sometimes made it difficult to meet the needs of some small firms, particularly small manufacturing concerns, for growth capital. Of course, the SBA regulation to which I have referred will permit these larger transactions, and, in addition, as many as five SBIC's may participate in a transaction with each putting up the $500,000 maximum.

However, instances are certain to arise under this program where a truly small firm, needing, say, a million or a million and a half dollars, will be unable to find an SBIC willing to make the deal whose portfolio will allow this large an investment. Putting together a participation deal with three or four SBIC's will certainly be a possible solution to these problems. However, this sort of thing takes time and will not always be as easily accomplished as one might think. One of the underlying reasons for the enactment of this program was the fact that, not only was the small public securities market a prohibitively expensive source of capital for small firms, but the time delays involved in raising money in this manner worked a hardship upon small firms. In my opinion, Mr. President, it is entirely conceivable that examples will arise where small firms may be unable to raise needed capital, within a reasonable period of time, from the only source available to them, the SBIC's. Indeed, I am inclined to feel that this limitation may result in making needed capital unavailable, as a practical matter, to many truly small businesses.

Of course, Mr. President, one purpose of this limitation was to assure that SBIC funds were loaned or invested with truly small business, and this is a matter of which I have always been especially mindful. However, the term "small business" is a relative one. What is small business in one industry may be big business in another. One person's view of small business may be entirely different from another's. Sometimes I feel that we tend to think of "big business" in terms of the biggest business in the community in which we live. Indeed, however, this may sometimes be a truly small manufacturing concern competing with the real giants of American industry.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the logical way by which we can assure that SBIC funds are going only to small firms is to review from time to time the definition of small business, or the size standards, as they are called by SBA. These size standards have been adopted by SBA after years of experience in aiding small businesses. If the standards are such that loans and investments are going to firms larger than those which Congress intended to benefit through this program, then it seems to me that the logical way to solve this problem would be to change the standards. If a firm is big business, it should not get a loan or an investment from an SBIC even if the amount of that loan or investment is $500,000, $200,000, or even $10,000. On the other hand, if a business concern is a truly small business of the type that we were trying to help in passing this legislation, then I wonder if it is sound economics to set an arbitrary maximum upon the amount that may be provided.

As I have said, Mr. President, I have yet to reach any firm conviction of my own regarding this matter. I know that there are some who do have strong feelings about it on both sides. Personally, I would welcome an exchange of ideas with them, as I feel that this is a matter which affects substantially the future of the SBIC program.

Another matter covered by the testimony received at Portland was that of a statutory loss and bad debt reserve for the SBIC's. Provision is made for a reserve of 20 percent in Senate bill 903, on which I was privileged to be a cosponsor. This bill is pending before the Finance Committee, and there is a comparable bill before the Ways and Means Committee in the other body. As I have indicated, the arguments made by the industry in support of this bill were strong indeed. We all know, Mr. President, that the 12-percent reserve given to savings and loan associations some years ago has been a most significant factor in the growth of that program. It may be that the time has come to lower the reserve for savings and loan associations. The industry is now well established, and investments in real estate are vastly more stable today than when the reserve was first written into our tax laws, or so the argument goes. There are some who might say that it is a contradiction to take the 12-percent reserve away from the savings and loan associations and at the same time write a 20-percent reserve into the law for SBIC's. On the contrary, in my opinion, the history of the savings and loan program points rather vividly to the wisdom of providing this kind of tax benefit to a young federally supported program such as the SBIC's. Think what it will mean to the small businesses of America if, through this type of tax incentive, the SBIC program will grow and prosper as the savings and loan program has grown and prospered in recent years.

The potential need for capital by small firms has been estimated at approximately $500 million per year. With the total capital available in the SBIC program now being only a little over $500 million, it is apparent that we have only scratched the surface in meeting this need. I am confident that we shall never attract enough private capital into this program to meet the needs of small businesses until some statutory reserve for losses and bad debts is provided. After all, Mr. President, we should remember that if the SBIC's are doing the job intended for them by Congress, they are engaged in extremely risky investment ventures. It seems only logical to me that a substantial statutory reserve equal to or at least approaching the 20 percent provided in S. 903 should be provided.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, Senator SPARKMAN, has previously indicated that the committee will file a full report to the Senate upon completion of the hearings and the committee's study of this matter. However, I wanted to make this brief report on the work of the committee in Portland and to express to the Senate some of my views on this very vital and growing program. Although there is a great deal yet to be done in meeting the need of small business for long-term credit and equity capital, I am confident that in my State, and in the West, this program has been operating in the way that we intended and has accomplished much for our small businesses.

I am proud to report from the Senate floor today to the people of my State that I shall always be pleased to stand on the record I have made in the Senate in support of the small business program. Not only have I been one of its supporters from the beginning and one of the cosponsors of many legislative proposals in connection with it, but also I have been privileged to serve as a member of the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate.

I recognize that if we are to keep a system of private enterprise in this country we must see to it that the small businessmen of this country are maintained in a position so that they can compete, because competition is the essence of the private enterprise system. One of the constant threats to the private enterprise system, against which we must constantly be on guard, is the tendency for business to turn itself into monopoly.

As I have been heard to say before, I close my argument today by repeating the warning that there is not any private enterprise connected with monopoly, for monopoly is, after all, the opposite of private enterprise, because under a monopolistic control there is no effective competition, whereas under the private enterprise system the very heart and dynamics is competition.

Our small business program in the Congress of the United States in my judgment has constituted a real service to that competitive enterprise upon which small business is so dependent. I shall always be proud to have the Record show that I have stood shoulder to shoulder with my colleagues in the Senate who share that philosophy in regard to the need for and importance of strengthening small business in our economy.

THE INDIANA DUNES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, opponents of the effort to save the Indiana Dunes from destruction often claim that this effort has no significant support from within Indiana. They also claim that the Dunes have no values worth saving.

A recent article by M. E. Perrin Schwartz of Elkhart, Ind., which appeared in the Elkhart Truth for March 30, 1962, belies both of these false arguments. I ask unanimous consent that this fine article by a longtime Hoosier newspaper reporter be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hart in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Case for the Dunes

Many persons who are most vocal in the dunes-lake port controversy, discussed in today's editoral column, have never seen a dune.

A day in the dunes can be a genuinely rewarding experience.

There are dunes and dunes wherever the sand blows, but we Hoosiers believe that the northern Indiana Dunes which fringe the shore of Lake Michigan are something pretty special.

Centuries of winds off the lake, rolling the shore sands inland, have created a wilderness of natural beauty that is truly unique.

Viewed from the airlines which jet over the area, the dunes look as though some giant's child, tired of play along the beach, might have trudged shoreward scattering his huge play buckets of white sand as he went.

Glimpsed from the comfort of a speeding train or motorcar, the alternating bits of forest, patches of desertlike sand waste and swamp are intriguing. Afoot in them, the dunes have a primitive spell that grips one.

The huge marching hills appear to have halted momentarily and bits of woodland thicket have grown up as if to anchor the restless sands. In tiny valley pockets stagnant pools have become covered with lily pads where frogs croak mournfully these early spring evenings, and lazy turtles slip from rotting logs into the primal slime at one's approach.

Weird events have transpired betimes amid these Indiana Dunes. Once Indians here made their battle rendezvous. Lured by the lush prairie growths at their fringes, some ancient saddened settlers guessed wrong and tarried for a time. Early day outlaws hid out in their undulant wilds; and many a hermit here has found the coveted solitude he sought.

Once, it is told, a club of Chicago young bloods—Bohemians of the gay nineties—bore the body of a colleague to a weird funeral pyre which they kindled here on the bleak dune shores.

More recently, writer folk and artists have come to love the dunelands and realtors have been quick to capitalize upon this interest.

Here and there on the bare exposed windward sides of the dunes, an adventurer comes upon startling revelatory skeletons of ancient trees, even bits of wagons and abandoned cabin sites, long ago covered by the shifting sands and now coming to light again as the mounds have rolled on. Indeed, the dunes have proven untrustworthy custodians of many a grim buried secret.

Teeming industrial cities at their very borders can quickly be forgotten in their primitive solitude; and the din of transcontinental traffic on two highways and a half dozen rail lines reaches one as a faint but hardly disturbing whisper.

Safer lake beaches, and a wider use of their picnic and recreational possibilities, could logically be expected from their supervision by a park service.

As a State park once preserved these odd sand formations from annihilation, so now perhaps a Federal park system can preserve them further—with, of course, a sensible and realistic consideration for the industrial and civic needs of an expanding Indiana economy.

E.P.S.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in a recent article the Louisville Courier-Journal has pointed out that the so-called dunes story still has a number of loose ends. Chief among these is the failure of the administration of the State of Indiana to make any serious effort to find another location for the proposed port. The Louisville Courier-Journal, its editor and publisher, Barry Bingham, and its reporting and editorial staff consistently, and in the best tradition of American journalism, have taken a long and close look at the attempt to destroy the dunes.

I ask unanimous consent that a fine Courier-Journal article on the dunes of April 3, 1962, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Dunes Story Still Has Loose Ends

Indiana's Gov. Matthew Welsh is carrying on the fight his Republican predecessors started to build a deepwater port in the middle of the State's unique and lovely dunes on Lake Michigan. Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, is opposing the efforts of the dunes wreckers, and this newspaper in turn has supported the Senator's efforts to save the dunes country—what is left of it—and incorporate it in a national preserve.

We have stated our position time and again over a period of several years. It is essentially this: The dunes in question are a priceless natural asset that would be ruined by a port at the Burns Ditch site in Porter County. Alternative sites in Indiana are available, but Indiana officials, past and present, have made no serious effort to find another location.

In an editorial on February 27 of this year we restated this position and suggested that while a Senate subcommittee was holding hearings on the dunes controversy, it might inquire why it is that Indiana officials have been so dead set on the Burns Ditch location, which will primarily benefit two steel companies. It seemed to us that the relationship between Indiana officials, past and present, and the industrial interests involved would be a legitimate line of inquiry. We also mentioned land speculation in the Burns Ditch area.

Governor Welsh took exception to the editorial and issued a statement attacking Senator Douglas and the Courier-Journal editorial. In his statement, Governor Welsh made three main charges:

1. That Senator Douglas is first of all interested in blocking an Indiana port development to head off competition for Chicago port interests.

2. That the editorial erred in saying that no real effort had been made to find an alternative location for the proposed Indiana port.

3. That the editorial was unfair in suggesting that the relationship between Indiana officials, industrial interests, and land speculation might be a "fruitful line of inquiry."

As for the first point, this raises a question of motivation, and Senator Douglas will have to speak for himself on that. For the record, he had this to say in response to Governor Welsh's statement: "I have pledged myself to support any (one of three) alternative sites in Indiana." Specifically, he mentioned Lake County and Michigan City. As a third alternative, he suggested construction of a ship canal 4 or 5 miles inland, "as was done in Houston, Tex."

As for the second point, we were not speaking of "preliminary" surveys or cursory on-the-spot inspections, but studies-in-depth of alternative sites, studies equivalent to the ones made for the Burns Ditch area. If such detailed studies have been made, as the Governor says, where are they? The Senate Interior Subcommittee, which held hearings on Senator Douglas' bill, asked the Army Corps of Engineers for the results of surveys of alternative sites. Although a month has gone by since the hearings, Senator DOUGLAS reports that the results of such detailed studies have yet to be submitted to the subcommittee.

Now we come to the third point. Governor Welsh contends that this newspaper was off base in suggesting the existence of improper connections between business and public officials. He added that we failed to offer "a single specific or shred of evidence" to warrant calling for such an inquiry.

First, we did not say the connections were "improper." That was Governor Welsh's word. We don't know whether they were or not. Presumably this would be determined by an investigation. We did maintain, and still do, that enough connections, of some sort, exist to justify an inquiry.

We are puzzled why, at this late date, Governor Welsh should be so affronted by such a suggestion. We made similar suggestions several times before February 27.

And as long ago as July 23, 1961, Gordon Englehart, of our Indianapolis bureau, did a thorough review of the dunes controversy in this newspaper. It dealt in detail with the history of land speculation and with the ties between Indiana officials and interests pressing for the Burns Ditch development.

THE TIES ARE ON THE RECORD

The information was drawn from public records. It reveals a history of land speculation in the dunes area. In 1954, for example, a firm called the Consumers Co. of Chicago was engaged in sand-mining land it owned in the dunes area in dispute. The company was controlled by the Dallas multimillionaire, Clint W. Murchison. To sell land in Indiana it had to incorporate in that State, which it did in September of that year as the Consumer Dunes Corp. in Indianapolis. Its purpose: to speculate in dunes land.

This was just 2 months before former Governor Craig pushed for a $3,500,000 appropriation to buy a port site near Burns Ditch. The Indiana resident agent for Consumer Dunes was the C. T. Corp., located in the office of Craig's old Indianapolis law firm. Craig had quit the firm when he became Governor.

This is only one aspect of the story recited by Mr. Englehart last summer. Another is this: Frank McKinney, a powerful ally of Governor Welsh, has worked closely with the Murchisons in their various enterprises. Mr. McKinley was named a director of the New York Central Railroad, one of the Murchisons' holdings. That railroad is—or was last summer—seeking to lease and operate railroads and warehouses within the proposed Burns Ditch port area.

Many more interesting circumstances surrounding the Burns Ditch project were cited in the story. They're on the record.

We do not say that any of these circumstances were improper. But we do insist that there is every reason to inquire what bearing, if any, they have on the single-minded determination of Indiana officials to push for a Burns Ditch location for the port to the exclusion of any other.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator from Illinois for the wonderful fight he is putting up for the preservation of and the conservation of this natural resource known as the Indiana Dunes. I know what it means to be fighting in the conservation field against selfish interests, which seem to think that the private enterprise system means privateering and which, very often, show a lack of regard for their trusteeship responsibility, which they, along with the rest of us, have as trustees of these great natural resources for future generations of America.

I make this statement of commendation to the great battler from Illinois, who can always be counted upon to be fighting courageously for what he knows to be in the public interest. This is in the public interest.

I should like to ask the Senator a question, because we need to have our memories refreshed periodically. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to take a moment or two to put into the RECORD an answer to the question as to what is the present status of the controversy over the so-called Indiana Dunes issue?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The bill introduced by six Senators and by me to create the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, S. 1797, is now before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate. Hearings have been held on the bill. It would create a national lakeshore park of 9,000 acres which would preserve a lakefront of about 5 miles. This would be in addition to the existing little Indiana Dunes State Park of 2,180 acres and 3½ miles of lakefront.

It is not at all certain what the subcommittee will do.

The recent report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission correctly pointed out that, marvelous as the national parks are, they mostly are located a long way from where the people are, and that what is most needed is to save beautiful recreational areas as close in to the metropolitan regions as possible. It so happens that this description fits the Indiana Dunes like a glove. This is a marvelous area only 40 miles or an hour's travel by train or automobile from the center of Chicago.

One difficulty confronting those of us trying to save the dunes arises largely from the fact that the dunes are located in Indiana. They are used and enjoyed by people from all over the country, but primarily by people from Illinois. The State of Indiana has taken the position that it is not proper for Indiana to appropriate money to provide recreation for the people of Illinois. The State of Illinois has taken the position that it should not appropriate money to be spent by the State of Indiana.

This is a case in which, if we were to confine ourselves purely to State action, it would fall between two stools. This clearly is not a matter merely for State action, but a matter of regional and national concern requiring national action, because the people who do use and could use the area come from many States. That is why we have been advocating a national park. I have been criticized because I live in one State and, while representing that State, propose to deal with property in another State.

I do not know that this is a proper statement for me to make, but it is a truthful one. Before I assumed the sponsorship of the bill, I went to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and proposed that he lead the fight and I would support him. It was only after he refused to do so that I felt I could not let the issue go by default and took on the job, along with many other colleagues.

The immediate threat to the dunes is from two giant steel companies. These are National Steel, headed by Mr. George M. Humphrey, and Bethlehem Steel. Bethlehem is one of the most curiously run companies in the country, because the board of directors is composed, I believe, largely of salaried officers and former officers who own very little stock in Bethlehem but who in the past have voted very liberal salaries and stock options to themselves.

National Steel has said that it intends to construct an integrated steel mill on its property and it has constructed a small finishing mill there, but not a basic steel mill.

Bethlehem Steel has said that it wants the area for another steel mill, although in public statements it has refused to give any time limit as to when it intends to construct the mill.

It is the position of those of us who love nature that if two additional steel mills are put in, not only will they destroy very beautiful areas, particularly the land which Bethlehem now owns, but they also will pollute the air and water so as to render the rest of the dunes and beaches largely unenjoyable, and will destroy the possibility of their public use.

Today the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. HARTKE] in this body and Representatives HALLECK and ROUSH in the House introduced bills to authorize the construction of a Burns Ditch Harbor in the Indiana Dunes. I think that this action is a frank admission that their harbor proposal is so unjustified economically that its proponents are afraid to seek the authorization by normal procedure. They are asking for a Federal appropriation of $25½ million to be combined with a State appropriation of approximately $38 million. If Bethlehem should not build its mill, the measure would benefit almost exclusively National Steel headed by George Humphrey. If they obtain the harbor, they can build the mills. But if they do not get the harbor, they cannot build the mills. They may be able to prevent us from getting an authorization for a national park through Congress, but we may be able to prevent them from getting a harbor.

Normally, legislation to authorize Federal participation in the building of a harbor is introduced only after the Corps of Engineers reports on the proposed project goes through three steps:

First, it must be circulated among the interested Federal agencies and State government for their views; second, it must be approved by the Secretary of the Army; third, it must be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its report on whether the project is in accord with the program of the President.

It may be remembered in this connection that the President advocated a national park specifically in that region along the lines, at least, of the proposal contained in Senate bill 1797, sponsored, among others, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

By their introduction of the proposed legislation before these normal steps had been completed, the Senators from Indiana and Representatives HALLECK and ROUSH are admitting their fear that the Bureau of the Budget will turn down the project as not justified on economic grounds and as being in conflict with the President's program.

I dislike to make such a statement about my colleagues, but since the Senator from Oregon asked me about the subject, I felt must make this statement. Had I known that the issue was coming up, I would have notified these Senators that I intended to take the floor and discuss it.

I think we should insist that there be hearings on the Hartke-Capehart proposal before the Senate Committee on Public Works.

The attempt at an end run around normal procedure should put the members of the Committee on Public Works on guard. All friends of the outdoors should be on guard.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe the Senator from Illinois should worry about the criticism which he says he has received because he is seeking to help establish a national park in a State outside the State of Illinois. We all do that whenever we pass judgment on the whole park program.

We must keep in mind what undoubtedly will happen in the next score of years in this country with the great onrush of automation. Leisure time will be one of the assets of the American people. At least, they can make it an asset. It could become a liability.

The need for recreation facilities will grow by leaps and bounds. I believe that within the next 20 years income from recreation and from all the incidental things that go along with recreation, will be the No. 1 source of income for my State. Within 20 years income from recreation will bring into Oregon more income than agriculture. At the present time the order is agriculture, lumber, and recreation. Within 20 years it will be recreation, agriculture, and lumber. I believe that we shall see such a shift in income position.

I see the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in the Chamber. Senators will recall that last year, when the Senator from Alabama was taking through the Senate in his very able way a piece of legislation known as the housing bill, there was a section in that bill that had to do with so-called open spaces for our great metropolitan areas, such as Chicago, Gary, Indianapolis, Detroit, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other great metropolitan areas of the country. The Senator from Illinois will recall how sad we were on that day to find that we could not muster a majority vote in the Senate to retain in that bill a provision that would provide for a Federal cooperative program in connection with making open spaces in those metropolitan areas available to the people for their enjoyment and their recreation. I remember pointing out in that debate what the evidence so clearly shows. In every great metropolitan area there are literally hundreds of boys and girls who never get outside the city limits of the metropolitan area in which they live until they have gone beyond the age of 12.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Tens of thousands.

Mr. MORSE. They do not know what it is like away from the sidewalks of New York, so to speak, or from the tenement areas of Pittsburgh, Chicago, and the other highly populated metropolitan areas of the country. We all know that that is one of the great plagues from which our cities suffer. They do not know what it is to really get out into an open space and commune with their God. I offer no apology for my statement, which I made on the floor of the Senate not so many days ago when I was fighting the materialists that want to destroy Glover-Archbold Park in the District of Columbia, assisted by the powerful lobby organization known as the American Automobile Association. That association is always motivated by a desire to lay down an apron of cement, irrespective of its cost to our culture, esthetic values, and our natural resources. So we add the sad spectacle of the spokesmen for the American Automobile Association, whose representatives were here testifying really to tear to the ground, as I have said, that great natural cathedral.

Someone wrote a letter to the editor stating that he had gone through the park and did not think it was such a beautiful cathedral, as the Senator from Oregon had described it. The writer had found briars, weeds, and stones in parts of the park which were in an unkept condition. That statement illustrates all the more reason why we should save what we have. There is little enough left.

I assure those who share the views of the writer of that letter and who wish to commune with nature that they can walk through that park, as I have, and—I care not what hour of the day or night it is—and the experience will take them nearer to their Creator. That area should be available to those who cannot get out to the great canyons of the West, which the Senator from Illinois honored me by visiting many times. They cannot get out into the primeval forest. They cannot get out to a stream foaming with rapids flowing from the glaciers on the mountains of the West. They cannot be that close to their Creator. But we should leave something.

The sand dunes of Indiana are a great natural phenomenon.

I do not think that in the interest of profit dollars for the steel corporations or any other business organization we can justify destroying natural beauty. I want the Senator from Illinois to know that I will continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with him in trying to enact legislation which will conserve and preserve the Indiana dunes for future generations of Americans.

I do not believe it is true that we cannot find any other place where steel mills can be built, or that there is no other place where we can take care of the transportation problems if we do not build a harbor there.

There are many such places. However, once we destroy the Indiana dunes, they will be gone for all eternity. Once we destroy Glover-Archbold Park, we destroy it forever.

Therefore, when I listen to the materialists, the Army Engineers, and the District of Columbia Commissioners, who have gone along with the American Automobile Association and all the others who want to destroy that park, I do not want them to tell me, "Senator, if you do not do it this way, we shall have to tear down private homes and new apartment buildings."

My answer is that I am still unimpressed, because we can always rebuild the houses if necessary, and we can always rebuild apartment houses. They can all be rebuilt elsewhere.

However, we can never rebuild the natural cathedrals that I am urging the Senate to preserve for future generations.

We must carry out our trust. I am proud to be associated with the Senator from Illinois in this great conservation battle in the Senate, because we are up against it constantly. This is not the last conservation fight we shall have. We shall have a great many of these fights in many parts of the country. I say to my colleagues in the Senate that we must stick together. We must stick together, for the alinements in the Senate become very interesting. We were defeated by the alinement last year. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] will recall that we had some of what we urged returned later in another piece of legislation, but we first were frustrated in our endeavors.

From all of this we can learn a lesson. Senators have come to me afterward and said, "I was mistaken in that vote." I say to the Senator from Illinois that he can count me in on the team. I want to be a member of the team.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will yield in a moment. I first wish to say that the statement of the Senator from Oregon pleases me very much. As we all know, he is a very brave battler. In the civil wars in England, when Oliver Cromwell rode over the moors to join his troops, the forces of the Commonwealth would take heart. When WAYNE MORSE takes his spear and comes into these battles, the forces who are trying to conserve our natural beauties take heart.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I always appreciate the comments of my good friend from Illinois. However, I always say to my friends that the Senator from Illinois is a biased friend. That is a precious commodity, Mr. President.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In order that the RECORD may be complete, I should like to say to the Senator from Oregon that while it is true that we lost the fight in the Senate on the open spaces, the House voted in favor of it on the same bill. In the Senate we had two pieces of new legislation, really new to the Senate. One of them was a bill dealing with mass transportation, and the other with open spaces. The Senate voted for mass transportation and voted down the open spaces proposal. The House voted for open spaces and voted down mass transportation.

That made a very easy trading arrangement in the conference committee, and we got both in the final legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This could be described as an hour of enlistment. The Senator from Illinois has sounded the battle cry for the protection of the Indiana dunes. He knows I am interested in that subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota is one of the sponsors of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, and proudly so. The Senator from Minnesota has heard the response of the able and courageous Senator from Oregon, who is a conservationist second to none. I assure Senators that my interest in this subject is not merely my interest in the Indiana sand dunes, but in the whole subject of conservation of our natural resources.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And the preservation of our wilderness areas.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As has been mentioned today, the President's report on the Outdoor Recreation Commission is a blueprint of action which Congress ought to take.

Every day we hear some one talking about the population growth, or the great population splurge. Millions of new people are inhabiting our land. It is predicted that in a very few years from now, in 1970, the population of our country will be 220 million. There will be the same amount of land, but we shall have an increasing number of people. Our cities are growing bigger and bigger every day.

All this has become one of the great challenges of American governmental and social organizations. A society that lives an urban life, with people who are literally on wheels, and with all kinds of automotive transportation, and, as the Senator from Oregon has said, with an industrial society in which automation is the pattern of the day, and with more and more time available for families and individuals, for whatever purpose they wish to use that time, the conservation and preservation of these great areas of natural beauty, these wilderness areas, these God-given areas, which no man can replace once they are taken away, become not only a matter of public interest, but also a matter of public duty so far as Members of Congress are concerned.

We have a duty to ourselves and a duty to future generations.

I come from a State in which we take great pride in our wonderful recreational facilities. We have more than 22 million acres of forest land. We believe we have more than 20,000 lakes. I regret to report to my colleagues in the Senate that because of the inadequacy of certain laws, Federal and State, rivers and lakes in a beautiful State like Minnesota have become polluted.

As the Senator from Oregon has pointed out so many times on the floor of the Senate, as has also the Senator from Illinois, here in the Nation's Capital the Potomac River, a river which has a page in every history book of every young American, is a polluted river. It is not safe to go swimming in the Potomac River. It is dirty. It is one of the most polluted streams on the eastern seaboard.

Why is that? It is because the people have put their temporary little monetary and financial advantage ahead of the needs of posterity. Today if we tried to clean the Potomac River, to make it usable for recreational purposes, or to use it as a source of clean water, it would cost millions of dollars. I believe that even such an investment would be worthwhile.

Therefore I say to the Senator from Illinois that he need not make any apologies for being interested in preserving an area in this country for recreational purposes, for wholesome outdoor recreational purposes, even though it may be located in another State.

I want the Senator to be interested in the forest lands of my State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want him to be interested in the great parks and forest lands of Oregon and the great land areas of Illinois. We are Senators of the United States of America. We have a duty to the Nation as well as to our respective States.

When anyone thinks he is going to ride over this conservationist in the Senate he has a fight on his hands the like of which he never had before.

So I say we might as well throw down the gauntlet now and be ready to fight for the few areas we still have in this country that have been untouched and unsullied.

Let anyone who is worried about commerce or about where a steel mill should be built or where an industry should be located, come to northeastern Minnesota, where we have the Great Lakes, and the finest water transportation in the world, where we have the St. Lawrence Seaway, and where we have workers who are unemployed. These workers have worked in mines and steel plants. We have the city of Duluth and the city of Two Harbors, and, across Lake Superior, the city of Superior. We have the dockage facilities, the ore boats, and the workers necessary to operate steel plants. It is not necessary to damage the Indiana dunes.

We have available good commercial property, property which was zoned for this very purpose a long time ago. Besides, anyone who goes there to invest or work, can be in the virgin forests of the Lake Superior country within 1 hour; he can go by canoe into areas untouched by human kind.

If he does not like it there, he can go by plane or automobile further into the more open recreational areas. We guarantee good pike fishing, good swimming, good picnicking, good camping.

Minnesota affords commercial opportunity; it has available workers and available commercial sites. It has happy people. It has recreational facilities.

At the same time, the dunes can be protected. I know the Senator from Illinois will want to tell us that his State also can provide commercial property and space for steel plants somewhere in Illinois. But I thought I would put my bid in first for Minnesota before any other Senator put in a bid for his State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. As one who has walked down the Willamette Valley, across the Coast Range, to the Oregon beaches; who has walked up the Oregon beaches almost their full length, and walked on the Washington beaches, I know something of the beauties of the States of the Northwest. I should like to preserve a full share of them for future public use.

Also, I know something of the beauties of Minnesota, and I should like to see them developed.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who is now presiding over the Senate, has sponsored a national park in the so-called Sleeping Bear area of his State. Such a park is badly needed. I pledge my support to him and to his colleague from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] in their sponsorship of that measure, against the great opposition which they face.

Every time one of these proposals is advanced, the tendency is for local interests to oppose it. I walked through the Yosemite last fall and found that when John Muir advocated saving the Yosemite and making a national park of it, the people in the vicinity were very much opposed to the proposal.

The same thing occurred in the Yellowstone, and at Glacier, in Montana. It happened in the Grand Tetons, in Wyoming. I believe the only instance when there was no local opposition was when the Great Smokies National Park was created in North Carolina and Tennessee. Generally, we find local interests opposed to such developments, because they think they can make more money otherwise. The great system of national parks has therefore been largely developed by people from outside the areas immediately concerned.

There is another weakness. People will make general declarations that they are in favor of recreational facilities for the teeming millions of the metropolitan areas. They think that by making a general declaration they have performed their public function and duty. But when a specific project comes up for consideration, they say that commerce and industry are more important. It is necessary for us to be faithful to our principles in concrete situations, and not merely express general principles.

We all remember the story of Rip Van Winkle, about whom Washington Irving wrote one of his best stories. Rip Van Winkle was a total abstainer in principle; but whenever he had a chance to imbibe, he would say, "I won't count this time." That is the way people behave very largely in connection with the creation of national parks.

I observe that my reference to Rip Van Winkle has excited the interest of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am happy to tell the Senator from Illinois that recently we in Louisiana have had something of an opposite experience, fortunately. Kaiser Aluminum Co. has been willing to give up, at no expense to the State or the Federal Government, a valuable piece of property which that corporation owns adjoining the Chalmette Battlefield, where Andrew Jackson's troops defeated the British. There is some hope of making a national monument of that particular area, which is now owned by private industry.

That is one instance in which a private corporation, and a large one, has the public interest at heart. It has said it is willing to relinquish to the Government the land which is needed in order to make a national monument of the battlefield on which American and British troops fought the Battle of New Orleans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. The Kaiser Co. is one of the most public spirited companies in the Nation. It showed its public spirit only last week when, with Inland Steel, it refused to go along with the price increase which United States Steel and Bethlehem Steel initiated. The action of Inland and Kaiser, together with the tacit refusal of American Rolling Mills Corp. and of Granite City Steel to put the price increase into effect, helped the President to roll back the price increase. The Kaiser Co. is one of our very best concerns.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The offer of Kaiser Aluminum probably gives some insight into the motive of that company in not going along with the price increase. As the Senator has so well said, that company has given indication on occasion of being somewhat self-effacing for the benefit of the overall national need.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. We have tried, directly and indirectly, to appeal to similar instincts which we hope exist among the leaders of National Steel Corp. and Bethlehem Steel Corp. Thus far we have been greeted with a stone wall of silence on the part of Mr. George M. Humphrey, who is the main force in the National Steel Corp., and an outright refusal on the part of Bethlehem Steel. Those companies have an opportunity to "get right" with public opinion by being willing to cooperate.

In this connection, while I appreciate the desire of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to have steel mills locate in Minnesota, I correct any possible inference that I am trying to get them for Illinois. This charge has been made upon occasion by the Governor of Indiana; and upon occasion it has been repeated by Members of Congress from Indiana. This is not true. I should be very glad to support the construction of a harbor at other places in Indiana along Lake Michigan. One alternative site would be at Michigan City, 10 miles to the east. Michigan City has an 18-foot harbor which could be deepened quite readily to 27 feet. It is also the northern terminus of the Monon Railway.

I should be very glad to support a harbor at an inland location which could be reached by a canal constructed at the approximate location of Burns Ditch and which would run 4 or 5 miles into the interior. Steel mills could be located there, while still preserving the Dunes.

Perhaps best of all would be a harbor to be built in Lake County, Ind., west of Gary. There is already a breakwater protecting the entrance to Lake Calumet, in the southern part of Cook County. There also is a breakwater to protect the public port at Indiana Harbor, which is a 27-foot harbor. Those two breakwaters could be connected, and land could be filled in behind the breakwater in Indiana which could then be used by the steel companies.

But, Mr. President, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said, although the steel mills could move elsewhere, once the Dunes are destroyed they are gone forever. As Carl Sandburg has said, "the Dunes are to the Midwest what the Grand Canyon is to Arizona and Yosemite to California. They constitute signature of time and eternity: once lost their loss would be irrevocable." Mr. President, it is this precious area which some of us are trying to save, but it is this which many are seeking to destroy.

I wish to be guarded in what I say; but in both parties in Indiana there are strong political influences that are seeking to destroy the Dunes, in the name of steel. There are strong political forces which are hoping to profit from an increase in land values. Two powerful steel companies—National Steel and Bethlehem — and the Public Service Co. of northern Indiana and various private groups are seeking to destroy this area.

But, Mr. President, I am greatly heartened by the comments of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota, and by the reinforcement the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has given us by his references to what is happening in his area. I can promise that although the opposition may be able to prevent this bill to save the Dunes from being passed by Congress, yet we will give them a fight over the question of whether they can have $25½ million of public funds to build a port to be used, at best, almost solely for the benefit of two steel companies, and quite possibly for the benefit of only one steel company. We will do our best to save this priceless area for the people and for both this generation and those which are to follow.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CENTER FOR HUMAN UNDERSTANDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by Prof. John Nef, of the University of Chicago, dealing with the establishment in the District of Columbia of a Center for Human Understanding.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CENTER FOR HUMAN UNDERSTANDING—PLANS FOR ITS DEVELOPMENT—1962–68

The center is a part of the University of Chicago, which receives gifts and administers all funds.

OBJECTIVES

An old world is going out. The human condition is different from any known to history, and the danger of extinction confronts men and women everywhere with problems such as they have never faced before, problems which they can only meet, and live, by increasing understanding and agreement. In this new world of nuclear weapons unlimited violence has become a luxury which the human race can no longer afford. The members of a center for human understanding form a small group, disinterested personally, but with a central and overwhelming interest in helping the human race, as individuals, to fulfill their destiny and to make our planet a more decent place for the generation of children being born in every country in the 1950's and 1960's. In addition to these members, the center includes the sponsors (with their wives or husbands) now known as "associates of a center for human understanding and of the committee on social thought of the University of Chicago."

Our purpose as a corporate body of members and associates is to examine any major phase of human activity in the light of a hope for relative peace on earth, and in the knowledge that relative peace is unattainable unless there are fundamental changes for the better in the manifestations of human nature. Our function is to help persons everywhere to discover what changes are necessary in the spirit in which individuals conduct their lives, in the objectives which they serve and in the manner of serving these objectives, in politics, business enterprise, education, labor and craftsmanship, law, science and art.

And, further, our function is to suggest possible ways in which these necessary changes can be brought about. So it is our function both to try to define and to represent, in company with such other more specialized and more organized groups as share our concern, the interests all men and women have in common, mostly without realizing it, beyond and in the midst of the misunderstandings and quarrels between nations, races, ideologies and factions, and thus to help reveal what is so readily concealed and so often buried—the dignity of God in man.

PROCEDURES

With these ends in view the members plan to hold, during the next years, periodic meetings in Washington because of the special facilities there available for assemblies of this kind and the special opportunities there provided for direct contacts with persons from many nations who contribute to the great decisions which will determine human destiny. The associates as well as the members and prospective members are invited to these meetings. So are a number of other persons whose knowledge and ideas concerning the subjects discussed command respect, and whose participation in the discussions is encouraged. The maximum attendance at any single session will be 40 to 50.

The opening meeting will be held in Washington this spring beginning the morning of Thursday, April 26, and ending Monday, April 30. It is hoped that the participants from out of town may arrive in the afternoon or evening of Wednesday, April 25. The Institute of Contemporary Arts will serve as host for the meetings and provide a setting for the future development of this new center at Meridian House, 1630 Crescent Place NW., Washington, D.C. Some rooms have been reserved at the Mayflower Hotel to provide accommodations for those who need them, in particular members of the center who will come from Europe and Chicago.

PROGRAM FOR THE 1962 MEETING, APRIL 26–29

The general subject is "Approaches to a Surer Peace." Six formal discussion sessions are planned, to be held on the mornings and afternoons of Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. These sessions will be followed in the evenings and on Sunday by informal conversations. At these the members, associates and other participants will exchange their second thoughts concerning the issues raised in the formal sessions. Arrangements are being made to provide luncheons and dinners during the 4 days in Washington for members, associations and invited guests.

The main object this year is to decide what are the all-important questions under each of six subjects of discussion, so that these can be explored much more deeply in subsequent years. The subjects have been chosen because each could provide promising roads to better understanding. Those of us who assemble next April will formulate, in tentative form, the key issues relating to each subject, and will discuss what kinds of reforms are likely to help provide goals for human endeavor other than those likely to end in mutual suicide.

The persons mentioned under each of the following headings will, it is hoped, help to initiate the discussion of the issues concerning each subject. We regard all six subjects as integrally related to the general objective of all the sessions; to suggest to men and women everywhere surer roads to peace, opportunities for constructive, exciting work and exaltation such as have been partly and often tragically provided by organized warfare for the settlement of differences. As it is one of our main purposes to transcend the barriers which now hinder and often prevent understanding between specialists, we hope that it may be possible for the members, associates, and invited guests to attend as many meetings as they can with a view to treating each subject in the perspective of the others, and relating all of them to this central theme.

1. Thursday, April 26, at 10 a.m.: "Common Ground in Religious Approaches to International Understanding." A comparison of the influences of science and Christianity upon history in their relation to a more peaceful and constructive world. Participants: John Nef; Charles Moraze, professor in the Ecole Polytechnique of Paris; Mircea Eliade, member of the center and the committee; Rev. Martin D'Arcy.

2. Thursday, April 26, at 3 p.m.: "Cultural Foundations for a Better Understanding Among Peoples: Arts and Letters." Participants; Jacques de Bourbon Busset, Charles E. Bohlen, Robert M. Richman, Nadia Boulanger, Ralph J. Mills, Jr.

3. Friday, April 27, at 10 a.m.: "How Can Popular Culture Contribute to Understanding?" A consideration of the role of newspapers, magazines, films, television, radio, et cetera, in human communion. Participants: Rev. William F. Lynch, Charles Benton, William Ward Prince.

4. Friday, April 27, at 3 p.m.: "To What Extent and in What Ways Can a Higher Economic Standard of Living Contribute to a More Peaceful World?" A consideration of the roles of individualism, mechanization, automation and craftsmanship as bases of human communion. Participants: Clarence Randall, Ambassador Konan Bedie of the Ivory Coast, Friedrich Hayek, Arnold O. Wolfers.

5. Saturday, April 28, at 10 a.m.: "Can Science and Technology Strengthen the Peace?" A consideration of the role of scientific inquiry, scientific knowledge and military manners in human communion. Participants: The Honorable James H. Douglas, Louis Leprince-Ringuet, Sir George P. Thomson, Lewis Strauss, General Thomas White, George Kistiakowsky.

6. Saturday, April 28, at 3 p.m.: "Can the United Nations Establish a Rule of Law?" A consideration of the possible role of natural law and legislation, poltical institutions and judicial decisions in human communion among diverse peoples. Participants: Mr. Justice John M. Harlan, Charles S. Rhyne, Sir Arthur L. Goodhart, Frederick Eaton.

PUBLICATIONS

The discussions will be recorded. They will be carefully edited with a view to publication by the executive secretary, Bruce Phemister, formerly executive secretary of the Committee on Social Thought.

Monsieur Angoulvent, president and director of the Presses Universitaires de France, has signified his interest in publishing a series of volumes for the Center for Human Understanding. The first, which is being published in English in March 1962 by the Henry Regnery Co., of Chicago, is John Nef's "A Search for Civilization." M. Angoulvent has undertaken to publish this (under the title "A la Recherche de la Civilization") as the first of his series in French. The second volume will be presented to M. Angoulvent in French translation as proceedings of the spring meeting. It is hoped that either the Henry Regnery Co. or University Publishers, Inc., will present the series in English.

THE SUBJECTS AND PARTICIPANTS FOR SIX SUBSEQUENT PROGRAMS—1963–68

1. "The Place of Religious Faith in an Approach to Human Understanding." Among those to be invited as participants: R. P. Carre, Mircea Eliade, Rhadakrishman, Aldous Huxley, William Hyghe, Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, William G. Cole and representatives of Africa, the Near and Far East and Latin America.

2. "The Place of Beauty in an Approach to Human Understanding." Among those to be invited as participants: Alexis Leger, Andre Malraux, T. S. Eliot, Marc Chagall, Henri Peyre, Ivan Albright, Anthony di Bonaventura, Jacques de Bourbon Busset, Ralph J. Mills, Jr.

3. "The Place of Popular Culture in an Approach to Human Understanding." Among those to be invited as participants: Jerome Bruner, Rev. William F. Lynch, Amory Houghton, Charles Benton.

4. "The Place of Economic Enterprise in the Achievement of Human Understanding." Among those to be invited as participants: Robert Buron, Friedrich Hayek, Clarence Randall, William Wood Prince, Ambassador Konan Bedie, the Honorable William Benton, Senator Paul Douglas, Jacques Ellul, and representatives from Africa, India, the Near and Far East and Latin America.

5. "The Place of Science and Technology in an Approach to Human Understanding." Among those to be invited as participants: The Honorable James H. Douglas, Sir George P. Thomson, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, the Honorable Roswell L. Gilpatric, James R. Killian, Hans A. Bethe, Louis Leprince-Ringuet, George Beadle, George Kistiakowsky and representatives from Africa, India, the Near and Far East.

6. "The Place of Politics and the Rule of Law in Human Understanding." Among those to be invited as participants: Mr. Justice John M. Harlan, Sir Arthur L. Goodhart, Gabriel LeBras, Charles S. Rhyne, Julius Stone, Arthur Larsen, Dean Erwin N. Griswold, Frederick Eaton and representatives from Africa, India, the Near and Far East, and South America.

CONTINUOUS EXISTENCE

It is vital to the impression we hope to make on leaders in all lines of endeavor, and to groups devoted to limiting war, that the center have a continuous existence, and means of publishing and coordinating the results of each of the meetings, and showing the interrelations of all of them. These must be not simply a series of conferences held here and there, the experience of which evaporates quickly after they are over. Ever louder echoes of our work should appear in the United States and throughout the world.

URBAN RENEWAL PLAN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the revitalization of the sections of our great urban centers which have undergone economic decline is not a job for the Government alone. Urban renewal is more than the clearing away of old structures and the substitution of new ones. The injection of new vigor and life into the central city communities of the Nation requires the cooperative efforts of businesses, community associations of various kinds, and of local, State, and Federal governments.

An article which appeared in the February 1962 issue of the Illinois Banker about the Englewood section of Chicago, provides a fine example of how local business interests can provide the initiative for community revitalization.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Unique Urban Renewal Plan Revitalizes Ailing Shopping Area," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Unique Urban Renewal Plan Revitalizes Ailing Shopping Area

A neighborhood shopping area which 3 years ago had "the pall of sure death on its brow" has today become one of the brightest and most prosperous shopping areas in the world.

More importantly, observers say the community's spectacular recovery may well point the way for other cities faced with revitalizing their downtown areas.

The community, known as Englewood and located on Chicago's southside, had more than the average city's normal share of problems. Not only were numerous suburban shopping centers and the downtown Loop draining away its previous flow of shoppers and dollars, but the continual downhill pattern was having a demoralizing effect upon many merchants and property owners.

One merchant summed it up: "I've been in business here a long time, but the whole section is getting to be like an automobile I once had. It was a good car—until after a while it gave so much trouble I wanted to just walk off and leave it."

And "walk off" is what a lot of business people did. For example, when a large department store at the main intersection in the heart of Englewood had the building condemned following a fire, the owner chose to use the insurance coverage to move elsewhere.

For 6 years the vacant corner was thus left to serve as a reminder that "the world's largest neighborhood shopping area" also possessed one of the world's largest community problems.

Finally in 1958 it appeared the entire community was beginning to want to walk off and get away from itself.

NEW LEADERSHIP

Ironically, the man who was most instrumental in reversing the downward trend to oblivion is a soft-spoken Georgia-born bank president who arrived in Englewood just in time to see the community reach its lowest ebb.

The banker, W. Norbert Engles, had been assigned to take over as president of the Chicago City Bank & Trust Co.—largest bank on the southside and located in the center of a sagging shopping area.

Actually he had not been recruited from another bank, but rather from the Small Business Administration in Washington. His conspicuously successful background in working with independent business enterprises throughout the country, convinced the owners of Chicago City Bank & Trust (bought in 1958 by Diversa, Inc.) that Mr. Engles could do a better job than anyone else in strengthening the bank's position.

But his job, as Mr. Engles saw it, was to first spearhead a campaign to strengthen the community itself.

When Mr. Engles had been in his new position less than 6 months, he was asked to breathe new life into the 40-year-old Englewood Businessmen's Association.

The results of his efforts, as president of both the bank and the association, are now a matter of record and arithmetic.

Not only was the trend to oblivion halted, but the curve of gross business volume gradually climbed to show a 25-percent improvement for the first 2 years (from $80 million in 1958 to more than $100 million in 1960). And advance figures indicate the curve has reached an even steeper pitch upward for 1961.

SECRET OF SUCCESS

According to Mr. Engles, the most important step in the entire campaign was that of creating a new kind of hope and determination in the community.

In short, it was a problem of selling businessmen on the idea of joining forces and helping themselves with a sort of do-it-yourself urban renewal program.

Evidence of his association's work is everywhere. As an example:

The vacant corner where the department store had stood was immediately recognized as a kind of monument to failure Certainly this vacant property, valued at $500,000 but serving as hardly more than a place to display circus and campaign posters, was not a suitable hub for his association's wheel of progress.

Efforts were made to inspire enough confidence in outside investors to build a profitable structure on the vacant corner. When there were no takers, Mr. Engles took the most logical (and most difficult) approach.

FORMS VIGILANTES

He formed a vigilantes group called the Englewood Community Corp. and set out to sell debentures and shares of stock to merchants and businessmen throughout the area. He did not sell the idea of earning a quick profit (indeed, the investors were guaranteed only a 2-percent return). Instead he sold the concept of investing in the community.

After several months of intensive selling, the corporation had raised $425,000 toward the $725,000 that was needed. For the other $300,000 Engles went before his own board of directors and asked for a loan. The collateral offered? Not the profit from a new building across the street. The mortgage rather was on the bright future of a revitalized community.

Today, the modern building has been completed and is profitably leased to the Walgreen drug chain.

MERCHANTS BUY LIGHTS

Another typical victory for Mr. Engles and his businessmen's committee was through a tedious but effective merchant-to-merchant campaign to "throw some real light on the community."

Old fashioned lightpoles have now been removed from the streets and replaced with such modern facilities that it now is credited with being "one of the brightest spots in the world."

Significantly, the merchants and property owners themselves are paying the entire cost of the installation, maintenance, and additional power of the new lighting system.

This feat was achieved by approaching each merchant and stressing the vital importance of the appearance of the area, even at night.

With each streetlight installation costing $2,000 and electric power estimated at $50 per month for each installation, the merchants nonetheless enthusiastically supported the program.

Total cost for the new lighting system was $500,000.

Recently, when the new system was ready, Mr. Engles and many thousands of Englewood citizens gathered at the central intersection to hear messages of congratulations from Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON and Chicago's Mayor Richard J. Daley.

Both dignitaries praised the committee and the community as a whole for having staged a spectacular recovery and thus setting a pattern for other troubled shopping communities throughout the country.

JOB NOT OVER

Admittedly, the job is not over; but Mr. Engles and the other businessmen of Englewood are confident the hardest part is behind them.

Businessmen in Englewood realize that the banker from Georgia by no means accomplished the revitalization alone, yet they are eager to point him out as the man who provided the leadership and fortitude that sparked the spectacular recovery program.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on March 22 the Senate was operating under a parliamentary procedure which restricted remarks which then might be made. On that date I introduced S. 3059, a bill recommended by the Attorney General of the United States. I wish now to make a very brief summary, and I add the note, hopefully, that the Senate may take favorable action on the bill.

S. 3059 would amend title 18 of the United States Code. It is intended thereby to eliminate some of the more serious difficulties which have been encountered in regard to prosecution of cases involving police brutality. This has been a subject on which the Civil Rights Commission has made some specific recommendations. It is a subject which the Congress has had before it in various forms many times prior to this date.

The Attorney General's recommendation appears to me to be completely justified. If the bill is enacted into law, it will go far toward providing adequate sanctions in cases involving persons, acting under color of law, who have infringed upon the rights of American citizens.

As will be seen in the letter from the Attorney General, which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, there has been serious difficulty both in regard to obtaining indictments and in regard to court actions, which do not result in convictions because of the complexity which is introduced in the establishment of intent.

Specific intent on the part of police officers is made difficult to prove because of the present general nature of existing statutes and the rule of law laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of Screws against United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter which the Attorney General addressed to the Vice President when he transmitted the language of the bill may be printed in the RECORD, along with the text of S. 3059.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the letter and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1962.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Enclosed for your consideration and appropriate reference is a legislative proposal "to amend chapter 13 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to civil rights."

This Department has encountered a number of difficulties in prosecuting cases of police brutality under 18 U.S.C. 242. Under that section it is a misdemeanor for any person, acting under color of law, willfully to subject any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or district to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States. The generality of the statutory language makes it difficult to impress upon grand and petit jurors the specific nature of the offense. Further, the specific intent requirements laid down by the Supreme Court in *Screws* v. *United States*, 325 U.S. 91, have permitted offending police officers to raise the defense that they did not know of the particular constitutional guarantee they were charged with violating, let alone have the specific intent to violate it. A further difficulty in prosecuting under section 242 is the inadequacy of its misdemeanor punishment for offenses that have resulted in severe injury to the victim—or even death.

The proposed bill would meet these difficulties. Its application is limited to summary punishment and coerced confession cases, which make up virtually all of the cases which this Department handles under section 242. The specific intent is spelled out in the bill. Aggravated punishment is provided for cases involving injury or death.

Though bills have frequently been introduced in the Congress to meet the above difficulties, they have sought to achieve their purpose by amending existing sections of the law. I believe that a better method is to enact a new code section such as that set forth in the attached proposal. In this manner, prosecutive difficulties can be eliminated in many cases, while at the same time preserving the flexibility found in the present statute.

The Department therefore urges the early introduction and favorable consideration of this legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

S. 3059

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 13 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended (a) by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 245. Imposition of summary punishment and coercion of statements

"Whoever, under color of law, statute, ordinance regulation, or custom, strikes, beats, assaults, injures, or threatens or attempts to strike, beat, assault, or injure the person of another for the purpose of inflicting summary punishment upon such other person or for the purpose of compelling such other person to make any statement shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both: *Provided*, That if physical injury results the punishment shall be by fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than five years or both, and if death results the punishment shall be by imprisonment for any term of years or for life.

"For the purposes of this section, summary punishment means any injury inflicted otherwise than in accordance with the procedures prescribed by State or Federal law or regulation."

(b) By adding at the end of the table of sections for chapter 13 of title 18 of the United States Code the following:

"245. Imposition of summary punishment and coercion of statements."

ALOHA WEEK AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I wish to extend to the Members of the Senate and to the readers of the Congressional Record a very warm welcome on behalf of Michigan State University, East Lansing, as it approaches its Aloha Week.

The Michigan State University Hawaiian Club and Student Government Association, an all-student work group, have sponsored what I am sure will be a most enjoyable and colorful affair. The profits to be derived from this activity, which will extend from April 30 through May 5, will be divided between the general student scholarship fund of Michigan State University and a fund for scholarships for students attending the East-West Center of the University of Hawaii.

Additionally, it is intended to acknowledge the efforts of Michigan State University in behalf of international education and the attempt to create better relationships and understanding between the United States and Asiatic countries through the East-West Center.

There are 41 Hawaiian students attending the Michigan State University, and this activity will provide them an opportunity to present to Michigan State University students the customs, the history, and the cultural background of our 50th State.

I was visited by a delegation of Michigan State University student leaders who came to this city in order to inform the Nation generally of their activities and interests.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. ESCAPEE PROGRAM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we have just marked the 10th anniversary of the U.S. escapee program. On March 22, 1952, President Truman determined that mutual security funds should be made available to implement the escapee program, a program first authorized by the Mutual Security Act of 1951. As my colleagues know, the escapee program is administered by the Department of State to provide reception, material aid, resettlement and assurance in making local adjustment for escapees from Communist-bloc countries.

It is a program which operates primarily through contracts with voluntary agencies which carry out individually approved projects to assist in the resettlement and adjustment of qualified escapees. The agencies are reimbursed by the program for the expenses incurred in these activities. Under close supervision of USEP officials, all projects are in keeping with the humanitarian objectives of the agencies and the overall operational objective of establishing the escapees as self-sustaining and useful citizens of the free world community whether in this country or abroad. In so doing the program has helped to alleviate the frequently serious economic and political impact of the escapees on the countries in which they seek asylum, thus enhancing the economic and political stability of the free world.

Over the past decade, more than 926,000 persons have been assisted through the escapee program at a total cost of just under $55 million. Over 54,100 of these escapees have been admitted to the United States. The remaining persons have stayed in the countries of first asylum, or have been resettled in other parts of the world.

There is no yardstick with which to measure accurately the impact of our refugee policies on our foreign relations or the strength of the free world. But I suggest that our treatment of refugees and escapees does play a vital role in this regard. USEP, certainly, has been a highly successful program and a good investment in free world security. It has demonstrated tangibly America's traditional humanitarianism for oppressed and persecuted people, the constancy of our opposition to communism, and our concern for those enslaved by its tyranny. By maintaining and strengthening the escapees in the processes of democracy, USEP has also served to blunt considerably the effectiveness of the Soviet propaganda campaign for the redefection of escapees from communism. All of these things are important in our struggle for the vindication of democracy's belief in the individual worth of human beings.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, has proposed in its recent annual report a review of USEP. Such a review will establish a record of the program's achievements over the last 10 years, and would evaluate its present position and determine the level and nature of its future operations in the light of changing conditions. Experience has taught us that refugee problems are anything but static. They constantly change in nature, in dimensions and in location. They are not problems which can be defined at once for all time. So I am hopeful that the subcommittee will be able to conduct its proposed investigation within the very near future, for the information of Congress and the American people.

In this connection, I am also hopeful that the Senate will soon consider the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962. Among its provisions authorizing American participation in refugee programs, is one which provides for the continuation of USEP. While it is true that considerable progress had been made in reducing the caseload of USEP, under present conditions we must anticipate a flow of escapees for some time into the future. I attach great importance to this bill, and believe its passage is urgent—not only for the continuation of USEP, but also for the other programs the bill authorizes, including the Cuban refugee program.

A few days ago I received a booklet containing letters transmitted to President Kennedy on the escapee program. The letters were written by representatives of 12 participating voluntary agencies, and were kindly sent to me by Mr. James P. Rice, chairman of the Committee on Migration and Refugee Problems of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc. These letters tell a success story, Mr. President, one in which all Americans should be proud. As one is concerned with matters in this area, I commend the Congress for its support of USEP, the State Department for its efficient administration, and the voluntary agencies for their unqualified dedication to the cause of freedom. As it is true of most refugee programs, it is the voluntary agencies and their representatives on the scene who are the essential links between the program and the people in need.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of American voluntary agencies writing letters to President Kennedy, and excerpts from these letters, including a transmittal letter to the President from Mr. Rice, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the list, letter, and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

List of American Voluntary Agencies Sending Letters to the President of the United States

American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.

American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees.

American ORT Federation.

Catholic Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Church World Service, National Council of the Churches of Christ.

Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere (CARE).

International Rescue Committee.

Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee.

Tolstoy Foundation.

United Hias Service.

United Ukrainian American Relief Committee.

American Friends of Russian Freedom.

American Council of Voluntary
Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc.,
New York, N.Y., March 19, 1962.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: On the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the U.S. escapee program, I have the honor to transmit to you herewith letters from 12 voluntary agencies who wish to express their appreciation for the achievements of this program.

On behalf of us all, may I respectfully express to you our deep conviction that the U.S. escapee program is a unique instrument of our Government which demonstrates for the whole world how to combine a useful instrument of our foreign policy with our traditions of humanitarianism and devotion to the cause of freedom. We feel that it is particularly appropriate to address these letters to you not only because you are our President during this crucial period of our history, but because it has been the privilege of many of us to have worked with you when, as Senator from Massachusetts, you gave your support and leadership to a number of legislative measures to assist victims of oppression. Thousands of these former refugees are today taking their place as citizens and supporters of our democracy. The voluntary agencies representing all sectors of the American people are proud of the role that we and the representatives of our Government have played in making this possible.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. RICE,
Chairman, Committee on Migration and Refugee Problems.

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FROM AMERICAN VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

It is these refugees, numbering hundreds of thousands, living normal lives, in freedom, in almost every country of the free world who are the testimony to the effectiveness of the U.S. escapee program. USEP because of its operation through private organizations, has been able to function with flexibility to meet needs as they arose, and to mobilize the resources of the private, voluntary groups in many lands.

It is on behalf of these grateful refugees that we offer on this 10th anniversary, a word of deep appreciation to the Congress and to you, Mr. President, for your constant interest and support of the program. This tribute would likewise, not be complete, without a word of thanks to those in Government who have been responsible for the administration of the escape program. They are devoted public servants who have earned the respect of all who have worked so intimately with them for the past 10 years.

Most Rev. EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Executive Director, Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference

Today marks the 10th anniversary of a vital American effort which commenced as the President's escapee program. Now an integral part of the Department of State, the U.S. escapee program has gained affection and respect from hundreds of thousands of refugees fleeing totalitarianism. It is appropriate that we in Church World Service should take this occasion to express to you our sincere appreciation for the leadership and strength that devoted USEP officials have provided throughout this past decade. We are gratified that Congress and the private American community join with us in expression of approval for the achievements of USEP as witnessed by recent legislative developments.

JAMES MACCRACKEN,
Director, Immigration Services, Church World Service, National Council of the Churches of Christ.

The American people can take great pride in this unique humanitarian endeavor which has provided both freedom and dignity to so many thousands of victims of totalitarianism.

The American people have, however, benefited to a far greater extent than is generally appreciated. Permit me to cite three refugees who were resettled in the United States with the active participation of the U.S. escapee program by the International Rescue Committee in recent years in order to demonstrate the contributions which they and their fellow refugees have made.

They have enriched our store of knowledge, broadened our culture, and contributed substantially to our economy. As we enter a new decade, it is the earnest hope of the International Rescue Committee that the U.S. escapee program will continue to enjoy the full support and dedicated cooperation of the U.S. Government and the American people.

WILLIAM J. VANDEN HEUVEL,
President, International Rescue Committee.

POLISH AMERICAN IMMIGRATION AND RELIEF COMMITTEE.

The program displayed our American alertness and necessary flexibility. It proved that, as a nation, we are responsive to occurring world changes, but that the essential concept of our open-door policy and assistance to the oppressed remains the cornerstone of our policy. The dramatic search for freedom, without regard to price, will undoubtedly continue for years to come. The dynamic and deeply penetrating methods of Communist conspiracy demand from us a vigorous counteroffensive. Our assistance to those who in protest flee the Communist paradise is an important political and psychological weapon. It is so especially, if we are to continue the message of hope to the enslaved people of Poland and other captive nations.

We sincerely hope that the U.S. escapee program will continue to fulfill its important mission with undiminished force and the same broad vision.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. FELIX F. BURNT,
President.
WALTER ZACHARAIASIEWICZ,
Executive Vice President.

We consider it a privilege to express our appreciation and gratefulness on behalf of hundreds of thousands who have benefited of American generosity through one of its established channels—the U.S. escapee program (USEP) of the Department of State—celebrating its 10th anniversary of service in the field of foreign aid.

The task bestowed upon this arm of the American Government by the will of Congress in implementing the Kersten amendment was one of the most sensitive and responsible manifestations of the firm will of the American people to stretch out their helping hand to all those, who sought freedom from behind the multicolored curtains and walls, erected by the evil force of international communism. USEP became instrumental in alleviating the suffering of countless victims of political instability, lack of freedom, and outright terrorism, reigning in their homelands.

ALEXANDRA TOLSTOY,
President, Tolstoy Foundation.

On the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the U.S. escapee program, United Hias Service wishes to express its deep appreciation for this historic undertaking by our Government.

The 10th anniversary of USEP is not merely a climax to a long list of substantial achievements, but marks a vantage point of invaluable experience from which the continued challenge to democratic ideals must be met in the days and years ahead. In helping to meet this challenge, we of United Hias Service are immeasurably encouraged by the support of the U.S. escapee program. We extend our congratulations for past achievements of the program and express our hope that our Government will continue to carry out its purposes in the difficult days ahead.

JAMES P. RICE,
Executive Director, United Hias Service.

CUBAN REFUGEES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, one of the most pressing matters in the United States today involves the future of Cuban refugees. A hundred thousand or more of them are concentrated in the Miami-Dade County area in southern Florida. They are a highly diversified occupational group, but they find very limited employment opportunities in southern Florida where tourism is the principal industry. Over half of them are dependent on public cash assistance. A major resettlement program for the Cubans is essential to their welfare as well as that of Florida and the Nation as a whole.

An important part of a successful resettlement program is one of informing the American people of the seriousness of the plight of the Cubans. Helpful to this end is an excellent editorial on the resettlement of Cuban refugees, published in the Washington Post of April 2. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESETTLING REFUGEES

Nearly 2,000 Cubans, refugees from Castro's tyranny, continue to arrive in Miami, Fla., each week. About 125,000 of these uprooted people have come to the United States since Castro came to power in their homeland. Some 25,000 have moved from Florida to other parts of the country, leaving perhaps 100,000 clustered in Miami with half of them on relief. Another 100,000 will come in before 1962 is ended.

These are good people with a love of freedom which entitles them to a welcome here. Concentrated in Miami, they present a problem, however. Understandably, they are inclined to stay there, 90 miles from their Communist-dominated island, waiting for friends and relatives to join them, hoping that some sudden political development will throw Castro out of power and enable them to go home again. Their situation during the busy Florida tourist season of booming business has not been as bad as it might have been. With the slacking off of the tourist trade, jobs are likely to be much more scarce.

The only real solution for these people is to move to other parts of the United States where they can find work and places to live. Miami, supported by the Federal Government through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has dealt with them generously. It is time now for other communities to help in extending hospitality to the refugees by giving them a chance to resettle. "The resettlement program is the key to the whole Cuban refugee problem," Secretary Ribicoff said recently. The U.S. Employment Service can be counted on for assistance, and HEW will play its part in providing relief and medical care if necessary.

But the resettling job will have to be done by voluntary agencies—by the several religious groups which have always responded so warmly to human needs in the United States. They, in turn, must have support from local communities acting through churches, social agencies and neighborhood groups which will undertake to sponsor refugee families and help them to find jobs and living quarters. The Cuban Refugee Center in Miami is the headquarters for registration of refugees, voluntary resettlement and relief services to which all local groups can hold out a hand of hope and welcome.

REFUGEES HERE AND AROUND THE WORLD: ADDRESS BY MICHEL CIEPLINSKI

Mr. HART. Mr. President, earlier this month Mr. Michel Cieplinski, the Acting Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, addressed the Indiana Immigration Conference in Indianapolis, Ind. His topic was "Refugees Here and Around the World."

I commend this comprehensive review of the world refugee situation to all concerned with the responsibilities that our Nation, and others have for these unfortunate and destitute peoples.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cieplinski's remarks appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REFUGEES HERE AND AROUND THE WORLD

(Remarks by Mr. Michel Cieplinski, Acting Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, before the Indiana Immigration Conference, Indianapolis, Ind., April 3, 1962)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is a distinct honor and pleasure for me to participate in this conference devoted to consideration of the problems of immigration and refugees. Because of the scope of the topic assigned to me, I shall be able to give you little more than the highlights of each of the problems.

Let me take a few minutes to describe some of the responsibilities of the Department of State and consular officers abroad in the administration of our immigration laws. As you know, all immigrants who want to come to the United States must be in possession of visas. These visas are issued by American consular officers stationed in foreign countries after they determine that an applicant qualifies for a visa under existing law and that a quota number is available to him if he is subject to quota restrictions. The Department has been making great efforts to select carefully those officers who deal with visa applicants and to train them so that these officers not only understand the law but also the problems each alien may have who applies for a visa. Some 500,000 visas are issued each year. As you also know, once an immigrant arrives at a port of entry, he is double checked by officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, an arm of the Department of Justice. An infinitesimal number of aliens holding visas are excluded at ports of entry (less than 100 of some 1,500,000 aliens asking for admission, many of them repeaters). This is the best illustration that our officers do a competent job in screening visa applicants.

During the past few years, our efforts have been concentrated on eliminating red tape in the issuing of visas. Without sacrifice to the enforcement of our laws, we have streamlined and simplified application forms and visa procedures.

The groups represented here, of course, are interested in modernizing our immigration laws. It must be recognized that changes in the immigration laws traditionally have not taken place overnight, but by a gradual development. Many of the changes which have taken place since the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 were suggested originally by the Department of State. The elimination of fingerprinting of visitors and the elimination of the question formerly put to every applicant for an immigrant or visitor visa to his race and ethnic classification are two of the more important changes in this category. Of course, the Department's interest in changes in our immigration laws is prompted by its concern with our foreign relations. As you know, existing law accords nonquota status to most, but not all, countries in the Western Hemisphere. Foreign policy considerations prompted the Department to emphasize the importance of placing all independent countries within the Western Hemisphere on equal footing by according them nonquota status. Those of you who are interested in some of the Department's views on immigration legislation may want to read the letter the Department addressed to Senator KEATING on September 12, 1961, which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the same date. The points raised in this letter by no means cover the entire range of the Department's concern with various provisions of the immigration laws, but it is the Department's policy to make its views known only to Congress, in reply to requests for comments on pending legislation or in formal presentation, when occasion arises.

A bill of great interest to the Department, introduced by Congressman WALTER and passed by the House, is now before the Senate. This bill among other things would provide for an important reorganization of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs which, if accomplished, in my opinion would go far in improving its efficiency. It would authorize continuation of the Department's refugee and migration programs as well as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Cuban refugee activities. In addition it would extend indefinitely the provision of Public Law 86-648 to permit continued admission of a limited number of refugees under the parole process.

Other migration and refugee legislative proposals have been introduced into both the Senate and the House. You are doubtless familiar with many of them particularly the measures introduced by Senators HART, PELL and DODD.

In view of the limits of time it would be impossible for me to give you a detailed inventory of all the refugee problems existing in the world today. For the same reason I could not outline all of the public and private efforts being expended in behalf of these refugees. At best I can identify for you here today only the most pressing of these problems and make a brief comment as to the various programs being conducted in their behalf.

On a global basis there are those who have used a figure of 12.5 million refugees. This figure lacks validity in that it fails to include some recent groups, particularly the newly developing refugees in Africa, while it includes large groups of earlier refugees whom I believe are now firmly integrated into the areas to which they have been resettled. Actually, the world refugee problem today, in terms of refugees who have not yet been reestablished on a satisfactory basis, is in the neighborhood of 3.5 million persons.

The refugee groups best known to most of you are the anti-Communist refugees and escapees in Europe. Of this group the Hungarians made the most dramatic impression on the free world. I am happy to tell you that by dint of the conscientious and generous help of the U.S. Government and other governments of the free world aided by the dedicated voluntary agencies and private citizens of this and other countries the problem of the older refugees in Europe is well on its way to solution. Through the efforts of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees assisted by the almost global response to the World Refugee Year emphasis there remain only 9,000 refugees in official refugee camps in Europe. The UNHCR has plans and funds to resettle or provide permanent solutions for all of these persons who have lived so long in drab and sordid camps. There still remain in Europe approximately 50,000 out-of-camp refugees most of whom require varying degrees of assistance in becoming reestablished. The generous world response to these refugees coupled with the greatly improved economic situation in most of the European countries has resulted in a virtual miracle by solving most of the vast refugee problems in Europe including the 200,000 Hungarians who escaped to freedom.

The Federal Republic of Germany has achieved unbelievable success in absorbing well over 13½ million expellees, displaced persons, refugees and escapees. In the West German economy refugees have become an asset rather than a liability. I hasten to add, however, that the refugee problem in Germany as well as elsewhere in Europe is not static. East Zone refugees still find ways of escaping to West Germany in spite of the diabolic wall erected in Berlin and the increased control measures resorted to by the puppet East German regime calling itself a sovereign government. Escapees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania still manage to penetrate the tight border controls established by the Communists to make sure that their oppressed peoples remain in their self-proclaimed "worker's paradise." Large numbers of Yugoslavs continue to arrive in Italy, Austria, Greece and other European countries.

The flow of escapees and refugees will continue so long as the Communists pursue their attempts to deny individual freedom and to subject all men to a common mold of belief or endeavor. I must call your attention at this point to the fact that not only are the Communists responsible for the conditions which create refugees, but they continue to engage in a costly and widespread program of propaganda and intrigue among the emigre groups in an effort to discredit the humanitarian motives of the free west.

The United States will continue to assist these new arrivals through its U.S. escapee program (USEP). It is of interest to note that the escapee program has just celebrated its 10th anniversary. During the 10 years of its existence USEP has assisted a total of 926,000 escapees from Communist and Communist-dominated countries. They have been given food, clothing, medical and dental care, language and vocational training, counseling and many other benefits. Of this almost 1 million persons, one-third or 330,000 have been helped to become integrated into the countries granting them initial asylum and another 157,000 have been successfully resettled in some 48 countries. Through its generous support of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM) and the UNHCR, the United States will continue its help to these recent escapees and to the residual group of older refugees still in need of our help.

Another group of anti-Communist refugees to which the United States has made significant contributions, both public and private, are the more than a million refugees from Red China presently in Hong Kong. In spite of the magnificent job which the Hong Kong colonial government is doing for these refugees who make up one-third of the colony's population there still is need for additional aid from international sources. The needs to be met encompass housing, medical and clinical services, education, and in many instances food and clothing. In addition to a liberal World Refugee Year contribution for construction of a refugee center, schools and clinics, the United States provides annually approximately $1 million in cash and surplus foods estimated at $5 million for these refugees.

External resettlement of these refugees is not the solution except for a relatively few who will find migration opportunities. The answer lies in their being assimilated into the economy of Hong Kong. This process will continue to be required for those already there and more importantly for the estimated 50,000 arriving each year.

Another 50,000 Chinese refugees present a serious problem to the authorities in Macau. Assistance to this group is limited and consists primarily of U.S. help.

A relatively small but highly significant problem is that of the White Russian refugees arriving in Hong Kong from Red China. Over 20,000 of these refugees, who are fleeing communism for the second time, have already been resettled by ICEM and the UNHCR and some 6,000 still in China are expected to come out over the next several years. The United States has contributed substantially to this resettlement program and will continue to do so until the problem is finally resolved.

The 60,000 Tibetans who have escaped the Communist Chinese takeover of their country are now in India and Nepal represent one of the most pitiful groups of refugees anywhere in the world. Limited private aid has gone into both India and Nepal. The United States has made available both surplus food and cash to meet as many of the needs as possible. U.S. funds are being used to augment private funds in helping to relocate Tibetan young people and children in Europe, particularly in Switzerland where a Swiss organization is doing a splendid job in attempting to extend vocational training and understanding of Western culture to develop these young Tibetans into future leaders.

Most of you are aware at least to some degree of the more than 100,000 Cuban refugees who have fled to this country to escape the oppression and totalitarian measures forced upon them and their peace-loving relatives by Castro and his Communist henchmen. The United States has now become a country of first asylum and finds itself confronted with the same problems and expenses of helping a large number of refugees which have been faced by other countries abroad. Voluntary agencies and citizens' groups are helping the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to cope with this stupendous problem. The primary difficulty lies in reducing the burden on the State of Florida, Dade County, and the city of Miami where the bulk of these proud and able people are congested. Their numbers, if distributed over the country, would present practically no problem from a housing, employment, or welfare standpoint, but localized as they are in Florida and in New York City these refugees are creating serious social, economic, and political problems, the solution to which requires immediate and careful resettlement throughout the country. Each community must become as generous as it was in accepting Hungarians by providing for its share of these close friends and violently anti-Communist neighbors.

The victims of political stalemate, more than a million Palestine refugees continue to present a pathetic picture in the several Middle East countries. The solution to their problem presents some of the most politically sensitive issues facing the United Nations. Until these issues can be resolved the problem will remain acute and the present relief program of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) must continue. The United States supports this Agency to approximately 70 percent of its annual $35 million budget.

The Director of UNRWA has recently launched an appeal for funds to increase and intensify the vocational training facilities for the young people of this pathetic group. Since the limited programs of this type have had excellent results it is hoped that the approximately 3,000 young men now being helped to secure jobs and independence can be increased materially.

Within recent weeks the future of the more than 300,000 Algerian refugees in Tunisia and Morocco seems more helpful. These refugees consisting mainly of women, children, and elderly men were forced from the war areas in Algeria. They have been cared for by the combined efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the League of Red Cross Societies. The United States has been a primary supporter of these activities both in cash and in large supplies of surplus foods.

A cease-fire in Algeria will not in itself end the problems of these refugees, for as they return to their war-damaged farms and desert villages, they will be forced to share with more than 2 million other Algerians presently displaced within Algeria the problems of rehabilitation and of reconstruction of their personal economies. I can assure you that your government and other governments sympathetic to the plight of these people will do the utmost to help these victims of political upheaval achieve as rapidly as possible a return to normal living.

It is not necessary for me to go into any details with reference to the millions of Hindu refugees in India and Moslem refugees in Pakistan who were created by the partition of India in 1947 and subsequent events. The overwhelming bulk of these refugees have now been successfully integrated in their countries of present residence, and the authorities in these countries are actively pursuing similar solution for the relatively small residual numbers. I can also mention that the more than 850,000 North Vietnamese moved from the presently Communist-controlled areas in North Vietnam have been so successfully integrated into South Vietnam that they no longer constitute a problem. Similar success can be reported for the North Korean refugees in South Korea.

Scattered elsewhere throughout the world but particularly in southeast Asia are pockets of refugees, mostly Chinese who are in varying degrees of need but also including 50,000 anti-Communist Lao refugees in Laos who have been displaced from their tribal homes by Communist guerrilla activity and for whom the United States is providing emergency assistance.

In Africa, the historic march toward independence of states which for generations have been colonial possessions has more often than not been accompanied by strife and political upheaval, creating new refugee problems of serious proportions. More than 150,000 refugees fled from Angola to the Republic of the Congo, while within the Congo over 300,000 Baluba refugees have required relief assistance in the Provinces of Katanga and Kasai. Elsewhere tens of thousands of other refugee tribesmen present similar problems in Togo, Ruanda-Urundi, Uganda, and Tanganyika. In all of these the U.S. Government, operating as much as possible through the United Nations, the League of Red Cross Societies and the UNHCR, has poured in surplus food items and assisted with cash contributions where required.

You may ask why must the United States feel it necessary to support refugee programs to the extent it does. Or, you may want an answer to the question of how long will new refugee problems continue to emerge? Is there any hope that the day will come when there will be no refugee problems to challenge the conscience and command the attention of civilized mankind?

The answer to the latter is simpler. As long as modifications in political entities are made and geographic boundaries are changed, each bringing with it inevitable changes in leadership and followers, there will be those who are forced or choose to flee to escape political persecution or economic oppression. As long as there are totalitarian regimes, whether Communist or any other form of despotism, there will be refugees and escapees in need of a helping hand. I have mentioned the great achievements made in reducing the staggering numbers of displaced persons, refugees, and escapees. I have called your attention to the fact that the refugee problem is not static. Therefore, my answer must be that until mankind finds the formula to live in complete peace and harmony one with another, and when the dignity of man is given due and proper recognition, then and then only will the problems of refugees vanish.

The interest of the U.S. Government and the interest of the American people in refugees is as natural as the American way of life. I believe President Kennedy gave the best answer to this question in his letter last July to the Congress in explanation of his requested refugee and migration legislation:

"The United States, consistent with the traditional humanitarian regard of the American people for the individual and for his right to a life of dignity and self-fulfillment, should continue to express in a practical way its concern and friendship for individuals in free world countries abroad who are uprooted and unsettled as the result of political conditions or military action.

"The successful reestablishment of refugees, who for political, racial, religious, or other reasons are unable or unwilling to return to their country of origin or of nationality under conditions of freedom, dignity, and self-respect, is importantly related to free world political objectives. These objectives are: (a) continuation of the provision of asylum and friendly assistance to the oppressed and persecuted; (b) the extension of hope and encouragement to the victims of communism and other forms of despotism, and the promotion of faith among the captive populations in the purposes and processes of freedom and democracy; (c) the exemplification by free citizens of free countries, through actions and sacrifices, of the fundamental humanitarianism which constitutes the basic difference between free and captive societies.

"Some refugee problems are of such order of magnitude that they comprise an undue burden upon the economies of the countries harboring the refugees in the first instance, requiring international assistance to relieve such countries of these burdens."

It is for these reasons that the United States since the end of World War II has admitted more than 800,000 refugees, escapees, and displaced persons. During that same period the United States has expended over $1.5 billion in direct appropriations for refugee programs in addition to other assistance provided indirectly through our foreign-aid programs in behalf of refugees affording asylum to refugees.

These then are the highlights of the problems of refugees here and around the world.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the Vice President, the Chair announces the appointment of Senator CARROLL, vice Senator BIBLE, to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy.

On behalf of the Vice President, the Chair also announces the following appointments to the Mexico-United States

Interparliamentary Conference, to be held in Washington, D.C., from May 14 to May 17, 1962, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420:

Senators SPARKMAN, MORSE, ENGLE, SMATHERS, GORE, GRUENING, METCALF, CAPEHART, KUCHEL, GOLDWATER, and TOWER.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 17, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 683. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the Federal Communications Commission;

S. 1371. An act to amend subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit the Commission to renew a station license in the safety and special radio services more than 30 days prior to expiration of the original license;

S. 1589. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the issuance of radio operator licenses to nationals of the United States;

S. 2522. An act to defer the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project; and

S.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 19, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 17, 1962:

U.S. MINT

Earl F. Haffey, of Colorado, to be Assayer of the mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Ellsworth Ingalls Davis, O18658, U.S. Army, to be a member and President of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37; 33 U.S.C. 642).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Luke 19: 38: *Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we have entered upon Holy Week, commemorating days in the life of our Lord whose significant meaning and majestic wonder we cannot fully comprehend.

We thank Thee for the King of Kings, who on Palm Sunday ushered in these memorable days by proclaiming His sovereignty over the spirit of man and of whose wise and beneficent rule there shall be no end.

Grant that in this week of solemn and sacred memory we may understand more clearly that the kingdom of righteousness and peace for which we are praying and laboring can never be established until the heart of humanity is moved and controlled by the power of sacrificial love.

To Thy name we shall ascribe the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11027. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11038. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 320) entitled "An act to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 205) entitled "An act to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs."

USE OF DOGS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10440) to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting through the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, are authorized to acquire, train, and maintain a total of not to exceed one hundred dogs to be used in connection with law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "a total of not to exceed one hundred dogs" and insert "as many dogs as may be necessary."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to lend my full support to the passage of this bill (H.R. 10440). As stated by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DAVIS, the bill would authorize the District of Columbia to acquire, train, and maintain as many police dogs as the police department may deem necessary to be used in connection with law enforcement in the city of Washington.

When we stop and think for a moment what the crime conditions are in our Capital City, it makes many of us blush with shame. The crime rate in our Capital City ranks near the top among all cities in the Nation. Physical crimes lead the list with assaults, yokings, muggings, and robberies occurring in every conceivable place. The number of rapes and murders are astounding. All of the facts and circumstances prove that strict law enforcement is essential for the protection of both the personal and property rights of those who reside or visit in Washington.

In an effort to increase the capability of the law enforcement officers of the District of Columbia, six dog teams were placed on the streets of the city in April 1960. By the end of that year, the number had increased to 20 such teams, and today the corps has 45 dog teams on the streets and 6 more in training, making a total strength of 51.

The effectiveness of the canine corps as an arm of the Metropolitan Police force may be evaluated from the following statistics for the calendar year 1961, which were submitted to the committee by the Police Department:

Number of arrests made by men with the assistance of dogs, classified according to types of offenses: housebreaking, 62; robbery, 37; assault, 21; larceny, 13; disorderly, 14; homicide, assaults on police officers, destroying property, and so forth, 50; total, 197.

This total constituted 40 percent of all the arrests made by these men during that year.

In addition to their actual participation in these areas, the dogs of the canine corps have proved invaluable on many other occasions by the deterrent effect of their mere presence at the scene of actual or potential trouble. The dogs' keen sense of smell enables them to locate fugitives hiding in buildings, junkyards, and other places where the policemen would otherwise have a most difficult and dangerous task in apprehending them.

It is the hope of the Metropolitan Police Department that these dog teams might be built up to a total of 100 within the next 2-year period. Thus far, all the dogs used by the police department have been donated by civic-minded people. However, in all probability, it will be necessary to purchase some of the dogs in the future, and it is estimated that they may cost as much as $250 each. Another item of expense in providing these dog teams is the food and veterinary care for the animals, plus the maintenance of fenced yards and a small additional compensation to the police officers who handle the dogs and are charged with their care, keep, and transportation.

The cost of adding 25 more man-dog teams to the present canine corps is estimated to be approximately $19,000. It is hoped that these 25 additional teams can be acquired, trained, and ready for police work within the next 12 months. It is the unanimous opinion of the officials and technicians who have been in charge of this work during the past 2 years that this new arm of the law-enforcement agency of this city has been an invaluable asset as a strong weapon against the appalling crime situation in Washington.

Hearings were held on this bill and the witnesses were unanimously in favor of the continuation and the enlargement of the canine corps, except for the opposition of one organization. The only organization to express opposition to the use of police dogs was the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). The record shows that this group picketed the Metropolitan Police Department in opposition to the acquisition, training, and use of additional police dog teams. It is impossible to understand how CORE or any law-abiding group of citizens would be so narrowminded and unreasonable as to object to the Police Department improving its quality and capability in law enforcement. The sole purpose of the Police Department, as well as the passage of this bill, is to provide greater and more complete protection to the property and people in Washington.

Each police dog is at all times under the control of the police officer who has him in charge. The dog never attacks anyone unless directed to by his teammate, the police officer. Both grown folks and children pet and fondle the dogs on the street and there has not been one single incident of any person having been injured by any dog. These dogs have been compared to a soldier who is trained to fight but who never fires his gun until he is actually at war.

This bill should be passed by an overwhelming vote, because it adds strength to law and order and provides additional means of reducing the outrageous rate of crime in our Nation's Capital.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC HARBOR ON SHORES OF LAKE MICHIGAN IN INDIANA

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this minute to report that today, together with other Members of this body and the other body, I have introduced a bill to authorize the construction of a public harbor on the shores of Lake Michigan in my district in the State of Indiana.

I began my support of this very meritorious project shortly after I came to the Congress in 1935. At that time I appeared in support of it with the then Governor Paul V. McNutt, of Indiana, and the then Senators Minton and Van Nuys of the State of Indiana. Through the years this project has had the support of the Governors of our State, of the congressional Representatives and of the Senators from our State. We now have a favorable report from the Army Engineers. I rise at this time, Mr. Speaker, to express the hope that the Bureau of the Budget will look with favor on this project and that in this session of the Congress we may begin the construction which I think is so vital to the overall interest of the State of Indiana.

I might add that this project is now favored very strongly and vigorously by our present Governor, Hon. Matthew Welsh of Indiana.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE ON THURSDAY

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have permission to sit during general debate in the House on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MERCHANDISE MART OF CHICAGO RAISES ITS RENT

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the wire services report that the Merchandise Mart, a Chicago office building owned by Joseph P. Kennedy, father of the President, is raising some of its rents 3 to 5 percent. This is about the percentage price increase which United States Steel recently announced, then rescinded in the face of violent pressure from the administration.

The Merchandise Mart's general manager, Wallace Ollman, said the rents were going up because of "increased operating costs, principally labor and taxes." These were the same reasons given by United States Steel to justify its price increase.

The President charged United States Steel with "ruthless disregard" of the public interest and ordered an investigation under the direction of his brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

I have written to the Attorney General urging an investigation to determine if Joseph P. Kennedy showed "ruthless disregard" of the public interest by jacking up rents at the Merchandise Mart.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO REPRESENT THE CONGRESS AT THE 375TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LANDING OF THE LOST COLONY AND THE BIRTH OF VIRGINIA DARE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 438 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint committee to be composed of six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate to represent Congress at ceremonies to be conducted at Roanoke Island, North Carolina, during the week August 12 to August 18, 1962, inclusive, jointly by the committee and by the Governor's commission for the celebration of the three hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the birth of Virginia Dare, in commemoration of the three hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the landing of Sir Walter Raleigh's colony on Roanoke Island, North Carolina, and the birth of the first English child in America, Virginia Dare. The members of the joint committee shall select a chairman from among their number.

The expenses of the joint committee incurred in carrying out the purposes of this resolution, not to exceed $10,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers authorized by such joint committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery]; and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is very simple. Its reading makes clear the purpose of the resolution. I do not propose to take any time unless there are questions.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This provides for a delegation of six Members from the other body and six Members from this body. Do I understand the 5- or 6-day proposition is going to cost $10,000?

Mr. BOLLING. It is my understanding from testimony before the Committee on Rules that the full $10,000 would be unlikely to be used, and that this is not an unusual resolution commemorating such an important event.

This was the first Colony founded by English-speaking people in what is now the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I think it ought to be commemorated, but is it not on the rich side, the $10,000 for 6 days or less for 12 people with as little travel as there will be between Washington and Roanoke, Va.? It seems to me that is more than a little bit plush. I would hope that we can have assurance from someone that the full $10,000 will not be expended.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I want to assure the gentleman from Iowa that I am just as much interested in economy as he is.

Mr. GROSS. I know that.

Mr. BONNER. This is the usual resolution. Certainly the $10,000 is not going to be spent or anywhere near that. I assure the gentleman the only expense would be for travel and the hotel bill of the committee of Congress that is appointed.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have that assurance of the gentleman from North Carolina, and I hope we will not be compelled to offer amendments to bills of this kind in the future to cut or strike out the money.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose that anybody would find it in his heart to oppose a resolution such as this this morning, especially in view of the very persuasive representation that was made before the Committee on Rules by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Bonner] that this resolution should pass. I am wondering, however, if we might not be setting a precedent. I am sure our State of Kansas some day will be celebrating our 350th anniversary, and I assume, Mr. Speaker, if this resolution is passed, that every State that reaches the time of its 300th anniversary or its 350th anniversary, that State can anticipate a $10,000 appropriation from Congress to defray the expense of a visiting delegation from the House and from the other body.

Certainly, I am not going to oppose it, but I am wondering seriously if we might not be establishing some kind of a precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I anticipated the question by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] and I can enlighten him just a little further as to how this works out. Assuming it was necessary to utilize all of the $10,000, it would figure about $950 a day, as I work this out, which would mean, assuming all 12 members were in attendance, that they would utilize approximately $80 a day apiece for the 6 days that their time would be needed for this observation. Congratulations to the great State of North Carolina on the occasion of this anniversary. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the calendar.

MARY R. GALOTTA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8946) for the relief of Mary R. Galotta.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MRS. ETHEL KNOLL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7332) for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

JAMES L. MERRILL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5061) for the relief of James L. Merrill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the limitations of time upon the filing of claims for benefits under section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948 are hereby waived in favor of James L. Merrill, of San Jose, California, and his claim for detention benefits as the surviving son of Frank S. Merrill (Foreign Claims Settlement Commission claim numbered 121775) under such section 5 is hereby authorized and directed to be acted upon under such Act if filed with the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission within six months after the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FRANCES MANGIARACINA AND HER CHILDREN, CONCETTA MARIA, ROSETTA, AND TOMASINO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1404) for the relief of Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina and her children, Concetta Maria, Rosetta, and Tomasino.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina, and her children, Concetta Maria, Rosetta, and Tomasino, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina shall be considered to be a returning resident alien."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA ISERNIA ALLOCA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3595) for the relief of Anna Isernia Alloca.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Isernia Alloca may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provision of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "212(a) (1)" and substitute in lieu thereof "212(a) (9)".

One page 1, at the end of the bill, add a new section 2 to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. The provisions of section 24(a) (7) of the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 657), shall be inapplicable in this case."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGELINA RAINONE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3633) for the relief of Angelina Rainone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angelina Rainone shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Angelina Rainone. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Angelina Rainone shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADELE ANIS MANSOUR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4655) for the relief of Adele Anis Mansour.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Adele Anis Mansour shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Adele Anis Mansour. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Adele Anis Mansour shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "For the relief of Adele Anis Mansour."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO THE ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ADOPTED CHILDREN

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 677 relating to the admission of certain adopted children.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Anna Kapsalis, formerly Anna Mastoraki, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. John E. Kapsalis, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Kazimiera Przyborowska, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Anton Hartmann, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Antonina (Gutowicz) Olsenwik, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Olsenwik, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 4. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Kook Nam Whang, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Cornie L. Van Zee, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 5. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Leokadia-Danuta Kleban, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Jozef Makowski, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 6. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Wlodzimierz Miska and Wanda Miska, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Jan K. Miska, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 7. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ja Han Hong, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Edward A. Ruestow, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 8. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Bogumil Getris, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Alex Getris, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 9. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Tadeusz Romuald Czyz, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Walter Czyz, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 10. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Cynthia Ann Foutris, formerly Cynthia Ann Fili, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. James Foutris, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 11. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Gaetanina Paola Angelone and Adele Anna Teresa Angelone, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. Giuseppe Marinucci, a citizen of the United States.

Sec. 12. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, John Andrew Nichols and Anna Sophia Nichols, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Nick A. Nichols, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 13. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Manuel Calvete Pereira, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Richard Roeder, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 14. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Urszula Kosior, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. John Kosior, a citizen of the United States.

Sec. 15. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Teresita Fernandez and Apolonio Fernandez, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Felecisimo C. Fernandez, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 16. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Franciszek Kopec and Wladystaw Kopec, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Kopec, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 17. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Theresa Godino, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Godino, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 18. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Vladimir Tsvetanov Trifonov, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Sam Triffin, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 19. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Teresa Mikucki, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Jan Mikucki, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 20. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Cecylia Orszula Pulit, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Edward C. Pulit, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 21. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Yvonne Hutia Bright, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Doctor and Mrs. Robert D. Bright, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 22. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Krystyna Pietrzycki, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. John Pietrzycki, citizens of the United States.

Sec. 23. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ignacy Pietrzycki, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Mr. and Mrs.

Joseph Pietrzycki, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 24. For the purposes of sections 101 (a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Wojciech Antoni Drogoszewski, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Antoni Drogoszewski, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 25. For the purposes of sections 101 (a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jan Kazimierz Lewandowski, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Chester Lewandowski, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 26. For the purposes of sections 101 (a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Stanislaw Jozef Scislowski, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. Joseph Scislowski, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 27. For the purposes of sections 101 (a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Filomena Darmi, formerly Coccia, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Dominic Darmi, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 28. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children Despina McCrain, formerly Despina Doxis, and Vassilire McCrain, formerly Vassilire Doxis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born children of Mr. and Mrs. William J. McCrain, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 29. For the purposes of sections 101 (a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jean Mary Haynes, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Haynes, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 30. For the purposes of sections 101 (a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Michalina Adela Chudziak, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Michael Chudziak, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 31. The natural parents of the beneficiaries of this Act shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VINCENT EDWARD HUGHES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6330) for the relief of Vincent Edward Hughes.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Vincent Edward Hughes, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 349(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Vincent Edward Hughes shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "For the purposes of section 101(a)(27)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vincent Edward Hughes and his wife, Carmel Philomena Hughes, and their alien children, shall be held and considered to be returning resident aliens."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "For the relief of Vincent Edward Hughes, his wife, Carmel Philomena Hughes, and their alien children."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENEWAL OF PATENT NO. 92,187 RELATING TO THE BADGE OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11032) granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date of May 8, 1934, being patent numbered 92,187, is hereby renewed and extended for a period of fourteen years from and after the date of approval of this Act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same, being generally known as "the badge of the Sons of the American Legion."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE BADGE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11033) granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date of June 1, 1920, being patent numbered 55,398, is hereby renewed and extended for a period of fourteen years from and after the date of approval of this Act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same, being generally known as "the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE BADGE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11034) granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296 relating to the badge of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date of December 9, 1919, being patent numbered 54,296, is hereby renewed and extended for a period of fourteen years from and after the date of approval of this Act, with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same, being generally known as "the badge of the American Legion."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEYMOUR ROBERTSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 505) for relief of Seymour Robertson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Seymour Robertson, of Pearl River, New York, the sum of $1,269.01. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Seymour Robertson against the United States for loss of compensation incurred by him between April 21, 1944, and November 27, 1944, the period during which he was denied the opportunity to perform service in the field service of the Post Office Department following his discharge from the United States Navy: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated to this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN E. BEAMAN AND ADELAIDE K. BEAMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 508) for the relief of John E. Beaman and Adelaide K. Beaman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit may be instituted in the United States Court of Claims at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of John E. Beaman and his wife, Adelaide K. Beaman, for compensation for depreciation of real property owned by them, the value of which allegedly has depreciated as the result of jet aircraft activities carried on by the United States at and in the vicinity of MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida.

SEC. 2. Proceedings in the suit authorized to be instituted by the first section of this Act, appeals, and judgments rendered therein shall conform to proceedings, appeals, and judgments in cases heard under section 1491 of title 28, United States Code. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARLYS E. TEDIN AND ELIZABETH O. REYNOLDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 704) for the relief of Marlys E. Tedin and Elizabeth O. Reynolds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Marlys E. Tedin of Sitka, Alaska, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $580.38, representing an amount erroneously paid her for cost-of-living allowance during the period from September 23, 1955, to March 26, 1956, while she was an employee of the Public Health Service on detail at Seattle, Washington, from her headquarters at Juneau, Alaska.

SEC. 2. That Elizabeth O. Reynolds of Pine Ridge, South Dakota, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $646.30, representing an amount erroneously paid her for cost-of-living allowance during the period from March 19, 1956, to August 24, 1956, while she was an employee of the Public Health Service on detail at Seattle, Washington, from her headquarters at Juneau, Alaska.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Marlys E. Tedin and Elizabeth O. Reynolds, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from them on account of the payment referred to in the first section of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARVEY BURSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2151) for the relief of Harvey Burstein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Harvey Burstein of Mamaroneck, New York, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $1,047.34, representing overpayments of salary which he received as an employee of the Department of State for the period from October 7, 1953, through February 19, 1954, as the result of his appointment to a position in grade GS-14 in violation of section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (the so-called Whitten amendment), as amended.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Harvey Burstein, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY E. ELLISON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2319) for the relief of Harry E. Ellison, captain, U.S. Army, retired.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Harry E. Ellison, captain, United States Army, retired (O1797269), of Seattle, Washington, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $3,998.54, representing the amount of overpayments of basic pay, foreign duty pay, and rental and subsistence allowances received by him for the period from September 10, 1942, through January 31, 1954, while he was serving as a member of the United States Army, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Harry E. Ellison, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD L. WERTHEIM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2549) for the relief of Edward L. Wertheim.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money available for medical care to veterans, to Edward L. Wertheim, of Douglaston, Long Island, New York, the sum of $314.07, in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for reimbursement of certain medical expenses which he incurred while receiving outpatient medical treatment during the period from November 14, 1959, through June 16, 1960, after his discharge from the Veterans' Administration Hospital, New York City, New York, on November 10, 1959, the said Edward L. Wertheim having failed to obtain an authorization for such outpatient treatment as a result of erroneous advice given him by an official of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. DON WALSH AND LT. LAWRENCE A. SHUMAKER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6021) for the relief of Lt. Don Walsh and Lt. Lawrence A. Shumaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lieutenant Don Walsh and to Lieutenant Lawrence A. Shumaker, the amount certified with respect to them by the Secretary of the Navy under section 2 of this Act: *Provided,* That the payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lieutenant Don Walsh and Lieutenant Lawrence A. Shumaker against the United States for hazardous duty pay for the period spent by them before July 12, 1960, as members of the crew of the bathyscaph Trieste.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy shall determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts which would have been payable to Lieutenant Don Walsh and Lieutenant Lawrence A. Shumaker as hazardous duty pay for the periods before July 12, 1960, during which each of them served aboard the bathyscaph Trieste if such service had been performed on board a submarine.

SEC. 3. No part of either of the sums appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEO A. DEKAT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6386) for the relief of Cleo A. Dekat.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Cleo A. Dekat, of Wamego, Kansas, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $1,378.58, the amount by which he was overpaid as an employee of the Post Office Department during the period from December 3, 1955, through March 21, 1961, as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cleo A. Dekat, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike "March 21, 1961", and insert "February 17, 1961".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN W. SCHLEIGER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7617) for the relief of John W. Schleiger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John W. Schleiger of Tucson, Arizona, the sum of $1,917.05. Such sum represents the amount of settlement for which the said John W. Schleiger was required to pay for the loss of money from registered mail. Said John W. Schleiger, a letter carrier in the United States post office at Tucson, Arizona, apparently lost the register or the register was stolen from him while making collection of mail on a scheduled collection tour: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. CLARA MAY MATTHEWS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8321) for the relief of Maj. Clara May Matthews.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Clara May Matthews, major, Women's Army Corps, L58, retired, is hereby relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $5,913.60, which was paid to her as compensation for employment at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, from April 1, 1960, through February 18, 1961, which employment has been held to have been in violation of section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 62). In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SFC. JESSE O. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9466) for the relief of Sfc. Jesse O. Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Sergeant Jesse O. Smith, RA44080654, United States Army, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $483.60 which was paid to him in the form of a reenlistment bonus on June 18, 1957, and was subsequently determined to have been in excess of the amount due him by reason of an administrative interpretation. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Sergeant First Class Jesse O. Smith, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amount paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. A. A. WATSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9782) for the relief of Col. A. A. Watson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Colonel A. A. Watson, United States Army (retired), the sum of $1,785.52 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss sustained by the said Colonel A. A. Watson as the result of damage to and destruction of his personal property in the warehouse of H and R Transfer and Storage Company, Sierra Vista, Arizona, by a fire which occurred on September 19, 1960: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS J. FITZPATRICK AND PETER D. POWER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10026) for the relief of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick and Peter D. Power.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the limitation on the time within which applications for disability retirement are required to be filed under section 7(b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2257(b)) is hereby waived in favor of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick and Peter D. Power of Newfoundland, Canada, former employees of the United States Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland, and their claims for disability retirement under such Act shall be acted upon under the other applicable provisions of such Act as if their applications had been timely filed, if they file application for such disability retirement within sixty days after the date of enactment of the Act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period prior to the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, benefits payable by reason of the enactment of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM RADKOVICH CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10314) for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That jurisdiction be, and the same is hereby, conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of William Radkovich Company, Incorporated, arising under contracts with the United States for the construction of various structures, said contracts being numbered W-04-353-eng-2036 and W-04-353-eng-2050, against the United States for the difference between the reasonable value of said structures as of the time of the completion of such contracts and the amount paid to said company for such structures, said recovery to be permitted only in the event that it shall be established that the actual cost to the said William Radkovich Company, Incorporated, of erecting such structures exceeded the reasonable value of such structures, such judgment to be entered notwithstanding any limitations imposed by law upon Government representatives whose responsibility it was to let the aforementioned contracts and notwithstanding the technical provisions of said contracts with respect to payment thereunder: *Provided,* That the suit herein authorized shall be instituted within six months from the date of the approval of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of William Radkovich Company, Incorporated, arising out of contracts numbered W-04-353-eng-2036 and W-04-353-eng-2050, against the United States for the reasonable value, computed as of the time when made, of any reasonable and necessary changes and increase beyond the terms of said contracts made at the direction of the contracting officer, for which the said William Radkovich Company, Incorporated, was not compensated because of the provisions of section 12 of the Military Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 565), which precluded payment of more than $7,500 per unit for the construction of temporary family quarters: *Provided,* That the suit herein authorized shall be instituted within six months from the date of the approval of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELL MINERAL ESTATE IN LANDS IN MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8134) to authorize the sale of the mineral estate in certain lands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of Americc in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized, at his discretion to sell to the surface owners, and their successors in title, the mineral estate reserved to the United States in the following described lands which were patented under section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g):

Township 3 north, range 6 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, Maricopa County, Arizona.

Section 10. All.

Section 11. Lots 6, 7, 8, 9, west half east half, west half.

Section 14. Lots 9, 10, 11, 12, west half east half, west half.

Section 15. All.

Section 22. All.

Section 23. Lots 9, 10, 11, 12, west half.

Section 26. Lots 9, 10, 11, 12, west half.

Section 27. All.

Total 4,540.57 acres.

Such sales shall be made at the fair market value of such mineral estate as determined by the Secretary of the Interior by appraisal or otherwise, as of the time of such sale.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 11 to 14, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"All sales of the rights of the United States to the mineral estate under the provisions of this Act shall be on condition of payment of the fair market value for such rights, but in no event shall payment be less than $5 per acre, plus the cost of the appraisal thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIO C. YSRAEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2103) for the relief of Antonio C. Ysrael.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio C. Ysrael shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUGUSTIN RAMIREZ-TREJO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2187) for the relief of Augustin Ramirez-Trejo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Augustin Ramirez-Trejo may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to waive the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Augustin Ramirez-Trejo. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Augustin Ramirez-Trejo shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued. *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to waive the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARLOS SEPULVEDA ABARCA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2198) for the relief of Carlos Sepulveda Abarca, Rosario Perez Sepulveda, Carlos Perez Sepulveda, Jorge Sepulveda, and Antonio Perez Sepulveda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carlos Sepulveda Abarca, Rosario Perez Sepulveda, Carlos Perez Sepulveda, Jorge Sepulveda, and Antonio Perez Sepulveda shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed to waive the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act in the case of Carlos Sepulveda Abarca.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Carlos Sepulveda Abarca. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Carlos Sepulveda Abarca shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "For the relief of Carlos Sepulveda Abarca."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISS SUSANNA MOSCATO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5916) for the relief of Miss Susanna Moscato (Reverend Mother Charitas).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DAVID B. KILGORE AND JIMMIE D. RUSHING

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8631) for the relief of David B. Kilgore and Jimmie D. Rushing.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $720 to David B. Kilgore, 201 East Xenia Drive, Fairborn, Ohio, and the sum of $374.40 to Jimmie D. Rushing, 605 Kirkwood Drive, Vandalia, Ohio, in full settlement of their claims against the United States for compensation during the period between January 14, 1959, to July 21, 1959, inclusive, while serving as members of a Nuclear Accident Control Team at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. In this period, during which they served two thousand two hundred and eighty hours and one thousand and seventy-four hours, respectively, they were required to hold themselves in readiness to report to their command posts within thirty minutes of a call: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM FALBY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1653) for the relief of William Falby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William Falby, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 349 (a)(4)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said William Falby shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SONIA MARIA SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2672) for the relief of Sonia Maria Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Sonia Maria Smith, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Doris and Cecil Smith, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, after the words "of the United States" change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JANINA MACIEJEWSKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3714) for the relief of Janina Maciejewska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Janina Maciejewska shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Janina Maciejewska. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Janina Maciejewska shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOLLY KWAUK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9669) for the relief of Molly Kwauk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Molly Kwauk may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *Provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, Molly Kwauk is the daughter of Dr. Dorothy Yueh-Ching Ma, a resident of my congressional district who is now employed as chief of anesthesia at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Louisville, Ky. Dr. Ma is a naturalized citizen of the United States. She originally came to this country from China in 1948 to do postgraduate work in her medical specialty, anesthesiology. She left her daughter, Molly Kwauk, in Shanghai with the child's maternal grandmother, now 80 years old. The child's father had died before Molly was born.

Shortly after Dr. Ma's arrival in this country, the Communists took control of China and Dr. Ma was prevented from returning to her home and her medical practice. For 14 years she did not see her daughter and for most of that time was unable to maintain contact with her. In 1955, Dr. Ma received her American citizenship papers. Last fall Dr. Ma was able to arrange for her daughter's emigration from Red China under the then relaxed travel policies of the Communist Government. Through her mother's continued efforts Molly was admitted to Hong Kong under a transit visa. Dr. Ma went to Hong Kong and was successful in persuading authorities there to extend Molly's visa to March 5, 1962. A visa petition filed by Dr. Ma to accord Miss Kwauk second preference status in the issuance of an immigrant visa to this country was approved December 19, 1960. Subsequently, Miss Kwauk became entitled to nonquota status under the provisions of Public Law 87–301. In November 1961 Miss Kwauk was refused an immigrant visa by the American consul, Hong Kong, on the ground that she is feebleminded. She was then faced with deportation to Red China. It was at this point that Dr. Ma came to me seeking my assistance. As a result, H.R. 9669 was introduced on January 15, 1962. Since that time, with the splendid cooperation and assistance of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Departments of State and Justice, the American consul at Hong Kong, the Governor, and other Government authorities of Hong Kong, and the Colonial Office of the British Embassy, which I here publicly acknowledge, we have obtained permission from the Governor of Hong Kong for Miss Kwauk to remain in the colony at the home of a friend of Dr. Ma pending a final decision as to whether she will be permitted to enter the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to occupy the time of the House by recounting in further detail the history of the causes of the separation of this mother and daughter or the legal technicalities which make a real reunion of these people so near and yet so far. I do not intend to dwell on those facts which the Committee on the Judiciary has in its files in the form of departmental reports. The medical report of the examination of Miss Kwauk establishes that she is mentally retarded or feebleminded, but there is no indication in that report as to the degree of the retardation. Dr. Ma is of the opinion that her daughter has a mental age of 10 years. The important thing is that her case is not a hopeless one, if in fact, any mentally retarded person could ever be considered hopeless. This young woman has been without the love, care, and tender encouragement of her own mother for more than 14 years. Bear in mind that Miss Kwauk, in effect, never had a father and lost her mother when she was 11. She apparently has a mental age of 10. During her separation she has been forced to do manual labor, has not had the benefit of that considerable area of treatment that does help these people. I am not a physician and I cannot, therefore, speak with authority about this young woman's prospects for improvement or partial recovery. I can speak only as a human being and a parent. The alternatives for this young woman are either the love and care and security of a life with her mother or a return to the fields of Red China with hard labor and an unbelievably insufficient diet as her only future.

Our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], rendered a splendid service toward a better understanding of the problems of mental retardation in his address to the House on March 22. Appended to his remarks is an address by Mrs. Eunice

Shriver who serves as special consultant to the President's Panel on Mental Retardation. I urge the Members of the House to read these addresses which appear in the Congressional Record beginning at page 4785.

Molly Kwauk may well be a leading example of the accidental nature of mental retardation. There is no other known instance of mental retardation on either side of her family. I have compiled a list of the accomplishments and educational feats of her nearest relatives in order that the House may be fully advised:

Mother: Physician, chief of anesthesia.

Father—deceased: Died while a medical student.

Paternal grandfather—deceased: Engineer, managing director, Shanghai-Nanking Railroad, Shanghai Arsenal, Shanghai Mint.

Paternal uncles: First, physician, degree from McGill University; second, chemical engineer, master's degree, Princeton University; and, third, shipbuilding engineer, Newcastle upon Tyne, England.

Maternal uncles: First, professor of entomology, master's degree; second, chemical engineer; third, physician; and, fourth, civil engineer, McKee Chemical Engineering Construction Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, if there is hope for the mentally retarded, and there is every reason to believe that there is, Miss Kwauk would appear to occupy an advantageous position. Her mother is a doctor who pleads for the chance to care for her daughter. Her mother is in a comfortable financial situation according to the report submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Dr. Ma is in excellent health and has a good, secure earning potential. Molly's uncle, an engineer, is an American citizen working in Cleveland and is in a position to assume responsibility for her care if something should happen to Dr. Ma. In other words, Miss Kwauk's position is such that there is little likelihood of her ever becoming a public charge.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge the House to take favorable action on H.R. 9669.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

MRS. ETHEL KNOLL

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 491, the bill (H.R. 7332) for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That national service life insurance policies V-320-78-33 and V-322-62-08 issued on the life of George L. Knoll (Veterans' Administration claim numbered XC-5392945) shall be held and considered to have been in force on the date of his death, January 7, 1959. Payments made by reason of this Act shall be made out of the national service life insurance appropriation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY R. GALOTTA

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 474, the bill (H.R. 8946) for the relief of Mary R. Galotta.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the marriage of Mary R. Galotta (widow of Edward John Galotta, XC-4039308) to Tanios Touma annulled in the probate court of Massachusetts, by decree, shall be held and considered to have been void within the meaning of section 101(3), title 38, United States Code, and she shall be considered as the widow of said Edward John Galotta.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11289) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, while we will move along as fast as we can, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 6 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 74]

Addonizio
Alger
Andrews
Ayres
Blitch
Boykin
Brooks, Tex.
Cahill
Celler
Chelf
Cohelan
Daniels
Dawson
Diggs
Dowdy
Doyle
Fascell
Finnegan
Fino
Garland
Grant
Hansen
Hays
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Jones, Ala.
Kearns
Kee
Kitchin
Lankford
McDonough
Miller, George P.
Miller, N.Y.
Moorehead, Ohio
Moulder
Murray
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Reece
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
St. George
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Steed
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Utt
Weis
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MISS SUSANNA MOSCATO

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 543, the bill (H.R. 5916) for the relief of Miss Susanna Moscato—Reverend Mother Charitas.

Mr. Speaker, in the early morning, objection was made to the consideration of this bill at the time it was called. The objection has been withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Susanna Moscato (Reverend Mother Charitas) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon the payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of section 101(a)(27)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Susanna Moscato (Reverend Mother Charitas) shall be held and considered to be a returning resident alien, and the provisions of section 212(e) of that Act shall be inapplicable in her case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11289) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11289, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 3 hours, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 3 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today the largest peacetime appropriation bill in the history of the U.S. Government. The funds provided today in this bill, if approved, would be equivalent to a levy upon every person in the United States, 185 million people, in the sum of $258.

So without question this is a bill of great magnitude and I say to you that it is a measure of great significance.

DEFENSE VERSUS NONDEFENSE SPENDING

I would like at this point to examine with you this bill in terms of the relationship between defense spending and nondefense spending. There is a tendency on the part of many Americans in and out of Government to feel, more or less, that high taxes, big government spending and the increase in the ceiling on the national debt are the result of defense spending. This is not correct. We should not give ourselves an opiate and lay all our problems at the door of defense spending; we must have defense and we must pay, and pay in very large sums, for defense. And, insofar as I know, the American people almost unanimously support a high level defense program.

The Korean war ended in mid-1953. So I would like to use as a point of reference the fiscal year 1954 which began on July 1, 1953, the Korean war at that time having just concluded.

During the year 1954 we spent a certain amount for defense and we spent a certain amount for nondefense purposes. During the following years through fiscal year 1961, the last fiscal year to be concluded, defense spending increased by 1 percent. Nondefense spending during this 1954-61 period increased by 65 percent.

If you extend this period through fiscal year 1962, from 1954 through 1962, which will conclude on June 30 of this year, the increase in defense spending over 1954, according to the current budget estimates, is 9 percent and the increase in nondefense spending is 85 percent.

If you project this through fiscal year 1963, which will begin on July 1, 1962, you will find again, according to the budget estimates, that through that period the increase in defense spending will be 12 percent above 1954 and nondefense spending will be 94 percent above nondefense spending in 1954.

In other words, the Government has held, since the Korean war, a rather even level of spending in defense. It has been edging up and down a little, but relatively it has been even, especially prior to about a year ago. But nondefense spending has gone up precipitously so that at the end of the fiscal year 1963 it will be 94 percent, according to the estimates, above 1954.

These are facts that need to be considered, and especially at a time when we discuss this large bill.

In referring to defense spending versus nondefense spending I have included in defense spending not only the Defense appropriation bill, which is by all odds the largest item, but I have also included the small sums for the Selective Service, and the cost of the stockpiling program and defense production, military construction, the military foreign aid, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

In substantiation, Mr. Chairman, I include the following official table:

Analysis of new obligational authority and budget expenditures for the fiscal years 1954-63

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	National defense function		Other than national defense		Budget totals	
	New obligational authority	Budget expenditures	New obligational authority	Budget expenditures	New obligational authority	Budget expenditures
1954 actual	38,901	46,986	23,864	20,551	62,765	67,537
1955 actual	33,656	40,695	23,420	23,694	57,076	64,389
1956 actual	35,903	40,723	27,295	25,501	63,198	66,224
1957 actual	40,234	43,360	29,945	25,606	70,179	68,966
1958 actual	40,448	44,234	35,897	27,135	76,345	71,369
1959 actual	45,517	46,491	35,848	33,851	81,365	80,342
1960 actual	44,761	45,691	34,813	30,848	79,574	76,539
1961 actual	45,994	47,494	40,681	34,021	86,675	81,515
1962 estimate	52,644	51,212	43,104	37,863	95,748	89,075
1963 estimate	54,744	52,690	44,559	39,847	99,303	92,537

NOTE.—The data on this table corresponds to the classification used in the 1963 budget. National defense functions include Department of Defense including military assistance, Atomic Energy Commission, stockpiling of strategic and critical materials, Selective Service System, expansion of defense production, and civil defense.

PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of this bill is evident. It is to increase further the military strength of the United States. Our foreign policy, to be effective, must be backed up by military power of unquestioned superiority. The purpose of this bill, stating it another way, is to deter aggression, to deter and prevent war. The purpose of this bill is to enable us more effectively to fight communism in the cold war and to fight communism successfully in a hot war should this country be attacked.

We do not know what the future holds. There are many uncertainties that lie ahead of us. About one thing there is no doubt, however, and that is the necessity, the urgent necessity, to maintain superior military strength in this country. The passage of this bill will evidence to the whole world the determination of the United States Congress to stand resolute and firm in the face of the Berlin crisis, in the face of all other international crises, in the face of threats to our freedom in any area of the world.

There has been some talk, and I think we should say some loose talk, about a no-win policy. Such a policy is unthinkable, and I have not seen evidence of such a policy in the legislative or executive branches of the Government, where policies are made and implemented. No one in his right mind would think that Congress would appropriate $47 billion for the purpose of supporting a no-win policy. No one in his right mind would conclude that we in the Congress would pass a bill equivalent to a levy of $258 on every man, woman, and child in the country with anything in mind other than a victory policy, and that is the policy of the American people.

A $7.5 BILLION INCREASE IN APPROPRIATIONS

Since fiscal year 1961, if we take into account the funds provided in this bill, we have raised defense appropriations for the functions covered in this bill by $7.5 billion, from about $40 billion-plus to about $47.5 billion-plus. Why does this Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, support for fiscal year 1963 an appropriation bill for the Department of Defense $7.5 billion above the 1961 figure?

The purpose of this program for defense is simply to accelerate the rate of the buildup of military power that is needed to maintain the position of strength that this country requires in the face of the threats which confront us. It is plain for all to see that the threats against our security have been intensified in recent months. Our accelerated program is calculated to meet these intensified threats. There is a need to add more strategic power in the new area of intercontinental ballistic missiles, and there is a great need, which the bills last year and this year fill, to add to our power in conventional warfare weapons.

There has been a very marked change in the situation which confronted us in the 1950's and the situation which is confronting us in the 1960's. It is no criticism of any past policy of the Congress to say that we have abandoned the level of defense that we had 2 years ago and have raised the level of the program to a higher plateau. A program to acquire a more immediately alert posture to resist aggression was inevitable. It has no political complexion. It would have come about sooner or later under any administration. It happens to be coming at this time, and it is timely. The committee feels that this action should no longer be deferred.

There was a time when we were so preponderant in nuclear weapons and other factors were such that we could safely afford to have a lower program for defense. The growth of nuclear weaponry in this country and in Russia enters into the picture. Intercontinental ballistic missiles are a part of the picture. The Army needs to come to the fore more than has been required in recent years. That is all a part of this pattern.

When and how to apply our military power is in large measure up to the Executive. It is up to the Congress, however, and it is the responsibility of the Congress to provide funds for the development of our military power. It is a sobering and demanding responsibility which we are required to fill in this field. It is the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations that additional funds are necessary. Let me say that in the matter of defense this year, as in former years, politics has played no part in the formulation of this bill. I cannot remember any occasion that members of the subcommittee divided along partisan lines on any issue which was recommended to the full committee in connection with this bill. That, I think, is the sort of atmosphere that the people of the United States desire and have a right to expect of the Congress, and I am glad that we can work in the area of defense in that kind of atmosphere.

GENERAL DETAILS OF THE BILL

I think it would be well to say that I have no disposition to undertake to discuss in great detail the provisions of this bill. Several hours would be required to do so. The report, especially the first few pages, contains much significant information which Members will want to have. The report points out, on page 2, that the bill carries a total of $47.8 billion for the Army, Navy and Air Force. Of this sum $11 billion plus is for the Army, $15 billion plus for the Navy and $19 billion for the Air Force. For the other defense agencies, in excess of $2 billion is provided. A table will be asserted to provide more detail.

If we look at this huge program in another way, we find that for the military personnel the bill recommends $12 billion plus.

For operation and maintenance and this, of course, is one of the "musts" that have to be provided for, $11.5 billion is recommended.

For procurement $16.5 billion.

For research and development $6.8 billion.

That makes up the principal part of the total of the bill before us. I insert, to provide more detail, a summary of appropriations table:

Summary of appropriations

Title	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in bill, 1963	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963
Title I—Military Personnel	$12,805,000,000	$13,050,200,000	$12,901,890,000	+$96,890,000	−$148,310,000
Title II—Operation and Maintenance	11,731,130,000	11,568,800,000	11,551,473,000	−179,657,000	−17,327,000
Title III—Procurement	16,714,896,000	16,445,000,000	16,525,770,000	−189,126,000	+80,770,000
Title IV—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	5,243,930,000	6,843,000,000	6,860,358,000	+1,616,428,000	+17,358,000
Total, titles I, II, III, and IV	49,494,956,000	47,907,000,000	47,839,491,000	+1,344,535,000	−67,509,000
Distribution of appropriations by organizational component:					
Army	11,802,312,000	11,654,000,000	11,546,567,000	−255,745,000	−107,433,000
Navy	14.545,665,000	15,269,900,000	15,081,570,000	+535,905,000	−188,330,000
Air Force	18,836,534,000	18,926,500,000	19,177,634,000	+341,100,000	+251,134,000
Defense agencies	1,310,445,000	2,056,600,000	2,033,720,000	+723,275,000	−22,880,000
Total, Department of Defense	46,494,956,000	47,907,000,000	47,839,491,000	+1,344,535,000	−67,509,000

The bill provides, ladies and gentlemen, and it is your bill if you adopt it by your vote here today or tomorrow, for the support of men and women in uniform in the total number of 2.6 million-plus. It provides pay for approximately 1 million civilian workers.

It provides, of course, for millions of non-Government workers in defense plants of one kind or another. It provides for the support and operation of more than 30,000 aircraft. It provides for the operation and support of more than 860 ships, more than 700 active military bases and major installations. It provides for two additional regular divisions of the Army, and a tremendous acceleration of the state of readiness of the Army and of the other services.

It provides significantly, and I am sure the committee is unanimous on its decision, for support of the resumption of nuclear atmospheric testing in order to make sure that in this race for survival the United States shall not be caught short. Indeed, it provides strength and support for the Secretary of Defense and for the President of the United States during the forthcoming fiscal year at the conference tables wherever and whenever conferences may be held.

AIRCRAFT VERSUS MISSILES

Much has been said about missiles in recent years, and the buildup has been rather spectacular in the field of missiles, but there is no disposition to abandon the aircraft or to rely in the future on pushbutton warfare, so to speak.

The bill provides for a total procurement of 2,412 aircraft, of which 719 would be helicopters. In looking at it in dollars and cents and including research and development, plus procurement, the estimate included $8 billion for aircraft, and it provides 6 billion-plus for missiles. I offer a tabulation which shows this comparison in more detail:

Aircraft and missiles as recommended in the estimates for procurement and research and development

[Dollars in millions]

	Aircraft	Missiles	Aircraft to be procured	
			Type	Number
Army:				
Procurement	$218.5	$558.3	Helicopter	534
Research and development	52.8	447.0	Fixed wing	48
Total, Army	271.3	1,005.3		582
Navy and Marine Corps:				
Procurement	2,134.6	952.7	Helicopter	144
Research and development	160.4	671.9	Fixed wing	755
Total, Navy and Marine Corps	2,295.0	1,624.6		899
Air Force:				
Procurement	3,135.0	2,500.0	Helicopter	41
Research and development	489.8	1,304.1	Fixed wing	890
Total, Air Force	3,624.8	3,804.1		931
Total	8,054.4	6,434.0		2,412

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this is a very pointed matter. I wonder if we might have a little better order.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to say to my colleagues on the committee that it is good to be heard when one speaks, but it is not so important that our colleagues or the citizens of our country hear the message that is contained in this bill today; the important thing is that the enemies of this country need to hear what is said, but more especially to take cognizance of what is done by this bill. It represents a resolute and determined position of the people of this country in the contest for world leadership.

RS-70 AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

I think it desirable to discuss the B-70 aircraft program, or the RS-70 as it is now known, the reconnaissance strike aircraft program. The report beginning at page 7 gives a very excellent statement on this situation. It gives evidence of support by the Appropriations Committee of the B-70 program which we have supported in prior years, in some instances even above the budget, as we do this year. It points out that we are now in the process of producing three 2,000-mile-an-hour prototype XB-70's, shall I say. The first one of these planes will fly, according to the estimates, in December of this year. The other two will come along later. The Air Force had desired an acceleration of this program to a six-plane program. The whole matter is being restudied by a high level policy group in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and by a high level policy group in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. We cannot see what the future will hold, but we have in this bill taken care of any eventuality from the standpoint of money insofar as the RS-70 is concerned.

We have provided $171 million, which is requested in the budget; we have provided another $52 million requested in the budget for use in connection with items akin to component parts of the RS-70. Then there are other programs which will inure to the benefit of the RS-70 program.

The committee provides $52.9 million above the budget for application to the RS-70 program.

In the event there are breakthroughs which will precipitate a much more rapid program for the RS-70, we have made available in this bill the sum of $300 million in emergency funds which are provided by direct appropriation or by transfer.

So it seems to me undoubtedly true that the RS-70 program will not suffer for funds in 1963. It is the view of the committee that it should not suffer for needed funds because of the tremendous significance and importance of this program.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas whether or not this item of some $52.9 million was taken through action by the committee, or was this a request from the Department of Defense; or, in other words, why was it put in here?

Mr. MAHON. It was taken as committee action, but not without consultation with the Department of Defense, particularly the Air Force. The figure is an Air Force figure. This money would be applied to the component parts of the RS-70 needed to make it a fighting weapon. It applies to the most significant area of the component parts and the perfection of this particular program will more or less make or break the program, because these are pace-setting programs within the framework of the RS-70 concept.

Mr. ARENDS. I approve heartily of what the committee did, but my question was, Did it come about through a request from the Department of Defense or was this solely and wholly by committee action?

Mr. MAHON. It was wholly and solely committee action but based upon consultation with the Air Force. As stated, the figure is an Air Force figure. The question of additional funds was also discussed with the Director of Research and Engineering of the Department of Defense.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES

Mr. Chairman, I forgot to mention, in saying what this bill supports, that we provide for the maintenance of the National Guard at 400,000 drill pay strength, as in previous years; we provide for the maintenance of the Reserves at a strength of 300,000 as in previous years. We have not been critical of the determination on the part of the Army and of the Department of Defense to give a greater degree of readiness to the Reserve program. But we have felt this level that has been maintained through the years will be a stabilizing and wholesome influence upon the guard and the Reserve program.

It is my hope this bill may be passed unanimously. I hope that our action will, in effect, be a message of encouragement to the enemies of this country to abandon aggressive designs and work with the free world toward the objective of peace and better understanding.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, a number of us have been in receipt of communications from educational institutions in our districts—and I know the matter was referred to in the press in a statement by the president of Columbia University—in regard to a provision in the bill that would restrict the overhead charges on grants with the Defense Department being handled by educational institutions to a figure of 15 percent. I am not familiar with all of the details, but I am advised by the educational representatives that this restriction would virtually eliminate many of our respected educational institutions from taking part in assisting the Defense Department. I wonder if the gentleman would comment on this or whether he might suggest a way in which we could amend the language so that we would not eliminate these respected and valuable institutions from the great service that they have been rendering.

Mr. MAHON. Well, I would be glad to comment on that.

The American people—and that applies to our colleges and universities; indeed, to all of us—more or less like to avoid restrictions, if possible. Nobody likes restrictions; we all like blank checks wherever reasonably possible.

Now, this restriction applies only to grants. The research grants provided in this bill are in the area of $40 million. Most of the programs for defense which are carried out by the colleges and universities are done not through grants but through contracts, and this provision does not relate to contracts. It relates only to the grants that are given by the Federal Government to the institutions.

Year before last a request was made for only $8 million for this purpose—for grants. Last year it was $28 million, and like most Government programs, it has snowballed forward and become more expensive. This year the sum of $40 million is requested for grants.

It is not the desire of the committee to hurt the colleges. I have a college of 10,000 students in my home town, Texas Technological College of Lubbock, Tex. Officials of the college have been in touch with me. Members of the Committee knew that this limitation would generate a lot of interest. This is all very wholesome and very good. I believe that as the result of this display of democracy in action, through the use of the telegraph and telephone and letters, we will be able to focus attention on this problem and that we will be able to arrive ultimately, in conference with the Senate, on a figure that will be reasonably adequate, 15 percent, less or more. The indications are that it might be more.

So, this is the situation in which we find ourselves. We must bear in mind that this is not really a Federal aid to education bill. That legislation is pending before another committee. But, we have gone along and provided funds for defense research in the colleges, and we are now simply trying to keep this thing from getting completely out of hand. I am sure that the colleges and the universities and the Members of the Congress are interested in preventing chaos in this area. Likewise we are aware of the importance of the work in research in the colleges.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Should it not be pointed out, I ask the chairman, that this is a limitation on indirect costs in the field of grants? This is to keep the costs not directly associated with the work that is being done for the Government from getting out of the ball park.

Mr. MAHON. The purpose is to get more defense out of the dollars we are appropriating by restricting the overhead to 15 percent.

That is a very obvious reason.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield further, in talking about indirect costs one may be talking about the cost involved with which to pay the fireman who fires the boiler in order to keep the university warm.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think it should be pointed out that for the last several years we have had a 15 percent limitation in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department appropriation bill. Second, the Committee on Appropriations has sought for years to get a policy established in the executive branch of the Government whereby we would have uniform rules and regulations as to the amount of indirect overhead. The executive branch of the Government, for one reason or another, seems to want to avoid this problem. It is like a plague to them, and we have not been able to get any straight policy enunciation. I admit that this is a tough, hard way to approach it, but I am convinced that this is the only way to get any action from the administration.

Mr. MAHON. I must say that all of the items in the bill were not unanimously agreed to, but it was unanimously agreed by the committee when this bill was marked up that this research provision would generate more discussion and heat than many items in the bill involving even several billions of dollars. This is all right, but let us hold firm and work out a program during the legislative process that will be reasonably acceptable to all. We all have interests involved. The various colleges are very much interested, and should be, and I am sure they will accommodate to a program of sense and reason. Because of the way this program has skyrocketed, it needs to be brought under control in its early phase rather than after it has become a program of confusion in administration.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. In connection with this very problem, on page 49 of the report there is an indication that the investigative committee has found that indirect costs to the universities in their research programs is exceeding 32 percent. However, in this report on page 14 you indicate that there is no desire on the part of the committee to hurt the institutions or to be too restrictive.

Does not the gentleman think that a reduction of 15 percent for legitimate costs, if they are legitimate costs, is being unduly restrictive?

Mr. MAHON. This varies. I think the overhead at Harvard is about 27 percent. The overhead at some of the other schools is higher. Many of them are lower. But why should a school in one State get a better break on overhead costs in programs of similar nature than a school in another State? What is wrong with some degree of uniformity in a Federal bill involving 50 States? That is what is sought to be achieved here. I think this will generate interest, to the point where the other body, plus this body, having heard all the facts—and that is one of the purposes of this amendment—will come to an agreement that will be reasonably acceptable. I hope the 15 percent might be reasonably adequate, but if it is not—and many think it is not—we do not want to do anything that would disrupt the important work which the great colleges and universities in this country are doing.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again to me?

Mr. MAHON. I yield again to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] with respect to this, and particularly the reiteration of his view that he is not interested in disrupting this program. If I understand the gentleman correctly, the gentleman would recommend some adjustment in the 15 percent figure, so that the figure included in the legislation is not necessarily a hard and fast figure. I wonder if the gentleman might support an amendment offered on the floor which would raise this figure somewhat so that when we meet with the other body we can arrive closer to a final figure that would cause the least such disruption to our educational research programs?

Mr. MAHON. There is a time for everything. This is a time to sit steady in the boat and let this problem be aired completely.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas, whose judgment I respect, a question with reference to the indirect cost of research grants:

Why is it, if, as the committee report says, the Committee on Appropriations is undertaking to arrive at a proper overhead cost and is planning to study the problem, why should we be attempting to arrive at a solution before we have had the results of that study? I would assume that the chairman is not suggesting that the present approach of paying these indirect costs is giving these institutions blank checks, which I believe was the gentleman's expression?

Mr. MAHON. I think what I said was I do not think we should give the colleges blank checks as to how many defense dollars they may apply to overhead.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that in every case under this flexible approach they have to justify the indirect costs in order to get reimbursement? I notice on pages 80–85 of volume 5 of the hearings, that the Department of Defense comes out in strong opposition to this approach of a 15-percent limitation. They say that there would be very real penalties imposed upon the educational institutions if we should apply this limitation as is now proposed.

I notice that Princeton University, in my State, has a figure for indirect costs of 72 percent as compared to the direct costs. The programs, I might point out, involve research and development in air propulsive systems, aircraft design, and so on.

These indirect costs would have to be justified in order to have reimbursement. I think that this limitation now being proposed would result in a very serious problem and create inequity, if the figure should be mandatorily reduced to 15 percent. I do not see how the committee can justify imposing it on the present system.

Mr. MAHON. This figure is the same overhead limitation that is carried in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill. Defense is important, but health is also important. This was patterned after that provision. The ultimate figure will be fixed as the result of the legislative process, and this is the beginning of the legislative process in the House. The House can work its will. But I would urge the House to let this figure stay as it is at this time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further, briefly?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is it not true that Dr. Brown, Director of the Division of Research and Engineering, pointed out that there were very real differences between the programs of Health, Education, and Welfare with reference to costs as compared to programs conducted for defense? Did he not argue that for that reason we should have a flexible approach in the case of defense and perhaps a fixed limitation in the case of other programs?

Mr. MAHON. It is true that in the hearings we tried to develop the pros and cons on this issue. Dr. Brown expressed views in opposition to the limitation. It is true that Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense is one of the ablest men in or out of Government. He is doing an excellent job, in my opinion, for the country. But the gentleman from New Jersey would be the last to say that the only function of Congress is to be a rubberstamp for the administrative branch. What we are trying to do here is to represent the taxpayers of the country generally and to try to bring into proper focus the handling of these grants to the various colleges.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection, and I am sure the majority of the Members of this House have no objection, to this Committee and the Congress taking a long and hard look at this problem. This is not the only area in which this problem presents itself. It presents itself also in the grants for the National Science Foundation. We have a problem here—that is, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Independent Offices. We do not believe there ought to be a restriction of 15 percent to every college and university in America. The gentleman did state that it might be 15 percent in one area and 30 percent or 40 percent or 28 percent in another. I do not think we ought to say that it shall be 15 percent for every university. I think the gentleman recognizes that the costs at a particular university may be a little higher than at some other university in some other States around the Nation.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman would agree, too, that this would vary as well with different programs. But this is an attempt to try to get hold of the reins, so to speak, and prevent a runaway.

Mr. BOLAND. There is no doubt about it.

I should like to read into the RECORD a telegram from Harvard University on this matter:

> At Harvard University we are deeply concerned about that part Defense Department appropriations bill placing limitation 15 percent for indirect costs associated with grants. Our experience shows such limitation will place serious burden Massachusetts universities doing Government research. Indirect expense rate at Harvard, developed in accordance formula prescribed by U.S. Budget Bureau and audited by U.S. Navy Audit Section, is 28.2 percent. A 15-percent limitation on defense agency grants would necessitate the university making up the difference. As a result primarily of statutory indirect cost limitations on NIH grants, Harvard contributed over $1 million 1960–61 toward cost Government grant and contract research work. All other universities incurred proportionate losses which had to be met by diversion of funds from other university programs of research and education important in the interests of national security and welfare. I urge your support in removing this limitation from the defense appropriations bill.
>
> NATHAN M. PUSEY,
> *President.*

So actually Harvard is losing money under NIH grants.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will permit, I should like to read a wire I have received from Paul A. Miller, president of West Virginia University. It is just three or four lines:

> Urge your consideration of increasing 15-percent limitation indirect costs of research in defense appropriation bill. This inadequate level distorts total university program by forcing transfer funds from other uses to guarantee indirect cost on federally sponsored research.

In conversation with members of the committee I find that they say the president of the university evidently has a mistaken idea of this. Would the gentleman mind explaining the situation he has raised here? He says the facts stated here are not the facts in the case.

Mr. MAHON. It is true that of the money we give to colleges in grants many of them are using in excess of 15 percent for indirect costs. It cannot be denied that many of the schools are using more than 15 percent.

Mr. BAILEY. Did I understand the gentleman to say earlier in his explanation that it did not apply to contracts?

Mr. MAHON. I did. There are about $300 million to be spent on contracts and about $40 million on grants.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for two questions?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The gentleman has talked about grants and contracts. As far as indirect costs are concerned, is there any difference?

Mr. MAHON. As to indirect costs, there might not be a marked difference, but in the one case it comes about as the result of the negotiation of a contract. We do not recommend any limitation in that area.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. There has recently been a study that has been released by the National Science Foundation. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would comment on it. The Office of Economic and Statistical Studies for the National Science Foundation shows that the national average of indirect cost related to research in large universities is 28 percent and in small universities 32 percent. At another point the National Science Foundation has stated that if a 15-percent limitation is placed on these contracts or grants, either one, $36 million of university funds must be used to pay for these indirect costs. This is at a time when the Committee on Education and Labor is looking at the colleges and universities with a rapidly increasing enrollment and we have legislation passed by the House to give Federal funds to help build classrooms and to pay some of the costs they must meet. I wonder if the gentleman would comment, therefore, on these two reports from the National Science Foundation.

Mr. MAHON. I have not read the reports. I realize that the action of the appropriations committee is opposed by the colleges, that they would like to have no restrictions and probably larger sums. They are doing a great work. We want to encourage them to do a great job. We will be glad to look further into this whole problem and are sympathetic to it. I am not one who is wholly untouched and unrelated to it. I have the second largest State-supported school in Texas in my own home town. The Members of the House can rest assured that this thing will be handled in a prudent way.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The gentleman talked about the universities and colleges objecting because of the needs there, but this is the National Science Foundation, really a branch of the Government, that in its study comes up with the fact that in the large universities the cost is 28 percent and the small ones 32 percent. This, it seems to me, is an objective statement.

Mr. MAHON. It is a point in the controversy which has arisen. It is a part of the story.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Apparently the General Accounting Office made available some statistics recently which indicate that millions of dollars are being wasted in the Defense Department by the type of travel practices and procedures followed. Did the gentleman and his committee find any evidence as to a lot of waste in the travel practices of the Defense Department personnel?

Mr. MAHON. For years we have been hammering away in the Congress at excessive travel costs, and the gentleman has participated in this effort. We have made arbitrary percentage cuts. We have written reports. We have done what we could in this area. I think our efforts have been helpful in keeping these costs from going completely beyond bounds. The Department of Defense is now using the practice of having people who travel at times to travel second class rather than first class. I am sure many of the Members of the House of Representatives, when they make a long trip, travel coach probably or tourist class in the big planes. There is no good reason why there should not be some economy here. It is not a matter of first-class citizenship or second-class citizenship. It is a matter of providing an adequate expense allowance and that program is being implemented to some extent at this time in the Department of Defense.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, always makes a very, very splendid statement about our defense program. I want to commend the gentleman for the great job of work he does for the Congress and for the country along that line. I was particularly impressed by the method by which the gentleman portrays the fact that we are not pursuing a so-called no-win policy. The gentleman makes it crystal clear that every citizen in this country by paying $258 of this bill, certainly, is trying to carry forward a win policy. I would like to make this comment. Just a few days ago, we had the Secretary of State before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I asked him this question: "Mr. Secretary, if you should find a single individual in your Department pursuing or advocating a no-win policy, would you fire him immediately?" He said he would fire such an individual.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his very generous reference to me.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the committee.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do want to say in reference to the comments by our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] that I am only one member of a team on the defense subcommittee. We all work together and I deserve no special credit.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask the chairman a question about the language on page 39 of the report. I have had an opportunity to discuss this language with him.

Mr. MAHON. I had hoped my colleague would defer that discussion until later.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to have that point clarified at some point in the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my colleague, a member of the committee.

Mr. LAIRD. With reference to this particular section, in the committee I offered an amendment to limit the cost of the carrier to $280 million. That particular amendment was adopted. Now at the top of page 39 there is this sentence in the report:

> Should additional funds be required for the construction of the carrier, they can be reprogramed from prior year funds presently available, and through the competitive assignment of other ships to private yards, without the loss of any ships from the approved program.

My question, Mr. Chairman, is, Is this an invitation to go beyond the $280 million?

Mr. MAHON. In the opinion of the gentleman from Texas, it is certainly not an invitation to go beyond the $280 million. I realize the statement could be misleading. It was the determination of the committee that the aircraft carrier, that is the new carrier that is being talked about, would cost $280 million. It is true technically that there are some ways by which modification may be made in the future, but this language should not be interpreted to mean that the committee feels there should be any change in the $280 million figure.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would like to point out that one subcommittee on which I serve looked into NIH operations. We found that in some instances 7 percent is too much for indirect cost, but in other cases perhaps 28 percent is not too much. It depends upon the bookkeeping methods and allocations to direct and indirect costs.

My question is this: If we put a limitation of 15 percent on indirect costs, would not this in effect result in forcing a bookkeeping system upon the grantee which would shift some of the indirect cost over to direct cost?

Mr. MAHON. I would think they they would make a sincere effort to live within the limitation that is fixed upon them by the Congress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to get back to section 540 again, if I could. Do I understand if this should be included that we would be obliging the institutions to prove that their indirect overhead costs are justified? Even if they submitted proof could they get no more than 15 percent of those costs, even though as in the case of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology the indirect costs have been over 51 percent? Would they be limited to a 15-percent reimbursement? Even to get that much would they have to prove that they spent over 15 percent? Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. I believe the statement I have previously made in connection with this problem clarifies my position on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I will make a few comments at the outset indicating my approval of the committee recommendations. As in every instance where we have legislation before the Committee on Appropriations there are cases where you may or may not agree with every specific decision. Even with that reservation, however, I certainly endorse what the committee has proposed.

In my judgment this appropriation bill is in general a continuation of the basic military policy that we established right after the Korean war. There are some changes in programs and policies in the recommendations this year; on the other hand, it is not a significantly different program than the ones we have had over the last few years. The changes that have been made in programs or policies reflect the different conditions that we face today worldwide or conditions which we may be called upon to face several years hence.

I would like at this point to review the actual committee decisions as to the budget itself. I do this because if one makes a casual observation of the committee report one might come to the conclusion that the committee is recommending a very insignificant dollar reduction. If you refer to page 2 of the committee report you will find that the net reduction according to the statistical information is only $67,509,000 against an overall amount recommended in the bill of $47,839,491,000. In reality, if one carefully reads the report one will find that the actual reduction below the budget recommended by the administration is $581,509,000, which is a reduction of 1.2 percent.

The committee in reducing this appropriation bill has acted no differently than in the consideration of other appropriation bills over the last few years.

For example, in the 85th Congress, 1st session, the House on the recommendation of this committee reduced the appropriation bill by 7.1 percent. In the 85th Congress, 2d session, the House increased the administration's military request by 0.5 percent. In the 1st session of the 86th Congress the House, on the recommendation of this committee, reduced the appropriation bill by 1 percent. In the 2d session of the 86th Congress, the House approved this committee's recommendation increasing the appropriation by 7.3 percent. In the 1st session of the 87th Congress, last year, the House went along with the reductions recommended by this committee of 0.5 percent. In the 5-year span I outlined, the average reduction has been 1.5 percent. The reduction this year, if you will look at the true figure, is 1.2 percent.

So our committee has not treated this bill one iota differently than we have treated any others. The committee in 1962 exercised its judgment for reductions and increases just as we have done heretofore. We have found areas of disagreement with the Department of Defense in this bill as we found in previous years.

How did we arrive at the $581,509,000 for reduction? To understand the result requires some careful consideration of the process.

Last year the Congress approved $514.5 million to be earmarked for the procurement of long-range bombers. In the law which we approved for appropriation of the Defense Department in the fiscal year 1962, the Congress said: "of which not less than $514,500,000 shall be available only for the procurement of long-range bombers."

This language gave the Defense Department the right to spend this much money for the additional procurement of B–52's, B–58's, and possibly B–70's. The Defense Department decided not to use this money in fiscal 1962.

At the time President Kennedy recommended his budget for fiscal 1963, he proposed that this $514.5 million, which could only be spent this year for long-range bomber procurement, be carried forward to help provide funds for fiscal year 1963. He requested that the Congress free these funds from this limitation in fiscal year 1962 to help finance the program for the next fiscal year. Our committee has decided and is recommending that we in effect rescind this $514.5 million, and then appropriate a new amount of $514.5 million on the basis that if in fiscal 1962 the administration was not going to follow the directive of the Congress and spend this money for B–52's, B–58's, or B–70's procurement, we should strike the availability of the funds and start fiscal 1963 fresh.

So on page 25 of the bill before you, you will find this language:

> *Provided further*, That funds restricted to procurement of long-range bombers in this appropriation for fiscal year 1962 shall not be available for obligation after June 30, 1962.

With that action taken, then we added $514.5 million to the Air Force aircraft procurement account. From that point on we considered the administration's request on its merits for fiscal 1963. We are simply following out what makes sense to me, namely the policy that if the executive branch of the Government does not carry out the will of the Congress, we should take action to rescind that which we proposed and then start afresh in the new year.

Actually we added $514.5 million to the aircraft procurement account for the Air Force as shown on page 25 of the appropriation bill before you. As a consequence of the previous action, the actual amount that we started with in that account was $3,649,500,000. On the other hand, after we had taken that action, we then reduced this account by $141.6 million in the following way:

We reduced the fund to the extent of $40 million, because we believe they can improve fiscal management and increase competitive contracting.

We cut the obligation authority in this account by $2.5 million because we think they can do better in the component improvement program.

We cut $85 million in this account because we think their replenishment program for aircraft spares was overstated.

We cut $10 million in this account because we feel that private industry should contribute $10 million to the C–141 program. It is the committee's feeling that the C–141 program, which is the new long-range military transport, should not be completely supported by the Defense Department. This particular aircraft, when it is flying, will have certain benefits for private industry. It can be used and will be used by private industry; at least, a private industry version can and undoubtedly will be built and used. It is our committee's feeling that private industry ought to make a contribution to the development cost of this aircraft.

There is a $2 million reduction in the painting of aircraft program. This item is somewhat interesting. The Air Force wanted $17,631,000 to paint aircraft to prevent corrosion. We admit there is need to paint aircraft to prevent corrosion, but we thought $17,631,000 was a pretty expensive painting program, particularly when they were only going to spend $140,000 on paint. So, we just took $2 million off and thought they could get this painting job done and done adequately for $15,631,000.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. Is it not a fact that to paint one aircraft they wanted some $65,000? That was just for the painting of one aircraft.

Mr. FORD. I think the gentleman is right. Our committee thought this program needed a careful scrutiny, and we are helping them by cutting $2 million from the request.

The committee has recommended a $2.1-million reduction in the procurement of aircraft for the logistic support program for missile sites. The net result is in this one account we have added $514.5 million, but on the other hand, as I have indicated, we reduced it by $141.6 million.

It should be pointed out, in addition, on the broad picture, that the committee is recommending an increase of $698,792,000, which includes the $514.5 million and $184,292,000. The $184,292,000 are as follows:

> 1. $52,900,000, for further component development related to the RS–70;
> 2. $42,000,000, to accelerate the Dyna-Soar manned glider space program;
> 3. $16,970,000, to insure a more economical buy on certain aircraft;
> 4. $11,500,000, to insure keeping the Mark 46 torpedo on schedule, because of its importance as an antisubmarine warfare weapon;
> 5. $58,800,000, to maintain the strength of the Army National Guard at 400,000 and the Army Reserve at 300,000;
> 6. $2,122,000, for water service at certain Marine Corps and naval facilities, and for the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice.

On the other hand, we are making reductions—and this is the important thing—which are financial adjustments of $456,210,000, plus $310,091,000 in program decreases. The details of these various reductions are set forth on pages 3 and 4 of the committee report. The reductions are itemized in the following insert:

> 1. $196,110,000 eliminated for the proposed military family housing revolving fund, pending authorization by law;
> 2. $116,500,000, based on committee estimate of increase in anticipated recoupments of carryover funds from prior years;
> 3. $45,000,000, to discourage excessive unobligated balances;
> 4. $39,500,000, on basis that off-shelf sales receipts have been underestimated;
> 5. $30,000,000, as change in ship construction financing;
> 6. $20,000,000, substitution of transfer from the Navy industrial fund to finance construction of a MSTS ship;
> 7. $9,100,000, for several additional minor adjustments.
>
> (b) Program decreases totaling $310,091,000, including:
>
> 1. $134,000,000, in aircraft spare parts procurement and management;
> 2. $68,600,000, related to better contract procedures, improved pricing, and sharing development costs with industry;
> 3. $25,000,000, in communications improvement programs;
> 4. $20,000,000, by reason of changes in the mobile mid-range ballistic missile program these funds will not be needed in fiscal year 1963;
> 5. $62,491,000, representing numerous other decreases in operation, procurement, and research and development programs.

Mr. Chairman, in the past it has been my practice to take some time in the discussion of this bill to lay out in some detail the amounts that are in each account and the specific reductions or additions, account by account. I have done this through the use of charts. But this year, because there are a number of specific items that need special attention, in my opinion, I will change my method of explaining the bill and concentrate on the several areas which I think are vitally important.

First, may I make a few remarks about competitive bidding: This Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and the Committee on Appropriations as a whole have been very concerned about the competitive bidding problem for several years. The committee has been deeply disturbed about what we call letter contracts. We have been disturbed about letter contracts that seem to drag on ad infinitum, and for months never reach the status of a firm contract.

Mr. Chairman, last year in our committee report the committee had this to say, on page 40:

> Lack of competitive procurement in defense contracts.

That is the title of the section, and I am quoting from the report itself, now:

> At the heart of the procurement problem is the failure to award many major contracts on a competitive formally advertised basis.

Then, Mr. Chairman, on page 41 of the committee report for fiscal year 1962 we had this to say:

> The Armed Services Procurement Act expresses indisputable preference for formal advertising. Even the Armed Services Procurement Regulation of the Department of Defense gives clear expression of preference in this regard. The committee has revised section 523 of this bill to give additional emphasis to this stated statutory policy.

Later on in the committee report, on page 41, this is added, and I quote again:

> This statutory policy must be implemented and not bypassed as has been done to date.

Mr. Chairman, the committee report goes on to quote from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric. He had made a speech, and he spoke out very forthrightly to the effect that we had to do something about competitive bidding, and they promised to do something. I, for one, applaud this attitude.

Mr. Chairman, this year in the hearings, part 4, under "Procurement," our committee had the pleasure of having the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics, Mr. Tom Morris, before us. He made a very fine presentation about the improvements that are being made in the operation of the Defense Department. I applaud this.

On page 492 of the hearings Mr. Morris had this to say, and I quote:

> No other subject has received more attention—

Speaking of competitive procurement—

> during the past year in our 60 major procurement offices. This accounts for the encouraging trend which shows a rise in price competition during the first 6 months of fiscal year 1962, to 36.2 percent, compared to 32.9 percent for the fiscal year 1961.

This attitude made a good impression on our committee.

Over on page 494, Mr. Morris had this to say:

> Our principal progress in achieving greater price competition has been through informal price competition rather than formal advertised bidding. We endorse and advocate the use wherever possible of formal advertising as the preferred method of procurement, since this method imposes safeguards against any favoritism in procurement by its requirement for unrestricted competition, sealed bids, public opening, and automatic award.

At the same time that Mr. Morris was before the committee, we had the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Materiel, the Honorable Joseph S. Imirie, and he spoke of the progress which was being made in the Air Force Department in getting more competition, open competitive bidding. We applauded that point of view.

Then we had the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Logistics, the Honorable Paul R. Ignatius, and in his statement on page 509 he said:

> Formal advertising is, of course, the preferred method of procurement. Its advantages need no elaboration here.

Then we had a statement by the Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics. He spoke at page 514 about increased competition and he said:

> Without question, increased competition among qualified producers is an effective way to reduce weapon costs.

This was a very impressive presentation by the three people in charge of procurement for the three military departments. I was encouraged. But last Friday, to my utter amazement, I heard through the press that in apparent disregard of the procurement laws, the procurement regulations and the previous policy statements, a procurement award by telephone had been made of $5 to $6 million to Lukens Steel of Coatesville, Pa., for the procurement of 11,000 tons of special heat-treated armorplate. It is difficult to imagine—a telephone order of $5 to $6 million without consideration to competitive bidding. I could not believe what I had heard. But I checked with the Department of the Navy today and I am told that in midafternoon of Friday, the 13th, the Navy did award an order of 11,000 tons of special treatment steel for the Polaris program.

It is my understanding that there are three companies that heretofore had made or are capable of making this special armorplate. It was developed initially a few years ago by United States Steel and produced by them at the company's Homestead, Pa., plant.

They did not patent the process even though the company might have done so. They made it available to their competitors, including Lukens Steel, of Coatesville, Pa. For the last several years Lukens Steel of Coatesville, Pa., and United States Steel at its Homestead plant have been bidding competitively to provide this steel to the Defense Department. It has been an open competition with sealed bids. Sometimes Lukens has received the award and sometimes United States Steel has received the award, and sometimes both have received a piece of it.

Within the last year Armco, another major steel producer, developed a similar capability. This company has a plant down in the great State of Alabama. They call it the Armco Sheffield plant. Recently they have been bidding on this program, and I understand they have been getting through competitive bids, sealed bids, a share of this business. But I understand on last Friday about midafternoon the Navy, as directed by higher authority, called up Lukens Steel and ordered from this one company the full amount of 11,000 tons. They ignored Armco, that was another company that had not raised its prices. The basis for the award, according to what the Navy tells me, was that Lukens had not raised its price. However, it should be pointed out Armco had not raised its price. I wonder why the Navy called only Lukens? Why did the Navy exclude Armco, Sheffield Division?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman has very clearly pointed out an apparent violation of law by the Secretary of Defense and by the Department of Defense in not following the competitive-bid practices and procedures which are laid down by law. It seems to me, and I am going to develop this in my remarks a little later, that this whole award was illegal. If we are going to get away from the idea of competitive bidding regardless of what the established price may be by a particular manufacturer, if we are going to do away with this whole competitive bidding procedure, this Department of Defense appropriation bill is going to go up by leaps and bounds in the future. I think that we have to call the Department of Defense to task for this violation of the laws enacted by this Congress.

Mr. FORD. At this point I want to raise several questions. I am asking our chairman to have our committee hold hearings where the representatives of the Defense Department can answer certain questions. I do not know whether the law has been violated or not. I think the committee ought to ask some very pertinent questions on this specific point.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman knows there were no bids submitted.

Mr. FORD. There is no doubt about that, in view of the telephone order of $5 to $6 million.

Let me ask these questions, and these are some of the questions I want our committee to go into:

First. Why was the competitive-bid process as required by law and by regulation bypassed in this instance?

Second. Why was the Defense Department's alleged policy of getting more rather than less competition changed in this instance?

Third. Were the legitimate rights of the unemployed in the Homestead mill area in Pennsylvania ignored?

This is a very interesting question. In the Homestead, Pa., area they have had for some time substantial and persistent unemployment. This area, where the United States Steel plant is, is under Department of Labor designation a group E area, which means that unemployment is between 9 and 12 percent. As of February 1962, according to the statistics of the Department of Labor, unemployment is 9.9 percent in this area.

The Lukens Steel Co. plant is in Coatesville, Pa., which is in Chester County. This area in February 1962, had 7.1 percent unemployment. Previously it had been designated as a group D unemployment area which means substantial but not persistent unemployment. The group D has an unemployment of 6 to 9 percent.

Our committee ought to ask why this procurement was directed to the Coatesville area when they have less unemployment than they have in Homestead. I do not understand why they want to take an opportunity to bid competitively from a company that has its plant in an area where unemployment is higher. I cannot understand the administration's policy in this regard. These are the kind of questions we ought to go into.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Would the gentleman say that this apparent or alleged violation in placing an order without regard to competitive bidding has all the earmarks of being associated with the recent proposed steel price rise?

Mr. FORD. There is no doubt in my mind that this was a method of trying to club or coerce somebody by unusual means. This is a strange tactic of big government against private enterprise. In this instance the taxpayer is adversely affected by a lack of competitive bidding.

Now I would like to ask another question: Why was the procurement expedited by 6 months? Normally, according to the information I have, this procurement would not have been made until early fall 1962 and it would have been actually a procurement by the private shipyards that have the specific Polaris contracts. But, in this case for some strange reason, it was a procurement made by the Government from 4 to 6 months ahead of schedule.

Then another question: If I came from the State of Alabama, I would ask this question: Why, when the telephone order was placed for $5 to $6 million, did the Navy not call Armco Steel in Sheffield, Ala., and give them a chance to get in on the award. Armco had not raised its prices. If I were in Armco's boots, I would protest to the General Accounting Office. Armco has a justifiable reason to complain.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I have impressed on you the fact that we ought to have an investigation of this matter. We ought to find out what the facts are. Were there any violations of the law? What are the reasons for any change of policy.

Mr. Chairman, on page 32 of the committee report, the committee makes some comments about the ineptness and the inconsistency of the security review program. We reduced this part of the budget by $66,000.

I am thoroughly convinced that the security review functions of the Department of Defense too often have been handled in an inept and confusing manner. The right to and the necessity of an objective security review of testimony given in executive session before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations is not the issue. The problem is the operation or management of this important responsibility. Our committee made a reduction of $66,000 in funds included for these security review functions under "Operation, defense agencies." On page 32 of its report, the committee says:

> Statements made by certain representatives of agencies have been deleted in some instances while statements of representatives of other agencies containing the same information have not been deleted from other portions of the record.

Quite frankly the committee in effect is saying that in the security review operation, in many instances the "right hand does not know what the left hand is doing."

The dissemination of information on governmental activities is a vital cornerstone of any free society. The people of the country must be sufficiently well informed to make their wishes known on important issues. At the same time, information which is not of assistance to the people of the United States but would be of assistance to military intelligence agents of the Soviet Union or any other enemy should not be revealed. There is sometimes a fine line between the two. For this reason, those who are empowered to make the decisions as to what information shall be given the American people and what information shall be withheld from them must be persons of competence and complete objectivity. The use of security review to withhold information from the American people or to cover up vital issues for political reasons cannot be permitted. The Directorate for Security Review of the Department of Defense should be adequately manned by able, knowledgeable individuals, and they should be directed by persons who have no political axes to grind and who impress upon their staffs the need for objectivity and uniformity in their decisions.

In examples to be cited later I will show that the persons who deleted or censored portions of testimony in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations were not even aware of other testimony on the same point being given before the same subcommittee within a very short period of time. The attempt to delete from the record my innocuous statement concerning the U-2 flights, in the face of the public testimony which has been available for almost 2 years now, seems like the attempt of the totalitarian government described in George Orwell's book "1984" to rewrite history to suit the current viewpoint of the Government.

The examples I will give are but two of many which the members of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations had to contend with during this session of Congress. A great many, even more ridiculous, attempts at censorship were made. After inquiry by the members of the committee as to the reasons therefor, many of them were cleared for printing in the public record and the original censoring explained as a clerical error or inadvertent deletion.

Dr. Harold Brown, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, presented a very interesting statement to the committee. Upon the completion of this statement some of the members asked Dr. Brown how such a statement could be unclassified and placed in the public record. After pointing out that the statement had been reviewed and that it did not contain material which it was thought would be helpful to an enemy he said:

> My own judgment is that because the way we determine things in this country, and it is the right way, the way that distinguishes us from the other side, we must have an informed public. We can only have an informed public by giving out information that we perhaps sometimes wish not so many people knew.

This is the viewpoint which must be shared by those whose duty it is to review remarks by personnel of the Department of Defense. The Senate Committee on Armed Services has had extensive hearings on the censoring of speeches of military officers. I have no desire to involve myself or our committee in their deliberations. However, the Committee on Appropriations this year has had unfortunate experiences with the censoring of testimony not only of military officers but of questions of Members of Congress. Obviously all is not well with the Public Affairs Office of the Department of Defense. And I urge that immediate steps be taken to see that a proper job is done in this important field. There have been enough excuses and alibis. The committee wants an objective and consistent job done immediately.

Now let me illustrate what I mean and also present the basis for the committee viewpoint. I have been deeply concerned about the vital necessity of proof or system testing of our ballistic missile systems with nuclear warheads such as the Atlas, Titan, and Polaris, which means the firing of a ballistic missile with a nuclear warhead by operational crews. Throughout the hearings in 1962 on the fiscal year 1963 military budget I repeatedly asked questions on the problem of General Lemnitzer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, General Smith, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and General Decker, Chief of Staff of the Army. In 1961 during the hearings on fiscal year 1962 budget the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. George Mahon, made similar inquiries concerning this important matter.

The security review in this area, as I will illustrate, has been far from satisfactory. Let us look at the record, which speaks for itself, as found in the published hearings of 1961.

In the hearings, Department of Defense Appropriations for 1962, part 4, page 442, Mr. Mahon asked on May 1, 1961, the following question of the Under Secretary of the Air Force, Hon. Joseph V. Charyk, and Lt. Gen. Roscoe G. Wilson, Deputy Chief of Staff for Development:

> Mr. Mahon. Have we ever fired a fully equipped missile with an atomic warhead and had it explode and carry out its mission?

After an off-the-record discussion General Wilson made the following statement:

> General Wilson. I think you can determine an estimate of reliability mathematically, but in the end you have to conduct tests to prove out your hypotheses. So testing is the only answer. Would you bear me out, Dr. Charyk?
>
> Dr. Charyk. Sure.
>
> Mr. Mahon. Do you mean to say unless you fire an ICBM with a nuclear warhead, you have not sufficiently tested your weapon?
>
> Dr. Charyk. I think that is correct; yes, sir.
>
> Your probabilities can run very high, indeed, without tests, but they remain, until you test them, hypotheses. That has been the military view.
>
> We have been extremely nervous about having anything in stockpile that has not been tested, even though we are assured that the probability of success is very high. We feel so much depends upon a high order of success that we must test things.

A bit later Mr. Mahon asked this question:

> Mr. Mahon. Where are we going to get definite and complete assurance? If we are going to place the chief reliance at some future time on the intercontinental ballistic missile for the protection of this country, we need to know the facts of life with the greatest degree of accuracy.
>
> Dr. Charyk. Actually, we of course can fire a missile and check all elements of the system, but——
>
> Mr. Mahon. We have never fired a nuclear warhead, subjecting it to the shock it would be subjected to at the time of launch, and subjecting it to the speeds and atmospheric changes incident to its flight to its objective. How are we to know but that this might bring about some change in the weapon that would make it ineffective?

Having attended the hearing in 1961, knowing what was in the published hearings and being deeply concerned about proof or system testing of nuclear warheads of ballistic missiles, on February 1, 1962 I asked the Secretary of Defense and General Lemnitzer certain questions about the situation. My questions and the answers were deleted from the printed hearings by the security review process.

This was difficult to understand bearing in mind the questions asked in 1961 by Chairman Mahon and the responses by Under Secretary of the Air Force Charyk and Lt. Gen. Roscoe G. Wilson. The inconsistency of this decision is more flagrant if one reads the following from the printed hearings for this year, 1962.

On page 412 of the hearings, Department of Defense appropriations for 1963, part 2, I asked the following question of the Chief of Naval Operations:

> Mr. Ford. I think this is very impressive, but let me ask you this question: Have you ever fired a Polaris missile with a nuclear warhead from a Polaris submarine operating at sea?
>
> Admiral Anderson. No. We have done all the testing up to the point of having the nuclear head in the weapon itself. We have had instead, telemetering to give us the information back that we would presume would give us the degree of reliability, or the indication of reliability that we have to have.

No request was made by the Directorate for Security Review for this material to be deleted from the printed record. McNamara and Lemnitzer testified February 1, 1962 and Admiral Anderson 5 days later.

On page 507 of the same hearing I asked the following question during the appearance of the Secretary of the Air Force and Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force:

> Mr. Ford. I am disturbed that scientists who designed these weapons are the ones who are telling us that they are going to work. It would be very helpful, it seems to me, if the military people who have to use them had some practical experience in the firing of them.
>
> General Smith. Actually, I would like to expand on that, Mr. Ford, because as far as firing is concerned the military people do get practical experience. In our category 3 testing of Atlas, for instance, and in category 3 that will come on for Titan I and Titan II and Minuteman, the SAC crews actually fire the weapons system and fire it on a range where results are measured for accuracy. And crews are checked for their ability to handle the complex jobs they have to perform prior to, and during, launch.
>
> The only thing that has not been exercised in Atlas, as an example, is the actual detonation of the warhead at the termination of an actual trajectory. All of the relays and other things which have to function after the reentry body comes back in have been tested.

In concluding a longer and somewhat detailed discussion of this problem, the following concluding question and answer were made—page 508:

> Mr. Ford. If such tests were undertaken, and assuming that the Soviet Union would have means of knowing such tests were

> made, it would certainly improve the credibility of our deterrent force.
>
> General SMITH. I believe so, sir.

In this instance General Smith testified 12 days after McNamara and Lemnitzer. I am completely puzzled by the paradox that the testimony of General Smith, Admiral Anderson, Secretary Charyk can be published but the statements of Secretary McNamara and General Lemnitzer may not be printed. I can see no justification for a deletion in one and not in the other.

Let me take another example. In this case inconsistencies in policy are obvious but in addition in this instance I confess there is some evidence that the deletion of my question and the answer have a political rather than a security flavor.

On February 1, 1962, while General Lemnitzer and Secretary McNamara were testifying in executive session before the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations there were questions raised and answers given concerning the adequacy of our military intelligence program. Because of an answer given by General Lemnitzer I asked a question about the U–2 program and the impact of its discontinuance in May 1960. In my judgment it was an important question which should have been answered for the record. My reference in the question to the U–2 program by any definition, including past decisions by security review, was certainly printable. Yet it was deleted in the security review process by the Department of Defense.

Let me show how inconsistent and unreasonable the deletion was.

On June 2, 1960, the then Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, Jr., in testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate, page 124, stated:

> We obviously were interested in the results of these flights as we are in all of our Nation's intelligence collection results. For example, from these flights we got information on airfields, aircraft, missiles, missile testing and training, special weapons storage, submarine production, atomic production and aircraft deployment, and things like these.
>
> These were all types of vital information. These results were considered in formulating our military programs. We obviously were the prime customer, and ours is the major interest.

The above testimony was printed and made available to the general public.

At a later point in the same hearing the following colloquy took place—page 136:

> Senator HICKENLOOPER. Now, these U–2 flights have been extremely valuable in the securing of intelligence, have they not?
>
> Secretary GATES. They have indeed, Senator.

Still further—page 138—the following colloquy took place:

> Senator LONG. If it were essential or important that the U–2 flights be made for years, right up to and including May 1, is the defense of the United States adversely effected by an absolute discontinuance on May 13?
>
> Secretary GATES. We have lost, through compromise, an important source of information.
>
> Senator LONG. In other words, we do badly need the same information that we were gathering with the U–2 flights?
>
> Secretary GATES. We need a continuity of this information, I think, Senator.

Still further on page 143:

> Senator LAUSCHE. My question is, If you did not have the knowledge acquired through the U–2's, could you have intelligently developed your national defense to cope with the actual, potential military power of the Soviet?
>
> SECRETARY GATES. Not as well, Senator; by no means.

Still further, page 154, the following colloquy took place:

> The CHAIRMAN (Senator FULBRIGHT). In other words, the result of your overflights and the information you got has given you a better appreciation of their military strength and that appreciation is that they are very well armed—is that correct—better than you expected?
>
> Secretary GATES. In some case, yes. In some case, perhaps less well than they advertised.

The then Secretary of State, the Honorable Christian Herter testified—on page 7:

> The U–2 program was an important and efficient intelligence effort.

Later in the same hearing—page 37—the following colloquy took place:

> Senator HICKENLOOPER. Would you care to give an opinion on the value to this country, in our defensive posture, of these flights, this series of flights which have gone on over Russian territory for the last several years?
>
> Secretary HERTER. Yes, sir. I will give you this opinion. It is a layman's opinion rather than an expert's opinion, but I think they were of very great value to us.

If all this testimony by responsible Government officials could be printed, there was absolutely no reason to censor my question on the U–2 program.

The committee action in reducing funds for security review by $60,000 may appear to be harsh. However the reduction in funds is about the only method I know to straighten out the problem and accomplish better management. Certainly the current operations as they affect testimony before our committee are unsatisfactory. Individual committee members and the committee staff could give many similar illustrations, some more ridiculous than those I have cited.

In conclusion let me assure those responsible in the Department of Defense that when there is evidence that the management and operation of the security review section is remedied I will personally do all that I can to see that adequate funds are available.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Since the gentleman is looking at the committee report, page 32, yesterday we had the Department of Defense military construction authorization bill before us. That bill carried authority for the command to spend up to 50 percent of the cost of replacing a comparable family housing unit to rehabilitate an existing one.

I am trying to translate that over into the appropriations that are included in this bill. Would that be compensated for in this bill? Or how is that to be correlated?

Mr. FORD. Until that becomes law it is a little difficult to be specific.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I think I should state that such items referred to in the construction bill do not appear at all in this bill. This bill does not relate to that. That would be dealt with by the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]. This bill deals with aircraft, missiles, ships, and the general running of the establishment.

Mr. FORD. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, but after the buildings to which the gentleman refers are built, operation and maintenance money in this bill does take care of their operation and maintenance.

Mr. VINSON. But I may say in reference to the operation and maintenance hereafter under the bill we passed yesterday it will have to be authorized before it can be appropriated for. That was in the bill yesterday.

Mr. AVERY. If I understand it, then—I am only trying to develop an understanding, not to create controversy—after this year the money for rehabilitation will appear as a line item?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct; that was written in the bill yesterday.

Mr. AVERY. Then for all practical purposes we are proceeding now as we have in the past.

Mr. VINSON. That is it exactly.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. WESTLAND. The gentleman earlier touched a matter that has caused me considerable concern. In section 535 of the bill the committee apparently has attempted to slow down the defense contractors in their advertising of products they are making for the Defense Department. Apparently this language is completely inadequate; apparently it does not stop the defense contractors from advertising very classified matter in the workaday journals. Recently I saw an ad by some Texas company that was producing parts for our Polaris submarines, and I have seen heat exchangers advertised, things that we knew the Soviets were interested in. I am trying to find some way of stopping it. I do not know whether the gentleman has had this matter before his committee, whether it has been discussed and whether we cannot get some language in this bill to deal with that sort of thing effectively.

Mr. FORD. We tried to do that in the bill last year because of flagrant abuses in spending Defense Department procurement dollars to advertise company products.

This was getting to be a scandalous situation. When companies were puffing their products, so to speak, they were inevitably releasing certain classified information. Our committee last year put in a tough provision which sought to cut down the drain on procurement funds. We have done all we can in this area to, first, reduce the cost to the Government and, second, to emphasize to the departments these absolutely absurd advertisements are not necessary and should not be necessary to sell their products to Uncle Sam.

Mr. WESTLAND. Admiral Rickover and I have discussed this matter a good many times to try to find some solution.

Mr. FORD. He and I have done the same.

Mr. WESTLAND. It has been an attempt. He has called the gentleman in the well at this time and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], who, I believe, was instrumental in preparing this type of phraseology. I do not know just how far the Appropriations Committee can go in legislating in a matter of this kind, but there should be some way of stopping these contractors from giving away our secrets free to the Soviets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

If the gentleman tomorrow, when the RECORD is printed, will read my remarks about the inadequacy, the ineptness, the inconsistency of the Office of Security Review, he will understand my sentiments about the way this shop is being run. I have documentation of instance after instance where they have done, in my judgment, an inconsistent, inept job.

Mr. WESTLAND. It is still going on, and it is very obvious.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, on page 9 of the committee bill there is this provision:

> *Provided*, That not more than $311,740,000 may be used for the repair and alteration of naval vessels in shipyards.

On page 23, there is the following provision:

> *Provided*, That not more than $299,195,000 of these funds may be used for conversion of naval vessels in Navy shipyards.

These two provisions are an attempt to see to it that the private industry shipyards of the United States get a larger share of the repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels. It is a very frank effort to see to it that the private yards go from 25 percent of the work to 35 percent of the work with resulting savings to the Government and taxpayers. On the other hand, if this is approved, the share going to the public yards will go from 75 percent in fiscal 1962 to 65 percent in the next fiscal year.

What are the facts? Every witness who ever testified on the subject from the Department of the Navy has admitted categorically that the private yards in new construction, repair, alteration, or conversion, can do the job anywhere from 8 to 22 percent less. The private yards can save money for the Navy and the taxpayers.

Now, if you are interested in saving money, support the committee amendment, because it will mean that the Navy can get the job done cheaper by having it done in the private yards rather than the Navy yards. And, I have citation after citation by Admiral James, head of the Navy shipbuilding, and others to support the point.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. In view of the statement the gentleman has just made, what is the justification, then, for keeping the Navy yards?

Mr. FORD. The justification is that we must have a Navy yard capability. I am not arguing for the dismantling of Navy shipyards.

These facts are interesting. In fiscal 1962 the Navy yards are operating at 90 percent of capacity with about 100,000 employees. The private yards throughout the country are operating at 50 percent of capacity. They have only about 50,000 employees working on Navy work.

Now, let us take a look at the facts, comparing 1962 with fiscal 1963. In fiscal 1962, this year, the total amount of work for repair, alteration, and conversion is $784 million, of which the Navy yards will get $586 million and the private yards $197 million under repair and alteration. If this bill goes into effect, we will have a change in the allocation from 75 percent to 65 percent for the Navy yards and 25 percent to 35 percent for the private yards. Overall, for conversion, repair, and alteration, comparing fiscal 1962 with fiscal 1963, the Navy yards will end up with $24 million more work in fiscal 1962 than in fiscal 1963. The total will go from $586 to $610 million.

It is also true that the private yards will end up with an increase, but there will be no less dollar amount of money made available to the public yards in fiscal 1963 even with this limitation; in fact, there will be $24 million more.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I am not sure whether I took the figures down correctly, but I believe the gentleman said that in the private yards there would be a saving of between 8 and 22 percent for repair, conversion, and new construction.

Mr. FORD. That is what Admiral James said. I am only repeating what he said.

Mr. HARDY. I have heard Admiral James give a lot of figures, but I never heard him come up with anything like that.

Mr. FORD. Let me quote what he said. On page 271 of part 5 of the hearings for fiscal 1962 I asked this question: Does this—meaning the estimated saving of 8 to 15 percent for work done in the private yards—apply to repair as well as original construction? Admiral James answered: "Indeed, yes, sir."

Mr. HARDY. I am trying, if the gentleman will yield further, to understand, if I can, whether the Admiral made a distinction between the savings which he contends would occur with respect to new construction and the savings which would occur with respect to repair and maintenance.

Mr. FORD. I am just quoting his statement to that effect.

Mr. HARDY. Well, it was not very clear to me. Maybe it was clear to the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Well, I would suggest, then, that you look at page 275, part 5, of our hearings last year, and it will be very clear.

Mr. HARDY. I shall do that, but in the meantime will the gentleman tell us whether in Admiral James' testimony he indicated that a reduction in these figures or an adjustment in these figures had been made for such matters as additional expense for military supervision, for training ships crews or for other items which would not apply at private yards.

Mr. FORD. I will say this: Admiral James is not for this amendment.

Mr. HARDY. I wonder if the gentleman could be sure of that?

Mr. FORD. Let us put it this way: I understand the Department of the Navy is not for it, and I assume he and they feel alike.

Mr. HARDY. I wish I could be sure of that. I have always had a feeling myself that Admiral James is partial to private yards and would like to expand the contract work.

Mr. FORD. I do not think that he does feel that way. In fact, it is my opinion, from hearing him testify, that he has a strong feeling that we ought to have fully adequate Navy yards.

Mr. HARDY. I would prefer——

Mr. FORD. But, I would say this: I believe he and the committee disagree on how much work ought to go to the Navy yards, and how much should go to the private yards. I do not think the Navy yards should be maintained at 90 percent of capacity, which is the case. I think the private yards ought to be operated at greater than 50 percent of capacity.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD. I would be very glad to yield further.

Mr. HARDY. Again, I do not know where these figures came from, but when you talk of 90 percent of capacity I think you should have some base period, or some basis on which to make that comparison. For instance, the Navy yard in my district has an employment level now of only about one-fifth of what it had in World War II. I would hardly say it is 90 percent capacity, or even 60 percent or 65 percent of capacity.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman would not want the Navy yard at Norfolk to be working at 90 percent of World War II capacity, would he?

Mr. HARDY. Not at all. I do not mean to leave that impression.

Mr. FORD. That was the impression I got.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. HARDY. Would the gentleman take a little more time in order that I might pursue this further with the gentleman?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I could not believe that was the impression the gentleman wanted to create.

Mr. HARDY. What I was trying to find out is what base you were using to make a determination that 90 percent of capacity is now being utilized in the naval shipyards?

Mr. FORD. All I am doing is quoting the figures given the committee. They say the Navy yards are being used at 90 percent of capacity. The private yards tell us their yards are being utilized at 50 percent of capacity. All our committee is trying to do is to give free enterprise a little more leeway and save money. The committee wants to increase the dollar amount for the private yards in this area by about $145 million. At the same time it would mean that the Navy yards would receive a $24 million increase. I do not think that is inequitable.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further on that point?

Mr. FORD. Surely.

Mr. HARDY. I subscribe to the proposition that our private yards should be kept healthy also. My district has a good many private yards, as well as the naval shipyard. But I do not believe that by placing them in a straitjacket with a specific limitation that we can serve the best interests of the industry or of the Government. Frankly, I wish the committee had had before it a different witness than Admiral James.

Mr. FORD. I, personally, admire Admiral James. I think he is doing a fine job. I just do not happen to agree with his plan to allocate the funds for ship repair and conversion in 1963. Our committee is trying to nudge him a little bit further along the line of helping free enterprise and saving money without hurting the Navy yards.

Mr. Chairman, I might say to my friend from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] that the 65-35 percent figure does not satisfy the private yard advocates either. They wanted 75 percent for the private yards and 25 percent for the public yards. We did not go anywhere near that figure.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD. I would be glad to yield further to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Does not the gentleman agree that there are situations in which conceivably there would be times when much more than 65 percent should go into the naval yards and times when much more than the 35 percent should go into the private yards? Is not this a situation that ought to be flexible?

Mr. FORD. Within the bill as we have submitted it there is plenty of flexibility. We simply say that no more than 65 percent of the dollars can go to the Navy yards; and the dollar amounts are large; they total $939,900,000. That figure gives a lot of money for flexibility.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman will recognize that flexibility is all on the side of the private yards and not on the side of the Navy yards?

Mr. FORD. Oh, no; the flexibility is for both.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has made the point as far as private enterprise is concerned. I would like to make the point that I believe this amendment of the committee is in the interest of the American taxpayer. Here is where you are going to save from 15 to 25 percent in a particular area involving large sums of money. This is not what the private shipbuilding industry wanted. They wanted, in their appearance before our committee, 75 percent. The Navy has plenty of flexibility here with the amendment of the committee. And after all, this is good for just 1 year and we can take another look at it next year and see where we are at that time. But I think that the taxpayer is being protected.

Mr. FORD. Let me give you a good example. There is a request in here for a new aircraft carrier. The Navy testified that if this aircraft carrier were built at a Navy yard the cost would be $325 million. They also testified that if the aircraft carrier were built at a private shipyard, by private industry, the cost would be $280 million, a differentail of $45 million. The budget figure as recommended by the administration was $310 million. I think that is two-thirds of the difference between the private and the Navy yards' figures. Our committee thought we ought to take advantage of the lower figure and we reduced the carrier from $310 to $280 million. We hope the Navy can find a way to build the carrier for $280 million.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman has made a pretty good point for competitive bidding in the procurement of new construction. I think undoubtedly there have been evidences of savings so far as new construction contracts are concerned. But when you get into the question of actual cost, I should like to ask the gentleman if the committee had any figures on the cost of the *Kittyhawk*.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add this comment, because I suspected that it would be brought up probably by my good friend from Georgia. He probably will say that we should not direct that x number of dollars be spent in the private yards and x number in the public yards. I think you can argue that for some years the Congress has directed how Navy funds should be spent, particularly for new construction. And if it is good policy for new construction it is good policy for repair, alteration, and conversion. Under the Vinson-Trammell Act—and the gentleman from Georgia, I am sure, can tell me the date when it became law—the Congress directed that every ship of a class should go to alternate type yards, public and private. If it is good to direct that new construction should go half to the private and half to the public, I cannot see why we should not make some arbitrary decision about repair, alteration, and construction.

It seems to me it is the same problem: shipbuilding, shipyards, Navy dollars. I think the precedent was established a long time ago that the Congress on its own make some decisions in this matter. We are now carrying out the same general policy. I do not think there is any basis for a distinction between new construction, alteration and repair, and conversion. Therefore, I strongly hope that these provisions I have indicated remain in the bill. They are fair to all concerned. I for one want it known now that I intend to oppose any deletion, and if we have a rollcall we will find out who stands up for free enterprise and who does not. Who wants to say dollars and who does not.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Michigan for the very able and capable presentation he has made here in the House of Representatives today. The gentleman from Michigan, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], are two of the greatest authorities on the defense of this Nation. We are certainly fortunate to have men like Mr. MAHON and Mr. FORD on this important committee.

Mr. FORD. I appreciate the gentlemans' comments. We have a great number of people who are extremely competent and qualified in this area on our committee and on the House Committee on Armed Services. If both committees work together and try to resolve our differences we can come up with good programs for the defense of this country. We have in the past and I am sure we can in the future.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I regret that I missed a few minutes of the gentleman's presentation this afternoon. I wonder if he commented on this situation that has grown enormously, of contracting for technical management services and consultants. I would ask the gentleman, when the present administration said it would come in with a report on this by March 1, what reason was given for not coming in with this report?

Mr. FORD. It is my understanding that such a report will be released shortly. It is long overdue.

Mr. GROSS. It certainly is.

Mr. FORD. Our committee did not have the benefit of its recommendations. As a consequence, we cut $5 million, as I recall the figure, for the contracts with Rand, the MITRE Corp., the Space Technology Laboratory, and others.

Mr. GROSS. Aerospace.

Mr. FORD. And Aerospace. We made an arbitrary cut, because we felt the matter was getting out of hand. We did the same thing last year. We made some very strong statements in the report last year. We have seen very little progress in the executive branch in straightening out the situation in the past year. We have been waiting for this report. The only way we could handle the problem was to cut $5 million. Perhaps we can get some action in this way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The gentleman has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. CONTE. I want to ask the gentleman this question. I agree with the committee formula in regard to public and private shipyards, and I want to go along with him. However, I am a bit confused in regard to the language on pages 38 and 39 in regard to the aircraft carrier, where you set somewhat of a limitation of $280 million, stating that you could save $35 million by building this aircraft carrier in a private shipyard.

Mr. FORD. I can give the gentleman an answer: $280 million is available to build the aircraft carrier; no more. We said that the administration must follow the law in making the award. I believe the gentleman is familiar with what the law says. We are not inviting them to come in and ask for additional funds over the $280 million, nor are we inviting them to have a reprograming request. As a matter of fact, I want it perfectly clear without any qualification that they build that aircraft carrier for $280 million, period.

Mr. CONTE. I think that clarifies it. I think we should have some legislative history here because the report would seem to indicate to the contrary. It is my hope that this aircraft carrier will be let to a private yard—it would mean a great saving to our taxpayers.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Can the gentleman tell me something about the provision of the $150 million for the emergency fund defense contained in title IV of the bill on page 30?

Mr. FORD. It is the same provision, as I recall, that we have had heretofore. The emergency fund provides $150 million in obligation authority plus the right of transfer of another $150 million.

Mr. LINDSAY. Why is that a fixed amount each year? Does it always turn out to be $150 million worth of emergencies?

Mr. FORD. This is 1-year money, which amount over the years has been found to be adequate to meet any unforeseen emergencies.

Mr. LINDSAY. May I ask the gentleman what kind of emergencies?

Mr. FORD. Many of the requests for emergency fund expenditures are of a classified nature. If the gentleman will look at the printed hearings, we show you the ones that are unclassified, but many of the requests for this money are of a classified nature.

Mr. LINDSAY. One hundred and fifty million dollars is an awful lot of classification, in my judgment.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, and if he will look at part 5 of the hearings, he will find on page 103 a great portion of the transfers of an unclassified nature which make up almost the entire transfer for this past year.

PROFESSIONAL AND CLERICAL STAFFS OF THE COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, on page 5354 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appears a table purporting to tabulate the professional and clerical staffs of the committees of the House with reference to their political affiliation.

So far as the staff of the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, it could not be more erroneous. Of the 50 members of the staff accredited to the Committee on Appropriations, I have appointed all but 6. I have not known at the time of appointment—and I do not know today—to what political party, to what church or to what fraternal organizations a single one of the 50 belongs, and may I say further, Mr. Chairman, that none of them are from my congressional district, or from my own State. I have never exercised personal political preference in the appointment of any of them.

In the distribution of the patronage of the House, a list of all appointive positions, and that includes the charwomen, custodians, elevator operators, policemen, clerks and those who officiate at the desk, all others, is compiled and the sum total—the aggregate of all their salaries—is divided by the majority membership of the House and each Member of the House has the right to appoint his allotted share, with the exception of the chairmen of committees.

Chairmen of committees are not included in this disposition of patronage because each of them appoints the staff of his respective committee. That, of course, fluctuates with the political control of the House and any changes in the chairmanship.

But the staff of the Committee on Appropriations is permanent. It is made up of careermen who serve for life. Special qualifications are required, and we have our own system of civil service. For example, former service in some budgetary capacity in a Federal department is one of the requirements. In order to know how to tear down a budget the clerk must have had experience in building up a budget. There are other requirements, of course, that are essential. In selecting the last addition to the staff something like 200 men were screened—without their knowledge, of course—before we reached the man we took.

Incidentally, no one who applies for a position is ever appointed. We do not have room for a man who is looking for a job. We can use only men who are so efficient and so well located that they have no desire for a change; and any man who makes application to us for one of these jobs thereby automatically eliminates himself from consideration.

Every now and then a Member of the House comes to us to recommend some good man from his district. He will assure us: "Why, this man can carry his ward any time." But the men we can use must assist in the distribution, as shown here today, of hundreds of millions of dollars in every department of governmental activity. They have highly responsible duties; they must be technical, scholarly, objectively minded men and, of course, men of immaculate integrity.

We cannot pay them what they are worth; we cannot pay them what they should have, but we do retain them for life as long as they will stay with us.

You do not hear much of these devoted men because it is a breach of committee procedure to praise them. It is a breach of committee procedure to praise them in the report of the subcommittee to the whole committee, or in the report of the whole committee to the House. But it is unnecessary to say that they are deeply appreciated and that they have the confidence and the affection of every subcommittee chairman.

These men—and I would like to emphasize this point because this was the matter that was under consideration at the time the table was presented in the House—these men are available to any member of the committee irrespective of whether he is a minority member or a majority member.

Any member of the subcommittee may go to any member of the staff of his subcommittee, and all the staff will work for him and with him and in cooperation with members on one side of the aisle as well as on the other side. There is no difference in their attitude toward members of the committee or subcommittee in that respect.

The staff proper consists of 21 men. The remainder of the 50 are stenographers and are equally divided—half of them are assigned to subcommittee chairmen and half to the ranking minority members of the subcommittees. That means they are appointed on the recommendation of the men they serve, and are of course personal appointees.

In other words, the suggestions and implications set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 5354 when this table was inserted, do not apply in any respect to the staff of the House Committee on Appropriations.

I shall be glad now to answer any questions on the subject here on the floor or in committee at any time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has inserted two provisions in this bill which to my mind are highly objectionable.

The effect of these provisions is to require that not more than 65 percent of conversion, repair, and alteration of naval vessels can be performed in naval shipyards.

That is to say, then, that under all circumstances—at least 35 percent of the conversion, repair, and alteration of naval vessels must be done in private yards.

Now, this sounds entirely reasonable on its face. It seems to be a proper and fair distribution of work between the naval shipyards and the private shipyards.

But it is one of those pictures that is very much better on its face than it is when you dig down a little below the surface.

I do not care what percentages would be imposed by the Appropriations Committee. I do not care whether it is 65 percent as against 35 percent—or 75 percent as against 25 percent—or 10 percent as against 90 percent. The fact is that any rigid percentage figures in themselves constitute a disservice to the proper functioning of our naval ship program.

The minute that a percentage figure is imposed on the Secretary of the Navy, he loses his discretion.

And what is wrong with his loss of discretion?

Just this: When the Secretary of the Navy loses his discretion he loses his opportunity to bargain, and when he cannot bargain, there is only one person who suffers and that is the taxpayer of the United States.

Such a proposal is economically unsound, is philosophically unsound, and is plain, simple, bad business.

I am as anxious as any man on the floor of this House to see to it that our fundamental principles of private enterprise are preserved.

I am just as anxious that the Government not become a provider of subsidies for private shipyards or for private manufacturers or producers of any kind.

I want to go into the marketplace and get the best price I can. That is fundamental in our history and fundamental in our economy.

If I am limited as to what store I can trade at, then I lose all of my ability to bargain, to walk a few steps farther and get what I want a few cents cheaper.

Or in this case, a few million dollars cheaper.

There are only a limited number of adequately equipped private shipyards within the United States which are capable of performing the kind of work that we are talking about here.

If they know that they are going to get a great influx of work—more than they have ever had from the Navy before—they are going to sit back in their big chairs with the widest smiles on their faces that you ever saw. And they are just going to let the money roll in.

They do not even have to work for the money because the competitive aspect of ship conversion, repair, and alteration has been eliminated.

All right, that is the economics of the situation. And I want to repeat that I do not care what the percentages are. The basic philosophy is unsound. It imposes exactly the kind of rigidity which we have always opposed in this country in our economic dealings.

As a matter of practical fact in the area of new ship construction, private shipyards have traditionally gotten the lion's share—going as high as 100 percent.

The lowest in recent years was in 1953 when the private shipyards still got more than the naval shipyards but in that very low year, all they got was 54 percent. Normally, new construction runs better than 70 percent in private shipyards.

Of course, we are here in this bill talking about conversion, alteration, and repair to ships. But the whole picture is not clear unless we see what the private shipyards are getting today in the way of shipwork.

It does not make much difference what the work is—the dollars are just the same.

Now, a few more practical considerations.

Naval shipyards cannot be properly compared with private shipyards. They might look the same to a layman but they are very different, indeed, from a private shipyard. They have highly specific and complex functions that private shipyards do not have, do not need, and from an economic standpoint, do not want. Naval shipyards have a higher overhead than private shipyards—and for a very good reason.

They must keep a steady number of key, highly trained personnel who perform functions that are performed only in naval shipyards. These functions relate to battle damage, expensive and intricate repairs, and alterations which a private shipyard is not designed to perform.

And if we force this kind of work into private shipyards, we will pay for it. And we will pay for it by tremendously increased costs.

Special personnel will have to be hired by the private shipyard; special equipment will have to be installed in the private shipyard; special training will have to be given to shipyard personnel.

There is no one on this floor who believes that the private shipyards are going to absorb these additional costs. How will these additional costs be paid for? Higher contract prices—or in the alternative, by direct subsidies to the private shipyards.

Here is a situation that I can easily visualize. Side by side are a private shipyard and a naval shipyard. In the naval shipyard, there are today all of the special skills and special equipment. Next door is the private shipyard with none of these things.

Along comes a requirement that this conversion, repair, and alteration go into the private shipyard. What happens? We duplicate the facilities of the naval shipyard in the private shipyard.

And when I say "we," I mean you and me and every taxpayer in America.

It simply makes no sense.

Also—and this is a very important consideration—at the naval shipyards are facilities for the officers and men of the ship. Facilities to house them, feed them, and take care of them during the time the ship is being altered or repaired.

Now, private shipyards do not have these facilities. So what is the result? The officers and men must go out on the local economy and find a place to live, and a place to eat.

In addition to these considerations is the fact that naval families tend to reside in the home port area of the particular ship.

There waiting are the wives and children of the sailors. The sailors have been at sea on a long cruise. Now there is the opportunity for the family to be together again. This is part of the career—these visits with the family during the periods of vessel repair and alteration.

This is an expected thing.

But now—where do we find ourselves? The family is on the east coast and the ship is being repaired on the west coast. But even if it were only a distance of 100 miles, much the same disruption of family life would be involved.

I think we all agree that we have some obligation to our military personnel—at least the obligation not to disrupt their family life any more than is reasonably necessary. In the case of the Navy, this disruption is a necessary part of their career. Let us keep it to a reasonable minimum.

Another consideration is the fact that when repair and alteration is done in a naval shipyard, the crews are right there. The crews watch and observe and study the work that is being done on the vessel.

They—the crew—are going to have to live with these changes at sea, perhaps under very extreme circumstances. They have got to know how to make repairs at sea. They have got to be familiar with these changes that are being made in their vessel.

And I am talking about intricate, complex changes in electronic equipment, in fire-control systems, and in all sorts of complicated devices that are on our modern ships.

Everything that I am saying is based on sound facts. Economics have their place in any operation of this kind but even if the economics did dictate that more work go into private yards, there are very substantial military reasons why the current practices should be continued.

For example, there is a real danger that there will be a period while the private yards are attempting to get the capability to handle this new and different kind of work during which the military readiness of the fleet will be endangered by lack of the kind of logistic support which has always been immediately available.

Furthermore, key private yards could be paralyzed by strikes. It has happened before.

Most private yards do not have the pier and crane capacity, the depth of water, the dry docks, and the electronic and guided missile repair capacity that are absolutely essential for modern warships.

As I said before, this capacity would have to be provided and we know it will not be provided by anyone but the U.S. Government, either through higher contract prices or from subsidies.

And of course, since only a few private yards have the basic capability—and I am talking about depth of water, piers, cranes, and things of that kind—these yards would be preselected. And what does this mean?

It means that the Navy is forced into negotiated contracts, and we all know what this means. It means one very simple thing. No competition, and no competition means higher prices.

One other inevitable effect is that about 5,000 naval shipyard personnel would lose their jobs. And this is more than the mere loss of 5,000 people. These 5,000 naval civilians still have to make a living and so they will be scattered throughout industry and when we see—and we will see—the error of our ways, these highly trained people will no longer be available.

We want to see private shipyards flourish.

We want to see private shipyards make money.

We do not want to see private shipyards flourish and make money at the expense of military readiness and at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Just let me make this point and let me read one of the provisos that is, to my mind, objectionable. It reads:

> *Provided*, That not more than $311,740,000 may be used for the repair and alteration of naval vessels in naval shipyards.

Now the total amount of money in the budget for the repair and alteration of naval vessels, including the Military Sea Transportation Service, is $479,662,000, and the $311,740,000 represents 65 percent of that larger sum.

Now the way I read this amendment is that the Appropriations Committee is directing that 35 percent of this work go into private shipyards.

Not so long ago on the floor of the House some members of the Appropriations Committee raised very serious questions about the word "direct." They objected to it very strenuously.

Apparently it makes quite a bit of difference as to who is doing the "directing," the Armed Services Committee or the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I am sure the gentleman has checked the figures for fiscal 1963 compared with fiscal 1962 under this limitation. Assuming that he has, he will find that under this limitation the Navy yards will get $24 million more work than they did or are getting in fiscal 1962.

Mr. VINSON. Well, I am giving a 10-year average in order to show how it has been allocated and has been going on, taking into consideration all three of them—new construction, conversion and repair. Here are the figures:

[In percent]

	Naval shipyards	Private shipyards
New construction	29	71
Conversion	89	11
Alteration and repair	80	20

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important subject, and let me say this: I am not disturbed about the threat that the gentleman from Michigan made with reference to a rollcall vote so as to see who stands up for private enterprise, and who stands up for Government operations. My record, I think, demonstrates conclusively that no man in the House of Representatives has done more to bring about elimination of Government in fields in which it had no business than I. So, let us have a rollcall on this, and let us stand up for what we think is right. Let us stand up and say that we are not going to adopt today a policy of "direction," when we refused to adopt a policy of "direction" a few days ago.

Mr. Chairman, what does the committee do? The committee wrote a magnificent report. They said this:

> The committee does not fully endorse the position taken by the representatives of private shipbuilding interests, who appeared before the committee, that the vast majority of the repair, alteration, and conversion work in this program be channeled into private yards. Nor does it fully agree with the Navy that the present method used to allocate work to public yards rather than private yards is proper.

Now, what do they suggest we do? Listen to this:

> The entire problem of the utilization of shipyard facilities is a matter for intensive study by the Department of Defense and the Navy with a view toward working out a realistic, practical, and economical approach to the utilization of this capability in a manner commensurate with the best interest of the Government. The committee will expect the Secretary of Defense to cause such a study to be made and the results thereof made available to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate prior to the consideration of the fiscal year 1964 budget estimates.

Mr. Chairman, in view of that and in view of the fact that this is only a 1-year limitation, why not wait and see what the study concludes, and then base action on these conclusions? They are asking for a study. They recommend a study. Yet at the same time, and before the study is made, they write into the law what they think is the proper allocation of work with reference to the private yards, and to the public yards. Why bother to have the study? The decision has been made.

Now, I say the sensible and commonsense way to approach this matter is this: Make the study and, after the Appropriations Committee has had an opportunity to study what it discloses, to write these findings into the law. The horse and the cart are then in the proper order.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. The proposed dollar allocation even under the amendment for fiscal 1963 for repair, alteration and conversion, is greater than it is in the current year.

Mr. VINSON. That may be true.

Mr. FORD. And therefore the amendment does not do any harm whatsoever to the Navy shipyards.

Mr. VINSON. That may be true. But the principle is unsound.

The gentleman has pointed out that he was not satisfied with the situation. Therefore, the gentleman is trying to commit us to figures with which right here, in your report, the gentleman says he is not satisfied. I say that sensible men should try to act in a sensible manner, and let us have this study and let us see what it discloses. If it discloses what the committee thinks it will disclose, then write the proper language in the next appropriation bill. But not in this one.

Mr. FORD. There will be no harm done to the program in fiscal year 1963 under this limitation. What is the difficulty with putting a limitation in the bill if we can save money and help a taxpaying industry.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ANFUSO. Is it not a fact that very few private yards are capable of doing repair work within a certain limit of time?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. ANFUSO. And if that is so, Mr. Chairman, would not this cause many layoffs in Government enterprise and eventually affect our national security which, to my mind, is even more important than private enterprise?

Mr. VINSON. If this amendment goes through, this is what will happen. The Secretary of the Navy was in my office this morning at 8:30 and he advised me that there would be 5,000 Navy workers laid off in the shipyards of this country. I say that this is not the sensible way to approach this matter. The sensible way to approach this is to have this study and then decide what to do when the study is completed.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, let me correct him, if I may. Under this limitation the dollar amount in the next fiscal year will be more, not less, than they have this year. I ask the gentleman, how can you lay off x number of people in such a situation? It just does not follow.

Mr. VINSON. The Secretary advised me this morning——

Mr. FORD. With all due deference to the Secretary, he has not looked at the figures if he makes that kind of statement.

Mr. VINSON. That is the very reason for the study. You are asking the committee to act upon this matter now. The effect of these provisions is to require that not more than 65 percent of the conversion, repair and alteration of naval vessels be performed in naval shipyards. This sounds entirely reasonable on its face.

It seems to be proper and fair—the distribution of work between the navy shipyards and the private shipyards. But we must dig down a little under the surface. I do not care what the percentage figure is. As I said I do not care what the percentage is, 65 percent or 35 percent or 50–50 or 75 percent or 25 percent or 10 percent, the facts are that a rigid percentage figure constitutes a disservice to the proper functioning of our naval shipbuilding program. This is the point I want to make. The minute that a percentage figure is imposed on the Secretary of the Navy, he loses discretion; he has no discretion, and when you have no discretion you have no bargaining power.

Let us look at this picture. Here are 35 percent of these ships that must go into the industrial yards. The industrial yards will not even have to compete, because they know that 35 percent of the work will come to them. So what do they do? Why, as I say, under this law they know they are going to get 35 percent and do not have to compete at all. The Secretary cannot take but 65 percent for the navy yards. The private shipbuilder knows that he has 35 percent that he is going to build. He knows that he is going to get these contracts, and up goes the price on the contracts.

Mr. Chairman, as we are going to have some amendments to offer, here is another thing to think of. What about strikes? Let me tell you about that. What about strikes in the navy yards?

What about strikes in the industrial yards?

You do not have any strikes in Government yards. Recently the great Quincy Navy Yard, the Bethlehem yard, had 11 ships that were being built. A very long strike took place there. Now think about it. If you send these ships that have been damaged in action, or in any fashion, to an industrial yard and a strike occurs, it slows down your whole program.

What about the facilities when you repair the ships? In every one of these navy yards they have quarters for the crew while the job is being repaired. In an industrial yard you do not have them at all.

I say we are getting along fine, we are doing a magnificent job. We are for private enterprise, we are for the private yards, but let the Secretary continue to allocate them just as he has, and you will get competition. The industrial yards that are qualified to do this work will get their share and without any subsidy from the Government. A great many of them do not have the trained personnel for repair, alteration and conversion of naval vessels. A great many of them do not have the facilities. Therefore, somebody will have to pay for it either by raising the contract price or direct subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, I propose tomorrow to offer amendments striking these two provisos out of the bill. I welcome a rollcall vote on it, and I will be happy to discuss this matter in detail later.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the chairman of our Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], for his understanding and devoted leadership in connection with the responsible task of determining the vast requirements of our vital Defense Establishment. It has been a privilege for me and a valued opportunity to serve as a member of this subcommittee, and with the passing of each year I am increasingly conscious of the great contribution he has made toward the development and the maintenance of a defense posture second to none in this troubled world.

Each and every member of our subcommittee, I believe, deserves a word of tribute for their untiring and unstinting efforts throughout the long period of our hearings on the defense budget, particularly for their individual and collective understanding of the vast and far-reaching problems and operations associated with such a large establishment as our Defense Department and the respective military services.

In that connection, no one deserves more credit than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], who served as the ranking minority member of this important subcommittee. May I say that he is thorough and commands a keen grasp and knowledge of the many aspects of our military function, its management, as well as the many important programs and weapon systems. I am proud to be associated with this subcommittee, and I regard it with a high sense of satisfaction. During the 3½ months of our hearings on this nearly $48 billion Defense appropriation bill, 6 volumes or more than 3,500 pages of testimony were taken by the committee.

Generally speaking, this is a sound and adequate bill and I believe it will continue to provide for an excellent state of readiness. Although this appropriation constitutes a new high for peacetime military defense, and I want to repeat that because it is important to know that this bill constitutes a new high for peacetime military defense, however, we are, in my humble judgment, doing the right thing. It can be said that in no sense are we "rocking the boat." As our chairman has so well pointed out, "it would be an indication of weakness to reduce this appropriation by any sizable amount."

Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the tremendous responsibility that rests on our Nation's shoulders, particularly as it relates to the security and preservation of the free world. Our overall balance of forces, our terrific striking power, our capability to retaliate and destroy any enemy who may decide to attack us constitutes the greatest deterrent to an all-out nuclear war. Let there be no mistake about it. Our strength is our security and a deterrent to war. We have in the past possessed that superior posture and there is every indication today that we shall continue to hold first place in this world struggle. Our know-how coupled with the development and possession of a weapons system second to none, mobile and deployed throughout the world, gives us a devastating striking power that any enemy must calculate with and respect. Yet, we must also be aware that it remains a challenge, and I might add a costly one. It is bound to be a heavy drain on our resources and a constant burden on our Nation. Mr. Chairman, until and unless, a meaningful arms control and disarmament agreement can be reached, we have no alternative but to maintain a military capability and might that commands the recognition and the respect of the Communist world. I believe that our continued superiority will play an important role in the realization of any arms agreement that might ultimately be entered into. As has been pointed out, this new high defense appropriation bill of nearly $48 billion is $1,344 million over that of last year. Yet, it is only fair to point out that defense spending has not increased percentagewise to the same degree as compared to the nondefense expenditures of our Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I would venture to predict that defense costs will level off during the foreseeable years ahead at approximately the level that is provided for in this 1963 defense appropriation bill.

As our report discloses, the defense programs for this year were presented to us in terms of military missions which they are designed to serve and the Defense Department has provided us with long-range projection of these programs for a period of the next 5 years. Both of these innovations proved helpful to your committee and we certainly commend the Defense Department for utilizing this procedure.

In summarizing this 1963 appropriation for defense, we are dividing it into four major parts and the funds are allocated in this way. For example, in the overall $48 billion defense programs, military personnel alone takes some $13 billion.

That is the overall financial support for our military personnel which requires $13 billion for all branches of the services. Operation and maintenance, which is no small item in the functioning of our Military Establishment, requires as you will note in our report, $11.5 billion.

Procurement, that is procurement of weapons, yes, our entire weapons system including missiles, aircraft, ships, tanks and many other phases of our entire military force, amounts to about $16.5 billion.

Last, but not least, is the area of research, development, test, and evaluation packaged together under one phase of our overall defense operation and that general field totals about $6.8 billion. If you divide this total $48 billion defense appropriation by services, Mr. Chairman, it shows up something like this:

The Army is allocated for the support of their program, a total $11,500 million.

The Navy receives in this 1963 defense appropriation, a total of $15 billion and the Air Force is allocated some $19 billion.

All other related defense agencies amount to a total of $2 billion.

On page 6 of our committee report, Mr. Chairman, you will find an excellent table which clearly discloses a breakdown of the major military programs and their relationship in terms of dollars to military personnel, operations, and maintenance, procurement, and research and development, tests and evaluations.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct a few moments to the subject of military personnel. In this particular area you will note that this budget provides for a total of 2,684,000 uniformed personnel on active duty, plus a total of 740,000 civilian employees under the overall planned program.

And I might point out that no provision is made in this bill to cover the recall of Reserve components beyond the period of July 1 of this year. Directives have already been issued for the release of all recalled reservists not later than some time in August, and a recent order calls for the release of the Navy and Air Force reservists by the end of the current fiscal year, namely, July 1.

Our committee did propose higher strength levels for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserves than that provided for in the budget as submitted by the administration. The budget requests for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserves call for levels of 367,000 for the National Guard and 275,000 for the Army Reserves.

It has been pointed out previously, but I desire to remind you, that we have included funds in this bill to maintain the National Guard at a 400,000-man level and the Reserves of the Army at a 300,000-man level.

An important and costly aspect of our military responsibility is that of retired pay. I wonder how many are aware of the fact that our annual appropriation for this obligation, retired pay on an annual basis has passed the billion-dollar mark.

It is estimated within a period of many years it will reach a $3 or $4 billion obligation annually.

Time will not permit a complete description of our overall missile and strategic strength and that of the armament program as envisioned in this appropriation bill. Suffice it to say, we have missiles of every conceivable type operational today, missiles which have a capability of operating from air-to-air, air-to-ground, and ground-to-air, intercontinental missiles, intermediate-range missiles, and otherwise, in the Army, in the Navy, in the Marine Corps, and in the Air Force. All of the services are equipped and are now maintaining a missile force.

As our report indicates, Mr. Chairman, we will have over 1,000 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles, plus 650 Polaris missiles by 1967. Four additional Minuteman squadrons are funded in this bill. These ICBM missiles brings our total forces to 800 hardened and dispersed missiles. And, too, Mr. Chairman, we are providing for the completion of 13 Atlas squadrons and 12 Titan squadrons in this overall missile program.

In connection with our strategic retaliatory forces, it is interesting to note that we will have during the same period of time over 700 long-range bombers, such as the B-58 and B-52. These supersonic bombers are being equipped with the so-called Hound Dog and Skybolt missiles which have a long-range target capability. In other words, we have literally hundreds of supersonic bombers equipped to launch a missile from midair to a target many, many miles away.

The RS-70 program has been discussed heretofore, and I shall not deal with this particular phase of the program because I believe in the first instance our report clearly points out the situation as it exists today, as well as the reasoning behind the committee's decision to provide a considerable amount of funds in this bill over and above the original budget request.

I should like, Mr. Chairman, to take a moment, if I may, to speak about the fantastic Polaris atomic submarine and its place in our overall weapon system and its great and important part in the defense and security of this Nation.

As you all know, the Polaris atomic submarine is equipped with missiles—mobile and fast nuclear submarines capable of firing ballistic missiles from the depths of the ocean, into the atmosphere, then into outer space, to a target from 1,500 to 2,500 miles away.

I thought you might be interested to know that 35 of these atomic Polaris submarines have been funded up to now; 29 have been built or are under construction; 6 more are added by this bill, and 6 additional atomic Polaris submarines are funded insofar as long lead items are concerned.

Yes, in addition to that, we have in this bill 8 additional atomic-powered nuclear submarines, and in the overall program the Navy will have 826 ships in the active fleet, of which 383 are wartime ships.

And, an interesting and important aspect of this defense and naval operation is one which is known to us as antisubmarine warfare. We know today that the Soviet Union and the Communist world have literally hundreds of submarines of one kind or another roving the seven seas. Our committee has been increasingly concerned with the need and the importance of developing greater antisubmarine potential and capability and the development of additional means to combat such a threat and menace. We are happy to say that the Defense Department, and more particularly the Navy, has recently placed the antisubmarine warfare program under single management, with a director heading this program. We believe it is reasonable to say that real and effective progress is being made in this important field of our defense insofar as submarine warfare is concerned.

The Navy in its testimony before our committee impressed upon us that the mission of the Navy is the control of the seas. They claim that they have that control and that in our great power and strength and with all the weapons systems and the outstanding developments that have taken place, we have outstripped any potential enemy in this important field.

I might add that I was privileged within a matter of the last few days to witness, along with other Members of the Congress, naval maneuvers of the Atlantic Fleet which took place off the coast of North Carolina. The aircraft carrier operation with their bombers, with their antisubmarine warfare operations, with their missiles from planes in the air, with the amphibious operations of Marines was an impressive sight. It clearly established the capability of our Navy in dealing with these aspects of our defense. As I understand it, a certain need for aircraft carriers and other weapons systems, including ships, exists in the South Pacific and the Indian Ocean area of the world. And, I am sure as we recognize our great mobility that our operations not only at sea but our bases otherwise throughout the world, with our balanced forces, with our terrific weapons systems, weapons of great potential and a great striking capability, whether it be bombers, bombers with missiles, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and other strategic weapons represents the greatest known strength and might, all of which, is essential to peace, essential to our security, and essential to the preservation of the free world.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this Defense appropriation bill for 1963 might well be regarded as the most important measure and appropriation bill to come before the House of Representatives this year because it constitutes the life blood of our security, and I do believe that we have provided adequately and generously. I further believe we have provided essentially, and that this program will give us the potential necessary for progress and development of weapons heretofore unknown. We must be supreme in might and in know-how.

Research and development, the progressive stages of these weapons is vital to our keeping ahead and remaining ahead in this troubled world.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to what has been said about a steel contract which was awarded last Friday. Now, I am a strong advocate of competitive bidding. My colleagues know that. I am not expert on this present situation which has been discussed. However, I am told by the Department of the Navy that there is a requirement for a special type of steel that in this special procurement, which is for Polaris submarines, a long leadtime item, only Lukens and United States Steel are suppliers.

Now, the other companies named may have the capability to produce this steel, but they are not now suppliers. Only Lukens and United States Steel are now suppliers. Lukens did not increase its price to the Government. United States Steel did.

Mr. Chairman, this is a long leadtime item for the new-type Polaris submarines. Consequently a contract was awarded.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, would my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], yield?

Mr. SIKES. Of course.

Mr. FORD. Previous procurements of this steel have been by competitive bidding—sealed invitations for bids. It is most unusual that that system which has worked successfully should be abandoned under these circumstances.

Mr. SIKES. The $6 increase in the price of steel to the public which must come out of the taxpayers' pockets is also unusual.

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman will yield further, we did not know that would have been the case, because no bids were invited by the Navy and consequently no proposals were submitted under the regular competitive bidding situation.

Mr. SIKES. I think the situation is clear on the surface. It speaks for itself. The Government is fully justified in making such a saving. I should like to point out, too, that certain exceptions to the law on competitive bidding are permitted. One is under requirements for defense. This exception was followed when a noncompetitive contract was awarded to Lukens.

Mr. Chairman, some serious charges have been made in this matter, and a hearing has been requested. I think that a hearing is indicated. I think it will serve a useful purpose. But I do think my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. FORD], will agree that there are two sides to the question.

Mr. Chairman, now let me get to my subject. At the outset let me say that in my opinion, we have one of the strongest teams ever assembled at the level of the Secretariat in the Department of Defense. This is reflected in the aggressive manner with which defense problems are met all along the line. Secretary McNamara has shown an amazing ability to grasp the broad and complex details of the huge establishment which he runs. When he came before this subcommittee early in the year, he brought with him for presentation to the committee, the most complete document that I have seen developed within the Department of Defense. He spent an entire week before the committee explaining the Defense Department's program, its capabilities and its requirement, and I do not recall that he at any time had to refer to a backup witness for information with which to answer committee questions. This is almost unbelieveable. As a matter of fact, he left such a complete picture in the minds of his listeners that he nearly killed the rest of the hearings. Much that followed was anticlimax.

Mr. McNamara has been able to insure a degree of coordination, cooperation, and unification that no one else has matched. He has even been able to require the Air Force to fly Navy planes and Marines to fly Army helicopters and, this indeed, is a new high in achievement. Someone has said that the individual services are so angry with the Secretary that they are forgetting to fight each other, but the sum of it is that here is a strong man who is pulling the services together and giving America the strongest defense team we have had in many years.

Now I shall not talk generally about the details of the bill and the program which it makes possible. This already has been done. I shall, instead, touch on the number of items which I think should have particular stress. In passing, I want to say that this bill, more than any we have had in a long time, provides for a buildup of general purpose strength. Last year, after long neglect of the field of conventional warfare, we gave particular stress to a buildup in that category. The present bill is one that offers a continuing reinforcement of national defense in both conventional and nuclear capability. We are building up strategic retaliatory forces with long-range bombers, Hound Dog and Skybolt missiles; Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman missiles; and Polaris submarines. At the same time, conventional capability is being built up and regular forces are being strengthened to deal with the limited war situations in which we currently are engaged and are likely to remain engaged for a long time. Airlift and sealift forces are being modernized and airlift forces in particular are being expanded. This has been another area of very serious deficit. All of this adds up to a costly program but an essential program, for it is this solid buildup in all categories of America's defense effort which is making Mr. Khrushchev easier to talk to.

Now I want to be doubly sure that the House understands what we are doing in the field of the RS-70. The Department of Defense had proposed that three airframes be built so that there would be complete testing of this new concept of a 2,000-mile-an-hour reconnaissance strike aircraft. Because of the extreme cost in building this entirely new aircraft, with new design, new engineering and new materials problems necessitating years of experimentation prior to perfection, it was felt unwise by the Department of Defense to spend the additional money necessary to have an RS-70 plus its complete operating weapons system. By the time this plane is ready for operation with the forces, there is always the possibility that it will be obsolete and of no significant military value. However, that is a risk we take with all new weapons.

The SAC bomber today, which was developed years ago, continues to be the backbone of our retaliatory capability. The various missile systems which are so prominent in the news have never been tested in war. They may or may not function according to plan. Yet it is almost certain they will function according to plan. It is also very likely that there will continue to be a need for aircraft at the time the RS-70 is perfected. Consequently, this committee believes that the development of the weapons system which will make the RS-70 functional as a military weapon should proceed simultaneously with the airframe itself. This is in keeping with the thinking of the Committee on Armed Services.

Questioning by our committee revealed that the Department of Defense anticipates it can successfully use some $52 or $53 million over and above budget estimates in the development of new improved side-looking radar and photographic equipment and new missiles which can be carried within the aircraft. Present-day equipment is inadequate for the requirements of the RS-70. Present-day missiles which are mounted externally on SAC bombers would burn up in the atmosphere at the great speed at which the RS-70 will travel. So additional funds are provided. Actually it should be said our position is something of a compromise between the original proposal of the Armed Services Committee for the full development of six RS-70 aircraft with complete weapons systems, and the present budget proposal for three airframes plus limited development on the weapons system.

Nike-Zeus is another area of question and controversy. I recall a number of years ago when America was stunned by Russia's achievement in putting the first satellite into space. In the hearings which this committee held in an effort to stimulate and speed up America's lagging satellite program, it was brought out that Wernher von Braun's work at the Redstone Arsenal would have permitted us to place a satellite in orbit a year ahead of the Russians had he and his team received the necessary backing. It was this team which, when given the go-ahead, placed a satellite in orbit some months after the Russians—the same satellite that he had proposed originally to orbit ahead of the Russians. In those hearings, Dr. von Braun said that given the go-ahead a Nike-Zeus could be developed which would be effective against intercontinental ballistic missiles. He has maintained continuously that years could be saved in the development of an anti-ICBM capability if production were initiated simultaneously with research and testing.

This program years later carries no funds for production. We are still testing the Nike-Zeus. This year's budget will implement tests which are planned in the South Pacific against missiles fired under conditions approximating those which will exist in war. These will be the most realistic tests of the Nike-Zeus ever undertaken. The Department of Defense is not convinced that the costly Nike-Zeus system will provide sufficient safeguard to the people, the homes, the defenses, and the industries of America to justify production. Current tests on Nike-Zeus are very promising and missiles have been destroyed in flight with this weapon.

But, the Department of Defense says that the controlled conditions of testing done thus far do not provide a realistic answer to the capability of Nike-Zeus to meet a salvo of missiles accompanied by decoys and chaff which will make selectivity extremely difficult. The Army is just as insistent that it can lick all of these problems and that by spending 172 or so millions now on production, we can save 4 years in achieving a realistic defense against ICBM's. We know the Russians are working hard in this field. We think they are following the same course that we are following. We do not think that they are significantly ahead of us. We have no highly promising substitute for Nike-Zeus. We may be missing the boat by failing to begin production now. Another year should tell us much more and perhaps we will not have lost time that is invaluable. But we will have lost invaluable time if the Russians achieve a realistic defense against ICBM's ahead of us. That would provide a breakthrough very costly to our security.

It is the field of the Reserve components that I want to discuss in detail. We have encountered the same proposals for cutbacks in the Reserve components that have confronted us for years. This, despite the fact that the essentiality of the Reserve components has never been more strikingly evidenced than was true in the peacetime callup last year when the Reserves were needed to strengthen the Regular Forces at the time of the Berlin crisis. The Department of Defense has been highly laudatory of the contributions of the Reserve components and of the reservists themselves during this period. I realize that criticisms have been launched against the manner in which the reservists were uitilized in some areas. But, the fact remains that they constituted bodies in uniform and added impressively to our total strength. This is the thing that our enemies see and this is much more important than shortcomings which others portray and which in any big program will always be present.

The current recommendation for a decrease in strength in Reserve components is accompanied by a proposal for a reorganization of the Reserve components. It is not for Congress to say whether there should be a reorganization or how it shall be effected. The organization of the Reserve components should always be that which provides the greatest support to the regular forces and reorganization in keeping with new concepts of warfare is justifiable. We also are assured that there will be a more realistic effort to properly equip the Reserve components. Historically, the Reserve components have had to take what is left over and some of them got little in the way of equipment. A realistic program of reorganization is fully acceptable provided it is meaningful and provided modern equipment is procured and made available at the same time.

The reduction in numbers in the Reserve components is another matter. The ink with which the proposed reorganization was written is scarcely dry on the Pentagon papers. As a matter of fact, it has been in frenzied formulation during these recent weeks. It probably will be changed to a considerable extent before it is made operational. At best, months are going to be required for its implementation. This is not a time for reorganization plus a reduction in personnel. We know that the reservists are, if world conditions permit, going to be returned within a few months to their homes. The majority of them will go back into their Reserve units. It is inappropriate to express our appreciation for a year of service by sending men back to units which no longer exist. During the time required for reorganization there should not be the further chaos of reduction in personnel. And, there is nothing to indicate that there is a lessening requirement for a strong overall defense, of which reservists are an essential part, at the time this bill is written. Next year may bring another story. But, we should cross next year's bridges when we get to them.

I think all the Members of this body—and of the other body—are committed to continuance of our Reserve programs. The cost of the Reserves is a small fraction of our defense cost; yet the Reserves are as vital to our national survival as any other element of our defense structure.

All of us will be pleased that the committee has seen fit again to include sufficient funds to preserve the present strength of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard. This requires a relatively small addition to the budget as submitted by the Pentagon. Yet this addition is vital to the maintenance of a sound defense posture and a modern, trained, equipped Reserve Force in the Army.

We note with some misgivings that the same degree of support is not accorded the Navy and the Air Force Reserve. I consider this is because the Pentagon had not fully informed the committee, that its members did not insist upon restoring cuts which had been imposed in these programs.

Proportionately, these cutbacks were greater than those proposed for the Army Reserve and Army National Guard. Yet the cuts have been so gradual, over several years, that the impact was not fully felt until now.

In both the Naval Reserve and Air Force Reserve, there has been for several years, a continuing erosion of strength. In my opinion, this represents a danger to our country. The costs of correction would be minor and should be appropriated.

The Naval Reserve has suffered consistent erosion in the following line items:

First. The Selected Reserve—48 paid drills, 15 days active duty for training:

Mobilization requirements	155,000
Secretary of Defense and congressional authorization	135,000
Proposed 1963 budget	122,488

This program covers the Naval Surface Reserve and the Naval Air Reserve.

These are the reservists who are organized for instant mobilization to augment the fleet and to provide air and surface ASW forces. The history of the gradual erosion is as follows:

1960 budget	130,000
1961 budget	127,500
1962 budget	125,000
1963 budget (proposed)	122,488

Second. Category D training—Nondrill pay program—15 days active duty for training with pay:

Officers in program	24,000
1960 budget	10,259
1961 budget	7,645
1962 budget	2,700
1963 budget (proposed)	2,700

This program represents the only paid training—2 weeks' active duty— received by officers in the specialists component—naval research, and so forth—and young officers who are fresh from the fleet and who cannot join the Selected Reserve. Our particular concern relates to the younger officers. These officers are products of the various officer procurement programs who have had from 2 to 5 years' active duty in the fleet. All of them are competent. Some of them have been heads of departments on such complicated ships as the new fleet destroyers. If they can go to sea for 2 weeks each year, they will retain their competence. If they cannot, they will soon become useless as naval officers and will lose interest and be lost to the Navy.

In our view, this cut is shortsighted economy and is a waste of real talent trained at considerable expense.

In 1961 the Congress enacted an appropriation for Reserve personnel, Navy of $88 million. Immediately upon receipt of the appropriation, the Bureau of the Budget impounded $2 million. The Defense Department Comptroller almost equalled the speed of the Bureau of the Budget in holding back an additional $2 million. The Navy forced to curtail its plans to fit the reduced apportionments and it followed that obligations and expenditures were reduced and approximately $4 million were not used. This served to form a new and lower plateau for the 1962 appropriation which was reduced to approximately $84 million. The 1963 budget has been reduced again and the net decrease for the Naval Reserve amounts to $1,400,000.

To bring this program back to its authorized strength would cost approximately $4½ million.

The House Appropriations Committee has usually given the Navy exactly what it asked for in its Naval Reserve budget. The reductions have come about through impoundments and reduced apportionments which have gradually cut this program down to its proposed strength of 122,488 men.

It should be noted that by next August, the Navy's selected Reserve will undoubtedly have on board approximately 122,000 men. There were 130,000 on board when the recall went into effect. This will mean that those splendid reservists who responded immediately to the recall and who have performed so effectively without complaint will be denied entry into the selected Reserve program when they are released to inactive duty and if they are placed in the program, others who are now in it will have to be eliminated in order to make room for them.

The Reserve personnel budget for the Air Force Reserve has also been subjected to seemingly slight reductions in the defense appropriations bill over the past several years. These reductions while appearing to be so small as to hardly be noticeable, have partially hamstrung the Air Force Reserve program, particularly in view of the added mission inherent in the activation of Air Force Recovery Groups and Squadrons throughout the country. The legislative history shows that the fiscal year 1961 and 1962 appropriations in this area were $54 million each year. In 1962 the budget request was held at $52 million—although the Congress added $4 million which the Department of Defense did not allocate to the Air Force for their use. This year the budget request has again been reduced to $50.1 million.

It is not necessary for me to go into detail on the appropriations required to support the Air Force in developing and proving the capability of the recovery units. It is apparent, however, that the current restrictions in the proposed Department of Defense budget—allocating $8.3 million in Reserve personnel funds and 20,000 drill pay spaces to the recovery program—which means 50 percent manning and only 24 drills, will merely smother a program which really needs a spark to show its merits. If the program is worthwhile—and we believe it and believe the Congress believes it—the full requirements for fiscal year 1963 are an additional $6.7 million. This would provide an additional 12,000 drill pay spaces and 48 drills for all personnel assigned to this mission.

These are problems which have been disregarded too long.

Mr. Chairman, I now call attention of the membership to a number of items in the report that I think deserve special consideration. One is a weakness in the modernization program of naval aircraft shown on page 185, volume 4 of the hearings.

One is the inclusion of funds to implement the work of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice on page 33 of the report. Another is the stress on competitive procurement and industry cost-sharing, both of which are carried on page 35 of the report. Still another is the mention on page 50 of the report of the increase in the funding for the Chemical Biological Warfare effort of the Nation. I would like to place emphasis not contained in this report on the significance of the contributions of this agency to the Nation's health programs. The hearings carry much more detail, and is shown beginning on page 170, volume 6 of the hearings. Members will do well to read this. There is one point in particular which should not escape our scrutiny. If we should achieve an agreement on nuclear disarmament, the Russians are certain to stress capability in other fields of warfare. They have a significant capability in the field of CBR—much greater than our corresponding defense capability.

All in all this bill does not carry a great many changes in the recommendations made by the Department of Defense, but that is because the recommendations of the Department of Defense are among the soundest and most impressive that we have noted for a long time.

It does carry a significant advancement in our defense capability—and even in this enlightened age—in the year of our Lord, 1962, a strong defense is the only sure and certain way to preserve this wonderful institution which is America.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to comment on the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Michigan in presenting this bill to us today. I am sure it is the unanimous opinion of the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee that we insist that our country continue to carry forward a policy which will lead to victory, a win policy. There are certain things, however, that have come up during the past month, yes, the past year, which have led me to question just what kind of policy we are pursuing as a nation.

Yesterday I was concerned to read in the New York Times of the new State Department master strategy plan which is under study in the White House. On the front page of the New York Times of yesterday is a story with a Washington dateline which discusses for the first time in the public press a heretofore secret report which has been prepared under the direction of Mr. Walter W. Rostow, Counselor and Chairman of the Planning Council of the State Department.

This particular document which I requested some time ago through the professional staff of our Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, was refused and our staff was advised that this particular document would not be available for the deliberations of our committee because it was secret in nature. During the course of the hearings which have gone on since early January, our committee has received all secret and top secret information about the defense plans of our Nation as approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense. Now the State Department has moved in to downgrade the victory policy of our Defense Department. They classify it secret and refuse to produce it. One has to go to the public press for its alarming recommendations.

At no time has any member of the committee violated security on the information which has been given to our committee. I do not feel the Rostow report should have been withheld from consideration by members of our Defense appropriations committee. There must be some reason for this action but as of this date no explanation has been offered.

The New York Times story reveals for the first time some basic State Department recommendations for changing this nations defense strategy. The changes recommended by the Rostow report should be first reviewed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Defense Department before the White House adopts this new strategy.

We have to have the will and the determination, we have to lend credibility to the power which we have today if we are truly going forward with a victory policy in this cold war with international communism.

There are several sections of this bill which I should like to discuss for a few moments.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE

During the hearings on the bill we went into the call to active service of the National Guard, the 49th and 32d Divisions. We also took testimony on the Reserve Units, which were called into active service by the President late last summer and early last fall.

Mr. Chairman, on Wednesday, April 11, the President announced that the release of Army National Guard units and Army Reserve units now on active duty would commence next August.

In commenting upon the release of the reservists on active duty, he said that the release was not the result of any marked change in the international situation which continues to have many dangers and tensions. It is the result, rather, of the successful buildup of permanent instead of emergency strength. He continued by stating that the units to be released will remain available in a new and heightened state of combat readiness if a new crisis should arise requiring their further service.

Since that statement was made, I have received a great many letters from National Guardsmen and reservists training with the 32d Infantry Division of the Wisconsin National Guard. Their concern is the President's suggestion that, after having served on active duty for almost 1 year and because their unit has improved its combat potential, that division will be available for immediate recall. The implication here, as they see it, is that in the event of a future emergency cold war crisis arising shortly after their release or at some later period, these National Guardsmen and reservists would again be called upon to serve on active duty. This problem is discussed on page 233, volume 6, of our hearings. The 10 months of training which the 32d and 49th Divisions have had will be in vain if the men resign on return home.

Their concern, I am sure you will agree, is understandable. It would appear here that in defense planning a heavy burden is being placed upon a few while the vast majority of the National Guardsmen and reservists are not being readied to perform active duty service in the event of further emergency.

My concern, as I view this situation, is that the new Department of Defense Reserve policy is tending to place too great an emphasis on the readiness of too few National Guard and Reserve organizations and that by so doing we are not providing for an equal share of the defense burden, but rather we are planning to call again on those who have already just recently served.

This is related directly to the proposed new Department of Defense reorganization of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve which is currently the subject of hearings before a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee.

The Defense Department proposal would be to eliminate a great many of the existing units of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve and to place the emphasis on manpower, equipment and training of a few select divisions and supporting elements, and that these organizations would be expected to carry the burden in future emergencies.

Our committee believes it would be well to maintain these Reserve forces at their present strengths and with the present numbers of organizations. It is necessary to provide for the proper training and equipment of all of these Reserve and Guard forces in order that they might all be available for duty in the event of all-out mobilization. We cannot depend on our Regular Forces to meet mobilization needs. I think that there is ample evidence and precedent demanding that we have in this country a wide mobilization base rather than a small highly ready group of National Guard and Reserve organizations. This is the way we must match the Soviet Union on a manpower basis in the event we are called upon for all-out mobilization.

The Regular Forces must provide the highly ready group to meet cold war crisis situations. I am sure the members of our committee feel that within our present and future programed Regular Forces we have the manpower to meet the challenge of a Cuba, a Laos, or a Vietnam. If we are willing to use our power to preserve peace and prevent aggression we do not need to rely on our National Guard or Reserve Forces to meet crisis situations but can use them properly in the event of all-out mobilization.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. May I express my appreciation for the gentleman's statement. I know many people in the service have the same concern that the gentleman has had in reference to this Reserve situation. The gentleman has made a great contribution in this respect. Can the gentleman tell us something about the cost of calling these Reserves and Guard during this emergency?

Mr. LAIRD. The cost of calling up the Reserves and Guard was set forth in our committee record. The funding that was used to have the Reserves and National Guard called up was in section 512(c) of this bill, which gives to the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense the authority to fund this callup on a deficiency basis.

Thus far the Department of Defense has not submitted a supplemental request or deficiency request in connection with the terms of the 1962 appropriation act. We have estimates on this particular cost. In committee I thought that we should fund this particular program on a line item basis and require the Department of Defense to come up on a line item basis to fund this program completely through August. But, as of this date the Department of Defense has not come up through the Bureau of the Budget with any deficiency request under the terms of section 5-12-c of the 1962 appropriation act, and, of course, has not used the section which we are discussing today.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Thirty-one Members are present; not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 75]

Addonizio
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Andrews
Ashley
Ayres
Baker
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Becker
Boggs
Boykin
Brademas
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Cahill
Celler
Chelf
Chiperfield
Cramer
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Fallon
Fascell
Finnegan
Fino
Friedel
Gallagher
Garland
Garmatz
Gavin
Glenn
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Hays
Hébert
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Horan
Huddleston
Jarman
Jones, Ala.
Kearns
Kee
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kitchin
Lankford
Loser
McDonough
Madden
Mason
Miller, N.Y.
Moeller
Moulder
Murray
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
Patman
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Rains
Riley
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
St. George
Scott
Scranton
Selden
Sheppard
Shipley
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Utt
Weis
Wharton
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Zelenko

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BOLLING, having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11289, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 343 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], shortly before the quorum call, asked for the cost of the Army Reserves and National Guard called up late last summer and fall.

I want to make clear that the Department of Defense has not come forward with these figures from the Bureau of the Budget as yet, but they are expected to do this within the next week or 10 days. So these figures are not Bureau of the Budget requests, but are estimates of the Department of Defense in accordance with the understanding the Department has with our committee.

In fiscal 1962 the cost of the Reserves and National Guard called into active duty, Army personnel account, will be \$213½ million, Army O. & M.; \$139½ million, Army, personnel; making a total cost of \$353 million in the fiscal year 1962. In fiscal 1963 to fund these two National Guard divisions and reserve units through August the cost will be \$111 million, for Army personnel account; \$42 million, Army O. & M. account; or a total cost for the 2 months in fiscal year 1963 of \$153 million. The grand total of the 10-month cost in fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the Army Reserve and National Guard callup is Army personnel account costs of \$324.5 million, Army O. & M. account costs, \$181.5 million, or a total cost for this callup of \$506 million. This \$506 million will fund the National Guard and Reserve units through the cutoff date in August as announced by the President last Wednesday.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon the gentleman from Michigan brought out a very important point. It had to do with the use of competitive bidding in the Department of Defense. Competitive bidding must be done on an open public basis. Costs and reliability must be emphasized.

RELIABILITY MUST BE SPOTLIGHTED

Mr. Chairman, during recent hearings before the House Appropriations Committee, much of the testimony presented emphasized efforts being directed toward procurement of defense materials and supplies at the lowest possible price.

Further, the procurement and contract administration practices and policies currently being followed by many Government agencies, including Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, Treasury Department, General Accounting Office, and the recently established Defense Supply Agency, also emphasize, if not force, procurement at the lowest possible price. This year's hearings are full of statements which give emphasis to price and price alone.

Personally, I am greatly alarmed by this increasing trend which emphasizes price over performance and reliability. I am further concerned by what seems to be a diminishing comprehension of the fact that lowest price is not necessarily synonymous with lowest cost and the fact that initial cost can be substantially different from final or total cost.

To arrive at the point of my remarks, I submit that we are experiencing a trend of unrealistic price buying which in reality is penalizing the taxpayers, the U.S. Government, and American industry, millions of dollars in unnecessary cost.

In these times of rising prices, the American housewife is probably as aware as anyone of how to get true economy with her shopping dollars. Price alone is not enough to induce her to buy even a can of beans. She selects a brand she can rely on to meet her demands for quality at the price level she is willing to pay.

Can we afford to be any less prudent when purchasing the materials and weapon systems that form the basis for the deterrent strength of this country? The answer is obvious. However, there are altogether too many indications that many of our actual procurement practices ignore the obvious truth that sacrificing quality and reliability in the interest of a low price can lead to national disaster.

By now we should be aware that obtaining the performance and accuracy demanded for advanced weapon and space exploration programs is neither simple nor cheap. The Government and industry personnel associated with the recent successful entry into orbit and return of *Friendship 7* spent thousands of man-hours checking and rechecking every detail that could have any bearing on the success of the mission. In spite of this tremendous effort to insure that all components and systems would function properly, troubles did develop in flight. Fortunately they were not serious enough to prevent the safe return of Astronaut John Glenn.

If malfunction occurred during the *Friendship* 7 mission in spite of considerable special effort to insure maximum reliability, what can we expect in performance of weapons systems produced without this special attention on a production basis, especially in view of the current trend to place price ahead of quality and reliability.

Paragraph 1–302.2 of Armed Services Procurement Regulations states:

> Irrespective of whether the procurement of supplies or services from sources outside the Government is to be effected by formal advertising or by negotiation, competitive proposals (bids in the case of procurement by formal advertising, proposals in the case of procurement by negotiation) shall be solicited from all such qualified sources of supplies or services as are deemed necessary by the contracting officer to assure full and free competition as is consistent with the procurement of types of supplies and services necessary to meet the requirements of the military department concerned, and thereby to obtain for the Government the most advantageous contract price, quality and other factors considered.

Note that the paragraph states "and thereby to obtain the most advantageous contract price, quality and other factors considered."

In other words, paragraph 1–302.2 directs that the contracting officer assure that contracts are awarded to qualified sources which have the capability, price notwithstanding, to fully meet applicable requirements including delivery schedules, quality, and reliability.

Obtaining prime and subcontracts that are truly most advantageous to the Government is not a simple matter. Modern weapon and space exploration systems represent a highly complex state of art. Advancing design specifications call for closer tolerances, reduced weight, improved properties, and higher performance at all levels of the procurement and supply system. To meet these new specifications has required the development and use of new metals and materials; new fabrication, forming, and joining methods; new inspection and quality control methods and techniques; new facilities, equipment, experience, and know-how.

Developing the new capabilities required has involved expenditures in the billions. While much of the expenditure has been with Government funds, many industrial concerns have invested very substantial amounts of private funds in order to keep pace with advancing defense procurement technology. The companies who have demonstrated the willingness to develop, with private funds, the facilities, methods, and know-how required to meet demanding specifications inherent in advancing weapon and space systems, rightfully expect to provide their products at a price which will recover these investments. In fact, they must be able to do this in order to remain a defense supplier.

It would be expected that companies that have not made the investment necessary to keep pace with weapon and space technology could sell at a lower price. All too often that lower price reflects insufficient comprehension of the quality and reliability required to fully meet applicable specifications. Contracts awarded under these circumstances almost invariably result in serious losses in terms of rejections and shipping delays. Even more serious, if the deficiency in product quality and reliability remains undetected, human life and national security could be endangered. If this is economy, the price is too high.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] 5 additional minutes.

DYNA-SOAR

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, there is one amendment in this bill which increases the Dyna-Soar program. I would like to take a few minutes to discuss this program. For all our hopes that space may not become an arena for future conflict, we must clearly recognize that if man can go into space for peaceful exploration and research, he can use this same environment for military purposes. Those people in this country that are today placing all emphasis on getting to the moon at a cost of billions of dollars are making a mistake.

I am convinced that there will be future military weapon systems operating in space and that some, perhaps most, of these systems will have to include men to be most effective. To support this view I can quote passages from the speeches of our adversaries:

Maj. Gen. G. I. Pokrovskiy, director of the Zukovsky Air Military Engineering Academy, said on October 2, 1957, 2 days before the first sputnik:

> The struggle in and for outer space will have tremendous significance in the armed conflict of the near future.

Mr. Khrushchev himself said in 1959 that "after disarmament the U.S.S.R. will be prepared to reveal all its space secrets but not now because these secrets are of great military importance."

We must be prepared to counter this new threat to the security of our Nation that may be unveiled at any time it suits the purposes of the Soviets.

The concept of manned space vehicles for military purposes is not new. As early as 1942, a proposal to use rocket boosted space gliders to bombard the United States of America was seriously considered by Germany. In the early 1950's proposals were made to the Air Force to develop such a system in this country. A number of studies were then sponsored by the Air Force to establish the feasibility of extending future weapon systems capabilities to the fringes of the atmosphere and beyond. At the same time NACA—National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—predecessor of NASA—was considering the requirements for a test vehicle to extend aeronautical research from the regime of the X–15 research airplane up to orbital velocities. In 1958 an understanding was arrived at by NACA and the Air Force to jointly develop the Dyna-Soar. With the establishment later that year of NASA, the agreement was continued by that agency and is in force today. Active development of Dyna-Soar began in May 1960, and the Air Force is funding and administering this program.

In considering the military requirements of a space weapon system, several features distinguish the differences between the need for exploration and research, and for military operations in space. Foremost among these is the requirement for the positive recovery of men and equipment from space missions. The ballistic reentry from orbit of the Mercury capsule with parachute descent and recovery by prepositioned surface units is an appropriate and relatively simple first step for flight into space. The follow-on NASA Gemini program and the Apollo lunar landing program can use and extend this principle of recovery. But from the beginning it has been recognized by the Air Force that military space operations could not be based on this concept which restricts launch direction and timing, is affected by weather conditions and depends on predeployment of recovery units.

What is needed for the routine, reliable and flexible military exploitation of space is the means for reentry from a wide spectrum of orbit inclinations with sufficient maneuverability within the atmosphere to return to the United States with minimum delay and then to proceed to a conventional landing at a chosen base, all under the precise control of the pilot. The Dyna-Soar system is being developed to obtain and demonstrate the required technology to meet this need. It is a piloted space glider in which the pilot will have the freedom to choose the time when he will initiate reentry from orbit and to control the point at which he will make a conventional landing. In achieving this goal, Dyna-Soar will demonstrate satisfactory solutions to design problems in aerodynamics, aerodynamic heating, radiation cooling, structures, materials and a host of other technical problems. In addition, this vehicle will afford the Air Force the means of investigating the role of man in military space operations.

DEVELOPMENT OF DYNA-SOAR

Prior to initiating active development of Dyna-Soar in 1960, a design competition was conducted by the Air Force. The vehicle configuration was selected after intensive evaluation of the capabilities of a broad spectrum of modified capsules, lifting bodies and various glider concepts. The glider vehicle selected is still considered the most practical approach to achieve the program objectives within the current state of the art.

When active development was begun, there was no suitable rocket booster under development which could launch a vehicle of the size of Dyna-Soar into orbit in the forecast time period. Thus a modified Titan ICBM booster was selected for a preliminary suborbital test program. The quickening pace of space developments in this country and the advent the Titan III "work horse" space booster has made it possible to eliminate the suborbital test program and go directly to orbital flight tests.

Although the Dyna-Soar as it is now conceived is not in itself a weapon system, the basic space glider with the Titan III space booster together provide the principal building blocks which can be rapidly exploited when particular military mission needs are more clearly defined in the future.

The unique technology being developed and to be demonstrated in the Dyna-Soar program is not included in any other part of the national space program. This technology will provide the bases for the development of future practical manned military space systems. In addition, it will provide a large body of aerodynamic and space flight data of great value to the useful exploration of space and to the technological progress of the Nation.

LAIRD ADD-ON AMENDMENT

Through fiscal year 1962 the Air Force will have spent $187.7 million on the active development program, plus $21.5 million on design competition and configuration studies. For fiscal year 1963 the OSD budget for the program has been established at $115 million. However, the Air Force has provided information and testimony to our committee indicating that $42 million additional could be utilized in the coming fiscal year to conduct the program at a pace compatible with the Titan III booster development. In addition, the program would be augmented to reduce technical risks. Adding this money as provided by my amendment will make possible the first orbital flights of Dyna-Soar early in 1965 rather than late in that year. It will also permit attainment of the range of capabilities necessary to properly exploit the concept during the initial test program.

We in the Appropriations Committee have concluded that the Air Force should have the additional $42 million in fiscal year 1963. The Congress has supported Dyna-Soar since 1958 and we are convinced that this, our only manned military space program, should be conducted as vigorously as circumstances will permit. The level of funding recommended by the President in fiscal year 1962 and proposed for fiscal year 1963 does not seem to provide a development pace that recognizes the urgency of this program.

It is my hope that this House will support your committee recommendation. Four years ago this House supported a similar Polaris submarine add-on amendment proposed by me. During these past 4 years I believe this add-on has been justified. The future will show that this Dyna-Soar add-on will also be justified.

SECTION 535 ADVERTISING COSTS DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to comment on the remarks made earlier today by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Westland] about section 535 of this bill.

I would like to commend the Department of Defense for establishing its regulation concerning advertising. These regulations are set forth on page 111, volume 6, of our hearings.

There is some indication that the Department and the President recommended the continuance of section 535 this year because it thought our committee desired such inclusion. But, in the meantime, the Department has promulgated very strict advertising cost regulations which are more restrictive than the law. Since the Department has promulgated this regulation, it appears that continuance of section 535 as a part of the 1963 appropriation bill is not necessary. The Department has testified that it would continue its regulation regardless of whether or not the provision is included in the law.

The Department, of course, knows that some of us on the committee, because of the existence of the new regulation, do not now insist that section 535 be repeated in this year's appropriation bill. It may well be that the other body may concur with this view. While I was one of those who favored including the identical provision last year, its purpose has been accomplished and I do not believe that Congress ought to legislate perhaps unnecessarily. I am hopeful that the Department will reexamine its views as set forth on page 110, volume 6, of our hearings prior to Senate consideration of this matter.

Mr. Chairman, the Defense Appropriations Committee has worked long and hard on this bill. I believe that this bill merits the support of the House.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, as is unusual for this bill, this whole day has been a love feast. I never heard so many people say so many nice things about each other and about a $47 billion appropriation bill in the years I have been on this committee and the years I have been in this House.

If anybody told me there was not something the matter with this bill I would start looking at it from now on, after this hanky-panky debate here all day about this wonderful bill. As a matter of fact, I usually am cast in the role of a skunk in a stump about this time of the debate on an appropriation bill, and I usually have a pot full of amendments here to try to straighten out in a couple of hours of 1 day what this distinguished committee tried to do in about 4 months. I have never had much success with those amendments, but I have found out all you have to do around here is live long enough or have the people in your district have the good judgment to return you often enough and you get practically everything you want, and that is about what has happened to me in this bill.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. This is a real general. If you never saw a real general, this is a real general, my distinguished friend from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. It seems to me this might be a good time to point out that one of the reasons the gentleman from Pennsylvania has nothing to be mad about is the fact that through the years he has worked so diligently and so zealously for the improvements in our defense program which at long last are being realized that he sees here the achievements that we have long sought, that we all have wanted. I want to commend publicly the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his great contributions to a strong defense for the United States.

Mr. FLOOD. Is not that nice? I wrote that for him just 10 minutes ago. He is a real fast study.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. This is the man I have had more trouble with than anybody else. He is my chairman.

Mr. MAHON. I cannot resist saying that I know of no man in this House who has more diligently pursued the cause of the defense of the United States in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood]. I know of no man on the committee who has been more regular and more loyal in his attendance upon the sessions of the subcommittee, and they have been many and long.

Mr. FLOOD. What I had better do, Mr. Chairman, is quit while I am ahead.

Talking about generals, you know, I am one of these—it is one word, so it is perfectly parliamentary—"damyankees" from the coal mines of Pennsylvania. When you sit back in the cloakroom with these boys from the South for 16 years, you learn to call it the War Between the States. I used the words "Civil War" when I came down here in 1944. But it is the War Between the States. In talking about these generals, whom I have the most of my trouble with, they tell the story about Pvt. Johnny Allen. Johnny Allen came back after the war. He decided he was going to run for Congress. The fellow he was going to run against was a general. The general got up before this big crowd and he said, "My friends, I was up there in that bivouac during that rain, with my troops up on that hill, and I stuck under that tree while we were facing all those Yankees. I was there all that night with my men. I think you ought to recognize that and appreciate that and vote for me." Pvt. Johnny Allen got up and said, "Yes, he was there. Well, I will tell you my friends, the general was under that tree because I was standing there guarding him all night. So I want all of you fellows who are generals to vote for the general and all of you fellows who are not generals to vote for me." So that is how Johnny came here.

Well, there are a couple of things I want to talk about. However, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes] is quite right.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the greatest advocate that the Tennessee Valley Authority ever had.

Mr. EVINS. How are we to address the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as general or private?

Mr. FLOOD. I have been called so many things that I would rather not get into that right now. I will see you out in the hall.

Mr. Chairman, the fact remains, I have been one of the very few advocates for many years, in what has been called a limited war, I have never believed all during the years since the last war that there was going to be this atomic chaos. I do not believe it now. I never believed it. I sat on this committee all these years when it was building up and I voted for these things because we must have them. If the other fellow has them, we have got to have more and bigger and better. But, I have never been satisfied that, God forbid when the shooting goes on, and according to the Good Book, there will be wars and rumors of war until the end of time—and it is going on now and people are getting killed and shot all over this world every hour, every day in some kind of little war—you know that. Right now Americans are getting shot and killed in another little war—I know that. And that is the war and that is the kind of fighting that we have not been prepared for and we have not been trained for and we were not equipped for and we are just now getting ready for. Do not forget that. I sat here for 8 years—the last 8 years—and I lost a division a year for 8 years. Every year I lost a division in this Army. What were they going to do? They were going to make bellhops or policemen out of my Marines. I tried here, and I introduced amendments—and I am glad that you are smiling because you all voted against them—I tried here last year and the year before—for 8 years to increase the Army to a million men. I wanted to raise it to 16 to 18 to 20 divisions—and you voted against it. I gave you plenty of chance. There is nothing nicer than being a Monday morning quarterback. I love to come down here today in this year of our Lord 1962 and say, "Didn't I tell you? Didn't I tell you every year for 6 years you had to have an army of a million men? Did I not tell you you had to train for guerrilla warfare and train guerrilla warfare fighters? Did I not tell you you had to train guerrillas?" For 10 years I pleaded with you for that. Now we are training guerrilla fighters. We have 5,000 training now—it should be 10,000. The only thing the matter with this good bill is that you did not listen to me. So after 6 or 8 years, you are doing it—you are doing all right—you are doing it now. I am proud of you. I am proud of you; there is not going to be a vote against this bill. I cannot imagine anybody voting against this bill. I would bet you there will not be one who will vote against it.

These things are going on in the Army. Now we are going to have that kind of an Army. I pleaded with you to leave your hands off the Marines.

Good Lord. No matter what you do, do not touch the Marine Corps. If there is trouble any place you send the Marines. You paid no attention to them; the administration paid no attention to them. You cut back the Marines, but now you are bringing them back to 190,000. Let me tell you one thing. Last Saturday I thought I was going to get 200,000 marines and somewhere between here and the foot of the hill I lost 10,000 marines in about a half an hour. I have not been able to find out exactly what happened. Anyway we will have 190,000 marines, three full divisions, three full air wings, and a cadre for a fourth division, and a cadre for a fourth air wing. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, in this bill there should be four full Marine divisions and four full air wings. That is one thing that is the matter with this bill.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, because of what he has down there in Cleveland. If he does not keep on giving us hardware we cannot go very far.

Mr. MINSHALL. I would like to say to the Members present that there is no man on the committee, on either side, who is better informed on military affairs than is the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dan Flood. I should also like to remind him, since he is extolling himself, that he has forgotten one of his greatest accomplishments in which I assisted in a little way.

Mr. FLOOD. What is that?

Mr. MINSHALL. That is the Bomarc.

Mr. FLOOD. You mean that old dog Bomarc they have spent $2 billion on and sent to the Canadians supposed to help us in their defense? I do not think it could knock the starlings off the Department of Justice building down here, yet it has cost us $2 billion. It is as phony as a $3 bill, but there it is. We cannot do much about it.

Strac. For years I have been telling you that you should have four divisions in the Strategic Air Corps for the continental United States, and now you are going to have them.

You had one medium tank battalion down at Fort Bragg training on medium tanks. This was 2 or 3 years ago. Then we found out that the tanks they were training with were not battle-fit tanks. When called to their attention they said, "Well, train them anyway. We will send the trainees overseas and they will be equipped with good tanks." When we got the tanks overseas it was found they were in worse shape than the training tanks at Fort Bragg.

How many times did you oldtimers around here hear me almost get down on my knees and plead with you to give us an airlift, to give us an airlift that could move large numbers of men? But you did not have an airlift up until this last year, you could not airlift a division of the U.S. Army to South Philadelphia inside of 30 days, and there is no question about that, no question about it. You could not go much further, yet we have $500 million—thank goodness for that—in this bill for an airlift, for C–143's which are coming off the line. The C–141's will not be coming off for a year, but we are starting, but we have had to wait 6, 8, or 10 years for this.

Examine the list of officials that come before us, secretaries and assistant secretaries and assistants to the assistant secretaries, admirals, and generals. Try to pin the blame on somebody for something that goes wrong, and if he is an admiral he is a way out to sea somewhere; if he is a general he has gone back to civilian life; and if he is a civilian nobody knows where he is, he is back somewhere making money.

Now about this aircraft carrier. The gentleman from Michigan mentioned the aircraft carrier; did you not?

Mr. FORD. I mentioned that we were going to save $30 million.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is getting things mixed up with the Lukens Steel Co. I know what he is trying to do and what I am trying to do. But that is something else. Nobody talked about the carrier. The carrier in the bill is a conventional carrier. I voted for it. I voted for a conventional carrier because it was a conventional carrier or nothing, and in limited war you must have carrier support. You cannot run a limited war without that. But I think the conventional carrier is a mistake, I think it is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, a conventional carrier at this time will take 4 years to build, a long leadtime. I believe by the time a conventional carrier will be operational it will not be obsolete, it will be obsolescent. If you are going to have a carrier, why do you not match the *Enterprise* we were down with last week. We should have a brandnew, modern nuclear carrier, the biggest and best in the world. Why not? Do not tell me you cannot afford it. I am sick and tired of that. There should be no part of that kind of talk in a defense budget. You can afford it. You can afford it and like it. Make no mistake about that. You should have a nuclear carrier. But I have not got the votes. I need not try. I am not going to offer an amendment, it would not get to first base. The varsity here is against me, and I know better. But you should have a nuclear carrier. In 4 years that is what you want to have, not a conventional carrier, though I am for the conventional carrier. But that is not the way it should be.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I would like an answer to this question from the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Every year for the past 3 years we see just before the appropriation bill comes out of the committee a newspaper report showing that the Nike-Zeus missiles are becoming operational, conventional, and are becoming successful.

Can the gentleman tell us in his own inimitable way whether all of these releases are propaganda or whether there is any merit to it?

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is asking me, and I will tell him for what it is worth. The last administration was wrong, this administration is more wrong on the Nike-Zeus. I have been trying to offer amendments, and the gentleman will remember that. We have been working on the Nike-Zeus for years. The only defense of missile against missile on the face of this earth is the one we have being run by the Army, the American product, the antimissile missile Nike-Zeus. There is no other. The Russians do not have one, we do not have one, but we are further advanced than they are.

They told me 5 years ago, you will never be able to hit one bullet with another bullet. I told McNamara, "I bet you a hat you are wrong." I won the hat, but he bought it in London. We can hit one missile with another missile. They have done it, and they are going to do it in December. The only problem is, they say, they do not want to go ahead any further than they are with the research and development money because of radar. There are three sets of radars, the target radar, the extension radar, and the radar to select, the discrimination radar. They say the Russians will throw a missile with garbage and debris, and when the head breaks you will not know whether there is one or five warheads. But I know this. One of them or two of them will have a warhead. A warhead is a warhead; it is not something else. It is not garbage or debris. And, I believe there will be a breakthrough by our long-haired, fabulous scientists who will find that out. They broke through with the solid propellent for the Polaris overnight. I said for 3 years that our scientists will do the same thing with the selection radar on the Nike-Zeus. I say that the Eisenhower administration made a mistake for the last 3 years when they did not put money in this bill to study the long-range production of hardware so that when we did break through we could get into production. And, the Kennedy people are just as wrong, because they have refused to do it. And, before you get home tonight, the scientists are liable to break through with this. The first nation that does break through with the intercontinental ballistic missile has the other nation absolutely at its mercy. Yes, naked you are; make no mistake about this. That is the story all along.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. There is money in here for the R. & D.; enough money. They do not need more money for the R. & D. That is not what I am talking about. They do not have enough money in here for long lead time production items.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, when the Defense appropriation bill, H.R. 11289, is before the Committee of the Whole for amendment tomorrow, I intend to offer three amendments and will ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc:

> On page 28, line 2, strike out "$1,317,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,318,000,000."
>
> On page 28, line 16, strike out $3,480,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,483,900,000."
>
> On page 49, strike out lines 18 through 22.

The effect of these amendments is twofold—to restore research and development funds to the bill which were deleted by the committee in the amount of $4 million, and to strike out section 540 which limits indirect costs of research grants to 15 percent of direct costs.

Mr. Chairman, this is a novel provision in a defense appropriation act and is especially disturbing because the committee in its report on page 48 announced that "this year the committee is applying this same limitation to other departments of the Government."

It should be noted first that the limitation of 15 percent for indirect costs applies only to research grants, not to research contracts, but the effect of the amendment will be far reaching and, in my opinion, will have a disastrous effect upon institutions of higher learning in the country, their scientific research programs, and upon the research and development activities of the Federal Government.

I propose to show that the limitation is hastily adopted, that it has not received sufficient study, that it bristles with problems in its administration, that it will not save money, and that it is a rigid and basically unsound approach to a complicated and serious problem.

The only testimony concerning this provision occurs in part 5 of the committee hearings on pages 80–85, 162–163, 222–223, and 361. The evidence contained in the hearings is overwhelming in opposition to the imposition of a limitation. Perhaps the best statement is that made by Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, pages 81-85 of the hearings. The following passages from Dr. Brown's statement set forth the difficulty of separation of direct from indirect costs, showing the basic fallacy of the rigid percentage limitation technique:

> The concept of a mandatory flat overhead rate limitation overlooks the fundamental cost-accounting principle that there is no real difference between direct and indirect costs, except for the manner in which they are allocated to the work benefited by their incurrence. The costs of the material directly used in the work and the salaries of people directly employed on the work can be clearly and readily identified and classified as direct costs. Other materials and labor costs serving some general support purpose are not readily identifiable directly with the work but can be reasonably prorated as indirect costs. Both types of costs (direct and indirect) are made up of such elements as salaries and wages, materials, supplies, and services. A dollar of indirect cost is exactly equal to a dollar of direct cost in terms of outlay. The man who fires the furnace that heats the laboratory in which the researcher performs his work contributes in his way to the research just as surely as does the researcher himself.
>
> There are no hard and fast rules governing the division of total costs between those to be treated as direct costs and those to be treated as indirect costs. Consequently, the total costs of a contractor with a high overhead rate could very well be less than the total costs of a contractor with a low overhead rate. In the absence of an artificial stimulus such as a mandatory, fixed overhead rate limitation, the logical and economical division of total costs is a matter dependent on such factors as how the contractor is organized, the nature of his business, how he keeps his books and whether the costs were specifically incurred for a particular purpose such as the performance of a contract or grant or whether they were incurred for common or joint objectives not readily subject to treatment as direct costs of a contract or grant or other activities.
>
> In the case of educational institutions, the Department of Defense follows the policy of measuring the costs of its grants and contracts in accordance with the cost principles issued for that purpose by the Bureau of the Budget (Circular A–21 issued for Government-wide application). These cost principles provide for fair and equitable costing under the particular circumstances prevailing at educational institutions. This includes a logical division of direct and indirect costs flowing from the fund accounting systems employed by educational institutions.
>
> In regard to the various questions asked by your committee with respect to the imposition of a 15-percent indirect cost limitation, if such a limitation were imposed on the funds used to pay for DOD research performed by educational institutions, the institutions might be said to have three alternatives (1) absorb the additional costs, (2) make radical changes in the logical costing pattern (division between direct and indirect costs) in order to get the maximum amount of costs classified as "direct" so they can be reimbursed and increase the base to which the 15-percent rate would apply, or (3) drastically curtail the research activities vital to the defense of the Nation. Actually, in our opinion, the institutions would be forced to curtail DOD research activities because they simply could not afford to absorb the additional indirect costs or install the cost-accounting procedures necessary to change the logical costing pattern.
>
> In view of the importance of university research to DOD research and development programs as outlined above, curtailment of the university research activity for DOD such as a flat rate would impose, would constitute a serious impediment to the research and development programs vital to the Nation's defense and security.

The committee, in fact, concedes that it has not given careful study to this limitation in the following passages in its report on page 48:

> The committee has no wish to establish a limitation which will be too restrictive as there is no desire to hamper or discourage cooperation between colleges and universities with the Department of Defense. The Committee plans to study this problem in an effort to achieve more uniformity and better performance in the research programs of the Department of Defense.

The committee concedes that the Department of Defense estimates that it is paying an average of 32.6 percent in direct costs—page 49 of report—but nevertheless removed $1 million from the $11,700,000 Army research grant program. One of my amendments would restore this million-dollar cut.

The committee report, pages 54–55, estimates a reduction of indirect costs on $26,500,000 on research grants from the Air Force will be in excess of $4 million and has taken $3 million out of the bill. Another of my amendments would restore this amount to the Air Force research grant program.

Federal expenditures for research conducted in institutions of higher education are now approaching the billion dollar mark according to reports prepared by the National Science Foundation. This agency estimates that for fiscal 1960 and fiscal 1961 slightly more than half of the $800 to $900 million for federally sponsored research went to educational institutions proper, while the remainder went to special research centers operated by educational institutions, for example, the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory of the University of California, or the electronic defense group at the University of Michigan.

Federal research funds are made available to educational institutions by grant or by contract, but no matter how the arrangement is described both the Nation, as represented by the Federal Government, and the institution expect to benefit from it and both at the same time assume obligations in connection with the relationship established by the grant or contract.

The Government has a right to expect that it and the Nation will receive benefits from sponsored research at colleges and universities that are in some way commensurate with the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. The institution, on its part, has a right to expect that it will be adequately and equitably reimbursed for undertaking Government-sponsored research, even though there will be particular benefits to the institution in terms of advancement of knowledge and effective use of staff which the institution might otherwise be unable to secure or retain.

HOW THE GOVERNMENT DETERMINES OVERHEAD COSTS

There is, at present, no consistent policy for determining the overhead cost which is followed by all agencies of the Federal Government. Thus, a university doing research for the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will find that the overhead or indirect cost of this research will be computed in three different ways depending on the agency with which the institution is dealing. A decade ago, the problem of reimbursement for overhead cost was one that concerned a relatively few institutions engaged in large-scale research projects for the military agencies. Until 1958, the principal policy document governing computation of overhead for Federal research was the so-called blue book developed in 1947 by a group representing educational institutions and the Departments of War and Navy.

Then, in 1955 the National Science Foundation recommended that all Federal agencies reimburse educational institutions to the maximum extent possible for the indirect cost of sponsored research projects. In 1958, following lengthy discussions between groups representing colleges and universities and an interagency committee representing the Federal Government, the U.S. Bureau of the Budget issued Circular A–21 setting forth the principles for determining the costs applicable to research and development under grants and contracts with educational institutions. Although some of the details of Circular A–21 were not satisfactory to the educational institutions, it was generally recognized by them that this action by the Bureau of the Budget was a major step toward a uniform Federal policy.

Even so, Circular A–21 is not applied uniformly throughout the Federal Government. The Department of Defense uses a modification of Circular A–21 in determining indirect costs of research on projects which it sponsors. Likewise, the Atomic Energy Commission uses its own adaptation of the principles of Circular A–21. The National Science Foundation, which pressed most vigorously for a uniform Federal policy on reimbursement for indirect costs of sponsored research, until recently has arbitrarily limited the payment of indirect costs to 15 percent of the direct costs of the project and has only recently raised this limit to 20 percent of the direct costs. Since 1957, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been prohibited by law from paying more than 15 percent overhead on the direct cost of grants for research projects. Thus far, efforts to repeal or modify this rider to the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill have been unsuccessful.

BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN OVERHEAD COST AND GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS

Until the Bureau of the Budget published Circular A–21 in 1958—revised in January 1961—colleges and universities that believed they were not receiving equitable treatment from the Federal Government with respect to the indirect cost of sponsored research had no single point of reference upon which to base such a claim. However, a recent—but as yet unpublished—study by the National Science Foundation leaves no doubt that for lack of a uniform Federal policy on payment of the indirect costs of sponsored research in colleges and universities, those institutions which undertake such projects are forced to pay almost $1 of indirect cost for each $1 of reimbursement for indirect cost received from the Federal Government. Note that the title of the study is "Interim Report on Indirect Costs of Federally Sponsored Research and Development in Colleges and Universities, Fiscal Year 1960," prepared by NSF for the Federal Council for Science and Technology.

The NSF study, which is the most comprehensive and thorough yet made, examined research cost data from 89 large universities and colleges with total expenditures for federally sponsored research of $357,982,000 in fiscal year 1960. Comparable data were obtained from 61 small colleges and universities with total research expenditures of $11,358,000 in fiscal 1960. To these cost data the National Science Foundation applied the Circular A–21 method of computing overhead costs. The results of this analysis were as follows:

First. The national average indirect cost rate of federally sponsored research and development of large colleges and universities, in 1959–60, was 28 percent of direct costs. In computing this rate, employee benefits were considered part of direct costs, and the principles of the Bureau of the Budget Circular A–21 were used. Each large college and university has a rate established under Circular A–21 by a cognizant Federal agency.

Second. The national average indirect cost rate of federally sponsored research and development of small colleges and universities, in 1959–60, was 31 percent of direct costs. These small colleges and universities do not have an established rate and, therefore, the abbreviated principles of Circular A–21 were used by the institutions in computing this rate. Consequently, there are some technical accounting differences in the methods used for small versus large institutions.

Third. In fiscal year 1962, using the principles of Circular A–21 as a base—28 percent of direct costs—applied to the Federal grant programs of all institutions, it is estimated that the total indirect costs of federally sponsored research and development grants will be $83 million. Since current practices of Federal agencies call for an outlay of $47 million to cover the indirect costs of grant programs for research and development, it is estimated that an additional $36 million would have to be made available either by the colleges and universities or the Federal Government in order to cover the total indirect costs of federally sponsored research and development.

The impact of this compelled cost sharing varies from institution to institution. The National Science Foundation study applied an average indirect cost rate of 28 percent and found a $36 million difference between indirect costs and Federal reimbursement for these costs. But 38.2 percent of the large institutions reporting to the National Science Foundation had overhead costs in excess of 30 percent, and 72.2 percent of the small institutions had overhead costs in excess of 30 percent. Again, it should be emphasized that this computation of overhead costs was made by the National Science Foundation, not by the institutions themselves.

The effect of the 15-percent indirect cost limitation is that a burden of $4 million is now being transferred from the Federal Government to hard-pressed universities and colleges and will result in their acquiring this money from their State legislatures or elsewhere or else being forced to refuse to engage in research thought to be desirable by the Defense Department.

The limitation of a percentage of indirect costs to direct costs presupposes a universal system of accounting among the universities and colleges. There is no such uniformity, however. A large university, for example, may make a direct charge to a department having a research grant of such items as maintenance, use of equipment, and so forth, while another institution, possibly a smaller one, would simply lump such contributions into the total overhead cost of operating the university.

In effect this percentage limitation of indirect costs is meaningful only if the Federal Government is to establish a universal accounting system for all institutions of higher learning and thus assert a Federal right to interfere and control the business management of these institutions of higher learning. This is a dangerous precedent because it asserts the predominance of the bureaucratic mind over scientific research—the supremacy of Parkinson's law over a field which by its very nature demands imagination and freedom of thought if worthwhile new discoveries are to be made for the benefit of mankind.

Mr. Chairman, Federal funds devoted to research and development have been soaring, and the trend will be for further increases rather than reductions. It is estimated that some $15 billion of Federal funds through one agency or another are now being expended annually on scientific research and development programs, either by the agencies themselves or through research contracts and grants.

The matter of indirect costs is only one of many problems that arise from these huge and growing expenditures. Universities have become concerned that huge proportions of their total budget are derived from Federal funds.

The University of Michigan is located in Ann Arbor, Mich., my hometown, and their officials estimate that approximately 22 percent of the total budget of the University of Michigan in 1959 was represented by federally financed research.

The California Institute of Technology had at the same time some $50 million in Government research representing 83.6 percent of its total expenditures.

Harvard University became concerned about the impact of Federal research expenditures on the program of the university and in September 1961 issued a report entitled "Harvard and the Federal Government." After reciting that at least 80 percent of the institutions of higher education in the United States now receive Federal funds, the report recited, on page 3, that in 1959 and 1960 Federal funds supplied one-fourth of the budget of the university as a whole and supplied 55 percent of the budget of the School of Public Health and 57 percent of the budget of the medical school. The report also noted on page 13:

> One of the most serious of questions in Federal programs is that of unreimbursed indirect costs on grants. Most spectacular in 1959–60 were the unreimbursed costs arising from research grants, which made satisfactory allowance for direct, but not for indirect costs. While spending $11,860,836 of Federal funds for project research, the university incurred $687,500 in unreimbursed indirect costs.

In fiscal year 1961 the University of Michigan had a total of $17.3 million of federally financed research contracts and grants of direct costs of which $10.3 million were from the Department of Defense and $7 million were nondefense.

In the same fiscal year, according to Federal Government auditors—Signal Corps—the university had a total of indirect costs for the administration of these Federal contracts and grants of $5.9 million, of which $4.4 million were reimbursed by the Federal Government, leaving approximately $1.5 million of indirect costs for which the University of Michigan was not reimbursed.

From the foregoing it is clear that Federal expenditures in scientific research are having a tremendous impact upon our institutions of higher learning. The fact that the Federal Government refuses to pay the entire cost of the program but requires the universities to find substantial amounts of funds elsewhere either from their State legislatures, their nonearmarked charitable contributions or students' tuition fees to assist in financing research activities for the benefit of the Federal Government is an extremely serious problem when both State supported and private institutions of higher learning are having difficulty in obtaining sufficient funds to operate their educational and research programs in which the Federal Government does not have a direct interest.

This financial problem of institutions of higher learning has clearly been recognized by the Federal Government and by the Congress. Indeed, there is now pending in the Rules Committee of the House a bill to provide substantial assistance to institutions of higher learning for the construction of facilities. Another bill is shortly to be before us which will provide assistance for the construction of facilities for medical schools.

Is it not strange that at a time when the Federal Government is seeking to assist institutions of higher learning by such measures on the one hand we here in the House adopt a harsh limitation on research costs, making the financial plight of institutions of higher learning even more difficult than it is today?

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the matter of costs I think many people in scientific circles are beginning to become concerned about the impact of Federal expenditures on the educational and scientific programs of institutions of higher learning—to what extent are they being distorted or shaped by the large sums of Federal money they receive. The scientists may well believe that an area of research holds great promise for new discoveries but is an area of research of no direct or immediate interest to the Federal Government. Scientific manpower and talent is limited. It tends to be devoted to the areas where the large sums of Federal money are directed and diverted away from other areas of research which in the opinion of the scientific investigator might well have far greater priority.

The philosophy of the limitation on indirect costs also means greater Federal bureaucratic interference with the management of institutions of higher learning. The percentage limitation on indirect costs is meaningful only when all institutions of higher learning use the same accounting system at least insofar as they segregate costs as between direct and indirect. The lack of uniformity of such accounting systems may proceed from many factors outside the control of the management of the institutions of higher learning such as requirements of budget presentation to State legislatures or business methods requirements and accounting practices designed by their governing bodies to meet the particular characteristics of the institution.

The imposition of a uniform pattern of accounting leading to uniform business management directed and controlled by the Federal Government might well impose a stultifying influence of Federal bureaucratic procedures in an area where results can be expected only from the unfettered freedom of an inquiring mind and a willingness to pursue unmarked paths of exploration into the unknown outer reaches of scientific knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, for this reason I have believed that a comprehensive and penetrating inquiry needs to be made into the whole subject of research and development financed in whole or in part with Federal funds. I believe this problem is of such magnitude and difficulty that it is beyond the capacity of any congressional committee or its staff. I believe it is also beyond the capacities of committees of the executive branch, partially because any study conducted by the executive branch would inherently be bound to existing practices and philosophies which have grown up much like Topsy without any plan. The detachment and capacity to attack this problem successfully would be expected only in a statutory commission on the order of the Hoover Commission. In the past such study commissions have been generously supported by congressional appropriations and have been able to acquiring an able and sizable staff permitting thorough examination and analysis of the problem.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I have today introduced a bill to establish a Commission on Government Operations in Research and Development, a copy of which I incorporate at this point in my remarks:

A bill to establish a Commission on Government Operations in Research and Development

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

Section 1. The Congress finds that research and development activities conducted by or under the sponsorship of the various agencies of the Federal Government, including the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Veterans' Administration, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other Federal agencies have a major impact upon the conduct of scientific research in the United States, and vitally affect the overall pattern and direction of future Federal programs and private activities. It is the purpose of this Act to provide for a thorough study of the operations and activities of such programs, for the purpose of assisting in the elimination of overlapping and duplication of effort, evaluating the effectiveness of such programs and their efficiency and economy, with particular reference to indirect costs involved therein, and determining the extent to which such programs and activities require administrative or organizational reforms. It is further the purpose of this Act to provide for the making of recommendations to the President and to the Congress of proposals for necessary improvements in the operation of programs and activities in the field of research and development.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION; DUTIES

Sec. 2. (a) Commission Established.—There is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the "Commission on Government Operations in Research and Development" (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Duties of Commission.—In conformity with the findings and furtherance of the purpose declared in section 1, the Commission shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all operations of the Federal Government in the field of research and development, whether conducted by Federal agencies directly or through contract, grants-in-aid, or otherwise. The Commission shall report the results of its investigation and study to the President and to the Congress, and shall make such recommendations with respect to the operations of the Federal Government in the field of research and development as it may deem desirable.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) Number and Appointment.—The Commission shall be composed of fourteen members as follows:

(1) Ten appointed by the President of the United States, four from the executive branch of the Government and six from private life;

(2) Two Members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President; and

(3) Two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

(b) Political Affiliation.—Of each class of members, not more than one-half shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(c) Vacancies.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

Sec. 5. Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 6. (a) Members of Congress.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members From the Executive Branch.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary $20,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members From Private Life.—The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 7. The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

CERTAIN LAWS INAPPLICABLE TO COMMISSION AND ITS STAFF

Sec. 8. The service of any person as a member of the Commission, the service of any other person with the Commission, and the employment of any person by the Commission, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of section 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 10. (a) Committees.—The Commission may create such committees of its members with such powers and duties as may be delegated thereto.

(b) Hearings and Sessions.—The Commission, or any committee thereof, may for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof.

(c) Obtaining Official Data.—The Commission, or any committee thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, or any committee thereof, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or of the committee concerned.

(d) Subpena Power.—The Commission, or any committee thereof, shall have power to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of section 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

EXPIRATION OF COMMISSION

Sec. 11. The Commission shall cease to exist on June 30, 1964.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express the joy that I share, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], over the tremendous improvement that has been made in the level of appropriations and in the planning for our general purpose forces in the last couple of years. I do, however, wish to take one exception to the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It could have been inferred from them that, in his efforts to increase appropriations for "general purpose forces" in past years, he stood nearly alone. I wish to say to the gentleman that I strongly supported him, although I am not so sure it did not amount to almost the same thing.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Not only on that did the gentleman support the gentleman from Pennsylvania, he did so on the Army amendment and the Air Force amendments as well. The gentleman from Michigan was one of the corporal's guard which supported me every year.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for mentioning that fact and for his able leadership in this field because I could not be more pleased with the new direction of our defense policy than I am. I have felt over the past half dozen years, both before and after becoming a Member of the House of Representatives, that our greatest danger lay in the growing weakness of our conventional war forces in comparison to those of the Sino-Soviet bloc. I felt that this weakness could lead to all too many situations in which we would be faced with a decision between resort to all-out nuclear war, which all of us want to avoid, and the surrender on some objective vital to us and to the free world.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and its members, as well as members of the full Appropriations Committee, for the attention they have given to this problem They, the President and Secretary of Defense McNamara have taken important and long-needed steps to strengthen our military forces that will enable us to face the difficult days ahead with determination and strength.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Santangelo].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 11289 making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. However, I wish to bring to the attention an appropriation in this defense appropriations bill which is not only unfair but unwise. I refer to the limitation of 15 percent for indirect costs incurred by universities under Defense Department research grants.

Academic spokesmen have indicated to me that indirect costs usually far exceed 15 percent. Mr. Grayson Kirk has indicated in a telegram to me that its indirect costs approximate 23 percent. To place a limitation of 15 percent would mean that educational institutions are giving aid to the Federal Government to the extent of 8 percent. Other institutions claim that their indirect costs approximate 30 percent. Their position is even worse.

Indirect costs include laboratory space, telephones, library use, utilities and similar items.

The contributions by universities are indispensable to the Government and the security of the Nation. We should not hamstring their efforts.

I include several telegrams which I have received and I include them herein.

I also include an editorial from the New York Times which clearly explains the issues and reveals why institutions should not be burdened with indirect costs which they incur by reason of these programs to help America's defense.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *April 15, 1962.*

Representative ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I understand that Defense appropriation bill reported by House Appropriation Committee puts 15-percent limit on indirect cost of research grants. Actual indirect cost is about 23 percent at Columbia. The difference would represent a subsidy from educational funds of the university. While this research is valuable to the Defense Department and to education, continued subsidy unfairly consumes university funds which should also be used for education in English, architecture, business, law and many other areas which do not receive Government grants but which are important in that educational effort.

Amount of Government grants in special subjects increases each year because universities have best resources for research but failure to provide full audited indirect cost must lead to refusal to accept some grants from Government or to sharp limitation of all other university work.

Please urge change of 15 percent to payment in full audited indirect costs on all grants to universities. Such action will preserve effective educational programs.

GRAYSON KIRK,
President, Columbia University.

ITHACA, N.Y., *April 13, 1962.*

Hon. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
Washington, D.C.:

If the 15-percent limitation on overhead on Defense contracts, which I understand is in the Defense Department appropriation bill to be debated on the House floor, is allowed to prevail, it would place such a financial burden upon this university as to force us to reconsider our whole participation in the Defense contract program. I will appreciate very much your careful consideration of this matter.

DEANE W. MALLOTT,
President of Cornell University.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *April 16, 1962.*

Hon. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I understand that the appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1963 will be presented to the House of Representatives on Tuesday, April 17, and that it contains a limitation of 15 percent on the recoverable indirect costs of research grants.

If extension of the 15-percent limitation on indirect costs contained in the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1963 works a hardship on all institutions which participate in the Federal research and development program and places a significant burden on the financial resources of New York University.

I strenuously urge your assistance in having this limitation removed and I would welcome the opportunity to support your efforts.

JAMES M. HESTER,
President, New York University.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 17, 1962]

RESEARCH FOR DEFENSE

A clause in the Defense appropriations bill, which comes to the floor of the House today, would set an arbitrarily low limit on payments for indirect costs incurred by universities under Defense Department research grants. Indirect costs include laboratory space, telephones, other utilities, library use and similar items.

The limit proposed is 15 percent of the total grant. Academic spokesmen point out, however, that such costs usually far exceed that figure. Columbia University estimates its average to run to 23 percent, and other institutions put it as high as 30 percent.

The universities do, of course, reap important benefits from such grants. The scope of their operations, especially in science would be greatly reduced without them. But the universities' contributions are also indispensable to the Government and to the security of the Nation. Even if such work could be carried out by industry, which is not feasible, the cost would be far greater.

Higher education is already in serious financial straits, faced with the simultaneous challenges of vastly expanding its facilities, competing for scarce faculty talent and maintaining or even improving the quality of instruction. For the Federal Government to ask, in effect, that the universities partially finance Defense Department research with their own funds would be most unfair. To do so would threaten to interfere with the basic purposes of education, as the Defense Department grants would thus siphon off badly needed general education money. The fact that such Defense Department grants have grown from about $8 million last year to $28.8 million this year merely underlines the danger.

In simplest terms, what must be avoided is a kind of Federal aid in reverse, aid by education to the Federal Government, when education is so desperately in need for assistance. The minimum repayment by the Government should cover the full cost, responsibly audited, shouldered by the universities.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to preface these remarks by paying tribute to the able chairman of the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. He guided the subcommittee through weeks and months of hearings, was completely fair at all times, and in every way tried to bring out all points of view on complicated and sometimes controversial issues.

I would also like to commend most highly the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the able and distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. He provided, for us in the minority, the kind of skilled, competent, and calm leadership which is so necessary in dealing with problems of vital importance to the future safety of our Nation.

He avoided studiously the pitfall of carping criticism, but instead attempted always to find facts and the truth upon which to base a sound judgment.

This bill is not without controversy. I do not think any legislation written by the Congress can be completely without some overtones of controversy. Thanks to the untiring efforts of the chairman and some long, hard hours of work, this bill does contain a minimum of the extremely controversial.

We have tried to reach a compromise on some points. We have, on others, stood firm for what we believe to be the overwhelming will of the Congress—often repeated.

In one area of controversy—that surrounding the mach 3 RS-70—we have reached in this measure what I consider to be a compromise. As you will note from the report accompanying this bill, the Secretary of Defense has two teams of experts to reexamine the whole field of this new bomber and reconnaissance plane. The experts are to examine not only the technical feasibility of developing the plane, but its possible use in future missions as a sound weapons system.

Personally I feel strongly that this country should have undertaken the proper and orderly development of this plane on a production-line basis a long time ago. There are those who maintain that the concept of strategic warfare has so completely changed since 1955—when the B-70 was first proposed—that the plane will be obsolete before it is airborne. They say that warfare has changed to missiles, guided and ballistic, and that the role of the manned bomber is past.

Every expert Air Force witness before the committee countered these assertions and allegations.

Witness after witness told us firmly and vigorously that there is a definite role for the manned bomber in the future and that we dare not depend completely on our intercontinental ballistics missile system for our retaliatory force. We must have men at the controls of these planes, men who are capable of thinking for themselves and not just storing within electronic brains certain predetermined data.

However, over the years there has been a stubborn resistance to this idea on the part of the civilian Secretaries of the Pentagon. There has been an insistence on keeping the expenditures for this new bomber—new concept of aircraft—at an absolute minimum.

However, as I said, we are here working on a compromise solution. The President in his budget asked for $171 million for the continued development of the RS-70, plus nearly $52 million for radar components and other navigational equipment. The committee has added another $52.9 million for these specialized components, and $300 million has been made available to the Secretary, through the emergency fund—should his team of experts agree that the plane is essential and can perform a beneficial and vital function in protecting our Nation in the future. If need be, he can use all or any part of the emergency fund for this plane.

In another area of controversy the committee has accepted no compromise because it is our feeling that, in this, we are simply expressing the will of Congress. I refer to the decision, taken recently by the Secretary of Defense, to cut back sharply the strength of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserves.

Congress has repeatedly insisted that the guard be maintained at a strength of at least 400,000 men. We have repeatedly insisted that the Army Reserve components be maintained at a strength of 300,000 men. And yet, only a few weeks ago the Secretary issued orders cutting the guard back to 367,000 and the Reserves to 275,000.

The Pentagon in its public statement on this issue said that it was reorganizing the Guard and Reserves to make them more modern—to make them more efficient and to make them more effective in future emergencies.

This was, I feel, a smokescreen. The actual fact is, I believe, that on this matter the Department has taken an arbitrary position.

During the past few years efforts have been made again and again by the Department to lower the strength of either the Guard or the Reserves—or both. And every time that this has happened, the Subcommittee on Defense has refused to go along with the plan.

We have consistently provided the Defense Department with adequate funds to maintain the Guard and the Reserves at the 400,000 and 300,000 figures as an effective backup force for our Regular Army. Every time we have done so, the Congress has backed us to the very limit. As Members of Congress we are well aware of the role that the National Guard and the Reserves have played in the past. Those of us who live in States where floods are a frequent and common menace during the spring of the year, are eternally grateful for the effective and tremendous role played by the National Guard in defending our communities against the ravages of nature.

I have been in communities which have been fighting for their very existence against the rampant waters of a stream out of control. The whole situation has always calmed down considerably when the guard troops arrive on the scene. The citizens know that—although they may not be out of danger—they at least have a strong right arm giving them a helping hand.

This ability to lend a helping hand is not confined to flood victims by any means. In visiting with our National Guard people in Nebraska some time ago, I was told an interesting story which I would like to pass along for the benefit of my colleagues in the House.

It happened in September of 1958—some 4 years ago—but the moral of this story is as true today as it was then.

It seems that one of our strategic Army Corps units—a Strac signal battalion—was en route from Fort Meade, Md., to the west coast to take part in maneuvers. It was traveling overland and was supposed to have built-in maintenance.

By the time the convoy reached Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., things had begun to go wrong. Vehicles were going out of commission—losing transmissions—motors and some minor parts were breaking down.

The trail maintenance unit was stuck at Fort Harrison trying to repair the vehicles while the convoy went on across country. From Indiana through Illinois and Iowa the convoy left a string of broken-down vehicles—many of them needing only minor repairs—but without the trailer maintenance unit these repairs were impossible. The convoy was supposed to stop overnight at Camp Ashland, Nebr., an Army National Guard camp which is maintained by the State of Nebraska and is frequently used by such overland convoys.

The unit was, by this time, a sorry sight. Nearly every vehicle needed some overhauling. Some of them needed major repairs. In all, some 143 vehicles were either out of commission or on the verge of it.

The unit's commanding officer had contacted XVI Corps headquarters in Omaha and also Offutt Air Force Base. Neither could provide him with the required spare parts or the required maintenance help.

He then contacted Col. D. G. Penterman, the Nebraska National Guard State maintenance officer. Colonel Penterman took a crew out to Camp Ashland from Lincoln and they took a look at the situation.

First of all they called the Indiana National Guard maintenance officer and told him the story. His crew—which happened to be located at Fort Benjamin Harrison—went to work at once. They repaired the vehicles—replacing transmissions and motors and getting them into shape to travel again. This released the trail maintenance unit which was able to sweep the countryside from Indiana to Nebraska, repairing the stranded vehicles.

Meanwhile it was determined just what parts were needed and the Nebraska guard dispatched its plane to Pueblo, Colo., to pick up the equipment. The Strac unit was behind schedule and had ordered groceries from Lexington, Nebr. A quick call was made to the guard armory and the grocer at Lexington was advised to put the order back on the shelf for a day or so.

Within 48 hours the unit was rolling again. And the Nebraska guard had contacted Wyoming guard officers to pick it up and escort it through their State.

The Strac outfit was to have had a day off in Wyoming to rest up, but because of the break in Camp Ashland, was able to pass that up, and by the time they reached the west coast they were on schedule again.

The service rendered to this one outfit was made possible because the National Guard—throughout the country—is geared to provide emergency service of all kinds. It is alert and ready.

The guard, in my estimation, is essential to the welfare and protection of our Nation.

It must be maintained at full strength and on the alert.

To provide an adequate Reserve force this bill contains $1.8 billion. It had been my hope that the committee could insert mandatory language in this bill as to the strength figures for our Guard and Reserve which we feel must be preserved, but I am afraid that my friends who are parliamentarians and sticklers for technicalities would have knocked it out on a point of order. Despite this, I am most hopeful that the Secretary of Defense will heed the wishes of the Congress and spend this money as it is intended to be spent—for the maintenance of a sound and strong Reserve force of citizen soldiers.

To do otherwise would be an even worse blunder than the Pentagon decision to cut back the Reserve force in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, in the matter of Regular Army troops, the budget this year shows a vast improvement over the first couple of military budgets submitted last year—a matter which I had occasion to discuss at some length in last year's debate on the Defense appropriations bill. There were those of us who considered it extremely dangerous to maintain the Army's regular force strength at below 900,000 men, and our position was amply supported by the military witnesses from the Army who called for a regular force of at least 925,000 men.

In his last revision of the military budget in 1961, President Kennedy came around to this point of view. Spurred by the Berlin crisis, the President called for a minimum force of 1 million men, including the Reserves to be called to active duty.

On June 30, 1961, actual Army strength was only 857,000 men. By December 31, strength had been built back up to over a million men.

With the planned return to civilian life of the Reserves this August, the Army's actual strength will be reduced once more to below the million-man mark. However, it is good to see that the budget requested 960,000 for the Regular Army. Our committee has concurred in this request.

It is, in my estimation, the very minimum strength we can have with safety.

During the second Eisenhower administration, the needed scientific breakthrough occurred and we were able to start developing the arsenal of balanced deadly missiles which are today one of the bulwarks of our deterrent force. This was a very costly process and in developing this program, of necessity, other phases of our defense were deemphasized.

It has, in the past few years, become increasingly obvious that we cannot depend alone on missile strength to prevent aggression. We must have skilled, highly trained, and well-armed foot soldiers. They still bear the heaviest load of responsibility for our defense.

Upon their skill and dedication rests our hope for victory or the danger of defeat.

The Army modernization program is progressing well and this bill carries it even further.

I would like to mention just one more point, Mr. Chairman, and that involves the reunion of soldiers overseas with their families.

During the height of the Berlin crisis, the order went out barring general oversea travel by dependents. It was then a matter of logistics and of present danger should the East Germans and Soviets undertake a rash military adventure.

Although the crisis is not past, the tensions have eased considerably.

I discussed with Secretary McNamara during our hearings the possibility of lifting this ban. He assured the committee that it is under active consideration.

I feel strongly that the travel ban must be lifted as soon as possible. The morale of our fighting forces is being impaired seriously by the separation of families. It is my hope that nothing will intervene during the next few months and that this travel ban can be lifted and our soldiers and their families can once again resume as close to a normal life as possible.

In summing up, Mr. Chairman, I think that on the whole this is a sound bill and will provide the United States with a firm military posture.

I perhaps could have wished for more strength in the matter of Reserves and the National Guard but our committee did include in this bill what I consider to be ample funds for maintaining a solid Reserve force.

We are developing a good mixture of fighting forces—a good balance between the strategic deterrent force which will prevent the Kremlin from undertaking the rash action of launching a nuclear attack and the kind of strong, flexible, and versatile ground forces which will be capable of stopping short any limited aggression the Communist world might undertake.

I strongly recommend the bill to the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in further reference to a point made previously by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes], I have discussed the matter with officials of the Defense Department and am advised that this action was in the public interest. The following statement was provided me:

> Admiral Smith, of the Navy, determined last Friday morning that it was necessary to purchase additional quantities of a special type of steel for the Polaris program. This steel is processed by only United States Steel and Lukens. During the past, for well over a year, the Navy has been buying this steel from those two companies, generally splitting orders between them. United States Steel publicly stated it was raising its prices 3½ percent and Lukens stated they were not raising but were still selling at the old price. Admiral Smith quite properly proposed in the public interest to obtain the lower price on the entire order.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the provision in this Defense appropriations bill which would place a limitation of 15 percent on payments for indirect costs incurred by universities conducting research under Defense Department grants, and in support of the amendment which will be offered at the appropriate time.

I am particularly familiar, and as a result concerned, with the problem that such a limitation would create since I have been closely associated with the University of California at Berkeley, which is in the Seventh California District I have the privilege to represent.

Mr. Chairman, the financial problems confronting our institutions of higher education today are enormous—problems of such significance as constructing urgently needed academic facilities, securing adequate supplies of qualified teachers, and improving the quality of our education to meet the increasingly complex challenges of our ever-changing world.

We in the Congress certainly should not add to these already serious problems. We would do exactly this, however, if we were to accept this 15-percent limitation. We would do this for the overhead costs in conducting these research studies are, on the average, substantially in excess of 15 percent, ranging to as high as 30 percent.

To be sure, Mr. Chairman, universities conducting research under Defense Department grants receive direct and local benefits. Of vastly greater importance, however, is the contribution which this research makes to the security of our Nation and to that of the free world. In brief, this research is indispensable to that security.

Recognizing these factors, I urge the House to reject the 15-percent limitation—to reject it as being unjustified and not in our best national interests. I also urge the House to approve this amendment we are now considering for the reasons I have already mentioned.

Mr. Chairman, this morning's New York Times, in a clear and incisive statement expressed vigorous endorsement for this position, and I commend this thoughtful and penetrating analysis to our colleagues' attention:

RESEARCH FOR DEFENSE

> A clause in the Defense appropriations bill, which comes to the floor of the House today, would set an arbitrarily low limit on payments for indirect costs incurred by universities under Defense Department research grants. Indirect costs include laboratory space, telephones, other utilities, library use and similar items.
>
> The limit proposed is 15 percent of the total grant. Academic spokesmen point out, however, that such costs usually far exceed that figure. Columbia University estimates its average to run to 23 percent, and other institutions put it as high as 30 percent.
>
> The universities do, of course, reap important benefits from such grants. The scope of their operations, especially in science, would be greatly reduced without them. But the universities' contributions are also indispensable to the government and to the security of the Nation. Even if such work could be carried out by industry, which is not feasible, the cost would be far greater.
>
> Higher education is already in serious financial straits, faced with the simultaneous challenges of vastly expanding its facilities, competing for scarce faculty talent and maintaining or even improving the quality of instruction. For the Federal Government to ask, in effect, that the universities partially finance Defense Department research with their own funds would be most unfair. To do so would threaten to interfere with the basic purposes of education, as the Defense Department grants would thus siphon off badly needed general education money. The fact that such Defense Department grants have grown from about $8 million last year to $28.8 million this year merely underlines the danger.
>
> In simplest terms, what must be avoided is a kind of Federal aid in reverse, aid by education to the Federal Government, when education is so desperately in need for assistance. The minimum repayment by the Government should cover the full cost, responsibly audited, shouldered by the universities.

> BERKELEY, CALIF., *April 16, 1962.*
>
> Hon JEFFERY COHELAN,
> *Member of Congress,*
> *New House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> California Institute of Technology, Stanford University, University of Southern California, and all campuses University California all request that you inform entire California delegation of their very strong objection to House appropriation bill for Department of Defense which contains limitation of 15 percent on indirect costs reimbursement to universities conducting research under Department of Defense grants. Understand bill comes to House floor Tuesday or Wednesday this week. Also understand Congressman Meader may introduce amendment on floor deleting objectionable portion. This limitation has dramatic impact on all privately and publicly supported higher education in California. Respectfully suggest that no California Congressman should vote for or against this provision without full facts which are too involved to present by wire.
>
> CLARK KERR,
> *President, University of California.*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, when the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], took the floor earlier in the debate, he devoted some time to the provisions of section 540. This section would limit to 15-percent the amount of indirect costs which could be paid to a recipient of a Federal grant. As the gentleman from Texas explained it, one reason for this limitation is to prevent the grant program from getting out of hand.

I fail to understand, Mr. Speaker, why the grant program should be any less manageable than the contract program. As I understand it, the indirect costs must be carefully justified before any claim for reimbursement will be honored. Of course the Federal grants for defense projects have been increasing, but must we assume that these grants are more costly to the taxpayers of the Nation than other approaches? If they are needlessly expensive, why not study the reasons therefor, then come up with specific recommendations? The committee report indicates—on page 48—that such a study is currently underway. Why not wait until this study is completed? Why is there being advocated now such a sweeping restriction, which unquestionably will work real hardship on the recipients of these grants?

As I indicated previously, Mr. Speaker, the Defense Department has already certified unequivocally, on pages 80–85, against this ceiling which section 540 seeks to impose. Indeed, the Defense Department, on page 83, expressed the fear that a 15 percent limitation might drastically reduce present university research activity and this curtailment would constitute "a serious impediment to the research and development programs vital to the Nation's defense effort." On page 85 the statement is made that "many critical areas of research would be seriously jeopardized if an arbitrary reduction in overhead rates to 15 percent" were to be approved.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I personally feel this kind of ceiling is most unwise. At the very least it will necessitate major changes in the present bookkeeping activities of our universities. It may well affect drastically, and disadvantageously, present and future research programs. Furthermore, I doubt whether it will save the Government any substantial sums of money, unless perhaps some universities refuse to undertake future research activity.

Certainly we cannot expect our universities to divert desperately needed revenues of their own to the subsidization of Federal research projects. Indeed, this may be too often the case now, in cases where the 15 percent limitation on reimbursement for indirect costs presently applies. Before extending this principle, we should examine the whole question most carefully. I see no reason why anyone's feet should be held to the fire while a sensible program is being worked out.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and Mr. PRICE having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11289) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking today on the defense bill H.R. 11289 may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include tabulations and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING 10 O'CLOCK ON APRIL 18

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

INDIANA'S DEEPWATER PUBLIC PORT

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I join today with the distinguished minority leader in introducing a bill to authorize Federal participation in the construction of Indiana's deepwater public port. Identical legislation is also being introduced by the Senators from Indiana.

Indiana has the dubious distinction of being the only one of the several States which border on the Great Lakes which does not have a public deepwater harbor with Federal navigation improvements. There is strong bipartisan support for the construction by the State of Indiana of such a facility. The Indiana State Legislature authorized and funded a port commission and delegated to that group the task of creating a public harbor for our State during its 1961 session by near unanimous votes in each house. Our Governor has taken the lead in driving the project forward to reality. Within a month the actual construction work on the State facilities will begin when sand will be taken from the area of the terminal facilities under terms of a sale agreement.

The Burns Waterway Harbor project is one of the most studied civil works projects in the history of our Corps of Engineers. After a most favorable interim report on the harbor was given in 1960, it was recalled and additional study was made.

Now the Chief of the Corps of Engineers has signed the report of the Board of Engineers of Rivers and Harbors which is even more favorable. In this report, the Corps of Engineers indicates, and I quote from their report:

> The district engineer reports that there is a need for a harbor on the Indiana shore of Lake Michigan at the Burns Waterway site.

The views of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors as expressed in that report are these:

> The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurs in general in the views and recommendations of the reporting officers. It notes the conflict of interest in use of the area and has carefully considered all points of view. The Board also notes that the State of Indiana fully supports establishment of a public harbor in the Burns Waterway area to meet the requirements of increasing commerce and new industry in the State. The improvements proposed by the district engineer are in accord with the desires of the State of Indiana and are considered to be in the general public interest. The benefits from the proposed navigation improvement are considered to be in the general public interest. The benefits from the proposed navigation improvement are considered general and of the nature warranting the expenditure of Federal funds. The proposed improvements are suitable for the prospective vessel traffic and are economically justified.

This report has been forwarded to the appropriate agencies for consideration.

Preliminary reports have been received from the agencies by the district and division engineers in the course of their study and I trust that the Department of the Interior and the Public Health Service will comment immediately on the report so that this project might be expedited.

Both agencies have given the project a good deal of scrutiny and I am certain that they have all the facts at hand. There should be no reason for any delay in their resubmitting statements to the corps. To this end, I have asked the Secretary of the Interior and the Surgeon General to expedite their respective reports.

Indiana badly needs the facilities of a public deepwater harbor on Lake Michigan if it is to realize the potential it has for further industrial development. The jobs and tax base which will develop as a result of expansion around the harbor will benefit the citizens of our entire State. My district lies some 100 miles to the east of the port facility. I know, however, that the benefits which will accrue to the State will richly benefit my constituents.

The State of Indiana is also mindful of the recreational needs of her citizens and her neighbors from Chicago. It fully realizes the need for conservation of natural treasures like the Indiana dunes. It has developed and maintained a park in the area of the dunes for this purpose. Further conservation of land in this area is considered desirable by the State of Indiana and it has so testified before a Senate committee studying a proposal to create an Indiana national seashore. These two projects are not contradictory or competitive. They can and should proceed together complementing one another. The area east of the Northern Indiana Public Service property is of significant value for preservation and the State of Indiana has recommended to the Congress that additional lands be acquired in this area for conservation purposes. But the land to the west of this industrialized Northern Indiana Public Service Co. property has been used for decades for industrial or commercial purposes and should be developed as a port and industrial area. I strongly urge that the Committee on Public Works schedule hearings on this subject so that early consideration can be given to this important project.

ARE WE HARBORING A NAZI CRIMINAL IN THE UNITED STATES?

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, we have always taken great pride in the fact that the United States has offered asylum to people escaping from religious or political oppression. But I think we are not serving the cause of freedom and democracy when we give asylum to those who have in the past been affiliated with Nazis or Communists and who were linked with the murder of innocent men, women, and children.

Such a person now enjoys asylum in this country and freely walks the streets of New York—a privilege which he refused to others when he had power. His name is Nicolae Malaxa, a Rumanian alien, who now resides in New York. He came to this country in 1946 on a temporary visit and has remained here ever since.

In Rumania during the 1940's he was associated with the Fascist Iron Guard as one of their financial backers. During the years 1940-41 the Iron Guard reputedly slaughtered 7,000 Rumanian Jews. In the years during World War II, Malaxa was connected with the German Nazis. After the war, when Rumania came under Communist control, the same Malaxa switched allegiance to the Communists and carried on shady dealings with them. In fact, it is reported that he was paid some $2,500,000 in compensation by the Russians for factories taken from him, and the Communists even allowed him to transfer those funds to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I think this man's background, his stay in this country, his possible connections with the Nazis in Argentina where he stayed in the year 1955, his sham operations in setting up a nonexistent industrial plant in California in order to gain permanent residence in the United States, his questionable relations with the Communists—all that is cause for a full-scale investigation of this man.

What disturbs me most of all is that Malaxa's stay in this country was made possible through a bill introduced by former Vice President Nixon, who was then a U.S. Senator from California. I want to quote from a statement in 1952 by our distinguished colleague, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who made the following observations when the Nixon bill was before his committee:

> I saw something rather suspicious about the bill and I made inquiry about Nicola Malaxa. The bill provided that, despite his violation of the immigration laws and the orders that he received to depart from this country, he might remain here as a legal resident. I discovered that this man Malaxa had had very questionable relations with Communists. I think Senator Nixon is now on the defensive to tell the Nation what he knows about Nicola Malaxa and why he sponsored that bill of one who apparently is a Communist to remain in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why Mr. Nixon introduced a bill to allow one who was associated with Nazis and Communists to remain in the United States; but, be that as it may, I think it is time to take action against this man. By providing asylum to persons of the type of Malaxa, we lose the good will of freedom-loving people everywhere and we encourage criticism and suspicion as to our true aims. The Justice Department and the Department of State would be wise to look into this situation. We cannot afford to harbor such individuals.

AIR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remark at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, within the last year or so it has become perfectly apparent that if our air transportation system is to serve all of the people as well and as economically as it is possible to expect, there must be a greater emphasis upon the use of regional airports which will serve several smaller communities instead of one. We must move away from the use of individual airports at each small community. The Administrator of Federal Aviation and the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, as well as individual members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, have issued statements in which they espouse the cause of the regional airport. They point out that a single community may not be able to support more than a bare minimum of one or two round trips a day if it is the only community served at a particular airport. To be contrasted with this is the situation where a number of smaller communities are served through a single airport conveniently located to all. Under these circumstances, the economic ability of the combined communities to produce passengers for air transportation is such that a much wider and more complete spectrum of service may be economically provided with little expense to the Government in the form of subsidy or in the form of matching airport construction funds.

As the Members of this House know, the Federal Government spends a great deal of money each year in assisting individual communities with the construction of airports and airport facilities and in subsidizing the local service air carriers for the primary purpose of providing service to the smaller communities.

The Members of Congress are understandably concerned lest the amount of money spent for airport construction or the amount spent for subsidy should get out of hand or increase out of proportion to the service being provided.

I hasten to add that I am a user of air transportation myself and that, in my judgment, the provision of air transport services to more rather than fewer people of the United States is highly desirable. I further am not reluctant to vote for appropriations to provide that service where substantial segments of the public will benefit.

I am, however, firmly of the opinion that the moneys of the Federal Government for both airport construction and subsidization of airline service should be spent in such fashion as to secure the most and best airline service for our people at a minimum cost to the Federal Treasury. I believe the area airport concept as developed in speeches and pronouncements of the FAA and the CAB would go a long way toward meeting this objective if it is judiciously and firmly exercised.

I notice that the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April 5 on the subject of transportation also commended the area airport concept. The President in his statement said:

> The development of single airports to serve adjacent cities, or regional airports, is also clearly necessary if these subsidies are to be eliminated and if the Federal Government and local communities are to meet the Nation's needs for adequate airports and air navigation facilities without excessive and unjustifiable costs.

However, there is a situation in eastern North Carolina where several communities are certificated or are proposed by the CAB to be certificated for service within a 25-mile radius. Each of these communities either has or proposes an airport adjacent to itself. I speak of the communities of Kinston, Goldsboro, and Rocky Mount, N.C. Right now there is pending before the FAA an application on the part of one of these cities for matching funds to construct a completely new airport which the city of course desires to be as close as possible to its own boundaries, and which is necessary or desirable in order to accommodate more modern aircraft. Other communities in the area which have not been certificated for service by the CAB, despite the earnest urging by the cities, include Greenville, Wilson and a number of other smaller communities. These cities, having failed to be designated for service by the CAB, have no way to influence location of a central airport which will offer the kind of service the area needs.

And yet all of these communities are so located that the Federal Government could, if it would, establish an airport centrally located to all of the communities which would make possible a much greater facility of service than is possible at any individual community. In addition, instead of having to maintain four or five separate airports, the communities and government would have to maintain only a single airport. When these facts are added to the fact that any airline or airlines serving such a centrally located airport would be able to eliminate duplicate facilities as well as certain operating expenses, the economic soundness of the area airport concept becomes clear.

So far, neither the Administrator nor the Civil Aeronautics Board, to my knowledge, has given any active consideration to ordering a regional airport for the area.

I am hopeful that in the situation I have described in eastern North Carolina, as well as in similar situations, where a number of adjacent communities can sensibly be served through a central facility, the offices of government will use their very best efforts to see such a central facility is provided and that the transportation and financial resources of this country will not be squandered through the provision and operation of separate facilities as small communities where, by such division of effort, the only result must be inferior airline service. I sincerely hope that this government will not spend its money unwisely in building an airport for one city to the exclusion of usefulness to others, particularly where under our

Government's announced policy the airport could be constructed as a model area airport.

THE REPUBLICANS AND "THE LIBERAL PAPERS"

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1962 on the "Ev and Charlie Show," we first heard of a book called "The Liberal Papers." Ev and CHARLIE—the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]—sort of "associated" my name with this book. Immediately, that very day, I wrote the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] the following letter:

MARCH 15, 1962.

DEAR CHARLIE: My name is mentioned in a press release issued by the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership following a leadership meeting this morning, March 15, 1962.

The facts of the matter are set forth in the statement which I issued today:

"My attention has been called to a statement by the Republican National Committee that I am supposed to be a member of a liberal project which is about to publish a book on foreign policy.

"I have never been a member of any liberal project, and have no connection with any book sponsored by it or with any papers that went into the book."

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS.

Evidently the lines and communication between the distinguished minority leader [Mr. HALLECK] and his Republican cohorts are not entirely effective. Yesterday morning, Monday, April 16, 1962, I received the following letter from the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD] advising me of the intention of himself and nine of his colleagues that my name would be "associated" with "The Liberal Papers," and that something would be said on the floor about it yesterday afternoon.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1962.

Hon. HENRY REUSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On Monday next, April 16, I have secured time to address the House with nine of my colleagues in connection with the recent Doubleday edition of the "Liberal Papers."

I mention this to you since your name has been associated with these papers, so that you will be aware of our intention in the event you wish to be present in the House at the time.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STAFFORD,
Member of Congress.

Since I do not particularly enjoy suggestions that I am any less patriotic or loyal than any other Member, I forthwith replied to the gentleman from Vermont, making sure that my reply was hand delivered to him at 11:15 o'clock, Monday morning, April 16, 1962, as follows:

APRIL 16, 1962.

DEAR MR. STAFFORD: Thank you for your letter dated April 13 which I just received at 10:15 today (Monday morning, April 16), in which you say that you and nine of your colleagues intend to address the House today and that my name has been "associated" with "the recent Doubleday edition of the 'Liberal Papers'."

I shall not be able to be present in the House when you and your nine colleagues conduct your symposium. However, if you or any of your colleagues propose to mention my name, you should be aware of the facts. I have never been a member of the liberal group or the liberal project, and I have no connection with the "Liberal Papers." When my name was mentioned in connection with the liberal project 2 years ago, I issued a public statement to the effect that I was not a member of the liberal project or the liberal group. I have not seen the "Liberal Papers," and have nothing whatever to do with them.

If you or any of your nine colleagues intends to mention my name so as to suggest in any way that I had any connection with the "Liberal Papers," I request that you include the contents of this letter in your remarks.

I would hope, too, that you or any other of your nine colleagues would, before mentioning my name, show your confidence in what you are saying on the floor by waiving your congressional immunity for what you say on the floor.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

I am glad that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD] and his nine Republican colleagues received my letter. In the 11 pages of this morning's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 16, 1962, pages 6707–6718—my name is not mentioned.

But in the course of reading these 11 pages, I am disturbed by the attitude of the 10 participating Republicans. They seem not merely to disagree with the ideas which they say are expressed in "The Liberal Papers." By denouncing these views as "most naive and dangerous to our security," "wild extremism shown by the apostles of appeasement and the disciples of defeat," tending toward "a weakening of the United States and of the free world"—they apparently deny the right under our American system of the authors of these papers to express their views.

I have no way of telling, Mr. Speaker, what kind of a view the 10 Republican Members gave us yesterday of "The Liberal Papers." From what they say, some of the papers appear to have been written by well known and respected scholars, others by persons unknown to me. Some of the ideas suggested seem good, some distinctly mediocre, many quite zany.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is not whether some of the ideas presented are crackpot, but whether the authors of the Liberal Papers have a right to present their ideas and be heard. I defend the right of the authors of these papers to make public their ideas. As Thomas Jefferson said in his first inaugural:

> Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.

I do not find that the Goddess of Reason was hovering over much that was said here yesterday. For example, one of the participants in the symposium denounced the following suggestion by Prof. Quincy Wright: "Breaking down nationalistic and ideological barriers to trade, and facilitating the development of the world through the pacifying influence of international commerce."

At the risk of being called a Red, I would like to align myself with Professor Wright on this. I am all for world trade and I think it is a good thing.

In fact, I do not find that the remarks of the 10 Republican Members particularly strengthen the cause of the free world in its struggle against communism. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] says—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6717—speaking of our relations with Chancellor Adenauer's Germany:

> Adenauer has long been toying with the idea of announcing himself neutral and making a deal with the Russians.

I would defend to the end the right of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] to slander Chancellor Adenauer on the floor of the House, but I think he is dead wrong, and I am confident that his views are not shared by any other Member.

The Republican Members attempt to involve the White House in "The Liberal Papers" in a most ingenious way. August Heckscher, who is currently helping out in the White House on cultural matters, wrote a book review of "The Liberal Papers" in the New York Times book review section for April 8, 1962, in which he made the general point that it is a good thing for new ideas to be expressed. For this, Mr. Heckscher was criticized on the floor by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that later on in the debate another Republican Member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] made the same point that Mr. Heckscher did. Said the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL]—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6718:

> I have read those Liberal Papers with a great deal of interest. The Liberal Papers have provoked an interesting discussion in that they have made their greatest contribution. Even though I cannot agree with all that has been written by them, they have given us an opportunity to further discuss all of these matters that relate to the preservation of ideals and the promotion of ideals that must be established in all parts of the world if we are giong to have a peaceful world and if we are going to realize the kind of a situation we all want so that all of us can have a more abundant life.

It would be silly, Mr. Speaker, to say on the basis of this that the Republicans have endorsed and sponsored "The Liberal Papers." But I think it is equally silly to try to pin it on the White House because of Mr. Heckscher's book review.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the American people are so forlorn that we cannot stand hearing new ideas—good, bad, or indifferent—and accept them or reject them on their merits. The Republicans who think that they have a shillelagh may end up with a political boomerang.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has explained his position to me and, if he disassociates himself, as far as I am concerned, that is it.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman, although unfortunately that apparently was not it for his young Republican colleagues, and I ask the gentleman what kind of communication exists between the minority leader and these 10 freshman Republicans?

Mr. HALLECK. I have here a photostatic copy of a statement given at a liberal project press conference on April 19, 1960 in room 346 of the House Office Building, printed on the stationery of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER].

Mr. REUSS. Yes, I know all about that 2-year-old press release, and I wrote the gentleman on March 15, 1962, to inform him that the release was in error. Two years ago I got out a statement showing that the press release was inaccurate, and that I was not a member of "liberal group," yet the gentleman on March 15, 1962, took the television microphone and mentioned my name.

Mr. HALLECK. But the gentleman does recognize that he was listed as one of the participants.

CREATION OF YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, infrequently does major legislation receive such overwhelming support from all areas of the country as has been evidenced in the case of legislation to create a Youth Conservation Corps.

At this time I would direct my colleagues' attention to an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, April 13, which shows that over 70 percent of the people in all regions of the Nation—East, Midwest, South, and Far West—regardless of political party or affiliation, favor the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps along the lines of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's as a means of accomplishing many worthwhile conservation projects and, at the same time, effectively attacking the youth unemployment problem.

I am pleased to say that the House Education and Labor Committee has reported on March 29, 1962, H.R. 10682, the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1962, title I of which makes provision for a Youth Conseravtion Corps. I sincerely hope that Rules Committee clearance at an early late can be obtained for this important legislation so that the full membership will have an opportunity to take prompt action on this popular demand. I include the full article to which I have referred following remarks at this point in the RECORD:

EIGHT IN TEN FAVOR REVIVAL OF CCC YOUTH CAMPS

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—As a way of dealing with the growing problem of out-of-school, out-of-work young men, the American public is highly in favor of reviving the concept of the CCC camps of the 1930's.

Supported by 8 out of 10 persons, such a proposal would set up youth conservation camps for men between the ages of 16 and 22 who want to learn a trade and earn a little money by working outdoors.

Such a concept is embodied in the youth training bills now before Congress, with differing Senate and House versions. The Senate bill calls for a maximum of 150,000 youths in the program by the year 1965; the House version would limit the number to 12,000 at any time over a 3-year period.

To see how the public feels about the general principle of modern-day CCC camps, Gallup poll reporters put this question to a cross section of adults:

"It is proposed that the Federal Government set up youth camps—such as the CCC camps of the 1930's—for young men 16 to 22 years who want to learn a trade and earn a little money by outdoor work. Do you think this is a good idea or a poor idea?"

The vote nationwide:

	Percent
Good idea	79
Poor idea	16
No opinion	5

Analysis shows that the youth camps win overwhelming support in all regions of the Nation—East, Midwest, South and Far West.

Big majorities of older voters—who recall the CCC camps of the 1930's—as well as younger voters endorse the idea of youth camps.

Although the proposal has bipartisan support at the grassroots level, a modern-day CCC has more appeal to Democrats and Independents (83- and 80-percent approval respectively) than it does to rank-and-file Republicans (70-percent approval).

Although the public supports the basic principle of youth conservation camps, the question of whether youths who are out of school and out of work should be required to go to these camps provokes some controversy.

Authorities estimate that as many as 1 million young men each year find themselves out of school, out of work, and not accepted by the military service. Many youth experts contend that this situation, in addition to providing a breeding ground for juvenile delinquency, constitutes a great waste of the Nation's manpower.

Overall, when asked about requiring such young men to go to youth camps, more persons approve of the mandatory approach than disapprove of it.

Among Republicans interviewed, however, the prevailing sentiment is against requiring young men to go to the camps. Democrats and Independents support such an approach.

Younger voters tend to vote against such a method of handling the youth camps; a majority of older voters are in favor of it.

During the 1930s, upwards of 2 million men were at one time members of the Civilian Conservation Corps or its predecessor, the Emergency Conservation Work Agency.

Gallup poll files show that no New Deal measure was so consistently popular with the public as the CCC camps.

In July 1936, after the camps had been in operation for 3 years, 83 percent of persons in a national survey were in favor of continuing the CCC.

In April 1938, another Gallup poll recorded nearly 8 out of 10 in favor of establishing the camps on a permanent basis.

AN INCREDIBLE WEEK

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to compare two editorials from two of the leading dailies of the United States on the question of the "hassle" between the President and management of some of the large steel companies.

The subject of the controversy is not new; Presidents in the past have tried to use their office to deal with wage negotiations within the steel industry.

The impact of this effort will be felt for years to come.

The editorials to which I have referred are as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 16, 1962]

AN INCREDIBLE WEEK

In a long life not without its share of amazements, we never saw anything like it.

On Tuesday one of the country's steel companies announced it was going to try to get more money for its product. And promptly all hell busted loose.

We wouldn't have been surprised ourselves if some people had shaken their heads in puzzlement at the new price list. Although after 20 years of inflation a price rise in anything is hardly unusual, there was some reason for wondering if the company officials had made the right decision in today's market.

But what happened was no mere headshaking. The President of the United States went into what can only be described as a tirade. Not only had the company changed its price list without consulting him but it had also set a price which, in his opinion, was "wholly unjustified." With a long preamble in which he rang in the Berlin crisis, the soldiers killed the other day in Vietnam, the wives and mothers separated from their husbands by the Reserve callup—all of which he cast at the feet of these irresponsible steel officials—he wound up by crying that these men had shown their "utter contempt" for the welfare of the country.

The response in Washington was instantaneous. The Justice Department, the Federal Trade Commission, the congressional inquisitors all leaped to arms.

Then came the night riders. At 3 a.m. Thursday morning a reporter for the Associated Press was awakened by Government agents unable to wait even for regular office hours in their driven haste to find out what testimony he could give about the criminal conduct of these steel officials. At 5 a.m. it was the turn of our own reporter in Philadelphia. At 6:30 a.m. the scene was repeated in Wilmington, Del., for a reporter on the Evening Journal. All this without any warrants, only orders from the Attorney General of the United States.

By mid-Thursday morning the United States Steel Corp. had been subpenaed for all documents bearing on the crime and had learned that a Federal grand jury would move swiftly to see what laws had been violated by asking three-tenths of a cent a pound more for a piece of steel.

This brought us to Thursday afternoon. Then Mr. Roger Blough, the chairman of this company, felt forced to stand up to an assembly of microphones and television cameras and defend himself before the country for the wickedness of his deeds. And to be treated by the reporters at that gathering as if they were a part of the prosecution and he was, indeed, a malefactor in the dock.

And that leads to what is probably the most amazing thing of all about last week. Across the country—on the radio, in newspapers, and at street corners—the necessity of the defenders to justify themselves before the righteous accusers was simply accepted as a premise from which the trial should begin. There were few to say otherwise.

In such a climate it was not at all surprising what the mailed fist could do. All day Friday steel company offices were awash with Government agents, while the threats of punishment were mingled with promises of reward for doing the rulers' bidding. It is a technique of Government not unknown elsewhere in the world, and it is a combination almost irresistible. So by Friday night Mr. Kennedy had his victory.

Finally the jubilation. The President himself said all the people of the United States should be gratified. Around him there was joy unrestrained at this proof positive of how naked political power, ruthlessly used, could smash any private citizen who got in its way. So far as we could tell, the people did seem relieved that it was all over and that the malefactors had been brought to heel.

Yet what, in all truth, is this crime with which these men stood charged by a wrathful President?

It had nothing to do with arguments about whether this particular asking price was economically justified, or fair to the steel stockholders, or somehow responsible for dead soldiers in Vietnam. This last is sheer demagoguery, and the others are questions no man can answer—neither Mr. Blough nor Mr. Kennedy.

What was really at issue here, and still is, is whether the price of steel is to be determined by the constant bargaining in the marketplace between the makers and buyers of steel; you may be sure that if the makers guessed wrong the market would promptly change their decision. Or whether the price of steel is to be decided and then enforced by the Government. In short, the issue is whether we have a free market system or whether we do not. That, and nothing more.

Thus the true crime of this company was that it did not get permission from the Government and that its attempted asking price did not suit the ideas of a tiny handful of men around the White House.

It was for this that last week we saw the President of the United States in a fury, a public pillorying of an industry, threatened reprisals against all business, the spectacle of a private citizen helplessly trying to defend himself against unnamed accusations, the knock of policemen on the midnight door. And there was hardly a voice rising above the clamor to ask what it was all about.

If we had not seen it with our eyes and heard it with our own ears, we would not have been able to believe that in America it actually happened.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 14, 1962]

ECONOMICS WINS IN STEEL

The collapse of the price rise movement in the American steel industry, including its abandonment even by those who initiated it, is a triumph for commonsense.

There have been efforts to interpret it in political terms; but the much more cogent factors in the outcome were economic.

The forces of public opinion were effectively invoked by President Kennedy, but public sentiment has been invoked before, either against business or organized labor, with much less effect.

For decades the United States Steel Corp., by far the largest producer, has been the acknowledged policy leader in American steel. This time the crucial factor probably was that a significant number of other steel managements just could not believe that an increase in charges to customers was the way to sell more steel.

And to sell more steel is the big need of American companies both at home and overseas. The great difference between this occasion and the many wage and price rises of earlier times is that now the American steel industry is part of a world market.

No longer can it either sit behind a tariff wall that insures supremacy in its domestic market nor be unconcerned about sales abroad. In both areas it has always operated against heavy wage differentials, making up its disadvantage by efficiency, but now European and Japanese steelmakers also have highly modern equipment.

Moreover—not unlike the railroads, facing competition by highway, waterway, and air—American steel manufacturers have seen need to look to their defenses against displacement by substitute materials, either nonferrous metals or plastics, as well as against inroads of foreign steel.

The manner of the reversal of the intended price rise has several lessons in it. Spokesmen both of business and government have backed away from the implication that this was a premeditated challenge to the Kennedy administration. Or that such a conflict could possibly be desirable.

The break came when it was apparent that two relatively small, but by no means inconsequential, producers—Inland and Kaiser—would not join in making steel more expensive. This gave Defense Secretary McNamara an opportunity to state that suppliers who kept the old prices would be favored in Government contracts. The move not only was logical in taxpayers' interests but hinted what might be the reaction of less massive buyers down to the purchaser of an electric toaster.

The denouement offers a surprising but conclusive answer to the crux of the Attorney General's antitrust theory in the case. Obviously the United States Steel Corp. did not hold so dominant a position as to control the action of the rest of the companies.

Further, the episode leaves intact points made by Roger Blough, chairman of that firm: (1) That the steel industry of America has absorbed several wage-cost increases since its last price increase. (2) That depreciation allowances under Federal income taxes are far from sufficient to permit it the means of financing necessary plant expansion.

On the matter of tax relief, even tax inducements to facilitate modernization, the American steel industry now has a far stronger case than appeared for a few days.

And the entire Nation can move into an era of heightened production with a unity and vigor that were briefly very much in danger.

SHALL WE TURN OUR BACKS ON THOSE WHOSE ONLY DESIRE IS TO SERVE?

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELEY-BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, the Armed Services Committee is conducting hearings on the proposal by the Department of Defense to reorganize the Reserve components of the Army.

This proposed reorganization would include what the Department chooses to call the realinement of the 43d Infantry Division, the famous Winged Victory Division of World War II. I am particularly opposed to the plan to reduce the 43d from a division to a brigade, and I have requested the committee to permit me to testify at the hearings, as have some 20 or more Members of this House.

The greater part of the Connecticut National Guard is in the 43d Division, which has its headquarters in Connecticut, with Maj. Gen. Edmund Walker as commanding officer. National Guard units of the Rhode Island and Vermont National Guard also are part of the 43d.

It is the patriotic interest of a large number of young men of New England whose only desire is to continue to serve their country, which impels me to speak out against a reorganization which forecloses that kind of service.

I, for one, and I am sure that I am joined in this by every Member of the Congress, am as eager as the Department of the Army can possibly be to "improve the overall combat readiness of the Reserve components of the Army," as the Department of Defense has announced.

It is a wise provision of the law, it seems to me, which requires the Department of Defense to submit its plans for proposed changes in our military posture to the appropriate committees of the House and of the Senate. In this way, Congress very properly exercises a veto power over the significant acts of the Defense Establishment. In this way, too, not only is the solemn tradition, which is as old as our country, observed, of ultimate civilian control of the military; but also the elected representatives of the people are assured of full knowledge of military programs before they are undertaken.

As the Armed Services Committee inquires further into this plan for reorganization, perhaps its members, too, as I do, will find it difficult to see how the "overall combat readiness of the Reserve components" of the Army can be improved by reducing the 43d Infantry Division, composed of units of the National Guard of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Vermont, to a brigade.

I believe that this situation which represents my particular interest is an example of Pentagon thinking which has far deeper significance.

The present Reserve structure consists of 27 National Guard divisions and 10 Army Reserve divisions. The Secretary of the Army, in a memorandum to the Governors of the various States, said:

> It has been determined that eight infantry divisions in this structure are excess to our mobilization requirements, the eight consisting of four National Guard and four Army Reserve divisions.

So, they are realining these surplus divisions by reducing them to brigades. Heaven forbid that, in battle, it should ever be necessary to realine our forces that way.

I expect that the committee will weigh carefully the proposed reorganization of the Reserve components, to determine in what way overall combat readiness of our entire Defense Establishment can be improved by reducing Reserve Forces in being to a status which is little more than existence on paper.

As contemporary intelligence to accompany the Army's news about its plan to increase its overall combat readiness by reducing eight divisions to brigades, I offer the substance of two news items from the press of last week.

One carries a headline, "Defense Officials See a Low Draft Rate in the Next Few Years." The other says "an Army spokesman hinted" that "tens of thousands of reservists who have not participated in organized units since leaving active duty may face compulsory summer training." The news item goes on to say that as part of a planned reorganization of the Reserves, "the first to be tapped would be young reservists who had 6 months' active duty with the Army, followed by former draftees, reservists with 2 years' active duty, and other categories."

On the one hand, the Selective Service is going to call up fewer and fewer young men when they arrive at the age for required service; and on the other hand, men who have had 6 months of active duty are to be called back.

These two items do not make very much sense by themselves; but the whole picture makes even less sense when we add to it the Army's proposal to improve combat readiness by wiping out four National Guard divisions, one of which, the 43d, has a heritage of glory that can match that of some of the proudest divisions of the Regular Army.

It has been claimed, by spokesmen for the brass hats who throughout our history have managed only to tolerate the National Guard as a part of our Military Establishment, that Regular Army outfits yield "more bang per buck" for our country than the joint Federal-State forces of the National Guard.

Since it has been the established policy of our country for some time now that military preparedness and the security of the Nation demand the potential service of men of all ages and of all occupations, in various ways, it is difficult to see how this argument has any bearing upon the demobilization of the National Guard now proposed.

The Defense Department proposed for the 1963 fiscal year a total strength of 670,000 for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve, a reduction from the 700,000 for which Congress provided funds in the current fiscal year. Later, the Pentagon proposed cutting this authorized strength to 642,000, or 58,000 less than the strength for which Congress provided funds this year.

However, the Appropriations Committee, after due study, says it "is not in sympathy with the drill strength estimates" submitted by the Army, and "recommends the appropriation of funds for the continuation of a program of 700,000 paid drill strength. It is expected that the paid drill strengths of these components of the Reserve Forces will be maintained at 400,000 for the Army National Guard and 300,000 for the Army Reserve."

So, benching the National Guard as an economy move is one that is not endorsed by the greatest economizers known to our Government, the members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. And if it is a move in the interest of efficiency, the Army will have to demonstrate to the Armed Services Committee, it seems to me, that it can achieve more overall combat readiness by recruiting and training 58,000 fewer troops.

There is more to combat readiness or military effectiveness than hardware. The best possible equipment is essential; but more essential is what is inside the man who is to do the fighting.

Men join up, in the Regular Army, in the National Guard, in the Reserves, for a variety of reasons, beyond the obligation for service which the present Selective Service Act imposes.

It is a well-known fact that the recruiting of men for the National Guard costs far less than the really impressive costs of recruiting a man for the Regular Army. In peace and in war, men who join like to serve with their own buddies, with fellows from their own hometown. Whatever differences of opinion there may be at times about the combat readiness, it will be admitted, I believe, that the morale of most National Guard divisions in all of our wars has been conspicuously high, and has been of great effect in difficult times.

The commanding general of the American Forces in Germany at the present time, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, said recently:

> The National Guard made an outstanding contribution to victory in the First World War, but it was in World War II that the guard really proved its importance as one of the shaping forces in our national policy.

A history of U.S. military policy on Reserve Forces from 1775 through 1957, prepared by Eilene Galloway, national defense analyst of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress makes some concluding observations after reviewing the always-controversial part that the National Guard has played ever since the beginning of our country.

A particularly appropriate observation, it seems to me, is this one:

> Military manpower laws must be supported by what Mr. Justice Holmes called a preponderant public opinion. Such opinion has been in the process of being formulated and of making an adjustment to the continuing threat posed by aggressive communism, and is now much more firm in supporting an adequate and stabilized Military Establishment than it has been throughout the greater part of the Nation's history when the threat of war was intermittent. Even so, a very careful balance must be struck between compulsory and voluntary provisions by which the citizen may discourage his military obligation.
>
> Legislation alone is not the answer to all the problems. Success depends also upon a combination of leadership and morale, good programs and adequate appropriations, wise departmental regulations and administration, facilities and equipment, and public understanding.

When the 43d Infantry Division came home from the Japanese mainland after World War II was over, with its record of 7,610 casualties and 11,806 decorations, the commanding general of the Army Ground Forces had this to say:

> Ranking as it does, with the finest military units of the United States, the 43d Infantry Division can look back with justifiable pride upon its splendid accomplishments in the Asiatic-Pacific theater of operations. The division contributed to our glorious victory over a fanatical foe and won the undying esteem of a grateful Nation.
>
> You officers and men of the 43d, possessing sterling qualities of courage, sacrifice, and deep devotion to duty, must as individuals feel proud of the battles won in four major campaigns—Guadalcanal, the Northern Solomons, New Guinea, and Luzon. Now that the advance of peace permits the inactivation of the 43d Division, may I commend you and your organization and add my sincere appreciation for a job well done.

Today, the officers and men of the 43d Division are of a later generation, all but a few of the senior officers, perhaps. But the division is the same, and its soldiers are of the same stock as those who earned so valiantly the commendation quoted.

The way to improve combat readiness is to recruit to full strength the 43d Division, and others like it, to back up the Regular Army and our fighting forces all over the world.

These men of the 43d Division are eager to serve their country, as they have been doing. Shall we turn our backs on them?

U.S. FOREIGN TRADE POLICY—A DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES BY A COMMITTEE OF ECONOMISTS

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHNEEBELI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, this House has been subjected to the most remarkable number of unfounded assertions about what the so-called trade expansion bill, H.R. 9900, would accomplish. It was refreshing, therefore, for us to receive testimony of a completely objective nature on the measure from a distinguished committee of economists. The statement was prepared and delivered by Prof. Patrick M. Boarman, of Bucknell. The chairman of the committee is the distinguished professor emeritus, O. Glenn Saxon, of Yale. The vice chairman is James Washington Bell, likewise a distinguished professor emeritus from Northwestern University:

A DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES BY A COMMITTEE OF ECONOMISTS

(Presented to the House Committee on Ways and Means April 9, 1962, by Patrick M. Boarman, associate professor of economics, Bucknell University)

I

The committee of economists whom I have the privilege to represent (their names are appended to this statement) is not concerned with the special interest of any particular group or entity—firm, industry, occupation, or geographical region. Our concern is rather with the interest of the Nation as a whole as we judge this interest to be affected by the proposed tariff reform legislation known as H.R. 9900.

It is our belief that unless there are substantial changes in the proposed legislation and unless it is accompanied simultaneously by thoroughgoing internal reforms (which we shall presently specify), its net effect will be to harm the Nation's domestic economy and worsen its already weak international posture.

Let it be said at the outset that all of us as economists support the ideal of universal free trade and all that it implies. All of us will agree with Adam Smith that "it is the maxim of every prudent master of a family never to attempt to make at home what it will cost him more to make than to buy" and that "what is prudence in the conduct of every private family can scarcely be folly in that of a great kingdom."

We favor free trade and the measures which will promote such trade for reasons which are derived directly from the first principles of economics. Free trade increases economic welfare for all the participating countries. It expands consumers' choices, giving them the possibility of acquiring goods which cannot be had at home, or which can be had at home only at higher prices. Free trade makes it possible for each country to specialize in those lines of economic endeavor in which it is most efficient, thus maximizing the gross gain to the world from the world's resources.

This much said, however, it behooves us to inquire into the conditions under which this gross gain to the world from free trade will be fairly shared by the participating countries. Free trade was never supposed to operate in a vacuum, but only within the context of certain conditions. These are, first, that there will be no quantitative restrictions of trade (quotas) imposed by the trading countries. Reductions of tariffs on specified items will be meaningless where there are limitations on the quantity of the commodity which may be imported.

Secondly, it is assumed that full and complete convertibility of currencies prevails, i.e., that the free trade area in question constitutes, in effect, one homogeneous payment community. Were this not to be the case, reductions in tariffs, whether undertaken unilaterally or multilaterally, could be deprived of any real significance. Of what use would it be to have the tariff reduced on a given import if one cannot freely acquire the foreign exchange needed to buy the import in the first place?

Thirdly, for free trade not to result in unfavorable advantage being taken by one country or another, it is assumed that no special advantages are reserved to one country in virtue of its tax structure, the subsidies it pays to domestic producers, or the domestic monopolies and cartels its laws may permit to exist.

Fourth, while it is not necessary for wages in a multilateral system to be the same in every country—indeed, the existence of trade is to a large extent predicated upon such differences—it is necessary that the ratio of money wage increases to productivity increases be approximately uniform in the free trade area. It is easy to see what the consequence would be if this condition were not met. If wages in Country A are increasing faster in relation to the increases in its productivity than wages are increasing relative to productivity elsewhere, A will find that its cost of production in respect to labor will place it at an increasing disadvantage in the world's markets, leading to a fall in its exports. Moreover, where the unfavorable wages-to-productivity ratio is maintained, a rise in imports will ensue as A's industries lose out to foreign producers even in their own home markets. These issues are of particular concern to the United States at the present time since the wage-productivity relationship has become increasingly unfavorable for us. The statistics cited by Emile Benoit in his study "Europe at Sixes and Sevens"[1] show that while wages in manufacturing rose 31 percent in the United States between 1953 and 1960, they rose 34 percent in France, 45 percent in Italy, 49 percent in Japan, 60 percent in Great Britain, and 69 percent in West Germany. However, the apparent modest increase in the level of U.S. wages was more than offset by the relative stagnation of U.S. productivity in the same period. Thus, U.S. productivity in manufacturing rose only 15 percent as compared with a rise of 53 percent in Germany, 54 percent in France, 58 percent in Italy, and 71 percent in Japan. Even Great Britain, where productivity growth has lagged, registered an increase of 29 percent, a rate almost twice that of the United States.

It may be argued that a country such as the United States will be forced ultimatelv to shift resources into activities where it is most productive and in which its high general level of wages is justified. This is correct but two vital considerations impose themselves in this case. The first is the extent and the duration of the transitional process involved in the reallocation of the factors of production. A sudden displacement of factors from present employments, where there are no immediate prospects of reemployment, is a situation attended always by the danger of cyclical upset. The larger the quantity of factors involved and the longer the time needed to reabsorb them into other lines of activity, the greater is the likelihood of a domestic collapse of confidence leading, via the multiplier effect, to the perverse dynamics of a recession. Moreover, the fewer are the alternative uses to which the factors can be put, the more likely it is that factor displacement due to imports will be chronic (for example, sheet glass factories can be used only to produce sheet glass; there is no other use to which they can be put should imports put an end to the sheet glass industry). Widespread and chronic underuse of labor and other factors, and the economic stagnation which accompanies unemployment of this kind, must be regarded as heavy price to pay for the gains of free trade. Indeed, the gains of free trade will in this case accrue only to one segment of the population, namely, those who are still employed and who have incomes available to expend on imports.

The second consideration is that it is at least theoretically conceivable that a wage-to-productivity ratio could become so unfavorable for a given country (in our case, the United States) that there would be continuous shrinkage of domestic employment to industries of the highest productivity. The more unfavorable the overall wage-productivity ratio becomes, the smaller will be the volume of domestic employment that it can support. In an extreme case, 50 percent of our labor force could conceivably be put out of work with the employed 50 percent earning the exceptionally high wages that it is possible to pay in the remaining most productive industries.

A fifth, and most important basic assumption of a free trade world in which there will not be chronic balance of payments disequilibria, is that the participating countries are all following roughly parallel fiscal and monetary policies. The postwar period has provided us with some egregious examples of the problems which result where this is not the case. If country A follows a persistently inflationary course whereas country B follows a strictly anti-inflationary course, the resulting relative excess demand in A will tend to consume exportable resources, thus slowing exports to B, and to suck in imports, often regardless of price. Conversely, the relatively restrained level of demand in B will free resources for export to A while simultaneously slowing B's consumption of imports. The combined effects of these movements will be to cause A to have a chronic deficit and B a chronic surplus in its balance of payments. To the extent that tariffs and other barriers to trade are lowered, these imbalances will tend to become even more pronounced.

Other characteristics of a free trade world would be the absence of barriers to the free flow of labor and capital across national borders and security for capital investments against nationalization without just compensation. These and all of the preceding conditions which have been mentioned are indispensable to the operation of a free trade system which is not to result in the exploitation of one country by another or in chronic international disequilibrium, or both. But it is patent that today not one of the conditions mentioned is fulfilled, at least as far as the trade between the United States and the rest of the world is concerned. In particular, there is a glaring lack of parallelism in the monetary and fiscal policies of the United States and other countries. It is this circumstance which will undoubtedly give us the most trouble as we embark upon any program of trade expansion.

II

Among the most dramatic recent examples of what happens where there is sharp divergence in internal monetary and fiscal policies amongst the members of a trading system is provided within the European complex itself. The notorious chronic export surpluses of West Germany in the fifties were due primarily to the fact that Germany, remembering her disastrous inflations, was pursuing a determinedly anti-inflationary policy whereas Great Britain, France, and the Scandinavian countries, remembering the great depression, were pursuing policies of monetary ease, tolerating inflation for the sake of promoting full employment and the objectives of the welfare state. Equally notorious and annoying, in consequence, were the chronic balance-of-payments deficits registered by these countries. Indeed, so acute did intra-European imbalance become in the middle fifties, so scarce the D-mark, that the painfully reerected system of partial multilateralism in Europe was on the point of collapse. It was only when the British in 1957, under the leadership of Macmillan, the "great deflationist," abandoned the long-dominant cheap money philosophy (the British Central Bank raised its rediscount rate in that year to an alltime high of 7 percent) that a semblance of equilibrium was restored.

More particularly, it was because France at the end of 1958 put a stop to inflation and devalued the franc, coupling these acts with certain drastic reforms of the domestic economy, that the Common Market became possible. In effect, the Common Market countries all adjusted their internal policies to those of the most disciplined member, West Germany. Had France not so adjusted its internal price and income levels, the opening of the Common Market on January 1, 1959, even with the relatively modest tariff reductions which then occurred, would have bankrupted that nation overnight.

Frenchmen with their inflated incomes and prices would have rushed to buy German goods, whereas Germans, with their relatively lower incomes and lower prices would have had no particular urge to purchase French commodities in spite of lower French tariffs. The point is that France in the pre-Common Market era did not suffer from progressively larger deficits because she was poor—she was and is potentially one of the richest nations of Europe. And Germany did not enjoy progressively larger export surpluses because she was rich. Two things—wrote Wilhelm Roepke[2] apropos of the French difficulties of 1957—must be kept distinct:

---

[1] Emile Benoit, "Europe at Sixes and Sevens" (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961).

"On the one hand, the economic potential of a country or what may be called the foundations of its wealth and, on the other, its economic-monetary order upon which depends the degree to which this potential is activated. Attention must be directed to the undeniable fact that the economic potential of France is in spite of everything greater than that of Germany by a not inconsiderable margin. Against this, however, Germany was more fortunate in the activation of its economic potential than France * * * the former country succeeded by means of a clearly conceived and for the most part effectively executed economic policy in solving the economic problem No. 1 of every economic system; viz, the problem of economic order. This is the secret of everything which has occurred since the reform of summer 1948 under the rubric of the German economic miracle. The principle which requires that one not confuse economic potential with economic order, nor superiority of economic condition with economic equilibrium was especially pertinent in the case of German balance-of-payments surpluses and recent French balance-of-payments deficits.

"The differences in economic condition between France and Germany—differences which are in France's favor—remained in spite of the disturbance to the balance of payments * * * But it was precisely the perverse effect of the disturbance to balance of payments equilibrium between France and Germany and of the associated differences in inflationary pressure between them that the poorer country was forced to become the creditor of the richer country."[3]

It is perhaps unnecessary to add that Professor Roepke's analysis and his prophecy that the French economy needed only the right policies in order to come alive and realize its full potential were fully vindicated in the turnabout in the French balance of payments from deep deficit to substantial surplus. What is of significance here is that it was not the establishment of the Common Market or the lowering of tariffs as such which made the Common Market countries economically strong. On the contrary, it was the return to monetary and economic discipline of these countries and their individual efforts to adjust their internal policies to a common international standard which made possible the Common Market and the associated benefits of tariff cutting. Free trade, in short, and the tariff reductions which it implies, are but pleasant byproducts of prior monetary and fiscal integration and harmonization.

III

It is now the United States which has moved into the deficit position in the international economy once held by certain of our European neighbors. The dollar shortage which so mesmerized the attention of economists until a very short while ago, has been converted to a dollar glut. And if the chronic dollar shortages (and D-mark shortages) of the early postwar period were due chiefly to the refusal of some nondollar (and non-D-mark) countries to remove excess demand from their economies by appropriate monetary and fiscal policies, the dollar glut must be attributed in great part to the persistent failure of the United States to make the internal adjustments necessary to maintain balance with the changed world surroundings of the 50's and 60's.

The real issue confronting the United States today in its international economic relationships is not, therefore, whether we should have tariff reform or no tariff reform. It is whether we should have tariff reform with, or tariff reform without simultaneous (or better still prior) internal fiscal, monetary, and economic reforms. But concern for such reforms is conspicuously absent in H.R. 9900.

If the appropriate conditions under which free trade can work to our advantage in the present world situation seem to us to have been unduly neglected in the proposed legislation, it is nevertheless clear that what the proponents of this legislation have in mind is something far more than the simple economic gains to consumers here and abroad which more free trade will bring. The trade expansion program is supposed to achieve in one fell swoop nothing less than the following ambitious goals:

1. Increase in consumer welfare.
2. Increase in employment.
3. Accelerated growth of the U.S. economy.
4. Maintenance of U.S. economic leadership of the free world.
5. Aid to the developing nations.
6. Overcoming of U.S. balance-of-payments deficits and ending of the drain on U.S. gold reserves. (This has been implied by spokesmen for H.R. 9900; there is no specific mention of this objective in the bill itself.)

Free trade, in fact, is being urged as the answer to almost all our problems, domestic and international. It is important to note that there is a very large assumption on which these expectations are based. The assumption is that the proposed legislation will not only cause exports to increase to an extent equal to the expected increase in imports, but that it will yield a net increase in exports over imports. Obviously, if exports increase only at the same rate as imports, none of the stated objectives, except perhaps increased consumer welfare, can be attained. Only if exports increase faster than imports will it be possible to maintain our present rate of expenditure abroad for national defense and foreign aid without further aggravation of the existing and cumulative balance of payments deficits. And only if there is a net increase in exports can employment be increased and growth rates accelerated.

There is, however, no guarantee whatsoever that unilateral tariff reform by the United States, no matter how sweeping, will yield the expected net increase in exports. This is evident if we consider, first, the improbability of the proposed drastic tariff reductions being matched by our neighbors abroad, in particular, by the Common Market countries, and secondly, the effects on the trade balance of persistent inflation in the United States.

U.S. tariffs are already at exceptionally low levels as compared both with U.S. tariffs in earlier periods and with the tariffs of other industrial countries now. Using the (admittedly imprecise) gage found in the ratio of total duties collected to dutiable imports, it would appear that the present U.S. tariff level is only one-fifth of what it was in the unlamented days of Smoot-Hawley. And from the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress has come a set of figures which shows the average posted tariff rates imposed on industrial goods by various key countries, including the Common Market and the United States taken as a unit. The pertinent rates are shown in the accompanying table:

Industrial tariffs

(Weighted averages)

	Percent
Japan	19
Austria	19
United Kingdom	17
New Zealand	17
Italy	16
Canada	16
France	15
EEC	14
Australia	12
United States	11
Norway	11
Benelux	11
West Germany	9
Sweden	8
Switzerland	8
Denmark	6

Source: Joint Economic Committee.

The table indicates that only four countries, including one member of the Common Market (Germany), have a lower average tariff than the United States. This being the case, it may be asked why the many benefits (in particular, the expected tariff concession by other countries) which are alleged to follow a program to reduce tariffs have not as yet become apparent?

What is clear is that the existing low level of U.S. tariffs gives our negotiators relatively little leeway in making future concessions for the purpose of getting other countries' tariffs against the United States reduced. A representative example of the difficulty which confronts us here is the tariff on automobiles. Our import duties on foreign automobiles were reduced recently from 8.5 percent to 6.5 percent in exchange for a much-touted reduction by the EEC group of automobile duties from a proposed high of 29 percent to 22 percent. The actual duty paid by U.S. automobile exporters to Germany and to the Benelux countries, to which the bulk of our automobile exports go, has been 18 percent but will be increased to 22 percent under the new common external tariff of the EEC. Is it likely that reduction of our tariff from 6.5 percent to zero, for example, will bring a reduction of the EEC tariffs from 22 percent to zero?

It would be naive to expect such more-than-proportionate reciprocity from the Common Market group. This being so, the implications of lowered U.S. automobile tariffs are disturbing in the extreme. Demand by Americans for European vehicles is already relatively intense as compared with European demand for American vehicles which is slack. Further lowering of our tariffs on foreign automobiles will bring these close to zero and increase the already significant U.S. demand for such imports. A proportionate lowering of European duties would still leave exports of U.S. vehicles handicapped by a substantial tariff obstacle, not to mention the discriminatory use taxes and horsepower taxes imposed on American vehicles in European markets.[4]

But there is no guarantee that even proportionate reciprocity will be forthcoming from the Common Market. It is certainly no secret that the lowering of duties amongst the Common Market countries and the simultaneous raising of external tariffs against outsiders is aimed at creating a mass market in which the economies of scale of mass production—heretofore a U.S. monopoly—will become possible. Moreover, this economic unification and consolidation is viewed only as a way station on the road to the more substantial goal of political unification. It is thoroughly unrealistic and unreasonable to suppose that the Common Market countries, out of their sheer love for the United States and a desire to help us retain our economic primacy, will veer away from their stated economic and political objectives. It is not to be expected, in short, that our friends abroad will be willing to pull American balance of payments chestnuts out of the fire. George Washington's wise words are worth recalling in this connection: "There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion, which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard." (Farewell address.)

---

[2] Wilhelm Roepke is the internationally respected German-Swiss authority on European trade problems.

[3] Wilhelm Roepke, "Zahlungsbilanz und Nationalreichtum," in Gegen die Brandung (Erlenbach-Zurich: Eugen Rentsch Verlag, 1960), pp. 306–312.

[4] Facts to keep in mind in connection with the American automobile industry are that in 1951 American automobile firms produced 72 percent of the world's total output of passenger vehicles. In 1959, this share was only 48 percent. (Source: George Romney, quoted in Wall Street Journal, Dec. 19, 1960.)

The truth is that the Common Market has a good thing going and will indubitably strive to keep it going. This is an uncomfortable prospect in some ways, so uncomfortable that many of us will wish we had not been so precipitate in encouraging and supporting the closed economic bloc (as contrasted with the original more broadly conceived free trade area) which is now emerging. But it is a prospect which realism requires us to entertain. One of the strangest and most paradoxical omissions in H.R. 9900, in the judgment of our committee, is its almost total failure to make provision for genuine trade reciprocity. This omission is naive and it is dangerous.

IV

Even if these guarantees of full reciprocity in tariff reductions by other countries are obtained; even, to use an extreme case, if other countries were to reduce their tariffs to zero, are there other factors involved which would hold back U.S. export growth? The truth of the matter is that it is not primarily foreign tariffs which are keeping our goods out of foreign markets. Large categories of American goods are noncompetitive in the world's markets, even where they have no tariffs or other trade barriers to hurdle. In the production of these commodities, other countries simply have lower unit costs than we do, primarily due to their substantially lower wage costs. And in those commodity areas where superior American capital endowment and productivity still gives us an edge, in spite of our wage scales, the trends indicate that the U.S. advantage is diminishing, that is, European capital endowments in these areas are increasing substantially. The resulting cost reductions which will be realized will be intensified to the degree that increasing economies of scale are achieved, as will certainly be the case in the European Common Market.

The hope that foreign wage levels will rise and thus make U.S. goods more competitive is at once unrealistic and cynical. It is unrealistic because wages in Germany, for example, are already at inflationary levels, causing great concern to the authorities there, and because the amount of increase in German wages (which are now about 27 percent of average earnings in U.S. industry) needed to bring about equality would be enormous and completely unacceptable to the Germans. Thus, last year, German labor costs increased about 10 percent while U.S. labor costs increased only 5 percent. But a 10-percent increase of a 75-cent wage is only 7½ cents an hour while a 5-percent increase of a $3 wage is 15 cents an hour. This gap may be closed over a period of years; it certainly will not be closed in the near future. The hope placed in foreign wage rate increases is cynical because the assumption is that other countries should have inflation merely because we have not had the fortitude or the determination to put an end to it.

It is worth remembering that the unusual political stability of West Germany and her resulting very substantial contribution to the stability and strength of the whole free world is due in no small measure to the single-minded and largely successful German fight against inflation in all its forms. Does our rescue from the consequences of our own homemade inflation require that one of the most dependable of our allies permit the erosion of the monetary foundations of its economic and social order?

But it is above all domestic inflation in the United States, and its continued toleration, which will tend to cancel out any increased price advantages our goods may enjoy in foreign markets due to reduced foreign tariffs (assuming our tariff reductions are fully matched abroad). Where U.S. inflationary pressures are greater than those abroad, and this is especially true today in respect to the Common Market group of countries, U.S. producers will tend to concentrate their selling efforts in the domestic rather than in the foreign market. They will do so because, given the relatively high level of domestic costs and the associated relatively high level of domestic incomes, sales in the home market yield more profit than sales abroad. Pep talks to American businessmen to interest themselves in the "vast opportunities" abroad cannot substitute for the fundamental economic motivations for enterprise, whether at home or in foreign markets. But domestic inflation dampens these incentives. Exports fall off in this situation because the interest in foreign markets diminishes and other countries are increasingly able to undersell and outsell us in third markets. In addition, otherwise exportable resources are diverted to American home consumption because of the inflationary expansion of domestic demand. Conversely, imports tend to rise in a context of inflation, both because they may be more competitive costwise than comparable domestic products and because, apart from price-level differences, they serve to fill "the inflationary gap" (which occurs when the total monetary claims on a nation's resources exceed what is available to satisfy them).

Occasionally, it is asserted that inflation can hardly be the cause of our present international economic difficulties since the U.S. cost of living (the most commonly used barometer of inflation) has not moved up significantly faster than this same index in the countries now drawing off our gold, e.g., West Germany. The answer is that the movement of the cost-of-living index (or of other similar indexes) only very imperfectly and partially reveals the extent of domestic inflation. Indeed, it is perfectly possible for severe inflation to coexist with price stability. For inflation need not, though it often does, take the form of rising prices. Inflationary pressures emerge in the first instance where the economy's liquidity, i.e., the total monetary claims on its resources, is increasing disproportionately to the rate of increase of real, i.e., physical product.

For such overliquidity (or latent excess demand) two principal escape valves, apart from increased saving, are available: (1) A rise in prices, which offsets or absorbs the increased liquidity, and/or (2) an increase of imports over exports, which has the same effect. It is precisely our foreign deficits—the excess of imports over exports [5]—which, together with whatever price rises have occurred, reveal the full measure of our homemade inflation. Domestic price stability is no proof by itself of domestic economic virtue.

V

H.R. 9900 is concerned to increase exports, but it makes no attempt to come to grips with a major and continuing cause of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit, viz, the outflow of private capital. It is necessary, however, that the causes of this large and rapid outflow of funds from the United States be analyzed and acted upon if the deficit is to be brought under control. The outflow of private capital is, like the relative diminishment of our export surplus, not unrelated to the domestic inflation of costs, prices, and incomes. Entrepreneurs everywhere seek to invest their capital in projects which will yield the highest return. But returns will tend to be higher—other things being equal—where costs, especially wages, are lower. While there is in principle no reason to be concerned at the outflow of private capital from a country so plentifully endowed with it as the United States, the close dependence of employment upon capital—the instruments of production—cannot be overlooked.

Capital outflow, where it occurs in sufficiently large amounts and rapidly enough to depress opportunities for employment of domestic labor, is something about which one has a right to be alarmed, particularly where the outflow is occurring because inflation makes it uneconomic to invest in the home country. It is ironic that the same persons who lament the "slack" in the domestic economy tend to favor precisely that course of action—the toleration of inflation for the sake of alleged growth—which is creating the slack by forcing domestic capital into foreign enterprise.

This is not intended to imply that we should raise artificial barriers to the export of American capital or in any other way interfere with freedom of investors to place their money wherever they choose. In this light, it is our contention that to impose a discriminatory tax on undistributed earnings from foreign investments would be a mistake. It would not stop the outflow as such for the bulk of this capital is not going abroad for tax advantages. It is going abroad because costs of production abroad are substantially lower than in the United States. If American firms withdrew from foreign production operations, the repatriated capital would not necessarily be used to expand American production of the commodities in question. Rather, foreign firms would move in to fill the vacuum left by the departed American concerns. The competition of American subsidiaries abroad, that is to say, is not with U.S. producers of the same commodities. It is with other foreign producers. A punitive tax on U.S. earnings abroad would place U.S.-owned firms at a tax disadvantage with their real competitors abroad.

What is important is that conditions within the domestic American economy which are giving rise to what may be an unhealthy large capital outflow should be corrected. It is hard to see how our international accounts can be brought into better balance until these issues and the need for internal reforms which they imply are faced and effectively dealt with; it is, however, even more difficult to see how drastic reductions in tariffs will enable us to deal with them.

VI

In sum, U.S. inflationary pressures coupled with a probable lack of full reciprocity by other countries in tariff reductions make it likely that the Nation will experience an increase not of exports but of imports. Two important consequences may be expected from such a net increase in imports: (1) The disemployment of domestic labor and other factors; (2) the aggravation of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit.

---

[5] Exports are defined here as all transactions which give rise to U.S. claims against other countries; imports are defined as all transactions which give rise to foreign claims against the United States.

There can be no question but that with a significant portion of the labor force already unemployed and with the existing substantial amounts of unused industrial capacity, a further deliberate disemployment of domestic factors would be a reckless course of action. For this would slow down our already low rate of economic growth, demoralize the labor force, and reduce the output of the economy precisely at a time when the fullest possible mobilization of our potential is required. The adjustment assistance portion of H.R. 9900, which is intended to deal with expected dislocations, represents, in our judgment, a vast and ill-considered scheme to substitute bureaucratic government administration of business for the private enterprise system. If the adventures of the U.S. Government in agricultural adjustment and assistance are any criterion of what may be expected in this field, the prospect of having such a system applied even more extensively throughout the economy must arouse deep misgivings. Our committee strongly urges the most serious consideration of the ultimate implications—in terms of cost, efficiency, and of survival of the free enterprise system—of a nationwide dole system, such as the proposed legislation envisages.

Even if exports were to increase pari passu with imports, the problems created by the need to transfer resources disemployed by imports to the export industries could be severe. Indeed, not all resources now employed in producing for home consumption are so transferable. Certain tools, certain machines, certain factories, certain workers are suited to do one thing only. No amount of adjustment assistance will avoid the losses, possibly substantial, that would be suffered here. It is in any case clear that too sudden disemployment of domestic factors of production, such as would ensue from large and extensive tariff reductions accomplished in a short period, would cause a catastrophic disruption of existing patterns of consumption, production, and employment. It is on this account that our committee strongly urges that the staging requirements of the present bill be strengthened; reduction in duties should be limited in amount to a reasonable figure, say 5 percent a year. This would allow at least some time for a cushioning of the impact on the economy of the inevitable structural dislocations of reduced tariffs.

VII

What is of deepest concern to our committee is not alone the longrun structural consequences of the radical change in our tariffs proposed in H.R. 9900, but the shortrun balance-of-payments effects of the anticipated increases in imports. It is these effects, as we are all aware, which demand attention as never before. Clearly, increases in imports at this time, where not accompanied by rises in exports (and such rises, as we have seen, are based on pure hypothesis) can only enlarge our already alarming payments deficit and aggravate the outflow of gold. In the first 2 months of this year alone, the United States experienced net gold losses of $152 million, bringing the total gold stock of the Nation to an alltime low of $16.7 billion. For its part, continental Europe increased its monetary gold reserves (excluding dollar assets) to $18 billion, thereby clearly displacing the United States as No. 1 in monetary strength. Moreover, European gold stocks are mostly free of short-term liabilities; the U.S. stock, however, is doubly mortgaged, both by the statutory 25 percent gold cover requirement (over $11 billion) and by foreign short-term claims in excess of $21 billion.

The crucial question is: How much larger can the cumulative deficit become and how much more gold can flow out before international confidence in the dollar, already on very shaky foundations, collapses, and the pressures leading to a devaluation of the dollar become irresistible? The latter occurrence, it seems fair to assume, would be both a national and an international catastrophe. If our reasoning is correct, the proposed legislation, far from helping to cure the ills of the dollar, may have shortrun consequences—an inrush of imports—which could precipitate a flight from the dollar and thereby wreck the monetary foundations of the free world. The alleged gains from the proposed tariff reform legislation are too small and too uncertain by far to justify the assumption of risks of such magnitude.

VIII

To sound the trumpets of tariff reform as is now being done, appears courageous on the surface. And it is very popular. Who wants to be called a protectionist? In fact, it is taking the line of least resistance, politically and economically. For such action, and the spirit of righteousness with which it can be undertaken, becomes a substitute for facing up to the real issues: the need to undertake internal reforms, to end domestic inflation, to put a stop to wage increases which make our commodities increasingly noncompetitive in world markets, and to establish strict priorities in Federal spending to the end that deficits of the Federal budget shall be avoided.

Since there is no formally stated intention to accompany tariff reforms with these vital internal reforms, we believe the passage of H.R. 9900 to be fraught with danger to the Nation.

We object especially to the sweeping powers granted to the President to reduce or eliminate at his sole discretion any or all remaining tariffs on U.S. imports, without review or supervision by Congress. The effect of this would be to substitute arbitrary Executive discretion for rule of law in what is a critical area of national life. The President is also authorized in the proposed legislation "to proclaim such increases in or imposition of, any duty or other import restriction" as he wishes. This means that the incumbent President or some future President could raise tariffs as well as lower them, or impose new tariffs, or subject imports to any kind of other restriction or control he deemed necessary. As someone has remarked, this section of H.R. 9900 is the granddaddy of all escape clauses.

By granting such drastic powers to the President, which he could use either for protectionism or free trade, the Congress in effect would be abandoning its sovereignty in matters upon which in the present conjuncture, a very large part of the national welfare is dependent. In the area of tariff reduction, the consequences of any given action are not easy to predict and to estimate; if mistakes are made, the damage to the Nation could be considerable and irreparable. Hence, we strongly urge that any legislation which is enacted provide for adequate review by Congress of the President's actions in this field. We urge, finally, that the grant of powers be in any case limited to 2 rather than 5 years. This will provide each new Congress a chance to examine the record and to determine if changes in the program are indicated.

OUR RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Federal budget should be balanced (by economies in nondefense spending) with the purpose of ending debt-monetization and inflation; for inflation raises prices, stimulates imports, reduces exports and employment, and reduces our gold reserves.

2. Our tax structure should be thoroughly overhauled to provide adequate incentives for the modernization of American plant and equipment. The tax burden should be shifted as far as possible from the producers of income and wealth to the consumption and trade sector of the economy. In West Germany's economy, to take that one outstanding example of rapid and steady growth and full employment, more than three-quarters of total tax revenues are derived from consumption taxes and business turnover taxes, less than one-quarter from direct taxes on income and wealth.

In the United States, the tax burden is distributed in an exactly opposite ratio, with three-quarters of the tax revenue derived from direct taxes on income and wealth and one-quarter from consumption and use taxes. We have enjoyed a high-consumption economy as a result, but by the same token we have seriously dampened the incentives that make for growth and prosperity in a free society. We must gain a new appreciation of the truth, long since learned by heart by our European competitors, that it is more important to increase the size of the national cake than to quarrel about the more equal distribution of any smaller cake.

3. Foreign aid funds should be expended in the United States to the maximum extent practical; they will naturally tend to be spent in the United States if domestic inflation is stopped and our goods and services are made otherwise competitive with those elsewhere.

4. Annual productivity gains of U.S. industries should be used primarily to reduce prices, thereby stimulating consumption and employment, encouraging exports, and increasing the real wages and incomes of all our people.

5. The President should have the authority, with congressional review made mandatory, to negotiate elimination of all trade barriers (not merely tariffs) in amounts and at a rate which will not jeopardize our own economic development and the maintenance of an adequate Defense Establishment.

We believe that the overriding obligation of the President and the Congress and of all citizens is to do what is necessary to activate the full and unquestionably enormous economic potential of the United States. In doing this, we must abandon the techniques and the catchwords which were designed especially for the depression phase of our economic history and which have dominated policymaking in the United States in the postwar era.

We must adopt a radically new approach, such as was adopted originally in West Germany, and is now being applied in the other Common Market countries and in Japan, and the results of which are visible to all. It is a "grand illusion" to believe that by knocking down a few already low tariffs we are going to solve all the problems of the U.S. economy at home and abroad. The benefits of H.R. 9900 have been extravagantly overadvertised, in our opinion. Free trade is fine but it cannot save the world. Free trade did not save Europe from the cataclysm of World War I, nor did it insure the economic dominance of Great Britain, the first free trade nation. Other more powerful and elemental forces are at work in the world than the law of comparative advantage, valuable though this be. It is the anti-inflationary and anticollectivist free enterprise systems now rising around the world which are challenging our long dominance of the international economy. If these forces are to be met successfully, then they must be met on their own terms, viz., by adjustments of our internal economic and monetary policies, not by the mere manipulation of our tariffs.

Tariff reductions coupled with the internal reforms we have specified and within the context of the new approach we have mentioned could go far toward restoring to the United States the economic primacy in the free world which it rightfully deserves. Tariff reductions of the sort envisaged in H.R. 9900 which are applied without the needed internal reforms could spell disaster both internally and internationally.

APPENDIX

(List of those subscribing to "a declaration of principles," submitted to the House Committee on Ways and Means on April 9, by Prof. Patrick M. Boarman, Bucknell University)

The "declaration of principles" on foreign trade policy has been subscribed to by the following economists without qualification:

1. James Washington Bell, professor emeritus, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., presently secretary, American Economic Association.
2. Herman H. Beneke, professor emeritus, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.
3. Prof. Patrick M. Boarman, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
4. Prof. Frederick A. Bradford, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.
5. Prof. Lewis E. Davids, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
6. Prof. L. E. Dobriansky, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.
7. Prof. Roy L. Garis, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
8. Prof. Harold Hughes, West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, W. Va.
9. J. H. Kelleghan, economic consultant, Chicago, Ill.
10. Prof. Donald M. Kemmerer, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
11. Prof. Russell M. Nolen, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
12. Prof. Clyde W. Phelps, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
13. O. Glenn Saxon, professor emeritus, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
14. Prof. Arthur Sharron, C. W. Post College, Long Island University, Brookville, N.Y.
15. Charles S. Tippetts, professor emeritus, University of Pittsburgh (now residing in Oxford, Md.).
16. Prof. J. B. Trant, Louisiana State University (now vice president Guaranty Life Insurance Co.), Baton Rouge, La.
17. Edward J. Webster, professor emeritus, American International College, Springfield, Mass. (now residing in Sarasota, Fla.).
18. Prof. G. Carl Wiegand, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill.
19. Prof. Ivan Wright, University of New York City, New York, N.Y.
20. Hudson B. Hastings, professor emeritus, Yale University.

QUAKER CITY AIRWAYS

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Rousselot] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1962, I placed an affidavit of three pilots, namely, Albert B. Cross, Donald Crose, and John A. Tyson, in the Congressional Record—see pages 4021–4022. I stated that affiants were former pilots of Quaker City Airways, doing business as Admiral Airways. It has has been brought to my attention that affiants were employed as pilots by Admiral Air Service. As far as I can determine, Admiral Air Service is not connected with Quaker City Airways. Affiants state in their affidavits that they were employed by Admiral Airlines. To my knowledge, Admiral Airlines and Admiral Airways are not one and the same.

In all fairness, I wish to correct what appears to be an error on my part.

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Price). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Santangelo] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, a measure of a nation's worth is the care and attention it devotes to the education of its young people. We cannot expect great traditions to last if they are not passed on to succeeding generations. We cannot expect technological advances and gigantic scientific strides to form the basis for ever-greater accomplishments if we do not provide our young people with the intellectual tools for progress. And we certainly cannot expect the philosophical foundation of freedom to stand if we do not assure that our youth can interpret and respect these basic tenets.

Education is the basis of progress. It is the beginning of hope. It is the end of discrimination. It is the creator of ideas and the destroyer of superstition. It is the father of wisdom and the son of experience. Appreciation for it is age-old. Aristotle, the Greek philosopher, was asked how much educated men were superior to those uneducated: "As much," he said, "as the living are to the dead." And as much, I would add, as the free to the enslaved.

I have a reverence for education instilled in me by a father, who, while possessing no formal education, had wisdom and practical experience. He taught his 10 children, all of whom went through public schools and colleges, that without education, our opportunities and horizons are limited. He taught us that learning was the key to understanding, advancement, and success.

Mr. Speaker, I know I need not acquaint my colleagues in this House with the basic reverence for education that has characterized our country's development. But I wish to acquaint them with a grave crisis that threatens to stultify and eventually destroy a significantly important segment of our educational system: the private parochial school.

In the current vicious battle being waged against Federal aid to parochial schools, the question of constitutionality has arisen as the pivotal argument. There are those who say that any aid to parochial schools is unconstitutional, that it violates the principle of separation of church and state.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to state unequivocally that it is my sincere belief that not only is aid to parochial schools constitutional—but to deny such aid is contrary to the basic principles of our country.

If this country is truly sincere about its intention to solve the educational crisis that confronts us, then it is time to make a rational appraisal of this problem.

Opponents to aid to private schools use as the basis for their arguments article 1 of the Bill of Rights, which reads:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the use of this article to justify discrimination against parochial schools is distortion, complete disregard of history, and an unwarrantedly narrow interpretation of language. To oppose Federal aid to private schools because of a notion that such aid violates constitutional provisions ignores history, misreads court decisions, and disregards existing church-related Federal programs.

Our Constitution is an uncommon document, for it was written by uncommon people who came to this country under uncommon circumstances. If they were overly fearful of government, it was because they came to America to escape tyranny—to search for the right to live as they please—to worship as they please—to raise their family in dignity. If they feared a state church, it was because they came from countries dominated by one church, intolerant of the tenets of any other belief. They came to America because they were a proud people, zealous of the right to enjoy human dignity, the right to exercise individual responsibility and the right to choose.

They who had been denied equality were determined to assure equality. They who had been forbidden to worship as they chose were determined to assure this right in perpetuity. They who had been discriminated against were determined to end forever any and all base for discrimination.

The Constitution is clear in saying that the Government shall pass no law respecting an establishment of religion or the free exercise thereof. This constitutes a clear prohibition against a state church and a clear assurance of religious freedom. But is it in line with this time-honored and dearly bought principle to so discriminate against a religion as to destroy one of its principal beliefs: parochial education?

If Federal aid to education is limited to public schools only, the principle of equality will be violated and the principle of religious freedom will be trammeled.

I support vigorously a Federal aid to education program that provides assistance to private and church-related schools as well as to public schools.

To listen to the outraged cries of those opposed to aid to parochial schools, one would think this is an entirely new problem—one that had never been even thought of before, let alone been implemented. This is a deliberate propaganda device. There are at present better than 50 educational programs which provide assistance to public and private education and church-related institutions. I call the attention of my colleagues and the American public to the following list of major programs which are receiving funds:

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT PROGRAMS

Student loans: Since 1958, the Federal Government has been financing loans to needy college students. The Federal loan funds are available to nonprofit colleges operated by churches, as well as to other types of institutions.

Graduate fellowships: The Government finances 1,500 fellowships each year for advanced study by college graduates, who may attend denominational colleges if they choose.

Private-school loans: Federal loans are made to private elementary and high schools for purchase of equipment to strengthen their teaching of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. Church affiliation is no bar.

Research and training: Several programs provide Federal financing for various types of research and special training for teachers in both private and public colleges.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Schooling for war veterans: For veterans of World War II and the Korean war, the Federal Government has provided payments to finance their education. At first, tuition payments were made directly to the school attended—and denominational schools were included. The present program makes payments directly to the veteran, who pays his own tuition at the school of his choice.

Vocational rehabilitation: Training is purchased by the Government from educational institutions of all types for rehabilitating disabled war veterans.

War orphans: Children of war veterans who died of service-connected causes are given payments by the Government to obtain college or vocational education.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

School lunches: Federal funds for school lunches are made available to elementary and high schools without regard to their religious affiliation.

Milk: Funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation provide low-cost milk to schoolchildren.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

College housing: The Housing and Home Finance Agency makes loans to both private and public colleges and hospitals for construction of student housing.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Hospital grants: The Government contributes to the cost of constructing hospitals.

Health training and research: Federal funds go into grants and fellowships for research and training in the field of public health.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Grants and fellowships: Federal funds help finance projects for research in vocational rehabilitation at educational institutions. Federal fellowships finance special study in this field. There is no bar on church-supported schools.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Cooperative research: In financing cooperative projects for social security research, no discrimination is made against institutions with religious affiliation.

Crippled children: Grants are made for projects in the field of services for crippled children and maternal and child health, with no discrimination against sectarian institutions.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Nuclear studies: Federal funds are given educational institutions to acquire reactors and other nuclear equipment. For students of nuclear physics, there are fellowships. No sectarian bars are raised.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Science education: To foster education and research in science, there are grants, fellowships, and institutes, without regard to religious factors.

STATE DEPARTMENT

Student exchanges: Schools with religious affiliation are used for student-exchange programs with other countries, with the cost financed by the Federal Government.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Training and research: The Department of Defense has a number of training and research programs which finance activities at a variety of institutions of higher learning.

SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Grants for research: Federal funds for space research have gone to schools with religious affiliation.

It would seem completely obvious then that there are certain forms of assistance which are completely within the bonds of constitutionality. Why, then, do we seem unable to devise a program of aid to meet the crisis within our educational system? If we are concerned about constitutionality, we have only to turn to the opinion of a distinguished constitutional lawyer, Arthur E. Sutherland, written in response to a letter from our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, John W. McCormack, and printed in U.S. News & World Report of April 3, 1961. This opinion indicates that there is no constitutional objection to Federal aid to private schools.

Dear Congressman McCormack: This letter I write in answer to the request from your office for my views on the constitutionality of Federal legislation providing long-term loans of public funds alike to public and nonprofit private schools, for school purposes generally, even where the private schools aided are in many instances connected with or controlled by a church.

What I say in this letter is related solely to the issue of constitutionality. Quite different considerations arise in debate on legislative policy, or in marshaling reasons which might underlie the Presidential veto of any legislative measure.

A Senator or a Representative has many responsibilities in the preparation of legislation in addition to those of compliance with the Constitution. Much legislation that could be within the constitutional power of the Congress may still be unwise and undesirable.

For the purposes of this letter, then, I assume, for example, a measure providing loans on terms similar to those provided by title 4 of the Housing Act of 1950, 12 U.S.C. section 1749 and following.

Suppose that the Congress should be convinced that better elementary and secondary education was necessary to the general welfare of the United States, to its capacity to produce necessary scientists and technicians to aid in our national defense, and to produce the necessary educated men and women to conduct our complex Government and private economic system.

The Congress might consider that our children and youths must look to the elementary and secondary schools in this country for a firm grounding in such basic building blocks of education as an accurate and understanding use of the English tongue; elementary mathematics; the history of the United States and its neighbor nations; some knowledge of the geographical fundamentals of the United States and of the rest of the world, and of our own resources and those for which we depend on other nations; a reasonable familiarity with the structure of our National and State governments, with our constitutional ideals and practices; some knowledge of the basic principles of the sciences on which we depend more and more for existence; and some acquaintance with some of the languages used by our friends of other countries. The Congress might also be impressed by the useful technical skills taught in many of our school systems.

Suppose, further, that the Congress should decide to promote the national welfare in aid of these educational objectives by making loans for, say, 50 years, at not more than 2¾ percent interest to such of our public and private nonprofit schools alike as attain reasonable standards. Would these loans violate the Constitution of the United States if a large number of the private schools to be aided should be church schools, including in their curriculums, not only such standard in their curriculums not only such standard instruction in the doctrines of a religious faith?

The principal constitutional clauses which bear on this question are article I, section 8, clause 1, which provides that—

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States," and clause 18 of the same section:

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

This general grant of power is to some extent limited by various other clauses. The one here relevant is in the first part of the first amendment:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

This portion of the first amendment contains two quite different provisions. The last six words eliminate from possible congressional power any law "prohibiting the free exercise" of any religion. Such a restriction is not relevant to this letter. I hear of no proposal for compulsory participation in religious exercises, nor for compulsory abstention from, or penalty for, religious exercises. Such a measure would raise considerations quite different from those discussed in this letter.

The only question you put to me, as I understand it, is whether the Congress is devoid of constitutional power to make such long-term loans as I have described because they would be provided in a statute which should be considered a "law respecting an establishment of religion."

A DIFFICULT INQUIRY

Relevant to this study are several possible sources of information. One of these concerns the frame of mind of the Senators and Congressmen who proposed the first amendment, and that of the State legislators who ratified it. This is a difficult inquiry; the men involved were very numerous; the records of their motivation are not complete; different men may well have been prompted by different ideas; and one who engages in this research may begin to doubt whether the Congress in 1961 should have its powers delimited by an uncertain guess at the frame of mind of men who lived 170 years ago.

Another source of guidance as to the meaning of the establishment clause is study of the decisions handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States. Under our system that Court has the last word in constitutional construction, but judgments on "establishment" are hard to find.

Justices of the Supreme Court, in the course of opinions, have on various occasions expressed ideas having a general connection with "establishment"; but American lawyers traditionally draw a rather sharp distinction between those things which a court actually decides, and those expressions made by the way, obiter dicta [incidental opinion], off the immediate issue, not directly involved in the adjudication.

Thus the Everson case, which arose under the 14th amendment, presented an issue described by Mr. Justice Black in the Court's opinion as follows—the case involves schoolbus fares:

"The only contention here is that the State statute and the resolution, insofar as they authorized reimbursement to parents of children attending parochial schools, violate the Federal Constitution in these two respects, which to some extent overlap:

"First. They authorize the State to take by taxation the private property of some and bestow it upon others, to be used for their own private purposes. This, it is alleged, violates the due-process clause of the 14th amendment.

"Second. The statute and the resolution forced inhabitants to pay taxes to help support and maintain schools which are dedicated to, and which regularly teach, the Catholic faith. This is alleged to be a use of State power to support church schools contrary to the prohibition of the 1st amendment which the 14th amendment made applicable to the States."

The majority of the Court found no constitutional obstacle preventing this reimbursement for bus transportation. But, in his opinion, Mr. Justice Black also wrote:

"The establishment-of-religion clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or nonattendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect a wall of separation between church and state."

While all lawyers properly pay respect to such dicta, still, statements of this sort, not directly relevant to the decision of the Court, do not carry the weight, as precedent, of an actual adjudication.

FEW COURT RULINGS "DIRECTLY RELEVANT"

A third source of guidance can be found in the decisions of the Congress and the President of the United States appearing in the enactment and approval of legislation. Members of the Congress and the President are, of course, bound by oath to support the Constitution, and they conscientiously carry this out. Hence their judgment, expressed in the enactment or approval of legislation, properly has weight as precedent, particularly where, as in the field we are discussing, there is very little judicial decisional matter directly relevant.

I shall in this letter briefly discuss these three sources of constitutional material: the opinions of the sponsors of the first amendment; judicial opinions; and legislative enactment and Presidential approval as an indication of constitutionality.

The subjective intentions of the congressional draftsmen of the first amendment and of the State legislators who ratified it are not clear. In 1789, when the Congress proposed the Bill of Rights, favored religions were supported by taxation and other measures in a number of States. Massachusetts continued such tax support until 1833.

The members of Congress who proposed the first amendment had before them as an example of establishment the "established church" in England; they knew or could have known of controversies over tax support for churches in various States.

Part of the motivation for the first 10 amendments, which took effect in 1791, was a desire to protect "States rights," as appears from the terms of the 10th amendment.

Some who favored the first amendment may have thus desired to protect their existing State support for a favored church from Federal interference by a "law respecting an establishment of religion." Others may have felt an opposition to any and all governmental intervention in religion. But the earliest Congresses provided for chaplains in the U.S. Army; the earliest legislators must have recognized that no completely tight wall was possible between church and state.

The words of the first amendment are not explicit on federally supported schools. It would be difficult, and probably not useful, to guess at whether the people who 170 years ago proposed and ratified the establishment clause would have thought it forbade the suppositious school loan bill I have described.

Adjudications of the Supreme Court on Federal legislation challenged under the establishment clause are hard to find. I here do not refer to such obiter dicta as I mention earlier in this letter, but to adjudications on the merits. Perhaps the small number of such adjudications can in part be explained by the doctrine in the Federal courts that a Federal taxpayer, not otherwise affected by an act of Congress, has no standing in court to argue that the statute is unconstitutional.

There are a few cases which approach the problem of this letter, though none is precisely in point.

There are a few cases discussing the constitutionality of "establishment" by a State, after the enactment of the 14th amendment in 1868. I have already mentioned the Everson case, which upheld New Jersey payments for bus transportation of parochial pupils equally with others. In Mr. Justice Black's opinion in that case sustaining the constitutionality of the payment, the Court stressed its concern for the safety of schoolchildren on the highways.

The case could be thought of as upholding the New Jersey statute authorizing the payments, on the ground that the State legislature primarily considered the benefits to the children, not the benefit to the parochial school which was only incidental to the other primary objective.

Another case involved provision by the State of Louisiana of lay textbooks for children in parochial as well as public schools. This was *Cochran* v. *Louisiana Board of Education*. Citizens and taxpayers in Louisiana brought suit in the State courts in an effort to enjoin Louisiana officials from paying out State moneys for this purpose. The plaintiffs argued that this violated the 14th amendment in that private property was taken by the State and used for private purposes, that it was so taken "to aid private, religious, sectarian, and other schools not embraced in the public educational system of the State by furnishing textbooks free to the children attending such private schools." The Supreme Court upheld the State statute providing for the textbooks.

Pointing out that, among the books, none was adapted to religious instruction, the Court held that the taxing power of the State was exerted for a public purpose. "The legislation does not segregate private schools or their pupils as its beneficiaries or attempt to interfere with any matters of exclusively private concern. Its interest is education broadly; its method, comprehensive. Individual interests are aided only as the common interest is safeguarded."

WHEN RELIGION WAS TAUGHT IN ILLINOIS

Some mention should here be made of the opinions in *Illinois ex rel. McCollum* v. *Board of Education*. Here a parent of a child in the Champaign, Ill., public schools, the parent being also an Illinois taxpayer, succeeded in enjoining a program under which teachers of religion not paid by public funds of any Illinois municipality came into the public schools each week, for 30 or 45 minutes depending on the grade, to give religious instruction on the school premises to children of their respective faiths. Children not desiring to participate were allowed during that period to go to other places in the school building to pursue secular studies.

Mr. Justice Jackson, writing a special concurring opinion in the McCollum case, pointed out that here, unlike the Everson case, there was no showing of any resulting measurable burden upon the complaining taxpayer. He points out that perhaps the religious classes might be said to add some wear and tear on the public buildings and they should be charged with some expense for heat and light, but he adds that the cost was neither substantial nor measurable and "no one seriously can say that the complainant's tax bill has been proved to be increased because of this plan."

To sustain the jurisdiction of the Court in the McCollom case, recourse might be had to the personal embarrassment imposed upon the child for whom the parent spoke. The boy was obliged to dissent from his classmates, to claim exemption from religious instruction, in their presence, to embarrass himself by being different.

The McCollom case therefore can be thought of as presenting a case of individual hardship imposed on a schoolchild, on religious grounds, which is quite a different thing from a religious objection put forward when no one is individually harmed.

One ends with the conclusion that the Supreme Court of the United States has never held that a loan, such as that in the statute which I outline above, would be in excess of congressional powers because of the first amendment. Insofar as actual adjudication on State statutes is concerned, the Everson and Cochran cases indicate the contrary. It may be significant that in those cases the aim of the legislation was not religious indoctrination but the safety and the lay educational advancement of the schoolchild, the aim which I assume the Congress would have if it were to provide for such loans.

Congressional and executive action furnishes more precedents concerning Federal aid which includes religious schools than can be found in judicial determinations.

A number of Federal statutes make grants of Federal funds in aid of some educational end, and include among the proposed recipients of distribution nonprofit private institutions which may be under sectarian control. Instances are more numerous above the high school level than at or below it.

Grade-school children get the benefit of funds distributed under the National School Lunch Act. Under this legislation, if the State is barred by its laws from distributing funds to nonprofit private schools of any category, the United States may distribute funds directly to such nonprofit private schools.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 provides for loans of Federal funds to elementary and secondary schools, including private schools of a nonprofit character, for the purpose of equipping these schools with scientific and modern-language instructional equipment. Congressional committee reports on this legislation show the purpose of the Congress to increase the excellence of education in subjects thought necessary in our defense and foreign relations efforts.

Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950 provides for loans of Federal money for a period up to 50 years, at a rate of interest of 2¾ percent or less, to provide "housing and other educational facilities for students and facilities" at any public or nonprofit private educational institutions, if it offers at least a 2-year program leading toward a baccalaureate degree. These loans, thus, by the terms of the statute, go to institutions above the high school level, but the distinction in principle between a junior college and a senior high school is not entirely clear.

The United States is authorized by legislation to make grants for reactors to "institutions or persons." The United States provides scholarship funds to various classes of deserving students; these funds in due time come to the institutions which the students attend. The GI bill of rights is a familiar example. Also familiar, so much so that it goes almost unnoticed, is the Federal provision of Reserve officer training programs leading to Army, to Air Force, and to Navy commissions. Many of these programs are in effect at colleges and universities under the control of religious orders.

WHAT AID PROGRAMS HAVE IN COMMON

Certain common characteristics are observable in all this legislation.

In the first place, it does not make grants or loans to churches, religious missions, etc. The benefits go either to students or to institutions training students; the benefits go to public and private institutions alike; they go to private institutions regardless of their religious or nonreligious affiliation. The religious affiliation of a school or college receiving a loan, or of a school or college to which students resort under scholarships, is therefore incidental and is not singled out by the Federal legislation.

In the second place, there is in each of these pieces of legislation an observable end other than the cultivation of religion. Federal funds go to strengthen the Armed Forces, to build up our national scientific or linguistic capabilities, or, as in the grants under the Housing Act of 1950, to build up our educational system generally.

The comment might be made that in none of these instances is there a Federal loan or grant of money to an institution to be spent however the institution sees fit, or to be spent as the institution sees fit except for religious instruction. This fact is notable; but perhaps the distinction between existing Federal provisions and an across-the-board benefit is more apparent than practical.

Suppose, for example, a junior college with limited funds, needing essential faculty housing and student dormitories. A 50-year Federal loan for such prescribed building under the Housing Act of 1950 would release the college's funds for other purposes. Some of the college's general funds which otherwise would necessarily be used for student housing might then be available for religious instruction. An elementary or secondary school needing science and language equipment, but with a limited budget, has funds released for general educational purposes when the United States provides funds for scientific and linguistic purposes.

It seems to me that a congressional loan such as that outlined earlier in this letter, to raise the standard of instruction in basic lay educational subjects, might well in its terms exclude the direct expenditure of its funds for religious or sectarian purposes. But the indirect effect on a sectarian school would, however, be to release for general purposes some funds perhaps otherwise used for lay instruction. This possibility has not in the past inhibited the Congresses which passed such legislation as I have mentioned, or the Presidents who approved it. No governing distinction is apparent to me between these legislative precedents and the hypothetical measure which I described at the beginning of this letter.

During the mid-1930's, many writers sharply criticized the American doctrine of judicial review of the constitutionality of social and economic legislation enacted by the Congress. None of that criticism was directed against unconstitutionality on "establishment" grounds. Indeed, I know of no case in which the Supreme Court ever has held any act of Congress invalid as a "law respecting an establishment of religion."

IT WOULD BE UPHELD

As the school-aid legislation I here discuss would not impair any person's free exercise of religion, it would have to be judged as a question of ultra vires [exceeding legal authority]. The absence of any ultra vires holding on Federal legislation by the Supreme Court since 1936 increases my feeling that, if in some way such a school-aid statute could be brought before that Court, it would be upheld.

The subject is long and complex. The effect of the relevant constitutional provisions is not clear and evident; it must be guessed at, as a matter of emphasis and degree. But, assuming that the existing Federal aid to education is constitutional—which seems to me a reasonable assumption—the distinction between these existing programs and the proposal which I discuss is not sufficiently evident to persuade me that a measure providing for long-term loans of the character which I have described, to aid education in basic lay subjects, would conflict with the provisions of the first amendment.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR E. SUTHERLAND.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference has completely dissected the legal aspects of this problem and in an extensive brief released in December of last year, proved that aid to Catholic education was not only constitutional but logical.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, may I submit to this House a synopsis of that brief.

Synopsis of National Catholic Welfare Conference Legal Department Study—"The Constitutionality of the Inclusion of Church-Related Schools in Federal Aid to Education"

A careful examination of relevant decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States reveals that there is no constitutional bar to the inclusion of church-related schools in general programs of Federal aid to education. On the other hand, the exclusion of church-related and other private nonprofit schools from the secular educational benefits of any comprehensive programs of Federal aid would point the way to government monopoly of education and to a resultant uniformitarian society.

The precise question to which this study is addressed is: May the Federal Government, as part of a comprehensive program to promote educational excellence in the Nation, provide secular educational benefits to the public in private nonprofit schools, church-related as well as nondenominational? Three related questions are not treated: The basic constitutionality of Federal aid to education; the constitutionality of Federal aid to education exclusively in public schools; and the constitutionality of Federal aid to religious instruction.

While no conclusion is expressed respecting the desirability, in principle, of large-scale Federal aid to education, it is clear that it would be both needful from the viewpoint of national policy and lawful from the viewpoint of constitutionality to assist the secular aspects of education in church-related schools if such large-scale Federal aid should be undertaken.

The specific conclusions to which this study comes are as follows:

1. Education in church-related schools is a public function which, by its nature, is deserving of governmental support.
2. There exists no constitutional bar to aid to education in church-related schools in a degree proportionate to the value of the public function it performs. Such aid to the secular function may take the form of matching grants or long-term loans to institutions, or of scholarships, tuition payments, or tax benefits.
3. The parent and child have a constitutional right to choose a church-related educational institution meeting reasonable State requirements as the institution in which the child's education shall be acquired.
4. Government in the United States is without power to impose upon the people a single educational system in which all must participate.

Considerations respecting policy: As President Kennedy has indicated, it is in the national interest that every American child have the opportunity for an education of excellence. But it is also in the national interest that our Judaeo-Christian moral heritage be preserved, along with the freedom to acquire education in diverse, non-State institutions. Herein lies the unique public value of our church-related schools. While our great public school system—built by men of all faiths—should receive the particular interest (as it does the financial support) of those who are dedicated to church-related schools, it is also true that the immense public contribution of the latter schools should be better known.

These schools were the original source of American popular education. Far from deviating from the American educational tradition (which was one of hospitality to religious values) they stand at the very core of that tradition. Today, Catholic schools (the largest of the groups of our church-related schools) are providing education (recognized by the States as meeting essential citizens needs) to 4½ million elementary school children and 1 million high school children—or around 13 percent of the total school population of the Nation. In 19 States whose school population represents half that of the Nation, Catholic schools are providing education to 18.6 percent of all children in elementary and secondary schools. For the year 1960 alone, the Catholic educational system saved American taxpayers $1,800 million.

However, one of the principal public benefits attributable to the Catholic schools is not economic but social. Typically, the Catholic schools are a meeting place for children of different economic and ethnic backgrounds and have usually not been located according to de facto zoning which divides neighborhoods racially. They have historically proved an invaluable training ground to prepare citizens for full participation in a pluralist society. Their graduates are found everywhere in American life, contributing commonly with all other citizens, to the welfare of the American society.

If, as seems true in the current educational crisis, all of the country's means of education should be utiilized to their fullest extent, then (unless constitutional considerations dictate to the contrary) sound policy requires that if the Federal Government offers large-scale aid to education, this should include education in private, nonprofit schools, church related as well as nondenominational.

Considerations respecting constitutionality: Constitutional considerations fully support these policy requirements. The provisions of the Federal Constitution chiefly involved in discussions of Federal aid to education in church-related schools are the religion clauses of the first amendment and the due process clause of the fifth amendment. Historically, it is clear that the Founding Fathers did not and would never have written into their Constitution any clauses which would be aimed at sterilizing all public life and institutions of religious content. Opponents of aid to church-related education, however, rely principally on the language of the first amendment that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." When this clause was drafted it was understood to mean that Congress could not create a national church or give any religion a preferred status. This "no establishment" clause was aimed at preventing governmental transgressions upon religious liberty and not at preventing all relationships—even certain cooperative relationships—between church and state. Certainly it was never understood to mean that religious institutions which perform public services are disqualified to receive compensation for them through the governmental organs of the society which has benefited by the services. Neither was it understood to mean that government may proffer its assistance to the health and education of our citizens only through secularized governmental institutions. No decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court contradict these last-stated points; in fact, the Supreme Court decisions which are closely relevant support them.

There are three decisions of the Supreme Court which relate to the constitutionality of aid providing by government for the accomplishment of public welfare objects through church-related institutions. Not only do none of these decisions hold such aid providing unconstitutional, they all flatly affirm its constitutionality. These decisions are *Bradfield* v. *Roberts*, 175 U.S. 291 (1899), *Cochran* v. *Board of Education*, 281 U.S. 370 (1930), and *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947). The Bradfield case held that the appropriation by Congress of money to a Catholic hospital, as compensation for the treatment and cure of poor patients under a contract, did not constitute an appropriation to a religious society in violation of the no establishment clause. The Court expressly disavowed the view of those who brought the suit, that religious institutions performing public functions cannot, on account of the no establishment clause, be aided by government.

The Cochran case established that the use of State funds to provide secular textbooks for all school students, including those in church-related schools, is constitutionally justifiable as an expenditure for a public purpose.

The Everson case held constitutional a New Jersey statute which provided that reimbursement to parents might constitutionally be made out of public funds for transportation of their children to Catholic parochial schools on buses regularly used in the public transportation system. The underlying principle of the case is: that Government aid may be rendered to a citizen in furtherance of his obtaining basic citizen education, whether he obtains it in a public or a private nonprofit school. It should be noted that the Supreme Court stated in Everson that "no tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions." Some commentators have said that this statement was mere dictum in the case, while some others have said that it meant that Government may not constitutionally support public welfare objects accomplished in church-related institutions. Both are plainly incorrect. The statement was part of the basic reasoning in the majority opinion. And it must be read in the light of what the Court actually decided in the case, namely, that it is constitutional to pay for school bus service to citizens at public expense, in order to enable them to acquire the secular benefits of education, regardless of whether they attend public or private (including church-related) schools.

Two further Supreme Court decisions, widely cited in controversy over Federal aid to education in church-related schools, are *McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 203 (1948), and *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306 (1952). Each dealt with the constitutionality of "released time" programs in the public schools and so is not in point with respect to the present discussion of aid providing by government, save insofar as each contains comment upon the general meaning of the "religion" clauses of the first amendment. The McCollum case involved a released time program conducted on the public school premises and carefully integrated into the public school program; this was held unconstitutional. The Zorach case involved an unintegrated program conducted off the public school premises, and this was held to be constitutional. Since the majority opinion in the McCollum case spoke three times of the first amendment's creating a "wall of separation between church and state," some commentators believed that the Supreme Court had stated a doctrine of absolute separation of church and state and that the way had now been prepared for the liquidation of fruitful relationships between government and religion which had been the American experience of 160 years. The decision of the Court 4 years later in Zorach proved these commentators wrong.

In Zorach the Supreme Court made it clear that the concept, derived from the first amendment, of separation of church and state was not to be taken in any absolute sense. The Court stated that "we are a religious people," and that religion and government may in various ways cooperate.

Neither the McCollum nor the Zorach case constitutes in any sense precedent against the kinds of possible aid to education in church-related schools here under discussion.

A third group of Supreme Court decisions relevant to this discussion is *Meyer* v. *Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390 (1923) and *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510 (1925). These involved the all-important rights of free choice in selecting education institutions. The Meyer case involved the violation, by a teacher in a Lutheran parochial school, of a State statute making it a crime to teach in any elementary school any language other than English. The U.S. Supreme Court reversed the conviction, stressing that there are three groups of rights which the Constitution protects against unreasonable intrusion by the state: those of the child, the parent, and the teacher. The Court struck forcefully at the view that all educational rights belong to the state, and it said that the desire of the legislature to "foster a homogeneous people" could not be fulfilled at the expense of liberties guaranteed by the Constitution.

The landmark case of *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters* involved an expanded recognition of parental and child rights in education. Here an Oregon statute (which had been promoted by the Ku Klux Klan and some allied groups) required that parents send their children only to public schools. The plan of the statute was to "Americanize" all children in what was described as the "public school melting pot." Protestants, Jews, and Catholics rose in opposition to the scheme. The Supreme Court of the United States ruled the statute unconstitutional as denying parental and child rights freely to choose education in nonpublic (including church-related) schools. The Court said that the legislature could not give the state a monopoly over education. Most significantly it said:

"The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in the Union repose excludes any general power of the state to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public school teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the state."

The Meyer and Pierce cases thus strongly underscore the protection with which the American Constitution jealously surrounds individual rights in education. Each stresses child-parental rights and by clear implication attacks the concept of the statist culture which would result from the permitting of government monopoly of education.

Legislation as constitutional precedent: In addition to the historical tradition and Supreme Court decisions, legislative precedent should be consulted as a guide to the constitutionality of a program of Federal aid to education in church-related schools. The judiciary is not the sole branch of Government charged with the duty of judging the constitutionality of legislation. The legislature must itself carefully make such judgments. No stronger answer is to be found to the argument that no aid may be afforded education in church-related schools than the fact that the Congress has in numerous ways over the years deliberately provided such aid. A list of 41 such programs—all, by the way, consisting of grants to church-related institutions—was issued on March 28, 1961, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. One of these programs, the Surplus Property Act of 1944, has resulted in 488 grants of land and buildings to religious-affiliated schools belonging to 35 different denominations.

Having thus considered present questions of policy and, in addition, the governing constitutional law, some consideration should be given to probable future consequences of programs of massive Federal aid to public education which would exclude church-related education. The predictable result would be a critical weakening of the latter, presaging the ultimate closing of many church-related schools. Since, de facto, most parents would no longer enjoy the freedom to send their children to church-related schools, therefore practically speaking the freedom of parent and child protected by the Pierce decision would have been rendered meaningless.

Moreover, a practical governmental monopoly of education would result. This would not only dangerously transform our free, pluralistic society but would also pose the most serious problems respecting freedom of belief. Freedom of belief would be endangered by the fact that virtually all children would be compelled to attend State-run schools. Values are inculcated in all schools, not only in those in whose curricula specific ethical or social concepts are advocated, but also in schools whose curricula distinctly omit such concepts. For the person whose conscience dictated the choice of a church-related school, here as a matter of practicality would be the result discountenanced in McCollum: coercion to

> participate in schooling, the orientation of which is counter to belief.
>
> The present argument over aid to education has unhappily become overclouded by opinions which have tended to engender the belief that the problems here involved are to be solved by simple, absolutist interpretations of the Constitution and by generalizations based thereupon. Ours, however, is a Constitution of rationality, not one of absolutes which paralyze social action. The problems here involved are predominantly practical: no constitutional bar exists to the aid herein described to education in church-related schools. Constitutionally proper forms may be found in which such aid may be given. Practicalities, not slogans, should govern the determinations to be made—determinations which give clear recognition to the rights of parents, the rights of children, the enlargement of freedom, and the preservation of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we can establish without doubt that the current fight over aid to private schools is not based on substantial grounds. There can be aid to both public and private schools. I call your attention to my bill, H.R. 9887, which I introduced on January 24, and sets out what I feel to be an equitable solution to this problem. My bill would authorize a 2-year program of financial assistance for all elementary and secondary school children in all of the States. It would provide $828 million for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, and $936 million for fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963. The bill provides for equal educational opportunities for every American child regardless of race, color, or religious belief. It preserves the parent's freedom of choice in education and recognizes that our system is a pluralistic system.

My bill authorizes an annual grant for financial assistance for each child attending school, whether public or private. For children attending public schools, grants would be issued to the local school agency of the political subdivision in which the school is located. In the case of a private-school child, the grant would go to the parent or legal guardian and would be honored for payment only when endorsed by the payee of the school of the pupil's attendance, and then endorsed by an authorized official of that same institution. The title of my bill is cited as the School Children's Assistance Act of 1962.

Perhaps the worst facet of this battle of words and emotions over aid to private schools is the harm it is doing to our children.

With every day that passes without a constructive solution, we chip away another section of the foundations of education.

With every day we permit schools to be on half sessions, classrooms to be crowded, buildings to deteriorate, we endanger that much more the preservation of our way of life.

With every slogan, such as "separation of church and state," that is used to further delay educational progress, we lose another skirmish in the cold war.

It is time to separate these slogans and myths from the facts. It is time to remember that we neither want a state church—or a state form of education. It is time to remember that we glorify our pluralism. We do not want homogeneity. We do not want to penalize the individuality or freedom of choice.

It is time to remember that all children must be properly educated. We cannot refuse to arm them for the increasing complexities of this world—just because they happen to go to a church-related school.

Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a world battle that will be won by education. The victor will be the ideology that can perpetuate itself—and communicate its messages to the world. To do this, we must step up our drive to assure educational excellence. We must stop this bickering over an issue that has no basis. We must have an effective program to aid education that does not discriminate against private and church-related schools. My bill shows a way. Let us take the road to equality of education and opportunity for all children in our beloved country.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks during general debate today on the bill H.R. 11289.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE JOHN HANCOCK MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when American democracy and our system of free enterprise are being severely tested in a rapidly changing world, it is reassuring to take inventory of those long-established institutions which have survived previous challenges and lent the country much of its strength.

I think it is appropriate to invite the attention of my distinguished colleagues to the fact that this month one of these great companies—whose headquarters are situated in my native Commonwealth of Massachusetts—has reached its hundredth year of business life.

Like most firms, the John Hancock's beginning was modest. Founded by a group of Boston merchants and bankers on an investment of $104,000, its first office was a single room housing a handful of employees. At the close of its initial business year, policyholders numbered 287, and its uncommitted cash reserve stood at $913.

Today, operating from a home office building a city block square and agencies in all 50 States, the company serves some 12 million policy owners and invests their funds in every corner of the Nation at an average rate of more than $2 million a day.

Between these century marks lies the history of the United States itself. As it grew and prospered, suffered setbacks, met its crises, fought its wars, and developed its resources, so also did the John Hancock and other companies of the same era.

In 1862, when the Hancock was established, life insurance benefits were out of reach for the majority of workers whose income of $300 to $500 a year limited them to the bare daily necessities. For thousands of uninsured families the future was a bleak prospect involving broken homes, orphaned children, public charity or, at best, already overburdened kin.

As industry rose and the living standard advanced, insurance companies were able to help the individual provide a measure of security for his family by making coverage available to the blue collar worker on a weekly, pay-as-you-earn basis. Need for such a plan was evidenced by experience of the John Hancock, which became the first mutual firm to inaugurate a program. More than 36,000 subscribers applied for industrial life insurance in the 2 years following its introduction in 1879.

With the opening up of the West, in which the company was a pioneer investor, the boom was on. Manufacturing and production leapt ahead in response to expanding markets, and, together with the rest of the insurance industry, John Hancock was a catalyst for growth.

Since that time billions of dollars have been funneled into our vast enterprise—railroads, farms, factories, highways, commercial and residential construction, research projects—in fact, almost any area in which development capital has been needed. Between 1948 and 1960, life insurance companies supplied more than half the new money required for expansion by the country's business and industrial concerns.

Equally important, the life insurance industry has encouraged the widespread thrift essential to fiscal stability, helping the economy to meet the stress of depression and disaster. Meanwhile, the basic function of life insurance protection has broadened to include accident and health benefits, group, annuity and retirement programs, and medical care for the aged.

On April 23, some 25,000 John Hancock people will gather at 94 dinners across the Nation to celebrate their company's entrance into its second century. Perhaps the most fitting expression of their understandable pride is implicit in a statement of basic philosophy by the company's president, Byron K. Elliott:

> The individual's self-reliance and responsibility for freedom from economic dependence—his own and others; this is what the John Hancock was born to foster, this is what it exists to serve.

To this corporate good neighbor and very fine citizen, I believe that best wishes are in order for another century.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in felicitations to the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. on the completion of its first hundred years of service to the Nation.

In the finest tradition of the Revolutionary patriot whose signature has become a symbol of our country's independence, the John Hancock, together with many other fine companies, has helped translate this ideal into an instrument for the freedom from financial dependence for millions of American families. In this connection I understand that, in 1961 alone, the company paid out more than one-half billion dollars in benefits to its policy owners.

As a trustee of public savings, a steward of individual security, and an investor in the development of our economic resources, I submit that the John Hancock's contribution to the advancement of both the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Nation at large has been of incalculable significance.

Personally, I have had a small policy in the John Hancock Co. for over 70 years and I know what a sound, solid institution it is.

Under the able leadership of its aggressive president, Byron Elliott, I am sure it will forge ahead to new triumphs of achievement in the years ahead.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues from Massachusetts in tipping our legislative hats to the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance of Boston, Massachusetts on the occasion of its 100th anniversary.

This centennial observance underscores a remarkable advance by a truly great American enterprise from its beginning in 1862 to this year of 1962. John Hancock's impression in the life insurance industry has been as indelible and emphatic as the great name it so gloriously bears. Its rise has been spectacular. Today, it is placed as the 5th largest life insurance company in the world. Its record of service to its policyholders has been, is, and will continue to be a proud and outstanding one. It maintains its preeminent position in the great insurance field by a constant concern for its policyholders and a continuing application of sound business principles.

Mr. Speaker, no private business could have reached the heights that John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance has reached without a dedicated and devoted organization of men and women. From the small beginning of 100 years ago to the present day, John Hancock has been blessed with this kind of spirit among the people who have contributed to its great success.

I congratulate Judge Byron Elliott who has presided over the affairs of this company for the past 5 years and who has to date given 26 years of service to it. I extend my best wishes to the men and women of the John Hancock organization on the occasion of the anniversary of their great company. I am proud to note this event and express the sincere hope that the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. will continue to prosper and remain a great force for good in Boston, in Massachusetts, and in the Nation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to confer my congratulations to the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. on the occasion of its 100th anniversary on April 21.

To countless men and women throughout our country, the John Hancock Co. represents fulfillment of the basic tenets of our democracy by encouraging independence, thrift, prudence, and individual responsibility. It is indeed a tribute to this institution that it has existed for 100 years—never faltering from its position of the highest integrity and responsible leadership among our great business institutions.

That a company which has fostered such leadership during the last century should bear the name of the first Governor of Massachusetts—John Hancock—a man of courage, self-reliance and patriotic devotion to his country, is highly appropriate.

For contributing so much to the business segment of our country, for stimulating the Nation's economy by directing policy owner funds into business enterprise, and for providing a model of public service and leadership during a century of great achievement, the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. deserves our best wishes on this memorable 100th anniversary.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have permission to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LITTLE-PEOPLE-TO-LITTLE-PEOPLE PROGRAM

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, during the years it has been my honor and privilege to serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have many times had the occasion to observe how much the cause of peace could be served if only a means could be found to increase understanding and promote friendship on a people-to-people basis.

We have seen how false and misleading propaganda emanating from their own officials has given people in the Iron Curtain countries a distorted and incorrect picture of American aims, aspirations and objectives. When we try by official means to correct these impressions we know that much of what we do is discounted as propaganda on our part.

It is for this reason that we have tried to supplement our Voice of America broadcasts by a number of other activities to give the people abroad a better and more accurate picture of what Americans are really like. Over the past few years our efforts have been augmented by our efforts to increase personal contacts between Americans and citizens of other countries. These activities have included the student exchanges under the Fulbright-Hays Act, the leadership grants under which we bring leaders to the United States and give them an opportunity to see our country, meet a number of our people and gain firsthand impressions about our way of life. This effort to provide a mutual increase in understanding is back of our stepped-up programs to stimulate language studies and official sponsorship of such institutions as the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, popularly known as the East-West Center.

All of these efforts are necessarily limited in scope, and we can hope only to reach a small percentage of the people we would like to have gain accurate and favorable impressions about America. It is for that reason that I am particularly pleased to add my own word of commendation for the plan originated by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable Peter W. Rodino, Jr., who is fostering a little-people-to-little-people program. Congressman Rodino for a long time has been very active in promoting contacts between Americans and individuals in other countries for the purpose of increasing mutual understanding and good will. I well remember his highly successful activities in connection with personal contacts on a city-to-city basis and a people-to-people basis. His new program was inaugurated by a letter written by Mr. Rodino's 10-year-old son, Peter Rodino III, to Premier Khrushchev asking him to stop the nuclear bomb testing in the interest of the health and safety of people all over the world.

Peter Rodino's letter has stimulated countless other children to write Khrushchev in similar fashion. How much good this will do is doubtful but it can do no harm and the effort is worthwhile, especially as Congressman Rodino's real purpose is to foster and encourage the writing of letters by American children to children in other countries.

At the present time Congressman Rodino is busily engaged in the process of gathering names of individuals and groups in foreign countries with whom correspondence can begin.

Naturally, Congressman Rodino does not expect that such a program of letter exchanges between little people of different countries can immediately produce results strong enough to overcome the chief obstacles to a better understanding of American ideals and aspirations. Congressman Rodino is a realistic idealist who visualizes the program inaugurated by his splendid young son as an important and highly progressive step in the right direction, one which supplements existing activities and one which, if carefully sustained and followed, can make a real contribution toward attainment of that better understanding between peoples upon which conditions of world stability must be built.

In the exchange of such correspondence between little people, I see opportunities for a healthy and worthwhile gain for the American children who correspond, as well as with those who will be the recipients of their letters. We have ourselves much to gain by the additional knowledge that will come to our young people through such personal communications and the stimulus they will serve for learning more about the conditions under which other people live in distant places.

As one who is convinced that the little-people-to-little-people program has a great potential for good, I extend my heartiest commendation to Congressman Peter Rodino and my best wishes for success in his patriotic efforts.

CENSURE OF ISRAEL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Buckley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent the following telegram to the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State:

Hon. Dean Rusk,
The Secretary of State
Washington, D.C.:

I am appalled at the action of the American delegation at the United Nations sponsoring the Security Council resolution condemning Israel and completely failing to reflect the facts of persistent Syrian provocations, the constant Arab threats to liquidate Israel, boycott its commerce, trespass on Israel's territory and threaten the peace-loving citizens of that democracy.

Whatever rights are enjoyed by the member States of the United Nations belong to Israel without addition or diminution. Whatever obligation any member State owes to another, the Arab states, and certainly Syria, owes to Israel. If Syria, by persistent attacks on Israel's sovereignty, denies to that democracy the plenitude of its charter rights, then it inflicts deep injury on Israel. Israel's competence to invoke Security Council action aganist Syria is seriously compromised and reduced.

Under the charter, Syria is bound to regard Israel as a state endowed with sovereignty equal to its own. It is bound to respect the territorial integrity and the political independence of the state of Israel, and especially to refrain from the use of force against that integrity and that political independence. Syria failed completely by its provocation to carry out the letter of the United Nations Charter. Israel undertook security measures in the exercise of its inherent right of self-defense.

Mr. Secretary, I find it incomprehensible that the American delegation failed to distinguish between acts of aggression and self-defense. Not for one single moment throughout the entire period of its national existence has Israel enjoyed that minimal physical security which the United Nations confers on all member states and which all other member states have been able to command.

Time after time, this deplorable situation has been brought to the attention of the State Department, but to no avail as witness the action of the American delegation in the Security Council. Mr. Secretary, beyond these incidents, grave as they are, I discern issues of even greater moment. Our Government must surely choose between two candidates for its confidence; on the one hand, the men, women, and children of Israel building a democratic society and culture in its renascent homeland; and on the other hand, the warlike Arabs who have set their armed might upon Israel in an attempt to wipe it off the face of the earth, by armed intervention, by murder and plunder. The Arabs blare forth the most violent threats of Israel's destruction and accumulate vast armaments for bringing this about.

This is aggression, this is belligerency, in the Middle East and Israel has been its victim, and not its author.

Mr. Secretary, Israel and the Arab States, the region in which they must forever live, now stands at the crossroads of its history. Our signpost is not to back aggression and belligerency, but to favor peace. Whatever Israel is now ordered to do, Syria and its Arab brethren must have in their counterpart a reciprocal duty to give Israel the plenitude of its rights.

The horizon must be of peace by agreement, peace without blockades in the Gulf of Aquaba or the Suez Canal, peace without frontier provocations, peace without constant threats to the integrity and independence of Israel and without military activities directed against Israel's independence.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS CITE CONGRESSMAN JAMES A. BURKE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1962, at Brockton, Mass., the Disabled American Veterans cited Congressman James A. Burke for his outstanding work on behalf of the disabled veterans. At a testimonial banquet at the Elks Home in Brockton, over 300 citizens from all walks in life witnessed the presentation of a plaque to Congressman Burke. I am very pleased to have this opportunity to relate this event to the Members of Congress who feel as I do that this award was truly merited. Congressman Jim Burke has served his Nation, his State, and his community with devoted and dedicated service. During World War II he served as a special agent in military intelligence and was attached to the fighting 77th Infantry Division in the South Pacific. He was awarded four battle stars, the Bronze Star, the Bronze Indian Arrowhead, and several other decorations for his brilliant war record. The 77th Infantry Division was the amphibious division of the U.S. Army in the South Pacific and participated in more than nine beach landings under enemy fire. He learned firsthand of the hazards of war and the suffering that our war heroes went through during wartime. He has never forgotten his wartime buddies. As a member of the Massachusetts General Court he gave unstintingly of his time and effort in order to have legislation passed that would benefit the Veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict. Over 32 laws are now on the statute books of Massachusetts as the result of his work as a member of the World War II Legislative Commission and also as House chairman of the Korean War Veterans Commission. Amongst these laws is the $200 million housing law that provided housing for over 20,000 veterans and their families, the adjustment payment to veterans of the Korean conflict, hospitalization, and several other laws benefiting all Massachusetts veterans and their families.

The invited guests were:

Hon. James F. Burke, State senator; Hon. Alvin C. Tamkin, Governor's councilor; Hon. F. Milton McGrath, mayor, city of Brockton; Peter G. Asiaf, State representative; George H. Burgesson, State representative; James R. Lawton, State representative; Paul M. Murphy, State representative; Francis R. Buono, national commander DAV; Dr. William Winick, director, Brockton VA Hospital; Boyd H. Bowers, State commander, DAV; Marjorie Feeley, State commander, DAV auxiliary; Henry M. Barry, commander, chapter No. 32, DAV; Hilma E. Migliaccio, commander, chapter No. 32, DAV auxiliary; Joseph R. Harold, State department, adjutant, DAV; Joseph Lawler, assistant director, Brockton VA Hospital; Robert McGillvary, secretary of Congressman Burke and, Kenneth G. Dalton, Brockton Enterprise news commentator.

The program of the evening was as follows:

Musical selections; processional, honored guests; invocation, John F. Barrett, chaplain, No. 32 DAV; national anthem; welcome, Clifton L. Haynes, chairman; toastmaster, Walter Morgan; presentation of guests; remarks, honored guests; remarks, George A. Wells, national second junior vice commander; presentation of James A. Burke.

Master of ceremonies, Walter Morgan; chairman, Clifton Haynes; cochairman, Dr. William Winick; program committee, E. Richard Corey; tickets, Ralph S. Jumpe; hall and entertainment, Arthur Pigeon.

As a Member of the U.S. Congress the Honorable James A. Burke has supported legislation that would improve conditions in our veterans hospitals and he has consistently voted for bills that help solve the many problems our war veterans face.

REGULATION NEEDED FOR PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 11358, to license and regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia.

In a recent statement the Department of Labor commented on the unregulated activities of private employment agencies in Washington stating that "one of the most important reasons for regulating private employment agencies is to protect applicants against excessive fees." In Washington these fees are not regulated and abuses have occurred. This bill is designed to eliminate these abuses and others which occur in an area which seriously needs to be regulated. It closely follows the New York State law which was designated by the Department of Labor as being one of those which conformed to its major recommendations.

This bill should eliminate much of the litigation resulting from what are considered excessive fees.

The New York law on which my bill is based provides a maximum of 10 percent of a month's salary for domestic workers and unskilled laborers. For clerical and professional jobs the fee maximum ranges from 25 percent of a month's salary for jobs up to $225 a month to 60 percent of a month's salary for jobs of $400 or more a month. I incorporated that schedule in my bill, because I believe that it is fair and adequate.

One aspect of the private employment agency business that has disturbed me is the bringing into the District of domestics without regard to the consequences to the prospective employee. Many times the employment agencies will recruit domestic help far from the District without any clear prospect of employment for them and without any provision for their maintenance when they arrive here.

This bill provides that the agency must provide food and shelter for these prospective clients when they are brought here and that they must provide for their return transportation if they are not provided with jobs or if the term of employment does not exceed 30 days.

The present law which provides for the licensing of private employment agencies in Washington is much too general and needs modernization. It has not been reviewed since its enactment in 1932.

I do not pretend that this bill is the last word on the subject. It is intended for study, comment, and suggestion by the appropriate agencies of the District government and by those interested or affected by it. I will, however, press for action on it early in the next session.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, 1962, I was on official duty as congressional adviser on space to the U.S. mission to the United Nations. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea" for the rule for debate on H.R. 10788 under House Resolution 589.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Thompson of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. Albert), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Santangelo, for 15 minutes, on April 18.

Mrs. Bolton, for 15 minutes, on April 18.

Mr. Mathias (at the request of Mrs. May), for 30 minutes, on Thursday, April 19, 1962.

Mr. Dulski (at the request of Mr. Mahon), for 1 hour, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Nix.

Mr. Meader, the remarks he made during general debate in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Alger.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. May) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pillion.

Mr. Schneebeli.

Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Avery.

Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Cohelan (at the request of Mr. Mahon), in Committee of the Whole on H.R. 11289 and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Mahon) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. St. Germain.

Mr. Monagan in two instances.

Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Anfuso.

Mr. Evins.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 683. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by eliminating the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with Federal Communications Commission;

S. 1371. An act to amend subsection (e) of section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit the Commission to renew a station license in the safety and special radio services more than thirty days prior to expiration of the orignal license;

S. 1589. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the issuance of radio operator licenses to nationals of the United States;

S. 2522. An act to defer the collection of irrigation maintenance and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project; and

S.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans to commemorate the three hundredth anniversary of the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 16, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8921. An act to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9751. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10700. An act to provide that section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act, which authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of that act, is amended by striking out "1962" and "$40 million" and substituting "1963" and "$63,750,000", respectively.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 18, 1962, at 10 o'clock a.m.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86-472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86-628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency and dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, covering expenditures for the previous calendar year. The consolidated report is to be forwarded to the Committee on House Administration, which, in turn, shall print such report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 legislative days after receipt. There is submitted herewith a supplemental report from the House Committee on Education and Labor:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1961

[U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency]

Name	Country	Lodging	Meals	Transportation	Miscellaneous	Total
Pucinski, Roman	United Kingdom	112.96	19.00	18.06	38.80	188.82
	France	108.63	28.00	17.00	62.00	215.63
	Germany	37.50	30.00	42.00	60.00	169.50
	Switzerland	67.37	30.00	50.00	40.00	187.37
	Italy	37.00	20.00	95.26	50.00	202.26
Brademas, John	Denmark-Germany	28.00	30.00	6.00	20.00	84.00
	Russia		60.00	60.00	84.00	204.00
	Denmark		18.00	6.00	8.00	32.00
	England	45.00	90.00	45.00	49.00	229.00
	Greece		76.00	32.00	48.00	156.00
Total		436.46	401.00	371.32	459.80	1,668.58

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

APR. 13, 1962.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1948. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to adjust the terms of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to increase the salaries of members of such Board, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1949. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Virgin Islands Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 392); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1950. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare relative to reporting a violation of administrative control of funds procedures in connection with the obligation of funds in excess of an allotment within an appropriation of this Department for the fiscal year 1961, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1951. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1952. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy so that they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1953. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the cost ascertainment report of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1961; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1954. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for assistance to States in the promotion, establishment, and maintenance of safe workplaces and work practices, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1955. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the mileage of rural delivery and star routes used as a factor in apportionment of Federal-aid primary and secondary funds"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1956. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, to encourage early restoration of moneys made available to the States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11257. A bill to amend section 815 (article 15) of title 10, United States Code, relating to nonjudicial punishment, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1139. An act to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the waters of the Little Missouri River in order to extend the expiration date of such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1613). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2132. An act to approve the revised June 1957 reclassification of land of the Fort Shaw division of the Sun River project, Montana, and to authorize the modification of the repayment contract with Fort Shaw Irrigation District; with amendment (Rept. No. 1614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9647. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an amendatory contract with the Burley Irrigation District, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 606. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 2206, a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; without amendment (Rept. No. 1616). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 607. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6949, a bill to amend section 4(e) of the Natural Gas Act, to authorize a gas distributing company to complain about a rate schedule filed by a natural gas company and to give the Federal Power Commission authority to suspend changes in rate schedules covering sales for resale for industrial use only; without amendment (Rept. No. 1617). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 608. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8031, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to give the Federal Communications Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus; without amendment (Rept. No. 1618). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALLECK:

H.R. 11339. A bill to authorize the improvement for navigation of Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 11340. A bill to promote the security and welfare of the people of the United States by providing for a program to assist the several States in further developing their programs of general university extension education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 11341. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 11342. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to exempt certain officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives from the requirements of such act relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators when they can prove legal residence in some State; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 11343. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a salmon and steelhead development program in California; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11344. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11345. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States and its territories and possessions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 11346. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguished brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 11347. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the disposition of certain nationals of the United States in foreign countries who are alleged and determined to be of unsound mind, and dangerous to persons or property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11348. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for confinement and treatment of offenders against the Uniform Code of Military Justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11349. A bill to provide for the discharge of minors who enlist in the naval service or the Coast Guard without consent of parents or guardian; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.R. 11350. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to approve a bridge on Interstate Highway 29 at Sioux City, Iowa, as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 11351. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to designate as national forest wonderlands certain areas of the national forests having outstanding scenic and recreational values, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 11352. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a salmon and steelhead development program in California; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 11353. A bill to amend section 25 of the act of October 30, 1951, to provide for refunds of certain amounts withheld from annuities payable under the Railroad Retirement Acts on account of joint or survivor annuity elections which were revoked; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H.R. 11354. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that limestone spalls, fragments, and fines may be imported free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 11355. A bill to amend the act of March 4, 1907, to provide that the 16-hour limitation upon continuous duty for certain railroad employees shall apply to employees installing, repairing, and maintaining signal systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 11356. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a salmon and steelhead development program in California; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 11357. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a salmon and steelhead development program in California; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11358. A bill to license and regulate private employment agencies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 11359. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 11360. A bill to authorize the improvement for navigation of Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 11361. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a salmon and steelhead development program in California; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 11362. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 11363. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 to provide for the protection of classified information released to or within U.S. industry and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 11364. A bill authorizing modification of the existing project from the Intracoastal Waterway to Bayou Dulac, La. (Bayous Grand Caillou and Le Carpe), and maintenance of the Houma Navigation Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 11365. A bill authorizing modification of the existing project for the Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana, in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 11366. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a salmon and steelhead development program in California; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 11367. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses with deduction from original annuities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 11368. A bill authorizing modification of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, La. and Tex., in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11369. A bill authorizing improvements along the Mississippi River below New Orleans for prevention of hurricane tidal damages; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 11370. A bill authorizing modification of the existing project for the Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana, in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11371. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a salmon and steelhead development program in California; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 11372. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.R. 11373. A bill to provide a right to ingress and egress across national forest lands to all persons owning property within the boundaries of such national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11374. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773, 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11375. A bill to require the establishment of an appeals procedure in matters related to the sale of timber from national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11376. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended (48 Stat. 1246, 12 U.S.C. 1701), to require the use of domestic manufacture of lumber and wood products in the construction of housing federally financed and/or federally insured, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MEADER:

H.R. 11377. A bill to establish a Commission on Government Operations in Research and Development; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 11378. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus property to schools for the mentally retarded, schools for the physically handicapped, educational television stations, and public libraries; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 11379. A bill to provide for an elective Governor and an elective Lieutenant Governor of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 11380. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that limestone spalls, fragments, and fines may be imported free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 11381. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 11382. A bill authorizing modification of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, La. and Tex., in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.J. Res. 697. Joint resolution to designate the 18th day of April of each year as "Patriots Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.J. Res. 698. Joint resolution regarding Indian fishing rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. Res. 604. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the production, distribution, and exhibition of objectionable motion pictures and related advertising; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BEERMANN:

H. Res. 605. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 11383. A bill for the relief of Ivan I. Mueller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11384. A bill for the relief of Pablo T. Rinonos and Tomasa A. Rinonos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11385. A bill for the relief of Samuel Ellis Beckles and Vida Bernese Beckles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 11386. A bill for the relief of George R. Lore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 11387. A bill for the relief of Me Soon Song; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 11388. A bill for the relief of Maurice Casner and Eileen G. Casner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

309. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Britton Rey, city clerk, Belvedere, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of income derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

310. Also, petition of R. R. Balotto, city clerk, Glendora, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of income derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

311. Also, petition of Morris E. Erickson, city clerk, Exeter, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of income derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

312. Also, petition of Rachael N. Cordes, clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Siskiyou County, Calif., relative to opposing Federal taxation of income derived from State and local bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Questionnaire Report—Fifth Congressional District, State of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have completed the tabulation of a questionnaire which I distributed to about 10,000 of my constituents in the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut. The questionnaires were distributed by my office in February 1962 to a mailing list of constituents who have corresponded with me from time to time on legislative and policy matters, and to those who participated in a similar survey I conducted in 1961.

The American electorate has often been stated to be apathetic or unconcerned about affairs of government. This is not the case in my district. In the 2 years I have been conducting public opinion polls on legislative and policy matters I have been highly gratified with the response, not only in the return of questionnaire forms which provide space for categoric yes or no answers to questions on complex matters, but also in the number of letters I have received in which responsible comments and recommendations are submitted.

EIGHTEEN PERCENT RETURNED

In 1961 I distributed about 7,350 forms and received about 1,375 returns, an average of over 18 percent. In 1962 the return from about 10,000 questionnaires was about 1,795, again an average of about 18 percent. This, I am told by expert pollsters, is an extremely high average. The anticipated return from professional polls is about 10 percent.

By their willingness to complete the questionnaire, and their desire to expand upon their views with accompanying letters, the voters of my district have demonstrated a genuine interest in and knowledge of their Government and legislative affairs. I have prepared this questionnaire to obtain a cross section of opinion on some of the major issues which vitally concern every one of us. This report, and the comments of my constituents, will be of great value to me in the consideration of measures now pending in the Congress. Although I do not propose to follow these results in any slavish manner, but to exercise my own judgment on questions which arise, nevertheless they do provide helpful guidance.

I want to point out that the questionnaire forms were not printed at Government expense, and those who returned them affixed their own postage. I was very pleased to receive additional requests for supplies of questionnaires. One such request was for 200.

I shall append to this statement a tally showing the complete results of my 1962 questionnaire, but I wish to comment briefly on the subjects covered. I also intend to include excerpts from some of the letters returned with the questionnaire forms.

THE RESULTS

The questionnaire form provided space for yes or no answers, but in many cases there were enlightening and interesting letters attached. The final tabulations show overwhelming support—see chart—for resumption of nuclear tests in the atmosphere; for limitations on executive authority to reduce tariffs; for medical care for the aged under social security; for Federal aid for elementary school construction—but not for teachers' salaries or parochial school; for U.S. membership in the U.N.—purchase of U.N. bonds was favored, but by a slim margin; for annual appropriations of adequate funds for space explorations; for an Alliance for Progress with Latin America, with financial assistance where necessary; for continuance of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

My constituents opposed establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs at Cabinet level by a score of 827 to 796, with 172 registering no opinion. The score on U.S. purchase of U.N. bonds was 822 yes; 677 no; and 283 uncommitted.

The following are excerpts from letters received in response to the questionnaire:

Woodbury: "The President has requested Congress to give him the power to cut tariffs across the board. I oppose this delegation of power to the executive and the entry of the United States into the Common Market."

Torrington: "I want to thank you for the questionnaire you sent me. It was very interesting and I will appreciate more in the future if you will send them to me."

Roxbury: "I note, incidentally, that the card was not printed at Government expense, I suppose for the usual reasons. This is one case, however, which I think should be made an exception. This imaginatively conceived method for taking the public pulse on important public issues, it seems to me, should not depend for its financing on the limited income of individual Congressmen, which means that its use can only be sporadic and, to that extent, inadequate, and inconclusive. Our Government should assist in the establishment and dissemination of such questionnaires by providing special funds, earmarked for that purpose, for the use of Congressmen."

Waterbury: "Although I do not like much of the conduct of the House Un-American Activities Committee, I think the committee could fill an essential role if the members would observe properly the civil rights of witnesses and not use it as a headline hunting vehicle."

New Milford: "I am all in favor of every tax dollar being collected from everyone who is properly required to pay it. However, honesty like morals cannot be legislated and measures such as the one proposed merely drive the actual offenders to more ingenious methods of evasion leaving the others to hold the tab."

Watertown: "There should be a Federal program for medical and hospital care for the aged. While I believe that the Federal Government has the propensity for massive growth at the expense of States rights and individual liberty, this is one area where the National Government should act and probably under social security as it has for old age retirement and disability."

Washington: "Please send me six more questionnaires. Regarding support for Latin America, I do believe that is the most important section of the world to us and that we should aid the countries which want to be our friends—not any country which espouses 'neutralism.'"

Prospect: "I probably am wrong, but I detest nuclear tests in the atmosphere and dread the outcome of them."

Kent: "No to the abolition of the Un-American Committee because apart from other good reasons, it would be too much of a triumph for the pinks and reds. No to unlimited tariff-cutting powers, for while I'd be inclined to trust President Kennedy with such powers as he is today, he might change, and so will the Presidency."

Lakeville: "Too many of us get involved with the many immediate problems of daily living and do not stop to really think about the big decisions which should be our responsibility as much as yours."

Falls Village: "Thank you for this opportunity to express our opinions."

Bridgewater: "May I have six more of the excellent questionnaire to give to some Bridgewater people who would like to have this opportunity of expressing their views to you, their Representative. Thank you."

Naugatuck: "Kindly send me 20 copies of the questionnaire on issues before the 2d session, 87th Congress. Our Retired Men's Club has become interested in your suggestion."

Litchfield: "If the space program is to be pushed forward to enhance J.F.K.'s chances for election in 1964, then we say not 1 red cent for space."

Ansonia: "I am greatly opposed to anything that is supported by the National Association of Manufacturers. Keep an eye on the tariff program for the Naugatuck Valley. I have confidence in your judgment."

Derby: "This questionnaire is a fine idea. But when the chips are down you are going to have to use your own judgment on what's good for the district and for the country."

Beacon Falls: "The question of Federal aid for education has lost its original significance and is now a political and religious controversy. Why not let it cool off for a year or so?"

Winsted: "I would be in favor of a Department of Urban Affairs at the Cabinet level, but I'm afraid the question is now on a broader issue. We are not being confused by the sounds and fury being raised in some quarters against medical care for the aged. We want it."

Thomaston: "How can we avoid nuclear testing? While I find it repulsive to contemplate the possibilities of a nuclear war, the alternative of not being prepared for one is even worse. Don't trust the Russians."

Colebrook: "I normally vote Republican, but I am favorably impressed with your interest in obtaining grassroots opinion. I don't like some of the things the United Nations is doing, and not doing, but guess we'll have to stick with it until something better comes along."

The questionnaire tally chart follows:

Results of questionnaire (1,795 cards tabulated)

Do you favor—	Yes	No	Uncommitted
1. Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs at Cabinet level?	796	827	172
2. Federal aid to elementary education?	1,006	518	217
a. For school construction?	1,019	582	194
b. For teachers' salaries?	755	844	196
c. For parochial as well as public schools?	579	997	219
3. Medical and hospital care for the aged?	1,224	285	286
a. Under social security?	957	504	334
b. By federally assisted State programs?	572	760	455
4. Resumption by the United States of nuclear tests in the atmosphere?	1,258	433	104
5. Withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations	204	1,519	72
6. Purchase of $100,000,000 U.N. bonds by the United States to help finance U.N. deficit?	822	677	283
7. Abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee?	454	1,157	184
8. Support of an Alliance for Progress with Latin America, with financial assistance where necessary?	1,466	235	94
9. Congress giving the President broad tariff-cutting powers to negotiate across-the-board trade agreements?			
a. Without limitations?	295	1,070	430
b. With limitations providing for appeal and review of agreements?	1,166	355	274
10. Annual appropriations of adequate funds for space explorations?	1,584	138	74

Why Do We Give Haven to Murderers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, beginning at sundown on Wednesday, Jewish homes all over America will commemorate the Passover, the liberation of the ancient Israelites from Egyptian slavery?

This year, the Jews of America and Jews all over the world will also mourn at this Passover season a tragedy so momentous that non-Jews have little conception or understanding of it.

It is the anniversary of the greatest mass murder in history—when 6 million Jews went to their deaths in the gas chambers and the open pit graves of Hitler.

I ask that those of the non-Jewish faith, those who have not known such terribly tragedy, join first in expressing our sympathy, and second make sure that any others who persecuted the Jews be punished, even as Adolf Eichmann now awaits punishment.

In this connection I regret to report that another who participated in the persecution of the Jewish people, even before Eichmann, is now living in New York City, enjoying the blessings and benefits of American protection. He is not a citizen, but for some unexplained reason, he has been allowed to remain here.

Early in the war, in fact even before persecution of the Jewish people reached a gruesome climax in Germany, the Rumanian Iron Guard massacred, tortured, imprisoned, and hung thousands of Jews. Between 8,000 and 10,000 died. This was the forerunner of Hitler's gas chambers.

The man who financed the Iron Guard, according to war documents published by the State Department, is the man who now resides at 1158 Fifth Avenue, New York, namely the big Rumanian industrialist, Nicolae Malaxa.

The record of this man is one of the most amazing in the postwar world. Even more amazing is the fact that he remains in the United States.

In the first place he was the wartime partner of Albert Goering, brother of Field Marshal Hermann Goering, the No. 1 war criminal after Hitler, who committed suicide in an Allied jail. Malaxa and Goering, according to the record of the Immigration Service, worked together during the war and Malaxa helped supply Hitler's army with some of the metallurgical products so badly needed during the war.

With the end of the war, Malaxa switched from the Nazi side to the Communist side. Wrapping himself in the cloak of the Communist Government of Rumania, he came to the United States in 1946 on a trade mission. He was a representative of the Rumanian Government and therefore came here under the auspices of a Communist government. Yet he has remained here ever since.

One of the most tragic books written since the war is called "The Destruction of the European Jews" by Raul Hilberg. Dr. Hilberg, a student at Columbia University, and now on the faculty of the University of Vermont, spent some years studying the Federal war records in Alexandria, Va., and has compiled a gruesome account of the tragic massacre of the Jewish people.

In his chapter on Rumania, page 489, Dr. Hilberg reports:

> Iron Guardists had stormed into the Jewish quarter, burning down synagogues, demolishing stores, and devastating private apartments. For miles around the city the guardists had left traces of their revolution. On January 24, travelers on the Bucharest-Ploesti Road discovered at Baneasa over a hundred Jewish bodies without clothes. Gold teeth had been knocked out of the mouths of the dead. (Gypsies were believed to have been the looters.) On the road to Giurgiu passers-by stumbled upon another 80 bodies of Jewish slain. In the city itself the German military attaché was busy collecting casualty reports. "In the Bucharest morgue—

He wrote—

> one can see hundreds of corpses, but they are mostly Jews (doch handelt es sich meistens um Juden)." Jewish sources report that the victims had not merely been killed; they had been butchered. In the morgue bodies were so cut up that they no longer resembled anything human, and in the municipal slaughterhouse bodies were observed hanging like carcasses of cattle. A witness saw a girl of 5 hanging by her feet like a calf, her entire body smeared with blood. On January 27, the Jewish community organization had identified 630 of the dead; another 400 were missing.

The tragic account goes on and on. A total of between 7,000 and 10,000 Jews were massacred by the Iron Guard in Rumania, largely in the month of January 1941.

Now I turn to another book—an official volume published by the State Department. It is called "Documents on German Foreign Policy From 1918 to

1945," and it contains the many captured notes exchanged between the German Foreign Office in Berlin and its Nazi Ambassadors around the world.

On pages 1050–1051 there is published German Document No. 623 from the Nazi Minister in Rumania Fabricius to the foreign ministry in Berlin, a telegram dated January 8, 1941, the exact period when the Iron Guard massacre of the Jews was taking place in Rumania. The German note refers to the Iron Guard as legionnaires.

After describing friction between General Antonescu and the Iron Guard, the German minister cabled Berlin as follows:

> In this fight between the General (Antonescu) and the legionnaires (the Iron Guard) command, a man plays a role who even earlier played a secret part in Rumanian politics: Carol's former friend and the present financial mainstay of the legionnaires, M. Malaxa. The legionnaires let this clever big industrialist finance them. He has in his plants the leader of the legionnaire labor organization, Gana, and there the green flags of Sima flutter everywhere. Sima and his (group missing) have let themselves be roped in and want to come to an agreement with Malaxa on a settlement, while the general, as the exponent of order and purity, demands that Malaxa hand over all the property stolen from the State. Malaxa therefore considers the general his mortal enemy and makes common cause with the legionnaires against him. Malaxa has even again supplied with arms the legionnaire police, who had already been disarmed. Yesterday, while the scene between the general and Sima occurred in the office of the Minister President, they established themselves in the Prefecture of Police with machineguns.
>
> The general, whose entourage kept this information from him last evening, is now extremely angry. He would like best to send Malaxa and his family off to Germany in order to get rid of them for a while. In reply to a question from him, I told him that, if he wishes it, we would be glad to oblige him by taking Malaxa in, since German industry had always been on the best of terms with him. The general considers this his only chance of getting rid of this troublesome schemer.
>
> General Antonescu described the events to me in detail. He asked me to treat the information in strict confidence.—Fabricius.

This is the man who supplied arms to the Iron Guard police, even after they had already been disarmed, and who supplied the finances for those who wantonly murdered and tortured the Jewish people of Rumania.

I quote once again from Hilberg's tragic volume, "The Destruction of the European Jews":

> A witness saw a girl of 5 hanging by her feet like a calf, her entire body smeared with blood. On January 27 the Jewish community organization had identified 630 of their dead; another 400 were missing.

The date of that particular massacre was January 27; the warning cabled by the German Minister in Rumania to the German foreign ministry in Berlin was January 8, both in 1941.

That is the shocking, terrible, tragic evidence—not hearsay, not a newspaper account, but the official war records published by the State Department after having been seized by the U.S. Army after the war.

And yet the man who was described as "the financial mainstay" of the Iron Guard now resides at 1158 Fifth Avenue, in New York.

I ask the reason why.

Could it be that these documents lie. I do not think so. It is true they are German documents, but they have a ring of accuracy about them. In addition they are substantiated by the Immigration hearings. Various prominent Rumanian witnesses appeared before immigration officials to testify that Malaxa was the financial backer of the Iron Guard. Among these witnesses was Alexander Cretzianu, former Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs for the Rumanian Government; also Marion Novotny, who testified that he had seen Iron Guardsmen enter Malaxa's home to obtain arms stored there for use of the Iron Guard. Max Ausnit, a leading Rumanian industrialist, also identified Malaxa as the financial mainstay of the Iron Guard.

Now here is another amazing point. Malaxa would not answer questions on these and other tender points when he appeared before the Immigration Service. In effect, he took the fifth amendment. On such vital questions as whether he was affiliated with the Iron Guard, as to whether he had the backing of the Communist government after the war in Rumania, as to whether he had worked with the Nazis during the war, on all these points Malaxa stood silent.

Can you imagine an ordinary criminal being admitted into the United States when he took the fifth amendment?

Yet this man who helped to perpetrate crimes far worse than those of an ordinary criminal would not answer questions, yet he has been allowed to remain here.

I am informed that the distinguished chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, has done his best to try to secure the deportation of this alien—without success.

I know that the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has publicly branded this alien as a Communist and has told how Malaxa used political influence to remain in the United States.

These are influential and able gentlemen and I cannot understand why their advice has not been listened to.

I know that the Immigration Service has recommended deportation. But this deportation has not been carried out. The Immigration Service has been overruled.

I cannot understand why. Why are we permitting this man—who was seriously implicated with the murder of some 10,000 Rumanian Jews—to remain living in wealth and luxury on Fifth Avenue while the Jewish world mourns its dead?

There are no people in the world who have suffered more tragically during the past war. They have borne their suffering in silence. They have buried their dead. It is not for the Jews of the United States to rise up and ask why we are keeping this man in the United States, it for the rest of us who are non-Jews to fight this battle.

I for one hope the distinguished chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee will reopen this case and bring the records forward for all to see.

It was Moses who, as the people of Israel sought to escape from Egyptian bondage, cried out in the name of the Lord: "Let my people go that they may serve Me."

And I say, let those who have been guilty be punished; let those who are not of Jewish faith rise up in wrath and defense of our Jewish colleagues and in atonement for the sins of others.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, April 14, 1962)

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 has occupied the full attention of the Committee on Ways and Means for the past month. This week we completed public hearings and started executive sessions to consider the testimony. Fair trade between nations and fair competition between the products of nations is obviously in the best interest of the United States. The President's bill, H.R. 9900, will promote neither fair trade nor free trade. The conditions indispensable to free trade do not exist and cannot exist without a basic change in U.S. economic policies and a change in laws now on the books pertaining to immigration, minimum wage, agriculture, and other areas which contribute to the cost of doing business.

The regulation of imports to assure fair competition between foreign and domestic products can no longer be based on tariff adjustment. The United States, with duties averaging 12 percent on industrial products, is fourth lowest of the nations of the world in the level of its duties. Our duties have been reduced so low that in the Tariff Commission's peril-point investigation it was determined that nearly 40 percent of the items on which concession had been requested by other countries tariffs could not be further reduced without causing or threatening serious injury to many U.S. industries. On items requested by the European Economic Community, 75 percent were already at the peril point. Rather than accepting the President's bill as presented to the committee, we need a comprehensive study of the domestic cost consequences of inflationary pressures created by continued governmental deficits, and of the systems of taxation, State and Federal, which place our industries at a cost disadvantage with foreign competitors.

The President's bill asks Congress to abdicate its responsibilities. H.R. 9900 requests Congress to abdicate its powers and responsibilities under the Constitution, by granting the President absolute discretion to reduce or eliminate duties without any limiting standards. It denies judicial review, eliminates the peril point, and gives the President a life or death decision over American industry. More than half of the 60 pages of the bill gives the President power to reorganize the Nation's economy and increases Federal planning in the retraining and relocation of workers who lose their jobs because of a Presidential tariff decision and to subsidize industries hurt as a result of the application of this act.

Bureaucratic reorganization of our whole domestic economy will be the end result of this bill. By giving the President the sole power to choose the industries, workers, and communities which shall receive the full brunt of duty-free competition from the products of lower cost countries, and the further power to select from those industries the ones which he will assist by tax relief and other forms of adjustment assistance, the bill would give the President unrestrained power to determine without coming to Congress, the future development of the U.S. economy. There are no guidelines in the bill which the President must follow.

The President's bill contemplates Government price control. In questioning Under Secretary of State Ball I was able to secure his admission that the administration is prepared to use tariff concession on industrial and agricultural products to bring about lower prices. President Kennedy, himself, acknowledged in a speech in New York City on October 12, 1960, "Frequently imports may be only a relatively small percentage of our domestic market, 2 or 3 percent, but it breaks the price for the other 97 percent." It is plain the administration intends to use the unlimited authority requested in H.R. 9900 as an experiment in price control both in domestic and foreign markets.

This bill will not insure free trade, but on the contrary will further restrict American exports and will place unconstitutional and dangerous power in the hands of the President. On the floor of the House on Wednesday evening I offered a trade program which I believe will accomplish the ultimate purpose of freer trade without endangering our own economy or liberties: (1) Extend the present trade agreements law for a 4-year period; (2) within present law, give the President additional authority to reduce duties by 20 percent, to take effect 5 percent a year; (3) strengthen the existing peril-point and escape clause provisions by requiring a finding of actual or threatened injury by the Tariff Commission whenever there exists, or would be imminent, a combination of either (a) a decline in the share of the market supplied by domestic productions and a decline in the domestic price level or in domestic industry earnings; or (b) a decline in the share of the market for domestic products and a decline in employment or wages paid in the domestic industry; (4) provide against the sappings by excessive imports at the rate of growth of industries, by adding to the peril-point and escape clauses, as alternate bases for action, circumstances characterized by an increase in imports, the continued expansion of the domestic market, but a decline in the established rate of growth of the industry producing like or competitive products; (5) direct the President to make a determined use of legislative tools already at hand designed to promote the expansion of U.S. exports without the necessity for new duty reductions; (6) establish a congressional commission, adequately staffed, to make a comprehensive study of all the factors relating to our foreign trade position.

Trade and tariffs legislation is a highly complicated and technical study, but is one of the main concerns of my Committee on Ways and Means. The bill we are now considering could have more serious and far-reaching effects on every individual citizen than any other measure coming before Congress and for that reason I have spent and will continue to spend practically every waking moment in trying to see to it that we shape a measure which will protect our economy, our industry, the jobs of our people, and will preserve our constitutional liberties and the responsibilities of the legislative branch of the Government.

Answers to Questionnaires—They Provide Cross Section of Public Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I recently submitted to the citizens of the 21st Congressional District of Texas a questionnaire, containing 24 current issues. Approximately 15,000 returns have come in and have been tabulated. This represents an unusually high percentage of responses, and bespeaks the extraordinary interest in the affairs of government on the part of the people who reside in that district.

The results follow:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Foreign affairs:			
Should foreign aid be confined to friendly countries?	85.76	7.07	7.16
Should foreign aid be reduced?	78.59	10.90	10.50
Do you favor the President's proposal to increase the foreign aid's Peace Corps from $10,000,000 to $52,000,000 a year?	11.90	78.64	9.45
Should we maintain a strong stand in defense of Berlin even if it means use of force?	86.40	4.57	9.02
Fiscal:			
Do you favor the President's request that Congress give him standby authority, subject to veto by Congress, to reduce taxes on personal income, as an antirecession measure?	36.71	53.90	9.38
Do you favor the President's proposed establishment of a Cabinet-level new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing?	9.69	77.09	13.21
The President has recommended pay raise reforms for Government employees, estimated to cost $1,000,000,000 per year:			
Do you favor any increase in wages for Government employees?	15.33	72.80	11.85
Do you favor any increase in wages for postal employees, in particular?	16.85	70.07	13.07
School aid:			
Do you favor any Federal aid for school construction?	25.16	69.64	5.19
Do you favor any Federal aid for teachers' salaries?	15.45	79.64	4.90
Welfare:			
The President has recommended that the Congress provide standby authority to the President to accelerate and put into effect up to $2,000,000,000 of public works when unemployment is rising. Do you favor this?	25.14	66.16	8.60
The President has proposed the initiation of a Youth Employment Opportunities Act, designed to train young people for job opportunities, estimated to cost $75,000,000 the 1st year, $100,000,000 for each of the next 2 years. Do you favor this?	26.73	63.62	9.64
The President has proposed the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, modeled roughly after the CCC of depression days. Do you favor this?	25.21	62.97	11.80
Subversive activities: Do you favor the continuation of the House Un-American Activities Committee	77.97	9.97	12.04
Medical care: The President has proposed that all employers and employees be required to pay additional social security tax to provide limited medical and hospital care for elderly social security annuitants, regardless of their need or desire. Do you favor this?	18.66	75.45	5.88
United Nations: The President has asked the Congress to approve the purchase of $100,000,000 of a $200,000,000 bond issue by the U.N., to help finance that organization, contending that would result in less outlay by us in the long run. Do you favor this?	18.11	68.04	13.83
Foreign trade: The President has requested that he be given authority by the Congress to reduce tariffs by 20 percent or more on major groups of commodities, in exchange for concessions from other countries, especially those in the Common Market of Europe. Do you favor this?	35.00	47.30	17.69
Veterans:			
A bill in Congress provides that GI educational benefits be extended to veterans who serve in peacetime, estimated by VA to cost, initially, $330,000,000 per year. Do you favor this?	26.00	65.33	8.66
Another pending bill, H.R. 3745, would give 1,564,000 veterans of World War I, who served 90 days or more, a pension of $102 per month. Income limits in the bill would exclude about 30 percent of World War I veterans in the higher income brackets. (The VA estimates 1st-year additional cost $942,000,000 annually, with a total additional cost of $11,000,000,000). Do you favor this?	23.85	64.19	11.95
Agriculture: Do you favor reduction in costs and controls in farm program?	77.04	15.16	7.78
Labor:			
Do you favor "right-to-work" laws which provide that a worker does not have to join a union to hold a job?	93.16	4.57	2.26
Do you favor legislation requiring labor unions to conform to antitrust laws now applicable to private corporations and business enterprises?	81.40	6.04	12.54
The President has asked for legislation which would require all unemployment compensation laws of the various States to be federally standardized. Do you favor this?	27.92	57.85	14.21
The President has urged an increase in and an expansion of coverage of unemployment benefits. Do you favor this?	15.90	74.21	9.88

Mr. Speaker, it can be said with assurance that these results represent a fairly accurate cross section of public opinion in that district.

MEDICAL CARE PROPOSAL IS UNPOPULAR

It will be noted that only 18.66 percent favor while 75.45 percent oppose the President's proposal that limited medical and hospital care be provided for elderly people who are covered by social security, a whopping majority of 4 to 1.

Under the Kerr-Mills Act, now in effect, all needy elderly people are entitled to medical and hospital care in those States that cooperate by implementing the Federal law enacted by Congress 2 years ago.

PEOPLE WANT FOREIGN AID REDUCED

By a decisive ratio of 85.76 to only 7.07 percent, the people want foreign aid confined to friendly countries, and 78 percent feel that foreign aid should be reduced, or eliminated.

STANDBY AUTHORITY AND NEW WELFARE PROPOSALS ARE UNPOPULAR

The results reveal a strong conviction on the part of the people that the Congress should retain its constitutional responsibilities in several areas covered by questions. By a ratio of 36.71 to 53.90 percent the people oppose the President's request that Congress give him standby authority to reduce taxes on personal income, as an antirecession measure.

By a ratio of 2½ to 1, they oppose the President's recommendation that the Congress provide standby authority for him to put into effect a public works program when unemployment is rising.

They strongly oppose the proposed Youth Employment Opportunities Act and the proposed Youth Conservation Corps.

PEOPLE OPPOSE FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

It will be noted that 25.16 percent favor and 69.64 percent oppose any Federal aid for school construction. And even more decisively they oppose any Federal aid for teachers' salaries.

U.N. BOND PURCHASE DISAPPROVED

By a percentage of 18.11 percent for and 68.04 percent against, the people are opposed to the proposed purchase of $100 million of bonds to help finance the United Nations.

A considerable number, in comments, express grave doubts as to the future usefulness of the United Nations organization. They feel, as I do, that unless changes are made which will enable that organization to more effectively project and maintain the position of the United States and our allies in respect to means of maintaining peace and repudiating the warmaking activities of the Communists, we should seriously consider withdrawing from membership. And they feel very strongly that all other nations should be required to pay their proportionate share of the costs of operating the United Nations; otherwise they should be automatically deprived of the privilege of voting. In my opinion this position is sound and proper.

LABOR UNIONS SHOULD BE UNDER ANTITRUST LAWS

It will also be noted that by a margin of 81.40 and 6.04 percent, the people feel that labor unions should be made to conform to antitrust laws now applicable to private corporations and business enterprises.

I strongly support this position. I have introduced legislation to accomplish that objective. The simple fact is that labor unions have grown up. They are now big business. They no longer need to be wet-nursed and coddled. They do not need nor should they longer expect special treatment by being exempted from our antimonopoly laws. The public interest must be protected against harm that comes from conspiracies in restraint of trade, whether it be by big business or big labor.

The people also very strongly oppose any expansion of coverage of unemployment benefits. Several hundred of those who answered cited specific instances, within their own knowledge, of abuses by individuals who receive benefits under this program. The effect of this is to magnify rather than to relieve the problems related to unemployment. In fact, in many instances it serves to promote unemployment by providing a method whereby many make use of this program in order to avoid working, and actually refuse to seek or accept gainful employment while they are drawing such benefits.

It is clear that this, a State program, should be investigated and appropriate steps taken to better protect the public interest against these unjustified abuses. The program can be protected and applied as intended, while effectively preventing the free riders and chiselers from making a farce of the real purpose and intention of the program.

WITHHOLDING OF TAX ON SAVINGS AND DIVIDENDS IS UNPOPULAR

Mr. Speaker, while the issue was not included in the poll hundreds of people in their comments have expressed opposition to the pending proposal to withhold the tax on interest, savings, dividends, and so forth. It will be recalled that this issue was included in the recent tax bill which was passed by the House. I was one of those who voted against it. With the computer system now being installed by the Internal Revenue Service, it is believed that we are approaching the time when such withholding will be wholly unnecessary. The proposed withholding will be irritating and it will involve tremendous expensive bookkeeping operations by those who would be required to do the withholding for the Government.

PEOPLE FAVOR MORE FREEDOM, FEWER CONTROLS

Throughout these questionnaires the people have spoken out against so much concentration of governmental activities in Washington. They want less regimentation, fewer controls, in all activities, including agriculture and business. A Coleman ranchman expressed the views of many thus:

> I am strongly opposed to giving the President any of the powers that now belong to Congress. I am in favor of reducing Government spending at all levels and returning the economy of this country back to the people where it belongs.

Quite a number have expressed concern over deficit spending and other policies widely endorsed by liberals. Many people ask questions about the attitude of such liberal organizations as the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) and the AFL-CIO's political arm, known as COPE. They believe that the liberal policies of these and other similar organizations should be considered with caution and restraint on the part of the Congress.

Several comments included requests for information about the extent of conformance by Members of Congress to policies advocated by ADA and COPE. In that connection, I have in my possession a number of reprints of the voting records of Congressmen as viewed by those organizations. They will be sent to any constituents who request them.

Mr. Speaker, there are other comments and other issues which I should like to discuss in this report, but space will not permit. I do want to take this means of expressing my appreciation to all of my constituents who took the time and trouble to return their questionnaires and the many who gave me the benefit of some timely and enlightening comments.

Medical Care for the Aged Under Social Security Rather Than Private Insurance Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FERNAND J. ST. GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the introduction in recent days of several medicare bills on a so-called voluntary basis rather than under the social security program is most pleasing to me in several respects, and yet disturbing in others.

There is a growing recognition by opponents of the medicare program that the aged do not have the adequate means of meeting the expenses of major, and often chronic, illnesses that strike them in this period of their lives; that the aged desire a program whereby they can finance the necessary insurance against the costs of required treatment; that health insurance coverage is a desirable national objective for all. I repeat "all" of our aged, and that it is in the national interest to aid and encourage the aged who seek the protection of medical care under an effective, financially sound and encompassing program. The very recognition of the need has long been lacking among many Members of this Chamber. It may possibly be the voting strength of the aged that has influenced many Members of the House to approach the subject of medical care for the aged in a more realistic and fruitful manner.

There is, however, one major divergence of opinion between the new proponents of the medicare program and myself. We are not in agreement as to the best basis upon which to finance the coverage. The phrase "extended without Government interference on a voluntary rather than compulsory basis," as used in the recently introduced legislation, is a facade that insults the intelligence of the senior citizens of this Nation and of my distinguished colleagues in this Chamber. Objections to social security are a little late; almost 30 years too late. It is a justified, effective, financially sound and fully accepted means of providing what private funds cannot provide and is an acceptance by the Government of a responsibility which lies upon its shoulders. It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that we should not hesitate to act when action is within the sphere of governmental responsibility and I submit that the health and welfare of the people of this Nation is within that sphere. To argue against the social security program is to ask for the withdrawal of so much that has kept America prosperous and its people in dignity and independence even in the most trying of times.

Mr. Speaker, the social security approach to medical care for the aged is the one that will best solve the problems involved and not create new headaches for the Nation. The private, the "voluntary," and I put "voluntary" in quotes, ignores the basic problem of the payment, by the aged, of the needed insurance. The bills introduced state that the aged sector of the population does not have the means to meet the requirements in the area of medical care and yet the burden is still upon them under the provisions of these measures. The social security approach is a longrun plan for the most effective use of the funds available and an equitable distribution of the burdens of the program. It is not a shortrun plan to appease the aged and pass the buck. It is a plan that will provide the necessary coverage in the future, at the lowest possible cost to the individual, without placing a great burden on the aged at a time when their earning capacity is little if anything, and is the method, Mr. Speaker, which I urge the Congress to adopt in the best interests of the Nation.

Plight of the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1962, I set forth my views concerning the plight of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and this includes all of the railroads in this country.

[From On the Track, Association of American Railroads magazine]

"The railroads of the United States simply must have some help if they are to continue. There is no alternative to this; and words will not do it.

"As a Member of Congress, I am deeply concerned about the future of the railroad industry as one of the major instruments of the defense of our Nation. There is simply nothing that could take the place of what railroads would have to be called upon to do if we needed to move either manpower or material from one corner of this country to the other right away."

The Philadelphia leader said that his insight regarding the need of the industry has been sharpened since he has been called upon to go regularly by train to Washington.

"In trying to make its ends meet, the equipment of the industry is being rapidly depleted and much of this costly machinery had to be purchased when we were at war and the railroads meant the difference between getting our fighting gear to the many strategic ports and having it pile up on the premises of the manufacturers. You can't shoot guns unless you can get them to soldiers. As a veteran, I know what I'm talking about."

In addition to the distinguished Congressman's interest in the railroad industry as an overall asset for the country, Mr. Nix was quick to point out that he did not divorce this from the interests of Negroes who, when that industry is healthy, receive approximately $1 million a day in earned income from more than 100 roads.

"Negroes have more than a sentimental interest in keeping the railroad industry in existence, and their friends in high places need to constantly remember that fact. One million dollars a day is equal to a lot of good education. It adds up to a great deal of good housing. And, most of all, it is the kind of thing that keeps people believing in our way of life."

The Congressman felt certain that the "plight of railroads would have to be high" on the list of things before the White House for early action. "This saving of the railroad industry is no political football. I sincerely believe that a majority of the Congress is stanchly in favor of some form of help. What remains is for that form to take shape. I believe it will."

Statement of the Honorable John S. Monagan, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Fifth District, which I represent, and of all of Connecticut have been following with interest the developments in the Congress and the Federal Communications Commission which would influence and affect television reception within the State.

I was very pleased to learn that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has favorably reported H.R. 8031 (H. Rept. 1559) which would delegate power to the FCC to require that all television sets shipped in Interstate and Foreign Commerce be capable of receiving all 82 television channels including the 12 VHF channels and the 70 UHF channels. This action, taken with the withdrawal of the FCC's deintermixture program which would have deleted VHF channel 3 from Hartford, Conn., represents a very satisfactory conclusion to an issue that was of great concern to me and to my constituents.

I have consistently opposed the deintermixture program because it would have created a complete television blackout to nearly 45,000 residents of the Connecticut 5th Congressional District and it would also have had adverse influence upon the television reception of about 250,000 Connecticut viewers.

These developments, I am confident, are in concert with the desire of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Federal Communications Commission to afford the best possible reception opportunities for all television set owners.

I wish to compliment the Honorable Oren Harris, Chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Chairman Newton N. Minow of the Federal Communications Commission and the other members of the FCC, members of the Connecticut delegation, and Gov. John Dempsey, of Connecticut, for their enlightened endeavors which have brought about this very favorable development.

With permission to extend my remarks, I include a statement which I presented at the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings on March 5, 1962, on H.R. 8031.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I want to thank you for this opportunity to testify before you and to make known my views on H.R. 8031 and the other bills that have been referred to here this morning.

I consider that this legislation is of vital importance to thousands of Connecticut residents, including many in the Fifth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. That is roughly the northwestern and western sectors of Connecticut.

At the outset I wish to state that I am wholeheartedly in accord with the principle of all-channel television legislation, such as H.R. 8031.

This bill would delegate power to the Federal Communications Commission to require that all television sets shipped in interstate and foreign commerce be capable of receiving all 82 television channels, including the 12 VHF channels and 70 UHF channels.

I support this bill with strong reservations, however, and I want at this time to make known the reasons for these reservations. Simultaneously, I wish to ask the committee to give favorable consideration to the enactment of H.R. 9256, H.R. 9291, and several identical bills which would serve the purpose of H.R. 8031, but would also prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from its stated purpose of deleting the VHF from Hartford, Conn.

I cannot support H.R. 8031 in its present form because, while purportedly serving the interests of all future television receiver owners, it would surely afford the FCC with a weapon to deprive 44,814 residents of my district of any TV reception and reduce the reception of 104,004 others to 1 channel and no selective choice of channels.

This legislation would have the effect of requiring that television receivers sold in my district be equipped to receive all channels; but if it were adopted without the FCC restrainers contained in H.R. 9267, we could find ourselves in the position of having no channels operating in the reception area of 44,814 residents. Their fine equipment would be useless, like an expensive boat on a dried-up lake. I would favor H.R. 8031 without reservation if it were amended to include a prohibition against the deletion of VHF channel 3 from Hartford.

I am aware that H.R. 8031 has the sponsorship of the Federal Communications Commission. The FCC is also sponsoring the proposal for the deintermixture of Hartford, Conn., which would result in the deletion of channel 3 VHF from the capital city of my State. I have already communicated to the FCC my objections to this deintermixture, and with your permission I will leave with you a copy of my statement addressed to the FCC on January 26, 1962.

I ask that it be made a part of the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, we will be glad to receive that for the record.

(The statement of Mr. MONAGAN referred to follows:)

"STATEMENT FROM REPRESENTATIVE JOHN S. MONAGAN TO THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, RE DOCKET NO. 14241—IN THE MATTER OF DEINTERMIXTURE OF HARTFORD, CONN.

"The proposal of the Federal Communications Commission to delete channel 3 from its present use in Hartford, Conn., would deprive Connecticut residents, especially those in rural and suburban areas, of television service to which they are both accustomed and entitled.

"As a Member of Congress and as a frequent television viewer, and also as a regular participant in television presentations, I hereby make objection to this proposal, and recommend that the Hartford deintermixture proposal be withdrawn. It would not be in the public interest.

"This experiment, and it is apparent from the divided expressions of opinion voiced by members of the FCC that it is only an experiment, to determine whether multiple UHF stations can effectively supplant VHF service, would work an immediate hardship on nearly 260,000 people. The elimination of channel 3 from Connecticut would deprive these 260,000 people of the only clear television picture now available to them. An additional 145,000 people would have their choice of television programing reduced by 50 percent and be confined to a single outlet. Connecticut residents should not be compelled to accept the imposition of this blackout in the name of experimentation.

"It has been well stated by FCC Commissioner John S. Cross, who opposed the Hartford deintermixture, that 'it cannot be successfully argued that major population centers are entitled to a full complement of programs from all three networks when this end can be achieved only by depriving large numbers of people (living outside these metropolitan centers) of all or a substantial part of the service they now receive.'

"It is certainly to be hoped that no effort will be made to thrust UHF upon a reluctant public in the vain hope that it might fan a spark of life into UHF television, despite the cost in loss of service to the rural population.

"The Commission must understand that a substantial segment of the Connecticut population, the residents of all of Litchfield County and a great part of New Haven County, included in the Fifth Congressional District which I represent, would suffer a serious disservice in this proposed departure from the acceptance of the laws of nature.

"It has been well established that UHF is neither effective nor desirable television service in sparsely populated areas, and in areas of rough, hilly, and wooded terrain. Consisting largely of such terrain, Connecticut and the Fifth Congressional District must look to VHF stations for television reception.

"The Commission has on file statistics showing that the elimination of channel 3 would deprive 44,814 residents of predominately rural and sparsely settled Litchfield County of a clear television picture. It would limit 104,004 residents of Litchfield County and of Naugatuck, Southbury, Middlebury, Waterbury, and Oxford, in New Haven County to single channel reception.

"The towns in Litchfield County most seriously affected by the elimination of any reception would be Sharon, Salisbury, North Canaan, Norfolk, Colebrook, Winchester, Barkhamsted, New Hartford, Torrington, Goshen, Cornwall, Harwinton, Litchfield, Warren, Kent, New Milford, and Bridgewater.

"The elimination of channel 3 would, in these circumstances, set Connecticut communications back immeasurably. It would cut off television communication between the capital of the State of Connecticut and communities which have welcomed and benefited from the wide range of news, entertainment, educational, weather, public service, and religious programing offered by channel 3. I find neither assurance nor guarantee in FCC studies and reports that UHF stations will provide the comparable service now or in the foreseeable future.

"It is interesting that strong objection to the deintermixture proposal has been voiced by other news media of Connecticut, including newspapers and radio stations whose editorial protests have been made a part of your file.

"I should like to call particular attention to the fact that on a previous occasion the Commission has held that the prospective loss of service by thousands of viewers required the retention of channel 3 in Hartford. This earlier opinion of the FCC was upheld by the court of appeals in Washington as 'not only rational but reasonable.' The Supreme Court of the United States sustained this decision. This position should not be reversed.

"As a Member of Congress, I have received communications from governing bodies and officials of many cities and organizations, in the form of resolutions opposing the removal of channel 3 from Connecticut, in addition to a large number of letters from individuals.

"Following are the sources of the resolutions coming to my attention:

"Board of Aldermen, City of Waterbury, Conn.; American Legion, Department of Connecticut, executive committee; town meeting, town of Middlebury, Conn.; junior membership, Connecticut State Federation of Women's Clubs; president's council, Connecticut State Federation of Women's Clubs; Connecticut Chiefs of Police Association; Board of Councilmen, City of Torrington, Conn.; board of directors, Manufacturers Association of Connecticut; Salisbury, Conn., town meeting; Connecticut State Grange; board of directors, Naugatuck Chamber of Commerce, Naugatuck, Conn.; board of directors, Chamber of Commerce, State of Connecticut.

"In each case the resolution praised the service currently provided to TV viewers in Connecticut and objected to the proposal to eliminate channel 3.

"I urgently recommend to the Commission that it recognize the wisdom of its previous ruling; that it consider the requests of Connecticut residents, communities, and organizations; and that it permit channel 3 to continue and enlarge upon its commendable VHF service to Connecticut viewers.

"In accordance with the provisions of section 1.54 of the Commission rules, 14 copies of this submission are filed herewith."

Mr. MONAGAN. The people of Connecticut have a vital interest in the retention of channel 3 at Hartford, and they have made known their feelings through letters and resolutions which have been received in my office in large numbers. Their interest has also resulted in the formation of the Governor's committee to which Senator BUSH has already referred. I have been privileged to be invited by Gov. John Dempsey to serve as a member of that committee, and I have been happy to do so.

I have been informed that over a quarter of a million residents of my State of Connecticut will be adversely affected if channel 3 is taken from Connecticut. It should be emphasized that past decisions of the FCC and the Supreme Court have held that public interest required the continued assignment of channel 3 to Hartford, Conn.

I wonder how many of the 250,000 Connecticut residents who will be injured by this deintermixture action are fully aware of the seriousness of the threat it poses to their news, entertainment, and public service programs, with or without the enactment of H.R. 8031.

I want it clearly understood by this committee, by the FCC, and by the residents of my State and of my district, that I support the expanded and enlarged use of UHF television channels where practical. It is possible that the development of more UHF channels will ultimately provide greater opportunity for television, as a public service and as a business enterprise. But I see no reason why the experiment with UHF must be at the expense of existing VHF channels and to the detriment and discomfort of present audiences. If there is to be an experiment with UHF, let it be in concentrated metropolitan areas where none will be left without reception.

It has been established that UHF is not effective in sparsely populated areas, and in areas of rough, hilly, and wooded terrain. Thus, it can be stated that UHF would not measure up to the standards of VHF presentation now enjoyed in Connecticut, whose rural and suburban areas are hilly and wooded.

I ask this committee to give the FCC the authority it seeks to require that all television receivers be fully equipped for VHF and UHF reception. I also ask this committee to protect the interests of 250,000 television receiver owners in Connecticut, by amending this measure to prohibit the deletion of WTIC channel 3 from Hartford, Conn. I ask this most specifically in the names of nearly 45,000 residents of the Fifth Congressional District, who are faced with a complete television blackout if this FCC experiment with UHF is permitted in spite of congressional and public objection.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Annual Congressional Tour of New York City—May 18, 19, and 20

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, plans have been perfected for the annual congressional tour of New York City on May 18, 19, and 20, for Members of Congress and their families. The Department of Commerce of the City of New York, in its traditional role as host of these annual congressional tours, has cooperated in arranging an interesting 3-day program for the congressional delegation.

Some of the highlights of the tour include a sightseeing cruise of Manhattan Island, an afternoon in Chinatown, a visit to the world's first bronze and glass skyscraper, varied luncheons and buffet dinners, a fashion show, a visit to the new head office of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and so forth.

A copy of the official announcement which will be sent to Members of both branches of Congress is as follows:

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Friday, May 18: 9:45 a.m. daylight time we leave Union Station via the Pennsylvania Railroad. Luncheon in dining car. We arrive Penn Station 1:45 p.m. and buses will take us to city hall, reception by Hon. Robert F. Wagner, mayor of New York City. Busses to Chase Manhattan Bank for reception and tour of banking facilities. Buses to Hotel Paramount; 6 p.m. buses leave hotel for Time & Life Inc., reception and dinner. Evening open to attend the theaters, movies, and so forth. (Movie tickets available at Hotel before 6 p.m., limited number.)

Saturday May 19: 9 a.m. buses leave hotel for the IOGWU breakfast, fashion show, and tour; 12 noon, buses to A.T. & T., reception, tour and luncheon; 3 p.m., buses to Paramount Hotel; 4:30 p.m., buses leave hotel for the Seagram Building—reception and tour; 6:15 p.m., buses to the Gladstone Hotel for dinner. Evening open for theater.

Sunday May 20: 10 a.m., buses leave hotel for sightseeing cruise of Manhattan Island; 12:30 p.m., buses leave pier for Chinatown—reception and lunch; 5:15 p.m., busses leave for Penn Station. Party will meet in Penn Station at track 13. Train will be ready for loading about 10 or 15 minutes before departure; 6 p.m. daylight time, train leaves for Washington. Dinner in the diner; 10 p.m. daylight time, due to arrive home.

Make your reservations today. Dial extension 4576, room 1104, House Office Building.

Summary of Replies to a Questionnaire—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the third part of the tabulated results of the replies to my questionnaire. This part consists of the questions and replies for the sections entitled "Budget Expenditures, Disarmament, Nuclear Tests, Fallout Shelters, and United Nations."

The tabulated results follow:

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

To indicate the increase in Federal spending, a listing is given of selected 1956 and 1963 expenditures. Please indicate items you would like to decrease or increase (B equals billion dollars; M equals million dollars).

	Actual, 1956 (millions)	Proposed, 1963 (millions)	Decrease	Increase
31. Military; equipment, personnel	$35,000	$48,000	1,502	3,774
32. Military assistance (foreign)	2,600	1,400	4,018	1,448
33. Atomic energy, nuclear materials	1,600	2,800	842	4,415
34. Foreign aid, loans	1,800	3,000	4,984	855
35. Manned space flight, technology	71	2,400	1,080	4,114
36. Agricultural subsidies, services, research	4,800	5,900	4,577	1,385
37. Recreation, Fish, Wildlife Services	85	200	2,499	2,917
38. Land, forest, water resources	940	2,000	1,608	3,738
39. Aviation subsidies, air control	180	866	2,976	2,382
40. Urban renewal, public housing	35	675	4,148	1,677
41. Public assistance (Department of Public Welfare)	1,400	2,800	4,473	1,182
42. Health, Federal aid, and research	342	1,400	2,140	3,162
43. Education, college aid	44	541	2,208	3,328
44. Elementary, high school educational aid	181	457	2,574	2,939
45. Veterans' pensions, compensation, medical care	4,800	5,300	2,771	2,507
46. Legislative and judiciary operational costs	114	193	3,757	1,388
Total, 1956 budget expenditures	66,200			
Total, 1963 budget requests		92,500		

Disarmament, nuclear tests, fallout shelters, United Nations	Yes	No
47. Should the United States resume nuclear testing, and the production of all forms of nuclear weapons?	5,895	629
48. Should the United States continue disarmament and nuclear test ban negotiations with Soviet?	4,249	2,403
49. Do you favor a new Federal aid program of 60 percent of cost of fallout shelters for public schools, hospitals, other State-operated institutions, to cost $450,000,000 the 1st year but excluding commercial and privately owned buildings?	1,879	4,543
50. Shall the United States purchase $100,000,000 of United Nations bonds?	2,742	3,668
51. Does the U.S. membership in the U.N. serve a useful purpose?	4,769	1,524
52. Do you approve of U.S. sponsorship which admitted Soviet satellite Outer Mongolia to the U.N. last fall?	1,762	4,404
53. Do you favor Red China's admission to the U.N.?	1,014	5,451

Save the Mourning Dove

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, various groups wish to hunt down and kill the mourning dove. A fine Member of the House of Representatives from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH] has introduced a bill to protect this beautiful bird. I have had some correspondence with the director of conservation of Illinois, a very dear friend of mine, who wants me to oppose the bill to protect the mourning dove. I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, the mourning dove injects a note of both beauty and melancholy which we need in city, suburban, and country life. I hope that we can protect the mourning dove.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.,
February 6, 1962.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

We urge your support in opposing passage of H.R. 9882.

WILLIAM T. LODGE,
Director,
Illinois Department of Conservation.

FEBRUARY 21, 1962.

Mr. WILLIAM T. LODGE,
Director, Illinois Department of Conservation, Springfield, Ill.

DEAR BILL: I have your telegram urging me to oppose passage of H.R. 9882, which calls for no hunting of the mourning dove. For a great many years I have regarded the mourning dove as one of nature's noblemen. A lovely and peaceful bird, its lilting call can be heard for hundreds of yards, much to the pleasure of those fortunate enough to be within range.

Your opposition to this bill confuses me, and so I write for the reasons supporting your opposition. I confess I have no scientific knowledge of the bird other than what I have observed in my passing glimpses of the species. Should it be hunted because it is a nuisance in some areas? Surely it is not needed for food, for then we should be in a sorry state to have to rely on such tidbits of meat for our protein supply. The feathers can't be in great demand, for already our Defense Department has hundreds of thousands of surplus feathers.

I will try to be objective about this, and if you will let me know the arguments against this bird, I will give every proper consideration to your request to oppose H.R. 9882.

With best wishes.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION,
Springfield, Ill., March 6, 1962.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Replying to your letter of February 21, I would like to give you the following information as to why we feel that the mourning dove should not be placed on a protected list that would prevent the shooting of it any place in the United States.

The dove is hunted primarily for sport, although many people do eat them. They are an extremely sporting target, tricky in flight, hard to hit and they withstand heavy shooting pressures without any material effect on their numbers. The food and feathers from the dove are not of any great importance but, by the same token, neither is the food nor feathers from the bobwhite quail, the pheasant or, in fact, the duck.

The dove furnishes a very substantial portion of the total amount of hunting that is carried on in Illinois, about 20 percent of our hunters actually shooting doves, and probably killing more per hunter than of any other game bird. There is no question that there are probably more shells fired at doves than at any other game species, due largely to the fact that they are very hard to hit. Therefore, this particular type of hunting is of great importance to the revenues collected under the Pittman-Robertson excise tax on arms and ammunition, and its discontinuance would seriously affect the Pittman-Robertson program of wildlife management and restoration.

Hunting of the dove has not proved to be an important factor in determining the total dove population nor in effecting population fluctuations. Despite continued hunting with liberal seasons and liberal bag limits, the total population is increasing. States which do not hunt doves do not produce nor hold any more birds than do those which do shoot them. It has been stated by certain individuals that the hunting season in Illinois interferes with the nesting of the doves, but research which has been carried on by our department and by the natural history survey of the State of Illinois shows that less than 2 percent of the birds are still nesting when our season opens on September 1.

To sum up our position, we have nothing against this bird and are very anxious to continue research in the production and management of it, so that we can continue to have it as a game species. We do not feel that the sentimentality often entering into the picture of dove hunting: that it is the bird of peace, that is a gentle bird which should not be subjected to hunting pressure and other such sentimental feelings, should be allowed to influence the decision regarding the management of this species as a game population.

Yours very truly,
WILLIAM T. LODGE,
Director.

MARCH 15, 1962.

Mr. WILLIAM T. LODGE,
Director, Illinois Department of Conservation, Springfield, Ill.

DEAR BILL: Thank you for your letter outlining the reasons why the mourning dove should be hunted. I have read your reasons carefully and tried to be as objective about this as possible. However, I confess the more I read and ponder the question, the more I feel myself siding with the dove. I felt a pang of anxiety when you wrote that probably more shells are fired at doves than at any other game species. I sighed with relief when you further wrote that this was due largely to the fact that the doves are very hard to hit. I am glad to know that their ability in flight is often superior to that of the hunter in chase.

I realize that this type of hunting is of great importance to the revenues collected on the excise tax on ammunition. I also realize that it is important to the doves themselves. None of us like to be shot, and I believe this also holds true for the doves.

I cannot in good conscience oppose H.R. 9882, which calls for the protection of the mourning dove. This bird is not so populous as to be a nuisance, it does no damage to farm crops, and it in no way poses a threat to the safety of the barnyard fowl and livestock. My reason for approving this bill is none other than a lifelong love of the dove.

With best wishes,
Faithfully yours,
PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Taxing of Farmer Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the new tax bill contains some unsound provisions, particularly the provisions relating to the taxing of farmer cooperatives.

Here, for the first time, Congress proposes to upset by legislative fiat the principle of voluntary cooperation which has been the basic principle of all bona fide American farm organizations for nearly a century.

The amended clause for taxing the dividends of farmer cooperatives, which the Ways and Means Committee wrote into the tax bill at the last moment, is based entirely on the principle of "compulsion." If it should become law, this bill would transfer the ultimate authority over co-op policies and co-op finances from the farmer members, where it belongs, to the professional co-op managers.

The farming community has long prided itself that its affairs are carried on in the spirit of free men operating in a free society. This bill would nullify that claim. This bill would compel the farmer to pay a tax on money he has not received and may never receive.

The Revenue Act of 1962 as it is now drafted authorizes the farmer cooperatives, if its bylaws so provide, to retain dividend funds or patronage refunds indefinitely, while the individual farmer member is compelled to pay the tax. If he balks at paying the tax on money he never gets the farmer has only one recourse—to quit the co-op entirely.

Thus, the principle of the union shop is introduced into the voluntary association of American farmers. The notion that the farmer can cure the situation by resigning is both unrealistic and untrue. It is like saying that a worker who does not like the union shop has a remedy—to quit his job. In large areas of American agriculture, membership in the local co-op is not only advisable for the individual farmer but an absolute requirement if he wants to market his produce. This is true because in the case of many products like citrus fruit, lemons, and other fruits and perishables, the market is entirely in the hands of the cooperatives. If the farmer should attempt to go it alone he would find himself without a buyer.

If the Congress can legally pass control of the farmers' funds over to the co-op managers, then Congress has the legal power to take the next logical step and compel the farmer to join a co-op or other farm organization whether he wants to or not. If some Members of the House believe this conclusion to be absurd, please let him consider what the courts said in nullifying the last attempt which Congress made to tax the dividends of farmer cooperatives.

In nullifying the legislation on co-op taxation which Congress enacted in 1951, the court said it was incredible that Congress intended to inflict on co-op patrons the "hardships and burdens" of paying income taxes upon money they never received and might never receive. Yet this is precisely what the Ways and Means Committee proposes to do in this statute. If you are still a doubter, read what the court said in the case of Long Poultry Farms, Inc. against Commissioner, the classic case in this matter. The court said:

> To require the inclusion in income of contingent credits such as are here involved, would be to require the patrons of cooperatives to pay tax upon income which they have not received, over which they have been given no control, and which they may never acquire. Apart from the question of the constitutionality of such a requirement, which would be a serious one, it is a safe assumption that Congress never intended to impose upon the patrons of cooperatives the hardships and burdens which the taxability of these contingent credits would involve.

But what the court thought was incredible, the revenue bill wants us to do. In another case, B. A. Carpenter against Commissioner, the court rejected the doctrine that the farmer had taken his dividends and had then voluntarily reinvested them in the co-op. Said the court:

> The petitioner never had any real dominion or control over the funds represented by certificates. The decision to retain the funds in the business rested solely with the directors. The certificates themselves had no fair market value and we do not see that whether or not the cooperative was obliged to issue such certificates adds anything significant to the situation.

This present statute does precisely what the courts said Congress should never do—try to tax an individual for money he never received and might never receive. It has established the dangerous principle that farmers may, in effect, be required to join a farmer cooperative. Why not go further and write legislation requiring that farmers be required to join a farm organization, since these perform services beneficial to all agriculture. For years now farm spokesmen have opposed such devices as the union shop, whereby workingmen have been compelled to join a labor organization as a requisite of employment. Will these same farm spokesmen now embrace this principle for farm organizations? I doubt it.

Let us consider an individual case to demonstrate the absurdity of this provision. A patron, or farmer, is notified by the co-op that an annual dividend of $100 has been allocated to him on the books, but as the co-op wants the cash, he will be paid nothing. At most, the farmer will be entitled to a credit for the 20-percent withholding tax paid by the co-op. However, he is liable for tax payment on the full amount. The next year he gets another book allotment of $100 and no cash, and the third year the same thing.

Would this be an isolated case? By no means. A study by the Farmer Cooperative Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture revealed that about 90 percent of the co-ops now have bylaws authorizing the directors to keep co-op dividend money as long as they wish, regardless of the will of the patron. In other words, most of the co-op members already are bound by this legislation to pay a tax on money they may never receive. And the present bill authorizes the remaining 10 percent to adopt similar bylaws if they wish.

In practice, how long do the co-ops retain dividend funds? According to the Department of Agriculture, the time varies from 3 to 15 years. In other words, under this bill a farmer could be compelled to pay income taxes for 15 years on funds he has not received and might never receive. He might be compelled to pay for many more years.

This bill will not achieve its basic purpose of imposing a single tax on the dividends of farmer cooperatives. But it will increase immeasurably the autocratic control of the professional co-op managers over funds which rightfully belong to the farmer. Ironically, in first exempting marketing co-ops from payment of the Federal corporation tax, Congress laid down the fundamental rule as a first requirement that the co-ops must be democratically organized and democratically managed.

This bill is the antithesis of democracy. It takes away from the farmer control over his own money. It gives the professional co-op managers a degree of control over the funds of members or stockholders which Congress would never dream of giving to an industrial corporation. This bill takes away from the farmer both his money and his rights and deposits them with a small group of co-op directors or managers, exactly what years ago Congress tried to avoid.

At stake in this measure is something more than an abstract debate concerning the need for democratic control over farmer cooperatives. There is something more concrete at issue. A study made by the Farmer Cooperative Service about 4 years ago revealed that a group of 1,157 associations were holding $510 million in "revolving capital." The term "revolving capital" is the euphemism employed to describe money belonging to the members which is held back by the co-op managers to be used for expansion purposes.

This group of 1,157 studied by the Department of Agriculture comprise about one-sixth of all the farmer co-ops in the country, about 70 percent of which qualify for exemption from the corporate income tax under the regulations of the Treasury Department.

However, on the basis of what we know, it seems reasonable to assume that the total of patronage or dividend funds being held by the co-op directors is in excess of $3 billion.

This is tax avoidance on a massive scale. When Congress first exempted marketing co-ops from the corporate tax and later gave the same privilege to purchasing co-ops, it never intended that co-op dividends should likewise be free from income tax payments. But this is exactly what is happening.

By the device of holding back dividend money which rightfully belongs to the farmers, the co-ops have managed to avoid paying taxes at either level. This is a privilege granted no other group of citizens in the United States.

With the Federal tax on corporation profits fixed at 52 percent, plus the tax on personal income, it is safe to say that if industrial corporations had held back this $3 billion, in unpaid dividends, Uncle Sam would have collected more than half in taxes.

Who wants this business of taxing farmers on money they never get, which has been written into this bill, and which the courts said is incredible?

Oddly enough, the committee, in redrafting, followed the precise language wanted by the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. This organization represents the interests of the professional managers who run the co-ops.

Who will benefit by this provision? Again, oddly enough, the co-op managers.

Why did they want this particular amendment? Because it gives them control over the money of the farmer which they could never get from the farmer himself. No man who tills the soil would be foolish enough to commit himself voluntarily to pay taxes for 15 years or more on money he may never get.

Armed with this new power, if Congress enacts this provision, the professional co-op managers can expend on a scale never known before. They can pass beyond the processing of agricultural products and take up manufacturing in a big way, as some already are doing. There is nothing to prevent them from entering the steel business to make farm implements, the textile business, the clothing manufacturing business, the making of drugs and insecticides, or any other line which may suit their fancy.

With full control over the purse, the professional managers will have gained full control over policy. The rule of the farmer in the tax-exempt co-op will be over.

Legislative Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, during the fall months, I mailed a questionnaire to every family in my congressional district, identified through the telephone directories. Over 100,000 questionnaires were mailed out, and I received about a 10-percent return.

There were 19 questions in this questionnaire, many of them having more than one part. These questions were directed to legislative matters, as well as major policy decisions of this administration.

Believing that this information may be of interest to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the tabulated results of the response to this questionnaire in the RECORD.

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. If more Federal spending is necessary for national defense should the money—			
(a) Be raised by increased taxes?	40	39.0	21.0
(b) Be financed through deficit spending?	18	54.0	28.0
(c) Come by a postponement of domestic programs now planned?	72	15.0	13.0
2. Do you favor Federal aid to education for—			
School construction?	39	54.0	7.0
Teachers' salaries?	19	74.0	7.0
Parochial and private schools	10	83.0	7.0
3. Under existing world tensions, do you believe a summit meeting between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev would be helpful?	24	64.0	9.0
4. Do you believe the $40,000,000 Peace Corps mission is necessary for the success of our foreign policy?	19	60.0	21.0
5. Do you favor resumption of nuclear testing in the atmosphere if necessary, notwithstanding the fallout hazard and world opinion?	49	42.0	9.0
6. Do you favor medical care to the aged program?	50	41.0	9.0
If so, should it be financed by—			
(a) Social security?	39	39.3	51.7
(b) Federal grants to State medical aid programs?	19	49.0	32.0
(c) No Federal program assistance, leaving it to the States?	44	28.0	28.0
7. Do you favor increased postal rates to reduce the Department deficit?	54	39.0	7.0
8. Do you favor the foreign aid program with long-range planning?	46	38.0	16.0
(a) Financed by Treasury borrowing (back-door spending)?	8	63.0	29.0
(b) Financed by annual appropriations by Congress?	63	21.0	16.0
9. Do you believe we need more civil rights legislation?	30	54.0	16.0
10. Do you believe our world prestige is as high as in January 1961?	45	39.0	16.0
11. In view of the recall to military duty of many men, do you believe current reserve and draft programs are effective and equitable?	54	19.0	27.0
12. Do you think labor union leaders should be permitted to call a nationwide strike in an industry which affects all phases of our economy, such as the transportation industry?	7	89.0	4.0
13. Should we abolish the loyalty oath now required in the National Defense Education Act?	10	76.0	14.0
14. Do you favor the use of U.S. military forces to defeat Castro in Cuba?	47	38.0	15.0
15. Do you think we need intensified fallout and bomb shelter programs?	36	48.0	16.0
(a) Should the Federal Government pay part of the cost?	24	59.0	17.0
16. Do you favor extending production and price controls to farm commodities not now included?	12	76.0	12.0
17. Do you favor a GI educational benefits program for peacetime veterans?	32	60.0	8.0
18. Do you believe the Federal Government should have control over TV and radio programs?	24	67.0	9.0
19. Number the following issues in the order of their importance to you: 1. National defense 2. Balanced budget 3. Reduction in Government spending 4. Inflation 5. Foreign affairs 6. Juvenile delinquency 7. Labor problems 8. Farm problem 9. Civil defense 10. Social security 11. Federal aid to education 12. Veterans' benefits			

Iran a Real Ally—The Case Against Neutralism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the recent statements by the Shah of Iran were refreshing and encouraging.

In his recent appearance before the joint session of Congress the Iranian leader showed his appreciation of the assistance this country has provided his nation in the past. He also made it clear that a nation, even though it shares a common border with the Soviet Union, is not required to proclaim a neutralist policy in order to remain free and strong and to escape extreme Soviet pressure.

Mr. Dan Brown, of Sparta, Tenn., who has served in the Foreign Service in the Near East for a number of years and who was assigned to accompany the Shah on his visit to the United States, has written a short article on the Shah's visit which I was pleased to include in my weekly newsletter. Columnist Roscoe Drummond has also written of the Shah's visit and has pointed out that our distinguished visitor is indeed a real ally of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include my newsletter entitled "The Shah of Iran Addresses Congress," and Mr. Drummond's column, entitled "A Real Ally—The Case Against Neutralism," in the RECORD.

THE SHAH OF IRAN ADDRESSES CONGRESS

The House and the Senate met in a joint session this week to hear an address delivered in English by the Shah of Iran, a friendly ally visiting in the United States.

Iran, situated in the Middle East, is larger than Texas, rich in oil reserves, and geographically adjacent to Russia, but ideologically is allied with freedom and the United States. She is a stanch foe of communism and an ally of our country.

Because of his knowledge and experience and having served in this area of the world, I have asked Dan Brown, of Sparta, White County, Tenn., our own district, who is a Foreign Service officer and Chief of the Near East and South Asia Press Section of our Government, to serve as guest writer this week. Dan Brown has been assigned to travel with the Shah during his visit. The following is his report:

"Shah Mohammed Pahlavi, of Iran, came to Washington this week for meetings with President Kennedy and top officials of the State and Defense Departments. Iran is a stanch ally of the United States. We are allied with Iran through a bilateral defense agreement and associated with her through working committees of the Central Treaty Organization. We have contributed around $1 billion in aid to this Middle Eastern country. Approximately half of this aid has been in military supplies and training to help stiffen Iran's military backbone against the Soviet Union.

"In his address before the Congress, the Shah told the American people of the hopes and aspirations of the people of his country.

"'We are endeavoring,' he said, 'to give a firm foundation to our reform activity by evolving a government of the people, by the people. We are building local self-government from the bottom up.'

"Iran, the Shah said, is firmly determined to defend itself.

"'I have no doubt,' he continued, 'that it is to your advantage that our allies should have this resolution. Unfortunately, today the old-fashioned arms are no longer of use for defensive purposes, and an army would be helpless without the modern weapons of warfare, however high its morale and however firm its determination.'

"Halfway through his prepared speech the Shah departed from his text and said: 'I recognize that the United States is carrying a very heavy burden in the defense of freedom across the entire world, and that many of you are tired of carrying this burden for so long a time.

"'You have so far borne this task. It is not yet finished. The threat to freedom and security remains strong and aggressive.

"'You must decide whether it is in the interest of the United States for this struggle to be successful, but I can assure you that whatever your decision may be, the people of Iran have not maintained their freedom for 2,500 years in order to now surrender.'

"The applause of the legislators was long and sustained. This is a language the American lawmakers and taxpayers understand and it is an attitude that is appreciated.

"I have found in traveling around the United States in recent months with a number of heads of foreign states that one thing has struck me forcibly; namely, that our American people are willing to pay taxes to support a free world defense effort when they are convinced that their money is going to a country with the will to defend itself and to share its part of the sacrifice to preserve freedom."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 16, 1962]

A REAL ALLY—THE CASE AGAINST NEUTRALISM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

I should like to say a few words against neutralism. I have been talking with one of the most committed, fearless nonneutrals of them all, the Shah of Iran—and it was an exhilarating experience.

It is fashionable in Washington these days to lay it on pretty thick about how we esteem, how much we want to work with and aid the neutral nations as they look benignly on both sides in the East-West struggle.

I am not saying that this U.S. policy is wrong. It is in our national interest to aid neutral nations to achieve a degree of economic progress which will enable them to safeguard their independence and resist the shortcut, deceptive appeals of Communist propaganda.

American aid does not and should not rest on the premise that the recipient countries must not be neutralist—if they choose to be—or must fashion their economies in the image of the United States. Our overriding objective is to help raise the standard of living and strengthen the independence of both allies and neutrals.

This is fine. It became the policy of the Eisenhower administration. It is the policy of the Kennedy administration.

But in our effort to cooperate with and to give economic help to the neutralist countries, let's not slip into the groove of thinking that neutralism is a policy of special virtue or is a noble thing in itself. It isn't.

Neutralism is the refusal to choose openly between the foreign policy goals of the Soviet Union and those of the Western allies, or to give a nation's support to the side which is nearer right.

The alternative to neutralism is not antisovietism; the alternative is collective security, the willingness of a people and its government to stand up and be counted in active behalf of the common security.

The right to be neutral expresses a national sovereignty America respects. But let's not praise it as any resplendent ideal. I do not call it immoral, but I call it less than worthy. A commitment to the common defense of everybody's independence is far better.

This is the commitment of the Shah of Iran, who in addressing Congress urged continued American aid, but declared simply and without reservation that, whatever America decides, Iran will never go over to the other side. It will resist Communist aggression whether alone or in alliance.

There's an ally for you.

The Western Allies, whether in NATO or SEATO (in southeast Asia) or CENTO (in the Near East), are not seeking to impose anything on or take any action against the Soviet Union or Red China. They are simply seeking together to preserve their own independence. The only thing they ask of the Communist nations is to refrain from aggression in all its forms.

The point I want to make is this: Unquestionably it is the right of any nation to choose neutralism, to choose aloofness, and detachment from the great epochal struggle for human freedom. But in recognizing that right, let's not raise it to the level of a shining virtue or pretend that it is better for the free world for the neutrals to stand aside.

Think what it would mean if India and Sweden, Burma, Cambodia, and Laos, the stable nations in Africa, should say to each other and to the world: "The independence and freedom from encroachment of each are essential to the independence and freedom of all; from here out we will pool all our resources in the cause of our collective defense; we are not joining against anybody; we are joining together to secure our common freedom."

This is the stand which distinguishes the Shah of Iran, the brave and committed leader of a nation long harried by the Soviets. This is the stand taken by Turkey and Pakistan and Norway, by all the NATO countries.

Omaha Youth Thanks the U.S. Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, modern-day youth is the target of criticism and condemnation from all sides. Supposedly he is lacking in discipline and consideration of others, he is an ingrate and knows nothing of the meaning of responsibility. Every newspaper we pick up carries accounts of his misdeeds and shortcomings.

This morning, however, I picked up a newspaper which carried a different story—a shining example of the type of young people we have in my hometown, and, I am sure, in many other parts of our country also. This story was told in a letter to the editor but it is intended for all American taxpayers. In order that my colleagues and all Americans might receive the message, I include the letter which appeared in the "Public Pulse" column of the Omaha World-Herald:

Thanks to Taxpayers

Omaha.—I write in thanks to our country's taxpayers.

My naval ROTC appointment is an investment on their part.

I will do my best to return a dividend.

Evan A. Ash, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, who could doubt, after reading the letter, that this young man will return a dividend on his country's investment in him?

Guns, Patriotism, and Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1961, I introduced a bill, H.R. 613, which would require the registration, under the auspices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of all firearms owned by private individuals. The bill was referred to the House Judiciary Committee for consideration. The committee has obtained reports on the measure from several interested Government agencies, but no hearings have been held on it to date.

In recent weeks several extremist groups have begun a violent campaign against this bill urging people to write to me and to their Congressman voicing opposition. They are entitled to their opinion. The only trouble with these letters is that the writers have been stirred up by demagogs and their letters are most abusive and insulting. Instead of presenting their views and arguing intelligently with facts, the writers resort to name calling and vituperation.

What disturbs me, however, is not the contents or the tone of these letters. I am suspicious of the motive behind this whole campaign. I believe that certain extremist rightwing groups are using organized pressure tactics against this measure. These groups have raised the cry that my bill is seeking to take away guns from those who have a right to possess them. This is not the intention of the bill. Its sole purpose is to prevent firearms from getting into the hands of minors and juvenile delinquents, and thus help solve the crime problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a letter to the Honorable Emanuel Celler, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, requesting that hearings be scheduled on the bill at an early date. In view of the interest in this matter, I am inserting into the Record the text of my letter to the chairman. It reads as follows:

April 13, 1962.

Hon. Emanuel Celler,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Last year I introduced a bill, H.R. 613, which would require the filing of a registration statement with the FBI with respect to pistols possessed by private individuals. The bill was referred to your committee. I believe the time is ripe for hearings on the measure.

In recent weeks I have received letters from various parts of the country expressing opposition to the bill in the most vehement terms. Other Members of Congress, too, have received such letters. I discovered that some extremist rightwingers have begun, what appears to me, as organized pressure against this bill, which makes me suspicious of their motive. In an effort to justify their activities and to demonstrate that they are great patriots, they have deliberately distorted the purposes of the bill.

The purpose of my bill is a very simple one. It is intended solely as a measure to combat crime and juvenile delinquency. Almost daily we see reports in the press, particularly in the large cities where crime has become almost uncontrollable, of all sorts of criminal acts against innocent and peaceful citizens. Murder, robbery, rape, and other heinous crimes have made life miserable in the large cities of our Nation, especially after dark.

I am the father of five children and a former judge on the bench in New York where I was confronted daily with tragedies resulting from acts of crime. Many of these could have been prevented, if we had only been more rigid in controlling the sale of pistols, revolvers, guns, and other weapons to criminals and to minors.

The one and only purpose of my bill is to see that deadly arms do not get into the hands of youngsters and juvenile delinquents who have no business possessing these weapons, as well as in the hands of gangsters and hoodlums who terrorize decent American citizens. The bill is, in my estimation, a way to check crime—and nothing more.

There is no intention on my part to take away arms from those who have every legitimate right to bear arms. My bill does not seek to disarm police, law enforcement officers, hunters, law-abiding citizens, and others who have a need for such arms. I have no quarrel with them, nor am I questioning their rights in the matter which I recognize as a constitutional guarantee.

I am interested only in finding a way to prevent deadly weapons from being easily available to criminals. I think it can be accomplished if we set up a registration system of guns in private possession, under the auspices of the FBI. I have utmost faith in the FBI and its very able Director, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, an outstanding American, in whose hands we can entrust a responsible task of this kind. If necessary, it can be stipulated that the registration lists are to remain confidential and the sole property of the FBI, and that they be used only in the effort to eradicate crime.

The New York Journal-American of April 6, 1962, published an editorial in support of my bill. The Journal-American, a Hearst newspaper, has a long record of fighting for many patriotic causes. But it also knows the problem we face in the big cities in combating crime. I quote herewith for your information the full text of the editorial:

"Way off Target

"One of those far-right sheets is flooding the mails with a plea for protests against a bill introduced in Congress by Representative Victor L. Anfuso, Democrat, of Brooklyn, which would require all pistols to be registered with the United States.

"'They want to pick up your guns,' screams the headline. It seems that all this is a plot by the internationalists who cannot get control of the United States until they have seized the firearms of the people.

"What rot. We assume the "firearms of the people" include the gun with which an inhumanly vicious mugger shot a 58-year-old grandmother in the face although she put up no resistance when he robbed her of $25.

"When this sadist is captured he should get the limit of the law. And the police should find out how he came by this 'firearm of the people.'"

The alarmists instigating the public against the bill know that they are not honest with the people. They are not interested in presenting the true facts concerning the crime problem in the cities. They are not seeking to help our country solve this problem. They are, however, promoting chaos and disorder by their vicious attacks and are undermining the faith of the people in our national leadership. In this way they are playing into the hands of the Communists under a cover of patriotism.

Mr. Chairman, in the light of these attacks against my bill, I urge you to schedule early hearings on it. I would further suggest that you summon these individuals and let them present their views to your committee, and I shall present my views as to how this bill can help the country solve the difficult crime problem. Then let each member of the committee and every Member of Congress vote according to his conscience.

Sincerely yours,

Victor L. Anfuso,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am also inserting into the Record two items from the New York Journal American of Sunday, April 15, 1962, one an editorial "Secret Arsenal?" and the other a news article "Anfuso Assails Foes of Arms Bill." Both of these—especially the editorial—show strong support for my bill. They read as follows:

Secret Arsenal?

Why should anyone who has a legitimate reason for possessing firearms object to having the weapons registered with the FBI?

Such a requirement is no more a restriction of individual liberty than is a fishing license.

Yet a powerful wave of organized pressure is building up against a measure sponsored by Congressman Victor L. Anfuso, Democrat, of Brooklyn, which would require such registration in order to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, juvenile delinquents, and other irresponsible elements.

How extensive this pressure is was disclosed by the Congressman in a letter to the Journal-American after we commented on the hysteria shown by some of the far-right groups that are attacking this bill. He said he is being subjected to threats and flooded with letters from people who have been misled by propaganda distorting the purpose of the bill.

Most sinister of all, Mr. Anfuso says the nature of the attacks has aroused "a very strong suspicion that some of the fanatic groups in this country are building up secret arsenals, ostensibly for use in a struggle against communism, but actually to be used some day against our own citizens of different race, creed, color, or national origin."

This is a shocking charge. The threat of armed force by any group, regardless of the motives, is repugnant to decent Americans.

To bring the opposition into the open, Mr. Anfuso has asked Representative Emanuel Celler, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, to schedule early hearings on the bill.

You can help to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and irresponsible elements by clipping and signing this editorial and mailing it to Representative Emanuel Celler, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D.C.

ANFUSO ASSAILS FOES OF ARMS BILL

Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Democrat, of Brooklyn, warned yesterday that "organized pressure" tactics by certain groups are being exerted in opposition to his congressional bill to fight crime through compulsory registration of all privately owned firearms.

"In an effort to justify their activities and to demonstrate that they are great patriots," he said, "they have deliberately distorted the purpose of the bill."

The Brooklyn legislator stressed that his bill is "intended solely as a measure to combat crime and juvenile deliquency" by having all privately possessed guns registered with the FBI.

"There is no intention to take away arms from those who have legitimate right to bear them," he added.

"My bill, introduced last year, does not seek to disarm hunters, law-abiding citizens and others with a need for such arms."

NOT GIVING FACTS

Representative ANFUSO referred to the "pressure groups" opposing the bill as "far-right extremists who know they are not honest with the people."

"They are not presenting the true facts about crime problems in cities, and they are not seeking to help our country solve this problem by fighting the bill."

He expressed conviction that many acts of crime could be prevented if a rigid control of pistols and other weapons to minors and criminals were established.

"Murder, robbery, rape, and other heinous crimes have made life miserable in large cities, especially after dark. Many of these crimes could have been prevented if we had only been more rigid in controlling the sale of pistols, revolvers, guns and other weapons to criminals and minors."

Representative ANFUSO, in a letter to Representative EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, also a Brooklyn Democrat, urged hearings on the bill be scheduled as soon as possible.

PRAISES PAPER'S STAND

In a letter to Kingsbury Smith, New York Journal-American publisher, Representative ANFUSO reemphasized the importance of his bill toward reducing crime, and expressed appreciation for this newspaper's support in that direction.

"I want to commend you for the editorial, 'Way. Off Target,' which appeared in the New York Journal-American on April 6," he wrote. "You have rendered a real service to genuine American patriotism."

He called attention to the editorial's reference to "those far-right sheets" flooding the mails with protests against the bill, and disclosed that he had received threatening letters—"calling me vile names and accusing me of the basest intentions, all because I introduced a bill to check the growth of crime and juvenile deliquency."

"Your fine newspaper," he wrote, "can render an important service to our Nation, to its future freedom and welfare, by exposing these groups and their devious aims."

TEXT OF EDITORIAL

Representative ANFUSO, in his letter to Representative CELLER, sent a copy of the Journal-American editorial "Way Off Target," which was as follows:

"One of those far-right sheets is flooding the mails with a plea for protests against a bill introduced in Congress by Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Democrat, of Brooklyn, which would require all pistols to be registered with the United States.

" 'They want to pick up your guns' screams the headline. It seems that all this is, is a plot by the internationalists 'who cannot get control of the United States until they have seized the firearms of the people.'

"What rot. We assume the 'firearms of the people' include the gun with which an inhumanly vicious mugger shot a 58-year-old grandmother in the face although she put up no resistance when he robbed her of $25.

"When this sadist is captured he should get the limit of the law. And the police should find out how he came by this 'firearm of the people.' "

Representative ANFUSO's letter to Representative CELLER concluded:

"The Journal-American, a Hearst newspaper, has a long record of fighting for many patriotic causes. But it also knows the problem we face in big cities in combating crime."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1962

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Revelation 19: 6: *The Lord God omnipotent reigneth.*

O Thou who art the Supreme Ruler of the universe, may we continue to cling with increasing tenacity of patience and perseverance to the eternal truth that nothing can ultimately frustrate and defeat us if we follow Thy divine will.

Make us confident that we need never to surrender to those diabolical forces which are daily mocking our human frailties and tempting us to break faith with our nobler and better self.

Grant that we may not retreat from the fields of battle for truth and righteousness, but be eager to participate to the fullness of our ability until Thy kingdom shall be gloriously triumphant.

In Christ's name we give Thee all the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 449. A joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10607. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and certain related laws to provide for the restatement of the tariff classification provisions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1057. An act to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer had appointed the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy, in place of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], excused.

The message further announced that pursuant to Public Law 86–420, section 1, the Presiding Officer also had appointed the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Florida, [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference to be held in Washington, D.C., from May 14 to May 17, 1962.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11289) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 76]

Addonizio
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Bailey
Blitch
Bolling
Bonner
Boykin
Brewster
Brooks
Cahill
Celler
Chiperfield
Clark
Coad
Cooley
Cramer
Dowdy
Downing
Elliott
Fascell
Fino
Fogarty
Friedel
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Hansen
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Jones, Ala.
Kearns
Kee
McDonough
McSween
Macdonald
Moeller
Moulder
Murray
Norrell
Patman
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Steed
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Tollefson
Utt
Vanik
Weis
Westland
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11289) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 11289, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, you can be thankful when you see me here in the well of the House if for no other reason than that I am one of the last of a long train of speakers that have come down here to tell you about our defense appropriation bill. I am the caboose, so to speak, at least on the Republican side. I understand we have 41 minutes left on the Republican side of the aisle, and I assure you I am not going to use all that time. I am going to be as brief as possible because I know many of you are anxious to hit the road on your way to an Easter recess. At the same time, I think it is imperative that we give this all-important bill that we have before us every consideration before we bring it to a final vote.

Mr. Chairman, we on the Committee on Appropriations are very proud. We are proud because we work hard and we work long hours. I think we can point with pride to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has saved the taxpayers literally billions of dollars throughout the years. It has been my privilege to be a member of this all-important committee for only the last 4 years, but I have seen at firsthand the ability and the hard work that all of the members on all of the subcommittees put into their efforts.

I am particularly fortunate to serve on the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee. I think it is one of the most important committees of the House. Certainly, we meet longer hours than any other committee of the House. We meet daily, for long hours. Our committee hearings for the most part are closed. They are top secret and when the record comes out, it is pockmarked with the phrase "off the record," meaning material deleted for security purposes.

One thing I should like to mention is the fact that last year we had in our subcommittee over 8,000 pages of testimony. There would have been much more than that if there had been added to the record of the testimony those pages that had been deleted for security purposes.

Our witnesses include the Nation's top military men, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries of the services, right on down the line—the men who have their fingers on the pulse of the Defense Establishment of America. We on the defense committee do not pose as military experts but we are exposed to the facts.

I think before I get into the bill itself today, I would be most remiss if I did not pay tribute to the outstanding chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], a most able and fair Member of the Congress, an excellent, wonderful chairman. Our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], does an outstanding job. His great ability and dedication to duty are of immense help to the committee.

The bill before the House is not a controversial piece of legislation. In the vast majority of instances, the Appropriations Committee has agreed with and concurred in the proposals made by the Department of Defense for the programs which are to be carried out in fiscal year 1963. The total made available in the bill is close to the sum requested in the budget—short some $67 million.

What has been one of the most controversial matters in the bill is the determination as to the proper approach to follow in the development of the reconnaissance-strike aircraft called the RS-70. It is important that the proper decision be made. A wrong decision in a program of such magnitude not only wastes taxpayers' dollars but drains vital time and effort from other defense programs.

In the past the executive branch has proposed and the Congress has appropriated funds for weapon systems which were developed and never used. In some instances the development program did not fulfill the earlier expectations of those who advocated it. In other instances weapon systems have been successfully developed, but it was found that they were either supplanted by other more significant developments which had resulted in more effective or efficient systems, or that, due to the passage of time, the requirement for the weapon no longer existed at the time the weapon was finally perfected. In today's cold war weapon systems are developed, produced, added to the military operational inventory, and then made obsolete by the passage of time. This cannot be avoided. We must develop the weapons so they will be available if needed.

The development of weapons which do not offer sufficient improvements over those already in the inventory can be avoided. We can avoid too the expenditure of effort on systems that are obviously duplications. We can also eliminate programs which do not fulfill a needed military requirement. War is not a precise science, a cold war is even less so. Differences of opinion will arise over such issues. At this juncture there is still considerable controversy as to which of these categories the proposed RS-70 will fall. There is still the big unknown—will it ever be successfully developed and produced in time to fulfill its mission?

During the committee hearings on the Department of Defense budget request, it had become obvious that the development program for this weapon system would be a controversial matter. More hours of hearings were spent in exploring the many facets of the development of the RS-70 than on any other single program. The Secretary of Defense presented and recommended to the committee the B-70 program, as requested in the budget. Subsequently the authorizing legislation for the procurement of military aircraft, missiles, and vessels was reported to the House. This legislation recommended a much different program than the one recommended by the budget. In order to be well informed from both sides, the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations heard many witnesses on the RS-70. Among them, Dr. Harold Brown, the Director of Research and Engineering. Dr. Brown testified at great length on the RS-70 program. He supported the views of the Secretary of Defense on the $171 million budget request for the RS-70 development program. The committee record clearly reflects how intensively and thoroughly Dr. Brown was interrogated. The testimony in the committee files, deleted for security purposes, emphasizes this point even further.

The additional $320 million above the budget request which had been recommended in the report of the authorizing committee was the fiscal year 1963 funding level favored by the Air Force. For testimony on this side of the issue the committee heard the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development, Brockway McMillan, Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Research and Technology, and Lt. Gen. Bernard Schriever, Commander of the Air Force Systems Command. These, and many supporting witnesses, gave the committee a comprehensive presentation on the position of the Air Force. Witnesses were examined at great length, so we would have all the information available. The Secretary of the Air Force and the Vice Chief of Staff also testified before the committee.

To further present the Air Force side the committee requested the Air Force to give a special briefing on the Air Force concept of the RS-70. Col. David C. Jones, Deputy Chief of the Strategic Division of the Directorate of Operations of the Air Force, made this presentation. His was detailed testimony which discussed the Air Force concept of the RS-70 and spoke of each of the subsystems which would be a part of the RS-70 weapons system. Yes, we gave most careful attention to this program. Many, many hours, as reflected in the printed copy of the hearings.

Some of the history of the B-70 program is helpful in understanding the issues. The funding of this development program was initiated in fiscal year 1955. The B-70 program at that time called for the development of a faster, higher flying replacement for the then relatively new B-52 long-range bomber. In its early history, the B-70 was referred to as the "chemical bomber." This terminology indicated the intention to burn a high-energy so-called "exotic" fuel which contained the element boron. The Congress funded this version of the B-70 program. The Congress also funded a parallel development program which attempted to achieve the development of boron high-energy fuels. However, the exotic fuel "chemical bomber" program was abandoned several years ago as not suitable for use in jet aircraft.

At the time that the B-70 program was initiated, the strategic warfare concept of the United States was based primarily on penetration of enemy air defenses by B-52 and B-47 bombers. These bombers were programed to fly over targets and release gravity bombs, World War II style. The Air Force thought at that time that a bomber which could fly at supersonic speeds and at great altitudes would be relatively safe from attack from surface-to-air and air-to-air defenses. It was also planned that the B-70 would fly over its targets and drop gravity bombs in the same manner as the B-52 and B-47 bombers. Its principal advantage would be that it would be less vulnerable to enemy defensive countermeasures because of its speed and altitude.

The successful development of the intercontinental ballistic missile changed the basic concepts for strategic nuclear warfare. It is now generally conceded by military planners that a future strategic attack would involve a first strike by intercontinental ballistic missiles. At this time there is no known defense against these missiles.

With this change in strategic warfare there was pressure on the Department of Defense to terminate the B-70 development program. Such an aircraft, even if it performed fully as expected, would be less effective and more vulnerable than intercontinental ballistic missiles. As air defense weapons became more sophisticated it was obvious that the speed and the altitude capabilities of the B-70 would not be sufficient to protect it from enemy air defenses.

Although it was generally conceded by all who examined the program that the B-70, as a bomber, would probably not be nearly as important as it was thought that it would be in 1955, there were reasons for continuing the program. The development of a mach-3 aircraft of the size of the B-70 would be a considerable advancement in the science of manned flight. The lessons learned in the B-70 development would have definite application to the development of supersonic aircraft for commercial purposes.

The committee report points out on page 8:

> Today this proposed aircraft is no longer planned for use as a primary nuclear strategic attack weapon.

Recently, a new concept for the use of the B-70 has been proposed—the RS-70. The RS-70, or reconnaissance-strike aircraft, would have the ability to make determinations as to whether or not a target had been successfully destroyed with equipment contained in the aircraft. This same aircraft would then have the capability of launching missiles to destroy those targets which had not been hit. This seeking out of the undestroyed targets and hitting them with air-to-ground missiles would be done very quickly in a matter of minutes under the new concept. It was determined that the airframe being developed for the B-70 primarily could be used to carry high resolution radar equipment, communications equipment, and strike missiles required for such a system. We on the committee support the development of such a reconnaissance-strike aircraft. As I have pointed out, however, the development of such a weapons system will not be easy, and even final success is not yet certain.

The development of a reconnaissance-strike weapon aircraft such as the one proposed will not be easy and at the very best will be most complicated.

First, there is the development of the airframe and engines. No one doubts that this development will be successful and that the aircraft will fly as predicted. Then there is the development of environmental equipment within the aircraft so that man can live and work while it is traveling at speeds in excess of 2,000 miles per hour—over 30 miles a second. The speed of the aircraft itself does not propose a problem, but the resulting heat generated by flight at such speeds does present a serious problem that must be controlled in order for man to function.

Second, the development of an extremely high resolution radar system is a fundamental and difficult requirement of this program. Such a radar would have the capability of recognizing targets from altitudes as high as 70,000 feet. The radar system would need to gather the information, process it, and display it in such a way as to be properly interpreted by the crew of the aircraft. All this must be done in a very short period of time. The Department of Defense does not believe that we can with any degree of assurance presently say that satisfactory equipment can be developed to process and display this electronic information in this decade.

Third, the transmission of information obtained by an RS-70 to headquarters for use in retargeting followup strikes by other bombers and intercontinental missiles is another and separate development problem. The communications problem will be complicated by the post-strike environment in which the aircraft would operate.

Fourth, if the RS-70 is to be a strike system as well as a reconnaissance system, there must be developed missiles which can be launched by the aircraft against new targets. There are no air-to-surface missiles today capable of fulfilling this mission. Existing or planned air-to-surface missiles could not function from this type of aircraft. The development of new air launch strike missiles will be another separate difficult development task.

Our scientists and engineers have solved difficult development problems in the past and no doubt, in time, can solve the problems of the RS-70; but it is premature to try to accurately predict a time at which a development of all of these phases of this program will be successful.

Because a weapon can probably be developed eventually, we do not necessarily pursue this development. An important factor in deciding what weapon will be developed and what weapon will not is the cost effectiveness ratio of the weapon. In other words, get the most for our dollar. There is no reason to fund a more expensive system if the less expensive system will accomplish the same mission. The RS-70 program as well as all other weapons systems must face this type of evaluation continuously as the system is developed.

The budget as presented to the Congress last January proposed the continuation of work on development of the B-70 aircraft and requested $171 million for this purpose. This effort would have been placed on development of the airframe itself, the engines, and the bombing-navigation system. The budget also requested $52 million of research and development money for development of a radar system of the type to be used in the RS-70.

The Air Force made a series of proposals to the Department of Defense for the development of an RS-70 weapons system. To this date none of these proposals has been accepted by the Department of Defense. The Air Force presented to the Congress the details of a development program for a complete RS-70 weapons system which would require funds in the amount of $491 million in fiscal year 1963.

The committee chose to support a middle ground position and advocate still another approach to the problem. This bill neither emphasizes nor deemphasizes the RS-70. The committee recommends the appropriation of the $171 million in the budget for the development of the airframe and engines for the B-70 or RS-70. The committee recommend an appropriation of the $52 million for development of high resolution radar as recommended in the budget along with other funds somewhat applicable to the RS-70. The committee further recommends the appropriation of $52,900,000 above the budget request for funding of further development of the radar and/or other related development efforts. The committee included language in the pending bill making $223,900,000 available only for the RS-70 program.

After there was a question in the Congress as to the proper development program for the RS-70, the Secretary of Defense appointed two study groups to investigate the related problems. One of these study groups is within the Air Force, the other study group is within the Department of Defense and is headed by the Director of Defense Research and Development. These two study groups are directed to study the problem both jointly and separately. The same information is to be made available to both groups so that the problems involved can be considered fully and freely. It will be a few weeks before these groups have made their recommendations. Until this is done, the committee feels that the appropriation of the extreme amounts recommended either on the high side or on the low side would not be proper. No such study was ever resolved in this way. The committee feels that the appropriation of the $275,900,000 in new appropriations it recommends, along with the emergency fund provisions carried in the bill which make $159 million in new appropriations and $150 million in transfer authority available to the Department of Defense for application to any research and development program for which it is decided that such funds can be utilized, makes sufficient money available in fiscal year 1963 to carry out any RS–70 development program approved. In view of the tremendous impact of the decision on development of the RS–70 on our future military strength and the careful studies now being made of this program, I believe that the well reasoned recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations is the best approach that the Congress can take to this problem at the present time and I hope that the House in its wisdom will adopt these recommendations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I deem it a great privilege to be able to stand in the well of the House of Representatives today in support of this legislation. It is my opinion that when the final chapter of freedom's triumph over tyranny is written, the Members of this Congress who are supporting this legislation will rank high in the annals of that history.

Mr. Chairman, I think that Mr. Khrushchev would be wise to look upon the debate today and see the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the ranking minority member of this committee, joining the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, to develop for our country a budget which will give us a defense system second to none. I am convinced that the committee has done an excellent job, and I certainly am very proud to be able to support this legislation. This committee has performed an impressive public service. However, there is one provision in this bill which I do hope will be deleted. At the appropriate time I shall offer an amendment, if no one else does, to strike the following language from the bill: On page 43, line 17, there is a proviso which states as follows:

> *Provided further*, That no funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of a price differential on contracts hereafter made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations.

Mr. Chairman, we attempted to remove this language from the Defense appropriation bill last year. We succeeded on the teller vote, but then were defeated on the rollcall vote. After that vote last year, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense and asked the Secretary for his interpretation of that proviso with reference to the allocation of defense contracts to surplus labor areas. At the appropriate time in our proceedings today I shall include in the RECORD the entire letter which I have received from the Secretary of Defense, as well as other documents on this subject. But suffice it to say that within the limited time I have now, permit me to read this significant excerpt from his letter, dated July 17, 1961. The letter was signed by Mr. Clyde Bothmer, Director of Small Business Policies of the Defense Department. In order to give you some background, at that time I pointed out that as long as this proviso remained in this bill, the Secretary of Defense is completely helpless in carrying out President Kennedy's effort to give assistance to labor surplus areas through defense contracts.

During debate on the bill last year, I was told that there was no such meaning in this proviso. Here is what the Secretary of Defense advised me, through his assistant:

> The primary technique which we use for preferential treatment of labor surplus area concerns, and the one to which you undoubtedly have reference, is the set-aside technique. Under this procedure, when it has been determined that the quantity of military items required may appropriately be divided into two economic production runs, one portion is reserved (i.e., set aside) for exclusive negotiation with firms that will perform in depressed areas. Since a great many of our procurements cannot be so divided—

This is very significant; and I repeat—

> Since a great many of our procurements cannot be so divided, we do not use this procedure as frequently as would be the case if we were able to set aside total procurements.
>
> It has been our conclusion for some time that we are precluded from making total set-asides because of the proviso in the Appropriation Act to which you have referred. Recently we reaffirmed this conclusion by specifically requesting the advice of the General Accounting Office as to whether or not we could, in the face of this proviso, revise our previous practice and make total set-asides. We were informed that we could not do so.

At the appropriate time in our proceedings I shall include in the RECORD a statement from the General Accounting Office supporting the Defense Department's interpretation of the proviso. So long as this proviso remains in this bill I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that you are going to continue reading about scandals in the defense program that are now being uncovered by the other body; you are going to continue reading about $168 million of profit on missile programs and about other profiteering in stockpiling because what we have done here with this proviso in effect is this: We say that a research and development contractor gets the basic contract. He gets the first contract. He bids on it, he has got the facilities, and he gets the contracts.

Then because of the nature of the development he usually gets the first production run and the second production run because he can afford to be low bidder since he received Federal payment for the original research and development. And this is what the Secretary stated in his letter:

> Since a great many of our procurements cannot be so divided, we do not use this procedure as frequently as would be the case if we were able to set aside total procurements.

What we have done here is lock the Department of Defense into dealing with one set of manufacturers. We have taken away all latitude from the Defense Department in awarding contracts to labor surplus areas. I suggest that this proviso be stricken from the bill.

It has never been my intention, and I am sure it has not been the intention of any other Member, that Defense appropriations shall be used as a pump-priming program, but by the same token I say that as long as this proviso remains in the bill, the Department of Defense has no choice but to deal with the very people who are being indicted for price-fixing conspiracies, who are being disclosed in the other body for excessive profits in stockpiling and various other defense program abuses.

At the appropriate time, I would recommend that Members of the House who are interested—and I am sure we are all interested—in striking from this program any possibility of excessive profits, any possibility of wrongdoing, should support us in striking this provision.

The next proviso on page 43 reads:

> That none of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used except that, so far as practicable, all contracts shall be awarded on a formally advertised competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

In the second proviso we have adequate protection to assume that the Government gets the lowest price on these defense contracts. However, so long as we have this first proviso beginning on line 17 in this bill, we are saying to the Defense Department, "You have no choice, you have no alternative. You have to deal with these people even though these people get an advantage in the first instance by the defense expenditure for research and development to make the lowest bid on subsequent production contracts."

It is no surprise that they can come in later and offer a lower bid on the first production run. They have gotten all this Federal help in the first part of the program, research and development. They have gotten tooled up, they have everything going. The people in labor surplus areas—and we have many of them in Chicago; our electronics industry has suffered very badly in Chicago—because of this proviso have no hope of benefiting from defense contracts. If you want to see a fair distribution of this defense work in America; if you want to help eliminate the abuses that are coming to light in defense procurement, we urge you to join in striking this provision from the bill.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I should like to thank the gentleman for his very effective and pointed statement. I would certainly support his amendment.

May I ask the gentleman whether it would be true that if this section is not eliminated from the bill it may well be that in some unemployment areas the Government will have to spend many, many times more in terms of aid through the area redevelopment program or in unemployment assistance than would be involved in a slight differential in a defense contract that would keep people at work?

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman makes an excellent point. Recently we appropriated $455 million, to the best of my memory, for a manpower retraining bill, yet under this proviso we permit industries to be transferred wholesale to other areas of the country for these contracts. I think the gentleman has made an excellent point. There will be a differential in the price, yes, but the President has said repeatedly he wants to help these areas of continued unemployment, hard-core unemployment. We have 5 million people unemployed, yet oddly enough in areas where these contracts are going to go, there is actually a shortage of labor in the skilled labor field. We have vast areas in America where there is great unemployment, but with this proviso we give the Defense Department absolutely no leeway. They have to give these contracts to these people because they have done the research and development and therefore most often automatically are the low bidder. Ironically, too often, the difference between the low bidder and the next bidder—perhaps from a labor surplus area—is very small but under the proviso, the Defense Department cannot help the depressed area.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. STRATTON. In other words, the gentleman's amendment is really an economy amendment. I want to support it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In the long run, yes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent, I am sure, or will be very soon, that this is my maiden voyage to the well of the House. I hope you will pardon my personal pride in the almost superhuman result of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee from my home State, and his entire group.

I must point out, however, one place where this bill fails to provide adequately for the Naval Reserve. I should like to read a very brief statement provided by the Navy Department:

> The fiscal year 1963 budget request provides for 2,700 paid active duty for training billets for officers in nondrill-pay status. There are approximately 26,800 officers who are in a nondrill-pay status.
>
> It is not considered essential that all 26,800 officers be paid active duty for training each year. In order to conserve the training dollar and to provide sufficient training, these officers should be provided training about every third year.

I should like to point out the fact that this was not an oversight on the part of the committee. This information was not provided to the distinguished chairman and his committee in time.

While I am very new in this great body, I am not so new in the Naval Reserve. When the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor in 1941, I was on the staff of the late beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn. Some of you were fortunate enough to be Members then.

A few days later, I was called to active duty with the Navy. During World War II I had the opportunity to command more than one ship—almost entirely manned by Reserves. These men and officers acquitted themselves nobly. When the war was won, they returned to their civilian pursuits—but they stayed in the Naval Reserve.

Many officers of the volunteer nonpaid Reserve were recalled during Korea. When they came home they took up where they left off—back into active participation in the Naval Reserve.

The officers and men that I am so concerned about receive no pay; they receive no honors; all they ask is the honor of serving their country in time of war. They spend days, nights, and weekends attending Reserve schools and drilling units to keep themselves in readiness.

There are 26,800 of these officers. To maintain themselves in a state of readiness so as to be useful in case of mobilization, they should have 2 weeks' active duty training at least every 3 years. The bill that we are considering—and of course I shall support it—provides this training for only 2,700 of the 26,800, or just about 10 percent. Said another way, a reservist in a nonpay unit would have a mathematical chance for 2 weeks' training only once each 10 years.

Let me say to you that these officers are World War II officers. About half of them were called back during Korea, and a small percentage of them are now on active duty during the present emergency.

I wish to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], for his assurance that these men will receive full consideration.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a memorable moment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROBERTS] is in the well of the House for the first time to make a formal presentation to the Committee of the Whole. I think it worthy of note to point out that he is the successor to one of the great Americans of all time, the late Speaker Rayburn, and his being here and addressing the House calls to mind the great career of the venerable Speaker.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the issue here, this matter was not forcefully or adequately called to the attention of the subcommittee. I believe the Navy has a paid drill strength reserve program of about 122,488. The gentleman is talking about a certain group in a non-drill-pay status in what is known, I believe, as category D. I frankly admit I do not know all of the implications involved here. I hope the gentleman will not offer the amendment. If this matter is submitted to the other body, and I am sure it will be by the gentleman from Texas or others, I personally would be inclined to look very sympathetically on this matter. I do pledge the gentleman from Texas and those who are interested in this important matter that I shall personally go into it very thoroughly with the view to trying to do what appears to be in the best interests of defense and of the Navy Reserve.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. I tried to point out to the distinguished chairman that this information was provided adequately to the committee and it was certainly no oversight or any fault of the committee.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Texas on his initial visit to the well of the House. I feel he has selected an item of particular merit. He is correctly stating the situation. Here is a matter that should be remedied and I sincerely hope it will be remedied before this bill is finally written into law. I think we have a general understanding that additional funds are needed, and although it comes to this Committee a little late and additional facts are needed and should be provided before action is taken, I am confident the matter can be worked out and that these funds can be made available when the bill becomes law.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. This is an important subject. Certainly, I believe before this bill is completed, the oversight should be corrected.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in commending the gentleman from Texas for his leadership in this matter and for arousing the interest of the Committee and many of his colleagues in this matter. I support the gentleman's position and appreciate very much the attitude that has been expressed by the able and very distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have welcomed the opportunity to join the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROBERTS] on this matter because of a profound conviction that the Reserve and National Guard expenditures of our country are among our wisest investments in national defense.

Obviously, as the Secretary of the Navy has advised the committee, it is essential that some active duty training be provided reservists—and guardsmen as well—if their usefulness to the service is to be preserved.

I have personal knowledge of the importance of these 2-week tours of active duty to the effectiveness and morale of a non-drill-pay unit.

In my hometown of Muskogee, Okla., we have one of the Navy's finest and most active composite Reserve units, and the officers and men of that unit are a continuing credit to the Navy in every way.

Regular tours of active duty, however, are absolutely essential if any such unit is to maintain its strength and effectiveness, and the proposal of the gentleman from Texas to restore the budgetary cuts in this program is assuredly a proposal of real merit.

I appreciate the committee's assurance that it will sympathetically consider any restoration of funds for this purpose that may be provided in the other body, where I am told a full presentation on the merits will be made in committee.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman from Texas in his decision to withhold any offer of amendment on this point at this time, and will also join him in pressing the matter in the other body.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. I think the assurances we have received from the members of this committee are, indeed, heartening. I feel certain that the Navy Reserve program is worthy of their consideration, and I hope this matter is corrected before the bill finally passes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. I thank the gentleman. I wish to thank the distinguished chairman. I shall certainly do all I can to support his bill, and I appreciate very much his indulgence in this matter. I regret that we did not get the information to him soon enough to take care of these men who are serving without pay and who ask only for the privilege of serving their country and to have 2 weeks of active duty for 3 or 4 years.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I believe the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], said yesterday that this bill is in effect a levy of some $258 upon every man, woman, and child in the country. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MAHON. I believe the calculation is approximately correct. The funds involved are equivalent to a levy of about $258 upon every individual.

Mr. GROSS. Therefore with an average of four members per family, that is a levy of about $1,000 per family in the United States to provide the nearly $48 billion here requested. For this reason, if there is any fat in this bill we certainly ought to cut it out.

I have always been interested in the money spent on entertainment. It is a growing item in almost all bills that come before Congress. In this one I find it most difficult to ascertain how much is going to be spent on entertainment, although I am sure the Defense Department and the military services do a great deal of entertaining. I find only one reference to entertainment in this $48 billion bill and I believe that is on page 12. I want to be corrected if I am wrong, but scattered through the bill at least $31 million is listed for contingencies of one kind and another. I am sure that not all of the $31 million will be spent on wining and dining, and so on and so forth, but I would like someone on the subcommittee to give me some idea if it is possible to do so of how many millions, since there are no line items in this bill with reference to entertainment, how many millions are being used for that purpose?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman shows a very proper interest in the budgeting of funds for various purposes. I will have to check the funds for entertaining through various categories: For operation and maintenance in the Defense agencies, $83,000; for operation and maintenance, Army, $399,000; operation and maintenance, Navy, $313,000; operation and maintenance, Air Force, $560,000. This adds up to a total of $1,341,000. There is an additional classified figure which cannot be discussed on the floor involving additional funds.

The total amount of the entertainment funds in all going to support the military services in one way or another at home or abroad is estimated at $1,981,000.

It is said, of course, that this is a considerable sum, but high-ranking men in the Armed Forces, departmental secretaries, and others, are required to entertain visiting dignitaries and their wives. They have responsibilities in many areas of the world, and while this sum seems large in a way, when you take into consideration the number of commands, the number of posts—there are more than 700 major installations—and that the responsibility is worldwide, this amount for entertainment does not seem to be completely out of line.

Mr. GROSS. This seems to me to be completely out of line. It is a lot of money to be spending in entertaining visitors to this country, people to whom in many instances we give military equipment and so on and so forth. I can think of many places where this money could be better spent than for entertainment.

We are in trouble, I will say to the gentleman, we are in serious financial trouble in this country. Apparently the House will consider a bill in this session to spend $2 billion on a standby unemployment program. There are advocates of a youth corps to take care of the unemployed youth. We are not exactly wallowing in affluence in this country. We are wallowing in deficit spending and debt, and that is one of the best reasons why these entertainment funds should be cut to the bone in all bills.

Mr. MAHON. We are concerned with a very serious fiscal situation. I have discussed this matter of entertainment funds personally with the Secretary of Defense, who is, in my judgment, one of the ablest men I have ever seen in or out of the Government. He is a man of remarkable ability and dedication. I think we ought to be proud we have a man of his stature in that position.

Mr. GROSS. That is fine, but this is not a question of personalities.

Mr. MAHON. May I say that I called upon this Secretary and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and others, to make sure none of these funds are improperly expended and that the spending shall be held at the lowest possible level. It is true that rules and regulations exist which require that these funds be tightly controlled. In the military departments these expenditures are made under regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense. We are trying to prevent misuse in this field. I am completely sympathetic with the gentleman's viewpoint. We have done the best we could under the circumstances. We cannot afford to deny to our civilian officials and military officers financial assistance when they are called upon to represent the U.S. Government. We do not want the Government belittled. We do not want to make it necessary to have only men of high wealth in these positions in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. We do not want to make it necessary to have just rich men as Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries.

Mr. GROSS. Let me suggest to the gentleman that next year there be line items in this appropriation bill describing these entertainment funds for what they are. The appropriation bill for the State Department, among others, identifies the funds for liquor and other entertainment. I ask you to break out in your appropriation bill next year the line items for entertainment and the amounts to be appropriated for that purpose.

Now, I want to go to another subject. How much is due the Air Force for the Congo operation?

Mr. MAHON. The Congo operation has cost something like $32 million, as far as the Air Force is concerned. I will get the exact figure. The State Department has to a very considerable extent reimbursed the Air Force for its expenditures in connection with the airlift, and so forth, in the Congo. The United Nations owed the Air Force a very considerable sum of money. Only about $5 million has been repaid to the Air Force.

Mr. GROSS. How is it proposed to collect the $26½ million from the United Nations? Does the gentleman have any idea or does anybody in the Defense Department have any idea of how this Government is going to collect $26½ million owed to us as of December 29, 1961? Of course the bill of expense for that purpose has increased since that time. How is this Government going to get the money? Does the gentleman have any idea?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is a very studious follower of bills in the House, and he probably has read these hearings. A lot of the money has been recovered. I certainly share the hope of the gentleman that all of these funds will be collected from the United Nations and that we will be made whole in this operation. I will provide the details of where we stand as of the end of March for the RECORD.

As of March 30, 1962, the Department of Defense had submitted bills for support of the United Nations Congo operations as follows:

To the Department of State	$11,500,000
To the United Nations	26,300,000
Total bills submitted	37,800,000
Payments received as of March 30, 1962:	
From Department of State	10,900,000
From United Nations	5,800,000
Total payments received	16,700,000

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will recall that with the greatest of ease the House voted through an appropriation in the deficiency appropriation bill a few days ago in the amount of $25,616,000—I believe that was the figure—for the Congo operation. There is not a sign—I think the gentleman will have to admit—that we are going to get back a dime of the money owed to us for this airlift operation.

Mr. MAHON. We have already gotten back about $5 million.

Mr. GROSS. But we still have more than $26 million coming.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, and I certainly hope it will be recovered, and I shall join the gentleman in doing all I can in that direction.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to see the committee giving the consideration it has to this research business that is getting out of hand, and I would like to call the gentleman's attention to a Navy research project in which 300 sparrows were shipped from San Jose, Calif., to Baton Rouge, La.; painted blue, red, and green, and released at Baton Rouge, La., as a naval research project. Can the gentleman tell me what on earth we are doing spending money as a naval research project to paint and release sparrows around over the country? Can the gentleman give me information on that?

Mr. MAHON. There is in excess of $6 billion in this bill for research, development, test, and evaluation, and some of this money is spent in the field of basic research. It might be in the category of studying what makes the grass green, but the purpose of all these studies is to contribute to the defense and security of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. How are painted sparrows going to contribute to the defense of the United States?

Mr. MAHON. Some of these scientific people have ideas and views that are not exactly compatible with the views of those who do not work in the scientific field. I do not know the details of the sparrow operation, but I do know that a bird in the hand is better than one in the bush, and I hope something good will come out of it.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman that these birds are not in the hand; they are flying around somewhere today, apparently nobody knows where. The newspaper story says that they were released in great confusion.

Mr. MAHON. I will submit at this point in the RECORD a statement in regard to this matter. But, as I say, there are thousands of research and development projects. The reason this country leads the world in defense and in weaponry is that we have done a lot of effective research and development work. The following statement in regard to the sparrow program referred to was supplied to me by the Department of the Navy:

APRIL 18, 1962.

Subject: Translocation of migratory birds.

1. The Office of Naval Research is sponsoring a project under the direction of Dr. L. R. Mewaldt, associate professor of zoology, San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif. This project is concerned with the tracking of migratory birds. Approximately 300 birds of migratory races of zonotrichia leucophrys (white-crowned sparrow) will be shipped from a carefully studied winter population of these birds located at San Jose, Calif., to Baton Rouge, La. These freshly captured birds will have their plumage color marked and banded with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife bands. Attempts will be made to trace the movements of these birds at their release at Baton Rouge.

Efforts of volunteer observers will be concentrated in the Louisiana region and later throughout the Midwestern States and the Pacific Northwest, the latter being the breeding home of the species. Continuous live trapping at the San Jose winter grounds during the winters of 1961–62 and 1962–63 will check for return of the transshipped birds.

2. The Navy is quite interested in this project as part of its biological orientation research program. The objective of this program is to determine how a wide variety of living organisms are able to detect and identify targets as well as to navigate with a high degree of accuracy and precision to these targets from distances up to thousands of miles. It has been ascertained that many animals are able to detect and select targets as well as to navigate toward them at levels of efficiency which exceeds the most advanced manmade equipment. Therefore, it is hoped that the data obtained from the investigation of living systems will lead to the development of new and/or improved mechanical and electronic devices for long-range targets detection and navigation. Dr. Mewaldt's project is designed to provide data which will be useful toward the attainment of the objectives just cited.

3. Dr. Mewaldt's project has been funded through grant No. GB-40-62 covering the period October 1, 1961, through December 30, 1962, and involves an expenditure of $1,000 in fiscal 1962 research funds.

Mr. GROSS. I think a few of the families that have $1,000 invested in this one bill would be interested in knowing about these and other research projects that are just about as foolish.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to discuss items that appear in this bill concerning the purchase of drugs and pharmaceutical products by the armed services. I have discussed this problem briefly with our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], as well as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The appropriations contained in this bill provide funds for the purchase of drug products and pharmaceutical products by our Armed Forces. The American pharmaceutical industry employs 94,961 workers within the United States. These are March 1961 figures.

The average pay to the American workers engaged in this industry is in excess of $3 per hour. There are more than 400 establishments in nearly every State of the Union. However, I will say that the pharmaceutical industry is chiefly centered in Chicago, Ill., in California, Missouri, New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, and Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, this great American industry, the pharmaceutical industry, is really in a dilemma. The average pay of similar workers in the United Kingdom, for example, is 88 cents an hour, in France it is 92 cents an hour, in West Germany it is 87 cents an hour, and in Japan it is 34 cents an hour. In Italy the hourly rate is 55 cents an hour. But this is not the biggest problem. This is not the problem I want to discuss with the Members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, the American pharmaceutical industry spends millions of dollars every year in the research and development of new products. For those Members from the State of Texas, I would like to say there are a lot of dry holes in the pharmaceutical industry just as there are in the oil drilling industry. For every successful product developed there are thousands that are rejected. After these drug products have been perfected, after painstaking research, they are then patented with the U.S. Government, and thereby the manufacturers of these products have the exclusive right to manufacture and license this drug product over a period of years. Many nations, Italy, for example, do not have patent laws pertaining to drug or pharmaceutical formula. Now, what happens? The very formula developed here in the United States of America, after untold effort and the expenditure of millions of dollars, and then patented with our U.S. Patent Office, and thereby the manufacturers are guaranteed the exclusive rights of manufacture, these formulas are pilfered; they are stolen; they are purchased from very dubious sources, with a complete disregard of the valid patent in existence.

The Italian drug manufacturers, for example, proceed to manufacture this product. Who is the biggest purchaser of these bootleg drugs made from pirated formulas? The U.S. Government. We compound this lack of ethics by being the biggest purchaser of bootleg drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I have made four speeches during this session on our patent system. I feel that it is the very heart of our free enterprise system. I think this guarantee to individuals and corporations of exclusive rights of manufacture of new processes and new formulas developed adds to the incentive of expenditures of millions of dollars for research and development of new products.

Mr. Chairman, I hope—and I might say this for the information of the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]—I had contemplated placing an amendment before this body in this appropriation bill. However, I feel that it would be legislative and subject to a point of order. Therefore, I do not intend now to do so. I do hope, however, that this terrible injustice to a great industry will be kept in mind in future considerations.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I will be very happy to yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Is it not true that if an amendment of this kind were adopted, or if legislation of this kind were written into the law, that it would be a means of protecting and encouraging private enterprise?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. It certainly would. I thank the gentleman for that observation. It will also be the means of protecting some 94,000 American jobs.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman discussed this serious matter with me. He is correct in assuming that it is subject to a point of order. The full ramifications of the matter have not been thoroughly explored, although the committee has been provided with certain information in regard to it. I am glad that the gentleman is not going to offer the amendment.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bruce].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I simply rise to commend the gentleman for his diligence in this matter all through the session. It is a matter of great importance not only with reference to the question of economic impact, which is of prime importance, but also on the preservation of the research and the finances that have gone into building the finest medical system in research in the world.

Mr. Chairman, to allow and to actually perpetuate the pirating of these formulas is almost beyond conscience. I commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush] for his diligence in this matter, and pledge my cooperation in the future toward a correction of this important matter.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I thank the gentlemen for his observation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make two additional points. Number one: We not only protect the workers and our patent system, but we would protect the recipients who are the soldiers, sailors, marines, and Air Force people receiving these drugs which are of very delicate molecular structure, and oftentimes in the pirating are not reproduced exactly as they should be.

Secondly, I would like to recall that there were hearings in the Committee on Armed Services, not this year but last year, concerning the inefficacy and lack of ethicality in this pirating and rebuying by the armed services, and the famous Roudebush amendment was put on the foreign aid program last year, which precluded this, and that was sustained.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], in explaining the bill, I raised a question with regard to the provisions of section 540 of the bill which places a 15-percent limit on indirect or overhead costs with regard to research projects carried on by educational institutions for the Department of Defense. The total sum involved with respect to this amendment is actually very small, a total of $4 million in a $48 billion bill. Yet, Mr. Chairman, as has already been mentioned in the discussion on the defense appropriation bill, this very small item in terms of size could have tremendous complications with respect to our overall American educational system and with respect to the effectiveness as well as the economy of our defense program.

On page 48 of the committee report the committee indicates that it plans to study the general problem of indirect or overhead costs. And yet, Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the committee has added to the bill—and it is a new amendment and a new approach—is actually going to do a much more serious job than it seems to me should ever be done unless and until the detailed study that the committee proposes has already been completed, and unless and until it demonstrates a much more serious situation than I believe prevails.

Actually the chairman of the subcommittee indicated yesterday that he was not wedded to the 15-percent figure, that he was willing to do a little dickering in conference with the other body, but he says he wants to put the reins on our defense research expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, this disturbs me. I am a little bit worried about just whom we are putting these reins on. I am wondering whether we are really putting the reins on expenditures or whether we may instead be putting the reins on effective research to keep this country strong and free. I wonder if by this relatively small item and this relatively simple proposal we may not in fact be cutting off our nose to spite our face.

As the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] a member of the committee, pointed out on yesterday, we just cannot have a fixed rate for indirect costs for research in educational institutions because some educational institutions have different accounting procedures from others. The committee proposes a flat rate of 15 percent. This is totally unrealistic as the committee report itself indicates and as the hearings indicate.

Harvard University, for example, has a rate of 30 percent; Princeton University has a rate of 75 percent; the great University of Columbia, in my own State of New York has a rate of 23 percent. So if section 540 of the bill is allowed to stand this means that all of these great institutions are either going to have to get out of the defense research field or else we are going to have a form of aid to education in reverse, with the educational institutions of our Nation diverting funds of their own, desperately needed for educational purposes, to underwrite the vital research needed by our Government in its defense effort. Surely, as the distinguished gentleman from Texas knows, the real difference between our defense strength and that of the Soviet Union, lies in our superior defense research, much of it handled most successfully by our educational institutions. If the section is allowed to stand, either we have our colleges and universities paying for our defense research or else the research program will be impaired.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman on his very fine statement and wish to be associated with him in his remarks. As the gentleman knows, I discussed this issue on page 6861 in the Record on yesterday, but I would like at this time to call to the attention of the House the fact that I received a telegram from President Clark Kerr of the University of California which I placed in the Record speaking for the California Institute of Technology, Stanford University, the University of Southern California and all campuses of the University of California expressing the point of view so ably presented today by the distinguished gentleman from New York, and my colleague on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for his support. I think it is most important for the defense of this country that we eliminate this provision.

May I conclude with a brief comment with regard to the position of the administration on this point. The Assistant Secretary of Defense makes no bones about it. On page 82, part 5 of the hearings, he says:

> The Department of Defense most strongly believes that flat indirect cost rates would have the effect of distorting the cost base or would force mandatory cost sharing across the board, and would not be in the best interest of the long-range scientific development program.

Again, he says, on page 83:

> Curtailment of the university research activity for the Department of Defense such as a flat rate would impose, would constitute a serious impediment to the research and development programs vital to the Nation's defense and security.

Mr. Chairman, let us not impair the Nation's defense by leaving this proposal contained in section 540 in the bill. Let us strike it out, as my amendments will do when they are offered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Seventy-eight Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 77]

Addonizio
Alford
Andrews
Ashley
Auchincloss
Bailey
Bolling
Boykin
Brooks, Tex.
Celler
Clark
Cooley
Cramer
Curtis, Mass.
Diggs
Dowdy
Elliott
Ellsworth
Fascell
Fino
Friedel
Garmatz
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Kearns
Kee
McDonough
Macdonald
Mason
Moulder
Murray
O'Neill
Patman
Pilcher
Powell
Price
Rains
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
Scott
Selden
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Utt
Westland
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Zelenko

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Keogh, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11289, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 371 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, including aircraft and vessels; modification of aircraft; design and alteration of vessels; training and education of members of the Navy; administration; procurement of military personnel; hire of passenger motor vehicles; welfare and recreation; medals, awards, emblems, and other insignia; transportation of things (including transportation of household effects of civilian employees); industrial mobilization; medical and dental care; care of the dead; lease of facilities; charter and hire of vessels; relief of vessels in distress; maritime salvage services; military communications facilities on merchant vessels; dissemination of scientific information; administration of patents, trademarks, copyrights; annuity premiums and retirement benefits for civilian members of teaching services; tuition, allowances, and fees incident to training of military personnel at civilian institutions; departmental salaries; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels, and other instructional, entertainment, and welfare expenses for the enlisted men; procurement of services, special clothing, supplies, and equipment; installation of equipment in public or private plants; exploration, prospecting, conservation, development, use, and operation of the Naval petroleum reserves, as authorized by law and not to exceed $6,000,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, as authorized by section 7202 of title 10, United States Code, to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; $2,671,916,000, of which $1,100,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses", Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1963, and $16,980,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation "Operating expenses", Coast Guard, fiscal year 1963, for the operation of ocean stations: *Provided*, That not more than $311,740,000 may be used for the repair and alteration of naval vessels in Navy shipyards.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Vinson: On page 9, line 16, following the word "stations" strike the colon and insert a period, and strike all of the proviso appearing on lines 16, 17, and 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday there was some brief discussion of this amendment, and in order to refresh the memory of the members of the Committee, I want to call attention to a portion of the debate which took place yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, in this magnificent report which has been filed by the Committee on Appropriations there is pointed out that a study and investigation was being made, because the Appropriations Committee was not satisfied with the conclusions of the private shipbuilders. They were not satisfied with the allocation of shipwork that is being made within the Department of the Navy. Therefore, they recommended, most strongly, that a study be made by the Department of Defense.

But, notwithstanding that, they insist on an arbitrary limitation. I am offering an amendment to strike this limitation.

The Secretary of the Navy did not appear before the Committee on Appropriations during the consideration of these limitations. There was a hearing at which the advocates of the private shipyards appeared, but not the Navy. The private shipyard people, of course, said they should have a larger portion of the work. I am hoping, in view of the fact that a study is being required by the committee, that we will do the sensible and proper thing, strike this out, permit the study to be made, and when the study has been made then let us act upon the facts as determined by the study.

A great deal was said with reference to private enterprise. If the law requires an increase in construction in the private yards in the area of repair and conversion it will force the Department to get away from competitive bidding and to enter into negotiated contracts. We do not want that. Yesterday we had the benefit of the views of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan who pointed out what happened when a contract is awarded as a result of negotiation. We want to have competitive bidding and we cannot have successful competitive bidding in the field of repair and conversion under these limitations, because it is impossible to tell just how much repair will be involved when you send a ship in for its periodic maintenance overhaul and repair. Therefore, the policy of the Navy Department is to give those ships to the Navy yards and to give much of the new construction of ships to the industrial yards. They are right on that, because the private industrial yards can build these new ships for less money than they can be constructed in Navy yards. And there we have the great benefit of competitive bidding.

Now do not think for a moment that this is a move against private enterprise. It is nothing of the kind. Here are the figures—and I particularly invite the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] to these figures. Here is how the money was allocated in 1961 in three fields: construction, repair, and conversion. In the Navy yards, for new construction, $480 million; repairs in Navy yards, $348 million; and conversions in Navy yards, $150 million. That makes a total of $979 million.

In private yards, in new construction, the industrial yards of America received contracts—and rightly so—in a total amounting to $1,470 million.

What does that amount to? That means that out of the money in the 1961 budget for these three categories, private industry, the private yards of this country, received $1,561 million. They received over half a billion dollars more work than the Navy yards received.

I have already stated why. Of course, the biggest portion of that is new shipbuilding. In repair and in conversion what are the percentages on the average? Eighty-nine percent of the conversions are taking place in Navy yards, and 11 percent are taking place in industrial yards. In alteration and repair, 80 percent is taking place in Navy yards and 20 percent in industrial yards. The limitation recommended by the Appropriations Committee would put at least 35 percent of repair in industrial yards and not more than 65 percent repair in Navy yards.

The reason why alteration and repair is less in the industrial yards is due to the fact, as I stated, you cannot get competitive bidding on most of this kind of work. You have to enter into negotiated contracts.

What is the situation? On the Atlantic side there are six Navy yards. These Navy yards are located at Portsmouth, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Norfolk, and Charleston. On the west side they are located at Puget Sound, San Francisco, Mare Island, Long Beach, and Pearl Harbor.

I want to call the Committee's attention to this: There are a very limited number of industrial yards that are qualified to do certain types of repair on these large ships.

Here is the whole story: My objection arises from a number of considerations, but the most important one is the rigidity which any percentage requirement forces on a program of this kind.

Several times yesterday the statement was made that Navy shipyards are operating at 90 percent of capacity. To my mind, this figure at worst is meaningless and at best misleading.

There are several ways to look at these statistics—but a reasonable one, in my opinion, is to look at the average employment in naval and private shipyards today as they relate to the period of the Korean war.

During the Korean war, the total private shipyard employment averaged about 135,000 people. Today the private shipyards employ about 120,000 people.

Today Navy work being performed in private yards requires about 50,000 people. I am speaking of employees of the private yards doing Navy work. And this is about the same as it was during the Korean war.

However, in Navy shipyards, there are now about 100,000 people employed as against 135,000 during the Korean war.

Viewing the figures this way, we find that employment represents 72 percent for naval shipyards and almost 90 percent for private yards.

So, the private yards are better off today than they were during the Korean war when compared to the Navy yards.

Another point which was made on yesterday was that the Navy yards could not suffer since they were getting $24 million more in fiscal 1963 than they did in fiscal 1962.

This statement merely beclouds the picture.

Here are the facts. The increase in fiscal year 1963 funds is due to a large increase in money for ship conversion. The requirement for shipyard employees does not go hand in hand with the availability of money.

There are necessary and inherent delays in assignment, planning, and the putting of the ships to be converted into the shipyards.

Because of this, much of the expenditure of fiscal 1963 money will actually be in fiscal year 1964.

An actual study of workloads shows that the current workload as limited by the $311 million limitation in the bill—and because of the lag of time which I have referred to—will cause the firing of 5,000 personnel which I mentioned yesterday.

Fundamentally—and I concede that it is somewhat difficult to make this principle entirely clear—but fundamentally, there is such a great difference between the repair, alteration, and conversion work performed by a Navy shipyard as against new ship construction in a private shipyard that no real comparison can be made.

For example, much repair work simply cannot be described or specified to a private contractor until after the sides of the ship are actually opened up and the difficulties ascertained.

Obviously, a private contractor cannot bid on something that cannot be described to him—something that simply is not known. Here we have an example of why Navy shipyards exist.

They have to, in effect, take the ship apart before they know what they have to do. Obviously, under these circumstances, there cannot be competitive bidding.

When I say the work could not be done, I—of course—refer to not every single bit of work, but to a very great proportion of it. And even where the work could be done by a private shipyard, this capability is based on the assumption that the private shipyard has the facilities and equipment and personnel to do the work.

This simply is not so in most instances. There are very few private shipyards—very few, indeed—that can do this kind of work without unusually high contract costs or direct subsidies from the Government.

No one argues but that a private shipyard can construct a new ship less expensively than a Navy shipyard. There is no argument about this.

But this—by no stretch of the imagination—means that a private shipyard can do repair and alteration work cheaper than a Navy yard. And this is the simple fact.

Yesterday Admiral James—the Chief of the Bureau of Ships of the Navy—was quoted as saying that private shipyards could do repair and alteration work 8 to 22 percent cheaper than a Navy shipyard.

This statement, on the floor, was based on an isolated reference made by Admiral James which he afterward corrected during hearings before the Armed Services Committee.

Admiral James does not contend that a private shipyard can do alteration and repair work cheaper than a Navy yard. Let me repeat this—Admiral James does not believe that this work can be done cheaper in a private shipyard.

On page 2838 of the July 1961 hearings before the Armed Services Committee, Admiral James said this:

> May I attempt to correct a statement that Mr. Hood has made, that I think he made inadvertently.
>
> He referred twice this morning to a statement at an appropriations hearing, where I did say there was a 2- to 15-percent differential in cost.
>
> The statement was made in connection with new construction, rather than repair, alteration, and conversion.

So that clears up that point.

I think everyone could concede that the bulk of new ship construction should go into private yards. The work is done cheaper in private yards.

The alteration, repair, and conversion work should not go into private yards for all of the reasons I have cited.

And these reasons are cost and capability.

One more point on this matter: In new ship construction, competition is the normal way of life.

In conversion and repair of warships, negotiation would be the way of life if done in private shipyards.

We all know which we favor when we have the choice between competition and negotiation.

In a nutshell, new construction does not require instant readiness, or responsiveness to command on the part of the yard.

Active fleet readiness imposes a requirement for alert, command responsiveness, well equipped and instantly ready naval shipyards for overhaul and repair work.

I have already mentioned messing and living facilities for crews of ships being repaired. Naval shipyards have them—private shipyards do not have them.

I have also mentioned the morale factor: the separation of families where repair and overhaul work is done in private yards.

I am going to offer amendments to strike out these two restrictive provisions in the bill: one relating to conversion, and the other to repair and alteration.

These provisions are unsound, ill conceived, dangerous, and very much against the best interests of our defense.

After the study has been made which the Appropriations Committee has required of the Secretary of Defense, then let us see what we should write into the law.

Logic dictates thinking and study—then acting.

Not act—and then think and study.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Let us visualize the lengths to which this 65- to 35-percent distribution could go.

Let us suppose that all of the 65 percent for naval shipyards in the area of repair and alteration has been distributed. And, of course, this has to be planned and done in advance.

Here we have the Navy shipyards filled to their capacity with repair and alteration work.

Then, and this has happened many times in the past, the *Enterprise*, or the *Forrestal*, or the *Kitty Hawk*, or any other very large ship runs aground or is damaged in some fashion. Repairs must be made immediately—and I mean immediately from a military standpoint.

What is the Navy going to do now? Violate the law in order to get the *Enterprise* or the *Forrestal* repaired?

There are very few shipyards indeed in the whole world which can repair one of these ships, and the chances are very good indeed that there would not be room for a ship of this size to be put into even one of those few shipyards.

This example may seem extreme—it is not extreme—but it does point up the ill conception of the 65–35 percentage. Think on this.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I am sure that anybody who has served on an aircraft carrier during World War II or otherwise knows when an aircraft carrier goes in for repair, they take the aircraft off the carrier and fly them to a naval air station and do not leave them on the ship when the ship is in for repairs.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. I agree with you thoroughly and that makes my point that much stronger. Where are you going to put the aircraft? When the ship goes into a naval yard for repairs, you would be able to fly the aircraft to a field that is near the Navy yard. But, if the ship goes into an industrial yard, you may have to fly the aircraft a very great distance.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, you are being very unrealistic because there are private yards in the San Francisco area as well as public yards; and in practically every other area where we have Navy shipyards, we also have private shipyards. The employees who work in a Navy yard one year can take their lunch box and work in a private yard next year or vice versa. May I add just this one point, Mr. Chairman, the chairman has made a great point of the contention that when these ships come in for repair, they should go to a Navy yard because the men assigned to the ships can be better housed. I cannot help but recall an experience I had in World War II. I was assigned to a ship which was under construction in a private yard belonging to the New York Shipbuilding Co. in Camden, N.J. For 3 months we lived on the ship while it was being fitted out. The whole crew lived on the ship and that ship was in a private yard. I think the argument which the chairman is making in that respect is not sound.

Mr. VINSON. Then what is the justification for building barracks and officer's quarters in and around the Navy yards, if it is not to house the personnel when the ship is brought into a Navy yard? Why do we spend, as we did the other day—why do we spend money in every one of these Navy yards for that purpose? For whom are we planning accommodations? These accommodations are for the crew that comes into the Navy yard when the ship is being repaired.

Mr. FORD. Will my chairman yield to me to answer that point, sir?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. FORD. My chairman knows as well as I do that there are permanent people assigned to every naval base.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, there are.

Mr. FORD. Those are the people, both the enlisted personnel and officers, who need the quarters that you and your committee are so amply providing.

Mr. VINSON. All right, I agree that that is one of the reasons. We also build the type facilities that I have described.

What happened up there at Bethlehem? There was a strike there while we were building several ships. It lasted for a whole year and became so aggravated that the Government had to withdraw some of the ships. Think about it. We might be in a position where ships are coming in that must be repaired as soon as possible and get back to take their place in the fleet. Under these circumstances we could be caused great difficulty.

All we are asking is that we await the study that is to be made. This distinguished committee is dissatisfied with the situation. When that study has been made then let us see what we should do.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we have talked boldly about the necessity for control of public expenditures, but when it comes to the time to really make the regulations or provisions to control more adequately the purse strings, those who want a blank check without congressional controls oppose us every step of the way.

The only thing we have in mind here is better control of defense spending. It has been embarrassing to me through the years to be confronted by my colleagues from time to time who ask, "Why do you not ride herd in a better way over the Defense Department? Why do you provide these large lump-sum appropriations? Has Congress surrendered the power of the purse?" Here in this proviso, this limitation in this bill, we are tightening the control of the purse. It is our constitutional prerogative, and I believe the Members of the House will support the action of the committee on this very important issue.

My genial and able friend from Georgia does not want any restriction here; he wants the Department to have complete flexibility.

Well, when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] became coauthor of the Vinson-Trammell bill quite a number of years ago, he said that 50 percent of the Navy's ships, generally, should be constructed in Government yards and 50 percent in private yards. If it was right to exercise some congressional control when the Vinson-Trammell Act was passed, then why is it wrong to apply controls in repair, conversion, and alterations today? Why is it wrong to try to assert a little congressional control? It is not wrong. If the principle was right under the Vinson-Trammell bill, it is right in this provision. The gentleman finds himself riding two horses going in opposite directions. I cannot go along with his inconsistency.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I will state to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that when we reached that decision we reached it after a year's study as to what was the right proportion. That is all I am asking you to do, study it, find out what should be done and then do it.

Mr. MAHON. We must have a continuing study and we have had a continuing study throughout the years. Our studies reveal that the cost for ship construction, for the 1963 program, in public yards is $70 million more than it would be if all construction were in private yards. We do not want to abandon the public Navy yards, but there is something wrong in the operation of this program in the light of the fact that it is possible to build these ships in private yards for $70 million less. How ridiculous would we be, when we are levying the equivalent of $258 per capita on the public in this bill, if we did not take note of this situation.

As a matter of fact, we do not take much note of it. We just simply say that in the case of repairs and alterations the public yards can still do 65 percent of it. The private yards will do 35 percent. That is approximately what is happening this year, and I believe the facts will bear that out.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The truth is under this amendment we propose that more money be spent in the public yards next year than is being spent during the current year. This argument that people will be laid off in public yards is unsound. It seems to me we cannot spend $24 million more in public yards and end up with less employees.

Mr. MAHON. Defense Department officials provided me with these figures. They point out that under the limitation as contained in the committee bill the Department of the Navy is authorized to accomplish ship conversions, repairs, and alterations in Navy yards next year in a total sum of not to exceed $610 million.

This compares with a total of approximately $586 million for the current year. So there will be more work for the public yards provided this year than was provided last year. How then can it be said that there will be some reduction in the way of personnel in public yards?

The gentleman from Georgia makes this point very well, What happens if there is a strike? What happens in the construction of new ships if there is a strike? About half of them will have to be built in private yards. If it is bad, then why do we not repeal the Vinson-Trammell Act so that all ship construction can be done in public yards?

It just does not make sense, I must say. And, the threat of a strike is just as serious in the construction of ships as it would be in repair.

I would point out that when it comes to the berthing of the crew, I have had the privilege of going to the christening and commissioning of ships and it has been my observation that months in advance, in private yards and in public yards, the crew is on hand, as you know. They train and are there whether it is a private yard or a public yard. So, this invalidates, as I see it, the argument of the gentleman here. The point really is that we are trying to follow a policy of saving some money if possible where there is something wrong in the operation of these programs. There must be something wrong if we can save $70 million by doing all the construction work in the private yards; there must be something wrong, and this is an attempt to tighten the strings of the purse and make the Navy come up with an answer to the question "How come?"

I have heard no storm of protest in regard to this provision. It is all right to make studies, but we have simply said that approximately the division that is being made this year, in the repair and alteration work, between private yards and public yards shall be carried out next year.

Now, with respect to bids. We provide in the bill that 65 percent of the ship repair will be done in public yards. Alteration jobs are based on competitive negotiations in the private yards. So, it seems to me this is a very modest step, so modest that we almost apologize for it, but it is a step in the right direction; it is a step for better control; it is a step in the preservation of the prerogatives of the Congress, and it is something that I believe the committee will support because of the moderation in which we have approached this question.

Talk about studies of this question. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy] made a study of the shipyard situation. There have been many studies and there will be other studies, and should be. But, while we are studying, let us save a little money and let us demand and secure better operation and management of the public yards under the able leadership of that fine Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, who is doing a great job in trying to bring about better management and control. If we have better management in the huge defense program, which I think we will, we can save a couple of billion dollars a year in this defense program.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. In connection with your contention about congressional control, I fully subscribe to congressional control, but you cannot get congressional control on repair items. You do not do it on anything else. You cannot get it on ships. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] pointed out, this is a matter that you have to have negotiated contracts on whenever you go into conversion or repair in private yards.

Mr. MAHON. If we allocate 50 percent to the private yards in the construction of ships, why cannot we have congressional control in this area of repair and alteration? Why do we not do something to bring down this excessive cost? The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] said that if there is any fat in this bill, let us take it out. Well, this is an effort to try to take fat out of this bill and demand and secure better management.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman has spoken about the fact that we do have an allocation of new construction under the Vinson-Trammell Act. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Vinson-Trammell Act, as a matter of actual fact, has not resulted in any 50-50 distribution of shipbuilding. It had the flexibility that is required in an area such as this and the flexibility has permitted a distribution of shipbuilding which has adjusted itself with the times since 1934. For example, some 70 percent of new ship construction is in private shipyards today.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman was wrong, that is, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], when he sponsored the Vinson-Trammell Act, then he is even more wrong today in offering this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. There is flexibility in the Vinson-Trammell. There is no absolute requirement that the 50-50 provision be used. And as a matter of fact 71 percent of the new ship construction is in private yards. This proves the flexibility.

Mr. MAHON. It is something over 50 percent, but here we are only asking for 35 percent for private yards, under free enterprise operation, and 65 percent for Government yards. Let us be sensible. Let us do this rather than do something more drastic at a later date. This is a modest step in the right direction.

Mr. VINSON. All we are asking and all we are insisting on is reasonable discretion in the Secretary of the Navy.

Do not tie it down by any fixed percent. That is the error. There was no error of that kind in the Vinson-Trammell Act. It was hoped that it would be 50-50, but it was not rigid.

Mr. MAHON. If the committee will bear with me, we are taking a very modest step to save a little money and assert better control. Of course, if you have shipyards in your district—and maybe you have private and public shipyards—it is a controversial question for you. But for those of us who live in the great interior where we do not have much surface water—not nearly as much as we would like—we can be completely objective. A completely objective approach calls for this modest limitation of 35 percent to private yards and 65 percent to the public yards.

Then, if there were some alteration in the language eventually needed, that could be cared for. We will have, from this provision, something somewhat resembling the same control, and with flexibility in allocating contracts, as between and among the yards that we have in the construction of ships.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. In the remarks of the gentleman to the effect that there is no difference between the case of a ship under construction and a ship under repair, when it comes to a strike, I would suggest that in the case of ships under repair we are trying to get them back on station. We do not have any backup where we can tolerate a delay in getting a new ship into the fleet, and we cannot tolerate a delay in getting an existing ship back on station when we plan to have it on station. There seems to be a difference in that respect.

Mr. MAHON. I might say, if the gentleman takes that position, the gentleman should offer legislation to build and repair all ships in Government yards so there would be no problems due to strikes. However, I think that would be a very invalid position.

The gentleman has not offered legislation to support his position.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I have extreme admiration for the author of this bill, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], but there are some questions which I do not think have been answered here; that is, that very few private yards have the drydocking capacity, the depth of water, the pier and crane capacity, as well as the electronic and missile repair capability, or facilities for messing and berthing ship personnel, to undertake extensive work on warships.

If private yards were to do this, they will lack private capital to do it, and they would have to resort to the Government.

Mr. MAHON. Let me say this to my friend who has made generous reference to me: The private yards are doing extensive construction at this time under the Vinson-Trammell bill, and they are only operating at 50 percent of capacity. The Government yards are operating at 90 percent of capacity. So, with all this unused capacity it would seem most remarkable to me, if there were not sufficient capacity for them to do at least 35 percent of the repair and alteration work. There would be ample flexibility as between yards in this area of activity. The gentleman raises a good question, and I think I have given a good answer.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk first about a few points that were made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon]. I know the gentleman is completely sincere in his observations, but I am afraid he is off base in some of his conclusions.

Mr. Chairman, now about this 50-90 percent proportion which the gentleman from Texas mentioned a moment ago. I had a colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] on this point yesterday, and he used those figures in the general debate. He said that the Navy yards are now operating at 90 percent of capacity, and private yards are operating at 50 percent. I was not able to get the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] to tell me the source of his figures or the basis on which they were determined.

I submit that you can come up with almost any kind of a percentage figure if you choose the basis carefully. I do not know what base the gentleman used; I do not know how he determined what is the capacity of the shipyards, whether Government yards or private yards. But I do know that if we compare the utilization of shipyards during the Korean war period with the situation as it is today, we come up with an entirely different figure from that which was used by the gentleman from Texas a moment ago and that which was used by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] on yesterday.

Naval shipyard employment during the Korean war was in the neighborhood of 135,000, and today is less than 100,000. During that same period the level of employment in private shipyards was about the same—135,000—and according to figures which have been given to me, is about 120,000 today. And I might also point out that the total Navy work in private yards reflected by employment is about the same today as it was during the Korean war period—it represents about 50,000 employees. Using this comparison we arrive at factors of 72 percent for naval shipyards against 89 percent of capacity for private yards, and it makes the gentleman's figures—the source of which I do not believe he indicated—look a little bit inaccurate.

Mr. Chairman, there is another subject I want to talk about and that is the point which the gentleman from Texas mentioned and which he said was the major point at issue. He said we are going to save money. He suggested that nobody argues that you cannot save money by using the private shipyards, and I agree that he makes a good case as far as new construction is concerned. But with respect to repair or conversion neither the gentleman from Texas nor anybody on the committee has submitted any valid figures to support that position.

The gentleman from Michigan on yesterday suggested that I read page 257 of the hearings of last year before the Committee on Appropriations. I suppose that is what he wants to read now, but I am going to say to the gentleman this: He quoted Admiral James and according to Admiral James he was quoted out of context. If the gentleman had seen fit to read the hearings held before the Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services last year he would have seen that Admiral James completely repudiated the interpretation which the gentleman has placed on his remarks.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I hope and trust that the gentleman will read page 271 of part 5 of last year's hearings. I have page 271 before me, and I should be glad to read what Admiral James said.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman will have to do that on his own time, because I am going to tell him what Admiral James said to the Committee on Armed Services in August of last year, which was some months following the testimony which the gentleman quoted. At the conclusion of the hearings the chairman of the committee asked the admiral if he had any further statement to make and he said in substance that he wanted to take issue with the points raised by representatives of the shipbuilders council in connection with savings which could be accomplished by using private yards for repair of ships. These are his words:

> Admiral James. May I attempt to correct a statement that Mr. Hood has made, that I think he has made inadvertently.
>
> He referred twice this morning to a statement at an appropriation committee hearing, where I did say there was a 2- to 15-percent differential in cost.
>
> The statement was made in connection with new construction, rather than repair, alteration and conversion, as Mr. Hood has seemed to believe that it was.

That is the statement that Admiral James made before the Committee on Armed Services subsequent to the statement which the gentleman from Michigan wants to emphasize. I say to the gentleman that Admiral James' own testimony refutes the point that he has tried to make.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman permit me to read what Admiral James said before our committee and let the record speak for itself?

Mr. HARDY. I am giving the gentleman Admiral James' statement which was made at a later date than the one the gentleman has, and the gentleman can draw his own interpretation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy] may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, it is my contention that the Nation needs shipyards, both private and naval, which are modern, adequately staffed, and kept in a healthy economic condition. I fully realize that to so maintain private yards it is necessary that a substantial portion of naval work be done in private yards. This is being done under the present system and it must continue to be done, but it should not be restricted by any arbitrary dollar figure or percentage. The Navy should be left free to assign work to private yards or to naval shipyards in keeping with factors as they exist at the time.

The system has worked well in the past and it enables the Navy to make the most advantageous assignments, keeping in mind cost factors, employment factors, workload factors, and the time schedules which are required for fleet readiness. Under this system as it is now being done the relative percentages of work performed in Navy yards and private yards varies from time to time. I believe this flexibility in assignment is necessary to assure that our naval ships—our Navy as a whole—is maintained constantly in a status of peak efficiency and readiness. We ought to adopt this amendment.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I supported the Vinson amendment.

The policy of limiting the total employment in the naval shipyards is a Defense Department decision which is not in the interest of the city of Philadelphia and the other naval bases in the country. This policy could also be detrimental to the operation of the fleet as well as to our Nation's security.

The Philadelphia Naval Shipyard is presently only using 70 percent of its facilities on a one-shift work basis. The implementation of the Defense Department decision could result in a loss of employees at the Philadelphia naval base.

It also appears that the recommendations of the Armed Services Committee on utilization of facilities of naval shipyards are being ignored and the repair and conversion of vessels is largely the work of our naval bases. The continued improvement of existing ships is an important phase of our national security. Over 80 percent of conversion work is taking place in the navy yards and a limitation of manpower may result in a reduction of this type of work.

I support the Vinson amendment to delete the limitation provision from the bill because it is in the interest of our country and the naval base at Philadelphia.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, before getting to the text of my own comments, I should like to read from page 271, parts 5 and 6 of the Defense Department appropriation hearings for the fiscal year 1962. These were hearings conducted last year. The principal witness on behalf of the U.S. Navy ship construction program was Admiral James, a man of great experience, a man of integrity, and a very fluent and articulate witness. He testified extensively before the committee. He then personally had an opportunity to review and correct his own statement before it came back for printing. So Admiral James made this statement to the committee, and he had a chance to correct the record before it was printed. This is what he said—Several members of the committee were interrogating him: Mr. Minshall asked a question about the price differential between private and public yards.

> Admiral James. I attempted to do that, Mr. Minshall, and I had to suggest a spread between 8 and 15 percent, which is not very precise. It can range even greater in some instances.

Here is the crux of the matter.

> Mr. Ford. Does this apply to repairs as well as original construction?
>
> Admiral James. Indeed, yes, sir.

There is no question about what I asked and no question about what he said.

Mr. HOSMER. Will the gentleman read what he said immediately thereafter?

Mr. FORD. I will be glad to.

Mr. HOSMER. Explain the context of this statement. It was explaining the fact that the industry was down at that time and there was cutthroat bidding. Will the gentleman read the last part of it?

Mr. FORD. I would be very glad to. It is true that the private yards were not operating at full capacity then, nor are they now, so it does not make any difference. It is immaterial.

I will be glad to read it, but let me read first what he said to begin with:

> Indeed, yes, sir. As the repair yard is filled with commercial work plus Navy work they show their dissent by offering a high bid. If there is nothing in a given locality they will resort to cutthroat competition, which is an unhealthy condition.

It may be unhealthy for the private yards, but it is good for the taxpayers.

I turn to the next question:

It is agreed by my good friend from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and my good friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that in the new ship construction private yards can do the job at far less cost to the taxpayers.

We are not in disagreement on that point.

Admiral James in his testimony this year referred to a differential between 8 and 15 percent. This year in regard to the new ship construction program Admiral James said that if all went to the private yards we would save $70 million. Mr. MAHON said in questioning the witnesses:

> Let us assume all these ships were all in private yards. What would be your saving in the whole 1963 shipbuilding program?
>
> Admiral JAMES. We have such a figure. We have studied this problem. There would be $70 million that would not be needed.

There is no question, Mr. Vinson, Mr. Hardy, Admiral James, all agree that we can save significant amounts in new shipbuilding.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VINSON. The reason why you can save the money in shipbuilding construction in private yards is due to competition; is it not?

Mr. FORD. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. That is the only reason—because you have the facilities in the industrial yards to build them. Now when you put the repair and conversion work into the industrial yards, you have to have negotiated contracts because no plan can be drawn for competitive bidding. So, therefore, your provision is going to save money on the shipbuilding in the industrial yards, but in the repair work it is going to cost more than it does in the Navy yard.

Mr. FORD. I must say with all deference to the gentleman from Georgia, I disagree with him. I am positive—I am certain that when new ships are built, they use what we call an informal competitive negotiation. That is a technical term—"informal competitive negotiation." That is the phrase and that is the procedure that they use. When we come to ship repair work, alteration and conversion, they use exactly the same kind of procedure—informal negotiated competition. There is not one bit of difference.

So if they can get competition in new construction with that kind of proposal, then they can get competition in alteration, repair, and conversion with that kind of contract. As a matter of fact Admiral James, in his testimony before the committee this year, stated that the Navy awarded ship maintenance work through competitive procurement. It is the same contract, the same ships, and the same dollars. But you can save, and the gentleman from Georgia admitted that on new shipbuilding you can save anywhere from 8 to 15 percent. Admiral James says that we can save $70 million, if we put all the new shipbuilding work in private yards in 1963. Now why do we not make some small effort to utilize the private yards in alteration, repair, and conversion work and save some money?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman inform the committee how he arrives at the 35-percent figure? What facts and figures warrant such an estimate as that?

Mr. FORD. I will be delighted to answer that. This brings out the point that this committee listened to, but did not accept, the recommendations of the private yards—they wanted 75 percent for themselves and 25 percent for the Navy yards. We took a cold hard look at the practicalities of the situation and said—well, in the first year while this study is going on, we will only increase the private yards from 25 to 35 percent. We will not go to the 75 percent as they wanted. We felt that we had to take a little bite to help the taxpayer by directing some additional amount to the private yard.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to answer another question which the gentleman brought up, but I do not recall whether it was my good friend from Georgia or some other gentleman who stated that only the private yard people testified before our committee. That is not an accurate statement. We had the Secretary of the Navy. We had Admiral Anderson. We had a whole room full of Navy admirals up there testifying on the question of new construction and on conversion, alteration, and repair. They had plenty of witnesses. They told us the truth—that we could save $70 million on new construction.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. MAHON. This amendment applies only to repairs and alterations and in repairs and alterations the figure which we provided of 35 percent for the private yards and 65 percent for the public yards, the percentage of expenditure is much nearer 35 percent. So we are increasing, really, to a very limited amount the work that would go to the private yards, doing so out of an abundance of caution because we do not want to rock the boat while we are trying to buy the boat for less money or while we are trying to repair the boat for less money.

Mr. FORD. I would like to add to what my distinguished Chairman has said in this regard. The charge was made yesterday—it was not repeated today, so I guess the statement was found to be in error—that if this amendment went into effect there would be some 5,000 people put out of work in the public yards. It is pretty hard to understand how you are going to have fewer people working in the Navy public yards if even under the committee proposal they are going to have $24 million more to spend. Here are the figures: Under the program this year where they gave $784 million for repair, alteration, and conversion, the Navy yards will get $586 million worth of work—that is 75 percent; and 25 percent will go to private enterprise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. FORD was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FORD. Under this small effort we are trying to make in this committee——

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. FORD. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes after the gentleman has concluded his remarks.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MAHON. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. I object.

Mr. MAHON. Twenty minutes after the gentleman has concluded his remarks.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I will have to object.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. We are trying to get through with the bill.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for the balance of his 5 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, because of the interruption I will start afresh in making a point I think is important.

In fiscal 1962, this year, the Navy yards under the 75–25 allocation will have $586 million worth of work. Under the 65–35 percent in the next fiscal year the Navy yards will have $610 million worth of work; in other words, they will have $24 million more work next year even under our formula. So it is absolutely asinine and ridiculous to argue that any Navy yard employees are going to be laid off by this amendment. All we have done is to increase the proportion for the private yards. That results in some increase in the dollar amount, of necessity.

In fiscal 1962, this year, private yards will get $197 million. Under our amendment the private yards will get $328 million. This means that there will be greater opportunity to save money, because a greater percentage of the work in dollar amounts is going to the private yards, which every witness I have listened to says will result in savings of between 8 and 15 percent. Some private yards say the saving will be as high as 22 to 25 percent.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. What is the difference between last year and this year in private yards? The gentleman mentioned $24 million increase next year for the public yards. What increase are the private yards going to get?

Mr. FORD. I just read the figure: From $197 million to $328 million. This gives more dollar amounts to private industry.

Mr. GAVIN. That is the point I am trying to figure out. The gentleman mentioned the figure of $24 million.

Mr. FORD. It is a $131 million increase for the private yards.

Mr. GAVIN. This is a big jump from the $24 million proposed for the Navy yards.

Mr. FORD. This dollar increase for private yards is $131 million.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman stressed the increase in naval yards would be $24 million, but he did not stress that there is going to be $131 million of an increase in private yards.

Mr. FORD. I am glad to bring that out. I am interested in helping private enterprise, I am interested in helping that segment of the shipbuilding industry that can save the taxpayers' money. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the same motives.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. One of the points I believe the gentleman has made is the fact that there will be no increase in the Navy yard operations. As a matter of fact there will be an increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I think that the most significant point which we have failed to recognize here is that we are taking away a power from the Secretary of the Navy which he has exercised properly in the past. If you place this limitation, you are going to restrain him. It has been acknowledged here that if a new ship is to be built and be recognized that a private contractor can do it better he will give it to them. But if it requires a repair job and other things which cannot be done in a private yard, then certainly he should not be restricted by this limitation.

There are very few private yards—I understand there are none on the west coast—which have the drydock capacity, depth of water, pier and crane capacity, electronic and missile repair capability or facilities for messing and berthing ship personnel to undertake extensive work on warships.

Since most private concerns also lack the capital to acquire such capabilities, the Government would have to make them available at considerable cost, either through high contract prices or through direct subsidy. In the absence of such capability at all but a few yards, these yards will have to be preselected.

In this case, repair contracts would have to be negotiated, thereby losing the advantage of broad competitive bidding which now prevails for amphibious and auxiliary types, and resulting in no cost savings and possibly some increases.

There is no requirement that private yards be immediately responsible to military requirements at the expense of their commercial customers. Delivery dates could not therefore be assured and operational schedules in turn could not be planned with certainty. This would be particularly serious in the event of an emergency which would require the return of warships to the line on a crash basis.

The limitation in the appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1963, which we are now considering, is about $37 million less than would be required for continuation of past practice in the use of naval shipyards. Such a restriction would result in reductions in force at the Navy shipyards of approximately 5,000 people, with attendant economic disruptions in the areas in which they work. I am particularly perturbed over this possibility because the Brooklyn Navy Yard, located in my district, would be so affected.

Finally, a significant increase in the number of warships scheduled for private shipyards would cause many additional hardships for naval enlisted personnel and junior officers. Sailors spend much of their time at sea away from their families; reunions take place when the ship returns to its scheduled overhaul yard. If warships were planned for private yards on a competitive basis, the crews and their families would not know in advance where the ship would be repaired. This could result in costly and frequent travel or moves for the families, at great personal expense, with its consequent adverse effect on reenlistment rates, which, as many of you are well aware, already constitute a difficult problem in the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am especially concerned with the future of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, in my congressional district, which is the oldest and largest yard of its kind in the United States. Should this bill pass with the limitation to which I referred a moment ago, thousands of skilled, loyal, and patriotic workers now employed in the Brooklyn Navy Yard would have to be laid off. This would hurt not only our economy but also our national security, because in the event of an emergency we may never be able to get these skilled men back, nor would we be able to reestablish the installations in good working conditions in a hurry. We must look at this matter from a wider standpoint than merely the problem of private versus Government control, since the welfare of our Nation and our capacity to defend it are involved. I urge you to take that into consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I asked the Secretary of the Navy to give me his views on this matter, and this is what he wrote me:

> In order that I may discharge my responsibilities for the defense of the United States I must have some assured facilities to support men-of-war; the most reliable source of such support is our Government yards. Naval shipyards, because of their organization and operation under direct Navy control, are immediately responsive to fleet requirements. These yards are not subject to work stoppages due to strikes or jurisdictional disputes. They maintain specialized skills, facilities for the accommodation of crews of ships undergoing overhaul, and diverse inventories of Navy equipment which private yards would find uneconomical to maintain because of the uncertainties of competition. Even if all shipwork were done commercially the Navy would have to maintain many activities at or near commercial yards to perform these services now provided by Naval shipyards.
>
> The Navy has no desire, per se, to compete with private industry. However, we must maintain a constant capability to perform any required repairs to the highly complex installations on which the effectiveness of modern warships depend. This capability is not readily available from industry, and has little prospect of becoming available on a broad competitive basis.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the intent of the language the Vinson amendment will strike from the bill is nothing more than an effort on the part of private shipyards to become part of what we call the FRAM program of the Navy. The FRAM program of the Navy is a program which modernizes existing Navy ships. This is not a new construction program but as I have said one which modernizes present ships and extends the ships useful life by about 8 to 10 years.

I certainly disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. He was talking about new ships. I agree with him when he says it is possible for the crew to live on a ship while in a state of completion, but when you modernize a destroyer, destroyer-escort, frigate, submarine, or other kind of a ship it is necessary to strip it down almost to the keel; therefore, the personnel must be sent to a barracks. In support of the barracks there must be medical facilities, recreational facilities, and so forth. Your private yards do not have these facilities. This is one of many reasons why the Navy has not put the FRAM program into what we call private yards.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in a few words, this matter involves the readiness of the U.S. Navy. Like the gentleman from Michigan does, I want to save money but I tell you that you cannot do it and still have a fleet in a state of readiness and one to protect the security of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted me to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN ZANDT.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue my statement by stating that I have been aboard new ships under construction, and I have had command of ships in the Navy yard, for overhaul. Therefore, I know what is necessary in regard to personnel. What private yard is equipped with barracks, with medical and recreational facilities to take care of the officers and men? None of them. If you put this work into private yards, the taxpayers of this country will be called upon to finance the construction of barracks, medical facilities and also recreational facilities, and this, of course, will be in addition to the cost of conversion or the modernization of the ships.

Now, Mr. Chairman, again let me state that this matter concerns the security of this country, and I say to you, as I said a moment ago, we must have a fleet in a state of readiness at all times. These ships are spending more days at sea than ever before in the history of the Navy except in wartime. When they return to their home port the Navy yard takes them in, the job is done, and they are sent back to sea for duty. Frankly this schedule of modernization, and so forth, is an impossibility as far as the private yards are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, neither naval shipyards nor this particular problem that we are discussing now is anything new. We started building a Navy yard in the 1700's, about the time we were starting to have a Navy. There were private shipyards as there are now, and all during the years this apportionment of work between the private and the public yards has been accomplished upon a reasonable give and take basis without legislative intervention.

Believe me, there has been plenty of pressure from all directions throughout all these years to adjust it fairly, and it has been adjusted fairly in relation to the private yards and in relation to the requirements and necessities of the U.S. Navy.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of repair is not comparable to the cost of new construction at all. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] when he read the additional statement of Admiral James, indicated that when private yards do get busy the repair prices they quote go up, and when work is slack, they go down. He is talking about temporary situations. That is the reason this ratio adjustment should not be written into law. It should be left free for adjustment according to current circumstances. One of those now is that today's Navy is fighting what President Kennedy calls a "long, lonely, cold war." Another is that today's Navy is a married man's Navy.

Mr. Chairman, in my part of the country, the Pacific coast, the ships go out to the Far East station 6 months at a time, plus 1 month going and 1 month coming back. This means 4 months at home in which the crews of these ships are able to be with their families. Because these men are away, the families must locate themselves around the naval shipyards, and the naval centers, where their families are cared for while the men are away to a certain extent. When these men come back, they should come back where their families are located, not to yards almost anyplace up and down the coast. There are a few that are fairly inaccessible—and believe me, I have been sent to a lot of yards like that in my time—where it costs $2 to $5 to get a taxi to get out of the place and get back into it; where the opportunities to see your family in this limited period of time are so restricted it is difficult if not sometimes impossible to be with them.

Mr. Chairman, some have talked about saving money. There is another part of these hearings that was not quoted. It was the part relating to a 20-percent personnel turnover, in no small part based on these reasons of difficulty of family life. If we do not make provision for these men to see their families when they go back, we will run up more costs as a result of changing personnel and training personnel far more than we will by putting the ships where the crews can see their families when they come back here for these limited times.

This does not mean that 35 percent or even more of the work cannot go to the private yards. Possibly it should. But if we keep this provision in the law, it makes it extremely difficult for the Navy to do it and at the same time schedule its ships in such a manner as to maximize use of private yards while at the same time maximizing the time families can be reunited. I think this matter can better be worked out as a matter of Navy Department policies and operating procedures than it can as a matter of legislative fiat. I am anxious to see the private yards get all the business that is feasible, just, and in the interests of both national defense and our private economy. But I would not want to see it accomplished at the expense of the morale of Navy men and their families.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It has been contended here that this amendment will save money. On the other hand, we have expert testimony from the same witnesses at different points of time claiming different results. I refer, of course, to the colloquy between the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. So, we just do not know if it will save money.

Mr. Chairman, another contention has been made that this is in response to the needs of free enterprise. If that is our aim, we should not be talking about a percentage of 65 percent going to the Government yards. We ought to eliminate it altogether, if that is what we are trying to achieve.

I have been in the Navy for a period of almost 10 years, and I have had ships go into the Navy yard for repair and overhaul, as have other officers and enlisted men who have spoken here on the floor of the House today. The thing is not black and white. One time you do one thing, and one time you do something else.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] indicated that if the *Enterprise*, with 4,000 men, came into a Navy yard, it would be necessary to house all the personnel. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] contends that that is not so, because you fly the planes off and they go to a naval air station. Of course, that is correct only in respect to the aviation department on the ship, which represents only one-seventh or only one division of the whole group. So, there is a lot of white and a lot of black in here. But the real problem that we are considering here is the question of a lack of work for both the private and for the public shipyards. The pie has been getting smaller. Both want work. This is the outgrowth of pressure that has been exerted in the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, 75 percent of the ships in the U.S. Navy today are from World War II, and in 6 or 7 years we will have mass obsolescence of our Navy unless we do something about it. So I say it is vitally important today for us to keep all our shipyards going, both private and public, so that when this shipbuilding program which I hope is undertaken by this Congress is ready, we will have the yards ready to assume the responsibility and have the people and facilities ready to do the job that needs to be done.

In the meantime, let us not adopt an inflexible policy that might be detrimental to the national interest. The Appropriations Committee has indicated that a study of the matter is underway in the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy. This debate has indicated that the facts are not clear. Let us get the facts and then make our decision. The amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I support the views that with respect to the allocation of repair and conversion of Navy ships as between private and naval shipyards, the naval shipyards' share should not be reduced to 65 percent.

The reason for the establishment of all naval shipyards was to provide essential support for vessels of the U.S. Navy. That is the overriding consideration here. These yards are an essential element of national defense and must be kept active at all times by an adequate workload so that not only the facilities but the shipbuilding skills can be maintained at the highest possible levels.

Naval shipyards are equipped to do quality work and to integrate their activities to the operation schedules of the fleet.

They carry a large inventory of ship equipment and spare parts which permits them to perform their work expeditiously.

They maintain facilities and capabilities which private yards cannot maintain.

Furthermore, the naval bases have facilities where the ships' personnel can have an opportunity for recreation, for training, for medical and dental care, for church attendance and welfare. Such services cannot normally or comparably be had where private shipyards are located.

May I read from a speech given by Rear Adm. R. K. James last August before the Naval Civilian Administrators Association in Washington, D.C. He makes a most convincing case for the Navy's position.

NAVAL SHIPYARDS PROVIDE ESSENTIAL SUPPORT TO VESSELS OF THE U.S. NAVY

As of January 1, 1961, a naval ship construction and conversion program having a total cost of over $4,323 million was under contract with private yards. Thirty-one private shipbuilding firms throughout the country are participating in this program.

This contributes importantly to the economic well-being of the shipbuilding and repair industry. It is unfortunately true that many commercial shipyards are in a depressed condition and some have closed and still others face bankruptcy today. The primary cause of the difficulties does not rest with the Navy.

One of the least publicized, but one of the most obvious reasons for the difficulties experienced by the private shipbuilders has been a decline in commercial ship construction and repair work. Insofar as employment is concerned, private yard employment on Navy work has increased from 26,069 in 1957 to 41,743 in 1960.

Nevertheless, in spite of this increased employment on Navy work, overall employment in private shipyards went down from 127,100 to 117,500 in the same period. This pinpoints the cause of the industries' reduced operation—a decline in commercial work.

I can offer no panaceas for the commercial shipbuilding industry, but I do not think it is reasonable to hold the Navy responsible for their plight. In the allocation of Navy shipwork, we have always shown, and continue to show great concern for maintaining the mobilization potential represented by private shipyards.

We must, however, retain flexibility in determining how much naval shipwork can be advantageously apportioned to private yards, without destroying an important part of our military potential—our naval shipyards.

Naval shipyards have a long and illustrious history dating back to 1797 when the Naval Committee of the House of Representatives recommended that a sum be appropriated for a proper site for a Navy yard. Following the Appropriation Act of 1799, the Secretary of the Navy purchased sites for shipyards at Norfolk, Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, New York, Charlestown, Mass., and Portsmouth, N.H.

An act of Congress on August 31, 1852, authorized and directed the Secretary of the Navy to select a site for a Navy yard in the San Francisco Bay area. Every single one of the naval shipyards was established in this manner by the Congress acting for the people of the United States. Each of the naval shipyards has been, since establishment, the subject of continual congressional approval by inclusion in the various appropriation acts of funds for their maintenance, improvement, and in many cases, their expansion.

The reason for the establishment of all of these naval shipyards was to provide essential support for the vessels of the U.S. Navy.

Let me reemphasize the point I have just made. If the naval shipyards are in competition with private shipyards, it is an accidental and incidental result of the necessity, as determined by the Congress, to maintain the naval shipyards to support the fleet. The overriding consideration must be the effective support of a strong Navy. The naval shipyards do not exist at the whim of any person or group of persons in the Navy. They are an essential element of national defense.

Let us spend just a minute recounting the factors that make the naval shipyards "an essential element of national defense." In doing so be warned that a strict listing of the factors is not inspiring—at least to a layman's confidence in the unlimited capability of private industry.

The understanding that you, as experienced shipyarders have, is needed to fill out this outline—to give it real meaning.

For example, our detractors have failed to mention the effect their quest for more conversion and repair work would have on ships' personnel. We can reply that our naval bases have the facilities needed to give these men an opportunity for recreation, for training, for medical and dental care, for churchgoing and for welfare.

Further, we can state that the low bidder would rarely, if ever, be located in a place where such services would be readily available for our shipboard personnel. We know that this is true and we know that our men and ships need such services, if they are to operate at top efficiency.

However, the typical layman does not personally benefit from such services and is not personally in a position to evaluate their effect. You are in such a position based on your personal contact and experiences.

I am sure you appreciate the great importance of having ships assigned whenever possible to the ship's homeport to permit the morale building effects of family life. Under competitive bidding practices, as I have indicated, the assignments to homeports would have to be abandoned, as this work would have to go to the lowest bidder.

The naval shipyards maintain the messing and berthing facilities to service ships' crews who must be billeted or fed ashore as is very often required during the course of overhauls. This is another reason for performing this work in naval shipyards.

To move along quickly, our reasons include the facts that:

We are oriented in producing quality work on time and, thus, our efforts can be readily integrated with fleet operational schedules.

We carry an extensive inventory of shipboard equipment and spare parts in our shipyards which permits us to finish work expeditiously.

We do not go out on strike, which means the fleet can depend on us at all times.

We maintain facilities and capabilities which would not be economic in a profit type organization but which permit us to take on any job with adequate reserve.

For good and sufficient reasons we do not normally prepare for repair and alteration work, plans and specifications adequate for comparative bidding.

Other similar reasons you could list as well as I.

As I indicated above, the problem is to get an understanding of the validity of these reasons, and they are valid. Further, any efforts in this direction must be completely ethical and within any administrative restrictions.

I believe you will note that for each of these reasons I have listed above our detractors can provide a counterargument—usually in the form of an assumption that they will do in their normal course of business something they have never done before. I am convinced that the effectiveness of the fleet will be greatly reduced if its support is turned over to profitmaking organizations which cannot have, unless heavily subsidized, the same motivation toward service that you people in this room have.

The naval shipyards do not operate for profit but function wholly to support the naval forces operating at sea. We are staffed and equipped just for this purpose. On the other hand, private shipyards need not maintain a similar level of skills and facilities.

Private yards' skills and facilities are controlled by economic analysis with the greatest profit in mind and for this same reason they tend to pick and choose the work they will do. The naval shipyards, on the other hand, accept all jobs and perform them quickly, promptly, and as economically as possible. I think it is important to reemphasize the capabilities possessed by the naval shipyards to perform extremely complex and difficult repair and alteration work expeditiously and at the same time, to properly service the ships' crews.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my very good and able friend from Michigan, concerning free enterprise, that I do not believe there is anyone, and I think it is well known, that has stood up for private enterprise as I have over many years. However, I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that our distinguished and able chairman in 1917 was on the Committee on Naval Affairs, and for 45 years he has followed the affairs of the Navy. He is known as the father of the modern Navy. I have confidence, I have faith in what he recommends to us. Therefore it is my intention to vote for the recommendations that have been made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], who I think is eminently qualified to pass on any matters which concern the Navy. So it is my intention to support the Vinson amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I think the issue that is presented to us by the so-called Vinson amendment has not been clearly stated. This amendment applies to repairs and alterations in private yards.

The private shipbuilding industry came before our subcommittee and made the request that 75 percent of alterations, repairs, and conversions be assigned to the private shipbuilding industry, because it could be done at a lower cost and because these yards were operating at only 50 percent capacity. Our committee did not approve a 75 percent allocation. We felt, however, that it was necessary to assure the private segment of our economy part of this particular business with resulting savings to the taxpayers and so we attached an amendment which gives them 35 percent of the alterations and repairs, which will be done in the fiscal year 1963.

What does this mean? In 1962 33 percent of the repairs and alterations were accomplished in private yards. This amendment only provides for a 2 percent increase in the amount of work that will be done in private yards, but it does allocate this amount to the private segment of our economy which has proven, it is beyond doubt in our hearings, that it can do this work at lower cost.

We have had some talk today about whether this will be done on a competitive-bid basis. The gentleman from Virginia has indicated that it cannot be done on a competitive-bid basis in the private segment of our economy. This simply is not in accordance with the facts and I direct your attention to page 281 of our hearings in which this particular matter was discussed with Admiral James.

I direct your attention to the bottom of the page, where he states:

> We have continued this pattern, and the pattern today is approximately 25 percent of the money in this budget that is for ship maintenance—

And that includes repairs and alterations—

> will be allocated to private industry on a competitive basis to do the repairs on these commercial-type ships.

This repair and alteration work can be done on a competitive basis. Any statements made to the contrary are not in accordance with the record which was set out before our subcommittee.

Let us look at the dollar amounts. I want to make it perfectly clear that this amendment we have before us now does not apply to conversion. We already have on the statute books a law that provides for a 50–50 basis as far as new ship construction is concerned. This amendment applies merely to alterations and repairs. Last year 33 percent of the alterations and repairs were done in the private segment of our economy. This amendment in the bill which the gentleman from Georgia attempts to strike out would do away with this assurance that 35 percent of the work would be done in the private segment of our economy in fiscal 1963.

The actual dollar amount assigned to private yards in fiscal year 1962 was $187.9 million. That is $20 million more than the committee limitation places on the private yards in fiscal year 1963.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Members of this House will give careful consideration to this amendment. This amendment will strike from the bill the assurance that the private segment of our economy in the shipbuilding industry will have 35 percent of this business, after proving beyond a question of a doubt that they can protect the interests of the taxpayer and can save money. We can reduce Federal expenditures by keeping the language which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] seeks to strike from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, let me see if I can sum up this situation in a nutshell. First of all, it is important that we bear in mind that this limitation in this appropriation bill applies only to the money in this particular bill for the year 1963. Also, we should remember that this limitation applies only to repair, alteration, and conversion. It must not be misconstrued as applying to new shipbuilding generally. All new construction is under a different arrangement, and of course the limitation in the law today applies to new construction.

It might be of interest to know that the private shipbuilding industry is operating at only 50 percent of capacity, and they have a total employment of about 120,000 persons. The naval shipyards are operating at 90 percent of capacity, and they employ approximately 100,000 people.

In effect, this limitation divides the allocation of funds on a 35–65-percent basis. Bear in mind that this change is designed to achieve a 10-percent adjustment in the overall allocation as between private and public construction today insofar as it applies to repairs, alterations, and conversion.

As to this limitation applying to these funds this next year, I should like to call attention to the fact that in the year 1962, our current fiscal year, the Navy has utilized $586 million in their own shipyards as compared with the private industrial business of $197 million.

However, in this year's bill if this allocation stands, it will be $610 million for the Navy as compared with $328 million for the private yards. This means an increase for the Navy public yards of some $24 million while an added increase to private shipbuilders in the amount of $131 million. The point remains that the Navy yards will continue to operate on the same or a higher level than heretofore.

It has been alleged that the Navy yards are essential in time of war or emergency and I do want to share that conviction. But this percentage application of funds for repair, alteration, and conversion in no way weakens the Navy shipyard posture and I am sure that those of us who support this provision in this defense appropriation bill would vigorously resist any attempt to impair this important operation of our Navy. I trust that the pending amendment will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the point was made by the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Virginia that there would be no competition in the private yards on repairs, alterations, and conversion work. I do not believe this is true. Furthermore, I suggest there is no competition in the public yards at any time. You will have competition in the private yards because they are only using 50 percent of their capacity today. As a consequence all the private yards are hungry for business. They are actually, as Admiral James said, in a cut-throat competition amongst themselves. This may be tough on the industry from day to day, but believe me, it is helpful and beneficial to the taxpayer. I am sure if we increase by $131 million the funds for alterations, repairs, and conversion for the private yards without cutting back but actually increasing the public yards allocation, the taxpayer will end up with additional savings.

Now to conclude, Mr. Chairman, may I reemphasize, this is the same kind of contract, the same kind of negotiations that will be used by the Navy in repair, alterations, and conversion work as they use in new construction work. The Navy contends that they can save in new construction 8 to 15 percent if they go private. If they use the same contracts and procedures in repairs, alterations, and conversion, they can save the same amount of money if they go private rather than public. That is all we are suggesting that they do, and if they do that the taxpayer will be benefited.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Sheppard], a member of the subcommittee and chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations for military construction.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I was privileged to sit with the other members and my committee chairman in the Committee on Appropriations when this amendment was originally proposed. I have lived with the pattern of procedure in matters involving military construction and procurement for a number of years and feel that to a reasonable degree at least I am capable of evaluating, this issue and other presentations that are made affecting such military construction and procurement problems. But, Mr. Chairman, I must say this to you, after listening to the evidence presented to the committee and the language that was placed in the bill, and after listening to the presentations that have been made in favor of the amendment, I find myself forced to support the position of the committee based upon the evidence that has been brought out here on the floor of the House, and that is the way I expect to vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I earnestly hope that this amendment will be voted down and that we may make this modest effort to secure better management and save some money in the repair and alteration of ships. We have already provided for a division of work in the construction of ships. This provision establishes a limited division in the repair and alteration work. In construction work, it is about 50–50. We are asking only that 35 percent of repair and alteration work be allocated to the private yards.

It seems to me in a bill of this magnitude, under all the circumstances, it would be wiser for the House to follow the Committee on Appropriations, which is not free from error from time to time, I admit. I believe that in this highly complicated matter it would be in the best interests of orderly procedure and good operation on the part of the House to vote down the amendment, and I so ask, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 64, noes 130.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV

Research, development, test, and evaluation

Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law, $1,317,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer three amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk will report the three amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. CEDERBERG, of Michigan:

On page 28, line 2, strike out "$1,317,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,318,000,000."

On page 28, line 16, strike out "$3,480,900,000" and, insert in lieu thereof "$3,483,900,000."

On page 49, strike out lines 18 through 22.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of these amendments is to restore to this bill the amount that has been stricken as a result of the 15 percent limitation imposed on overhead for defense research contracts at our various universities. In my opinion the 15 percent limitation is unrealistic. It seems to me that it would be far better to require a detailed study of this problem with the view of establishing a uniform policy for all agencies of Government. Yesterday the gentleman from Michigan ably presented the problems confronted by our universities if the 15-percent limitation is adopted.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this proposed 15 percent limitation in section 540 of the bill was discussed in general debate yesterday. I spoke at some length in favor of striking the 15 percent limitation and restoring $4 million in research funds to the bill. My remarks appear on page 6855 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Basically, this amount of $4 million, which the committee says will be saved, would not really be saved. It simply adds an additional burden on the already financially hard-pressed universities and colleges of this country that accept research grants from the Department of Defense, which they can ill afford to assume.

The evidence in the committee hearings shows that these overhead costs currently run on the average of 32 percent.

What this does is to take away from the universities funds which they must get from State appropriated funds, tuition fees, from charitable donations, or otherwise, for their educational program; and, in effect, subsidizes the Federal Government for the conduct of national defense research.

This is a strange policy for us to adopt in the House when we have pending in the Rules Committee of the House a bill which would grant substantial assistance to the institutions of higher learning in this country to improve their facilities recognizing their need for financial support. We also have pending in the Rules Committee of the House a bill recently reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which will provide substantial assistance to institutions of higher learning for the construction of medical school facilities.

It is strange also when 2 days ago this House by unanimous consent adopted a bill in this very area which liberalized the handling of indirect costs of research contracts and grants with universities, a reform which educational institutions have been pressing for.

Now, the committee cites the precedent that one appropriation bill and only one, namely, the Health, Education, and Welfare bill, does contain a 15-percent limitation of the same character as that provided in section 540, which, for the first time, the committee is writing into a defense appropriation bill.

The committee asserts in its report that the committee is going to add this limitation to all other appropriation bills, Atomic Energy, NASA, and all other departments and agencies.

But, let me tell you as one who has been in the thick of this fight that the universities have been complaining for many years about the 15-percent limitation in the Health, Education, and Welfare bill.

A year ago I joined the vice president of the University of Michigan, who spoke for universities generally, in urging that the 15-percent limitation on indirect costs in the Health, Education, and Welfare bill either be eliminated or be increased.

We had a colloquy on this subject when the HEW appropriation bill was before the House just a few days ago, and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], who has been adamant against increasing or liberalizing the indirect cost limitation indicated that he felt some relief should be given to the universities, and we are hopeful that when the Health, Education, and Welfare bill goes into conference that at least the limitation will be increased as high as 20 percent, if not 25 percent.

Now, I said in my remarks yesterday—that this is a very, very serious and complicated problem; that it is not sensible to deal with it in this meat ax approach, imposing a restriction on the universities participating in research.

The rigid 15-percent limitation is going to present universities with these alternatives: Either the universities will have to go to their State legislatures and ask them to help subsidize Federal Government research activities; or they are going to have to take the money out of tuition or charitable donations; or they will have to convert their bookkeeping and set up cost accounting systems to change items from indirect cost to direct cost, which will enlarge the base to which the 15-percent overhead allowance will apply; or they will go to research contracts where the limitation does not apply; or they will have to reduce their participation in the research work the Defense Department thinks is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very unwise provision. I think it should be stricken from the bill and the money that was taken out should be restored.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STRATTON as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG]: Page 49, line 21, strike out "15" and insert "30."

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, of course, is directed to the same topic on which the gentleman from

Michigan has already spoken and on which I spoke earlier in the committee and also on yesterday. The effect of the amendment is that in lieu of eliminating the restriction on indirect costs altogether, it proposes a much more generous figure than that included by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I personally feel strongly that the limitation on indirect costs should be eliminated. It seems to me that the evidence which I cited earlier from the committee hearings makes it clear that a flat percentage figure is totally unrealistic, because some institutions in the country have a low ratio of indirect cost and other institutions, for example, Princeton, have a very high ratio, not because some of them are more or less efficient than others but simply because of differences in their individual accounting procedures.

I would be glad to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], but an opportunity to discuss this matter with other Members of the House convinces me that the possibility of adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is relatively slight. I do feel that we would have a much better chance of adopting an increase in the ceiling itself so that when we go to conference with the other body, as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MAHON] suggested on yesterday, the reduced figure that we get would be much higher, and therefore result in much less harm to our educational institutions, that would be the case if the present 15-percent figure remains in the legislation, as I am afraid is likely to be the case, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] is rejected.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. How much money is involved in the gentleman's substitute amendment?

Mr. STRATTON. I have not had a chance to detail the cost on my substitute, but the total involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] represents only $4 million; that is, if you take off the restriction altogether. So my amendmen would amount to something less than $4 million.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I would be glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] for the simple reason that the average indirect cost of the program is 32 percent, and the gentleman is taking an average, and limiting indirect costs to 30 percent, some of those whose indirect costs exceed 30 percent must practice some economy. Most of the restitution by a 30-percent limitation will be fully reimbursed. I think the gentleman's amendment is very fair and I am very happy to support it.

Mr. STRATTON. I appreciate the support of the able gentleman from New York. I might say that the figures of the American Council on Education have indicated an average cost of 28 percent for the larger institutions, and an average cost of 32 percent for the smaller ones.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Since the gentleman has said that he really prefers the Cederberg amendment which would strike this language from the bill, why does not the gentleman withdraw his amendment and see if we can pass the Cederberg amendment?

If we fail, the gentleman can then offer his amendment. In this way it will give us an opportunity to vote on the Cederberg amendment first.

Mr. STRATTON. There is a question regarding the parliamentary situation, since the amendments are proposed en bloc with respect to section 540 and other sections, and there is some question as to whether, in the event the Cederberg amendment is defeated, section 540 would still be properly open to amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] is voted on and defeated, will not the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] then be in order to offer his amendment changing 15 percent to 30 percent?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that in his opinion at the time the bill was read the gentleman from New York could at that point offer his amendment, which is now offered as a substitute.

Mr. JUDD. Then I would suggest to my colleague from New York that to withdraw his amendment will give us a chance to clarify the matter, by permitting us to vote on the Cederberg amendment first, and then on his amendment if that amendment is not adopted.

Mr. STRATTON. In view of the ruling of the Chair, and as I understand it, the Chair ruled that my substitute amendment would still be in order, I will be glad to withdraw my amendment and will support the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan.

However, my impression is that we do not have the votes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that in his opinion the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], would be in order only in the event that the Cederberg amendment, which is now pending, is voted down.

Mr. STRATTON. That was my understanding of the ruling, Mr. Chairman, and with that assurance I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House have permission to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in regard to this section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cederberg amendment. It is astounding to see that in this Defense appropriation bill, the 15-percent limit will be incorporated. This limit is presently being used for research grants in HEW programs. As far as I am concerned, the 15-percent limit is not acceptable even in HEW and I expect that some change will be made when the conference report comes to the House.

It might be argued that universities and colleges, especially those which are publicly supported, should do research on health problems and on possible improvements in educational methods while not receiving reimbursement for all indirect costs. This might be argued because some of the results accrue to the benefit of the institution and the State.

However, when research is defense oriented, it is clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government to finance the entire cost. Constitutionally and traditionally the Federal Government has accepted the responsibility for the defense of our country and it should continue to do so.

The arbitrary limit of 15 percent will cover the indirect costs of a few defense research grants, but you know that the vast majority of grants would need institution financing since now the indirect costs average 32 percent. Even a 25- or 30-percent limit would be unfair in principle since all with indirect costs above that amount would be penalized. For this and other reasons, the Cederberg amendment ought to be adopted.

This amendment affects educational institutions all over the country. From the University of Minnesota I have received the following telegram:

> Defense appropriation bill provision of 15-percent limit on indirect costs means people of Minnesota must subsidize future university grant work for Defense Department. If proposed provision were now in effect our university would be out $52,000 on grant work currently in progress. Legislation of indirect costs on research markedly hampers ability of such universities as ours to serve Federal Government and yet meet our obligations to our State constituency. Principles involved have been carefully studied with university representatives by earlier Congresses and embodied in circular A-21 which provides for equitable reimbursement on basis of actual costs involved.

If we are shortsighted enough to permit the 15-percent limit to stand, the long run effects could be detrimental. Much of the defense research is presently done by universities and colleges. The limit could have a twofold effect.

If the institution continues to accept these grants for defense work it will be necessary to deplete the funds which otherwise would have been expended for disciplines not defense research oriented. This is shortsighted because disciplines such as the humanities are as important to our country's survival as any other work of higher education.

The second effect of the limit might be that many institutions could no longer accept the research grants. If this were the case it would be still necessary to conduct the research and the job would have to be done either by the Government or by a private firm.

In both cases you can rest assured that the entire cost will come from Federal revenue and this is presently the situation where "in house" and private firms are concerned. The biggest loss if this happens is that when research is done in an educational institution, future scientists and technical assistants are being trained and this would be reduced. The future holds an even greater need for research and many more people must be trained. If this limit stays in the bill the great side effect which has resulted in the past in the training of needed people in science through research could be greatly reduced. The resultant loss of time could not be retrieved and new special aid to education programs might be inaugurated.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I support the Cederberg amendment, and if it should fail, I will support the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Studies conducted by the National Science Foundation show that indirect costs of research projects sponsored by Federal agencies average about 28 percent. Accordingly, a 15-percent limitation is unrealistic. Already, the 15-percent limitation imposed by the U.S. Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health has worked a hardship on the educational institutions which have undertaken research projects in the health domain.

The Agricultural Experiment Station and the Engineering Experiment Station at Virginia Polytechnic Institute have conducted a number of research projects sponsored by NIH and NSF. Other research projects are in progress at this great land grant college. VPI will continue to cooperate on a partnership basis with the Federal Government whether this amendment is adopted or rejected, because the institution is anxious always and in all ways to promote the national interest in the field of research. And yet, this institution and no other educational institution can afford forever to absorb 85 percent of the indirect costs attached to Government-sponsored projects.

I hope that either the Cederberg amendment or the Stratton amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I support the Cederberg amendments which I sought to introduce under my name.

These amendments restore $4 million for basic and applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation for Army and Air Force and strikes out the 15-percent limitation on indirect costs which are paid to educational institutions doing research. The elimination of this limitation will add $4 million.

The committee report on page 49 indicates that the cost to institutions for indirect costs averages 32.6 percent of their direct costs. The committee report on page 48 states that it has no wish to establish a limitation which will be too restrictive as there is no desire to hamper or discourage cooperation between colleges and universities with the Department of Defense.

Dr. Brown, representing the Department of Defense, on page 82 of the hearings stated that:

> The Department of Defense most strongly believes that flat indirect cost rates would have the effect of distorting the cost base or would force mandatory cost sharing across the board and would not be in the best interest of long-range scientific development program.

Mr. Brown further stated on page 83 that—

> The curtailment of the university research activity for the Department of Defense, such as a flat rate would impose, would constitute a serious impediment to the research and development programs vital to the Nation's defense and security. It is advantageous to the military not to erode the strength of our educational institutions in their role of developing our national scientific resources.

I say that if these indirect costs are legitimate they should be paid. If they are not legitimate they should be disallowed.

Yesterday the New York Times had this to say:

> In simplest terms, what must be avoided is a kind of Federal aid in reverse, aid by education to the Federal Government, when education is so desperately in need for assistance. The minimum repayment by the Government should cover the full cost, responsibly audited, shouldered by the universities.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, it is ironical that at a time when our colleges and universities are under more severe financial pressures than they have ever experienced, at a time when both Houses have passed bills by large margins to help the institutions meet the future demands society will place on them, at a time when the very life of our Nation depends upon their research, we should be considering a proposal which would in effect require them to use their own general funds to pay for the Defense Department's needs. Those general funds can come only from State tax sources, from individuals and foundations dedicated to the support of the broad educational process, and ever increasingly from the students through tuition and fees.

Because of limitations already placed on indirect costs by the National Institutes of Health—15 percent—and by the National Science Foundation—20 percent—our universities are facing a cruel dilemma, knowing on the one hand that fruits of their research are essential to the Nation's welfare but on the other hand that the funds that should be used for the education of their students are instead being devoured by their research laboratories and aiding only graduate students in a limited number of disciplines. They are seriously considering whether, if they are to fulfill their major function, they should not either cut back or at least level off the amount of research they conduct below cost. Universities and colleges were not founded, and are not supported, as profitmaking institutions. Neither, however, are they founded and supported to subsidize the Government.

A report just being issued by the Office of Economic and Statistical Studies of the National Science Foundation shows that the national average of indirect cost related to research in large universities is 28 percent and in small universities 32 percent. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the letters being received from college presidents by the Special Subcommittee on Education, which is conducting a study on the Government's relationships to education, this drain on institutional resources is mentioned as the greatest problem the universities face.

National Science Foundation says that if this 15-percent limitation is imposed, $36 million of university funds must be used to pay for these indirect costs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, three excellent and widely respected colleges and universities have recently commented to me on this matter. They report in the administering of federally supported educational and research programs that the one major special difficulty they encounter is the limitation on indirect costs.

A. L. Cotton, Oberlin College controller, wrote me just 2 weeks ago that—

> There is indeed a very real difficulty that Oberlin encounters in administering programs sponsored by Federal agencies, and this is that the allowance for indirect expense falls far short of reimbursing the college for the costs actually attributable to the programs. Preliminary reports indicate that like Oberlin, most small colleges having no established rate for reimbursement for indirect costs actually incurred expense far in excess of the maximum allowed the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation.
>
> I have read and listened to presentations suggesting that colleges should be willing to share in the cost of such programs. What this point of view overlooks, however, is that the colleges have no profits to share. Oberlin, for example, has three major sources of income to cover the cost of its educational program: (1) Income earned by its endowment funds, (2) gifts from alumni, corporations, foundations, and other friends of the college and (3) tuition and fees paid by its students. Aiming only at a break-even operating result, we of necessity must set our tuition and fee rates at a level sufficiently high to close the gap between operating costs and income received as endowment earnings and as gifts. In a very real sense, therefore, part of the tuition charge of $1,350 that the parents of Johnny Jones from Centerville must pay next September will actually be used to subsidize programs sponsored on our campus by the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation. In these days of debate on the subject of Federal aid to education, this is indeed an incongruous condition.

President Charles E. Odegaard, of the University of Washington, wrote me last week that—

> We are becoming increasingly concerned about the financial impact of the greatly accelerated health research program at the

> University of Washington. During the most recent fiscal year, the university was unable to recover approximately $200,000 of indirect costs attributable to programs supported by the National Institutes of Health. This differential, calculated by comparing associated indirect costs determined under the Bureau of the Budget formula with actual reimbursements, represents an enforced appropriation by the university of a substantial sum needed to meet vital academic needs inherent in a greatly increased enrollment situation.

And Louis Levin, dean of science at Brandeis University, states that—

> We now find that accepting such grants is beginning to place a heavy burden upon us. As has been stated many times, the indirect costs of conducting research are considerably greater than the amounts allowed for such costs by most granting agencies and, in particular, by the National Institutes of Health. We are aware of some of the problems connected with this matter, but we should like to point out that it appears to us that it is not correct to suggest as some have done, that because most universities continue to accept such grants the indirect costs are not, in fact, a heavy burden. They are, indeed, an increasingly heavy load but universities feel they are forced to accept the added load not only because it is, indeed, a function of a university to conduct research but also because any university which does not do so will soon lose its best and most active people to those institutions which do.
>
> Another important consequence of the expanding research activity on the university's economy is that of certain hidden costs which, though a direct consequence of the research program, are not amenable to inclusion in any of the kinds of grants which are readily available and which are generally not considered a part of the indirect costs. I refer to many of the ordinary, everyday operating expenses, hidden and open, which are brought about by a research program. As an example, I can tell you that I, in my capacity as dean, am continually besieged by our scientists for funds to defray the costs of converting or changing laboratories so that they may be most useful for the continually changing aspects of the research program. Each of these may be a relatively small item but in toto they add up to a considerable sum each year. There are many such costs for which there is no ready outside source of support and I find that I must use general university funds in order to keep our research enterprise on the highest possible level.
>
> A third major consequence of expanding research programs relates to staff salaries.

And Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering of the Defense Department, told Mr. MAHON during budget hearings last month:

> We concur in the basic policy that in supporting research conducted in institutions of higher learning, agencies of the Federal Government if requested, should reimburse these institutions for the indirect costs associated with the direct cost of research supported. We believe that the agencies, within the broad policy and guidelines established governing the programs conducted by them, should determine the avenues of research to be pursued at their expense and believe it only fair that all cost of such research be a proper charge to the activities so conducted, except, of course, to the extent others are interested in such research and equitable arrangements for a sharing of the cost can be agreed upon.
>
> The concept of a mandatory flat overhead rate limitation overlooks the fundamental cost accounting principle that there is no real difference between direct and indirect costs, except for the manner in which they are allocated to the work benefited by their incurrence. The costs of the material directly used in the work and the salaries of people directly employed on the work can be clearly and readily identified and classified as direct costs. Other materials and labor costs serving some general support purpose are not readily identifiable directly with the work but can be reasonably prorated as indirect costs. Both types of costs (direct and indirect) are made up of such elements as salaries and wages, materials, supplies, and services. A dollar of indirect cost is exactly equal to a dollar of direct cost in terms of outlay. The man who fires the furnace that heats the laboratory in which the researcher performs his work contributes in his way to the research just as surely as does the researcher himself.
>
> In the case of educational institutions, the Department of Defense follows the policy of measuring the costs of its grants and contracts in accordance with the cost principles issued for that purpose by the Bureau of the Budget (Circular A-21 issued for Government-wide application). These cost principles provide for fair and equitable costing under the particular circumstances prevailing at educational institutions. This includes a logical division of direct and indirect costs flowing from the fund accounting systems employed by educational institutions.
>
> In regard to the various questions asked by your committee with respect to the imposition of a 15-percent indirect cost limitation, if such a limitation were imposed on the funds used to pay for DOD research performed by educational institutions, the institutions might be said to have three alternatives (1) absorb the additional costs, (2) make radical changes in the logical costing pattern (division between direct and indirect costs) in order to get the maximum amount of costs classified as "direct" so they can be reimbursed and increase the base to which the 15-percent rate would apply, or (3) drastically curtail the research activities vital to the defense of the Nation. Actually, in our opinion, the institutions would be forced to curtail DOD research activities because they simply could not afford to absorb the additional indirect costs or install the cost-accounting procedures necessary to change the logical costing pattern.
>
> In view of the importance of university research to DOD research and development programs as outlined above, curtailment of the university research activity for DOD such as a flat rate would impose, would constitute a serious impediment to the research and development programs vital to the Nation's defense and security.
>
> It is advantageous to the military not to erode the strength of our educational institutions in their role of developing our national scientific resources. The ability of most educational institutions to share in the support of these increased activities in research is limited since this expansion has grown to the point where only a portion of its cost can be borne adequately by the funds obtained from traditional sources.
>
> To the extent that the indirect costs in this expanded research program are not reimbursed by the Government, the additional burden thrown on educational institutions would require them to—
>
> (1) Use unrestricted funds from other sources for this scientific research, thus diverting funds from other activities to science, or
>
> (2) Restrict the volume of research in science to the level at which they can carry the portion of costs imposed on them.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Cederberg amendment. The 15-percent limitation is unrealistic and unfair. It will seriously prejudice some of our greatest universities. In New York, for example, Columbia, Cornell, and New York Universities will find it almost impossible to continue their research programs for defense, national security, and health connected with national security. The indirect cost factor can be adequately policed in the making of grants. The Congress does not insist upon this provision in contracts. The executive polices it in the writing of contracts. The executive can do the same in grants, but sensibly, realistically and with due regard to the facts. If there are "abuses", as some have said, there should be tighter auditing procedures.

Our universities have made a necessary and important contribution to Government research. They should be encouraged, not discouraged. This is poor economy, and in the end will be more costly. The Cederberg amendment should be adopted.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, through permission granted the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, I would like to extend my remarks in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The problem of research grants to universities and indirect costs involved have a direct relationship to the fiscal programs of our universities and colleges, particularly those which are tax supported.

In our own State of Washington, Washington State University and the University of Washington operate upon a budget fixed by the legislature of the State and they are not luxury budgets, due to the financial problems which are involved in our State for adequate financing of various State programs.

Certainly our universities and colleges are happy to participate in the defense effort and to lend their research facilities and abilities to forwarding research, but if the indirect costs are not repaid to the university by the Federal Government, these costs become a subsidy of the Federal Government by the State of Washington. In the limited tax fields available to the State, it would be impossible to contemplate such subsidization.

All colleges and universities are bursting at the seams. Academic facilities are short and there is pending now a bill before Congress to aid these universities. Therefore, it is extremely unrealistic to provide additional burdens.

From our own State, University President Charles E. Odegaard has sent me a wire which says:

> We have been informed that the defense appropriation bill places a 15-percent limit on reimbursements of indirect expenses related to research grants and contracts financed by defense agencies. If passed, this limitation would reduce the level of indirect expense reimbursements currently received by the university by $220,000 annually.
>
> This loss, combined with the $200,000 loss suffered by the university due to this same limitation in National Institutes of Health grants, will force a reduction in levels of university research critical to this Nation's educational and scientific future. This regressive step seriously undermines Ameri-

can universities when they can least afford it.

Your assistance in removing the 15-percent limitation from defense appropriation bill is urgently requested.

Dr. Odegaard's wire expresses the concern all of us should have for the welfare of our major colleges and universities.

On Monday, we passed a bill which can be of genuine assistance to our universities in this research field.

In a further discussion of this matter, I would seriously urge that all universities collectively adopt uniform accounting procedures as one answer to the cost problem; however, I certainly do not believe that the universities in our own State, nor in other States, are the recipients of give-away money.

Let me outline for you the way a research project is usually developed at a college or university. This procedure is as follows:

First. The scientists prepare a research report outlining the objective and plans to accomplish their objective. The document also includes a detailed budget listing personnel, salaries, periods of employment, supplies and equipment, and a provision for indirect costs based upon the audit report of the cognizant audit agency of the Federal Government for the previous year.

Second. The report is forwarded to the graduate dean, in order that he may determine whether the proposed research will assist in the overall objective of the university, that the scientific staff is available, and that the objective has merit and reasonable possibilities of success.

Third. The report is then forwarded to the business manager to determine that space, equipment, and utilities are available.

Fourth. The report then goes to the comptroller, who checks the budget for accuracy and reasonableness and determines that the budget includes a provision for indirect cost reimbursement at rates established by Department of Defense audit.

Fifth. If a project survives through these tests, it is then forwarded by the university to an agency with a request for support.

Certainly I can say in closing that the college budgets of tax-supported institutions in my own State have the most careful scrutiny of a very money-conscious legislature. Long and extensive hearings are held on these budgets. Accounting procedures are continually reviewed and I know that in the research field, the application of these careful procedures are continued.

I do wish to urge the adoption of the gentleman from Michigan's amendment.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor of representing a State where much of the important research work of our Nation goes on. Our institutions of higher learning, the various campuses of the University of California, the California Institute of Technology, and many others, all have played important roles in stocking our great storehouse of scientific knowledge.

Without Government help, none of this would have been possible. How could our tremendous efforts in atomic energy, space technology, astronomy, and countless other fields have been made without the broad base of support provided by the resources of our Federal Government?

The amendment under consideration here would strike at the heart of these activities. It would seriously hamper scientific efforts in nearly all of these fields. Today, obsolescence is almost concurrent with development. New equipment is needed as we refine and accelerate our explorations into new areas of understanding. To limit the acquisition of this new equipment, as the amendment under consideration here does, would be to limit the rate at which we breech the frontiers of knowledge.

Let me urge my colleagues to consider carefully any action they take in this vein, and especially to consider the impact this restriction would have on our Nation's future.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I favor removing from this bill the provision that none of the funds can be used to pay any recipient of a research grant an amount for indirect expenses exceeding 15 percent of the direct costs. The committee has stated that it has no wish to be too restrictive or to hamper or discourage cooperation between colleges and universities with the Department of Defense. The committee contends that it wants to devote more study to the problem, and I am of the opinion that we should not place this rather arbitrary and restrictive limitation in the bill until we are absolutely certain that a fair and equitable solution has been worked out.

Colleges and universities have found it very difficult in some situations to work under this 15-percent limitation. I can see their point of view as well as the point that some limitation is necessary to prevent abuse. I am certain that a workable balance can be achieved somewhere along the line which will insure both that the maximum benefit is being obtained from these research grants and that the colleges and universities are not doing this research at their own expense.

I think the better approach would be to leave this limitation off until an acceptable solution is found, rather than place this flat 15-percent limitation on indirect costs without being certain either that it is necessary or that it is workable.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, although the concern for economy exhibited by the Appropriations Committee is laudable, I find one provision of the proposed legislation appropriating funds for the Department of Defense quite disturbing. Section 540 of the bill strikes a blow at one of our basic resources for national security, economic strength, and cultural progress, the universities. This section provides that none of the funds provided in the bill shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 15 percent of the direct costs. This would bring the Department of Defense university research program into line with a practice long followed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but at the very time when the President has requested that the limitation be removed from the HEW appropriations bill.

As a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have been particularly interested in the relation between Federal research programs and the total scientific effort of the United States. Our committee has had a number of occasions to take note of the intimate connections between Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, and research conducted in universities and other nongovernmental organizations. The Federal Government provides an estimated 65 percent of the total funds currently being invested in research and development programs in this country. A large proportion of this total comes from the Department of Defense. In view of the magnitude anrd importance of the Defense Department's role in the national scientific effort, we must closely scrutinize proposals of this nature. After studying the aforementioned section in the defense appropriations bill, I am convinced that the 15-percent limitation would adversely affect the invaluable scientific capability of our universities and seriously impede their effective contribution to the general welfare of the Nation.

The apparent attractiveness of this proposal disappears upon close examination, both because it is basically unjust and because it would have decidedly harmful effects on the relationships between the DOD and our academic institutions. First of all, there are many instances in which the 15-percent limitation would simply not cover the actual indirect costs which universities incur in the conduct of important research for the Defense Department. Presently such overhead costs range from about 8 percent to about 45 percent of total direct costs, although they do go higher in certain rare cases. They vary greatly from institution to institution and from one type of research effort to another. The flat limitation of 15 percent would ignore these basic differences, and would amount to a dereliction of public responsibility in that it would seek to avoid payment of expenses legitimately attributable to the Government.

What would be the net effect of this understandable, but arbitrary and unreasonable effort at economy? There are several pertinent facts and reliable estimates which should be considered on this point. Indirect costs are just as real as direct costs and if the Government does not bear them, as it should in the cases to which I am referring, then the burden will have to be carried by the individual institutions themselves. Even granting the debatable point that the 15-percent limitation serves a useful purpose in the HEW appropriations bill, it is fair to say that the research conducted under DOD auspices is sufficiently different to require separate treatment. DOD research often costs more, both directly and indirectly, than that sponsored by HEW.

The Defense Department university research program to which the proposed limitation would apply now runs to approximately $350 million. In a thoughtful statement submitted to the cognizant Appropriations Subcommittee, the Department expressed its candid view that the universities engaging in such research could not bear the additional costs which the limitation would throw upon them:

> The institutions would be forced to curtail DOD research activities because they simply could not afford to absorb the additional indirect costs.

To the extent that the universities attempted to meet the new expenses, they would be compelled to drain off precious funds from other activities at a time when the Nation is already seeking methods to alleviate the financial strain on our institutions of higher learning. This process would aggravate the grave danger that the universities will cease to be unfettered sources of creative work.

I have received a telegram from the distinguished president of Yale University, Dr. A. Whitney Griswold, which states the case accurately and plainly. Dr. Griswold, no doubt expressing the views of most other educational administrators, declares that the 15-percent limitation will either force rejection of research activity important to national security or diversion of university funds from other important areas in order to meet actual indirect costs entailed in research grants. Even for well-supported institutions it tends to distort use of resources at expense of liberal arts and professions. Such distortion is most unwise and unhealthy for quality, independence, and self-determination of American universities. He strongly urges that the 15-percent limitation be omitted in favor of a provision for the payment of the full, audited indirect costs which the individual institutions incur in each instance. This or a similar provision seems eminently more reasonable than the present one.

From the point of view of the Appropriations Subcommittee chaired by our able colleague from Texas [Mr. Mahon] the 15-percent limitation doubtless seems a sensible means of helping to control the rampant growth of defense expenditures. But from the point of view of overall national policy, such a limitation is clearly a false economy. There should be no impediment to the optimum employment of all our resources, including universities, in the interest of national security. On that I am confident we are all agreed. But we must always safeguard the traditional functions of our institutions of higher learning as havens of learning and instruction, if we are to preserve and amplify our great heritage. The limitation on payment of indirect costs to only 15 percent of direct costs would almost certainly tend to restrict the vital contribution to national security which many of our universities are now making, while at the same time handicapping them in the execution of their other obligations to promote broad-ranging inquiry and to educate succeeding generations. On both counts, then, the passage of such a provision would be most unfortunate.

The Congress should carefully weigh this matter and devise a more equitable balance of the relevant factors. Let us sacrifice neither this essential element in our national defense nor the vitality of our universities in a misguided quest for economy. True economy calls for the public sector of our economy to meet the costs of public programs. There can be no justification for shifting these expenses to the individual institutions which are already contributing so much to the national welfare. I am sure the Congress will recognize the higher wisdom of removing from the defense appropriations bill this unrealistic and unfair provision regarding indirect costs.

I offer for the Record the complete text of Dr. Griswold's telegram:

> Pending defense appropriation bill reported to provide that universities could not be reimbursed for indirect costs in connection with Defense research grants above 15 percent of direct costs. Such limitation will either force rejection of research activity important to national security or diversion of university funds from other important areas in order to meet actual indirect costs entailed by research grants. The limitation puts a real squeeze on institutions not fortunately endowed. Even for well-supported institutions it tends to distort use of resources at expense of liberal arts and professions. Such distortion most unwise and unhealthy for quality, independence and self determination of American universities. Strongly urge substitution of full audited indirect costs for the 15-percent limitation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I heartily support the amendment to remove the 15-percent limitation on reimbursement for indirect costs.

Budget Bureau Circular A–21 provides a workable, if not ideal, means of apportioning the costs of Government-sponsored research projects in our colleges and universities, and it seems highly undesirable to me to legislate a rigid percentage-of-direct-costs limitation. In application this limitation would inevitably result in a heavy burden being put upon the unrestricted endowment income of schools conducting research projects, and would lead many schools to curtail severely their Government research activities.

The underlying problem that has precipitated debate over various formulas for reimbursing schools for so-called overhead expenses is that many of the expenses of research are difficult to identify and pinpoint in amount. For lack of a better term these have been referred to as "indirect" costs, but they are no less necessary costs of research. It is concededly difficult to determine what portion of a school's total bill for heat, light, janitorial services, library, or administration may be properly attributable to a particular research project, but these services are obviously required for any such project.

The 15-percent rate imposed in this bill, or, indeed, any flat rate limitation, can only be an arbitrary figure imposed in the hope of bringing certainty and ease of administration to the process of reimbursement for Government research projects. But this certainty and ease is illusory, and the flat rate limitation will, in my judgment, only spawn more problems and uncertainty. For one thing, there are no standard rules for determining which costs are to be treated as direct costs and which as indirect. Pension and retirement contributions, for example, are treated differently by different schools. Secondly, a flat rate can never be perfectly equitable in all cases. In projects where there are high actual indirect costs and direct costs are limited to salaries and wages, the school may take substantial losses. Conversely, where direct costs are high—perhaps because of the purchase of expensive equipment for the project—the flat rate reimbursement may result in a payment that exceeds actual indirect costs.

On the surface the problem we are discussing here appears to be only a problem of accounting procedures, but accounting formulas reflect deeper policy considerations; they are not ends in themselves. If it were the policy of the Government to provide full reimbursement for the costs of Government-financed research we would seek a formula that would maximize payments, recognizing that it is impossible to determine precisely what the exact total costs are. I am disturbed, however, by the suggestion in the hearings on this legislation that the committee intended to save money by reimbursing for less than full costs. This seems to me to be not only unsound policy—because of the inhibition it creates in our schools to accept Government research work—but not even established policy. We will soon enact into law the College Academic Facilities Act, which takes recognition of the fact that our institutions of higher education are vital national assets that are threatened because of insufficient funds. Yet here we would impose a limitation that would have the effect of requiring these institutions to supply funds to make up part of the cost of doing research for the Government.

I do not suggest that we use research funds as a means of subsidizing our schools, but it does seem inconsistent to express a policy in this legislation that is directly contrary to a policy that we have expressed in legislation that we have already passed during this session.

In a recent letter to me President Robert F. Goheen, of Princeton University, said:

> All research financed by the Government must be judged by the criterion, Will it be worth to the Nation what it will cost?

Our standards must be qualitative and not quantitative. If a project is important we should be willing to pay for it without penalizing the school for conducting it; if it is not important or worthwhile our duty is clear, and we have no business arguing about the degree to which we will reimburse for it.

That the imposition of this 15-percent limitation would be a penalty to Princeton University is well borne out by a comparison of results that would obtain for that school under Circular A-21 and a flat 15-percent rate:

For fiscal 1959-60, the last year for which computations and audit of indirect costs have been completed (although negotiations are not yet final), the direct costs of Government-sponsored research were as follows (the total being more than half of the whole university operating budget):

Direct salaries	$4,464,000
Direct expenses (materials, supplies, experimental apparatus, etc.)	5,922,000
Direct costs exclusive of capital expenditures	10,386,000
Capital expenditures for equipment and construction	12,399,000
Total	22,785,000

Princeton's latest computation of indirect costs under Bureau of the Budget Circular A-21 for the above total of Government-sponsored research amounted to $3,316,000; the Government's latest interpretation of Circular A-21 would allow $3,122,000. The allowance for indirect costs under a 15-percent limit would amount to only $1,560,000, or about half the indirect costs computed either by the university or by the Government. The difference, which would have to be paid by the university, would use up approximately all of the unrestricted endowment income received by the university for that year.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment to remove the 15-percent limitation from this bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee's action, under section 540, limiting to 15 percent of the direct costs funds for research grants, is a mistake.

We are at a period when more and more there is emphasis on research within our colleges and universities. It is imperative that we depend on them for this effort. I am placing in the RECORD, Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-21, upon which that agency expended 3 years' work. The impression that no check is made on the moneys charged by the universities is erroneous. There is a very careful check.

I am enclosing this circular so that Members may know that there is a check. Also, Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing excerpts from hearings before the Manned Space Subcommittee on March 7 and March 8, concerning this subject. This colloquy between people in the space agencies and members of our committee will further prove that the Appropriations Committee has made a mistake:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., September 10, 1958.

Circular No. A-21.

To: The heads of executive departments and establishments.

Subject: Principles for costing research and development under grants and contracts with educational institutions.

1. Purpose: This circular provides the basis for a uniform approach to the problem of costing research and development performed by educational institutions under grants from and contracts with the Federal Government. The principles and related policy guides provided herein are designed for Government-wide use. All Federal agencies that sponsor research and development work at educational institutions are requested to apply these principles and related policy guides to the fullest extent practicable in determining the amounts to be authorized under grants or contracts for such work and in developing budget estimates therefor.

2. Policy guides: The following general policy guides are provided for the information of the Federal agencies concerned:

(a) Each college and university has its own unique combination of staff, facilities, and experience, and should be encouraged to conduct research in a manner consonant with its academic programs and institutional objectives while fulfilling its contractual responsibilities.

(b) The successful application of these principles requires development of mutual understanding between representatives of universities and of the Federal Government as to their scope, applicability, and interpretation.

(c) The extent of agency and institution participation in the financing of a particular research or development project is properly the subject of negotiation between the particular agency and the educational institution concerned.

(d) It is not intended that the application of these principles should require any significant changes in the generally accepted and established accounting practices of colleges and universities.

3. Cost principles: The principles and standards to be followed in costing Government-sponsored research and development projects conducted by educational institutions are set forth in the attachments, as follows:

(a) Attachment A: "Principles for Determining Applicable Costs Under Research Agreements."

This document states the general principles to be applied in costing research and in associating indirect costs with particular research agreements. Agencies are requested to promulgate this document without change, where practicable, in order to assure uniformity of approach throughout the Government.

(b) Attachment B: "General Standards for Selected Items of Cost."

This document sets forth standards with respect to the allowability of the particular items of cost listed therein. The need for a continuing review of these standards is recognized; individual agencies may find it necessary to request amendments to these standards from time to time. (See 4c below.)

4. Objectives: The objective of this circular and its attachments is to provide to educational institutions recognition of their full allocated costs of research under generally accepted cost accounting principles. Alternative methods are specified as permissible in unusual circumstances or to prevent inequities. No provision for profit or other increment above cost is intended.

5. Reports: Agencies that sponsor research and development work at educational institutions are requested to report to the Bureau of the Budget as follows:

(a) On or before November 30, 1958: Advise by letter the extent to which the provisions of this circular have been placed in effect, and include copies of any internal instructions issued.

(b) On or before June 30, 1960: Advise by letter any changes to attachment A of this circular which the agency considers desirable.

(c) As necessary: Advise by letter any changes to attachment B of this circular which the agency considers to be of sufficient importance to warrant consideration. Include drafts of language covering any amendments for which consideration is desired.

By direction of the President:

MAURICE H. STANS,
Director.

(Attachments.)

ATTACHMENT A

PRINCIPLES FOR DETERMINING APPLICABLE COSTS UNDER RESEARCH AGREEMENTS

I. GENERAL

A. Purpose and scope

1. This attachment sets forth the general principles which Federal agencies are requested to follow in determining the allowable costs of research and development performed by educational institutions under grants, cost-reimbursement-type contracts, and cost-reimbursement-type subcontracts. To the extent costs are applicable, these principles may also be used as a guide for the pricing of fixed price contracts and subcontracts.

2. It is the intent of these principles to provide Government agencies and educational institutions with a common basis for determining the allowable costs of research sponsored by the Federal Government. Application of these principles should enable agencies and institutions to identify the allowable direct costs of such research, plus the allocable portion of the allowable indirect costs, less applicable credits. The tests of allowability of costs applied in these principles are reasonableness and allocability under consistently applied generally accepted cost accounting principles and practices; however, these provisions are subject to any limitations as to types or amounts of costs set forth in the research agreement.

3. These principles do not attempt to identify the circumstances or dictate the extent of agency and institution participation in the financing of a particular research and development project, but rather are confined to the subject of cost determination. Arrangements concerning financial participation are properly the subject of negotiation between the particular agency and the educational institution concerned.

4. These principles should be applied to all Government-sponsored research at an educational institution, including research conducted at locations other than the main campus of the institution.

5. A negotiated fixed amount in lieu of indirect costs may be appropriate in certain instances for off-campus or segregated research projects where (a) research agreements are charged directly for the cost of many of their administrative or housekeeping services, or (b) the cost of benefits derived from an institution's indirect services cannot be readily determined by use of apportionment or allocation bases normally employed, or (c) the costs of apportioning and allocating expenses to research agreements are excessive. The negotiated amount should not exceed a conservative estimate of anticipated indirect costs.

B. Definition of terms

1. For the purposes of this document, the following terms are defined:

(a) Research agreements are agreements to perform federally sponsored research through grants, cost-reimbursement type contracts, cost-reimbursement type subcontracts, and fixed price contracts and subcontracts for research.

(b) Apportionment is the process by which the indirect costs of the institution are assigned to (1) instruction and research, and (2) other institutional activities.

(c) Allocation is the process by which the indirect costs apportioned to instruction and research are distributed to research agreements.

(d) Sponsoring agency means the Federal agency for which the institution is performing research. Its use in this document does not imply a change in concept or intent for those agencies that have traditionally used a grant rather than a contractual instrument.

(e) Original complement means the complement of equipment initially placed in buildings to perform the functions currently being performed in such buildings. If a permanent change in the function of a building takes place, a redetermination of the original complement of equipment may be made at that time to establish a new original complement.

(f) Other institutional activities means all organized activities of an institution not directly related to the instruction and research functions, such as residence halls, dining halls, student hospitals, student unions, intercollegiate athletics, book stores, faculty housing, student apartments, guest houses, chapels, theaters, public museums, financial campaigns, and other similar activities or auxiliary enterprises. Also included under this definition is any category of cost treated as "unallowable," provided such category of cost identifies a function or activity to which a portion of the institution's general overhead expenses are properly allocable.

C. Direct costs

1. Direct costs are those identified as having been specifically incurred to perform a particular research agreement. The general types of direct costs are:

(a) Direct salaries and wages, including employee benefit expenses and pension plan costs (see attachment B) to the extent that they are consistently treated by the educational institution as a direct rather than an indirect cost, are those applicable directly to the performance of a research agreement. Such salaries and wages should be charged at the actual rates paid by the institution. Where professional staff paid on a salary basis work directly part time on a research agreement, current and reasonable estimates of time spent may be used in the absence of actual time records.

(b) Direct material costs include raw materials, purchased or supplied from stock, which are directly consumed or expended in the performance of a research agreement, or are otherwise applicable directly to a research agreement.

(c) Other direct costs include other expenses related directly to a particular research agreement or project, including abnormal utility consumption. This may include services purchased from institution service operations, provided such are consistently treated as direct rather than indirect costs and are priced under a recognized method of costing or pricing designed to recover only actual costs and conforming to generally accepted cost accounting practices consistently followed by the institution. Purchases of equipment will be included under this heading only to the extent expressly provided for in the research agreement or approved pursuant to such agreement.

D. Indirect costs

1. Indirect costs are those which, because of their incurrence for common or joint objectives, are not readily subject to treatment as direct costs of research agreements or other activities. The general types of indirect costs are:

(a) General administration and general expenses are those incurred for the general executive and administrative offices of educational institutions and other expenses of a general character which do not relate solely to any specific division of the institution. Employee benefit expenses and pension plan costs may be included in this category to the extent that they are consistently treated by the educational institution as an indirect rather than a direct cost.

(b) Research administration expenses are those which apply to research administered in whole or in part by a separate organization or an identifiable administrative unit. Examples of work relating to research which is sometimes performed under such organizational arrangement are: contract administration, security, purchasing, personnel administration, and editing and publishing of research data.

(c) Operation and maintenance expenses are those incurred for operating and maintaining the institution's physical plant. They include expenses normally incurred by the institution for administration or supervision of the physical plant; janitorial service; repairs and ordinary or normal alterations of buildings, furniture and equipment; care and maintenance of grounds; utilities; and other expenses customarily associated with the operation, maintenance, preservation and protection of the physical plant.

(d) Library expenses are those incurred for direct operation of the library plus a use allowance for library books. The use allowance shall not exceed 8 cents per volume per year.

(e) Use allowance is a means of compensation for the use of buildings, capital improvements, and equipment over and above the expenses for operation and maintenance when depreciation or other equivalent costs are not considered. The use allowance for buildings and improvements shall be computed at an annual rate not to exceed 2 percent of acquisition cost. The use allowance for equipment shall be computed at an annual rate not exceeding 6⅔ percent of acquisition cost of usable equipment in those cases where the institution maintains current records with respect to such equipment on hand. Where the institution's records reflect only the cost (actual or estimated) of the original complement of equipment, the use allowance shall be computed at an annual rate not exceeding 10 percent of such cost. In those cases where no equipment records are maintained, the institution will justify a reasonable estimate of the acquisition cost of usable equipment which may be used to compute the use allowance at an annual rate not exceeding 6⅔ percent of such estimate. Computation of the use allowance shall exclude the portion of the cost of buildings and equipment paid for out of Federal funds and the cost of grounds.

(f) Indirect departmental expenses are those incurred for departmental administration, such as salaries of deans or heads of colleges, schools, departments or divisions, and related secretarial and other administrative expenses.

E. Applicable costs

1. The cost of a research agreement is comprised of the allowable direct costs incident to its performance, plus the allocable portion of the allowable indirect costs of the institution, less applicable credits.

2. When any types of expense ordinarily treated as indirect costs are charged to a research agreement as direct costs, the costs of similar items applicable to other activities of the institution must be eliminated from indirect costs allocable to the research agreement.

3. Where a particular understanding has been reached regarding specific items of cost to be reimbursed, the research agreement should clearly state such understanding.

4. Attachment B provides standards to be applied in determining the allowability of certain items of cost. Attachment B also identifies certain types of expenditures which relate solely to instruction and therefore do not enter into the costs of research agreements, either as direct costs or indirect costs; such costs of instruction shall be excluded from the computations provided herein.

II. DETERMINATION OF INDIRECT COSTS

A. General

1. In determining the indirect costs applicable to federally sponsored research agreements, the allowable indirect costs should first be apportioned equitably between (a) instruction and research activity and (b) other institutional activities, as provided in paragraph II–B below.

2. The amounts of indirect costs apportioned to instruction and research should then be allocated in an equitable manner to research agreements, as provided in paragraph II–C below.

3. Actual conditions must be taken into account in determining the most suitable method or methods to be used in the apportionment and allocation of indirect costs. The objective should be the selection of a method or methods which will distribute the indirect costs in a fair and equitable manner to the Government research and development work and other work of the institution, giving due consideration to the nature and extent of the use of the institution's facilities by research personnel, academic staff, students, and other personnel or activities, and to the materiality of the amounts involved. The methods used should conform with generally accepted cost accounting practices, provide uniformity of treatment for like cost elements, be applied consistently, and produce equitable results. Any significant change, such as in the nature or extent of Government work or other activities sponsored or conducted by the institution, may require reconsideration of the methods previously in use to determine whether they continue to be equitable.

B. Apportionment

1. Where indirect costs relate to research, instruction, and other activities, such indirect costs shall be apportioned as between (a) instruction and research activities, and (b) other institutional activities as defined in paragraph I(B)(1)(f) above. The apportionment shall be made as follows:

(a) General administration and general expenses, on the basis of total expenditures; if more appropriate in the circumstances, however, other bases may be used.

(b) Operation and maintenance of the physical plant, if not separately costed, on the basis of total square or cubic footage of the buildings.

(c) Other types of indirect costs normally do not require apportionment. Where they do, an equitable basis for making the apportionment should be selected.

C. Allocation

1. After determination of the total amount of indirect costs applicable to instruction and research activities, such indirect costs shall in turn be allocated between instruction activities and research agreements as described below.

2. The following criteria should be used with such appropriate modifications as will under the circumstances produce reasonably equitable allocation of the indirect costs associated with research agreements:

(a) General administration and general expenses should normally be allocated on the basis of total expenditures (exclusive of capital expenditures and use allowances) if equitable, direct salaries and wages, or other bases appropriate in the circumstances.

(b) Research administration expenses should be allocated to (1) applicable research agreements and (2) other research benefiting therefrom on the basis of records reflecting the proportion fairly applicable to each or, in the absence of such records, on the basis of a reasonable estimate.

(c) Operation and maintenance expenses should be allocated on a basis that gives primary emphasis to space utilization. The amount allocated may be developed as follows:

(1) Where actual space and related cost records are or can readily be maintained without significant change in the accounting practices, the amount allocated to research agreements should be based on such data.

(2) Where the space and related cost records maintained are not sufficient for purposes of (1) above, a reasonable estimate of the proportion of total space assigned to research agreements normally will suffice, and this proportion of operation and maintenance expense should be allocated to research agreements. Where it can be established that the cost of maintaining space assigned to research varies significantly from the cost of maintaining other space, appropriate weighting factors may be used to give effect to such variations.

(3) Where more definitive information is not available, either of the following simplified techniques for determining space may be used, as most appropriate:

(a) Reduce the total space identified with instruction and research by the amount of space occupied by undergraduate students, including appropriate portions of classrooms and access and related space. Reduce by the same proportion the amount of maintenance and operation expense that has been apportioned to instruction and research, and then allocate to research agreements on the basis of the relationship that direct salaries and wages of research agreements bears to direct salaries and wages of instruction and research; or

(b) Prepare a reasonable estimate of the average gross space assigned per research worker, and extend to the equivalent annual number of research workers under research agreements. The resulting product should then be related to total space assigned to instruction and research in order to obtain the proportion of space utilized for research agreements. The resulting proportion should then be applied to operation and maintenance expense to obtain the amount allocable to research agreements.

(4) Where it can be demonstrated that an area or volume of space basis of allocation is impractical or inequitable, other bases may be used provided consideration is given to the use of facilities by research personnel and others, including students.

(d) Library expenses should normally be allocated to research agreements on the basis of population including students and other users. Where appropriate, consideration may be given to weighting segments of the population figures as necessary to produce equitable results.

(e) Use allowance for buildings and equipment should, if depreciation or other equivalent costs are not considered, be computed in accordance with paragraph I(D)(e). The cost of buildings and equipment used by "other institutional activities" (as defined) should be excluded from any computation of use allowances. If available records permit, use allowances may be specifically allocated in whole or in part to research agreements. In the absence of such usable records, use allowance may be allocated to research agreements on the same basis as that used for allocating operation and maintenance expenses.

(f) Indirect departmental expenses. The salaries and wages of department heads and their offices, including the allocated portion of deans of schools and their offices, which jointly benefit both research agreements and other activities should be allocated between research agreements administered or supervised by the department and other work of the department on any equitable basis, possibly direct salaries and wages, total direct expenditures, or approximate time so devoted. Where equitable results would be obtained, the distribution may be made on a composite base which would include all schools and departments.

3. Indirect costs allocated to research agreements normally should be treated as a common pool. The costs in such common pool should then be distributed to individual research agreements benefiting therefrom on a single rate basis. This rate will be the percentage which the indirect cost pool is of direct salaries and wages of the applicable research agreements. If appropriate, total direct expenditures may be used rather than salaries and wages.

4. It is recognized that in certain cases, due to the nature of the work, the facilities or personnel involved, or other considerations, the application of a single indirect expense rate on research agreements may produce inequitable results to the institution or to the Government. In such cases, it may be necessary to develop two or more indirect expense rates by means of: (a) Appropriate adjustment to the basic indirect expense rate developed through use of the common pool, or (b) segregation of the indirect expenses allocated to research agreements into two or more indirect expense pools. In the latter case, the costs in each such pool will be distributed to the specific research agreements benefiting therefrom on the basis of direct wages and salaries or total direct expenditures, as appropriate. Examples of conditions which may justify the development of two or more pools of indirect expense are:

(a) Where the nature of a particular type of overhead cost requires a different basis of allocation to produce equitable results.

(b) Where a research agreement or group of agreements or the facility in which such agreement(s) is performed provides its own services to a significant degree, as may be in the case of a hospital or a segregated or off-campus facility.

(c) Where a research agreement requires significantly different degrees of indirect services from the institution. For example, such conditions may exist where: (1) significant amounts of Government-owned facilities or equipment are provided in lieu of that normally furnished by the institution, (2) a research agreement requires an unusual amount of power or other utilities, (3) the cost of a special library provided in lieu of regular library services is reimbursed by the Government, or (4) construction constitutes a significant portion of the work.

(d) Where it is appropriate to associate certain costs more directly with the activities benefited, such as where the research work is performed on one campus of a multicampus university.

5. Where research is separately administered, in whole or in part, or separate services are provided in lieu of those services normally provided by the institution, the cost of the normal institutional administration or other services replaced thereby shall be excluded from allocation to such research.

D. Overhead determinations acceptable under special circumstances

1. Indirect costs may be claimed at a rate which is anticipated to be less than that which would otherwise be allowable with provision made in the research agreement for adjustment if actual costs subsequently prove to be less than the claimed rate.

2. The degree of preciseness required in the computation of indirect costs will be influenced by considerations such as the materiality of the amounts involved, the size of the educational institution, and the aggregate dollar volume of Government-sponsored research at the institution. Generally, where the total direct cost of Government-sponsored research and development work at an institution does not exceed $250,000 in a year, the use of abbreviated procedures in the determination of allowable indirect costs may be acceptable when the results obtained are equitable. For example, educational institutions which have a relatively small dollar volume of Government-sponsored research may compute allowable indirect expenses on the basis of data available in the institution's financial reports. One permissible method in such cases would contemplate the use of a single indirect expense pool composed of:

(a) General and administrative expenses, exclusive of unallowable costs (see attachment B), but inclusive of allocable salaries and expenses of deans of schools and department heads.

(b) Operation and maintenance expenses.

(c) Library expenses.

The indirect expense pool should then be allocated to research agreements and other activities of the institution on any equitable basis, possibly total expenditures (exclusive of capital expenditures).

ATTACHMENT B

GENERAL STANDARDS FOR SELECTED ITEMS OF COST

A. PURPOSE AND APPLICABILITY

1. This attachment provides standards to be applied in determining the allowability of certain items of cost. All Federal agencies that sponsor research and development work at educational institutions should adopt these standards and apply them to the extent deemed practicable in determining costs under grants and contracts for such work.

2. The standards adopted hereunder should apply irrespective of whether a particular item of cost is properly treated as direct cost or indirect cost. Failure to mention a particular item of cost in the standards should not imply that it is either allowable or unallowable; rather determination as to allowability in such case should be based on the treatment or standards provided for similar or related items of cost.

3. In case of discrepancy between the provisions of a specific research agreement and the applicable standards provided, the provisions of the research agreement should govern.

B. COSTS APPLICABLE TO INSTRUCTION

1. Except as specifically noted, the following types of costs apply only to instruction and therefore do not enter into the costs of research agreements, either as direct costs or indirect costs, unless specific provision is made therefor in the research agreement:

(a) Commencement and convocation costs.

(b) Sabbatical leave costs, including leave of absence to employees for performance of graduate work or sabbatical study, travel or research.

(c) Scholarships, fellowships, tuition and other forms of student aid costs. However, in certain cases such costs may be allocable in part to research agreements under the conditions set forth in paragraph C-35 of this attachment.

(d) Student services costs, including such activities as deans of students, administration of student affairs, registrar, placement officers, student advisers, student health and infirmary services, and such other activities as are identifiable with student services. However, in the case of students actually engaged in work under research agreements, a proportion of student services costs measured by the relationship between hours of work by students on such research work and total student hours including all research time may be allowed as a part of research administration expenses.

C. ALLOWABLE AND UNALLOWABLE COSTS

1. Advertising costs include the cost of advertising media and related technical and administrative costs. Only the following advertising costs are allowable: (a) help wanted advertising, (b) other advertising necessary for the performance of the research agreement to the extent authorized.

2. Bad debts including losses (whether actual or estimated) arising from uncollectible accounts and other claims, related collection costs, and related legal costs are unallowable.

3. Capital expenditures are unallowable except as provided for in the research agreement. This includes costs of books, equipment, and buildings, as well as repairs which materially increase the value or useful life of such equipment or building.

4. Civil defense costs are those incurred in planning for, and the protection of life and property against, the possible effects of enemy attack. Reasonable costs of civil defense measures (including costs in excess of normal plant protection costs, first aid training and supplies, firefighting training, posting of additional exit notices and directions, and other approved civil defense measures) undertaken on the institution's premises pursuant to suggestions or requirements of civil defense authorities are allowable when apportioned to all activities of the institution. Capital expenditures for civil defense purposes shall not be allowed, but a use allowance may be permitted in accordance with provisions set forth elsewhere. Costs of local civil defense projects not on the institution's premises are unallowable.

5. Communication costs including telephone services, local and long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, radiograms, postage, and the like are allowable.

6. Compensation for personal services. Each institution shall maintain control over its salary and wage rates according to its established policy consistently applied, provided, however, that the excess of salary and wage rates paid to personnel working on Government research agreements over salary and wage rates paid to personnel working on the institution's departmental research or other research will not be allowed unless specifically provided in the agreement or approved by the contracting officer. This principle does not prohibit the charging of the full salary of any temporary employee in whose favor a salary differential exists solely by virtue of the nature of his employment in accordance with the regular practice of the institution concerned. Faculty members shall be considered as employed for the period represented by the sum of all semesters and other periods during which they are required to work under the practice of the institution concerned. (Example: Professor of X institution is required to work two semesters of 4½ months each, or a total of 9 months out of the academic year. His compensation is $5,400. During the summer months, July, August, and September, he works full time on Government research projects in the institution laboratory. Unless the established practice of the institution relating to summer compensation, not based on Government contract experience, would result in a different computation, his compensation for that period, chargeable by the institution to the Government research agreement, will be $1,800, computed as follows: $5,400÷9=$600; $600×3=$1,800.)

7. Contingency provisions to provide for events the occurrence of which cannot be foretold with certainty as to time, intensity, or with an assurance of their happening, are unallowable.

8. Deans of faculty and graduate schools, or their equivalents, including their staffs and related expenses, are allowable.

9. Employee morale, health, and welfare costs and credits, such as house publications, health or first-aid clinics and/or infirmaries, recreational activities, and employees' counseling services, incurred in accordance with the institution's established practice or custom for the improvement of working conditions, employer-employee relations, employee morale, and employee performance, are allowable. Such costs shall be equitably apportioned to all activities of the institution. Income generated from any of these activities shall be credited to the cost thereof unless such income has been irrevocably set over to employee welfare organization.

10. Entertainment costs including costs of amusement, social activities, entertainment, and incidental costs relating thereto, such as meals, lodging, rentals, transportation, and gratuities, are unallowable.

11. Equipment and other facilities: The cost of equipment or other facilities, including books purchased specifically for use on the project, are allowable where such purchases are approved by the sponsoring agency concerned or provided for by the terms of the research agreement.

12. Fines and penalties: Costs resulting from violations of, or failure of the institution to comply with, Federal, State, and local laws and regulations are unallowable except when incurred as a result of compliance with specific provisions of the research agreement, or instructions in writing from the contracting officer.

13. Insurance and indemnification: Insurance includes those types of insurance which the institution is required to carry, or which is approved, under the terms of the research agreement, and any other insurance which the institution maintains in the general conduct of its activities. Indemnification includes securing the instituion against liabilities to third persons and other losses not compensated by insurance or otherwise.

(a) Costs of insurance required or approved, and maintained, pursuant to the research agreement, are allowable.

(b) Costs of other insurance maintained by the institution in connection with the general conduct of its activities, are allowable subject to the following limitations:

(1) Types and extent and cost of coverage shall be in accordance with sound institutional practice;

(2) Costs of insurance or of any contributions to any reserve covering the risk of loss of or damage to Government-owned property are unallowable except to the extent that the Government shall have required or approved such costs;

(3) Contributions to a reserve for an approved self-insurance program are allowable to the extent that the types of coverage, extent of coverage, and the rates and premiums would have been allowed had insurance been purchased to cover the risks;

(4) Costs of insurance on the lives of officers or trustees are unallowable except where such insurance is part of an employee plan which is not unduly restricted; and

(5) Actual losses which could have been covered by permissible insurance (through an approved self-insurance program or otherwise) are unallowable unless expressly provided for in the research agreement, except: (a) costs incurred because of losses not covered under nominal deductible insurance coverage provided in keeping with sound business practice are allowable; and (b) minor losses not covered by insurance, such as spoilage, breakage and disappearance of small handtools, which occur in the ordinary course of doing business, are allowable.

14. Interest costs for interest on borrowed capital or temporary use of endowment funds, however represented, are unallowable.

15. Investment counsel and staff costs are unallowable.

16. Labor relations costs incurred in maintaining satisfactory relations between the institution and its employees, including costs of labor management committees, employees' publications, and other related activities are allowable.

17. Losses on other research agreements or contracts: Any excess of costs over income under any other research agreement or contract of any nature is unallowable. This includes, but is not limited to, the institution's contributed portion by reason of cost-sharing agreements or any under-recoveries through negotiation of flat amounts for overhead.

18. Maintenance and repair costs necessary for the upkeep of property (including Government property unless otherwise provided for) which neither add to the permanent value of the property nor appreciably prolong its intended life but keep it in an efficient operating condition, are allowable.

19. Material costs of purchased materials, supplies, and fabricated parts directly or indirectly related to the research agreement are allowable. Purchases made specifically for the research agreement should be charged thereto at their actual prices after deducting all cash discounts, trade discounts, rebates, and allowances received by the institution. Withdrawals from general stores or stockrooms should be charged at their cost under any recognized method of pricing stores withdrawals conforming to sound accounting practices consistently followed by the institution. Incoming transportation charges are a proper part of material cost. Direct material cost should include only the materials and supplies actually used for the performance of the research agreement, and due credit should be given for any excess materials retained, or returned to vendors. Due credit should be given for all proceeds or value received for any scrap resulting from work under the research agreement. Where Government-donated or furnished material is used in performing the research agreement, such material will be used without charge.

20. Memberships, subscriptions and professional activity costs.

(a) Membership costs of the institution's membership in civic, business, technical, and professional organizations are allowable.

(b) Subscription costs of the institution's subscriptions to civic, business, professional, and technical periodicals are allowable, excepting those obtained for the library for which a use allowance is made.

(c) Meetings and conferences. This item includes cost of meals, transportation, rental of facilities for meetings, and costs incidental thereto, when the primary purpose of the incurrence of such costs is the dissemination of technical information. Such costs are allowable.

21. Patent costs: Costs of preparing disclosures, reports, and other documents required by the research agreement and of searching the art to the extent necessary to make such invention disclosures, are allowable. In accordance with the clauses of the research agreement relating to patents, costs of preparing documents and any other patent costs, in connection with the filing of a patent application where title is conveyed to the Government, are allowable. (See also C-32 below.)

22. Pension plan costs are allowable if in accordance with the established policies of the institution, provided such policies meet the test of reasonableness and the methods of cost allocation are not discriminatory, and provided appropriate adjustments are made for credits or gains arising out of normal and abnormal employee turnover or any other contingencies that can result in forfeitures by employees which inure to the benefit of the institution.

23. Plant security costs including wages, uniforms and equipment of personnel engaged in plant protection, and necessary expenses to comply with Government security requirements, are allowable.

24. Preresearch agreement costs are those which are incurred prior to the effective date of the research agreement whether or not they would have been allowable thereunder if incurred after such date. Such costs are unallowable unless specifically set forth and identified in the research agreement.

25. Professional services costs—legal, accounting, engineering and other.

(a) Costs of professional services rendered by the members of a particular profession who are not employees of the institution are allowable, subject to (b) and (c) below, when reasonable in relation to the services rendered and when not contingent upon recovery of the costs from the Government. Retainer fees to be allowable must be reasonably supported by evidence of services rendered.

(b) Factors to be considered in determining the allowability of costs in a particular case include:

(1) The past pattern of such costs, particularly in the years prior to the award of Government research agreements;

(2) The impact of Government research agreements on the institution's total activity;

(3) The nature and scope of managerial services expected of the institution's own organizations; and

(4) Whether the proportion of Government work to the institution's total activity is such as to influence the institution in favor of incurring the cost, particularly where the services rendered are not of a continuing nature and have little relationship to work under Government research agreements.

(c) Costs of legal, accounting, and consulting services, and related costs, incurred in connection with organization and reorganization, and the prosecution of claims against the Government, are unallowable. Costs of legal, accounting and consulting services, and related costs, incurred in connection with patent infringement litigation, are unallowable unless otherwise provided for in the research agreement.

26. Profits and losses on disposition of plant, equipment, or other capital assets. Profits or losses of any nature arising from the sale or exchange of plant, equipment, or other capital assets, including sale or exchange of either short- or long-term investments, shall be excluded in computing research agreement costs.

27. Proposal costs are the costs of preparing bids or proposals on potential Government and non-Government research agreements or projects, including the development of engineering data and cost data necessary to support the institution's bids or proposals. Proposal costs of the current accounting period of both successful and unsuccessful bids and proposals normally should be treated as indirect costs and allocated currently to all activities of the institution, and no proposal costs of past accounting periods shall be allocable in the current period to the Government research agreement. However, the institution's established practices may be to treat proposal costs by some other recognized method. Regardless of the method used, the results obtained may be accepted only if found to be reasonable and equitable.

28. Public information services costs such as news releases pertaining to specific research or scientific accomplishment are unallowable unless specifically authorized by the sponsoring agency.

29. Rearrangement and alteration costs. Ordinary or normal rearrangement and alteration costs are allowable. Special arrangement and alteration costs incurred specifically for the project are allowable when such work has been approved in advance by the sponsoring agency concerned.

30. Reconversion costs are those incurred in the restoration or rehabilitation of the institution's facilities to approximately the same condition existing immediately prior to commencement of Government research agreement work, fair wear and tear excepted. Reconversion costs are allowable, only to the extent of the cost of removing Government property and the restoration or rehabilitation costs caused by such removal.

31. Recruiting costs such as help wanted advertising, operating costs of an employment office necessary to secure and maintain an adequate staff, travel costs of employees while engaged in recruiting personnel, and travel costs of applicants for interviews for prospective employment, are allowable. Where the institution uses employment agencies, costs not in excess of standard commercial rates for such services are also allowable. Costs of special benefits or emoluments offered to prospective employees beyond recognized practices for recruiting such personnel are unallowable.

32. Royalties and other costs for use of patents. Royalties on a patent or amortization of the cost of acquiring a patent or invention or rights thereto, necessary for the proper performance of the research agreement and applicable to tasks or processes thereunder, are allowable unless: (a) the Government has a license or the right to free use of the patent; (b) the patent has been adjudicated to be invalid or has been administratively determined to be invalid; (c) the patent is considered to be unenforceable; or (d) the patent has expired.

33. Severance pay is a payment, in addition to regular salaries and wages, by institutions to employees whose services have been terminated. Severance pay is allowable as a cost only to the extent that it is required by law, employer-employee agreement, established policy that constitutes in effect an implied agreement on the institution's part, or circumstances of the particular employment. Severance payments are divided into two categories as follows:

(a) Those due to normal, recurring turnover. The actual costs of such severance payments shall be regarded as expense applicable to the current fiscal year and equitably apportioned to the institution's activities during that period.

(b) Those due to abnormal or mass terminations. Abnormal or mass severance pay is of such a conjectural nature that measurement of cost by means of an accrual will not achieve equity to both parties. Thus accruals for this purpose are not allowable. However, the Government recognizes its obligation to participate, to the extent of its fair share, in any specific payment. Thus, allowability will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

34. Special services costs, such as general public relations activities, catalogs, and alumni activities, are unallowable.

35. Staff benefits are allowances and services provided by the institution to its employees as compensation in addition to regular wages and salaries. Costs of such staff benefits are allowable and include vacations, holidays, sick leave, military leave, employee insurance, social security taxes and workmen's compensation insurance. The payment of tuition or remission of tuition for employees and their families are allowable to the extent that such payments or remissions are made under established policies consistently applied.

36. Taxes: In general, taxes which the institution is required to pay and which are paid or accrued in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and payments made to local governments in lieu of taxes which are commensurate with the local government services received are allowable, except for:

(a) Taxes from which exemptions are available to the institution directly or which are available to the institution based on an exemption afforded the Government and in the latter case when the sponsoring agency makes available the necessary exemption certificates.

(b) Special assessments on land which represent capital improvements.

Any refund of taxes, interest, or penalties, and any payment to the institution of interest thereon, attributable to taxes, interest, or penalties which were allowed as research agreement costs, shall be credited or paid to the Government in the manner directed by the Government provided any interest actually paid or credited to an institution incident to a refund of tax, interest and penalty shall be paid or credited to the Government only to the extent that such interest accrued over the period during which the institution had been reimbursed by the Government for the taxes, interest, and penalties.

37. Transportation costs: Transportation costs include freight, express, cartage, and postage charges relating either to goods purchased, in process, or delivered. These costs are allowable. When such costs can readily be identified with the items involved, they may be direct costed as transportation costs or added to the cost of such items. Where identification with the materials received cannot readily be made, inbound transportation costs may be charged to the appropriate indirect cost accounts if the institution follows a consistent, equitable procedure in this respect. Outbound freight, if reimbursable under the terms of the research agreement, should be treated as a direct cost.

38. Travel costs consist of transportation, lodging, subsistence, and incidental expenses.

(a) Travel costs incurred by institution personnel in a travel status while on specific research business are allowable.

(b) Travel costs incurred in the normal course of overall administration of the institution and applicable to the entire institution are allowable. Such costs shall be equitably apportioned to all work of the institution.

(c) Subsistence and lodging, including tips or similar incidental costs, are allowable either on an actual or per diem basis. The basis selected shall apply to an entire trip and not selected days of the trip.

(d) Costs of personnel movement of a special or mass nature are allowable only when authorized or approved in writing by the sponsoring agency or its authorized representative.

EXCERPT FROM MARCH 7, 1962, TRANSCRIPT

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Just one question I would like to ask Dr. Seamans.

In respect to these contracts with the universities, this is on a set basis, that is, the contract covers some dollars? Is there a provision in the contract for additional cost, are they allowed so much, say less 15 percent or 20 percent?

Mr. WYATT. Mr. RIEHLMAN, there are two kinds of relations. One is straight contract, which is treated fiscally as any other contract. They estimate their cost and overhead. This is handled in accordance with contractual procedure. We do have grants. The difference being that we do not ask for the specific execution of a specific task grant. In this case it is a dollar grant to the university, subject to the audit as to whether the charges against it——

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I know in the Department of Defense for a long time there was overhead of additional amounts up to 15 or 20 percent that could be charged against a research program by universities. HEW has the same program and they are up to 15 percent.

The Defense Department has eliminated any percentage and they can come in at a later date with additional overhead costs and sometimes it is as much as 100 percent. I just learned this the other day. I hope we are not going to get in that same situation.

Mr. SIEPERT. Our overhead in this regard is the same as Defense. There is campus overhead rate which is determined by audit agencies from the military department. That rate is applied to all our contracts in the institution.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I don't want to prolong the discussion. Somewhere along the line I hope we can get into this matter, because I know HEW is asking for this restriction to be taken off their contracts with the universities. It is 15 percent and they are held to that position. They want to follow the line of the Defense Department, that there be no limit as to the amount of overhead that can be charged in addition to the original contract.

I think we should explore this. I am certainly not going to request that we hold to the limit of 15 percent. I think there must be a limitation somewhere.

Mr. RYAN. I think that is a good point. I wonder if we could see a sample contract that you have and see exactly how it is spelled out.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I'm not opposing to the universities that are carrying on these research programs having some leeway for additional overhead expense, but I just don't think you can take off completely the limitation and this has been done in the Defense Department and I repeat, HEW has a limit of 15 percent and they are now pleading for that to be removed or lifted.

Mr. RYAN. Hasn't NASA written a restriction in their contracts with the universities?

Mr. SIEPERT. We have not assumed an obligation. We negotiate with the university based on established overhead rates which were audited rates as of a given period of time. We do not obligate ourselves to pay some sudden charge in the overhead rate. I will have to get the exact information and supply it to the committee. They do provide at the completion of a school year or calendar year, the auditors from the agency do come in and audit again the actual expenditures; if it was any less we take the benefit of it. We do not write in unlimited cost arrangements.

Mr. DADDARIO. Perhaps Mr. Siepert could go into this just a bit since it has been opened up as to why it is necessary to have this fluctuating capability.

Mr. SIEPERT. You mean a predicted rate and actual rate?

Mr. DADDARIO. To get the answer to Mr. RIEHLMAN's question. Why can't you put a ceiling on it so you will know you are not going over that?

Mr. SIEPERT. My impression and I would like to correct this if I am wrong, that the only fluctuation in this is in favor of the Government. If it goes down, we don't pay.

Mr. DADDARIO. The times when you go over 15 percent are very few, but you need the capacity?

Mr. SIEPERT. Let me correct that. The 15-percent limitation is a limitation that the Congress has placed in the appropriation bills for each year in the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation.

This is not an audited expenditure rate of the campuses. This is a point of disagreement where the universities have held that in this situation the Federal Government is only paying a portion of the true overhead that is applicable to these particular grants. I don't propose to evaluate the competency.

Mr. DADDARIO. Is it your opinion that 15 percent is a proper limitation?

Mr. SIEPERT. In response to your direct question, I think it is not. I think the universities have been requested to perform an essential public service and that their sources of income to provide for their total operation of the institution as an educational enterprise, and in addition perform research for the Federal Government, requires that some way or another that their true overhead cost be paid.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Let me ask you this question: Are you in favor of taking off completely limitation?

Mr. SIEPERT. No, sir. If you mean by taking it off that universities can charge the Federal Government any overhead that comes in its head, the answer is "No."

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I don't want it that broad. I am talking about a limitation. We had it written in the appropriations bill and we still have it in HEW. The Defense Department has decided to take off completely any percentage amount based on percentage and let them come in and press their overhead cost and apparently accepted it after evaluating it.

My question is, Do you feel that this is the way NASA should handle it, or should they have some percentage limitation that they can charge over and above the regular contract that they have entered into or leave it wide open?

Mr. SIEPERT. I believe it should be subject to looking at the facts. This does not make it wide open. There have been detailed discussions with these campus people each time. The basic problem is to reach an agreement between the Government and the university as to which of their costs are incurred because they are teaching people and which of their costs they have had to put in the picture because they are performing research for the Federal Government.

What you are saying should it just be the college point of view that should prevail? Obviously the answer is "No."

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I agree it is a complicated problem to evaluate exactly what they are allowed to charge against the contract versus what they would charge for teaching purposes.

Mr. DADDARIO. You think it should have a strong auditing?

Mr. SIEPERT. I think it can be controlled with a strong auditing. In the past the campus rates have been so determined.

Mr. RYAN. As I understand it, there is no limitation on the NASA appropriations?

Mr. SIEPERT. No. We coordinate this part of our procurement policy with the Department of Defense.

Mr. RYAN. Who does the auditing or does DOD do it?

Mr. SIEPERT. By an agreement with the Department of Defense, we do not audit separately the campus overhead of any institution which has work under way for the Department of Defense. As a result, the Department of Defense has put their auditing staff in there. We have only one Government group go over the books of the campus for that purpose.

We accept those figures.

Mr. RYAN. Are there instances where you have a contract with the campus and the DOD isn't involved at all?

Mr. SIEPERT. At the present time, no.

Mr. TEAGUE. At the present time how about the National Science Foundation?

Mr. SIEPERT. I am sorry. I think the AEC may have some of the campuses.

The predominant ones I would think the Army actually has the major amount of auditing of college campuses. We could get that information.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I would like it.

I think at a later date we might like to go into this more fully.

EXCERPT OF TRANSCRIPT OF MARCH 8, 1962—SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

Mr. TEAGUE. Dr. Siepert, after our prior discussion, the land-grant college contacted me concerning this 15 percent we discussed.

Should there be any figure? Should there be any limit?

Mr. SIEPERT. Our recommendation would be "No."

We believe the way that the overhead is negotiated now by quite rough-minded auditors from the Government is such that the universities under the present policy are only recovering that overhead which is fairly attributable to the research load we place upon them.

I am planning, Mr. RIEHLMAN, to put in the record certain additional information in response to your question.

Since this has come up, I would like to correct one thing.

I was in some doubt yesterday as to whether there was a precise controlling limitation on the overhead rising after we had reached an obligation with the university.

The situation is that these overhead rates are determined in accordance with the Bureau of the Budget Circular A-21. The Department of Defense, prior to the issuance of this circular, did its own determinations in accordance with criteria with the so-called Aspera Armed Services Procurements Regulations in the last 2 years, have been converting to the A-21 Circular.

Now in this, what we do is reach an agreement on a provisional basis.

The provisional basis is the last audited rate. This is a determination made unilaterally by the Government based upon its examination of the books, not what the university wants us to pay.

At the end of the fiscal period, there is another audit made and the overhead is adjusted to the actual expenses that were incurred.

Now the question, I believe yesterday, was, "Is a university in a position substantially to change its overhead experience during that period of time and, if so, are we just obligated to pay whatever comes up?"

We have checked that against our own records over a 2-year period of time and find there is a remarkable stability between provisional rates and the actual.

Over a 2-year period of time there has only been a change of 3 percentage points on the average in the cases we looked at at random.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. With your experience for the past 2 years, what has been the percentage of overhead in respect to the actual contract?

Mr. SIEPERT. The percentage we use is computed on a different base than the 15 percent you asked about yesterday.

Our understanding of the 15 percent is that this is 5 percent of the total of direct costs in the grant.

Our percentages under Circular A-21 are computed only against the direct labor costs that are in the grant and not supplies and materials, and equipment, and that sort of thing.

So these percentage rates we use will show higher; whether they are actually higher in dollar terms it would be a little hard to compare.

For instance, the Ohio State rate in 1949 was 44 percent. Ohio State University, that is. It was 44 percent again in 1960.

Not all of them are this stable.

The most unusual increase in the percentage is the University of Chicago, according to our records, which was 29 percent of direct labor in 1959; 47 percent in 1960 and 50 per percent in 1961.

See, those are the two extremes with which we are dealing.

The overall average is only a 3-percent climb.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, we will probably go into this in more detail and I think it is well to have on the record whether or not the Department feels there should be a limitation on a percentage basis.

Mr. SEAMANS. Could I make just one comment here, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Mr. Seamans. From my experience, when I was at MIT, I know it happened to be the Navy in this case; the Navy auditors were very careful and very diligent and very thorough in the manner in which they carried out their audit.

It is a complicated business at any institution, because there are facilities that are shared. Actual rooms that are shared.

When you get into the electric light bills and various things that go into the running of a big plant, these things are shared.

Mr. Teague. Yes.

Mr. Seamans. I would myself think that a university would find it very difficult indeed if they were to carry out a program with an arbitrary, somewhat arbitrary, percentage on direct labor, because they have no financial resources that are readily available to pay the difference, assuming that that didn't cover their actual overhead.

Mr. Riehlman. Well, you certainly do have some guidelines set down by GAO, that is, the Defense Department does.

Mr. Siepert. The guidelines that they follow are really not now GAO guidelines, but the Budget Bureau Circular A–21, which was prepared in full cooperation with the General Accounting Office.

There was a joint task force in which they were fully represented.

Mr. Riehlman. I see.

Mr. Siepert. As a matter of fact, Mr. Einhorn, Associate Director of the General Accounting Office, was the representative at that time in that negotiation.

I think one other thing that I might add here that is relevant, we do deal with the universities with two kinds of contractual instruments.

One is a grant, and this is to support the general level of effort work of ideas by their teaching research staff they want to work on which are important to us.

Mr. Seamans. In a given field.

Mr. Siepert. In a given field.

The second, are contracts for them to do a specific job for us including the building of instrumentation that flies in a payload.

Now, the contracts are cost contracts and my remarks this morning have related to the way overhead is determined on the cost contracts.

Now on the grants, on the grant, we pay the overhead—the provisional overhead or the amount requested by the university; whichever is the lesser—and on a number of these grants they will come in and actually request a smaller percentage overhead than, in fact, they request when they are doing contract work.

So that in no event do we go in excess of the so-called A–21 overhead determination.

Mr. Riehlman. That's all I have.

Mr. Teague. Then we have people suggesting a maximum of 42 percent.

Mr. Siepert. The only comment, I'd like to look at the land-grant colleges and find out whether that improves, stabilizes, or hurts their position.

Mr. Holmes. Also on what base.

Mr. Teague. I think that is relevant inasmuch as the present limitation is 15 percent they deal with HEW, so if they get 42 percent they'd be happy.

Mr. Siepert. Except again, the 15 percent they are talking about is 15 percent of a larger base of costs because that's 15 percent of the total cost, not just labor costs.

The 40 percent they are talking about is tied, or should be tied, to labor which is the way that is determined.

Mr. Daddario. Well, Mr. Siepert, from your testimony yesterday, I felt that you leaned toward the position where you kept as flexible as possible just because of what you've said that the 15 percent of the 42 percent is purely relative as the base toward which it's pointed.

Mr. Siepert. That's right.

Mr. Daddario. Therefore, as long as we can be assured that there is a strong auditing procedure, this should take care of the difficulty and not put restrictions upon you, which might prevent you from accomplishing your research and development programs with institutions?

Mr. Siepert. This is right.

Our feeling is that the audit people have now joined together with some common understanding of what our criteria of allocatable cost is and the auditors are pretty hardheaded in using a so-called realistic determination of cost which I think bids—has good promise for introducing comparable treatment of overhead across the various agents.

Mr. Daddario. If Congress places an arbitrary ceiling on this, it places you in the position you really don't have any room to move around on under that?

Mr. Siepert. Our position—we think, in dealing with the universities we want them to engage in work they haven't previously done. It would be extremely difficult to have us get them pioneer in our field if we were not in the position to pay the cost of their overhead.

If we could only pay the direct cost, I think there would be some doubt.

Mr. Daddario. Since you and Dr. Seamans in particular said you think the university should play a better part in the space program than they have, it seems to me this would be a point for us to consider and we should allow as much flexibility as possible.

Mr. Siepert. It is.

We would allow as much flexibility as the present Circular A–21 permits other agencies.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, it would be inconsistent for the Congress to promote higher education by the enactment of appropriate legislation, and, at the same time, to impose a heavy burden on the budgets of our colleges and universities by requiring a 15-percent limitation on the indirect costs allowable on defense research grants.

Since indirect costs of such research are, in fact, much higher than this figure, we would be forcing our universities to subsidize these programs so important to the national defense. Funds that might otherwise be used for education in English, architecture, business, law, and many other fields, would have to be diverted to support Federal contract research projects. This is borne out by the many messages I have received from presidents of leading universities, including Cornell University, of which I am an alumnus.

Furthermore, should a 15-percent limitation be imposed, universities might be forced to adopt the distressing alternative of refusing to accept research assignments from the Defense Department. This would be a serious loss to the country because, in many instances, these institutions possess the best facilities and personnel for research.

Certainly, the Federal Government should never allow excessive overhead costs as a means to aid education, but a carefully administered uniform system of cost accounting should be the method employed to govern the amount of true indirect expenses.

Therefore, I oppose the bill only insofar as it sets an arbitrary limit in this area.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I hope I will not have to object, I wish somebody would explain the amendment that was offered on this side of the aisle, the Cederberg amendment. We did not get an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. That will be done.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observed the following Members standing: Messrs. Mahon, Gross, Meader, Stratton, Santangelo, and Bailey.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to raise the point, but some of the Members who stood had just finished speaking on the amendment and the opposition to this amendment has not yet had an opportunity to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out to the gentleman that some of that comment to which the gentleman referred was addressed to a substitute amendment to the pending amendment, which substitute has since been withdrawn.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, in response to the comment of the gentleman from Iowa, who said that the amendment had not been explained, let me say that there are three amendments, which are related.

The first amendment would add $1 million to the Army research grant section. That is $1 million which was deleted by the committee on the ground that it would be saved by the 15 percent limitation imposed by section 540.

The second amendment takes similar action with respect to the research grant section for the Air Force by restoring the $3 million which the committee deleted for the same reason that it deleted the $1 million for the Army.

The third amendment would strike the limitation contained in section 540 which is a limitation of indirect costs to 15 percent of direct costs. This matter has been thoroughly explained and argued during general debate. I believe the membership understands what the amendments would do. We would simply say that this House is not going to impose a $4 million burden on the educational institutions of higher learning in this country for accepting research grants from the Department of Defense.

Last year, fiscal year 1961, the University of Michigan, on the research that it did for the Federal Government, spent, of its own funds on indirect costs for conducting that research, $1½ million more than the amount reimbursed by the Federal Government.

I say that these hard-pressed institutions of higher learning should not be forced to be put in the position of diverting education funds to a Federal purpose or of refusing to accept defense research grants from the Federal Government because it costs them so much that they cannot take the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my support to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to strike this limitation on the universities. I am doing it on the suggestion of the president of my university that they cannot carry on the programs under the limitation in the bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that unless action of this sort is taken to relieve the squeeze on the educational institutions, some of the universities and colleges simply will not be able to continue to accept these grants for doing research under conditions which make them suffer a loss? Therefore, if we do not vote for this amendment, we are endangering research programs that are essential to our national defense.

Mr. BAILEY. After receiving the wire from the president of my university I had a telephone conversation with them and they said that they had reached the point where they would not be able to carry on these activities further.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I would like to say that if this limitation is carried over into the NASA setup it would greatly retard all of our effort in space. If we take this step suggested by the committee it would be a great step backward.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I desire to associate myself with the remarks made by the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the gentleman from California, and also the remarks made by my able colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SANTANGELO yielded his time to Mr. STRATTON.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, there is no byplay going on with regard to this amendment. It is quite obvious that the Cederberg amendment has support on both sides of the aisle. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] commented on it in great detail in the RECORD yesterday. There is support for the proposal substantially on the Democratic side as there is on the Republican side. As a matter of fact, the elimination of this restriction is a substantial principle of the administration itself.

As I mentioned earlier in the debate, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, Dr. Brown, testified that the Department feels very strongly that there should be no limitation whatsoever.

I think there is some question as to whether the Cederberg amendment will prevail, and the reason for my offering the substitute amendment was simply to preserve our rights so that if the all-out amendment, which I fully support, fails, at least we will have a secondary position to retreat to. I know that sometimes the parliamentary situation is such that after a vote is taken you find there is no secondary position to retreat to. I am glad we have protected that secondary position.

Now, the question in this amendment is simply whether we are going to impose a restriction on the cost of defense research projects carried on by educational institutions which is totally and completely unrealistic and therefore as a practical matter can serve only to gut the educational research programs now being carried on, and, therefore, either seriously undermine our whole research program in the Defense Department or else transfer it either to the Defense Department itself or to some of these so-called nonprofit institutions like the Ramo-Wooldridge Corp., whose rather excessive profits have been a matter of investigation in this Congress over the past couple of years.

I certainly do not think we ought to do anything to harm our defense research program, yet the Assistant Secretary of Defense said the curtailment of the university research activities which the proposal included in section 540 of the committee's bill would bring about would constitute a serious impediment to the research and development programs vital to the Nation's defense and security. It is just as simple as that.

Here we have a system where our great educational institutions are spending 30, 40, in some cases 50 percent in terms of indirect costs because they have different accounting procedures, and the committee comes in and says, "You can spend only 15 percent." The chairman says, "We know that is not realistic, but we are going to meet with the other body." I think we have a responsibility as Members of this body not to put any irresponsible provisions into this measure, not to do anything that would jeopardize our educational institutions, and certainly not to jeopardize our defense program, the essence of which, like the real measure of our security, lies in the superiority of our defense research and development programs over those of the Soviets.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the committee over a period of years has sought to get the executive branch of the Government to come up with some uniform procedures, some consistent rules and regulations in this area. We have been conspicuously unsuccessful. We have not received the necessary results. I do not think there is any excuse for their delay. This committee in its feeling of frustration finally decided we had to make a very arbitrary limitation.

Now the whole matter could be resolved, and I think to the reasonable satisfaction of most people, if the Department would come up with a study that they have promised to produce for some time. That study, which is to include some uniform rules and regulations, is overdue. They have told us it is imminent for some time. We do not think they are playing fair and square with the committee, and we took this action to stimulate them to some affirmative action. I hope and trust that the House will stick with the committee so that we can get results.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to close debate on the pending amendments.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I think there may be some need for clarification of the issue before us. In my town there is a college of about 10,000 students. The colleges have a friend in court in the gentleman who is now addressing you, and who certainly would be one of the last who would want to injure the colleges of our country. I must oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG]. The amendment strikes out an attempt to control the appropriations which the Congress makes. The Congress in its exercise of the power of the purse can assert itself, and contribute to the doing of a better job for this country, or it can abandon its responsibility for, and lose its control of, the power of the purse.

What is the situation, Mr. Chairman? It is proposed that not more than 15 percent of the money which is given in research grants to the colleges can be used for overhead. To grant the colleges money and make the modest request that they use not more than 15 percent for overhead—what is wrong with that? I think we would feel in many cases when we give a grant of money to institutions or States and municipalities, we should ask for matching funds. But we are not asking for any matching funds on these grants. This is Federal aid to education, to the colleges, in and through the Department of Defense.

Most of the work really done by the colleges is not done on the basis of grants. It is done on the basis of contracts. About $300 million of research business is placed by the Department of Defense with the colleges on a contract basis and that is in no way affected by the provision of the bill we are discussing. But about $40 million worth is done on a grant basis. So this limitation applies only to the $40 million, and would provide a modest degree of control. If we do not do this, this situation may get out of hand just like a lot of other things have gotten out of hand. Two years ago the grant program was only $8 million. Last year it was $28 million. This year it is $40 million and it is on its way to a much higher level. This is an effort to bring to bear the control of the Congress on the expenditure of public funds.

The colleges cannot lose any money. The grant money is going to be given to them. They are not going to lose anything, I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota.

It was said when this provision was put in the Health, Education, and Welfare bill about 5 years ago that this limitation would just wreck the program—that it would absolutely wreck it. It was said that the colleges would have to back out of the field of research in health, education, and welfare. But in 1955 the colleges were using $34 million, with this 15-percent limitation.

This year they are using $441 million with this 15-percent provision in full force and effect. If there had not been a 15-percent restriction imposed it might have gone not from $34 million to $441 million, but to $1 billion. This sort of thing is apt to get out of hand, and those who are watching and studying these problems month after month and year after year are just trying to prevent this from getting out of hand.

I ask you what is wrong with giving money to colleges and universities, and requesting that they give defense value for defense dollars, using only 15 percent for overhead? The answer is there is nothing wrong with it.

I ask you to support the committee.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which would strike section 540, that is, the 15 percent limitation on the indirect expenses in connection with research grants.

Testimony before the Committee on Science and Astronautics has indicated that such a limitation will have an adverse effect upon the Government grant research projects being carried on in our universities and colleges. Where universities and colleges are performing such a public service, overhead costs, which can be allocated to the performance of the project, should not be borne by the other educational funds of the institutions. At Columbia University the indirect cost is about 23 percent.

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, has said:

> The difference [between 15 percent and 23 percent] would represent a subsidy from educational funds of the university. While this research is valuable to the Defense Department and to education, continued subsidy unfairly consumes university funds which should also be used for education in English, architecture, business, law, and many other areas which do not receive Government grants but which are important in whole educational effort. Failure to provide full audited indirect cost must lead to refusal to accept some grants from Government or to sharp limitation of all other university work.

Dr. James M. Hester, president, New York University, has said that a 15-percent limitation "places a significant burden on the financial resources of New York University."

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. Cederberg) there were—ayes 80, noes 96.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. Mahon and Mr. Cederberg.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were ayes 93, noes 115.

So the amendments were rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Sec. 523. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food, clothing, cotton, spun silk yarn for cartridge cloth, or wool (whether in the form of fiber or yarn or contained in fabrics, materials, or manufactured articles) not grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States or its possessions, except to the extent that the Secretary of the Department concerned shall determine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any articles of food or clothing or any form of cotton, spun silk yarn for cartridge cloth, or wool grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when needed at United States market prices and except procurements outside the United States in support of combat operations, procurements by vessels in foreign waters and emergency procurements or procurements of perishable foods by establishments located outside the United States for the personnel attached thereto: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall preclude the procurement of foods manufactured or processed in the United States or its possessions: *Provided further*, That no funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of a price differential on contracts hereafter made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used except that, so far as practicable, all contracts shall be awarded on a formally advertised competitive bid basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Pucinski: On page 43, line 17, after the word "possession" strike the language after "possession" in line 17 through line 20.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will support my amendment to remove this proviso from this bill. This proviso, in its present form, bars the Secretary of Defense from awarding a contract in an area of labor surplus unless the bidder is the lower bidder.

I would certainly agree with this proviso if that was the practice of the Defense Department, but the next proviso, right in this bill, on page 43, line 21, provides that the Defense Department may, so far as is practicable, award contracts not to the lowest bidder. So, what we are saying in this second proviso is that they can manipulate defense contracts any way they want as long as the bidder is not in a depressed area. And, there is not a Member of this body who does not know how often contracts are awarded to contractors who are not the lowest bidder under this proviso that is now in the bill, and yet we say in the first proviso, that the Defense Department cannot use that same principle of negotiating contracts in a labor surplus area.

We will shortly be asked to support legislation to provide $600 million for public works—and incidentally, there is talk of a $2 billion standby program for public works, and we recently passed a bill appropriating $455 million for retraining of unemployed workers. We have been trying through other legislation in this Congress to help people in these chronically unemployed areas, yet we come along with this $48 billion defense budget and we say in this proviso that the Secretary of Defense cannot consider the fact that an area has a labor surplus in awarding a defense contract under preferential treatment.

I cannot think of any better way to help these people in these depressed areas, in these chronically unemployed areas, than to help them with defense contracts, if they meet all the other requirements. I am not suggesting awarding of contracts to areas simply because they are depressed. It is my hope that by removing this proviso, the Secretary would have greater latitude in awarding contracts to areas with a labor surplus if they meet all the other requirements of the contract and are able to fulfill the contract.

The argument may be raised that to drop this proviso would increase the cost of defense. I submit that argument is totally fallacious because of the second proviso, which permits the Secretary of Defense to negotiate contracts even though they are not to the lowest bidder.

Just so there will be no doubt about my contention that the Secretary of Defense cannot give preferential treatment in awarding defense contracts to depressed areas, let me read one short paragraph from a letter from the Defense Department which I received in reply to the question I am raising here:

> It has been our conclusion for some time that we are precluded from making total set-asides because of the proviso in the appropriation act to which you have referred. Recently we reaffirmed this conclusion by specifically requesting the advice of the General Accounting Office as to whether or not we could in the face of this proviso, revise our previous practice and make total set-asides. We were informed that we could not do so.

You see what is coming to light on defense contracts in the investigation in the other body, and I tell you, my colleagues, that if we do not take this proviso out, the revelations in the other body's investigation may be just the beginning because right now the Secretary of Defense, within this proviso, is almost forced to deal exclusively with the firms being named in the investigation. I think that the Secretary should have greater latitude in awarding defense contracts since, because of their numerous advantages, these companies usually are the low bidder. I am not surprised that people often ask why the Government continues to do business with these firms. I submit the Defense

Department has no alternative in the face of the proviso which I am trying to remove from the act. I think he should have the right to take into consideration a depressed area to help those people get back in the stream of the economy. Therefore it is my hope that this provision will be knocked out by the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman referred to the provision which follows, or the provision that the gentleman seeks to knock out, and the gentleman did refer to the fact that it says "may so far as practicable" award contracts without regard to competitive bidding.

But I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the language of this provision is that none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used and except so far as practicable, all contracts shall be awarded on a formally advertised, competitive bid basis, to the lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentleman deny that the Defense Department has been awarding contracts in innumerable instances to contractors that were not the lowest bidders because of that "so far as practicable" escape clause? Would the gentleman deny that?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I concede that perhaps there have been some contracts by virtue of their peculiarities which required that "so far as practicable," to waive the competitive bidding.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But he cannot waive competitive bidding to help workers who may have been unemployed for many years, and are on public relief rolls, and are draining their community resources; they cannot be a factor to be considered by the Secretary in awarding a contract under this proviso?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to advise the gentleman from Illinois that the language which was carried in this bill was asked for by the Department of Defense and supported by the Bureau of the Budget, as well as by the administration.

This was no change which was made by our committee. We accepted the language of the administration, and the justification as submitted to us by them. We approve the language as submitted by the administration itself.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Let me then read the gentleman an excerpt from a letter from the General Accounting Office in respect to this question.

Mr. LAIRD. I am not talking about the General Accounting Office.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Just one second. Let us see what the genesis of this proviso is.

Mr. LAIRD. I am talking about the administration and the Department of Defense requesting that this language be inserted.

Mr. PUCINSKI. This proviso was first adopted in 1954. It has been in there since 1954 after the Small Business Administration started diverting defense contracts into small business. This letter says, as follows:

> The procedures adopted with respect to awards to labor surplus area firms, however, became the subject of controversy in Congress, which resulted in the enactment, in section 644 of the Defense Appropriations Act of 1954, of the limitation—

Mr. LAIRD. If the gentleman will yield further, it seems to me I gave the clear impression that the administration was supporting this language. He quotes from the Comptroller General.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am not aware what the administration position is.

Mr. LAIRD. This language is supported by the administration and was submitted to us in the recommended draft of the bill, approved by the Kennedy administration, and approved by the Bureau of the Budget, as well as the Department of Defense.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Wisconsin, I think, is trying to put something into this bill that is not in this bill. It may have been suggested by this administration, but it has been in the bill for years, and was a part of the bill in the Eisenhower administration too.

Mr. LAIRD. I did not state that there was a clear implication here that the committee had written in some language that was opposed by the administration.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I did not say that. I did not not mention the administration.

Mr. LAIRD. It is supported by the administration.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am merely pointing out that we removed this proviso in the House last year on a teller vote, and then it was restored on a rollcall vote. I say it should come out if you want to really help the unemployed people of America.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in 1953 a proviso was placed in the defense bill, and it has been there ever since. That proviso is as follows:

> No funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of price differentials on contracts hereafter made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations.

Mr. Chairman, this proviso has not been successfully challenged since 1953. It would be a calamity to strike this language from the bill and to invite the use of national defense funds for economic aid to the various areas of the country. There is other legislation having to do with aid of one kind and another to depressed areas. So I feel confident that Members in nondepressed areas will certainly not want price differentials to be paid from funds in this bill.

I think that Representatives from the depressed areas will feel that there are other statutes and parts of the law that would apply. Under the Armed Services Procurement Act preference can be given to depressed areas under certain circumstances but not on the basis of price differentials.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have read from the letter of the Secretary of Defense stating that within the framework of this proviso he cannot engage in total set-asides and therefore cannot grant contracts to depressed areas.

Mr. MAHON. He cannot give price differentials; and that is the only thing involved in this particular amendment. So, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down. If not, we would be entering into a very dangerous field.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think everybody is very sympathetic to conditions of unemployment throughout the Nation. I know no Member who would not be normally. But if we are going to break up the procedures of the Department in issuing defense contracts, then we would be getting into a devastating problem; I think there is no question about that. I should like to call attention to the fact that we have now pending for presentation a bill for public works wherein something like $600 million would be used at once for the purpose of taking care of this type of problem with provision for the use of up to $2 billion later. I think that so far as conditions now obtain the amendment should not be agreed to. But when it comes to consideration of the other bill, that is when we should direct our efforts to accomplishing this result.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment should and will be voted down.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject at issue.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment because it is clearly in the national interest. We cannot hide from the fact that Federal funds have a distinct impact on the national economy. Giving the Secretary of Defense the privilege of awarding Defense contracts to depressed areas is consistent with all other efforts of the Federal Government to provide stimulants to the economy. This amendment carries with it the recognition that all Government efforts should be coordinated and not considered independently of each other. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, few can deny the general economic improvement of our Nation in the months since President Kennedy took office. Many factors contributed to this improvement, including some vigorous steps on the part of our new President. Yet, the picture still bears clouded areas. Unemployment is high enough to warrant concern and further action; industrial growth is not keeping pace with the increase in the work force as youngsters graduate from schools and colleges.

Nevertheless, improvements have been made. And I wish to point out to this body that the improvements have come about, even in those cases where Government intervention was necessary, without tampering with the Nation's security. In no case has it been found necessary to abrogate the sound principle of competition and open bidding in areas of national defense. Efforts to throw our defense effort into the breach against recession have failed, rightly I believe. The Nation's defenses should not be made to serve a secondary purpose, such as aiding economic recovery.

No man in the Congress has been more sympathetic to the needs of our unemployed, of our hard-pressed businessmen, and the families of those hurt by economic hardship. I will support any responsible approach to Government help in these areas, from area redevelopment to unemployment compensation extension. But what I will not support, and will never support, is the unnecessary and dangerous attempt to place our Nation's security in the toolbox of economic repairmen.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand the committee print of the budget that is submitted to the Congress by the executive branch of the Government. This is the print that includes all the dollars and the language recommendations of the administration. This committee print includes the language which the gentleman from Illinois wants to strike. This language was recommended by the present administration; it was recommended by the previous administration. Both administrations believe that this language is essential in order to prevent the Defense Department from getting involved in a WPA program. Both administrations think the Defense Department should be operated solely and exclusively for the national security. If you knock out this language you invite the Defense Department to become involved in economic and social rehabilitation in all of the 50 States. Let us not handicap the people who are trying to protect the country from aggression from without by giving them the added burden of trying to economically rehabilitate all the people and the industries in various economically distressed areas. I feel that we have other programs in the Government that can better do this job. Let us not turn the Defense Department into a WPA agency.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If we were to follow that logic and reasoning, which I do not, because I do not think the Secretary of Defense would just helter-skelter give out these contracts, unless there were responsible bidders, but if we were to follow the gentleman's reasoning, then it seems to me that the gentleman ought to move to strike out the escape clause, "so far as practicable" in the second proviso which gives the Pentagon the right to negotiate contracts even though lower responsible bids are submitted. You have seen them use this second proviso and I have seen it happen every day.

Mr. FORD. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois. It is my recollection that several years ago when we were trying to knock this whole second proviso out in conference I fought against that particular phrase and against that second proviso. I do not think they should be in there, because the present procurement legislation is adequate to take care of that situation.

May I conclude by just adding this: We want the Defense Department to buy guns, tanks, and any other supplies on the basis of quality, on the basis of delivery schedule, and at the lowest price. Let us not turn the Army, Navy, and Air Force people into sociological reformers and economic rehabilitators. Let us have them do the job and not be WPA administrators.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, all day yesterday and all day today, I have sat and listened to Members of the Appropriations Committee extolling their own virtues and the excellent job which they have done in bringing the Department of Defense appropriation bill for 1963 to the floor. They have given in detail a careful analysis of all the provisions in the bill, but they have completely overlooked the actual operation of this bill by the Department of Defense.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] strikes from the bill the proviso "That no funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of a price differential on contracts hereafter made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations:".

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] has stated that the Department of Defense and the President requested this language, and that it has been in the Department of Defense appropriation acts since 1954. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] has stated that it is not the intent of Congress to set up in the appropriation bill a sociological experiment, or to make a WPA project out of the Defense Department.

The mere fact that this provision has been in prior appropriation bills is no excuse for its continuance if it is wrong, and I am satisfied it is wrong, nor is there any attempt by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] and myself to have this bill become a sociological experiment or WPA project.

The intent of the Pucinski amendment will merely tell the Department of Defense that the other laws that Congress has passed relating to set-aside contracts in depressed areas may be utilized by the Department of Defense. These areas of substantial and persistent unemployment do not ask or expect any price differential. They do not ask or expect a sociological experiment. They do not ask or expect the Department of Defense appropriation act to become a gigantic WPA project. They do not ask or expect the Department of Defense to buy war material of inferior material or inferior workmanship.

The people who live in these areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are Americans. They are proud of their country and they have served it in outstanding numbers in every war. If this amendment is adopted, they will be able to have their skills utilized by the Department of Defense in the cold war.

From bitter experience in dealing with the Department of Defense, this very provision has been used by the Defense Department as an excuse for not giving any consideration to areas of substantial and persistent unemployment.

It seems strange and ironic to me that the administration which on the one hand is asking for a $2 billion standby public works authorization, and a $600 million public works bill to relieve these areas of chronic unemployment, should persist in continuing a provision in the Department of Defense appropriation act which prevents the military from setting aside portions of defense contracts.

I sincerely hope this amendment is adopted because by so doing it will make a better bill than the one presented by the Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead].

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor]. I suggest that this proviso may have the effect of almost forcing the Secretary of Defense when he is entering into a negotiated contract, to go to an area where there is no labor surplus, because if he should negotiate a contract in a depressed area such as Pittsburgh he might be accused of violating this very language. Therefore, this provision is loaded against depressed areas. It is not neutral. I think the proviso should be eliminated, and the Secretary of Defense should not be blocked from entering into negotiated contracts in depressed areas when the companies in those areas can produce what is needed for national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] asked a moment ago if he wanted to make the Department of Defense a vast WPA project or a group of sociological reformers. I think we ought to quit kidding ourselves that the defense program does not have a tremendous impact right now on the economy of the Nation. Studies are being proposed to look into the economic effects, if there were to be a substantial disarmament program. Certainly the effects would be very substantial on our economy. Just the other day in the steel price increase case we saw what a tremendous impact the suggested purchase of steel products from one section of the country rather than another can have, if such purchases were to be made by the Department of Defense. Certainly, we have to keep in mind, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just said, the needs of those areas of our country which are suffering from unemployment. Some months ago the President said he wanted to try to channel defense contracts as much as possible into unemployment areas. So with the expenditure of a relatively small increase in funds, if the Pucinski amendment goes through, we could accomplish a great deal more and much more cheaply in terms of helping our unemployment areas than if we had to put money up for unemployment insurance and through the provisions of the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask in view of all the facts and circumstances, and the dangers involved here, that this amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PUCINSKI), there were—ayes 36, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 531. Of the funds made available by this Act for the services of the Military Air Transport Service, $80,000,000 shall be available only for procurement of commercial air transportation service from carriers participating in the civil reserve air fleet program; and the Secretary of Defense shall utilize the services of such carriers which qualify as small businesses to the fullest extent found practicable: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense shall specify in such procurement, performance characteristics for aircraft to be used based upon modern aircraft operated by the civil airfleet.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question or two concerning the operation of Military Air Transport Service—MATS. I read in a recent issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the official report of two House Members, and I am not singling them out for any special reason except that they visited some 11 foreign countries and turned in a transportation bill for $371.32. My question is: Could these gentlemen have been paying their own expenses? Could they have been supplied transportation by MATS and MATS not be reimbursed for transportation? The sum of $371.32 to travel from Washington and through 11 foreign countries, then back to Washington is just not possible for two persons.

I would like to know whether MATS is being reimbursed by the committees of Congress and just what is taking place. Will the chairman of the subcommittee explain how this operates in the matter of junketing Congressmen?

Mr. MAHON. The MATS program is operated under the industrial fund, and on special flights that are arranged the industrial fund is reimbursed from other appropriations which might be involved in the operation.

If a Member of Congress rides on a MATS flight as such there would be no reimbursement, but if, for example, a plane is used for the transportation of Members of Congress to a specific point not on a scheduled flight there is a reimbursement; but if it is a flight that goes regularly there is no reimbursement.

I must agree that I am not completely familiar with all the regulations of the Military Air Transport Service, but generally speaking that is my understanding of it.

Mr. GROSS. We appropriate a great deal of money to one particular committee. I am not going to name the committee, but I think their appropriation is larger than that of any other House committee of the Congress and I suggest the committee ought to reimburse MATS for transportation costs of its members who use its service.

I am not impressed one bit with this space available explanation. I recently inquired into one of these operations and found that a big jet was being used as a courier plane to Palm Beach. I found that members of families of Government officials and others travel to Palm Beach, Fla., on a space available basis on what is known as a courier plane, a big jet, used for the transportation of a few mail pouches. I am not a bit impressed with this space available thing.

There was also the case of the daughter of one Government official of this country who traveled on a space available basis to Paris to visit some of her girl friends over there. This space available business is all too often a dodge, and an expensive one for the taxpayers.

Now I call attention to another situation which indicates to me that appropriations for alleged defense could be cut and cut plenty. There is a lot of fat in this thing. We learned in the subcommittee of which I am a member that the Navy Department was called upon last summer to run a check, a nose count of how many GS–12 Negroes and above there were in the Navy installations all over the world. I do not know whether there is money in this bill for the President's Equal Employment Committee or not, but if there is the taxpayers are paying for a real boondoggle in the name of defense.

If this information as to the color of the individual civilian employee of the Navy, if this nose count was important why was it not on the job applicant's Form 57? Why is it not a matter of record someplace? And I wonder how it is possible to tell by simply looking at a person whether he is a Negro or exactly what his racial origin?

At any rate, the Navy was compelled to spend thousands of dollars to produce this information in a period of 5 days. Five days. It had to resort to radio, to telegraph, to teletype, to long distance telephone; and if anybody can tell me why it was necessary to have this information in 5 days I would like to hear it. We could not get that information from the witness before our subcommittee.

If this information is important, why is it not also important to know about all other minorities; how many American Indians there are in the civil arm of the Navy, Army, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force? Why is it not important to know how many people of Jewish origin there are in the military establishments throughout the world?

It is time to tighten belts in this country instead of engaging in this kind of foolishness, all of which is helping to bankrupt the Government.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 540. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with such project in excess of 15 per centum of the direct costs.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. STRATTON: On page 49, line 21, strike out "15" and insert "30."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, that it comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is directed to section 504, and the Chair holds that the amendment comes in good time.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the Committee long at this late hour. The matter has been largely discussed. Unfortunately, my guess as to the temper of the House was correct.

I feel that the amendment which I am offering now does represent a suitable alternative, and I hope a majority of the Members of the House will be able to support it. The amendment displaces the totally unrealistic limitation on indirect costs contained in section 540 with a much more realistic figure of 30 percent.

As I mentioned earlier, the American Council on Education has estimated that the average ratio of indirect costs for major educational institutions which many Members are concerned with, including those in my own great State of New York, is 28.2 percent. The average cost for smaller institutions is something on the order of 32 percent. So the 30 percent figure in my amendment gives us a realistic figure and one certainly that is not subject to abuse either.

I do not accept the argument advanced here that we should put an unrealistic figure into this bill merely so that the Members of the other body can take some of the credit for generosity they have been trying to take with reference to the tax bill and the postal rate increase bill, by getting this limitation up to a more sensible figure. We in the House ought to do the right thing, and I think we can do it by putting in a figure that will not materially impair our great college and university research programs.

The gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, professed concern and shock a moment ago that so much more money was going into university research. That is not because the universities of the country are trying to make a killing at the expense of the Government; it is because in the nature of the case our great defense program is having to be based more and more on complex research and because the kind of research required is more and more available only in the universities of our country.

I am sure the chairman is not suggesting that the universities are trying to chisel the Government and that we have to cut down on their exorbitant profits. Certainly we want all the research to be made that must be made to keep up ahead of the Soviet Union. So I do not think the figures on research that the chairman has given us ought to weigh in this discussion one little bit.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted, so that we can preserve the defense of the Nation and also protect our educational institutions.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Libonati] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that section 540 provides for a fixed limitation of 15 percent on the question of reimbursement of indirect research costs as it relates to the programs at the university level under the various departments of Government adhering to this formula.

The Bureau of the Budget issued in 1958 a set of principles for the calculation of indirect costs of educational institutions that are applicable to research contracts and grants. The Bureau requested that all Federal agencies use this method of computation. The Department of Defense and most other agencies have been able to do so. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been a notable exception.

At present HEW limits reimbursement of indirect costs to 15 percent of the direct cost. At the University of Illinois a percentage of total costs computed under the formula set forth by the Bureau of the Budget would indicate a reimbursement of approximately 35 percent of the total direct costs.

Interpreted into dollars, this means that the university would have been entitled to $700,000 more than it received for indirect costs on contracts which it handled for HEW in the year ended June 30, 1961.

The universities have accepted the principles set forth by the Bureau of the Budget, and it is difficult to understand why these principles should not be applied by all Federal agencies. On the other hand, it is recognized that such a move at this time from past policy of HEW to the other formula could cause considerable budgetary difficulty. As a compromise, therefore, it would seem appropriate that the adjustment might be made in several steps, with HEW moving first to a reimbursement rate of 25 percent of total direct costs, and in the subsequent year, to full reimbursement based upon the principle set forth by the Bureau of the Budget.

I have received telegrams and other correspondence from the major educational organizations urging the Congress to remove the 15 percent limit on indirect research costs, and the University of Illinois and the University of Chicago have joined in this position; my personal attitude is that under the present budgetary problems that the above suggestion for realizing the change in several steps would be a reasonable procedure to standardize the equities involved.

I wholeheartedly support the Stratton amendment to section 540 of the Defense Appropriation bill from 15 percent limitation to 30 percent on indirect expenses on defense grants and contracts for research. This adds to the financial stability of every educational institution in the United States. The Department of Defense is now paying an average of 32.6 percent in direct costs. The bill would mean a reduction of costs $1 million for Army research and $3 million for the Air Force research. These savings to the Government are loaded upon the already overburdened and financially critical educational institutions. The universities that are tax supported will fall back upon the State legislature for this added expense. An expense resulting from research work for the Department of Defense. Certainly as a practical matter we can predict that the Department of Defense will hereafter conduct its own research in its established laboratories or schools—if the Congress appropriates millions for this purpose—for the present arrangements with the universities will be cancelled.

Thus in total effect this limitation reducing by over 17.6 percent the present consideration given for this exceptional service and use of apparatus, student body, scientists, and so forth, including all facilities and material used in the experimental tests, dooms in the future university participation in the much needed field of research for Government agencies. The Committee is flirting with a dangerous and sensitive field which in scientific activity lists hundreds of advancements for the preservation of the Republic and the security and development of the economy.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I commend my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. Libonati] on the lucid, informative, and convincing statement he has made, and join with him in support of the Stratton amendment. I esteem the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] as one of the ablest Members of this body, and I place the highest valuation on his judgment in a field in which he is so thoroughly informed and so highly qualified. I am sure he realizes the tragical repercussions both on our defense effort and upon our universities in their research work if the 15 percent limitation is contained in the final enactment. I anticipate he is expecting the percentage to be raised in conference, and I am confident this will have the approval of the gentleman from Texas when he meets with the other conferees.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it wise and prudent that this bill should leave the House with the unrealistic 15 percent limitation even though no one anticipates that that figure will remain after the conferees have acted. This is certainly not the time to cripple our universities in the research that is the very foundation of our security and so much of our progress in combating disease. I urge the adoption of the Stratton amendment. This is too grave a matter not to take positive action at this time.

I do not think anyone will question the contribution to our Nation of the scientists at the University of Chicago. It has only to be remembered that the nuclear studies and research at the University of Chicago solved the secrets of the atom. The contribution of the University of Chicago to the Nation in medical research, and in other lines, has been equally noteworthy. I am deeply concerned, and I think it should be a matter of concern to all my colleagues, when the president of the University of Chicago states:

> Our ability to meet our obligations to continue vital research for the Federal Government will be jeopardized by this proposed action.

Please note that he does not say, "willingness" to continue. It is the ability to continue without funds to meet the overhead bills.

Mr. Chairman, I am reading from two telegrams I have received, one from the president of the University of Chicago, and one from the president of the University of Illinois:

> This is to advise you that the recommendation contained in House Appropriations Committee report No. 1607 to put 15 percent limit on university researchers grant overhead will result in distress to the University of Chicago and other major universities engaged in federally supported research. Our ability to meet our obligations to continue vital research for the Federal Government will be jeopardized by this proposed action. This university appreciates the need for uniformity in Federal Government overhead policy and strongly recommend that such overhead be at least the 20-percent figure established by the National Science Foundation and more realistically 25 percent. We urge you to oppose

the 15-percent limitation when it comes up for scheduled House action Tuesday.

GEORGE W. BEADLE,
President, University of Chicago.

On January 24 I sent you a report on the financial problem at the University of Illinois created by the 15-percent limitation in reimbursement of indirect costs of NIH grants to universities. Reports of congressional opinion encouraged the hope that this maximum would this year be increased.

Contrary to this expectation, House Appropriations Committee has recommended a similar limitation of 15 percent in Defense Department grants. Approval of this provision will have serious financial implications, and will aggravate the financial problems of institutions of higher education.

DAVID D. HENRY,
President, University of Illinois.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. Chairman, nothing would be gained by rehashing the debate of yesterday and today on this bill. The principle has been debated. We have had a teller vote on the proposition and the Members have supported your Appropriations Committee. When Congress provides grants to the colleges and universities in a research program, there is nothing wrong with attaching some restrictions on the overhead costs, and that is all we propose.

I hope the committee will reaffirm the position it took earlier in the afternoon and will vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STRATTON) there were—ayes 38, noes, 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11289) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 388, nays 0, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—388

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alexander
Alford
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Anfuso
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass, N.H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Breeding
Brewster
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brown
Broyhill
Bruce
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clancy
Coad
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cook
Corbett
Corman
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Dorn
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Durno
Dwyer
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Fenton
Findley
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garland
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Granahan
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hiestand
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Hosmer
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
McSween
McVey
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mack
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Merrow
Michel
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Perkins
Peterson
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Ray
Reece
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rousselot
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Ullman
Vanik
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Weis
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Winstead
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—50

Addonizio
Andrews
Bailey
Bolling
Boykin
Brooks
Celler
Clark
Cooley
Cramer
Dent
Dowdy
Elliott
Fascell
Fino
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Huddleston
Jones, Ala.
Kearns
Kee
McDonough
Moulder
Murray
Nedzi
Patman
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Scott
Selden
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Utt
Westland
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.
Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Cramer.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Clark with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Westland.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and that all Members who spoke on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include pertinent matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

EASTER RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 465).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the

House adjourns on Thursday, April 19, 1962, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 30, 1962.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERIM AUTHORITY TO THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 30, 1962, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EMPLOYMENT OF RESEARCH SPECIALIST

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 613) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective February 1, 1962, there is hereby authorized to be paid from the Contingent Fund of the House of Representatives, such sum as may be necessary to pay the salary of a Research Specialist, Office of Coordinator of Information, at the Basic Rate of $2,180 per annum until June 30, 1962.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I was called away on official business and failed to respond to the rollcall. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1609)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

" 'PART IV—GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION BROADCASTING FACILITIES

" 'Declaration of purpose

" 'SEC. 390. The purpose of this part is to assist (through matching grants) in the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities.

" 'Authorization of appropriations

" 'SEC. 391. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years such sums, not exceeding $32,000,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of section 390. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available for payment of grants for projects for which applications, approved under section 392, have been submitted under such section prior to July 1, 1968.

" 'Grants for construction

" 'SEC. 392. (a) For each project for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities there shall be submitted to the Secretary an application for a grant containing such information with respect to such project as the Secretary may by regulation require, including the total cost of such project and the amount of the Federal grant requested for such project, and providing assurance satisfactory to the Secretary—

" '(1) that the applicant is (A) an agency or officer responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within that State, or within a political subdivision thereof, (B) the State educational television agency, (C) a college or university deriving its support in whole or in part from tax revenues, or (D) a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting and is eligible to receive a license from the Federal Communications Commission for a noncommercial educational television broadcasting station pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Commission in effect on April 12, 1962;

" '(2) that the operation of such educational television broadcasting facilities will be under the control of the applicant or a person qualified under paragraph (1) to be such an applicant;

" '(3) that necessary funds to construct, operate, and maintain such educational television broadcasting facilities will be available when needed; and

" '(4) that such television broadcasting facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

" '(b) The total amount of grants under this part for the construction of educational television broadcasting facilities to be situated in any State shall not exceed $1,000,000.

" '(c) In order to assure proper coordination of construction of educational television broadcasting facilities within each State which has established a State educational television agency, each applicant for a grant under this section for a project for construction of such facilities in such State, other than such agency, shall notify such agency of each application for such a grant which is submitted by it to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall advise such agency with respect to the disposition of each such application.

" '(d) The Secretary shall base his determinations of whether to approve applications for grants under this section and the amount of such grants on criteria set forth in regulations and designed to achieve (1) prompt and effective use of all educational television channels remaining available, (2) equitable geographical distribution of educational television broadcasting facilities throughout the States, and (3) provision of educational television broadcasting facilities which will serve the greatest number of persons and serve them in as many areas as possible, and which are adaptable to the broadest educational uses.

" '(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Secretary shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding (1) 50 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project, plus (2) 25 per centum of the amount which he determines to be the reasonable and necessary cost of any educational television broadcasting facilities owned by the applicant on the date on which it files such application; except that (A) the total amount of any grant made under this section with respect to any project may not exceed 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Secretary to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project; and (B) not more than 15 per centum of any such grant may be used for the acquisition and installation of microwave equipment, boosters, translators, and repeaters which are to be used to connect two or more broadcasting stations. The Secretary shall pay such amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine.

" '(f) If, within ten years after completion of any project for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities with respect to which a grant has been made under this section—

" '(1) the applicant or other owner of such facilities ceases to be an agency, officer, institution, foundation, corporation, or association described in subsection (a)(1), or

" '(2) such facilities cease to be used for educational television purposes (unless the Secretary determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation so to do),

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of such facilities the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facilities are situated) of such facilities, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facilities.

" 'Records

" 'SEC. 393. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this part shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out his functions under this part, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

" '(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this part.

" 'Definitions

" 'SEC. 394. For the purposes of this part—

" '(1) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

" '(2) The term "construction", as applied to educational television broadcasting facilities, means the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus (including towers, microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, mobile equipment, and video-recording equipment) necessary for television broadcasting, including apparatus which may incidentally be used for transmitting closed circuit television programs, but does not include the construction or repair of structures to house such apparatus.

"'(3) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"'(4) The term "State educational television agency" means (A) a board or commission established by State law for the purpose of promoting educational television within a State, (B) a board or commission appointed by the Governor of a State for such purpose if such appointment is not inconsistent with State law, or (C) a State officer or agency responsible for the supervision of public elementary or secondary education or public higher education within the State which has been designated by the Governor to assume responsibility for the promotion of educational television; and, in the case of the District of Columbia, the term "Governor" means the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"'(5) The term "nonprofit" as applied to any foundation, corporation, or association, means a foundation, corporation, or association, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"'Provision of assistance by Federal Communications Commission

"'SEC. 395. The Federal Communications Commission is authorized to provide such assistance in carrying out the provisions of this part as may be requested by the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide for consultation and close cooperation with the Federal Communications Commission in the administration of his functions under this part which are of interest to or affect the functions of the Commission.

"'Rules and regulations

"'SEC. 396. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this part, including regulations relating to the order of priority in approving applications for projects under section 392 or to determining the amounts of grants for such projects.

"'Federal interference or control prohibited

"'SEC. 397. Nothing contained in this part shall be deemed (1) to amend any other provision of, or requirement under this Act; or (2) to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over educational television broadcasting or over the curriculum, program of instruction, or personnel of any educational institution, school system, or educational broadcasting station or system.'"

And the House agree to the same.

That the title of the bill be amended to read as follows: "An Act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes."

OREN HARRIS,
KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
MORGAN M. MOULDER,
JOHN E. MOSS,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
PAUL F. SCHENCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
NORRIS COTTON,
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as agreed to in conference is in form and for the most part in substance the same as the amendment of the House to the Senate bill. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are set forth in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and minor or clarifying changes.

The several important changes which have been made in the House amendment have the common objective of expediting as much as possible the construction of additional educational television broadcasting facilities. The construction of such additional facilities has been long overdue. At present the Federal Communications Commission has reserved 273 educational television channels of which only 62 are in use. Only through the establishment of additional educational television broadcasting facilities and the activation of noncommercial educational television broadcasting stations can the goal of creating an adequate television system to serve the needs of all the people in the United States be accomplished. The conference agreement, thus, must be considered an integral part of a broader legislative program now under consideration in the Congress which is aimed at expanding and improving television service in the United States.

Grants for surveys: In order to accomplish this objective the conference agreement omits all provisions for the preparation of State surveys of educational television needs which were contained in the House amendment. Educational television legislation was first considered during the 85th Congress when it was passed by the Senate and was reported favorably to the House of Representatives by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Between that time and the present extensive national studies have been undertaken by educational television organizations of educational television broadcasting needs. These studies show a minimum need of 1,197 television channels for educational broadcasting stations. Therefore, the time for additional surveys has long since passed and the time has arrived to take prompt action to get the needed additional educational television stations on the air as promptly as possible.

Authorization of appropriations for construction grants: In recognition of the urgent need for the construction of additional educational television broadcasting facilities the conference agreement authorizes the appropriation for fiscal year 1963 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years of not to exceed $32 million, in the aggregate, for construction grants. The House amendment had authorized the appropriation of not to exceed $25 million while the Senate bill authorized the appropriation of not to exceed $51 million for the making of such grants.

If sufficient applications are submitted and approved to utilize available funds authorized by the conference agreement, numerous additional educational television broadcasting facilities will be constructed because of the requirement that these Federal grants must be matched.

Thus, it is expected that the Federal funds authorized by the conference agreement will be effective in providing a much-needed initial momentum to get this large and badly needed expansion program underway at the earliest possible date.

In order to assure proper coordination of construction of educational television broadcasting facilities within States which have established State educational television agencies, applicants for construction grants within such States are required to notify the agency of each application for a grant which is submitted by them and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in turn, is required to advise the agency of the disposition of each such application.

Administration: The conference agreement places the administration of the program in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The House amendment placed the administration of the program in the Commissioner of Education.

The conferees placed the responsibility for the execution of this program in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare rather than in an office or bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, because of the realization that, if the relatively small program provided for by this legislation is to be carried out speedily and effectively, it must be given proper priority among the many other important and far-reaching programs which are now administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Under no circumstances should this program be subordinated to or tied in with other Federal programs in the field of education. This could only result in unavoidable delays which would prevent the achievement of goals which the conferees seek to accomplish by this legislation.

The execution of this new program will quite likely involve the establishment of policies and the rendering of decisions for which ready precedents may not be available. By placing the responsibility for the execution of this program in the Secretary himself, the Secretary is placed in a position where he may designate a person responsible immediately to him who will be in a position to expedite the formulation of such policies and the making of such decisions. However, the full responsibility for the administration of the program remains with the Secretary, with whom it has been placed under the conference agreement.

The conferees anticipate that the Secretary will keep the committees of the Congress responsible for this legislation advised at regular intervals of the operation of this program.

The decision of the conferees to enact this legislation in the form of an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 likewise lends emphasis to their view that this program is a program aimed at promoting particular broadcast services within the general framework of broadcasting in the United States. Attention is called by the conferees to the provision contained in the legislation that the Federal Communications Commission is authorized to give to the Secretary all assistance requested by the Secretary to carry out the program. The conferees are gratified that the Federal Communications Commission has recently established in its Broadcast Bureau an Office of Research and Education for the specific purpose of assisting educational broadcasters in their efforts directed at expanding and improving educational broadcasting. The conferees are confident that the Federal Communications Commission will put forth its best efforts to promote the educational television program provided for in this legislation. If the Secretary will avail himself of the expert services which can be rendered by the Federal Communications Commission he will be in a position to minimize the administrative expenses incurred in connection with the execution of this program.

Entities eligible for construction grants: Under the House amendment nonprofit community educational television organizations would not have been eligible to receive construction grants. The Senate bill would have permitted any nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which was organized to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting to receive construction grant funds.

The conference agreement makes eligible to receive construction grants any nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association, which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting and which is eligible according to the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in effect on April 12, 1962, to receive a license from the Commission for a noncommercial educational broadcasting station.

The conferees adopted this language in the light of the following representation made by the Federal Communications Commission in its memorandum relating to the provisions of the Senate-passed bill and the House amendment thereto:

"In this connection, you are advised that under the Commission's rules and policies, qualified applicants for the reserved noncommercial educational stations have been limited to the following:

"(a) One or more duly accredited public or private educational institutions, organizations, or bodies;

"(b) A municipality or other political subdivision which has no independently constituted educational organization;

"(c) One or more tax-supported cultural organizations (e.g., public libraries); and

"(d) An association of nonprofit community organizations chartered by a State to engage in noncommercial educational broadcasting. Such groups have been broadly representative of the educational, cultural, and civic groups in the community and have included public or private educational organizations or representatives.

"Thus, a single nonprofit organization, unless it were an accredited educational organization or a tax-supported cultural organization, would not be considered eligible to receive a license for a noncommercial educational television reservation."

Interconnecting apparatus: The conference agreement limits to 15 percent of any grant, the amount that the recipient may utilize for the acquisition and installation of microwave equipment, boosters, translators, and repeaters which are to be used to connect two or more broadcasting stations. The purpose of this change is to assure that most of the available funds will be used for putting new educational television broadcasting stations on the air. Expenditures made to interconnect stations with each other should be incidental to this primary purpose.

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico: The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House amendment making the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico eligible to participate in the educational television construction grant program.

OREN HARRIS,
KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
MORGAN M. MOULDER,
JOHN E. MOSS,
W. L. SPRINGER,
J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
PAUL F. SCHENCK,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting reading of conference report). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if he is going to explain this conference report?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to take a little time to explain the report and the provisions of it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report brings to a culmination long efforts to bring about the construction of additional educational television stations and that will encourage the utilization of a highly important natural resource, the radio spectrum, insofar as radiofrequencies are assigned for educational purposes.

The conference report itself is very explicit. There were some substantial differences between the House bill and the Senate bill, but the conferees have worked together and we feel we have brought back a very good bill. Some of the questions that were raised in the House have been covered, and I will take a minute to discuss them very briefly.

First, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, as I understand this conference report, in substance what has been done is to restore to the bill the provision stricken out in the House that would provide for nonprofit educational organizations to be recognized and to be licensed.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct. But I will say further that it does tighten and clarify that provision of this legislation to do what the gentleman from Michigan had in mind, in my judgment, at the time he offered his amendment. We have made it very clear and explicit that those organizations he referred to, and which other Members of the House referred to should not be permitted to come under the program. They are excluded. Those that were excluded unintentionally I think are now included and are eligible under this program.

Mr. BROWN. If I understand correctly, any nonprofit organization—in some States it takes only three incorporators and $10 to incorporate a nonprofit organization—incorporated for educational purposes would qualify under FCC so-called restrictions we have heard so much about. There is an organization called the Committee of Political Education—COPE, as it is sometimes used—and that organization, as I understand it, is a nonprofit organization, so recognized under the law for tax purposes as an educational organization. Could that organization, under the provisions of this bill as it is brought back to us, qualify to take the air and educate the public on political matters or on any other matters?

Mr. HARRIS. It would not be eligible and could not participate.

Mr. BROWN. Explain why not.

Mr. HARRIS. Because the conference report provides in section 392(b) as follows: "a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association, which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting and is eligible to receive a license from the FCC for a noncommercial educational television broadcasting station pursuant to the rules and regulations of the Commission in effect on April 12, 1962."

Then on page 8 of the conference report, in the statement of the managers, we set out what those Commission rules are. Therefore, it is clear and explicit that an organization such as the gentleman has suggested would not be eligible.

Mr. BROWN. The gentleman is absolutely certain that under those circumstances that particular organization or any organization of that type could not qualify for one of these licenses?

Mr. HARRIS. I am certain of it. And, I may say categorically to the gentleman that is the type of organization that would not be eligible.

Mr. BROWN. Or any other group of three citizens going out and incorporating as an educational institution, claiming it was strictly for educational purposes? Maybe they would want to promote the idea to the people that the moon is made of green cheese, and under a lot of court decisions that could be held to be an educational program.

Mr. HARRIS. I will say to the gentleman, in the first place they would have to meet the criteria under section 392 (a), paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4. Then, in addition to that, they have got to meet the criteria of an association of nonprofit community organizations chartered by a State to engage in noncommercial educational broadcasting. In other words, they have got to meet these criteria to be eligible. Such groups—and here is the crux of it—such groups must be broadly representative of the educational, cultural, and civic groups in the community.

Mr. BROWN. In other words, what you are saying is that the Federal Communications Commission in its great, innate wisdom, will decide what education is, what culture is, and all of these other activities. You and I know that the members of the Commission are only human, after all; they are not demagogs, and sometimes we see different types of men serving on different commissions, with the result that we have different views on these matters quite often. In other words, you feel—and I ask this question because I have great confidence in the gentleman and I have served on his great committee——

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN. Both as an expert and as an attorney that this bill will protect the American people from these so-called special incorporated nonprofit organizations that are set up for some particular purpose or other which they may claim is to educate the listeners but that you and I might agree was not for educational purposes?

Mr. HARRIS. Three things I would like to say in response to the gentleman in order to try to make it as definite as possible that the gentleman is correct: No. 1, they have got to be an organization established for educational television purposes; No. 2, they cannot be fly-by-nights.

Mr. BROWN. If you will just pause there, of course, the question of what an educational purpose is might be a matter of discretion.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, let me read you what it says.

Mr. BROWN. I have read it.

Mr. HARRIS. It helps to make the record.

A single nonprofit organization, unless it were an accredited educational organization or tax-supported cultural organization, would not be considered eligible to receive a license for a noncommercial educational television reservation. And, I want to make it very clear here and now that it is the intention that this would be congressional policy, and it is the intention of the Congress that the Federal Communications Commission and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare carry out this policy. If anyone comes in and attempts to get a license or a grant who is not eligible under these rules, then they are to see that the congressional intent is carried out.

Mr. BROWN. Now, I am sure the gentleman from Arkansas, brilliant as he is, knows that the reason why I asked these questions is to well define the legislative history on this bill so that there can be no question arise in the future about it; where the courts, at least, will know what the intent and the purpose of the Congress is, if we have people on the bench who can read the English language.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for making this legislative history as clear as possible and that he will go along with the conference report.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, since I offered the amendment on the floor, which was a source of some controversy concerning this legislation, I should like to take a few moments to comment upon the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, we should be aware, of course, that in this legislation we are providing a measure and a kind of Federal aid to education. In a sense, we should look at this legislation as we would view a bill to build classrooms for educational institutions, because this bill authorizes the use of Federal funds to finance the construction of educational facilities.

The crucial issue is: To whom should Federal funds be made available for educational purposes?

If my amendment was too restrictive as it was offered, let me say that, in my opinion, the language of the bill on this point, as it was brought to the floor from the committee, was much too broad and all-inclusive.

In the course of the conference, I think the conferees have agreed upon better, more precise language which provides at least some limitation as to the groups and associations that will be considered as "educational" for the purposes of this bill.

The gentleman from California, [Mr. Moss], who made a very good statement when the bill was on the floor earlier, might be inclined to say now: "We said then that the FCC must determine who will get a license to operate an educational TV station." But the conferees have improved the legislation in this respect. They have adopted criteria and standards by referring to specific FCC regulations as of a particular date; and the FCC will not be able to change those standards tomorrow or next week.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], has said, in order to qualify for assistance under this legislation an applicant must be an educational institution, or tax-supported cultural organization, or a subdivision of government, or a nonprofit association organized for educational purposes that is chartered by the State.

I would still prefer that the assistance be limited to regularly accredited and recognized educational institutions. However, under the conference agreement an educational association must be State chartered to qualify. Accordingly, the ultimate determination and control as to what is an "educational" association will rest with the State.

I think the language adopted by the conferees is an improvement and I shall not oppose the conference report.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Let me say that I would like to compliment the gentleman for his interest in this matter, and the contribution he has made to this very important and worthwhile program.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman who is a member of the committee.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin] just said. But I would say to the House of Representatives that his judgment in this matter has been of little assistance so far. As I recall, the last time the distinguished gentleman from Michigan offered an amendment and commented on the subject of educational TV, he got in a great deal of difficulty. As I recall, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan's amendment knocked out one educational TV facility in Michigan under the provision of this bill. So I would say that the gentleman's comments are singularly of little value to the House of Representatives today.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when the bill was up for debate on the House floor, the chairman mentioned a number of broadly based community supported television stations, including the Metropolitan Pittsburgh educational television station, WQED. I would like to ask the gentleman on behalf of my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] whether a station like WQED would qualify under the conference report?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton] also a few minutes ago inquired about the same station as the gentleman now is inquiring about, and the answer is "Yes, they would be qualified."

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Could this in any way lead to pressure to provide tax support for more cultural organizations in order to provide all of the qualifications for the establishment of a broadcasting facility?

Mr. HARRIS. I do not view it in that light; no.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, one of the provisions is to the effect that they be a tax-supported, cultural organization. Is that not true?

Mr. HARRIS. That is one of the provisions under the legislation and under the regulations.

Mr. GROSS. I hope we do not get a deluge here of organizations of one kind or another asking for Federal tax support.

Mr. HARRIS. This is a limited program. I think a great many people who are interested in promoting educational television overlook one thing and that is that the purpose of this legislation is not primarily to broaden the educational programs in various areas. The primary purpose here is to utilize a natural resource—the radio spectrum—that is not being utilized so that those who are engaged in education may have the benefit of this natural resource. We are interested in this resource being utilized for the benefit of the public. That is the primary purpose of this legislation.

The House provided a limitation of $25 million. The other body provided for $50 million. Both the House bill and the Senate bill provided a limitation of $1 million for facilities in any one State. That limitation is still included, naturally. We did compromise on the amount. We agreed to a limitation of $32 million in the program. The other body accepted the House requirement of matching grants of 50 percent—50 percent to be supplied by the applicant except where there is a facility that has already been constructed. There they will be given a 25-percent credit toward their future facilities for the amount already expended by the organization.

We placed a limitation of 15 percent on the amount that could be used for microwave relays and similar facilities used to interconnect two or more broadcasting stations.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment this is a most important step that we are taking toward encouraging local people to utilize this natural resource that we have for educational purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts], who is unable to be here today, is in fact the prime sponsor in the House of this program of educational television. The Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] has been a long-time sponsor of such a program in the other body. So far as the success of this program is concerned, and the fact that we have reached this stage in it, we should keep in mind that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] has done a magnificent job. He has been constant, he has been sure in his own mind that this would be a program that would contribute so much to the education of our people and the education of our children so that they might become great leaders in this country. I pay him this tribute and I compliment him for the long, continuous, and arduous efforts he has made over the years in behalf of this program. The House bill as reported by the committee was the bill sponsored by him, and therefore he becomes one of the coauthors of this program and is entitled to a great deal of credit.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, as we contemplate the conference report on the educational TV bill, Senate 205, I feel it my privilege, as well as my duty to call attention to the magnificent efforts made by my good friend, the able Representative of the Fourth District of Alabama, the Honorable KENNETH ROBERTS, one of the most active members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives.

He has the distinction of heading up one of the subcommittees, and while I am not privileged to be on that subcommittee, I have frequently attended meetings of his subcommittee because of the importance of the legislation he has been considering for our people all over the Nation. But it is in the field of educational TV that his work has been particularly outstanding this session of Congress.

Mr. ROBERTS has been a legislative pioneer in the field of educational television and the conference report we are considering at this time is a product of his efforts over the past 5 years.

The State of Alabama, whom KENNETH A. ROBERTS has the honor to represent, has been one of the stanchest advocates of the medium, well recognizing the value in the field of teaching.

Congressman ROBERTS first introduced a bill for educational TV during the 85th Congress and has been continually endeavoring to obtain passage of a bill that would provide this medium to all States and thereby greatly increase our Nation's educational potential.

I wish to commend my esteemed colleague and friend from Alabama for his never-ending faith that this distinguished body would some day enact a measure of this type.

It is with pride that I can say I have had the distinct pleasure of sitting with our colleague from Alabama on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and that I have never seen a more devoted individual toward the health and welfare of his fellow man. Mr. Speaker, for his efforts in assisting to bring about legislation that I am sure we all agree will increase the standards of education in our country and provide specialized training where heretofore it was unavailable due to the limitations of personnel, I believe we should all commend KENNETH A. ROBERTS and express our thanks to him for a job well done.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I think that the committees in the House and in the other body share considerable glory at this time in a significant piece of legislation. It was characterized throughout the deliberations as a completely nonpartisan matter. A great many members of the committee in both parties have made contributions to the preparation of this legislation.

I do want to join the chairman in taking particular cognizance of the work of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS]. The only regret I have in connection with this legislation is that the bill upon which we went to conference did not bear his name, because he has worked for a number of years to bring about the passage of this legislation, which will have a significant impact upon the improved educational opportunities of the American people.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the conferees unanimously agreed on this conference report. We feel we have a good program here and we commend it to the House.

Since I do not have any further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight Thursday, April 19, 1962, to file a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

A PRAYER FOR PEACE BY THOMAS MERTON, HOLY WEEK 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOWALSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, as Easter approaches and our Nation contemplates the resumption of nuclear testing, I would like to take this occasion to offer a prayer for the preservation of mankind.

My prayer was written for this occasion by Thomas Merton, master of novices at the Abbey of Gethsemani, Trappist, Ky., and a member of the Cistercians of the Strict Observance. Brother Thomas Merton is the author of such enduring works as "Seven Storey Mountain," "Waters of Siloe," "Sign of Jonas," and "Bread in the Wilderness." His most recent work is a prose poem inspired by the bombing at Hiroshima, entitled "Original Child Bomb."

In a letter accompanying his prayer, he writes:

> I feel very close to the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. No day goes by without my explicitly praying for the victims of the bomb in my mass. We have an enormous responsibility. I offer you my wholehearted encouragement in your efforts for peace and disarmament. Such efforts are a sacred duty.

In this prayer Brother Thomas expresses for me the anguish of man groping to control the monstrous weapons he has devised for the annihilation of civilian populations and the sorrow of man for the incalculable injury we and our adversaries inflict on all men and on their children for generations to come.

The world is at the crossroad. Ahead lies either the atomic crucifixion of the human race or a resurrection of faith in God's presence in man.

With unanimous consent, I will read Brother Thomas' prayer:

> Almighty and merciful God, Father of all men, creator and ruler of the universe, lord of history, whose designs are inscrutable, whose glory is without blemish, whose compassion for the errors of men is inexhaustible, in Your will is our peace.
>
> Mercifully hear this prayer which rises to You from the tumult and desperation of a world in which You are forgotten, in which Your name is not invoked, Your laws are derided and Your presence is ignored; because we do not know You, we have no peace.
>
> From the heart of an eternal silence, You have watched the rise of empires and have seen the smoke of their downfall.
>
> You have seen Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Greece, and Rome, once powerful, carried away like sand in the wind.
>
> You have witnessed the impious fury of 10,000 fratricidal wars, in which great powers have torn whole continents to shreds in the name of peace and justice.
>
> And now our Nation itself stands in imminent danger of a war the like of which has never been seen. This Nation dedicated to freedom, not to power, has obtained through freedom a power it did not desire.
>
> And seeking by that power to defend its freedom, it is enslaved by the processes and policies of power. Must we wage a war we do not desire, a war that can do us no good, and which our very hatred of war forces us to prepare?
>
> A day of ominous decision has now dawned on this free Nation. Armed with a titanic weapon, and convinced of our own right, we face a powerful adversary, armed with the same weapon, equally convinced that he is right.
>
> In this moment of destiny, this moment we never foresaw, we cannot afford to fail. Our choice of peace or war may decide our judgment and publish it in an eternal record.
>
> In this fatal moment of choice in which we might still begin the patient architecture of peace, we may also take the last step across the rim of chaos.
>
> Save us then from our obsessions. Open our eyes, dissipate our confusions, teach us

to understand ourselves and our adversary. Let us never forget that sins against the law of love are punished by loss of faith, and those without faith stop at no crime to achieve their ends.

Help us to be masters of the weapons that threaten to master us.

Help us to use our science for peace and plenty, not for war and destruction.

Show us how to use atomic power to bless our childrens' children, not to blight them.

Save us from the compulsion to follow our adversaries in all that we most hate, confirming them in their hatred and suspicion of us.

Resolve our inner contradictions, which now grow beyond belief and beyond bearing, they are at once a torment and a blessing: for if you had not left us the light of conscience, we would not have to endure them.

Teach us to be long suffering in anguish and insecurity.

Teach us to wait and trust. Grant light, grant strength and patience to all who work for peace—to this Congress, our President, our military forces, and our adversaries.

Grant us prudence in proportion to our power, wisdom in proportion to our science, humaneness in proportion to our wealth and might, and bless our earnest will to help all races and peoples to travel in friendship with us along the road to justice, liberty, and lasting peace.

But grant us above all to see that our ways are not necessarily Your ways, that we cannot fully penetrate the mystery of Your designs, and that the very storm of power now raging on this earth reveals Your hidden will and Your inscrutable decision.

Grant us to see Your face in the lightning of this cosmic storm, O God of holiness, merciful to men, grant us to seek peace where it is truly found.

In Your will, O God, is our peace. Amen.

REQUIEM FOR A FREE PEOPLE

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, listen carefully, my colleagues, are the bells tolling the death knell of the liberties of the individual in America and in the passing bringing us the whisper of despair for freedom for all mankind? The past week's events may prove to be the most tragic of our entire history for we have seen a President of the United States use, with a ruthlessness never before experienced, the awesome power of the Federal Government to coerce and intimidate private industry and to arouse public suspicion and distrust by the people of respected business leaders.

In making these remarks I am neither defending nor criticizing the action of the steel companies in announcing an increase in price. There is a much larger question here, the question of to what lengths an ambitious Chief Executive will go in the use of power to achieve results he desires. In the past few days we have seen here in the United States an angry President Kennedy denouncing, without a hearing, the leaders of the steel industry. We have seen President Kennedy using the medium of television and his highly placed public relations experts to arouse public indignation against those with whom he was personally displeased. We have read news stories of private citizens and newspapermen being aroused in the dark hours of the night by the agents of the Federal Government to answer questions pertaining to news sources and stories which had appeared in the press. Are we, the citizens of this land of the free, now to expect the thunder of boots in the night, the knock at the door, the summons to appear to justify our actions whenever we say anything or do anything that does not meet with the approval of the President and the planners who surround him?

I warn those who may now support the President's high-handed methods and disregard of the rights of freemen because they are not directly concerned, that once this power to use the force of the Federal Government against any segment of society is established, then the freedom of all of us is in danger. Does labor truly expect that President Kennedy will be satisfied to pressure business and industry into complying with his plans without exerting that same pressure upon those who work in the mines, mills, and factories when they, too, may attempt to exercise their freedom? Recent history should show us that freedom once lost is most difficult to regain. And can there be any doubt that any man who once finds that he can bend the people to his will on an economic matter will not soon be tempted to try the same tactics to assure political control? Oh, America, will you awake before it is too late, or are we to lie sleeping, while the forces of dictatorship are seething in the dark recesses of the minds of those who do not trust the people to govern themselves?

While a long, tragic step toward the abolishment of our free society has been taken, there is yet hope that it is not too late for the people to convince President Kennedy that his disregard of the rights of freemen is the wrong course. There is a ray of hope in the reaction of the Nation's press in these last few days to what has taken place. Under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include some of the articles and editorial comment.

In 1960 Candidate Kennedy made a great to-do over the image of the United States abroad. The following items from the U.S. News & World Report show what President Kennedy did to the American image in one short speech and a night of ill-advised action:

Theodore C. Sorensen, Kennedy aid, wrote the statement in which the President criticized leaders of the U.S. steel industry.

Observers from Europe, listening to President Kennedy's remarks on steel, commented that no leader in the most socialized country of Western Europe would think of delivering an attack of that kind on a private industry.

Correspondents for the Soviet news agency, attending the President's news conference, cabled that President Kennedy had pictured a little group of business executives as running the United States against the Nation's welfare.

The Washington Daily News raises the grave question of police-state tactics in the following editorial from the edition of April 16, 1962:

KNOCKS ON THE DOOR

One side-bar aspect of the uproar over the now canceled increase in steel prices has an ugly connotation.

In Philadelphia, an Associated Press reporter was routed out of bed at 3 a.m. Thursday by the FBI and an hour later two G-men were pounding on his door.

At 5 a.m. the same day, a Wall Street Journal reporter was awakened by the FBI.

In Wilmington, Del., the G-men were sitting on the doorstep when a Wilmington Evening Journal reporter got to work at 6:30 a.m.

All of these newsmen were questioned by the FBI about a statement each had got earlier in the week from the president of the Bethlehem Steel Corp., who was quoted as saying "there should not be any price rise." That's all.

The questions could have been asked the next day, in business hours. Or next week. The rush by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy smacked of hysteria. Knocks on the door, or phone calls, in the middle of the night by agents of the law are repugnant in a free country—especially for such questions. It reflects on our ablest enforcement agency.

The following news story from the Wall Street Journal, April 16, 1962, with the foreboding quotes from some of the President's aids, gives an indication of how business, industry, and labor will probably react to the steel question and indicates the fear with which a free society and free institutions will operate in the future so long as President Kennedy remains in the White House:

STEEL SEQUEL—BUSINESS, LABOR LIKELY TO SHY FROM CHALLENGE TO PRESIDENT'S POLICIES—FARM, MEDICAL LEGISLATION ALSO MAY GET PUSH FROM KENNEDY'S POWER DISPLAY—BUT VELVET GLOVE IS ON NOW

WASHINGTON.—Steel prices are back where they were last Monday. But not the steel industry, nor business generally, nor labor, nor the Government.

President Kennedy is pulling his velvet glove back on—in supreme confidence everyone will keep vividly in mind his display of the iron fist.

"The President has come out of this stronger than if the affair had never happened," declares one of his chief lieutenants. "It has focused the attention of every businessman and labor leader on Kennedy's policy of wage-price stability. Everyone is going to be very reluctant to try to pull off what steel tried."

What the bulk of the steel industry tried, of course, was a 3½-percent average increase in its prices. The move began Tuesday night and appeared successful by Wednesday, but Mr. Kennedy's violent counterattack made use of almost every conceivable governmental weapon; by Friday he had gained his objective—complete capitulation.

"We have no idea of going around flexing our muscles at everyone," says a top Government official. "The idea is that it simply won't be necessary. And a good many people outside Government agree that perhaps it won't.

"Now it's going to be tough for any big company in any industry to get a price increase," comments one top steel executive. Says a man in organized labor: "It now will be extremely difficult for any union to break away from the administration's wage guidelines."

BROAD IMPACTS

The confidence which the Kennedy team now feels in its own smartness, skill and strength may spill over into matters far removed from the steel struggle. Officials feel that the President has emerged with the clear image of being on the side of the public and that the public must, of necessity, be grateful. On Capitol Hill, Democrats seem unanimous in believing the President's stock has soared in the wake of the victory. They think it could help him win controversial parts of his legislative program—from farm schemes to medical care for the old folks.

Apart from picking up grassroots support, they predict the President will fight for more of his proposals—making less use of the carrot and more of the stick. A good many of these are measures business has been battling, such as the package of "consumer protection" bills sent to Congress last month.

But the White House makes it very clear it wants to avoid giving any impression of acting out of spite against business. Officials insist that even at the height of the steel price dispute the President was careful to confine his anger to the one industry, and his object was solely to get the price increases rescinded—not to punish.

Now that this has been accomplished, it's stated the administration feels an obligation to help steel companies modernize their equipment, a need they stressed in boosting prices. Thus, Treasury officials will push revision of their Bulletin F which will give steel companies a better tax break in calculating depreciation. And the administration will redouble its efforts to push through Congress a special tax credit for business spending on modern equipment.

NO GLOATING

"The President has set a tone of no gloating, no crowing" after stamping out the steel price hike, declares one Presidential assistant. "The administration's attitude is 'let's forget it happened and get on with the main job of keeping the economy growing without inflation.'"

Magnanimity will have its limits, though. Says one White House official: "Roger Blough [United States Steel Corp. chairman] just can't ever again walk into this office and be treated in the same friendly way he was before." More importantly, perhaps, the Justice Department is not calling off the grand jury probe in New York of the steel industry. Says Antitrust Chief Lee Loevinger: "The investigation will continue until we have enough evidence to reach a determination whether or not we should take action."

Initially, the antitrusters were thinking in terms of two kinds of suits, one striking at an alleged price-fixing conspiracy by the eight steelmakers who in rapid succession scrambled to a higher price plateau and the other aimed at busting up the industry leader, United States Steel, into enough pieces so that it would no longer hold a commanding position in the industry. Specialists in antitrust law suggest the quick rollback to the prehike position would practically kill the first sort of case. "Maybe you could prove a technical violation, maybe not," says one attorney, "but what court or jury would want to impose criminal fines in a case involving a conspiracy lasting less than 3 days?"

But some lawyers argue the speedy withdrawal of the price increases would not necessarily cripple an attempt to break up United States Steel. "Antimonopoly cases are based on price performance not over a period of days, but years," comments one lawyer. Another notes such cases include a variety of elements, including a firm's share of the market, its control over raw materials and transportation facilities depended on by its competitors and its ability to keep new firms from entering the field.

While labor leaders are happy enough about seeing big companies taking their licks, it's plain they have mixed feelings. "Kennedy is obviously committed to being just as tough on us, if the occasion arises, as he was on the steel companies," observes one union official. An AFL–CIO aid says that the power Mr. Kennedy has displayed amounts to being able to dictate wage and price terms in any situation involving what he determines to be the national interest. "The question now is when and how Government will use this new price and wage power," he comments.

It seems likely that the turn-around in steel will not merely rescue but will revolutionize the President's labor-management council. By Thursday night, it seemed as if the council had been struck a fatal blow. But by winning the steel war, the administration puts the council in a different role. Instead of being a forum for labor-management discussions, some union officials believe that it will become a council where labor and management sit and listen to what the Government wants.

"Instead of just being a participant, Government is now the first party in the council," observes one union official. "Labor and management will now figure the Government is ready to use force to get what it wants, so that they had better go along."

This is likely to affect one of the key reports the council is working on, setting forth wage and price policy for unions and industry. Earlier there seemed to be no chance that any significant agreement could be reached on this matter; now, however, it's rated likely that the administration's beliefs will be strongly emphasized. "Both labor and management will go into future council meetings with a new awareness of the power of Government," says an AFL–CIO aid.

UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER

It can well be argued—and some steel executives do argue—that economics played a greater part than power politics in killing off the steel price boost. But the administration went at it as a power exercise, and Mr. Kennedy was personally determined to achieve unconditional surrender.

This was demonstrated when the President dictated the terms under which Labor Secretary Goldberg and Clark Clifford, a Kennedy friend currently in private legal practice, were permitted to undertake a secret meeting with representatives of United States Steel. The tale of this clandestine confrontation is an intriguing one.

Shortly after the Labor Secretary walked into his office Friday morning he received a call from Mr. Blough. Would Mr. Goldberg, the head of United States Steel asked, be willing to meet with some people in New York if he received a call later?

Mr. Goldberg said he would, but immediately told President Kennedy of the overture from Mr. Blough. Discussions were held as to precisely what the Blough call could mean.

The President, with full concurrence of his advisers, ordered that no "deal" or compromise should be made with United States Steel; the President wanted complete capitulation.

At around 10:30 a.m. Mr. Blough phoned again. Mr. Goldberg canceled out of a White House strategy session on the steel war and was on his way before 11:30 a.m.

The meeting took place in the Carlyle Hotel, an old Kennedy haunt in uptown New York City, far from United States Steel's downtown headquarters. Arrangements had been made for Mr. Blough and the other United States Steel officials to slip into the hotel suite unnoticed: they were there when Mr. Goldberg arrived with Mr. Clifford, former special counsel to President Truman.

The men from United States Steel who were gathered with Mr. Blough were not the same ones with whom Mr. Goldberg had dealt in arranging the early wage contract agreement with the United Steelworkers Union; in the room were members of United States Steel's finance committee, credited by many union and Government officials with having more to do with the steel price increase than Mr. Blough.

"Goldberg did not go there to bargain," declares one of his associates. Whether bargaining was attempted by United States Steel remains unclear; at any rate the conversations were interrupted by two telephone calls which made bargaining pointless. Mr. Blough was called out of the room to take the first message, Mr. Goldberg for the second—and it seems certain both calls conveyed tidings that Bethlehem Steel Corp., second largest in the industry, was rescinding its price hike. With that break in the line of the biggest companies, the Government knew the price fight could only end in victory; Mr. Goldberg left the suite aware that United States Steel would shortly announce its retreat.

The role of economics in the steel industry's sudden abandonment of its sudden price advance can be stated rather convincingly.

It starts with the fact that companies owning about 30 percent of the mill capacity never raised prices in the first place, and a number of them felt no sharp need to do so. Leader of these holdouts was Inland Steel Co., which is producing at about full tilt to meet demand in its Chicago area and is enjoying a profit margin on sales substantially above that of bigger companies. Armco Steel Corp. of Middletown, Ohio, another important holdout, was in similar shape.

BEHIND BETHLEHEM'S RETREAT

Bethlehem, which had proclaimed its need for higher prices, was the first price hiker to retreat—perhaps because its directors are company officers and decisions can be made in a hurry. Some steel men figure Bethlehem reasoned that Armco and Inland were putting heavy pressure on such producers as Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. by not raising prices and that these other mills would collapse soon. So Bethlehem decided to rescind itself.

One source close to Bethlehem's situation suggests it feared the loss of important markets for flat-rolled steel, used by big auto and appliance makers in the Midwest. Bethlehem serves these Midwest markets from distant mills at Buffalo and Sparrows Point, Md. Also, Bethlehem sends tinplate by boat to the west coast to compete with Kaiser Steel Corp., another holdout. "This is a competitive industry," comments one top Pittsburgh steel man.

Once Bethelehem had yielded, United States Steel faced lower-priced competition in every section of the country, so it pulled back. After that, the parade was on, with Republic Steel Corp., Pittsburgh Steel Co., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., National Steel Corp., Youngstown Sheet & Tube, and Wheeling Steel Corp., rescinding their price advances in that order. Announcement after announcement reiterated the contention that higher prices were fully justified to raise funds for building more competitive facilities; yet they were impossible to maintain in a competitive market with other steel companies selling at lower prices.

By this logic, it can be contended prices would have dropped back down again, at least on some products and after a period of testing the market, without any pressure from Government. But perhaps no one will ever be able to prove it, one way or the other, and most industry officials are not discounting the effectiveness of the Presidential activity.

"I don't think there's any question this is a big victory for Jack Kennedy, and I do think this is a clear indication of what Jack

Kennedy and his administration are all about," says one steel executive grimly. He declares such use of Presidential power in the "national interest" could produce a "controlled economy—which means nothing but administered prices."

AVOIDING "VINDICTIVE" ACTIONS

The President opened a Friday war council at the White House with an admonition to his top officials that "it is very important we not take any action that could be interpreted as being vindictive." Yet governmental efforts which might unnerve many a businessman were already in full swing.

Agents of the Chief Counsel's Office of the Internal Revenue Service were ordered on Wednesday to make an intensive check of United States Steel's option plan, which has existed for years to give incentive benefits to that company's executives. Investigators of the tax agency's intelligence division reportedly began an audit of tax reports of other top steel executives.

FBI agents, working day and night, visited the offices of a number of steel companies, trying to build evidence for the criminal antitrust investigation by a grand jury in New York.

Quite apart from the bitter accusations made by the President on television, the industry heard plenty from Washington privately, as Mr. Kennedy's subordinates got on the long distance phone—working especially to encourage those firms which had not raised prices to continue holding out. Under Secretary of Commerce Gudeman, Under Secretary of the Treasury Fowler and Under Secretary of State George Ball were among those intensively employed.

Defense Secretary McNamara spent practically full time on the task, personally dialing the phone numbers of men he knows in the steel industry. He ordered defense contractors wherever possible to shift their purchases to steel companies which had not raised prices, a move some thought put a special squeeze on Bethlehem.

To underline his appeals, Defense officials advanced by about 10 days the decision on award of contracts for about $5 million of special steel plate to be used in Polaris submarines. * * *

Additional articles for your study include five editorials and news stories from the Wall Street Journal; an editorial on "The Angry Government," from the National Observer of Sunday April 15, 1962; a column, "Profits and Inflation," written by George E. Sokolsky for the Washington Post of April 17, 1962; the impact of President Kennedy's spending programs on our currency as contrasted to his bitter denunciation of the steel industry, a column written by Lyle C. Wilson in the Washington Daily News of April 16, 1962, called "Two-Bit Dollar Is Near"; a significant editorial written by David Lawrence for the U.S. News & World Report of April 23, 1962; and a column by David Lawrence, "Will Victory in Steel Boomerang?" from the Washington Evening Star; "The Attack on Steel," an editorial from the Dallas Morning News; "U.S. Coercion Against Steel," a column by David Lawrence in the April 13, 1962, edition of the Washington Evening Star; "Mr. Kennedy and the S-Bomb," an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 16, 1962]

An Incredible Week

In a long life not without its share of amazements, we never saw anything like it.

On Tuesday one of the country's steel companies announced it was going to try to get more money for its product. And promptly all hell busted loose.

We wouldn't have been surprised ourselves if some people had shaken their heads in puzzlement at the new price list. Although after 20 years of inflation a price rise in anything is hardly unusual, there was some reason for wondering if the company officials had made the right decision in today's market.

But what happened was no mere headshaking. The President of the United States went into what can only be described as a tirade. Not only had the company changed its price list without consulting him but it had also set a price which, in his opinion, was "wholly unjustified." With a long preamble in which he rang in the Berlin crisis, the soldiers killed the other day in Vietnam, the wives and mothers separated from their husbands by the reserve callup—all of which he cast at the feet of these "irresponsible" steel officials—he wound up by crying that these men had shown their "utter contempt" for the welfare of the country.

The response in Washington was instantaneous. The Justice Department, the Federal Trade Commission, the congressional inquisitors all leaped to arms.

Then came the night riders. At 3 a.m. Thursday morning a reporter for the Associated Press was awakened by Government agents unable to wait even for regular office hours in their driven haste to find out what testimony he could give about the criminal conduct of these steel officials. At 5 a.m. it was the turn of our own reporter in Philadelphia. At 6:30 a.m. the scene was repeated in Wilmington, Del., for a reporter on the Evening Journal. All this without any warrants, only orders from the Attorney General of the United States.

By mid-Thursday morning the United States Steel Corp. had been subpenaed for all documents bearing on the crime and had learned that a Federal grand jury would move swiftly to see what laws had been violated by asking three-tenths of a cent a pound more for a piece of steel.

This brought us to Thursday afternoon. Then Mr. Roger Blough, the chairman of this company, felt forced to stand up to an assembly of microphones and television cameras and defend himself before the country for the wickedness of his deeds. And to be treated by the reporters at that gathering as if they were a part of the prosecution and he was, indeed, a malefactor in the dock.

And that leads to what is probably the most amazing thing of all about last week. Across the country—on the radio, in newspapers and at street corners—the necessity of the defenders to "justify" themselves before the righteous accusers was simply accepted as a premise from which the trial should begin. There were few to say otherwise.

In such a climate it was not at all surprising what the mailed fist could do. All day Friday steel company offices were awash with Government agents, while the threats of punishment were mingled with promises of reward for doing the rulers' bidding. It is a technique of government not unknown elsewhere in the world, and it is a combination almost irresistible. So by Friday night Mr. Kennedy had his victory.

Finally the jubilation. The President himself said all the people of the United States should be gratified. Around him there was joy unrestrained at this proof positive of how naked political power, ruthlessly used, could smash any private citizen who got in its way. So far as we could tell, the people did seem relieved that it was all over and that the malefactors had been brought to heel.

Yet what, in all truth, is this "crime" with which these men stood charged by a wrathful President?

It had nothing to do with arguments about whether this particular asking price was economically justified, or fair to the steel stockholders, or somehow responsible for dead soldiers in Vietnam. This last is sheer demagoguery, and the others are questions no man can answer—neither Mr. Blough nor Mr. Kennedy.

What was really at issue here, and still is, is whether the price of steel is to be determined by the constant bargaining in the marketplace between the makers and buyers of steel; you may be sure that if the makers guessed wrong the market would promptly change their decision. Or whether the price of steel is to be decided and then enforced by the Government. In short, the issue is whether we have a free market system or whether we do not. That, and nothing more.

Thus the true "crime" of this company was that it did not get permission from the Government and that its attempted asking price did not suit the ideas of a tiny handful of men around the White House.

It was for this that last week we saw the President of the United States in a fury, a public pillorying of an industry, threatened reprisals against all business, the spectacle of a private citizen helplessly trying to defend himself against unnamed accusations, the knock of policemen on the midnight door. And there was hardly a voice rising above the clamor to ask what it was all about.

If we had not seen it with our eyes and heard it with our own ears, we would not have been able to believe that in America it actually happened.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 17, 1962]

The Price of Ignorance

President Kennedy's victory over the steel companies last week was certainly a convincing display of Government power. But it was also an equally convincing demonstration of the administration's lack of economic knowledge.

For one thing, any business, be it United States Steel or the corner drugstore, must continually weigh its income against its outgo if it is to survive. No company can go on indefinitely paying increasing amounts to its employees and suppliers without increasing its income. At the end of that road, as any schoolboy should know, lies bankruptcy.

Wage costs of the steel industry have risen four times since the last price increase, in 1958. United States Steel's profits have been heading downward. In the circumstances, what could have been more normal than to test the market with a price increase?

United States Steel, of course, knew that the price increase might not stick. Competition in its industry was—and is—strenuous. Some smaller, newer companies in the industry, such as Inland Steel, have on the average more modern, more efficient plants than United States Steel, and thus are feeling the profit pinch less severely. Other companies, such as Armco Steel, rely on higher priced specialty steels for much of their volume, and it is these items that have been most affected by import competition.

So it's possible that economic factors alone could have forced United States Steel to back away from its price increase. But the Government seemed not to understand the power of such factors, for it refused to let them even be tested. Indeed, it seemed to argue that these competitive forces did not exist, and that the big steel companies were displaying "monopoly power."

Mr. Kennedy's excuse for forbidding any test of the steel market was that he was fighting inflation. This is a word that the Government seems to misread completely. Whatever Mr. Kennedy may think, it is the Government, and the Government alone, that has been inflating the supply of money and credit. So it is the irresponsible fiscal and spending policies of the Government, and not the "irresponsible" steel executives, that are to blame for inflation.

In the wake of the industry's cancellation of the price boost, there was fresh evidence of this lack of understanding of inflation. A Kennedy aid was quoted by this newspaper as saying, "The administration's attitude is, 'Let's forget it happened and get on with the main job of keeping the economy growing without inflation.' "

The trouble is that the administration seems to think one sure way to promote growth is to increase Federal spending. Even before the steel debacle, Government officials were worrying about the speed of recovery and talking of the possible need for a new "stimulus" from Federal spending. And last week in Omaha a Budget Bureau aid told an audience of economists that the public's feeling about the budget—that it's a good thing to have it balanced—may "constitute a significant barrier to the achievement of sustained full employment and vigorous economic growth."

"Vigorous economic growth" requires not a fast-spending Government but a vigorous private economy. Businessmen must be developing new products, pushing into new markets, creating new jobs. Government can only retard such growth by levying excessive taxes to support its excessive spending and by creating a climate of fear in the business community.

And there is no question businessmen now are fearful. As a Kennedy lieutenant says, "Everyone is going to be very reluctant to try to pull off what steel tried." The shock absorbed by business confidence could be felt for a long time. No businessman builds a new plant or launches a new product unless he believes it will return a profit—a profit based on prices in reasonable relation to costs. But the Government seems unaware of the importance of business confidence.

The smashing impact of the administration's economic power now is evident to all. We can only hope the Nation will not have to pay too high a price for economic ignorance.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance

Even before the steel industry started to back down in its battle with the Kennedy administration, the key question about the price increase announced last week was whether it could be maintained, or would have to be canceled or at least shaded in actual practice. Yet the outcome may affect profoundly the course of general business in the United States for many months.

Whether the price increases could be maintained depended at least as much on the economic background as on what the Government did. Indeed, the question about the future of steel prices would have arisen even if Washington had said nothing about the matter, and even if some makers had not thereupon refused to join in the boost and others had not decided to rescind it.

The mere fact that the steel industry has not operated at more than about 80 percent of capacity this winter, even during the recent period of demand inflated by fear of a strike, is itself a basic factor militating against strength in steel prices. So is the lack of inflationary trend in wholesale prices generally for the last several years. The index for all commodities, which throughout 1958 held between 119 and 120 percent of the 1947–49 average, is still there today.

Even more telling, in regard to the price trend, is the fact that the component of the wholesale index which covers "crude materials for further processing" is down 5 percent since 1958. It moved that year within the range of 97 to 102. It is now below 95. This fact suggests that, but for wage increases obtained more than once each by many strong unions since then, the total index might well be down, too. The cost of increased pay is what has pushed semifinished and finished goods prices up enough to offset declining raw material prices, keeping the total index steady.

Under the circumstances, with steel orders reduced below the recent high level, now that wage negotiations are over, it would have been clear without any reaction from Washington that the price was boosted to test the market. The men who made the decision undoubtedly knew the market's ability to take a price rise was doubtful, and that the new prices might not hold.

However, the test was to be an economic one solely. But it became a political one. For an example of how crucial that might make the issue, the record of the late 1930's, when Franklin D. Roosevelt was President, is available.

Almost exactly 25 years ago, on April 2, 1937, President Roosevelt at a press conference attacked what he labeled as excessive prices and production rates for durable goods and singled out a price boost announced in copper a few days earlier for special criticism. He said the Government was going to try to punish the producers of copper and other metals, and of goods containing them, by arranging that less Government money, including unemployment relief money, be spent on such goods.

This move followed by little more than a month another action that had already begun to sap business confidence. It was a request to Congress to pass a bill adding six to the number of Justices on the Supreme Court. His purpose was to "pack" the Court, as the phrase went in those days, with men who would approve left-leaning and reform legislation that he favored. The Court had held unconstitutional two major acts that Congress had passed on his recommendation.

The business community regarded the Court as the final bulwark for the basic rights of the people and was dismayed at the prospect this bulwark might be removed. Coming on top of that news, the attack on prices thoroughly frightened businessmen.

The decline in business which followed was one of the steepest on record. The industrial production index of the Federal Reserve Board declined in 1 year from 42 percent of the 1957 level to an index figure of 28, a drop of 33 percent. By contrast, the 1958 recession, itself a relatively sharp one, pulled the index down 15 percent in 1 year.

New orders received by manufacturers of durable goods dropped from a high of 164 percent of the 1935–39 average (after seasonal adjustment) in March 1937, to 70 in April 1938, or more than 55 percent. Residential building contracts fell more than 40 percent from a seasonally adjusted high of $102 million in January 1937, to $53 million a year later. And total private domestic investment, one of the key components of the gross national product, was almost halved from $11.7 billion in calendar 1937 to $6.7 billion in 1938. This kind of spending, of course, is relatively slow to respond to declines in business sentiment, as most commitments once made have to be carried out.

None of this means, of course, that the decline in business was caused entirely by the Roosevelt moves. It is probable that a recession was on the way early in 1937 and would have occurred in any case. There is a real question, however, whether it would have gone so deep.

In somewhat the same way, the outcome of last week's price boost in steel, whenever it might have occurred, would have had a real effect on business sentiment even with no governmental action. Maintenance of the increase would have been a tonic, and failure to maintain would have been a depressant. But either way the effect would last only as long as normal fluctuations in business do.

Now, however, a more profound and lasting effect could be seen. Business might fear not only the normal forces of economics but the possibly violent impact of politics.

It might wonder what decisions, formerly regarded as within the competence of management, would have to be submitted, whether formally or merely in effect, to Government. It might foresee a spread to all industry of the overegulation which President Kennedy the other day blamed for the ills of the railroads. It might even conceivably adopt the same timid approach to new investment and expansion which caused the labor force's percentage of unemployed to remain throughout the 1930's at three times the present proportion.

George Shea.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 13, 1962]

Business in the Doghouse

The businessman is back in the doghouse, and anything that happens to him from here on out—trustbusting, rough tax treatment, or whatever—will be too good for him. Thus does our Washington bureau sum up the administration's mood in the wake of the steel price increase.

It is an assessment implicit in the President's denunciation of the steel companies and his threats of action. For business generally, it is an assessment long implicit in the antibusiness attitudes of many in the administration and Congress. The price boost gives them what they consider a magnificent opportunity to do many more of the things they have been eagerly trying to do anyway.

In President Kennedy's stated view, of course, it is the business community, spearheaded by the steel industry, that has flung down the gauntlet, and it is the noble knight of Government that has accepted the challenge. As he put it, "a tiny handful of steel executives whose pursuit of private power and profit exceeds their sense of public responsibility" have shown "utter contempt for the interests of 185 million Americans."

With this and other comments in his statement, the President neatly portrays businessmen as unpatriotic monsters of unbelievable greed, whose profits, naturally, never go anywhere except into their own bulging pockets. Obviously this portrayal is considered the way to put oneself on the side of the angels, politically speaking, just as it was 30 years ago.

That may be right, politically speaking. Certainly it has been an axiom for liberal Democrats all these years that the business community is not the place where the votes are.

But there is more to the administration's current mood than politicking on this crass level. There is frustration and resentment that the economy performs so well without the control of officialdom. There is—not to put too fine a point on it—an overweening pursuit of public power and profit, and hence a burning itch to punish these free enterprisers for being free.

This administration has paid an enormous amount of lipservice to business. That is another way of saying it has protested its love too much. For all the while it has been acting in a different way. It has increased all the many harassments at the Government's disposal. Its henchmen in Congress are constantly devising new and fantastic ways of obstructing business activity. It has sought a tremendous broadening of the public sector, which means reducing the private economy to ineffectiveness.

Now there will be much more. Among specific actions being mulled: Stepped-up activity by the already ubiquitous Federal

Trade Commission. An attempt to break up United States Steel. Alternatively, a move to classify the steel and other big industries as monopolies and regulate their prices. Even general price control cannot be ruled out. And price control, let us remember, is the opposite of a free economy.

So the business community will be well advised to understand exactly what its position is. It is not good. We would not venture to predict the outcome, though it is not the first time business has been under insensate political attack.

Still, things have changed since the thirties. The market economy has proved itself a cornucopia for the people. It has brought about a vast improvement in working conditions. Instead of tycoons owning companies, we have today salaried managers of publicly owned corporations, and everyone knows of their contributions to local communities and national culture.

The owners alone number many millions today. The number of people who own United States Steel is far greater than the number of people who work for United States Steel. And both owners and workers throughout the Nation have a better understanding than they used to have of the role of free enterprise in a free society.

Perhaps, in the supercharged air of the moment, many Americans agree with the President's denunciation of business. But on further reflection, it is possible they might find distasteful a rabid new Government onslaught on the free economy.

Grand Jury Inquiry Set on Steel Prices; Hodges Warns Federal Policy May Change—Records Subpenaed From at Least Eight Big Steelmakers; Defense Buying Restudied

The Justice Department gave vent to President Kennedy's intense anger over the steel price increase by ordering a grand jury investigation.

At least eight major producers, including the company that triggered the 3½ percent price rise, United States Steel Corp., have received subpenas. It seems probable that other steel companies, whether or not they've raised prices, will be ordered to provide information for the grand jury to be convened in New York. The pattern became evident when two companies that so far haven't moved on prices, Armco Steel Corp. and Inland Steel Co., received subpenas.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy disclosed the grand jury inquiry last night after United States Steel Chairman Roger Blough, defending the price increase before a televised press conference, said that his company had been subpenaed. The Attorney General's brief statement didn't elaborate on the charges the Government will file.

OTHER MEASURES MAY BE STUDIED

So far seven steel producers in addition to United States Steel have raised prices. Though the antitrust action is the most immediate result of President Kennedy's fury at what he called "irresponsible defiance of the public interest," other retaliatory measures may be in the works.

In New York yesterday, Commerce Secretary Hodges warned that the steel price rise "could lead to a change in the economic philosophy and program" of the Kennedy administration. Early yesterday morning the President called a "war council" of top officials, and Mr. Hodges said "all sections of the Government" were asked "to see what can be legally done" in response.

Another facet of this response may come today from the Pentagon, which is expected to make an announcement relating to steel. Although it remained uncertain what the Defense Department will do, it's understood that at least some discussion has covered action designed to encourage defense contractors to use more foreign steel. Another possibility: The Pentagon might try to persuade those domestic steel companies that haven't joined the price rise to hold the line by promising them a larger share of defense steel orders.

At least in one area, however, the administration's initial anger seems to have cooled somewhat, though the steel and other industries still won't like the result. At one point during the retaliatory planning, the President and his aides discussed omitting the steel industry from a long-planned overhaul of tax depreciation rules by the Treasury. The idea appears to have been dropped. Now, Treasury technicians, while still including steel, are studying ways to scale down the revisions so as to minimize Federal revenue losses as an offset to the higher steel-product procurement costs foreseen by the Pentagon. It may be some weeks before a final decision is made on the new depreciation guidelines, which will allow companies to claim bigger annual deductions from taxable income for machinery wear-and-tear in the early years of the equipment's use.

In addition to United States Steel, Inland and Armco, the five other companies known to have received subpenas are: Bethlehem Steel Corp., Republic Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., and Wheeling Steel Corp. All five participated in the price increase.

Officials of two companies said their subpenas were returnable April 20 to the New York grand jury. An official of one company said the Government is asking for names of personnel and for documents, dating back to January 1, 1961, that might have a bearing on the recent price increase. He said the Government's request for information on how price policy decisions are reached within a company makes it clear that the antitrusters are looking for price collusion among the steel companies.

TWO POSSIBLE MAJOR GOALS

Though the exact nature of the Justice Department's prosecution is unclear and may remain so until the grand jury's investigation is completed, top antitrust lawyers feel that two major efforts might be involved: One aimed at breaking up United States Steel on the ground it exercises monopolistic control over the industry; and another aimed at proving that several top steelmakers have illegally tried to establish common prices.

It will be up to the grand jury to determine whether the evidence supports either allegation. If the jurors are not convinced, they simply will refuse to indict. If they believe the facts present a reasonable question of illegality, they will return an indictment or indictments.

An attempt to break up United States Steel—if it materializes—would stem not from a criminal indictment but from a subsequent civil suit. The Justice Department does not have authority to subpena records or require testimony in a civil suit; it may do so only by convening a grand jury. Frequently, therefore, the Government has first investigated by the grand jury method, and followed a criminal indictment with a companion civil suit. At present the administration is asking Congress to authorize the Justice Department to issue subpenas in civil cases too.

At the Department's Washington headquarters about a dozen top antitrust lawyers worked until 10 o'clock Wednesday night preparing to battle the steel giants in court; they reported back to their desks early yesterday morning and continued to toil until late in the day.

Both Attorney General Robert Kennedy and FTC Chairman Dixon attended President Kennedy's special session yesterday morning in the Cabinet room of the White House. Others attending were Defense Secretary McNamara, Labor Secretary Goldberg, Commerce Secretary Hodges, Treasury Under Secretary Fowler, Chairman Heller of the Council of Economic Advisers, and a number of Presidential aides.

Interviewed later in the day, Mr. Dixon said his agency "will give every cooperation we can to the Justice Department."

"We've got a lot of records and expertise on steel here," he added. In 1951 the FTC issued an order in which all major steel producers agreed not to pursue "any planned common course of action" in fixing or maintaining price levels.

Mr. Dixon said the Commission will continue to study recent developments in the steel industry to determine whether that order has been violated. If the FTC went to court, it could seek fines of $5,000 for each steel transaction at the increased price, provided it could prove that the price increase was the result of an industry agreement—tacit or otherwise.

The exact nature of the Justice Department's prosecution is unclear and may remain so until the grand jury's investigation is completed.

EXCEPTION TO "BUY AMERICA"

At the Pentagon, sources said the Buy America Act's preference for domestic companies contains several exceptions that might be used if it were decided to buy more foreign steel. Example: One section of the act removes its restrictions when it is determined that the cost of the domestic product "would be unreasonable or that its acquisition would be inconsistent with the public interest."

Also, Defense Secretary McNamara on Tuesday evening discussed with President Kennedy the possibility of putting a ceiling on the price the Government would pay for steel in defense procurement. But this was before other steel companies followed United States Steel's lead in raising prices, and Mr. Kennedy at his Wednesday press conference conceded that maneuverability in this area was somewhat limited.

As for depreciation rules, the Treasury's overhaul is a revision of the Internal Revenue Service's Bulletin F, a list of suggested useful lives of equipment and other depreciable assets. The project's aim is to shorten the useful lives to more realistic periods. Firms which rely on outdated useful lives in the present Bulletin F could claim bigger annual depreciation deductions in a given year. The Treasury hopes this administrative overhaul, plus congressional approval of tax rebates of as much as 8 percent on new purchases of machinery, will let companies modernize their equipment. The administration has been touting this approach as an alternative to the type of price increases posted by the steel industry as a source of expansion funds.

After some momentary wavering, this philosophy appears to be unchanged. Indeed, Treasury Secretary Dillon is portrayed as feeling that tax actions leading to cost-cutting modernization may be more necessary than ever to combat inflationary pressures of the steel price increase.

Early planning of the Bulletin F project produced estimates that it would cost the Treasury about $1 billion in annual lost revenue, though officials argued much of this would be made up later because of the salutory economic effects. Actually, the range of revenue loss ran between $800 million and $1.2 billion, depending on how deeply the old useful lives were cut.

The prospect of heavier Pentagon spending due to higher steel prices—a prospect contested by Mr. Blough—currently is causing the Treasury to take a second look at the size of the Bulletin F revision. Officials could elect to trim the Bulletin F package closer to the $800 million price tag.

Much of this planning depends, in turn, on the fate of President Kennedy's tax bill now pending in the Senate. The administration wants the Senate to add some revenue-raising features to the bill which the House ignored. These would reduce the revenue loss from the tax credit, and perhaps allow the Treasury to be more generous in its Bulletin F revision. But if the bill's final version contains heavy revenue losses, the Bulletin F plan might be modified further.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 13, 1962]

FBI Rouses Reporter at 3 a.m. To Check Steel Pricing Remarks Laid to Bethlehem

Philadelphia.—The Federal Bureau of Investigation awakened Newsman Lee Linder, of the Associated Press, at 3 p.m. yesterday, to question him about steel price statements attributed to Edmund F. Martin, president of Bethlehem Steel Corp., after the company's annual meeting Tuesday.

The FBI agent asked Mr. Linder to confirm he had attended the Bethlehem meeting in Wilmington, Del., as a reporter and that he had talked with Bethlehem's president afterward. Mr. Linder said "Yes," and the agent replied: "We're coming right out."

Two FBI agents arrived at Mr. Linder's home at about 4 a.m. Mr. Linder, who had suggested they wait until morning to see him at his office, was awakened again, along with his wife, by loud knocking on the door. The agents talked with him less than an hour.

Mr. Linder said the agents went over his entire conversation with the Bethlehem Steel president and what Mr. Martin had told the stockholders. "I repeated what the AP had reported, that Martin had said there should not be any steel price rise, that in fact competition in the United States and from foreign sources should result in price reductions," Mr. Linder said.

Yesterday, Bethlehem Steel issued this statement:

"Neither Mr. Martin nor the company has issued any statement concerning remarks attributed to him at the annual stockholders' meeting on April 10. In response to an inquiry from Washington, made yesterday (Wednesday), a Bethlehem representative explained that Mr. Martin was quoted incorrectly as saying that 'There should not be any price rise even after the new labor contract goes into effect on July 1.' Mr. Martin was, in fact, indefinite about the matter of prices. He indicated that the further increase in costs which will result from the new labor agreement is unfortunate at a time when we were trying to hold the price line."

[From the National Observer]

The Angry Government

We don't know how often President Kennedy gets angry; any President must find frequent occasions to try his temper. In the past week, at any rate, the President didn't bother to conceal his anger at United States Steel's announcement of a price increase. And by the week's end, he had given the Nation an instructive demonstration of his economic and political power. Nobody should miss its moral.

For a look at the cause of his anger tells a good deal about the present relationship of the Federal Government and the private economy. Mr. Kennedy could not be unconcerned about this action of a private company because he and his administration were deeply involved in the recent steel union-management settlement.

The administration put heavy pressure on both sides to settle without a strike, and they did, 3 months before the strike deadline. It was a political victory for the White House, and the President himself hailed the agreement as "noninflationary." That is because the contracts provide for no direct hourly wage increases in the first year, and the administration obviously expected the steel firms to show "restraint" on price increases.

This optimism, however, ignored certain economic facts. In the 4 years since steel prices were last raised, there have been no less than four boosts in steelworker wages and benefits, not counting the cost of the benefits in the new contracts. So it would seem that "restraint" has been a somewhat one-sided affair. In those circumstances, United States Steel argued it couldn't go on without a price increase if it was to continue to be an efficient producer.

Whatever the merits of that argument, and we think them considerable, the upshot was the curious spectacle of the President of the United States reacting to this private economic decision as though it were a personal affront—if not, indeed, a crime. For the Government investigators are already busily looking into the steel price increase.

An observer must wonder where this angry attitude is going to lead. To price controls, perhaps? And it must be asked how the Nation has come to this strange pass of such furious Federal intervention into the lives of all of us.

People talk a lot about the free economy, and it certainly is that compared to many others in the world. Still "free" economy is plainly not a literal description. The Federal impact on the economy has grown enormously, and the Federal momentum is constantly gaining. For one thing, there are so many Government restrictions on managerial freedom of action today that no man could count them all.

Even more important, the cost of Government weighs heavily on the economy, pressing down its freedom and vitality. Federal spending budgeted at nearly $93 billion in the next fiscal year is at the expense of the private economy. Some of it, as for defense, is essential; much of it is just political, and the Government refuses to cut back the latter for the sake of the former.

On the contrary, the Government constantly seeks new ways to spend money, which also means ever new intrusions on the freedom of action of individuals, businesses, municipalities, and States. And the taxes which must be exacted to support this Federal edifice are the greatest single drain on the economy's potential for heavy growth.

Most of the time for more than 30 years, however, even the oppressive taxes have not sufficed to feed the appetite of government. And so we have had the kind of deficit financing which in effect creates dollars out of thin air.

The effects of that inflation hit especially hard in the early years after World War II; we can all remember when the prices of practically everything seemed to take a new leap every week. Prices were jacked up so much, in fact, that our competitive position in world trade is still suffering. Out of that inflationary flood let loose by the Federal Government came the famous wage-price spiral of the postwar years.

The Government did one further thing to encourage the spiral. By granting unions a host of legal immunities—notably exemption from antitrust prosecution—it gave them the powerful bargaining threat of the nationwide strike in such basic industries as steel. Because such strikes can indeed threaten the Nation, the Government feels compelled to intervene still more.

And that progression suggests the larger pattern of the constant Federal encroachment on the free economy. The more the Government tries to take away from the free economy, the more it weakens it, and the more justification it finds for further meddling and regulation. This is, if anything is, the way to the controlled economy, which you may be sure will benefit neither individuals nor unions nor businessmen nor the national economy nor the political liberties we presumably still value.

It is understandable that a President should get annoyed when a particular economic intervention isn't working out as he planned. And given the Government's power, he was able in this case to force a victory. But perhaps the private citizen has cause for anger too—or at least reasons to stop and take a good look at what a Government angry at free institutions is doing to this country.

[From the Washington Post]

Profits and Inflation

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The capitalist system more correctly might be called a profit-and-loss system. It differs from feudalism or socialism in this fundamental respect, that under the capitalist system an individual may accumulate earnings, no matter how earned, to be disposed of by himself for such purposes, private or public, as he chooses. It is on the basis of this definition that the Internal Revenue Service taxes thieves, gamblers, prostitutes, and other immoral persons and sources of income, without regard to the method by which the funds were accumulated. Al Capone's crime, for which he was punished, was not murder or vice, but failure to pay income taxes.

In a word, a person may do as he pleases with his earnings and accumulations of capital provided he pays his taxes.

The prudent person employs his accumulations of wealth, whether inherited or earned, to increase his estate, to provide for his family, to leave a legacy after his death. He may do this in many ways, such as purchasing insurance, keeping money in savings banks, purchasing real estate, bonds, shares of enterprises, etc.

There can be no purpose in any of this economic activity unless the accumulation increases. Some persons choose conservative methods for this purpose; others are more speculative. That is each individual's free choice, but in every instance, his objective is to increase his accumulation of wealth.

If they purchase shares in a company, the investors have two hopes; one, that the value of the shares will increase through good management; two, that the company will issue dividends, which, in effect, are a share of the profits earned by this economic activity. Of course, sometimes the investment is lost through poor management, the elimination of the industry from the market, noncompetitive conditions, etc. But the purpose of the investment is not to lose but to gain, and a gain can only be made through a profit.

What is a proper dividend? That depends upon the reason the investor has in making the investment. For instance, if one invests in what are called blue chips, he is satisfied with a smaller dividend; his object being a return on a secure investment. Sometimes the security disappears, as with the railroads. The more speculative person, the risk taker, goes into enterprises with the objective of benefiting in rises in value of the shares on the market. But few companies rise in value unless profits are earned.

The easiest way to produce a depression is to put a ceiling on profits, because in such an eventuality those who possess accumulations of wealth either send it out of the country, purchase shares in foreign companies, convert their money into foreign currencies, put their money into savings banks or in a shoebox under the bed.

President Kennedy, in his quarrel with the steel companies, might have used other grounds for attack, but when he attacked the concept of profits, his anger led him astray. Surely, he believes in profits; if he does not, what is our economic system to be? The flight of capital has already done damage to the American economic system; an attack on profits can be disastrous.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 16, 1962]

Two-Bit Dollar Is Near

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

There was in President Kennedy's denunciation of the steel industry one special paragraph that need be changed only a little to mean something else again entirely.

The President's paragraph began like this: "If this rise in the cost of steel is imitated by the rest of the industry, instead of rescinded, it would increase the cost of homes, autos, appliances," and so on. That was the beginning of a paragraph that firmly put on the steel industry responsibility for inviting more rotting of the U.S. dollar by inflation.

Now, to aim that paragraph in a different direction, read the opening this way:

"If the politicians continue deficit Treasury spending instead of balancing the Government's budget, it would increase the cost of homes, autos, appliances, and most other items for every American family. It would increase the cost of machinery and tools to every American businessman and farmer. It would seriously handicap our efforts to prevent an inflationary spiral from eating up the pensions of our older citizens and our new gains in purchasing power.

If the steel industry does not concede that the cost of living must increase if steel prices are raised, it is equally true that the politicians do not concede the equal or greater inflationary curse of deficit financing. The consumer is caught in the middle.

First to feel the squeeze will be the pensioners mentioned by President Kennedy, with all others on fixed incomes. Last through the inflationary wringer will be the families whose incomes increase at least as rapidly as the purchasing power of the U.S. dollar shrinks. In the end, none will escape.

That is, none can escape the end result of dollar rotting if Government and industry alone or together encourage the dollar rotting trend. In fewer than 25 years the U.S. dollar (1939 value) has shrunk to a real value of less than 50 cents in present purchasing power. The two-bit dollar is not here yet, but it is in sight.

National defense can be no stronger than the U.S. economy. The Nation's economy can be no stronger than its unit of currency. If the economy is tied to a sickly dollar, the national defense is supported by a sickly economy.

If the voters were smart, they would fire the politicians who are spending the United States toward disaster.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 23, 1962]

Coercion

(By David Lawrence)

The heavy hand of government has just won a Pyrrhic victory.

The steel companies, which had based their price rise on economic necessity, found themselves coerced by the Kennedy administration as it announced that it would withhold defense contracts and use its investigative powers to bring about prosecutions for alleged violation of the antitrust laws.

When the American people, however, become fully aware of the consequences, they will long remember the outburst of emotion by President Kennedy at his news conference on April 11 as he denounced the decision of a few companies to raise steel prices and issued a public threat of reprisal.

The President's prepared statement, delivered at his news conference, referred to the proposed increase as "a wholly unjustifiable and irresponsible defiance of the public interest." Mr. Kennedy expressed bitterly his feeling that "a tiny handful of steel executives whose pursuit of private power and profit exceeds their sense of public responsibility can show such utter contempt for the interests of 185 million Americans."

Even a President may be forgiven if he manifests his displeasure when things don't go his way. But it's one thing to discuss objectively the merits of a complicated economic issue, and quite another to indulge in invective and to impugn the patriotism as well as the integrity of those with whom you disagree.

Economic facts, moreover, cannot be changed merely because politicians dislike them. Nor can America's private enterprise system survive very long if the Federal Government itself engages in the mudslinging of class warfare and, in effect, tells an industry it must disregard profits, disregard dividends, and pay labor whatever the administration says shall be paid even if, as in this case, it costs the industry an additional $100 million a year.

Did the President really think that the steel industry, which has granted wage increases for nearly 4 years in succession without a price increase, could go on doing this indefinitely? Apparently he believed that the administration could coerce the industry into submission, anyhow. For what else was meant by Mr. Kennedy's statement that "the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission are examining the significance of this action in a free, competitive economy"? Didn't the President also request congressional committees to begin "investigations"?

What was the meaning of the grand jury investigation ordered by the President's brother? This implied a threat of criminal prosecution. It was a move designed to terrorize those who disagreed with the administration. No such rebuke was ever administered to the big labor unions when they demanded and got, by concerted action throughout the steel industry, increases which the companies were really unable to afford.

Furthermore, the Defense Department announced that it would withhold defense contracts not only from contractors but from subcontractors if they accepted the proposed higher prices in steel.

All this had its effect. One after another, the steel companies capitulated.

The President says the first announcement of a price rise came with "suddenness." Yet if he had read the interview with Roger Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel Corp.—as published in the February 26 issue of this magazine—he would have found the facts about the steel problem stated clearly there and a prediction made as to the inevitability of a price increase if labor costs were raised this time, as they now have been.

If the President felt that the Government must fix prices, then he should have asked Congress to enact a system of wage-and-price control.

The administration has shown that it believes in more and more concentration of power in the executive branch. While denying any inclination toward state socialism, the President's action on steel prices points inevitably to a Federal dictatorship over business.

What is at stake really is the preservation of the profit-and-loss system. The steel companies have borrowed large sums in the last few years in order to modernize their plants. They believe in paying back the money they borrow. They must earn profits to do this and also to pay dividends to compensate investors. Mr. Kennedy minimizes these responsibilities. He now has made the profit squeeze acute.

The only persons in the world who can truly derive satisfaction from President Kennedy's tragic performance are the advocates of state socialism—often a forerunner of communism.

In the congressional elections of November 1962, the American people will be presented with a grave issue. Will they give a vote of confidence to the head of the Democratic Party? For, by disrupting the morale of American industry, has he not frustrated the economic expansion so much needed to bring a real recovery from the current recession?

[From the Washington Evening Star]

Will Victory in Steel Boomerang?—President's Action Called a Blunder, Wage-Price Law Held Inevitable

(By David Lawrence)

There's only one way the American people now can be spared the economic distress which may eventually follow President Kennedy's tragic blunder of last week. For a recession that could conceivably become a deep depression is as certain as day follows night if Mr. Kennedy continues to allow wage increases and then terrorizes and coerces business when it seeks to cover its added costs with a rise in prices. Stability can be achieved now only by the enactment by Congress of a law to fix the standards of wage and price control and to entrust them to a commission to administer during the so-called emergency. This is an action that nobody likes, but which Mr. Kennedy has made inevitable.

For the American people will not long consent to leave in the hands of one man—even the President—the opportunity to raise or lower prices or wages without sanction of law. The talk of "victory" for the President now being heard in Capitol corridors from the leaders in a rubber stamp Congress will be short lived if the big problem of meeting labor costs remains much longer in the confused situation it is in today. For some companies it means a cut in profits and in tax payments to the Government, as well as the passing up of dividends this year Probably about 100,000 steelworkers will be idle in the next few months.

How many businessmen, moreover, who sell across the country will dare to raise prices if they live in fear of Government reprisals? The President has been brainwashed by his advisers and now has led the public into believing that price increases are sinful or unpatriotic but that wage increases usually are justified.

Mr. Kennedy is a man who follows the advice given him that seems plausible even if it is one-sided. In the conference last Tuesday night which he held at the White House with Roger Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp., the newspapers now report that Secretary of Labor Goldberg did much of the talking. Mr. Goldberg was formerly general counsel of the United Steelworkers Union, and he read the riot act to Mr. Blough. The President, of course, would never have ventured to appoint the general counsel of the United States Steel Corp. or of any other steel company to be Secretary of Commerce to advise him on the other side of labor questions. What becomes of the "conflict of interest" concept when the same man who helped negotiate for the steelworkers the very contract which prompted the decision last week to increase prices sits at the side of the President and advises him to take reprisals against the steel industry?

The demoralization of businessmen today is extensive. How can they do any long-range planning now?

Politically the President's tactics last week may boomerang. Wage increases in other industries will have hard sledding and the unions will be unhappy. Also, if the profit squeeze continues and more persons are thrown out of work, the current recession will not soon be ended and could get worse. The Democrats could, therefore, lose many seats in Congress next November.

The talk of prosecuting the steel companies is largely poppycock. If the steel companies violated the antitrust laws by following each other successively with announcements on price increases, didn't they, by the same theory, violate the antitrust laws by withdrawing their price-rise announcements one by one? Isn't price-holding then a form of price-fixing, too? There was no collusion in either case, but the Government says concerted action amounts to the same thing. Yet labor unions fix wage costs in a whole industry by concerted action. Labor, however, contributed millions of dollars to help elect Mr. Kennedy and the Democratic Party. So the antitrust laws will not soon be amended to include national unions.

The fateful events of the last few days are best summed up by the Associated Press in a dispatch from Washington on Saturday which said:

"The arsenal of weapons the President wheeled into his all-out economic foray against big business leaders was an awesome display of coldly determined political and economic power seldom if ever before employed by the Government. Every major governmental department got into the act."

Is this democracy, or is it the forerunner of a quasi-Fascist system? Is it a government under a written constitution, or is it a government by usurpation of legislative authority? Economic facts—unlike political maneuvers—do not depend on artificial public relations. Business depends on confidence in the fairness of a government that operates under laws and rules which can be understood and are applied equally to all sides. Without such confidence there cannot be profits or prosperity or increased jobs. Without prosperity, Treasury receipts from corporate taxes decline and the Government's deficits pile up thus pushing downward still further the purchasing power of the dollar. Loss of public confidence then leads to a psychology of inflation which breeds economic disaster.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 13, 1962]

THE ATTACK ON STEEL

The President, it seems to the News, could have disagreed with steel executives on the $6-a-ton price increase without accusing them of being power crazy and of showing "utter contempt" for 185 million Americans. Would he have done the same to organized labor which supported him so strongly in his candidacy?

It's popular—and fashionable—for a politician to jump on big business. But the country is not served by such attacks. Steel is basic in our free enterprise economy. It must keep its head above water for steelworkers to have jobs, for the Government to get tax revenues, for investors to get returns, for entire communities from Pittsburgh to Daingerfield to stay alive.

Steel executives who raised the ton price know that the industry must remain solvent—so consider the following:

In the last 10 years, employment costs per hour in steel have gone up 85 percent; output per man-hour rose only 12.

Employment costs per ton went up 70 percent—prices only 49, with no increase the last 4 years.

The new contract adds another 2.5 to 3 percent to costs per hour.

But other threats seriously endanger this industry. Under its foreign-aid program the last 15 years, our Government has lent or given countries like Japan and Germany huge sums to rebuild their own steel mills.

This money came from U.S. taxpayers—including a huge 52 percent whack out of American steel companies. The steelmakers, therefore, have been subsidizing their own competition—and possible extinction.

Not long ago Japanese steel was shipped across the Pacific through the Panama Canal, up the east coast and finally to Cleveland where it was sold for $18 a ton cheaper than the same product made in that Ohio city.

In 1957 we were exporting 4 million tons of steel more than we were importing; in 1961, imports exceeded exports by 1.2 million. In 4 years, then, the net loss in American steel markets has been more than 5 million tons.

Profit margins in the industry are thin. Without profit, there can be no expansion to compete with foreign mills which have been built in large part by American tax revenues. And with organized labor demanding benefits which no doubt they need to live, costs to the American industry have become prohibitive.

The industry is hurt badly enough by inflation, taxes, labor costs, and competition without having to endure Presidential abuse and invective.

The charges he throws at steel—the pursuit of power and "utter contempt for 185 million Americans"—can be made with validity against certain policies of the administration itself.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 13, 1962]

U.S. COERCION AGAINST STEEL—FEDERAL MOVES SINCE PRICE INCREASE CALLED VENDETTA AGAINST AN INDUSTRY

(By David Lawrence)

A new era in American history—a declaration of war by the Government on the profit system as it functions under private capitalism—has been ushered in by President Kennedy.

The stock market reacted yesterday with a drop to the lowest point of 1962. Businessmen everywhere have become concerned. For the President was not content with an open denunciation of the motives and patriotism of the executives of the steel companies—he undertook, in addition, to use the powers of the Department of Justice to intimidate, if not coerce, the steel industry to do his bidding.

Nothing like this has happened before—the launching of a Government vendetta against a particular industry because it refuses to follow a course of action dictated not by law but by economic theorists in Washington.

The President's own statements at his Wednesday press conference were answered to an assembly of reporters in New York yesterday by Roger Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp. Some of Mr. Kennedy's remarks were characterized as unwarranted by the facts. Thus, for instance, the President has said that the increase in steel prices would cost the Government about $1 billion more in defense expenditures. Mr. Blough estimated it wouldn't add much more than $20 million. This is quite a discrepancy.

Mr. Blough conducted himself with dignity and restraint and explained the cost-price problem of his company in detail. He denied the President's comment that there had been no intimation whatsoever given to the public heretofore about a price increase. He cited an interview he had authorized 2 months ago in which he, in effect, predicted an increase in steel prices. The interview was published in the February 26 issue of U.S. News & World Report.

Here is what Mr. Blough said at that time:

"Our hourly employment costs over the last 3 years have gone up fairly close to 12 or 13 percent. At the most, you would expect the output per man-hour—which is not a very satisfactory measure of this thing called productivity, but which is used by some people—to go up, say, not more than 2 percent a year. The steel industry record, since 1940, is something like 1.7 percent. But, if you say it's 2 percent per year, that would be about 6 percent of improvement in the last 3 years.

"Now, our other costs, such as purchased goods and services, have also gone up—all without a price increase in over 3 years.

"So, adding the whole thing up, my guess is that over the last 3 years we've had a cost increase of something in the nature of 6 percent—that is, the 12 percent minus the 6 percent (productivity improvement). It's very close to that.

"And you're asking me how long can that continue to increase and how long can it be borne without some kind of a remedy? I would give you the answer that it's not reasonable to think of it as continuing. In other words, even now there should be a remedy. If any additional cost occurs, the necessity for the remedy becomes even greater."

Mr. Blough's answer was in response to this particular question: "Can you continue to increase your employment costs—whether in the form of fringe benefits or in the form of wage increases—without increasing prices?"

Since Mr. Blough gave the interview, the cost to the steel industry of the fringe benefits granted in the new labor contract has been estimated at approximately $100 million a year.

Mr. Blough in his February interview was also asked:

"Do you think you will raise prices in 1962?"

"Well, since you mention it," he replied, "that's not a bad idea. I wouldn't like to forecast an increase in prices, but I would say that, otherwise, something very unusual would have to happen."

Mr. Blough spoke, for instance, of reducing costs through efficiency, but pointed out that this could not be accomplished overnight.

The steel company chairman revealed in his news conference this week that profits in the first quarter of 1962 are low. He explained that many factors entered into the decision on Tuesday to increase prices, but that the most important one was the need to earn profits immediately so as to pay for the heavy expense of modernizing plant and equipment in order to be able to meet foreign competition.

Mr. Blough spoke of the more than 325,000 stockholders of the United States Steel Corp., in all walks of life, including pension funds, insurance companies and charitable and educational institutions. His company is truly an example of "people's capitalism" in America.

An interesting thing happened just after Mr. Kennedy on Wednesday denounced the price increase. He had spoken of it as "a wholly unjustifiable and irresponsible defiance of the public interest," and had expressed his displeasure that "a tiny handful of steel executives whose pursuit of private power and profit exceeds their sense of public responsibility can show such utter contempt for the interests of 185 million Americans."

These misleading quotations were promptly seized upon by the representatives of the Soviet press who were present at the President's news conference and exultantly cabled at once to Moscow for broadcasting over the airwaves of the world as confirmation of the oft-repeated thesis of the Communists that America is ruled by a few capitalists and that state socialism is better than private capitalism.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 13, 1962]

MR. KENNEDY AND THE S-BOMB

The S-bomb that he exploded over Washington—the steel price rise—has already had a blast effect which, United States Steel's

Roger Blough indicated yesterday, surprised him by its intensity. The fallout has yet to be measured. How lethal it will be, and how far ranging, depends largely on President Kennedy.

The reaction of the administration and its friends on Capitol Hill has been marked by a vindictiveness. The talk has ranged from criminal prosecutions to breaking up United States Steel, from withholding Defense Department orders from the offending companies to scrapping the Treasury's plans for liberalized depreciation allowances for all industry. Two congressional investigations have been announced, and the executive departments are honing their knives with all the intensity of juvenile gang members bent on a rumble. "Kennedy can be a hater," one White House official put it, "and right now I don't think there's any doubt he hates United States Steel." Many fear that all business has been kicked into the Kennedy doghouse.

The President has a right to be concerned, both with the direct effect of the rise on the price level generally and with its indirect impact on his drive to achieve a stable balance of prices and wages. But this hardly justifies the massive punitive expedition his forces are mounting.

More to the point, perhaps, is that a President, acutely sensitive to his public image, was given a public drubbing. And he was caught off guard. He had deeply involved his own prestige in holding the steel price line. But this was his doing, not the companies'. They never promised to hold prices.

They offended by not doing the President's bidding. They exercised their right, in a free economy, to set their prices according to market forces and not by Presidential dictation.

In asking them to submerge their own interests, in the face of rising costs, sagging profits, burdensome taxes, and an acute need for investment capital, Mr. Kennedy asked them, in effect, to subsidize his efforts to stabilize prices and hold down future wage increases.

Perhaps they should have done so; perhaps not. But the point is that he has no lawful power to compel them to and he should have none.

The prospect of another kick for the wage-price spiral is disturbing, but not nearly so much so as the administration attitudes—and arrogance—so nakedly exposed. The economy can absorb another steel price rise better than it can stand price controls, whether imposed by law or by the massive extra-legal coercive power at the President's disposal.

If he persists in his war of reprisal against the steelmakers, and even more if he marks all business as the enemy or moves toward more intervention as the answer to an intervention that failed, Mr. Kennedy may patch up his image, temporarily, as the consumer's defender. But the consumer's interest, that of the jobseeker and that of the Nation, lie with the healthy functioning of a free economy. And it won't function healthily in an environment of coercion and fear.

Mr. Speaker, these editorials and news stories should arouse every Member of Congress and every citizen of these United States to the very real danger which threatens our system. The President must be made to realize that his actions are endangering the cornerstone of freedom's foundation. If he is determined to pursue his present course of demanding additional Executive powers and by threatening, intimidating, using the power of his office and the law enforcement agencies of the Federal Government against those who do not fall into line according to his will, this once proud structure of a free society may well fall in ruins, victim to ambition, and the lack of understanding of a free economy.

DISARMAMENT

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, judging from my mail, the American people are frightened over the policies taken by their own Government. Particularly, they are worried over our efforts to disarm ourselves and leave our Nation and its heritage at the mercy of the Communist madmen.

But watch the storm now, following a United Press International dispatch of April 18, 1962. It opens:

> GENEVA, April 18.—The United States today proposed to cut the world's arms by almost two-thirds in 6 years and replace national armies with a United Nations Peace Force in about a decade.
>
> The American plan was presented to the 17-nation disarmament conference as a draft treaty for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world.
>
> In it, the United States took a considerable political risk by agreeing to accept Russia's word on the amount of arms and troops the Soviets would have in service at the start of disarmament.

That could be the understatement of the history of man. The risk, Mr. Speaker, is freedom's very survival. Have the Soviets kept their word, except in instances where it was distinctly to their advantage? Have the Soviets given us any assurance that their promises are anything more than meaningless? Can the administration, who must account to 180 million people for their lives and fortunes, really propose this plan in seriousness?

Additionally, the UPI dispatch discloses that an inspection system will be based on a so-called sampling technique. The dispatch says:

> U.S. officials said Soviet delegates seemed interested in the new inspection proposal.

Mr. Speaker, they certainly would be. Just how foolish and naive are the men speaking for our country. We could not be playing into the Communists' hands any better if we merely attached a motor to the Statue of Liberty's arms and waved them on it.

I urge the Congress to voice its strong disapproval and head off this administration proposal before it brings the United States closer to ruination.

WHAT IS DEFENSE DEPARTMENT TRYING TO HIDE?

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, just what is the Department of Defense trying to hide?

The latest censorship of a military man's speech involves the Daughters of the American Revolution, meeting in convention here in Washington. The thought that Maj. Arch E. Roberts would tip off something big, a military or strategic secret, to the dear ladies of the DAR not only reaches comical proportions, but blackens the service of a distinguished military officer.

Mr. Speaker, we have been seeing numerous stories in newspapers in the past 2 weeks, relating to a statement being prepared to define this Nation's goals and objectives. We have seen stories of reported concessions we are preparing to make on the disarmament front. We have seen other stories about administration officials plotting to eliminate our "first strike weapons."

Nobody can get anybody in an official capacity to explain these reports, published by respectable newspapers and magazines.

I would hope that the wraps would be taken off these budding theories, which if put into practice would alter the entire complexion of this country's past, present and future.

The censorship of Major Roberts' speech before the ladies of the DAR is, on the surface, farcical. Or was the speech scrapped because of something to hide?

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, there are three points concerning the Defense Department appropriations which I want to discuss. First, although I support the bill, I regret the committee in recommending funds for an aircraft carrier did not see fit to specify that it would be a nuclear-powered ship.

Recently, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I participated in hearings aboard the U.S.S. *Enterprise*. Being on a carrier was no new adventure to me because I served in World War II on one in the South Pacific. But the experience of witnessing maneuvers and demonstrations in connection with the hearings on this nuclear-powered carrier gave me a new concept and attitude about the advantage it has over conventional ships of this nature. It seems to me that the success of the *Enterprise* would dictate that all new carriers would be propelled by nuclear energy.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry no additional nuclear-powered surface ships of other types were included in the Defense Department appropriations bill we are considering today. One of the arguments for a conventional carrier is that a nuclear-powered carrier is limited by the conventional-powered ships that make up the task force to which the carrier might be assigned.

We already have the *Longbeach*, a carrier, and we soon will have the guided missile frigate *Bainbridge*. It would appear to me the sensible approach would be to construct other nuclear-powered surface ships to form a nuclear-powered task force. Such a task force could be a deterrent that would give us an advantage which would take years for an enemy to counteract.

I am pleased, however, to note that the committee has recommended additional nuclear-powered Polaris-class submarines. I highly approve of this move to increase our Polaris fleet to 12 by the end of the fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to take up my second point. This is the provision of the bill to authorize that 35 percent of the repairs, alterations, and conversion of naval ships be carried out in private shipyards. As you know, the Vinson-Trammell Act provides that 50 percent of new construction be allocated to private industry. If I remember correctly, the appropriations bill last year set a 20-to-80 ratio for repairs, alterations, and conversions.

On the surface it would seem as if the higher ratio for private yards recommended for fiscal 1963 would reduce the amount of work scheduled for naval shipyards. This isn't the case, however. The fact is that naval shipyards will have $24 million more work during the coming fiscal year than during fiscal 1962. This should eliminate any doubts about the future of naval shipyards in fiscal 1963.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that private shipyards save our taxpayers money. Rear Adm. Ralph K. James has stated that costs in private yards are 8 to 15 percent lower than in naval shipyards. An independent survey has supported this contention by showing that private yards can do the same work as naval shipyards at costs between 17 and 23 percent lower. The study, in this case, takes into consideration the tax which private yards have to pay, thereby indicating a higher savings than the admiral anticipated.

Mr. Speaker, the private shipyards can do everything a naval shipyard can do. And, if all work were contracted to private industry, this Nation would save up to $70 million. I say that if the 35-to-65-percent ratio is reduced an unnecessary drain will be put on the public treasury.

One other point, Mr. Speaker, which I think of vital importance is section 535, which provides that no part of the funds appropriated shall be available for paying costs of advertising. I support this section, but from the standpoint of national security I believe it is inadequate because there is nothing in the section to prevent a defense contractor from advertising, with his own funds, classified matter.

All one has to do, Mr. Speaker, is to pick up a technical journal and leaf through its pages to discover advertising of potential value to our enemies. For example, I have seen an advertisement which pictured in detail a silo at one of our hardened missile bases. It is obvious that classified projects are being advertised to the detriment of our national security. Perhaps legislation outside this bill we are considering today is necessary to prevent such leaks of classified information. If this is true, I hope the appropriate committee will study this matter and come up with an acceptable solution for the Congress to act upon.

POSITIVE PROGRAM FOR VICTORY OVER COMMUNISM

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, on December 4, 1961, in Santa Monica, Calif., I delivered a speech in which I outlined what I feel we must do to achieve total victory over the international monolithic Communist conspiracy. I titled my speech, "Positive Program for Victory Over Communism."

Many of my constituents have expressed an interest in reading the speech. For their benefit I would like to have it printed in a public document to which they have ready access. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is such a document. I therefore have asked, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, that it be printed in the body of the RECORD:

POSITIVE PROGRAM FOR VICTORY OVER COMMUNISM

(Originally delivered December 4, 1961, in Santa Monica, Calif., before Women for Better Government, Mrs. Robert Mazet, president)

(Introductory remarks were made by former Congressman Donald Jackson)

Tonight, I will offer a positive program for victory over communism. We have heard so much from the leftwing establishment that we as conservatives or "militant patriots" have not come forward with a positive plan for total victory. I say to this sincere but misled group, "You are wrong. We as conservatives do have a plan. You as collectivists just have not had the opportunity to understand it. You have spent so much time attacking those of us who are trying to point out that there is an internal Communist threat that you have become deafened by your own noise."

Before discussing my suggestions for a positive program for victory, we should review quickly the advancement of communism in the world.

In 1848, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, in their "Communist Manifesto," made the following statement:

"A specter is haunting Europe—the specter of communism." Paraphrasing this statement 113 years later, we can say, "A specter is haunting all the world—the specter of communism."

Remember, it was only 1903 when a devoted follower of Marx, Nicolai Lenin, and a handful of trained terrorists and revolutionaries began to search for a country to call their own. Since that time, the ruthless and barbaric Communists—and that is what they are—have enslaved nearly 40 percent of the world's population, 1 billion people. The rate of growth of this insidious and false ideology is unparalleled in the annals of human history. Those devoted to the preservation of individual freedom and liberty must become alert by taking positive action to halt this menace and, more important, they must advance and vigorously advocate the cause of individual freedom and constitutional government.

It is not necessary to describe in detail the aims, nature, and tactics of communism, because here in southern California we have been fortunate in recent months to have several schools of anticommunism, thousands of study groups, and living-room discussion groups. Many of our service clubs have been of tremendous assistance in providing additional educational programs. However, it does become necessary to review quickly the basic concepts of communism in order to understand why it is absolutely necessary to commence a positive program for victory immediately.

We must not fall for the leftwing or collectivist establishment line that these goals are unrealistic in "today's complex world." We know that communism is anti-God, that it considers each of us as basically an animal who needs only clothing, food, shelter. It has no standards of values other than one which dictates that an act, no matter how ruthless or destructive, is good if it serves to promote one thing—communism. It absolutely refuses to allow freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom to assemble, freedom to move about in a country without restrictions, freedom to express oneself and develop one's creative abilities to the fullest, freedom to own property, freedom of opportunity in education, freedom of choosing one's own job, freedom to make a profit, freedom to keep the major portion of one's own wage. Life in a Communist nation for those other than the privileged elite is sterile, mediocre, destitute of ideals, and utterly bankrupt of individual freedoms for which you and I are fighting.

A French woman who recently traveled extensively in Russia summed it up this way in a magazine called Realite: "Russia today is a huge paternalistic and clerical village where the boss is the state and the bible is Pravda." How much more do we need to know about the Communist philosophy when it is so graphically drawn for us?

Conceivably, we could get along with Communists if they were nonexpansionists. But they are not, and this is the important point. Communist ideology dictates that communism must take over control of the world. Communists argue that as a result of class warfare they will rule the world. All Americans have at one time or another been deceived by this insidious philosophy—sometimes our youth, sometimes our journalists, sometimes our teachers, sometimes our businessmen, sometimes our ministers, sometimes our wage earners, sometimes our politicians. No segment of our society has been exempt.

Communism with its sugar-coated humanitarianism claims historical justification which it does not have. On this erroneous claim, Khrushchev bases his "We will bury you" policy. This policy makes it all too clear that we are in a fight for the survival of our free system. In the words of Lincoln we are in a fight to determine whether a "Nation * * * so constituted (as ours) can long endure." The Communists have drawn the line; we have not. It is they who steal, lie, cheat, and deceive at every conference table. It is not the Americans who have done those things. The Communists are the deceivers, as J. Edgar Hoover so aptly observes in his book, "Masters of Deceit."

There is considerable discussion and disagreement among people in all walks of life, as well as among elected and appointed officials, as to where the basic threat to America lies. The question raised is, "Is the threat external or internal?" Many of us know it is both. J. Edgar Hoover said at the 1957 American Legion convention, "To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat in the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide." We have many authorities to prove the validity of Mr. Hoover's statement. James Burnham discusses the internal threat in his book, "Web of Subversion." This well-documented book shows the nature and extent of Communist activity within our own Government and how Communist cell members were able to move and promote themselves upward during and after World War II. We have former FBI counterspies such as Herbert Philbrick and Matt Cvetic who have constantly and consistently said the Communist threat is internal. They ought to know, having participated in the conspiracy. We have books written by Whittaker Chambers, Dr. Bella Dodd, Elizabeth Bentley, and many others who were duped into joining the Communist Party on humanitarian grounds and later left the party because they discovered that Communists profess an interest in humanitarian causes only as a means of covering up their ultimate objective, namely, total enslavement or control of mankind. We have those, and this is very important, who have come to our shores because they have escaped the ironclad control of communism—Hungarians, Czechoslovakians, Cubans. Today in Florida there are over 200,000 exiles from Cuba who did not recognize the internal Communist threat posed by Castro until it was too late.

Just plain American commonsense and logic will tell us the threat is internal. All we have to do is look around us and see the evidence. For instance, a poll taken in one of our local schools showed that 67 percent of the students would rather live under communism than fight a war.

What does the freedom versus communism scoreboard show?

First, we have seen country after country fall not only because of the external threat but because they were internally molded mentally to accept communism before they fell. In eastern Europe—Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Latvia, Rumania, Poland, Albania, Yugoslavia. In the Far East—Outer Mongolia, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Laos. We find other countries that are in danger today. We know the Communists have heavily infiltrated the northern border of India. There are many active Communists today in Cambodia, South Vietnam, and Indonesia. In Latin America, Communists have scored in Cuba, British Guiana, where a known Marxist was just recently elected Prime Minister, northern areas of Brazil, and Venezuela, whose President is a man who has been a proponent of communism for years. In Africa Communist agitation is extensive in the Congo, Guinea, and Ghana. Thus, we see many countries falling into the Communist orbit, because they have been softened up internally to accept communism.

Examples of the internal threat of communism to the United States are not hard to find. Our Government continues to extend aid to Communist countries, even though we know their goal is to bury us. A group of professors from leading universities formed a Fair Play for Cuba Committee to promote friendlier relations with Fidel Castro. It took our State Department almost 3 years to admit that Castro is a Communist. Let me just give you part of Castro's statement reported by the United Press International last weekend: "Premier Castro has settled once and for all Saturday the question of his politics. He is a dedicated Communist, dedicated to the principles of communism and has been so since the days of his college. 'I am a Marxist-Leninist,' he said, 'and I will remain one until I die.'" As our President told us in the last election, our State Department had continual reports from ambassadors saying Castro, his brother, Raul, and Che Guevara, were Communists. We actually encouraged the Communist takeover in Cuba. Our own State Department helped put Castro in power. In recent months well-meaning Americans with Presidential blessing formed a Tractors for Cuba Committee. Our House Un-American Activities Committee, which is made up of some of the finest men I know from both parties in the House of Representatives, has been degraded by many. Showing of a well-documented film, "Operation Abolition," has been prevented in some places because it is "controversial" or "we have to understand the other side." Our well-meaning administration goes to summits, not really prepared to deal with Communist duplicity. We trade with Communist countries. We make loans to Communist countries. Some of our leaders tell us there is no internal threat. Yet we continue to make the same mistakes. Obviously, we are not winning, and I think most Americans are coming to this realization rather quickly. As a matter of fact, Edward R. Murrow admitted this in a recent interview with the Hearst papers. In response to the question, "Are we winning the psychological war?" he said, "No."

When some of us say we are not winning, that the internal threat is very real, there are those who stand up and call us extremists or superpatriots. They don't understand that the some 5,000 people who recently protested U.S. aid to Tito by picketing outside the Hollywood Palladium during President Kennedy's speech are good Americans who, on their own, have come to the commonsense conclusion that we should stop dealing with our known enemy. I will go a step further—I believe most Americans subscribe to the principle set forth in article III, section 3, of our Constitution. It says that giving aid and comfort to an enemy is treason. Tito is a Communist and he recently reemphasized his close alliance with Moscow. Consequently, Tito is our enemy and to continue giving him aid and comfort would be treasonable. To paraphrase Patrick Henry, one of America's greatest patriots, "If this position be extremism, make the most of it."

I think we should look at some comments made by a very fine American in 1949 in a speech in Congress when, in my opinion, he was a little closer to the people than he is right now. In this particular speech, John F. Kennedy made the following statement: "The indifference, if not the contempt, with which the State Department and the President treated the wife of the head of the Nationalist Government who was then fighting for a free China, Madame Chiang Kai-shek, was the final chapter in this tragic story. [Remember, this is John F. Kennedy in 1949.] Our policy in China has reaped the whirlwind. The continued insistence that aid would not be forthcoming unless a coalition government with the Communists was formed was a crippling blow to the Nationalist Government. So concerned were our diplomats and their advisers—the Lattimores and the Fairbanks—with the imperfections of the diplomatic system in China after 20 years of war and the tales of corruption in high places that they lost sight of our tremendous stake in a non-Communist China. There were those who claimed and still claim the Chinese Communists were not really Communists at all but merely advanced agrarian movement which did not take direction from Moscow. The responsibility for the failure of foreign policy in the Far East rests squarely with the White House and the Department of State. This House must now assume the responsibility of preventing the onrushing tide of communism from engulfing all of Asia."

Mr. Kennedy, the American people are trying to say to you today—not because they are trying to be agitators, but because they recognize the enemy—that all Americans, including you, must accept the responsibility for preventing the onrushing tide of communism from engulfing the world. I say, let's get at it.

Some political writers claim that anti-Communists try to simplify what they (the writers) call complex problems. With this word, "complex," they try to muddy the water with fuzzy thinking so as to make commonsense conclusions virtually impossible. I violently oppose those who try to discourage the American people from studying, understanding, and undertaking the task of doing something about the Communist threat, claiming that it is too complex for them. The strength of our Nation lies in the composite judgment of an informed citizenry—commonsense mixed with personal study and education. Every man has the capacity to contribute to the fight for survival against the international Communist criminal conspiracy. If this is superpatriotism, I am proud to be called a superpatriot.

I have been constructively critical of the leadership of the present administration in the battle against the internal threat of communism, but criticism alone will not get the job done. It is incumbent upon me and other conservatives to present some ideas for a positive program for victory. I am not presumptuous enough to speak for my party, of which I am proud to be a part, or any great segment of people. These are just the ideas which occur to me as one public servant.

On the international scene—

1. We must declare our purpose to win against the Communist conspiracy and say that a state of hostility does exist between ourselves and international communism and that we intend to win. My colleague Congressman DONALD BRUCE, of Indiana, has introduced House Joint Resolution 444 which recognizes that a state of hostility exists, and directs the President to develop a program for total victory. It is time for the administration to stop talking tough, while backing away an inch at a time. We must state to the rest of the world that we have many moral reasons for wishing to eliminate all traces of the Communist conspiracy and that we have a responsibility to develop and execute a program for total victory.

2. It is absolutely imperative that we break diplomatic relations with Russia and all other Communist nations. As I indicated earlier this evening, and as many of you in this audience and most Americans watching tonight know, we cannot honorably deal with Communists. They are nothing more than international cutthroats who intend only one thing and that is "to bury us." Breaking diplomatic relations will not hurt our ability to have listening posts in Outer Mongolia or any other place. Our intelligence sources give us far more information than we are able to gather through most of our embassies, since the Russians usually "bug" our embassies or wiretap our communication systems. We could go on the diplomatic offensive if we broke relations and said to the rest of the world, "We hope you will follow our example, because you know as well as we do that Communists cannot be trusted in any respect. We are willing to take the leadership in breaking relations with an international gangster of this type." When the day arrived that we could honorably reestablish diplomatic relations, we would, of course, do so.

3. I think we must immediately break all trade relations with every Communist country or pro-Communist country and establish a strong economic blockade wherever possible. We have had recent hearings in Washington—Congressman GLEN LIPSCOMB

from our State has been very active in those hearings—showing that you cannot trade with the Communist conspiracy without building up its ability to defeat you. So, I think that this is an absolute must.

4. I think that there must be a drastic change or reorganization within the United Nations or we should cancel our membership. We want to get along with the rest of the world. We have done everything to make the U.N. an effective instrument of freedom and world peace. But, of course, we know Alger Hiss helped to organize the U.N. He hired over 600 people, some of whom are still there. I sincerely believe, and I have given this subject a tremendous amount of study, that the United Nations as now constituted, is an instrument of Soviet foreign policy. The longer we stay in, the more recklessly our money will be spent.

I intend to support a resolution calling for our withdrawal from the U.N. which Congressman JAMES UTT, a great patriot, will introduce early in the next session of Congress. The resolution will be based on a well-documented case showing that the U.N. is today controlled by the Communist conspiracy. This will be a positive thing, because it will make clear to the rest of the world that we do not intend to belong to any organization which the Communist conspiracy controls, dominates and runs. Congressman JOHN ASHBROOK, of Ohio, has also introduced a worthwhile bill which calls for an investigation of U.S. funds spent in the U.N. The bill would prevent the expenditure of any further funds until the investigation is complete.

5. I think we must do a better job of training overseas personnel. In the last session of Congress, I introduced a bill, H.R. 7291, which provides for the establishment of a 5-year Foreign Service Academy, the management of which would be shared by Congress, the Defense Department, and the State Department. The curriculum of the Academy would be such that Academy graduates would be thoroughly prepared to meet the Communist challenge overseas.

6. It is essential that we drastically improve our U.S. Information Agency. I would again like to quote Mr. Edward R. Murrow, who now heads this organization. In an interview with a Hearst organization paper (this organization owns several newspapers, including the Los Angeles Examiner and the Los Angeles Herald-Express, which do an excellent job of telling us what the Communist conspiracy is), Mr. Murrow was asked, "Would you say we are winning the propaganda war?" He answered, "No, I would not." It is obvious that through this agency we must do a better job of telling peoples of other countries about our constitutional form of government and our system of free enterprise. This could be done through books, films, and other things which we send overseas today. I am afraid that USIA has neglected to tell our free enterprise story. USIA books and films tend to suggest that socialism best promotes the ideas of freedom. We must do a better job of using the talent that our free enterprise system makes available in the fields of public relations, advertising and promotion. We spend billions and billions of dollars to promote our own products in this country, but we don't take the time to sell the ideas in our Declaration of Independence and Constitution. Thus, we must improve our overseas information program.

7. I think it is extremely important that we have a full investigation of our State Department—the quicker the better. I am not suggesting witch hunts, as I am sure some of our opponents will imply after tonight. What I am asking for is a well-planned, objective investigation. You know, Senator Robert Taft agreed to get into the 1952 Eisenhower campaign after being promised that should Eisenhower be elected, there would be a full investigation of the State Department. Mr. Taft passed away before this occurred. I think that this investigation has been desperately needed, not because I do not have faith in our State Department (as some will try to infer), but because I believe many people who have the responsibility for managing our foreign affairs, such as the people who dealt with the Cuban problem, do not fully understand what the Communist conspiracy is. This is obvious when we continually lose countries to the Communists by making the same mistakes. And so, I think we need a full and complete investigation of our State Department to make clear to the American people why these mistakes have been made and how we can avoid them in the future.

8. We must reestablish military training programs which inform our troops of the true Communist threat. I know I do not have to go into this extensively, because Gen. Edwin A. Walker did it very ably a few nights ago on television. He told you why it is tremendously important that we always properly indoctrinate our troops not only as to how to work in the battlefield, but mentally to know what the enemy is and how he tries to subvert us. It is important that our troops know what the Communist conspiracy is in order to know what they are fighting to preserve. We must reinstate a more active, vigorous troop information program such as General Walker developed.

9. I think we must totally revise our foreign aid program. It needs new criteria. The money which we send overseas must serve to advance the cause of freedom and not promote socialism and/or communism which tend to be blood brothers and operate together overseas. We must encourage private capital to be reinvested abroad in areas that are safe under a true self-determined type of government. We must not fail, as we did in Cuba, to protect that capital once it has gone abroad. If Castro had known that we would send our troops the moment they confiscated private property belonging to Americans, he never would have started the 26th of July movement. Evidently, he had some strong indication that the U.S. Government would let its own citizens be harassed and their property confiscated without the kind of affirmative protection we enjoyed during the administration of Teddy Roosevelt.

10. We must work more aggressively to help promote the objectives of our true friends. As an example, Chiang Kai-shek is reported to have crack guerrilla troops which could be used in warfare now going on in Asian countries. If the Asian country involved is willing, and only under that condition, we should encourage the use of Chiang's troops to fight for freedom in the Asian area. This would have several important advantages for the free world: eager, effective troops, which we have trained and equipped at considerable time and expense would finally be used. This would nullify any potential claim of white intervention, because it would be orientals against orientals.

We must work aggressively with our friends overseas, and not with known enemies such as Cheddi Jagan of British Guiana, who says, "I am a Marxist."

On the domestic scene:

1. We have to stop inflation by living within our means as a Federal Government. This is important to the stability of our economy. Mr. Bulganin said in 1954, "The American working man is too well fed. We cannot appeal to him. But when through inflation America has priced herself out of the world market and unemployment increases, then we will settle our debt with the United States." The Communists have told us time and time again that they seek to stimulate inflation and Government activity so we can kill ourselves internally by spending ourselves to death. They laugh at us as they tell us, because somehow Communists believe our zealous sense of generosity will allow us to spend ourselves to death through a decadent Government bureaucracy.

I submit that we must stop inflation by living within our means as a Federal Government. A balanced budget is what we need. This is important to the welfare of our country, though some of our left-wing establishment would not like to believe so.

2. We must eliminate unnecessary Federal welfare expenditures which under our Constitution have no justification. Compulsory social security denies an individual the right to determine for himself what retirement system he will use. I think it is wrong for the Government to confiscate property from people who refuse to participate in the social security program for religious reasons. The Amish people in Pennsylvania are a case in point. Recently, Federal officials confiscated the plowhorses of an Amish farmer who had not paid social security taxes. On religious grounds the Amish do not accept social security or any other kind of assistance from the Federal Government. Do the American people ever figure that it may be their car or their home that is confiscated next by the Federal Government on the command of some bureaucrat in Washington?

I say the American people are tired of having the Federal Government impose supertaxes upon supertaxes to promote programs for which no need has been established in congressional hearings and which are properly the responsibility of individuals and/or local groups and governments to do for themselves. When the local or State government or private charities do a more adequate job, let's keep the Federal Government out of welfare programs. This does not mean we who advance this suggestion are antiwelfare. What it means is that we do not believe in economic feudalism imposed by a Federal Government, which is far removed from local problems and largely insensitive to the needs of particular areas.

3. In the field of agriculture I think we could make a tremendous gain by turning agriculture back to the private sector of our economy and getting the Government out of the agricultural business. By the way, Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, who has traveled extensively in agricultural areas since his recent election, tells me that farmers are saying they want the Government out of the agricultural business, because it is a poor manager of their business. We saw a good example of this last year when farmer William Smith of Big Flats, N.Y., went into the soil bank program just to show how stupid it is. He got $6,000 for not producing anything on a parcel of land which he said was really marginal in the first place. With the money he bought a Cadillac, on the back of which he put a sign reading, "Thanks to the Government I now have a Cadillac for producing nothing." I am convinced that we must take the Government out of agriculture. Of course, we must do this on a step-down basis in order to avoid chaos.

4. I think we as a Nation must toughen our laws against the narcotics peddlers who operate throughout this country on an interstate basis. Communists work vigorously to destroy the moral vitality of our society. We know the Communist conspiracy uses narcotics to advance the moral disintegration of our country. I am confident that there will be laws introduced this year to toughen the Federal Government's ability to prosecute and get rid of the peddlers who work so insidiously even among our youth.

5. I think it is important that we tighten the internal security laws and penalties for Communist subversion in this country. We must learn that the Communists play for

keeps and that we must deal with them with this in mind. Congressman H. ALLEN SMITH has introduced a bill, H.R. 2302, which provides for the imposition of heavier penalties on people whom we can show have been in the Communist conspiracy over long periods of time.

The bill also provides for extensive jail sentences and fines for people who engage in activity designed to contribute to the overthrow of our fine Government. Such people mean only one thing—to bury us. Congressman SMITH's legislation does something about it.

6. We must eliminate government from businesses that can be properly handled by private enterprise. This is a positive program because it provides that businesses will be returned on an open-bid basis to the private sector of the economy, which is where they belong. Congressman JAMES B. UTT has introduced House Joint Resolution 23, otherwise known as the Liberty Amendment, which provides for the selling, over a period of years, of Government agencies that compete improperly with private enterprise—e.g., agencies which manufacture ice cream, rope, and run railroads. By selling these agencies, nearly 700 all told, to private enterprise, we could reduce the Federal budget by almost $40 billion annually. These businesses would be back on the tax rolls instead of being a drag on all taxpayers. Finally, under this amendment it would be possible to eliminate or greatly reduce the Federal personal income tax. This is not an irresponsible measure. Passage of House Joint Resolution 23 would greatly stimulate our private enterprise economy.

Marx and Engels, in their "Communist Manifesto," recommended a heavy progressive and graduated income tax. I do not believe that they had the best interest of free constitutional government in mind when they recommended this. Yet you look at our tax structure today. We have followed the Communists' concepts of progressive taxation at both State and Federal levels of government. Passage of House Joint Resolution 23 would encourage savings and private investment. It would stop money from going to a Federal Government which keeps from 10 to 50 percent of every tax dollar for administrative costs and unproductive work. This measure is a good, sound, aggressive proposal that you and I should support.

The part of the individual citizen:

You ask, "What can we do as individual citizens to fight communism or collectivism in any form?"

1. There are certain conditions under which we must operate.

(a) We must understand that it is going to take a long time to reverse the advance of this insidious philosophy.

(b) We must have perseverance and determination and not be easily discouraged.

(c) We must learn that we cannot coexist with the Communist conspiracy in any respect, and help others to understand this vital point.

(d) We must be willing to educate ourselves to the tactics and purposes of the Communist conspiracy.

This training and education at the grassroots level will take time. A persistent, dedicated, and patient effort will be required by all.

2. We must learn, as I think most Americans already know, that there is no such thing as a free-lunch program for anybody. You and I pay for it. We must turn this philosophy around so that we understand the need for infusing creative initiative and individual responsibility back into our society.

3. We must educate all people to the benefits and attributes of capitalism and the free enterprise system. "Capitalism," "profit," and other words and concepts which are fundamental to our economic system must be given the dignity they deserve, despite efforts of collectivists to downgrade them. Capitalism works, as we have proven, and it is far more inevitable, logical, and desirable than communism. We must tell this story in our schools, unions, businesses, and community organizations.

4. We must encourage all communication media to report the news accurately, with a sense of integrity and fairplay, and be sure that our side of the issue is not distorted.

5. We must constantly improve the quality of responsible anti-Communist and pro-American activity in all groups. This means in every association in which we participate we must make sure that people understand what the capitalist system is—what free enterprise is—what constitutional government really means.

6. We must reintroduce spiritual values into our daily lives. This will give us the moral judgment, the toughness of purpose that we have lacked in some instances. We must renew our dedication to the spiritual ideals which made this the greatest country in the beginning that was ever created by man. But we did not create this alone. Remember, in the Constitutional Convention Benjamin Franklin called upon all members to begin each day with a prayer. One who holds strong moral and spiritual values is not usually easy prey for communism.

7. Finally, as individuals we must be activists for freedom. We have got to start the greatest do-it-yourself movement ever witnessed by man. Do not wait for someone else to do it. Be willing to stand up and be controversial. Do not just back away because you want to be "socially acceptable."

In closing, many of us have been accused of being superpatriots. "Super" in the dictionary means over and above in quantity and in quality or degree—more than. Patriot means one who loves his country and zealously supports its authority and interest.

I am proud to be among the superpatriots, because I assume the superpatriot is better than just a plain patriot. I am sure that all Americans regard themselves as superpatriots. So let's be proud of our patriotism and not be defensive about it. To those who say, "Well, the superpatriots are overfearful, or too afraid and suspicious," let us say, "No, we are not afraid and suspicious. We believe in this crusade for freedom. We are willing to talk about it." To talk about freedom is good, because to do so might agitate and stimulate a little conversation. Let us join the conversation and not back away. So why don't we pledge tonight to join together in a great movement of superpatriotism. In becoming superpatriots we will work more fervently to see that others in the world have the same rights and freedom that we have. Others will follow our example because we don't apologize or back away from our system. We're for it, and we're willing to fight for its preservation.

Remember, Jesus was not a middle-of-the-road Christian. He placed intense reliance on the deeper spiritual values in life. It must be the same with us as a Nation if we are to survive.

So I recommend as one citizen that we embark upon a dramatic program of intensified patriotism in the classical sense; that we rejuvenate the good concepts of capitalism by eliminating the stifling retrogression of socialistic, economic feudalism and big government muzzlement. We can win with constitutional freedom and economic capitalism. Let us right now begin the task.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 2

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday, May 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE JOHN HANCOCK MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO., 1862–1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, one of Boston's very good neighbors and respected corporate citizens will reach its hundredth year of business life.

I am pleased to extend my best wishes to the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. and its officers, employees, and well-wishers, who will officially celebrate this proud occasion on Monday, April 23.

At a time when we are witnessing the rebirth of our great city, the John Hancock anniversary serves to remind us of the significant role this and other long-established institutions have played, not only in the advancement of the city of Boston, but of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Nation as well.

When the John Hancock first opened its doors in 1862, we are told that the company comprised a handful of personnel in a crowded, one-room office on State Street in Boston, Mass. There were no customers—only the faith of the founders and of the Boston merchants and bankers whose belief in the instrument of life insurance persuaded them to provide the necessary initial capital.

That their confidence was well placed is evident today. With a nationwide organization and policy owners numbering nearly 12 million, the company ranks among the largest of the country's business leaders. Yet despite its size and scope, the John Hancock has retained its essential Boston character and its contribution to the economic, social, and cultural development of our city continues to be substantial.

More than 5,400 men and women from our metropolitan and suburban areas find employment in the John Hancock's home office, whose lofty tower is a symbol of progress on Boston's skyline. During 1961, the company's compensation to these and other Boston agency forces reached $28¾ million, while property taxes channeled another $2½ million directly into the city's economy.

We have only to look about us to remember that, over the past century, the John Hancock has encouraged the expansion of our urban resources through the steady investment of its policy owners' funds in commercial and residential projects. Currently, the company's outstanding mortgage loans and commitments of $81 million—which most recently include Charles River Park—stand as abundant confirmation of the company's belief in the future of Boston.

In other areas the John Hancock has also conducted itself as a worthy builder, in its support of our arts festival, in its advocacy of the freedom trail, and in its vigorous aid to the many educational and charitable organizations without which our community would be considerably impoverished.

Finally, in the best tradition of the Revolutionary patriot, whose signature the company adopted, the John Hancock has devoted itself unceasingly to those principles of thrift, self-reliance, and financial independence of the individual which Bostonians, lovers of liberty, have long held in the greatest esteem.

SPEAKER MARTIN: GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein articles from the Worcester Telegram, and Boston Globe, relative to the exercises honoring our dear, illustrious friend, Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., on Sunday, by the presentation of a most artistic and beautifully done bust of him, to be placed in the Hall of Fame of the House of Representatives.

Never in the history of this House has an honor been so appropriately bestowed as the one paying fitting tribute to Speaker MARTIN.

Virtually his whole life has been devoted to the service of his country and the people. By reason of his great ability, fidelity to duty, untiring energy and hard work, he has risen to one of the loftiest positions in the Government. His achievements are too numerous to relate; his accomplishments praiseworthy and historic; the reach of his influence for good immeasurable.

Beloved, respected and admired on both sides of the aisle, hailed by every group in the Nation for his broad understanding and noble humane qualities, he is without doubt a man of unsurpassed modesty and humility, of simple tastes and down-to-earth fundamental loyalties.

The present distinguished and illustrious Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, fittingly referred to JOE MARTIN as one of the greatest Americans of our times and, in that one phrase, he epitomized and summarized better than a thousand words, the fame, patriotism and simplicity of this devoted, lovable and dedicated public servant.

We are all devotees, admirers and friends of JOE MARTIN. We are proud to be his friends. Because the Nation that could produce such a sterling leader, endowed with the finest qualities we prize in American life, can boast a possession richer and more meaningful than that of any kingdom or principality.

I heartily join in the sentiments expressed on the occasion of the presentation of the bust, and heartily congratulate Speaker MARTIN and his family upon this great honor. It symbolizes the great esteem and deep affection which people everywhere hold for him, which history will record in golden letters, because JOE MARTIN is indelibly impressed with the loftiest brand of patriotism and has the endearing love and gratitude of his colleagues, his fellow citizens and the peoples of the entire free world. Generations yet unborn will long continue to be inspired by his great contributions.

Hail and salute to a noble son of Massachusetts. May he enjoy good health and happiness in his great work for many years to come.

The articles follow:

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Apr. 16, 1962]

CONGRESS HONORS MARTIN

WASHINGTON.—Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts, watched as a marble bust of himself was unveiled yesterday and said simply "I wish I could convince myself that this honor was deserved."

The unusual honor was accorded the 77-year-old former House Republican leader and Speaker as more than 700 members of the National Federation of Republican Women, Senators, House Members and others jammed the caucus room in the old House Office Building.

Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, summed up the tributes when he said "JOE MARTIN, Speaker MARTIN, is one of the great Americans of all times."

The marble bust, by Madame Suzanne Silvercruys Stevenson, will be taken down one floor to the House's "Hall of Fame" in the rotunda of the office building.

MARTIN will have the distinction of being the only living person with a memorial in the rotunda. The other eight leaders whose busts have been placed there are dead.

They are:

Former Speakers Joseph Cannon, of Illinois, Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio, Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, and Champ Clark of Missouri; former Democratic leaders Oscar Underwood, of Alabama, and Claude Kitchin, of North Carolina; former Republican leader James R. Mann, of Illinois; and Martin B. Madden, Illinois Republican, who once was head of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. J. B. Parks, president of the National Federation of Republican Women, presided at the ceremonies. The GOP women started the idea of a bust of MARTIN while he was serving his second term as House Speaker in the 83d Congress. They sponsored a nationwide campaign for funds.

Mrs. Parks read a greeting from former President Eisenhower and his wife, Mamie, in which they saluted Martin as a "dedicated man." Messages from former Vice President Nixon and Gov. John Volpe, of Massachusetts, also were read.

WILL LIVE 25 YEARS

MARTIN said that when he looks at the statues he thinks "of the end of the road, it brings a touch of sadness," but he brightened and added "someone told me I will live 25 years longer and I am going to, I think."

MARTIN confided that he had decided to quit Congress 2 years ago but someone told him he would be dead within 2 years if he did. He said the advice was probably correct and he was glad he decided to stay on in Congress.

MCCORMACK, who accepted the bust for the Hall of Fame, said that MARTIN "represents the spirit of America. His life is like a Horatio Alger story, newsboy at 5, reporter at 18, owner of a daily newspaper at 24—and over 50 years of humble and trustworthy public service."

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, Apr. 16, 1962]

BUST OF JOE MARTIN UNVEILED IN HOUSE

WASHINGTON.—Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts, 77, watched as a marble bust of himself was unveiled Sunday and said simply, "I wish I could convince myself that this honor was deserved."

The unusual honor was accorded the former House Republican leader and Speaker as more than 700 members of the National Federation of Republican Women, Senators, House Members and others jammed the caucus room in the old House Office Building.

GREAT AMERICAN

Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, summed up the tributes when when he said, "JOE MARTIN, Speaker MARTIN, is one of the great Americans of all time."

The marble bust, by Madame Suzanne Silvercruys Stevenson, will be taken down one floor to the House's "Hall of Fame" in the rotunda of the office building.

MARTIN will have the distinction of being the only living person with a memorial in the rotunda. The other eight leaders whose busts have been placed there are dead.

The other eight busts are: former Speakers Joseph Cannon, of Illinois, Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio, Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, and Champ Clark, of Missouri; former Democratic leaders Oscar Underwood, of Alabama, and Claude Kitchin, of North Carolina; former Republican leader James R. Mann, of Illinois; and Martin B. Madden, Illinois Republican who once was head of the House Appropriations Committee.

GREETING FROM IKE

Mrs. J. B. Parks, president of the National Federation of Republican Women, presided at the ceremonies. The GOP women conceived the idea of a bust of MARTIN while he was serving his second term as House Speaker in the 83d Congress. They sponsored a nationwide campaign for funds.

Mrs. Parks read a greeting from former President Eisenhower and his wife, Mamie, in which they saluted Martin as a "dedicated man." Messages from former Vice President Richard M. Nixon and Mrs. Nixon, and Gov. John Volpe, of Massachusetts, also were read.

DOMESTIC PETROLEUM AND COAL INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the remarks I make today will, in my opinion, be the most important remarks I have ever made as a Member of this House and, perhaps, ever will make. My remarks will be devoted to the matter of an adequate supply of petroleum and coal for this Nation. I believe in this problem is involved the future security and life of the Nation, and because of that I do not believe anything of greater importance could be discussed by anyone.

Mr. Speaker, we are faced in this Nation in the next few years with a disaster unless something is done to change the trend that has prevailed in the two great energy industries of domestic coal and the petroleum industry in recent years. The fact that this matter is serious is attested to best by the fact that under existing law the President of the United States in his wisdom has seen fit to issue an executive order in which he found that the importation of foreign oils did pose a threat to the national security and, therefore, he invoked quotas to try to cure the problem. This authority was taken under the national security clause contained in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act passed 3 years ago. It is unfortunate that the program to this date has not been effective. The purpose of my remarks today is to try to call the attention of the Congress to the seriousness of the situation and to the urgent and vital need for a very easy and simple answer to this problem.

The simple truth is that unless we can do something and do it now, it will only be a matter of a few years before these United States will run short of the one indispensable source of energy—petroleum.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and I, with many others, today have introduced companion bills which are designed, in order to assure the national security and to support an expanding economy, to make certain that our domestic fuels industries—petroleum and coal—are maintained in a strong position.

Experience of two World Wars, Korea, and the cold war that has followed have demonstrated that this Nation cannot afford to become dependent upon uncertain foreign sources of petroleum which may be cut off without warning by precipitous action of unstable governments or through enemy action.

The Suez crisis of 1956 clearly demonstrates the dangers of becoming dependent upon foreign oil. This experience further demonstrates that adequate supplies of domestic fuels can serve to avert war as well as to win war. During this crisis, Europe was threatened with a fuel shortage. It was the assurance of an adequate supply of petroleum from the United States which served to avert war.

No subject has had more careful and repeated study and consideration during the past few years, by both the Congress and the executive branch, than has the oil import problem. The problem of excessive oil imports was one of the principal considerations Congress had in mind when it adopted the national security provision of the trade law. This provision was last reviewed, amended, and strengthened by the Congress in 1958. Early in 1959, based upon a finding that oil imports threatened the security of the United States, the executive branch of Government inaugurated an oil import limitation program which continues in effect. Three years experience under this program demonstrates that although it has been helpful in mitigating the trend of increasing imports, it has not accomplished the objective of providing a vigorous and expanding petroleum industry.

The proposal constitutes a moderate strengthening of the program now in effect and which has had general acceptance throughout both the Government and the petroleum industry.

Prior to World War II, total petroleum imports, including crude oil and all products amounted to 5 percent of domestic production of crude oil. This ratio has continuously increased, now exceeding 26 percent of domestic production. This constitutes too much reliance and dependence upon uncertain sources. This trend of increasing dependence, in the interest of both domestic growth and national security, must be corrected.

The proposal provides that the national security provision of the Tariff Act of 1930 be amended as follows:

H.R. 11420

A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the national security provision (19 U.S.C.A. 1352a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, be amended by adding the following new subsections:

"(f) Whenever the President has taken action pursuant to the authority of this section to adjust imports of any article by means of a quantitative limitation on imports, such limitation shall apply to all imports of such article and its derivatives from all sources, and, except as otherwise provided under this section, shall not exceed that quantity which bears the same ratio to United States domestic production of such article for each annual period during which said limitation is in effect as the ratio which all imports of such article and its derivatives bore to United States domestic production of such article during a prior representative base period which the President may select.

"(g) In administering any action taken pursuant to the authority of this section to adjust imports of any article, due regard shall be given to (1) the elimination of competitive inequities, (2) the maintenance of a competitive domestic industry, (3) the prevention of monopolistic practices, and (4) the encouragement of small business.

"(h) In order to assure that imports do not threaten to impair the national security and pursuant to the national security objectives of this section, the President shall establish quantitative limitations on the importation of crude petroleum and its derivatives and liquids derived from natural gas.

(1) Imports (including supplies for vessels or aircraft) of crude petroleum and its derivatives (excluding residual fuel oil for use as fuel) and liquids derived from natural gas shall be limited for each annual period to not more than 14 percent of the U.S. production of crude petroleum during a prior representative base period as the President may select.

(2) Imports (excluding supplies for vessels or aircraft) of residual fuel oil for use as fuel shall be limited for each annual period to an amount which together with domestic production will meet national requirements, provided that in determining national requirements the availability of domestic fuels shall be considered, and provided further that the import level established shall not exceed the average level of such imports during a prior representative base period as the President may select.

"(1) The President, upon finding that an emergency makes it necessary to provide additional supplies, may adjust the import limitations established under this section to the extent he finds necessary to assure adequate supplies of any article or its derivatives to meet national requirements during the emergency period, provided that in determining whether adequate supplies are available the availability of competing or substitute products shall be considered."

I would like at this point to explain the intent and purpose of the provisions of this proposal, but first, I would like to point out that the national security provision of existing law has been incorporated in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (H.R. 9900) as section 232. I am hopeful, therefore, and wish to urge that the Ways and Means Committee incorporate the bill my colleague and I have introduced today, as an amendment to section 232 of H.R. 9900.

GENERAL LEGISLATIVE STANDARDS

The first provision of this proposal, paragraph (f), is a general noncommodity amendment which would be applicable to all commodities. This provision would not alter the President's authority under present law in determining whether or not the national security provision should be invoked. The determination as to whether or not imports of an article threatens to impair the security of the Nation is left to the President as under existing law. It, therefore, does not involve a basic change in existing law. It is designed to implement existing law by establishing a clear standard to be followed in the administration of the law whenever the President finds that the national security provision should be invoked.

First, paragraph (f) would require that whenever the President determines that imports should be limited in the interest of national security, then any limitation established would apply to all imports of the article from all sources. The purpose is to require that there be established an overall limitation without exemption of any source. This does not mean, however, that the President would have no flexibility in recognizing that imports from certain countries might be more important from the standpoint of national security than imports from other areas. If the President deemed advisable, he would be free to accord preferential treatment to imports accordingly to source; but any preferred treatment would have to be granted within the overall limitation. For example, under the present oil import program, imports from Canada and Mexico are exempt. As a result, Canadian imports have increased substantially while domestic oil production has been static. This does not serve hemispheric defense and it is inequitable. Under paragraph (f) Canadian imports could not be exempt and would have to be within the overall limitation. It is important to note, however, that under this provision, Canadian imports could be given preferred treatment and be left free to increase as now; but if Canadian imports were permitted to increase, then imports from other sources, less important from the standpoint of national security, would have to be reduced commensurately.

Paragraph (f) would further require, once the President determined imports should be limited in the interest of national security, that a limitation be established which would not exceed the ratio that imports bore to domestic production of the article during a prior representative base period to be selected by the President. The purpose of this provision is to assure that imports of the article could not, after a finding that imports theatened security, continue to increase year after year relative to the domestic production of the article. This I submit is a most reasonable and sound requirement.

In the case of petroleum, despite the limitation program, imports have increased while domestic production has been substantially static. This means that the ratio of imports to domestic production of crude oil has continued to increase. This obviously does not serve the national security objective of maintaining a growing and vigorous domestic industry which has been found to be essential to national security.

SMALL BUSINESS STANDARDS

The second provision of the bill, namely paragraph (g), is designed to protect and encourage small business and to provide specific legislative standards to this end. It establishes standards to be followed in the administration of the national security provision in that it would require the administrators of any import limitation program of any commodity established under the national security provision to give due consideration to (1) the elimination of competitive inequities, (2) the maintenance of competitive domestic industries, (3) the prevention of monopolistic practices, and (4) the encouragement of small business.

CONTINUATION OF OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

The third provision of the bill, paragraph (h) would constitute a congressional finding that imports of petroleum threaten to impair the national security and, therefore, should be limited. The Government has recognized the need to limit oil imports for 7 years. First, it was sought to find the solution through Government urging voluntary action on the part of importing companies. That effort was not successful. In 1959, 3 years ago, it was found necessary to invoke the law Congress had provided in 1958 which is referred to as the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Act. This law was first enacted in 1954, strengthened in 1955 and again in 1958. It is particularly pertinent to observe here that petroleum was one of the commodities Congress had in mind in adopting this law. Congress then rightly was concerned about ever-increasing imports of foreign oil. It rightly should be concerned today about too much dependence and growing dependence upon foreign oil.

In 1954, when the national security provision first was enacted by Congress, oil imports already had increased from 5 percent of domestic crude oil production during pre-World War II days to 16.6 percent. By 1958, the ratio had increased to 25 percent and last year, it exceeded 26 percent. Again, I say this is too much dependence on uncertain foreign sources for a fuel vital to our national growth and security.

After this long history of concern and action on the part of both the executive branch and the Congress with respect to the problem of excessive oil imports, it seems to me entirely appropriate for the Congress to further strengthen and implement the national security provision. It seems to me entirely appropriate, and necessary in the interest of the security of our Nation, for the Congress to now strengthen and implement the efforts of the past 6 years on the part of the Executive so as to effectively limit oil imports.

To serve this purpose, paragraph (h) would require that the President continue a quantitative limitation on oil imports such as has been in effect during the past 3 years.

In addition, paragraph (h) would establish a level beyond which oil imports could not exceed, except in case of emergency.

First, under subparagraph (1), imports of crude petroleum and its derivatives—excluding residual fuel oil for use as fuel—and liquids derived from natural gas would be limited to 14 percent of crude oil production. This was the ratio which existed in 1956. And 1956 was a crucial turning-point year in the domestic oil producing industry. Since 1956, the industry has suffered continuous deterioration. Every major activity which serves as an indicator of the economic health of the industry has declined and there is no basis to expect that these declines have yet reached bottom or will cease unless positive action is taken. Subparagraph (1) of paragraph (h) is designed as a step to reestablishment of the oil producing industry to the position enjoyed in 1956. For this reason I believe the ratio imports bore to production in 1956 is a reasonable and logical standard for the determination of the level of imports. The reasonableness of this proposal is shown from the recent history of the ratio these imports bore to crude oil production:

	Ratio
1946–50	7.2
1951–55	10.3
1956	13.9
1957	15.3
1958	17.9
1959	16.6
1960	16.7
1961	17.3

Imports of the products covered in subparagraph (1) during 1961 averaged 1,245,000 barrels daily. Under the 14-percent ratio these imports would be reduced by about 250,000 barrels daily.

Subparagraph (2) of paragraph (h) pertains to residual fuel oil for use as fuel. Residual fuel oil is a fuel used by industry and large commercial consumers such as boiler fuel for ships, utilities, manufacturing enterprises, and large office and residential buildings. It is not used by the individual homeowner or to any great extent by small businesses. Under this provision, residual fuel oil would be limited to the average level of such imports during a prior representative base period to be determined by the President. In the United States, on the average, about 10 percent of each barrel of crude that is refined becomes residual fuel oil. It is, therefore, an important factor in the economics of the industry. Some crude oil contains a much higher content and the relationship in such cases relatively is more important. Producers of such heavy crudes are more directly affected by excessive imports of residual fuel oil. In addition, residual fuel oil competes with coal for many uses, and I am sure my colleague from West Virginia will have something to say regarding the impact of excessive imports on the domestic coal industry.

I wish to emphasize that paragraph (h) would do only two things: first, it would require that a quantitative limitation on oil imports, such as we have now had for 3 years, be continued; second, it would establish the level of the basic quotas. It would not limit the wide discretion the President now has in administering the oil import program. For example, the method or formula for distributing the quota among individual importers would be left entirely to the President or his designate, just as it is under existing law. Also, the President would be free to continue to accord district V—the Western States—different treatment than the remainder of the United States; or to provide preferred treatment to Canada and Mexico as is now done. In other words, the present program could be continued in its entirety. The only difference would be that the overall level of total imports would be reduced by about 250,000 barrels daily below the level of last year. The United States consumes about 10 million barrels of oil daily. The reduction would amount to 2½ percent of the current consumption—a modest and relatively small reduction as compared with the total picture. It would be a small price to pay in the interest of national security and the economic health of a basic industry.

ESCAPE CLAUSE

Paragraph (i) of the bill is a very important provision because it assures that the President at all times will have the broadest of authority to protect the Nation from any situation that might develop. This paragraph would give the President authority to adjust any basic quota established under the national security provision in order to meet a military threat or to protect the Nation from any shortage emergency that might arise. It is a safety valve which, in the last analysis, leaves the matter of import limitations established under the national security clause of the law entirely in the hands of the President.

THE NEED FOR LEGISLATIVE STANDARDS

For 7 years, the Government has recognized the need to limit oil imports in the interest of national security. The specific objective to serve this purpose was the maintenance of a healthy, vigorous domestic oil producing industry. Yet, today, the domestic oil producing industry is not healthy. It is not vigorous.

The need now is specific legislative standards that will give stability to the oil import limitation program that the President has established. The industry needs long-range assurance that imports will not continue to take a larger and larger share of the domestic market.

Only legislation can provide this long-range assurance. Under the present law, the import level is subject to change each 6 months. The industry cannot know what to expect or how to plan. As a result, the industry is depressed. It is stagnate, and in the interest of our economy and security, the Congress should assume its responsibility and act. I believe the proposal Congressman MOORE and I have introduced will meet this need.

The oil import problem has been a matter of concern by Congress and the Executive for 7 years. We should not experiment on such a vital matter any longer.

GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO LIMIT OIL IMPORTS

The various legislative proposals considered by the House of Representatives are subjected to a variety of criteria by which we measure the justification and adequacy of bills introduced.

Three of these yardsticks are fundamental. They involve the national security, the present and future general welfare, and the impact of specific legislation on a specific industry. This is as it should be.

From time to time we used these yardsticks to assess the need for legislation related to our domestic petroleum industry and have made decisions accordingly. The Executive also has given deep consideration to this industry and has been concerned to the extent that it has initiated studies carried out by special committees. The members of these special committees have been dedicated men, all of exceptional talents, selected for their ability to make critical analysis of the problems and to make recommendations essential to the Nation's well-being.

On July 30, 1954, the President established an Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. In addition to its Chairman, the Director of ODM, the Committee was composed of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, Justice, Interior, Commerce, and Labor. On February 26, 1955, the White House released the report prepared by this Committee and included among their recommendations was one concerning oil imports. The Committee concluded that imports of crude oil and residual fuel should be kept in balance with domestic production of crude oil at the proportionate relationship that existed in 1954. The Committee stated:

> If imports of crude oil and residual fuel oil should exceed significantly the respective level that these imports of oil bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense.

This conclusion was simple, direct, and uncomplicated based on existing facts.

Gentlemen, the prophetic belief of this Committee that our national security would be undermined by imports in excess of the 1954 ratio has proven to be well founded. I would like to emphasize that the ratio of imports in the benchmark year of 1954 was 16.6 percent of domestic production. Last year the ratio was 26.3 percent of domestic production.

How has this happened? A brief outline of the actions taken by the Government since this Presidential Committee made its report in 1955 will clearly indicate how procrastination and temporizing in the form of additional studies by additional committees plus a lack of firmness in administering the various programs to limit petroleum imports have led to ever-mounting volumes of oil imports each and every year since 1954.

In 1955, the Government attempted to handle the oil import problem by requesting the importing companies to limit their imports voluntarily. No levels or quotas were established. Many importing companies cooperated with the Government's pleas for restraint. However, other importers disregarded altogether the Government's various requests for cooperation and continued to increase their volumes of imported oil. Of course, imports continued to rise alarmingly.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, who was charged with responsibility for this Nation's industrial mobilization readiness efforts, on April 23, 1957, certified to the President pursuant to section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, that he had reason to believe that crude oil was being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security.

As a result of this ominous warning, the President, on June 26, 1957, formed a Special Cabinet Committee to make an investigation on his behalf to determine the facts as to whether crude oil was being imported into the United States in such quantities as to threaten to impair the national security. This Special Cabinet Committee was composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Labor.

The Committee made its recommendations which were approved by the President on July 29, 1957. The Committee report stated:

> Your Committee's investigation of the oil import problem has been confined to the effect of the present trend of imports on national security.
>
> In summary, unless a reasonable limitation of petroleum imports is brought about, your Committee believes that:
>
> (a) Oil imports will flow into this country in ever-mounting quantities, entirely disproportionate to the quantities needed to supplement domestic supply.
>
> (b) There will be a resultant discouragement of, and decrease in, domestic production.
>
> (c) There will be a marked decline in domestic exploration and development.
>
> (d) In the event of a serious emergency, this Nation will find itself years away from attaining the level of petroleum production necessary to meet our national security needs.

A formal voluntary program to control oil imports was established for the last half of 1957, by the President's approval of the recommendations made by the Special Cabinet Committee. Some 20 months elapsed during this so-called voluntary import program. Again many importing companies cooperated with the plan. However, a number of others ignored the program and the Government attempt to solve the problem. During this period imports of unfinished oil and finished petroleum, which were not included in the program, soared to record levels.

On January 22, 1959, the Secretaries of State and Defense requested an investigation with respect to imports of both crude oil and petroleum products in accordance with the provision of section 8 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. As a result of the investigation made by the Director of OCDM, the President was advised on February 27, 1959, of the Director's conclusion that crude oil, as well as the principal petroleum products, were being imported in such quantities and under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security.

The President issued a proclamation which established a mandatory oil import program on March 10, 1959. Thus, 4 years had gone by, with ever-mounting imports, while the fundamental point made by the Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy back in 1955 was reexamined, restudied, and I might add, reiterated by each group analyzing the impact of excessive oil imports on the Nation's security.

As a result of these delays, import levels when finally established under the mandatory import plan were set at the then existing levels of imports which were too high since damage to the vigor of the domestic industry from these existing volumes of imports were already much in evidence.

Furthermore, the mandatory plan was weakened and watered down almost from the start by amendments which granted exemptions for overland imports being received from Canada. The spirit of temporizing was clearly in evidence when certain imports moved by tanker from Mexico were also granted the exemption from control and included in the "overland" classification. The rationalization behind this move is still vague.

The primary objective of the several import control plans was to assure a healthy and vigorous domestic petroleum industry in the interest of national security.

We have temporized and we continue to temporize and thereby we are failing to face up to this problem.

I submit that the import program of the past 3 years has not accomplished its intended purpose of insuring a stable, healthy industry in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new hemispheric reserves to replace those being depleted.

We have continued to study and investigate this problem of oil imports since 1954. Meanwhile, the domestic industry has suffered and today is sick. A new study is again underway under the chairmanship of the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, to be completed by midsummer—again more delay.

While studies continue, petroleum imports move upward relentlessly and the health and vigor of the domestic producing industry continues to wane.

Import limitations have been helpful in preventing a flood of foreign oil from entering this country. But import limitations have been helpful only by comparison; only by conceiving the deterioration of the industry and the rapidly growing dependence on foreign oil that would have resulted without an import program at all.

OIL IMPORTS AND FOREIGN PRODUCTION INCREASE

In 1961, oil imports averaged almost 2 million barrels a day and the value of these imports exceeded $1.6 billion. Petroleum is now the largest item in our import trade while at home we have 30 percent of our producing capacity of oil shut-in for lack of markets. This is like sending coffee to Brazil or textiles to Japan.

It is clear that we should now reorient our purpose. Instead of taking a negative position based on limitation of injury, the Government should so frame its oil import policy as to promote an ascending industry.

Since 1956, while crude production in the United States has been stagnated, what has been the situation in the other major producing areas of the world? Canadian production is up 30 percent, Venezuela increased production almost 20 percent. Other Western Hemisphere countries, 60 percent, the Middle East, 60 percent, and the Soviet Union stepped up its production 100 percent.

It is obvious that our petroleum import program has not prevented substantial expansion of oil production in other producing areas of the world.

I must here emphasize that only two major nations of the entire world are capable of producing all of their petroleum needs. These two nations are the United States and the Soviet Union. In marked contrast to our temporizing and procrastination in coming to grips with this problem, the Soviet Union is exerting its full resources to expansion of its petroleum industry.

During the past 5 years, Soviet oil production has more than doubled. U.S. production has been static. Exploration and development in Russia is expanding. There is a continuing decline in the United States.

Between 1950 and 1960, U.S. crude oil production increased 30 percent, world production doubled, but Soviet output quadrupled. The Soviet Union in 1960 displaced Venezuela as the world's second largest producing country, second only to the United States. Russian production, which was only 9 percent of U.S. output in 1945, has increased steadily during the postwar years and in 1961 amounted to 46 percent of U.S. production.

The Soviet petroleum industry is now in the fourth year of its 7-year plan—1959–65. This plan calls for doubling the 1959 production rate of 2.6 million barrels daily, and a fourfold increase in natural gas production. The initial phase of this planned expansion program covering the years 1959–61 have been completed successfully, and competent observers believe that the Soviet petroleum industry will attain or perhaps exceed the petroleum goals for 1965.

In view of Russia's increasing strength as to petroleum, the United States must have the assurance of adequate domestic oil supplies. This requires an effective program of limiting U.S. oil imports so that domestic production can expand in keeping with national requirements.

DOMESTIC INDUSTRY DECLINES

Domestic producers must be given an opportunity to participate in any future growth in the home market if our security as to oil is to be maintained.

In the interest of national security, and to assure adequate energy reserves here at home, it is high time that we closed the screen door a little tighter on imports. I say screen because it resembles a sieve, and I say to you further that it has some holes in it as witness the exempt crude imports from Canada and Mexico. These imports represent a large part of the "leakage" in the present Government program.

Now let us examine the conditions in one of the bellwether operations of the industry—the drilling and completing of wells.

In this department, there has been continuing decline in activity since 1956. In that year the domestic industry drilled 58,160 wells—last year only 46,962 wells, a 5-year decline of 20 percent.

But these figures tell only part of the story. With prorated wells in Texas limited to only 8 producing days, and with Oklahoma allowables at a bedrock level and with other prorating States restricting production, there is not the incentive to add new oil wells.

Under present producing rates, payouts are being stretched over an uneconomic span of years. The small operator who requires bank loans on production to finance his ventures is in deep trouble. There is increased reluctance on the part of outside money to foot the bill for an interest in wells in the face of severely restricted producing rates. Gentlemen, the situation is drastic.

Possibly the most revealing and startling element in the entire drilling picture comes from a look beneath the surface of the declining statistics.

While total well completions have declined 20 percent, 1956 as compared with 1961, the number of exploratory wells drilled has declined by 30 percent. It is this latter activity which is the principal yardstick in measuring the future vigor of the industry. The violent drop in the all-important exploratory activity, the wildcat wells that find new fields, is cause for real concern as to our future reserve position.

The future of the domestic producing industry can also be directly related to our geophysical and core drilling activity which precedes the drilling of exploratory wells by 2 years or more. The history of this activity tells a clear but alarming story.

Average number of crews active

1952	734
1953	752
1954	713
1955	666
1956	623
1957	580
1958	506
1959	490
1960	434
1960 versus 1956:	
Crews	−189
Percent	−30.3

The decline in the number of crews in 1954 was a clear warning. The decreased drilling during the past 5 years was the inevitable result of the decline in geophysical activity which still continues.

We need more drilling in the United States. We need a capacity, beyond question or doubt, to produce our military and civilian needs without reliance on a single barrel of foreign oil. And we need this capacity in wells that have recently been drilled; where there is substantial additional flush production promptly available by merely turning a valve.

This factual requirement suggests still another aspect of concern. Again, it is a point frequently overlooked.

I refer to the production from stripper wells—those producing 10 barrels daily or less—and secondary recovery operations. In 1960, wells in these categories produced 22.3 percent, or nearly one-fourth of the total production of the Nation.

But these wells—over 400,000 in number—have a fixed ability to produce. Their production rates are virtually inflexible, ranging from one-quarter barrel per day in Pennsylvania to 12.8 barrels per day in Michigan.

While these wells are a vital link in our producing pattern, by their very nature they do not possess the reserve producing capability we so urgently require in time of emergency.

Our reserve picture is heartening but has been on a plateau, showing little change for several years. The American Petroleum Institute has only recently released its reserve figures for 1961. These calculations show that we have 38.8 billion barrels of proved recoverable reserves. But last year we only added some 378 million barrels to our proved reserves after deducting 2.9 billion barrels of production.

This volume of added reserves, which required a year to develop, would only last this Nation a little more than 1 month at the present rate of consumption.

Under the existing adverse circumstances, this is quite a laudable achievement on the part of the industry. But we must do better than that. We must drill more wells.

Historically, the domestic industry reinvests two-thirds of its income from production in the drilling of new wells. Under the proposal my colleague and I have introduced, imports would be reduced by 250,000 barrels daily, which is a relatively small cut compared with the

2 million barrels daily of total oil imports. Even so this action woud give the domestic industry additional income to drill some 5,000 more wells each year. This would restore less than half the decline in drilling since 1956, but it woud be a start.

The declining exploration and development activity in combination with a static level of crude oil production in this country have taken toll in employment. The number of employees engaged in the production of crude oil and natural gas has decreased significantly since 1957, as is shown by the following table:

Number of employees, crude oil and natural gas production

1954	318,100
1955	331,900
1956	340,100
1957	344,000
1958	327,500
1959	330,900
1960	313,900
1961	308,800
1961 versus 1956:	
Employees	−31,300
Percent	−9.2

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The employment in 1961 was the lowest experienced since 1951 despite a 40-percent increase in U.S. oil consumption. The prospects for improvement in the employment situation this year are nil under the present conditions of excessive imports and the current low level of drilling operation.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEMS

Excessive oil imports also contribute to our balance-of-payments problem. Last year, the excess of petroleum imports over petroleum exports amounted to $1.2 billion. The total deficit in our balance of international payments totaled $2.4 billion. The deficit in our petroleum trade account has amounted to over a billion dollars annually for each of the last 4 years.

Our bill, proposing a reduction in oil imports of 250,000 barrels per day, would save about $210 million a year off of our adverse petroleum trade balance. I realize that such a saving is indeed modest in view of our balance-of-payments difficulties but it would at least provide a positive step toward a solution of a most pressing problem.

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT

There is a critical need, in the interest of our national security, to come to grips with the problem of oil imports. There is a pressing need for a stable balance between imports and domestic production. The long-range efforts to find and develop sufficient petroleum supplies require a firm policy relative to oil imports. The stability needed can be provided only by legislation.

Immediate and positive action must be taken. We can no longer afford to delay or temporize.

In the public interest, we must rebuild the vigor of this industry. It must have more economic breathing room. It must drill more wells. It must create the ability to produce sufficient oil to satisfy any need at any time.

I submit it is late, but not too late.

The oil industry's domestic exploratory program last year moved at the slowest pace in a decade. The effort was more expensive, too, because the fewer wells were directed to greater depths with less success.

The statistical box score shows:

Total wells 10,992—lowest since 1950.

Producers 1,970—lowest since 1949.

Success rate 17.92 percent—lowest on record.

Total footage 54,442,127—lowest since 1951.

Average footage per well 4,952—highest on record.

The figures are being made public in the annual report of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists. The compilation is the work of a special committee headed by J. Ben Carsey, Houston consulting geologist, assisted by Marion S. Roberts, geologist with Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston.

TRUE TO FORM

Most oil men were aware that selective drilling was the exploratory theme for 1961, but few actually realized how tight drilling was.

The 10,992 wildcats drilled during the year were 712 fewer than 1960 and the lowest since 1950 when the industry drilled only 10,306 tests.

But just as disturbing was the trend—1961 wildcatting marked the 5th straight year of declining drilling since the postwar peak of 16,173 wildcats in 1956.

This might not have been so serious if the success ratio had not hit the skids also. The 1,970 wildcats that discovered oil or gas last year were the lowest number of producers since 1949 when explorers turned up 1,830 producers. And 1961's success rate of 17.92 percent rivals the 18.3 percent rate of 1948 for the postwar low.

Total exploratory footage last year of 54,442,127 represented a decline of 1,388,509 feet from 1960 and was the lowest since 1951, when the industry drilled 49,343,694 feet of hole.

Average footage per well, however, is another story. The average of 4,952 feet was sharply deeper than the 1960 average of 4,770 feet and the 1959 average of 4,795 feet which was the previous alltime record depth average.

NEW FIELDS

Figures for new-field wildcats—those tests drilled on nonproducing structures—totaled 6,909 for the lowest effort since 1952. They represent a decline of 411 from the year before.

The new-field success rate showed a slight improvement over 1960. Of the 6,909 tests drilled, 745 were producers—a 10.78-percent rate. The year before, 7,320 tests were drilled, also with 745 producers, for a 10.18-percent success rate.

Average depth of the new-field wildcats also was greater. It was 5,125 feet compared with 4,904 feet in 1960 and the previous alltime high of 5,043 feet in 1959.

Statistics show that oil finders had to drill 3.88 feet of dry hole for each producer found in 1961 and had 4.58 dry holes for each successful well. The year before the figures were 3.54 feet of dry hole and 4.34 dry holes for each producer.

PROFIT PICTURE

The AAPG also made an interesting study of exploratory drilling in a 17-State area between 1945 and 1955 in an effort to determine profitably of drilling.

Of 56,593 new-field wildcats drilled during the period, only 1 out of 8.8 wells had some oil or gas. Only 1 out of 11.6 showed promise of being commercial. Of these, 1 out of 36.9 producers proved to be capable of containing reserves of more than a million barrels.

Even the producers often proved disappointing. Figures in the survey showed that of all wells starting as producers only 1 of 3.8 wells completed actually proved commercial.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill we have introduced be made a part of my remarks and that I may have permission to revise and extend my remarks and to include a detailed and factual analysis of the bill and this problem involving imports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for their interest in this oil import problem and their sponsorship of legislation to help bring about improved future conditions.

I have introduced a bill similar to that mentioned by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] and I hope it can become a part of the legislation pertaining to the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It is vital to the future of the domestic coal and oil industries that such action be taken.

I represent the major coal-producing district of Virginia, and we have felt the effects of the unfair competition from residual oil imports. During my tenure in the House, I have constantly sought to bring about improvements in this situation—through many contacts with the executive branch regarding the oil import control program, through legislation, through committee appearances, and so forth. Last August, 16 of my colleagues joined me in a discussion of the need—for national security reasons—to retain the residual oil import controls. If you will refer to this discussion, as printed in the RECORD of August 16, 1961, you will find a clear-cut case for the adoption of the legislation we have introduced here today. But, if national security reasons are not sufficient, I suggest that anyone interested in learning more about the problems of our coalfields, which are of severe economic nature, visit in southwest Virginia, eastern Kentucky, or West Virginia. The loss of any further coal markets to residual oil would be unthinkable.

As I have previously pointed out, the Nation faces the sobering fact that if coal production is depressed any further, it is extremely doubtful that the industry could possibly expand production significantly or rapidly enough to meet emergency needs. We should remember that it would fall to the coal industry not only to meet any emergency, but to also fill the gap that would be caused by the cutting off of foreign oil shipments.

I had the pleasure of appearing before the subcommittee headed by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], which made the detailed study of the oil import problem referred to in this discussion. My testimony was aimed at correcting information previously given to the subcommittee by the New England council. I mention this because these hearings are "must" reading to secure the overall and correct picture of this situation.

My concern that the entire east coast coal market might be lost to foreign oil imports was strongly expressed to the subcommittee. This concern is no less today. We simply cannot afford to have further reduction in coal production, if we are to maintain our industry in a state of readiness to meet any demands made upon it.

Mr. Speaker, a spokesman for coal recently appeared before the Ways and Means Committee regarding the trade bill. I quote from his statement:

> Under these circumstances, we believe that the national security and welfare require establishment of a stable program for foreign fuel imports based on the principle that such imports should supplement domestic supplies rather than supplant them. As previously indicated, the security amendment (sec. 232) was designed for the purpose of protecting the national security as it depends on domestic industry. However, experience clearly demonstrates that this is completely inadequate. Since this section, in similar form, is now a part of the trade expansion bill, we suggest that a permanent legislative formula be adopted as a part of the proposed act, under which foreign fuel imports would be related proportionately to a level of imports established on a historical basis (we suggest a 5-year average); and that provision be made whereby future increases in such imports be limited to a reasonable share of the total energy growth together with domestic fuel sources.

The objectives of the coal industry, and those of us concerned with our national security and the economic problems of the coalfields, would be met by the bill I have introduced today. The bill states, regarding residual oil:

> Imports (excluding supplies for vessels or aircraft) of residual fuel oil for use as fuel shall be limited for each annual period to an amount which together with domestic production will meet national requirements, provided that in determining national requirements the availability of domestic fuels shall be considered, and provided further that the import level established shall not exceed the average level of such imports during a prior representative base period as the President may select.

I would stress, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment we have proposed be for the life of any bill that is adopted on the trade program. This would insure stability and thus produce a favorable effect on the coal industry. It would tend to eliminate the "on again-off again" approach we have seen in the past.

The adoption of the amendment we have proposed is reasonable to expect. It is aimed at promoting the Nation's "general welfare, foreign policy, and security," quoting from the title of the bill. It then, has the same general objectives as the pending trade legislation. Those of us interested in seeing the Nation's trade opportunities grow and new markets obtained for our products, can rightly feel that we must have consideration for the problems that have been and are being created by the growing importation of oil and its derivatives, such as residual.

I join fully in the effort to bring about adoption of this bill and will promote its chances at every opportunity.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma a question with respect to some of the evidence which was developed in our hearings and that I believe adversely affect the oil producers of our country.

Was it not the gentleman's impression as the testimony was developed at our hearings that this very thing could possibly happen to our domestic oil producers in the United States; that is, they might find themselves in the not too distant future by reason of this vast network of pipelines being developed from Canada, coming into the United States, that would be combating foreign oil, foreign and domestic crude, right in their own backyards, and there is in reality an invasion of the midcontinent area by Canadian crudes which places itself in direct competition with Texas and Oklahoma crude and the vast oil refineries in the southwestern part of the United States.

Mr. STEED. The gentleman is entirely correct.

And, I might say that additional information that has come to our attention since the hearings tells the story of how this impact from the Canadian sources has become even heavier than our witnesses thought it would at the time we were listening to them, and it is getting constantly worse.

Mr. MOORE. Let me ask the gentleman this further question as the result of our hearings. Were you not rather amazed to hear testimony develop which indicated that in Petroleum District No. 1, which is the vast New England industrial complex, their energy boilers are now fired to the percentage of about 70 percent of their energy needs by foreign residual oil and that these boilers are now so constructed that if they were to lose that foreign residual oil, they could not convert back to either coal or any one of the energy sources that would be available in the United States?

Mr. STEED. That is absolutely true, and in such an instance they would be dependent completely upon the domestic supply of oil or they would have to shut down. And, if the New England complex ever loses its productive power, it would bring industrial disaster to the entire United States, because it dovetails in with our entire industrial complex. While this matter may seem to be primarily a problem to New England, I think that their dependence on foreign oil is a risk that they do not run by themselves. They compel the entire Nation to run that risk with them.

Mr. MOORE. In the event we would have an accumulation of factors similar to that which existed during World War II, is it not reasonable to assume that the United States would lose this vast industrial complex, as contributing to the overall defense effort of the United States as the direct result of their overreliance on foreign residual oil?

Mr. STEED. I think the evidence was so clear that nobody could dispute it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I should like very much to be brief. The gentleman from Oklahoma has very well described the work of our subcommittee. I think the thing that we really want to emphasize here is that ours was an open hearing. Invitations were sent out to all of those that might be affected by that which would be taken into consideration during the hearings. We did accumulate a vast amount of information, and I believe both the gentleman from Oklahoma and myself, it is fair to say, received a rather modest education on this particular problem. It is really a known fact for those of us that represent coal-producing States that our problem today is more difficult than it has been over a long period of years. We were beset with unstable market conditions which are directly attributable to the great extent of dumping of foreign residual oil and natural gas sold under various sorts of contracts into the United States.

Dumping is resorted to in a number of instances. I might say, as the gentleman speaks of his concern, and of the area that he represents, the oil producing area of the United States, that my observation, coming from the coal producing States, is this—I want this one thing perfectly clear—the coal industry and its workers do not expect or ask that all imports of foreign oil should be prohibited. It realizes that there are certain amounts of imports that become necessary because the great volume of such imports in recent years has encouraged many users to convert to burning equipment which can no longer utilize any other fuel. However, the coal industry believes that a reasonable limit should be placed in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], always an uncompromising fighter for a prosperous domestic oil industry, and I today are introducing an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, "to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States" and we hope that every Member of this House will join us in supporting this bill, or in sponsoring similar bills.

Coal, oil, and gas all are available and important to the people of West Virginia's First District, which it has been my privilege to represent in the 85th, 86th, and the 87th Congresses, so that it may be said in truth that I am well acquainted with the problems of the domestic fuels industry, and the best interests of all segments of the vital industry are close to my heart.

The gentleman from Oklahoma, as chairman, and I as ranking minority member of the House Small Business Subcommittee which held extensive hearings on residual and crude oil imports last fall, heard many expert witnesses, and have given considerable thought to the substance of the Steed-Moore amendment which we are both sponsoring today.

The matter of domestic fuels production and the prosperity, profits, and growth of the industry are of vital importance to everyone in the Nation. In complete agreement and in the spirit of bipartisanship and deeply concerned with the national interests, the gentleman from Oklahoma and I believe that our bills go to the heart of the security of this Nation.

Regardless of Common Market considerations, the benefits of international trade and, indeed, the essentiality of trade among nations which we all recognize, no device has yet been brought forth to put aside, lightly, the interests of a nation in the preservation of its national security. In this instance, the United States must, above all else, be able to deal on a global basis as a Nation with a strong economy, tremendous productivity, and without doubts and fears that anyone in another nation by political coup, the issuance of a proclamation, or the denial of a treaty can cut off our life's blood which is truly that of our fuels supply which produces the energy upon which our entire productive economy depends, and from which our wonderfully high standard of living is derived.

Therefore, it is not a partisan effort in which I am participating; it is one which must have the approval of both of our great political parties and of all Members of the Congress. This effort motivates, and is expressed in the bill, which seeks to establish a means whereby the domestic fuels industry can thrive and grow, and provide the necessary fuels, without interruption, for the support of our Nation.

During the past 15 or 16 years, the United States has changed from an exporting country, with respect to petroleum products, to a major importing country. Coal is our only fuel sold to any extent in international trade. Our domestic fuels industries are efficient, capable, and dedicated to supplying the Nation's needs if safeguarded ever so slightly from the onrush of a worldwide flood of petroleum, mainly in the control of countries far distant from our shores—a perilous distance, I may say—should an emergency situation ever again arise.

In bringing about the high standard of living which has long been maintained in the United States, we are not generally a "cheap" producer of products. For many years, we have enjoyed a tremendous advantage of mechanization, and widespread use of ingenious machines of all kinds in our production complex. Today, after many years of foreign aid which we have generously bestowed on a large scale, we find that many countries have attained the same standard of efficiency which we have, but with a lower standard of living to maintain, thereby confronting us with a differential which must be frankly recognized if we are to support and encourage the development of a strong domestic fuels industry.

The tremendous investments required to build new coal mines, and maintain an adequate transportation system demand that Congress grant not only the coal industry, but also the oil and gas industries, some recognition of their problems, and establish a long-term stability of relationship between domestic and imported fuels. Congress needs to act now so these industries can develop the facilities necessary to insure our Nation of an adequate fuel supply at all times.

Congressional action is desperately needed because fluctuations are inherent in the type of voluntary and mandatory control programs which the domestic fuels industry has been obliged to live with in recent years, and it is now imperative to establish a stable relationship among the fuels.

We have seen increases of foreign fuels compounded upon increases, and it is high time that this situation should be corrected. There is no alternative except for Congress to spell out exactly what it deems to be in the best interests of our national security and what it wishes to take place.

Everyone is aware of the devastation which has taken place in coal areas in many States across our country and of the hardships suffered by the coal industry as a result of the flood of cheap residual oil deluging a great industrial area on the eastern seaboard.

The basic unsettling characteristic of the present mandatory quota program is that it is subject to revision or abandonment by the executive branch of the Government at any time.

The coal and allied industries—management, owners, workers—have no way of knowing from year to year how extensive residual oil imports will be. They do not even know that the quota system will be maintained more than 1 year, if that long. The annual review provides the possibility of a change at any time and subjects the coal industry to the prospects of disaster at least once every 12 months. No other American industry must undergo such risks.

The situation makes it impossible for the coal industry to plan for the future. It does not know what cutrate competition it will have. Consequently, it cannot plan for the large investments required by the replacement of existing mines as they are depleted. The very real possibility of greatly increased residual imports, which will undercut coal and take away additional sizable markets is an impediment to capital expenditures. And yet, these expenditures must be made if the coal industry, as an essential part of the American economy, is to survive. The average life of a coal mine is about 20 years. This means that just to remain even, the industry has to spend at least $5 billion in the next two decades. To expand to meet the anticipated fuel requirements of the next 20 years—to say nothing of capacity to meet any national emergency demands—would require additional billions.

Profits in today's coal industry—beset by unstable market conditions attributable to a great extent to dumped foreign residual oil and natural gas sold under interruptible contracts—just does not provide that kind of money.

The coal industry does not expect, or ask, that all imports of foreign oil should be prohibited. It realizes that a certain amount of imports have become necessary because the great volume of cheap imports in recent years has encouraged many users to convert to burning equipment which can utilize no other fuel. However, it believes that a reasonable limit, which recognizes the needs of domestic industries which have become reliant on it and the foreign nations which produce it, should be established without ignoring the welfare of the coal industry or without disregarding the national security implications of a sound domestic fuels complex.

The coal industry must have long-term assurance of a stable market so it can commit the capital funds necessary to maintain capacity and insure proper expansion. This requires—

First. A residual oil import control program established on a long-term basis of at least 5 years.

Second. Import quotas limited to those of a fair base period, such as the average annual rate of imports during the last 5 years, or a representative year to be selected by the appropriate governmental agency.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from West Virginia in taking the initiative in this matter at this time. Both of you have performed an excellent service, in bringing this issue before us at this appropriate time

Mr. Speaker, this matter of excessive oil imports is an issue of long standing. I think I am justified in pointing with pride to the fact that on October 18, 1949, I introduced the first bill embodying the general principles of the measure a number of us are introducing today.

Subsequent to the introduction of the measure in 1949, in the 82d Congress, I introduced another measure in 1950 in which was included the element of domestic consumption of petroleum products to justify limitation of imports.

I think, however, it is more understandable and more simple to relate imports to domestic production, the data on which can be definitely established.

Even back 13 years ago it was obvious that a problem existed, and as obvious that the problem would grow. No one can successfully argue that it has not grown and that it has long since reached proportions untenable from the standpoint of the domestic oil producer. The domestic oil-producing industry is in a seriously depressed condition. The record shows the decline in the number of exploratory wells. While our general economy is advancing at an unprecedented rate, the domestic oil production has been static for about 6 years. Inevitably it will decline more rapidly in the future than it has in the past, unless action which we propose here today is adopted by the Congress and becomes the policy of our Government.

The proposal which we make here today should be a part of H.R. 9900, and I trust the Ways and Means Committee of this House of Representatives will make it a part of that bill.

Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues in this body have brought forcefully to our attention the plight of several other domestic industries by reason of excessive imports which affect them. I have joined in some of the efforts to protect our domestic industries, with the deep conviction it was wholly justified. We did so because industries such as textiles and others were in serious circumstances. We did so on the basis of protecting the investments of American citizens in free enterprise undertakings.

We are well aware of the difficulties confronting the coal industry as related to oil imports. The coal people have able representatives to speak for them and it is not necessary I comment further, but I would remind you that several expensive schemes are proposed for the relief of people caught in these circumstances They call for expenditures of Federal funds and for Federal controls which would not be required if proper action was taken to cure the cause of unemployment in the coal industry.

In this instance, of course, this is an important part of our argument, but in addition there is the further tremendously important proposition of it being in the interest of our national defense. Either of these major reasons would be adequate argument to limit foreign oil imports. I have become weary of hearing arguments to the effect that we must give priority consideration to the interest of those nations from which major imports come. I am not impervious to this consideration, but not to the extent that it impairs the welfare of our own citizens and impairs our national defense posture.

Mr. Speaker, I probably represent as many independent oil operators as any Member of Congress. It is not necessary to turn to paper statistics to see the results of declining operations. In my area, the fact that oil rigs are stacked on storage lots is evidence to anyone that a serious situation exists.

Another important and vital consideration is education in petroleum.

One of the greatest bulwarks of American industry and free enterprise has, through the years, been education, skills, and know-how.

In objectively viewing the sorry state of the domestic petroleum industry, no one factor is more alarming or indicative than the reduction in numbers of those receiving formal education in petroleum engineering. As the outlook for the future of the industry has grown darker with each recent year, there has been a parallel decline in freshmen enrolling in petroleum engineering classes.

The bare facts set the stage. At the University of Texas, as an example, freshmen enrolling in petroleum engineering have dropped, during recent years, from a norm of 130 to less than 15 in the current semester. The number of students in geology are dropping off as rapidly.

In the areas of skilled workers, drilling crews are searching for employment in other business as rigs are stacked.

Highly trained geophysical workers are in a similar position with this activity down in all areas of the Nation as well as Texas.

For the industry that found birth in this country, that developed the technology and know-how and tools that have spread the world over, to be now so technically enfeebled is unthinkable. But it is what has happened.

Still another vital consideration is that of proved reserves.

There is a definite sequence to adding to the Nation's stockpile of proved crude oil reserves.

The first step is to undertake initial exploratory work by seismograph or other means.

Structures so located and considered favorable are then tested with exploratory wells.

The successful ventures result in new field discoveries which are then developed with additional drilling of the new reserve.

The money to finance these steps in the total operation is gained primarily from the sale of production.

However, when total Texas crude and condensate production has declined from 1,108 million barrels in 1956 to only 940 million barrels in 1961, the money for these operational steps toward added reserves are not available.

As another measure of this activity of the industry, allowable producing days per year have declined from 190 days in 1956 to only 101 in 1961, or to an average of only 8.4 days per month.

These adverse conditions express themselves in exploration, "wildcat" drilling, development drilling, and in the final analysis, in the reserves of oil for national security.

In the State of Texas we are witnessing progressive but certain deterioration of a great industry—one that serves the State and the Nation, and one acknowledged as essential to the security of 180 million American citizens.

We hope, Mr. Speaker, that we may have the interest of our colleagues in this vitally important matter, and hence, our efforts here today in order that we may present factual data supporting our position that the measure to which we refer may become a part of the reciprocal trade bill, which we shall soon consider.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks following my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend and congratulate the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] on the introduction of their bills to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

It is with extreme pleasure that I introduce similar legislation at this time.

There can be no question, Mr. Speaker, but that the domestic fuels industries are vital to the strength and security of our Nation. Yet these industries are being severely damaged by excessive imports of crude and residual oil imports. As I stated recently in a booklet published under the auspices of the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc.:

> The importance of domestic fuels to this country of ours cannot be underestimated. The financial, as well as the military, strength of the United States is the result of the wise use of these natural resources. We must conserve these valuable resources so that we will not be dependent on other countries in time of need.

I am sure I will be joined in my statement by many Members of Congress.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that all of those who have spoken out in the past for reasonable oil import controls, as well as many others, will support this amendment.

The importance of our domestic fuels can be judged by the fact that significant quantities of coal, oil, and natural gas are present in at least 40 of our sovereign States, and contribute substantially to their economic well-being.

Wyoming is blessed with substantial quantities of both coal and oil, although it is not listed among the major producing States of either fuel. Although our production of coal amounted to only approximately 2 million tons last year, we have reserves of more than 120 million tons to supply the energy needs of our country.

Recent forecasts indicate that there will be tremendous increases in the demand for energy fuels in the Mountain States and on the west coast in the 1960's and 1970's, and States such as Wyoming, which have large, untapped resources of fuels, must be in a position to expand their production to meet the demand. The domestic industries can do so only if they are provided with a fair share of the market today.

I believe that the gentlemen from West Virginia and Oklahoma are performing a genuine service in introducing a bill which would relate foreign oil imports to domestic production, providing the stability which our domestic fuels need in order to make their proper contribution to the growth in our national economy, and to our national security.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] be permitted to extend his remarks along with others making statements in support of the Steed-Moore bill in respect to oil imports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined with other Members of the House of Representatives in introducing legislation which is designed to correct the continuing threat of excessive oil imports. My study of the effects of imports upon our domestic petroleum industry, and continuing discussions with knowledgeable leaders of the industry and of this legislative body, have revealed the need for such legislative action.

It is essential to the well-being and safety of the Nation that its sources of energy be strong and healthy, with an assured future based on an increasing demand for its products.

Seventy percent of the energy needs of the Nation are met by the petroleum industry. In ordinary circumstances, given a rising American economy and increasing standard of living, the petroleum industry would seem assured of a glowing future.

However, there is a world surplus of oil. Many new and major sources of oil have been developed since World War II. These have been primarily in low productive cost areas. Similarly, a surplus of tankers has contributed, combined with the market pressure of the new sources, to depress the world price of crude oil.

It is only natural that the greatest market for petroleum and its products, the United States, would be sought with deadly aim. The result has been a flood of oil from the Middle East, Latin America, and nearby continental sources.

Initially relief was sought through voluntary controls. This system was at the point of collapse when the mandatory program was initiated. American companies were attracted to investment overseas to hedge against increasing costs at home. Once they were in production they sought their share of the home market.

This, then, has become the situation. Costs of drilling, oil field goods, labor, development, refining and marketing costs are rising in America. An ever increasing flood of low-cost oil is pressing for a market in a consumers market which in recent years has reached maturity and a period of much slower growth. The volume of imports is such as to depress the market price even though domestic costs justify fully present sales prices.

The effects upon the American oil industry have been drastic. Maintenance of a healthy volume of reserves depends upon a steady supply of new capital, wildcatting for new sources, and considerable developmental costs. All have sagged since the flow of imports has appeared in the American markets.

Dependence upon foreign sources of oil is fatal to the national interest and security. Foreign supplies could be cut off instantly on the whim of the producers, or by positive action by an aggressor nation, or by any of a variety of political actions, such as closing the Suez Canal.

Additionally, it is foolish to believe that once foreign oil had captured the American market from a weak and dormant American oil industry prices would remain low. A monopoly or controlled market is a high-priced market.

The oil industry of Kansas is representative of the problems faced today, particularly by midland producers who customarily market their products in peripheral areas such as in the States bordering the Great Lakes and the Atlantic seaboard. Kansas historically has been the fifth largest oil-producing State in the United States, and in the year 1960 was the sixth largest oil-producing State.

The cost of discovering and producing a barrel of oil in Kansas has been found to be over $3 which is the prevailing market price in a market depressed by the impact of oil imports.

The Kansas oil industry cannot long be expected to invest capital which is needed to maintain or improve its oil reserves when the sale price of its product does not equal its cost.

The day of the wildcatter, typically the rugged individualist, independent, and indispensable to the oil industry, is numbered.

The Kansas oil industry as it exists today, with steadily increasing imports, is suffering grievous attrition. Market after market, served for years, is being lost. These losses are primarily in the Great Lakes area which is open without restriction to Canadian oil imports.

Make no mistake about it, unless imports are not only not allowed to increase, but are actually cut, Kansas oil, especially the independents, who do not have the resources of the major companies, are in for serious trouble.

While the loss of a market for 7,000 barrels per day may not be serious to one of the mammoth corporations, it can be nearly fatal to the small independent operator. Such an event has actually been recorded in the case of one small Kansas producer.

The oil industry has long been one peculiarly in need of fresh capital for prospecting, drilling, and development, with returns far from sure. The present situation is drying up capital sources. The future of the Kansas oil industry is inextricably tied to a strengthening of limitations on oil imports.

The U.S. oil industry is capable of producing all of the oil desired by consumers even in a growing market, if it is permitted to remain healthy. In order to remain in such a condition depleted reserves must be replaced. In order to replace depleted reserves it is necessary, at many times, to wander far afield, to take chances. This is historically the role of the wildcatter, the independent.

However, today's prospects of regaining investment in exploration and development are dim indeed. Capital is hesitant to enter a market of surplus, where the prospects of recovering cost are so dim due to the market conditions caused by competition of low-cost oil imports.

The results of this are that drilling activity and developmental procedures are lagging. Many are thrown out of work. Pipelines slow down their flow of fluids, refineries curtail their activities in midland areas, throwing more people out of work. We note that even college enrollments in petroleum geology have declined.

Thus we have an industry beginning to wither on the vine, so to speak, which is capable under normal conditions of completely serving the American market.

In periods of emergency, when the need is greatest, dependence must be placed necessarily on domestic sources of supply. How can this be done with a starved industry?

With State conservation agencies rigorously controlling production by cutting allowables to the bone it is inevitable that much oil economically recoverable will be lost forever. This is particularly true of secondary recovery projects.

Should the imports of crude oil and petroleum products, excluding residual fuel, be reduced to and stabilized at 14 percent of domestic crude production, as has been suggested as an equitable solution, it would reduce the present rate of imports by about 250,000 barrels per day. This in turn would trim by some $210 million the adverse trade balance. An adverse trade balance or an excess of imports over exports means a drain on the Nation's gold reserve because that excess of imports must be paid for.

The drain of gold reserves has already reached alarming proportions, it is affecting the value of the dollar on the international market and contributes to inflation.

In 1961 there was a net imbalance of international trade in petroleum, its products, casing and line pipe, and oilfield equipment which reached a total of about $1.5 billion. Considering only petroleum and petroleum products the deficit in 1961 was about $1.2 billion or nearly one-half of the total national deficit which was approximately $2.5 billion on total balance. Military purchases of oil overseas amounted to an additional $300 million. This is dangerous to the national security.

There has been a marked decrease in the vigor, growth pattern, and competitive structure of the American oil and gas industry. This is dangerous to the future economic progress and improved standards of living. An industry which supplies 73 percent of the total energy for the national economy, as it did in 1960, must be healthy, vigorous, and growing; and its growth should not be inhibited by the deadly competition of oil imports, no matter how low the monetary cost might be. There are other factors which are more important.

Theoreticians say that in a world free of aggression, where competitive forces were such as to serve to protect the public interest of all, the lowest cost sources of supply should be utilized. The present case is not so simple. The world, to begin with, is not free of aggression and the potential threat of aggression. The world is divided into the East, the West, and the neutrals. In such a situation the nations of the West must maintain themselves at the ready in order to be prepared for any contingency.

America cannot afford to let one of its most vital industries wither by default, for want of vigorous action. Oil imports must be controlled so as to permit the domestic industry to have its fair share of the domestic market, replace its depleted reserves, maintain an efficient distributive system and a strong financial structure. Only then can America retain its position of world leadership and prosperity in peace as well as a posture of strength to meet any military situation.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in complete accord with my colleague from Oklahoma in the remarks he is making on the need to correct the continuing threat of excessive oil imports. He has taken a strong lead on this subject in the Congress and I welcome this opportunity to pay him a well-deserved tribute.

I believe the Steed proposal will provide a much-needed incentive to develop the oil and gas reserves necessary to provide for the national security of our Nation. It is with that belief that I have introduced a companion bill to that of the gentleman from Oklahoma. It is my sincere hope that this proposal will be incorporated as an amendment to H.R. 9900, the trade bill now before the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] for the work he has done in this area, and for his presentation to the House of Representatives today. As the gentleman knows, in our State the income to our State depends a great deal upon the well-being of the oil industry. I have been very interested in what the gentleman has had to say today.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. I want to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] for the introduction of this bill, and say that most of the independent dealers in my area in the State of Kansas are highly interested in this legislation. Therefore, for that reason I have also introduced a companion bill today in connection with the introduction of the bill by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], for the outstanding work he has done in connection with the hearings which he held last year, and for the fine legislation that has resulted from those hearings. I congratulate the gentleman further for the presentation he has made in the House of Representatives today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma and say that I have introduced the same legislation as he introduced today, and hope to work with him toward its inclusion in the trade bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with a number of my colleagues today in introducing legislation which would provide for a limitation on imports of petroleum and petroleum products in order to protect the security of the United States—the stability of our domestic petroleum industry and the orderly development of additional domestic reserves.

The story of the importation of petroleum and petroleum products is a long and complicated one. In order that the Members of the House may have the benefit of a carefully prepared commentary on this subject, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert immediately following my remarks an excerpt from a statement made before the Ways and Means Committee on March 22, 1962, by Mr. Harold Decker, president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. DECKER

I would like to invite your attention to our foreign trade balance in petroleum in relation to the total deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments. During the past 7 years the excess of oil imports over oil exports shows an average deficit of $829 million per year. The total deficit in our balance of payments has averaged $2.2 billion annually during this same period. Therefore, the adverse balance of trade in petroleum represents 38 percent of the overall U.S. balance of payment deficit during the past 7 years. Last year alone, the excess of petroleum imports over exports amounted to $1.2 billion or approximately one-half of the Nation's $2.4 billion deficit in international payments.

For the period 1956–60, petroleum was the principal item in U.S. import trade, averaging $1,503 million per year or 11 percent of the total value of all imports. The value of U.S. petroleum imports has quadrupled since 1947–49 whereas the value of all other commodity imports has doubled. This is an anomalous situation since about 30 percent of our oil producing capacity, or 3 million barrels per day, is shut-in and idle. It seems clear that the domestic petroleum industry has contributed more than its fair share to expanding foreign trade.

From the security standpoint, the vital importance of adequate and readily available domestic supplies of petroleum for peace or war—and perhaps most important, as a deterrent to war—has been recognized by both the Congress and the executive branch of Government as requiring special consideration in foreign trade policies. Under the national security provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, oil imports have been limited by the Government since March 1959, thereby setting aside petroleum imports from other commodities in U.S. foreign trade.

The need and justification for an effective Government program of limiting oil imports to assure adequate domestic supplies is apparent when we recall how oil imports were cut off during World War II, when 6 of the 7 billion barrels needed to meet the requirements of the United States and our allies came from U.S. sources. More recently, during the Suez crisis, it was U.S. oil that overcame shortages in Western Europe and averted the threat of World War III.

With the world in a state of tension, Soviet oil production is being expanded greatly to strengthen Russia internally and to increase oil exports as a prime weapon in the Russian economic offensive. It would be foolhardy in the extreme for the United States to pursue policies that would weaken our security position as to petroleum supplies.

In short, we cannot afford the risks involved in becoming increasingly dependent on foreign sources of oil.

From the standpoint of economic growth, petroleum (oil and natural gas) supplies three-fourths of total U.S. energy needs. Energy is the indispensable ingredient of higher standards of living, and national income in the United States has paralleled the growth in energy consumption. In addition to its role in supplying energy for the consuming public, petroleum is the principal mineral produced in the United States, exceeding the combined value of all other mineral production including coal, iron ore, aluminum, uranium, gold and silver. Petroleum producing activities provide the economic lifeblood for thousands of communities in 33 states.

Increasing oil imports, resulting from a substantial and increasing world surplus of oil, pose a grave threat to the domestic producing industry. Imports of crude oil and oil products (excluding residual fuel oil) increased from 255,000 barrels daily in 1946 to 991,000 barrels per day in 1956. From 1956 to 1961, these imports increased to 1,245,000 barrels daily, despite the voluntary controls imposed in 1957 and the mandatory controls established in 1959. The ratio of these imports to U.S. crude oil production rose from 5.4 percent in 1946 to 13.9 percent in 1956 and increased further to 17.3 percent in 1961.

Petroleum imports, therefore, have continued to increase both in total and in relationship to U.S. production. In contrast, U.S. production of crude oil has shown practically no change since 1956 and there has been a marked decline in the vigor and health of the domestic industry.

1. Geophysical and core drilling crews active in exploration in 1961 were 30 percent below 1956.

2. Wells drilled in 1961 were 19 percent below 1956. Exploratory drilling dropped 30 percent in this period.

3. Rotary rigs active in 1961 were 33 percent below 1956.

4. Employment in the production of oil and gas was 9 percent below 1956.

5. The price of domestic crude oil in 1961 was 21 cents a barrel below 1957, in the face of steadily increasing costs.

6. The rate of return on invested capital for the petroleum industry is below all manufacturing companies.

7. During the last 5 years there has been an unhealthy trend toward sellouts and mergers in the producing segment of the domestic oil industry.

Deteriorating conditions in the domestic petroleum industry and continuing increases in oil imports brought about a series of Government actions as to oil import policies, culminating in the establishment of the so-called mandatory oil imports program on March 10, 1959. This program of limiting U.S. oil imports has been in effect since

> March 1959. These 3 years afford ample experience by which to evaluate the program's effectiveness in attaining its stated goal of maintaining a vigorous domestic oil industry.
>
> The facts show that there is a clear need, in the interest of national security to strengthen the mandatory oil import program. There is a need for a substantial reduction in the level of oil imports. Of fundamental importance, there is a need for a stable and assured balance between imports and domestic production established by law. The necessary long-range investments required to find and develop adequate petroleum supplies require the assurance of a lasting national policy as to oil imports. That assurance is lacking today. Uncertainty prevails and the industry's future is thereby threatened. While the mandatory oil import program has been helpful, experience has demonstrated that the program has not accomplished its security objectives.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill and to congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma for his intelligent interest in this matter. I have today introduced a companion measure.

So far as the economy of the southwestern part of the United States is concerned, this is not just an ordinary bill. It is a prescription to cure the insidious economic illness which for 10 years now has been sapping the strength of our domestic oil industry.

There can be no doubt that the oil industry is ailing. It is in dire straits because it has been denied the markets essential to its health and growth.

As to the reasons for this ailment, you have to look no further than statistics on the volume of foreign oil imports. In 1947, this country was importing approximately 410,000 barrels a day. Today the import level is about 1,900,000 barrels a day—an increase of more than 460 percent.

As the level of imports has climbed upward, it has gobbled up an ever-increasing percentage of the domestic market, and U.S. oil production has sharply declined.

Who imports this foreign oil? Well, practically all of it is imported by 31 big companies—31 big companies that have been growing at the expense of the 15,000 independent producers in the United States.

These 31 huge importers enjoy a competitive economic advantage of about $1 a barrel because of lower production costs on foreign oil, and because of Government subsidies applied to foreign investments.

These major companies can use this profit advantage in turn to advance their own competitive position in the domestic industry. The result is that the small independent producer is being squeezed out. Thus the increasing import level has intensified the stranglehold of monopoly.

Many of these small independents have, in fact, found themselves driven to the wall. In my own State of Texas, for example, producers are supplying 470,000 barrels a day less than they were in 1956.

Production allowables have been trimmed to the point that Texas wells are being allowed to produce for only 8 days out of every month. Any business limited to such a narrow base of operation would be a sick business. But that is not the worst of it.

Our oil reserves have been jeopardized, too. Historically, it has been the small, independent producer who has done most of the exploring for new oil fields. Today such exploratory activities have dwindled drastically.

In one 19-county area of west Texas, for example, there were 275 rotary drilling rigs operating 2 years ago. Today there are only 40.

The sickness besetting our oil industry affects our defense posture as well. Foreign oil sources would be vulnerable, of course, in case of war. Look at the Middle East. Russia is probably capable of seizing this area almost at will. Therefore we dare not develop any basic reliance on Middle Eastern oil.

This means that if the United States is to be assured a continuing supply of petroleum in emergency, exploration and drilling must continue at a pace sufficient to keep the oil industry alive and healthy and active in the United States first, and then in the neighboring nations of the Western Hemisphere.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in sponsorship of this bill.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Under the gentleman's bill, is the President given the power to set the quantity limitation on imports of crude and byproducts based on a past period? Is that how it operates?

Mr. STEED. Yes. Under present circumstances when the President finds that the importation of an article impairs or threatens national security, he invokes quotas. If our amendment is adopted he would have to select a base year and the ratio of the division of the market from that point forward would be in the same ratio as it was in the base year that the President selected. In other words, since we have imports of oil under the national security clause already, if he saw fit he could freeze it where it is today.

Since the figure of 26 percent has been used here, if that happened 5 years from now the division of the market would still be 26 percent. The amount of it might change but the percentage would remain fixed.

Mr. SHIPLEY. Also, in case of national emergency, he can increase this quota? Is this true?

Mr. STEED. Yes. The amendment has sort of an escape clause in that under certain emergency conditions the President can adjust the program to meet whatever the national interest would call for.

I think it is important for me to emphasize right here that even with the adoption of paragraph F of this amendment, until and unless the President of his own initiative has found that the national security is in danger, there would be no program at all and none of this section would apply. I want to emphasize over and over again that what we propose here today would be largely a limitation on what is already law. It would have nothing to do with the vast power the President already has under this program itself, the fixing of an exact ratio once he decided that it should be fixed.

Mr. SHIPLEY. I appreciate very much the effort on the part of the gentleman from Oklahoma in bringing this to the attention of the Congress.

To help protect the welfare and security and economic growth of the United States, I enthusiastically cosponsor the bill to regulate petroleum imports recommended by the House Committee on Small Business which recently held extensive hearings. Excessive petroleum imports have killed outright many small domestic coal and petroleum producers, thrown thousands of employees, many with families, out of work and on to taxpayer-supported relief, created sorry pockets of economic distress, and stifled the growth of the domestic coal and oil industries.

Crude oil production in the United States has increased only 17 percent in the past 10 years. Production in 1951 was 2.25 billion barrels as compared with 2.62 billion barrels in 1961. In sharp contrast, Russia has doubled its crude oil production in the last 6 years. In that same time period production by the free world outside the United States has increased 50 percent, whereas the U.S. share of world oil production in the last decade dropped drastically, from 51 percent to but 34 percent.

From 1954 to 1961 our imports of all petroleum and petroleum products increased 78 percent, from 388 million barrels to 689 million barrels. In the same period, imports of crude oil alone rose 58 percent, from 242 million barrels to 382 million barrels; imports of residual fuel oil rose 82 percent, from 129 million barrels to 235 million barrels, and imports of other petroleum products rose 341 percent, from 16.5 million barrels to 72.8 million barrels. Imports from Canada and Mexico which are now exempt from controls should be included in future import controls. Imports from Mexico have been decreasing, but imports from Canada have increased considerably.

The tremendous increase in imports of oil and its production depressed or repressed the petroleum and coal industries in the United States. This has been the case even under the mandatory import quotas on petroleum and its products put into effect in 1959. Production has been nearly static; employment has declined; new oil wells drilled annually dropped 29 percent as between 1955 and 1960; and average prices of domestic crude oil at wells dropped 13 cents per barrel from 1958 to 1960. Indeed, oil production in Texas has averaged only about 8 days per month in recent years.

I urge your support of this bill because it is high time that we set a limit on imports of oil and its products. We must give our domestic industries a fair chance to thrive.

This bill would give the President power to set quantitative limits on imports from all sources of crude oil and its derivatives based on levels of a prior based period, and, in national emergencies, he could allow reasonably increased imports over those limits. In regulating imports, due regard would be given to elimination of competitive inequities, maintenance of a competitive domestic industry, prevention of monopolistic practices, and encouragement of small business. The availability of competing or substitute domestic products would also be considered.

This legislation is badly needed. The bill is a just and fair one which deserves our support.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not know of a Member of this House who has made a greater contribution in calling to the attention of the membership of this body and the entire Nation, for that matter, the significant importance of a healthy domestic oil industry to the best interests of the United States. I think the gentleman has consistently fought for the idea that unless we do have a strong and a vital domestic production we are in dangerous waters in any time of war or in any time of international distress. I have heard him make remarks many times in groups of Members of this body that the most dangerous thing that could happen to the United States from the standpoint of military security would be to get in a position in which we had to rely on foreign sources of supply for petroleum products. The arguments in support of the gentleman's position on the subject of safeguards for our domestic industry have been convincingly advanced by my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, who is chairman of our Oklahoma delegation in the Congress of the United States. I do not know much that could be added from this angle on that subject. Every member of our delegation shows the deep concern already expressed by the gentleman who is in the well of the House as to what is happening to the oil industry of Oklahoma.

The decline in exploratory wells of about 39 percent since 1956 and the decline in the total of all wells drilled of about 27 percent since 1956 are two indications of the very serious trend that has continued for a number of years in this industry.

I am equally concerned about what the employment figures show in our State in the field of the crude and natural gas production industry. Just a few years ago, in 1956, in fact, we had 48,692 people working in this industry in Oklahoma. The preliminary figures for 1961 indicate that has fallen to 41,817, down nearly 7,000 from the level of employment just a very few years ago in this most vital industry.

Needless to say, the entire economy of our State is suffering as the result not only of this loss of income for the industry and of reduced production, which is at the lowest level it has been in 10 years, but also in the loss of jobs, in the loss of economic security for thousands of American working men and women.

I thank the gentleman, who performed a great service not only to our State but to the Nation by leading this fight to see that we have in our basic legislation adequate safeguards for a strong domestic oil industry.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I was interested in the gentleman's observations about the finding and drilling of oil wells. I wonder if this means it is no longer necessary to have the oil depletion allowances?

Mr. STEED. I might say to the gentleman, in my opinion, the only reason we have any drilling at all going on right now is because the depletion allowance gives a little crutch to the industry. If you take that away, we would have disaster in the industry tomorrow, and not in 2 or 3 years. Without that one incentive, the industry would already have reached the point of disaster. There just is not enough incentive left. I certainly hope that we do not contemplate making an already dangerous and complicated situation worse by adding to it unnecessarily by tampering with the depletion allowance.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I commend the gentleman for the great contribution he has made in the effort to find a solution to this problem. This is not a new problem. It is a problem that we have been working on for a long time. Many people have put in much exhaustive time and study on it. The gentleman from Oklahoma and his committee are entitled to the highest commendation for the work they have done in preparing a bill which has now been introduced and which I think will do a great deal to solve this problem.

In the hearings, the gentleman from Oklahoma had a great deal of testimony with regard to the economics involved. I want to ask him this question. If this bill is passed by the Congress and signed by the President, in his opinion as an expert on this subject having gone into it exhaustively, what will it do for the economics of this country?

Mr. STEED. Unfortunately, I think it will not do nearly enough. I do believe it will answer the national security part of the problem. I think it will assure the Nation of an adequate supply of oil. But I think in the administration of this act lie some of the answers for the economic phases of it. I have no illusion that the adoption of this amendment, vital to the very life of our Nation as it is, will solve the economic problems of the oil industry. We will still have many, many difficult problems facing us, but I do believe the industry can and will solve these problems if it is given this one absolutely necessary protection that is asked for here.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I would like to point out to my colleagues that there are other areas of the economy that are also greatly affected just as the oil industry is. But I think the oil industry is in a situation where it can act as a leader. I have in mind the sugar situation. The House of Representatives in the very near future will have to face that problem. At the present time we are importing a tremendous amount of our sugar. As a matter of fact, 45 percent of our domestic requirements and needs for sugar is imported from foreign countries.

We made some very bad mistakes in the past trying to depend on foreign sources for some of the strategic minerals and metals. I do not think we should make that same kind of mistake at this time with regard to oil. I think it would be well for the Members of this Congress and for the people of the United States, if they would keep in mind that during World War II when we needed manganese, and we have manganese in this country, yet, we were dependent upon foreign sources for that manganese. And when the manganese was being shipped in, guarded by convoys consisting of 70 ships, the German intelligence was so good that they were able to come with their submarines and sink two or three of the ships carrying the manganese. That put us in a very serious position several times, so I repeat, I think it would be well for the people of America to think about that when we think of the problems of our own economy and when we think of a product as important as the fuel needs of this country.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to join the others of my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Oklahoma and his very fine subcommittee for bringing to the attention of the House and of the Congress this very vital and important problem. For many years the industry has been concerned about the effect of continued encroachment by the increased importation of oil; that is, crude oil and crude oil products. I share the feeling the gentleman has expressed here this afternoon as have other gentlemen. I think it is of vital concern to the American people as well as to the industry itself. I hope that the kind of study and attention that the gentleman and his committee has given to this problem will be carefully considered by all those concerned.

I am sure the great Committee on Ways and Means will take into consideration what has been said and offered here this afternoon as they consider this problem now and certainly in the light of what has happened in the past. I would not want, however, to leave any impression, by the discussion, that we are now faced with running out of fuel.

Serious as the problem is from the long-range standpoint, that is the concern I have, but I do not want our American people to get any idea that we are about to run out of fuel in the field of petroleum and coal.

I think it is abundantly clear that we do have ample supplies of both coal and fuel oil, but if we permit the condition which the gentleman has explained here to continue, the long-range proposition is that we will not have a sufficient new coverage to keep up as we have had ever since 1914, as the record has shown. But in this regard and insofar as the present administration is concerned, is it not a fact that the regular quotas on a quarterly basis under the law have been maintained and that in recent weeks the Secretary of the Interior recommended, and I believe the President approved quotas for the present quarter we are in and I believe for the next quarter also, which is the same as the last quarter. Is that not true?

Mr. STEED. That is true. The point here is this: 30 percent of our daily production of our reserve picture is in what we call secondary recovery. That has been a windfall, a blessing, but to take advantage of that secondary recovery you have got to get those reserves out of maximum speed. That is a measurable thing. We know we are going to use up that oil in a few years. The gentleman knows, as I do, that in bringing in a well there is a long leadtime after getting the drilling started. The thing we are trying to bring to attention here is that we know that in the next few years if conditions go as they are going that soon we are going to be faced with this very serious shortage situation unless the long leadtime necessary to get wells drilled is anticipated and provided for so that secondary recovery will carry us along and we will have in being the new wells, some 7,000 a year more than we are getting now, but which we will have to have 4, 5, or 6 years from now if we are going to have enough oil to meet our needs.

The oil men who must drill these wells tell me that they must have the assurance in law that in 4 or 5 years when they drill these new wells they will be assured of having at least as much of the market then as they have now. That has not been so during the last 11 years. The increase in the market over the last 11 years has gone to foreign importers rather than to our domestic producers.

The whole thing resolves itself down to this, it makes no difference what anybody says or does until and unless something is done to get the men in the oil business to drilling. That the situation is serious is evident from the fact that this is the first time I can ever remember when virtually the entire domestic coal and oil industry is unanimous in standing before Congress and making this request.

The very fact that those two industries can get together and agree on anything emphasizes how desperate they find the situation today.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not disagree with the gentleman. I think he has stated the situation on a long-term basis exceptionally well. The fact remains that we not only have the long-term or long-range problem ahead of us if we are looking to the future but we also have presently about a 3-million-barrel-per-day capacity that is shut in. In other words, if it were not for the fact there were extensive importations or if there was increased consumption, we have a capacity in this country now of an additional 3 million barrels per day that we could supply our consumers.

Mr. STEED. I think right here is a good place to say that none of us want to quit using foreign oil. We want to use as much of it as we can without destroying our own domestic industries and getting out into this short supply situation.

On the ability to produce, such authorities as Chairman Murray of the Texas Railroad Commission, who sits in control of and in touch with two-thirds of all the known reserves in this Nation, and more than one-third of the Nation's total production—in other words, the one man on earth who has more contact with oil than anybody else—says we cannot produce this extra 3 million barrels of oil for 30 days. It would hard press us to maintain that margin for 30 days.

When I asked him how long he thought we had, how much additional time we could drift, he said we have no time, it has run out, we must make the change now or it is too late.

It is in view of statements of authorities like that that I state here we are at a more serious point in our national security than ever existed in the history of our country. We do have plenty of oil now, we can always have plenty of oil, there is no question about this Nation's ability to provide the oil source that we need if we can get the drilling done.

Mr. HARRIS. I share the gentleman's feeling toward the distinguished and very able gentleman from Texas, and his colleague, General Thompson. I think he is one of the most outstanding men in this field. He is probably about the most knowledgeable in the entire field. I would certainly agree that whatever the general said is pretty much the fact.

But I want to get back to the present situation. I know that when recently the matter of the import quotas came up, there was consideration given to it and there was great feeling among the industry, I think with some justification, that the import quotas were going to be thrown wide open. I do know that the decision was made at the White House or in the administration, on the part of the Secretary of the Interior who had the responsibility that we maintain for the next quarter the same quota that we have had in the past quarter.

Has there been any increase in the importation quotas in crude oil for the last six quarters that the gentleman is aware of?

Mr. STEED. There has been an increase, not in the quotas as such, but under the program we have. The continental sources are exempt. There has been a very marked increase in the amount of oil coming into the United States from Canada, which is not included in the total, so the total amount of oil coming in is considerably higher than when this program was started.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the point I wanted to bring out, and I hoped it would be brought out, because we have a program set up under the Reciprocal Trade Act wherein quotas are imposed. But there is a loophole that permits an increase, without having any authority to do anything about it, on what is coming in, and particularly with reference to the loophole, as it might be called, to the south of us.

I say this is one of the most important things that ought to be impressed on the Committee on Ways and Means and this Congress, the State Department, and the President himself. I think there is really the problem that ought to be pursued in order that this matter might be stabilized and, if we do not, why, the industry cannot, in my judgment, expect any stabilization in the future.

Mr. STEED. I agree with the gentleman. Our bill will cure exactly what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I failed, for the first time in 16 years in the Congress, to vote for the Defense Department appropriation bill. I was over at the Defense Department trying to get some contracts for West Virginia, and I did not get back in time.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I will be happy to.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma in introducing legislation dealing with this most important problem. I rise to make my first speech in this body since being elected to represent the 13th District of Texas in January of this year.

I realize that the traditional role of a first-year Member in Congress is to say little and try to observe and learn much. But the problem before us is one which is vital to all the people of the United States, and one that is misunderstood by too many of us.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, because I see a danger which could result in the destruction of these United States.

I think all of us realize the importance of oil and its products in the time of war or other national emergency. This Nation must be capable of producing the petroleum required to carry us through such a period. If the present policy continues, this will not be the case. For at this moment, we are pursuing a policy which is leading directly to the destruction of the independent oil industry. We are depressing our domestic oil industry to the point where it is faced with extinction.

In the next 3 to 4 years, 30 percent of our present domestic sources of oil will be depleted. Under our present conditions, the independent businessmen who drill new wells and discover new sources of oil are going out of business by the hundreds. One does not need to look very hard at this picture to see what would happen if no change is made in our basic policy on oil imports and an emergency should arise.

We can foresee, without much difficulty, situations that would completely cut off our supply of oil from other countries. If this should happen we would be entirely dependent on our domestic oil producers for the vast supplies of petroleum that we would need to fight a war, carry out airlifts like the one in Berlin a few years ago, and for many other uses. For this reason alone, I believe, it is imperative that we keep our domestic oil industry strong enough to meet these potential demands. The bill that is being proposed, then, is in the interest of our national security; in fact, is imperative to our national security.

While we strive to maintain an acceptable balance of payments in foreign trade with the result that we still are losing gold in the process, we continue to increase the imports of oil from other nations. Until 1950, this Nation was an exporter of oil. Since that time, our domestic oil industry, particularly the independent producer, has dwindled to the point that he is now in danger of vanishing from the American scene.

And I would point out here that the independent producer, the small businessman in the oil industry, drills 90 percent of the wells and produces 65 percent of the oil.

We are all very interested in reciprocal trade and our policies in that field. If we are not careful, if we do not approve this proposal and grant the oil man some relief from oppressive imports, there is not going to be a domestic oil industry capable of trade reciprocation.

Those of us who feel we know the problems that face our domestic oil producing industry are of the opinion, I believe, that the Congress must show that it is going to take action to help preserve this important segment of our economy before we can justify any favorable action on proposed legislation in the broad field of reciprocal trade agreements that would further hamper this already crippled industry in our Nation.

This great Nation was founded on the premise that a man could go into business, and make a profit if he knew how to operate that business in an efficient and proper manner. Our Federal Government is empowered with the responsibility of protecting the businessman who is operating his business in the proper manner from financial damage at the hands of foreign competition using labor that gets almost slave wages, in countries where the worker gets a very small share of the benefits of his labor.

I know that none of us want to be a party to the systematic destruction of a vital segment of American industry. I know that none of us want to see the production of our petroleum products fall entirely into the hands of a few giant worldwide companies. We recently saw the results of that kind of situation in the steel industry.

We must, I believe, for our own protection, save our domestic oil producers from unfair foreign competition that is right this minute in the process of destroying them completely.

What is the situation in the domestic oil industry today? The independent oil producers in this country are being economically wiped out through no fault of their own. The enemy of this industry is the growing import of crude oil and its derivatives from other nations. As a result of these ever-increasing imports, the millions of dollars spent by these small independent businessmen to locate the necessary new oil reserves is locked in the ground. There is just not enough of a market left after the foreign oil is consumed to make oil production profitable for the independent operator.

While the consumption of oil in the United States continues to climb, there has been no appreciable increase in the allowable production of domestic producers since 1956. I think it is time we started to look after this vital industry before we lose it.

Let us look now at some of the actual results on the economic health of the domestic oil-producing industry in the years 1956 through 1961, the period since the sharp increase of foreign oil imports began.

First. In our area of Texas, the drilling of new exploratory wells, known in the industry as "wildcat" wells, is down 75 percent below the 1956 level.

Second. In that same area, the drilling of new wells of all kinds, including those in established fields, is down to one-half of the 1956 level.

Third. In our area, the expenditures for drilling operations are down to one-half of the 1956 expenditures in this phase of the industry.

Fourth. In the field of exploration, there were 30 percent fewer geophysical and core drilling crews in operation in this country last year than in 1956.

Fifth. The price of domestic crude in the United States last year was 21 cents per barrel below the 1957 price, in spite of increased operating costs, and the decrease in the value of the dollar.

Sixth. All this in face of the fact that imports of crude oil from foreign sources was up 31 percent during the same period of 1956 through 1961.

This is a very sad picture, indeed, in the face of our ever-increasing standard of living on a national scale. It is unfair, I think, to ask any one segment of our economy to bear this much of a load in our efforts to increase trade with nations in the Middle East and north Africa.

This existing situation is particularly disheartening when we think of the important part oil has played in the progress of our Nation. The tremendous strides of economic progress and social achievement in the United States have been principally evolved out of the development of machines and the production of fuel to supply them. Even today, the relationship of oil to the standard of living we enjoy throughout the world is evidenced to a large degree by the parallel of each nation's per capita consumption of oil.

I think it should be pointed out here that oil imports are one of the largest causes of the Nation's unfavorable balance of payments and gold outflow. Oil imports accounted for the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments in the last 4 years as follows: 30.7 percent in 1958, 26.9 percent in 1959, 27.8 percent in 1960, and over 40 percent in 1961. The deficit on oil imports alone last year amounted to about $1.2 billion, not counting $300 million in foreign military purchases.

The world oversupply of oil is now further complicated by the entry of Soviet oil into the world market with the twofold purpose of gaining foreign exchanges, or foreign goods, coupled with their economic and political offensive against the free world. Recent action on the part of the Soviets indicates that they will make any sacrifice to gain either political advantage or to gain much needed steel and other products necessary to expand their oil operations. So we see our potential enemies building up their oil-producing potential while we in America seem bent on destroying this potential in our own country.

In the interest of national security, in the interest of our balance of trade, in the interest of our domestic economy, and in the interest of good, old-fashioned American fairplay, we must pass this legislation to give relief to the independent oil producers of the United States.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to compliment our distinguished colleague from Texas on this very learned speech he is making upon the value of our oil resource and the part it plays in our national defense structure and our national economy.

It certainly reflects, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] has studied the subject, and knows what it is all about.

Mr. Speaker, since this is his first speech I want to commend him on it. My guess and hope is that he will be with us for many, many years.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], for taking the lead in this very vital subject. The gentleman comes from the great State of Oklahoma where oil is a large resource. The gentleman knows his subject, and we are all indebted to him for his leadership in this particular undertaking. May I say to my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], that as long as he, the gentleman from Arkansas who is now occupying the chair and who is chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, and who has certainly studied the oil and gas problem of this country for many years, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL], go hand in hand, the Nation is going to be safe, and I think our oil problem will be worked out.

Mr. Speaker, again may I compliment my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to observe for the information of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] that some of the big, giant oil companies to which the gentleman referred happen to come from the State of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell]. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that they are operating and developing their foreign concessions under the benefits of the 27.5-percent depletion allowance. I think that allowance should be confined to domestic operations.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PURCELL. I am glad to have the comment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Bailey] on the matter to which he referred.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the oil import problem is one of the major domestic problems confronting our Government today.

In the district which I have the honor to represent, we have 5 counties which mine and sell over 25 million tons of coal annually and, in addition, the Second District produces more oil than any other section of Kentucky. The home office of the Texas Gas Transmission Corp. is located in the Second District of Kentucky and the program presented today to the House is of vital concern to all of the power producers in my section of this Nation.

Unless we operate under an adequate residual control program, our national security will be dangerously threatened due to the fact that our depressed fuels industries will be unable to meet the demands for increased production which an emergency would impose upon them. Today we are passing through the most crucial period in the history of our country and we must be prepared to meet every eventuality.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed] and the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] for their presentation of this all important problem and to assure you that my people are very much concerned over its solution.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has already been said and written about the threat of residual oil imports to the bituminous coal industry. In West Virginia, where coal is king, these residual oil imports have had a serious and biting effect on our economy.

For many years, I used to read George Sokolsky only before going into battle for some worthy cause—not to receive inspiration, but to be spurred by a reaction against what he said. But there is a new George Sokolsky who makes a great deal of sense. Two days ago on April 16, Mr. Sokolsky's column on residual oil proved to be a brilliant summary of the West Virginia story. It tells the story better than I can, and I will insert it at this point in the Record:

The Problems With Residual Oil

(By George Sokolsky)

In a police state, it is possible to decide that the country requires so many engineers, so many doctors, so many miners and the state recruits the individual and forces him to accept the career allotted to him. A free society is defined by freedom of choice. In a free society, a person selects the pattern of his own life and assumes responsibility for that, come what may.

In such a State as West Virginia, the coal miners are trapped by the accident of the elimination of their product. Bituminous coal cannot compete with other producers of heat and light. Despite the high cost of production, the price of bituminous coal has not advanced during the past 10 years. The average value of bituminous coal at the mine in 1957 was $5.08 a ton; in 1960, $4.73. As the value of the dollar has decreased, the price of coal has actually decreased during this period. Nevertheless, American bituminous coal has been sold in West Germany, England, France and Belgium, in coal producing countries, at from $2 to $5 less a ton than native coal because of superior quality and the mechanization of American mining processes.

John L. Lewis, one of the truly great statesmen in labor, always supported mechanization in the hope of increasing the output per miner and therefore increasing his wages; he did not, however, count on quotas, tariffs, Government licenses and other devices used in Europe against American products. It is reported, for instance, that recently the British steel mills petitioned their Government to import American coking coal as it was $2 to $3 a ton cheaper than British coal and of a better quality, but the British Government turned down the petition and refused to grant import licenses. While American exports suffer in European markets because of quotas, etc., the United States permits residual oil to come in from Venezuela to compete with American products.

What is residual oil?

The name is clear. It is a waste product, left over from the processing of crude oil. Generally it is thrown away or sold at whatever price it can get. It is being dumped into this country at less than coal can be produced at the mine. Its economic and social effect is to throw American miners out of work. It would be like selling the sudsy, dirty water that is thrown down a drain after the dishes have been washed. I suppose someone will some day find use for that, too.

Why is residual oil imported into the United States despite the demonstrable fact that it has brought ruination to such a State as West Virginia? It is done for political, not economic, reasons; that is, the objective is to make Venezuela prosperous, just as we pay exorbitant prices for coffee to benefit Brazil and Colombia.

This type of oil cannot be used by most folks. It requires special equipment which only large users can afford.

What is the solution for such a problem? Of course, politically, Venezuelans seem to be more important than West Virginians, which is one reason that President Eisenhower was unpopular in that State. So, the idea is to retrain the miners and to move them from their homes to where jobs can be found for retrainees. Young people in the mining towns move to the big industrial cities and, in time, the mining towns can become ghost towns like the silver and gold towns of the West. How many Americans want to be forcibly retrained? How many of them want to leave their homes and churches and graveyards because Venezuela wants to export residual oil?

There is some very bad thinking in the political approach to economic problems. The sociology of it is all wrong. From the standpoint of the Kennedy administration, it would seem to me that the economics of this country cannot be dealt with piecemeal but as a whole, as a matter that requires a national rather than an international approach. The export of jobs has imperiled the automobile and some smaller industries; the import of steel products has imperiled the steel industry; the import of residual oil has ruined the bituminous coal industry.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I have introduced a bill as a coauthor of the measure sponsored by him and by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore].

I come from the State of Kansas. Western Kansas depends, to a large part, on the oil industry. As the gentleman has stated, we are in a depressed condition there and do need some protection from foreign imports. Less than an hour ago I was in contact with the officials of the Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association and they are in full accord with the legislation the gentleman has sponsored.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate personally and I am sure the others who have worked so hard on this problem also appreciate the fine show of cooperation and support we have had here today. I am very happy for and flattered by the kind remarks that have been addressed to me personally. I hope that the administration and those in a position to decide this matter will take note of the strong, the overwhelming interest shown here today in this very vital problem. I hope they make no mistake in the way they analyze its significance.

I say that this problem must be solved and if it is not solved this Nation is going to face a disaster. I can only say that failure to solve this problem would have to come under one of two headings: either lack of understanding of it or for a selfish interest. If we fail, if we are defeated in what we are trying to do I think history will tell us under which classification those who are the architects of defeat will be listed.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore], in introducing legislation to stabilize the relationship between imports and the domestic fuels industries—oil and coal.

This legislation is not aimed at the President's foreign trade proposals. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the matter of an adequate supply of fuel is so basic to the security of the Nation that it deserves special consideration apart from all other commodities involved in our international trade. Without adequate amounts of fuel at reasonable prices this country's industrial and economic expansion could be checked and the very defense of the Nation in time of emergency could be made extremely difficult.

What we are trying to do in this legislation is to establish a reasonable base for the importation of oil. We are not trying to deny foreign oil producers access to the U.S. market. But we are trying to hold imports in check and not permit them to increase as fast as they have in recent years.

Imports have contributed materially to the present depressed state of the domestic oil industry. Imported oil can be landed at the head of the Houston ship channel for $1 a barrel below the domestic price. If enough oil comes into the country at that depressed price, the domestic oil industry will be forced to curtail its operations even further.

The Nation needs a strong, expanding oil industry. This can be achieved only through a reasonable, realistic import policy such as proposed in this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the domestic oil industry of the United States is sorely pressed.

This is especially apparent in the 14th Congressional District of south Texas, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress. An accurate picture of the condition of our domestic oil industry can be readily found in an examination and comparison of the activities of the industry in the year 1961 to the year of 1951. During this decade drilling operations and new discoveries fell off at least one-half and the industry reached the lowest level it has sunken to since oil was selling for 10 cents a barrel back in 1932.

Although, admittedly, the domestic oil industry of this country has various inherent economic problems of the times, as is true of most industries, there is no doubt, that the importation of foreign petroleum and petroleum products has contributed substantially to the economic difficulties of this vital industry.

Much of the economic problems of my congressional district are directly caused by the plight of the domestic oil industry and I have joined in introducing companion legislation which I hope will bring some relief to the situation. That the national interest and the security of our Nation demands a wholesome domestic oil industry is so well recognized as to not admit of controversy.

I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] and I commend him for his effort and activity in the interest of promoting a more wholesome condition of the domestic oil industry of our great Nation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the legislation introduced today by my colleagues, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE]. The legislation would serve as an amendment to the pending Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and would affect the imports of fuel oils.

As a Representative of an area that includes a section of the anthracite belt of Pennsylvania, I am quite familiar with the plight of the coal industry in this country.

The survival of the domestic fuels industry, particularly the major coal-producing areas, depends on import quotas being set up on a long-range stable basis.

It also is quite obvious that we must place firm restrictions on fuel imports for no other reason than to preserve our national security. There is no question in my mind that the foreign sources would be immediately cut off in the time of war.

The legislation introduced today will help conserve these valuable resources so that we will not be dependent on foreign countries in time of need.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] on his work as chairman of the subcommittee to which he refers and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE]. He and his associates have worked diligently and effectively. I do trust proper action will be taken to protect our domestic oil industry. As one who represents a congressional district in east Texas I shall continue to exert every possible effort to see that this vital industry is protected properly.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS FOR PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's proposal that the United States purchase a total of $100 million in United Nations bonds, out of a total issue of $200 million, to bail the organization out of its present near-bankruptcy, is running into heavy weather in the Congress. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has recommended that the original purchase be limited to $25 million, further purchases to be made on a matching basis with the United States buying, beyond the original sum, only as other countries buy.

The Senate on April 4 adopted the Mansfield-Dirksen substitute to S. 2768. In addition to authorizing appropriations for a $100 million loan, with interest and duration to be set by the President, the substitute retained provisions in S. 2768, requiring that the amount beyond $25 million would be on a matching basis with other nations and requiring that a sum equal to the annual installment on the principal and interest due on the loan be deducted from the annual U.S. payment of its assessed share of the United Nations budget. This amendment is an improvement and the House should favor it.

Now, what are the real issues at stake in the U.N. bond proposal? Perhaps the best approach to the discussion of this subject would be to start with the general aspects of the problem and then narrow consideration down to the specifics.

From a general point of view, the real, the fundamental issue is perhaps the issue of war and peace itself, the consuming issue of our times. For those who may think I exaggerate to pose the question in these terms, I invite your attention to where the proceeds from the bonds will go.

Essentially, they will be used to underwrite two immensely important peacekeeping operations, one in the strategic Middle East, the other in a large, rich and important country in the heart of Africa.

Each new crisis with which we are faced tends to obscure or erase an older crisis. For this reason, under the strains and stresses of Berlin, gigantic Soviet nuclear test explosions and other current headline news we are inclined to forget the harrowing weeks in 1956 when the great powers drifted close to war in the Middle East, or the more recent events in July of 1960 when U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold called the U.N. Security Council into session to try to avert an explosion in the Congo. But the situations which gave rise to these older crises still exist, in large measure, and without the dampening influences of the United Nations they could flare up again and threaten general conflagration.

Perhaps it would be well to recall at this point just why a United Nations Emergency Force was sent to the Middle East in 1956 and why a United Nations operation was started in the Congo in 1960.

In 1956 Great Britain had developed a dangerous mood of frustration over the Egyptian seizure of the Suez Canal. Although a solution was in sight, and the late U.N. Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold, was, among others, including Secretary Dulles, working ably toward this end, the British Government's exasperation at President Nasser's high-handedness had reached the breaking point. France and Israel, for reasons of their own, were also prepared to play for very high stakes in the Middle East, risking their own fate and that of the rest of us in the process. Without consulting their friends and allies, these three countries launched an attack against Egypt, to impose their policies by force where persuasion had been to no avail.

The United States, at that time under a Republican administration, was faced with immensely difficult choices. Would we oppose our two strongest allies in the North Atlantic with risks to our protective treaty in that area? Would we slap down Israel, whom we had helped to found? Should we stand by and perhaps chance world war?

The choice this country had to make was that of picking among several evils. I, for one, believe that the Eisenhower administration and his Secretary of

State, the late John Foster Dulles, made the moral decision. They decided to oppose the aggression, the flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, by our closest allies. The United States voted against them in the U.N. Security Council. Secretary Dulles instructed the U.S. delegation at the United Nations, then headed by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, to vote in favor of sending a U.N. Emergency Force to the Middle East to stabilize the situation and help keep the peace. No American forces were to serve, or have served, in this peace-keeping operation. All this country obligated itself to do was to help pay the bills.

The Emergency Force has been helping to keep the peace in the Middle East since 1956. It is a small force and the cost of sustaining it is not great, only about $20 million a year. Other countries join with us in footing this bill, including Great Britain, France, and Israel who, to their great credit, took their setback with equanimity and good grace. Indeed, Great Britain, at least, has paid more than its assessed share for the maintenance of the Force.

Now, for the Congo operation. In the middle of 1960 the Belgian Government, panicked by the tornado-like winds of change sweeping through Africa, precipitously abandoned its responsibilities in the Congo and turned the government over to inexperienced and untrained native leaders. The results were hardly surprising: a mutiny of the Congolese armed forces; general economic breakdown; secessionist movements in various parts of the country—which is as large as the United States east of the Mississippi—and massacres among both Congolese and white settlers. As precipitously as they had withdrawn, the Belgians sought to rush back in. But this was no longer possible without serious international repercussions. The Congo had become independent, for better or worse. At the same time it had become a fertile breeding ground for power politics.

In July 1960, the United States, under its Republican administration, backed to the hilt the U.N. intervention in the Congo. I, for one, believe that this decision was a proper one. The choices, in this case, were also difficult. Would the United States back a move by the United Nations to try and restore law and order? Should this country gamble on intervening and thus invite Soviet intervention? Would it be better to back certain Congolese factions, even at the risk of a divided Congo, one Communist and one free world? Should we risk a long-drawn-out struggle of the Spanish Civil War type against the Communists, laboring, as we would be, under the burden of our NATO connections? A dangerous war far from our own shores perhaps eventually involving United States and Soviet troops? Again, I repeat, I believe the decision of the Eisenhower administration to allow U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold to try to keep the cold war, and perhaps a hot war, out of the Congo was a proper one. Things have not always gone well there, but there is now hope for a united and stable Congo—a hope which, under other circumstances, might long since have died.

The U.N. Congo operation has cost on the order of about $10 million a month, or $120 million a year, and the United States has picked up the tab for about half this sum. I think we should compare this with what it cost the United States to engage in the Korean war, which was largely U.S. run. The minimum estimate of U.S. expenditures in the Korean war is something like $18 billion for the 3 years of the war. The maximum estimate is in the neighborhood of $79 billion. But more important, thousands of American soldiers were killed and wounded. It seems incredible that so much fuss should be made over the costs of the United Nations Congo operation, in which no U.S. troops are employed and for which we only pay part of the bill, when we compare it with the Korean war, and, indeed, with other actions in which we are engaged throughout the world today, notably in southeast Asia, where funds are being consumed at a really enormous rate running into the hundreds of millions yearly with far less promising results.

Narrowing the question down to specifics, the United Nations bond issue has been proposed as one way of bailing the organization out of the disastrous financial position in which it now finds itself due to these two police actions in the Middle East and the Congo. After careful consideration it seems to me that the U.N. bond proposal is a carefully thought-out and prudent plan. I commend the people in our Department of State and in our U.S. mission to the United Nations who, I am sure, had much to do with the original conception.

Basing myself upon the premise that we really want to keep the United Nations in the Middle East and in the Congo—a premise which I doubt that some of the opponents of the bond proposal hold—what are some of the specific advantages of this plan over previous methods of financing?

In the first place, the U.N. bond plan would reduce our share of the financing from close to half to about a third, and it would spread the costs throughout the entire membership of the United Nations. The United States has, since 1956, paid about 46 percent of the costs of the Middle East force, and, since July 1960, about 49 percent of the Congo operation. Under the U.N. bond plan, redemption of the bonds would come from assessments on U.N. members through the regular United Nations budget. Members of the United Nations have, without a single exception, always paid their assessments for the regular budget. The reason for this is that if they do not do so they eventually lose their vote in the U.N. General Assembly. Now, the U.S. share of the regular budget is 32.02 percent. Therefore, through the U.N. bond plan our percentage of the cost of financing these and other peace-keeping operations would be sharply reduced.

In the second place, the U.N. bond plan would provide the poorer members of the United Nations with a method of paying for peace "on the installment plan" as it were. For a number of U.N. members, particularly among the new countries, the payment of their assessments to international organizations, however small, comes as a real hardship. Stretching payments over a period of 25 years, as the U.N. bond plan provides, would make it easier for them to meet their obligations.

A third advantage would be that it would do away with the system of rebates for poorer U.N. members, made up by voluntary contributions from richer countries, chiefly the United States, which has grown up during the past 1 or 2 years. I need not point out the dangers of this trend, under which countries vote themselves out of paying their full share for peace-keeping operations. The U.N. General Assembly is a body of sovereign states where each country has both duties and responsibilities. Any tendency to exercise power while shirking duty is a dangerous tendency. Under the U.N. bond plan, the financing of peace-and-security operations by the U.N. would be put back under the regular scale of assessments and each country, no matter how small or how poor, would have to pay its fair share.

Fourth, the Communist countries oppose our participation in the bond plan. They desire to see the Congo operation fail because if it does fail then communism will have a chance to succeed. The Communist countries refuse to contribute any funds to bring about a successful Congo operation, for success in the Congo means failure for communism in that area. It behooves us to see that communism will fail by approving the plan to have the United States purchase $100 million in bonds, which is in essence a loan. Since the bonds must be repaid by regular assessments on each country, including the Communist bloc, the burden of financing the Congo and Far East operations will be placed where it properly belongs, that is, upon all participating members of the United Nations. Failure to meet the regular assessments carries with it the loss of voting privileges.

Now, a word about the Republican substitute proposal of a 2-year loan to the United Nations. It may be, as some suggest, such as in the New York Times, that the U.N. bond plan only serves to reprieve the United Nations and does not provide a solution to its long-term financial problems. Even if this is true, it is clear that the Republican loan proposal does not even offer a reprieve. The U.N. General Assembly would never approve a loan on such terms from the U.S. Government simply because it would know that such a loan could not be repaid within the length of time, and subject to the interest rate, stipulated. This proposal strikes me as irresponsible, an attempt to put its proponents in the position of being able to affirm: "We support the United Nations, but——." But we do not support what is necessary to keep it functioning.

The danger in the Republican proposal is not that it will be adopted by the Congress. Rather, it is that it will rob the U.N. bond plan of so much support that it, also, will fail of adoption. Such an event would be truly disastrous. Let us recognize this danger and act while there is still time.

I would plead with my fellow Members of Congress to give this U.N bond issue their most careful and serious consideration. We are here to lead and to act wisely for those we represent back home and for our country.

One scholar, John G. Stoessinger, stated recently: "There has never been a shortage of Cassandras predicting that the United Nations would end with a bang. There now exists a real possibility that it may end in a whimper"—the whimper of fiscal insolvency. In large measure the result rests with this body. I feel certain that we shall meet our responsibility and approve the plan to purchase $100 million in United Nations bonds.

PRESERVING OUR HERITAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, last summer this body passed unanimously a bill to protect the property across the Potomac from Mount Vernon from the encroachments which are attempted from time to time—Public Law 87–362. The immediate danger then was the determination of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission to build a large sewage disposal plant on Mockley Point. A local hearing brought loud protests from several hundred people and the representatives of a number of national organizations as well against such intrusion upon the view from Mount Vernon, the Memorial Highway, and Fort Washington. The bill passed both Houses of Congress without a dissenting vote and was signed by the President on October 4, 1961. This resolute effort to insure protection for the view from Mount Vernon, our most cherished national shrine, had both President Kennedy's and Speaker Rayburn's earnest support. That the Sanitary Commission contemplated building a sewage disposal plant on Mockley Point was as impossible a thought to them as to the hundreds of thousands of Americans who come to Mount Vernon. Indeed, that anyone should aggressively refuse to protect the area for future generations is truly shocking. Such, however, has been the case. The Interior appropriations bill, which contained the funds approved by the Budget to implement Public Law 87–362, came out of committee with this appropriation deleted.

Examination of the hearings revealed that not only was the full story not told, but the testimony given was strangely inaccurate.

Never in the 22 years of my service in this House have I witnessed committee action taken on so much misstatement of fact, on so little actual knowledge, and with so little courage. The report gives little, if anything, upon which to base judgment. Partial quotations were used and the real situation was beclouded by them. Unfortunately the House paid little attention during the floor discussion to the statement of the Honorable John Saylor, who presented the true facts of the case with great restraint and clarity in an effort to preserve the integrity of this body.

On George Washington's birthday this year the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] told the story of what has been done to protect the area. He gives the matter so succinctly that I include portions of his statement here as part of my remarks:

> On this commemoration of the birthday of George Washington, the 87th Congress may take pardonable pride in its recent efforts to further protect the Nation's most beloved shrine of Mount Vernon. Last year, Mount Vernon was about to experience a serious onslaught of commercial urbanization. The shores opposite Mount Vernon have been maintained to date, much as they were in the time of George Washington. Not only has this been of significant historical consequence, but it has been an inseparable part of the character and setting of Mount Vernon, and this view from the veranda of the mansion has thrilled and inspired the citizenry of our country and foreign dignitaries alike.
>
> When the threat to establish a sewage treatment plant on the Maryland shores of the Potomac, directly across from Mount Vernon, was apparent, the Congress of the United States acted swiftly and decisively. The Congress enacted Public Law 87–362, which authorized the Federal Government to acquire the land opposite Mount Vernon for preservation in keeping with its original open and wooded character.
>
> The overwhelming support of this measure by the Congress offers proof, beyond the words of praise, of the feeling the citizens of this country, and their elected representatives, have for the memory of George Washington.
>
> This body has been extremely fortunate over the years to have the very capable counsel and leadership in the area of natural resources of the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Wayne Aspinall. In learning of this threat, he introduced legislation to protect properly the environs of Mount Vernon. He was joined in this leadership by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Mr. Rutherford. These men were acutely aware of the need for fast action, if Mount Vernon was to receive adequate protection.
>
> During the committee's deliberation it became apparent that the preservation of this area heretofore had been achieved through planning and sacrifice by individual citizens. Private covenants were established to maintain the character of the area. Local government cooperation was asked, and plans were effected to establish zoning to the end of preservation. In addition, regional organizations charged with the overall planning and coordination of the other areas of Metropolitan Washington, cooperated in urging that the area be kept in an open or park status.
>
> The State of Maryland had initiated standards to achieve the preservation of these lands. These activities have continued for over 15 years—activities that were manifested in good government by private citizens and local authorities. Unfortunately, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission had wide powers of condemnation and eminent domain granted to it by the State, and the groups, both private and governmental, that labored so long were unable to restrain the sanitary commission from their plans of establishing a sewage treatment plant opposite George Washington's front porch.
>
> The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission held hearings over a year ago, on January 13, 1961, in which the majority of the affected landowners, in addition to national conservation and historic societies, vigorously objected to these plans and procedures.
>
> On August 17, 1961, the Subcommittee on National Parks, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Congressman from Texas, held hearings on the measures introduced to afford Federal protection to these areas. In the course of these hearings, it became apparent that there were other locations that could better serve the area than the one chosen by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission. A great deal of testimony was given to the committee as to the advisability of locating a much larger sewage treatment plant at the Mattowoman Creek site, and in an area already industrialized. This would be a plant more in keeping with the future needs of the area, would be a joint venture between Prince Georges and Charles Counties, in the State of Maryland, and a design and type much recommended by the Federal Anti-Pollution Control Act. Additional testimony was given that existing facilities could indeed handle the existing sewage treatment problem. No opposition witnesses appeared before the subcommittee. As a result, the proponents of the sewage plant could not be questioned. Yet despite their failure to appear, those urging the construction of such a plant continued to urge the need for speeding up this construction.
>
> None of the supporters of the measure to protect Mount Vernon desired precipitous action. None desired to work serious hardship on the local residents. All were somewhat baffled at the insistence of the great urgency to construct this sewage treatment plant.
>
> On further investigation, it was revealed that the developers of a subdivision across the Piscataway Bay, and some distance from the area in question, had plans to create a high-density development. In order to achieve this objective, proper sewage disposal was necessary. They applied for a permit to erect a sewage treatment plant on their own area of development. They then proceeded to abandon the plans for such a plant, and indicated plans to build a marina in the area that was to have served them for proper sewage disposal.
>
> At this point, they then urged the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission to construct a sewage plant at Mockley Point, which had the effect of taking the sewage from a high density development and dumping it onto an area of low density development. With this knowledge and information, the committee acted to authorize the Federal Government to acquire these areas. The measure was drafted in order to avail the Federal Government of the generosity of the private foundations who offered to give their land to the Federal Government for the purposes of preservation.
>
> Our own colleague, the distingushed Congresswoman from Ohio, Mrs. Frances Bolton, who is also the vice regent of the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, provided from her private resources, funds to enable the Accokeek Foundation to acquire considerable acreage in order to prevent commercialization. These foundations now stood ready to donate almost 50 percent of the entire land that would be acquired under Public Law 87–362. The House, upon hearing the able presentation of the chairman of the National Parks Subcommittee, Mr. Rutherford, acted without a dissenting vote to authorize this legislation.
>
> The Senate was no less mindful of this threat to Mount Vernon, and under the capable leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Mr. Anderson, who was joined in

this effort by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, Mr. BIBLE, introduced legislation to provide for the Federal protection of Mount Vernon. Since a number of inquiries had not been answered by those seeking to erect a sewage treatment plant, Senator ANDERSON wrote the chairman of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Mr. Blair Smith, indicating that the 1st session of the 87th Congress was about to end, and that the Senate might better appraise the situation, if it were allowed the time to do so.

Senator ANDERSON then asked if any plans for construction could be held in abeyance until the Senate returned, thus affording a more ample opportunity to investigate the matter. The chairman of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission replied that they would be happy to have the advice of the Senate, but made no commitment as to holding plans in abeyance until the Senate returned. As a result of this correspondence, hearings were scheduled quickly before the Subcommittee on Public Lands, under the able chairmanship of Senator BIBLE. Witnesses opposing the measure were members of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, the real estate developers and two landowners. The overwhelming majority of witnesses however, were in strong support of the Anderson bill. The indecisive actions of the opposing witnesses appeared no match for the volume of evidence in support of the measure, and this no doubt hastened the committee, and subsequent Senate action, as the measure passed without dissent. Few measures have come before the Congress with such wide and vigorous support, and it appears that the Congress, in its swift resolve of the matter, has worked the will of the people.

Beginning with the hearings in the Senate, the tactics of the real estate developers and the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission underwent a subtle change. They renounced their earlier position of placing a sewage treatment plant at Mockley Point and assured the Senate that the area could accommodate a park and a sewage treatment plant. There were further assurances that such a plant would not be seen from Mount Vernon, or intrude in any way upon the scenic area, or be disadvantageous to the proposed park itself.

This, of course, would have required a reduction in the proposed park area. Later arguments of this same group indicate not only would the plant not be visible, but it would be appropriately landscaped and blended with the area surrounding it. Evidence to this fact, they contend, is the sewage treatment plant contiguous to the Washington-Baltimore Parkway, which is so well concealed that few people know of its existence.

The proponents of the legislation to protect Mount Vernon have sought to decide these issues on the merits of the relative cases. It should be stated candidly however, that the proponents of the sewage treatment plant are either incompetent, or they are not coming clean in their discussion of these issues. They use the analogy of the sewage treatment plant near the Baltimore Parkway. Is it their contention that their proposed sewage treatment plant on the Piscataway Bay shore of Maryland is to be of the same size, using essentially the same techniques of sewage disposal? Why do they continue to be vague as to the new location of the sewage treatment plant. Precisely where is it to be? Are we to take their word that while they will need part of the park area, it still will not be seen from Mount Vernon?

Mr. Speaker, these arguments are spurious and fall by their own weight. If the plant is to be so small, why do not the developers put it on their own land? But then can it be so small, if the main reason for locating it in the Piscataway area is to serve a large area? As to the exact location, the framers of the legislation were completely aware of possible alternatives and drew the boundaries for Federal acquisition and protection of Mount Vernon with precisely this in mind. The argument that a little sewage treatment plant tucked in the corner of the proposed park would not be intrusive, will not wash.

That the developers are anxious to place their sewage in this low density area, or into the park, is without question. I ask unanimous consent Mr. Speaker, to include in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a letter from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission to Mr. Douglas L. Hatch, president of the Prince Georges Utilities Co., an organization controlled by one of the real estate developers, confirming that these real estate developers, through the Prince Georges Utilities Co., had offered a contribution of $500,000 to the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, if they would build this plant in the Piscataway Bay area. Perhaps it is good business for the developers to enhance the value of their own property by paying to have their sewage dumped on someone else, but it is a serious question as to whether it is good business for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it takes quite a degree of callousness to infer that the legislation authorizing Federal acquisition is too greedy, and too asking in terms of the need it seeks to meet, when the people making these charges are the same ones who would have public agencies bail them out of their own financial dilemma at a considerable cost to the American public in terms of a most serious intrusion upon one of the most majestic, most historic, most revered scenes of the Nation.

The concern of this country has been manifest again and again at the disappearance of open space. The encroachments upon national shrines and monuments, and the need for concerted action to preserve and protect these beneficences of nature that are irreplaceable. This is not a matter of partisan politics, but rather of deep national concern that touches all regardless of political persuasion. Those who have been active in the effort to further protect Mount Vernon represent every walk of life.

The leadership in this great body to which I referred to earlier has been forthright and basic, and practiced by Chairman ASPINALL and the members of his committee. The same statement can be made of the distinguished chairman, Mr. ANDERSON, who has a like role in the Senate. The backgrounds of these men indicate the knowledgeability and wisdom that they consistently bring to these matters.

Certainly, the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association is to be congratulated for their longtime efforts in the early restoration and preservation of Mount Vernon, inclusive of all its grounds and buildings. The State of Virginia has aided and abetted the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association over the years in order to present to the American people and the world, the home of America's first President in a proper and reverent setting, and their efforts should be honored and appreciated.

Aid and invaluable assistance in this vigilance was received by the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, under the leadership of Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, often referred to by his colleagues and Government leaders alike as "Mr. Conservation." Their concern for the dignity and preservation of monuments so cherished by this country has been long evidenced by the activities of this fine group and their judgments respected.

Of great significance, has been the appreciation and gracious demeanor of our First Family for the shrine of Mount Vernon, perhaps evidenced by Mrs. Kennedy's description as the "Nation's most revered house." This is a charge to all Americans to keep it that way.

WASHINGTON SUBURBAN
SANITARY COMMISSION.

Mr. DOUGLAS L. HATCH,
President, Prince George's Utilities, Inc.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HATCH: Please refer to the commission's letter of August 26, 1960, wherein you were advised that the commission had approved the project consisting of a sewage treatment plant and the necessary sewers and pumping stations to serve the Piscataway drainage basin, subject to a contribution of $500,000. As you know, since that time considerable opposition has been voiced toward the construction of a sewage treatment plant in the Piscataway Bay area, both by letters and in person at the hearing held by the commission on January 13, 1961, at the courthouse at Upper Marlboro regarding this project.

At the hearing the commission was strongly urged to undertake a joint project with Charles County and construct a sewage treatment plant in the vicinity of Mattawoman Creek. Preliminary investigations have been made and the matter discussed with the officials of Charles County and the indications are that Charles County would not be in a position to proceed promptly with such a project. Before making any final decision on the location of a sewage treatment plant, however, the commission would like the engineering department to complete its study regarding this possibility and pursue the matter further with officials of Charles County.

One of the major objections to the construction of a sewerage system in the Piscataway drainage basin at this time is that a large part of the area is outside of the regional district of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and not subject to zoning controls. The Park and Planning Commission has included in its proposed legislation that this area be added to the regional district at this session of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland. If such legislation is passed it would normally be effective June 1, 1961.

At the hearing the commission presented a letter from Mrs. Wolman and Geyer, consultants to the Washington Metropolitan Regional Sanitary Board, indicating that the construction of a plant on Piscataway Bay would not be inconsistent with the regional sewerage system for the metropolitan area. The commission has been advised that the final report being prepared by those consultants is expected to be completed in June. The commission desires, if possible, that its sewerage program be consistent with the regional sewer plan for the metropolitan area.

In view of the above, the commission has decided that it is not in a position to proceed at this time with the proposed project for Piscataway Bay which it indicated it would undertake subject to a contribution of $500,000. Before definitely deciding to proceed with this project, the commission desires to have available to it the results of further discussion with Charles County, the decision as to whether the area is added to the regional district and the report of the Washington Metropolitan Regional Sanitary Board. It appears that all of this information should be available by July of this year, at which time a decision can be made as to the method of handling the sewage of the Piscataway Basin. The commission realizes that this will delay our program, but it is believed to be in the best public interest to follow such a procedure.

Very truly yours,
JOHN BONIFANT,
Secretary.

Much work has been done on this by many people. So that we may have the whole story in one place, let me give you the speech made by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] when the Interior appropriations bill was before the House on March 20, 1962:

Mr. Chairman, as the Members of the House are aware, I have attempted many times in recent years, to call their attention to the preservation of our great natural and historical resources in the valley of the Potomac River.

Last summer, this House approved a bill which I introduced without a dissenting vote.

A companion bill, introduced into the Senate by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, also passed without a dissenting vote.

Our efforts were signed into Public Law 87–362 by President Kennedy.

Members of both parties acclaimed this action to preserve the view from Mount Vernon, the home of George Washington.

Now we have before us the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House. This report disallows in toto the authorization of $937,600 to carry out the provisions of Public Law 87–362, passed less than 5 months ago.

The House Appropriations Committee report correctly states the reasons why the Congress passed Public Law 87–362. From that point the committee report appears to try to make these three points:

First. The present plans of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission will not detract from the Mount Vernon view.

Second. Adequate planning and zoning controls now exist.

Third. The cost will be far greater than that estimated when the bill was passed a few months ago.

Before this body votes on this measure, I wish to correct the records on these points, so that the House is voting with true facts at their disposition.

The House Appropriations Committee report cites that the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission piously states that it will "refrain from further consideration of a site at Mockley Point." But the report fails to quote the next sentence from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission publicity release which says:

"The commission believes that a treatment plant can be located at another site on the southern shore of Piscataway Bay."

Nor does the committee read further in the commission's same recent public pronouncement which says:

"The commission will not consider * * * any site which adversely affects the Mount Vernon vista."

Despite this pronouncement the commission testified in the Senate only 10 days ago on the site it now contemplated.

Of course the commission testifies that the two-story structure it will build at the present will be attractive, and that a sewage treatment plant need not be obnoxious. To sanitary engineers they are the most beautiful and utilitarian structures in the world.

The House Appropriations Committee report states that the Maryland National Park and Planning Commission has recommended the new location planned by the commission for the sewage disposal plant in the lower valley of Piscataway Creek.

Again the House Appropriations Committee, in an otherwise commendable attempt to save printing costs, has treated this body to a partial quotation. The report referred to states:

"The long range needs of the [Prince Georges] county will be better met by a plant located at Mattawoman Creek in Charles County."

The report continues:

"It would be our preference that a lagoon system be used rather than a disposal plant [at the Piscataway Bay site] with the thought that when a larger plant is ultimately located in Charles County, those sites could be abandoned as disposal plants and the lands used for park and recreation purposes."

A careful reading of the full Maryland National Park and Planning Commission report shows almost the exact opposite of the House Appropriations Committee report citations.

For example, the House Appropriations Committee report states that the area in question is under "adequate planning and zoning controls."

The same Maryland National Park and Planning Commission report has this to say on zoning controls for the area:

"We do not believe that a proper zoning plan can be developed for this area unless and until an estate and farm zone requiring 2- and 5-acre lot sizes are available."

No such classification now exists in Prince Georges or Charles Counties.

Even if such a zone classification did exist, it could not be applied to prevent a sewage plant here, or any place else. Repeated testimony before the Congress last fall showed that the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission was not subject to zoning in location of its plant, and that local government in this area has no control and no veto over the location of a sewage plant. As the Members of the House may remember, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission in its majesty did not deign to testify before the House last summer, and refused pointblank to give a commitment to the Senate that it would not proceed to build a treatment plant while we considered the matter further. That is why the law was passed. It was the only way to stop this agency of the State, and was resorted to only after all local remedies had been tried and failed.

The House Appropriations Committee report further states:

"The acreage in question is primarily owned by three families which have held property (totaling 540 acres) for generations."

This is not even a half-truth. Public Law 87–362 refers to 1,186 acres of land along the waterfront. One-half is owned by foundations who have offered to donate their holdings to the Government without cost. Despite repeated testimony on these generous gifts, the House Appropriations Committee completely ignores this fact.

In addition, two other major waterfront landowners have told the Department of the Interior since Public Law 87–362 passed that they will donate easements on their property to the Government.

The three cited by the committee in their report are the only waterfront landowners who have objected.

The report states:

"No evidence was given to the House Appropriations Committee that these (the three cited above) plan to dispose of their property or take any action that was not in keeping with the present rural character of this area, or would not give satisfactory scenic easements."

The House Appropriations Committee chose to ignore that the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission testified before them that it is currently planning to acquire one of the three tracts for its sewage disposal plant and has the power of eminent domain to back up its decision. The owners plans have little to do with this impending change.

The House Appropriations Committee is also unaware that despite the fact that these protesting owners did not testify to this point, they have advised the Department of the Interior that they would not give any easement which would in any way restrict their right to develop their lands as they saw fit.

The House Appropriations Committee questions the adequacy of the $937,600 authorized in Public Law 87–362 and questions the $1,600-per-acre estimate on the 586 acres proposed for purchase in addition to the over 500 acres which will be donated outright.

This estimate was made by the Department of the Interior. It was based on the sale of a 50-acre farm in the center of the area along the river opposite Mount Vernon. This sale, which took place last summer, was a private sale between a willing seller and an informed buyer, and was at the price of $1,300 per acre, including the house, barns, and other improvements.

Of course, the objecting families cited by the House Appropriations Committee testified that the acquisition price of their land would be much higher, but I believe that courts would hold that the fair market value is established by recent sales. One of the protesting families' representatives testified before the Senate last fall that the price would be much higher. Close questioning by the chairman of the Senate subcommittee failed to elict any figure at all from the witness.

The House Appropriations Committee, in making this report on the purported inadequacy of the authorization, was apparently unaware that two of the major waterfront landowners have offered to donate easements on their lands to the Federal Government without cost, since Public Law 87–362 has passed. Another major landowner offered to donate easements on his waterfront lands before the bill passed. These easement donations, if accepted by Interior, would be deducted from the estimated cost of acquiring the 586 acres.

In addition, the House Appropriations Committee was apparently not aware that testimony given subsequently in the Senate showed that over one-half of the resident landowners in the Moyaone Reserve in the area covered by Public Law 87–362 have signed statements that they will donate visual easements on their property to the Federal Government without charge. The House Appropriations Committee was also unaware that several hundred acres in the Moyaone Reserve area as covered by this bill are under conservation covenants whose provisions already meet the requirements of this bill. Therefore, even where payments for scenic easements were required, the cost would be very small.

Lastly, the House Appropriations Committee makes the point of its policy that acquisition of park lands in this area is the responsibility of local jurisdictions, and suggests that the local planning commission should acquire the acreage in question if it is determined desirable or necessary.

This body should be aware that the Interior Committee in considering Public Law 87–362 made very clear in the hearings that this was not a local park bill passed for the local citizens. We, on the committee, recommend this bill unanimously to protect the view from Mount Vernon for the millions of visitors who come to the shrine from all over America and all over the world.

It must not, cannot, and will not be considered a local park bill. The support for this legislation and for the proposed appropriation which has come from all corners of the Nation, is not support of a local park bill. It is support for protection of a national shrine. I cannot believe this country is so poor that we cannot afford to protect that shrine, especially in view of the fact that private individuals are contributing such a large share of the cost.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I quote part of an editorial as recent as April 3, 1962, from the Washington Star:

> Especially disappointing was the refusal of funds to preserve a large park area on the scenic Maryland shore of the Potomac opposite Mount Vernon. This action flew unaccountably in the face of a specific authorization voted by Congress after extensive hearings were held last year. In explaining the rejection, the Appropriations Committee referred to its policy that future acquisition of parklands in the Washington area should generally be the responsibility of the local jurisdictions, which enjoy some of the highest per capita incomes in the country.
>
> The fallacy in this policy, however, is its assumption that local jurisdictions in Maryland and Virginia will provide the wherewithal not only for their local recreational playgrounds and parks, but for those which are wholly of a national character, as part of the setting of the Federal City. This is a role which local areas of course will not fill, nor should they be expected to. There is no reasonable way in which the proposed, 1,186-acre shoreline park across from Mount Vernon can be rationalized as a local responsibility. As Congress agreed in its legislation last year, this stretch of shoreline would become a marvelous addition to the National Capital park system. It possesses historical and archaeological importance as the site of an early Indian village described by Capt. John Smith. And most important, it would preserve a view of great beauty from Mount Vernon which, unless Congress acts, most certainly will give way to bulldozers in the not-too-distant future.

Also, from the Washington Post editorial of March 24, 1962:

> The public can never be sure that this national shrine has been properly safeguarded until the land on the opposite shore of the Potomac is in public ownership reserved for park purposes. The fact that last year's authorization now seems too small merely illustrates the cost of procrastination. To our way of thinking, the national interest requires this buffer park across the river from Mount Vernon, and if the House Appropriations Committee's dilatory tactics should prevail the site may ultimately cost several times its present price.

There have been actions taken by the Congress in the past that required vision and courage. One of these gave us Rock Creek Park. I wonder what this Capital city would be without it. Certainly the thousands upon thousands who come here each year are proud that their Capital is so surrounded. Have we lost our vision, Mr. Speaker, here on the Hill? Certainly our people across the country even to Alaska and Hawaii have not lost theirs, or there would not have been a unanimous vote in both Houses to authorize this acquisition of land across the Potomac from the home of President Washington. More and more people, as they realize that their Representatives did not have the courage to carry through this national demand, will insist upon the protection they consider both valid and necessary for this small area on the Potomac River. No, the matter is not ended, and there are many from all areas of the United States who will watch every move made in the area lest damage be done.

The Congress should also note the following organizations, both local and national, that are actively supporting this move to protect the environs of Mount Vernon:

LOCAL GROUPS

The Accokeek Civic Association.

The Calvert Manor Civic Association.

The Moyaone Reserve Civic Association.

The Piscataway Hills Civic Association.

The Alice Ferguson Foundation will donate land.

The Accokeek Foundation will donate land.

The Swan Creek Citizens Association.

The majority of local landowners have signed a statement that they will donate easements.

NATIONAL GROUPS

Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

Izaak Walton League of America.

Mount Vernon Ladies Association.

National Audubon Society.

National Wildlife Federation.

National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Wild Life Management Institute.

Wilderness Society.

The General Federation of Womens Clubs.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Prince Georges County commissioners of the State of Maryland.

Governor and Legislature of the State of Virginia.

Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

That this may be as complete as possible this record should note at least the following editorials supporting this law which have been sent to Mount Vernon in addition to literally hundreds of news stories:

The Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot, June 14, 1961; the Alexandria Gazette, July 18, 1961; the Des Moines Register, July 24, 1961; the Baltimore Evening Sun, August 2, 1961; the St. Paul Pioneer Press, August 3, 1961, and March 29, 1962; the Savannah Evening Press, August 9, 1961; the Boston Sunday Herald, August 20, 1961; the Augusta Herald, August 23, 1961; the Raleigh News & Observer, August 27, 1961; the Richmond Times Dispatch, August 30, 1961; the Charlotte News, September 4, 1961; the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, September 14, 1961; the Washington Post, September 19, 1961; the Washington Star, September 25, 1961; and the Covington Virginian, February 7, 1962.

COMMUNISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today as never before we are faced with the stark reality that communism is an ever-increasing threat to our Nation.

In recent years we have witnessed the struggle that has taken place in other countries in this hemisphere. Only 90 miles from our shores the Communists have overrun Cuba. We would be foolish to think it could not happen elsewhere—even right here in the United States.

We believe all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. The doctrine of communism denies this. Philosophically, communism is a complete throwback. It is a return to barbarism.

The Communist assault on the foundation of our Government goes on day after day without end. Our laws, particularly those pertaining to our security, are principal targets of Communist subversion.

What can we do to combat these Communist assaults? For one thing, we should all know more about it. We must study communism, learn its basic doctrines, its strategies and tactics, its approach to current national and international affairs.

This was the purpose of the cold war seminar recently sponsored by the Buffalo Jaycees in Buffalo, N.Y. If we have knowledge of what communism stands for, what it proposes to do, and how it plans to accomplish its purpose, we will not become its stooges, and we can successfully attack and thwart this menace.

In 1958, an Institute for American Strategy was organized for the purpose of educating the American people as to the profound strategic problems facing this Nation, and to offer positive programs for helping to meet them.

Cold war seminars were inaugurated by this institute to stimulate and encourage research and public study of the technical, ideological, economic, military, and moral factors in the protracted conflict between the free world and the totalitarian Sino-Soviet axis.

More than 4,000 speeches have been made at these seminars during the past few years by institute advised programs.

Last year the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce was asked to conduct a cold war seminar in Buffalo. The Buffalo Jaycees, believing that this would provide area educators, businessmen, Reserve and National Guard reservists with a comprehensive grasp of the global conflict between the free and Communist worlds, and of the original resources and methods used by the Communists to achieve their aim of world domination, made the necessary arrangements, and the seminar was held in Buffalo on March 30 and 31, 1962.

The Jaycees also plan to develop objective discussion and understanding of the requirements for successful U.S. strategies, plans, and programs in support of free world military, political and economic security. American traits and ideals will be explored, and also how our beliefs can be preserved and fulfilled in harmony with the aspirations of other free people.

Months of preparation went into this seminar, under the able direction of Mr. John R. Owen, Jr., general chairman. Mr. Owen, born and educated in Buffalo, is employed as a representative of the Whitmier & Ferris Co. in Buffalo. He has served in the Army, saw duty in Korea, and holds the Army Commendation Ribbon with Medal Pendant. He is presently assigned to the Buffalo USAR School as the unit's sergeant major. As a member of the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce, he was an adviser to the Junior Achievement of the Niagara Frontier.

The honorary chairman for this seminar was B. John Tutuska, sheriff of Erie County. Mr. Tutuska was born and educated in Buffalo and joined the Buffalo Police Department in 1946. Sheriff Tutuska has been very active in this field, and on many occasions has called the public's attention to the threat of communism and Communist infiltration in our community. He is a strong believer in our American heritage and rights of all citizens in a democracy.

I had the privilege of attending this seminar, and I want to commend Mr. Owen on the splendid job he did in making this a success and procuring outstanding speakers. Some of the speakers traveled hundreds of miles to address the seminar.

Under the chairmanship of Mr. Martin J. Travers, senior vice president of the Marine Trust Co., the Strategy Seminar was opened by welcoming ceremonies, followed by the keynote address which was delivered by the Honorable Michael A. Feighan, a Member of Congress from Ohio.

Mr. Feighan was born in Ohio and educated at Princeton and Harvard where he received his law degree in 1931. Representative Feighan has been in public life since 1937, when he was elected a member of the Ohio State Legislature. He has been a Member of the the United States House of Representatives since 1942. Representative Feighan is an authority on the enslavement of the non-Russian nations in the Communist empire and their rights to national sovereignty and independence. He is a member of the House Judiciary Committee, since 1943, serving on the Immigration Subcommittee. He is also a member of a Select Committee of the House of Representatives, 83d Congress, to investigate Communist aggression. Mr. Feighan has received many awards and honors, a few of which are: the Grant Cross of the Royal Order of Phoenix awarded him by the King of Greece; honorary degree of doctor of political science, University of Munich; Vigilant Patriot Honor Plaque awarded by All-American Conference To Combat Communisn. The President of the Italian Republic conferred the Cross of Knight Commander upon him for his interest in the problems of emigration. Congressman Feighan was also awarded the Freedom Plaque for Distinguished Service by the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York, July 20, 1960. In January 1962, he was elected Hibernian of the Year.

Congressman Feighan's address appears in the Congressional Record of April 3, 1962, on page 5861.

This was followed by a movie, "Communist Encirclement," sponsored by the United Anti-Communist Committee of Western New York.

Dr. Anthony Bouscaren, professor of political science at Le Moyne College, Syracuse, N.Y., spoke on the subject, "Soviet Challenge and Free World Response." Dr. Bouscaren has lectured at the National War College, Naval War College, Command and General Staff College, and other military commands and posts. He is a nationally prominent authority on communism, and has authored many books. One, "A Guide to Anti-Communist Action," with J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit," was recommended by the American Bar Association's 1958 Committee on Communist Strategy, Tactics, and Objectives. Other books include: "Soviet Expansion and the West," "Imperial Communism," "America Faces World Communism," and "Modern Ideologies." He has written a number of articles for leading publications. Dr. Bouscaren has also received several awards, including the Freedoms Foundation, Wisconsin DAR Award, and the Christopher Award.

The afternoon session of the first day was chaired by Mr. Russell F. Kleinhans, State chairman of the national purpose project, New York State Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, U.S. Army, retired, who was Deputy Chief of Information, U.S. Army, from 1951 until he retired last August, spoke on the topic "Military Preparations and Policies."

He was followed by Rev. Joseph Cantillon, of Canisius College. Reverend Cantillon, speaking on the "United States and the United Nations," made a great contribution outlining the features of the United Nations program. He stressed why it was very important for the United States to keep its voice in the United Nations. He cited a number of fine examples in his lecture.

Dr. Charles Wesley Lowry, D.D., president of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, delivered a talk on "Communism and Christianity."

Dr. Lowry was Episcopal chaplain, University of California, 1949–50. In 1952 he represented the United States at the first International Convention on Peace and Christian Civilization in Florence, Italy. During 1956 he received a special audience by Pope Pius XII and lectured in England and France. In 1959 he was elected president of the American Peace Society.

Mr. Mark F. Soukup, member of the board of directors, Buffalo Jaycees, was chairman of the morning session on the second day of the seminar.

A movie, "Challenge of Ideas," prepared by the U.S. Information Office, was shown.

"The Civil Defense Problem" was the title of Mr. Richard P. Draine's address.

Mr. Draine is presently Director of Training, Education, and Public Affairs of the Department of Defense—Civil Defense Region I at Harvard, Mass. He is a graduate of the University of Chicago and the Chicago Teachers College.

Mr. Stuart L. Hannon, of Radio Free Europe, spoke next on "Why the Russians Win."

Mr. Hannon is presently the Staff Assistant, Office of the President of the Free Europe Committee—Radio Free Europe.

Prior to his present position, he served for 9 years with the Department of the Army and the U.S. Foreign Service in England, Luxembourg, Germany, Greece, and Switzerland. At the end of World War II, Mr. Hannon was assigned by military government to Radio Stuttgart to help direct the rebuilding of the former Reichssender into a democratic, public service institution. In 1947 he became Chief of the Information Control Division in Baden-Wuerttenberg. In 1948, during the period of Communist guerrilla warfare in Greece, he was sent on a special assignment to Athens. Under the U.S. High Commissioner, John J. McCloy, Mr. Hannon became the Director of the Public Affairs Division in south Germany. In September 1952 he was reassigned to the U.S. Embassy in Bern as Public Affairs Officer for Switzerland. On behalf of Radio Free Europe and Crusade for Freedom, Mr. Hannon makes regular lecture tours throughout the United States.

Col. William R. Kintner, U.S. Army, retired, chose as his topic for this seminar, "Strategy for the Sixties."

Dr. Kintner is deputy director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania. He has written many articles and authored and coauthored many books: "Forging a New Sword," "Protracted Conflict," "A Forward Strategy for America," and "The New Frontier of War." Colonel Kintner has been awarded the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star (OLC) (V). Colonel Kintner is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

Rev. Stephen Gerencser, headmaster of Calasanctius Preparatory School in Buffalo, spoke on "Education: Russian and the United States."

Reverend Gerencser obtained American citizenship in September 1954. He was educated in Hungary and obtained his Ph. D. and S.T.D. at the University of Budapest. Reverend Gerencser's activities are well known in the fields of psychology, philosophy of religion, and education, and he has published several books and articles. He speaks Hungarian, German, Latin, French, Catalan, Greek, and English.

In the afternoon, the seminar was chaired by Judge William J. Regan.

"Disarmament and Its Prospects" was discussed by Ambassador Jacob D. Beam, of the State Department.

Dr. Lev Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, delivered a lecture on "Soviet Russian Weaknesses and Vulnerabilities."

Dr. Dobriansky is presently a professor of economics at Georgetown University. He has had a brilliant career in education and public service. Dr. Dobriansky authored the Captive Nations Week resolution (Public Law 86–90) and has received frequent testimonies in the U.S. Congress since 1948. He has received many honors: Charles Hayden Memorial Scholar, Hirshland Political Science Fellowship, Freedom's Foundation Award, and holds an honorary LL.D.

from Munich. His published works include: "Veblenism a New Critique," "The Free Trade Ideal," "Discussion for a Better America," "The Great Pretense," "The Crimes of Khrushchev," and "Europe's Freedom Fighter: Tara Shevchenko."

Dr. Dobriansky's lecture follows:

SOVIET RUSSIAN WEAKNESSES AND VULNERABILITIES

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

The authorities of the University of Buffalo, the membership of the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce, and others responsible for this important cold war seminar deserve the highest praise and admiration not only from the citizens of this Greater Buffalo area but also from our people throughout the country. It is a distinct privilege for me to participate in this seminar because the ideas, perspectives, and judgments exchanged here will undoubtedly make themselves felt in other parts of our Nation, not to say in several quarters of the globe. If you think this is simply a flowery introduction to my subject, then just ponder the fact that the intense activity shown by the city of Buffalo in the annual observance of Captive Nations Week has had a continuous impact not only on other major cities in the United States but also, in another way, upon the imperio-colonial city of Moscow.

It is plainly evident to every alert citizen that never before has the relationship of commercial and industrial enterprises, military preparation, educational effort, and governmental conduct been more interlaced and interdependent than in our time. The proceedings of this seminar clearly reflect the chief aspects of this basic pattern, and its results, bearing on cold war problems, cannot but prove to be salutary for alert citizenship, for popular interest in our foreign policy, for our will and determination to win the cold war. As I view it, this seminar is a people's forum for a free exchange of ideas, for the flow of data and facts which many of our newspapers, periodicals, and other media fail to bring to public light, for constructive evaluation and also criticism of the policies of our Government. This is intellectual democracy in action. And surely one of our most responsible tasks is to gain an understanding of the strength, weaknesses, and vulnerabilities of the Soviet Russian adversary.

THE STRENGTH-WEAKNESS-VULNERABILITY FORMULA—(SWV)

In analyzing the Soviet Russian colossus it is necessary to distinguish at the outset between weakness and vulnerability. The two are not identical and should not be confused. A weakness is a condition of defect and impairment which does not in itself constitute a vulnerability. For it to develop into this state requires an active external agent, a stimulus seeking to take advantage of the condition. No doubt there are many deep and open weaknesses in the totalitarian Soviet Russian Empire, but so long as they remain untapped—indeed, in many critical instances unnoticed and even ignored—they cannot by logical definition be deemed as vulnerabilities. Thus, in terms of a working formula of thought, policies of patched-up containment, evolution, and wishful thinking on the coming break-up of the so-called Communist bloc serve only to guarantee the inconvertibility of imperial Soviet Russian weaknesses into vulnerabilities. The active external agent, the powerful stimulus or catalyst, is lacking.

Now there is little difficulty in taking an item-by-item inventory of weaknesses in the Soviet Union and enumerating them in the ideologic, political, economic, sociologic, military, and other spheres of this substrate empire. Essentially, this bookkeeping approach would be meaningless, devoid of perspective and weighted proportion, and virtually useless for pragmatic objectives in our struggle for survival. By far the more effective and meaningful way is to rank the paramount points of weakness and possible vulnerability in some order of logical importance, revealing the main and crucial spots of each in a particular critical area.

What significantly results from this realistic approach is the strength-weakness vulnerability formula. According to this formula, the points of Soviet Russian strength increase in some direct proportion to our failure to convert its weaknesses into vulnerabilities and can substantially decrease in inverse proportion to our success in staging such conversions. The prodigious irony of the current situation is the fact that beneath the surface of most Soviet Russian accomplishments and points of strength rest their most profound weaknesses.

As will be shown by concrete fact and experience, rather than by dangling theory or speculation, it is my aim here to emphasize one area of strength and also actual weakness over others. This is not because I am especially attracted to this area. Rather, it is because this most critical area still is quite vague and unfamiliar to most Americans; it is because in history, logic, and strategy the area of totalitarian Soviet Russian domination and influence over the two dozen captive non-Russian nations from the Danube to the Pacific still is the primary battleground between the forces of freedom and totalitarian imperialism. The areas of southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America are only secondary and tertiary battlegrounds of the enemy's choosing. Further plans and expenditures to mend the fences of freedom in these areas are, to be sure, necessary, but they are also, in the context of the cold war, expressions of inadequacy under a shortsighted policy of patched-up containment.

THE PERMANENT COLD WAR CONTEXT

To assess with meaning and a ruling sense of proportion the strength and real weaknesses of imperialist Soviet Russia, it is indispensable for us to bear constantly in mind the permanent cold war context. Outside of this existential context, predicated by the backward political institutions of Russia itself, the accomplishments and weaknesses of Moscow fall short of significant meaning. As some of us have taught for over a decade, we should consciously recognize that, given our own military buildup, the future will not be one of any global military holocaust involving the insecure forces of Moscow. Instead, it will be one of more or less intense cold war activity whereby the Russian totalitarians will seek in the best tradition of Russian empire-building to frustrate and sap the will and determination of their targeted victims.

Looking back over the past 17 years, one would be justified in writing a book on our foreign policy under the title "From Air Supremacy and Atomic Monopoly to Creeping National Self-Paralysis." This is not a pretty title, but neither is our sad record of losing the peace and also parts of the free world piece by piece twice in this century. Rarely in the history of mankind has a country spent so much in life and treasure for peace and freedom, and yet has lost so much in so little time than our Nation since World War II. Policies have their results and consequences, and ours have spelled increasing failure to halt the enemy, no less defeat him. There is not only no indication of any necessary substantial change in our policy today but also no evidence of a complete grasp of Russian cold war activity.

When we focus our attention on the major strengths and also weaknesses of the Soviet Union and Moscow's extended empire, let us keep reminding ourselves of the real "ifs" of history as well as the "whens." If President Wilson had an accurate knowledge and understanding of the Czarist Russian Empire, there can be no doubt that he would have listened to the French and applied the basic principle of national self-determination to all the non-Russian nations in that empire. The mythology of communism and the reality of Russian imperio-colonialism would surely have been but echoes in the arena of contemporary history. If President Roosevelt had understood the makeup of the Soviet Russian empire, under the legalistic disguise of the U.S.S.R., there also can be no doubt that he would have utilitzed our overwhelming power to place Moscow under increasing pressures of freedom. Instead, duped by Moscow's skillful propaganda and diplomacy, he acquiesced to the power-politic thought of dividing the world into spheres of influence. As the files of Cardinal Spellman show: "China gets the far East; the United States, the Pacific; Britain and Russia, Europe and Africa. But as Britain has predominantly colonial interests, it might be assumed that Russia will predominate in Europe."[1]

And, as I shall show, our operational understanding of Moscow's colonial empire, and its effective techniques haven't improved much since. This situation as certainly a source of tremendous comfort and encouragement to Moscow and its quisling puppets. It indicates to them that if they can largely realize their 7-year and other plans, if they can improve and expand their military hardware, if for propaganda and other reasons they can continue their spectacular explorations into space, they will enjoy even greater successes in the cold war with the diverse instruments and resources produced in these fields. Through these means and more they will, in time, expand their empire, whether it will be in the Middle East, Asia, Africa, or Latin America, and at the same time avoid any hot global conflict. After all, part of their totalitarian empire lies only 90 miles from our southern border.

Cuba is an actual example. But for a possible example, if as a result of Russian-supported subversion and agitation Iran falls under the process of an overtake, ask yourselves what really could we do? Would you send SAC or the marines in there? Would you employ nuclear weapons? In short, with all our armaments and economic handouts, aren't we neutralized on the world scale by the special type of cold war activity Moscow wages? The sudden discovery of the uses of guerrilla warfare—10 years after many of us advocated it in connection with the captive nations—is on this scale an open invitation to miniature Koreas along the broad front of the free world.

The techniques of Russian cold war activity are in form and substance old techniques. They are scarcely the creation of self-designated Communists. They are in essence the techniques by which Russian imperio-colonialists were able to build up an unprecedented empire in the past, from Ivan the Terrible down to 1917, and the present empire is a continuation and expansion of the past one. As then, so now, they skillfully utilize deceptive ideologies to mask themselves and their colonialist movements; as then, so now, they employ Potemkin Village tactics, whether in the military field, the economic, diplomatic, or even athletic, to disarray, confuse, and frighten their targeted victims; as then, so now, they make full use of conspiratorial, infiltrative, subversive, and blackmail methods. These techniques of incessant cold war aggression are plainly not the products of irrelevant Marxism or of Pavlovian psychology. They are the fashioned tools of centuries of cumulative experience in successful empire-building.

---

[1] "The Cardinal Spellman Story," Look magazine, Mar. 13, 1962, vol. 26, No. 6.

The real decision before this Nation today is not whether to push or not to push into space, to disarm or not to disarm, to negotiate or not to negotiate, to trade or not to trade with the Red Empire. Instead, the basic and real decision is whether to meet or not to meet the full cold war challenge of colonial Moscow. Once we make this decision, all other subordinate decisions will fall into place. When and if the real decision is placed before this Nation and we should resolve seriously to engage the enemy in the total context of the cold war, it wouldn't and couldn't be a matter of fighting this war only on our side of the 50-yard line. In any league the best defense is the offense, and it should be obvious that the defense of freedom is being battered from Laos to Cuba because our mere defensive and reactive posture is not the best defense.

Where, then, do Soviet Russian achievements and correlative weaknesses enter into this analytic framework? Quite clearly, a cold war offensive would not permit Moscow's imperialism to nibble away at us, for such an offensive necessitates the conversion of well-known weaknesses in the enemy's empire into vulnerabilities and the systematic exploitation of these vulnerabilities toward his eventual destruction. We would have to seize upon these formed vulnerabilities with the same caution, skill and courage as they do in the free world, this despite the overhanging presence of thermonuclear weapons. Put in another way, we must study the weaknesses and the associated achievements of the avowed enemy to convert them into vulnerabilities which can be exploited for our national self-preservation and the survival of freedom. The manifest irony of our present situation is that we wouldn't think twice about attending to this necessity if we were suddenly catapulted into a hot global war, but in the more insidious cold war of our time this necessity is being virtually overlooked. Instead, some seem to content themselves with philosophical exhortations about the spreading disease of freedom and the human penchant for diversity.

THE IDEOLOGICO-PROPAGANDA SWV

There are five major areas for our analysis: (1) the ideologico-propaganda; (2) the empire; (3) the so-called economic race; (4) the military-space field; and (5) the party apparatus. Applying to each our working formula of strength-weakness-vulnerability, let us consider the first, the ideologico-propaganda. The strength of Moscow's ideologico-propaganda drive is admitted as being superior by most students of the subject. Moscow's tremendous feat in this all-encompassing area is the sustained impression and opinion generated in too many parts of the free world that a new way of life, a new philosophy, and new methods and operations of social order are represented by the Soviet Union and other sectors of Moscow's empire. The way of life is socialism in transition to communism; the philosophy is Marxism-Leninism with unspecified revisions now and then; and the new methods and operations are ostensibly the products of a planned economy. Our personalist way of life, our democratic philosophy, and our capitalist methods and operations stand in contradiction to these essentials of so-called Soviet society.

With his grandiloquent and constant babble Khrushchev has enlarged this ideologico-propaganda achievement by convincing many unsuspecting Americans and others that the momentous contest is between two social systems—socialism versus capitalism—in the atmosphere of peaceful coexistence. We are supposed to be in an economic and technologic race, the outcome of which is predestined by Moscow's interpretation of history. As in the case of Hitler and his 1,000 years of the New Order, the Russian totalitarians see themselves riding the wave of the future.

To prevent this, we spend considerable time, capital, and energy in the simple belief that we are fighting international communism or, at best, Communist imperialism. Clouding up the situation further is the notion that our adversary is "the Soviets"—mind you, councils of workers and peasants. No one will deny here that to confuse, deceive, and distract your chosen opponent is a basic accomplishment in and of itself. As concerns the nature of the struggle and its manifold ramifications, the Russian totalitarians have succeeded in this with us. In the past Russian tyrants cloaked their totalitarian rule and imperialist conquests with equally spurious ideologies of super-religious orthodoxy and racist pan-Slavicism. Today it is millenarian communism, interspersed at times with these old ideologies in what suits the occasion.

We have uncritically accepted this and inadvertently impute philosophic respectability and dignity to what is essentially not the ideology but the mythology of communism. The pendulumic swings of attitude in the United States, viewing the Russians as 4-footers at one time and then 11-footers at another, indicate both our uncertainty of knowledge and susceptibility to Moscow's manipulation of half or isolated truths. On the one hand, we deprecate Moscow's activities in Asia, Africa, and Latin America as "mere propaganda," while, on the other hand, we complain that our story is not reaching the university students and the peoples of these areas. We have still to appreciate the central importance and significance of propaganda in the cold war. The heirs of Pushkin, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, and other practical psychologists have remarkably developed this basic art to make a relatively backward state appear as a prime contender to the slumbering American giant, to make the worst empire of its kind appear as the great proponent of national liberation and independence, and to move the minds of millions throughout the world in the belief that all this is so.

However, the weaknesses of Moscow's ideologico-propaganda are deep and fundamental. These have been time and time disclosed by experience and events, not theory or speculation. After 20 years of so-called indoctrination millions of Ukrainians, Georgians, Russians, and others deserted colonial Moscow in World War II; after 10 years of heavy propaganda Hungarian students and workers staged the 1956 revolution, shouting, "Russky, go home"; after years of enslavement in the Vorkuta, Karaganda, and other labor correction camps, inmates of all different nations struck for freedom. These are only a few of the hundreds of examples proving the utter bankruptcy of what we uncritically call Communist ideology. Without iron curtains, walls, and the oppressive apparatus of totalitarian rule this existential bankruptcy would come into full bloom, the Hitlerian totalitarian and imperialist nature of so-called communism would be clear to all, this Trojan horse of thought and weapon of deception with no basic relevancy to 19th-century Marxism would become transparent even to the newly independent nations and peoples who know little about Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

Nevertheless, Moscow continues to capitalize on this massive deception chiefly because of our failure to develop these weaknesses into critical vulnerabilities. Such development requires a realization of the central importance of propaganda—a forceful, well-planned propaganda of truth and fact—and also a grasp of the real nature of the threat stemming from Eastern Europe. Our Voice of America is but a pygmy compared to Moscow's media. Worse still, the policies of USIA run counter to the task of developing vulnerabilities in the U.S.S.R. For example, 4 years ago, by virtue of congressional hearings, the USIA was stopped in its attempt to curtail and eliminate Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Georgian, and other non-Russian broadcasts to the U.S.S.R.[2] It sought to have the captive non-Russian peoples listen in the language of their Moscow captor. Today, again, this attempt is being made to appease Moscow.

The opportunities for demolishing the image Moscow casts of its empire are many. For one, we could easily show the theoretic Russian perversion of Marxism and the vacuity of so-called Communist ideology. Points on economic determinism, the technocratic elite in the U.S.S.R., the appeal to underdeveloped areas in the name of socialism, surplus value and economic and colonial exploitation in the Soviet Union, state versus society, are only a few to establish the Russian mythology of communism. As one writer recently put it: "Bolshevism evidently stems from the traditional messianic and universalist outlook of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia which fastened upon Marxism as an instrument of its own will to 'change the world.' "[3] The fact is that Soviet Russian mythology is a Comtean impulse to reorganize wholesale the societies of other nations in the image of backward and barbarian Russian institutions.[4] The combination of oppressive institutions and modern technology, the latter largely the creation of the West, has produced a mythology which in every fundamental respect is Hitlerian totalitarianism.

If we are to win the cold war, we must recognize and repeatedly stress the real threat which Soviet Russian mythology conceals. And this is the Soviet Russian imperio-colonial system of totalitarian rule. Make no mistake about this. This is not a matter of academic theorization and speculation. As I'll show in connection with our second area, it has been successfully tested and, indeed, more tests are in order so that this fundamental truth would be ingrained in the minds of our people and the people of the world. It is scarcely comforting to learn, alas, that we are fighting against a mythology, but it is reassuring to know that along with all the captive nations in Moscow's empire we have pierced through the mythological facade of communism to the real enemy, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

Our most powerful weapon against this last remaining empire in the world is the ideology, the system of ideas and truths, embodied in our own Declaration of Independence. About 10 years ago we called for a universalization of the Declaration, aimed particularly at the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.[5] The evidence of this past decade proves the soundness of this position. However, when we find Secretary of State Rusk declaring in a letter to the House Rules Committee last August that Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia are traditional parts of the Soviet Union, meaning, in effect, that we should not disturb Moscow's eminent domain over these captive areas, we cannot but wonder about the understanding and vision of some of our leaders.[6] Three months later Ambassador Stevenson in a U.N. declaration talks about an independent Ukrainian Republic, about an Armenia that declared its independence in 1918, about the independent state of Georgia.[7] It is such confusion of thought that inhibits us from converting a major weakness into a critical vulnerability. It is such cross-purpose operation that causes men like Madariaga to say, "This is a war of ideas, brains, and heart. The West's foreign policy is passive and flaccid. It will never get an understanding with Russia. How about Russian imperialism? It's the worst imperialism the world has ever known * * *."[8]

---

[2] "Review of U.S. Information Agency," Committee on Foreign Affairs, September-October 1958, Washington, D.C., pp. 102–122.

[3] Lichtheim, George, "Marxism, An Historical and Critical Study," New York, 1961, p. 398.

[4] Dobriansky, Lev E., "Veblenism: A New Critique," Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1957, pp. 85–86.

[5] "Universalized Declaration of Independence: America's New World Revolution," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 9, pages A713–714.

MOSCOW'S EXPANDED EMPIRE

Well, how about Russian imperialism? The second general area of Moscow's obvious strength is its expanded empire. Contrary to much current wishful thinking about Red China and Albania, about "the slow fragmentation of the Communist bloc," the Soviet Russian Empire continues to consolidate itself in substantial terms of economic integration, military accretion, and an expedient exploitation of nationalist forces. One of Moscow's paramount goals in the past 5 years has been to gain Western acquiescence to the permanence of its present empire, and our increasing indifference toward the captive nations has helped in this.

Since its accidental inception in 1917, Soviet Russia has reduced to captivity one non-Russian nation after another. The history of Soviet Russian conquest began with most of the nations now held in bondage within the Soviet Union itself—White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, and others—and this process, either directly or indirectly, continues in Cuba, South Vietnam, Laos, Iran, and elsewhere.[9] The most significant development in all areas of the empire is the emphasis placed on the old formula, "national in form, socialist in content." To attract the instinctive nationalist forces in Poland, Ukraine, Hungary, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, North Korea to the global ambitions of Moscow, the Russian totalitarians are accommodating themselves to the stress of national heroes and events of the past. In this they hope to prove that the future of these captive nations rests with them rather than "the imperialist powers" of the West. Moscow exploits past and present national grievances to its own advantage, constantly telling Poles and Ukranians, for example, about the Germain atrocities of the past and constantly reminding Azerbaijani and Armenians about their claims against Iran and Turkey, respectively.

Moscow plays every angle to strengthen its hold on the empire, on both the internal captives within the Soviet Union and the outer captives outside it. Feelings of pan-Slavicism, religious orthodoxy, national pride, past hatreds and national uncertainty toward the future are exploited. Disagreement with Red China and Albania is more of a proof of this overall tendency of expedient accommodation than of any basic disintegrative tendency. Whether in Georgia or Azerbaijan or Ukraine or Turkestan, Khrushchev often has tried to persuade the non-Russian nationals there that they are "independent."

Those who today preach that the Soviet Russian Empire is showing signs of disintegration, that the future is with us, that all that is required is a military buildup and trade with this empire, are gravely misleading the citizens of this country. There is no substantial evidence of this. In fact, all the important and basic evidence of increasing empire strength points the other way. Of course Moscow has its problems. Who doesn't? It had even graver problems at Stalin's death, during the Hungarian Revolution, but it nonetheless continued to build up its composite power.

Yet beneath the surface of this imperial power and strength lies the most profound weakness of the Soviet Union and of the entire structure of Moscow's imperial rule and power. This weakness is the immense latent power of genuine patriotic nationalism, both within and outside the Soviet Union. This weakness is so deep that despite his public disclaimers of Stalinist terrorism, Khrushchev deemed it necessary to have two Ukrainian nationalist leaders in exile murdered.[10] It is this power of patriotic nationalism which is our most formidable weapon against Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, not the superficial disagreements between puppets and the prime power.

Despite the unmistakable clues given by Khrushchev himself, we have yet to translate this fundamental weakness into a vulnerability. The most important and conclusive test of my observation here is Khrushchev's haunting fear of any implementation of the Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by Congress in 1959. Except for the U-2 incident, no event in the past 10 years has had as violent an impact on Moscow as this resolution. Our Presidents and others have spoken in behalf of some of the captive nations before 1959, but this produced no sensitive reaction from Moscow. It was only when Congress included all the captive nations, meaning the majority of them in the Soviet Union, that Khrushchev and his puppets exploded. And they have been erupting over this ever since because they know, if we do not, the disastrous effects that a methodic implementation of this resolution could have on their worldwide propaganda operations and on the nations within their empire.

Let me cite just one example of how our opinionmakers interpret this resolution. In an article a few months ago Stewart Alsop wrote, "When I was in Moscow during the October party congress, Khrushchev once again violently denounced the innocuous Captive Nations Week Resolution which Congress passes every year to attract minority votes."[11] I wonder how an informed and intelligent American reader reacts to this stroke of logic and fantasy. Very simply, if the resolution is truly innocuous, why should Khrushchev, the leader of the supposed second largest power in the world, again violently denounce this resolution? As to the other parts of this fantastic observation, the resolution is self-renewing and thus is not passed every year, nor had its bipartisan passage any relation to minority votes. Is it any wonder that we are losing the cold war?

THE ECONOMIC ILLUSION

Turning now to the economic area, it should be readily recognized that for cold war objectives the empire economy of the Soviet Union is strong, secure, and increasingly threatening. The usual comparisons about their surpassing us in this or that are of barren meaning, a source of much economic illusion. The U.S.S.R. economy is and always has been a war economy in essence. With a gross imperial product of only about 40 percent of our GNP, with an industrial output of about 45 percent of ours and requiring over 20 percent more labor, with an agricultural output below ours by one-third and requiring 50 percent of their labor force as against 10 percent of ours, with available goods and services only 33 percent of ours and on a per capita basis only 25 percent of ours, and with the inevitable problems of growth yet to be experienced by them, Moscow has a long way to go to match our economy even in its present state. However, being a totalitarian and essentially a war economy, the U.S.S.R. poses an increasing threat as $12 to $20 billion of additional output becomes annually available to it for cold and hot war purposes.

Weaknesses in this economy are many, but most fundamental are the disparities of real income and status between the new class of the ruling elite and party functionaries and underlying population, and also the rampant economic colonialism to which the captive non-Russian peoples are subjected. In combination with the other weaknesses, these can be transformed into vulnerabilities as we concentrate on the Russian people and the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Such concentration by way of focusing worldwide attention and opinion on these two paramount economic weaknesses would provide important political leverage to the liberal Russian and nationalist non-Russian forces within the U.S.S.R.

Again, to cite an example, there are today some 40 resolutions in the House Rules Committee calling for the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.[12] One of the main objectives of this committee would be to study and make known the scope and depth of Moscow's economic colonialism in the Soviet Union. These measures seek to implement the Captive Nations Week resolution, but so far the leadership and the administration have resisted such a step, despite all the evidence of Moscow's troubled concern over such implementations.[13]

THE MILITARY-SPACE SWV

Perhaps even clearer and more distinct SWV aspects appear in the military-space field. The general and specific strength of the U.S.S.R. in this area are the consummate result of top priority allocation in this war economy. Matching in dollar volume our total military expenditures, over 20 percent of the gross product in the U.S.S.R. goes to military pursuits. Every weapon, every means, from ICBM's to pistols, receives high qualitative and quantitative development. In space exploration, tremendously expensive in itself, Moscow has, as we know, made an early start under the rule of inordinate concentration. In all these areas the technologic achievements are basically and almost entirely Western. They have little or nothing to do with so-called Socialist economy or Communist pretension. Their further development poses, nevertheless, certain dangers, particularly in significant breakthroughs capable of magnifying the military power of the imperio-colonial tyrant.

Behind the military technocracy in the U.S.S.R. lie deep weaknesses which no amount of nuclear blackmail or military display can hide. Before World War I the Russian czar virtually terrorized the capitals of Western Europe with the threat of the great Russian "steamroller," the vast imperial forces of the Russian Empire. Today, following in the paved traditions of Russian cold war diplomacy, Khrushchev threatens us and the world with "global missiles." He has been so effective in propagandizing the empire's military and space feats that in addition to naive and pacifist groups doing his work for him in the free nations, even our own leaders invoke from time to time the pangs of nuclearitis as an excuse for the absence of a well defined and developed cold war policy.[14]

---

[6] "State Proves the Necessity of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 7, 1962, p. 3583.

[7] "Spotlight on Moscow's Imperio-Colonialism," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 7, 1962, p. 3569.

[8] Salvador de Madariaga, Washington Post, May 26, 1961.

[9] Dobriansky, Lev E. "History of Communist Aggression," report, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., 1961, pp. 14–22.

[10] George Vine, "I Killed for Russia," the Daily Mail, London, Nov. 18, 1961.

[11] Stewart Alsop, "The Berlin Crisis: Khrushchev's Weakness," the Saturday Evening Post, Dec. 16, 1961.

[12] "Action on the Creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 11, pages 15376–15384.

[13] See "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee,' CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 3, pages 3518–3544.

But the innovation of present military-space technology in no way alters the persistent weaknesses in the armed services of the U.S.S.R. Complete and striking military power is not just a conglomeration of new weapons. The ultimate weapon is still man and his morale, loyalties and will. No one is more aware than Moscow of the overriding fact that, despite changing military technology, in all three major wars in this century the motley and multinational forces of the Russian Empire, whether czarist or Soviet, disintegrated early. In the Russo-Japanese and the two World Wars political factors associated with the freedom of the Russian people and the independence of the non-Russian nations accounted for this record. About 43 percent of U.S.S.R's armed forces is non-Russian and, despite the fact that the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. calls for separate Republic war ministries, troops are carefully intermixed and dispersed.

Capitalization of this vital weakness into a vulnerability rests obviously on a broader program directed at the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Along with this is the necessity for a full and superior development of all our arms, nuclear and conventional. We made a grave mistake in accepting a nuclear test ban, and disarmament in the realistic context of the cold war is a political myth. The only sure and safe way to preserve the gray peace and to move forward toward cold war victory is by attaining to unquestioned superiority along the entire spectrum of military technology and weaponry. Our economy can flexibly accommodate this; the empire economy of the U.S.S.R. cannot. In space, with 33 of our earth satellites as against 2 of theirs, we already enjoy an overall superiority. As in so many other respects, the Russians potemkinize their firsts and demonstrate in time their lack of depth. There is no commonsense reason why we or the free world should cooperate and share our space discoveries with the Russian totalitarians. Whether we like it or not, even space is not excludable from the Russian cold war matrix.

THE PARTY

The final major area for SWV analysis is the party. Not unlike the Nazi Party under Hitler, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the cohesive agent of totalitarian Soviet Russian strength. There are some 8 million in the party today, but this figure is misleading. Predominantly Russian, the party consists of members with families, relatives and associates who, though not members, share both material and spiritual interests in the strength and power of the party. And these number well over 25 million. The party, thus, is the strong vehicle for totalitarian rule in the empire and subverting conspiracy beyond it.

However, it is not without weaknesses that, along with others, could not be developed into fatal vulnerabilities. The perennial problem of succession, intraparty feuding, the pressures of national parties in Ukraine, Georgia, and elsewhere, and infiltration of party councils and machinery lend themselves to such a development. Here, as elsewhere, our offensive in the cold war would necessarily have to be organic, composite and totalistic. Pursuing one weakness as against others would be both foolish and wasteful. But it will be noted that involved in each of these major weaknesses is the basic cross-sectional problem of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Can you now understand why for 3 years Khrushchev and his puppets have been violently attacking the Captive Nations Week resolution? From the viewpoint of our cold war disadvantage, can you now understand why our State Department opposes this resolution and why our Presidents have with the utmost reluctance issued proclamations of the week every July?

These are facts, not academic theories and speculations inscribed in some newly written book. It was painful for me, as indeed to others, to see how thoroughly incapable our Vice President was in his encounter on these problems with Khrushchev in July 1959. It is equally painful to observe how, today, we continue to miss our opportunities for eventual cold war victory. However, I haven't the slightest doubt that with more shock treatments and an aroused citizenry the dominant facts of international life and the predominant weaknesses of the Soviet Russian Empire will lead us to the pursuit of an inescapable policy of emancipation and a cold war strategy designed for decisive victory. All the elements, all the outlines for such a policy and strategy are available to us. All that is necessary is will, courage, and an understanding of the Soviet Russian Empire which, after all, is our prime foe and the world's cancer.

Mr. Speaker, "Thinking of the Russian People Regarding Their Leaders" was an interesting subject discussed by Senator James F. Murray, Jr., of New York City.

Senator Murray is now an international lawyer. He travels extensively and in the past 2 years he has been behind the Iron Curtain twice. Mr. Murray has been awarded the Lateran Cross and the Italian Order of Merit for his international cultural activities.

The main address of the afternoon was given by the gentleman from New York, Hon. JOHN R. PILLION. Congressman PILLION has been a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives since the 83d Congress in 1950, and has been a leading western New York Congressman since that time. His interest in the democratic process has earned him the respect of his colleagues and the people of western New York. He is author of House Resolution 447, "A Declaration of War Against 98 Communist Parties," a psychomoral offensive against the international Communist conspiracy.

Congressman PILLION's speech, entitled "War, Survival and Peace," follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN R. PILLION, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW YORK, AT THE COLD WAR SEMINAR. UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO, MARCH 31, 1962

Mr. Chairman, my compatriots, and my esteemed friends, you know about a month ago, the Young Republican Clubs held their national convention in Washington.

I was invited to participate in a panel discussion. The subject question was:

"Shall we make communism a campaign issue?"

My initial answer was "Yes" and "No" and "Maybe."

Now, please do not conclude that this was a flippant politician's answer. Nor was it intended as an ambiguous Delphi oracle pronouncement.

Rather, my purpose was to emphasize the fact that the subject of communism is of such great magnitude, imbedded with so many variables and imponderables, permeated with so many complex policies, strategies and tactics, that it does not lend itself to a simple, categorical, dee-finitive solution.

I don't suppose there is anyone in this room who has not given some apprehensive thought of how much radioactive materials our families may safely ingest through the air we breathe and the food we consume.

Each of us, I'm sure, has given some fleeting consideration to protective measures, including fallout shelters, against a possible nuclear attack.

This is taxpaying time. Fifty-five billion dollars, or 60 percent of the Federal budget of $93 billion, is allocated for military and other defense purposes.

A reduction of 60 percent in our Federal taxes would be a most attractive prospect.

Today's newspapers are headlining the crises over Berlin, nuclear testing, disarmament, Dutch New Guinea, and South Vietnam.

Why, who, and what threatens your life and mine?

Why, who, and what threatens to destroy this Nation and those cherished constitutional principles upon which it was founded?

Why, who, and what is endangering the morality, the ethics, the political freedom, the religious bodies, the economies, of the free world of the Christian-Judaic concepts, of all Western civilization?

What is the common denominator in this sweeping, deliberate devastation?

Is the Soviet Government the common denominator? The answer is "No."

Is it the basic principles and philosophies of Marx and Lenin?

Is it a historical inevitability?

Is it colonialism, or imperialism?

The answer in each case must be "No."

The common denominator is communism. The direct and immediate causative force is the international Communist conspiracy.

Despite our fears, despite our stark realization of the depth and imminence of our peril, we stil know relatively nothing about this Communist enemy force.

As a corollary, and as a result, we know relatively nothing about the principles, policies, strategies, and tactics needed to contain or destroy this enemy.

It is most discouraging for me to hear highly respected citizens, businessmen, professional men, educators, parrot and lend their support to pro-Communist causes. These men are loyal citizens. Their idealism exceeds their practical knowledge.

It is most disheartening to see our television networks, newspapers, and other communications media repeatedly serve the Communist cause.

But most frightening, and most frustrating, is to know that our highest Government officials, including the membership of the U.S. Congress, lack a basic knowledge and comprehension of the magnitude, the scope, the principles, the strategies, the tactics of this predatory force, the international Communist conspiracy.

In a representative republic, such as ours, public opinion does exert a direct and powerful effect upon governmental policies.

Cuba is a prime example of an American public opinion that brought about a pro-Communist result. The New York Times, Jack Paar, Ed Murrow, the Columbia and National Broadcasting Networks, share in this dishonorable distinction.

It is not essential that the American public have a profound and detailed knowledge of the complexities of communism.

---

[14] "Text of President's News Conference," the Evening Star, Feb. 14, 1962, Washington, D.C.

It is essential, however, that the American public does understand the broad general principles of communism. It is necessary for the American public to be able to recognize pro-Communist causes and pro-Communist actions.

It is vital that the leaders of our community, in our churches, in our schools, in our fraternal organizations, in our businesses, oppose, attack, and defend against those persons and those causes that are giving aid and comfort to the Soviet and to the international Communist conspiracy.

That is why this seminar is a superb public service. I take this opportunity to commend each of you for your devotion and sacrifice in the cause of freedom.

There is no community, social, recreational, or educational project that can compare with this in value and in importance.

The Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce has performed a great service in sponsoring, organizing and presenting this seminar.

The Niagara Frontier Chapter of the Association of the United States Army deserves our highest praise and deep appreciation for their cosponsorship.

Up until the last 5 years, this Nation was faced with the primary question of whether or not we had the will, the willingness to make the necessary sacrifices to defend our system, our Government of maximum freedoms, our highest living standards.

It is my judgment that we must now add another condition to this question. That is, "Can we win this war, even though we may be able to muster up our will to do so." I am not at all complacent about the answer.

The American people, collectively and currently, are giving lipservice to the ideals of freedom, survival, and peace. To most of us these words are merely vague, abstract concepts.

We cannot hope to resolve the constantly recurring crises confronting the free world without a careful examination and evaluation of freedom, survival, and peace as human aspirations and as national goals.

Our political, educational, and religious leaders have, in large measure, failed to grasp the significance of these universal ideals.

As a result, our people are confused and befuddled. Our Nation today lacks direction and purpose. It has lost its sense of destiny. It is helpless in the revolutionary storms surrounding it.

We must, as a people, as a nation, first establish priorities in value for freedom, survival, and peace.

A large segment of our population judges peace to be of supreme importance. They are the citizens who accept the pro-Communist slogan: "Peace at any price."

This attitude is reflected in our national policies, that too often materialize into appeasement, and the attempted bribery of the Communist-Soviet forces.

Another large segment of Americans consider survival to be all-important. This spirit is exemplified by another pro-Communist slogan: "Better Red than dead."

These Americans have forgotten that survival without freedom is servitude.

It is heartening to know that there is a third segment of the American people. It is they who accept freedom as the indispensable ingredient of man's existence.

Human history is a record of man's struggle to be free. This Nation was founded not upon concepts of survival or peace. It was founded upon the concept of human freedom.

In order to effectively bear the burden of our world responsibility, this Nation must reestablish freedom as the keystone of our national purpose. It must be the rallying cry for the free world against the Communist dictatorship, not of the proletariat but over the proletariat.

We must never forget that freedom is indispensable, survival is crucial, peace is desirable.

There are those, including Mr. Khrushchev, who maintain that this country must choose between freedom, survival, or peace. I do not believe that we must necessarily sacrifice any one of these objectives in order to preserve the others.

I am convinced that a realistic approach by this Nation, and our people, to the causes of the world crises would realize freedom, secure survival, and attain an enduring, true peace for all humanity.

No sober-thinking American can fail to see that this world is in the midst of the greatest political, economic, social, and military crisis in all history.

The phenomenal sweep of Communist power is a gruesome fact of life. It immediately threatens our lives, our freedoms, our national existence.

If we reflect upon the past, assess the present, and look to the future, we cannot help but ask, "How long will it be—3, 10, or 15 years—before the United States becomes another captive nation of the Communist-Soviet Empire?"

The free world has been shocked and staggered by an uninterrupted series of Communist aggressions and victories.

Since 1939, country after country has fallen before the Communist offensive. Total power has been seized in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, North Korea, Red China, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia, Tibet, Cuba, and British Guiana.

Another 20 or more nations are on the verge of Communist seizure, ready to follow Communist direction and dictation.

Let us examine the causes of today's crises:

Why is communism winning?

Why have our policies failed?

Unless we immediately recognize our enemies, and fully comprehend the magnitude of the forces that seek our destruction, we shall very soon reach a point of "no return."

If we understand the Communist philosophy, its organization, its strategies, its tactics, we cannot fail to conclude that we are engaged in a life or death total global war.

It is a war of demoralization, disintegration, and destruction. It is a relentless, incessant war.

It is a war of indefinite duration, of orthodox and unorthodox methods.

It is a war being waged by a disciplined organization, combing new techniques conceived by that mad genius, Lenin.

This total war is a dual war, carried on in two separate campaigns.

The major campaign is being waged by the international Communist conspiracy.

The Communist Internationale was established at Moscow in 1919. Ever since then, the International Communist Conspiracy has carried on a continuous campaign of infiltration, subversion, and all forms of revolutionary and guerrilla warfare.

It is not a conflict, it is not economic competition, it is not peaceful coexistence, it is not a cold or warm war. It is an all-out global war for total destruction.

It has mastered the techniques of political power seizure and quasi-military conquest.

This international conspiracy consists of 98 Communist parties, all of whom are associated together in one common goal, the destruction of all non-Communist organizations, institutions, societies, and nations.

You may be interested to know that three of these Communist parties are in the United States; Communist Party United States, Communist Party Puerto Rico, Communist Party Hawaii.

The Communist parties have a force of 36 million disciplined, trained member agents, distributed throughout the world. They owe a single allegiance, not to any nation, not to any church, but solely to the Communist-Soviet conspiracy.

This alliance of Communist parties has repeatedly declared its incessant war against the free world.

At their last world conference in December 1960 they adopted the Moscow Manifesto. It repledges all these parties to an intensified offensive against us.

Yet this Nation, our people, the free world, cannot grasp the deadliness of this war.

We have failed to comprehend the nature, the totality, the scope, the strategies and tactics of the new forms of war.

We have allowed ourselves to become obsessed with only the minor phase of this war, the other part of the war carried on by the Soviet Government, the Soviet satellites and the Soviet associated nations.

If we look back upon the Communist advances, we will find that almost all of their success has been due, not to military power, but was achieved by the Communist techniques of political, psychomoral war.

The United States has in the past, and continues today, to wage a unilateral campaign for peace. The Communist forces have been waging a unilateral campaign of political, psychomoral, diplomatic and economic war.

No one can dispute that we are steadily losing this war at an alarming and accelerating pace.

As a consequence of our lack of comprehension of the true nature of the Communist force, our foreign policies have completely failed to meet the realities and the practicalities of this war.

Our foreign policies have not materially changed in the past 30 years, under either Democrat or Republican administrations. Our policies have been, and are today, defensive, self-deceptive, and self-defeating.

Permit me to remind you of a few of these foreign policies:

For a long period of time, we relied upon military supremacy to contain the Communist drive. Yet our heaviest losses, all of middle Europe, Red China, were sustained in the period between 1945 and 1953 when the United States had a preponderant military superiority.

NATO and our other military alliances have had considerable value. However, they have not proven an effective answer to the Communist war of subversion.

You remember Mr. Dulles, and his theory of massive retaliation. Massive retaliation has not been the answer.

The world's reliance upon the United Nations has been shattered.

Summit meetings and endless negotiations have not even slowed down the Communist drive.

Foreign aid, President Eisenhower's atoms for peace plans, international loans, disarmament proposals, have all proven to be figments of our own gullibility.

Our foreign policy, in a broad sense, has been that of containment. It has had variations, such as bribery of the Communists, appeasement, negotiation, compromise and vacillation. The trouble is, they have not remained bribed.

All of our efforts have eventuated into retreat and surrender, bit by bit, nation by nation.

It is my conviction that the steady decline of U.S. power and prestige, coupled with the increase in Communist-Soviet power, is leading us to the grim and desperate alternatives of either:

Surrender, or a preventive thermonuclear war.

Our international posture is seriously threatened. Our allies in the free world, especially in Europe, are seriously questioning the quality of our leadership, the effectiveness of our policies. We face the possibilities of general demoralization and panic of the peoples of the free world.

I am hopeful and confident that there is a third alternative, besides those of surrender or war, if we possess the will to accept the realities of our situation.

We must find and adopt a course that will assure our people and the free world not only peace but survival, and, above all, freedom.

This third alternative is contained in House Joint Resolution 447 which I introduced on June 12 of 1961.

This resolution proposes to meet and counter the Communist war with our own declaration of a political, economic, psychomoral war against the international Communist conspiracy.

The best testimonial I know for the resolution is that Pravda, Izvestia, La Rubezhum have printed four separate attacks upon me and this resolution.

It would be a war not of missiles and marching soldiers with bayonets.

It would not be a war against any government. It would meet the Communist war in the fourth dimension.

It proposes a war against our actual enemy, the 98 Communist parties, constituting the international Communist conspiracy.

This declaration would not create a new war. It realistically recognizes an existing war in which we are the No. 1 target.

We cannot hope to successfully defend this Nation if we ignore this war against us.

We cannot survive, if we limit ourselves to suffer all losses in this war, and allow all victories to go to the Soviet.

We cannot formulate effective policies to cope with Communist-Soviet aggressions, infiltrations, subversions, guerilla wars, unless we fully comprehend the magnitude of this war, identify our enemies, locate the deployment of its forces.

The United States cannot survive this war alone, nor can we win it alone. The resources of all the free world must be totally committed in this life and death struggle. The leadership must come from the United States. How can we expect other peoples to resist Communist threats and bribes if we in the United States continue our policies based upon fiction and fantasy?

We must face the stark reality. The Communist philosophy allows no compromise. Our domestic programs must be subordinated to, and consistent with the all-important cause of survival.

Gentlemen, we are being warred upon. Let us recognize and declare it. Let us win it.

In the main, there are two fundamental requirements that this country must adopt if we are to survive.

These requirements are basic to the declaration of nonmilitary war. They must be met before we can take the offensive in a war upon the Communist parties throughout the world.

The first requirement is that of military superiority. The Communist-Soviet mentality completely lacks Christian-Judaic ethics. It knows no moral or legal restraint. It respects only power and force.

We have permitted our military and retaliatory power to erode to a point where the Soviet has attained a relative parity.

The Soviet, today, is acknowledged to be superior in the fields of rocketry, space technology, and intercontinental missiles.

Its army of 150 divisions located west of the Urals, together with 60 satellite divisions, is vastly superior in number, in equipment, in training, to that of the free world.

Although the United States excels in its Air Force, its Navy, and its total atomic stockpile, the question of overall superiority, of total destructive firepower and war capability is in serious doubt.

Superiority would depend upon the strategy and the nature of war.

Unless we take immediate action to restore an unquestioned military supremacy, we are inviting national and international suicide.

This Nation should place our intercontinental missile program on a crash, 24-hour-per-day, 7-day-a-week basis.

We should proceed with full-scale atomic testing to further increase our atomic firepower and weapons system.

We must proceed full scale with the development and testing of the neutron bomb.

We should concentrate upon the development and production of a weapons system, not for clean fusion bombs, but for fission bombs having a maximum radioactivity and a low ceiling, to take advantage of the prevailing air currents over Russia.

I haye personally urged Chairman Seaborg and the Atomic Energy Commission, over a long period, to take these steps.

They would be a salutary answer to Mr. Khrushchev's threats to launch his 100-megaton bomb.

Our Navy is technologically obsolete, with the exception of our Polaris submarines. Although we had complete mastery of the seas in the Korean war, our Navy was almost helpless, except for maintaining our supply lines. That war decisively exposed the impotence of our existing naval strategy concepts.

We need a vast program to equip every naval vessel with both nuclear power and nuclear missiles.

This program would give the United States hundreds of movable missile bases dispersed around the world. This program would divert Soviet missiles away from the United States.

Our present concrete embedded missiles attract and invite a missile attack upon our land.

The recommendations of Governor Rockefeller and President Kennedy for the construction of fallout shelters by our citizens is a confession of the gravity of our situation.

We must be prepared not only to wage a war, and to win that war; but more important, we must strengthen ourselves to a degree that will prevent the inception of any kind of war.

Our military superiority should be maintained at a minimum ratio of 1.5 to 1 over the Soviet. A 2-to-1 ratio is preferable.

We have the wealth, the technology, the economy to attain and maintain this superiority.

It is a cheap price to pay for our survival.

In the field of international affairs, we need a complete reexamination, reevaluation, reorganization of our national goals, our foreign policies and our policymaking machinery.

There is an apparent complete failure of orientation and coordination between our military capabilities and our foreign policies.

Our foreign policies and military capabilities are interdependent and must be mutually supporting if we are to attain our national objectives. As Mao Tse-tung has repeatedly reminded us, foreign policy comes out of the muzzles of guns.

The fiasco of Cuba, under both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, is a classic example of the failures. the lack of coordination between the President's Office, the State Department, the Defense Department, the National Security Agency, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

A military supremacy, combined with a firm, tough, realistic foreign policy, is our last and only hope for survival

I am, presently, preparing and drafting a bill to implement my resolution, House Joint Resolution 447. I hope to introduce this measure within the next 2 weeks.

It proposes to create a new Cabinet post and Department for International Political Affairs. It would centralize into one agency the responsibility of coordinating the political efforts of our Government. Today, they are disjointed, uncoordinated, and spread throughout more than a score of Federal agencies.

This Department would also be directly and primarily charged with formulating, coordinating, and executing all political objectives in the international field.

The power to formulate political policies is too awesome a responsibility for any one man. The life of this Nation, of the free world, is dependent upon our international political decisions. This responsibility does not belong and should not be placed exclusively upon the occupant in the White House, whoever he may be.

We must not forget that the U.S. Constitution charges Congress with the responsibility for safeguarding the welfare of this Nation, to provide for its defense, to declare war, to regulate our Armed Forces.

That is why I will propose in my bill that the power and responsibility for international political decisions be placed not in the Cabinet officer but in a board, consisting of the following responsible public officials:

1. The Vice President, as Chairman.
2. Secretary of Defense.
3. Secretary of State.
4. Secretary of Treasury.
5. The Cabinet officer, to be appointed by the President, upon the recommendation of the board.
6. The Speaker of the House of Representatives.
7. The majority leader of the House of Representatives.
8. The minority leader of the House of Representatives.
9. The majority leader of the U.S. Senate.
10. The minority leader of the U.S. Senate.

The Cabinet officer shall be the executive officer for the board.

We must remember that, in essence, we are in a political war.

Military power, or weapons, per se, do not create wars.

The Communists clearly recognize that war is only another method of attaining political objectives.

Military power can, however, be used either to accelerate or reduce the possibilities of war. Military power gives shape, a time element, to political aims.

It is basic political aims or conflicts that create wars. That is why we must reanalyze, reevaluate, and completely overhaul and reorganize our present totally inadequate, totally ineffective, disorganized structure for formulating and effectuating our international political policies.

This proposal is not intended to, nor would it actually, interfere with the President's powers. It is intended to fortify his powers, to strengthen his powers, to integrate the congressional responsibilities with those of the Executive, to give maximum public support to a unified political effort, to successfully defend this Nation's goals of freedom, survival, and peace.

We must never forget that freedom has never been free. Its price has always been vigilance, courage, sacrifice, and dedication.

Mr. DULSKI. At this point I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pillion].

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is a high privilege to join my distinguished colleague [Mr. Dulski] in extending our highest praise to the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce for sponsoring a cold war seminar in the city of Buffalo, on March 30 and 31. This seminar was an outstanding public service. It is evident that the general public, and our highest national leaders, continue to lack a basic understanding of the Communist conspiracy, its organization, its purposes, its strategies, and its tactics.

As a consequence of this lack of comprehension, the United States and the free world are steadily losing the total global war being waged by the Communist-Soviet forces.

Our policies are basically defensive and ineffectual. For the last 30 years, our approach to the Communist-Soviet offensive has been one of vacillation, accommodation, negotiation, compromise, bribery, appeasement, direct aid to Communists, and piecemeal retreat.

This country is under the tragic delusion that it can negotiate an honorable and effective disarmament agreement with the Soviet. We are deluding ourselves and the free world with dreams of a just and lasting peace.

We fail to understand that communism is basically and fundamentally a philosophy of war and destruction. It cannot coexist with a system of free nations.

The essence of the Communist total global war is that of political penetration, political infiltration, political subversion, and political seizures.

The Communist-Soviet gains in this war have been so alarming that today, we face not the question of whether we have the will to win, but the added question of, Can we win this war, even if we can summon a united national will to win?

Mr. Speaker, I pay special tribute to Sheriff B. John Tutuska, and Mr. John R. Owen, Jr., for their great contributions as honorary chairman and general chairman of this seminar.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], delivered a most impressive keynote message.

Our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN], delivered a most stirring and informative concluding address.

They are to be highly commended for their devotion and their sacrifice in the greatest of all causes—man's struggle to remain free.

I take this opportunity to publicly acknowledge the extensive and most valuable contributions made by my neighbor and colleague, Mr. DULSKI, to awaken this Nation to the Communist-Soviet war upon all free peoples, societies and nations.

Mr. Speaker, I note in today's newspapers that our Government is proposing to the 17-nation Geneva Conference a plan for partial disarmament. It would place the responsibility for peace upon the armed forces of the United Nations.

This is a tragic, monumental error. We are fanatically, and foolishly obsessed with disarmament and peace.

The freedom of our people, the survival of this Nation, the peace of the world lies not in reliance upon Communist-Soviet promises. It lies on our own strength, our power to defend the Nation.

We must never forget that wars are not the result of military forces. Wars and military forces result from political objectives. Our nuclear and military power are not contributing forces toward a war. Our military retaliatory power has been a preservative force for peace. Military might is not, in itself, a determinant of war. Our great danger lies not in the war powers of the Soviet forces. The basic threat to peace, the imminent danger of war, is caused by the inflexible and immutable political philosophy and political goals of the Communist Party and the Soviet nation to impose a Communist system upon every free nation.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the evening and concluding session of this very informative and effective seminar was chaired by Mr. Elmer Lux, former city councilman and president of the common council, and now serving in an executive position with the State of New York.

The major address was delivered by the Honorable AUGUST A. JOHANSEN, a Member of the House of Representatives from Michigan.

Representative JOHANSEN, who has been in Congress since 1955, is the second ranking member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He is also a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Congressman JOHANSEN is a former newspaperman and Congregational minister.

Congressman JOHANSEN's address appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 4, 1962, on page 5977.

I highly recommend the reading of the speeches made by Congressmen FEIGHAN and JOHANSEN at this seminar.

We, who live in the Niagara Frontier area, are very fortunate to have an active committee in this field—the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York.

On alert—long before Cuba became a Russian satellite and the Soviet Union polluted the atmosphere of the earth with atomic fallout, an earnest group of western New Yorkers formed a committee to alert the rest of us to the serious menace of world domination by the Communists. Since 1959 the United Anti-Communist Action Committee of Western New York—U.A.C.A.C. of W.N.Y.—has maintained a speakers bureau, and to date has given nearly 200 lectures to alert the people of western New York and Canada to the serious menace of world domination by the Communists.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BECKWORTH, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. TOLL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 minutes, tomorrow, Thursday, April 19.

Mr. DOMINICK (at the request of Mrs. MAY), for 1½ hours, on May 9, 1962.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mrs. MAY), for 10 minutes, on April 19.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DENT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOOLEY.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. AVERY in two instances.

Mr. MACGREGOR.

Mr. AYRES.

Mrs. BOLTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mr. ASHMORE.

Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. GLENN (at the request of Mrs. MAY), in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 11027. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 449. Joint resolution providing for the former establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 505. An act for the relief of Seymour Robertson;

S. 508. An act for the relief of John E. Beaman and Adelaide K. Beaman;

S. 704. An act for the relief of Marlys E. Tedin and Elizabeth O. Reynolds;

S. 1057. An act to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution;

S. 2151. An act for the relief of Harvey Burstein;

S. 2319. An act for the relief of Harry E. Ellison, captain, U.S. Army, retired; and

S. 2549. An act for the relief of Edward L. Wertheim.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 19, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1957. A letter from the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting in duplicate notice of the intention of the Department of the Army and the Department of Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of military and national forest lands, pursuant to the act of July 26, 1956 (70 Stat. 656); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1958. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the procurement of unassembled jettisonable fuel tanks by the Department of the Air Force under negotiated fixed-price contracts with Beech Aircraft Corp., Wichita, Kans., and Fletcher Aviation Corp., Rosemead, Calif.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1959. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected supply management functions and responsibilities of the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency (MC & TSA), Philadelphia, Pa., the operating agency that was established in 1956 to manage clothing and textile materiel within the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1960. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report which provides information on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1961. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of February 28, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1962. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the review of the automatic data processing of series E U.S. savings bonds by the Parkersburg, W. Va., office of the Bureau of the Public Debt, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 23. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Arbuckle reclamation project, Oklahoma, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 9736. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit certain property to be used for State forestry work, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 10594. A bill to amend section 372 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to privately owned nonprofit agricultural research and experiment stations or foundations; with amendment (Rept. No. 1621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 10708. A bill to amend section 203 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, with respect to communication service for the transmission of voice, sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds through the use of electricity; with amendment (Rept. No. 1622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. S. 1126. An act to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10204. A bill to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1624). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 62. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 25th anniversary of the establishment of soil conservation districts; without amendment (Rept. No. 1625). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 11261. A bill to authorize an adequate White House Police force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 11389. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11390. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, to provide full benefits (when based on retirement age) at age 60 for women and age 62 for men; to increase benefits and the amount of earnings on which benefits are computed; to provide more liberal terms and conditions for determinations of disability and entitlement to disability benefits; to provide hospitalization and surgical insurance; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 11391. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to finance the testimony of expert witnesses before the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 11392. A bill to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ship's officers and crew members and their dependents and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 11393. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11394. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to widows and children of World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 11395. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 11396. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 11397. A bill relating to the Indian heirship land problem; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 11398. A bill to require the establishment of an appeals procedure in matters related to the sale of timber from national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11399. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 11400. A bill to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 11401. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 11402. A bill to provide for the expansion of the national cemetery at Alton, Ill.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 11403. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11404. A bill to amend section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to provide for the recognition and retirement of the public debt as reflected by the budget; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD (by request):

H.R. 11405. A bill to provide for the maintenance and repair of Government improvements under concession contracts entered into pursuant to the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 11406. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 11407. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase the lending authority of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEERMANN:

H.R. 11408. A bill to provide for the division of the tribal assets of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska among the members of the tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 11409. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States and its territories and possessions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 11410. A bill to amend section 36 of the Investment Company Act of 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11411. A bill to amend section 641 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that deductions shall not be made from Federal payments to a State home because of amounts collected from the estates of deceased veterans and used for recreational or other purposes not required by State laws; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 11412. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 to permit the planting of additional nonsurplus crops on diverted acreage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 11413. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 to permit the planting of additional nonsurplus crops on diverted acreage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H.R. 11414. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 to provide for the protection of classified information released to or within U.S. industry and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 11415. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 11416. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 11417. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 11418. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 11419. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 11420. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 11421. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 11422. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 11423. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 11424. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 11425. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 11426. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 11427. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 11428. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 11429. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 11430. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 11431. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 11432. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 11433. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 11434. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 11435. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 11436. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Texas:

H.R. 11437. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 11438. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 11439. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 11440. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 11441. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 11442. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 11443. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 11444. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 11445. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 11446. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 11447. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 11448. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 11449. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 11450. A bill to extend the provisions of the Railway Labor Act to certain carriers by water engaged in interstate or foreign commerce and their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 11451. A bill to provide for assistance to States in the promotion, establishment, and maintenance of safe workplaces and work practices, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 11452. A bill to authorize modification of the existing project for the Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, La., in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.J. Res. 699. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the States exclusive control over public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 700. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a joint committee of the two Houses of the Congress to study all matters relating to national strategy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 461. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States with foreign nations or international bodies in a program for the utilization and exploration of space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY:

H. Con. Res. 462. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States with foreign nations or international bodies in a program for the utilization and exploration of space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. Con. Res. 463. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States with foreign nations or international bodies in a program for the utilization and exploration of space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. Con. Res. 464. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States with foreign nations or international bodies in a program for the utilization and exploration of space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. Con. Res. 466. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States with foreign nations or international bodies in a program for the utilization and exploration of space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H. Con. Res. 467. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States with foreign nations or international bodies in a program for the utilization and exploration of space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 468. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States with foreign nations or international bodies in a program for the utilization and exploration of space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. Con. Res. 469. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States with foreign nations or international bodies in a program for the utilization and exploration of space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H. Con. Res. 470. Concurrent resolution to withhold participation in any program for space exploration with the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H. Con. Res. 471. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States with foreign nations or international bodies in a program for the utilization and exploration of space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Res. 609. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives relating to the appointment of professional and clerical staffs of the committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 610. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information with respect to the reasons underlying the U.S. sponsorship and active support of the censure of Israel by the United Nations Security Council; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H. Res. 611. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H. Res. 612. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct an investigation and study of the policy making procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the Department of State; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. Res. 614. Resolution to direct a study by the Secretary of Commerce of the processes and conditions of collective bargaining in the ocean shipping industry and of the consequences thereof upon the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States as such commerce is conducted under the Shipping Act, 1916, the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933, and the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 615. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the production, distribution, and exhibition of objectionable motion pictures and related advertising; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 11453. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lionello Farrari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 11454. A bill for the relief of Gerald St. John; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 11455. A bill for the relief of Winifred Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 11456. A bill for the relief of R. V. Myers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 11457. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Domenico Colaiacovo and their children, Giuseppa and Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 11458: A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lee Ma Chin-Ying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 11459. A bill for the relief of Kam Man Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 11460. A bill for the relief of John Tomaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11461. A bill for the relief of Elefterios Theodore Kamarinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 11462. A bill for the relief of Akabi Ozdere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 11463: A bill for the relief of Llewellyn B. Griffith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

313. Mr. STRATTON presented a petition of the Town Board of the Town of Rotterdam, Schenectady County, N.Y., supporting legislation pending in Congress to incorporate into the social security system medical care features, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Model Congress: Kansas State University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, during the last week in April, the students of Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans., will conduct a unique laboratory experiment on how the Federal legislative process works. On the campus of the school, a model congress will be held. The entire event is planned and carried out by the students. A steering committee, headed by Art Groesbeck, junior in government, Manhattan, has provided the organizational structure for the congress. Students are chosen to be senators and representatives on the basis of written application. The interesting point is that any student may make application. Such is not limited only to students majoring in political science and other like fields. As a result, students in practically every curriculum at the university will be taking part in the novel experiment. In order to make the participation more meaningful, voting records and political affiliations of the Members of Congress are distributed and thereby a student can make application to represent a Congressman whose views most nearly represent his own.

The model congress will operate as nearly as possible as does the U.S. Congress. The opening joint session features two keynote speakers from the Congress of the United States representing the Republican and Democratic Parties. Following this meeting, the model congress will meet for the introduction of bills. The next session will consist of committee meetings for consideration of the bills. This is followed by a session during which the bills reported by the committees will be debated. Then the bills will be voted on by the two bodies of congress. Finally, a joint session is held during which the accomplishments of both legislative bodies will be summed up.

Throughout the 3-day affair, campus organizations will register as national lobbies and will in turn present their views on various legislative proposals to the "congressmen."

For anyone who has visited the Congress of the United States, they soon learn the famous bean soup is a part of the tradition and atmosphere of the hallowed legislative halls. The Kansas State students are not to be denied—they too will have their bean soup. Through the cooperation of this office, the recipe for bean soup has been sent to the university cafeteria and such will be offered the "hungry and hard-working legislators" during the course of the model congress.

Kansas State is one of the few universities offering such a realistic and broad educational activity in an attempt to give the students a practical understanding of the legislative process. In previous years at K-State, the students have staged mock political conventions and model U.N. assemblies, but this will mark the first time a model congress has been held. Certainly this endeavor should provide the students with a valuable education to supplement that gained from the textbook.

In addition to Art Groesbeck, the following students are active with the arrangements of the model congress:

Bob Ireland, junior majoring in agricultural economics, from Yates Center, is the representation commissioner for the congress.

Gary Keeny, senior majoring in medical technology, from Manhattan, is the scheduling clerk.

Verna Wilborn, junior majoring in history, from Hoisington, is the administrative assistant to the chairman.

Tom Atkinson, junior majoring in psychology, from Belleville, is the special coordinator.

Marion Loper, junior majoring in speech, from Plainville, is the public relations counsel.

Senator Keating Speaks His Mind on the Moral Crisis in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the author of "The Moral Crisis in America," an address delivered at Iona College in New Rochelle, N.Y., on the occasion of the inaugural Charles Carroll lecture in American history and government, of the Iona College Alumni Association lecture series needs no introduction.

It gives me pleasure to incorporate in the RECORD this provocative statement by an outstanding U.S. Senator:

THE MORAL CRISIS IN AMERICA

(By Senator KENNETH B. KEATING)

Tom Kelly, brother president, reverend brothers, reverend sisters, County Executive Michaelian, Mr. President, ladies, and gentleman, I am delighted to be here today, and it is a great honor which you have accorded me in inviting me to deliver one of the Charles Carroll lectures. This patriotic pioneer in our Nation's history was not only, as we know, a signer of the Declaration of Independence but he was also one of the most distinguished members of the legislative body in which I now have the honor and privilege of serving through the assistance, I am sure, of many in this group. Your respected alma mater, which I have had the privilege of inspecting in part, is a college young in years but rich in reputation. Here at Iona there is being continued a tradition of excellence that has its roots deep in time and history—for excellence is an anticipated and certain attribute wherever in this world the Christian Brothers of Ireland establish a seat of learning.

Speaking of learning, it may surprise you to know that I once was a teacher. Indeed, I taught Latin. As to the transformation from a teacher of Latin to my present status, I have only this to say: After having declaimed over and over again that all Gaul is divided into three parts, I discovered that all of America was divided into only two parts—Republicans and Democrats—and since this struck me as a much simpler arrangement, I entered political life.

In the language of today's geopolitics, strength is determined by a precise, virtually mathematical formula. It is determined by the arithmetic of power—by the cold, inexorable statistics of nuclear force, missile thrust and missile quantities, bombers and bomber speed, submarine range and rocket firepower.

Like boxers, nations are placed in categories of strength—with the nuclear heavyweights dominating the scene.

Today, as never before in history, this concept of strength—the lethal ability to destroy—or to retaliate—dominates the lives of men.

The interplay of claim and counterclaim—the running tally of rocket thrust achieved, megatons exploded and missile accuracy is like a cosmic scorecard that the world follows with bated breath—because power has become the common denominator of security, of success—yes, and of survival. You will recall our national apprehension during the 1960 presidential campaign at the claim that Russia was stronger than we—that a so-called missile gap existed. And later, you will remember, our mass sigh of relief in this country when the missile gap proved to be a figment, not fact. Never in all of our political history was the truth more efficiently taught to do the twist.

But tendency to equate raw power with national strength—to consider that we are one up on the Soviets if we merely send a rocket higher or further—represents a grave, self-deceiving trend in our national thinking. To use the language of the day—indeed, the language of power—it has clouded and contaminated our thinking with a "fallout" of materialism—in the sense that national strength has become in our minds a matter of muscle, of hardware. We have become accustomed to contemplate the power image of our Nation—as though science gave us the one and exclusive attribute of national strength. The sublime, timeless, infinitely deeper, more meaningful spiritual source of our strength is minimized, if not disregarded in the mass worship of raw power as both symbol and substance of greatness. I suppose that one might say that, historically, there is a certain poetic justice in the adoption of this popular frenzy that I referred to called the twist. For it reflects a distortion—yes, a contortion in our system of values—for traditional values, I mean, upon which our country was founded in which Charles Carroll had such a prominent part, and which have made our country preeminent in the world.

The dangerous fallacy exists that the power to destroy—or to keep from being destroyed—is virtually an end in itself. Surely, we cannot minimize the importance of security—but man does not live by security alone any more than by bread alone.

It is a sad and disheartening paradox that in this age which finds our military strength unparalleled, our moral and spiritual strength is sapped and weakened as never before in our history. We have forged the massive shield to protect our way of life, yet that way of life was never less noble, less worthy of those who created it and fought for it, than it is today.

While we arm militarily, we disarm morally—and this moral disarmament may well prove an ally of our enemies, a time bomb of our own creation that will explode in our faces.

It is not merely that we are nurturing an enemy within our walls, within our frontiers, but within ourselves. America's moral weakness is a mass problem because it is first and foremost an individual problem. The infection is not localized. It has spread through the structure of our society, seeped its poison into big cities and small, young minds and old—and this virus thrives until the antibiotics of individual conscience and of a Nation's conscience intervenes to arrest it. One need not look beyond the unprecedented mass of pornographic literature that is flooding this Nation to know what I mean.

This country was founded upon values hard as the rock the Pilgrims landed on. In our day we have witnessed the erosion of those values, as expediency, opportunism, materialism, apathy have ridden like the legendary Four Horsemen across the land.

So often we protest our Americanism in words that ring like steel on steel—but we live that Americanism in milksop fashion, avoiding, not practicing its principles, circumventing, not observing its basic responsibilities.

We pay lipservice, not soul service to freedom. We subscribe to the concept of equality, provided that it is a membership club, or that it has a sliding scale of applicability. We inveigh against Communist oppression, while engaging in oppression ourselves. We wear patriotism as though it were a carnation, to be worn on appropriate occasions, or we go to the opposite extreme and wrap ourselves so tightly in the American flag that we stumble into the pitfall of intolerance.

As we know full well, the basic strength of America has historically been a strength of soul and heart, built upon a deep and abiding belief in God, expressing itself in thoughts and actions wholly consonant with such a belief. What makes this country great is not what is in her arsenals, her atomic stockpiles, or in her skyscrapers. It is in the character of her people.

We talk much these days of projecting our image of this country to the world. Let us here for a few moments today project it to ourselves. Not in its entirety, not by any means in its entirety, but only in those aspects that distort the true image, the aspects that you and I would wish to change.

To begin, I think that you will agree with me that there has grown up in this country what might be described as a "gold rush" philosophy—a preoccupation with getting rather than giving—a measurement of everything in terms of price rather than value. There is a veneration of things rather than principles—a tendency to make success in life a purely financial proposition.

Now I hasten to say that I am by no means condemning materialism as such. In its essence, materialism is not wrong. This is a fact of life with which we must live. We have to be materialistic to survive, as a people or as individuals. It is only when materialism becomes an end in itself, when it becomes a kind of tribal religion, with mammon as its deity—when it loses all identity with the lofty spiritual side of man, that it becomes a virus against which we must attempt to inoculate ourselves.

There is no "crash program" possible in this kind of development—there is no such thing as "instant culture" or "instant morality." You know, sometimes I think the concept of speed in our social and economic system is carried to a dangerous extreme. I read an ad the other day in the newspaper for "instant French." The promise was that if you bought this course you'd be speaking French like crazy in 3 hours. This opens up another vista which I wish I had the time to explore with you. For instance, a course in "instant chemistry" would certainly have instant reverberations.

But the essential point I want to make is that it is the true, deep culture of the spirit—the spirit of man's response to his relationship to God that puts armor plate on a man's or woman's character—that fortifies the basic moral fiber. Easy money is an affront, not a temptation, to the person whose soul has been educated as well as his brain. And that is one of the things you do at Iona, and that's why Iona is so important to this community, and to our State, and to our Nation.

This is a part of the great challenge of our times. The Communists, ignoring their own black scars, gloat over every wound in the body of freedom. With monumental hypocrisy, the Communists portray opportunism and materialism as major characteristics of the Western World.

Unfortunately, we sometimes supply the Communists readymade illustrations. Placing profits before principles, there are those who are doing their best right now to increase business with the Communists. And, incredibly, these Red-traders are being aided and abetted by high Government officials attempting to limit any controls whatever on trade with the bloc. A Presidential task force has recommended that we remove all controls on shipments of strategic goods or anything else to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries. Now, I don't want to be misunderstood—that's a task force; it has not had the approval of the President, nor do I believe it will, and it certainly will not have the approval of the Congress of the United States. Under present circumstances, the embargo on Cuba recently placed, which is long overdue and which I have been advocating for many, many months—this embargo is itself hypocritical. We have adopted economic sanctions against Cuba because of its domination by the Soviets, but we have not imposed any such sanctions on the Soviets themselves. On the contrary—in one of those ironies of diplomacy which I cannot fathom, we are gradually reducing our restrictions on trade with Russia, and their commercial missions are warmly welcomed throughout the free world. Our State Department frowns upon any kind of economic warfare against the Russian Communists at the very moment in history when it calls upon all of our Latin American neighbors to cooperate in a program designed to economically annihilate Cuba's Communists.

Now, don't misunderstand my remarks. I favor every action which will speed the end of Castroism, and I pray that our embargo will succeed. In fact, I believe it is imperative to obtain cooperation from all of our allies in our economic offensive against this Soviet satellite. The embargo on Cuba cannot be effective if our friends in Canada or France or West Germany or Britain stand ready to fill every gap we open in the Cuban economy. The free world's professed mutual dedication to defeating Communist tyranny will have a hollow ring indeed as long as our allies embrace every Communist overture with profit potentialities.

We cannot blame our European allies completely for their lack of cooperation. According to my information, the United States has not to this day requested such joint action in its move against Cuba. The time for such a request is long overdue. The American people have been making sacrifices for more than two decades in joint efforts to halt Communist expansion in Europe. It is not too much for us to ask that our friends there join in a similar effort to halt Communist expansion in the Americas.

Now perhaps we hesitate because of the basic inconsistency in our position on Cuba and the Soviet Union. We may find it difficult to explain to our allies why it is all right to send jet airplanes to Yugoslavia and diesel generators to Russia—but not all right to send cotton or woodpulp to Cuba. Let's face it. Let's face it. The Soviets are a more attractive market. Red China, moreover, seems to appeal to some of our allies as the answer to all their economic woes. The benefit of such trade to the Communist military machine and economy is not considered. The danger of such trade to the security of the free world is ignored. And the immorality of such trade in the light of the nature of communism is ridiculed. These are disheartening observations, but we cannot escape from the facts. At home and abroad this Nation needs to reaffirm its ideals, and renew its dedication to high purposes—in the face of the iron resolve of a competing philosophy to win the minds and souls of men.

No one ever speaks of "adult delinquency"; yet, how richly is the term deserved. The payoff, the kickbacks, the brazen theft of union dues by appointed stewards, collusion in the awarding of contracts, undercover deals between management and labor executives, the padding of expense accounts, the protection-for-pay that certain police sell to lawbreakers—these are not mere malefactions, they are shames. That is what I mean when I say that anything that detracts from our national honor detracts, too, from each of us. Worse than the effect of any bomb is the "fallout" of contamination that an evil precept or an evil example showers upon the land.

Any assessment of morality in America would be incomplete without mention of what is surely the most formative influence of all—the home. Too often, in our time, the home is an address rather than a place of living and learning. In extreme cases it becomes a kind of hotel, with the mother and father as resident managers—often with neither the time for residing nor the gift for managing. Our homes must be made, not addresses, not stopover places, but places of unity and love—sacred places where God dwells as well as people, where the good is learned by precept and example, because the home marks a man or woman for life, and the parent alone makes that mark.

One thing we must always remember: We cannot consider human dignity as a birthright, as something traditionally handed down like grandmother's silver. It has had to be fought for to be won—fought for to be preserved—over all the centuries, and we must fight for it in our time. It can be a quiet, even silent fight, not a dramatic one.

Every time we speak up against bias or prejudice, we are on the side of human dignity—or moral rectitude. Every act of charity is an act of faith in the high destiny of mankind. And—if you'll permit a Senator to talk shop—the very act of voting—of making your voice count—is a blow struck for the freedom of the human spirit.

After all, we have the lessons of history to show us that nations can lose this freedom. There is a dehumanization in Russia that has attempted to legislate man's soul out of existence. Fortunately, they have found it extremely difficult to separate a man from his God by an official decree. There is even a refinement of this dehumanization in Red China—where the system of communism seeks to root out not only the spirit of man but the spirit of the family.

Too many—far too many—Americans believe that they are the soul of patriotism because they are against communism. They attack it with words—belligerently, righteously—in private conversation—and stand as godly as Sir Galahad, guarding Castle Freedom against the scaling parties, against the battering rams of the insidious enemy. But this conversational aggression is too often a substitute for positive action—for forcing communism back not with dialog but with dedication—with active, dynamic involvment in the promotion of the kind of nation, the kind of world that affords no soil for the growth of communism, no climate for its nourishment.

In a word, it's not enough to know the wrong and to condemn it—above all, we must know the right and practice it. Here is the difference between the negative and positive approach in this tremendous and fateful problem that history has forced upon us. We must know, not what we are fighting against—but what we are fighting for—and to do this we must search into our souls and into our history for the values that are beyond the reckoning of dollars and cents—for the principles that anchor us not to the free-floating buoy of expediency but to the imbedded rock of eternal truths, of timeless virtues, of personal lives that reflect the glory of God, not the abasement of man.

And in this regard, and in these rather sober observations, there is one final thought I would leave with you. One of the great ironies of history, I feel, is that the success of communism—the success we do deplore, has come about through the intensity of purpose, the selfless dedication to a goal, the unremitting toil, the boundless zeal which characterized the creation of our own nation, which carved our free government out of the wilderness. This fact is at once a paradox and a challenge. Our forefathers dedicated their lives, their sacred honor, to ennoble man. Communism dedicates itself—with scarcely less ardor—to degrading, dehumanizing man.

The challenge for each of us is clear. We must rebuild America from the heart outward. We must know that the ultimate weapon against tyranny and its forces lies not in our arsenals but in our souls—and that to the extent our spirit is eroded by false values, our survival as free men in a free nation is placed in ever greater jeopardy. Wherever and whenever the bell tolls for freedom—for freedom that has died—let us remember that freedom is only as immortal as men make it—only deathless for those who do not let it die. For history has recorded the many ways in which freedom has died—gloriously, cravenly, but the saddest, most ignominious death of all is when freedom has died in its sleep.

Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, Hadassah, the women's Zionist Organization of America, has 300,000 members divided into 1,200 chapters and groups. It is organized in every State of the United States and in Puerto Rico. In 1956 it had a budget in excess of $9 million.

Hadassah was founded in 1912 by Henrietta Szold, a noted scholar, social worker, and reformer from Baltimore, Md. Its object was and is threefold: To raise the standard of health in what was then the state of Palestine and what is today the Republic of Israel; to encourage the development of Jewish life in America; and to foster the Jewish ideal.

In 1912 Palestine was plagued with many diseases, and had little in the way of medical facilities or financial resources. To meet this problem, a group of women Zionists—the Daughters of Zion—was organized in New York under the leadership of Henrietta Szold, with the object of raising funds to finance the dispatch of a medical team to Palestine. The Daughters of Zion were later to adopt the name of "Hadassah," which is the Hebrew name of Queen Esther and also means "myrtle," the hardy plant, indigenous to Palestine, that binds barren soil and returns fruitfulness to the earth. In 1913 Hadassah sent two American-trained nurses to Palestine to establish a small welfare station in Jerusalem for maternity care and the treatment of trachoma, a dread eye disease common to underdeveloped sections of the Middle East.

In World War I Hadassah sent one of its nurses to Alexandria, Egypt, to aid the refugee health crisis there, and at the close of the war, in 1918, the American Zionist Medical Unit was established on a permanent basis, with funds supplied by Hadassah. Four American-style hospital-clinic operations went into effect the same year in different sections of Palestine; sanitation activities were introduced in both rural and urban centers, and a nurses' training school was opened in Jerusalem.

The concept of educating a population to understand its medical problems and to demand a high standard of medical services was one of Hadassah's most significant contributions to Palestine.

Today, in Israel, Hadassah conducts a health and social welfare program, which includes a network of diagnostic, curative, and preventive medical service and health stations; a youth program, "Youth Aliyah," for the benefit of young persons recently arrived from different lands; vocational education, and land redemption projects.

Together with Hebrew University, Hadassah runs the only medical school in Israel, which is an integral part of the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center.

In the United States Hadassah conducts a general and Jewish education program. Hadassah policy is the responsibility of the entire membership represented in an annual national convention, and is carried out by a national board. Junior Hadassah—organized in 1920—is the Young Women's Zionist Organization, which includes girls between the ages of 17 and 25.

Summary of Replies to a Questionnaire—Part 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert the fourth and final part of the tabulated results of the replies to my questionnaire. This part covers the sections entitled "Reciprocal Trade; Education; Medical Care; and Postage Rates and Federal Pay."

The tabulated results follow:

	Yes	No
RECIPROCAL TRADE—EDUCATION—MEDICAL CARE		
54. Do you favor extending the present reciprocal trade law for 1 year to enable the United States to obtain more definite information concerning European Common Market impact on U.S. exports and imports?	5, 374	855
55. Is it practical to legislate Federal loans to businesses for modernization, automation, diversification, where they are adversely affected by imports?	2, 705	3, 349
56. Do you believe that assistance to unemployed (caused by imports) and subsidies to business (due to imports) will develop into massive, unworkable Federal subsidies, and should be avoided?	5, 033	1, 137
57. Do you believe that a stabilization of wages, taxes, plus increased production to lower costs is desirable to both stabilize living costs at home and to meet foreign import and and world market competition?	5, 418	745
58. Do you favor the President's reciprocal trade recommendations subject to such safeguards as Congress may deem appropriate?	4, 804	1, 018
59. What is your judgment of the Morse bill to provide Federal aid to public secondary schools?	2, 204	3, 996
60. Do you favor an additional Federal grant of 4-year scholarships to college students, costing $500,000,000 per year?	3, 369	3, 205
61. What is your position on Federal aid for art and culture?	1, 250	5, 115
62. Do you favor retaining the Kerr-Mills Act, providing hospital-medical payments under Federal-State program, limiting payments under a formula based on need?	3, 090	2, 850
63. Do you favor the King-Anderson proposal, providing automatic hospitalization payments limited to social security beneficiaries?	2, 774	3, 389
64. Do you favor limiting public medical-hospital payments to the indigent and leaving medical-hospital insurance to private health insurance plans, such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield?	3, 951	2, 311
65. Do you favor creating a new Cabinet Department of Urban Affairs and Housing?	1, 779	4, 453
POSTAGE RATES—FEDERAL PAY		
66. What is your attitude on the increase in postage rates as contained in the Murray bill?	4, 251	2, 079
67. Do you favor legislation to ban postal delivery of foreign Communist propaganda?	5, 591	914
68. What is your position on the proposed Federal pay increases amounting to about 15 percent spread over the next 3 years?	2, 900	3, 199
69. Do you favor increasing the pay of Cabinet members from $25,000 to $35,000 per year?	1, 762	4, 866

Fairness on Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have drafted legislation providing needed hospital and medical care for our senior citizens. We are all familiar with the rapidly rising costs of medical services and hospital facilities which have accompanied the fast-developing modern improvements and refinements of medical techniques and equipment. We know of the financial burdens these rising costs place on some citizens, particularly those in many cases who are least able to pay. My legislative plan is embodied in H.R. 11066 which I introduced April 3, 1962.

The MacGregor bill would supplement, not supplant, the legislative help already provided in the Kerr-Mills Act of 1960. The latter provides financial help through State governments on the basis of demonstrated needs of the individual. About half of the States have qualified for participation in the Kerr-Mills program and the act is now at work in those States. My State of Minnesota has not as yet qualified, and I am doing my utmost to see that our State legislature passes the needed legislation to achieve this early next year.

The MacGregor bill, like the Bow bill, stresses voluntary participation by any person over 65 who wishes to participate. It is tailored to fit the differing needs of individuals, with two alternative insurance plans offered for the free choice of each participant. Under this proposal, any person aged 65 or over would subtract $125 from his Federal income tax due, and use that amount for the purchase of a medicare insurance plan. Or a relative or employer providing this medicare insurance for an individual aged 65 or over would be allowed the tax credit of $125.

For those whose tax is less than $125, including those who have no tax liability at all, the MacGregor bill authorizes the Treasury Department to issue insurance certificates. Each certificate would cover the difference between $125 and the actual tax due, and would be used to apply on purchase of the insurance.

The insurance people have indicated that they can provide the insurance under this proposal for persons 65 and over regardless of their previous medical history and on a guaranteed renewable basis. The program would result in little, if any, profit for the insurance companies. The first of the two alternative plans is a general health insurance program providing payment of hospital and surgical charges. The second is a more major medical plan involving a deductible amount and partial payment of certain charges by the insured.

The MacGregor bill corrects several weaknesses of the King-Anderson bill which is compulsory, discriminatory and is financed by a basically regressive tax. The King-Anderson bill would force people to pay higher taxes for benefits many do not want or need, it discriminates against senior citizens not under social security, and it would be financed by tax rates which are the same for the wealthy as for the poor.

My plan would cover about 16.2 million persons as opposed to about 14.2 million to be covered by the King-Anderson bill. It would cover physician and surgeon fees. The Kennedy-supported bill would not. The MacGregor bill provides hospitalization benefits unlimited by duration of stay while the King-Anderson plan offers only limited hospitalization and nursing services subject to a $90 deductible feature if a patient is hospitalized 9 days or more.

My bill offers every elderly American the opportunity for complete and meaningful medical care insurance including payments for surgery and doctor's services. It does not create any expanded Government bureaucracy, and eliminates the possibility of Government interference in medicine. It would serve to stimulate an important segment of our free enterprise economy.

It is completely voluntary, does not require action by State or local governments, contains no means test, does not discriminate between citizens, and fosters the highly desirable personal relationship between each individual and the tax collector, the health insurance carrier of his choice, his doctor and his hospital.

Tabulation of Results of the Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that a Congressman be properly informed on the views of the people he represents. In this connection, a public information questionnaire was sent to the constituents of the new Second Congressional District of Kansas. The following are the results. Approximately 102,000 questionnaires were distributed. They were mailed to every person with a telephone, to post office boxes, and copies were distributed through clubs and organizations requesting such. A total of 9,500 questionnaires were returned with over 50 percent including a special letter or additional comments.

When analyzing the results, consideration was made for the fact that it is difficult to answer some of the questions with a simple "Yes" or "No."

If anyone desires extra copies of the tabulation, I will be happy to send such.

I am grateful for the fine response and I hope everyone will continue to write me on matters of interest.

The tabulation follows:

Question	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. If more Federal spending is necessary for national defense, should the money—			
(a) Be raised by increased taxes?	40	39.0	21.0
(b) Be financed through deficit spending?	18	54.0	28.0
(c) Come by a postponement of domestic programs now planned?	72	15.0	13.0
2. Do you favor Federal aid to education for—			
(a) School construction?	39	54.0	7.0
(b) Teachers' salaries?	19	74.0	7.0
(c) Parochial and private schools?	10	83.0	7.0
3. Under existing world tensions, do you believe a summit meeting between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev would be helpful?	24	64.0	9.0
4. Do you believe the $40,000,000 Peace Corps mission is necessary for the success of our foreign policy?	19	60.0	21.0
5. Do you favor resumption of nuclear testing in the atmosphere if necessary, notwithstanding the fallout hazard and world opinion?	49	42.0	9.0
6. Do you favor medical care to the aged program?	50	41.0	9.0
If so, should it be financed by—			
(a) Social security?	39	39.3	21.7
(b) Federal grants to State medical aid programs?	19	49.0	32.0
(c) No Federal program assistance, leaving it to the States?	44	28.0	28.0
7. Do you favor increased postal rates to reduce the Department deficit?	54	39.0	7.0
8. Do you favor the foreign aid program with long-range planning?	46	38.0	16.0
(a) Financed by Treasury borrowing (backdoor spending)?	8	63.0	29.0
(b) Financed by annual appropriations by Congress?	63	21.0	16.0
9. Do you believe we need more civil rights legislation?	30	54.0	16.0
10. Do you believe our world prestige is as high as in January 1961?	45	39.0	16.0
11. In view of the recall to military duty of many men, do you believe current Reserve and draft programs are effective and equitable?	54	19.0	27.0
12. Do you think labor union leaders should be permitted to call a nationwide strike in an industry which affects all phases of our economy, such as the transportation industry?	7	89.0	4.0
13. Should we abolish the loyalty oath now required in the National Defense Education Act?	10	76.0	14.0
14. Do you favor the use of U.S. military forces to defeat Castro in Cuba?	47	38.0	15.0
15. Do you think we need intensified fallout and bomb shelter programs?	36.0	48.0	16.0
(a) Should the Federal Government pay part of the cost?	24.0	59.0	17.0
16. Do you favor extending production and price controls to farm commodities not now included?	12.0	76.0	12.0
17. Do you favor a GI educational benefits program for peacetime veterans?	32.0	60.0	8.0
18. Do you believe the Federal Government should have control over TV and radio programs?	24.0	67.0	9.0
19. Number the following issues in the order of their importance to you: (1) National defense (2) Balanced budget (3) Reduction in Government spending (4) Inflation (5) Foreign affairs (6) Juvenile delinquency (7) Labor problems (8) Farm problems (9) Civil defense (10) Social security (11) Federal aid to education (12) Veterans' benefits			

ATCHISON COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1(a)	34	47	19
Question 1(b)	18	53	29
Question 1(c)	73	13	34
Question 2(a)	39	54	7
Question 2(b)	19	71	10
Question 2(c)	17	76	7
Question 3	25	63	12
Question 4	22	62	16
Question 5	54	39	7
Question 6	54	39	7
Question 6(a)	42	37	21
Question 6(b)	15	44	41
Question 6(c)	51	34	15
Question 7	60	35	5
Question 8	47	37	16
Question 8(a)	6	63	31
Question 8(b)	55	25	20
Question 9	23	58	19
Question 10	43	42	15
Question 11	48	18	34
Question 12	15	80	5
Question 13	9	78	11
Question 14	44	42	14
Question 15	38	52	10
Question 15(a)	22	62	16
Question 16	13	78	9
Question 17	28	59	13
Question 18	23	69	8
Question 19: (1) National defense (2) Reduction in spending (3) Inflation (4) Balanced budget (5) Foreign affairs (6) Farm problems (7) Labor problems (8) Civil defense (9) Social security (10) Juvenile delinquency (11) Federal aid to education (12) Veterans' benefits			

BROWN COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1(a)	33	33	34
Question 1(b)	17	37	46
Question 1(c)	21	18	11
Question 2(a)	31	54	15
Question 2(b)	21	74	5
Question 2(c)	11	75	14
Question 3	22	52	26
Question 4	23	57	20
Question 5	53	30	17
Question 6	44	36	20
Question 6(a)	25	19	56
Question 6(b)	24	25	51
Question 6(c)	58	21	21
Question 7	55	43	2
Question 8	48	34	18
Question 8(a)	7	44	49
Question 8(b)	60	16	24
Question 9	24	58	18
Question 10	44	38	18
Question 11	53	14	33
Question 12	7	82	11
Question 13	7	82	11
Question 14	38	51	11
Question 15	34	44	22
Question 15(a)	20	62	18
Question 16	12	78	10
Question 17	29	60	11
Question 18	30	54	16

Question 19:
(1) National defense
(2) Reduction in spending
(3) Balanced budget
(4) Inflation
(5) Foreign affairs
(6) Labor problems
(7) Juvenile delinquency.
(8) Civil defense
(9) Farm problem
(10) Social security
(11) Veterans' benefits
(12) Federal aid to education

CLAY COUNTY

Question 1(a)	37	49	14
Question 1(b)	23	44	33
Question 1(c)	76	14	10
Question 2(a)	34	57	9
Question 2(b)	11	75	14
Question 2(c)	11	75	14
Question 3	30	58	12
Question 4	17	63	20
Question 5	45	43	12
Question 6	49	40	11
Question 6(a)	44	40	16
Question 6(b)	26	46	28
Question 6(c)	63	34	3
Question 7	49	46	5
Question 8	43	42	15
Question 8(a)	14	56	30
Question 8(b)	71	17	12
Question 9	37	44	19
Question 10	35	42	23
Question 11	69	16	15
Question 12	8	85	7
Question 13	9	75	16
Question 14	49	33	18
Question 15	28	57	15
Question 15(a)	19	69	12
Question 16	12	80	8
Question 17	38	51	11
Question 18	25	64	11

Question 19:
(1) National defense
(2) Balanced budget
(3) Reduction in spending
(4) Inflation
(5) Foreign affairs
(6) Juvenile delinquency
(7) Labor problems
(8) Farm problems
(9) Civil defense
(10) Social security
(11) Veterans' benefits
(12) Federal aid to education

DONIPHAN COUNTY

Question 1(a)	35	46	19
Question 1(b)	18	60	22
Question 1(c)	69	13	18
Question 2(a)	39	51	10
Question 2(b)	23	72	5
Question 2(c)	9	85	6
Question 3	28	59	13
Question 4	22	66	12
Question 5	52	38	10
Question 6	47	47	6
Question 6(a)	43	40	17
Question 6(b)	16	56	28
Question 6(c)	55	29	16
Question 7	54	39	7
Question 8	45	38	17
Question 8(a)	9	65	26
Question 8(b)	62	21	17
Question 9	25	54	21
Question 10	42	41	17
Question 11	43	19	38
Question 12	5	91	4
Question 13	9	74	17
Question 14	49	32	19
Question 15	26	55	19

DONIPHAN COUNTY—Continued

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 15(a)	18	68	14
Question 16	17	75	8
Question 17	33	56	11
Question 18	25	62	13

Question 19:
(1) National defense
(2) Balanced budget
(3) Reduction in spending
(4) Inflation
(5) Foreign affairs
(6) Labor problems
(7) Farm problems
(8) Civil defense
(9) Juvenile delinquency
(10) Social security
(11) Veterans' benefits
(12) Federal aid to education

GEARY COUNTY

Question 1(a)	46	42	12
Question 1(b)	22	67	11
Question 1(c)	69	16	15
Question 2(a)	38	39	3
Question 2(b)	19	79	2
Question 2(c)	10	89	1
Question 3	20	70	10
Question 4	26	64	10
Question 5	53	38	8
Question 6	54	37	8
Question 6(a)	50	38	12
Question 6(b)	27	59	14
Question 6(c)	47	40	13
Question 7	63	22	5
Question 8	55	34	11
Question 8(a)	16	72	12
Question 8(b)	70	23	7
Question 9	31	60	9
Question 10	54	35	11
Question 11	54	27	19
Question 12	6	90	4
Question 13	17	75	8
Question 14	52	39	9
Question 15	42	48	10
Question 15(a)	36	53	11
Question 16	11	77	12
Question 17	31	63	6
Question 18	33	55	12

Question 19:
(1) National defense
(2) Reduction in spending
(3) Balanced budget
(4) Inflation
(5) Foreign affairs
(6) Juvenile delinquency
(7) Labor problems
(8) Civil defense
(9) Farm problems
(10) Social security
(11) Federal aid to education
(12) Veterans' benefits

JACKSON COUNTY

Question 1(a)	44	41	15
Question 1(b)	17	73	20
Question 1(c)	71	18	11
Question 2(a)	44	55	1
Question 2(b)	16	80	4
Question 2(c)	4	93	3
Question 3	26	67	7
Question 4	15	75	10
Question 5	52	45	3
Question 6	49	44	7
Question 6(a)	44	44	12
Question 6(b)	15	60	25
Question 6(c)	57	25	18
Question 7	59	38	5
Question 8	43	44	13
Question 8(a)	1	80	19
Question 8(b)	70	26	4
Question 9	33	52	15
Question 10	40	43	17
Question 11	58	20	22
Question 12	2	95	3
Question 13	11	78	11
Question 14	43	48	9
Question 15	29	60	11
Question 15(a)	19	67	14
Question 16	16	69	15
Question 17	26	69	5
Question 18	24	73	3

Question 19:
(1) National defense
(2) Balanced budget
(3) Reduction in spending
(4) Inflation
(5) Farm problems
(6) Social security
(7) Civil defense
(8) Labor problems
(9) Juvenile delinquency
(10) Foreign affairs
(11) Veterans' benefits
(12) Federal aid to education

LEAVENWORTH COUNTY

Question 1(a)	40	41	19
Question 1(b)	20	56	24
Question 1(c)	74	14	12
Question 2(a)	39	55	6
Question 2(b)	21	65	14
Question 2(c)	12	82	6
Question 3	22	70	18
Question 4	20	66	14

LEAVENWORTH COUNTY—Continued

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 5	56	34	10
Question 6	60	33	7
Question 6(a)	46	37	17
Question 6(b)	15	56	29
Question 6(c)	62	34	4
Question 7	60	32	8
Question 8	47	43	10
Question 8(a)	11	76	13
Question 8(b)	59	23	18
Question 9	36	53	11
Question 10	49	36	15
Question 11	50	26	24
Question 12	7	90	3
Question 13	12	80	8
Question 14	56	26	18
Question 15	39	47	14
Question 15(a)	26	63	11
Question 16	15	66	19
Question 17	36	58	6
Question 18	27	64	9

Question 19:
(1) National defense
(2) Balanced budget
(3) Inflation
(4) Labor problems
(5) Reduction in spending
(6) Civil defense
(7) Foreign affairs
(8) Farm problems
(9) Juvenile delinquency
(10) Federal aid to education
(11) Social security
(12) Veterans' benefits

MARSHALL COUNTY

Question 1(a)	46	47	7
Question 1(b)	25	67	8
Question 1(c)	73	18	[illegible]
Question 2(a)	35	55	10
Question 2(b)	15	77	8
Question 2(c)	11	80	9
Question 3	22	68	10
Question 4	21	66	13
Question 5	49	44	7
Question 6	42	45	13
Question 6(a)	24	31	45
Question 6(b)	26	49	15
Question 6(c)	48	18	42
Question 7	53	46	1
Question 8	45	42	13
Question 8(a)	8	63	29
Question 8(b)	67	23	10
Question 9	30	60	10
Question 10	44	36	10
Question 11	57	15	28
Question 12	9	87	4
Question 13	8	78	14
Question 14	43	40	17
Question 15	33	46	21
Question 15(a)	27	44	29
Question 16	10	75	15
Question 17	30	60	10
Question 18	20	70	10

Question 19:
(1) National defense
(2) Balanced budget
(3) Reduction in spending
(4) Inflation
(5) Foreign affairs
(6) Juvenile delinquency
(7) Farm problems
(8) Civil defense
(9) Labor problems
(10) Veterans' benefits
(11) Social security
(12) Federal aid to education

NEMAHA COUNTY

Question 1(a)	32	42	26
Question 1(b)	20	56	24
Question 1(c)	72	12	16
Question 2(a)	37	58	5
Question 2(b)	15	75	10
Question 2(c)	9	85	6
Question 3	20	71	9
Question 4	20	62	18
Question 5	44	47	9
Question 6	41	50	9
Question 6(a)	34	49	17
Question 6(b)	16	49	35
Question 6(c)	49	23	28
Question 7	49	45	6
Question 8	46	37	17
Question 8(a)	3	60	37
Question 8(b)	62	27	11
Question 9	34	43	23
Question 10	37	47	16
Question 11	51	22	27
Question 12	4	94	2
Question 13	7	79	14

NEMAHA COUNTY—Continued

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 14	53	34	13
Question 15	44	46	10
Question 15(a)	19	65	16
Question 16	9	85	6
Question 17	35	61	4
Question 18	18	77	5

Question 19:
(1) National defense
(2) Balanced budget
(3) Inflation
(4) Foreign affairs
(5) Reduction in spending
(6) Farm problems
(7) Labor problems
(8) Civil defense
(9) Juvenile delinquency
(10) Social security
(11) Veterans' benefits
(12) Federal aid to education

POTTAWATOMIE COUNTY

Question 1(a)	32	44	24
Question 1(b)	17	58	25
Question 1(c)	74	11	15
Question 2(a)	39	52	9
Question 2(b)	17	73	10
Question 2(c)	17	75	8
Question 3	20	68	12
Question 4	21	52	27
Question 5	40	48	12
Question 6	45	44	11
Question 6(a)	44	37	19
Question 6(b)	27	43	30
Question 6(c)	46	24	30
Question 7	59	31	10
Question 8	37	40	23
Question 8(a)	11	57	32
Question 8(b)	65	18	17
Question 9	33	48	19
Question 10	41	40	19
Question 11	53	11	26
Question 12	9	84	7
Question 13	10	71	19
Question 14	47	33	20
Question 15	40	37	23
Question 15(a)	29	48	23
Question 16	15	75	10
Question 17	40	53	7
Question 18	18	76	6

Question 19:
(1) National defense
(2) Inflation
(3) Balanced budget
(4) Foreign affairs
(5) Reduction in spending
(6) Farm problems
(7) Juvenile delinquency
(8) Labor problems
(9) Civil defense
(10) Social security
(11) Federal aid to education
(12) Veterans' benefits

RILEY COUNTY

Question 1(a)	43	37	20
Question 1(b)	10	55	35
Question 1(c)	73	22	5
Question 2(a)	42	55	3
Question 2(b)	22	71	7
Question 2(c)	6	89	5
Question 3	30	55	15
Question 4	25	61	14
Question 5	48	45	7
Question 6	51	38	11
Question 6(a)	40	54	6
Question 6(b)	23	69	8
Question 6(c)	54	40	6
Question 7	60	35	5
Question 8	67	24	9
Question 8(a)	15	77	8
Question 8(b)	70	20	10
Question 9	29	50	21
Question 10	38	36	26
Question 11	54	14	32
Question 12	5	91	4
Question 13	18	72	10
Question 14	42	45	13
Question 15	38	45	17
Question 15(a)	28	58	14
Question 16	10	79	11
Question 17	32	59	10
Question 18	23	68	9

Question 19:
(1) National defense
(2) Foreign affairs
(3) Reduction in spending
(4) Balanced budget
(5) Inflation
(6) Juvenile delinquency
(7) Labor problems
(8) Farm problems
(9) Civil defense
(10) Federal aid to education
(11) Social security
(12) Veterans' benefits

SHAWNEE COUNTY

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1(a)	44	31	25
Question 1(b)	10	49	41
Question 1(c)	79	15	16
Question 2(a)	44	52	4
Question 2(b)	26	67	7
Question 2(c)	10	82	8
Question 3	26	69	5
Question 4	24	66	10
Question 5	50	43	7
Question 6	60	37	3
Question 6(a)	45	29	26
Question 6(b)	17	43	40
Question 6(c)	37	29	34
Question 7	48	34	18
Question 8	52	35	13
Question 8(a)	4	57	39
Question 8(b)	60	23	17
Question 9	28	61	11
Question 10	46	44	10
Question 11	45	33	22
Question 12	8	88	4
Question 13	13	76	11
Question 14	50	36	14
Question 15	37	48	15
Question 15(a)	28	52	20
Question 16	9	64	27
Question 17	34	60	6
Question 18	19	78	3

Question 19:
- (1) National defense
- (2) Balanced budget
- (3) Reduction in spending
- (4) Inflation
- (5) Foreign affairs
- (6) Civil defense
- (7) Labor problems
- (8) Farm problems
- (9) Federal aid to education
- (10) Juvenile delinquency
- (11) Social security
- (12) Veterans' benefits

WABAUNSEE COUNTY

Question 1(a)	48	33	19
Question 1(b)	24	58	18
Question 1(c)	79	13	8
Question 2(a)	43	52	5
Question 2(b)	15	82	3
Question 2(c)	11	86	3
Question 3	23	65	12
Question 4	15	68	17
Question 5	42	47	11
Question 6	56	35	9
Question 6(a)	44	44	12
Question 6(b)	19	64	17
Question 6(c)	57	31	12
Question 7	47	48	5
Question 8	45	42	13
Question 8(a)	13	69	18
Question 8(b)	63	22	15
Question 9	30	52	18
Question 10	47	34	19
Question 11	49	15	36
Question 12	5	94	1
Question 13	9	71	20
Question 14	48	38	14
Question 15	39	52	9
Question 15(a)	22	64	14
Question 16	6	90	4
Question 17	28	61	11
Question 18	22	70	8

Question 19:
- (1) National defense
- (2) Inflation
- (3) Foreign affairs
- (4) Reduction in spending
- (5) Balanced budget
- (6) Juvenile delinquency
- (7) Farm problems
- (8) Labor problems
- (9) Social security
- (10) Federal aid to education
- (11) Civil defense
- (12) Veterans' benefits

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Question 1(a)	36	35	29
Question 1(b)	12	44	44
Question 1(c)	75	9	16
Question 2(a)	41	49	10
Question 2(b)	19	71	10
Question 2(c)	7	83	10
Question 3	24	67	9
Question 4	21	61	18
Question 5	41	47	12
Question 6	40	53	7
Question 6(a)	21	75	4
Question 6(b)	19	34	47
Question 6(c)	44	20	36
Question 7	40	50	10
Question 8	30	50	20
Question 8(a)	5	79	16
Question 8(b)	65	20	15
Question 9	29	41	30

WASHINGTON COUNTY—Continued

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 10	44	45	11
Question 11	56	14	30
Question 12	1	97	2
Question 13	8	84	8
Question 14	37	50	13
Question 15	42	44	14
Question 15(a)	25	54	21
Question 16	14	80	6
Question 17	30	63	7
Question 18	21	64	15

Question 19:
- (1) National defense
- (2) Balanced budget
- (3) Foreign affairs
- (4) Reduction in spending
- (5) Inflation
- (6) Labor problems
- (7) Social security
- (8) Farm problems
- (9) Juvenile delinquency
- (10) Civil defense
- (11) Veterans' benefits
- (12) Federal aid to education

WYANDOTTE COUNTY

Question 1(a)	48	33	19
Question 1(b)	14	51	35
Question 1(c)	66	17	17
Question 2(a)	45	54	1
Question 2(b)	22	71	7
Question 2(c)	12	77	11
Question 3	25	72	2
Question 4	26	65	9
Question 5	50	44	6
Question 6	67	25	8
Question 6(a)	51	25	24
Question 6(b)	18	40	42
Question 6(c)	30	34	36
Question 7	56	35	9
Question 8	45	39	16
Question 8(a)	6	52	43
Question 8(b)	56	23	21
Question 9	30	60	10
Question 10	58	30	12
Question 11	55	23	22
Question 12	14	84	2
Question 13	6	82	12
Question 14	49	36	15
Question 15	42	44	14
Question 15(a)	31	49	20
Question 16	9	73	18
Question 17	39	54	7
Question 18	31	62	7

Question 19:
- (1) National defense
- (2) Foreign affairs
- (3) Balanced budget
- (4) Inflation
- (5) Reduction in spending
- (6) Farm problems
- (7) Juvenile delinquency
- (8) Labor problems
- (9) Civil defense
- (10) Veterans' benefits
- (11) Social security
- (12) Federal aid to education

OUT OF DISTRICT

Question 1(a)	40	31	29
Question 1(b)	12	40	48
Question 1(c)	52	14	34
Question 2(a)	39	53	8
Question 2(b)	12	76	12
Question 2(c)	5	90	5
Question 3	25	53	12
Question 4	17	65	18
Question 5	49	41	10
Question 6	41	41	18
Question 6(a)	26	22	52
Question 6(b)	4	35	61
Question 6(c)	32	16	52
Question 7	58	32	10
Question 8	46	29	25
Question 8(a)	2	40	58
Question 8(b)	57	12	31
Question 9	21	63	16
Question 10	53	29	18
Question 11	61	18	21
Question 12	4	94	2
Question 13	10	55	35
Question 14	58	32	10
Question 15	34	46	20
Question 15(a)	18	53	29
Question 16	10	82	8
Question 17	25	71	4
Question 18	20	70	10

Question 19:
- (1) National defense
- (2) Balanced budget
- (3) Reduction in spending
- (4) Foreign affairs
- (5) Inflation
- (6) Labor problems
- (7) Farm problems
- (8) Social security
- (9) Juvenile delinquency
- (10) Civil defense
- (11) Veterans' benefits
- (12) Federal aid to education

Minshall Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, since 1955, I have had the privilege of representing the 23d District of Ohio in the Congress of the United States. This intellectually outstanding district, with a population of 440,000 people, includes some of the finest residential communities in America. During the time that I have represented this suburban area of Cleveland, every effort has been made to sound out the sentiment of the district and be well informed of the views of the residents. I have also made a continuing effort to keep the people advised of the events in Washington through regular newsletters, other news media, opinion polls, and annual traveling office meetings. This constant interchange of ideas between voter and Representative has helped me keep in close touch with the district and better enabled me to represent my constituents effectively in Congress.

Again this year another opinion poll was mailed to the home of every registered voter, 125,000 homes in all. As in previous polls, the response was excellent. Nearly 20,000 returned the questionnaire and of these approximately 2,500 amplified their views with additional comments, some with detailed letters on the key issues before the Congress. Many were personal notes of appreciation for being asked to participate in this activity. The percentage of returns from Ohio's 23d District is much higher than other areas conducting similar polls. I am pleased with this response for it shows the great interest the residents of this district have in their Government.

I should like to emphasize that I do not use the results of the poll as a blueprint or political weathervane for voting on the many issues, but do derive much benefit from having the excellent comments and thinking of those I represent. This expression of the sentiment of a good cross-section of suburban Cleveland voters will aid me in the process of arriving at decisions on the issues that confront the Congress and the Nation.

In comparing the results with previous polls, it is interesting to note that Federal aid for public school construction shows a large decline in support, for last year 62.8 percent voted yes and this year the vote was 49.9 percent yes and 42.5 percent no. The vote on foreign aid remained about the same as a year ago, with 46.5 percent voting yes against 44.4 percent last year. Opinion on mandatory medical care for the aged under social security remained about the same with an increase of less than 1 percent in favor of it.

Protest at big spending was reflected by the overwhelming number who opposed raising the debt ceiling. There were 64.6 percent who did not want to see the debt limit raised to $308 billion. The new trade and tariff proposal received outstanding support with nearly 73 percent in favor. The military defense of Berlin was given tremendous support with 73 percent voting for the use of combat forces, if necessary.

The results of the poll follow:

Minshall opinion poll

[In percentages]

Do you favor—	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Federal aid to education to provide for—			
(a) Public school construction?	49.9	42.5	7.5
(b) Teachers' salaries?	30.2	59.8	10.0
(c) Aid to private and parochial schools?	17.2	76.5	6.3
(d) Aid to colleges and universities only?	26.9	56.3	16.7
2. A mandatory program of medical care for the aged under social security?	49.8	44.5	5.6
3. Continuation of the foreign aid program?	46.5	41.6	11.6
4. The President's program to lower U.S. tariffs to compete with the European Common Market?	72.8	16.0	11.0
5. Formation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing?	24.6	62.2	13.0
6. Purchase of $100,000,000 of U.N. bonds for financing special U.N. operations?	30.2	48.9	11.8
7. Continuation of the Peace Corps?	56.3	31.3	12.3
8. The Federal fallout shelter program?	17.6	69.4	12.7
9. Granting the President the power to adjust income tax rates?	19.9	69.4	10.2
10. Tighter Federal controls over TV programing?	39.3	49.3	11.4
11. The administration proposal to increase the national debt limit to $308 billion?	19.4	64.6	15.8
12. Entering into a cooperative space program with Russia?	47.0	39.6	13.3
13. The intervention of U.S. combat forces in Vietnam if present measures prove inadequate?	51.2	31.6	17.2
14. The use of U.S. combat forces to defend Berlin?	73.0	18.3	8.7

Eightieth Anniversary of the Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, this year the Knights of Columbus is observing its 80th anniversary and I should like to felicitate the organization on the work it has done since its founding in 1882 in helping to foster such admirable causes as regards the safeguarding of Christian morality, inculcating ideals of American patriotism, promoting the advance of tolerance, concern for the education of youth, and other humanitarian ends.

This 80th anniversary finds the organization with a membership of some million and a quarter men. They make good, responsible neighbors. While my own religious persuasion differs from their beliefs, I am fortunate to have among my friends a number of men belonging to this Catholic fraternal society. In the Utah district I represent, as in every area Knights of Columbus councils have been established, the story is much the same: members have a well-earned reputation for their unselfish willingness to join hands with other highminded fraternal or civic organizations in projects directed toward the benefit of the whole community, regardless of creed, race, or economic status.

The record is not newly compiled. During World War I, as many of our surviving doughboys can recall, the Knights of Columbus rendered yeoman service in looking to the welfare and morale of the troops. Throughout World War II and since, this society has given unflagging support to the work of the USO.

In these days of a peace which is not peace, members of the Knights of Columbus can be counted on for enthusiastic and effective participation in the proper observance of patriotic occasions, and make common cause with veterans' and other patriotic groups in their efforts to nurture the spirit of love of country along with a sense of all it embodies, particularly among the young.

The Knights of Columbus constitute an admirable society in our land, working with dedication in the service of God and country. Over the past many months we have heard many eminent citizens and organizations of long-proven fidelity irresponsibly denounced as being soft on communism. Thus far I have yet to hear of the demagog—and these individuals seem to make a fat living with their rhetoric—who has had the temerity to fling such a smear at the Knights of Columbus.

Massachusetts General Court Passes Resolution Urging the Department of State To Take a Firm Position Against Arab Interference in the Conduct and Business of American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the Massachusetts Legislature urging action to end the discrimination in certain foreign countries against American citizens deserves support. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, has had ample evidence of discrimination by Arab countries against certain American citizens. There was even evidence that an airplane carrying a congressional delegation might not be permitted to land in one Arab country until assurance had been given that no person of a certain minority group would be included in the visiting party. This requirement was subsequently waived.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has taken a strong position against discrimination. The Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act of 1961 provided:

> It is the sense of Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to U.S. citizens generally is repugnant to our principles; and in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this title these principles shall be applied as the President may determine.

These provisions duly enacted by the Congress should be implemented by executive action. Discrimination against American citizens by some countries which receive our foreign aid is inconsistent with such aid. If it results in shutting off a profitable tourist trade because visitors from an adjoining country are not allowed to cross the border to view shrines and monuments of worldwide interest, the country practicing that discrimination is denying itself foreign income which would reduce the need for our aid.

The Massachusetts resolution urging such implementation should be commended and will receive my vigorous support.

National Lottery of New Zealand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of the House about the national lottery of New Zealand. Although New Zealand is a small nation, it is long on financial wisdom, for it has had the sense to recognize the merit in harnessing the gambling urge so as to make it work for the public good. This worthy end has been accomplished, in New Zealand as elsewhere, by a national lottery.

In 1961, the national lottery of New Zealand took in just short of $2 million, which figure represented a 15-percent rise over the previous year.

Needless to say, New Zealand utilizes its lottery revenues for sound purposes, the profit of the Government—which last year amounted to over $800,000—going to help support welfare, charitable, cultural, and youth organizations.

In New Zealand, they have the good sense to realize that even if a lottery is not operated on a large scale, it is in many ways still a great boon to the nation. Not only does the New Zealand lottery aid many worthy causes, but it controls the gambling urges of New Zealanders, which otherwise might turn in directions less favorable to the general welfare.

We in the United States, Mr. Speaker, would do well to look discerningly at the experience of New Zealand and other nations profiting from national lotteries. A national lottery here in America would not only cut away the props of organized crime, but would provide vast new revenues totaling $10 billion a year to our hard-pressed Treasury. Let us grasp this financial wisdom—it is never too late.

Tribute to Hon. Olin Teague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, on occasion it is necessary for Congress to move swiftly to protect the interests of our Nation and the American people.

Today I pay tribute to a great American, the gentleman from Texas, Representative Olin Teague, my colleague on the House Science and Astronautics Committee, for his foresight. And it is with deep pleasure that I join with him in introducing a concurrent resolution to alert the Congress and the American people to the dire effects that can occur from sharing our space secrets with Russia.

Such a proposal has my vigorous opposition, and I call on my colleagues in this House to join with us in expressing the sense of Congress that our Nation should not disclose any information concerning our advances in space technology, until positive action is taken by the Soviet Union. And this positive action must be agreement to a full and complete inspection system as part of any international agreement on disarmament—and the release of information that it now holds secret from its own program of space exploration.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, you cannot separate the peaceful exploration of space from military application, as some are trying to do.

Our Nation today stands ahead of the Russians in a vast system of satellites—such as mapping, weather, geophysical, navigational, and communications.

Our Nation is rapidly closing the gap between us in the race for powerful booster rockets. Our guidance system, in my opinion, is far superior. We have, by far, the most sophisticated electronic systems, developed down to microminiature size. We stand on the threshold of atomic-powered rockets.

History has proven that you cannot cooperate with the Soviet Union, for to them cooperation is a one-way street.

Mr. Speaker, the President, in his state of the Union message, delivered before this Congress, stated:

> Today, this country is ahead in the science and technology of space.

There is no doubt that we are in a race for space, and that we are ahead in many fields. Why then, Mr. Speaker, throw your adversary a towrope to pull him even with you? If Russia plays this game as it has in the past, once it acquires all the knowledge it can from the United States it will again clamp down on information of its own efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the President has called for a cooperative effort in the peaceful exploration of space with the Soviet Union. This resolution would not prohibit such a program. But it would require the Soviet Union to exhibit its good faith prior to the release of any of our secrets. And, in this, I strongly agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Representative Teague.

Send the Reservists Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the administration's decision to release 20,000 Navy and Air Force men by June 30 accentuates the need for immediate release of 145,000 Army, Navy, and Air Force reservists called up last fall.

The callup has been admitted as an error. It has been shot through with inefficiency. The administration should reexamine its callous attitude that "there is injustice in all of life." These men should be returned to their careers now instead of prolonging the injustice until August. Since they are due to be released in August, it is obvious they are not needed for defense, but are being kept in unnecessary service by the capricious conduct of the Kennedy administration.

The callup was an inexcusable foulup from the start. Some 45,000 men who had served their draft hitches were called—some had just gotten out of uniform—to act as fillers in Reserve units that had vacancies. They were not even active reservists, but were required by law to return to military service if needed.

Camps were not ready for the reservists. Three men who could not walk without canes were called, kept in service for 3 months before they were released. A helicopter training center had no helicopter to operate. Equipment was old, scarce, and misdirected to units not needing it, withheld from units supposed to be trained in its use.

Medical officers were overabundant in one camp—Fort Smith, Ark.—yet transfers were refused. Two Morse code operators were called back into duty to repair radios at one camp. Neither could repair radios.

Misassignments were rife. A reservist with 2 years of active duty who was a flight operations specialist was assigned to the position of a washman in a medical unit. A reservist who was an aircraft maintenance crewman was made an ambulance driver. A Reserve officer who was an air defense missile unit commander was assigned as a general duty nurse. An accountant, who was an administrative specialist was made an ammunition storage inspector. A guided-missile propellant-explosive specialist and a carpenter were assigned to positions requiring a single-rotor helicopter mechanic.

A guided-missile installation electrician, with 13 months active duty in that job, was sent to school to become a cook.

The list goes on and on—waste of manpower, should the need for military action have been real incapacity to perform as fighting units—waste for a year in the lives of these men, many of whom had served their country honorably and well in the Armed Forces in past wars or in the regular peacetime forces.

The Kennedy administration made the callup as a grandstand play to divert attention from its failure in the Berlin situation. The administration made the callup with no intention of military activity since most of the reservists were held for weeks in idleness before the military decided what to do with them.

The President delivered his Berlin crisis speech in late July. It was not until adverse public reaction began swelling that the callup was formulated. On August 25 the Pentagon announced the first callup. Many were not called until mid-September.

After the complaints became so widespread that they could no longer be brushed off, the Army sent out a questionnaire to 5,000 recalled men. It had 17 parts and required a Philadelphia lawyer to answer.

First, the reservists were asked if they had completed DA forms 1140. Then they were asked if they knew what the form was.

Then, in ludicrous, unmilitary fashion, they were asked how they learned that their unit had been called. From the unit commander; at a Reserve meeting; radio; television; newspaper; friend or relative?

Then, a loaded question:

> Do you feel there was a need for your unit to be called to active duty at this time?

They were assured that their answers would be kept confidential and not go into their military record.

Many reservists did register a protest. One wrote a letter to Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah. He is now facing court-martial for criticizing President Kennedy in his letter. He wrote the letter, 75 members of his unit signed it.

Another talked to a reporter. He is doing 6 months at hard labor for daring to criticize this "Keystone Cops" boondoggle.

Then John Bailey, hoof-in-mouth Democratic national chairman, charged that anyone criticizing the callup was "playing the Communist game for them." This attempt to silence by smear was liberally blasted in the press as discomfited Pentagon officials began to realize the magnitude of their errors. His blast at me was termed by the Akron Beacon Journal: "almost too silly to take note of."

On November 21, Maj. Gen. Michael J. Galvin, commander of the 94th Infantry Reserve Division told the Massachusetts Legislature:

> The Government should not call up Ready Reserve again to support diplomatic offensives in a cold war that may last a generation.

President Eisenhower had earlier warned against "responding to each new feint of the Communists in panic."

General Galvin said that Khrushchev had made the administration look like it was crying wolf by simply ending the Berlin crisis as quickly as he had created it.

The Reserve callup came as draft quotas were being cut. Married men with children were serving in misassigned roles as 19-year-olds eligible to be drafted were not called.

In all, the Reserve mess indicated that Defense Secretary McNamara erred when early in 1961 he resisted efforts by Congress and the military to bring Reserves to top strength. It proved America was not ready should the need for hard-hitting units have been actual. It proved the Democratic Party's high command was willing to resort to a Communist smear campaign to support blindly an action that sensible Americans realized was a phony from the start.

It proved that the Kennedy administration was incapable of measuring the Russians and East Germans in terms of intention or capability. It proved that the panic button is on a desk at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

It was, and its prolongation by a willful administration today, is, a sorry chapter in the annuals of America's military history—a history brimming with brave deeds and sacrifices by brave men—a history that deserves better than to be sullied by the deplorable Reserve mess we have witnessed.

In simple justice to men who came when called, for what purpose they may never find out, this travesty should end and these men should be restored to civilian life.

Congress should demand the full story, then take measures to see that this type of fiasco, which could be mortal to our Nation's welfare in the event of a real shooting war crisis, cannot be repeated.

Securities and Exchange Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, the Investment Company Act is a comprehensive regulatory scheme and not merely a disclosure act. The Securities Exchange Commission is the regulatory agency of Government under the act.

For the last several years, there has come about a slew of vexatious lawsuits alleging gross misconduct or gross abuse of trust on a theory of implied liability under section 36 of the act. An undue advantage has been taken by reason of the unsettled condition of the law and, in my opinion, this is a studied weakness that could be cured by regulation without any harm to the exercise of bona fide rights.

When the present administration first came to power, there was an immediate move to reorganize all of the independent agencies. One of the most important of all of the independent offices and agencies is the Securities and Exchange Commission which was established by Congress to regulate the securities industry. One of the laws which it administers is the Investment Company Act of 1940 which provides a regulatory scheme authorized by Congress for the protection of shareholders in investment companies, more popularly known as mutual funds. That law was based on an original bill recommended by the SEC in 1940 and was drafted on the basis of a 5-year study of investment companies. Congressional hearings occupied 21 days during a period of 3 months, and the final bill was drafted after 5 weeks of intensive work by the SEC and lawyers representing the investment company industry—hearings on S. 3580 and H.R. 10065, 76th Congress, 3d session, 1940.

For over 20 years after its enactment in 1940, the Investment Company Act has been considered one of the most effective of all the securities laws. During those 20 years the courts were often faced with cases involving provisions of the other Federal securities laws, but mutual funds coming under the 1940 act were rarely involved in court actions.

During these 20 years mutual funds have become a major financial institution. Mutual fund growth has been spectacular and the net asset value of mutual funds has grown from less than one-half billion dollars in 1940 to over $20 billion today. There are now more than 250 individual funds with more than 5 million shareholders, most of whom are small investors in the middle and lower middle income groups who now have a stake in the free enterprise system and own a share in American industry.

Nothing is more important to the wellbeing of our national economy and to the strength of the free enterprise system than the encouragement and protection of small shareholders, so that all Americans can safely and effectively participate in the ownership of the companies which provide employment opportunities and profits from which Federal tax revenues are drawn.

I am greatly disturbed by a recent publication in the Columbia Law Review entitled "Mutual Fund Litigation—New Frontiers for the Investment Company Act." This article by implication seems to consider that mutual funds are paying excessive advisory fees to the management organizations whose counsel and advice have resulted in the extraordinary growth and profits experienced by mutual funds. The value of professional and management advice, like the advice of doctors and lawyers, is worth about what one pays for it. Over 80 percent of the mutual funds have followed an industry pattern of paying one-half of 1 percent of net asset value for management advice, with the contracts approved by the directors or stockholders annually. Management depends on personal qualities of experience, knowledge, training, and judgment. It cannot be purchased like physical property on a low-bid basis.

The law imposes high fiduciary standards on fund managers. Under section 36 of the act the SEC must enjoin as gross misconduct or gross abuse of trust any doubtful management arrangement, including excess management fees. It is a little difficult to follow the philosophy expressed by the authors of "Mutual Fund Litigation—New Frontiers for the Investment Company Act," since the SEC has tacitly approved the one-half of 1 percent fee for 20 years. Of most particular concern to me is the fact there are some 50 lawsuits pending against various mutual funds alleging that the standard one-half of 1 percent is excessive, and as such constitutes a gross abuse of trust, despite prior approval by the SEC. Some of these lawsuits were instigated by former SEC personnel immediately upon their resignation from the Commission.

These lawsuits are an extremely serious matter for the millions of shareholders in mutual funds for two reasons. First, they shake the public confidence in mutual funds as a vehicle for small investors to pool the risk of security investment. Second, they subject the mutual funds to extremely expensive litigation, interference with management and day-to-day operations, and all of the other side effects which attend complicated lawsuits. There should be no private right of litigation until after application has been made to the SEC to act under section 36 of the act.

Section 36 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 is now as follows:

> SEC. 36. The Commission is authorized to bring an action in the proper district court of the United States or United States court of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, alleging that a person serving or acting in one or more of the following capacities has been guilty after the enactment of this title and within five years of the commencement of the action, of gross misconduct or gross abuse of trust in respect of any registered investment company for which such person so serves or acts: (1) as officer, director, member of an advisory board, investment adviser, or depositor; or (2) as principal underwriter, if such registered company is an open-end company, unit, investment trust, or face-amount certificate company. If the Commission's allegations of such gross misconduct or gross abuse of trust are established, the court shall enjoin such person from acting in such capacity or capacities either permanently or for such period of time as it in its discretion shall deem appropriate.

I propose the following amendment:

> *Provided*, That no court of the United States or United States court of any place or territory subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall entertain any private cause of action based on liability implied under this section unless and until the Commission has exercised jurisdiction under said section, and successfully obtained an injunction whether or not upon application of an interested party.

Therefore, I have introduced a bill which will limit the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States from entertaining any private cause of action based on implied liability under this section until the Commission has exercised its jurisdiction upon its own application or that of an interested party.

Opinions of Leaders in Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us want to know what our people back home are thinking. In February of this year I sent an opinion poll to the homes of all registered voters in my district, and later gave you a report of the results. Recently, I took a special poll of industrial leaders in the Greater Cleveland area. I asked if they favored the proposed legislation to reduce tariffs through reciprocal trade agreements with the European Common Market and other free countries of the world.

Questionnaires were sent to the top officials of approximately 500 industrial firms in the Cleveland area who employ over 100 employees each. Replies were received from 262 industries, 144 of which are engaged in export business, whereas 118 reporting firms had no direct foreign trade.

Of the 144 industries engaging in export trade, the percentage of such export business to total business ranged from a fraction of 1 percent to 50 percent—with the average industry export sales being 7½ percent.

Sixty industries indicated that if U.S. tariffs were reduced or abolished on foreign competitive products they would require some type of protection by the U.S. Tariff Commission or assistance by the Federal Government to prevent a serious loss of business, and a resultant reduction in employment. Eighty-nine industries were unable to predict at this time whether such trade protection or Federal adjustment assistance would be required, while 113 industries indicated they would need no protection or assistance in competing with foreign imports.

There has been a decided split of opinion in the business community as to the wisdom of entering into reciprocal tariff agreements with other countries whereby certain tariffs can be abolished and others reduced up to 50 percent of their present rates. Many industries have very definite opinions on the proposed tariff legislation, while others are undertaking a thorough study of its effects on their products and have not as yet reached a decision whether to support or oppose this legislation. This situation is clearly reflected in the results received on the question: "In general, do you favor enactment of the proposed trade legislation?" A favorable vote was received from 98 industrial leaders, a negative vote from 75, while 89 industry officials stated that they were undecided.

It is interesting to compare the results of this industry poll with the percentage results received on a similar trade-tariff question asked on my February 1962 opinion poll sent to the homes of all registered voters in the 22d Congressional District.

	For	Against	Undecided
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Industry poll	37.4	28.6	34.0
1962 voter opinion poll	68.0	15.0	17.0

These results seem to indicate that the men who run our industries have far greater reservations about the beneficial effects of reduced tariffs and a freer flow of trade among the non-Communist countries of the world than does the average citizen.

Fallout Protection: What To Know and Do About Nuclear Attack—Preparation for Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the people of Oklahoma have a vital interest in learning the facts about the effects of a nuclear attack and what might be done to prepare for such an attack. The location of the military bases, such as Altus and Clinton-Sherman Air Force Bases, Fort Sill, and the Atlas missile sites within the State makes it imperative that all the people of Oklahoma alert themselves to the dangers of attack and the precautions which can be taken now to lessen the effects of potential disaster. It is obvious that those military installations would be targets for attack in the event of the outbreak of war. While the entire policy of our Government is directed toward the peaceful course of events, it is wise to prepare now for the possibility of nuclear attack.

I have received many requests from interested citizens for information to protect themselves and their families in the event of nuclear attack. I want to bring to their attention and for their use the Department of Defense booklet titled "Fallout Protection: What To Know and Do About Nuclear Attack." In this booklet the dangers of a thermonuclear attack and the national defense program are described. The basic vocabulary of nuclear blast and its aftermath is defined, and the effects of such a blast are discussed. Programs of shelter building which might be undertaken by communities or individuals are outlined; shelter supplies are listed in detail. I strongly believe that the maximum number of citizens must be given this information.

Danger from nuclear attack is not limited to target areas. The blast of the explosion is followed by a huge and violent wind which carries upward a tremendous amount of earth vaporized or contaminated with radioactivity. When this material reaches the cold upper air, it condenses and falls back to earth. Fallout is dangerous far beyond the target zone and is a hazard wherever the winds may blow it.

Since fallout constitutes the chief hazard of nuclear attack in rural areas, the booklet will be of special interest to the Oklahoma farmer in two ways. First, the booklet contains general instructions on building a family fallout shelter which is the only practical solution to the fallout problem in sparsely settled areas. The last page of the booklet gives a list of references for those interested in the details of family shelter building.

Secondly, the problems of prefallout preparations for the protection of livestock and produce are discussed at some length along with post fallout cleanup. There are many precautions which may be taken to guard against fallout and remedy the after effects. A general rule is to place as much livestock, produce, and equipment under cover as possible. That which is exposed to fallout should be washed or brushed off. Animals which have been exposed to fallout can be slaughtered; muscle meat but not internal organs may be eaten. Chickens raised under cover and eggs could continue to be important sources of food supply. Potatoes, corn, and other field crops would be safe after threshing; washing the grain would reduce the danger of radioactivity even further. Seeds are resistant to radiation and would not need special protection.

County agents could be of great assistance in helping the farmer decide which crops, pasturage, and decontamination methods will be best to use. I hope that appropriate steps will be taken by the Department of Agriculture to assist the farmer in his efforts to protect himself, his family, his crops, and his livestock from the evil effects of fallout.

In conclusion I urge that citizens become aware of the sensible measures which can be undertaken for their protection and which are fully explained in the literature on civil defense. Time spent in preparations now could make the difference in lives later.

Dedication of National Guard Armory, Chesterfield, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, we are much concerned with the plight of the National Guard and the cutback which we think will weaken the defense of our country.

In this connection I wish to include under leave given to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, a speech given by my colleague, the Honorable ROBERT W. HEMPHILL at the dedication services of the National Guard Armory, Chesterfield, S.C., on April 15, 1962:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, OF THE FIFTH SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT, AT THE DEDICATION SERVICES OF THE NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY, CHESTERFIELD, S.C., APRIL 15, 1962

Mr. Chairman, General Pinckney, ladies, and gentlemen, all of us should be happy to be here today and grateful for the privilege of participating in this celebration, characteristic of our freedom, symbol of our strength. I am sure we are mindful as we stand here of the heritage we possess, and recollect with understandable pride the exemplary service always given by guardsmen, reflected in the pages of our history, saluted as the lifelines of our freedom. We are reminded, too, of many instances of noble sacrifice, or noble services, but I would channel your thoughts momentarily to another April in 1775, when Paul Revere, one of the first guardsmen, made his immortal ride. His alertness on that 19th day of another April was the kind of alertness that we know and love in our National Guard today.

In a world that yesterday and today faces determined, continuous and deadly communistic aggression, and may face tomorrow the ravages of an atomic war, we accept all too casually the strength of our guard. Rest assured that the enemies of our freedom know the strength, the disposition, the state of alertness of every unit, and I am happy in the fact that our state of alertness is such that the National Guard is a major deterrent force today. I would not take from the Strategic Air Command any of the glory it deserves, but I would not, for one moment, minimize the necessity of an active, alert, National Guard. To the officers and men gathered here, I express not only my personal gratitude but the gratitude of a great nation, proud of this great reserve force.

We are now faced with the potentials, the probabilities, good or bad, which may flow from the "realinement" policy of our Defense Department. Although the threat of communism, the mobilizations of the nation of Satan, have not diminished in any degree, we find that eight divisions of our reserve forces may be eliminated, and drastic changes and reductions are proposed.

This is no new thing. We in the Congress have long had on our current and continuing agenda the fight to preserve the National Guard, its numbers as well as its strength. We in the Congress know the necessity of the preservation of this great and ready force. We have long wondered whether the malicious attacks on the National Guard, the constant threat of reduction and dissipation, are products of those in our own Nation who are jealous of the stature of these troops, or whether some enemy from without has so infiltrated our system as to be able to persuade our policymakers to do away with the Army National Guard.

To reduce the National Guard strength by 10 percent will weaken our defenses, hurt our morale, accelerate the evolution which some desire: the disposition of the National Guard. If we do not have a strong National Guard, we cannot have a strong Army. With the exception of the Strategic Army Corps, the National Guard composes the only combat-ready Army strength of any importance in the U.S. Army today. I know this is a bold statement, but I challenge those of authority to deny it. I make these statements because of the seriousness of the question before us, the seriousness of our desire, the necessity of realistic approach to the plans and problems of realinement.

Under the announced plan, South Carolina will lose its association as part of the Rattlesnake, a division known, admired, and feared. To be sure, we will be assigned other groups, but those of us who have had any experience at all with the military know that in the regrouping will come the necessity of retraining, reduction of combat effectiveness, of the 5,000 or more units of the guard, its potential weakened or lessened. These and other problems and considerations we have facing us as we stand here today to dedicate this building, to do honor to these privileged men, to recognize their place and importance on the front lines of freedom. We think of our great State, conscious of the importance of these 5 acres, happy in the contribution of $38,127 toward the acquisition and construction. To be sure the Federal Government contributed almost $100,000 ($99,918) but this property is owned by the State of South Carolina and you who are gathered here today should be proud of the deed and the title.

We come to dedicate this new edifice as a monument for peace, a symbol of our desire for freedom, a place of refuge and help and preservation of the lives and property of local citizens. We dedicate it to the minutemen of yesterday, the patriots of the Revolution, the Confederates at Shiloh, the heroes at San Juan, and the silent voices from Chateau Thierry. We do not want war ever again, but we do not fear war, we do not fear death. Thanks to a strong National Guard we do not fear or expect defeat. We therefore dedicate also to victory, over tyranny, for freedom, to peace.

Independent Retailing Must Be Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, in my State of New Jersey, there are a good many people who would join me here today in expressing support of Senate Joint Resolution 159. These people have had some grueling experience with marketplace conditions with which this bill deals.

You will recall that perhaps the worst gasoline price war in our modern history took place in my State. The time was just a few years ago. Month after month, for more than a year, gasoline was being sold at subbankruptcy prices. There was an outcry from the independent gasoline station owners who saw their livelihood, their savings, and their businesses rapidly disappearing. One might say motorists had a field day. They did. They got gasoline cheaper by far than the dealer could buy it from the refiner, cheaper perhaps than the refiner could produce it.

The constructive good offices of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business were brought into play to stop the gasoline price war, and in the nick of time, too. I shudder to think what might have happened to the independent gasoline dealers, to gasoline distribution, in

New Jersey, if the price war had not stopped when it did. The independent gasoline dealer would surely have disappeared. Would we have wound up with gasoline distribution in the hands of two or three great distributors and thus exposed ourselves to monopoly pricing—that most dangerous threat to the welfare of the consumer?

Unfortunately, it is not only the gasoline dealer who has suffered from a kind of selective, monopoly-producing price cutting known as customer-bait pricing. Independent retailers in all fields are being relentlessly liquidated.

What is happening to independent retailing will, I am sure, be brought out in the hearings before the Senate committee. I have had called to my attention a few statistics which tend to show what is happening and what may likely happen to independent retailers.

A comparison of independent and chain drugstores shows that in 1955 the independents accounted for 81 percent of drugstore sales volume; in 1961, they accounted for only 76 percent. This is not good for independent druggists. It can get worse, however, if the experience of independent grocers is any guide. In 1955, the independent grocers accounted for 60 percent of total grocery store sales; in 1961, they accounted for only 53 percent. And even this figure does not quite tell the full story because a substantial portion of this 53 percent was accounted for by giant independent supermarkets.

Concededly, there are any number of reasons for the decline of independent retailing. But I think the inability of the small storekeeper to sell—at a fair profit—the famous brand name products which are his bread and butter, must come at, or near, the top of these reasons.

Senate Joint Resolution 159 will not cure customer-bait pricing entirely, but its enactment will help to curb it.

In urging approval of this legislation, may I say that the bill reflects free enterprise at its enlightened best. It enables manufacturers, if they wish, to guard the reputation of their trademarks, brand and trade names. In so doing, the bill, if enacted, would restore fair competitive pricing in the marketplace. Senate Joint Resolution 159 would cost neither the Government nor consumers a single penny.

Must Accelerate Determination Under the Antidumping Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to take this opportunity to present my statement given to the House Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 10081, the amendment to the Antidumping Act of 1921, for the information of the Members of Congress:

Statement of Hon. John H. Dent, a Representative in Congress From the State of Pennsylvania

I appreciate your courtesy in extending to me the privilege of expressing my views on the bill I have introduced, H.R. 10081.

The purpose of my proposed amendment to the Antidumping Act of 1921 is to insure reasonable speed in its administration. These remarks are intended to set forth the need for this bill and to explain its provisions. It is my sincere hope that the proposed amendment can be approved promptly by the Ways and Means Committee and enacted, if time permits, at this session of the Congress.

Before proceeding further, I should like to stress the nonpartisan nature of H.R. 10081. It is noteworthy that since the introduction of the original bill earlier this session by our esteemed colleague, Representative Francis E. Walter, a number of Democratic and Republican Members of the House of Representatives have introduced bills identical to mine, all of which vary in only a minor technical way from H.R. 10021 introduced by Mr. Walter. The Representatives and the number of the bill each has introduced, excluding those of Mr. Walter and myself, are as follows: Representative Carleton J. King, Republican, of New York, H.R. 10057; Representative J. Ernest Wharton, Republican, of New York, H.R. 10076; Representative Dominick V. Daniels, Democrat, of New Jersey, H.R. 10118; Representative Stanley R. Tupper, Republican, of Maine, H.R. 10479; Representative Willard S. Curtin, Republican, of Pennsylvania, H.R. 10534, and Representative Philip J. Philbin, Democrat, of Massachusetts, H.R. 10626.

In addition, I should like to call your attention to views expressed recently by one of the members of your committee, Representative Thomas B. Curtis. His excellent statement on this subject in the Congressional Record of April 3 is attached herewith. Indeed, the measure merits broad and nonpartisan support which I hope it will receive both from the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress:

"JUSTICE DENIED

"Extension of remarks of Hon. Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, April 3, 1962

"Mr. Curtis of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there is an old expression in the legal profession that 'justice delayed is justice denied.' There is very much truth in this, as indeed there seems to be in many common expressions if analyzed. The administrative processes of our Federal Government often give a justice that is long delayed.

"One of the examples of this administrative delay is in the handling of actions under the Antidumping Act of 1921. The provisions of this act are to come into play when it is found that imported goods are being sold in the United States at prices below those at which they are sold abroad—when foreign products are being dumped on the American market. The remedy under this act to such dumping, and the resultant injury to American domestic industry, is the imposition of a differential duty, a special tariff merely to cover the differential in prices and eliminate the dumping aspect of the sales in this country. This is not protectionism in the classical sense of this word, but rather a shield against unfair competitive practices on an international scale.

"The situations calling for the application of this act are fairly clear; the procedures for invoking its protection are, on the surface, relatively easy. Two steps are taken as preliminary factfinding in the administration of this act. First, the Treasury Department must find the existence of price differentials; then, this matter is reported to the Tariff Commission to determine if there is any injury to American industry. If there is an affirmative finding as to both the existence of suspected dumping and of injury, it is returned to the Treasury Department for the assessment of the differential duty.

"The Tariff Commission is required to act in its function under the bill in 3 months. No time limits are placed on the Treasury, either in its factfinding role or in the suspension of regular tariffs, awaiting the determination of the possible special dumping duties, or in the assessment of them. As a result of there being no limits set for the time within which the Treasury Department may act, there has been great delay in the determination of these cases, the delay which denies justice. The delay affects both the domestic industry and the exporters, injecting confusion and uncertainty into the international trade field to the detriment of international commerce.

"Legislation has been introduced by various members of this body to correct this situation by providing time limitations on the functions of the Treasury Department in such cases. I would certainly commend this proposal to the attention of the Congress."

As you know, under the Antidumping Act, sales in the United States of an imported product at a price below the price at which that product is sold abroad result in the imposition of a special dumping duty if the sales involved injure an industry in the United States. This special dumping duty is limited to the amount of the price differential and serves no purpose other than to insure that the product is not sold in the United States below its foreign price. If that price is lower than the price at which competitive American-made goods are sold, that is of no concern under the act. The Antidumping Act, therefore, protects against nothing other than injurious price cutting and is not involved in the question of protectionism versus free trade.

As indicated, two steps are involved in a dumping investigation: price differentials must be established, and resulting injury to an American industry must be proved. Under the act the function of investigating price differentials is the responsibility of the Treasury. If Treasury finds dumping prices, it refers the case to the Tariff Commission, which then has the responsibility of determining within 3 months whether resulting injury has or is likely to occur. H.R. 10081 is directed to the first step, namely Treasury investigations to ascertain whether price differentials exist.

In contrast to the Tariff Commission, which Congress has decreed shall conclude injury investigations within 3 months, the Treasury has had no time limit imposed upon it in connection with price investigations. A careful review of the time taken by Treasury to conclude such investigations in recent years will show that Treasury decisions have taken far too long, have as a result exposed importers and domestic producers to unjustifiably large financial contingencies and should now be subjected to a statutory time limit.

The need for reasonably prompt Treasury processing of dumping investigations is clear. Dumping, of course, is a very serious matter. Imposition of dumping duties is designed to affect pricing of foreign products in the United States and those intending to sell such products here are entitled to know what their prices will have to be. From the domestic side, competitive industries should be entitled to prompt protection from injurious dumping.

Clearly, this view does not represent a partisan position. The fact that a number of Members of the House of Representatives from both political parties are supporting the proposed amendment to the Antidumping Act is one indication. Another is the fact that the Treasury Department itself, in testimony delivered in 1957 by then Assistant Secretary David W. Kendall before the Committee on Ways and Means at hearings on H.R. 6006, 6007 and 5120 stated:

"If there is dumping going on, it is only fair that we get at it as swiftly as possible and come to a final determination as swiftly as possible, both for the protection of the domestic fellow and for the protection of the importer whose funds are tied up, and who does not know the full answer until a final solution has been made."

The need for reasonable speed is emphasized by another feature of the Antidumping Act. If, in the course of its investigation, Treasury concludes as a preliminary matter that there is reason to believe or suspect that dumping is going on, it is authorized to order the withholding of final duty assessments on the product involved. Such a preliminary decision has the effect of insuring that if special dumping duties are ultimately assessed, they will be assessed on such imports caught by the withholding order. This means that such imports entering the United States during the course of Treasury's investigation and with respect to which the importer is making contracts, may themselves become the subject of special dumping duties, thereby completely disrupting an importer's cost calculations. If the importer wishes to continue to sell the products involved, he must post a bond to cover the potential special dumping duty. The disrupting effect of these withholding orders has been repeatedly recognized in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee by both importers and domestic producers, as well as Treasury itself. It is to the interest of all concerned that the period of uncertainty created by these orders be as short as possible.

In the face of the admitted need for reasonable speed, Treasury's record in recent years is thoroughly disappointing. A study completed in January of this year and based on information available from the Federal Register disclosed that in 39 dumping investigations terminated by Treasury since August 1958, in which withholding orders were issued after that date, an average of 8 months elapsed during which such withholding orders were in effect. There is no way of ascertaining from public information how much time elapsed from the dates of complaint to final decisions in these cases. In 9 investigations uncompleted by January and in which withholding orders were issued after August 1958, such orders were in effect an average of 13 months.

An even more detailed study involving 13 cement dumping complaints brought on behalf of Pennsylvania and other northeast cement producers discloses the practical consequences of Treasury's delays, both for the importers involved and for the relevant domestic industry. Of the nine such cement dumping investigations thus far completed by Treasury, the fastest processing involved 7 months from the date of complaint to the date of final determination; the slowest took 25 months; the average for all 9 cases was 15 months. Of the four such remaining investigations still undecided, one has been pending 2 years and 8 months. The complainants and the importers have thus far had to wait an average of over 14 months without final Treasury action on any of these 4 cases.

In virtually every one of the 13 cases Treasury issued the withholding order mentioned above, with the result that over 1,700,000 barrels of cement were caught by such orders—an enormous contingent liability which, this study indicates, would have been materially reduced had Treasury—like the Tariff Commission—been required to render final determinations within a reasonable period of time.

Viewed from the standpoint of the domestic industry, during the time from the filing of the respective complaints to final Treasury determinations, or through December in the case of three investigations not yet terminated, a total of over 2 million barrels of cement has been entered at northeastern coast ports and sold in competition with domestically produced cement. All this barrelage had either been determined to have been sold at dumping prices, or in the case of unfinished investigations, Treasury has found reason to relieve or suspect sale of this cement at such prices. This study also confirms that if Treasury had been required to act within a reasonable time, this figure would have been materially reduced, thus sparing the domestic industry, to some extent at least, from unfair price competition.

The time consumed in Treasury processing of dumping investigations has been brought to the attention of Congress before. The problem was raised at the House Ways and Means Committee hearings on H.R. 9476, the Customs Simplification Act of 1954, by which Congress transferred responsibility for injury determinations from Treasury to the Tariff Commission. Data submitted by Treasury to the Ways and Means Committee at that time did not disclose the time consumed by Treasury in reaching its final determinations under the act prior to 1954. Those data, however, did include 16 dumping cases that had not been completed at the time. Of those, two had been pending for more than 4 years, two for approximately 2 years, two for 16 months, and four for about 6 months.

Treasury's stated excuse at that time was that it had proved difficult to assemble information as to past injury. Nonetheless, Congress provided that the injury determining function which it transferred to the Tariff Commission had to be completed within 3 months of the date a dumping case was referred to the Commission by Treasury with a determination of dumping prices. At that time the Senate Finance Committee, in Senate Report No. 2326, concluded that thereafter in conducting the pricing investigation that was left in its hands, the Treasury "should ordinarily make its determination within a period of 90 days and believes that it will conform to such a time limitation to the full extent practicable."

As summarized above, Treasury's record since the 1954 amendment demonstrates that the expectations of Congress have not been fulfilled. Accordingly, it was concluded that only appropriate amendment of the Antidumping Act will insure the prompt processing of dumping investigations by Treasury, and that is the principal purpose of H.R. 10081. Congress has imposed time limits on injury investigations in dumping cases; it should do the same for the pricing investigations.

Rather than the 90-day period envisaged by the Senate Committee, H.R. 10081 would require Treasury decisions within a period of 4 months from the date a dumping complaint is filed. It is believed this is a reasonable time limitation, especially in view of the 3-month limit now imposed on the Tariff Commission.

As stated previously, the principal purpose of my bill is to insure reasonably speedy Treasury action in cases arising under the Antidumping Act. In reviewing the recent administration of that measure, however, another matter has come to light which involves an old problem for the Congress; namely, the preservation of fair competition from unwarranted price discriminations masquerading as so-called quantity discounts.

The Antidumping Act, of course, is a measure comparable to the Robinson-Patman Act. Both acts are directed against price discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act being primarily concerned with interstate commerce and the Antidumping Act being concerned with our foreign commerce. Under the Robinson-Patman Act a domestic producer is allowed to charge a lower price to a customer buying in relatively large quantities only if he can show that such larger quantities result in cost savings to him that are being passed along to his customer. It is believed that foreign producers selling in the United States in competition with American producers who face the burden of cost justifying quantity discounts, should in fairness also be subject to the same burden. As presently administered by Treasury, foreign producers escape that burden. H.R. 10081 would insure equal treatment of both foreign and domestic producers.

It is a fairly common occurrence that goods are sold to the United States in quantities that are considerably greater than the quantities in which those goods are sold abroad. It may well be that production and sales of such larger quantities result in significant savings in manufacturing, selling, or other costs. Under such circumstances the Antidumping Act realistically allows such cost savings to be passed along to customers in the United States—and does not condemn the resulting lower prices to the United States as dumping prices. Instead, section 202(b)(1) authorizes Treasury to make "due allowance" for price differences resulting from differing quantities in which goods are sold.

This "due allowance" is comparable to the act's provision for due allowances for other differences in circumstances of sale and for the fact that sales abroad and in the United States of similar but not identical merchandise are being compared. It is perfectly clear, however, that in these two cases the "due allowance" is limited to an amount justified from cost information.

Thus, the Ways and Means Committee Report No. 1261 recommending enactment of the 1958 amendments to the act authorizing "due allowance" for "other differences in circumstances of sale" explicitly states that "examples would be differences in terms of sale, credit terms, and advertising and selling costs." Similarly, that report in connection with the 1958 amendment authorizing "due allowance" for the fact that similar but not identical merchandise was under consideration, gave as an example the comparison of long-handled shovels sold to the United States and otherwise identical but short-handled shovels sold abroad and stated that the price comparison would then be made after "allowance for the fact that the long handles cost more than the short handles." Identical statements respecting both kinds of "due allowance" appear in the 1958 Senate Finance Committee Report No. 1619.

H.R. 10081 is designed to insure that, as in the case of comparing similar but not identical merchandise and "other differences in circumstances of sale," any "due allowance" for sales of relatively larger quantities to the United States is justified in terms of cost savings. For this purpose H.R. 10081 borrows verbatim the relevant language of the Robinson-Patman Act and would limit due allowances for differing quantities of sale to "differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery" resulting from the difference in quantities. By this amendment there would be imposed on foreign producers the same burden to cost justify quantity discounts as is now imposed on their competitors in the United States, the domestic producers, by the Robinson-Patman Act.

In conclusion, I urge the Ways and Means Committee to give endorsement to the provisions of and the need for H.R. 10081. This nonpartisan bill amending the Antidumping Act of 1921 is clearly in the public interest. In fairness and equity, it deserves wholehearted support and enactment at the earliest possible moment.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Dr. Ludvik Nemec, chaplain of Braddock General Hospital, Braddock, Pa., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Eternal Father, as we pause at this moment to invoke Thy blessing upon this august Senate of the United States of America which is graciously extending its wise and powerful hand to relieve the slavery of nations behind the Iron Curtain, grant it the light to recognize the means, and the grace to use the opportunity, to overcome the evil of atheistic communism, that seeks to destroy the dignity and rights of men and the nations they have formed in the mold of Christian principles.

Thou who, in Thy providence, didst enlighten the minds of the Founding Fathers of the United States to write into their Constitution the freedoms which the enslaved nations seek to regain, impart to the legislators of this great Nation a sympathy and an understanding of the problems which beset their brothers abroad. In their present position as leaders in the free world, let them not lose their sense of dedication to the cause of justice and right. Let them recall that the tragedy by which Czechoslovakia was forced under the heel of communism is not an isolated incident. May they recognize the fact that that pattern of perfidy has spread ever nearer to the shores of this great American Nation. Let them view with horror the martyrdom, the imprisonment, and the exile of the civil and spiritual leaders of their enslaved brothers in Czechoslovakia: the denial and the thwarting of divine worship, the closing of private schools, the suppression of the free press, curtailment of the free pursuit of the arts and sciences, the imposition of false teaching and the insidious deception of their youth. May these legislators do all in their power to relieve the suffering that follows stark fear, hunger, the displacement, and the massacre of thousands of innocent people. May they recognize their opportunity to resist this, the most violent barbarism in history. Make known to all the free world the inspirational leadership of those silenced at home, as well as those in exile. Bless the deliberations of the scholars presently engaged in the first Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences in America, so that their work may reflect truth as a liberating and prevailing principle. Grant that truth will prevail and justice shall not perish.

From Thee, O benign dispenser of all good, the great and small nations await the bestowal of Thy blessing, so that they may enjoy freedom with the dignity of men, in love, in peace, and in justice, and that having shared in today's passion, they may know the fulfillment of tomorrow's resurrection in the pursuit of happiness under God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 17, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 16, 1962, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 193. An act for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd;

S. 270. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic;

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito;

S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska;

S. 1578. An act for the relief of Edward Yin Liang;

S. 1638. An act for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza;

S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla;

S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani; and

S. 2101. An act for the relief of Aida Mary Sorino Boccalery.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1404. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina;

H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of William Falby;

H.R. 2103. An act for the relief of Antonio C. Ysrael;

H.R. 2187. An act for the relief of Augustin Ramirez-Trejo;

H.R. 2198. An act for the relief of Carlos Sepulveda Abarca;

H.R. 2672. An act for the relief of Sonia Maria Smith;

H.R. 3595. An act for the relief of Anna Isernia Alloca;

H.R. 3633. An act for the relief of Angeline Rainone;

H.R. 3714. An act for the relief of Janina Maciejewska;

H.R. 4655. An act for the relief of Adele Anis Mansour;

H.R. 5061. An act for the relief of James L. Merrill;

H.R. 5916. An act for the relief of Miss Susanna Moscato (Reverend Mother Charitas);

H.R. 6021. An act for the relief of Lt. Don Walsh and Lt. Lawrence A. Shumaker;

H.R. 6330. An act for the relief of Vincent Edward Hughes, his wife, Carmel Philomena Hughes, and their alien children;

H.R. 6386. An act for the relief of Cleo A. Dekat;

H.R. 7332. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll;

H.R. 7617. An act for the relief of John W. Schleiger;

H.R. 8134. An act to authorize the sale of the mineral estate in certain lands;

H.R. 8321. An act for the relief of Maj. Clara May Matthews;

H.R. 8631. An act for the relief of David B. Kilgore and Jimmie D. Rushing;

H.R. 8946. An act for the relief of Mary R. Galotta;

H.R. 9466. An act for the relief of Sfc. Jesse O. Smith;

H.R. 9669. An act for the relief of Molly Kwauk;

H.R. 9782. An act for the relief of Col. A. A. Watson;

H.R. 10026. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick and Peter D. Power;

H.R. 10314. An act for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.;

H.R. 10440. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 11032. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion;

H.R. 11033. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary.

H.R. 11034. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296 relating to the badge of the American Legion;

H.R. 11289. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 677. Joint resolution relating to the admission of certain adopted children.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 438. Concurrent resolution to provide for a joint committee of the Congress to represent the Congress at ceremonies celebrating the 375th anniversary of the landing of the Lost Colony and the birth of Virginia Dare; and

H. Con. Res. 465. Concurrent resolution that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 19, 1962, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, April 30, 1962.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 205. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for education purposes;

S. 505. An act for the relief of Seymour Robertson;

S. 508. An act for the relief of John E. Beaman and Adelaide K. Beaman;

S. 704. An act for the relief of Marlys E. Tedin and Elizabeth O. Reynolds;

S. 1057. An act to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution;

S. 2151. An act for the relief of Harvey Burstein;

S. 2319. An act for the relief of Harry E. Ellison, captain, U.S. Army, retired;

S. 2549. An act for the relief of Edward L. Wertheim;

H.R. 11027. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 449. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1404. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina;

H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of William Falby;

H.R. 2103. An act for the relief of Antonio C. Ysrael;

H.R. 2187. An act for the relief of Augustin Ramirez-Trejo;

H.R. 2198. An act for the relief of Carlos Sepulveda Abarca;

H.R. 2672. An act for the relief of Sonia Maria Smith;

H.R. 3595. An act for the relief of Anna Isernia Alloca;

H.R. 3633. An act for the relief of Angelina Rainone;

H.R. 3714. An act for the relief of Janina Maciejewska;

H.R. 4655. An act for the relief of Adele Anis Mansour;

H.R. 5061. An act for the relief of James L. Merrill;

H.R. 5916. An act for the relief of Miss Susanna Moscato (Reverend Mother Charitas);

H.R. 6021. An act for the relief of Lt. Don Walsh and Lt. Lawrence A. Shumaker;

H.R. 6330. An act for the relief of Vincent Edward Hughes, his wife, Carmel Philomena Hughes, and their alien children;

H.R. 6386. An act for the relief of Cleo A. Dekat;

H.R. 7617. An act for the relief of John W. Schleiger;

H.R. 8321. An act for the relief of Maj. Clara May Matthews;

H.R. 8631. An act for the relief of David B. Kilgore and Jimmie D. Rushing;

H.R. 9466. An act for the relief of Sfc. Jesse O. Smith;

H.R. 9669. An act for the relief of Molly Kwauk;

H.R. 9782. An act for the relief of Col. A. A. Watson;

H.R. 10026. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick and Peter D. Power;

H.R. 10314. An act for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.;

H.R. 11032. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion;

H.R. 11033. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary;

H.R. 11034. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296 relating to the badge of the American Legion; and

H.J. Res. 677. Joint resolution relating to the admission of certain adopted children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7332. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll;

H.R. 8946. An act for the relief of Mary R. Galotta; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 8134. An act to authorize the sale of the mineral estate in certain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 10440. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11289. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 438) to provide for a joint committee of the Congress to represent the Congress at ceremonies celebrating the 375th anniversary of the landing of the Lost Colony and the birth of Virginia Dare, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint committee to be composed of six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate to represent Congress at ceremonies to be conducted at Roanoke Island, North Carolina, during the week August 12 to August 18, 1962, inclusive, jointly by the committee and by the Governor's Commission for the celebration of the three hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the birth of Virginia Dare, in commemoration of the three hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the landing of Sir Walter Raleigh's colony on Roanoke Island, North Carolina, and the birth of the first English child in America, Virginia Dare. The members of the joint committee shall select a chairman from among their number.

The expenses of the joint committee incurred in carrying out the purposes of this resolution, not to exceed $10,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers authorized by such joint committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

WITHHOLDING FROM PAY OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES DUES FOR MEMBERSHIP IN CERTAIN EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the withholding from the pay of civilian employees of the United States the dues for membership in certain employee organizations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET, 1963, FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 88)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1963, involving an increase in the amount of $2 million, for the Department of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON NOTICE OF DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY AND AGRICULTURE TO INTERCHANGE JURISDICTION OF CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, and Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the intention of their Departments to interchange jurisdiction of military and national forest lands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF EXISTING LAW, RELATING TO RELATIONSHIP OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY TO THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy so that they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 AS AMENDED

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATION AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of February 28, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING OF SERIES E U.S. SAVINGS BONDS, BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT (PARKERSBURG, W. VA., OFFICE)

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of automatic data processing of series E U.S. savings bonds, Bureau of the Public Debt (Parkersburg, W. Va., office), Treasury Department, dated April 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT, UTILIZATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF SELECTED LAND AND BUILDINGS IN THE 1ST AND 12TH DISTRICTS, U.S. COAST GUARD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of management, utilization, and maintenance of selected land and buildings in the 1st and 12th

Districts, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, dated April 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Selected Supply Management Functions and Responsibilities of the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency, Department of Defense

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected supply management functions and responsibilities of the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency, Department of Defense, Philadelphia, Pa., dated April 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Examination of Procurement of Certain Fuel Tanks by Department of the Air Force

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of procurement of 1,700-gallon unassembled jettisonable fuel tanks by the Department of the Air Force under negotiated fixed-price contracts with Beech Aircraft Corp., Wichita, Kans., and Fletcher Aviation Corp., Rosemead, Calif., dated April 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 9

"Resolution relative to ratifying the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States was proposed to the legislatures of the States of the United States by the 40th Congress on the 26th day of February 1869; and

"Whereas the said 15th amendment was declared to have been ratified in a proclamation by the Secretary of State on the 30th day of March 1870, and thus became a constitutional provision; and

"Whereas the objective of this amendment was to forbid depriving Negroes of their voting rights on the basis of race or previous condition of slavery; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California has not heretofore ratified said amendment; and

"Whereas the said 15th amendment has long been a vital part of the Constitution of the United States and should be ratified by the State of California to show the concurrence of this great State with the principles therein enunciated; and

"Whereas the said 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides as follows:

" 'Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

" 'Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly, a majority of all the members elected to each house of said Legislature voting in favor thereof)*, That the said 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of California; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of California to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED—RESOLUTION

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Worcester, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to place medical care for the aged under social security.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it resolved, That the city council request the Ways and Means Committee of the Congress of the United States to take favorable action on the King-Anderson bill placing medical care for the aged under social security.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS—RESOLUTION

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution adopted by the county commissioners of Essex County, Mass., relating to the Youth Conservation Corps.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

At a regular meeting of the county commissioners held at Salem on Tuesday, April 10, 1962, Chairman Cahill and Commissioners Burke and Pratt were present.

Upon motion of Mr. Pratt, duly seconded, it was unanimously voted that the county commissioners endorse H.R. 10682 re Youth Conservation Corps, and that they request Senators Leverett Saltonstall and Benjamin Smith, and Congressmen William H. Bates, Thomas J. Lane, F. Bradford Morse, and Torbert H. Macdonald, to do all possible to secure passage of this most desirable legislation.

NATIONAL AND STATE BANKING SYSTEMS IN OREGON—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently I received from John Steelhammer, executive director of the Independent Bankers of Oregon, a resolution adopted by its board of directors on February 15, 1962. It describes the activities of the National and State banking systems in Oregon. It calls attention to what the board feels is growing domination of Oregon banking by two national banks operating statewide in the State, and urges that the dual banking system be encouraged.

I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution appear in the Congressional Record, and I particularly call it to the attention of the Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution of the Board of Directors, Independent Bankers of Oregon, February 15, 1962

Whereas the dual banking system has long been recognized in the State of Oregon as a system accruing to the best interests of all of the people of the State of Oregon; and

Whereas the dual banking system has prohibited the monopolistic domination of the banking industry in the State of Oregon by any one or any combination of large statewide national branch banking systems; and

Whereas the following statement is compiled as of December 30, 1961, from the reports of condition of all of the banks in Oregon, to wit:

	Deposits	Percent	Loans	Percent	Total assets	Percent
The First National Bank of Oregon	$932,500,000	--------	$486,255,000	--------	$1,024,995,000	--------
The United States National Bank of Portland	906,712,000	--------	427,073,000	--------	1,002,087,000	--------
Total	1,839,212,000	79.2	913,326,000	79.3	2,027,082,000	79.5
The Bank of California N.A	102,520,000	4.4	51,074,000	4.4	105,315,000	4.2
All other banks in Oregon, including 8 smaller independent national banks	381,057,000	16.4	187,356,000	16.3	416,457,000	16.3
Total, all banks in Oregon as of Dec. 30, 1961	2,322,789,000	100.0	1,151,758,000	100.0	2,548,854,000	100.0

Whereas currently the First National Bank of Oregon and the U.S. National Bank of Portland together operate 167 branches, which, with the home banks, total 169 banking offices now operating within the State of Oregon, and whereas there are 40 State charter banks having 38 branches, and 9 national banks and the Bank of California, totaling 88 banking offices now operating in the State of Oregon.

Whereas there is concentrated in two statewide national banking offices 79.5 percent of the banking assets of the State of Oregon, and in the State-chartered banks, other national banks, including the Bank of California, only 20.5 percent of the banking assets of the State of Oregon.

Whereas the above figures disclose that the two statewide national banking offices in Oregon are approaching monopolistic domination of the banking industry in the State of Oregon: Be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Independent Bankers of Oregon, That the dual banking system be encouraged and continued and that all efforts be made to perpetuate the dual banking system in the State of Oregon; be it further

Resolved, That the increasing concentration of the banking assets in the State of Oregon in the hands of the statewide national banking offices be called to the attention of the Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; that copies of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the State of Oregon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 2919. A bill to authorize retired personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries (Rept. No. 1344).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 8916. An act to authorize grants for planning and carrying out a project of construction for the expansion and improvement of the facilities of George Washington University Hospital in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1345).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 1834. A bill to further amend the Act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, by providing for an increase in the authorization funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; by extending the time in which grants may be made; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1346); and

S. 3011. A bill to amend section 4 of the Act of Congress approved March 1, 1899, entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous and unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1347).

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 2793. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assess reasonable fees for the restoration of motor vehicle operators' permits and operating privileges after suspension or revocation thereof (Rept. No. 1352); and

H.R. 7752. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1351).

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 9699. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Prince William County, Va., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1350).

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 3086. A bill to provide for a reduction in the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1348); and

H.R. 2838. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Army Distaff Foundation (Rept. No. 1349).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 2357. A bill to provide for the regulation of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1353); and

S. 2795. A bill to prohibit the use by collecting agencies and private detective agencies of any name, emblem, or insignia which reasonably tends to convey the impression that such agency is an agency of the government of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1355).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 699. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America," approved March 2, 1907, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1354).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 2250. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 78 years old (Rept. No. 1356); and

H.R. 6967. An act to provide for the incorporation of certain nonprofit corporations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1357).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3197. A bill for the relief of Clara B. Fry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3198. A bill for the relief of Renata Lattanzi; and

S. 3199. A bill for the relief of Peter K. Bechtold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3200. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States and its territories and possessions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. McCarthy):

S. 3201. A bill to amend section 401 of the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383; 16 U.S.C. 715s), in order to authorize increased payments to counties in which Federal wildlife refuges are situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 3202. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to adjust the terms of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to increase the salaries of members of such Board, and for other purposes; and

S. 3203. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Robertson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 3204. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to confirm in the State of Idaho clear title to certain school indemnity lands heretofore selected by the State; and

S. 3205. A bill to afford relief for deficiencies in grants for school, college, and university purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

RENATA LATTANZI

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Renata Lattanzi. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Muskie in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3198) for the relief of Renata Lattanzi, introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Renata Lattanzi, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mrs. Mary DiLorete, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of Renata Lattanzi shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

PETER K. BECHTOLD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Peter K. Bechtold. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3199) for the relief of Peter K. Bechtold, introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter K. Bechtold shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 16, 1956.

TERMINATION DATES OF CHAIRMAN, VICE CHAIRMAN, AND MEMBERS OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the Federal Reserve Act by changing the termination dates of the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. It would also increase their salaries.

This bill was proposed by the President in his letter of April 17, 1962. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the President's letter and the text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3202) to amend the Federal Reserve Act to adjust the terms of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to increase the salaries of members of such Board, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Robertson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That the second paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 242) is amended by striking out the third sentence of such paragraph which now reads: "Of the persons thus appointed, one shall be designated by the President as chairman and one as vice chairman of the Board, to serve as such for a term of four years." and by inserting in lieu thereof the following four sentences:

"The term of each member of the Board lawfully in office on January 31, 1964, shall expire on January 31 of the year following the year in which his term would have expired in accordance with his appointment. One member of the Board shall be designated by the President as chairman and one as vice chairman of the Board, each to serve as such for a term of four years expiring on January 31 of the year in which the term of office of the President expires, and the terms as chairman and vice chairman of the members serving as such on January 31, 1965, shall expire on that date. Upon the expiration of the term for which a member of the Board is designated as chairman or vice chairman of the Board, such member shall continue to serve as chairman or vice chairman, as the case may be, until his successor as such is designated by the President. Whenever a vacancy shall occur, other than by expiration of term, in the office of chairman or vice chairman, another member of the Board shall be designated by the President to fill such vacancy and shall hold such office for the unexpired term of his predecessor."

Sec. 2. The Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 is amended, effective at the beginning of the first pay period commencing after the date of enactment of this legislation,

(a) by adding at the end of section 102 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2201) the following:

"(11) Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.";

(b) by adding at the end of section 103 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2202) the following:

"(b) The annual rate of basic compensation of members (excluding the chairman) of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (6) shall be $22,000.";

(c) by deleting paragraph (8) of section 105 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2204) and changing the numbering of succeeding paragraphs accordingly; and

(d) by deleting from the list of agencies set forth in paragraph (45) of section 106(a) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2205(a)) the words "Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (6)".

The letter presented by Mr. Robertson is as follows:

April 17, 1962.

Dear Mr. President: In my Economic Report to the Congress on January 20, I recommended two reforms affecting the Federal Reserve System: (1) revision of the terms of the Chairman and other members of the Board of Governors so that a new President will be able to nominate a Chairman of his own choice at the beginning of his term, and (2) giving adequate recognition to the important responsibilities of the Board of Governors by increasing their salaries.

Both of these reforms were proposed by the independent and nonpartisan Commission on Money and Credit in its report last year. Both were endorsed in the Annual Report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress on my January 1962, Economic Report.

1. REVISION OF TERMS

The Board consists of seven Governors appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for terms of 14 years, staggered so that one term expires on January 31 every second year. The Board shares important responsibilities for the policies of the System with Presidents of the 12 Federal Reserve Banks. By these arrangements the Congress has assured the System both continuity and independence from political influence.

Federal Reserve monetary policies affect, and are affected by, the economic and financial measures of other Federal agencies. Federal Reserve actions are an important part, but not the whole, of Government policies for economic stabilization and growth at home and for the defense of the dollar abroad. Therefore, as has been recognized throughout the history of the Federal Reserve, the principal officer of the System must have the confidence of the President. This is essential for the effective coordination of the monetary, fiscal, and financial policies of the Government. It is essential for the effective representation of the Federal Reserve System itself in the formulation of Executive policies affecting the System's responsibilities.

Prior to 1935 the Federal Reserve Act provided that one member of the Federal Reserve Board "be designated by the President as Governor and one as Vice Governor" and specified no definite terms for these officers. Until 1927 the President customarily designated the Governor for 1 year at a time. Thereafter, until the Banking Act of 1935, a Board member was designated as Governor "until otherwise directed." The Banking Act of 1935 amended the act to provide that the President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman from the membership of the Board of Governors "to serve as such for a term of 4 years." Evidently the term was set at 4 years in order to relate it to the Presidential term. However, the timing was not specified, and in practice the terms of the officers of the Board have never coincided with the Presidential term. In fact, the timing is a matter of chance, subject to change whenever the offices of Chairman and Vice Chairman are vacated by death or resignation. From 1936 to 1948, each term of the Chairman expired on January 31 of the final year of the Presidential term. At present it expires on March 31, 1963.

The draft bill which I am transmitting with this letter embodies amendments to the Federal Reserve Act to revise the terms of office as follows:

"(a) Beginning in 1965, the term of the Chairman and Vice Chairman will be 4 years beginning each February 1 following the election of the President. Should either office be vacated by death or resignation, the President would designate a member of the Board of Governors to fill the vacancy, not for 4 years but for the unexpired term. As a transitional arrangement, the term of a Chairman or Vice Chairman appointed prior to January 31, 1965, will expire on that date.

"(b) In order that the President may be able to appoint a Chairman of his own choice shortly after his inauguration, he must have an opening on the Board of Governors to fill at the same time. The terms of members of the Board now expire on January 31 in even years. To make them expire in odd years instead, it is proposed that the terms of incumbent Governors be extended by 1 year."

Chairman Martin of the Board of Governors concurs in these proposed changes.

2. INCREASE IN SALARY STATUS

The Board of Governors has immense responsibilities for the health of the U.S. economy. The performance of its tasks requires specialized knowledge and good judgment in exceedingly complex fields of domestic and international economics and finance. The salaries of the Governors should be commensurate with their grave responsibilities, sufficient to attract outstanding men and to give them the prestige and status necessary for effective performance of their duties. As I said in my Economic Report, "The United States is behind other countries in the status accorded, by this concrete symbol, to the leadership of its 'central bank,' and I urge that the Congress take corrective action."

From 1913, when the Federal Reserve System was established, until 1925, and from 1935 to 1949, the salaries of members of the Board were the same as those of Cabinet members. At present, under the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, the salary of the Chairman is $20,500 and the salary of other Governors is $20,000. I recommend that the salary of the Chairman be fixed at $25,000, equal to that of department heads; and that the salary of other Governors be fixed at $22,000. The Chairman and the other Governors should, of course, receive further salary increases in accordance with their new status whenever the general scale of salaries of Federal executives is revised upward to make it consistent with the increases in civil service salaries I recommended in my message of February 19 on Federal pay reform. The draft bill transmitted herewith provides for the necessary amendments of the Federal Pay Act of 1956.

Sincerely,

John F. Kennedy.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 for 2 years and would make a number of other changes in the act.

This bill was proposed by Mr. Edward A. McDermott, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record Mr. McDermott's letter and the statement and draft bill which he enclosed with his letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3203) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Robertson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows: Section 303(a) is amended by deleting from the parenthetical clause the word "domestic".

Sec. 2. Section 303(b) is amended by inserting a comma and the words "except for sales or contracts for processing or refining," after the phrase "but not extending".

Sec. 3. Section 303(f) is amended by adding the following paragraph at the end of the section:

"In lieu of such transfers, metals, minerals, and materials so acquired may be used to make payment in kind for the refining or processing into a form better suitable for stockpiling of any materials held in, or to be transferred pursuant to this subsection, to the national stockpile established pursuant to the Act of June 7, 1939, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). Such use shall otherwise be treated as a transfer under this subsection."

Sec. 4. Section 304(b) is amended by inserting the following after the first two words of the penultimate sentence: "incurred for the purpose of carrying out transactions under section 302". Section 304(b) is further amended by inserting after the penultimate sentence the following:

"Notes or obligations issued on amounts borrowed or which may be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out activities under section 303 shall not bear interest after June 30, 1961, and interest accrued or owing to the Treasury on such notes or obligations is hereby canceled."

SEC. 5. Section 304 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The net unrecovered loss, including nonrecoverable expenses and the unrecovered balance of exploration grants, incurred prior to and including June 30, 1961, by departments, agencies, officials, and corporations of the Government through the use of funds borrowed from the Treasury of the United States pursuant to this section shall, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, be written off by such departments, agencies, officials, and corporations, and the notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations issued to the Secretary of the Treasury in connection therewith shall be reduced or canceled accordingly. Upon the cancellation of any such notes or other obligations issued to the Secretary of the Treasury, the aggregate amount of borrowing which may be outstanding at any one time under section 304(b) of this Act, as amended, shall be reduced in an amount equal to the amount of such notes or to the obligations so canceled. *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to reduce or write off the liability of any person, association, or corporation to the United States."

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 717(a) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1964".

SEC. 7. This Act may be cited as the "Defense Production Act Amendments of 1962".

The letter presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

APRIL 19, 1962.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation "To amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes." It is proposed that (1) the Government be enabled to sell excess materials at prices which are competitive with those of other sellers; (2) contracts of sale and contracts for the upgrading of materials be exempted from the time limitations of section 303(b); (3) excess materials may be used as payments in kind for the upgrading of materials held under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act and materials so used shall otherwise be treated as if transferred to the stockpile under section 303(f); (4) unpaid interest on funds borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out section 303 provisions be canceled or waived as appropriate; (5) outstanding notes issued to the Treasury in the amount equal to unrecovered losses to date be canceled, accompanied by a corresponding reduction of the borrowing authority; and (6) the act be extended for a period of 2 years to June 30, 1964. Discussion of each of the foregoing is presented below in the above sequence.

1. In attempting to comply with the President's request that surplus materials be employed in the foreign aid program to the greatest extent practicable, we have encountered an apparent statutory obstacle (viz, metals and minerals shall not be sold at less than the current domestic market price), which in many cases has made it impossible for the Government to sell its materials at prices prevailing in foreign markets or which are quoted for materials to be delivered to foreign markets. In order to eliminate this difficulty it is proposed that the Government be granted authority to sell excess materials at prices which are competitive with those of other sellers in the same markets.

2. Section 303(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 authorized the President to make purchases or commitments to purchase, and sales of, metals, minerals, and other materials. By means of this authority the Government brought about an expansion of the metals and minerals industry to satisfy defense demands. The main device used by the Government was the type of contract which assured a producer that if he expanded his production and subsequently was unable to sell the increased production, the Government would purchase it for a stated price during a stipulated period.

As a consequence of many factors, the Government has had to purchase substantial inventories of various metals and minerals in excess of its requirements. Notable among these factors were the economic recession of a few years ago and a drastic change in mobilization planning. The former caused producers to exercise their rights to put production to the Government. The latter stipulated that mobilization planning was to be based on a 3-year emergency rather than the 5-year period which had previously been in use. This cutback resulted in immediate excesses since in many cases amounts which had already been acquired were more than the 3-year requirement.

Section 303(b) of the act provides that purchases or sales can be made during the period ending June 30, 1965. In order for the Government to be able to liquidate the excesses referred to above in an orderly manner and recover its investment without disturbing the economy, it may be necessary in some instances to enter into long-term contracts for refining or processing materials to more useful products as well as into long-term sales contracts. Accordingly, it is requested that section 303(b) be modified in such a manner as to exempt sales of materials and upgrading contracts from the time limitation of the provision.

3. The Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1962 specifically provides for the use, without reimbursement, of Defense Production Act inventories for the upgrading of materials in the national stockpile. This authority is desirable in that it makes the best use of surplus materials. However, it also has the unfortunate consequence of having the borrowing authority account reflect as outstanding indebtedness, the acquisition cost of such materials even after they have been used for stockpile purposes.

Section 303(f) of the act authorizes the transfer of these excess materials to the stockpile and the cancellation of the outstanding notes. It is proposed that in lieu of such transfer, excess materials may be used as payment in kind for upgrading materials held under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act and that such use will otherwise be treated as transfers, i.e., outstanding notes may be canceled.

(4) The costs of the section 303 expansion programs and the loan program under section 302 are financed by funds obtained from the Treasury through borrowings authorized by section 304(b). Under the last-named section, agencies carrying out functions under section 302 or 303 are authorized to issue notes, debentures, bonds or other obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury. The section stipulates that such instruments shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary.

Under section 302 the Government lending agency charged interest on the loans it made and, in turn, paid interest to the Treasury, in accordance with the statute, on money borrowed for this purpose.

Moneys which were borrowed to carry out section 303 purposes, however, were not lent to producers. Rather they were used to pay premium prices and subsidies and to make other similar types of nonrecoverable expenditures. In many cases the Government purchased large amounts of low-grade materials which had no commercial markets, but which could have been used in the direst circumstances of all-out war. In other cases the Government committed itself to buy material when the market could not absorb it. It was recognized that there would be losses on these programs and that the notes issued to finance them would, with the approval of Congress have to be written off. To put it another way, it was not anticipated that such programs would produce income against which interest on borrowed capital would be a proper charge. In these circumstances the payment of interest to the Treasury serves no purpose other than to increase the indebtedness.

Historically, it should be noted that the provision for payment of interest on borrowings from the Treasury was included in the act because of the precedent established in World War II when the various subsidiary corporate entities of the RFC, e.g., the Rubber Reserve Corporation and the Metals Reserve Corporation, paid interest on their borrowings. However, it should also be noted that at the time the Government was the sole purchaser and seller for a large number of materials, including tin and rubber. As a consequence it could assure that the sales prices included the cost of the interest. There is no such assurance in section 303 programs.

As indicated above, neither logic nor actual experience will provide a rational support for the requirement that interest be paid on Treasury borrowings which are made for noneconomic defense-required programs. Section 303 activities were undertaken because the defense of the country demanded them, not for the purpose of producing cash profits. If after all expenses are paid, there remains some available funds, they should be "covered into" the Treasury. If after all expenses are paid, the Treasury is holding unredeemed notes, provision will need to be made for their cancellation.

In view of the foregoing, section 304 should be amended to eliminate the requirement that interest be charged on notes issued to carry out section 303 programs.

5. Many programs undertaken under the Defense Production Act by the various departments and agencies have been completed, and it is unlikely that any new programs will be required in the foreseeable future. Here, too, the continuation of financing under the act which includes provision for payment of interest to the Treasury for borrowings for these purposes is inappropriate. The recommended amendment would permit provision to be made for the closing out of these programs and the settling of outstanding accounts.

The proposed amendments described in 4 and 5 above would result in the cancellation of notes and other obligations in the amount of $445.2 million for the period ending June 30, 1961. Interest for the fiscal year 1962 has been estimated at $71 million. Minor savings amounting to several thousands of dollars a year, would result from reduced administrative and bookkeeping costs on the programs which would be terminated.

(6) It is proposed that the act be extended for an additional 2 years to June 30, 1964. Under the act the President has authority; to require priority of performance of defense contracts and to allocate materials for defense purposes; to guarantee loans made in connection with defense contracts; to

make loans, purchases, and purchase commitments to bring about an expansion of defense capacity and to assure adequate supplies of materials required for defense; to approve, and thereby exempt from the antitrust laws, certain voluntary agreements and programs entered into by businessmen to further the purposes of the act; and to establish and train a reserve of executive personnel for employment by Government during periods of emergency.

Enclosed is a document which describes in more detail each of the foregoing authorities. They provide substantial support to current defense programs and a nucleus of power to mobilize the industrial and civilian economy in the event of emergency. Accordingly the act should be extended to June 30, 1964.

This legislative proposal constitutes a part of the program of the President. It is respectfully requested that it be introduced in order that it may be considered for enactment.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. MCDERMOTT.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

The following is a brief discussion of the parts played by the authorities now existing in titles I, III, and VII of the Defense Production Act both in the conduct of current defense activities and in the improvement of our state of readiness for an emergency production program should that become necessary.

The priorities and allocations authorities of title I of the act are the keystone of emergency production controls. By their use the Government man make certain that "first things come first." At the present time production contracts which are let by the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission carry with them the requirement that the manufacturers give such preference to their performance as is necessary to meet delivery schedules. This requirement for preference extends also to the delivery of components and supplies for the use of the contractor. Such preferential treatment guarantees prompt handling of defense orders.

The defense materials system, operated by the Department of Commerce under a delegation of title I authority, involves the determination of requirements, the application of priorities, and the submission of reports. It requires producers of basic forms and shapes of steel, copper, aluminum, and nickel alloys to reserve certain percentages of their production for the filling of identified defense orders. This, incidentally, accomplishes a distribution of defense orders among the various producers of these basic items, assuring to each producer of such materials a large share of his production for supplying his customers in the civilian market.

Quite properly, the use of priorities and allocations is presently limited to assuring adequate handling of direct defense orders. The law does not authorize control of the distribution of goods in the civilian elements of the economy, unless heavy defense demands should result in significant dislocations in the civilian market to such a degree as to create appreciable hardship.

In addition to usefulness in the conduct of current procurement programs the defense materials system provides us with a readiness measure of great importance. It is a mechanism in being which could be quickly expanded in time of mobilization to control all use of critical materials throughout the economy. Based on the Korean experience, it would take at least 3 months to put a similar system in operation starting from scratch.

Title III of the act provides various powers designed to assure productive capacity and supply both for current programs and for the development of a mobilization base adequate to an emergency. The loan guarantee provisions are useful to the procuring agencies as a means of assisting their contractors, particularly smaller contractors, to secure working capital and additional equipment needed for the performance of defense contracts. The other authorities in title III for direct loans, procurement for Government use or resale, and so forth, have been used sparingly in recent years but have substantial importance as tools to meet new production requirements which may result from changing technology and military strategy. Accelerated research and development of new weapons may in the future require greater production of key materials and the development of new processes requiring such forms of financial assistance as are available under title III.

As of September 30, 1961, there were approximately $938 million worth of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory. Because of the ample production of most metals during the last few years, the Government has had no alternative but to hold on to these inventories. Current policy calls for disposing of excess inventories, but only when it can be done in an orderly manner. The size of a disposal must depend on the capacity of the market to absorb the material.

It should be pointed out also that we are engaged in a broad study to determine the materials requirements which would follow a nuclear attack on the United States. In order to avoid the possibility of having to buy back materials after such requirements are computed, it has been determined that, meanwhile, inventories will not be reduced below levels which would meet the normal requirements of industry for a 6 months' period.

Besides being a necessary measure of preparedness in the light of world conditions, the continuation of title III authority provides a tool for overcoming defense deficits as they develop, and the flexibility required in the management of the inventories which have already been acquired.

Title VII of the act contains various general provisions and authorities in support of those in the other two titles. Of great importance among these is the voluntary agreement authority. This makes possible the use of the joint experience of defense contractors in improving and speeding the output of weapons, through integration committees in which technical advances and know-how can be shared, without danger of violating the antitrust laws. A number of existing integration committees of the Department of the Army depend upon this authority, and the development of new weapons will no doubt give rise to a need for others.

Of importance, too, is the authority provided by title VII to train a reserve of officials capable of doing the many executive jobs in Government that must be done in time of mobilization. Executive reserve programs have been undertaken by 17 Government departments and agencies. Over 2,600 reservists are presently being trained, and more will undoubtedly be added as the field programs are developed in the States.

CLEARING OF TITLE TO CERTAIN SCHOOL INDEMNITY LANDS IN IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to confirm in the State of Idaho clear title to certain school indemnity lands heretofore selected by the State.

The lands in question are now owned by the State of Idaho, subject to a reservation in the United States of rights to the phosphate in them. They were selected as indemnity for lands which would have been granted to Idaho, under the admission act, but for the circumstances that they fell within the boundaries of national forests, national monuments, Indian reservations, fractional townships, or were for other special reasons unavailable. The admission act authorized the State, in lieu of such lands, to select from the vacant and unappropriated public domain other lands of equal value.

Difficulties arose when the State undertook to make these selections, however, because other lands of equal value simply were not available. In the early decades of this century, the hard-pressed State government, needing school revenue, accepted certain sections as indemnity lands in which the phosphate minerals were reserved. The bargain was a bad one for Idaho, entered into under circumstances which rendered it impossible for the State to obtain the benefits clearly intended by the Congress when the admission act was approved.

The purpose of the bill I now introduce is to rectify this inequity by granting to the State of Idaho clear title to the lands and minerals in question. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may appear in the RECORD following these introductory remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3204) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to confirm in the State of Idaho clear title to certain school indemnity lands heretofore selected by the State, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to amend the certificates attached to Clear Lists numbered 15, 16, 18, 21 and 25, approved by the Department of the Interior on January 31, 1918, March 27, 1918, July 10, 1918, December 27, 1919 and October 13, 1920, respectively, by deleting from each such certificate all reference to a reservation in the United States of phosphate in the lands covered by said Clear Lists, thereby confirming to the State of Idaho full and clear title to the school indemnity lands so listed, without reservation.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to assign to the State of Idaho the interest of the United States in any lease or contract affecting the lands described herein to which the United States is a party.

RELIEF FOR DEFICIENCIES IN GRANTS FOR SCHOOL, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY PURPOSES

Mr. CHURCH. Next, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill of general application to afford relief for deficiencies in State land grant selections made available by Congress in support of public education.

In nearly all the public lands States, certain sections out of each township were set aside, under the various admission acts, for the benefit of the State public school systems. The intent of the Congress, in making these grants, was to compensate the States, in part, for the fact that much of the land within their borders is in the public domain, and produces little tax revenue.

In cases where the sections granted to the States had been withdrawn, or were later withdrawn, by the Federal Government for special uses—as was done when the national forests were established—the laws generally provided that the States could select other land, of equal value, from the public domain, as indemnity for their losses. But many of the States have not in fact been made whole by these provisions, for the reason that other lands of equal value, on a section-for-section basis, have simply not been available.

The bill I now introduce is intended to be of general application in all such cases, and to carry out the intent of the Congress in making the original grants. It directs the striking of a balance, under which the States could not obtain, from the public domain, lands equal in value to the original grants.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be published in full at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3205) to afford relief for deficiencies in grants for school, college, and university purposes, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in any case where a State has been granted under Federal law, other than under the indemnity laws, land for school, college, or university purposes, and such State has not received the full title to all the lands granted to it in place or selected by it pursuant to a quantity grant, whether by reason of appropriation, withdrawal, reservation, or mineral character of any of the lands, such State may within two years from the effective date of this Act notify in writing the Secretary of the Interior of its election to obtain the benefits of this Act.

(b) Such election shall constitute a full and final waiver of any right of the State under any other law to apply for and receive indemnity for any deficiency in school, college, or university grants.

SEC. 2. Any State which has elected to come within the purview of this Act shall be entitled to apply for and receive patent to lands and mineral interests in lands equivalent in value to (1) the full value of the lands, and minerals therein, in place or selected by it which did not vest but would have vested in the State, but for appropriation, withdrawal, or reservation of any such lands, or the mineral character of any of the lands, less (2) the value of all lands, and interests therein received by such State by reason of (a) the original grants or (b) any indemnity or lieu selection law.

SEC. 3. A complete description of the lands and mineral interests selected under this Act shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior within five years after the effective date of this Act. In addition to such description there shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior at the same time a description of the lands or mineral interests therein for which relief is sought under this Act.

SEC. 4. All determinations of value under this Act shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior through appraisal as of the date of the filing of the election specified in section 1 of this Act, with the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 5. (a) Selections under this Act may be made in accordance with, and subject to the limitations of, section 2276 of the Revised Statutes, as amended and supplemented, 43 U.S.C. 852. However, no requirement therein as to the nature of the base land shall in any way affect the right to selection under this Act.

(b) Any selection under this Act shall be subject to classification by the Secretary of the Interior under the principles of section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act, 43 U.S.C. 315f, as amended.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENT OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, by request, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 3126, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962, to provide greater continuity of Federal financing in the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas.

Mr. President, a number of organizations requesting the submission of this amendment have stressed to me the importance of continuity in Federal financing if this proposed mass transportation program is to succeed. A number of Senators have indicated to me that the method of financing enacted last year by Congress for the mass transportation demonstration program, which was hamstrung during the closing hours of the session last year, should be preserved and continued for the proposed long-term grant program.

Therefore, I am submitting this amendment, so that this important question may be fully discussed during hearings on the legislation, and so that the Senate may be permitted to express its will, as it was unable to do in the closing hours of the session last year.

Mr. President, I should like for a moment to describe some of the arguments that have been made to me on behalf of this amendment, by a number of different organizations and individuals. They stem from two aspects of the President's legislative recommendations which I had the pleasure of introducing on April 5.

First, the President stressed the importance of developing the planning, organization, and financing mechanisms necessary to achieve a coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of urban areas. Quite obviously, this is not going to be an easy task. It is going to require a high degree of cooperative effort on the part of many separate political jurisdictions, over a long period of time.

Secondly, the President's proposals recommend that the Federal grants be not only matched by local contributions, but also be applied only to the net cost of any mass transportation project. The net project cost would be the part of the project cost which cannot reasonably be financed from revenues. In other words, this means that some part of the cost—and in many cases a major portion of the cost—will be borne by private financing, probably through the issuance of revenue bonds.

It was for these reasons that the President stated in his message that—

> Only a program that offers substantial support and continuity of Federal participation can induce our urban regions to organize appropriate administration arrangements and to meet their share of the costs of fully balanced transportation systems.

Clearly, State governments and local governments in metropolitan and other urban areas are not going to undertake the difficult and time-consuming efforts to plan and organize for the development of comprehensive urban transportation systems unless they have assurance that the proposed assistance will actually be forthcoming when they have completed their efforts.

Perhaps even more important is the relationship between Federal assistance and private financing.

Let us assume that a city wishes to undertake a $50 million mass transportation project to provide a rapid transit line from an outlying suburb to the downtown area of the city; and let us assume that it is determined that $20 million of the cost should be privately financed out of either estimated project revenues or other revenues of the system. That leaves a net project cost of $30 million, which under the proposed bill would be shared two-thirds by the Federal Government and one-third by the State or local government.

Clearly, the Federal Government cannot commit its share of the $20 million in this instance in a single year for a single project in a single city, given the total amounts provided in the bill. It will have to space the grants for the project over a number of years, if the assistance is to be of help to more than a handful of cities.

The important point here is that State or local governments would find it extremely difficult, and most public authorities would find it virtually impossible, to arrange for private financing of the original $20 million portion of the project if they must wait year by year to find out whether the full Federal grant will be forthcoming.

In other words, it is impossible to "sell" an incomplete financing package to private investors, especially in a field such as mass transportation, which never has been an attractive investment field. In order to finance privately the original $20 million, the investors must be assured that the full $20 million in Federal grants and the full $10 million in State or local contributions will be committed to the project.

Therefore, many individuals and organizations have emphasized to me their belief that the authorization and annual appropriation process proposed in Senate bill 1326 would make it very difficult to make long-term commitments and to formulate the financing package that would make possible substantial private investment. This would be especially true in undertaking major new mass transportation systems.

The proposed amendment would not eliminate a review of the program by the annual appropriations process; but it would give the administrator of the program a definite authority of $500 million over 3 years, or whatever amount Congress might decide to approve, with which the administrator could make contract commitments. In this way the State and local governments could make their long-term plans and financial arrangements with assurance that there would be continuity in Federal financing; and Congress would still exercise its annual appropriation review process.

This is the procedure which has been adopted by Congress for the urban renewal and other programs, and it has worked exceedingly well. Those who urge this amendment for the mass transportation program contend that the need here is even more compelling.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that this amendment will serve to provide the opportunity for a careful, thorough, and responsible exploration of this question by the committee and by the Senate, for it does seem to me that the arguments raised on behalf of the amendment are worthy of serious consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

COSPONSORS OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION BILL, S. 3126

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on April 5 I had the pleasure of introducing the administration's urban mass transportation bill, S. 3126. I would like to inform the Senate at this time that the following Senators joined in sponsoring this measure, and had their names added to the bill when a star print was made to correct errors in the bill: Senators BEALL, BIBLE, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, CLARK, COOPER, DODD, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, GRUENING, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, KUCHEL, LONG of Hawaii, LONG of Missouri, MORSE, MUSKIE, SMITH of Massachusetts, SYMINGTON, and YOUNG of Ohio.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EZRA GLASER TO BE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, April 20, 1962, at 10 a.m., in Room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Ezra Glaser, of Virginia, to be Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THURGOOD MARSHALL TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, SECOND CIRCUIT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing scheduled for Tuesday, April 24, 1962, on the nomination of Thurgood Marshall, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit, has been rescheduled for Tuesday, May 1, 1962 at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], as chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF STEPHEN J. ROTH TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, April 26, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Stephen J. Roth, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Clifford O'Sullivan, elevated.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and myself, as chairman.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 19, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 205. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes;

S. 505. An act for the relief of Seymour Robertson;

S. 508. An act for the relief of John E. Beaman and Adelaide K. Beaman;

S. 704. An act for the relief of Marlys E. Tedin and Elizabeth O. Reynolds;

S. 1057. An act to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution;

S. 2151. An act for the relief of Harvey Burstein;

S. 2319. An act for the relief of Harry E. Ellison, captain, United States Army, retired; and

S. 2549. An act for the relief of Edward L. Wertheim.

HATTON W. SUMNERS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we have just received the sad news that a distinguished statesman of this country—Hon. Hatton W. Sumners—passed away this morning at Dallas, Tex., at age 87.

He retired voluntarily from Congress in 1946, after having served for 34 years in the House of Representatives; and for many years of his service there he was chairman of the powerful House Judiciary Committee.

Hatton Sumners, like many other Texans, including Davy Crockett, Sam Rayburn, Sam Houston, and others—was a native of Tennessee. He was born in Tennessee in 1875, came to Texas at age 18, and was admitted to the Texas bar in 1897. He was elected prosecuting attorney of Dallas County in 1900, and served two terms, during which he was president of the District and County Attorneys' Association of Texas.

He was elected to Congress in 1912, and came to Washington in March 1913. He served through succeeding Congresses until January 1947.

Chairman Sumners was recognized as one of the outstanding constitutional lawyers of the Nation. He achieved great distinction in the House of Representatives, and he lived out that distinction to the end.

He was beloved by the people of Texas. After his retirement from Congress, he lived in Lawyers' End, at the Southwestern Legal Institute, on the campus of Southern Methodist University.

Mr. President, later today I shall make an appropriate motion.

It is with great regret that we have learned of the passing of Hatton W. Sumners.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of interest in the recommendations of the Freedom of Communications Subcommittee with regard to political candidates and their use of Government licensed media radio and television stations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the unanimous report of the subcommittee, as filed with the Commerce Committee.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

1. INTRODUCTION

In dealing with that part of the public domain known as the broadcast spectrum, the Congress has been confronted with unique and varied problems. The impact of this technological revolution in communications upon traditional concepts and institutions has been felt in almost every phase of the American way of life.

From the inception of commercial radio broadcasting, Congress has been concerned with the use of the air waves as a vital means of communication, capable of making a major contribution toward an informed public, which is indispensable to the proper functioning of our democratic system. It is to encourage the full realization of these capabilities within our institutional framework of freedom that the Congress has legislated in this field. So, it is in the best American tradition that the Congress, in granting access to broadcasting facilities to a limited number of private licenses, has required that these public franchises be used in the public interest. There can be no question that, since the use of air waves is a privilege granted by the people to private licenses, it is within the right of the people, acting through the Congress, to attach such conditions to the use of that privilege as they may deem wise, reasonable, and prudent.

Our primary concern has been the use of this technology as a communications link between candidates for public office and the people. Section 18 of the Radio Act of 1927, carried forward later as section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, delineated the basic safeguards which Congress believed were minimal regarding the use of broadcast facilities by candidates for public office. Section 315, popularly called the "equal-time provision," simply stated, required equal-time opportunity for all candidates for a particular office, once any candidate was allowed use of broadcast facilities.

Congress, in section 315, purposed to preserve for the public the benefit of the viewpoint of all of the candidates for a given office, whenever broadcast facilities were used for the viewpoint of one candidate. Equal time was not conceived to serve candidates for public office. Equal time was designed to serve the public. Licensees were denied the privilege of deciding arbitrarily that one candidate could be heard by the electorate, while another candidate for the same office could not be heard.

It is within a very limited legislative framework, then, that these vital means of political communication—radio and television as we know them today—have developed.

Regulations by the Federal Communications Commission in this general area have, likewise, been limited. Since the "Report on Editorializing by Broadcast Licensees," issued by the Federal Communications Commission on June 2, 1949, it has been incumbent upon the licensees to "devote a reasonable percentage of their broadcast time to the discussion of public issues of interest in the community served by their stations and that such programs be designed so that the public has a reasonable opportunity to hear opposing positions on the public issues of interest and importance in the community."

It is this concept of the paramount right of the public to hear different attitudes and viewpoints, and the responsibility of the licensee to present opposing viewpoints on controversial issues, which has come to be known as the "fairness doctrine."

"Equal time" applies only to candidates for political office, while the scope of the "fairness doctrine" extends to discussion by anyone of a controversial issue over the airwaves.

Few people realize the freedom of political expression which licensees enjoy. It is not commonly known that any radio or television station can use a reasonable part of its time to editorialize—and that includes editorializing on behalf of a candidate for public office or for or against an issue before the public which is to be voted on in an election. A licensee can use any hour of the day or night, or any number of minutes he may desire for such editorializing. A licensee may put on a program about a candidate whom he favors, or a documentary presentation favoring one side of a controversial issue. A licensee could run an editorial program an hour a day on a radio or television station—the only restraint being the obligation at all times to operate in the public interest, and the mandate of the "fairness doctrine" that opposing positions must also be presented.

By law and regulation, the broadcast spectrum has been kept free from governmental dictation, on the one hand, and free alike from similar restraints by the private licensees, on the other.

In 1959, by the passage of Public Law 274 of the 86th Congress, the Congress for the first time modified the "equal-time" requirement in the use of broadcast facilities by legally qualified candidates on bona fide newscasts, bona fide news interviews, bona fide news documentary, and on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events.

In 1960, by the passage of Public Law 86-677, approved August 24, 1960, the Congress suspended the equal-opportunity provisions of section 315(a) for the period of the 1960 presidential campaign, with respect to nominees for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States.

Senate Resolution 305, adopted by the Senate on June 14, 1960, authorized this subcommittee "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to (1) Federal policy on uses of Government-licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and advertising, and the presentation of political candidates; and (2) a review and examination of information and complaints concerning the dissemination of news by such media."

The dissemination of news, particularly during a political campaign, by radio and television stations is a public service function which requires the highest standards of integrity and a comprehensive understanding of the nature of the democratic process. The American people have a right to be informed on all sides of public questions. Only by hearing opposing positions on public issues of interest, importance, or, perhaps, survival, can the American people exercise their collective judgment intelligently at the ballot box.

It would be utopian to expect complete impartiality. But it is incumbent upon every radio and television newscaster to bear in mind at all times, in the selection and manner of presentation of political news, that the medium being utilized belongs to the public. It is this aspect—the ownership of the airwaves by the public as contrasted to the private ownership of newspapers and news magazines—which places radio and television newscasts in a different frame of reference.

A newspaper publisher or news magazine publisher can color or shade or emphasize or ignore in handling political news; but there is no statutory requirement that he has to act in the public interest. But here again we recognize that the elimination of bias and the achievement of impartiality is difficult. There is no question but that considerable latitude in the exercise of editorial judgment by licensees is necessary.

No licensee has time to report all of the news fit to be broadcast. However, in the sifting and selection process of what news is to be reported over radio and television, the licensee has to be constantly aware of his public-interest obligation. Particularly in reporting political news and discussion of controversial issues, the licensee has to walk a tightrope. But this is simply a measure of responsibility, and those unwilling to act responsibly in utilizing a public privilege are subject to the loss of the use of that privilege.

The licensee has been encouraged to editorialize; and we would not want to deter editorializing; however, many licensees are loath to follow through, once the medium has been used to editorialize on one side of a public issue, and see to it that the public has a reasonable opportunity to hear the opposing position.

The subcommittee determined at the outset of its work that it could only practice hindsight in examining complaints concerning the dissemination of news by Government licensees. To try to take up each complaint concerning newscasts, as distinguished from straight political broadcasts, with the networks and licensees as they came in during the heat of the campaigns of 1960 would have led to the charge that some manner of censorship or Government control was attempting to be exercised by the subcommittee on newscasts. Consequently, the subcommittee requested the nationwide radio and television networks to provide the subcommittee with scripts used by their newscasters of all 15-minute newscasts for the period September 26 through November 7, 1960. This the networks have done. In most cases we were able to reconstruct the nationwide news programs for the period set. In a few cases the scripts of newscasts simply were lost, or misplaced, or unavailable for one reason or another. We are confident that the networks cooperated to the best of their ability; but, just as some of the speeches of the presidential candidates, themselves, were lost, some news scripts were lost.

In part IV of this report, we have printed these newscasts. In attempting to analyze in depth the news in the presidential campaign so presented, it became immediately apparent that any such analysis would require as well the news source material, i.e., what the candidates were actually saying from day to day.

Parts I, II, and III of this report present in full the speeches, remarks, press conferences, study and position papers, and statements of Senator Kennedy and Vice President Nixon.

2. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The preparation of parts I, II, III, and IV of this report would not have been possible without the cooperation and assistance of many people. Acknowledgment must be made to Sam Brightman, Muriel Hart, Mary Clyne, Clara Boone, Jack Christy, Mrs. Reggie Schuebel, and Maurice Keville, of the Democratic National Committee staff; Elizabeth Fielding, of the Republican National Committee staff; Mrs. Christine Grimsley, Office of the Press Secretary, the White House; Mrs. Dorothy Cosby, of Vice President Nixon's office; and Ben Franklin, librarian, of the New York Times.

In addition, the subcommittee is appreciative of the willingness of the following people who helped in obtaining material for the volumes:

Alfred Beckman, American Broadcasting Co.

Jack L. Bell, Associated Press.

Ed Bunker, Columbia Broadcasting System.

Dr. Clay Cochran, AFL–CIO.

Clyde Ellis, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Norman Gelman, Commerce Committee Staff, U.S. Senate.

Ted Koop, Columbia Broadcasting System.

Stephen J. McCormick, Mutual Broadcasting System.

Howard Monderer, National Broadcasting Co.

Morris Novik, radio consultant, New York City.

Mr. and Mrs. Nelson Poynter, Congressional Quarterly.

Ben Stong, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee staff, U.S. Senate.

In particular, the cooperation and assistance of Dr. Hugh Elsbree, Director of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, and his staff were invaluable.

Special acknowledgment is made to Aaron Blauer, Laurence Frank, and Joseph Roth, of the Government Printing Office, and to William Throckmorton, of the subcommittee staff, who have rendered invaluable assistance in the preparation of this report.

3. NETWORK NEWSCASTS IN THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Insofar as the two major Presidential candidates are concerned, and with regard to nationwide network newscasting, the subcommittee has presented in the first four parts of this report the raw material for an analysis of the dissemination of news by radio and television networks. The volumes of each of the four parts have been set up in chronological order, so that it is a relatively easy matter to read, for any given day in the Presidential campaign, what both candidates said on that day; and then by checking part IV, one can find what the network radio and television newscasters were reporting of what the candidates said. It is in the exercise of editorial judgment of what to report, out of the daily volume of words which seems the imperative of Presidential campaigning, that radio and television newscasters exercise a tremendous power over the formation of public opinion during a Presidential campaign.

It is also fruitful to read the various newscasts on any given day and compare what was considered significant by individual newscasters.

It is possible to follow the development of such 1960 campaign issues as religion, national growth, the prestige of America abroad, etc., as they were developed or defended by the candidates themselves and as reported by the newscasters. In some instances, it is interesting to read what the candidates actually said, alongside of what some of the newscasters said they said.

In most cases, network newscasting was balanced as to time spent on reporting each of the two major candidates. Quantitatively, at least, the scales were balanced in most cases. Qualitatively, we must simply defer judgment. [Individual members of this subcommittee reserve their personal opinions as to this matter of qualitative coverage.]

In only one instance brought to the subcommittee's attention did a network newscaster openly endorse and editorialize in favor of one of the two major candidates. (See the broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr., November 7, 1960, p. 1156, part IV of this report.) That this was a clear abuse of newscast time, there can be no doubt. The 1959 amendment, modifying the equal-time requirement on newcasts, specifically charged broadcasters with the obligation, in connection with the presentation of newscasts, "to operate in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance." So-called newscasters who abuse the public franchise in such a manner should probably be barred from use of the medium. [Senator SCOTT dissents from this conclusion, on the ground that there is insufficient evidence of a demand for equal time.]

There were myriad complaints about individual network newscasts. On a given day, perhaps a hundred people over the country would complain that a particular newscast was biased in favor of one of the two major candidates. In most cases, complaints would also be heard about the very same newscast as being biased in favor of the other candidate. Complaints about camera angles, lighting, bad sound recording, selective camera shots (such as ones showing empty seats at a rally), etc., were numerous.

It is on the local level that the opportunity for abuse in newscasting is most prevalent. Under the umbrella of "editorial judgment," the process of selectivity can black out a congressional or senatorial candidate. In communities where a blackout of political personalities and controversial ideas is maintained by the newspapers, then, it is imperative that radio and television fill the gap and supply the knowledge to keep the democratic process functioning. Grave questions arise as to whether licensees who exercise their editorial judgment, to the point of censorship of news of candidates and issues of which they disapprove, should continue to enjoy the privilege of a public franchise.

After considering the many complaints received by the subcommittee during September, October, and November, 1960, the most representative were selected for public hearings held in Washington, D.C., March 27, 28, and 29, 1961. These hearings, with extensive exhibits in the appendixes, are printed in full as part V of this report.

It is from these hearings, and a consideration of the other complaints and information received by the subcommittee, that the following recommendations are derived:

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

I

Section 312(a) of the Communications Act provides that the FCC may revoke any station license "(4) for willful or repeated violation of * * * any rule or regulation of the Commission."

The report on editorializing, adopted by the FCC on June 1, 1949, should now be readopted by the FCC—and codified either by reference or inclusion—as a rule, a violation of which would be a cause for revocation of a station's license.

At no time in our Nation's history has it been so important that the public be informed. It is out of the conflict of ideas, the delineation of alternate courses, the discussion of controversial issues, that the public will garner the information necessary for the intelligent collective judgment, which is the genius of our democratic processes.

Licensees should editorialize. Strong convictions are to be encouraged. It is in the quagmire of moderation that intellectual integrity suffers the most. Individual licensees have the responsibility for determining specific material for broadcast. This responsibility, however, carries with it the obligation on the part of the licensee not to impose personal private restraints which deprive the public of its right to hear opposing positions on the critical issues. Above all, the principle of absolute fairness should apply.

A licensee may entertain the personal opinion that officeholder "A" should be retired from public life, or that candidate "B" would be a better public servant. But this opinion may not extend to the point that news bureaus and television cameramen are instructed to ignore officeholder "A" and what he has to say to the public, or to cover only candidate "B" and his program to the exclusion of his opposition. Partisan, one-sided presentation of issues and candidates by a private licensee to the point of excluding contrary views and personalities is not to be tolerated.

The Federal Communications Commission should be able to act promptly for an immediate review of the performance of a licensee upon complaint of abuse in this area, rather than wait on a renewal proceeding.

II

Licensee editorializing on behalf of a political candidate or a political party requires some ground rules. The Federal Communications Commission should consider a series of rules to cover the situations which have developed. Some ground rules are here suggested:

1. When a licensee editorializes on behalf of or against a candidate or party, the script of the broadcast, if on radio, or a film or tape, if on television, should be required to be kept on file and available for inspection by interested parties for a reasonable period of time, not less than 1 week.
2. Advance notice that an editorial is to be broadcast should be given to the candidate or candidates or political party against whom the editorial is directed so that it may be observed or monitored.
3. Equal opportunity to use the station's facilities to answer such editorial should accrue to the candidate or party against whom the editorial is directed.
4. Candidates and parties editorialized against should have the right to designate the person or persons to appear and present the opposing view to such editorial.
5. A reasonable cutoff time on such editorials, prior to an election, should be set—at least 48 hours before the opening of the polls.
6. Licensee promotion of an editorial, spot announcements, and other advertising should also be equalized for the opposing viewpoint to such editorial.
7. Where a licensee editorializes on behalf of a slate of candidates in one time segment (say, 5 minutes) but the time spent on any one candidate is minimal—a few seconds for the mentioning of his name—the opposing candidate or candidates should in fairness be allowed sufficient time for his representative to present adequately the opposing position (say, 2½ minutes?).

III

The Federal Communications Commission should modify the rule or regulation under which licensees may require the advance filing of scripts of the speeches of political candidates. Candidates should not be required to file scripts in advance. Licensees may not censor the material in political broadcasts, and duly qualified candidates should be able to speak extemporaneously or from scripts revised at the last minute or even during a broadcast, if they so desire. In lieu of filing scripts, candidates, if timely notice be given, should be able to order and pay in advance, at the going rate charged by the licensee, for a tape recording to be made of a political speech during delivery of same, said tape to remain on file at the station and be available for hearing or reproduction by interested parties.

IV

The Federal Communications Commission should prescribe appropriate rules and regulations under section 315 covering the use of licensee facilities by legally qualified candidates for public office to the effect:

1. That licensees who determine in advance of a political campaign that time will not be made available to any candidate in a particular race may not change said determination without the acquiescence of all candidates in said race.
2. That licensees may not arbitrarily set a cutoff date for the sale of political time prior to an election. Once time is made

available, the use and timing thereof is a political judgment of which timing is a most important element. Licensees should not have the power to guide the course of a political campaign as they see fit, to the exclusion of the public's right to hear candidates as the candidate determines best.

V

Section 326 of the Communications Act should be amended to provide additionally:

"Nothing in this act or the foregoing sentence shall prevent the Federal Communications Commission, acting upon a complaint in an 'editorial fairness' case, to direct a licensee to make time available and present the opposing position or a particular person in order that the paramount right of the public to be informed on all sides of public issues be preserved."

VI

The Federal Communications Commission should study in depth the use of broadcast time for discussion of controversial issues. Some guidelines should be established for the licensee to follow in presenting both sides of such issues:

1. The licensee should be required to set in motion an effort to schedule the opposing viewpoint prior to the presentation of the original editorial discussion, rather than awaiting complaint or relying upon a blanket offer to anyone wishing to take issue. Every effort should be made for balanced programing in order that the public could be informed at the time of the editorializing that the opposing view will be heard at a given time.

2. The Federal Communications Commission should determine whether the licensee can require a commercial advertiser, who buys time for the advertising and promotion of his product but utilizes a portion of that time to editorialize on one side of a controversial issue, to make available equitable time for the opposing viewpoint to be heard on the commercial advertiser's program. The commercial advertiser has, by use of his time to discuss one side of a controversial issue, placed the licensee in the position of having to make available noncommercial public service time to meet the licensee's obligation under the fairness doctrine. Should not the commercial advertiser, who uses part of his time for editorializing, be required in fairness to make available equitable opportunity on his commercial time for the opposing viewpoint to be heard?

VII

Licensee refusal to sell commercial time for the presentation of news, discussion, or entertainment programs sponsored by organizations such as political parties, labor unions, citizen committees, or business groups espousing a viewpoint with which the licensee is not in sympathy should be required to be reported immediately by the licensee to the Federal Communications Commission. Censorship by the licensee by refusal to sell time for the presentation of a news commentary program by a commentator who may espouse a viewpoint contrary to that held by the licensee, or refusal to sell time for a speech or discussion program to be made by a public figure who, in the licensee's opinion may be controversial, may be a denial to the public of its right to hear those contrary viewpoints which are so necessary for the formation of intelligent opinion and sound judgment. This is doubly true when the licensee accepts programs and sells time for commentators or for public figures whose views and biases are well known, but contrary to those to whom he refuses to sell time.

The licensee has no mission to function as a thought control policeman. Our freedom and democracy are developing institutions. The democratic dialog must be encouraged at all costs. Democracy is a way of doing business, and our freedom is protected by developing institutions which follow the guidelines of due process of the law.

It is in the deepening of our understanding and the constant reexamination of the ends to be achieved by our society that our strength lies. In public apathy lies the danger of failure of political morality.

So long as the American people are eager to explore ideas, to want to hear and discuss and think and read and seek information, we have a reservoir of strength which can see us through any crisis. In order to act responsibly, the individual has to be informed. The individual has a right to be informed. It is the right to hear open discussion of all viewpoints which concerns us here. Only through such discussion will we achieve the continuing education of us all which is so necessary if we are to survive.

Licensees who practice a continuing pattern of refusal to sell commercial time for such programs are not fulfilling their license obligation to act in the public interest.

The Federal Communications Commission should view a continuing accumulation of refusal notices to sell such time by a licensee as a failure on the part of the licensee to act in the public interest.

VIII

It is the subcommittee's opinion that consideration of a permanent statute to qualify section 315 of the Communications Act along the lines of the presidential and vice presidential candidate exemption of 1960 is premature at this time, but recommends a review of this matter early in the next (the 88th) Congress.

Various suggestions have been put forth that section 315 should be permanently modified so that not only the presidential and vice presidential candidates would be excluded from the coverage of the statute, but that candidates for the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, State Governors, and perhaps other candidates, be likewise exempted.

In a majority of the U.S. congressional and senatorial campaigns and State gubernatorial campaigns, there will be only two legally qualified candidates in the general elections of 1962. In these cases, licensees could, under the provisions of section 315, make time available for a series of debates or joint appearances or other presentations of the opposing candidates. We would be better advised to wait until the elections of 1962 have been held and to consider the actions of the licensees in making time available in those cases where only two candidates are involved before considering permanent legislation of this type.

The drive for suspension of section 315 permanently has some curious overtones. There seems to be a feeling on the part of some proponents of this type of legislation that those who are eminently qualified in the field of entertainment are better able to judge the format and content of political programs designed to enlighten the public than the candidates themselves. Those who test the public response and rate programs accordingly for entertainment value or the sale of commercial products may not be the best judge to analyze the citizen's quest for information or his taste for political controversy. Programs of a political nature in our society are a paramount public service responsibility of licensees. And the interposition of the licensee between the candidate and the public does not mean that the licensee is to act as a filter, substituting his judgment for that of the candidate as to what the American people want to know.

The substitution of licensee judgment for that of the candidates themselves, as to how best to present the candidates and the issues, the format and content of political programing, is freedom abused.

A very substantial part of the public's acceptance of a candidate rests on the public's concept of the candidate's judgment; and the candidate's judgment is ofttimes best expressed in his exercise of that judgment as to what tactics and strategy would best serve his campaign. The exercise of editorial judgment by licensees can very easily be used by them in political programing to direct a political campaign the way they think the campaign ought to go.

Despite claims to the contrary, the exemption from section 315 of the presidential campaign in 1960 did not give us a comprehensive picture of what would happen if the exemption were made permanent. The 1960 exemption became effective on August 26, 1960, after both national conventions of the two major political parties. Performance of the networks and licensees in the period prior to the conventions under such an exemption has not been tested.

The "Survey of Political Broadcasting, September 1-November 8, 1960," prepared by the FCC in response to Senate Joint Resolution 207, 86th Congress, raises as many questions as it answers. The situation in a presidential election year is different from that in an off year like 1962. In order to see the whole aspect of political broadcasting, a survey for 1962 is necessary.

The trend in radio broadcasting to the so-called news and music formula, which seems to exclude 15- and 30-minute news and discussion programs with the only political availabilities being spot announcements, needs thorough analysis.

The Congress, therefore, before considering permanent revision of section 315, should have available to it first a summary, not only of network and individual licensee performance in the presidential campaign of 1960, but a survey in depth of performance by networks and licensees in the elections of 1962.

And we would be well advised to consider then whether or not a case has been made for any exceptions to the coverage of section 315, and whether or not such exceptions are in fact class legislation and at variance with the fundamental objectives which the Congress seeks to protect.

IX

The Federal Communications Commission should reform its internal procedures for the handling and processing of "equal-time" and editorial "fairness" complaints. The time lag at the Commission must be cut to the minimum. Here are issues in which time is most certainly of the essence.

The physical handling of such complaints—in the mailroom—at the first point received by the Commission must be so organized and staffed so that the action to ascertain all necessary facts on a given complaint begins within 24 hours of receipt of same by the Commission.

Licensees likewise should advised by the Commission that receipt by the licensee of a query from the FCC for information in regard to complaints in this field are to be answered forthwith without delay within the time stated. In case of arbitrary delay and refusal to answer within a stated time, the Commission should call an immediate hearing.

The Federal Communications Commission should consider the establishment of a hearing system under competent examiners for the immediate taking of testimony in the field when necessary to perpetuate a record concerning complaints under the "fairness doctrine" and equal time.

The Federal Communications Commission should consider its experience in this field and advise the Congress exactly what is needed in the way of legislative authority and personnel in order to preserve for the public the freedom to hear and to see on the public airwaves, free from governmental dictation on the one hand, but free as well from private licensee dictation, on the other.

Let there be free and open discussion; let the public hear both sides of the controversial and critical issues of our time, and this dialog will better maintain Americanism and the way of life it represents than anything else we can do. We must practice at home the freedom we preach abroad. We can convince only by example; let us make of our example the most of which we are capable.

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.
GALE MCGEE.
HUGH SCOTT.

DR. VANDIVER, NOTED TEXAS HISTORIAN, EDUCATOR, CHARTS BATTLE FOR MEN'S MINDS IN THE CIVIL WAR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a noted historian of my State recently delivered to the Public Relations Society of America the initial lecture of that organization's Foundation for Public Relations Research and Education. Entitled "The First Public War," the treatise explores the utilization of means of formation of public opinion during the American Civil War.

Few contemporary observers are more eminently qualified to appraise any facet of that remarkable period of our history than the lecturer, Dr. Frank E. Vandiver, whose scholarship and whose family's friendship I value highly. Currently professor of history at Rice University in Houston, Dr. Vandiver is widely recognized for his studies of the Civil War. He is a native of Austin, and is a graduate of the University of Texas; and he is president of the Texas Institute of Letters, which in 1957 honored him with its Carr P. Collins Award. Dr. Vandiver is author of "Mighty Stonewall," "Fields of Glory," "Plowshares Into Swords: Josiah Gorgas and the Confederate Ordinance."

Dr. Vandiver is such a remarkable scholar that he was awarded a Ph. D. degree from the University of Texas without having obtained a bachelor's degree. He did the work for a bachelor's degree before he was 16. He was such a brilliant scholar that he had earned his Ph. D. at an age when most men are seeking their bachelor's degree.

The address is a most informative account of the efforts of the rival Presidents to mobilize public opinion in the segments of the Nation of which they had control through their armies; and he points out that Abraham Lincoln won the battle of public opinion before he won on the battlefield. The address was delivered before the conference of the Public Relations Society of America, at the Shamrock-Hilton Hotel, in Houston, Tex., on November 13, 1961.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address by Dr. Vandiver, entitled "The First Public War, 1861–65."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST PUBLIC WAR—1861–65

(By Frank E. Vandiver)

Strange that after a hundred years Americans still try to discover just what the Civil War means to them. If there is lingering confusion today, there was a good deal more in 1861—but much less by 1865. To the war generation, as perhaps to all war generations, conflict gave confidence; bloodshed brought a kind of rectitude. Sturdy blue men could die willingly and well on fields from Virginia to Texas because they had something worth the dying. And across the bayonets from them, gaunt gray men laid down their lives with like gallantry for a cause which lent them grandeur. How was it that two causes so ennobling appeared to call Americans to the worst of brothers' wars? How was it that willing thousands raged, fought and fell for North and South and knew they must go on to the end?

This morale, this élan, this patriotism if you will, came from a certain understanding of American ideals, an understanding provided by propaganda, by crude attempts in the field of public relations.

Virtue is the basic ingredient of patriotism—every belligerent nation claims virtue is on its side, that its cause is just, its aims unsullied, its honor sacred. So it was with North and South. Both felt sure of virtue, sure of sanctity, sure of God's favor. Especially they felt their triumph certain because each fought for revered American principles, fought to keep the image of America bright for the world. And curiously enough they both were partly right in this conviction.

As things worked out, the Civil War cut between two views of America, both of which had always been part of the dream of the New World, and both of which promised more than the Old World had yet achieved. History would later blame the war on slavery, on differences between the workaday Yankee and cavalier southerner, on diverging economic systems, on the success of the industrial revolution, on the ineluctable triumph of a modern state over a decadent slavocracy. These were all part of the greater difference, a difference in mind dating from the American Revolution.

In time the views, differing governmentally, of Hamilton and Jefferson jelled into two political party ideals, became the fundaments of policy for the later Whig and Democratic Parties. But they were also the articulation—with modifications—of the libertarian and equalitarian concepts of the United States. The North would stay steadfast to freedom and equality, while liberty would constantly charm the South.

Southern political leaders—John C. Calhoun and his followers—caught the libertarian urge of the dual ideal. The great promise of America to them was political freedom, political independence. And this was no small promise; it was, after all, the aim most cherished and most boasted during the Revolution, it had hallowed history and the virtue of success. For this ideal the Founding Fathers had pledged their lives and fortunes and had forged their sacred honor. The social ideals of the Declaration of Independence had been insinuated into the Revolution by Jefferson in a document many knew to be essentially rhetorical. In the southern mind the real meaning of liberty was self-determination.

But self-determination did not mean self-destruction. Democratic impulses were fine when kept in hand—the Virginia lady who said that she did not mind being democratic with people as long as they were not democratic with her clearly summed the views of Calhoun and his cohorts.

These southern leaders saw clearly enough that the surgent spirit of equality in the North threatened the safety of a class-based society, threatened the comfort of cotton oligarchs, the foundation of their economic order and the continuance of their system. Above Mason and Dixon's line independence had been coupled with freedom; liberty had social as well as political significance. It was true. It had been true from the time of the Declaration. In Jefferson's sage eyes, liberty could not endure without freedom for the individual. Political independence had appeal, yes, but no thrilling summons to patriots unless it meant also that all men were equal in opportunity and free to improve their chance. He never swerved from this image of America, made it a part of the northern mind and a lingering hope of the world.

Few southerners doubted that if northern nationalism triumphed, slavery more and more would feel the pressure of abolition and the cotton States would come increasingly under the domination of eastern men of money. And if this truly came to pass, Jeffersonian visions were bound to win out everywhere. Political freedom would go under in the overwash of mass democracy and valor, and mass machinery.

In the face of these possibilities, Calhoun and fellow southern leaders began constructing elaborate defenses for the self-determination of the South. They clung to political freedom as the essence of the American dream. In their view, political freedom conferred the best type of liberty—because with the blessings of liberty went the requirements of responsibility. The ruling class understood responsibility and politics, and acknowledged an obligation to exercise leadership, to give time to Government.

It should be remembered that for some time southern politicians did not think of openly defending the "peculiar institution." Many of them, and this is certainly true up to 1830, suspected that slavery might be immoral and many were willing that it should erode. But they did think the South had a calling—a calling to preserve for posterity venerable American traditions of localism, independence, liberty and property.

True, they came finally to an active defense of slavery, to a full-blown rejection of much they once held inviolate. But when this happened, it happened because of external pressures and the imminent prospect of oblivion. And it happened swiftly.

The South was Jefferson's section, but it turned against him and his ideas with a vengeance after 1831—the year of Nat Turner's insurrection. Following that year abolitionist propaganda shoved the southerner into a new philosophy: all men are not created equal; the black man is inferior. With this new conviction in mind if not in heart, the southerner found the North more alien than ever. Southerners now felt compelled to preserve their special way of life, as well as their old concept of American independence. Newspapers spewed forth the latest catechism day after day; ministers found Biblical support for slavery, medical men found biological proofs of Negro inferiority. Everyone rallied round a system increasingly insulated from outside ideas. Mails were censored; abolitionist books burned. Freedom of thought gave way to compulsion to conform.

Conformity added to southern strength at least on the surface. The whole section entered into a frenzied demonstration of singlemindedness. All southerners became myrmidons of State rights and of southern nationalism.

The Confederate States of America, proudly proclaimed at Montgomery, Ala., in February 1861, seemed the personification of old ideas of State rights. The very name implied the nature of the Government—a confederation, with the States remaining sovereign. At Montgomery, however, in the deliberations over the Confederate constitution, a strong strain of federalism cropped out among the delegates, and the document which emerged bore striking resemblance to the Constitution of the United States. Many members of the provisional congress spoke in federalist phrases about law and order and fear of mass revolution. But the words were for a time lost in the fervor of southern patriotism. A president was elected to lead the new nation, and hopes were high for liberty and southern independence.

Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, the Confederacy's Chief Executive, had the requisite experience and public prestige for the job, but never had he camped with fire-eating secessionists—he was a moderate, and so his administration. Although he had fought in the U.S. Senate for States rights, he soon saw the need for a strong government and became a Confederate nationalist. As such, he strove for aims remarkably like those beguiling the President of the United States.

In working to perfect a cause, make a government and win a war, Davis and Abraham Lincoln were the central figures of the years 1861–65. Each gave voice to one of the dual ideas of democracy, each typified his Nation to a large degree and each had an image of his country's destiny and fought to forge that destiny with every tool available. Forming government is, after all, largely an executive function. And it was especially so in 1861, for never before had Americans faced efforts so prodigious, war so total. No previous experience offered guidance, not even the career of postrevolutionary France with its levee en masse. For the French had faced outsiders, could count on solid patriotism. But Lincoln and Davis faced civil war, consequently the possibility of defection and blurred patterns of loyalty. Davis faced, too, the special problem of building a nation while constructing a war effort.

It is not surprising then, that the Civil War became largely a war of opinion, a war to win people's approval, a truly public war. Victory might well go to the people who responded first and with the fullest national effort.

Even a cursory glance at statistics showed that the South stood little chance in a test of resources. But Americans had faced worse odds and won, so statistics failed to cool southern blood. Jefferson Davis, more of a realist than most of his confreres, feared the outcome of a war of attrition and worked to win public support early. Quick mobilization, an undivided dedication to independence and an olive branch extended in a strong hand might win northern consent to secession.

Be it said for the embattled rebel President that he knew how to begin. From the outset the need to put the South in proper public posture was clear to him. In his inaugural address—given on the picturesque portico of Alabama's white-columned capitol—he sketched an image of his cause. "We have changed the constituent parts," he said, "but not the system of government." The Confederacy stood as the bulwark of constitutional government in America; it had been formed to preserve the political compact and to resist the dictatorship of the masses. In essence it represented a return to first American principles. Davis repeated the timeless call for sacrifice to sustain the new nation: "Doubly justified by the absence of wrong on our part, and by wanton aggression on the part of others, there can be no cause to doubt that the courage and patriotism of the people of the Confederate States will be found equal to any measure * * * which their honor and security may require * * *. We have entered upon the career of independence, and it must be inflexibly pursued * * *. Reverently let us invoke the God of our fathers to guide and protect us in our efforts to perpetuate the principles which by His blessing they were able to vindicate, establish, and transmit to their posterity." Lest the more optimistic southerners feel too sure of peaceful separation, Davis urged the likelihood of a terrible war.

In the years following, the Confederate President worked to sustain morale by using accepted methods of public appeal. Often he spoke to Congress, outlining policy and fostering cooperation. Increasingly it grew difficult for him to persuade and cajole as the cause faded on the battlefield; increasingly he preached and demanded. Consequently contemporaries, hence historians, regarded him as unable to lead and branded him a latent dictator. Close scrutiny of many of his speeches to Congress, his public proclamations, his direct appeals to the Confederate people, shows this stereotype to be just that. True, he lacked the warmth and humanness of Lincoln, had no talent for enshrining his cause in ringing words, but he did have a certain charm and deathless devotion to his country. Always during the war he spoke of independence, heralded the horrors of defeat and finally advocated emancipation to ensure liberty. He tried to win the southern press to his administration and at first succeeded. But the Richmond papers, powerful because they were close to the mighty, soon showed the contempt of familiarity and several became vitriolic voices of opposition.

Many other papers in the Confederacy followed suit, especially when the President sponsored such un-Confederate measures as conscription, tax in kind, impressment of private property, mild regulation of private industry and public transportation, and the use of slaves as soldiers. When the press turned against the Government Davis fell back on more speeches himself and on requests to Governors for appeals to their own citizens. He sought, too, approval from the pulpit—long a standard method of reaching large segments of the populace. Southern clergymen, most of them, proved stanch rebels; paeans of patriotism rose each Sunday, and countless sermons to civilians and soldiers praised the country, the cause, the Government and called down the wrath of the Old Testament's Jehovah on barbarous, un-Christian Yankees.

Southern Governors were not nearly as helpful as southern ministers. After all, one of the things many southerners felt they fought to sustain was State rights; none thought so more fervently than Gov. Joseph E. Brown of Georgia—a larger Confederate millstone. Often at odds with Davis, often in direct conflict with Confederate war policies, State-Righter Brown did much to wreck the southern effort. But even Brown could be fired to nationalism by an occasional Presidential plea. Following the disasters of 1863's summer, Davis urged the Governors to even more herculean efforts. John Milton of Florida, John Shorter of Alabama and one or two other State executives reacted with typical dedication, and this time Brown reached into his large store of rhetoric to assist the Government. He issued a proclamation "to the people of Georgia" which illustrates accepted propaganda practice—leaves virtually nothing unsaid, touches every sentiment sacred to southerners. "Georgians, you who remain in this State owe further volunteering to the gallant men who have left their homes and gone to distant fields to meet the foe. You owe it to the orphans of the immortal dead who have lost their lives in your defense. You owe it to the noblewomen of Georgia, who, with hearts full of patriotism, have, by their untiring energy, clothed the naked and contributed millions of dollars to the support of our cause, and who, like guardian angels, have ministered to the comfort and soothed the agony of the sick and wounded. * * * You owe it to your own wives and children, to the families of our soldiers now in service * * * and to unborn posterity." Exhortations of this kind usually had some measurable effect.

That Davis asked for them, though, shows how chancy was the business of molding public opinion. The President tried direct methods himself, and three times made a "swing around the circle," toured the Confederacy, speaking to as many rebels as could be gathered to hear him. He did this to bolster morale, to nerve people for bad news, or to call for more money and men. When he spoke informally he generally scored. Only when he read from a prepared text did he sound like a pallid Calhoun arguing an abstruse point of order. In person he had force, breathed some of his verve into his words, and carried listeners with him. But he could reach just so many.

Some local efforts by loyal rebels occasionally helped to prop up morale. Many southern school textbooks offered sound lessons in Confederate superiority. Arithmetic problems, for example, were often put in propaganda terms: "If 1 Confederate soldier can whip 7 Yankees, how many soldiers can whip 49 Yankees?" A few private societies appeared, dedicated to caring for soldiers' families and to encouraging the home front. But for the most part Davis had to rely on haphazard methods of morale building—the church, whimsical Governors, disorganized civilian activities. Even the Press Association of the Confederate States, which disseminated news via telegraph, did not cooperate with the Government—was not asked to do so, in fact.

Still, the picture is not all bad. Davis did have one propaganda success. With the wisdom born of war, he and his shrewd Secretary of State, Judah P. Benjamin, saw the desperate need of providing favorable views of the Confederacy to Europe. They sent an experienced journalist, Henry Hotze, to England, financed him in establishing the London Index, and aided in making this paper a highly respected source of pro-Confederate news.

At home, though in the absence of continuing encouragement and persuasion, Confederate morale sank in direct ratio to military defeat. Things at length so deteriorated that numerous peace societies sprung up and did their deadly business without serious opposition. About the only voices raised against this sort of sedition were Davis' and those of a few Members of Congress. But Congress had always been too far away and Davis had lost his luster in the backwash of disaster. Still, he kept on trying. And he showed best when everything crumbled around him. At the very end, after Lee had given up the Richmond-Petersburgh siege lines and his army trudged wearily to Appomattox and to history, Davis—president on the run—made his most eloquent appeal to his people. He told of Richmond's fall, of Lee's retreat, of Yankees ringing round, but spoke, too, of the future. "Animated by the confidence in your spirit and fortitude, which never yet has failed me, I announce to you, fellow countrymen, that it is my purpose to maintain your cause with my whole heart and soul. * * * If by stress of numbers we should ever be compelled to a temporary withdrawal from Virginia or * * * any other border State, again and again will we return, until the baffled and exhausted enemy shall abandon in despair his endless and impossible task of making slaves of a people resolved to be free. Let us not then despond, my countrymen, but, relying on the never failing mercies and protecting care of our God, let us meet the foe with fresh defiance, with unconquered and unconquerable hearts."

Liberty and independence lingered as the Confederacy's dream. For this dream, southerners were willing to change everything about the South, to submit to regimentation, to cooperate with Confederate nationalists, and finally to alter their social structure and abandon slavery. But this willingness was individual, without direction and often unspoken. The reasons for final Confederate collapse were many, but surely among the most important was the absence of a clear understanding of war aims and the absence of an articulate national purpose.

Lincoln faced similar problems in public relations himself. When the Southern States began to leave the Union the North reacted variously. Many in New England and the Midwest voiced relief that the South at last had gone its way. Others felt secession to be illegal but felt coercion to be equally beyond the law. Some called for preservation of the Union at any cost. How could these discordant elements be welded into a national opinion? It could be done, it turned out, by reminding northerners of a common dream—the dream of equality and freedom. Abraham Lincoln recalled it, refurbished it, made it the buckler of the Union.

Means and measures available to Lincoln were not very different from those used in the South: speeches, textbooks, newspapers—even Greeley's antiabolitionist New York Tribune. Lincoln had to rely on the same media for public information as did Davis, but he had a few significant advantages.

The northern people had long been addicted to private associations as a means of getting things done; the craze for joining hit the North much more forcefully than the South. And as a consequence, such voluntary organizations as the Union League and the Loyal Publication Society became important adjuncts of the northern war effort. Private funds and private zeal made the league one of the most successful morale builders for the Union Army. Volunteers went with the troops, ministered to their comforts, offered small luxuries midst the crudities of camp. And always these zealots provided rations of propaganda in the form of articles, books, poems, and speeches. The Loyal Publication Society, founded in New York City, was especially energetic in distributing patriotic reading matter. It raised over $30,000 during the war, published 90 pamphlets, and distributed 900,000 documents. Associations of this sort were not officially recognized nor under Government direction, but they had wide membership and did much more useful service than disorganized southern citizens.

Like Davis, Lincoln also appreciated the importance of winning Europe's favor. Early in the war he dispatched a propaganda commission to France and England charged with presenting the North in favorable guise. The main task of this commission turned out to be constant efforts at counteracting Hotze's Index.

But Lincoln's greatest asset was himself. True, some northern Governors emulated southern ones in issuing proclamations and in summoning heroics by the pen, but their activities were insignificant in comparison to the President's.

Lincoln had a terrific advantage over Davis in public relations because he had long been a stump-speaking officeseeker, had for years wheedled country voters and coaxed canny politicos, while Davis' honors came by appointment or unopposed election. Experience taught the North's leader how to talk to people, how to engage their help, win their confidence, use their talents, accept their opposition. In the early stages of his administration, Lincoln felt his way into the northern mind. When the North was uncertain and confused about secession, about Fort Sumter and about the cause, Lincoln waited, selected the moment, and moved in to explain what the war was about, to mold the will of the Union. He began the process with the first inaugural, March 4, 1861. "I hold, that in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual * * *. It follows from these views that no State, upon its own mere motion, can lawfully get out of the Union * * * and that acts of violence, within any State or States, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances." After thus explaining his political philosophy, he moved to the issue of the moment, the one that then and later seemed the cause of all the trouble: "One section of our country believes slavery is right, and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is wrong, and ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute." The last part of the inaugural address is often quoted as an example of Lincolnian prose at its best; and is also superb propaganda. "In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict, without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the Government, while I shall have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect, and defend' it."

In this one speech Lincoln took a stand for perpetual Union, focused on slavery as the evil in dispute, and fixed war guilt squarely on southern shoulders—no small achievement for a Presidential neophyte.

In this address, as in most of his early utterances, the President harped on maintaining the Union. All else, even abolition, could be deferred or abandoned—indeed, he once wrote Horace Greeley that "I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the Constitution. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that." But unlike most of his northern contemporaries, and unlike Davis and southern leaders, Lincoln kept an open mind on objectives to be gained by the war; he regarded objectives as weapons, as catalysts for public morale. If one failed him, another would be found. When, for instance, after the long string of Confederate successes in the summer of 1862, he found the "Union forever" a tiring theme, he issued his Emancipation Proclamation. This proved a master stroke. It freed no slaves at once, but it killed the dream, hence crushed the power of the rabid abolitionist element in the Republican Party. And it made human freedom part and parcel of the crusade to preserve a government "whose leading object is," said Lincoln, "to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders—to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all—to afford all an unfettered start, and a fair chance, in the race of life." So now he gave voice to the old American promise of freedom and equality and human betterment—the goal of Jefferson, the Transcendentalists, and of the waves of immigrants who came to the North. Once articulated, the theme would not die. It sustained the Union through long, dark days and it touched the hearts of oppressed thousands in England and Europe. Freedom and liberty and man's dignity has lasting compulsion. The southern aim of independence seemed shoddy by comparison.

Public addresses, proclamations and messages to Congress could accomplish just so much. Politician Lincoln had learned back in Illinois that suasion could often be exercised by mail, and so from the White House issued hundreds of letters. Some went to urge friends to sustain a point, others to enemies to soothe a ruffled feeling, some to party leaders to cajole a reluctant vote. In these ventures in personal propaganda, Lincoln showed his great human appeal. To a lady he thought had lost five sons in the war he opened a boundless heart; to a New York Democratic leader who loved the Union but thought Lincoln trampled on the Constitution in order to save it, the President showed himself a hard, logical politician, one whose honesty and realism could not be questioned.

At his best when delineating the deeper meaning of the war, Lincoln relied often on impromptu talks to sharpen his own conception of the cause. The Gettysburg Address was not impromptu, but it gave Lincoln's final perception of the war as a crucible of freedom. In this, his shortest speech, his eloquence reached the ages. The United States, he recalled, had been "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." He chided listeners with the admonition that "the world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

And since the forming of a government, the molding of a cause, is an executive function, it must be concluded that Lincoln ranks as a consummate executive. More than that he ranks as a practical politician, a prescient political theorist. These qualities elevated him above his time, made him one of the people and yet the people's conscience. They made him, too, perhaps the most effective fashioner of public opinion in American history. It was Lincoln, rhetorician, master of public relations, and poet of democracy who conjured the menace of the future for an uncertain North in 1862: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We * * * will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance, or insignificance, can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. * * * We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth."

Fate gave the North a leader whose language would echo down to history with timeless luster, a leader whose vision of freedom and whose conception of the Union transcended the moment to capture the future; it gave the Confederacy a leader whose wisdom none could doubt but whose appeal was muffled in legalistic phrase. It may well be that in selecting voices so aptly tuned to each cause, fate foredoomed one and evoked the other.

ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO APRIL 30

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 465), that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 19, 1962, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 30, 1962.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this measure has been cleared with the minority, and that the Senate should now be prepared to act.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENT AND GRAIN STORAGE PROGRAMS

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 17, 1962, I submitted a resolution, the purpose of which was to have made a full and complete study and investigation relating to the administration by the Department of Agriculture and any of its agencies of (1) acreage allotment programs for cotton and other agricultural commodities and (2) storage programs for grains and other agricultural commodities, with a view to determining in the case of each such program the manner in which officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture have discharged their duties and obligations in dealing with persons affected by, or receiving benefits under, such programs.

The request for this investigation was particularly pointed at the financial transactions which had taken place between the Department of Agriculture and Mr. Billie Sol Estes, of Texas, and the allegation that numerous high officials in the Department of Agriculture had been the beneficiaries of his benevolences.

Mr. Estes is alleged to have improperly, if not illegally, obtained substantial allotments for cotton acreage, in addition to having a multi-million-dollar grain-storage operation with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In this connection, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, three very significant articles, the first of which appeared in the Washington Daily News of April 16, 1962, in which is outlined the manner in which two employees lined up farmers with displaced cotton acreage allotments, in violation of the law. These employees were suspended for 2 weeks, and then were put back on the payroll.

The next two articles, the first of which appeared in the Kansas City Star of April 15, and the second of which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 17, call attention to the manner in which attempts are being made to turn the Department of Agriculture into a vast political propaganda bureau, and also calls attention to the manner in which certain high-placed officials were allegedly involved in the manipulations of Mr. Billie Sol Estes.

I ask unanimous consent that these three articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of Apr. 16, 1962]

TWO AGRICULTURAL AIDS SUSPENDED IN DEALS

The Agriculture Department confirmed today that two of its employees in Oklahoma were suspended and reprimanded last year for accepting commissions in connection with the transfer of cotton acreage allotments.

The two were identified to United Press International as Russell Dill, office manager of the Custer County Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service at Clinton, Okla., and Harvey E. White, performance supervisor.

Mr. Dill received a total of $4,108.75 and Mr. White, $3,665.

Informants said that Fred Chandler, Sr., Fort Stockton, Tex., paid each of the officials $1,765 for lining up farmers with displaced cotton acreage allotments. The sale of such allotments is prohibited by law.

An Agriculture Department spokesman said the two employees were suspended 2 weeks without pay. They were put back on the payroll after they returned the commissions.

[From the Kansas City Star, Apr. 15, 1962]

A POLITICAL STAR DIMS—EMERY E. JACOBS HAS RANGED THE CAPITOL HILL PATHS FOR THE AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT BUT A REPORT FROM TEXAS CHANGES THINGS—LINK TO ESTES—THE EMBATTLED TYCOON HAS BEEN HOST AT TWO DEMOCRATIC PARTIES

(By Jack Williams)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—Agriculture, with more than 100,000 on its payroll and spending upward of $6 billion a year, carries the biggest troupe of trained politicians of any Federal department.

One of its stars has been Emery E. Jacobs, 55, Vice President of the Commodity Credit Corporation and Deputy Administrator for State and County Operations of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

"WILL REFUTE THEM"

Jacobs, 245-pound redhaired Oklahoman, has resigned in the midst of charges he was accepting gifts, such as $245 suits from Billie Sol Estes, 37-year-old Texas agriculture tycoon.

Jacobs says he resigned so that he could go to Texas and refute the charges. He has announced no time for his departure for the Lone Star State.

Jacobs is a big, friendly man. His friends call him "Red." He has had the range of the political front here from the White House rose garden to table reservations at the $100-a-plate Democratic dinners of the New Frontiersmen.

Washington, ever alert for a fresh scandal, is wondering just how much the Agriculture Department is involved in the affairs of the fabulous Billie Sol Estes of Pecos, Tex. The FBI is investigating. A Federal grand jury has indicted Estes on 57 allegations of fraud.

The quietest places in the Capital today were the massive Agriculture Department Buildings near the Potomac. Questions were not being answered.

FBI IS BUSY

After Secretary Freeman accepted the resignation of Jacobs, it was reported at the Department the FBI was investigating charges that Department employees had accepted gifts from Estes.

Two other employees are understood to be under investigation after their names came up in questioning at an inquiry into the affairs of Estes by Will Wilson, attorney general of Texas.

They are Dr. James T. Ralph, former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture now in training to become Agricultural Attaché for the Department in the Philippines, and William E. Morris of the Farm Credit Administration. They have not offered resignations or been suspended pending the investigation.

Jacobs, whose salary in the ASCS was $16,530 a year, is reported to have acted as master of ceremonies at the State ASCS "convention" here about 10 days ago.

There are three ASCS members from each State and all were said to have attended the session here. Critics charged the meeting cost the taxpayers $75,000 and was to put pressure on Congress to bring out the Kennedy farm bill now bogged down.

Jacobs is said to have escorted the group to the White House rose garden for a chat with the President and to lend prestige to their presence here as the farm bill was tied up in the House committee. The politically appointed top State ASCS men then called on Members of Congress from their States.

It was revelation of the amazing financial operations of Estes that brought the Agriculture Department and Jacobs into the picture. Secretary Freeman had named Estes to the Cotton Advisory Committee.

Estes bought two tables for President Kennedy's birthday dinner here May 27, 1961. The 20 seats cost $2,000. One of Estes' guests was Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas.

Morris, whose name is involved in the testimony at the Texas inquiry, also was listed as a guest at the Estes table.

Again, January 20, at the big inaugural anniversary dinner here, Estes and his wife were hosts at two tables. YARBOROUGH was present again. Estes is reported to have been a contributor to Democratic campaigns in Texas and the $100-a-plate expenditures could be counted toward the State campaign contribution total to the national committee.

Jacobs turned in his resignation 24 hours after the Texas court of inquiry heard testimony he was with Estes when Jacobs went shopping for $245 suits at the Neiman-Marcus store in Dallas.

The investigation also is going into the allotment of cotton acreage to Estes for acreage which had been transferred from and which had been taken over for reservoirs and airfields.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Apr. 17, 1962]

FIRE AGRICULTURE AID IN PROBE OF ESTES LAND DEALS—INVESTIGATE LINKS WITH TEXAS TYCOON

(By Russell Freeburg)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—The Department of Agriculture today fired an employee linked with Billie Sol Estes, Texas farm magnate. The dismissal came just 3 days after a Department official resigned in the face of a probe of his dealings with Estes.

Estes, his cotton and fertilizer empire gone, is under indictment for fraud. His tangled financial dealings are being investigated by a grand jury in Texas.

The case broke wide open late last week when Emery Jacobs, the $16,530 a year deputy administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, quit following testimony that he had received gifts from Estes.

DISMISS CREDIT OFFICIAL

William A. Morris, 46, $14,380 assistant to the director for Farm Credit, was fired today. Thomas R. Hughes, executive assistant to Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, said Morris was dismissed for failure to discuss the case with Department investigators.

Meanwhile, two Republican Congressmen introduced resolutions in the House calling for probes of the ASC. An investigation was considered by the House Agriculture Committee, but Representative HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, committee chairman, said tonight that his group will not act at this time.

Introducing the resolutions were Representative ROBERT DOLE, Republican, of Kansas, and Representative FLORENCE DWYER, Republican, of New Jersey. DOLE said the Jacobs incident was the latest in a series which has embroiled the ASC in political controversy during the Kennedy administration.

SELLS MINE STOCK

Morris is a former administrative assistant to Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN, Republican, of Minnesota, who also has been linked to Estes in Texas testimony. ANDERSEN said today his dealings with Estes were strictly business. He said he, along with Morris, was an overnight guest in Estes' home during a trip concerned with the sale of stock in a family coal mine. Estes, ANDERSEN said, invested some money in the mine.

The case of the allotments on 3,123 acres of Texas cotton land was reported by Agriculture Department officials to have involved more than 100 farmers in Georgia, Alabama, Oklahoma, and Texas. They made contracts to transfer their allotments to lands they were buying from Estes in Texas.

Estes would receive Government price supports for the cotton grown on the acreage.

Agriculture spokesmen said the 3,123 acres would yield at least two bales each. With Government price supports at about $175 a bale, the total would be more than $1 million.

The contracts provided that Estes lease back the land from the farmers for as high as $50 an acre in some cases. Lease payments, however, were small compared with the money from price supports. Besides, the lands would revert to Estes if the farmers missed purchase payments.

EDITORIALS ON MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a number of New Jersey newspapers have commented on the President's recent transportation message, especially on his recommendations for legislation on urban transportation.

Several editorials have pointed to the apparent paradox between the President's recommendations for less regulation and subsidization of intercity transportation and his proposal for a $500 million, 3-year capital grant program to improve urgan mass transportation.

I think it important to recognize that the problems of intercity transportation and urban transportation are entirely different.

In almost every metropolitan and urban area, large and small, private bus, rail, and transit carriers are caught in a squeeze of increasing capital and operating costs and a corresponding decline in revenue, through loss of offpeak and weekend riders.

The result has been round after round of fare increases, deferred maintenance, and discontinuance and retrenchment of service—which only serve to accelerate the downward spiral.

Thus, while transit continues to serve an essential rush hour and standby need for those unable to use automobiles, and while the urban areas need increased levels of rush hour transit service, in order to help cope with the growing problems of traffic congestion, the private carriers are finding it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, to provide it.

The only solution is the injection of public funds, in order to help bridge the gap between the financial abilities of the private carriers and the increasing needs of the urban areas. And as President Kennedy's message recognizes, the Federal Government has an inescapable responsibility to bear some measure of the financial burden, together with State and local governments and private enterprise.

While some may question Federal aid in this area, I would say that without it, the demise of private enterprise in urban transportation will become all but inevitable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record several thoughtful editorials that discuss the President's recommendations.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday Star-Ledger, Apr. 8, 1962]

SIGNIFICANT STEP

One of the more striking documents of the New Frontier is President Kennedy's just-issued message on transportation.

It contains so many criticisms of Federal regulation and governmental control that it might easily be mistaken for a discarded Republican campaign proposal.

The President lists two objectives of major concern to Jerseyans:

A national transportation system to provide the most efficient and inexpensive connections between the 40 supercities that are growing up in the United States.

Vast improvements in mass transportation within the big cities.

To achieve the first objective, the President urges sweeping removals of governmental controls that have been accumulating over the past 75 years. And he wants fewer Government subsidies. He recommends an emphasis on free competition to improve services and reduce costs.

When he gets to the big cities, the President finds governmental activity less objectionable. He proposes a half-billion dollar public program to improve urban transportation. But even here, he sets limits on the types of uses to which public funds would be put.

His program, if adopted, would commit the Nation to reliance on private enterprise to meet our transportation needs. In an era of bigger and bigger Government, that would be a significant commitment.

The question now is whether the proposals will be acted upon. The need for transportation reforms has been pointed out many times before. Hopefully, the President's word will carry enough weight to stir some action in Washington.

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Evening Press, Apr. 7, 1962]

KENNEDY'S TRANSIT PROGRAM

The best feature of President Kennedy's transportation program is the fact that he has recognized the problem and tackled it. Obviously there will be considerable debate over the merits of the specific recommendations the President has made to Congress, but his proposal will serve to center attention on the gravity of the transportation crisis and speed efforts toward solving it.

There is a paradox in Mr. Kennedy's suggestion that there be less Federal subsidization of transportation and his recommendation for massive Federal aid. But the Chief Executive draws a distinction between long haul transportation by railroads, airlines, trucks, and buses and the development of mass transportation in and around cities. He feels that intercity routes should be relieved of strangling regulations and subjected to greater competition that would improve service and produce innovations aimed at more efficient transportation. While curtailing subsidization of long-haul routes he would increase aid in urban centers.

Concern in this area lies chiefly with the President's program for developing adequate mass transportation in metropolitan areas. This newspaper has long contended that too much emphasis has been placed upon promoting automobile travel in the urban regions while mass transit has been allowed to disintegrate to the point of collapse. Thirty years ago this trend promised to provide adequate urban transportation but its failure is now obvious. Crowded highways are carrying more cars into the cities than their streets and parking areas can accommodate. Most metropolitan areas, indeed, are being strangled by a glut of automobile and truck traffic. Meanwhile the railroads, recognized as the most efficient means of carrying hundreds of thousands in and out of the cities, have deteriorated to the point where they are not equal to the job.

Mr. Kennedy would rectify this by providing $500 million over 3 years to State and local governments for development of improved mass transportation. Emergency aid would also be supplied to existing facilities faced with collapse and a $10 million fund would be devoted to research looking toward improved techniques. Much of this program would be focused on New Jersey, where the inadequacy of mass transit to the New York and Philadelphia metropolitan regions threatens tragic economic and social dislocations.

The President's program is the result of considerable study and it obviously contains many meritorious proposals. It is equally obvious that further study as it is being considered by Congress will produce objections and recommendations for drastic alterations. But that does not detract from the great service Mr. Kennedy has performed in emphasizing the gravity of the problem and starting the wheels in motion toward a solution. At last there is hope that this country's mass transportation system will be rescued from a collapse that threatens to disrupt our entire economy.

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal, Apr. 6, 1962]

KENNEDY'S MASTER TRANSIT PROPOSAL

Traffic-strangled cities, which certainly include the New Jersey-New York metropolitan area, are slightly nearer to positive Federal attention to their difficulties, but even the form and substance of assistance still are remote.

The 10th message to the Congress from President Kennedy has committed the administration to sympathetic measures and the Senate has legislation sponsored by New Jersey's Senators Case and Williams supplementing the White House proposal, although offered in independent gestures.

The President presented a summary of obvious needs and advocated a $500 million appropriation. Senator Case almost simultaneously pressed his bill to advance coordination of mass transportation and highway systems. An earlier measure in which Senator Williams participated also contemplates Federal assistance and would make funds available.

The Presidential program looks to continued use of privately owned and operated facilities, to the overhaul of the complex and disputatious rates and variances now permitted, and particularly to measures to reverse the trend of mass movement of people from rapid transit to automobiles.

These are the necessities of the situation. The first step toward effectuating them will provoke controversy and progress will be born in strife. Within the transport industry bickering over advantages in the current rate structure is constant and bitter. The railroads, the truckers, the water carriers, the airlines fight among themselves and denounce the publicly built highway and the private vehicle.

Mr. Kennedy is to be commended for his daring. He was cognizant of the condition—everybody on Capitol Hill knows it—when elected to the White House. This message was promised long ago, but was delayed, presumably for study of what it should contain. Now it has been delivered and it is good. Activation will be more difficult than design.

As for the more specific proposals of the New Jersey Senators: They can be contributory, they may be molded into starting points for the whole program.

That would be appropriate for certainly no region stands in greater need in transit and transport—especially transit—than the section of the Garden State in which they live. The urgency of the situation will tolerate no useless delays.

[From the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier-News, Apr. 7, 1962]

TRANSPORTATION

Both of New Jersey's Senators are in the thick of the action in Washington this week called for by President Kennedy in his transportation message to Congress. It is appropriate that New Jersey should take the lead in this discussion.

The President asked for a program that would emphasize more competition, and less regulation of fares and rates on railroads, airlines, trucks, and barges. At the same time, the President recommended massive Federal aid for developing mass transportation systems in and around cities.

Senator Harrison A. Williams, Democrat, of Westfield, sponsored the transportation legislation introduced immediately following the President's message. Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican, from Rahway, introduced a bill to promote coordination of mass transit and highway systems in urban areas, but using a different technique and giving the Federal Housing Administrator a much greater part in the program.

We encourage the leadership of New Jersey Senators and Congressmen in the search for a solution to the transportation problem.

The solution sought for should stimulate free, competitive enterprise and steer away from the course of prolonged Federal subsidy or Government ownership.

TRENDS AND OUTLOOK IN URBAN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to an informative and valuable speech on the subject of urban transportation, delivered earlier this year by Mr. Delmer Ison, executive director of the Washington Metropolitan Transit Commission.

Mr. Ison has very clearly outlined in his speech the causes and the nature of the problems facing mass transportation in meeting urban transportation needs, particularly with respect to bus service.

He makes the important point that:

> While transit has lost approximately half of its customers over the last decade, the demand for service facilities has not diminished. In order to handle the rush hour traffic, which has either increased or remained constant, the transit operators are required to maintain in service at least as many vehicles as were required 10 years ago to transport twice as many passengers * * *. It is a matter of plain economics that an operator cannot be expected to maintain a large fleet of modern buses to operate only 2 to 4 hours daily.

Yet Mr. Ison goes on to point out what is becoming increasingly clear to more and more people, that this limited rush-hour service is essential because the costs of trying to meet it exclusively with highways and automobiles are tremendously expensive and tremendously damaging to the structure of the city.

He concludes that governments definitely should assist in financing urban transit, and this is the reason for the administration's bill, S. 3126, to aid in this effort. Mr. Ison goes on to say that the public assistance should not be used to subsidize operating expenses. With this I completely agree, and the legislation I mentioned in fact prohibits such use.

Mr. Ison also goes on to discuss the role of private enterprise in the field of transit, and points out that there need not be any necessary conflict between the use of public funds and private operation of transit services. In fact, I would go so far as to say that if public funds are not soon provided to fill the gap between the financial abilities of the private carrier and the increasingly pressing mass transportation needs of our urban areas, the demise of private enterprise in this field is all but inevitable.

In his message to Congress, recommending a program of financial assistance to improve mass transportation, President Kennedy stated:

> Although grants and loans would be available only to public agencies, those agencies could lease facilities and equipment or make other arrangements for private operation of assisted mass transportation systems. The program is not intended to foster public as distinguished from private mass transit operations. Each community should develop the method or methods of operation best suited to its particular requirements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Ison's speech to the Second Annual Institute of Motor Transportation Management last February be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Delmer Ison's Speech Before the Second Annual Institute of Motor Transportation Management

In commencing my presentation today, the views expressed are my own and do not necessarily reflect the views of my commission, although I am not aware of any disagreement in views.

In order to fully appreciate the present trends in urban transportation, it is necessary to go back as far as World War II. The World War II era, which was a flourishing era revenuewise for the carriers, now appears to have also been a breeding ground for the present trends in urban transportation. The events and circumstances of those days, insofar as travel was concerned, pointed to public transportation. The rationing of gasoline and rubber precluded any extensive use of the private automobile. The absence of heavy automobile traffic on the streets was a direct benefit for public transit. The fact that people either worked long hours or by shifts of up to three shifts made it possible for the operator to get almost maximum use out of its entire fleet during the entire day and even at night. There were no real rush hour periods in the present day sense. The results culminated into a heyday for the transit operator and for the only time in history transit operators enjoyed a substantial monopoly on urban transportation. Even though fares were very low, urban transportation enjoyed its greatest financial success. In fact, many of the regulatory bodies viewed the profits as being unreasonably high.

Ironically, despite the high earnings during the war, the carriers were literally unable to plow these earnings back into service facilities. The production demands of the military simply did not allow fulfillment of the need for rolling stock of transit operators. Although urban transportation was amazingly efficient, under all the circumstances during the war, yet because of the inability of the carriers to replace revenue equipment they were unable to give the standard of service demanded by the American public.

The war had no more than ended until the very events and circumstances which brought about the financial success for urban transit began to unravel. The wartime restrictions disappeared. Times continued to be good and in addition to two chickens in every pot there were two cars in many garages. The American public became very independent. Means of transportation became a status in life. Industry not only went back to one shift but the working day was shortened considerably.

Television, primarily because of its newness, kept people at home at night, away from the movies. The events which had been knitted together by circumstances to cause a tremendous boon in urban transit during the war years had suddenly unraveled as if by a sudden jerk of a string.

The decline in riding staggered the imagination of everyone. While revenues declined, operating expenses increased. Despite the noble efforts of the carriers to replace wornout equipment following the war, looking back now it appears that they were thwarted at every turn. With expenses on the rise and revenues going down, it became necessary to seek fare relief.

Generally, the regulatory bodies were in no hurry to grant relief. Many felt that the downward trend in riding would reverse itself.

Others were smarting under the feeling that the transit operators had received excessive profits during the war years and they were in no hurry to act.

Never before in the history of regulation did the term "regulatory lag" take on so much added significance. Generally, the regulatory bodies had the right to suspend the proposed fares for a period of 5 to 7 months and generally the entire period was allowed to run before any new fares became effective. In many instances, additional relief was needed before the original relief sought was granted.

This situation was not conducive to the type of cooperation needed between the regulatory bodies and the carriers.

The result was that confidence in urban transit received a shocking blow. Even the most optimistic transit operator was discouraged.

Higher fares became another deterrent to transit riding.

Public ownership appeared to many to be the answer. A trend got underway in that direction. Public transit authorities started appearing on the scene. Urban transportation in most of our large cities is being performed more and more by transit authorities. The governments not only built the transit systems but are actually operating them. Local governments in a number of other cities have taken over private transit systems.

How has urban transit fared under public ownership? Reasonable men have honest differences of opinion on this question. Certainly, a public authority can perform safe and adequate urban transportation, given the money to do it with. Whether or not a public authority can perform transportation economically is another question. For instance, the annual governmental subsidy of the New York transit authority exceeds $100 million.

A frank discussion of the views in support of either side of these questions necessarily involves disagreement with the views in support of the other side. My personal view is that private enterprise should be permitted to operate urban transit, under regulatory control, as long as it can prove itself capable of performing the type of service needed in the particular community. The first important step needed to enable free enterprise to continue operating transit is the removal of the tax burden. Generally, transit authorities are exempt from taxes. In 1960, State and local taxes of the Nation's 1,200 plus private transit operators amounted to approximately 35 percent of their net revenues. But public ownership does not in fact remove the burden of taxation. It merely shifts it.

I do not suggest that governments should not assist in financing urban transit. They definitely should.

What it comes to is that whether operation is private or public, mass transportation in our big cities is the business of the entire community. Mass transportation facilities are part of the transportation of the area just as streets and highways are. There is nothing illogical or even arguable about the proposition that just as streets and expressways are publicly owned and the users then have to provide the vehicles and pay the fuel and repair bills, so in the same way, the capital cost of mass transportation should be a matter for the community and the fares should then cover all the operating costs, including the costs of the operating equipment. On that basis, and it is the only sensible basis, mass transportation cannot only compete with the private automobile, but for the daily mass rush hour movement of people can work wonders for our cities.

As far as outright public financial support, I would draw the line at capital investments. When you place the Government in a position of performing nongovernmental, day-by-day operating functions, is when you lose control over the economics of the operation. I have heard it put this way: The Government cannot put out on bids the various operating expenses of a transit operation as it can projects involving capital outlays. Let's face it, when the profitmaking incentives and initiatives are destroyed, inefficiencies are considerably more difficult to control.

What are the major causes of our urban transportation problems? I could go back and discuss the blunders committed by the cities in planning for future transit needs, but what good would it do? The problems are here. They are real. They can be solved.

In my opinion, there is only one real problem—it is one absolute and inescapable certainty of the modern great city in respect to movement of people. And that is the morning and evening rush hours. This, of course, is due to another inescapable fact—that the modern city is wholly organized on the basis of everyone going to work and returning home at approximately the same hours of every working day. It is also obvious that this rush hour situation has intensified greatly since World War II. As hours of work have shortened, the rush hour periods have become more acute.

Speaking of the rush hour problem, I would like to quote Robert L. Sommerville, president, Atlanta Transit System, during a discussion of the transit problems in Atlanta:

"The metropolitan area of Atlanta has just topped the million mark and is growing fast. Of that metropolitan area my company serves a population of 626,000 with 550 transit vehicles, just over 300 trackless trolleys and the balance diesel buses, all the buses being less than 7 years old. We have 1,100 employees, carry upward of 50 million revenue passengers a year and travel 16 million miles a year to do it. Of all the people who come into central Atlanta every working day, we carry half. And here is one significant thing. We have lost passengers like every other transit system. We carry only half of the total who traveled by transit a decade ago and yet we actually carry about the same number of people in the rush hour that were carried in the rush hour 10 years ago. Again mark that rush hour. It is not so much the key to the future as the immovable fact to which cities have to adjust.

"Now although we have lost passengers, as I say, we have faced the facts of the changing city and put on 54 new or extended lines in the last 6 years. Our route miles have gone up from 453 in the middle of 1954 to 696 at the end of 1960. Practically all this new service is rush hour work. That is when the people want to go so that is when we have to take them."

The experience of the Atlanta Transit System keynotes the problem being experienced by the transit industry generally stemming directly from the rush hour travel. While transit has lost approximately half of its customers over the last decade, the demand for service facilities has not diminished. In order to handle the rush hour traffic, which has either increased or remained constant, the transit operators are required to maintain in service at least as many vehicles as were required 10 years ago to transport twice as many passengers, even though many of these vehicles are used in service only anywhere from 2 to 4 hours a day. It is a matter of plain economics that an operator cannot be expected to maintain a large fleet of modern buses to operate only 2 to 4 hours daily. Consequently, many of the buses used in rush hour service are old and outmoded, resulting in many passengers getting a poor impression of transit service in general. Addressing myself for a moment to the situation here in Washington, on the average it requires three buses to perform rush hour service as compared to one bus to perform the base hour service. Consequently, for about 20 hours a day, a large fleet of buses is sitting idle on the lots of the transit operators. Base service requires only one-fourth of the bus fleet of the suburban operators. If the operators in the Washington area were required to maintain a completely modern fleet of buses to perform the rush hour service, unquestionably the fares would have to be considerably higher than they are at the present time. A new modern air-conditioned bus costs something in the neighborhood of $33,000, and based on an annual amortization charge of approximately $2,500 per bus, a fleet of 100 such buses would require an annual amortization expenditure of $250,000 to be paid by the traveling public. Thus, it behooves everyone, in a position to act, to resort to every means in order to alleviate the rush hour traffic problems.

Again addressing myself to the Washington area, the Bureau of the Budget has done what I consider an excellent job in the staggering of working hours for Federal employees. The starting hours of Federal Government agencies are spread over 2 hours in the morning and dismissal times over 2 hours in the afternoon. While the policy of staggered hours is probably further advanced in Washington than in most other American cities, there are still marked peaks of transit riding in the morning and in the evening. The Bureau of the Budget, in cooperation with several other agencies, is taking a new look at the situation to see if further improvement can be made. The improvement lies not in spreading starting and quitting times beyond the 2-hour range presently in effect, but in achieving a more uniform distribution in the numbers of Federal employees reporting and quitting at the various times within that period. The spreading of peak transit riding more evenly over 2 full hours in the morning and evening could lessen the present disparity between rush hour and base day equipment requirements and as a result reduce the cost of transit operations to the transit operators in the Washington Metropolitan District.

In looking to the future, I would like to address myself to what is being done in the National Capital region, which, I think, may very well serve as a national guide for urban transportation in general. As our cities have expanded and overflowed across political boundaries, in many instances many States have become involved in a common urban transportation problem. This problem prompted the President of the United States to comment in the following language:

"The city and its suburbs are interdependent parts of a single community, bound together by the web of transportation and other public facilities and by common economic interests. Bold programs in individual jurisdictions are no longer enough. Increasingly, community development must be a cooperative venture toward the common goals of the metropolitan region as a whole."

Perhaps, no other problem confronting our urban areas is more pressing than the mass transit problem.

It has been suggested that the creation of a special agency with powers to regulate and control all facets of mass transit is the answer to the transportation problems in the metropolitan areas. Given the power to regulate and control all facets of mass transportation without regard to jurisdictional or political lines, such agency can more properly coordinate and regulate all transportation activities. A unique and, I hope, refreshing example of this modern development is the effort now being made in finding a solution to our transit problem in our Nation's Capital.

In order to fully appreciate the background of the diverse difficulties attendant mass transit in the Washington metropolitan area from a regulatory point of view, four distinct regulatory bodies were jurisdictionally involved, namely: the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, the Virginia State Corporation Commission, the Public Service Commission of Maryland and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Movement of transit from either Maryland or Virginia into the District or from the District into a neighboring State or from one State into the other State, and movements, intrastate or intradistrict, all required regulation, either separately, concurrently, or successively, by one or more of these four regulatory bodies. That this was costly, cumbersome, time consuming, and indeed aggravating to all concerned, is stating it mildly.

Accordingly, Congress empowered a transportation study of the National Capital region which was participated in by representatives of the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, and the Federal Government. The result of this study was a recommendation that the following three steps should be taken:

First, an interstate compact between Maryland, Virginia, and the District, approved by Congress, to establish an interstate agency to regulate transit on a regionwide basis.

Second, the creation of a Federal agency to complement the efforts of the regulatory agency. The agency should be empowered to acquire rights-of-way and construct express transit facilities (such acquisition and construction in Maryland and Virginia to be subject to approval of those States).

Third, a second interstate compact to be negotiated and adopted, creating a new interstate agency to succeed the Federal agency. This agency should have power to construct and own transit facilities, to operate them or provide for their operation.

Steps 1 and 2 have already been taken—step 1 by means of the interstate compact approved by Congress creating the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, and step 2 by act of Congress in 1960 creating the National Capital Transportation Agency.

First, I shall discuss the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission which became effective and assumed jurisdiction on March 22, 1961. The area over which the Commission has jurisdiction consists of the entire District of Columbia, the counties of Prince Georges and Montgomery in Maryland, the counties of Fairfax and Arlington and the cities of Falls Church, Alexandria, and Fairfax in Virginia. These areas make up what is known as the Washington metropolitan area transit district under the jurisdiction of the commission.

Although the creation of the new commission involved the removal of jurisdiction from the regulatory bodies of Maryland, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, Congress and the State Legislatures of Maryland and Virginia put aside all provincial and political considerations with the single purpose of improving transit in the Washington metropolitan district. It should be pointed out, however, that under the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Virginia was not able to delegate to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission authority over intrastate matters in Virginia.

The commission is composed of three members, one from each of the participating governments. The appointments from Maryland and Virginia are made by the Governors, and by the Board of Commissioners of the District for the District, and, in each instance, under the compact, the appointee must be selected from the regulatory commissions of the respective jurisdictions.

In order that the views of local political subdivisions and planning commissions might be expressed to the commission, there was also created by the compact a Traffic and Highway Board, which is composed of the heads of the traffic and highway departments of each of the States and of the counties and cities encompassed within the metropolitan district. In addition, the various planning commissions within the Washington metropolitan district are also represented on the board. The primary purpose of this advisory board is to make recommendations to the commission with respect to traffic engineering, the selection and use of streets for transit routing and the requirements for transit service throughout the metropolitan district.

What are the advantages of vesting in a single commission the regulatory authority exercised by separate State and Federal commissions? Clearly, the regulatory processes are simplified considerably. The carrier is able to avoid the cumbersome task of seeking relief from a multiple of jurisdictions, which necessitated separate proceedings entailing uncertain and often make-believe allocation of revenues and expenses. The commission is able to grant the relief on an areawide basis and to assure the public of transportation service at nondiscriminatory fares without regard to State boundaries. While these advantages are sufficiently important to warrant the creation of the commission, they are not what I consider to be the most important advantages. Perhaps the primary advantage is the ability of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission to coordinate all mass transportation facilities in the metropolitan area to the end that the maximum use is obtained from all existing facilities. This, in turn, will assure the public the maximum efficiency in service at the lowest possible cost.

Another important advantage enjoyed by the commission, which distinguishes it from the ordinary type of regulatory commission, is the power to order things done as opposed to the mere power to approve things the carriers desire to do. Another important activity of the commission is the coordinating of transit planning with the various local highway and traffic departments to the end that in building highways, adequate transit facilities such as bus stop facilities and bus bays are included in the highway plans. Contrary to the opinions of some, the commission has found the highway and traffic departments, both on the State and local levels, to be very conscious of the need to include in highway planning adequate transit facilities. This commission has been afforded the opportunity to discuss the need for these facilities with the various highway and traffic departments, and we feel encouraged as to what the future holds in this area.

It has been estimated that by 1980 the population of the Washington metropolitan district will increase from the present 2 million to 3 million people. To provide a rapid transportation system for this increased population, Congress, as I stated earlier, took step 2 in creating the National Capital Transportation Agency. This Agency is a Federal agency headed by a Federal administrator appointed by the President. The basic purpose of the Agency is to prepare a transit development program, which program must be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress not later than November 1, 1962. The program must contain recommendations for a rapid transportation system including organization and financial arrangements for transportation in the National Capital region. In preparing its recommendations, the Agency must consult with the governments and other agencies of the National Capital region. The program must be approved by the Congress, and by the Governors of the States of Maryland and Virginia before it can be placed into effect in those States.

The bold program underway in our Nation's Capital to solve our urban transit problems could serve as a national guide. The creation of a single commission (Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission) through interstate compact, to coordinate all transportation facilities involving several carriers, is an important breakthrough in urban transit regulation, especially where metropolitan areas have spilled across political boundary lines. The power of such an agency to establish joint fares and through routes largely defeats the argument that a coordinated transportation system cannot be provided on an area-wide basis by several carriers.

The congressional legislation creating the National Capital Transportation Agency providing for the development of a future transit program for our Nation's Capital specifically requires that the program must provide for its operation by private enterprise wherever possible. Thus, the traditional myth that public moneys cannot be used to assist private enterprise in solving our urban transportation problems has been erased. And it would appear that unless mere lipservice is paid the clear intent of Congress in making money available for transit improvements, that the trend toward publicly operated transit will be reversed.

In concluding my remarks, I would like to summarize briefly the trends and outlook in urban passenger transportation, the subject of my discussion. First, true to the basic traditions upon which this country has been able to prove its greatness, urban transportation was performed by free enterprise.

Following World War II, a series of events and circumstances collaborated in a strange way to deal the free enterprise era in urban transportation a severe blow. Many of these events and circumstances can be attributed directly to either action or inaction of governmental authorities. Taxes, many of which were imposed during the war, were allowed to continue without proper justification in light of all the circumstances. Public authority indifference to financial needs of urban transit operators seriously weakened the confidence of private investors and the ability of private industry to render a high standard of service. In the absence of a fair chance to survive, public authorities commenced taking over. While some governmental authorities were willing to relieve the tax burden somewhat, hardly any were willing to make an outright financial donation to private industry. The feeling was that publicly financed projects had to be owned and operated lock, stock and barrel by governmental authorities. The result was that a trend set in, calling for both public ownership and publicly operated urban transit. This is where we are today.

COMMUNIST MILITARY AID TO CUBA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the State Department has been the subject of criticism by persons both within and without this Government. I wish to call attention to an incident that happened to me personally. On February 6, following a statement circulated in a newspaper, I sent a letter to the distinguished Secretary of State requesting that the State Department make available to the American public the information with reference to the arms buildup in Cuba and the possibility of Soviet jet bombers and ballistic missile bases being made available to them. I also asked the distinguished Secretary to establish a policy for the State Department to keep the American public continually advised and informed as to this situation.

On March 2 I received a call from a Mr. Barrett, of the State Department, advising me that within a matter of 2 weeks I would have the information and answer to my request.

On March 7 a release was circulated among Members of Congress from the Department of State with reference to many of their activities, a portion of which was devoted to congressional correspondence, in which they stated that there was a stepped-up drive to insure replies of a prompt, responsive, and accurate nature.

As of that date I still had no reply to my letter of February 6.

On March 27 the Department of State issued to the press an extensive release with reference to the military arms buildup in Cuba.

On April 13 I finally received a letter from the State Department in answer to my original inquiry of February 6. Attached to it was a copy of the Department's press release of March 27.

My purpose in bringing this matter to the attention of this body this morning is to prevent this from happening to others of my colleagues, and in the hope that the State Department will adopt in fact a policy of keeping the American public informed.

In closing this statement, it is my hope that the information contained in the March 27 release is a complete and full statement of the situation as it exists.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to the Secretary of State and the letter I received, together with the Department's release, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1962.

The Honorable MAURICE J. MURPHY, JR.,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: I refer to your letter of February 6, 1962, about the arms buildup in Cuba and to your telephone conversation with Mr. Barrett of the Department's Office of Cuban Affairs.

Communist military aid has turned the Cuban military establishment into one of the most formidable in Latin America. We are informed by the appropriate Government agencies, however, that there is no evidence the Soviet Union has supplied Cuba with missiles or that missile bases are under construction in Cuba, and no Soviet bombers are known to have been delivered to Cuba.

An armed attack by Cuba against the United States or a Latin American nation would bring into operation the provisions of the Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. Further, the U.S. military machine has the capacity to meet any such aggression.

I am pleased to provide the enclosed copy of the recent Department press release on the subject of Sino-Soviet bloc military aid to Cuba.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

Frederick G. Dutton,
Assistant Secretary.

SINO-SOVIET BLOC MILITARY AID TO CUBA

The following summary on Sino-Soviet bloc military aid to Cuba is issued in response to numerous requests for up-to-date information on this subject.

For about a year and a half the Sino-Soviet bloc has supplied Cuba with large-scale military assistance. Bloc military deliveries—primarily from the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia—have included a wide assortment of land armaments ranging from small arms through heavy tanks. Bloc aircraft supplied to Cuba include MIG jet fighters, helicopters, transports, and trainers. Extensive military training has been provided both in the bloc and in Cuba. Communist military aid has turned the Cuban military establishment into one of the most formidable in Latin America, and it has introduced a military capability hitherto not present in any of the Latin American countries of the Caribbean area. However, there is no evidence that the Soviet Union has supplied Cuba with missiles, or that missile bases are under construction in Cuba.

The Soviet Union at first moved cautiously in responding to Cuban requests for military assistance. Once underway, however, the Cuban buildup proceeded swiftly. Bloc support has aided the Castro regime in consolidating its control over the Cuban people. For the past several months the bloc's military aid program in Cuba has been concerned primarily with training, assimilating new equipment, and remolding the Cuban military establishment along bloc organizational lines.

BACKGROUND

Preliminary attempts to procure Soviet bloc arms were initiated by the Cuban Government as early as 1959, but no firm military aid pacts were concluded until the summer of 1960. During 1959 and early 1960, Cuban purchasing missions traveled frequently to the bloc to investigate new sources of supply. Discussions reportedly covered a whole range of equipment from small arms to modern jet aircraft. Mikoyan's visit to Cuba in February 1960 signaled the beginning of a massive bloc trade and aid program which gained momentum throughout 1960 as United States-Cuban relations deteriorated.

Military negotiations with the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia in 1960 were followed up by a well-publicized trip to Prague and Moscow by Raul Castro, which probably was the occasion for the conclusion of secret arms deals. By August, Czech small arms were being issued by some Cuban militia units, and in the autumn the first major shipments of Communist arms began arriving in Cuba.

SCOPE OF BLOC MILITARY AID

From the autumn of 1960 until the late summer of 1961, bloc arms deliveries were made regularly to Cuban ports. No financial information on the bloc's arms deals with Cuba has been disclosed, but it is estimated that on the order of $100 million worth of equipment and technical services has been provided. Moreover, several hundred Cuban military personnel have received training, including pilot training, in the bloc.

On January 5, 1962, during a military parade celebrating the third anniversary of takeover by the present regime, Cuba unveiled an array of military hardware indicative of deliveries up to that time. Units equipped with medium and heavy tanks, assault guns, truck-mounted rocket launchers, artillery, antiaircraft weapons, and mortars, as well as rifles and machineguns, were featured prominently. A fly-by of MIG jet fighters, including some high-performance MIG-19's, was one of the highlights of the air display.

In the latter part of 1961 the focus of the bloc's military aid to Cuba was on assimilation of new equipment, intensive training, and completion of the reorganization of Cuba's military establishment. Recently, however, military shipments to Cuba have resumed and for the first time have included small naval vessels.

The capabilities of the Cuban ground forces have increased steadily since the introduction of bloc equipment and training in the autumn of 1960. The ground forces are estimated to number some 300,000. All units are equipped with bloc small arms and many have heavier equipment as well. Bloc aid is strongly reflected in Cuba's ground forces organization which resembles that of the East European satellites. Soviet bloc arms aid has given the Cuban ground forces an armored, artillery, antiaircraft, and antitank capability largely lacking in the past and unknown to other Latin American countries of the Caribbean area. Thousands of modern bloc small arms have been delivered. Soviet bloc instructors have been used extensively for training purposes and they serve as full-time advisers to some individual units.

Following the takeover by the present regime, the capabilities of the Cuban air force declined sharply as a result of purges and defections of key personnel. One of the major goals of the new regime, however, was to acquire combat jet aircraft, and most of the Cuban military trainees who went to the bloc in the summer of 1960 were air cadets. Their training has been one of the most important tasks of the bloc's military air program. Cuban pilots have now returned to Cuba where they are continuing instruction on MIG jet fighters which arrived last summer. The bloc has also supplied helicopters, piston-engine trainers, and small, single engine transports. About a dozen IL-14 twin-engine transports were delivered this autumn for the Cuban civil airline. No Soviet bombers are known to have been delivered to Cuba.

During the first year and a half of the bloc's military aid program, the Cuban navy did not receive any significant assistance. Since the first of the year, however, a number of Soviet patrol vessels and motor torpedo boats have been supplied.

BLOC ARMS AND MILITARY EQUIPMENT SUPPLIED TO CUBA

Type of equipment:	*Estimated quantity*
MIG jet fighters	50–75
Medium and heavy tanks	150–250
Assault guns	50–100
Field artillery	500–1,000
Antiaircraft artillery	500–1,000
Mortars	500
Small arms	200,000
Patrol vessels	Some
Motor torpedo boats	Some

February 6, 1962.

The Honorable **Dean Rusk,**
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I understand that certain information relative to the arms buildup in Cuba has recently been declassified by the State and Defense Departments. This information indicates that Castro has built up the "most formidable military establishment" ever seen in Latin America.

It is also my understanding that Castro is now in the process of establishing ballistic missile bases and may soon have late model Soviet-built jet bombers. This type of weapon is not needed by the Castro regime to continue its stranglehold on the Cuban people. To me this would indicate that Castro could engage in aggressive warfare, either against this Nation or others in this hemisphere.

I urgently request that the American people be given full and complete information relative to the military buildup in Cuba. I also urge that a policy be established immediately within the State and Defense Departments making new information on this situation public as soon as it becomes available.

Since the Communist world obviously knows what is going on in Cuba, it would seem to me to be an unreasonable and meaningless procedure to keep this information from the American people.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Maurice J. Murphy, Jr.

March 7, 1962.

Dear Senator: I want you to know of several new services which are being undertaken in the State Department's Congressional Relations office and which I hope you may find useful.

1. Newsletter possibilities: A twice-monthly compilation of short items on a variety of foreign policy developments will be available for those Members of Congress who prepare newsletters to send to their constituents. These reports will be objective and nonpartisan, and will not duplicate regular news sources. If you would like to receive these materials, please have your office call Miss Meredith Burch in my office (code 182, ext. 5395).

2. Briefings for special visitors: Special foreign policy briefings will be initiated this month for visitors in Washington on request of individual Congressmen. These briefings will be held each Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at 9:30 a.m. They will follow the small early morning tours for congressional guests at the White House, and are being provided for the same general group of visitors. Large groups cannot be handled because of the limited facilities available here. If you want special guests included in these sessions from time to time, please have your office call and give their names to Meredith Burch at least 24 hours in advance (code 182, ext. 2663).

3. Radio and television taping: Arrangements are being made for some of the principal State Department officials to be available from time to time for brief television or radio interviews with individual Members of Congress. These sessions will be scheduled so as to complete a maximum number of interviews within a time period making effective use of Department officials. Because of the large number of Congressmen who might avail themselves of this service, we will appreciate your making only limited use of it. If you are interested in scheduling Department officials for radio or TV taping in the House or Senate studios, please have your office call Mrs. Mary Russell (code 182, ext. 3277).

When you are on a regular television or radio public affairs programs such as "Meet the Press" or one of the others, we will be glad to try to provide up-to-date background materials on current foreign policy matters for you. For this, your office should call Meredith Burch (Code 182, Ext. 5395).

4. Notice of State Department officers in your area: Officials of the Department accept speaking engagements from time to time in various parts of the country, and we are undertaking to inform the relevant Mem-

bers of Congress when that occurs. Your office may then want to consider contacting the particular official as to the possibility of other nonpolitical use of his time to provide public information on foreign policy problems if his travel schedule will permit that.

Congressional correspondence is now the object of a stepped-up drive to assure that the Department's replies are prompt, responsive and accurate. If you have criticism of such correspondence, please let me know or have your office contact the new reviewing officer for congressional correspondence, Miss Jean Gildea (Code 182, Ext. 6654).

Telephone inquiries from congressional offices concerning matters that cannot await a letter are now being specially handled by Mrs. Edith Waskewich (Code 182, Ext. 4747).

The steps listed above are being taken to encourage better service for Members of Congress and to facilitate better public understanding of U.S. foreign policy objectives. None will require additional personnel. If ever you have suggestions on how we can be of greater assistance to you, I hope you will be sure to let me know.

Sincerely,

Frederick G. Dutton.

LABOR AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this year college debate teams throughout the Nation are considering the question, "Should labor organizations be under the jurisdiction of antitrust legislation?"

There recently came to my attention an excellent statement on this topic by A. J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists of the AFL-CIO.

This will be of interest not only to debate teams, but to all who are interested in the question of labor unions and the role they play in a free and dynamic society. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hayes' article be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Labor and Antitrust Laws

(By A. J. Hayes)

(This year most debate teams are arguing a question that concerns, not only union members, but the welfare and prosperity of our entire Nation. Essentially, the argument is whether labor unions should be encouraged under the law as a kind of organization that is necessary to the American system—or whether they should be outlawed as "restraints of trade." Recently, I was invited by the Midwest Debate Bureau of Normal, Ill., to answer three questions that students are asking on this subject. This brief contains my answers to those questions. We are reprinting them here with the hope that they will help debaters and also help to inform others who are interested in avoiding a serious miscarriage of justice.)

Should labor organizations be under jurisdiction of antitrust legislation?

At the outset let it be clearly stated, and fully understood, that labor organizations and business organizations are two entirely different institutions. They are in no way comparable since the purpose of business is to make a profit, while the purpose of unions is to protect workers. Thus, legislation applicable to one is not necessarily applicable to the other.

In the case of antitrust legislation, the purpose is to protect the public against artificial price distortions by those possessing a high degree of economic power over the economy. Since workers and their families comprise the overwhelming majority of the public, the application of such laws to worker organizations would in effect penalize—and reduce—the efforts of the majority to protect themselves against economic exploitation.

Those who support the application of antitrust legislation to labor organizations pretend to see an equation between the commodities that business sells—and the labor a worker sells. However, easily identifiable differences between the two make such an equation patently false.

First, commodities can generally be withheld from the market, without loss of value, when the price is not satisfactory. Labor by comparison, is highly "perishable." Any attempt to withhold it from the market when the price (that is, the wage) is too low results in an immediate and permanent loss to the worker.

Second, commodities can easily be transferred from an unfavorable to a favorable market. Labor, on the other hand, is relatively immobile, being rooted in a particular locality not only by such ties as family, friendship, church affiliation and familiarity of surroundings, but by lack of knowledge of employment opportunities elsewhere.

Third, buyers of commodities are vastly more varied and numerous than are employers of labor. In fact, in recent years a trend of corporate mergers and absorptions has concentrated greater and greater control of production and jobs into fewer and fewer hands. At the present time, for example, more than one-half of America's productive capacity—and more than two-thirds of its industrial profits—are accounted for by only 150 of its largest corporations.

Fourth, owners of commodities, corporate and otherwise, normally have financial resources in cash, credit, property and inventory that workers do not possess.

Because of these significant differences, there can be no valid comparison between labor organizations and business organizations. As Congressman Emanuel Celler has so cogently summed it up, unions cannot be compared to business monopolies because they "do not have the control over the labor of their members that is enjoyed by owners over the goods they sell. No more than their individual members can unions store or ship that labor. Nor are they in a position to make unrestricted delivery of it. This imperfect control, compared to the control exercised by sellers over their goods, sharply limits the power of unions. They are not truly sellers but brokers of labor, a perishable, variable, and relatively immobile product."

Thus, the test that must be applied to any legislation aimed at reducing the role and effectiveness of unions in our economic system is: would it enhance or reduce the public welfare?

In part, the answer can be found by referring to earlier years in this century when unions were weak and workers competed without union protections in the job market. The results hardly contributed to the national good since they included sweatshops, speedups, the exploitation of women, child labor, the 12-hour day, company towns, an appalling industrial accident rate, and a generally depressed standard of living for the working people of America.

However, these were the only results that could logically be expected, since pure competition between workers will normally be expressed in terms of who can or will set the lowest value on labor.

There is little reason to suppose that in the absence of a strong labor movement conditions such as these would not be repeated today.

And if they were repeated, would the public interest be served?

Are low wages and their corollary, low purchasing power in the work force, beneficial in a society where capacity to produce already threatens to outrun effective ability to consume?

Can low wages and depressed conditions in the work force provide a base of prosperity for merchants, doctors, teachers, farmers, or for industry itself?

Can America meet the challenge of rapid economic expansion in the Soviet Union with a depressed, "low wage" economy?

The answers are evident. Even the Taft-Hartley Act recognizes that without effective unions there can be no effective bargaining between employers and workers. And, without effective bargaining, wages and working conditions must inevitably sink to the level set by the most ruthless employer, and the hungriest worker.

Since the purpose of antitrust legislation is to prevent undesirable monopolies it must be noted that this purpose would be directly contravened by application of antitrust principles to unions. For it is only through unions that workers have achieved a measure of control over the conditions under which they labor. And if unions were destroyed, through misapplication of the antitrust principle, this control would revert to the employer. In effect this would reestablish, under the exclusive control of self-interested employers, complete monopoly of jobs and job conditions.

It is probable that the severance of long-established bargaining relationships would initially lead to chaos in labor-management relationships. A corporation with 10 separate plants would not bargain with one union for one agreement covering all, but with 10 fragments for 10 different agreements.

However, the unexpressed purpose of those who seek to treat unions as a "conspiracy in restraint of trade" is to achieve industrial peace by transferring to employers absolute power in the work place. And undoubtedly, this kind of peace they would eventually achieve. For it is obvious that large corporations would have little difficulty disposing of the labor movement once it was fragmented into tens of thousands of isolated parts.

And once management possessed complete and absolute power it could safely ignore any demand by workers for a greater share of their own rising productivity. And, of course, as production continued to outstrip consumption the eventual result would be economic stagnation.

In a society as highly industrialized and interdependent as ours the Federal Government could not sit idly and watch the economy die. Drastic countermeasures, involving far greater regulation of business and industry, would be necessary. In the end, free collective bargaining between workers and employers would be supplanted by complete Government regulation of the employer-employee relationship.

This necessary enlargement of the Government's role would automatically diminish the prerogatives of management. For, as employers in other countries have found, once government takes the first step toward regulation and control of wages, hours and working conditions, the next step—to government regulation of prices, production. markets and profits—is both short and inevitable.

Finally, it must be noted that the question implies that unions now enjoy a blanket exemption from the anti-trust laws. However, such an implication has no basis in fact. The purpose of the anti-trust laws is to prohibit a "conspiracy in restraint of trade." And though the Clayton Act specifically declares that unions per se are not such a conspiracy, this does not mean that unions are exempt from prosecution when they engage in activities (in concert with employers) that do, in fact, constitute a restraint of trade.

IS ORGANIZED LABOR TOO POWERFUL IN THE UNITED STATES?

Any attempt to compare the so-called power of organized labor with the all-pervading influence of big business in our society becomes ludicrous upon rational examination of the evidence.

Although organized labor directly represents some 18 million workers and seeks to advance the economic, social, and political welfare of all workingmen's families, its effectiveness is seriously impaired by the control that businessmen exert over the Nation's press, television, radio, magazines, advertising and other media of public information and understanding. One result of this control is, of course, that political candidates friendly to labor are invariably handicapped by a hostile and unfair press.

A further result is that the wishes and views of big business outweigh those of labor at all levels of government, from local school boards to the Senate of the United States. Accordingly, it is not labor, but the business community that selects the Nation's textbooks as well as the Nation's laws. This was dramatically illustrated in the 1961 session of Congress.

Although labor fought, and fought hard for such desperately needed national programs as Federal aid to education, medical care for the aged, minimum standards that would protect migrant farm workers against merciless exploitation, and the plugging of special tax exemptions for the very rich, these measures were buried under the disapproval of such affluent and politically influential groups as the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Medical Association, the American Farm Bureau, and the oil and gas industry.

Similarly, in most State legislatures, years of effort by organized labor have failed to achieve basic and long-overdue reforms in antiquated workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and factory inspection laws.

In looking at the myth of "labor's power" it is also necessary to consider that not a single union in the country has assets that compare with those of the large corporations that dominate the American economy.

The resources of the United Auto Workers, for example, are microscopic as compared to those of any single producer in the auto industry. The total assets of the United Steel Workers, after a quarter of a century of operation, are only a fraction of 1 year's net profits of any of the major steel producers. The reserves of the Machinists Union, including the value of its headquarter's building, amount to less than $25 a member. And so it is in industry after industry.

As a result of industry's financial and political advantage—and despite the distortions of the press—industrial democracy is far from being realized in the United States today. In the 1960's, as in the 1930's, organizers are still being beaten by company inspired police or company hired thugs.

Workers who desire to exercise rights supposedly guaranteed them by well defined Federal legislation are still subject to economic, and sometimes physical, reprisals. And, as the workers in Henderson, N.C., and Winchester, Va., know well and bitterly, even a long-established union tradition can be crushed by the economic power of an implacable employer, especially if that power is supported by court injunctions, imported strikebreakers, biased newspaper reporting, brutal police tactics, and the presence of the State militia.

Actually, the campaign to fragment the labor movement under the pretense of antitrust comes at a time when union strength is declining due to such factors as automation, chronic unemployment, unfair labor legislation, and a consistently biased press. Under such conditions, and with only one worker in four organized, labor's ability to maintain decent working standards is already less than the level needed to insure a healthy balanced economy.

Finally, it should be noted that if organized labor were as powerful as its enemies claim, this power would be reflected in a simple analysis of income distribution in the United States.

It would be expected, for example, that the people most likely to be represented by unions—i.e., the lower income families—would be increasing their share of the total national income at the expense of those in the upper income brackets. However, such is not the case.

In 1944, for example, 60 percent of the Nation's families—i.e., the lowest three-fifths—received only 32 percent of all family incomes in the United States. The upper two-fifths of the income groups received the other 68 percent, with almost two-thirds of this going to the families in the top fifth. Today, 17 years later, these ratios are almost exactly the same. The families included in the lower three-fifths of all income groups receive only one-tenth of 1 percent more of the national total than they did in 1944. Thus, it is evident that while the rich have stayed rich, the relative position of workers has not changed.

The illusion of labor's overwhelming and irresistible strength which prevails in spite of the above may be due in part to the fact that when organized workers are forced or driven to strike, editorial writers customarily view with alarm this evidence of "great power" by unions to stop industrial production. Yet few of these same editors have ever challenged or questioned the far greater power of industrial managers to stop production and to close factories, sometimes temporarily, sometimes permanently, without regard for the welfare of either the work force or the community.

As Prof. James Kuhn of Columbia University has noted, "The unions' ability to stop production when others wish it to continue is not unique. Only the public resentment of union stoppages is unique. Managers stop production and reduce output for months on end despite the readiness, willingness and desire of workers to work. Few question the throttling down of factory production, though unemployment probably is a lingering, wasting cancer more destructive than the clean, swift wound of strikes."

DO UNIONS TAKE UNFAIR ADVANTAGE OF EMPLOYERS IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING NEGOTIATIONS?

Since organized labor is a human institution made up of human beings it is not possible to say that every union has always bargained with complete responsibility. However, it must be recognized that in any bargaining situation the employer holds certain economic trumps that make it far easier (and more typical) for him to exploit workers than for unions to take unfair advantage of him.

Not only does management enjoy superior financial resources and political power, but it is management that owns the jobs. Though workers have organized for the purpose of gaining an equity in their jobs based on years of service, it is management in the final analysis that controls the availability and number of jobs. This, in itself, is a powerful bargaining weapon.

Moreover, a union's demands must always be tempered by the realization that management must remain competitive and profitable. In other words, a union cannot bargain in a way that will destroy an employer's incentive to remain in business. For to do so would be self-destructive.

If the employer goes out of business or moves the plant because of unrealistic union demands, it is union members who lose jobs. This not only places a self-regulating brake on union demands, but motivates unions to make special efforts to help employers who are in a bad competitive position.

In practice, as well as in theory, unions are acutely aware that the prosperity of workers depends on that of employers. A real problem for America rises from the fact that so many corporate managements do not understand that the principle works both ways. Though workers obviously cannot enjoy prosperity and good wages if management is unprofitable, management, by the same token, cannot enjoy the benefits of an expanding economy if workers are poorly paid.

All of these factors, taken together, place a definite limit of reasonableness on unions' activities. And, as can be easily demonstrated, this limit has been observed by the overwhelming majority of the Nation's unions over the course of many years.

First, if unions had been taking unfair advantage of employers in collective bargaining, the evidence would be easily observable in the declining profits of industry. However, the evidence actually points the other way. Not only have corporate profits after taxes, plus depreciation set-asides, doubled since 1953, but the mass-production industries in which unions have been strongest (steel, automobile, rubber, aircraft, and electrical equipment) have all made substantial progress in the 25 years since these industries were organized.

Second, while industrial productivity has increased 20.9 percent since 1953, unit labor costs (including all fringe benefits) of production workers have increased only one-tenth of 1 percent. By comparison, unit salary costs (again including fringe benefits) of white-collar workers (including executives at the management level) have increased 33 percent.

In this connection it is appropriate to point out the relationship between labor's long-term drive for better wages and management's continuing search for greater productivity.

It is no accident that the American worker is also the most productive worker in the world. Before workers formed unions it is true that wages were low, but individual productivity was also low. In effect, labor was cheap but production was expensive. But when unions drove the price of American labor above the subsistence level, management was compelled to find ways to use this more expensive labor more economically.

Thus, unions acted as a catalytic agent for technological progress. Instead of seeking profits through exploitation of cheap labor, management began to develop laborsaving machines and adopt better and faster methods of production. This interaction, between increased wages and intensified technology has given America the industrial leadership of the world.

Today, the United States, with 6 percent of the earth's labor force, produces more than 50 percent of the world's goods.

Finally, this whole question must be analyzed in context with the long-range struggle between capitalism and communism in the world. Assuming that mankind escapes nuclear destruction, America must nevertheless realize that it is engaged in long-term competition to prove that democratic free enterprise provides the world with the best formula for meeting its human and economic needs.

In other words America must provide the world with a real alternative to communism. And since a free labor movement is an integral part of the system of democratic free enterprise (as witnessed by the fact that democracy has never survived the destruction of the labor movement in any country.) America without its labor movement would provide the world with no real alternative at all.

It is indeed ironic that while America seeks to show Asians, Africans and others how to build a strong labor movement as a base for democratic free enterprise, its own labor movement at home is constantly threatened and harassed by the threat of legislation, the effects of which are little understood by either those who support it or those who would suffer because of it.

YOUTH CAMPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was extremely pleased to read in the New York Herald Tribune of April 13, 1962, the report on the Gallup poll which indicates that 8 out of 10 people queried feel it would be a good idea to set up youth camps, such as are provided in measures now reported out of both the Senate and House Committees on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to be the principal sponsor of similar legislation in the 86th Congress, which passed the Senate and was bogged down in the House due to the opposition of the Eisenhower administration. I was also privileged to be the principal sponsor of legislation which has been reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to establish a Youth Conservation Corps for young men between the ages of 16 and 22 for work on needed conservation projects and public lands.

The Gallup poll shows an overwhelming number of people in favor of the Youth Conservation Corps in all regions of the Nation and in all age groups. Even 70 percent of the rank and file Republicans approve this proposal, which has been supported by a Democratic administration.

No other proposal which the Senator from Minnesota has advanced in legislative form except the Peace Corps has evoked such a tremendously favorable response. I call to the attention of my colleagues the manner in which the American people have responded to this proposal to provide useful work and training for young men who are finding each year a more difficult labor market.

The American people in their innate good sense recognize the Youth Conservation Corps as a powerful preventive against juvenile delinquency and a magnificent method of developing character and skills among our young people.

The proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps is legislation which the American people want and which they want in overwhelming degree. I am confident that the Congress will act to authorize and establish such Youth Conservation Corps before adjournment this summer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by George Gallup appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of April 13, 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GALLUP POLL—8 IN 10 FAVOR REVIVAL OF CCC YOUTH CAMPS

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—As a way of dealing with the growing problem of out-of-school, out-of-work young men, the American public is highly in favor of reviving the concept of the CCC camps of the 1930's.

Supported by 8 out of 10 persons, such a proposal would set up youth conservation camps for men between the ages of 16 and 22 who want to learn a trade and earn a little money by working outdoors.

Such a concept is embodied in the youth training bills now before Congress, with differing Senate and House versions. The Senate bill calls for a maximum of 150,000 youths in the program by the year 1965; the House version would limit the number to 12,000 at any time over a 3-year period.

To see how the public feels about the general principle of modern-day CCC camps, Gallup poll reporters put this question to a cross section of adults:

"It is proposed that the Federal Government set up youth camps—such as the CCC camps of the 1930's—for young men 16 to 22 years who want to learn a trade and earn a little money by outdoor work. Do you think this is a good idea or a poor idea?"

The vote nationwide:

	Percent
Good idea	79
Poor idea	16
No opinion	5

Analysis shows that the youth camps win overwhelming support in all regions of the Nation—East, Midwest, South, and Far West.

Big majorities of older voters—who recall the CCC camps of the 1930's—as well as younger voters endorse the idea of youth camps.

Although the proposal has bipartisan support at the grassroots level, a modern-day CCC has more appeal to Democrats and Independents (83 and 80 percent approval respectively) than it does to rank-and-file Republicans (70 percent approval).

Although the public supports the basic principle of youth conservation camps, the question of whether youths who are out of school and out of work should be required to go to these camps provokes some controversy.

Authorities estimate that as many as 1 million young men each year find themselves out of school, out of work, and not accepted by the military service. Many youth experts contend that this situation—in addition to providing a "breeding ground" for juvenile delinquency—constitutes a great waste of the Nation's manpower.

Overall—when asked about requiring such young men to go to youth camps—more persons approve of the mandatory approach than disapprove of it.

Among Republicans interviewed, however, the prevailing sentiment is against requiring young men to go to the camps. Democrats and Independents support such an approach.

Younger voters tend to vote against such a method of handling the youth camps; a majority of older voters are in favor of it.

During the 1930's, upward of 2 million men were at one time members of the Civilian Conservation Corps or its predecessor, the Emergency Conservation Work agency.

Gallup poll files show that no New Deal measure was so consistently popular with the public as the CCC camps.

In July, 1936—after the camps had been in operation for 3 years—83 percent of persons in a national survey were in favor of continuing the CCC.

In April, 1938, another Gallup poll recorded nearly 8 out of 10 in favor of establishing the camps on a permanent basis.

PROPOSED FEDERAL CROP QUALITY LABORATORY AT UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, IN ST. PAUL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I propose that there be established under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Agriculture a Federal crop quality laboratory at the University of Minnesota campus in St. Paul.

The dividends to this Nation from such a laboratory might be incalculable.

They would far outweigh the direct costs which might accrue—an estimated $2.6 million.

The purpose of the laboratory would be to provide for the first time an organized basis for genetic modification of existing crop lines for largely new purposes.

Instead of dealing, as we do at present, with existing crop lines, trying to adapt them to new food, feed, fiber, and vegetable oil purposes, this proposed laboratory would do basic research on devising new strains for new purposes.

The case for such a laboratory was presented by Mr. Donald G. Fletcher, executive secretary of the Crop Quality Council, Inc., before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

As Mr. Fletcher pointed out, no facility exists today whereby the science of genetics and plant breeding is given the resources in men, money, facility, and equipment to experiment in basic research toward crop innovations.

Throughout the Nation at State experimentation stations and elsewhere, important work is at present being done with existing crop lines for the purpose of fulfilling presently felt needs, including adaptation for industrial—such as plastic—purposes.

But if we are to achieve genuine breakthroughs, we must give to the plant geneticists, the plant physiologists and to other members of multidisciplinary teams the resources to conduct basic research, free from the day-to-day requirements of applied research and development.

It is my hope, and that of my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], that the Senate Committee on Appropriations will include in the 1963 USDA, appropriations bill an amendment for such a laboratory. It is our further hope that the invaluable resources of the University of Minnesota will be utilized for this purpose by authorizing the construction of such a laboratory in St. Paul directly adjacent to the new $1 million Crop Research Laboratory. This latter new building has been constructed entirely through appropriations by the State of Minnesota and is a part of the Institute of Agriculture. There, skilled teams from the Divisions of Agronomy, plant pathology, biochemistry and soil work on problems of crop research.

This $1 million center is, in turn, part of a master plan for a $6 million State-financed enterprise which will embrace one of the most modern and comprehensive agricultural research establishments in the Nation.

In recent years, a number of important Federal laboratories have been established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. For example, in the last 2 years, laboratories have been established in North and South Dakota, respectively.

We are familiar, too, with the previous record of the world-famous efforts of the Peoria, Ill., Utilization Laboratory.

The time has come for an enterprise of the type which I have described to be established—and Minnesota would be an ideal choice for its site.

I may say, too, that one of the first purposes of such a laboratory would be to compile information on plant genetic work anywhere else in the United States and abroad which could provide helpful "leads" for the laboratory's work. In turn, the laboratory would disseminate its findings to geneticists elsewhere as promptly as they are developed.

In other words, Mr. President, we seek to utilize plant physiologists and geneticists in this field to develop strains of seeds which will modify the crops which are produced from our land, so that those crops can be used for chemical and industrial purposes, not merely for food purposes. In this way we shall be able to utilize the vast acreage of America which now stands idle, which will provide income for farm producers and at the same time provide new products for American industries.

I am confident this proposal may well open an entirely new era of chemistry and biochemistry, and a new era of industry, through the utilization of food and fiber products modified for industrial purposes and for industrial development.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Muskie in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Dr. Emanuel R. Piore, of New York, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Herbert Hollomon, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of persons in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of persons in the U.S. Coast Guard be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

IMPORTATION OF EGGS FROM POLAND AND ITS THREAT TO THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I call attention to another ridiculous situation resulting from one of our foreign aid giveaway programs.

During the past 2 years our Government has shipped to Poland 826,300 metric tons of grain under Public Law 480. Under the terms of this sale the American taxpayers receive practically nothing for this grain, since whatever is charged is paid in the form of Polish currency, which in turn can only be used by the U.S. Government in that country. Dollar sales of grain to Poland in that same period were less than 5 percent of the total.

It is true that under the most of these sales agreements the grain being shipped supposedly was not to be used for the feeding of livestock, but, under a socialistic government which handles all importation of grain for livestock feed as well as that for human consumption, certainly the grain cannot be kept separate.

In any event what is in effect practically a gift of 826,000 metric tons of grain to Poland has the indirect effect of reducing the cost of all grain in that country, whether such grain is used for livestock feed or for human consumption.

The result has been that Polish poultry farmers for the past 2 years have been able to buy American grain or byproducts from American grain, for the feeding of their livestock, at prices far cheaper than are available to poultry farmers here in America

As evidence of the ultimate effect of such a contradictory policy, Poland is now beginning to ship eggs produced with this cheap American grain back into the United States, thereby further depriving the American farmers of their normal markets.

The Department of Agriculture has just confirmed that delivery of 40,000 cases of shell eggs has been arranged by a Canadian citizen, and that this Canadian importer is in turn selling some of these eggs in the United States.

This is but the beginning, and unless our State Department and Agriculture Department take prompt steps to correct this situation the increased influx of eggs imported from Poland can prove disastrous to our eastern markets.

Already the production of cheap eggs in Europe from poultry flocks that are fed with subsidized American grain has destroyed our export markets.

I have received assurances that both Departments are aware of the results of a continuation or acceleration of the importation of these eggs and have promised to give this problem their attention.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed a letter dated April 17, 1962, just received from Mr. Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture confirming these importations and the shipments of this subsidized grain.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1962.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to the April 8 telephone request of Mr. Ralph Peters of your office, for information concerning the recent importation of Polish shell eggs into the United States.

This Department understands from trade reports that a Canadian citizen has purchased from Poland approximately 40,000 cases of shell eggs which are scheduled for delivery in parcels of some 3,400 to perhaps as high as 10,000 cases each, between the latter part of March and the middle of May. It is understood that the Canadian importer has been selling some af these eggs in the United States to egg breakers.

There are no restrictions against the sale of such eggs in the United States, provided the 3½ cents per dozen import duty is paid and that they meet the food and drug requirements with respect to the importation of shell eggs.

This Government has supplied Poland with wheat and barley for human consumption under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (P.L. 480) since 1957. In earlier years, relatively small quantities of corn and grain sorghums were included in the programs. However, in view of the increase in Polish exports of poultry and livestock products, the programing of feed grains was discontinued after the July 1960 agreement. The agreement of December 15, 1961 did not include any grain for feed, but did include a requirement that Poland purchase U.S. feed grains commercially for dollars as a condition for receiving wheat under the program, since the Polish Government was unwilling to agree to limit exports of poultry and livestock products. It is emphasized, however, that grain for poultry feed has not been sold to Poland recently under Government programs.

This department is following the importation of these eggs and is continuing to make inquiries so as to assure that the laws and regulations of the United States are not violated.

The following is submitted in response to Mr. Peters' specific question. Our records of imports in the United States for the past 5 years (1957-61) show that no eggs have entered this country from Poland. Exports of grains to Poland during the same period were as follows:

Exports for dollars:	*Metric tons*
1957	None
1958	None
1959	3,300
1960	16,600
1961	16,500
Exports under title I, Public Law 480:	
1957	None
1958	155,200
1959	120,500
1960	439,900
1961	387,400

We hope the foregoing information is helpful to you and that you will request further information in the event same is needed.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. MURPHY,
Under Secretary.

CALIFORNIA SETS PACE IN EDUCATION

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, we Californians are proud of our State's leadership in education.

Among the many achievements of the administration of Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown are the steps taken to provide even finer educational opportunities for today's young people and for those who will follow them into the classroom in the years to come.

One aspect of California's preeminence in the field of education is discussed in an article by Mr. Ron Moskowitz, education editor of the San Francisco Examiner, in the newspaper's April 13 issue.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Apr. 13, 1962]

WE'RE SETTING PACE—STATE LEADS IN COLLEGES

(By Ron Moskowitz)

Los Angeles County is a wondrous place. You drive for miles and miles through subdivision after subdivision until you feel almost like "Alice in Suburbialand."

And no matter from which direction you head out of Los Angeles' sprawling downtown area, if you drive long enough through this caricature of all suburbs, you will reach a State college. Usually a beautiful State college.

There are now 15 State colleges with 16 campuses. And two more are planned for the Los Angeles area, which already has the majority.

I sometimes wonder if the people of California realize the wonder of it all. State colleges close enough to the people so their sons and daughters can commute from their homes.

Beautiful new colleges that are attracting better and better faculties.

Last week the State board of education met on one of the newest of the campuses, at San Fernando Valley State College at Northridge. Ten years ago it was a bald spot in a desolate area. Today it is a growing campus—growing in prestige as well as size and enrollment. And growing in quality.

A similar miracle is taking place in its earlier stages just 50 minutes from San Francisco. Today, near Cotati in Sonoma County, 275 students study in temporary quarters. Nearby is a 275-acre plot of land barren except for a few trees.

In about 20 years, that land will be topped with a carefully planned campus of Sonoma State College and enrollment will have grown to 12,000. The master plan was tentatively approved last week by the board.

Again, I wonder if Californians appreciate the fact that the site was purchased at a reasonable price before the people crowded into the area; that the master plan for the campus was carefully developed so buildings would be designed for the type of program to be offered there; that such far-ahead planning and vision is saving the State millions of tax dollars while providing Californians with better education than many States not afflicted with the growth problems we have here.

At a dinner party the other night, the inevitable What brought you to California? question made the rounds and a couple in their forties answered:

"We were living in the East, where the good colleges and universities are so crowded that even students of better than average ability are unable to enter.

"It was the chance for our two sons to go to good colleges that brought us to California. We don't have a lot of money."

I wonder how many people good education has brought to California. I wonder how many new industries have been attracted to the west coast because of good educational planning.

I wonder if those businesses and industries realize that tax dollars are well spent when they are invested in education.

California is setting the pace in the Nation in higher education. I hope Californians realize it.

CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE AND THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, farmers in California are deeply concerned about the possible effects of the Trade Expansion bill. They are now taking a long, hard look in an attempt to estimate what new tariff negotiations might mean to their livelihood.

They have some considerable reason for concern, because recently announced European Common Market external tariffs fixed rates on several products at levels higher than the average of duties of member countries. I have specific reference to prunes, fruit juices, and canned pineapple. These new higher-than-average tariffs are disappointing and have brought some disillusionment, not only to prune growers and the others directly affected, but to other producers who cannot be sure that they will not receive similar treatment in the future.

California leads the Nation in agricultural exports, with more than 200 specialty crops. Our farmers necessarily fear that these specialty crops—many of them grown primarily if not almost entirely in California—may be used as concessions in future negotiations aimed at gaining entry into Common Market markets for other U.S. products. Recognizing that California is something of a "political sitting duck" with only two U.S. Senators and only a limited number of agricultural Congressmen, California farmers are anxious about what the Trade Expansion Act might mean to them.

Nevertheless, they have not turned against the bill. Instead, they are suggesting ways in which the bill might be revised to take care of certain specific problems.

One of the best, moderate statements on the subject is that of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRUIT INDUSTRY—EXPORT POLICY STATEMENT BY U.S. NATIONAL FRUIT EXPORT COUNCIL

The membership of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council represents the major U.S. fresh and processed fruit exporting industries. The council's objective is to facilitate exports. In recent years it has emphasized the need to obtain competitive access to export markets. The major problem confronting U.S. fruit exporters has been the existence of nontariff barriers (quotas, prohibitions, licensing, etc.), maintained by Western European countries. These countries provide the major offshore markets for our products; and the council has concentrated its efforts on this problem. Although some of these barriers have been removed, many important ones still remain. They are maintained to protect European markets for local or associated producers, even though they no longer are justified under the rules of the GATT, but, in fact, are contrary to the terms thereof.

The council testified at the hearings on the extension of the trade agreements legislation in 1955 and in 1958. It stressed the need to obtain removal of these foreign barriers to trade in horticultural products in order to make reciprocal trade truly a two-way street. We supported extension of the Trade Agreements Act, even though in the case of perishables, the act had not worked in the way it was intended, and U.S. fruit and fruit products were discriminated against.

One of the major purposes of the Trade Agreements Act of 1958 was to enable the negotiation of favorable tariffs with the European Economic Community. The recently announced EEC common external tariffs agreed upon at GATT negotiations and the provisional Common Market fruit and vegetable policy are a great disappointment to us. Tariffs on important segments of our trade (for example: dried prunes, fruit juices, and canned pineapple) were fixed at rates higher than the average of the duties of the member countries, this at a time when reductions were supposed to be negotiated under the authority of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. We are also concerned from study of the provisional Common Market fruit and vegetable policy, that the EEC countries intend to continue or indeed increase their nontariff barriers.

We need to know whether the common external tariffs negotiated with the EEC, are capable of being nullified by nontariff barriers. If they are, the United States should either obtain firm commitments that this will not be done or else withdraw concessions commensurate in value to the trade in these products.

European duties on horticultural items too often have been augmented by nontariff barriers in recent years, and the benefit of concessions lost thereby.

This leads to our principal recommendation, which is, that the Congress should incorporate in new trade agreements legislation, steps to maintain and improve access for U.S. horticultural products into the Common Market, and other foreign countries, and should instruct the President in utilizing the steps incorporated in the authority of new trade agreements legislation. To do this, the President should take special precautions to insure that existing tariffs or subsequent tariff concessions for the entry of these products are not offset by quotas or other import restrictions.

The legislation should provide that whenever the EEC or any foreign country takes action to nullify or impair concession granted on these products, equivalent withdrawals will be made by the United States. Similar action should be taken against countries who refuse to remove existing unjustifiable barriers.

The legislation should also prohibit the President from making any future concessions available to any country that has unjustifiably nullified or impaired concessions previously granted to the United States without having made adequate compensation therefor; concessions negotiated in multilateral agreements must be withheld from any such countries.

This recommendation is made because experience has demonstrated that representations on the part of the United States have not succeeded in modifying or removing some of these nontariff barriers, despite GATT obligations for their removal. We are informed that continuing representations have taken place over the past several years in an endeavor to seek relaxation of quantitative or seasonal restrictions on imports of fresh apples and pears in most Western European countries, on winter grapefruit and processed orange and grapefruit products in the United Kingdom, and on imports of most horticultural products into France. Despite these, little significant progress has been made. Hence, representations alone apparently are not capable of securing removal or even reductions of these barriers.

Another recommendation which is related to the previous one, is that the United States modify its most-favored-nation policy for tariff concessions. We suggest that tariff concessions be available only to those countries who have tariff agreements with the United States or are members of the GATT. We cannot understand why countries who do not reciprocate with the United States should receive the benefit of our tariff concessions.

Mexico is a good case in point. Despite increased imports into the United States from Mexico, of horticultural products, practically all U.S. exports of horticultural items to Mexico are restricted. At times, these exports have been subjected to embargoes almost without notice. We believe that a country which continues to impose such restraints on trade should not be eligible for the benefits of all concessions made under our trade agreements program.

Also, we believe that the most favored nation policy should be modified so that concessions may be withdrawn from individual countries which maintain nontariff barriers.

Because representations alone have proved inadequate to secure access to foreign markets, we believe the Congress must insist that withdrawals of concessions be used as a means to accomplish this end.

We recognize the danger to trade involved in a mutual withdrawal of concessions. Also, we know that retaliatory measures involving other products will not alone guarantee us reasonable access to foreign outlets for our products. But lack of progress in the removal of these trade barriers has persuaded us that measures stronger than those heretofore used are required if we are to obtain continuing reasonable opportunities to export our products.

LOBBYING BY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Kennedy's Lobby Is Turned Back," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 18, 1962. The editorial deals with the successful battle by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to upset the Kennedy administration's plan to convert more than a million Federal Civil Service workers into a huge lobby on behalf of administration programs. I thoroughly agree with the views expressed in the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Apr. 18, 1962]

KENNEDY'S LOBBY IS TURNED BACK

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, has succeeded in another of his copyrighted one-man battles, this time by upsetting the Kennedy administration's plan to convert more than a million Federal civil service workers into a huge lobby to plug administration programs. The plan had the blessing of Chairman John W. Macy of the Federal Civil Service Commission and of the President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

Mr. WILLIAMS seized his opportunity when the administration presented a half billion dollar appropriation bill. The Senator offered an amendment which put it up to the administration to back out of its scheme for organizing the Federal lobby or risk loss of funds it badly needed. The amendment specified that no part of the money should be used to propagandize the public.

Other Senators, though they realized that debasement of the civil service was indefensible, attempted to induce Senator WILLIAMS not to make an issue of the matter. But the Republican Senator refused to retreat. He recalled that Macy had distributed a circular acknowledging that the law forbade civil service employees from engaging in "propaganda or publicity" affecting legislation, but then went on to counsel Government workers to do this very thing. They were authorized "to explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation."

When Attorney General Kennedy was asked to comment on the subject as a question of ethics, he wrote that it would be "a serious impropriety" and a "distinct breach of duty" for a civil servant to oppose any administration measure. But the Attorney General had no corresponding caveat regarding lobbying in favor of the New Frontier.

Mr. WILLIAMS did not need to labor the point that this was a scandalous attempt to convert the whole of the civil service into advocates who could only see one side of any question. President Kennedy himself endorsed the plan when he told 175 agricultural stabilization and conservation committeemen that, though their activities were supposed to be circumscribed by custom and law, they were still at liberty to function as lobbyists "acquainting" Members of Congress with the administration's views on farm policy.

Before Senator WILLIAMS could bring the controversy to a vote, he was called off the floor to take a telephone call announcing Macy's capitulation. Senator HAYDEN, Democratic chairman of the Appropriations Committee, also received a call and announced that Macy had withdrawn his ill-advised scheme.

Although Senator WILLIAMS' triumph was complete, this whole business leaves a bad taste. The administration brazenly sought to destroy the essential reason for civil service, which is that it should give the country politically disinterested public servants. The highest officers of the administration advised that the law be violated openly, and the President, his brother, and their civil service chairman emerged as principal offenders against the Hatch Act, which prescribes that no one receiving Federal funds shall engage in partisan politics.

It was a good day's work by the Delaware Senator—one among many for which his fellow citizens should be duly grateful.

KENTUCKY ARMY RESERVE, 100TH DIVISION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding the mustering back into active duty of the 100th Division, Kentucky Army Reserve, as a part of the program to strengthen our defense capabilities to meet the challenge to world peace and our own national security.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORTON

Late last summer the deteriorating Berlin situation and the Kremlin's belligerent attitude during this crisis gave the United States little choice but to strengthen our defense capabilities to meet this challenge to world peace and our own national security.

The military establishment turned to the citizen-soldiers of the Reserves, our peacetime minutemen, to provide the muscle for the buildup of the Armed Forces. The first division to be mustered back into active duty was the 100th Division, a Kentucky Army Reserve outfit whose primary mission is the training of troops.

The Pentagon picked the 100th Division because its record clearly demonstrated its superiority to do the job. The "Century men" entered active duty on September 25, 1961, and within a week were fully mobilized at Fort Chaffee, Ark. Three weeks later the division received its first trainees for 8 weeks of instruction in the basic art of infantry combat.

Since then, thousands of young soldiers have received their indoctrination in the basic skills of infantry warfare at the hands of real professionals. The division's performance at Fort Chaffee has more than justified the judgment of the Pentagon in recalling the "Century men" for their important and necessary national security assignment.

Recently, it was my great pleasure to visit Fort Chaffee, spend time with my fellow Kentuckians, inspect various facilities, and observe the division in action. Let me say that I was never prouder of Kentuckians. Their record at Fort Chaffee is exemplary of the finest of our citizen-soldier traditions. They have done the job called for and more. They have not only far surpassed the training demands originally projected, but their trainees have shown a remarkable degree of proficiency at the end of basic training.

I recall one incident where the division was assigned trainees of low aptitude and ability. By the end of 8 weeks, these soldiers had been so capably handled that their proficiency records were considerably higher than had originally been anticipated for the group.

The division, according to procedure, is supposed to have a week's respite between graduating one group and receiving another. It is standard practice now for companies to ship our trainees on Saturday morning and receive a new group Saturday night, picking up where they left off without a break. When asked if it can handle additional soldier-trainees, the division does not say, "We'll study our capabilities and let you know later." It says, "Sure, we can handle them," and then adjusts its manpower and facilities to handle the additional load without in any way impairing its training efficiency.

I was also intrigued by an administrative procedure followed by Maj. Gen. Dillman A. Rash, the division commander. General Rash meets weekly with the divisions top noncommissioned officers, who constitute a NCO advisory council, at which the noncoms are free to discuss division matters. These are not gripe sessions, but are valuable in transmitting the enlisted man's views to the division command, thus contributing to the division's operational efficiency. There's an old saying that "the chiefs run the Navy," and I guess the parallel is that "the sergeants run the Army." I would like to invite the attention of the Armed Services Committee to this technique, and say that when the generals are called to testify on Reserve matters it might be well to listen to the opinions of some of the Reserve sergeants who have been called up.

I was deeply impressed by the morale, spirit, determination and willingness of the officers and men of the Century Division. It is obvious that the same dedicated and patriotic determination with which the division captured the fortress city of Bitche in 1945, shattering two centuries of military history, still prevails at Fort Chaffee.

To say that the members of the division are completely happy is not true. It is impossible to uproot 3,000 men, most of them with families, from the peaceful pursuits of civilian life and transplant them as soldiers hundreds of miles away without creating hardship. Many of the Century men and their families have real serious and human problems.

They have suffered a reduction in income, or had to give up their homes, or surrender business opportunities, or interrupt their education. They were, of course, anxious to know when they would return to civilian occupations, taking up where they left off more than 6 months ago. The Pentagon's announcement of an August release was, I am sure, welcome news at Chaffee.

Despite the tremendous sacrifices each man has been making, it is to the division's everlasting credit that it has accepted the necessary responsibilities entrusted to it as reservists without creating incidents such as we have seen at other locations. These men are conscientious, dedicated and patriotic Americans who are performing a necessary task during a national emergency. They recognize the continuing seriousness of the crisis which led to their calling up, and they know that these Communist-mastered world tensions still exist.

Kentucky has always been noted for its breed of fighting men, and the Century men of today are worthy heirs of the traditions of Americanism handed down by their forebears. The Commonwealth and the Nation have every reason to feel secure in the faith placed in their care. Perhaps the division's dedication is best stated in its creed: "The American fighting man, endowed with a firm belief in his God and the country he represents, has not and will never be defeated."

THE EASTER SPIRIT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a weekend of great significance to all Christendom approaches. Upon our adjournment today for the Eastertide, we will all have occasion to be reminded of the tragic day when Jesus Christ was crucified and the glorious day of His resurrection. The question, "Why did Christ die?" has been asked time and again down through the ages. The answers to this question will forever be important to all mankind.

I am indebted to the Reverend James McNamee, pastor of the Church of the Madalene in Tulsa, Okla., for a searching analysis into this all-important "why." His statement was published in the Tulsa World on Good Friday of last year. It is a dissertation fitting this season and all seasons and all years. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why Did Christ Die?

(By Rev. James McNamee, pastor, Church of the Madalene, Tulsa, Okla.)

Many Christians and even theologians attempt to fit Christ's action into the pattern of the ancient sacrifices (animals were offered, Christ was offered), but that is seeing the shadow, not the reality. The ancient sacrifices were only faint shadows of what Christ was to do. We should not define Christ's action by the old and imperfect foreshadowings, but do the reverse: We should explain the old sacrifices in the light of Christ and His work.

Why did Christ die? One of the reasons offered for the crucifixion of Christ is that it "satisfied the anger of God" toward men. God, it is implied, was placated by one man's blood and was thereafter ready to forgive men their sins. To atone, which originally was two words, "at one," took on a new meaning.

This theory goes back about a thousand years, actually to the time of St. Anselm, of England. It did not seem too strange to a race of men who were sadly used to the irresponsible anger of kings and petty tyrants.

To people of today it is appalling that a good God would demand blood, especially the blood of His own Son. Actually God was never unwilling to save men. It was—and is—men who didn't want to be saved.

Is there any other way of looking at this event? Is there any way that does not reflect discredit on God? Certainly there is.

We may ask, "What did Christ come on earth for?" The answer is very clear. He came to set up a kingdom: the Kingdom of God, with the limitation that He must not destroy or corrupt men in the process. His only means therefore was by preaching the truth—the very "foolish" truth that the way to save mankind here and hereafter was by meekness, by mercy, by purity, by uniting peacefully for justice, and all this to be accepted freely by men. By these means alone the world should be changed for the better, not perverted.

These means did not seem too realistic in Christ's time, or, to be truthful, in our time. We are prone to imagine that there must be a quick, easy way to the Kingdom of God. But they are the only means to change the world without degrading man.

Easier methods were offered Christ. The first suggestion of the people of that time was that He should set up the Kingdom by force, put the world to rights first, and then wait for men to become good. This would have been slavery. The Kingdom could not depend on fraud or bribery either, as the devil suggested: by making stones into bread. It had to come by full acceptance of men if it was to be a "Kingdom of justice, love and peace."

Christ did not court death. He was not ordered to die, and if men had accepted His method, He would not have died until the natural time arrived. He was told to set up the Kingdom of God by methods that would really save men. He died in the effort. The Father was not placated by Christ's blood, He does not rejoice at murder, but he was pleased that Christ obeyed Him and did not distort His Kingdom even if He was killed in the effort. "Christ for our sake became obedient unto the death of the cross, therefore hath God raised Him up." It would have done no good for God to have rescued Christ in the last minute. It would have stultified His whole life, made it into a pretense.

It is somewhat the same as a soldier who volunteers to cover the retreat of his comrades. He dies but he saves his fellow soldiers. Does his captain want him to die or rejoice at his death? That would be dreadful. The captain is glad that the man was a good soldier and saved his men, but he is sad at the death of a hero. The Father did not order Christ to die. That was the idea of wicked men. But the Father did command Christ to set up a kingdom, and by the right methods, even if He were to be killed in the attempt. Christ carried out the Father's will to the letter, dying in the effort. Christ is therefore "The faithful and true witness." He did not change the Father's will even when it seemed to human eyes that the Kingdom was all finished on the cross. But God raised Him up "And of His Kingdom there shall be no end."

SECOND NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PEACEFUL USES OF SPACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], I ask unanimous consent that material relating to the Second National Conference on Peaceful Uses of Space, as prepared for that conference, together with the opening statement of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and material were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator Magnuson

This Nation, and the world, are on the brink of the most fantastic scientific revolution in history. In weather forecasting, in communications, in education, in new materials and techniques for industry, and in many other ways, we are all going to benefit from our space research program.

The United States, always at the front in scientific developments, will emerge as a stronger leader of the free world because of our present efforts. I sincerely believe that our children will consider commonplace many of the things that amaze and startle us today.

Our growth has been so rapid in the civilian space effort and the applications of this new science so swift that there is still little realization in this country of the impact which this new technology will have on our everyday life.

It is for this reason that I wish to call attention to the Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space, which will be held at the Seattle World's Fair on May 8 through 10. This historic meeting, the second of its kind to be held in this country and the world, will contribute to the broadening of public understanding of the impact space science will have on our lives.

The leading authorities on space, in Government service and in private industry, will present a complete overview of what we are doing and where we are going in this exciting new frontier. It will not be a technical meeting of scientist talking to scientist, but instead a forum from which the entire world public can gain a better appreciation of what this country means when it talks about "peaceful uses" and space.

From my own committee work, I have some knowledge of the eventual global impact of our communications satellites. I predict that someday people throughout the world will have access to visual instruction on how to decrease mortality by the adoption of simple health measures and how to increase their food production. I know that the communications satellites, which are but one portion of our civilian space program, can be a most valuable instrument of good will and understanding.

As many Senators know, the genesis of this conference was in the imaginative thinking and foresight of the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma who heads our Aeronautical and Space Committee. The first conference was held last year in Tulsa. It was so successfully received that many of the leading citizens in my State decided that a second meeting should be organized this year and agreed to underwrite the expenses as did the people of Tulsa last year. With the cooperation of Mr. Webb, Administrator of NASA, the Seattle sponsoring committee has organized an outstanding program.

Vice President JOHNSON will participate, as will the 10 American space pioneers who have gone over 100,000 feet into space in balloons, X–15's and Mercury capsules. Distinguished national leaders will discuss the impact of space programs on society and a group of high school and college panelists will consider the effect those programs will have on the future of youth.

It is my sincere hope that many Senators will find it possible to be present at the Second National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space. Once Senators have had this experience, I believe they will agree that similar meetings should be organized in other parts of the country so that all Americans can have a better realization of the civilian benefits of space research.

Because of the great interest in this subject, I request permission to insert into the RECORD, at this time, a projection of some of the peaceful dividends which can be derived from our present and future space programs. It was prepared by Edward Gottlieb and Associates, Ltd., the international public relations organization which has been retained by our sponsoring committee in Seattle.

CIVILIAN DIVIDENDS FROM SPACE RESEARCH

"It is the policy of the United States that activities in space be devoted to peaceful purposes. All of us in the United States and in all nations can derive many benefits from the peaceful application of space technology. The impact of this new science will be felt in our daily lives. It can bring all people closer together through improved communications. It can help control the weather and the climate around us. We can safely predict that the impact of the space age will have a far-ranging effect within industry and in our labor force, on medical research, education and many other areas of national concern."—PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Outer space is our newest frontier, says James E. Webb, Administrator of NASA, who points out that our Space Agency is dedicated to the acquisition of knowledge and its dissemination for peaceful and scientific purposes to benefit all mankind.

"Many of the instruments, equipment, power sources and techniques that we devise to make manned lunar expeditions possible," Mr. Webb reminds us, "will be adaptable to other uses. The result will be a great variety of new consumer goods and industrial processes that will raise our standard of living and return tremendous benefits to us in practically every profession and activity."

Just what is happening in our efforts to conquer space? How will this research benefit mankind in everday life? What lies ahead in this exciting frontier? Many answers to these questions will be presented at the Second National Conference on Peaceful Uses of Space, to be held May 8–10 at the Seattle World's Fair. This "report to the Nation" will be the most ambitious program of the type ever undertaken by our National Space Agency. The conference will bring together the Nation's outstanding Government and industry space research scientists.

From Government, scientific and industrial sources the following peaceful uses of space research—already achieved or reasonably attainable in the foreseeable future—has been compiled:

FOR HEALTH AND HUMAN BETTERMENT

Research in aerospace medicine will further worldwide improvements in the diagnosis and treatment of diseases, and in the prolongation of life.

Consider, for instance, the miniature instruments (sensors) attached to our Astronauts to gage their physical responses in space-flight via telemetry. These devices measure heartbeats, brain waves, blood pressure, breathing rates, etc. In civilian life, the "electronic nurses" are already being applied to hospital patients so that they can be watched by remote control. The moment a patient's condition changes, it is instantly recorded and a warning flashed. Such telemetering systems are used in the Lafayette Clinic, Detroit, Mich., and for surgery patients on operating tables at the North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill. The sensors are components of the automated hospital of the future.

Pressured space suits (developed by B. F. Goodrich Co.) are making it possible for bedridden victims of strokes to walk and work. They may restore the necessary tone of the blood vessels so that blood pressure would be normal. The theory is based on the fact that space suits are designed to maintain normal circulation of blood that otherwise would be impeded by stresses in space flight, such as high altitude, sudden acceleration and deceleration. An Illinois farmer, afflicted with a rare disease that adversely affected his blood pressure and made him an invalid for years, donned space suit trousers and was able not only to walk but to do heavy farming chores. Cases of stroke victims who walked again have been reported in Los Angeles and Santa Monica, Calif.

This spring, an electronically rigged helmet was used during football practice at Northwestern University to obtain data about the degree and kind of head shock received by gridiron players. The apparatus, located in the crown of the helmet, resembles that used by our space experts in telemetering critical data back to earth from the astronauts. The research at Northwestern is to determine minimum standards of performance for football headgear.

Among drugs emanating from our space efforts is one, developed from a missile propellant, which is treating mental illness. Army research has been working toward a radiation-immunization drug which could be taken before exposure, with injections of bone marrow to cut down biological aftereffects of radiation. The techniques are of special interest to astronauts who may have to subject themselves to varying intensities of radiation in space. Civil defense authorities look forward to the possible protection of lives with such methods during nuclear warfare.

Another antiradiation device has been developed by the Chemalloy Electronics Corp., of Santee, Calif. This is a calorimeter which absorbs otherwise harmful radiations. Thus far, the calorimeters have been used in the space program chiefly to check out tracking radars, focus energy in space and to determine what signal levels exist to propagate through space.

Miniaturization is gradually revolutionizing medical science by giving the surgeon and the diagnostician remarkable new tools and tracking devices. It was U.S. space exploration and our defense program that gave miniaturization its biggest boost. For example, pinpoint size ball bearings, devised for satellite equipment, have made possible the new, almost painless, ultrafast dental drills with a speed of 250,000 or more revolutions a minute.

Hearing in deaf persons has been restored electronically via an operation and surgical implant of a tiny electronic device. The technique stems from space research by the General Data Corp., of Garden Grove, Calif., which develops instruments for spacecraft. The company's scientists are also engaged in a medical-electronic study aimed at developing a sight aid for the blind.

Doctors now foresee a battery-powered television system, small enough to be swallowed, transmitting an on-the-spot pictorial report from a patient's stomach. Already in use are an ingestible capsule that takes samples of stomach fluids, capsule transducer-transmitters that broadcast intestinal data, and transmitters attached to teeth for studies of night grinding.

People with certain heart defects can now wear a rhythm-control device to keep their hearts functioning while they go on living normally. This heart stimulator, now miniaturized by space scientists, is powered by tiny mercury batteries and can be sewn into a heart patient's body. Thus, some individuals literally owe their lives to space age technology.

Other devices include a tiny instrument that can be inserted into the heart through a vein in the arm, so that valve sounds can be heard from their source. Miniature microphones, broadcasting to receivers the size of a cigarette pack, may soon be used by doctors and the patients themselves to monitor heart activity.

Mercury-powered batteries, similar to those being used in satellites, have been adapted for a number of medical devices, such as an artificial larynx which permits people to speak who otherwise couldn't.

What we learn about the effect of weightlessness in space on breathing, sleeping, eating and working—and how long isolation affects the mind—many pave the way to improved medical and psychiatric practices.

Perfected for space vehicles, a new electrostatic camera which produces movies or still "instant pictures" without any processing may turn out to be of immense value in recording a patient's condition. When focused on a patient in a critical condition, such a camera could keep vital, instantly available photographic records for doctors.

According to the Aerojet-General Corp., of Azusa, Calif., X-ray equipment now used in examining Polaris solid propellant motors can produce X-ray pictures at only 1/30 of the radiation exposure possible with even the most advanced X-ray equipment.

Surgery with an intense pinpoint of light from a LASER has been accomplished successfully in eye operations. This light is a million times brighter than the sun. The LASER, originally developed by the Hughes Aircraft Co., is being used by Minneapolis-Honeywell for our satellites. The Kollsman Instrument Corp., Elmhurst, N.Y., indicates that LASER may be used for coagulation in brain surgery as well as in eye tumor removal and retinal welding. (For more on LASER, see "Communications.")

Our astronauts' flights into space may affect the physical checkups your doctor will give you. Following John Glenn's debriefing, after his historic flight, Lt. Col. Stanley C. White of the Air Force Medical Corps, who monitored Glenn's physical condition during the orbit, suggested that routine electrocardiograms and regular physical checkups should start at the age of 30, rather than at 40. Medicine, Dr. White urged, should move toward a "dynamic type of physical" in which the patient is examined while duplicating his everyday tasks, instead of just sitting still while things are done to him. In other words, if you're a sedentary worker but sometimes run for a bus, you'll be tested while running on a treadmill, to get a true picture of your health.

NEW BENEFITS FOR THE CONSUMER

For the housewife, the homeowner, for all citizens, numerous practical byproducts are emerging from technological and scientific research dealing with space—and more are constantly on the way.

Our study of foods best suited for space flights is bound to lead to improved nutrition for the earthbound. The use and growth of synthetic fabrics or new foods could prove invaluable as the world's population explodes and the need for food and clothing mounts.

From its space experimentation with algae, the Boeing Co., of Seattle, has fully developed a process for making flour of high nutritive value from bleached seaweed. The flour, originally developed as a possible space food, has actually been used in making cookies, and it has been offered by Boeing as a low-cost, easily produced earth food.

Out of outer space-related research have come specific new tools for the food and agriculture industry. Infrared food blanching, for instance, is highly effective in preparing foods for canning and freezing.

The American Machine & Foundry Co., believes that better coffee is in the offing due to a new teflon-coated cloth filter, designed for use in space research where extreme cleanliness is required. The company reports that the flavor of percolated coffee is enhanced when this filter is substituted for ordinary paper or cloth filters.

Housewives will bless the virtually indestructible toasters and refrigerators that will eventually come out of the research on space materials. Already they are beginning to use new pots and pans made from pyroceram, a material originally devised for nose cones. These utensils can be taken out of a freezer and instantly put over the hottest flame without damage. Another boon is a glass that stays permanently sterile.

Improved protective clothing, plastic fabrics and specially ventilated garments developed for our spacemen will affect even the clothes we'll wear in the not-too-distant future.

For homeowners, there's a housepaint that never needs renewing. Do-it-yourself householders who like to repair gutters, flashings, utensils, bikes, screens, metal boats, radiators, electrical joints and other items will find multiple uses for the new fluxless aluminum soldering, an outgrowth of missile work. It's already being sold in hardware stores.

In heating our homes, new cheaper ways of utilizing fuel may come from the work of scientists in learning to control the temperatures in space capsules. Less energy would be needed for heating and cooling if the exterior of a home were controlled with shuttering devices developed for satellites. Nonchattering solenoid valves and other plumbing innovations developed for missiles and other space vehicles should provide important refinements for household air-conditioning systems.

Your home may be better safeguarded from fire as result of the ultraviolet phototubes developed for space probes by the industrial laboratories of I.T. & T. These tubes may turn up as effective flame detectors of the fire-alarm type.

The car you drive will reflect the progress of space science. Among the things to come are miniaturized electronic controls for automobiles, capable of maintaining highway speed, slowing the car to avoid obstacles and stopping it in dangerous situations. The powerplants of tomorrow's automobiles may be no bigger than a coffee can—burning new fuels with much greater efficiency. According to the Aerojet-General Corp., a new brushless generator now in use with various space programs may be used in the automobiles of tomorrow. From space telemetry will come a system for the automatic changing of road signs as the weather changes.

Tiny batteries designed for space equipment—the same mercury batteries that operate a timing mechanism developed for an Explorer satellite—have been adapted for a wristwatch you can buy now. On the market is a radio the size of a lump of sugar. Dick Tracy's famous two-way wrist radio is not as incredible as it once sounded. A transistor portable radio manufactured by Hoffman Electronics Corp. of Los Angeles gets its power from solar cells, originally perfected for spacecraft power. This portable can operate as long as the sun is shining. It can be used in a shelter with the "solar pack," placed on the roof, sending power down a cable which also doubles as an antenna.

New battery-powered flashlights can be recharged simply by plugging them into an electric current, using the same small nickel-cadmium batteries devised to store solar energy and keep the instruments of a satellite operating when it is hidden from the sun.

Even the water we drink from the faucet at home may be influenced by our space program. The threatening water shortage in some areas may be finally solved as a result of the search for ways to reuse water aboard spacecraft. AMF Co., for example, is adapting techniques of water desalination to water reclamation (by recycling) for use in space vehicles. Successful accomplishment of this space process may, in turn, bring about the solution that will permit desalination on an economical basis.

Many little-known products destined to touch our daily lives were born in this satellite age. One of the most accurate portable clocks in existence, developed by the Hewlett-Packard Co. of Palo Alto, Calif., grew out of precise navigational requirements of the missile space program—a significant improvement of time measurement. Another byproduct of our aerospace program is the creation, by Sundstrand Aviation of Denver, of a photochromic material which darkens rapidly when exposed to sunlight. With this material, some day we may have self-accommodating sunglasses and antiglare windows.

Scientific advances come in many shapes. The Aluminum Co. of America developed an ultrathin aluminum foil for Project Echo (aluminum coated spheres). The company feels that this material has potential in the field of freeze-dried products, and in the pharmaceutical industry.

An important side effect of our space work has been pointed out by J. R. Dempsey, senior vice president of General Dynamics Astronautics:

"The cleanliness requirements in an advanced missile plant today indicate the new level of product refinement expected in the space age. Practically all foreign matter must be removed from the missile to assure a successful flight. As engineers and production workers trained in the astronautics and aeronautics industries filter into other fields, they will take along their high standards. The result will be more reliable, longer-lasting consumer and industrial products such as kitchen equipment, outboard motors, television sets and machine tools. Without knowing it, consumers will profit as an indirect result of the tax dollars they invested in precision training of space industry employees."

GLOBAL WEATHER OBSERVATION—AND ITS POTENTIAL

With our Tiros meteorological satellites, and the upcoming Nimbus and Aeros spacecraft, we are heading for an eventual worldwide system of invaluable long-range weather forecasting—with far greater accuracy and for much longer periods in advance. Someday you may know, with more than a pure guess, what the weather will be like weeks or even months ahead.

The initial values of our weather satellites have by now been definitely demonstrated. Benefits will continue to be reaped in areas which lack adequate conventional types of weather observations as well as in adjacent regions. These are not confined to distant oceans, the polar regions or sparsely populated countries. Today, weather data obtained from such ocean areas as the Atlantic southeast of the United States, and the Pacific west of Baja, Calif., are still hardly enough to permit us accurately to forecast storms affecting our mainland, especially our ships and aircraft. It is in these areas that satellite observations of the cloud cover and patterns have significantly helped our meteorologists to analyze existing weather conditions.

Through such improved observations, our storm-spotting Tiros satellites have already saved many lives and an estimated billion dollars a year in property losses, according to a report to Congress by Dr. Francis W. Reichelderfer, Chief of the U.S. Weather Bureau.

Improved long-range forecasting depends on much more than better observations over areas that had hitherto been neglected. We must also understand more clearly just how the atmosphere operates and get the data which can be applied to our knowledge. How the atmosphere behaves as a heat engine will hopefully be learned through satellite observations of reflected solar radiation and emitted long-wave or infrared radiation. We know that the sun's heat is the basic fuel that drives the atmosphere—and creates our weather. We're also aware that the long-wave radiation lost to space is roughly like the exhaust. But we've never been able to see in detail how these losses and inputs vary from time to time, from place to place. With what satellites tell us, we can now begin to do this job. By applying future similar observations quickly enough, we'll be able to make far better weather forecasts.

Right now, cautious weather experts can't say for certain just what will develop but the benefits of even partial success would be tremendous. You could be prepared, for instance, for either a tough or mild winter. Communities armed with long-range predictions of probable droughts or heavy rainfall could prepare for special control of their watersheds. People alerted through satellites and forecasts to the likelihood of hurricanes, floods, severe storms, and other catastrophes will have more time to plan and carry out evacuations, raise levees, strengthen shelters or get ready for disaster relief.

By taking advantage of long-range forecasts, farmers could plant and harvest during most advantageous periods, decide which particular crops to grow and how much land to use. They'd get maximum yields and cut down their risks and losses from crop damage. Our meteorological satellites will be worth many millions of dollars to them, perhaps enough to pay for much of the cost of our space program.

All people will benefit. Knowing long in advance what the weather will be like, you could arrange your vacation, here or abroad, to benefit from favorable conditions. Such events as baseball games, county fairs, golf tourneys, and championship fights could be scheduled for good weather days. Weather-sensitive industries such as construction and travel resorts would find a foolproof, long-range weather service an invaluable asset.

What's the state of weather reports today and just what progress have our satellites been making?

At present, meteorological observations from the ground and balloons equipped with radios can provide us with only a 20-to-30-percent coverage of weather phenomena, mostly from the Northern Hemisphere and the underside of the atmosphere. Only one-fifth of the globe is covered by any regular observational and weather reporting systems.

Extensive areas are not yet covered and they constitute regions in which storms can be generated and grow without detection before they move over inhabited areas. These gaps may be filled in the next 5 years by an ingenious satellite system that could photograph the whole panorama of weather, from the march of cold fronts to the birth of storms.

As the House Committee on Science and Astronautics reported: "An improvement of only 10 percent in accuracy could result in savings totaling hundreds of millions of dollars annually."

Substantial progress has been made in NASA's development of meteorological satellites to provide worldwide observations of atmospheric elements—the data weathermen must understand—what's going on in the atmosphere—in order to make accurate predictions.

The first step toward an operational system was made with the launching on April 1, 1960, of the hatbox-shaped Tiros I. Equipped with two TV camera systems, its primary source of power was solar cells which covered the top and sides. In addition to pictures taken over and near the United States, through tape recorders other pictures were stored that were taken over areas distant from the United States and then "read out" as the satellite passed over the command and data acquisition stations at Fort Monmouth, N.J., and Kaena Point, Hawaii.

During its 78 days of useful life (until June 17, 1960), Tiros I made 1,302 orbits around the world. Orbiting at altitudes averaging 450 miles and transmitting 22,952 television pictures of the earth's cloud patterns, the 270-pound satellite proved eminently successful. Tiros I proved that it's feasible to use satellites for observing cloud patterns and related atmospheric conditions. It opened a new era in weather observation.

Within 60 hours after this first Tiros was in orbit, reports from it less than 6 hours old were being applied to day-to-day weather forecasting. In the Pacific, Tiros pictures helped trace the monsoons. Data on storms in the Indian Ocean were used by Australian meteorologists.

Tiros II, launched in November 1960, was an improvement on the first weather satellite in that its sensors were able to report important information about the atmosphere such as the reflection of solar heat back from the earth into space and the loss of long-wave or infrared radiation. Radiation balance has a significant effect on the earth's weather.

For a year in orbit, our second weather satellite continued to provide us with data. Its photographs of the icepack breakup in the St. Lawrence confirmed the indications of Tiros I that weather satellites could be used to show ice boundaries and open seas. Tiros II also aided forecasters on weather conditions for the suborbital flight of Astronaut Alan B. Shepard, Jr.

Tiros III; popularly known as the "Hurricane Hunter," was placed in a near-circular orbit in July 1961, to coincide with the hurricane season. Eight days after it was launched, the satellite was helping to analyze and track Hurricane Anna in the Atlantic. Then, on September 10, Tiros III detected Hurricane Esther as it was forming in the mid-Atlantic—2 days before conventional methods, or weather reconnaissance aircraft. The result was additional warning time.

Esther was the first hurricane ever to be discovered solely by a satellite, although earlier Tiros III had spotted related types of storms in the eastern Pacific. Without the pictures it transmitted to earth, the Weather Bureau pointed out, it's possible the hurricane might have remained undetected for several days, until reported by a passing ship. With the space information, hurricane search planes were able to confirm the existence of the hurricane. The Tiros III feat was one of the best demonstrations until then of the potential of meteorological satellites for improving weather analysis and forecasting.

In the Atlantic, Tiros III photographed a total of five hurricanes and one tropical storm. In the eastern Pacific it saw two hurricanes and a tropical storm in areas where they greatly influenced fishing operations. Nine typhoons were followed in the central and western Pacific. Fifty advisories on these storms and other important weather developments were sent by telephone, telegraph, or radio to Japan, the Philippines, Mexico, Hong Kong, Formosa, and Guam, as well as to Honolulu, San Francisco, Miami, New Orleans, and San Juan.

Japanese weathermen made good use of Tiros III data. According to the chief of Japan's weather bureau, the information was valuable in plotting tropical storms. Weather satellites, he declared, would open a new era in forecasting typhoons, from which Japan has suffered so heavily in the past.

NASA also used Tiros III for weather support of Astronaut Virgil Grissom's Mercury suborbital flight. Twice a day, as the Tiros passed over the Caribbean, one of its two TV cameras was triggered to report weather conditions in the area of the flight.

Tiros IV was placed in orbit on February 8, 1962, traveling around the earth in 100 minutes. Within a few hours its observations were being incorporated into weather forecasts. It marked the fourth straight success for the Tiros program—the weather-seeing "eyes in the sky" designed to help us develop a global system of weather satellites within this decade.

As one of its first jobs, Tiros IV helped to forecast the weather around the world for the orbital flight of John Glenn, Jr.

Three more in the Tiros series will be launched, followed by the advanced Nimbus type. These will tell the forecaster how much energy is gained or lost in the atmosphere. The day-to-day variations in this amount will affect the weather and contribute to the existence of wind, cloud, and rain.

Planned for some time after the middle of this decade is the Aeros satellite family. "The meteorologist," says Dr. Morris Tepper, Director of NASA Meteorological System, "is interested in a capability of continuously observing the developments of a particular storm area. This is particularly true of short-lived and severe storms where the entire life history may be only a matter of a few hours. It is also important to be able to follow the development of nascent storms before they explode into full maturity. The development of the Aeros family of satellites is for the purpose of satisfying this requirement."

The planned Aeros satellites will be launched into "stationary" orbit 22,300 miles above the equator. Thus, they will remain fixed overhead in a specific geographic area and will be able to watch weather happenings over nearly an entire hemisphere.

In the opinion of Dr. Harry Wexler, the U.S. Weather Bureau's director of meteorological research, a system of satellites of two types would be ideal for chartering the world's weather. One system would circle the earth over the poles, the other would circle around the equator. Both types could send their observations into a central weather office. They could also pick up and transmit information from automatic weather stations located in uninhabited areas.

Since weather is an international problem, the values of our weather satellite system will not be limited to this country. At least 10 nations (Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and West Germany) have been participating in the Tiros program by making special ground measurements to correlate with satellite observations as it passes over their countries. More countries will be invited and are expected to join in such observations as well as the use of the satellite-gathered data. Here is one product of the space age that may serve to bring the international community into closer cooperation and harmony.

And still further in the future (no reliable scientist would yet care to speculate just when) may come the time when man may be able to exert at least limited control on weather conditions. To do this without the danger of producing unforeseen and possibly catastrophic side effects, we must learn tremendously more about our atmosphere and its processes than we now know. Our predictions must first be close to perfection—otherwise we run the danger that good weather in one area is obtained at the cost of a damaging storm somewhere else.

Toward this end, our weather satellites and the data they gather may be expected to play a vital role. But they alone will not be enough. All types of weather observations and many years of research and study lie between us and the day when the possibility of diverting a crippling snowstorm can seriously be considered.

THE NEW ERA OF COMMUNICATION

With the development of NASA's global communication satellite system (Echo, Courier, and the forthcoming Relay, Telstar, Syncom and Advent) within your lifetime you may be enjoying these peaceful uses of space:

Almost instant mail without mailmen. A single satellite with modern facsimile equipment could transmit letters to any place on earth in a few minutes.

You may be able to watch the 1964 Olympics in Japan—live, as it's happening—on your home TV set. Or tune in on an opera in Paris.

You may be reading an orbital newspaper originating in London, New York or Tokyo—simply by pressing a button.

A business conference with associates halfway around the globe could be held by turning a knob.

Dialing Hong Kong would be as simple as calling a local number and the cost would be reduced substantially.

We may have a universal language as communication satellites pull the world together. Or we can expect direct voice-to-voice automatic translations; a Russian may speak his native tongue and an English version will automatically be heard.

Children in our schools will be exposed to important worldwide events as they occur, through space-based TV and radio. (For millions of people in emerging countries who can't read, improved communication will foster better understanding of important issues.)

The picture-phone is already a reality. With a satellite phone, you may some day be able to see the art treasures in the Louvre or use the Vatican library without leaving your living room.

What's the score to date on our state of communications and the progress of satellite systems?

It's clear that our present capacities will not be enough to meet future demands for long-distance communication. Overseas calls are expected to jump from 4 million today to some 100 million by 1980. We'll need 10,000 circuits. At present, there are little more than 500 circuits (for 500 phone calls) for the busiest route, from the United States to Europe.

A single TV channel is equal in bandwidth to 1,000 phone channels. At present, television can't be transmitted directly more than two or three hundred miles. Without satellites, it's hard to see how transoceanic television would be economically feasible.

Communications satellites are coming to the rescue. There are two types. Echo, a passive reflector system, contains no electronics. The satellite reflects or bounces the signal back to ground-based receiver antennas. The second type (in this category are Relay, Telstar and Syncom) is an active satellite system. The satellite contains its own receiver, transmitter, antenna, and power supply. A signal received from the ground by the satellite is amplified and retransmitted back to the ground.

NASA's first communications satellite, Echo I, a 100-foot aluminum-coated plastic balloon, was launched August 12, 1960, and went into orbit at about 1,000 miles. It proved that it's feasible to use passive satellites as radio communication reflectors.

Echo I demonstrated conclusively that satellites, used as reflectors or communications relays, can extend line-of-sight transmissions to intercontinental ranges. Such a satellite can provide tremendous bandwith capacity. It has been estimated that a single $40 million active satellite in an equatorial orbit would take care of as much traffic as a half-billion-dollar cable system.

The capabilities of Echo as a "radio mirror" was proved during its first orbit when it transmitted a tape-record voice from California to New Jersey—despite a solar disturbance at the time which had blacked out high-frequency long-distance radio communications.

Since then, other communications experiments have included transmission of teletype signals, two-way phone talks using commercial equipment, transatlantic wireless codes, and wire-photos sent from Iowa to Texas. On August 22, 1960, space scientists bounced the first transatlantic voice message off Echo I and later transmitted a recording of "America the Beautiful" from Holmdel, N.J., to listeners in Jodrell Bank, England. The first letter to be processed through outer space—Speedmail—was bounced off Echo I from Stump Neck, Md., to Newark, N.J., on November 10, 1960. Echo I is still in orbit.

This year (1962), the United States is expected to launch at least six new communications satellites. Four are built with Government funds, two are privately financed by A.T. & T.

The NASA satellites, to test two-way telephone, telegraph and television communications, include:

A "passive" Echo II, larger than the first, in a polar orbit.

The active repeater Syncom. At a 22,300-mile altitude, the 55-pound synchronous satellite would have a speed identical to that of the earth's rotation and thus would appear to be in a fixed position in space. Three of these so-called "24-hour" satellites, suitably placed (one above the Atlantic, a second over the Pacific and the third above the Indian Ocean) could provide world-around coverage. Each could, by line-of-sight transmission, transmit to one-third of the globe.

Relay and Telstar satellites, both of them "active" types, will be orbited at 3,000-mile altitudes. They are designed to demonstrate transoceanic television and multichannel voice and telegraph communication. Each will conduct scientific experiments to produce information about effects of the space environment on electronic components. It has been estimated that 20 to 30 Relay and Telstar satellites would be needed for global radio or television coverage. (Project Telstar is a cooperative enterprise of NASA and A.T. & T.)

The implications of all these efforts are far reaching. Consider what happens when emergencies saturate land lines and people can't "get through" for hours. With communications devices in the heavens, the lines would be virtually foolproof, except for a missile deliberately sent to destroy them. Conventional radio communications, on the other hand, are subject to complete breakdown from magnetic storms.

Before the 1960's are over, a worldwide network of inexpensive and speedy satellite-based links will probably be a reality. First will come telephone calls bounced back by an orbiting sphere, then high-fidelity radio and finally many channeled TV. General David Sarnoff, RCA board chairman, predicts:

"Ten years hence there will be TV stations in virtually every nation on earth. An audience of a billion people might then be watching the same program at the same time. The instrument which will give television's second epoch this distinctive global character is satellite relay television."

New component developments will stimulate and make possible new and exciting needs for communication. One of the most amazing is the LASER (light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation), termed one of the great scientific breakthroughs in recent years. A LASER, built by Minneapolis-Honeywell, throws a light a million times brighter than the sun. In satellite communications, a LASER (described as coherent light) could send signals thousands of miles. One beam from a LASER theoretically can carry as much information as 25,000 of our present television channels. (As noted earlier, a LASER has other important uses, as in eye surgery.)

Appraising the eventual global impact of our communication satellites, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON recently observed:

"Everywhere in the world people will welcome visual instruction on how to decrease mortality by the adoption of simple health measures. Everywhere they will welcome programs on how to increase their food production. Everywhere they will welcome news telecasts of events affecting them. The communications satellite can be the most valuable manmade instrument of good will and understanding in history.

AIR TRAVEL IN THE FUTURE

"In the not too distant future," predicts Gen. James H. Doolittle, "we may be able to fly, or project ourselves, from Los Angeles to New York in half an hour or from Los Angeles to Paris in one hour."

Aeronautics, obviously, has received a tremendous impetus from space era advances. Flight equipment, engines, automatic pilots, radar systems—all required to meet the high standards demanded by spacecraft—will show a vast improvement over prespace aircraft.

Now in the concept stage, new supersonic transports are based partly on the results of our X-15 research planes and other advanced aerospacecraft. These planes, which will have adapted some of the operating elements of space vehicles, will fly 1,500 miles an hour, at an altitude of 50,000 feet or more.

"Aircraft manufacturers," says J. R. Dempsey of General Dynamics Astronautics, San Diego, Calif., "are already beginning to think of boosters and launch vehicles as the trucks of space. In the next few years, improved air traffic, navigation and control devices will also be developed and these will be based in large degree on navigation satellites and radio and inertial guidance systems originally built for missiles."

Another outgrowth of aerospace research is the Posifix rescue system developed by the Douglas Aircraft Co. of Santa Monica, Calif. This system uses radio signals to accurately fix the location of downed pilots up to a distance of 150 miles.

The Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co. of Minneapolis, recently announced a new pushbutton autopilot for light business aircraft, based on principles derived from research into control of space vehicles. The system makes it possible for an inexperienced pilot to fly as smoothly and safely as a professional. The feature of the autopilot, shared in common with the hypersonic X-15 and the Air Force's Dyna-Soar manned space glider, is a computer which virtually "thinks for itself" or adapts automatically to compensate for varying flight conditions such as speed, altitude, weight and wind gusts.

Flying will be safer, too. According to the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., navigation equipment and techniques are being applied to solve the increasingly severe problems of air traffic control.

NAVIGATION WILL BE REVOLUTIONIZED

The Transit program, an experiment carried out by the Navy, has proven the feasibility of precise navigation at sea via satellite, even when the stars are completely obscured by clouds. Envisioned are several satellites receiving, storing and relaying navigational orientation to ships anywhere in the world, in all kinds of weather.

Three successful launches were conducted in Project Transit. Such a satellite navigation system will be able to operate in fair weather or foul, day or night. It will not be necessary for a navigator to see with the naked eye a body of land on which he is sighting. Four satellites would permit determination of position at any place on earth, every hour and a half. Ships of all nations could take advantage of the system.

It has been predicted that 5 years from now, navigators on ships or planes will no longer need sextants or radio beam finders. To get a "fix" on their position, they will "tune in" on a satellite 400 miles overhead. The navigational information will be fed into a simple computer which will pinpoint their position within five-tenths of a mile.

BENEFITS TO INDUSTRY

At least 9,000 industrial and business organizations worked together to help launch our astronauts into space. The concerns range from giant corporations to tiny, family-held enterprises. Their special fields range from nuts and bolts to the most intricate and sophisticated electronic equipment known to man. Numerous byproducts and applications of space research to peaceful uses are emerging virtually every day.

New materials—metals, alloys, fabrics and compounds—created by space activities are already being produced commercially. Many of the fabricated items will be valuable wherever long life, great strength or resistance to high temperatures and radiations are essential. For example, new types of glass have been adapted to filter intense light automatically. From our work in space vacuum and in extreme low temperatures, new plastics will give industry highly durable, unbreakable products for a variety of purposes, such as plumbing and many personal and household products.

The Brookings Institution reports:

"The development of new materials, including among them many synthetics and composites of synthetics and metals, reflects a concentrated effort to meet the special and unique requirements of space flight. Fabrics to be used must be light in weight, high in strength, resistent to temperature extremes, noncorrosive and tolerant of multiple accelerations.

"Reinforced plastics are being considered for increasingly wide use in missiles and other space vehicles. Silicones, polyesters, epoxyresins, and phenolics reinforced with a variety of materials—asbestos, quartz fibers, graphite cloth, glass fiber, etc.—show mechanical strengths far exceeding most common construction materials. A filament-wound, glass-reinforced epoxyresin has been developed with the ultimate strength of 130,000 pounds per square inch and density of 0.072 pound per cubic inch, giving it a very high strength-weight ratio. To perform equally well, steel would have to have strength in the neighborhood of 500,000 pounds per square inch.

"Various plastics and new metal alloys could replace traditional fabricating metals, if the costs of the new materials should prove to be competitive with the costs of steel, aluminum and the like. The long life of products utilizing these new materials would substantially lower replacement requirements."

With spacecraft pushing into strange new environments, materials research has been forced into new frontiers. "The metals industry," says J. R. Dempsey of General Dynamics/Astronautics, "is currently undergoing a quiet revolution equal perhaps to the development of aluminum." While at first material developed may prove too expensive for common use, Mr. Dempsey predicts that later "the materials of astronautics may be put to work in consumer products such as the automobile."

One example is PSC-Durock, a ceramic insulation material produced by Packard Bell Electronics of Los Angeles. Originally it was created to withstand the extreme heat generated by exotic rocket fuels. Now it is used as a high temperature and radiation-resistant coating on inreactor sensors employed in the search for an economical way to produce atomic energy for civilian use.

Daystrom, Inc., a subsidiary of Schlumberger, Ltd., developed a metal film precision resistor for use through a wide range of environmental conditions in space exploration. These same precision resistors are now used commercially in analog computers, improving their overall performance. This company feels that its aerospace products have potential in communications, weather reporting and forecasting, navigation, and food processing.

AMF has developed a new hydraulic fluid for use in rocket launching systems where mixtures of regular hydraulic fluid and liquid oxygen could cause an explosion. This new fluid will not burn, even in the presence of 100 percent oxygen atmosphere. It is believed that this new hydraulic fluid will find many uses in aviation and industry.

E. C. Burkhart, president of Genisco, Inc., Los Angeles, believes "the navigation of the space ocean to be as vital to the future of mankind as the exploration of the Vikings, Columbus, or Cortez was to our time. It is inevitable. It is necessary." His company's products, oriented to many phases of the space research effort, have civilian applications. Example: the analog-to-pulse-width digital converter is used in weather stations and accelerometers for inertial navigation.

Technical devices are being applied outside the space effort. The Thiokol Chemical Corp., of Bristol, Pa., cites its solid propellant rocket motors which are being used for auxiliary power units. Because of their tremendous output, they can move heavy objects or supply a vast amount of electrical or mechanical energy for short periods of time. Another possible application is using small rocket motors for safety brakes to actuate hydraulic systems on runaway trucks or trains or to provide a retrobraking system.

Space vehicles must first be tested in giant vacuum chambers. Besides developing aerospace techniques and vacuum systems important to the systems testing of space vehicles, the Consolidated Vacuum Corp., Rochester, N.Y., has been applying its coating techniques, done under vacuum processes, for the production of costume jewelry, mirrors, glasses, and similar products. Consolidated's vacuum-coating techniques are also being utilized commercially for transistorized TV sets, radios, and other transistor products.

Some companies sit astraddle the space-civilian markets. For example, Texas Instruments, Dallas, produces a number of important devices for space research, including the very important semiconductors. Yet almost anything developed for this area can be adapted to the civilian market to give us smaller and better radios and industrial computers. Conversely, items developed for the civilian market can also be adapted for space research.

Collins Radio of Cedar Rapids is another in this group. This company has developed certain techniques and subcircuits in its aerospace activities that, with modifications, have been applied to the latest commercial FM transmitters, which give better FM system performance.

In mining of taconite (very hard rock) iron ores, jet drilling—"captive rockets" that melt the rock—is actually burning holes for blasting charges. Experts estimate that in less than 20 years we'll be getting about a third of our ores from taconite.

Telemetry, so important in our space vehicles, is being utilized to collect information from inaccessible or dangerous locations. For example, the Bechtel Construction Corp., building the traffic tunnel from San Francisco to Treasure Island, planted telemetry units deep in the silt along the route. Over a 2-year period, the units have monitored seismic and other earth movements to provide the engineers with information they must have. The Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill., installed a telemetering system that enables pistons in experimental engines to broadcast their operating temperatures.

The trend toward improved, high-speed, lightweight computers has been accelerated by space exploration. Naturally, spacecraft need electronic computers to determine the moment of launch, for fixing orbits, navigation and onboard processing of collected data. Because space vehicles are limited in size and weight, the giant electronic brain will soon be replaced by equipment only a small fraction of its present size and cost using solid state techniques.

The impact of this development will be tremendous on industry, business and the professions. One side effect will be the release of much brainpower from time-consuming chores, making it available for basic, creative thought. Thus the high-speed lightweight computer is destined to become, more than ever, an integral part of our working lives.

The possibilities include an electronic computer so small that it will fit into a briefcase. Packard Bell's SE-1000 system, the first computer-controlled automatic checkout system built for space vehicle application, has already been adapted to schedule railroads, search for oil and regulate refinery processes.

Remington Rand reports: "The Nation's space program has resulted in the development of the UNIVAC ADD series of spaceborne computers. These computers employ the latest in micro-miniaturization techniques, enabling for the first time a computer occupying less than one cubic foot to perform calculations that were at one time limited to computing systems many times larger."

Space-related programs at the Ford Motor Co.'s Aeronutronic Division, Newport Beach, Calif., have developed three amazing computer projects. One, BIAX, is an ultra-high-speed computer element so fast that it can perform 10 million computer operations in the time it takes to pronounce its name. In addition to satellite installations, the tiny elements can be used in computing equipment for language translations, library searching and decoding. Another computer, MIND, artificially duplicates parts of the human nervous system and carries out learning processes. A third type, bio-computers, is leading to a new generation of computers capable of adaptive, or learning processes. All three programs have important space-age application for development of machines with which scientists can investigate distant planets. They may also lead to a wide variety of machines to make auto driving easier and safer, household chores less burdensome and everyday living simpler.

AMAZING NEW SOURCES OF POWER

When we send a three-man expedition to the moon, the fuel cell—a young and promising form of power source—will go along. A fuel cell converts chemical energy directly into electricity; its fuel and ovidant are supplied from outside and, like a car, it will perform as long as the fuel and oxidant continue to be supplied. It has no machinery or working parts. In the spacecraft, in addition to powering radios and running computers, the fuel cell based upon a mixture of hydrogen and oxygen, the fuel cell will supply the astronauts with the purest kind of drinking water. This will be one of its first practical applications. But already the Navy plans to convert some of its diesel submarines to fuel-cell power. And the auto industry is talking of fuel-cell cars.

New sources of power, such as the fuel cell, have been in great demand for our space program, largely because all spacecraft require a compact electrical energy source operating reliably over long periods. The power source must be able to energize equipment and, in some cases, to propel the vehicle after launching.

Besides the fuel cell, much progress has been made with solar power, in which the sun's radiation is converted directly into electricity. Space-stimulated power systems research has also produced the thermionic converter. Nuclear devices have the advantage of needing neither storage units nor heat sources. Eventually this may reduce the cost of large nuclear power stations to service newly developed areas of the world where fuel resources are inadequate.

Still another potential source is plasma power, generated through the use of hot ionized gas. This gas acts as a conductor of electricity. It is simple, rugged and efficient. Already 10 municipal areas along the Mason-Dixon line are preparing to experiment with electric power derived from this source.

The compact new power sources will make possible self-powered home appliances and self-powered industrial equipment.

They will permit the designing of walls for homes and buildings with their own built-in, self-contained heating, cooling, lighting and electrical systems, feeding on fuel cells, small gas flames or free energy from the sun. By the end of this decade, this may turn into a business as huge as space communications.

DIVIDENDS FOR OUR ECONOMY

Directly or indirectly, the benefits from space research and development affect almost every part of the American economy.

"Perhaps the greatest economic treasure," says Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of NASA, "is the advanced technology required for more and more difficult space missions. This new technology is advancing at a meteoric rate. Its benefits are spreading throughout our whole industrial and economic system."

The needs of the space program, Representative Edwin Mitchell points out, "Spread across the entire industrial spectrum—electronics, metals, fuels, ceramics, machinery, plastics, instruments, textiles, thermals, cryogenics, and a thousand other areas."

Western Electric, which coordinated all electronic tracking for the Mercury project, estimated that about 5,000 companies were involved in its portion of the project. The McDonnell Aircraft Co., which built the Mercury capsule, counted about 4,000 companies as participants in its manufacture, as subcontractors or as direct or indirect suppliers.

Clearly, our space program is providing the incentive to American industry to remain in the world's technological vanguard. As the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., Waltham, Mass., puts it: "The Nation's space program has indeed compelled our Electronics and Instrumentation Division into technological research and development into new areas. It is continually forcing us to higher accuracy standards and the development of new products which would probably have been developed eventually, but were developed much sooner because of the stimulation received."

When growth industries, such as chemical, communications, electronics, and metallurgy, join the space effort, inevitably it means new jobs, new job categories. Andrew Haley, past president of the International Astronautical Federation, believes that within two decades the space and astronautics field will outdistance the giant automotive industry. As a great new industry spur in the Nation, astronautics and space could fill the gaps in employment ranks being left by automation.

New careers are opening up for our youth and our school curriculums will have to include opportunities in the space field. At Seattle, for instance, where the Second Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space will be held, students and teachers will find a new world of knowledge in the remarkable exhibits set up by NASA and industries.

AND MORE TO COME

Not tomorrow, nor next year, will all the predictions of the space experts emerge as realities. But the magnitude of the space era potentials is evident.

"As our space explorers venture farther into the unknown," says James E. Webb, NASA Administrator, "we can expect countless other practical values as yet undreamed of. Whatever our investment in this greatest enterprise of the century, the feedback will be well worth the price."

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Chairman of the National Space Council, recently underscored this point: "Our entire space program—even at the peak planned for next year—is costing annually less than the $5 billion we spend on face powder, lipstick, and nail polish. And it is estimated conservatively that our space outlays will yield $2 return for every $1 invested; for every nickel we put into it, we get a dime back. The real and legitimate goal of science is the endowment of human life with new inventions and riches. That is the goal of our space effort today—to endow all of human life, in all lands, with new inventions and riches."

PRINCIPAL SOURCES OF MATERIAL

A special survey of major industrial firms engaged in space research and development.

Report to the Congress from the President of the United States, January 1962.

Astronautics, October 1961.

"Proposed Studies on the Implications of Peaceful Space Activities for Human Affairs," prepared for NASA by the Brookings Institution.

Report of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, 87th Congress, 1st session, March 24, 1961.

"The Practical Values of Space Exploration," report of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, 86th Congress, 2d session (July 5, 1960), U.S. Government Printing Office.

"The Peacetime Uses of Outer Space," edited by Simon Ramo (McGraw-Hill, 1961).

"Speaking of Space," edited by Richard M. Skinner and William Leavitt (Little Brown & Co., 1962).

Proceedings of the First National Conference on Peaceful Uses of Space, Tulsa, Okla., May 26–27, 1961.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

JAMES M. NORMAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1361) for the relief of James M. Norman.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so that our colleagues may be notified that we are coming rather close to the conclusion of this brief session, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IS IT TRUE THAT OUR PRESENT TREATMENT OF INCOME EARNED ABROAD BY AMERICAN-DIRECT INVESTMENTS HAS AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as I stated on the floor on April 17, 1962, I expect to present for the RECORD my comments on the question, Are direct investments in oversea subsidiaries beneficial to the U.S. economy?

I expect to present factual information in answer to the questions I then raised.

My remarks today and in the days that follow on this subject will be in relation to our tax laws and the proposals of the administration for changes in these laws. My remarks are not to be construed as pertaining to the administration's proposals for trade agreement legislation, tariff revision, or for a delegation of powers over tariff to the President. Those matters will be considered later by the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate. Although I do not favor the administration's trade proposals I shall at this time speak about the tax proposals only.

I intend to discuss the question as to whether it is true that our present treatment of income earned abroad by American direct investments has an adverse effect on our balance of payments.

Every Senator is necessarily concerned with our continued overall deficit in the balance of payments and the continued reduction in our gold reserves. It is well recognized by the President of the United States that these pressures would not exist were it not for the necessity of maintaining troops abroad and supplying economic assistance to underdeveloped countries. The private sector of our economy not only is in balance but is producing substantial surpluses which have been used to defray the cost of necessary Government programs overseas. It is essential that any proposed changes in our tax laws do not result in a worsening of the overall balance of payments by reducing the surpluses presently generated in the private sector of our economy.

The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was correct when he stated on February 19 that there are inadequacies in our overall statistics involving income from foreign investments as well as the net dollar outflow for new investment. Certainly every effort should be made to secure the most accurate data that we possibly can; nevertheless, the junior Senator from Tennessee in discussing the data for the year 1960 said:

> Income from foreign investments amounted to $3.2 billion, certainly an important item. Of this amount, direct investment income amounted to $2.3 billion. We ought to be receiving a much greater return from foreign operations. This, it seems to me, is out of proportion * * * [1]

In the first place receipts from direct investment in the amount of $2.3 billion is not an inconsiderable amount. The statement that we should be receiving a much greater return from foreign operations fails to consider a number of important factors: The majority of foreign direct investments are relatively new. It is expected that any enterprise—domestic or foreign—will not yield a high return during the early years of its development. Furthermore, profits which may be realized are plowed back into the business so that it may grow to its maximum effectiveness. If there is a strong prospect of a higher return in future years, there is every reason for prudent management to reinvest earnings abroad so that the future profits which may be remitted as dividends may be larger and, of course, the U.S. Government will receive 52 percent of the results of such investments. The fact that our investment accounts overall do produce a return to the United States clearly shows that such foreign investment has been profitable and by permitting it to grow in a natural way will help to rectify the present deficit in our overall international accounts.

---

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 19, 1962, p. 2425.

The remarks by the junior Senator from Tennessee apparently fail to give adequate consideration to the fact that if American investments were not made in areas with good market potentials, similar investments would be made by nationals of other countries. Should this occur, in the long run, there would be no net balance in our favor on investment accounts.

Mr. Donald C. Alexander, a partner in the Cincinnati law firm of Taft, Stettinius & Holister, discussed the balance of payments before the Committee on Ways and Means. He said:

> Under present law the investment of U.S. corporations in foreign subsidiaries located and operated in the more developed countries creates a situation favorable to the generation of earnings. Although official figures show a substantial portion of such earnings is remitted each year as dividends, the remainder is reinvested to generate increased earnings in future years. This reinvestment may be in the same country or in a different one, perhaps one that is a so-called less developed country. It is obvious that, in the long run, the present tax treatment of these foreign subsidiaries will have a very favorable effect on our balance-of-payments position, and one that will outweigh any temporary advantage that could result from taxing the income of these foreign business operations, as earned, under the heavier burden of our tax structure. This is true even under the assumption that foreign business ventures would continue with investment practices followed under current law; however, it seems apparent that the administration proposals will have an adverse effect on further investment in existing oversea companies, and a particularly adverse effect on new investment in new foreign business ventures. Thus the difference will be greatly magnified.
>
> It should not be forgotten that the moneys invested and reinvested in the stable developed countries are in general, within the economic power of businesses controlled in the United States. Thus, they represent assets of our country in the balance-of-payments picture and not liabilities.[2]

Another witness, Mr. Harold D. Arneson, president and general manager of Abbott Laboratories International Co., testified on this aspect of taxing foreign investments. He said:

> The suggested taxation would place our company at a distinct disadvantage in competing for business in Western Europe as well as in the developing areas of the world. Our foreign competitors are increasing the use of base company operations. For instance, the OTC in England. They would be pleased to see U.S. private investments overseas shrink and withdraw from world markets. This is just what would happen if our Government is allowed to penalize American industry overseas by taxing unremitted earnings.[3]

Perhaps the best summary of the contribution of direct foreign investment by American firms to our economy may be found in the testimony of Mr. Ray R. Eppert, president, Burroughs Corp. He said:

> Underlying the tax proposals, it seems to us, is a basic misunderstanding of the purpose and function of direct American investment abroad. American direct investments are made to take advantage of potential demand, to satisfy potential markets that cannot be served through U.S. exports. Last, but not least, American business trades and invests abroad in order to remain competitive with foreign competitors and to maintain and expand exports as part of a balanced worldwide marketing effort.
>
> There is no alternative to American business investing abroad if we are to hold and expand markets for American enterprise. This is vital to the maintenance and expansion of the number of jobs in the United States and the attainment of a maximum export trade surplus. Stated differently, this oversea activity contributes greatly and directly to our domestic economy.
>
> The tax proposals would treat American direct investment abroad much more harshly than foreign investments are treated by other countries with which we compete. This would weaken American business abroad since foreign-earned income is generally not taxed by other countries until returned to the parent company and in some instances not at all, as, for example, Canada.
>
> Increasing the cost of doing business abroad would also seriously injure America's economy. We know of no other case where a country proposed a program to make it more difficult for itself or its citizens to compete with foreigners for world markets.[4]

The junior Senator from Tennessee expressed concern in his statement of February 19 that not only were the returns from foreign investment inadequate but that capital outflows exceed the inflows of dividends and interest in the case of the developed countries of Western Europe and that we were receiving a considerable net income from underdeveloped countries. He believes that this is unfortunate inasmuch as the underdeveloped countries are the areas of the world that we are trying to assist.

Again a careful review of the entire testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means provides a further perspective to appraise American direct investment in developed countries with our foreign policy objectives to provide assistance to the underdeveloped nations. It is not generally realized that a large portion of the income presently received from underdeveloped countries is only made possible because of investments by U.S. concerns in developed areas.

Mr E. G. Collado, director of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, testified on this aspect of foreign investments. He said:

> A further objective of the administration is to redirect private foreign investment from the industrially developed to the developing countries. In the administration view, U.S. investment in the advanced countries is no longer needed, whereas investment in the developing countries continues to serve the national interest.
>
> There is no reason to believe that foreign investment denied outlet in Europe will seek outlet in the developing countries. The quantitative importance in foreign investment of so-called footloose industries, that is, industries willing to shift their base of operations in response to marginal investment advantages, has often been exaggerated.
>
> The location of the bulk of foreign investment is determined by basic consideration of markets, costs, and sources of supply and will not be affected by marginal incentives. These foreign investments will not be made at all if tax penalties make them economically unattractive.
>
> Foreign investment is also closely tied into a network of world trade which cannot easily be sliced into segments of developing country trade and developed country trade.
>
> This interdependence is seen clearly from the experience of the oil industry. Investments in the industrially developed countries provide the market for most of the crude produced in the developing countries. Let me illustrate. Over the past decade U.S. oil companies have spent in excess of a billion dollars to develop additional crude oil producing and transportation capacity in the Middle East. Without the markets in Western Europe assured by these investments in refining and distribution facilities, the American oil companies could not have justified such large investments in the Middle East.
>
> A great deal of emphasis has been given in these hearings to a regional comparison of income received and new funds invested over the past few years. It has been claimed that, over the period 1957 to 1959, this comparison shows a deficit of $200 million for the industrially advanced countries and a surplus of $1.7 billion for the developing countries.
>
> Such a comparison ignores the complementary nature of much of foreign investment. It also overlooks the fact that a substantial portion, perhaps as much as 40 to 50 percent, of the income attributed to U.S. operations in the developing countries is actually earned in Europe, Canada, and Japan largely through sales to affiliated enterprises in these countries.
>
> The alleged regional imbalance of income received and new funds invested quite simply reflects a failure to take into account the interdependence of U.S. foreign investment and foreign operations in different parts of the world.[5]

Mr. Collado also provided a table which compared the percentage of earnings distributed by Western Europe subsidiaries of American corporations from 1957 to 1960 which shows that in 1957, 47 percent of earnings were distributed and that they reached a high of 61 percent in 1959. During this same period of years, U.S. corporations distributed between 50 and 60 percent of their earnings as dividends to domestic stockholders. Hence, there does not seem to be too great a disparity between the operations of foreign subsidiaries and the parent U.S. corporations.

Mr. President, another witness, Mr. Arneson of the Abbott Laboratories clearly demonstrated that in terms of his own company's investments in the developed countries that the principal source of funds to invest in underdeveloped countries was derived from the profits in the developed countries. In many descriptions of foreign taxation, the term "tax haven" has been used in a manner that suggests tax avoidance for such an operation. Mr. Arneson said:

> Abbott carries on all of its trading activities outside the Western Hemisphere through the use of a base company. During the past 5 years 48 percent of Abbott's base company's earnings were derived from industrial

---

[2] President's 1961 Tax Recommendations, hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 87th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 4, pp. 2868–2869.

[3] Ibid., p. 2856.

[4] Ibid., p. 2830–2831.

[5] Ibid., pp. 2672–2673.

countries of the world, and 52 percent from the so-called developing countries. Upon analyzing the use of these earnings, we have found that 82 percent of the base company's funds that have been reinvested abroad, have gone into the developing countries, and only 18 percent back into the industrial countries.[6]

Mr. President, I purposely cited testimony relating to specific companies which avoids the qualifications and statistical problems involved by using Department of Commerce estimates of global activities. The House Ways and Means Committee testimony conclusively shows that American investments in developed countries are positive assets when we consider our balance-of-payments problem.

For example, table B76 in President Kennedy's Economic Report sets forth our international statistics for the years 1956 to September 1961. When these data are consolidated for the entire period, we find that total U.S. payments for all accounts were $162,017 million. U.S. direct investments represented a net outflow of $9,271 million. During this same period the income received from direct investments totaled $12,998 million. Our total gold sales over the entire period were $3,889 million. The net excess of receipts from direct investments over new investments totaled $3,727 million. If private investments had not been made and these receipts had not been obtained, our international overall statistics would be far less favorable, and we might find that our gold supply was in serious jeopardy.

The junior Senator from Tennessee compares the dividends paid by domestic corporations in 1960 with new money going into them. He suggests that this ratio should be applicable to oversea subsidiaries. He said:

> Taking our domestic operations as a guide, we find that dividends paid by domestic corporations in 1960 amounted to more than 160 percent of new money going into these corporations. With this as a guide, our foreign corporate subsidiaries ought to be sending home in dividends at least 60 percent more than new money we send abroad to pump into them. * * *
>
> Applying this yardstick to all subsidiaries, it would appear that our foreign subsidiaries could together contribute a $1 billion improvement each year in our balance of payments * * *.[7]

As I have already indicated, many foreign investments are new, and they have yet to attain their maximum earning capacity. On the other hand, some firms have had an opportunity to reinvest a substantial capital over a period of many years so that dividends based on this well-developed structure would naturally represent a sum in excess of new direct investments.

The junior Senator from Tennessee completely disregards the fact that in corporations where U.S. nationals are not the sole stockholders, dividend policies cannot be adopted solely to return the maximum dollar exchange to the United States. Such a course would inevitably result in resentment toward this country and would jeopardize our commercial relations with many nations.

Other developed countries are seeking to establish themselves throughout the world and are giving many preferences to their investors that have never been accorded U.S. firms venturing overseas. New restrictions on the accumulation of surpluses by foreign corporations would only tend to cause their abandonment by U.S. parent corporations. This would result in foreign firms facing no competition in this field.

It is doubtful that any Senator would advocate such a course. Again, Mr. Arneson places this problem in better perspective. He said:

> I should like to comment also briefly on some principles of taxation which are being propounded by a few tax theorists and doctrinaires with little regard to our country's stake in international trade and the challenge of the industrial competition throughout the world. There must be fuller recognition by our Government that business has to be conducted in foreign areas on the basis of the customs and the laws of these areas, and that American industry overseas should not be hampered by laws, rules, and regulations, including tax laws, which were designed for the regulation of business in the United States. It is a grave misconception to believe that U.S. companies overseas are presently getting special tax incentives from our Government. Quite the contrary, in fact. For example, as long as an American industry abroad is not given full credit by our Government for income taxes that are waived by a foreign country, U.S. concerns will be gradually losing to competition of these foreign firms.
>
> What should be considered, too, is that income taxes in most foreign countries are a smaller part of the total burden on business than in the United States. On the other hand, sales taxes, turnover taxes, 25 percent in France for example, transmission taxes, manufacturers' excise, capitalization taxes, property taxes, and a host of others are usually much higher in other Nations than in the United States.
>
> The U.S. manufacturer overseas is penalized by our Government which allows credit for foreign income taxes only, not for the rest of these taxes. In other words, U.S. industry overseas pays all of the local non-income taxes which I have mentioned, plus a total of 52 percent on the resulting net income, while our foreign competitors often pay a much lower total amount of tax. This situation, I can assure you, is a most serious threat to the future of our own company and portends a significant retreat of American industry in general to the benefit of foreign competitors in the world markets.[8]

Mr. Robert R. Schorn, the tax counsel of American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp., showed that in the case of his company the American parent total investment in foreign subsidiaries is considerably less than its present net equity. In this instance it totals less than $10 million and no subsequent investment was made after 1930. Through the reinvestment of earnings, at present, the net equity is $58 million and more than $30 million has been repatriated to the United States in the last 10 years on which U.S. taxes were paid. All this was made possible by permitting an original investment of $10 million to grow under favorable conditions so that as other newer foreign investments mature, the dividends repatriated to the United States will grow.

Arguments against the administration's proposals to tax earnings of foreign investments are quite well stated by Mr. Schorn. He said:

> The proposals would not help to redress the balance of payments, but would actually adversely affect this balance to the extent that they would discourage American expansion abroad, which has the purpose and effect of bringing more dollars back to the United States than are invested in foreign countries. This point is more fully developed below.
>
> There is no reason to assume that investment not made in or withdrawn from developed countries would be rechanneled to undeveloped countries, since this presupposes an interchangeability of markets, available resources, manpower, skills, etc., which in fact does not exist.
>
> Since in many developed countries the combined effective corporate income and dividend withholding tax rates are not significantly different from the U.S. corporate income tax rate, the proposals would to this extent produce no important additional revenue; on the contrary, they would tend to decrease revenue, since the substantial expenses of compliance would be borne to the extent of 52 percent by the U.S. Treasury.
>
> The accounting, legal, and other services required to satisfy the requirements of the proposals are very extensive and burdensome. Foreign corporations affected by the proposals would in effect have to maintain an additional set of books for U.S. tax purposes and would have to submit their proposed and executed transaction to scrutiny from a U.S. tax standpoint.
>
> Complex problems of interpretation would arise in connection with the computation of a foreign corporation's earnings and profits by U.S. standards, as, for example, in the area of foreign exchange valuation.
>
> The international implications, both economic and political, of the proposals, are unfortuate, both as to substance and as to timing.
>
> The proposals tend to create the impression that the United States is financially weak, and this is calculated to impair our world prestige and to lessen the attractiveness of our leadership for neutral nations.
>
> The fact that the United States will continue to give substantial economic assistance to many countries, including so-called developed countries, is unlikely to offset this damage to our worldwide image, although it will more than offset any revenue gain from the proposals. Indeed, the statement that the proposed list of developed countries is for use only for tax purposes and "is not intended to suggest whether or not U.S. economic assistance * * * may be justified" indicates both the insincerity of the approach and the awareness of the difficulties inherent in it. The proposals may thus fairly be characterized as having as their theme: aid, not trade.
>
> Similarly, they constitute an act of economic isolationism, without even the short-run financial benefits which such a policy could normally be expected to offer.
>
> The proposals for the immediate taxation to the U.S. parent of undistributed profits of a foreign corporation in which it may own a very small interest will undoubtedly be interpreted by the foreign economic community and governments as an unwarranted interference in their affairs, particularly since the proposals proceed by way of disregarding foreign corporate entities and are

---

[6] Ibid., p. 2848.

[7] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 19, 1962, p. 2426.

[8] President's 1961 Tax Recommendations, op. cit., pp. 2855–2856.

> to be implemented by onerous administrative requirements sought to be imposed by U.S. law on the foreign corporation itself. Such a policy would also invite reprisals against U.S. enterprises wherever possible.
>
> The proposal for the immediate taxation of undistributed profits of foreign subsidiaries, as well as those for the elimination of so-called tax haven companies and exclusion of foreign-earned salaries, add up to a resounding Yankee go home. They will effectively take the United States out of the running as a capital-exporting country (i.e., exporting capital through trade, as distinguished from aid), and will leave the field to other capital-exporting countries with more forward-looking policies.[9]

Our colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland, in an address delivered in Pittsburgh on March 21, 1959, predicted the difficulties we are now facing because of our unfavorable overall international gold balance. He showed that this situation resulted from the activities of our Federal Government and not from normal private economic activities by investors throughout the world. He said:

> On Friday, March 13, President Eisenhower requested the Congress to approve $4 billion in additional funds for the mutual security program. I believe that it is essential for us to assist our allies in strengthening their defenses to meet the onslaughts of atheistic communism; however, very few of our citizens comprehend the magnitude of the President's request.
>
> Fortune magazine in its July 1958 issue ranked America's leading industrial corporations in terms of their sales. On the basis of this list, I find that the taxes paid in 1957 by 44 of our largest industrial corporations do not equal $4 billion. In fact, they paid taxes to the Federal Government in the amount of $3,811 million. These taxes in turn were predicated on sales of $91 billion worth of products. The production of these goods required the use of assets costing $73 billion. The production to furnish these taxes required the employment of more than 4 million employees. These taxes merely support the foreign aid program. Remember, this leaves nothing for our own defense expenditures, interest on the public debt, veterans, agriculture, reclamation, education, slum clearances, public housing, urban renewal, and the countless other programs suggested for our own economic development.
>
> I might add that the 44 corporations I have listed obviously include many whose headquarters are centered in Pittsburgh, such as the United States Steel Corp., Westinghouse, the Aluminum Co. of America, the Jones & Laughlin Steel Co., and Gulf Oil, as well as other leading firms such as General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, General Electric, Du Pont, and the major oil companies.[10]

The senior Senator from Maryland also stated:

> American citizens are not permitted to convert paper dollars into gold; however, foreigners have this opportunity. In recent years we have been providing them with dollar resources to enable them to draw on our gold balances. Unless we maintain competitive prices in world markets and bring about a balance in terms of our international payments our economy is headed for serious trouble.
>
> In 1948 U.S. gold stocks reached a postwar high of $24.6 billion. At the end of last year they stood at $20.6 billion, a decline of $4 billion. The reduction in 1958 alone totaled $2.3 billion. In fact, the monthly figures show a falling gold stock for every month since January 1958. While a $20 billion gold stock provides an adequate base for our currency, it must be self-evident that a decline of about 10 percent a year can no longer continue without completely destroying our own economic system. This, perhaps, is the best way for us to fully appreciate the impact of unsound economic policies, since an excess of demands for dollar payments abroad over purchases from us will sooner or later be reflected in our monetary reserves.[11]

The great virtue of a free enterprise economy as compared with other economic systems is that it provides flexibility so that management may adopt policies which maximize profit opportunities.

This often entails foreign investment, export sales, and perhaps licensing arrangements. It is naive to suggest that the management of any American firm is not aware of the necessity of providing adequate dividends to its stockholders. Since the vast majority of them are American citizens, this entails a flow of dollars to the United States which will, of course, be taxed by the Federal Government.

Testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee showed that a conscious effort is made on the part of most companies not only to reinvest their earnings abroad but also to repatriate the funds to the American stockholders in the form of dividends which of course are taxable.

Mr. Frank X. White, the president of Machine & Foundary International, a subsidiary of the American Machine Foundry Co., Mr. Collado of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and Mr. Harold D. Arneson of Abbott Laboratories, testified on this matter. Mr. White said:

> Investment abroad is being conducted according to a long-range plan based upon capturing and keeping a reasonable share of oversea markets for our products. The plan calls for the return of dividends to the United States for distribution to stockholders in a reasonable period of time, and, at every annual meeting of the company, the management is reminded by the stockholders that, although they support the company's interest in international business, the wait for dividends cannot be and will not be indefinitely sustained.[12]

Mr. Collado said:

> Thus, in 1960, we paid out $485 million in dividends, of which two-thirds was attributable to foreign income. You may be sure that many millions of dollars in U.S. taxes are paid by Jersey shareholders on such income.[13]

Mr. Harold D. Arneson said:

> I wish to emphasize that our foreign earnings have always been reinvested abroad for normal business reasons and not to thwart collection of U.S. income taxes. Our company, in common with a vast majority of companies, is publicly held. The stockholders would not permit the indefinite retention of foreign source earnings overseas.[14]

There is obviously no conflict between the long-term interest of parent-company stockholders and the U.S. Treasury. They both seek the maximum return in the form of investment income for every dollar which is sent abroad to expand our market position in competition with the well-organized firms throughout the world that can offer not only capital but also management skills and techniques, patents, and scientific programs.

Those firms which through foreign investment are entrenched in local markets will enjoy the fruits of the expansion of the world's economy. Those who are timid and do not venture abroad or are prevented from doing so by restrictions imposed by their own governments will not be in a position to go forward. Of the leading countries of the world, the United States appears to be the only one that is even considering any deterrents to foreign investment.

In his testimony, Mr. Charles I. Derr, vice president of Machinery & Allied Products Institute, stated that:

> A foreign subsidiary facilitates contacts with foreign customers, it establishes local identification for the U.S. company, and it permits the kind of market penetration that is not readily available to a domestic which does not have such identification. It leads to more extensive foreign distribution channels. Demand is created for U.S.-manufactured components. Much of the initial investment, incidentally, is offset almost immediately by a demand for and export of American capital goods. And again our records would seem to bear this out.
>
> I sum this all up by saying that this very substantial impact on American exports serves not only to assist in the adjustment of the balance of payments, but contributes materially to employment in the United States.[15]

American business, at no cost to the taxpayer, can perform a task that can be achieved in no other manner in oversea operations. Mr. Derr also said:

> It makes possible the application of U.S. technology, managerial skills, and resources to the development of industry throughout the world, and particularly in underdeveloped areas. Certainly it contributes to the promotion of friendly relations on a people-to-people basis through the employment of a good many Americans abroad. Third, it brings about a closer and a longer lasting relationship between American business and their foreign counterparts than is ordinarily possible in government.
>
> Business leadership abroad is generally more stable than is government's, so that you have here a continuing relationship of very considerable value in our judgment. Finally, the presence of American business in underdeveloped areas has served largely to dispel the image of America as a race of dollar exploiters. I would suggest that in India, for example, in what might be called head-to-head competition with our Soviet rivals, American business has come off very well indeed. Much of this contribution would be lost and further growth would be retarded, in our judgment, if the administration's proposals were to be adopted.[16]

Our balance-of-payments problem cannot be solved by deterring oversea investment or by an export drive.

---

[9] Ibid., pp. 2898–99.

[10] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 4, p. 4857.

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 4, p. 4859.

[12] President's 1961 Tax Recommendations, op. cit., p. 2696.

[13] Ibid., p. 2672.

[14] Ibid., p. 2856.

[15] Ibid., p. 3079.

[16] Ibid., p. 3076.

The American dollar for many years has been one of the world's principal currencies. Without our seeking world responsibilities, they have been thrust upon us. The role of our private oversea investments over the long term was set forth in the June 1961 Monthly Letter on Business and Economic Conditions, of the First National City Bank of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this bulletin be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In his tax package President Kennedy recommended overhauling the tax treatment of income earned by Americans abroad. Secretary Dillon presented the proposals before the House Ways and Means Committee and pressed for prompt enactment.

The principal and most controversial proposals would make a far-reaching change in the long-established tax treatment of profits earned abroad by American firms operating through foreign subsidiaries. At present, such earnings are taxed in the country where the subsidiary operates and then again in the United States when they are distributed to the parent company in the form of dividends. Earnings retained abroad are not subject to U.S. tax. It is now proposed that the United States should tax earnings retained abroad by foreign subsidiaries in economically advanced countries. Profits earned and reinvested in developing countries would continue to be eligible for what the administration proposals call the "privilege of tax deferral" (postponement). The tax burden on dividends from both areas would be increased by technical changes.

The idea is not only to enlarge U.S. tax revenues, but to make oversea investment in advanced countries less attractive to American industry. Thus it introduces a new concept of public policy. Ever since the United States, which was benefited for many decades—and still is—by foreign investment in its own development, became in turn a capital generating and exporting country, it has been believed that U.S. investment abroad helped other countries by building up their production, stimulating their economic growth, and increasing their trade. Similarly, it helped the United States by expanding markets for U.S. products, building U.S. assets abroad and providing a flow of income back to the U.S. investor. Economic history is filled with lessons of these mutual benefits. The history of Great Britain, whose investments helped build other countries and whose oversea assets in turn aided immeasurably in her fight for survival through two world wars, is a dramatic example.

The benefits of the flow of capital over international boundaries, which indeed is as natural as the flow of water from one level to another, have seldom been questioned in principle, though to be sure there has been much controversy on nationalistic or other narrower grounds. In these days of widespread Government grants and aids, there seems special reason not to discourage the investment of private capital, which brings a return flow of income in support of the balance of payments and tax revenues, and which ought to be encouraged and expanded to lighten the burden the Government programs lay on the taxpayer.

The new proposals therefore raise fundamental questions. One argument advanced for them is that they would reduce private capital outflows and bring about increased remittances to this country, thus helping to overcome the balance-of-payments deficit and win the battle to safeguard the dollar. Another is that the change would make the tax system more equitable. The basic issues include not only these points, but how economic growth, production, trade, and capital formation everywhere would be affected.

Implicit in the use of the balance-of-payments argument is an assumption that private capital investment is at least a bad boy, if not the bad boy, in the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. This, however, is contradicted by readily available figures.

Despite the implications that American corporations have been hiding income in tax havens abroad, the fact is that data of the U.S. Department of Commerce show that American corporations do bring home, for inclusion in U.S. income tax returns, large and growing amounts of earnings. Remittances of income, year after year, are larger than the outflow of new funds going into plants abroad—so-called direct investment.[17]

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that the administration in attempting to justify its proposals to tax undistributed earnings of foreign corporations should base its position on the need to improve our balance of payments. This is predicated on data involving our international accounts with Western Europe particularly over the 4-year period 1957 through 1960. The fact of the matter is that in the first 3 of these 4 years, 1957 through 1959, there was a favorable balance. One widely publicized transaction involving the purchase of the foreign-owned stock of the Ford Motor Co. subsidiary in the United Kingdom resulted in an outflow of approximately $376 million.

By carefully selecting the period for study it is possible to develop almost any argument with reference to our balance of payments. However, such a course is unfair to our national interest. The only meaningful data is to examine the results over a sufficiently long period of time to reveal probable future trends. While I agree with the junior Senator from Tennessee that the Department of Commerce data are not necessarily conclusive, I am confident that over a long period of time the discrepancies tend to cancel each other.

Mr. President, let us not lose sight of the fact that the best official data show that in every year since 1950 income returned to the United States from direct private investment overseas has exceeded net capital outflows.

During a 10-year period the aggregate repatriated income on investment accounts exceeded new investments by more than $8.5 billion. Whether we examine the data submitted by specific companies concerning their own operations or whether we consider official overall data we find that foreign investment provides a net flow of dollars to the United States which is subject to taxation in this country. Private direct investments overseas have played a major role in making it possible for the U.S. Government to assume the heavy burdens of defense and foreign economic assistance.

Mr. President, I intend to discuss further aspects of the administration's proposals with reference to the taxation of foreign subsidiaries of U.S. corporations as the Senate Finance Committee continues with its current hearings.

PRICE INCREASES AND INFLATION

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, recently there has been much discussion in this body and throughout the country about price increases and the imperative need of holding the line against inflationary trends. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Alerting Mr. Kennedy to a Price Rise," published recently in the Chicago Daily Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALERTING MR. KENNEDY TO A PRICE RISE

A rise of at least a half cent a quart in the price of milk by July 1 is being forecast because of impending higher labor costs for dairies. Fred Nonnamaker, executive secretary of the Associated Milk Dealers, Inc., estimates that on May 1 plant workers will receive an increase in pay and fringe benefits totaling 43.67 cents an hour, which will boost their average pay to $137.30 a week (not including fringe benefits).

Milk wagon drivers are scheduled to get a total increase of 13.45 cents an hour in pay and fringe benefits, and their average pay will go up to $135.92 a week for home delivery, and $221.68 for store delivery.

These increases are the second and last under a 2-year contract, negotiated last July in settlement of a strike. Mr. Nonnamaker says the higher costs cannot be absorbed by the dealers because their net profit is generally between a fifth and a third of a cent a quart.

In fact, he said, a milk price increase on May 1 probably was averted by a scheduled decline, equivalent to a half cent a quart, in the price paid to farmers. The farm price of milk is scheduled to go up again on July 1. These adjustments, based on seasonal factors, will take place under an agreement between farmers and dealers.

If the price hike occurs, it will be interesting to observe the reaction in Washington. Will President Kennedy, who became so agitated over the proposed price increase in steel, now speak out with similar vigor in behalf of consumers of milk?

Mr. Kennedy's excuse for condemning the steel companies and threatening them with punitive action, which caused them to call off the announced steel price increase, was that benefits granted labor in the recent negotiations did not justify a price rise. In the case of Chicago area dairies, the dairy workers' and milk wagon drivers' unions appear to have received more substantial benefits.

If he is consistent, Mr. Kennedy will be as forthright in condemning actions of unions that raise the cost of food as he was in condemning the steel companies.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the period of time between now and Monday, April 23, the President pro tempore or the Vice President be authorized to sign enrolled bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so that Senators may be informed when the Senate completes its work today, it is planned to adjourn to Monday next at noon. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

---

[17] Ibid., p. 3320.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TREATY ON GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the subject of the basic provisions of the Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament as presented in Geneva, Switzerland, yesterday by the representatives of the U.S. Government at that disarmament conference.

As a longstanding advocate of disarmament under proper safeguards, I was greatly encouraged by the presentation in Geneva yesterday of a new U.S. proposal for a treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. Any openminded person who reads this down-to-earth document cannot fail to see that the United States has taken a giant step toward ending the arms race. Never before has a major power made such concrete suggestions, based on such manifest self-interest, for the reduction and elimination of the sources of its power—namely, its military forces, armaments, and weapons delivery systems—with such absolute assurance that as it disarms, its most likely adversaries will have to follow suit.

In other words, they will have to do as is required of us.

President Kennedy is perfectly justified, in describing this draft treaty as "the most comprehensive and detailed proposal in the field of general disarmament ever put forward by any government."

Some people may call this proposed treaty utopian, but only if they also consider "utopian" the goal of a world of law and order free from the menace of accidental or aggressive war and free from the intolerable burden of armaments.

The latest U.S. plan breathes the spirit of its principal author, President Kennedy. Last September in the United Nations General Assembly, President Kennedy challenged the world to end the arms race and to join what he so aptly termed the "peace race." At that time—in the midst of mounting anxiety over a United States-Soviet clash in Berlin—the President said:

> Men no longer debate whether armaments are a symptom or a cause of tension. The mere existence of modern weapons—10 million times more powerful than anything the world has ever seen and only minutes away from any target on earth—is a source of horror and discord and distrust. Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes, for disarmament must be a part of any permanent settlement. And men may no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness, for in a spiraling arms race a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase.

These words are even more valid today than they were on September 25, 1961. The balance of terror has not shifted. Arms and the destructive power of armaments have increased, not diminished. Horror and discord and distrust are still prominent features on the international landscape. The best that can be said today is that for the first time in many, many months there seems to be an international atmosphere conducive to the discussion, if not to the solution, of our problems.

It is therefore singularly appropriate that the President has chosen this moment to again put forward a detailed comprehensive program of disarmament that moves the United States into first place in the peace race. No longer can the Soviet Union claim to have the only disarmament proposal before the Geneva Conference in so-called "treaty" form. We have firmly seized the initiative for peace. We have kept our pledge to the United Nations and to all of humanity that peace with honor and absolute security has the highest priority in American policy. Once again the President has proven that we shall never be afraid to negotiate, but we do not and never shall negotiate from fear.

In the most literal sense of the word, we are negotiating from strength. Our disarmament proposals are presented at a time when the United States has unequaled strength, and when our rivals have shown that they respect our strength in areas of direct confrontation. In short, these are the proposals of a strong nation that seeks to use its military, economic, and political might to lead the world in the paths of peace.

Finally, we have shown that we understand mankind's yearning for a disarmament agreement that rests on something stronger than the thin reed of trust among the great powers. If two men stand with pistols drawn at 10 paces, neither is going to drop his weapon without absolute assurance that the other will do the same. The best way to prevent a suicidal duel through accident or miscalculation is to have an impartial third party to guarantee that neither of the two antagonists will take advantage of the other's momentary weakness. This is why our plan gives such a prominent role to a United Nations peace force capable of safeguarding world peace during and after the process of general disarmament. Stage III of the U.S. proposal stipulates that the United Nations peace force, to be established in stage II, will be progressively strengthened until it has "sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it."

The provision in the draft treaty relating to the United Nations peace force follows many suggestions made by others over the past years. This proposal, however, needs the most careful analysis. We shall want to consider the voting pattern in the U.N., the financing of such a peace force; what would be the command of the peace force; and we will have to ask and find out if such a force is subject to the Security Council or the General Assembly. These questions and many more concerning our relationship to the United Nations need to be clarified and answered. It is the provision that will be the subject of much debate and dissent. Frankly, I want to know more about it.

Mr. President, the new plan demonstrates the soundness of our judgment last year in establishing the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. My colleagues in the Senate will recall that on the occasion of the discussion of that legislation I reminded them that we needed to study arms control and disarmament as carefully as we study problems of national security in terms of the defense of this Nation, the military operations that may be required for the defense of this Nation.

I have pointed out repeatedly that in recent years we have neither had an arms policy nor a disarmament policy; we have had a budget policy. A budget policy is hardly adequate for the kind of world in which we live where there is the constant danger of Communist aggression and totalitarian force. Today we have an arms policy and a national security policy, and today we have also a disarmament policy. They are the two sides of the same coin of national security.

The new U.S. plan, Mr. President, shows that our disarmament officials have studied the problems of disarmament and arms control far more thoroughly than have their counterparts in the Soviet Union. Our people have not been content to deal in semantics. For instance, although the draft treaty offers the familiar outline of a three-stage disarmament process, it assigns precise time limits for the completion of the first two stages; it offers a scientifically cheatproof method of verifying disarmament and measuring total military capacity; it grapples with the problem of militarily significant states which may be reluctant to disarm; it provides for the exact categories and types of arms to be progressively reduced; finally, as I have said, it sets up an international police force to fill the vacuum left by the elimination of national forces in the final stage.

The chief Soviet delegate to the Geneva Disarmament Conference apparently finds nothing new in the American proposals and calls them unacceptable.

I cannot dispute that statement, even though Soviet officials privately have expressed interest in our proposals. However, I can say that the U.S. plan contains several features never before seen in any serious disarmament plan.

The most striking new feature of the U.S. disarmament plan, Mr. President, is the verification function of the International Disarmament Organization, which is to be established early in stage I of disarmament. Not only would the IDO be supposed to verify both the reduction and destruction of armaments, but it would employ a unique method of checking up on remaining force levels and arms inventories as disarmament proceeds. This is the so-called spot-check method. Now, this unique feature needs very careful examination. It may not be adequate inspection; nevertheless, it represents a constructive proposal.

It is well known, Mr. President, that the Soviet Union, both in disarmament and nuclear test ban negotiations, has balked at the idea of opening up its territory to on-site inspections by foreign nationals. This attitude has its roots in the traditional secretiveness and xenophobia of the Russians. Ostensibly they argue that there can be inspection only of the weapons marked for destruction, not of the weapons that remain in their arsenal or the bases where they may be deployed. Anything else, they claim, would be a device for espionage. We should expect this response, for the Soviet Union treats every foreigner that crosses its borders as a potential or actual spy. Why, therefore, should it treat the members of an international control commission any differently—although no rational person would conceive of an international disarmament inspector engaging in espionage for military purposes.

In other words, the Soviet Union has built its own monster, a monster of secrecy and fear. They have to live with that monster. It is suspicious of everyone else. Our task is to break down that suspicion. Our task is to penetrate the crust of secrecy by insisting upon disarmament with international inspection and a control system which is designed for one purpose; namely, to supervise disarmament agreements.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota in presenting this very able speech this afternoon. It is particularly apropos that the speech, presenting the American point of view, should be made by the Senator from Minnesota on this last session of the Senate before Eastertide. I believe at this time it is important that the American people reflect once more and rededicate themselves once more to the spiritual values on which the disarmament program of the United States is based.

I intend to discuss the subject of disarmament briefly later this afternoon. However, I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota for making his speech. I am glad he is leading off in the discussion. The people of this country should know, if they do not know already—and I am sure millions of them do—that no one in the Senate has contributed more in the past several years to the subject of disarmament than has the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. He and I serve together on the Committee on Foreign Relations. I can rise at any time as his witness to testify to what the Senator from Minnesota has done. I commend him again, as I have in committee, for his great statesmanship on this subject.

It is so difficult to get the people to understand, not only here but also elsewhere, that we will either solve the disarmament problem or we will lose the heritage of our people through increased international tension or war. We do not have much time. I do not know what we can do to get the people, not only in our country, but also around the world, to recognize that this is probably the greatest issue confronting this generation.

It is so easy, as one listens to the flag wavers, to forget that the best way one can serve that flag is to lead mankind to the acceptance of the American program for disarmament.

As I have said, I shall discuss the subject later, but the Senator is so right in pointing out that we cannot have disarmament unless we have both inspection and control and, as I shall show later, enforcibility also.

Enforcibility cannot be carried out by the President. Enforcibility will have to be carried out through the application of the rule of law by way of the procedures of the United Nations, as the President of the United States has had the courage to tell the American people and the world. He had the courage to say that last September in the magnificent speech he made at the United Nations, and he had the courage to repeat it again yesterday, as he again discussed this subject.

I consider it not only a privilege, but a trust, on my part as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to join the Senator from Minnesota this afternoon, in these relatively few hours before Eastertide, to see what we can do to get the people to think once more positively and constructively in regard to our obligations to mankind to get behind the President in this great statesmanlike drive of his for disarmament.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon. The task of working in the field of foreign policy, particularly in the area of disarmament, is one that sometimes is subject to misinterpretation. There are persons in our country and elsewhere who feel that if one discusses disarmament, he is revealing weakness, is indulging in appeasement, or recommending some form of unilateral disarmament which would gravely weaken our national security. I feel certain that every sensible, reasonable person knows that what we are seeking to do is to discuss the complex problem of arms control and disarmament in the framework of, as the Senator from Oregon has said, international inspection and international control, with enforcibility through the institutions of the United Nations, the World Court, and others. No one recommends that we take these actions alone; all these proposals are encased in the doctrine of mutuality. Whatever we do in the field of disarmament must be done by others; it must be all embracing.

I say this because I can almost hear now the charges that will be brought against this proposal and against those of us who think that the proposal deserves the most careful consideration and study.

Everyone knows that when he discusses disarmament, he lays himself open to the false charges of weakness or of being unwilling to face up to the Communist menace. I have tried to say on these problems that the world today has a choice of risks. One is the great risk with which we are living right now, the risk of an ever-increasing arms race, a race which history demonstrates must end in catastrophe. The other is the risk of negotiating a safeguarded agreement to end the armaments race. I would be the last person to say that there was not a risk involved in the latter alternative; but I think that risk, if we are careful enough in our negotiations, if our plans are meticulously and carefully designed, is the lesser of the two risks.

What is more, as the Senator from Oregon has said, the people of our political faith, the people of our ideals and religious conviction, ought to be the peacemakers, with honor and with justice, and in freedom. There is not a thing wrong in being a peacemaker. The strongest force, the strongest personality, the strongest spirit the world has ever known was a peacemaker; while the weakest man was a warrior, and warmaker.

I am hopeful that in this Easter season we may discuss this subject with sincerity and in the conviction that we yearn for a just and enduring peace, and that we may find the ways and paths to accomplish it.

In any case, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, under the leadership of Mr. William Foster and with the expert assistance of officials throughout our Government, came up with a plan that tries to meet Soviet objections without compromising our basic objective of controlled, foolproof disarmament. Our draft treaty calls on all nations, but principally the United States and the Soviet Union, to divide their territory into a number of zones and to make a full report at the beginning of each disarmament step as to the type and amount of armaments, forces, and military activity in each zone. There have been suggestions of a checkerboard pattern of 20 zones for each nation.

Once the zones were agreed upon, the International Disarmament Organization would then choose at random one zone to inspect for disarmament and residual military capacity. No one would know in advance what zone was to be inspected, but once it was selected, the home country would give a full accounting of the arms and forces based in the zone, and the IDO would verify the statement. This method would guard the Nation being inspected against full-scale espionage while accomplishing the purpose of progressively total disarmament. A zone once inspected would "remain open for further inspection while verification was being extended to additional zones." Thus, beginning with approximately 5 percent of a nation's territory, disarmament and inspection would extend progressively to 100 percent of the territory by the end of stage II. In this way the most stubborn obstacle to a workable disarmament treaty—the conflict between international and national inspection concepts—would be scientifically overcome.

This spot-check proposal is an ingenious alternative to trust in international relations. I could never understand how such a pathologically suspicious country as the Soviet Union could ever agree to disarmament without controls unless it really intended to cheat while the other fellow disarmed—just as it cheated in breaking the nuclear test moratorium last fall.

At least, it is worthy of serious study, which, I am sure, will result in an improvement of the principle itself. Why cannot the Soviet Union see that this procedure takes full account of its need for national security? It eliminates any possibility of espionage, and at the same time fulfills the responsibility of safeguarding disarmament.

Without examining every feature of the new disarmament plan, Mr. President, I want to mention one important new proposal which would let disarmament enter its first stage even without the adherence of Communist China. Our disarmament plan entails a reduction of 30 percent in categories and types of weapons which at the present time are possessed in quantity only by the Soviet Union, Britain, and the United States. These include missiles, missile-launching pads, heavy bombers, missile-launching submarines, and the like. Armed Forces personnel would be reduced in stage I to 2.1 million men each for the United States and Soviet Russia. But even if such reductions take place without corresponding reductions by China, none of the great powers would be militarily vulnerable to Chinese aggression.

For one thing, nuclear weapons would be frozen at their existing levels without, however, reducing United States or Soviet nuclear retaliatory power in the first stage. Limitations would be imposed on the production of armaments; the production or transfer of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons would be halted forthwith; and a nuclear test ban treaty under international control and inspection would go into effect if it had not already done so.

This is all in stage 1. Plainly none of these measures would permit a shift of the balance of power in favor of Communist China or any other militarily significant state.

However, Communist China would have to abide by the second-stage commitments. In other words, if the second stage is to be fulfilled, then it must include the militarily significant states, particularly Communist China. For at this point, any meaningful disarmament agreement would have to include all nations, and particularly any aggressive military power such as Communist China. Why? Because during stage II those nations which, like the United States and the Soviet Union, had already reduced their armaments by 30 percent would undergo a further reduction of 50 percent. Communist China, therefore, would have to list all its armaments by category and type and would have to make a 65-percent reduction so as to bring itself into line with the other powers. No one is suggesting that Communist China would agree easily to this course, but at least the methods and procedures would be airtight. The great powers could go it alone without China up to a certain point. After that, Communist China would have to follow suit or bear the odium of frustrating mankind's desire for a lasting peace.

This thought leads me to say it is entirely probable that Communist China does not care at all about world public opinion or about bearing the odium of frustrating mankind's desire for a lasting peace. This is a probability and a possibility that we must face.

If in stage II Communist China or other militarily significant states did not adhere, then the treaty would be "off"; there would be no agreement. I wish to make this clear because I have long felt that we could not recommend any form of overall disarmament unless it included all possible major military powers. I do not believe the question of disarmament is strictly one between the United States and the Soviet Union, even though they are the two nations today which have the capacity for a surprise attack; which have the capacity for an all-out nuclear war.

Nevertheless, if there is to be disarmament which provides any modicum or degree of security for the world, it must include Communist China, which is the most aggressive military power today. Fortunately for mankind, Communist China does not have the weapons for massive destruction; it does not have the means to deliver thermonuclear weapons. But we must face the fact that in the years to come, these most destructive weapons and vehicles of delivery most likely will be in the possession of Communist China. That is why the senior Senator from Minnesota is so gravely concerned about the prospects of an expansion of the arms race. The arms race is not merely one between the United States and the Soviet Union; it is not merely a race between the Warsaw Pact countries and the NATO countries.

Every hour of the day, every day of the week, and every day of the month, Communist China comes closer to developing nuclear weapons; and as she does, she also develops missiles and rockets. With more than 700 million people, with her aggressive leaders, with her apparently utter disdain for human life, and with her declared bitterness and hostility toward the West, I say that the day when Communist China gets nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them, not a single mortal will live in peace and security. That will be a dark day for humanity, and will literally be a day of fear, suspicion, and distrust that will know no length or bounds.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me to be imperative that every effort be made by intelligent and rational human beings to bring to a halt the expansion of nuclear weapons, the proliferation of those weapons, and the development of the means of their delivery by nations other than those which now possess them; and even those which now possess them must be willing to agree to inspection and control under effective and balanced controls.

It is very easy for us to talk about our military strength and to presume that it will always be very great. But, Mr. President, the fact is that in the world today there is an antagonist even more belligerent and more aggressive than the Soviet Union, and that antagonist—even with all its problems and weaknesses of today—is Communist China. I warn the American people and the other free peoples of the world that when Communist China gets nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them, all mankind will live in the shadow of death.

That is why we are discussing disarmament. It is not an act of weakness—instead, I say it is an act of bravery and courage—to propose plans of disarmament; and only a great Nation such as ours, with the great power it now possesses, is capable of making this proposal in sincerity. We make it because we have the moral, the political, the military, and the economic strength to make it and because we believe we should be making it.

That is why I rise to commend the President and his associates for their great statesmanlike act.

Mr. President, I have shown that the U.S. proposal is the world's first detailed blueprint for general disarmament on a global scale. It removes any ground for complaint by the Soviet Union that the United States stands for "control without disarmament" or "legalized espionage." It also removes any ground for justifiable criticism here at home that the U.S. disarmament proposals may weaken our security. The U.S. proposal is carefully designed with appropriate safeguards—inspection and controls at every stage and at every step.

I emphasize this point because in speeches made in the Senate and in speeches made elsewhere in the Nation it has been said that these disarmament proposals are unilateral and that they jeopardize our security and would weaken our military strength but would not weaken that of the Soviet Union. Mr. President, I brand such arguments as false, as misrepresentations, and without any foundation in fact. We are not proposing a single thing which in any way would weaken our security. We are proposing staged, step-by-step reductions in disarmaments and a slowing down of the production and accumulation of armaments, not only for ourselves, but also for others; and we have said that unless others accept the inspection, control, and supervision that will guarantee fulfillment of the agreement beyond any shadow of doubt, there will be no agreement. Let us make that point clear before the discussion proceeds further.

Furthermore, in the event of disagreement or noncompliance, the matter could be referred to the United Nations Security Council where we, as well as the Soviet Union, have the power of veto. Although the first two stages are designed to be completed in 6 years, there is no time limit for completion of the third, and final, stage. Final compliance with the treaty could take from 9 to 15 years.

In other places, some have said that in 9 years we would be totally disarmed. But, Mr. President, such talk is irresponsible. There is no guarantee that even in 19 years either we or the Soviet Union would be totally disarmed. The agreement declares that under stage 1 and stage 2, in 6 years, certain things will be accomplished. But stage 3—the important one, which provides for final reduction of arms—will come about only if certain conditions are fulfilled; and they require the establishment of an international disarmament organization of sufficient proportions and sufficient quality so that we can be sure there will be no cheating, no avoidance of responsibility, and no way in which anyone could in any way disobey or violate the terms of the agreement. It is clearly recognized that the Soviet Union does not trust us, and I am sure the United States does not trust the Soviet Union. Therefore, as Admiral Radford, formerly Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, it is the task of modern statesmen to develop an alternative to trust. He was then speaking of the international inspection system required for disarmament.

We do not trust the Soviets, nor should we; and in every measure or proposal we have presented, we have insisted that there be an alternative to trust, known as the international control and inspection system. No such treaty would ever be ratified by the Senate unless it provided that as a minimum protection.

At no stage will our power, relative to that of any other state or combination of states, be dangerously reduced. Every clause of the treaty is based on the principle that what we do, the Soviets must do. It guarantees that no nation can take advantage of disarmament, to threaten the security of any other nation. It promises the blessings of peace to all nations with the will and the foresight to set in motion the treaty machinery.

Several important aspects of the U.S. plan should be set in motion even before formal ratification of the entire treaty. The treaty is not a package; some parts can be implemented now—separately. I particularly refer to the provision in the first stage for ending nuclear weapons production and development, for guaranteeing the peaceful exploration of outer space. Outer space must be effectively quarantined against weapons of mass destruction in orbit and for reducing the risk of war.

None of these is beyond our grasp at this very moment. Again I call upon the Geneva Disarmament Conference to recommend an immediate special meeting between the United States and the Soviet Union on the means of avoiding accidental war. U.S. efforts in 1957 and 1958 to get an agreement limiting the danger of surprise attack, with special emphasis on the Arctic, were spuriously vetoed by the Soviet Union in the U.N. Security Council. Nevertheless, the time seems ripe to renew these efforts. The scope of any agreement along these lines should be expanded.

There is growing danger of war by miscalculation or escalation, and the world has a right to expect the two greatest military powers to control their weapons of mass destruction. These weapons have become so complex, and yet paradoxically so simple and automatic to unleash, that they could reduce the civilized world to ashes in a matter of minutes. Procedures equally complex and yet simple to operate, must be agreed upon to guard against the danger of war by accident. We have the technical means to destroy ourselves. We must develop and use the technical means to save ourselves from destruction. Surely this is something as important to Chairman Khrushchev as it is to President Kennedy.

Our press, our magazines, and our public documents have revealed for the world to see the many measures which have been taken by us to prevent accidental war, to prevent the detonation of a nuclear weapon, for example, that may be carried in a B-52 plane that crashes, to prevent the launching of a missile because some electrical or electronic device may be faulty and set off that missile. We have taken elaborate measures to prevent accidental war. My question to the world is, What has the Soviet Union done to prevent accidental war?

Last year I spoke here in the Senate urging our delegation to the U.N. to press a resolution in the U.N. to call upon the Soviet Union to list for the public, for the world, and for U.N. inspection itself, those measures which its military leaders and political officers had taken to prevent accidental war or war by miscalculation.

Every Member of this body knows there is a danger of such possibility every hour. With vast numbers of airplanes on the alert, with our air fleet in the sky loaded with weapons, and with our ships at sea loaded with nuclear weapons, ready to go out at a moment's notice, the danger is there. The same is true of the Soviet Union, and perhaps more so. Our scientists and military leaders have built in an elaborate protective system against the possibility of accidental war. We have told the world about it. In fact, we may have slowed down our retaliatory possibilities because of our concern over accidental war.

Has not humanity the right to know what the Soviet Union has done in that respect? What have the Russians done to prevent the possibility of this happening? Today we stand in ignorance of it. I submit, that at Geneva, even if progress should bog down on every other subject on the agenda, we should press relentlessly, in the name of humanity, and in the name of the Russian people themselves, who could be destroyed by accidental war, for a conference to prevent accidental war or surprise attack.

One step which need not be part of any formal disarmament plan, but which would help establish the atmosphere for meaningful disarmament, would be the proclamation of an International Space Cooperation Year modeled on the International Geophysical Year of 1958. During this year the United States, the Soviet Union, and other interested nations could implement the initial feelers that have already been made for joint space activities. Such cooperation is essential if outer space is to become a laboratory of peaceful research and scientific exploration, rather than a battlefield filled with the hideous weapons of mass production. I first proposed an International Space Cooperation Year a little over a year ago. The need for it is even greater today.

We must seek, above all things else, to prevent outer space from becoming another launching platform for weapons of mass production. Time is running out. The next 2 to 5 years may well determine whether or not we are going to permit outer space to become a grotesque battlefield that can destroy the entire world, or whether we are going to convert it into a laboratory that will make this world the garden of plenty and happiness it should be.

Finally, even the first steps of a disarmament agreement mean that all nations, great and small, must endow the United Nations and the International Court of Justice with progressively greater power and confidence. With the withering away of the possibility of unilateral military action, nations will have to transfer the settlement of their disputes from the national to the international level.

It is for this reason that I have long felt we ought to strengthen the International Court of Justice and ought to remove from our own adherence to the treaty relating to the International Court of Justice or World Court the so-called Connally reservation. If we want international law, we must have a chance of having international justice when it is especially needed.

In stage 2, for instance, all parties to the disarmament treaty would have to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. This would have the effect, if the Senate ratified the disarmament treaty, of nullifying the Connally reservation to our participation in the World Court. Yes, this is a step I have long proposed. It is long overdue. It serves no useful purpose for a free people and for our Nation.

Mr. President, I have given some of my first impressions of the latest U.S. plan for general and complete disarmament. My remarks do not pretend to be a complete and exhaustive analysis. Nor do I say this treaty is all it should be. It is a proposal. It is a draft treaty. It is a beginning. It is a document around which men of good will and reasonable intelligence can negotiate. We can make whatever adjustments are required. I think the plan is a good one which deserves to be studied and to be improved.

I have no illusions about the success it will meet at Geneva, although I am glad to note that our proposals have produced a favorable impression upon many neutral delegates and even upon some Soviet representatives in their off-duty moments.

I understand that the Soviet Union takes a negative attitude on this proposal. It is in a negative frame of mind. But I have never believed the United States should govern its actions or should permit its actions to be determined by the actions of the Soviet Union. Let us establish our own standards. Let us chart our own course. Let us lay down the principles in which we believe, and let us ask others to rally to those principles.

At long last we have come to grips with the problem of disarmament. We have done it fearlessly, courageously, and openly; and I will predict that many of the nations of the world will cheer and herald this initiative on our part. Mark my words, as nation after nation finds out that the Soviets are unwilling to negotiate, that they are afraid to negotiate, those nations will become our friends—and give sympathetic support to the principles for which we stand.

This plan is a worthy embodiment of the principles of the peace race as enunciated by President Kennedy on September 25, and reiterated by Secretary Rusk at Geneva on March 15. It is a blueprint of which the United States can justly be proud throughout the negotiations that lie ahead.

If accepted in the spirit in which it is offered, if considered in the spirit in which it is offered, it could be a broad steppingstone toward peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Digest of U.S. Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World," as prepared by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIGEST OF U.S. OUTLINE OF BASIC PROVISIONS OF A TREATY ON GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD

(Prepared by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Washington, D.C., Apr. 18, 1962)

FOREWORD

The "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament" was submitted by the U.S. delegation in order to facilitate progress in the negotiations now taking place in Geneva. This document is based upon the proposal submitted by President Kennedy to the General Assembly on September 25, 1961. The present document, however, represents both an elaboration and modification of the September 25 proposals.

If nations are to agree on a disarmament program, it will be necessary in negotiations to move from general proposals to discussion of more specific and detailed provisions of a disarmament program. The new U.S. document represents an effort to set forth in more specific terms an outline of the provisions which could form the basis for negotiation of specific treaty obligations.

The new document is the most comprehensive and detailed proposal in the field of general disarmament ever put forward, by any government.

The goal of the United States in proposing the new document is a free, secure, and peaceful world for independent states where force has been subjected to the rule of law, where change is peaceful, and where there is general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The objectives stated in the "U.S. Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World" are to insure that war is eliminated; that the world is disarmed except for forces necessary to maintain internal order and to establish U.N. Peace Force and that procedures are established for the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the U.N. Charter.

Among the guiding principles to achieve these objectives are:

1. Disarmament should be balanced so that no state can gain a military advantage.
2. Compliance with disarmament obligations, including the maintenance of agreed levels of armaments and armed forces, should be effectively verified.
3. The United Nations should be progressively strengthened for the preservation of international security and the peaceful settlement of differences.

Disarmament would proceed in three stages. Stage I would begin when the United States, the U.S.S.R., and such other states as might be agreed have ratified the treaty; stage II when all militarily significant states had become parties; stage III when all armed states had become parties. Transition from stage to stage would take place when the Control Council of the IDO determined all undertakings in a prior stage had been carried out and all arrangements for the subsequent stage had been made. In the event of disagreement, the matter would be referred to the Security Council of the U.N.

Stage I

Stage I would consist of three 1-year steps. Major categories of both nuclear delivery vehicles and conventional armaments of specified parties to the treaty would be reduced by 30 percent of the inventory at an agreed date. The parties would declare inventories of all types of armaments within the agreed categories. For example, the United States would declare as types of armaments the B–52 aircraft, Atlas missile, Titan missile, etc. Fixed launching pads would be reduced with their related missiles. In the first part of each step, one-third of the armaments to be eliminated would be placed in depots under the IDO. During the second part, the deposited armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses. The IDO would verify that armaments were destroyed and that retained armaments did not exceed agreed levels. Production of armaments would be limited to agreed allowances but there would be compensating destruction of armaments in the same category to assure that the reductions would not be impaired.

Force levels of the United States and the U.S.S.R. would be reduced to 2.1 million each and for other parties to be specified, to levels not exceeding 2.1 million. Other parties would, with agreed exceptions, reduce force levels to 100,000 or 1 percent of their population, whichever were higher; but no party would exceed present levels.

Fissionable material production for nuclear weapons would be halted and agreed quantities of weapons-grade U^{235} would be transferred by the United States and U.S.S.R. from stocks to nonweapons purposes. The nuclear powers would agree not to transfer to any nonnuclear state control over nuclear weapons nor give to such a state aid in manufacturing nuclear weapons, and nonnuclear states would agree not to seek control over nuclear weapons or to manufacture them. Nuclear weapons tests would be halted under effective international control if this had not already been done.

Parties in this stage would examine ways to eliminate nuclear weapons stockpiles, to reduce stocks of chemical and biological weapons, and to reduce military expenditures.

Measures would be taken to reduce the risk of war and would include advance notice of, and observation posts to report on, military movements. The parties would examine other means of further diminishing the risk of war by accident, miscalculation, or surprise attack.

The parties would agree to cooperate in the peaceful use of outer space and not to place in orbit weapons of mass destruction. Production and tests of space vehicle boosters would be limited.

The IDO would have adequate powers to verify disarmament measures and would consist of a general conference of all parties, a control council with major powers as permanent members and other parties on a rotating basis, and an administrator.

To strengthen peacekeeping arrangements, the parties would refrain from the threat or use of force contrary to the United Nations Charter and also from indirect aggression and subversion. They would utilize specified processes for peaceful settlement of all disputes and support a study to make such processes more effective. They would develop arrangements for the establishment of a United Nations Peace Force in stage II and would also create a United Nations Peace Observation Corps.

Stage II

Stage II would be of 3 years' duration. Those parties reducing their armaments by 30 percent in stage I would reduce their armaments to levels 50 percent below those at the end of stage I. Parties which had not been subject to reductions in stage I would reduce their armaments to levels 65 percent below those at the beginning of stage II. Additional categories of armaments would be subject to reduction by all parties. Production of armaments would be halted except for production of parts for maintenance.

Armed Forces of the United States and the U.S.S.R. would be reduced to levels 50 percent below the levels agreed for the end of stage I. The forces of other states would be reduced by agreed percentages.

Parties to the treaty would reduce remaining nuclear weapons and fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons to minimum levels determined in the light of their examination of the means of reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons stockpiles. Fissionable materials for use in weapons would be reduced on the basis of agreed percentages by safeguarded transfers to nonweapons purposes, and nonnuclear components of nuclear weapons from which fissionable materials had been removed would be destroyed. To facilitate verification of the final reduction of nuclear weapons in stage III, nuclear weapons and fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons would be internationally registered at the end of stage II.

Agreed military bases and facilities, wherever they might be located, would be dismantled or converted to peaceful uses, in an agreed sequence.

The strengthening of peacekeeping arrangements begun in stage I would continue. This process would include acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the development of rules of conduct related to disarmament and methods for settling disputes, and the establishment of a United Nations Peace Force. In addition, the International Disarmament Organization would be strengthened to insure its capacity to verify measures in stage II.

Stage III

Stage III, which would be of an agreed duration, would continue the disarmament process until states had at their disposal only those forces and agreed types of nonnuclear armaments required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens. The United Nations Peace Force would be progressively strengthened until it had sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World," as prepared by the same Agency, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE OF BASIC PROVISIONS OF A TREATY ON GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD

(Prepared by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency)

In order to assist in the preparation of a treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, the United States submits the following outline of basic provisions of such a treaty.

A. OBJECTIVES

1. To insure that (a) disarmament is general and complete and war is no longer an instrument for settling international problems, and (b) general and complete disarmament is accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the settlement of disputes and by effective arrangements for maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. Taking into account paragraphs 3 and 4 below, to provide, with respect to the military establishment of every nation, for—

(a) Disbanding of armed forces, dismantling of military establishments, including bases, cessation of the production of armaments as well as their liquidation or conversion to peaceful uses;

(b) Elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, biological, and other weapons of mass destruction and cessation of the production of such weapons;

(c) Elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction;

(d) Abolition of the organizations and institutions designed to organize the military efforts of states, cessation of military training, and closing of all military training institutions; and

(e) Discontinuance of military expenditures.

3. To insure that, at the completion of the program for general and complete disarmament, states would have at their disposal only those nonnuclear armaments, forces, facilities and establishments as are agreed to be necessary to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens.

4. To insure that during and after implementation of general and complete disarmament, states also would support and provide agreed manpower for a United Nations Peace Force to be equipped with agreed types of armaments necessary to insure that the United Nations can effectively deter or suppress any threat or use of arms.

5. To establish and provide for the effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations for the purpose of insuring that all obligations under the disarmament program would be honored and observed during and after implementation of general and complete disarmament; and to this end to insure that the International Disarmament Organization and its inspectors would have unrestricted access without veto to all places as necessary for the purpose of effective verification.

B. PRINCIPLES

The guiding principles during the achievement of these objectives are:

1. Disarmament would be implemented until it is completed by stages to be carried out within specified time limits.

2. Disarmament would be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any state or group of states gain military advantage, and so that security would be insured equally for all.

3. Compliance with all disarmament obligations would be effectively verified during and after their entry into force. Verification arrangements would be instituted progressively as necessary to insure throughout the disarmament process that agreed levels of armaments and armed forces were not exceeded.

4. As national armaments are reduced, the United Nations would be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to insure international security and the peaceful settlement of differences as well as to facilitate the development of international cooperation in common tasks for the benefit of mankind.

5. Transition from one stage of disarmament to the next would take place upon decision that all measures in the preceding stage had been implemented and verified and that any additional arrangements required for measures in the next stage were ready to operate.

INTRODUCTION

The treaty would contain three stages designed to achieve a permanent state of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. The treaty would enter into force upon the signature and ratification of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and such other states as might be agreed. Stage II would begin when all military significant states had become parties to the treaty and other transition requirements had been satisfied. Stage III would begin when all states possessing armed forces and armaments had become parties to the treaty and other transition requirements had been satisfied. Disarmament, verification, and measures for keeping the peace would proceed progressively and proportionately, beginning with the entry into force of the treaty.

Stage I

Stage I would begin upon the entry into force of the treaty and would be completed within 3 years from that date.

During stage I the parties to the treaty would undertake:

1. To reduce their armaments and armed forces and to carry out other agreed measures in the manner outlined below;

2. To establish the International Disarmament Organization upon the entry into force of the treaty in order to insure the verification in the agreed manner of the obligations undertaken; and

3. To strengthen arrangements for keeping the peace through the measures outlined below.

A. Armaments

1. Reduction of armaments:

a. Specified parties to the treaty, as a first stage toward general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, would reduce by 30 percent the armaments in each category listed in subparagraph b below. Except as adjustments for production would be permitted in stage I in accordance with paragraph 3 below, each type of armament in the categories listed in subparagraph b would be reduced by 30 percent of the inventory existing at an agreed date.

b. All types of armaments within agreed categories would be subject to reduction in stage I (the following list of categories, and of types within categories, is illustrative):

(1) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of 40,000 kilograms or greater; missiles having a range of 5,000 kilometers or greater, together with their related fixed launching pads; and submarine-launched missiles and air-to-surface missiles having a range of 300 kilometers or greater.

(Within this category, the United States, for example, would declare as types of armaments: the B–52 aircraft; Atlas missiles together with their related fixed launching pads; Titan missiles together with their related fixed launching pads; Polaris missiles; Hound Dog missiles; and each new type of armament, such as Minuteman missiles, which came within the category description, together with, where applicable, their related fixed launching pads. The declared inventory of types within the category by other parties to the treaty would be similarly detailed.)

(2) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of between 15,000 kilograms and 40,000 kilograms and those missiles not included in category (1) having a range between 300 kilometers and 5,000 kilometers, together with any related fixed launching pads. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(3) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of between 2,500 and 15,000 kilograms. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(4) Surface-to-surface (including submarine-launched missiles) and air-to-surface aerodynamic and ballistic missiles and free rockets having a range of between 10 kilometers and 300 kilometers, together with any related fixed launching pads. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(5) Antimissile missile systems, together with related fixed launching pads. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(6) Surface-to-air missiles other than antimissile missile systems, together with any related fixed launching pads. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(7) Tanks. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(8) Armored cars and armored personnel carriers. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(9) All artillery, and mortars and rocket launchers having a caliber of 100 millimeters or greater. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(10) Combatant ships with standard displacement of 400 tons or greater of the following classes: Aircraft carriers, battleships, cruisers, destroyer types, and submarines. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

2. Method of reduction:

a. Those parties to the treaty which were subject to the reduction of armaments would submit to the International Disarmament Organization an appropriate declaration respecting inventories of their armaments existing at the agreed date.

b. The reduction would be accomplished in three steps, each consisting of 1 year. One-third of the reduction to be made during stage I would be carried out during each step.

c. During the first part of each step, one-third of the armaments to be eliminated during stage I would be placed in depots under supervision of the International Disarmament Organization. During the second part of each step, the deposited armaments would be destroyed or, where appropriate, converted to peaceful uses. The number and location of such depots and arrangements respecting their establishment and operation would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

d. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in a treaty annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing reduction and would provide assurance that retained armaments did not exceed agreed levels.

3. Limitation on production of armaments and on related activities:

a. Production of all armaments listed in subparagraph b of paragraph 1 above would be limited to agreed allowances during stage I and, by the beginning of stage II, would be halted except for production within agreed limits of parts for maintenance of the agreed retained armaments.

b. The allowances would permit limited production in each of the categories of armaments listed in subparagraph b, of paragraph 1, above. In all instances during the process of eliminating production of armaments:

(1) any armament produced within a category would be compensated for by an additional armament destroyed within that category to the end that the 10 percent reduction in numbers in each category in each step, and the resulting 30 percent reduction in stage I, would be achieved; and furthermore

(2) In the case of armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of 15,000 kilograms

or greater and of missiles having a range of 300 kilometers or greater, the destructive capability of any such armaments produced within a category would be compensated for by the destruction of sufficient armaments within that category to the end that the 10-percent reduction in destructive capability as well as numbers in each of these categories in each step, and the resulting 30-percent reduction in stage I, would be achieved.

c. Should a party to the treaty elect to reduce its production in any category at a more rapid rate than required by the allowances provided in subparagraph b. above, that party would be entitled to retain existing armaments to the extent of the unused portion of its production allowance. In any such instance, any armament so retained would be compensated for in the manner set forth in subparagraph b(1) and, where applicable, b(2) above to the end that the 10-percent reduction in numbers and, where applicable, destructive capability in each category in each step, and the resulting 30-percent reduction in stage I, would be achieved.

d. The flight testing of missiles would be limited to agreed annual quotas.

e. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing measures were not conducted at undeclared locations.

4. Additional measures:

The parties to the treaty would agree to examine unresolved questions relating to means of accomplishing in stages II and III the reduction and eventual elimination of production and stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction. In light of this examination, the parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements concerning chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction.

B. Armed Forces

1. Reduction of armed forces:

Force levels for the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be reduced to 2.1 million each and for other specified parties to the treaty to agreed levels not exceeding 2.1 million each. All other parties to the treaty would, with agreed exceptions, reduce their force levels to 100,000 or 1 percent of their population, whichever were higher, provided that in no case would the force levels of such other parties to the treaty exceed levels in existence upon the entry into force of the treaty.

2. Armed forces subject to reduction:

Agreed force levels would include all full-time, uniformed personnel maintained by national governments in the following categories:

a. Career personnel of active armed forces and other personnel serving in the active armed forces on fixed engagements on contracts.

b. Conscripts performing their required period of full-time active duty as fixed by national law.

c. Personnel of militarily organized security forces and of other forces or organizations equipped and organized to perform a military mission.

3. Method of reduction of armed forces:

The reduction of force levels would be carried out in the following manner:

a. Those parties to the treaty which were subject to the foregoing reductions would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration stating their force levels at the agreed date.

b. Force level reductions would be accomplished in three steps each having a duration of 1 year. During each step force levels would be reduced by one-third of the difference between force levels existing at the agreed date and the levels to be reached at the end of stage I.

c. In accordance with arrangements that would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the reduction of force levels and provide assurance that retained forces did not exceed agreed levels.

4. Additional measures:

The parties to the treaty which were subject to the foregoing reductions would agree upon appropriate arrangements, including procedures for consultation, in order to insure that civilian employment by military establishments would be in accordance with the objectives of the obligations respecting force levels.

C. Nuclear Weapons

1. Production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons:

a. The parties to the treaty would halt the production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons.

b. This measure would be carried out in the following manner:

(1) The parties to the treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration listing by name, location, and production capacity every facility under their jurisdiction capable of producing and processing fissionable materials at the agreed date.

(2) Production of fissionable materials for purposes other than use in nuclear weapons would be limited to agreed levels. The parties to the treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization periodic declarations stating the amounts and types of fissionable materials which were still being produced at each facility.

(3) In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared facilities and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing limitations were not conducted at undeclared facilities.

2. Transfer of fissionable material to purposes other than use in nuclear weapons:

a. Upon the cessation of production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would each transfer to purposes other than use in nuclear weapons an agreed quantity of weapons-grade U^{235} from past production. The purposes for which such materials would be used would be determined by the state to which the material belonged, provided that such materials were not used in nuclear weapons.

b. To insure that the transferred materials were not used in nuclear weapons, such materials would be placed under safeguards and inspection by the International Disarmament Organization either in stockpiles or at the facilities in which they would be utilized for purposes other than use in nuclear weapons. Arrangements for such safeguards and inspection would be set forth in the annex on verification.

3. Transfer of fissionable materials between states for peaceful uses of nuclear energy:

a. Any transfer of fissionable materials between states would be for purposes other than for use in nuclear weapons and would be subject to a system of safeguards to insure that such materials were not used in nuclear weapons.

b. The system of safeguards to be applied for this purpose would be developed in agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency and would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

4. Nontransfer of nuclear weapons:

The parties to the treaty would agree to seek to prevent the creation of further national nuclear forces. To this end the parties would agree that:

a. Any party to the treaty which had manufactured, or which at any time manufactures, a nuclear weapon would:

(1) Not transfer control over any nuclear weapons to a state which had not manufactured a nuclear weapon before an agreed date;

(2) Not assist any such state in manufacturing any nuclear weapons.

b. Any party to the treaty which had not manufactured a nuclear weapon before the agreed date would:

(1) Not acquire, or attempt to acquire, control over any nuclear weapons;

(2) Not manufacture, or attempt to manufacture, any nuclear weapons.

5. Nuclear weapons test explosions:

a. If an agreement prohibiting nuclear weapons test explosions and providing for effective international control had come into force prior to the entry into force of the treaty, such agreement would become an annex to the treaty, and all the parties to the treaty would be bound by the obligations specified in the agreement.

b. If, however, no such agreement had come into force prior to the entry into force of the treaty, all nuclear weapons test explosions would be prohibited, and the procedures for effective international control would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

6. Additional measures:

The parties to the treaty would agree to examine remaining unresolved questions relating to the means of accomplishing in Stages II and III the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles. In the light of this examination, the parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements concerning nuclear weapons stockpiles.

D. Outer Space

1. Prohibition of weapons of mass destruction in orbit: The parties to the treaty would agree not to place in orbit weapons capable of producing mass destruction.

2. Peaceful cooperation in space: The parties to the treaty would agree to support increased international cooperation in peaceful uses of outer space in the United Nations or through other appropriate arrangements.

3. Notification and prelaunch inspection: With respect to the launching of space vehicles and missiles:

a. Those parties to the treaty which conducted launchings of space vehicles or missiles would provide advance notification of such launchings to other parties to the treaty and to the International Disarmament Organization together with the track of the space vehicle or missile. Such advance notification would be provided on a timely basis to permit prelaunch inspection of the space vehicle or missile to be launched.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex of verification, the International Disarmament Organization would conduct prelaunch inspection of space vehicles and missiles and would establish and operate any arrangements necessary for detecting unreported launchings.

4. Limitations on production and on related activities: The production, stockpiling and testing of boosters for space vehicles would be subject to agreed limitations. Such activities would be monitored by the International Disarmament Organization in accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification.

E. Military Expenditures

1. Report on expenditures: The parties to the treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization at the end of each stage a report on their military expenditures. Such reports would include an itemization of military expenditures.

2. Verifiable reduction of expenditures: The parties to the treaty would agree to examine questions related to the verifiable reduction of military expenditures. In the light of this examination, the parties to the treaty would consider appropriate arrangements respecting military expenditures.

F. Reduction of the Risk of War

In order to promote confidence and reduce the risk of war, the parties to the treaty would agree to the following measures:

1. Advance notification of military movements and maneuvers: Specified parties to the treaty would give advance notification of major military movements and maneuvers to other parties to the treaty and to the International Disarmament Organization. Specific arrangements relating to this commitment, including the scale of movements and maneuvers to be reported and the information to be transmitted, would be agreed.

2. Observation posts: Specified parties to the treaty would permit observation posts to be establishd at agreed locations, including major ports, railway centers, motor highways, river crossings, and air bases to report on concentrations and movements of military forces. The number of such posts could be progressively expanded in each successive step of stage I. Specific arrangements relating to such observation posts, including the location and staffing of posts, the method of receiving and reporting information, and the schedule for installation of posts would be agreed.

3. Additional observation arrangements: The parties to the treaty would establish such additional observation arrangements as might be agreed. Such arrangements could be extended in an agreed manner during each step of stage I.

4. Exchange of military missions: Specified parties to the treaty would undertake the exchange of military missions between states or groups of states in order to improve communications and understanding between them. Specific arrangements respecting such exchanges would be agreed.

5. Communications between heads of government: Specified parties to the treaty would agree to the establishment of rapid and reliable communications among their heads of government and with the Secretary General of the United Nations. Specific arrangements in this regard would be subject to agreement among the parties concerned and between such parties and the Secretary General.

6. International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War: The parties to the treaty would establish an International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War as a subsidiary body of the International Disarmament Organization to examine and make recommendations regarding further measures that might be undertaken during stage I or subsequent stages of disarmament to reduce the risk of war by accident, miscalculation, failure of communications, or surprise attack. Specific arrangements for such measures as might be agreed to by all or some of the parties to the treaty would be subject to agreement among the parties concerned.

G. The International Disarmament Organization

1. Establishment of the International Disarmament Organization: The International Disarmament Organization would be established upon the entry into force of the treaty and would function within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with the terms and conditions of the treaty.

2. Cooperation of the parties to the treaty: The parties to the treaty would agree to cooperate promptly and fully with the International Disarmament Organization and to assist the International Disarmament Organization in the performance of its functions and in the execution of the decisions made by it in accordance with the provisions of the treaty.

3. Verification functions of the International Disarmament Organization: The International Disarmament Organization would verify disarmament measures in accordance with the following principles which would be implemented through specific arrangements set forth in the annex on verification:

a. Measures providing for reduction of armaments would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization at agreed depots and would include verification of the destruction of armaments and, where appropriate, verification of the conversion of armaments to peaceful uses. Measures providing for reduction of armed forces would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization either at the agreed depots or other agreed locations.

b. Measures halting or limiting production, testing, and other specified activities would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization. Parties to the treaty would declare the nature and location of all production and testing facilities and other specified activities. The International Disarmament Organization would have access to relevant facilities and activities wherever located in the territory of such Parties.

c. Assurance that agreed levels of armaments and armed forces were not exceeded and that activities limited or prohibited by the treaty were not being conducted clandestinely would be provided by the International Disarmament Organization through agreed arrangements which would have the effect of providing that the extent of inspection during any step or stage would be related to the amount of disarmament being undertaken and to the degree of risk to the parties to the treaty of possible violations. This might be accomplished, for example, by an arrangement embodying such features as the following:

(1) All parts of the territory of those parties to the treaty to which this form of verification was applicable would be subject to selection for inspection from the beginning of stage I as provided below.

(2) Parties to the treaty would divide their territory into an agreed number of appropriate zones and at the beginning of each step of disarmament would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration stating the total level of armaments, forces, and specified types of activities subject to verification within each zone. The exact location of armaments and forces within a zone would not be revealed prior to its selection for inspection.

(3) An agreed number of these zones would be progressively inspected by the International Disarmament Organization during stage I according to an agreed time schedule. The zones to be inspected would be selected by procedures which would insure their selection by parties to the treaty other than the party whose territory was to be inspected or any party associated with it. Upon selection of each zone, the party to the treaty whose territory was to be inspected would declare the exact location of armaments, forces, and other agreed activities within the selected zone. During the verification process, arrangements would be made to provide assurance against undeclared movements of the objects of verification to or from the zone or zones being inspected. Both aerial and mobile ground inspection would be employed within the zone being inspected. Insofar as agreed measures being verified were concerned, access within the zone would be free and unimpeded, and verification would be carried out with the full cooperation of the state being inspected.

(4) Once a zone had been inspected it would remain open for further inspection while verification was being extended to additional zones.

(5) By the end of stage III, when all disarmament measures had been completed, inspection would have been extended to all parts of the territory of parties to the treaty.

4. Composition of the International Disarmament Organization:

a. The International Disarmament Organization would have:

(1) A General Conference of all the parties to the treaty;

(2) A Control Council consisting of representatives of all the major signatory powers as permanent members and certain other parties to the treaty on a rotating basis; and

(3) An Administrator who would administer the International Disaramment Organization under the direction of the Control Council and who would have the authority, staff, and finances adequate to insure effective and impartial implementation of the functions of the International Disarmament Organization.

b. The General Conference and the Control Council would have power to establish such subsidiary bodies, including expert study groups, as either of them might deem necessary.

5. Functions of the General Conference:

The General Conference would have the following functions, among others, which might be agreed:

a. Electing nonpermanent members to the Control Council;

b. Approving certain accessions to the treaty;

c. Appointing the Administrator upon recommendation of the Control Council;

d. Approving agreements between the International Disarmament Organization and the United Nations and other international organizations;

e. Approving the budget of the International Disarmament Organization;

f. Requesting and receiving reports from the Control Council and deciding upon matters referred to it by the Control Council;

g. Approving reports to be submitted to bodies of the United Nations;

h. Proposing matters for consideration by the Control Council;

i. Requesting the International Court of Justice to give advisory opinions on legal questions concerning the interpretation or application of the treaty, subject to a general authorization of this power by the General Assembly of the United Nations;

j. Approving amendments to the treaty for possible ratification by the parties to the treaty;

k. Considering matters of mutual interest pertaining to the treaty or disarmament in general.

6. Functions of the Control Council:

The Control Council would have the following functions, among others which might be agreed:

a. Recommending appointment of the Administrator;

b. Adopting rules for implementing the terms of the treaty.

c. Establishing procedures and standards for the installation and operation of the verification arrangements, and maintaining supervision over such arrangements and the Administrator;

d. Establishing procedures for making available to the parties to the treaty data produced by verification arrangements;

e. Considering reports of the Administrator on the progress of disarmament measures and of their verification, and on the installation and operation of the verification arrangements;

f. Recommending to the Conference approval of the budget of the International Disarmament Organization;

g. Requesting the International Court of Justice to give advisory opinions on legal questions concerning the interpretation or application of the treaty, subject to a general authorization of this power by the General Assembly of the United Nations;

h. Recommending to the Conference approval of certain accessions to the treaty;

i. Considering matters of mutual interest pertaining to the treaty or to disarmament in general.

7. Functions of the Administrator:

The Administrator would have the following functions, among others which might be agreed:

a. Administering the installation and operation of the verification arrangements, and serving as chief executive officer of the International Disarmament Organization;

b. Making available to the parties to the treaty data produced by the verification arrangements;

c. Preparing the budget of the International Disarmament Organization;

d. Making reports to the Control Council on the progress of disarmament measures and of their verification, and on the installation and operation of the verification arrangements.

8. Privileges and immunities: The privileges and immunities which the parties to the treaty would grant to the International Disarmament Organization and its staff and to the representatives of the parties to the International Disarmament Organization, and the legal capacity which the International Disarmament Organization should enjoy in the territory of each of the parties to the treaty would be specified in an annex to the treaty.

9. Relations with the United Nations and other international organizations:

a. The International Disarmament Organization, being established within the framework of the United Nations, would conduct its activities in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. It would maintain close working arrangements with the United Nations, and the Administrator of the International Disarmament Organization would consult with the Secretary General of the United Nations on matters of mutual interest.

b. The Control Council of the International Disarmament Organization would transmit to the United Nations annual and other reports on the activities of the International Disarmament Organization.

c. Principal organs of the United Nations could make recommendations to the International Disarmament Organization, which would consider them and report to the United Nations on action taken.

(NOTE.—The above outline does not cover all the possible details or aspects of relationships between the International Disarmament Organization and the United Nations.)

H. Measures To Strengthen Arrangements for Keeping the Peace

1. Obligations concerning the threat or use of force: The parties to the treaty would undertake obligations to refrain, in their international relations, from the threat or use of force of any type—including nuclear, conventional, chemical, or biological means of warfare—contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

2. Rules of international conduct:

a. The parties to the treaty would agree to support a study by a subsidiary body of the International Disarmament Organization of the codification and progressive development of rules of international conduct related to disarmament.

b. The parties to the treaty would refrain from indirect aggression and subversion. The subsidiary body provided for in subparagraph a would also study methods of assuring states against indirect aggression or subversion.

3. Peaceful settlement of disputes:

a. The parties to the treaty would utilize all appropriate processes for the peaceful settlement of all disputes which might arise between them and any other state, whether or not a party to the treaty, including negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, submission to the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations, or other peaceful means of their choice.

b. The parties to the treaty would agree that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the treaty which were not settled by negotiation or by the International Disarmament Organization would be subject to referral by any party to the dispute to the International Court of Justice, unless the parties concerned agreed on another mode of settlement.

c. The parties to the treaty would agree to support a study under the General Assembly of the United Nations of measures which should be undertaken to make existing arrangements for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, whether legal or political in nature, more effective; and to institute new procedures and arrangements where needed.

4. Maintenance of international peace and security: The parties to the treaty would agree to support measures strengthening the structure, authority, and operation of the United Nations so as to improve its capability to maintain international peace and security.

5. United Nations Peace Force:

The parties to the treaty would undertake to develop arrangements during stage I for the establishment in stage II of a United Nations Peace Force. To this end, the parties to the treaty would agree on the following measures within the United Nations:

a. Examination of the experience of the United Nations leading to a further strengthening of United Nations forces for keeping the peace;

b. Examination of the feasibility of concluding promptly the agreements envisaged in article 43 of the United Nations Charter;

c. Conclusion of an agreement for the establishment of a United Nations Peace Force in stage II, including definitions of its purpose, mission, composition and strength, disposition, command and control, training, logistical support, financing, equipment, and armaments.

6. United Nations Peace Observation Corps: The parties to the treaty would agree to support the establishment within the United Nations of a Peace Observation Corps, staffed with a standing cadre of observers who could be despatched promptly to investigate any situation which might constitute a threat to or a breach of the peace. Elements of the Peace Observation Corps could also be stationed as appropriate in selected areas throughout the world.

I. Transition

1. Transition from stage I to stage II would take place at the end of stage I, upon a determination that the following circumstances existed:

a. All undertakings to be carried out in stage I had been carried out;

b. All preparations required for stage II had been made; and

c. All militarily significant states had become parties to the treaty.

2. During the last 3 months of stage I, the Control Council would review the situation respecting these circumstances with a view to determining whether these circumstances existed at the end of stage I.

3. If, at the end of stage I, one or more permanent members of the Control Council should declare that the foregoing circumstances did not exist, the agreed period of stage I would, upon the request of such permanent member or members, be extended by a period or periods totaling no more than 3 months for the purpose of bringing about the foregoing circumstances.

4. If, upon the expiration of such period or periods, one or more of the permanent members of the Control Council should declare that the foregoing circumstances still did not exist, the question would be placed before a special session of the Security Council; transition to stage II would take place upon a determination by the Security Council that the foregoing circumstances did in fact exist.

Stage II

Stage II would begin upon the transition from stage I and would be completed within 3 years from that date.

During stage II, the parties to the treaty would undertake:

1 To continue all obligations undertaken during stage I;

2. To reduce further the armaments and armed forces reduced during stage I and to carry out additional measures of disarmament in the manner outlined below;

3. To insure that the International Disarmament Organization would have the capacity to verify in the agreed manner the obligations undertaken during stage II; and

4. To strengthen further the arrangements for keeping the peace through the establishment of a United Nations Peace Force and through the additional measures outlined below.

A. Armaments

1. Reduction of armaments:

a. Those parties to the treaty which had during stage I reduced their armaments in agreed categories by 30 percent would during stage II further reduce each type of armament in the categories listed in section A, subparagraph 1.b of stage I by 50 percent of the inventory existing at the end of stage I.

b. Those parties to the treaty which had not been subject to measures for the reduction of armaments during stage I would submit to the International Disarmament Organization an appropriate declaration respecting the inventories by types, within the categories listed in stage I, of their armaments existing at the beginning of stage II. Such parties to the treaty would during stage II reduce the inventory of each type of such armaments by 65 percent in order that such parties would accomplish the same total percentage of reduction by the end of stage II as would be accomplished by those parties to the treaty which had reduced their armaments by 30 percent in stage I.

2. Additional armaments subject to reduction:

a. The parties to the treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration respecting their inventories existing at the beginning of stage II of the additional types of armaments in the categories listed in subparagraph b. below, and would during stage II reduce the inventory of each type of such armaments by 50 percent.

b. All types of armaments within further agreed categories would be subject to reduction in stage II (the following list of categories is illustrative):

(1) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of up to 2,500 kilograms (declarations by types).

(2) Specified types of unarmed military aircraft (declarations by types).

(3) Missiles and free rockets having a range of less than 10 kilometers (declarations by types).

(4) Mortars and rocket launchers having a caliber of less than 100 millimeters (declarations by types).

(5) Specified types of unarmored personnel carriers and transport vehicles (declarations by types).

(6) Combatant ships with standard displacement of 400 tons or greater which had not been included among the armaments listed in stage I, and combatant ships with

standard displacement of less than 400 tons (declarations by types).

(7) Specified types of noncombatant naval vessels (declarations by types).

(8) Specified types of small arms (declarations by types).

c. Specified categories of ammunition for armaments listed in stage I, section A, subparagraph 1.b and in subparagraphs b. above would be reduced to levels consistent with the levels of armaments agreed for the end of stage II.

3. Method of reduction: The foregoing measures would be carried out and would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization in a manner corresponding to that provided for in stage I, section A, paragraph 2.

4. Limitation on production of armaments and on related activities:

a. The parties to the treaty would halt the production of armaments in the specified categories except for production, within agreed limits, of parts required for maintenance of the agreed retained armaments.

b. The production of ammunition in specified categories would be reduced to agreed levels consistent with the levels of armaments agreed for the end of stage II.

c. The parties to the treaty would halt development and testing of new types of armaments. The flight testing of existing types of missiles would be limited to agreed annual quotas.

d. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing measures were not conducted at undeclared locations.

5. Additional measures:

a. In the light of their examination during stage I of the means of accomplishing the reduction and eventual elimination of production and stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction, the parties to the treaty would undertake the following measures respecting such weapons:

(1) The cessation of all production and field testing of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction.

(2) The reduction, by agreed categories, of stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction to levels 50 percent below those existing at the beginning of stage II.

(3) The dismantling or conversion to peaceful uses of all facilities engaged in the production or field testing of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction.

b. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

c. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that retained levels of chemical and biological weapons did not exceed agreed levels and that activities subject to the foregoing limitations were not conducted at undeclared locations.

B. Armed Forces

1. Reduction of armed forces:

a. Those parties to the treaty which had been subject to measures providing for reduction of force levels during stage I would further reduce their force levels on the following basis:

(1) Force levels of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be reduced to levels 50 percent below the levels agreed for the end of stage I.

(2) Force levels of other parties to the treaty which had been subject to measures providing for the reduction of force levels during stage I would be further reduced, on the basis of an agreed percentage, below the levels agreed for the end of stage I to levels which would not in any case exceed the agreed level for the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the end of stage II.

b. Those parties to the treaty which had not been subject to measures providing for the reduction of armed forces during stage I would reduce their force levels to agreed levels consistent with those to be reached by other parties which had reduced their force levels during stage I as well as stage II In no case would such agreed levels exceed the agreed level for the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the end of stage II.

c. Agreed levels of armed forces would include all personnel in the categories set forth in section B, paragraph 2 of stage I.

2. Method of reduction: The further reduction of force levels would be carried out and would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization in a manner corresponding to that provided for in section B, paragraph 3 of stage I.

3. Additional measures: Agreed limitations consistent with retained force levels would be placed on compulsory military training, and on refresher training for reserve forces of the parties to the treaty.

C. Nuclear Weapons

1. Reduction of nuclear weapons:

In the light of their examination during stage I of the means of accomplishing the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles, the parties to the treaty would undertake to reduce in the following manner remaining nuclear weapons and fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons:

a. The parties to the treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration stating the amounts, types and nature of utilization of all their fissionable materials.

b. The parties to the treaty would reduce the amounts and types of fissionable materials declared for use in nuclear weapons to minimum levels on the basis of agreed percentages. The foregoing reduction would be accomplished through the transfer of such materials to purposes other than use in nuclear weapons. The purposes for which such materials would be used would be determined by the state to which the materials belonged, provided that such materials were not used in nuclear weapons.

c. The parties to the treaty would destroy the nonnuclear components and assemblies of nuclear weapons from which fissionable materials had been removed to effect the foregoing reduction of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons.

d. Production or refabrication of nuclear weapons from any remaining fissionable materials would be subject to agreed limitations.

e. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

f. In accordance with arrangements that would be set forth in the verification annex to the treaty, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing limitations were not conducted at undeclared locations.

2. Registration of nuclear weapons for verification purposes: To facilitate verification during stage III that no nuclear weapons remained at the disposal of the parties to the treaty, those parties to the treaty which possessed nuclear weapons would, during the last 6 months of stage II, register and serialize their remaining nuclear weapons and would register remaining fissionable materials for use in such weapons. Such registration and serialization would be carried out with the International Disarmament Organization in accordance with procedures which would be set forth in the annex on verification.

D. Military bases and facilities

1. Reduction of military bases and facilities: The parties to the treaty would dismantle or convert to peaceful uses agreed military bases and facilities, wherever they might be located.

2. Method of reduction:

a. The list of military bases and facilities subject to the foregoing measures and the sequence and arrangements for dismantling or converting them to peaceful uses would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures.

E. Reduction of the Risk of War

In the light of the examination by the International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War during stage I the parties to the treaty would undertake such additional arrangements as appeared desirable to promote confidence and reduce the risk of war. The parties to the treaty would also consider extending and improving the measures undertaken in stage I for this purpose. The Commission would remain in existence to examine extensions, improvements, or additional measures which might be undertaken during and after stage II.

F. The International Disarmament Organization

The International Disarmament Organization would be strengthened in the manner necessary to insure its capacity to verify the measures undertaken in stage II through an extension of the arrangements based upon the principles set forth in section G, paragraph 3 of stage I.

G. Measures To Strengthen Arrangements for Keeping the Peace

1. Peaceful settlement of disputes:

a. In light of the study of peaceful settlement of disputes conducted during Stage I, the parties of the treaty would agree to such additional steps and arrangements as were necessary to assure the just and peaceful settlement of international disputes, whether legal or political in nature.

b. The parties to the treaty would undertake to accept without reservation, pursuant to article 36, paragraph (1) of the statute of the International Court of Justice, the compulsory jurisdiction of that Court to decide international legal disputes.

2. Rules of international conduct:

a. The parties to the treaty would continue their support of the study by the subsidiary body of the International Disarmament Organization initiated in stage I to study the codification and progressive development of rules of international conduct related to disarmament. The parties to the treaty would agree to the establishment of procedures whereby rules recommended by the subsidiary body and approved by the Control Council would be circulated to all parties to the treaty and would become effective 3 months thereafter unless a majority of the parties to the treaty signified their disapproval, and whereby the parties to the treaty would be bound by rules which had become effective in this way unless, within a period of 1 year from the effective date, they formally notified the International Disarmament Organization that they did not consider themselves so bound. Using such procedures, the parties to the treaty would adopt such rules of international conduct related to disarmament as might be necessary to begin stage III.

b. In the light of the study of indirect aggression and subversion conducted in stage I, the parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements necessary to assure states against indirect aggression and subversion.

3. United Nations Peace Force: The United Nations Peace Force to be established as the result of the agreement reached during stage I would come into being within the first year of stage II and would be progressively strengthened during stage II.

4. United Nations Peace Observation Corps: The parties to the treaty would conclude arrangements for the expansion of the activities of the United Nations Peace Observation Corps.

5. National legislation: Those parties to the treaty which had not already done so would, in accordance with their constitutional processes, enact national legislation in support of the treaty imposing legal obligations on individuals and organizations under their jurisdiction and providing appropriate penalties for noncompliance.

H. Transition

1. Transition from stage II to stage III would take place at the end of stage II, upon a determination that the following circumstances existed:

a. All undertakings to be carried out in stage II had been carried out;

b. All preparations required for stage III had been made; and

c. All states possessing armed forces and armaments had become parties to the treaty.

2. During the last 3 months of stage II, the Control Council would review the situation respecting these circumstances with a view to determining at the end of stage II whether they existed.

3. If, at the end of stage II, one or more permanent members of the Control Council should declare that the foregoing circumstances did not exist, the agreed period of stage II would, upon the request of such permanent member or members, be extended by a period or periods totaling no more than 3 months for the purpose of bringing about the foregoing circumstances.

4. If, upon the expiration of such period or periods, one or more of the permanent members of the Control Council should declare that the foregoing circumstances still did not exist, the question would be placed before a special session of the Security Council; transition to stage III would take place upon a determination by the Security Council that the foregoing circumstances did in fact exist.

Stage III

Stage III would begin upon the transition from stage II and would be completed within an agreed period of time as promptly as possible.

During stage III, the parties to the treaty would undertake:

1. To continue all obligations undertaken during stages I and II;

2. To complete the process of general and complete disarmament in the manner outlined below;

3. To insure that the International Disarmament Organization would have the capacity to verify in the agreed manner the obligations undertaken during stage III and of continuing verification subsequent to the completion of stage III; and

4. To strengthen further the arrangements for keeping the peace during and following the achievement of general and complete disarmament through the additional measures outlined below.

A. Armaments

1. Reduction of armaments: Subject to agreed requirements for nonnuclear armaments of agreed types for national forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens, the parties to the treaty would eliminate all armaments remaining at their disposal at the end of stage II.

2. Method of reduction:

a. The foregoing measure would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements that would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements that would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that retained armaments were of the agreed types and did not exceed agreed levels.

3. Limitations on production of armaments and on related activities:

a. Subject to agreed arrangements in support of national forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens and subject to agreed arrangements in support of the United Nations Peace Force, the parties to the treaty would halt all applied research, development, production, and testing of armaments and would cause to be dismantled or converted to peaceful uses all facilities for such purposes.

b. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

c. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing measures were not conducted at undeclared locations.

B. Armed Forces

1. Reduction of armed forces:

To the end that upon completion of stage III they would have at their disposal only those forces and organizational arrangements necessary for agreed forces to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens and that they would be capable of providing agreed manpower for the United Nations Peace Force, the parties to the treaty would complete the reduction of their force levels, disband systems of reserve forces, cause to be disbanded organizational arrangements comprising and supporting their national military establishment, and terminate the employment of civilian personnel associated with the foregoing.

2. Method of reduction:

a. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that the only forces and organizational arrangements retained or subsequently established were those necessary for agreed forces required to maintain internal order and to protect the personal security of citizens and those for providing agreed manpower for the United Nations Peace Force.

3. Other limitations: The parties to the treaty would halt all military conscription and would undertake to annul legislation concerning national military establishments or military service inconsistent with the foregoing measures.

C. Nuclear Weapons

1. Reduction of nuclear weapons: In light of the steps taken in stages I and II to halt the production of fissionable material for use in nuclear weapons and to reduce nuclear weapons stockpiles, the parties to the treaty would eliminate all nuclear weapons remaining at their disposal, would cause to be dismantled or converted to peaceful use all facilities for production of such weapons, and would transfer all materials remaining at their disposal for use in such weapons to purposes other than use in such weapons.

2. Method of reduction:

a. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that no nuclear weapons or materials for use in such weapons remained at the disposal of the parties to the treaty and that no such weapons or materials were produced at undeclared facilities.

D. Military Bases and Facilities

1. Reduction of military bases and facilities: The parties to the treaty would dismantle or convert to peaceful uses the military bases and facilities remaining at their disposal, wherever they might be located, in an agreed sequence except for such agreed bases or facilities within the territory of the parties to the treaty for agreed forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens.

2. Method of reduction:

a. The list of military bases and facilities subject to the foregoing measure and the sequence and arrangements for dismantling or converting them to peaceful uses during stage III would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measure at declared locations and provide assurance that there were no undeclared military bases and facilities.

E. Research and Development of Military Significance

1. Reporting requirement:

The parties to the treaty would undertake the following measures respecting research and development of military significance subsequent to stage III:

a. The parties to the treaty would report to the International Disarmament Organization any basic scientific discovery and any technological invention having potential military significance.

b. The Control Council would establish such expert study groups as might be required to examine the potential military significance of such discoveries and inventions and, if necessary, to recommend appropriate measures for their control. In the light of such expert study, the parties to the treaty would, where necessary, establish agreed arrangements providing for verification by the International Disarmament Organization that such discoveries and inventions were not utilized for military purposes. Such arrangements would become an annex to the treaty.

c. The parties to the treaty would agree to appropriate arrangements for protection of the ownership rights of all discoveries and inventions reported to the International Disarmament Organization in accordance with subparagraph a above.

2. International cooperation: The parties to the treaty would agree to support full international cooperation in all fields of scientific research and development, and to engage in free exchange of scientific and technical information and free interchange of views among scientific and technical personnel.

F. Reduction of the Risks of War

1. Improved measures: In the light of the stage II examination by the International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War, the parties to the treaty would undertake such extensions and improvements of existing arrangements and such additional arrangements as appeared desirable to pro-

mote confidence and reduce the risk of war. The Commission would remain in existence to examine extensions, improvements or additional measures which might be taken during and after stage III.

2. Application of measures to continuing forces: The parties to the treaty would apply to national forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens those applicable measures concerning the reduction of the risk of war that had been applied to national armed forces in stages I and II.

G. International Disarmament Organization

The International Disarmament Organization would be strengthened in the manner necessary to insure its capacity (1) to verify the measures undertaken in stage III through an extension of arrangements based upon the principles set forth in section G, paragraph 3 of stage I so that by the end of stage III, when all disarmament measures had been completed, inspection would have been extended to all parts of the territory of parties to the treaty; and (2) to provide continuing verification of disarmament after the completion of stage III.

H. Measures To Strengthen Arrangements for Keeping the Peace

1. Peaceful change and settlement of disputes: The parties to the treaty would undertake such additional steps and arrangements as were necessary to provide a basis for peaceful change in a disarmed world and to continue the just and peaceful settlement of all international disputes, whether legal or political in nature.

2. Rules of international conduct: The parties to the treaty would continue the codification and progressive development of rules of international conduct related to disarmament in the manner provided in stage II and by any other agreed procedure.

3. United Nations Peace Force: The parties to the treaty would progressively strengthen the United Nations Peace Force established in stage II until it had sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it.

I. Completion of Stage III

1. At the end of the time period agreed for stage III, the Control Council would review the situation with a view to determining whether all undertakings to be carried out in stage III had been carried out.

2. In the event that one or more of the permanent members of the Control Council should declare that such undertakings had not been carried out, the agreed period of stage II would, upon the request of such permanent member or members, be extended for a period or periods totaling no more than 3 months for the purpose of completing any uncompleted undertakings. If, upon the expiration of such period or periods, one or more of the permanent members of the Control Council should declare that such undertakings still had not been carried out, the question would be placed before a special session of the Security Council, which would determine whether stage III had been completed.

3. After the completion of stage III, the obligations undertaken in stages I, II, and III would continue.

GENERAL PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL STAGES

1. Subsequent modifications or amendments of the treaty: The parties to the treaty would agree to specific procedures for considering amendments or modifications of the treaty which were believed desirable by any party to the treaty in the light of experience in the early period of implementation of the treaty. Such procedures would include provision for a conference on revision of the treaty after a specified period of time.

2. Interim agreement: The parties to the treaty would undertake such specific arrangements, including the establishment of a Preparatory Commission, as were necessary between the signing and entry into force of the treaty to insure the initiation of stage I immediately upon the entry into force of the treaty, and to provide an interim forum for the exchange of views and information on topics relating to the treaty and to the achievement of a permanent state of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world.

3. Parties to the treaty, ratification, accession, and entry into force of the treaty:

a. The treaty would be open to signature and ratification, or accession, by all members of the United Nations or its specialized agencies.

b. Any other state which desired to become a party to the treaty could accede to the treaty with the approval of the Conference on recommendation of the Control Council.

c. The treaty would come into force when it had been ratified by—states, including the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and an agreed number of the following states:

---

d. In order to assure the achievement of the fundamental purpose of a permanent state of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, the treaty would specify that the accession of certain militarily significant states would be essential for the continued effectiveness of the treaty or for the coming into force of particular measures or stages.

e. The parties to the treaty would undertake to exert every effort to induce other states or authorities to accede to the treaty.

f. The treaty would be subject to ratification or acceptance in accordance with constitutional processes.

g. A depository government would be agreed upon which would have all of the duties normally incumbent upon a depository. Alternatively, the United Nations would be the depository.

4. Finance:

a. In order to meet the financial obligations of the International Disarmament Organization, the parties to the treaty would bear the International Disarmament Organization's expenses as provided in the budget approved by the General Conference and in accordance with a scale of apportionment approved by the General Conference.

b. The General Conference would exercise borrowing powers on behalf of the International Disarmament Organization.

5. Authentic texts: The text of the treaty would consist of equally authentic versions in English, French, Russian, Chinese, and Spanish.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain newspaper items in the morning press, relating to the proposal for a general disarmament, along with an editorial from the New York Times of this morning, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 19, 1962]

KENNEDY HOPES PROPOSAL MAY BE BLUEPRINT

(By Murrey Marder)

The United States yesterday presented its most ambitious disarmament plan, to cut world military forces by two-thirds in 6 years and ultimately replace all armies by a United Nations force.

There is no real prospect that this plan, or the Soviet counterpart to disarm totally in 4 years, is attainable in the foreseeable future.

What advocates of the new United States' program privately hope, however, is that it may provide a negotiating base to check the arms race spiral and initiate a start on disarmament.

President Kennedy, at his news conference yesterday, called the three-stage U.S. proposal, which he first outlined in general terms before the United Nations on September 25, a blueprint for disarmament progress. Secretary of State Dean Rusk discussed the President's proposals in Geneva on March 15.

Mr. Kennedy said the present 25-page draft treaty is "the most comprehensive and specific series of proposals the United States or any other country has ever made on disarmament."

With this plan, the President said, "the United States is making a major effort to achieve a breakthrough on disarmament negotiations" in Geneva.

In the 17-nation Geneva disarmament conference where the expected American plan was formally unveiled yesterday, the United States and the Soviet Union are in absolute deadlock on the core of the whole Western outlook on disarmament: effective inspection.

The Soviet Union insists that as disarmament develops, there can be inspection only of what weapons are marked for destruction; the Western Powers insist there must also be inspection of the weapons which remain in a nation's possession, to forestall cheating.

The new U.S. plan attempts to meet Soviet insistence that any inspection of Soviet territory represents "espionage," by limiting the amount of inspection to zones chosen at random by an international authority. The amount of inspection would only be equal to the amount of disarmament.

Privately, some Soviet officials have indicated interest in this kind of a spot check, but officially the Soviet Union so far has adamantly held its ground while refusing to accept any kind of onsite inspection in the more limited field of nuclear test suspension.

In other words, instead of throwing all of the Soviet Union open to inspection at the outset, initially a zone representing only one-twentieth of its territory might be inspected. This would be followed by opening a second zone of equal size the next year, and so on, in both the United States and the Soviet Union, until full disarmament is achieved. No nation would know in advance what zone would be inspected.

Chief U.S. delegate Arthur H. Dean said in Geneva that the new plan, to "realize the oldest dream of man," is one "to freeze the military situation" and then "to shrink it to zero."

LIKENED TO BALLOON

Ambassador Dean said that the disarmament concept is "like a balloon—instead of permitting more and more air to be blown into the balloon until it bursts, the air is let out of the balloon, and the balloon shrinks in simple proportion until all the air is gone."

By presenting the plan yesterday in Geneva, the United States accomplished at least one thing. It countered Soviet insistence that the Geneva disarmament conference had to concentrate on the Soviet disarmament plan, because it was the only one before the delegates 'in treaty form."

MONTHS IN PREPARATION

The plan is the product of many months of effort by the new United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, headed by William C. Foster, and much consultation inside the Kennedy administration. It has been discussed, largely sympathetically, on Capitol Hill, but there is no congressional commitment on it.

The disarmament offer is not a package which must be accepted or rejected in total, officials said. It is negotiable in detail. While it provides a 30-percent cut in all weapons in its first stage of 3 years, and a second cut of 35 percent in the next 3 years, the time period for achieving the third stage of "general and complete disarmament" is unspecified. Officials said this might be anywhere from 9 to 15 years, or more.

Stage I of the plan could go into effect without Communist China. But the participation of Red China and "all militarily significant states" would be required before stage II could begin. For stage III to become effective, when nations theoretically would be left with only the nonnuclear forces necessary for "internal order," it would be necessary for all states possessing armed forces and armaments" to be treaty signers.

TRANSFORMATION NEEDED

Officials acknowledge bluntly that before that day can dawn there would have to be a vast transformation in the international scene. Among other things, it would require acceptance by the United States, and all nations of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in matters affecting world peace, and acceptance of a whole set of new procedures in the United Nations for maintaining international order.

In brief, the new U.S. plan provides:

Stage I: In three 1-year steps, major categories of nuclear and conventional weapons would be reduced 30 percent. The United States, for example, in the top category, would declare its numbers of B–52 bombers, Atlas, Polaris, and other big missiles, and the Soviets would do the same.

The reductions, however, could be in terms of destructive power, and not just in numbers. That is, the United States could choose to dispose of nuclear-carrying aircraft and keep its Polaris missiles in this stage. The same would be true in other categories of combat aircraft, tanks, artillery, etc.

Arms to be eliminated would be placed in depots and later destroyed or converted to peaceful uses, under an International Disarmament Organization, which would operate closely with the U.N. Military force levels of the United States and Soviet Union would be reduced to 2.1 million men each, and for other nations to corresponding levels.

Production of fissionable material for military use would be halted. Measures to reduce risks of war would be taken, and studies made of ways to eliminate nuclear weapons and reduce stocks of chemical and biological weapons. Participants would agree to cooperate in peaceful uses of outer space. Arrangements for a U.N. Peace Observation Corps would begin. (Officials suggest it might even be advisable to equip a U.N. force with nuclear weapons.)

To verify that disarmament was taking place, it is suggested that each participating nation could be divided into a number of agreed zones, on a checkerboard pattern. For example, there might be 20 zones each in the United States and the Soviet Union and each would declare in advance what weapons and forces were in the zone.

WOULD REMAIN OPEN

A selection then would be made by agreed process of which zone was to be inspected on another nation's territory. Upon selection of the zone, the country involved would then declare the exact location in it of arms and forces. Once a zone was inspected, it would remain open to further inspection while additional zones were opened, as disarmament progressed.

Stage II: A further reduction, during 3 years, of 35 percent in numbers of weapons and forces. Nations just joining the pact at this point would have to reduce their armaments an equivalent of 65 percent. Armed forces of the United States and U.S.S.R. would be reduced 50 percent more. Military bases and facilities, in agreed numbers, would be reduced. Building of peacekeeping machinery would continue.

HALT IN TESTING

Development and testing of new weapons would be halted. The U.N. Peace Force would come into being within the first year of stage II and would be progressively strengthened.

Stage III: In this final period, "of an agreed duration," disarmament would continue until each nation retained only forces for internal order and personal security of its citizens. The U.N. Peace Force would be bolstered "until it had sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it."

During the disarmament process, machinery would be created to try to adjudicate disputes; any gross violation, however, presumably would cancel the treaty.

Transcript of President Kennedy's News Conference Yesterday

The **President**. I have several announcements to make.

DISARMAMENT

The United States has today tabled at Geneva an outline of basic provision of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World. It provides a blueprint of our position on general and complete disarmament as well as elaboration of the nature, sequence and timing of specific disarmament measures.

This outline of a treaty represents the most comprehensive and specific series of proposals the United States or any other country has ever made on disarmament. In addition to stating the objectives and principles which should govern agreements for disarmament, the document calls for the grouping of individual measures in three balanced and safeguarded stages. We are hopeful that through the give and take of the conference table this plan will have a constructive influence upon the negotiations now in progress.

I want to stress that with this plan the United States is making a major effort to achieve a breakthrough on disarmament negotiations. We believe that the nations represented at Geneva have a heavy responsibility to lay the foundations for a genuinely secure and peaceful world starting through a reduction in arms.

America's Disarmament Plan

In a major effort to achieve a breakthrough toward realizing man's ancient dream of beating swords into plowshares, the United States has submitted to the Geneva Disarmament Conference a complete and detailed draft treaty for total disarmament. Characterized by President Kennedy as the "most comprehensive" such plan ever advanced by any nation, it calls for the abolition of all national armaments and armed forces, except for domestic police, within approximately 9 years.

This goal is to be reached in three stages under supervision of an international control organization. It would have ever-widening powers, both to prevent cheating and to maintain the balance of power on which peace now depends, until peace can be safeguarded by a United Nations peace force so powerful that no nation would dare to challenge it.

By submitting a complete draft treaty, the United States has at last overcome the self-imposed disadvantage of making a merely piecemeal approach toward limited disarmament. Having now put forward a positive program of our own in the field of disarmament, we should meet Russian tactics in the ideological and political arenas also—by countering the Communist manifestos with a "Manifesto of Freedom," and by proposing a broad European peace settlement, on which real disarmament in the last analysis depends.

The American disarmament plan is so sweeping and of such fateful impact on the life or death of nations that it must be subjected to the most searching scrutiny before final judgment can be passed on it. But at first sight the American plan seems to represent a practical basis for further negotiations. It envisages gradual, progressive, and balanced reduction of national armaments and armed forces, including in particular nuclear weapons, until they are wholly eliminated and their function is taken over by the "peace force" built up in the meantime. A nuclear test ban under effective international control is to be one of the first steps.

An innovation that involves a serious but calculated risk is the dilution of the controls that must be the crux of all disarmament measures. To meet professed Soviet apprehensions about "espionage," the plan drops the previous Western insistence on an initial census of all armaments to establish a basis for the reductions. It also drops the previous demands for unhindered inspection of disarmament and of rearmament. For both aspects of the problem it adopts the "sampling" technique used in checking commodities, the idea being that the "sampling" of one area could be projected for the whole country.

This new control idea is a very great concession to the Soviet Union; and it is one more earnest of the American determination to reach a disarmament agreement with the Russians if it is possible for reasonable men to reach one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I just quote this one paragraph from the New York Times editorial which I think is worthy of our attention:

> In a major effort to achieve a breakthrough toward realizing man's ancient dream of beating swords into plowshares, the United States has submitted to the Geneva disarmament conference a complete and detailed draft treaty for total disarmament.

The editorial also points out:

> The American disarmament plan is so sweeping and of such fateful impact on the life or death of nations that it must be subjected to the most searching scrutiny before final judgment can be passed on it.

With this I fully agree. That is the purpose of the discussion. That is why I have said that the draft treaty should be the subject of rational discussion as well as the subject of such modification and adjustment as may be required following such discussion.

The final paragraph of the editorial is worthy of our attention:

> This new control idea is a very great concession to the Soviet Union; and it is one more earnest of the American determination to reach a disarmament agreement with the Russians if it is possible for reasonable men to reach one.

In other words, we have walked the extra mile. We have extended the hand of friendship in a spirit of trying to save the world from catastrophe.

I believe the President of the United States, in taking this courageous step—which will undoubtedly subject him to criticism, along with those of us who support him—has taken a necessary step. It reveals spiritual and moral courage on the part of the President, his officers, the Secretary of State and the disarmament agency. This is the kind of courage needed in the quest for peace.

Men who will go to the battlefield if there is a nuclear war will need courage, also. That courage may be obliterated in the fiery furnace of nuclear destruction.

The President has asked the world to join us in the peace race. He is leading. He has not been afraid to lead. He has marched out to the front of the forces, seeking a just and enduring peace, asking all to follow. This is a quality of statesmanship which merits the approval—at least the genuine friendly support—not only of the American people, but of all other peoples throughout the world.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished acting majority leader has discussed a topic which I think is most appropriate as we approach the Easter period. I was glad to hear him state that no action would be taken on the part of our Government without rigid—and I trust foolproof—inspection, because we have had some experiences in dealing with the group of people in the Soviet Union who are ideologically opposed to us.

On September 1, 1961, Mr. Khrushchev violated agreements with our people meeting at Geneva on nuclear tests, and since that time the Russians have exploded more than 50 nuclear bombs. Those bombs were not made after September 1 of last year. They were made in the preceding 2 or 3 years.

I have great faith in our negotiators. I think Arthur Dean is one of the great men of this period, and is a very able negotiator. He is a tough negotiator, and certainly he has great patience.

As one Senator, I appreciate the great interest in a program of disarmament. I hope we shall be able to make progress but as we make this progress let us not let our defensive guard down.

I think we must proceed cautiously, as we take these steps, and proceed on the theory that there will be rigid and foolproof inspection of any program entered into.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Kansas, whose ideas on these questions are always constructive and helpful. I am sure the Senator knows that I feel very much the same as he does, as I so expressed myself during my remarks. We cannot rely upon the word of the Soviets, and sometimes not even upon the word of others. We must build into the proposals the safeguards which will give reassurance to oursleves and to the world.

Whatever we do in the field of national security is not merely for the security of the United States, but for the security of the entire world. We have commitments to many nations. Even as we negotiate a treaty, we must think of our commitments to others.

It is the record of this U.S. Senator to vote for every measure for the defense for this country. The same is true of the Senator from Kansas. I have voted to strengthen our country. I have never seen any conflict between having the United States of America militarily strong, and at the same time seeking, at the conference table, to negotiate a reduction in the arms race.

That is the only basis on which we can ever negotiate with the Soviets. We must come to the negotiation with confidence which comes from strength, and the Soviets must know we are strong.

To those who say, "Senator, how can you be for disarmament on the one hand and yet vote for a big Air Force, vote for Polaris missiles, and vote for increased strength of our Armed Forces?" I say, "In the kind of world in which we live, we have no choice other than to be strong militarily, whatever the cost."

By the same token, we should use our strength not to wage war, but to launch a peace race. We should launch the peace race. I know this is the general feeling of Members of Congress and of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the address by President Kennedy before the United Nations General Assembly, on September 25, 1961.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US CALL A TRUCE TO TERROR

(Address by President Kennedy)

We meet in an hour of grief and challenge. Dag Hammarskjold is dead. But the United Nations lives. His tragedy is deep in our hearts, but the task for which he died is at the top of our agenda. A noble servant of peace is gone. But the quest for peace lies before us.

The problem is not the death of one man; the problem is the life of this Organization. It will either grow to meet the challenge of our age, or it will be gone with the wind, without influence, without force, without respect. Were we to let it die, to enfeeble its vigor, to cripple its powers, we would condemn the future.

For in the development of this Organization rests the only true alternative to war, and war appeals no longer as a rational alternative. Unconditional war can no longer lead to unconditional victory. It can no longer serve to settle disputes. It can no longer concern the great powers alone. For a nuclear disaster, spread by winds and waters and fear, could well engulf the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the committed and the uncommitted alike. Mankind must put an end to war, or war will put an end to mankind.

So let us here resolve that Dag Hammarskjold did not live—or die—in vain. Let us call a truce to terror. Let us invoke the blessings of peace. And, as we build an international capacity to keep peace, let us join in dismantling the national capacity to wage war.

DEDICATION TO U.N. CHARTER AND WORLD LAW

This will require new strength and new roles for the United Nations. For disarmament without checks is but a shadow, and a community without law is but a shell. Already the United Nations has become both the measure and the vehicle of man's most generous impulses. Already it has provided—in the Middle East, in Asia, in Africa this year in the Congo—a means of holding violence within bounds.

But the great question which confronted this body in 1945 is still before us: whether man's cherished hopes for progress and peace are to be destroyed by terror and disruption, whether the foul winds of war can be tamed in time to free the cooling winds of reason, and whether the pledges of our charter are to be fulfilled or defied—pledges to secure peace, progress, human rights, and world law.

In this hall there are not three forces, but two. One is composed of those who are trying to build the kind of world described in articles 1 and 2 of the charter. The others, seeking a far different world, would undermine this Organization in the process.

Today of all days our dedication to the charter must be maintained. It must be strengthened, first of all, by the selection of an outstanding civil servant to carry forward the responsibilities of the Secretary General—a man endowed with both the wisdom and the power to make meaningful the moral force of the world community. The late Secretary General nurtured and sharpened the United Nations' obligation to act. But he did not invent it. It was there in the charter. It is still there in the charter.

However difficult it may be to fill Mr. Hammarskjold's place, it can better be filled by one man rather than by three. Even the three horses of the troika did not have three drivers, all going in different directions. They had only one, and so must the United Nations executive. To install a triumvirate, or any rotating authority, in the United Nations administrative offices would replace order with anarchy, action with paralysis, and confidence with confusion.

The Secretary General, in a very real sense, is the servant of the General Assembly. Diminish his authority and you diminish the authority of the only body where all nations, regardless of power, are equal and sovereign. Until all the powerful are just, the weak will be secure only in the strength of this Assembly.

Effective and independent executive action is not the same question as balanced representation. In view of the enormous change in membership in this body since its founding, the American delegation will join in any effort for the prompt review and revision of the composition of United Nations bodies.

But to give this organization three drivers, to permit each great power to decide its own case, would entrench the cold war in the headquarters of peace. Whatever advantages such a plan may hold out to my own country, as one of the great powers, we reject it. For we far prefer world law, in the age of self-determination, to world war, in the age of mass extermination.

PLAN FOR GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

Men no longer debate whether armaments are a symptom or a cause of tension. The mere existence of modern weapons—10 million times more powerful than anything the world has ever seen and only minutes away from any target on earth—is a source of horror and discord and distrust. Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes, for disarmament must be a part of any permanent settlement. And men may no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness, for in a spiraling arms race a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase.

For 15 years this organization has sought the reduction and destruction of arms. Now that goal is no longer a dream; it is a practical matter of life or death. The risks inherent in disarmament pale in comparison to the risks inherent in an unlimited arms race.

It is in this spirit that the recent Belgrade Conference, recognizing that this is no longer a Soviet problem or an American problem but a human problem, endorsed a program of "general, complete and strictly and internationally controlled disarmament." It is in this same spirit that we in the United States have labored this year, with a new urgency and with a new, now-statutory agency fully endorsed by the Congress, to find an approach to disarmament which would be so far-reaching yet realistic, so mutually balanced and beneficial, that it could be accepted by every nation. And it is in this spirit that we have presented, with the agreement of the Soviet Union, under the label both nations now accept of general and complete disarmament, a new statement of newly agreed principles for negotiation.

But we are well aware that all issues of principle are not settled and that principles alone are not enough. It is therefore our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race but to a peace race—to advance together step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has been achieved. We invite them now to go beyond agreement in principle to reach agreement on actual plans.

The program to be presented to this Assembly for general and complete disarmament under effective international control moves to bridge the gap between those who insist on a gradual approach and those who talk only of the final and total achievement. It would create machinery to keep the peace as it destroys the machines of war. It would proceed through balanced and safeguarded stages designed to give no state a military advantage over another. It would place the final responsibility for verification and control where it belongs—not with the big powers alone, not with one's adversary or one's self, but in an international organization within the framework of the United Nations. It would assure that indispensable condition of disarmament—true inspection—and apply it in stages proportionate to the stage of disarmament. It would cover delivery systems as well as weapons. It would ultimately halt their production as well as their testing, their transfer as well as their possession. It would achieve, under the eye of an international disarmament organization, a steady reduction in forces, both nuclear and conventional, until it has abolished all armies and all weapons except those needed for internal order and a new United Nations Peace Force. And it starts that process now, today, even as the talks begin.

In short, general and complete disarmament must no longer be a slogan, used to resist the first steps. It is no longer to be a goal without means of achieving it, without means of verifying its progress, without means of keeping the peace. It is now a realistic plan and a test—a test of those only willing to talk and a test of those willing to act.

Such a plan would not bring a world free from conflict or greed, but it would bring a world free from the terrors of mass destruction. It would not usher in the era of the super state, but it would usher in an era in which no state could annihilate or be annihilated by another.

In 1946, this Nation proposed the Baruch plan to internationalize the atom before other nations even possessed the bomb or demilitarized their troops. We proposed with our allies the disarmament plan of 1951 while still at war in Korea. And we make our proposals today, while building up our defenses over Berlin, not because we are inconsistent or insincere or intimidated but because we know the rights of free men will prevail—because, while we are compelled against our will to rearm, we look confidently beyond Berlin to the kind of disarmed world we all prefer.

I therefore propose, on the basis of this plan, that disarmament negotiations resume promptly and continue without interruption until an entire program for general and complete disarmament has not only been agreed but has been actually achieved.

PROPOSALS TO HALT TESTING AND NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

The logical place to begin is a treaty assuring the end of nuclear tests of all kinds, in every environment, under workable controls. The United States and the United Kingdom have proposed such a treaty that is both reasonable, effective, and ready for signature. We are still prepared to sign that treaty today.

We also proposed a mutual ban on atmospheric testing, without inspection or controls, in order to save the human race from the poison of radioactive fallout. We regret that that offer was not accepted.

For 15 years we have sought to make the atom an instrument of peaceful growth rather than of war. But for 15 years our concessions have been matched by obstruction, our patience by intransigence. And the pleas of mankind for peace have met with disregard.

Finally, as the explosions of others beclouded the skies, my country was left with no alternative but to act in the interests of its own and the free world's security. We cannot endanger that security by refraining from testing while others improve their arsenals. Nor can we endanger it by another long, uninspected ban on testing. For 3 years we accepted those risks in our open society while seeking agreement on inspection. But this year, while we were negotiating in good faith in Geneva, others were secretly preparing new experiments in destruction.

Our tests are not polluting the atmosphere. Our deterrent weapons are guarded against accidental explosion or use. Our doctors and scientists stand ready to help any nation measure and meet the hazards to health which inevitably result from the tests in the atmosphere.

But to halt the spread of these terrible weapons, to halt the contamination of the air, to halt the spiraling nuclear arms race, we remain ready to seek new avenues of agreement. Our new disarmament program thus includes the following proposals:

First, signing the test ban treaty by all nations. This can be done now. Test ban negotiations need not and should not await general disarmament.

Second, stopping the production of fissionable materials for use in weapons and preventing their transfer to any nation now lacking in nuclear weapons.

Third, prohibiting the transfer of control over nuclear weapons to states that do not own them.

Fourth, keeping nuclear weapons from seeding new battlegrounds in outer space.

Fifth, gradually destroying existing nuclear weapons and converting their materials to peaceful uses; and

Finally, halting the unlimited testing and production of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles and gradually destroying them as well.

WORLDWIDE LAW AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

To destroy arms, however, is not enough. We must create even as we destroy—creating worldwide law and law enforcement as we outlaw worldwide war and weapons. In the world we seek, the United Nations emergency forces which have been hastily assembled, uncertainly supplied, and inadequately financed will never be enough.

Therefore, the United States recommends that all member nations earmark special peacekeeping units in their armed forces, to be on call of the United Nations, to be specially trained and quickly available, and with advance provision for financial and logistic support.

In addition, the American delegation will suggest a series of steps to improve the United Nations' machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes, for on-the-spot fact-finding, mediation, and adjudication, for extending the rule of international law. For peace is not solely a matter of military or technical problems; it is primarily a problem of politics and people. And unless man can match his strides in weaponry and technology with equal strides in social and political development, our great strength, like that of the dinosaur, will become incapable of proper control and, like the dinosaur, vanish from the earth.

EXTENDING THE RULE OF LAW TO OUTER SPACE

As we extend the rule of law on earth, so must we also extend it to man's new domain—outer space.

All of us salute the brave cosmonauts of the Soviet Union. The new horizons of outer space must not be riven by the old bitter concepts of imperialism and sovereign claims. The cold reaches of the universe must not become the new arena of an even colder war.

To this end we shall urge proposals extending the United Nations Charter to the limits of man's exploration in the universe, reserving outer space for peaceful use, prohibiting weapons of mass destruction in space or on celestial bodies, and opening the mysteries and benefits of space to every nation. We shall further propose cooperative efforts between all nations in weather prediction and eventually in weather control. We shall propose, finally, a global system of communications satellites linking the whole world in telegraph and telephone and radio and television. The day need not be far away when such a system will televise the proceedings of this body to every corner of the world for the benefit of peace.

UNITED NATIONS DECADE OF DEVELOPMENT

But the mysteries of outer space must not divert our eyes or our energies from the harsh realities that face our fellow men. Political sovereignty is but a mockery without the means of meeting poverty and illiteracy and disease. Self-determination is but a slogan if the future holds no hope.

That is why my Nation, which has freely shared its capital and its technology to help others help themselves, now proposes officially designating this decade of the 1960's as the United Nations Decade of Development. Under the framework of that resolution, the United Nations' existing efforts in promoting economic growth can be expanded and coordinated. Regional surveys and training institutes can now pool the talents of many. New research, technical assistance, and pilot projects can unlock the wealth of less developed lands and untapped waters. And development can become a cooperative and not a competitive enterprise, to enable all nations, however diverse in their systems and beliefs, to become in fact as well as in law free and equal nations.

COLONIALISM AND THE PRINCIPLE OF FREE CHOICE

My country favors a world of free and equal states. We agree with those who say that colonialism is a key issue in this Assembly. But let the full facts of that issue be discussed in full.

On the one hand is the fact that, since the close of World War II, a worldwide declaration of independence has transformed nearly 1 billion people and 9 million square miles into 42 free and independent states. Less than 2 percent of the world's population now lives in dependent territories.

I do not ignore the remaining problems of traditional colonialism which still confront this body. Those problems will be solved, with patience, good will, and determination. Within the limits of our responsibility in such matters, my country intends to be a participant and not merely an observer in the peaceful, expeditious movement of nations from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals. That continuing tide of self-determination, which runs so strong, has our sympathy and our support.

But colonialism in its harshest forms is not only the exploitation of new nations by old, of dark skins by light—or the subjugation of the poor by the rich. My Nation was once a colony, and we know what colonialism means; the exploitation and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of the many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to be governed, whatever their continent, their class, or their color.

And that is why there is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not reached the Communist empire, where a population far larger than that officially termed "dependent" lives under governments installed by foreign troops instead of free institutions, under a system which knows only one party and one belief, which suppresses free debate and free elections and free newspapers and free books and free trade unions, and which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners. Let us debate colonialism in full and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every corner of the globe.

TWO THREATS TO THE PEACE

Finally, as President of the United States, I consider it my duty to report to this Assembly on two threats to the peace which are not on your crowded agenda but which cause us, and most of you, the deepest concern.

The first threat on which I wish to report is widely misunderstood: the smoldering coals of war in southeast Asia. South Vietnam is already under attack—sometimes by a single assassin, sometimes by a band of guerrillas, recently by full battalions. The peaceful borders of Burma, Cambodia, and India have been repeatedly violated. And the peaceful people of Laos are in danger of losing the independence they gained not so long ago.

No one can call these wars of liberation For these are free countries living under their own governments. Nor are these aggressions any less real because men are knifed in their homes and not shot in the fields of battle.

The very simple question confronting the world community is whether measures can be devised to protect the small and weak from such tactics. For if they are successful in Laos and south Vietnam, the gates will be opened wide.

The United States seeks for itself no base, no territory, no special position in this area of any kind. We support a truly neutral and independent Laos, its people free from outside interference, living at peace with themselves and with their neighbors, assured that their territory will not be used for attacks on others, and under a government comparable (as Mr. Khrushchev and I agreed at Vienna) to Cambodia and Burma.

But now the negotiation over Laos are reaching a crucial stage. The ceasefire is at best precarious. The rainy season is coming to an end. Laotian territory is being used to infiltrate south Vietnam. The world community must recognize—all those who are involved—that this potent threat to Laotian peace and freedom is indivisible from all other threats to their own.

Secondly, I wish to report to you on the crisis over Germany and Berlin. This is not the time or the place for immoderate tones, but the world community is entitled to know the very simple issues as we see them. If there is a crisis it is because an existing peace is under threat, because an existing island of free people is under pressure, because solemn agreements are being treated with indifference. Established international rights are being threatened with unilateral usurpation. Peaceful circulation has been interrupted by barbed wire and concrete blocks.

One recalls the order of the Czar in Pushkins' Boris Godunof: "Take steps at this very hour that our frontiers be fenced in by barriers. * * * That not a single soul pass o'er the border, that not a hare be able to run or a crow to fly."

It is absurd to allege that we are threatening a war merely to prevent the Soviet Union and East Germany from signing a so-called "treaty of peace." The Western Allies are not concerned with any paper arrangement the Soviets may wish to make with a regime of their own creation, on territory occupied by their own troops and governed by their own agents. No such action can affect either our rights or our responsibilities.

If there is a dangerous crisis in Berlin—and there is—it is because of threats against the vital interests and the deep commitments of the Western Powers and the freedom of West Berlin. We cannot yield these interests. We cannot fail these commitments. We cannot surrender the freedom of these people for whom we are responsible. A "peace treaty" which carried with it the provisions which destroy the peace would be a fraud. A "free city" which was not genuinely free would suffocate freedom and would be an infamy.

For a city or a people to be truly free, they must have the secure right, without economic, political, or police pressure, to make their own choice and to live their own lives. And as I have said before, if anyone doubts the extent to which our presence is desired by the people of West Berlin, we are ready to have that question submitted to a free vote in all Berlin and, if possible, among all the German people.

The elementary fact about this crisis is that it is unnecessary. The elementary tools for a peaceful settlement are to be found in the charter. Under its law, agreements are to be kept, unless changed by all those who made them. Established rights are to be respected. The political disposition of peoples should rest upon their own wishes, freely expressed in plebiscites or free elections. If there are legal problems, they can be solved by legal means. If there is a threat of force, it must be rejected. If there is desire for change, it must be a subject for negotiation, and if there is negotiation, it must be rooted in mutual respect and concern for the rights of others.

The Western Powers have calmly resolved to defend, by whatever means are forced upon them, their obligations and their access to the free citizens of West Berlin and the self-determination of those citizens. This generation learned from bitter experience that either brandishing or yielding to threats can only lead to war. But firmness and reason can lead to the kind of peaceful solution in which my country profoundly believes.

We are committed to no rigid formula. We see no perfect solution. We recognize that troops and tanks can, for a time, keep a nation divided against its will, however unwise that policy may seem to us. But we believe a peaceful agreement is possible which protects the freedom of West Berlin and Allied presence and access, while recognizing the historic and legitimate interests of others in assuring European security.

The possibilities of negotiation are now being explored; it is too early to report what the prospects may be. For our part, we would be glad to report at the appropriate time that a solution has been found. For there is no need for a crisis over Berlin, threatening the peace, and if those who created this crisis desire peace, there will be peace and freedom in Berlin.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The events and decisions of the next 10 months may well decide the fate of man for the next 10,000 years. There will be no avoiding those events. There will be no appeal from these decisions. And we in this hall shall be remembered either as part of the generation that turned this planet into a flaming funeral pyre or the generation that met its vow "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

In the endeavor to meet that vow, I pledge you every effort this Nation possesses. I pledge you that we shall neither commit nor provoke aggression, that we shall neither flee nor invoke the threat of force, that we shall never negotiate out of fear, we shall never fear to negotiate.

Terror is not a new weapon. Throughout history it has been used by those who could not prevail, either by persuasion or example. But inevitably they fail, either because men are not afraid to die for a life worth living or because the terrorists themselves come to realize that freemen cannot be frightened by threats and that aggression would meet its own response. And it is in the light of that history that every Nation today should know, be he friend or foe, that the United States has both the will and the weapons to join freemen in standing up to their responsibilities.

But I come here today to look across this world of threats to the world of peace. In that search we cannot expect any final triumph, for new problems will always arise. We cannot expect that all nations will adopt like systems, for conformity is the jailer of freedom and the enemy of growth. Nor can we expect to reach our goal by contrivance, by fiat, or even by the wishes of all.

But however close we sometimes seem to that dark and final abyss, let no man of peace and freedom despair. For he does not stand alone. If we all can persevere—if we can in every land and office look beyond our own shores and ambitions—then surely the age will dawn in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

Ladies and gentlemen of this Assembly, the decision is ours. Never have the nations of the world had so much to lose—or so much to gain. Together we shall save our planet, or together we shall perish in its flames. Save it we can—and save it we must—and then shall we earn the eternal thanks of mankind and, as peacemakers, the eternal blessing of God.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I said earlier today, I am highly pleased that at the last session of the Senate prior to Easter, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], made the very able and eloquent speech that he made in support of our Government's disarmament program.

I wish to discuss a few facets of American foreign policy relating to the thesis set forth by the Senator from Minnesota.

How well he put it when he called attention to the life of the great Peacemaker. On this subject I speak as a religious man, proud to be a Christian. Time and again I have failed, as we have all failed—because of the human frailties with which we are also endowed—to live up to the great spiritual obligations and trusts of our faith. But as I speak as a Christian today, I think I also speak in keeping with the faiths of all religions based upon belief in a divine being, for it has been my observation, as I have read over the years the writings of authorities on comparative religions, that there is no question about the ultimate goals or the comity of the spiritual teachings of all faiths that believe in a divine being.

When we are dealing with the problem of disarmament, we are dealing with a subject that imposes a great spiritual trust on all governments, for I believe we have a spiritual obligation to rise above the limitations of human frailties and seek to lead mankind into a disarmament program that will bring an end of the scourge of war for future generations.

As the Senator from Minnesota so ably pointed out today, when we speak on this subject, we must expect to be misunderstood, and we must be ready for criticism. But he and I have faced those consequences for many years as members of the Foreign Relations Committee, as we have been willing to warn the American people time and time again that unless an enforceable way is found to end the mad, immoral nuclear armament race that now plagues mankind, the best of civilization as it has developed so far in the history of mankind will be destroyed, for we know—and I think the Russians know—that there will be no victors in a nuclear war. The antagonists in this great armament race have gotten themselves into a position in which they can bring about a mutuality of destruction. I would have those who are still trying to convince others—if in fact they have convinced themselves—that we must use American military might in an endeavor to establish a system of permanent peace in the world, that it will not work. If we eliminate for a moment in such a discussion the moral principle involved in that proposal, the reality is that American military might cannot establish a system of permanent peace in the world.

The exercise of American military might would lead to world destruction, so far as the great civilized nations are concerned, just as the use of Russian military might would accomplish the same horrendous result. So as we bow our heads in reverence to the great spiritual teachings and obligations during these holy days, I would have the American people reflect on what some of our obligations of statesmanship are in respect to peace, for, as my colleagues know, I hold to the point of view that the statesmanship of the officials of our Government, by and large, will never be any higher or more notable than the statesmanship of the American people as a whole. The American people cannot shuffle off that responsibility to the officials of their Government. They must join the officials of their Government in evolving and developing a foreign policy that will give mankind its best hope of survival and future generations their only hope of inheriting freedom and peace.

One's motivations, of course, can always be questioned by those who disagree. But for the record I speak from a nonpartisan motivation today. As I have said before, I speak as a disciple of a great Republican in the field of foreign policy, who was my leading teacher when I first came to this body in 1945. I refer to Senator Arthur Vandenberg, with whom I worked very closely on a series of foreign policy issues. In my judgment, there is no answer to the tenet of that great man when he said so many times in those historic speeches on the floor of the Senate that partisanship in the field of foreign policy must stop at the water's edge.

There is great need for a rededication to that principle among many in our country today. Speaking nonpartisanly, I wish to pay a deserved tribute to our great President, who has shown not only courage, but an enlightened understanding of this issue unsurpassed in our Republic or in our world today.

Would that we could come back 25, 35 or 50 years from today, provided there is anything to come back to, to read the evaluation that history will place upon the magnificent speech of President Kennedy at the United Nations last September. In that great speech our President laid down the blueprint for disarmament. He laid down the blueprint for the substitution of the rule of law for the law of the jungle. He had the courage to refer in that speech to the willingness on the part of our Government to adjudicate differences.

However, the important point in that speech, I believe history will record, is that he laid down an unanswerable challenge to the Communists. He made perfectly clear the willingness of the United States to engage in a full-scale disarmament program. It was the effective answer to the demagoguery of Khrushchev. As Khrushchev, in his propaganda endeavors, seeks to convince the people of the underdeveloped areas of the world that Russia stands for total disarmament, he of course completely ignores the essentiality of enforceable disarmament. Unless there is enforceable disarmament there will be no disarmament at all. Essential to disarmament, of course, are both inspection and control. They are completely absent from the Russian program—or, more accurately described, the Russian propaganda about disarmament, because if we are to attribute to it the label of a program, it ought to contain within its provisions the procedures for enforcing it. Up to the moment that I speak the Russians have made very clear time and time again that they will not go along with the doctrine of enforceability of disarmament.

The President of the United States, in his disarmament program, as he announced it in his great speech in September at the United Nations, and as he brilliantly presented it again yesterday in stating his position on this subject, has made clear to the world that we stand ready and willing to enter into a disarmament program which would result in enforceability, which would provide for inspection and control, and which would authorize the United Nations to enforce it.

I can well imagine some of the articles that we shall read about that part of the President's statement, on the part of those who seem to think that American military might be used to enforce peace. I shall refer to some of their specific suggestions before I finish this discussion.

However, the President of the United States has made perfectly clear that he recognizes there cannot be disarmament unless all the powers are disarmed. That includes the United States, of course. In my judgment there will be no permanent peace until that happens; and, as Senator Vandenberg used to point out, until the nations of the world are willing to set up a system of procedures, under an international body such as the United Nations, for the application of the rules of reason to every dispute threatening the peace of the world, for final and binding decision in accordance with the principles of international law, each decision to be enforced by an international body such as the United Nations.

In this closing hour of the session before Easter, I dissociate myself from all the recent attacks on the United Nations, in this body and elsewhere, and from the downgrading of the United Nations, and the attempt on the part of some to substitute NATO or any other military alliance for the United Nations. I am satisfied that a resort to military alliances at the expense of weakening the United Nations will lead us directly to a nuclear war.

If we could imagine any degree of survival from such a war, we would have to start all over again, because ultimately we would have to set up an alliance of all the nations of the world; not a military alliance, but an alliance of all the nations of the world who are willing to pursue a course of peace under such a challenge and a charter as is set forth in the San Francisco Charter.

In my judgment there is as much need for putting into practice the ideals of the San Francisco Charter as there was at the very critical time that that charter was signed.

Many leaders of the world played a noble part in bringing about the birth of the United Nations. However, Americans can take great pride in the part played by Franklin Roosevelt, ably assisted by Members of Congress. I know of no one who gave him greater assistance than did Senator Vandenberg. Franklin Roosevelt did not live to see the consummation of his dream. However, the interesting thing is that the first act that President Harry Truman did after he was sworn in as President was to make the announcement that the San Francisco Conference would go on.

What a great record he made as President of the United States in support of peaceful procedures for the settling of disputes, confronted as he was, time and time again, by the actions of the Russians, which were anything but peaceful. Standing for disarmament, and urging the substitution of the rule of law for military might as an instrumentality for settling disputes among nations, does not mean that we cannot support the President of the United States in his great, statesmanlike speeches in September, in the United Nations and, again, yesterday; it does not mean that we shall be a party to weakening the defenses of our country.

Many people do not understand the paradox which confronts us as members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Many of them like to think that there is some inconsistency in the position we take. We sit in the Senate and vote billions of dollars for the defense of our country, knowing that if we do so indefinitely, the armaments race will be bound to result in war. But in fairness to myself and those who have confidence in me, I say once more that I have voted not only for large requests for defense purposes from all the Presidents under whom I have had the honor to serve in the Senate, but I have voted for more money for defense than each one of them has recommended. I voted for more money for defense than Franklin Roosevelt recommended on some occasions; I voted for more than Harry Truman recommended; for more than Dwight Eisenhower recommended; and already on one occasion I have voted for more than President Kennedy has recommended, and I may do so again if I think the facts warrant my doing so.

Inconsistency? I think not, unless one wishes to reject my major premise. Of course, if one disagrees with my major premise, then my argument, so far as he is concerned, falls to the carpet of the floor of the Senate. But my major premise, based upon my work on the Committee on Foreign Relations and based upon my work as a U.S. Delegate to the United Nations in the 15th General Assembly, convinces me that if Russia ever thinks we are weak enough to enable her to make a nuclear war, Pearl Harbor type of attack on us, she will not hesitate to do so. Therefore, by keeping ourselves as strong as I have voted to do by way of military appropriations, I have tried to make it clear that we are buying time. It is important that we have time to seek to arrive at the blueprint for disarmament, about which the President has spoken; and to devise procedures for the settlement of these disputes by the application of a rule of law.

It is necessary to have faith that the Russian people and the Russian leaders will eventually recognize our peaceful purposes and motivations. We must have faith that sooner or later the masses of the people of the countries of the world will come to understand our peaceful purposes; then our program will eventually be adopted. I do not know what the alternative is because, as I have said before, war is an unthinkable alternative.

Speaking in regard to the major premise to which I have referred, this conviction of mine explains why I have taken certain courses of action during my many years of service in the Senate, which sometimes have been misunderstood or criticized or rejected by many of my liberal friends. How well I remember speaking in the Senate as one of the three authors—the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] being the others—of the bill which outlawed the Communist Party in the United States. We were subject to much attack then; but if one will check through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and I handled the legal argument at that time for my colleagues, under an arrangement for a division of work in the debate—he will see that I pointed out that I had no doubt that the Communist Party, as it operates in the United States and elsewhere in the world, meets the definition of a criminal conspiracy. There is no doubt that the party and its apparatus seek to use whatever means they can to destroy the United States, and would not hesitate to use force if they thought that by force they could succeed.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will speak for itself; but in that speech I pointed out that when one is dealing with a conspiracy, it is not necessary to wait for the conspirator to take direct, overt action in order to carry out the objectives of the conspiracy. Individual rights were protected in the Kennedy-Humphrey-Morse bill to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States, because we made it a mens rea crime. We made it perfectly clear that there must be a finding of knowingly, willingly, and intentionally being a party to the conspiracy. We made it very clear that if a defendant in one of those cases could demonstrate to the satisfaction of a jury that he did not know the kind of organization to which he belonged—in other words, that he was unaware of the import of the conspiracy which had succeeded in spinning its web around him—he would not be guilty under the law; the jury would have to find specific intent. It was not a malum prohibitum crime which was set forth in the bill outlawing the Communist Party; it was a malum in se crime; but we knew its essentiality so far as checking the Communist conspiracy in this country was concerned.

One law enforcement official after another has assured me that it has been a very effective legislative tool in carrying out the obligations and the trust of the law enforcement agencies of the country.

But I stress, as we talk about disarmament today, that enforcibility, inspection, and control are its essentials; and the President has made that clear over and over again in his brilliant statements on the subject. To those sincere, dedicated, deeply religious people—and I receive much mail from them these days—who are members of various peace groups in the United States, and who say, "We are somewhat at a loss to understand your position in this whole matter," because I refuse to accept their proposal for unilateral disarmament, I say again, as I said to them last Saturday in my home State, and as I have said to many of their delegations which have visited my office in Washington, D.C., "Where we part company is on this premise: You seem to think that the United States could unilaterally disarm and still survive. You seem to think that Russia would not commit a nuclear attack upon us if we got ourselves into a position so defenseless that we could not counter that attack, although we know that war would destroy both countries."

So there is a complete failure to have any meeting of minds on this subject matter, for these wonderful people—and they are wonderful, and I always have great admiration for those who are motivated by sincerity of purpose, even though I think their case is completely unsound; nevertheless, they stand by their convictions—have no common premise with me, insofar as the crux of the problem is concerned, although I certainly share all their ideals, and I certainly agree with them about the great moral principles for which they stand. But as a Member of this body, I have a trust to perform which they do not have. As I said to them the other evening, I really wonder whether they would vote or take the position they are asking me to take, if they sat in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as Members of the U.S. Senate, and became convinced, on the basis of the evidence submitted to the members of the committee, that to follow such a course of action would certainly guarantee the destruction of the United States. Under such circumstances, I wonder whether they would cast such a vote or take such a position.

Mr. President, there can be no meeting of minds, so far as I am concerned, with those who propose unilateral disarmament. I will not run the risk, I will not make the gamble, I refuse to take the chance, because I believe I have a great responsibility to the people of the United States to resolve all doubts in this field in favor of adequate defense which will make clear at all times—day and night—to Khrushchev that he has everything to lose and nothing to gain by a nuclear war.

But that leads me to discuss another aspect of this problem. There are many groups—not only the so-called peace groups composed of very dedicated men and women, but also others, including some scientists—who are very much alarmed and disturbed because of the possibility and, with each passing day, the increased probability, that once more the United States will engage in atmospheric testing.

It is well known by Members of the Senate that I believe atmospheric testing to be immoral. It is a rather sad reflection on today's level of civilization that we are even confronted with the problem of nuclear testing. Yet it leads us into another paradox. In this instance I wish to state that in my judgment Senators are put in the position of having to make a choice between degrees of immorality, for let the record clearly show that I support the position the President has taken in regard to atmospheric testing. I reluctantly support it, as I know he reluctantly reached his decision. I sadly support it, as I know he was sad when, after the evidence was presented to him, he felt it necessary, in fulfillment of his trust to the Nation, to announce to all the world that unless a workable understanding could be reached with Russia in regard to ending all atmospheric tests in the future, it would be necessary for him to authorize atmosphere testing, although highly limited in scope, by our country. The last part of the President's program is very easily overlooked by many persons; but again it should be said, as some of us have said before, that the President is not proposing wide-open atmospheric testing. He is acting on the basis of an accumulation of evidence, which has been submitted to him as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of our country, regarding what was accomplished by the Russians when they broke faith and engaged in the ignominious deception practiced upon the group meeting at Geneva for the purpose of trying to reach some agreement on nuclear weapons testing. Nevertheless, even while they were meeting, the Russians were preparing their bombs for atmospheric testing—preparations which required a minimum of 30 days for any bomb they would test, and for the larger ones—and most of them were larger—required from 90 to 120 days.

To some of my friends who find it most difficult to believe that the leaders of any government, such as Russia, could possibly be as amoral as they demonstrated themselves to be at the Geneva conference in regard to nuclear testing, I say that it is only necessary to consider the evidence. The Russian delegates sat for weeks in that international conference, complete deceivers, planning—even while they pretended to be trying to work out such an arrangement—again to endanger mankind by engaging in atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons.

All I can say in a public address such as this is that I am satisfied, as the President has tried to make clear, by the use of language which I think so clear that those who read cannot possibly misunderstand, that the evidence clearly shows that in their last atmospheric testing the Russians made great headway in regard to perfecting the delivery of nuclear warheads.

We do not know how much progress they made in regard to the development of an antimissile missile. But again all we can do as members of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I understand the same is true insofar as the briefings received by members of the Armed Services Committee are concerned—is to operate as jurors on the evidence submitted to us when we come to pass judgment in regard to the policy to be established. That evidence left no room for doubt in my mind, and I know of not one member of the Foreign Relations Committee who does not share with me this point of view. I think this is one point on which there is complete unanimity—as there is, to the surprise of many persons, but not to the surprise of those of us who serve on the committee, on most of the issues which come to the Foreign Relations Committee, once its members receive briefings by the experts, scientists, and diplomats who bring to that committee information which, for security reasons, cannot be brought to the country as a whole——

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGee in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am impressed by the Senator's statement that generally there is unanimity of opinion among the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, after they are briefed—presumably by officials from the executive departments, including, no doubt, the State Department. Does the Senator from Oregon mean to imply that, after they receive such briefings, members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are generally in accord in regard to, and that they thoroughly support, the recommendations and policies of the State Department?

Mr. MORSE. No. The votes taken in the committee show that, when the members of the committee come to decide on a legislative course or policy to be recommended by the committee to the Senate, time and time again they find themselves unanimous, or with only a small number of minority votes.

I am proud to say to the Senator from Idaho that in the Foreign Relations Committee I never think of the Democratic or Republican side of the committee table, and I do not think any of my colleagues do; but there is general recognition that there is a common trust in that committee to make a determination based on where the facts lead. Very often, on both sides of the table, we find ourselves practically unanimous in our opposition to a recommendation, as well as practically unanimous in support of a recommendation.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will thet Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure the Senator's mail from back home, as is true of mine, is extremely critical of some of the policies and programs sponsored by the State Department, particularly in handling the aid program and in operating measures in South America, for example, where the Senator from Oregon is vitally interested. I wonder if, in such cases, the Senator's committee takes any steps involving remedial action to correct what may be abuses or ineptitude on the part of the State Department.

Mr. MORSE. Time and time again we have done so. At the present time we are completing our hearings in regard to the authorization bill for mutual security. Time after time an overwhelming majority, or sometimes all of us, have found ourselves in disagreement with some suggestions that have been made, or in agreement on the need for modifying them.

I am proud of the Foreign Relations Committee's part in modifying some of the foreign policies as they have come before the committee in both Democratic and Republican administrations.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Of course, that is logical procedure, because the State Department is largely dominated, not by the Secretary of State, but by so-called career professional personnel, who make the contacts and formulate the policies after considering the developments in various countries abroad. In those circumstances it is natural that partisanship should be missing in the deliberations and activities and policies outlined by the State Department.

Mr. MORSE. There is no doubt that the administrative officers of the State Department, the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, and the various Assistant Secretaries of State, must rely very heavily for their information upon our embassies and missions abroad; but let me say to the Senator from Idaho that I think we have reason to be very proud of the valued judgments which the administrative officers have made, at least under all the administrations in the 18 years I have been a Member of the Senate.

Many persons have the false notion that policies in the State Department are not subject to the precious protection that the American people are entitled to, which we know as the system of checks. I happen to know that time and time again the Secretary of State has opposed and rejected proposals made to him by foreign missions or embassies or subordinates in the State Department.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I know the Senator from Oregon has made many inspection tours in Latin American countries. In view of the extensive commitments made last year by the United States to support, during the next decade, the Alliance for Progress program to bring greater security to the underdeveloped countries of South America, I am wondering whether the Senator has sensed any lack of understanding on the part of our personnel in the embassies and the various agencies of the executive department which are supervising the aid program in South America, particularly insofar as self-help and cooperative features inherent in the program are concerned.

Mr. MORSE. No. My answer must be in the negative. By and large, our Foreign Service officers and our officials in embassies in Latin America are not only dedicated public servants, but are very able. Some of the very best help we have had in evaluating proposals in some of the Latin American countries for assistance has come from our embassies, both prior to the Alliance for Progress program and now under the program. A good many caveats, a good many warnings, a good many suggestions for changes being made in proposals made by Latin American countries, have come from some of our embassies themselves.

Of course, there cannot be such a far-flung organization as our Foreign Service without having persons in it from time to time follow a course of action where the composite judgment is bad. It has always been so, and will always be so, in an organization composed of human beings. We have all been pained in recent days to learn it is possible in domestic affairs, as was the case in the Department of Agriculture, that a few public officials may not have lived up to the highest standards we are entitled to expect from a public servant. I was not surprised to see the Secretary of Agriculture lose no time in eliminating from the service that type of person.

I do not hold to the point of view that the American people have not been receiving very high level and dedicated service from our Foreign Service people.

I happen to believe in a career Foreign Service corps with checks in it. It is a good thing to have a considerable number of noncareer ambassadors. It is a good thing to have a good many of our missions composed, not entirely of career service people, but of persons taken from a cross section of American life.

I shall not go into the subject now, but I intend later to discuss at some length in the Senate, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America, the fact that the most important technical assistance that has been rendered for years in Latin America has been the technical assistance provided by American businessmen. The technical assistance provided by American businessmen, both in quantity and quality, has been far superior to any Government program we have been able to inaugurate thus far. Having raised the question, I think I ought to document it with at least one example.

I made a video tape yesterday on a subject matter I shall discuss later in my speech. It was one of these roundtable give-and-take affairs. This subject matter came up in respect to our technical assistance program to Latin America. I pointed out that the story is not known as to how long a great technical assistance program has been going on in Latin America on the part of American business concerns.

On that telecast I said, "Let us consider the work of the McGee Construction Co. of Ohio." Who knows about the technical assistance it has rendered in Latin America? I can cite two of its great pieces of construction, and they are only two of many: the great steel plant of the Argentine and the great steel plant of Brazil. How many people know that those steel plants now are being operated, so far as supervisory staff is concerned, by the people of those countries for the most part? Of course, that is even more true with respect to those below the supervisory staff. From the foreman level up 90 percent plus of the supervisory staff members the employees come from the indigenous population. It took the people who built the plant and invested in the plant a long time to provide the technical assistance which made it possible to turn the operation of those plants over to the Brazilians and to the people of Argentina. In my judgment that is the most worthwhile type of technical assistance. I could cite legions of examples.

It was interesting to note, as I went through Latin America and talked to American businessmen, their reactions. As the Senator knows, in all principal cities there are U.S. Chamber of Commerce groups, composed of American businessmen who operate in the area.

I have always been pleased to find very little criticism from those men in regard to our Embassy staffs and in regard to our Government policies in relation to American businessmen in Latin America. They have many suggestions for improved policy. Always they will have those. But one does not run into criticism of efficiency, of cooperation, and of high standards of our personnel.

I am in favor of a career service, with a check upon it by having people out of the career service participate in it to a degree, yet I look at foreign service personnel of some of our allies. Let the record be perfectly clear. I do not wish to substitute the British system for the American system. I do not wish to substitute the Canadian system for the American system. I only wish to learn from them the lessons of value they can teach us.

As the Senator knows, those are out-and-out career services, by and large. There are a few exceptions. One who good-naturedly refers to himself—and I refer to Her Majesty's Ambassador in Washington, D.C., at the present time—says he is not a career servant; but he is a pretty able one. He climbed up the political ladder in Great Britain. By and large the embassies are operated by men who, as young men, went into the career service and were trained in diplomacy.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Last November I was a member of a senatorial group which made an inspection tour of South American countries. I recall that in every large city there was a group with whom we did confer, the so-called American chambers of commerce, to receive suggestions, advice, and complaints if there were any.

As I remember the trip, there was probably a quite limited criticism of the operation of our Embassy offices in the various countries. However, I recall there was very much alarm and apprehension in regard to the hostility which was becoming more apparent on the part of some of the governments in Latin American countries. Some of the governments were proposing punitive tax measures. Expropriation of American business properties was occurring.

While it was the general consensus of the members of the American business community that every cooperative effort should be made to help develop those countries and to stabilize their economies, there was an apparent concern and doubt in regard to whether the American businessman could accomplish much toward bringing greater stability to those countries.

Does the Senator recognize the threat of expropriation in those countries?

Mr. MORSE. There was a great deal of concern about it in the Committee on Foreign Relations. In fact, the committee discussed it as recently as day before yesterday with State Department officials.

It happened to be my responsibility to ask for it, but as chairman of the subcommittee I asked for the preparation of a detailed memorandum, to be followed by a conference, in respect to the problem in Brazil, about which we have all been hearing or reading so much in the newspapers. We will get that detailed memorandum, and we will be briefed in respect to what steps are being taken by way of negotiations in respect to the problem.

This is one of the most troublesome of all the issues confronting us in Latin America. I shall comment upon it very briefly.

The Senator may recall that in 1960 the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I filed a report with the Senate in respect to what our policy should be in connection with the so-called government monopolies which are being operated by various countries; such as Mexico, in respect to oil; Brazil, in respect to oil; and at one time the Argentine—and they may get back into it, for who knows what will happen?

One of the great dangers which confronts us is the successful propaganda of the Communists that if we seek to influence the Latin American countries against government monopolies we are seeking to participate in economic intervention. It is true that in many places in Latin America the leaders are as much concerned about economic intervention as they are concerned about military intervention. We must find some balance.

I happen to be one who is opposed to nationalization of industry, yet I would be less than honest if I did not frankly recognize that if some foreign country wishes to nationalize its industry it has a sovereign right to do so.

The question is, If it involves American property, what will be done diplomatically to see to it that adequate compensation—and I underline the word "adequate"—is paid for the property which is expropriated.

I have no knowledge in regard to the progress which has been made in connection with the Brazilian incident. I am confident, if they go ahead with the program of taking over the utilities involved, that there is no question about the position our Government will take; that is, compensation will have to be adequate.

I am a strong believer in that. I shall have something to say before I finish in respect to certain Latin American problems which relate to it.

I now wish to finish the part of my speech which deals with disarmament.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator leaves the Latin American part of his speech—and particularly the colloquy between him and the distinguished Senator from Idaho—I wonder if he will yield to me for a question.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator discussed the bipartisanship or nonpartisanship approach which the Foreign Relations Committee uniformly takes toward measures. The Senator recalls, I am sure, that the late distinguished Senator from Michigan to whom he referred, Senator Vandenberg, who was a very able member and a very able chairman of that committee, used to refer to it as "unpartisanship."

He took the viewpoint that there should be no partisanship whatsoever. In other words, he distinguished even as against the term "bipartisan," because he wanted it to be absolutely unpartisan.

Is it not the feeling of the Senator from Oregon that during all those years, particularly since shortly after the end of World War II, when Senator Vandenberg exercised such great leadership in bringing about this nonpartisan feeling, the Committee on Foreign Relations has acted in that respect with reference to all questions before it?

Mr. MORSE. There is no doubt of it. The leadership of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], our present chairman, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is the ranking Democrat on the committee next to the chairman, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who are the ranking Republicans on the committee—and I shall say something further about them in a moment—has given us the assurance that in the committee we shall follow the Vandenberg policy of what the Senator has referred to as "unpartisanship," and which I refer to as "nonpartisanship."

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield to me further, I would particularly like to call to the attention of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] a point of which he knows, I am sure, but one that is pertinent at this time. The Senator from Oregon has talked about some of the various forces that play upon the final determination of an issue involving our international relations with any particular country.

The Senator from Oregon omitted one particular force. It is something that I think has played a very great part in international relations over the last several years. That has been the frequent consultation between the executive branch—sometimes the President and sometimes the Secretary of State—and the Foreign Relations Committee, and particularly the subcommittees of that committee that serve geographical areas. Elaborating upon that subject, there is a pulling in of congressional representation in connection with international conferences.

I remember when the OAS Conference was held at Punta del Este in connection with the Cuban situation. The distinguished Senator from Oregon, as chairman of the Latin American subcommittee, and the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who was the ranking Republican member of that subcommittee, were invited from the Senate to accompany the Secretary of State. The delegation that went there included two Representatives from the House. They were my colleague from Alabama, Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR., who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the House of Representatives, and Representative CHESTER E. MERROW, from New Hampshire, who is the ranking Republican on that committee. The four of them went down to Punta del Este. I was particularly interested in the reports that came back to this country during the time of that Conference.

I do not know whether the point has been called to the attention of the Senator from Oregon, but from time to time during the course of that conference we received reports that the delegation had exercised a great influence on that conference. I had the pleasure of being at the White House when the delegation returned. I heard the President pay his respect to the work that had been done down there. He called the names of the four congressional representatives who went to that conference and paid his respects to the work that they had done.

Later, when Secretary of State Rusk was making his remarks, he likewise called the names of the four representatives and mentioned what they had accomplished. At times the part that has been played by the fine cooperation and coordination between the executive and legislative branches of our Government has been overlooked.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to have the comments of the Senator from Alabama. I wish to say a word about my Republican colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee. As the Senator knows, the ranking Republican member of that committee and, when the Republicans controlled Congress, the chairman of the committee, is the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Many times when we have had rather vigorous discussion in the committee, the Senator from Alabama has heard him say, "Will someone tell me what is in the best interests of our country?"

That is the only thing that counts. It is the attitude that the Senator from Wisconsin has taken as the ranking Republican member of the committee. He richly deserves the high commendation that I now give him.

I should like to refer to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is the ranking Republican member of my Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. The Senator from Iowa would be the first to agree with me that on a great many domestic issues he and I do not always vote the same in the Senate. I suppose the majority of times we do not vote together. But it has been a thrilling experience to serve with him over the years on the committee designated to examine Latin American problems. We were joint delegates to the Bogotá Conference in 1960 that brought out the Act of Bogotá, which was really the forerunner of Punta del Este and the Alliance for Progress program. It was really the forerunner of the increasing acceptance on the part of the Latin American countries—at least their governments—of the essentiality of self-help programs on their part if they are going to expect the American people to help them further.

I wish to pay my very high tribute to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] because he, too, asked the question, What do the facts show the public interest to be? It is in that spirit that we have worked cooperatively in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, before the colloquy I had with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I was discussing the paradoxical situation in which we find ourselves in respect to the resumption of atmospheric testing. I had made the point that we must make the choice among degrees of immorality. That is difficult. I have made clear that I support the President's program for the resumption of limited atmospheric testing if the Russians are not willing to accept an enforceable control system. Every indication is that they are not. I had already made the point that while we were negotiating in good faith at Geneva, the Russians were obviously negotiating in bad faith and shocking deception, because at the very time they were negotiating, they were preparing their bombs for testing.

I had made the point that atmospheric nuclear testing is immoral if we are to evaluate the question from the standpoint of its effects upon mankind. It is pretty shocking to sit and listen to the scientists tell us what fallout is bound to do to the human organism, although scientists dispute among themselves as to the degree of damage the fallout will cause. I have never talked with one of them who, when pressed under cross-examination, was not willing to admit that it would be much better for mankind if none of the damage were done.

Atmospheric testing is immoral, in my judgment, but there is another thing more immoral connected with the nuclear issue. It would be so much more immoral for the Government of the United States and the people of the United States to make the mistake of not keeping themselves in a position where Khrushchev would understand that he has everything to lose and nothing to gain by all-out nuclear war. If we let him get such a lead, then my major premise, to which I referred earlier in my speech, might go into effect and have application. I repeat it. That major premise is that if the Communist segment of the world ever thinks that if the Communist segment of the world ever thinks that the Western Powers, particularly the United States, are permitting themselves to get into such a weakened defense position that the Russians can knock them out quickly in a nuclear war, and survive themselves, they would try that step.

Therefore, wrestling as one does with his conscience in this matter and communing with one's God—and I offer no apology for saying that—I have had no hesitancy in reaching the conclusion that the President should and must be supported.

I am very happy to note that the American people by and large recognize that fact. At the same time, as a religious people we feel that in some way, somehow, reason will come to prevail in the Russian minds and that they will be willing to sit down with us and negotiate the kind of disarmament agreement the President so nobly and eloquently presented once again to the American people yesterday.

That is my general position on disarmament. I am pleased to give my support to the Senator from Minnesota, who honors me with his presence as acting majority leader this afternoon, and to say to him once again that I believe the speech he made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon is a speech that not only the American people will have to come back to time and time again, but is also a speech the premises of which must be accepted by the leaders of the nations of the world if we are to leave to our grandchildren the heritage of freedom to which I have referred.

Some say to me, "Mr. Senator, you keep on saying that we have got to do this to buy time."

Some, not so kind, have said to me, "Mr. Senator, you keep saying that we have got to have more time, but will you tell us how much time we can risk?"

I cannot answer that question, other than to say that, so long as there is hope, no other course is open to us.

I cannot imagine our making the mistake of changing this course of action which is giving so much hope to so many millions of people in the so-called weaker countries. They themselves recognize the fact that their hope for survival is for the United States, eventually with our Western allies, to lead the nations of the world to an enforceable disarmament agreement.

Once in a while I hear critics of the United Nations deplore the fact that many much smaller nations and much more underdeveloped nations than the United States have an equal voice in the United Nations with the United States. They seem to think that some great danger lurks in that fact.

I have sat in the United Nations. I wish to say that in the General Assembly the doctrine of equality, as far as votes are concerned, is one of our great strengths. I am not one of those who would give to the militarily mighty in the United Nations a greater voice than I would to smaller nations. I have seen those smaller nations operate. They recognize that their only hope for survival is putting into international practice the ideals of a Roosevelt and a Vandenberg and the program of a Truman.

We have a cause that stands upon its merits. When we talk on these international problems in the United Nations, we do not have to worry about the acceptability of the merits of our case.

I sat there during the session when Khrushchev came to the United Nations in a rage, because he had to leave the Congo or be thrown out by the United Nations. The great Dag Hammarskjold made perfectly clear to the Russians, when they were trying to move into the Congo, that unless they moved out they would be moved out. I have always thought that that was one of the main reasons for Khrushchev's high state of rage when he came to New York and made for the first time his troika proposal which attempted to hamstring the effectiveness of the General Assembly.

I close this section of my speech by saying that I want the Record to show that I support the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], and give full and complete support to the President of the United States in regard to his program both in the field of testing and in the field of disarmament.

There are other developments in American foreign policy that concern me very much in these hours. So I close my speech with the last section, which deals with some problems of Latin America. I speak in the capacity of my chairmanship of the subcommittee that deals with Latin American affairs.

There are thousands of Cuban exiles in the United States. No one could give greater support to their admission to the United States than the senior Senator from Oregon. In keeping with the spirit of the words engraved on the Statue of Liberty, we once again open our doors to the oppressed. We have become a great refuge and escape asylum for them. I am proud of it as an American. I am in favor of continuing to give them this haven of security. However, I speak most respectfully when I say that they, too, have responsibilities and obligations, which they in turn owe to the United States. Therefore, I am concerned when I pick up the New York Times and read a headline: "Ex-Castro Officers Build Force in the United States."

The article reads, in part:

> Washington, April 18.—A compact guerrilla force built around former officers of Premier Fidel Castro's army is being organized in Florida and Puerto Rico for eventual action against the Cuban regime.
>
> According to Cuban informants, this force has been in preparation since last summer and may soon be ready for action.
>
> Its aim is to enter Cuba and engage in guerrilla operations at an opportune time—possibly if local uprisings occur as a result of the deterioration of the island's economic and political situation.
>
> The group's recruiting headquarters is in Miami, and most of its training is conducted in Florida on an individual basis. The new guerrilla force has no direct connections, however, with the U.S. Government.
>
> The bulk of this force is made up of officers and men who were prevented for political reasons from participating in the rebel invasion of Cuba a year ago yesterday. The Central Intelligence Agency was in charge of that invasion attempt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ex-Castro Officers Build Force in United States

Washington, April 18.—A compact guerrilla force built around former officers of Premier Fidel Castro's army is being organized in Florida and Puerto Rico for eventual action against the Cuban regime.

According to Cuban informants, this force has been in preparation since last summer and may soon be ready for action.

Its aim is to enter Cuba and engage in guerrilla operations at an opportune time—possibly if local uprisings occur as a result of the deterioration of the island's economic and political situation.

The group's recruiting headquarters is in Miami and most of its training is conducted in Florida on an individual basis. The new guerrilla force has no direct connections, however, with the U.S. Government.

The bulk of this force is made up of officers and men who were prevented for political reasons from participating in the rebel invasion of Cuba a year ago yesterday. The Central Intelligence Agency was in charge of that invasion attempt.

The objection against these men last year was that although they were violently anti-Communist and anti-Castro, they favored certain aspects of the Cuban social revolution. Many of them had broken out of Cuban prisons to reach the United States.

A large segment of the new force is made up of men identified with the People's Revolutionary Movement. This movement is headed by Manuel Ray, who, during the 1961 invasion, belonged to the Cuban Revolutionary Council. The abortive attack was staged in the name of this council.

However, an estimated total of 170 volunteers from the Revolutionary Movement were kept out of the invasion force after arriving at the staging area in Guatemala. Others were kept in Miami.

ALL-CUBAN OPERATION

The basic concept of the new guerrilla group is that all anti-Castro activities should be conducted and directed by Cubans and not by U.S. citizens. For the time being the only desire of these Cubans is that the United States grant them freedom of movement to aid them at a later stage, should the need arise.

Recently, informants said, Col. Ramon Barquin, a Cuban regular army officer and formerly military adviser to Señor Ray, agreed to head the new force.

Colonel Barquin, who now lives in Puerto Rico, where he operates a boys' military academy, has just finished a lecture tour of South America.

His top aids are reported to be Col. Martin Helena, who was chief of staff of the 1961 invasion army until he was deposed by a rightwing revolt in the Guatemala training camps, and Capt. José Lopes Legon, who was head of the movement's military camp in Florida.

Another contingent participating in the new force is the so-called Huber Matos Garrison group. This force is made up of officers of Premier Castro's "Rebel Army"—the official name of the Cuban military establishment—who served under Maj. Huber Matos in Camaguey Province in 1959.

At that time, Major Matos tried to resign his post in protest against the Communist infiltration in the army. He was arrested by Dr. Castro and sentenced to 30 years in prison.

OFFICERS ESCAPED

Most of his officers were jailed, but succeeded in fleeing to Miami in 1960. Although they offered their services to the invasion army, they were kept out, reportedly on orders of the CIA. Their leader is Capt. Napoleon Becker.

The main advantages of the new group are that most of the members have guerrilla experience and that they have acquaintances among the officers in Dr. Castro's rebel army in Cuba.

Intelligence reports have indicated that numerous officers and men in the Cuban army—and even in the militia—are in sympathy with anti-Castro movements. But the reports say they must be given to join the ranks of an active opposition.

The new guerrilla group rules out political ties with any Cuban refugee group and plans to operate primarily as a military entity. Some of its men are civilian underground specialists in sabotage.

CASTRO FOE SLAIN

Key West, Fla., April 18.—Havana radio said today that Premier Castro's force had shot down a counterrevolutionary in an abortive attempt that was made under instructions from U.S. Intelligence Agency agents at the Guantanamo Naval Base.

The announcement of the death of the counterrevolutionary, Heriberto Rodriguez Pena, followed a report by the Havana radio that anti-Castro elements had taken refuge at the U.S. Naval Base and were agitating for weapons to fight the Cuban Government.

The Rodriguez case is the second official report in as many days of action against counterrevolutionaries.

The Havana broadcast said Señor Rodriguez was shot several days ago in Santiago

> de Cuba. The city is an important port about 40 miles southwest of Guantanamo Bay.
>
> Yesterday the radio reported the slaying of Osvaldo Ramirez Garcia, a top counterrevolutionary who was reported to have been active against the Castro regime since mid-1959.
>
> FREED PRISONERS ARRIVE HERE
>
> Seven Cuban prisoners arrived at New York International Airport yesterday and made an emotional appeal for funds to liberate the 1,119 prisoners still being held by Premier Castro.
>
> About 300 persons, some of them relatives of the prisoners, cheered the men as they stepped off a plane from Miami. The greeters shouted in Spanish, "Long live free Cuba" and "Down with communism."
>
> All seven prisoners had been seriously wounded or sick, and some were on crutches.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have checked with the State Department, as was my duty upon a reading of that article. I have been assured that there is no U.S. involvement in or knowledge of such training operations in Florida. I made is perfectly clear that I intended to make a statement today in regard to whatever response I got from the State Department. I am satisfied that the State Department is dealing with me forthrightly, accurately, and honestly concerning this subject. Therefore, I have made this statement.

But in the April 19 issue of the Washington Star, I read another item which disturbs me. The dateline is "San Juan, P.R., April 19," and the article reads as follows:

> A Cuban exile leader, Col. Ramon Barquin, called last night for the use of U.S. Marines to liberate Cuba from Fidel Castro's Red regime.
>
> Mr. Barquin, onetime Cuban military attaché in Washington, told newsmen that Marines had been used in Latin American nations in the past and should be employed to free his country.
>
> He made his remarks after returning from a 2-day trip to Miami, where it was reported he had conferred with heads of the People's Revolutionary Movement on plans for possible anti-Castro warfare.

Yesterday afternoon the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], participated with me—and I referred to the incident earlier in my speech—in the making of a video tape to be shown later in respect to an article written by the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín, and to be published in the May issue of Reader's Digest. I speak for myself when I say I was a little surprised in that program to find the undertone—and not too much of an undertone—that perhaps the time had come when there ought to be participation by the United States in some kind of invasion of Cuba. I felt that a distinguished Cuban exile who participated with us in the program did not speak out against such a proposal as I think Cuban exile leaders should speak out.

Delicate as this subject is, I feel that it is my duty, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, to reject and repudiate any thought or proposal of U.S. invasion of Cuba. I have some right to speak on this subject, because I led the fight in this body some years ago against U.S. support of Batista. It was the public hearings held by my subcommittee in January 1958, as the RECORD will show, that brought out the admission by the State Department that Batista could not remain in power without U.S. military aid. We who knew anything about Latin America knew that that was true. Some of us had for some time dared to challenge such aid by this country. Some of our problems in Latin America have been caused by too much exportation of bullets rather than bread to that area of the world. Many of the problems in Latin America have been caused by the American military interventions of the past, and we have been decades in living it down. Only in recent years has there developed a better understanding of what was meant when Franklin Roosevelt initiated the good-neighbor policy.

But the fear by Latin America of American military intervention has plagued us for decades. I think we must make it crystal clear at this hour that Cuban exile leaders, who, in my judgment, are betraying the obligation they owe their sanctuary, are presenting propaganda that is no part of American foreign policy. Yet I am concerned at how many persons seem to think—for I get their letters—that the way to handle Castro is to go in and conquer his country with American military might.

I say I have the right to speak on this subject because not only did I lead the fight in this body against the Batista regime, but I was the first, and the first for some time, to speak out against Castro, because it was clear to me almost from the beginning that Castro was adopting totalitarian procedures—and I judge a government by its procedures. The procedures of a government determine whether people are free. Governments can have the finest sounding constitutions; but unless those constitutions are implemented by procedures which guarantee freedom, they become but scraps of paper. We all know that the problem of implanting freedom in Latin America is a long-pull proposition. It will not be possible to press any button, whether it is for the Alliance for Progresss program or any other type of program, and have freedom in Latin America overnight.

What must be made crystal clear to Latin America and the rest of the world at all times is that the United States has no intention of violating its treaty obligations; has no intention of conducting a unilateral military action anywhere in Latin America, including Cuba; but does have the intention of carrying out its share of the joint responsibilities under the charter of this hemisphere, the Charter of the Organization of American States. That was the purpose of Punta del Este. That was the purpose of the council meeting of the Organization of American States in Washington a few weeks ago, following Punta del Este. The time has come to make it perfectly clear to the Cuban leaders who are in exile in the United States that this country is no place for them to stir up, by way of their propaganda—a considerable amount of which, upon checking, is found to be false—a public opinion which would seek to lead our Government into unilateral military action in Cuba.

No one could hate the Communist regime of Castro or any other Communist regime more than I do; but it is my view that if we participate in exporting freedom under the Alliance for Progress program, political freedom will take root in Latin America, and Latin America will gradually become a haven of economic and political freedom for the mass of the people there, and communism in Cuba will rot on the political vine.

In passing, Mr. President, we should note what some of the inevitable results of unilateral action by our country would be. I am convinced that there is no danger of it, for any administration in our country would make a colossal mistake if it let the Cuban exile propagandists lead us into military action in Cuba.

First, Mr. President, let me make clear that if any aggressive course of action were to be taken against the United States by Cuba or, through Cuba, by Russia, Red China, or any of the other members of the Communist bloc, there would be no question as to what our position then would be. However, there is a great deal of difference between being a defender against aggression and becoming an aggressor, regardless of the nature of the political sovereignty against which a country engaged in such aggression, whether it be Communist, Fascist, or of some other political ideology. The Cuban exile leaders who are advocating an American invasion of Cuba are proposing that the United States become an aggressor, in violation of all its treaty commitments—those under the OAS Treaty, the Rio Treaty, the Caracas Treaty, and the other treaties to which our Nation's signature has been affixed.

Mr. President, not one more hour should be allowed to pass without our registering a protest, here in the Senate, against the propaganda activities in this country by some of the Cuban exile leaders. But such activities are not limited to the Cuban exile leaders.

Yesterday, there was submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a statement by the Honorable Spruille Braden, a member of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee. I wish to comment briefly on it, because I want the RECORD to leave no room for doubt that I reject and repudiate the major premises of his statement. If our country ever were to follow the foreign policy advocated by Mr. Braden in that statement, we would overnight, lose our friends around the world, for his statement cannot be reconciled with the glorious foreign-policy record of our country—a foreign policy based upon defense of our rights, but not based upon aggressive action. In a moment I shall refer in detail to his statement; but, first, let me point out what the newspapers yesterday and today have stated about it.

I read the following from the Washington Star of yesterday:

BRADEN URGES CUBA INVASION

Spruille Braden, a former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba, said today an invasion by U.S. military forces is the only way to rid the Caribbean country of communism.

"If we wipe out the Communists in Cuba," Mr. Braden said, "they will fail everywhere else in the Americas."

Mr. Braden told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in a prepared statement that approval of President Kennedy's 10-year, $20 billion Alliance for Progress program of aid to Latin American countries would be "a criminal waste of the taxpayers' money."

"The first, imperative, and for the moment the only thing to do," he said, "is immediately and quickly to drive communism out of Cuba and then out of the rest of the hemisphere, including our own country.

That is completely irresponsible talk by Mr. Braden.

I read further from the article:

URGES FULL ATTACK

Mr. Braden continued: "The only way to rid that island of Soviet domination and Communist control, not to mention Castro, is to give our leadership and with our patriotic and courageous Cuban and other Latin American friends to organize an all-out invasion by the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marines."

In addition to his Cuban assignment, Mr. Braden has been Ambassador to Colombia and Argentina and was Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs in the Truman administration. He made his statement to the committee as a member of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

Mr. President, the rest of the article does not deal with Mr. Braden, so I shall not read it now. But so there may be no question about the accuracy of my reporting, I ask that the remainder of the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER ASKS CUT

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce recommended today a $1,088,100,000 cut in President Kennedy's $4,878,500,000 foreign aid program in earlier testimony.

Its spokesman, John O. Teeter, of New York, asked, in addition to the slash a concerted effort "to strengthen the role of private enterprise" in underdeveloped countries and more effective action to coordinate worldwide programs to stop duplication and waste.

Mr. Teeter, vice president of Pfizer International, Inc., was among a score of witnesses invited to appear for the committee's final day of hearings on the foreign aid authorization measure, on which the committee will start voting next week.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the purpose of additional emphasis, I call special attention to one paragraph of Mr. Braden's statement. On page 8 of his statement, as submitted to the committee, he said:

> If we wipe out the Communists in Cuba, they will fail everywhere else in the Americas. The only way to rid that island of Soviet domination and Communist control, not to mention Castro, is to give our leadership and with our patriotic and courageous Cuban and other Latin friends to organize an all-out invasion by the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marines.

Mr. President, let us consider for a moment that hypothesis. Let us assume that utter madness overcame our judgment, and that as madmen we followed such a course of action. What would be our justification in terms of international law, or in light of our commitments under the OAS Charter and under the Rio Treaty, the Caracas Treaty, and the other treaties to which we are signatory; and what would be our answer in the United Nations when a resolution of condemnation was introduced, and when it was asserted that we had violated treaty after treaty under which we had pledged ourselves to follow a nonaggressive course of action?

The Braden philosophy—and let me say it is held by too many persons in this country—is the philosophy of a return to the point of view that might makes right. It never has, and never will.

I am satisfied that the information I have received in my capacity as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee is correct when I have been told by our military and other experts that an attempt at such an invasion in its early stages would cost a minimum of 40,000 lives of American boys.

When the cause is just and right, there is no question of what the American people and the American military will do by way of sacrifice; but my answer to Mr. Braden is that he could not possibly justify in the pages of American history a sacrifice of a minimum of 40,000 lives of American boys, in the early stages of the invasion, when that cause would be unjust and wrong so far as American foreign policy is concerned.

I think the time has come when we no longer can take in silence the insidious and invidious propaganda program going on in our country to sell the American people the proposition that we ought to seize Cuba.

In closing, let me say that we can seize Cuba. But there would be sacrifices that cannot be justified in such a course of action, which would go down in history as international outlawry. And would we be ready, Mr. President, to face the consequences in the rest of Latin America? Would we be ready to lose the support of the masses of the people of Latin America for decades? Would we be ready to face the great crisis that would mount as one government after another toppled in Latin America?

The Bradens and their ilk are strengthening the Communist cause in Latin America by the irresponsible sponsorship of an aggressive course of action on the part of the United States of America against Cuba. I recommend the prevailing American foreign policy in Latin America. It is a policy of statesmanship and reality. It is a policy of keeping faith with our ideals and being true to the signature we have affixed to one treaty after another in Latin America. It is a policy whereby we say, in furthering the Roosevelt and the Truman good neighbor policy, the Eisenhower people-to-people policy, the Kennedy Alliance for Progress policy, "We seek to be partners with you in the cause of establishing a system of economic freedom for the masses of the people of Latin America, out of which will develop political freedom and all the precious rights of individual freedom and dignity that men and women should enjoy."

The Punta del Este conference, in effect, quarantined Cuba. The Punta del Este conference in effect laid the foundation for the implementation of the Punta del Este program throughout the rest of the hemisphere. The Punta del Este conference was a pledge by the free nations of the American States to work jointly together to resist the spread of Castro communism, which we all know is fed and nurtured by the Marxist-Leninist line as set forth in Russia. But the Punta del Este conference did not advocate war. The Punta del Este conference made perfectly clear, Mr. President, that the way to peace in the Western Hemisphere is not by way of war.

I have all the sympathy that one could have for the patriots of Cuba who have fled Cuba to the United States, but I close by saying to their leaders, "In my judgment, you are not true to your obligations under the sanctuary granted you when you seek to use American soil as a propaganda platform to encourage the United States to follow a foreign policy course of action which is foreign to our ideals and inconsistent with our glorious history."

I hope, Mr. President, I have made myself unequivocally clear that, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin-American Relations, I shall continue to do all that I can to implement the Alliance for Progress program, and I shall continue to stand out against those who aid and abet communism in Latin America, however unwillingly and unknowingly, by advocating American unilateral military action against Cuba.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

GOVERNOR EGAN'S CORRECT COURSE IN SEIZING JAPANESE FISHING VESSELS IN ALASKAN WATERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, upon the initiative of Gov. William A. Egan, of Alaska, the State of Alaska has seized two Japanese fishing boats that were fishing in Shelikof Strait, located between Kodiak Island and the Alaskan mainland.

The invasion of Alaska's fishing grounds by foreign vessels—Japanese and Russian—in recent months has been a very sore point with the people of Alaska. The fisheries—salmon, halibut, herring, king crab—have been and are Alaska's principal economic resource and industry. The economy of Alaska's long Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea coastlines, with their numerous communities from Ketchikan at the lower end of the Panhandle to Bristol Bay, depends upon it. It is the livelihood, directly or indirectly, of all the people who live there—and the overwhelming majority of Alaska's communities is coastal.

My reason for taking the floor on this subject is because of what I consider to be the mistaken views and assumptions expressed in an editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Wednesday, April 18, which was highly critical of Governor Egan's action. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA ON ITS OWN

Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska apparently needs to be reminded that Alaska joined the Union and did not become an independent nation. His seizure of two fishing vessels during the last few days in Shelikof Strait and the arrest of the captain of another Japanese boat on charges of fishing without a license were undertaken without the advice or consent of the State Department. The Governor took upon himself the responsibility for creating an international incident that appears to be beyond his jurisdiction.

In defense of his action Governor Egan contends that Shelikof Strait between the Alaska Peninsula and Kodiak Island is an inland body of water. But this seems to be in conflict with the view of the Department of State. The Government has asserted no claim that this Strait, which varies in width from 21 to 30 miles, constitutes inland waters, and it would doubtless be very difficult to get such a claim recognized if it did so. Of course, Alaska has no standing to assert independent claims on questions of this sort.

The State does have authority, under an act of Congress, to control fishing off its shores out to the traditional 3-mile limit of sovereign jurisdiction recognized by the United States. Some reports are to the effect that one boat was seized 1 mile inside these territorial waters, and the controversy over where the seizures took place may have to be settled in court. Apart from this, however, Governor Egan has handled the problem with little regard for its delicacy.

Mr. Egan did protest to the State Department against what he regarded as illegal fishing from a Japanese fleet in Shelikof Strait. Both the State and Interior Departments sent men to consult with the Governor and investigate the alleged violations. Instead of waiting until they could report their findings in Washington, Governor Egan acted against the Japanese fishermen without so much as notifying the State Department of his intention. Whatever the final outcome may be, he needs to be taught a lesson to the effect that international relations are handled by the Department of State.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is Governor's Egan's view, which I share, that he felt compelled to act because of the inability to get appropriate and timely action by the State Department.

I telephoned Governor Egan Wednesday morning to read him the Post's editorial. Governor Egan informed me, first, that in practice the waters of Shelikof Strait has always been considered Alaskan waters. He stated to me categorically that in territorial days these waters had been subjected to the regulation of the Federal agency charged with that responsibility—the Fish and Wildlife Service. Since statehood these functions have been assumed by the corresponding State agency, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

When the Japanese fishing fleet began invading these waters, Governor Egan wrote the State Department on March 30 and followed it up with a telegram on April 2. Hearing nothing, he telephoned Acting Secretary George Ball on April 9. To the Governor's surprise and consternation, Acting Secretary Ball had no inkling of the previously sent letter and telegram. At Governor Egan's insistence, the State Department sent a representative to Alaska. However, this representative said it would require some 3 weeks for him to make up his mind whether the Japanese fishing was illegal.

By that time, Governor Egan naturally feared that the Japanese boats would have secured their catch of fish and departed, or, if succeeded by other fishing vessels in the absence of any restraining action, would come into contact with Alaskan fishermen, who would be reaching these areas in their own boats, with possibly unfortunate consequences. It should be noted that our Alaskan fishermen are subject to strict regulation in the interest of conservation. Foreign vessels can and do flout those conservation regulations, and can, in a few weeks, destroy the painstaking compliance of our own fishermen, and the efforts of our regulatory agencies.

Certainly by Governor Egan's prompt action he eliminated the possibility of violence, with casualties and loss of life, which in past decades has occurred between Alaskan and Japanese fishermen in analagous circumstances.

In addition to that, it was clear that at least one of these boats, if not more, had actually been fishing within the 3-mile limit.

I would say that I had a similar experience, which may be pertinent, some months ago.

On that occasion I was informed by Governor Egan that Russian fishing vessels were in Alaskan territorial waters and that he had sent a telegram to the Secretary of State, asking the Department of State immediately to notify the Navy and the Coast Guard to send out appropriate vessels or planes in order to observe these operations and see whether they were violative of law and treaty arrangements. This took place on a Tuesday. On Thursday, wishing to satisfy myself as to what the facts were, I telephoned Admiral Caldwell at Kodiak, Alaska, commandant of the 17th Naval District and of the Alaska Sea Frontier. To my amazement, he had received no word whatever from the State Department, and my phone call was his first apprisal of the situation.

I immediately telephoned the Acting Secretary of State, but was unable to reach him for a few hours. It was only upon my very urgent insistence that I finally was able to talk to him by phone. He said he would look into the matter. Subsequently, I was informed by State Department officials that the State Department's failure to act was due to the fact that the State Department official who usually handled such matters had been on his vacation, and upon his return—thinking that Governor Egan's telegram referred to an earlier situation which had passed he had therefore done nothing.

Meanwhile, I tried to reach the Secretary of the Navy, who was out of town, and left word as to the situation, and thereupon the Navy was officially alerted.

A more favorable and, I think, a more correct view of the situation and of Governor Egan's action was taken by station WTOP, Washington, D.C., in an editorial of Wednesday evening, April 18, over both TV and radio, which editorial was repeated the morning of April 19. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The incident of the Japanese fishing boats in Shelikof Strait off the State of Alaska seems to prove one thing for sure—which is that the State Department had better make it a practice to move with somewhat more than deliberate speed in the handling of Alaskan fishing complaints.

It can be argued that Alaska's Gov. William Egan exceeded his authority when he ordered the impounding of a couple of Japanese vessels in the Shelikof Strait, which is the narrow body of water between the Alaska mainland and Kodiak Island.

But it can also be said that officialdom here in Washington might have prevented an unpleasant little episode if there had been less ponderous movement toward getting the dispute settled.

In a phone conversation with Senator Ernest Gruening, Governor Egan reported that he wrote the State Department to complain about the presence of Japanese fishing boats on March 30 and followed up with a telegram on April 2. Then, the Governor said, when he checked back with the Department on April 9, he found that little if any action had been taken. And, the Governor explained further, when a Department representative finally showed up in Alaska to see what was going on, he said he would need 3 weeks to furnish his report—by which time the fishing boats would be loaded and gone.

There seems to be considerable disagreement about the various legal implications of the presence of the Japanese fishermen in the strait. However, there is no doubt that Alaskans are genuinely disturbed about what they consider to be encroachments by Japanese—and Russians as well—in the State's territorial waters. Under these circumstances, the State Department ought to ring a loud alarm bell when and if future cries for help from Alaska are received here.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am happy to report, however, that the State Department appears now to be taking a more energetic attitude. I was informed yesterday by Secretary Ball that the prosecution in the Alaska courts will proceed without objection by the State Department and that an emphatic demand will be made of the Japanese to keep out of Shelikof Strait until a legal determination may be made as to the right—which the government of Alaska affirms—of Alaskans to consider these waters to be domestic, and not international, waters.

It is my view that Governor Egan deserves commendation for acting as and when he did. In the circumstances it was the only way to bring an intolerable situation to a head and to clarify the issues. It is my hope that the State Department will now insist vigorously on the protection of our American interests in Alaska.

I would like to say, also, that I am hopeful that the Japanese, with whom the State of Alaska is developing most useful and mutually beneficial commercial relations, will take a reasonable view of this situation and accommodate themselves to Alaska's position. We in Alaska appreciate Japan's problems. Japanese capital has, in part, financed a most useful enterprise, a pulp mill in Sitka; the Japanese are exporting Alaskan lumber and are further interested in the acquisition of various of Alaska's raw materials, minerals, oil, and other vital resources, which they lack, and which Alaska would be willing to sell. We hope that this developing commercial intercourse and an otherwise friendly relationship will not be jeopardized.

However, it is, in my opinion, the almost unanimous view of Alaskans that the invasion of our traditional Alaskan fishing grounds by foreign vessels, would be intolerable. I heartily support that view. Shelikof Strait is only one of these fishing grounds.

What really should be secured, besides an affirmation of these rights, is the extension of our fishing grounds to a 12-mile limit. The 3-mile limit is an obsolete provision dating from days when 3 miles was the approximate distance a cannonball from a shore battery could hit a hostile vessel.

I ask unanimous consent that three articles from the Anchorage Daily Times of Monday, April 16, 1962, reporting on the seizure of these Japanese vessels, be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE TAKES TWO VESSELS, ARRESTS THREE CAPTAINS

KODIAK.—A second Japanese fishing boat has been seized and the captains of three Japanese fishing vessels charged in Alaska Superior Court with poaching in Alaska waters.

The seizure of the vessels and the arrests brought immediate reaction from the Japanese Government in Tokyo. Officials there called on the U.S. Government to make a full report of the incident.

The move by Alaska State officials climaxes years of dissension over fishing by the Japanese in waters claimed by Alaska.

The seizure of Japanese fishing fleet vessels began Saturday night when Capt. E. L. Mayfield of the Alaska State Police boarded the 65-foot herring catcher *Ohtori Maru No. 5* at the mouth of Uganik Bay in Shelikof Strait.

The *Ohtori Maru*'s skipper, Tadao Higashama, was charged with fishing commercially without a license and without having registered his gear or boat. The *Ohtori Maru* was escorted to Kodiak by the Alaska State Fish and Game Department vessel *Teal* and held in lieu of $25,000 bond.

A second boat, the *Shoishi Maru No. 7* was boarded in Shelikof Strait last night and escorted to Kodiak by the Alaska Fish and Game Department vessel *Widgeon*.

The *Shoishi Maru*'s skipper, Tadashi Abe, was charged with violating Alaska's inland waters.

The 2 seized Japanese boats were part of a fleet of 5 accompanied by a 1,772-ton mother ship, the *Banshu Maru*, which has 123 people aboard. Alaska officials claim the Japanese have been taking herring in Shelikof Strait for about 2 weeks.

The *Banshu Maru*'s captain, Mongo M. Hanasaki, also was charged with fishing commercially without having notified the State.

Judge Davis, who flew to Kodiak from Anchorage yesterday, released Tadao and Hanasaki on condition they return for a later hearing.

The only casualty of the incident occurred last night when Sgt. Gerald Williams, of Anchorage State Police Department, slipped and broke a leg while boarding the *Shoishi Maru*. He was evacuated to Kodiak by a U.S. Coast Guard rescue plane.

In Washington, officials said today the question of Japanese fishing operations in waters claimed by Alaska is in the process of being resolved. Until the United States determines whether the waters are U.S. territory, officials would not comment on the weekend incidents.

In Tokyo, the Japanese Foreign Office said it had cabled the Embassy in Washington to ask for a full report from the U.S. Government on the incident. Officials said the Japanese Government would protest if it found the Japanese ships had not violated territorial waters.

Also in Tokyo, a spokesman for the Taiyo Fisheries Co., which owns the vessels, commented:

"We have ordered the fleet to operate at least 5 miles off the coast of the United States, 2 miles outside the accepted territorial water boundary. We are confident no violation is involved."

Shelikof Strait, varying in width from 30 to 19½ miles, lies between Kodiak Island and the Alaska Peninsula. Alaska claims it as inland waters, reasoning that it is an extension of Cook Inlet. Kodiak Island lies off the southern tip of the Kenai Peninsula, which forms the eastern shore of Cook Inlet.

Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska said the strait "traditionally has been an inland body of water." He said it had been regulated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service before Alaska was a State and by the State ever since statehood.

Egan wrote and wired George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, asking the Federal Government to act when the fleet was first sighted. He said this week's action was taken without notification to Federal authorities, because he had not received any satisfaction from them.

The Governor said he was in telephone contact yesterday with the Departments of State and Justice. In Washington, neither Department would comment.

Alleged poaching by Japanese fishermen has been a hot issue in Alaska for at least 25 years. In 1938, the Alaskan delegate in Congress, Anthony Dimond, even suggested that the United States bomb Japanese fishing boats encroaching on Alaska waters. Tension continued until and after World War II, but this is believed to have been the first time arrests were made.

TWO CAPTAINS PROMISE TO RETURN

KODIAK.—Two Japanese fishing vessel captains arrested Saturday night in Shelikof Strait for alleged violation of Alaska fishing regulations were released following their arraignment here yesterday on condition they return when further court proceedings are scheduled.

Capt. Mongo Hanasaki, master of the mother ship *Banshu Maru*, and the captain of a catcher boat seized Saturday night by the State, Tadao Higashama, were arraigned here before Superior Court Judge Edward V. Davis who had been flown from Anchorage in an Alaska Air National Guard C–123 for the proceeding.

The two captains speak no English and an interpreter located in Kodiak had an insufficient grasp of English to permit Davis to convey an explanation of the charges against them and that they had a right to counsel before further proceedings are undertaken against them.

Hanasaki, wearing a blue uniform with four gold stripes on each sleeve, rose to his feet each time a question was asked by Mrs. Kinuko Perkins and replied at length, with great dignity. Davis understood him to say that he believed he had been operating in international waters.

"He can't understand why he came here," Mrs. Perkins told Davis.

Assistant District Attorney Dick Bradley, who with Clarence Weberg, Director of the Division of Protection in the Department of Fish and Game, have been directing the vessel seizure operations from Kodiak, appeared for the State at the arraignment.

Upon Bradley's recommendation, the judge set bail in the case at $25,000 and ordered the boat seized Saturday held in lieu of the bail.

Davis said the captains would be released if they promised to return when their presence was required. Hanasaki made such a promise but said he would not leave his ship "if a storm comes."

Davis accepted the promise, saying he understood that men have no control over the acts of nature.

Hanasaki was being returned to his ship by the State today. Higashama returned to his boat at anchor in Kodiak Harbor.

The captain of another vessel boarded by the State last night is expected to be arraigned here late today before Superior Court Judge James Fitzgerald who will fly from Anchorage.

Davis yesterday ordered Bradley to contact the nearest Japanese consulate and ask officials to provide legal assistance for the men under arrest.

ALASKA'S NAVY SCORES SUCCESS

(By Jerry Bowkett)

Everything could have gone wrong—but the Alaskan navy in its first action Saturday night, against a foreign fishing vessel off Kodiak Island was eminently successful.

For more than a week agents of the State's department of fish and game had watched closely from aircraft the movements of the 1,772-ton Japanese mother ship, *Banshu Maru* and her five smaller catcher boats in and near Shelikof Strait, claimed as inland waters by the State.

Two patrol vessels of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game had been standing by on the northern side of the island awaiting orders to run out into the strait and move against the Japanese.

They are not sleek fast patrol boats. One is a power barge, the *Widgeon*, that can do 8 knots, and the other the *Teal*, looks more like a real patrol boat but it can only run about a knot faster. Each is about 70 feet long. All of the vessels in the Japanese fleet have greater cruising speed.

On Saturday, a Japanese catcher boat, the *Ohtori Maru No. 5*, was spotted at anchor off Uganik Bay, and Gov. William A. Egan decided to seize it.

Shortly after 5 p.m. Saturday the two Alaskan vessels got underway from anchorages in two different bays—the *Teal* from Uyak Bay and the *Widgeon* from Port Bailey in Kupreanof Strait—and converged on the Japanese fishing boat at near maximum speed.

The weather was clear and the water unusually calm.

On each Alaska vessel were several National Guardsmen, State police, and agents of the fish and game department. The guardsmen had been issued ammunition for their weapons, which included automatic firing grease guns.

No one was sure just how the operation would be concluded, but there was no anticipation of trouble with the Japanese. Aboard the *Widgeon*, one person supposed that a shot probably should be fired across the bow of the Japanese vessel but wasn't sure how you went about it.

There was speculation the Federal Government, which is responsible for this Nation's foreign policy, might take a dim view of the State's naval operation and try to prevent it.

But Egan had given explicit orders—the Japanese vessel was to be seized and nothing should be allowed to interfere with the operation.

When the two patrol vessels approached the *Ohtori Maru* it was riding at anchor. No one was on deck and the Japanese apparently had no intention of running. It was decided the guardsmen, in their battle dress, could probably better serve by going below and staying out of sight.

The *Widgeon*, skippered by Lynn Crosby, was the first alongside and several Japanese came out on the deck of their vessel and appeared to be a bit puzzled as to what was going on. The *Teal*, under the command of Howard Marks, was coming up on their port side.

Widgeon crewmen heaved some lines over on the *Ohtori Maru* and the Japanese made them fast. It was 8 p.m. and growing dark.

Crosby was elated at having gotten his barge to the Japanese vessel first.

"For an old slab like this that's pretty good," he grinned. "I could have taken the governors off the engines and got 400 more rpm's. If I was in a hurry I would."

State Police Capt. E. L. Mayfield, W. B. (Buck) Stewart, area protection supervisor for the Fish and Game Department, and Sueman Moon, a Japanese-speaking Kodiak cannery employee, went aboard the Japanese vessel and told the captain, Tadao Higashama, he was under arrest for commercial fishing without a license and failing to obtain vessel and fishing gear licenses from the State.

Higashama was asked to come to Kodiak to answer the charges against him. The State representatives emphasized there was nothing personal about the arrest—the State wanted only to assert its right to inland waters. They also had a warrant for Mongo Hanasaki, captain of the mother ship, which was about 6 miles away. Hanasaki contacted the *Banshu Maru* and told of his plight. Hanasaki said he would bring his ship over and confer with the officers.

The *Teal* went alongside her when she arrived off Uganik Bay, and the same officers went aboard. After nearly 2 hours of discussions, Hanasaki agreed to go into Kodiak with the *Teal* and the *Ohtori Maru*.

In Kodiak harbor yesterday morning, while awaiting the arrival of U.S. Public Health Service Officer M. E. Lindburg from Anchorage to conduct a quarantine inspection, Hanasaki said he was surprised Alaskans were so upset over the presence of his boats near Kodiak.

His fleet was prospecting for herring but had not yet begun to fish, he said. He said he believed he was operating in international waters.

He had been charged by Alaska with operating a commercial fishing enterprise without providing the Department of Fish and Game with a written statement of intention to operate in State waters.

On April 1, the date of the alleged violation, the Japanese had caught some herring but did so only for subsistence he said. A skiff had broken loose on that day and drifted into a Kodiak island bay and a larger vessel went in to retrieve it, he said.

Department of Fish and Game agents said the Japanese had been spotted within the 3-mile limit around Kodiak on several occasions.

Crosby calculated the *Ohtori Maru* was 1 mile within the limit in 30 fathoms of water off Uganik Bay when seized by the State.

AN EASTER PRAYER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as we enter the concluding days of Holy Week, we again remind ourselves of the dark and dismal Friday, and we approach Easter Sunday with hope, light, and life. This gives us strength and courage to carry on in a world that is fraught with distrust, unrest, and deep trouble.

God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore, we will not fear, though the earth be removed and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea. He maketh wars to cease unto the ends of the earth.

At this Easter season we pray that the glory of the Lord may shine on Thy people of every name; make them strong in the dark days ahead, rooted in the stability of faith until peace and rest shall be won. Oh, lead the struggle to emancipate all people in bondage and redeem the sacrifice and toil of the noble living and the noble dead.

Dr. James Shera Montgomery, a former Chaplain of the House of Representatives, whom we all loved, concluded one of his prayers with the following:

> Break every weapon forged in fires of hate,
> Turn back the foes that would assail Thy gate,
> Where fields of strife lie desolate and bare
> Take Thy sweet flowers of peace and plant them there.
> Come, blessed peace, as when in hush of eve
> God's benediction falls on souls that grieve.
> As shines the star when weary day departs,
> Come, peace of God, and shine in every heart.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe there is no further business to come before the Senate. Therefore I move that, pursuant to the previous order, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the previous order, until Monday, April 23, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, April 19, 1962:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Stephen J. Roth, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Clifford O'Sullivan, elevated.

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the 17th plenary session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299.

To be lieutenant colonel

Bailey, Leslie W., O24045.

To be majors

Abagis, Kenneth M., O71433.
Abele, Louis E., O59231.
Aboe, Kenneth R., O69577.
Abt, Frederick T., O70244.
Adams, Arlye D., O86981.
Adams, Billy J., O59933.
Adams, Charles M., O59126.
Adams, Dexter W., O62247.
Adams, Earl R., Jr., O58288.
Adams, Marvin L., O60612.
Adams, Thomas E., Jr., O59949.
Adkins, Alvin E., O65940.
Ahern, John R., O59918.
Akin, Karl E., O59900.
Aldridge, George W., Jr., O84935.
Alexander, David B., O59956.
Allbee, Howard G., O68069.
Allbright, Marion C., O63678.
Allen, Andrew S., O78696.
Allen, Boyde W., Jr., O59203.
Allison, Charles C., O65729.
Alloway, Curtis H., O59772.
Allred, William M., O58809.
Allyn, John O., O65941.
Alter, George M., O58290.
Amburn, Warren G., O78700.
Amos, Carl R., Jr., O90008.
Anderson, William A., O78702.
Andreen, Robert B., O59149.
Andrews, William J., O58162.
Antrim, Ralph C., Jr., O65170.
Applin, Paul L., Jr., O57968.
Armstrong, Frank H., O60273.
Armstrong, George E., O65598.
Armstrong, John R., O65159.
Armstrong, Robert A., O81949.
Arnette, John Q., O59418.
Arnold, Stanley W., O78704.
Arnold, William J., Jr., O80035.
Ashley, Lewis J., O62231.
Ashley, Merle W., O80036.
Autrey, Lewell V., O84587.
Awalt, Thomas Y., Jr., O57496.
Bache, Claude V., O61100.
Backhaus, Gus, 3d, O60714.
Bailey, Walter D., O65945.
Baker, Dallas O., O58820.
Baker, Joe, Jr., O63359.
Baker, John E., O65151.
Baldwin, Cecil C., O6226.
Bales, James C., O56989.
Ball, Doric W. J., O62258.
Ball, John J., Jr., O78709.
Ballou, DeForrest, 3d, O58299.
Ballou, William R., O60701.
Balmer, Jesmond D., Jr., O59219.
Bamford, Thomas F., O59166.
Bangert, Robert L., O60217.
Banks, Ray C., Jr., O81952.
Barbero, Richard J., O60717.
Barlow, Raymon C., Jr., O59287.
Barnes, Metullus A., Jr., O58302.
Barnitz, Gerald W., O60669.
Barnwell, John C., O80040.
Barrett, Ernest F., O65114.
Barrett, Frederick P., O80557.
Barrett, George B., O62265.
Barris, Donald F., O80041.
Barrow, George R., O59480.
Barry, Clarence D., O58303.
Barth, Sam L., O57511.
Baskin, Ronald R., O70264.
Bates, William E., Jr., O59939.
Battreall, Raymond R., Jr., O59108
Bauer, Eugene R., O69586.
Baumann, Lewis R., O62808.
Baxley, John B., O59919.
Bayard, Louis P., O59097.
Beard, Rutland D., Jr., O57813.
Becker, Henry C., Jr., O63389.
Beckwith, Charles M., O81953.
Becton, Julius W., Jr., O65716.
Beer, Warren G., O59966.
Bell, Cleo O., O65190.
Bell, Clyde B., Jr., O59227.
Belnap, Glen D., O63088.
Belser, Adolph L., O59913.
Bender, John A., O59317.
Benedict, William G., O65117.
Bentley, Richard S., O59490.
Bercaw, Woodson W., Jr., O59077.
Berens, Robert J., O58306.
Berger, Newell J., Jr., O78717.
Bergner, John, O78718.
Bernard, Carl F., O69589.
Berres, John P., O62276.
Bertholf, Cheney L., Jr., O65202.
Bethany, Charles W., Jr., O74637.
Betts, Earl C., O59300.
Betts, Edward E., O65950.
Biggs, Thomas R., O63104.

Bishop, Bertram J., O78719.
Bivens, Courtland C., Jr., O65237.
Bjostad, Louis B., Jr., O65138.
Black, George S., O65953.
Black, Gorham L., Jr., O65111.
Black, Robert W., O59350.
Black, William E., O80047.
Black, William L., O63412.
Blair, Thomas G., O60678.
Blake, Thomas B., O58311.
Blalock, Bill R., O63348.
Blodgett, Rexford J., O60657.
Blood, William C., O78721.
Blunck, Stanley R., O58837.
Bodman, Walter J., Jr., O88013.
Boggan, Edgar W., O59928.
Boland, Herman T., Jr., O59092.
Bolte, David E., O59307.
Bolton, Virgil W., O69595.
Bowman, Truman R., O78725.
Bookout, Hal H., O68179.
Booth, James R., O65052.
Bosan, George S., O78727.
Boss, Keith A., O57308.
Bott, Frank M., O65481.
Bounds, Marcellus W., O59262.
Boyer, Samuel R., Jr., O78731.
Bracey, Spencer M., O58317.
Bradley, Charles R., Jr., O81963.
Bradley, Jerry F., O65489.
Bradley, Robert L., O59244.
Bratton, Joseph K., O57077.
Braun, Albert W., O87480.
Braun, Walter D., O69865.
Braunstein, Howard H., O65196.
Brazier, Vincent M., O60653.
Brettell, James A., Jr., O69600.
Bringham, William N., O60665.
Brister, Alan A., O65742.
Britt, Colon R., Jr., O57806.
Brock, Ernest O., O81966.
Brock, Luther A., O78738.
Brockmeier, William E., O57651.
Brockmyer, James J., O63401.
Broida, Donald, O60641.
Brooks, Glenn P., O60694.
Brooks, William A., O69601.
Brown, Latham H., O58321.
Brown, Lorence F., O60223.
Brunkhorst, Harold H., O58324.
Bryan, Leo C., O91775.
Bryant, Robert L., O58164.
Bryant, Vernon W., O58127.
Buchanan, Crawford, O69605.
Buchanan, John O., O58846.
Buchanan, Thomas W., O60835.
Buckingham, Clay T., O59247.
Bulawsky, Lawrence H., Jr., O69606.
Bunch, James E., O58325.
Bundy, Richard N., O59169.
Burke, Thomas P., O62803.
Burks, John R., O81969.
Burnett, Neill C., O85733.
Burt, Thomas H., O59416.
Busey, Matthew W., 3d, O60845.
Bush, Louis S., O59264.
Bushong, Charles R., O80054.
Butler, James F., O65960.
Butler, Jerome J., Jr., O65146.
Butler, Millard J., O91562.
Byers, Lex J., O63366.
Cadenhead, Charles R., O76853.
Caid, Larry A., O69612.
Calenberg, Harry D., O76855.
Calhoun, Leon J., O65613.
Callero, Milton F., O65064.
Calnan, Francis M., O84852.
Campbell, James G., Jr., O58330.
Campbell, Robert E., O69614.
Campbell, Robert M., O65736.
Caraccia, Marco J., O57694.
Carlisle, Wilford B., O65069.
Carlson, Robert E., O57646.
Carney, Charles V., O60783.
Carr, John E., 3d, O66141.
Carr, John L., O59206.
Carrell, Robert F., O58855.
Carrigan, Mark C., O63414.
Carroll, George F., O78753.
Carroll, Murray L., O57442.
Carroll, Robert M., O63355.
Carswell, Bruce M., O59132.
Carter, Robert P., O63396.
Carty, Robert T., O65188.
Catullo, Albert, O65144.
Caulder, LeRoy W., O65122.
Cerny, Edward V., O59845.
Cerrone, Michael J., O62254.
Chadbourne, James F., Jr., O65962.
Chamberlain, Donald E., O60823.
Chandler, David J., O59271.
Chandler, John P., O59095.
Chandler, Norman P., O60817.
Chandler, William W., O57493.
Chateau, Louis A., O60236.
Chilcoat, William J., O74658.
Chism, John W., 057676.
Christ, Ernest W., O59936.
Christensen, John F., O72842.
Christianson, J. Milton, O65965.
Church, Edward H., O59940.
Church, William M., O58336.
Clardy, Ray A., O65488.
Clark, Chester M., 2d, O69620.
Clark, Egbert B., 3d, O62267.
Clark, Harry E., O60357.
Clark, James M., O58338.
Clark, Julius E., Jr., O60841.
Clark, Richard W., O62242.
Clark, Warren M., O65294.
Clarke, Frank P., O59144.
Clayton, Charles C., O60852.
Clinedinst, Clinton R., O65225.
Cloninger, Adrian S., O65726.
Cloud, James C., O65743.
Clouser, Maurice L., O60232.
Coan, Bernard F., O78765.
Coatney, Loren C., O58340.
Coffey, Ray W., O57457.
Coghlan, James J., Jr., O59342.
Cohn, Frank, O58341.
Cohn, Merrill R., O58342.
Cole, Grady A., O58343.
Cole, William M., O58148.
Coleman, Rennie C., Jr., O69886.
Collins, Philip R., O80666.
Collins, Robert S., Jr., O63383.
Collins, Thomas E., O69624.
Compton, William I., O57447.
Confer, Rodney R., O58865.
Connaway, Charles E., O65130.
Connell, Richard M., O59098.
Connelly, John R., O65135.
Conner, Judson J., O59242.
Connolly, Richard J., O65139.
Conrad, Herman A., O78770.
Consolvo, John W., O60215.
Converse, Stanley P., O62262.
Cook, Charles W., O65968.
Cook, Robert J., O59922.
Cook., Sidney H., Jr., O58133.
Cooley, Richard E., O78771.
Cooper, Paul A., O65133.
Corcoran, Edward F., O65239.
Cordova, William R., O70308.
Corkan, Lloyd A., Jr., O59811.
Costa, John J., O59112.
Costello, Thomas A., O65132.
Costen, Charles B., O58350.
Couch, Roy E., O58351.
Coughlin, John T., 2d, O58013.
Coughlin, Thomas B., O59323.
Council, Ranald D., O59179.
Covell, Charles R., O58284.
Cox, Cleatus J., O59243.
Craig, Richard S., O59401.
Crane, Joe D., O78775.
Crecelius, Richard A., O80064.
Creel, Elnomac V., O65238.
Cribb, William J., Jr., O60695.
Croonquist, Henry T., O59152.
Crosby, Paul M., O60837.
Crowell, Steven S., O65156.
Crowley, Edwin K., Jr., O65614.
Crozier, Ted A., O70317.
Cubbison, Gordon R., O60234.
Cummings, William J., O57807.
Cunningham, Harold D., Jr., O65973.
Curd, Vernon F., O95007.
Cushing, Robert L., O78780.
Custer, George A., O58356.
Dabbs, Ralph T., O65244.
Dahl, LaVerne H., O78782.
Dahlquist, Frederick C., Jr., O60221.
Dalusky, George A., O87720.
Davidson, William C., O65125.
Davis, Charles E., O60726.
Davis, Harold O., O60242.
Davis, Ovid M., O58360.
Davis, Preston A., O58361.
Davis, Ralph E., O59813.
Day, Bartley E., O59201.
Day, Seth S., O59288.
DeBord, Norman D., O65720.
de Correvont, Leon L., O59258.
DeHaas, George D., O65978.
DeHaven, Oren E., O63382.
De La Mare, Wendell F., O69628.
DeLoach, William M., O59978.
DeLorimier, Charles T., O78789.
DeMaria, John M., O91208.
deMarsche, Joseph M., O65723.
de Rusha, Richard A., O63416.
Dearing, John W., O65201.
Demory, Richard S., O65079.
Dempsey, Albert P., Jr., O57443.
Dempsey, Frederick G., O63097.
Dempsey, James E., O63101.
Denend, William L., O58365.
Denham, Ernest W., Jr., O59373.
Dennington, John F., O65083.
Dews, Hampton, O78797.
Dibella, Alfred L., O59489.
Dibrell, Jack H., O65979.
Dickerson, Harvey G., Jr., O68094.
Dickerson, Paul J., O58368.
Dickinson, Dean B., O59160.
Dickinson, Hillman, O59090.
Dill, Harold E., O65143.
Dillinder, Jack P., O78800.
Dittamore, Rex T., O70326.
Dixon, Albert V., O69630.
Dixon, Ralph R., Jr., O58371.
Dixon, Roland M., Jr., O65128.
D'Louhy, George J., O78802.
Dodd, Stephen F., O58372.
Doherty, Richard J., O58373.
Dohleman, Kenneth E., O69632.
Donoho, Louie W., O61135.
Donohoe, Patrick J., O59102.
Dorsey, Clifford R., O69634.
Dorsey, Ralph M., O63394.
Doster, Robert W., O88660.
Doty, Otis J., O62269.
Downes, Marlboro R., O59910.
Drury, Clinton A., Jr., O57517.
Dunks, Fred, O78809.
Dunn, Clyde, O60654.
Dunn, Harold R., O80076.
Dunn, John M., O65252.
Durant, Billy C., O58376.
Duray, Joseph B., O65257.
Durham, Howard W., O59902.
Durr, Richard H., O58888.
Durst, Harold E., O66148.
Dutchak, Eugene M., O57458.
Dye, Clarence C., O58377.
Eagers, Joseph A., Jr., O59367.
Early, Charles C., O65601.
East, Charles M., Jr., O70329.
Ebbs, Joseph M., O68339.
Ednie, Robert L., O60243.
Edwards, Grey H., O88258.
Eggers, John F., O84055.
Eichelsdoerfer, Howard H., O60718.
Elliott, Harold N., O58138.
Ellis, Thomas G., Jr., O65106.
Emerson, Earl E., Jr., O57642.
Emerson, Vaughn C., O78820.
Emery, John R., O59992.
Emery, Thomas D., O69640.
Engberg, Robert W., O65104.
English, Allan J., Jr., O59316.
Erbe, Robert L., O59196.
Esco, Oliver N., Jr., O78824.
Escue, Hodges S., O63375.
Estes, Robert K., O59187.
Evans, Alexander R., O65494.
Evans, Lloyd R., O59942.
Evans, Thomas C., O58382.
Everding, Francis R., O78828.
Everett, George W., O60685.
Ewing, Amos D., O91399.

Ezell, Bert P., O59818.
Fairlamb, John C., O60681.
Falk, Byron A., Jr., O65171.
Falkenbury, Stephen B., Jr., O59508.
Fancher, Paul T., O65205.
Farnum, Lawrence B., O61211.
Fatum, John J., O59380.
Faul, Lloyd J., O81994.
Feeney, Thomas J., O84856.
Feir, Philip R., O59189.
Fender, Louis H., O78831.
Ferguson, James W., O87740.
Ferguson, James W., O59659.
Ferrer, Ferdinand, O62831.
Fiasca, Alfred M., O84605.
Finlayson, Hugh S., Jr., O80756.
Fischman, Kurt, O65744.
Fisher, Charles H., O58142.
Fisher, Robert W., O58386.
Fisk, Eugene N., O80084.
Fitz, Harold C., Jr., O59159.
Flagg, Austin T., O58387.
Flaggert, James J., Jr., O63345.
Fleeson, George S., O59486.
Fleischman, Gordon K., O59477.
Fleri, Paul C., Jr., O59251.
Florio, John D., O63398.
Fluckey, Wallace N., O58389.
Foley, John J., Jr., O65209.
Font, Joe A., O57454.
Ford, Earl P., O59233.
Ford, Edward A., O70338.
Ford, George L., O58391.
Ford, John O., O60891.
Fordyce, John W., O87743.
Foreman, William G., O63106.
Forrest, John F., O59269.
Forsthoff, Charles W., O59485.
Foss, Romaine S., O59947.
Fox, Charles C., O65730.
Fox, Donald C., O65154.
Frandsen, Donald P., O58396.
Frandsen, Oscar R., O58397.
Freeman, Arthur L., O83597.
Freeman, David G., O59393.
Freiman, William D., O65993.
French, Daniel L., O63850.
Frizzell, Harry P., O84613.
Fry, Louis C., O65608.
Frye, John W., O78838.
Fullerton, Avery S., O59124.
Fulton, Taylor R., O80087.
Fulton, William S., O70137.
Gaige, Delburt C., O78840.
Gaines, James S., O60655.
Gappa, Casimer S., O58401.
Garcia, Oscar M., O58402.
Gard, John D., O59820.
Gardiner, William P., O92193.
Garitty, Lyle J., Jr., O58403.
Garner, Hugh M., O60218.
Garofalo, William E., O63409.
Garrett, John K., O60684.
Garties, Richard G., O71347.
Gentille, Paul J., O63415.
George, Kenneth E., O89513.
Geraci, John P., O65127.
Gerardy, William L., O60667.
Gershater, Ephraim M., O59959.
Gibbons, Benjamin F., O60816.
Gibbs, Marvin H., O58405.
Giboney, Thomas B., O60708.
Gibson, Floyd S., O60844.
Gibson, Joseph T., O59184.
Giglio, Rudolph F. L., O63399.
Gillespie, Richard E., O59172.
Gillis, William D., O62833.
Gilman, John P., O57640.
Gilmore, Robert L., O67683.
Gilroy, Robert J., O59355.
Giuffrida, Louis O., O59903.
Glasser, Anthony P., O59810.
Glunn, Franklin J., O94299.
Goche, Leo N., O59937.
Godfrey, Carl F., O58410.
Godwin, Harold A., Jr., O87757.
Goessling, Ward C., Jr., O59224.
Golden, Alonzo J., O61210.
Goodrich, John R., O65124.
Goodwin, William H., O59195.
Gordon, William T., O84858.
Gorlinsky, Victor W., O65709.
Gower, Donald N., O59246.
Grabove, Maxwell, O59771.
Graeser, Herbert O., O62002.
Graham, Douglas M., O57510.
Graham, Raymond E., O70353.
Gray, Homer E., Jr., O65198.
Gray, John E., O58411.
Green, Charles E., O58125.
Green, Charles E., O70347.
Green, Warren L., O78859.
Greenbaum, Bernard, O59141.
Greene, Vernon E., O80094.
Greer, Edward, O57426.
Greetham, George A., O63342.
Griffith, Girvan H., O60591.
Griffith, Harry A., O59089.
Grigsby, Alfred J., O60727.
Grinnell, Douglas D., O62843.
Groseclose, Tom S., O63108.
Guelzo, Carl M., O58416.
Gunn, Raymond McC., O65118.
Guthrie, Sidney C., O57451.
Haden, Clinton B., O65177.
Hagadus, Raymond, O78863.
Hahn, Eric L., O65075.
Hale, Alfred B., O59217.
Hale, Lindsey W., O65607.
Hale, William B., O59478.
Halgren, Spencer V., O57644.
Hall, Allen K., O58421.
Hall, Reginald W., O65741.
Hall, Rupert P., O74708.
Hall, Turner P., Jr., O60238.
Halley, William F., O89336.
Hammerquist, Robert E., O59969.
Hammond, John B., O65725.
Hammonds, Eugene, O65179.
Hampton, Kenneth R., O59982.
Haney, Leslie D., O91672.
Hannon, Laurence K., O58915.
Hannum, Clifford P., O59965.
Hanrahan, William P., Jr., O67693.
Hanson, James N., O65600.
Harbin, Darwin D., O80836.
Hardage, John M., O69500.
Harger, Clyde J., O66006.
Harkins, Donald E., O65217.
Harlan, Lowell B., O69668.
Harouff, Donald L., O65165.
Harper, James C., O63379.
Harper, William H., O60670.
Harrington, James L., O65221.
Harrington, Lonnie E., Jr., O57681.
Harris, Richard E., O59979.
Harris, Ronald V., O69670.
Harrison, Oscar J., O58428.
Harrison, Walter R., Jr., O57433.
Hartman, William F., O85179.
Harvey, James V., O68012.
Harwood, Richard D., O65113.
Hassell, John N., O63368.
Hassin, Donald J., O63361.
Hassman, Phillip E., O59972.
Hathaway, Clyde T., O65599.
Hathaway, Leander R., Jr., O60645.
Hawthorne, Victor J., O69671.
Hayes, Duane, O58430.
Hayes, John G., O66160.
Hayes, Joseph W., Jr., O66012.
Haygood, Jack L., O89069.
Haynes, Return C., O63102.
Healy, Michael D., O70368.
Heard, William C., O69672.
Hearin, Joseph N., Jr., O63848.
Heckendorn, Robert J., O59945.
Heiden, Charles K., O59117.
Heidenreich, Ellsworth W., O60214.
Heller, Thomas J., O57924.
Helton, Carl J., O65095.
Hemmings, Haven H., O65168.
Hemphill, James A., O70371.
Hempling, Leonard J., O59784.
Henderson, Hubert H., Jr., O70373.
Henderson, Joseph E., O69676.
Henderson, Joseph L., O78875.
Hendricks, Meredith E., O59129.
Henry, William H., Jr., O63109.
Hensel, Raymond G., O66016.
Hervey, Theodore E., O59208.
Hess, Lewis E., O59815.
Hetzel, Foster G., Jr., O80864.
Hickey, Pennell J., O59361.
Hicks, Joseph E., O65727.
Hicks, Robert R., O80106.
Hiestand, William C., O59113.
Higginbotham, Travis L., O78880.
Hilburn, Jack B., O65224.
Hill, Glen A., O66018.
Hill, James F., O88736.
Hill, John P., O84861.
Hill, Robert W., O65227.
Hill, William B., O58167.
Hillman, Lawson R., O63344.
Hilmar, James E., O60651.
Hindman, Edward R., O59114.
Hinges, Norman P., O60652.
Hirsch, Edward, O80870.
Hjorth, George E., O58440.
Hoddinott, George R., O59479.
Hodes, John T., O59261.
Hoffman, John J., Jr., O62255.
Hoffmann, William H., O59279.
Hoffmaster, George C., Jr., O59222.
Hogan, John D. A., Jr., O60720.
Holden, Needham C., Jr., O63105.
Holloway, Kenneth H., O58441.
Holt, James H., O59185.
Hoot, Herbert L., Jr., O59292.
Hopkins, Norman B., Jr., O59385.
Horey, Robert L., O58442.
Hornstein, David H., O78888.
Horton, Max G., O82028.
Hougen, John H., O63107.
Howard, Charles F., O78891.
Howard, Edward B., O59223.
Howard, Harmon, O62180.
Howard, Norman F., O80886.
Howell, Fred F., O78892.
Howell, Martin D., O59181.
Huber, Leo K., O59250.
Huber, William E., O59088.
Hughes, Billy D., O65236.
Hughes, Irving C., O69690.
Hughes, James E., O58444.
Hughes, James E., Jr., O58445.
Hughes, Walter P., Jr., O62816.
Huie, Douglas T., O57266.
Hull, James M., O65733.
Hunt, Alexander H., O66164.
Huntzinger, Harvey W., O70387.
Hurst, Cam J., Jr., O65491.
Hurtt, Clarence M., O70388.
Hutton, Robert B., O58933.
Hynes, Joseph D., O63390.
Iannamico, Lucky R., O91880.
Insani, John L., O69693.
Ivey, Benjamin F., Jr., O58448.
Jackson, Hal G., Jr., O88753.
Jackson, Kenneth F., O58159.
Jacobs, Winston R., O58449.
Jacques, Jasper P., O65180.
Japinga, Robert M., O65142.
Jaugstetter, Joseph P., O65487.
Jeffery, Theron E., O75217.
Jenkins, Donald L., O69698.
Jenkins, Thomas F., O65085.
Jenkins, W. Hugh, Jr., O62809.
Jenkins, Wilbur G., O65099.
Jenkinson, Robert C., O84630.
Jennings, Richard M., O58935.
Jensen, Reed G., O59358.
Jenson, Lloyd K., O59788.
Jessup, Maurice E., O59821.
Johnson, Carlton S., O63121.
Johnson, Charles McC., O57650.
Johnson, Clayton E., O62244.
Johnson, James A., O89343.
Johnson, Lawrence H., Jr., O69702.
Johnson, Robert J., O59357.
Johnson, Ross LeR., O59176.
Johnson, Thomas L., O58453.
Jones, Chesley H., O78901.
Jones, Clinton K., O70394.
Jones, Douglas C., O58454.
Jones, Frank P., O82033.
Jones, George M. D., O58456.
Jones, Harry T., O65119.
Jones, Hugh H., Jr., O65163.
Jones, John R., O78903.
Jones, Norman G., O78904.
Jones, Ogden S., Jr., O59237.

Jones, Paul E., O62234.
Jones, Philip D., O70395.
Jones, Roy M., O65115.
Jones, Walter F., O60208.
Joosten, William J., O61206.
Jordan, Jesse L., Jr., O63362.
Jordan, William F., O60704.
Jorgensen, Julius J., Jr., O65112.
Junge, Edwin B., O59964.
Junk, William P., Jr., O63358.
Jurden, Delbert A., O62241.
Kalagian, Samuel P., O78907.
Kapec, Andrew J., O62278.
Kast, Kenneth F., Jr., O62239.
Kaster, Paul R., Jr., O59483.
Katz, Phillip P., O59957.
Kaufman, Phillip, O63092.
Kavanaugh, Martin J., O76889.
Kean, John J., O89231.
Keebaugh, Harold G., O69705.
Keegan, Thomas F., Jr., O60676.
Keeling, William O., Jr., O58150.
Kees, William G., O91508.
Keith, Donald R., O59170.
Kellam, Lawrence M., O61099.
Kelley, Thomas W., O61240.
Kemble, Charles R., O59143.
Kendrick, Robert C., O68021.
Kennedy, Robert W., O60729.
Kennedy, William J., O59235.
Key, Milton E., O58464.
Kiefe, Joseph C., Jr., O60850.
Killam, Howard W., O62268.
Kimmick, Leonard, Jr., O60558.
King, Edward L., O65175.
King, John E., O69712.
King, Justice B., O80126.
King, Lemuel G., O58465.
King, Melvin E., O59661.
King, Ward D., O93448.
Kingdom, Arthur J., O59202.
Kinghorn, Alan, O66175.
Kingston, Joseph P., O59386.
Kinnan, Floyd H., O78919.
Kinne, Harold C., Jr., O61212.
Kirby, Gilbert W., Jr., O59134.
Kirk, Robert J., O59974.
Kirkpatrick, Monroe, O59926.
Kisling, Richard D., O82034.
Kitlas, Albert C., O58466.
Klein, John H., Jr., O58176.
Klevesahl, Fred C., O78920.
Knapp, Albert C., O59920.
Knapp, Theron W., Jr., O59186.
Knipling, Louis H., Jr., O58467.
Kogan, Rudolf W., O65098.
Konopnicki, Emil L., O67711.
Koseki, Reginald W., O65094.
Kostka, Bohuslav Z., O65611.
Koziel, Richard J., O65235.
Krakower, Albert M., O78924.
Kreiner, Richard E., O78925.
Kriwanek, Robert J., O60648.
Kruger, Robert E., O82035.
Kuefler, Kenneth T., O59493.
Kuhlman, Arthur H., Jr., O59963.
Kuntze, Robert A., O65203.
Kurtz, Maurice K., Jr., O59107.
La Bounta, Gerald C., Jr., O66033.
LaPorte, Arthur E., Jr., O58472.
Lamar, Henry C., Jr., O58950.
Lamar, Kirby, O59257.
Lamason, Jerry L., O78929.
Lamb, Joe B., O62266.
Lambert, John E., O57450.
Lambert, Robert O., O63400.
Lambourne, Robert D., O57851.
Lamothe, Frank E., O65711.
Lamp, Russell J., O59115.
Lampros, James, O59283.
Landau, Calvin J., O66034.
Landis, Charles M., O65193.
Landre, Lowell H., O66035.
Landry, Edward L., O69719.
Landry, Wilson A., Jr., O63378.
Landseadel, Robert J., Jr., O65496.
Lang, Jack B., O63381.
Lang, Vincent W., O62841.
Lansing, Ernest J., O63113.
Larkin, Daniel T., O78933.
Larsen, Edward D., O78935.
Larsen, Narion G., O58473.
Larson, Gale L., O65185.
Latham, Willard, O65141.
Lauber, Robert W., O58475.
Lauer, Jerry B., O59164.
Lawlor, Thomas A., O69723.
Lawrence, Renn M., O57696.
Lawson, James E., O62260.
Lay, James R., O63110.
LeGro, William E., Jr., 067837.
LePage, Julien H., O59476.
LeVier, Earl R., O59925.
Leahy, Thomas M., Jr., O82041.
Leary, John R., O78939.
Ledford, Gerald E., O60219.
Lee, Charles B., O59305.
Lee, Myron E., Jr., O65712.
Legg, Elbert E., O58477.
Lehner, Charles R., Jr., O59241.
Leister, James W., O65738.
Leneker, Herbert W., O78942.
Leneten, Charles C., O63114.
Lentini, Anthony R., O58479.
Lewis, Addison L., O65216.
Lewis, John D., O60682.
Lewis, John L., O69726.
Lewis, Mose E., 3d, O59904.
Lewis, Samuel A., O65191.
Liddle, John W., O62233.
Liichow, Robert E., O59174.
Lind, Thomas D., O58483.
Lindeman, Arthur H., Jr., O59177.
Lindholm, James R., O69728.
Lippincott, John C., O65732.
Litle, Robert F., Jr., O66039.
Little, Robert A., O70409.
Littlejohn, John C., O57886.
Livingston, Hoyt R., O60228.
Livingston, Leon R., Jr., O58487.
Lober, William J., Jr., O69729.
Lochhead, Earl J., O59336.
Locke, Theodore F., Jr., O59951.
Loe, Robert J., O59960.
Lombard, Harold F., O59205.
Lombardi, Arthur P., O69730.
Long, Eldredge R., Jr., O58122.
Long, Herlihy T., O60715.
Long, Homer S., Jr., O59158.
Longbottom, John H., O59916.
Longstroth, Alma G., O60666.
Lopez, Henry F., O62840.
Love, John A., O89095.
Lowden, Charles B., O60642.
Lowrey, Willis H., O59148.
Lowry, Phillip E., O60721.
Loy, Albert, O82045.
Luebbert, William F., O59096.
Lumpkin, Benjamin E., Jr., O57425.
Lynch, Robert E., O59893.
Lynch, Robert O., O59346.
Lynch, William D., O65081.
Mac Neill, Francis W., O70416.
Mace, John S., O59789.
Mack, Richard E., O58492.
Mackert, John R., O59146.
Madigan, William P., O66044.
Madison, John H., Jr., O59212.
Maggio, Christopher S., O59975.
Magnotti, John F., Jr., O59200.
Mahone, Worthington M., O65282.
Maihafer, Harry J., O59167.
Malinowski, Theodore B., O78958.
Mallory, Phillip L., O59769.
Maness, Harold M., O63339.
Manifold, Max D., O60345.
Manly, Clarence H., Jr., O59941.
Mann, James W., O57497.
Manning, John R., O57463.
Maple, John C., O57346.
Maranger, George J., O69525.
Marcus, Gerald R., O88430.
Marder, Eugene, O62807.
Marks, Patrick W., O88432.
Marley, John T., O59314.
Marshall, Francis R., O58496.
Marshall, Magness W., O91920.
Martin, James S., O57660.
Martin, Norman L., O63370.
Martin, Robert J., O62253.
Martin, Stuart F., O59368.
Martinez de Andino, Jose A., O78960.
Mason, Phillip L., O60728.
Masters, John J., O60697.
Mathern, Louis G., Jr., O63349.
Mathews, Amos C., O59104.
Mathews, Wayne C., O70422.
Mathieu, Robert N., O78962.
Mauderly, Allen J., O63369.
Maughan, George E., O78964.
Maughn, William, Jr., O63085.
Maul, David D., O65169.
Maurer, John A., O59225.
Mautz, Wayne A., O65228.
Maxwell, Lavern W., O59484.
May, Roy R., Jr., O59809.
Mayer, Arthur J., O59221.
Mayer, Jack, O60240.
Mayne, Robert K., O67721.
Mazuchowski, John P., O78965.
McAfee, Glen R., O63410.
McAleer, John J., Jr., O82050.
McArdle, John F., O59135.
McBride, Richard M., 058071.
McCabe, Jerome M., O82052.
McCaig, Milton E., O62240.
McCarron, Dean J., O59218.
McCarthy, James L., O58502.
McClaran, Jack L., O70425.
McClure, Bruce, O65211.
McClure, George W., Jr., O58504.
McConaghy, David D., O58506.
McConkey, Kernon M., O63384.
McCracken, Walter S., O58970.
McCrary, Charles E., O58507.
McCravey, James L., O60649.
McCulloch, Robert C., O60723.
McCune, John R., O78966.
McEntee, Francis A., O69737.
McFadden, George L., Jr., O60722.
McGarey, Richard V., O58508.
McGinnis, Charles I., O58509.
McGlone, James F., O78968.
McGough, Gordon H., O65041.
McGowan, Edgar, O63404.
McGuinn, Michael E., 3d, O65734.
McGuire, Robert D., O69740.
McGurk, Jack B., O82056.
McIntosh, James C., O88147.
McIntosh, James F., O65210.
McIntyre, Kenneth E., O59087.
McKee, Charles F., O66050.
McKelvey, Vincent T., O66181.
McKenna, Edward C., O66051.
McKiernan, Brian J., O78972.
McKinsey, Ray A., O60797.
McLaughlin, Robert L., O78973.
McNeal, John L., O65174.
McNeil, William R., O59931.
McSwain, Richard G., O63098.
McTaggart, Richard R., O78975.
Mead, Chester R., O92095.
Meadows, Byron D., O76896.
Mears, Joe G., O66052.
Medsger, Gerald W., O57080.
Meek, Carroll S., O59274.
Meek, John W., Jr., O63095.
Mehosky, Edward S., O60688.
Melcher, Ralph W., O88831.
Melner, Sinclair L., O58513.
Merck, Carl J., O57801.
Meredith, Francis, Jr., O57498.
Meritt, John F., O69743.
Mesick, Robert A., O60610.
Messinger, Lucien E., 3d, O59294.
Metcalf, Donald J., O60712.
Metz, Clarence E., O75252.
Metzger, J. Hayes, O59340.
Meyer, Harold J., O65097.
Meyer, Robert J., O69746.
Middleton, Harry F., O78980.
Mihoch, John P., O69748.
Miles, Edwin R., Sr., O78983.
Millard, Richard C., O63356.
Miller, Amory A., Jr., O84060.
Miller, Charles F., O65222.
Miller, Lewis, O89108.
Miller, Robert C., O59303.
Miller, Rowlan L., O58517.
Miller, Russell J., O63388.
Milton, Wilburn E., O59943.
Minis, Carol E., O74783.
Mirochna, Thaddeus M., O89360.

Mitchell, John D., Jr., O59116.
Mitchell, Richard F., O63338.
Mitchell, Terry C., O66056.
Mitchem, Winfred E., O60596.
Mize, Clifford E., O60838.
Moe, Wayne J., O69990.
Mohr, Phillip J., O83609.
Moller, Andreas J., O58520.
Mollison, Douglas A., O62213.
Monahan, Lawrence P., Jr., O59190.
Monk, Eugene E., O59467.
Monroe, Howard E., O81063.
Montgomery, Ernest G., O91942.
Montgomery, George M., O66057.
Montgomery, Hunter M., O59495.
Monyhan, William J., O88844.
Moore, Albert E., O63364.
Moore, Donald G., O60832.
Moore, Fred S., O62257.
Moore, Herbert S., Jr., O60677.
Moore, Howard McK., O63387.
Moore, James E., O69992.
Moore, James T., O58522.
Moore, John H., O65093.
Moore, Merl M., Jr., O58523.
Moore, William T., O59120.
Moran, Clayton L., O59298.
Moreau, Donald W., O69752.
Morris, Charles E., O65206.
Morris, Davis O'N., O69753.
Morrison, John H., Jr., O65121.
Morrissey, John J., O70439.
Morrow, Charles, Jr., O58983.
Morrow, Jack G., O67730.
Morton, Karl R., O89112.
Morton, Langdon L., O65603.
Morton, Richard L., O59313.
Mortrude, James O., O78997.
Moses, Albert R., O62235.
Moses, Thomas L., O59280.
Motola, Mario, V., O63406.
Muckerman, Joseph E., 2d, O59356.
Mullens, Robert M., O65246.
Mumma, Harry F., O57456.
Munroe, Irving W., O79002.
Murphy, Edward L., Jr., O58527.
Murphy, Meredith E., O65176.
Murphy, Powell D., O62842.
Murray, Clive E., Jr., O58529.
Myers, Allen L., Jr., O59968.
Myers, Robert W., O79005.
Myers, William G., O59658.
Nash, Vernon L., Jr., O59921.
Neil, James M., O59101.
Nelson, Edwin B., O57167.
Nelson, Knute, R., O61220.
Nelson, Loyal E., O65714.
Nelson, Neil G., O59660.
Nelson, Robert B., O59211.
Nelson, Robert C., O59091.
Nelson, Wallace W., O69757.
Nelson, William J., O58532.
Nevin, John I., O63804.
New, William R., O59961.
Newell, Arthur, O69533.
Newport, Elswick, O80153.
Nicholas, Billy B., O65116.
Nielsen, Jack W., O58534.
Nikas, Nick J., O67733.
Noce, Robert W., O59175.
Nolan, John M., O57452.
Norcom, Henry C., O70455.
Nordin, William H., O59137.
Norman, William C., O59296.
Norton, Doyt P., O65149.
Norton, Dunbar S., O65199.
Norwood, Wayne D., O60693.
Notbohm, William R., O60643.
Nowak, George A., O58539.
Nulsen, Charles K., Jr., O59260.
Nunnally, Stephens, W., O59110.
Nyquist, Joel B., Jr., O65107.
Oba, Juneus T., O66187.
Oberley, Thomas E., O58161.
Oberst, Tom C., O59178.
O'Brien, Peter, O79011.
O'Brien, Richard E., O65187.
O'Brien, Robert T., O59136.
Odom, Louie W., O65231.
O'Donnell, Edward H., O57683.
Ogden, Lawrence J., O59372.
Ogilvy, Hubert W., O65134.
Ohm, Herbert P., O79012.
O'Kelley, William C., O59871.
Olentine, Charles G., O59125.
Oliver, Kenneth M., Jr., O65054.
Olson, Robert E., O58542.
Ondishko, Joseph J., Jr., O60576.
Oravetz, Milan J., O82072.
Ortega, George A., O66062.
Osato, Timothy, O60241.
Osick, John J., O79015.
Osterhout, Fred A., Jr., O66189.
Oswald, Donald C., O69762.
Owsley, Homer, Jr., O59498.
Padalino, Martin L., O70463.
Page, James MacM., Jr., O70465.
Page, Philip E., Jr., O92059.
Palmer, Charles D., 059348.
Palmer, Richard A., O58546.
Panzer, Dwayne A., O58547.
Paris, Edward J., O82073.
Parish, Freddy B., O82074.
Parker, Charles H., O82353.
Parker, Joseph L., O65172.
Parsons, George A., O79018.
Patrick, Wayne A., O66067.
Patterson, Clyde H., Jr., O58173.
Patterson, Loren S., O59309.
Patterson, William H., Jr., O58995.
Patton, Teddy L., O82075.
Patton, Thomas J., O65155.
Paulson, Paul A., O59318.
Payne, Bruce R., 2d, O79020.
Peabody, Richard R., O63354.
Pease, Quentin, O59934.
Peck, George E., O58126.
Peiker, Raymond J., O84657.
Peixotto, Roland E., O59263.
Pence, Edward W., O58552.
Pendergrass, Alva W., Jr., O58169.
Penfield, Walter A., O65707.
Penny, Robert G., O59946.
Perfect, Burns I., O70470.
Perry, Raymond L., O79023.
Peters, Elmer B., O59198.
Peterson, Hartwin R., O60713.
Petranck, John J., O59236.
Petruzzi, Anthony B., O65105.
Petty, Edgar L., Jr., O62249.
Pfeffer, William J., O60593.
Phelps, Franklin E., O79024.
Phillips, Charles L., O66191.
Phillips, Donald M., O94950.
Phillips, Eugene, Jr., O65242.
Phillips, William G., O69770.
Piper, Harvey D., O57449.
Piserchia, Joseph, O60656.
Pizzi, Joseph E., O60216.
Pleier, William F., O79027.
Plummer, Frank S., Jr., O63093.
Poe, James E., O60700.
Poerner, Homer W., O65219.
Pollin, George A., Jr., O59168.
Ponder, Lewington S., O59823.
Post, Sterling T., Jr., O67855.
Powell, John C., Jr., O68395.
Powell, Joseph L., O82081.
Powell, Richard L., O79033.
Powell, Roger D., O58560.
Powers, George McL., O59003.
Powers, Louis W., O82082.
Powers, Terence A., O59286.
Prather, Lewis D., O69772.
Preuit, James V., O63360.
Price, Wallace W., O65030.
Price, William S., O65247.
Prichard, Chesley D., O58562.
Proctor, William B., Jr., O58563.
Prout, William L., O59977.
Puckett, Ralph, Jr., O59165.
Pue, Eddie B., O75272.
Pumphrey, Richard T., O60703.
Quackenbush, Harold G., O65110.
Quigley, Quentin D., O60909.
Quinn, John D., O79037.
Quinn, Thomas G., O79038.
Rafferty, Arthur J., O58566.
Rahmann, John C., O66078.
Ramos, Rene, O59005.
Rank, William A., O59099.
Rankin, Edward, O84664.
Ransier, John G., O63376.
Rasmussen, John W., Jr., O59193.
Rasmussen, Raymond J., O59161.
Rathlev, Arnold, O59944.
Rawls, Lucian R., Jr., O65713.
Ray, John L., O58570.
Raymond, William B., O84463.
Ream, Forrest D., O59503.
Redd, Milton LeR., O79041.
Reed, George M., O69774.
Reed, James B., O57921.
Reese, Neil, O65101.
Reid, Robert A., O65718.
Reign, Lewis L., Jr., O79045.
Rhine, Macolm K., O63306.
Rhodes, Clifford D., O65589.
Rhodes, William H., O58154.
Rice, Foy, O65088.
Rich, Charles E., O70489.
Richardson, George M., O60843.
Richey, Thomas B., O59938.
Richters, Robert L., O65109.
Riddle, Hugh H., O66194.
Rider, Vernon R., O59488.
Ridlehoover, Edward M., O60222.
Riggs, Noble L., O59791.
Riggs, William G., O69777.
Riley, Evan F., O60370.
Ring, Alfred C., O65153.
Ringenbach, Frank P., Jr., O60706,
Riordan, John B., O67745.
Rishell, Clair L., O79049.
Rives, James C., O6[illegible]38.
Roach, Neal H., O60689.
Robbins, Stephen L., O80175.
Robert, John F., O59914.
Roberts, Ernst E., O59229.
Roberts, Wayne G., O63486.
Robertson, Jack L., O60716.
Robinson, Herbert A., O79052.
Robinson, Robert H., O69779.
Roby, Houston S., Jr., O62834.
Roebuck, Charles G., O59154.
Roegge, Alvin L., O79056.
Rogers, David D., Jr., O59341.
Rollier, Robert L., O85244.
Rooks, David L., O63391.
Rose, Robert M., O59127.
Rosner, Albert A., O65077.
Ross, Edgar B., Jr., O59220.
Ross, Hugh A., 3d, O94955.
Ross, Marion C., O59273.
Rossman, Warren W., O63235.
Roth, Theodore R., O76913.
Rovegno, Lawton C., O79062.
Rowe, Gordon D., O58583.
Royal, Everett C., O58584.
Rumore, Sam, O69783.
Runkle, Robert L., O65724.
Ruppert, John P., O62273.
Rusche, Ralph R., O59970.
Ruschmeyer, Gerald F., O62229.
Rush, Donald P., O62232.
Ruzich, Rudolph L., O65178.
Ryan, Wendell J., O66088.
Sadler, Jack R., O59081.
Samuel, James E., O89591.
Sanders, James H., O59908.
Sanders, Paul, O59953.
Sando, Raymond W., O66090.
Sandrock, George W., O59905.
Sanelli, Alfred A., O60212.
Sargeant, Edward W., O62250.
Sarsfield, Francis L., O59312.
Savage, Paul L., O58589.
Schaefer, Martin W., O79072.
Schappaugh, George H., O66092.
Scheib, Helmut V., O79073.
Scheumann, Marcus C., Jr., O66094.
Schiller, Melvin D., O60668.
Schleh, Wittmer I., O62271.
Schmalzel, Joseph L., Jr., O59252.
Schmidt, Norbert O., O59123.
Schoen, Harry P., Jr., O60848.
Schulz, Gerhard W., O59121.
Schulz, Theodore G., O79078.
Schumacher, David J., O87608.
Schwartz, Jack J., O87909.
Schwarz, Robert H., O59310.
Seibert, Donald A., O60224.
Seibert, Donald W., O63413.

Selby, Lewis S., O63402.
Selfe, John K., O79080.
Sellers, Homer L., Jr., O65084.
Semmens, Gervies L., O59976.
Semple, Charles C., O59929.
Semsch, Philip L., O58596.
Shapira, Norman I., O60239.
Sharpe, Edgar B., O62263.
Sharpe, Melvin B., O79083.
Shaw, Harold E., O58600.
Sheets, Henry B., Jr., O59268.
Shelnut, James R., O60725.
Shelton, Louis H., O58602.
Sheppard, Robert D., Jr., O57800.
Sherman, Robert, O61101.
Shields, Buren R., Jr., O60230.
Shields, Lawrence D., O66097.
Shiely, Thomas P., O57437.
Shoemaker, Charles J., Jr., O62274.
Sickafoose, Keith E., O59138.
Siegrist, Raymond E., O65120.
Sills, Charles W., O84672.
Sills, Gerald H., O76917.
Sims, Thomas A., O79086.
Singletary, Albert W., O59180.
Singleton, William T., O70504.
Sizemore, Burley, O79090.
Smith, Charles D., Jr., O60827.
Smith, Charles L., O59399.
Smith, Dale M., O69795.
Smith, Donald E., O62001.
Smith, Duane H., O59191.
Smith, Harold F., Jr., O66101.
Smith, John A., O82095.
Smith, Lloyd D., O91263.
Smith, Malcolm R., O79095.
Smith, Paul T., O69798.
Smith, Richard D., O65158.
Smith, Robert L., O65129.
Smith, Samuel L., O59917.
Smith, Simeon M., Jr., O59338.
Smith, Vance O., O63346.
Smith, Wayne C., Jr., O59382.
Smithey, Paul C., O59817.
Smithson, Robert W., O63086.
Smyth, Carl B., O65173.
Snell, Dillon, O62230.
Snipan, George, O62264.
Snow, Morgan W., O80191.
Soucek, Leo E., O60006.
Soucy, Robert H., O82100.
Southerland, John T., O60659.
Speights, Duris, Jr., O87924.
Spence, Ralph W., O58145.
Spencer, Orton F., O59240.
Spettel, Charles L., O59128.
Spivey, Ray V., O63489.
Spoede, Robert W., O58610.
Springer, Robert M., Jr., O59210.
Spruill, Victor F., O69799.
Staigers, James McC., O69800.
Staley, J. Wayne, Jr., O60842.
Stam, Charles W., O81255.
Staples, Franklin E., O65616.
Starkey, Posie L., Jr., O63373.
Stauffer, Joseph R., O59103.
Stedham, Dan D., O66204.
Steele, Warren B., O63377.
Steenburn, Donald H., O58614.
Steinke, John E., O57885.
Stelman, Chester R., O63352.
Stephens, Rome O., O92255.
Sterrett, John D., O59474.
Stickney, Louis S., Jr., O69804.
Stigall, Arthur D., O69805.
Stivers, Fred, Jr., O65089.
Stockell, Charles W., O79108.
Stockton, Thomas W., O59199.
Stoltenberg, Jack G., O65123.
Stone, James L., O65096.
Stone, Joel E., O58165.
Stone, R. E., O84890.
Stooke, Willard N., O79109.
Story, Robert P., O57654.
Strauss, George H., O58618.
Strawn, Louis F., O59041.
Streett, St. Clair, Jr., O59163.
Strohecker, Howard L., O59084.
Stukhart, George, Jr., O59139.
Stump, Robert M., O58134.
Sturdivant, Leslie W., O58620.
Sugg, Leon H., Jr., O65226.
Sugiyama, Shigeki J., O92126.
Suglia, Anthony S., O65108.
Sullivan, George A., O75301.
Summers, Archie W., O60237.
Sunski, Chester F., O65087.
Surut, Lee E., O59150.
Suther, Russell J., O58623.
Suttle, Albert B., Jr., O59182.
Sutton, John E., O59155.
Swafford, Fred G., Jr., O63087.
Swett, Trevor W., Jr., O59321.
Sylvester, Loren H., O62243.
Symmes, Kenneth R., O79115.
Tallman, Richard J., O59277.
Taylor, Charles E., O60231.
Taylor, Donald L., O69811.
Taylor, Mack, Jr., O57427.
Taylor, Richard F., O69812.
Taylor, Victor C., O84892.
Teague, Phillip E., O70155.
Teasdale, Robert D., O84677.
Tedick, Eugene, O59481.
Teel, Joseph F., O65164.
Templeman, James M., O60007.
Terry, Charles A., O58628.
Tesko, Stanley, O82109.
Thams, Robert W., O65609.
Thayer, George E., Jr., O69813.
Thoma, William C., O63397.
Thomas, Charles M., O63357.
Thomas, Jack D., O59255.
Thomas, Wilson E., O82111.
Thome, Matthew R., O75306.
Thompson, Lawrence D., O60644.
Thompson, Paul A., O65604.
Thornton, Aubrey O., O69816.
Thying, Lunsford, O81291.
Tice, Raphael D., O70530.
Tieman, Wilbert A., O65075.
Tierney, William P., O69817.
Timmerberg, Paul M., O70531.
Tobin, Paul G., O68804.
Tobin, Richard E., O59329.
Topham, Everett G., O65091.
Townes, James E., Jr., O59906.
Townsley, Edwin S., O59094.
Trabue, Earl N., O58635.
Tracy, George W., O59145.
Trask, Norman E., O79119.
Travers, Francis A., Jr., O60709.
Travis, William H., O57292.
Trinkle, Frank W., O65204.
Trost, Robert W., O79120.
Tuberty, James T., O66109.
Tucker, Harold, O79121.
Tunnell, Teddy B., O85455.
Turley, Joseph, McL., O59404.
Turman, Robert L., O58636.
Turnbull, Francis W., O63112.
Turner, Albert F., O59293.
Turner, Frederick C., O58637.
Turner, Glenn E., Jr., O58638.
Tussing, Austin F., O69820.
Tutwiler, Guy I., O60698.
Tyler, John E., O70540.
Tyson, William P., Jr., O71423.
Unger, Guinn E., O58641.
Updike, Robert E., O79125.
Upton, Clifford A., O79126.
Urrutia, Carlos E., O66112.
Utley, Jack C., O57519.
Vail, William H., O59954.
VanDyken, Harold B., O80199.
Van Hook, James McN., O59768.
Van Horn, Vannah E., O88986.
Van Laethem, Fernand R., O63350.
Van Meter, Jack D., O65182.
Vargovick, William S., O59285.
Vaughan, Miles C., Jr., O62259.
Vaughn, James B., O65181.
Vaughn, Robert D., O69822.
Vincent, Caleb R., O60813.
Vogt, Robert L., O60691.
Vollmer, John P., O59284.
Voseipka, John R., O63365.
Waddell, Edward S., O63068.
Waddell, Jack L., O66114.
Wagner, Richard H., O59122.
Wagonhurst, Arland H., O65715.
Walden, John E. 2d, O57684.
Waldrop, Andrew J., O57808.
Walker, Albert L., O58644.
Walker, John R., O79134.
Walker, Robert G., O81312.
Wallace, Bruce E., O65610.
Wallis, Vernon V., O63072.
Walsh, John J., Jr., O70549.
Walters, Edwin S., O58646.
Walton, John M., O58647.
Wardle, Theron G., O84468.
Warlick, William F., Jr., O65213.
Warner, Walter J., O84469.
Warnke, John J., Jr., O58649.
Warren, Hancel L. E., O65722.
Warrington, Robert O., 079135.
Watling, Edward T., O59506.
Watson, Henry, Jr., O71892.
Watson, William R., O66118.
Wayne, Norbert J., O65090.
Weaver, Robert N., O69826.
Webb, Roy L., O80202.
Webel, Herman, Jr., O59899.
Webster, Dobson L., O59816.
Weissinger, Jack K., O84684.
Welch, John M., O57799.
Wendling, Donald E., O65150.
Wenz, Albert L., O65148.
Wesolowski, Stanley, O58655.
West, Oliver I., O65597.
West, William F., O58656.
Westermann, Thomas R., O62275.
Wheeler, Harold L., O60696.
Wheeler, Neil W., O79142.
Whelan, Raymond A., O69829.
Whichard, William A., O65212.
Whistler, Donald E., O59204.
Whitaker, Bill, O84685.
White, Charles R., O66210.
White, Joseph F., O63048.
White, Richard V., O58172.
Whitelock, Thomas D., O65195.
Wickham, Robert E., O66121.
Wienecke, Herman E., O60673.
Wieteki, Donald W., O81335.
Wightman, John D., O59381.
Wilcox, George L., O65731.
Wild, Charles B., Jr., O63065.
Wilkins, Frank E., O63408.
Wilkinson, Edward S., Sr., O84689.
Wilkinson, Harry W., O69831.
Will, Clement H., O75319.
Willett, Curtis L., Jr., O85390.
Williams, Edwin J., Jr.,O58660.
Williams, Gordon E., O79147.
Williams, Murray W., O59197.
Williams, Robert W., O60839.
Williams, Theodore, O57462.
Williamson, Dan H., Jr., O59173.
Williamson, Wade H., O70128.
Wilmot, Fred W., O59770.
Wilson, Calvin O., O63094.
Wilson, Clifford C., O59066.
Wilson, Edwin C., O60650.
Wilson, Francis B., O65737.
Wilson, J. Frank, O79148.
Wilson, Jode R., O78177.
Wilson, Leo L., O62836.
Wilson, Planter M., O50884.
Wilson, Robert B., O84691.
Wilson, William V., O81347.
Wilton, Clifford J., O79149.
Winn, Charles C., O58664.
Winslow, Francis J., O69836.
Wintersteen, Joseph O., Jr., O58151.
Withers, Langhorne P., O68062.
Wolak, Francis A., O59086.
Woltmon, Jack W., O60686.
Womble, Phelps R., O66647.
Wood, John F., Jr., O63372.
Woodward, Dean R., O62237.
Woolshlager, Richard J., O58667.
Worth, William J., O62844.
Wren, John J., O58669.
Wright, Charles D., O60662.
Wright, Lloyd G., O65103.
Wyatt, Willard S., O65166.
Wyruchowski, Edward P., Jr., O65241.
Yadon, James C., O58671.
Yaggi, Albert S., Jr., O69839.
Yarbrough, John D., O62238.
Yeats, Joseph J., Jr., O59151.

Yellman, Edward K., O59364.
Yepsen, John H., O59267.
Yerkes, Charles W., Jr., O79156.
Yerkes, Walter E., O57455.
Yost, DeVerne R., O60381.
Young, David R., O63091.
Young, William V., O60604.
Youngblood, Lewis H., Jr., O59967.
Younger, Ralph K., O58673.
Zarnowski, Walter J., O65605.
Zohn, Jerome, O60229.
Zollicoffer, Marion B., O65184.
Zumwalt, Charles B., O58679.

To be majors, Chaplain

Brady, John C., O79689.
Dolan, Francis J., O73444.
Eyler, Mervin S., O71917.
Farrow, Alpha A., O71668.
Hutchins, Gordon E., O75213.
Ketchersid, Corbin W., O83543.
Kettler, Earl C., O78632.
Killinger, Joseph G., O71687.
Kittermann, Henry O., O75223.
LeBlanc, Paul J., O71694.
Ledebuhr, Albert F., O75231.
Lewis, Francis R., O73164.
MacGregor, John M., O73074.
McNally, Carl P., O76795.
Miller, Alfred A., O88833.
Murray, Ralph J., O73230.
Paznonskas, Leonard J., O80353.
Reed, John E., O91495.
Remark, Phillip B., O88895.
Taylor, George O., O75303.
Thompson, Parker C., O81864.
Walter, Louie W., O84292.
Williams, Robert W., O69834.
Wilson, Robert D., O75322.

To be majors, Women's Army Corps

Bray, Lydia M., L00574.
Buzzetti, Helen J., LO0337.
Eliker, Martha C., LO0354.
Hill, Georgia D., LO0398.
Leete, Alice W., LO0352.
Long, Alice A., LO0544.
Steir, Helen D., LO0390.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Akers, William A., O73435.
Austerman, Warrington, O73121.
Baker, Floyd W., O71901.
Barrett, O'Neill, Jr., O72321.
Baugh, Joseph H., O74634.
Berbary, Maurice S., O73126.
Boyd, Howard A., O73237.
Bridges, Berly E., Jr., O87689.
Burkett, Harry E., O71907.
Carey, Philip O., O72328.
Ceccarelli, Frank E., O72839.
Chamblin, Stuart A., Jr., O71459.
Conrad, Marcel E., Jr., O71658.
Cox, Dana D., O69472.
Cox, Robert S., Jr., O69473.
Crudo, Frank S., Jr., O72695.
Dalton, James B., O74671.
Dixon, Leon M., Jr., O75349.
Edwards, Leon C., O76101.
Fenstermacher, James M., O73954.
Ford, George W., O75356.
Fulton, Nolen W., Jr., O73466.
Guenter, Kenneth E., O71504.
Hanson, Thomas A., O75367.
Herman, Robert H., O72335.
Huycke, Edward J., O75214.
Jefferson, Samuel C., O71815.
Johnson, Cecil V., O76268.
Johnson, Waine C., O71816.
Kent, Alfred H., O71686.
Kimbrough, Edward E., 3d, 076296.
Kortis, Howard I., O71689.
Longfellow, Don W., O70695.
Louro, Jose M., O72342.
MacNair, Donald S., O70830.
Mansfield, John O., O73967.
McFadden, Archibald W., O71702.
McGregor, John G., O72935.
Mendelson, Janice A., K73107.
Morss, Dwight F., Jr., O73076.
Murray, Thomas B., O76453.
Pearson, Jack W., O71246.
Plunket, Daniel C., O78018.
Pogrebniak, Alexander, O72350.
Potter, Stanley E., O76522.
Powers, Joseph F., O76525.
Rasmussen, Donald L., O74820.
Shamburek, Roland H., O75427.
Spotnitz, Murray, O71284.
Steuer, George Z., O91521.
Thompson, James W., O72657.
Turner, Guthrie L., Jr., O75436.
Walton, Spencer, O73250.

To be majors, Dental Corps

Alderson, Thomas H., O78565.
Alexander, William N., O78566.
Andrews, James L., O74626.
Bundt, Lyle D., O75980.
Crowe, Patrick D., O78045.
Davis, Quince B., 078050.
Davis, Thomas H., O76061.
Grisham, William K., O94859.
Horkowitz, Gabriel W., O85573.
Howe, Michael J., O78067.
Jaggers, Joe H., O72739.
Jones, Rex D., O68191.
Lee, Leslie M., O95060.
Legg, William J., O78003.
Morgan, Samuel C., O78104.
Paul, Parks S., O88174.
Seibert, Jay S., O76607.
Smith, Duncan M., O73259.
Steele, Richard A., O86813.

To be majors, Veterinary Corps

Brown, Heyward G., O75054.
Crippen, James G., O71474.
Fowler, James L., O73069.
Hays, William L., O71508.
Lorentzen, Kay W., O68375.
Sheehy, Robert W., O85084.

To be majors, Medical Service Corps

Allen, Edward V., O78640.
Arnberg, Wilber H., O69850.
Baker, Eugene M., 3d, O65140.
Barr, John W., O69854.
Bentley, Richard E., O69859.
Blakesley, Lyman, O70279.
Blue, Jack T., O65556.
Buker, Leland A., O84731.
Bynum, Robert M., 3d, O70293.
Camp, Frank R., Jr., O80288.
Carroll, Nicholas V., O65192.
Chadbourne, Ernest D., O69679.
Cheek, Norfleet R., O84733.
Clapp, Marshall W., O69882.
Cohen, Milton, O69883.
Cooper, Robert E., O78644.
Crampton, George H., O71910.
Crimen, John C., O70315.
Crook, Samuel L., Sr., O70316.
Cross, Jack, O69892.
Cross, John R., O58354.
Davenport, James D., Jr., O69897.
Davidson, Louis F., O69899.
Davis, William V., O70321.
Downing, Jack W., O69906.
Erne, Walter F., O69914.
Ess, Earl D., O69915.
Eveland, Charles L., O70332.
Fleury, Thomas C., O84737.
Gillespie, Harold S., O69934.
Ginalick, Matthew, O70352.
Harcus, Alan, O69942.
Hayes, Cecil H., O69944.
Hayes, William H., O69945.
Hedlund, James L., O71678.
Hino, Chester T., O69950.
Huggins, Lewis H., O70386.
Israeloff, Joseph, O78650.
Janbaz, Edward H., O81869.
Kerrigan, Robert J., O84830.
Leifheit, Howard C., O63460.
Lindsay, Clyde J., O84744.
Little, Roger W., O65220.
Lord, Henry E., O69972.
Lysak, William, O72376.
Madere, Glenn W., Jr., O65200.
Marquis, Charles E., O84746.
McAleer, Charles F., Jr., O69981.
McArthur, James E., O69982.
McMartin, George M., O84747.
Mullins, William S., O69996.
Norem, Leroy K., O84749.
Pace, Erroll W., Jr., O70462.
Parker, James W., O72347.
Patrick, Darvin O., O78656.
Pavlo, Michael J., Jr., O70013.
Paxson, Earle A., O58790.
Pendrak, Theodore S., O70015.
Pezzulli, Frank, O78658.
Porter, William R., O78659.
Powell, Winston K., O70020.
Prescott, William J., O70475.
Ramshur, Loren C., O78660.
Rooney, William S., O60892.
Sauls, Wayne R., O84328.
Shafer, Keith O., O65102.
Simpson, Wayne LaV., O70503.
Smith, Grayson, O70040.
Snyder, John S., O70507.
Spencer, Ralph A., O70512.
St. John, Frederick B., O58791.
Stone, Robert A., O70046.
Thomas, Charles A., Jr., O73056.
Touchette, Norbert E., O81873.
Turnbull, Samuel J., Jr., O70535.
Tyndall, Arnold E., O88314.
Wasson, Val J., O84836.
Wegner, William M., O70554.
White, Raymond H., O70561.
Wittlif, Charles L., O70068.
Wright, Dallas P., O84039.
Wykoff, Dale E., O58678.
Young, James J., O70575.
Ziesenheim, Joseph C., O66130.

To be majors, Army Nurse Corps

Anderson, Marion V., N3006.
Bochman, Beverly E., N1794.
Bongiovanni, Esther T., N2891.
Bowman, Betty O., N2839.
Bradley, Mary L., N2530.
Brosmer, Margaret M., N1849.
Brown, Virginia L., N2832.
Bullock, Sarah C., N2857.
Chase, Dorothy L., N2896.
Christensen, Donna M., N2527.
Connolly, Margaret M., N2833.
Corbin, Mabel H., N2616.
DeLaney, Ramona E., N2550.
Dean, Martha, N2541.
Delaney, Marion P., N2910.
Donovan, Mary L., N2612.
Duncan, Mildred, N2621.
Eckhoff, Genevieve E., N2548.
Fairaizl, Berniece I., N2617.
Farland, Vivian, N2574.
Frazier, Doris S., N2348.
Gerster, Dorothy C., N2873.
Glover, Mayme V., N2661.
Grant, Helen E., N1835.
Griffith, Margaret M., N2620.
Haegele, Ida L., N2640.
Hambrick, Julia E., N1775.
Hathaway, Edythe J., N2815.
Hill, Helen M., N2641.
Horton, Virginia A., N2691.
Hughes, Margaret E., N2843.
Jablunovsky, Anne C., N2022.
Jacoby, Jane E., N1854.
Johnson, Elizabeth F., N2692.
Jones, Mary A., N2627.
Kern, Marion L., N2875.
Knox, Grace E., N2666.
Krekel, Dorothy J., N2608.
Kropski, Lena S., N2688.
LeBlanc, Claire V., N1851.
Levangie, Catherine L., N1939.
Lewis, Vivian B., N2876.
Liebowitz, Ethel, N1852.
MacGarvie, Elizabeth E., N2942.
Mahar, Mary E., N1762.
Marta, Katherine M., N1853.
McCaleb, Lois M., N2845.
McConnell, Amy L., N2829.
Mead, Pettrina M., N1797.
Mooney, Sara C., N1752.
Moore, Daisy E., N2647.
Mortensen, Louise L. N2605.
Neirby Gladys O., N2649.
Nichols, Barbara J., N2650.

Painter, Mary E., N2847.
Paxton, Annie D., N2887.
Pilger, Marion H., N2877.
Pishak, Irene R., N1818.
Piiler, Vivian L., N1938.
Quesenberry, Esther M., N2819.
Quigley, Kathleen E., N2619.
Ramirez, Rosa J., N2628.
Renegar, Velma F., N2946.
Roberts, Lucile M., N2906.
Rolph, Marion L., N2953.
Schiffman, Regina H., N2567.
Senn, Minerva A., N1813.
Sidell, Norma A., N2908.
Sulpizio, Virginia M., N1802.
Tague, Lena M., N2674.
Traverse, Veronica R., N2657.
Twohey, Barbara J., N2610.
Tyarks, Margaret E., N2921.
Utt, Yvonne M., N2968.
Varner, Marjorie L., N2602.
Verhonick, Phyllis J., N1800.
Weeks, Nelda L., N2659.
Werick, Lenora B., N1819.
Wilson, Ruth A., N2347.
York, Elta R., N1766.
York, Elva M., N1765.

To be majors, Army Medical Specialist Corp

Eason, Martha J., M10094.
Fauble, Phyllis H., M10087.
Kennon, Barbara L., R10100.
Perry, Joan H., M10096.
Williams, June E., R10102.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be major

Ginikowre, George J. (MSC), O80296.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be major

Vnencak, Paul A., O2287603.

To be captains

DeLisle, Frederick C., O4030928.
Fendler, Donn C., O2003765.
Fuller, Richard G., O4030946.
Hall, John F., O4010341.
Hill, Robert A., Jr., O1925072.
Mode, Albert K., O1876389.
Rios-Matta, Luis R., O1924145.
Seale, Thomas A., O4010600.
Search, Charles T., O4004580.
Troknya, Robert J., O4032138.
Wang, Jesse, O2021218.
Webber, Herbert M., O4013477.

To be first lieutenants

Bisch, Frederick R., O5503826.
Bunker, David L., O5304096.
Caruso, Michael L. A., O5301507.
Corns, Johnnie H., O5203857.
Crittenden, Oliver H., O5400710.
Dramis, George J., Jr., O5503630.
Gentile, Nicholas A., O4084403.
Lindstrom, Frank V., O5506190.
Nelson, Maynard L., O4062115.
Schiermeier, John J., O5305512.
Steinmetz, Charles P., O4035412.
Turner, James W., O5304525.

To be second lieutenants

Anchor, Leonard J., O5008061.
Anderson, Jimmie M., O5307304.
Arthur, James F., Jr., O5312088.
Boyce, John P., O5511764.
Brown, John L., O5311416.
Caravana, Richard R., O5307057.
Cassada, Thomas W., O5509113.
Harrington, William B., O5307471.
Hosford, Larry D., O5209362.
Johnson, Victor V., Jr., O5001880.
Lemoine, Jarod J., O5403349.
Mills, David E., O5404876.
Sims, Jackie D., O5309566.
Smallen, Ray H., O5307690.
Troche, Alfonso, O5006036.
Wild, Allan R., O5008235.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3291, 3293, and 3294.

To be captain, Chaplain

Sather, Donald R., O2269808.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Adams, Herbert F., Jr., O4045239.
Andrews, D. M., O2296457.
Beckelheimer, Robert G., O5210108.
Betts, Alan F., O5501030.
Call, Thomas, O5204145.
Linder, William E., Jr., O4029558.
McNeill, Thomas J., O5206297.
Morton, Charles B., O4070685.
Rice, Jack D., O5209497.
Stegman, Donald D., O5210102.
Wallace, John R., O2284652.
Willenborg, George C., O4052330.
Zablotny, Florian H., O5004479.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Ansbacher, Rudi, O4036105.
Blizard, Eugene B., O5216798.
Colletti, Paul R., O4052265.
Coyner, John L., O5216925.
Cullen, Stanley I., O5501324.
Dinapoli. Raphael J., Jr., O5004675.
Edgett, Joseph W., Jr., O4049698.
Coppola, Ralph J., O4052414.
Eller, Jimmie L., O4003353.
Fortiner, Robert H., O5003642.
Garcia, Luis F., O4028472.
Helmly, Robert B., O4044810.
Howland, Justin, O5703215.
Kisiel, John, Jr., O5004875.
Lowe, Reginald S., O5306822.
McDonald, Herbert L., O4041981.
McNaney, Joseph W., Jr., O5012708.
Mehr, Michael P., O2295415.
Miller, Dudley C., O4042027.
Olson, Elbert R., O2297917.
Pike, William B., O4076317.
Proctor, Robert F., O4043839.
Rave, Norman L., O5213617.
Rieman, Raymond L., O4052478.
Stelter, Gerald P., O4029942.
Stoneback, Raymond D., O5203606.
Swartz, Harold M., O2295403.
Taber, Joseph W., Jr., O2295539.
Thoms, John M., O4056891.
Walter, Daniel L., O5500628.
Willi, Franz J. P., O4067482.
Wood, Laurence W., O4045106.
Yadon, Lowell G., O4057640.

To be captains, Veterinary Corps

Schlinke, Orville C., Jr., O4024437.
Wyckoff, George H., Jr., O4037425.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Kaiser, Joan L., N2292886.
Lee, Linda, N2292701.
MacTaggart, Eunice, N2297871.
Scott, Roberta W., N5407192.

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain

Beaver, Reinard W., O2290185.
Brereton, Thomas F., O2300880.
Clark, Donald D., O5701457.
Hilton, Gerald K., O2298086.
Matthias, Charles B., O4046995.
Rivers, Daniel L., O5306557.
Thomas, Everette J., O5301292.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Ellison, Norig, O5200063.
Schaefer, Charles E., O2305197.
Sprengelmeyer, James T., O2305200.
Washburn, Kenneth B., O2300869.
Wagner, Clyde W., Jr., O2300871.

To be second lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Mitani, Norma, J2300178.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Marsh, Carolyn J., N5407342.
Schumacher, Carol Y., N5411223.
Scott, Carolyn M., N5411330.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Aulick, Louis H.
Bell, George T.
Bowman, Robert W., Jr.
Brittain, Roy C., Jr.
Clark, Thomas H.
Colvin, John D., III
Cunningham, Jerry A.
Davis, Charles T.
Ervin, Edward L.
Fortune, Rex C., Jr.
Grady, Milton
Long, Freddie E.
Lynch, Jeffrey G.
McCullough, Jackson R.
Murphy, William H.
Nielsen, William W.
Oliver, Gerald C.
Pedersen, Carl E., Jr.
Roberts, Daniel C.
Rogers, Bobby E.
Rose, Robert D.
Thomas, Charles L.
Thornton, Joseph A., Jr.
Tolman, Joseph B.
Troy, Milton W., Jr.
Whitmore, Paul V., II
Zimmerly, James G.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Ackerman, Richard C.
Adams, Bobby R.
Adams, John E.
Aitken, James J.
Allgair, John A., Jr.
Amos, William H. Jr.
Arrington, Robert D.
Baiden, Arthur H., III
Baker, Ronald B.
Banks, Gary G.
Barker, Elvis G.
Bartlett, Harvey S., II
Beauford, Richard E.
Bell, William P., II
Benson, Phillip E.
Bentley, James H.
Benton, John G.
Berg, James M.
Black, Wendell W.
Blackwood, William A., Jr.
Blase, James W.
Boggs, Carl A., Jr.
Borner, Russell E., Jr.
Bowling, Herbert E.
Boyd, David S., Jr.
Bray, Donald F.
Bressi, James A.
Brown, Thomas M.
Brown, William L.
Brown, William R.
Bryson, Edward B., Jr.
Burns, Samuel A., III
Butts, Samuel J.
Campbell, Winton G., Jr.
Canatsey, John D.
Carmack, Douglas W.
Cassady, John R., II
Cassetty, Jimmy L.
Caustic, Dennison M.
Christensen, Christen A., Jr.
Clark, Pat E.
Clarke, Joseph W.
Clary, Joe K.
Clauss, Karl J.
Conway, John L.
Cooney, Joseph C.
Crawford, Walter K., Jr.
Creech, William R.
Crockett, James R.
Cropsey, Karl S.
Crowe, Charles E.
Dansby, Robert F., Jr.
Davis, Hugh L.
Davis, Motier D., Jr.
Davis, Richard E.
Dempster, Robert J., Jr.
Deutsch, Henry A.
Dill, Earnest W.
Doenecke, William T.
Dollhausen, Hans C.
Draper, Shirley W., Jr.
Eager, Benjamin F., III
Earle, Richard H.
Edgeworth, Charles A.
Edwards, Thomas B.
Elliott, Jackie R.
Emge, William P.
Farnsworth, Melvin R., Jr.
Fillers, Donald J.
Frankhouser, Lemar R.
Gagliotì, John W.
Gaines, Glenn T.
Gaither, Thomas D.
Gardner, Alan D.
Garner, John E., Jr.
Gayer, Barry F.
Geary, Michael B.
Geimer, William S.
Gerhardt, William F.
Gerst, Jackson C., Jr.
Gillespie, Clarke M., Jr
Gittinger, Theodore D.
Glenn, Thomas J.
Gordon, Don E.
Greene, Fred W., III
Haigler, Thomas E., Jr.
Hall, William A., III
Harris, Dalrymple M., Jr.
Hartman, Benjamin C.
Hassell, Richard L.
Hasty, Donald D.
Haynes, Frank
Heiser, Joel M. S.
Heldstab, John C.
Hendrickson, Gustav D.
Henry, James J.
Hensel, Mark C., Jr.
Heyman, David L.
Hidalgo, Richard L.
Hightower, Dennis F.
Hill, Thomas R., Jr.

Hogan, Thomas M., 2d.
Holcomb, Cecil B., Jr.
Holtsinger, Rollie
Honaker, Errol K.
Ingram, William L.
Jackson, Murphy
Jackson, Randall C.
Jemison, Paul O.
Jennings, Gordon L.
Johnson, William L.
Jones, Bobby A.
Jones, James B.
Jones, Lee M.
Jordan, John T., Jr.
Kaplan, Thomas J.
Keisling, Harold G.
Keller, David L.
Kilgore, David M., 3d
Kitchings, Philip, Jr.
Kobaly, George, Jr.
Kolker, Edward F.
Kunhart, Thomas J.
LaFrange, Joseph W., III
LeGate, Richard E.
Lemmer, John F.
Lindseth, Marvin D.
Lloyd, James W.
Lowsley, James P., Jr.
Lucas, Larry F.
Malcor, Dennis P.
Martin, Donald H.
Mathern, Vernon J.
Matthews, Daryl B.
McAnany, Robert B.
McClure, Donald L.
McCotter, Orson L.
McCoy, Ronald L.
McCullough, Joe G.
McDavitt, Gerald
McDowell, Thomas D.
McGee, Willie T.
McLaughlin, William H.
Mendicino, Vincent F.
Miller, James W.
Montgomery, William C.
Mooney, Lowell T., Jr.
Moore, Howard W., Jr.
Moore, Robert A.
Morgan, William H.
Mount, Wallace K.
Myers, William R.
Navarro, Roberto, Jr.
Neidlinger, Darryl M.
Neilson, Robert S.
Newman, Harold
Nolen, William R.
Noles, William O.
O'Neal, Samuel K.
Onley, Benjamin R.
Osborne, John W.
Ozment, Robert L.
Page, David R.
Pellegrino, Joseph P.
Pelzl, Albert L.
Peters, Frederick J.
Phillips, Richard K.
Pierce, Edward D.
Piersol, Lawrence L.
Pillow, William T.
Pippin, James D.
Poole, George E., Jr.
Porterfield, Kenneth N.
Power, Joseph W., III
Prim, David F.
Quigley, Ralph P.
Ramey, Arthur
Ransburg, Judge
Redden, Paul J.
Ressler, Ronald K.
Reynolds, William J.
Richman, Gerald F.
Riddle, Dempster W., III
Riegel, Curtis E.
Roberts, James T., Jr.
Robinson, Richard M.
Rogan, James P.
Rossi, David M.
Russell, Stanley W.
Ryan, John W.
Sagerty, Kenneth T.
Sampson, Jon L.
Sans, John A.
Scott, Hal G.
Shelton, Gerald F.
Simpson, Donald A.
Sisk, Freddie D.
Smith, James A.
Smith, Randolph L.
Smith, Turner T., Jr.
Stancer, William H.
Stanley, Gerald I.
Statum, Herman C.
Stewart, John F., Jr.
Stiegler, Douglas P.
Story, Eddie B.
Summers, Clark H., Jr.
Surls, William J.
Taylor, Robert E.
Thomas, Billy M.
Thomas, Eddie L.
Thornton, Jack R.
Thrasher, Robert H.
Thurmond, Donald W.
Tietz, Henry M., Jr.
Tincher, James C., III
Tobin, Jacob G. W.
Tucker, Charles G.
Ulveling, Max G.
Van Cleave, John T.
Vivas, Ernest E.
Wagner, Frederic C., III
Waldren, Roy A.
Walsh, Gordon O.
Walters, Floyd J., Jr.
Washington, Thomas E.
Waynick, William C.
Webb, Quentin R.
Weeks, Thomas L., Jr.
Weisz, Paul J.
Weleber, Kenneth F.
Wharton, Richard R., Jr.
Whatley, Tommy V.
Wheadon, Aquilla W.
Whittington, William R.
Wilkerson, Roger C.
Wiley, Jerry D.
Williams, Michael J.
Williams, Warren B.
Wilson, Lester R.
Woodham, Gary E.
Woodruff, Edward D.
Woods, James B., III
Wren, Richard C.
Wuench, Robert L.
Young, Stefan A.
Zugel, Raymond J.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 19, 1962:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

J. Herbert Hollomon, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be commanders

Jalmer O. Brown
James Cavahaugh
Rodman W. Vaughan
Arnold J. Larsen
Frederick B. Thatcher
William B. Durham
Hamlett I. Allen
Theron H. Gato
Charles F. W. Cullison

To be lieutenant commander

Alvin J. Boxwell

To be lieutenant

Clement H. E. Kerans, Jr.

To be ensigns

Harry Andrew Allen
John Knight Andrews
George Eddings Archer, Jr.
William Leon Avery
Albert Frank Baker
Clifford Eugene Banner
Robert Andrew Bastek
Peter Michael Bernstein
Raymond Demetrius Bland
Richard Carl Blaschke
Robert Kent Blaschke
Thomas Walter Boerger
Harold Lance Bonnet
William Andrew Borchers
David Thomas Boyle
Robert Frederick Boysen, Jr.
John Wentworth Brittain
Larry Dennis Brooks
Phillip Jeffrey Bull
Carl Henry Burkhart
David Kevin Carey
Louis Michael Casale
George Anthony Casimir
David Raynor Coady
Walter Melbourne Coburn
Richard Vincent Consigli
Joseph Lawrence Crowe, Jr.
Laurence Joseph Dallaire, Jr.
John George Denninger, Jr.
Joseph Patrick Dibella
Joseph Henry Discenza
Lance Arthur Eagan
Joseph Robert Finelli
Arthur Richard Gandt
David Shaw Gemmell
James Franklin Greene, Jr.
Richmond Dean Greenough, Jr.
William Scott Haight
Glenn Edgar Haines
David Wade Hastings
William Colbert Heming
Arthur Eugene Henn
Peter Christian Hennings
Stephen Henry Hines
Eugene Hornstein
Raymond Jerry Houttekier
Kwang-Ping Hsu
Norman Henry Huff
Herbert Miller Hurst
Harry Nelson Hutchins III
Thomas Patrick Keane
Don Michael Keehn
Thomas Joseph Kenney
Frederick Arthur Kelley
Richard Joseph Kiessel
Daniel Tobias Koenig
James Henry Lightner
Thomas Henry Lloyd, Jr.
Neal Mahan
Robert David Markoff
George Edward Mason
John Thomas Mason
John Michael McCann
Robert Edward McDonough, Jr.
James Charles McElroy
Thomas Peter McGann
Thomas Francis McGrath III
James Andrew McIntosh
Alexander Clark McKean, Jr.
Timothy George McKinna
Arthur William Mergner, Jr.
Wade Mulford Moncrief, Jr.
Francis William Mooney
Charles Wesley Morgan
Stewart Brandhorst Morgan
James Lowell Mueller
William Stewart Murray
Michael Owen Murtagh
Peter Thomas Muth
Richard Brien O'Keefe
Leonard Joseph Pichini
Ronald Martin Potter
David William Proudfoot
David William Robinette
Edward Kenneth Roe, Jr.
Allen Edward Rolland
William Henry Roth
Jon Patrick Ryan
Joseph Henry Sanford
Lawrence Michael Schilling
Michael Joseph Schiro
John Gallup Schmidtman
Richard Eugene Shrum
Frederick Damien Smith
Joseph James Smith
Thomas David Smith
Anthony John Soltys
Theodore Arthur Somes
Elmer Sorensen, Jr.
William Harry Spence
Wayne Paul Stevens
Hugh Lafayette Thomas, Jr.
Henry Bradley Traver
James Alexander Umberger
Joseph Louis Valenti
Harvey Landin Wahnquist, Jr.
James Lee Walker
William James Wallace, Jr.
Thomas William Watkins III
Thomas Samuel Whipple
Daniel Michael White
Jack Warwick Whiting, Jr.
David Hart Whitten
David Harold Withers
John Anthony Wuestneck
Ronald Charles Zinzer

To be chief warrant officer, W-4

Joseph A Nartonis

To be chief warrant officers, W-2

Richard D. Borden
Marlan H. Murphy
Louis DeBernardi, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 15: 13: *Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.*

Almighty God, in these closing days of Holy Week we are bowing unto Thee in penitence and praise as we think of the great High Priest who, on Good Friday, laid upon the altar the acceptable sacrifice of His own life for the salvation of the world.

Grant that on Easter Sunday, when we commemorate His glorious resurrection and victory over the grave, we may receive insight to see our own life in a new perspective and with more of radiancy and light, triumph and hope.

May we hereafter rise to higher levels of character and conduct and be blessed with a new attitude of soul, whose music is set to a finer and firmer key.

Inspire us with such newness of life that when its eventide comes we may be ready and worthy to join our loved ones and the saints of all the ages in the communion and companionship of Thy nearer presence.

Hear us in the name of our risen Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE HATTON SUMNERS

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, on this day, Maundy Thursday, it is with the deepest sorrow that I report to my colleagues what I learned only minutes ago of the passing of our dear former colleague, Hatton Sumners, Representative of the Fifth District, Texas, the district I now represent. He was a public servant in the highest sense of the word. He served in this body for 34 years. His wise counsel and untiring efforts as a Member of this body were a constant inspiration to me. I have had a long friendship with him. and he extended to me his close friendship, advice, and counsel. My sympathy goes to the remaining members of his family and his friends. While we mourn his passing, we certainly take pride in his long and useful career, knowing full well that our city of Dallas, the State of Texas, and our country are the better because Hatton Sumners was among us.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of this great American came as a shock to those of us on the Committee on the Judiciary who had the privilege of serving with Judge Sumners. Our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who was unable to attend this session, called me this morning and asked me to express his very deep sympathy.

To have associated with Judge Sumners was a great privilege. He was a constitutional lawyer in every sense of the word. He knew and understood the reasons behind all the provisions in the Constitution of this great Republic. For a long while he fought to the best of his ability to prevent things from happening which he felt would bring about a change in our form of government. I remember distinctly the occasion when a proposal was made to pack the Supreme Court. The proposal was first submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary. Judge Sumners submitted the question to the committee. We took a secret ballot on the proposal; and he was always very proud of the fact that the committee overwhelmingly rejected the proposal to increase the size of the Court, a proposal which had as its purpose insuring favorable action on legislation which was pending at that time.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Sumners has made a niche in the history of our great Nation and in the halls of this great legislative body, and America is better for his having been a Member of the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to hear of the death of my dear friend, Hatton Sumners, of Texas. He was one of the mental giants of this body during the period of service that he rendered here. As chairman of the great Committee on the Judiciary, he performed his duties both as chairman and as a Member of the House of Representatives with outstanding ability, keen vision, and great merit and courage.

During his service in this body, he and I become very close personal friends—a friendship that I value greatly and that I shall always treasure and remember in the years that lie ahead. Hatton Sumners was truly one of the great legislators of all time. He was a great American and his contributions to the legislative history of our country will be forever clearly and indelibly imprinted on the pages of our legislative history.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I came to the Congress in 1935. There were not very many Republicans here then and, certainly, I was something of an oddity because I was the lone Republican from Indiana at that time. But, we had a freshman class which included Democrats as well as Republicans that came to the Congress at the same time. We held meetings from time to time and invited people to come to speak to us. I shall never forget the impression that Hatton Sumners made on me. One thing he said was that the genius of our great Government is evidenced in the fact that in times of great crisis the people of the country have been willing to grant to the Central Government in Washington tremendous powers to meet the crisis. But, he said, the genius of government as practiced in the United States is better evidenced by the fact that when that time of crisis has passed, the people recapture for themselves the power that they granted to the Central Government.

Mr. Speaker, those words have stayed with me. I followed the wise counsel and advice of Hatton Sumners while he was here with us. For quite some time, from time to time, I maintained some contact with him. All I can say is that in my opinion he was one of the great students of American government, one of the greatest statesmen of my time, and I join with the gentleman from Texas in mourning his passing.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved to learn this morning of the death of my old and valued friend and former colleague, the Honorable Hatton W. Sumners, at the age of 87.

He served in the House of Representatives as a Member from the Dallas, Tex., district for 34 years, and retired voluntarily in 1946 at the close of the 79th Congress. He was chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives from 1931 until his retirement in 1946. Possessing one of the great legal minds of his generation, his service as chairman of the Judiciary Committee brought him to the front as one of the outstanding constitutional lawyers of his time, and his rare speeches in the House on the fundamental principles of constitutional law attracted wide attention in the Congress, the legal profession, and the press. He possessed the rare faculty to state in clear, concise, and understandable terms his philosophy of our constitutional system of democratic government.

After his retirement from the Congress he authored his book, "The Private Citizen and His Democracy." Characteristically brief and to the point, it traced the history of government from its beginning, with particular reference to our own democratic system. It is so well and concisely written in such simple language that this generation would benefit were it required reading in every school in the land.

But his laurels do not rest alone upon his great intellect, his forensic ability, or the eminence of his statesmanship. He was one of those rare individuals equally at home in any group from the highest to the lowest of our citizens, always kindly, courteous, and considerate, always interested and attentive to the problems of others, delightful and sparkling in conversation, and always concerned and helpful in the affliction of others.

Having been his close personal friend for many years, I had occasion to know of many of his private charities and helpfulness to others which he endeavored to keep concealed within his own bosom. Our country has produced few men of so many great qualities.

His modesty is best exemplified by his brief autobiography in the Congressional Directory:

> Hatton W. Sumners, Democrat, of Dallas, Tex., was elected to the 63d and succeeding Congresses.

My sympathies go out to his family, particularly his devoted sister, who knew more than anyone else of his great stature as a statesman, humanitarian, and a devoted friend.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I have not yet become used to the idea that Hatton Sumners is no longer with us. We all remember his sterling qualities. He was with us so long we took him for granted. He lived to be 87; we could say 87 years young, because he always had a smile, a joke, or a friendly pat on the back, or some word of encouragement to all who met him. He first came to Congress in 1912. Much water has gone over the dam since Hatton Sumners arrived to give his aid to the Government.

His memory will continue to be a beacon for those who would dedicate themselves to public service.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, in the heritage of Texas and in the annals of law as we know and enjoy it in our America, few names are equal in significance to that of Hatton W. Sumners. As a lawmaker, statesman, Representative, and font of wisdom, Hatton Sumners had no peer.

The records of this body reflect three decades of his devotion and dedication to the thesis that America might enjoy a better code of justice through the dint of untiring effort and good counsel toward the end of our present judiciary system.

As a Texan, I feel deeply the loss of his good counsel and his words of encouragement in times of stress. His great joy was in giving creative assistance to his fellow man and his colleagues.

Hatton Sumners was a man of law and, too, a man of God. His respect for law was based on and nurtured by his profound inner strength which he derived from a deep spiritual belief and appreciation that man's efforts are but the handiwork of the Creator's design.

I shall miss Judge Sumners—as he was so affectionately known—as will every Texan and all with whom he was associated across the length and breadth of America.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am very sad to learn about the death of one of the most outstanding Members of Congress with whom I ever served, the Honorable Hatton W. Sumners. He was a great and good man who did much for the people of this Nation during the time he served here. His manifold contributions will continue to have a lasting effect very favorable in nature on our beloved Nation. I express my sincerest sympathy to his relatives and friends in the passing of this splendid gentleman. We all shall miss him.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, while I was not privileged to serve in this House with the late Honorable Hatton W. Sumners, of the Fifth District of Texas, I am well aware of the debt owed to him by me and all other Members who regard the U.S. Constitution as a living, valid document for this modern time.

Before his voluntary retirement in 1946, Hatton Sumners had served in this Chamber for 34 years. For almost half of that time he was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and it was in this capacity that he exerted such tremendous influence on behalf of constitutional law.

Hatton Sumners had a deep-rooted faith in the Constitution as the grantor of the individual liberties of Americans. He was closely familiar with the language of the Constitution. He was thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the Constitution. And, although he knew that much had changed in the United States and in the world since the creation of that document, he knew also that certain principles—principles written into the Constitution—do not change. He held steadfastly to those principles and he effectively summoned others to follow his example.

It is highly appropriate, and it is almost heartening, that the memory of what he was and of what he did should be honored here today.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened to learn of the passing away on April 19 of a former outstanding Member of this body, Hon. Hatton Sumners, of Texas.

I did not have the privilege of serving in this body with Judge Sumners. He voluntarily terminated his service as a Member of Congress with the ending of the 79th Congress, and my service began when the 80th Congress convened.

I knew Judge Sumners well, however. His sister, Mrs. Willis J. Davis, and her husband reside in the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia which I represent. They have been close and warm personal friends of mine for nearly 40 years. Judge Sumners on many occasions visited in their home in Atlanta, and it was my pleasure to see him there often. I admired Judge Sumners for his ability, his integrity, for his patriotism, and for his devotion to the principles of constitutional government.

Judge Sumners did me the honor to present to me an autographed copy of his book, "The Private Citizen and His Democracy."

He and I became fast friends, and I treasured that friendship throughout all the years of our acquaintance.

His life was an example of good citizenship. Our Government is stronger, our country is greater because of his service.

He will be greatly missed as a statesman, good citizen, lawyer, jurist, and in all the circles in which he moved. I shall miss him greatly as a warm personal friend.

I extend deepest sympathy in this time of bereavement to those who survive him.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 the grim reaper claimed the life of one of the most illustrious men who has served in this Congress during the present century. I am referring to the late Hatton W. Sumners, who passed away at the age of 87.

A confidant of Presidents and long one of the most powerful men in the Congress, the handiwork of this great man will be felt for generations yet to come. As a stanch defender of the Constitution and always a battler for good government, Hatton Sumners asked no quarter and gave none.

It will be recalled that Hatton Sumners voluntarily retired from Congress in 1946 after serving for 34 years, during about half of which time he was chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. It is said that he was a personal friend and adviser of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman.

Like Jefferson, he fought against overcentralization in government. He was so eloquent in his philosophy that those who disagreed with him were often forced to recognize the soundness and validity of his arguments. History will record that he was one of the most powerful influences in the successful opposition to the attempt by President Roosevelt to pack the Supreme Court.

Born on a farm near Fayetteville, Tenn., Sumners moved to Texas at the age of 18. He came up the hard way. Beginning as an office boy in a Dallas law office, he read law and advanced rapidly. He was admitted to the bar in 1897, and 3 years later was elected prosecuting attorney of Dallas County, where he served for two terms, and a little later was elected to the 63d Congress.

Hatton Sumners was a dedicated man. He fought for what he believed in. He was an advocate of hard work, of individual initiative and of limited governmental functions. He was probably one of the last of the truly great defenders of constitutional law. He was a realist and a widely recognized authority on government finance. Always plugging for balanced budgets, he warned repeatedly of the pitfalls of irresponsible spending.

His manifold contributions to the cause of good government could easily fill a volume. And what a collection of commonsense and simple truths such a book would contain.

Sumners was indeed a man of great courage and devout patriotism. He was never known to falter in pursuing his unassailable logic while advocating a cause. Those who dared heckle or disparage him were sure to feel the sharp lash of his quick wit and his silver tongue. He was a giant among men.

Mr. Speaker, I valued the personal friendship of Hatton Sumners. After his retirement from the Congress I was privileged to visit with him on occasions. His solicitude was reassuring and inspiring. I recall the last time I saw him, a little more than a year ago. He was spending the night in the Dallas home of his close friend and protege, Elmore Whitehurst. I recall that after dinner that evening, we, joined by Ruth Whitehurst, retired to a patio where we sat under the stars for some 2 or 3 hours. There Hatton, inspired by questions, was nostalgic as he drew upon his great reservoir of memories and recounted in intimate detail many of his experiences of the past. He was a philosopher. To listen to him as he poured out his life upon us, pungent with bits of humor but serious and entertaining, was an experience that one does not soon forget.

To paraphrase the words of a great man, the world is just a little bit darker because his lights have gone out; the world is a little bit colder because his heart has grown cold in death.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of our late colleague, Hatton Sumners.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications from the Committee on Public Works, which were read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1962.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House, the Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives approved on April 10, 1962, prospectuses for the following alteration projects which were transmitted to this committee from the General Services Administration:

LOCATION AND TYPE

Alabama, Anniston: PO CT.
Alaska, Fairbanks: PO CT jail.
California, Bell: Federal warehouse center.
California, Los Angeles: PO CT.
California, Oakland: 1515 Clay Street.
California, San Francisco: PO CT.
Colorado, Denver: Customhouse (new), PO CT (two buildings).

Colorado, Denver: Federal center.
Colorado, Denver: facility, 3800 York Street.
Connecticut, Hartford: PO CT.
District of Columbia: Agriculture Administration.
District of Columbia: Archives Building.
District of Columbia: Commerce Building.
District of Columbia: Executive Office Building.
District of Columbia: FOB No. 1.
District of Columbia: Federal Trade Commission Building.
District of Columbia: GSA Building.
District of Columbia: GSA regional office building.
District of Columbia: HEW, north building.
District of Columbia: HEW, south building.
District of Columbia: ICC, Labor Building.
District of Columbia: Interior Building.
District of Columbia: Internal Revenue Building.
District of Columbia: Justice Department Building.
District of Columbia: Lafayette Building.
District of Columbia: Munitions Building.
District of Columbia: Navy Building.
District of Columbia: Pension Building.
District of Columbia: Post Office (city).
District of Columbia: Post Office (new).
District of Columbia: State Department Building.
District of Columbia: Tariff Building.
District of Columbia: Veterans' Administration Building.
District of Columbia: West Heating Plant and Steam Distribution System.
District of Columbia: White House, east and west wings.
District of Columbia: 701 Independence Avenue SW.
Illinois, Chicago: PO annex (two buildings).
Illinois, Springfield: PO CT.
Iowa, Cedar Rapids: PO CT.
Kentucky, Bowling Green: CT FOB.
Louisiana, Lafayette: PO.
Maryland, Baltimore: PO CT.
Maryland, Suitland: Hydrographic Building.
Massachusetts, Boston: PO CT.
Massachusetts, Springfield: PO CT.
Minnesota, Minneapolis: Buzza Building.
Missouri, Joplin: PO CT.
Missouri, Kansas City: PO.
Missouri, St. Louis: CT customhouse.
Missouri, St. Louis: Mart building.
Montana, Helena: PO CT.
Montana, Missoula: PO CT.
New Hampshire, Laconia: FOB.
New Mexico, Carlsbad: PO FOB.
New York, New York: Foley Square CT.
North Dakota, Bismarck: PO CT.
Ohio, Canton: PO FOB.
Ohio, Cleveland: PO customhouse CT.
Ohio, Toledo: CT customhouse.
Oklahoma, Lawton: PO CT.
Oregon, Portland: PO.
Pennsylvania, Philadelphia: Customhouse and appraisers stores.
Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh: PO CT (new).
Rhode Island, Providence: PO FOB.
South Carolina, Greenville: PO CT.
Texas, Sherman: PO CT.
Utah, Provo: PO FOB.
Utah, Salt Lake City: PO CT.
Virginia, Arlington: FOB No. 2.
Virginia, Richmond: PO CT customhouse.
Washington, Seattle: FOB.
Wisconsin, Eau Claire: PO CT.
Wisconsin, Green Bay: PO FOB.
Wisconsin, Milwaukee: PO CT.

Total: 74 projects.

Sincerely yours,

Charles A. Buckley,
Chairman,
Committee on Public Works.

(CC: Appropriations Committee, Senate Public Works Committee, General Services Administration.)

Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1962.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives approved on April 10, 1962, prospectuses for the following public building projects which were transmitted to this committee from the General Services Administration:

LOCATION AND TYPE

Arizona, Tucson: border patrol sector headquarters.
Arkansas, Pine Bluff: PO CT.
California, Fresno: CT FOB.
California, West Los Angeles: FOB.
Georgia, Newnan: PO CT.
Illinois, East St. Louis: FOB.
Indiana, Gary: FOB.
Indiana, New Albany; CT FOB.
Louisiana, Baton Rouge: PO FOB.
Maine, Bangor: PO CT.
Mississippi, Greenwood: PO FOB.
Missouri, Hannibal: PO CT.
Missouri, Independence: PO FOB.
Montana, Bozeman: PO FOB.
Montana, Havre: border patrol sector headquarters.
Nevada, Carson City: PO CT.
Nevada, Las Vegas: CT FOB.
New Hampshire, Portsmouth: PO FOB.
New Jersey, Newark: FOB.
New Mexico, Clovis: FOB.
New York, Rochester: FOB.
Puerto Rico, San Juan: CT FOB.
Tennessee, Alamo: FOB.
Tennessee, Winchester: PO CT.
Texas, Alice: PO FOB.
Texas, Pasadena: PO.
Vermont, Swanton: border patrol sector headquarters.
Washington, Blaine: border patrol sector headquarters.
Washington, Spokane: border patrol sector headquarters.
District of Columbia: FBI Building.
District of Columbia: GSA Federal records center.

Total: 31 projects.

Sincerely yours,

Charles A. Buckley,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

(CC: Appropriations Committee, Senate Public Works Committee, General Services Administration.)

MINORITY PAIR CLERK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 616) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, one of the minority employees authorized therein (minority pair clerk) shall be the following named person, effective May 1, 1962, until otherwise ordered by the House, to wit: Walter Patrick Kennedy, to receive compensation at the basic rate of $5,000 per annum.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on the bill H.R. 11040.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have until 6 o'clock this evening to file a report on the bill H.R. 11413.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF HOUSE IN PRESENT SESSION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the Easter recess, I take this opportunity to commend all Members of the House upon their splendid record of substantial achievement during the first 100 days of this historic session.

The legislative program is moving forward in a businesslike way, and our committees will be ready with a number of the remaining major bills as soon as Congress resumes after the well-earned Easter recess.

Thus far in the second session the 87th Congress has completed action on 33 public laws, or about one enactment every 3 days.

Four additional major bills are in conference, and 21 other measures of national significance have been completed in the House and now await Senate action.

In addition, 6 of the 10 departmental appropriation bills for 1963 already have been cleared to the Senate, including the Department of Defense appropriation of $47.8 billion—our most impressive military program since the war years, and the greatest in our entire peacetime history.

In this field of appropriations, the legislative program is well ahead of the normal schedule of previous years at the Easter recess.

The record of 64 bills passed by the House in 100 calendar days is an accomplishment of which every Member well may be proud.

No better measure could be found for the deep attachment of this Congress to the traditions, methods, and procedures of orderly constitutional Government.

In this Congress, in these difficult days, we are together the sworn protectors and defenders of liberty under law.

The record since last January demonstrates for all the world that these grave responsibilities are regarded conscientiously by every Member.

Our first interest has been in national defense and in related measures to strengthen the posture of freedom throughout the world.

Our new military authorization program approves $13 billion for additional procurement to strengthen every arm of our mighty defense system.

All the world is thus on notice that this Nation is fully prepared, ready, able, equipped, and determined to protect American constitutional freedom wherever it may be threatened.

The Revenue Act of 1962 was passed by the House on March 29.

We have cleared the bill to increase postal rates.

We have overhauled and tightened the enforcement provisions of the laws regulating welfare and pension funds—Public Law 87-420.

A broad new program of Federal assistance in college fellowships and academic facilities has been passed by both the House and Senate.

Four separate measures have been passed by the House to strengthen our internal defenses against Communist subversion and enemy sabotage.

A broad national program has been enacted authorizing $435 million for assistance to the States in establishing retraining programs in areas of persistently high unemployment—Public Law 87-415.

Happily, our labors this session have been in a buoyant climate of sustained economic recovery, both in this Nation and throughout the free world.

Our recovery at home is now in its 13th successive month from the trough of the 1960 recession, and the March reports, just in this week from the Federal Reserve System and the Department of Labor, show yet one more wholesome decline in unemployment, with the national index of total industrial production up 13 percent from a year ago.

There were 800,000 more men and women at work in this country in March 1962 than a year earlier.

This is solid business recovery, stimulated and nurtured by robust public confidence in the future of America.

Let us continue to cultivate this glowing national confidence by every means at our command.

PROPOSED FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House will be visiting with their constituents back home over the Easter recess and, no doubt, many questions will be asked of us about H.R. 11222, the proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. This legislation now is under consideration in our House Committee on Agriculture. As chairman of this committee I have directed the preparation of a brief summary of H.R. 11222, and now am inserting this summary in the body of the RECORD in the thought that this will be useful to the Members in discussing the provisions of this legislation with the people back home.

H.R. 11222 supersedes and replaces H.R. 10010, the original bill which embraced the proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. The House Committee on Agriculture revised and amended H.R. 10010. The amended language was tentatively approved by the committee and the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 was reintroduced as H.R. 11222. This digest explains the provisions of H.R. 11222. The committee has taken no final action on this bill, but has adopted two amendments, notations on which occur at the conclusion of this summary.

The bill contains five titles. Title I deals with land-use adjustment; title II amends Public Law 480, 83d Congress; title III deals with marketing orders and agreements; title IV deals with commodity programs, including feed grains, wheat, and an emergency program for milk; and title V makes amendments in the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961. Following are the major provisions in each title:

TITLE I—LAND-USE ADJUSTMENT

Changes would be made in existing conservation, land-use, and watershed protection and flood-prevention programs to provide new authorities for the Secretary of Agriculture to promote the conservation and economic use of land through the following amendments:

1. The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is amended to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into long-term agreements with farmers to provide for changes in cropping systems and land use for development of soil, water, forest, wildlife, and recreation resources by means of payments, cost-sharing, and other assistance.

2. Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended to include the more economic use of lands not currently needed for agriculture and to provide for recreational development and wildlife protection. The new provisions permit the Secretary of Agriculture to assist local organizations through financial and other aid to develop and carry out programs of land conservation and land utilization.

3. The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act is amended (a) to provide for cost-sharing assistance for recreational development, for Federal assistance to local organizations in acquiring land rights and basic facilities needed for public use of reservoirs and other areas for fishing, hunting, or other recreational purposes; (b) to increase the limitation on flood-prevention capacity in any single structure from 5,000 acre-feet to 12,500 acre-feet; (c) to include water supply storage in a structure at the time it is built on the promise of a responsible local organization to begin repayment of the Federal cost in not more than 10 years; (d) to give the Secretary greater latitude in setting equitable rates of cost sharing in consideration of national needs and cost-sharing provisions of other Federal legislation; (e) to clarify existing authority under the act, particularly in regard to the 11 watershed improvement programs authorized by section 13 of the act of December 22, 1944.

TITLE II—AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT (AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954 (83D CONG.))

Section 201 of the bill would amend title IV of Public Law 480, as amended, which authorizes long-term supply contracts for dollar credits, in the following respects:

(1) Clarifying the purposes.

(2) Permitting agreements with financial institutions of friendly nations.

(3) Authorizing transactions with foreign and U.S. private trade.

(4) Changing the requirement for repayments to reasonable annual amounts with authority to defer the beginning of such payments to not later than 2 years after the date of the last delivery of commodities in each calendar year.

(5) Changing from mandatory to discretionary the authority under which other exporting nations are permitted to participate in the program.

Sections 202 and 203 amend the authorities for carrying out school lunch programs overseas. In addition to the authorities in three sections of law for donations to needy persons, donations are authorized for use in assistance of nonprofit school-lunch programs. The 3 sections amended are: Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, section 308 of Public Law 480 (83d Cong.), as amended, and section 9 of the act, September 6, 1958. A new provision also is added as section 203 regarding student participation in the financing of school-lunch programs. Under current legislation, the extent to which donations could be made for school-lunch programs has not been clear.

The amendments would clearly authorize donations for general use in school-lunch programs without the necessity of determining that all children in the school were from economically needy families, and would also require charges to parents who could afford to pay for their children's lunches on a basis similar to that used in the national school-lunch program in the United States.

TITLE III—MARKETING ORDERS

Section 301 amends section 8c(2) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to exempt potatoes for dehydrating from the authority for the issuance of marketing orders.

TITLE IV—COMMODITY PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—Feed Grains

(1) The Secretary would proclaim a marketing quota (only at the national level) for each year equal to the total requirements of corn, oats, grain sorghums, and barley (rye could be included at discretion of Secretary) for livestock feed, human food, seed, industrial uses and exports; less estimated imports and, if CCC stocks are excessive, less an amount not to exceed 7 percent of total utilization as the Secretary determines to be necessary. The Secretary could increase the quota to assure an adequate carryover or to meet a national emergency or an increase in demand.

(2) A national acreage allotment would be proclaimed equal to the number of acres which the Secretary determines will, on the basis of expected yields, produce the feed grains needed during the year less an amount to be taken from CCC stocks when stocks are excessive.

(3) The national acreage allotment (less a small reserve to take care of new areas coming into production) would be apportioned to the States, counties, and farms on the basis of the average acreage of feed grains during the base period, as adjusted.

(a) The base period for the 1963 to the 1965 crops would be 1959 and 1960; for subsequent crops, the base period would be the two most recent calendar years for which statistics are available.

(b) Adjustments in farm bases would be authorized for abnormal conditions affecting farm acreages, for hardship, and other factors.

(4) Farms with a feed grain base of 25 acres or less would not be subject to program unless the producer elected to participate. If the producer did not so elect, he could plant up to his base acreage but

would not be eligible for land-use payments, for price support.

(5) All producers with a feed grain base established for their farm would be eligible to vote in a 1-, 2-, or 3-year referendum except producers who elected to be exempt from the program. A two-thirds vote would be required to approve the program.

(6) Production on acreages of feed grains in excess of farm allotments would be subject to a marketing penalty at the rate of 65 percent of the parity price per bushel.

(7) The Secretary could permit wheat to be planted on the feed grain allotment to the extent that this did not impair the effective operation of the program.

(8) Producers would be required to devote to conservation uses an acreage equal to the difference between the acreage of feed grains during the base period and the farm acreage allotment for feed grains.

(a) Acreage so diverted would be in addition to the acreage normally devoted to conserving uses, summer fallow, and idle land.

(b) A penalty would apply if the producer used the diverted acreage to produce crops, unless the crop is one named in the act and which is designated by the Secretary as not being in surplus supply.

(c) The Secretary could permit the diverted acres to be grazed, but if such acreage were grazed between April 1 and September 30, no diversion payment could be made.

(9) The Secretary would be authorized to make payments with respect to the 1963, 1964, and 1965 crops, respectively, in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, but not to exceed 50 percent of the value of normal production on the acreage diverted in 1963, 40 percent in 1964, and 30 percent in 1965.

(a) The Secretary could permit producers to divert an acreage, in addition to any acreage required to be diverted, equal to 20 percent of the farm acreage allotment.

(b) Producers could also, at their election, divert such additional acreage as would bring the total diverted acreage on the farm to 25 acres.

(10) The level of price support for feed grains would be between 65 and 90 percent of parity as determined by the Secretary.

(a) If marketing quotas were in effect, price support would be available only to producers who stay within all acreage allotments on the farm and all acreage allotments on any other farm, and comply with the land-use requirements explained under item 8.

(b) No price support would be provided if marketing quotas were disapproved by producers, and CCC would be authorized to sell feed grains for unrestricted use at market prices in amounts not to exceed 7 percent of total utilization during the year.

Subtitle B—Wheat

(1) The Secretary of Agriculture would set a yearly national marketing quota for wheat, including wheat for food and beverage, seed, exports, and the amount of wheat normally fed in recent years, less an amount to be taken from CCC stocks when stocks are excessive. The national marketing quota would be converted into a national acreage allotment, based on yields expected in the coming year. The 55-million-acre national minimum allotment in present law would be repealed.

(2) The national acreage allotment (less a small reserve for new areas) would be distributed to States, counties, and farms in the continental United States (except Alaska).

(3) The 15-acre exemption would be terminated and producers would receive an acreage allotment based on their average acreage in wheat in the period 1957–61. Farms with average acreages of 15 acres or less in the period, 1957–61, could elect to participate in the program or to be exempt. If they chose to be exempt, they would not be eligible for price support, marketing certificates, diversion payments, or to vote in the referendum. Producers who elected to be subject to the program would be eligible for payments, price support, marketing certificates and to vote in the referendum.

(4) A producer referendum would be held for a 1-, 2-, or 3-year program, subject to approval of two-thirds of those voting. The choices in the referendum would be between supply management program with price support, or no production adjustment program and no price support.

(5) If no production adjustment program were in effect, the Secretary could reduce CCC stocks by making annual domestic sales up to 200 million bushels of Government-held surplus wheat.

(6) Producers would divert to conservation uses on acreage equal in most cases to the difference between the allotment for any future year and the 1961 acreage allotment in addition to other conserving, idle, and fallow acreages. Diverted acreage could be grazed from October 1 to April 1 without loss of payments, but no payments would be made if the land were grazed during the remainder of the year. The Secretary could permit the production of certain crops on diverted acreages, but would reduce diversion payments according to the value of the crop being produced.

(7) Diversion payments would be made in cash or in kind at rates determined by the Secretary to be "fair and reasonable," but not to exceed 50 percent of the value of normal production of the diverted acreage in 1963; 40 percent in 1964; and 30 percent in 1965. The Secretary could permit producers to divert an additional acreage equal to the greater of 20 percent of the wheat acreage on the farm or 15 acres.

(8) Price supports would be provided between 75 and 90 percent of parity on the wheat marketing allocation, on that portion of the national marketing quota which the Secretary determines should be supported at the higher level in order to achieve the objectives of the program. Marketing certificates would be issued by CCC to each producer, based on the farm acreage allotment, the normal yield per acre on the farm, and the determination of the Secretary of the proportion of the crop which would need to be supported at the higher level in order to achieve the income objectives of the act. The balance of the wheat would move in regular market channels without certificates, would be valued at approximately its value as a feed grain, and would be eligible for price support on that basis.

Marketing certificates would have a face value equal to the difference between the price support for noncertificate wheat (set in relation to feed value, feed grain price support, and world prices for wheat) and the price support on certificate wheat.

(9) Processors and exporters of wheat would be required to purchase certificates in the amount of wheat processed and exported.

(10) Wheat and feed grains would be interchangeable on the wheat allotment, unless such substitution would impair the operation of the program. The 30-acre wheat-for-feed exemption in the present law would be repealed, but producers who have been planting under it would receive credit for it in their feed grain base acreage.

(11) Penalties would be assessed against noncooperating producers by (a) denying land retirement payments, and price supports, and (b) levying a civil penalty based on the production on the acreage in excess of the farm allotment, times 65 percent of parity. A penalty would also be applied if the producer used the diverted acreage to produce crops other than ones named in the act and designated by the Secretary as not being in surplus supply. Persons other than wheat farmers violating provisions dealing with marketing certificates may be prosecuted for a misdemeanor, and any person (including wheat farmers) who falsely makes, issues, alters or counterfeits a wheat certificate would upon conviction be guilty of a felony.

(12) Provisions of law permitting farmers to plant wheat in excess of their farm wheat allotments for storage on the farm under bond to be applied to a subsequent year's short crop, would be repealed.

Subtitle C—Dairy

This subtitle authorizes an emergency surplus dairy reduction payments program for the marketing year ending March 31, 1963, by which producers may on a compensated basis voluntarily reduce their marketing of milk and dairy products below the lower of (i) their 1961 marketings or (ii) their current level of marketings. Commodity Credit Corporation may enter into agreements with producers who agree to reduce their marketing by not less than 10 percent nor more than the greater of 25 percent or 7,000 pounds of milk for any quarter of the marketing year. Payments shall not exceed (i) $2.50 per hundredweight, (ii) that amount which the Secretary determines necessary to secure a reduction in marketing, or (iii) the cost of acquiring an equivalent quantity of dairy products.

Section 436 of the subtitle authorizes amending marketing agreements and orders under the Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 by which the reduction of a producer under his agreement with Commodity Credit Corportation shall be considered as made from the lowest class use under the marketing orders and agreements thereby protecting his share in the highest use milk.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended to (1) authorize loan assistance to farmers in developing recreational facilities and recreational use of land in rural areas, (2) authorize loan assistance to nonprofit organizations for development of sewer systems, and (3) increase from $10 to $25 million the amount of loans which the Secretary may make and have on hand at any one time while in the process of selling these loans to private investors on an insured basis.

NOTE.—The Committee on Agriculture has approved two amendments to H.R. 11222, as follows:

AMENDMENTS

1. Revising title II of Public Law 480 (83d Cong.) to permit acquisition of surplus commodities for title II programs (donations to needy people in foreign countries) from private stocks. Such donations now are confined to stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under this amendment, surplus stocks of any food commodity could be acquired for foreign relief purposes.

2. Provide in the feed grains section of H.R. 11222 (title IV) that "notwithstanding any other provision of this part, in any feed deficit area in which the Secretary determines (1) that the application of the provisions of this act would result in hardship to producers in such area, would unduly increase the price of feed grains in such area relative to other areas, and would disrupt normal farming practices in such area, and (2) that the exception provided by this section would not impair the effective operation of this act, he may provide in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe that no farm marketing quota (i.e., production on the acreage allotment) for any crop of feed grains shall be applicable to any farm in such area, if the acreage of such crop of feed grains does not exceed the farm base acreage determined for the farm. If the Secretary so provides, (i) for the purposes of section 360h, the farm acreage allotment for such crop of feed grains

shall be deemed to be the farm base acreage, (ii) the land-use provisions of section 360j shall be inapplicable to the farm, (iii) such crop of feed grains shall not be eligible for price support, and (iv) the producers on such farm shall not be eligible to vote in any referendum on marketing quotas for such crop."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 465. Concurrent resolution that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 19, 1962, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, April 30, 1962.

FIREARMS LEGISLATION

Mr. **DULSKI.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DULSKI.** Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address delivered by Judge William J. Regan, of Buffalo, N.Y., before the National Rifle Association Convention on April 2, 1962.

One of his many judicial duties is the issuance of all pistol permits in Erie County, N.Y., under the Sullivan law. During the past 2 years, Judge Regan has revised considerably the operation in handling these permits. This revised arrangement has met with great satisfaction among the sportsmen in our area and, therefore, the Rifle Association was anxious to hear Judge Regan's views in this subject.

Having known Judge Regan for many years, I consider him to be a true friend who is devoted to his work. He was an outstanding attorney and upon his elevation to the judgeship he has brought added dignity to our Erie County court. I know that those who come before him seeking justice will find in Judge Regan a very humane and honest weighmaster.

The judge's address follows:

A JUDGE LOOKS AT FIREARMS LEGISLATION

(Address by the Honorable William J. Regan, county judge, Erie County, N.Y.)

It is a great pleasure and privilege for me to speak at this annual meeting of the National Rifle Association. Mr. Orth and I met for the first time at a dinner meeting in Canada last summer, where I was speaking to a group of shooters about my views on pistol permits in general and competitive shooters in particular under the Sullivan law.

I suppose this must be one of the very few times in the history of your convention when anyone would speak who is a nonshooter. I must confess at the outset that I know nothing about guns, but I have developed, in a little over 2 years, a great affection and respect for people who are in the category of organized competitive shooters. So, I thought perhaps you might be interested in the thought processes of a lawyer elected a judge in November of 1959 in Erie County, N.Y.—who, being at the low end of the totem pole in seniority, inherited the responsibility of issuing, and denying, all pistol permits in Erie County. When I received that assignment I had never heard of pistol permits, except to have an occasional defendant who violated 1897, our famous Sullivan law. I had no idea that there were such things as pistol clubs of organized shooters. The only thing I knew about the NRA was that back in the depression it was known as the National Recovery Act. So I approached the job of issuing pistol permits with no knowledge at all of the problems of existing policy under the Sullivan law.

You must realize that when you are elected a judge in a responsible criminal court you do not automatically know all the mechanics of your job, and I think you can appreciate that it took me a considerable period of time to just get my sea legs as a trial judge to learn the mechanics of adoption, commitments to State hospitals, handling of criminal appeals, and so forth, so that the problems, if any, of pistol permits were not my first concern.

I was surprised to find out that I inherited a pistol permit department in our county consisting of Shelton Brown, a man I have since found to be a tremendously capable pistol permit director, and a man who, incidentally, is a great friend of the shooters and, in fact, feels that all children should be able to carry guns. In addition to Mr. Brown, two girls were employed in the office, and I came to find that they were far from avid fans of competitive shooters.

After I had been there a short time, I was signing pistol permits for various people, to my amazement, who had applied 7 or 8 months before. Being new at the job, I didn't press the point and just assumed that it must be tremendously complicated.

Somewhere along the line, casually I mentioned to the pistol permit director, "How many people have permits?" He didn't know. "How long had they had them?" It developed that they had been issued on a "good until revoked" basis back in 1937. I suggested, very casually, that I thought sometime it might be a good idea to just check up on all the holders of permits and find out where they were and if they were still alive and needed permits, etc.

I apparently mentioned this to more than one person rather casually, and I found that the rumor was all over our county that this new fellow, Judge Regan, was going to revoke all pistol permits and start over. I found myself getting glares from all kinds of people who were entitled to carry guns.

So I had a meeting with representatives of the competitive shooters early in 1960, at which time they explained their viewpoint to me, and I concurred that shooters should be treated in a different light if the clubs would accept responsibility.

I had a meeting with the law enforcement people and found that, generally speaking, (1) they were not very enthused with people being their own policemen, (2) that they respected organized sportsmen as long as they were actually on the square, and (3) they expressed some concern about some of the people being licensed as private guards.

So I set up a sort of an unofficial rule that people would have to have some connection with competitive shooting on an organized basis or else be in the category of armed guards to obtain a permit. I attended a dinner with a friend of mine from one of the newspapers. He inferred in a very hush-hush conversation that I was mishandling the pistol permit department because of the fact that I had apparently given a pistol permit to our district attorney, whose life had allegedly been threatened, and that I had had his application preferred so that it was processed ahead of other pending applications.

At this time, I wasn't aware of any tremendous backlog. However, the next day, sometime early in May of 1960, I had our pistol permit department in and got a lot of statistics together, and found to my amazement (something I should have known before) that not one single person who had applied for a permit in 1960 had received one except the district attorney, because of the fact that their applications were still in a pile on the desk of the girl who handled them in our pistol permit office. In addition, I found upon talking to shooters, basically competitive shooters, that they were concerned, No. 1, about being treated, in many respects, as second-class citizens when they came into our pistol office; and, No. 2, it was virtually impossible, requiring something like an act of Congress, to get a simple pistol permit application. Understandably, I felt that all public offices require that citizens be treated courteously and pleasantly and without any discrimination whatsoever. Needless to say, we changed personnel, except for our director.

So when I hired girls to replace those who had left us, I merely asked them if they would do their best to be nice to people. I was not too concerned about their basic typing ability and, in fact, one of the girls I hired at first could hardly type at all.

Suffice to say that by the end of 1960 all pistol permit applications in our county were being handled on a current basis. The Sullivan law requires an application under oath—name, address, position, criminal record, if any, and three character references. The sworn application with fingerprint cards is filed with the FBI, the New York State Department of Correction, and a copy of the application is sent to the local police department for a police investigation.

Every person who now applies in our county can be sure that his papers are in process within 48 hours. Although I now require a personal interview with me as the issuing judge in my court, the average time for obtaining pistol permits has been reduced from about 8 months to an average of 3 to 4 weeks. Any citizen who walks in off the street can obtain an application without any difficulty. All people who come into the office are treated as they should be, as citizens seeking information and assistance in a public office.

I interview pistol applications on Thursday and Friday mornings from 8:30 to 9:30. They are always prompt and my juries chuckle when I explain to them that we might start a little late because I am interviewing my pistol people.

In going through the pistol permit records, I found as a practical proposition that for many years we had virtually a quota system in use so far as pistol permits were concerned. This is borne out in that the maximum number issued for any 1 year was approximately 370 carry permits, and the minimum 355, and premise permits 25. With a policy which has now generally been approved by the competitive shooters in our area, the number of permits issued has increased tremendously. For example, in 1960 I signed nearly 700 carry permits and roughly 60 premise permits, and in 1961 I signed 741 new carry permits and 60 new premise permits.

I have found on evaluating pistol permits, that they fall into roughly three categories. Over 70 percent of the applicants belong to responsible gun clubs or sportsmen's groups and fit into the category of shooters for sport. I have worked up a gentlemen's agreement with each club and have now had the pleasure of speaking at approximately 50 of them in our county. The agreement, in substance, is this: I will give permits to any member of a responsible shooting club as long as the club assumes the responsibility of teaching him how to shoot and makes certain that he remains a relatively active shooter. On a personal interview in my courtroom, each of the shooters agrees with me that he will use his permit in the general area for which he is applying; namely, something reasonably connected with competitive shooting and legal hunting and that, generally speaking, that will be the limit of the use of these pistols. This is a practical compromise in a metropolitan area of over 1,200,000 people, and I have found, much to my amazement, this policy meets with the almost unanimous approval of responsible shooters, most of whom feel that under normal circumstances their weapons should be used for sport and nothing else.

This, incidently, came as quite a shock to me when I first became a county judge. I was of the opinion that all shooters wanted to carry guns 24 hours a day, somewhat in the manner of Matt Dillon or Wyatt Earp. However, I find on going to gun competitions that shooters carry their guns wrapped in silks and satins and in very fancy carrying cases, together with the spy glasses that I understand you people call scopes. As nearly as I can see, shooters take at least as good care and probably, in many cases, better care of their weapons than they do their wives, so that I no longer am concerned about giving so many permits to people in a metropolitan area as sportsmen. I feel that I can issue almost an unlimited number of gun permits to competitive shooters, without any qualms whatsoever, in one of the largest counties in the United States and in a county with population greater than several of our States.

It is my judgment, based on interviews with some 2,000 shooters and the privilege of meeting with their clubs at innumerable meetings, that they are fine, responsible, respectable citizens and that to them shooting is a sport, much the same as bowling is to me. I am convinced that to shoot their weapon is their sport, just as my bowling ball is used for bowling. However, I am pleased to see that they use their pistols more effectively than I use the illusive bowling ball.

About 20 percent of our permits fall into the categories of private detectives or special policemen. I found to my amazement that many of the agencies were licensing private policemen without ever training them how to shoot, a frightening prospect if you are a citizen who might be somewhere within the range of their weapons. We have instituted a program with their security officers whereby all men who are special policemen are receiving regular pistol instruction and practice, and all have gone through at least basic NRA courses under competent instructors from the various gun clubs. I enter into a gentlemen's agreement with both the employers and the employees that they will use their permits for exactly what they have obtained them for and that under no circumstances will they be used in a tavern. To be frank, if a tavern is tough enough that they need an armed special policeman, it probably should be closed.

The other 10 percent of the applications fit into what is roughly known as personal protection. Each of these is handled on an individual basis, and quite frankly, a good many in this category are denied, because strangely enough most of those wanting guns for personal protection have no connection with organized sportsmen's groups, have little or no familiarity with pistols and, as nearly as I can see, in most cases, are more of a menace to themselves, untrained, with a pistol than they can possibly imagine.

In our county pistol permits have been issued on a good until revoked basis since 1937, so we instituted a survey of these permits under oath, using a form that was agreeable to responsible members of the various gun clubs. Essentially the questionnaire asked the shooters to give their name, address, the reason for permit, intervening arrests, if any, intervening commitments to mental hospitals, if any, and present reason for desiring permit. It is to be signed before a notary public and filed with our office. Such a survey produced amazing results. We found out that out of, roughly, 7,800 carry permits that had been issued in our county, 621 permit holders had died, which fact had not been reported to us. These permits have been cancelled. Even the most avid shooter agrees that there is no reason for them to still have permits.

Roughly, another 1,300 were canceled for various reasons such as parties having moved out of the State, or no longer desired permits, or formerly were guards and had terminated their employment. Roughly 1,000 people could not be found. They could not be checked through city directories and telephone directors, and, in fact, the Buffalo Courier Express published a complete list of names and addresses of the missing parties, following which about 1,000 permits were canceled.

Four thousand eight hundred and two people answered our survey wanting to keep their permits, and their survey forms were approved. Some 1,293 people reported changes of addresses that had not previously been reported to us. Premises permits, mostly war souvenir permits, included some 3,200 old permits. Two hundred and sixty-two of the permit holders were dead. Another 1,600 plus were canceled for various reasons, and slightly less than 1,200 indicated they wanted their premise permits continued and were approved. Those were all of the survey forms that were returned to our office. Nearly 400 changes of address were found as a result of this survey.

At least we can now say with some accuracy where every pistol permit is in our county, where the people reside, etc.

I found that policy presented many other idiosyncrasies; one that if a person lost his permit, it appeared to be almost impossible to get a replacement without filing a new application. Without getting technical, we found what I consider to be a legal way to achieve the proper result. Nearly 500 of the old carry and premise permits were replaced with new permits in 1961, with a minimum of difficulty to the applicants. At least, now, we have permits with photographs that look somewhat similar to the people who hold them.

One other thing I found is a rule known as the "rule of three." That is, roughly, that no man in our county could have more than three guns on his permit without the specific approval of the county judge. At first blush this sounded like a very sensible rule to me, so I made every person who wanted to add a gun come in to see me. We had 100 a month, so you can see my problem. I found the more I got to see "dyed in the wool" shooters, that the only limit to the number of guns a competitive shooter can have would be the amount of money he has in the bank, so we now have worked up a practical rule. Our pistol permit director knows guns. If a gun that a shooter wishes to add has some reasonable connection with competitive shooting, it is added without his coming in, regardless of where it fits numerically—4th, 5th, or 20th—on his permit. If, however, a person who has a permit for a guard or personal protection wants to add a second gun, I make them come in, because it seems to me you only need one gun to shoot somebody.

I think that competive shooters in western New York will agree that we are now living with the Sullivan law with a minimum of difficulty so far as they are concerned. I recognize that shooters do not like the Sullivan law and do not like legislation concerning pistol registration, etc. I, however, have become very practical. From time to time my friends say to me, the reasons for which the Sullivan law was passed certainly are no longer sound and probably never were sound. I am aware of the very sound arguments made in the March issue of The Rifleman in an editorial entitled "Logic and Reason" and, while each of the arguments presented has effective reasoning behind it, I must face the fact that I am a judge whose sworn duty is to uphold the constitution of the State of New York and the laws of the State of New York. One of the existing laws is what you call the Sullivan law. I concede that shooters who are sportsmen are not the people that the Sullivan law was aimed at, and, as a result, I have tried to treat competitive shooters in a reasonable and, what I consider to be, a practical manner.

You must appreciate that when I took office I was not fond of the thought of a great many people running around like Matt Dillon or Wyatt Earp. It took me many months to become convinced that most of the people who have pistol permits are sportsmen and a great asset to their community, rather than a menace. Many people told me when I went into office, "Be tough on the people who want gun permits," "Who needs a gun," etc. So it seems to me that the problem that organized shooters face, rather than going around with their fur ruffled and their feelings hurt, is not one of anger and belligerence, but one of education. It seems to me that the approach taken by shooters in New York State is more sensible, for example, putting their best foot forward in connection with the NRA hunter training program and doing the many things that constructive, intelligent, sportsmen shooters can do. There certainly is no strong feeling, that I have been able to detect, to repeal all firearms legislation in New York State. As a matter of fact, even responsible shooters concede that there is nothing wrong with the result of keeping guns out of the hands of incompetents, minors, drug addicts, etc. I appreciate that a type of law other than the Sullivan law could probably achieve this result. Perhaps the more regular use of additional prison penalties for the use of a gun in the commission of a crime could be more effective.

I don't pretend to know the answer. All I know is that I am convinced that you people are not the people that the Sullivan law was aimed at. However, if you live in New York State the Sullivan law applies to you. Judges cannot change the law. This is a matter of legislation so, rather than argue with you about the constitution, the right to bear arms, or the fallacy, if any, in the reasoning behind the Sullivan law, it seems to me this is a matter that requires calm consideration, because I know that when I go back to Buffalo I will still be working with the law that is not popular with shooters but, yet under which shooters are obligated to live quite easily in Erie County.

Perhaps all this has not made much sense to you, but, at least, it takes you through my thinking problems in a little over 27 months. You know back in the early thirties a man named Little Jack Little used to sing a song in favor of President Roosevelt's NRA. The first part of it certainly, in my judgment, is equally applicable:

> "Hip, hip, hooray! For the NRA
> It's OK for the USA."

JUNE IS MARKET MONTH

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, New York's great coat and suit industry is again demonstrating its aggressive leadership by designating June as Market Month so all manufacturers will have fall lines ready when buyers are in the city.

The designation by the board of directors of the New York Coat and Suit Association, Inc., is another example of how labor and industry work together in the industry, insuring that New York and America maintain their leadership in design, skilled craft work and outstanding manufacture of coats and suits.

Joseph L. Dubow, executive director of the association, has outlined plans for major advertising and promotion campaigns supporting Market Month and aimed at bringing buyers from throughout the Western Hemisphere into New York during the buying month.

In the past some producers had their fall lines ready for sale in early June, others around the middle of the month, and others not until early July. Under the Market Month concept, the association will assure buyers that all lines will be open when they come into New York.

This is the kind of aggressive, industrywide action which other American businesses could well adopt to deal with their particular problems.

In his letter announcing the Market Month concept, Mr. Dubow said the association hopes to "create a high degree of excitement and bring to every buyer in the country the message that June is Market Month for the members of the New York Coat and Suit Association."

He noted that by making June Market Month the association will be sure that "every member who participates and every retail buyer who attends will find that this June will be the greatest month in the history of the New York coat and suit industry."

LET US STOP THE NONSENSE

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Prime Minister John Diefenbaker announced that Canada would hold a general election on June 18. Thus, within 60 days, our great neighboring republic will choose all the members of her national Parliament.

Why cannot we in the United States follow the example of Canada and practically every other democratic country in the civilized world?

The example of this nation of close to 18 million people again emphasizes the desirability of eliminating the circuses which our presidential elections have become.

May I again call attention to my bills House Joint Resolution 127 and H.R. 2500 which would limit presidential campaigns in this country to a period of 60 days. This would preserve the health of the candidates and, at the same time, eliminate the boredom and lack of intest which these campaigns generate in the electorate.

With the shorter campaign we could concentrate on issues and cut down the dramatics and histrionics.

In a time of great national challenge, can we afford to do any less?

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF APRIL 30

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the week following the Easter recess.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, there will be no legislative business on Monday, April 30.

Tuesday, May 1, we will take up the bills H.R. 6949, natural gas, resale; and H.R. 8031, to require television receivers to have all channels.

Any record votes except on rules on Tuesday will go over until Wednesday, May 2, because of the Alabama and Oklahoma primaries.

And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for that purpose, I will ask unanimous consent, pursuant to custom, that any record votes except on rules and procedural matters that may be in order on Tuesday, May 1, following the Easter recess, may go over until Wednesday, May 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. On Wednesday and the balance of the week we will call up for consideration H.R. 11040, Communications Satellite Act of 1962, if a rule is reported.

There will be no record votes on Saturday, May 5, on account of the Texas primary.

This announcement is subject, of course, to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that it is expected that an additional program will be announced on Monday or Tuesday following the Easter recess.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

THE PROCEDURES OF TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the President announced his seven-point program of assistance for the textile industry on May 2, 1961. There was no reference in that program to section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. Under point 7 of that program the President assured that an application by the textile industry under section 8 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, as amended, would be carefully considered on its merits.

On May 15, 1961, 10 textile trade associations, cooperating as a representative of the combined textile industry complex, filed an application with the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization under section 8 of the 1955 act, requesting that an investigation be initiated to determine whether imports of textiles and textile manufacturers of cotton, wool, silk, and manmade fibers were threatening to impair the national security.

An investigation was promptly initiated by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, written briefs and evidence were submitted by all parties, and the record was closed on October 15, 1961.

Under the law the function of the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization—now known as the Office of Emergency Planning—is limited to making a finding as to whether or not imports of textiles and textile manufactures are threatening to impair the national security. If he makes such a finding, the President is immediately cloaked with power under the statute to take such action as he deems necessary to adjust imports to remove the threatened impairment.

Thus, a favorable decision by the Director of OEP under the pending textile national security case would give the President all of the authority required to enforce the long-term cotton textile arrangement for both participants and nonparticipants. The administration is apparently unwilling to allow the Director of OEP to make a decision in the textile industry case, and therefore is pushing for the enactment of H.R. 10788.

So far as the long-term cotton textile arrangement is concerned, a new element of uncertainty as to whether that arrangement will amount to anything has come to light in the form of a supplement to the arrangement released in Geneva on February 16—1 day after the White House released the text of the arrangement. That supplement provides an escape clause from the enforcement provisions of the arrangement. There is thus doubt as to what countries would be bound by the enforcement provisions of the arrangement even if the arrangement is ratified by the countries that negotiated it. The ratifying countries also have the right under the terms of the arrangement by majority vote to postpone the effective date of the arrangement indefinitely. The supplement follows:

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

LONG-TERM COTTON TEXTILES ARRANGEMENT: PROCEDURE RELATING TO RESERVATIONS TO ARTICLE II AND ANNEX B

When the long term arrangement was drawn up by the Cotton Textiles Committee a procedure was agreed to whereby a country which considered that it fulfilled the following criteria, namely (1) that in the decade preceding the entry into force of the arrangement it had experienced a substantial contraction in its cotton textile industry; and (2) that it was importing a substantial volume of cotton textiles, in particular from the less developed countries and territories and Japan, in relation to its own production of cotton textiles, might attach a reservation to its acceptance of the arrangement in order to provide, in effect, an escape clause from the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 3 of article 2 and of paragraphs 2 and 3 of annex B.

A country wishing to make such a reservation should submit its request to that effect not later than September 1, 1962. If by October 1, the date on which the arrangement is to enter into operation, none of the contracting parties at present members of the Cotton Textiles Committee which at that time had accepted the arrangement without themselves having entered reservations, had raised an objection, the reservation would be deemed to be valid. Reservations thus accepted would be attached in the form of protocols to the arrangement.

MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I and other members of the Committee on Ways and Means may be permitted to file minority views to accompany the report of the House Ways and Means Committee on H.R. 8846, these views to be printed as part II of this report.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have discussed this with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TOLL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, proposals to extend hospitalization insurance benefits to all persons covered by old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and their dependents were first introduced 2 decades ago. The first bill to extend hospitalization benefits to those entitled to OASI benefits was introduced 10 years ago. Similar proposals have been introduced in each Congress since then.

In 1957 former Representative Aime Forand first presented his bill providing nursing home and surgical benefits in addition to hospitalization benefits. The bill was not reported by the Ways and Means Committee; however, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was requested to make a study of alternative ways of providing insurance against the cost of hospital and nursing home care for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance beneficiaries. The report was submitted by the Secretary on April 3, 1959.

Representative Forand introduced his bill again in 1959, and hearings were held before the Ways and Means Committee. However, the committee reported a bill by the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman MILLS, which passed the House and was amended in the Senate as the Kerr-Mills Act. This act, approved September 13, 1960, authorizes Federal participation in approved State plans which provide medical assistance on behalf of aged recipients of old-age assistance, and for aged persons not on old-age assistance whose incomes and resources are not sufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services.

President Kennedy, in his "Special Message on Health and Hospital Care," proposed that medical care be provided through the social security system to everyone aged 65 and over who is "eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits." The administration proposal was introduced by Representative KING (H.R. 4222) and Senator ANDERSON (S. 909).

The great majority of Americans will be covered. Workers, their wives and widows will be entitled to benefits under the same tests as for old-age benefits under social security or railroad retirement benefits. They will be eligible at 65 even if they have not actually retired.

The cost of four kinds of services will be paid:

First. All hospital services usually provided, in semiprivate rooms, up to 90 days in one spell of illness. Services include bed, board, nursing (not private), operating room, drugs, diagnostic services, and so forth. All costs are paid after the 9th day. The patient pays only $10 a day for only the first 9 days—with a $20 minimum.

Second. Skilled nursing home services after transfer from a hospital, up to 180 days after 60 days or less of hospitalization, or up to 120 days after 90 days in the hospital.

Third. Home health services for up to 240 visits a year, including part-time nursing, and therapy provided by a home health agency.

Fourth. Outpatient hospital diagnostic services, including X-ray and laboratory services. The patient pays only the first $20.

The cost of the program will be met by a small increase in the social security taxes. The most any worker will pay is 22 cents a week. The typical payment will be only 2 to 3 cents a day. But the program will be soundly financed.

The bill includes safeguards for the freedom of patients to choose their own doctors, hospitals, and so forth. Doctors will continue to have full responsibility for decisions on patient care, including the need for hospitalization. The program will pay for hospital care when needed, but not otherwise.

The bill does not permit the Federal agency to interfere with hospital administration or supervise or control the practice of medicine. Patient-doctor relationships would not be affected, and good quality hospital and nursing home services would be encouraged.

Despite the obvious beneficial features of the program, a number of objections are presented by those who oppose the legislation. Support has been developed for the Kerr-Mills bill which passed the 86th Congress as legislation providing medical care for the aged who are in actual need. They indicate that Federal and State matching funds may provide total medical care for the aged who need help. They point to the administration of Governor Lawrence as responsible for the limited benefits in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. They also indicate that the use of voluntary insurance has been included in the Kerr-Mills procedure in Texas to provide broader benefits. The recipients in Texas are insured through its funds in Blue Cross.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports that the first Texas 1961 Medical Assistance Act authorizes effective January 1, 1962, hospitalization, nursing home care, and surgical and medical benefits for old age assistance recipients. The State agency has contracted with Blue Cross for a prepayment plan for hospitalization and surgical medical services. It is providing nursing home care through vendor payments. The Texas old age assistance medical care payments are provided only for persons who meet the test of indigency.

The 86th Congress passed the Kerr-Mills Act as a substitute for a social security old age health care program. Kerr-Mills has had a fair trial and has been found wanting, except, perhaps, as a supplement to the social security approach. The best proof of failure is the now louder-than-ever cry for a social security measure.

Kerr-Mills is a relief program, intended for the neediest. It inflicts a pauper's oath—a means test—upon those needing health care. It is dependent upon continuing State grants from the legislatures. In some cases, it has already become a substitute for State old-age medical care relief programs. It has not begun to meet the medical care needs of the senior citizen.

The bill was supposed to have cost the Federal Treasury $202 million of general tax revenue for its first year. Within 5 years the Federal share of costs was supposed to rise to $340 million. Under the Kerr-Mills formula, the Federal Government was to assume from 30 to 70 percent of the program's costs, depending upon the wealth of each participating State. The $340 million projection was based upon participation of all the 50 States.

Kerr-Mills outlays from the Federal Government for its first year are estimated at an inadequate $140 million. The act initially was supposed to have provided relief payments to some 1.3 million medically indigent persons past age 65. While figures are not yet available, there is every reason to believe that results have fallen far short of expectations.

The State of Arizona illustrates the obstacles even to an effective Kerr-Mills program.

As Kerr-Mills passed, Arizona law strictly prohibited participation by the State in medical welfare programs. Arizona may have been an extreme case, but others were without medical aid programs of any kind, and in most, enabling legislation was required.

An AFL-CIO expert noted that Georgia, New Mexico, and Iowa have passed enabling legislation. He pointed out that this does not mean the old people in these States are going to be helped, since no appropriations have been forthcoming from the legislatures. The same is true of most other States. Not even the barest edge of need has so far been blunted.

In December 1961, only 72,159 seniors received help under State medical aid for the aged programs, and 51,549 lived in three States—New York, Massachusetts, and Michigan. HEW figures showed that only 17 States had actually appropriated any money at all for aged medical aid.

In Louisiana, only eight persons were actually receiving benefits. In New Hampshire there were 25, and in Utah there were 57. Benefits varied according to State rather than need, and eligibility requirements were such that a person counted a pauper in one State was too well off for benefits in another.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania reached agreement with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on a State Kerr-Mills program. The cost was estimated at $11.6 million for the 6 months remaining in the State's fiscal year and was to be shared by the Federal and State Governments.

Care is about the equivalent of that provided under city and State public assistance programs. While the program is probably as good as any so far established, it is, in effect, only an extension of existing State welfare programs. Kerr-Mills depends upon regular appropriations from State legislatures which tend to be dominated by rural legislators with extremely conservative economic views. When legislatures fail to make adequate appropriations, programs are slashed. Economy at the expense of welfare is all too common at the State level. As a result of State limitations, services under medical assistance for the aged have been provided to comparatively few of the Nation's older citizens. The majority of recipients have been concentrated in a few States. In December 1961, the recipients were largely in 5 of the 18 States reporting expenditures for that month.

The Anderson-King bill is hardly a radical measure. It seeks only to alleviate the heaviest medical care financial burdens of the aging. It has the full support of former Representative Aime Forand, now honorary chairman of the Senior Citizens for Health Care Under Social Security.

As already pointed out, the heaviest burdens of old-age medical care come as the result of lengthy hospital stays and the high cost of nursing care. These are the areas in which Anderson-King would provide major help.

The measure would not relieve the senior citizen of the total costs of such care, but would make him a partner with the Nation in meeting these costs. The measure provides that in-hospital patients would have to pay $10 a day for each of the first 9 days (not more than the first $90 of costs). It would, however, take care of the greater part of costs in illnesses requiring a long stay in the hospital.

The program would be financed by a fourth of 1-percent tax on the first $5,200 of wage or salary income upon both the gainfully employed and their employers. This maximum cost of a quarter per week for each worker and the same for the employer for each worker on the payroll, would yield the billion-plus dollars needed to finance the program.

The Anderson-King bill is admittedly modest. It would not pay doctor or surgical care bills. It would not pay all hospital costs. But it would make a significant difference to millions of seniors who must undergo lengthy hospital stays during their declining years. It would be a long step forward and an indication that this Nation truly cares for its elders.

America now has had a quarter of a century of experience with old age and survivors benefits under the Social Security System. Despite warnings that it would create a nation living on handouts, the Nation now produces more than ever and is better off than ever. Despite warnings that the new "welfare state" would be the start of an omnipotent totalitarianism, freedom has prospered. Social Security put a floor under old age income and has become one of the great stabilizers of the U.S. economy.

Social Security was a minimum program, and so is the Anderson-King bill. Warnings that Social Security would end personal savings programs and private pension programs have proved pointless. Today, the insurance industry prospers partly because Social Security has popularized insurance and private pension plans. Anderson-King, obviously, is no substitute for private health and welfare programs, which will continue to grow. It simply puts a floor beneath the needs of the aged.

America is fortunate in its approach to the solution of such social problems as old-age health care. It has learned to legislate for an acceptable minimum—to place a floor under need. It has supplemented this minimum with voluntary action: collective bargaining, personal savings, community action, private pensions, and voluntary association.

The claim has been made that the social security approach will encourage excessive hospitalization. With a $10-a-day charge for each of the first 9 days still falling directly upon the retired, this allegation is without foundation. Few seniors have $90 to throw away for the dubious pleasure of spending needless time in the hospital.

An overwhelming proportion of the aged would be eligible for benefits with the passage of the Anderson-King bill. As time goes on virtually all people who reach retirement age would come under the protection of the health insurance plan.

More than 8 out of 10 people who will be 65 or over in 1964 would be eligible under social security or the railroad retirement program.

Ninety-five percent of those over 65 will be eligible in the future.

Nearly all those not covered under the health insurance plan would be covered by other public programs such as the Federal employee retirement program, the veteran's program, and State assistance programs.

Some people ask why health insurance for the aged belongs in the social security system. The whole point of social security is to provide financial independence to people who have worked all their lives and don't want to be a burden on their relatives, or to depend on charity and means tests.

Cash benefits now paid are barely enough to enable most older people to keep themselves housed, clothed, and fed. They certainly are not adequate to meet the cost of expensive and unpredictable illnesses, nor are they large enough to pay high health insurance premiums.

Social security cannot provide financial independence without this additional program of basic health insurance.

The aims and ideals embodied in the health insurance program will help social security do the job it was designed to do—provide dignity and independence for America's aged citizens.

Countless individuals, organizations, and publications throughout the Nation support the principle of financing health insurance for the aged through social security. Among the most prominent of these are the following:

The 1961 White House Conference on Aging, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations and affiliated unions, American Nurses Association, American Public Health Association, American Public Welfare Association, Council of Golden Ring Clubs of Senior Citizens, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Family Service Association, Group Health Association of America, National Association of Social Workers, National Consumers League, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Senior Citizens, National Farmers Union, National Federation of Settlement and Neighborhood Centers, National League of Senior Citizens, Nationwide Insurance Co.'s, Railway Labor Executives' Association, Synagogue Council of America, Women's Division of Christian Service of Methodist Church's Board of Missions, YWCA National Board, more than 30 State Governors (1960).

Outstanding social security, hospital, and medical experts including William L. Mitchell, Commissioner of Social Security and all former Commissioners of Social Security; Arthur Altmeyer, Madison, Wis.; Charles I. Schottland, School of Social Welfare, Brandeis University; John W. Tramburg, commissioner, New Jersey State Department of Institutions and Agencies; E. M. Bluestone, M.D., recipient of 1961 Distinguished Service Award of American Hospital Association; J. Douglas Brown, dean of faculty, Princeton University; Dr. Eveline M. Burns, professor of social work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University; Fedele F. Fauri, dean, School of Social Work, University of Michigan; Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Eisenhower administration; Seymour Harris, Littauer professor of political economy, Harvard University; Arthur Kornberg, M.D., Nobel prize winner in medicine; Arthur Larson, director, World Rule of Law Center, Undersecretary of Labor in Eisenhower administration; Basil C. MacLean, M.D., former president, Blue Cross Association; Howard Rusk, M.D., New York University Medical Center; Herman M. Somers, chairman, political science department, Haverford College; Benjamin Spock, M.D., professor of child development, Western Reserve University; Paul Dudley White, M.D., formerly personal physician to President Eisenhower.

Business Week, Life Magazine, the New York Times, and the Washington Post.

A THREAT TO AMERICA WE MUST SEARCH TO FIND

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, this week we have debated and passed the military construction authorization and we have appropriated the funds for the armed services to perform their mission in the coming year. In so doing we have participated in the largest single financial transaction that any peacetime Congress has ever been asked to conduct—the support of the American Defense Establishment.

Few, if any, Members of Congress will shrink from performing this duty with resolution and with conviction, although all of us realize the many implications and difficulties that are involved in a huge defense program. Rather, we have supported the Armed Forces because we understand the alternative, and because we appreciate what the uniformed services are doing for the Nation and the free world.

The dollar figures with which we deal in this area of national responsibility are immense. When we appropriate so many dollars we naturally want to know as much as possible about the need for each item of dollar expenditure. We need as much knowledge as possible about the technical developments in the various components of the services which have made our defense so expensive. In the hope that I can be helpful to my colleagues in a small way I should like to share the information I gained recently about the rather specialized and rapidly changing art of antisubmarine warfare.

It would be a physical impossibility for all Members of Congress to have a personal knowledge of all the activities of the military, naval, and air branches. Since we are limited in opportunities for personal observation, I was glad to have a chance to see what is going on in the antisubmarine forces, which I consider to be one of the more vital of our defense components.

Times have changed since World War II when I first became aware of the problems of combating submarines. The nature of antisubmarine warfare has developed with each new discovery in science and technology. There are many new tricks which I was glad to see.

As a member of the Naval Reserve, I completed a tour of active training duty last January during which the Navy assigned me to the staff of the commander, Carrier Division 16, Rear Admiral Eastwold, who commands an ASW hunter/killer task group in the Atlantic Fleet.

To say I was very impressed with the operations I observed would be gross understatement. ASW is truly a never-ending, around-the-clock, all-weather, complex operation. The Navy, in my opinion, has not publicized strongly enough the tremendous effort they are making in this area. I wish to make known, for the record, some aspects of the ASW problem.

The problem of ASW is larger than the general attention it has received. National security demands that the control of the seas be retained in the hands of the free world. Our shipborne commerce must be able to move over the seas wherever required. Enemy forces must be denied the use of these seas for mounting or supporting any assaults they may plan against the United States or the free world.

The existing Communist bloc force of over 400 submarines, some of which are missile equipped, is recognized to be the principal potential threat to the free world's control of the seas and a potential contributor to a nuclear weapon attack against the United States. A large number of the submarines of various capabilities which compose this force are long-range snorkel types equipped with torpedoes for attacks against ships.

A small number of nuclear powered submarines—some missile equipped—have recently made their appearance, and more of these may be expected. The Soviets undoubtedly will improve the capabilities of their missile launching nuclear submarines to levels approximating our own Polaris submarines. Such action will increase further the submarine launched ballistic missile threat to the United States and will demand continued emphasis on our part to produce effective countermeasures.

The ability of the modern submarine to remain submerged for long periods has necessitated the design and procurement of complex vehicles, equipments and weapons required to detect, localize, classify, and kill enemy submarines. Highly trained officers and men are required to maintain and employ these devices required in modern ASW operations.

As the Navy increases its ability to strip off the cloak of concealment which the depths of the ocean offer, it is faced with continuing advances in Soviet submarine performance and capability. ASW cannot stand still, and the Navy knows it.

Specific actions in recent months show the Navy's progress in the ASW area. Forty destroyer-type ships and 18 aircraft squadrons were recalled from the Ready Reserve for augmentation of the ASW forces as a result of the Berlin crisis. A new ASW helicopter and an improved version of the standard carrier-based ASW aircraft have been introduced into the fleet, and a new patrol-type aircraft is expected shortly, all with the latest integrated ASW systems installed. Underwater sound detection equipment, sonar, of greatly increased power is being installed in increasing numbers of ASW ships and submarines. Increased production of the newer, high-performance ASW torpedoes has been initiated. To provide destroyer types with the capability of killing submarines as soon as they are detected, a new weapon delivery system, Asroc—antisubmarine rocket—has now joined the fleet. A second system, Dash—Drone antisubmarine helicopter—is nearing completion. These new systems can deliver homing torpedoes or depth charges within ranges of several miles. The ASW capability of some of the World War II destroyers is being greatly improved by means of the fleet rehabilitation and modernization—Fram—program.

Our fleets at sea, as I have seen, are working hard to refine their current capabilities in order to make the most of what they have, and to be ready to exploit the improved equipments and weapons now in production. They are developing new ASW tactics to counter more advanced types of enemy submarines.

Navy forces and the entire Navy organization all are contributing in one way or another to ASW. It is teamwork, and many contributions are made to this effort by other areas of the Government, by industry and by universities, colleges and private research institutions. A major factor in the Navy's ASW effort is research in the many scientific areas such as oceanography and electronics. The results of this research give birth to better equipments, weapons, and techniques. These, together with the trained maintenance and operating personnel required, must be placed into fleet operation as quickly as possible in order that fleet training may insure their effectiveness.

Our efforts in the future must be directed toward countering the new and improved types of Soviet submarines which most probably will be nuclear. ASW will, in effect, become ANSW—antinuclear submarine warfare. This will be difficult. This will be expensive. This is, however, vitally necessary.

The Navy is giving worldwide attention to Communist submarine activity, and the navies of our free world allies work closely with us in the maintenance of an ASW posture appropriate to the potential threat. There has been little evidence so far of the Soviet use of submarines in an aggressive cold war role.

Navy emphasis is on teamwork and offensive strategy in concert with our allies. We must maintain strong naval forces in proper balance and at adequate levels to perform all naval missions.

Modernization and new construction both are needed in a proper balance with due regard for present readiness and the need to overcome obsolescence of our forces.

Emphasis on procurement to provide the products of research and development to the operating forces is necessary to keep ahead of Soviet submarine improvements.

Continuing support from Congress and the public must be provided for planned Navy developments in order to keep pace with the Soviet threat.

DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Congress makes legislation for the Capital, and almost 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation it is high time Congress took effective legislative steps to end discrimination in housing in the District of Columbia. It is incredible that in 1962 such legislation is still necessary. Unbelievable as it is, there is no doubt that a stone's throw from the seat of government Americans are being denied the same opportunity to live in decent housing as their fellow citizens because of their religion or the color of their skin. Community leaders and Government officials testifying during the recently held Civil Rights Commission hearings pointed out the longstanding discriminatory practices of landlords, owners, and real estate brokers in the sale and leasing of property within the District of Columbia.

The Commission heard Sterling Tucker, executive director of the Washington Urban League, state that as long as the "real dictators of housing patterns—brokers, bankers, and suburban landlords—are allowed to continue in the business as usual fashion" there will be no changes in the pattern of housing discrimination.

Discriminatory practices in District housing are so prevalent that the State Department testified that such practices curtail our ability to conduct foreign relations. Roger W. Jones, Under Secretary of State, testified, "It is patently obvious that we cannot conduct effective foreign relations, when on the basis of color alone, representatives of other nations, along with our own citizens, are denied suitable housing in Washington."

The State Department made it clear that it was not only the problem of housing for non-white diplomats which concerned it. Chief of Protocol Angier Biddle Duke testified, "Even when we are successful in placing African diplomats in adequate housing these diplomats need only look about to see that they are being singled out and that an American Negro, otherwise every bit as qualified, can not move into the same building. It is not only his own housing problem that concerns the African diplomat."

The Protocol Chief advocated "additional legal sanctions in the District of Columbia which will guarantee equal access to housing for all."

Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams also emphasized the detrimental effect that discrimination in housing within the District of Columbia has on foreign policy. "Open housing" the Secretary concluded "is the only answer."

Discrimination in the District is not based solely on color. Irving M. Engel, honorary president of the American Jewish Committee, in his well documented testimony before the Civil Rights Commission charged that in 13 areas within the District of Columbia and surrounding communities Jews are prevented from buying or leasing property.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps more than any other place in the United States our Nation's Capital should be a showplace of our belief that all men are created equal, that we are against discrimination of any kind. Segregated housing is a disgrace in the Capital of the Nation that leads the free world.

Two bills I have introduced today constitute a double-barreled legislative attack that would help eliminate Washington's disgraceful and humiliating ghettos which are the product of housing discrimination.

One of my bills is patterned after New York City's Sharkey-Brown-Isaacs law. It would prohibit any owner or other person, except a religious organization, from refusing to sell, rent or lease to any person because of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry. The measure would also prohibit discriminatory terms or requirements.

This bill sets up a 12-member Fair Housing Practices Panel with director and staff to hear complaints and to try to eliminate violations. The Panel will have the power to obtain a court injunction against sale, rent or leasing of housing accommodations until it is determined whether a violation has in fact been committed. If the Panel finds a violation, then it may direct the Corporation Counsel to bring court action to compel sale or lease to the complaining party.

The other bill I have introduced today would amend the present law licensing District of Columbia real estate brokers. The present law provides machinery for revoking licenses for a number of unethical acts. This amendment would add another section, providing that the licenses of real estate brokers and salesmen may be revoked or suspended if they engaged in discriminatory practices in the sale or leasing of housing accommodations.

Segregated housing is perhaps the most fundamental of all segregation. It is basic to most discrimination and it engenders such evils as increased mortality, delinquency, intergroup tension and unconstitutional racial segregation in public schools and other facilities. In the words of John P. Murchison of the District Chamber of Commerce—

> Discrimination against the Negro in housing is perhaps the main prop which holds democracy up most glaringly before the entire human estate as a fraud and a sinister device.

Mr. Speaker, freedom from racial and religious discrimination is one of our foundation principles. We have waited for too long a time to transform that principle into reality. Let us strike a blow for democracy by ending discrimination in housing in the Nation's Capital.

THE 18-NATION CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the news announced yesterday from the 18-Nation Conference on Disarmament now taking place in Geneva, is both disturbing and heartening. The day—April 18—is the anniversary of a famous point in American history—"Paul Revere's Ride," and I can not help but notice the difference in our attitude now as a nation and what it was at that time.

If I remember my history and the poem made famous by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, the farmers of Massachusetts, when warned the British were coming, did not suggest that they all sit down and talk things over with the admiral of the Somerset man of war, proposing that each drop their weapons and depend upon "good faith" to pull them through the crisis. Those farmers knew how to face reality. They knew they had an enemy and they knew who their enemy was.

Many of our citizens today apparently still do not realize we have an enemy. For example, the group of 452 psychologists who this past February took a huge ad in some of our major newspapers—consisting of an open letter to President Kennedy demanding that he declare the United States would not test nuclear weapons in the atmosphere.

According to comments of the Mutual Broadcasting Service at that time "in their pursuit of the mysteries of the mind, the psychologists may have lost contact with the realities of the world."

I have the feeling that some of our so-called disarmament experts in Geneva have likewise lost contact with world realities. Obviously some of them do not even read their own State Department releases, which for months now have been recounting their lack of confidence in the promises of the Soviets — and reiterating our determination not to back down on our plans for nuclear testing until and if the Soviets agree to inspection by a U.N. team.

For reality, let us take a quick look at some modern history of the back-and-forth jockeying indulged in between the U.S.S.R. and the United States on the question of development of nuclear weapons. For 16 years the United States has been trying to get some controls. Starting in 1946, we had a monopoly of atomic weapons. We offered this monopoly to a world agency if the Soviets agreed to inspection of all atomic work. The Soviets said "No," but managed somehow not to make it final, indicating they would like to keep on talking.

And so we talked, until 1949, when Russia got the A-bomb and we lost our previous monopoly. Then the nuclear-arms race started.

In 1952 the United States got the hydrogen bomb. We nervously offered to disarm, with inspection. The Soviets again said "No," but still wanted to talk.

In 1953, the Soviets got the H-bomb. Again the arms race speeded up.

In 1955, we were all still talking. We offered "open skies" and the exchange of military blueprints. Although the Soviets called this "ridiculous," they still wanted to talk about it.

In 1957, the Russians put up the first satellite—and then really talked loud and long about their strength and ability to rule the world through communism. Our State Department shuddered. Our entire educational system began self-examination, and decided our school system was at fault—that we should teach more mathematics, science, and related subjects. This a great number of parents had been saying for a number of years, without anyone listening to them. Of course this could not be done without the Federal Government's help, according to our educational experts. And so we began this program of help.

In 1958, the United States—still shuddering—announced a moratorium on atomic tests. We felt we were unpopular with other countries. We had been called aggressors and warmongers so many times by the Russians that we almost began to believe it ourselves, and an all-enveloping "guilt complex" seemed to rest on our whole Nation.

The Soviets promised to join in the moratorium on atomic tests. We assumed this was true, because naturally no inspection was allowed. More talking continued to take place, negotiating for a permanent ban on nuclear weapons.

In 1961, the Soviets suddenly began testing and ended with more than 40 testings of nuclear devices, including what they claimed to be a 100-megaton bomb. This particular test took place almost simultaneously with a speech made by President Kennedy before the United Nations. Even though the world protested and the U.N. expressed objections and disapproval, Russia went ahead with the detonation of this bomb.

Soviet Russia has been making it a habit to not quite be definite enough in saying "No" to the inspection idea proposed by the United States. It seemed to be a more or less "not right now but maybe later" attitude. Now, after first making sure of her own nuclear weapons, Russia flatly objects "to any on-site inspection whatsoever," according to President Kennedy's statement on March 29.

However, Soviet Russia wants to talk some more—and so we talk—at this Disarmament Conference in Geneva. And out of this talking has come the joint United States-United Kingdom plan for "general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world."

Ambassador Arthur H. Dean, at the urging of our President, has presented the U.S. treaty draft—considerably more detailed than the one Russia presented at the opening of the Conference 5 weeks ago. Our draft is an elaboration of the one presented last September 25. The 6 months' lapse of time is explained by the statement that "the U.S. Government had to determine its relationship to all American commitments, cold war areas, and Soviet strength and intentions."

Our three-stage plan for disarmament is to be carried out by means of a 30-percent reduction by the United States, Russia, Britain, and so forth, over a period of 3 years—of nuclear delivery vehicles and major conventional armaments. In addition, the United States and Soviet Union are to reduce armed forces to 2.1 million men each.

While production of armaments would continue, new weapons would have to be offset by destruction of old ones. In other words, total destructive capacity would have to go down by 30 percent.

Fissionable materials for nuclear weapons production would cease. Fissionable material already made would be largely transferred to peaceful uses. Nuclear weapons, however, could not be transferred from one country to another, and nuclear weapon testing would be banned.

Production, stockpiling, testing of boosters for space vehicles would be limited.

In stage 2, over a 3-year period, Russia and the United States are to destroy one-half their remaining nuclear delivery weapons and major conventional armaments. After 6 years from the beginning of disarmament, each is to have left only 35 percent of the original amount.

Each is to limit armed forces to 1,050,000 men. All other states possessing any military significance are to join the treaty, and reduce their arms by 65 percent. Production of only spare parts for existing armaments would be allowed. The United Nations peace force must be established; compulsory jurisdiction must rest in the hands of the International Court of Justice—World Court—under the United Nations.

Then comes stage 3. All states possessing armed forces and armaments must join the treaty. All armaments are to be eliminated, except for nonnuclear arms for agreed types of national forces necessary to maintain internal order. Arms production is to be limited to requirements of these forces and of the U.N. peace force.

While we announced the third stage was to be completed "within an agreed time period as promptly as possible," Lord Home, the British Foreign Secretary, has stated this would probably require about 9 years.

According to our U.S. officials, the Soviet delegates seemed "fascinated"—interested in the new inspection proposal—although, of course, the nuclear test ban portion requiring international verification was still rejected outright.

In checking with the State Department division concerned with this plan, I asked a few pertinent questions, such as:

How would our inspection be carried out? I find no inspection of existing weapons stockpiles is involved. In other words, we agreed to accept Russia's word on the amount of arms and troops the Soviets would have in service at the start of disarmament. One of our newspapers commented thus: "In it, the United States took a considerable political risk by agreeing to accept Russia's word on the amount of arms and troops the Soviets would have in service at the start of disarmament."

I consider this the understatement of the year. Not only is it a "political risk"—but more important—it is a "physical safety risk." However, we must evidently proceed on the theory that trust and confidence is indicated, at least on this point.

Another question I asked was:

What type of inspection would be used—that is, how do we go about this very important item?

I was advised there were three kinds of inspection involved. However, all the necessary details are not as yet worked out. But for a beginning, the comprehensive disarmament would also need control posts, similar to those detailed in the nuclear weapon ban program. The "spot check" system described in newspaper announcements is a shorthand kind of description and does not really spell out what is involved.

The United Nations would not carry out these inspections, but instead a new international organization would be set up. On this team we would have U.S. people and the Soviets would have their people—each to go along on inspection visits to the countries involved—the one team to inspect what the other country was doing and how well it was carrying out its pledges—and the other team to watch what the inspecting team might be doing. Each country would be divided up into zones. These zones would be inspected, but never know ahead of time just which zone would be checked, thus safeguarding against the possibility that material, and so forth, might be moved out just previous to the inspection period.

The State Department counsel assured me also that if at any time, during the proceeding of any of the three-stage plan for disarmament, we discovered Russia was not keeping to her bargain—we could withdraw from the treaty and resume the arms race. This problem would, of course, have to be brought up in the Security Council of the United Nations—in which we as well as the Soviets have a veto.

In view of our unpleasant experience in the Security Council for several years, I am wondering just how effective any handling of a complaint by one of the major powers would be. Of course, we can be comforted by the fact mentioned above that we do have the veto power. We are one of the group of five permanent and major powers on this Council—consisting of China, France, the U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and the United States. The other six consist of countries elected to serve 2-year terms. Any question brought before the Council must have seven votes in the affirmative, five of which must be votes of the permanent members. A veto by any one of the five permanent members would cause the question to be dropped.

Now, I would like to discuss the section of our disarmament program which involves the vitally important issue of a complete nuclear test ban. This situation remains, in the old Air Force slang, as SNAFU—situation normal, all fouled up. For nearly 3 years the need to include an adequate verification of nuclear test bans was accepted by the Soviet delegation at Geneva, in theory, although there was considerable disagreement as to details. The test ban treaty was presented to the conference by the United States on April 18, 1961, and has now been re-presented by the United States and the United Kingdom, in a joint message on April 10 of this year. It was rejected summarily in 1961 and no progress has been made so far on this issue. The U.S.S.R. simply refuses to change its position. In a statement made by Secretary Rusk on March 26, 1962, he said:

> The faster we seem to move forward toward the Soviet position, the faster they themselves seem to run away from it, and we have not had any success in closing the essential gap which is on the question of verification.

The Soviets appear to take the position, "Just ban the bomb and trust us not to cheat." Khrushchev has said:

> Why don't the Western Powers put us to the test and display their understanding and wisdom by signing (an unpoliced) treaty on disarmament?

I was much relieved to find in a press release from the State Department on my desk this morning, dated April 12, 1962—wherein the substitute offered by the Soviets of paper pledges instead of guaranteed agreements is discussed—that our position is: The United States does not intend to place its security and the security of its allies at the mercy of Soviet on-again-off-again tactics. We are ready to conclude an effective test ban agreement now. But we cannot be led into another paper pledge which, far from guaranteeing a halt to nuclear testing, would only give rise to a false sense of security and provide yet another opportunity for the Soviet Union to prepare in secret for its own nuclear testing."

Briefly, our nuclear plan would require setting up 180 control posts around the world. Nineteen of these would be in scattered points inside the Soviet Union. Sixteen are to be in the United States. Fourteen in British territory, and others inside Communist China. This latter point puzzles me, and I will comment on it a little later.

To continue with our plan: More than 1,000 technicians, along with other nations' representatives, would be stationed at these posts, using seismographic equipment to detect A-tests.

All nuclear testing is to be banned, including low-yield explosions underground—but not including peaceful-uses tests.

With regard to the plan to place nuclear test ban inspection sites inside Communist China, I am wondering how this would be handled. Red China is not a member of the United Nations and our policy has been that we do not intend to allow Red China to be admitted to membership. Are we to assume that the Chinese Communists would feel bound by a treaty of this type? While some may regard it as a branch of the Soviet Union, I am convinced Red China does not regard herself as such at all. In fact, according to all the news stories, they seem to be feuding with the U.S.S.R.

Our own Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas stated in a speech given before the Association of Wisconsin State College faculties on April 6 of this year that Red China will have the nuclear bomb by 1972. Therefore, he concludes, we must admit Red China to the United Nations, and then we must all develop "a rule of law for the world to prevent war." To quote him directly: "Disarmament without Red China is really foolish. They have one-fourth of the people in the world." He further predicted that Communist China will be the third greatest world power by 1967, but is bickering with Russia because the Soviets have departed from the Stalinist position that Red China holds to.

I believe it would be fair for us to insist that the question of Red China being included with our plans for nuclear test banning should be clarified for the American people.

Our Secretary of State addressed the Geneva Disarmament Conference on March 23 and said:

> What we need above all in this field is confidence and not fear, a basis for trust and not for suspicion. To get this is the major purpose of our insistence on effective international arrangements to ensure that nuclear weapon tests, once outlawed, do not, in fact, ever occur again.

At another time, the Secretary said:

> We do not intend to be caught again as we were in the autumn of 1961, and there is no reason why we should have to be caught again by a unilateral Soviet decision to resume nuclear weapon tests. This is a risk to national and international security which the United States cannot and will not take. A test ban, or any disarmament measure, will be acceptable to us only when it is accompanied by adequate measures of verification * * * a nuclear test ban agreement can be signed in short order. * * * Only one element is missing: Soviet willingness to conclude an agreement.

President Kennedy said on March 2 of this year:

> We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparations, and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium.

Let us hope these brave and firm words are not weakened in any way. It indicated, happily, that our Government is facing reality at least and our lessons of the past must not be forgotten, or we run the risk of not having the chance to make the same kind of mistake again. The Soviets are stubborn on this particular issue. We must be even more stubborn, for we hold in our hands the safety of not only our Nation, but the entire world.

Eight neutral members of the disarmament conference have joined with the West in insisting that this is an essential requirement. This is good news and indicates they also are facing reality.

At this point I would like to state that President Kennedy improved his stature when he publicly announced that if the Soviets do not accept international verification of a nuclear test ban, we must and will resume testing sometime next week in the Pacific area. This strong leadership is necessary, and I believe most thinking Americans will back him to the hilt on his decison, even though we disagree with some other proposals he has made to the Congress.

This is not because we are bloodthirsty monsters—but because we know our alternative choice on the nuclear test ban issue lies in the cowardly "Better Red than dead" philosophy. Trouble was never avoided by running away from it.

Many unknowns are involved in the decision to test or not to test. For example, we have developed 30 types of nuclear weapons, while Russia has an estimated 10 to 15 types.

We have material that shows we have conducted 175 nuclear weapons tests, while Russia has conducted 105.

We have an estimated 40,000 nuclear bombs and warheads on hand. Russia has an estimated 20,000.

In addition we are supposed to have many times more bombers, ships and missiles to deliver nuclear weapons than Russia has.

However, new information has been developed that the Soviet arsenal has been thoroughly "proof tested"—meaning that fully assembled rockets have been sent into the sky with their nuclear warheads attached—something, incidentally, we have never done.

Russia has pushed weapons which are new to them but similar to those we have, including antiaircraft warheads, tactical weapons for battlefield use, antisubmarine torpedoes for the Russian Navy.

The Soviets have been able to slim down bulky warheads and pack in more destructive power per pound. One-half the 40 plus tests we know Russia has made were devoted to the firing of warheads in the range of 1 to 5 megatons.

Russia has also held major experiments aimed at achieving an antimissile missile—and we are afraid a breakthrough has been achieved.

The superbomb of 58 megatons was exploded, 3 times as big as any U.S. blast. This created relatively little fallout, thus indicating the Soviets have a cheap and "clean" trigger for big bombs.

The Soviets have undertaken "effects tests" at very high altitudes. In one instance, for example, this was done at a height of 100 miles, having the effect of creating a blackout of certain communications for 2,500 miles in all directions for an entire day. We know all this because of a series of clues, during such tests as we have been able to undertake, consisting of sound waves, electromagnetic energy pulses, visible light, and radioactive fallout collected by air patrols and fallout-detection stations.

President Kennedy, in making his understandably hard decision to start nuclear weapons tests next week in the atmosphere over the Pacific, hopes to get answers to questions such as:

Can Soviet H-bombs detonated 100 miles high jam radio and radar critical to the U.S. defenses?

Can hardened U.S. missile sites withstand multimegaton attacks?

Can U.S. missiles be equipped to penetrate new Soviet defenses?

Can a sure-fire missile defense be achieved for North America?

Not only the President, but our entire country—after the announcement was made that we must resume nuclear testing if the Soviets did not accept international verification, has been made the target of a multitude of protests—some misguided, and some intentional and due to Communist-guided propaganda methods.

Some of the protests came from students in our own country. Some from student riots taking place in Japan. Peace parades have been held in Britain. Peace parades and White House picketing have taken place here in Washington, D.C. Delegations of housewives have called upon Mrs. Khrushchev and our First Lady, evidently naively feeling these ladies might intercede with their husbands. One hundred and three mothers and grandmothers, 51 of them Americans—including Mrs. Cyrus Eaton and Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr.—1 from Russia, and the remainder from other countries—made a trip to Geneva to urge both sides taking part in the disarmament conference to come to an agreement.

I am not suggesting that of these people protesting, none of them were sincere. I am sure most of them were. But when any group or groups try to claim that the United States should not deal from a position of strength, if this is forced upon us by Soviet Russia, they are sincerely mistaken, to say the least.

Let us face reality. If international communism, for some indefinable reason, suddenly ceased being a threat to world peace—would this mean mankind would be free of its ancient and well-known affinity for war? Would greed, hatred, irrationality—mental and spiritual problems which have always brought about wars—become things of the past?

Then let us consider, how do we rationalize the actual wars—which have in the past gone on and which still are going on all over the earth today—with the demands going on for global disarmament? Can a "paper agreement" with Russia somehow perform the strange alchemy which will change human nature and abolish wars? Will this "paper," in other words, bring about a utopia on earth? The perfection of man will come in God's time—not by means of a scrap of paper purporting to be a serious treaty.

How do we go about signing a "serious treaty" with a country which has consistently in the past broken treaties at will? We have shown our good faith, as a nation, by creating a permannt Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—for the purpose of studying problems of disarmament. This in the face of repeated Soviet failures to live up to their pledges. The present crisis, we must remember, was not caused by the fact of nuclear weapons, but by men. While our outward conditions of life have changed, and radically, our basic problems today are actually no different than they were back in the days when Paul Revere rode to arouse the countryside to the dangers prevailing at that time.

Why then do we suddenly feel we must apologize for trying to conserve our strength as a nation? Milton said: "What is strength without a double share of wisdom?" Let us not demonstrate a lack of wisdom by trying to pit idealism against the cold materialism of the Soviet Union.

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow caught the idealism and spirit of America, coupled with its love of freedom, in his poem "Paul Revere's Ride," when he said:

> And yet, through the gloom and the light
> The fate of a nation was riding that night;
> And the spark struck out by the steed in his flight,
> Kindled the land into flame with its heat.
> So through the night rode Paul Revere
> And so through the night went his cry of alarm
> To every Middlesex village and farm,
> A cry of defiance, and not of fear,
> A voice in the darkness, a knock at the door,
> And a word that shall echo forevermore.
> For borne on the night-wind of the past,
> Through all our history, to the last,
> In the hour of darkness and peril and need,
> The people will waken and listen to hear
> The hurrying hoofbeats of that steed,
> And the midnight message of Paul Revere.

Let us have done with apologies—with fear—with breast-beating before nations of the world.

We do not intend to bow our knees to communism. Why then do we waste our time—and other nations' time—with countless conferences—countless discussions—announcements of this or that—decisions made and remade—and unmade?

Let us get on with the business of living. Let us, in short, face reality and if we find the reality unpleasant or unpalatable—which it is—why let us remember we have been doing this since the dawn of the world and the dawn of our Nation on the earth. We have much to offer the world, and one of the most valuable things is a quiet confidence in our way of life, in our ability and determination to remain strong and to protect that way of life. If some wish to join us, we welcome them. If they prefer instead to accept the yoke of a godless Communist ideology for their lives—such as those who swear by the slogan "Better Red than dead"—we pity them, but we must not be hampered in our continued search for the freedom and dignity of man, eloquently set out in our Constitution and Bill of Rights—and fought for so bravely by those farmers of Massachusetts and all those who followed through the years—by the faint hearts of those who accept the premise that communism will triumph in this world.

REQUIEM FOR A FREE PEOPLE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the title of what I have to say today is "Requiem for a Free People." Listen carefully, my colleagues, are the bells tolling the death knell of the liberties of the individual in America and in the passing bringing us the whisper of despair for freedom for all mankind? The past week's events may prove to be the most tragic of our entire history for we have seen a President of the United States use, with a ruthlessness never before experienced, the awesome power of the Federal Government to coerce and intimidate private industry and to arouse public suspicion and distrust by the people of respected business leaders.

In making these remarks I am neither defending nor criticizing the action of the steel companies in announcing an increase in price. There is a much larger question here, the question of to what lengths an ambitious Chief Executive will go in the use of power to achieve results he desires. In the past few days we have seen here in the United States an angry President Kennedy denouncing, without a hearing, the leaders of the steel industry. We have seen President Kennedy using the medium of television and his highly placed public relations experts to arouse public indignation against those with whom he was personally displeased. We have read news stories of private citizens and newspapermen being aroused in the dark hours of the night by the agents of the Federal Government to answer questions pertaining to news sources and stories which had appeared in the press. Are we, the citizens of this land of the free, now to expect the thunder of boots in the night, the knock at the door, the summons to appear to justify our actions whenever we say anything or do anything that does not meet with the approval of the President and the planners who surround him?

I warn those who may now support the President's high-handed methods and disregard of the rights of freemen because they are not directly concerned, that once this power to use the force of the Federal Government against any segment of society is established, then the freedom of all of us is in danger. Does labor truly expect that President Kennedy will be satisfied to pressure business and industry into complying with his plans without exerting that same pressure upon those who work in the mines, mills, and factories when they, too, may attempt to exercise their freedom? Recent history should show us that freedom once lost is most difficult to regain. And can there be any doubt that any man who once finds that he can bend the people to his will on an economic matter will not soon be tempted to try the same tactics to assure political control? America, will you awaken before it is too late, or are we to lie sleeping, while the forces of dictatorship are seething in the dark recesses of the minds of those who do not trust the people to govern themselves?

While a long, tragic step toward the abolishment of our free society has been taken, there is yet hope that it is not too late for the people to convince President Kennedy that his disregard of the rights of freemen is the wrong course.

There is a ray of hope in the reaction of the Nation's press in these last few days to what has taken place. Under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to include some of the articles and editorial comment.

In 1960 Candidate Kennedy made a great to-do over the image of the United States abroad. The following items from the U.S. News & World Report show what President Kennedy did to the American image in one short speech and a night of ill-advised action.

We read first that:

> Theodore C. Sorenson, Kennedy aid, wrote the statement in which the President criticized leaders of the U.S. steel industry.

Undoubtedly, however, this expresses President Kennedy's views.

Te second item is as follows:

> Observers from Europe, listening to President Kennedy's remarks on steel, commented that no leader in the most socialized country of Western Europe would think of delivering an attack of that kind on a private industry.

Further:

> Correspondents for the Soviet news agency, attending the President's news conference, cabled that President Kennedy had pictured a little group of business executives as running the United States against the Nation's welfare.

How much greater damage can we do to a nation of free people at a time when we are locked in mortal conflict than to run down our entire economic system as the President has done?

The Washington Daily News had this to say:

> The rush by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy smacked of hysteria. Knocks on the door, or phone calls, in the middle of the night by agents of the law are repugnant in a free country—especially for such questions.

Which could have been handled at another time and in another way.

The Wall Street Journal commented in many other articles that I think are excellent, and which I shall include as part of my remarks. From the Wall Street Journal of April 16, 1962:

> WASHINGTON.—Steel prices are back where they were last Monday. But not the steel industry, nor business generally, nor labor, nor the Government.
>
> President Kennedy is pulling his velvet glove back on—in supreme confidence everyone will keep vividly in mind his display of the iron fist. * * * Mr. Kennedy's violent counterattack made use of almost every conceivable governmental weapon; * * *
>
> "We have no idea of going around flexing our muscles at everyone," says a top Government official. The idea is that it simply won't be necessary. And a good many people outside Government agree that perhaps it won't.
>
> "Now it's going to be tough for any big company in any industry to get a price increase," comments one top steel executive. Says a man in organized labor: "It now will be extremely difficult for any union to break away from the administration's wage guidelines."

So we know now who is going to run both industry and labor. It will be the President.

The President will fight for more of his proposals, we are told, making less use of the carrot and more of the stick, because of his success in the steel matter.

And again:

> Magnanimity will have its limits, though—

Says one White House official—

> Roger Blough just can't ever again walk into this office and be treated in the same friendly way he was before. * * *
>
> An AFL-CIO aid says that the power Mr. Kennedy has displayed amounts to being able to dictate wage and price terms in any situation involving what he determines to be the national interest.

Further we learn that:

> Instead of being a forum for labor-management discussions, some union officials believe that it will become a council where labor and management sit and listen to what the Government wants. * * *
>
> "Labor and management will now figure the Government is ready to use force to get what it wants," one union official was heard to observe.

Also:

> Mr. Kennedy was personally determined to achieve unconditional surrender.

The Wall Street Journal editorial goes on to say—and there are a number of other articles which I shall include. I would like to read from the New York Herald Tribune of April 13, 1962:

> MR. KENNEDY AND THE S-BOMB
>
> The S-bomb that he exploded over Washington—the steel price rise—has already had a blast effect which United States Steel's Roger Blough insisted yesterday surprised him by its intensity. The fallout has yet to be measured. How lethal it will be, and how far ranging, depends largely on President Kennedy.
>
> The reaction of the administration and its friends on Capitol Hill has been marked by a vindictiveness. The talk has ranged from criminal prosecutions to breaking up United States Steel, from withholding Defense Department orders from the offending companies to scrapping the Treasury's plans for liberalized depreciation allowances for all industry. Two congressional investigations have been announced, and the executive departments are honing their knives with all the intensity of juvenile gang members bent on a rumble. "Kennedy can be a hater," one White House official put it, "and right now I don't think there's any doubt he hates United States Steel." Many fear that all business has been kicked into the Kennedy doghouse.
>
> The President has a right to be concerned, both with the direct effect of the rise on the price level generally and with its indirect impact on his drive to achieve a stable balance of prices and wages. But this hardly justifies the massive punitive expedition his forces are mounting.
>
> More to the point, perhaps, is that a President, acutely sensitive to his public image, was given a public drubbing. And he was caught off guard. He had deeply involved his own prestige in holding the steel price line. But this was his doing, not the companies'. They never promised to hold prices. They offended by not doing the President's bidding. They exercised their right, in a free economy, to set their prices according to market forces and not by Presidential dictation.
>
> In asking them to submerge their own interests, in the face of rising costs, sagging profits, burdensome taxes, and an acute need for investment capital, Mr. Kennedy asked them, in effect, to subsidize his efforts to stabilize prices and hold down future wage increases.
>
> Perhaps they should have done so; perhaps not. But the point is that he has no lawful power to compel them to and he should have none.
>
> The prospect of another kick for the wage-price spiral is disturbing, but not nearly so much so as the administration attitudes—and arrogance—so nakedly exposed. The economy can absorb another steel price rise better than it can stand price controls, whether imposed by law or by the massive extra-legal coercive power at the President's disposal.
>
> If he persists in his war of reprisal against the steelmakers, and even more if he marks all business as the enemy or moves toward more intervention as the answer to an intervention that failed, Mr. Kennedy may patch up his image, temporarily, as the consumer's defender. But the consumer's interest, that of the jobseeker and that of the Nation, lie with the healthy functioning of a free economy. And it won't function healthily in an environment of coercion and fear.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, in the middle of these remarks, that I wonder if these newspapers are afraid. I suspect that retaliation against these individual newspapermen will be rather full and complete. I understand it has already been launched.

I also read 2 weeks ago, I believe it was in the U.S. News & World Report, where White House reporters are denied articles if they did not in their last article correctly portray the President as he and his aids want to be portrayed, to create the correct image.

What kind of nation do we have, that a President can so dictate what is even put in the papers? I take my hat off to these members of the press that had and will have the courage to speak. And now I wonder what will happen to Members of Congress. Will the gentleman addressing you now be personally subject to attack, to be silenced? I rather think the President's power is not that great, but maybe we in Congress shall learn something to the contrary. Maybe we will not be free to speak on the floor in the future; I do not know. But as long as we are free to speak this voice will be heard against this kind of high-handed dictatorial practice on the part of our Chief Executive. Since I criticized President Eisenhower in the previous administration many times when I thought he was wrong, I certainly have the right to do so now, and I shall. This is the role of the responsible opposition.

What really is at issue here, still is, is whether the price of steel is to be determined by the bargaining in the marketplace, between makers and buyers of steel.

Thus far I have not gotten around to the question whether the steel people were right or wrong in asking for a steel price increase. That is not the point. The point is, Does the President of the United States have the right to dictate prices? Many people now speak up and say, "Good for you, Mr. President; slap it to the rich, these big, wealthy corporations."

But those corporations are owned by the small stockholders, too, by those of modest income, the little people, as they are frequently called, and so often depicted by those who cry loudly about the plight of the common, the little man. We do not have little men in this country, in my picture of our Nation, our country. Those businesses are owned by people, many of them, who are very small shareholders.

I have many other comments here I would like to make, but because of the breadth of this subject and the amount of material I am including in the Record at this point, I should like to direct my colleagues' attention to material that was placed in the Record yesterday, April 18, page 6938.

I should like to add to the remarks another editorial in yesterday's Wall Street Journal called "Government by Fear." This is an element that I do want to mention and deal with very briefly:

Government by Fear

"Kennedy is mad and so am I," said a Detroit auto worker quoted in this newspaper the other day; "the Government shouldn't let them do it."

So far as one can tell, that man was expressing a very general reaction of Americans to the great steel explosion. We think that attitude needs some further examination, for it concerns an issue far broader than the price of steel, and it is an issue that was not settled by the President's victory over the steel industry.

Let us first of all be clear about just what the Government did. It said that a private company could not change the price of its product, a property right which is obviously basic to a free economy. In other words, the Government set the price. And it did this by the pressure of fear—by naked power, by vituperation, by threats, by agents of the state security police.

The auto worker, and the many others of similar view, presumably reason that both the end and the means are justified in this case. After all, United States Steel is big and doesn't need any tears shed over it; anyway, what happens to United States Steel is no skin off anyone else's nose.

That, we think, is a mistaken interpretation. It doesn't require much imagination to see this same kind of power employed elsewhere. It could be directed against that auto worker's own union, if the Government so chose. It could be directed against the corner grocer, if the Government decided it didn't like his prices. It could be directed against anybody's property. For the principle the Government has promulgated with its steel action is that Americans are free to deal with their property only if officialdom approves. It is a novel principle in this country.

Whatever the majority of contemporary Americans may feel, the fact is that their forefathers understood the connection between economic freedom and political liberty. Property rights, in their view, were basic, as basic as life itself. There is nothing abstract or academic about that proposition; it means purely and simply that free acquisition and disposal of property is the mark of a free man. All history shows that economic freedom is essential to the maintenance of free political institutions.

Throughout our own history, the people have always sensed this, even if they might not have been able to put it in the terms of philosophical discourse. Sometimes, indeed, they carried it to extremes. They used to hang horse thieves, for instance—a practice we today would hardly condone. Yet that harsh penalty was society's recognition of the fundamental nature of property rights. Steal a man's horse in those days and you stole his livelihood, which is very near to saying his life.

Now we are not contending that the Government, in 3 short days, has managed to extinguish freedom. But it is worth noting that the Government has made considerable inroads on the property rights of all of us. It has done so broadly, with its crushing taxation. It has done so in the case of specific groups, such as farmers. And in this latest development it has displayed its whip for all to see.

The Government, in short, has made the people beholden to it. Having done that, it may not find it necessary to use the whip immediately again; the fact that it exists, and has been so triumphantly cracked, may suffice for a time. In government by fear, it is not only selected individuals, or business entities, that suffer. The knowledge that the security police can come knocking at midnight on any man's door, without warrants, engenders a general atmosphere of fear. Sure, we still have constitutional rights, but if such an atmosphere continues to develop, who will be eager to test them?

So we hope there will be more thought and more discussion of the events of last week. No one can be unaffected by them, whatever he may believe at the moment. Infringement of property rights infringes all rights. And no one should forget that this Nation was founded so men could be free of government by fear.

Mr. Speaker, yes; I have seen examples of fear already. I think I have seen it before the Committee on Ways and Means when men testified against the Trade Expansion Act, but they did not say that. They said they were for the objectives of the bill, then proceeded to tear it to ribbons, proving they were not for the bill at all but were afraid to speak up and say what they really thought. Who wants a tax investigation tomorrow the way the President has used power in the steel situation?

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 16, 1962]

An Incredible Week

In a long life not without its share of amazements, we never saw anything like it.

On Tuesday one of the country's steel companies announced it was going to try to get more money for its product. And promptly all hell busted loose.

We wouldn't have been surprised ourselves if some people had shaken their heads in puzzlement at the new price list. Although after 20 years of inflation a price rise in anything is hardly unusual, there was some reason for wondering if the company officials had made the right decision in today's market.

But what happened was no mere headshaking. The President of the United States went into what can only be described as a tirade. Not only had the company changed its price list without consulting him but it had also set a price which, in his opinion, was "wholly unjustified." With a long preamble in which he rang in the Berlin crisis, the soldiers killed the other day in Vietnam, the wives and mothers separated from their husbands by the Reserve callup—all of which he cast at the feet of these "irresponsible" steel officials—he wound up by crying that these men had shown their "utter contempt" for the welfare of the country.

The response in Washington was instantaneous. The Justice Department, the Federal Trade Commission, the congressional inquisitors all leaped to arms.

Then came the night riders. At 3 a.m. Thursday morning a reporter for the Associated Press was awakened by Government agents unable to wait even for regular office hours in their driven haste to find out what testimony he could give about the criminal conduct of these steel officials. At 5 a.m. it was the turn of our own reporter in Philadelphia. At 6:30 a.m. the scene was repeated in Wilmington, Del., for a reporter on the Evening Journal. All this without any warrants, only orders from the Attorney General of the United States.

By mid-Thursday morning the United States Steel Corp. had been subpenaed for all documents bearing on the crime and had learned that a Federal grand jury would move swiftly to see what laws had been violated by asking three-tenths of a cent a pound more for a piece of steel.

This brought us to Thursday afternoon. Then Mr. Roger Blough, the chairman of this company, felt forced to stand up to an assembly of microphones and television cameras and defend himself before the country for the wickedness of his deeds. And to be treated by the reporters at that gathering as if they were a part of the prosecution and he was, indeed, a malefactor in the dock.

And that leads to what is probably the most amazing thing of all about last week. Across the country—on the radio, in newspapers, and at street corners—the necessity of the defenders to "justify" themselves before the righteous accusers was simply accepted as a premise from which the trial should begin. There were few to say otherwise.

In such a climate it was not at all surprising what the mailed first could do. All day Friday steel company offices were awash with Government agents, while the threats of punishment were mingled with promises of reward for doing the rulers' bidding. It is a technique of government not unknown elsewhere in the world, and it is a combination almost irresistible. So by Friday night Mr. Kennedy had his victory.

Finally the jubilation. The President himself said all the people of the United States should be gratified. Around him there was joy unrestrained at this proof positive of how naked political power, ruthlessly used, could smash any private citizen who got in its way. So far as we could tell, the people did seem relieved that it was all over and that the malefactors had been brought to heel.

Yet what, in all truth, is this "crime" with which these men stood charged by a wrathful President?

It had nothing to do with arguments about whether this particular asking price was economically justified, or fair to the steel stockholders, or somehow responsible for dead soldiers in Vietnam. This last is sheer demagoguery, and the others are questions no man can answer—neither Mr. Blough nor Mr. Kennedy.

What was really at issue here, and still is, is whether the price of steel is to be determined by the constant bargaining in the marketplace between the makers and buyers of steel; you may be sure that if the makers guessed wrong the market would promptly change their decision. Or whether the price of steel is to be decided and then enforced by the Government. In short, the issue is whether we have a free market system or whether we do not. That, and nothing more.

Thus the true "crime" of this company was that it did not get permission from the Government and that its attempted asking price did not suit the ideas of a tiny handful of men around the White House.

It was for this that last week we saw the President of the United States in a fury, a public pillorying of an industry, threatened reprisals against all business, the spectacle of a private citizen helplessly trying to defend himself against unnamed accusations, the knock of policemen on the midnight door. And there was hardly a voice rising above the clamor to ask what it was all about.

If we had not seen it with our eyes and heard it with our own ears, we would not have been able to believe that in America it actually happened.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 17, 1962]

The Price of Ignorance

President Kennedy's victory over the steel companies last week was certainly a convincing display of Government power. But it was also an equally convincing demonstration of the administration's lack of economic knowledge. * * *

The trouble is that the administration seems to think one sure way to promote growth is to increase Federal spending.

* * * * *

"Vigorous economic growth" requires not a fast-spending Government but a vigorous private economy. * * *

The smashing impact of the administration's economic power now is evident to all. We can only hope the Nation will not have to pay too high a price for economic ignorance.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance

In somewhat the same way, the outcome of last week's price boost in steel, whenever it might have occurred, would have had a real effect on business sentiment even with no governmental action. Maintenance of the increase would have been a tonic, and failure to maintain would have been a depressant. But either way the effect would last only as long as normal fluctuations in business do.

Now, however, a more profound and lasting effect could be seen. Business might fear not only the normal forces of economics but the possibly violent impact of politics.

It might wonder what decisions, formerly regarded as within the competence of management, would have to be submitted, whether formally or merely in effect, to Government.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 13, 1962]

Business in the Doghouse

In President Kennedy's stated view, of course, it is the business community, spearheaded by the steel industry, that has flung down the gauntlet, and it is the noble knight of Government that has accepted the challenge. As he put it, "a tiny handful of steel executives whose pursuit of private power and profit exceeds their sense of public responsibility" have shown "utter contempt for the interests of 185 million Americans."

With this and other comments in his statement, the President neatly portrays businessmen as unpatriotic monsters of unbelievable greed, whose profits, naturally, never go anywhere except into their own bulging pockets. Obviously this portrayal is considered the way to put oneself on the side of the angels, politically speaking.

But there is more to the administration's current mood than politicking on this crass level. There is frustration and resentment that the economy performs so well without the control of officialdom. There is—not to put too fine a point on it—an overweening pursuit of public power and profit, and hence a burning itch to punish these free enterprisers for being free.

This administration has paid an enormous amount of lipservice tc business. That is another way of saying it has protested its love too much. For all the while it has been acting in a different way. It has increased all the many harassments at the Government's disposal. Its henchmen in Congress are constantly devising new and fantastic ways of obstructing business activity. It has sought a tremendous broadening of the public sector, which means reducing the private economy to ineffectiveness. * * *

Perhaps, in the supercharged air of the moment, many Americans agree with the President's denunciation of business. But on further reflection, it is possible they might find distasteful a rabid new Government onslaught on the free economy.

[From the National Observer]

The Angry Government

We don't know how often President Kennedy gets angry; any President must find frequent occasions to try his temper. In the past week, at any rate, the President didn't bother to conceal his anger at United States Steel's announcement of a price increase. And by the week's end, he had given the Nation an instructive demonstration of his economic and political power. Nobody should miss its moral.

For a look at the cause of his anger tells a good deal about the present relationship of the Federal Government and the private economy. Mr. Kennedy could not be unconcerned about this action of a private company because he and his administration were deeply involved in the recent steel union-management settlement.

The administration put heavy pressure on both sides to settle without a strike, and they did, 3 months before the strike deadline. It was a political victory for the White House, and the President himself hailed the agreement as "noninflationary." That is because the contracts provide for no direct hourly wage increases in the first year, and the administration obviously expected the steel firms to show "restraint" on price increases.

This optimism, however, ignored certain economic facts. In the 4 years since steel prices were last raised, there have been no less than four boosts in steelworker wages and benefits, not counting the cost of the benefits in the new contracts. So it would seem that "restraint" has been a somewhat one-sided affair. In those circumstances, United States Steel argued it couldn't go on without a price increase if it was to continue to be an efficient producer.

Whatever the merits of that argument, and we think them considerable, the upshot was the curious spectacle of the President of the United States reacting to this private economic decision as though it were a personal affront—if not, indeed, a crime. For the Government investigators are already busily looking into the steel price increase.

An observer must wonder where this angry attitude is going to lead. To price controls, perhaps? And it must be asked how the Nation has come to this strange pass of such furious Federal intervention into the lives of all of us.

People talk a lot about the free economy, and it certainly is that compared to many others in the world. Still "free" economy is plainly not a literal description. The Federal impact on the economy has grown enormously, and the Federal momentum is constantly gaining. For one thing, there are so many Government restrictions on managerial freedom of action today that no man could count them all.

Even more important, the cost of Government weighs heavily on the economy, pressing down its freedom and vitality. Federal spending budgeted at nearly $93 billion in the next fiscal year is at the expense of the private economy. Some of it, as for defense, is essential; much of it is just political, and the Government refuses to cut back the latter for the sake of the former.

On the contrary, the Government constantly seeks new ways to spend money, which also means ever new intrusions on the freedom of action of individuals, businesses, municipalities, and States. And the taxes which must be exacted to support this Federal edifice are the greatest single drain on the economy's potential for heavy growth.

Most of the time for more than 30 years, however, even the oppressive taxes have not sufficed to feed the appetite of government. And so we have had the kind of deficit financing which in effect creates dollars out of thin air.

The effects of that inflation hit especially hard in the early years after World War II; we can all remember when the prices of practically everything seemed to take a new leap every week. Prices were jacked up so much, in fact, that our competitive position in world trade is still suffering. Out of that inflationary flood let loose by the Federal Government came the famous wage-price spiral of the postwar years.

The Government did one further thing to encourage the spiral. By granting unions a host of legal immunities—notably exemption from antitrust prosecution—it gave them the powerful bargaining threat of the nationwide strike in such basic industries as steel. Because such strikes can indeed threaten the Nation, the Government feels compelled to intervene still more.

And that progression suggests the larger pattern of the constant Federal encroachment on the free economy. The more the Government tries to take away from the free economy, the more it weakens it, and the more justification it finds for further meddling and regulation. This is, if anything is, the way to the controlled economy, which you may be sure will benefit neither individuals nor unions nor businessmen nor the national economy nor the political liberties we presumably still value.

It is understandable that a President should get annoyed when a particular economic intervention isn't working out as he planned. And given the Government's power, he was able in this case to force a victory. But perhaps the private citizen has cause for anger too—or at least reasons to stop and take a good look at what a Government angry at free institutions is doing to this country.

[From the Washington Post]

Profits and Inflation

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The capitalist system more correctly might be called a profit-and-loss system. It differs from feudalism or socialism in this fundamental respect, that under the capitalist system an individual may accumulate earnings, no matter how earned, to be disposed of by himself for such purposes, private or public, as he chooses.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 16, 1962]

Two-Bit Dollar Is Near

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

There was in President Kennedy's denunciation of the steel industry one special paragraph that need be changed only a little to mean something else again entirely.

The President's paragraph began like this: "If this rise in the cost of steel is imitated by the rest of the industry, instead of rescinded, it would increase the cost of homes, autos, appliances," and so on. That was the beginning of a paragraph that firmly put on the steel industry responsibility for inviting more rotting of the U.S. dollar by inflation.

Now, to aim that paragraph in a different direction, read the opening this way:

"If the politicians continue deficit Treasury spending instead of balancing the Government's budget, it would increase the cost of homes, autos, appliances, and most other items for every American family. It would increase the cost of machinery and tools to every American businessman and farmer. It would seriously handicap our efforts to prevent an inflationary spiral from eating up the pensions of our older citizens and our new gains in purchasing power. * * *"

National defense can be no stronger than the U.S. economy. The Nation's economy can be no stronger than its unit of currency. If the economy is tied to a sickly dollar, the national defense is supported by a sickly economy.

If the voters were smart, they would fire the politicians who are spending the United States toward disaster.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Apr. 23, 1962]

Coercion

(By David Lawrence)

The heavy hand of government has just won a pyrrhic victory.

The steel companies, which had based their price rise on economic necessity, found themselves coerced by the Kennedy administration. * * *

Even a President may be forgiven if he manifests his displeasure when things don't go his way. But it's one thing to discuss objectively the merits of a complicated economic issue, and quite another to indulge in invective and to impugn the patriotism as well as the integrity of those with whom you disagree. * * *

If the President felt that the Government must fix prices, then he should have asked Congress to enact a system of wage-and-price control.

The administration has shown that it believes in more and more concentration of power in the executive branch. While denying any inclination toward state socialism, the President's action on steel prices points inevitably to a Federal dictatorship over business.

What is at stake really is the preservation of the profit-and-loss system. * * *

In the congressional elections of November 1962, the American people will be presented with a grave issue. Will they give a vote of confidence to the head of the Democratic Party? For, by disrupting the morale of American industry, has he not frustrated the economic expansion so much needed to bring a real recovery from the current recession?

[From the Washington Evening Star]

Will Victory in Steel Boomerang?—President's Action Called a Blunder, Wage-Price Law Held Inevitable

(By David Lawrence)

There's only one way the American people now can be spared the economic distress which may eventually follow President Kennedy's tragic blunder of last week. For a recession that could conceivably become a deep depression is as certain as day follows night if Mr. Kennedy continues to allow wage increases and then terrorizes and coerces business when it seeks to cover its added costs with a rise in prices. * * *

How many businessmen, moreover, who sell across the country will dare to raise prices if they live in fear of Government reprisals? The President has been brainwashed by his advisers and now has led the public into believing that price increases are sinful or unpatriotic but that wage increases usually are justified. * * *

The demoralization of businessmen today is extensive. How can they do any long-range planning now?

Politically the President's tactics last week may boomerang. Wage increases in other industries will have hard sledding and the unions will be unhappy. Also, if the profit squeeze continues and more persons are thrown out of work, the current recession will not soon be ended and could get worse. * * *

"The arsenal of weapons the President wheeled into his all-out economic foray against big business leaders was an awesome display of coldly determined political and economic power seldom if ever before employed by the Government. Every major governmental department got into the act."

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 13, 1962]

The Attack on Steel

The President, it seems to the News, could have disagreed with steel executives on the $6-a-ton price increase without accusing them of being power crazy and of showing utter contempt for 185 million Americans. Would he have done the same to organized labor which supported him so strongly in his candidacy?

It's popular—and fashionable—for a politician to jump on big business. But the country is not served by such attacks. Steel is basic in our free enterprise economy. It must keep its head above water for steelworkers to have jobs, for the Government to get tax revenues, for investors to get returns, for entire communities from Pittsburgh to Daingerfield to stay alive.

Steel executives who raised the ton price know that the industry must remain solvent—so consider the following:

In the last 10 years, employment costs per hour in steel have gone up 85 percent; output per man-hour rose only 12.

Employment costs per ton went up 70 percent—prices only 49, with no increase the last 4 years.

The new contract adds another 2.5 to 3 percent to costs per hour.

But other threats seriously endanger this industry. Under its foreign-aid program the last 15 years, our Government has lent or given countries like Japan and Germany huge sums to rebuild their own steel mills.

This money came from U.S. taxpayers—including a huge 52 percent whack out of American steel companies. The steelmakers, therefore, have been subsidizing their own competition—and possible extinction.

Not long ago Japanese steel was shipped across the Pacific through the Panama Canal, up the east coast and finally to Cleveland, where it was sold for $18 a ton cheaper than the same product made in that Ohio city.

In 1957 we were exporting 4 million tons of steel more than we were importing; in 1961, imports exceed exports by 1.2 million. In 4 years, then, the net loss in American steel markets has been more than 5 million tons.

Profit margins in the industry are thin. Without profit, there can be no expansion to compete with foreign mills which have been built in large part by American tax revenues. And with organized labor demanding benefits which no doubt they need to live, costs to the American industry have become prohibitive.

The industry is hurt badly enough by inflation, taxes, labor costs, and competition without having to endure Presidential abuse and invective.

The charges he throws at steel—the pursuit of power and utter contempt for 185 million Americans—can be made with validity against certain policies of the administration itself.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 13, 1962]

U.S. Coercion Against Steel—Federal Moves Since Price Increase Called Vendetta Against an Industry

(By David Lawrence)

A new era in American history—a declaration of war by the Government on the profit system as it functions under private capitalism—has been ushered in by President Kennedy.

Nothing like this has happened before—the launching of a Government vendetta against a particular industry because it refuses to follow a course of action dictated not by law but by economic theorists in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, these newspaper editorials and news stories should arouse every Member of Congress and every citizen of these United States to the very real danger which threatens our way of life. The President must be made to realize that his actions are endangering the cornerstone of freedom's foundation. If he is determined to pursue his present course of demanding additional executive powers and by threatening, intimidating, using the power of his office and the law enforcement agencies of the Federal Government against those who do not fall into line according to his will, this once proud structure of a free society may well fall into ruins, victim to ambition and the lack of understanding of a free economy.

Now I want to diverge from this principal theme of the President's lack of jurisdiction to say something going beyond the question of whether the President had the right to do what he did. I happen to think and I want to state on at least several grounds that the steel price increase is a necessary thing. So here I am going into a different issue, the question of whether a steel price increase should be considered at this time.

First of all, the costs of making steel have increased for quite some time without the price going up commensurately.

Second, labor when Government has stepped in to do the negotiating has had the breaks, not industry.

Third, the steel industry, in order to stay competitive in the world today, where foreign countries have highly industrialized plants, must have the money to reinvest in plant and equipment through depreciation and through the retention of their profits so they can reinvest and stay competitive.

Fourth, and most important, it is important that the people's right to make money, a profit, not be infringed when they invest their money. The President's attack at this time on the steel industry was an attack on the capitalistic system, the profit motive, in the United States, which has made this country of free people what it is in the world today. Under this system the Kennedy family gained and enlarged their wealth. I decry any effort of any man to tear down our system in the eyes of the people of the world. This dictatorial act on the part of the President challenges the right of a man to make and hold money, and that is the cornerstone of the economic system we have built up over a long period of time, creating the highest living standard in the world's history.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. First, let me say how happy I am the gentleman from Texas has taken the time to develop some of the serious issues that are involved in this recent steel price increase and the actions not only by the executive branch of the Government under the Kennedy administration but also the actions of some of the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives. I think the gentleman is pointing out some of the very serious issues involved.

I have listed these issues under three major categories: First, unnecessary political partisanship, second, civil rights, and third, economics.

I want to refer briefly to the unnecessary political partisanship, but do not want to develop it fully. It is an unfortunate thing it occurred. There should not have been any partisanship displayed in this steel price issue because certainly the Republican Party through its leadership or otherwise had taken no position in regard to what were the economic factors involved and who might be right or who might be wrong.

Yet the approach and the statements of the President and the President's brother who is the Attorney General were along the lines of narrow partisanship. Certainly, what occurred on the floor of the House last Wednesday, and I was present and I was amazed to see a series of 1-minute requests granted to Members of the Democratic party in the House of Representatives, during which time these minutes by the way extended possibly to 2 minutes, but in every instance these were not the words of the people who were taking the well of the House—these were written documents from which they were reading. I do not know where these documents were prepared, but they all followed the same tenor. They were partisanship to the extreme. I think it would serve a good purpose if the leadership of the Democratic Party in the House would say whether or not these were prepared over in the White House and were part of—as it seemed to me very obvious they were part of a public relations movement to set forth this extreme partisanship approach in regard to this very serious economic problem which confronted our problem. I am satisfied that if the President had taken the trouble to consult with Republican leaders, and I am certain it is true here in the House—if the Democratic leaders had taken the trouble to approach the Republican leaders—we would have said just what I did say as this series of prepared speeches was put into the RECORD—that now was not the time to draw up political sides on this until we had gone into the economic facts and that I felt very strongly that the Republican Party would join in in urging that an objective—and I emphasize as I did then the word "objective" — an objective committee study be gone into to find out what the economic problems were.

Then, after we do that, maybe there would be a difference of opinion between the two political parties because I happen to feel that partisanship is a very necessary and proper thing in a two-party system and enables our people to understand the issues involved. But, certainly, on an issue this serious to our country where the President felt he had to use these powers, it was not one on which partisanship should have been the first objective, as if the President were wrapping around his shoulders and that of his party the concern for the economy of our country and a concern for the people and the consumers.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield at this point?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield on this point, but I hope the gentleman will let me have more time to develop some further thoughts.

Mr. ALGER. The gentleman is developing three points and before he leaves this matter of partisanship I would like to call the gentleman's attention, with reference to his comment on that, to the opening sentence of an editorial which I am placing in this RECORD called "Government by Fear." "Kennedy is mad and so am I" said a Detroit auto worker quoted in this newspaper the other day. "The Government should not let them do it."

Is the gentleman suggesting that the Government is acting almost in a demagogic way appealing to the people—big business against modest wage earners—and then milking that for political gain by lining the great mass of people up against the wealthy and people who run big business? Is that what the gentleman is suggesting?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I regret to say I am not only suggesting it, I am trying to say it as best I can. That, unfortunately, follows the same line of false propaganda that the Democratic leaders many times have pursued in the past and in the present, that the Republicans are not concerned about the little people and are interested in the dollar. That, of course, is untrue. Our concern, if it is a concern, and it is, I think, for the dollar—particularly the taxpayers' dollar is because we are concerned about the people. These issues are serious enough that we should get away, in my judgment, from the demagoguery and put it out into the open where our honest differences of opinion are as to why this program in one person's or one party's judgment is not suited to gain the best for our people and another program is, because we are all, I hope, concerned with the welfare of our country.

We are all, I hope, concerned with the welfare of our country and not in the attack on the heads of the steel industry. I join the gentleman in saying I have no brief for them. I have been critical in the past of some of the actions of United States Steel in particular, but I certainly do not believe these men are unpatriotic; and I think the President of the United States when he attacks the patriotism of other citizens simply because he disagrees with their economics is carrying things entirely too far. Underlying all of this attack is this attack on something that is even more serious than is the attack on one's patriotism, if there can be anything more serious—and, indeed, there may be—that is the attack on the humanitarianism of another person, whether or not they do follow the Judeo-Christian theories which down through the years have the basic premises that underlie our religious tenets in our society.

I want to analyze this kind of approach, that the Republicans are just as interested in people; indeed that is one of the basic principles of humanitarianism and religion that are so dear to all of us—using them to win these arguments. I do not assume that one group is for the people and another is against them, and it was this indication by the President that I think was unnecessary partisanship, unfair, and untrue.

Mr. ALGER. Before the gentleman develops his further point I want to share with him that concern. He mentions the matter of partisanship. I wonder if the gentleman would think it appropriate or important in the rest of his remarks to comment to this House on the matter of the relationship between the Presidency, the executive branch, and the Attorney General, his brother, who is a most skillful politician, and who at the proper time and in the proper place has every right to exercise his partisanship. I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on this matter of the Attorney General being the President's brother, especially in view of our doctrine of the separation of powers.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not criticize the fact that the men are brothers. I will say that that can be consistently so. But let me mention something I do criticize, that I criticized during the time my party was in power and that I criticized when Attorney General McGrath held that office under President Truman. I continued the criticism in the Eisenhower administration which did not correct this basic error. I criticize this administration for the same practice.

What I am saying is that the Attorney General, I believe, should be appointed on a political basis and he should be partisan to the party that has been elected, but once that person has been selected he should be divorced from politics; and, indeed, he should be divorced from the process of political patronage. Neither Attorney General McGrath as chairman of the Democratic National Committee nor Attorney General Brownell, when the Republican Party committed the same error, should be further connected with the process of patronage. The Attorney General's job is not to elect political candidates but to enforce the law. It is so easy to be partisan, as Attorney General McGrath said, I recall, in the matter of appointments: "Of course, we have to select them and we select them somewhat on a partisanship basis." I am interpolating that, not exactly quoting him verbatim, but I think my interpolation is fair.

This is a grave error. I do think it is true that when the relationship between the Attorney General and the President does include the fact they are brothers, and close, it adds to this particular problem. I would not direct any criticism to the fact that the men are brothers. I can see very clearly how one could as Attorney General, if he were divorced from the political aspects of the administration, and certainly the patronage end of it, could be the kind of an impartial person we should seek for this job.

Let me say finally on this partisanship matter, of course, I would like to get away from it, important as it is. I hope it is not going to occur again. But our party will be guilty of it, I am sorry.

This is not casting stones against one side or the other. A number of Members came on the floor of the House and in the other body talking about how they were going to have hearings or conduct an investigation. All one has to do is to read the remarks in which they said they were going to investigate the steel situation and immediately conclude it is impossible for those gentlemen as chairmen of committees to conduct an objective investigation. They have already made up their minds. Their remarks were quite partisan.

Let me go on. I do not know how to develop this much further because the gentleman has done it so well. I refer to the civil rights aspect of this problem, and what powers the executive branch of the Government should be using in this area. I think the executive branch has concern about the mechanics involved in the situation, like those involved in steel prices. It is always going to be a question of degree to which the executive branch uses its powers, and the manner in which these powers are used. The gentleman has well pointed out number one as intemperate. An angry person is not the kind of person, in my judgment, we anticipate to be holding these great powers of Government. I think no matter how angry they actually may be, they can rise above the anger and look calmly at the problems involved. Some of the things were done by innuendo. One of the most disturbing to me was the suggestion of using the powers that were vested in the Internal Revenue Bureau in reference to taxes, and even the hint that the tax returns of individuals who were involved in the steel industry should be gone into. Even the hint of such a thing is a dastardly thing. I wish that the President or Attorney General would make it clear that wherever these innuendoes might have seemed to exist they were no more than people concluding where they had no right to conclude.

There was a suggestion of use of antitrust powers. That is a clear instance where these were threats. If the steel industry is guilty of antitrust violations, we should have gone after them a long time ago. Certainly to the extent this recent episode is a threat to use the laws or whether there is antitrust violations, it becomes important. But that is not the way this was handled. This was clearly in a vindictive way, if I might say that—I do not know whether it should be "vindictive"—but certainly it was to create pressure and to use laws that the Congress only intended to be used calmly and after proper study under judicial processes in which people are permitted to come in and be heard.

Mr. ALGER. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that on that subject the President and his associates have made use of the phrase "carrot and the stick?"

The gentleman knows that the tax laws, as he has related them to this instance, as a threat of reprisal is being used in both ways, as a carrot and as a stick.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There is no doubt about what the gentleman says. There is no doubt but what some of the Presidential advisers went out with our tax structure. They did not want it to be neutral. Many students and economic authorities think they should be.

It should not be used for this kind of thing. Naturally this group, mainly economists, feel that it is necessary for the Federal Government to be allocating our resources; that we cannot rely on the private sector. This gets into the economic aspects, and before going into that I want to point out one other power that was used, and here it looks as if it was a clear violation of the law. This was missed by the press, apparently, as they seem to miss a number of things that are important.

In the debate of yesterday on the Defense Appropriation Act, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. FORD, on page 6837 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 17, 1962, pointed out—after discussion, I might say—that attempts had been made by the Committee on Appropriations and the Defense Department to develop and correct procedures for procurement. The Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK, and I have been deeply concerned, as are many other Members, too, about the general practice, particularly in the military—and the Joint Committee on Economics has a subcommittee on this—because we think this is such a serious thing. The gentleman from Michigan, Mr. FORD, pointed out on the floor of the House yesterday that the procedures that are good on defense procurement have been violated by the Secretary of Defense in calling up by telephone and offering bids for some $3 or $4 million worth of steel to companies—well, now, I will not go any further, because the gentleman from Michigan made the point that his committee was looking into whether or not the allegations as he made them—and they are in the RECORD—were true and whether or not the Executive did use this great power of procurement in this manner and whether or not he used the power in accordance with the law. Certainly this kind of thing can be very damaging to all of us.

Now, if I may, finally, just move briefly to the economic aspects of this thing. The President has said that there is no justification, or words to that effect, for this steel price increase. Now, that, in my judgment, is untrue, and regardless of how one concludes about the issue, there is a serious economic problem involved here. There had been a number of wage increases since the last steel increase. They totaled in excess of 6 percent. The price increase of $6 per ton—which is an average, by the way; it is hard to get the exact figures—but the average of $126 a ton price of steel, of course, is less than 6 percent.

Now, if someone wanted to pick out this from a political angle, I think one could have pointed to the steel settlement back in 1960, which our Vice President, then, Mr. Nixon, had a great deal to do with, as an inflationary settlement and whether or not there was any politics involved in this settlement when big steel did not increase the price. I thought at the time that there was a question about that.

Mr. ALGER. If the gentleman will pause, the gentleman has been expressing concern, as I understand it, over the assumption of this power and this action by the President per se, regardless of whether the price ought to go up, down, or stay where it is.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. ALGER. Now the gentleman is speaking in behalf of the economics of the matter and suggesting that there might well be reason for increasing the price.

What I am saying is whatever your conclusion is, there are reasons, and valid economic reasons, involved in this.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ALGER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I do not desire to get into this colloquy, but I am sure that the gentleman in the heat of debate did not want to use any connotation that no one would use with respect to the President. I am certain that it is within his right to disagree with the President, but it seems to me that by using the phrase that something which the President said is "untrue" is a little strong.

I say that I do not in any manner criticize the context of what the gentleman was saying, and do not want to inject myself into the argument.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield further.

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If I used the word "untrue," I did not mean it in any sense to cast aspersion on the character of the President. I am referring to what is fact, and not fact.

Mr. ALGER. In other words, the gentleman is not talking about intent. He is talking about the merits of the argument, and the gentleman from Missouri thinks the argument is untrue, and that the grounds are fallacious. I think we join with the gentleman from Oklahoma in that expression, that we are not going to impugn the veracity of the President, but we are seriously criticizing the interpretation of facts.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, I think I should rise here and say that what the gentleman is saying is true, and I am happy to clarify that, because I certainly do not intend to get into anything other than facts.

When I said that I thought his remarks were untrue, or no justification, that we are talking about, and I am pointing out, that there are economic factors that amount to justification. One factor is that the President could still conclude that these are insufficient justifications, and it balances the action he calls for and does not support the action which he calls for. To say there was no justification is what I am trying to point out. Perhaps that is a better choice of words.

Mr. ALGER. But I think we are also saying that we are indeed accusing the President of having gone too far and being very wrong. We are pointing out the President went much too far in what he did and what he said, and that is why we are concerned. His action was illegal and unconstitutional.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, I do think the President was in error in attacking the patriotism and good faith of those with whom he disagreed on economic problems.

Mr. Speaker, there is another thing involved here, and I do hope the Joint Economic Committee will get into it, to get to the bottom of this thing. I think this is a matter of proper public concern, because we have inflationary forces at play, and they are serious. I, personally, believe that it has been the fiscal policies of the Federal Government that are primarily responsible for them. As long as we continue deficit financing we are going to continue these inflationary forces. I certainly think the President of the United States should pay attention to that aspect of the economics and raise the question to himself and to his own administration policies if, indeed, a good bit of the trouble in the steel situation does not arise from these governmental policies. If this is so, we are going to find price increases cropping out in other areas. The question arises, does the President intend to use these vast powers in these areas that may have escaped notice, or is he really preparing to come before the Congress and ask for price and wage controls, which at least has the merit of being government by law and not government by men, because under this circumstance, when the President, without law, picks out a particular price increase in the private sector and says, "I am going to apply great powers in this area, but not apply them in other areas," we have government by men and not government by law.

And my final conclusion on this matter of economics rests on this same concern that I have for government by men; because I have seen it in this administration in other areas, particularly in granting what they did to the textile people. And I was glad they got that grant for their own sake, but not the way it was done, on liberalized depreciation. That was last fall. But why the textile people? There are other industries all through this country that need liberalized depreciation, and in my judgment are entitled to it.

The previous administration and this administration have promised government by law to liberalize depreciation schedules, but not so that the President may select one group and give them this benefit and deny it to others. That is the issue involved in our Reciprocal Trade Act that the Committee on Ways and Means is going over now, the request for the President in so many instances which was blanket authority to give him the power of economic life and death over our people—not government by law.

That was the issue last fall in the Du Pont case, concerning which I took the floor at 8 o'clock at night to point out, "Why select Du Pont for this favorable treatment on involuntary divestiture as a result of the antitrust law?" I was in sympathy with the equities as far as Du Pont was concerned, but the Attorney General insisted that this be limited to Du Pont and not be written into the general law so that it would apply across the board. And I said, "Yes, and we will have the Hilton Hotel case out pretty soon." And that is what I just asked to file minority views on. And then who else is going to be granted this privilege?

This is not government by law. And once we go to government by men, the whole basis of our structure and our society begins to disappear.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying to the gentleman from Texas that I am so pleased that he has brought this out on the floor of the House for discussion. I was happy to join in it. I hope my colleagues, regardless whether they are Democrats or Republicans, and the people of this country, whatever their political faith, will consider the serious implications that are involved in this steel price situation and the implications for the future of our beloved country.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I want to assure him that I share his views, as I understand them as they were expressed. I should like to ask him a question. Does the gentleman feel, as to this matter of government by fear, that the President's action will have a measurable effect on businessmen who testify before Congress and the people in public expression as to what they think to be in the best interests of this Nation?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not think there is any question about it. And that is what is the situation right now. Even the headlines in this morning's paper say that the President does not intend to punish.

Mr. ALGER. As though he had that prerogative.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. As though he had the power. And indeed, the way it has been used, that is what it has been.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a second question of the gentleman. Does the gentleman feel that the newspapers of this country, the editors and the newspaper reporters themselves, will be afraid or will be less reliable in reporting now, if they feel that the mailed fist will be used against them?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me say this to the gentleman. The encouraging thing about this whole matter has been the press. I really mean that. And the gentleman knows I have been a great critic of them. But I have been encouraged by the manner in which our press has spoken out on this matter. I just thank God that this situation has come to a head at this time when our country is still strong enough to understand this issue. And I believe it does.

Yes, in the long run the gentleman is correct. These things can intimidate members of the press. But I honestly believe this is one of the encouraging signs as a result of this crisis.

Mr. ALGER. Then let me ask the gentleman this question: Is it the view of the gentleman in answering that as to the press that he believes that if the President of the United States were so disposed to use his powers in the full as he did in the steel situation, we have not gone beyond the point of no return on Congress reclaiming Executive power, and does the President indeed have dictatorial power, whether it be in withholding newsprint or other retaliation against newspapers? Does the gentleman tell me that the President in using this power could not retaliate against the newspapers?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That could be, but I say and I have always said that it is not the laws but the self-discipline we impose on ourselves that is important, the self-discipline that the gentleman from Texas and I and other Members of Congress try to impose on ourselves when we take the oath of office to uphold and support the Constitution, the self-discipline that the Justices of the Supreme Court subject themselves to when they take a similar oath, and the same self-discipline that is at the root of our society. I regret to say I do not believe there is much that can be done about it.

But again reverting to the manner in which the press has handled this, I am really encouraged that we will see an end to what has been aptly referred to as the managed public relations, with managed news, of this administration with the cooperation, the strange cooperation, of the Washington press here in Washington, D.C. I have not seen it out in the interior of our country, but certainly in Washington there has been managed news. We see it, and I say this about a bill which I happen to favor, the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, the way that has been managed. It could only be managed if the press were not doing what I regard as its job. But I think we may see an end to this, and maybe it took a crisis like this steel crisis to bring it about.

Mr. ALGER. The gentleman knows it will be necessary for the public to understand what is happening and to support those of us that decry dictatorial use of power; otherwise the course of freedom is lost.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There are enough people in America that still stand unafraid and feel they are responsible only to God, if I may say so.

Mr. ALGER. I have asked the gentleman questions relative to fear that might silence businessmen and newspapers. I want to ask a third question I talked about earlier, that is, whether it will silence Congressmen. I think it will not. If the gentleman would like to comment on this I should like to have his views, but for my part, it is my prayer that this naked use of power by the President, no matter how well-intentioned he is, will not scare those Members of Congress who in the past have been forthright in speaking out against the misuse of Government power. It is my prayer they cannot be reached by offers of public works projects or judgeships or whatever these carrots and sticks are in politics—we are human beings, we should understand these things—but now the use of the naked fist has me wondering whether that will silence them. Members of Congress must speak as they would like to, without fear of reprisal.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It will not stop the gentleman from Texas or me but, being Republicans and on the opposite political side, it could be interpreted that way. I am waiting to hear some members of the Democratic Party take the floor and express similar concern, just as I, when my administration was in power, and other Republicans from time to time did take the floor of the House when we thought our administration was in error and had gone too far in certain matters.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman. I hope this happens.

I will conclude by saying it is my prayer that the views expressed here today will be heard by the people, other than the few people who are present. I have wondered many times why many of the things we say on the floor of the House never see print in the press. I wonder if the President will ever hear these views, other than through the Congressional Record, what we say here on the floor of the House today.

Mr. MASON. As one who has taken the floor many times in the last 26 years to utter protests against the action of the executive department of the Government, and many times under the former President who is supposed to be a Republican, I want to say this—that this Nation is pretty safe as long as it has the caliber of men elected to the Congress who have the courage of their convictions and express that courage and their convictions on the floor of this House. That is a saving grace, in my opinion, and one of the things which will insure the future of this Nation and when we do not have that then we will be beyond the point of coming back. That is the situation. I join the gentleman in his sentiments with reference to this problem of the steel industry. I have written an article vindicating, in my opinion, the steel industry in their increase in prices in my weekly letter so that my people will all understand it. I am glad that this is being aired on the floor of the House because if it is aired on both sides, we then may be able to get at the truth.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. I also commend my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas for taking the time to have this discussion of a very serious national crisis. Yesterday, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry] and I were discussing a point closely related to what the gentleman from Texas discussed earlier in his remarks concerning the propriety of Presidential action in this situation. We both had listened that morning to a television broadcast in which the man being interviewed was Mr. Sidney Hyman who is the White House historian. We were not only amazed but startled by the unexpected answer which he made when he was asked if there were any precedents for this type of Presidential action. His answer implied, and could only imply, that it did not matter what the law said or did not say concerning Executive authority; that it was all right; that the President could go ahead and do this as long as public opinion was behind him. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry] had intended to comment on this broadcast and its implications during the special order of the gentleman from Texas, but, unfortunately, business has called him off the floor. I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to ask unanimous consent that his remarks concerning this broadcast be inserted at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it was my misfortune to hear one of the most astounding statements I have heard in a long time on the "Today" CBS-TV program on the morning of April 18, 1962. They were interviewing Mr. Sidney Hyman, White House historian, about the so-called battle between the President and United States Steel and asked Mr. Hyman if there was any precedent for the President's action. Mr. Hyman made some startling statements that I think should be recorded for the reference of anyone who might be interested in the New Frontier philosophy.

In his answer to questions Mr. Hyman indicated that the action of the President was what could be known as government by public opinion. To my amazement he stated that no matter what the laws says he—the President—can do and cannot do, it is the instrument of public opinion that makes it possible for him to move forward.

Mr. Hyman then moved forward with his further explanation and quoted Abraham Lincoln as his authority for the statement that "if you have public opinion against you, you can do nothing—if you have it with you, you can do anything." Mr. Hyman neglected to point out that Abraham Lincoln was talking about having public opinion with you but within the framework of the Constitution.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln had no thought of suggesting that a President could do "anything" if he had public opinion with him. Abraham Lincoln was talking about action within the framework of the Constitution of the United States. This is the thing the New Frontier forgets.

Mr. Speaker, ours is a government of law and not of men. If the President or the Congress or the courts decide that the Constitution is too limited in its scope to meet certain conditions that may exist at the moment the constitutional procedure is to amend the Constitution and not to disregard it or junk it.

It was government by public opinion that resulted in Adolph Hitler's complete dictatorship. It was government by public opinion that resulted in Benito Mussolini's complete dictatorship in Italy and it is government by public opinion that is creating such chaos in many of the nations around the world, including some in our own Western Hemisphere.

It is frightening, Mr. Speaker, when a public official, representing the White House, goes on a nationwide TV program and tells the people that no matter what the law says he can do and cannot do, it is the instrument of public opinion that makes it possible for him to move forward.

If any one has been in doubt as to the road the New Frontier is traveling, this statement should alleviate such doubt.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution and the contribution of our colleague from South Dakota [Mr. Berry]. I think the first thing all of us would think of in the light of a remark like that concerning public opinion is to say there is a document called the Constitution which we all swear to support when we take our oath of office when we come to the Congress every 2 years, not to support public opinion. I think that is the answer—does the gentlewoman not agree?

Mrs. MAY. Certainly, I agree. The man interviewed in this amazing broadcast said Abraham Lincoln agreed with that idea and quoted from him, but he failed to mention that our great President, Abraham Lincoln, was always talking within the framework of the Constitution when he spoke of public opinion.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEERMANN. As a fairly new Member of the Congress, I have listened to this colloquy today and share in the opinions of the gentleman. I think it has been one of the most interesting speeches I have heard or have had the privilege to sit here and listen and understand what the gentleman is talking about. Some of the things were a little heated, but I think the comments of the majority leader were appropriate. Of course, one of the reasons that prompted me to seek to become a Member of this body was the worry about the amount of authority that the Congress was giving to the executive branch.

Being a farmer and businessman, I have been worried for some time about the takeover of the food supply in our country on the basis of congressional law administered by the executive branch. There are a few other areas, I may state, in which I am equally concerned: Education, communication and transportation, and public power.

One of my main concerns was the large number of farmers in the United States; and, divergent as their opinions are, if the growers of our food supply can be controlled on a centralized federally operated basis, with that large group of people, how simple and easy it would be to control any of the other segments of our economy. I wonder if we do not see it in this steel price situation. I am not prepared to say whether the increase in the price of steel was right or wrong, but I am prepared to say that I think that the action that was taken to get them to retract the price increase was not in line with what we call freedom in this country.

Since in our deliberations in the Committee on Agriculture we cannot agree to give centralized authority for compulsory control, with the committee divided three to two, 21 to 14, Democrats versus Republicans, and probably not in favor basically of compulsory control, I think the President's action is in direct opposition to this line of thinking.

Our President took action against a small group of people and probably had some support from some people in the United States, as the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. May] said, and I wonder whether the gentleman from Texas is going to commend her. I agree with what the gentleman said at the close of his colloquy, that Members of Congress will stand up and be counted during the rest of this session, the sessions to come, and the new Congress. I say we will return and support our free way of life.

I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I share with him his concern. Let me say that if at times I tended to sound intemperate, I feel intemperate. I do not know of anything that has upset me more in the 8 years I have been in this office than the action taken by the President. I do not apologize. I am prejudiced. I have years ago prejudged dictatorial action as wrong. I want to be fair, but I also want to be as outspoken and forthright as I know how. If I seem intemperate it is because I am deeply moved. I am concerned about this milestone of the use of dictatorial power, but I am more concerned with the spread of dictatorial power which threatens the Congress, the States, the localities, and the people. It is to this deep concern that I directed my remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to bring this matter up to today, this date, I shall here include two news accounts from the Wall Street Journal of the last 2 days' developments:

Kennedy, Blough Meet; White House Calls Talks Cordial, Useful; United States Steel Silent

Washington.—President Kennedy and Roger Blough, chairman of United States Steel Corp., met for 45 minutes last evening at the White House.

The White House said only the conference was cordial and useful. United States Steel spokesmen were silent on what was discussed.

However, the administration reaction was in sharp contrast to the aftermath of the previous session between the two men precisely a week before; at that time Mr. Blough set off a massive Presidential campaign against the large steel companies by telling Mr. Kennedy that United States Steel was raising prices an average of $6 a ton.

By late last Friday, basic steel prices had been returned to where they were before the United States Steel increase. And the administration has indicated a determination not to appear vindictive against the steel companies or business in general after the price rollback.

Presumably, the steel situation will come up at the President's press conference this morning. United States Steel's position was that it needed higher prices to finance more modernization of its production facilities.

MEANY, HUMPHREY ALSO SEE KENNEDY

Mr. Blough was one of a number of visitors to Mr. Kennedy yesterday. AFL–CIO president, George Meany, also saw the President, but the labor chieftain refused to talk to reporters afterward.

And earlier yesterday, Senator Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, took to the President his proposal that a special commission be created to study the steel industry. Chances remained slim, however, Senator Humphrey's plan would be adopted.

The Senator discussed his proposal with Mr. Kennedy at the regular weekly White House meeting with Democratic congressional leaders. Though Mr. Humphrey described the President's reaction as "very friendly," others said the discussion was brief and as yet the idea isn't receiving serious consideration within the administration.

Nevertheless, the door was left slightly ajar. Although administration officials definitely rule out any attempt at major legislative changes as a result of Mr. Kennedy's victory over the steel industry, they said a "faint chance" exists that the President might at some point decide to set up a steel study group.

One strong argument against such a decision, however, is that even though the Justice Department will continue with its New York grand jury inquiry of the steel industry, the President, in effect, has issued orders to "let bygones be bygones" now that the industry has rescinded its 3½ percent price increase.

IT COULD BE PLANNED AS SUBSTITUTE

In fact, it's been speculated by some that Mr. Humphrey proposed his study commission in reflection of the administration's magnanimous attitude. The motive, according to this reasoning, would be to substitute an administration study in place of what is expected to be a more vengeful probe of the industry by the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee headed by Senator Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee. But this hope seems to be evaporating. The Kefauver subcommittee already has served subpenas on 12 major steel companies for cost-price data, and Mr. Kefauver said yesterday he expects to begin hearings in about 6 weeks.

Senator Humphrey proposed the study group in a Senate speech Monday. He suggested the President name a commission of management and labor representatives, economists, financiers and public representatives to make a 1-year analysis of the steel industry "in terms of the domestic and world economic situation."

He said the commission should study the need for modernizing and automating steel plants, requirements for capital, productivity of workers, and how to keep American steel competitive in world markets. The proposed commission would be empowered to use personnel and facilities of any Federal agency, including law-enforcement agencies.

After his meeting with the President yesterday, Senator Humphrey said he also discussed his plan with Chairman Heller of the Council of Economic Advisers, and also intends to speak to Commerce Secretary Hodges.

PROPOSALS UNLIKELY TO PASS

Without administration support, there appears no chance that Congress will enact any of the legislative proposals that cropped up during last week's steel drama. These proposals ranged from utility-type regulation of the industry to abolishing stock option advantages for executives.

In Congress yesterday, two Republicans charged the Defense Department with an "absolute violation" of defense contract regulations by awarding a $5 to $6 million contract to Lukens Steels Co. for a special armorplate for the missile-firing Polaris submarine. Normally, United States Steel Corp. would have received about half of this order, but the full contract went to Lukens, which didn't raise prices.

President Says He Will Continue To Press Major Industries on Price, Wage Policies

Washington.—President Kennedy made clear his administration's intention to become as deeply involved in the wage and price policies of other major industries as it was in steel.

The President told his press conference yesterday that the public's stake in major wage and price decisions must be forcefully presented to labor and management officials, and that he intends to do exactly that. He kept insisting, however, that the administration is not "setting" wages and prices; labor and management can always ignore the administration's advocacy of the public interest, he suggested.

Mr. Kennedy did not discuss whether union or company officials in any industry would dare ignore administration guidelines after what happened when major steel companies tried to increase prices last week. The President publicly denounced the steel companies; the Justice Department ordered a grand jury investigation of possible antitrust violations; two congressional committees planned hearings; the Defense Department told contractors to buy steel from companies that hadn't raised prices; and the withdrawal of promised tax concessions was threatened.

NEED FOR FURTHER PRESSURE DOUBTED

Obviously, the White House is confident that other industries have gotten the message, and that a repeat of the pressure tactics employed against steel won't be needed in aluminum, canmaking, aircraft-missiles, and other fields.

"We can attempt," the President said at one point yesterday, "to bring before the parties in the most effective way possible the public interest that is involved and must be involved, particularly in these basic industries." At another point, discussing possible administration involvement in coming west coast union negotiations with aircraft-missile makers, the President said "we will certainly attempt to describe to the people involved, particularly in a program so important to the national security, the public interest, which, after all, is their interest as well as that of the Nation."

Mr. Kennedy himself brought up the subject of steel in a "let bygones be bygones" vein, and throughout his press conference he clearly was attempting to convey a conciliatory attitude toward the steel companies and industry generally. He declared there is no room for "feelings of hostility or vindictiveness;" he said the administration and steel companies really agreed on more matters than they disagreed on. Time and again he spoke of the importance of the free economy and market competition; and he promised tax depreciation and other help for industry efforts to modernize.

GOVERNMENT TO PRESS FOR STABILITY

But under questioning the President displayed his determination to push his fight for wage and price stability in key industries—with the help of market forces whereever possible, and with all the influence of the Government wherever necessary.

The President's remarks again and again swung back and forth—from an assertion of the right of business and unions to follow the price and wage policies they want, to the need for them to accommodate these policies to the "public interest." Mr. Kennedy defined this to mean the need to keep the general price level stable, hold down defense costs, and minimize balance-of-payments problems.

"This is a free economy," Mr. Kennedy said in answer to one question. "These matters are reached by the process of competition and collective bargaining." But a breath later, he was adding that "we would like both labor and management to be very conscious of the public stake at this time, and that is what we are attempting to bring forth."

HE DENIES SETTING PRICE OF STEEL

A reporter commented that the Wall Street Journal and some others "have accused you directly of having set the prices of steel."

"I am aware of the accusations," the President replied. "What we attempted to do was project before the steel companies the public interest, and it was a combination of the public interest placed upon the table in front of them, and competition, which I think brought the price down. Several companies refused to increase prices, and therefore competition worked its will. We want to be sure that competition is an active force in our economy. I would not accept the view of the Wall Street Journal in regard to my feeling or a description of my actions or of the public interest."

Later in the conference, the President said no one in the administration was suggesting that the President had or should have power to set prices and wages. In fact, he declared, the administration is well aware of the limitations on the Government's power to deal with prices and wages.

But just a few moments later, Mr. Kennedy was arguing that the national security and the Nation's need for price stability make "the public interest mandatory in these matters" of wage and price levels in key industries. "It is our responsibility to present it to those involved," he declared. "That is what we tried to do in the steel case."

Discussing the New York grand jury investigation of possible antitrust violations by major steel firms, the President said this inquiry would continue. More pleasing to steel, however, Mr. Kennedy said cancellation of the price increase probably improves the outlook for the administration's proposed tax credit for new business investment, currently pending before the Senate Finance Committee.

Twice Mr. Kennedy seemed to be conceding that United States Steel Corp. might be in a somewhat less favorable economic position than other steel companies—a concession that conceivably might be a reflection of the President's surprise 45-minute conference Tuesday night at the White House with Roger Blough, United States Steel chairman.

Asked whether stockholders as well as labor should not share in increased productivity, the President replied that he thought owners of steel stocks have "shared very much in the last 10 years." For example, he said, United States Steel stock has been split repeatedly and still pays a "very good dividend," and "what is true of United States Steel is true to even a greater extent in other steel companies."

HE CALLS PROFITS "ENTIRELY SATISFACTORY"

Earlier, the President had declared that profits in the last quarter of 1961 and the first quarter of 1962 were the highest in history, and that "while some particular companies and some industries may have special problems, the overall profit situation is entirely satisfactory."

A reporter asked for the President's comments on the actions of Federal Bureau of Investigation agents who woke three reporters up in the middle of the night to check on remarks by Edmund F. Martin, Bethlehem Steel Co. president. The President facetiously remarked that "reporters have called up a good many people in the middle of the night themselves."

Then, more seriously, he observed that the facts were needed in connection with the grand jury investigation. He said he had not realized the reporters would be awakened and the "intention was not to disturb" them, but "as always the FBI carried out its responsibilities immediately." Anyhow, he noted, "all of the reporters except those for the Wall Street Journal were most cooperative." Three reporters had interviewed Mr. Martin; reporters for the Associated Press and a Wilmington, Del., paper answered the FBI questions, while a Wall Street Journal reporter refused.

CHICAGO.—A. M. Castle & Co., Chicago steel distributor, sent a special letter to 30,000 stockholders and customers criticizing the Federal Government for exerting pressure on steel producers to keep them from raising prices. Last week several major producers lifted prices 3½ percent, but later rescinded the increase.

In a letter signed by John M. Simpson, chairman, and R. J. Heggie, president, Castle said the important consideration isn't whether the industry can justify a price increase but "whether our free competitive system can long endure under Government influence as demonstrated last week."

The company said it believes "the manner in which the Federal Government projected itself into what has always been a matter to be determined by competitive forces is the forerunner of controls in many areas of our private freedoms."

The Government "cannot long control selling prices by law or by pressure without eventually controlling all costs that go into the products," including wages and salaries, the letter said.

Mr. Simpson and Mr. Heggie said the letter was the company's response to "many calls from our customers in the last few days regarding actions of steel producers and the Federal Government on the pricing of steel."

HOUSE PANEL POSTPONES STEEL PRICE HEARINGS

The House Antitrust Subcommittee headed by Representative CELLER, Democrat of New York, said it has postponed for a brief period its hearings on the steel price rise.

Previously Mr. CELLER had said the hearings would begin May 2 to determine whether new antitrust legislation should be enacted after a number of major steel companies last week raised their prices an average of $6 a ton. He suggested that there might be a need for a law to authorize breaking up large companies in industries as concentrated as steel. Although the subcommittee's principal target was removed when the steel price increases were rescinded, the unit denied yesterday that its investigation would be called off.

Preparation is going forward for the hearings, the subcommittee said, and a staff member added that legislation being considered may not be limited to the steel industry.

The other planned congressional inquiry into the steel industry, by the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee of Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat of Tennessee, is scheduled to begin within 6 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, to present some early reactions to the President's action I now include the letters of readers to the editor of the Wall Street Journal. These give both sides of the question. For my part, these clearly show the justifiable concern of thinking citizens. The champions of the President's action, it seems to me, in their zeal to denounce and oppose higher prices, have overlooked the greater danger.

READERS VIEW KENNEDY BATTLE WITH STEEL

WHAT THE PRESIDENT KNOWS

CHICAGO, ILL.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

The irresponsible comments made by President Kennedy during his April 11 news conference regarding the steel industry price increase deserve immediate rebuttal.

The President said that steel industry earnings are increasing. He knows that they have declined whether viewed as an absolute amount, a percent of sales or as a percent of gross national product.

He knows that the steel industry earnings on net assets dropped from 15.2 percent in 1955 to 6.4 percent in 1961, placing steel in 34th spot from the top in a field of 41 industrial groups.

He knows that America has the oldest steel mills in the world. He knows that we can only remain competitive if we modernize our plants and facilities. He knows that profits are the factor which generate capital investment and without this investment our industry would continue to decay and more and more jobs would be lost.

The steel industry has spent $15 billion since 1946 on new facilities to keep our industry competitive and provide jobs. This money must come ultimately from earnings. If we reduce or eliminate earnings we will eventually have an unprofitable, noncompetitive industry which will lose more and more markets and jobs.

The President knows that there are almost a million owners of the American steel industry, considerably more than there are employees in the industry. He knows that the owners had no increase in dividends in 5 years, and that in some cases dividends have been cut and the market value of steel shares has declined while employees have been awarded their fourth increase in the same period.

He knows that millions of dollars are needed each year to continue research which has given us stronger, better steels per dollar over the years.

The recent noninflationary contract settlement will cost the industry over $100 million over the next 12 months. This comes on top of 40 cents per hour of increased costs the industry has absorbed since 1958. The President knows this. But he says that the industry can absorb this cost just as he said last fall that his advisers told him the industry would make 12 percent to 15 percent on their investment. In 1961 steel earned about half that (6.4 percent).

He knows that 52 percent of any increase in profits will be taken by the Government in the form of taxes so that the amount realized by the industry would be under $3 per ton.

He knows that this increase in the price of steel would amount to about $4 per person per year on the average and this is a trifling amount when compared with the cost of our farm program. The Government inflicts upon the consumer the higher costs because of surplus purchases, storage costs, higher food prices and interest. Government distortion of normal supply and demand pricing, in agriculture alone, costs every man, woman and child hundreds of dollars a year.

The President knows all these things, yet either out of political expediency or because of unrealistic advisers, he has made grossly inaccurate statements and slandered the industry publicly.

E. J. O'DAY.

PERSONAL PROFIT

MARTON, WASH.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Like many Americans, I was appalled at the announcement by U.S. Steel that it was going to increase prices as much as $6 per ton—about a 4-percent increase.

Just how far can a nation trust its destiny to those who place personal profit above country?

GEO. H. GANNON.

IGNORANCE OF STEEL INDUSTRY

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

The steel industry is due a defense to President Kennedy's scathing remarks. For the past 9 years, I was associated with one of the so-called big steel companies, and more recently have accepted a position with a smaller specialty steel concern.

It is untrue that a lack of pricing competition exists in steel, as any experienced national purchasing agent will testify.

President Kennedy shows a complete lack of knowledge of the steel industry, its competitive ability and the urgency of investment needed to modernize our mills. His remarks can only be attributed to the same unrealistic group that advised the President on Cuba.

DOUGLAS A. BOEHMER.

NEW METHODS NEEDED

PRINCETON, N.J.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I wish to express support for the concern shown by President Kennedy over that rise in steel prices. I also wish to say that I consider the way in which the steel companies increased their prices to evidence very clearly the fallacy involved in regarding the price mechanism in the steel industry as operating in such a manner as to maximize the economic welfare of the Nation.

Certainly there are some forms of competition in the steel industry. But just as clearly there is not the kind of competition necessary to regulate the prices in an adequate manner. The steel companies have sufficient power versus the buyers of steel to be able to exploit them. Further, because of their extremely important and powerful position in this economy, the steelmakers thereby exploit the Nation.

I believe this is the most outstanding recent example of the injury done to the people of this Nation by some of the pricing systems presently in use. I further believe that this injury can no longer be tolerated. Since there is unfortunately no other institution able to establish a new procedure for determining the prices in critical industries like the steel industry, the Federal Government must undertake the task. Just as we earlier discovered that the existing system was not able to establish optimal prices in the rail industry and that a different procedure was needed, so we now must reform the system presently employed in the steel and many other sectors of the economy.

I believe that this is the time for the Government, with the help of academic and industrial leaders around the country, to study the present pricing mechanisms and the alternative methods which could be instituted.

Surely, some form of control of the industrial systems by the people of the United States is needed very urgently. They are not able to do this as buyers in the manner postulated by classical economic theory. There is nothing sacred about "private" price determination. The method which best serves the general populace by maximizing its longrun economic welfare must be chosen. Some new way must be found.

It is extremely unfortunate that our industrial leaders are not aware of the responsibilities accompanying their positions. It is not pleasant to see all roads leading to Washington. But something must be done.

RICHARD R. CORNWALL.

UNPATRIOTIC ACCOUNTING

WASHINGTON, D.C.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Slow to anger at the likes of Castro and Khrushchev, Mr. Kennedy has assumed an air of towering rage against the steel companies. One can understand his annoyance. Here Mr. Kennedy has the whole country in the hole and the steel companies are out trying to balance their books. It's unpatriotic.

The important thing is, we've got to stop inflation. Mr. Kennedy doesn't like inflation at all. If necessary, he would spend $20 billion to fight it.

JERRY C. DAVIS.

NOT ONLY SELFISHNESS

ROSLYN, PA.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Nothing the Socialists, the Communists, the most radical unions have been able to do has so effectively worked for the nationalization of industry as the recent actions of United States Steel. It is not only selfishness, it is stupidity.

ED SCHEMPP.

ROBERT KENNEDY'S ROLE

HUNTINGDON VALLEY, PA.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

The dangers inherent in the President's brother being Attorney General are clearly pointed up by the recent controversy over the steel price rise.

We have President Kennedy infuriated at United States Steel, because it did something it has a perfect right to do. Then we have the Attorney General, his brother, setting in motion a grand jury trial, an antitrust suit, and a criminal investigation, not because a matter of justice is involved, but because his brother, the President, has been affronted by the steel companies.

Two reporters are roused out of bed at 4 a.m. by the FBI and told they must see them at once. One of them, quite naturally, thinks it is a joke.

Sadly it is no joke, but the vast powers of the Presidency, augmented tremendously by his alter ego, the Attorney General, being used in a frightening manner.

It gives me the shivers.

HELEN W. RITTEMAN.

AU REVOIR

BERGENFIELD, N.J.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I didn't think that you were so crazy about earnings and profits that you would resort to the type of editorializing that you had on the steel price rise.

I know you won't miss me, and I'll just have to keep out of the terrible "under $8,000" bracket by some other means. I'm asking my delivery man to drop my subscription. So long.

LEON WEINSTOCK.

MAIL AND METAL

CHICAGO, ILL.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

This is not the first time a man with "a beam in his own eye has seen a mote in the eye of another" but what else explains the extremes of the President's actions?

United States Steel raises its prices three-tenths of a cent a pound and arouses the President's ire, but the U.S. Post Office wants to raise its rates a full penny an ounce (16 cents per pound) and this the President favors as something good for 185 million Americans.

Both United States Steel and U.S. Post Office claim rising costs of operation make it necessary for them to charge more. In both cases higher charges will reduce business.

J. KESNER KAHN.

LOST OPPORTUNITY

BEVERLY, N.J.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

So Mr. Kennedy did not appreciate the $6 per ton price hike of Big Steel. Did it ever occur to him to take a look at the $93 billion budget and the expected Federal deficit as the true reason for inflation?

On the other hand, the chairman of United States Steel is not so hot either. He had an opportunity with a capital "O" and he failed to deliver. He had a chance to sell the American system to the voters who have been burdened with liberalism and neosocialism to the breaking point and he did not do it. He should have delegated the job to his general sales manager.

It is a terrible thing when your champion fails to deliver. It is a terrible thing when fate deals you a straight flush and your leader chucks in his hand.

RALPH SHAW, Jr.

WAY OF THE PARASITES

NEW YORK CITY.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

The performance of the last few days is a logical consequence of our "mixed economy" (which translated, means creeping socialism) and has brought the conflict into such bright light that it is difficult to evade it any longer.

By what right does President Kennedy, or any other man who has no part in the owning or running of United States Steel, arbitrarily dictate what he feels is justifiable for them? The idea that the President must be consulted before making an economic judgment, that he is in the proper position to recommend what is economically feasible, is the threshold to totalitarianism.

If the principle is applied consistently, every local fruit vendor must check in at the White House before he changes the price of his apples, and every American worker who asks for a raise in his salary must first submit to Mr. Kennedy before he dares to raise the price of his labor.

Mr. Kennedy and all other collectivists operate on the premise that man does not have the right to the product of his labor, that his own well-being and happiness are not the prime objectives of his life and that the welfare of all others except himself is paramount.

It is desirable to reaffirm the concept upon which this country was originally founded. That is, that man has an inherent right to life, which means the freedom to pursue his own rational self-interest. His own life is an end in itself, not a means to the ends of others. The free market is the economic manifestation of this moral principle, where men deal with one another as traders, voluntarily exchanging goods and services.

When each man holds his own happiness as the goal of his actions, neither accepting nor giving sacrifices, all profit by the exchange. The only men who profit by the opposite system are those who have nothing to trade—those who have no values to offer, spiritual or material—and whose only means of survival is that of a parasite.

LOIS ROBERTS.

IT LETS THE LIGHT IN

KANSAS CITY, MO.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Would you kindly send me a picture of the person that wrote the editorial "The President's Fury" (Apr. 12). I have always been curious to know what a man looks like with a hole in his head.

DAVID T. LYON.

NARROW POSITION

NEW YORK CITY.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Your editorials concerning the President's reaction to the steel price increase seemed to me to show evidence of the same lack of statemanship that you are often bemoaning in other people.

It seems to me that the President's policy of encouraging less greedy approaches, both by the unions and mills, as part of the general effort to keep our products competitive in the world and help prevent further inflation, is just the kind of statesmanship that calls for support of moderate and intelligent people, and I am very disappointed to find you adopting such a narrow position.

RALPH H. CHEW.

MONOPOLY WITHOUT REPRIMAND

EL DORADO, KANS.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

After listening to the President's news conference of April 11, I find that I am in sympathy with the steel companies. And I am a housewife, consumer, voter and taxpayer which puts me in the general category of those for whom the President expressed concern.

Everything that is the matter in this country can't possibly be the fault of the steel companies. The outflow of gold is due to the foreign policy of our Government officials. In 1961 the businesses of this country had an export surplus of almost $6 billion. The Government loaned and gave enough money to foreign countries to put us on the deficit side of the ledger and then called it critical.

The head of one union controls all steel employees and that is a monopoly. The recent wage agreement in the steel industry was well done but in the past the union requests and settlements have been highly inflationary. There was no public recrimination and reprimand then nor suggestion of Government interference.

JOAN BOND.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

The thing that annoys me is the statement that there was no wage increase to the steelworkers. The 10-cent extra allowance certainly is an increase in compensation.

An increase in price by the company carries no must with it. Customers can buy elsewhere or other materials or refrain from buying, but when the steelworkers say they want more they simply get it or shut down the whole works.

If the steel executives had said "no increase to workers" would they not then have been terrible monsters?

EDWIN ELLIOT.

ORGANIZING STOCKHOLDERS

WATERFORD, N.Y.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

It would seem high time that the millions of American stockholders were heard from. They are unorganized and ignored. No Government official ever mentions the almost countless thrifty citizens who have invested their savings in job-creating and tax-paying enterprises.

Instead, from the President down, they pretend that the Government and labor are opposed by only "a little handful of executives."

The attack on steel cannot be localized. It is a blow at all investor-owned industry and should shock the stockholders of the Nation into getting organized.

WILLIAM H. BARKER.

BUSINESSMAN'S LIVELIHOOD

NEW YORK, N.Y.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Since Mr. Kennedy has proved victorious at regulating the price of steel in a free market, it would be well to clarify one point. It has become a crime to make a profit, which is a businessman's livelihood in the same sense a worker's wages are his.

VERA YOUNGQUIST.

TWO OTHER PARTICIPANTS

MIDDLE VILLAGE, N.Y.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

Higher steel prices would hurt most of us, not only as consumers (for obvious reasons), but also as earners (through higher costs to the industries in which we earn our living). While we share the President's wrath at the action of the leading steel manufacturers, we wonder why he completely ignored the key role of Government and labor in the wage-price spiral.

RODNEY R. ADLER.

TIME TO LEARN

BALTIMORE, MD.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I nominate as understatement of the year: Roger Blough, "Well, I think you gentlemen can readily see that I do not know anything about politics."

And I think it's about time businessmen did learn something about politics.

JULIUS WOLFF.

Two editorials deserve attention. First Gould Lincoln's article from the Washington Evening Star:

THE POLITICAL MILL—KENNEDY'S FRIENDLY VOICE

(By Gould Lincoln)

President Kennedy's voice at his press conference yesterday was conciliatory, more like that of a cooing dove, compared to the strident tones he used a week ago to denounce the steel companies for increasing prices. He made no apology, however, either for what he had said or for what his administration had done to beat United States Steel and other companies to their knees. He insisted that the public interest had been served when the steel price increase was rescinded. The President appeared to be holding out an olive branch, not only to the steel industry, but business generally, which had been wondering when its turn, or any part of it, would come for such drastic use of influence and power. He recited a long list of things on which he and the steel companies and business saw alike. And he also recited what his administration was trying to do to aid industry, through tax credits on money used to extend and improve industrial plants and through more lenient depreciation allowances.

While President Kennedy was loudly applauded for his courage and for being a strong President in his operations against the steel companies last week, there has been a considerable surge of resentment at the tactics he used. He has been criticized for using his powers to fix the prices of steel. He was criticized for using the economic power to force United States Steel and other companies to abandon price increases which they said were essential to care for needed replacement of obsolete facilities and plant extensions. It was charged he did this by threatening to give Government contracts for steel to companies that held the line against the price increases and by threatening to deny contracts to companies that insisted on the increased prices. The Government is a huge buyer of steel. He was criticized, too, for lashing out, through grand jury investigation and the threat of punitive measures, against the steel companies.

NEED IS NOT DISPROVED

The President's apparent justification was to preserve the country's economy, to serve the public by preventing increases in prices of steel, basic in so many ways. An increase in steel prices would be a signal for price increases all along the line, as has been the case in the past. Admitted that the announcement of the price increase by steel was ill timed, it has not yet been demonstrated that the increases are not warranted.

The President said several times yesterday that he has no power to fix prices or wages. It is evident that he did have this power and used it against steel—backed by loud protests from the public. When he was questioned on whether he would move in similar ways to prevent other price increases, however, the President insisted he had no power to fix prices or wages. Indeed he would not say what he would do in the event a labor union demanded excessive wage increases—increases that could only make price increases essential to a continuance in business. Obviously, he could not deal with labor as he dealt with the steel companies. He could not threaten them economically by producing strikebreaking workers. He could not threaten organized labor with punishment under the antitrust laws, for labor unions are not subject to these laws. On the other hand, organized labor can threaten retaliation at the polls.

ONLY CONGRESS CAN ACT

Congress is the only body which can deal with big labor and curb it when it threatens to strike, and does strike, to compel higher wages in violence to the welfare of the country and the general public. Beyond the Taft-Hartley Act, amended by the Griffin-Landrum Act, Congress has done nothing about labor, save in some particulars relating to national defense industries. Nor does there appear much prospect it will. Senator MCCLELLAN of Arkansas, who conducted the Senate investigation of racketeering and collusion between labor and management, has introduced bills to strengthen the laws where work stoppages are threatened in transportation industries and at defense production plants. The Kennedy administration has still to recommend any laws which would deal effectively with paralyzing strikes.

Obviously the President was seeking to convince business he is not its enemy. He said, in effect, that his administration cherishes no ill will against the steel industry because of last week's battle over prices. He is contemplating no punitive measures against big steel which, he said, had corrected its mistake and rescinded price increases. At the same time, he said the grand jury investigation would be continued to see if the antitrust laws had been violated and there had been concerted price fixing. But that was to be expected—the administration has to go through with it, for obvious reasons.

By and large, the President gave business a pat on the back, expressed his friendship and said the Government, business and labor must cooperate for the good of all the country—and that this must be done through collective bargaining, in which the public has a tremendous interest. He predicted that business profits would be greater than ever, and that investors, through dividends, would receive their full share.

Next David Lawrence's article in the Star, entitled "Buttering Up U.S. Business." It is important to note that the President neither asked nor was given commitments from steel in labor negotiations that wage increases wouldn't be reflected in price rises:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 19, 1962]

BUTTERING UP U.S. BUSINESS—PRESIDENT'S BID TO INDUSTRY HELD SOFTENED BY SIDESTEPPING QUERY ON LABOR

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy tried in his press conference yesterday to "butter up" American business, including the steel companies. He said there was no ill will toward anybody and that there was no room on either side for "any feelings of hostility or vindictiveness."

But, unfortunately, the President nullified much of what he said when he refused to answer a reporter's question as to how he would treat labor unions if they do the same thing the steel companies did—namely, if they make demands for wage increases that go beyond the administration's formula for a "hold the line" or stabilization program.

The reporter's question was as follows:

"Assuming that a price increase in steel would eventually be necessary and justified, do you have any thoughts as to how this price increase should be reached? And, secondly, if some major labor union made excessive demands for wage increases, would you move as sharply against that union as you did last week against steel?"

The exact record of what the President said in reply was as follows:

"Well, to take the second part first, we had worked very closely with the steel union in an attempt to persuade them that it was in their interest and the country's interest to meet the standards set by the Council of Economic Advisers, and it was done. And that is why this matter came into particularly sharp focus last week."

Mr. Kennedy's avoidance of an answer is regarded as particularly significant, because it means that the administration intends to continue to put pressure on business and threaten it with lawsuits and the withdrawal of orders by the Defense Department, but will exercise no analogous pressure on the labor unions.

Mr. Kennedy pleaded that he doesn't really have the power to restrain wage increases. Actually, he has no legal power to restrain price rises either. Mr. Kennedy seemed to sidestep the point made by one of the reporters that, by holding the line, he was actually fixing prices. The reporter said:

"Some of your critics feel that you set prices, or have gone into the field of price control by Executive fiat in the steel situation, and further that this sets a precedent which you would have to follow in future situations. Do you feel that you have set a precedent—that, as these situations arise, you would again have to invoke this sort of power?"

Mr. Kennedy argued that "everyone is quite aware of what the powers are of the Government, and the limitation on these powers." He then added:

"But I have not suggested that—our power—that we have powers to set, or that those powers would be desirable to set prices or to set wages."

The President insisted that he had merely attempted to put before the parties on both sides the importance of the public interest, and he did say that the interrelationship of various factors makes the public interest mandatory in these matters. He put it this way:

"Public interest is very definitely involved, but in asserting the public interest we have always recognized the proper limitations of that—of the power of the Government to enforce any collective bargaining agreement. We do not have that power. That power has not been given to us."

Mr. Kennedy, nevertheless, did not hesitate last week to use all the pressure and power of the U.S. Government to force the steel companies to recede from their announcement of a price increase. There is no power to do this under the law, but he applied it nevertheless. The Defense Department withheld orders promptly and ignored the principle of competitive bids by simply shifting contracts without requiring formal submission. Coincidentally, a Federal grand jury investigation of certain steel companies was ordered.

Mr. Kennedy's remarks were particularly unsettling, however, when he discussed future profits and productivity. He gave the impression that shareholders should be content with a record of high returns on their investment during the last 10 years. He said nothing about the current situation, in which the value of the stock held by United States Steel shareholders is approximately $63, compared to $108 2 years ago.

Mr. Kennedy also seems to think that the steel industry would get a $500 million increase in profits when steel production goes up to 85 or 90 percent of capacity. But nobody in the steel business expects any such result as this for a long time to come. In fact, the realistic experts among them say that what's important is not the total amount of profits, but the return per shareholder. They also say that a better way to measure progress is by the rate of return on sales which the steel companies receive. The industry figures show that in the last 4 or 5 years these percentages have been steadily going downhill.

A newsworthy piece of information in the President's press conference was his admission that at no time during the administration's discussion with the steel companies, before the decision was reached to raise prices, was there any assurance given that there would or would not be a price increase. One of the reporters had asked whether such assurances were given, either directly or indirectly, because on the day the contract was ratified the President had stated that the settlement was "noninflationary." Mr. Kennedy replied finally that they "were not asked and they were not given."

The foregoing is an example of what American business is up against. The President, himself, hasn't revealed clearly just what happened in his attempts to get a "noninflationary" settlement, or the kind of pressure he used in coercing the steel companies to withdraw their price increase.

To conclude, it is my hope, my prayer, in this Easter season that all of us can take time to reflect on the great principles upon which our country is founded. Freedom is the cornerstone. In the past it has been our heritage and birthright. Let us not change it. Our future will be secure only as our freedom is securely protected by our Government. It is in this spirit that I have presented my views here today.

GOVERNMENT BY PRESIDENTIAL ANGER

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, having previously expressed my own opposition to "government by Presidential anger," I welcome President Kennedy's latest statement that—

> This administration harbors no ill will against any individual, any industry, corporation or segment of the American economy.

I earnestly hope that subsequent deeds will confirm these fine words.

I also hope that the President's avowed concern for "the public interest" will extend to the rising cost of big Government, to excessive Federal employee pay increase proposals, and to reckless big union demands.

I am interested too in Mr. Kennedy's statement that—

> Everyone is quite aware of what the powers are of the Government, and the limitations of those powers.

And in his denial of any intention to set prices or wages.

Again, the proof of these disclaimers must await future events.

Meanwhile, at the risk of being accused of trying to "turn back the clock," I call attention to some sober wisdom which is all of 10 years old. I quote from several of the majority opinions of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1952, when it ruled, 6 to 3, that President Truman's seizure of the steel mills was unconstitutional.

Said Mr. Justice Black, who delivered the opinion of the Court:

> In the framework of our Constitution, the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker. The Constitution limits his functions in the lawmaking process to the recommending of laws he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad. And the Constitution is neither silent nor equivocal about who shall make the laws which the President is to execute.

Said Mr. Justice Douglas, in concurring with this decision:

> We pay a price for our system of checks and balances, for the distribution of power among the three branches of Government. It is a price that today may seem exorbitant to many. Today a kindly President uses the seizure power to effect a wage increase and to keep the steel furnaces in production. Yet tomorrow another President might use the same power to prevent a wage increase, to curb trade unionists, to regiment labor as oppressively as industry thinks it has been regimented by this seizure.

Speaking of the claim of "inherent powers" of the President, Mr. Justice Jackson said:

> Such power either has no beginning or it has no end. If it exists it need submit to no legal restraint. I am not alarmed that it would plunge us straightway into dictatorship, but it is at least a step in that wrong direction.

Mr. Justice Jackson had some further observations, pertinent today:

> Executive power has the advantage of concentration in a single head in whose choice the whole Nation has a part, making him the focus of public hopes and expectations. In drama, magnitude, and finality his decisions so far overshadow any others that almost alone he fills the public eye and ear. No other personality in public life can begin to compete with him in access to the public mind through modern methods of communications. By his prestige as head of state and his influence upon public opinion he exerts a leverage upon those who are supposed to check and balance his power which often cancels their effectiveness.

And he added:

> With all its defects, delays, and inconveniences, men have discovered no technique for long preventing free government except that the Executive be under the law, and that the law be made by parliamentary deliberations.

I respectfully commend these wise admonitions to the present—and all future—occupants of the White House.

THE WARSAW GHETTO

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today is a significant anniversary—a grim but glorious one. Nineteen years ago, on April 19, 1943, the world was given indisputable proof that the human spirit is unconquerable, that man will resist to the death oppression, tyranny, and outrage. Nineteen years ago today the inhabitants of the Warsaw ghetto rose in determined revolt against their Nazi torturers who were determined to erase every remnant of Judaism.

The epic of the Warsaw ghetto uprising is a deathless saga of heroism—of the spirit of man which would not be denied and rose to give weakened and starved bodies the strength to hold at bay strong, well-armed Nazis troops. In the 5 weeks of resistance, thousands of Jews died, but they died only after a heavy toll was inflicted on the Nazis.

As horrible as the atrocities perpetrated against Jews in every country were, none match the unspeakable tortures endured by the Polish Jews. On the eve of World War II there were over 3 million Jews in Poland. In the terror-filled years that followed, Jews by the hundreds of thousands were killed—in the streets, in the unspeakable hell of the extermination camps—in the fire-ravaged horror of the ghetto uprising.

When Poland was overrun by the Nazis in 1939, every effort was made to stamp out all vestiges of Jewish settlements there. Into the Ghetto they poured as many as half a million Jews at once—in an area that had been inhabited by 80,000 before the tyranny began. They began to decimate—systematically and calculatingly—the Jewish population, carrying them away by the carloads to the "final solution"—death in Treblinka, in Belzec, in the other infamous camps that abounded in Poland.

To list just a few of the grisly statistics, on July 22, 1942, 6,289 Jews were removed from the Warsaw Ghetto; July 23, 7,815; July 24, 7,444—in the period from July 2 to July 23, 66,701; 142,353 were removed in August; 56,730 in September. And these official German figures are just some of the statistics.

The Nazis butchered, but they could not kill the spirit, the dignity of this people. They maimed, but they could not scar the beauty of hope. They degraded, but they could not debase an age-old love of life, liberty, and God.

The fight against their implacable foes was carried on by the bravest, most daring, indestructible Jews. They proved to be indominatable, defying all threats. Numbering about 1,000 hard-core idealists, these fighters began their last and most glorious fight in April.

On this day, 19 years ago, Nazi storm troopers were dispatched to liquidate, forever, all traces of the ghetto. The Jews were outnumbered by at least 1,000 to 1, and in terms of arms and equipment, perhaps by 10,000 to 1. But they fought on for better than 5 weeks, until sheer force of arms and decimation of forces had reduced their number to only 80 survivors.

Mr. Speaker, this appalling and inhuman action is, nonetheless, an everlasting memorial to these fighters, to the spirit which was unquenchable.

I call to the attention of my colleagues a declaration by the Honorable Nelson Rockefeller, Governor of my State of New York, proclaiming April 19, 1962, Warsaw Ghetto Day.

> WARSAW GHETTO DAY
>
> On April 19, 1943, the world witnessed a scene of incredible valor in the revolt of the Jewish inhabitants of the Warsaw Ghetto. Hopelessly outnumbered from the start, knowing they would fall and without modern arms, they rose in rebellion against the might of the Nazi military war machine.
>
> Faith and spirit were greater than material things, for at first their hopeless rebellion was successful. With the bravery of desperation they threw back the first attack of the storm troopers who had been sent to liquidate them. It took the full fury of the then irresistible German Army to crush them.
>
> These unforgettable patriots fought to death as martyrs in the cause of freedom. On this day we honor them as God-fearing men and women who preferred to die fighting rather than to live on bended knees in humiliation and slavery.
>
> Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim April 19, 1962, as Warsaw Ghetto Day in New York State.
>
> Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 29th day of March 1962.
>
> By the Governor:
>
> NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.
> WILLIAM J. RONAN,
> *Secretary to the Governor.*

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues and our fellow Americans will join in this significant commemoration, honoring the spirit of these freedom fighters and dedicated to the preservation of this spirit, the perpetuation of the principle of liberty and freedom for which these people gave their lives.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight Tuesday, April 24, to file a report on the bill H.R. 11040.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE EASTER RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to adjourn today I would like to make the observation that the House of Representatives has earned its Easter recess.

We have passed well over a score of important measures, several of which are on the statute books while others sent to the Senate are in varying stages of process toward final enactment.

Of course the bulk of our labor thus far, as is usual and necessary in the early months of every new session, has been performed in the committee room where studies, discussions and hearings must be conducted prior to final preparation of bills for action by the House as a whole.

Some of this spade work is still under way on phases of the broad program proposed in a series of presidential messages and communications.

However, hearings have been concluded on the all-important trade expansion measure designed to meet the development of the European Common Market and to reduce mutual barriers to the free flow of international commerce.

The authorization bill for foreign assistance is nearing that same point.

The proposed new program for agriculture is being written up in committee and ready to emerge.

The largest of all the appropriation bills, that for the Department of Defense, has been passed.

Action on all of these will be among our early tasks after reconvening on Monday, April 30.

The list of major actions up to date in this 2d session of the 87th Congress follows:

ENACTED

Jobless retraining, Public Law 87-415; storm damage relief, Public Law, 87-426; enforcement provisions for Pensions Disclosure Act, Public Law 87-420; authority for nationwide program of rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents before Federal courts, Public Law 87-428; temporary increase in national debt limit, Public Law, 87-414.

PASSED BY HOUSE AND SENATE

Authorization for procurement of missiles, naval vessels, aircraft including the RS-70, H.R. 9751; college construction program, H.R. 8900; Peace Corps expansion and authorization for fiscal 1963, H.R. 10700; compelling production of documentary evidence in civil antitrust suits, S. 167. In conference, grant to States to encourage educational TV broadcasts, S. 205.

PASSED BY HOUSE

H.R. 10606: Revamping public assistance programs, raising benefits.

H.R. 10650: Revenue Code revisions.

H.R. 7927: Postal rate increases.

H.R. 3728: Increased compensation for blinded veterans.

H.R. 10743: Increasing rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities.

H.R. 10079: Authorizing continued U.S. part in international refugee programs, including Cubans in asylum here; reorganizes loyalty, security functions of State Department.

H.R. 7336, H.R. 946: Measures to aid oyster production industry whose beds were destroyed by storm and disease.

H.R. 10162: Authorizes United States to join with other countries in loans to the International Monetary Fund to help stabilize world currencies.

APPROPRIATIONS

House Joint Resolution 612: Supplemental, Veterans' Administration, 1962, Public Law 87-404.

H.R. 10562: Treasury, Post Office, and executive office.

H.R. 10802: Interior and related agencies.

H.R. 10904: Labor-HEW.

H.R. 11038: Second supplemental, 1962.
H.R. 11151: Legislative branch.
H.R. 11289: Defense.

EFFECT OF EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY ON THE AMERICAN FORESTRY INDUSTRIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, recently, my good friend Arthur Temple, Jr., president of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, addressed the annual meeting of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association on the subject "The Trade World We Live In." Mr. Temple so vividly expressed the situation facing the allied industries of the forestry interests in the United States posed by the European Common Market that I believe them to be of significant interest to this body in further deliberations on our relations with the European Economic Community:

THE TRADE WORLD WE LIVE IN

Gentlemen, those of us who make frequent speeches soon stop being bothered by the truth of the Biblical quotation, "A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country, and in his own house." But we do get bothered when the circumstances of business become such that the quotation can be modified to read, "A country is without profit save at the cost of its honor in its own house." We want to know why this should be.

As many of you know, I recently had the privilege of joining a group of architects, construction executives, and building material suppliers, gathered together by House & Home magazine, for a tour of four major countries of Europe. I had read a good deal about the Common Market and about the new vitality of the Western European economy but, like most Americans, I had tended to scoff at the idea that this Phoenix rising from the ashes of war constituted a significant threat to our own world and domestic trade. Gentlemen, I have been there; I have seen it; I couldn't have been more wrong.

The Common Market is a force for trade which can alter the entire commercial flow of the free world. If we are to maintain our markets and our own growth rate in the United States, we must understand the Common Market, we must examine its relationship to our own national economy, and we must take economic actions which will assure that despite shifting influences at home and abroad we will receive our fair share of the lumber markets everywhere.

Let us look for a moment at this new development. The European Economic Community (called the Common Market) is a 4-year-old economic union consisting, at present, of France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg. Great Britain has announced its decision to apply for membership and Denmark is negotiating for membership.

The objective of the Common Market is to build mass consumption within the areas by removing tariffs, quotas and other trade barriers; to create a uniform external tariff; to abolish restrictions on the movement of labor, capital, business enterprises and services anywhere within the area; to coordinate monetary policies; to establish a common agricultural policy; and to extend benefits and protection to the associated states (colonies and associated territories mainly in Africa).

It must be clear at once, to the most casual observer, that in effect the European Economic Community is providing its member nations with the same freedom of economic homogeneity that we have in the United States among our several States.

The main difference, as I see it, is that the rules for the conduct of business within a nation are still made by that nation and each nation is exerting every effort to structure its procedures in such a way that its own businessmen can have a business advantage. In essence, the countries of Europe are applying the principles of states rights to the needs of their business community and holding, inviolate, the power of decisions within their own borders.

In the United States, on the other hand, we find the national government imposing an inequitable tax system, restrictive regulation, and other harassments of business across the board in a way which more often than not hampers the economic growth and opportunity of every businessman regardless of where his plant is situated and regardless of where his markets are.

For instance, if the State of Texas were to give a job producing business tax advantage, it could be nullified by Federal tax demands. A producer in a Common Market country, if given a business advantage by his own country, need not fear that such advantage will be canceled by an oppressive tax from the overriding power of the Common Market.

The Common Market situation, where country competes against country with the same ground rules and within the same modus operandi is a healthy and beneficial condition. It is the very essence of the spirit of free enterprise which, frequently in our own country is subordinated to social and diplomatic considerations which while good must be balanced against the growth and prosperity of our own citizens.

Our own Federal Government had the foresight to help establish the Common Market to foster economic recovery and progress in Europe and yet our Federal Government does not espouse the same rules for its own business community. We have been cornered into a situation where our friends across the seas recognize the advantages of free competition in a free society and sponsor it, while our own Federal Government frequently ignores the effect of its actions which thwart the effort of American business to remain free and competitive.

We can no longer harbor the belief that our shores are inviolate because we stand for free enterprise. We are being faced now with a dynamic foreign free enterprise system. Unless we as a nation move boldly into foreign trade we will be driven from the marketplace and be relegated to a secondary role in world economics. With full employment in Western Europe, we have nearly 5 million unemployed at home.

The superior rate of growth of production, of new plant and equipment, and of market vigor and expansion in many other countries, makes our own industrial mechanism appear, relatively, to be grinding to a halt. The malfunctioning of this mechanism cannot be attributed to a lack of readiness of our business system. We are ready.

The adaptability of competitive enterprise to new responsibilities and opportunities has been proved too often to be indicted now for failure. The defects are apparent in a nebulous, confused national policy—especially in jurisdictional uncertainties among Government departments as to where they stand. It is an understatement to say that this condition makes it difficult for the business community to find out where it stands.

Let me make it clear that I am not pointing the finger at the present administration alone. The conditions confusing business have persisted and been compounded during several administrations, regardless of the party in power.

In the case of our own lumber and wood products industry—and this is true for industry generally—our main challenge of the moment is to find out what the ground rules are and who makes those rules. Too often those in Government who should have the greatest understanding of our industry, do not appear to be making the decisions. The elusive trail to decision meanders through the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Commerce, the General Accounting Office, and, now, seemingly to the State Department. We need a road map to Government reality.

I submit to the President of the United States, that there is something radically wrong when your own people, familiar with every aspect of an industry, cannot clean out the confusion so as businessmen we can have some form of effective communication with our Government to determine our chances of staying in business or being put out of business. We want to stay in business; we only expect Government to provide an atmosphere that makes it possible for us to do so.

We are occasionally told, and sometimes from unexpected sources, "Here is your solution" without having been asked "What is your problem?" The solution may be elaborate. The problem may be nonexistent, or a distortion of the real difficulty. We businessmen would prefer that the State Department not exercise powers having primary effects in decisions affecting our domestic industry until it is authorized to do so. Yet, it appears increasingly obvious that this department's concern with building up other nations takes precedence over any realistic effort to make full utilization of our own resources for our own economic development.

The businessmen I talked with in Europe gave testimony to the morale of their business community. Some of them were frankly puzzled—perhaps I should not go so far as to say "amused"—by what they had heard and read concerning the prolonged attempts of American business to find out whether our Government is or is not antibusiness.

If the atmosphere in which we operate and sell is to be created by the State Department, we would like to know it. If our industry is to be discouraged from greater productivity because we are already marked down on the list of those to be sacrificed in the administration's trade expansion proposals, we demand the right to know. At least, knowing the worst, we can prepare to fight it.

We urge our Government not to endorse and exploit low wage conditions in other countries at the cost of jobs for American workers. We ask Government not to go further in suppression of one of the great sources of our national wealth and employment—our renewable forests—at the expense of shutdown of mills and plants in American communities and the loss of jobs to American workers destroying the well-being of entire American communities.

It is not within my province, nor within my time to explore the many ramifications of the administration's seeking powers to negotiate tariff reductions with the European Common Market, and therefore, with other countries under the most favored nation principle. Each specific of the program must be judged on its own merits by the Congress. No doubt there will be some alternative solutions in many areas of the problem. Nor can we hide our heads in the sand and fail to realize that the EEC and the United States must have some form of free economic union.

Our disagreement is in the proposed program which fails to recognize inequality of opportunity for American producers. The basic, ultimate solution is a containment of costs for American producers, a profit incentive, and an attitude and action by Government that—even, if not directly encouraging—is at least not punitive to domestic industries such as ours.

I believe we will not see any real correction of inflation, our budget deficit, our deficit in balance of foreign payments, and the threat of a lower standard of living for our people, until the question of costs and profits in the United States is answered.

Our own industry affords classic examples of just about every factor you can think of in terms of trade reciprocity—as it sounds on paper and as it works out in practice when American producers are not backed up by their own Government.

Imports of hardwood plywood from Japan and other countries, where wages are 30 cents an hour or less, have taken far more than half of our American market, have caused a large number of companies to operate at a loss, others to close down, and, of course, have thrown thousands of workers out of jobs. Since 1955, the hardwood plywood industry has made two appeals for relief—and has been denied. The phrases "peril point" and "escape clause" cease to be meaningful when interpreted in a way that circumvents the will of the Congress.

Entirely different factors are involved in the increasing spread of Canadian softwood lumber in our domestic market. In the first place, our industry has long been inclined to broad concepts in dealing with our Canadian friends, with whom this country has such strong economic ties. Canadians buy 16 times as much per capita from us—in all commodities—as we buy from them. Lumber tariffs are inequitable but we have leaned over backward to make the trade relationship work. Now, however, Canadian softwood has taken 12 or 13 percent of our markets (and increasing), and, we are necessarily reevaluating our situation.

All its complexities were explored at your own import-export meeting 2 months ago and at a combined meeting of the NLMA Foreign Trade and Executive Committee this month. We have no quarrel with Canadian producers. The basic problem is that the Canadian Government empathizes with lumber manufacturers and acts in an economically flexible manner to give them a competitive edge in our market. By way of contrast, our softwood producers operate under conditions that are punitive.

You are so painfully familiar with these punitive measures and policies that I shall only make a rollcall of a few of them.

First, we have Government timber sales practices that force the costs up to a point at which our products cannot be marketed at a profit.

With Government as the biggest timber owner in the country (and having a monopoly in many areas of the West), it is to the long-term interest of the Government's own forest economy that its commercial timber be sold, utilized, and replaced with new crops of better trees for coming generations. The present policy caters to speculative buyers or those unable to carry out the kind of operations that embody all we have learned about forest management for sustained yield in the last half century.

Federal accounting procedures are partially responsible for this suppression of proper utilization of a constantly renewable source of wealth and jobs of essential importance to our total economy. Is the accounting requirement to get the highest dollar for Federal timber so sacred that it must be bought at the price of unemployment and community instability? On this score, gentlemen, I might say that the picture is not altogether black.

On February 21, this industry of ours achieved a landmark in industry unity, in the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture. I wish each of you could have been with us to share the sense of pride each of us felt as more than a hundred key people in the solution of Federal timber supply problems waited for the Secretary to arrive.

We had 55 lumbermen there, representing every region, and companies, large, medium, and small; there were 20 Senators and Congressmen present and 24 others were represented by their principal staff assistants.

We had a good case, and we presented it firmly and in complete unity, without fear of reprisals, without thought of selfish personal interest, without any prior deals or commitments having been made. And because we were together, because we were firm and forthright, we were heard with respect and understanding.

Visualize sitting in a room listening to Senator WAYNE MORSE stating, after our presentation, that the management of the national forests must be related to the ringing of cash registers on the main streets of dependent communities. However, he later negated his help for dependent communities by advocating additional Government power over our industry.

Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, called our proposals reasonable indeed and cited the fact that there were twice as many workers unemployed in the woods in his State than there had been a year ago.

Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, warned the Department of Agriculture that, and I quote: "The curtailment of cutting national forest timber would only create a vacuum in the market and that vacuum will be filled by substitute materials which will lead surely to the death of the lumber industry."

Representative JULIA HANSEN, of Washington, called for immediate action by the Department on our proposals.

Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington, urged the Department to enter into immediate conferences with the Congress to cure the industry's ills.

Congressman CLEM MILLER, of California, demanded that these matters be aired at the highest policy levels of the Department and that the gap between the lumber producer, and the Secretary's Office be closed.

Representative TOM MORRIS, of New Mexico, said that if the Forest Service was not administering the law of 1897 in a way that served the modern needs of the lumber industry, perhaps the Congress should rewrite the basic forestry law so that it would serve the industry today.

And these, gentlemen, were public statements by lawmakers.

How did we generate these spontaneous expressions of concern for our interests? By being united in our approach and convictions and by being wholly honest and reasonable in our demands. I cannot emphasize too strongly that without the strong statements by lumbermen from the WCLA, Bernie Orell, "Stub" Stewart and the behind-the-scenes influences of Dave James and Nat Giustina, we could not have achieved the marked success we enjoyed.

This session with the Secretary of Agriculture in the presence of influential Members of Congress was, in my opinion, the most significant meeting of lumbermen with Federal officials in history, and here I must say that Secretary Freeman received our presentation with genuine concern. With total industry support we will win a vital battle for relief from unjust and uneconomic practices by the Federal Government upon which the very future of our industry may well depend.

Second, there is the subsidy that west coast lumber pays to domestic shipping.

I wonder how many American homebuyers really know that the Jones Act—requiring that American products shipped by water between two points in the United States must travel on domestic ships—means an added cost of $8 per thousand board-feet delivered.

Recent devaluation of the Canadian dollar for the benefit of Canadian exporters added another competitive edge for Canadian lumbermen—$5 for every $100 worth of lumber sent into our markets. And, of course, this advantage comes on top of the lower prices at which the Canadian government sells its stumpage to producers and the lower wages in the British Columbia region—principal competitor of our great west coast region. Western producers must absorb all these costs to be competitive.

Third, there are other extraneous costs charged off to lumber.

We are taxed for the superhighways on which logs rarely move. At the same time we bear the entire cost of building access roads to timber supply which are in large measure used and enjoyed by the general public.

And let us put in the record now, that on industry-owned forest land there were more than 6 million recreation visits by the American people in 1960. There were 55,000 miles of road open to the public; 54 million acres open to hunting; 37,000 miles of stream available for fishing, and 735,000 acres of lakes open to the public—all financed by private capital.

When it is borne in mind that Government owns more commercial forest land in some States than the forest industries and requires public funds—over and above its timber sales and other income from the forest land, to provide recreation—our industry's hospitality looks very good indeed.

Lumber is the only building material that has such a public-spirited function, involving extra costs for facilities and extra measures for protection of our raw material. But, be it to our credit, we continue to expand recreational opportunities for the public to uphold the principle that America's forests can be both perpetually productive and perpetually enjoyable.

Fourth, whenever our industry seeks to take the initiative to develop markets elsewhere—such as our effort to develop a housing program in South America—we have been unable to get cooperation from the Government.

When disaster struck Chile we moved in to offer assistance—much later the administration came up with a $20 million loan program with opportunities for private enterprise methods absent from the program.

Fifth, our industry has had little benefit from the Buy American Act.

Through interpretations, exemptions, and exceptions, there is no effective application of the Buy American Act to softwood lumber, the major item affected in our industry. Until there is mandatory marking of imported lumber as to country of origin, domestic producers are at a disadvantage.

These matters that I have cited among others have considerable bearing on the approach which we insist that the Congress will take when it considers a new framework of trade legislation. Certainly, we should not accept a program so drastic for some of our industries that entire communities will go on the dole.

The administration's proposed relief in face of a new flood of imports is to give the jobless 65 percent take-home pay for a year; provide retraining for work in other industries; and money to move to another job location.

May I put a question here: How will other industries stand the impact of the drop in

American consumer buying power when this new phase of unemployment begins?

Now, for the businessman who is injured by the program, the Government is going to give him technical advice; a tax benefit to those who improve or diversify their production into other areas; and lend money for modernization. That is the three-point program for business under the administration proposal.

As for modernization, which the planners set forth as a means by which American industry can compete with low-wage countries, I suggest that these planners go take a look at some of the plant and equipment in some of these foreign countries.

We have been losing American supremacy in this regard also for lack of profits to plow back into business and for lack of assurance that our productivity will be permitted its proper outlet. I am happy to say that the present administration is at least making noises indicating a recognition of this program.

It was only about 14 months ago that President Kennedy, in his stirring inaugural address, told all of us that we should not ask what our country could do for us but what we could do for our country. The entire Nation applauded that statement and yet, within the past year, we have seen forces moving to lock up lands for exclusive use as playgrounds without any consideration of their significance as economic resources for jobs and payrolls. We have seen trade unionists move to serve themselves and not the Nation by negotiating a contract which provides for a 25-hour workweek.

Reductions in raw material resources and in productive labor will never do anything for our country. Gentlemen, Americans need more resources and more employment; not more playgrounds and more leisure.

The trend away from multiple-use of our forests and the desire to lock up vast areas from all access to the typical American family in the name of preservation—has, of course, produced a condition of constant intimidation of our industry. Withdrawals actual and threatened, inevitably force stumpage costs up.

Public misconceptions of what this struggle is all about will have swaying power over many candidates for Congress unless we ourselves do the educational job necessary to expose the fallacies of these seemingly benevolent programs.

It occurs to me that each of you has an obligation to acquaint your own Representatives and Senators with the facts with respect to the economic concepts of national forests and private holdings in their respective States and districts if we are to achieve a truly representative voice in the Congress of the United States.

I firmly believe that if our Representatives in Congress truly know the facts they will vote to serve the best interests of their districts and their States. If they don't know the facts, it's your fault and mine for failing to prepare and present a convincing presentation of the facts that affect American business.

If they know the facts and still play footloose with our economic lives, our businesses, our employees' well-being and that of our dependent communities, let's work together and get them out of office. If they don't help us, then they can't complain.

It was Supreme Court Justice Brandeis, who said: "Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding."

The American people must understand that utilization of our commercial forest land must continue as a basic and renewable source of our wealth. They must understand there is no shortage of our raw material and that, unlike iron ore or oil deposits, we can continue to grow this raw material at an ever-increasing rate through scientific forest management.

Government must sell a reasonable proportion of its timber as it matures. It is in business itself in this regard. Yet our industry—unlike the situation in other countries—carries on alone in developing and promoting markets for the lumber and other forest products, markets on which Uncle Sam as the biggest owner depends and exacts exorbitant raw material prices from our industry.

Mr. President, we ask you to look at our industry as it is viewed by our realistic competitors abroad and open equal access to foreign markets for your own American industry. We ask you, Mr. President, to look at our industry, as we ourselves view it as businessmen—uncertain from one day to the next as to whether we can continue to exist as an industry with so many political pressures working aaginst us. I think you will heed our plea, Mr. President, because it is fair.

The responsible stewardship of forest resources by the forest products industries is an established fact. The very word, "forestry," means "good forestry." There is no other kind. And good forestry is good business. There is no sustained business or sustained profits or sustained employment without long-term timber management. And this takes capital risk, with land and investment tied up for many years. That is why, Mr. President, we need to know now some of the ground rules.

We do not ask for help, Mr. President, in competing with our fellow lumbermen or producers of competing materials. We believe, however, that advantages given to other nations should not be denied the 3 million dependent on our industry. We are engaged in a strong program to develop markets so that we can make a profit—so that we can stay in business and provide jobs. If we are forced out of business Government will have to take over the whole job of producing, manufacturing and selling or else let the wealth of our forests go into total discard.

This is not the cry of despair, Mr. President. Rather than asking for help, we ask only for some relief from excessive programing against us. We must preserve, Mr. President, the integrity and security of the freeman in America who capitalizes upon his own sweat, talent, and energy, and succeeds or fails as his own master. The freemen of our Nation are the Government of this Nation. It is their right as individuals to move forward as far as their wills, their abilities, and their opportunities will permit them to advance. If we stifle the freedom of every man to excel and to realize his potentialities through personal effort and endurance, then, indeed, we will have surrendered the security of our own and all freemen to the inevitable chains of economic slavery.

Mr. President, we ask to be given nothing and offer our all to help you build this Nation. We ask you to examine your programs and ask yourself, "Am I doing all I can to clear up the confusion, thus making it possible for American business to compete in international markets with foreign producers who have the wholehearted support of their governments?"

We know, Mr. President, that what you do for American business will be criticized by some who don't have to face the daily obligation of having to provide jobs for people. But this, Mr. President, is a cross I know you are willing to bear. So then, ask us what we can do to help you lift and bear this burden, and we shall share and lighten your load and bear it gladly. And what is more, we will help you demonstrate anew to the world the greatness of freemen in a free country working together through the greatest economic system ever introduced on this planet, the free individual American enterprise system.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE FIELD OF AERONAUTICS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, I have been deeply impressed and pleased, as I know my colleagues have been, with the great strides that we as a nation have made in space, climaxed most recently, of course, by Col. John Glenn's spectacular orbital flight.

Yet while I enthusiastically applaud the vigorous emphasis we have given the space effort, and while I recognize that our space committee is responsible in large measure for that emphasis, I do want to express one note of concern about it.

As we vigorously push research and development in space work, we must, I believe, also continue to push our research and development in a closely related field, the field of aeronautics.

I know that many scientists and engineers, including experts in government, share my concern about the need to focus on this important problem. Many of them feel, with alarm, that this country has so intensively focused its interest and energies on the space effort that its interest in aeronautics has seriously, perhaps dangerously, waned. This country cannot afford to neglect its progress in the aeronautical sciences.

The aeronautical sciences and the astronautical sciences are closely related fields. In countless instances, the progress which we make in one of these fields will aid our progress in the other. It is important that we keep our perspective in the vast field of flight. Our long-range national interests will be most effectively served, I think, by a balanced approach. This is reflected, of course, in the name which the Congress gave to NASA.

Recent developments have made many of us inclined to think of NASA as a space agency and only a space agency, but as John Stack, the director of aeronautical research at NASA, likes to remind us, the first A in the name stands for Aeronautics.

In the post-World War II period, the United States has dominated both the military and commercial development and production of aircraft.

I am satisfied that this Nation continues to hold the dominant position in overall aeronautical technology. However, our leadership is being challenged and challenged intensively by the Soviet Union. Our dominant position in this field will not perpetuate itself indefinitely unless we make continued leadership in aeronautical technology one of our national goals.

Clearly it should be one of our goals. The development and production of supersonic and hypersonic aircraft have many far-reaching implications, which bear not only upon our continued aeronautical supremacy but also upon our military strength, our industrial progress and our national security.

It should, in fact, be a concerted goal within the free world. To achieve it, this country should not hesitate to draw upon the scientific resources of the free world.

For several reasons, we should be moving, and moving strongly, in the direction of developing aircraft which will fly at speeds of mach 3 and faster. In this effort, we should utilize whatever technology the free world has to offer.

We would suffer another serious setback in the cold war if the Russians became the first to achieve a recoverable space booster. Yet the Russians could very well score this important first, because they have been working intensively on multiple-cycle air-breathing technology in aeronautics.

We must intensify our own efforts in this direction, and do so now, if we are to hold any hope of averting this setback.

I call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the National Observer on April 8. It bears upon the competition which the free world faces in the development of hypersonic transports and recoverable boosters. It recognizes the Soviet threat, it also recognizes the possibility that the challenge can best be met by our drawing upon the scientific resources of the free world. The article follows:

A Super Jetliner To Outrun Sun Whisks Into View

The supersonic airliner may yet get off the ground.

Last week Najeeb Elias Halaby, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, said the Government will soon award $11 million in research contracts on a commercial version of this transport that will fly so fast it will outrun the Sun.

Before the first supersonic transport (SST) streaks down the runway in the early 1970's, staggering research and development problems must be solved, and equally staggering costs must be absorbed. But Mr. Halaby, anyway, feels that this country cannot afford not to build it.

It's not just the estimated $3 to $4 billion world market for such an aircraft, says Mr. Halaby. It's not just the large segment of world passenger traffic. It's not just international prestige, or even the plane's possible use as a troopcarrier. "It's not just all that," he says forcefully. "It is a question of: Are we going ahead with our technology and leadership in aviation? I think we should."

The aircraft's 2,000-m.p.h.-plus speed, combined with the vagaries of shifting national and international time zones, will cause confusion in the passenger cabin. An SST leaving New York City at 9:30 a.m., EST, will arrive in Los Angeles at 8 a.m., PST. A man could leave New York for Tokyo at breakfast time—and find himself having breakfast in San Francisco, and again in Honolulu, en route.

FLIGHT TEST THIS DECADE

This first American mach 3 (three times the speed of sound) airliner could be flight tested in the late 1960's; by the early 1970's it could be whisking passengers from New York to London in about 2 hours (one third the present flying time).

John Stack, Director of Aeronautical Research for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), says when that day comes, "speculators will probably be trying to figure out how to take a couple of billion bucks out of a London bank, fly to New York and get an extra day's interest on it."

Great Britain and France are working together on an aluminum plane to fly somewhat slower at mach 2, may get it into the air first. But aluminum loses its strength beyond mach 2, hence American aeronautical engineers see little growth potential for such an aircraft.

It's also a good bet that the Soviets will fly some form of mach 2 or mach 3 transport before the United States.

As envisaged, the SST will be a striking airplane.

Two thirds the length of a football field, with a possible wing spread of 100 feet, the aircraft will stand three stories high. Four to six jet engines, generating more than 150,000 pounds thrust, will propel the SST over a 4,000-mile range at cruising altitudes of 65,000 to 70,000 feet. The plane will carry 150 passengers.

One of the biggest worries is the problem of "sonic boom" caused by the shockwave that moves downward from and along with an airplane in supersonic flight. With a crack like artillery fire, it can shatter windows, damage structures, and disturb entire communities.

Finally, the SST will be a "rubber" airplane; it must use conventional airfields and runways, operate efficiently over a wide range of speeds from subsonic to supersonic. The two speed ranges are antithetical as far as wing shapes, propulsion, etc., are concerned. For example, in supersonic, high-altitude flight, an airplane cleaves the air best with highly swept back wings; when landing and taking off, it requires more wing spread.

To meet this problem, NASA engineers have long been experimenting with a "variable sweep" or "variable geometry" wing which could be moved forward and backward mechanically.

ENGINES MUST CHANGE

Today's jet engines will not be versatile enough for efficient subsonic-supersonic flight, says A. J. Evans, deputy to Mr. Stack. Therefore, a new "engine cycle," or method of generating power, must be worked out. The possibility under study is a turbofan-ramjet combination.

The rather conventional jet turbofan would power the airplane's takeoff and initial acceleration. The ramjet, which can only operate at high speed, would provide cruise propulsion.

The economic picture is a subject of hot debate in aviation circles. Mr. Halaby has requested another $25 million in "seed money" for the fiscal year beginning July 1, to round out a 2-year basic research effort.

He is frank to say that until the results of 2 years' research is in, he isn't sure what kind of "Government-industry formula" can be worked out. But he firmly maintains that support by private industry will be forthcoming.

"One estimated total cost of developing and building a fleet of supersonic transports was $2 billion for 145 aircraft," he says. "Another figure was $12,600,000 to $20 million per individual aircraft. No manufacturer—not one—will step up to this kind of a bill; hence the Government must play a 'large part."

Airline presidents, with subsonic jet bills still to pay, and many empty seats in their new 600-miles-per-hour jets, have just finished a bad year. Their eyes roll back in their heads at mention of supersonic transport costs—but they all agree that, somehow, the United States must build it.

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT MARKS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to what I consider to be an important anniversary which will occur next week while the House is in recess.

Next Wednesday, April 25, 1962, will mark the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the General Land Office which is now the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior. In marking the sesquicentennial of Federal administration of public lands, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I am pleased to tell the House that our former colleague, Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, has been making significant progress in modernizing land management techniques and procedures.

I have had occasion at other times and wish again to state for the record that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and its members on both sides of the aisle have had good working relationships with the Bureau of Land Management regardless of the administration in power. As we enter the 151st year of active management of our public lands, I am pleased to further inform you that we are working in our committee in a bipartisan endeavor to enact legislation that will modernize the underlying policies governing our public lands; I hope that we can bring this legislation to the floor during this anniversary year, which will also mark the 100th anniversary of the Homestead Act of 1862, the Land Grant College Act of 1862, and the Land Grant Transcontinental Act of 1862.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of Chairman ASPINALL in greeting the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of planned management of the public lands of the United States.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, I am pleased to join in informing the House of the fine spirit of cooperation that exists between our committee and the Bureau of Land Management and its Director, Karl S. Landstrom, who was formerly on our staff and is familiar—like the Secretary of the Interior himself—with the problems both downtown and here on the Hill.

Mr. **SAYLOR**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SAYLOR**. Mr. Speaker, I, too, desire to associate myself with the remarks of the Honorable Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, in sending greetings to the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management on this historic occasion. As has been indicated, next Wednesday will be the 150th anniversary of the creation of the General Land Office whose functions have since been taken over by the Bureau of Land Management.

Through the years that I have been here in Congress, through Democratic and Republican administrations, through Republican and Democratic control of Congress, we have bipartisan cooperation by both the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs and the Bureau of Land Management. In recent meetings of the committee, we have been advised of some of the efforts being made by the Bureau of Land Management to modernize its management techniques. On the occasion of this anniversary, I wish them well and hope that they are successful.

THE EASTER RECESS

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I take this time personally to thank all of the Members of the House and all of the officers and employees of the House for their cooperation, tolerance, patience, understanding and assistance during the first 100 days of the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I know I join all Members of the House in expressing our gratitude to you for the wise and fair manner in which you have presided over this House and for the high quality of your leadership. To you and to Mrs. McCormack and to all Members, officers and employees of the House I extend my heartfelt wishes for a happy, blessed and well-earned Easter holiday.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Ryan of New York, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Alger, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. Derwinski, for 1 hour, on May 3, 1962.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Mason and to include a magazine article.

Mr. Pucinski.

The following Members (at the request of Mrs. May) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Ostertag.

Mr. MacGregor.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. Bailey in 2 instances.

Mr. Powell.

Mr. Kastenmeier.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The **SPEAKER** announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 205. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 465, the House stands adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, April 30, 1962.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 465, the House adjourned until Monday, April 30, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1963. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1963 in the amount of $80,000 for the Delaware River Basin Commission, and a proposed provision for the U.S. Study Commission—Texas (H. Doc. No. 398); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1964. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1965. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of management, utilization, and maintenance of selected land and buildings in the 1st and 12th Districts, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1966. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1967. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the withholding from the pay of civilian employees of the United States the dues for membership in certain employee organizations"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1968. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. **RUTHERFORD**: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 476. An act to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. **McMILLAN**: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1745. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, relating to the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. **COOLEY**: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 4083. A bill to reduce the frequency of reports required of the Veterans' Administration on the use of surplus dairy products; without amendment (Rept. No. 1630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. **COOLEY**: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 8434. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey a certain parcel of land to the city of Mount Shasta, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. **COOLEY**: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5546. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act, as amended, with respect to screenings of seed; without amendment (Rept. No. 1632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 10374. A bill to amend section 6 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, to reduce the revolving fund available for subscriptions to the capital stock of the banks for cooperatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11413. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 to permit the planting of additional nonsurplus crops on diverted acreage; without amendment (Rept. No. 1634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. House Resolution 595. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962; without amendment (Rept. No. 1635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5456. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owners thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 1627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 11464. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 11465. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11466. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 11467. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 11468. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 11469. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises (now exempt) engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing of clothing or fabrics which compete substantially in the same metropolitan area with similar enterprises not exempt and to lessen unfair competition; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 11470. A bill to provide for the transfer for urban renewal purposes of land purchased for a low-rent housing project in the city of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 11471. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 11472. A bill to provide for the conveyance under certain conditions of the phosphate rights in certain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 11473. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that any territory over which the United States has jurisdiction under a treaty shall be regarded as a separate quota area; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 11474. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 11475. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Louisiana among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIRNIE (by request):

H.R. 11476. A bill to amend the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, relating to labor organizations of employees of air carriers, in order to deny to certain labor organizations which do not make reasonable efforts to settle labor disputes the right to act as the representative of such employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 11477. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 11478. A bill to amend the act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 526), as amended, relating to the establishment of a register of names in the Department of Commerce of certain motor vehicle drivers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 11479. A bill to eliminate racial and religious discrimination in housing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11480. A bill to provide for suspension or revocation of the license of real estate brokers in the District of Columbia who engage in discriminatory practices on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry in the sale or leasing of housing; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 11481. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 11482. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 11483. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 11484. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.J. Res. 701. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the States exclusive control over public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 472. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the veterans' direct home loan program is not being administered consistently with the intent of the Congress expressed in the enactment of Public Law 87-84, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Res. 617. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the production, distribution, and exhibition of objectionable motion pictures and related advertising; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Res. 618. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on Predator Control; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H. Res. 619. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the production, distribution, and exhibition of objectionable motion pictures and related advertising; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Res. 620. Resolution providing for a salary increase for the superintendent of folding room, Office of Doorkeeper; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 11485. A bill for the relief of Terence Montague; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 11486. A bill for the relief of Dr. Servillano Y. Yumang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 11487. A bill for the relief of Anthony F. Bernardo and Ambrose A. Cerrito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 11488. A bill for the relief of Arthur Austin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 11489. A bill for the relief of Georgios Rousakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11490. A bill for the relief of Eftichios Protopapadakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 11491. A bill to provide that Capt. Rupert E. Stivers may be granted a commission in the Regular Army, without regard to the restrictions contained in section 3286 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

314. Mr. LANE presented a resolution adopted by the City Council, Lynn, Mass., in opposition to the bill that provides withholding tax on interest on savings bank accounts, dividends, stocks, U.S. Government bonds, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Statement on Patriot's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to comment upon Patriot's Day, the anniversary of the battle of Concord and Lexington; a day on which every American is entitled to feel a little better, and perhaps a little taller.

Patriot's Day—the 19th of April—commemorates a moment in history that has reverberated down the years to the present time. It was an occasion of great significance when, for the first time in modern history, a people rose in the name of democracy, to divest themselves of tyrannical rule.

As Emerson so clearly observed, the first patriot gun at Concord "fired the shot heard around the world." The sound was clearly heard in France where, 14 years later, the First French Republic was established, on the precedent set forth at Concord. It was also heard in Prussia, where republican patriots fought valiantly but in vain to overthrow the monarchy in 1848. It was also heard in Sicily, where Garibaldi led the democratic cause to victory, in 1860. By this time, practically all the South American nations had followed suit, to free themselves forever from the imperial will of Spain and Portugal.

In each case, the odds against the democratic cause were great. But the story of Concord and Lexington made clear the fact that the odds are merely a single factor, and not necessarily the deciding factor, in a situation involving the cause of human liberty.

In the spring of 1775, the British military force at Boston was regarded as sufficiently strong to overawe New England, the seat of revolutionary sentiment in America. But this was not the case, in fact. The British had the guns, the training, the military know-how and the better organization. But the American colonists had a cause, and there is nothing like a cause to strengthen the will of freedom-loving people.

Advised that the patriots of Massachusetts had assembled a quantity of military stores at Concord, British General Gage dispatched a force from Boston to sieze the stores in the name of the British crown. When the British left Boston, en route to Concord, the patriot Paul Revere set out ahead of them, to sound the alarm. Therefore, when the British arrived at Concord, the patriots were waiting for them, ready for battle.

In the fighting that ensued, at Concord and Lexington, the patriots gave way momentarily to the force of British arms. But when the British set off on their way back to Boston, the patriots pursued them, and, with dogged persistence, cut many of them down. All in all, the British loss, in killed, wounded and missing was 273 men, as opposed to the patriots' loss of 103.

The battle of Concord and Lexington aroused the people of the Colonies. Those in New England resolved to bottle up the British force at Boston, if that was possible, and those in the Middle and Southern Colonies rose to New England's defense. In consequence of this, the power of the royal governors began to fail, and by the end of summer, 1776, was virtually nonexistent.

The war that followed established the right of Americans to live according to their own beliefs, free from royal interference. The world took notice and the cause of freedom began to spread from land to land.

In recent years we have had the misfortune to witness a counterdevelopment, in the form of international communism, turning back the tide of democratic achievement in Europe and Asia. But this must surely pass. The spirit of Concord and Lexington is a genuine thing, free from the hypocrisy of Communist philosophy. It is the spirit of Concord and Lexington that ultimately shall triumph on a universal scale as it has already triumphed in America.

And when that day arrives, the world, as well as America, shall have cause to salute that little band of patriots, who beat the odds at Concord and Lexington. To them will go the praise of people in every land, for taking a stand in behalf of the greatest experience in human existence: the experience of freedom.

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Bureau of Land Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1962

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I wish to include the following statement by me on the 150th anniversary of the Bureau of Land Management:

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Next Wednesday, April 25, will mark the 150th anniversary of the Bureau of Land Management and its predecessor the General Land Office. Since the House will be in Easter recess next week, I want to take this opportunity to offer a few remarks concerning this significant anniversary.

Every State in the Union has shared in the disposition of these Federal public lands.

Every State has shared in the granting of well over 100 million acres of land for educational purposes. There is an agriculture college in each State as a result of the Land Grant College Act of 1862. A majority of the States have received elementary and secondary school grants. These alone have amounted to over 75 million acres. Today the school sections spread across the Nation are an important instrument in the education of our youth. The land grant colleges provide classroom instruction for 20 percent of our college graduates. American education has its roots in the land.

In excess of 140 million acres of the public domain were granted to the States and railroad corporations for the creation of a system of transportation for the Nation. Nearly every State in the Union has received grants for either canals, wagon roads, river improvements, or railroads. The public lands played a key role in the development of the finest internal transportation system in the world.

Perhaps one of the most laudatory aspects in the history of the disposition of the public lands was the Homestead Act. This act passed 100 years ago May 20, 1862, enabled 1.6 million Americans to claim over 270 million acres of land for a new home—for a new start. This, in my estimation, was and for that matter still is democracy in action.

I have a personal interest in this important anniversary, first as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of the Interior, and secondly because Ohio claims a number of firsts in the history of the public lands of America.

The first rectangular survey was made in the Seven Ranges region of Ohio. This system of survey has endured to this very day and is the basic system of surveying in this country.

The first sale of federally owned land was made in Ohio to an Ohioan.

The first patent was issued to a citizen of the State of Ohio.

The first Commissioner of the General Land Office, Edward Tiffin, was appointed to that position from the State of Ohio.

The first appropriation of public lands for internal improvements was made in the State of Ohio for the establishment of public roads.

The first grant of public lands for the construction of a canal was issued by the Federal Government to the States of Ohio and Indiana.

Perhaps the most important first was the fact that the State of Ohio was the first State created out of the public domain under the conditions established in the ordinances of 1785 and 1787.

Today the Bureau of Land Management is charged with the responsibility for the administration and management of 477 million acres of the remaining 770 million acres of federally owned land. The lands are being used for a multitude of worthwhile public purposes—grazing, recreation, forests, and conservation.

I want to join with other Members of Congress who will be extending anniversary best wishes to the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau, and employees of the Bureau of Land Management.

Comparison of MacGregor and King-Anderson Proposals for Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the following makes a clear comparison between provisions of the MacGregor medicare bill, H.R. 11066, and the King-Anderson bill, H.R. 4222.

	MacGregor bill		King-Anderson
Who is covered	Everyone who reaches age 65 who wishes health insurance		OASDI eligible persons age 65 and over, including employed aged; also includes railroad retirees; 13.75 million OASDI beneficiaries and 0.5 million railroad retirees.
How many	16.2 million (as of 1962)		14.25 million (as of 1963).
Benefits	Medical care insurance under a choice of policies, the minimum benefits of which are described as plans 1 and 2.		Hospitalization, nursing home and diagnostic care subject to deductible charges enumerated below.
	MacGregor plan 1 (payment of all charges is made by the insurance carrier)	MacGregor plan 2 (subject to a deductible feature with not to exceed 25 percent coinsurance)[1]	
Hospitalization	Hospital room and board up to $12 per day, and up to $1,080 in a calendar year; other hospital charges including charges for surgical or emergency outpatient treatment up to $120 in any calendar year.	Hospital room and board equal to charges for semiprivate accommodations; other hospital charges including charges for surgical or emergency outpatient treatment.	90 days per benefit period, with $10 per day deductible required for 1st 9 days, with a minimum deductible of $20.
Nursing homes	Convalescent hospital room and board up to $6 per day, and up to $186 in any 1 calendar year, following discharge from hospital.	Convalescent hospital room and board up to $6 per day, and up to $540 in any 1 calendar year, following discharge from hospital.	180 days per benefit period, or 2 days for each unused hospital day up to a total of 150 units of service.
Home health service	None	None	240 visits a year; 2⅔ visits for each unused hospital day; includes therapy and homemaker services; medical social work, etc.; no prior hospitalization required.
Nurses' fees	None	Up to $16 per day for registered nurse, and up to $480 in any 1 calendar year.	None.
Surgeons' and physicians' fees.	Surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a $300 maximum.	Surgical charges according to a fee schedule with a $300 maximum, and $5 per call for other than surgery or postoperative care.	None.
Diagnostic, laboratory, and X-ray services.	When hospitalized as above	Diagnostic X-rays and other diagnostic and laboratory tests; X-ray, radium, and radioactive isotope treatment.	Provides for necessary laboratory tests and X-rays in a hospital, either on inpatient or outpatient basis, but requires $20 deductible for each diagnostic study on an outpatient basis.
Drugs and related requirements.	Drugs used in hospitals	Charges for drugs and medicines which require a doctor's prescription; blood or blood plasma not donated or replaced; anesthetics and oxygen; rental of durable medical or surgical equipment such as hospital beds or wheelchairs.	Only drugs used in hospital.
Financing method	Through tax credits for individuals who pay their own premiums or are covered by insurance paid for by near relatives or former employers, and through issuance of "medical care insurance certificates" for all others.		Increases OASDI taxable wage base from $4,800 to $5,000 beginning with 1962; provides for rate increase beginning in 1963 of ½ of 1 percent of 1st $5,000 of employee wages; ⅜ of 1 percent of 1st $5,000 for self-employed.
Total costs (estimate)	Cost estimated to be comparable to other legislation, but difficult to predict because of lack of (a) precise information on amount of deductions now taken by or for individuals over 65 which would be an offset against cost of tax credit; (b) knowledge concerning probable degree of participation.		$1.1 billion, early year cost.

---

[1] Payment of benefits may be subject to either (1) a deductible of not more than $100 in a calendar year and a lifetime maximum of not less than $5,000; or (2) a deductible of not more than $200 in a calendar year and a lifetime maximum of not less than $10,000.

Bowl Down Cancer Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, beginning Sunday, April 22, and continuing for the rest of the week, more than 4,000 proprietors of bowling alleys throughout America who are members of the Bowling Proprietors' Association of America will stage a nationwide fundraising drive to help the American Cancer Society.

I believe that this worthy effort should be called to the attention of the American people.

As far as I know, this is the first nationwide fundraising and educational campaign ever conducted by an American industry in behalf of a major philanthropic cause.

The Bowling Proprietors' Association of America has been joined by the leading bowling equipment manufacturers, AMF Pinspotters, Inc., and the Brunswick Corp. to make this campaign a success.

While the main purpose of this nationwide activity is to raise funds for the American Cancer Society, of equal importance is the fact that arrangements have been made for elaborate displays in all of the participating bowling alleys to inform the public of effective ways to combat cancer.

It is estimated that during this Bowl Down Cancer Week, some 26 to 28 million of the Nation's bowlers in more than 3,000 counties will have had an opportunity to view this very important educational material on cancer and at the same time be given an opportunity to make a contribution to the American Cancer Society.

The Bowling Proprietors' Association of America has arranged a series of interesting contests during the week to stimulate an even greater interest in this anticancer campaign and I feel confident that a large segment of the American population will be better informed on this tragic disease by the time the nationwide effort is concluded on April 28.

This program has been endorsed by many outstanding Americans including Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg.

It has also been approved by the American Bowling Congress, the Women's International Bowling Congress, and the National Duckpin Bowling Congress.

It is my judgment that this very worthwhile project deserves the attention of all Americans. We have assurances from leading medical authorities that the oftentimes tragic results of cancer can be minimized and even avoided with early detection of this disease.

I believe that any industry which attempts to bring this message to millions of Americans, such as this project being sponsored by the Bowling Proprietors' Association of America, deserves the gratitude and appreciation of all Americans.

I wish to join in wishing this project great success on the eve of Bowl Down Cancer Week in America.

Results of a Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1962

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I recently conducted a poll among the residents of the 39th Congressional District of New York, seeking their views on some of the most important issues facing the Nation and the Congress. More than 6,700 persons responded to the questionnaire, and it is gratifying to have such an outstanding demonstration of interest and concern among the people of the area I am privileged to represent in the Congress.

The results were highly interesting and informative, and contained a number of surprises, also. So that all Members of Congress may have the benefit of this expression of views from the people, I list below the questions and the tabulation of replies:

	Percentages		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you favor Federal aid for education to—			
(a) construct public schools?	54.4	40.9	4.7
(b) pay teachers' salaries?	29.3	63.8	6.9
(c) support nonpublic schools?	21.0	74.6	4.4
2. Should Congress—			
(a) enact a new program of medical care for persons retired under social security, with an increase in social security taxes?	39.9	52.4	7.7
(b) expand the present voluntary Federal-State medical care program for persons over age 65?	52.6	32.0	15.4
3. Should Congress revise the dairy price support program to include Federal control of the amount of milk produced on each farm?	10.7	82.8	6.5
4. Do you favor amending the Federal tax laws to—			
(a) authorize withholding of taxes on interest and dividends?	28.2	63.2	8.6
(b) eliminate the present tax credit and exemption on dividends?	23.3	59.8	16.9
5. Should the House Un-American Activities Committee be abolished?	19.4	71.9	8.7
6. Do you favor increased spending for our space exploration programs?	59.4	35.2	5.4
7. Do you approve of Federal aid for construction of public fallout shelters in schools, hospitals, and other public centers?	38.7	58.3	3.0
8. Should Congress enact a new program for freer trade, by granting the President greater authority to reduce U.S. tariffs on foreign-made goods in return for tariff reductions by foreign nations on our products?	59.3	35.7	5.0
9. If the Soviet Union refuses to accept a controlled ban on nuclear testing, do you believe the United States should resume testing in the atmosphere to improve our nuclear military weapons?	82.3	14.5	3.2
10. In your opinion, have our foreign-aid programs of military and economic assistance strengthened our position and the free world?	53.7	37.2	9.1
11. Should the U.S. Government purchase $100,000,000 of United Nations bonds to finance United Nations special operations?	46.6	45.8	7.6
12. Should the Constitution be amended to revise our present electoral college system of electing our President and Vice President?	71.4	24.9	3.7

Tax Loopholes: Fact or Myth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1962

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in Look magazine, issue of March 13, 1962, there is a very fine article by Hon. ROBERT S. KERR, Senator from Oklahoma, under the title "Tax Loopholes: Fact or Myth?" Senator KERR is a ranking member of the Finance Committee, and one of the leading authorities in the Congress on tax matters. His article is very pertinent because H.R. 10650 is still pending before the Senate Finance Committee, and will probably be coming back to the House for a final vote.

I think that we could all benefit from reading Senator KERR's views. Accordingly, under unanimous consent, I incorporate this article in the RECORD. It will only take about two pages:

[From Look magazine, Mar. 13, 1962]

TAX LOOPHOLES: FACT OR MYTH?

(By Senator ROBERT S. KERR)

One of our most persistent national myths is that U.S. tax laws include provisions that favor small groups of people and permit them to escape paying their fair share of taxes. The statement is frequently made—by some professors, editors, economists, authors, radio and TV commentators and even a few politicians—that if Congress would close loopholes, substantial reduction in income taxes could be made. After serving on the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate for over 12 years, I have come to the conclusion that the word "loophole" is loosely used to apply to some provision of the Internal Revenue Code that some industry, group of persons or individual does not like, regardless of its merits.

The provisions that are called loopholes by the groups clamoring for their elimination are, in practically every instance, not loopholes at all, but protective provisions designed by the congressional committees, after hearings and deliberation, to eliminate hardships and remove inequities. The American people, when acquainted with the purpose and effect of these provisions, would not want them eliminated.

Any idea that some industry, individual or group of individuals is pulling the wool over the eyes of the legislators and their staff of experts is just plain nonsense. As with all human mechanisms, mistakes creep in at times, but they are spotted and corrected. Congress can and does act quickly when a correction in the code should be made, because shaping Federal tax legislation is a continuing process when Congress is in session.

Five of the more publicized so-called "loopholes" have come under frequent attack in recent years, and some 15 others are mentioned from time to time by critics of our tax laws. The five most controversial provisions of the tax code seem to be these:

Oil-depletion allowance: For 35 years, Congress has recognized the fact that, every time a barrel of oil is taken out of a well, the owner's property is being depleted. The oil well is worth less, just as a merchant's inventory is worth less as items that cannot be replaced are sold from it. God Almighty put the oil in the ground, and nobody else can ever replenish or restore it.

Before 1926, Government engineers tried to estimate the value of a new oil well within 30 days after it was discovered. Then the owner was permitted to take a yearly deduction based on a percentage of that estimate. This caused great uncertainty, because two engineers sometimes differed by as much as 400 percent in their estimates.

A new approach was worked out in 1926. Both houses of Congress felt that owners of oil wells should be allowed to deduct a percentage of their yearly gross income as a depletion allowance. The Senate proposed 30 percent, and the House, 25 percent, but they then compromised on 27½ percent of the yearly gross income, provided that it could never exceed one-half the net. Many times in the years since then, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, this oil-depletion-allowance provision has been attacked, studied and reconsidered. Each time, Congress has voted to keep the existing law.

This depletion allowance is more important today than it was in 1926. Without it, oil producers could not continue the extraordinarily expensive and risky search for new oil reserves. And U.S. oil reserves are already dangerously low. Eighty percent of the free world's known oil reserves is within relatively easy reach of Russian troops. Much of the balance is in foreign lands, where the future of American property rights is in grave jeopardy. Would any American who recognizes how vital oil is to defense want us to become totally dependent upon such areas?

I am sure that most adult Americans still remember the hardships resulting from nationwide gas rationing during World War II. Our domestic production was inadequate to provide the fuel needed to win the war without drastic curtailment of civilian consumption. Even in World War I, we were compelled to restrict civilian use of gasoline to enable us to furnish quantities required by the military forces. During that emergency, gasless Sundays were ordered by the Government.

We are now forced to go ever deeper in the search for oil. Last year in this country, oil producers drilled 78,560 feet, nearly 15 miles, for every million barrels added to reserves. Fifteen years ago, the same addition to reserves was obtained by drilling only 35,700 feet, or approximately 6 miles. In addition, drilling costs, material costs and other expenses of oil exploration have greatly increased since 1926.

Our legislative history shows that percentage depletion is the most effective and equitable method of providing a stimulant for investment in the discovery and production of oil and other minerals. In 1952, President Harry S. Truman's Materials Policy Commission recommended continuing the depletion allowance and also recommended some extension of this tax treatment to encourage the development of other minerals.

During the last presidential campaign, John F. Kennedy was asked about this alleged loophole. He said he would have an opinion when the subject was studied in the light of present conditions. It was a statesmanlike position for him to take, because depletion is so interwoven with future plans and policies of the National Security Council and the Department of Defense. Richard M. Nixon, who had served on the Council for almost 8 years, was opposed to any change.

The constructive positions of President Kennedy and Nixon contrast sharply with the loud voices of those who contend that the depletion provisions are a loophole. But then, there is usually some difference between those who have major national responsibility and those who have not given adequate study and thought to the program.

Company expenditures for goodwill: Our tax laws have long permitted companies to receive deductions for expenditures for goodwill. This is simply a recognition of an ordinary expense of doing business in a free-enterprise, competitive economy, in which goodwill is a legally recognized business asset. Businessmen use different methods to secure business. Congress will not, and the Internal Revenue Service should not, substitute its judgment for that of management. Our tax code allows deductions only for those goodwill expenditures that are necessary for the ordinary conduct of business.

Split-income provisions: Before the so-called split-income section was enacted in 1948, there were 12 States—commonly called community-property States—with constitutional or statutory provisions enabling husband and wife to consider their total earnings acquired during marriage as belonging half to the husband and half to the wife. The Supreme Court of the United States upheld the split-income procedures for these 12 States. This prompted a number of other States to amend their constitutions or laws to give their citizens the same privilege. Finally, in order to provide equal tax treatment. Congress very wisely permitted all married couples to split their income for income tax purposes. Repealing the provision would only cause all of the non-community-property States to take individual action to put us back to just where we are today.

Stock option provisions: These provisions enable a company to permit its managers to have an ownership interest in the company. Stock options help a company to attract better managers.

Henry Ford II, in an article cited in the July 1961 hearings of the Finance Committee, has ably presented the benefits of stock options. I quote from his article:

"I believe that stock options are very much in the public interest. If the detractors of monetary incentives had a sufficient appreciation of the importance of good, soundly motivated management to the real interests of all Americans, I am sure they would become as great supporters of the stock option and other incentive devices as they are now detractors. Unfortunately, many such critics are not well informed on the subject.

"They do not understand that:

"Stock options are in the public interest because they encourage good management.

"They encourage business executives to work in ways that are most efficient, most productive, most progressive—and thus contribute most to raising people's incomes and living standards * * *.

"Stock options, in short, foster both the most efficient use and the most economical allocation of one of our scarcest and most precious national resources—management. And today, more than ever, it is essential that we wisely and economically allocate that resource."

Dividend credit: This provision was enacted as a very limited start toward eliminating double taxation on corporate profits—once when the corporation pays a 52-percent rate on its earnings, and again when the individual pays income taxes on dividends received. The House Ways and Means Committee again refused to repeal this credit after a careful review a few months ago.

"Four of our tax provisions designed to help the aged, the handicapped, and working mothers are also attacked occasionally as loopholes. Opponents of the present provisions suggest these changes:

1. Eliminate the special deductions for persons 65 years old and for the blind.
2. Tax social security payments, gifts, and life insurance proceeds as income to recipients or beneficiaries.
3. Tax pension payments at ordinary income rates when pension funds are distributed in a lump sum to retired people.
4. Repeal the income tax deduction of up to $600 permitted to a working mother for child care.

These four changes would not plug up loopholes, but would instead eliminate limited benefits for those who are most in need of consideration under our tax code.

The extra $600 personal exemption for citizens over 65 and for the blind was Congress way of recognizing that the old are caught in the scissors grip of rising costs and reduced earning power and that the blind need help in covering the extra expenses resulting directly from their handicap.

A tax on social security payments would weaken this program, which is now recognized as a basic economic requirement by almost all Americans. To tax life insurance proceeds would defeat the purpose for which insurance was purchased in the first place—to provide for the survivors, usually a widow and children. And gifts have never been regarded as income since our first income tax law was passed.

Taxing pension funds would simply rob the aged of the money upon which their welfare depends. Congress has considered such a proposal many times in the past and has always rejected it.

The $600 child-care deduction for working mothers was proposed by Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH and me and was adopted by Congress in 1954. Its sole purpose is to aid families with limited income, in which the wife has to work to help maintain the home. The provision also applies to widows and widowers who need someone to care for their children while they are away at work. It saddens me to think that anyone could consider this humane measure a tax loophole.

Two tax amendments, often suggested, would seriously affect the millions of American families who are now buying homes.

One proposal is to prohibit the deduction of interest paid by an individual on a mortgage on his home. From as far back as the period of the Civil War (when the first income-tax act was passed), interest on mortgages has been considered a deductible expense.

A second and far more preposterous suggestion is that a homeowner be required to count as part of his income for tax purposes "a fair rental value of his home." For example, if the taxpayer's home could be rented to someone else for $150 a month, he would have to add $1,800 to his income for the year and pay a tax on it.

This tax would not be on income, since the taxpayer would not have realized any income. It would be a tax on capital, pure and simple, and there is no place in our income-tax system for such a proposal. I don't think either of these suggestions can be justified so long as it is the policy of the Federal Government to encourage private homeownership.

Farmers would be severely hurt by two other proposals. One would require the farm family to figure up the value of the products produced on the farm and consumed by the family and to pay a tax upon the total value. I am convinced that this would be both undesirable and unworkable. To tax the farmer or the gardener for producing food on his own land for his own consumption would be putting a penalty on thrift and diligence.

A TAX ON PROGRESS

A second suggestion that would harm our farmers is the proposal to levy a tax at ordinary income-tax rates when a taxpayer disposes of depreciated property, including dairy and breeding herds. This would discourage the purchase of new machinery and equipment by farmers and small businessmen and would keep farmers from upgrading their herds.

Investors are the targets of three other proposed changes in our tax code. These measures would:

Drastically increase the capital-gains rate above the present 25 percent limit.

This could help bring on a recession by discouraging investment—and our unemployment figure is much too high right now. An increase in the capital-gains rate would prevent the sale of property and stifle business expansion.

Eliminate the deduction for interest on State and municipal bonds.

If this were done, States and local subdivisions could no longer sell their bonds at a reasonable interest rate. Investors who depend upon income from bonds would be the first to suffer, but all taxpayers would soon be affected.

Tax all foreign income as it is earned by foreign subsidiaries, regardless of when it is paid to shareholders in the United States.

This would make it almost impossible for American enterprises to do business abroad. This proposal not only runs counter to our foreign economic policy, but would also establish a monstrous precedent. Although no stockholder in a company doing business at home pays any tax except on dividends as received, American shareholders in a foreign corporation would be required to pay a tax immediately upon income earned by the company, even though they had received no income whatever from it. Those earnings upon which stockholders were taxed would be still subject to the risks of the business and might never be paid out to them. We would have established a clear statutory precedent for ignoring corporate entities and taxing shareholders directly for the earnings of a business—rather than taxing the dividends they receive.

Here are some other proposals for Federal tax changes that seem to me indefensible:

Limit the amount of deductions for State and local taxes.

This would amount to double taxation of the same income. It would be grossly unfair to require taxpayers to pay a Federal income tax on money they no longer have, because they have already paid it out for State and local taxes. In some cases, the combined Federal-State-local tax bill under such a provision as this could add up to more than 100 percent of income.

Limit the deduction for a charitable contribution of property to the amount used as a tax basis for the property.

Under present law, when an individual donates to charity property that has increased in value, he is entitled to a charitable-contribution deduction based on the value of the property at the time of the gift. Under the proposed change, the deduction could not exceed the amount the individual originally paid for the property. Existing law is a great incentive for contributions that benefit churches, hospitals, colleges, and many other institutions. Congress has rejected this proposed change many times.

Tax as capital gains the increase in the value of property above original cost at the date of death.

Our estate-tax rates are already high, taking as much as 77 percent of the property left at the time of death. If we added a capital-gains tax to the estate tax, the total could exceed 100 percent, leaving nothing to pass to the heirs.

Repeal the marital deduction for estate and gift taxes.

Like the proposal to repeal the split-income provision, this would result in various taxpayers being treated differently by the Federal tax law, depending upon the State in which they live.

These are the major changes offered by those who are convinced that some groups are unduly favored in our present tax code. I think each of the present provisions serves a worthy purpose. They encourage homeownership, stimulate investment, promote development of our natural resources, remove inequities or benefit the aged or handicapped.

Our high income taxes today are not caused by the often-discussed but seldom-studied tax loopholes, but by the world situation. In many cases, if we followed the glib advice to close the loopholes, the effect on our tax revenue would be just the reverse of what people clamoring for these changes claim. I am sure the American people are far too alert to be deceived by such a mirage.

A Poll of the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1962

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I am today including the results of a poll sent to some 30,000 constituents in the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin. The number of responses in favor of each alternative is printed in parentheses after the percentage figure:

MY ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE—JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1962

Many important decisions must be made by President Kennedy and the 87th Congress in the months ahead. As in previous years, I am requesting your assistance in determining Second District attitudes on a number of the serious issues. Your replies to this annual questionnaire will help me to understand better the thinking of many of the more than 550,000 residents who make up Wisconsin's largest congressional district.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

In 1960 Congress passed the Kerr-Mills bill offering Federal grants to States that choose to participate in a program of general aid to the needy aged. Now, the administration, feeling this approach inadequate, has proposed a bill to provide health benefits to the aged through social security. Which of the following statements most nearly expresses your views?

No Government program to provide medical care for the aged is necessary—22.1 percent (705).

Social security is the best way to provide medical care for the aged—55.7 percent (1,777).

The existing Kerr-Mills approach is adequate and should be continued—22.2 percent (707).

DISARMAMENT

Which of the following statements comes closest to your own views of the disarmament problem?

We should persist in our efforts to reach an agreement for controlled disarmament with full inspection—68.6 percent (2,286).

Disarmament negotiations are futile since we can never trust the Russians to live up to an agreement—23.6 percent (786).

Even if no agreement can be reached, we should, unilaterally, begin limited disarmament to reverse the arms race—7.8 percent (261).

NEW DEPARTMENT

Should the Congress approve the President's proposal to create a Department of Urban Affairs? Yes, 46.7 percent (1,420); no, 54.3 percent (1,625).

CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The President's proposal for a Federal program to help communities provide fallout shelters has stimulated considerable discussion about the overall question of civil defense. How do you feel about civil defense? Check only one of the following:

I believe that civil defense should be strictly the individual's own responsibility—28.6 percent (908).

I favor the administration plan for a $750 million matching-fund fallout shelter program—20.5 percent (652).

I feel that civil defense offers no realistic solution in the thermonuclear age—39 percent (1,239).

I believe we must spend at least $150 billion to build deep bomb-blast shelters—2.2 percent (69).

Civil defense increases the likelihood of war and may turn us into a nation of groundhogs—4.7 percent (150).

I favor Congressman HOLIFIELD's recommendation that a $20 billion mass fallout shelter system be built—4.9 percent (157).

INCREASE IN POSTAL RATES

A new postal rates bill has passed the House of Representatives. This bill raises most postal rates, including the cost of first-class mail which will go from 4 cents to 5 cents. Do you approve this method of eliminating the Post Office Department's deficit? Yes, 54.4 percent (1,791); no, 45.6 percent (1,501).

NUCLEAR TESTING

Last fall Russia resumed testing of nuclear bombs with a series of tests in the atmosphere. Later, the United States resumed testing of nuclear bombs but all have been underground explosions. Do you think the United States should or should not resume tests in the atmosphere? We should, 64 percent, 2,030; we should not, 36 percent, 1,143.

TAX REFORM PROPOSALS

The House Ways and Means Committee is considering numerous proposals to overhaul the Federal tax program which could have a considerable impact on most Americans.

1. Would you approve of tightening the tax provisions dealing with expense account spending? Yes, 89.8 percent, 2,893; no, 11.2 percent, 329.

2. Would you favor giving the President temporary authority to cut taxes in a recession? Yes, 57.7 percent, 1,824; no, 42.3 percent, 1,339.

3. Do you feel the gas and oil industry should continue to receive its 27½-percent depletion allowance as a tax credit? Yes, 20.2 percent, 600; no, 79.8 percent, 2,370.

4. Would you approve the administration view that dividends and interest payments should be withheld at the source of payment? Yes, 50.9 percent, 1,535; no, 49.1 percent, 1,480.

THERMONUCLEAR WAR

United States-Russian tensions in general and the Berlin crisis in particular have made many Americans feel that an all-out war may be inevitable. Which of the following statements best reflects your views:

The probability is that we will have a thermonuclear war within the next 10 years—17.4 percent (516).

Thermonuclear war is extremely unlikely in the foreseeable future—79.7 percent (2,360).

The probability is that we will have a thermonuclear war in the very near future—2.9 percent (86).

ASSISTANCE TO DISPLACED WORKERS

1. Do you believe there should be a Federal program to help retrain, relocate and resettle workers who lose their jobs either because of automation or foreign imports? Yes 60.6 percent (1,949); No 39.4 percent (1,267).

FOREIGN TRADE

The President has proposed that he be given authority to bargain broadly with our tariffs in exchange for tariff reductions abroad. One reason given is that the European Common Market is presenting the United States with the possibility that a huge area of the world's trade market may be cut off by higher tariffs. Which of the following statements best reflects your opinion:

The existing Reciprocal Trades Agreement Act is adequate; it should be continued without change—14.3 percent (442).

The President's request for greater authority to negotiate import and export tariffs should be granted—65 percent (2,002).

U.S. tariffs should be totally eliminated in accord with a policy of free trade—9.8 percent (303).

U.S. tariffs should be increased as much as necessary to keep out foreign-made goods—10.9 percent (335).

THE U.N.—TIME FOR DECISION

The President has strongly urged that the United States support the United Nations by purchasing $100 million in bonds. Do you support the President's proposal? Yes 57.7 percent (1,851); No 42.3 percent (1,356).

SPEECHES BY MILITARY

Do you believe that military officers should have speeches checked in advance to see that they do not run counter to national policy? Yes 67.4 percent (2,146); No 32.6 percent (1,040).

A QUESTION FOR DAIRY FARMERS

1. In general, do you approve of the present milk price support program? Yes 38.5 percent (636); No 61.5 percent (1,018).

2. If faced with this alternative: would you rather have milk supported at 75 percent of parity or would you rather participate in a supply management program involving production quotas? Lower supports 50.7 percent (765); production quotas 49.3 percent (744).

Independence Day of Sierra Leone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, we take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to the Prime Minister of Sierra Leone, Sir Milton A. S. Margai; and Sierra Leone's Ambassador to the United States, Dr. R. E. Kelfa-Caulker, on the occasion of the first anniversary of Sierra Leone's independence.

April 27 of 1961 marked the birth of a new independent nation in west Africa. On that day Britain's most ancient and most loyal—and also potentially richest—west African colony attained its independence. This act was brought about by the mutual consent of the British Government and the representatives of the people of Sierra Leone. Soon after the formal ceremonies, witnessed by joyous and jubilant people at the capital city, Freetown, the house of representatives of the colony became the Parliament of independent Sierra Leone. A new Government was instituted under the premiership of able and experienced Sir Milton Margai, and on September 28 Sierra Leone was admitted into the United Nations by the unanimous vote of the U.N. Assembly, thus becoming the 100th sovereign and independent member of that organization.

Sierra Leone is a small strip of land on west Africa's Atlantic coast, with an area of about 28,000 square miles and its inhabitants number about 2,500,000. The country is sandwiched between Liberia on its south and the Republic of Guinea on its north and northwest. Since 1787 its inhabitants had enjoyed British protectorate. The British had of course profited immensely by the wealth of this colony, and it is also fair to say that the people of Sierra Leone have benefited by the orderly and efficient government instituted there by the British. It is true that Sierra Leone's wealth in diamonds, copper, and iron had enriched many individual Britons, yet the natives had also shared, in one way or another, in the prosperity of the country. What is perhaps more important, native leaders were educated and trained in British institutions of learning, and today many of these extraordinarily able, gifted, intelligent, and public-spirited leaders are in charge of Sierra Leone's destiny. It is to the credit of Premier Sir Milton Margai and his able associates that the shift from the status of colony to independence took place in a most harmonious spirit. He has retained Sierra Leone's place in the family of British Commonwealth, has successfully strengthened democratic institutions in the country, and has maintained cordial relations with all other sovereign states.

On the first anniversary of her independence day Sierra Leone has become a model state in west Africa, sovereign and independent, democratic and prosperous. Just as the people of Sierra Leone were fortunate in the type of British Government under which they lived in the past, so today they are even more fortunate in their wise and statesmanlike leadership in the person of Prime Minister Sir Milton Margai and his associates. I greet the citizens of Sierra Leone on this historic anniversary, on their first independence day.

Legislative Report to the People of the First Congressional District of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1962

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the people of my district my votes and actions during the first part of the 2d session of the 87th Congress. Although I have tried to fulfill my responsibilities to the best of my ability, I know that my work and votes will not satisfy everyone. Nevertheless, I believe that the people of the First Congressional District have the right to receive a full accounting of my position and efforts on issues which are of importance to them, and to our entire Nation.

The Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am the ranking member, has been one of the busiest committees of the House this year. In my own subcommittee we have drafted legislation improving the National School Lunch Act. We have been considering my own bill offering a new approach to Federal aid to education, as well as numerous bills creating a Federal Commission on the Aged and Aging as recommended by the White House Conference on Aged and Aging.

The full committee, in addition to the School Lunch Act amendment, has considered and approved the Adult Basic Education Act of 1962; the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1962, a measure authorizing a Youth Conservation Corps; two bills making needed changes in the Davis-Bacon and the so-called eight-hour laws; and the Equal Employment Opportunities Act.

Three important bills enacted by the House were measures from the Committee on Education and Labor. They were the Manpower Retraining Act and amendments to the Pension and Welfare Disclosure Act, both of which have been signed into law. The House also approved a bill authorizing financial assistance to colleges and universities for construction of academic facilities. This bill awaits final action by House and Senate conferees.

The House has passed several major appropriation bills in this session. One of the bills, providing money for the year that will begin on July 1 for the Treasury, the Post Office, and the Executive Office also has passed the Senate.

The House has made some wise reductions in the appropriations bills, achieving savings that will benefit taxpayers next year and in subsequent years. The Treasury and Post Office appropriations were reduced by $113.7 million below the budget estimates. Reductions in Treasury appropriations totaled $53.5 million. They were made for the purpose of compelling the Department to prepare acceptable and thorough plans for replacing Coast Guard vessels and shore installations, and to appraise more carefully the Internal Revenue Service's increases in personnel and their promotion, travel and the equipment improvement program. Post Office appropriations requested in the budget were based on too high an estimate of increase in mail volume, as in past years, and on excessive requests for additional facilities and equipment. The Congress made adequate provision for the work of the Post Office, while reducing spending authority by $60 million.

These reductions will remove an obstacle to providing the well-deserved raise in pay for postal workers that is proposed in my bill to be made effective in the current 1962 fiscal year. I want to emphasize again that the postal worker's pay is still 23 percent short of the pre-World War II purchasing power.

The House has passed an appropriations act for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, which reduced appropriations $114 million below the budget estimates. The principal reduction within the Department of Labor was made because of an inflexible limitation in the basic legislation providing for training under the area redevelopment program. However, the reduction will not affect the program. The reduction below the budget estimates for HEW is the net result of a number of increases, and of reductions in public assistance grants for which no authorization exists, and reimbursement for military service credits. The most significant feature of our action on this bill is the increase above budget estimates for hospital construction, research in cancer, heart diseases, mental health, neurology and blindness, arthritis and so on. The Department is urged to bring in more adequate programs for retarded children, library services grants, vocational rehabilitation, water quality standards, occupational health of miners and others, water pollution control, and other programs.

In the Department of Interior appropriation bill we made reductions of $62 million below the budget. The emphasis in this bill is on making more effective use of personnel. Substantial reductions also were made where excessive emphasis had been placed on Civil War areas. The Bureau of Mines has been directed to reprogram its research in order to undertake short run projects that have great promise for the coal industry.

The legislative appropriations bill reduced library and various other appropriations in a total of more than one-third of a million.

The second supplemental appropriations bill for 1962 was recently passed. The largest reduction in this bill was of the funds for NASA construction, because authorization had not been enacted into law.

National defense appropriations were enacted by the House on April 18, by unanimous vote. The bill provides $47.9 billion to accelerate the buildup of strength to deter aggression, and responds to intensified threats against our security. The House provides more money for the Air Force in this bill than was requested in the budget. Compared with 1962 fiscal year, the appropriations for 1963 are increased most substantially for research and development. During debate on this bill, I obtained from the subcommittee chairman a clarification of the bill, to the effect that no limitation is applied to overhead costs of research work performed under contract by colleges. The bill limits overhead on research grants to colleges; these total a much smaller amount than the contracts.

I supported the tax bill which passed the House on March 29. The bill provides new inducements to invest in productive equipment, to encourage economic expansion throughout the Nation. It shifts some of the load of supporting the Government to many persons who have failed to report and pay tax on interest and dividends. Collection of tax on these incomes by withholding—as on wages and salaries—will bring additional revenue of $630 million, several times as much as the additional public health programs which the House provided. During debate on the bill I obtained from the chairman of Ways and Means a statement that this provision would not involve hardships for retired persons. They could obtain within 3 weeks refunds of taxes withheld for which they were not liable. The tax bill makes the Federal income tax more equitable in many other ways, such as making expense accounts deductible only if directly related to the trade or business, narrowing the opportunity of U.S. owned businesses abroad to accumulate income free of tax, and preventing tax advantages from sale of property—except buildings—on which excess depreciation has reduced past tax bills.

As you are aware, one of the most crucial issues before the Congress this year is that of our foreign trade policy. The administration has proposed a sweeping program designed to expand our foreign trade; this is to be accomplished largely by granting the President considerably expanded powers to reduce tariffs and other trade restrictions. While I have always recognized the importance of trade with other nations, I am firmly convinced that the administration bill (H.R. 9900) does not provide adequate safeguards for American industries and American workmen. As I stated to the House Committee on Ways and Means on March 27 of this year in testifying on this bill:

> I do not oppose the idea of reciprocal trade agreements. What I do ask is that greater safeguards be thrown around basic American industries to assure a fair profit return on investments in our industries and to protect the jobs of working men and women in these United States, and particularly in my State of West Virginia.

While this bill does, I admit, contain extensive provisions to assist industries, plants, and workingmen who are seriously hurt by any increases in imports resulting from trade concessions we might make, its philosophy is basically wrong. It calls for eliminating such safeguards as the peril point and escape clause provisions that are part of the present reciprocal trade agreements program, both of which can do much to prevent injury from becoming too serious or which can result in protective measures being taken before injury becomes excessive. The President's program involves assistance only after the injury has taken place.

Specifically I believe the President's trade bill should be modified in at least the following ways. The bill should extend our Trade Agreements Act by not more than 3 years (instead of the 5 proposed by the administration). Pretrade agreement hearings should be held to preserve the proper caution in negotiations; the Tariff Commission should be able to lay down guidelines for the State Department. The requested authority to cut tariffs by as much as 50 percent should be restricted to a much smaller percentage. Above all we should retain and strengthen the escape clause. It is in my judgment far better to remedy injury in this fashion than to add to our redevelopment burdens here at home.

In conclusion, I should like to remind you that the Congress is about to start its traditional Easter recess. That will give me the opportunity to spend some time in my own district and to see many of you. Such a period is both useful and enjoyable for me. There is nothing like a visit back home to see many of the issues confronting us in Washington in a sounder and more realistic perspective.

I extend my cordial greetings to you in this joyous Easter season.

Congressman Fulton Records Position on Legislative Bills and Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1962

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 5, 1962, and Tuesday, February 20, 1962, I was out of the city on necessary committee work and official congressional duties. Therefore, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my position on certain bills.

On Monday, February 5, 1962, I would have voted "nay" on the motion to suspend rules and pass on S. 383. Likewise on Tuesday, February 20, 1962, I would have voted "nay" on agreeing to House Resolution 549, providing for the consideration of H.R. 10050, and "nay" on the passage of H.R. 10050.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 23, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. James O. Duncan, editor, the Capital Baptist, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

In a world in which every day brings forth its change and challenge, help us to remember, O God, that Thou art forever the same and that Thou hast not changed.

Thou who didst travel with Thy servant, Abraham, to the top of Mount Moriah, with Moses across the Red Sea, with Thy Son to Calvary, give to us the assurance that Thou dost journey with us through our life.

Even as Thou art not limited to time and space, so Thou art not limited in Thy wisdom; so we pray, O God, that Thou wilt give us wisdom, that we may discern the great issues of life; and courage, that we may accept the challenges which this changing world forces upon us.

In Jesus' name, we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 19, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar was dispensed with.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the executive calendar will be stated.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dr. Emanuel R. Piore, of New York, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1966.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination has been confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF D.C. TRANSIT SYSTEM, INC.

A letter from the president, D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that system, for the year ended December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUTHORIZATION FOR GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR TO ACCEPT AND WEAR A CERTAIN DECORATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to accept and wear the Grand Cordon of the Order of the Rising Sun with Paulownia Flowers which has been tendered him by His Majesty, the Emperor of Japan (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the acquisition of certain property in the District of Columbia and its conveyance to the International Monetary Fund, on a full reimbursement basis, for use in expansion of its headquarters (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other designated officials (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1962

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expansion of services and facilities provided under such programs, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF DIVISION OF COAL-MINE INSPECTION, BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Division of Coal Mine Inspection, Bureau of Mines, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the **PRESIDENT** pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS CONCERNING THE REPAYMENT PROVISIONS OF THE TEMPORARY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1958

"Whereas, as a result of the national economic recession in the United States in 1958, Congress passed the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 extending benefits to individuals who had exhausted their regular unemployment benefits; and

"Whereas Rhode Island together with 16 other States which had entered into agreements with the Federal Government paid extended benefits under the said program, the repayment of which our employment security fund or the employers in the State can ill afford; and

"Whereas the Congress has recognized by the adoption of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961 that the matter of extended unemployment requiring extended benefits to individuals unemployed for a long period of time is a national problem and not one to be financed by individual States; and

"Whereas the situation in 1958 was exactly comparable with that existing in 1961, when Congress provided for the financing of the program by a tax on all employers under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act of 1961: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, earnestly requested to use their best efforts to obtain passage of legislation in the said Congress which would either forgive repayment of funds made available during the 1958 program or provide for reimbursement by a uniform tax on all employers in all jurisdictions; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to enact legislation which would carry out the purposes of this resolution."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works.

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution relative to Federal aid for State Highway Route 115

"Whereas State Highway Route 115, from San Jose, in Santa Clara County, to Patterson, in Stanislaus County, via the vicinity of Mount Hamilton, is the only east-west connection between the San Joaquin Valley and the seacoast between the Altamont and Pacheco Pass, a distance of over 50 miles; and

"Whereas this route, although a part of the State highway system, has not been accepted for maintenance by the California Department of Public Works, and is presently maintained by both Santa Clara and Stanislaus Counties; and

"Whereas this route would be of inestimable value as an avenue of escape should there be a need for dispersal of the citizens concentrated on the heavily populated peninsula below San Francisco in the case of an atomic attack or other disaster; and

"Whereas the highway is now designated as the only escape route directly eastward from San Jose in the civil defense operations plan of the State of California; and

"Whereas in addition to its national defense benefits, if improved, the highways could be of great economic and recreational benefit to the coast counties and the northern part of the San Joaquin Valley, in particular, and to the nation generally; and

"Whereas because of the heavy commitments of the State of California in its construction and maintenance of highways, money is not available to substantially improve or reroute this highway in order to provide an adequate connection between the coast counties and the San Joaquin Valley for the smooth flow of traffic in case of enemy attack or natural disaster: Now therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the President and Congress of the United States are respectfully memorialized to provide Federal funds for the highway between San Jose and Patterson; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative of the State of California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police, at Lakewood, N.J., relating to alleged police brutality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **KEFAUVER** (for himself and Mr. GORE):

S. 3206. A bill to authorize and direct the Atomic Energy Commission to convey to the city of Oak Ridge certain real estate for the establishment of a public park at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—THE CONGRESSIONAL "JUNK MAIL" AMENDMENT

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to the Legislative Appropriation Act, H.R. 11151, which was passed by the House of Representatives on April 11, 1962.

The purpose of the amendment is to put a stop to the use of congressional junk mail, to which I have referred earlier as an unconscionable abuse of the franking privilege.

This amendment is virtually identical to one offered in the House of Representatives on April 11, 1962, at which time it was offered as part of a recommittal motion, and was defeated by the narrow margin of 192 to 197.

Under the terms of this amendment, Members of Congress would be required to put names and addresses on mail which they send out under the frank. The amendment is intended to prevent the abuse of the frank, and at the same time to remove the very justified criticism of the Congress for using the franking privilege to flood the mails with political propaganda.

I believe the vast majority of the Members of the Senate support this amendment; and judging from the extremely narrow margin by which the recommittal motion containing this amendment was defeated in the House of Representatives 2 weeks ago, there is considerable sentiment there in favor of such an amendment.

At a time when the Congress is working on legislation which will raise the postal rates for virtually every private citizen in this country, the Congress should be more than willing to put a stop to an abuse of the mails which it has extended to itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

> On page 26, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:
>
> "SEC. 105. No part of any amount appropriated in this Act shall be available to finance, under authority of section 4167(a) of title 39, United States Code, the mailing and delivering of mail matter sent through the mails with a simplified form of address under the franking privilege by any Member or Member-elect of Congress to postal patrons, including those patrons on rural or star routes."

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from a recent address by himself, delivered over Wisconsin radio stations, on the subject of "Outlook for Dairying."

Address delivered by him before the B'nai B'rith in Milwaukee, Wis., at the celebration of its 100th anniversary.

Excerpts from recent radio address by himself over Wisconsin radio and television stations, regarding the preservation of Wisconsin's moraines.

THE PRESIDENT'S ACTION IN REGARD TO THE PRICE INCREASE FOR STEEL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, since the President's action in regard to the price increase for steel, I have received from Kansas citizens many letters expressing concern and opposition to the action taken.

The following paragraph from one of the letters is typical of the views expressed in the letters I received:

> I am not in a position to be sure whether or not the 3½-percent price increase which the industry felt it needed was in reality necessary, nor do I care. The important thing is that the President of the United States has, by himself, without regard for the Constitution or tradition, set the price of steel at a figure which suits him.

The action taken by the President relative to the increased price of steel will not be conducive to increased confidence on the part of business and industry, which is so vital for expanded growth in our Nation's economy.

The President had a right to be concerned, both with the direct effect of the rise on the price level generally, and with its indirect impact on his drive to achieve a stable balance of prices and wages. However, that did not justify the massive punitive expedition by Federal forces toward industry in general, and toward the steel industry in particular.

Our Nation needs to encourage private industry, not threaten it with punitive action.

The staff of radio station KFH, of Wichita, Kans., wrote and broadcast an editorial on the steel situation. It is an excellent statement in regard to the situation and the powers of the President. I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL SITUATION

> The American system of free, private enterprise, took one of the most serious beatings of its history Friday, April 13. One of the giant corporations of American industry, United States Steel Corp., bowed down before the awesome might of an all-powerful Federal Government. Roger Blough, United States Steel board chairman, announced his company would not increase the price of steel. This announcement came after a day of much activity in Washington. KFH does not propose to discuss the merits of a steel increase. Whether the increase was justified is not the point. What's more important is that the Federal Government, at the urging of President Kennedy, proved that free competitive business continues to operate only at the pleasure of the bureaucracy in Washington. What did the Kennedy administration do to bring about this defeat of a giant?
>
> First, the power and prestige of the Presidency was directed vehemently, against the individuals who compose the leadership of the steel industry. The denunciation by Kennedy was one of the most violent ever leveled by a President. The Justice Department moved immediately to bring United States Steel and other corporations into the grand jury room, where neither press nor public is allowed. And then came the crowning blow. The Defense Department directed its contractors not to purchase steel from any of the seven steel companies who had raised prices. No company can survive when the Federal Government orders other companies not to buy their products. This perhaps sets a precedent of the most dangerous sort. The Kennedy administration successfully proved that the power of the Presidency and the entire Federal system can bring economical pressures upon private industry and individuals.
>
> We seriously question the wisdom or for that matter the constitutionality of the methods used to bring about that solution. The auto industry could be next, then the maritime industry, then the farmers and so on until every form of private enterprise is directly controlled in management affairs by the Government in Washington. In an era where more and more industry is coming under increasing Federal regulation, KFH asks this question of every serious thinking American: "Where will it end?" If an industrial giant such as United States Steel can be so quickly brought to its knees, cannot lesser industries suffer the same fate? What has happened to the free enterprise system that made this Nation the greatest industrial, political, and military power on the face of the earth? Where is the philosophy of the Founding Fathers that government is best which governs least?
>
> Perhaps the public interest was served in this instance, but at what a price.

THE LITERACY TEST BILL

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the so-called literacy test bill, which is scheduled to come before the Senate this week, is very loosely referred to as civil rights legislation. But I submit that such a title for the literacy test bill is just a catch phrase which is quite misleading. It is certainly a misnomer, because, in fact, the real question involved is one of constitutional principle.

The fact is that Congress does not have the power to enact legislation of this type.

As I pointed out in testimony before the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee last week, and repeat here, the language of the Constitution itself plainly prohibits congressional action in the field of voter qualifications. The question of what qualifications an elector shall have is one strictly reserved to the several States, and does not fall within the purview of the Federal Government and the Congress.

Every student of constitutional law in the Senate, I believe, should recognize this fact at once, and therefore recognize the unconstitutionality of this proposal; but no doubt the matter will be discussed at great length, and what the real purpose of the proposed legislation is, and what its enactment would mean to our Constitution. This will certainly be my purpose, as it will be the purpose of those who will speak in opposition to the measure.

I feel that should a measure of this kind actually be adopted by the Congress, and should it be sustained by the courts—which I do not believe will happen—it will mean, in effect, that our written Constitution is gone.

PAN AMERICAN DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently there appeared an editorial in the New York Times entitled "Pan American Day." The editorial recalls to our minds some of the problems that we and that the Latin American nations themselves face in Latin America. I read one paragraph of the editorial:

> To blame the ferment and distress in Latin America merely on communism is dangerous nonsense. Communism is a result, not a cause; it acts to take advantage of an existing situation. Except in Cuba it has little actual strength in Latin America, but it is a troublemaker and a potential threat of formidable proportions.

This particular editorial points up the necessity for a long-range program of social reform, land reform, housing, and education, in order to provide the answers to some of the pressing problems of Latin America and to the Communist threat.

I hope all Americans will read the editorial and give it serious thought, because there is no area of the world that is more meaningful to the United States and our relationships with the rest of the world than that of our friends in the Western Hemisphere. I think our foreign policy may be judged on how well we do in cooperation with our friends of the Western Hemisphere to build a domestic and free society.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAN AMERICAN DAY

Each year since 1890 on this day the United States and the Latin-American nations have celebrated their desire and need for unity and have taken stock of hemispheric affairs. In 1962 the hemisphere is not united, economies are shaky and the political atmosphere is stormy.

Taken as a whole, Latin America is an underdeveloped area belonging to that great majority of poor nations to which most of Africa, the Middle East, south and southeast Asia in the non-Communist world also belong. Economists have for years been pointing to the grim fact that the inequalities between the relatively few rich nations and the many poor nations have been growing. Historians tell us that we live in the most revolutionary age known to man. Sociologists add the fact that the masses in the poor nations for the first time in history realize that poverty, ignorance, and disease are not foreordained or necessary and they are demanding social justice with an insistence and impatience that cannot be denied.

To blame the ferment and distress in Latin America merely on communism is dangerous nonsense. Communism is a result, not a cause; it acts to take advantage of an existing situation. Except in Cuba it has little actual strength in Latin America, but it is a trouble maker and a potential threat of formidable proportions.

The assumption of power by the military in Argentina a few weeks ago had nothing to do with communism. The critical situations in Ecuador, Brazil, Venezuela, Bolivia, Guatemala, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic are not the result of communism. They are caused by social imbalances, land hunger, the pressure of the fastest rate of population growth in the world, inflation, unemployment, low commodity prices, illiteracy, ill health. The lure of the Cuban revolution and its leader, Fidel Castro, is still great despite the economic collapse on the island and the general aversion to its Marxism-Leninism.

On this April 14 only a Pollyanna could be cheerful about Latin America. But only a fool or a weakling would despair. The natural wealth of the region, the vitality and intelligence of its people, the heritage of a civilization which is the same as ours, the reaching out for a better life with freedom, the rising middle class, the growing industrialization—these are all positive factors.

As Raul Prebisch, the Argentine economist who has headed the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America, said a few days ago at the John Hopkins University, the ideas of the Alliance for Progress were first formulated in Latin America and the plan is "a clear response to an insistent Latin American challenge." A long-range program of social reform, land reform, housing and education will provide the answers to the pressing problems of Latin America and to the Communist threat.

THE ARREST OF JAPANESE FISHERMEN IN ALASKAN WATERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week, I took the floor to express my emphatic approval of the action of Governor Egan in causing the seizure of Japanese vessels that were illegally fishing in Shelikof Strait. The burden of my remarks, and the necessity for Governor Egan's action, were based on the complete inaction of the State Department, despite Governor Egan's appeals. I also pointed out that I had had a similar experience of lack of action at an earlier time, when Russian vessels were found to be nearing Alaskan waters and a telegraphic request had been made by the Governor that the State Department alert the Navy and the Coast Guard to observe them. This request was ignored—although not deliberately but through inadvertence.

Among my reasons for airing this subject on the floor were misinformed and erroneous conclusions in an editorial in the Washington Post of Wednesday, April 18. Governor Egan has himself replied to this editorial, and his letter, printed in the Washington Post of Saturday, April 21, speaks for itself.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Egan's statement of his position, as well as a letter from my colleague, Senator BARTLETT, which followed Governor Egan's letter, be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN INTERNATIONAL INCIDENT

I have just read the editorial (April 18) "Alaska on Its Own" and am compelled to provide you with the information your editorialist either lacked or ignored. Particularly am I concerned over the implication that Alaska—or more specifically, I, as its Governor—acted precipitately and without due regard for the international complications involved.

The facts are clearly to the contrary. On March 30, after learning that the Japanese fleet was in Shelikof Strait, I sent a letter to Under Secretary of State George Ball explaining to him the seriousness of this intrusion and asking for State Department advice.

On April 2 I cabled Secretary Ball stressing again the urgency of the matter and advising him that the State sought guidance in the handling of a potentially explosive situation. On April 9, after failing to receive even an acknowledgment from Washington, I personally called Secretary Ball and impressed upon him the need for prompt and decisive action. He advised me that he had seen neither my cable nor my letter, but that he would look into the matter immediately.

On April 10 I received a call from Mr. Chayes of the State Department. I advised Mr. Chayes that Alaska fishing regulations were being violated daily, and the State had no choice but to act to enforce the fisheries laws in the coastal waters of Alaska. I impressed upon Mr. Chayes the immediate need to send a representative to Alaska to confer with us on the matter.

On April 12 Raymond Yingling arrived in Juneau. He emphasized that he was not authorized to state policy for the Federal Government, but that he had, in essence, come on a factfinding mission.

After Alaska's attorney general and I thoroughly discussed the entire question with him, Mr. Yingling advised that a matter of weeks would be needed for the State Department to come to a decision. I emphasized that in a matter of weeks American salmon fishermen would be in Shelikof Strait, compounding what already had become a dangerous situation. I told him that we could not possibly wait any longer and that in the absence of Federal direction I was compelled to act.

On April 13 I clearly indicated to him that the State would act on the following day. On the evening of April 14 and on the following day, agents of the State, at my direction, arrested the captains of two Japanese catcher boats and the captain of the mother ship, *Banshu Maru*.

While the Japanese fleet came to Shelikof Strait to fish for herring, it was clear to me from the beginning—and has since been verified by accounts published in Japanese newspapers—that the primary aim of the Japanese was to establish rights in these waters.

In view of this chronology, it should be clear to all that contrary to your suggestion that "Alaska apparently needs to be reminded that Alaska joined the Union and did not become an independent nation," the more proper suggestion would have been to say, "The State Department needs to be reminded that Alaska is now a State of the Union." That the Governor of a State who asks the Department of State for advice in handling an extremely delicate incident involving a friendly power cannot receive prompt consideration is incredible.

In this case, more than 10 days elapsed before we received any recognition, and then only after a personal telephone call which I placed to Under Secretary Ball and not because of any initiative by the State Department in response to earlier urgent requests.

It was our belief and our hope that the State Department, upon hearing of this situation, would immediately request the Japanese Government to withdraw the ships from Alaskan waters until some determination of rights was made. If this had been done, an unfortunate international incident could have been prevented.

It is true that the State Department has not yet issued an authoritative statement upholding the position of the State of Alaska concerning the waters of Shelikof Strait. However, in view of past action by Federal agencies in regulating fisheries in these waters down through the years as well as the present critical condition of U.S. coastal fisheries it is inconceivable that the United States would abandon its historical rights to these valuable waters.

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor of Alaska.

JUNEAU, ALASKA.

Gov. William A. Egan, of Alaska, had no need of your editorial reminder that in joining the Union of States Alaska "did not become an independent nation." He is fully aware of that.

It is a fact that in the days when Alaska was a territory, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service did exercise fishery management over these very waters. One Japanese boat was taken within the 3-mile limit and as to that vessel there can be no possibility of denying the State's right to act.

Governor Egan felt himself bound by an opinion of the State attorney general, written in 1959, that these very waters were in fact under State jurisdiction.

Governor Egan felt himself under a compulsion to act at once. He felt compelled to do so not only in protection of the Alaska fishing industry but in protection of American fishing rights.

It is my conviction that had Governor Egan failed to do this, he would have done a disservice not only to Alaskans but to the entire country. The record shows clearly that Governor Egan sought to handle this grave and vexing problem with "delicacy" and moved unilaterally only after endless frustrations and delays.

E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senator From Alaska.
WASHINGTON.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I likewise ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press dispatch from Kodiak, dated April 19, reporting on the progress of the court action against these Japanese fishermen, be included following these other insertions.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1962]

JAPANESE CAPTAINS POST BAIL IN ALASKA

KODIAK, ALASKA, April 19.—Three Japanese fishing captains were freed today on the condition that their fleet leave Shelikof Strait within 5 days.

Under the agreement, concluded this morning before Superior Court Judge James Fitzgerald in Anchorage, the boats and crews, held in Kodiak Harbor, also were released.

The captains were arrested last weekend and charged with violating Alaska State fishing regulations. The Japanese, fishing for herring, contend the waters of the strait between Kodiak Island and the Alaska Peninsula are international.

A trial is to be held in Anchorage at a date to be set.

The agreement between the State of Alaska and the Eastern Pacific Fisheries Co., Japanese owners of the craft, in no way settled the dispute over the right to fish in the waters of Shelikof Strait.

The agreement stated that "neither party shall waive, surrender or abrogate any rights, historical or otherwise, that they may have had or claim or which may be in existence at the time of the seizure."

However, the company agreed to cease fishing in the disputed area until a final decision is reached.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order that the Members of the Senate and other interested parties may be advised of public building projects approved by the Committee on Public Works, under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on this matter.

The first is a list of 31 new buildings approved by the committee on April 16, 1962.

The second list is 76 projects for modification, alterations, and repairs to existing buildings approved on the same date.

Approval of these buildings is based on prospectuses submitted to the committee by the Administrator of General Services, in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 249, 86th Congress. The committee also held a public hearing at which representatives of GSA appeared, and discussed the public building program, its operation, and the need for the recommended new buildings and alterations to existing buildings.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

New buildings

Location:	*Estimated cost*
Arizona: Tucson, border patrol headquarters	$423,000
Arkansas: Pine Bluff, post office and courthouse	2,903,000
California:	
Fresno, courthouse and Federal office building	6,802,000
West Los Angeles, Federal office building	15,550,000
Georgia: Newnan, post office and courthouse	1,279,000
Illinois: East St. Louis, Federal office building	1,292,000
Indiana:	
Gary, Federal office building	1,554,000
New Albany, courthouse and Federal office building	1,253,000
Louisiana: Baton Rouge, post office and Federal office building	5,179,000
Maine: Bangor, post office and courthouse	4,550,000
Mississippi: Greenwood, post office and Federal office building	1,286,000
Missouri:	
Hannibal, post office and courthouse	2,387,000
Independence, post office and Federal office building	1,806,000
Montana:	
Bozeman, post office and Federal office building	2,845,000
Havre, border patrol sector headquarters	401,000
Nevada:	
Carson City, post office and courthouse	2,814,000
Las Vegas, courthouse and Federal office building	5,885,000
New Hampshire: Portsmouth, post office and Federal office building	2,950,000
New Jersey: Newark, Federal office building	15,107,000
New Mexico: Clovis, post office and Federal office building	1,050,000
New York: Rochester, post office and Federal office building	9,398,000
Puerto Rico: San Juan, courthouse and Federal office building	10,024,000
Tennessee:	
Alamo, post office and Federal office building	396,000
Winchester, post office and courthouse	1,186,000
Texas: Alice, post office and Federal office building	752,000
Vermont: Swanton, Border Patrol headquarters	368,500
Washington:	
Blaine, border patrol sector headquarters	$387,000
Spokane, border patrol sector headquarters	360,000
District of Columbia:	
FBI Building, Federal office building	60,000,000
Geological Survey, Federal office building and laboratory	32,240,000
GSA Federal Records Center, warehouse	13,355,000
Total (31 buildings)	205,782,500

Alterations to existing buildings

Location:	*Estimated cost*
Alabama: Anniston, post office and courthouse	$308,000
Alaska: Fairbanks, post office and courthouse	564,000
California:	
Bell, warehouse center	2,700,900
Los Angeles, post office and courthouse	6,070,000
Oakland, Clay Street building	1,099,500
San Francisco, post office and courthouse	2,506,000
Colorado:	
Denver (2), post office and courthouse and customhouse	2,675,000
Denver, Federal center	13,778,000
Denver, York Street building	1,795,000
Connecticut: Hartford, post office and courthouse	1,836,000
Illinois:	
Chicago (2), post office annex	581,000
Springfield, post office and courthouse	243,000
Iowa: Cedar Rapids, post office and courthouse	654,000
Kentucky:	
Bowling Green, courthouse and Federal office building	299,000
London, courthouse and Federal office building	340,000
Louisiana:	
Baton Rouge, post office and courthouse	307,000
Lafayette, post office	465,000
Maryland:	
Baltimore, post office and courthouse	1,060,000
Suitland, hydro building	2,144,000
Massachusetts:	
Boston, post office and courthouse	3,593,000
Springfield, post office and courthouse	3,425,000
Minnesota: Minneapolis, Buzza building	435,000
Missouri:	
Joplin, post office and courthouse	351,000
Kansas, post office	1,108,000
St. Louis, Mart building	3,919,000
St. Louis, customhouse and courthouse	1,588,000
Montana:	
Helena, post office and courthouse	1,751,000
Missoula, post office and courthouse	1,020,000
New Hampshire: Laconia, Federal office building	408,000
New Mexico: Carlsbad, post office and courthouse	408,000
New York: New York City, Foley Square courthouse	6,149,000
North Dakota: Bismarck, post office and courthouse	510,000

Alterations to existing buildings—Continued

Location:	*Estimated cost*
Ohio:	
Canton, post office and Federal office building	$3, 472, 000
Cleveland, post office and courthouse	1, 726, 200
Toledo, courthouse and customhouse	727, 000
Oklahoma: Lawton, post office and courthouse	265, 000
Oregon: Portland, post office	1, 578, 000
Pennsylvania:	
Philadelphia, customhouse	3, 585, 000
Pittsburgh, post office and courthouse	2, 583, 000
Rhode Island: Providence, post office and Federal office building	875, 000
South Carolina: Greenville, post office and courthouse	557, 000
Texas: Sherman, post office and courthouse	260, 000
Utah:	
Provo, post office and Federal office building	478, 000
Salt Lake City, post office and courthouse	950, 000
Virginia:	
Arlington, FOB No. 2 (Navy annex)	4, 454, 000
Richmond, post office and courthouse	791, 000
Washington: Seattle, Federal office building	2, 136, 000
Wisconsin:	
Eau Claire, post office and courthouse	315, 000
Green Bay, post office and Federal building	218, 000
Milwaukee, post office and courthouse	2, 245, 000
District of Columbia:	
Agriculture Administration Building	2, 438, 000
Archives Building	3, 662, 000
Commerce Building	13, 945, 000
Executive Office Building	1, 638, 000
Federal Office Building No. 1	3, 121, 000
Federal Trade Commission Building	717, 000
General Services Administration Building	8, 072, 000
GSA Regional Building	6, 002, 000
Health, Education, and Welfare North Building	2, 385, 000
Health, Education, and Welfare South Building	1, 714, 000
Interior Building	2, 065, 000
Interstate Commerce Commission-Labor Building	3, 965, 000
Internal Revenue Building	14, 200, 000
Justice Building	3, 788, 000
Lafayette Building	779, 000
Munitions Building	637, 000
Navy Building	850, 000
Pension Building	540, 000
Post Office (city)	897, 000
Post Office (new)	5, 244, 000
State Department Building	823, 000
Tariff Commission Building	229, 000
Veterans' Administration Building	4, 007, 000
West Heating Plant	5, 283, 000
White House Wings	1, 102, 000
701 Independence Avenue Building	741, 000
Total (76 projects)	180, 350, 400

FOUR-POINT SENIOR CITIZENS PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years the Nation's senior citizens—by work, sweat and dedication—have helped to create this great country.

Traditionally, the needs of later life have been met by (a) building a nest egg; and (b) the family. Because of changing social and economic conditions, however, this—to a large degree—is no longer true.

To the contrary, a great many older folks—after completing their productive years—find themselves in serious economic straits; living in poor housing; suffering from malnutrition and poverty; relegated to uselessness and isolation—often literally rejected by society.

As a nation, we cannot—morally or economically—allow this to happen permitting the 17 million folks over 65 to become a generation of lost souls.

Instead, the country, I believe, has a moral responsibility—and an economic opportunity—to design more realistic programs, to enable these folks to continue to play an essential role in our social and economic life; and, in many cases, to make a contribution to our progress.

The program should include the following:

First. A nationwide awareness of—and an effort to better understand and resolve—the great complex problems confronting the aging.

Second. More dynamic nongovernmental efforts to better meet the general needs of food, housing, income, employment, and so forth.

Third. Carry out the necessary revision of laws including (a) liberalization of social security laws to permit individuals—capable of holding jobs—to earn more than $1,200 annually without a reduction in benefits; (b) liberalization of regulations and laws relating to housing for the elderly; (c) allowing more surplus foods to be available to the indigent; (d) adoption of a realistic health program to provide—through cooperative efforts of individuals, private enterprise, and local, State, and Federal governments—an adequate health care program.

Fourth. Undertaking a more creative, enterprising effort—particularly at the community level—such as:

Greater efforts to make older folks feel "at home" in—and a part of—the civic, church, social and community life.

The formation of advisory boards of individuals in vocations to provide counsel and advice in their fields. In Wisconsin, for example, a board of retired businessmen has served to provide management counsel and advice to small business—many of which could not otherwise afford such service.

The utilization of senior citizens for leadership in civic, social—and, yes—political activity in the community.

As a nation we cannot—in my judgment—afford to waste this vast reservoir of experience—nor to ignore our moral obligations in failing to provide an environment for these folks to live in respect, dignity, decency, and comfort.

SOCIAL WELFARE ATTACHÉ

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for approximately 10 minutes in the morning hour in order to make a statement.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, all of us are much concerned about our foreign policy, and particularly the ways and means to strengthen our Foreign Service. I want to speak about the need to strengthen our Foreign Service particularly in one area, through representation of our social welfare policy abroad.

On many occasions I have emphasized that the United States, in its foreign policy, must clearly demonstrate its concern for improvement of social conditions abroad. The time has long since passed when we can limit our concern to political relationships and economic productivity. We must share—and we must show that we share—with other governments our interest in social reform and the social benefits which should be available to the masses of people. We must also gain new insights into those causes of political instability and economic stagnation which are deeply rooted in the social structure and social unrest. This kind of assessment requires the special skill in analysis and interpretation of qualified experts in the social welfare field.

HEW officials, on recent visits to other countries, have been repeatedly impressed with the lack of information on what our American society now accomplishes for human welfare.

In other words, they know of our great capital accomplishments; they know of our tremendous buildings; they know of our great highways; they know of our military strength, but there has been an inadequate amount of information as to social welfare progress in the United States.

There is surprising ignorance in other countries, among even the most highly educated, of the scope and magnitude of our Nation's program for the social welfare of our people.

National leaders in other countries, when they have an opportunity to observe developments in the United States, comment with surprise on the scope of our welfare activities and the fact that so little is done to interpret these policies abroad.

The significance of such accomplishments is illustrated by President Kennedy's statement, in his historic address to the United Nations:

> Political sovereignty is but a mockery without the means of meeting poverty, illiteracy, and disease.

Are the newly developing nations aware that the United States leads the world in its efforts to solve these problems? And that agencies of the U.S. Government were the first in the world to give technical assistance to other nations in the field of social welfare? As peoples in other lands learn about U.S. social services, they will more readily understand our deep interest in human welfare in all parts of the world.

In our last session, Congress, in the new foreign-aid legislation, took an important step by authorizing both social and economic development in the Act for International Development. The Alliance for Progress, with its emphasis on social development, is also a major step forward. Now we need to take specific steps to strengthen our Embassies and assure not only that these new policy statements are reflected in our direct contacts with the peoples of other countries, but that the social factors in these countries are interpreted to those responsible for administration of our aid programs in terms that will enable them to plan adequately for social as well as economic development.

Discussions are currently underway, and I might add have been for several years, concerning the need for social welfare attachés in our Embassies abroad. Our representatives in foreign countries in many instances now have no one on their staffs equipped to interpret our social welfare programs or to analyze welfare problems and developments in other countries. The establishment of a social welfare corps in the Foreign Service would close a serious gap in our Foreign Service representation. Specialized attachés now cover other important sectors of the social and economic fields, treasury, commerce, agriculture, and labor. A welfare attaché, specially concerned with a country's investment in human resources, would be alert to family conditions, to child welfare needs, and to the availability of community services. He would be expert in training of personnel for the national welfare programs which nations all over the world are striving to develop or improve. In this connection we have only to look at the ministries and departments of social welfare which have come into existence in recent years in many of the newly developing countries.

Basically, I would see this attaché handling three main tasks.

First, he would promote better understanding of U.S. social policies and objectives in the whole field of social welfare. There is urgent need for expert representation of our services and of the extensive programs in the United States for the welfare of people. The activity of a welfare attaché would insure skilled presentation of the United States as a country interested both in the welfare of its own people and in people all over the world.

Second, this attaché would bring to our ambassadors and to the Department of State expert analysis and evaluation of country social conditions and services and of their relationship to political and economic conditions. This is the new dimension in foreign policy.

I add, Mr. President, it is a dimension which has been added by act of Congress; through the Act for International Development and the Alliance for Progress.

These attachés are needed not only in developing countries but also in the most highly developed as well. The European Economic Community, for example, has long since recognized the interrelationship of social, economic, and political factors. The Treaty of Rome, which established the EEC, requires that an annual report be made on the social evolution of the community as a means of gaging the effectiveness of economic measures. The experience of the EEC in this field should be of vital interest to us, as should also the effect of new policies in the free trade communities of Europe and South America.

The social ferment in many countries of the Old World, as well as the demands for social reform and specific social services in the newly developing states of Africa and south Asia, underscores the urgent need for accurate information and assessment. We all recognize, and have for some time, the significance of economic productivity and trade relationships, and take account of these factors in dealing with other nations. But to what extent is our policy based on expert assessment of social needs and of the welfare services and benefits that most immediately affect the lives and well-being of the people themselves and contribute directly to political stability and increased economic productivity? Are we fully aware of the impact of the activities of the Economic and Social Councils of the United Nations and the Organization of American States and the extent to which they have stimulated countries to recognize the importance of social factors in integrated programs of national development?

Third, I think we have failed to recognize the growing intercountry social service problems that are presented daily to almost every Embassy in the world. More than 14,000 alien children from all parts of the world have been admitted to this country, under special legislation, to join American families during the past year. The need for services required by Americans in the process of repatriation has continued to grow. American voluntary relief agencies each year report substantial expenditures of funds in almost every region of the world. The exchange programs have resulted in widening contacts in the social welfare field. Last year, for example, 81 countries sent experts or trainees to observe and study U.S. social welfare programs. Moreover, we work with representatives of other countries on social welfare matters through our participation in the U.N., in the OAS, and in many international voluntary agencies. All of these services and activities make growing demands on our Embassies for accurate, expert opinion as a basis for decisions on policy and services.

I understand that both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of State are in favor of this social welfare attaché program. When the Foreign Service had two such posts several years ago in New Delhi and in Paris, their value was amply demonstrated to our Government and to voluntary social organizations. No one denies the impact of their activity in France and India. The program should be reestablished and expanded to include all geographic sections.

This plan for a Social Welfare Corps in the Foreign Service is timely. It offers an unrivaled opportunity to implement our new foreign policies and to provide tangible evidence of the sincerity of our interest in social reform and better social conditions for people everywhere.

Mr. President, I recall that some years ago the United States had a science attaché program, and it was discontinued about 1953. We found that the stopping of the program adversely affected our national interest. Therefore, about 1957 or 1958 the program was reestablished. Today in many countries of the world the United States has science attachés. We find this works to the benefit of the countries in which our Embassies are located, as well as to the benefit of the United States of America.

I am convinced that the social welfare attaché is required as well, and could provide a valuable service to our Government, and indeed to the countries we seek to aid and to the countries with whom we have friendly and cordial relationships. I am hopeful the Department of State and the executive branch of our Government will see the necessity for establishing the social welfare attaché program.

CRIME IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a series of articles entitled "Challenge to a Free People," which recently appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald. In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed two editorials relating to this series.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 29, 1962]

Congress Censured for District Crime

(By Elsie Carper)

Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, said yesterday that Congress shares the blame for the crime that has made Washington "the most dangerous place in the country after dark."

In a Senate speech, Dodd declared that "we in the Congress share the power to govern this city and therefore we must bear a large share of the responsibility for what happens here."

Dodd, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, recommended a broad approach to meet the problem and to get at the sources of crime and delinquency.

"We have the responsibility," he said, "of providing better police facilities, better court facilities, better laws, and improved social conditions.

"And until the Members of Congress become just as concerned with the needs of the District of Columbia as they are with their own home districts or their own home States, the Nation's Capital stands in danger of becoming the Nation's crime capital."

Dodd recommended that Congress:

Take immediate action to build up the Metropolitan Police force to the authorized strength of 3,000 men "instead of slowly adding these men in yearly installments."

Appropriate the requested number of man-and-dog teams. The Police Department should step up its training program so that the K–9 teams can be put into action in months instead of years.

Give the Police Department's Juvenile Bureau at least 10 police cruisers on the streets each night instead of the present 5 or 6.

Consider ways "to remove the obstacles placed in the path of effective police work by provisions and interpretations of the Durham and Mallory decisions."

He listed five specific ways that Congress could help with the large number of out-of-school, out-of-work youths, who become delinquent.

"The District," he said, "must have the funds for its schools which are necessary to give youth the guidance and skills needed to qualify them to compete in the labor market." School Superintendent Hansen has continuously spelled out what can be done, Dodd said.

The District of Columbia Employment Office must have more funds to maintain a large enough staff to provide counseling aid, he said.

He also called for a subsidized youth employment program, a Fair Employment Practices Act, and a review of child labor laws.

Dodd cited statistics for 1961 showing a growing incidence of crime and said that not since the "turbulent years of World War II" has so much crime been committed by juveniles. One such case involved an 18-year-old youth, who committed 30 yokings in an 8-month period, Dodd said.

"He operated with three heavy rings, two of lead and one of brass, on the last three fingers of his right hand," Dodd said. The youth boasted that "they work pretty good the way I use them," Dodd quoted the youth as saying. The suspect also claimed that crime should go down 100 percent with his arrest, it was said.

Dodd said his subcommittee has been investigating the availability of cheap mail order guns, and has found that they are being delivered to slum areas and to areas where crime is prevalent.

With the growing crime rate in the city, particularly that of aggravated assaults, it is easy "to raise a clenched fist, to denounce the police or the younger generation of the District of Columbia," Dodd declared.

"It is easy," he added, "to blame the problem on race relation or softness on the part of the court system or 'welfare giveaways.'

"The people who live in the District have every reason to feel frustration and anger at what they see going on around them. But those who are in positions of leadership in the community had better examine their own conduct before they make sweeping judgments on what is happening here," he said.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 30, 1962]

Challenge to a Free People—I: "Are Rat Packs, Street Crime the Best the District of Columbia Can Offer?" Senator Dodd Asks

(By Eve Edstrom)

Out-of-school youth, jobs for whites but not for Negroes, rat packs, and street crimes—is this the best the Nation's Capital can offer?

This was the basic question which Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, put to the Congress of the United States this week.

The question was asked of the Nation's lawmakers because, as Dodd emphasized, "we in the Congress share the power to govern this city; therefore, we must bear a large share of the responsibility for what happens here."

And then Dodd went on to answer the question. Like many speakers before him, he said the Nation's Capital "ought to be the model of the Nation in every field." But the reasons he gave differed from those heard so often in the past.

The District should be a model, Dodd said, not because the world's diplomatic leaders visit here or their press representatives write about us or that millions of fellow Americans flock to their Capital.

Our chief goal, he said, is to make Washington "the symbol and the image of the best that we can do as a free people."

"It ought to represent what we hope to achieve in the country and in the world," he continued. "The Nation's Capital should be the Nation's leader in education, in urban development, in parks and playgrounds, in schools, in housing, in race relations, and, above all, in law enforcement."

And so Senator Dodd charted a course of action for the Nation's Capital—a course which only Congress, by loosing its purse strings and enacting long-sought legislation, can put into effect.

For weeks now, Dodd, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Delinquency, has been disturbed over the upsurge in crime here.

To combat the law violators Dodd offered many-sided solutions ranging from putting more policemen on the streets to broad job opportunity measures in an effort to strike at the core of the causes of crime.

In so doing, Dodd did not deal with brand-new solutions. In fact, he noted that many of the proposals have been discussed by District officials for years.

But they haven't been put into effect because, Congress has not provided the money. In addition, many of them have not enjoyed uniform community support because of the cleavage between those who would adopt a punitive approach to criminals and those who seek to rehabilitate them.

Dodd, as a conservative Member of the Senate, as a former prosecuting attorney and as a former Federal Bureau of Investigation agent, has adopted a middle-of-the-road approach to the problem.

He wants strong law enforcement tools—more police, more man-and-dog teams, more Juvenile Bureau police cruisers—to stop the vicious criminal and to protect the public.

But he views as equally important strong rehabilitative measures—more flexible court sentencing procedures, expanded probation and parole services—to help those who can be turned away from crime.

Therefore, it may be possible that Dodd's proposals can serve as a bridge between conflicting views which have existed in Congress and the community. If so, it may be possible to make a start on preventing many of the causes of crime.

In succeeding articles in this series, various avenues suggested by Dodd for correcting the problems will be examined.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 30, 1962]

Senator Dodd's List

Senator Dodd has given us a thoroughly enlightened list of countermeasures against attacks and robberies in Washington's streets, the volume of which has become intolerable. He observes, correctly, that we must work at two levels. We need immediate protection against the results of this city's failures, over the last generation, in education and welfare. We must concurrently work diligently at curing these failures over the next generation.

Generously, but also accurately, the Senator acknowledges that "We in Congress share the power to govern this city and therefore we must bear a large share of the responsibility for what happens here." Home rule for the District is, of course, the real answer to the low quality of municipal government provided by the Congress of the United States.

Lowering the crime rate will require more money than Congress, our city council, has ever before provided. But the District must be prepared to use the money boldly. The Metropolitan Police must be given the men and equipment they require. The mail-order business in firearms ought to be stopped at once. But there is much more to be done, and quickly.

The youths involved in serious street crimes usually have one characteristic in common: They have been in trouble with the police before. If the surveillance and assistance of youths with police records can be improved, the city will have closer control over that relatively small number who are the chief danger to women and elderly men on the sidewalks at night.

Now that the juvenile court is about to have its three judges, we can expect cases to be heard promptly. But sooner or later boys must be sent home on probation. The average load carried by a probation officer is 80 boys. That is to say, each of them is likely to get only cursory attention. The city needs more parole and probation officers, and it needs to broaden their responsibilities. The truly critical point in the careers of these youths is their return home.

Senator Dodd makes several very helpful suggestions when he speaks of training for these boys and young men, local legislation against racial discrimination in hiring, and most important of all, an earnest effort with public support to find jobs for them. For boys being released from detention, the city might profitably establish a halfway-house, where they could live under the eyes of professional counselors while they found work and associations away from the places where they first got into trouble.

Many parts of Washington are neighborhoods only in the geographical sense. They evoke no sense of community, they lack common civil institutions. No resident there feels any responsibility for what goes on around him. These are the neighborhoods where children turn into yokers. The city is not entirely powerless to instill a measure of community feeling in these blocks. For example, last summer the Welfare Department asked for money to begin a pilot experiment to that purpose in the northwest redevelopment area. Congress cut the item out of the budget. In the end, Congress will have to decide whether to spend this kind of money or put armed men on every street corner after sundown.

Challenge to a Free People, II—Dodd Stresses Money Needs in Fight on Crime

(By Eve Edstrom and Alfred E. Lewis)

If Congress wants to curb violence on the streets of the Nation's Capital, it must "face the fact" that money is needed to buy expanded crime-prevention and crime-control tools, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, said yesterday.

He pledged that he will do all he can to get that message across when hearings begin on the District's budget for the next fiscal year.

Dodd, who charted a course of action for the Nation's Capital in a speech to the Senate this week, made clear that his plea for more policemen on city streets was not based on the desire to make an armed camp out of Washington.

To the contrary, he believes the police force, as well as all other municipal services, should be the very best that can be operated by a free people.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, which soon will hold hearings on police needs here, Dodd said Washington's Metropolitan Police Department under Chief Robert V. Murray is a good one.

But, he said, Congress has the responsibility to make it "the crack police force of the Nation"—efficient in terms of crime detection and a guiding example in establishing programs to prevent crime. If it enjoyed such a reputation, Dodd said, problems of recruiting men of excellent caliber would be diminished.

Dodd said the timetable for increasing the police force should be stepped up. Currently, the Police Department is 2,836 strong, 8 under the number for which funds have been provided. By July 1, funds are expected to be available for 2,900 men. The following July 1, the fully authorized strength of 3,000 men is expected to be attained.

But Dodd urged that Congress take "immediate action" to obtain the 3,000 men now "instead of slowly adding these men in yearly installments."

Dodd also wants more training of police. And the training, he said, should not be geared solely to law enforcement measures.

Policemen, Dodd said, should be particularly sensitive to the special social problems that exist in their community so that they can understand and, therefore, deal more effectively with the causes of crime. The entire community must be able to look up to its police force as the protector of all its citizens, he said.

In addition, Dodd said police should be acquainted with many facets of life in an ever-growing metropolitan area. Urban living, he continued, presents many difficult problems that are not apparent to those who may have been reared in closely knit small communities.

Dodd does not overlook the extremely important role played by the Youth Aid Division under Deputy Chief John E. Winters.

He strongly supported Winters' efforts to increase the 52-member Division with 20 more officers and 4 more scout cars.

"We actually want to establish a preventive patrol," Winters said. "When we see idle youth hanging around joints and street corners, we would like to be able to spend more time talking to them and to their parents so as to avert trouble."

Dodd, who declared that "I'm all for the preventive approach," recalled his experience as a former Federal Bureau of Investigation agent who dealt with many young car thieves. He said much more can be done with young people before they get into trouble.

But of necessity, Dodd said, the Youth Aid Division and the entire police department must operate on a "symbolic" law enforcement basis.

"This means that at no time does the police force have enough equipment and men to control all crime," he said. "They must selectively distribute their force among high-crime areas as directed by periodic flareups of law violations.

"Thus, it is extremely crucial that the police force be given at least the minimum amount of men and equipment they request.

"This is what the people of this community want," he said. Dodd reported that the response of Washington residents to published reports of his Senate speech "has been tremendous."

He was particularly impressed with a letter from the Georgetown Citizens Association which shared the Senator's views on increasing the number of police-and-dog teams on city streets. Mrs. Frank Allen West said the association felt so strongly about this that they raised $1,350 to buy more dogs.

"You must find it refreshing as a change to have citizens contributing instead of requesting money," she wrote.

Dodd said he did find it refreshing. He said it was all the more reason for Congress to take stronger measures than it has.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1962]

Dodd Seeks To Curb Mail-Order Guns Here

(By Eve Edstrom)

A law to get mail-order guns out of the hands of undesirables here will be passed soon if Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, has his way.

He has collected a drawer full of the deadly weapons. And he has a sheaf of Washington police criminal records, one 5 pages long, on some of those who ordered similar guns by mail.

For several months now, staff members of his Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency have been at Railway Express Agency offices here, looking at the names and addresses of gun recipients.

Of 174 names checked with police, 43 had criminal records. This represents about 25 percent of those checked, but Dodd believes this is a minimum figure.

It was impossible to verify criminal records in many instances, he notes, because some recipients, who picked up their guns at the Railway Express Agency, used fictitious names and addresses.

When Dodd's investigators attempted to locate them, they found, for example, that one person's address was in the middle of the Potomac River.

Some of the guns had been ordered by persons previously convicted of such felonies as assaults with guns, knives, and icepicks, assaults on policemen, narcotics violations, and homicide.

In one instance, a man with 15 arrests obtained his pistol through mail order shortly after the Metropolitan Police Department had confiscated his gun.

In another case, delivery of the gun to a narcotics addict was halted when it was found that he was in the prison ward of a mental hospital.

Investigators also were able to establish that at least two mental defectives and seven minors received mail-order guns. One minor was refused delivery when his only identification was a juvenile court probation card.

In addition Dodd's investigators found that mail-order gun recipients "for the most part live in the so-called slum areas of the city." Many are itinerants who live on a "bare survival" basis.

This was emphasized last week by Dodd when he made a Senate speech charting the numerous ways in which the Congress could help the Nation's Capital curb crime as a first step toward making Washington "the symbol and the image of the best that we can do as a free people."

Delivery of mail-order guns, Dodd said, "corresponds with the high crime areas in the city." More guns went to residents of precincts Nos. 2, 1, 13, 10, and 9. In crime rates these rank first, second, third, fourth, and fifth respectively.

"We are drafting legislation to deal with interstate mail-order traffic in guns and have already suceeded in obtaining the voluntary support of many of the responsible elements in the production, transportation, and sale of weapons," Dodd said.

In the past, efforts to limit firearms have run into strong opposition from such powerful groups as the National Rifle Association of America.

But Dodd and his staff have spent many hours laying the groundwork for the legislation which would be acceptable to such groups, none of which want to see guns in the hands of hoodlums.

At present, guns may be ordered by mail but cannot by law be shipped through the mails. They may, however, be shipped direct to purchaser by common carrier.

Tentative proposals considered by Dodd are:

Making it unlawful for a common carrier, such as Railway Express, to deliver a pistol or revolver to any person under 18.

Raising the license fee for firearms dealers, making it more likely that only legitimate dealers would seek licenses.

Specifying a statutory age limit of 21 for obtaining a dealer's license. At the present time, there is none.

Requiring shippers of pistols and revolvers to label gun packages clearly if the shipment is of 10 or less items. Larger shipments would be exempted because they are most frequently the object of intransit pilfering.

Such remedial legislation is only one facet of the blueprint for action which Dodd believes is necessary if the Nation's Capital is to be "the model of the Nation in every field."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1962]

Challenge to a Free People, IV—Dodd Has Open Mind on Mallory, Durham

(By John P. MacKenzie)

In the midst of pressures to administer justice this way or that way in the District of Columbia, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, is a calm man.

The Senator, who wants to see Congress do more to keep the city's people free from violence, is steadfast in his desire to see that liberties are not abridged in the process.

Law-enforcement officers, sociologists, and civil liberties advocates all are having their say as the rate of street crimes appears on the rise. Dodd says he begins his quest for law and order with no preconceptions, but he is sure of this:

"There's no impasse between protecting the rights of people and efficient enforcement of the law."

The courts as well as the streets of Washington were embraced in Dodd's wide-ranging speech Wednesday, which asked that the city become "the symbol and the image of the best that we can do as a free people."

Singling out the Mallory and Durham decisions as the sources of complaints by police, Dodd said he wanted to satisfy himself that these were not "obstacles" to law enforcement. He called for a review of their impact and an intelligent appraisal of how to get along with them.

Amplifying his remarks in an interview, Dodd said he is not ready to call for legislation. He said he lacks the assurance of both those who praise the rulings and those who condemn them.

"I don't say we should do away with the Mallory rule," said Dodd. "I say we can do a better job at living with it than we've been doing."

In the 1957 Mallory decision, a unanimous Supreme Court reaffirmed a 1943 ruling that confessions may not be extracted from prisoners arrested by Federal officers without sufficient evidence to take them promptly before a judge for a hearing. Since it freed a District man who had confessed to rape, the decision aroused the ire of police and many citizens.

Dodd, a former prosecutor who has also tried cases for the defense and served as an FBI agent, says he has no taste for abuses of the law by police and no desire to eliminate the restrictions against such abuses. A concentration, especially in the Detective Bureau of more skilled interrogators may be one answer, Dodd said.

Turning to criticism of the District's rule on criminal insanity, Dodd said he has no proof of any connection between the rise in insanity acquittals and the general rise in crime. He said he is keeping an open mind.

A study is underway, he noted, to find out what happens to those who are excused from criminal responsibility and sent to a mental hospital instead of jail. He wants to know whether such persons, if later released, contribute significantly to the police problem.

The rise of insanity verdicts from a handful before the 1954 Durham decision to 34 acquittals in 1960 makes for statistics that are easy to "exploit" and oversimplify when talking about crime, Dodd said.

Informal surveys have indicated that the rate of criminal "repeaters" among those who have been released after treatment at St. Elizabeths Hospital is dramatically lower than the repeater rate in the Federal prison system. Dodd noted, however, that there is a "public uneasiness" about the problem.

"The man on the street is fussing. He says there are too many getting out on grounds of insanity," Dodd said.

The Senator said he had some reservations about the ability of the "average juror" to evaluate psychiatric evidence. At the same time, he asked, "Can we slam the door on science? Can we say that our broadening knowledge in the mental health field has no application to the criminal process?"

Proponents of the Durham rule contend that a broadened standard of insanity—replacing the century-old criterion of the defendant's ability to know he was doing "right" or "wrong"—gives juries more of the facts needed for an intelligent verdict. Critics say it has caused "confusion."

Agreement that the court rulings can be "lived with" came yesterday from U.S. Attorney David C. Acheson, who, as the District's top prosecutor, represents still another interest Dodd said must be reckoned with in working out answers. Among points made by Acheson in an interview were:

There is no proof that the Mallory decision has encouraged crime. "If you believe that," he said, "you'd have to believe the average criminal had enough understanding of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and made a conscious calculation of his chances for acquittal before breaking the law.

"The real basis of civil liberties, which makes us superior to the Nazi or Communist state, are our criminal safeguards. They are the last aspects of the criminal law I would tinker with."

Reversals of convictions on the grounds of Mallory rule violations have been few. Prosecutions dropped because they were based strictly on such prohibited evidence numbered only 2 or 3 a year out of about 1,000 criminal indictments and half that many trials.

While not being described as "happy" with the Durham rule, "I wouldn't say we can't live with it."

Acheson has supported legislation to modify the rule and has argued in the courts for changes he considers "in the interest of clarity and concreteness." Much more disturbing than any rule, said Acheson, is the low caliber of some psychiatric testimony.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 3, 1962]

Challenge to a Free People, V—Job Training of School Dropouts Seen as Crime Deterrent

(By Jean White)

At least one of every five District youngsters aged 16 or 17 is not enrolled in schools and almost half do not have jobs.

These statistics, from the files of the Senate Subcommittee Investigating Juvenile Delinquency, point up the problem of the District's unemployed youth. It is the out-of-school, out-of-work boy or girl, with idle time, who is the most crime prone.

Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, troubled by the rise in Washington's crime, last week listed expanded job opportunities for youth as one way to get at the causes of crime. In this, as in every field, the Senator said, the Nation's Capital should be a model, "the symbol and the image of the best that we can do as a free people."

For the school dropout, the first 3 months out of school can be crucial both for him and for the community.

"If we or some other interested group don't get him within 3 months and help him find a job, he is lost. He has formed a pattern of life—life on the streets—and joined groups."

These are the words of Beatrice H. Thompson, whose job is to help District youth find jobs. She heads the youth employment section of the U.S. Employment Service office for the District.

The link between youth unemployment and crime has been summed up this way by District Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner: "Too many young people with nothing to do and limited job opportunities seems to be one of the major reasons for the increased crime rate here."

In Washington, the task of finding jobs for 16- and 17-year-olds is complicated by several factors: race discrimination, lack of job skills, limited industry in a Government-dominated city, and some outmoded laws.

The first is the tough one. At least 75 percent of the youthful job seekers are Negroes. Discriminatory hiring practices of some employers freeze them out of many job chances.

What can be done to find jobs for the District's youth?

Congress, Senator Dodd has suggested, can help in at least five ways:

Provide funds for the District schools to job-condition youths to compete in the labor market.

Provide more money for the District employment office to counsel out-of-school, out-of-work youths and help them to jobs.

Set up a subsidized youth employment program for on-the-job training.

Enact a Fair Employment Practices Act.

Review child labor laws and set up a program to educate employers about them.

Such a subsidized youth employment program would be aimed at helping the most delinquency-prone and least employable group in Washington's youth population—the school dropout, the potential dropout and the delinquent child committed to Children's Center.

The dropout would, first of all, receive some prejob training on good grooming, how to fill out an application, how to make out a sales slip. Then a counselor would place him on a job with part of the salary being subsidized by the city. This way he could learn minimal skills on the job to compete in the local labor market.

The Senate subcommittee has estimated that it would cost about $200,000 a school year to subsidize employment for 340 enrollees. They would work 40 hours a week up to 6 weeks and be paid $1 an hour.

The important thing, Commissioner Tobriner emphasizes, is to spot the potential dropout the year before he leaves school. Then there is time to give him at least a rough finishing course to prepare for job competition.

With no job skills or training, the dropout carries a big handicap—one that he will have all his life.

In Washington, the chief industry is Government. This results in a sharp demarcation in job opportunities—the civil service job, which requires education and technical background, and the services industries.

For a civil service job, an applicant must be 18, pass a test, and/or have a high school education or the equivalent. This eliminates the school dropout.

But with minimal training, dropouts can be prepared for some jobs in offices, hospitals, laundries, and gasoline stations. They can be busboys in restaurants, messengers, sales clerks, and waitresses.

But training isn't all. Here is where race enters the picture. The basic fact is that Washington operates an integrated school system in a highly segregated labor market.

Nothing, as Tobriner points out, can be more frustrating to a Negro than to be trained for a job and then be frozen out. This is seen again and again as Negro boys from the city's vocational high schools (with the training that dropouts do not have) find union apprenticeship programs closed to them.

Only 13 percent of the retail sales jobs here are definitely open to both races, the Senate subcommittee files show.

In the retail trade, outmoded child-labor regulations cut down job opportunities for girls. Society has changed and evening hours are now part of the shopping pattern. But girls under 16 can work only to 7 p.m. in the District.

Within limited funds and staff, the schools, U.S. Employment Service, and other groups are trying to help the unemployed youth here.

Each month the schools send the U.S. Employment Service office a list of dropouts. The U.S. Employment Service reaches about two-thirds of these through letters and they report for counseling and vocational tests. Placement officers go out and beat the bushes to find them jobs.

"No job comes to us," Mrs. Thompson says. "We have to go out and drum them up. We play on an employer's sympathy. Whatever you say, the problem of juvenile delinquency is one for all of us. Employers can help by giving these boys and girls a chance."

Once the dropouts are given a chance with a good employer, they become good workers, she finds. But only 15 percent of the District employers hire dropouts, the Senate subcommittee says.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 4, 1962]

Challenge to a Free People, VI—Neglect of District of Columbia Schools Called Major Cause of Crime

(By Carole Bowie)

Neglect of the District school system is one of the basic causes of the ever-growing rate of delinquency in the Nation's Capital, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, said yesterday.

"Authorities have repeatedly stated that the school is the most vital element in the development of a child—next to the family. I think that we have been grossly negligent in recognizing this factor," he said.

Adequate support of education was listed by the Senator last week among wide-ranging proposals to curb crime here. In education, as in all other fields, the Senator said, the District should be the symbol and the image of the best that we can do as a free people.

"We have neglected our schools because we have attempted to teach 80 percent of our children in dilapidated, demoralizing, decaying shacks and because these 80 percent are taught in the oversize classes where effective instruction is all but impossible," he said.

Dodd, whose mother, daughter and three sisters are teachers, also pointed out that more than 700 children were barred from kindergarten classes this year because space and teachers were not available. Another 2,000, he said, attend school only part time.

"These children are forced to absorb the complete education given to more fortunate youngsters in a much shorter period of time. It is small wonder that some of them never acquire education but are forced to drop back to become truants, to roam the streets and finally take the road to crime," he said.

Requests by school officials for new classrooms to take youngsters out of substandard facilities and for more teachers to reduce class size and provide special help for more than 2,000 retarded pupils now in regular classes, Dodd noted, have been granted only partially or denied altogether.

"It has been similarly recognized that all schoolchildren, and particularly those who manifest problems, occasionally need the services of school counselors professionally trained to deal with disturbed young criminals," he said.

"However," he continued, "from a requested number of 39 school counselors for elementary, junior, and senior high schools, the school board has received only 6."

He cited further evidence of neglect in the school board's failure to win "even a minimum amount of money" for repair of schools. "It is impossible to measure the demoralizing influence which inferior school buildings have on young children," he declared.

Dodd and District School Superintendent Carl F. Hansen agree that these deficiencies in the basic school program—lack of classrooms, teachers, and specialists—must be remedied if the schools are to fulfill their role in the fight against crime.

"Our first need," Hansen has said, "is for a generally adequate school program beginning at the kindergarten level. If we were bold enough," he says, "we would say even before kindergarten for children who are deprived in their homes."

But Hansen would go beyond the traditional school program to reach the potential school dropout, the troubled youngster who is most likely to drift into crime, and to prepare him to take his place in the labor force.

Dodd has asked Congress to heed his recommendations, to give the District "the funds for its schools which are necessary to give youth the guidance and skills needed to qualify them to compete in the labor market."

Some of Hansen's programs, aimed specifically at potential dropouts and supported largely with private funds, are already being tried on a limited scale in District schools. They include efforts to:

Curb a major cause of delinquency and dropout—failures to learn to read and write—by giving youngsters special language training in early grades.

Discover talented students and keep them in school by providing special guidance and remedial help at the junior high school level.

Identify potential dropouts and give them practical training in such areas as shoe repair, car painting, printing and electrical trades and custodial work, on a part-time-school, part-time-work basis.

Allow children who cannot afford to stay in school to finish their education by providing scholarship aid.

Hansen would expand all these programs, greatly increasing opportunities for part-time school and work training. "We need," he said, "to show students who are rejecting school a direct relationship between class training and job experience."

Also needed, he has stated, are added vocational shop facilities and teachers to train students in skills, such as electronics, that are needed in this area. Special instruction, he says, should also be provided for seriously disturbed youngsters who cannot attend regular classes and for those forced to leave school because of pregnancy or incarceration.

Hansen has held often that such a school program, geared to the individual needs of children would be the best investment a community could make in terms of increased employment and decreased crime.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 5, 1962]

CHALLENGE TO A FREE PEOPLE, VII—GUIDANCE URGED FOR PRISONERS RETURNING TO SOCIETY

(By Eve Edstrom)

A guidance center where Washington's youthful offenders can make the transition between life in prison and life in the community was called for yesterday by Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut.

The center was one of several crime preventive and control measures which Dodd said are necessary if street crimes are to be curtailed in the Nation's Capital.

He amplified on a speech made to the Senate last week when he chartered a broad course of action to make Washington "the symbol and the image of the best that we can do as a free people."

Of particular concern to Dodd was the high percentage of criminals who repeat their offenses.

To cut down on the number of violators who must be returned to prison, Dodd recommended that plans be drawn for an "intermediate rehabilitative institution" where offenders could go after leaving Lorton Youth Center to receive counseling and employment assistance services.

Since last fall, the Federal Bureau of Prisons has been experimenting with a similar program in small guidance centers located in Los Angeles, Chicago, and Brooklyn. At any one time, the centers accommodate between 20 to 30 youthful offenders who are believed to be good parole risks but who are still in custody.

With the cooperation of employment, school and family agency officials, the youths are helped to get jobs or to return to school. Many receive expert counseling services centering on the family or other difficulties which caused them to get into trouble.

When an offender finally appears ready to make it on his own, he is taken before parole authorities and usually wins his release under supervision.

In seeking such a program here, Senator Dodd also noted that the rehabilitative facility is needed because the Lorton Youth Center, not yet 2 years old, is on its way to running out of bed space.

The youth center will have a capacity for 400 inmates when a new dormitory housing 100 men opens in a month. But Dodd observed the commitment rate to the center "is building up at such a speed that it will soon reach 200 a year" while the average stay of a youthful offender is slightly under 2 years.

"Therefore, the institution will be forced to release about 200 cases each year regardless of whether correction has been completed," Dodd said.

Besides the proposed rehabilitative facility, Senator Dodd, who is chairman of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, made a strong plea for strengthened probation and parole services.

This need long has been recognized here and was the subject of an exhaustive study made in 1957 by a blue-ribbon committee headed by the late District Commissioner David B. Karrick. Some gains, made following the Karrick report, have been wiped out by increasing caseloads.

Although the nationally recommended caseload for a probation officer is 50 cases, Dodd noted that probation officers for the U.S. District Court for the District carry caseloads of 80. In addition some officers, who also must make presentence investigations, are responsible for as many as 100 cases a month.

Although Chief Probation Officer Edward W. Garrett requested nine additional workers for this fiscal year, Dodd said he obtained only one.

"This again is one example, one underlying cause, why we have the crime conditions in Washington that have alarmed us in recent months," Dodd said.

Dodd emphasized that he would ask Congress to include funds for the eight probation officers in the budget for the next fiscal year.

In addition, he said he would seek seven more workers to eliminate excessive caseloads carried by the District Board of Parole. And he warned that the two new judges authorized for juvenile court will not be effective in rehabilitative efforts unless that court also obtains probation manpower.

"If we are dedicated to reduction of the serious crime situation in the District," Senator Dodd said, "we will have to reevaluate our needs in terms of priorities and give crime fighters the necessary tools.

"It is important to recognize that probation and parole are institutions with two major goals. They strive to treat, correct, and rehabilitate a law violator to return him to a constructive life but, on the other hand, they are also charged with protecting and safeguarding the community from criminals and delinquents.

"Unless probation and parole caseloads are of a realistic size, it is not difficult to understand the failures that do take place."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 7, 1962]

THE DROPOUTS

The Devil finds work for idle hands, as the saying reminds those who look for the causes of street crime in the District. Senator Dodd has observed the clear connection between the rate at which children drop out of high school and the frequency of sidewalk violence. In this city, 1 of every 10 youngsters 16 and 17 years old is out of school and out of work. Some left their classrooms because the work had defeated them, some because their families pressed them to begin earning money. Once out of school, they promptly learned the bitter lesson that in this generation only real skill entitles a man to a steady job. And they are utterly unskilled.

The school system acknowledges its responsibility to identify future dropouts well before they turn 16. It is already experimenting with new kinds of training devised to keep them in school and provide them with work that will impress them as relevant to their own lives. In a very hopeful departure, schools here and throughout the country are devising broader vocational courses with on-the-job-training that actually pays wages.

But vocational courses are particularly difficult to administer, for the schools must be sure that they are training boys for jobs that exist. Since this is a city of large public buildings, Cardozo High School is setting up a very sensible program to train 20 boys to be building custodians. The capacity of this program, unlike a course in English literature, is severely limited, not by the number of children who want it or need it, but by the number of jobs that annually are to be filled.

American high schools are being required increasingly to diversify their fare. For some pupils, this will mean instruction in Russian or advanced mathematics. For some it will mean instruction in running heating plants and waxing floors. But highly diversified education, providing special work for small groups of youngsters, is very expensive.

Senator Dodd has suggested specific steps by which the District can improve its vocational training and job placement facilities for young people. Most of them require money. Against that cost, we must balance the price of a high crime rate. The solid good sense of the Senator's recommendations is apparent. Whether we can proceed to put them into effect depends essentially upon the attention that Senator Dodd's congressional colleagues pay to his advice.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1962]

CITY LACKS PENAL SPOT FOR JUVENILE TOUGHS

(By Leslie H. Whitten)

The tough young defendant is a special problem in the District.

Juvenile court cannot send him to the adult institutions at Lorton or to the District of Columbia Jail.

Federal prison officials do not want him at the National Training School. And there is no other juvenile facility to which he can be sent.

Caught in this quandary, the juvenile court has been doing one of three things:

It has sent the youth to the National Training School, but limited the commitment to his 18th birthday or 18 months, whichever is longer. This is done under an agreement with Federal officials that the court will not make use of its power to commit a youth until age 21.

It has in rare cases placed him on probation in the hope that he will sin no more—at least not until he is 18 and his offenses thus no longer come under juvenile court.

It has waived some youths to district court who probably would not have been sent to adult court if the District had its own institution for older youths. Waivers, reserved for serious cases, still enable district court to take advantage of the Federal Youth Corrections Act which pegs the period of imprisonment to a young criminal's progress toward rehabilitation.

The heart of the District problem is aggressive 15-, 16-, and 17-year-olds who come before the court and those 18- and 19-year olds who are already in the training school under juvenile court commitment.

Their offenses include robbery, housebreaking, serious assaults, and other crimes of violence. And although some adapt to the school—which is designed for younger inmates from out-of-State—the unruly few from the District have disrupted school activities, according to officials.

Early release from the training school or the seldom-used but risky probation for these aggressive youths, probably is a small but potentially dangerous factor in the city crime picture, officials report.

And a recent survey showed that out of 28 waivers from juvenile court—where nonjudicial findings that the youth is involved in the offense almost always precede a waiver—a total of seven escaped both treatment and punishment.

Paradoxically, the situation may get worse when the District's two additional judges are appointed. As they dig into the youth case backlog of some 830, they will be bringing an increasing number of youths into court—and the problem of what to do with them will arise more often.

Judge Orm W. Ketcham, the court's lone judge, said last year he was sending 100 to 125 youths to National Training School a year. On April 10, youths sent by juvenile court made up 136 of the 385 inmates.

The growing desire of the Bureau of Prisons to transfer the school to a site in the South makes the need for a solution even more urgent.

There is general agreement that the solution lies in a new juvenile institution for the District—one that would replace and enlarge the services now provided. But the budget problem has not been solved and as long as the school can be used as a makeshift, officials have been reluctant to press the issue.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, who, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has interested himself in the question of a new institution, had this to say yesterday:

"There are several alternatives. (It) could be located at Lorton under the administration of the District Department of Corrections as proposed by Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana.

"It could be placed under the authority of the Bureau of Public Welfare. It could be administered independently, or it could be administered by the juvenile court."

The problem cannot be adequately solved even on a temporary basis, by sending older aggressive youths to young adult institutions outside the city, as has been done by the Bureau of Prisons, DODD pointed out. The practice is legally questionable.

The Hartke bill would provide facilities for 15-year-old youths and older and those unmanageable at the National Training School.

It would require that juveniles be kept separate from the young adults, but would allow use of certain facilities by the two groups of inmates at different times.

The Hartke bill has passed the Senate and is before the House District Committee.

At present a juvenile court advisory committee study is being made of the whole problem by a subcommittee under G. Howland Shaw, a civic leader and youth guidance specialist.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the articles were written as a result of the activities of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is chairman and of which I have the honor of being a member. They were concerned with the incidence of adult and juvenile crime in the Nation's Capital and especially the high rate of assaults on citizens of the District, which has prompted many to call it the most dangerous city in the Nation.

The committee for many years, including the time that I was chairman, has been putting forth efforts to better the delinquency prevention institutions in this city. Under the very able chairmanship of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], we have continued in this direction. With the help of the Washington Post and Times Herald, which should be commended for its continuing fight against the forces which create crime in this city, I think the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] has made a substantial contribution by alerting the Congress and providing it with solutions to some of this city's many-sided crime problem. It is to be hoped that through the efforts of the committee, the Congress, and the responsible leaders in this community we can turn what is called the most dangerous city in the Nation into one of the safest and most desirable capitals of the world.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe there is no other business to come before the Senate; therefore, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 24, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 23, 1962:

U.S. ASSAY OFFICE

John P. Botti, of New York, to be Superintendent of the U.S. Assay Office at New York, N.Y.

IN THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Col. Carroll H. Dunn, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress, approved June 28, 1879 (21. Stat. 37) (33 U.S.C. 642), vice Brig. Gen. William R. Shuler, reassigned.

IN THE U.S. COAST GUARD

Vice Adm. Edwin J. Roland, U.S. Coast Guard, to be Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard with the rank of admiral.

IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Theodore William Parker, O18369, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John Honeycutt Hinrichs, O17174, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. August Schomburg, O18422, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 23, 1962:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Dr. Emanuel R. Piore, of New York, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1966. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Preservation of Wisconsin's Moraines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation—experiencing great forward strides of development and progress that literally changed the face of America—should, I believe, concurrently take action to preserve and perpetuate significant features of our national heritage.

In Wisconsin, for example, exist natural features of our landscape—sculptured long ago by glaciers—called moraines: of great geological, scientific, historical, and scenic significance.

The preservation of Wisconsin's moraines is desirable for our economy and for preservation of these natural formations—sculptured long ago by glaciers—of great scientific, historical, and scenic significance.

For these reasons, I have introduced legislation to establish an Ice Age National Park in Wisconsin.

After studying my bill, the Department of Interior supported the idea of preserving the moraines and made alternative recommendations.

Now, the time has come for action.

Consequently, I am urging early hearings by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to: First, consider both my original bill and the Department's recommendations; second, adopt necessary accommodations between the two approaches for preserving the moraines; and, third, expedite legislation for a go-ahead on the project for preserving these moraines of great significance to Wisconsin.

Particularly, I was gratified to note that the Department of Interior has distributed a special brochure, published with private funds—donated to the public service—on the Department's recommendations for creating a proposed Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in Wisconsin.

The brochure, in my judgment, represents a splendid effort to reflect the significance of preserving these outstanding features of our national heritage, not only for Wisconsin, but for the Nation.

Recently, I was privileged to discuss other aspects of this project in an address over Wisconsin radio-TV stations. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts of Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley

Friends, the Nation, progressing at a rapid pace, must, I believe, also take appropriate action to preserve and perpetuate significant features of our national heritage.

Across the Nation, and particularly in Wisconsin, we have outstanding features of natural landscape. At this time, I refer especially to our moraines—natural formations sculptured long ago by glacial action—of great geological, scientific, historical, and scenic significance. Unique and unequaled anywhere in the country, these moraines, if allowed to go unprotected, would deteriorate and ultimately be lost to generations of the future. The preservation of such features of our national landscape would, in addition to being of historical value, be of importance economically to Wisconsin. Our Kettle Moraine State Park, for example, now attracts millions of tourists. As a result, the park is a great asset to the tourism industry, one of the major sources of income for Wisconsin.

During the first session of this Congress, I introduced legislation to create an Ice Age National Park in Wisconsin.

As proposed, the bill would provide for the establishment of a park comprised of significant features of our moraines. I well recognize, of course, that, in the establishment of such a park, a variety of serious questions would be involved, including the following:

1. What land would be included in such a project?

2. How would adjacent areas be affected?

3. Could adequate financing be equitably obtained?

4. How could the administrative problems best be handled?

Despite the existence of such significant problems, however, which are not unsolvable, I believe that constructive action should be taken to preserve the moraines.

Recently, the Department of Interior, which administers such programs, proposed, after long evaluation of the bill, a substitute recommendation. The major features of this substitute would be the following:

1. The area would be designated the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin.

2. Federal funds, not exceeding $50,000, would be allocated for planning the project.

3. The proposal would authorize establishment of the reserve administered by the State and its political subdivisions in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary's cooperation would consist of:

(a) Formulating, within 2 years, a comprehensive plan for preservation of the outstanding examples of continental glaciation in Wisconsin;

(b) Assisting the State and its political subdivisions in acquiring additional lands needed in the reserve; and

(c) Assisting in maintaining facilities for the visiting public.

4. When plans have been completed, the Secretary in consultation with the State of Wisconsin would designate a boundary for the Ice Age Scientific National Reserve.

5. Federal financial assistance would be provided as follows:

(a) For the acquisition of additional lands and interests in land within the boundary of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve; (b) but, the grants could not exceed 50 percent of the fair market value of the additional lands acquired; (c) further, the Secretary could contribute not to exceed 75 percent of the cost of providing interpretive facilities and services within the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve; and (d) not more than 50 percent of the annual cost of maintaining all physical facilities within the reserve.

SCOPE OF RESERVE

Under the recommendations of the Department, the reserve should consist of roughly 32,500 acres to present the ice age story. It would be comprised of approximately 17,000 acres in the northern unit of the Kettle Moraine and Campbellsport drumlin areas; 3,500 acres in the Devil's Lake area; 10,000 acres in the Bloomer area of Chippewa County; and 2,000 acres in all other areas. Within area in which the reserve would be established 20,500 acres are owned by either the State or a county. Realistically, these recommendations of the Department of the Interior differ in scope and nature from the proposals in my bill S. 1981.

Nevertheless, this represents:

A recognition by the Department of the significance of the moraine in Wisconsin; and

A willingness to cooperate in preserving these moraines, including: Assistance in solving the problems and acquiring and administering such a project.

In view of this positive attitude, then, I am urging the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to hold early hearings:

1. To consider both the originally introduced bill and the Department's recommendations;

2. To adopt necessary accommodations between the two approaches for preserving the moraines; and

3. To expedite legislation that would enable the going ahead on the project for preserving these moraines of great significance to Wisconsin.

Outlook for Dairying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the farmer—in dairying as elsewhere—still sweats and labors under the dual handicap of a production-consumption imbalance and a cost-price squeeze for the farmer.

Consequently, the Nation—through free enterprise and governmental cooperation—must now find a farm program that will, first, better serve the American public; second, reduce as possible, the cost of the price support program to the taxpayer; and third, brighten the outlook for the dairy industry—an important segment of our agriculture and national economy.

The Nation—in my judgment—should expand research, not only for stepping up consumption, but also for greater utilization of dairy products for commercial and industrial purposes. For this reason, I introduced a bill, S. 2414, to create a Dairy Research Laboratory in Madison, Wis.—the heart of America's dairyland. The purpose would be to expand research to find commercial and industrial utilization for the component parts of milk and milk products.

Recognizing the need for greater efforts in this direction, the Committee on Agriculture has now reported a bill, S. 2786, to the Senate. Significant among its proposals, was a provision to establish an Agricultural Research and Industrial Use Administration within the Department of Agriculture, to carry on an expanded research program for industrial uses of agricultural commodities.

The goal is meritorious. Questions, however, will evolve around whether the creation of a new administration within the Department of Agriculture is the best vehicle for getting the job done. With growing surpluses and dropping income in dairying, however, there is a special need for strong emphasis on research. The committee recommendation provides new support for the objective of the Wiley bill, S. 2414.

Recently, I was privileged to discuss these, and other aspects of the dairy outlook in an address over Wisconsin radio stations.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts of Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley

Earlier this session, the administration presented its dairy recommendations to Congress. In Congress—and on the farm front—these proposals have been largely unacceptable.

As things look now, the dairy farmer may well be caught in a political—as well as economic—squeeze. How? The Agriculture Committees in both the Senate and House of Representatives, for example, have failed to favorably report a resolution for maintaining a reasonable level of price supports.

The administration has dropped dairy price supports to $3.11 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk. According to predictions, the drop will cost the American dairy farmers about $250 million. Wisconsin, alone—the No. 1 dairy State—will have an income loss estimated to reach about $50 million.

This is a hard blow to the dairy farmer.

Realistically, we recognize, that, with the present supply-demand situation—involving substantial dairy surpluses—there is little likelihood of getting a return to the $3.40 level of price supports.

The Congress, however, can—and should—enact a compromise bill authorizing price support levels somewhere between the $3.11

and $3.40—perhaps within the $3.22–$3.30 range.

This would, I believe:

1. Prevent too great a drop in income for the dairy farmer—still caught in a cost-price squeeze;

2. Help to remedy the supply-demand situation; and

3. Serve the taxpayer by holding down the costs of the price support program, without rendering as much of a blow to the dairy farmer.

To prevent an economic catastrophe in dairying and a demoralizing of the dairy farmer, however, fast action is now needed by the Congress.

Now, briefly, let's review the outlook for the legislation affecting the dairy farmer.

SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK AND SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS

Over the years, the national school lunch and special milk programs have served as useful outlets for dairy and other farm surpluses—particularly in improving the health of schoolchildren.

Across the Nation, about 14.3 million children—including 270,000 in Wisconsin—participate in the school lunch program. Under the school milk program, about 2.4 billion half pints were distributed last year, serving about 20 million people. In Wisconsin, these were distributed to about 4,500 schools and child care centers, serving over 91 million half pints of milk.

For Wisconsin, the estimated participation for fiscal year 1962 amounts to about 300,000 children under the school lunch program, and distribution of about 100 million half pints under the special milk program.

Nationally also, commodities distributed under these programs have helped to feed about 7 million needy persons.

Currently, requests for funds to carry forward these programs are pending before Congress. These include $105 million for the special milk program; and approximately $170 million for the school lunches.

The Congress—in my judgment—should approve these requests for appropriations for the school lunch and the school milk programs.

ADDITIONAL STEPS

In addition, I believe, that—to best serve the dairy industry and the Nation—the following steps need to be taken:

1. Provide greater protection for the dairy industry from too great a flow of imports; for example, the recent proclamation by the President, modifying the quota for bluemold cheese, authorizes expansion of imports by 283,000 pounds yearly. Recognizing that we already have a dairy surplus, this hits the dairy industry hard; for each pound of imported cheese takes over the market for a pound of domestically produced cheese.

2. Considering the substantial surpluses, there is a real need also—in my judgment—for greater utilization of dairy products for shipment abroad under Public Law 480. The purpose would be to utilize these high nutritive foods for humanitarian purposes, as well as for strategic weapons in the cold war.

3. The Nation can and must expand its research, not only for consumption but, also for greater utilization of dairy products for commercial-industrial purposes. For example: The enactment of the Wiley bill, S. 2414—to create a dairy research laboratory in Madison, Wis.—would establish a sound foundation for expansion of such much needed research.

CONCLUSION

Recognizing that the outlook for helpful action on price supports is extremely dim, there needs to be renewed efforts to expand these supplementary programs to help handle the problems in dairying and other farm problems.

The 100th Anniversary of B'nai B'rith in Milwaukee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 23, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege on the 16th of April to address B'nai B'rith in Milwaukee, Wis., at the celebration of its 100th anniversary. There were present at the dinner some 500 of the citizens of that community and others including Label Katz, president of B'nai B'rith national with Ben Barkin the national director from 1936 to 1941 who presided and did a great job.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from my address upon that occasion, together with a copy of the program and an article entitled "B'nai B'rith Today."

There being no objection, the excerpts, program, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

Mr. Toastmaster, President Katz, Governor Nelson, distinguished clergy, friends, I am happy to join in the celebration of the 100th anniversary of B'nai B'rith in Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin. Recently, I was privileged, also, to join in the 50th anniversary observance of Hadassah in Washington, D.C.

Truly, B'nai B'rith—through its work and ideals—symbolizes the best traditions of America.

Fortunately, we—here in this great country—enjoy, and should be grateful for, a climate in which we can adhere to differing faiths, principles, and ideals. Yet, respecting these differences, we can work side-by-side for mutual, meritorious goals—each making his unique contribution and thereby speeding progress and enriching our society.

Bonded together, not only by an ancestral heritage but a dedication to high ideals, you—members of B'nai B'rith—reflect in your constitution many of the principles of our national life, aimed toward developing and elevating mental and moral character; invoking the purest principles of philosophy, honor, and patriotism; alleviating the plight of the poor and needy; rescuing victims of persecution; and otherwise attempting to serve the fundamental needs of humanity.

Realistically, you have re-created these laudable ideals into practicable, workable programs for better citizenship; improved vocational service; youth organizations; strengthening the spirit of patriotism among our citizens; helping to meet the special needs of members of the Armed Forces and veterans—and other worthy goals.

ISRAEL: LAND OF HOPE AND PROMISE

The centuries-old dream of Israel (as a land of hope and promise—and as an economic, political and spiritual homeland) also became a reality because of the unstinting prayers and work of folks like yourselves, in B'nai B'rith. The great transfusion of human, economic, and spiritual lifeblood into a largely desert land made it bloom with promise for the homeless and homeward bound.

Globally, Israel, too, has become a democratic outpost—a bastion of freedom for the free world.

LOOKING AHEAD

For the future, the challenge, however, will be of even greater magnitude than in the past.

Around the world, there is a need for a greater universal effort—with humanity joined hand in hand—to work toward elimination of intolerance, prejudice, and hatred; eradication of poverty, malnutrition, illiteracy, and disease; promoting the brotherhood of man; encouraging respect and recognition of human dignity for all people; vigilantly opposing oppression and aggression against people and nations; strengthening the ethical, moral and spiritual fiber of all citizens; and improving the outlook for peace in the world.

Realistically, each of us has special interests or purposes in life. By adopting goals that serve not only ourselves, but the broader needs of human beings—particularly the less fortunate—however, such action will indeed warrant the blessings of humanity.

Upon your 100th anniversary, then, I warmly congratulate you for your fine work and accomplishments of the past. For the future, I pray God's presence in your efforts to serve your fellow men.

CENTENNIAL BANQUET, APRIL 15, 1962, BETH EL NER TAMID SYNAGOGUE, IN HONOR OF GILEAD LODGE NO. 41, SPONSORED BY MILWAUKEE B'NAI B'RITH COUNCIL, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

PROGRAM

Presentation of colors: U.S. Armed Forces.

National anthem: Sol M. Altschuller, cantor, Congregation Emanu El B'ne Jeshurun.

Invocation: Mrs. Ben Strauss, president, B'nai B'rith Women, Milwaukee Council.

DINNER

Welcome: Joe E. Smith, program chairman.

Toastmaster: Ben Barkin.

Greetings: Hon. Gaylord A. Nelson, honorary chairman, Governor of Wisconsin; Hon. Alexander Wiley, U.S. Senator; Hon. Henry W. Maier, mayor, city of Milwaukee; Hon. John L. Doyne, executive secretary, Milwaukee County; Rev. William F. Kelly, S.J., president, Marquette University; Mrs. Morton Gorchow, president, B'nai B'rith Women District No. 6; Ervine Lavine, president, B'nai B'rith District Grand Lodge No. 6; Harry J. Plous, president, Milwaukee Jewish Welfare Fund; Avrum M. Chudnow, president, Milwaukee B'nai B'rith Council; Dr. Louis J. Swichkow, rabbi, Beth El Ner Tamid Synagogue.

Membership salute: Ben Z. Glass, executive secretary, B'nai B'rith District Grand Lodge No. 6.

Soloist: Frank Glazer, concert pianist.

Address: Label A. Katz, international president, B'nai B'rith.

Benediction: Paul L. Moskowitz, second vice president, District Grand Lodge No. 6.

LODGES OF B'NAI B'RITH

Excelsior Lodge No. 170—past presidents, 1872–88: 1872, Dr. Kahn; 1874, Joseph Pollack; 1876, S. H. Goodman; 1877, J. Nathanson; 1879, E. M. Oberndorfer; 1880, A. W. Rich; 1881, S. B. Auerbach; 1882, M. Oberndorfer; 1883, E. D. Adler; 1884, D. H. Friend; 1885, H. M. Oberndorfer; 1886, W. Katzenstein; 1887, Charles Kahn; 1888, Charles Kahn.

Shorewood (Bay Shore) Lodge No. 1373 (instituted June 15, 1939)—past presidents: 1939–40, Abe Rice; 1940–41, Herman J. Scholl; 1941–42, Dr. Carl O. Diamond; 1942–43, Joe E. Smith; 1943–44, Sol Raskin; 1944–45, Lawrence S. Katz; 1945–46, Samuel Goldenberg; 1946–47, Dr. Sam Granof; 1947–48, I. E. Lample; 1948–49, Edwarde F. Perlson, 1949–50, Ervin R. Abramson; 1950–51, Marvin Klitsner; 1951–52, Hyman B. Parks; 1952–53, Sidney Melvoin; 1953–54, Sidney Sayles; 1954–55, Jack Berland; 1955–56, Bernard J.

Hankin; 1956–57, Dr. Benj. L. Feldman; 1957–58, Philip E. Lerman; 1958–59, Louis Heller; 1959–60, Louis Heller; 1960–61, Armin Solomon; 1961–62, Bernard Goldstein.

Shofar Lodge No. 1388 (instituted November 19, 1939)—past presidents: 1939–41, Avrum Chudnow; 1941–42, Bernard Solochek; 1942–43, Nathan J. Rakita; 1943–44, Sidney A. Levner; 1944–45, Milton Holzman; 1945–46, Lionel Rosenberg; 1946–47, Harry Weintrob; 1947–48, Hy Cofar; 1948–50, Ben Sax; 1950–51, Philip Zarem; 1951–52, Ervin Abrams; 1952–53, Arthur Hirschbein; 1953–54, Dr. Charles Goldstein; 1954–55, Saul Rapkin; 1955–56, Oscar Eisendrath; 1956–57, Dr. Bernard Sharp; 1957–58, Alex Zaidins; 1958–59, Louis Silberman; 1959–60, Matthew J. Berlowitz; 1960–61, Leonard Edelstein; 1961–62, Louis Riches.

Washington Park Lodge No. 1460 (instituted May 4, 1941)—past presidents: 1941–42, Herman Schwartz; 1942–43, Sol Forman; 1943–45, Max Raskin; 1945–47, Manuel Holtzman; 1947–48, Maurice Marks; 1948–49, Clarence Goldberg; 1949–51, Abe Parelskin; 1951–53, William Kay; 1953–54, Davis Cohen; 1954–55, Joe Radoff; 1955–57, Dr. Jack C. Biller; 1957–58, David Gutkin; 1958–59, Harry Sicula; 1959–61, Ervin Wolkenstein; 1961–62, Irving Fields.

Sholom Aleichem Lodge No. 1559 (instituted March 25, 1945)—past presidents: 1945–46, Joseph Bursten; 1946–47, Ben Trosch; 1947–48, Sam Korelstein; 1948–49, Sam Schneiderman; 1949–50, Simon Hoffman; 1950–51, Leon Goldberg, 1951–52, Simon Hoffman; 1952–53, Jacob Joseph; 1953–62, Abraham Gecht.

Milwaukee Memorial Lodge No. 1962 (instituted July 22, 1947)—past presidents: 1947–48, Leo Lichter; 1948–49, C. Irvin Peckarsky; 1949–51, Lawrence Cohen; 1951–51, Norman Saichek; 1952–53, Philip Croen; 1953–55, Arthur L. Kahn; 1955–57, Hyman W. Rubin; 1957–59, Leslie Bern; 1959–60, Leonard S. Marcus; 1960–61, Edwin Goldman; 1961–62, Samuel Gilbert.

Lake Shore Lodge No. 1985 (instituted June 27, 1954)—past presidents: 1954–55, Thomas Kaufman and Gerald Kahn; 1955–56, A. L. Meyer; 1956–57, Adolph Stern; 1957–58, Arthur Posner; 1958–59, Jack Shlimovitz; 1959–60, Robert M. Rice; 1960–61, Gerald Minkoff; 1961–62, Robert Lessin.

Flagstone Lodge No. 2266 (instituted April 2, 1960): 1960–61, Norvall O. Winnik; 1961–62, Shale Yanow.

Century Lodge No. 2304 (instituted February 12, 1961): 1961–62, Robert Temkin.

B'nai B'rith Today

For more than a century B'nai B'rith has made the goals of humanitarian service and devotion to the Jewish people the basis of its unparalleled achievements.

In exploring the historical record, we note that an important factor in the vitality of the order has been its ability to keep step with the dynamic development of American life. The United States today faces challenges unknown to the struggling young Nation of the 1840's. So, too, the concerns of B'nai B'rith are now focused on problems that are vastly different than those of an earlier era when the physical welfare of Jews was a paramount motivation for a B'nai B'rith involved in philanthropic activities.

Today, the affluent society of modern America has rendered orphan homes and relief funds obsolete. Instead the challenge to Jewish life is to conquer the more subtle erosion of its spiritual heritage and deepen its creativity.

Prime Minister David Ben Gurion, addressing the 1959 triennial convention of B'nai B'rith in Jerusalem, warned that American Jewry was facing "mitat neshika"—"the kiss of death" that comes not from persecution but from the forces of assimilation.

Instinctively, American Jewry rejects this dire prophesy. Moreover, there is much evidence to the contrary, signifying an upsurge in American Jewish life.

Nonetheless, B'nai B'rith recognizes that the future of our community cannot rest on optimistic statements, and the order's current objectives stem from a determination to assure the creative continuity of American Jewry,

For this goal a program of education on all levels is basic. Thus, more than half of B'nai B'rith's annual budget is devoted to educational projects for youth and adults.

The B'nai B'rith Hillel foundations are now operating on 241 campuses in the United States and overseas. In this vital area of service, B'nai B'rith carries almost sole responsibility for deepening the Jewish knowledge and commitment of those who will form our future leadership cadre. The demands upon B'nai B'rith resources are increasing constantly with the tremendous growth in college enrollment and the need to reach the relatively isolated young intellectuals now in academic life.

On a more informal level this educational process is a basic ingredient of the B'nai B'rith Youth Organization, now the largest Jewish youth movement in the world. By combining skillful group work techniques with fine projects and publications, B'nai B'rith provides young people—more than 43,000 at present—with an outstanding program imbued with positive Jewish content.

B'nai B'rith also recognizes that growth in the Jewish educational stature of our youth runs the risk of becoming meaningless unless it is mirrored by similar developments amongst their elders. B'nai B'rith's response to this challenge has been a multifaceted adult education program of informal learning that is pioneering in the development of new ways to involve the Jewish community in cultural and educational activities.

There are manifold obligations undertaken by the order in other areas of Jewish life. Both in the United States and on the international scene, B'nai B'rith is widely regarded as a leading spokesman of the Jewish people. In recent years it has frequently focused public attention on the plight of the Soviet Jewish community. The visit of President Label Katz to the Soviet Union last year, and his representations to the United Nations Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities are part of an on-going effort to point up to the world the gap between official promises of equality and cultural freedom and the realities of Jewish life in the U.S.S.R.

In the area of community relations, the activities of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith have also undergone shifts in emphasis to meet the changing times. The comic caricatures and stereotyping that were vaudeville standbys 50 years ago—and motivated B'nai B'rith to establish the league—no longer exist in a more urbane and sophisticated America. Similarly, the brutal forms of anti-Semitism that erupted during the Hitler era, and which forces here and abroad have sought to utilize as a political weapon, have receded greatly as the body politic becomes more and more aware of the indivisibility of liberty and freedom.

During the postwar years, the Anti-Defamation League moved from the wholly negative aspects of a "defense agency" to widespread programs of democratic education. It also leveled its fire on existing patterns of discrimination. In the past 15 years, through both educational efforts and Federal and local legislation, there has been significant progress in eliminating religious bias in employment and higher education. Today, ADL applies its skills and experience to exposing and combating the pockets of social and housing discrimination that still persist.

The significance of B'nai B'rith as a worldwide movement, with membership in 41 nations of the free world, is reaching greater proportions than ever. Through such structures as the B'nai B'rith International Council, the order seeks to maintain close relationships with Jews in other parts of the world, particularly with the Jewish community in Israel, promoting projects which can add to the strength and potentialities of Jewish life wherever it is lived.

By vigorously implementing its 119-year-old principles in an ever expanding program, B'nai B'rith has demonstrated a continuing ability to make a concrete reality of the ideals of its dedicated founders.

SENATE

Tuesday, April 24, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of wisdom, in all our fallible ways Thou hast called us to be fellow workers with Thee—channels through which Thy will may be done on earth, as it is in heaven. While we come praying for our ailing world, with a realization that our strength is unequal to our tasks and that our insights are not deep enough for the solving of the tangled problems which confront us, we would pray most of all for ourselves—that the golden glory of April flowers and foilage may be a parable of the blossoms of the divine grace of meekness, gentleness, charity, and forgiveness which shall make the barren wastes of our own lives even as the garden of the Lord.

Now that the time for the caroling of birds has come, in all and through all, may our glad hearts sing:

"This is my Father's world,
And though the wrong seems oft so strong,
God is the ruler yet."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 23, 1962, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Facilitation of Work of the Forest Service

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to facilitate the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AWARDED WITHOUT FORMAL ADVERTISING

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Air Force military construction contracts awarded by that Department without formal advertising, for the period July 1, 1961, through December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROCUREMENT RECEIPTS FOR MEDICAL STOCKPILE OF CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY SUPPLIES

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reporting, pursuant to law, on the actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ended March 31, 1962; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the period July 1961–February 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of aviation war risk insurance, as of March 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO PERSONAL PROPERTY IN CUSTODY OF PROPERTY CLERK, METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend provisions of law relating to personal property coming into the custody of the property clerk, Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT ON GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Government Printing Office, fiscal year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN MAJOR SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT BY BUREAU OF SHIPS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the procurement of certain major shipboard equipment by the Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, dated April 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the **PRESIDENT** pro tempore:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

"Joint resolution relative to aid to students of foreign countries attending colleges and universities in the United States

"Whereas the United States has long been recognized among nations of the world as a promoter of international cooperation, as a supporter of free institutions of higher learning, and as a firm believer in scientific and educational exchange programs; and

"Whereas the attendance of students from foreign countries at universities and colleges in this country promotes cultural and educational good will and, as such, is an integral part of the Federal foreign aid programs and aims; and

"Whereas although the attendance of such students at colleges and universities in this country is promoted by the Federal Government as part of its foreign relations and foreign aid program, the financial burden of the cost of educating such students falls not on the Federal Government but on the State governments when the students are attending State institutions of higher learning; and

"Whereas California and other States have provided generous reductions in the tuition fees charged such students; and

"Whereas the cost of educating such students constitutes a financial burden on the local taxpayers; and

"Whereas the encouraging of foreign students to obtain their education in the United States lies within the realm of international diplomacy and is therefore properly the responsibility of the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to provide Federal funds to subsidize able foreign students attending State institutions of higher learning in this country; and to provide funds to the States to aid in meeting the expense to the States of educating such students in State institutions of higher education; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 5

"Joint resolution relative to establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps

"Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States are now considering legislation to establish a Youth Conservation Corps; and

"Whereas among the most pressing and depressing problems of today are the rise in unemployment, rising relief costs, and increase of juvenile delinquency; and

"Whereas it has been established that a Youth Conservation Corps would be a most important resource of combating all of these three undesirable phases of our national life; and

"Whereas such a Youth Conservation Corps could achieve essential public improvements, worth more than the cost entailed; and

"Whereas the work most needed to be done generally lies on forest, range, watershed, and recreational lands of public interest: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully urges Congress to enact legislation as proposed in H.R. 10682, which would authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Pittsburg, Calif., protesting against the enactment of legislation to impose a Federal income tax on income derived from public bonds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **DIRKSEN**:

S. 3207. A bill to provide for the expansion of the national cemetery at Alton, Ill.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. **McNAMARA**:

S. 3208. A bill to provide for assistance to States in the promotion, establishment, and maintenance of safe work places and work practices, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY ACT

Mr. **McNAMARA**. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to occupational safety. I ask unanimous consent that a covering letter on this bill from the Secretary of Labor to the President of the Senate, and a statement explaining the intent and purpose of the bill, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3208) to provide for assistance to States in the promotion, establishment, and maintenance of safe work places and work practices, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter and explanatory statement presented by Mr. McNAMARA are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1962.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting a draft bill, "To provide for assistance to States in the promotion, establishment, and maintenance of safe work places and work practices, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower."

I am also enclosing a summary statement explaining the need for the legislation and the purpose and effect of the bill.

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget as being in accord with the program of the President.

It is in the nature of new legislation and would not amend any existing law.

Yours sincerely,
ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

(Enclosures.)

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATES FOR OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY PROGRAMS

With the growing demands on our productive capacity and the rapidly rising labor force in the United States, there is an urgent need for conservation of skilled manpower through the prevention of occupational injuries. Action by the Federal Government to aid the States in their efforts to prevent injuries on the job has been long overdue.

The attached draft bill, which is a part of the legislative program of the Department of Labor for 1962, would authorize this action. It would provide for financial and technical assistance to States to establish and expand occupational safety programs. The development of safety codes and standards requiring safe workplaces and work practices would be left to the States, as would the creation of a climate favorable to the acceptance and observance of such codes through the voluntary cooperation of labor and management.

NEED FOR EXPANDING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY PROGRAMS

The prevention of occupational injuries is a matter of national importance, both in terms of the general welfare of the working population and in terms of the reduction of the social costs of occupational casualties. Between 13,000 and 15,000 workers have been killed and 1¾ to 2 million others injured on the job every year for the past 10 years. In 1961, 13,500 workers were killed on the job and 1,836,000 sustained occupational injuries.

Automation, radiation, noise, speed, vibration, and other modern hazards to which workers are now exposed increase the need for competent safety control measures and personnel.

The annual cost to the Nation in wage loss, medical expenses, workmen's compensation payments and lost production in 1961 was estimated at $4.4 billion. Vast as this loss is, it fails to take into account the suffering of the injured worker and the deprivations to his family.

If these figures represented an inevitable minimum of annual occupational casualties, there would not be much to do except deplore the human costs of the Nation's job processes. However, that is not the case. As a result of experience in the field of occupational safety during the past 40 years, safety experts generally believe that we know how to prevent over 90 percent of all work injuries. Where sound safety measures have been adopted there has been a substantial decrease in accidental injuries.

Several of our largest industrial corporations have reduced the frequency of job injuries 90 percent or more in 40 years. Unfortunately, in establishments too small to afford full-time safety engineers, control of accidents has not kept pace with technological developments. As the Nation's work force expands, and as further technological progress is made, more safety consultants with higher qualifications will be required. As the work force becomes more highly skilled, it will be more costly to lose workers due to accidents.

NEED OF THE STATES FOR ASSISTANCE IN EXPANDING THEIR PROGRAM

State labor departments have not, despite strong and sometimes successful efforts, generally obtained sufficient funds to employ adequate staffs. Few State labor departments are properly equipped to advise employers on the ways and means of preventing occupational injuries. Comparison of the safety requirements of the various States and their respective fiscal allocations makes it readily apparent that in many cases State resources are so inadequate as to preclude the attainment of even minimum acceptable levels. Recent studies indicate that more than two-thirds of the States did not have sufficient staff to make one inspection per plant annually in the industrial establishments coming under their jurisdiction.

A study made by the President's Conference on Occupational Safety in 1949 showed that of 37 States reporting, less than two-thirds spent as much as 10 cents per year per industrial worker. Personal contacts with the States and recent safety code comparisons indicate little improvement has been made. With inadequate funds it is impossible for the States to get a properly qualified staff adequate for the job to be done. To assure the same measure of safety for workers throughout the country, there is a need for more uniformity in State occupational safety requirements.

The Federal Government has responsibility for occupational safety and health in several areas, such as mining, railroad operation, aviation control, longshore and harbor work and certain Government contract employment. Programs assisted by funds under this draft bill would be State programs under State law—separate and apart from the Federal programs. The proposal would effect no change in the relationship of Federal and State safety programs. However, expanded State programs within the scope of State law which would be made possible by financial assistance under the proposal might furnish a basis and an incentive for future cooperative arrangements between State and Federal Governments in the discharge of their respective and separate safety responsibilities, saving in time and money. Close cooperation is anticipated between the Federal agencies administering safety functions and the Department of Labor in any matters of mutual interest presented by plans which may be submitted under this proposal.

Safety programs under the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, which is administered by the U.S. Bureau of Mines, are expressly exempted from this proposal since that act, among other things, also authorizes certain Federal-State action under prescribed State plans. Further, provision is made for the Secretary of Labor to consult the Secretary of Interior before he approves any State plan which relates to a safety program in the mineral extractive industries.

PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

The proposed bill would provide money for grants to the States to finance part of the cost of establishing and administering improved and more uniform standards to insure safe work places and work practices. Acceptance of such standards through the voluntary cooperation of labor and management would be sought. Through State help the safety techniques now being used successfully in large plants which employ full-time safety personnel could be made available to the small workplaces in which a large percentage of the work injuries occur and in which there is no employed personnel to give safety advice and guidance.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall annually allot the funds appropriated to carry out this program among the several States. To encourage the development of these plans, grants for the first biennium could be as much as 75 percent of the total cost of the State plan. In the second biennium, Federal grants would be reduced to 66⅔ percent maximum, and thereafter the grants would be made on a matching basis. Before allocation of Federal funds to a particular State could be made, the State would have to submit, and have approved by the Secretary, a plan that accords with certain general requirements set forth in the bill. The actual amount of a particular grant would be determined by such criteria as the special industrial hazards of the State, its financial need, and the adequacy of its existing program. Grants could not be awarded for less than $15,000, except in those few instances where a State has no plan at all, and the necessity exists to create public awareness of the benefits of a safety program. In these cases, grants of not more than $15,000 annually could be made by the Secretary for a period of 2 years in order to promote the formulation of a State plan and an agency to administer it. The Secretary is also authorized to require the plan in lieu of any or all other provisions to provide for the establishment of special projects to list safety techniques or to provide special training and new techniques.

Further, the Secretary is authorized, after notice, and opportunity for a hearing, if he finds that in the administration of a plan there is failure to comply with any requirement of the proposal or any provision required by a plan to withhold funds until he is satisfied there is no longer failure to comply. Judicial review of the Secretary's action is provided in the U.S. circuit court of appeals.

These provisions are administratively sound and would adequately insure the economical use of Federal funds to help achieve the stated purpose of the bill. The program would pay big dividends toward reducing the cost of occupational injuries which in 1961 exceeded $4 billion.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address delivered by him at Sturgeon Bay, Wis., on April 16, 1962.

YOUNG AMERICAN MEDALS FOR 1960

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am extremely proud to inform the Senate that two fine young citizens of Michigan have been selected as winners of the Young American Medals for 1960.

These Young American Medals for Bravery and Service, as you know—were established by the Congress in 1950 to provide recognition for boys and girls under 19 who perform outstanding acts of bravery or service in a calendar year.

Not more than two Bravery Medals and one Service Medal may be awarded each year—but no award need be made at all if the Young American Medals Committee feels that no candidates meet the high standards.

The winners were announced last week by the Attorney General. They will come to Washington to receive their medals in a White House ceremony to be arranged later.

A winner of the 1960 Young American Award for Bravery is Gordon Bernard

Kilmer, the 15-year-old son of Dr. and Mrs. Paul B. Kilmer, of Reed City, Mich. Gordon won the award for his heroic performance in saving a friend from drowning on Wells Lake, Mich., after their boat had capsized.

Gordon demonstrated remarkable courage and resourcefulness—not only in saving his polio-crippled friend from drowning by towing him some 400 feet to shore—but by reviving him through artificial respiration, after the boy had sunk three times.

Mary Ann Kingry—a 17-year-old senior at Sts. Peter and Paul High School in Saginaw, Mich.—has been named winner of the Young American Award for Service because of her outstanding work on behalf of the Junior Red Cross while she maintained an excellent academic record and took part in a variety of other activities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the detailed citations of the accomplishments of these two splendid young people be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I am informed by the Justice Department that this is the first time in the history of these awards that two winners in 1 year have come from one State. Those of us from Michigan are most proud of Gordon Kilmer and Mary Ann Kingry.

I think special mention must be made of the fact that Miss Mary Ann Kingry is the first girl ever to win the Service Award. It is worth noting further that this highly prized honor has not been awarded since 1955.

Mr. President, all Americans share a sense of pride in the achievements of these remarkable young people. I know that my colleagues in the Senate join me in expressing the warmest congratulations to Gordon Kilmer and Mary Ann Kingry and their justifiably proud parents.

There being no objection, the citations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE NEWS RELEASE

An Oregon boy who rescued two younger brothers from their burning home, a Michigan youth who saved a friend from drowning, and a Michigan girl with an outstanding record in the Junior Red Cross, are the winners of the Young American Medals for 1960, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy announced today.

Mr. Kennedy said Gordon Bernard Kilmer, 15, Reed City, Mich., will receive the Young American Medal for Bravery, at a special White House ceremony to be arranged later.

The Young American Medal for Service will be awarded at the same time to Mary Ann Kingry, 17, Saginaw, Mich., Mr. Kennedy said.

The Bravery Awards will be the 15th and 16th, and the Service Medal the 5th since Congress established the Young American Medals in 1950 to provide recognition for boys and girls under 19 who perform outstanding acts of bravery or service in each calendar year.

Not more than two Bravery Medals and one Service Medal may be awarded annually, but no award need be made. The Service Medal was last awarded in 1955.

The selections, made by the Young American Medals Committee, were approved by the Attorney General. Members of the committee are: J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, chairman; Archibald Cox, Solicitor General of the United States; and Edwin O. Guthman, Special Assistant for Public Information, executive secretary of the committee.

Mr. Kennedy said:

"The accomplishments of the young people selected by the committee—and of the many other young people nominated for the awards by Governors from across the country—provide renewed evidence of the intelligence, courage, and responsibility of young America today and of adult America tomorrow.

"The medal winners, their parents, and their schools merit warmest congratulations from every citizen."

GORDON BERNARD KILMER

Gordon Bernard Kilmer, born June 8, 1946, one of three children of Dr. and Mrs. Paul B. Kilmer, 350 West Upton Street, Reed City, Mich. He attends Reed City High School.

Gordon was chosen as a medal winner for his heroic performance on the afternoon of June 13, 1960. Gordon, then 14, a friend, Mark D. Seath, 15, and Gordon's golden retriever, King, were sailing in a 14-foot aluminum boat on Wells Lake, near Reed City. While they were in the middle of the lake, the boat capsized, dumping the boys and the dog into the water ranging from 20 to 40 feet in depth.

Seat-type life preservers floated out of reach and the boys had to alternate holding on to the overturned craft because it would not support their combined weight. After about 15 minutes in the cold water, they saw two men at the far end of the lake. Their calls for help were unheard so the boys decided to start swimming. They had swum about a hundred feet when Mark, a one-time polio victim, told Gordon he didn't think he could make it.

Gordon encouraged and coaxed him, but Mark sank. Gordon, then about 10 feet in front of his friend, swam back, dove and dragged Mark back to the surface. Mark, bigger than Gordon, struggled with his rescuer, but Gordon pulled Mark over onto King who was swimming with them. With Mark holding on to King's tail, they again headed for shore.

Young Seath sank again, however, and again Gordon brought him to the surface. He couldn't hold Mark by the hair because of his crew-cut and Mark once again went under. For the third time, Gordon brought him up. He then took hold of Mark's sweatshirt and swam approximately 400 feet to shore.

After reaching the shore, Gordon noted that Mark had stopped breathing, had swallowed his tongue, and that he had turned a deep blue color. He immediately pulled Mark's tongue free and applied mouth-to-mouth respiration, even though he had no previous training in this procedure, until Mark had started breathing again and until he could feel Mark's heart beating.

Gordon then applied another form of artificial respiration until Mark regained consciousness and was able to advise Gordon that he would be all right while Gordon sought aid and called an ambulance. At this point, two men arrived in a rowboat. Gordon left Mark in their care and rowed their boat across the lake to his parents' cottage, which had the only telephone in the area. He called Michigan State police giving instructions so the ambulance could locate his friend.

Another man and woman, however, meanwhile had picked up Mark and brought him to the Kilmer cottage. It was necessary to meet the police and ambulance and redirect them to the cottage.

Young Seath was hospitalized for shock and exposure. He was treated by Gordon's father, Dr. Paul B. Kilmer.

MARY ANN KINGRY

Mary Ann Kingry, born May 6, 1944, one of three children of Mr. and Mrs. Vincent P. Kingry, 1213 Brockway Street, Saginaw, Mich.

Mary Ann was chosen for the Service Medal because of her outstanding work during 1960 on behalf of the Junior Red Cross while she maintained an excellent academic record and participated in a variety of other activities.

She served as a resource member of the midwestern area for the American Red Cross and was chosen as one of two American representatives at the Canadian Training Center of the Junior Red Cross in Ontario, Canada.

Mary Ann was elected secretary of the Midwestern Area Advisory Council of the Junior Red Cross, was appointed to the 16-member National Youth Council of the American Red Cross, and was the subject of a feature article in the Journal of the American Red Cross.

In other activities, she served on her high school student council, was vice president of the Saginaw Youth Council and president of the citywide senior high council.

She was elected sophomore representative to the Sodality Club at her high school, Sts. Peter and Paul, won numerous school, regional, and State debates, and won honors for her mathematics project entry in the Saginaw Science Fair. Mary Ann has continued as a member of the Scholastic Honor Society throughout high school.

WARNING AGAINST SMEAR CAMPAIGNING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for the election year 1962, the people of Wisconsin—both Republicans and Democrats—deserve, in my judgment, first, a thoughtful, careful analysis of problems and issues; second, realistic, not smear-type, evaluations of candidates; third, criticism, as warranted, of present policies, but only if accompanied by constructive alternatives; and fourth, a positive program for progress and peace.

Unfortunately, early primary tactics demonstrate that some individuals—apparently not competent for constructive campaigning—still abuse the public podium; distort, rather than clarify, the issues; and waste the voters' time by inane allegations that reflect neither truth nor the facts of life. For example, candidates for the U.S. Senate have resorted to labeling the Wiley record "left-winger," "soft on communism," ad nauseum.

For 23 years—longer service than any Wisconsin Senator in history—the Wiley record has been one of tough and relentless anticommunism, including a strong internal security program; support of a powerful defense; indefatigable efforts to step up our nonmilitary counteroffensives—politically, economically, psychologically, ideologically; and to mobilize our people in will, spirit, energy, resources, to defeat communism.

Fortunately, campaign tactics of malodorous labeling will win for themselves just what they deserve: obscurity.

Nevertheless, a political campaign offers a candidate a golden opportunity to analyze, discuss, evaluate, and make recommendations for coping with the great challenges of the times. For 1962, I am sincerely hopeful that such high principles of campaigning—not blanket condemnations by the lazy minded, using distortions of untruths—will be the highlights of the electioneering.

Mr. President, today I received from a former opponent of mine a very fine letter in which he states:

> I believe that you will live in history as one who clearly recognized communism for what it is, and spoke out about it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD my April newsletter and the letter from John Chapple, of the Ashland Daily Press.

There being no objection, the newsletter and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY'S WEEKLY NEWSLETTER FROM OUR NATION'S CAPITAL

EASTER, 1962

The symbol of the crucified Christ reawakens in the soul of humanity—particularly in adherents of the Christian faith—a recollection and reappreciation of spiritual values.

On the horizons of the world, however, the darkly gathering clouds of communism—an anti-Christ of the times—threatens the existence of religious life for all people.

The would-be gods of communism—Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung, and fellow fanatics—would, allowed to triumph, supplant—gradually, then completely—all spiritual life with a materialistic political-economic system.

Kneeling in our Garden of Gethsemane, then, we pray: "Lord, let this cup pass from us." To be powerful, however, prayer cannot be just a passive, intangible man-and-God communication. The great will, rather, can be accomplished only by infusion of right spirit, thought, and idea into human souls, and then transformed into reality by the sweat of the brow.

Observances of Easter can have greater significance if we, individually, become rededicated to ever higher moral and spiritual principles and ideals; gird ourselves with the truth to make, and keep, men free; preach the gospel of respect for God-created human life and moral-ethical values; and seek and find the door of understanding through which all men may voluntarily join in the battle for the triumph of freedom, and good, in the world.

NEEDED: CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS ON ICE AGE NATIONAL PARK IN WISCONSIN

The preservation of Wisconsin's moraines is desirable for our economy, as well for preservation of these natural formations—sculptured long ago by glaciers—of great scientific, geological, historical, and scenic significance.

For these reasons, I have introduced legislation to establish an Ice Age National Park in Wisconsin. After studying my bill, the Department of the Interior supported the idea of preserving the moraines, and made alternative recommendations.

Now, the time has come for action. Consequently, I am urging early hearings by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to (1) consider both my original bill and the Department's recommendations; (2) adopt necessary accommodations between the two approaches for preserving the moraines; and (3) expedite legislation for a "go-ahead" on the project for preserving these moraines of great significance to Wisconsin.

FOREST FIREFIGHTERS CALLED OUT EVERY 5 MINUTES

Every 5 minutes during 1961 a forest fire started and burned an average of 346 acres an hour. Statistics compiled by the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service are based on reports from national forest, State foresters, and agencies in the Department of the Interior and the Tennessee Valley Authority. Forest fires totaled 98,512 during 1961 compared to 103,387 reported in 1960. Acreage burned showed a greater drop—from 4,478,188 acres in 1960 to 3,045,374 in 1961—as a record low.

In Wisconsin, the record for 1961 was not so favorable to the reduction in numbers of countrywide forest fires. The figures increased from 1,253 acres to 1,906; the acreage burned likewise increased from 6,078 acres in 1960 to 13,317 in 1961. One thousand eight hundred and eighty-one of the fires were estimated as having been caused by debris—undetermined causes—smokers, and railroads were responsible for the remainder. The fire record for Wisconsin still needs improving. Let's protect Wisconsin's forests!

DEAR SENATOR AND MRS. WILEY: Your Easter message was a deeply touching and inspiring one.

Your discernment of communism as an anti-Christ of the times is one of the truly great statements of all of the leaders of our times.

I believe that a generation and more from now, I believe that you will live in history as one who clearly recognized communism for what it is, and spoke out about it.

Sincerely, and with deep admiration,
JOHN CHAPPLE.

THE LITERACY TEST BILL

A SHOCKING AND SHAMEFUL ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we are today beginning a civil rights battle to vindicate the Constitution, sustain and implement the 15th amendment, and secure the voting rights of thousands of Americans disenfranchised by abuse of literacy tests in certain Southern States. It is sad and yet symbolic that we must do so under the pall of another sad chapter in race relations in our country.

The current campaign of the White Citizens Council of New Orleans to cast away destitute Negroes from their native States to other cities will surely go down in history as a shocking and shameful act.

I have undertaken a study of the legislative means that may be necessary to deal with the extralegal aspects of this situation. But in the meantime and quite apart from the requirements of law, New Yorkers have already shown that they will receive innocent instruments of domestic injustice in the same way they have received the oppressed and the exploited throughout modern times—in the same way they have received refugees from czarist Russia, from Nazi Germany, and from Hungary, Poland, Cuba, and other places.

And I have no doubt that other cities of the North, within applicable law, will meet their responsibilities to these fellow human beings, too.

I do harbor some doubt, however, as to whether those who are responsible for this shameless stunt truly understand the moral issue involved.

A destitute person is a destitute person whether he lives in New Orleans or New York; and whether he is black or white. The challenge to our society is that we must erase such human suffering, not exploit it.

I believe the American people will be aroused by this heartless display of theatricalism at the expense of the indigent. It is a hoax that will fool no one. It is a gimmick that may call attention to the plight of the underprivileged, but it cannot camouflage the ugly fact that Negroes are being deprived of their rights in key areas of the South.

It is in every sense a strange backdrop to the effort to enact a bill barring unreasonable literacy tests for voting.

But this action by the White Citizens Council of New Orleans—and the filibuster that is advertised to begin today—can only serve to spotlight the fact that in 16 southern counties of large Negro population, not a single Negro was registered to vote in 1959; that in other counties fewer than 5 percent of eligible Negro citizens were registered; that there is widespread disenfranchisement of Negroes through the shocking misuse of literacy tests; and that college educated Negroes—even college professors—have been denied the right to register by the arbitrary action of registrars.

These are the simple truths which will not be lost on the Nation in this debate.

I believe Americans will be sickened by the spectacle of other Americans playing a game of spite; and I believe they will reflect their strong feelings in the struggle that is to begin in the Senate today. The chances for a successful cloture vote on a civil rights bill—the first in history—will, I believe, be materially enhanced by this development.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Under the 3-minute limitation, the time available to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 30 seconds more.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if that is to be the custom here, that is quite all right. I do not desire to object; but some of us may have statements which may somewhat exceed the 3-minute limitation, and I wish to be sure that the same custom is to be followed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Georgia that any time he wants to limit his statement to 30 seconds, I shall not make objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I refuse to be bound by any such limitation, and I object to any further extension at this time——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may finish the sentence I began.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not like——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I object.

PUBLIC TAKING OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the case of Griggs against Allegheny County, decided by the Supreme Court of the

United States on March 5, 1962, again highlighted some of the issues involved in the public taking of private property rights for Federal or federally assisted programs. This particular case related to the taking of an air easement in connection with a federally assisted airport.

I have long been concerned about the legal and economic aspects of the acquisition of property for Federal or federally aided programs. My concern has arisen in part from numerous hearings held before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing. Testimony has repeatedly detailed some of the effects on owners, tenants, nearby properties and businesses, and all taxpayers of the acquisition of sites, especially for the urban renewal and the Federal highway programs. In the case of urban renewal, the Urban Renewal Administration has indicated in its report on "Relocation from Urban Renewal Project Areas" that a cumulative total of over 32,000 families, 10,000 individuals, and 6,900 business concerns were displaced from urban renewal sites in the United States through mid-1960. And the President's transportation message indicates that, under the interstate highway program alone, 15,000 families and 1,500 businesses are being displaced each year.

To relieve private businesses of some of the burdens that may be imposed by public acquisition of commercial properties for urban renewal project sites, the Housing Act of 1961 incorporated two important amendments. One amendment removed the ceiling on relocation payments to private business concerns, and provided for full reimbursement of total certified actual moving expenses. The other amendment authorized the Small Business Administration to make loans on special terms under its disaster loan program in order to assist small business concerns in reestablishing their businesses, provided such concerns suffered substantial economic injury as a result of displacement from the urban renewal, Federal highway, or any other construction program conducted by or with funds provided by the Federal Government.

While these amendments should help to remedy some inequities that may arise from the acquisition of property for Federal or federally assisted programs, additional measures may well be necessary to assure a fair and just distribution of costs and benefits under all Federal or federally aided programs, and to establish uniformity in acquisition practices and procedures among these programs. It is for these reasons that I have been concerned about the legal and economic consequences of all Federal and federally aided property acquisition. In both the 86th and 87th Congresses, I introduced legislation to establish a nonpartisan commission authorized to conduct a thorough and impartial study of compensation to persons affected by property acquisition under all Federal and federally aided programs, including a review of the present methods and procedures, and the awards and the amounts of awards, to be followed by a final report with specific recommendations.

As I said on the floor of the Senate on January 30, 1961, in introducing S. 671:

> This study should be broad enough to cover all land acquisitions under Federal and federally assisted programs, such as highway programs, public works programs, urban renewal programs, and military programs. It should be broad enough to cover all land acquisition, no matter how the property is acquired or by whom. It should be broad enough also to cover all the widespread effects of these land acquisitions—their effects on owners, on tenants, on nearby property and businesses, and on others affected by the acquisition. It should be broad enough to cover the benefits and burdens of these land acquisitions, in relation to the persons and businesses involved and to the Federal programs under which the properties are acquired. For example, the study should include the extent to which the costs of Federal programs are borne by individuals or firms whose property is taken or whose property or business is either destroyed or reduced in value by the taking of neighboring property, and the extent to which these costs are borne by the general public which underwrites these programs. It should also include consideration of the benefits which these programs may provide for persons and businesses in affected areas.

Several months after I introduced S. 671 in the 87th Congress, the House Committee on Public Works voted to establish a select subcommittee of its own to conduct a study along lines similar to those of the two bills I had previously introduced. According to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works dated August 24, 1961, the select subcommittee was established "to make a comprehensive study of the acquisition of property under Federal or federally assisted programs, through condemnation proceedings, or otherwise, and to conduct hearings, receive testimony, and develop legislative proposals, if appropriate."

To indicate how the House subcommittee was established and to outline its objectives, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a press release announcing the creation of the subcommittee and an address by the chairman of the select subcommittee made before the American Association of State Highway Officials several months ago.

Soon after the House Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition was set up, I wrote identical letters to Congressman Clifford Davis, chairman of the select subcommittee, and to Congressman Robert E. Jones, ranking member, expressing my interest in the proposed activities of the subcommittee. In response to my letter, Congressman Davis said in part:

> Your excellent statement of January 30, 1961, on introducing S. 671 provides a clear picture of the need for this study so that the Congress may be satisfied "that all persons affected by the acquisition of property by the United States or under Federal or federally assisted programs shall receive fair, just, and equal treatment." The Bureau of the Budget in reporting on S. 671 and several similar House bills, expressed the administration's endorsement of the project and suggested that it might be accomplished most effectively by a legislative committee. Our Committee on Public Works created the select subcommittee to implement this suggestion.

Congressman Jones, in his reply, noted that "we intended that the study the select subcommittee should undertake would be of the same broad and inclusive character as what your bill, S. 671, proposed."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the Record a copy of the identical letters I addressed to Congressman Davis and Congressman Jones, and a copy of their replies to me.

It is my understanding that the House Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition, under the direction of Mr. Henry H. Krevor, as its chief counsel, now has the study well in hand. It will be a study, I am sure, that will provide some illuminating insights into the general process of property acquisition, in which either private or public parties, or both, may be involved, as well as into the specific details of public acquisition for various Federal or federally aided programs. As the first study of its kind ever made, it will undoubtedly furnish important guidelines for Federal policies relating to property acquisition in both urban and rural areas. The study should present an opportunity to analyze not only the legal but also the economic aspects of property acquisition as one stage of the general process by which uses of land change from time to time.

The able membership of the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition, the high caliber of its staff, and the significant objectives of its operations suggest to me that there is no further need for action by the Senate on S. 671 at this time. I can assure the House select subcommittee that I, as well as my other colleagues in the Senate, will follow their progress with keen interest. I should like to take the liberty of sending to the select subcommittee any cases that may come to my attention highlighting problems involved in acquiring property for Federal or federally aided programs. I feel certain that all Senators will be glad to furnish whatever assistance may be helpful.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. Clifford Davis,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I have been informed of the appointment of the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition and of its plans to undertake a study of real property acquisition by Federal, State, and local governments for Federal and federally assisted programs.

I have been interested in this subject for some time. During the last Congress I introduced a bill, S. 2802, which would have established a commission to make a study of this subject. On January 30, of this year I introduced a revised bill, S. 671, for the same purpose. For your information I enclose a copy of the statement I made at the time I introduced S. 671, together with a copy of that bill. I also enclose a copy of a letter I wrote to Senator McClellan on June 5, 1961, commenting on various suggestions made by agencies with respect to the bill and also pointing out references to the problems involved in the bill which arose in connection with the hearings on the housing legislation of 1961, together with a copy of these hearings.

As I understand it, it is the intention of the select subcommittee to make the same study in as comprehensive and impartial a fashion as I had in mind for the Commission proposed in S. 671. If this is the case, it would seem to me unnecessary to take any further action with respect to S. 671.

I was interested to note that the committee has named Mr. Henry H. Krevor as the chief counsel for the select subcommittee. Mr. Krevor is, I know, an acknowledged authority in this field, and I am glad to say was of substantial assistance to my staff in reviewing and revising S. 2802 of the 86th Congress for introduction this year as S. 671.

I should appreciate being advised of your plans with respect to this study in order to determine whether any further action is necessary with respect to my bill, S. 671.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SPARKMAN.

DECEMBER 7, 1961.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I appreciate very much your interest in the new Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition and your kind remarks about our chief counsel.

The purpose of this bipartisan subcommittee is to make a comprehensive study of existing laws, practices, and procedures in the acquisition and evaluation of real property required for Federal and federally assisted programs to determine whether they are unfair either to property owners because of inadequate payments or to the taxpayers because of overpayments; and to produce a considered report with sound recommendations and legislative proposals, if appropriate. It is to be an impartial, objective study project, and is not designed as an investigation into alleged improprieties or irregularities. Additional details are set out in the enclosed copy of an address which I presented before the American Association of State Highway Officials at its annual meeting this year.

Your excellent statement of January 30, 1961, on introducing S. 671 provides a clear picture of the need for this study so that the Congress may be satisfied "that all persons affected by the acquisition of property by the United States or under Federal or federally assisted programs shall receive fair, just, and equal treatment." The Bureau of the Budget, in reporting on S. 671 and several similar House bills, expressed the administration's indorsement of the project and suggested that it might be accomplished most effectively by a legislative committee. Our Committee on Public Works created the select subcommittee to implement this suggestion.

The work of this subcommittee is just getting underway and we are going to need a great deal of help. As I see it, the success of the study will depend, in large measure, upon the action taken in the early stages. If you have any additional thoughts as to specific problem areas which should be explored, or any other comments or suggestions concerning the study, they will be most welcome.

With all good wishes, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

CLIFFORD DAVIS.

[Press release, Sept. 15, 1961]

The newly created Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition of the House Committee on Public Works held an organizational meeting today and named Henry H. Krevor as its chief counsel. The subcommittee is preparing to undertake a comprehensive and impartial study of real property acquisition by Federal, State, and local governments for Federal and federally assisted programs.

This is the first study of its kind ever undertaken by the Federal Government and will embrace all pertinent Federal and State laws, practices, and procedures for the evaluation and acquisition of real property by both negotiation and condemnation, to ascertain if laws and practices are unfair either to property owners because of inadequate payments or to taxpayers because of overpayments. The appraisal process and techniques now employed in measuring the value of property taken or damaged for public improvements will be thoroughly analyzed to determine its accuracy and effectiveness of application.

This study is expected to require about 2½ years to complete, and the subcommittee will conduct hearings, receive testimony, and develop legislative proposals, if appropriate, and report its findings and recommendations to the Committee on Public Works for transmittal to the Congress. Two of the largest programs to be included in the study are the acquisition of property for the construction of navigation and flood control dams and other facilities by the Army Corps of Engineers and for construction of Federal-aid highways by the States, under supervision of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. The cost of right-of-way for the 41,000 mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, alone, is estimated to cost over $6¼ billion.

Mr. Krevor, who will direct the subcommittee staff in carrying out the study, is well experienced in the field of land acquisition. From 1952 to 1957 he was with the Acquisition Division of the Army Corps of Engineers, where he served as chief of the civil works section of the Condemnation Branch, and from 1957 until the present time he has been Assistant General Counsel, Chief of the Lands Division, of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee, is chairman of the subcommittee, and the other members are Representative ROBERT E. JONES, Democrat, of Alabama; Representative ED EDMONDSON, Democrat, of Oklahoma; Representative FRANK W. BURKE, Democrat, of Kentucky; Representative HAROLD T. JOHNSON, Democrat, of California; Representative HOWARD W. ROBISON, Republican, of New York; Representative WALTER L. MCVEY, Republican, of Kansas; Representative WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Republican, of Ohio; and Representative JOHN C. KUNKEL, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

ADDRESS BY HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS, OF TENNESSEE, BEFORE THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS, DENVER, COLO., OCTOBER 9, 1961

I should like to talk with you today about a congressional study which is just getting underway and which will be of great importance to the Federal-aid highway program and to you personally. On August 24 of this year, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives created a Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition, on which I am privileged to serve as chairman.

This subcommittee is bipartisan, with five Democrats and four Republican members. We are charged with the responsibility of making an impartial, nonpolitical, objective, and comprehensive study to determine if existing laws, practices, and procedures in the acquisition and evaluation of real property acquired for Federal and federally assisted programs are unfair either to property owners because of inadequate payments or to the taxpayers because of overpayments.

It is now estimated that the study will require about 2½ years to complete. Our study will include the acquisition of real property for Federal projects by the Departments of Justice, Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Post Office, and Health, Education, and Welfare; and by the Atomic Energy Commission, Veterans' Administration, General Services Administration, Federal Aviation Agency, Tennessee Valley Authority, Capitol Architect, and others.

The Federal-aid programs to be embraced in the study will include acquisitions of real property for highways, airports, urban renewal, and others. We are particularly interested in the Federal-aid highway program for it involves the acquisition of more property at greater expenditure of public funds than any other single program, and it directly affects people throughout the entire country.

As you know, the cost of right-of-way for the 41,000-mile Interstate System alone is estimated to be over $6¼ billion, almost 16 percent of the total cost of the Interstate System. This is a lot of money.

I know that you share the desire of the members of the subcommittee to assure that this money is properly expended in return for value received, and at the same time to assure that property owners are adequately compensated.

In recent years, there has been growing attention, at the Federal, State, and local levels, to the question of adequacy of just compensation under the traditional concepts of eminent domain.

This is not startling in light of the vast increase in the amount of real property being acquired for the many and various kinds of public improvements and the increasing complexities in measuring the value of property taken.

The Constitution of the United States and that of each of the several States assure that property will not be taken without due process of law and without payment of just compensation. Neither the Constitution of the United States nor the Federal statutes define "just compensation," and the same is generally true as to State laws.

Interpretation of the requirements and limits of just compensation has been a judicial function of the courts. They have generally held that just compensation is measured by the market value of real property taken, plus the diminution in market value of the owner's remaining real property resulting from the taking and the use to be made of the property taken. This measure of just compensation presupposes a willing seller and a willing buyer; however, in the acquisition of property for public improvements, the seller is often unwilling to sell, but is forced to do so.

When the "willing seller" rule for determination of compensation is applied to an unwilling seller, it is obvious that there may be dissatisfaction, controversy, and litigation. In some instances the property owners are greedy and try to obtain more than they are entitled to under any test of fairness and equity; in other instances the property owners suffer real and substantial losses for which they cannot be paid under existing laws.

In these latter cases, courts have been known to engage in judicial legislation, juries often effect compromises, appraisers sometimes exercise flexibility in arriving at opinions of value which strain if not completely distort the appraisal process, and negotiators and those authorized to approve settlements on occasion depart from sound concepts of market value, all in the name of serving "basic justice."

However, this is not justice; it is giving preferential treatment to some, without equal protection to all. If our present laws and procedures are inadequate or unfair they should be changed. On the other hand, if they provide for the proper measure and payment of compensation, they should be applied uniformly.

During the past decade, the Congress and many State legislatures have been urged to correct alleged inequities in existing law. The proposed changes have taken many forms. For example, bills have been introduced in the Congress to require payment for business losses, loss of goodwill, moving costs, the value of personal property located on real property taken, and expenses of litigation, including attorney fees.

There have been bills before the Congress to require that buildings and other improvements be appraised on the basis of their current replacement cost irrespective of their actual market value; to require, in addition to all other compensation, payment of an amount equal to the average annual net income earned from agricultural properties during the preceding 5 years; and to provide for payment, in addition to the market value of the property taken, of the difference between such value and the cost of locating and purchasing suitable replacement property.

You are familiar with similar legislation considered by your own State legislatures. It is true that most of these bills have not been enacted into law; but there is a growing sentiment among Members of Congress, Federal, State, and local officials, and the public generally, that the laws and practices for the acquisition of property for public use have not kept pace with the advances of society and that some inequities may exist.

Though the market value definition runs through the whole history of just compensation, there have been expressions in some of the cases indicating that an owner should actually be indemnified for all losses in the value of his property resulting from a public improvement, rather than to be paid the fair market value of the property taken for the improvement.

This has been demonstrated by laws which have been enacted in some States to provide for payment for damages not generally regarded as compensable in eminent domain, such as may result from changes of highway grade, interference with air, light, and view, and interference with access by creating a cul-de-sac.

Other State statutes have been enacted to require payment of costs of moving personal property and for litigation expenses, including attorney and expert witness fees. On the Federal level, Congress has authorized the Defense Department agencies and the Department of Interior to reimburse owners and tenants for moving costs, in amounts not to exceed 25 percent of the value of property taken; and the Housing and Home Finance Agency may pay fixed sums up to $200, without relation to actual expenses, for moving of individuals and families, and "the total certified actual moving expenses" of businesses. The Tennessee Valley Authority also has authority to pay moving costs.

In practically every instance the proposed or enacted legislation has been piecemeal, designed to meet a specific problem, the correction of which sometimes produces even greater problems through lack of uniformity.

This same pattern of legislation is evident in the present Congress. As you know, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 was amended in the Senate to include in the definition of "construction" advisory and administrative expenses in connection with the relocation of building tenants. This provision was eliminated in conference because of objection by the House conferees.

The House Committee on Public Works also now has before it legislation recommended by the General Services Administration which would authorize reimbursing owners and tenants for moving expenses, losses, and damages, in amounts not to exceed 25 percent of the value of the real property acquired in connection with the acquisition of real property by the United States for any Federal use.

Such a piecemeal approach is inefficient and wasteful of time, money, and effort; it ignores the desirability of consistency in governmental activity and of reasonable uniformity in treatment of all the people; and it results in varying amounts being paid to property owners, depending upon which Federal agency happened to take their property, or for which Federal or Federal-aid program it is being acquired.

Furthermore, the isolated consideration of only one of the many elements of value, damages, expenses, and benefits which make up the total picture of losses suffered and compensation received, is neither fair to property owners nor to the taxpayers, for it cannot be viewed in proper perspective alone.

The Committee on Public Works believes there is real need for a comprehensive and impartial study of the acquisition of property for Federal and federally assisted programs. We do not believe it should be assumed that property owners generally are not adequately compensated.

It is true that property owners are not paid for some kinds of damages, losses, and expenses which may be related to the taking of their property and the construction and use of public improvements.

It is also known that the amounts awarded by courts are often substantially more than the amounts of negotiated settlements for comparable properties. It is also recognized that under the laws and practices of many States, the public does not receive credit for all benefits accruing to property owners' remaining properties from public improvements.

We are undertaking this study with open minds and without any preconceived opinions as to what our findings and recommendations will be. The valuation and acquisition of real property is highly technical and complex, and we are well aware of the controversial nature of the subject matter, particularly so since fundamental differences of opinion give rise to thousands of litigated condemnation cases each year.

This is the first comprehensive study ever undertaken of real property acquisition by Federal, State, and local Governments for all Federal and Federal-aid programs. The subcommittee is determined to make a thorough and impartial study, and to produce an objective report with sound recommendations, together with legislative proposals if appropriate.

We realize the seriousness of this undertaking, for what we do can have a lasting impact upon Federal and State legislation and upon the expenditure of public funds by all levels of government. It may also materially influence negotiation and condemnation practices and appraisal techniques.

We are most fortunate in securing Mr. Henry H. Krevor as our chief counsel. Many of you know Mr. Krevor.

He is a member of the AASHO right-of-way committee and has served as Assistant General Counsel, Chief of the Lands Division, of the Bureau of Public Roads since 1957. Prior to joining Public Roads he was employed in the acquisition division of the Army Corps of Engineers for a period of 5 years, where he was chief of the civil works section of the condemnation branch.

It is particularly appropriate that the man who will direct our staff activities has had firsthand experience in both the largest Federal land acquisition program and the largest Federal-aid program with which we will be concerned. I am indebted to Mr. Rex Whitton for releasing Mr. Krevor from the Bureau for the period that the subcommittee is in existence.

The magnitude of legal and factual material to be considered in a comprehensive and exhaustive study of this kind can become overwhelming, and it is essential that the work proceed in orderly progressive steps.

The staff will first compile and analyze existing laws, practices, and procedures. Then the subcommittee will examine the effectiveness and acceptability of these laws, practices, and procedures in the light of experience in their implementation and the attitude of modern society, to identify specific problem areas.

Once this has been accomplished, the most difficult work begins, which is to weigh in the balances of equity and fairness the interest and welfare of affected property owners with that of the public, so as to draw informed and sound conclusions upon which recommendations may be passed. We plan to make use of all pertinent material which has already been developed, such as the excellent compilation and analysis of highway laws prepared by the highway laws committee of the highway research board, which work was done under the sponsorship of your organization.

It is also planned to contact all appropriate Federal and State agencies to secure information and data on all aspects of real property valuation and acquisition. Again, some of this material is already assembled in usable form, such as the State highway departments' right-of-way procedure manuals and the periodic reports of interstate right-of-way condemnations filed with the Bureau of Public Roads.

Also, the land economic and severance damage studies which have been pioneered by the California State Highway Department, promoted by public roads, and undertaken by many States, will be of immeasurable value, particularly as to the adequacy of current appraisal processes and techniques in measuring damages to remaining property in partial takings.

After completion of preliminary work by the staff, the subcommittee will hold hearings and invite testimony from Federal, State, and local officials, bar associations, judicial organizations, right-of-way and land-acquisition associations, appraisal societies, property owners, educators, and others.

We are going to need a lot of help, and we are looking to the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads, among others, to serve as reservoirs of wise counsel and advice. In the near future you will be asked to supply information and material relative to your laws, practices, and procedures for the appraisal and acquisition of real property, and the results obtained in their application, as well as to identify problems which you believe the subcommittee should consider.

At an appropriate time, you will be afforded an opportunity to testify at hearings of the subcommittee. However, any suggestions or thoughts which you may have at any time relative to the study are welcomed, and solicited.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Finance Committee be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object in this instance, I must point out that a few weeks ago, when we had a rather lengthy debate over a companion subject, objection was made to committees meeting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator reserve his right to object?

Mr. RUSSELL. I reserve my right to object, yes, and I shall not object. I merely wish to say I shall not object today, but on subsequent days objection may be made to committees meeting while the Senate is in session.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I share the feeling of the Senator, and I joined with him in objecting before. It does happen, however, that committees have not had notice. Witnesses are here from out of town, and we ought to give the committees an opportunity to clear their desks and hear the witnesses; but, if necessary, I may join in any objection when this important business is before the Senate. I hope Senators will be here, and not scattered through three buildings.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to have that statement by the distinguished minority leader. I am not impressed with the statement that notice has not been given, because I think considerable notice has been given. However, I shall not object today. If I object tomorrow or the day following, I hope the distinguished minority leader will join me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none.

INJUSTICES SUFFERED BY ALASKA HOMESTEADERS REQUIRE REMEDIAL ACTION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, recently, with the cosponsorship of 10 of my colleagues, I introduced a bill, S. 3107, to establish in the Department of the Interior, a Board of Public Lands Appeals. The impetus for the introduction of such legislation was, on my part, the many injustices suffered by Alaska homesteaders because of the lack of any effective and practical machinery in the Department of the Interior to redress grievances or to protect homesteaders against arbitrary and capricious actions by employees in the Bureau of Land Management or the Geological Survey in that Department.

During the 86th Congress, I sought to obtain legislation protecting the oil and gas rights of the Alaska homesteaders. In the face of strong opposition by the Department of the Interior, all the legislation that could be obtained, Public Law 86-789, provided justice for a relatively few homesteaders and then only on the Kenai Peninsula.

I argued at the time that the statute was clear and that the Secretary of the Interior was without power to confiscate the land and improvements of a homesteader who refused to waive his oil and gas rights. I pointed out that the statute permitted the Secretary only to issue a patent reserving the oil and gas rights to the Federal Government. Many Alaska homesteaders, faced with the necessity of raising money to develop their land, were virtually forced to sign waivers.

The speedy passage of S. 3107 will give the homesteader assistance—a practical appeal procedure with the appeal being heard at a convenient location by an objective individual.

Recently the American University Law Review published a legislative note written by my research assistant, Joseph J. Brewer, ably presenting support for the legal position advanced by many of the embattled homesteaders of Alaska during the course of hearings on my bill. Of course, being an article presented for publication in a law review, it could not detail the human issues involved in the struggle of the Alaska homesteaders to prove up on their land. To the enormous obstacles of climate and terrain were added the manmade roadblocks of interminable delay, misinformation, legal technicalities and misinterpretations.

The article presents carefully, with the points well documented, the legal pitfalls encountered.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Joseph J. Brewer of Anchorage, Alaska, now a student at the Washington College of Law of the American University, appearing in that school's Law Review in the issue for January 1962, and entitled "A Bill Designed To Do Equity to a Small Group of Homesteaders in Alaska by Quitclaiming Oil and Gas Rights to Them," be printed in the Congressional Record immediately following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Legislation Note: A Bill Designed To Do Equity to a Small Group of Homesteaders in Alaska by Quitclaiming Oil and Gas Rights to Them. 74 Stat. 1028 (S. 1670) (1960) [1]

This was a bill granting mineral rights (specifically, oil and gas rights) to the entrymen in certain homestead lands in the State of Alaska, to alleviate hardships accruing to the entrymen as a result of certain procedural actions by the Department of the Interior. Although the final version of the bill was made applicable only to lands located in a 6-mile-wide strip along Cook Inlet on the Kenai Peninsula, the underlying problem involves basic rights of homesteaders throughout the vast land areas of Alaska. The problem arose from a document of April 22, 1957,[2] under which the Gelogical Survey reclassified sedimentary lands in all States and territories as "prospectively valuable" for gas and oil.[3] The reclassification had the direct result of destroying the homesteaders' prospective mineral (oil and gas) rights in their lands—rights which they had every reason to believe had become vested—and it was from this deprivation that S. 1670 granted relief to Kenai homesteaders.

The Department's action poses a question as to whether it represents a departure both from its own prior practice and from case law governing the subject. For the last four decades, Alaskan entrymen's mineral rights have been determined by the act of March 8, 1922,[4] as supplemented by traditional Interior Department practices and relevant case law concerning such mineral rights. Under the 1922 act, where lands classified as mineral were concerned, title could pass to the settler only with reservation of mineral rights to the United States.[5] As to nonmineral lands, the practice of the Department of the Interior was both to grant oil and gas leases and to allow homestead entries on the same land. Where no lease had been granted on the same tract, a patent eventually would be granted the homesteader, conveying the mineral rights to him, provided that the U.S. Geological Survey, in a report required prior to issuance of final patent, indicated the land was not mineral in character.[6] Where a lease had been granted, a patent would issue to the homestead entryman but it would be subject to the outstanding lease; however, if the tract remained classified as nonmineral in character, the mineral rights reverted to the homesteader upon expiration of the lease.[7]

This was the situation existing at the time of the Department's blanket reclassification in 1957. That document, by placing all sedimentary lands in the category of "prospectively valuable" for gas and oil, had the effect of barring any entryman on affected lands, to whom final patent had not yet issued, from obtaining mineral rights to the land he had entered and improved.

If there had been no reclassification, homestead entrymen on such tracts would have gained their mineral rights to their land upon compliance with homestead law requirements, as some did prior to the reclassification.[8] Following reclassification, on land subject to a lease the mineral rights no longer would revert to the homestead entryman at the expiration of the lease, as they would have prior to the reclassification,[9] and the entryman had no hope of ever gaining control of the leased subsurface rights to his land. On homestead tracts not subject to any lease, mineral rights were statutorily reserved to the United States,[10] as soon as the blanket reclassification went into effect.[11]

---

[1] Sec. 1 of the act reads as follows:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the United States hereby quitclaims as of the date of this Act or as of the date of issuance of patent, whichever is later, to the patentee or to his lawful heirs if title to the lands prior to the date of this Act had by devise or succession passed out of the patentee, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to oil and gas deposits in lands in the Kenai Peninsula in the State of Alaska patented to homestead entrymen pursuant to homestead entries on which all requirements of the homestead laws had been complied with prior to July 23, 1957, except for the actual submission of acceptable final proof."

[2] Hearings on S. 1670 before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 86th Cong., 2d sess., 253 (1961).

[3] Id. at 250–252.

[4] 48 U.S.C. 376, 377; 42 Stat. 415.

[5] Ibid., which reads in part: "* * * homestead claims may be initiated by actual settlers on public lands of the United States in Alaska known to contain workable coal, oil, or gas deposits, or that may be valuable for the coal, oil, or gas contained therein, and which, are not otherwise reserved or withdrawn, whenever such claim shall be initiated with a view of obtaining or passing title with a reservation to the United States of the coal, oil, or gas in such lands, and of the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same; * * * should it be discovered at any time prior to the issuance of a final certificate on any claim initiated for unreserved lands in Alaska that the lands are coal, oil, or gas in character, the patent issued on such entry shall contain the reservation required. * * *" [Actually, it has been possible to homestead in Alaska since the Act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. 409), as amended, but the 1922 Act allowed homestead entry on mineral land, not previously permissible. Acts relative to homesteading public lands subsequent to 1898 and prior to 1922 were specifically barred from application to Alaska, as will be noted, infra. See notes 9 and 27 (the Act of July 17, 1914)].

[6] Supra note 2, hearings at 240.

[7] Ibid.

S. 1670 was introduced in the U.S. Senate early in 1959 to provide relief to Alaska homesteaders who, because of the reclassification of their lands, suddenly were confronted with the imminent deprivation of part of the rights they normally would have expected to gain.[12]

Litigation in the area underscores the fact that the courts' historical stand has been in direct opposition to the Department's criteria and procedure in the 1957 reclassification of the land. The reclassification of 1957 apparently was made, not on the basis of known mineral content, but instead, on the basis of the same data that was available when the land previously was classified as nonmineral.[13] It has long been held that in order for land to be classified as mineral, its mineral character must be clearly established.

In *Davis's Adm'r* v. *Wiebbold*,[14] where two conflicting patents, one mineral and one nonmineral, had been issued, the court held that in order for the mineral patent to be valid, the land referred to would have to be known to contain valuable minerals prior to the issuing of the patent. In *Steele* v. *Tanana Mines Ry. Co.*,[15] where plaintiff sought to enjoin the company from building a railroad over a placer mining claim, the decision favoring the railway company was affirmed.

The court held the company had obtained a right-of-way from a prior homestead entry claimant and the land was not considered so valuable for minerals as to defeat the homestead entry.[16] The case was cited as controlling and the principle followed in *Meyers* v. *Pratt*,[17] some 13 years later. In the oft-cited case of *Diamond Coal & Coke Co.* v. *United States*,[18] where patents to land known to be valuable for its minerals were obtained fraudulently and subsequently were annulled, the court held that in order for the land to be considered valuable for minerals, the known condition of the land would have to be such as to justify expenditure for the profitable extraction of the minerals.[19]

In the light of those decisions it would seem to follow that the Department of the Interior had no solid basis for approving reclassification of all sedimentary lands in the country as "prospectively valuable" for gas and oil in the absence of some clear and reasonable indication that the hitherto nonmineral portions of such lands were valuable for mineral deposits, or were mineral in character. This is especially clear in the apparent absence of evidence of changed data on which to base such a reclassification.[20]

Following a July 1957 oil strike on the Kenai Peninsula, entrymen were asked to waive oil and gas rights before final entry for homesteading was granted.[21] By definition "waive" means to relinquish something voluntarily, especially, a right which can be legally enforced. If there were no doubts that the Government owned outright the mineral contents of the lands involved under the April 1957 reclassification, a request for a waiver from the entryman—asking him to relinquish a right which the Government insisted by its Reclassification Act that he did not have—would appear to be superfluous. It also would appear to be contrary to the express provisions of the statute which merely requires reservations in lands "known to contain workable coal, oil, or gas deposits * * * or that may be valuable for the coal or gas." [22]

The means by which homesteaders were deprived of mineral rights on their homesteads raises the question of whether the Department's action constituted a denial of due process. In *United States* v. *348.62 Acres of Land In Anchorage Recording District, et al.*,[23] in which the court decided in favor of a homestead entryman and against the Federal Government over disputed lands, it was said that a qualified entryman, who "enters public land with intent to acquire title, has a vested right of which he can only be deprived by failure to comply with the law." Also, it was stated that where the "right to a patent has once become vested in a purchaser of public lands, it is equivalent, so far as the Government is concerned, to a patent actually issued. The execution and delivery of the patent after the right to it has become complete are mere ministerial acts of the officers charged with that duty." In *Orchard* v. *Alexander*,[24] where it was disputed as to which of two entrymen had a better claim to patented lands, the court held that lack of notice and a hearing insofar as one of the interested parties was concerned clearly was denial of due process.

These cases establish the proposition that homesteaders' rights cannot be taken away arbitrarily. Here, the entryman had an implied statutory right to obtain the mineral rights to lands not classified as mineral in character, in the absence of interim discovery of minerals on such lands. This therefore was a right which could not be destroyed without, at the very least, the granting of due notice and proper hearing at which the Government might establish reasonable grounds for the deprivation. The failure of notice and hearing thus would seem to amount to a denial of procedural due process.

---

[8] Id. at 96.

[9] Supra note 2, hearings at 240. (S. 1670 referred only to Alaska since in the 11 Western public lands States south of Canada, it was mandatory, by statute, before any entry was allowed, to classify the individual tract, or homestead site. That statute, known as the Taylor Grazing Act, 43 U.S.C. sec. 315–315n, was never in force in either the Territory or State of Alaska. The 1922 statute that applies to Alaska refers to land that has been withdrawn, classified or reported as valuable for it mineral content.)

[10] Supra note 5.

[11] Control of surface rights to the land, as well as subsurface rights, was lost by the entrymen under the blanket reclassification, since under the 1922 act lessees could enter the land to use or occupy "so much of the surface thereof as may be required" incident to the mining and removal of minerals. The United States could always lease its reserved mineral rights. However, while the Department's practice under existing regulations was to require a $1,000 bond from the lessee if the oil or gas lease application was filed after the homestead entry was filed, no bond was required if the gas or oil application preceded the homestead filing. Thus a lessee, if his application was filed first, could enter the homestead and destroy crops or damage buildings, without liability to the homestead. See 43 CFR 66.2(b) and 43 CFR 66.6.

Furthermore, when the land was opened to homestead filing, many entrymen were not told of overriding oil and gas leases on the tracts they selected. When they were subsequently informed of that situation, many of them deemed it unfair, since a flood of leases had been applied for, and granted, at a time when the land was subject to a withdrawal order; thus, the homestead entrymen thought no other applications for the land existed, only to learn later that such applications were granted at a time when they—the would-be homesteaders—were barred from competing, insofar as priority of filing applications was concerned. Had they been forewarned of overriding leases at the time of their entry, it presumably would have been possible to select other land, or, at the very least, they would have known the risk to which the land they wanted was subject. See also note 2, supra at 195, 197, 201 where instances of damage were cited for which there were no compensation payments forthcoming.

[12] Supra note 2 at 94. See also 43 CFR sec. 192.71 providing that a homesteader may contest the classification of the land he's entered as "mineral." To defeat the required reservation to the United States of mineral rights to his land contestant must prove land was not known to be valuable for mineral content at time of reclassification. The reclassification document was marked "Not for public inspection." Supra note 2. Thus, it would have been impossible for a homestead entryman to refute a document he could not have known existed.

[13] Id. at 99.

[14] 139 U.S. 507 (1891).

[15] 148 F. 678 (9th Cir. 1906).

[16] In the words of the court: "Doubtless colors of gold may be found by panning in the dry bed of any creek in Alaska, and miners, upon such encouragement, may be willing to further explore in the hope of finding gold in paying quantities. But such prospects are not sufficient to show that the land is so valuable for mineral as to take it out of the category of agricultural lands and to establish its character as mineral land when it comes to a contest between a mineral claimant and another claiming the land under other laws of the United States." Id. at 680.

[17] 255 F. 765 (1919) (Held, colors of gold found in mountain streams on forest land opened for agricultural entry near Juneau, Alaska, was not sufficient to overturn agricultural entrant's claim).

[18] 233 U.S. 236 (1914).

[19] Id. at 239, 240. "[I]t must appear at the time of the proceedings which resulted in the patent the land was known to be valuable for mineral; * * * that the known conditions at the time of those proceedings were plainly such as to engender the belief that the land contained mineral deposits of such quality and in such quantity as would render their extraction profitable and justify expenditures to that end." The court further held that the good faith of the agricultural entryman cannot be impugned by reason of any subsequent change in conditions; i.e., that at the time of entry his purpose was to develop agriculture, not to glean a profit from any potential mineral discovery. See also; *Deffeback* v. *Hawke*, 115 U.S. 392 (1885) (proof of land's known mineral value at time of entry determines whether land is more valuable for mineral than agricultural purposes); *Bay* v. *Oklahoma Southern Gas, Oil & Mining Co.*, 13 Okla. 425, 73 P. 936 (1903) (burden of proof falls on party alleging land's mineral character, not on homestead entryman, to overcome nonmineral classification); *McLemore* v. *Express Oil Co.*, 158 Cal. 559, 139 Am. St. Rep. 147 (mineral claimants must show by a "preponderance of testimony" that land in question is more valuable for minerals than for agriculture before homestead claim can be defeated); on the latter point, see decisions rendered by the Department of the Interior, with precisely same holding; *Cresswell Mining Co.* v. *Johnson*, 8 L.D. 440 (1889); *Dobler* v. *Northern Pac. R. Co.*, 17 L.D. 103 (1893), *Winscott* v. *Northern Pac. R. Co.*, 17 L.D. 274 (1893), *Aldritt* v. *Northern Pac. R. Co.*, 25 L.D. 349 (1897). In *McLemore*, supra, court held mineral claimants must show land more valuable for mining than agricultural purposes "as a present fact; not that it might possibly hereafter develop minerals in such quantity, and of such character, as to establish its mineral value."

[20] Supra note 2 at 99.

[21] Id. at 97.

[22] Supra note 4.

[23] 10 Alaska 351 (1943).

[24] 157 U.S. 372 (1895).

In an opinion of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, dated January 27, 1958,[25] the act of July 17, 1914[26]—which was not applicable in Alaska—is relied on as authority for holding that land "prospectively valuable" for minerals requires reservation to the Government. "Prospectively valuable" apparently is equated in the opinion with "coal, oil, or gas in character" as required by the 1922 act.[27] The language of the 1914 act, however, is "reported as valuable,"[28] a description not synonymous with "prospectively valuable."

Cases hereinbefore cited[29] indicate that the value of land for mineral development is not established unless the mineral content is known sufficiently to induce informed persons to expend money to extract the minerals contained.[30] Yet, the Department approved reclassification of the lands as "prospectively valuable" without benefit of substantial proof of the kind referred to in case law,[31] and in former decisions of the Department itself.[32] Case law, as we have seen, holds that more than mere inferences are necessary to switch classification from nonmineral to mineral. It would appear that no additional discoveries of oil and gas were reported upon which to base such a reclassification, so broad as to include the U.S. portions of sedimentary lands throughout the North American Continent.[33]

As to entrymen on lands on which there had been no determination as to mineral content, the 1922 act would seem to provide that mineral rights shall revert to the United States only on condition that, prior to issuance of a final certificate, it should "be discovered that the lands are coal, oil or gas in character."[34] Therefore, as to such entrymen—including the Kenai Peninsula settlers herein involved—the deprivation of mineral rights by the blanket reclassification of April 1957 would appear to be an obvious ultra vires action.

As to land on which homestead claims had not been filed as of the date of the reclassification, a somewhat more difficult problem of statutory interpretation is involved. The act requires reservation to the United States of mineral rights of lands "known to contain workable coal, oil, or gas deposits," or lands "that may be valuable for the coal, oil, or gas contained therein."[35] Does the latter alternative clause represent authority for Department reclassification in the absence of objective evidence of actual existence of such mineral deposits? The Solicitor of the Department, in the memorandum of January 27, 1958,[36] would seem to take the affirmative position, relying primarily on the contention that Congress' intent was to require mineral reservation in lands "reported or believed to be valuable." However, it is hardly to be supposed that Congress intended such a "belief" to be established in an arbitrary and capricious manner, based on nothing more than mere conjecture on the part of the Department. The Department reversed its "belief" as to the nature of the lands involved, without benefit of any new data or evidence as to mineral content, in its blanket reclassification order. Whatever the congressional intent, it would not seem to provide justification for arbitrary action.

The Alaska lands affected were withdrawn, in 1946, from all entry, sale, location, or settlement until 1952, when gradually, by specific blocks of homestead tracts, they were again opened for agricultural entry. During the time of the withdrawal, and notwithstanding the existence of the withdrawal order, the Department of the Interior accepted and granted oil and gas applications to lease, or offers to lease, much of the land,[37] a situation which many homesteaders, ignorant of outstanding leases, deemed unfair.[38]

When S. 1670 was introduced it met with the opposition of the Department of the Interior, and was not finally passed until late in 1960, and then in modified form, becoming Public Law 86-789. The original version would have extended quitclaims by the United States to gas and oil rights in favor of several hundred homesteaders in the process of proving up on lands they had entered, but who had not yet received final patent. The final version, however, was limited to those who had entered the once-withdrawn lands of the Kenai Peninsula, and who had met every requirement as provided in the homestead statutes, except for submission of final proof of entry as of July 23, 1957, the date of the announcement of the oil strike on the Kenai. The Department of the Interior accepted this version, since the Secretary felt that some homesteaders who might have submitted final proof prior to the oil strike, may have refrained from doing so due to the existence of a suspension order of the Department in granting use of land in the area, for a 15-month period prior to the oil discovery.[39]

Since passage of the act, some two dozen entrymen of those affected have received final patents to their homesteads, which grant them full subsurface or mineral rights to the land, according to decisions by the Department of the Interior.

In view of the language of the statutes and past practices of the Geological Survey in classifying public land tracts individually, as well as case decisions on the subject, the 1957 action of the Department approving the reclassification of the lands would appear to be questionable from both legal and equitable standpoints, as well as perhaps amounting to an ultra vires act. Control of the mineral rights to those lands in all probability would have reverted to potential homestead patentees at expiration of the leases, in many instances at least, if classification had continued on the basis of known mineral character of the lands. Those rights have now been denied the vast majority of Alaska homestead entrymen who had not received patents to the land prior to July 23, 1957, because of the questionable reclassification.

It should be clearly noted that section 1 of the act of September 14, 1960[40] (S. 1670), in no way nullifies or reverses the action of the Department. In that sense, it is not a complete remedy. The view has been expressed that the rights denied homestead entrymen in this manner should have been restored by administrative action within the Department itself.[41] In its limited form as passed by Congress, the measure excludes homesteaders from its provisions unless they were located on the Kenai Peninsula. Homesteaders in other locations of the vast land areas of Alaska, who may have been subject to the same inequities, were denied any form of legislative relief when the original version of the bill was amended severely. Thus, S. 1670 was restricted to what amounts to a private relief bill for a handful of homesteaders. Even though the original version of the measure was broader in scope, it would not have reversed or amended the Department's action. Thus, any such relief measure is seen as less desirable than would be departmental action to reverse what may have been an abuse of power by the Department.

JOSEPH BREWER.

TRANSPORTATION OF NEGRO FAMILIES TO THE NORTH

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished colleague from New York for calling attention to a shocking situation in our Nation.

Mr. President, as we are about to engage in debate on the basic rights of American citizens, it is fitting that we take note of press reports to the effect that white citizens councils are planning to export Negro families by giving them one-way bus transportation to northern cities such as Washington and New York. I commend the attitude, of which we have read, taken by New York that it will receive these expatriates of other States in accordance with the Constitution of the United States and in accordance with our basic laws.

Mr. President, it is fitting that the Senate consider the words inscribed on the Statue of Liberty and that all Americans do so. This inscription was not designed as a welcome to New York City, but to the Nation. It is shocking at this date in our history to discover that some of our fellow Americans cannot find a home and opportunity in land their forefathers were brought to more than a century ago. I cannot believe that the cruel and callous actions of the White Citizens Council represent the sentiments of any substantial group in our population, either in the North or South.

We all know our brethren from the South have the same compassion that those of the North have; I cannot believe this small group speaks for any substantial number of the people of any area of our country.

But where are the voices of protest and indignation? Have they been drowned out by fear or by years of complacent acceptance of the second-class status under which Negro citizens have suffered?

---

[25] 65 I.D. 39, Opinion M-36483 (NOTE.—Prior to 1930, Department of the Interior land decisions were abbreviated L.D., see note 19, supra. With volume 53 in 1930, the Public Lands reference was dropped from title and citations thereafter referred to as I.D.).

[26] 38 Stat. 509, 30 U.S.C. 121-123.

[27] Supra note 5.

[28] Supra note 26.

[29] *McLemore* v. *Express Oil Co.*, supra note 19; *Diamond Coal & Coke* v. *United States*, supra note 18.

[30] Supra note 29.

[31] Supra notes 18 and 19.

[32] See note 19, supra.

[33] Supra note 2 at pp. 250-253.

[34] See notes 4 and 5, supra.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Supra note 25.

[37] Supra note 2 at 96, 97.

[38] Supra note 11.

[39] Supra note 2 at 186-187.

[40] Supra note 1.

[41] Supra note 2 at 211.

Incidents such as these portray in human terms the sum and substance of what this effort for civil-rights legislation means.

Our great communications media can do much to direct public attention to the significance of the debate we start today by publishing pictures of the Statue of Liberty on front pages and television screens, dramatizing for all Americans our responsibility to uphold the principles upon which our Republic was founded.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if all other Senators seeking recognition in the morning hour have been recognized, I seek recognition again in the morning hour.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the morning hour over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. The Senator from New York has been recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas desires recognition, I shall take my seat, for I am not entitled to recognition until all other Senators seeking recognition have been recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. McClellan may be found in the Appendix of the daily Record.)

THE LITERACY TEST BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to finish one sentence I began when I was last recognized.

Mr. President, it seems to me we are at least in the possibility of facing a historic moment, when there may be a successful vote to close debate in connection with the debate on a civil rights bill. If so, it will be the first such event in history. I think it is highly desirable, and I think it is richly deserved by the unanimous findings of the Federal Civil Rights Commission, upon which the measure which is to be before us is based.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the chances for such a motion being successful will be very materially enhanced if there is truly a recognition of what is occurring, how serious it is, and the desperation or extremism to which people can be driven by the persistence of such a situation as we find in respect to voting, and other violations of basic civil rights in one area of our country.

Mr. President, I hasten to point out that of course there are violations of such rights in other areas of our country, including the North, but in those areas the whole governmental machinery and the whole social climate are in favor of redressing people's rights and not denying them.

Finally, I wish to say that I hope what is happening in New Orleans may give to the American people enough realization of what is at stake, both at home and throughout the world, so that they will use their influence in terms of marshaling public opinion to help us see, at long last, that there is an effective cloture vote. I believe that, coupled with the full effort of the administration in this area, as well as our effort on the minority side, may have a desirable result.

Finally, I should like to join with my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], who was kind enough to commend me for raising the question—and I commend him—in the hope and the prayer that there will be an expression of very keen feelings on the part of our fellow Americans from the South with respect to the shameful exhibition in New Orleans. We know that there are millions of very fine, high-minded Americans in our Southern States. It will be very good for the rest of the country to hear from them in this situation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business which the Senator asks be laid before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business is the bill for the relief of James M. Norman, H.R. 1361.

Mr. RUSSELL. Was that bill made the unfinished business yesterday, or on what day?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. One day last week; April 17.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, has any announcement been made by the distinguished majority leader as to his intention? We have been reading in the newspapers a good many stories as to what is to be proposed. We have heard from Senators on the floor that a certain piece of proposed legislation will be brought before the Senate.

Has any official announcement been made as to what vehicle is to be used to bring this proposed legislation before the Senate? If so, it has escaped my attention. I must confess I was not on the floor yesterday. The Senate was briefly in session, and it adjourned before I was able to get over.

We from my part of the world know that in election years we must look out for one of these biennial invasions of the South by people who find nothing whatever wrong in their own areas but who desire to see that all the people of the South live and act according to their concepts. I know certain voices become very strong in these election years.

However, I should like to know—if the frailties of the southern people are to be corrected—as to what is the vehicle which the distinguished leadership intends to use for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There was no notice given to anyone I know of that the bill, which is the unfinished business, would be the vehicle; but, as long as the Senator has raised the question, this will be the vehicle for the literacy test amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. May I inquire, Mr. President, as to whether or not the hearings which were held before the subcommittee have been printed? I do not expect the Senators to restrain themselves from proceeding with the bill to await any detailed study and consideration given before the subcommittee or the full committee as is the case with other legislation, but I know that the subcommittee has pursued the hearings very vigorously. I saw some of the statements presented to the subcommittee and found them to be very enlightening. I should like to inquire as to whether or not those hearings have been printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has no knowledge as to the printing of the hearings.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the hearings before the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] have been concluded and that they are in galley proof and will be available in the next day or so. I am quite certain that they will be on the desks of all Senators long before this debate is concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can assure the distinguished Senator that if the Senator from Georgia has anything to do with it, the hearings will be printed. When hearings have been held, I think the hearings should be made available before the discussion of the subject matter is commenced. The Senator, of course, knows that is the general practice; that we usually have printed copies of hearings available.

I do not think anyone would charge the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] with any dereliction as to processing the hearings. If such a charge has been made, I have not seen it.

Of course, we get into some rather weird situations when we meet proposed legislation of this type to come before the Senate. Judging from the issue which has been drawn in distinguished papers, such as the New York Times, which somewhat sets the tone for the so-called liberal press in this country, as set forth in an article I read on yesterday, it appears that this issue which the Senator says the Senate will consider, that it is claimed a group of sadistic southerners, inspired by the most sordid motives, desires to take advantage of our Negro citizens. I should like to read a part of the article from yesterday's New York Times:

> The Senate is scheduled to touch off a talking match Tuesday over the administration's major civil rights proposal for this session.
>
> The issue will be a bill to limit discriminatory use of literacy tests to keep Negroes from voting in the South. The measure would declare anyone with a sixth-grade education literate for voting purposes.
>
> Southerners have sworn to fight the literacy bill to the end. Their weapon will be talk. They have made clear that, if necessary, they will open a full-scale filibuster.

So far as I am advised, with the exception of an editorial in the Washington Post, questioning the constitutionality of the bill, that somehow slipped by, it has seldom been brought to the attention of those who depend upon our most prominent media of communication for the transmission of news that a very serious constitutional question is involved in the issue, and that the southerners, whose sole weapon this article charges will be talk, feel that we are armed with what was once a weapon more potent than the good blade Excalibur when borne by King Arthur—and that is the Constitution of the United States of America.

We are convinced that we are living up to our obligations under our oaths of office to oppose the measure with every means at our command because it offends express provisions of the Constitution. As I have said, we know that biennially we shall be confronted with proposed legislation of the sort we are now talking about. It is rather remarkable that it is always presented in an election year.

I try to read the hearings held in regard to such proposed legislation. I had noticed in such of the hearings as I have been able to see that practically every witness, including the Attorney General and the dean of the Harvard Law School, who presides over the Civil Rights Commission, stated to the committee that there were existing laws dealing with the abuses this bill claims to attempt to remedy.

I digress for a moment to say that I believe there are more laws, both civil and criminal, aimed at punishing the denial of the right of any citizen to vote than there are laws to protect any two or three other rights inherent in citizenship in the United States.

I see that it is contended there are 100 counties in which voting rights have been violated. I daresay there are almost 3,000 counties in which the crime of murder is committed. If voting rights are withheld and denied, it is a criminal offense. We know that the Department of Justice of the United States has a vast horde of lawyers at its disposal. My latest information is that there are almost 2,000 such lawyers in the employ of the Justice Department and are supported by the taxpayers. The taxpayers are also defraying their expenses to travel about the country. If the matter were pursued with zeal, it seems to me that those 2,000 lawyers should cover the 100 counties in which there are claimed violations, and the violators could be punished under existing law, without our undertaking, by simple statute, to repeal two clauses of the Constitution of the United States.

I am well aware that certain organizations that are very potent in the political life of our country are pressing the issue. I am well aware of the fact that certain political organizations have advised the present administration to get rid of the South, drive it out of the Democratic Party, and make their big play an effort to get the votes of those in the cities to which the people have now moved and live in vast numbers. There are great masses of seething humanity in the cities. I am aware that such advice has been given. I do not know why the Attorney General of the United States has seen fit to demand a new law when he well knows there are existing laws under which violations could be prosecuted. I do not know of any contention that has been made anywhere that Federal judges or Federal juries in the Southern States have failed up to the present time to do justice in any of the cases that have been brought in that area.

Never in the history of this country has the Federal judiciary been as subservient to the views of the Department of Justice as it is at the present time. In case after case we have seen the Supreme Court of the United States take the briefs filed by the Department of Justice—sometimes as amicus curiae; not even a party to the case—transpose the wording of the brief of the Department of Justice, and hand down what they solemnly, but somewhat erroneously, have designated as "their decision" or "their opinion."

With a few heroic exceptions the inferior Federal courts have vied with each other to see which could stretch the most recent decision of the Supreme Court the farthest.

When the Department has said that there are laws covering every incident of which complaint is made, it is difficult to understand why an issue should be brought here that would wipe out the right of States to prescribe qualifications and confuse that issue with alleged denial of qualified voters to register. It is certainly not necessary to twist or distort the Constitution in this fashion when there are existing laws which could be used to punish offenses which, we are told, are limited to 100 of the 3,000 counties in the United States.

I do not think anyone would claim that the Attorney General of the United States is too lazy to set in motion the vast Federal machinery of almost 2,000 lawyers, the FBI, and all the other powers he has. He is a man of action and energy. He has not hesitated to utilize such power in the prosecution of gangsters and labor leaders who, in his view, were somewhat out of line. He has not hesitated to use that great power in the past 2 weeks to require the most mighty men in industry and business to knuckle down to the demands of our central Government.

But in this peculiar category of cases in which there is demand for legislation by the groups to which I have referred, he is not willing to utilize existing law which he and other witnesses have stated cover such cases, but is demanding new and revolutionary legislation to repeal two parts of the Constitution, and, in addition, to invade the lawful domain, the powers, and the rights of the several States.

Mr. President, that is very strong evidence to me that the proposed legislation, to represent it in even the most kindly light, has a somewhat political flavor. I believe that the right to have a vote counted fairly when it has been cast is as important as the right to avoid other discriminatory practices in the exercise of State qualification laws with respect to the registration of voters.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at this time.

Mr. President, I have heard contention after contention with respect to frauds of one kind or another that take place in great cities in which machine bosses control politics. We do not hear anything on the floor of the Senate about that. No legislation is proposed that would say, "We are going to see that the bosses who control the huge cities of the United States do not exploit the great power that is theirs, financial and otherwise, to control the votes of thousands of citizens of those communities." These are accepted as minor matters. They are merely little peccadilloes, not worthy of any consideration whatever. They are not brought up here or presented as bills to the attention of the Senate. Of course we understand that the white people in the South must be made the whipping boy. In 1960 the Democratic Party with the help of the South, gained control of both branches of the Government. It may be that the ADA and similar groups were right when they said that the present-day Democratic Party would be much better off if the South were driven out of the party.

Mr. President, if we are driven out of the house of our fathers we will take with us in that last hour when we go, the ark of the covenant of the democracy of Jefferson and Jackson—the Constitution of the United States. We will still be opposing all efforts to twist, distort or destroy that priceless charter.

We understand, of course, that in certain areas the Constitution is considered to be completely outmoded. Some people have put the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution of the United States in about the same category, and consider the Constitution as just so much of a hindrance in the great march to progress they would lead if unhampered by the limitations on unbridled power found in that document. Being afraid that a direct junking of the Constitution would arouse our people, they have resorted to a whittling process in court and Congress to destroy it by degrees.

So if the ADA is successful in driving us out of the Democratic Party, we will at least carry with us the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian principles and will have a Democratic Party that will appeal to more than the temporary passions and prejudices of the great mass of people who live in the cities of the United States.

The odds against us are great enough, as we undertake to defend what we believe to be the principles of the Constitution of the United States, without also having our actions misrepresented constantly, day after day, hour after hour, as merely an effort to keep Negroes in the South from voting. In my own State of Georgia, the voting by Negroes is the least of our racial issues. I know that the Civil Rights Commission stated that there are two or three counties where they are not registered. If that is true and force or coercion has been the cause the action is in violation of already existing law. It is the duty of the Department of Justice to prosecute such cases, as they prosecute other categories of offenses. There are over 200,000 Negroes registered in the State of Georgia, and they vote as freely as the white people do. Their rights in that regard are the same as those of the white people and their bloc voting has been controlling in some of our elections.

My attitude toward the proposed legislation is based on the fact that I am completely convinced—and I am not referring in any invidious fashion to the two authors of the bill—that this is an attempt by force to bring the bill to the Senate in an effort to rewrite the Constitution without going through the amending process that is prescribed in that document.

Mr. President, there is no issue that can be properly solved in our system of government on the theory that the "end justifies the means," especially if it means wiping out portions of the Constitution of the United States by simple statute.

As I have said, some of us feel that we are under enough handicap by reason of a paucity of numbers, without being compelled to fight under the illusion, as the country is being told over and over, that we are undertaking to persecute and tread down upon our Negro citizens in the South.

I wish to say to some of our colleagues who still have some freedom of action in the Senate, and who still exercise independence of action, that they might well consider long and prayerfully the wisdom of making this proposed excursion with the "end justifies the means" people. We will undertake to see to it that they will have an opportunity to consider it long and, we hope, they will ponder it prayerfully.

It is inevitable that there will come a time when those who play politics with the Constitution of the United States will be hoist by their own petard. After the Constitution has been twisted and distorted, the time will come when constitutional guarantees will have been eliminated, and they will find the same weapons used against them. They might well consider that indeed.

Mr. President, in view of the statement that has been made by the distinguished majority leader, and also in view of the fact that I regard this matter to be of vital importance, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum before we proceed with the issue. I do suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion and yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to have the Senator's comment on a statement of the Attorney General. It is a very brief statement. He made the following statement on the bill before the committee:

> Our experience shows that existing laws are inadequate. The problem is deep rooted and of long standing. It demands a solution which cannot be provided by lengthy litigation on a piecemeal, county-by-county basis. Until there is further action by Congress, thousands of Negro citizens of this country will continue to be deprived of their right to vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I read that statement. Of course I read it. However, there are also other clauses and conclusions in the Attorney General's testimony. I do not have the text of it before me. He explicitly stated that there were laws in existence which deal with this subject. That is a plea in confession and avoidance. He is taking the easy road. He says he wants Congress to legislate rather than expect him to prosecute under existing laws. The Civil Rights Commission has found a condition to exist in a hundred counties. Of course I do not regard their statement as wholly objective. Assuming it is correct, why does not the Government institute a number of lawsuits, to be carried on by that Department? Certainly the Department is adequately staffed. It has multiplied the number of its lawyers in recent years. Of course, the Attorney General had to try in some way to justify the bill he had drawn. Either he or some other witness stated that if it were not for the findings of fact which were in it, the bill would not be constitutional. I do not quote verbatim, but certainly that was the inference he drew.

Since when can findings of fact in a statute be used as justification for the wiping out of two clauses of the Constitution of the United States? I care not how deplorable a situation may be; the Constitution of the United States cannot legally be repealed except through the process of constitutional amendment and letting the people of the country have an opportunity to pass on such a proposal, as is provided in the Constitution.

We know who are the forces behind the bill. Whatever may be said in the publicity, the opposition to this movement is being waged by honest men who firmly believe that they are fulfilling their oaths to defend the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). The question is, Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have a right to suggest the absence of a quorum, in order to have a quorum present before the question is determined. I have suggested the absence of a quorum. The Constitution of the United States may be outmoded; but one of the few provisions of the Constitution which is written into the rules of the Senate is that a quorum shall be present for the transaction of business. I demand the enforcement of that rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 45 Leg.]

Boggs
Cannon
Capehart
Case, S. Dak.
Curtis
Dirksen
Douglas
Dworshak
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Jordan
Keating
Mansfield
McClellan
Monroney
Moss
Pastore
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, but before I do so, I wish to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia for making the suggestion that a quorum was not present. I express the hope that from now on there will be much more than a quorum present.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 25, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Excerpts From Address by Senator Wiley at Sturgeon Bay, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 24, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the 1962 shipping season through the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system opened yesterday.

As things look now, the traffic—despite some opening problems—will exceed the volume of previous years.

Around the Great Lakes—and particularly in my home State of Wisconsin—trade, business, shipping, and other interests are looking forward to economic benefits from the expansion of trade for the season.

Recently, while in Sturgeon Bay, Wis., I was privileged to discuss some of the major aspects of the outlook. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

Friends, a bright economic outlook for Wisconsin and the Nation depends upon maximum utilization of all our economic potentials.

At this time, I want to discuss with you the greatest economic development—since the westward thrust of railroads: That is, the St. Lawrence Seaway.

As author of the seaway law, I am particularly gratified by the benefits annually accruing to Wisconsin and the whole Great Lakes region.

Following its completion in 1959, there has been a marked increased in: trade and commerce; more jobs; expansion of services and other enterprises; more demand and markets for our goods and services; greater activity for our water, rail and road transportation enterprises; greater concentration of national interest upon Wisconsin and the Great Lakes as a mecca for tourism and other economic rewards.

Unfortunately, however, the transportation policies of both government and nongovernment interests have not yet been adequately revised to take advantage of the seaway.

In my judgment this is absolutely essential if the economy is to benefit from the full potentials of the waterway.

THE 1962 SHIPPING SEASON FOR SEAWAY

Following the winter ice breakup, the 1962 shipping schedule is to open about mid-April. Unfortunately, the complex waterway system of lifting and lowering boats in transit to and from the Great Lakes to the ocean develops difficulties from time to time. Recently, for example, there was a reported impairment of the Eisenhower lock.

Recognizing the significance of an early opening for the shipping season, there is a real need for expeditious action by the Corps of Engineers to analyze the difficulty in making any necessary repairs and to get the locks in operation as early as possible.

To obtain maximum benefits—now and in the years ahead—additional action will be needed, including the following:

1. Further improving and developing ports and harbors—experiencing increased traffic as a result of the seaway.

2. Completing the deepening and improving of the Great Lakes connecting channels to allow deep-sea shipping to extend to all of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system.

3. Establishing a district office of the U.S. Department of Commerce in Milwaukee, to provide assistance to business and industry—in Wisconsin and elsewhere in the Midwest—in efforts to expand trade; incidentally, funds for the office have been included in the 1963 budget.

4. Encouraging free enterprise and governmental interests to revise trade patterns to take advantage of the seaway's less expensive routes to and from ports of the world.

5. Also, we need to guard against efforts by old foes of the seaway—who never seem to fade away.

GUARDING AGAINST OLD FOES

Despite the facts—Congress authorized U.S. construction on the seaway; the American people have a $140 million investment; and the operations of the waterway have demonstrated real economic benefits to the American people—there are still attempts to sabotage the seaway. The recent sneak attacks include:

1. A bill introduced in Congress to prohibit the dissemination of seaway information by the corporation. This effort is contradictory to the need, and for that matter, to general policy. Instead of prohibiting information, there is, in my judgment, a great requirement for more information on the operations and benefits of utilizing the seaway.

2. An effort by Eastern seaboard interests to change the formula for cost computation of seaway operations, and, as a result, threatening to drastically increase tolls and by so doing discourage traffic.

Interestingly, the sniping communities, in the past, have asked for and received millions—yes, sometimes billions—of dollars for development of navigation, port and harbor facilities, flood control, and other programs in their own yard without payback obligations such as required by the Wiley-sponsored seaway law.

Recognizing that selfish interests, however, will continue to snipe at the seaway—we need then to be extremely aware and watchful—to protect not only our interests in this new door of opportunity for trade in commerce, but also the investment in the seaway by the American taxpayer.

EXPANDING THE TOURIST INDUSTRY

Briefly now, let me turn to another challenging opportunity: that is the expansion of the tourist industry here in Door County and elsewhere in the State and in the Nation.

With untouched reservoirs of unique natural resources, however, I believe we can cut ourselves a still larger slice of this tourist pie.

Overall, tourism benefits not just a few, but many segments of the community's economy, including services, transportation, accommodations, entertainment, cleaning services, products such as sporting equipment, souvenirs, fashions, etc.; utilities (power, water, light). The result: greater economic growth.

To further expand tourism, then, we need also forward-looking efforts to improve our transportation system, especially the roads and trails leading to lakes, rivers, streams, and other recreational areas; expand and improve our already fine accommodations; and further develop boating, skiing, and other outdoor sports aiming to increase year round, as well as seasonal tourism.

The expansion of the tourist industry, however, cannot be accomplished automatically or magically. Rather it will require hard work; imaginative, creative salesmanship; further exhibiting our recreational resources, and more attractive lures for visitors. This means real salesmanship in selling Wisconsin as a top vacation spot for Badgers, as well as for national and international travelers.

Annually, I invite fellow Senators and their constituents to visit Wisconsin and enjoy a truly great vacation, in a land of great natural beauty, unlimited opportunity for indoor and outdoor recreation, and a friendly, wonderful people.

Particularly, you have wonderful opportunities for promoting tourism here in Door County.

CONCLUSION

For the future, then, we need a renewed effort to take maximum advantage of—and gain rewards from—utilization of our potentials in tourism, expanding trade in commerce, as well as best utilization of other human and natural resources in our national life.